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PREFATORY NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

The idea and aim contemplated in the Meyer series of commentaries, as also the general plan laid down for the work of translation, has been already explained by Dr. Dickson in his Preface to the Epistle to the Romans, and elsewhere. The merits, also, of Dr. Lünemann as a coadjutor of Meyer, have been sufficiently discussed by Dr. Gloag in connection with his translation of the Epistles to the Thessalonians. It only remains to add, that the aim in the translation of this commentary has been to give a faithful and intelligible rendering of Lünemann's words, and in general to produce a worthy companion volume to those of the series already issued. It is hoped that a comparison with the German original will show the work has not suffered in the process of transferring to our own soil.

It will be admitted that the commentary of Lünemann on the Hebrews—of which the first edition appeared in 1855, the second in 1861, the third in 1867, and the fourth, enlarged and greatly improved, in 1874—has claims of a very high order in a grammatical and lexicographical respect. He threads his way with a nice discrimination amidst a multitude of conflicting interpretations, and generally carries conviction with him when he finally gives his own view, or that in which he concurs. Even where, as in the case of some three or four controverted explanations, he may not have weighed the whole argument in favour of an opposite view, he has at least revealed to us the process by which his own conclusion is reached, thereby contributing to place the reader in a position for forming an independent judgment for himself.
The opinions of Dr. Lünemann, as regards the position occupied by the writer of our Epistle towards the Scriptures of the Old Testament, have been expressed with great candour. Unfortunately no one seems to have made the questions here raised a matter for any very prolonged and detailed examination since the time of John Owen. With the eventual answer which shall be given to these questions will stand or fall the claim of Barnabas to the authorship of the Epistle, and many other things besides.

It is, however, by his grammatico-critical and purely exegetical labours that Lünemann has rendered the greatest service to the cause of sacred literature. The judicious use of his commentary can hardly fail to lead to a more intimate acquaintance with the letter and spirit of this apostolic writing, well styled by the Helmstädt professor Walther a "beyond all measure profound epistle."

Of the very abundant exegetical literature pertaining to the Epistle to the Hebrews, our space admits of the mention of but a very few writings. Nor was it needful to give an account even of all that have been collated in preparing this translation. Most of the German commentaries published after the middle of the eighteenth century were entirely overshadowed by the appearing of the great work of Bleek, and those of subsequent writers. For many particulars concerning the authors specified in the following list, more especially of those who flourished about the time of the Reformation, I am indebted to the kindness of the Rev. James Kennedy, B.D., librarian of New College, Edinburgh. To the list of works enumerated might be fittingly added the suggestive translation of the New Testament made by Sebastian Castellio (1542–1550), mostly during the time of his retirement in Basle.
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THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. 1.—THE AUTHOR.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is the work of an unknown writer. The question, by whom it was composed, was already variously answered in ancient times, and has not to the present day been solved in a way which has found general assent. The supposition that the Apostle Paul was its author has obtained the widest currency and the most lasting acceptance. And in reality this supposition must most readily suggest itself, since an unmistakably Pauline spirit pervades the epistle, and single notices therein, such as the mention of Timothy as a man standing in very close connection with the author (xiii. 23), might appear as indications pointing to Paul. Nevertheless, there is found nothing which could have the force of a constraining proof in favour of this view, and, on the contrary, much which is in most manifest opposition thereto.¹ For—

(1) The testimonies of Christian antiquity in favour of Paul as the author of the epistle are neither so general nor so confident as we must expect, if the epistle had been from the beginning handed down as a work of the Apostle Paul. — Not unfavourable to the claim of Paul, but yet by no means decisive, are the judgments of the early Alexandrian Church. Pantaenus, president of the school of catechets in Alexandria about the middle of the second century, the first from whom

an express statement as to the name of the author has come down to us, certainly assigned the epistle to the Apostle Paul. But yet it is to be observed that even he felt called to set aside an objection, which seemed to lie against the justice of this view, namely: that, contrary to the custom of Paul, the author has not, even in an address prefixed to the epistle, mentioned himself by name; whether it was that this difficulty first arose in the mind of Pantaenus himself, or that, in opposition to others who had raised it, he wished to show the invalid nature thereof. (Comp. the notice of Clemens Alexandrinus on Pantaenus, in Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. vi. 14: "Ἡ δὲ, ὡς ὁ μακάριος ἔλεγε πρεσβύτερος, ἐπει ὁ κύριος, ἀπόστολος ὑπὸ τοῦ παντοκράτορος, ἀπέσταλε πρὸς Ἑβραίους, διὰ μετριώτητα ὁ Παῦλος, ὡς ἄν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀπεσταλμένος, οὐκ ἐγγράψει εἰς αὐτὸν Ἑβραίων ἀπόστολον διὰ τὸν κύριον τιμὴν διὰ τὸ τὸ ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ τούς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστέλλειν, ἐθνὸν κήρυκα ὑστα καὶ ἀπόστολον.) — Clemens Alexandrinus, too, the disciple of Pantaenus (end of the second and beginning of the third century), makes repeated mention of the epistle as a work of the Apostle Paul (Strom. ii. p. 420, iv. p. 514 sq., ed. Sylburg, Colon. 1688, al.). But yet he does not venture to ascribe it in its present form immediately to Paul. Not only is for him, too, the same objection, which his teacher already had undertaken to set aside, still of sufficient weight for him to attempt its removal in a new, though, it is true, equally unsatisfactory manner; but also the un-Pauline character of the language in the epistle does not escape his glance. Rather to Luke than to Paul does the garb of the letter seem to him to point. On this account he assumes that a Hebrew (Aramaic) original writing of Paul forms the substratum of the epistle, but that our present epistle is only a version or adaptation of that original writing by Luke, designed for Hellenes. (Comp. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. vi. 14: Καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους δὲ ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου μὲν εἶναι φησι, γεγράφθαι δὲ Ἑβραίως Ἑβραίῳ φωνῇ, Δουκᾶν δὲ φιλοτίμως αὐτὴν μεθερμηνεύσαντα ἐκδόουσι τοῖς Ἑλληστὶς ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνα εὑρίσκεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ταύτης τε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν πράξεων μὴ προγεγράφθαι δὲ τὸ Παύλου ἀπόστολος, εἰκότως. Ἑβραίως
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ἐπὶ τούτῳ οὖ ηάρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἀνδρεῖς ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδόκασαν· τίς δὲ ὁ γράφας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθές θεος οἴδειν ἢ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθίσασα ἱστορία ὑπὸ τιων μὲν λεγόντων, οτὶ Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος 'Ρωμαιῶν ἐγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, ὑπὸ τιων δὲ, οτὶ Δουκᾶς ὁ γράφας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις.— Only subsequently to the time of Origen, accordingly, was the epistle universally regarded within the Alexandrian Church, as within the Egyptian Church in general, as a writing which proceeded immediately from the Apostle Paul. Declarations thereof are appealed to, as simply the words of Paul, by the Alexandrian bishops, Dionysius, about the middle of the third century (in Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. vi. 41); Alexander, about 312 (in Theodoret, H. E. i. 3, Opp. ed. Schulze, tom. iii. p. 736, and in Socrat. H. E. i. 6, ed. Vales, Paris 1686, p. 11); Athanasius (+373), in his thirty-ninth epistola festalis, and elsewhere; Didymus, the president of the Alexandrian school of catechetes (+395), the Egyptian monks, Macarius the elder, and Marcus Ascetes (c. 400), and others.

In the ancient Syrian Church the epistle, it is true, was held very early in ecclesiastical repute. For it is already

1 That ὁ γράφας denotes the actual author, and not, as Olshausen ("De auctore ep. ad Hebr.," in his Opusc. Theol., Berol. 1834, p. 100), Stenglein (Historische Zeugnisse der vier ersten Jahrhunderte über den Verf. des Br. an die Hebr., Bamb. 1885, p. 35), and Delitzsch ("Über Verf. und Leser des Hebräerbr.," in Rudelsbach u. Guérinckes Zeitscr. f. die Luth. Theol. 1849, p. 259), assert, with the assent of Davidson (Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, vol. I., Lond. 1868, p. 228 f.), the mere "scriba" or "penman," is shown even by the analogy of the closing words: Διότι ὁ γράφας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις. Wrongly does Delitzsch (in his Kommentar, p. xvii.) object that Origen, indeed, concedes to the apostle a part [in its composition], and that Luke also, in the Gospel and the Acts, was working up a material not of his own invention, but one ready to his hand. For the part which Origen assigns to Paul is not an active, but a passive one; that Paul exerted an immediate influence on the writing of the Epistle to the Hebrews, or was directly occupied with the same—of this Origen says nothing; the dependence upon Paul is limited in his estimation to the fact that the epistle was composed by a disciple of Paul, and in the spirit of Paul. By the consideration, however, that Luke in his two works was using a material "ready to his hand," his authorship in reference to these works is not annulled; for the notion of authorship is not destroyed by the mode in which it is exercised. Besides, if Origen had wished to denote the particular way in which the writings of Luke arose, he would have put, not ὁ γράφας, but ὁ ὑποτάξαμαι, or something similar.
received into the Peshito, belonging to the end of the second century. But that it was so soon as this held to be a work of Paul, does not follow from this reception. On the contrary, the fact that the Epistle to the Hebrews has been placed in the Peshito not already after the letters of Paul addressed to churches, but only after those of his letters addressed to private persons, might rather be interpreted as a sign that this letter, only on account of its similar character, had been attached, as it were, by way of appendix to the Pauline Epistles, while not assigned to Paul himself. Yet the later church of North-Eastern Syria seems to have ascribed this writing to the Apostle Paul. For while Jacob, bishop of Nisibis (c. 325), cites declarations of the Epistle to the Hebrews only in general as utterances of an apostle (Galland. Bibl. Patr. v. pp. xvi. lxii. al.), and this indefinite mode of citation is also the prevalent one with Jacob's disciple Ephraem Syrus († 378); yet the latter, at any rate, seems not to have doubted the composition by Paul, since (Opp. Graec. tom. ii., Rom. 1743, fol. p. 203) he joins together the passages Rom. ii. 16, Eph. v. 15, Heb. x. 31, by the common introductory formula: Περὶ ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας θοᾶ καὶ Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος, and then abruptly separates from further citations by the words: θοᾶ δὲ καὶ ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος.—In like manner in Western (Grecian) Syria, after the middle of the third century, the epistle was probably assigned to the Apostle Paul; since, in the letter issued by the Antiochian Synod (c. 264) to Paul of Samosata, Heb. xi. 26 and sentences out of the two Epistles to the Corinthians are connected together as sayings of the same apostle (comp. Mansi, Collect. Concil. t. i. p. 1038).

Elsewhere, too, in the Eastern Church, the opinion that Paul was the author became in subsequent times more and more general. Nevertheless, doubts as yet by no means ceased to be heard. Thus Eusebius of Caesarea (in the first half of the fourth century) often, indeed, quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews as the work of Paul, and without doubt reckons it, since he expressly accepts fourteen Pauline Epistles (Hist. Eccles. iii. 3), in the chief passage on the New Testament canon (Hist. Eccles. iii. 25),—as a constituent part of the
epistles of Paul, which are mentioned only in general,—to belong to the Homologumena. But yet he regards the epistle only as a version from a Hebrew original of Paul (Hist. Eccles. iii. 38), and can tell of Greeks who, in reliance upon the adverse judgment of the Roman Church, denied the Pauline origin of the epistle in any sense (Hist. Eccles. iii. 3). Nay, in another place (Hist. Eccles. vi. 13), himself even reckons the epistle among the ἀντιλεγόμεναι γραφαί;¹ inasmuch as he places it in one line with the Wisdom of Solomon, that of Jesus Sirach, and the epistles of Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, and Jude! On the other hand, the epistle is acknowledged as directly the work of Paul, in the sixtieth canon of the Council at Laodicea after the middle of the fourth century, by Titus of Bostra († c. 371), by Basil the Great († 379), and his brother Gregory of Nyssa; by Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem († 386); by Gregory of Nazianzus († 389), in the Jambi ad Seleucum, where, nevertheless, the remark has been inserted: τιμεῖς δὲ φασὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἐβραίους νόθον; by Epiphanius († 402), Chrysostom († 407), Theodore of Mopsuestia († c. 428), and others. Yet Theodoret in his Prooemium to the epistle (comp. also Epiphanius, Haer. 69. 37) is still engaged in polemics against those of Arian sentiments, who rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews as νόθος, denying its Pauline authorship.

While thus the testimonies of the East in general are favourable indeed to a Pauline origin of the epistle, an immediate composition thereof by Paul, however, was for the most part asserted only in later times, whereas in the earlier period more generally only a mediate authorship was maintained; the West, on the other hand, during the first centuries, does not acknowledge an authorship of Paul in any sense.—A voucher for this statement is Tertullian, belonging to the North African Church, at the end of the second century and the beginning of the third. Only on a single occasion does

¹ According to Delitzsch, indeed (Komment. p. xvii. f.), this supposition rests upon a misunderstanding of the words of Eusebius. But Eusebius' words are surely clear enough. They are as follows: μήκροτερῷ ἐν αὐτῶι καὶ ταῖς ἀντὶ ἄντιλεγόμεναι γραφαῖς μαρτυρίαις, τίς τι λεγόμενα Ἰακοβιτικός σφίς καὶ τῆς Ἴησου τῶν Σφόρων καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἐβραίους ἱεροτολείη, τίς τι Βαρβάρα καὶ Κλημέντος καὶ Ἰουδα.
he make express mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in order to cite from it the words vi. 4–8, and it is here evidently his endeavour to rate as highly as possible the authority of the writing cited by him. Of a composition thereof by the Apostle Paul, however, he knows nothing; instead of Paul he names Barnabas as its author, and that not in the form of a conjecture, but simply and without qualification, in such wise that he manifestly proceeds upon a supposition universally current in the churches of his native land. (Comp. de Pudicitia, c. 20: Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum. Exstat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, a Deo satis auctoritati viri, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore: “aut ego solus et Barnabas non habemus hoc operandi potestatem?” Et utique receptior apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum. . . .)

Hoc qui ab apostolis didicit et cum apostolis docuit, nunquam moecho et fornicatoris secundam poenitentiam promissam ab apostolis norat.) — Also, in the time immediately following, the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot in Proconsular Africa have been regarded as a writing of the Apostle Paul. This is proved on the authority of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage († 258), who, with the single exception of the short Epistle to Philemon, makes citations from all the letters of Paul, and yet nowhere quotes passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews, but asserts, on the other hand, that Paul wrote only to seven churches (comp. Testim. adv. Jud. i. 20; De Exhortat. Martyrii, c. 11).

But as the early Church of North Africa, so also the early Roman Church knew nothing of an appertaining of the Epistle to the Hebrews to the Pauline collection of letters. This is the more noteworthy, inasmuch as within the Roman Church the earliest trace is met with of the existence of the Epistle to the Hebrews. For a series of characteristic expressions of the latter is taken up by Clemens Romanus (towards the end of the first century) in his Epistle to the

1 Thus we have to read, with Oehler (Tertull. Opp. tom. i., Lips. 1853, p. 839), in place of adeo satis auctoritatis viri.
Corinthians (comp. specially cap. 36 with Heb. vi. 4, i. 3, 4, 5, 7, 13; cap. 17 with Heb. xi. 37; and in general, Lardner, Credibility of the Gospel History, Part ii. vol. i., Lond. 1748, p. 62 ff.; Böhme, p. lxxv. sq.). These derived expressions, however, are not introduced as citations, but are blended with his own discourse. They prove, therefore, only that Clement was acquainted with the Epistle to the Hebrews, and highly prized it, but afford no information on the question as to whom he regarded as the author. That, however, Clement believed the Apostle Paul to be the author is rendered extremely improbable by the position which the Roman Church of the subsequent period assumed towards this epistle. In the fragment on the canon of the Roman Church, discovered by Muratori, belonging to the close of the second century, it is stated that Paul wrote to seven churches; upon which follows an enumeration of our present thirteen Pauline Epistles. Besides these two, other letters are then named, which have been forged as coming from Paul; but of the Epistle to the Hebrews not even mention is made. It cannot thus in the Roman Church of that time have been invested with any canonical authority, much less have been looked upon as a writing of the Apostle Paul. — In like manner Caius, presbyter at Rome at the end of the second century and beginning of the third, recognised, in express opposition to the περὶ τὸ συντάγματος καυνᾶς γραφᾶς προπέταμε τε καὶ τόλμα, only thirteen epistles as the work of the Apostle Paul, to the exclusion of the Epistle to the Hebrews (comp. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. vi. 20). — Even as late as about the middle of the third century the Epistle to the Hebrews was not in the Roman Church esteemed to be a work of Paul, nor indeed regarded as a canonical writing. This is evident from the fact that Novatian, in his dissertations, De Trinitate and De Cibis Judaicis (in Gallandi, Biblioth. Patr. t. iii. p. 287 sqq.), although these abound in Biblical citations, and although their subject might naturally suggest the employment of the Epistle to the Hebrews, nowhere so much as makes mention of the same; an omission which, supposing its recognition as a canonical writing, and one proceeding from Paul, would be the more inexplicable,
inasmuch as Novatian could hardly have urged any passage of Scripture in favour of his severer view with regard to the receiving again into the communion of the church of those who had lapsed, with greater appearance of justification than this very text of Heb. vi. 4–6. — So likewise Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. vi. 20) expressly observes with respect to his age (first half of the fourth century): καὶ εἰς δεύτερο παρὰ Παύλου τισίν οὐ νομιζέται τοῦ ἀποστόλου πτυχάνειν. —

Of Irenaeus, moreover, the representative of the Church of Southern Gaul at the end of the second century and beginning of the third, Stephanus Gobarus relates, in Photius, Bibl. Cod. 232 (ed. Hoeschel, Rothomagi 1653, fol. p. 903), that he, equally as Hippolytus, denied that the Epistle to the Hebrews was composed by Paul. In harmony with this statement is the fact that Irenaeus, in his great work Advers. Haereses, often as he had occasion to cite this epistle, and frequently as he otherwise adduces proof passages from the epistles of Paul, yet nowhere appeals to the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the lost writing Βιβλίον διαλέξεων διαφόρων, he did indeed, according to a notice in Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. v. 26), cite some passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews (just as he did from the Wisdom of Solomon); but that Irenaeus regarded the Apostle Paul as its author is not said by Eusebius either.

Only after the middle of the fourth century did the opinion that Paul was its author gradually find acceptance in the West—a change of views which, without doubt, is to be traced to the preponderating influence of the Greek Church upon the Latin. As a work of Paul it is cited by Hilary, bishop of Poitiers († 368); Lucifer of Cagliari († 371); his contemporary, Fabius Marius Victorinus; Philastrius, bishop of Brescia († c. 387); Ambrose, bishop of Milan († 397); Rufinus of Aquileia († c. 411), Jerome († 420), Augustine († 430), and others. That change of views comes out with special distinctness in the African synods at the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth. In the thirty-sixth canon of the synod at Hippo (393), as in the forty-seventh canon of the third synod at Carthage (397), in the determination of those books of the New Testament to be held as canonical, the
number of the epistles of Paul is declared to be altogether thirteen; and then is added: by the same, the Epistle to the Hebrews (Pauli apostoli epistolae tredecim; ejusdem ad Hebraeos una). This separate mention shows that at this time they did not yet venture to concede to the Epistle to the Hebrews a perfectly equal rank with that of the thirteen universally recognised letters of Paul. Presently after, however, in the twenty-ninth canon of the fifth Carthaginian synod (419), it is said, on the occasion of a similar enumeration: epistolarum Pauli apostoli numero quatuordecim. Yet, spite of this revolution of the judgments in general, doubts as to the canonicity and Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews were not entirely reduced to silence, even in this late period. Philastrius still remarks that the same was only rarely read in church among the Latins (Haeres. 89); and in Haeres. 88 mentions, among the books which, according to the appointment of the apostles and their successors, were alone to be publicly read in the assemblies, only thirteen Pauline Epistles. The commentary of Hilary (Ambrosiaster), moreover, covers indeed the whole thirteen Pauline Epistles, but not the Epistle to the Hebrews; and even Rufinus adds, on a mention of the epistle (Invectiva in Hieronymum 1, Opp. Hieronymi, ed. Martianay, t. v. p. 279), the words: si quis tamen eam receperit. With like wavering does Jerome also often express himself (e.g. on Tit. i. 5, Opp. ed. Vallars, 2, t. vii. P. 1, p. 695: Si quis vult recipere eam epistolam, quae sub nomine Pauli ad Hebraeos scripta est.—Ibid. on ii. 2, p. 714: Relege ad Hebraeos epistolam Pauli, sive cujuscunque alterius eam esse putas), and observes expressly, e.g. Epist. 125 ad Evagrium (ed. Marianay, t. ii. p. 571): Epistola ad Hebraeos, quam omnes Graeci recipiunt et nonnulli Latinorum.—Comment. on Matt. xxvi. 8, 9 (ed. Vallars, t. vii. P. 1, p. 212): Paulus, in epistola sua, quae scribitur ad Hebraeos, licet de ea multi Latinorum dubitent.—Catalog. c. 59 (ed. Marianay, t. iv. p. 117): sed et apud Romanos usque Hodie quasi Pauli apostoli non habetur; and similarly elsewhere. In like manner Augustine also observes (De Pecatorum meritis et remissione, 1. 27, Opp. ed. Bened. t. x., Antw. 1700, p. 18) that the Epistle to the Hebrews is nonnullis incerta, although he himself is decided in his judg-
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ment by the auctoritas ecclesiarum orientalium, among whom this writing also is held in canonical repute.

But as we are not able to appeal, in support of the hypothesis that Paul is the author of this epistle, to the decided and unanimous tradition of antiquity, so also—

(2) The hints afforded by the epistle itself, with regard to the person and historic situation of its author, do not lead us to think of the Apostle Paul. The passage ii. 3 is absolutely decisive against Paul. For here the author reckons himself among the number of those who have received their knowledge of the gospel not immediately from the Lord Himself, but only through the medium of the first disciples and ear-witnesses. He claims thus no equal rank with the twelve apostles, but takes his place at the standpoint of Luke (Luke i. 2). That is, however, the direct opposite of the manner in which Paul expresses himself, when he sets forth, whether polemically or without any secondary aim, how he obtained his acquaintance with the gospel: he denies expressly that he had acquired his knowledge of the gospel from the teaching of men; it was communicated to him immediately, by revelation, from the Lord Himself; and on that account he stands upon a complete equality of apostolic dignity with the twelve original apostles (Gal. i. 1, 11, 12, 15, 16, ii. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 1, xi. 23; Eph. iii. 2, 3).—Indications of a Pauline origin, it has been thought, may be discovered in x. 34, xiii. 18 f., 23, 24. But altogether without reason. The first passage would favour a reference to Paul only in the case that the lectio recepta tois desmobis mou were correct. It is, however, decidedly false; instead thereof we have to read tois desmobous. The second passage likewise affords no sufficient ground for thinking of Paul. For the statement that the author was a prisoner is not at all to be found in it; since the concluding words of xiii. 23 plainly show that the author, at the time of inditing his epistle, was in a position of entire freedom.¹ Further, from the third

¹ That the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was in a state of captivity, and was begging of the church for intercession with God in his behalf, Tobler (“Studien nach dem Codex Sinaiticus über den Hebräerbrief,” in Hilgenfeld’s Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1864, H. 4, p. 357 f.) has nevertheless felt bound to deduce from the form of the text in the Codex Sinaiticus: ἥματος ἵκερ ἀναγράφοντος Ἰχάμην ἐν πάσιν καλῶς ἰδεῖναι ἄναγράφοντος.
passage we may certainly conclude that the author was on terms of friendship with Timothy, the well-known assistant of Paul. But this fact could be regarded as a sign indicative of Paul himself only if Timothy were characterized as a person who occupied a subordinate position towards the author, which is not the case. As the words read, the passage is appropriate to any disciple of Paul as the writer. To this the consideration must be added, that in the passage in question the deliverance of Timothy out of his captivity is announced: the readers must thus have had a knowledge of the imprisonment itself; it could not therefore have been either insignificant or of short duration. Of an imprisonment of Timothy, however, so long as he was the assistant of Paul, there is not found the slightest trace, either in the epistles of the latter or in the Acts of the Apostles.¹ Much more probable is it, therefore, that this notice refers to an imprisonment suffered by Timothy only after the death of the Apostle Paul. The fourth passage,

According to Tobler, καλη. έα is to be derived from καλουη, and indeed is to be regarded as an earlier contraction for καλεδῆμα, in which the quantity of the crasis has remained resting on the former vowel (!); so that καλεδῆμα, in this connection, would correspond to the Latin in jus vocari, citari, Acts iv. 18, xxiv. 2, and the sense would result: "Pray for us, for we are summoned before the tribunal, must plead in our own defence; that we may have a good conscience, a cheerful spirit, to give an account; for in all things, and in this case too, we wish to walk rightly." But in order to perceive the erroneousness of such a mode of argument, a glance at the codex itself may suffice. This presents Heb. xiii. 18 in the following arrangement:

Evidently καλη. is nothing else than the καλη. following in the next line, inasmuch as a stroke at the end of a line is very often placed in the Cod. Sin. instead of an end letter; so that by a mere error of transcribing, of which there are very many in the Cod. Sin., of καλη, which belonged only to the third line, was wrongly placed in the second, and here pushed out the three first syllables of the καλεδῆμα, which the copyist had before him in the text given him for copying. That the copyist really had καλεδῆμα—for which, moreover, the fourth hand has put καλεδῆμεν by way of correction—before him for copying is clearly shown, as well by the έα, as also by the γαρ of the third line. Comp. against Tobler also Volkmar, in Hilgenfeld's Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1865, H. 1, p. 108 ff.

¹ That Ebrard (p. 417 ff.) is very much inclined to bring out of the construction of Phil. ii. 19, 23 an imprisonment of Timothy at Rome, at the time when Paul was held captive there, deserves to be mentioned only as a curiosity.
finally, is supposed to show that the epistle was written from Rome, and on that account probably by Paul. But from \( \text{o} \iota \deltavota \omicron \taurhorho \omicron \alpha \omicron \lambda \zeta \varsigma \) the author could send salutations only if he were somewhere outside of Italy. If he had himself been present in Italy, with the Italian Christians from whom the salutations come, at the time of the composition of the epistle, he must have indicated them as \( \text{o} \iota \epsilon 
omicron \taurhorho \omicron \alpha \omicron \lambda \zeta \varsigma \) (comp. 1 Pet. v. 13). At most, we could only assume that the author had meant by \( \text{o} \iota \deltavota \omicron \taurhorho \omicron \alpha \omicron \lambda \zeta \varsigma \) Roman Christians out of the province, in opposition to \( \text{o} \iota \epsilon 
omicron \rhooum \nu \omicron \eta \), the Christians of the Roman capital. Then he would certainly have been dwelling in Rome. But how would it be explicable, in that case, that he should neglect to convey a salutation from these Christians of the capital? While, on the other hand, if the author was writing outside of Italy, the isolated expression of greeting from \( \text{o} \iota \deltavota \omicron \taurhorho \omicron \alpha \omicron \lambda \zeta \varsigma \) is simply explained on the supposition, that in the place of his dwelling for the time being, a Christian church from which he could likewise send salutations did not yet at all exist.

Against Paul as the author argue—

(3) The style and manner of presentation characteristic of the epistle. Origen has already observed (\textit{vid. supra}, p. 3), that every one who is a judge of the diversities of language must admit that this writing is \( \sigma
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The harmonious symmetry of the sentences is preserved uninterrupted, even where parentheses of consider-
able extent are inserted (comp. vii. 20–22); nay, parenthesis is enclosed within parenthesis, and yet the writer steadily returns to complete the construction begun (comp. xii. 8–24). The greatest care is bestowed throughout upon euphony and musical cadence (comp. e.g. i. 1–4, vii. 1–3), upon the effective grouping of words (comp. e.g. vii. 4), and even the use of particles and participles betrays throughout an acquaintance with the art of composition and a learned rhetoric. While the Apostle Paul is everywhere concerned only about the matter itself which he is presenting, never troubles himself about a fair form of its clothing in language, and with him even the most affecting outbursts of natural eloquence are never anything but the immediate product of the moment,—in the Epistle to the Hebrews the endeavour after euphony and adornment of style extends even to the details of expression and the turns of the discourse. Where, for instance, the plain and simple μισθός, of which Paul regularly makes use, might have been placed without any difference of sense, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews chooses just as regularly the fuller sounding μισθαπόδωσις (ii. 2, x. 35, xi. 26), and in accordance therewith makes use of ὄρκῳμοισία (vii. 20, 21, 28), αἵματεκχυσία (ix. 22), and other sonorous compounds. Whilst, further, e.g., the sitting of Christ at the right hand of God is indicated by Paul simply by ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος (Col. iii. 1; comp. also Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20), in the Epistle to the Hebrews the majestic formulas: ἐκάθεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσίας ἐν ὑψηλοῖς (i. 3), ἐκάθεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσίας ἐν τοῖς ὑπάρχοις (viii. 1), ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκαθίκεθε (xii. 2), serve to express the same thought. Further, that which Paul predicates of Christ, in describing Him simply as εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Cor. iv. 4), or as εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀδρατοῦ (Col. i. 15), or as ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων (Phil. ii. 6), is expressed by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in more carefully chosen language by means of the characteristic ἐν ἀπαίγουσα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτηρίᾳ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ.1—As, however, the author of the Epistle

1 Many further differences of language in details, in part connected with the fact that in the Epistle to the Hebrews the language is preponderantly rhetorical, with Paul preponderantly dialectic, see in Schulz, Der Brief an die Hebr.,
to the Hebrews surpasses the Apostle Paul in respect of this external side of the diction, and of all writers of the New Testament comes nearest to a classical perfection,—in such wise that only some portions in Luke bear comparison therewith,—yet, on the other hand, he falls considerably behind the Apostle Paul in respect of the inner character of his mode of presentation. There is wanting to his argumentation that dialectic acuteness (comp. e.g. xii. 25), to his sequence of thought that severe and firm connectedness (comp. e.g. iv. 14), to his expression that precision and definiteness (comp. e.g. vii. 27), which are characteristic of the Apostle Paul.

(4) Deviations from Paul are shown, further, in the doctrinal subject-matter of the epistle. Certainly in the main, and regarded as a whole, its fundamental doctrinal conception is the same as in the Pauline Epistles, as also in details it affords manifold notes of accord with the doctrinal presentation of the latter. Nevertheless, this dogmatic harmony is not without peculiar, individual, independent colouring in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Apostle Paul regards as the most important fact in the history of salvation, the resurrection of Christ; by this did the work of salvation first receive the divine sanction and attestation; by it was Christ


1 Comparisons of points of coincidence, which, however, stand in need of critical sifting, see in Fr. Spanhemius, *De auctore epistola ad Hebraeos* (Opp. t. ii., Ingd. Bat. 1708, fol. p. 171 sqq.); Cramer, p. lixi. sqq., lxxxi. sqq.; Petr. Hofstede de Groot, *Disputatio, qua epistola ad Hebraeos cum Paulinis epistolis comparatur*, Traj. ad Rhen. 1826, 8.

2 Yet on account of this independence to regard the epistle, with Riethm (Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbrieves, Ludwig. 1858, 1859, II. p. 861 ff.), after the example of R. Köstlin (Theol. Jahrb. of Baur and Zeller, 1854, H. 4, p. 469 ff.), also Ritschel (Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche, 2 Aufl., Bonn 1857, p. 159 ff.) and Weiss (Studien u. Kritiken, 1859, H. 1, p. 142 ff.), as not the work of a writer of the Pauline school, but to discover in it a later stage of development of the primitive apostolic Judeo-Christianity, is a proceeding not warranted by any sufficient ground. There is the less reason for such judgment, inasmuch as a very close personal connection of the author of the epistle with Paul and his disciples and fellow-labourers is conceded; in the doctrinal conception of the epistle not only no contradiction of Paul is discovered, but, on the contrary, a higher agreement with him on all essential points; and it is, moreover, taken for granted that the epistle arose through the incitement and under the influence of Paulinism.
first by a divine deed proved to be the Son of God. Of the
death of Christ, therefore, Paul speaks almost always in con-
nection with the resurrection. This importance, however, the
resurrection of Christ has not for the author of the Epistle to
the Hebrews. Only incidentally, in the invocation xiii. 20,
is it mentioned by him; in the body of the epistle, on the
contrary, stress is laid exclusively upon the death of Christ
and the heavenly high-priesthood, of which office the Saviour
Christ, exalted to the right hand of God, is the occupant and
fulfiller. In addition to this, the notion of πίστις is different
with our author from what it is with Paul. Whereas with
Paul the πίστις involves an opposition to the νόμος and the
ἐργα νόμου, and has its object in particular in Christ, the
author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand,
understands thereby in general the believing, humble con-
fiding in God's grace and promises, in opposition to the seeing
of their realization,—a phase of the conception which but
rarely (comp. 2 Cor. v. 7) is met with in Paul. It is, more-
ever, a remarkable fact that no reference is made to the par-
ticipation of the Gentiles in the Messianic kingdom,—although
the author must have entertained the same views as Paul on
this point, inasmuch as he regards Judaism only as an imper-
fect preparatory stage to Christianity, and demands a coming
forth from the former, in order to become partakers of the
blessings of the latter,—whence it seems to follow that the
author found his life's task not so much in the conversion of
the Gentiles, as in the conversion of his Jewish kinsmen.
Peculiar to this epistle is, further, the prevailing fondness for
a typico-symbolic mode of contemplation,¹ which is met with
indeed in Paul's writings (e.g. Gal. iv. 21 ff.; 1 Cor. x. 1 ff.),
but yet only in isolated instances; and other peculiarities
besides. Comp. Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. I. p. 221 ff.,
p. 241 ff.

(5) Decisive against Paul are, further, the citations from
the Old Testament. While Paul not merely makes use of the

¹ Comp. de Wette, "Über die symbolisch-typische Lehrrt des Briefes an die
Hebr." (in the Theologische Zeitschrift of Schleiermacher, de Wette, and Lücke,
Heft 3, Berlin 1822, p. 1 ff.).
LXX., but is also at home in the original Hebrew text, and often independently translates this for himself, for the most part also cites with more or less freedom and from memory; the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews follows the LXX. exclusively, and generally with great exactness. He even bases an argument upon its inaccurate renderings (comp. specially x. 5–7), in such wise that he can have possessed no knowledge of the Hebrew, or at any rate but a very unsatisfactory knowledge,—a fact which even in early times was not overlooked by the opponents of the Pauline origin of the epistle (comp. Jerome on Isa. vi. 9, Opp. ed. Martianay, t. iii. p. 64: Pauli quoque idcirco ad Hebraeos epistolae contradicitur, quod ad Hebraeos scribens utatur testimonii quae in Hebrais voluminibus non habentur). The references in detail see in Bleek, Abtheil. 1, p. 338–369.

(6) The author describes, ix. 1–5, the arrangement of the Jewish sanctuary, and presupposes (ver. 6) that this still continues in its original form in the Jewish temple of his time. In so doing, however, he falls into divers historic errors (comp. the exposition), such as would have been impossible with Paul, who had lived a considerable time in Jerusalem.

(7) If Paul were the author, he would not have deviated from his constant practice of mentioning his name in an address prefixed to the epistle. For a tenable ground for such deviation is not to be discovered. Comp. Bleek, Abth. 1, p. 295 ff.

(8) Regarded in general, it is very improbable that Paul should have written an epistle to purely Judaeo-Christian congregations, to whom the epistle is, however, addressed (see sec. 2). For he would thereby have been untrue to his fundamental principle of not intruding into another man's sphere of labour (Rom. xv. 20; Gal. ii. 9).

The arguments enumerated are in their totality of such constraining force that we can feel no surprise if, upon every revival of the critico-scientific spirit in the church, doubts, too, with regard to the Pauline origin of the epistle should always be excited afresh, after they had long seemed to have died out. At the time of the Reformation, Cajetan and Erasmus within the Catholic Church declared themselves against the claim of Paul to the authorship of the epistle. The former was on
that account assailed by Ambrosius Catharinus; the latter was compelled to defend himself against the Sorbonne, and the Council of Trent suppressed all further expression of a freer judgment, in decreeing the epistle to be the fourteenth epistle of Paul.1 Yet more decidedly was the Pauline authorship of the epistle denied by the Reformers. Luther separated the Epistle to the Hebrews from the letters of Paul in his editions of the New Testament, and placed it, with the Epistles of James and Jude and the Apocalypse, after “the right certain main books of the New Testament,” since those four books “of old time (vöreciten) had another estimation put upon them.” “First of all,” he says (see Walch, Thl. 14, p. 146 f), “that this Epistle to the Hebrews is not St. Paul’s or any other apostle’s, is shown thereby, that it stands in chap. ii. 3 thus: this doctrine has come down to us through those who themselves have heard it of the Lord. By this it is made clear that he speaks of the apostles as a disciple to whom such doctrine has come from the apostles, perhaps long after. For St. Paul, Gal. i. 1, powerfully attests that he has his gospel from no man, nor by man, but from God Himself. Besides this, it has a hard knot, in that it in chap. vi. and x. straightway denies and refuses repentance to sinners after baptism, and in xii. 17 says Esau sought repentance and yet did not find it. The which, as it sounds, seemeth to be against all gospels and epistles of St. Paul. And although one may make a gloss thereon, yet the words after all sound so clear, that I know not whether it will suffice. To me it seems that this is an epistle put together out of several parts, and not in regular order treating of one and the same thing. However this may be, it certainly is a wondrously fine epistle, which speaks in a masterly and solid way of the priesthood of Christ out of the Scriptures, and, moreover, finely and fully expounds the Old Testament. This is clear, that it comes from an excellent learned man, who was a disciple of the apostles, had learned much of them, and was firmly experienced in the faith and exercised in the Scripture. And though he, indeed, lays not the foundation of the faith, as he himself

1 Fourth sitting of the 8th April 1546: Testamenti Novi . . . quatuordecim epistolae Pauli apostoli, ad Romanos . . . ad Philmonem, ad Hebræos.
testifieth, chap. vi. 1, that which is the office of the apostles,—yet he builds thereon fine gold, silver, precious stones, as St. Paul says, 1 Cor. iii. 12. On that account we shall not be troubled if perchance a little wood, straw, or hay be therewith mingled, but receive such fine teaching with all honour, without being able to equal it in all respects to the apostolic epistles. Who wrote it, however, is unknown, and will indeed remain unknown for a while yet; but that is no matter. The doctrine shall content us, since this is so firmly based on and in the Scripture, and likewise shows a right fine grasp and measure for reading and handling the word of Scripture." As Luther, so also Melanchthon, the Magdeburg Centurators, Lucas Osiander, Balduin, Hunnius, and others, denied the Pauline origin of the epistle; and of the Reformed Church, Calvin, Beza, Jos. Scaliger, Dan. Heinsius, cum multis alis.\(^1\) Later, however, even in the Protestant Church the supposition that Paul was the author became gradually again more general, and was after the beginning of the seventeenth century the ecclesiastically accepted opinion, from which only the Arminians and Socinians ventured to depart. A freer research was first set going again by Semler and Michaelis; it has almost universally decided unfavourably to Paul. Yet the theory of a directly Pauline origin has still found defenders in Storr, Hug, G. W. Meyer (in Ammon and Bertholdt's *Krit. Journal der neuesten theol. Literat.*, Bd. ii. St. 3, p. 225 ff.), Heinrichs (but comp. the preface to the second edition), Hofstede de Groot (*Disputatio, qua ep. ad Hebr. cum Paulinis epp. comparatur*, Traj. ad Rhen. 1826), Moses Stuart, Gelpke (*Vindiciae originis Paulinae ad Hebraeos epistolae, nova ratione\(^2\))

\(^1\) Yet, while the Lutheran Church preserved in its symbols a freer position towards the canon, the Reformed Church in the *Confessio Belgica* (cap. iv. p. 171 sq., ed. Augusti. Comp. also the *Helvética* of 1566, cap. xi. p. 25 sq., xvi. p. 43, and the *Bohemica* of 1585, art. iv. p. 281, vi. p. 286, xx. p. 323) adopted the decision that Paul wrote fourteen epistles.

\(^2\) The *nova ratio* consists in the circumstantial demonstration that the Epistle to the Hebrews betrays an affinity to the writings of Seneca (!), mainly to his little book *de Providentia*, which reaches so deeply that it cannot have arisen by accident. It is thus in all probability due to a personal intercourse of the writer of the epistle with Seneca,—a fact which is applicable only in the case of Paul, who, according to a trustworthy early tradition, was brought into communication with Seneca.
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tentatac, Lugduni Batav. 1832, 8.), Paulus, Stein, Bloomfield (Greek Testament, 9th ed. vol. ii., Lond. 1855, p. 572 ff.), Biesenthal (Epistola Pauli ad Hebraeos cum rabbinico Commentario, Berol. 1857; Ztschr. f. Luth. Theol. u. Kirche, 1866, H. 4, p. 616), J. Chr. K. v. Hofmann (Der Schriftbeweis, II. 2, 2 Aufl., Nördling. 1860, p. 105, 378; Die heil. Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht, Thl. 5, Nördl. 1873, p. 520 ff.), Robbins (in Park and Taylor's Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. xviii., Andover 1861, July, p. 469 ff.), W. Volck (in the Dorpat Ztschr. für Theol. u. Kirche, Jahrg. 1869, Bd. ii. H. 4, p. 504 ff.), J. B. M'Caul (The Epistle to the Hebrews in a Paraphrastic Commentary, with Illustrations from Philo, the Targums, the Mishna and Gemara, the later Rabbinical Writers, etc., Lond. 1871, p. 4, 329), Joh. Wichelhaus (Akadem. Vorles. über das N. T., herausgeg. v. A. Zahn, Halle 1875, p. 3 ff.), and Jatho (Blicke in die Bedeutung des mosaischen Cultus, Hildesh. 1876, p. 1 ff.); while Woerner (Der Brief St. Pauli an die Hebräer., Ludwigsb. 1876, p. 253 ff.) expresses himself with hesitation, and Guericke (Einleitung in das N. T. p. 441), Delitzsch (in Rudelbach and Guericke's Ztschr. f. d. Luth. Theol. 1849, p. 266, and in the commentary), Ebrard, and some others seek at least to trace back the epistle indirectly to Paul, inasmuch as they suppose it to have been written by his direction and under his oversight. But that this last modification also is an untenable and unjustified one, is evident. For, of a fact of this kind there must of necessity be some indication found in the epistle itself; whereas this writing everywhere gives the impression of an independent work of an independent Christian teacher. So likewise, inasmuch as then, too, Paul would surely be the only representative of the subject-matter of the epistle, the meaning of such expressions as ii. 3 and others would become more absolutely inexplicable.

If the Epistle to the Hebrews can thus be neither directly nor indirectly a work of the Apostle Paul, the question further arises, whether the true author is still to be discovered with any degree of probability. The decision of some has been in favour of Barnabas, others of Luke, others of Clemens Romanus, others again of Silvanus, and others, finally, of Apollos.
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Barnabas has been looked upon as the author by J. E. Chr. Schmidt (Histor.-Krit. Einleit. in's N. T., Abth. 1, p. 289 ff.), Twesten (Dogmatik, Bd. 1, 4 Aufl. p. 95), Thiersch (De Epistola ad Hebr. commentatio historica, Marb. 1848, p. 1'), Wieseler, Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters, Götting. 1848, p. 504 ff.; Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief, namentlich seinen Verfasser u. seine Leser, 1 Hälflte [Schriften der Universität zu Kiel aus dem Jahre, 1860, 4, Bd. VII.; also printed separately, Kiel 1861, 8]), Adalb. Maier (Comment. üb. d. Br. an d. Hebr., Freib. im Br. 1861, p. 13 ff.), Ritschl (Theol. Stud. u. Kritt. 1866, H. 1, p. 89), and Renan (L'Antechrist, Paris 1873, p. xvii. f. 210 f.).

According to Wieseler, of all the claims to the authorship, that of Barnabas is best vouched for by the tradition of antiquity. But in reality there remains only the single testimony (certainly a very definite one) of Tertullian (vide supra, p. 7) in favour of Barnabas. For that it was also held in the majority of churches of the East to be a work of Barnabas, cannot be inferred, with Wieseler (comp. already Ullmann, p. 391), from the words of Jerome (Epist. 129, ad Dardan., Opp. ed. Martianay, t. ii. p. 608): Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam, quae inscribitur ad Hebraeos, non solum ab ecclesiis orientis sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Graeci sermonis scriptoribus quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi; licet plerique eam vel Barnabae vel Clementis arbitrentur, et nihil interesse, cujus sit, quem ecclesiastici viri sit et quotidie ecclesiae lectione celebretur. To supply a

1 Yet Thiersch—and similarly Meier—assigns also a part in the composition of the epistle to the Apostle Paul. Thiersch says, l.c.: "Barnabam igitur, qui et ipse gentium fuit apostolus, et Paulum communi consilio et conjuncta opera literas illas elaborasse existimo. Ita quidem ut in maxima parte Barnabas, vir ille dono prophetiae et fervore apud sanctos insignis agnoscatur, epilogum vero Paulus sua manu adjecerit atque ita, concedente Barnaba, suum fecerit epistolam." Comp. also Thiersch, Die Kirche im apostol. Zeitalter, Frankf. and Erlangen 1852, p. 197 ff.

2 Joh. Cameron is also named as a representative of this view. Bleek (Abth. 1, p. 261, note 364) refers to Cameron's Quaestio ii. in Ep. ad Hebr., and Ullmann (p. 389, note) to his Myrothecium Evangelicum. But in the latter work, at any rate, there is found no statement of this kind. In this Cameron usually speaks of the author as Apostle, but certainly distinguishes him from the Apostle Paul. Comp. e.g. on Heb. vii. 18, ed. Salmur., 1677, 4, p. 270.
nostrorum to the plerique, with Tholuck and Delitzsch, out of the preceding nostris, is indeed impossible; plerique can receive its more precise definition only either from the last member of the sentence beginning with ab, or else from the two such members. But it is in an equal degree unjustifiable, in connection with the latter supposition, to assign vel Barnabae, in distinct separation, to the ecclesiae orientis, and vel Clementis to the Graeci sermonis scriptores, and then to help out the verdict thus gained—to wit, that the majority in the East traced the epistle indeed to Paul, but derived its present Greek form from Barnabas—with the conjecture “that the original tradition of those Eastern churches pointed to the sole authorship of Barnabas.” Rather is Jerome’s manner of expressing himself in the fore-cited passage in more than one respect inaccurate; inasmuch as he is, moreover, acquainted with Luke, as a third person who might be mentioned in the same category with Barnabas and Clement, and elsewhere is able to adduce only a single early authority in favour of the opinion that Barnabas composed the epistle, and this authority belonging not to the Eastern church, but to that of the West. The passage finds its corrective in the words of the Catalogus Scriptorum, c. 5 (Opp. ed. Martianay, t. iv. p. 103 sq.): Epistola autem, quae fertur ad Hebraeos, non ejus creditur propter stilis sermonisque distantiam, sed vel Barnabae juxta Tertullianum, vel Lucae evangelistae juxta quosdam, vel Clementis Romanae ecclesiae episcopi, quem ajunt ipsi adjunctum sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornasse sermone,—according to which Jerome was acquainted only with Tertullian as the representative of the view that Barnabas wrote the epistle. If, further, Philastrius, Haer. 89, observes: Sunt alii quoque, qui epistolam Pauli ad Hebraeos non adserunt esse ipsius, sed dicunt aut Barnabae esse apostoli, aut Clementis de urbe Roma episcopi, it is likewise entirely unprovable that the aut Barnabae did not refer merely to Tertullian. In like manner it does not, of course, at all follow, from the fact that the Epistle to the Hebrews is placed after the Pastoral Epistles in the Peshito, that the early Syrian Church regarded the epistle as the work of none other than Barnabas. It is, in the last place, a mere assertion
when we are told that in the *Versus scripturarum sanctarum*—an ancient stichometric catalogue of the sacred writings of the O. and N. T., which is preserved to us, inserted in the Codex Claromontanus between the Epistle to Philemon and that to the Hebrews (comp. *Cod. Claromontanus*, ed. Tischendorf, Lips. 1852, 4, p. 468 sq.)—the Epistle to the Hebrews bears the name of an *Epistola Barnabae*. (So first Credner in the *Theol. Jahrb. 1857*, p. 307 ff.; *Gesch. des Neuest. Kanon.*, Berl. 1860, p. 175 ff.) That catalogue presents only the words: *Barnabae epist. ver. DCCCL*; it simply mentions, therefore, the Epistle of Barnabas, and adds how many verses or lines (stichoi) it contains. The supposition is thus only natural, that the same writing is meant which elsewhere in the early church bears the name of the Epistle of Barnabas, and in the Codex Sinaiticus is bound up with the canonical books of the New Testament. Nay, this supposition is raised entirely beyond doubt by the fact that, in addition to the "Barnabae epist.,” and on the same level therewith, the *Pastor*, the *Actus Pauli*, and the *Revelatio Petri*, thus writings which in later time were just as little reckoned among the canonical books (the "sanctae scripturae" of the catalogue) as the Epistle of Barnabas, are likewise enumerated and stichometrically defined in this catalogue. Moreover, the Epistle to the Hebrews, if this had been thought of in connection with the "Barnabae epist.,” must at least have been denoted by the reading *Barnabae ad Hebraeos epist.*; as also Tertullian (comp. p. 7) did not deem the addition *ad Hebraeos*, for the designation of our Epistle to the Hebrews, redundant. It is true the assertion has been made, that the number of lines mentioned points to the Epistle to the Hebrews. But we should be permitted to make a deduction from this number of lines, only in case the number of lines for the several books of the New Testament were a fixed one in the mss. It is, however, an altogether wavering and changing one. Thus the accounts of the lines for the Epistle to the Hebrews (comp. Tischendorf, N. T. ed. 7, P. ii. p. 596) vary between the numbers 703 and 830. Not one of these numbers reaches the sum of 850 mentioned in the catalogue. If, therefore, we are to make any deduction at
all from these data, we must rather suppose that the number 850 is much more favourable to the epistle otherwise known as the Epistle of Barnabas than to our Epistle to the Hebrews, since the former exceeds the latter in extent by about a third. (In the Codex Sinaiticus the Epistle of Barnabas occupies 53 1/2 columns, and the Epistle to the Hebrews 40 1/2.) It is asserted, further, that the Barnabae epist. of the catalogue must be regarded as the Epistle to the Hebrews, because it has obtained a place in the enumeration before the Revelation of John and the Acts of the Apostles, and so by the intervention of the two latter writings is separated from the Pastor, the Actus Pauli, and the Revelatio Petri. But this order of enumeration does not warrant such conclusion, any more than a special mark of design is to be discovered in the unusual order of mentioning the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon only after the Pastoral Epistles, which is observed in the same catalogue. The consideration that, if our view be correct, the Epistle to the Hebrews has been entirely passed over without mention in the catalogue, can present no difficulty. We need not even suppose that the mention thereof has been overlooked in consequence of a mere blunder in copying. This is indeed possible, since the Epistles to the Thessalonians and that to the Philippians have for a like reason been passed over unmentioned, and otherwise the negligence of the copyist displays itself in the catalogue, in the fact that the two Epistles of Peter, e.g., bear therein the appellations ad Petrum I. and ad Petrum II. The non-mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews is rather to be explained simply from the fact, well known from other sources, that this epistle was not invested with any canonical authority in the early church of the West, from which this catalogue comes down to us. — Favourable to the claim of Barnabas might appear the historic incident of his receiving this his name (υἱὸς παρακλήσεως), according to Acts iv. 36, on account of his gifts of prophetic or spiritual utterance, with which the eloquent language of the Epistle to the Hebrews might be shown to accord. Nor would there be anything directly opposed to such view in the circumstance that in Acts xiii. 9 ff., 16 ff., xiv. 9 ff., not Barnabas but Paul
is described as the chief speaker, and that consequently the former is in Acts xiv. 12 compared to Zeus; the latter, on the other hand, to Hermes. For although the Epistle to the Hebrews is superior in point of diction to the Pauline Epistles, a greater facility of graceful writing does not of necessity argue a greater facility of oral discourse. In favour of Barnabas, might, further, his birth in Cyprus be supposed to plead, and consequently—since Cyprus was in various ways connected with Alexandria—the Alexandrian type of thought which appears in the epistle would not be inappropriate to him. But absolutely decisive against Barnabas is the fact that, according to Acts iv. 36, 37, he was a Levite, and must have long time dwelt in Jerusalem, since he even possessed land there. He must therefore have been more accurately informed with regard to the inner arrangements of the temple in Jerusalem at that time than was the case with the author of our epistle.¹ For the temple at Jerusalem is meant (see sec. 2), and not that at Leontopolis in Egypt, as Wieseler supposes.

Luke has been frequently regarded even in early times as at least the translator or the penman of the epistle; and a share in the work of its composition has been ascribed to him by Hug (in the later editions of his Einleit. in's N. T.), and more recently Delitzsch (in Rudelb. and Guericke's Zeitschr. für die Luth. Theol. 1849, H. 2, p. 272 ff., and in the Kommentar zum Hebr.-Br. p. 704) and Ebrard, as also J. V. Döllinger (Christenthum u. Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung, Regensb. 1860, p. 86), inasmuch as the first-named attributes to him the linguistic garb of the epistle, and the others assign to him the elaboration of the thoughts furnished to him by the Apostle Paul. As the independent composer, on the other hand, Luke has been regarded by Grotius and S. Crell (in the pseudonymous writing, Artemonii initium ev. Joannis ex antiquitate ecclesiastica restitutum, P. 1, 1726, 8, p. 98); and Delitzsch also (comp. his commentary on the Ep. p. 707)

¹ If the so-called Epistle of Barnabas were genuine, the diversity of character between that and the Epistle to the Hebrews would likewise form a decisive counter-argument against the claim of Barnabas. But the genuineness of that epistle is, to say the least, doubtful.
now holds this view to be at least possible. To the Pauline Christian Luke, certainly the self-characterizing of Heb. ii. 3 is appropriate (comp. Luke i. 2), as well as the purer Greek and the more skilful formation of periods. There are also to be discovered certain peculiarities in the phraseology—to which Grotius already calls attention—which are met with only in the writings of Luke and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Nevertheless, these points of contact are only of a subordinate nature, whilst side by side with them a thorough diversity of style and presentation is to be observed. In Luke, where he writes independently, there is displayed a mere smoothness in the flow of the language; in the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, a self-conscious majesty of rhetoric reveals itself. Moreover, there is nothing in Luke to correspond to the Alexandrian-Jewish spirit of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The proof which Delitzsch has recently sought to establish in his commentary—namely, that the most decided similarity as regards the choice of words and the construction of the sentences connects the Epistle to the Hebrews with the writings of Luke, nay, that even in characteristic points of doctrine a striking coincidence is to be observed between the respective writings—was therefore predestined to failure. The evidence for his assertion has been scattered by Delitzsch through his whole commentary; and it almost seems as though this, for the reader and critic highly inconvenient mode of proceeding, had been chosen under the unconscious feeling that the evidence was not in a position to admit of synoptical classification, without in such case at once being laid bare in all its weakness. For, so soon as we critically sift that which has been uncritically piled together by Delitzsch; so soon as we separate therefrom that which is not exclusively peculiar to Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews; so soon as we also put out of the account that which Luke has only taken up out of the sources employed by him, and cease to lay any weight upon isolated expressions and turns of discourse which were the common property either of the Greek language in general, or of the later Greek in particular, and are only accidentally present in Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews,—there is nothing whatever left of an actual
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affinity, such as must of necessity admit of being traced out between works of the same author. That, namely, on which Delitzsch founds his argument is the following:—

The particle τε, i. 3, and frequently, is but rarely found in the N. T. save in the writings of Paul, and more especially of Luke. — The middle ποιεῖσθαι, i. 3, is a favourite one with Paul, and particularly so with Luke. It is here similarly used, as, e.g., in δεήσεις ποιεῖσθαι, Luke v. 33; Phil. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1; κοπητὸν ποιεῖσθαι, Acts viii. 2; ἀναβολὴν μηδὲ-μίαν ποιεῖσθαι, Acts xxv. 17. — παρά, after the comparative, i. 4, is also not foreign to Luke (Luke iii. 13). — δέ, i. 13, in the third place, as Luke xv. 17; Acts xxvii. 14; Gal. iii. 23. — προσέχειν τινί, ii. 1, like προσέχειν τοῖς λαλομένοις, Acts xvi. 14. — τὰ ἀκούοντες, ii. 1, is the word of salvation, which in the Epistle to the Hebrews is nowhere called εὐαγγέλιον, as also Luke in his writings (with the exception of Acts xv. 7, xx. 24) loves to express the idea of εὐαγγέλιον by various forms of periphrasis. — συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν, ii. 4, is formed after the manner of συνεπιτίθεσθαι, Acts xxv. 9. — ποικύλαι δυνάμεις, ii. 4, has its analogon in Acts ii. 22 (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 9). — διαμαρτύρεσθαι, ii. 6, is specially frequent in Luke, e.g. Acts xx. 23; Gal. iii. 11.— The construction ἐν γὰρ τῷ κτ.λ., ii. 8, corresponds entirely to that of Acts xi. 15. — ἀρχηγὸς, ii. 10, xii. 2, is the name which Jesus bears also in Acts iii. 15; ii. 31. — καταργηέν, ii. 14, a favourite word with Paul, is found besides in the N. T. only in Luke xiii. 7. — δῆπον, ii. 16, occurs, it is true, only here in the N. T.; but yet δῆ, which also is rare in the N. T., occurs with the greatest comparative frequency in Luke ii. 7. The colouring of the expression is thoroughly Lucan. The δῆν, which is met with six times in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is foreign to the letters of Paul, but occurs Acts xxvi. 19. Ὅμοιωθηναῖ is employed exactly as Acts xiv. 11 in the cry of the men of Lystra. Ἰλασκεβαί has in Luke xviii. 13 its single parallel in the N. T. Κατὰ πάντα is, Acts xvii. 22, certainly to no less extent Lucan than Pauline. Τὰ πρὸς θεόν occurs, indeed, elsewhere only v. 1 and Rom. xv. 17; but at Luke xiv. 32, xix. 42, Acts xxviii. 10 (comp. also Luke xiv. 28, Acts xxiii. 30, according to the textus receptus), τὰ
πρὸς is likewise found as a current form of expression.—
δύνασθαι, ii. 18, here, as with few exceptions throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews, construed with the infinitive aorist, just as in Luke i. 20, 22, iii. 8, v. 12, and often.—
πέπονθεν πειρασθείς, ii. 18, has again its parallels in Luke; inasmuch as, according to Acts xx. 19, sufferings, as such, are πειρασμοί; and according to Luke xxii. 28, the sufferings of the Lord in particular were so.—μέτοχοι, iii. 1, vi. 4, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Luke v. 7.—κατανοεῖν, iii. 1, x. 24, is a favourite word with Luke, e.g. xii. 24, 27, and often; comp. especially Acts xi. 6.—The γάρ, iii. 16, accentuating the question, is equally Lucan, Acts xix. 35, viii. 31, as Pauline, 1 Cor. xi. 22.—ἀλλ' οὐ, iii. 16, is placed as in Luke xvii. 7 f.; comp. ἀλλὰ τί, Matt. xi. 7—9.—ἐπαγγελία, in the signification of assurance, promise, iv. 1, is of most frequent occurrence with Luke and Paul; and the combination with the bare infinitive, instead of τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν, which recurs xi. 15, is like that of Acts xiv. 5.—εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, iv. 2, used passively of the persons to whom glad tidings are proclaimed, is common to the Epistle to the Hebrews with Luke vii. 22, xvi. 16.—καίτοι, iv. 3, is a particle, attested also Acts xiv. 17, xvii. 27, as well as καίτοιγε and καίγε.—ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, iv. 3, ix. 26, is not met with in the LXX., but is found in Luke xi. 50, and often elsewhere in the N. T.—With ζῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, iv. 12, we may compare, in addition to 1 Pet. i. 23, also Acts vii. 38 (λόγοι ζώντα); and τομώτερος ύπέρ, iv. 12, is construed as Luke xvi. 8.—ἐνθυμήσεις, iv. 12, occurs elsewhere only Acts xvii. 29; Matt. ix. 4, xii. 25.—κρατεῖν, iv. 14, vi. 18, with the genitive, as Luke viii. 54.—Of ἀσθένεια, iv. 15, mention is made in Luke v. 15 and other places; comp. Matt. viii. 17.—περικείσθαι τι, v. 2, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts xxviii. 20.—The construction ἐδόξασεν γεννηθῆναι, v. 5, is similar to that of Luke ii. 1; Acts xi. 25, xv. 10; Col. iv. 6.—καθώς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ, v. 6, is similar to the reading of Acts xiii. 35.—μετὰ κραυγῆς ἱσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων, v. 7, reproduces the most salient features with which precisely Luke (xxii. 39—46) describes the agony of prayer in the garden, as these now force themselves upon the
mind. — In the use of εὐλάβεια, v. 7, and εὐλαβεῖσθαι, the Epistle to the Hebrews coincides in a characteristic way with the usage of Luke (apart from Acts xxiii. 10). — ἀπό, v. 7, is employed exactly as in Luke xix. 3, xxiv. 41; Acts xii. 14, xx. 9, xxii. 11. — On αἰτίος, v. 9, we have to compare ἀρχηγός, ii. 10; Acts iii. 15, v. 31. — φέρεσθαι, vi. 1, expresses the idea of external impulse and forward pressing urgency, as Acts ii. 2. — ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, iv. 1, as ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου or τοῦ θεοῦ = τὸ εἰσαγγέλιον, most frequently in the writings of Luke, who hardly ever uses εἰσαγγέλιον. — The construction μετάνοια ἀπό, vi. 1, is Lucan, Acts viii. 22; moreover, πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν or τὸν κυρίον, which is not entirely foreign to Paul's writings, Rom. iv. 5, 24, is found with Luke, as well as πιστεύειν εἰς, at least more ordinarily than with any other N. T. writer, Acts ix. 35, xi. 17, xvi. 31, xxii. 19; and as to the thing intended, Acts xx. 21 is similar to Heb. vi. 1, inasmuch as in the former place τὴν εἰς θεόν μετάνοιαν is employed with as little apparent significance, and as really deep significance, as in the latter place πιστεος ἐπὶ θεόν. — With reference to the delineation of the sin against the Holy Ghost, chap. vi. and x., the Epistle to the Hebrews has its immediate parallel in Luke xii. 8—10. — ἐπὶ with a genitive, after a verb of motion, vi. 7, as Acts x. 11, and frequently. — εὐθετος, vi. 7, is in the N. T. a word of Luke's, xiv. 35, ix. 62. — In vi. 9 also we hear the language of Luke. For as ἡ ἐκμενη, Luke xiii. 33, Acts xx. 15, xxi. 26, xiii. 44, denotes the day immediately following, so too ἐκάμενα σωτηρίας, that which stands in immediate connection with the salvation, which has reference to the salvation. — The classic ἐκεῖνος with a following infinitive, vi. 13, is Lucan, Luke vii. 42, xii. 4; Acts iv. 14, xxv. 26. Considering the Lucan form of the expression, it is doubly noteworthy that allusion is made precisely in Luke's writings, as well Luke i. 73 as Acts vii. 17, to the solemn confirmation of the promise by an oath, Gen. xxii. 16 (comp. xxiv. 7). — καὶ οὕτος, vi. 15, is used as Acts vii. 8, xxvii. 44, xxviii. 14, and also frequently with Paul. — The μιν solitarium, vi. 16, belongs to the number of the not rare anacoluths, as well of Luke, e.g. Acts i. 1, as of Paul, e.g. Rom.
x. 13 f. — **σουλή**, vi. 17, of God's gracious will, is an expression current with Luke, vii. 30, Acts ii. 23, and frequently. With Paul, only Eph. i. 11. — On **πράγματα**, vi. 18, we have to compare **πράγματα**, Luke i. 1. — **καταφεύγειν**, vi. 18, is found also Acts xiv. 6. — **πατριάρχης** is a Hellenistic word, and in the N. T. Lucan; it occurs elsewhere only Acts ii. 29, vii. 8, 9. — **ἱερατεία**, vii. 5, the epistle has in common with Luke i. 9 (comp. i. 8: **ἱερατεία**). — **τούτος εὐστίν, κ.τ.λ.,** vii. 5, is a Hebraistic mode of expression, as Acts ii. 30. — **μαρτυρεῖσθαι**, vii. 8, xi. 2, is a favourite expression as well in the Acts, vi. 3, x. 22, xvi. 2, xxii. 12, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is found, besides, only once with Paul and once with John. — **ἀνιστασθαι**, vii. 11, *to be set up by God upon the theatre of history*, as Acts iii. 22, vii. 37; and according to the ordinary interpretation, also Acts xiii. 32. — **προσέχειν τίνι**, vii. 13, as 1 Tim. iv. 13, comp. Acts xx. 28. — **εἰς**, vii. 14, as Acts ii. 25; Eph. v. 32. — **εἰς τὸ παντελῆς**, vii. 25, is found again in the N. T. only Luke xiii. 11. — The **ἀνάγκην ἔχειν** conjoined with the infinitive, vii. 27, is Lucan, Luke xiv. 18, xxiii. 17; while Luke in the Gospel and Acts employs, instead of **ἀναφέρειν** in the sense of offering, the expression **προσφέρειν**, likewise usual in our epistle. — **ἀληθινός**, viii. 2, the epistle has in common with Luke xvi. 11 and the three Johannine writings, and besides these only 1 Thess. i. 9. — **λατρεῖν**, viii. 5, is specially frequent in the writings of Luke. — The passive use of **χρηματίζεσθαι**, viii. 5, is found also in Acts x. 22, Luke ii. 26, and twice in Matt. — To the passage of Scripture cited, viii. 5, Stephen refers in Acts vii. 44. This is again to be noted as a Lucan parallel. — **ἀμεμπτος**, viii. 7, passively, as Luke i. 6, and everywhere in the N. T. — The mode of expression, **ζητεῖν τότον**, viii. 7 (comp. τότον εὑρίσκειν, xii. 17), is similar to that of **τότον λαμβάνειν**, Acts xxv. 16; τότον διδώναι, Rom. xii. 19. — **ἐπικείσθαι**, ix. 10, with the subsidiary idea of pressing and burdening, as Acts xv. 10, 28. — With **μίχρι καὶροῦ διορθώσεως**, ix. 10, we have to compare Acts xxiv. 3, where the text wavers between διορθώματον and καθορθώματον. — **παραγίγνεσθαι**, ix. 11, is the usual word for historic self-presentation and presence, Luke xii. 51; Matt.
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iii. 1; 1 Macc. iv. 46.—οὐ χειροποιήτου, ix. 11, 24, is a word of Luke’s in like connection, Acts vii. 48, xvii. 24.—To τὸ ἅλοιμα, ix. 12, xiii. 12, a parallel is presented in Acts xx. 28.—αὐτρωσις, ix. 12, is, along with ἀπολύτρωσις, a word of Luke’s, Luke i. 68, ii. 38; comp. ἀπολύτρωσις, Luke xxi. 28 (in the usage of Paul the only word); λυτρωθαι, Luke xxiv. 21; λυτρωτῆς, Acts vii. 35.—διά, ix. 14, of the inner principle, just as Acts i. 2, xi. 28, xxi. 4.—The mode of expression, λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, ix. 15, xi. 13, in the sense of the taking to oneself the very blessing promised, the epistle has in common with Acts ii. 33.—As to ix. 15, the most apt N. T. linguistic parallel is Acts xiii. 38 f., so also in expression and thought everything is Lucan. To be compared is Acts iii. 25; Luke xxii. 29 f.—On τοῦτο τὸ ἅλοιμα, ix. 20, which, as seems probable, consciously or involuntarily refers to the words of the Supper, we have to observe that in these the ἔστιν is wanting only with Luke, xxii. 20; although they read similarly in Matt. and Mark.—σχεδόν, ix. 22, occurs only twice besides in the N. T., and precisely with Luke, Acts xiii. 44, xix. 26. On each occasion it stands in immediate connection with πᾶς.—αὖθεσις, sc. ἀμαρτίαν, ix. 22, commonly met with in Luke’s writings.—To αἰματεκχυσία, ix. 22, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυσώμενον, Luke xxii. 20 (comp. xi. 50), forms verbally and really the most natural parallel.—ἐμφανίζειν, ix. 24, xi. 14, is a word common to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and especially Luke, who employs it as well in the signification “make known,” Acts xiii. 22, as “present oneself, appear,” Acts xxiv. 1 (= ἐμφανίζειν τινὶ ἑαυτὸν = ἐμφανίζεσθαι).—ἀποκειόμαι, ix. 27, is in the N. T. common to Luke xix. 20; with Paul, Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 8.—ἐκ δευτέρου, ix. 28, as Acts x. 15, xi. 9, and elsewhere.—The construction of παύεσθαι with the participle, x. 2, for the rest the usual one, is the same as Acts v. 42, οὐκ ἐπαύωντο διδάσκοντες.—ἀναρτεῖν, x. 9, is a favourite word with Luke.—περιελεῖν, x. 11, as Acts xxvii. 20, περιήγητο πᾶσα ἐλπίς.—παροξυσμός, x. 24, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts xv. 39, there in a good sense, and here in a bad sense.—τιμωρία, x. 29, is found only here in the N. T.; to be compared, however, is Acts xxii. 5, xxvi. 11.—τὰ ὑπάρχοντα,
x. 34, with the genitive, as *e.g. Luke xi. 21 (with the dative, *c.g. Luke viii. 3). — προσδέχεσθαι, x. 34, of willing reception, as *e.g. Luke xv. 2. — ὑπαρξίας, x. 34, is a word of Luke's, Acts ii. 45. — εἶναι τινὸς, x. 39, with personal subject and genitive of the property, as Luke ix. 55 (*Rec.) ; Acts ix. 2. — The infinitive with τοῦ, xi. 5, a not unclassic form of expression, is in the N. T. specially peculiar to Luke. — ἐκζητεῖν, xi. 6, as Acts xv. 17; Rom. iii. 11. — The construction of τοῦ with the indicative, xi. 8, is as Acts xx. 18, x. 18, xv. 36, and frequently elsewhere. — παράκλησιν, xi. 9, is equivalent to παροικεῖν ἥδεν, of which the style of Luke presents not a few examples. Apart from the most similar passage, Luke xxivv. 18, παροικεῖς εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, where this reading is too ill attested, we have to compare Acts vii. 4, εἰς ἥν ὑμεῖς νῦν κατοικεῖτε; xii. 19, εἰς τὴν Καισαρείαν διετριβέν; Luke xi. 7; Acts viii. 40, and xviii. 21, xix. 22, *Rec. — τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς, xi. 9, is written instead of τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαγγελίας, as elsewhere only Luke ii. 8. — Corresponding to the καὶ αὐτῇ Σάββα, xi. 11, there is found also in Luke καὶ αὐτὸς in like position with proper names, Luke xx. 42, καὶ αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ; xxivv. 15, καὶ αὐτὸς Ἰσσών; comp. Acts viii. 13, Σίμων καὶ αὐτὸς. — For the combination δύναμις εἰς, xi. 11, only Luke v. 17, δύναμις κυρίου ἢν εἰς τὸ ἰάσθαι αὐτούς. — The διὸ καὶ, xi. 12, xiii. 12, bringing cause and effect, means and end, reason and consequence into very close reciprocal relation, is equally Lucan (Luke i. 35; Acts x. 29, xiii. 35) as Pauline. — ἀποθνῄσκειν, xi. 21, to lie a-dying, as Luke viii. 42. — ἀρπαίον, xi. 23, comp. ἀρπαίον τῷ θεῷ, Acts vii. 20. — ἑπί, xi. 30, of the space of time, as Luke iv. 25; Acts xiii. 31, xix. 10. — The mode of expression ἔργα ἤξεσθαι δικαιοσύνην, xi. 33, recurs also Acts x. 35 (comp. Jas. i. 20). — The phrase στόμα μαχαλρας, xi. 34, is Lucan, Luke xxi. 24. — To the ἵνα κρείττουσι ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν, xi. 35, a parallel is presented by τυγχάνειν ἀναστάσεως, Luke xx. 35. — The heightening ἐτι δεί, xi. 36, is met with also Luke xiv. 26; Acts ii. 26. — ὑπερούμενοι, xi. 37, is used absolutely, as in Luke xv. 14; Phil. iv. 12, al. — We are reminded as well by παράκλησις as by διαλέγεται, xii. 5, of Luke in the Acts. There we meet with παρά-
κλησις of apostolic address, going to the heart, Acts xiii. 15, xv. 31 (comp. also 1 Tim. iv. 13); there also διαλέγεσθαι, in the inchoative sense: "to open a conversation, to enter upon it," is the constant word for the standing up of Paul among the Jews, Acts xvii. 2, 17, xviii. 4, and often besides. — On ἡτις διαλέγεται, xii. 5, we have to compare Luke xi. 49: ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπεν. — μεταλαμβάνειν, xii. 10, is (besides 2 Tim. ii. 6) the word common to the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Acts for "to become possessed of," i.e. to come into the enjoyment or possession of a thing. — δε μᾶλ- λον, xii. 13, as Luke x. 20 (Rec.). — The combination ρίζα πικρίας, xii. 15, comp. χαλη πικρίας, Acts viii. 23; and the verb ἐνοχλεῖν, Luke vi. 18 (according to A B L, al.), comp. ὠχλέων, Acts v. 16; and παρενοχλεῖν, Acts xv. 19, is Lucan. — The accus. cum infin. μὴ προστεθήναι αὐτοῖς λόγον, xii. 19, governed by the παρητῆσαντο, employed, as ver. 25, Acts xxv. 11, in the sense of "begging off from, declining with entreaty" (pure Greek, with μὴ in the infinitive clause), resembles Luke xx. 27. — ἐντρομος, xii. 21, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts vii. 32, xvi. 29. — Ἱερουσαλήμ, xii. 22, is the form of the name with Luke, Paul, and in the Apocalypse. — ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς, xii. 23, has its parallel in Luke x. 20: τὰ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ἑγράφη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; and the verb ἀπογράφεσθαι, in Luke ii. 1, 3, 5. — λέγων, xii. 26, the Hebrew דֵּבָּק, is employed as in Luke i. 63, and frequently in the N. T., specially with Luke. — The neuter plural of the subject, τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα, xii. 27, is combined with the singular of the predicate μείναι, as Acts i. 18, xxvi. 24; and the perfect is followed by the subjunctive (conjunctive) aorist, as e.g. Acts ix. 17. — ἔχειν χάριν, xii. 28, to cherish and manifest gratitude, as Luke xvii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 3. — The conception in the exhortation, xiii. 7, is out and out Lucan. For ἡγούμενοι is the Lucan appellative of the leaders of the congregation, Acts xv. 22, comp. Luke x. 26, elsewhere only Heb. xiii. 17, 24. Paul says similarly, προιτάμενοι, 1 Thess. v. 12. Then λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ is the ordinary Lucanic expression for the preaching of the gospel, Acts iv. 31, viii. 25, xiii. 46, and often. The verb ἀναθεωρεῖν, of continued penetrating con-
temptation, occurs again, outside of the Epistle to the Hebrews, only Acts xvii. 23. And for ἰηβασεις (1 Cor. x. 13), of the end of life, or as it is here designedly termed, of the walk, Luke has at least the synonymous expressions ἕως, Luke ix. 31, and ἄφιξις, Acts xx. 29. — ἀλυσιτελίς, xiii. 17, does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., but ἀντιευτελεί is found Luke xvii. 2. — πειθόμεθα, xiii. 18, is Lucan, according to Acts xxvi. 26. — ἐνώσιον τοῦ θεοῦ, xiii. 21, is with Luke, much more than with Paul, a favourite expression, and to the preface to the wish (ver. 20) there is no more fitting parallel than Acts xx. 28, where the church of the Lord is, as here, designated as a flock which He has purchased by His own blood. — xiii. 22 is altogether Lucan: ἀνέχεσθαι, to give a patient, willing hearing, Acts xviii. 14, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 4; λόγος παρακλήσεως, Acts xiii. 15; ἐπιστέλλειν (like mittere), to write a letter, elsewhere only Acts xv. 20, xx. 25.

— The ἀπολύειν, not occurring with Paul, is employed in the style of Luke, as well of release from custody or prison (apart from Luke xxii. 68, xxiii. 16 ff., e.g. Acts iii. 13, iv. 21), as of official delegation, Acts xiii. 3, xv. 30 (for which Paul has πέμπειν; e.g. 2 Thess. iii. 2); solemn dismission, Acts xv. 33; and in general, dismissal, Acts xix. 41, xxiii. 22. — οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, xiii. 24, denotes the Italiotes, according to the usage of Luke, Acts x. 23, 38, xii. 1, xvii. 13, xxi. 27.

That which Delitzsch adduces besides (in the commentary, p. 705 f.) in favour of Luke as the penman of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in favour of a joint-participation of the Apostle Paul in the composition thereof, namely—(1) that the worldly calling of Luke as a physician (Col. iv. 14) is in striking keeping with the conformation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, inasmuch as this, so to speak, contains an anatomic (iv. 12 f.), a dietetic (v. 12–14), and a therapeutic passage (xii. 12 f.), and much besides which would seem appropriate to the pen of a physician; as, e.g., the use of νοοθρός, v. 11, vi. 12; βρῶματα καὶ τόματα (as with Hippocrates, ed. Littré, i. 622, iv. 380), in connection with which it might perhaps be observed that ἐπιχειρεῖν, as employed Luke i. 1, is a favourite word of Hippocrates; (2) that it is hardly accidental that the Epistle to the Hebrews, according to its earliest
location, followed immediately upon the Epistle to Philemon, among the last words of which occurs the name of Luke; (3) that it is hardly accidental, that just where the author of the Acts begins to relate with "we" (xvi. 10), the account of the association of Timothy with Paul has preceded; and, finally, (4) that it is hardly accidental that the Epistle to the Hebrews begins in a manner so strongly alliterating on the name ΠΑΤΑΔΟΣ,—all these are arguments which ought not to have been found at all, in a work which lays claim to a scientific character.

Fully decisive against Luke is the consideration that he, according to Col. iv. 14 as compared with Col. iv. 11, was a Gentile-Christian,1 whereas, as is universally admitted, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews can only have been a born Jew. That this counter-moment is not to be set aside by the shift of Delitzsch (in the dissertation, p. 274), to the effect that Luke, as is made manifest in his other writings, had "enough lived himself into that which was Jewish and Christian" to be able to compose the epistle "in accordance with the hints" of Paul, is self-evident.

1 If J. N. Tiele (in the Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1858, H. 4, p. 753 ff.) has sought to prove from the many Hebraisms in the writings of Luke that he must have been a Jew by birth, that is altogether wide of the truth, since those Hebraisms in Luke are to be set down only to the account of the sources from which he draws. — Delitzsch also (in the commentary, p. 705) now holds that the deduction of Luke's Gentile origin, made from Col. iv. 11, 14, is by no means certain (yet without advancing his reasons for this judgment); and Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, II. 2, 2 Aufl., Nördl. 1860, p. 99 ff., directly disputes the soundness thereof. But neither do passages like Acts xx. 6, xxvii. 9, point to a born Jew as the author of this work, as is supposed by Hofmann; nor can, in Col. iv. 10, 11, the sense be found, with Hofmann, that while, on the one hand, Aristarchus had come to Rome with Paul and belonged to his well-known surroundings; of the number of Jewish-Christians, on the other hand, beyond those of his own company, who were teaching the word of the gospel in Rome, only Marcus and Jesus united with him in harmonious working. For of such diversity of character in the relations of the three persons mentioned, towards each other and towards Paul, neither ενυποκάλοιτι μει, ver. 10,—which, as is evident from ver. 23 of the contemporaneous Epistle to Philemon, can only be understood figuratively,—nor any other expression affords a hint; εἰ δένοισιν παρετβαίνεις οὕτω μένοι κ.τ.λ. (ver. 11) cannot therefore be referred back simply to Μάρκου καὶ Ινεοῦ, but must at the same time be referred to Αρισταρχους, unless that which naturally belongs to one whole is to be unnaturally dislocated and rent asunder. The demonstrative force of Col. iv. 11, 14 continues accordingly to assert itself in undiminished vigour.
The claim of Clemens Romanus to the authorship has been favoured by some among the moderns. Erasmus was inclined to regard him as such; and, finally, Bisping, following the example of Reithmayer (Einleit. in die kanon. BB. des N. T., Regensb. 1852, p. 681 ff.), has decided in favour of Clement. In order, however, not to approach the declaration of the Council of Trent too nearly, Bisping assumes that Clement prepared the epistle independently as a sort of homily, only as far as xiii. 17, to which xiii. 18 ff. was then added as a brief supplement by the Apostle Paul, in order thereby to adopt the whole letter as his own. But—apart from the fact that xiii. 18 ff. can proceed from no other author than that of the whole preceding letter, inasmuch as a change of the speaking subject is nowhere indicated, but, on the contrary, the opposite clearly presupposed in ver. 22—the sentences in the first, indisputably genuine, Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, which in point of contents and composition remind of the Epistle to the Hebrews (vid. supra, p. 7 f.), have evidently only been taken over by him from this epistle, in consequence of a use and imitation thereof. For, as regards originality and grasp of mind, the Epistle of Clement is far inferior to the Epistle to the Hebrews. In other respects, the character of the respective writings is too greatly diverse for them to be able to proceed from one and the same author. Of the Alexandrian speculative mind, and the oratorical flight of the Epistle to the Hebrews, not a trace is found in the Epistle of Clement.

Of Silvanus have Böhme and Mynster (Kleine theol. Schriften, Copenhagen 1825, p. 91 ff., and Studien u. Kritiken, 1829, H. 2) thought; and Riehm also (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. II. p. 893) regards this supposition as possible. But Silvanus was, according to Acts xv. 22, originally a member of the Christian congregation at Jerusalem. He, too, must thus have had a more exact acquaintance with the temple of that day, than is displayed by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The opinion that Apollos was the author of this epistle was first broached by Luther. Comp. on Gen. xlviii. 20 (ed. Witeberg. 1561, t. vi. p. 710): autor epistolae ad Hebraeos,
quisquis est, sive Paulus, sive, ut ego arbitror, Apollo. — Sermon von den Sekten, 1 Cor. iii. 4 ff. (with Walch, Th. xii. p. 1996): “This Apollo was a highly intelligent man; the Epistle Hebraeorum is of a truth his.” — Epist. am Christtag., Heb. i. 1 ff. (with Walch, Th. xii. p. 204): “That is a stout, powerful, and lofty epistle, which soars high, and treats of the sublime article of faith in the Godhead of Christ; and it is a credible opinion that it is not St. Paul’s, for the reason that it maintains a more ornate discourse than is the wont of St. Paul in other places. Some think it is St. Luke’s, some St. Apollo’s, whom St. Luke extols as having been mighty in the Scriptures against the Jews, Acts xviii. 24. It is indeed true that no epistle wields the Scripture with such force as this; that it was an excellent apostolic man, be he whosoever he may.” Luther’s conjecture has been accepted by Lucas Osiander, Clericus, Heumann (Schediasma de libris anonymis ac pseudonymis, Jenae 1711, 8, p. 33 sqq.), Lorenz Müller (Dissertatt. de eloquentia Apollinis, viri apostolici, Schleus. 1717), Semler (in his “Contributions to a more accurate understanding of the Epistle to the Hebrews,” prefixed to Baumgarten’s commentary, p. 15 f.; yet he expresses himself with hesitation), Ziegler (Vollständ. Einleit. in den Br. an die Hebr., Götting. 1791, 8, p. 255 ff.), Dindorf (on Ernesti lectt. p. 1180); and recently by Bleek, Tholuck, Credner, Reuss, Bunsen (Hippolytus und seine Zeit, Bd. I., Leipz. 1852, p. 365), Henry Alford (Greek Testament, vol. iv. P. 1, Lond. 1859, Prolegg. p. 58 ff.), Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. II. p. 894), which last, however, only claims the same degree of probability in favour of Apollos as of Silvanus; Bäumlein (Commentar üb. d. Ev. des Joh., Stuttg. 1863, p. 26), Samuel Davidson (Introduction, p. 255 ff.), J. H. Kurtz (der Br. an die Hebr. erkl., Mitau 1869, p. 55 f.), Hilgenfeld (Hist.-krit. Einl. in das N. T., Leipz. 1875, p. 356, 386 ff.), and others, even by the Catholics Feilmoser (Einl. in’s N. T. p. 359 ff.) and Lutterbeck (Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe, Bd. II., Mainz 1852, p. 101 ff.).

According to Lutterbeck, however, the Apostle Paul must have added the last nine verses, and Apollos, in communion with Luke, Clement, and others of the Pauline school, have issued the epistle.
one. The mental portrait which we are compelled to form to ourselves of Apollos, in harmony with the notices of the Acts (xviii. 24 ff.) and the First Epistle to the Corinthians (chap. i.–iv., xvi. 12), harmonizes exactly with the traits in which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has unconsciously depicted himself. This agreement is so striking and reaches so deeply, that as against it, seeing the lack of a definite tradition coming down from the apostolic age, the circumstance becomes of no moment, that among the conjectures of the ancients not one has lighted upon Apollos as the author of the epistle. Apollos was no immediate disciple of the Lord, but belonged to a second generation of Christians. By friends of Paul he was more deeply instructed in Christianity, and lived on terms of intimacy with Paul himself. He was, however, as a Christian teacher, too original and prominent for standing merely in the relation of an apostolic helper. He was a Jew by birth, and his labours as a Christian teacher were directed by preference to the conversion of his Jewish kinsmen; on which account the personal acquaintance of the author of the epistle with the Palestinian Jewish-Christians, presupposed Heb. xiii. 19, can least of all surprise us in the case of Apollos. He was a native of Alexandria, versed in the Scriptures, and qualified for expounding and applying the same, and for deducing therefrom the proof that Jesus is the Messiah. Appropriate to him as an Alexandrian is the preponderantly typico-symbolic mode of teaching in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the endeavour to point out under the veil of the letter a deeper spiritual meaning. He was above all distinguished by the gift of brilliant eloquence. In him, finally, as an Alexandrian Jew, the exclusive use of the LXX., as well as the want of acquaintance with the internal arrangement of the temple in Jerusalem at that time, need cause no surprise.

That, if we are to fix upon a particular person as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, this can be no other than Apollos, because contents and form of the epistle are so admirably fitting to no other Christian teacher of the apostolic age as to this, is admitted also by W. Grimm (Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1870, p. 74 ff.). He finds, however, an instance of decisive counter-evidence against Apollos in the passage Heb.
ii. 3 as compared with Acts xviii. 24–28. For, according to Heb. ii. 3, the message of salvation had come to the author of the epistle, equally with his readers, by the instrumentality of those who had heard the Lord Himself; whereas, according to the Acts, Apollos, as a disciple of John, had been only in the vestibule of Christianity, and had been first introduced into the sanctuary thereof by means of the Christians Aquila and Priscilla, who were converts of Paul's. But apart from the fact that—as Grimm himself acknowledges—the narrative of Acts xviii. 24 ff. is so far obscure and not free from self-contradiction, as it represents Apollos, although he knew only the baptism of John, nevertheless as κατηχημένος τὴν ὀδὸν τοῦ κυρίου, and an ἀκριβῶς διδάσκειν τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ is attributed to him (ver. 25),—we must remember that at Heb. ii. 3 recipients and author of the epistle are characterized only as belonging to a second generation of Christendom. Not that every single one of the persons mentioned ver. 3 had received the word of salvation at the mouth of immediate ear-witnesses, or were by these specially received into instruction, is expressed; but only that the message of salvation was handed down in a certain and trustworthy way from the original ear-witnesses to the totality of the Christian circle which is formed by the ἡμεῖς, and thus came to the knowledge of each single one of this totality. Even, therefore, if Apollos had not been directly brought into any intercourse with the ἀκούσαντες, yet the passages Acts xviii. 24 ff. and Heb. ii. 3 would not be irreconcilable the one with the other. But is it at all conceivable that such a leading Christian teacher as Apollos, who continued in such intimate association with the Apostle Paul, should come into no personal contact whatever with the original apostles?—To the further objections brought by Grimm against the Apollos-theory, he himself attaches no decisive weight. They are the following:—(1) In connection with a former disciple of John, it must appear exceedingly strange that he makes no mention, i. 1, of the distinguished position occupied by John the Baptist, as the greatest prophet (Luke vii. 28, Matt. xi. 11) and forerunner of the Lord, towards the kingdom of God; (2) Clemens Romanus, although making frequent use of the epistle, could hardly have known it as a
work of Apollos, since it would otherwise have only been natural that he should, in the 47th chapter of his Epistle to the Corinthians, have reminded the Corinthian Christians of our epistle as a work of Apollos. But that Clement must necessarily have so acted cannot be maintained. For a reference to John the Baptist, however, Heb. i. 1 offered no occasion whatever; because it was with the author only a question of contrasting with each other the revelations of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament as such.

SEC. 2.—THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.1

That the epistle was designed for a Jewish-Christian circle of readers is not only universally acknowledged, but also becomes so palpably certain from contents and aim (comp. sec. 3), that Roeth's supposition of the opposite (Epistolam vulgo "ad Hebr." inscriptam non ad Hebr., i.e. Christianos genere Judaeos, sed ad Christianos genere gentiles et quidem ad Ephesios, datam esse, Francof. ad Moen. 1836, 8) can only be regarded as a manifest error. But likewise the view represented by Braun, Lightfoot (Harmony of the New Testament, I. p. 340), Baumgarten, Heinrichs, Stenglein (i.e. p. 61, note, p. 90), and Schwegler (Nachapostolisches Zeitalter, Bd. II. p. 304), that the epistle was addressed, without respect to any particular locality, to all Jewish-Christians in general, is one which is characterized a priori as absolutely untenable. For everywhere throughout the epistle are individual wants of the readers presupposed, such as were by no means common to all Jewish-Christians; and even the personal references, v. 12, vi. 10–12, x. 32 ff., xii. 4, xiii. 7, 19, 23, 24, suffice to show that the author had before him a definite, locally-bounded circle of readers. How could the author, among other things, promise his readers a speedy visit (xiii. 23), if he had thought of them as the Jewish-Christians scattered in all lands?

The Jewish-Christians in all Asia Minor, or at least in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Asia proconsularis, have been regarded as the original recipients of the epistle by

1 Comp. my Whitsuntide Programm: De literarum, quae ad Hebraeos inscribuntur, primis lectoribus, Gott. 1853.
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All these opinions, however, which in part rest upon the erroneous supposition that the epistle is the work of the Apostle Paul, find their refutation at once in the fact that it cannot have been addressed to so-called mixed assemblies,
consisting of Jewish- and Gentile-Christians, but only to an exclusively Jewish-Christian circle of readers. Not even the slightest reference is made to conditions such as must of necessity arise from the living together of converted Jews with converted Gentiles, and which, by reason of the manifold conflicts to which they would give occasion, were of too great importance to be passed over unnoticed. Nowhere is the relation of the Gentiles to the Jews, and of both to the kingdom of God, spoken of; rather is everything specially referred to the Jewish people of God, already sanctified in their fathers. Unmixed Jewish-Christian congregations, however, cannot be historically proved, in the late time at which the date of the epistle falls (see sec. 4), in any of the fore-mentioned places. The fact, likewise, is opposed to those suppositions, that the readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews regarded the continued participation in the institutions of the Jewish temple-service and sacrifices as so necessary, that without this they thought they could obtain no complete expiation of their sins. Such a form of Judaism, still continuing to operate in the Christian state, does not apply to the Jewish-Christians of the diaspora, but only to those who had their dwelling-place in the immediate vicinity of the Jewish temple. For in the case of Jews who lived at a greater distance from the temple, the zeal for the Mosaic law manifested itself naturally most of all in a tenacious clinging to the rite of circumcision, to the injunctions regarding food and purification, to the observance of the Sabbath, and the like.

A Jewish temple, however, besides that at Jerusalem, existed at the time of our epistle only in Egypt. The

---

1 For this reason it cannot be asserted, with Holtzmann (Stud. u. Krit. 1859, H. 2, p. 298), that there is nothing at all contradictory in the supposition of the epistle being addressed to a large congregation, still outwardly composed of Gentile- and Jewish-Christians; that there the epistle had naturally sought out its Jewish readers; and on that account it leads us, without any address properly speaking, in medium rem. That the epistle presupposes exclusively Jewish-Christian readers has been anew disputed by Wieseler (Schriften der Universität zu Kiel aus d. J. 1861, p. 21 ff., Stud. u. Krit. 1867, p. 695 ff.), by Holzmann (in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1867, p. 26 f.), by Mangold (in Bleek's Einl. in d. N. T. p. 612), and by Hilgenfeld (Einl. in d. N. T. p. 380, 386), but in a by no means convincing manner. See the detailed and effective refutation of this supposition in Grimm (Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1870, p. 34 ff.).

In favour of Alexandria as the place of destination for the epistle, the following arguments have been advanced:—

1 Very arbitrarily, nevertheless, Ebrard represents the epistle as not being written to the whole congregation at Jerusalem, but only to “a private circle of neophytes” there. For it neither follows from v. 12 “that all the readers had embraced Christianity at one and the same time, the one with the other;” nor from vi. 10 that we can think “only of a very narrow and limited circle of individuals in a community;” nor, finally, from χριστόν ἡσυχίαν τῇ λόγῳ θεόις, v. 12, “that the readers were really again placed under instruction.”

2 W. Grimm also supposes now that the epistle was addressed to a town of Palestine; only not Jerusalem, but Jannia. Comp. Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1870, p. 71 f. Nevertheless we know nothing of the existence of a Christian congregation in Jannia.
(1) Even in ancient times the Epistle to the Hebrews bore likewise the title of a letter to the Alexandrians, and in general there is seen to be a wavering within the early church itself in the indication of the original circle of readers. Whether, indeed, the superscription Πρὸς Ἐβραῖους proceeds from the author himself, a view to which Bleek and Credner are inclined, is doubtful. But not only is this superscription very ancient, since it is found in the Peshito, and with Tertullian, Origen, and many others; but the fact, moreover, is universally presupposed in Christian antiquity as beyond doubt that the Ἐβραῖοι, whose name the epistle bears at its head, were the Palestinian Christians. The evidence for this statement is afforded by Pantaenus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and many others. It is now indeed supposed that we possess a testimony in favour of the Alexandrians as the original recipients of the epistle, namely, in the so-called Canon of Muratori, in which we read: Fertur etiam ad Laudecenses (Laodicenses), alia ad Alexandrinos, Pauli nomine fictae (fictae) ad haeresem Marcionis, et alia plura, quae in catholicam ecclesiam recipi (recipi) non potest (possunt). Fel enim cum melis miseri non congruit. For that by the words alia ad Alexandrinos the Epistle to the Hebrews is meant must be assumed, as is supposed, since otherwise the Epistle to the Hebrews would, remarkably enough, not be even mentioned in the fragment, which, forsooth, is a list both of the genuine and spurious epistles ascribed to the Apostle Paul. Now this epistle, it is argued, not being in the early Roman Church either regarded as a work of Paul, or indeed as canonical, must have been mentioned by name precisely in this passage, in which the writer is speaking of epistles of which the authorship is falsely imputed to the Apostle Paul. But against this it must be said that the characteristics of the epistle ad Alexandrinos, of which the fragment makes mention, are not suitable to the Epistle to the Hebrews. For the former was a forgery, composed "Pauli nomine," the meaning of which is too distinct for us to be able, with Wieseler, to subtilize it into the statement that the epistle had only indirectly, from its contents and general bearing, left the impression of its
proceeding from Paul; which rather can only indicate that
this epistle, in a prefixed address altogether wanting to the
Epistle to the Hebrews, put forth the claim to be a work of
Paul. Moreover, it was fabricated "ad haeresem Marcionis,"
which can mean nothing else but that its contents were in
agreement with the errors of Marcion, and were designed to
wage a propaganda for the same. With Marcionite errors,
however, the Epistle to the Hebrews has confessedly nothing
in common; but, on the contrary, "its fundamental doctrine
of Mosaism as pointing forward to Christianity, as well as the
idea of the incarnation of the Divine Logos, is in glaring
contrast with Marcion's Gnosis" (Grimm, Zeitschr. f. wiss.
Theol. 1870, p. 55), as accordingly it obtained no reception
into Marcion's canon.¹ That, finally, the fragmentist must
necessarily have mentioned the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot
be asserted, inasmuch as, considering the non-currency thereof
within the early Roman Church, it was quite possible that he
should not be at all acquainted with it. Comp. also Fr. H.
Hesse, das Muratorische Fragment neu untersucht und erklärt,
Giessen 1873, p. 201 ff.— But as it cannot be shown that
the Epistle to the Hebrews passed in antiquity for an epistle
to the Alexandrians, so in like manner it cannot be shown
that this epistle was regarded by others in early times as an
epistle to the Laodiceans. This last has been inferred from
the words of Philastrius (Haeres. 89): Haeresis quorundam
de epistola Pauli ad Hebraeos. Sunt alii quoque, qui epistolam
Pauli ad Hebraeos non adserunt esse ipsius, sed dicunt aut
Barnabae esse apostoli aut Clementis de urbe Roma episcopi.
Alii autem Lucas evangelistae ajunt epistolam etiam ad
Laodicenses conscriptam. Et quia addiderunt in ea quaedam

¹ This counter-moment Wieseler now, indeed, seeks to deprive of its force, by
giving to the words in Muratori's fragment another punctuation than that given
above, as also formerly by himself, in supposing the comma after Marcionis is
to be deleted, and one placed after fictae; so that the sense shall be: "There
is also in circulation an epistle to the Laodiceans, another to the Alexandrians,
which have been fabricated under the name of Paul; with the sect of Marcion
there are also several other things current, which, etc." But what unnatural
twisting and rending by such construction of that which is simply and naturally
connected; and how little can it serve to the recommendation thereof, that ad
haeresem Marcionis must be taken in the sense of apud Marcionitas!
non bene sentientes, inde non legitur in ecclesia; etsi legitur a quibusdam, non tamen in ecclesia legitur populo, nisi tredecim epistolae ejus et ad Hebraeos interdum. But manifestly the words *Alii autem*, etc., are only a concise expression for the declaration that others looked upon the evangelist Luke as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and not only as the author of this, but also of the Epistle to the Laodiceans. The Epistle to the Laodiceans was not at all read in the service of the church; the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, was read indeed in the service of the church, not, however, as the thirteen Pauline Epistles, regularly, but only occasionally. Just as little, finally, is there any indication of a controversy with regard to the original recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when Chrysostom, in the *Prooemium* of his commentary, takes up the question: *ποῦ δὲ οὖσιν ἐπέστελλεν*; and then answers this with *ἐμοί δοκεῖ ἐν Ἰεροσολύμωσι καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ*. For Chrysostom perceived that the superscription of the epistle was in and of itself an ambiguous one, inasmuch as it admitted the possibility of thinking of the Jewish-Christians

---

1 The opinion, still entertained by Wieseler, that the *quia addiderunt in ea* is to be referred to the Epistle to the Hebrews, is manifestly untenable in face of the contradiction in that case arising from the conflicting statements *non legitur in ecclesia* and in ecclesia *legitur interdum*. The new punctuation, moreover, by which Wieseler seeks to help his acceptation of the words of Philastrius out of the difficulty, is no happy one. According to Wieseler, namely, we have to divide as follows: . . . Episcopi, aliia autem Lucae evangelistae. *Ajunt epistolam etiam ad Laodicenses conscriptam. Et quia, etc.* Against this arrangement of the words argues—(1) That the proposition *Ajunt . . . consecr- tam* would then stand forth quite abrupt and without any connection, whereas when we make the beginning of a new proposition with *Alii autem*, the grammatical nexus of the sentence is an entirely simple and natural one; (2) That if Philastrius had wished first to begin a new proposition with *Ajunt*, he would have appended the closing member of the previous sentence, not in the form: *aliia autem Lucae evangelistae*, but in the form of expression corresponding to that which precedes: *aut Lucae evangelistae*; finally, (3) that the position assigned to *etiam* points to the fact that it serves specially to bring into relief *ad Laodicenses*, and consequently opposes the Epistle to the Laodiceans to another epistle already mentioned. If Philastrius had only intended to say that the Epistle to the Hebrews too, so far as its destination is concerned, was considered as belonging to Laodicea, then *etiam*—inasmuch as it would in that case belong to the whole proposition—must have been placed immediately after *Ajunt*. 

---

1 The opinion, still entertained by Wieseler, that the *quia addiderunt in ea* is to be referred to the Epistle to the Hebrews, is manifestly untenable in face of the contradiction in that case arising from the conflicting statements *non legitur in ecclesia* and in ecclesia *legitur interdum*. The new punctuation, moreover, by which Wieseler seeks to help his acceptation of the words of Philastrius out of the difficulty, is no happy one. According to Wieseler, namely, we have to divide as follows: . . . Episcopi, aliia autem Lucae evangelistae. *Ajunt epistolam etiam ad Laodicenses conscriptam. Et quia, etc.* Against this arrangement of the words argues—(1) That the proposition *Ajunt . . . consecr- tam* would then stand forth quite abrupt and without any connection, whereas when we make the beginning of a new proposition with *Alii autem*, the grammatical nexus of the sentence is an entirely simple and natural one; (2) That if Philastrius had wished first to begin a new proposition with *Ajunt*, he would have appended the closing member of the previous sentence, not in the form: *aliia autem Lucae evangelistae*, but in the form of expression corresponding to that which precedes: *aut Lucae evangelistae*; finally, (3) that the position assigned to *etiam* points to the fact that it serves specially to bring into relief *ad Laodicenses*, and consequently opposes the Epistle to the Laodiceans to another epistle already mentioned. If Philastrius had only intended to say that the Epistle to the Hebrews too, so far as its destination is concerned, was considered as belonging to Laodicea, then *etiam*—inasmuch as it would in that case belong to the whole proposition—must have been placed immediately after *Ajunt.*
in general as the recipients of the letter; he thought it needful, therefore, to state the limitation with which in his estimation the Πρὸς Ἕβραιν, of such wide signification, is to be understood.

(2) The description of the Jewish sanctuary (ix. 1–5), as well as the acts of ritual performed in the same (vii. 27, x. 11), is supposed to point to the temple at Leontopolis in Egypt. But even if it could be proved that the temple arrangements at Leontopolis furnished the standard for that description, and that the original regulations of Moses were identified with these, yet only the conclusion would be warranted with respect to the author, that he must have been by birth an Egyptian Jew, but it could not be inferred with equal necessity that his readers also were to be sought in Egypt. Nevertheless, that assertion itself by no means admits of proof. For Josephus,— to whose testimony Wieseler appeals,— where he is describing in general that τερόν at Leontopolis, designates the same as ὅμοιον (Antiq. xii. 9. 7), or as παραπλήσιον (Antiq. xx. 10) τῷ ἐν Ἰεροσολύμωις, but then observes, Bell. Jud. vii. 10. 3, where he is relating somewhat more exactly, as follows: Ὅνιας τὸν μὲν ναὸν ὅμοιον φιλοδήμησε τῷ ἐν Ἰεροσολύμωις ἀλλὰ πύργῳ παραπλήσιον, λίθων μεγάλων εἰς ἑξήκοντα τίχες ἀνεστηκότα, τοῦ βωμοῦ δὲ τὴν κατασκευὴν πρὸς τὸν οἶκον ἑξεμιμήσατο καὶ τοῖς ἀναθήμασιν όμοιος ἐκοσμήσε, χωρὶς τῆς περὶ τὴν λυχνίαν κατασκευής. Οὐ γὰρ ἕπολις ἡ λυχνία αὐτοῦ δὲ χαλκευσάμενος τῶν λύχνων χρυσῶν ἐπιφαίνοντα σέλας χρυσῆς ἀλύσεως ἐξεκρέμασεν. Josephus accordingly relates that the temple of Onias in Egypt was indeed as to its outward form different from the temple at Jerusalem, inasmuch as it stood upon a foundation or sub-structure of great stones rising sixty cubits high, and thereby acquired a tower-like appearance;

1 If Josephus had, as Wieseler supposes, ascribed to the μόι only a total height of sixty cubits, he would neither have characterized it as tower-like, nor have designated it as unlike the μόι in Jerusalem. For the latter also had, at any rate, a height of sixty cubita. It is true Wieseler finds actually expressed by ἀλλὰ τὸ γεγένησαν παραπλήσιοι not a dissimilarity, but a resemblance to the temple erected at Jerusalem by Zerubbabel; but he reaches this result only by unwarrantably translating ἀλλὰ as " but yet," and accordingly taking ἀλλὰ . . .
that, on the other hand, its inner arrangement, with the single exception of the golden candlestick, was constituted in the same manner as that of the temple at Jerusalem, for the altar of burnt-offering and the other sacred objects were similar in both. Now, how does it follow from these statements that the golden altar of incense in the Egyptian temple occupied the very site which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews assigns to it at ix. 4, in contradiction with the actual position thereof in the temple at Jerusalem, namely, in the Most Holy Place? Of such a difference—and surely just this point would have called for proof—Josephus says in truth not a single word, but, on the contrary, leaves the opposite impression. And then how could the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, if he had had the temple of Onias before him in his description of the sanctuary, have written ἐν ἡ ἡ λαυξυῖα, ix. 2, when, according to the express statement of Josephus, there was not therein a lamp-stand resting on the ground, as in the temple at Jerusalem, but a chandelier suspended by a golden chain?—In Philo, too, Wieseler has subsequently (comp. Studien u. Kritiken, 1867, p. 673 ff.) fancied he could discover a support for his opinion. In de sacrificantibus, § 4 (ed. Mangey, II. p. 253), and de animal. sacrifíc. § 10 (ed. Mangey, II. p. 247), it is thought that Philo expressly testifies that in the temple of Onias the altar of incense, as well as the vessels mentioned Heb. ix. 4, 5, were present in the Most Holy Place. Yet how entirely unsuccessful this attempted proof of Wieseler’s is, has been already convincingly shown in detail by Grimm, Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1870, p. 60 ff.—But just as little do the notices, Heb. vii. 27, x. 11, lead to think of the temple of Onias. For even supposing—that is far, however, from being the case—that it could be historically proved, with regard to the Egyptian temple, that the high priest entered into the Most

siovnsiva as a kind of parenthetical insertion: “Onias erected the temple not indeed equal to that one in Jerusalem, but yet tower-like, since it was built up of large stones sixty cubits high; in the construction of the altar, however, he imitated that of his native land.” That ἀλλά, on account of the preceding ἥχ, can signify only but, on the contrary [sonderm], and introduces the particular point of difference by which the before-mentioned dissimilarity is evidenced, ought not to have been called in question.
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Holy Place every day, yet such fact would not so much as accord with the presuppositions of the Epistle to the Hebrews. For, Heb. ix. 7, it is expressly said that the high priest went into the Most Holy Place only once in the year. Nor, as we need hardly remark, can this passage, in connection with ix. 4, vii. 27, x. 11, contain the sense which Wieseler would put into it, that the high priest entered indeed the Most Holy Place every day, but only once in the year with blood. For to eis μὲν τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν διὰ παντὸς εἰσίασιν οἱ ιέρεις only the words eis δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἀπαξ τοῦ ἐναυτοῦ μόνος ὁ ἄρχιερεῖς form the opposition, and not until after the laying down of this opposition is the nearer modality for the final member added, namely, that the high priest, in the (special) case of his entering the Most Holy Place, enters it not without blood.

The fact, however, in general, that the original recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews attached so high a value to the temple service and the sacrificial ritual, that even as Christians they regarded continual participation in the same as necessary for the attaining of salvation, is one which points not to Alexandrians, but only to Palestinians. For, quite apart from the consideration that we do not even know from other sources whether the Christian congregation of Alexandria was an unmixed Jewish-Christian one, nay, whether an organized Christian congregation existed there at all so early as the time of our letter, the Alexandrian Jews had been so greatly affected by Grecian culture and philosophy, that their whole bent of mind had become a spiritualistic one. Far from all narrow-minded cleaving to the letter of the Mosaic law, they sought by allegoric interpretation to discover and bring into recognition the deeper spiritual sense underlying the precepts and institutions of Judaism. In addition to this, the temple of Onias in Leontopolis was not able to boast even in Egypt itself of any high estimation. The Egyptian Jews were to a great extent displeased that it did not stand upon Moriah; the Egyptian Samaritans, that it did not stand upon Gerizim (comp. Jost, Allg. Gesch. des Israel. Völk., in 2 vols., Bd. I. p. 515 ff.). The yearly temple-gifts, too, were on that account for the most part sent not to Leontopolis, but to Jerusalem.
(comp. Frankel, Histor.-krit. Studien zu der Septuaginta, Bd. I. Abth. 1, Leipz. 1841, p. 186, note d); and pilgrimages of Alexandrian Jews to Jerusalem, to offer prayers and sacrifices in the temple there, did not cease so long as this temple continued to exist. Even Philo vouches for this. (Comp. Opp., ed. Mangey, t. II. p. 646: καθ' ἐν χρόνον εἰς τὸ πατρίδον ἱερὸν ἐστελλόμην εὑρόμενός τε καὶ θύσιν.)

(3) In favour of the supposition of Alexandrian readers is the fact further thought to plead, that the epistle is not composed in Aramaic; a Greek epistle to Palestinian Jews would at any rate, it is argued, be less probable than an Aramaic letter. But as it is absolutely certain, on the one hand, that the Palestinians understood not only Aramaic, but also Greek; so, on the other hand, it is altogether doubtful whether the author, who by his whole epistle proclaims himself to be a non-Palestinian, was in an equal degree qualified for writing not only a Greek, but also an Aramaic epistle.

(4) "The whole manner of conducting the argument and the spiritual exposition of the ideas employed," is said to accord best with the supposition of Alexandrian readers. But that this mode of argumentation is thought of "at once as familiar to the readers," cannot be maintained. There can thus be found therein only an indication as to the author, and not as to his readers.

(5) That the author so exactly follows the Septuagint in his Old Testament citations, even in the case of striking deviations of the same from the original text, is said not to harmonize with the hypothesis of Palestinian readers, since with them the Septuagint was held in no estimation; but certainly with that of Alexandrians, for whom the Septuagint had long been the accepted book of the synagogues. But were that translation really in so little credit in Palestine, then neither would the Apostle Paul, educated as he was at Jerusalem, have made such frequent use of it, nor would the Palestinian Josephus have fallen back upon that oftener than upon the original text. Moreover, the fact that the Alexandrine recension is to be traced in the text of the Septuagint used in the Epistle to the Hebrews (comp. Bleek, I. p. 372 ff.), and (Heb. xi. 35 f.) reference is made to the second Book of Maccabees.
(Köstlin, l.c. p. 402), i.e. a writing peculiar to Alexandrian Judaism, admits only of an inference pointing back to an Alexandrian author, but not to Alexandrian readers.

(6) To the Alexandrians as original recipients of the epistle, is the circumstance, finally, supposed to point, that the first mention of the epistle is met with in the Alexandrian fathers. These same Alexandrian fathers, nevertheless, confessedly agree in speaking of the epistle as addressed to the congregations in Palestine.

As, however, no valid ground is to be adduced in favour of Alexandria as the place of destination for the epistle, so are the objections urged against the claim of Palestine very easily disposed of. They are the following:—(1) That the readers, according to Heb. x. 32 ff., xii. 4, had already endured persecutions, but not μετὰ αἰματος, which consistently with Acts viii. 1–3, xii. 1, 2, could not have been said of the Palestinian Christians; (2) That the readers, according to Heb. vi. 10, xiii. 16, had exercised liberality towards other Christians, and were still further enjoined to do so, whereas, according to Acts xi. 30, Gal. ii. 10, 1 Cor. xvi. 1–3, 2 Cor. viii. 9, Rom. xv. 25 ff., these very Palestinian Christians appear as poor and in need of assistance; (3) That according to Heb. ii. 3 they had received their knowledge of the gospel only from a secondary source; (4) Finally, that (xiii. 18, 19, 23) they are represented as standing in friendly relations as well towards the author, who was surely an adherent of Paul, as towards the Pauline disciple Timothy. That, nevertheless, these relations were of a particularly close and intimate nature does not follow from the passages adduced; a friendly footing, however, of a more general kind with Apollos, and, after the death of the Apostle Paul, also with Timothy, has nothing surprising about it. The other statements to which allusion is made all find their justification in the fact that, as is also clearly apparent from xiii. 7 and v. 12, the recipients of the letter already belonged to a second generation of Christians.

Whilst the above-mentioned arguments are common to the majority of those who dispute the Palestineo-Jerusalemic destination of the epistle, Köstlin has sought to confirm his position by the following additional counter-moments peculiar to himself:
(1) The author, as is shown by his entire dependence upon the Septuagint, was acquainted only with Greek. But it results from xiii. 19 that he himself belonged to the congregation to which he is writing. If, therefore, the epistle were directed to Palestine, the author himself would have been a Palestinian Christian; as such, however, hardly of so exclusively Hellenistic culture, but without doubt familiar with the vernacular of Palestine, and notably acquainted with the original text of the Old Testament. Reply: But that the author himself was a member of the congregation to which he is writing, does not at all follow from xiii. 19. Comp. the exposition of the passage.

(2) It cannot be assumed that in the Palestinian Christians, or rather in the chief congregation thereof, that of Jerusalem, in the first century, and notably in the years 60–70, there could have been found such great indifference as regards the knowledge of the central truths of the Christian faith, such great want of capacity for understanding the mysteries of the Christian doctrine, such culpable lukewarmness and weakness of faith, a discontent on account of Jewish reproaches and persecutions, which was altogether unworthy of their position, while they must long have been accustomed to these, and such a disloyal inclination to a relapse into Judaism, as the epistle presupposes in its recipients. But where, we ask, could there have been a Jewish-Christian congregation in connection with which the conditions described would have been more easily explicable, than precisely in Jerusalem, where the ancient ritual, with its seductive splendour and its charms for the sensuous nature, stood before the very eyes of the Christian converts, and the tenacious power of resistance on the part of the ancient Judaism most vigorously exerted itself? Comp. also Acts xxii. 20 ff.

(3) If Jerusalem had been the place of destination for the epistle, the author (ii. 3) could not have omitted to remind the readers that the Lord Himself had walked, and taught, and wrought among them, had in their midst, nay, before their eyes, suffered the death of the cross, among them had found the first witnesses of His resurrection and ascension; and the more so, since during the years 60–70 there must still have
been a large number of the immediate disciples of Jesus present in Jerusalem. But, in reply, we cannot at all expect to see the personal life and labours of Jesus described ii. 3, because the connection does not lead thereto. For that which is essential in ii. 3 is not the relation to author and readers of the epistle, but that about which the writer is concerned is only to oppose to the Old Testament Λόγος, as something higher, the salvation of the Christians. The question thus, in connection with this opposition, is that of the Christians in general, or of the salvation which is the common possession of all Christians; while, then, only as a mere secondary consideration, which might have been wanting without prejudice to the connectedness of thought, the remark is yet further added, that the knowledge of this Christian blessedness has been transmitted in a sure and trustworthy manner to the present (second) generation of Christians, to which alike author and readers of the epistle belong. An occasion for speaking more fully of the meanwhile personal activity of Jesus among the readers did not accordingly at all present itself; and a reason for urging the declaration ii. 3 against the supposition of Palestinenses as recipients of the epistle is the less to be thought of, inasmuch as the fact that the Lord had once Himself proclaimed the salvation to the ancestors of the present church members is not excluded by the words. But that a great number of the original disciples must have been still living in Jerusalem during the years 60—70 is a gratuitous assertion, to which may be opposed the consideration that surely Luke too, in the prologue of his Gospel—i.e. of a writing, the composition of which at any rate falls within the decade of the seventies, which thus is only a few years later in date than our epistle—without hesitation reckons himself and his contemporaries as belonging to a second generation of Christians. Even supposing, however, that immediate disciples of Jesus were still to be found in Jerusalem, yet these could number towards the close of the sixties, to which time the origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews is to be assigned (comp. sec. 4), only a few solitary individuals; a possible exception here and there would have been no hindrance in the way of characterizing the members of the congregation of that day as
belonging to a second generation of Christians, just because only the character of the congregation in general, or as it presented itself in the main and on the whole, was being taken into account.

(4) The author presupposes, in various passages, what does not apply to the case of the primitive congregation, that his readers have been for only a comparatively short time members of the Christian church. But from iii. 14, vi. 11, x. 32, vi. 1–5, x. 23, this conclusion does not follow; on the other hand, the opposite is to be inferred from v. 12.

(5) The Jerusalemic Christians, he asserts, consisted partly of members who became believers immediately after the resurrection,—some of them, perhaps, even earlier,—partly of such as only later acceded to this primitive stock. They composed a congregation which was only gradually formed, and, particularly so long as James was alive, received constant augmentation from the adherents of Judaism; the community of the ἸΕβραίοι had not arisen in this gradual manner during a long succession of years; but the conversion of all its members, or at least of by far the greater number, had taken place at one and the same time: it must have been formed by the simultaneous passing over of a considerable number of Jews to the Christian church, and have maintained itself up to the time of our epistle with much the same total of members as it at first counted. But for a conclusion of this kind the words ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες πολλὴν θλήσεων ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων, x. 32, afford no warrant. For only the fact is there brought into prominence, that the conflict of suffering, which the readers formerly endured, fell at a period of their life in which they were already Christians. On the peculiar circumstances (modality) of their conversion the words contain nothing.

(6) From the carefully-chosen designation τοῖς ἁγίοις, it is evident that the ἸΕβραίοι are here presupposed to be a non-Palestinian community, who have aided the Palestinenses with their support. Any other congregation (!) than the primitive one could not have been thus simply designated as οἱ ἁγίοι, whereas the employment of this name with regard to that congregation is very frequent (1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor.
viii. 4, ix. 1; Rom. xv. 25, 31). A usage to be accounted for by the fact that, as distinguished from all the other ἐκκλησίαι, the Palestinian, and specially the Jerusalemic Christians, were the ἅγιοι κατ' ἐξοχήν, who before all others, chosen and separated from the world by Christ and His apostles themselves, became the first recipients of the divine word and of the Holy Spirit, were the first witnesses and intermediate channels of Christian truth for all other Christian communities, and were also, as such, acknowledged (specially Rom. xv. 27), until, owing to the destruction of Jerusalem and the rending progress of Gentile Christianity, this relation of dependence and filial affection was gradually dissolved of itself.—In order, however, to show the mistake in such reasoning, it suffices to point to the use of οἱ ἅγιοι in passages like 1 Cor. vi. 1, 2, xvi. 15; Rom. xii 13, xvi. 2; 1 Tim. v. 10; to the addresses of the Pauline epistles; to the addition τῶν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ, considered necessary in connection with τῶν ἅγιων, Rom. xv. 26; and many similar instances. (1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, on the other hand, there was no need of such addition,—against Kurtz,—because the collection which is the subject treated of in those passages was a business already known to the Corinthians, and before earnestly enjoined upon them; while, Rom. xv. 25, it was already apparent from νῦν δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, and, Rom. xv. 31, from ἥ εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, of what ἅγιοι the apostle was speaking.) Yea, Köstlin has even overlooked the consideration, that by means of this argument, if it were well-grounded, he would most effectually refute himself! For what further proof, that the readers of the letter are to be sought in Jerusalem, would it then need than the utterance of our epistle itself, xiii. 24: ἀστάσασθε πάντας τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ὅγιοις?

(7) That the Jerusalemic congregation remained, as is clear from Acts ii. 46, iii. 1 (comp. xxi. 20), from the first in connection with the temple ritual. By the recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, all religious connection with Judaism was originally relinquished, and only now had they become involved in peril, as well through the influence of teachings which would urge the necessity of holding firmly
to the Mosaic law (xiii. 9 ff.), as also, as it seems, through the influence of enticing offers (comp. xii. 16 ff.), partly also by harassing manifestations of ill-will on the part of their former Jewish fellow-believers, of being seduced into a return to the Jewish religious constitution. But the actual state of matters is by this assertion inverted into its exact opposite. For that the recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews not only still continued to occupy themselves with the Jewish temple-service and sacrificial ritual, but even regarded participation therein as a necessary requirement for the complete expiation of sins, certainly underlies the whole argumentation of the epistle as an everywhere-recurring presupposition.

SEC. 3. OCCASION, OBJECT. AND CONTENTS.

The Epistle to the Hebrews was occasioned by the danger to which the Christians in Palestine, particularly in Jerusalem, were exposed, of renouncing again their faith in Christ, and wholly falling back again into Judaism (comp. specially vi. 4–6, x. 26 ff.). This danger had become a very pressing one, inasmuch as many had already as a matter of fact ceased to frequent the Christian assemblies (x. 25). The epistle accordingly aims, by the unfolding on every side of the sublimity of the Christian revelation as the perfect and archetypal, above that of the Old Testament as the merely preparatory and typical, as well as by setting forth the terrible consequences of an apostasy, to warn against such falling away, and to animate to a faithful perseverance in the Christian course. — Differently, but quite incorrectly, does Thiersch (De epistola ad Hebr., Marb. 1848, p. 2 sqq.; Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter, Frankf. and Erlang. 1852, p. 188 ff.) define the object of the epistle, to the effect that it was to be a consolatory letter to the Christians of Jerusalem, on account of the exclusion from the Jewish temple with which they had been visited on the part of their unconverted compatriots at the outbreak of the Jewish war. Nothing in the epistle points to any such state of the matter; but, on the contrary, even the one passage, Heb. xiii. 13, serves to place in a clear light the erroneousness of this conjecture. For, instead of mentioning a state of exclusion,
and bestowing a word of consolation upon the occasion of an event like that, the author here assuredly summons to a coming forth out of Judaism as a voluntary act, and thus, as in his other reasoning, presupposes that the readers were still in the midst of Judaism, and adhered thereto with narrow-minded and unchristian stubbornness. A special support for his hypothesis Thiersch fancies is to be found in the eleventh chapter. All the historic instances there adduced are, he tells us, chosen by the author with a special bearing upon such a position of the readers as is assumed by him. But a glance at the paraphrase of the eleventh chapter, which Thiersch affords in proof of this assertion, shows that everything from which he derives his argument has first been imported by himself into the text.

— That, finally, also Ebrard’s view— according to which the epistle was designed to be “a kind of manual (Leitfaden)” (!) for Jerusalem “neophytes” (!), who, “out of dread of exclusion from the temple cultus,” seemed about to withdraw again from Christianity1—is an extremely arbitrary one, needs hardly a word of further demonstration.

As regards its contents, the epistle is ordinarily divided into two parts,— a dogmatic (i. 1–x. 18) and a paraenetic (x. 19–xiii. 25). But a rigid separation does not exist, inasmuch as exhortations, some of them of considerable extent, are already often incorporated in that first part, and the main tendency of the whole letter is a paraenetic (hortatory) one.

The contents themselves run as follows:— The revelation of God in Christ is superior to His revelations under the Old Covenant. For Christ, as the Son of God, is exalted above the angels, as mere servants (chap. i.). So much the more are we called to hold firmly to the Christian faith. For if even

1 “Hostility of the other Jews,” and “apprehension of being excluded from the temple cult,” is also assumed by v. Dollinger (Christenthum und Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung, Regensb. 1860, p. 84) as the cause of the tendency to apostasy; while Kluge (der Hebräerbriefer. Auslegung und Lehrbegriff. Neu-Ruppin 1863, p. 203 ff.) discovers in the letter a product of the Jewish apocalyptic (!?) transplanted upon Christian soil, which as such has arisen only after the destruction of Jerusalem, and received its outward occasion from the final catastrophe of the Jewish people. Deriving its theme from Rom. xi. 32, it is supposed to pursue the soterio-pedagogic object of an exhortation to repentance for the chosen people, and of a warning to the Jewish-Christian readers descended from Israel against apostasy from their living hopes.
the Mosaic law, given through the ministry of angels, could not be transgressed with impunity, the culpability of slighting the Christian salvation, proclaimed by the Lord and attested by God Himself, is incomparably greater (ii. 1–4). Not to angels, but to Christ, the Son of man, is the Messianic kingdom made subject. Certainly Christ was for a little time abased beneath the angels; but thus it must be, in order that mankind might obtain salvation: He must suffer and die, and in all things become like unto men, His brethren, in order to be able, as High Priest, to reconcile them to God (vv. 5–18). Therefore consider well Jesus, the Envoy and High Priest of our confession! He is more exalted than Moses; so much higher does He stand than Moses, as the son, who is lord over the house, has precedence over the servant of the house (iii. 1–6). Take heed, therefore, in accordance with the admonition of the Holy Ghost, of unbelief and apostasy; since the fate of the fathers, who because of their disobedience became the prey of destruction, serves to you as a warning. The promise of God of an entering into His rest is still unfulfilled; to you, also, the entrance is open, if you have faith, whereas rebelliousness against the admonition which is addressed anew unto you delivers you over to the vindicatory righteousness of God (iv. 1–13). The readers ought to hold fast to the Christian confession, since they possess in Jesus a High Priest who is not only highly exalted, but also is qualified to redeem mankind (vv. 14–16). The two main essential qualifications which every human high priest must possess,—namely, the capacity for having sympathy with erring humanity, and the being no usurper of the office, but one called of God to the same,—Christ also possesses. He is a High Priest after the manner of Melchisedec (v. 1–10). But before the author passes over, as is his purpose, to the more detailed presentation of the high-priestly dignity belonging to Christ after the manner of Melchisedec, and thus to His exalted rank above the Levitical high priests, he complains, in a digression, of the low stage of Christian knowledge at which the readers, who ought themselves long ago to have been teachers of Christianity, still remain. He exhorts them to strive after full manhood and maturity in the Christian life, and, in a note of warning,
reminds them that those who have already experienced, in its influence upon them, the fulness of blessing which pertains to Christianity, and nevertheless apostatize from the faith, by their own fault let slip beyond recovery the Christian blessedness; then, however, expresses the confidence he feels that it will not be so with the readers, who have distinguished themselves, and do still distinguish themselves by works of Christian love, and indicates what he desires of them, namely, perseverance to the end; while at the same time he directs their attention to the inviolability of the divine promise and the objective certainty of the Christian hope (v. 11—vi. 20). With the seventh chapter the author returns to the subject under discussion. He dwells first upon the person of Melchisedec himself, following up the hints of Scripture as he presents to his readers the exalted position of Melchisedec, and shows a threefold superiority of the same over the Levitical priests (vii. 1—10). From this relation of inferiority, however, it follows now that the Levitical priesthood, and thus consequently the Mosaic law in general, is imperfect and incapable of leading on to perfection. For otherwise there would have been no need, after the law had long been instituted, of the promise and the appearing of another priest of other descent (vv. 11, 12). That the Levitical priesthood, together with the Mosaic law, has lost its validity, is evident from the circumstance that Christ, to whom that divine utterance Ps. cx. 4 has reference, belongs as a matter of fact to a tribe which, according to Mosaic ordinance, has no part in the administration of the priestly office (vv. 13, 14); it is further evident from the consideration that the new priest who is promised is to bear a resemblance to Melchisedec, in which is implied just the particular, that his characteristic peculiarity is other than that of the Levitical priests (vv. 15—17). The end, to the bringing in of which the Levitical priesthood was wanting in power, is attained by Christ's everlasting priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec (vv. 18, 19). The pre-eminence of this over the Levitical priesthood appears further from the fact that it was constituted by God by virtue of an oath, whereas the former was constituted without an oath (vv. 20—22). The Levitical priests, moreover, die one after another:
Christ's priesthood, on the other hand,—and that forms a third point of superiority,—since He ever liveth, is an unchangeable and intrinsitory priesthood (vv. 23–25). A fourth point of superiority is manifested in the distinction, that while the Levitical priests are sinful men, who each successive day must offer sacrifices for their own sins and the sins of the people, Christ is the sinless Son of God, who once for all has offered up Himself as a sacrifice (vv. 26–28). But not only as regards His own person is Christ exalted far above the Levitical priests: the sanctuary, too, in which He exercises the high-priestly functions, is exalted far above the Levitical one. For Christ administers His office of high priest in the heavenly tabernacle, erected by God Himself, of which, as the prototype, the earthly tabernacle in which the Levitical priests minister is a mere copy (viii. 1—5). So much more excellent is the personal ministry of Christ, inasmuch as the covenant, whose Mediator He is, is a better covenant, because resting upon the foundation of better promises. The character of this promised new covenant is a more inner, spiritual one; and by the promise of a new covenant the old is declared to be worn out and no longer serviceable (vv. 6–13). In the disposition of the Mosaic sanctuary itself, and the ordering of the priestly ministration in conformity therewith, lies the indication on the part of God, that Mosaism is not itself the perfect religion, but only the preparatory institution for the same (ix. 1–8); as accordingly also the Levitical sacrifices, since they belong to the domain of carnal ordinance, are not in a position to make real atonement, whereas the sacrifice of Christ, presented by virtue of an eternal spirit through the efficacy of His own blood, possesses an everlasting power of atonement (vv. 9–14). In order to be the Middle Person of the New Covenant, Christ, however, must needs suffer death. That follows from the notion of a διάθηκη, since such acquires a binding character only when the death of the διάθεμενος has been before proved; as accordingly also the first, or Old Testament διάθηκη, was not consecrated without blood, and without blood-shedding there is, under the Mosaic law, no forgiveness. For the consecration of the earthly sanctuary the blood of slain animals sufficed, but for the consecration of the heavenly sanctuary there was need of a more
excellent sacrifice than these; this Christ has offered once for all at the end of the world, by His sin-cancelling sacrificial death; and in connection with His return, to be looked for unto the salvation of them that wait for Him, no repetition of sacrifice will be necessary (vv. 15–28). In the imperfection of the Mosaic law is to be sought the cause that under it the expiatory sacrifice is repeated every year; that repetition contains the reminder that there are ever sins still present, as truly a cancelling of sins by the blood of bulls and of goats is from the very nature of the case impossible (x. 1–4). Already in Scripture has it been expressed, that not by animal sacrifices, but only by the fulfilling of the will of God, deliverance from sins is to be attained. On the ground of this fulfilment of His will by Christ are we Christians sanctified (vv. 5–10). Hereupon the main distinction between the Old Testament high priest and the High Priest of the New Testament is once more brought into relief—namely, in that the former daily repeats the same sacrifices without thereby effecting the cancelling of sin; the latter, on the other hand, by His sacrifice once offered, has wrought everlasting sanctification; and finally, attention is drawn to the Scripture testimony, that there is no more need for further expiatory sacrifice (vv. 15–18).

The readers in possession of such an High Priest, and the blessing mediated by Him, are to cleave with resolution and constancy to the Christian faith, to incite one another to love and good works, and not, as has become a practice with some, to forsake the religious assemblies. And the more so since the Advent is now close at hand (vv. 19–25). For he who wittingly contemns recognised Christian truth, and sins against it, will not escape the avenging judgment of God (vv. 26–31). Mindful of the Christian courage they have displayed in former days, the readers are not to lose their Christian cheerfulness, but to persevere in the Christian career; for only a short time longer will it be before the return of Christ, and the entrance into the promised fulness of blessing (vv. 32–39). The author hereupon defines the nature of the πίστις which he requires of the readers, and then sets before them examples of the heroism of faith from times gone by (chap. xi.). In possession of such a multitude of examples,
and with the eye fixed upon Jesus Himself, the readers are to endure with stedfastness the conflict which awaits them, and to regard their sufferings as a salutary chastisement on the part of that God who is full of fatherly love towards them (xii. 1—13). To this attaches an exhortation to concord and growth in holiness (vv. 14—17). The very constitution of the New Covenant, to which the readers have come, obliges them to the endeavour after sanctification. Whereas the Old Covenant bore the character of the sensuous, earthly, and that which awakens merely fear, the New Covenant has the character of the spiritual, heavenly, brings into communion with God and all holy ones, and confers reconciliation. The readers are therefore to be on their guard against apostatizing from the New Covenant, for their guilt and exposure to punishment would be thereby incomparably augmented. Rather should they be filled with gratitude towards God for the participation in the unshakeable kingdom of the New Covenant, and serve Him with awe and reverential fear (vv. 18—29). To this are now appended exhortations to continued brotherly love (xiii. 1), to hospitality (ver. 2), to the assistance of prisoners and oppressed (ver. 3), to chastity (ver. 4), to the eschewing of covetousness and to contentment (vv. 5, 6), to the remembering of former teachers and the emulating of their faith (ver. 7), to the avoidance of unchristian doctrines and precepts (vv. 8—15), to benevolence (ver. 16), to obedience towards the presidents of the congregation (ver. 17). There follows a call to intercession on behalf of the author (vv. 18, 19), a wish of blessing (vv. 20, 21), the petition for a friendly reception of the epistle (ver. 22), the communication of a piece of intelligence (ver. 23), the prayer for the delivery of salutations, and, at the same time, the conveying of salutations to the readers (ver. 24), and the concluding wish of blessing (ver. 25).

SEC. 4.—TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

The epistle can only have been written at a late time. For, according to ii. 3, xiii. 7 (comp. also v. 12, x. 32 ff.), the recipients belonged to a second generation of Christians.
According to xiii. 7, the presidents and teachers of the congregation had already been snatched away from the same by death, and that a death by martyrdom. The death, too, of James, the brother of the Lord, who as president of the congregation at Jerusalem was reckoned one of the pillars of the Christian church (Gal. ii. 9), must thus have already taken place; as it is, moreover, on general grounds hardly conceivable that, so long as James was still living, an encroachment upon his province, by means of a letter of such tone and contents as are displayed by the Epistle to the Hebrews, should have been made by the author of this epistle. The Epistle to the Hebrews cannot therefore have been written before the year 63 (Josephus, Antiq. xx. 9. 1). Its time of composition, however, must yet fall in the period before the destruction of Jerusalem. For the presupposition that the Levitical service of the temple is still continuing, underlies the current of the whole epistle. Instances in proof are found not only viii. 4, 5, ix. 6 ff., xiii. 10 ff., and specially ix. 9,—where the continued existence of the foretabernacle (or holy place) in the Jewish sanctuary is expressly explained as a typical reference to the time now being, in which the priests still continue to offer sacrifices which are unable to afford satisfaction to the conscience (comp. besides vii. 8, 20, viii. 13, x. 2),—but also in general a great part of the contents of the epistle, wherein the erroneous persuasion of the readers that the attainment of everlasting salvation is not possible without continued participation in the Levitical sacrificial rites and temple cultus, is controverted by our author. Further, our epistle must have been composed even before the beginning of the Jewish war; for if this had already broken out, distinct references thereto could not have been wanting. Yet it would seem that the commotions and insurrections which immediately preceded the outbreak of the Jewish war had already begun. For, x. 25, reference is made to the fact that the visible signs of the approaching advent of Christ have already appeared before the eyes of the readers; and their personal condition was, according to xii. 4 ff., xiii. 13, one of great suffering. That supposition is thus the most natural
one which places the date of the epistle’s composition between the years 65 and 67.

According to Orelli (Select. patrum eccles. capp. ad εἰσοργημένα sacram pertinentia, P. III., Turic. 1822, p. 4 sq.), the Epistle to the Hebrews was composed only towards the year 90; according to Holtzmann (Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1867, p. 6 f.), Harnack (Patrum Apost. Opp. I. p. lxxxii.), and others, only after the persecution under Domitian; according to Schwegler (Nachapostolisches Zeitalter, Bd. II. p. 309), somewhere about the close of the first century; according to Hausrath (Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch., 1st ed. III. p. 401 f.), only after Trajan’s persecution; according to Volkmar (Religion Jesu, p. 388 f.) and Keim (Geschichte Jesu v. Nazara, Bd. I., Zürich 1867, p. 148 f., 636), only between the years 116–118. See, on the other hand, the remarks of Grimm in the Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1870, p. 23 ff. Without ground does Mangold (in Bleek’s Einl. in d. N. T., 3d ed., Berlin 1875, p. 617) object against the conclusiveness of Grimm’s reasoning, that “the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews conducts his argument on the basis of the Scripture representation of the tabernacle” as of “a purely ideal magnitude,” which does not guarantee “the actual continuance of the temple cultus.” This objection would be admissible if the preterites εἰσέχεν, ix. 1, and κατεσκευάσθη, ix. 2, had, in the formula which resumes all the previous description,—τούτων δὲ ὁπῶς κατεσκευασμένον, ver. 6,—been followed by a participle aorist. But it becomes directly impossible when instead thereof a participle perfect is chosen; inasmuch as, by this construction, beyond doubt the opinion of the author is manifested that in the inner arrangement of the temple the inner arrangement of the tabernacle is still perpetuated. The following praesentia can therefore be understood only in the most strictly present sense, and not “as praesentia of the legal defining.”

The place of composition is indeterminable. Only thus much is clear from xiii. 24, that it is to be sought outside of Italy.
SEC. 5.—FORM AND ORIGINAL LANGUAGE.

That the composition was an actual letter, and not, as has been assumed by Berger (Götting. theol. Bibli., Th. III. St. 3, p. 449 ff.; Moral. Einleit. in das N. T., Th. III. p. 442 f. Comp. also Reuss, Geschichte der h. Schriften N. T., 5th ed., Braunschweig 1874, § 151), a homily, is acknowledged, and is, moreover, rendered certain by the personal allusions at the close of the composition, since these admit neither of our regarding them, with Berger, as the later appendix of another author, nor, with Schweger (Nachapostolisches Zeitalter, Bd. II. p. 304), as a "literary fiction."

In like manner, the opinion frequently expressed in ancient times,—originally broached with a view to the removal of the difficulties arising from the literary character of the book, upon the presupposition of the authorship of the Apostle Paul,—and in recent times specially advocated by Joseph Hallet, jun., and John David Michaelis, that the epistle was originally composed in the Hebrew (Aramaic) language, and only afterwards translated into Greek, is at the present time universally recognised to be erroneous. Even on account of the great freedom with which the translator must have proceeded in the remoulding of the original,—on account of the purity in the Greek expression, the skill in the formation of genuine Greek periods, such as are foreign to the Aramaic, —on account of the many compound terms, the equivalent of which could have been expressed in Aramaic only by means of periphrases (as πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, i. 1; ἄπανγαςμα, i. 3; μετανοάθειν, v. 2; ἐπιπερίστατος, xii. 1, etc.),—on account of the multitude of paronomasias, which could not possibly be in every case the work of chance (i. 1, ii. 2, ii. 3, ii. 8, ii. 10, ii. 18, iii. 13, iv. 2, v. 1, v. 8, v. 14, vii. 3, vii. 9, vii. 13, vii. 19, 22, vii. 23, 24, ix. 10, ix. 23, x. 29, x. 34, x. 38, 39, xi. 27, xii. 37, xii. 24, 25, xiii. 14),—and on account of the ambiguous use of διαβήκη, ix. 15 ff.,¹ this view is wanting in all probability and naturalness. Absolutely inadmissible, however, it becomes only from the fact that the author, not

¹ Nevertheless, as has already been observed by Braun, as also by Bleek, the ἤτερος, adopted by the Aramaic from the Greek and occurring in the
only in connection with his Biblical citations, but also in the conducting of his argument, bases his reasoning throughout upon the form of the text in the LXX., even when this version gives a sense entirely at variance with that of the original text. With particular distinctness does this appear x. 5 ff., where in place of the Hebrew יִהְמוֹן אָבְרָהָם the entirely diverse σώμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι of the LXX. is adopted by our author, and then at ver. 10 the προσφορὰ τοῦ σώματος Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ brought into relation therewith.

Talmud, as frequently also in the Peshito; or the פֶּסְחִית, more usual with the Chaldee Paraphrasts, as also in the Peshito,—might certainly also have combined the twofold signification of a "covenant" and a "testament."
'Ἡ πρὸς Ἐβραίους ἐπιστολή.

A B K N have merely πρὸς Ἐβραίους. Simplest and probably earliest superscription.

CHAPTER I

Ver. 1. ἵσα ἵσατω] Elz.: ἵσα ἵσατω. Against A B D E K L M N, most min., Vulg. Copt. al., and many Fathers. The plural ἵσατω arose from the τῶν immediately following. —

Ver. 2. In place of καὶ τοὺς αἰώνας ἵσατων of the Recepta, A B D* D** E M N, 17, 37, al., Vulg. It. Copt. Syr. al., Patres Gr. et Lat. m. have καὶ ἵσατων τοὺς αἰώνας. Already recommended by Griesb. Rightly adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. In addition to the strong attestation, this position of the words is favoured by the internal ground that in this order the emphasis falls, as was required, upon ἵσατων, instead of falling upon τοὺς αἰώνας. —

Ver. 3. Before ἔλαθεν ἔλατον, Elz. Wetst. Griesb. Matth. Scholz, Bloomf. Tisch. 7, Reiche (Commentarius Criticus in N. T., t. III. p. 6 sq.), with D**, almost all min. Syr. utr. (Aeth.?) Ath. p. 362, Chrys. in text. et comm. dis., Oec. Theoph. Aug. (?) add δὲ ἐλατου. But δὲ ἐλατοῦ, instead of which δὲ ἐλατοῦ (according to Theodoret's express observation to be read as δὲ ἐλατοῦ) is found with D* 137, Copt. Clar. Germ. Cyr. (semel) Didym. Theodoret, in t. et comm. Euthal. Damasc. in textu, is wanting in A B D** N, 17, 46* 47, 80, Vulg. Arm. Cyr. (saepe) Cyr. Hieros. pseudo-Athanas. (ed. Bened. ii. 337), Damasc. (comm.) Sedul. Cassiod. Bede. Already suspected by Mill (Prolegg. 991). Rightly deleted as a gloss by Bleek, de Wette, Lachm. Tisch. 1, 2, and 8, and Alford. For although the addition δὲ ἐλατοῦ (by Himself, i.e. by the offering of Himself, inasmuch as He was at the same time High Priest and Victim) is in perfect keeping with the after deductions of the epistle, it is nevertheless not indispensable; and though it is conceivable that δὲ ἐλατοῦ was taken up into the preceding ἐλατοῦ, yet it is, on the other hand, hardly credible, seeing the endeavour of the author after linguistic euphony,
that he should have placed the words αὐτῷ, δι' ἵνα πρῶτος (αὐτῷ) in immediate juxtaposition the one with the other.— Instead of τοιοῦτος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, Bengel, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Alford read: τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τοιοῦτος. In favour of the latter decides the preponderant attestation on the part of A B D E M ἴ., 37, 46, al., Vulg. It. Cyr. Cyr. Hieros. Athan. Did. ps.-Athian. Dam. (comm.). — τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν] Elz. Matth. Scholz: τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. But ἡμῶν is wanting in A B D* E* M ἴ., 67** al., Vulg. It. Copt. Syr. Aeth. Cyr. utr. Nyss. Didym. Damasc. Aug. Sedul. Cassiod. al. Already suspected by Mill (Prolegg. 496) and Griesb. Rightly rejected by Lachm., Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Reiche, Alford. It was added as a dogmatic precaution, in order to guard against a referring of the words also to the own ἁμαρτία of the subject.— Ver. 8. ῥάβδος εὐθύνης ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου] Instead of that, Lachm. in the edit. stereot. (as likewise Tisch. 8) read: καὶ (A B D* E* M ἴ., 17, Aeth. Clar. Germ. Vulg. ms. Cyr.) ἡ (A B M ἴ., Cyr.) ῥάβδος τῆς (A B M ἴ.** Cyr.) εὐθύνης ῥάβδος (A B M ἴ.** Cyr.) τῆς βασιλείας σου. In the later larger edition, vol. II., on the other hand, he has adopted καὶ ῥάβδος τῆς εὐθύνης ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου. The καὶ at the beginning is, as also Bleek and Alford decide, to be looked upon as original, but in other respects the Recepta is to be retained, inasmuch as the ἡ before the first ῥάβδος (in the first edition of Lachmann) would be a variation from the text presented by the LXX., such as could hardly be ascribed to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, considering the closeness with which he follows that translation in other cases, and the purity in other respects of his Greek expression.— Ver. 9. ἀνομίας] A ἴ., 13, 23, al., Cyr. Chron. Alex. Eus. Chrys. ms. ἀνομίας; preferred by Bleek, since it is also found in the Cod. Alex. of the LXX. Adopted also by Tisch. 8. But ἀνομίας might easily be changed into ἀνομίας, since the latter formed a more direct opposite to the preceding δικαιοσύνην.— Ver. 12. ἡλιξών] Beza, Bengel, Tisch. 8: ἀλλάξων. Only insufficiently supported by D* ἴ., 43, Vulg. (not Harl.*) It. Tert. — αὐτῶν] Lachm.: αὐτῶν, ὡς ἱμάτιον, after A B D* E ἴ., Aeth. Arm. Clar. Germ. Spite of the strong authority, an apparent gloss, explanatory of ὡς ἤμεθαβλαν.  

Vv. 1–4. Without beginning with the ordinary salutation, with the omission even of any kind of preface, the author proceeds at once to place the revelation of God in Christ in contrast with the revelations of God under the Old Covenant, inasmuch as he characterizes the revelations under the Old Covenant as imperfect, while he shows the perfection of this
new revelation by a description of the incomparable dignity of its Mediator. With vv. 1–3 the author strikes the keynote for all that which he is subsequently to disclose to the readers. The utterances of these three verses afford the theme of his whole epistle. For the later dogmatic disquisitions are only the more full unfolding of the same; and for the later paraeneses they form the motive and fundamental consideration. To ver. 4, however,—which combines grammatically with that which precedes into the unity of a well-ordered, rhetorically vigorous and majestic period,—vv. 1–3 stand related as the universal to the particular, since that which was before expressed in a more general way is in ver. 4 brought into relief on a special side, which finds in the sequel its detailed development, in such wise that then ver. 4 in turn forms, as regards its contents, the theme for the first section of the epistle (i. 4–ii. 18).


Ver. 1. Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως κ.τ.λ.] After God had spoken oftentimes and in manifold ways of old time to the fathers in the prophets. The twofold expression Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως (comp. Maximus Tyrius, *Dissert.* vii. 2, xvii. 7) is by no means merely rhetorical amplification of one and the same idea (Chrysostom: τοντέστι διαφόρως; Michaelis, Abresch, Dindorf, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Reiche, Tholuck,1 and others). Τὸ πολυμερές is that which is divided into many parts (τὸ εἰς πολλὰ μεριζόμενον, Hesychius). Πολυμερῶς therefore presents the λαλεῖν of former ages from the point of view of something which was accomplished in a multiplicity of successive acts, whereas πολυτρόπως brings out the manifold character of the modality in which, in connection with those acts, the λαλεῖν was accomplished. Common thus to both expressions is, indeed, the notion of changeful diversity;

1 The last-named expositor would otherwise expect an antithetical ἀπαλλήλως (!) or ἤστατος at the close of the verse.
but the former marks the changeful diversity of the times in which, and the persons through whom, God revealed Himself; the latter, the changeful diversity of the divine revelations as regards contents and form. For not only was the substance and extent of the single revelations disproportional, but also the modes of their communication varied, inasmuch as God spoke to the recipients of His revelations sometimes by means of visions and dreams, sometimes mouth to mouth (comp. Num. xii. 6 ff.), sometimes immediately, sometimes by the intervention of an angel, sometimes under the veil of symbols and types, sometimes without these.\(^1\) By the very choice of πολυμερός καὶ πολυτρόπος our author indicates the imperfection of the O. T. revelations. No single one of them contained the full truth, for otherwise there would have been no need of a succession of many revelations, of which the one supplemented the other. And just so was the continual change in the modes of communicating these revelations a sign of imperfection, inasmuch as only a perfect form of communication corresponds to the perfect truth. — As, moreover, on the one hand, by means of the adverbs the imperfection of the O. T. revelation is indicated in contrast with the perfection of the N. T. revelation; so, on the other hand, by means of the identity of the subject θεὸς in αὐτοῖς and εἰδάνειν, the

\(^1\) Eroneously does Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt A. K. Z. 1857, No. 29, p. 661) raise against the above explanation, according to which πολυμερός has respect not only to the purport, but also at the same time to the form of the divine revelations, the objection that the properly understood is τῷ ἔργῳ (see below) does not accord therewith, inasmuch as revelations "mouth to mouth," or by the intervention of angels, would not have been a speaking of God in the prophets, but to (τῷ) the same. For what is spoken of (ver. 1) is not the relation of God to the prophets in itself alone, but the relation of God to the fathers through the medium of the prophets. The fact, however, that the prophets, as men in whom God was present, brought to the knowledge of the fathers the revelations received, is independent of the way and manner in which those revelations were previously communicated to themselves by God. — Since, moreover, the prophets as recipients of revelation in the first rank are distinguished from the fathers as recipients of revelation in the second rank, and only an interweaving of the relation of God to both takes place, we cannot assume either, with Riehm (Lehrgeb. des Hebräerbr. p. 90), who in other respects rightly explains πολυτρόπος, that the form of the communication of the word of God to the prophets is to be taken into account only so far as a duly proportioned form corresponded to it, even as in the prophetic word the revelation of God became known to the fathers.
inner connection between the revelations of the O. T. and that of the N. T. is brought into relief, and in this way attention is tacitly drawn to the fact that the former was the divinely appointed preliminary stage and preparation for the latter. — \( \pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota \) of old, in long bygone times. For Malachi was looked upon as the last of the O. T. prophets, and since his appearing already from four to five centuries had elapsed. Delitzsch: \( \pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota \) is not so much antiquitus as antehac, since the contrast is not between ancient and recent or new, but between past and present. Wrongly; for the opposition of a "prius" and "post" has certainly been already expressed by \( \lambda\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma \) and \( \epsilon\delta\alpha\lambda\iota\eta\varsigma\epsilon\nu \), whereas \( \pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota \) still finds its special, and indeed very significant opposition in \( \epsilon\nu' \, \epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon \, \tau\omicron\varsigma \, \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\varphi\omicron\nu \, \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \), and must accordingly be explained after the analogy of this. — \( \lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota \) particularly in our epistle of very frequent use, to indicate divine revelations. Comp. ii. 2, 3, iii. 5, vii. 14, ix. 19, xi. 18, xii. 24, 25. — \( \tau\omicron\varsigma \, \pi\alpha\tau\rho\alpha\mathrm{\ddot{o}}\varsigma\upsilon \) to the fathers (forced, and needlessly; Kurtz: \( \tau\omicron\varsigma \, \pi\alpha\tau\rho\alpha\mathrm{\ddot{o}}\varsigma\upsilon \), and equally so afterwards \( \eta\mu\iota \), is \( \mathrm{d}a\mathrm{t}i\mathrm{v}us \, \mathrm{c}o\mathrm{m}o\mathrm{d}i \), i.e. to the forefathers of the Jewish people. Comp. Rom. ix. 5. The expression in its absolute use characterizes author and recipients as born Jews. — \( \pi\rho\omega\phi\epsilon\theta\tau\alpha\iota \) is to be taken in the widest sense, in such wise that all holy men of the O. T. history who received revelations from God are comprehended under it. For unquestionably the aim of the discussion now begun, that of expressing the pre-eminence of the revelation contained in Christ over each and all of the O. T. revelations, demands this. But thus must Moses also, and very specially, be reckoned as belonging to the \( \pi\rho\omega\phi\epsilon\theta\tau\alpha\iota \), since Moses held the first rank in the series of development of the pre-Christian revelations; as, accordingly, iii. 2 ff., the superiority of Christ even over Moses is expressly asserted. Nor does the wider acceptation of \( \pi\rho\omega\phi\epsilon\theta\tau\alpha\iota \) encounter any difficulties on the ground of Biblical usage. Comp. e.g. Gen. xx. 7, where Abraham is spoken of as a \( \pi\rho\omega\phi\epsilon\theta\tau\alpha\iota \) (\( \kappa \nu \zeta \)); Deut. xxxiv. 10, where it is said of Moses: \( \kappa\alpha\iota \, \omicron\nu\kappa \, \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon \, \acute{\epsilon} \, \pi\rho\omega\phi\epsilon\theta\tau\alpha\iota \, \eta\iota \, \acute{\iota}\sigma\rho\alpha\iota\upsilon \, \omicron\nu \, \acute{\iota}\, \sigma\omicron\varphi\omega\varsigma \, \omicron\nu \, \omicron\nu\mu\omega\upsilon \upsilon \upsilon \upsilon \). Philo, too (de nom. mut. p. 1064 A, ed. Mangey, I. p. 597), calls Moses the \( \acute{\alpha}r\chi\nu\pi\rho\omega\phi\epsilon\theta\tau\alpha\iota \). — By virtue of this wider acceptation of \( \pi\rho\omega\phi\epsilon\theta\tau\alpha\iota \) in itself, the opinion of Er. Schmid and Stein, that
ἐν τοῖς προφήταις signifies: “in the prophetic Scriptures,” becomes an impossibility; quite apart from the consideration that this interpretation is also sufficiently refuted by the antithesis ἐν ὑιῷ. But just as little is ἐν τοῖς προφήταις to be made equivalent to διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, as is done by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, and the majority, also Böhme, Reiche, Tholuck, Stengel, Ebrard, Bisping, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Maier, and M'Caul. For the linguistic character of the Epistle to the Hebrews affords no warrant for the supposition of such a Hebraism in the interchange of prepositions. Nor is this proved by iver 25, to which Tholuck appeals in following the precedent of Fritzsche (Jen. Literaturzeit. 1843, p. 59). Ἐν is of more extensive significance than διὰ. While the latter would signify the mere medium, the mere instrument, ἐν implies that God, in revealing Himself to the fathers by the prophets, was present in the latter, was indwelling in them, in such wise that the prophets were only the outward organs of speech for the God who spoke in them. Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 3; Matt. x. 20. — ἐπ' ἐσχάτον τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων] Antithesis to πάλαι. Wrongly does Delitzsch, with the approval of Meier (comp. also Schneckenburger in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1861, H. 3, p. 557), take τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων as apposition to ἐπ' ἐσχάτον: “at the period’s close, which these days form,”— for which, on account of the article before ἡμερῶν, the placing of ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐσχάτου would at least have been required,— while he then still more arbitrarily finds in ἐσχάτον τῶν ἡμερῶν “the expression indicative of one idea, equivalent to ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἑρώτας, and makes τούτων belong logically to the whole idea! The ἡμέραι αὐται are identical with that which is elsewhere called ὁ αἰῶν οὗτος, in opposition to ὁ αἰῶν μελλόν. The demonstrative τούτων refers to the fact that these ἡμέραι are the period of time in which the author equally as his readers lives, and of an ἐσχάτον of these ἡμέραι he speaks, because like all N. T. writers—the author of the Second Epistle of Peter (iii. 4 ff.) excepted—he regards the return of Christ, for the transforming of the present order of the world and the accomplishment of the Messianic kingdom, as near at hand; comp. x. 37, ix. 26. — ἡμὲν] to us, namely, who belong
to the age just mentioned, the ἐσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων. Antithesis to τοῖς πατρᾶσιν. — ἐν υἱῷ anarthrous, as vii. 28; not because υἱὸς has acquired the nature of a nomen proprium (Böhme, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 272), but for the indication of the essential property: in one (to wit, Christ) who is not merely prophet—who is more than that, namely, Son.

Vv. 2–4. The author unfolds the idea of superiority contained in υἱῷ, ver. 1, in sketching a brief portraiture in full of the Son of God, and setting vividly before the readers the incomparable dignity of this Son, as manifested in each single one of the various periods of His life.

Ver. 2. As far as τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, ver. 3. The dignity of the Son as the premundane Logos.— Τιθέναι with double accusative, in the sense of τοιοῦτοι τινά τι, is no Hebraism (τοιοῦτον, τίσιν), but is very frequent with the classics. Comp. e.g. Herodian, Hist. v. 7. 10: Ἕφ αὖ Ἀντωνίων πάν ἡγαλλε καὶ μετεγγραφή, θέμενοι αὐτὸν υἱὸν καὶ κοιμών τῆς ἀρχῆς; Xenophon, Cyrop. iv. 6. 3: ὁσπερ ἂν εὐθαίμονα πατέρα παιὸς τιμῶν τιθης; Aelian, Var. Hist. xiii. 6; Homer, Odys. ix. 404, al. Comp. also Elsead loc.; Kühner, II. p. 226.— Ἐθηκεν, however, has reference not so much to the time when Christ, having completed the work of redemption, has returned to the Father in heaven (so the Greek expositors; and in like manner Primasius, Erasmus (Paraphr.), Calvin, Cameron, Corn. a Lapide, Grotius, Schlichting, Calov, Hammond, Braun, Limborch, Storr, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 295 ff.; 1 Maier, Moll, and others), but

1 According to Riehm, the author first (ver. 2) glanced at the final point of the power of the Redeemer, and then at the beginning thereof, and after this (ver. 3) described the way to that final point with respect to the beginning. But however delicate and acute this conception of the subject, it is too greatly refined and artificial. In point of simplicity and naturalness it falls short of the view that at vv. 2, 3 the various phases of the life of Christ are described in their historic succession, so that only in connection with the intermediate member—ὁ... φιλον τι κ.τ.λ., ver. 3 (see on the verse)—there resounds throughout, in addition to the main reference to an earlier condition of the life of Christ, at the same time the subordinate reference to a later condition of His life. That which Riehm urges in support of his own view, and in refutation of the opposite one, is easily disposed of. When he thinks, in the first place, that only by his apprehension the whole structure of the period becomes thoroughly clear, this is
relates to the appointment made in the eternal decree of God before all time; thus has reference to Christ as the premundane Logos. This application is required in order to a due proportion with the declarations immediately following, and to the logical development of the well thought-out periods, in which the discourse reaches the exaltation of the incarnate Redeemer only with ἐκάθεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλουσώσεως ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, ver. 3. The idea of the pre-existence of Christ or
the Son of God as the eternal Logos with its nearer definitions, as this comes forth here and in that which immediately follows, is the same as is met with also in Paul's writings. Comp. Col. i. 15 ff.; Phil. ii. 6; 1 Cor. viii. 6, x. 4, xv. 47; 2 Cor. iv. 4, viii. 9. Yet, in the shaping of this idea on the part of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, not only the teaching of Paul, but likewise the Logos-speculations of Philo, with whose writings the Epistle to the Hebrews has manifold points in common, have not been without influence.—κληρονόμον πάντων] heir, i.e. (future) Possessor and Lord of all things, namely, of the world. Chrysostom: Τῷ δὲ τοῦ κληρονόμου ὄνοματι κέχρηται, δύο δηλών, καὶ τὸ τῆς νομίμως γενήσιον, καὶ τὸ τῆς κυριότητος ἀναπόσπαστον. Comp. Gal. iv. 7; Rom. viii. 17.—δι' οὗ] by whom. Grammatically unwarranted, Grotius: propter quem (δι' ὧν). Comp. also ii. 10.—καὶ ἐποίησεν] The emphasis falls upon the word ἐποίησεν, on that account preposed, while τοὺς αἰώνας only takes up again under a varying form a notion already expressed in that which precedes, and καὶ indicates no heightening of the expression (even, or more than this; Wolf and others), but is intended to bring out the accordance between the statement in the second relative clause and that in the first; so that the fact that by the Son the αἰώνας were created is made to follow as something quite natural, from the fact that He was by God constituted κληρονόμος πάντων (by whom He also created, etc.). Wrongly does Piehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräbr. p. 298 f.) invert the relation of the two members indicated by καὶ, in finding out the sense: “the installation of the Son in the office of the world’s dominion is in entire accordance with the fact that by the Son the world was created; in other words, from the relation of the Son to God and the world, revealed in the latter fact, His installation in the office of the world’s dominion presents nothing extraordinary, but rather appears something which we could not at all expect to be otherwise.” [So in substance Owen, who seeks to combine the two meanings of τιθέναι.] Had this been meant, then δι' οὗ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰώνας, δὲ καὶ ἐθηκέν κληρονόμον πάντων must have been written. For the καὶ of the second clause accentuates the fact that what follows is in accord with that which precedes, not
that what precedes is in accord with that which follows. Comp. Phil. iii. 20, where by means of καὶ the fact that we expect the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven as a deliverer is represented as something quite natural, since our πολίτευμα is in heaven; but not conversely is the fact that our πολίτευμα is in heaven deduced from the presupposition of our expecting Christ from thence.— τοὺς αἰῶνας does not here denote the ages; either in such wise that the totality of the periods of time from the creation of the world to its close is meant (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Thomas Aquinas, Daniel Heinsius), for this thought would be too abstract; or in such wise that the two main periods in the world's history—the pre-Messianic and the Messianic—are to be understood thereby (Paulus, Stein), for in connection with the absolute τοὺς αἰῶνας no one could have thought of this special division into two parts. Nor must we either apprehend τοὺς αἰῶνας of the Αeonς in the sense of the Gnostics (Amelius in Wolf, Fabricius, Cod. Apocryph. N. T. I. p. 710); for at the time when our author wrote this notion of the word did not yet exist. τοὺς αἰῶνας is to be understood of the world's, of the totality of all things existing in time (and space), so that it is identical with the preceding πάντων and the following τὰ πάντα of ver. 3. ὁ αἰών, it is true, has always with the classics the strict notion of duration of time; but, as in the case of the Hebrew שָׁעִּים, this notion might easily pass over into the wider notion of that which forms the visible contents of time, thus into that of the complex of all created things. This interpretation is confirmed by the reading of xi. 3, where αἰῶνες cannot possibly be used in any other sense.— As parallel passages to this second relative clause of ver. 2, expressing the thought of a creation of the universe by the pre-mundane Son of God, comp. in Paul's writings, Col. i. 16; 1 Cor. viii. 6; in those of John, John i. 3, 10. Philo, too, supposes the world was created by the Logos, as the earliest or first-born Son of God. Comp. de Cherubim, p. 129 (ed. Mangey, I. p. 162): ἰδε τὴν μεγίστην οἰκίαν ἢ πόλιν, τὸν κόσμον εὐρήσεις ὡς αἴτιων μὲν αὐτῶν τῶν θεών, ὡς οὖ γέγονεν, ὡς τὰ τέσσερα στοιχεῖα, ἐξ ὦν συγκράθη, ὁργασσών δὲ λόγον θεοῦ, δι' οὖ κατεσκευάσθη, τῆς δὲ κατα-

Ver. 3. Continued description of the dignity of the Son. The main declaration of the verse, δε ἐκάθεν εἰς εδεξιά τῆς μεγαλουσίης εἰς ὑψηλόν, is established on the grounds presented in the preceding participles ὁ ... φέρων τε ... ποιησάμενος. The grounding, however, is a twofold one, inasmuch as the participles present still relate to Christ as the Λόγος ἀσαρκος, and describe His nature and sway, while the participle ἀορίστ has as its contents the redeeming act of the Λόγος ἐσαρκος. Of the two present participles, the first corresponds to the former half of the proposition, ver. 2, and the second to the latter half. — δὲ ἀπαίγασμα] not: quum esset, but: quum sit ἀπαίγ., or as ἀπαίγασμα. For the εἶναι ἀπαίγασμα κ.τ.λ. and φέρειν τὰ πάντα κ.τ.λ., which was appropriate to the Son of God in His prehuman form of existence, has, after the exaltation or ascension has taken place, become again appropriate to Him.1 — ἀπαίγασμα] an Alexandrian word, occurring Wisd. vii. 26, and frequently with Philo, but only here in the N. T. It is explained either (1) as a beaming forth or radiance, i.e. as a ray which flows forth from the light, e.g., of the sun. So Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz, and Hofmann, after the example of Clarius, Jac.

1 Hofmann (Schriftbew. I. p. 159 f., 2d ed.; comp. also his remarks in the Commentary, p. 64 ff.) believes that the ἄπαίγασμα κ.τ.λ. and the φέρω τὰ πάντα κ.τ.λ. must be referred exclusively to the exalted Christ, but on untenable grounds. For from the consideration that φέρω τὰ πάντα “forms the most unambiguous contrast to the condition of Christ’s life in the flesh,” nothing is to be argued in favour of this view; because this contrast is equally to be supposed, when we understand these words alike of the premundane as of the exalted Christ. The further assertion, however, that in the case of a referring of ἄπαίγασμα κ.τ.λ. to that which Christ is apart from His humanity, the declaration ver. 3 must have been connected by means of ἂν ἴσαι instead of ἄν, is lacking in all grammatical support. For, so far as concerns the sense, there is no difference whatever between ἂν ἴσαι and ἄν; only regard for rhetorical euphony and the due rounding off of the periods determined the author upon expressing himself as he did.
Cappellus, Gomar, Schlichting, Gerhard, Calov, Owen, Rambach, Peirce, Calmet, Heumann, Böhme, Reiche. Or (2) as image, reflected radiance, i.e. as a likeness formed by reflex rays, reflection. So Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Wittich, Limborch, Stein, Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt A. Kirch.-Z. 1857, No. 29, p. 661, and in his Lexic. N. T. p. 36), Nickel (Reuter's Repert. 1857, Oct., p. 17), Moll, and others; so substantially also Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 279).

In favour of the former interpretation it may be advanced that Hesychius paraphrases ἀπαύγασμα by ἕλιον φέγγος; and in Lexic. Cyrilis ms. Brem. are found the words: ἀπαύγασμα ἀκτίς ἕλιου, ἡ πρώτη τοῦ ἡλιακοῦ φωτὸς ἀποβολή, as accordingly also Chrysostom and Theophylact explain ἀπαύγασμα by φῶς ἐκ φωτός, the latter with the addition τὸ ἀπαύγασμα ἐκ τοῦ ἕλιου καὶ οὐχ ὄστερον αὐτοῦ; and Theodoret observes: Τὸ γὰρ ἀπαύγασμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐστὶ καὶ σὺν τῷ πυρὶ ἐστὶ καὶ αἰτίων μὲν ἔχει τὸ πῦρ, ἀχώριστον δὲ ἐστὶ τοῦ πυρὸς. ἐξ οὖ γὰρ τὸ πῦρ, ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα. But without reason does Bleek claim, in favour of this first interpretation, also the usage of Philo and Wisd. vii. 26. For in the passage of Philo, de Speciall. legg. § 11 (ed. Mangay, II. p. 356), which Bleek regards as "particularly clear" (Τὸ δὲ ἐμφανώμενον [Gen. ii. 7] δῆλον ὡς αἰθέριον ἢν πνεῦμα καὶ εἴ δή τι αἰθερίου πνεύματος κρείττον, ἀτε τῆς μακραίας καὶ τρισμακραίας φύσεως ἀπαύγασμα), there is found no ground of deciding either for or against this acceptance of the word. The other two passages of Philo, however, which are cited by Bleek, tell less in favour of it than against it. For in the former of these ἀπαύγασμα is explained by ἐκμαγεῖον [impression] and ἀπόστασις [shred] as synonyms, in the latter by μίμημα [copy]. (De Opific. Mundi, p. 33 D, in Mangay, I. p. 35: πᾶς ἀνθρωπός κατὰ μὲν τὴν διάνοιαν ὥσπερ θείος λόγος, τῆς μακραίας φύσεως ἐκμαγεῖον ἡ ἀπόστασις ἡ ἀπαύγασμα γεγονός, κατὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ σώματος κατασκευὴν ἄπαντι τῷ κόσμῳ. — De plantat. Noé, p. 221 C, Mang. I. p. 337: Τὸ δὲ ὁγάσμα ἄδειν ὁγάν ἀπαύγασμα, μίμημα ἀρχιτύπου ἐπεὶ τὰ αἰσθήσεις καλὰ καὶ νοήσει καλῶν εἰκόνες.) Finally, there are found also, Wisd. vii. 26, as kindred expressions, besides ἀπαύγασμα, the words ἔσωπτρον
and εἰκών. (Απαύγασμα γάρ ἐστι φωτὸς ἀδίων καὶ ἐσοπτρον ἀκηλιδωτόν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνεργείας καὶ εἰκών τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ.) The decision is afforded by the form of the word itself. Inasmuch as not ἀπαύγασμος, but ἀπαύγασμα is written, an active notion, such as would be required by Bleek’s acceptance, cannot be expressed by it, but only a passive one. Not the ray itself, but the result thereof must be intended. For as ἀπήχησις denotes that which is produced by the ἀτηχεῖν, the resonance or echo, and ἀποσκίασμα that which is produced by the ἀποσκίαζειν, the shadow cast by an object, so does ἀπαύγασμα denote that which is produced by the ἀπαύγασμα. Ἀπαύγασμα is therefore to be rendered by reflected radiance, and a threefold idea is contained in the word—(1) the notion of independent existence, (2) the notion of descent or derivation, (3) the notion of resemblance. — τῆς δόξης] of His (the divine) glory or majesty. For the following αὐτοῦ belongs equally to τῆς δόξης as to τῆς ὑποστάσεως. — καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ] and as impress of His essential being, so that the essential being of the Father is printed forth in the Son, the Son is the perfect image and counterpart of the Father. Comp. Philo, de plantat. Noë, p. 217 A (ed. Mangey, I. p. 332), where the rational soul (ἡ λογικὴ ψυχή) is called a coin which stands the test, οὐσιωθεία καὶ τυπωθεία σφραγίδει θεοῦ, ὡς ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐστίν ἀδίων λόγος. In the N. T. the word χαρακτήρ is found only in this place. To interpret ὑπόστασις, however, in the sense of πρόσωπον, or “Person” (Thomas Aquinas, Cajetan, Calvin [in the exposition], Beza, Piscator, Cornelius a Lapide, Gerhard, Dorscheus, Calov, Sebastian Schmidt, Bellarmin, Braun, Brochmann, Wolf, Suicer), is permitted only by later usage, not by that of the apostolic age. For the rest, that which is affirmed by the characteristic ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, the Apostle Paul expresses, Col. i. 15, by εἰκῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀδρατοῦ, and, Phil. ii. 6 (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4), by ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχουν. — φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ] and as He who upholds the whole creation by the word of His power. Comp. Col. i. 17: καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνεάτησεν; Philo, de Cherub. p. 114 (ed. Mang. I. p. 145): ὁ πνευματικὸς καὶ
κυβερνήτης τοῦ παντός λόγος θείος. — τὰ πάντα is not to be limited, with the Socinians, to the kingdom of grace, but is identical with πάντων; and τοῦ αἰῶνας, ver. 2, thus denotes the complex of all created things. On φέρειν in the signification: to uphold anything, so that its continued existence is assured, comp. Plutarch, _Lucull._ 6: φέρειν τὴν πόλιν; Valerius Maximus, xi. 8. 5: Humeris gestare salutem patriae; Cicero, _pro Flacco_, c. 38: Quam (republicam) vos universam in hoc judicio vestris humeris, vestris inquam humeris, judices sustinetis; Seneca, _Ep._ 31: Deus ille maximus potentissimusque ipse vehit omnia; _Herm._ Past. iii. 9. 14: Nomen Filii Dei magnum et immensum est et totus ab eo sustentatur orbis. — τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ] more emphatic than if τῷ ῥήματι αὐτοῦ τῷ δυνατῷ were written, to which Wolf, Kuinoel, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield would, without reason, make the words equivalent. Oecumenius: ῥήμα δὲ ἐπε δεικνύει πάντα εὐκόλως αὐτὸν ἀγειν καὶ φέρειν. Theophylact: τηλικοῦτον ὅγκον τῆς κτίσεως τὸν ὑπέρμεγαν ὡς οὐδὲν αὐτὸς διαβαστάξει καὶ λόγῳ μόνῳ πάντα δυναμένῳ. — Not the gospel, however, is meant by ῥήμα τῆς δυνάμεως; but as by the word of Omnipotence the world was created (comp. xi. 3), so is it also by the word of Omnipotence upheld or preserved. — αὐτοῦ] goes back to ὅς, thus to the Son, not to God (Grotius, Peirce, Reiche, Paulus). — καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος] after Ἐκκλησία ἔρχεται ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καθαρισμὸν τῷ κτισμῇ καθαρισμὸν τῷ στρατῷ ἐσώμενον, "We shall
cast him down headlong for an expiation of the army." To conceive of the áμαρτιαι themselves as a direct object to καθαρσιμῶν, to which Bleek and Winer, Gramm. 5th ed. p. 214 (differently, 6th ed. p. 168, 7th ed. p. 176), were inclined, and in favour of which Delitzsch and Alford (comp. also Hofmann ad loc.) pronounce themselves with decision,—in such wise that these are thought of as the disease of the human race, which is healed or put away by Christ,—is not at all warranted by the isolated and less accurate form of expression: ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτῷ ἡ λέπρα, Matt. viii. 3. Nor is it requisite to supply ἀπό before τῶν ἁμαρτίων, and assume a pregnancy of expression, since καθαρός and its derived words are not only connected by ἀπό, but likewise, with equal propriety, by the bare genitive. See Kühner, II. p. 163. — ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ἰσχλοῖς] sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high. Culminating point of the description. Characteristic of the dignity of the Son after the completed work of redemption, in the period of His return to the Father, which followed the period of His self-abasement. The sitting at the right hand of God is a well-known figure, derived from Ps. cx. 1, in order to designate supreme honour and dominion over the world (Rom. viii. 34, al.). — ἐν ἰσχλοῖς] Comp. Ps. xciii. 4, cxiii. 5; tantamount to ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, Heb. viii. 1; or ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, Eph. i. 20; or ἐν ἰσχίοις, Luke ii. 14, xix. 38, al. The addition belongs not to μεγαλωσύνης (Beza, Böhme, Bleek, Ebrard, Alford),—since otherwise the article would be repeated,—but to ἐκάθισεν. The plural ἐν ἰσχλοῖς is explained from the supposition of several heavens, in the highest of which the throne of the Divine Majesty was placed.

Ver. 4. The author has first, vv. 1–3, instituted a parallel between the mediators of the Old Testament revelations in general or in pleno, and the Mediator of the Christian revelation. But among the revelations of God under the Old Covenant, none attained in point of glory to the Mosaic; inasmuch as this was given not only through the medium of a man enlightened by the Spirit of God,—i.e. by one of the προφῆται, mentioned ver. 1,—but, according to the universal Jewish belief (vid. ad ii. 2), was given by the instrumentality not only of Moses, but also of angels. As, therefore, the author

Meyer.—Heb. F
has maintained the superiority of Christ, as the Son of God, over the προφήται, so is he now naturally further led to show the superiority of Christ over the angels also. This is done in the declaration, ver. 4, which in a grammatical sense is closely connected with that which precedes, and serves for the completing of the description of Christ's characteristic qualifications; at the same time, however, logically regarded, affords the theme for the following disquisition, which constitutes the first section of the epistle (i. 5–ii. 18).—

The supposition of Tholuck, that the addition of ver. 4 "has an independent object," i.e. is occasioned by polemic reference to the opinion spread abroad among the Jews, in addition to other conceptions with regard to the person of the Messiah, that He was an intermediate spirit or angel,¹ is entirely erroneous. It finds no countenance whatever in the reasoning of the author, and is opposed to the whole scope of the epistle, that of showing in detail the inferiority of the Old Covenant as compared with the New, and of influencing in a corresponding manner the conduct of the readers.—

The oratorical formula of comparison: τοσούτως ... διός, which recurs vii. 20–22, viii. 6, x. 25, is found likewise with Philo, but never with Paul.—κρείττων] better, or more excellent, namely, in power, dignity, and exaltedness; comp. vii. 19, 22, viii. 6, ix. 23, x. 34, xi. 16, 35, 40, xii. 24.—γενόμενος] marks the having begun to be in time, whereas διό, ver. 3, expressed the timeless eternal existence. Κρείττων τῶν ἄγγελων did Christ become just at that time when, having accomplished the work of redemption, He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high. The γενόμενος thus closely attaches itself to the ἐκάθεν, ver. 3, and is more fully explained by the fact that Christ, by virtue of His incarnation, and so long as He dwelt on earth, was made lower than the angels; comp. ii. 7, 9.—The comparative διαφορώτερον, found in the N. T. only here and viii. 6,

¹ That the defective view with regard to Christ, which saw in Him only an angel, must have called for rectification, has likewise been thought probable by Schneckenburger, who sought further to confirm this probability. Comp. the "Observations on the Epistle to the Hebrews," contributed by Riehm from Schneckenburger's remains, in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1861, H. 3, p. 544 ff.
serves, since even the positive διάφορον would have sufficed for the indication of the superiority, for the more emphatic accentuating of the signification of the word. The opinion of Hofmann, that the comparative is chosen because the name ἄγγελος is in itself an ὄνομα διάφορον, when the author contrasts the spirits of God with men living in the flesh, is quite remote from the idea of the passage.—παρά] after a comparative is very common in our epistle; cf. iii. 3, ix. 23, xi. 4, xii. 24. Comp. also Luke iii. 13; 3 Esdr. iv. 35; Thucyd. i. 23: ἡλιόν τε ἐκλείψεις, αἱ πυκνότεραι παρὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ πρὶν χρόνου μημονενόμενα ἔσεβθησαν; Herod. vii. 103; Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 225. With Paul it never occurs. Similar is ἐπέρ with the accusative, Heb. iv. 12; Luke xvi. 8.—ὅνομα] must not, with Beza, Calov, Wittich, Storr, Valckenae, Zachariae, Heinrichs, be altered into the notion of “dignity.” For this ὄνομα never signifies in itself, and its substitution would in our passage, in relation to κρείττων γενόμενος, bring about only a tautology. The name of pre-eminence above the angels, which Christ has obtained as an inheritance, is the name νίος, Son of God,— comp. ver. 5 and ver. 1,—while the angels by their name are characterized only as messengers and servants of God. Contrary to the context, Delitzsch says: the name νίος suffices not to express the thought in connection with ὄνομα. The supra-angelic name, to which the author refers, lies beyond the notionally separating and sundering language of men. It is the heavenly total-name of the Exalted One, His ὄνομα ὑπ’ἡλίον, nomen explicitum, which in this world has entered into no human heart, and can be uttered by no human tongue, the ὄνομα δ’ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτός, Rev. xix. 12. The following words of Scripture are, he supposes, only upward pointing signs, which call forth in us some foreboding as to how glorious He is. But this is opposed to the connection. For even though it be true, as advanced by Delitzsch in support of his view, that in the following O. T. passages there occur also, in addition to νίος, the wider appellations θεός and κύριος; yet, on the other hand, not merely ἐν νίο, ver. 1, as likewise ver. 5 with its proof-giving γάρ, but also the antithesis πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἄγγελους and πρὸς ὃ δὲ τὸν νιόν,
vv. 7, 8, shows that νίκες is the main conception, to which the words of address: ο θεός and κύριε, vv. 8, 10, stand in the relation of subordination, inasmuch as they are already contained in this very idea of Son. — The perfect κεκληρονιμηκεν, however, not the aorist ἐκληρονομησεν, is employed by the author; because Christ did not first obtain this name at the time of the καθίζειν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλ., ver. 3, but had already as pre-existing Logos obtained it as an abiding portion and possession. We have not, in connection with κεκληρονομηκεν, to think “quite in general of the O. T. time, in which the future Messiah received in the Word of God the name of Son,” as is asserted by Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 274), whose statement is endorsed by E. Woerner.¹ For this view is contradicted by the δι' οὐ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοῦς αἰώνας, ver. 2, in its relation to ἐν νίκε, ver. 1, according to which Christ already existed as the Son before all time. The declarations of ver. 5, which Riehm has urged in favour of the construction put by him on our passage, have only the object of affording vouchers for a condition of things already existing. — The difficulty raised, for the rest, that the name of Son is here insisted on as a distinguishing characteristic of Christ, while, nevertheless, in single passages of the O. T. (Job i. 6, ii. 1, xxxviii. 7; Gen. vi. 2, 4; Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 7; Dan. iii. 25), angels too are called sons of God, is already disposed of by the reflection that this is not the characteristic name for the angels as such. There is no need, therefore, of the justification of the author made by Bleek, that this writer, since he was not at home in the Hebrew text of the O. T., but only in the Alexandrine version thereof, which latter freely renders the majority of those passages by ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, may easily have overlooked, or perhaps have otherwise interpreted, those passages in which the literal translation is found in the LXX. (Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 7 [Gen. vi. 2, 4 ?]).

Vv. 5–14 follow the scriptural proof for ver. 4, and that in such form that in the first place, ver. 5, the διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοῖς κεκληρονομηκεν ὄνομα is confirmed, and then, vv. 6–14, the κρείττων γενόμενοι τῶν ἄγγέλων.

¹ Der Brief St. Pauli an die Hebräer, Ludwigab. 1876.
Ver. 5. *Τινὶ γὰρ εἶπεν ποτὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων*] For to which of the angels has He ever said, i.e. to none of the angels has He ever said.—The position of the words serves to put a strong accentuation at the same time upon τινι and upon τῶν ἀγγέλων.—The subject in εἶπεν is ὁ θεὸς, as is evident alike from the passage itself which is cited, and from our context; inasmuch as both in that which precedes (vv. 1–4) ὁ θεὸς was expressly mentioned as the subject of the main proposition, and in that which follows (ver. 6) the subject of εἰσαγάγη τὸν πρωτότοκον can only be God.—ποτέ] is particle of time, at any time, unquam. Wrongly taken by Ch. F. Schmid, Kuinoel, and others as a mere strengthening particle, in the sense of the German doch or the Latin tandem. For then ποτέ must have been placed immediately after τινι.—The citation νιώ...σε is from Ps. ii. 7, in verbal accordance with the LXX. In its historic sense the psalm relates to an Israelite king (probably Solomon), who, just now solemnly anointed in Zion as theocratic king, in the lofty feeling of his unity with Jehovah, warns the subjugated nations, who are meditating revolt and defection, of the fruitlessness of their undertaking. The author, however, sees Christ in the person addressed, even as a referring of this psalm to the Messiah was quite usual among the Jews of that period, and in the N. T. the Messianic interpretation thereof is further met with, besides ver. 5, in Acts xiii. 33.—νιώ μου] my Son, i.e. in the sense of the psalm, the king of my theocracy, my representative, the object of my fatherly love and protection. The author, on the other hand, takes νιώ in the sense unfolded, vv. 2, 3.—ἔγω σήμερον γεγέννηκα σε] I have this day begotten thee, i.e. in the historic sense of the original: I have, by the anointing accomplished this day, installed thee as the theocratic prince. In the sense of the author, γεγέννηκα denotes the fact of having become the Son. The question is now, how he conceived of the σήμερον. It is referred either to the moment in which Christ was manifested to be the Son of God, i.e. to the moment of the Resurrection or the Ascension (Hilary, in Psalmum; Ambrose, de Sacram. 3. 1; Calvin, Cameron, Grotius, Schlichting, Limborch, Jac. Cappellus, Owen, Calmet, Peirce, Storr, Bloomfield, Bisping,
Maier; comp. Delitzsch, who would have the words interpreted of "the entrance of the Son into the kingly life of supratherrestrial glory in God, of which the resurrection is the initial point"), or to the moment of the Incarnation (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Eusebius, in Psalmum, alii; Piscator, Böhme, Kuinoel, Hofmann, Schriftbew. I. p. 123 f. of the 2d ed.; Woerner), or, finally, to the period before the creation of the world, thus to eternity (Origen in Joh., t. i. c. 32; Athanasius, de decret. Nicen. Synod. § 13; Basil, contra Eunom. 2. 24; Augustine, in Psalmum [Arnobius of Gaul, in Psalmum]; Primasius, Theophylact, Thomas Aquinas, Cornelius a Lapide, Estius, Calov, Wittich, Braun, Carpzov, Bleek [but with wavering; more decidedly in the lectures edited by Windrath], Stein, Alford, Kurtz, and the majority). That the author, as Bleek I., de Wette, and Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 287 f.) deem possible, attached no definite notion to the αρχη του, as being without significance for his demonstration, is an unexegetical supposition. Exclusively correct, because alone in harmony with the context, is the referring of the αρχη του to eternity; since, according to ver. 2, God created the world by Christ as the Son, thus Christ must already have existed as Son before the foundation of the world. With Philo, too, occurs the same interpretation of αρχη του, as signifying eternity. Comp. De Profugis, p. 458 E (with Mangey, I. p. 554): αρχη του δ' εστιν ο άπερατος και άδινετυτπος αιων μηνον γαρ και έως αιωνων και συνων χρονων περιοδοι δομημα ανθρωπων ειναι άριθμων εκτεταμηκτων, το δ' ανευδετι δυναμαι αιωνος η αρχη του. — και παλιν] and further, serves, as frequently (e.g. ii. 13, x. 30; Rom. xv. 11, 12; 1 Cor. iii. 20; Philo, ed. Mangey, I. p. 88, 490, al.), for the introduction of a new passage of Scripture. The και παλιν κ.τ.λ. is not, however, to be taken as an assertory declaration, so that merely ειτεν would have to be supplied (in accordance with which Lachmann punctuates); but the question is continued in such wise that the proposition is to be completed by και (των ειτεν ποτε των ανγηλων) παλιν. — This second citation is derived from 2 Sam. vii. 14, in verbal accordance with the LXX. Comp. also 1 Chron. xvii. 1

1 Der Hebräerbr., erklärt von Dr. Fr. Bleek, Elberf. 1868.
(xviii.) 13. *αὐτῷ* and *αὐτός* refer in the historic sense to Solomon. To David, who designs building a temple to Jehovah, the divine direction comes by Nathan to desist from his purpose. Not David, but his seed, who shall ascend the throne after him, is to build a temple to Jehovah; to him will Jehovah for ever establish the throne of his kingdom; to him will Jehovah be a father, and he shall be to Him a son, and, if he transgress, Jehovah will chasten him with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men. Even this latter addition (which, for the rest, is not found in the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xvii. (xviii.) 13) makes it impossible to refer the words to the Messiah, as, moreover, the reference to Solomon is rendered certain even from the O. T. itself by the following passages: 1 Kings v. 19 (5), vii. 17 ff.; 2 Chron. vi. 9, 10; as also 1 Chron. xxii. (xxiii.) 9 ff., xxviii. (xxix.) 2 ff. — *εἶναι εἰς* Formed after the Hebrew חלפ. Comp. viii. 10, al.

Ver. 6. "*Ὅταν*, with the conjunctive aorist, takes the place of the Latin futurum exactum. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 289. "*Ὄταν εἰσαγάγῃ* cannot consequently mean, as was still assumed by Bleek I., and recently by Reuss: 1 "when He brings in," but only: "when He shall have brought in." To take *πάλιν*, however, with the Peshito, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Hammond, Bengel, Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Valckenae, Schulz, Kuinoel, Bleek, Stengel, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Reuss, alii, as ver. 5, i.e. merely as the formula for linking on a new citation, is forbidden by the position of the words. It must then have been written: *πάλιν δὲ, ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ... μέτέχει.* The possibility of an inversion of the *πάλιν* is defended, it is true, by Bleek, after the precedent of Carpzov, on the authority of two passages in Philo (Legg. Allegor. iii. p. 66; ed. Mangey, p. 93). But neither of these presents a case analogous to the one before us, nor does an inversion of the *πάλιν* at all take place in them. For in both *πάλιν* has the signification *in turn*, or *on the other hand*, inasmuch as in the former two classes of

persons (ὅ δὲ νῦν τῶν ἰδιῶν ἀπολείπτων and ὅ δὲ πάλιν ἀποδιδράσκων θεών), in the latter two classes of δόξαι or opinions (Ἡ μὲν τῶν ἐπὶ μέρους, τῶν γεννητῶν καὶ θυτῶν ἀπολυπτοῦσα and ἥ δὲ πάλιν θεών ἀποδοκιμάζουσα), are compared together by way of contrast, in such wise that in both πάλιν only serves for bringing the δὲ into stronger relief, and in both has occupied its legitimate place. By virtue of its position, πάλιν, in our passage, can be construed only with εἰσαγάγῃ, in such wise that a bringing again of the First-born into the world, which is an event still belonging to the future, is spoken of. In the former member of ver. 6 the reference can accordingly be neither to the time of the Incarnation of the Son (Chrysostom, Primasius, Calvin, Owen, Calov, Bengel, Storr, Kuinoel [Stuart: or beginning of His ministry], Bleek II. alii); nor to the time of the Resurrection and Exaltation to heaven (Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, Wittich, Braun, Wetstein, Rambach, Peirce, Whitby, and others); nor, as Bleek I. supposed, to a moment yet preceding the Incarnation of Christ, in which the Father had, by a solemn act as it were, conducted forth and presented the Son to the beings created by Him, as the First-born, as their Creator and Ruler, who was to uphold and guide all things, which in any case would be an entirely singular thought in the N. T.,—but simply and alone to the coming again of Christ to judgment, and the accomplishment of the Messianic kingdom. So, rightly, Gregory Nyssen, contra Eunom. Orat. iii. p. 541; Cornelius a Lapide, Cameron [Mede: for the inauguration of His millennial kingdom], Gerhard, Calmet, Camerarius, Estius, Gomar, Böhme, de Wette, Tholuck, Bisping, Hofmann (Schriftbew. I. p. 172, 2d ed.), Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 306, 617), Alford, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Woerner. The objection brought by Bleek and Ebrard against this interpretation of the former member, required as it is by the exigencies of the grammar,  

1 In like manner Reuss, lc. p. 201: "Il est plus naturel de songer au moment, où le monde nouvellement créé était sommé de reconnaître le Fils comme créateur. A ce moment, les anges seuls étaient les êtres formant pour ainsi dire l'Eglise du Verbe (comme xii. 22), et qui pouvaient recevoir l'ordre de Dieu d'adorer le Fils."
viz. that the discourse could not turn on the bringing again of the First-born into the world, unless an earlier bringing in of the same into the world, or at least a former being of the Son in τῇ οἰκουμένῃ had been explicitly spoken of, is invalidated by vv. 1, 3, where certainly the discourse was already of the historic appearing of the Son on earth, and thus of a first bringing in of the same into the world. The additional objection of Bleek, however, that the author would hardly have limited the scope of a divine summons to the angels to do homage to the First-born to a time even in his day future, is set aside by the consideration that, according to ii. 9, Christ was during His earthly life humbled to a condition beneath the angels, and only the Parousia itself is the epoch at which His majesty will be unfolded in full glory. — τὸν πρωτότοκον] in the N. T. only here without more precisely defining addition; comp. however, Ps. lxxxix. 28 (27). That the expression must not be regarded as equivalent to μονογενὴς, as is done by Primasius, Oecumenius (τὸ δὲ πρωτότοκον οὐκ ἐπὶ δευτέρου λέγει ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ἑνὸς καὶ μόνου τοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐκ τοῦ πατρός), Clarius, and even now by Stengel, is self-evident. But neither is it identical with τὸ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, Col. i. 15, in such wise that the temporal priority of Christ, as the eternal Logos, over all creatures, and the notion of His precedence over all creatures, necessarily resulting therefrom, should be contained in the word (Bleek, Grimm in the Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt A. K.-Z., No. 29, p. 662; Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 292 f.; Kurtz, Ewald, and others). For this interpretation is excluded by the absoluteness of the expression in our passage. Rather is Christ called the First-born with respect to Christians, who are His brethren (ii. 11 f.), and therefore likewise ιόλ of God (ii. 10). Comp. also Rom. viii. 29. — As, for the rest, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews terms Christ the First-born Son of God; so does Philo also term the Logos the First-born Son. Comp. de Agricultura, p. 195 B (ed. Mangey, I. p. 308): τὸν ὄρθων αὐτοῦ λόγον, πρωτόγονον υἱὸν. De Confus. Ling. p. 329 (ed. Mang. I. p. 415): τούτων μὲν γὰρ πρεσβύτατον υἱόν ὁ τῶν δύτων ἀνέτειλε πατέρ, δι' ἑτέρωθε πρωτόγονον ὀνόμασεν, al. — ἡ οἰκουμένη] the world, not in the
widest sense (equivalent to οἱ αἰῶνες, Bleek; or to ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα, Böhme); but, since the former member has reference to the Parousia, the habitable earth. — λέγει] sc. ο ὕθεσις, not ἡ γραφή (Grotius, Clericus, Böhme, and others). The present is chosen, because the utterance of God, which shall infallibly be made in the future, stands already noted down in the Scripture. — The citation is not derived from Ps. xcvii. 7, but from Deut. xxxii. 43. For, in the former passage, the LXX. have a reading divergent from that of our text, in the words: καὶ προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες [οἱ] ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, whereas in the Codex Vaticans of Deut. xxxii. 43, the words occur as in our text; while the καὶ, taken up by the author into his citation, manifestly points — seeing that it is without any importance for his reasoning — to the verbatim reproduction of an O. T. utterance. Now, it is true our author follows in other cases a form of the Sept. text which bears affinity less to that contained in the Codex Vaticans than to that in the Codex Alexandrinus, and the latter displays the variation from the Cod. Vat. Deut. xxxii. 43, in so far as νῦν ὕθεσις is found therein in place of ἄγγελοι θεοῦ. But the Song of Moses, of which Deut. xxxii. 43 forms the conclusion, is communicated anew, in many mss. of the LXX., and so also in the Codex Alexandrinus, in a second recension, having its place after the Psalms; and in this second recension the Codex Alexandrinus, too, reads ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, only the article οἱ has been interpolated between πάντες and ἄγγελοι. It is probable, therefore, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews did not take the citation direct from Deut. xxxii. 43, but mediately, i.e. from that second recension of the hymn. — It remains to be said that the words of the citation are wanting in the Hebrew; they are found only in the LXX. — προσκυνεῖν] with the dative only in the case of later classic authors, whereas the earlier combine the accusative with this verb. Comp. Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 463; Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 113, 266. The N. T. has both constructions, as besides them the Hebraizing turns προσκυνεῖν ἐνώπιον, or ἐμπροσθεῖν τινος, or τῶν πρὸς τινας τινος. See the Lexicons. — αὑτῷ] That this pronoun of the third person was to be referred to the Messiah naturally suggested itself, inas-
much as Jehovah is the subject speaking immediately before in the Song.

Vv. 7–12. Contrastful comparison of a declaration of Scripture characterizing the angels, and two declarations characterizing the Son.

Ver. 7. Διός] with regard to, as Luke xx. 19; Acts xii. 21; Rom. x. 21, and frequently. Comp. Matthiae, p. 1181; Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 378.— μέν] corresponds to the δε of ver. 8, thus places ver. 7 in express opposition to ver. 8. — λέγει] namely, God, in the Scripture. — The citation is from Ps. civ. 4, according to the LXX. (Cod. Alex., whereas Cod. Vatican. has πῦρ φλέγων instead of πυρός φλόγα). The psalm praises Jehovah as the Creator and Sustainer of all nature. In the Hebrew the words cited read: וְנָקָלָה הָאָדָם וּמַעֲשֵׂהוֹ, and, having respect to their connection with what precedes and that which follows, no doubt can obtain on the point that they are to be rendered,—what is objected thereto by Hofmann (Schriftbew. I. p. 325 f., 2 Aufl.), Delitzsch, and Alford is untenable,—“God makes winds His messengers, and flames of fire (lightnings) His servants,” in such wise that the thought is expressed: as the whole of nature, so are also winds and lightnings servants of God the Lord.¹ Otherwise have the LXX. apprehended the sense of the words, as is shown by the addition of the article before ὁ ἄγγελος and λευτουργοῦς, and they are followed by our author. [So the Targum also.] They have taken τοὺς ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ and τοὺς λευτουργοῦς αὐτοῦ as the objects, πνεύματα and πυρός φλόγα, on the other hand, as the predicates to ποιῶν, thus have found the meaning of the words: “He makes His angels winds, and His servants a flame of fire.” If we now observe the scope of the thought of those declarations of Scripture concerning the Son which follow, vv. 8–12, placed as they are in antithetical relation to the one before us, it is evident that the author must have discovered the inferiority of the angels compared with the Son, as attested in Scripture, in a twofold respect—(1) that the angels are servants, whereas the Son is ruler; (2) that the angels are mutable and perishable,

¹ Comp., as to the thought, Xenophon, Memorabilia, iv. 3. 14, where quite similarly lightning and winds (νεφελώ and αύγμα) are called ὑπηρέται τῶν θεών.
whereas the Son abides the same for ever. — The conception of such a subjection on the part of the angels, that they must submit even to be changed into elements, is, moreover, not uncommon among the Rabbins. Comp. e.g. Shemot rabba, sec. 25, fol. 123. 3: "aliando ipsis (angelos) facit ventos, q. d. qui facis angelos tuos ventos, aliando ignem, q. d. ministros tuos flammam ignis." Jalkut Simeoni, part II. fol. 11. 3: "Angelus dixit ad Manoah: nescio ad cujus imaginem ego faciam sim; nam Deus singulis horis nos immutat; cur ergo nomen meum interrogas? Nonnunquam facit nosi ignem, alias ventum, interdum viros, abas denique angelos." See in general, Schöttgen and Wetstein ad loc. — نة悤µµατα] not: spirits (Luther, Erasmus, Paraphrase; Clarius, Piscator, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Brochmann, Bengel, Böhme), but: winds. — αὐγγείλασ] only another name for ἀγγέλων.

Vv. 8, 9 derived from Ps. xlv. 7, 8 (6, 7). The psalm is an epithalamium, a wedding-song. But even by Rabbins like Aben Esra, Kimchi, and others, it is Messianically interpreted. — Ver. 8. The nominative ὁ θεός is taken by our author in the sense of the vocative (comp. e.g. Col. iii. 18 ff.; Luke viii. 54; Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufi. p. 172; Kühner, II. p. 155), thus as an apostrophe to the Messiah.¹ In the Hebrew words: אלְלֵהָיו יְהוָה יְחֵי, הָיוֹם יְהוָה יְחֵי, I will remember my Jacob's-covenant, i.e. the covenant made by me with Jacob), with Bleek, de Wette, and Kurtz: "thy throne of God," i.e. "thy divine throne;" or, with Ewald (ad loc. and Gramm. § 547): "thy throne is (throne) of God or divine." The Greek ὁ θεός, too, it has been thought by Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt Allg. Kirch.-Zeit. 1857, No. 29, p. 662) and Ewald (das Sendschr. an d. Hebr. p. 55), ought not to be explained in the

¹ Against the peculiar opinion of Hofmann (Schriftbew. I. p. 168 f., 2 Aufi.), that, vv. 8, 9, it is not Christ who is addressed; that, on the contrary, the author of the epistle leaves it to the reader "to take the words: ὁ θεός ὁ ἀνήκοιος ὁ θεός, as an address to Jehovah, or with a right understanding of the connection ἀνήκοιος τοῦ Ἰακώβ as an address to the king, the anointed of Jehovah," see Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 286, Remark.
sense of a vocative. According to Grimm, the words are to be taken in the acceptation: “Thy throne, i.e. the foundation of Thy throne, is God;” according to Ewald, they say that “the throne of the Messiah for everlasting ages is God Himself, so that where He reigns, there God Himself is virtually ever present.” But the argument urged by Grimm in favour of this construction—that, since Philo, as frequently also the Christian Alexandrians, makes a sharp distinction between ὁ θεὸς (with the article) as a designation of God, and θεὸς (without an article) as designation of the Logos, it is hardly to be regarded as probable that a man of Alexandrian culture, like our author, would have called Christ as to His divine nature ὁ θεὸς—would have had weight only if that designation, in place of being met with in a citation, had occurred in our author’s own discourse.—εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος] sc. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. The same (merely Hellenistic) formula, strengthening the simple εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (v. 6, and often), also Tob. vi. 18; Ps. lxxiii. 18, al. In independent discourse the author uses in place thereof εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς. Comp. vii. 3, x. 1, xii. 14.—ράβδος εὐθύτητος] a sceptre of uprightness, i.e. of righteousness. εὐθύτητα, in the N. T. only here; but comp. LXX. Ps. ix. 9, lxvii. 5, xcvi. 10, xcviii. 9. Comp. also Aeschylus, Persae, ver. 726 f. (according to the division in Hartung’s edition, Leipzig 1853):

εἰς ἀνδρὶ ἀπάσης Ἁσίδος μηλοτρόφου ταγέων, ἔχοντα σκῆπτρον εὐθυντήριον.

Ver. 9. Ἡγάπησας δικαισύνην κ.τ.λ.] Thou lovedst righteousness and hatedst wrong. In the Hebrew the corresponding verbs have a present signification: thou lovest justice and hatest wrong. Our author, however, refers the aorists of the LXX. to the historic life of the Son of God upon earth.—διὰ τοῦτο] therefore, i.e. as a reward for the ἀγαπᾶν δικαιοσύνην καὶ μυσίων ἄνωμαν. Comp. διό, Phil. ii. 9. Erroneously Augustine (in Ps.), Thomas Aquinas, Gerhard, Dorscheus, Brochmann, Schöttgen, and others: for this cause, that thou mightest love righteousness, etc.—ἐχρισαίνει σε, ὁ θεὸς, ὁ θεὸς σου ἔλαιον κ.τ.λ.] O God, Thy God hath Thee anointed with oil of gladness above Thy companions.
Here, too, the author takes δ θεός as an apostrophe, whereas in the Hebrew יִתְנָה is the subject to יְאֹרֶץ, and is taken up again into the discourse, and more nearly defined by יִתְנָה. The anointing with the oil of joy in the psalm is a figurative designation of the blessing and abundance given by God. Our author, however, understands it of the anointing to be king, as a figure of the divine glory with which the Son, after His life upon earth and His exaltation to heaven, has been crowned. Comp. also Acts iv. 27, ii. 36. The sense of the author is departed from when the Fathers and earlier expositors interpret the expression of the anointing of the Son with the Holy Ghost.— On the double accusative combined with ἐκρίθην (Rev. iii. 18), see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 212. As an analogon, comp. also Aristophanes, Acharn. 114: ἤνα μή σε βάψω βάμμα Σαρδινιακόν.— Παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σοι] refers in the original to the contemporary kings, the rulers of other lands. But what our author understood by it in the application is obscure. Kuinoel, Ebrard, Delitzsch, and Moll suppose the author, like the Psalmist, to intend the other kings; Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 306), all earthly and heavenly princes; Wittich, Braun, Cramer, the kings, high priests, and prophets of the O. T., inasmuch as they were anointed as types of Christ; Klee, all the creatures; Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Bengel, and Bisping, men in general; Theodoret, Calvin, Beza, Cameron, Piscator, Schlichting, Maier, Kurtz, the Christians specially [Owen hesitates between all believers and prophets and apostles]; Bleek, Olshausen, Alford, and Ewald finally, after the precedent of Peirce and others, the angels, “as beings which do not indeed appear as sitting at the right hand of God, but yet as existing in immediate proximity to the divine throne.” The last supposition is the most probable. It is true de Wette regards it as the least conceivable, because the author has “placed the angels in no other position than deeply below Christ,” and Ebrard even thinks the author

---

1 On account of ver. 8 this construction is more natural than the supposition of Grimm, L.c. p. 602; Alford, and Ewald (to which Delitzsch also leaves the choice open), that we have to explain in accordance with the Hebrew: “God, even Thy God.”
must have been "beside himself" if he had referred the words to the angels. But (1) it is a question throughout the whole section of a comparison of Christ with the angels; the renewed indication of this point of comparison also in ver. 9 cannot therefore in itself be found unsuitable. (2) If shortly before (ver. 7) the angels are placed deeply below Christ, so it will be admitted their inferiority is likewise expressly intimated by means of παρά in our passage. (3) The angels were, in the conception of the author, the next in rank after Christ; for they are exalted above men. To whom, therefore, could the author more fittingly apply the designation μετοχοι than precisely to them? The objection of Delitzsch, finally, that after all angels are not anointed ones, would be of weight only if the author were obliged of necessity to think of the μετοχοι too as anointed; he finds, on the contrary, in the anointing only of the Son, a fact expressed, from which the exaltedness of the same above His companions, i.e. of those who of all others stand nearest to Him in dignity, is necessarily deduced. For παρά is used here not in the sense of the quantity arising from the notion of comparison, but denotes the part accruing to one to the exclusion of others.

Vv. 10–12. A second citation — co-ordinate with the Scripture testimony adduced, vv. 8, 9 — derived from Ps. cii. 26–28 (25–27) according to the LXX. The psalm is a lamentation, belonging probably to the first century after the Captivity. The words of address refer in the original to God. The author, however, mainly indeed misled by the κύριε in the LXX., which was the ordinary appellation of Christ in

1 According to Delitzsch, indeed, it would be "a poor look-out" if that were "true." But when, following in Hofmann's steps, he objects against it that "we may already see from viii. 8 ff., xii. 6 ff., that the author is far from everywhere understanding Christ to be intended by the O. T. κύριος," these passages naturally prove nothing, since the usual practice is never the constant and invariable practice. When Delitzsch further adds: "such perversity originating in ignorance is not to be laid to the charge of an author who shows so deep an insight into the innermost core of the O. T.," that is a prejudiced verdict, arising from subjectivity and dogmatic partiality, to the establishing of which it would have been necessary first of all to bring forward the proof that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in reality possessed an accurate knowledge not only of the Greek text of the LXX., but also of the original text of the O. T.,—a proof which even Delitzsch has not been able to afford.
apostolic time, takes the utterance as an address to Christ, the Son of God. This interpretation must the more have appeared to him unquestionable, inasmuch as the scope of the utterance fully harmonized with his own conception of the Son of God as the premundane Logos. Comp. vv. 2, 3. When, for the rest, Hofmann (Schriftbew. I. p. 169 f., 2 Aufl.) supposes that the author found no address whatever to Christ designed in the kūrie of the psalm, but only meant to say in the words of Scripture what was true of Jesus according to his own belief and that presupposed in the readers, this is a freak of fancy without anything to justify it, and even opposed to the context (comp. πρὸς δὲ τῶν υἱῶν, ver. 8). For the author can have been concerned only about this very object of proving the higher attestation given to his assertion by the Scriptures. — Ka[,] not a constituent part of the citation, but a brief formula of connecting, when a further passage of Scripture is linked to that which precedes, comp. Acts i. 20. — σὺ κατ’ ἀρχὰς, κūrie, τὴν γην ἑθεμελιώσας] LXX. Cod. Alex.: κατ’ ἀρχὰς σὺ, κūrie, τὴν γην ἑθεμελιώσας; Cod. Vatic.: κατ’ ἀρχὰς τὴν γην σὺ, κūrie, ἑθεμελιώσας. It is probable the author changed the position of the words in order to make σὺ the more emphatic.— κατ’ ἀρχὰς] in the beginning. With the LXX. elsewhere only Ps. cxix. 152, instead of the more usual ἐν ἀρχῇ or ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς, but frequently met with in Philo and the classics (see Raphel, Wetstein, and Munthe ad loc.). In the Hebrew stands the more general וּלְדָוִד, "formerly," or "of old."

Ver. 11. Αὐτὸν] refers back not to earth and heaven, ver. 10, taken together (Kuinoel, Stuart, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Kurtz), but, as is evident from the following πάντες, and in particular from ἐλικεῖς, ver. 12, only to οἱ οὐρανοὶ.— ἀπολοῦνται] shall perish. Comp. Isa. xxxiv. 4, li. 6, lxv. 17; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xx. 11, xxi. 1. — σὺ δὲ διαμένεις] but Thou abidest for evermore (throughout all duration of time, διά). On account of the environment of futures, and because the future is used here in the Hebrew, Bleek, after the example of Luther, Cornelius a Lapide, Peirce, Bengel, Wetstein, alii, accentuates: διαμενέως. So also the Vulgate (permanebis). Hardly in the sense of the author. For,
since he employed only the LXX, not the Hebrew original, he surely took σὺ δὲ διὰμ. as a parallel member to σὺ δὲ δὲ αὐτὸς εἰ, ver. 12, consequently also construed the former as a present.— ὁς ἵματιν παλαιοθησόνται will grow old like a garment, which by long use is worn out and laid aside, to be replaced by a new and better one. Comp. Isa. 1. 9, li. 6; Ecclus. xiv. 17.

Ver. 12. Καὶ ὦσι οἱ περιβόλαιοι ἐλίξεις αὐτοῦς καὶ ἀλλαγησόνται and as a cloak (something flung about one) wilt Thou roll them up, and they shall become changed. In the original: As the vesture dost Thou change them, and they are changed. This sense of the original is rendered by the LXX. according to the reading of the Cod. Vat.: Καὶ ὦσι οἱ περιβόλαιοι ἐλίξεις αὐτοῦς καὶ ἀλλαγησόνται; whereas the Cod. Alex. presents ἐλίξεις; and this is also most probably the reading followed by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in our passage.—οὐκ ἐκλείψοντων] will know no end.

Ver. 13. Further citation from Ps. cx. 1, according to the LXX. The psalm was looked upon universally in the time of Christ (comp. Matt. xxii. 44 ff.; Mark xii 35 ff.; Luke xx. 41 ff.), and also in later times by many Rabbins (see Wetstein on Matt, xxii 44), as a prophecy relating to the Messiah; inasmuch as on the ground of the superscription πασιν David himself was regarded as the author of it, and in connection with this view the reference to the Messiah was easily proved on the ground of the words at the beginning: "to my Lord speaketh Jehovah," according to which David acknowledges, in addition to his God, also a Lord over him. The superscription πασιν, nevertheless, indicates not the writer, but the subject of the psalm. It is in its historic sense an oracle pronounced to David, when the latter was preparing for war against his powerful foes. See Ewald on the Psalm. — πρὸς τίνα δὲ δὲ in the third place, as often occurs after prepositional combinations. Comp. Klotz, ad Devar. p. 378 f.; Hartung, Partikellehre, I. p. 190 f.; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I. p. 397; Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 519.— The sitting at the right hand, figure of the highest honour and dominion, see on ver. 3. — ἐν τῶν ποδῶν σου] the footstool of Thy
feet. There lies in the expression an allusion to the custom of the victor of placing his foot upon the neck of the vanquished, in token of the complete subjection of the latter; comp. Josh. x. 24. — ἰποπόδιον] first used in the Greek of a later age. Comp. Sturz, de dial. Alex. et Maced. p. 199.

Ver. 14. Confirmation of the πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἄγγελων εἰρήκειν πόσε, showing the inconceivableness of such a thing by a reference to the nature of the angels, and with this the termination of the present train of thought. — The emphasis rests upon πάντες and λειτουργικά: are not all (alike, whether they belong to a lower or higher class of angels) ministering spirits [spirits in waiting]? πνεύματα here in a different sense from ver. 7. — εἰς διακονίαν] for service, sc. which they render to God, not to the men who shall inherit the σωτηρία; otherwise, in place of διὰ τοῦς μελλόντας, the dative τοῖς μελλοντί κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν (1 Cor. xvi. 15) or the genitive τῶν μελλόντων κ.τ.λ. would have been placed. — The participle present ἀποστέλλομεν brings out the permanent, habitual character of the action expressed by the verb. — διὰ τοῦς κ.τ.λ.] for the sake of those who shall inherit (everlasting) salvation (this is intended by σωτηρίαν, although without the article, see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 114; not: deliverance from peril, as Michaelis, Schleusner, Böhme, Kuinoel assume), i.e. in order, by means of the offices in which they are employed by God, to bring it in for the same.
CHAPTER II.

tem,” according to Tremellius in Tisch. edd. 7 and 8); comp. 
La Croze, Histoire du Christianisme des Indes, iii. 3. 64; Bode, 
Pseudo-crit. Millio-Bengel, t. ii. p. 339. So, too, it is found in 
Arab. Petropolitana of the 8th century (in Tisch. edd. 7 and 8): 
“quare χωρίς θεοῦ, qui eum sibi fecerat templum, gustavit 
mortem utrip xánsw τῶν ἀνθρώπων.” Above all, this reading was 
championed by the Nestorians (see Oecumen. and Theophyl. 
ad loc.). Among later expositors it has found defenders in 
Camerarius, P. Colomesius (Observatt. sacr. p. 603), Bengal, Ch. 
F. Schmid, Paulus, and Ebrard. But neither in our codd. nor 
in the versions (with the exceptions above named) does χωρίς 
θεοῦ find any countenance; it is met with only in the Cod. M 
(of Tisch.; with Wetst. and Griesb.: Cod. 53) of the 9th or 10th 
century, and in the Cod. 67 of the 11th or 12th century—in the 
latter only on the margin. On internal grounds, too, it is to be 
rejected (see the exposition, and Reiche in the Commentarius 
Criticus, p. 14 ff.). Probably arose from the placing of χωρίς 
θεοῦ, occasioned by 1 Cor. xv. 27, as a gloss to the words of 
ver. 8: othé ἄρηξαι αὐτῷ ἀνασάνασται; and this gloss being erron-
eously regarded by a later transcriber as a correction of χάρις 
θεοῦ, ver. 9, was taken up in place thereof into the text. — 
A B C D E M N, 37, al., many versions and Fathers, have αἰμα-
τός καὶ σαιρχός. Already approved by Bengal and Griesb. 
Rightly adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. The Recepta is 
a later transposition, since the order σάρξ καὶ αἷμα is elsewhere 
the more usual one.— τῶν αἵρετων] D* E* It. Eus. Theodoret 
(semel), Jerome: τῶν αἵρετων σαβημάτων. (Erroneous) explanatory 
gloss.— διὰ τῶν βαβατῶν] D* E* It.: διὰ τῶν βαβατῶν βαβατον. An 
addition incompatible with that which follows. Proceeded 
from an erroneous twofold writing of βαβατον.

Vv. 1–4. The author, in availing himself of the communi-
cative form of speech, deduces from the superiority of the Son 
over the angels, set forth in chap. i., as likewise from the fact 
that even the Mosaic law, given through the instrumentality 
of angels, could not be transgressed with impunity, the im-
perative obligation for the readers to hold fast to the salvation 
revealed by Christ, securely handed down, and confirmed by 
God with miracles. Thus there already comes out here the 
paraenetic main tendency of the epistle: to animate the 
Hebrews, urgently exposed as they were to the peril of 
apostasy, to perseverance in the Christian faith, as this aim is
also manifested elsewhere in repeated admonitions (e.g. iii. 6, 14, iv. 14, vi. 11, x. 23); although the author has the intention of speaking further concerning the relation of Christ to the angels (comp. ver. 5 ff.).

Ver. 1. Διό τοῦτο therefore, sc. because Christ, the mediator of the New Covenant, is as the Son of God so highly exalted above the angels, the intermediate agents in the giving of the Old Covenant.— δεί] indication of the inner necessity resulting of itself from the described conditions.— περισσοτέρως] so much the more, sc. than would be the case if He who proclaimed the άκονθότητα were one of lower rank. We have not, however, to connect περισσοτέρως with δεί (Grotius, Bengel, Dindorf, Böhme, Kuinoel), but with προσέχειν as the main idea.— προσέχειν τυλίπρ.] to give heed or attention to anything, sc. in order to hold fast to it.— τοῖς άκονθότησιν] to that which has been heard. The salvation preached by the Lord and His immediate disciples is intended, of which the readers had heard. Comp. ver. 3.— μήποτε παραρρήνωμεν] lest haply we should be carried past it (comp. LXX. Prov. iii. 21: νιηε μή παραρρήσομαι, τήρησον δε ἐμὴν βουλήν καὶ ἔννοιαν), i.e. lest we lose it, fail of obtaining the salvation promised to us by the word we have heard; comp. ver. 3. The interpretation of Erasmus, Clarlius, Beza, Cameron, Stuart, al.: lest we forget it, or let it escape attention, is unmeaning and almost tautological. παραρρήνωμεν (or παραρνώμεν, as Lachmann and Tischendorf 2 and 7 write it, after A B* D* L K), moreover, is not, as Wittich, Dindorf, and others suppose, conjunctive present active of παραρρήνω,—for the forms παραρρηνέω, παραρρήνω, παραρρήμιμι are mere figments of the grammarians,1 in order to derive certain tenses therefrom,—but sec. aorist conjunct. passive from παραρρήνεω.

Vv. 2–4. Establishing of the δεί περισσοτέρως προσέχειν ἡμᾶς τοῖς άκονθότησιν, ver. 1, by a warning reference to the great responsibility and culpability in the case of its neglect, and this in a conclusion α μινὸς ἃ μαίτις. Not justifiably does de Wette take vv. 2–4 as a "proving of the danger of the παραρρή." For not the possibility of foregoing salvation, but

1 Without warrant Delitzsch denies this. He has not been able to adduce an instance in favour of the opposite opinion.
the culpability of losing it through neglect, forms the central thought in vv. 2–4.

Ver. 2. 'O δι’ ἄγγελων λαλήθεις λόγος] the word proclaimed by angels (not: by human messengers, i.e. prophets; so Daniel Heinsius and G. Olearius, against the connection with chap. i., and contrary to Biblical usage), i.e. the Mosaic law. Of an activity of the angels in connection with the act of legislation on Sinai nothing indeed is mentioned in Ex. xix.; it was, however, a traditional view very widely spread among the Jews. See Schoettgen and Wetstein on Gal. iii. 19. The earliest traces thereof appear Deut. xxxiii. 2, LXX., and Ps. lxviii. 18 (17). It is clearly enunciated Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19; Josephus, Antiq. xv. 5. 3.— To understand other divine revelations given through the intervention of angels, like Gen. xix. 26, to the exclusion of the Mosaic law (Dorschus, Calov, Schoettgen, Carpzov, Semler, al.), or with the inclusion of the same (Baumgarten, Ewald, M'Caul: “To my mind, the transition to the law exclusively is in the present instance somewhat abrupt. Does it not rather also refer to the ministrations of angels vouchsafed from time to time during the whole of the earlier dispensation, and to which allusion is made in the concluding verse of the first chapter?”), as intended by the δι’ ἄγγελων λαλήθεις λόγος, is forbidden—apart from the connection in its main points, and the whole tendency of the epistle—by the expression λόγος in the singular.— The preterites ἐγένετο and ἔλαβεν characterize the period of the Mosaic law as a past one, the condition of life prevailing in the same as one now obsolete and historically surmounted.— βέβαιος] firm, i.e. inviolable and obligatory, as is evident from the explanatory clause καὶ πᾶσα . . . μισθαπ. immediately following.— παράβασις the objective transgression, παρακοή the subjective listless hearing or inattention, Übertretung and Überhörung. Not inaptly Bohme, in preserving the paronomasia, “non commissa solum, sed omissa etiam.” — ἐνδοκός] just, in the N. T. only here and Rom. iii. 8. μισθαποδοσία] selected, sonorous word, a favourite one with our author in the sense of the simple μισθάς, but not occurring elsewhere in the N. T. The term is a vox media, signifies thus recompense. It is here employed in the unfavourable
sense (= punishment), x. 35, xi. 26, in the favourable sense (= reward).

Ver. 3. The apodosis follows in the form of a question, which for the rest extends only to σωτηρίας, not to the close of ver. 4. — πῶς] how is it possible that. — ἡμεῖς] has the emphasis. The Christians in general are meant, in opposition to the men once belonging to the O. T. theocracy, of whom the writer has spoken at least by implication in ver. 2. — ἐκφευρωμέθεα] stands absolutely, as xii. 25; 1 Thess. v. 3. Needlessly do Heinrichs, Stengel, Ebrard, Bisping, Maier, and many others supplement from ver. 2: τὴν ἐνδικον μοθαμοδοσίαν. — ἀμελήσαντες] Instancing of the case or condition, after the arising of which an escape or deliverance from punishment becomes an impossibility: in case that, or if, we shall have neglected (slighted). The participle aorist is properly used, since the culpability must first have been incurred before a punishment can ensue. — τηλικαύτης σωτηρίας such a salvation, i.e. one so great, so far surpassing in exaltedness that of the O. T. Theodorus Mopsuestenens: ἐκεῖνο νομίμων δόσις ἦν μόνον, ἐνανθα δὲ καὶ χάριν πνεύματος καὶ λύσις ἀμαρτημάτων καὶ βασιλείας οὐρανῶν ἐπανελείματα καὶ ἀδανασίας ὑπόσχεσις. δέθεν καὶ δικαίως τηλικαύτης εἶπεν. — τηλικαύτης does not in itself contain a reference to ἤτοι (Tholuck and others; the former will then have ἤτοι taken in the sense of ὅστε), but stands there independently of any correlative; it is then, however, after the question has closed with σωτηρίας, enforced by the clause with ἤτοι (quippe quae).

— ἤτοι ἁρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ὅπο τῶν ἀκούσαντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη] which indeed, at first proclaimed by the Lord, was handed down with certainty to us by them that heard it. Wrongly does Ebrard translate: “which was confirmed to us by the hearers, as one proclaimed by the Lord from the very first,” in supposing that ἁρχὴν λαβοῦσα depends upon ἐβεβαιώθη as an “apposition of object.” For how can ἁρχὴν λαβοῦν λαλεῖσθαι denote something proclaimed “from the very beginning,” or “from the commencement”? And how unskilfully would the author have proceeded in the choice and position of his words, if—as Ebrard supposes—he had wished to express the thought, “that the σωτηρία
was directly revealed by the Lord, has been transmitted to us as a certainty, and thus as a divine legitimation of the σωτηρία by the ἀκούσαντες, the ear- (and eye-) witnesses!" Ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν, to begin, always presupposes an opposition, expressed or understood, to a being continued, or to a being brought to an end. When thus in our passage there is mention made not only of an ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν λαλεῖσθαι by the Lord, but also of a βεβαιωθήναι εἰς ἡμᾶς on the part of those who heard the Lord, it is clear that the author will have these two factors regarded as statements of two distinct but mutually corresponding periods of time. — In general, it is wrong when Ebrard, in connection with his explanation just adduced, will find in ver. 3 the twofold contrast with the law—

(1) That the law was a mere word (λόγος); the gospel, on the other hand, a deliverance, a redemption, an act. (2) That the σωτηρία was manifested and proclaimed to men as at first hand, by the Lord Himself; the law, on the contrary, only at second hand, by the angels. For, as concerns the first alleged point of difference, assuredly the emphasis rests neither upon λόγος, ver. 2, nor upon σωτηρία, ver. 3; but, ver. 2, upon διὰ ἀγγέλων, and, ver. 3, upon τὴν λαλαίην. The second alleged point of difference falls, however, with the consideration that the author employs the preposition διὰ, as before ἀγγέλων, ver. 2, so also before τοῦ κυρίου, ver. 3; thus indicates that the supreme Author alike of the Mosaic law and of the gospel is God Himself, both consequently are proclaimed to man "only at second hand." ¹ The pre-eminence of the gospel can accordingly have been discovered by our author only in the fact that in connection with this the Lord Himself was the intervening agent; in connection with the law, on the other hand, only the angels, who, according to chap. i., are

¹ I cannot bring myself to recall this remark, although Delitzsch takes so great offence at it that he finds therein "a toning down of the opposition in gross misapprehension of the sense of the author." The conception of an "immediate" speaking on the part of Jehovah in the N. T., on which Delitzsch insists, p. 49, 51, is regarded in general unbibical; it is, moreover, remote from the thought of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as the whole chapter in itself shows; only by forcing upon him dogmatic notions already a priori determined, and entirely disregarding the laws of grammar, can it be brought out from his statements.
subordinate to the Lord. — ἵπτε τῶν ἀκούσαντων] by them that heard it (sc. from the Lord; παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, Chrysost.), thus by His apostles and immediate disciples. From these ἀκούσαντες the author distinguishes himself and his readers (εἰς ἡμᾶς). As well he himself as the Palestinian Christians to whom he writes must consequently have already belonged to a second generation of Christendom, and the author of the epistle cannot have been Paul (comp. Intro. p. 11). When Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. p. 378, 2 Aufl.) objects to this: "from εἰς ἡμᾶς is in truth evident only that the author belonged not to the number of those who could testify that they had with their own ears heard the Lord, at the time when He was upon earth proclaiming that salvation which they now preached," this is indeed perfectly correct. But when he adds that Paul likewise had certainly only heard the word of salvation from the mouth of those who had listened to Jesus, this is—so long as the solemn asseveration of Paul himself (comp. expressly Gal. i. 12) has any value for us—decidedly false. For Paul reckons himself not among the disciples of the ἀκούσαντες, but among the ἀκούσαντες themselves. For the circumstance that the ἀκούσων was otherwise brought about in his case than in the case of the original apostles, inasmuch as these had stood in the relation of ἀκούσαντες to the Christ walking upon earth, Paul, on the other hand, stood in the relation of an ἀκούσας to the exalted or heavenly Christ, left the essence of the matter itself untouched. Nor even by the assumption of a so-called ἀνακούσων, to which recourse has very frequently been had, can the conclusion resulting with stringent necessity from the words of our verse be set aside; for that which the writer of a letter says to his readers by means of an ἀνακούσων is always of such nature as to be likewise true of himself; never can it stand in excluding opposition to himself. — ἐβεβαιώθη] corresponds to the ἐγένετο ἴησα, ver. 2; and εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη is a well-known blending of the notion of rest with that of the preceding movement. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 386 f. Theophylact: διεπορθέμενη εἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαῖως καὶ πιστῶς, it came to us in a firm, trustworthy manner, so that it has become for us a σωτηρία βεβαιά. Wrongly Heinrichs (and so
also Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Wolf, Cramer, Paulus, and others), according to whom εἰς ἡμᾶς signifies ad nostra tempora, or usque ad nos.

Ver. 4. Συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. in that, with them (the αἰκόνσαντες), God bore testimony in addition, to the same (the salvation, the σωτηρία), by signs and wonders. The doubly compound word συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν in the N. T. only here. Nor is it found at all in the LXX. With later profane writers, on the other hand, it is not rare. See examples in Bleek, Abth. II. 1 Hälfe, p. 218. — σημεῖα and τέρατα only distinguished in the form of conception as σigne and porlenta, not different in the notion conveyed by them. Comp. Fritzscbe on Rom. xv. 19 (t. iii. p. 270). — ποικίλας] belongs only to δυνάμεων. The adjective is not likewise to be referred to μερισμοῖς (Bleek, Maier). For the notion of ποικίλον is again specially brought into prominence in the sequel, in that it forms an element also in the contents of κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν. — The δυνάμεις, however, are not miraculous acts, but the source of the same: miraculous powers. — καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς κ.τ.λ.] and distributions of the Holy Spirit according to His good pleasure. πνεύματος ἁγίου is genitive objectiv., not subjectiv. (Cameron and others); and μερισμοῖς, which (iv. 12) signifies dividing, denotes here, in accordance with the use of the verb μερίζειν, vii. 2, Rom. xii. 3, 1 Cor. vii. 17, 2 Cor. x. 13: an apportioning or dealing out, distribution. — κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν] Addition, not to the whole period, ver. 4 (Abresch, Böhme), nor to ποικίλας . . . μερισμοῖς (Bleek), but only to μερισμοῖς (de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz), on which account this is also placed after the genitive πνεύματος ἁγίου. αὐτοῦ relates back to τοῦ θεοῦ, not to πνεύματος ἁγίου (Oecumenius, Carpzov), and the whole addition κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν has the design not only in general of representing the bestowal of the gifts of the Spirit on the part of God as a work of His free grace, but also of pointing to the manifold character of those distributions, inasmuch as, according to God's free determination of will, the Holy Spirit was communicated in greater fullness to the one than to the other, and of the special gifts of the Spirit to the one was granted this, to
the other that. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. — On the un-Attic
θέλησις, comp. Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 7, 353; Pollux,
v. 165: βουλήσις, ἑπιθυμία, δρέξις, ἥρως: ἡ δὲ θέλησις
ἴδιωτικῶν.

Vv. 5–18. Further investigation of the relation of Christ to
the angels, and demonstration of the necessity for the death
of Christ. Not to angels, but to Christ, the Son of man, has,
according to the testimony of Scripture, the Messianic world
been subjected. Certainly Christ was abased for a short time
lower than the angels; but so it must be, in order that man-
kind might obtain salvation; He must suffer and die, and
become in all things like unto men, His brethren, in order to
be able as High Priest to reconcile them to God.

Ver. 5. The author has brought into relief the fact, ver. 3,
that it was the Son of God, or the Lord, according to chap. i.,
highly exalted above the angels, by whom the Messianic
salvation was proclaimed, and from whose immediate disciples
it was handed down to Christendom. He now justifies this
order of things as founded in a higher divine decree, and
already foretold in the Scriptures of the Old Covenant. That
order of things is, however, justified, in conformity to the com-
parison of Christ with the angels, which is begun with i. 4,
first, e contrario or negatively, ver. 5, and then, ver. 6, posi-
tively. The emphasis lies in ver. 5 upon ἀγγέλους, and
this then finds its antithesis in ἄνθρωπος and νῦς ἄνθρωπον,
ver. 6. For when the author first in an absolute form of
expression says: For not unto the angels has He put into
subjection the world to come, and then continues: But one in
a certain place testifies, etc., the sense—on account of the
close connectedness of ver. 6 (see on that verse) with ver. 5
—is certainly this: for, according to the testimony of Scripture,
the world to come is put in subjection, not to angels, but to
Christ, the Son of man. — ἀγγέλους] without article. For it
stands generically: beings who are angels, who have the nature
of angels (Bleek). [Owen: nature angelical.] De Wette
supposes the reason for the anarthrous form to be in the
possibility that only a part of the angels are to be thought of.
Unsuitably, because in connection with οὐκ ἀγγέλους already
the definite antithesis: “but to the Son of man,” was present
to the mind of the author (comp. ver. 6). — ἵπταται τοῦ θεοῦ, which naturally follows from the τοῦ θεοῦ of ver. 4. The verb expresses the notion of making dependent, or of the placing in a position of subjection, and is chosen because the same expression is employed in the citation presently to be adduced (comp. ver. 8). — τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν the world to come. This mode of designating it is explained from the well-known Biblical phraseology, according to which the Messianic period was distinguished as the αἰων μέλλων, from the pre-Messianic as the αἰων οὗτος.\(^1\) What is meant, consequently, is not something purely future (Theodoret: ὁ μέλλων βίος; Oecumenius: ὁ ἐσόμενος κόσμος; Schulz: the new order of the world which is approaching; Bleek II. the blessings of the kingdom of God which will first be manifested and conferred upon believers at the return of the Lord in glory; Grotius, Maier, and others: heaven, as the future dwelling-place of the Christians also), but the new order of things in the Messianic kingdom, which in its first manifestations has already appeared, but as regards its completion is still a future one. Calvin: apparent non vocari orbem futurum dum-taxat, qualem e resurrectione speramus, sed qui coepit ab exordio regni Christi, complementum vero suum habebit in ultima redemptione. τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν is itself without emphasis; on the contrary, only resumes under another form the τῆλεκαίης σωτηρίας of ver. 3. It results from this, that the opinion according to which the tacit contrast is to be supplied in thought to the declaration, ver. 5: “the present world is indeed” to be regarded as “subjected to the angels, by them swayed and governed” (Cameron, Bleek, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 656, al.), is a baseless one. For it must then have been written οὐ γὰρ τὴν μέλλουσαν οἰκουμένην ἀγγέλους ἵπταται τοῦ θεοῦ, — περὶ ἣς λαλοῦμεν] does not go back to i. 6 (Theophylact, Zeger, Grotius, Schlichting, Schulz, Böhme; comp. also Delitzsch),—against which the present λαλοῦμεν, in place of which a preterite must have

\(^1\) We have not to seek the origin of the addition τὴν μέλλουσαν in the fact that at the time of the Psalmist (ver. 6), that which was promised belonged as yet to the purely future (so, along with the right explanation this likewise in Bleek I.).
been expected, and not less the addition τὴν μέλλουσαν to τὴν οἰκουμένην, is decisive,—nor is ἡλθοῦσαν put in place of a future: "de quo in sequenti testimonio loquemur" (Vatablus); but the relative clause is to be taken quite generally: which is the subject of our discourse (our epistle). Too specially Kurtz: "of which we are speaking just now, in this section of our epistle," which would have called for the addition of a χῦν. The plural ἡλθοῦσαν, moreover, has reference merely to the writer. Comp. v. 11, vi. 9, 11, xiii. 18. Without good reason does Bengel supplement nos doctores; while even, according to Hofmann, "all who believe the promise, the apostle and his readers," are the subject of ἡλθοῦσαν, inasmuch as it is only a question of an "additional explanatory clause, when the apostle adds that that world to come is intended, of which the Christians speak!"

Ver. 6 attaches itself closely to ver. 5, in that the adversative δέ (different from the disjunctive ἀλλα, but, on the contrary. Comp. Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 171), as iv. 13, 15, ix. 12, x. 27, xii. 13, 1 Cor. vii. 15, 25 fin., and frequently, as it were correcting the preceding negative statement, now places in opposition the actual state of the question: Some one, however (some one, on the contrary), testified in a certain place and said. Quite wrongly does Heinrichs suppose an entirely new section of the epistle to begin with ver. 6.—ποῦ τις] The wavering character of this form of citation is derived by Grotius from the consideration that the Psalms were the work of different authors, and the authors of particular psalms were often unknown. But the eighth Psalm, here cited, is, both in the Hebrew and the LXX., expressly ascribed to David. According to Koppe (Excursus I. ad epist. ad Roman., 2d ed. p. 379), Dindorf, Schulz, Heinrichs (comp. also Stengel), the indefiniteness of the formula is to be explained by the fact that the author is citing from memory. But the words agree too exactly with the LXX. to be a citation from memory, and, moreover, the indefinite ποῦ occurs again, iv. 4, in connection with the citation of Gen. ii. 2, thus in connection with an appeal to a passage of the O. T. Scripture, of which the place where it is found could not possibly escape the memory of our author. De Wette, after the precedent of
Bleek [cf. Peshito: *the Scripture witnesses, and says*], regards it as the most correct supposition that the author "was not concerned about the particular writers of Scripture, since for him God or the Holy Ghost spoke through the Scripture." Yet, if the reason for the form of expression is to be sought in this, then in general we should hardly expect the personal indication *τις* to be added, but rather a passive construction to be chosen. According to Hofmann, finally, ποῦ τις is intended to declare "that it is indeed a matter of indifference for his purpose who said this, and where it is found; that it is adduced as the utterance of some man, only an utterance which comes invested with the authority of Scripture!" The indefinite mode of citation has probably no other than a rhetorical ground, inasmuch as the author presupposes a universal acquaintance with the passage, without concerning himself to learn whether it is known to all or not. So substantially also Chrysostom (ποῦ ἐστὶν αὐτὸ, ὁ δὲ κρυπτειν καὶ μὴ τιθέναι τὸν εἰρηκότα τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς περιφέρομεν καὶ κατάδηλον οὐδὲν εἰσάγειν, δεικνύντος ἐστὶν, αὐτῶν σφόδρα ἐμπείρους εἰναι τῶν γραφῶν), Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Jac. Cappellus, Cornelius a Lapide [Owen: "the reason is plain; both person and place were sufficiently known to them to whom he wrote"], Calov, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, al. The same reticence in the mode of citation is often found with Philo. Comp. e.g. *de ebrietate*, p. 248 (ed. Mangey, I. p. 365): εἰπε γάρ ποῦ τις (sc. Abraham, Gen. xx. 12). Further examples see in Bleek, Abth. II. 1 Hälfte, p. 239. — The citation, which extends to ποῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ, ver. 8, is from Ps. viii. 5-7 (4-6). The utterance in its historic sense contains a declaration with regard to man in general; but the author, on the ground of the ideal import of the passage, as likewise in particular on the ground of the expression νιὸς ἄνθρωπον, which in consequence of Dan. vii. 13 was current with the Jews as an appellation of the Messiah (comp. John xii. 34), which, too, was one often bestowed by Jesus upon Himself, finds in it a declaration concerning the Son of man κατ' ἐξοχήν, i.e. concerning Christ.1

1 In contradiction with the design of the whole explication, as this clearly manifests itself from the context, do Beza, Piscator, Storr, Ebrard, Delitzsch
Paul, too, has Messianically interpreted the psalm, 1 Cor. xv. 27 f. (comp. Eph. i. 22). — *Τι ἐστιν ἀνθρώπος κ.τ.λ.* What is man that Thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that Thou regarded him! i.e., in the sense of the original, How small, weak, and insignificant, as compared with the majestic heavenly bodies, is man, that Thou shouldst nevertheless take a loving and careful interest in him! In the application: How great and full of dignity is man, that Thou so greatly distinguishest him with loving care! (Kuinoel, Heinrichs, Böhme, Bleek, Stein; otherwise, de Wette, Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 45, 2 Aufl.; Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 361; Alford, Moll, Kurtz, aJ). Thus the author could understand the words, although the “being mindful” and “looking upon” do not very well accord therewith, in that he was guided in his acceptance of them pre-eminently by the final clause δόξη...αὐτοῦ. — η] instead of this γ] instead of this is found in the Hebrew, thus introduces a purely parallel member, in such wise that *νιὸς ἀνθρώπων* is identical with *ἀνθρώπος* in the first member, and is distinguished therefrom only as a more sharply defined presentation of the same notion.

Ver. 7. *Ἡλαττωσας αὐτῶν βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους*] Thus the LXX. translate the Hebrew דֹּחֵם... את. The sense of the Hebrew is: “Thou hast made Him only a little lower than God, hast made Him only a little less than God.” The δοξή is consequently in the original a note of degree, and the whole former member ἰδαντωσας... ἀγγέλους con-
tains in the original the same thought as the immediately following δόξη καὶ τιμῆ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτὸν. The author, however, takes the βραχύ τι of the LXX in the temporal sense: "for a short time" (comp. ver. 9), and finds in the second member an opposition to the first, in such wise that in the application he refers the statement of the first clause to the humiliation of Christ, that of the second to the exaltation of Christ. — The words following these in the LXX. (as also in the Hebrew): καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἐργα τῶν χειρῶν σου (comp. the critical remarks), have been left out by the author as unsuitable to his presentment. For the statement that God has set the Son of man or the Messiah over the works of creation which proceeded from the hands of God, might appear to contain a contradiction to i. 10 (comp. also i. 2), where earth and heaven were designated as works created by the hands of the Son.

Ver. 8. Πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ] All things didst Thou put in subjection under His feet. In the psalm these words refer to the dominion which God has conferred upon man over the earth, and indeed specially (comp. Ps. viii. 8, 9 [7, 8]) over the whole animal world. The author of the epistle, on the other hand, taking πάντα in the absolute sense, understands them of the dominion over the universe which has been conferred upon Christ, the Son of man. Comp. Matt. xxviii. 18. — With ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι ... ἀνυπότακτον the author still dwells on the closing words of the citation: πάντα ὑπέταξας κ.τ.λ., in order by way of elucidation to unfold its contents, and thus to place in clearer light the truth of the main thought expressed vv. 5-8. γάρ consequently refers back to that which immediately precedes, and the supposition of Tholuck — that ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι κ.τ.λ., as the clause which affords the proof, is parenthetically preposed to the νῦν δὲ κ.τ.λ., as the clause which is to be proved, so that the connection would be: "but now we see not yet all things made subject to Him; for, according to the declaration of the psalm, all things without exception are subject to Him"—is to be rejected as entirely unnecessary; quite apart from the fact that no instance of such parenthetical preposing of an elucidatory clause with γάρ...
is to be found anywhere in the N. T. (not in John iv. 44, 45 either), although not rare with classical writers (comp. Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 467; Kühner, Gramm. II. p. 454). Nor does γάρ stand for οὖν (Heinrichs, Stengel), but is the explicative namely. The subject in ὑποτάξας, further, is not David, the singer of the psalm (Heinrichs), but God; and the emphasis rests upon the opposition between τὰ πάντα and οὐδὲν. The threefold αὐτῷ, finally, relates not to man in general (Beza [Piscator: the believers], Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Whitby, Storr, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, Hofmann, Woerner, and others), but to the Son of man, and that not merely as regards its signification (Masch, Bleek, de Wette), but—as is shown by the Ἰησοῦν, only incidentally added, ver. 9—to the Son of man as He appeared in Christ as an historical person (Calvin, Gerhard, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Peirce, Schulz, Tholuck, Klee, Stuart, Conybeare, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 364; Kurtz, Ewald, al.). The sense is accordingly: by the fact, namely, that God made all things subject to Christ, the Son of man, He left nothing that is not subjected unto Him; it is thus also—this natural inference the author leaves to the readers themselves to make—to Him, the Son of man, and not to the angels, that ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα (ver. 5), which is only a part of that τὰ πάντα, is subjected; nay, the angels themselves, seeing that all things have been put in subjection under Him, are themselves subject to Him.—With νῦν δὲ οὕτω ὅραμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτάσσαμεν the author limits the immediately preceding declaration by an admission, by which, however, as is then further shown, ver. 9, the correctness of the former assertion as to the actual state of the matter suffers no infringement: now, however,—that must be conceded,—we see not yet all things subjected unto Him. For we are as yet in the condition of the earthly body; as yet the kingdom of God is only partially established; as yet it has to wage warfare with many enemies (comp. x. 12, 13; 1 Cor. xv. 24–27). We shall see that all things have been made subject to Christ by God the Father only when Christ shall have returned for the consummation of the kingdom of God.

Meyer.—Her.
Ver. 9. Proof that, notwithstanding the circumstances just mentioned, the matter itself which has been asserted is perfectly true. Certainly we do not, at the present moment, as yet see all things made subject to Christ, the Son of man; but we do see Him already crowned with glory and honour, in that after suffering and dying He has been exalted to the right hand of the Father. From the reality of the one, however, which we see, follows of necessity the reality of the other, which we do not yet see. For if the word of Scripture: δόξη καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτῶν, has already been fulfilled in His case, there can be no kind of doubt but in like manner also the further word of Scripture: πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῶν, inseparably connected as it is with the former, has already attained its realization in Him. — The words of ver. 9 have undergone a strange misinterpretation on the part of Hofmann (Schrifbew. II. 1, p. 45 ff. 2 Aufl.). As Hofmann with regard to ver. 7 already denies that the two members of the sentence in that verse: τῷ βραχύ τι παρ’ ἄγγελον and δόξη καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτῶν, form in the mind of the writer an opposition to each other, so just as little is the writer in ver. 9 supposed to have had present to his mind in connection with τῷ βραχύ τι παρ’ ἄγγελον the humiliation of Christ, and with δόξη καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτῶν the exaltation of Christ. Ver. 9 is thought rather to refer exclusively to the Jesus “living in the flesh,” and the connection is thus explained: “Far from its being the case that we see all things subjected to man, He, on the contrary, of whom that which the psalm speaks of man holds good in full truth, Jesus namely, stands before our eyes in a position of divine appointment, as such demanded by the existing calamity of death, which, according to ver. 14, makes the devil a ruler and us bondsmen.” For by βραχύ τι παρ’ ἄγγελον there is reference made, in the opinion of Hofmann, to the person of man, of which the psalm is treating, with regard to the dignity belonging thereto as conferred by God,— inasmuch as βραχύ τι is to be taken of degree, — but by τῷ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου is indicated the misfortune consisting in death itself, and not his suffering of
death; and δόξα καὶ τιμὴ finally expresses, according to iii. 3, v. 4, 5, the glorious character of his position by virtue of his vocation. The sense of ver. 9, then, is supposed to be: “What He, in whom the wealth of human nature has appeared in full truth, denotes and represents on the part of God,—for the former is meant by τιμῇ, the latter by δόξα,—that He denotes and represents, for the reason that mankind is obnoxious to the suffering of death, and to the end that He might taste a death which should redound unto good for every one!” See, on the other hand, the remarks of Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.*, p. 333 ff., note.—τὸν βραχὺ τὶ παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἡλπτωμένον is the object, and δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον the predicate to βλέπομεν, while Ἰησοῦν is the appositional nearer definition of the object brought in only at the close. The sense thus is: “But we do indeed see the one for a time abased below the angels, namely Jesus, crowned with glory and honour.” Wrongly others: “As the one for a time abased below the angels do we recognise Jesus, who is crowned with glory and honour.” For, in order to express this thought, Ἰησοῦν τὸν . . . ἐστεφανωμένον must have been placed. Wrongly likewise Ebrard, with whom Delitzsch agrees in substance, who takes Ἰησοῦν as object, ἡλπτωμένον as adjectival attribute to Ἰησοῦν, and ἐστεφανωμένον as predicate to the object. The sense then is: “mankind is not yet exalted; but Jesus, who was indeed abased for a while below the angels, we see already crowned with glory and honour.” This construction, which at any rate rests upon the false supposition that the subject of discourse, vv. 6–8, is not already Christ, the Son of man, but only man in general, and that the author of the epistle had regarded as fully identical the two utterances of the psalm: δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτὸν, and πάντα ἰπτέαζας ἵποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, would only be permissible in the case that Ἰησοῦν δὲ, τὸν βραχὺ τὶ παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἡλπτωμένον, βλέπομεν κ.τ.λ., or τὸν δὲ βραχὺ τὶ παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἡλπτωμένον Ἰησοῦν βλέπομεν κ.τ.λ., had been written. By the position of the Ἰησοῦν after βλέπομεν it becomes impossible; since in consequence thereof Ἰησοῦν appears as entirely unaccentuated, consequently can be
regarded only as a supplementary addition by way of elucidation with regard to the question who is to be understood by the ὁ βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένος. Ἡσσοὺν might even have been entirely left out without detriment to the sense and intelligibility of that which the author would imply; it is nevertheless inserted, in order, by the express mention of His name, to cut off every kind of doubt upon the point that it is no other than Christ, the historic Redeemer, of whom the citation adduced, vv. 6–8, is treating.—βλέπομεν] we see, perceive; namely, with the eyes of the mind; comp. iii. 19, al. For it is openly testified that Christ rose from the dead, and ascended to the right hand of the Father in heaven; and Christians feel that He is reigning in power and glory by means of the Holy Spirit, which He has conferred upon them.—διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου on account of His suffering of death, belongs not to βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον (Origen, in Joann. t. ii. c. 6; Augustine, contra Maximin. iii. 2. 5; Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Beza, Schlichting, Cornelius a Lapide, Cameron, Calov, Limborch, Semler, al.), but to διὰ καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφανωμένου (Luther, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, Wetstein, Böhme, Bleek, Tholuck, de Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 357; Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, and many others). Only this mode of referring the clause has the merit of naturalness from the position of the words; only this is grammatically and logically justified. For not only with this construction does διὰ with the accusative retain its only possible signification, but the thought likewise finds its confirmation in the sequel (διὰ παθημάτων τελείωσαι, ver. 10), and accords with the view of Paul, Phil. ii. 9, according to which the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of the Father was the consequence and divine recompense of the voluntary abasement endured even to the death of the cross. Supposing the connection to be with that which precedes, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου must contain a later added nearer definition to ἡλαττωμένον; but a second supplementary nearer definition, seeing that Ἡσσοὺ already occupies such a position, would be extremely improbable, when we consider the carefulness with regard
to style which prevails in this epistle; it would not, like Ἡσυχία, have a purpose to serve, but be merely an instance of linguistic negligence such as ought not to be readily laid to the charge of our author. Moreover, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου, referred to that which precedes, does not even admit of any satisfactory explanation. For, as thus combined, it is interpreted either: humbled by reason of the suffering of death, i.e. by suffering death, or: humbled for the sake of the suffering of death, i.e. in order to be able to undertake it. But in the latter case the choice of the preposition διὰ would be an exceedingly ill-judged one, since we must, at any rate, have expected εἰς τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου, or something similar. In the former case, on the other hand, διὰ must have been combined with the genitive instead of the accusative, quite apart from the consideration that the author can hardly be supposed to limit the humiliation of Christ to the moment of His death, but rather (comp. ver. 14), like Paul, to comprehend in general the whole period of His life in the flesh. — ὅπως χάριν θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γενόσθαι θανάτου] that He by the grace of God might taste death for everyone, does not depend upon θανάτου. For the enduring of death was certainly not something which was to take place only after the exaltation, but already preceded this. The contorted interpretations, however: so that He died for all (Erasmus, Paraphr., Tena, Ribera, Morus, Valckenae, Kuinoel), or: in order that He may have suffered death for all (Ebrard), or: postquam mortem gustavit (Schleusner), are grammatically impossible. But since a connecting of the final clause with θανάτου (Akersloot, Bengel, Böhme, Bisping) is, considering the grammatical construction of ver. 9, quite inconceivable, ὅπως κ.τ.λ. can be only a further, but pregnant, exponent of the preceding τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου: on account of His suffering of death, namely, in order that He might, etc. — χάριν θεοῦ] for the grace and love of God is the supreme cause of the redeeming death of Christ (comp. Rom. v. 8; Gal. ii. 21). — ὑπὲρ on behalf of for the weal of. — παντὸς is not neuter, in such wise that the declaration should apply to the whole creation, including the angels (Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact; comp. Origen,
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in Joann. t. i. c. 40); for this thought comes into collision with ver. 16, and the expression thereof would be incorrect, since we must expect in that case 

\[ \nu \nu \varepsilon \rho \pi \alpha \sigma \eta \tau \theta \varsigma \kappa \tau \iota \varepsilon \omega \varsigma, \]

or at least \[ \nu \nu \varepsilon \rho \tau \sigma \tau \theta \nu \tau \alpha \nu \tau \omega \varsigma. \]

\( \Pi \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \omicron \) is masculine, and has reference only to mankind. The singular, however, is placed, not the plural \( \pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu \), in order distinctly to bring out the thought that Christ died on behalf of each single individual among men (namely, who will appropriate the salvation offered him), not merely for mankind as a totality, as a compact corporation. [Piscator and Owen understand: each and every one, sc. of the \( \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega i \nu \) mentioned ver. 10. Cf. Acts xx. 28.] — \( \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon \alpha i \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \iota \nu \) represents the experiencing of death under the figure of a tasting of the same. Comp. Matt. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27; John viii. 52. The formula corresponds to the rabbinical \( \eta \varsigma \iota \mu \nu \eta \pi \iota \varsigma \tau \iota \varsigma \) (see Schoettgen and Wetstein on Matt. xvi. 28), and has its manifold analogies in the Greek turns: \( \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon \alpha i / \alpha \varepsilon \kappa \omega \) (Soph. Trachin. 1101), \( \kappa \alpha \kappa \omega \) (Eurip. Hec. 379; Luc. Nigr. 28), \( \pi \varepsilon \theta \theta \nu \varsigma \pi \iota \kappa \rho \omega \) (Eurip. Alcest. 1069), \( \pi \iota \nu \omega \omega \) (Pindar, Nem. vi. 41), \( \omicron \iota \iota \sigma \tau \theta \) (Homer, Odys. xxi. 98), \( \tau \varsigma \alpha \chi \iota \varsigma, \tau \varsigma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \theta \epsilon \theta \epsilon \iota \iota \iota \iota \) (Herod. iv. 147, vi. 5), etc. The formula is only a more significant expression for the ordinary \( \alpha \tau \tau \tau \sigma \varepsilon \iota \iota \kappa \iota \epsilon i k \). Neither the notion of the brief duration of Christ's death (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Clarinus, Camerarius, Brann, Peirce, Cramer, Ch. F. Schmid), nor along with this the notion of the reality of that death (Beza, Bengel), nor, finally, the notion of the bitterness of the death sufferings (Calov, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz), lies in the expression.

REMARK.—In connection with the explanation of the reading \( \chi \omega \rho \iota \varsigma \theta \nu \iota \omega \) (see the critical remarks) comes forth the main diversity, that these words were either taken as closely conjoined with \( \nu \nu \varepsilon \rho \pi \alpha \sigma \eta \tau \theta \varsigma \kappa \tau \iota \varepsilon \omega \varsigma, \) or regarded in themselves as an independent nearer defining of the verb. The former mode of explanation is adopted by Origen, Theodoret, Ebrard, Ewald: "in order that He might suffer death for all beings, with the exception of God alone;" further Bengel, and Chr. F. Schmid: "in order that, with a view

\(^1\) Ebrard, too, finds the thought expressed in \( \nu \nu \varepsilon \rho \pi \alpha \sigma \eta \tau \theta \varsigma \kappa \tau \iota \varepsilon \omega \varsigma \) : "that Christ by His death has reconciled absolutely all things, heaven and earth;" but in connection therewith inconsistently takes \( \pi \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \omicron \) as a masculine.
to purchasing or subjecting all things except God, He might suffer death." But against both acceptations is the fact that \( \pi\nu\tau\iota\varsigma \) \( \text{cannot be neuter} \) (see above), against the latter, moreover, in particular the fact that the notion: "in order to purchase to himself," cannot possibly be expressed by the mere \( \iota\nu\tau\iota\rho\varsigma \) \( \text{παντός} \). As an independent addition \( \chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \ \theta\iota\nu\varsigma \) is taken by Theodorus Mopsuestenus, Ambrose, Fulgentius, the Nestorians, and P. Colomesius (Observat. Sacr. p. 603): "that He might taste death without God, i.e. without the participation of His God-head, with the mere sharing of His humanity in death." But that such a thought, in itself entirely alien as it is to the Biblical writers, could not have been expressed by \( \chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \ \theta\iota\nu\varsigma \), is at once apparent. There must at least have been written \( \chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \ \tau\epsilon\iota\nu\iota \ \theta\iota\nu\varsigma \ \delta\iota\nu\varsigma \varsigma \). To this place further belongs Paulus, with an appeal to Matt. xxvii. 46: "as without God, as one abandoned by God, not delivered." But the added "as," by which alone the interpretation becomes tolerable, is without grammatical justification the expositor's own additamentum.

Ver. 10. Not without design has the author, ver. 9, added to the declaration \( \delta\zeta\gamma \ \kappa\alpha\iota \ \tau\iota\mu\iota \ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\phi\alpha\nu\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\iota\nu \) the indication of the cause, \( \delta\iota\varsigma \ \tau\omicron \ \pi\acute{a}\theta\omicron\alpha\mu\acute{a} \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \theta\alpha\nu\acute{a}\tau\omicron \), and then brought into relief this superadded clause by the final statement: \( \delta\pi\omega\varsigma \ \chi\acute{a}\rho\omicron\tau\omicron \ \theta\iota\nu\varsigma \ \upsilon\acute{e}\rho\varsigma \ \pi\acute{a}\tau\omicron\varsigma \ \gamma\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\eta\tau\iota\varsigma \ \theta\alpha\nu\acute{a}\tau\omicron \). For the Redeemer's death of the cross, ridiculed by the Gentiles as folly, was to the Jews an offence (1 Cor. i 23). Even to the Hebrews, to whom the author is writing, the thought of a Messiah who passed through sufferings and death might be a stumbling-block not yet surmounted, and, with other things, have contributed to shake their confidence in Christianity, and incline them to relapse into Judaism. Without, therefore, further giving express utterance to the conclusion to be expected after ver. 9 (see on ver. 9, init.), but rather leaving the supplying of the same to the readers, the author passes over, ver. 10 ff., at once to the justification of that fact regarded as an offence, in bringing into relief the consideration that the choice of that way, so apparently strange, of causing the Messiah to attain to glory through sufferings and death, was altogether worthy of God (ver. 10), and necessary (vv. 14-18), in order that Christ might be qualified to be the redeemer of sinful humanity. — Wrongly does Tholuck suppose that ver. 10 attaches itself to \( \delta\zeta\gamma \ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\phi\alpha\nu\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\iota\nu \), ver. 9, and
expresses the thought that the glorification of Him could not fail of its accomplishment, who became to others the author of salvation. For the centre of gravity in the proposition lies not in τελειώσας, but in διὰ παθημάτων, which Tholuck erroneously degrades to a mere "secondary thought." — ἐπρεπεν] it was befitting; not an expression of necessity (Kuinoel, Bloomfield, al.), but of meetness and becomingness, in relation partly to the nature of God (comp. δι' δυν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' ὦ τὰ πάντα), partly to the ends He would attain (cf. vv. 14–18). Comp. Philo, Legg. allegor. I. p. 48 E (with Mangey, I. p. 53): πρέπει τῷ θεῷ φυτείων καὶ οἰκοδομεῖν ἐν φυγῇ τὰς ἀρετάς. — De incorrupt. Mundi, p. 950 B (with Mangey, II. p. 500): ἐμπρεπές δὲ θεῷ τὰ ἀμορφα μορφῶν καὶ τοῖς αἰσχρότοις περιτίθεναι θαυμαστὰ κάλλη. — αὐτῷ, δι' δυν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' ὦ τὰ πάντα] does not relate to Christ (Primasius, Hunnius, Königs- mann, Cramer, al.), but is a periphrasis for God. This periphrastic delineation, however, of the divine characteristics justifies the ἐπρεπεν in its truth and naturalness. For He who is the Supreme Cause and Creator of the Universe cannot have done anything unworthy of Himself. — τὰ πάντα] the totality of all that exists, not merely that which serves for the bringing about of salvation (Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Paulus). — δι' δυν] for the sake of whom, characterizes God as the One for whom, i.e. to accomplish whose ends, all things are designed, and corresponds to the εἰς αὐτῶν, Rom. xi. 36, 1 Cor. viii. 6; while δι' ὦ characterizes Him as the One by whom all things have been effected or created, inasmuch as, according to the popular conception, the notion of the originating is not strictly separated from that of effecting, since both are summed up under the more general notion of disposing, preparing [ποιεῖν, παρασκευάζειν, ἐτοιμάζειν]; comp. 1 Cor. i. 9; Gal. i. 1. In the case of our author, moreover, the placing of the inaccurate δι' ὦ instead of the more accurate εἰς ὦ (comp. Rom. xi. 36) or ὑφ' ὦ, may also have been occasioned with a view to the paronomasia produced by the use of the twofold διά with different cases. — πολλοΐς νῦν: εἰς δόξαν ἀγαθόντα] is not a preposed apposition to τὸν

1 Not: "at whose command or will," as Wieseler (Comm. ub. d. Br. an dis Gal., Göttingen 1859, p. 111) will have δὴ ὦ explained.


dpyrjybvTrjsoa>Tr)p[a<;ainwv: "it became God to make Him,—as one who led many sons unto glory,—namely, the Beginner of their salvation, perfect through sufferings" (Primasius, Erasmus, Paraphr.; Estius, Heinrichs, Stuart, Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl., p. 321 f.; Ebrard, Nickel, in Reuter's Repert. 1857, Oct. p. 20, and many others). Such construction is not indeed to be opposed, as Böhme and Bleek think, on the ground that the article τὸν could not in that case have been wanting also before πολλοίς. On the contrary, either the addition or the omission of the article before πολλοίς would be justified; only a modification of the sense results from the choice of the one or the other course. If the article is placed, then τὸν πολλοίς νιῶς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα and τὸν ἁρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν are two parallel but co-ordinate utterances, in such wise that the second repeats the first only in more sharply-defined form of expression. In connection with the omission of the article, again, the first expression stands in the relation of subordination to the second, and is a preposed statement of the reason for the same. But what really decides against that view is—(1) That according to ver. 11 the believers are brethren of Christ, and sons of God; consequently πολλοίς νιῶς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα would be unsuitable as an utterance with respect to Christ, while the interpretation of the νιῶς as sons of God, adopted by Nickel, l.c., in connection with the referring of the ἀγαγόντα to Christ, would be unnatural. (2) That, assuming the identity of the subject in ἀγαγόντα and ἁρχηγὸν, both expressions would in effect cover each other, consequently become tautological. We must accordingly take, as the subject in πολλοίς νιῶς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα, God; in τὸν ἁρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν, Christ. So Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Annott.; Luther, Vatablus, Calvin, Piscator, Grotius, Owen, Bengel, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch, Buttmann (Gramm. p. 262), Hofmann (Schrifthev. II. 1, p. 51 f.), Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 581), Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Woerner, and many others. It cannot, however, be urged against the referring of ἀγαγόντα to God (Carpzov, Michaelis, and others), that we have not, instead of the accusative ἀγαγόντα, the dative ἀγαγόντι, which no doubt would have been more accurate on
account of the preceding  

since this very accusative is otherwise the general case of the subject grammatically construed with the accusative. Transitions to the latter, spite of a preceding dative, are accordingly nothing rare; comp. Acts xi. 12, xv. 22; Luke i. 74; Kühner, Gramm. II. p. 346 f.; Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 367, fin. — Πολλοίς] not equivalent to πάντας (Seb. Schmidt). Πολλοίς renders prominent only the notion of multitude or plurality, quite apart from the question whether or not this plurality is to be thought of as the totality of mankind; comp. ix. 28; Rom. v. 15, viii. 29; Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28. — εἰς δόξαν] The δόξα is not distinguished, as to the thing itself, from the σωτηρία mentioned immediately after. The Messianic glory and blessedness is intended thereby. The word δόξα, however, was chosen in accordance with the words: δόξη καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφανωμένων, ver. 9, taken over from the psalm cited. — ἀγαγόντα] cannot signify: “since He would lead” (Bleek, Stengel, Bloomfield, and Bisping; after the precedent of Erasmus, Annott.; Piscator, Grotius, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Peirce, Starck, Wolf, Storr, Ernesti, Dindorf, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee). For the aorist has never a future sense. But neither is ἀγαγόντα to be rendered by “qui adduxerat,” with the Vulgate, Estius, Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 39, 1 Aufl.; Komm. p. 121; differently Schriftbew. 2 Aufl. p. 51), and others; in such wise that the thought were directed to the saints of the O. T., already led to glory. For the characterizing of Christ as the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν shows that the viol, in whom was accomplished the εἰς δόξαν ἁγεσθαι on the part of God, must already have been in communion with Christ,—the communion with Christ was the conditioning cause of their attainment to the δόξα. According to Tholuck, who is followed by Moll, the participle aorist indicates, “as the nearer defining of the infinitive aorist τελειώσαι, the specific character of the same without respect to the relation of time.” But only the infinitive, not the participle aorist is used non-temporally; and the “specific

1 For the same reason have we to reject the kindred interpretation of Kurtz, who takes the ἄγνως εἰς δόξαν as preceding the τελειώσαι, and refers the viol to the believing contemporaries of Jesus, with the inclusion of the believers under the Old Covenant.
character” of τελειώσαι cannot be expressed by ἀγαγόντα, for the reason that the personal objects of ἀγαγόντα and τελειώσαι are different. ἀγαγόντα can have no other meaning than: since He led, and is the indication of the cause from the standpoint of the writer. The participle aorist has its justification in the fact that, from the moment Christ appeared on earth as a redeemer, and found faith among men, God in reality was leading εἰς δόξαν those who believed, i.e. caused them to walk in the way to the δόξα. For only this notion of title to the δόξα in reversion, not that of the actual possession of the same, can be meant; inasmuch as the possession of the δόξα will only come in at the Parousia. The causal relation, however, of the participial clause: πολλοὺς νίους εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα, to the main statement: ἐπερεπε τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειώσαι, and consequently the justification of the latter by the former, lies in the fact that the πολλοὶ νιοί, just because they were not angels but men, could only be redeemed in that Christ for them became man, and for them suffered and died; even as the author himself will more fully show, ver. 14 ff. Others find the causal relation by supplying, in thought, διὰ παθημάτων to the first clause also. So Jac. Cappellus: “quum tot filios suos per afflictiones consecrasset, afflictionum via perduxisset ad gloriampatercoelestis, decebat sane et aequuin erat, ut principem salutierum eorum eadem via perduceret ad coelestem gloriam.” In like manner Grotius: “quia fierinon potest, ut qui se pietatidedunt, non multa mala patiantur... ideo Deus voluit ipsum autorem salutiferae doctrinae non nisi per graves calamitates perducere ad statum illum perfectae beatitudinis.” But in this case the express addition of διὰ παθημάτων in the first clause could not have been omitted. — τὸν ἀρχηγόν] Comp. xii. 2; Acts iii. 15, v. 31. Designation of the beginner, or first in a series, to which the further notion of author then easily attaches, so that the word is frequently used, as here, exactly in the sense of αὐτός. Instances in Bleek, Abth. II. 1 Hälfte, p. 302. — τελειώσαι] to bring to perfection, to lead to the goal, does not here express “an inner moral perfection, which has as its consequence the attainment of the highest outward goal” (de Wette, Tholuck, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 343, 346;
and, long ago, Cameron), nor does it denote the close of the appointed course with which God has brought Jesus to the goal of that which He was to become, to the end of His earthly temporal existence (Hofmann); but resumes the notion of the δόξη καὶ τιμὴ στεφανοῦσθαι, ver. 9, and is identical with this.

Vv. 11–13. Elucidatory justification, in passing, of the expression πολλοὺς νίους, employed ver. 10; in proof of the brotherly relation existing between Christ and believers, already indicated by that expression. That this view as to the aim and signification of vv. 11–13 is the true one, is contested indeed by Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 366 f. (comp. also Kurtz, and Hofmann ad loc). According to Riehm, vv. 11–13 are to be regarded not as mere accessory remarks, but as the first link in the proof for ver. 10, to which then ver. 14 f. attaches as second link; in such wise that only in the two thoughts together (vv. 11–13 and ver. 14 f.), not in ver. 14 by itself (see on the verses) alone, is a confirmation of ver. 10 to be found; and accordingly the (argumentative, not explicative) γάρ, ver. 11, belongs not merely to ver. 11. The following "chain of reasoning," namely, is supposed to shape the course of thought: "it became God, etc. For—(1) Christ is brother to the Christians; it is thus not unbecoming that He should have been made like them; and (2) He must be made like them, because His suffering and death were necessary, if they were to be saved." The untenable character of this statement of the connection of thought, as made by Riehm, is, however, sufficiently apparent from the fact — apart from the consideration that the contents of vv. 11–13 manifestly point back to the expression πολλοὺς νίους, ver. 10 — that if the proof for the main thought of ver. 10 was designed in reality already to begin with vv. 11–13, it would surely not be the proposition: it is not unbecoming that Christ should be made like unto the Christians (of which there was no express mention so early as ver. 10), which must have been proved, but solely and simply the proposition: it is not unbecoming that God should have led Christ through suffering to perfection, in which the true central thought of ver. 10 is contained. But such proof is not given. — δὴ γὰρ ἀγιάζων
... πάντες] Now He who sanctifies and those who are sanctified (through Him, i.e. through His atoning sacrificial death,\(^1\) comp. x. 10, 14, ix. 13 f., xiii. 12) all have their origin in One,—is a special statement concerning Christ and Christians. To take the words as a proposition of universal validity, the application of which to Christ and the Christians was left to the readers, wherein there is specially an underlying allusion to the O. T. high priest and those whose cleansing from sins he accomplished (Schlichting, Gerhard, Schöttgen, al.), is forbidden by the connection with that which precedes and that which follows.— The present participles ὁ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι are used substantively. Comp. Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 331 f. — ἐξ ἐνός πάντες] sc. εἶσιν. ἐνός is masculine. Wrongly is it by others taken as a neuter, in that they either supplement in thought: συνήματος, or αἱματος, or γένους (so Carpzov, Abresch, al.), or else explain: ex communi massa (Jac. Cappellus, Akersloot), or "of one and the same nature" (Calvin, Cameron: ejusdem naturae et conditionis spiritualis; Cornelius a Lapide, Owen, Whitby, Moses Stuart); for neither is the supplying of a substantive admissible, nor can ἐκ, expressive as it is of the origin, be transformed into a declaration of nature and constitution. We have, however, to understand by ἐνός, not Adam (Erasmus, Paraphr.; Beza, Estius, Justinian, Hunnius, Baumgarten, Zachariae, Bisping, Wieseler in the Publications of the University of Kiel, 1867, p. 26; Hofmann, Woerner) or Abraham (Drusius, Peirce, Bengel), but God. Yet the notion of fatherhood, which is in this way assigned to God, is not to be expounded in the universal sense, in such wise that God would be called Creator and Father in relation to Christians also, only in the same manner in which He is the Creator of every creature (so Chrysostom and the majority), but is to be referred specially to the fact that Christians are His spiritual children (Piscator,

1 Delitzsch arbitrarily takes ἁγιάζων, ver. 11, as synonymous with συνίστω, ver. 10: "In order to be crowned with μικρον τώ ἁγιάζων Jesus must first be sanctified, or, as the author says, ver. 10, be made perfect through sufferings, inasmuch as the sufferings melted away that about Him which was not capable of exaltation, that He, Himself sanctified before, might be able to sanctify us, and so to raise us to like μικρον." Of a being sanctified, on the part of Christ, there is no mention made either here or anywhere else in the epistle.
Grotius, Limborch, Paulus, Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll. Comp. John viii. 47; 1 John iii. 10, iv. 6, v. 19; 3 John 11. — πάντες Peirce and Bengel would have taken with οἱ ἀγιασμένοι alone. The position of the word, however, renders this impossible. Rather does πάντες, after the close connection between the ἀγιάζων and the ἀγιασμένοι has already been accentuated by means of the τέ . . . καλ, still further lay stress upon the fact that they all, the Christians not less than Christ, are ἡ ἐνός. — δὲ ἥν αἰρίαν Wherefore. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 6, 12; Tit. i. 13. The same formula also not rarely with Philo. — οὖν ἐπαινεῖται He (sc. ὁ ἀγιάζων) is not ashamed. For Christ is the higher one. Comp. xi. 16. — αὐτοῖς sc. τῶν ἀγιασμένων.

Vv. 12, 13. Documentary proofs from Scripture for the οὖν ἐπαυνεῖται αδελφοὺς αὐτοῖς καλέων, ver. 11.

Ver. 12. First proof, taken from Ps. xxii. 23 (22). In its historic sense the citation has reference to the composer of the psalm himself, who in the deepest distress supplicates God for deliverance, and promises to praise Him for the deliverance granted. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, interprets the psalm Messianically, and regards Christ as the subject speaking therein. — ἀναγγέλω LXX.: διηγήσομαι.

Ver. 13. Second and third proofs, taken from Isa. viii. 17, 18. The design of the author in dividing into two different citations, by means of καὶ πάλιν, the words which stand together in the Hebrew and the LXX., is not to present the relation of community between Christ and the Christians on two different sides, in that, namely, it is indicated in his first passage how the incarnate Son of God descended to the standpoint of man; in the second, on the other hand, how redeemed men are raised by God to the standpoint of Christ (Kurtz),—all of which is subtle and far-fetched; but only to pile up the Scripture testimonies, inasmuch as the end of ver. 17, as well as the beginning of ver. 18, seemed to him to contain each in itself an independent means of evidence for that which he would make good. The words of the first proof passage: πεποιθῶσ' ἐσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ, are likewise found in the LXX. at 2 Sam. xxii. 3 and Isa. xii. 2. But that the author
was not thinking of one of these passages (according to Ebrard, of the first), but of Isa. viii. 17, is the more natural supposition, because with the LXX. and in the original the words, which here, too, are first adduced (only in partially inverted order, and augmented by ἐγώ): καὶ πεποιθῶς ἐσομαι ἐπὶ αὐτῷ, immediately precede the directly following passage, taken from Isa. viii. 18. In their historic sense the words cited refer to the prophet and his sons, and, indeed, with the LXX., the ἐδοῦ...θεός is a further unfolding of the subject in ἐσομαι. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, however, regards the words as an utterance of Christ, led thereto, as Bleek rightly conjectures, by the καὶ ἐρεί, interpolated by the LXX. before ver. 17, which seemed to indicate another subject than the prophet, since he spoke throughout the whole section in the first person; and other than God, since He is spoken of, by virtue of ἐπὶ αὐτῷ, as the one in whom the speaker trusts. The demonstrative force of the words cited is found by our author in the fact that the person speaking, i.e. Christ, places Himself, by means of the testifying of His confidence in God, upon the same level with other men;¹ as also in that the author understands by the παιδία, not the children of the speaker, but the children of God, the children whom God the Father has given to Christ.

Vv. 14, 15. The author, after the subsidiary remarks, vv. 11–13, returns to the main thought of ver. 10, now further to develop the same. To lead Christ through sufferings to perfection, was a provision worthy of God. For it was necessary, if Christ was to be the Redeemer of sinful humanity. In order, however, to be able to take upon Himself sufferings and death, He must become man as other men, and place Himself upon one level with those to be redeemed. Comp. on ver. 14, Zyro in the Theol. Studd. u. Kritt. 1864, H. 3, p. 516 ff. — ὁδὲ is the outward sign of that return to the main thought. Logically it belongs not to the protasis, with which it is grammatically connected, but to the main thesis: καὶ αὐτὸς παραπλησίως μετέχειν κ.τ.λ. Αν

¹ Theophylact: καὶ ἴδα τούτων διάνοια, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἀληθεία ἡμῶν γίγνεται. ἐνεχθὲς Ἰησοῦς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡσεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς πίστις ἐν αὐτῷ, τονίσει τῇ φασίν.
attachment of ver. 14 to ver. 13, therefore, is effected only in so far as τὰ παιδία, ver. 13, has given occasion for the resuming of this word in the first clause of ver. 14. In a strangely perverted fashion Heinrichs (comp. also Valckenaer): "Quod si homo fuit Christus, infans quoque primo fuerit omnemque in nativitate sua humanam naturam induerit necesse est." — κεκοινώνηκεν] here, as often in the case of the classics, combined with the genitive; whereas elsewhere in the N. T. the dative is used with κοινωνεῖν (Rom. xv. 27; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 13, al.). The persons with whom the communion or the common participation takes place are not the parents (Valckenaer, who supplies γονεῖς), but the children themselves. One παιδίον with the other, one as well as the other, has part in blood and flesh, or possesses the same. The perfect, however, indicates the constant and definitive character of the order of nature, as this has always prevailed already, and still continues to assert its sway. — αἷματος καὶ σαρκὸς] The same succession of words, also Eph. vi. 12. Otherwise more ordinarily: σάρξ καὶ αἷμα. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Matt. xvi. 17; Ecclus. xiv. 18, xvii. 31. αἷμα καὶ σάρξ, the two main constituents of the sensuously perceptible outward nature of man. — παραπληθωσκοῦσα] is not: "equally" (Bleek, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Grimm in the Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt A. K. Z. 1857, No. 29, p. 663; Hofmann, Schriftenw. II. 1, p. 57, 2 Aufl.; Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 313 f.; Maier), or: "likewise" (de Wette), — a signification which is linguistically undemonstrable, — but: in a manner very closely resembling. It expresses the resemblance with the accessory notion of the diversity; in such wise that the author characterizes the human form of Christ's existence, in all its correspondence with the form of existence of other men, as still different from the latter (Cameron, Owen, Akersloot, Cramer, Böhme, Zyro, Moll, Woerner). And rightly so. For Christ was no ordinary man, but the incarnate Son of God. He was distinguished from His human brethren by His sinlessness (comp. iv. 15). As therefore Paul, Phil. ii. 7 (and similarly Rom. viii. 3), speaks of the incarnate Christ not as ἄνθωπος γενόμενος, but as ἐν
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ὁμοιόματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, even so the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also here places not ἐξ ἵσου, but παραπλησίας μετέσχεν τῶν αὐτῶν. Comp. also θεοί ἐφείλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἄδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθήμας, ver. 17. — μετέσχεν] The aorist. For the incarnation and the earthly course of Christ is a fact already belonging to the purely past; now Christ is already the glorified Son of God. — τῶν αὐτῶν] εἰς αἴματος καὶ σαρκός. Erroneously, because without taking into account the reference imperatively required by the former clause, Bengel: eadem, quae fratibus accidunt, sanguine et carne laborantibus, ne morte quidem excepta. — διὰ τοῦ θανάτου] by means of death, the enduring of which first became possible by the taking upon Him of flesh and blood. Bengel: διὰ τοῦ θανάτου Paradoxon. Jesus mortem passus vicit; diabolum mortem vibrans succubuit. —

The placing of the characteristic τὸν τὸ κράτος ἐχοντα τοῦ θανάτου before τὸν διάβολον is chosen, in order to gain a marked contrast to the preceding διὰ τοῦ θανάτου. —

A ruler's power over death, however, is possessed by the devil, inasmuch as by the enticement of the devil sin came into the world of men, and sin brings about death for man. Comp. Wisd. ii. 24: φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον; Rom. v. 12.

Ver. 15. Kai] consecutive: and in consequence thereof. — ἀπαλλάξῃ] stands absolutely: might set free, deliver. Without warrant do Grotius, Wolf, and others supplement τοῦ φόβου or τοῦ φόβου θανάτου. — Τούτων] does not go back to τὰ παιδία (Böhme, Kuinoel), but serves for the bringing into relief of the following ὅσοι, and τούτων δὲ οἱ κ.τ.λ. is a periphrasis of the unredeemed humanity; the thought is not merely of the Israelites (Akersloot, Rambach, Braun, Woerner), and still less merely of the Gentiles (Peirce). — φόβῳ θανάτου] out of fear of death, causal definition to διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν ἐνοχοί ἦσαν δουλεῖας. — διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν] throughout the whole life. The infinitive is employed, by virtue of the addition παντὸς, entirely as a substantive (διὰ

1 Over-refinedly does Elrard take τι κράτος absolutely, and τοῦ θανάτου as genitivus subjectivus: "him who holds in his hands the power which death exerts over us.”

METKE.—HEB.
This practice is more rare than the coupling of the infinitive with the mere preposition and article. Yet this very infinitive ζην is found exactly so used, as Bleek remarks, with Aesch. Dial. iii. 4 (ὅσπερ εἰς ἐστερον ζην ἐπιθανοῦμενος); Ignat. Ep. ad Trall. 9 (οὗ χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζην ὑπὲ ἔχομεν), ad Ephes. 3 (καὶ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζην). — ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλεῖας] belongs together; were held in bondage, had become subject to bondage. We have not to construe ἔνοχοι ἦσαν with φόβῳ θανάτου, and δουλεῖας with ἀπαλλάξῃ (Abresch, Dindorf, Böhme). For against this the position of the words is decisive. On the thought, comp. Rom. viii. 15.

Ver. 16. The necessity for the assumption of flesh and blood on the part of the Redeemer is more fully brought to light by means of an establishing of the characteristic τούτων ὅσοι κ.τ.λ., ver. 15. This assumption was necessary, since the object of this redemption was confessedly not angels, i.e. beings of a purely spiritual nature, but descendants of Abraham, i.e. beings of flesh and blood. — οὐ διήνοει] or δὴ ποὺ, as it is more correctly written, does not signify: "nowhere" (Luther, Zeger, Calvin, Schlichting, Limborch, Bisping, al.; Vulg.: nusquam), in such wise that ποὺ should be referred to a passage in the O. T., and the sense would result: nowhere in the O. T. is it spoken of, that, etc.¹ — For such reference must at least have been indicated by the context, which is not the case. Δὴ ποὺ stands rather, according to purely classical usage (in the N. T., for the rest, it is found only here; with the LXX. not at all), to denote, in ironical form of expression, the presupposition that the statement to be expressed is a truth raised above all doubt, which must be conceded by every one. It corresponds to our "assuredly," "surely" (doch wohl), "I should think," to the Latin "opinor." Comp. Hartung, Partikellehre, I. p. 285; Klotz, ad Devar. p. 427. — ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι πτως to take a helping interest in any one (comp. Ecclus. iv. 11), here to deliver him from the guilt and punishment of sin (comp. ἀπαλλάξῃ, ver. 15; and εἰς τὸ ¹ Ebrard still finds in ver. 16 a proof from the O. T. Only he supposes the author did not here feel it needful to cite a single passage, but that it sufficed to remind of a universally acknowledged fact of the O. T. !
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\[\text{ἐλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἀμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, ver. 17;}\]

wrongly, because \[\text{τούτους ὅσοι κ.τ.λ., ver. 15,} \]

stands not in reciprocal relation with \[\text{ἐπιλαμβάνεται, but with the antithesis ὅπις ἄγγέλων ἄλλα στέρματος Ἀβραάμ, ver. 16;} \]

Hofmann, \text{Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 59, 2 Aufl.: \text{“in order that the fear of death might not in our life terrify and enslave us”}}.

The present, since the \[\text{ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι is something still continuing.} \]

The interpretation of Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Erasmus, Luther, Clarius, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, Beza, Calov, Wolf, and many others: not angels, but the seed of Abraham, that is to say: not the nature of angels, but the nature of the seed of Abraham did Christ assume, has fallen into deserved disrepute;\(^1\) only Castellio, however, first perceived its grammatical impossibility. The proposal of Schulz to supply \[\text{ὁ θάνατος from vv. 14, 15 as the subject to ἐπιλαμβάνεται: \text{“for certainly he (death, or the lord of death) does not lay hold of, or carry off, angels, but the posterity of Abraham does he lay hold of,” is indeed grammatically permissible; logically, however, it does not commend itself, inasmuch as ver. 17 stands in close connection with ver. 16, but at ver. 17, as vv. 14, 15, the subject again is naturally Christ.} \]

\[\text{— ἄγγέλων] without article, like the following στέρματος Ἀβραάμ, generically.} \]

The author here excludes the angels from the province of the redemption which takes place through Christ. He is thus brought into contradiction with the teaching of Paul (comp. Col. i. 20)—a position which is wrongly denied by Hofmann, \text{Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 59 f.; Delitzsch, and Moll; by the first-named upon the untenable ground that “the design in this connection was not to say whom Jesus helps and whom He does not help, but what He is for those with whom He concerns Himself, for whom He exerts Himself!”—στέρματος Ἀβραάμ] does not denote mankind in general (Bengel, Böhme, Klee, Stein, Wieseler, \text{Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters, p. 491 f., al.}), in such wise that the expression should be taken in the spiritual sense, or \text{“the congregation of God, reaching over from the O. T. into the N. T., which goes back to Abraham’s call and obedience of faith for its fundamental beginning, Israel and the believers

\(^1\) M’Caul alone has espoused it afresh.
out of all mankind, the whole good olive tree, which has the patriarchs as its sacred root, Gal. iii. 29; Rom. iv. 16, xi. 16” (Delitzsch, Hofmann, II. 1, p. 60, 2 Aufl.; Kluge, Kurtz), which must have been introduced and made manifest by the context; but the Jewish people (comp. τοῦ λαοῦ, ver. 17; τὸν λαόν, xiii. 12). For Apollos, who (according to sec. 1 of the Introduction) is to be regarded as the author of the epistle, the conviction of the universality of Christianity must, it is true, have been not less firmly established than for Paul himself. He has mentioned, however, in place of the genus—i.e. in place of mankind in general—only a species of this genus, namely, Jewish humanity; just because he had only to do with born Jews as the readers of his epistle. Grotius: Hebraeis scribens satis habet de illis loqui; de gentibus alibi loquendi locus. Rightly at the same time does de Wette remark that Paul, even under a precisely identical state of the case, would hardly have expressed himself as is here done. Comp. also Reuss (Nouvelle Revue de Théologie, vol. V., Strasb. et Paris 1860, p. 208): “Nous doutons, que Paul eût pu traiter un pareil sujet en s’imposant un silence absolu sur un principe, qui était, à vrai dire, le centre de son activité apostolique.”

Ver. 17. Inference from ver. 16, and consequently a reverting to the main statement in ver. 14.—δέν] wherefore, sc. on account of the essential constitution of those to be redeemed, as indicated in ver. 16. The particle δέν is of very frequent occurrence in the Epistle to the Hebrews (comp. iii. 1, vii. 25, viii. 3, ix. 18, xi. 19). In Paul’s writings, on the other hand, it is nowhere met with.—οφείλεν] He ought. Expression, not of the necessity founded in the decree of God (cf. εἶν, Luke xxiv. 26), but of that founded in the nature of the case itself, comp. v. 3, 12.—κατὰ πάντα] in all respects. Chrysostom: τί ἐστι κατὰ πάντα; ἐτέχθη, φησίν, ἐτράφθη, γενεθηκέν, ἐπαθεὶ πάντα ἀπερ ἐχρήν, τέλος ἀπέθανεν. Theodoret: Ὁ μοίος γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ τροφῆς μετέλαβε καὶ τόνον ὑπέμεινε καὶ ἠθύμησε καὶ ἔδακρυσε καὶ θάνατον κατεδέχατο.—ὁμοιωθηναι] is not: “to be made the same or equal” (Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Bising, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 330; Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, al.), but expresses, as always, the
notion of resemblance. Christ was in all things similar to men, His brethren, inasmuch as He had assumed a truly human nature; He was distinguished from them, however, by His absolute sinlessness. Comp. iv. 15. — ελεήμων merciful, full of compassion for the sufferings of the ἀθέλοι, may be taken by itself (Luther, Grotius, Böhme, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Tholuck, Woerner [after Peshito, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions]), but also as πιστὸς, may be taken with ἀρχιερεύς (Owen, Bengel, Cramer, Storr, Stuart, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm, p. 330; Alford, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann). In the former case, which, on account of the position of the words, seems more natural, καὶ denotes “and in consequence thereof,” so that ελεήμων indicates the quality, the possession of which fits him to become a πιστὸς ἀρχιερεύς. — πιστὸς faithful, so fulfilling His high-priestly office as to satisfy the requirements of those to be reconciled. — τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν with regard to the affairs of God, or: with regard to the cause of God. Comp. v. 1; Rom. xv. 17. — ἡλασκεοθαῖ middle voice. — τοῦ λαοῦ of the people (of Israel, xiii. 12), see on ver. 16. — The idea of the high-priesthood of Christ here first comes out in this epistle. From iv. 14 onwards it is unfolded in detail. It is disputed, however, at what point our author thought of the high-priestly office of Christ as beginning, whether even on earth, with His death on the cross (so Cramer, Winzer, de sacerdotis officio, quod Christo tribuitur in ep. ad Hebr., Lips. 1825, Comment. I. p. vi. sq.; de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, and others), or only after the return to the Father; in such wise that, according to the view of the author, the offering of His own body upon the earth, and the entering with His own blood into the heavenly sanctuary, is to be regarded only as the inauguration of Christ to His high-priestly dignity, this dignity itself, however, beginning only with the moment when Christ, in accordance with Ps. cx. 1, sat down at the right hand of God the Father, Heb. viii. 1 (so Bleek and Kurtz, after the precedent of Faustus Socinus, Schlichting [Whitby], Griesbach, Opusc. II. p. 436 sq.; Schulz, p. 83 f., and others). It is certainly undeniable that the author in the course of his epistle very strongly accentuates the high-priesthood of Christ (comp. v. 9 f., vi. 19 f., vii. 24–26, viii. 4, ix. 24). But the polemic against readers who thought
they could not dispense with the ritual of the Jewish sacrifice of atonement for the attainment of salvation, naturally led him to insist with emphasis on the superiority of Christ as the heavenly High Priest over the Jewish high priests as the merely earthly ones. Since now, on the other side, it is equally undeniable that the author places the voluntary sacrificial death of Christ, and the entering with His blood into the heavenly Holy of Holies,—as the two inseparable acts of the same proceeding,—in parallel with the slaying of the sacrificial victim, and the entering of the earthly high priest with the sacrificial blood into the earthly Holy of Holies, and looks upon the sins of men as completely expiated by the sacrificial death of Christ itself (comp. ii. 14 f., vii. 27, ix. 11–14, 26, 29, x. 10, 12, 14, xiii. 12), there can be no room for doubt, that according to the mind of our author the investiture of Christ with the high-priestly dignity had already begun on earth, from the time of His death; and the representation of mankind in the presence of God is to be thought of as the continued administration of the high-priestly office already entered upon. So in substance also Riehm (comp. the detailed discussion by this writer, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 466–481); although it is certainly not in accordance with the view of the writer of the epistle, when Riehm afterwards (like Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 63 f., 2 Aufl.) supposes a distinction is to be made between Christ as High Priest and Christ as High Priest after the manner of Melchisedec, in that he represents Christ as having become the former by virtue of that which He did during the days of His flesh, as well as on His entrance into the heavenly Holy of Holies, and the latter only by virtue of His exaltation to God, where He ever liveth to make intercession for us.

Ver. 18. Elucidatory justification of ἵνα ἔλημον γένηται κ.τ.λ., and by means thereof corroborative conclusion to the last main assertion: ὁφείλειν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοωθήναι. Christ, namely, became qualified for having compassion and rendering help, inasmuch as He experienced in His own person the temptations, the burden of which pressed upon the brethren He came to redeem. Comp. iv. 15, 16 — ἐν φί] equivalent to ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι (comp. John xvi. 30: ἐν
τούτω, propter hoc), literally: upon the ground of (the fact) that, in that, i.e. inasmuch as, or because. Comp. Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 211; Fritzsche on Rom. viii. 3, p. 93. The interpretation "wherein," or "in which province" (Luther, Casaubon, Valckenaer, Fritzsche, l.c. p. 94, note; Ebrard, Bisping Kurtz, Woerner, and others), with which construction an εν τούτω corresponding to the εν ὅτι has to be supplied before δύναται, and εν ὅτι itself is connected with πέπονθεν or with πειρασθεῖτις, or else by the resolving of the participle into the tempus finitum is connected in like measure with both verbs, is to be rejected; not, indeed, because in that case the aorist ἐπαθεῖν must have been employed (Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 392, 2 Aufl.), nor because the plural εν ὅτι must have been placed (Hofmann, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 320, note),—for only slight modifications of the sense would result in this way, the substance of the statement itself remaining untouched,—but in reality for the reason that the thought thus resulting would be unsuitable. For Christ's capacity for conferring sympathy and help would then be restricted within the too narrow bounds of like conditions of suffering and temptations in the case of Himself and His earthly brethren. Bleek, too, understands εν ὅτι in the ordinary signification: "wherein," but then—after the example of Chr. Fr. Schmid—takes the words εν ὅτι πέπονθεν as a kind of adverbial nearer defining to αὐτὸς πειρασθεῖτις: "Himself tempted in that which He suffered," i.e. Himself tempted in the midst of His sufferings. So likewise more recently Alford: "for, having been Himself tempted in that which He suffered." Against this, however, the violence of the linguistic expression is decisive, since πειρασθεῖτις γὰρ αὐτὸς εν τοῖς παθήμασιν, or something similar, would have been much more simply and naturally written.—The emphasis rests not upon πέπονθεν (Hofmann), but upon αὐτὸς πειρασθεῖτις, inasmuch as not the πάσχειν in and of itself, but the πάσχειν in a definite state, is to be brought into relief: because He Himself suffered as one tempted, i.e. because His suffering was combined with temptations. αὐτὸς πειρασθεῖτις, however, was designedly placed at the end, in order to gain thereby a marked correspondence to the following τοῦς πειραξομένους.— δύναται]
not a note of the inclination (Grotius: *potest auxiliari pro potest moveri ad auxiliandum*, and similarly many others), but of the possibility. — τοῖς πειρατομένοις] a characteristic of τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, ver. 17. The participle present, since the state of temptation of the human brethren is one still continuing. — βοηθήσαι] to come to the help, sc. in that He entirely fills with His Spirit the suffering ones, whose necessities He has become acquainted with as a result of His own experience.
CHAPTER III.

VER. 1. 'Ἰοσοῦν] Recepta: Χριστὶν 'Ἰσοῦν. Rightly rejected by Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Scholz, de Wette, Tisch. Alford, al. For against it stands the preponderating authority of A B C* D* M κ, 17, 34, al., many vss. and Greek as well as Latin Fathers, and not less the usus loquendi of the epistle, since Χριστὶς 'Ἰσοῦς is found nowhere else therein, 'Ἰσοῦς Χριστὶς only [vi. 20, with D* E* It.] x. 10, xiii. 8 [20, with D* 17, al.], 21; quite commonly, on the other hand, the simple 'Ἰσοῦς (ii. 9, iv. 14, vi. 20, vii. 22, x. 19, xii. 2, 24, xiii. 12, 20) or the simple Χριστὶς (iii. 6, 14, v. 5, vi. 1, ix. 11, 14, 24, 28, xi. 26).— Ver. 2. ἐν ὑμωὸς ἔδω ὀἶκῳ ἀντίος] Instead thereof, Tisch. 1 and 2 reads merely ἐν ὑμωὸς ὀἶκῳ ἀντίος. But for the deletion of ὑμωὸς the authority of B, Sahid. Erp. Ambr. does not suffice. ὑμωὸς is defended not only by A C D E K L M κ, Vulg. al., but also by the consideration that it forms a constituent part of the passage Num. xii. 7, to which the writer has respect, and the complete formula ἐν ὑμωὸς ὀἶκῳ ἀντίος is, on account of its repetition in ver. 5, already presupposed for ver. 2.— Ver. 3. ὅπως ἔδωκα] Elz. Matthaei, Bloomfield: ἔδωκα ὅπως. Against A B C D E κ, 37, 47, al., It. Chrys. Transposition for bringing into marked relief the opposition ὅπως παρὰ Μωϋσῆ. — Ver. 4. In place of the Recepta τὰ πάντα, Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. read only πάντα. To be preferred, not merely on account of the strong attestation by A B C* D* E* K M κ, al. mult., Chrys. ms., but also because the notion of the universe, which τὰ πάντα would contain, does not suit the connection. — Ver. 6. In place of ἰαντεὶ, Lachm. (this editor, however, only in the edit. stereot.; in the larger edition he adds τε in brackets) and Tisch. have adopted, after B D* E* M κ* 17, the mere ἰαν. The author, however, is fond of the fuller ἰαντεὶ (comp. ver. 14, vi. 3), and here it has preponderating testimonies (A C D* E* K L κ* Lucif. Cal.) in its favour.— μίχρι τίλους βιβαίαν κατάχωμαν] Instead of this, Tisch. 2 and 7 reads merely κατάχωμαν. But, for the omission of the words μίχρι τίλους βιβαίαν (already condemned by Mill, Prolegg. 1208, and more recently by Delitzsch and Alford), the authority of B, Λεθ. Lucif. Ambr. does not suffice; and as a

Vv. 1–6. Even above Moses is Christ exalted. By so much higher than Moses does He stand, as the son exercising authority over his own house has precedence over the servant of the house. This new dogmatic consideration, to which the discourse now advances, was indeed already contained implicite as the minus, in the preceding argument as the majus; it must, however, still be separately insisted on, inasmuch as, in addition to the angels as the suprahuman agents (Vermittler) in connection with the founding of the Old Covenant, Moses, as the human agent (Vermittler) in the founding of the same, could not remain unmentioned. Appropriately to the subject, however, the author treats of this new point of comparison only with brevity, blending the same with the exhortation,
derived from that which precedes, to cleave firmly unto the end to Christ and the Christian hope; and then, from ver. 7 forward, further developing this exhortation in detail,—in the form of a parallel instituted between the people of God of the present time, i.e. the Christians, and the people of God of Moses' time,—in their interest, with even a warning impressiveness.

On vv. 1–6, comp. Carl Wilh. Otto, der Apostel und Hohepriester unsres Bekenntnisses. An Exegetical Study on Heb. iii. 1–6, Leipz. 1861, 8vo.\(^1\)

Ver. 1. "\( \text{δόθεν} \) refers back to the total characterization of Christ given in chaps. i. ii. Wherefore, i.e. seeing that it stands in such wise with Christ, His nature and disposition. As regards its contents, \( \text{δόθεν} \) is unfolded by the \( \text{τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν} \) immediately following, inasmuch as by these designations the preceding total-characterization of Christ is recapitulated in its two main features (vid. infra). For if the author says: "Therefore regard well Jesus, the \( \text{ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεύς τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν}!" that is only a Greek form of expression for the thought: "Therefore, because Jesus is the \( \text{ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεύς τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν} \), regard Him well!" — \( \text{ἀδελφόι ἄγων} \) belongs together.

\(^1\) This writer finds (comp. p. 96), by dint of a long extended chain of arbitrary assertions and erroneous presuppositions, the absolutely impossible sense in the words: "(Ver. 1) From this (ii. 10–18), beloved brethren, who, delivered from death, are presented a sacrifice to God, and have your right of citizenship in heaven, perceive that the Ambassador and High Priest, who in His own person has borne our confession to the heavenly goal, and as mediator continually introduces into heaven, namely Jesus (ver. 2), is one entrusted (an organ of confidence) of Him who made Him (such), i.e. (comp. p. 65) called Him into existence as Jesus, as was also Moses in the house of God, i.e. in the limitation and subordination, as this was presupposed by his position in the house of God. (Ver. 3) For (comp. p. 87) greater glory (i.e. higher position of power) has been vouchsafed to this man than to Moses, in which measure, as the house (sc. of God), so has He who has fitted it up, greater honour (sic!). (Ver. 4) For every house is fitted up by some one (but to correspond to all its requirements, no one is able); He, however, who has fitted it up with all things (sc. as Jesus the house of God, for time and eternity) is omnipotent, is of divine nature. (Ver. 5) And Moses, indeed, was trustworthy in all his house, as a servant, to testify what was to be revealed (ver. 6); Jesus, however, as the Christ (comp. p. 90), trustworthy as Son (sc. of God) over His (sc. God's) house. Whose (sc. God's) house we are and remain, if at any rate we retain the joyfulness and boasting of hope to the end."
With Michaelis, to separate the two words from each other by a comma, would be permissible only if by the isolation thereof a gradation were obtained. But this is not the case; since then only two relations parallel to each other, namely, on the one side the relation of the readers to the author (ἀδελφοί), and on the other side their relation to the non-Christian world (ἐγείροι), would be rendered separately prominent. — ἀδελφοὶ designates the readers not as brethren of Christ (so with an unwarranted appeal to ii. 11, 12, 17, Peirce, Michaelis, Carpzov, Pyle; comp. also Delitzsch, according to whom this is at least also to be thought of), nor does it express the brotherly relation in the national sense, i.e. the descent from the Jewish people common to the author and readers (Chr. Fr. Schmid), but has reference to the spiritual, ideal brotherly relationship, into which author and recipients of the letter have been brought towards each other by the common bond of Christianity. — κλησεως ἐπουρανίων μέτοχοι] ye who are partakers of a heavenly calling. This second direct address—to which Grotius needlessly supplies "nobiscum"—strengthens the former, and the two forms of address explain the ground of the obligation to the κατανοεῖν, by pointing to the reader's state of grace. κλησις stands actively. It denotes the call or invitation, which God1 has by Christ given to the readers, to participation in the Messianic kingdom. This calling, however, is termed ἐπουράνιος, either because the blessings, the possession of which it promises, are existent in heaven and of heavenly nature (Grotius, al.), or, what is more probable, because they have come to men from heaven [so Owen], where God their supreme author has His throne, and whence Christ their proclaimer and procurer (Vermittler) was sent forth. It is possible, however, that both references are to be combined: "a calling which proceeds from heaven and leads to heaven." So Bengel, Tholuck, Stuart, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 693; Alford, Maier, Kurtz, and others. — κατανοήσατε] direct your view to Jesus, sc. in order to cleave firmly to Him; regard well what He is and what you have in Him! — τὸν ἀπόστολον

1 For God, as everywhere with Paul also, not Christ, as Delitzsch supposes, is thought of as the καλ.
The envoy and High Priest of our confession, is comprehended into a unity of idea by the article τόν only once placed ("Him who is ἀπόστολος and ἁρκυρέας in one person"), in connection with which τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν is then also most naturally referred in equal degree to both substantives. τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, however, is not to be resolved into δι' ὁμολογοῦμεν (Luther, Cameron, Calov, Wolf, de Wette, Maier, and others; similarly Delitzsch: "who is the subject-matter of our confession;" and Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 427 f.: "who appertains to our confession"), but stands, like πίστις, Gal. i. 23, and ἔλεις, Col. i. 5, objectively: of our Christian confession (of our evangelical faith). Comp. iv. 14, x. 23; 2 Cor. ix. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13. [So Calvin, Piscator, Owen (with hesitation), Stuart.] The opposition is to the pre-Christian or Mosaic confession, without, however, the emphasis, as Kurtz supposes, falling upon ἡμῶν, which is forbidden by the position of the words: The deputed One (sc. of God) for our confession, i.e. sent by God (comp. Gal. iv. 4; Matt. x. 40, al.) in order to bring about our confession or Christian faith. The signification "mediator," which Tholuck attaches to the word ἀπόστολος, after the example of Braun and others, appealing in favour thereof to the authority of Rabbinico-talmudic usage, the latter never has. The notion of mediator follows, alike for ἀπόστολος as also for ἁρκυρέας, only from the context. By ἀπόστολος, namely, is referred back to the main thought of the last and highest divine revelation (the Χριστός), contained in Christ, of which the writer has treated i. 1–ii. 4; by ἁρκυρέας, to the main thought of the reconciliation of sinful humanity to God by Christ, then further treated in the second chapter. Aptly, therefore, does Bengel distinguish ἀπόστολος and ἁρκυρέας as "eum, qui Dei causam apud nos agit" and "qui nostram causam apud Deum agit."

Ver. 2. The discourse takes a turn, by virtue of a further alleging of reasons for the κατανόησατε, to the comparison of Jesus with Moses, in that first of all the relation of parity between the two is brought prominently forward. The O. T. passage which the author here has under consideration is Num. xii. 7, where Moses is designated by God as faithful in all His
the being faithful as an inherent property; the sense of a strict present is not to be asserted for the participle (with Seb. Schmidt and Bleek), according to which we should have to think only of an exalted Christ; rather does πιστῶν δυτα attach itself as well to the notion Ἰησοῦν τῶν ἀπόστολον τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν as to the notion Ἰησοῦν τῶν ἄρχιερεά τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν; δυτα embraces, therefore, equally the time from which Christ, as the incarnate Son of God, had appeared upon earth, and the time from which He, invested with the high-priestly dignity, has returned to the Father, and now continues to fulfil in heaven His high-priestly office. — τῷ πνεύσαντι αὐτῶν] Periphrasis of God: Him who created Him. Only this sense of the calling forth into existence can the word πνεύσων have when placed absolutely; comp. LXX. Isa. xvii. 7, xliii. 1, li. 13; Hos. viii. 14; Job xxxv. 10; Ps. xcix. 6, cxlix. 2; Eccles. vii. 30, al. Rightly is this accepted by the early Latin translation of the codd. D E (fidelem esse creatori suo), Ambrose (de fide, 3. 11), Vigilius Tapsensis (contra Varinadum, p. 729), Primasius, Schulz, Bleek, Alford, Kurtz, and Hofmann. Contrary to linguistic usage—for an appeal cannot be made to 1 Sam. xii. 6 (where πνεύσων [πνεύ] has its ordinary signification), and still less to Mark iii. 14 (where a nearer defining is given to the verb by means of ἢν κ.τ.λ.), or to Acts ii. 36 (where a double accusative is found)—do Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Vatablus, Clarus [Calvin], Cameron, Piscator, Grotius, Owen, Wolf, Bengel, Bohme, Kuinoel, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Stuart, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 286 f.), Reuse, Maier, Kluge, Moll, M'Caul, Woermer, and the majority, interpret τῷ πνεύσαντι either by: who appointed Him thereto (ex. Apostle and High Priest), or ordained Him thereto; or—what amounts to the same thing—explaining the supplementing of a second accusative to πνεύσαντι as unnecessary, by: who set Him forth upon the stage of history. Whether, for the rest, the author referred the notion of having created to the incarnation of Christ, as the above-mentioned early ecclesiastical writers suppose, or to His premundane generation as the First-born (cf. i. 5, 6), which Bleek rightly regards as at least possible, cannot be deter-
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mined. — ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς] sc. πιστῶς ἦν τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτῶν. — ἐν δὲ τῷ οἶκῳ αὐτοῦ] does not belong to πιστῶν δύνα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτῶν, in such wise that we have, with Calvin, Paulus, Bleek, Ebrard, and Hofmann, to enclose ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς within commas, but is to be comprehended with ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς (de Wette, Kurtz, and the majority). For not only, Num. xii. 7, do the words appended: ἐν δὲ τῷ οἶκῳ αὐτοῦ, stand in special relation to Moses,—so that the author might very well derive from that place the same addition with the same special reference to Moses,—but also the equal reference of ἐν δὲ τῷ οἶκῳ αὐτοῦ to Christ, as to Moses, would be unsuitable to the connection with that which follows, since the author, ver. 5 and ver. 6, definitely distinguishes the place occupied by Moses, as the position of a servant ἐν δὲ τῷ οἶκῳ, from the place occupied by Christ, as a position of ruler ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ; and in harmony with this distinction, already ver. 3 characterizes Moses as merely a member of the οἶκος itself; Christ, on the other hand, as the founder of the οἶκος. — αὐτοῦ] refers neither to Christ (Bleek) nor to Moses (Oecumenius and others), but, as is also determined by the form of the expression with the LXX. (ἐν δὲ τῷ οἶκῳ μου), to God. — But the house of God is the people of God, or the kingdom of God; and ἐν denotes the province, in the administration of which the πιστῶν ἐδώκει was made manifest.

Ver. 3. Continued alleging of reasons for the κατανοησατε, ver. 1, in bringing into more distinct relief the exaltedness of Christ above Moses. Ver. 3 is not, as de Wette supposes,

1 That which Delitzsch urges against either possibility, namely, that “although the man Jesus as such, so far as that which is essential in the notion of creation is the state of beginning in time, must be regarded as a creature, there could be no more unsuitable expression—because one almost unmeaningly colourless, or even indecorous—for the matchless and unique act of the formation of the humanity of the Son in the womb of Mary, than the term τινι, for the use of which, in this sense, no instances can on that very account be adduced;” and that “after the author has, i. 2, employed τινι as expression of the pure idea of creation, he could surely not now have employed it of the sublimer genesis of the Mediator of the world’s creation,” falls to pieces, because it rests upon mere subjectivity. For it is nothing more than a pronouncing upon the mind of the writer from the standpoint of the critic’s own ready-formed dogmatics.

2 Comp. Gabler, Dissert, exeg. in illustrem locum Heb. iii. 3-6, Jena 1778. (Reprinted in the Opiuoss. acad. vol. II. Ulm 1831, 8.)
explication or analysis of ver. 2. For a placing upon a parallel cannot be explained or analysed by a placing superior.—οὗτος] sc. Ἰησοῦς.—On παρά after a comparative, see at i. 4.—ηξιότατα] has been counted worthy, sc. by God. The verb stands, as ordinarily (comp. 2 Thess. i. 5, 11; 1 Tim. v. 17; Heb. x. 29), in the real sense, so that it includes the notion of the possession obtained.—The figure in the proposition of comparison, καθ’ ὅσον πλείον τιμήν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου κ.τ.λ., is occasioned by the preceding ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὕτῳ added in ver. 2. The words contain a truth of universal validity, the application of which, for the rest, to Christ and Moses, follows of itself. Greater honour than the house (in the wider sense [of household], the family and servants included therein) has he who has prepared it. Thus, also, Christ stands higher in honour and glory than Moses. For founder and establisher of the house of God, or the divine kingdom,—which in its first formations reaches back to the time of the Old Covenant, but by the New Covenant comes to full realization,—is Christ; while Moses is only a part of the οἶκος itself, only a (ministering, cf. ver. 5) member of this house, or an ὁικέτης in the same. Confusing and full of caprice is the indication of the connection of thought of vv. 3–6 as given by Delitzsch. See, in opposition to him, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Ἱερατευμ. p. 309.—τοῦ οἴκου] is governed by the comparative πλείον: more (greater) honour than the house. Mistakenly do Homberg, Wolf, Peirce, Michaelis, Heumann, Semler, Morus, Ernesti, Heinrichs, Paulus, Stengel, and others make it depend upon τιμήν: greater honour of the house, or in the house.—κατασκευάζειν] implies more than οἰκοδομεῖν. Not only the erection of the house, but also the arrangement thereof, the providing of it with the necessary furniture and servants, is thereby expressed.

Ver. 4. The author has spoken, ver. 2, of the house of God, and yet, ver. 3, has ascribed the founding and preparing of the same to Christ. For the justification of this apparent contradiction does the remark, ver. 4, serve. Although every house has its special preparer, yet this notwithstanding, it is God who has prepared all things. That special foundership of Christ does not exclude the universal higher foundership of
God. The proposition ver. 4 is incidental to the main argument. It is not, however, to be enclosed in a parenthesis, because αὐτοῦ, ver. 5, refers back to θεὸς, ver. 4. — In the second clause, θεὸς is subject, and ὁ δὲ πάντα κατασκευάσας predicate. Wrongly has θεὸς been ordinarily taken by others as predicate, and as subject either ὁ δὲ πάντα κατασκευάσας or merely ὁ δὲ, since πάντα κατασκευάσας was taken as a defining adjunct. The second member of the proposition was then referred to Christ, and the statement found therein that Christ is God. So Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Clarious, Beza, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Cornelius a Lapide, Cameron, Piscator, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Braun, Akersloot, Calmet, Bengel, Cramer, Whitby, Stuart, Baumgarten, and many others; also still Woerner. But with this thought the sequel is not in keeping. For not of Christ's being God, but of His exalted relation to the house of God as the νεός, while Moses was only a χριστὸς, does the author speak, vv. 5, 6. — πάντα] denotes not the universality of all created things, thought of as a unity, but in general: each and all, that exists.

Ver. 5 as far as αὐτοῦ, ver. 6. Return to the point of comparison between Christ and Moses, ver. 2 (πιστῶσ), and the exaltedness of the former above the latter, ver. 3 (νεός, ἐπὶ ... θεράπων, ἐν). — καὶ] is the more sharply-defining "and indeed;" whereas μὲν serves to bring into relief the personal name Μωϋσῆς, and finds in Χριστὸς δὲ, ver. 6, its emphatic opposition. Vv. 5, 6 init. does not, accordingly, contain a second proof for the superiority of Christ to Moses (Calvin, Bengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Woerner), but is only a more detailed unfolding of the thoughts, ver. 2 and ver. 3. — πιστῶσ] sc. ἤν, or else ἔστιν, in connection with which latter mode of supplementing, the thought would be less of the historic fact as such, than of the fact as it still continues present in the O. T. narrative. — αὐτοῦ] refers not to Μωϋσῆς (as Ebrard assumes, since he starts with the erroneous presupposition that the author speaks of a twofold θεὸς, and that the design of vv. 5, 6 was just that of rendering clearly apparent the difference of the house entrusted to Moses on the one hand, and that entrusted to Christ on the other), but to θεὸς, ver. 4. — ὡς θεράπων]
in his capacity as servant, comp. Num. xii. 7. Upon this, as upon the preceding ἐν, rests the emphasis of ver. 5. — εἰς μαρτύριον] belongs to θεράπων. It is unnaturally referred back by Estius, Seb. Schmidt, Stengel, and others to πιστός. — εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν ἀληθησομένων] to give testimony to that which should be spoken, or proclaimed to the people. Τὰ ἀληθησόμενα are not the revelations afterwards to be given in Christ (Erasmus, Calvin, Cameron, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Owen, Limborch, Wolf, Wetstein, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, Ewald, M'Caul, Woerner, and others), which must have been more precisely specified; and still less does the expression indicate: “dicenda a nobis in hac epistola de cerimoniis earumque significatione et usu” (Pareus), but the law to be proclaimed by Moses, at the mandate of God, to the Jewish people is intended.

Ver. 6. Χριστός δὲ ἐὰς viός] Christ, on the other hand, in His capacity as Son, comp. πιστός ἑστίων. Upon this supplement depends ἐπὶ τῶν οἶκον αὐτοῦ (comp. Matt. xxv. 21, 23); and as viός forms an ascent from the preceding θεράπων, so does ἐπὶ form an ascent from the preceding ἐν. Erasmus, Paraphr.; Vatablus, Piscator, Grotius, Delitzsch, Moll, and others supply to Χριστός δὲ . . . αὐτοῦ simply ἑστίων, whereby, however, the relation of just proportion between ver. 5 and ver. 6 is destroyed. The opening words of ver. 5, moreover,—inasmuch as they attach themselves not only to ver. 3, but also again to ver. 2,—manifestly point to the fact that the author will indicate not the mere difference between Christ and Moses, but their difference within the quality common to both. Yet others, as Bleek, de Wette, and Bisping, supply a double πιστός ἑστίων, the first after Χριστός δὲ, the second after αὐτοῦ; since, as the Vulgate, Beza, Estius, Grotius, Owen, Er. Schmid, Calov, Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Baumgarten, Gabler, Valckenaer, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Tholuck, and others, they refer αὐτοῦ back to viός: Christ, however, is faithful, as a son is faithful over his house. But a satisfactory ground for taking οἶκος αὐτοῦ, ver. 6, otherwise than the same expression ver. 5, is not to be found. The house of God, or the divine kingdom, is for Moses and Christ the common sphere of operation; only by the position which the two occupy towards this
house, are they distinguished the one from the other. — As αὐτῷ, ver. 6, so is the relative οὗ, with which the author prepares the way for a transition to the paraenesis, not to be referred to Christ (Oecumenius, Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Owen, Whitby, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Woerner, al.), but to God (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Calvin, Stengel, Stuart, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, and others); although as regards the matter itself even the former reference would not be incorrect, since the house of God, ver. 2, is likewise characterized as the house of Christ, ver. 3. — The article before οἶκος was not imperatively required, although the whole Christian community forms a single indivisible house of God, since the notion of the word was one sufficiently well known, and, moreover, adequately defined by that which precedes. — The absolute declaration: οὗ οἶκος ἐσμέν ἡμεῖς, on the import of which 1 Cor. iii. 9, 16, 2 Cor. vi. 16, Eph. ii. 20 ff., 1 Tim. iii. 15, 1 Pet. ii. 5, iv. 17, is to be compared,¹ and which is taken in a strangely perverted way by Ebrard (p. 137) and Delitzsch as the logical antithesis to εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων, ver. 5, the author limits by a condition. — The fuller εὐανεπρ is foreign to the epistles of Paul. — τὴν παρρῆσιαν not the bold confession (Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Hammond, Limborch, Whitby, Heinrichs, and others), to which βεβαιαν κατάσχωμεν would not be fitting, but cheerful confidence as a disposition. Comp. iv. 16, x. 19, 35. τὴν παρρῆσιαν, to which τῆς ἐλπίδος² belongs in like manner as to τὸ καίημα (against Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 739), is the main idea, whereas καὶ τὸ καίημα adds only an explicative subsidiary factor. That is manifest from the feminine βεβαιαν (which Stengel wonder-


² Both words are found combined in Josephus likewise, Antiq. xvi. 3. 3: καὶ δει τὴν κρίσιν ἀντιμετωπήσει τὴν παραπραξίαν τινὸς τῆς ὑπὸ προτέρου ὀφείλον ἐλπίδας αντικειμένως, μίαν ἄνοιξιν ὑπακοήν τῶν αἰδιομόνων, καὶ τὴν δικαικοσύνην διασκεδάζειν, α.τ.α.
fully refers back, in a *constructio ad sensum*, to ἐλπίδος. Instances of the agreement of the adjective in point of gender with the remoter substantive, in cases where this forms the principal idea, occur also with the classics. Comp. *Hom.* Π. xv. 344: τάφρος καὶ σκολόπεσιν ἐνυπλήκαντες ὁρυκτή; Hesiod. *Theogon.* 972 f.: ἃς εἰσ’ ἐπὶ γῆν τε, καὶ εὐφέα νῦτα θαλάσσης, πᾶσαν; Xenophon, *Anab.* i. 5. 6: ὅ δὲ σύλος δύναται ἐπτὰ ὀβολοὺς καὶ ἡμοβόλιον Ἀττικοὺς; Thucydides, viii. 63: πυθόμενος τὰ περὶ τὴν ναυμαχίαν καὶ τὸν Στρομβιχίδην καὶ τὰς ναύς ἀπεληλυθότα. See Bernhardy, *Syntax*, p. 431. — The ἐλπίς is the Christians’ hope of the consummation of the kingdom of God, and the glorification of the Christians bound up therewith. Comp. *Rom.* v. 2, also *Heb.* vi. 11, 18, vii. 19, x. 23. — καύχημα, however, is not here either equivalent to καύχησις (Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Stengel, Bisping, Maier, and others), any more than 2 Cor. v. 12, ix. 3, which have been unwarrantably appealed to (see Meyer ad loc.), but denotes the subject of the boasting. Sense: provided we shall have maintained the Christians’ hope as a cheerful confidence and subject of boasting firm unto the end. — μέχρι τελοῦν] not: until the death of each individual (Schlichting, Grotius, Kuinoel); not: “until the final decision of the readers in favour of going over to Christianity” (! Ebrard), but as ver. 14, vi. 11, 1 Cor. i. 8, al., unto the end of the present order of the world, intervening with the coming again of Christ, and thought of as in the near future (comp. x. 25, 37), at which time faith shall pass over into sight, hope into possession.

Ver. 7—xiv. 13. The author, in detailed development of the paraenesis already contained in vv. 1, 6, warns against unbelief and apostasy, making the basis of this warning the admonitory utterance of Scripture in Ps. xcv. 7—11; and by means of a parallelizing of the people of God of the present time, i.e. the Christians, with the people of God of Moses’ day, i.e. the Israelite fathers in the wilderness,—a parallelizing equally suggested by this passage of Scripture as by the preceding comparison of Christ with Moses,—he sets forth before the eyes of his readers the fate of the ancient people of God, who because of their unbelief were consigned to destruction, that the readers may earnestly ponder thereon.
Ver. 7. \(\Delta i\delta\) [\textit{Therefore, i.e. either}: because Christ stands higher than Moses (so Carpzov, Zachariae, Böhme, Stuart, Kurtz, and Woerner; comp. already Schlichting), or, which is better: because we are the \(\alpha\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\sigma\) of God, only in the case that we hold fast the \(\tau\alpha\rho\iota\rho\iota\nu\alpha\iota\aomicron\alpha\) and the \(\kappa\alpha\nu\chi\eta\mu\alpha\) of the Christian hope unto the end (ver. 6). The \textit{tempus finitum} belonging to \(\Delta i\delta\) is \(\beta\lambda\epsilon\nu\eta\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\), ver. 12 (Erasmus, \textit{Annot.}; Calvin, Estius, Piscator, Pareus, Grotius, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Bengel, Peirce, Carpzov, Wetstein, Abresch, Zachariae, Böhme, Bleek, Bisping, Alford, Kurtz, Woerner, \textit{al.}), in such wise that \(\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma\ldots\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\alpha\omega\mu\nu\) forms an intervening clause. The length of the intervening clause, at which de Wette takes umbrage, decides nothing against the supposition of such construction, which at all events possesses the advantage of greater regularity and naturalness, since the author, owing to the care which he everywhere bestows upon his diction, in other cases, too, accurately fits in his discourse again to the opening words of the proposition, notwithstanding the occurrence of lengthy intervening clauses. Comp. vii. 20–22, xii. 18–24. That, moreover, which de Wette further objects, that in the intervening clause the discourse takes a new departure with \(\delta\iota\), ver. 10, forms no valid counter-argument, since the connectedness of the preceding and following words as part of a Biblical citation follows naturally. In any case, ver. 10 connects itself with that which precedes, without a new beginning, in a simply relative fashion, if—as we are perfectly justified in doing—we write \(\delta\iota^{\prime}\ \delta\) instead of \(\delta\iota\). When de Wette, finally, discovers a difficulty in the fact that the warning, vv. 12, 13, does not appear in the form of a simple application of the passage of Scripture, but, on the contrary, begins with an analysis of the same, this also is without weight, inasmuch as the correctness of this assumed fact must itself be contested. In addition to this, if the author had conceived of the structure otherwise than has been indicated, he would assuredly have placed \(\beta\lambda\epsilon\nu\eta\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \omega\omicron\nu\), ver. 12, instead of the disconnected \(\beta\lambda\epsilon\nu\eta\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\). For neither is it permissible to appeal (with Tholuck) to the disconnected \(\beta\lambda\epsilon\nu\eta\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\), xii. 25, in proof of the opposite, since this passage, on account of the rhetorical character of the description which there immediately precedes,
is totally different from ours. Others, as Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Wittich, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Stengel, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Reuss, and Hofmann, connect διό immediately with μὴ σκληρύνητε, in connection with which, however, the direct address of God, coming in ver. 9 ff., occasions a great harshness; or else, as Tholuck, de Wette, and Maier, who appeal to Rom. xv. 3, 21, 1 Cor. i. 31, ii. 9, leave the application μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν to be supplied in thought from these words; or, finally, supplement διό in a somewhat free manner: therefore conduct yourselves in accordance with that which the Holy Ghost speaks. — τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ὅμων] the Spirit of God in prophecy; comp. ix. 8, x. 15. — σήμερον ἐὰν τὴς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούστητε] is in the Hebrew (Ἑβρ. מַפְסֹּךְ) an independent clause, and the expression of a wish: “would that you would only to-day listen to His (God’s) voice!” It is possible that the LXX. also understood the words as a wish, since elsewhere, too (e.g. Ps. cxxxix. 19), they render the particle of wishing, δὲ, by εἰ. Differently, however, does the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews take the words (against Hofmann). He regards εἰ as the protasis, and μὴ σκληρύνητε as the apodosis; comp. ver. 15, iv. 7.— In the application σήμερον denotes the time of salvation which has come in with the appearing of Christ upon earth, and ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ the voice of God which through Christ sounds forth to the readers by means of the gracious message of the gospel.

Ver. 8. Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation (contumacy), on the day of temptation in the wilderness. In the original, παραπικρασμὸς and πειρασμὸς are proper names (“as at Meribah, as on the day of Massah in the wilderness” [Ἐμενὲν Κωπών ἡμῖν τῷ Παραπικρασμὸν]), which, however, are understood by the author in the appellative sense (comp. ver. 16), in that he takes κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ as an expository note of time to ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ. On the history, comp. Ex. xvii. 1–7; Num. xx. 1–13. — τοῦ πειρασμοῦ] in the active sense: the tempting of God by contumacious behaviour, comp. ver. 9.

Ver. 9. Ὑδὲ] is taken by Erasmus Schmid, Bengal, and Peirce as attraction to πειρασμοῦ instead of Ὑ, wherewith.
But in this case οὗ would have been connected immediately with τεσσαρακοντα. It is the local “where;” thus stands, as frequently, in the sense of ἐπον, and refers back to ἐπαγμ. — οὗ ἐπεμβαν τι πατέρες ὑμῶν εἰς δοκιμασίᾳ, where your fathers essayed temptation, on the ground of proving or testing, i.e. where your fathers tempted me and put me to the test. Δοκιμασία as πεπάξειν here in the bad sense. The former contains an enhancement of the latter. This involves doubt with regard to the inclination of God to render help, that doubt with regard to His power of doing so. — καὶ εἰδον κ.τ.λ. and yet saw my works forty years long. This was a fact that aggravated their guilt. In the original, τεσσαρακοντα ἡγ. belongs to the following προσώπεια. To the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also this original connection was known, as is evident from ver. 17. If he nevertheless refers τεσσαρακοντα ἡγ. to that which precedes, and moreover consolidates this connection by means of the διὸ (διὸ 5) interpolated only by himself, he must have been guided by a distinct design in doing so. Rightly, therefore, is it assumed (Calov, Wittich, Akersloot, Surenhus, Schöttgen, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Abresch, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 618; Alford, Reiche, Comm. Crit. p. 22; Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others) that the author discovered in the forty years during which the Israelites in the wilderness saw the works of God, a typical reference to the about equal space of time during which the Hebrews had now also witnessed the government of God as manifested in Christ, and would make this reference clear to the readers, in order thereby to render the more impressive his exhortation to receptiveness, while there is yet time. The reminder of Akersloot, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Abresch, Bleek, and others, is at the same time worthy of notice, viz. that also in the Talmud and by the Rabbins a duration of forty years is assigned to the Messianic kingdom with reference to Ps. xcvi. and the forty years of the wilderness. Comp. Sanhedr. fol. 99, 1: R. Eliezer dixit: dies Messiae sunt quadraginta anni, sicut dicitur: quadraginta annos sqq. (Ps. xcvi. 10); Tanchuma, fol. 79, 4:

1 In an unnatural manner, Hofmann: as εἶδον, so also even εἰσέπαξεν finds its object in τα ἄρα μου.
Quamdiu durant anni Messiae? R. Akiba dixit: quadraginta annos, quemadmodum Israelitae per tot annos in deserto fuerunt.

Ver. 10. Αἰτίοις προσωποθείσα τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ Wherefore I conceived an aversion, or was incensed against this generation. — On διό, see at ver. 9. The verb προσωποθείσειν is not found at all in the classics, in the N. T. only here and ver. 17; with the LXX., on the other hand, very frequently. — In γενεᾷ lies neither the subordinate notion of meanness (Heinrichs, Stengel), nor yet the intimation that the men of a certain period belong in point of character and mind to a definite class (Bleek). Each of these subordinate notions τῇ γενεᾷ acquires only by the ταύτῃ which is added. — ἀετίλ note of time to πλανῶνται, not to εἰσόμεν (Erasmus). — αὐτοῦ δὲ] So the LXX. in the Cod. Alex., whose form of the text the author for the most part reproduces; the Cod. Vatican. has more in accordance with the Hebrew: καὶ αὐτοῖ ποικ ἐγνώσαν.

Ver. 11. ὅσοι ὄμοσα ἐν τῇ ὁργῇ μου] as accordingly I (as to the sense equivalent to: so that I; see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 431; in the Hebrew מְאֹה) swara (comp. Num. xiv. 21 ff., xxxii. 10 ff.; Deut. i. 34 ff.) in (not: by) my wrath. — εἰ εἰσελθήσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν μου] not enter, shall they, into my rest. εἰ is an exact imitation of the negative Hebrew particle דָּא in formulas of swearing, and is to be explained from an aposiopesis of the latter clause. Comp. Mark viii. 12; Ewald, Krit. Gramm. p. 661; Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 466; Buttmann, Gramm. des neuest. Sprachgeb. p. 308. — κατάπαυσις in the sense of the psalmist, the undisturbed possession of the land of Canaan promised by God; comp. Deut. xii. 9, 10: Οὐ γὰρ ἦκατε ὡς τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν καὶ εἰς τὴν κληρονομίαν, ἢν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν δίδωσιν ὑμῖν καὶ διαβήσειςθε τοῦ Ἰσραήλ καὶ κατοικήσετε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἢς κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κατακληρονομεῖ ὑμᾶς καὶ καταπαύσει εἰς μᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν τῶν κύκλω καὶ κατοικήσετε μετὰ ἀσφαλείας. Afterwards, because with the possession of the promised land the expected full repose and happiness had as yet by no means come in, the meaning of the promise was sublimated, just as that of the kindred κληρονομεῖν τὴν γῆν Ps. xxxvii. 9, into the everlasting Messianic blessedness.
This reference obtains, as is evident from the following disquisition, with our author also.

Vv. 12, 13. Close of the period begun with διό, ver. 7. — βλέπετε] beware, take heed. — μή ποτὲ ἔσται μή after βλέπε, ὅρα, and similar words, with the indicative future (comp. Col. ii. 8), expresses at the same time with the warning, the fear that the warning will be slighted. Comp. Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 463 f.; Hartung, Partikellehre, II. p. 140. The enclitic ποτὲ appended to the μή, not: at any time (Beza and others), but: hasty [ii. 1; Luke xiv. 29; Acts v. 39; Matt. iv. 6, etc.]. — ἐν τοίς ἤμων] different from ἐν ἤμιν. Calvin: Nec tantum in universum praecipit apostolus, ut sibi omnes caveat, sed vult ita de salute cujusque membris esse sollicitos, ne quem omnino ex iis, qui semel vocavi fuerint, sua negligentia perire sinant. Comp. ver. 13, x. 24, xii. 15. — καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας] an evil heart of unbelief; comp. iv. 2, 3. Wrongly Schulz and others: of faithlessness or ἀπείθεια, iv. 6, 11, iii. 18; for the latter is only the consequence of the ἀπιστία. ἀπιστίας is either genitive of origin, which proceeds from unbelief (Owen, Bleek, Stengel, and others), or genitive of result, which leads to unbelief, renders inclined to the same (de Wette, Bisping, al.), or genitive of reference to a more precise characterization of τονηρά: a heart evil (on account) of unbelief, which is then equivalent to καρδία πονηρὰν ἀπιστίας ἐγγονα (so Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 183; Ebrard, Alford, Meyer, Moll, and Hofmann). The last acceptance is to be preferred, since thereby ἀπιστίας is more clearly brought out as the main idea (for καρδία πονηρὰ is only a clothing of the same attaching itself to ἐν τῷ ἄποστημα ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος] more precise definition to ἀπιστίας for the declaration of the outward form of appearance, in which the inner unbelief comes forth: in the falling away from the living God, or in such wise that a falling away from the living God takes place. God (not Christ: Gerhard, Dorscheus, Calov, S. Schmid, Schöttgen, Carpzov, al.) is called living, not in opposition to the dead.

1 Schlichting: Duplex est enim incredulitas; una eorum, qui nunquam Deo credunt; altera eorum, qui credere desinunt, h. e. a Deo desciscunt seu apostatae sunt.
works of the law (ix. 14, vi. 1; Bleek), nor in opposition to the
idols of the heathen, similarly as 2 Kings xix. 16, 1 Thess.
i. 9, 2 Cor. vi. 16, Acts xiv. 15 (Böhme and others),—both
of which must have been suggested by the context,—but
because He does not allow His declared will to be slighted
with impunity. Comp. x. 31. That which is meant is the
relapse from Christianity into Judaism. Limborch: Defectio-
hic intelligitur a religione Christiana; quia enim illa continetur
ultima ac perfecta Dei voluntas, hinc sequitur, quod is, qui a
religione Christiana deficit, ab ipso Deo deficiat. Ergo qui-
cunque deserta fide Christiana ad Judaeismum reduct, a Deo
deficient; licet enim Deum non abnegent, qui legis Mosaicae
auctor est, tamen, quia Deus nunc non secundum legis prae-
cepta se coli velle testatur, sed juxta evangelium illique cre-
dentibus fidem in justitiem imputaturum, etiam, qui illud
deserunt, a Deo deficiere dicendi sunt. Deus enim multis ac
evidentissimis signis ac miraculis se Christum misisse ostendit,
et voce e caelode Diosse testatusest eum esse suum filium, in
quo sibi complacuit jussitque ut eum audiant. Ergo prae-
cepta ejus sunt praecepta Dei, etc.

Ver. 13. ‘Εαυτοίς] tantamount to ἀλλήλους, comp. 1 Cor
vi. 7; Eph. iv. 32; Col. iii. 13; 1 Thess. v. 13; 1 Pet.
iv. 8, al.; Kühner, II. p. 325. — ἄχρις οὗ] in the inclusive
sense: as far as that, i.e. so long as. Cf. 2 Macc. xiv. 10 :
ἀχρι γὰρ Θοιδας περιεστην, ἀδύνατον εἰρήνης τυχεῖν τὴ πράξι-
ματα. Josephus, Antiq. x. 2. 2: ηὕκετο μέχρις τῆς αὐτοῦ
ζωῆς εἰρήνης υπάρχαι; Xenophon, Cyrop. v. 4. 16: Καὶ ὁ μὲν
Ἀσσύριος διάέξει ἄχρις οὗ ἄσφαλῆς ἔστω εἰναι, ἀπετράπτετο. —
ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται] so long as the to-day, of which
mention is made in the passage of the psalm, is named, or: so
long as it is still called “to-day,” and it is thus not yet too
late to be obedient to the admonition of the psalm. So Luther,
Estius, Schlichting, Owen, Carpzov, Stuart, Bleek, Alford,
Maier, Kurtz, al. Others, as Heinrichs, Dindorf, Böhme,
Kninoel, Klee, Tholuck, Moll, Hofmann: so long as that to-day
of the psalm is called out, i.e. is called out, or proclaimed, to
you.—The “to-day” is not the duration of the lifetime of the
individuals (Basil, Ep. 42, Opp. iii. p. 130: τὸ σήμερον
σημαίνει δλον τὸν χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν; Theodoret, Theo-
phylact, Primasius, Erasmus, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, J. Cappellus, Dorscheus, Valckenaer, but (comp. μέχρι τέλους; v. 6, 14) the continued existence of the earthly world, which, with the Parousia of Christ—thought of as near at hand (x. 25, 37)—attains its end. — ἀπαύνη τῆς ἀμαρτίας] by the deception (the treacherous enticement or alluring) of sin. The ἀμαρτία is here personified, comp. Rom. vii. 11. What is meant is the allurement exerted by the seductive splendour of the ancient cultus to a relapse into the same, and therewith to an apostasy from Christianity.

Ver. 14. Warning justification of ἵνα μὴ σκληρωθῇ ἡ ὑμῶν τῆς κ.τ.λ., ver. 13, inasmuch as the fulfilling of a condition is necessary to the attainment of salvation.— μετώχι τοῦ Χριστοῦ] Participators in (iii. 1, vi. 4, xii. 8) Christ, i.e. in His treasures of blessing and in His glory. Schulz, Delitzsch, Kwald, Hofmann, and others explain: Associates of Christ (i. 9), i.e. His brethren (ii. 11 ff.), or His συμκυριονόμωι (Rom. viii. 17), inasmuch as “the δόξα, into which Christ, the Anointed One existing in kingly glory, has entered as our ἀρχηγός, is, by virtue of the ελήσις ἐπουράνιος, not only His, but also ours, although as to its revelation and consummation in hope” (Delitzsch); against which, however, the fact is decisive that ἑαυτῷ κ.τ.λ. points to a relation not of equality, but of dependence, and μετώχι τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἶναι corresponds to the notion of ἐκφράσεως εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν, vv. 11, 18. Compare, moreover, against Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 719, note.— γεγονόται] we have become. The author does not write ἐσμέν, as ver. 6, in order to dismiss at once the thought of claim existing from the first, and, on the contrary, to represent the said prerogative as one only acquired (by faith, comp. ἑαυτῷ κ.τ.λ.). — ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως κ.τ.λ.] if so be that (provided) we preserve the beginning of the confidence firm to the end, comp. ver. 6, ἵνα ὑποστάσεις does not here denote fundamentum (Erasmus, Paraphr.; Seyffarth, p. 67: prima religionis fundamenta; Schulz: the first anfänglichen firm foundation; Stein and others), nor substantia, whether this be taken as reality [Wesen], as Luther (the reality begun), or as that of which a thing consists [Bestand], which constitutes it (Vatablus: illud,
per quod primum subsistimus, i.e. fidem firmam; Estius: fidem, per quam in vita hac spirituali subsistimus; Bisping: the beginning of the subsistence [of Christ in us], i.e. faith; Ewald, al.). The expression stands, on the contrary, in the well-ascertained signification: confidence, which notion is here naturally defined by the connection as confidence of faith (not hope, as Whitby and Delitzsch think). Comp. Heb. xi. 1; 2 Cor. ix. 4, xi. 17; LXX. Ps. xxxix. 8; Ezek. xix. 5; Ruth i. 12. Compare also Polybius, iv. 50. 10: Οἱ δὲ Ἄρθροι, ἑθερόντες τὴν τῶν Βυζαντίων ὑπόστασιν, πραγματικῶς δεινοθέταν πρὸς τὸ καθιεσθαι τῆς προβέθεσι; vi. 55. 2: οἷς οὕτω τὴν δύναμιν, ὡς τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τόλμων καταπεπληγμένον τῶν ἐναντίων; Diodorus Siculus, Excerpta de Vint. et vit. (Opp. ed. Wesselingius, t. ii., Amstelod. 1745, fol.) p. 557: ἢ ἐν ταῖς βασάνοις ὑπόστασις τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τὸ καρπερικός τῆς τῶν δεινῶν ὑπομονής περὶ μόνον ἐγενθη τὸν Ἄριστογείτονα; Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 1. 6: τὸ ἀμετάλ- λακτον αὐτῶν τῆς ὑπὸ τοιούτου ὑποστάσεως,—τὴν ἄρχην τῆς ὑποστάσεως [the beginning of the confidence, i.e. not: the first confidence, which now begins to diminish (τὴν ὑπόστασιν, ἢ ἢρξασθε ἔσχεν vel ἢν ἐίχετε ἐν ἄρχῃ, Cameron; τὴν ὑπόστασιν τὴν ἢ ἄρχη, Grotius, Wolf, Bloomfield; τὴν πρώτην ὑπόστασιν ἡς τὴν πρώτην πλέον, 1 Tim. v. 12, and as τὴν ἄγαπην τὴν πρώτην, Rev. ii. 4; Abreash, Tholuck, Stuart, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 754; Maier, Kurtz, Hofmann), but the confidence with which we have made a beginning, in such wise that τὴν ἄρχην corresponds to the following μέχρι τέλους ἑβεσίαν. Thus, rightly, Bleek, de Wette, Alford.

Vv. 15–19. Confirmation of the warning statement, ver. 14. That the blessing-fraught fact (μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν), declared ver. 14, is realized singly and solely in the case that the condition stated, of firmness of faith to the end, is fulfilled, is shown by the example of the Fathers. Their unbelief, their ἀποστία (comp. ver. 19), was the cause why they did not attain to the goal.

Vv. 15, 16. With regard to the construction of ver. 15 the views of expositors greatly differ. It is assumed—(1) That ver. 15 forms an independent, complete sentence. It is then
supposed that the citation introduced by ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι embraces only the words σήμερον . . . ἀκούσητε, and that afterwards with μὴ σκληρύνητε κ.τ.λ. the author proceeds, it is true, in the following words of that Biblical citation, but appropriates them to himself, and employs them only for the clothing of the admonition to be uttered on his own part. So Flacius Illyricus, Jac. Cappellus, Carpzov, Kuinoel, Winer, Gramm., 5 Aufl. p. 620, and Bloomfield; comp. also Hoffman ad loc. As, however, the same words: μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς ἐν τῷ παρατικρασμῷ, had already been adduced, ver. 8, in the midst of the Biblical citation, and as a constituent part thereof, it could not possibly occur to the reader here at once to detach them from σήμερον . . . ἀκούσητε, and to understand them as words of the author addressed to themselves; and the less so, because ver. 16 ff. follows a comment on the passage, in which ver. 16 glances back to σήμερον . . . παρατικρασμῷ, ver. 15 (ver. 7 f.); ver. 17 to the προσώπιθενα κ.τ.λ., ver. 10; ver. 18, finally, to the ἀμώσα κ.τ.λ., ver. 11, so that the natural explanation can only be, that the author intended to refer back to the whole Scripture citation already previously adduced, vv. 7–11, but that—inasmuch as he might presuppose it as known from that which precedes—he expressly repeats it only to the point at which the first member of his comment could attach itself. (2) Ver. 15 is connected with that which precedes, in that ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι κ.τ.λ. is either regarded as exposition to μέχρι τέλους, ver. 14 (Primasius, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Bisping, Reuss), or is attached to the conditional clause εάντερ . . . κατάσχωμεν there occurring (Erasmus Schmid, Wolf), or to all the words of ver. 14: μέτοχοι . . . κατάσχωμεν (Ebrard, Alford), or, finally, is construed with παρακαλέσθε, ver. 13 (Cameron, Peirce, Bengel, Cramer, Baumgarten, Abresch). But in the first case one must expect ἀχρις ὅν λέγεσθαι, or something similar, in place of ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι. In the other cases ver. 15 would drag as a feeble addition; in the last, moreover, ver. 14 would, contrary to all probability, become a parenthesis. (3) Ver. 15 is combined with that which follows. With φοβηθῶμεν οὖν, iv. 1, it is connected by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Olearius,
Wittich, Valckenaer. Vv. 16–19 must then be regarded as a parenthesis, and οὖν, iv. 1, as a particle of resumption. But of a resuming of the, as yet, incomplete thought, ver. 15, in iv. 1, there is no appearance in the form of discourse in the latter passage, notwithstanding the accuracy of style on the part of our author. On the contrary, from the tenor of iv. 1, it is indubitable that this verse is represented by virtue of οὖν as a consequence from iii. 16–19. These verses, therefore, can form no parenthesis. But thus every possibility of connecting ver. 15 with iv. 1 falls away.—There remains, therefore, no course open but to take ver. 15 with the first question of ver. 16: τίνες γὰρ ἀκούσαντες παρεπικρανοῦν; as one whole. This is done by Semler, Morus, Storr, Heinrichs, Dindorf, Böhme, Klee, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 532; Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, and Woerner. The sense is: "When it is said: 'to-day,' etc., (now, I ask:) who then were they who, although they heard (the voice), resisted? was it not all, etc.?"

On ἔν τῷ λέγεσθαι, comp. ἔν τῷ λέγειν, viii. 13.—γὰρ serves for the strengthening of the particle of interrogation, but, at the same time, confirms the state of the fact expressed, ver. 14. See Klotz, ad Devar. p. 245 f. Comp. also Matt. xxvii 23; John vii 41; Acts xix. 25; 1 Cor. xi 22.—From what has been already observed, it is evident that ver. 16 contains two questions, of which the second forms the answer to the first. This view of ver. 16, appearing only rarely in antiquity (in the Peshito, with Chrysostom and Theodoret), and only asserted a fresh since the beginning of last century, is now almost universally regarded as the true one. According to the mode of interpretation formerly current, two affirmative statements were recognised in ver. 16, the first of which was limited by the second. τίνες was accordingly written instead of τίνες, and the thought

1 Wrongly is it supposed by Bisping, who (equally as M'Caul) espouses a fresh this interpretation formerly current, that it is a matter of indifference whether in connection therewith the two clauses be taken as questions or as absolute statements. For, in reality, οὐ has in a question, like the Latin nōnem, always an affirmative sense. See Kühner, II. p. 579; Hartung, Partikellehre, II. p. 83. ἄλλη οὐ σὲ διώσκει cannot consequently signify, as Bisping maintains, "but certainly not all," but, on the contrary, only "but certainly all."
CHAP. III. 17, 18.

was found expressed that some, it is true, but by no means the totality of the Israelites, proved rebellious. As those who formed an exception to the rebelliousness or unbelief of the τινὲς, expositors accordingly thought either of Joshua and Caleb only (so Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Seb. Schmidt, Owen, and others), or else, with reference to Num. xiv. 29 ff., i. 45, 47, at the same time of all the Israelites who, at the numbering, had not attained an age of twenty years, as also the Levites and women (so Cornelius a Lapide, Braun, Carpzov, al.). But, considering the small number of responsible believers, which, in comparison with the enormous total mass of responsible unbelievers (more than six hundred thousand), retires altogether into the background, the latter could not possibly be designated by the mere τινὲς; nor can appeal be made for the opposite view to 1 Cor. x. 7-10, since the τινὲς there several times recurring specializes only the ἐν τοῖς πλείωσιν, ver. 5, in its different subdivisions. In addition to this, the interrogatory form in the parallel clauses, vv. 17, 18, already presupposes the interrogatory form also for ver. 16, and, as follows of necessity from the whole subsequent disquisition (comp. iv. 1, 2, 6, 8), the thought must be expressed in ver. 16 that the whole of the Israelites were disobedient in the wilderness, and therefore came short of the promised goal, in connection with which the wholly isolated exceptions are passed over unnoticed as not being taken into account.—ἀλλά decides the preceding question with the expression of astonishment conveyed in a counter-question: but (can there be a doubt as to the answer?) was it not all of those who came forth out of Egypt?—πάντες οἱ Ἐρωτ. Bengel, Schulz, Kuinoel, and others: only such as, etc.—διὰ Μωϋσέως] by Moses, i.e. by his agency and under his guidance. διὰ is used with considerable freedom, since we should properly expect with it, instead of ἐξελθόντες, a passive notion as ἐξαχθέντες. Comp. δι' δόν ἐπιστεύσατε, 1 Cor. iii. 5.

Vv. 17, 18. Further development of the truth, ver. 16, by means of recapitulation of the other main points of the Scripture citation. It was just this perverse totality of the Israelites with whom God was wroth on account of their sin forty years
long, and against whom, on account of their disobedience, He closed by an oath the entrance into His κατάπαυσις. — Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Delitzsch, Moll, Hofmann, and others, place the second note of interrogation, ver. 17, immediately after ἀμαρτήσασιν, and then take δὲ ... ἐρήμῳ as an assertory statement. But on account of the environment of purely interrogatory clauses, and because the author indicates the result at which he aims only in ver. 19, it seems more correct, with Luther, Calvin, Beza, Mill, Wetstein, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford, Maier, and others, to take the whole clause: οὐχὶ ... ἐρήμῳ, together as a single question, in such wise that δὲ κ.τ.λ. forms a prolonged characterization of τοῖς ἀμαρτήσασιν. — τοῖς ἀμαρτήσασιν those that had sinned, namely, by unbelief and apostasy from God. — δὲ τὰ κόλα κ.τ.λ. pictorial description of seizure by a violent death, taken from Num. xiv. 29, 32. — κόλα] limbs (specially hands and feet), with the LXX., translation of the Hebrew דרים, thus in general bodies or corpses. — ἐπέσαν] fell down, were stretched out dead, comp. 1 Cor. x. 8.

Ver. 18. Τίσων] Dativus incommodi. — μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι] On account of the variation of the subject in the tempus finitum and the infinitive, an inaccuracy instead of μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι αὐτοῦς, but excusable since the subject of the infinitive was naturally afforded by the context. — εἰ μὴ]. Observe the mastery of style on the part of the author, appearing even in the variation of the negations: ἀλλ' ὦ ... οὐχὶ ... εἰ μή, vv. 16–18.

Ver. 19. Closing result from vv. 15–18. — καὶ βλέπομεν thus we see then. Grotius (to whom Carpzov and others assent): “Ex historia cognoscimus.” But more correctly Seb. Schmidt (with whom Owen, Bleek, Alford, and others agree): “βλέπομεν non de lectione aut cognitione historiae, sed de convictione animi e disputatone seu doctrina praemissa.” — δι’ ἀπιστίαν] on account of (their) unbelief. Placed with emphasis at the end.
CHAPTER IV.

VER. 2. Better attested, it is true, than the nominative singular συγκεκραμίνος (συγκεκραμίνος), which the Recepta presents, is the accusative plural of this participle, inasmuch as A B C D* M, 23, al., Theodor. Mops. read συγκεκρασμίνους (συγκεκρασμίνους), and D*** E K L 4, 6, 10, al. plur., Cyr. Alex. (semel) Macar. Chrys. Theodoret, Phot. al., συγκεκραμίνους (συγκεκραμίνους), and also the majority of translations (Syr. poster. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Slav. al.) render in the accusative. Griesbach therefore commended the accusative to notice. συγκεκρασμ(ου)ίνους is adopted into the text by the edd. Complut. Antw. Plantin. Genev., by Matthaei and others; συγκεκρασμίνους, by Lachm. Tisch. 1, and Alford. The accusative is, notwithstanding, to be rejected, as opposed to the context and unmeaning. This reading being accepted, we have as exposition either: "but the word listened to did not profit them, since they were not mixed in faith or joined together in one with Joshua and Caleb, who heard, i.e. were obedient to the word listened to" (so Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Hammond, Cramer, Matthaei, al.). But this interpretation is in conflict with iii. 15 ff., according to which the whole people of Israel brought out of Egypt by Moses is described as rebellious and unbelieving; between two classes thereof, on the other hand, a class of believers and another of unbelievers, no distinction whatever is made. Moreover, in connection with this interpretation, τοὺς ἀκούσαν suffers transmutation into a notion which it cannot have, regarded in itself only, much less here, seeing its evident correspondence with the preceding ἀκούσας. Not less untenable is the modification of this construction with Alford, who, rejecting all reference to Joshua and Caleb, will have τοὺς ἀκούσαν taken, not at all in the historic sense, but, like John v. 25, as an indication of the category: "ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκούσας having been mentioned in the general sense of the word heard, οἱ ἀκούσαντες is also in the general sense of its hearers, and the assumption is made that the word heard has naturally recipients, of whom the normal characteristic is faith. And so these men received no benefit from the word of hearing, because they were not one in faith.

 Meyer.—Heb.
with its hearers; did not correspond, in their method of receiving it, with faithful 'hearers, whom it does profit;'' as, accordingly, Alford himself frankly confesses that he does not feel satisfied with this explanation, and is only driven to adopt it on the ground of critical and grammatical difficulties,—difficulties of the latter kind, nevertheless, do not exist, and those urged by Alford are easily solved. Or else a passive notion is substituted for the active τοῦ ἀκούσαν. So already Theodore of Mopsuestia, who thinks τοῦ ἀκουσάν must be read (in Nov. Test. Commentariorum quae reperiri potuerunt Coll. O. Fr. Fritzsche, Turici 1847, p. 166: μὴ γὰρ τοῖς οἰκίσκω ἄρμιν αὐτῷ τὴν ἑπαγγελίαν τῶν μελλόντων, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ἱκίνοις: οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν κατὰ τὴν πίστιν τοῖς ἑπαγγελθέντες συνημένοι: δέν οὔτε ἄναγκαιστιν μὴ συγκεκπεραμένοις τῇ πίστις τοῖς ἀκουσάν, οὐ ἐστὶ τῆς σφὸς αὐτῶς γεγονεῖναι ἑπαγγελμαί τοῖς θεοί διὰ Μωσῆν;) further, as it appears, Theodoret, since—although in our editions τοῦ ἀκούσαν precedes—he makes use of the words: τι γὰρ ὤνησαν η ς τοῦ θεοῦ ἑπαγγελικα τῶν ταύτην δεξαμένους, μὴ πιστώς δεξαμένους καὶ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπάρχῃ, τεθεράπητας καὶ ὠν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγους ἀνακαθάριστας; and recently Bleek, who, led thereto by Noesselt’s remark on Theodoret’s exposition of Heb. iv. 2 (Theod. Opp. t. iii., Hal. 1771, p. 566, note 1), conjectures τοῖς ἀκούσαν. For such alteration of the text, however, there exists not the slightest diplomatic justification. We must therefore regard the accusative plural as having arisen from a transcriber’s error, to which the preceding ικίνοις gave occasion, and look upon the nominative singular of the Recepta συγκεκραμένος, which yields an excellent sense (see the exposition), as which was originally written by the author. Rightly, therefore, is the Recepta defended by Mill, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Reiche (p. 24 sqq.), and others, and also received again into the text by Tisch. 2 (συγκεκραμένος), 7 (συγκεκραμένος), and 8 (συγκεκραμένος). Nor is it by any means so badly attested that one could assert, with Bleek, that it could “claim not much more authority than as being a not improbable conjecture.” For it is supported by the testimony of the Peshito, which in antiquity surpasses any of our MSS., as well as by the Codex Sinaiticus, which has μὴ συγκεκραμένος. It is found, besides, in the Vulg. It. Erp., as well as with Cyr. Alex. (sem.) [Theodoret (Hervet.)] Lucif. and in five cursives (17, 31, 37, 41, 114).— Ver. 3. άπηγαγοκε: άπηγαγοκε γάρ. But with an exhortation, the following οἴκεται must be placed. — Ver. 7. Elz. Wetstein, Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomf.: οἴκεται. But in favour of οἴκεται, which

1 Also in one cursive ms. (Cod. 71) is found τοῖς ἀκούσαν.
is indirectly supported also by τρειάρησαν in B, 73, 80, the preponderating authority of A C D* E* Ν, 17, 23, 31, al., Syr. utr. Copt. Arm. Vulg. Cyr. Al. Chrys. Theodoret. Lucif. Bed. is decisive. Commended already by Grotius, Bengel, Griesbach. Rightly adopted into the text by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. Approved also by Reiche. — Ver. 10. ἀπὸ τῶν ἐργὼν αὐτοῦ] D* E, Syr. poster. Cyr. Chrys. ms.: ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐργῶν αὐτοῦ. Expansion from ver. 4. — Ver. 12. Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomfield: Ψυχής τε καὶ πνεύματος. But τε is wanting in A B C Δ Ν (in which last originally only μερισμόν καὶ πνεύματος was written, which, however, was already supplemented, as it would appear by the first hand, by a Ψυχή inserted before καὶ), 3, 73, al., with Origen (three times), Athan. Euseb. Chrys. Theodoret, Cyril Al. (eleven times), John Damasc. Theoph. and many others. Condemned already by Bengel and Griesbach. [Doubted by Owen.] Rightly rejected by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. Addition for the sake of uniformity with the following clause: ἀφήνω τε καὶ μελῶν, in which τε is wanting with no witnesses. — Ver. 15. Instead of the πεπισταμένον, commended by Griesbach and adopted by Matthaei, Tisch. 1, 2, 7, and Bloomfield, as earlier by Mill and Bengel (also preferred by Reiche), the πεπισταμένον of the Recepta, supported by A B D E Ν, Origen (four times), Chrys., al., is to be retained, with Wetstein, Scholz, Lachm. Alford, and Tisch. 8. For the context demands the notion of having been tempted, for which, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (cf. ii. 18, xi. 17, 37), only the verb πεπισταμένος is used, while πεπισταμένον would yield the totally unsuitable sense: who had made attempts. — Ver. 16. Elz.: ἠλιος. The form of the word, preferred by Tisch. Bloomf. and Alford, ἠλιος, is, however, required by A B C* D* K Ν, 17, 71, al. pl., Antioch.

Vv. 1–13. Thus, then, the promise of entering into God's rest is still unfulfilled. The promise yet avails for the Christians. Let, therefore, the readers be careful, lest they, too, by disobedience and unbelief forfeit the proffered salvation.

Ver. 1. Exhortation to the readers, deduced from the historic fact, iii. 15–19, and softened by the form of community with the readers adopted by the author, which, however, is involuntarily abandoned again at the close of the verse. — Φοβηθῶμεν οἴν] Let us therefore be apprehensive. — Indication not of the mere being afraid, but of the earnest endeavour, based upon the fear of coming short of the proposed
goal. Calvin: Hic nobis commendatur timor, non qui fidei certitudinem excutiat, sed tantam incutiat sollicitudinem, ne securi torpeamus. Metuendum ergo, non quia trepidare aut diffidere nos oporteat quasi incertos de exitu, sed ne Dei gratiae desimus.—καταλειπομένης...αὐτοῦ] is made by Cramer and Ernesti dependent on ἵστερηκέναι, against which, however, the anarthrous participle in itself suffices to decide. It is parenthetical, and καταλειπομένης with emphasis proposed: while there yet remains promise of entering into His rest. But a promise remains so long as it has not yet received its fulfillment. For with its fulfillment it ceases to be a promise, loses its existence—inasmuch as the character of the future essential to it has then become present. Erroneously do Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Strigel, Hyperius, Estius, Schlichting, S. Schmidt, Limborch, Braun, Semler, Carpzov, al., explain: "by neglect or non-observance of the promise." For, although καταλείποντι can signify that (comp. Acts vi.2; Baruch iv.1), yet in that case the article τῆς could not have been wanting before ἐπαγγελίας; and certainly also an active (καταλείφας τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν) would have been chosen in place of the passive participle. Finally, against the latter explanation, and in favour of that above given, pleads the ἀπολείπεται, vv. 6, 9.—αὐτοῦ] not of Christ (Rambach, Chr. F. Schmid), but of God. This is required by the connection, alike with that which precedes (iii. 11, 18) as with that which follows (vv. 3–5, 10).—η κατάπαυσις] the repose and blessedness which belong to God Himself, and which shall become the portion of believing Christians in the epoch of consummation beginning with the coming again of Christ.—δοκῇ ἵστερηκέναι should appear [be seen] to have come short, i.e. to have failed of attaining to the κατάπαυσις. The infinitive perfect characterizes that which, with the dawn of the Parousia, has become an historically completed, definite fact. δοκῇ ἵστερηκέναι, however, does not stand pleonastically in place of the bare ἵστερη or ἵστερηση (Michaelis, Carpzov, Abresch, al.), nor is it placed "because, in connection with the question whether and where the ἵστερηκέναι exists as a concluded, and therefore irreparable, fact, the human perception does not extend
beyond a mere *videtur*” (Kurtz); for it is not here a case of a question to be decided by men still living upon earth. It serves rather, as the *videtur* often added in Latin, to give a more refined and delicate expression to the discourse. Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 16. Erroneously, however, Delitzsch, that in δοκῇ there is contained not only a softening, but, at the same time, also an accentuation of the expression; the sense being: “they are to take earnest heed, lest haply it should even seem that this or the other has fallen short.” For the augmenting “even” is only arbitrarily imported.—Grotius explains δοκῇ by: “ne cui vestrum lideat,” for which, however, the construction with the dative (δοκῶ μοι) would have been required, and to which, moreover, the infinitive perfect does not lend itself. Schöttgen finally, Baumgarten, Schulz, Paulus, Stengel, Ebrard, and Hofmann take δοκῇ in the sense of opinetur. The author is thus supposed to be warning the readers against the delusion that they were too late, i.e. that they lived at a time when all the promises had long been fulfilled, and no further means of salvation was to be expected. But the linguistic expression in itself is decisive against this interpretation. The author could not then have put φοβηθῶμεν οὖν, μήποτε, but must have written μὴ οὖν φοβηθῶμεν ὑπερηψάναι, or something similar. Moreover, the whole historic situation of the readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews is out of keeping with this view. It was not therein a question of consoling and calming those who still despaired of being able at all to attain to salvation, but of the warning correction of those who were wanting in the assurance of conviction that faith in Christ is the sufficient and only way to salvation. Only a warning to the readers, not by their own behaviour, like the fathers, to incur the loss of salvation, can therefore be contained in ver. 1.

Ver. 2 corroborates in its first half the *καταλειπομένης*, ver. 1, while the second half shows the danger of the *ὑπερηψάναι* in the example of others. The emphasis in the first half lies upon ἐσμέν εἰπηγελισμένοι. The sense is not: for we, too, like them, have promise (to express this the addition of ἡμεῖς after καὶ γὰρ would have been called for), but: for promise (sc. of entering into the *κατάπαυσις*, cf.
vv. 1, 3) have we indeed, even as they (the fathers), sc. had it. — Most arbitrarily is the meaning of this and the following verse apprehended by Ebrard. According to Ebrard, ver. 2 ff. proclaims as the reason why the Jews did not attain the promised "katápausis", not their "subjective unbelief," but "the objective imperfection of the Old Testament revelation." With the second half of ver. 2, namely, a gradation (!) is supposed to begin, and the progress of thought to be as follows: "The word which we have received is even infinitely better than the word which the Israelites received through Moses. For, first, the word spoken by Moses was unable to bring the people to faith—it remained external to them; it set forth a promise, it is true, and also attached a condition, but it communicated no strength to fulfill this condition (vv. 2-5, comp. vv. 12, 13); but, secondly, the promise there given was not even in its purport the true one; there, earthly rest was promised; here, spiritual and everlasting rest (vv. 6-10)."
That the context affords no warrant for the bringing out of such a meaning is self-evident. For neither does the author here distinguish such twofold word of promise, nor a twofold "katápausis", nor can λόγος ... μὴ συγκεκριμένος signify a word which "could not prove binding." — Erroneous, too, is the view of the connection on the part of Delitzsch, to whom Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 798 ff.) accedes in all essential particulars. According to Riehm, the (as yet unproved) presupposition is first provisionally expressed in the parenthesis, ver. 1, in a simply assertory manner, viz. that there is still in existence a promise of entering into the rest of God, a promise of which the fulfilment is yet outstanding, and this presupposition is then repeated, ver. 2, in other expressions of a more general bearing, no doubt, but essentially in the same way of simple assertion. Upon this, however, the author now wishes to furnish proof that such presupposition is fully warranted. Accordingly, ver. 3, he formulates that presupposition in the most definite manner, inasmuch as in the opening words of ver. 3, εἰσερχόμεθα ... πιστεύσαντες, he lays down the theme which is to be proved in the sequel. This proof is afforded in the following way: the rest of God has existed long; nevertheless, in the
oath of God, mentioned in the words of the psalm, a rest of God is spoken of as yet future, and of a truth it is one and the same rest of God which, according to Gen. ii. 2—in so far as God enjoys it alone—has existed from the beginning of the world, and, according to the word of the psalm,—in so far as the people of God are to participate therein,—is one yet approaching. Although thus the long present rest of God was the aim and end of the creative activity of God, yet it is not the final aim which God has proposed to Himself. On the contrary, it is clearly apparent, from a comparison of the word of God pronounced upon the Israelites in the time of Moses, a word confirmed by an oath, with the account of the rest of God on the seventh day, that, according to the gracious designs of God, the rest, which He has enjoyed alone from the foundation of the world, should eventually become a rest of God which He enjoys in communion with His people. It is therefore indubitably certain, that even after the completion of the work of creation and the ensuing of the rest of God, there is still something outstanding [unfulfilled], an ἀπολευκτικὸς, and this consists in the fact that some, received by God into communion with Himself, are made partakers of that repose of God. This view is a mistaken one, because—(1) As regards the assumed proof, the assertion that in the oath of God, spoken of in the words of the psalm, mention is made of a yet future rest of God, is entirely untrue. Not of a particular form of the rest of God, which is still future, is the discourse, but only the fact is represented as future that it is shared on the part of men who enter into it. For a rest of God which has already existed long is not opposed to a rest of God which is still future, nor is the rest of God, mentioned Gen. ii., distinguished as of another kind than that mentioned in the psalm. On the contrary, the rest of God, or—what is identical therewith—the Sabbath-rest of God, has existed in fact and without change from the time of the completion of the works of creation, and this same rest of God it is, the participation in which was once promised to the Israelites on the condition of faith, and now upon the same condition is promised to the Christians; it is a question therefore only of the Christians taking warning from the example of the
fathers, and not, like them, losing the promised blessing through unbelief. (2) That the author was desirous of still proving the καταλείπεσθαι ἐπαγγελλαν, cannot at all be supposed. For this was a fact which, as self-evident from that which precedes, stood in no need of a demonstration; it is therefore expressed not only ver. 1, but also ver. 6, in a mere subsidiary clause, consequently in the form of logical subordination; and even ver. 9, in which it is introduced in an apparently independent form, decides nothing against our explanation, because ver. 9, while forming a certain conclusion to that which precedes, yet contains only the logical substructure for the exhortation attaching itself afresh at ver. 11. That at which the author alone aimed, in connection with ver. 2 ff., was therefore the impressive confirmation of the paraenesis, ver. 1; and just this paraenetic main tendency of our section likewise fails of attaining due recognition in connection with the explanation of Delitzsch and Riehm. But when Delitzsch thinks he can support his view, that the καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας, ver. 1, is first proved in the sequel, by declaring the otherwise to be accepted "thought that the promise of entering into God's rest has remained without its fulfilment in the generation of the wilderness, and thus is still valid," to be "entirely false," and exclaims: "What logic that would be! The generation of the wilderness perished indeed, but the younger generation entered into Canaan, came to Shiloh (the place in the heart of the land, which has its name from the rest, Josh. xviii. 1), and had now its own fixed land of habitation, whither Jehovah had brought and planted it, and where He fenced it in (2 Sam. vii. 10);" such conclusion would be justified only if the author had not understood the promise given to the fathers in the time of Moses, of entering into God's κατάπανος, at the same time in a higher sense, but had regarded it as fulfilled by the occupation of Canaan under Joshua; such, however, according to the distinct statement of ver. 8, is not the case.—καὶ after καθάπερ, the ordinary καὶ after particles of comparison. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 409. —ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς] Periphrasis of the notion ἐπαγγελία, ver. 1: the word of that which is heard (ἀκοή in the passive
sense, as Rom. x. 16; Gal. iii. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 13; John xii. 38), i.e. the word of promise which was heard by them, or proclaimed to them. This periphrasis is chosen in order already at this stage to point out that it was by the fault of the fathers themselves that the word of promise became for them an unprofitable word, one which did not receive its fulfilment. It remained for them a word heard only externally, whereas, if it was to profit them, they must manifest receptiveness for the same, must believingly and confidingly appropriate the same. This culpability on the part of the fathers themselves is brought into direct relief by the participial clause μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν, containing the indication of cause to οὐκ ὀφέλησεν, wherein τῇ πίστει forms an emphatic opposition to the preceding τῆς ἀκοῆς. The sense is: because it was not for the hearers mingled with faith; the dative τοῖς ἀκούσασιν denoting the subject, in relation to which the μὴ συγκ. τῇ πίστει took place. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 206. Thus interpret Erasmus, translation, Calvin, Castellio, Gerhard, Owen, Calov, Limborch, Bengel, Kypke, Storr, Stuart, Reiche, Comm. Crit. p. 30; Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 696, note; Maier, and others. But that the fault of this not being mingled was not in the word but in the men, was naturally understood from the connection. συγκεκραμένος is not to be connected with τοῖς ἀκούσασιν, so that τῇ πίστει would have to be taken as the dativus instrumentalis: “because it did not, by means of faith, mingle with them that heard it, become fully incorporated with them” (Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Dorscheus, S. Schmidt, Wolf, Rambach, Michaelis, Carpzov, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Valckenaeer, Klee, Paulus, Stein, Delitzsch, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner). For manifestly the centres of thought for the adversative clause lie in τῆς ἀκοῆς and τῇ πίστει, while τοῖς ἀκούσασιν only takes up again the indication of the persons, already known to us from the ἐκάλουσ, although now as characterizing these persons in attaching itself to τῆς ἀκοῆς.—τοῖς ἀκούσασιν, however,

1 Heinsius, Semler, Kuinoel, al., take τοῖς ἀκούσασιν as equivalent to ὑπὶ τῶν ἀκουσάντων, which is open to no grammatical objection (cf. Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 206), and makes no alteration in the sense.
not the mere demonstrative pronoun, is put by the author in order thus once more to place hearing and believing in suggestive contrast. Further, the author did not write μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ πίστει τῶν ἀκούσαντων, because he would thereby have conveyed the impression that the Israelites in the wilderness possessed indeed πίστις, but the word of promise which was heard did not blend into a unity with the same; whereas by means of μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν he denies altogether the presence of πίστις in them.

Ver. 3. Confirmation, not of καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας κ.τ.λ., ver. 1 (Bengel), nor of καλ γὰρ ἐσμέν εἱργασθασμένοι, ver. 2 (de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping), and just as little of the two clauses of ver. 2 taken together (Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerb. p. 799; Moll), but of τῇ πίστει, ver. 2. So also Bleek, Alford, and Kurtz. What Riehm (p. 800, note) alleges against this interpretation—viz. that the author has already, in iii. 15 ff. (specially iii. 19), shown clearly enough that the Israelites in the wilderness could not enter into the promised rest on account of their unbelief, that it was therefore impossible that a special proof for this fact should once more be required—does not apply; because this very πιστεύειν was the main question, about the quite special accentuation of which he is seen from the context to be concerned. For surely the whole disquisition, iii. 7—iv. 13, has its all-combining centre precisely in the endeavour to animate to πίστις the readers, who were in danger of sinking, like the fathers, into ἀπίστια. The emphasis rests, therefore, upon οἱ πιστεύσαντες, and the sense is: for into rest enter just those of us who have manifested faith. For οἱ πιστεύσαντες cannot signify: if we have displayed faith (Böhme, de Wette, Bisping); this must have been expressed by the anarthrous πιστεύσαντες. On the contrary, οἱ πιστεύσαντες adds a special characterization of the subject of ἐπιστεύετε, and has the aim of limiting the quite generally expressed “we” to a definite class of us. The present εἰσερχόμεθα is employed with reference to the certainty of that to be looked for in the future, and οἱ πιστεύσαντες, not οἱ πιστεύοντες, is placed, because the πιστεύειν must have already preceded as an
Chap. IV. 3.

Historic fact, before the εἰσέρχεσθαι can be accomplished. — καθὼς εἰρήκεν κ.τ.λ. Scripture proof for the first half of ver. 3, from the already cited words of Ps. xcv. 11. Wrongly is καθὼς εἰρήκεν connected by Piscator with ver. 1, by Brochmann and Bleek II. with ver. 2. For to suppose parentheses before it is unwarranted. In quite a contorted manner Hofmann (p. 187): with καθὼς εἰρήκεν begins a protasis, which finds its apodosis in τάλων των ὁρίζει ἡμέραν, ver. 7; and even the fact that the latter is apodosis to ἐπεὶ ἀπολείπτεται does not, according to him, preclude the possibility of this construction, because this second protasis is connected by οὖν with the first, as a deduction from the same! — εἰρήκεν] sc. ὁ θεός. — ἐν τῇ ὁργῇ μου] sc. at their unbelief and obstinate perverseness, which naturally suggested itself to the readers from the passage of the psalm more copiously adduced in the third chapter, and the reasoning of the author there attached to it. — καὶ τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γεννηθέντων] although the works were completed from the creation of the world; and accordingly the κατάπαυσις of God was something long present and lying in readiness, in which the Israelites, if they had been believing, might well have obtained part. The words, therefore, serve to point out the deep significance of the divine oath.¹ Wrongly are they taken ordinarily as epexegeis to τὴν κατάπαυσιν μοι, in supplying κατάπαυσιν afresh after καίτω. Then either τῶν ἔργων κ.τ.λ. is made dependent on the κατάπαυσιν supplied, in that καίτω is taken, contrary to linguistic usage, in the sense of “et quidem:” “into the rest, namely, from the works which had been completed from the creation of the world” (so Schlichting, S. Schmidt, Wolf, Carpzov, Kypke, Baumgarten, Stuart, Heinrichs, Klee, Bloomfield), to which construction, moreover, the repetition of the article τῶν after τῶν ἔργων would have been in any case necessary; or else τῶν ἔργων ... γεννηθέντων is regarded as a genitive absolute: “namely (or even, although), into a rest, which ensued upon the works of creation being completed.”

¹ The aim in καίτω τῶν ἔργων κ.τ.λ. is not, as Bleek thinks, to prove: “that men had not perchance even then, after the creation of the world, entered with Him [sc. by the institution of the Sabbath] into the rest here intended by God;” for this was a truth which hardly stood in need of any proof.
(so Vatablus, Calvin, Beza, Limborch, Cramer, Böhme, Bisping), which however, in like manner, must grammatically have been otherwise expressed. But, in general, the author cannot here have been at all occupied with the subjoining of a definition with regard to the kind of rest which was meant, since he does not anywhere distinguish several kinds of rest, but without further remark presupposes that the κατάπανος, which ensued for God after the completion of the works of creation is identical with that once promised to the Israelites and now promised to the Christians.— τῶν ἔργων] sc. τοῦ θεοῦ. The necessity for thus supplementing is apparent from ver. 4; comp. also ver. 10. Very arbitrarily, and forcing in a thought entirely foreign to the context, Ebrard understands τῶν ἔργων of the works of men, supposing that with καθὸς εἰρήκεν "the author proceeds to show to what extent even the O. T. itself points out the insufficiency of the law and its ἔργα" (!), regards τῶν ἔργων as antithesis to the preceding οἱ πιστεύοντες (!), and finds the thought, "that all that which can be called εἴργα has been wrought from the time of the creation of the world, but has not sufficed to bring mankind to the κατάπανος, to a condition of satisfied repose," whence follows "that an entirely new way of salvation—not that of human doing and human exertion, but that of faith in God's saving deed—is necessary in order to attain to the κατάπανος" (!).— ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου] from the foundation of the world, i.e. since the world began. Comp. ix. 26; Matt. xiii. 35, xxv. 34; Luke xi. 50; Rev. xiii. 8, xvii. 8.

Ver. 4. Scripture proof for the thought implicitly contained in καὶ τοις κ.τ.λ., ver. 3, viz. that the actual existence of the divine κατάπανος, from which the Israelites were to be excluded, has not been wanting. — The citation is from Gen. ii. 2, according to the LXX., with some non-essential variations. — To εἰρήκεν we have to supply as subject, not ἡ γραφὴ (Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Bisping, al.), but ὁ θεὸς. For although, in the citation, God is spoken of in the third person, yet in εἰρήκεν, ver. 4, the subject must be the same as in καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν, sc. εἰρήκεν, ver. 5; in this latter passage, however, the subject can only be ὁ θεὸς, as is proved by the following μον. — πον] see on ii. 6. — περὶ τῆς ἐξιθαύματος] with

Ver. 5. Renewed contrastful presentation of the relations of the Jewish forefathers to this existing rest of God: "And yet He says again in this place (namely, the passage already cited ver. 3): they shall not enter into my rest." — ἐν τούτῳ stands substantively, without requiring a supplementing of τόπῳ (Kuinoel), or χρόνῳ (Abresch), or ψαλμῷ (Carpzov). Comp. ἐν ἐτέρῳ, v. 6.

Vv. 6, 7. The author, founding his reasoning, on the one hand, on the truthfulness of God, and on the other, on the actual state of matters declared from ἀλλὰ, ver. 2, to κατάπανσίων μοι, ver. 5, now returns to the statements: καταλειτομένης ἐπαγγελίας, ver. 1, and καὶ γὰρ ἐσμεν εὐγεγελισμένοι καθὰπερ κάκεινοι, ver. 2, in order, by means of the opening words of the psalm cited, to render clear the truth contained in these statements concerning the non-fulfilment of the promise as yet, and also the necessity for not closing the heart against the same.¹ — The sense is: since then it still remains, i.e. is to be expected with certainty, that some enter therein, i.e. to be expected with certainty, since God carries also into effect that which He promises, and the earlier recipients of the promise did not enter in because of their unbelief, He marks out anew a definite day, etc.

From this relation of the first half of the protasis to the second, as that of a general postulate to a special historic fact, is explained also the indefinite τινάς in the first clause. Wrongly Delitzsch, according to whom τινάς signifies: "others than those." Some, again, find in ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολείπεται τινάς ἐσελθεῖν the meaning: since then the promise, of entering into His rest, is still left, i.e. awaits its fulfilment. So sub-

¹ Ebrard has here, too, entirely misapprehended the connection. He says: "Vv. 6–8, the author passes to a new thought, to a new point of comparison between the work of Christ and the work of Moses. The opposition between the work of the one and that of the other is twofold. . . . The first imperfection in the work of Moses consisted (iv. 2–5) in the fact that his work conferred no power for fulfilment,—did not combine by faith with the hearers,—and on that account did not avail to lead into rest; the second consists in the fact that the rest itself, into which the Israelites might have been led by Moses, and then by Joshua were led in, was only an earthly typical rest, whereas Christ leads into an actual rest, which intrinsically corresponds to the Sabbath-rest of God."

stantially Bleek: "since it now remains, that the divine rest has not yet been already closed by the complete (?) fulfilment of the prophecy relating thereto, in such wise that no more entrance exists for them." Against this, however, pleads the fact that the author would then have illogically co-ordinated, the one with the other, the two protases ver. 6, since the first would surely contain the result of the second. For the sequence of thought would then be: the former recipients of the promise came short of attaining salvation, and the consequence thereof is that the κατάπαυσις stands open for others. It must thus have been written: ἐτεὶ οὖν ἀποδείκται τῶν εἰσελθείν εἰς αὐτὴν, τῶν πρῶτον εὐαγγελισθέντων οὐκ εἰσελθόντων δι' ἀπείθειαν. — οἱ πρῶτον εὐαγγελισθέντες] sc. the Israelites in the wilderness.

Ver. 7. The apodosis. We have not to construe in such wise that the first σήμερον shall be taken as apposition to ημέραν: "He marks out, therefore, again a definite day (fixes anew a term), namely, 'a to-day,' in that—as was before observed—He says in David, so long time after, 'To-day, etc.'" (Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Jac. Cappellus, Carpzov, Schulz, Klee, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Maier, M'Caul, Moll). Nor yet so that the first ςήμερον is connected with λέγων: "He fixes, therefore, again a day, in that, after so long a time, He says in David 'to-day;' even as it says: 'To-day, if ye, etc.'" (Zeger, Schlichting, Heinrichs, Stengel). On the contrary, the first σήμερον already begins the citation; is then, however,—on account of the words parenthetically introduced by the author: ἐν Δαυίδ . . . προερηται,—resumed in the second σήμερον. — ἐν Δαυίδ] not: apud Davidem, i.e. in the Book of Psalms (Dindorf, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, Ebrard, Alford, Woerner, al.; with comparison of Rom. xi. 2, ix. 25), but: in the person of David, as the instrument of which God made use for speaking. The ninety-fifth psalm, although not Davidic, was ascribed to David in the superscription of the LXX., whom our author follows.—μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον] from the time of Joshua (ver. 8). — καθὼς προερηται] Reference to iii. 7 f., 15.

Ver. 8. Justification of the πάλιν τινὰ ὀρίζει ἡμέραν, ver. 7. If Joshua had already introduced into the rest of God, God would not still have spoken in the time after Joshua of a
term (period) of entrance into the same.—αὐτοῦς] sc. τοὺς πρῶτον εὑραγελομένους, ver. 6.—καταπαύειν] here (in accordance with the classic usage) transitive, as Ex..xxxiii.14, Deut.iii.20, v.33, al.: to lead into the rest.— ἐλάλει] sc. ὁ θεός.—μετὰ ταῦτα] belongs not to ἡμέρας (Hofmann, al.), but to ἐλάλει, and corresponds to the μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον, ver.7.

Ver. 9. Deduction from vv. 7, 8, and consequently return to the first half of ver. 6. "Thus still remaining, still awaiting its advent, is a Sabbath rest for the people of God," inasmuch, namely,—what the author in reasoning with the Hebrews might presuppose as admitted,—as from David’s time down to the present no one had entered into the κατάπαυειν of God. As Sabbath rest the author characterizes the rest of God, in adherence to the thought of ver. 4. As a type of the everlasting blessedness do the Rabbins also regard the Sabbath. Comp. e.g. Jalkut Rubeni, fol. 95.4: Dixerunt Israëlitae: Domine totius mundi, ostende nobis exemplar mundi futuri. Respondit ipsis Deus S. B.: illud exemplar est sabbatum. R. D. Kimchi et R. Salomo in Ps. xcii.: Psalmus cantici in diem Sabbati, quod hie psalmus pertineat ad seculum futurum, quod totum sabbatum est et quies ad vitam aeternam. See Wetstein and Schöttgen ad loc.—ἀρα] at the beginning of a sentence is, in prose, foreign to the classics. Comp. however, Rom. x.17; 2 Cor. vii.12; Luke xi.48; Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 519; Buttmann, Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgeb. p. 318.—The expression σαββατισμός (from σαββατίζων, ἡμί to observe the Sabbath, Ex. xvi.30, al.) only here and with Plutarch, De Superstit. c. 3.—τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ] to the people which pertainst to God, is recognised and treated by Him as His people, since it has believ ingly devoted itself to Him. Comp. Gal. vi.16: ὁ Ἰσραήλ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Ver. 10. There is not an establishing of the reasoning in ver. 9 by a reference to the essence of the Sabbath rest (Delitzsch and Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 804), but justification of the expression σαββατισμός, employed ver. 9. For not that which constitutes the nature of the Sabbath is here brought out, but the fact that in the case supposed a
katapανειν can be ascribed to man, even as to God. Wrongly (because at least εἰσελθὼν γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατάπανειν αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. must have been written) does Schulz refer ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθών to ὁ λαὸς: “and when it has entered,” etc. And just as wrongly, because the context affords no point of support for the same, do Owen, Alting, Starck, Valckenaer, and more recently Ebrard and Alford, find in ὁ εἰσελθών a designation of Christ, in connection with which the ἔργα are then understood of the redemption completed, or also of the sufferings and death undergone. On the contrary, ver. 10 contains a universal proposition: for whoever has entered into His (namely, God’s) rest, has also on his part attained to rest from his works (the burdens and toils of the earthly life;¹ comp. LXX. Gen. iii. 17: ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου; v. 29: οὐτὸς διαναπαύει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐργῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λυπῶν τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ἥς κατηράσατο κύριος ὁ θεός. Comp. also Rev. xiv. 13): even as God from His own (works, the works of creation); for him has thus the Sabbath of everlasting blessedness set in.

Vv. 11–13. Conclusion by way of warning admonition.—σπουδάσωμεν] not: festinemus (Vulg.), but: let our earnest effort be directed to this end.—οὖν] deduces the inference from all that has been hitherto said, from iii. 7 onwards.—ἐκεῖνην τὴν κατάπανειν] that very κατάπανεις, of which the discourse has heretofore been, which was described as a κατάπανεις of God, as one already promised to the fathers, and then again to us, as a possession which they, on account of their disobedience and unbelief, failed to obtain, but which is still open to us as an ideal Sabbatic rest and everlasting blessedness, if we manifest faith and confidence.—Ἰνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδέχηται πέσῃ τῆς ἀπειθείας] lest any one fall into the same example of unbelief, i.e. lest any one fall into the same obstinate perversity as the fathers, and like them become a warning example for others. Thus the Vulgate, Luther, Beza, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Abreash, Alford,

¹ What is meant is not the works or labour “of sanctification” (Tholuck, Grimm, Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmst. A. K.-Z. 1857, No. 29, p. 664); and still less the ritual ordinances of Judaism (Braun, Akersloot, Cramer, Semler, and Griesbach).
Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and others. \( \pi\iota\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon \ \epsilon\nu \) is also quite usual in classical authors; see Passow and Pape \textit{ad vocem}. From \( \pi\iota\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon \ \epsilon\iota\varsigma \) it is distinguished only by a greater degree of significance in that it does not merely like this express the \textit{falling into} something, but also the subsequent \textit{lying in} the same. Others, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Vatablus, Calvin, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Wolf, Bengel, Carpzov, Schulz, Heinrichs, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bisping, Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt \textit{A. K.-Z.} 1857, No. 29, p. 664; the last-named because the expression “to fall into an example,” instead of “to afford an example,” is supposed to be a forced one,—the expression, however, is only a concise one (see above),—and because \( \pi\iota\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon \) is probably chosen with a retrospective glance to iii. 17, the passage to which reference is here made, with the difference that the word there denoted the \textit{physical} destruction. But such intention in connection with the choice of the word is not at all to be assumed), Delitzsch, Riehm (\textit{Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.} p. 774), Maier, Kluge, Moll, Ewald, take \( \pi \epsilon \sigma \eta \) \textit{absolutely}: “fall, i.e. to be brought to ruin, perish.” In that case \( \epsilon\nu \) is explained either by \textit{per} (Wolf, Stengel, Ewald, \textit{ul.}), or “conformably to \textit{gemäss}” (Tholuck), or \textit{propter} (Carpzov), or, what with this construction would alone be correct, of the \textit{condition, the state in which one is} (Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, Maier, Moll): “in giving the same example.” But this whole construction is artificial. Opposed to it is likewise the position of \( \pi \epsilon \sigma \eta \). For had this word such emphasis as it must have so soon as it is taken in the absolute sense, it would not have been inserted in such subordinate, unaccentuated fashion between the other words, but have been introduced at the very beginning of the proposition: \( \iota \nu \alpha \mu \eta \ \tau \iota \varsigma \pi \epsilon \sigma \eta \ \kappa \tau \lambda \).

Vv. 12, 13. Warning demonstration of the necessity for compliance with the exhortation uttered ver. 11.\footnote{Ebrard’s commentary here too abounds in quixotic caprice, such as disowns all linguistic basis. According to Ebrard, the preceding warning of ver. 11 is yet further enforced, ver. 12, by the reminder that in our case (!) that excuse (!) is removed, which, according to ver. 2 (!), still existed in the case of the con-

\textit{Meyer.—Heb.}
The word of God. By these words we have not, with many Fathers, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Thomas Aquinas, Lyra, Cajetan, Clarius, Justinian, Cornelius a Lapide, Jac. Cappellus, Gomar, Owen, Heinsius, Alting, Clericus, Cramer, Ewald, al., the hypostatic word of God, or Christ, as the second person of the Godhead. For although this mode of designating Christ in the case of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, according to i. 1–3, and on account of the points of contact he displays with Philo, can present nothing strange in itself, yet the expression was too unusual for it to be employed and understood without further indication, in this special sense, where the connection did not even lead up to it. Moreover, the predicates ἐνεργής, τομώτερος κ. τ. λ., and κριτικός (instead of κριτής), seem better suited to an impersonal than a personal subject. The majority understand ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ of the word of God, as proclaimed and as preserved in Scripture. They refer it then either to the gospel (Cameron, Grotius, Wittich, Akersloot, Ebrard, al.), or to the threatenings of God (Schlichting, Michaelis, Abresch, Böhme, Heinrichs, al.), or, finally, to the threatenings and promises of God taken together (Beza, Schulz, Bisping, al.). ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ is to be understood quite generally: “that which God speaks,” as, indeed, the whole proposition, vv. 12, 13, contains a general sentence. But that “that which God speaks” was then, in its application to the case here specially coming under notice, the call to receptivity of heart repeatedly made by God through the psalmist, and the exclusion from His κατάπανωσις threatened in the event of obstinate disobedience and unbelief, was for the reader self-evident from the connection.— The word of God is characterized in progressive enhancement. It is called ἐνεργός, ἐνεργής, on account of its inner vital power (not on account of its everlasting, intransitory continuance, temporarily of Moses. For us nothing is wanting (!) on the part of the word of God; for (!) the word of God is living, powerful, penetrating into the soul; if we (!) should fall victims to unbelief, the guilt would rest upon ourselves alone (!). According to Ebrard, the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ forms an opposition to the first person plural οὐτὸς οὕτως (!), and ver. 2 a supplementary material opposition to ver. 2 (!). That “this profound and delicate connection has hitherto been overlooked by all expositors” is natural enough. Even after Ebrard has discovered it, it will still remain unnoticed.
Schlichting, Alresch; nor as "cibus ac nutrimentum, quod hominum animis vitam conservat," Carpzov; nor, in opposition to the rigid lifeless law, Ebrard; *évenγης, effective, on account of its asserting itself, manifesting itself vigorously in the outer world. The latter is the consequence of the former, and both in this connection refer to the power of punishing its contemners, which is inherent in the word of God.— The penetrating sharpness of this power of punishment is described in ascending gradation in the sequel. — *καλ τομάτερος ὑπὲρ πάσαν μάχαιραν διώστομον and more trenchant than every (any) two-edged sword. *ὑπὲρ after a comparative (Luke xvi. 8; Judg. xi. 25, LXX. Cod. Vaticanus), like παρά, i. 4. μάχαιρα διώστομος, a sword with twofold mouth, *i.e.* with an edge on both sides (ἀμφοτέρωθεν ὁξεία). The same expression in the LXX. Judg. iii. 16; Prov. v. 4. Comp. γομφοια διώστομος, Rev. i. 16, ii. 12; LXX. Ps. cxlix. 6; Ecclus. xxi. 3. Similarly, Eurip. Helen. 989: ἕμοι πρὸς ἤπαρ δοσι διώστομον ξύφος τόδε; Orest. 1309: δίπτυγα, διώστομα φάσγανα.— The proof for the statement: τομάτερος ὑπὲρ πάσαν μάχαιραν διώστομον, is contained in the words: *καλ διικνούμενον ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, ἀρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν* and piercing to the separating of soul and spirit, joints as well as marrow. *μερισμός* denotes the action of separating, and the separating subject is the word of God. Wrongly does Schlichting (comp. also Böhme) take it locally, or as reflexive: to the secret spot where soul and spirit separate. Such construction is to be rejected, as otherwise the clause following would have also to be explained in like manner: where joints and marrow separate. Joints and marrow, however, not being, in the human organization, things coming into direct contact, the thought would be inappropriate, whether we understand ἀρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν in the literal or non-literal sense. Schlichting, to be sure, will make ἀρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν no longer dependent upon *μερισμόν*, but take it as co-ordinate with *μερισμοῦ* (“... ut gladius iste penetrare dicatur ad loca in homine abditissima, etiam illuc, ubi anima cum spiritu co-nnectitur et ab eo dividitur, itemque ubi sunt membrorum compages et medullae”). But for this distinction the repetition of ἄχρι before ἀρμῶν would have been necessary. An entire
failure, finally, is also the method proposed by Hofmann
(Schriftbew. I. 2 Aufl. p. 297, and likewise still in his Comm.
p. 192), in order to preserve the local acceptation, in making
\( \psi \nu \chi \varsigma \ kai \ \pi \nu \varepsilon \mu \alpha \tau \varsigma \) dependent on \( \acute{\alpha} \rho \mu \omega \nu \ \tau e \ kai \ \mu \nu \varepsilon \lambda \omega \nu \) : "to
the point at which it dissects and dissolves both joints and
marrow of the inner life, the secret ligaments of its connection
and the innermost marrow of its existence." For then the
readers would be required to understand an arrangement of
the words which has not, as Hofmann thinks, perhaps "its
parallel" in Heb. vi. 1, 2, but which is, on the contrary,
altogether impossible, on account of the addition of \( \mu \varepsilon \iota \sigma \mu \omega \upsilon \) already to \( \psi \nu \chi \varsigma \ kai \ \pi \nu \varepsilon \mu \alpha \tau \varsigma \), and therefore nowhere finds
its analogon in the N. T., not to say in the Epistle to the
Hebrews. All four words: \( \psi \nu \chi \varsigma \), \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \mu \alpha \tau \varsigma \), \( \acute{\alpha} \rho \mu \omega \nu \), and
\( \mu \nu \varepsilon \lambda \omega \nu \), depend upon \( \mu \varepsilon \iota \sigma \mu \omega \upsilon \), and not a dividing of the soul
from the spirit, of jointings or joints from the marrow, is
intended, nor yet a dividing of the soul and spirit from joints
and marrow (Böhme), but a dividing of the soul, the spirit,
etc., each in itself is meant. The two last substantives, how-
ever, are not co-ordinate to the two first (Calvin, Beza,
Cameron, Storr, Delitzsch, al.), but subordinate. For \( \psi \nu \chi \varsigma \) and \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \mu \alpha \tau \varsigma \), which are distinguished from each other as
characterizing respectively the lower sensuous life and the
higher life of the spirit, here set forth without any more special
limitation the inner side of human life generally, in opposition
to the \( \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \) or body, which latter alone an earthly sword is
able to pierce, and \( \acute{\alpha} \rho \mu \omega \upsilon \ \tau e \ kai \ \mu \nu \varepsilon \lambda \omega \nu \) is not to be under-
stood of the joints and marrow of the body, \(^1\) but of the liga-
ments and marrow of the \( \psi \nu \chi \varsigma \) and \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \mu \alpha \tau \varsigma \), is thus a
figurative expression to denote the innermost, most hidden

\(^1\) So Delitzsch still explains, who represents the author as giving expression to
the grossly sensuous conception, regardless whether such conception is in
harmony with the author's refined mode of thought,—that the word of God
points out "to man the antitheistic forces of his bodily nature, which has
become wholly, and to all the joints and marrow (cerebral marrow, spinal
marrow, etc.), a seat of sin and death!" The expression is supposed to adapt
itself, without itself becoming figurative, to the figure of the \( \mu \varepsilon \chi \varepsilon \iota \mu \varepsilon \). It is
presupposed that the word of God has already accomplished its work of dissec-
tion (!) to the skeleton, with its bones and sinews (!), or at least presupposed
that all, so far as this, is manifestly to be performed with ease. A stop, how-
depth of the rational life of man. In such transferred signification \( \mu \nu \epsilon \lambda \delta \dot{\sigma} \) is used also with the classics. Comp. Themist. *Oral.* 32, p. 357: (\( \delta \dot{\omega} \nu \eta \)) εἰσδεδυκνία εἰς αὐτὸν που τὸν \( \mu \nu \epsilon \lambda \delta \dot{\sigma} \) τῆς \( \psi \chi \zeta \)ς; Eurip. *Hippol.* 255 f.: χρὴν γὰρ μετρίας εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλίας θητοίς ἀνακίνησθαι καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἄκρον \( \mu \nu \epsilon \lambda \delta \dot{\sigma} \) \( \psi \chi \zeta \)ς. ἀρμός, however, a fastening together, uniting, joint, could likewise be employed metaphorically, inasmuch as it receives its signification as joint of the human body only from the addition of τοῦ \( \sigma \mu \mu \mu \alpha \tau \circ \circ \circ \circ \) or from the connection, but elsewhere occurs in the most varied combinations and relations. Comp. e.g. ἀρμός \( \theta \dot{\upsilon} \alpha \rho \alpha \)ς, Dionys. Hal. v. 7; ἀρμοι λιθὼν, Ecclus. xxvii. 2, al.—It is, moreover, worthy of notice that Philo also ascribes to his divine Logos a like cutting and severing power. He calls the same \( \tau \circ \circ \circ \circ \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \circ \circ \) \( \tau \circ \circ \circ \circ \) \( \sigma \mu \mu \mu \alpha \tau \circ \circ \circ \circ \), which God has whetted to the most piercing sharpness, which on that account not only separates all sensuous things and penetrates to the atoms, but even divides the supra-sensuous, separating the soul into the rational and irrational, the reason into the true and false, the perception into the clear and the obscure. Comp. especially, *Quis rerum divinarum liacrcs.* p. 499 (with Mangey, I. p. 491): Εἰς ἐπιλέγει. Διείλειν αὐτὰ μέσα [Gen. xv. 10] τὸ τίς οὖ προσθεῖς, ἵνα τὸν ἀδιακότον ἐννοῆς θεῶν τέμνοντα τὰς τῶν σωμάτων καὶ πραγμάτων ἔξης ἀπάσας ἥρμοσθαι καὶ ἥρμοσθαι δοκοῦσας φύσεως τὸ τομεὶ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ δὲ, εἰς τὴν ὀξυτάτην ἀκονθεῖς ἁκμήν, διαιρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ αἰσθητὰ πάντα: ἐπειδὰν δὲ μέχρι τῶν ἄτομων καὶ λεγομένων ἀμερῶν διεξέλθῃ, τάλιν ὁτι τούτων τὰ λόγῳ θεωρητὰ εἰς ἀμεθῆτον καὶ ἀπεριγράφους μοίρας ἀρχεῖα διαιρεῖν οὖντος ὁ τομεὺς . . . "Εκαστὸν οὖν τῶν τριῶν διείλε μέσον, τὴν μὲν \( \psi \chi \zeta \)ν εἰς ever, is not made here, but it further separates the joints of the bones, with the sinews or tendons serving to their movement, and cuts through the bones themselves, so that the marrow they contain is laid bare. Thus, then, the word renders the whole man transparent to God and to himself, and unveils in sharpest and most rigid analysis his most psycho-spiritual and innermost physical (!) condition; whereby it is then seen that, in so far as the man has not yet given scope to the work of grace, and in so far as the latter has not yet been able to accomplish itself, the marrow of the body is as corrupt as the spirit, which is as it were the marrow of the soul, and the joints of the body as corrupt as the soul, which is as it were the joint of the spirit (!).
That the twofold αὐτοῦ and the δὲ, ver. 13, cannot be referred to Christ,\(^1\) follows from the correct interpretation of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 12. That, however, in general not the total notion ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (so Ebrard still) can form the subject of the pronouns, ver. 13, but only the ὁ θεὸς to be deduced therefrom, is evident from the expression τοῖς ὕπθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, which is appropriate only to the latter, not to the former. The transition from the word of God to God Himself was, moreover, a very natural one, inasmuch as in the word of God, God Himself is present and operative. — κτίσις] as Rom. viii. 39, and frequently, in the most universal sense: any creature, and indeed here not merely as regards its external existence, but also as regards its inner essence. Quite mistakenly Grotius, who is followed by Carpzov: Videtur mihi hoc loco κτίσις significare opus hominis, quia id est velut creatura hominis. — δὲ] on the contrary. See on ii. 6. — τετρα-

---

\(^1\) As is done even by Dorschens, Calov, Wittich, Braun, Brochmann, and Schöttgen, although they do not explain hypostatically the word of God in ver. 12.
CHAP. IV. 13.

χηλισμένα] laid bare. Hesychius: πεφανερωμένα. τραχυλιζέων means: to bend back the neck of the victim, in the act of slaying, in order to lay bare the chest, then generally: to lay bare, disclose, expose to view. See the Lexicons of Passow and Pape on the word. Comp. Hom. Π. i. 459: αὐτ ἐρυσαν, sc. τὸν τραχυλιστὸν τὸν ἱερὸ; Orpheus, Argon. 311: ταῦταν σφάζον, ἄνακλίνας κεφαλήν εἰς αἰθέρα διάν; P. Fr. Ach. Nitsch, Beschreibung des häuslichen, gottesdienstlichen u. s. w. Zustandes der Griechen, 2 Aufl. Th. I. p. 667. Others, as Elsner, Wolf, Baumgarten, Kuinoel, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, and Maier, would, after the precedent of Perizonius, ad Aeliani Var. Hist. xii. 58, derive the signification “lay bare” to τραχυλιζέων, from the practice in antiquity of laying hold of transgressors by the neck when they were being led away to execution, and bending back the head, that they might be exposed to the gaze of all. Appeal is made not amiss to Suetonius in favour of this custom, Vitell. 17: donec (Vitellius) religatis post terga manibus, injecto cervicibus laqueo, veste discissa, seminudus in forum tractus est . . . reducto coma capite, ceu noxii solent, atque etiam mento mucrone gladii subrecto, ad visendam praebet faciem neve submitteret. In like manner to Pliny, Panegyr. 34. 3: Nihil tamen gratius, nihil seculo dignius, quam quod contigit desuper intueri delatorum supina ora retortasque cervices. Yet a Roman custom cannot in itself afford a standard for determining the signification of a Greek word. Yet others, as Cameron, Brochmann, and Klee, suppose the general signification: “to lay bare,” for τραχυλιζέων, to arise from the circumstance that the verb is used also of the wrestler, who grasps his opponent by the throat, and hurls him down backwards, whereby the face of the latter is exposed to the full view of the spectators (Cameron: Videtur esse metaphora petita a re palaestrica. Nam luctatores tum demum adversarium dicuntur τραχυλιζέων, cum obstricto collo ita versant, ut objicient spectatorum oculis nudum conscipien- dum et retectum undiquaque, id quod tum demum maxime fit, quum ejus cervicibus inequitant). But the exposing of the face of the thrown opponent was a circumstance of no importance in the τραχυλιζέων of the athlete, because not at all necessarily connected therewith. Further, and not less im-
probable derivations, see in Bleek. — πρός δὲ κ.τ.λ.] is to be taken in close combination only with the αὐτοῦ immediately preceding, not likewise, as is done by Michaelis, Bloomfield, and Hofmann (Schriftenw. I. 2 Aufl. p. 104), with the first αὐτοῦ, and upon ἡμῖν falls no emphasis (against Ebrard and Alford). The words for the rest have too little the character of independence to justify our taking them alone, with Alford, and separating them by a colon from that which precedes. — πρός δὲ ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος] towards whom exists for us the relation, i.e. with whom we have to do. Calvin: vertendum erat: cum quo nobis est ratio: cujus orationis hic est sensus, Deum esse, qui nobiscum agit, vel cum quo nobis est negotium, ideoque non esse ludendum quasi cum homine mortali, sed quoties verbum ejus nobis proponitur, contremiscendum esse, quia nihil ipsum lateat. Comp. 1 Kings ii. 14 and 2 Kings ix. 5: λόγος μοι πρός σέ.— Aristides, Leuctr. iv. p. 465: ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ τούτῳ θαυμαστόν φαίνεται, εἴ τις τὸ μὲν Θεοῖαρ σώματος ἀντιπάλους ἡμῖν καταλειφθήναι δέδει, τὸ δὲ πρός ἀμφοτέρους ἡμῖν εἶναι τὸν λόγον, σωθεν ἄξιον κρίνει φόβου. Further examples in Wetstein and Bleek. Incorrectly do Luther, Vatablus, Cameron, Schlichting, Cornelius a Lapide [Piscator hesitates between this and the rendering above given], Grotius, Calov, Wolf, Schulz, Stengel, al., generally with an appeal to πρός, i. 7, 8, and a comparison of v. 11, take πρός δὲ ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος as equivalent to περὶ ὁδ ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος. Moreover, something entirely foreign is imported by Ewald when, with a reference to ii. 10 f., he finds in the words the sense: “to whom, as a friend and brother, we can always most confidently speak.” Finally, the Peshito, Chrysostom, Ocumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Erasmus Paraphr., Clarus, Zeger, Owen, Limborch, Michaelis, Whitby, Cramer, Stuart, Hofmann, al., explain: to whom we shall have to give an account of our actions. In itself this interpretation would be admissible; but, inasmuch as the words must in consequence thereof be taken in reference to an event yet future, we should necessarily expect the addition of ἐσται.

Ver. 14—x. 18. The author has, in that which precedes, compared Christ with the angels and then with Moses, and proved the superiority of Christ over both. He applies him-
self now to a third point of the comparison, in that he institutes a comparison between Christ and the Levitical high priests, and develops on every side the exalted character of His high-priesthood above the Levitical high-priesthood, with regard to His person, with regard to the sanctuary in which He fulfils His office, and with regard to the sacrifice presented. The copiousness of this new dogmatic investigation—which is subservient to the same paraenetic aim as the preceding expositions, and therefore opens with an exhortation of the same nature with the former ones, and is presently interrupted by a somewhat lengthy warning-paraenetic interlude—is to be explained by the greater importance it had for the readers, who, in narrow-minded over-estimate of the temple cultus inherited from the fathers, regarded the continued participation in this cultus as necessary for the complete expiation of sin and the acquiring of everlasting salvation, and, because they thought nothing similar was to be found in Christianity, were exposed to an imminent peril of turning away from the latter and relapsing entirely into Judaism. Compare the explanation already given by Chrysostom, Hom. viii. inii.: Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐδὲν ἦν (sc. in the New Covenant) σωματικόν ἢ φανταστικόν, οἷον οὐ ναός, οὐχ ἄγια ἄγιον, οὐχ ἱερεῖς τοσαύτην ἔχων κατασκευήν, οὐ παρατηρήσεις νομικά, ἀλλὰ ἄνωτερα καὶ τελεότερα πάντα, καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν σωματικῶν, τὸ δὲ πάν ἐν τοῖς πνευματικοῖς ἦν, οὐχ οὕτω δὲ τὰ πνευματικὰ τοὺς ἀσθενεστέρους ἐπήγειτο ὡς τὰ σωματικὰ, τούτου χάριν τούτου δόλον κινεῖ τὸν λόγον.—The transition to this new section is formed by vv. 14–16.

Ver. 14. The introductory phrase: ἐξοντες οὖν ἀρχιερεία, presupposes that the author has already had occasion to speak of Jesus as ἀρχιερεύς. We are therefore led back for οὖν to ii. 17, iii. 1. But, since there is further added to ἀρχιερεύς the qualification μέγαν and διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, and thus also these characteristics must be presupposed as known from that which precedes, we have consequently not to limit οὖν, in its backward reference, to ii. 17, iii. 1, but to extend it to the whole disquisition, i. 1–iii. 6, in such wise that (logically, indeed, in a not very exact manner) μέγαν, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς glances back in general to the
dignity and exaltedness of the person of Jesus, as described in these sections. — Erroneously does Delitzsch suppose that by means of οὖν the exhortation κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας is derived as a deduction from vv. 12, 13. Such opinion would be warranted only if, with the omission of the participial clause, merely κρατῶμεν οὖν τῆς ὁμολογίας had been written. For since κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας has received its own justification in the prefixed ἐχοντες κ.τ.λ., apart from that which immediately precedes, it is clear that, in connection with ver. 14, there is no further respect had to the contents of vv. 12, 13. It is not therefore to be approved that Delitzsch, in order to make room for the unfortunate reference to vv. 12, 13, will have οὖν logically attached to the verb κρατῶμεν, instead of the participle, with which it is grammatically connected, and to which, as the most simple and natural, the like passage, x. 19 ff., also points. What laboured confusion of the relations would Delitzsch require the reader to assume, when he is called to regard ἐχοντες κ.τ.λ. as being at the same time a recapitulation of that which has been said before, and continuation of the argument; and yet, spite of all this, to look upon κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας as a deduction from vv. 12, 13! In any case, the connection asserted by Delitzsch to exist between ver. 14 and vv. 12, 13: “the word of God demands obedience and appropriation, i.e. faith, not, however, as merely a faith locked up within the breast, but also a loud Yea and Amen, unreserved and fearless confession, ὁμολογία from mouth and heart, as the echo thereof,” is in itself a baseless imagination; because the before-demanded πίστις and the here demanded ὁμολογία are by no means distinguished from each other as a minus and a majus, but, on the contrary, in the mind of the author of the epistle are synonyms. It results that οὖν stands in a somewhat free relation to the foregoing argument, consequently must not at all be taken as, strictly speaking, an illative particle, with which that which precedes is first brought to a close, but as a particle of resuming, which, in the form of a return to that which has already been said before, begins a new section. — μὲν [...] does not in such wise appertain to ἀρχιερείᾳ that only in combination with the same
it should form the idea of the high priest (Jac. Cappellus, Braun, Rambach, Wolf, Carpzov, Michaelis, Stuart), but is indicative of the quality of the high priest, and means exalted, just as μέγας, x. 21, in combination with ιερεύς. Comp. also xiii. 20.— As the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews represents Christ the Son of God, so also does Philo (De Somn. p. 598 A, with Mangey, I. p. 654) represent the divine Logos as ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς. Comp. ibid. p. 597 (I. p. 653): Δύο γὰρ, ὡς έσοκεν, ιερά θεοῦ, ἐν μὲν οὖς ὁ κόσμος, ἐν δὲ καὶ ἄρχιερεὺς ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θείος λόγος, ἔτερον δὲ λογικὴ φύσις, ἡς ιερεύς ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἀνθρωπος. — διεληλυθοῦσα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ] elucidatory demonstration of μέγαν. Wrongly is it translated by Luther (as also by the Peshito): who has ascended up to heaven; by Calvin, Peirce, Ernesti, al.: qui coelos ingressus est. It can only signify [Piscator, Owen, Bengel, Tholuck, Stuart, al.]: who has passed through the heavens, sc. in order, exalted above the heavens (cf. vii. 26; Eph. iv. 10), to take His seat upon the throne of the Divine Majesty (i. 3, 13). Allusion to the high priest of the Old Covenant, who, in order to make atonement for the people, passed through the courts of the Temple, and through the Temple itself, into the Most Holy Place. Comp. ix. 11.— Σπεζίν τῶν νύν τοῦ θεοῦ] emphatic apposition to ἀρχιερέα μέγαν κ.τ.λ., in which the characterization of Jesus as the νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ (i. 1, 5, vi. 6, vii. 3, x. 29) serves anew to call attention to the dignity of the New Testament High Priest. Quite mistaken are Wolf and Böhme in their conjecture that the object in the addition of τῶν νύν τοῦ θεοῦ is the distinction of Jesus from the Joshua mentioned ver. 8. For the mention of Joshua, ver. 8, was, as regards the connection, only an incidental one, on which account there also not even a more precise definition was given to the name. — κρατώμεν τῆς ὀμολογίας] let us hold fast (vi. 18; Col. ii. 19; 2 Thess. ii. 15; wrongly Tittmann: lay hold of, embrace) the confession. ὀμολογία is not, with Storr, to be referred specially to the confession of Christ as the High Priest, but to be taken in general of the Christian confession. The expression is here too used objectively, as iii. 1, of the sum or subject-matter of the Christian's belief.
Ver. 15. Further justification of the demand, ver. 14, of stedfast adherence to the Christian confession.1 For the High Priest of Christians is not merely a highly exalted One (ver. 14), He is also qualified, since as Brother He stands very closely related to believers, and has been tempted as they are, to have sympathy for their weaknesses. Comp. ii. 17, 18. Calvin: In nomine Filii Dei, quod posuit, subest ea majestas, quae nos ad timorem et obsequium adigat. Verum si nihil in Christo aliud consideremus, nondum pacatae erunt conscientiae. Quis enim non reformidet Filii Dei conspectrum, praesertim quum reputamus, qualis sit nostra condition, nobisque in mentem veniunt peccata nostra? Deinde Judaeis aliud obstare poterat, quia Levitico sacerdotio assueverant: illic cernebant hominem mortalem unum ex alis electum, qui sanctuarium ingrediebatur, ut sua deprecatione reconciliaret frateres suos Deo. Hoc magnum est, quum mediator, qui placare erga nos Deum potest, unus est ex nobis. Haec illecebra poterat Judaeos illaqueare, ut sacerdotio Levitico semper essent addicti, nisi occurreret apostolus, ac ostenderet Filium Dei non modo excellere gloria, sed aquea bonitate et indulgentia erga nos esse praeeditum. Whereas δυνάμενου συμπαθήσαι and πεπερασμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ’ ὁμοιότητα bring out the homogeneity of the New Testament High Priest with that of the Old Testament (comp. v. 2), the dissimilarity at the same time existing between the two is rendered apparent by χωρίς ἀμαρτίας. — συμπαθεῖν] to have sympathy, compassionate feeling. Comp. x. 34. Preliminary condition to bestowing succour and redemption. — αἱ ἁσθενεῖαι ημῶν] the conditions of human weakness, as well moral as physical, which have been called forth by the entrance of sin into the world. — πεπερασμένον δὲ] contains in the form of a correction of μὴ δυνάμενον the proof of the capacity for having sympathy. — κατὰ πάντα] Comp. ii. 17. — καθ’ ὁμοιότητα] sc. ἡμῶν (comp. vii. 15: κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεdek), or ἡμῖν (comp. Polyb. xiii. 7. 2: Ἡν γὰρ εἰδωλων γυναικεῖων, πολυτελέσιν ἰματίωσι ἡμιφερασμένοι, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μορφὴν εἰς ὁμοιότητα τῇ τοῦ Νάβιδος γυναικὶ διαφόρως ἀπεργασμένον), or even πρὸς ἡμᾶς (comp. Philo, 1 Incorrectly does Ebrard take ver. 15 as elucidation of ἔχοντες ἀρχήν.
Ver. 16. Encouragement, derived from the character of the High Priest of the New Testament, as brought into relief,
ver. 15.—*προσέρχεσθαι*] approach, draw near, in order to have community with something. Comp. vii. 25, x. 1, 22, xi. 6, xii. 18, 22. Too specially Delitzsch, Kurtz, and Ewald, who explain: drawing near in prayer for aid or succour.—*μετὰ παράσπορας*] with confidence (iii. 6), inasmuch as we possess, in the very office of intercessor, a High Priest who is not only exalted, but also full of sympathy, who thus has not only the power, but also the will to help.—*θρόνος τῆς χάριτος*] not: Christ Himself (Gerhard, S. Schmidt, Carpzov, Ernesti, *al*.), not: the throne of Christ (Primasius [also Tena, arguing from the Vulgate of ii. 9], Schlichting, Limborch, Chr. Fr. Schmid, *al*.), but the throne of God, at whose right hand Christ is seated. Comp. viii. 1, xii. 2 [Eph. ii. 18]. It is called, however, the throne of grace, because the nature of the New Covenant has, as its presupposition, not strictly judicial retribution, according to the works of men, but compassion and grace on the part of God; the believer feels himself united to God as a loving Father, who has remitted to him the guilt and punishment of sin. A reference for the rest to the cover of the ark of the covenant, regarded as the seat of the Godhead in the sanctuary (the *nēbē* or *λαυτήριον* of the Old Covenant), assumed by Piscator, Schöttagen, Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Abresch, Kuinoel, Paulus, *al*., and still in recent times by Bloomfield and Bisping (comp. also Kurtz *ad loc*.), in connection with the expression: *ὁ θρόνος τῆς χάριτος*, is not indicated by anything in the text.—To obtain mercy and find grace (Luke i. 30; Acts vii. 46; comp. *ὑποτευχή*, Gen. vi. 8, xviii. 3, and frequently) are synonymous terms. All distinctions, as that of Böhme: *ἐλεος* magis id appellat, quo indigebant calamitasibus oppressi lectores, *χάρις*, quo peccatis non carentes; of Stein, that *ἐλεος* relates to compassion towards the sinner, *χάρις* to every manifestation of grace; of Bisping, that *ἐλεος* refers more to the forgiveness of sins and deliverance from sufferings, while *χάρις* refers to the communication of higher gifts of grace; of Hofmann, that *χάρις εὐρισκεῖν* means "to be brought into a state of favour with any one, to become an object of his good-will;" *λαμβάνειν ἐλεος*, on the other hand, is "a receiving of that which the kind and gracious One accords to those in need of His kindness, just on account
of their need," and many others, are untenable. — *eis eulakrop
βοήθειαν* for timely help, *i.e.* in order that we may in this
manner attain to a help which appears on the scene, while it
is still the right time, before it is yet too late (iii. 13).
Wrongly Tholuck, Delitzsch, Moll, Kurtz, and Hofmann:
"before the one in conflict with the temptations succumbs;"
and others (also Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr*. p. 740): "as
often as we stand in need of the βοήθεια."
CHAPTER V.

Ver. 1. Instead of the *Recepta* δῶρα τι καὶ δοσιάς, Lachm. and Tisch. 1 read merely δῶρα καὶ δοσιάς. But the single testimony of B (D**?)—for nothing is here to be inferred from the Latin versions—does not suffice for the condemnation of the particle. τι is protected by A C D*** (D*: δῶρα) E K L Ἐ, of, as it appears, all the cursives, Epiph. and many others. Cf. also Heb. viii. 3, ix. 9. — Ver. 3. Elz.: διὰ ταυτής. Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, al.: δι' αὐτῆς. To be preferred on account of the better attestation by A B C* D* Ἐ, 7, 80, al., Syr. utr. Chrys. ms. Cyril. Theodoret (alit.). — Instead of the *Recepta* ιαυτοῦ, there is placed in the text by Lachm., after B D*, αὐτοῦ; by Tisch. 1, αὐτοῦ. — But ιαυτοῦ is found in A C D*** E K L, almost all min., and many Fathers, and is on that account to be retained, with Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, and others. — The preference over the *Recepta* ὑπερ ἀμαρτίων (supported by C*** D*** E K L, the majority of the min. Chrys. Theodoret ad loc., al.; defended by Bleek, and more recently by Bloomfield and Reiche) is merited by the reading περὶ ἀμαρτίων, already commended to attention by Griesbach; adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, with the assent of Delitzsch and Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 434), partly on account of the stronger attestation by A B C* D* Ἐ, 17, 31, 47, 73, 118, Chrys. codd. Theodoret (semel), partly because περὶ might easily, on account of the περὶ placed twice before, be altered into ὑπερ, in conformity with ὑπερ ἀμαρτίων, ver. 1. — Ver. 4. ἀλλὰ καλοῦμενος] So rightly already the Editt. Complut. and Plantin.; in like manner Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, after the preponderating authority of A B C* D E K Ἐ, 23, 37, 44, al. plur., Chrys. Damasc. Procop. Oecum. The article added in the *Recepta*: ἀλλὰ ὁ καλοῦμενος, is not only badly attested (C** L, Constitutt. apostoll., Theodoret, Theophylact), but also unsuitable, since not a new subject in opposition to the unemphatic τι is required by the context, but an antithetic nearer defining in opposition to the significant ὁ χ.
iαυτῷ. — Instead of the Recepta καθάπερ (C* D*** E K L N*** Theodoret), approved by Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Bloomfield, al., Lachm., after C* (?) Chrys. Procop. reads: καθώς; Tisch., with Alford, after A B D* N* Damasc.: καθώσιπ. The last, in favour of which Delitzsch also declares himself, deserves the preference as the best attested, and as most in keeping with the predilection of the author for harmonious combinations. — The article ᾧ before Αἱρεῖν in the Recepta was already with justice deleted in the edit. Complut., and later by Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford, and others. Against it decides the weighty authority of A B C D E K L N, many min. and Fathers. —


Vv. 1–10. Emphasizing of two main qualifications of the earthly high priest, in which Christ likewise is not wanting.

Vv. 1–3. The first qualification: the capacity, as man, who himself is subject to human weakness, to deal leniently with erring humanity. To what extent and under what modification this characteristic of the earthly high priest is applicable also to Christ, is not discussed by the author in our passage. This might appear remarkable, since with respect to the second necessary qualification of the earthly high priest, further added ver. 4, the parallel relation in the case of Christ is expounded in detail from ver. 5 onwards. But yet there was no need of an express application to Christ, of that which was observed vv. 1–3. What the author had had to say with regard to this was already clear to the readers from the earlier disquisitions of the epistle itself. The element of the homogeneity of Christ
with the Jewish high priest, namely, that He, like the Jewish high priest, can have sympathy with sinful man, since He had become in all points like unto men His brethren, had been fully traced out in the second chapter, and attention is called anew to it in iv. 15 by the δυνάμενον συμπαθήσαι ταῖς ἁθενείαις ἡμῶν and πεπειρασμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοίωτητα. The element of the dissimilarity, on the other hand, namely, that while the Jewish high priest had to offer for his own sins, Christ was without sin, is first brought prominently forward in iv. 15 by means of χωρίς ἀμαρτίας, and, besides this, followed already from the exalted position the author had, in the opening chapters of the epistle, assigned to Christ as the Son of God.— That, in reality, also the paragraph w. 7–10, no less than w. 5, 6, is subordinate to the second main consideration, expressed ver. 4, has been denied, it is true, by Beza, Schlichting, Hammond, Limborch, Storr, Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, and others. They are of opinion that from ver. 5 onwards an application of all the statements, vv. 1–4, to Christ ensues; that this, however, takes place in inverse order, so that vv. 5, 6 refer back to ver. 4, vv. 7, 8 to ver. 2, and finally, vv. 9, 10 to ver. 1. The untenable character of such opinion is self-evident. For—(1) vv. 7, 8 cannot have the design of applying to Christ that which was observed ver. 2, because only the parenthetic clause of ver. 7 (ἐστι γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ἐσθήσεως) adapts itself to any extent to the contents of ver. 2, and this parenthetic clause stands in logical subordination to ver. 8 as the main point of the argument, consequently just ver. 8 and ver. 2 must present a similarity of contents, which is not the case. (2) That vv. 9, 10 should be referred back to ver. 1 cannot be accepted as correct, because ver. 1 forms in itself no independent and complete statement, but stands in closest concatenation with ver. 2, so that only with this verse comes in what is for ver. 1 the all-essential point of nearer definition.— From the foregoing it results that the harmonizing view of Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 444, 447) is unwarranted. According to this view, vv. 7, 8 are indeed, "in the first place," or "formally," a link in the demonstration that Christ did not become high priest by an act of arbitrary self-glorification, but as regards
the “contents” or “tenor” form, “at the same time also an indication corresponding to vv. 1–3, and pointing out that Christ upon His path of suffering has passed through experiences which were adapted not only to make Him acquainted with the human ἀθένεια, but also to prove in Him the capacity for the μετρωπάθεια.” — With Tholuck, for the rest, to take vv. 1–3 still in relation to the preceding chapter, as an antithesis to ver. 15, and to begin a new section with ver. 4, is not permissible. For a comparison of the main contents of vv. 1–3 with the main contents of iv. 15, points to the fact that the author designs to bring out a relation of resemblance and affinity. We cannot possibly, therefore, attach, with Tholuck, to the particle γάρ, v. 1, the sense: “the distinction namely arises, that.” The consideration, moreover, presents itself, that ver. 4 can only appear in relation to vv. 1–3, alike as regards tenor of contents as with regard to its lax grammatical nexus; as a further co-ordinate link in an enumeration, before begun, of the qualifications essential to the character of every earthly high priest, consequently is not appropriate to the introduction of a section entirely separated from that which precedes.

Vv. 1, 2. Justification of the δύναθαι συμπαθήσαι ταῖς ἀθένειαις ἡμῶν, iv. 15, as a necessary qualification in the case of Christ, since it is an indispensable requirement even in every earthly high priest. γάρ does not glance back to iv. 16, as is maintained by Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 395) and Delitzsch. For v. 1–3 can in point of contents be taken neither as enforcement nor as elucidation of the admonition, iv. 16. The supposition of Hofmann and Delitzsch, however, that γάρ logically controls the whole section, v. 1–10, is arbitrary, inasmuch as ver. 4 ff. is logically and grammatically bounded off from vv. 1–3, and the assertion that the aim in the section, v. 1–10, is to enforce the exhortation, iv. 16, by a reminder “of the nature of the high-priesthood of Jesus, how on the one hand it bears resemblance to that of Aaron, and on the other hand to the priesthood of Melchisedec” (Hofmann), or of the “blending of Aaronitic humanity (tenderness) with the Melchisedecian dignity in the person of Jesus” (Delitzsch), is entirely erroneous; because, vv. 5–10, Aaron
and Melchisedec are not yet at all distinguished from each other as the lower and the higher; but, on the contrary, this relation—in which the one stands to the other—is for the present left wholly in abeyance, and all that is insisted on is the fact that Christ, even as Aaron, was called by God to the high-priesthood, and that a high-priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec. — πάς] refers, as is evident from εἰς ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος, and from ver. 3, to the earthly, i.e. the Levitical, high priest. Wrongly, because going beyond the necessity of the case and the horizon of the epistle, Grotius (comp. also Peirce): Non tantum legem hie respicit, sed et morem ante legem, quum aut primo genitii familiarum aut a populis electi reges inirent sacerdotium. But neither εἰς ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος a part of the subject ("every high priest taken from among men, in opposition to the heavenly One;" Luther, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Akersloot, Peirce, Wetstein, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Abresch, Kuinoel, Paulus, Stengel, comp. also Tholuck). — for then the order πάς γὰρ εἰς ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος ἱερεύς would have been chosen,—nor is it intended "to lay stress upon the phenomenon, in itself remarkable, that the high priest has to represent men, who are thus his equals, in their relation to God" (Hofmann, Schriften II. 1, p. 396, 2 Aufl.),—for thereby a reference altogether foreign to the connection is introduced, and the thought thus presupposed is itself a singular one, because, so far from its being remarkable, it is, on the contrary, natural and appropriate that like should be represented by its like; it would be remarkable and unnatural if, for instance, a man should represent angels,—but it contains a note of cause to ἐπερ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται. The twice occurring ἀνθρώπων stands full of emphasis, and presents a correspondence between the two. By the εἰς ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος the ἐπερ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται is explained and justified. For the very reason that the high priest is taken from among men, is he also appointed or installed in his office as mediator with God. — καθίσταται] not middle, so that τὰ πρὸς τῶν θεῶν were accusative of object thereto (Calvin: Curat pontifex vel ordinat, quae ad Deum pertinent; Kypke), but passive, so that τὰ πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, as ii. 17, is to be taken as an accusative absolute. — ὅνα κ.τ.λ.] epexegetical amplifica-
tion of ἵππερ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν. — δῶρα
[ἀφίστον] and θυσίαι are properly distinguished as gifts
and sacrifices of every kind, and bloody sacrifices. The dis-
tinction, however, is not always observed. Comp. e.g. LXX.
Lev. ii. 1 ff., Num. v. 15 ff., Gen. iv. 3, 5, where θυσία is
used of unbloody sacrifices; and Gen. iv. 4, Lev. i. 2, 3, 10, al.,
where δῶρα is used of bloody sacrifices. In our passage the
author has, without doubt, specially the bloody sacrifices in
mind; as, accordingly, in the course of the epistle he opposes
the sacrifice presented by Christ to the Levitical victims in
particular. — ἵππερ ἀμαρτίων] i.e. for the expiation thereof. It
belongs not merely to θυσίας (Grotius, Limborch, Bengel,
Dindorf) or to δῶρα τε καὶ θυσίας (Owen, Alford), but to the
whole clause of the design.

Ver. 2 is to be coupled with ver. 1 without the placing of
a comma, in such wise that the participial clause: μετριοπαθεῖν
δυνάμενος, connects itself immediately with the preceding
clause of the design. The purpose of the author is not to
mention the bare fact that the high priest presents gifts and
sacrifices for the expiation of sins, but to dwell on the fact
that he presents them as one who is capable of μετριοπαθεῖν.1
μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος is therefore neither to be resolved into
ίνα δύνηται μετρ. (Heinrichs), nor is it connected, by reason
of a negligent participial construction, like λαμβανόμενος with
ἀρχερέως (Stengel), nor is it added merely “appendicis loco”
(Böhme). — μετριοπαθεῖν] stands not in opposition to συμπα-
θήσατι, iv. 15, for the indication of a difference between the
human high priest and the divine one (Tholuck); it is not,
however, identical in meaning with συμπαθεῖν (Oecumenius,
Calvin, Seb. Schmidt, Baumgarten, Semler, Storr, Abresch, al.),

1 When for the rest Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 396, 2 Aufl.) supposes that
for the expression of this relation of thought only καθίσταται... ἵνα πρεσβύτην
could be chosen, and not καθίσταται... εἰς τὸ πρεσβύτην, since the latter would
“only be a declaration of the vocation” of the high priest, while the former
“can take to itself the participial clause μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος, and thereby
signify to what end it serves in the exercise of his office, that he has been in this
way appointed thereto,” this is grammatically altogether baseless. Either turn
of discourse was equally open to the choice of the author. Only, in case the
latter was chosen, the nominative δυνάμενος must naturally be changed into the
accusative δυνάμενος.
but expresses a kindred notion. It is by virtue of its com-
position equivalent to μετρίως or κατά τὸ μέτρον πάσης, and
is accordingly used of the moderating of one's passions and
feelings, as opposed to an unbridled surrender thereto, but also
as opposed to that absolute ἀπάθεια which the Stoics demanded
of the sage. Comp. Diogen. Laert. v. 31: ἐφη δὲ (sc. Aris-
totle), τὸν σοφὸν μὴ ἐναυ ἐναὶ ἅπαθῆ, μετριοπαθῆ δὲ. Further
instances in Wetstein and Bleek. Here the moderation or
tenderness in the judgment formed upon the errors of one's
neighbour is intended, as this is wont to arise from a sympathy
with the unhappiness of the same which is produced by sin.
Thus: to be tenderly disposed or equitable.—τοῖς ἄγνοοις καὶ πλανομένοις
Dativus commodi: in consideration of
the ignorant and erring. Lenient designation of sinners.
Perhaps, however, designedly chosen (comp. also ix. 7: ἢτοίρ
ἔαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἄγνοορμάτων) in order to bring
into relief only one species of sins, the sins of precipitancy
and without premeditation, inasmuch as according to the
Mosaic law the sacrificial expiation extended only to those
who had sinned ἄκοινωσῖς; those, on the other hand, who had
sinned deliberately and with forethought were to be cut off
from the congregation of Jehovah, Num. xv. 22–31; Lev.
iv. 13 ff.—ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτῶς περίκειται ἀσθένειαν] Confirmation
of the δυνάμενος: since he indeed himself is encircled (as with
a garment) by weakness (altogether beset with it). ἀσθένεια
is to be understood, as vii. 28, of the ethical weakness, thus
also actual sin, comprehended under this expression; comp.
ver. 3.—The construction περίκειμαι τι, which in the N. T.
occurs likewise Acts xxviii. 20, is genuine Greek; comp.
Theocrit. Idyll. xxiii. 14: ύβριν τᾶς ὅργας περικείμενον;
Kühner, Gramm. II. p. 231; Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 215.
Ver. 3. Logical consequence from the second half of ver. 2.
The words form a merely incidental observation. They would
be on that account better regarded as an independent state-
ment than, with de Wette, Delitzsch, Hofmann (Schriftbev.
II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 397), and Woerner, thought of as still dependent
on ἐπει, ver. 2. — δι' αὐτὴν] sc. ἀσθένεια. Quite untrue is
the assertion that the feminine is used Hebraistically instead
of the neuter, which even Bengel and others, with a mistaken
appeal to Matt. xxi. 42 (see Meyer ad loc.), still hold to be possible. — ὄφελμεν] Reference not, as is supposed by Böhme and Hofmann, l.c., to the precept in the law of Moses (Lev. iv. 3, ix. 7, xvi. 6, al.), but, as ii. 17, to the inner necessity arising from the nature of the case. Non-natural the view of Delitzsch and Moll, that both alike are intended. — προσφέρειν] stands, as Luke v. 14, Num. vii. 18, absolutely. With Riehm (Lerhbrgr. des Hebräerbr. p. 434), to look upon ἐπὶ ἀμαρτίαις as definition of object to προσφέρειν is inadmissible, inasmuch as only the singular form ἐπὶ ἀμαρτίας is employed to indicate the notion of "sin-offering" with the LXX., as also in our epistle. Comp. Reiche, Commentarius Criticus ad loc. p. 35.

Ver. 4. The second necessary qualification: to be no usurper of the office, but one called of God to the same. — καὶ] Progress, not from ver. 3, nor yet from ver. 1, in such wise that λαμβάνει, ver. 4, should form a paronomasia with λαμβανόμενος, ver. 1 (Böhme, Bleek, Bisping, Alford, Maier), but from vv. 1–3. — And not to himself does any one take the honour (here under consideration), i.e. not any one appropriates or arrogates to himself the high-priestly dignity on his own authority. Comp. Xiphilinus, Gall. p. 187: νομίζων οὐκ εἰληφέναι τὴν ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ δεδόσθαι αὐτῷ. — ἀλλὰ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ] sc. λαμβάνει αὐτήν, he receives it. The λαμβάνει here to be supplied has consequently — what is wrongly denied by Delitzsch, Hofmann, and Woerner — another notion than the λαμβάνει before placed. This diversity of notion, nevertheless, comes out more strongly in German, where two different verbs must be chosen to indicate it, than in Greek, where one and the same verb combines both significations in itself. — καθώσπερ καὶ Ἄαρών] sc. κληθέλη ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτήν εἰληφεν. These words still belong to that which precedes. They are unnaturally referred by Paulus to the sequel, as its protasis. — Αaron and his descendants were, according to Ex. xxviii. 1, xxix. 4 ff., Lev. viii. 1 ff., Num. iii. 10, xvi.–xviii., called by God Himself to the high-priesthood. Comp. Bammidbar rabba, sec. 18, fol. 234. 4 (in Schöttgen and Wetstein): Moses ad Corachum ejusque socios dixit: si Aaron frater meus sibimet ipsi sacerdotium sumsit, recte egistis, quod contra
 ipsum insurrexistis; jam vero Deus idipsi dedit, cuius est magnitudo et potentia et regnum. Quicumque igitur contra Aaronem surgit, contra ipsum Deum surgit. Not until the time of Herod and the Roman governors were high priests arbitrarily appointed and deposed, without respect to their descent from Aaron. Comp. Josephus, Antiq. xx. 10. 5; Winer, Bibl. Realwörterb. I. p. 591, 2 Aufl. That, however, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Abresch, and others conjecture, the author intended by the words of ver. 4 at the same time to indicate that the high priests of that period were no longer true high priests at all, since they had acquired their office at the hand of men, and in the way of venality, is not very probable, inasmuch as the author would otherwise have expressed himself more clearly with regard thereto.

Vv. 5–10. Demonstration of the presence of the qualification, mentioned ver. 4, in the case of Christ also.

Ver. 5. In like manner also Christ appointed not Himself to be High Priest, but God the Father has appointed Him. The main emphasis in the verse falls upon $\omega\chi\varepsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\nu\ldots$ $\alpha\lambda\lambda\varsigma\omicron\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\sigma\varsigma$. With Hofmann for the rest (Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 398, 2 Aufl.), to take the opening words of the verse: $\omega\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ ka\ i\ \chi\rho\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\varsigma$, separately as an independent clause, is not warranted on any ground. $\omega\chi\varepsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\varepsilon\delta\omicron\varepsilon\alpha\varepsilon\nu$ $\gamma\varepsilon\nu\theta\iota\omicron\nu\nu\iota\ \alpha\rho\chi\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron$] He did not glorify (comp. John viii. 54) Himself (arbitrarily encircle Himself with honour and glory) in order to be made a high priest. — $\varepsilon\delta\omicron\varepsilon\alpha\varepsilon\nu$] is to be taken quite generally, so that it first acquires its nearer definition and completion, under the form of the intention, by means of $\gamma\varepsilon\nu\theta\iota\omicron\nu\nu\iota\ \alpha\rho\chi\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron$. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 298. The referring of the verb, with de Wette, specially to the glorification, mentioned ii. 9, is forbidden by the parallel relation to ver. 4, in that $\omega\chi\varepsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\varepsilon\delta\omicron\varepsilon\alpha\varepsilon\nu$ $\gamma\varepsilon\nu\theta\iota\omicron\nu\nu\iota\ \alpha\rho\chi\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron$ manifestly corresponds exactly to the foregoing statement, $\omega\chi\varepsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu$ $\chi\lambda\alpha\omicron\beta\omicron\alpha\omicron\nu\iota\chi\nu\iota\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$. On account of this parallel relationship in itself, clearly indicated as it is above by the $\omega\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ ka\ i\$, is the view of Hofmann too (Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 398 f. 2 Aufl.) entirely erroneous, namely, that $\omega\chi\varepsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\varepsilon\delta\omicron\varepsilon\alpha\varepsilon\nu$ acquires its nearer defining of signification from vv. 7, 8, in that this relative clause
CHAP. V. 6.

6. denotes the same thing as that negative clause, and consequently is to be brought into relief; not a path of self-glorification was it, but a path of anguish and suffering, by which Christ attained to glory. The violence done in this explanation is already shown, in the fact that the relative clause, ver. 7 ff., is logically subordinate to the οὐχ ἐαυτῶν ἐδόξασεν, as a farther demonstration of the truth thereof; and, moreover, in this relative clause the mention of the suffering of Christ forms not the main element, but only a subsidiary member. — ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ.] sc. αὐτῶν ἐδόξασεν γενηθήναι ἀρχιερέα. The participle aorist λαλήσας is anterior in point of time to the ἐδόξασεν. Thus ὁ λαλήσας: He who had said, sc. before the creation of the world; comp. i. 1–3. Inasmuch as the connection with that which precedes, and the opposition οὐχ ἐαυτῶν ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας, place it beyond doubt that the author can here only design to mention the person or authority by virtue of which Christ possesses His high-priesthood, it results that in the words νῦν μον ἐν σὺ κ.τ.λ. a proof for the fact that Christ is High Priest is not to be sought. Against Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, Limborch, Whitby, Peirce, Stengel, Ebrard, Maier, and others. If it were here already a question with the author of adducing a proof, he would have written without an article ἀλλ' ὁ θεός λαλήσας ("but God, in saying to Him," etc.), instead of writing with the article ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας. But why does not the author simply say ὁ θεός? Why does he employ the periphrasis of the idea of God by means of the words (already cited, i. 5) from Ps. ii. 7? In order to render already apparent, by this designation of God, how little ground can exist for surprise that He who occupies the rank of the Son of God should, moreover, also of God be appointed High Priest.

Ver. 6 now introduces the proof from Scripture that Christ, the Son of God, has also been appointed High Priest. — καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει] as He (sc. God) accordingly speaks in another place of Scripture (namely Ps. cx. 4; comp. Heb. i. 13). — καὶ] belongs not to ἐν ἑτέρῳ, so that we should have to assume that the author has already found in the citation, ver. 5, a Scripture proof for the high-priesthood of Christ,
and now in ver. 6 is adding thereto a second Scripture proof for the same thing (Schlichting, Ebrard, and others), but it belongs to the whole relative clause καθὼς λέγει, and is just the ordinary καί after a particle of comparison; comp. ver. 4. By means of this correct apprehension of the force of καί the objection is further set aside, that ver. 6, if a Scripture proof was first to be given in this place, must have been joined on to that which precedes simply with λέγων, as ii. 6, iv. 7, or with μαρτυρεῖ γὰρ, as vii. 17 (Abresch), or with λέγει γὰρ, or at least with καθὼς without καί (Ebrard). — εὖ εἰρήνευ] See on εὖ τούτῳ, iv. 5. — ἰερεύς] for the author equivalent to ἀρχιερεύς; comp. ver. 10, vi. 20. This equalization is likewise warranted. For Melchisedec (Gen. xiv. 18 ff.), with whom the person addressed is compared, was at the same time king and priest; but with the attributes of a king the attributes of an ordinary priest are irreconcilable; the character sustained by a superior or high priest alone comports therewith. — κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεdek] not: in the time of succession (Schulz), but: after the order or manner (τόν ἄρχαν) of Melchisedec, in such wise that thou obtainest the same position, the same character, as he possessed. Comp. vii. 15: κατὰ τὴν ὀμοιότητα Μελχισεdek. — εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα] the author combines (contrary to the sense of the original) with ἰερεύς into a single idea, comp. vii. 3, 8.

Vv. 7–10. Further proof — accessory to the Scripture testimony, ver. 6 — that Christ did not on His own authority usurp to Himself the high-priesthood, but was invested with the same by God. Far removed from all self-exaltation, He displayed in His earthly life the most perfect obedience towards God. In consequence thereof He became, after His consummation and glorification, the Procurer (Vermüller) of everlasting blessedness for all believers, and was appointed by God High Priest after the manner of Melchisedec. — We have to reject the explanation — mainly called forth by the expression προσενείγκας (compared with vv. 1 and 3) — of Schlichting, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Limborch, Akersloot, Cramer, Baumgarten, Heinrichs, Böhme, Klee, Bloomfield, and others, according to which the design in vv. 7–10 is to show that Christ already discharged the functions of the high-
priestly office during His earthly life, in that He offered prayers as sacrifices to God. For evidently the main gist of vv. 7–10 lies in the words of ver. 8: ἐμαθεν ἄφ' ἐν ἐπαθεν τῇ ὑπακοῇ, to which the statements vv. 9, 10 attach themselves only for the completion of the figure traced out vv. 7, 8, and for leading back to ver. 6. But by the fact that Christ manifested obedience, it cannot by any means be shown that He was already executing the office of High Priest. — Quite mistaken also is the opinion of Kurtz, that, vv. 7–10, a “third requirement of the Levitical high-priesthood, namely, obedience to the will of Him that founded it” (?), is shown to be satisfied in Christ. For neither does the form of the grammatical annexing of ver. 7 to that which precedes point in any way to the conclusion that the author designed to string on to the two necessary qualifications of the earthly high priest yet a third one of equal value; nor, as regards the import, is anything else to be found in vv. 7, 8 than a wider unfolding of the foregoing statement, οὗ ἐαυτὸν ἐδοξάσεν γενηθηναι ἀρχερία, ver. 5.

Ver. 7. Ὠς refers back to the last main idea, thus to ὁ Χριστός, ver. 5. The tempus finitum belonging thereto is ἐμαθεν, ver. 8, in that vv. 7–10 form a single period, resolving itself into two co-ordinate statements (ὅς ἐμαθεν . . καὶ ἐγένετο). To connect the ὅς first with ἐγένετο, ver. 9 (so Abresch, Dindorf, Heinrichs, Stengel, and others), is impossible, since ver. 8 cannot be taken as a parenthesis. — ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ] in the days of His flesh, i.e. during the time of His earthly life. Theodoret: Ἡμέρας δὲ σαρκὸς τὸν τῆς θυτότητος ἐφ' θανόν, τουτέστιν ἡμέρας θυτόν εἶχε τὸ σῶμα. On the whole expression, comp. ii. 14; on αἱ ἡμέραι, in the more general sense of ὁ χρόνος, x. 32, xii. 10. False, because opposed to the current linguistic use of σάρξ (Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. x. 3; Phil. i. 22, 24; 1 Pet. iv. 2, al.), and because ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ obtains its opposition in τελειωθείς, ver. 9,— whereby, in general, the period of Christ's life of humiliation is contrasted with the period of His life of exaltation,—Schlichting: what is specially meant is "tempus infirmitatis Christi, et praesertim illud, quo infirmitas ejus maxime apparuit . . . dies illi, quibus Christus
est passus." The note of time: ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, however, is to be construed with the main verb ἐμαθεῖν, not with the participles προσενέγκας καὶ εἰσακούοντες, which latter form a simply parenthetic clause. — As the occasion of this parenthetic clause δείχεσις... εὐλαβείασ,— in connection with which we have neither, with Theophylact, Peirce, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Maier, Kurtz, and others, to derive the colouring of the linguistic expression from the author's having respect to certain utterances of the Psalms (as Ps. xxii. 25 [24], ἰδίῳ ver. 3 [2], cxvi. 1 ff.), nor with Braun, Akersloot, Böhme, al., to suppose a reference to the loud praying of the Jewish high priest on the great day of atonement; neither is there an underlying comparison, as Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 399 f. 2 Aufl.) strangely supposes, of the supplication of Jesus, which He before (!) the learning of obedience offered for Himself as a sacrifice on account of weakness (!), with the sin-offering which, according to ver. 3, the Levitical high priest had on this day to present for himself before he could yet offer on behalf of the people, — the author has present to his mind, according to the prevailing and, beyond doubt, correct view, the prayer of Christ in Gethsemane, as this was made known to him by oral or written tradition. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 36 ff.; Mark xiv. 32 ff.; Luke xxii. 39 ff. It is true we do not read in our Gospels that Christ at that time prayed to God μετὰ δακρύων. But, considering the great emotion of mind on the part of the Saviour, which is also described in the account given by our evangelists (comp. in particular, Matt. xxvi. 37: ἡρῴατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἄδημονεὶν; Mark xiv. 33: ἡρῴατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἄδημονεὶν; Luke xxii. 44: καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἁγιωτάτῳ ἐκτενεστὲρῳ προσήνχετο ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ ἱδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἱματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν), that fact has nothing improbable about it; comp. also Luke xix. 41; John xi. 35. On account of the addition μετὰ κρανῆς ἵππος, others will have us understand the loud crying of Christ upon the cross (Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34), either, as Calvin, Cornelius a Lapide, Piscator, Owen, Limborch, Schulz, Stein, Stuart, Delitzsch, besides the prayer in Gethsemane, or, as Cajetan, Estius, Calov, Hammond, Kurtz, exclusively, or even,
as Klee, the last cry, with which He departed (Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark xv. 37; Luke xxiii. 46). The supposition of such references we cannot, with de Wette (comp. also Hofmann, Schriftdew. II. I, p. 70 f. 2 Aufl.), characterize as “entirely unsuitable.” For de Wette’s objection, that the author “manifestly regarded the prayer as the preparation and condition of the ἐμαθεῖ,” that it must “thus precede the suffering,” does not apply, since προσενέγκας is not to be resolved into “after,” but into “in that,” or “inasmuch as.” Not as “preparation and condition of the ἐμαθεῖ” is the prayer looked upon by the author, but rather is the historic fact of the fervent prayer of Christ mentioned by him as an evidence that Christ in reality submitted Himself to God, even in the severest sufferings. For that which Hofmann (l.c. p. 67) objects hereto, that the author, if he had meant this, would have written: μαθὼν ἅφ’ ἔπαθεν τὴν ἑπακοὴν δεήσεως τε καὶ ἰκετηρίας προσένεγκεν, is devoid of sense, because, by means of such a transposition, which is merely a secondary statement would be made the main statement. Yet the supposing of such references is not necessary, since also the plural δεήσεως τε καὶ ἰκετηρίας, to which appeal has been made, is sufficiently explained by the repetitions of the prayer in the garden of Gethsemane.—To ἰκετηρία, which conjoined with δέησις further occurs LXX. Job xi. 22 [27], as also with the classic writers, ὀλαία or πάθδος (not κλάδος) is originally to be supplemented, inasmuch as it denotes the olive branch which the suppliant pleading for protection bore in his hand. Later it acquired like significance with ἢκετεία or ἢκεσία. It implies thus the prostrate or urgent entreaty of one seeking refuge. As an intensifying of δέησις it is rightly placed after this. — πρὸς τῶν δυνάμεων σῶζεων αὐτῶν ἐκ θανάτου] is most naturally referred to προσενέγκας (so Calvin, Abresch, al.). To the connecting with δεήσεως τε καὶ ἰκετηρίας (Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll) we are forced neither by the position before μετὰ κραυγῆς ἱσχυρᾶς, nor by the fact of the combination of προσφέρεων with the dative being chosen elsewhere in the epistle (ix. 14, xi. 4), as it is also the more usual one with classical writers, since likewise the conjoining with
πρὸς is nothing out of the way. Comp. c.g. Polyb. iv. 51. 2: προσευγκάμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἀχαίον (equivalent to τῷ Ἀχαίῳ). τὴν χάριν ταῦτην. In the characteristic of God as the One who was able to deliver Christ from death, there lies, at the same time, the indication of that which Christ implored of God. σῷζειν ἐκ θανάτου, however, may denote one of two things, either: to save from death, in such wise that it needs not to be undergone, thus to preserve from death, or: to save out of the death to which one is exposed, so that one does not remain the prey of death, but is restored to life. In favour of the former interpretation seems to plead the fact that Christ, according to the account in the Gospels, in reality prayed that He might be spared the suffering of death. Nevertheless what decides against this, and in favour of the second, is the consideration, in the first place, that Christ in reality still suffered death, and then the addition in our verse that the prayer of Christ was answered. And then, finally, we have to take into account the fact that, according to our Gospels also, Christ does not pray absolutely to be preserved from death, but makes this His wish dependent upon the will of the Father, thus entirely subordinates Himself to the Father.— καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας] and being heard by reason of His piety, or fear of God. In this sense is εὐλαβεία (cf. xii. 28) rightly taken by Chrysostom, Photius, Oecumenius, Theophylact, the Vulgate (pro sua reverentia), Vigil. Taps., Primasius, Lyra, Luther, Castellio, Camerarius, Estius, Casaubon, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Calmet, Rambach, Heinrichs, Schulz, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebr. p. 327), Alford, Reuss, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others.¹ ἀπὸ, as an indication of the occasioning cause, is also of very frequent occurrence elsewhere; cf. Matt. xxviii. 4; Luke xix. 3, xxiv. 41; John xxi. 6; Acts xii. 14, xx. 9, xxii. 11; Kühner, Gramm. II. p. 270. Christ, however, was heard in His prayer, inasmuch as He was raised

¹ In this explanation Linden on Heb. v. 7-9 (Stud. u. Krit. 1860, H. 4, p. 783 ff.) likewise concurs, only he would have ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας separated by a comma from that which precedes, and taken in conjunction with that which follows. This construction, however, is not natural, inasmuch as ἀπὸ already has a nearer definition before and after it, and the linguistic symmetry with the foregoing participial clause is destroyed by the εἰσακουσθεῖς standing alone.
out of death, exalted to the right hand of God, and made partaker of the divine glory. To be rejected is the explanation of the word preferred by Ambrose, Calvin, Beza, Cameron, Scaliger, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Hammond, Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Wetstein, Whitby, Carpzov, Abresch, Böhme, Kuinoel, Paulus, Klee, Stuart, Stein, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt A. K.-Z. 1857, No. 29, p. 665), Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 69, 2 Aufl.), and many others, according to which a pregnancy of meaning is assumed for the same, and εὐλάβεια is interpreted in the sense of "metus:" "heard (and delivered) from the fear." There is then found expressed in it either the thought (and this is the common acceptation) that Christ was delivered from His agony of soul by the strengthening on the part of the angel, Luke xxii. 43, or εὐλάβεια is understood by metonymy of the object of the fear, i.e. death, from which Christ was delivered by the resurrection. So, among others, Calvin: "exauditum fuisse Christum ex eo, quod timebat, ne scilicet malis obrutus succumberet, vel morte absorberetur;" and Schlichting: "a metu i.e. ab eo, quod metuebat, nimirum morte." But against the first modification of this view pleads the fact that the being heard must refer to the same thing as that for which Christ had prayed, but from that which precedes it is evident that Christ had besought God not for deliverance from the agony of soul, but for deliverance from death. Against both modifications pleads the fact that the strong signification of fear is never expressed by εὐλάβεια. Only the mild signification of timidity or εὐνόεια (whether reverential awe of the Godhead, i.e. piety, or shyness of earthly things), as well as the notion arising from that of timidity, namely heedfulness, discretion, circumspection in arranging that which is adapted to the bringing about of a definite result, lies in the word; as accordingly also the Greeks themselves, particularly the Stoics, expressly distinguished from each other φόβος and εὐλάβεια, and pronounced φόβος to be worthy of reprobation; εὐλάβεια, on the other hand, to be a duty. See the instances in Bleek. Nor do the passages anew adduced by Grimm, l.c., Wisd. xvii. 8, 2 Macc. viii. 16, Ecclus. xli. 3, in which the word is
supposed to be used in the sense of fear, and the demonstrative force of which is acknowledged by Delitzsch (p. 190, and Observv. and Correctt.), Riehm (l.c.), and Moll, prove what they are thought to prove. For in the first-mentioned passage we have to understand by κατεγέλαστος εὐλαβεία the perverted, idolatrous, and therefore ridiculous religious awe of the Egyptian magicians; the second passage is only a dissuasive against standing in any awe of the outward superiority in force of the hostile army; and the third, finally, against feeling any awe of death, since this is the common lot of all men. The notion of mere awe, however, is, on account of the preceding strong expressions, μετὰ κραυγῆς ἵσχυρᾶς καὶ δικρών, unsuited to our passage.¹

In addition to this, the assumed construction praegnans in connection with a verb like εἰσακοουσθήναι is, in any case, open to doubt, and is not yet at all justified by the alleged parallels which have been adduced, namely Ps. xxii. 22 [21] (ἐξήσπασαν τὰς ἐκκλησίας, which, however, the LXX. did not understand, and reproduced without pregnancy); LXX. Job xxxv. 12 (ἐκεῖ κεκράξωνται καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσακουσθη [καὶ] ἀπὸ ὅβρεως πονηρῶν, where, however, ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ., as in the Hebrew, refers back to the first verb); Ps. cxviii. 5 (καὶ ἐπῆκουσέ μου εἰς πλατυσμόν κύριος); Heb. x. 22 (ἐφραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνεἴδησεως πονηρᾶς). — The addition καὶ εἰσακοουσθεῖς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας contains, for the rest, logically regarded, merely a parenthetic remark, called forth only by the contents of the foregoing participial clause.

Ver. 8. Καὶ περ ἀν νίοι] belongs together. With Heinrichs and others, to construe καὶ περ with ἔμαθεν, and in this way to enclose ver. 8 within a parenthesis, is forbidden by the

¹ According to Tholuck, the author has before his mind the first petition of the Redeemer in prayer at Gethsemane, the petition with σι ἰωμεῖν, in which is expressed a condition of "lingering hesitancy," of "detractio" (!), which also according to him εὐλαβίαι exactly indicates. From this hesitancy, which with the Redeemer continued just so long as He was absorbed in an abstract manner in the greatness of the impending suffering, He was delivered. Thus, it is true, the first prayer uttered in this condition remained unfulfilled, but it was certainly annulled in the second, wherein His own will had become perfectly harmonized with the divine will. So Tholuck. But neither does εὐλαβίαι ever signify "lingering hesitancy" (not even in Plutarch, Fud. Max. c. 1, where it denotes nothing more than caution or wariness).
grammar, since καὶπερ is never combined with a tempus finitum. καὶπερ ὅν υἱός, however, is to be connected neither, by virtue of an hyperbaton, with δεόντως...προσευχήκας, which Photius (in Oecumenius) and Clarinus consider permissible, but which is already shown to be impossible by means of the addition καὶ εἰσακοστοθείς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνλαβείας, nor yet with καὶ εἰσακοστοθείς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνλαβείας itself (Chrysostom, Theophylact). For against the latter καὶπερ is decisive, according to which the property of Sonship is insisted on as something in consequence of which the main statement might appear strange; it is not, however, strange, but, on the contrary, congruent with nature, if any one is heard by the Father on account of his sonship. καὶπερ ὅν υἱός belongs, therefore, to εὐδαιμονία τοῦ ὑπακοῆν, and serves to bring the same into relief by way of contrast. Notwithstanding the fact that Christ was a Son, He learned from suffering (learned, in that He suffered) obedience, resignation to the will of the Father. Comp. Phil. ii. 6-8. — The article before υπακοῆν marks the definite virtue of obedience. The article here cannot denote, as Hofmann will maintain (Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 72, 2 Aufl), the obedience "already present," or the obedience "in which Jesus stood." For, on the one hand, there must then have been previous mention of the obedience of Jesus, which is not the case; and then, on the other hand, we cannot any longer predicate the learning of a virtue of one in whom this virtue is already present. But altogether, that which Hofmann brings out as the import of ver. 8 is a wonderful Quid pro quo. Instead of recognising, to wit, in vv. 7, 8 the sharply and clearly defined leading statement: δι' ἐν ταῖς ἑμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ...ἐμαθεν...τῆν υπακοήν, in itself, and in its simply confirmatory relation to οὐχ ἐαντον ἑδόξασεν, ver. 5, Hofmann will have the stress to be laid upon the subsidiary defining note ἄφ' ὅν ἐπαθεν, and then, moreover, make the whole weight of the words: καὶπερ ὅν υἱός, fall upon that same ἄφ' ὅν ἐπαθεν! In this way the thought expressed in ver. 8 is, forsooth: that Jesus afterwards (!) suffered that (!) for the averting of which He had made entreaty. The special point is not that He learnt anything as Son, nor that He learnt obedience (?!). He did not learn to

ΜΕΥΕΡ.—ΗΕΒ.
obey, but the obedience in which He stood, He now (!) or in a new manner (!) so learnt, as it should there (!) be exercised, where (!) it was a question (!) of suffering. And this is to be taken as the meaning, in spite of the fact—apart from all other arbitrary assumptions—that we have ἀφ' ἐν ἐπαθεῖν written, and not even ἐν οἷς ἐπαθεῖν, which at least must be expected as a support for such an exposition as that? — ἐμαθεῖν] The disposition of obedience Christ possessed even before the suffering. But this needed, in order to become vouched for, to be tested in action. And this continued development of the disposition of obedience into the act of obedience is nothing else than a practical learning of the virtue of obedience. — ἀπ' with μαθάνειν, as Matt. xxiv. 32, xi. 29, denoting the starting-point. — ἀφ' ἐν ἐπαθεῖν] well-known attraction in place of ἀπ' ἐκείνου ἐπαθεῖν. — The combination ἐμαθεῖν . . . ἐπαθεῖν is also of frequent occurrence with the classic writers and with Philo. Comp. Herod. i. 207: τὰ δὲ μοι παθήματα, έόντα ἁχάριστα, μαθήματα γέγονεν; Soph. Track. 142 f.: ὡς δ' ἕγω θυμοφθορόθ, μὴ ἕκραθοις παθοῦσα; Xenoph. Cyrop. iii. 1. 17: πάθημα ἀρὰ τῆς ψυχῆς σὺ λέγεις εἴναι τῷ σωφροσύνη, ὀσπερ λύπην, σὺ μάθημα; Philo, de special. legg. 6 (with Mangey, II. p. 340): ἦν ἐκ τοῦ παθεῖν μάθη. Many other instances in Wetstein.

Ver. 9. Καὶ τελεσθεῖν] and being brought to consummation, i.e. being crowned with glory by His exaltation to heaven (comp. ii. 9, 10), sc. in consequence of the obedience to God proved by His sufferings and death. — ἐγένετο] He became. Author and Mediator of everlasting blessedness for His believers, Christ certainly was even during His earthly life. But in an eminent manner, because formally and manifestly accredited by God as such, He became so first by His resurrection and exaltation. — πᾶσιν] perhaps added in order to indicate the equal claim of the believing Gentiles also, to the salvation in Christ. — τοῖς ὑπακοίουσιν αὐτῷ] The expression attaches itself in point of form to τῆν ὑπακοήν, ver. 8, with which it forms a paronomasia; in point of subject-matter it is not different from τοῖς πιστεύωσιν (iv. 3). Comp. Rom. x. 16; 2 Thess. i. 8, al. — The mode of expression: αἰτιῶν τινι εἴναι σωτηρίας (comp. τον ἄρχηγον τῆς σωτηρίας
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avrov, ii. 10), is also often met with in Philo, Josephus, and the classical writers. Instances in Wetstein, Kypke, and Bleek.—The adjective aiównos with σώρηπα in the N. T. only here. Comp., however, LXX. Isa. xlv. 17.

Ver. 10 is not to be separated from ver. 9 by a colon, and to be referred back to all that precedes, from ver. 7 onwards (Böhme). On the contrary, the statement connects itself closely with ver. 9, in that it contains an elucidation of the αἰώνιος σώρηπας aiównion there found. Christ became for all believers author of everlasting blessedness, in that He was saluted (or named) of God as High Priest after the manner of Melchisedec. That is to say: In order to become the mediate cause of salvation for others, Christ must be the possessor of high-priestly dignity; but this was ascribed to Him on the part of God in the utterance from the psalm, already cited in ver. 6. Bengel: προσευγορία, appellatio sacerdotis, non solum secuta est consummationem Jesu, sed antecessit etiam passionem, tempore Psalmi cx. 4.—To appoint or constitute (Cassubon: constitutus; Schulz: proclaimed, publicly declared or appointed; Stengel: declared, appointed; Bloomfield: being proclaimed and constituted) προσαγορεύειν, a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in the N. T., never means; but only to address, salute, name.

Ver. 11—vi. 20. The author is on the point of turning to the nearer presentation of the dignity of High Priest after the manner of Melchisedec, which pertains to Christ, and thus of His superiority over the Levitical high priests. But before he passes over to this, he complains in a digression of the low stage of Christian knowledge at which the readers are yet standing, whereas they ought long ago themselves to have been teachers of Christianity; exhorts them to strive after manhood and maturity in Christianity, and with warning admonition points out that those who have already had experience of the rich blessing of Christianity, and nevertheless apostatize from the same, let slip beyond the possibility of recall the Christian salvation; then, however, expresses his confidence that such state of things will not be the case with the readers, who have distinguished themselves, and still do distinguish themselves, by works of Christian love, and indicates that which he desires of them,—namely, endurance to the end,—while at the same
time reminding them of the inviolability of the divine promise and the objective certainty of the Christian hope.

Ver. 11. *Peri oú* ἡμείς ἄρχιερεως κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ. To this total-conception, as is also recognised by Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräer. p. 780), is *peri oú* to be referred back. We have to supplement not merely Χριστοῦ (Oecumenius, Primasius, Justinian), because that would be a far too general defining of the object, inasmuch as confessedly the discourse is not first about Christ in the sequel, but everywhere throughout the epistle. But neither is Μελχισεδέκ to be supplied to *oú* (Peshito, Calvin [Piscator hesitates between this and the following application], Owen, Schöttgen, Peirce, Semler, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford, Maier, al.). For even though—a fact to which Bleek appeals—the author, after having concluded the digression (vii. 1 f.), begins by characterizing this same Melchisedec, yet this description is subordinated to a higher aim, that of setting forth the high-priestly dignity of Christ; as surely also the reference of vii. 1 ff. to the close of the digression (vi. 20) clearly shows, since the former is represented by yap as only the development now begun of the main consideration: Ἡσσούς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἄρχιερεως γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, taken up anew, vi. 20. To take *oú* as a neuter, with Grotius, Cramer, Storr, Abresch, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Stengel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Kurtz, and others, and to refer it to the high-priesthood of Christ after Melchisedec's manner,—according to which *oú* would thus have to be resolved into *peri* τοῦ προσαγορευθνη ἢντον ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄρχιερεα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ,—is possible indeed, but not so natural as when it is taken as a masculine, since the discourse in that which precedes was about the definite person of Christ. — πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος] ἡμείς. Wrongly, because otherwise ἰν εἰ ἡμῖν must have been added, and because a detailed development of the subject really follows afterwards; Peshito, Erasmus, Luther, and others: concerning which we should have much to speak. — καὶ and indeed. — λέγειν] belongs to δυσερμηνευτος. Heinrichs erroneously joins it with ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος. — Even on account of the connectedness of the λέγειν with δυσερμηνευτος, but also on account of the preceding
ημίν, followed by no υμίν, it is inadmissible, with Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Valckenar, Kuinoel, and others, to suppose the difficulty of the exposition or rendering intelligible of the λόγος to exist on the part of the readers, and thus to interpret δυσερμήνευτος in the sense of δυσνόητος, 2 Pet. iii. 16. On the contrary, as the author has abundant material for discoursing on the subject announced, so is it also difficult for the author to render himself intelligible thereon to the readers. The ground of this difficulty which obtains for him is introduced by the clause with ἐπεί, which on that account is to be referred only to δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν, not at the same time (Hofmann) to πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος. For the rest, Storr and Bleek have already rightly remarked, that in the connecting of λόγος with the two predicates πολὺς and δυσερμήνευτος a sort of zeugma is contained, inasmuch as λόγος is to be taken in relation to the first predicate actively¹ in relation to the second passively. On the high-priesthood of Christ after the manner of Melchisedec, the author has much to speak; and truly it is difficult for him to make plain to his readers the contents or subject of his discourse. — γεγόνατε] characterizes the spiritual sluggishness or dulness of the readers not as something which was originally inherent in them, but only as something which afterwards manifested itself in connection with them. Chrysostom: τὸ γὰρ εἰπεῖν ἐπεί νοθρὸν γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς δηλούντος ἢν, ὅτι πάλαι ἤγιαν καὶ ἕσκυποι, τῇ προθυμίᾳ ξειότες, καὶ ὑπερον αὐτῶν τοῦτο παθεῖν μαρτυρεῖ. — νοθρός] in the N. T. only here and vi. 12. — ταῖς ἀκοαῖς] with regard to the hearing, i.e. the spiritual faculty of comprehension. Comp. Philo, Quis rer. divin. haeres. p. 483 (with Mangey, I. p. 474): ἐν ᾕφυκοις ἀνδρίσιν, οἷς ὅτα μὲν ἔστω, ἀκοαὶ δὲ οἷκ ἔνειν. The plural is used, inasmuch as the discourse is of a multitude of persons. On the dative, instead of which the accusative might have been placed, comp. Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 202.

Ver. 12. Justification of the reproach: νοθρὸν γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς, ver. 11. — καὶ γὰρ ὅφειλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι] for when ye ought to have been teachers. καὶ gives intensity to

¹ This is erroneously denied by Delitzsch and Alford. Even the two instances from Dionys. Halicarn., on which Delitzsch relies, plead against him.
the ἄφειλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 10, al. Arbitrarily Bloomfield (ed. 8), according to whom an intermediate link is to be supplied in connection with καὶ γάρ: "[And such ye are,] for though ye ought, according to the time, to be teachers," etc.— διὰ τὸν χρόνον] by reason of the space of time, i.e. because already so considerable a space of time has passed since ye became Christians. In like manner is διὰ τὸν χρόνον often employed by classical writers. Comp. c.g. Aelian, Var. Hist. iii. 37: οἱ πάντες παρ' αὐτοῖς γεγηρακότες ... πάνουσι κόνειοι, ὅταν ἐαυτοῖς συνειδάσωι, ὅτι πρὸς τὰ ἔργα τὰ τῇ πατρίδῳ λυσιτελώντα ἄχρηστοι εἰσιν, ἵπποληρούντες ἕση τι αὐτοῖς καὶ τῆς γνώμης διὰ τὸν χρόνον. — As regards that which follows, there is a controversy as to whether we have to accentuate τίνα or τίνα. The word is taken as an interrogative particle by the Peshito and Vulgate, Augustine, Tract. 98 in Joh.; Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Wolf, Bengel, Abresch, Schulz, Kuinoel, Klee, de Wette, Tischendorf, Stengel, Bloomfield, Conybeare, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 780; Reuss, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, and the majority. As an indefinite pronoun, on the other hand, it is taken by Oecumenius, Luther, Calvin, Peirce, Cramer, Heinrichs, Böhme, Lachmann, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, Bisping, Alford, Woerner, and others. The latter alone grammatically possible. For in the opposite case, since the subject is a varying one in the tempus finitum (χρείαν ἔχετε) and the infinitive (διδάσκεσθαι), either the infinitive passive must be written, τοῦ διδάσκεσθαι ὑμᾶς, or to the infinitive active a special accusative of the subject (perhaps ἐμὲ) must be further added. Nor is 1 Thess. iv. 9 decisive in opposition hereto, since there the reading of Lachmann: οὐ χρείαν ἔχομεν γράφεων ὑμῖν, is the only correct one. See, besides, the remarks in my Commentary on the Thessalonians, ad loc. [E. T. p. 118 f.]. As, moreover, in a grammatical respect, so also in a logical respect is the accentuation τίνα to be rejected. For upon the adopting thereof the thought would arise, that the readers anew required instruction upon the question: which articles are to be reckoned among the στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ, or else: of what nature these are. But manifestly the author is only complaining—as is plain also from the
explicative clause: καὶ γεγόνατε κ.τ.λ.—of the fact that the readers, who ought long ago to have been qualified for instructing others, themselves still needed to be instructed in the στοιχεία. While, for the rest, de Wette and Riehm erroneously find in the indefinite τινά “too strong a signification,” Delitzsch is equally mistaken in characterizing it as “unmeaning” and “flat.” With justice does Alford remark, in opposition to the last-named: “So far from τινά, some one, being, as Delitzsch most absurdly says, 'matt und nichtssagend,' it carries with it the fine keen edge of reproach; q. d. to teach you what all know, and any can teach.” — ὑμᾶς] proposed to the τινά, in order to bring into the more marked relief the antithesis to εἰναι διδάσκαλοι. — The notion of rudimenta already existing in τὰ στοιχεία is made yet more definitely prominent by the genitive τῆς ἀρχῆς (Calvin: “quo plus incutiat pudoris”). Thus: the very first primary grounds or elements. Analogous is the use of the Latin prima rudimenta, Justin. vii. 5; Liv. i. 3; prima elementa, Horace, Serm. i. 1. 26; Quintil. i. 1. 23, 35; Ovid, Fast. iii. 179.— τῶν λογιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ] of the utterances of God. Comp. Acts vii. 38; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Rom. iii. 2. What is intended is the saving revelations of Christianity, which God has caused to be proclaimed as His word. To think of the Old Testament prophecies, and their interpretation and reference to the Christian relations (Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Schulz, Stengel, and others; comp. also Hofmann and Woerner ad loc.), is inadmissible; since the expression τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, in consideration of its generality, always acquires its nearer defining of meaning only from the context, while here, that which was, ver. 12, mentioned as τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ, is immediately after (vi. 1) designated ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος. — γεγόνατε] reminds anew, even as the preceding ἦδα, of the earlier more gladdening spiritual condition of the readers. — γάλακτος καὶ οὐ στερεάς τροφῆς] On the figure, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 2: γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρόμα. Philo, de Agricult. p. 188 (with Mangey, I, p. 301): 'Εστεὶ δὲ νηπίως μὲν ἐστὶ γάλα τροφῆς, τελείως δὲ τὰ ἐκ πυρὸν πέμματα, καὶ ψυχῆς γαλακτωδεὶς μὲν ἀν εἶν τροφαὶ κατὰ τὴν παιδείαν ἧλικιαν, τὰ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου μουσικῆς προπαιδεύματα τελειαὶ δὲ
By the milk, the author understands the elementary instruction in Christianity; by the solid food, the more profound disclosures with regard to the essence of Christianity, for the understanding of which a Christian insight already more matured is called for. In connection with the former, he thinks of the doctrinal topics enumerated vi. 1, 2 (not, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Clarius, and others suppose, of the doctrine of the humanity of Christ in contradistinction from that of His Godhead, which is foreign to the context); in connection with the latter, mainly of the subject, just the treatment of which will pre-eminently occupy him in the sequel,—the high-priesthood of Christ after the manner of Melchisedec. — The statement of ver. 12 has been urged by Mynster (Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1829, H. 2, p. 338), Ebrard, and others, in proof that the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot have been addressed to the Palestinean congregations, particularly not to the congregation at Jerusalem. The tenor of the verse might, it is true, appear strange, considering that the congregation at Jerusalem was the parent congregation of all the others, and out of its midst had proceeded the most distinguished teachers of Christianity. Nevertheless this last fact is not at all called in question by the statement of the verse. For the author has present to his mind the condition of the congregation as it was in his own time; he is addressing—in favour of which also διὰ τῶν χρόνων pronounces—a second generation of Palestinean Christianity. The narrow-minded tendency, however, which this second generation had assumed, instead of advancing in its growth to the recognition of the freedom and universality of Christianity as the most perfect religion, might well justify with regard to it the utterance of a reproach such as we here meet with. Only thus much follows from the words,—what is also confirmed by xiii. 7,—that when the author wrote, James the Lord's brother had already been torn from the congregation at Jerusalem by death, since he would otherwise certainly have written in another tone.

Vv. 13, 14. Establishing of the γεγονατε χρειαν έχοντες
γάλακτος καὶ οὖστερᾶς τροφῆς, ver. 12. Sense: for it is universally characteristic of him who (in a spiritual respect) has need of milk, that he is, because not of ripe age, still inexperienced in the λόγος δικαιοσύνης; and this is just your case. Solid food, on the other hand, is proper only for the τέλειος; τέλειος, however, ye are not yet. In connection with this acceptance of the words, there is no occasion for finding anything out of place in the γάρ in relation to that which precedes, and either, with Storr, making it co-ordinate with the γάρ, ver. 12, and referring it back like this to ver. 11,—which on account of the figure vv. 13, 14, retained from ver. 12, is already seen to be inadmissible,—or for saying, with Bleek and Bisping, that the progress of thought would come out more naturally if the author had written: πᾶς γάρ ὁ ἀπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης μετέχει γάλακτος· νῦντοι γάρ ἐστιν.—ο μετέχων γάλακτος] he who (in a spiritual respect) partakes of milk, i.e. only in this possesses his nourishment, is not in a position to take in solid food. Bengel: Lacte etiam robustiores vexuntur, sed non lacte praecipue, sedum lacte solo. Itaque notantur hoc loco ii, qui nil denique nisi lac aut capiunt aut petunt.—ἀπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης] sc. ἐστιν, he is still inexperienced in the word of righteousness. Expositors have almost without exception been guided by the presupposition (as also Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Kurtz still are) that λόγος δικαιοσύνης is only a varying form of expression for the same idea as is expressed, vv. 12, 14, by στερεᾶ τροφῆς, or, vi. 1, by τελειότητης. λόγος δικαιοσύνης has then either been taken as equivalent to λόγος δίκαιος or τέλειος, and the higher, more perfect type of doctrine found indicated in the expression. So Schlichting (“sermo justitiae videtur positus pro sermone justo, h. e. perfecto ac solido”), Grotius (“Hic δικαιοσύνης dixit pro τελειότητης . . . et genitivus est pro adjectivo”), Abresch (“doctrina vel institutione justa, h. e. perfecta, plena, omnina complectens, quae ad perspicuam distinctamque pertinens doctrinae Christianae intelligentiam”), Schulz (“that true [rightly so called] higher doctrine”), Kuinoel, Bisping, Kurtz, and many others. Or δικαιοσύνης has been more correctly regarded as genitive of the object. In the latter case δικαιοσύνη is taken either, as Michaelis, ad Peirc., with an appeal to the Hebrew וִיבִּ, in
the sense of ἀλήθεια, as the doctrine of the essence of the matter itself, in opposition to the typical figures thereof; or לוגוς δικαιοσύνης is understood specially, as by Oecumenius, of the לוגוς περί τῆς θεότητος τοῦ κυρίου, or, as by Carpzov, of the: “doctrina de sacerdorio Jesu Christi Melchisedeciano, quae dicitur ὁ λόγος δικαιοσύνης propterea, quia Melchisedecus, vi nominis, βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης vertitur, vii. 2, eaque appellatio ad Christum sacerdotem applicatur, cujus πρέπον fuit πληρώσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην, Matt. iii. 15;” or the words are made to refer, as by Primasius, Zeger, Bengel, de Wette, and others, to intellectual and moral perfection in general, as also already Chrysostom, who explains the expression by ἡ ἀνα φιλοσοφία (and after him Theophylact), leaves us the choice of understanding the βίος ἅλκος καὶ ἕρμεθωμένος (according to Matt. v. 20), or τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τὸν ἐνθαλθὸν περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον. But the fundamental presupposition, out

1 Delitzsch, too, with an allusion to the use of πρᾶτ, πρᾶ, προτῆρημ, takes δικαιοσύνη as a synonym of ἀλήθεια; but will then have the genitive δικαιοσύνης looked upon not as expressing the contents, but as a defining of the quality of λόγος, and will interpret λόγος of the faculty of speech. Thus, then, λόγος δικαιοσύνης is taken to mean: “the faculty of speaking in accordance with righteousness,” i.e. the “discourse on spiritual things which is guided in strict accord with the norm of the true, and harmoniously combines all the factors of the case, proportionately regarded, without leaving one of them out of sight;” and in ver. 13 is supposed to be contained the following “most rigid connection of ideas:” “he who must still receive milk is still ignorant of rightly-constituted, i.e. right-teaching or orthodox, discourse; for he is a child only beginning to liap, and not yet capable of speech.” This strange view, based upon the incompassible grounds, that “since νόσος (from νῦν and ἐνέχει) denotes one incapable of speech, an infant, there is a presumption in favour of λόγος in λέγει λόγος δικαιοσύνης having the signification of faculty of speech,—and this signification is here the more probable in regard to the αἰσθητήρα occurring in the antithetic parallel clause, inasmuch as ἀ λόγος, in the sense of language, is met with countless times in Philo along with the αἰσθητήρας or the νόσος αἰσθητήρας, of which the organs are known as αἰσθητήρα,”—bears its refutation upon the face of it. It is not at all suitable to the connection, as Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 734) and Alford have already observed; since according to this there is no question as to the faculty for speaking on spiritual subjects, but only as to the faculty for understanding the same. — As “discourse” will Hofmann also have λόγος interpreted, in that he fully subtilizes the notion lying in δικαιοσύνη, and finds indicated by the total expression λόγος δικαιοσύνης only “correct discourse.” For, according to him, the words ver. 13 are used in their most literal sense, and allude to the fact that he who is still fed with milk at the maternal breast is as yet no judge of correct discourse!
of which all these interpretations have sprung, is an erroneous one. For the emphasis falls not upon λόγου δικαιοσύνης, but upon the ἀπειρος, on that account preposed. Not for a non-possession of the λόγος δικαιοσύνης, but only for a want of experience in the same, only for an insufficient, schoolboy's knowledge of it, does the author blame the readers. The λόγος δικαιοσύνης in itself, therefore, stands as indifferently related to the notion of the στερεά τροφή or τελείωτης as to the notion of the στοιχεία, to which Ebrard reckons it. Only by the more or less exhaustive imparting of its subject-matter does it become the one or the other. For the word of righteousness is nothing more than a periphrasis of Christianity or the gospel, inasmuch as just the righteousness availing with God is the central-point of its contents. Quite analogous to this mode of designation is the Pauline characterization of the gospel office of teaching by ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης, 2 Cor. iii. 9, and of the teachers of Christianity by διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης, 2 Cor. xi. 15; on which account also it is unnecessary, for the justification of the expression chosen, with Bleek, Bisping, and Maier, to assume an allusion to the exposition of the name Melchisedec, βασίλεις δικαιοσύνης, given vii. 2.— νήπιος γάρ ἐστιν] for he is still a babe, a novice in Christianity. Setting forth of the naturalness of the ἀπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης.

Ver. 14. The opposition: for perfect or more matured

1 Of the righteousness availing with God (comp. also xi. 7), have Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Peirce, Storr, Klee, Tholuck, Bleek, Stein, Ebrard, Bloomfield, and others already rightly interpreted δικαιοσύνη. — In the above exposition, Alford, Richm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 733), and Woerner have concurred; save that, according to Richm, by virtue of an over-refined distinction, the gospel is not called the word of righteousness "because the righteousness availing with God is the central-point of its contents," but "because it leads to righteousness; because, by its proclamation to man, the possibility is created and the opportunity is afforded of entering into a condition of the righteousness of his relation to God, inasmuch, namely, as he assumes a believing attitude towards the word proclaimed." But why should the author, familiar as he was with Paul's manner of teaching, and attaching his own doctrinal presentation thereto,— albeit with independence of character,— have shrunken from recognizing, as the central theme of the gospel, "the righteousness which avails with God," since even this was only a general notion, which did not exclude a peculiar conception and treatment, where it was a question of the development of details, and insistence thereon?"
Christians, on the other hand (and only for them), is the solid food. — τελείων is with emphasis preposed. — τῶν δὲ τὴν ἔξιν κ.τ.λ.] more precise characterizing of the τελείων: for those who, etc. — ἔξις] like the following αἰσθητήριον, in the N. T. αὐτὰξ λεγόμενον. It corresponds to the Latin habitus, and is used in particular of the condition produced by use and wont. Here it denotes the capacity or dexterity acquired by practice. Comp. Quintil. x. 1. 1: firma quaedam facilis, quae apud Graecos ἔξις nominatur. — τὰ αἰσθητήρια] the organs of the senses; transferred to that which is spiritual: the power of apprehension. Comp. LXX. Jer. iv. 19: τὰ αἰσθητήρια τῆς ψυχῆς μου. — γεγυμνασμένα] Predicate; literally: as exercised. On the whole turn of discourse, comp. Galen, De dignot. puls. 3 (in Wetstein): δὲ μὲν γὰρ . . . τὸ αἰσθητήριον ἔχει γεγυμνασμένον ἰκανῶς . . . οὕτως ἀριστος ἄν εἰτ ἵππόμοιον. — πρὸς διάκρισιν κ.τ.λ.] for the distinguishing of good and bad. The words may be taken with γεγυμνασμένα, or they may be taken with the whole expression γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων. The καλὸν τὲ καὶ κακόν, however, is to be understood of the right and the wrong, or of the wholesome and the pernicious, not, with Stein, of that which is morally good or evil. Chrysostom: νῦν οὖν περὶ βίου αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος, ὡταν λέγη ἀντὶς διάκρισιν καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ (τοῦτο γὰρ παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ δυνατὸν εἶδέναι καὶ εὐκολον) ἀλλὰ περὶ δογμάτων ἰγιῶν καὶ ἰψηλῶν, διεφθαρμένων τε καὶ ταπεινῶν.
CHAPTER VI

VER. 2. Instead of the *Recepta* *διδακτια*, Lachm. reads *διδαχὴ*. But the accusative has the support only of B and the Latin translation in D (doctrinam), and is a mere transcriber's error.


Vv. 1–3. It is disputed whether in these verses the author carries out his purpose of advancing, with the pretermission of the Christian elementary instruction, to objects of deeper Christian knowledge; or whether there is contained in the same a summons to the readers, no longer to cling to the doctrines of the first principles of Christianity, but to strive to reach beyond them and attain to Christian maturity and perfection.1 The former supposition is favoured by Primasius,

1 Delitzsch and Rhein (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerb. p. 781 f.), to whom Maier, Kluge, Kurtz, and Woerben have given in their adhesion, have thought to be able to escape the stringency of the above either... or... They will have us recognise the one to the non-exclusion of the other, in that they find expressed at the same time the exhortation to the readers to strive after the τελειώμα, and the design of the writer to lead forward the readers to the τελειώμα. But this (comp. also Beich, Comment. Crit. p. 37, note 2) is an unnatural, absolutely impossible assumption. The announcement of the author's design to advance to a more difficult section of his disquisition, and the exhortation to the endeavour after Christian maturity addressed to others, are two so mutually irreconcilable declarations, as not possibly to admit of being expressed at the same time into the φιλεστάται, ver. 1, and τεντόν τυλικόν, ver. 3. Just as little can at the same time be indicated by τελειωμα, ver. 1, the condition of ripe age in Christianity, and the Christian teaching activity of another in reference to higher things. If, therefore, the author had designed to express both together,—alike an incitement of the readers, as also the carrying out of his own intention,—he must necessarily have brought under review each one separately, i.e. first the one and then the other. In addition to this, there is the further consideration that the view of Delitzsch and Rhein bears the character of half measures. For they do not even venture to push it to a consistent conclusion, in that surely the same two-sidedness of reference which attaches to the principal verb φιλεστατά (and to the τεντόν τυλικόν which resumes the thought of the same), must also attach to the participles ἄφιναι and καταλληλόων; but as it is, the participles are supposed to have grammatically, it is true, the same two-sided subject as the principal verbs; logically, on the other hand, to refer preponderantly (i.e. according to the preceding remark in Delitzsch, p. 209, init. : exclusively) to the author!
Luther, Vatablus, Zeger, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Limborch, Wolf, Bengal, Peirce, Cramer, Michaelis, Morus, Storr, Abresch, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Klee, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Reiche (Comment. Crit. p. 36 sqq.), Conybeare, Reuss, M'Caul, Hofmann (Komm. p. 231), and many others; the latter, on the other hand, by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, Gennadius (in Oecumenius), Theophylact, Faber Stapulensis, Calvin, Clarius, Justinian, Jac. Cappellus, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, Hofmann (Schriftden. I. p. 636, 2 Aufl.), Moll, and others. The connection with the preceding and following context decides against the first acceptation and in favour of the second. The author has just now charged the readers with dulness, and complained that they are still children in Christian understanding. It is not possible, therefore, that he should now continue in the strain: “on that account he purposes, passing over the doctrines of the initial stage, to treat in his address of objects of higher, profounder Christian knowledge;” whereas, on the other hand, the exhortation to ascend to a higher stage fittingly links itself to the complaint of the lower standpoint of the readers, which still continues unchanged notwithstanding all legitimate expectation to the contrary. No wonder, then, that expositors have been forced, in connection with the first-named explanation, to have recourse to arbitrary interpretations of the διό, vi. 1; either in completing the idea, as Grotius, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, and others, by: “therefore, because surely no one of you wishes to remain a νήπιος,”—which, however, as the middle term, must have been expressly added, since no reader could divine this from that which precedes,—or in referring it, as Schlichting and Reuss, to the first words of v. 11: περὶ οὗ πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμῆνετος λέγειν, and regarding all that intervenes in the light of remarks appended by way of parenthesis,—which, nevertheless, is to be rejected, even on account of the intimate connection of δυσερμῆνετος λέγειν, v. 11, with the following ἐπεὶ κ.τ.λ.,—or finally, what is lexically impossible, denying to it a causal signification, and then translating it either, as Morus, by “yet” (doch), or, as Zachariae, by “nevertheless” (indessen), or as Abresch, by
But no less does the coherence with that which follows decide against the first interpretation and in favour of the second. For it is quite comprehensible how the reason given, ver. 4 ff., should be able to lend emphasis to a preceding exhortation, but not how the declaration of the author, that he now intended to pass over to more difficult, more profound themes for instruction, should be explained thereby. (See on vv. 4—6.) In ἀφένεις there lies no decisive ground in favour of either the one or the other view (against de Wette, Bisping, and others), and ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα, as also θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενον, is more relevant to the case of the readers than to that of the author (vide infra).— Αἰών therefore, i.e. since the solid food is suited only to ἀφειότα, ye, however, do not yet belong to the number of the τελειοι. — ἀφιέναι] is not only employed by orators and historians to indicate that they intend to pass over some subject or leave it unmentioned (comp. e.g. Demosth. de Falsa Legat. p. 433, 28: πάντα τὰ ἄλλα ἀφεῖς, ἀ πάντες ὑμεῖς ὥστε ἐρῶ), but serves with equal frequency to denote the leaving unnoticed or leaving aside of an object in actual conduct. Comp. e.g. Mark vii. 8: ἀφένεις τὴν ἐντολήν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων; Luke v. 11: ἀφένεις πάντα ἥκολούθησαν αὐτῷ; Eurip. Androm. 393: ἄκηθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀφεῖς πρὸς τὴν τελειότην, ὅστεραν οὖσαν, φέρῃ; In our passage it is the leaving aside of the lesser, in order to reach beyond it and attain to the higher. Entirely akin to the ἀφιέναι τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγου is that which Paul, Phil. iii. 14, denotes as ἐπιθυμῶντες τὰ ὅπισώ. As in the passage named Paul speaks of a forgetting of that already attained upon the path of Christian perfection, only with a glance at the goal as yet unattained, and not in an absolute sense,—as though he would in reality deny all actual significance to that which was already attained,—quite so does the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews stir up the readers to an ἀφιέναι τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγου, only inasmuch as they are called to rise, beyond that which forms a mere preliminary stage, to something higher, without in any way implying thereby that the τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος, which certainly, as a base presupposed as already present, remains
necessary for all subsequent building, should at all cease to be
their possession. The objection, that ἀφέντες cannot be referred
to the readers, because instead of a leaving aside (letting go)
a holding fast or renewing of the τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος must rather be demanded as a means for attaining to
τελειότης, has therefore no force. Comp. Calvin: Jubet
autem omittit ejusmodi rudimenta, non quod eorum oblivisci
unquam debeant fideles, sed quia in illis minime est haerendum.
Quod melius patet ex fundamenti similitudine, quae mox
sequitur. Nam in exstruenda domo nunquam a fundamento
discendere oportet; in eo tamen jaciendo semper laborare
ridiculum.—τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον] the word of
the beginning concerning Christ, i.e. the Christian doctrine in its
first rudiments or elements. τῆς ἀρχῆς locks together with
τὸν λόγον into a single notion, and upon this total-notation
tοῦ Χριστοῦ depends. The whole expression, however,
amounts to the same thing as was before (v. 12) denoted by
τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ.—ἡ τελειότης]
in connection with our apprehension of vv. 1—3, determines
itself naturally as perfection, i.e. manhood and maturity in
Christianity, and that in an intellectual respect, not in an
ethical or practical one, in which latter sense the expression
has been accepted—arbitrarily, because opposed to the con-
nection with v. 11—14—by Chrysostom (βίος ἀριστος),
Gennadius (χρηστὴ πολιτεία καὶ τῆς πίστεως ἄξια), Photius
(ἡ ἐν ταῖς ἀρεταῖς προκοπὴ, ἡ τῶν θλίψεων καὶ διωγμῶν καὶ
πειρασμῶν ὑπομονή), Oecumenius (ἡ τῶν ἐργῶν φιλοσοφία),
Clarius (non solum superioris illius de Christo theologiae
comprehensio, quantum homini fas est, verum etiam professus
in virtutes et afflictionum persecutionumque tolerantia), and
others. Those who find in vv. 1—3 a statement of the author
concerning his intention, must naturally understand τελειότητος
of the perfection of doctrine, i.e. of the deeper disclosures with
regard to Christianity. But this is, at all events, a forced
interpretation of the simple notion of the word, such as neither
corresponds to the usage in other cases (comp. Col. iii. 14),
nor in our passage appears in keeping with the context. For,
since immediately before the discourse was of τέλειοι in
opposition to νηπίοι, so here only the condition of the
τέλειοι can consistently with nature be the meaning of the τελειότης. Had the author intended the perfection of doctrine, he must at least have written ἐν τὰ τῶν τελεῖον instead of ἐν τὴν τελειότητα; for only in this way would he have acquired a notion corresponding to the preceding ἡ στερεά τροφή, v. 14. — φερόμεθα] The author includes himself in the exhortation (cf. iv. 14, al.), and thereby tempers the same. φέρεσθαι ἐπὶ τι, to be carried away to something, to strive with zeal after something. — θεμέλιον καταβάλλομενοι] a formula fully current in later Greek style (Dionys. Halicarn. iii. 69; Josephus, Antiq. xi. 4. 4, al. [whereas Paul and Luke employ τιθέναι, 1 Cor. iii. 10; Luke vi. 48, xiv. 29]), to denote the laying of the foundation. Even on account of the usualness of this mode of speech, it is quite a misapprehension of the meaning when Ebrard would here vindicate for καταβάλλομενοι the signification: “demolish.” But also the position of the word decides against this, since καταβάλλομενοι must have its place before θεμέλιον, whereas the placing of it after shows that the emphasis must fall upon θεμέλιον, not upon the verb; θεμέλιον thus stands in antithesis to the following τελειότητα. The participial clause: μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβ. κ.τ.λ., accordingly forms an elucidation to ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγου. — The genitive μετάνοιας, etc., indicates the material with which the foundation is laid, and, indeed, each two of the instances named belong together, so that three pairs of the first principles of Christianity are enumerated. The article before the single substantives is omitted throughout; not, as Böhme and Bleek suppose, out of a consideration for the rhythm, lest otherwise the articles should too greatly accumulate, but because the sense is: with things such as μετάνοια, etc. — Further, as subject in καταβάλλομενοι we have to regard the readers of the epistle (not the author), because the same subject is presupposed for the μετάνοια and the θεμέλιον καταβάλλομενοι; but the μετάνοια, which cannot denote the doctrine of the change of mind, —since otherwise, as with the words in ver. 2, the addition of διδαχή could not have been wanting,—but expresses the act of the change of mind itself, beyond doubt relates to the readers of the letter, not to the author. — Not anew are the
readers to lay the foundation by μετάνοια ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων and πίστις ἐπὶ θεῶν; since this foundation has with them already been laid, it is now thus only a question of continuing to build upon the foundation laid. Not in such wise are they accordingly to behave, that the primary requirement of turning from the ἔργα νεκρά and having πίστις towards God, must ever afresh be made with regard to them. — The construction μετάνοια ἀπό, as with μετανοεῖν, Acts viii. 22; LXX. Jer. viii. 6. — ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων] By νεκρά the works are not characterized as sinful, and by sin occasioning death (Piscator, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Peirce, Abresch, Bisping, Stuart, and others), nor as defiling, as according to the law of Moses contact with a dead body defiled (Michaelis, al.), but as in themselves vain and fruitless [see on ix. 14]. Perhaps the author has—what is on no sufficient grounds contested by R. Köstlin (Theol. Jahrb. von Baur und Zeller, 1854, H. 4, p. 469 ff., Remark), Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 568), and Kurtz—before his mind the service of works under the Mosaic law, from which the readers had not yet been able to free themselves. A contradiction, as Riehm supposes (i.e. p. 835 f.), of the fact recognised, p. 16, that πίστις with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews does not, as with Paul, involve an opposition to the νόμος and the ἔργα νόμου, lies not in this expression. For neither in our passage is mention made of νεκρὰ ἔργα in relation to πίστις, but only in relation to the factor of the μετάνοια which precedes the πίστις. — καὶ πιστεύως ἐπὶ θεῶν] The positive reverse side to the negative μετάνοια ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων. The ideas conveyed by the μετανοεῖν and πιστεύειν, the μετάνοια and the πίστις, likewise associated with each other, Mark i. 15; Acts xx. 21. These words, however, are to be understood, as Abresch, Bleek, and others rightly insist, in accordance with the signification, which the author is otherwise wont to attach to πίστις, of the believing confidence in God, as the one who in part has already fulfilled the promises of salvation given in the person of Jesus Christ, in part will yet completely fulfill them.

Ver. 2. Βαπτισμοῦ διδαχῆς] We have not to divide by a comma, with Cajetan, Luther, Hyperius, Sykes, Semler, Morus, Heinrichs, Schulz, de Wette, Conybeare, and others
[after the Syriac], in such wise that \( \text{bap\tauio\}m\omega\) and \( \delta\text{ia}\chi\) are each separately enumerated as a particular subject for elementary instruction in Christianity. \( \Delta\text{ia}\chi\) must in this case mean the elementary instruction in Christianity connected with baptism, imparted either before or after the same. But since, at the close of the verse, the \( \alpha\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \nu\kappa\epsilon\rho\rho\nu\) and the \( \kappa\rho\mu\alpha\ \alpha\iota\omicron\nu\omicron\) are mentioned, while the treatment of these subjects for teaching belonged equally to the first stage of instruction in Christianity, it is not easy to perceive why, in addition to that \( \delta\text{ia}\chi\), these two points, presupposed in the same, should be brought into special relief by the author. Then there is the consideration that all the particulars which are mentioned before and after as constituent parts of the \( \theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\omicron\) are designated by a double expression. Seeing the care bestowed by the author upon the symmetrical proportions of his discourse, we should therefore naturally be led to regard \( \text{bap\tauio\}m\omega\ \delta\text{ia}\chi\) as a corresponding double expression. But even as thus apprehended the expression is capable of a twofold explanation. The question, namely, is whether the author is speaking of \( \text{bap\tauio\}m\omega\ \delta\text{ia}\chi\) or of a \( \text{bap\tauio\}m\omega\ \delta\text{ia}\chi\). In the first case baptisms with a view to doctrine are meant, in the second instruction concerning baptisms. In the first acceptance the term is taken by Bengel, Michaelis, Maier, Kurtz, as also Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 181 (less decidedly, 5 Aufl. p. 217); in the last, by Bleek and the majority. Against the first view pleads, on the one hand, the fact that the addition \( \delta\text{ia}\chi\) would be something too little characteristic, almost unmeaning, since a Christian baptism, not preceded, accompanied, or followed by instruction in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, would be something inconceivable; on the other hand, that in this way the erroneous secondary meaning would arise, that there were, in addition to the Christian baptisms with a view to doctrine, also other Christian baptisms. We follow, therefore, the second mode of interpretation. In connection with this the plural \( \text{bap\tauio\}m\omega\) still presents some difficulty. Gerhard, Dorscheus, Ernesti, M'Lean, Stuart, and others arbitrarily set aside this difficulty, in that they suppose just the plural to be placed for the singular.
But neither is the plural to be explained by the assumption that respect is had to the proneness of the Hebrews for often repeating the Christian baptism, in conformity with the many \textit{baptismoi} in Judaism (Oecumenius, Theophylact), or, at the same time, to the outward and inner baptism (Grotius, Whitby, Braun, Brochmann; Reuss: la différence du baptême d'eau et du baptême d'esprit). Just as little by the supposition that reference is made to a plurality of baptismal candidates or baptismal acts (Theodoret, Primasius, Beza, Er. Schmid, Owen, Heinrichs, \textit{al.}), or to a repeated immersing of the candidate. Most in its favour has the opinion of Jac. Cappellus, Seb. Schmidt, Schöttgen, Wolf, and others, in which more recently also Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Bleek, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (\textit{Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.} p. 724), Alford, and Moll have concurred; namely, that the author is thinking not so much of Christian baptism in itself, or exclusively, as along with it at the same time of the relation of the same to the Jewish lustrations, and perhaps also to the baptism of John. This view appears at least to acquire a point of support from ix. 10, according to which the readers still continued to esteem the washings enjoined by the Mosaic law as of importance for Christians too. Yet it seems to be precarious, with Jac. Cappellus, Bleek, and others, to urge in favour of this acceptation the distinction that in the N. T. only \textit{baptismo} is used for Christian baptism in the proper sense of the term, \textit{baptismo-μος}, on the other hand, being in the N. T. a word of wider signification (ix. 10; Mark vii. 4); precarious, because the expression \textit{baptismo} not occurring at all with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews [as also Josephus designates the \textit{rite of John} only by \textit{baptismo}, the \textit{action} by \textit{baptismos}, \textit{Antiq.} xviii. 5. 2], with regard to his usage in this respect thus nothing can be determined. — In close inner connection with the \textit{baptismoi} stands the \textit{ἐπιθεσίς χειρῶν}. As therefore the readers ought no longer to be in need of teaching concerning the nature of the former (and concerning its pre-eminence over the kindred institutions of Judaism), so was it also to be reasonably expected that they should experience a necessity for being instructed concerning the nature of the
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latter (and concerning the eminent blessings which attend thereon). The reference is to that laying on of hands by which those previously baptized were fully received into the communion, and through which the reception of the Holy Ghost was wont to be vouchsafed to them. Comp. Acts viii. 17 ff., xix. 6. From this close inner connectedness of the επίθεσις χεριῶν with the βαπτισμὸι results that, also as regards the external arrangement of words, the genitive επίθεσις does not depend immediately upon θεμέλιον, but like βαπτισμοί upon διδαχής. But, moreover, even the following genitives, ἀναστάσεως and κρίματος, are, as rightly apprehended by Storr, Böhme, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, and Woerner, governed by διδαχής. For not by the resurrection of the dead, and the everlasting judgment itself, since these facts will first unfold themselves in the future, but only by the doctrine thereof can the foundation be laid in Christianity. It would, however, be arbitrary to assign to the words ἀναστάσεως and κρίμα in themselves a signification which they can only have in combination with the foregoing διδαχής. A grammatical harshness (de Wette) is not to be discovered in this construction, on account of the close connection of the last clauses by means of τε and τε . . . καί; any more than de Wette is right in regarding βαπτισμοῖ βιοτεμιῶν, in the mode of interpretation above followed, as an unnatural trajectio without an example in the writings of our author; for βαπτισμὸι is proposed because the emphasis rests on that word, and an analogon in our epistle is already afforded by the Βαπτιστικὸς τε καιρὸν καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου] Two dogmas already belonging to the Jewish

1 Wrongly, however, is it supposed by Bisping (as before his time by Gennadius in Oecumenius, and Klee) that μετάνοιας and πίστεις, ver. 1, are already dependent upon διδαχής. — Just as wrongly would Calvin, who is followed by Piscator and Owen, enclose βαπτισμῶν διδαχής, Βαπτιστικὸς τε καιρόν within a parenthesis, "ut sit apposito . . . hoc sensu. Non jacientes rursus fundamentum poenitentiae, fidei in Deum, mortuorum resurrectionis, quae doctrina est baptismi et impositionis manuum . . . Nisi enim positiva legas, hoc erit absurdum, quod bis idem repetet. Quae enim baptismatis est doctrina, nisi quam hic recenset de fide in Deum, de poenitentia et de judicio ac similibus?" — Both views are deprived of their support by the reflection that μετάνοια and πίστεις, ver. 1, denote not a doctrine, but an act [against Stuart].
theology, which obtained by means of Christianity only their more definite, concrete signification. The expression in both these clauses is used quite generally. We have therefore no warrant for limiting, with Estius, Schlichting, Schöttgen, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, and others, the ἄνάστασις to the godly, the κρίμα to the ungodly. On the contrary, both have reference to the pious or believers, and the ungodly or unbelievers in common.

Ver. 3. Repetition of the exhortation, ver. 1, in order immediately to give thereto so much the greater emphasis by attaching the warning, ver. 4 ff.—καὶ τὸῦτο ποιήσωμεν] just this let us do. — τὸῦτο] sc. τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν τελείωτητα φέρεσθαι, ver. 1; Theodoret, ἀντὶ τοῦ σπουδᾶσωμεν, ἐπιθυμήσωμεν, πάντα πόνον ὑπὲρ τῆς τελείωτητος ἀπασχόλεται. To τὸῦτο we cannot supplement from the participial clause, ver. 1: τὸ θεμέλιον καταβάλλεσθαι, as was done, on the presupposition of the reading ποιήσωμεν, by Jac. Cappellus (who, however, besides this gives also the true reference, and comes to no decision), Schlichting, Grotius, Dorscheus, Wittich, Limborch, Calmet, Zachariae, Storr, Abresch, and is still done by Hofmann, as it is also regarded by Tholuck as possible; in such wise that there should issue the sense: this also, namely, the laying of the foundation, the author will do, sc. at another and more favourable time, if God permit. For—apart from the unsuitability of the sense resulting, according to which the author would declare his intention of treating the more difficult earlier than the more easy, which latter surely contains the preliminary condition for the understanding of the former—against such supplementing the fact is decisive, that the μή in connection with καταβαλλόμενοι, ver. 1, would be arbitrarily set aside; against the apprehending in this sense, the fact that for the expression of such a meaning ποιήσωμεν δὲ καὶ τὸῦτο must have been written.—ἐάντερ ἐπιτρέπῃ δ’ θεός] provided that God permits it (1 Cor. xvi. 7), inasmuch, namely, as all things, even the carrying into effect of good resolutions, are subordinated to the higher decree of God. Incomprehensible, therefore, is the assertion of de Wette, who has therein followed Abresch, that the addition ἐάντερ κ.τ.λ. is plainly irreconcilable “with the taking of our verse in the
sense of a demand." For the supposition, that in this case "the encouraging belief in God's gracious assistance" must be expressed, is an altogether erroneous assumption, since the author in the present passage is by no means aiming at the consolation of the readers, but, on the contrary—as is shown by vv. 4–8—at the alarming of them. To an encouraging and pointing to God's gracious help the discourse first advances, vv. 9, 10.

Vv. 4–8. Warning enforcement of the foregoing exhortation, by dwelling on the impossibility of leading back Christians who have already experienced the abundant blessing of Christianity, and for all that have fallen away again from the same, anew to a state of grace. Very appropriately (against de Wette) does this warning justification attach itself to the preceding demand; since the readers were not merely still far from the τελειότης in Christianity, but were, moreover, upon the way of entirely falling off again from Christianity. Comp. especially x. 25–31. In order, therefore, to deter them from such contemplated apostasy, there is very fitly set before the eyes of the readers the magnitude of the culpability which the completed apostasy would involve, and the terrible nature of the divine punitive judgment which it would entail. — In connection with the other view, that a declaration of the purpose of the author is contained in vv. 1–3, the connection of thought would be: Passing over the subjects of catechumenical instruction in Christianity, I shall apply myself to the subjects of deeper Christian knowledge. For it is surely impossible to convert anew Christians who have already been enlightened, and then have fallen away again. By the fruitlessness of enlarging on the initial doctrines, therefore, the author would justify his resolution. But one does not perceive the relevancy of this statement to the case of the readers. For since a preparatory transition, such as is afforded by the paraenetic φησίμεθα, ver. 1, and ποιήσωμεν, ver. 3,— in that the endeavour after Christian perfection necessarily includes the putting away of all that is opposed to it, thus also of the inclination to apostasy,—would then be entirely wanting, on the contrary, the declaration of the purpose of the author would connect itself with the censure
expressed, v. 11–14; in this way the explanation of this resolution must be found in the presupposition either that the readers already actually belonged to the number of the παραπεσόντες, or else that, since they must already be reckoned among the τέλειοι, what is said admits of no application to them. In the first case, however, the author would represent his own undertaking, for the benefit of such readers to pass over to the higher subjects of teaching, as a fruitless one; in the last case, having already just before blamed the readers for their νησιότης, would have fallen into self-contradiction.

Ver. 4. Τάρη] goes back to the last main utterance,—thus to τοῦτο ποιήσωμεν, ver. 3, and by means thereof to ἐπὶ τὴν τελειοτήτα φερόμεθα, ver. 1, not to μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι, ver. 1 (Whitby, de Wette, Bloomfield, Conybeare), nor yet to ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ θεός, ver. 3 (Piscator, Abresch, Delitzsch, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner), still less, at the same time, to ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ θεός and μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι, ver. 1 (Whitby, de Wette, Bloomfield, Conybeare), nor yet to ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ θεός and μὴ πάλιν δεικνύει, ver. 1 (Whitby, de Wette, Bloomfield, Conybeare), still less, at the same time, to ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ θεός and μὴ πάλιν δεικνύει, ver. 1 (Whitby, de Wette, Bloomfield, Conybeare).—ἀδύνατον] it is impossible. The import of the expression is absolute; and to weaken it into "difficile est" (so, after the example of the Latin translation in D and E: Ribera, Corn. a Lapide, Clericus, Limborch, Storr, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others), according to which we should have to suppose a rhetorical exaggeration, is an act of caprice. Nor are we justified in seeking to obtain a softening of the declaration, as is done by Er. Schmid, Clericus, Limborch, Schöttgen, Bengel, Cramer, Baumgarten, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Bloomfield (comp. already Ambrose, de Poenit. ii. 3), by urging the force of the infin. active ἀνακαίνιζειν as pointing to human activity, and thus, with a reference to Matt. xix. 26, making the impossibility to exist only on the part of men, not on the part of God. For only the impossibility of the ἀνακαίνιζειν in itself is accentuated, without respect to the person by whom it must otherwise be effected. Instead of the infinitive active, therefore, the infinitive passive ἀνακαίνιζεσθαι might have been chosen by the author without affecting the sense. — τοῖς ἀπαξ...aiōnos, ver. 5] characterizing of such as have not only become Christians, but also have already experienced the plenitude of blessing conferred upon Christians. — τοῖς ἀπαξ
those who were once illumined (x. 32), i.e. had already, through the preaching of the gospel, been made participants of the light of the knowledge (sc. of Christianity as the perfect religion). As regards the thought, the same thing is said by μετὰ τὸ λαβέιν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, x. 26.— ἀπαξ belongs, as to φωτισθέντας, so also to the three following participles (against Hofmann), and finds its opposition in πάλιν, ver. 6. It does not signify “plene” or “perfecte” (Wolf), nor does it denote an act which admits of no repetition (Delitzsch); contains, however, the implication, that the once ought to have sufficed and satisfied. Comp. [ix. 26] x. 2; Jude 3. — φωτίζειν τινά, of the spiritual enlightenment effected by teaching, is purely Hellenistic. Comp. Eph. iii. 9; John i. 9; LXX. Ps. cxix. 130; 2 Kings xii. 2, xvii 27, al. — γενσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεάς τῆς ἐπουρανίου] and have tasted the heavenly gift. γευσθαί τινος, to taste or receive a savour of a thing, figurative indication of perception by one’s own experience. See on ii. 9. The construction of the verb with the genitive (instead of being with the accusative, as ver. 5) does not justify us, with many strict Reformed expositors, in finding a mere “gustare extremis labris” in the expression. Besides, such an interpretation would be in conflict with the design of the writer, since it cannot be within his intention to represent the culpability of the persons in question as small; he must, on the contrary, aim at bringing out the same in all its magnitude. — By δωρεᾶ ἐπουρανίως, Primasius, Haymo, Estius, Michaelis, Semler, and others understand the Lord's Supper; Owen, Calmet, Ernesti, Whitby, M'Lean, Bloomfield, the Holy Ghost (against which the following special mention of the same is decisive); Klee, regeneration in general, in contradistinction from the special communication of the Spirit in baptism; M'Caul, “the persuasion of the eternal life, the χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. vi. 23;” Hofmann, righteousness; Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Paraphrase; Cameron, Hammond, Rambach, Ebrard, Maier, the forgiveness of sins; Justinian, Schlichting, Grotius, the peace of mind arising from forgiveness; Pareus, faith; Seb. Schmidt, Dorscheus, Peirce, Bengel, Carpzov, Cramer, Bisping, and others, Christ; Morus, Heinrichs, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart,
Stengel, and others, the Christian religion or the gospel; Abresch, Bleek, the enlightenment imparted to men through the preaching of the gospel, or the heavenly light itself, which effects the enlightenment, and by means thereof communicates itself to men. Inasmuch as the point to a close connection between the second clause and the first, and the emphasis rests upon the foregoing γενομένους, ἡ δόξα is at any rate to be taken quite generally. Most naturally, therefore, shall we think in general of the gift of grace, i.e. of the abundant grace of Christianity. It is called heavenly, inasmuch as Christ was sent forth from heaven in order to communicate it, and heaven is the scene of its full realization.—καὶ μετέχοντες γενομένους πνεύματος ἁγίου] and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost. The consequence and seal of the gift of grace just mentioned. Ver. 5. Καὶ καλῶν γενομένους θεοῦ ὑμᾶς] and have tasted the refreshing word of God. That the author already makes use afresh in this place of the verb γενομένους, after he has only just before employed it ver. 4, Bleek ascribes, not wrongly, to a certain perplexity on the part of the writer about finding for the idea to be expressed another term of the same import. For the supposition of Delitzsch, that the repetition of the same expression is to be explained from the design of bringing out so much the more strongly the reality of the experiences made and of their objects, would be admissible only if the second γενομένους, like the first, were placed emphatically at the beginning of its clause, and there were not already another verb inserted between the two γενομένους. γενομένους is here, as John ii. 9, construed with the accusative, which occurs only in the Hellenistic, never with the Greek classic writers. To assume, however, a different signification in the case of the two constructions,—Bengel: “alter (genitivus) partem denotat; nam gustum Christi, doni coelestis, non exaurimus in hac vita; alter (accusativus) plus dicit, quatenus verbi Dei praedicati gustus totus ad hanc vitam pertinet, quamquam eidem verbo futuri virtutes seculi annectuntur;” Bloomfield: “here (ver. 4) γενομένους signifies to have experience of a thing, by having received and possessed it; whereas in the clause following it signifies to know a thing by experience of its value and benefit;” Delitzsch (comp. also Moll): “with γενο-
The expression προφητεία καὶ σωτηρία serves, LXX. Josh. xxiv. 45, xxiii. 15, Zech. i. 13, for the rendering of the Hebrew נַעֲרֵי וֹסֲפָר and נַעֲרֵי מִלֵּי, and is used of words of consolation and promise spoken by God or the angel of God. In accordance therewith, we shall best also here refer καλὸν θεοῦ ρῆμα to the gospel, inasmuch as God thereby gives promises, and fulfills the promises given. So Theodoret (τῇ ὁποίᾳ σχεσιν τῶν διαθήκων), Estius, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Owen, Whitby, Abresch, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz. — Others, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Faber Stapulensis, Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Bengel, Peirce, Heinrichs, Alford, understand the expression of the gospel in general; in connection with which some, as Calvin and Braun, see denoted in καλὸν a contrast with the Mosaic law, the characteristic of which was judicial severity. According to Bleek, finally, we have to think of a personified attribute of God; which is supposed to be here mentioned because the gospel, with its consolatory message, is an efflux from the same,—an interpretation, however, which finds no sort of support in the context.

— δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος] and powers of the world to come. What is intended is the extraordinary miraculous powers wrought by the Holy Ghost, as these were called forth by the new order of the world founded by Christ. The αἰῶν μέλλων, namely (comp. αἰκονεμένη ἡ μέλλονσα, ii. 5), is for the author nothing purely future,—so that we have not, with Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Böhme, Kurtz, and others, to think of the everlasting life, or of the glory coming in with the Parousia of Christ, of which believers have received a foretaste here upon earth,—but already begins, according to his view, with the appearing of Christ upon earth, in that only its consummation still belongs to the future, namely, the time of Christ’s return.
Ver. 6. Kal παραπεσόντας] and (in spite of this) have fallen, i.e. have fallen away again from Christianity. — πάλιν] belongs to ἀνακατώσιειν. The taking of the same with παρα-πεσόντας (Heinsius, Alting, Peirce, and others) has the position of the word against it. A pleonasm, however (Grotius), is not produced by πάλιν along with the ἀνα in ἀνακατώσιειν. For ἀνα marks out the becoming new as a change ensuing, in opposition to the preceding state of the old man; whereas πάλιν has reference to the fact that the class of men described have already experienced that change, namely, at their first conversion. — ἀνακατώσιειν] to renew, to fashion inwardly new. To supplement an ἐαντοῦς to the verb (Erasmus, Vatablus, al.), according to which the preceding accusatives of the object would be changed into accusatives of the subject, is arbitrary. — εἰς μετάνοιαν] not equivalent to διὰ μετανοίας (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Zeger, Corn. a Lapide), but under the form of conception of the result: in such wise that change of mind or repentance should arise therefrom. — ἀνασταυροῦντας κ. τ. λ.] since they, etc. Note of cause to ἀδύνατον ἀνακατώσιειν. The impossibility of the renewal is explained by the magnitude of the culpability. By their action such men bear witness that the Son of God is in their estimation a transgressor and deceiver who has been justly crucified. — The compound form ἀνα-σταυροῦν occurs with classic writers only in the sense of “nailing up to the cross.” Comp. L. Bos, Exercitatt., and Wetstein ad loc. In itself, however, the explanation is equally admissible: “crucify afresh.” Thus it is accordingly taken without questioning by the Greek interpreters, and probably was so meant by the author. — ἐαντοῦς] Dativus incommodi: to their own judgment. Vatablus: in suam ipsorum perniciem. Too weak, Bleek,—to whom Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 769), and Alford give in their adhesion,—“they crucify Him to themselves, in so far as, by that crucifying again, they rob Him of themselves, who were in His possession.” False is the interpretation of Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Böhme, Bisping: as much as in them lies, διὸν τὸ ἐφ’ ἐαντοῦς; Heinrichs: each one for himself; Schulz: by themselves [by their own act]; Grotius, Abresch, Tholuck, explaining by the supposition of the so-called Dativus
localis: in themselves; Hofmann: as regards their own persons; Klee: to their contentment; Stengel: to the joy and pleasure of their obdurate heart; Kurtz: to the gratification of their hatred or their enmity against Him. Over refinedly Bengel and Delitzsch: sibi, as an opposition to παραδειγματίζοντας, ostentantes, &c. aliis. — τὸν νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ] A more palpable manifestation of the enormity of the crime than would have been the case had he written τὸν Χριστὸν οὗ Ἰησοῦν. Comp. x. 29.

— παραδειγματίζειν] to expose to scorn and insult; here, inasmuch as the death of the cross was a shameful one. παραδειγματίζειν stronger than the simple δειγματίζειν, Matt. i. 19.

Concluding remarks on vv. 4–6.—The declaration of vv. 4–6 has been of importance for the controversy of the early church, as to the question whether those who relapsed from the gospel renounced for ever the hope of salvation, or whether by means of sincere repentance they might once more attain to a state of salvation. The rigoristic view was especially maintained by the Montanists and Novatianists; and already Tertullian, de Pudicitia, c. 20, appeals to our passage in favour thereof. In opposition to this view, another sense was universally put upon the passage in the orthodox church from the time of the fourth century. The words were interpreted of an impossibility of imparting a second time the baptism once administered, and the consequent condemnable character of such an act, in that according to a later usus loquendi (first met with in Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 62, 65) they took φωτίζειν to be a designation of baptism, referred ἀνακαμίζειν eis metάνοιαν to the repetition of baptism, and in ἀνασταυροῦντας κ.τ.λ. found the indication of that which such repetition would produce or involve. (Comp. e.g. Theodoret: Τῶν ἄγαν ἀδυνάτων, φησιν, τοὺς τῷ παναγίῳ προσεληφθότας βαπτίσματι καὶ τῆς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος χάριτος μετειλήφότας καὶ τῶν αἰενίων ἀγαθῶν δεξαμένων τῶν τύπων αὕθες προσελθέων καὶ τυχεῖν ἐτέρου βαπτίσματος. Τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔστω ἔτερον, ἢ πάλιν τῶν νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ σταυρῷ προσηλθόντα καὶ τὴν γεγενημένην ἀτιμίαν πάλιν αὐτῷ προσάψαται. "Ωσπερ γὰρ ἂπαξ τὸ πάθος αὐτὸς υπέμεινεν, οὕτω καὶ ἡμᾶς ἂπαξ αὐτῷ προσήκει
that this interpretation, which is
still followed among later expositors by Faber Stapulensis, Clarinus, and Calmet, is a wrong one, is now generally
admitted. The justification, however, of this passage, which
furnished to Luther a determining reason for denying to the
epistle canonicity in the narrower sense (see the Introduction,
p. 18), is afforded by the fact that—as is also pointed out,
x. 26-31—the author is speaking not of a falling away in
general, but of a clearly defined falling away, i.e., as is rightly
urged by Calvin, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Estius, Seb. Schmidt,
Peirce, Carpzov, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Hof-
mann (Schriftenw. II. 2, p. 341 f. 2 Aufl.), Maier, and others,
those Christians are described who commit the sin against
the Holy Ghost (Matt. xii. 31 f.; Mark iii. 28 f.; Luke
xii. 10), or the ἀμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον (1 John v. 16). For
Christians are described who fall away, not, e.g., from mere
weakness, from a mere wavering of conviction, but in spite of
a better knowledge, and in spite of having experienced the
treasures of grace in Christianity; Christians who, according
to the parallel passage, x. 26 ff., against their better conscious-
ness and conscience, tread under foot the Son of God as
though He were a deceiver, brand His blood shed for re-
demption as the blood of a transgressor, and scoff at the Spirit
of grace as a spirit of falsehood. In regard to men of this
kind, the ἀδιψατον τὰλων ἀνακαίνησιν εἰς μετάνοιαν is
employed in its full right, since with them there must be
inwardly wanting every kind of receptiveness or receptibility
for the μετάνοια. The reference of the declaration to the sin
against the Holy Ghost is, moreover, so much the more
unquestionable, inasmuch as the author by no means says
that the readers have already committed it, but, on the
contrary, only sets at once before their eyes as a terrible
warning the extreme length to which their conduct may lead them.

Vv. 7, 8. Confirmation of the ἀδύνατον κ.τ.λ. on its objective side; since in connection with so great culpability and such ingratitude the divine punishment cannot fail to ensue. This thought is rendered manifest by means of a similitude. The common subject for ver. 7 and ver. 8 is not merely γῆ, but γῆ ἡ πιόυσα τὸν ἐπ'/ αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλάκις ὑπόν taken together. For the intention of the author is to point to the diversity of result arising from equally favourable preliminary conditions. The main point of the similitude, however, lies in ver. 8, while ver. 7 serves only by way of preparation, and as a means of bringing out into bolder relief the following opposition. — γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιόυσα . . . ὑπόν] for the field which has drunk in the rain frequently coming down upon it. Figure of the men before described, who oftentimes have experienced God's gracious benefits, and have received the same into themselves. — The participle aorist πιόυσα is chosen, while then participles present (τίκτουσα, ἐκφέρουσα) follow, because the fact already historically completed is to be emphasized, from which, then, two different effects are developed for the time present. — Αἱ πίνειν, τίκτειν, etc., is ascribed to the γῆ, because this, as in general is very frequently the case, is personified as a part of the life-displaying, assiduously productive nature. — ἐπ'/ αὐτῆς] The construction of ἐπ'/ with the genitive, after a verb of motion, is distinguished from the more usual one with the accusative, in this respect, that the former includes in itself at the same time the notion of tarrying. Comp. Winer, Gramm. 7 Aufl. p. 352. — καὶ τίκτουσα] In place of this, merely τίκτουσα or τίκτουσα μέν would have been more correctly written. Kal, however, does not stand in the sense of "also" (Hofmann), but is the ordinary "and." — Βοτάνη] in the N. T. only here, employed by the LXX. as a rendering of φῶλα (Gen. i. 11, 12), γεύσα (Ex. ix. 22, x. 12, 15), and νυν (Job viii. 12), denotes, according to its derivation from βόσκω, originally herbage or pasturage, but then also every kind of vegetation or produce of the field. — ἐκθέτοισι well-placed, fit, profitable. Comp. Luke ix. 62, xiv. 35. — ἐκείνοις]
may be referred to εὐθεῖαν (Böhme and the majority), but it also admits of being referred to τίκτουσα (Bleek, Alford, Hofmann). — δι’ οὗ] for whose sake. Grammatically false, the Vulgate, Zeger, and others: a quibus; Calvin: quorum opera; Erasmus, Vatablus, Heinrichs, and others: per quos; Luther: for those who till it; Schulz: for those who labour on it; Wieseler (Comm. üb. d. Br. P. an die Gal., Gött. 1859, p. 111): at whose command and disposal. — καὶ γεωργεῖται] it also (or even) is cultivated, brings into relief the naturalness of the τίκτειν βοτάνην εὐθεῖαν ἐκεῖνος, in that the ἐκεῖνος are the proprietors of the land, to whom the cultivation and produce of the same pertains. Incorrectly Schlichting (as likewise Böhme, Kuinoel, Hofmann): Ait autem “et colitur,” ut ad imbrium irrigationem etiam terrae istius diligentem accedere culturam ostendat. In the application of the figure, the ἐκεῖνος, δι’ οὗ καὶ γεωργεῖται are God and Christ; not God alone (Schlichting, Grotius, Cramer, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford), since in this way justice is not done to the plural. — μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ] receives part in the blessing at the hand of God, namely, in that its fruitfulness is progressively augmented. Comp. Matt. xiii. 12; John xv. 2. Too weak, Grotius, Wittich: it is praised or commended by God. — ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ] from God (as the bestower), is best connected with ἐκείνη, not with εὐλογίας.

Ver. 8. The contrast. — Ἐκφέρουσα] as to its signification not different from the preceding τίκτουσα. Without justification by usage is it supposed by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Wittich, Valckenaer, Klee, and Bloomfield, that the word is to be taken in malam partem, namely, in the sense: “Ejicere quasi abortus.” — ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους] Thorns and thistles. Proverbial designation of rankly springing weeds and wild growth. Comp. Gen. iii. 18; Hos. x. 8 (נָּשָׁה לוֹ כַּל); Matt. vii. 16. — ἀδόκιμος] sc. ἔστιν, it fails to stand the test, is rejected, namely, in the judgment of God, as is self-evident from the ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ in the preceding clause. Wrongly, therefore, Hofmann: it is unworthy to be treated as arable land. — καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς] and near to the curse, i.e. not: devoted to the execution of men (Hofmann), but exposed to the peril of

Meyer.—Heb.
being abandoned by God to everlasting barrenness and desolation. Enhancement of ἀδόκιμος. At the same time, however, there is to be found in ἐγγύς a softening of the expression, manifestly with a reference to the fact that it is not yet too late for the readers to combat their lustings after defection, and to return fully into the right way (comp. ver. 9 ff.). Chrysostom: Ἁβαί, πόσην ἐχει παραμυθίαν ὁ λόγος. Κατάρας γὰρ εἰπεν ἐγγύς, οὐ κατάρα· ὅ δὲ μηδέπω εἰς τὴν κατάραν ἐμπεσὼν ἀλλ' ἐγγύς ηενόμενος καὶ μακρὰν γενέσαι δυνήσεται.—ἡς τὸ τέλος εἰς καίσων] sc. ἐστίν, and its ultimate fate issues in burning. ἤς is referred by Camerarius, Abresch, Heinrichs, Stuart, Bleek, to κατάρας; but more correctly by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther, Seb. Schmidt, Bengel, Carpzov, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stengel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 773), Alford, Maier, Kurtz, Ewald, Woerner, and the majority, to the main subject; in such wise that the relative is to be complemented by γῆς, ἐκφεροῦσης ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβέδουν. In connection therewith, however, to take εἶναι εἰς, with Carpzov, Böhme, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Bisping, Maier, and others, as a Hebraism (? ἡς), is inadmissible. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 173.—The understanding, moreover, of a burning of the field, or of its produce, in order that the land may be improved, as that which is intended by καῦσις (Schlichting, Bloomfield, and others), is forbidden by the connection, since no other than the divine punitive judgment bursting in upon it has to be described. What is meant is the burning up of the field itself by fire and brimstone coming down from heaven; by which, e.g., the soil of Sodom and Gomorrha was rendered for ever incapable of tillage (Bleek, Tholuck, Ebrard, Alford, Maier, Moll, al.). Comp. Gen. xix. 24; Deut. xxix. 23; also Heb. x. 27: πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ἱππαντίους.

Ver. 9. Softening of the foregoing warning representation by attestation of the confidence, that this description will not be applicable to the readers.—Πεπεισμένα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν] But we are convinced in regard to you. Comp. Rom. xv. 14. —πεπεισμένα] stronger than πεποίημαι. —περὶ ὑμῶν] has the emphasis. It is therefore already placed here, not first
after σωτηρίας. — The appellation ἀγαπητοὶ only here in the epistle. Schlichting: Apposite eos sic vocat, ne putarent, eum aliquo ipsoorum odio laborare, sed ut scirent, eum amore Christiano erga ipsos flagrare, qui amor facit, ut semper meliora ominemur iis, quos amamus, et, si quid severius dicimus, animo corrigendi non nocendi cupidio dicamus. — τὰ κρείσσουνα] of that which is better. This may refer to the subjective side, but it may also refer to the objective side of the foregoing comparison. In the first case the sense is: that your condition is a better one, than that you should be compared to a land bringing forth thorns and thistles; in the latter case: that your fate will be a better one than curse and perdition. On account of the plural τὰ κρείσσουνα we shall do best to combine both factors together, as, indeed, the last is but the consequence of the first. When, however, Hofmann thinks that τὰ κρείσσουνα does not at all point to the foregoing comparison, but stands by itself without any reference, in that it denotes only the good in opposition to the bad, this is not only opposed to the context, but also grammatically false, since the comparative is never placed for the positive. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 227 f. — καὶ ἐκόμενα σωτηρίας] and of that which stands in contact with salvation, i.e. that you will attain to salvation. ἐκόμενον, with the genitive, denotes that which is closely joined to an object, that which is either outwardly (logically or temporally) or inwardly bound up with it. Instances in Bleek, II. 2, p. 220 ff. — εἰ καὶ οὕτως καλοῦμεν] Chrysostom: βέλτιον γὰρ ἕμας τοῖς ῥήμασι φοβῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀληθῆσητε. — οὕτως] sc. as was done vv. 4–8.

Ver. 10. Reason for the good confidence expressed ver. 9. — οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεός, ἐπιλαβέσθαι] for God is not unjust, that He should forget. God exercises retributive righteousness. Since, then, the readers have performed, and do still perform, actions worthy of Christian recognition, it is to be expected that God will be mindful thereof, and, provided they will only perform their own part fully (comp. vv. 11, 12), will conduct them with His grace and lead them to the possession of salvation. A claim to demand salvation of God, on account of their behaviour, is not conceded by the words of ver. 10;
only as a factor which God, by virtue of His retributive righteousness, will take into account in connection with the final result, is this brought forward for the consolation and encouragement of the readers; while, moreover, reference is at once made anew, ver. 11 f., to the still unsatisfactory character of their Christian state, and in general to the peril of falling again from their state of grace. — ἐπιλαθέσθω [The infinitive aorist expresses the mere verbal notion, without respect to the relation of time. See Kühner, II. § 445, 2. It is to be taken neither in the sense of a preterite (Seb. Schmidt: ut oblitus sit) nor of a future (Bisping and others).]

— τοῦ ἐργου ὑμῶν] your work (as lying completed), i.e. that which you have done. The expression is quite general. A more precise limitation thereof may be found in the following καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης, by taking καὶ as the epexegetic “and indeed,” “and that.” So Peshito, as also Kurtz and Woerner. But since, in any case, the passage x. 32 ff. is to be compared as a real (though not verbal) parallel to the statement ver. 10, and there, in addition to the love displayed, the steadfastness manifested by the readers under persecutions is lauded, it is most natural, with Schlichting, Grotius, and others, to suppose that just to this the general τοῦ ἐργου ὑμῶν in our passage also more especially alluded. — τῆς ἀγάπης] has not in itself alone the notion of love “to the brethren,” in such wise that ἐἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ would have to be translated: “for His name” (Matt. x. 41, 42, xviii. 20), i.e. to His honour (Vulgate: in nomine ejus; Böhm and others: ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ, Matt. xviii. 5). On the contrary, τῆς ἀγάπης acquires its object in the ἐἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, to be construed in relation to ἦς ἐνεδιδάσκασθε (not to διακονήσαντες κ.τ.λ., to which Beza was inclined). Thus: the love which ye have shown to His name (sc. God’s name, not Christ’s, Ernesti and others). This is the more general object, which only then obtains its more special reference and indication of purport by διακονήσαντες κ.τ.λ. A love exercised towards Christian brethren, inasmuch as Christians, as God’s children, bear the name of God. — διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἀγίοις] in that ye have rendered service to the saints (the fellow-Christians), have aided them when they were in distress and affliction (not specially: in
poverty). But that this was not merely a virtue exercised once for all, but one still continuously exercised, is clearly brought out by the addition ἐνδιακονοῦντες.

Vv. 11, 12. To that which the author hopes with regard to the readers, he now attaches that which he wishes to see performed by them. — ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ] now we long, most ardently desire. Stronger expression than θέλομεν or βουλομέθα [to set one's heart on it, Matt. xiii. 17; Acts xx. 33; 1 Tim. iii. 1, etc.]. — ἐκαστον ὑμῶν] More emphatic and accentuating than the mere ὑμᾶς would be. There is denoted by it, on the one hand, that the heart-felt interest which the author cherishes in the readers extends to every single one of them. On the other hand, there lies in it the thought that if haply single individuals among the readers already correspond to the demand here made, it is still of supreme importance that every one of them should so comport himself as is mentioned. — In the sequel, τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν is not in such manner to be taken together with ἅχρι τέλους that the main stress should fall upon this, and πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τὴς ἐλπίδος be regarded as a mere subsidiary factor. In connection with this mode of interpretation, adopted by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Grotius, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, and others, the demand of the author would amount to this, that the readers should manifest the same zeal which, according to ver. 10, they have already displayed, even to the end or in all future time. But in such manner it is assumed that the author has every reason for being satisfied with the Christian condition of the readers, and desires nothing more than a continuance of the same, whereas the whole epistle testifies that the state of things with the Hebrews was very different from this. Hence it is evident that the emphasis rests quite as much upon πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος as upon ἅχρι τέλους. The thought must thus be: the author longs for the readers to display the same zeal which they have already manifested in regard to an active love, in equal measure also in another relation, namely, in regard to the πληροφορία κ.τ.λ. (so Bengel, Cramer, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and
others), in connection with which, however, ἧν ρή τέλους is best taken, not, as is generally the case even with this correct determination of the thought, with ἐνδεικνυότατα, but in close juxtaposition with πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος. — πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἧν ρή τέλους] in regard to the full certainty of conviction concerning the Christian's hope, unto the end, i.e. in such manner that ye cherish and preserve to the end the Christian's hope of the Messianic kingdom to be looked for at the coming again of Christ, as a firm confidence of faith, untroubled by any doubts. Comp. iii. 6, 14. Opposite is the wavering conviction that the subject of the Christian hope is one founded in objective truth; the standing still upon the path of Christianity before the goal is reached, and the tendency to fall away again from Christianity and to relapse into Judaism. — πληροφορία] We have not, with Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, and others (after the example of the Vulgate: "ad explicationem spei"), to apprehend in the active sense of "perfecting, making full or complete;" but to take it, as everywhere in the N. T. (1 Thess. i. 5; Col. ii. 2; Heb. x. 22; comp. also Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5), with Erasmus, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Calov, Wolf, Abresch, Heinrichs, Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, and the majority, in the passive sense. — ἧν ρή τέλους] unto the end, i.e. until (at the Parousia of the Lord) hope passes over into the possession [of the kingdom] itself. 

Ver. 12. Further prosecution of πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἧν ρή τέλους, ver. 11. — ὥστε μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε] that ye become not sluggish. The γένησθε, pointing to the future, stands in no contradiction with γεγόνατε at v. 11. There, the sluggishness of the intellect was spoken of; here, it is sluggishness in the retaining of the Christian hope. There is therefore no need of the conjecture νόθοι (after xii. 8) for νωθροί (Heinrichs). — μεμητάλ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομοῦντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας] but rather imitators of those who, through faith and perseverance, inherit the promises. Of the two substantiveς πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας, the latter forms the leading idea; comp. ver. 15, where only μακροθυμίας is placed. καί is therefore the more nearly defining
“and indeed.” Thus: by faith, and indeed by persevering constancy in the same.— The μακροθυμία, elsewhere usually the divine attribute of long-suffering or forbearance, is likewise predicated of men, Col. i. 11; Jas. v. 7, 8, 10; LXX. Isa. Ivii. 15 (δυνατότεροι διούν μακροθυμίαν), and frequently, and in the first-named passage combined with ἰσομοίη as a synonym.— The ἐπαγγελίαι are those given by God in the time of the Old Covenant, which by means of Christianity attain to their full realization. Comp. vii. 6, viii. 6, xi. 13, 17, 33; Rom. ix. 4, xv. 8; 2 Cor. i. 20, viii. 1; Gal. iii. 16. Comp. also the singular ἡ ἐπαγγελία, ix. 15, x. 36, xi. 39.— κληρονομεῖν ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις denotes: to enter into the heritage of these promises, i.e. to attain to the enjoyment or possession of the blessings placed in prospect by them. That in our passage (comp. ix. 15, x. 36, xi. 39) κληρονομεῖν ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις cannot be understood, with Schulz and Bleek, of the mere “receiving of the imparting of the promises as such, apart from their fulfilment,” is shown by the very position of the words, according to which the main force of the statement is contained not in ταύτα ἐπαγγελία, but in κληρονομοῦντες. Comp. also ver. 15, where for the same reason ἐπέτυχεν is placed before the substantive ταύτα ἐπαγγελία. Besides, it is also evident from the fact that in such case there would be nothing in ver. 12 to correspond to the conception of the ensuing possession itself, indicated as this is in the ἄχρι τέλους of ver. 11.— In connection with τῶν κληρονομοῦντων almost all expositors, including Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Kluge, think of the patriarchs, especially Abraham, and of them either alone or with the inclusion of all believers of the New Covenant. This interpretation, however, to which they were without any necessity led by the consideration of ver. 13, is untenable. For, in order to harmonize with it in its first-named form, the writing of κληρονομησάντων would have been necessary,—for which, accordingly, many will have the participle present to be taken; to harmonize with it in its last-named form, the writing of κληρονομησάντων τε καὶ κληρονομοῦντων would have been required. The characterizing οἱ διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομοῦντες ταύτα ἐπαγγελία is, on the contrary, quite a
general one, and the participle present marks out that which assuredly takes place, or in accordance with a constant and fixed rule (as a rewarding of the fulfilled preliminary condition of πίστις καὶ μακροθυμία). The thought is therefore, not that the readers should take the patriarchs as a model, but in general that they should take as such those who manifest persevering constancy in the faith, and, on that very account, beyond doubt attain to the possession of that which is promised.

Vv. 13-15. Proof of the general truth that steadfast endurance leads to the possession of the promised blessing, from the special instance of Abraham. Calvin: exemplum Abraham aducitur, non quia unicum sit, sed quia praehi aliis illustre.—τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὁ θεὸς] for when God had given promise to Abraham. ἐπαγγειλάμενος we have, with de Wette, to take as in point of time anterior to ὅμοσέν. It has reference to the promises which God had already, Gen. xii. 7, xvii. 5, 6, xviii. 18, imparted to Abraham, and which were then, Gen. xxii. 16–18, not merely repeated to him by God, and confirmed by an oath, but likewise, in part at least, were fulfilled (see at ver. 15).—ἐπεί κατ᾽ οὖν ἐν ἕναν, κ.τ.λ.] because there was no greater or higher (οὖν ἐν ἕναν, masculine, not, as Hofmann supposes, neuter), by whom He could swear, He swear by Himself. Relation of the words, LXX. Gen. xxii. 16: κατ᾽ ἐμαυτῷ ὅμοσα, λέγει κύριος, with the reason for this form of declaration inserted. Comp. Philo, Legg. allegor. iii. 98 E (with Mangay, I. p. 127), where, with regard to the same passage of Scripture, it is said: εῦ καὶ τῷ ὅρκῳ βεβαιώσας τὴν ὑπόψεσιν, καὶ ὅρκῳ θεοπρεπεῖ. Ὄρας γὰρ ὅτι οὐ καθ᾽ ἐτέρον ὁμώς θεὸς—οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ κρείττων—ἀλλὰ καθ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ, ὅς ἐστὶ πάντων ἄριστος.

Ver. 14. Εἰ μὴν κ.τ.λ.] Adducing of the declaration, Gen. xxii. 17, with the difference, that in the case of the LXX. πληθυνῷ τὸ σπέρμα σου is in harmony with the original put in place of πληθυνῷ σε. This deviation is not to be explained by the supposition that the author chose σε instead of τὸ σπέρμα σου merely “for brevity’s sake” (Jac. Cappellus), or “in order to present the promise in a form as concentrated as possible” (Delitzsch), or that he cited from memory (Abresch), or that he
wished to place in the background all thought of the merely physical descendants of Abraham, and direct the glance of the reader exclusively to the spiritual or heavenly posterity of Abraham, which was appointed to him through Christ (Böhme, Bisping, and others). It has its ground simply in the fact that the author was here occupied exclusively with the person of Abraham himself (Bleek, de Wette, Maier). — εἰ μήν] in place of the Greek ἢ μήν, or of the εἰ μή, formed after the Hebrew נְדָּרָה, is met with elsewhere in the LXX. (Ezek. xxxiii. 27, xxxiv. 8, xxxv. 6, xxxvi. 5, al.), not, indeed, so far as concerns our passage in the Cod. Alex. and Cod. Vatic., but yet in other ancient ms.; and in any case, our author found it in the copy of the LXX. used by him. — The combination of the participle with the tempus finitum of the same verb (εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω κ.τ.λ.) is a well-known Grecising of the Hebrew infin. absol., occurring exceedingly often in the LXX, and serving generally — as here — for the augmented and solemn emphasizing of the idea contained in the verb. See Winer, Gramm., 7 AufL p. 332.

Ver. 15. Καὶ οὕτως] and in this way, i.e. since God on His part had in such manner afforded documentary evidence for the solemnity of His resolve. οὕτως belongs to ἐπέτυχεν. The combining of it with μακροθυμήσας, as is done by Stein, Tholuck,¹ and Bisping, and consequently taking the participle as an epexegetis of οὕτως, is inadmissible, because in that case the μακροθυμία of Abraham in particular must have been spoken of immediately before. The opinion of Delitzsch, however, who is followed by Maier, that “the combination of the two combinations” is “the right one,” refutes itself, since it requires that which is logically impossible. — μακροθυμήσας] because he showed [or: had shown] persevering steadfastness (sc. in the faith, comp. ver. 12), in particular by the fact that he had just now been so ready at God’s behest to sacrifice his son Isaac, although this soon appeared to afford the only hold for the realization of the divine promise. — ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας] he obtained the promise, i.e. the thing

¹ Who unaccountably advances, as an argument in support, the supposition that “then a parallel arises between the Christians, who, according to vv. 17, 18, are, on the ground of the divine oath, to hold fast the hope, and Abraham, who likewise did so.”
promised, inasmuch, namely, as not only Isaac was given back alive to Abraham, but he further lived to see the time when two sons were born to Isaac (comp. Gen. xxi. 5, xxv. 7, 26), and thus the divine promise was fulfilled in its earlier stage. Not a fulfilment, which Abraham first witnessed in the life beyond the grave (Maier, Hofmann), is intended. Nor have we here to take ἐπαγγελία, with Bleek, in the active sense [the giving of a promise], and to refer it to the Messianic salvation placed in prospect. For, apart from the consideration that in this case ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας would, in relation to ἐπαγγελάμενος, ver. 13, indicate no advance, the emphatically proposed ἐπέτυχεν can be understood only of the obtaining possession of the promised object itself. The promise repeated to Abraham, Gen. xxii. 17, 18, presented itself under a two-fold point of view. His seed was to be multiplied, and in his seed were all nations of the earth to be blessed. Only the first of these in its earlier stage could Abraham, from the nature of the case, live to see; the fulfilment of the latter was attached to the appearing of Christ upon earth, which was to be looked for in the distant future. The first-named reference obtains ver. 15. The last-named mode of contemplating the subject underlies the κληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ver. 17. That, too, which we read xi. 13, 39, is spoken from the last-named point of view, on which account there is not to be found in these passages a contradiction of ours.

Vv. 16–20. Not without design did the author, in connection with the historic fact, vv. 13–15, make mention also of the divine oath, although the mention thereof in that place was not necessarily required by the relation to ver. 12. His object, namely, was further to bring into special prominence the practical advantage accruing to the readers from this circumstance. This he accomplishes vv. 16–20. For, since the promise imparted to Abraham, in so far as it respected the blessing of all nations by means of his seed, could receive its fulfilment only in conditioning connection with Christ, the Saviour of all believers, the Christians are thus the heirs of the Abrahamic covenant; so also by the oath of God there is guaranteed to them, no less than to Abraham, an indefeasible claim to the object of promise. To hold fast to the Christian
hope, objectively assured and undisappointing as this is, the Christians therefore must feel themselves most powerfully animated.

Ver. 16. \( \Gamma \acute{a} \rho \] establishes the \( \acute{e} \tau \iota \epsilon \varsigma \varsigma \kappa \alpha \tau \tau \varsigma \varsigma \kappa \varsigma \tau \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \kappa \tau \lambda \varsigma \), \( \acute{e} \mu \omega \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \acute{a} \upsilon \tau \omicron \upsilon \), ver. 13. Not, however, ver. 16 merely (against Hofmann), but the whole paragraph, vv. 16–18, is to be looked upon as an establishing of these words. For ver. 16 is only a lemma, only a preparation for ver. 17 f.; and, indeed, ver. 16 states the practice valid among men with regard to the taking of the oath, while ver. 17 f. there is shown in connection with this the object contemplated by God in His declaration upon oath. — \( \kappa \alpha \tau \varsigma \tau \iota \upsilon \mu \epsilon \zeta \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \) by the \( \acute{H} \acute{i} \acute{h} \acute{e} \varsigma \) One. \( \mu \epsilon \zeta \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \) is not neuter (M'Caul: "to a thing that is greater, e.g. the temple, the altar;" Hofmann), but masculine, and thereby God is intended. — With \( \kappa \alpha \iota \) the second half of the sentence, ver. 16, is closely attached to the first: "and so," "and consequently." To the habitual practice of men just mentioned, the legal relation therefrom arising is joined on. — \( \tau \acute{a} \sigma \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \iota \varsigma \alpha \theta \iota \varsigm
Grotius and Cramer, it never has. — *eis βεβαιωσιν* unto ratification, or the creation of an indefeasible claim. Wrongly do Jac. Cappellus, Peirce, Paulus, and others take *eis βεβαιωσιν*—which belongs to the whole second clause, not merely to πέρας (Böhme, Bleek, Bisping, Alford)—along with ὁ ὁρκος: “the oath given in confirmation,” which must have been expressed by ὁ *eis βεβαιωσιν ὁρκος.* — It results as a necessary inference from ver. 16, that the author did not regard the taking of the oath on the part of men as anything forbidden. Comp. Calvin: Praeterea hic locus docet aliquem inter Christianos jurisjurandi usum esse legitimum.... Nam apostolus certe hie de ratione jurandi tanquam de re pia et Deo probata disserrit. Porro non dicit olim fuisse in usu, sed adhuc vigere pronuntiat.

Ver. 17. *Εν δὲ* Upon the basis of which fact, i.e. in accordance with this human custom, as one valid among men. *ἐν δὲ* namely, refers back to the whole contents of ver. 16 (not merely to ὁ ὁρκος), and coheres not with βουλόμενος ἐπίδειξαι (Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Rambach, Hofmann, al.), nor yet with the whole clause following (Delitzsch, Alford), but with ἐμετέρωσεν ὁρκ.. — *περισσότερον* is to be taken along with *ἐπίδειξαι.* It does not, however, signify unto redundancy, since this was not at all required (Beza, Schlichting, Seb. Schmidt, Carpzov, Storr, Klee, and others), but: *so much the more,* or: *more emphatically,* than would have been done by the mere imparting of the promise. — *τοὺς κληρονόμους τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*] to the heirs of the promise. By the κληρονόμοι, Grotius, Owen, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others understand the patriarchs as well as all believers; Tholuck and others, only the Old Testament saints; Morus even (notwithstanding the plural), only Abraham; Calvin, the Jews. But, as is clearly apparent from the elucidatory ἢνα ἔχουμεν, ver. 18, only the Christians can be meant. — ὁ *ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὑτοῦ* the unalterableness of His decree, namely, to make all believers blessed through the seed of Abraham. Arbitrarily, because to the violent setting aside of the nearest circle of thought furnished by the context itself, Abresch (and similarly Michaelis, Storr, and Delitzsch): “crediderim, non juratam eam promissionem spectari, quam Abrahamo factam in superioribus dixerat, sed illud
nominatim jusjurandum, quo Christus sit pontifex creatus ad Melchisedec rationem" (Ps. cx. 4). Neither ver. 20, nor vii. 1 ff., nor vii. 20, 21, 28, nor v. 10, contains a justification of this view. — The substantively employed adjective brings out the idea of the unchangeableness, about the accentuation of which the author was here principally concerned, more emphatically than if τήν βούλην αὐτοῦ τήν ἀμετάθετον had been written. — ἀμετάθετος in the N. T. only here and at ver. 18. — ἐμειθενων ἀρχαὶ He came forward, as an intervening person, with an oath. As an intermediate person, sc. between Himself and Abraham. Men swear by God, because He is higher than they. Thus, in the case of an oath among men, God is the higher middle person [so μεθενης, Josephus, Antiq. iv. 6. 7], or the higher surety, for the fulfilment of the promise. But when God takes an oath He can only swear by Himself, since there is no higher one above Him, and thus only Himself undertakes the part of the surety or middle person. μεθενεῖν, in the N. T. only here, is employed transitively and intransitively; in the latter sense here. It is taken transitively by Oecumenius, who supplements τὴν ἱπόσχεσιν; and Böhme, who supplements τὴν βούλην.

Ver. 18. Indication of purpose to ἐμειθενων ἀρχαὶ, ver. 17, and consequently parallel to the participial clause there, περισσότερον βουλόμενος ἐπίδ. τοῖς κληρονόμοις. τῆς ἐπ. τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ, but no mere repetition of the same, since the divine purpose, which was there presented purely objectively in relation to Christians, is now subjectively turned in relation to them. — διὰ δύο πραγμάτων ἀμεταθέτων] by virtue of two unalterable facts, namely, by virtue of the promise and the oath. Against the connection (comp. vv. 13, 17) Reuss: l'une de ces choses c'est la parole évangélique apportée par Christ, l'autre le serment typique donné à Abraham. — δύο. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 63; Buttmann, Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 25. — ἐν οἷς ἀδί ναν ὕψοσσαθαι θεῶν] in which (i.e. in connection with their fulfilment) it is impossible that God should have lied (deceived). For God is faithful. His bare word is trustworthy; how much more thus when He confirms it by an oath! To supply a ἥμας to ψεύσασθαι (Heinrichs) is
inadmissible. — παράκλησιν] not "consolation" (Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Böhme, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, and the majority), but, as the hortatory tendency of our whole section requires: encouragement (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Estius, Semler, Carpzov, Stuart, Bleek, Tholuck, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others). — Upon παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν, not upon οἱ καταφυγόντες (Primasius, Erasmus, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Akersloot, Wolf, Carpzov, Abresch, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, de Wette, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 749), Alford, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, and many others), does κρατήσαί τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος depend; so that οἱ καταφυγόντες is to be taken, with Oecumenius, Camerarius, Cameron, Seb. Schmidt, Heinrichs, Bleek, Maier, Hofmann, and others, absolutely. — οἱ καταφυγόντες] those who have fled, with the subordinate notion of having found refuge, thus the sheltered, saved ones. As regards the sense, the expression is to be thus filled up: we who have fled out of the sinful world, and have fled to God. As an analogen is compared οἱ σωζόμενοι (Acts ii.47, al.). — κρατήσαί τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος] to hold fast (Luther, Schulz, Stuart, Bleek, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Hofmann, and others) to the hope lying in readiness. To interpret κρατήσαί as "to lay hold" (Wolf, Tholuck, de Wette, Alford, Kurtz, Ewald, al.), with a right combining with παράκλησιν, is forbidden by the connection; comp. ver. 11, according to which the readers already possess the ἐλπίς, but not as yet any πληροφορία thereof; comp. further the διὰ μακροθυμίας, ver. 12, and μακροθυμήσας, ver. 15. — τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος is not the same thing as τῆς ἐλπίδος τῶν προκειμένων, "to the hope of the blessings of salvation which lie before us, which await us" (Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Maier), in such wise that a mingling of the objective notion of ἐλπίς with the subjective notion thereof would have to be assumed. Still less are we at liberty, with Grotius, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Peirce, Limborch, Heinrichs, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Bloomfield, Alford, Hofmann, and others, to interpret ἐλπίς in itself alone as "res sperata" (comp. Col. i. 5). On the
contrary, ver. 19 points to the Christian hope in the subjective sense. As προσκεμένη, however, lying at hand, or existing in readiness, this is characterized, since it is already infused into the Christians, has already been communicated to them as a blessing for possession, with their reception of Christianity.

Ver. 19. Description of the absolute certainty of this Christian hope.— ἥν [sc. ἐλπίδα. The referring back to παράκλησιν (Grotius and others) is possible only in connection with the erroneous interpretation of this word as "solatium," whereas, with the right apprehension of ver. 18, παράκλησιν ἔχομεν serves for the mere introduction of κρατήσας τῆς προσκεμένης ἐλπίδος; ἥν thus most naturally links itself with ἐλπίδος as the last preceding leading thought. To this must be added the consideration that frequently also elsewhere in antiquity—though nowhere else in Holy Scripture—the anchor is already employed as a figure of hope, and appears also upon coins as a symbol thereof. See Wetstein, Kyrke, and Kuinoel ad loc.— ἥν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς] which we possess even as an anchor of the soul, i.e. in which we possess, as it were, an anchor of the soul, which affords it support and protection against the storms and perils of the earthly life.— There exists no good reason for making ἔχειν equivalent to κατέχειν (Abresch, Dindorf, Bloomfield, and others).— ἀσφαλὴ τε καὶ βεβαιαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην κ.τ.λ.] which (sc. anchor) is sure and firm, and reaches into the interior of the veil. Wrongly does Carpzov (and so also Reuss) construe all these words with ἥν (sc. ἐλπίδα). For, in order to render this possible, ἔχομεν must have received its place only after τῆς ψυχῆς, in such wise that ὡς ἄγκυραν τῆς ψυχῆς should admit of being separated by commas from that which precedes and follows. Equally inadmissible is it, however, when Abresch, Böhme, Bleek, Bloomfield, and others take only ἀσφαλὴ τε καὶ βεβαιαν along with ἄγκυραν, and then refer back εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος τοῦ ἥν (sc. ἐλπίδα). For although the figure of an anchor reaching on high, instead of penetrating into the depths, is an incongruous one, yet metaphors are never to be pressed, and in our passage the choice of the expression εἰσίρχεσθαι εἰς τὸ
ἐσῶτερον points to the retention of the figure of the anchor, as well as the closely uniting τέ... καὶ... καὶ to the intimate coherence of the three characteristics. — καταπετάσμα] with the LXX. usually (Ex. xxvi. 31–35, xxvii. 21; Lev. xxi. 23, xxiv. 3; Num. iv. 5, al.), in the N. T. always (x. 20; Matt. xxvii. 51; Mark xv. 38; Luke xxiii. 45) of the second (ix. 3), or innermost curtain of the temple, the curtain before the Most Holy Place (τὸ ἱερόν). Comp. also Philo, de vita Mosis, iii. p. 669 B (with Mangey, ii. p. 150): ἡ δὲ τῷ μεθορίῳ τῶν τεττάρων καὶ πέντε κιόνων, ὅπερ ἐστὶ κυρίως εἰπτείν πρόναιον, εἰργόμενον δυσὶν υφάσμασι, τὸ μὲν ἔνδον δὲν καλεῖται καταπετάσμα, τὸ δὲ εκτὸς προσαγορεύεται κάλυμμα. Ibid. p. 667 C (II. p. 148): ἡ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν τὸ τε καταπετάσμα καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον κάλυμμα κατεσκευάζετο τὸ μὲν εἰσω κατὰ τῶν τέσσαρας κιόνας, ὡς ἐπικρυπτησαί τὸ ἄδυτον τὸ δὲ ἔξω κατὰ τοὺς πέντε κ.τ.λ.— τὸ ἐσῶτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος] the interior of the veil, i.e. that which is the interior with respect to the veil, or exists within the same, thus behind it. Designation of the Most Holy Place. Comp. Ex. xxvi. 33; Lev. xvi. 2, 12, 15. The Most Holy Place is spoken of as a symbol of heaven, where God is enthroned in His glory, and at His right hand is enthroned the exalted Christ.

Ver. 20. Close of the digression made from v. 11 onwards, and apt return to v. 10. — ὅτι] whither. Inexact, as Luke ix. 57, John viii. 21 f., and often, instead of the ὅτι, which is never used in the N. T. (see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 439); yet more significant than the latter, since it contains, in addition to the notion of having entered, the additional notion of remaining. — πρόδρομος] as harbinger. The expression, in the N. T. only here, characterizes Christ as the first member in a series, thus glances at the fact that those who believe in Him shall attain to the Most Holy Place. Comp. John xiv. 2, 3.— ἐντὸς ἡμῶν] in our interest, or for our eternal welfare, namely, to obtain pardon for us (ix. 12), to represent us in the presence of God (ix. 24), and to open up for us an entrance into heaven itself (x. 19 f.). ἐντὸς ἡμῶν is to be construed, not with πρόδρομος (Heinrichs, Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, and others), but (as
already the Peshito) with εἰσῆλθεν.——In that which follows
the emphasis rests upon κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ
(Böhme, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Hofmann), which on that
account is proposed; not upon εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (Bleek,
Woerner), which latter, on the contrary, as an additional
note of definition is derived only from the κατὰ τὴν τάξιν
Μελχισ.
CHAPTER VII.

VER. 1. Instead of τοῦ ὑψίστου, Elz. has only ὑψίστου. Against A B C D E K L Κ, 23, 44, 46, 48, al. pl., Clem. Chrys. Theodoret, al. mult. — ὃ συναντήσας] Lachm. and Alford, after A B C (corr.) D E K Κ, 17, 117, al.: ὃς συναντήσας. Notwithstanding the strong support of authorities, manifest error, arising from the reading together of the article and the initial letter of the participle. — VER. 4. Instead of the Recepta ϕ xai διεκάνην, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 read, after B D* E* Vulg. (Amiatin. Toletan.) It. Copt. Basm. Syr., merely ϕ διεκάνην. Certainly xai is not indispensable, and might be regarded as a later gloss from ver. 2. But with quite as much probability it may be supposed that it was added by the author himself, the words of ver. 2 being still present to his mind. It is therefore, since it has in its favour the considerable attestation by A C D*** E** K L Κ, by, as it appears, all the cursive, by the Vulgate (also Demidov. and Harlej.), Syr. Philonex. al., by Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. al., Aug. Bede, with Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Alford, to be retained. — VER. 6. The article τῶν before Ἀφραάμ is deleted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, and Alford, after B C D* Κ* 23, 57, 109, al. In favour of the omission pleads the very sparing use made of the article before proper names in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the article as a rule being placed only where, as in xi. 17, the perspicuity of the discourse imperatively demanded it. — VER. 9. In place of the received Λευ̂ we have here, with Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 2, to write Λευς, after Α (λευς) B C* Κ* (λευς). In the ed. vii. and viii. Tisch. writes: Λευς. — VER. 10. Elz.: ὅ μιλ- χισιδίας. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, Alford, after B C* D* Κ, 73, 118, al., Chrys.: μιλχισιδίας. The rejection of the article is to be approved on the same grounds as in ver. 6. — VER. 11. The Recepta εἰ' αὐτὴ νενομοδήπητο (defended by Reiche) has decisive witnesses against it. Instead of εἰ' αὐτὴ is εἰ' αὐτῆς (approved by Grotius, placed on the inner margin by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford), required by A B C D* E* Κ, 17, 31, 46, al., Cyril; instead of νενομοδήπητο is νενομοδεί-
\[\text{CHAP. VII. 259}\]

\[\text{τηγαί (already approved by Camerarius and Grotius, adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford), required by A B C D* Ν, 17, 47, 73, al., Cyril. — Ver. 13. \text{προσισχησιν] Tisch. 1, after A C, 17, al.: \text{προάσχεσι. Commended to notice by Griesb. also. Rightly, however, do Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche (Commentar. crit. p. 56, note 9), prefer the \text{Recepta προσισχησιν. In favour of this pleads, besides the yet stronger attestation (B D E K Λ Ν, Oecum. al.), the paronymasia with \text{μετίσχησιν, consonant with the style of the Epistle to the Hebrews. — Ver. 14. Elz.: \text{oùδίν \text{περὶ \text{iσρωσύνης. But A B C D* Ν Κ, 17, 47, al., It. Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Cyril. Chrys. (codd.) have: \text{περὶ \text{iσρίων οùδίν. Rightly adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch, and Alford. \text{περὶ \text{iσρωσύνης is a glossematic elucidation. — Ver. 16. Instead of the \text{Recepta σαρξικης, Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford have adopted \text{σαρκίνης, after A B C D* Ν Κ (also H in the title), many min. and Fathers. Rightly. \text{σαρκίνης might easily be changed into \text{σαρκικής by transcribers, since \text{σαρκίκης is an adjective of very frequent recurrence in the N. T., \text{σάρκινος a rare one. — Ver. 17. \text{μαρτυρεῖαν} Elz.: \text{μαρτυρεῖτι. Against preponderating testimony (A B D* E* Ν, 17, 31, al., Copt. Sahid. Arm. Cyril. Theophyl.). — Ver. 21. After \text{αιώνα Elz. Griesb. Matthei, Scholz, Lachm. Bloomfield, Reiche add once more: \text{xατά τὴν τάξιν Μιλχισιδίας. Deleted by Bleek, Tisch, and Alford, after B C, 17, 80, Vulg. Sahid. Basm. Arm. Ambr. (?) Bede. Rejected also by Delitzsch. But without sufficient ground. For the words are found in A D E K Λ Ν* Ε* It. Syr. utr. Copt. al., with Chrys. Theodoret, al., and the omission of them is to be explained by the fact that immediately after the same (ver. 22) the discourse is continued afresh with \text{xατά; the eye of the transcriber might thus easily wander from the first \text{xατά to the second \text{xατά. Also for \text{ν* there was found in the twofold \text{xατά the occasion for overlooking not only \text{xατά τὴν τάξιν Μιλχισιδίας, but in addition to this likewise \text{εἰς τὴν αἰώνα. — Ver. 22. \text{τοσουν] So Elz. Griesb. Matthei, Scholz, Bloomfield. But the weighty authority of A B C D* Ν* Athan. (cod.) al. decides in favour of the form of the word preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, \text{τοσουτο. — Ver. 23. \text{Recepta: γεγονότες \text{iσρεῖς. So also Tisch. 2, 7, and 8. As better attested, however (A C D E, Cyril. [twice] Chrys. [ms.], the order of words: \text{iσρεῖς γεγονότες, is to be preferred, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, Delitzsch, and Alford. — Ver. 26. Elz.: \text{ἐπρεπε. More correctly, however, Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Scholz (?), Tisch. and Alford, after A B D E, Syr. utr. Arab. Erp. Euseb.: \text{καλ ἐπρεπε.}}
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Vv. 1—10. While the author now in reality passes over to the work of developing the high-priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec, proper to Christ, and consequently of illustrating upon every side the pre-eminence of the same above the Levitical high-priesthood, he dwells first of all upon the person of Melchisedec himself, in that, following the thread of the Scripture narrative, he brings vividly before his readers the exaltedness of Melchisedec's position, and draws their attention to a threefold superiority of Melchisedec over the Levitical priests.

Vv. 1—3. Elucidation of κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μέλχισεδὲκ ἄρχηρενς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, vi. 20, by a delineation of the character of Melchisedec. Vv. 1—3 form a single proposition, in which μένει is the tempus finitum. The characterization of Melchisedec combines in the first half (βασιλεὺς Σαλὴμ . . . ἐμέρισεν Ἀβραὰμ, ver. 2) the historic traits which are afforded of him in Genesis (xiv. 18—20), while in the second half (πρῶτον μὲν κ.τ.λ.) the author himself completes the picture of Melchisedec, in reasoning from that historic delineation. — βασιλεὺς Σαλὴμ κύριος τῶν Σαλαμίων. By Salem is understood, on the part of the Targumists, Josephus, Antiq. i. 10. 2, the majority of the Church Fathers, Grotius, Drusius, Owen, Michaelis, Gesenius, von Bohlen, Winer, Realwörterb. II. 2 Aufl. p. 95, Stuart, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Knobel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Auberlen, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, and others, Jerusalem. On the other hand, Primasius, Zeger, Jac. Cappellus, Whitby, Cellarius, Reland, Rosenmüller, Bleek (see, however, at ver. 2), Tuch, Ewald, Alford, Maier, and others think of the place Σαλείμ, mentioned John iii. 23, situated eight Roman miles south of Scythopolis. The latter was, as we learn from Jerome (Ep. 126, ad Evagrium), the view already espoused in his day by the "eruditissimi" among the Hebrews, in opposition to "Josephus et nostri omnes," as accordingly also it was thought that the ruins of the palace of Melchisedec were still to be shown at the last-named place in the time of Jerome. This Σαλείμ, mentioned John iii. 23, has, moreover, been held by some recent exposi-

1 C. A. Auberlen, "Melchisedek's ewiges Leben und Priesterthum Hebr. 7" (Stud. u. Krit. 1857, H. 3, p. 453 ff.).
tors, as Bleek and Alford, to be likewise identical with the Σαλήμ, Judith iv. 4. More correct, however, is the first-named view. For, besides the earlier name Jebus for Jerusalem (Judg. xix. 10, al.), occurs also the early name Salem (Ps. lxxvi. 3 [2]), and the narrative in Genesis xiv. 17 ff. points unmistakably to the southern part of the land. Comp. specially Knobel, Genesis, 2 Aufl., Leipz. 1860, p. 149 f. — ἵερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υψίστου] priest of God, the Most High. In the monotheistic sense, as in Genesis, vid. ibid. ver. 22. — ὁ συναντήσας Ἀβραάμ κ.τ.λ. who went to meet Abraham when he was returning from the smiling of the kings (Gen. xiv. 12 ff.), and blessed him. — καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτῶν] Gen. xiv. 19, 20. Wrongly is it alleged by Heinrichs that εὐλογεῖν denotes only: gratulari de victoria tam splendida.

Ver. 2. To whom also Abraham portioned out the tenth of all (sc. that he had gained as booty; comp. ἐκ τῶν ἀκροβυσίων, ver. 4). — πρῶτον μὲν ἔρμηπονέμονος βασιλεύς δικαιοσύνης] he who first, interpreted (i.e. if one translates his Hebrew name מֶלֶךְ הַיָשָׁר into Greek), is King of Righteousness. Comp. Josephus, Antiq. i. 10. 2: Μελχισεδέκης, σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο βασιλεύς δίκαιος. — Bell. Jud. vi. 10: ο δὲ πρῶτος κτίσας (Ἰεροσόλυμα) ἦν Χαναάνων δυνάστης, ο τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ κληθείς βασιλεύς δίκαιος. The author of the epistle, however, following more closely the sense of the Hebrew words, renders the name by βασιλεύς δικαιοσύνης (instead of rendering it βασιλεύς δίκαιος, as Josephus does), and thereby brings out more clearly the part sustained by Melchisedec as a type of Christ, inasmuch as the latter is not only Himself righteous (comp. Zech. ix. 9; Jer. xxiii. 5), but also the mediatorial author of righteousness for others. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 30; Jer. xxiii. 6; Mal. iv. 2; Dan. ix. 24. — ἐπείτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεύς Σαλήμ, δ εὖτεν βασιλεύς εἰρήνης] and then also king of Salem, which is (denotes) king of peace. Comp. with regard to Christ as our peace and peace-bringer, Eph. ii. 14, 15, 17; Rom. v. 1; also Isa. ix. 6, 7. — δ εὖτεν] corresponds to the ἐρμηπονέμονος of the previous clause. — There is no reason for taking Salem, with Böhme and Bleek, after the precedent given by Petrus Cunaeus, de Rep. Hebraeorum, iii. 3, as not being the name of a place at all, but
βασιλεύς Σαλήμ together as forming the further name of the man, since the author of the epistle might discover a typical reference to Christ not only in the personal name of Melchisedec, but also in the name of the state over which he ruled as king and prophet. The author, for the rest, interprets the name of the place as though not ὅσιος (peaceful) but ὅσιος (peace) had been written in the Hebrew,—a mode of rendering in which Philo had already preceded him. Comp. Legg. allegor. iii. 25, p. 75 (with Mangey, I. p. 102 f.): καὶ Μελχισεdek βασιλεά τῆς εἰρήνης—Σαλήμ τούτο γὰρ ἐρμηνεύεται—ἱερὰ ἑαυτὸν πεποίηκεν ο θεός.

Ver. 3. Ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος] without father, without mother, without pedigree, i.e. of whom neither father, nor mother, nor pedigree stands recorded in Holy Scripture. This is the usual interpretation of the words, which has been the prevalent one in the church from early times to the present. Less natural, and only in repute here and there, is the explanation: χωρὶς πατρὸς καὶ γυνῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἔχων γενεαλογίαν, according to which the sacred writer must have recognised in Melchisedec a higher, superhuman being, who had only for a time assumed a human form. The latter view was taken by Origen and Didymus, who would maintain that Melchisedec is to be regarded as an angel; in like manner the unknown authority in Jerome, ad Evagr.; Hilary, Quaest. in V. T. quaest. 109, and the Egyptian Hieracas in Epiph. Haeres. 67, who saw in him an ensarcosis of the Holy Ghost; as also the Melchisedecites, a section of the Theodotians, who described him as μεγάλην τινὰ δύναμιν θελαν, surpassing in exaltedness even Christ Himself, since Christ appeared after the likeness of Melchisedec; finally, single individuals in the orthodox church, in Epiphanius, Haer. 55. 7; as also afterwards, P. Molinaeus, Vates, iv. 11 sq.; P. Cunaeus, i.e.; J. C. Hottinger, de Decimis Judaeorum, p. 15; d’Outrein, Starck, and others, who supposed that in Melchisedec the Son of God Himself had appeared in human form. This whole method of interpretation has against it the fact that ἀγενεαλόγητος—for not ἀγένητος is placed—can be understood without violence only of the neglect to cite the genealogical table of Melchisedec in the narrative of the Book of Genesis [comp.
and \( \dot{\alpha}p\acute{a}t\omega\rho, \dot{\alpha}m\acute{h}\tau\omega\rho \) must be taken conformably with the elucidatory \( \dot{\alpha}g\acute{e}n\acute{e}a\lambda\acute{\omega}\rho\gamma\acute{t}\acute{t}\acute{o}s \), thus are likewise to be explained merely of the father and mother being passed over unnamed in the historic account, not of their actual non-existence. The characteristics \( \dot{\alpha}p\acute{a}t\omega\rho, \dot{\alpha}m\acute{h}\tau\omega\rho, \dot{\alpha}g\acute{e}n\acute{e}a\lambda\acute{\omega}\rho\gamma\acute{t}\acute{t}\acute{o}s \), moreover, are to be referred—since \( \dot{\alpha}f\omega\mu\omega\mu\acute{m}\acute{e}n\acute{\nu}s \) \( \delta\varepsilon \tau\omicron\ \nu\acute{i}\zeta \) \( \tau\omicron\ \theta\acute{e}\omicron\upsilon\) cannot yet be brought into correspondence therewith—only to Melchisedec, without our being obliged to seek for them a special point of comparison with Christ, as is done by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Cornelius a Lapide, Jac. Cappellus, Bisping, al. (comp. also Kurtz ad loc.), in applying the \( \dot{\alpha}p\acute{a}t\omega\rho \) to Christ’s humanity, the \( \dot{\alpha}m\acute{h}\tau\omega\rho \) to His divinity, and the \( \dot{\alpha}g\acute{e}n\acute{e}a\lambda\acute{\omega}\rho\gamma\acute{t}\acute{t}\acute{o}s \) either likewise to His divinity or to His New Testament high priesthood. Comp. e.g. Theodoret: ‘\( \dot{\alpha}m\acute{h}\tau\omega\rho \) \( \mu\acute{e}n \) \( \gamma\acute{a}r \) \( \varepsilon\omicron\tau\acute{\iota} \) \( \acute{\omega}s \) \( \theta\acute{e}\omicron\upsilon\)· \( \acute{e}k \) \( \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\upsilon \) \( \gamma\acute{a}r \) \( \gamma\acute{e}g\acute{\iota}\nu\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota} \) \( \tau\omicron\ \pi\acute{a}\rho\acute{\e}\acute{t}\omicron\upsilon\omicron\ \phi\acute{m}i\omicron\)· \( \dot{\alpha}g\acute{e}n\acute{e}a\lambda\acute{\omega}\rho\gamma\acute{t}\acute{t}\acute{\omega}s \) \( \acute{\omega}s \) \( \theta\acute{e}\omicron\upsilon\)· \( \acute{o}u \) \( \gamma\acute{a}r \) \( \chi\acute{r}\acute{\iota}\zeta \) \( \gamma\acute{e}n\acute{e}a\lambda\acute{\omega}\rho\gamma\acute{\iota}\lambda\upsilon\acute{\alpha} \) \( \delta\varepsilon\chi\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\)·— By means of \( \dot{\alpha}p\acute{a}t\omega\rho, \dot{\alpha}m\acute{h}\tau\omega\rho, \dot{\alpha}g\acute{e}n\acute{e}a\lambda\acute{\omega}\rho\gamma\acute{t}\acute{t}\acute{o}s \), Melchisedec appears as presenting a contrast to the Levitical priests, since in the case of these scrupulous attention was paid to the descent.— The expression \( \dot{\alpha}g\acute{e}n\acute{e}a\lambda\acute{\omega}\rho\gamma\acute{t}\acute{t}\acute{o}s \) only here in all Greek literature.— \( \mu\acute{\iota}\acute{\varepsilon} \dot{\alpha}r\chi\acute{\gamma}n \) \( \acute{\eta}\acute{m}e\acute{r}\acute{\omega}n \) \( \mu\acute{\iota}\acute{\tau}e \) \( \zeta\omicron\upsilon\acute{\iota}\upsilon \) \( \tau\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\) \( \acute{\epsilon}\chi\alpha\omicron\upsilon\) without beginning of days and without end of life, namely, in that nothing is related in Holy Scripture either of his birth or his death. The statement is quite a general one. To limit it to the beginning and end of the priesthood (Cameron, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Whitby, Kuinoel, Hofmann, al.) is arbitrary. Nor is the meaning of the words, that Melchisedec was not born in the ordinary human way, and, something like Enoch and Elijah, was taken up to heaven without experiencing death (Hunnius, Braun, Akersloot; comp. also Bleek, p. 322 ff.; Nagel: “On the significance of Melchisedec in the Epistle to the Hebrews,” in the Stud. u. Krit. 1849, H. 2, p. 332 ff.; Nickel in Reuter’s Repertor. 1858, Feb. p. 102 f.; Alford), a sense which conflicts with the right apprehension of the opening words of the verse. — \( \dot{\alpha}f\omega\mu\omega\mu\acute{m}\acute{e}n\acute{\nu}s \) \( \delta\varepsilon \tau\omicron\ \nu\acute{i}\zeta \) \( \tau\omicron\ \theta\acute{e}\omicron\upsilon\) on the contrary (therein) made entirely like unto the Son of God, namely, as type of the
same. The words do not belong to μενει ἵερεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές (Peshito, Grotius, al.). For with justice does Theodoret already observe: εν μέντοι τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ οὐ Μελχισεδὲκ μεμίμηται τῶν δεσπότων Χριστὸν, ἀλλ’ ὁ δεσπότης Χριστὸς ἵερεν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ. They form, by means of the closely combining δέ, a more precise positive defining to the negative μὴ τῇ ἁρχῇ ημερῶν μὴ τῇ θεωρίᾳ τέλος ἔχον. Chrysostom: Ἀφομοιομένος δέ, φησι, τῷ νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πτοῦ ἡ ὀργάνης; Ὅτι καὶ τούτου κακείνου τὸ τέλος ἁγνοούμεν καὶ τῇ ἁρχῇ ἀλλὰ τούτου μὲν παρὰ τὸ μὴ γεγράφθαι, ἕκείνου δὲ παρὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι.—μενει ἵερεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές] remainis priest for ever, in that, as of his end of life so also of the cessation of his priesthood, nothing is recorded. He remains so in the reality of his office, but only as a figure and type of Christ. Against the view of Auberlen (I.c. p. 497), that Melchisedec is termed an everlasting priest in no other sense than as, according to the Apocalypse, all the blessed in heaven are so, see the observations of Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 202 f., Remark. The subject, moreover, in μενει is naturally the Melchisedec of Genesis, not, as Wieseler contends (Schrr. d. Univ. zu Kiel aus d. J. 1860, VI. 1, p. 40): “the Melchisedec of the passage in the Psalms just mentioned (vi. 20), or the true antitypal Melchisedec or Messiah.” For it is not grammatically allowable, with Wieseler, to take the words βασιλεύς Σαλῆμ . . . ἀφομοιομένος δὲ τῷ νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ as an apposition merely to ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ, and not to the whole expression ὁ ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ, and in connection with ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ to rest the emphasis exclusively upon ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ of the same import as εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, vi. 20. Comp. x. 12, 14.

Ver. 4. Θεωρεῖτε] is imperative, whereby a strain is to be put on the attention for that which follows: but behold, namely, inwardly, i.e. consider. — παρθένος] how great, i.e. how high and exalted. — ὁ ὁ Καὶ ἐκείνη Ἀβραὰμ ἐδώκεν κ.τ.λ.] Resuming of the historic notice already adduced at the beginning of ver. 2, in order then further to argue from the same. By the choice and position of the words, however, the author brings out the παρθένος in its truth and inner justice. (Choice of the words ἀκροβινη and παρθεκριάτης,—the latter in place of
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the elsewhere more usual ὁ πατήρ in regard to Abraham,—
and effective placing of the characterizing title ὁ πατριάρχης
at the close of the proposition at a far remove from the name
'Αβραάμ.) — καὶ δεκάτην] καὶ is not the merely copulative
also,” as ver. 2 (Hofmann), but is used as giving intensity. It
gives intensity, however, not to the subject (so Luther, Grotius,
Owen, Carpzov: “Abraham himself also”),—for then ὁ καὶ
'Αβραάμ δεκάτην ἐδωκεν must have been written,—but the pre-
dicate: to whom Abraham gave even the tenth. — ἀκροβίνα] com-
posed of ἀκρος and θῖν, in the N. T. α ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, denotes
the uppermost of the heap, the choice or best thereof. The
expression is most current with regard to the first-fruits of the
harvest presented to the Godhead; not seldom, however, is it
used of the best, which was selected out of the spoils of war
as an offering consecrated to the Godhead. In our passage, too,
ἀκροβίνα denotes not simply the spoils acquired by Abraham
(so Chrysostom: τὰ λάφυρα; Occumenius: ἐκ τῶν σκύλων
καὶ λαφύρων; Erasmus, Luther, Vatablus, Calvin, Schlichting,
Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Bloomfield, and the majority), but the
choicest, most valuable articles thereof. Theophylact: ἐκ τῶν
λαφύρων τῶν κρειττώνων καὶ τιμωτέρων. Not that the mean-
ing of the author is, that Abraham gave to Melchisedec the
tenth part of the most choice objects among the booty acquired,
but that the tithes which he presented to Melchisedec con-
sisted of the choicest, most excellent portions of the booty.—
ὁ πατριάρχης] he, the patriarch. The sonorous name of
honour πατριάρχης, composed of πατριά and ἀρχή, designates
Abraham as the father of the chosen race, and ancestor of the
people of Israel. Comp. Acts ii. 29, where David is dis-
tinguished by the same title of honour, and Acts vii. 8, 9,
where the twelve sons of Jacob are so distinguished.

Vv. 5–10. Unfolding of the πιστικὸς οὕτος κ.τ.λ., ver. 4,
in that Melchisedec is compared with the Levitical priests,
and a threefold superiority of the former over the latter is
pointed out.

Vv. 5–7. First point of superiority. The Levitical priests,
indeed, take tithes of their brethren, although these brethren,
in like manner as they, have descended from Abraham: they
have thus, it is true, a pre-eminence above these; but they
are inferior to Melchisedec, since this man took tithes of Abraham himself, the common ancestor of the Jewish people, and blessed him.

Ver. 5. Admission of the relatively privileged position of the Levitical priests. — **καὶ** the explanatory: *and certainly.* — *οἱ μὲν κ.τ.λ.* preparatory to the adversative *οὐ δὲ κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 6. — *οἱ ἐκ τῶν νιῶν Δευτ πρὸ τῶν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες* those of the sons (descendants) of Levi who obtain the office of priest. For not all Levites, but only those of them who claimed lineage from the house of Aaron, were entitled to enter upon the priesthood. Comp. Ex. xxviii. 1 ff.; Num. iii. 10, 38, xvi., xviii. 1 ff., al. Mistaken is the opinion of Delitzsch, Maier, and Moll (in coinciding with Hofmann), that the *ἐκ* in *ἐκ τῶν νιῶν Δευτ* is the *causae* of origin: "those who receive the priesthood from the sons of Levi, i.e. by virtue of their descent from Levi, in such wise that their person is not taken into account as such, but only in so far as they belong to this lineage." If that had been intended, *οἱ ἐκ τῶν νιῶν Δευτ ὅπερ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες* must have been written. — *ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν ἀποδεκατοῦν τὸν λαὸν κατὰ τὸν νόμον* have a charge to tithe the people according to the law. Comp. Num. xviii. 20—32; Deut. xiv. 22—29; Neh. x. 38, 39; de Wette, *Lehrb. der hebr.-jud. Archäologie*, 3 Aufl. p. 273 f.; Delitzsch, *Talmudische Studien*, XIV. Justification of Heb. vii. 5 ¹ (in Guericke's *Zeitschr. f. d. gesammte luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1863, H. 1, p. 16 ff.). — *κατὰ τὸν νόμον* belongs not to τὸν λαὸν (Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, Starck, Böhme, Hofmann), against which even the non-repetition of the article after λαὸν decides; nor yet to ἀποδεκατοῦν (Owen, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Ewald), but to ἐντολὴν ἔχουσι. — In the closing words, τοὺ-

¹ The justification consists of the attempted proof that in the post-exilian age the tenth was no longer levied in the first place by the Levites,—who had been wont only afterwards to render to the priests the portion pertaining to the same,—but the priests themselves had entered upon the right of levying the tenth, which had been originally assigned to the Levites. Nevertheless, however the matter may have stood in this respect, there was hardly any need of a justification of the words Heb. vii. 5, since no statement whatever as to the mode of receiving the tenths is contained in the same; on the contrary, these words are equally appropriate for indirect as for direct levying of the tithes.
tēstum tovs adelphous aivtōn, kai per k.t.l., Bleek, after the example set by Böhme, erroneously finds the sense: “that, although they are the posterity of Abraham, the lauded patriarch, who are tithed by the Levitical priests, yet they are, after all, still the brethren of the latter, i.e. fellow-Israelites; which cannot be so astonishing as when Abraham himself paid the tithes to Melchisedec.” On the contrary, the elucidation of τον λαον by τουτόσων tovs adelphous aivtōn serves to bring into more striking relief the singularity of the ἀποδεκατοῦν; since elsewhere only the higher receives tithes from the lower, not the equal from the equal (as here an Abrahamides from an Abrahamides), and this singularity of the ἀποδεκατοῦν is then yet further manifested by kai per ἐξηλυθότας εκ τῆς ὁσφύος Ἄβρααμ. The author can therefore only design, by means of ver. 5, to characterize the priests as primi inter pares. This superiority, however, in regard to their own fellow-Israelites, the author concede only in order immediately after, ver. 6, to oppose to the same the inferiority in regard to Melchisedec.— ἐξέρχεσθαι εκ τῆς ὁσφύος τινὸς So the LXX. render the Hebrew 'b'ynawr, Gen. xxxv. 11; 2 Chron. vL 9.

Ver. 6. Notwithstanding this privileged position of the Levitical priests (ver. 5), Melchisedec yet occupies a far higher position.— ὃ ἐξ is not to be taken alone, as by Böhme, Kuinoel, and Klee, and then to be supplemented by τὴν ἱερατεῖαν λαβὼν from ver. 5; but ὃ ἐξ μὴ γενεαλογοῦμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν belongs together: Melchisedec, on the contrary, without (μὴ) his family or descent being derived from them, received tithes of Abraham. — ἐξ αὐτῶν] refers neither to the Israelites (Epiph. Haer. 67. 7; Cornelius a Lapide, Braun, Ernesti, Schulz) nor to Levi and Abraham (Grotius), but to the vioi Levi, ver. 5. — The parallel clause, καὶ τῶν ἔχοντα τὸν ἐπαγγελίαν εὐλόγηκεν] and blessed him who had the promises, serves yet further to make manifest the dignity and exaltedness of Melchisedec. For, by the fact that Abraham had received the divine promises, that his seed should be multiplied, and in him all nations of the earth should be blessed (Gen. xii. 2 f., xiii. 14 f.), he had been already most highly favoured of God. How high thus must that man stand, who imparts his blessing to
one already so highly favoured, since truly—as is immediately expressly added, ver. 7—the dispenser of the blessing is ever more exalted than the recipient of the blessing! Oecumenius: έξηρε τον 'Αβραάμ, ίνα πλείου εξάρη τον Μελχισεδέκ.

Ver. 7 joined on by means of δέ, since the verse contains the major of a syllogism. The minor is already furnished in the second half of ver. 6, and the conclusion: “therefore Melchisedec is more exalted than Abraham,” is left to the readers themselves to supply. — The neuters τό ἐλαττόν and τό κρεῖττον serve for the generalization of the statement, inasmuch as the author has only persons in view. Comp. Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 167. — The truth of the statement, however, is apparent, in that the author is thinking of the blessing imparted in the name of God and by virtue of the divine authority. For Melchisedec as the priest of God was the representative of God, or one divinely commissioned, in the communicating of the blessings.

Ver. 8. Second point of superiority. The Levitical priests are mortal men; but of Melchisedec it is testified that he lives. — By καί δὲ μέν, “and here,” reference is made to the Levitical priests, by ἐκεῖ δὲ, “but there,” to Melchisedec, because the Levitical priesthood still continues to exist to the time of our author, thus having something about it near and present; the historic appearing of Melchisedec, on the other hand, falls in the period of hoary antiquity.— δεκάτας] The plural, on account of the plurality of tithes levied by the Levitical priests. — ἀποθνῄσκοντες] as the principal notion placed before ἀνθρωπον. — ἀποθνῄσκοντες ἀνθρωποι] men who die (irrevocably or successively), comp. ver. 23. — ἐκεῖ δὲ μαρτυροῦμενος ὅτι ζή] but there, one who has testimony that he lives, sc. δεκάτην ἔλαβεν. That by reason of the coherence with which which precedes only Melchisedec can be understood, and not (with Justinian, Jac. Cappellus, Heinsius, and Pyle) Christ, scarcely stands in need of mention. ζή, as opposition to ἀποθνῄσκοντες, can be interpreted only absolutely, of the life which is not interrupted by death. That the author, in connection with μαρτυροῦμενος, had before his mind a testimony contained in the Holy Scriptures of the Old Covenant, admits of no doubt. Whether, however, he derived the testi-
mony of Melchisedec's continued life from the silence of Scripture as to Melchisedec's death, or found in the declaration, Ps. cx. 4, a direct proof therefor, or, finally, combined the two facts together, and deduced his conclusion from both in common, is a question hardly to be decided. The first supposition is entertained by Calvin, Estius, Drusius, Piscator, Grotius, Owen, Wolf, Bengel, Stein, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, and others; the second, by Theodoret, Zeger, Whitby, Heinrichs, Bleek, Bloomfield, Alford, Conybeare, Kurtz, Mc'Caul, Woerner, and others; the third, by Böhme, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. pp. 201, 454, and others.

Vv. 9, 10. Third point of superiority. In Abraham, Levi the receiver of the tithes has also already been tithed by Melchisedec.— The formula ὦς ἐπος εἰπεῖν, of very common occurrence with classic writers, as likewise frequently met with in Philo, is found in the N. T. only here. It denotes either:

*to say it in one word (in short), or: so to say, i.e. in some sense.*

Theophylact: Τὸ δὲ ὦς ἐπος εἰπεῖν ἢ τὸ τοῦ σημάτως ὅτι καὶ ἐν συντόμῳ εἰπεῖν, ἢ ἄντι τοῦ ἰδίων ὅτι εἰπω. In the former sense our passage is apprehended by Camerarius, Jac. Cappellus, Er. Schmid, Owen (preferably), Elsner, Wolf, Bengel, Heumann; in the latter,—and this is here the more correct one,—the Vulgate, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Carpzov, Kypke, Heinsius, Böhme, Kinoel, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority. The author himself feels that the thought he is on the point of expressing has something singular and unusual about it. Thus he mitigates and limits the harshness thereof by ὦς ἐπος εἰπεῖν, whereby he indicates that the ensuing statement is, notwithstanding its inner truth, not to be understood literally. — *di' Ἀβραάμ* by Abraham, i.e. by the fact that Abraham gave the tenth. Ἀβραάμ is a genitive. Mistaken; Augustine (de Genes. ad lit. x. 19): *propter Abraham; Photius (in Oecumenius): διὰ τῶν δεκατω-θέντα Ἀβραάμ φησι τρόπον των καὶ ὅ ἐν τῇ ὄσφυι αὐτοῦ ἐτι ὑπὸ Λευ χεδεκατωταί.* — *Δευτέρον* As is shown by the participle present in the addition ὁ δεκάτας λαμβάνων, we have not to think of the mere individual personality of Levi, but of him in
connection with his posterity, thus of Levi as ancestor and representative of the Jewish priests.

Ver. 10. Proof for the assertion ver. 9. When Abraham gave the tenth to Melchisedec, he was as yet childless, and therefore at that time still bore his descendants as in germ in himself. When, accordingly, by the presentation of the tenth he acknowledged a superior rank of Melchisedec over himself, he rendered homage to the latter not only in his own person, but at the same time as the representative of his posterity, as yet incapable of independent action, because as yet unborn.— ἄτι ἐν τῇ ὁσφυί τοῦ πατρὸς ἐστιν] to be as yet in the loins of the father, or to be yet unborn. The expression is explained by the analogous ἔξωρχοσταὶ ἐκ τῆς ὁσφύος τινός, ver. 5: by generation to proceed from one's loins.— τοῦ πατρὸς] is not to be taken, with Bleek, as a "universally recognised designation" of Abraham (i.e. as father of the Jews and Christians). It stands in special relation to Levi; thus: his father, wherein, of course, seeing Abraham was the great-grandfather of Levi, πατήρ is to be understood in the wider sense, or as progenitor.

Vv. 11-17. The Levitical priesthood in general has, together with the Mosaic law, lost its validity.

Ver. 11. From the inferiority of the Levitical priesthood to the priesthood of Melchisedec, just proved, it followed that the former was imperfect and incapable of leading to perfection. This fact is now presupposed by the author as a self-evident consequence, and he proceeds at once to demonstrate the truth thereof.— οὖν deduces the conclusion from vv. 5-10, not from vi. 20 (de Wette, Bisping), whereby an interruption ensues in the continuity of the development begun by the author.— εἶ with the indicative preterite (iv. 8, viii. 4), supposition of an impossible case: if there were, if there existed; in combination with διὰ: if it were effected.— τελειωσία] perfection, i.e. attainment of the highest goal of mankind in a moral and religious respect. There is included in it the obtaining of the expiation of sins and the glory to come. Comp. ix. 9, x. 1, 14, xi. 40.— ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπὶ αὐτῆς νεομοθέτηται] for the people on the ground thereof hath received the law. These words can be taken only as a parenthesis (against Stein). νομοθετεῖν τινί signifies to give laws to one, to pro-
vide one with a law (here the Mosaic law). The mode of transposing this active construction into the passive ὁ λαὸς νεομοθήτης is quite the usual one; comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 244 f. — ἐπὶ αἰτητῆς relates not to τελειωσίν (so, upon the supposition of the reading ἐπτ αἰτητ, Vatablus, but undecided; Seb. Schmidt, Starck, Rambach), but to τῆς Ἰερουσαλήμ ἱερωσύνης. ἐπὶ, however, denotes: upon the ground or condition of the existence of the Levitical priesthood, i.e. the Levitical priesthood is indissolubly conjoined with the Mosaic law which the people has received; it forms a foundation pillar upon which the latter rests, so that with the fall of the one the other also must fall (ver. 12). Erroneously,—because the statement thus arising would be too insignificant, and because ἐπὶ in this sense is used only with verba dicendi (comp. Gal. iii. 16; Heindorf, *ad Plat. Charm.* p. 62; Bernhardy, *Syntax*, p. 248),—Schlichting and Grotius [as also Whitby]: de sacerdotio Levitico legem accepit [an interpretation already rejected by Junius and Piscator]; as likewise Bleek I.: the people had received legal instruction concerning the Levitical priesthood. — But to what end the parenthesis? Its design is to indicate the ground on which one might expect to attain to the τελειωσίν,—if the Mosaic law were at all capable of leading thereto,—by the intervention of the Levitical priesthood, since the Mosaic law is erected upon this very Levitical priesthood as its basis. — τίς ἐτι χρεία] sc. ἢ, or ἄν ἢ. The words following χρεία are not to be blended together into one thought (Faber Stapulensis, Luther, Baumgarten, Chr. Fr. Schmid), in such wise that λέγεσθαι is governed immediately by χρεία, and again all the rest (κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἐτερον ἀνιστασθαι ἱερία καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἰαρών) by λέγεσθαι. The position of the words would then be contorted, and one explicable on no justifying grounds. On the contrary, the infinitive clause κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἐτερον ἀνιστασθαι ἱερία depends at once upon the immediately preceding τίς ἐτι χρεία; and to this first infinitive clause the second καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἰαρών λέγεσθαι forms an epexegetic parallel clause: What need was there still then (or: would there then still have been) that another priest should arise "after the order of Melchisedec," and not be called (priest)
after the order of Aaron? — ἐτὲρον] sc. after the Levitical priesthood had long been instituted, and in general the Mosaic law promulgated. — ἐτερον] in distinction from ἄλλον, brings prominently forward the dissimilarity of his nature and constitution as compared with that of the Levitical priests. — To καὶ we have not to supplement the whole idea ἐτερον ἵερεα, but only ἵερεα. — οὖ, however, is placed, not μὴ as the infinitive λέγεσθαι might seem to require, because the negation extends to only a part of the clause. οὖ, namely, is closely associated with κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρῶν, and forms with the same merely a more precise definition to the ἵερεα which is to be supplied, so that the total expression καὶ (ἱερεὰ) οὖ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρῶν presents an opposition to the foregoing total expression κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μεθυσαθέκε ἐτερον ἵερεα. — λέγεσθαι] namely, Ps. cx. 4. That λέγεσθαι is not to be taken in the sense of εἶναι (Kuinoel, Stein, al.) is already shown by the λέγεται (Kuinoel, Stein, al.) is already shown by the λέγεται, ver. 13.

Ver. 12. In the parenthesis, ver. 11, the author has brought forward in general the close connectedness of the Levitical priesthood with the Mosaic law, and thereby already indicated that if the former is an imperfect and unsatisfying one, the same also is true of the latter; the perishing of the one involves also the perishing of the other. This truth the author now further specially urges, by means of a corroboration of the parenthetical remark, ver. 11. So in recent times also Alford and Woerner. Otherwise is the connection apprehended by Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 484), Maier, and Moll. They refer γάρ to the main thought in ver. 11, and find in ver. 12 an indication of the reason "why a change of the sacerdotal order would not have ensued without an urgent cause, namely, because such change would have involved also a change of the law in general." But subject-matter and form of expression in ver. 12 point back to the parenthesis, ver. 11. For in both the author is speaking of the inseparable conjunction of the Levitical priesthood with the Mosaic law; and ἐπ’ αὐτῆς, ver. 11, is resumed by τῆς ἱεροσύνης, ver. 12; νεομομβέται, ver. 11, by νόμον, ver. 12. — μετατιθεμένης] denotes, like the μετάθεσις immediately following, certainly as to its verbal
signification, only a transformation or change (not specially, as Chrysostom, Piscator, Grotius, Bengel, Heinrichs, Stuart, and others suppose, a transference of the priesthood to another tribe of the Jewish people, or to a non-Aaronides). As regards the thing intended, however,—as is manifest from the parallel ἀθέτησις, ver. 18,—an actual rendering obsolete or abrogation is spoken of. The author thus still expresses himself with delicacy of feeling.—That, further, νόμος is to be limited, neither, with Beza, Pareus, Piscator, Grotius, Wittich, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Zachariae, Whitby, Schulz, to the law of the priesthood, nor, with Calvin, Cornelius a Lapide, Jac. Cappellus, Carpzov, Kuinoel, Klee, and others, to the ceremonial law, but is to be interpreted of the Mosaic law in general, is self-evident.

Vv. 13, 14. First proof of ver. 12. Levitical priesthood and Mosaic law have lost their validity. For Christ, to whom the utterance of God, Ps. ex. 4, refers, belongs in point of fact to another tribe, which, according to Mosaic ordinance, has nothing to do with the administration of the priesthood.

Ver. 13. Ἡ οὖν ἡ ταύτα] With regard to whom. Comp. Mark ix. 12, 13; Rom. iv. 9.—λέγεται ταύτα] contains, like the λέγεσθαι of ver. 11, a direct allusion to the declaration of God, Ps. cx. 4. Wrongly Paulus: that which I have said heretofore.—φυλής ἐτέρας μετέσχηκεν] has part in another tribe (i.e. in a tribe different from that of Levi), namely, as member thereof.—αὐτῷ ἦς] descended from which, or belonging to the number of its members.—οὐδεὶς προσέσχηκεν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ] no one, namely, according to the ordinance of the law, attends at the altar, i.e. performs the priestly functions.

Ver. 14. Further evidencing of ver. 13.—προδηλον γάρ, διὸ] for it is clearly apparent that. The προ in προδηλον is not to be taken, with Peirce (following Owen), temporally, according to which the sense would be, that Christ's descent from the tribe of Judah was made known beforehand, i.e. before He had yet arisen upon earth,—with which, in the first place, the perfect ἀνατέταλκεν does not harmonize,—but contains the notion of lying manifestly before the eyes. Theodoret: τὸ προδηλον ὡς ἀναντιρήθην τέθεικε. προ serves, therefore, only for the strengthening of the simple δῆλον. Comp.
after the order of Aaron? — ἐν [sc. after the Levitical priesthood had long been instituted, and in general the Mosaic law promulgated. — ἐτέρον] in distinction from ἀλλον, prominently forward the dissimilarity of his nature and institution as compared with that of the Levitical priests. καὶ we have not to supplement the whole idea ἐτέρον, but only ἰερεία. — οὐ, however, is placed, not μὴ, infinitive λέγεσθαι might seem to require, because the infinitive extends to only a part of the clause. οὐ, not closely associated with κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ααρὼν, and for the same merely a more precise definition to the ἰερεία is to be supplied, so that the total expression καὶ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ααρὼν presents an opposition to the total expression κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μεχισθέκ ἐτέρον λέγεσθαι] namely, Ps. cx. 4. That λέγεσθαι is taken in the sense of eligi (Kuinoel, Stein, al.) shown by the λέγεσθαι, ver. 13.

Ver. 12. In the parenthesis, ver. 11, the author forward in general the close connectedness of the priesthood with the Mosaic law, and thereby already that if the former is an imperfect and unsatisfactory, same also is true of the latter; the perishing of the one involves also the perishing of the other. This author now further specially urges, by means of an indication of the reason "why a change of the order would not have ensued without an urgent cause," because such change would have involved also a change in the Mosaic law in general." But subject-matter and form in ver. 12 point back to the parenthesis in ver. 11, the author is speaking of "merely the Levitical priesthood with ver. 11, is resumed by ver. 11, by νόμον, ver. 12 ἐπέταθεσιν immediately.
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1 Tim. v. 24, 25. — ἐξ Ιούδα out of Judah, i.e. from the tribe of Judah (comp. Rev. v. 5; Gen. xlix. 9, 10). With emphasis preposed. — ἀνατέταλκεν has arisen or sprung forth. The figure which underlies the verb is either that of a rising star (comp. Num. xxiv. 17; Mal. iv. 2; Isa. lx. 1), or of a tender shoot coming up from the ground (Gen. xix. 25; Isa. xlv. 4; Ezek. xvi. 6; comp. also ἀνατολῇ, πρό, with reference to the Messiah, Jer. xxiii. 5; Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12). — ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν] Jesus Christ. — εἰς τὴν φυλὴν] in reference to which tribe. — πεπλήρετον] sc. who should be taken out of the same.

Vv. 15–17. Second proof of ver. 12. The abrogation of the Levitical priesthood and the Mosaic law follows further from the fact that the new priest who is promised is to bear resemblance to Melchisedec, whereby it is made manifest that his characteristic peculiarity is one quite different from that of the Levitical priests.

Ver. 15. Καὶ περισσότερον ἐστὶν κατάδηλον ἡμῶν] and the more still is it evident, namely, that with the Levitical priesthood the whole Mosaic law, too, is changed (and deprived of validity), ver. 12. Comp. also ver. 18. Not: what difference there is between the Levitical and the N. T. priesthood (Chrysostom : τὸ μέσον τῆς ἱεροσύνης ἑκάτερα, τὸ διάφορον, Clarlius, Zeger, Bisping); nor that perfection is to be found, not in the Levitical priesthood, but in the priesthood of Christ (Jas. Cappellus, Bengel, Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 551; Delitzsch); and just as little: that the priesthood is changed (Primasius, Justinian, Owen, Hammond, Rambach, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Stuart, Klee, Paulus). Quite mistakenly Ebrard: τὸ κατάδηλον ἡμῶν we have to supply from ver. 14 the clause δι’ ἑξ Ιούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν: “that Jesus descended from Judah is first in itself an acknowledged fact (ver. 14); this, however, is so much the more clear, since (ver. 15) it follows from the Melchisidecan nature of His priesthood that He could not be born κατὰ νόμον!” How then could it be inferred from the fact that Jesus could not be born κατὰ νόμον, that He must have descended precisely “from Judah”? — κατάδηλον] a similar intensifying of the simple form, as previously πρόδηλον. — εἰ … ἀνίσταται] ἐφ,
as surely is the case, there arises.\(^1\) ei thus, as to the sense, equal to ἐπειδὴ (Oecumenius, Theophylact). — κατὰ τὴν ὀμοιότητα Μελχισεdek] as the main idea placed first, and ὀμοιότης an elucidation of the τάξις in the passage of the Psalms. — The subject in the conditional clause is ἰερεύς ἐτερος (if . . . another priest arises), not merely ἐτερος (Schulz: “if . . . another is appointed as priest”), nor yet Jesus (if Ἰερο. . . arises as another priest).

Ver. 16. Nearer indication as to what is implied by the characteristic κατὰ τὴν ὀμοιότητα Μελχισεdek, ver. 15, what peculiarity of priesthood is expressed by the same. — δὲ] sc. ἰερεύς ἐτερος, not: Μελχισεdek. — δὲ . . . γέγονεν] who . . . has become so (sc. priest). — οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἐντολής σαρκίνης κ.τ.λ.] not according to the law of a fleshly command, but according to the power of indestructible [or indissoluble] life. In connection with νόμος, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Böhme, Kuinoel, Tholuck, Delitzsch, and others think of the Mosaic law; but against this argues the singular ἐντολής σαρκίνης, to take which, with the expositors mentioned, in the sense of the plural (according to the Mosaic law, whose essence consists in fleshly ordinances), or as a collective designation of the constituent parts of the law as ὁ νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν, Eph. ii. 15, is arbitrary. νόμος is therefore to be taken, as Rom. vii. 21, 23, in the more general sense: norm (rule, standard), and the ἐντολή is the special precept or ordinance which the Mosaic law contains regarding the Levitical priesthood. — It is called fleshly, however, according to Carpzov, Böhme, Stuart, and others, because it is mutable and transitory; more correctly, nevertheless: because it lays stress only upon external, earthly things, which fall a prey to transitoriness, and (comp. the contrast διὰ λατ. κατὰ δύναμιν κ.τ.λ.) appoints as priests only mortal men, of whom one after another is snatched away by death. Schlichting: carnale (praeeptum) vocatur, quia totum ad carnem spectat, carnisque rationem habebat. Partim enim ad certam stirpem, nempe Aaronicam, sacerdotii dignitatem adstrinxerat, partim mortalitati pontificum, quae

\(^1\) That Stein would combine ei and Ἰερο in the sense: “It is quite clear to all that, if at any time another priest after the manner of Melchisedec arises, he then,” etc., deserves to be mentioned only as a curiosity.
carnis propria est, consulens, successionis jura descripserat. 

Inde enim factum est, ut unum alteri succedere juberet, quo, morientibus sacerdotibus, sacerdotium tamen ipsum perpetuaretur. — κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκατάλυτον] i.e. inasmuch as the power of living for ever is inherent in Him. Comp. vv. 17, 24. 

Improperly do Cameron, Dorscheus, Calov, al., refer it as well, or solely, to Christ's power of communicating intransitory life to others. But wrongly, too, Hofmann (Schriftden. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 551 f.), Delitzsch, and Alford: the ζωή ἀκατάλυτος is to be limited to that life of Christ which began with His resurrection. On the contrary, the ζωή ἀκατάλυτος is thought of as a property inherent in the ἰερεύς ἐτερος, without respect to relation of time. Comp. also Eiehm, Lchrbdgr.des Ilebrderbr.p.458, Obs. 

Ver. 17. Scripture proof for κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκατάλυτον, ver. 16. This Scripture proof the author finds in the εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Ps. cx. 4, upon which words, therefore, the emphasis rests in ver. 17. — μαρτυρεῖται γὰρ] for he (namely, the ἰερεύς ἐτερος, ver. 15, i.e. Christ) has the testimony. μαρτυρεῖται is not to be taken impersonally: "it is witnessed" (Bleek, Bisping, Conybeare, al.). — ὅτι] recitative, as x. 8, xi. 18. 

Vv. 18, 19. Elucidation of that which is signified by this proclamation in the psalm, of the arising of a new everlasting priest after the manner of Melchisedec (ver. 17). By virtue of that proclamation of God, the Mosaic institution of the priests, and with it the Mosaic law in general, is declared—and that with good reason—to be devoid of force; and, on the other hand, a better hope is brought in. Theodoret: Παύεται, φησίν, ὁ νόμος, ἐπεισάγεται δὲ ἡ τῶν κρειτῶν ἐλπίς. — Vv. 18, 19 contain a single proposition, dividing itself into two halves by means of μὲν . . . δὲ, for which γίνεται forms the common verb, and in which οὐ δὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος constitutes a parenthesis. So, rightly, Theodoret, Occumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Luther, Zeger, Camerarius, Estius, Peirce, Bengel, McLean, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Conybeare, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbeigr.des Hebräerbr. p. 592), Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority. Others construe differently, in taking each of the two verses as an independent statement in itself. They then
vary as regards the interpretation of ἐπεισάγωγή, ver. 19, as this is looked upon either as predicate or as subject. As predicate it is taken by Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus (Version), Vatablus, Calvin, Hunnius, Jac. Cappellus, Pyle, Ebrard, and others, in supplying ἐστίν or ἐστὶ, and regarding as subject thereto οὐ νόμος. According to this, the sense would be: for nothing has the law brought to perfection; but it is (or its meaning consists in this, that it is) a bringing in of a better hope. But against this argues the fact that, if ἐπεισάγωγή δὲ was intended to form the opposition to the first half of ver. 19, the author could not possibly—after having placed a verb (ἐπεισέωσαν) in the first half, consisting as it does only of a few words—have continued in the second half otherwise than with a verb; he must have written ἐπεισάγη δὲ κρείττονα ἐλπίδα instead of ἐπεισάγωγή δὲ κ.τ.λ. Moreover, ἐτί in ἐπεισάγωγή would have remained without any reference upon the supposition of this construction. As subject ἐπεισάγωγή is looked upon by Beza, Castellio, Pareus, Piscator, Schlichting, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Carpzov, Whitby, Michaelis, Semler, Ernsti, Valckenaeer, Heinrichs, Stuart, and others. The sense would then be: the law indeed brought nothing to perfection; but the bringing in of a better hope did lead to perfection. Against this view, however, the consideration is decisive, that in such case, insomuch as the preceding νόμος has the article, ἐπεισάγωγή also must have obtained the article. — The statement of ver. 18 is to be understood in special relation to the subject in question (not, as is done by Schlichting, Heinrichs, and others, as a truth of universal import). The article before προαγούσης ἐντολής is wanting, because the design was to express the ἐντολή regarding the Levitical priesthood as one which had only the character of an ἐντολή προάγουσα. — ἀθέτησις a declaring void of force, abrogation. Comp. ἀθητεῦν, Gal. iii. 15. The substantive only here and ix. 26. — γίνεται results, namely, in the declaration of God, Ps. cx. 4. — The ἐντολή, the command, denotes not the whole Mosaic law (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Calvin, Grotius, Hammond, Owen, M’Lean, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Klee, Bloomfield), but the ordinance regarding the Levitical priesthood therein contained. Only with ver. 19
does the author transfer to the whole that which he here states concerning a part.— The ἐντολή, however, is termed προάγουσα (comp. 1 Tim. i. 18, v. 24), because, as a constituent part of the O. T., it preceded in point of time the institution of the New Covenant. Yet, at the same time, there lies in the emphatically preposed participle, on account of its reciprocal relation to ἐπεισαγωγή, ver. 19, at least the additional indication delicately conveyed, that this ἐντολή, since just as a mere precursor of something future it points beyond itself, naturally bears the character of the merely temporary and consequently unsatisfactory. — διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενείς καὶ ἄνωθενές ἵνα ἐπεισαγομενή] on account of its weakness and unprofitableness. The ἐντολή was weak, since it did not possess the strength to attain its object, namely, the reconciliation of men to God; but, because in such manner it did not fulfil the end of its existence, it became for that very reason something unprofitable and unserviceable. On ἀσθενείς, comp. Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 9. — οὐδέν] is not to be limited by means of οὐδένα (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Schlichting, Grotius, Kuinoel, Bisping), but, on the contrary, is to be left in the full universality of the neuter. Completion in general, in whatever respect, the law was not in a position to bring about. — ἐπεισαγωγή] a doubly composite term. Literally: introduction upon or in addition to, i.e. the bringing in of something new in addition to, or over and above, an object already present (here: in addition to the προάγουσα ἐντολή, ver. 18). ἔτι in ἐπεισαγωγή corresponds therefore to the πρό in προάγουσα. — κρείττονος ἐλπίδος] of a better hope, sc. than the προάγουσα ἐντολή was in a position to afford. 1 Better, more excellent, is the hope founded upon the newly instituted priesthood, in that this hope is certain

---

1 We have not to explain, with Schulz: "So is then ... something better introduced, the hope, by virtue of which," etc. To the same result as Schulz does Delitzsch also come, when he observes: "It is not meant that the law also afforded a hope, and that the one introduced by the word of the psalm is only by comparison better; but the κρείττον ἡλπίς, which possesses that which is truly perfected in the future, in the world beyond the grave, into which its anchor has been sunk (vii. 19), stands opposed to the ἡλπίς in the present state of its unsatisfying praxis." In the same manner, lastly, Alford: "The contrast is between the προάγουσα ἡλπίς, weak and unprofitable, and a better thing, viz. the ἡλπίς, which brings us near to God. This κρείττον ἡλπίς, τοῦτον ἡλπίδον α. τ. λ., is expressed by κρείττον ἡλπίς."
and infallible, thus in reality leads to the desired goal.—

δὲ ἡ ἑγγίζωμεν τῷ θεῷ by means of which we draw nigh unto God (Jas. iv. 8). Comp. vi. 19: εἰς ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, and x. 19 ff. In contrast with the character of the Old Covenant, since the people were not permitted to enter the Most Holy Place, where the throne of Jehovah was. Cf. ix. 6 ff.

Vv. 20–22. As one element in the superiority of the everlasting priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec, assigned to Christ, over the Levitical priesthood has been already implicitly brought forward, vv. 18, 19, namely, that the goal, for the attainment of which the strength was lacking to the Levitical priesthood, is really attained by the everlasting priesthood. A second point of superiority in the new order of things over the old follows in vv. 20–22. Of less moment than the everlasting priesthood of Jesus must the Levitical priesthood be; for the former was constituted by God by virtue of a declaration upon oath, the latter without a declaration upon oath. Vv. 20–22 form again a single period, the protasis being contained in καὶ καθ’ ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας, to which then καὶ τοσοῦτο κ.τ.λ., ver. 22, corresponds as the apodosis, while all that intervenes (οἱ μὲν γάρ, to the end of ver. 21) is a parenthesis. Wrongly do Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, Calvin (in the translation), Er. Schmid, and others join καὶ καθ’ ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας, too, to the closing words of ver. 19: and, indeed, a hope which is better, inasmuch as it is not brought in without an oath. So also Luther: “and moreover, which is a great thing, not without oath;” while, with not less violence, Lud. Cappellus, who, in enclosing vv. 18, 19 within a parenthesis, and taking καὶ καθ’ ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας with ver. 17, gives as the sense: “Deus constituit Christum sacerdotem secundum ordinem Melchisedec, et quidem non sine jure jurando.” — καὶ coupling on a farther link in the chain of enumeration, as vv. 8, 9, 23. — καὶ καθ’ ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας] sc. ἱερεὺς ἐστιν γεγονὼς; and inasmuch (ix. 27) as He has become priest not without a declaration upon oath, i.e. He has not become so without God having sanctioned His appointment to be a priest by a declaration upon oath (namely, by virtue of the oath, with which the
declaration, Ps. cx. 4, is introduced). Only this mode of supplementing is warranted by the connection, as is shown partly by the *οί μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας εἰσίν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες* immediately following, partly by the circumstance that the author is still engaged in the exposition of the Scripture statement, ver. 17, this statement thus containing for him the gist of the matter; as, accordingly, this declaration of Scripture is repeated anew, ver. 21, and then likewise the *εἰσίν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες* recurs in the further member of the thought, ver. 23 f. The explanation therefore of Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Heinrichs, Böhme, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Alford, Kurtz, and others is to be rejected, when to *καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας* they supplement from the apodosis *διαθήκης ἔγγυος γέγονεν;* as also that of Storr, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch, Moll, and Hofmann, when they supply *τοῦτο (σ. ἐπεισεγαγώνθη κρείττονος ἐπιίδος) γίνεται (γέγονεν).* — *οἱ μὲν γὰρ* namely, the Levitical priests. — *χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας* since nothing is related in Scripture of an oath of God, when He destined Aaron and his posterity to be priests. — *εἰσίν γεγονότες* forms one idea: have become. Wrongly, Paulus and Klee: are priests who have become so without an oath. Böhme (and so also Hofmann): *sunt sacerdotes, sed sine juramento (illi quidem singuli deinceps) facti* — which must have been expressed by *εἰσίν ἱερεῖς χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας γεγονότες.* Still more widely mistaken the view of Michaelis ad Poirc.: *fuerrorunt, i.e. esse desierunt,* — which is grammatically as well as logically impossible. The *tempus periphrasticum εἰσίν γεγονότες* marks the fact already belonging to the past as still extending onwards into the present. — *οἱ ἐδ* namely, Christ. — *μεθ' ὀρκωμοσίας* sc. *ἱερεῖς ἐστιν γεγονός.* — *διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς αὐτόν* i.e. in the sense of the author: *by God,* not: *by the psalmist* (Rambach, Heinrichs), although certainly the statement, Ps. cx. 4, that God hath sworn and will not repent of this oath, forms not a constituent part of the words of God Himself, but a remark of the psalmist, with which he introduces the words of God. Yet, when in the psalm it is said that God has sworn, and of this oath He will not repent, and then there is adduced as the subject-matter of this oath the declaration: *σὺ ἱερεῖς κ.τ.λ.* , this is tantamount
to saying that God has declared by virtue of an irreversible oath: σὺ ἰπείς κ.τ.λ. As, accordingly, the psalmist is relating the words of God, so does he also relate the oath which preceded them.

Ver. 22. The apodosis: Jesus has become the surety of a so much more excellent covenant, i.e. so much more excellent is the covenant of which Jesus has become surety. — ἔγγυος] in the N. T. only here. Comp. however, 2 Macc. x. 28; Ecclus. xxix. 15, 16. — Surety of a better covenant has Jesus become, i.e. in the person of Jesus pledge and guarantee is given that a better covenant has been established by God. For Christ, the Son of God, had become man in order to proclaim this covenant upon earth, had sealed it by His sufferings and death, and had been mightily accredited by His resurrection from the dead as a Founder of the Covenant who had been sent by God. — Incorrectly do Piscator, Owen, Calov, Wittich, Braun, and others find the thought expressed that Christ became surety to God for men, in that He vicariously took upon Himself the guilt which they must have borne; while, just as erroneously, Limborch, Baumgarten, Chr. Fr. Schmid, and others contend that a reciprocal suretyship, for God with men and for men with God, is meant. Each of these views has the context against it; since there respect is had only to that which has been guaranteed to men by the new order of things. Comp. ver. 19: κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, δι' ὃς ἔγγυομεν τῷ θεῷ; vv. 25, 26. — Ἰησοῦς] with emphasis placed at the end.

Vv. 23–25. Third point of superiority of the priesthood of Christ over the Levitical priesthood. The Levitical priests die one after the other; Christ's priesthood, on the other hand, is, since He ever lives, an unchangeable and intransitory one. The author consequently lays special stress upon that point of superiority to which already, ver. 16 f. (comp. ver. 8), he had pointed.

Ver. 23. Καὶ] parallel to the καὶ, ver. 20. — καὶ οἱ μὲν πλειονὲς εἰσιν ἰπείς γεγονότες] and they on the one hand have as several (or as a plurality) become priests, i.e. of Levitical priests there is a multiplicity. Attention is not here called to the peculiarity that many priests always existed contem-
poraneously the one with the other (so Erasmus, Paraphr., Braun, Delitzsch), or that "the Levitical priesthood was not given to one, but to a lineage" (Hofmann). That which is meant is—as is evident from the immediately following διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κοιλύσθαι παραμένειν, and from ver. 24—the successive plurality, in that one dies after another, and consequently the one succeeds the other. For the author in thus speaking has before his mind the high priests, since it is just with these that Christ is placed in parallel. Comp. ver. 26 ff., al.—καὶ τὸ θανάτῳ κοιλύσθαι παραμένειν because (wrongly de Wette: "by the fact that") they are (wrongly de Wette and Bisping: "were") prevented by death from continuing.—παραμένειν not: ἐν τῇ ἱεροσύνῃ (so Oecumenius, who is followed by Grotius, Seb. Schmidt, Kunoel, Klee, Stein, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebrüerbr. pp. 459, 437; Alford, Maier, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and others). It denotes, as is clear from the corresponding παρεμένειν τοῦ αἰῶνα, ver. 24, to continue in life. Comp. also Phil. i. 25, and Meyer ad loc.

Ver. 24. The other, on the other hand, because (not "by the fact that," de Wette, Bisping) He abides unto eternity, has His priesthood as an unchangeable one.—μένειν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα must not be explained, with Estius, Seb. Schmidt, and others, of abiding for ever as priest. For in this way the declaration of ver. 24 becomes tautological. The expression denotes the everlasting duration of life (comp. John xii. 34, xxi. 22, 23; 1 Cor. xv. 6; Phil. i. 25), is thus equivalent to the πάντως ἐν, ver. 25.—ἀπαράβατος a word belonging to later Greek (comp. Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 313), save here, foreign to the N. T., as also to the LXX. Erasmus, Schlitting, Bengel, Schulz, Böhme, Stengel, Stuart, Ebrard, Hofmann, Conybeare, and the majority, take it in the active signification: not passing over to another, thus remaining with the same person, or unchanging. So, as it would seem, already Theodoret (οὗτος δὲ ἀνάμετρος ὡς εἰς ἔτερον οὐ παραπέμπει τῇ ἱεροσύνῃ τῷ γέρας), Oecumenius (ἀδιάδοχον, ἀπελεύθητον), Theophylact (ἀδιάκοπον, ἀδιάδοχως). More correctly, however, because more consistently with the demonstrable usage of the language (see instances in Wetstein and Bleek), does Bleek, after the pre-
cedent of Elsner, insist upon the passive signification: "that which may not be overstepped, transgressed; therefore: inviolable, unalterable, immutable," which then, it is true, includes likewise the notion of "unchanging."

Ver. 25. "**08ev** Wherefore, sc. because His priesthood is an everlasting one. — καὶ also, represents the statement, ver. 25, as being the natural effect of the **άπαράβατον ἐχειν τὴν ἱερωσύνην**, ver. 24, as its cause. — εἰς τὸ παντελές] means: perfectly, completely, entirely (comp. Luke xiii. 11), and combines with **σῶξει** in one idea. Theodoret: αὐτὸν ἱπ σῶξει ἡμᾶς εἰρήκειν καὶ τελεῖαν σωτηρίαν παρέχειν. The meaning: in perpetuum, attached to the word by the Peshito, the Vulgate, Chrysostom (οὗ πρὸς τὸ παράν ἑον, φησίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ ζωῇ), Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, Schlichting, Grotius, Heinrichs, Schulz, Stein, Stengel, and others, in joining it either with σῶξει or with δύναται, is in accordance neither with the etymology nor the usage (instances in Bleek), but arises only from the connection, and is consequently to be rejected. — σῶξει] save, embraces the deliverance from the misery of sin and its consequences, and, on the other hand, the communication of everlasting blessedness. Too restricted, Hofmann: the answering of prayer, and deliverance out of every assault. — τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ] those who through Him, i.e. through faith in Him, draw near to God. — πάντα τέτοια εἰς τὸ ἐνυπνάμεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν] seeing that He evermore lives, to make intercession for them (Rom. viii. 26, 27, 34), or to represent them (sc. in the presence of God). More precise unfolding of the notion already lying in ἦθεν. — Similarly for the rest does Philo, too, ascribe to his Logos an intercession with God. Comp. Vit. Mos. iii. p. 673 C (with Mangey, II. p. 155): Ἄναγκαιον γὰρ ἂν τὸν ἱερομένου τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρί, παρακλήτων χρησθαι τελειοτάτω τὴν ἄρετὴν νῦν, πρὸς τα ἀμνηστίαν ἀμαρτημάτων καὶ χρηστίαν ἀφθονοτάτων ἁγαθῶν. — ζῶις τερ. διόν. haer. 42, p. 509 B (with Mangey, I. p. 501): Ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἴκητης μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦ θυσιοῦ, κπραίνοντος αἰεί, πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον.

Vv. 26—28. Fourth point of superiority of the priesthood of Christ over the Levitical priesthood, in the form of an establishing of ver. 25. The Levitical priests are sinful men, who need
daily to offer for their own sins and the sins of the people; Christ is the sinless Son of God, who once for all has offered up Himself as a sacrifice.

Ver. 26. Proof for the actual existence of a high priest who is able in a perfect manner to procure salvation, since He ever liveth to represent in the presence of God those who believe in Him (ver. 25), derived from the *meetness and adaptedness to our need* of just such a high priest: for such a high priest (as had just been described, ver. 25) also *beseeched us*. τοιοῦτος begins no parenthesis, so that ὃς κ.τ.λ. were only "the continuation of a series begun with πάντοτε γὰρ εἰς τὸ ἐντυπω-χάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν" (Hofmann), nor is "ὅς ὁ Ἰησοῦς to be supplemented from ver. 22" (Woerner), nor does it serve for the introducing or preparing the way for the following predicates, ὃς κ.τ.λ. (Grotius, Tholuck, al.), but refers back to the characterization, ver. 25; while, then, with ὃς κ.τ.λ. a newly beginning further description of this so constituted high priest, or a further unfolding of the τοιοῦτος, follows, in such wise that the ὃς κ.τ.λ. thus attached is best rendered by: He, since He is holy, etc., beseeemed us. — καὶ also, i.e. exactly. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 408. — ὃς holy or pure.

In regard to the relation towards God. Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 10; Eph. iv. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 8; Tit. i. 8. With the LXX. for the most part translation of τὸν, e.g. Ps. iv. 4 (3), xvi. 10 (Acts ii. 27, xiii. 35), xxx. 5 (4). — ἀκακος free from ἀκαία, from craft and malice. In regard to the relation towards men. Chrysostom: "Ἀκακος τί ἐστιν; Ἀπόνημοι, οὐκ ὑπονόοι καὶ ὅτι τοιοῦτος, ἀκονε τοῦ προφήτου λέγουσιν: Οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματί αὐτοῦ (Isa. liii. 9). — ἀμίαντος] unstained by any kind of impurity. In regard to the relation towards Himself. Comp. Jas. i. 27; 1 Pet. i. 4. — κεκορομημένος ἁπτὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν] separated from the sinners, i.e. not: different from them by reason of His sinlessness (so the Peshito, separatus a peccatis; Vatablus, Calvin, Cameron, Carpzov, Owen, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Klee, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Kurtz, and others), but—as is evident from the member immediately following—withdrawn by His exaltation to heaven from all contact with the sinners, so that He cannot be defiled by them. As the Levitical priests in general, so must very specially the high
priest preserve himself free from defilement (Lev. xxi. 10 ff.); before the great day of atonement he must, according to the Talmud, spend seven days in the temple, apart from his family, in order to be secured against defilement. See Tract. Joma, i. 1. Comp. also Schöttgen, Horae Hebraicae, p. 963 f. — καὶ ἔνθελότερος τῶν ὑπαρχόντων γενόμενος] and (not "also" or "even," as Hofmann contends) raised above the heavens, inasmuch, namely, as He διελήλυθε τοὺς ὑπαρχούς, iv. 14. Comp. Eph. iv. 10: ὁ ἀναβάς ἑπεράνω πάντων τῶν ὑπαρχόντων.

Ver. 27. In the πρῶτερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐδιώκν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἐπεί ταῦτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ there is an apparent allusion to the sacrifice of the high priest on the great day of atonement (Lev. xvi.), comp. ix. 7. We are prevented, however, from referring the words to this alone (perhaps to the including of the sin-offering prescribed, Lev. iv. 3 ff.) by καθ’ ἡμέραν, instead of which, as at ix. 25, x. 1, 3, κατ’ ἐναντίον must have been placed. For καθ’ ἡμέραν can signify nothing else than "daily" or "day by day." To foist upon it the signification: "yearly on a definite day" ("καθ’ ἡμέραν ὑφισμένην or τεταρτι-μένην"), with Schlichting (secundum diem, nenipec statam ac definitam, in anniversario illo videlicet sacrificio), Piscator, Starck, Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, M‘Lean, Storr, and others; or to take it in the attenuated sense, as equivalent to "saepissime, quoties res fert" (Grotius, Owen), or "πολλάκις" (Böhme, Stein), or "διὰ παντὸς" (de Wette), or in the sense of "one day after another" (Ebrard, who supposes the author is overlooking a succession of centuries, and so a succession of days present themselves to his eye, in which the high priest again and again offers a sacrifice!), is linguistically unwarranted. In like manner it is a mere subterfuge and arbitrary misinterpreting of the words, when Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 438), and Alford, concurring in the suggestion of Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 404 f., 2 Aufl.), seek to put into them the sense: that Christ needeth not to do daily that which the levitical
high priests need to do daily. Nor does it avail anything that Kurtz will take καθ' ἡμέραν in conjunction only with οἷς ἔχει ἀνάγκην, since these words do not occupy an independent position alone, and only acquire their more precise definition by that which follows. For that καθ' ἡμέραν has "nothing whatever to do with the θυσίαις ἀναφέρεις," is a mere assertion on the part of Kurtz; and his contention, that only the "daily renewal and daily pressing necessity," of the O. T. high priest on account of his daily sinning, the necessity, "ere (on the great day of propitiation) he could offer for the sin of the whole people, of first presenting a sacrifice for his own sins," was to be brought into relief, is a violent perversion of the words,—admitting as they do of no misapprehension,—from which even the πρώτον, ἐπέτατα, expressive of a relation of parity, ought to have kept him; in place of which, in order to bring out the subsidiary character of the one half of the statement, πρὸ τοῦ with the infinitive, or πρῶν (πρῶν ἐν), must have been written. We have therefore to conclude, with Gerhard, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Wolf, Carpzov, Bleek, and Tholuck, that the author had present to his mind, besides the principal sacrifice on the great day of atonement, at the same time the ordinary daily sacrifice of the Levitical priests (Ex. xxix. 38-42; Num. xxviii. 3-8), and by reason of an inexact mode of expression blended the two together; to which he might the more easily be led, in that, according to Josephus, the high priest—not indeed always, but yet on the Sabbaths, new moons, and other festivals (according to the Mishna tr. Tamith, vii. 3: in general as often as he was so minded)—went up with the other priests into the temple, and took part in the sacrificial service. Comp. Josephus, de Bello Judaico, v. 5. 7: "Ὁ δὲ ἄρχηρενς ἀνήει μὲν σὺν αὐτοῖς ἄλλ’ οὐκ ἂνει, ταῖς δ’ ἐβδομάδοις καὶ νουμηνίαις, καὶ εἶ τις ἔορτη πάτριος ἦ πανήγυρις πάνθημος ἀγομένη δὲ ἔτους. To be compared also are the words of Philo, who, Quis rer. divin. haer. p. 505 A (with Mangey, I. p. 497), remarks that in the daily sacrifice the priests offered the oblation for themselves, but the lambs for

1 The unsatisfactory character of the above exposition was afterwards acknowledged by Delitzsch himself, and the explanation retracted by him (in Rudelbach and Guericke's Zeitsehr. f. die gesammte luther. Theol. u. Kirche, 1860, H. 4, p. 595).
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the people (Διά άγια και τῶν ἐνδελεχῶς θυσίας ὥραις εἰς ἑαυτῶν δημημένας, ἢν τε ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀνάγουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς διὰ τῆς σεμι-
δύλεως καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἔθνων τῶν δύο εἰμῶν, οὐδὲ ἀνα-
φέρεις διεύρηται), and de Speciall. Legg. p. 797 E (with Mangey, II. p. 321), equally as our passage, ascribes to the high priest
the offering of a daily sacrifice (οὐτω τού σύμπαντος ἔθνων
συγγενῆς καὶ ἄγχιστει κοινῶς τον ἄρχων ἐς τε, πρωτανεύω
μὲν τά δίκαια τοῖς ἀμφισβητοῦσι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, εὐχας
dὲ καὶ θυσίας τελῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν). Recently
also Delitzsch (Talmudische Studien, XIII., in Rudelbach and
Guericke's Zeitschr. für die luther. Theol. u. Kirche, 1860, H.
4, p. 593 f.) has further drawn attention to the fact that like-
wise, Jer. Chagiga, ii. 4, and Bab. Pesachim, 57a, it is said of
the high priest that he offers daily.— τοῦτο] namely, το ὑπὲρ
τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀμαρτίων θυσίαν ἀναφέρειν. So rightly—as is
even demanded by ver. 28 (comp. iv. 15)—Chrysostom, Oecu-
menius, Theophylact, Claris, Estius, Piscator, Clericus, Seb.
Schmidt, Owen, Peirce, Carpzov, Whitby, Storr, Heinrichs,
Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Bloomfield,
Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 463),
Alford, Kurtz, and others. Less suitably do Beza, Jac. Cap-
pellus, Limborch, Bengel, and Ebrard supplement το θυσίας
ἀναφέρειν; while, altogether wrongly, Schlichting, Grotius,
Haunmond, and Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 1, 2 Aufl. pp. 405,
401 f.) refer back τοῦτο to the whole proposition πρότερον . . .
λαοῦ. For in the application to Christ, to explain the ἀμα-
ρίας as the " dolores, qui solent peccatorum poenae esse, et
quas Christus occasione etiam peccatorum humani generis
toleravit, et a quibus liberatus est per mortem " (Grotius), or
as " Christi infirmitates et perpessiones " (Schlichting, Hof-
mann, according to which latter in connection with έαυτοῦ
ἀνενέγκας, besides Christ’s suffering of death, His prayer in
Gethsemane (!) is at the same time to be thought of), becomes
possible only on the arbitrary supposition of a double sense to
the preceding words, and is equally much opposed to the con-
text (ver. 28) as to the linguistic use of ἀμαρτίας. — ἐφάπαξ
once for all; comp. ix. 12, x. 10; Rom. vi. 10. Belongs to
ἔποιησεν, not to ἀνενέγκας. — έαυτοῦ ἀνενέγκας in that He
offered Himself. Christ is thus not only the High Priest of the
New Covenant, but also the victim offered. Comp. viii. 3, ix. 12, 14, 25 f., x. 10, 12, 14; Eph. v. 2.

Ver. 28. Establishment of τοῦτο ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ, ver. 27, by the definite formulating of the statement of the fourth point of superiority of the New Testament High Priest over the high priests of the Old Covenant,—a statement for which the way has been prepared by vv. 26, 27. The law constitutes high priests men who are subject to weakness, and thus also to sin (comp. v. 2, 3), on which account they have to offer, as for the people, so also for themselves, and have oftentimes to repeat this sacrifice; the word of the oath, on the other hand (comp. ver. 21), which ensued after the law,—namely, only in the time of David,—and consequently annulled the law, ordains as high priest the Son (see on i. 1), who is for ever perfected, i.e. without sin (iv. 15), and by His exaltation withdrawn from all human ἀσθένεια, however greatly He had part therein during His life on earth; wherefore He needed not for Himself to present an expiatory sacrifice, but only for the people, and, inasmuch as this fully accomplished its end, He needed not to repeat the same. — Entirely misapprehending the reasoning of the author, Ebrard supposes that even the first half of the proposition, ver. 28, is likewise to be referred to Jesus. The author, he tells us, presupposes as well known, that Christ has been as well ἄνθρωπος ἀσθένειαν ἔχων (according to chap. v.) as ὁ λόγος ἔχει τόν αἰώνα (according to chap. vii.), and is here recapitulating (!) the two. Thus, then, ὅ νόμος γὰρ . . . ἀσθένειαν contains a concession (!) having reference to chap. v., and the thought is: "the law (in so far as it has not (!) been annulled) demands of all high priests (consequently (!) also of Jesus) that they be ἄνθρωποι ἔχουσι ἀσθένειαν; the sworn word of promise, however (given after the law), proceeding far beyond and above the same, constitutes as high priest the Son for ever perfected" (!). A misinterpreting of the meaning, against which even the opposition of ὁ νόμος . . . ὁ λόγος δέ, as a manifest parallel to οἱ μὲν . . . ὁ δέ, ver. 20 f., ver. 23 f., ought to have kept him. — τῆς μετὰ τῶν νόμων] The author did not write ὁ μετὰ τῶν νόμων, according to which the Vulgate and Luther translate, because he wished to accentuate ὅρκωμοσία as the principal notion.
CHAPTER VIII.

VER. 1. ἰπi τάς ληγομένων[ B: ἵν τας ληγομένων. Explanatory gloss. — Ver. 2. Recepta: καὶ ὅις ἀνθρωπος. But καὶ is wanting in B D* E* K, 17, It. Arabb. Euseb. Already rejected by Mill. Rightly deleted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford. — Ver. 4. Elz. Matth. Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, have εἶ μίν γάρ. Defended also by Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 504, Obs.), and Reiche. But γάρ cannot be referred back to ver. 3, and upon the referring of it back to ver. 2 the addition, ver. 3, would become aimless and inexplicable. More in keeping logically, and better attested (by A B D* K, 17, 73, 80, 137, Vulg. It. Copt., al.), is the reading: εἶ μίν οὖν, already commended to attention by Griesbach, and adopted by Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Alford, which is accordingly to be preferred. — Instead of the Recepta τῶν ἵερων τῶν προσφερόντων (approved by Bloomfield, who, however, encloses the first τῶν within brackets, and Reiche), Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford have rightly adopted merely τῶν προσφερόντων. Preferred also by Delitzsch. τῶν ἵερων, to the rejection of which already Grotius, Mill, and Griesbach were inclined, is an elucidatory gloss. It is condemned by the decisive authority of Α B D* E* K, 17, 67, 73, 137, al., Vulg. It. Copt. Aeth. Arm. — τῶν] before νόμων in the Recepta (recently contended for by Bloomfield and Delitzsch) is to be deleted, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, after A B K* 17, 57, 80, al., Theodoret. The later addition of the article is more easily to be explained than its omission. — Ver. 5. Elz.: παίησης. But all the uncial mss., many cursives, Orig. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. Occum. Theophyl. have παίησις, which also is found in LXX. Ex. xxv. 40. Commended by Griesbach. Rightly adopted already in the edd. Erasm. 1, Ald. Stephan. 1, 2, and recently by Matthaei, Scholz, Bleek, Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. Approved also by Delitzsch and Reiche. — Ver. 6. In place of the Recepta νυπὶ δι', Lachm. reads, but without sufficient authority (B D* Ath.): νυπὶ δι'. The more euphonious νυπὶ δι' is protected by A B*** D*** E K L Ν, min., and many Fathers. — Instead of the Recepta τίτυς (B D*** K*** min. Damasc. [once]Theophyl. [cod.]), there Meyer.—Heb.
is found in the edd. Complut. Plantin. Genet. the peculiarly Attic form: ριςυχας. This is supported by 47, 72, 73, 74, al., Athan. (thrice), Bas. Antioch. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. Best attested is the form: ριςυχας (by A D* K L s 80, 116, 117, al., Athan. Oecum. Theophylact), which is therefore rightly preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch, and Alford.— Ver. 8. αυτου] So Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, after B D*** E L s***, likewise, as it seems, almost all min. Chrys. Damasc. al.—Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 8 read αυτους. But the attestation of the latter (A D* K s 17, 39, al., Theodoret) is not at all decisive, and the accusative, seeing it requires the conjoining with μμμρσωμεσ, opposed to the context; see the exposition.—Ver. 10. η διαθηκη] Lachm.: η διαθηκη [μου], after A D E. μου is found, indeed, also with the LXX. in most mss. (but not in the Cod. Alex.); yet, nevertheless, since it forms a tautological addition, and does not correspond to the Hebrew original (נְכָלָל נְתָנָה), it probably arose only by a mechanical repetition from the preceding διαθηκη [μου].—Ver. 11. Recepta: τον στησιου. But the weighty authority of all uncial mss. (B: των στησιν), most cursives, as well as that of Syr. utra. Abb. Copt. Arm. It. al., Chrys. (codd.) Theodoret, Damasc. Aug. requires the reading: των στησιν, already presented by the edd. Complut. Stephan. 1, 2, al., and later approved by Bengel and Wetstein, as also adopted by Griesbach, Matthaei, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche, and others.—απο μικρου] Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield: απο μικρου αυτων. But αυτων is wanting in A B D* E* (?), K s, 17, 31, 61, 73, 80, al., Copt. Arm. It. Vulg., with Cyr. Chrys. al. Already suspected by Griesbach. Rightly deleted by Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 1 and 8, and Alford.—Ver. 12. και των αμαρτιων αυτων και των ανωτων αυτων] The concluding words: και των αμαρτιων αυτων, have been taken for a gloss by Bleek, Tisch. 1, 2, and 8, and Alford (comp. already Beza and Grotius); and in accordance with B s* 17, 23, Vulg. Copt. Basm. Syr. Arab. Erp. rejected. They are also declared suspected by Delitzsch. But in favour of their retention (Lachm. Bloomfield, Tisch. 7, Reiche) decides partly the preponderating authority of A D E K L s*** al., partly the recurrence of the same words on the repetition of the citation x. 17. The addition might easily be overlooked on account of the homoioteleuton.

Vv. 1–13. Not merely, however, as regards His person is Christ highly exalted above the Levitical priests; the sanc-
tuary, too, in which He fulfils the office of High Priest, is highly exalted above the Levitical sanctuary. For Christ sustains His high-priestly office in the heavenly tabernacle, erected by God Himself, of which as the archetype the earthly tabernacle, in which the Levitical priests fulfil their office, is a mere copy. So much the more excellent is the priestly ministry of Christ, in proportion as the Covenant of which He is the Mediator is a better covenant, because resting upon the foundation of better promises. The character of this promised New Covenant is a more inward, spiritual one; and by the promise of a New Covenant the Old is declared to be outworn and no longer serviceable.

Vv. 1, 2. 
Keφάλαιον δὲ] Now a main point is. Keφάλαιον is not accusative absolute (Bengel), nor yet the ordinary accusative with a λέγω τούτο to be supplemented (Ebrard), but nominative, and apposition to the whole ensuing proposition: τοιούτον . . . ἄνθρωπος, ver. 2. Comp. Rom. viii. 3. Just as keφάλαιον δὲ are also the kindred formulas: τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, τὸ δὲ δεινότατον, τὸ ἐσχάτον, τὸ τελευταῖον, etc., very frequently prefixed to a whole clause by way of apposition. See Kühner, II. p. 146, Obs. 2. The expression keφάλαιον itself is here understood by many expositors in the sense of “sum;” according to which the author would express the intention of immediately comprehending or recapitulating the substance of all his previous disquisition in a single statement. So Laurentius Valla (“in summam autem”), Erasmus, Clarius, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, H. Stephanus, Grotius (“post tot dicta haec esto summam”), Carpzov (“ut rem summamim et uno verbo complectar”), Stengel, Hofmann (Schriftenw. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 405), Conybeare, M’Caul, etc. This signification, however, although linguistically justified, is here inadmissible, since the author is passing over to something essentially new; a recapitulation of the previous argument accordingly does not take place at all. But neither is the anarthrous keφάλαιον—although in itself this is not inadmissible—to be taken as equivalent to τὸ keφάλαιον, as is done by Theophylact (Ἰ неделю τὸ μέγιστον καὶ συνεκτικότερον), Bleek (“the essential thing, to which all else is subordinated”), Ebrard (“the keystone”), Bisping (“the core of all”), Stuart, Delitzsch, Riehm,
Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. pp. 464, 481; Alford, Maier, Ewald, and others. For, besides the further main point in the superiority of the N. T. High Priest over the Levitical high priests, here to be mentioned (namely, His ministering in a better sanctuary), the author has yet before his mind the elucidation of a third leading distinction (that of the better sacrifice presented by Christ). Comp. ix. 9 ff. — ἐνὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις cannot be referred back specially, as is assumed by Erasmus, Clarius, Zeger, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Hammond, Carpzov, Schulz, Stein, Stengel, Ebrard, Ewald, and many others, to that which has already been said. For therewith the participle present λεγομένοις does not agree; εἰρημένοις must have been put instead of it. Nor, accordingly, can the sense be: "in addition to that already treated of" (Calov, Wolf, Rambach, Peirce, Storr, Ebrard, al.). On the contrary, ἐνὶ must be taken in the signification: "upon the supposition of," "in the case of," as ix. 17 and frequently, and ἐνὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις has essentially the same meaning as the genitive τῶν λεγομένων. Thus: now a main point in the case of those things we are speaking of (or: in our argument) is the following.

— With the utmost violence does Hofmann tear the words asunder (Schriftbew. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 406, and so still in his commentary, p. 302 f.), in that he will have κεφαλαίων δὲ separated from ἐνὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, and to the latter would supplement ἀρχιερεύσων, and renders: "besides those who are called high priests, we have a High Priest who has sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty." That, moreover, the thought thus resulting would be a senseless one,— inasmuch as it would then follow that Christians have several sorts of high priests,—has already been pointed out by Nickel (in Reuter's Repertor. 1858, Feb. p. 110). For how arbitrary it is when Hofmann seeks further to twist the statement, gained with so much toil, in the sense: "that the Christians possess a High Priest, compared with whom those who are so called have for them no significance," hardly needs to be observed. — τοιοῦτον] is a preparation for the following δι' ἐκάθενεν κ.τ.λ. Wrongly does Böhme refer it back to τοιοῦτος, vii. 26, and Carpzov to ἵππηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος in the same verse. The latter, moreover, with an erroneous
accentuation of the ἐχομεν: "habemus omnino talem pontificem sc. ὑψηλότερον τῶν ὑπάρχων, quippe qui adeo consedit ad dextram Dei εν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς," in connection with which the progress of the discourse is lost sight of, and the fact remains unnoticed that the centre of gravity in the statement, vv. 1, 2, is contained only in ver. 2.— δε ἐκάθισεν εν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης εν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς] who has sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven (Ps. cx.). Comp. i. 3: ἐκάθισεν εν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης εν ὑψηλοῖς.— The opinion of Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Klee, Bleek, and Alford, that the author designed by ἐκάθισεν, too, to indicate a point of superiority in Christ over the Levitical high priests,— inasmuch as the latter, when they entered the Most Holy Place, instead of sitting down were required to stand,— is far-fetched. There is nothing in the context to lead to such supposition. It is otherwise (on account of the express opposition there met with ἔστηκεν... ἐκάθισεν) chap. x. 11, 12.— εν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς] belongs to ἐκάθισεν, not to τῆς μεγαλωσύνης (Böhme), since otherwise the article would have been repeated; still less to the opening words of ver. 2 (Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 405 f.), since in that case τῶν ἁγίων τῶν εν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς λειτουργός would have been the only natural expression, the rhythmical proportion of vv. 1, 2 would have been destroyed, and the εν ὑψηλοῖς, i. 3, parallel to the εν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς in our passage, would have remained unnoticed as regards its coherence with that which precedes.

Ver. 2. Declaration of the capacity in which Christ has sat down at the right hand of God: as a sacrificing priest of the true sanctuary and tabernacle, which the Lord erected, not a man. Ver. 2 is to be joined without any comma to ver. 1. For only the qualification of the ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ., ver. 1, which is first added by means of ver. 2,— not merely the fact of the καθίσαι in itself, since this had already been often mentioned in the epistle,— contains the new main feature which the author aims at bringing into prominence.— τῶν ἁγίων] is not masculine (Oecumenius: ἀρχιερεὺς φησὶ τῶν ἡγιασμένων παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἁγιώτων ἡμῶν γὰρ ἄστιν ἀρχιερεύς, I'rimasius, Cajetan, Schulz, Paulus, Stengel) but neuter; it
denotes, however, neither the holy things (Luther, Hunnius, Balduin), nor that which is required for the priestly service (Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Rambach, Ewald), nor "such holy things as stand in essential relation to the σκηνή ἅληθινή" (Kurtz), but the sanctuary (according to Erasmus, Jac. Cappellus, Böhme, Stuart, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des hebräerbr. p. 513; Alford, Maier, and others, specially: the Most Holy Place), in which (or: in regard to which) the priestly service is performed. Comp. ix. 8, 12, 24, 25, x. 19, xiii. 11.—Synonymous with τῶν ἁγίων is the τῆς σκηνῆς, added by way of elucidation; and from the adjective of the latter, τῆς ἁληθινῆς, we have also to supply in thought the corresponding adjective τῶν ἁληθινῶν (comp. ix. 24) to the foregoing τῶν ἁγίων. For even the earthly high priest was a τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός; only a τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἁληθινῶν λειτουργός he was not.—λειτουργός] Comp. λειτουργεῖν, x. 11, and λειτουργεῖα, ver. 6, ix. 21; Phil. ii. 17; Luke i. 23. With the classic writers, λειτουργὸς denotes the bearer of any public office, or office of the State. In the general sense of a "servant" it stands i. 7; Rom. xiii. 6; Phil. ii. 25. But already with the LXX. (Neh. x. 39; cf. Ecclus. vii. 30, al.) it is spoken specially of him who discharges priestly service. In accordance therewith it has here, too (comp. ver. 3), as well as Rom. xv. 16, the signification: sacrificing priest.—τῆς ἁληθινῆς] The σκηνή is called true, not in opposition to the false, but as the archetype existing in heaven in contrast with the earthly image of the same (ver. 5), which latter, as is always the case with the copy in relation to the original, could be only something imperfect.—ἡν ἐπηξεν] Comp. Ex. xxxiii. 7.—ὁ κύριος] is here God, as elsewhere in our epistle only in the O. T. citations.—ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἀνθρωπός] Comp. σκηνής οὐ χειροποιητόν, ix. 11; οὐ χειροποιητά ἁγία, ix. 24. 

Ver. 3. Subsidiary remark in justification of the expression λειτουργὸς, ver. 2. The λειτουργεῖν, or the presenting of sacrifices, is just something essential in the fulfilment of the office of every high priest; a λειτουργός, or sacrificing priest,
must thus Christ also be.— By the statement, ver. 3, the argument itself is not interrupted. For enclosing the verse within a parenthesis, with Cameron, Stengel, and others, there exists therefore no reason.— γὰρ the explanatory namely.

— On πᾶς γὰρ ... καθισταται, comp. v. 1: πᾶς γὰρ ἄρχιερεὺς ... καθισταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας.— ὃθεν ἀναγκαῖον] sc. ἢν (Syriac, Beza, Piscator, Owen, Bengel, Bleek, de Wette, Hofmann, Komm. p. 306; Woerner), not ἐστιν (Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, Schlichting, Schulz, Böhme, Stuart, Kuinoel, Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 407; Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 505; Alford, Maier, Moll, Ewald, M'Caul, al.). For the author knows only one single sacrificial act of Christ, an act performed once for all (not one continually repeated), as is evident partly from the parallel passages, vii. 27, ix. 12, 25, 28, x. 10, 12, 14, partly from the preterite ἐρχόμενον in our passage.— ἐξειν τι καὶ τοῦτον, δ ἐρχόμενον that also this (High Priest) should have somewhat that He might offer up. By the τι the author understands Christ's own body, which He gave up to death as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sinful world. The indefinite mode of expression by τι, however, was chosen just because the reference to the sacrifice in this place was only an incidental one, and that which was intended could the less be misunderstood by the readers, in that immediately before, vii. 27, it had been declared by means of ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέκας in what the sacrifice of Christ consisted.

Vv. 4, 5. Return (οὖν) from the subsidiary remark, ver. 3, to the main thought in ver. 2 (τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἁληθινῆς, ἢν κ.τ.λ.), and proof for the same.

Ver. 4. A sacrificial priest Christ can only be, either in the earthly or the heavenly sanctuary; for a third, besides these two, there is not. The author now proves, ver. 4, that He cannot be a priest in the earthly sanctuary, whence it then follows of itself that He must be so in the heavenly one.— εἰ ἢν not: if He had been (Böhme, Kuinoel), but: if He were. To εἰ μὲν οὖν ἢν ἐπὶ γῆς we have, moreover, neither, with Grotius, Wolf, and others, to supply μόνον, nor, with Zeger, Bengel, Carpzov, Heinrichs, Böhme, and others, ἄρχιερεὺς or ἵπερεὺς. It signifies nothing more than: if He were now on
earth, had His dwelling-place upon earth. — \( \text{oúdē} \ \text{áv} \ \text{ýv} \ \text{iepeíνς} \)  

He would not even be a priest. Incorrectly Bleek, Bisping, and Ewald: He would not even be a priest—not to say a high priest. For the augmenting \( \text{oúdē} \) can refer only to the whole proposition, not specially to \( \text{iepeíνς} \), since otherwise \( \text{oúdē} \ \text{iepeíνς} \ \text{áv} \ \text{ýv} \) must have been written. \( \text{iepeíνς} \) is therefore to be taken as a more general expression for the more definite \( \text{áρχερείνς} \). Yet more erroneously Primasius, Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Rambach, Carpzov, and others: “He would not be that unique, real, or true priest, that everlasting priest after the manner of Melchisedec”—which, without an addition, the words cannot by any means signify. — The reason why Christ, if He were dwelling upon earth, could not at all be a priest, is contained in the \( \text{δῦτον} \ldots \ \text{τὰ δώρα} \). For on earth there are, of a truth, the legally appointed priests already present, and with these Jesus, since He belonged not to the tribe of Levi, but to the tribe of Judah (vii.14), has nothing in common. — \( \text{δῦτον} \ \text{τῶν} \ \text{προσφερόντων} \ \text{κατὰ} \ \text{νόμον} \ \text{τὰ δώρα} \) since assuredly there are present (\( \text{δῦτον} \) has the emphasis), sc. on earth, those who in accordance with law (i.e. according to the norm of the Mosaic law) offer the gifts, namely the Levites, among whom Christ could not be reckoned. \( \text{δῦτον} \) and \( \text{προσφερόντων} \) designate that which is still existing at the time of our author. To take the words as participles of the past (Peshito, Vulgate, Grotius,1 Braun, and others), is already forbidden by the present \( \lambdaτρείονσαι \), ver. 5.

Ver. 5. The author at once attaches to the proof given, ver. 4,—that Christ must be High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary,—the testimony of Scripture that the earthly sanctuary, in which the Levitical priests officiate, is a mere copy of the heavenly, thus only an imperfect sanctuary. Schlichting: Vel rationem quandam div. autor his verbis exprimit, cur Christus, si in terris esset, sacerdos esse non posset, nempe quia sacerdotes illi, qui in terris degentes offerunt, umbrae tantum serviant coelestium; vel tantum a contrario illustrat id, quod de pontifice nostro dixerat, nempe eum esse veri tabernaculi ministrum, legales vero pontifices

1 This writer with the explanation entirely foreign to the subject: “Erant, nempe quum psalmus iste scriberetur.”
umbrae tantum et exemplari illius coelestis tabernaculi servire. Not to enclose within a parenthesis (Griesbach, Schulz, Scholz, al.), since the same easily joins on syntactically to ver. 4, and διαφορωτήρας, ver. 6, points back to its subject-matter.—οὗτοις] nimirum qui.—ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ] a copy and shadow. ὑποδείγματι corresponds to the δεικτέα σοι in the ensuing citation, and denotes here (otherwise iv. 11) that which is shown only by way of hints, or only in its general outlines (comp. τὰ ὑποδείγματα, ix. 23), has thus the notion of a merely imperfect sketch or copy. Yet more emphatically is the notion of imperfection brought out by means of καὶ σκιᾷ. For σκιᾷ stands not merely opposed to the σῶμα, as the unsubstantial to the substantial (Col. ii. 17; Josephus, de Bello Jud. ii. 2. 5: σκιὰν αἰτοφόρων βασιλείας, ἢς ἠρπασεν ἑαυτῷ τὸ σῶμα; Philo, de confus. linguarum, p. 348; with Mangey, I. p. 434), but also to the εἰκόνα, as the shadow/image melting into obscurity, and only to be recognised in its exterior outlines to the likeness distinctly struck off, containing light and colour, and enabling one to recognise the original. Comp. Heb. x. 1: σκιὰν . . . οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων; Achilles Tatius, i. p. 47 (in Wetstein ad x. 1): οὕτω τέθηκεν καὶ τῆς εἰκόνος ἡ σκιὰ; Cicero, de Officiis, iii. 17: Sed nos veri juris germanaeque justitiae solidam et expressam effigiem nullam tenemus; umbra et imaginibus utimur.—λατρεύουσιν] is taken unnaturally by Calvin, Pareus, Bengel, Peirce, Schulz, and others in the absolute sense: "who serve God in a copy and shadow." The datives ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ τῶν ἐπουρανίων form the object of the verb (comp. xiii. 10): "who minister (as priests) to that which is but a copy and shadow of the heavenly."—λατρεύειν here, by virtue of the connection, entirely equivalent to λειτουργεῖν; in general, however, of wider signification, and differing from λειτουργεῖν as the Hebrew יָשָׁר from הַשָּׁר.—τῶν ἐπουρανίων] not "of the heavenly things" (Luther), "of the heavenly relations and facts of redemption" (Ebrard), "of the heavenly relations and divine thoughts" (Moll), "of the ideal possessions in general, belonging to the kingdom of God" (Tholuck); but: of the heavenly sanctuary. Comp. the citation immediately
following, as also ver. 2 and ix. 23, 24.—καθὼς κεχρηματισταυ Μωϋσῆς according to the response, or divine revelation, which Moses received. The passive χρηματιζοθαι in this sense only in the N. T. (xi. 7; Matt. ii. 22; Acts x. 22, al.) and in Josephus (Antiq. iii. 8, 8, xi. 8. 4).—ἐπιτελεῖν] denotes here not the completion of that which is already begun. What is meant is the execution of that which had previously only been resolved on.—The citation is from Ex. xxv. 40. The γάρ, even as φησίν, belongs to the author of our epistle, on which account ὑπό γάρ φησίν is to be written without placing a comma after γάρ. —φησίν] sc. ὁ χρηματισμός, the divine response, or, since in Exodus (xl. 1) God is expressly named as the speaker: ὁ θεός (Heinrichs, Bleek, Stengel, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Kurtz, al.), not ἡ γραφή (Böhme). —πάντα] is wanting with the LXX. —κατὰ τὸν τύπον] in accordance with the pattern (ὕπτε), i.e. corresponding to the archetype presented to the contemplation of Moses in the manner of a revelation, or by means of a vision. Comp. Acts vii. 44. Over-refined, indeed, although linguistically not less admissible than the other, is the interpretation of Faber Stapulensis, Rivetus, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Storr, Bleek, and Maier, that in connection with τύπος we have to think of a mere copy of the archetype, so that the Levitical priests served in priestly guise the copy of a copy.—τὸν δεικθέντα] LXX.: τὸν δεδειγμένον. —ἐν τῷ ὅρει] upon the mount, namely Sinai.

Ver. 6 repeats, in the form of an antithesis to vv. 4, 5, the main proposition of the new section, that Christ accomplishes His priestly service in the heavenly sanctuary (ver. 2); in the progress of the discourse, however, advances an additional argument in favour of this main proposition: in that the naturalness of the fact asserted is evidenced by the superiority of that covenant which has been brought in by Christ. As, therefore, the author (vii. 20–22) had deduced from the higher priestly rank of Christ the more excellent nature of the covenant brought in by Him; so here, conversely, from the better nature of the covenant established by Him, is inferred the higher order of His priestly ministry. νῦν δέ forms the opposition to εἰ μὲν οὖν, ver. 4, while διαφορωτέρας points
back antithetically to the contents of ver. 5. Theophylact: "Εκείνον τοῦ νοήματος ήρται ταῦτα, τοῦ Εἴ μὲν γάρ ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐκ άκ ἦν ἱερεύς· νυνὶ δὲ μὴ ἄνω, φησίν, ἐπὶ γῆς, ἀλλὰ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐχὼν ἱερατείαν, διαφοροτέρας ἐπέτυχε λειτουργίας
toucēs, οὐκ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ ἡ λειτουργία θοιαίη, οία ἡ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀρχιερεῖων ἀλλ' οὐράνιος, ἄτε τῶν ἔχουσα τῆς οἰκείας
teleτῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν. — νυνὶ δὲ] not in the temporal, but in the logical sense: but now. — διαφοροτέρας λειτουργίας] inas-
much, namely, as the σκηνή, in which He fulfils His office, is the ἄληθινή, ἶν ἐπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος (ver. 2).
— On the comparative διαφοροτέρας, see at ii. 4. — καὶ after δόξα renders distinctly apparent the inner correspondence of the two principal members in the proposition, ver. 6. — μεσίτης] Mediator (ix. 15, xii. 24; Gal. iii. 19, 20; 1 Tim. ii. 5; LXX. Job ix. 33), inasmuch as He has proclaimed the New and better Covenant, and has sealed the same by His death on the cross. — ἤτις] which, as such. Introduction of the proof that the covenant of which Christ is made the Mediator is a better one (vii. 22), i.e. affords full satisfaction to the heart seeking salvation and deliverance, which the Mosaic covenant was incapable of pacifying. The proof for this superiority the author derives from the fact that the New Covenant has been enacted upon the ground of (ἐπὶ [cf. vii. 11; Acts xiv. 3]) better promises, i.e. promises more excellent with regard to their subject-matter. The expression νενομοθέτηται is chosen not in order to denote the similarity of nature in the two covenant-foundings, but, after the analogy of the Pauline mode of expression, Rom. iii. 27 (ix. 31), in order to oppose to the Mosaic law, hitherto in operation, the New Covenant as in some sense a new law (comp. νόμον μου, ver. 10) now come into force. — κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις] What is meant is without doubt the several factors in the contents of the passage from Jeremiah cited immediately after —to wit, the promise of the forgiveness of sins (comp. ver. 12), which the Old Covenant was not able to bring about (Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iii. 10 ff.), in connection with the character of innerness of the New Covenant in general (vv. 10, 11), as opposed to the externalism of the Old. — The explaining of the κρείττονες ἐπαγγελίαι, with Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophy-
lact, Primasius, Clarius, Bengel, Carpzov, Whitby, M'Lean, Bisping, and others, of everlasting blessedness and the other eternal blessings of Christianity, in opposition to the purely terrestrial and temporal promises of Mosaism (the peaceful possession of the land of Canaan, a long life upon earth, etc.), is to be rejected; because—apart from the contradiction in which this interpretation stands with the elucidation given by the author himself by virtue of the ensuing citation from Scripture—it is, as Bleek rightly observes, improbable that the author should have referred the promises deposited in the Mosaic law to merely earthly things, in place of referring them to the object of which he understands the promise already imparted to Abraham—the bringing in of the great salvation for the people of God in the person of Christ.—The view, too, that the eiraykeia of the New Covenant are called κρείττονες because they are better guaranteed (Stengel and others), has the context against it.

Vv. 7-13. Evidence from Scripture that the New Covenant rests upon better promises than the Old, and consequently is a better covenant than that. God Himself has, by the fact of His having promised a new covenant, pronounced the former one to be growing obsolete.

Ver. 7. Justification of the κρείττονες and κρείττοσιν, ver. 6.—εὔνιν if it were (vii. 11, viii. 4).—ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη sc. διαθήκη. On the superlative, quite in keeping with the linguistic usage of the Greek, see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 229, Obs. 1.—ἀμεμπτός faultless (Phil. ii. 15, iii. 6), satisfactory, sufficient. Theodoret: τὸ αμεμπτός ἀντὶ τοῦ τελεία τέθεικε. —οὐκ ἄν δευτέρας ἐξητεῖτο τότος] place would not have been sought (sc. by God, in the O. T., or in the passage of Scripture immediately adduced) for a second (covenant); i.e. it would not have been expressed by God Himself, that a second covenant is to come in beside the first, and replace it. In this general sense ἐξητεῖτο τότος is to be taken, and the form of expression in the apodosis to be explained from a mingling of a twofold mode of contemplation (οὐκ ἄν δευτέρα ἐξητεῖτο καὶ δευτέρας οὐκ ἦν ἄν τότος: a second would not be sought by God, nor would there be any place for a second). No emphasis rests upon τότος; on which
account it is over-refining, when Bleek finds in ἐξητείτο τότος the reference that to the New Covenant, according to ver. 10, the place was assigned in the hearts of men, while the Old was written upon tables of stone.

Ver. 8. Making good of the assertion, ver. 7, that the Old Covenant was not free from fault, and God on that account made known His purpose of establishing a New one. Since μεμφόμενος manifestly corresponds to the ἀμεμπτος, ver. 7, and there the non-freedom from blame regards the covenant itself, not the possessors thereof, it is more natural to combine αὐτῶις with λέγει (Faber Stapulensis, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Peirce, Michaelis, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Kuinoel, Klee, Bleek, Stein, Bloomfield, Reiche, Comment. crit. p. 65 sq.; Conybeare, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, and others) than—what is certainly possible in a grammatical respect (see the Lexicons)—to join it to πεπεlesai (Peshito, Vulgate, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Er. Schmid, Bengel, Wolf, Carpzov, Heinrichs, Böhme, Stengel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Hofmann, al.). — λέγει] sc. ὁ θεός. Comp. the thrice-occurring λέγει κύριος in the following citation (vv. 8, 9, 10). — αὐτῶις λέγει] He saith unto them, namely, the possessors of the πρώτη διαθήκη. — The citation beginning with ἰδοὺ, and extending to the close of ver. 12, is from Jer. xxxi. (LXX. xxxviii.) 31–34, after the LXX., with slight deviations. — λέγει κύριος] so in the LXX. of the Cod. Alex. The Cod. Vatican, and others have φησί κύριος. — In place of καὶ συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰουδα, it reads in the LXX.: καὶ διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰουδα. Perhaps a change designedly made in order to characterize the New Covenant as a completed or perfect one.

Ver. 9. Οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἢν ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶι] negative unfolding of the foregoing positive expression καὶνὴν (namely, a covenant): not after the manner of the covenant (ἡν ἐποίησα) which I made for their fathers, i.e. one qualitatively different therefore, and that as being a better one. — ἢν ἐποίησα] LXX.: ἢν διεθέμην. — τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶι] in the Hebrew מַעַּרְכָּנָה, with their fathers. The mere dative with ἐποίησα excludes the notion of reciprocity in the covenant-
founding which has taken place, and presents it purely as the work of the disposition made by God. — ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπίλα-
βομένου μου κ.τ.λ.] in the day (at the time) when I took hold of their hand, to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt (בָּם־הַחַיִּים בָּבָר הַגַּזִּים עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִכָּרוּי). An unwieldy, but not exactly incorrect construction (see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 531), in place of which Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph. Jud. 11, in citing the same words of Scripture, has chosen the less cumbrous ἐν ἡ ἐπέλαβόμεν. The note of time characterizes the covenant as the Mosaic one. — ὅτι] for; not: “because,” as protasis to καγὼ κ.τ.λ. as the apodosis (Calvin, Böhme, Hofmann, al.). — καγὼ] emphatic personal opposition to αὐτοί: and consequently I also concerned not myself about them. — λέγει κύριος] LXX. (Cod. Alex. too): φησὶ κύριος.

Ver. 10. Justification of the διαθήκην καὶ νῦν διαθήκην κ.τ.λ., vv. 8, 9, by a definite indication of the nature of the covenant to be instituted. — ὅτι αὐτὴ ἡ διαθήκη κ.τ.λ.] for this (or the following) is the covenant which I will institute for the house of Israel. αὐτὴ introduces with emphasis the material characterization following with διδοὺς κ.τ.λ. — οἶκος Ἰσραήλ] here embraces the whole nation, while in ver. 8 it denoted one of the two kingdoms into which it had been divided. — μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας] after those days, i.e. after the days which must first have elapsed, before the ἡμέρα mentioned, ver. 8,—in which the New Covenant is to come into existence,—begin to dawn. Wrongly Oecumenius: ποιάς ἡμέρας; τὰς τὰς ἐξόδου, εν αἷς ἐξαξών τὸν νόμον. — λέγει κύριος] LXX.: φησὶ κύριος. — διδοὺς] So LXX. Cod. Alex., while Cod. Vat. and other mss. of the LXX. have διδοὺς δῶσω. In the Hebrew וְכַל. διδοὺς does not stand for δῶσω (Vatablus, Schlichting, Bengel, and others). Just as little have we to supplement it with δῶσω (Heinrichs, Stengel, al.), or with εἰμι or ἐσομαι (Kuinoel, Bloomfield), or διαθήσομαι αὐτήν (Delitzsch). Nor have we to join it to the following ἐπιγράψω (so Böhme, but undecidedly, and Paulus), in such wise that we must render καλ before ἐπιγράψω by “also.” It attaches itself grammatically to the preceding διαθήσομαι. In order to obviate any unevenness of construction, we may then place a colon after διάνοιαν αὐτῶν. : The separation, however,
of the καὶ ἐπιγράψῳ from that which precedes is not actually necessary, since instances of a transition from the participle to the tempus finitum are elsewhere nothing strange. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 533. — διάνοια] mind, i.e. soul, innermost part (η̑ν). Accentuation of the character of innerness in the New Covenant, as opposed to the externalism of the Old. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 3. — καρδίας] either accusative (Deut. iv. 13, v. 22, al.) or genitive (comp. Ex. xxxiv. 28; Num. xvii. 2, 3, al.). In favour of the latter pleads the singular in the Hebrew original; in favour of the former, the reading of the Cod. Alex.: ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας. We cannot take into account, in favour of the accusative, the greater conformity to the character of the Greek language, according to which, on account of the plurality of persons (αὐτῶν), one must also speak of καρδίαι in the plural. For without regard to this distinction the singular διάνοια has already been just placed, and in like manner the singular τὴν χειρός is placed, ver. 9. — In place of ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν. ἐπιγράψῳ αὐτῶν, the Cod. Alex. of the LXX. has: ἐπιγράψῳ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν, and the Cod. Vatic.: ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν γράψῳ αὐτῶν. — καὶ ἐνομαί αὐτῶν εἰς θεόν κ.τ.λ.] Comp. already Ex. vi. 7; Lev. xxvi. 12, al.; also 2 Cor. vi. 16. — The Hebraizing εἶναι εἰς (יוֹנָ֣מ) as i. 5.

Ver. 11. The consequence resulting from the διδόναι νόμον εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ., ver. 10. Comp. Joel iii. 1, 2; 1 John ii. 27. — καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν] and then they shall not instruct (Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 472; Buttmann, Gramm. des neuest. Sprachgebr. p. 183), as regards the sense equivalent to: and then it will not be needful that they instruct each other; the reason for which is stated immediately after, in the ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσιν με κ.τ.λ. On the intensifying οὐ μὴ, see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 471 f. — τῶν πολίτην αὐτῶν] his fellow-citizen. So in the LXX., Cod. Vatic., and most mss., while Cod. Alex. has in the first member τῶν ἄδελφον, in the second τῶν πλησίων. — γνώσθη] in the Hebrew the plural: בְּשַׁע. — μικρῶν] With the LXX. in most Codd.: μικρῶν αὐτῶν. — ἀπὸ μικρῶν ἑως μεγάλου αὐτῶν] Young and old (μικρός καὶ μεγάλος). Comp. Acts viii. 10; LXX. Jer. vi. 13; Jonah iii. 5; Gen. xix. 11, al.
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founding which has taken place, and presents it purely as the work of the disposition made by God. — ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλα-βομένου μου κ.τ.λ. [in the day (at the time) when I took hold of their hand, to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt (ὅτε οὖν ταξισίς Βωρὸς οὐδὲ ἁρύχα γεγενημένης) An unwieldy but not exactly incorrect construction (see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 531), in place of which Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph. Jud. 11, in citing the same words of Scripture, has chosen the less cumbrous ἐν ἡ ἐπιλαβώμην. The note of time characterizes the covenant as the Mosaic one. — ὅτι] for; not: "because," as protasis to καγώ κ.τ.λ. as the apodosis (Calvin, Böhme, Hofmann, al.). — καγώ] emphatic personal opposition to αὐτοι: and consequently I also concerned not myself about them. — λέγει κύριος] LXX. (Cod. Alex. too): φησί κύριος.

Ver. 10. Justification of the διαθήκην καυνήν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην κ.τ.λ., νν. 8, 9, by a definite indication of the nature of the covenant to be instituted. — ὅτι αὐτη ἡ διαθήκη κ.τ.λ.] for this (or the following) is the covenant which I will institute for the house of Israel. αὐτη introduces with emphasis the material characterization following with δίδωσι κ.τ.λ. — οἶκος Ἰσραήλ] here embraces the whole nation, while in ver. 8 it denoted one of the two kingdoms into which it had been divided. — μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας] after those days, i.e. after the days which must first have elapsed, before the ἡμέρας mentioned, ver. 8,—in which the New Covenant is to come into existence,—begin to dawn. Wrongly Oecumenius: σοιαὶ ἡμέρας; τὰς τῆς ἐξόδου, ἐν αἷς ἐλαβόν τῶν νόμων. — λέγει κύριος] LXX.: φησὶ κύριος. — δίδωσι] So LXX. Cod. Alex., while Cod. Vatic. and other mss. of the LXX. have δίδοσι δῶσο. In the Hebrew νב. δίδους does not stand for δῶσω (Vatablus, Schlichting, Bengel, and others). Just as little have we to supplement it with δῶσω (Heinrichs, Stengel, al.), or with εἰμί or εἴσομαι (Kuinoel, Bloomfield), or διαθήκοιαί αὐτὴν (Delitzsch). Nor have we to join it to the following ἐπιγράψω (so Böhme, but undecidedly, and Paulus), in such wise that we must render καλ before ἐπιγράψω by "also." It attaches itself grammatically to the preceding διαθήκοιαί. In order to obviate any unevenness of construction, we may then place a colon after διώνουν αὐτῶν: The separation, however,
of the καὶ ἐπιγράψω from that which precedes is not actually necessary, since instances of a transition from the participle to the tempus finitum are elsewhere nothing strange. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 533. — διάνοιαν mind, i.e. soul, innermost part (ἱν). Accentuation of the character of innerness in the New Covenant, as opposed to the externalism of the Old. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 3. — καρδιάς either accusative (Deut. iv. 13, v. 22, al.) or genitive (comp. Ex. xxxiv. 28; Num. xvii. 2, 3, al.).

In favour of the latter pleads the singular in the Hebrew original; in favour of the former, the reading of the Cod. Alex. ἐπὶ τὰς καρδιὰς. We cannot take into account, in favour of the accusative, the greater conformity to the character of the Greek language, according to which, on account of the plurality of persons (αὐτῶν), one must also speak of καρδιαὶ in the plural. For without regard to this distinction the singular διάνοιαν has already been just placed, and in like manner the singular τῆς χειρός is placed, ver. 9. — In place of ἐπὶ καρδιάς αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτοὺς, the Cod. Alex. of the LXX. has: ἐν ὑγράψω αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς καρδιὰς αὐτῶν, and the Cod. Vatic.: ἐπὶ καρδιάς αὐτῶν γράψω αὐτοὺς. — καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεὸν κτ.λ.] Comp. already Ex. vi. 7; Lev. xxvi. 12, al.; also 2 Cor. vi. 16. — The Hebraizing εἶναι εἰς τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ κτ.λ. as i. 5.

Ver. 11. The consequence resulting from the διδόναι νόμους εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν κτ.λ., ver. 10. Comp. Joel iii. 1, 2; 1 John ii. 27. — καὶ οὔ μὴ διδάξωσιν) and then they shall not instruct (Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 472; Buttmann, Gramm. des neuest. Sprachgebr. p. 183), as regards the sense equivalent to: and then it will not be needful that they instruct each other; the reason for which is stated immediately after, in the ὅτι πάντες εἰδῆσουσίν με κτ.λ. On the intensifying οὔ μὴ, see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 471 f. — τὸν πολίτην αὐτοῦ] his fellow-citizen. So in the LXX., Cod. Vatic., and most mss., while Cod. Alex. has in the first member τῶν ἄδελφων, in the second τῶν πλησίων. — γνώθι] in the Hebrew the plural:Ψ. — μικρῶν] With the LXX. in most Codd.: μικρῶν αὐτῶν. — ἀπὸ μικρῶν ἔως μεγάλου αὐτῶν] Young and old (μεγάλους μικροὺς). Comp. Acts viii. 10; LXX. Jer. vi. 13; Jonah iii. 5; Gen. xix. 11, al.
Ver. 12. The inner ground of this communion with God and this knowledge of Him. — ὅτι not: “that” (Michaelis, ad Petrec), but: for. — ἐνεῶσεν ἐσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν] I will be gracious (Ἡμεῖς) to their unrighteousnesses, i.e. will forgive and forget the same. — ἀδικίαι] in the plural, in the N. T. only here, but of frequent occurrence with the LXX. Designation of the alienation from God in its single outbreaks and forms of manifestation. — καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομίων αὐτῶν] LXX. merely: καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν, in accordance with the Hebrew: πρὸς ἀνομίαν.

Ver. 13. The author derives the result from the Scripture testimony, vv. 8—12. — ἐν τῷ λέγεων καὶ νῦν] in that He (sc. God) saith: a new (covenant). Comp. ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, iii. 15, and ἐν τῷ ὑποτάσι] He hath made the first old (contrary to linguistic usage, Ebrard: “relatively older”), i.e. has declared it to be out of date, worn, and no longer serviceable. — παλαιὸν] a word belonging to a later period of the Greek language, elsewhere ordinarily used in the intransitive sense: “to grow old,” and generally in the middle voice (as a little below, and i. 11); is found likewise in the transitive sense, “to make old,” in Lam. iii. 4; Job ix. 5. To abolish or render obsolete the word itself does not signify; but rendering obsolete is the natural consequence of pronouncing out of date or wornout. The author accordingly does not directly express notion of abrogation by πεπαλαιώκειν in this place,—a sense, moreover, which, on account of the following παλαιοῦμεν, would here be inappropriate,—but leaves the reader to divine it. — τὸ δὲ παλαιοῦμεν καὶ γηρᾶσκον ἑγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ] but that which is growing ancient and is becoming infirm with years, is near to disappearing or perishing. — γηρᾶσκειν] ordinarily said of human beings (to become enfeebled with age, senescere); then, however, also of things, comp. e.g. Xenoph. Ages. xi. 14: ἡ μὲν τοῦ σώματος ἴσχὺς γηρᾶσκει, ἡ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ρώμη ... ἀγνηρατός ἐστιν. — The author says sparingly: near to disappearing (comp. κατάρας ἑγγὺς, vi. 8), in that he takes his standpoint at the time of the divine promises just quoted. But if God in the time of Jeremiah already designated the Old Covenant as that which is nigh unto ruin, it was therein necessarily declared by
implication, that now, after so long a time is passed and the New Covenant has already been in reality brought in, the Old Covenant, as to its essence (if not yet as to its external manifestation), must have been already entirely abrogated, must have entirely lost its force and validity.
CHAPTER IX.

VER. 1. η πρώτη] Elz.: η πρώτη σκηνή. But the addition σκηνή is condemned as a gloss by the fact of its being wanting in all the uncial mss., in many cursives, in Syr. utr. Basm. Aeth. Arm. It. Vulg., with Gregory Thaumaturgus, Cyril, Chrys. Damasc. Photius, al. On the ground, too, of internal evidence it is to be rejected, since, on the one hand, the coherence with viii. 13, and through that with viii. 7 ff., leads to διαθήκη as the main idea to be supplemented; and, on the other hand, the expression η πρώτη σκηνή, ix. 1, would be made to denote something quite different from that which the same expression denotes in ix. 2. For, while in ver. 2 the outer division of the tabernacle is indicated thereby, in ver. 1 only the first or Old Testament, earthly tabernacle, in opposition to the New Testament, heavenly one, thus something entirely dissimilar, could be intended by this expression.—Ver. 2. After ἀρτῶν, B, Basmur. add καὶ ἐκ χρυσοῦνθυμιατήριον, and in return omit the words χρυσὸνθυμιατήριον καί, ver. 4. Violent intentional transposition, with a view to the removal of the archaeological difficulty.—Instead of ἄγια, Lachm. writes ἄγια, ἄγιων, after A (ἄγια, ἄγιων) D* E, It. But ἄγια ἄγιων is a mere slip on the part of the copyist, occasioned by ver. 3, and is to be rejected as devoid of sense.—Ver. 5. ξερουβίῳ] A: ξερουβίῳ, B D*** (and so Lachm. Tisch. 7 and 8): ξερουβίῳ, D* N: ξερουβίῳ. In the case of the LXX., too, the MSS. are wont equally to vary as regards the final syllable of the word.—Instead of the Recepta διός, Griesb. and Scholz have erroneously placed in the text τῆς διός. The article has against it all the uncial mss. and other witnesses.—Ver. 9. In place of the Recepta καθ' ἂν (D*** E K L, min. It. Copt. Sah. Basm. Syr. Tho. Theodoret, Theoph.), Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, Delitzsch, Alford have rightly preferred the reading καθ' ἂν, in accordance with A B D* N, 17, 23* 27, al., Vulg. Slav. codd. Damasc. Oecum. (comment.). Already approved by Mill, Prolegg. p. 1046, and placed by Griesb. upon the inner margin. The καθ’ ἂν, as affording an easier mode of appending to that which precedes, is a later correction of the more difficult and
ill-understood καθ’ ἥν.— Ver. 10. The Recepta reads: καὶ δικαιώματα σαρκῶς. But καὶ is wanting in A D* Ν* 6, 17, 27, 31, al., with Cyr. (twice) in Syr. Copt. Arm. al.; and in place of δικαιώματα, A B Ν*, ten cursives, Cyril., and many versions have δικαιώματα, while in D* It. Sahid. there is found δικαιώμα. Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, Alfond have therefore adopted δικαιώματα σαρκῶς, which was already approved by Grotius, Mill, Prolegg. p. 1355, and Bengel, and recommended by Griesb. Delitzsch and Reiche likewise give it the preference. This reading is in reality to be regarded as the original one. For it is more easily explicable that δικαιώματα should, on account of the foregoing datives, be changed into δικαιώματα, and joined on to them by means of καὶ, than that the καὶ δικαιώματα, if it already existed, should, on account of the closing word ἕστηκεν, be converted into δικαιώ-

4, 44, 52, Chrys. Theodoret, Oecum.—ι προτη] D* E* It.: η πρωτη διαβεγα. Exegetical gloss.—Ver. 19. Elz.: ξατα νομον. But the better attestation by A C D* L κ*** 21, 47, 71, al., Copt. Basm. Chrys. ms. Theodoret, Theoph. requires the reading preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, and Alford: ξατα τον νομον.—In like manner is the article τον wanting in the Recepta before τραγων to be added, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, in accordance with the weighty authority of A C D E (D E, Aeth.: τον τραγων και τον μοσχων) η* 80, al. mult. It. Vulg. Theodoret, ms.—So, in place of the Recepta ἑρμανιες here and ver. 21, we have, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, in accordance with all the uncials, to write ἑρμανιεсов.—Ver. 24. The order of the words followed by Lachm. in the stereotype edition, as well as recently by Tisch. in the ed. vii. and viii.: εισηλθεν ἁγια, rests only upon the testimony of Α, 37, 118. In the larger edition of Lachm., therefore, this has rightly given place to the Recepta ἁγια εισηλθεν. —Better attested than the Recepta ἐ Χριστος is the mere Χριστος (A C* D*, al. [Cod. B in its original form extends only to ομιδην, ix. 14]), preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, and Alford.—Ver. 26. Elz. Griesb. Matthæi, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Bloomfield, Delitzsch: vov δι. Better Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, in accordance with A C L (?) κ, 37, 39, 40, Orig. Chrys.: νυι δι.—ἀμαρτιας] A κ, 17, 73. Lachm.: της ἀμαρτιας. Against C D*** E K L, almost all the min. Orig. (once) al. mult.—Ver. 28. ωτως και] Elz. has only ωτως. Against decisive witnesses (all the uncial mss., most min., many translations and Fathers).—After της σωτηριαν, Lachm. in the stereotype edition had added, with A, 31, 47, al., Syr. Philonex. Slav. codd. Damasc., the words δια σιτισκως. Rightly, however, has he deleted them in the larger edition. The addition is a complementary gloss, which has against it the testimony of C D E K L κ, many min. versions, and Fathers, and betrays its character as a gloss by its changing position (Arm. 27, 31, 57, 61, al., have it before της σωτηριαν).

Vv. 1–14. The author has in chap. viii. insisted upon the fact, as a second main particular of the superiority of Christ as a high priest over the Levitical high priests, that the sanctuary in which He ministers is a more excellent one, namely, the heavenly sanctuary. He has made good this proposition by the consideration that no place would be found for Christ, as regards priestly service, in the earthly sanctuary; and then has proceeded to show the naturalness
of the fact that He accomplishes His ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, by the proof that He is the Mediator of a better covenant. This train of thought is still pursued in the beginning of chap. ix., in that attention is now finally called to the fact that in the arrangement of the Mosaic sanctuary itself, and the order of the priestly service corresponding thereto, there lies an indication on the part of God that Mosaism is not itself the perfect religion, but only an institution preparatory thereto (vv. 1–8). With this, however, is then connected, by means of one of those sudden transitions of which the author is so fond, the reference to the further truth, that, indeed, the Levitical sacrifices also, since they belong to the domain of fleshly ordinance, are not able really to atone; whereas the sacrifice presented by Christ, by means of His own blood, possesses, by virtue of an eternal Spirit, everlasting power of atonement (vv. 9–14), and thus a third main point in the high-priestly superiority of Christ is introduced, the development of which occupies the author as far as x. 18.

Vv. 1–5. Description of the arrangement of the O. T. sanctuary as regards its essential component parts.

Ver. 1. Ἐξέχεψεν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη] sc. διαθήκην. Against the supplementing of σκηνή (Cameron, Peirce, Whitby, Wetstein, Semler), see the critical remark.— ἐξέχεψεν] had. ἐβείζει is not written by the author, although the cultus of the Old Covenant was still continuing at the time when he wrote, not so much because—as is shown by ver. 2—it was his intention to describe the primitive arrangement thereof (comp. viii. 5), which is the opinion of Böhme, Kuinoel, Stengel, and Tholuck, as, what is more naturally suggested by the coherence with viii 13, because the Old Covenant had already been declared by God in the time of Jeremiah to be feeble with age and nigh unto disappearing, and consequently now, after the actual appearance of the promised New Covenant, has no longer any valid claim to existence. Chrysostom: ὅσει ἐλεγεν, τότε ἐξερχόμεν, οὐκ ἐκείνη. θεία τούτω αὐτήν ἐκκαινισκόμεν; τότε ἡ πρώτη ἡ σιν ὕσπιν. "Ὡστε οὔν, εἰ καὶ ἔστηκεν, οὐκ ἔστω. — μὲν οὖν] now truly. Admission that that which the author is about to detail is indeed something
relatively exalted. The antithesis, by which again this admission is deprived of its value and significance, is then introduced by ver. 6 (not first with ver. 11, as is supposed by Piscator, Owen, Carpzov, Cramer, Stuart, Bloomfield, Bisping, Maier, M'Caul, and others); yet in such wise that the material antithesis itself is first contained in the statement, ver. 8, which is connected syntactically only as a parenthetic clause. — καὶ] also. Indication that with the Old Covenant the New is compared, and possessions of the former are enumerated, which also (although, it is true, in a more perfect form) are proper to the latter. — δικαιώματα λατρείας] legal ordinances¹ in regard to worship, i.e. regulations made by virtue of divine authority respecting the cultus. — λατρείας] is genitive. To take the expression as accusative (Cameron, Grotius, Hammond, al.), according to which δικαιώματα, λατρείας, and τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικὸν would as three members be made co-ordinate with each other, is untenable; because the signification of δικαιώματα in itself would be too extensive to fit in with the further development of ver. 1, to which the author himself at once passes over, from ver. 2 onwards. For as the statement τὸ τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν receives its more full explication by means of vv. 2–5, so does the discourse in vv. 6, 7 return to the unfolding of the twofold δικαιώματα λατρείας, blended as this is in a logical respect into a unity of idea. — τὸ τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν] and the mundane sanctuary. Since, in accordance with the καὶ, possessions of the Old Covenant are to be mentioned, such as this has in common with the New,—while to the New Covenant there pertains no mundane, earthly sanctuary,—τὸ τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν must be regarded as a concise mode of designation for καὶ ἅγιον τί, τὸ κοσμικόν, “and a sanctuary, namely the mundane.” That such is the meaning of the author, is indicated by the fact that the article is placed before this second member, although it ought properly to have been inserted before κοσμικόν also. Yet the omission of the article in the case of adjectives placed after their substantives is not a thing unknown among other writers of the later period. See Bernhardy, Synt. p. 323; Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 126. Forced is the

¹ Wrongly Stengel: “Means of justification.”
explanation of Delitzsch, with the adherence of Kurtz and Woerner, that κοσμικόν as an adjectival predicate is to be taken in association with ἐίχεν: "the first covenant had likewise δικαιώματα λατρείας, and its sanctuary as mundane, i.e. a sanctuary of mundane nature." Had the author intended the readers to suppose such a conjoining, he would also—equally as vii. 24, v. 14—have indicated the same to them by the position of the words. He must, in order to be understood, at least have written: ἐίχεν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη δικαιώματα λατρείας κοσμικόν τε τὸ ἄγιον. Under an entire misapprehension, further, does Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 408 f., 2 Aufl.) suppose that τὸ τε ἄγιον κοσμικόν is not to be taken as a second object attaching itself to the δικαιώματα λατρείας, but as a second subject joining itself on to ἡ πρώτη,—a construction which, upon the presupposition of the Recepta ἡ πρώτη σκηνή being the correct reading, already Olearius adopted (comp. Wolf ad loc.), and upon the same supposition also more recently M'Caul maintained, in connection with which, however, τὸ τε ἄγιον κοσμικόν would limp behind in an intolerable manner, and would afford evidence of a negligence of style, such as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews would least of all have been guilty of. — The view of Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Zeger, Carpzov, and others, that ἄγιον is to be taken not in the local sense (sanctuary), but in the ethical sense (holiness, ἀγιότης, sanctitas, mundities), is altogether erroneous; since the expression chosen would be a remarkable one, the immediate sequel does not point thereto, and the more exalted seat of the cultus of the New Covenant forms the theme of the fresh train of thought opened up with the beginning of chap. viii.—Quite as much to be disapproved is the opinion of Wolf, who will have ἄγιον to mean "vasa sacra totumque apparatum Leviticum." — κοσμικός] means: belonging to the world, worldly, mundanus. Comp. Tit. ii. 12. The expression is equivalent to ἐπίγειος, and to it ἐπουράνιος stands opposed, as in general ὁ κόσμος in the N. T. very frequently has its tacit contrast in ὁ οὐρανός. Τὸ ἄγιον κοσμικὸν is consequently nothing else than ἡ σκηνή, ἢν ἐπηξεν ἀνθρωπός (comp. viii. 2), or ἡ σκηνὴ χειροποίητος, τούτεστιν ταύτης
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tής κτίσεως (comp. ix. 11), or τὰ χειροποίητα ἁγία (ix. 24), and a twofold idea is expressed in the adjective, first, that the sanctuary of the Old Covenant is one existing in the terrestrial world, then, that it is accordingly something only temporary and imperfect in its nature. Remote from the connection are the suppositions of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, and others: that the Jewish sanctuary was called κοσμικὸν, because the access to the same was open to the κόσμος, i.e. the Gentiles; a statement, moreover, which possesses historic truth only with reference to a part thereof, the court of the Gentiles (comp. Josephus, de Bello Jud. v. 5. 2; Acts xxi. 28), while here the sanctuary as a whole must be indicated;—of Theodorus Mopsuesten., Theodoret,1 Grotius, Hammond, Wetstein, Böhme, Paulus, and others: because the Jewish sanctuary symbolically represented the universe; the holy place, earth; the most holy, heaven; and the curtain before the latter, the firmament;—of Kypke, because the sense is: toto terrarum orbe celebratum (comp. Josephus, de Bello Jud. iv. 5. 2, where the Jerusalem high priests, Ananus and Jesus, are represented as τὸς κοσμικὸς θρησκείας κατάρχοντες, προσκυνοῦμενοι τε τοῖς ἐκ τῆς οἰκουμένης), which, however, could only be said with reference to the temple, not with reference to the tabernacle itself, of which the author is here specially thinking.— Entirely baseless, finally, is the opinion of Homberg, that κοσμικός is to be apprehended in the sense of “adorned, well-ordered.” For only κόσμιος, κοσμητικός, and κοσμητώς are used for the expression of this notion; never is κοσμικὸς put for it. See the Lexicons.

Vv. 2–5. Unfolding of the collective idea τὸ ἁγίον κοσμικὸν, as regards its several essential component parts. That the author has before his mind the Jewish sanctuary in its original form, i.e. the Mosaic tabernacle, is evident alike from the expression σκηνή, as from the use of the aorist κατεσκεύασθη. That, however, he likewise thinks of this original

1 Τὴν εἰσόδον οὖσαν ἐναλίθα, τῶν ἱερατευμάτων τοῦ κόσμου παντίς. Κατασκεύασθε γὰρ μίαν διχάσθε δίχα, καὶ τὰ μία ἄφθασεν ἑαυτὸν ἁγία, τὰ δὲ ἁγία τῶν ἁγίων. Καὶ ἠρµάζετε τὰ μία ἁγία τοῖς ἐν τῇ γῇ συλλειψισιν, τὰ δὲ ἁγία τῶν ἁγίων τὰ ἔφεσιν ἑαυτῶν ἑνωμένα. Αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ κατασκευάματα τῶν συμφώνων ἐσχάρω τὰν χρῆσαι.
disposition as still preserved in the temple of his day, is manifest partly from the present λέγεται immediately following, partly from the proposition: τοῦτον δὲ οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων . . . εἰσλάσων, ver. 6. — σκηνὴ γὰρ κατεσκευάσθη ἡ πρώτη] for a tent was prepared (set up), namely, the first or anterior one (the fore-tent). σκηνὴ stands first as the general notion, and only acquires its nearer definition by the ἡ πρώτη afterwards brought in, without, however, our having, with Beza, Bloomfield, and others, to place a comma after κατεσκευάσθη. That σκηνὴ ἡ πρώτη is not to be combined immediately in one, as expressing the signification: "the fore-part of the tent" (so Valckenaer, who compares in ultimis aedibus, and the like; also Delitzsch), is shown—although such acceptation presents no grammatical difficulty—by the corresponding σκηνὴ ἡ λεγομένη ἀγια ἀγιῶν, ver. 3, whence it follows that the author is regarding the two divisions of the tent separated by the veil in front of the Most Holy Place as two tents.—πρώτη] not temporal, but local. — κατεσκευάσθη] namely by Moses, at the behest of God (comp. viii. 5).—ἐν ἡ ἡ τε λυχνία] sc. ἐστίν (not ἢν, Alford, Kurtz, against which Xeyerai and ver. 6 are decisive): in which there is the candlestick (or lamp-stand). Comp. Ex. xxv. 31–39, xxxvii. 17–24; Bähr, Symbolik des Mos. Cultus, Bd. I., Heidelb. 1837, p. 412 ff. In the temple of Herod, too, there was, according to Josephus, de Bello Jud. v. 5. 5, vii. 5. 5, only one lamp-stand in the Holy Place, while in the temple of Solomon there were ten of them present; comp. 1 Kings vii. 49; 2 Chron. iv. 7.—καὶ ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων] and the table and the setting forth of the bread (or loaves), i.e. wherein is found the table, and the sacred custom is observed of placing thereon the shew-bread. Comp. Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 590. Wrongly do Vatablus, Zeger, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Bengel, Bloomfield, and others explain ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων as hypallage or antiptosis for οἱ ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως. Yet more unwarrantably do Valckenaer (and similarly Heinrichs) maintain that ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων is equivalent to ἡ τράπεζα τῶν ἄρτων τῆς προθέσεως. According to Tholuck, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Kluge, and Moll, πρόθεσις is, like the Hebrew προθήκη, to be taken concretely, strues panum. But πρόθεσις never has the
passive signification of strues. On the matter itself, comp. Ex. xxv. 23–30, xxvi. 35, xxxvii. 10–16; Lev. xxiv. 5–9; Bähr, l.c. p. 407 ff.—ήτες] sc. ἐκκηρώτης ἡ πρώτη. Not conjoined with the mere ἡ, because the fact alleged is something which is familiar to the readers.—ἀγία] Holy Place ([loc.]. So (as neuter plur.), not, with Erasmus, Luther, Er. Schmid, Mill, Whitby, Heinrichs, and others, ἀγία (as fem. sing.), have we to accentuate the word. It stands opposed to the ἀγία ἀγίας, ver. 3, and denotes the Holy Place, or the outer portion of the tabernacle, in opposition to the Most Holy Place, or the more secluded, inner portion of the same. Likewise with the LXX. and with Philo, the plural τὰ ἁγία in this sense is interchanged with the singular τὸ ἁγιόν. — ἁγία, however, not τὰ ἁγία, is placed, because the author was less concerned about mentioning the definite name coined for the expression thereof, than about bringing out the signification which this name has.

Ver. 3. Μετὰ] after or behind. Of local succession (Thucyd. vii. 58, al.), in the N. T. only here.—τὸ δεινέρον καταπέτασμα] the second veil (τοῦ βαθμοῦ). For before the Holy Place, too, there was a veil (τοῦ βαθμοῦ). On the former, comp. Ex. xxvi. 31 ff.—σκηνή] sc. κατασκευάσμα. — ἁγία ἁγίας] Most Holy Place. Periphrasis of the superlative (see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 231), and translation of τοῦ τιμίου, τοῦ τιμίου.

Ver. 4. Θυμιατήριον] is either interpreted as altar of incense or as censer. The latter, and indeed as a golden censer, which was employed by the high priest on the great day of atonement, is thought of by Luther, Grotius, de Dieu, Calov, Reland, Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Wetstein, Carpzov, Whitby, Schulz, Böhme, M'Lean, Stuart, Kuinoel, Stein, Bloomfield, Bisping, Alford, M'Caul, and others, after the precedent of the Peshito, Vulgate (turibulum), and Theophylact. The altar of incense, on the other hand (τὸ καθότι οὗτος or τὸ καθότι τοῦ θυμιατηρίου), of which mention is made as a constituent part in the Mosaic tabernacle, Ex. xxx. 1–10, xxxvii. 25–28, xl. 5. 26, as a constituent part in the temple of Solomon, 1 Kings vii. 48, 2 Chron. iv. 19, and as a constituent part in the Herodian temple (Josephus, de Bello Jud. v. 5. 5), is understood in the case of the Latin translation in D E (altare), as well as by Oecumenius (ad ver. 7), Calvin, Justinian, Piscator, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide,
Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Owen, Gerhard, Brochmann, Mynster (Stud. u. Krit. 1829, p. 342 ff.), Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräervbr. p. 489 f., Obs.), Maier, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Cony-beare, Hofmann, Woerner, and others. Instances from the classical writers in favour of either reference, see in Bleek, II. 2, p. 480 f. That a censer is intended may be urged from the language of the LXX., since with them for the indication of the altar of incense the expressions: τὸ θυσιαστήριον θυμάματος (Ex. xxx. 1, 27; Lev. iv. 7), τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν θυμαμάτων (1 Chron. vi. (vii.) 49, xxviii. 18; 2 Chron. xxvi. 10, 19), τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦ (Ex. xl. 5, 26, al.), τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ (δὲ) ἀπίναυει κυρίου (Lev. xvi. 12, 18); and, where the altar intended is clear from the context, merely τὸ θυσιαστήριον (Lev. xvi. 20, al.), are regularly employed, and only in unimportant mss. of the same θυματήριον presents itself in some few passages as a variation of reading. To this usage of the LXX., however, is to be opposed the equally important fact of the usage of Philo and Josephus, according to which, at their time, τὸ θυματήριον was quite the ordinary appellation of the altar of incense. Comp. Philo, Quis rerum divin. haeres. p. 511 sq. (with Mangey, I. p. 504): τριῶν δυτιῶν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις σκευῶν, λυχνία, τραπέζης, θυματήριον; De vita Mos. p. 668 (II. p. 149): "Ἀμα δὲ τοίτω ἐδημοφνηθητο καὶ σκεύη ἱερά, κιβωτός, λυχνία, τράπεζα, θυματήριον, βωμός. Ὡ μὲν οὖν βωμὸς ἑδύτου ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ κ.τ.λ.; Josephus, de Bello Jud. v. 5. 5: καὶ τὸ μὲν πρώτον μέρος . . . ἐλέυθερον τὸ δέ τρίτον θυμασιώτατα καὶ περιβόητα πάσιν ἀνθρώπων ἔργα, λυχνίαις, τράπεζας, θυματηρίον; Antiq. iii. 6. 8: μεταβὰ δὲ αὐτης (τῆς λυχνίας) καὶ τῆς τραπέζης ἐνδον . . . θυματηρίου, ξύλινου μὲν κ.τ.λ., al. Of the altar of incense, accordingly, the expression must be understood in our passage. For the manner in which the χρυσοῦ ἡθματήριον is mentioned, as a parallel member to τὴν κιβωτοῦ τῆς διαθήκης, shows that the former must be an object of equally great importance as the latter. But, since that is so, something as non-essential as a golden censer cannot be meant, but only the altar of incense, which formed an essential constituent part of the tabernacle. Besides, there
is nowhere any mention in the O. T. (not Lev. xvi. 12 either) of a particular censer, which had been set apart for the service on the great day of atonement. About the existence of such a censer at the time of the Mosaic tabernacle, which the author after all has mainly before his mind, nothing is known with certainty. Only from the Mishna, tract. Joma, iv. 4,¹ do we learn something about it. Moreover, according to tract. Joma, v. 1, vii. 4, this censer was first fetched out of the storehouse, carried by the high priest into the Most Holy Place, and upon the completion of the service again carried forth therefrom; even as it would be a priori improbable in the highest degree that such instrument should be kept within the Holy of Holies. For, according to Lev. xvi. 12, 13, the high priest was first to enter with incense into the Most Holy Place, in order that through the cloud thereof the glory of God, enthroned above the cover of the ark of the covenant, might become invisible to him, to the end that he died not. And yet ἐχοῦσα compels us to think of an abiding place of the θυματήριον; to explain ἐχοῦσα of the mere appertaining of the θυματήριον to the Most Holy Place as an object of use for the latter, as is usually done by the one class of expositors (but also by some advocates of the opposite view, as Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Owen, Mynster, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Conybeare, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 490, Obs.; Maier, Moll, Hofmann, and Woerner, with an appeal to רָבַיָּם וַעֲלַיָּם, 1 Kings vi. 22), is—inasmuch as the author sharply separates from each other in his description the two main divisions of the O. T. sanctuary, as well as the objects peculiar to each of these divisions, by means of μετὰ δὲ, ver. 3, and thus ἐχοῦσα, ver. 4, unmistakably corresponds to the ἐν τῷ, ver. 2—altogether arbitrary. If, then, we understand θυματήριον of the altar of incense, as we are compelled to do, there arises the archaeological difficulty that this altar had its standing-place not in the Most Holy Place, as is here presupposed by the author, but, on the contrary, in the Holy Place (Ex. xxx. 1 ff.). This point of inconsistency with historic truth is to be admitted, and therefrom the conclusion to be drawn, that the author did not himself live in the vicinity

¹ Omnibus diebus reliquis suffitum facturus de altari accept in turibulo argenteo... hoc vero die in aureo.
of the Jewish sanctuary, but had drawn his knowledge with regard to the same only from the Scriptures of the O. T., whence the possibility of an error is explicable. In favour of this possibility, Bleek rightly urges the following considerations: first, that Ex. xxvi. 35 there are mentioned as standing within the Holy Place only the table and the candlestick, but not the altar of incense also. Then, that where the standing place of this altar is actually spoken of, the form of expression chosen certainly, by reason of its indefiniteness, admitted of misconstruction. So Ex. xxx. 6: καὶ θῆσεις αὐτὸ ἀπέναντι τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦ δύνατος ἐπὶ τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῶν μαρτυρίων; ibid. xl. 5: καὶ θῆσεις τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσόν εἰς τὸ θυμίαμ ἐναυτῶν τῆς κιβωτοῦ; ver. 26: ἀπέναντι τοῦ καταπετάσματος; Lev. iv. 7, xvi. 12, 18: ἐναυτίον or ἀπέναντι κυρίου. Finally, that in the Mosaic law the altar of incense was brought into peculiar significance in connection with the solemnity of the atonement, since on this day it was sprinkled and cleansed by the high priest with the same blood which the high priest had carried into the Most Holy Place (Ex. xxx. 10; Lev. xvi. 18 f.). — χρυσοῦν] since the emphasis rests on it, is prefixed. The article, however, is wanting, because the sense is: a golden altar, namely, the altar of incense, in distinction from the brazen altar existing in the court, namely, the altar of burnt-offering. — καὶ τὴν κιβωτόν τῆς διαθήκης] and the ark of the covenant; comp. Ex. xxv. 10 ff., xxxvii. 1-9. — περικεκάλυμμένην πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ] overlaid on every side (within and without; comp. Ex. xxv. 11) with gold (plating of fine gold). According to 1 Kings viii., the ark of the covenant was also brought into the temple of Solomon. On the destruction of this temple by the Chaldeans it was lost, and the second temple was without an ark. Comp. Josephus, de Bello Jud. v. 5. 5: Ἠκεῖτο δὲ οὐδὲν δλως ἐν αὐτῷ, ἄβατον δὲ καὶ ἄχραντον καὶ ἄθαντον ἤν πᾶσιν, ἄγιον δὲ ἄγιον ἐκαλεῖτο. — ἐν ἤ στάμνος χρυσή ἐχονσα τὸ μάννα κ.τ.λ.] wherein was a golden pot with the manna, and Aaron's rod which had budded, and the tables of the covenant. ἐν ἤ does not refer back to σημεί, ver. 3 (Ribera, Justinian, Pyle, Peirce, and others) — for to the ἐν ἤ, ver. 4, the ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς, ver. 5, forms an opposition, but it refers to κιβωτός. On the
pot of manna, comp. Ex. xvi. 32–34; on Aaron's rod, Num. xvii. 16–26 (1–11); on the tables of the covenant, Ex. xxv. 16; Deut. x. 1, 2. According to 1 Kings viii. 9, there was nothing more in the ark of the covenant, at the time of its removal into the temple, than the two tables of the law; and according to Ex. xvi. 33, Num. xvii. 25 (10), the two first-mentioned objects were not to have their place within, but before the ark of the covenant. The same opinion, however, which the author here expresses as to the place of the preservation of the pot of manna and Aaron's rod, is found likewise with later Rabbins, as with R. Levi Ben Gerson at 1 Kings viii. 9 and at Num. xvii. 10, and Abarbanel at 1 Kings viii. 9. See Wetstein on our passage.

Ver. 5. The author turns from the objects to be found within the ark of the covenant to that which is above the same.— ἐπιτέρανω δὲ αὐτὴς] sc. τῆς κυβοτοῦ. — Χερουβὶς comp. Ex. xxv. 18 ff., xxxvii. 7 ff.; Winer, Bibl. Realwörterb. I. 2 Aufl. p. 262 ff.; Bahr, Symbolik des Mos. Cultus, Bd. I. p. 311 ff. There existed two of them, of fine gold, one at each end of the cover or lid of the ark of the covenant, upon which, with faces turned towards each other, they looked down, and which they covered with their outspread wings. In the midst of the cherubim was the glory of God enthroned (1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; 2 Kings xix. 15; Isa. xxxvii. 16), and from this place God would speak to Moses (Ex. xxv. 22; comp. Num. vii. 89). — Χερουβὶς is here treated as a neuter, as likewise generally with the LXX., with whom the masculine οἱ Χερουβὶς occurs but rarely (e.g. Ex. xxv. 20, xxxvii. 7). The neuter is not, however, to be explained by the supposition that πνεύματα is to be supplied to it in thought (comp. Drusius on our passage), but from the fact that the cherubim were regarded as ζώα. Comp. Josephus, Antig. iii. 6. 5, where the Mosaic cherubim are described as ζώα πετεινά, μορφήν δ' αὐδειν τῶν ἐπ' ἀυθρώπων ἐωραμένων παραπλήσια. Comp. also Ezek. x. 15: καὶ τὰ Χερουβὶμ ἤσαν τούτῳ τὸ ζώον, δ' ίδον κ.τ.λ. Ibid. ver. 20.—The cherubim are called Χερουβὶμ δόξης. That may mean cherubim of glory or brightness, to whom glory or brightness is proper (so Camerarius, Estius, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus,
Stuart, Kuinoel, al.), or the cherubim which pertain to the
divine glory, the καιροὺς, i.e. who are the bearers of the
divine glory (so the majority). Grammatically the former is
easier (on account of the absence of the article before δέξεως).
But the latter is to be preferred as yielding a more appropriate
thought, and the omission of the article is to be justified from
the usage of the LXX. Ex. xlv. 34; 1 Sam. iv. 22; Ezek.
ix. 3, x. 18, al.—κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱαστήριον] which over-
shadow the propitiatory (or mercy-seat). κατασκιάζειν in
the N. T. only here. Comp. συσκιάζειν, Ex. xxv. 20; σκιάζειν,
Ex. xxxvii. 9; 1 Chron. xxviii. 18. A more choice verb than
περικαλύπτειν, 1 Kings viii. 7. τὸ ἱαστήριον (ἡττοῖς), the
cover of the ark of the covenant, which on the great day of
atonement was sprinkled with the sacrificial blood for the
expiation of the sins of the people. Comp. Lev. xvi. 14 f.—
περὶ ὧν] goes back not merely to the cherubim (Ebrard,
p. 294), but also to all the objects before enumerated.—οὐκ
ἔστοι] it concerns us not, or: is not the place, or: is impossible.
Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 20. Of the same meaning as the more
definite οὐκ ἔστοι. With Kurtz to supply τόπος is inad-
missible.—κατὰ μέρος] in detail. The author does not
design to set forth the typical significance of every single
object enumerated; the indication of the typical significance
of the two main divisions of the Jewish sanctuary is that
which he at present aims at, and to this task he now addresses
himself in that which immediately follows, comp. ver. 8.

Vv. 6, 7. After the collective expression τὸ ἄγιον κοσ-
μικόν, ver. 1, has been analyzed into its single constituent
parts, vv. 2–5, and a recapitulatory reference has been made
to the total result of this given analysis by means of τοῦτων
οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων,— the opposition to μέν, ver. 1,
being formally introduced by δέ, and then receiving its more
precise material defining by means of the statement, ver. 8,
which is attached in a grammatical respect as a subsidiary
clause,—the discourse advances to the development of the
further general idea, which is placed in the forefront, ver. 1,
but has hitherto remained unnoticed, the twofold expression
Δικαίωματα λατρείας. — From the present εἰσίασιν, as
from προσφέρει, ver. 7 (comp. also ver. 8 f.), it follows that
the Mosaic cultus was still continuing at the time when the author wrote. The participle *perfect*, *κατεσκευασμένων*, however, denotes that which is extending out of the past into the present, and is still enduring in the present (see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 254). The present hereby indicated can, of course, only be that in which the author himself is living and writing. The endeavour to explain it of a present into which the author only mentally places himself, is as little warranted grammatically as is the asserting, with Hofmann, that the present in which the discourse here moves is “not a past, nor actual, nor something still continuing, but that set forth in the word of God, where it is to be read how the sanctuary erected by Moses was constituted, and what priests and high priests do in the same;” or with Mangold (in Bleek’s *Einleit. in das N. T.* p. 617), to find the Scripture picture of the tabernacle drawn in our passage as a “purely ideal magnitude, which by no means guarantees the actual continued existence of the temple worship.” For, in order to render possible suppositions of this kind, the conjoining of the *presents* with a participle *aorist* would have been indispensably necessary. From the form of discourse chosen: *τούτων οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων* (“in that these objects have been in such wise regulated”), in union with the present tenses *εἰσίασι* and *προσφέρει*, it therefore follows of necessity that the author, although here entering only upon the presentation of the typical significance of the two main divisions of the Mosaic sanctuary, nevertheless thinks of these two main divisions, together with all that appertains to them,—which he has just now enumerated,—as still preserved in being, thus also as still present in the Jewish temple of his day; by which supposition, it is true, he becomes involved in contradiction with the historic reality, inasmuch as alike the ark of the covenant as the vessel of manna and Aaron’s rod were wanting in the second temple. *Vid. supra ad ver. 4.* With very little reflection does Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 491, *Obs.*) object to this conclusion, that “with just the same right one might infer from the present in xiii. 11 that the author supposed the Israelites of his time to be still dwelling in a camp.” The passage xiii. 11 has nothing whatever in common with
ours, since it is here a question of the combination of a participle *perfect* with verbs in the present. That, too, which Delitzsch sets against it, that the τούτων σώτως κατεσκευασμένων, pointing back to κατεσκευάσθη, ver. 2, certainly shows that the author has the Mosaic period before his mind, utterly collapses, inasmuch as the participle *perfect*, and not the participle *aorist*, has been employed. Phrases, however, like those met with in Delitzsch: that the author was writing for just such readers as would not have given him credit for an ignorance like this, are peremptory decisions, for which the result is already fixed before the investigation, and consequently intimations of the grammatical conscience. — ἢ πρώτη σκηνή] as ver. 2, *the fore-tent or Holy Place.* — διὰ παντὸς] continually, i.e. day by day. Opposite ἀπαξ τοῦ ἑναυτοῦ, ver. 7. — οἱ ἱερεῖς] opposite μόνος ὁ ἄρχιερεύς, ver. 7. — τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες] performing the religious actions. Daily, morning and evening, an offering of incense was presented, and daily were the lamps of the sacred candlestick placed in readiness and kindled. Comp. Ex. xxx. 7 ff.

Ver. 7. Ἡ δευτέρα] sc. σκηνή, the Most Holy Place. — ἀπαξ τοῦ ἑναυτοῦ] once in the year, i.e. only on a single day of the year, namely, on the tenth of the seventh month (Tisri), on the great solemnity of atonement. The supposition that the high priest on this day more than once entered the Most Holy Place is not excluded by the expression, and the disputed question as to how many times this took place has no bearing on our passage. That the high priest was obliged to enter the Most Holy Place at least twice on this day, follows from Lev. xvi. 12–16. That he entered into it as many as four times is the teaching of the Talmud (tract. Joma, v. 1, vii. 4) and Rabbins. — μόνος ὁ ἄρχιερεύς] sc. εἰσείσαι. — προσφέρει] is not to be explained, as by Calov and others, of the sacrifices outside of the Most Holy Place. For in this case we should have to expect the aorist. It is employed of the blood of the victim before slain, which blood the high priest carries into the Most Holy Place, and here in the Most Holy Place presents to God (the Socinians, Grotius, Bleek). — ἕπερ ἑαυτόν καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἄγνομάτων] for himself and the transgressions of the people. To make ἑαυτόν likewise depend upon ἄγνομάτων Meyer. — Hed.
(for his own sins and those of the people: Vulgate, Luther (?), Calvin, Piscator, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Storr, Stuart, Paulus, and others), is, although the thought is not hereby altered (comp. vii. 27), grammatically false; because in that case the article τῶν could not have been wanting before ἐαυτῷ. — ἀγνοημάτων] see at v. 2, p. 198.

Ver. 8. Now follows (apparently as a subordinate thought) the main consideration, with a view to which the author has been led more fully to describe the ἄγιον κοσμικόν and the δικαιώματα λατρείας of ver. 1. — τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου] the Holy Ghost indicating this very thing (following). — τοῦτο] has the emphasis, and acquires its development of contents by means of μήπω πεφανερωθαί . . . στάσειν. — τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου] The arrangement of the sanctuary and priesthood prescribed by God to Moses is thought of by our author as carried into effect by Moses under the assistance and guidance of the Holy Ghost; the idea expressed in that arrangement might therefore very easily be represented as an indication designed by the Holy Ghost. — μήπω πεφανερωθαί τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὀδόν, ἕτερης πρώτης σκηνῆς ἑξούσιος στάσειν] that the way of the sanctuary is not yet manifested, so long as the fore-tabernacle still exists. — τῶν ἁγίων] is erroneously apprehended by the Peshito and Schulz (comp. also Zeger) as masculine. It is neuter. Does not, however, as ver. 2, denote the Holy Place, but, as vv. 12, 24, 25, x. 19, xiii. 11 (comp. also τοῦ ἁγίου, Lev. xvi. 16, 17, 20, al.), the Most Holy Place, and that not the earthly one (Kurtz), — for that would be a trifling statement; whereas surely τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου prepares the way for a deeper truth, vid. infra,— but the heavenly reality, the throne of the Godhead. — ἢ τῶν ἁγίων ὀδός signifies the way to the Most Holy Place. Comp. Matt. x. 5: εἰς ὀδὸν ἐθνῶν; Jer. ii. 18: τῇ ὀδῷ Αλαμπτοῦ, al.; Kühner, II. p. 176, Obs. 4; Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 176. — ἔχειν στάσειν further means: to have existence, to exist. We have not, however, with Böhme, to import into it a secondary reference to firmness or legal validity, and ἢ πρώτη σκηνή is not the one first in point of time, i.e. the earthly, Jewish sanctuary in opposition to the heavenly (Hunnius, Seh. Schmidt, Carpzov, Semler, Baumgarten, Bloomfield, al.), still less the
tabernacle in opposition to the later temple (Peirce, Sykes),
but the fore-tabernacle or Holy Place, in opposition to the in-
terior tabernacle or Most Holy Place. The thought is: by the
ordering that the Most Holy Place, the presence-chamber and
place of manifestation of God, might not be entered, save on
one single day of the year, and by the high priest alone, while
the daily Levitical service of the priests is accomplished in
the Holy Place, and thus approach to the former debarred and
shut off by the latter, the Holy Ghost proclaims that so long
as the Levitical priesthood, and consequently the Mosaic law
in general, continues, the immediate access to God is not yet
permitted; that thus, in order to the bringing about and render-
ing possible of a full and direct communion with God, the
Old Testament covenant-religion must first fall, and the more
perfect one brought in by Christ (ver. 11) must take its place.
Comp. Matt, xxvii 51, as also Josephus, Antiq. iii. 3. 7: τὴν
de τρίτην μοίραν [τῆς σκηνῆς] μόνω περιέγραψε τῷ θεῷ διὰ
tὸ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεπίβατον εἶναι ἀνθρώπων.

Vv. 9, 10 are closely, indeed, connected grammatically with
that which precedes, but, logically regarded, introduce the third
and last main point of the disquisition on the high-priestly
superiority of Christ over the Levitical high priests. For
after (1) it had been shown that Christ, as regards His person,
is exalted above the Levitical high priests (iv. 14—vii. 28),
and then afterwards (2) it was proved that likewise the
sanctuary in which He minsters surpasses in sublimity the
Levitical sanctuary (viii. 1—ix. 8), it is now further stated (3)
that the sacrifice also which He has offered is more excellent
than the Levitical sacrifices (ix. 9—x. 18).

Ver. 9. "Ἡτίς] is not synonymous with ἦ. It is employed
argumentatively, in that it presents the following declaration
as a fact, the truth of which is manifest. — We have not,
however, to take Ἡτίς with παραβολή as a designation of the
subject (Calvin, al.: which emblem was only for the present
time; Storr, al.: which emblem was to continue only to the
present; Zeger, Semler, de Wette, al.: which emblem has
reference to the present time). For the verb to be supple-
mented would not be the mere copula; it would have a
peculiar signification, and thus could not be omitted. Ἡτίς
alone is consequently the subject, and παραβολή the predicate. Yet ἦτες is not to be referred back to στάσιν (Chr. Fr. Schmid), for the expression στάσιν does not occupy a sufficiently independent position in the preceding context to justify this; still less—what is thought possible by Cramer—to τὴν τῶν ἀνίσων ὀδὼν, by which the idea would be rendered unmeaning. Nor have we to assume an attraction to παραβολή, in such wise that ἦτες should stand in the sense of ὅ,τι (so Bengel, who makes it point back to vv. 6–8; Maier, who makes it refer to vv. 7, 8; Michaelis, who makes it refer to μὴ πώς πεφανερώσθων κ.τ.λ., and others), or, what amounts to the same thing, to supplement to the phrase ἦτες παραβολή, comprehended together as a subject, παραβολή ἦτες as a predicate: which emblem (described vv. 6–8) is an emblem for the present time (so Nickel in Reuter's Repertor. 1858, März, p. 188 f.). For, in the course of vv. 9, 10, respect is had just to the closing words alone of ver. 8: ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐκχύσης στάσιν. The exclusively right construction, therefore, is the referring back of ἦτες to τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς, ver. 8.—παραβολή εἰς τὸν καιρόν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα] sc. ἦτες. παραβολή in the Gospels very frequently a fictitious historic likeness. Here a likeness by means of a fact, an emblem. Not incorrectly, therefore, is it explained, on the part of Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, by τῶν.— εἰς] in reference to, as regards. Instead of εἰς τὸν καιρόν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, consequently, the mere τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦ ἐνεστηκότος might have been written.—ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκός] the present time. The opposite thereto is formed by the καιρὸς διωρθώσως, ver. 10, by which the reader is referred to the Christian epoch of time, the αἰών μέλλων (vi. 5; comp. also ii. 5). ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκός is therefore synonymous with the αἰὼν οὗτος elsewhere, and indicates the pre-Christian period of time still extending onward into the present.1 The term καιρός, however, is chosen, instead of the more general χρόνος or αἰὼν, because

1 Quite mistaken (as is already apparent even from the opposition to καιρὸς διωρθώσως, ver. 10) is the opinion of Delitzsch, with whom Alford concurs, that ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκός denotes the present begun with the καιρὸς διωρθώσως, the present of the New Testament time, in which the parable has attained its close. See, on the contrary, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 494, Obs., and specially Reiche, Commentar. Crit. p. 74 sq. — That, for the rest, by ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκός
it is the thought of the author that this period of time has already reached its turning-point, at which it is to take its departure. — *καθ’ ἡμ*] conformably to which, or in accordance with which, applies not to *παραβολή* (Oecumenius, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Nickel, i.e., Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 495, *Obs.*; Alford, Woerner, al.), but to *τής πρώτης σκηνής*, as the last preceding main notion; stands thus parallel to ἢτις.

— *μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελείωσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα* is to be taken in close connection with δώρα τε καὶ θυσία προσφέρονται (against Böhme, who unwarrantably presses the force of the plural δώρα τε καὶ θυσία). — *κατὰ συνείδησιν* as regards the consciousness, or as to the conscience (Theophylact: κατὰ τῶν ἔσω ἀνθρωπον), i.e. so that the reality of being led to perfection is inwardly experienced, and the conscience in connection therewith feels itself satisfied. — *τὸν λατρεύοντα* him rendering the service (x. 2). Not specially the priest is meant (Estius, Gerhard; comp. also Drusius), but in general, the man doing homage to God by the offering of sacrifice, whether it be a priest who offers for himself, or another who presents this offering through the medium of the priest. [Matt. iv. 10; cf. ὁ προσερχόμενος, Heb. x. 1.]

Ver. 10. Μόνον ἐπὶ βρόμων καὶ πόμων καὶ διαφ. βαπτισμοῖς δικαίωματα σαρκός κ.τ.λ.] which, together with meats and drinks and divers washings, are only fleshly ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation. Apposition to δώρα τε καὶ θυσία, μὴ δυνάμεναι κ.τ.λ., ver. 9. — *μόνον* belongs to δικαίωματα σαρκός, but is placed in advance of this on account of the addition ἐπὶ βρώμασιν κ.τ.λ.; and ἐπὶ expresses the accession to something already present (Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 367[7]), or the existence externally side by side. Comp. e.g. Hom. *Od.* vii. 120: δρακήν ἐπὶ δρακήν γηράσκει, μῆλον δ’ ἐπὶ μῆλον; Thucyd. ii. 101: ἵπποςχόμενος ἀδελφήν ἕαυτον δώσειν καὶ χρήματα ἐπὶ αὐτῆς. — Otherwise is it explained by others, in that they take μόνον ἐπὶ in close combination, give to ἐπὶ only that present in which the author lived and wrote can be meant, needs not another word of explanation. When Kurtz and Hofmann deny this,— and the former will understand only an “imagined present,” into which the author “only transposed himself;” the latter, “that present in which the Holy Ghost prophesied by means of that which was written in the law,”—this is done only in the interest of their wrong interpretations of ver. 6.
the signification “in reference to,” and place both words still in relation to ver. 9. They then regard μόνον ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ. either as nearer definition to προσφέρονται (so, substantially, Vatablus, Schlichting, and others), or as opposition to κατὰ συνειδησιν τελειώσαι (so Schulz, Ebrard, al.). But against the first supposition the material ground is decisive, that the presentation of sacrifices in reality had reference by no means exclusively to the expiation of offences against the ordinances regulative of food and lustrations; against the second, the linguistic ground that ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ βρώμασιν μόνον κ.τ.λ. must have been written instead of μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασιν κ.τ.λ. Yet others take μόνον ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ. in close conjunction with τῶν λατρεύοντα, ver. 9. So perhaps already the Vulgate (perfectum facere servientem solummodo in cibis), then Luther (“him that does religious service only in meats and drink,” etc.), Estius, Corn. a Lapide, Olearius, Semler, Ernesti, Ewald, Hofmann, and others. But the additional words would too greatly drag, the thought resulting would be incommensurable with κατὰ συνειδησιν τελειώσαι, and the formula λατρεύειν ἐπὶ τυμ in the sense indicated without example.— The βρώματα καὶ πόματα are interpreted by Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Heinrichs, Maier, and others of the sacrificial meals; by Bleek and de Wette, of the partaking of the paschal supper in particular. But the mention of these practices would be, here at any rate, something too special, and the words xiii. 9 can furnish no standard for the interpretation of our passage. More correctly, therefore, is it thought in general of the meats and drinks permitted, as of those forbidden, in the Mosaic law. Comp. Col. ii. 16; Rom. xiv. 17. With regard to drinks, there are in the Mosaic law prohibitions only for special cases; comp. Num. vi. 3; Lev. x. 9, xi. 34. Comp. however, also Matt. xxiii. 24; Rom. xiv. 21. — καὶ διαφόρους βαπτισμοὺς] Comp. Ex. xxix. 4; Lev. xi. 25, 28, 32, 40, xiv. 6–9, xv. 5 ff., xvi. 4, 24 ff.; Num. viii. 7, xix. 17 ff., al. — δικαιώματα σαρκῆς] ordinances of the flesh, i.e. ordinances that relate to the flesh, and thus bear the impress of the earthly and transitory. — μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα] imposed (only) until the time of reformation. The καιρὸς διορθώσεως is the epoch of the promised New and more

Vv. 11, 12. Antithesis to vv. 9, 10. What the religion of the Mosaic covenant was unable to effect, that has been accomplished by Christ.— παραγενόμενος ἁρκετεὶς τῶν μελλόντων ἁγαθῶν] having appeared as High Priest of the good things to come. The verb in the same sense as Matt. iii. 1, 1 Macc. iv. 46; synonymous with ἀνίκασθαι, Heb. vii. 11, 15. Strangely misapprehending the meaning, Ebrard: παραγενόμενος is to be looked upon as an "adjectival attribute" to ἁρκετεἶς, and the thought is, "as a present High Priest,"— an acceptance which is incompatible with the participle of the aorist.— High Priest of the good things to come (comp. x. 1) is Christ called, inasmuch as these good things are the consequence and result of His high-priestly activity. They are the blessings of everlasting salvation, which the author, ver. 12, sums up in the expression αἰωνία λύτρωσις; and they are called future, inasmuch as they are proper to the αἰῶν μέλλων (vi. 5), or the οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα (ii. 5), and the full enjoyment of them will first come in at the consummation of the kingdom of God, to be looked for with the return of Christ.— διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειωτέρας σκηνῆς κ.τ.λ.] through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, which is not made with hands—that is to say, not of this world. The words belong to εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἄγα, ver. 12, and διὰ is used in the local sense: "through" (not instrumentally, as the διὰ, ver. 12). To join the words to that which precedes, and find in them an indication of that by means of which Christ became ἁρκετεῖς τῶν μελλόντων ἁγαθῶν (Primasius, Luther, Dorscheus, Schulz, Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 1, pp. 409, 412 f., 2 Aufl.,—which latter will accordingly also take the διὰ, ver. 12, in both cases along with ἁρκετεῖς τῶν μελλόντων ἁγαθῶν; otherwise, however, in the Comm. p. 337,—Moll, and others), is erroneous, because by virtue of ὅπε, ver. 12, the existence of an already preceding link in the nearer definition of εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἄγα is presupposed. — But to interpret the σκηνή through which Christ has entered into the Most Holy Place as the body of
Christ, or His *human nature* (so, on account of x. 20, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Clarinus, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Piscator, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Hammond, Owen, Bengel, Peirce, Sykes, Ernesti, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Friederich, *Symbolik des Mos. Stiftshütte*, Leipz. 1841, p. 296 ff., and others; also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 415, 2 Aufl., who, however, will have us think of the *glorified* human nature of Christ), or as the *holy life* of Christ (Ebrard), or as the (militant) *church upon earth* (Cajetan, Corn. a Lapide, Calov, Wittich, Braun, Wolf, Rambach, Michaelis, *ad Peirc.*, Cramer, Baumgarten), or, finally, as the *world in general* (Justinian, Carpzov), is inconsistent with the point of comparison suggested by the comparatives *melfonos* and *teleioteras* in accordance with the foregoing disquisition, in general is opposed to the connection with vv. 1—10, and has against it the antithesis in which τα ἄγια, ver. 12, stands to σκηνή, ver. 11, as also the addition οὗ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως. The lower spaces of the heavens are intended—corresponding to the πρώτη σκηνή of the earthly sanctuary (vv. 2, 6, 8)—as the preliminary stage of the heavenly Holy of Holies. Comp. iv. 14: διέληλυθοτα τούς οὐρανούς.— *melfonos* καὶ *teleioteras* sc. than the Mosaic σκηνή.— οὗ *χειροποιήτου*] Comp. v. 1: ἢν ἐπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἀνθρωπός, Acts vii. 48, xvii. 24; Mark xiv. 58; 2 Cor. v. 1.— οὗ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως] *not belonging to the earthly created world* (the earth) lying before one’s eyes (ταύτης). Wrongly Erasmus, Luther, Clarinus, Vatablus, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Wolf, Bengel, Kuinoel, Friederich, *l.c.* p. 296, and others: *not of this kind of building,* sc. the same as the earthly sanctuary; or: as earthly things in general.

Ver. 12. *Oüdè*] nor. *Oüdè* is written by the author, misled by the foregoing notes of negation: οὗ *χειροποιήτου* and οὗ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, whereas, properly, καὶ οὗ ought to have been written, since that which is introduced by *ōdè* is parallel, *not* to the negative expressions further characterizing the σκηνή, but to the preceding διά.— δι’ αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων] by (by means of) *blood of goats and calves,* by which the entrance of the earthly high priests into the Most Holy Place was made possible on the great day of atonement. Comp. Lev. xvi. 14, 15.— διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος] the Levi-
tical high priest entered the Most Holy Place not merely by means of the blood of animals, he entered at the same time with this blood (ver. 7). The author, however, has respect, with reference to the Levitical high priest also, only to the former notion, since only this, and not at the same time the latter, was suitable for application to Christ (Schlichting). If he had desired that the notion of the μετά should also be supplied in thought in our passage (Kurtz), he would have known how to express likewise this “somewhat gross material conception” (Bleek II.). — εὑρίσκεσθαι once for all. Corresponds to the following αἰώνιαν. — εἰς τὰ ἅγια] into the inner sanctuary of heaven. — αἰώνιαν λυτρώσων εὑράμενος] having obtained (by His sacrificial death) eternal redemption. Incorrectly do Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, and Moll take εὑράμενος as something coinciding in point of time with εἰσῆλθεν. If it had been so intended, the participle present would have been placed instead of εὑράμενος. — εὑρίσκεσθαι signifies: to find (for oneself), obtain. The λύτρωσις became Christ’s peculiar possession, thus—since He Himself, as the Sinless One, needed it not—to make it over to those who believe in Him. — This λύτρωσις is the ransoming, i.e. redemption from the guilt and punishment of sin, and it is called αἰώνια, eternal, or of indefeasible validity, in opposition to the sacrifices of the O. T. priests, which had to be renewed every year, since they were designed each for the [typical] expiation of the sins of a single year. — The feminine formation αἰώνια in the N. T. only here and 2 Thess. ii. 16.

Vv. 13, 14. Justification of αἰώνιαν λυτρώσων εὑράμενος, ver. 12, by an argument a minore ad majus. With the quantitative augmentation, however, expressed by εἰ...πόσον μᾶλλον, there is at the same time blended a qualitative augmentation by means of πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα and τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμ. κτλ., in such wise that the two following thoughts are enfolded the one in the other:—(1) If even the blood of animals works cleansing...how much more the blood of Christ? (2) If that effects the purity of the flesh, this effects purity of conscience. — καὶ σπόδος δαμάλεως] and ashes of an heifer. According to Num. xix., those who by contact with a dead body had become defiled, must be
sprinkled with a mixture of water and the ashes of a spotless red heifer wholly consumed by fire, of which the ashes were preserved in a clean place without the camp (with the so-called ἄσβεστος, Num. xix. 9, 13, 20, 21; LXX.: ὑδωρ ἄσβεστος), in order to become clean again.— ῥαντίζοισα τοὺς κεκοιμώμενον] sprinkling those who have been defiled. Free mode of expression for: with which (ashes) those who have been defiled are sprinkled.— τοὺς κεκοιμώμενους] belongs, since ῥαντίζοισα most requires an express addition of the object, to this verb (Erasmus, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, Woerner, al.), not to δύναμις (Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, Bengel, Schulz, al.), which latter stands absolutely: works sanctification.— τῶν τὴς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα] to the (producing of the) purity of the flesh. τρόπος, as v. 14. Indication of the result.

Ver. 14. Incomparably more efficacious must the sacrifice of Christ be. For—(1) Christ offered Himself, i.e. He gave up His own body to the death of a sacrifice, while the Levitical high priest derives his material of sacrifice from a domain foreign to himself personally; then: He offered Himself from a free resolve of will, while the Levitical high priest is placed under the necessity of sacrificing, by the command of an external ordinance, and the sacrificial victim whose blood he offers is an irrational animal, which consequently knows nothing of the end to which it is applied. The Levitical act of sacrifice is then an external one wrought in accordance with ordinance, a sensuous one; Christ's act of sacrifice, on the other hand, one arising out of the disposition of the heart, thus a moral one. From this it is already evident how it could be said (2) that Christ offered Himself διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου. The ethical belongs to the province of the spirit. Christ accordingly offered Himself by virtue of spirit, because His act of sacrifice was, in relation to God, an act of the highest spiritual obedience (Phil. ii. 8), in relation to the human brethren an act of the highest spiritual love (2 Cor. v. 14, 15). Αἱ δὲ πνεύματος αἰωνίου, however, by virtue of eternal spirit did Christ offer Himself, inasmuch as the notion

1 A. L. van der Boon Mesch, Specimen Hermeneuticum in locum ad Hebr. ix. 14, Lugd. Bat. 1819, 8vo.
of the eternal belongs inseparably and essentially to the notion of spirit, in opposition to σάρξ, which has the notion of the transitory as its essential presupposition. The adjective αἰωνιόν is added in natural correspondence with αἰωνιαν ἀναπτύσσω, ver. 12. For only by virtue of eternal spirit could a redemption which is to be eternal, or of ever-enduring validity, be accomplished. — The majority have interpreted διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνιόν of the Holy Spirit; then thinking either, as Clarius, Estius, Whitby, and others, of the third person in the divine trias, or as Bleek, de Wette, and others, of the Spirit of God which dwelt in Christ in all its fulness, and was the principle which animated Him at every moment. But this application is too special. For, in accordance with the force of the words and the connection of the thoughts, there can stand as a tacit antithesis to the expression: διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνιόν, only the general formula: διὰ σαρκός προσκαλέων, whereby the mode of accomplishing the Levitical acts of sacrifice would be characterized. Moreover, if the Holy Spirit had been intended, the choice of the adjective αἰωνιόν instead of ἀγιόν must have appeared strange, because indistinct and liable to being misunderstood; finally, the absence of the article also is best explained on the supposition that the formula is to be understood generically. Too special, likewise, is the explanation of the words adopted by Aretius, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Gomarus, Calov, Wolf, Peirce, M'Lean, Bisping, and many others, in part coinciding with the second form of the first main interpretation, according to which, by πνεῦμα αἰωνιόν, the divine nature of Christ, or "the principle of the eternal Sonship of God indwelling in Christ" (Kurtz), is designated. This view already finds its refutation in the fact that πνεῦμα has its opposite in σάρξ, and πνεῦμα and σάρξ are contrasted as spirit and body, not as divine and human. To be rejected farther is the procedure of Faustus Socinus, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Carpzov, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräbr. p. 525 ff.), Reuss,1 Kurtz, Woerner, and others, in

1 "L'auteur a voulu dire ici, par une tournure nouvelle, justement ce qu'il a déjà dit deux fois en d'autres termes (vii. 16, 25). La nature de Christ lui assure une vie éternelle, non sujette à la mort et par cela même seule capable de nous assurer un bienfait durable et éternel aussi."
making the \( \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\ a\i\omicron\nu\iota\nu \), as regards the thing intended, equivalent to the \( \delta\omega\nu\alpha\mu\iota\zeta\omega\heta\ \delta\alpha\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\tau\omicron\omicron\ ), vii. 16, whereby the essentially **ethical** import of the expression in our passage is lost sight of; entirely false and arbitrary, however, is the interpretation of Döderlein, Storr, and Stuart, who refer \( \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\ a\i\omicron\nu\iota\nu \) to Christ's state of glorification after His exaltation; of Nösselt (Opusc. ad interpret. sacr. scripturr. fascic. I. ed. 2, p. 334),—as also van der Boon Mesch, l.c. p. 100,—who espouse the opinion: “\( \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\ esse \) victi\( m\alpha\), quam Christus se immolando Deo obtulit, c\( a\i\omicron\nu\iota\nu \) d\( i\)c\( i\)p\( t\)e\( r\)a, qui\( s\) isti\( u\)s victii\( m\)ae vis ad homii\( n\)es salvandos perpetua atque perenni\( s\) futura sit;” of Michaelis, ad Peirc., who finds the sense, that Christ presented Himself not according to the **letter** of the Mosaic law, but yet certainly according to its **spirit**; and of Planck (Commentatt. a Roscm. etc., cdd. I. 1, p. 189), who even maintains that the spirit of prophecy in the prophets of the Old Covenant is thought of. Strangely also Oecumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, and others (comp. already Chrysostom): \( \delta\iota\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\varsigma\ a\i\omicron\nu\iota\nu \) stands in opposition to the \( \phi\i\ i\), by which the Levitical sacrifices were offered to God. Similarly Hofmann (Schriftboe. II. 1, p. 420, 2 Aufl.), who is followed by Delitzsch and Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 527, Obs.): “the spirit by which Christ offered Himself is called an eternal spirit, in opposition to the fleeting spirit of the animals which the O. T. high priest presented.” Of a “spirit” of the animals the author (cf. iv. 12) can hardly have thought, inasmuch as, though in the O. T. a \( \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\ ) is often ascribed to animals, this is understood only in the lower sense of the \( \psi\nu\chi\eta\ ). Needlessly, in the last place, does Reiske conjecture \( \alpha\gamma\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\varsigma\ ) instead of \( \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\varsigma\ . \) — \( \delta\iota\ ) denotes not the mere \textit{impulse} or \textit{impelling motive} (Vatablus, Ribera, Estius, \textit{al.}), nor yet the \textit{condition} or \textit{sphere} (Stengel, Tholuck, \textit{al.}), but the higher \textit{power}, by virtue of which the offering was accomplished and made effective. — \( \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\iota\eta\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon\nu\ ) is understood by Bleek, with whom Kurtz concurs, after the precedent of Faustus Socinus, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, and others, in the sense that Christ offered to God, in the heavenly Holy of Holies, His blood which was shed upon earth; which, however, is violent on account of \( \delta\iota\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\varsigma\ a\i\omicron\nu\iota\nu \), since these
words appertain to the whole relative clause, and are not to be referred, with Bleek, as a nearer definition merely to ἁμομοῦν. The undergoing upon earth of the death of the cross is that which is meant. — ἁμομοῦν] as a spotless sacrifice, yielding full satisfaction to God. The Levitical victim must be ἁμομοῦς (ἁμομοῦς), physically free from blemish. Here ἁμομοῦς is used of the higher, ethical spotlessness, and has reference to the sinlessness of character manifested by Christ during His earthly life. Erroneously Bleek: the expression has respect to "the condition of Christ after death and the resurrection, in which, raised above even the infirmities to which as very man He was subject upon earth, He could in particular no more fall a victim to death." — τῷ θεῷ] is to be taken along with the whole relative clause, not merely with ἁμομοῦν. — ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἐργῶν] forth from dead (legal) works, so that we free ourselves from them as from something that is unfruitful and useless, rise above them. The notion of the νεκρά ἐργα here the same as at vi. 1.

Vv. 15—28. In order, however, that Christ might become the mediator of the New Covenant, it was matter of necessity that He should suffer death. This follows from the very notion of a διαθήκῃ, since the same is only ratified after the death of the διαθέμενος has been proved; as accordingly the first or O. T. διαθήκῃ was not inaugurated without blood. For the inauguration of the earthly sanctuary the blood of slain animals sufficed; for the consecration of the heavenly sanctuary, on the other hand, there was need of a more excellent sacrifice. This Christ has presented once for all in the end of the world, by His sin-cancelling sacrificial death.

Ver. 15. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καὶ ἡ μετήπερ ἐστίν] and just for this cause is He the Mediator of a New Covenant. By means of καὶ, ver. 15 attaches itself closely to the preceding context, and διὰ τοῦτο points back to the main thought contained in vv. 9—14; just for this reason, that the sacrifice of Christ accomplishes that which the Levitical sacrifices are unable to accomplish; namely, that, presented by virtue of eternal spirit, brings in an eternal redemption, these, on the other hand, as ordinances of the flesh, are able to effect only purity of the flesh. Not specially to τῷ αἵμα,
ver. 14 (Sykes, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Maier), does \textit{dià tòutò} glance back. For in this case \textit{di' aðro}, or rather \textit{dià tòu aíμatos}, would more naturally have been written. Nor is \textit{dià tòutò} to be taken together with \textit{óptos}, as a mere preparation thereto (so Schlichting, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, Stengel, Ebrard, and many). For thereby ver. 15 would be torn from its connection with that which precedes.— Upon \textit{kaiνῆς} there does not rest an emphasis, as is supposed by Bleek and Delitzsch. For otherwise the adjectives must have been prefixed to the substantive. On the contrary, what is to be specially emphasized is \textit{διαθήκης}. For just the inner nexus of the N. T. \textit{διαθήκης}, with the redemptive death of Christ as its mediating cause, is to be brought out; whereas the adjective \textit{kaiνῆς} could be presupposed as familiar from the disquisition viii. 8 ff., in that there the perfect covenant promised by God was sufficiently characterized as a \textit{new} one. — \textit{óptos} in order that. False the interpretation of Heinrichs: "unde sequitur." The final clause \textit{διαθήκης} \textit{k.τ.λ.} is not designed to develop more nearly the \textit{dià tòutò}; it depends upon \textit{διαθήκης} \textit{kaiνῆς} \textit{μεσός έστιν}, and indicates the \textit{goal} to which, in accordance with the decree of God, the \textit{διαθήκη} \textit{kaiνῆ} should lead, and at the same time the way and means by which the attainment of this goal should be accomplished. — \textit{θανάτου γενομένου} a \textit{death} having ensued. The death of Christ is that which is meant. The author, however, expresses himself \textit{generically}, because he has already in mind that which is to be observed, vv. 16, 17.— \textit{Eis ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων} for redemption from the transgressions (or sins) committed under the first covenant (or at the time of the first covenant). Note of design to \textit{θανάτου γενομένου}, not to \textit{λάβωσιν}. — \textit{τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν} the promise, \textit{i.e.} the promised blessing itself. With \textit{τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν} we have to combine \textit{τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας}, as a declaration wherein the promised blessing consists (genitive of \textit{apposition}). By the separation of the two closely connected words, \textit{τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν} is brought out more emphatically, and the discourse gains in point of rhythm. Less suitably, although free from objection on linguistic grounds, did the Peshito, Faber Stapulensis, Braun, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Stein,
Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 594), Moll, Ewald, and others take τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας with οἱ κεκλημένοι: those who are called to the eternal inheritance.—οἱ κεκλημένοι] Comp. κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, iii. 1. The expression is here used absolutely, and is not to be referred exclusively to the Christians. For, according to ver. 26 and xi. 39, 40, the power of the redemptive death of Christ extends retroactively likewise to the generations of the past. And just for this reason the participle perfect is written, and not the participle aorist. For not to the historic act of the temporal vocation, but to the being called, as a fact in the decree of God already completed and extending into the present, is attention to be drawn.

Vv. 16, 17. Demonstration of the necessity of the θάνατον γενέσθαι by means of a truth of universal application. That Christ might be able to become the Mediator of a new διαθήκη, His death was required. For, to the validity of a διαθήκη, it is essential that the death of the διαθέμενος be first proved. Since immediately before (ver. 15) and immediately after (ver. 18 ff.) διαθήκη was employed in the sense of “covenant,” elsewhere usual in our epistle, we might naturally, on account of the conjunction of vv. 16, 17, by means of γὰρ, with ver. 15, and on account of δὲν, by which again ver. 18 is joined to vv. 15, 16, expect this signification of the word to be found also in vv. 16, 17. This has accordingly been insisted upon, here too, by Codurcus ( Crit. sacr. t. VII. P. ii. p. 1067 sqq.), Seb. Schmidt, Peirce, Whitby [in com.], Macknight, Michaelis, Sykes, Cramer, Paulus, and others, lastly also by Ebrard. But it is altogether inadmissible. For if we take διαθήκη as covenant, ὁ διαθέμενος could only designate him who makes or institutes the covenant; to take ὁ διαθέμενος as the mediator of the covenant, as is generally done in connection with that view, and to understand this again of the sacrificial victims, by the offering of which the covenant was sealed, is pure caprice. The thought, however, that for the validity of a covenant-act the death of the author of the covenant must first ensue, would be a perfectly irrational one. Irrational the more, inasmuch as, vv. 16, 17, only an entirely general
truth is contained, passing for a norm in ordinary life. Ebrard finds expressed the thought: "Where a sinful man wishes to enter into a covenant with the holy God, the man must first die, must first atone for his guilt by death (or he must present a substitutionary λόγος)." But all these definitions have been arbitrarily imported. For vv. 16, 17 nothing is said either about a "sinful man," or about a volition on his part, or about the "holy God," or about an "atonning for guilt," or about a "substitutionary λόγος." From what has been said, it follows that διαθήκη, vv. 16, 17, can be taken only in the sense, likewise very frequently occurring with the Greek authors, of "testament" or "disposition by will." It is true there arises therefrom a logical inaccuracy, owing to the fact that διαθήκη is used in these two verses in another sense than before, and the formal demonstrative force of that which is advanced by the author—although the underlying thoughts are in themselves perfectly just—is thereby sacrificed. It is, however, to be observed that while for us, since we are obliged to employ a twofold expression for the reproducing of the diversity of sense, the transition from the one notion to the other appears abruptly made, this transition for the author, on the other hand, might be an imperceptible one, inasmuch as in the Greek one and the same word included within itself both significations. Thus, accordingly, it has happened that the ancient Greek interpreters explain διαθήκη, vv. 16, 17, expressly in the sense of a testament or will, then at once pass over to the declaration contained in ver. 18,

1 For the author does not reason, as de Wette supposes, from the mere "analogy of a will or testament."—The course, moreover, pursued by Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 428 ff.), in order to manifest the non-existence of a logical inaccuracy, in that, namely, in the whole section, ver. 15 ff., he will have συνθήκη signify neither "covenant" nor "testament," but throughout the whole only "disposal" (Verfügung), is, as also Delitzsch and Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 598, Obs.) acknowledge, an utter breakdown. See likewise the observations of Nickel in Reuter's Repertor. 1858, März, p. 194 f.—Nor will it do, with Kurtz, to set aside the logical inaccuracy, at which he takes so great offence that he thinks himself obliged to designate such inaccuracy, in case it were present, an "inexcusable confusion" (!), in taking not only at vv. 16, 17, but also in like manner at vv. 15, 18, the συνθήκη in the special sense of "establishing as heir." For the connection with that which precedes (comp. vii. 22, viii. 6 ff., ix. 1, 4) leads at vv. 15, 18 exclusively to the idea of a covenant.
without so much as noticing the logical inaccuracy which presents itself. The sense consequently is: where a testament or deed of bequest exists, there it is necessary, in order to give it validity (comp. ἵνα τοιαῦτα, ver. 17), that the death of the testator first be proved. The New Covenant, therefore, which Christ has established between God and man by His sacrificial death, the author here represents—in accordance with the figure of the κληρονομία, ver. 15—as a testamentary disposition on the part of Christ, which, however, as such could only acquire validity, and put the heirs in possession of the blessings bequeathed to them, by means of the death of Christ. — 

τὸ νεκρὸν emphatically preposed, while τὸ διαθεμένον, upon which no emphasis falls, comes in at the end of the clause. — 

φέρεσθαι be declared or proved. Wrongly Grotius: the verb to be regarded as equivalent to exspectari ("est enim exspectatio onus quoddam"); Wittich: it denotes the being endured on the part of the relatives; Carpzov, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Schulz, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Stengel, Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 428), and others, that it denotes nothing more than ensue or γίνεσθαι, ver. 15.

Ver. 17. Confirmatory elucidation of ver. 16. The words of the verse are connected together as parts of a single statement. We have no right to break up the same, in such wise that διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκρῶν βεβαιά is made a parenthesis, and ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ. joined to ver. 16 (Hofmann). — ἐπὶ νεκρῶν] in the case of dead persons, i.e. only upon condition that the author of the διαθήκη is dead, or has died. — βεβαιά] firm or inviolable (comp. ii. 2), inasmuch, namely, as, after the death of the testator has supervened, the abrogation or alteration of the testament on his part is no longer possible. — 

μὴ ποτὲ never. The making of μὴ ποτὲ equivalent to μὴ πω or nonduum (Vulgate, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Luther, Schlichting, Böhme) is linguistically inadmissible. Oecumenius, Theophylact, Lud. de Dieu, Heinsius, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Lachmann, Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 429), Delitzsch, and Ewald regard the word as an interrogative particle, which does not alter the sense, and might appear the preferable course, since, on the supposition of an assertory statement, the objective 

Meyer.—Her.
been expected in place of the subjective μὴ γίνεται. Nevertheless, elsewhere too, with later authors, the placing of the subjective negation is not at all rare after ἐρεῖ, when it introduces an objectively valid reason. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 447; Buttmann, Gramm. des neuest. Sprachgebr. p. 304. — ἰσχύει] sc. διαθήκη, not ὁ διαθέμενος (Peirce).

Vv. 18–22. The first διαθήκη also was not inaugurated without blood, and without the shedding of blood there is no remission under the Mosaic law.

Ver. 18. "Οὖν] wherefore, sc. because, according to vv. 16, 17, a διαθήκη becomes valid only through the intervention of death. To enclose vv. 16, 17 within a parenthesis, and refer back δόθη to ver. 15 (Zachariae, Morus, Storr, Heinrichs, Conybeare, Bisping), is arbitrary. — οὐδέ] the augmenting: not even. — ἡ πρώτη] the first, or Old Testament, sc. διαθήκη.Erroneously do Wetstein and Koppe (in Heinrichs) supplement αἰτήτωρ]. — ἐγκεκαίμαται] was inaugurated, i.e. introduced in a valid manner. The verb occurs in the N. T. only here and x. 20.

Vv. 19, 20. Historic proof for the assertion, ver. 18, with a free reference to Ex. xxiv. 3–8. — κατὰ τὸν νόμον] is taken by Schlichting, Calov, Jac. Cappellus, Seb. Schmidt, Bengel, Storr, Böhme, Bleek, Bisping, al., along with πάσης ἐντολῆς: "every precept according to the law, i.e. as it was contained in the law." So already the Vulgate: lecto enim omni mandato legis. But against this construction the absence of the connecting article and the strangeness of the preposition κατὰ. Rightly, therefore, have Occumenius, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Vatablus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Wittich, Braun, Schulz, Kuinoel, Klee, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Hofmann, and others referred κατὰ τὸν νόμον to λαληθείσης. Only we must not explain, as is ordinarily done, "in accordance with the commandment received of God," but the sense is: after, in accordance with the law received of God, every precept had been proclaimed by Mōses to the whole people. The standard for the proclamation of the ἐντολαί was the νόμος, since it contained these ἐντολαί — παντὶ τῷ λαῷ] Ex. xxiv. 3 stands only διηγήσατο τῷ λαῷ. But παντὶ resulted from the ἀπεκρίθη δὲ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς there
immediately following. — καὶ τῶν τράγων] and of the goats.
Of goats slain in sacrifice the underlying narrative of Exodus says nothing. Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Bengel, Böhme, and others therefore suppose that the author had in view the burnt-offerings mentioned before the thank-offerings of oxen, Ex. xxiv. 5; inasmuch as, according to Lev. i. 10 ff., iv. 23 ff., ix. 2, 3, Num. vi. 10, 11, vii. 27, rams and he-goats, as well as other smaller animals, might be selected for burnt-offerings. Nevertheless, it is also possible that, as conjectured by Bleek, de Wette, and Bisping, there was present to the mind of the author that sacrifice of bullocks and goats already referred to, vv. 12, 13, which the high priest was to offer on the great day of atonement.— μετὰ ὀδατός καὶ ἐρυθαίς κοκκίνου καὶ υσώπου] along with water and crimson wool and hyssop. With regard to this also, nothing is stated in the corresponding passage of Exodus. But all three things are elsewhere mentioned in connection with legally enjoined aspersions for purification. Comp. Num. xix. 6, 17 f.; Lev. xiv. 2 ff., 49 ff. In accordance therewith, a mixture of fresh spring water in some cases with the ashes of the red heifer, in others with the blood of a slain bird, was prescribed in the case of aspersions which were appointed for the cleansing of one defiled by contact with a corpse or by leprosy. In like manner, according to the passages above referred to, hyssop (ὤμα, comp. on this plant, Winer, Bibl. Realwörterb. Bd. II. 2 Aufl. p. 819 f.) and crimson wool. With the latter the hyssop stem was probably bound round, and this served as a brush for sprinkling the blood. Comp. this use of hyssop in Ex. xii. 22.— αὐτὸ τὸ βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τῶν λαβὼν ἐράντισσαν] he sprinkled as well the book itself as also the whole people. τὸ βιβλίον is the βιβλίον τῆς διαθήκης, Ex. xxiv. 7. Of a sprinkling likewise of this book of the covenant, nothing, however, is told us in Exodus. It has therefore been proposed, by way of removing the difference, to make τὸ βιβλίον still dependent upon the preceding λαβὼν. So, after the precedent of the Coptic and Armenian versions, Grotius, Wittich, Surenhus, Cramer, Bengel, Michaelis, Storr, Morus, Ewald, and others. But the καὶ following βιβλίον renders this impossible. For the setting aside of this καὶ by
pronouncing it spurious (Colomesius, Valckenaer), or by the assumption of a pleonasm (so ordinarily), is an act of violence; while we are prevented from placing it, with Bengel and Ewald, in correspondence with the καὶ, ver. 21, as "et ... et vero," or "non modo ... vero etiam,"—apart from the clumsiness of construction thus arising, and leaving out of consideration the inconvenient δὲ,—by the twice occurring of the verb ἐράντισεν, vv. 19 and 21.—πάντα τῶν λαῶν] LXX. ver. 8: Δαβίδων δὲ Μωυσῆς τὸ αἷμα κατεσκέδασε τοῦ λαοῦ. Schlichting: Omnem autem populum conspersissedicitur, quia qui ex proxime astantibus conspersi fuerant, universi populi personam hac in parte gessere, ita ut totus populus conspersus fuisset censoretur.—ἐράντισεν] sc. for consecration and purification.

Ver. 20. Ex. xxiv. 8, LXX. : καὶ εἶπεν ἵδιον τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἢς διέθετο κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων τῶν λόγων τούτων.—ἡς ἐνετελατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός] Bengel: "praecipit mihi, ut perferrem ad vos."

Ver. 21 adds to that mentioned vv. 19, 20, not a simultaneous fact, but only something occurring later. For when the law was proclaimed by Moses, and the people promised to observe the same, the tabernacle had not yet an existence. Ex. xl, where we have the account of the erection and inauguration of the tabernacle, only an anointing of the tabernacle and its vessels with oil is enjoined, not a sprinkling thereof with blood. Comp. ibid. ver. 9. Similarly in Leviticus, a sprinkling indeed with blood (viii. 15, 19, 24) is supposed in regard to the altar; in regard to the tabernacle and its furniture, on the other hand, only an anointing (viii. 10 ff.). It is possible, however, that Jewish tradition preserved more precise details. At least mention is made by Josephus also (Antiq. iii. 8. 6) of an aspersion of the tabernacle and its furniture, on the part of Moses, with blood.—Erroneously, for the rest (on account of the aorist), do Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Cramer, and others find mentioned, ver. 21, in place of the one act of Moses, a sprinkling enjoined by the law of Moses, and occurring at different fixed periods, in connection with which the majority will have the sprinkling which is made on the great Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 14 ff., to be meant.—
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καὶ . . . δὲ] but also. Luke ii. 35; John viii. 16, al.—τὰ σκεῦη τῆς λειτουργίας] the vessels designed for sacred use.

Ver. 22. Confirmation of the special historic facts adduced vv. 19–21, by the general rule, which throughout the whole domain of Mosaic law was recognised as, with hardly any exception, of binding obligation. — σχεδόν] almost, nearly (Acts xiii. 44, xix. 26), does not belong to ἐν αἰματί (Bengel, Böhme). Still less is it to be joined to καθαρίζεται, as is done by Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact, and Primasius, who, in opposition to the cohesion with that which precedes and follows, will find the thought expressed that the purification accomplished in accordance with the law is only a partial, bodily one, and thus only imperfect, since it is not able to cancel sin. It belongs logically to τὰντα. The author, however, does not write καὶ ἐν αἷματι σχεδόν τὰντα καθαρίζεται, but, on the contrary, prefixes σχεδόν to the whole clause, in order to imply that the limitation contained in this expression extends to both members of the clause. The sense is consequently: and one must almost say that all things are according to the law purified with blood, and that without the shedding of blood no remission takes place. So, rightly, Bleek, Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 514 f.; Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 500; Alford, Maier, Hofmann, and Woerner. As concerns the thought, Grotius in his day aptly refers us to the saying of the Talmud (tract. Joma, fol. 5. 1; Menachoth, fol. 93. 2): δυνάμεν ἐν 

Wrongly Peirce and Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 563): all the furniture and utensils of the sanctuary. — κατὰ τὸν νόμον] in conformity with the law, i.e. so soon as the norm fixed by the Mosaic law is taken into account. The addition κατὰ τὸν νόμον is likewise to be supplied in thought to the second member of the clause. — αἰματεχυσία] a word not elsewhere met with in Greek literature. What is meant is
not specially the pouring out of the blood upon the altar (De Wette, Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 435, al.), but in general, the blood-shedding by the slaying of sacrificial animals (Bleek, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz, Hofmann, Comm. p. 363). — δικαιοσύνη remission, sc. of the guilt incurred.

Vv. 23–28. If the earthly sanctuary needed to be cleansed and consecrated by such things as these, there was required of necessity for the dedication of the heavenly sanctuary a more excellent sacrifice. This Christ has presented in the end of the world by means of His sin-cancelling sacrificial death; and at His return, which is now to be expected for the salvation of those that hope in Him, no repetition of His sacrifice will be required.

Ver. 23. The first of the two statements dependent on ἀνάγκη οὖν (τὰ μὲν ... καθαριζομένων) is deduced as a necessary consequence from vv. 18–22, while then the second statement (αὐτὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.) is derived as a necessary postulate from the first, and in such manner a return is effected to the necessity for the death of Christ, already shown at vv. 16, 17, in order to set forth the same on a fresh side. The necessity of the first-mentioned fact of ver. 23 is evident from the norm instanced, which is of validity in the domain of the Mosaic law; the necessity of that last mentioned, from the difference between the Christian and the Judaic. The main thought, however, lies in the second half of the clause, to which the first forms logically only the bridge. — οὖν] sc. because blood is so necessary a means for expiation and consecration. — ἀνάγκη οὖν] it is then needful. To ἀνάγκη οὖν we have to supplement ἐστίν, not, with Faber Stapulensis, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, Kurtz, and others, ἤν. For although the author has only one special fact in mind in connection with both members of the sentence, yet, as is shown by the plural θυσίαις, he expresses himself universally; because he is reasoning from the inner necessity, as this is presupposed by the state of the matter itself. — τὰ μὲν ὑπο- δείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τοῦτοις καθαριζομένων, αὐτὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] that the copy, indeed, of that which is in heaven should be purified with these, but the heavenly place itself with better sacrifices than these, i.e. for the characteristically Judaic the
means of expiation and consecration are necessarily determined in accordance with the norm specified in the Mosaic law; but since Judaic and Christian are distinguished from each other as the mere copy of the heavenly place and the heavenly place itself, so of necessity must the means of expiation and consecration in the Christian domain be a more excellent one than in the Judaic. — By τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς and τὰ ἐπουράνια we have to understand neither the heavenly possessions (Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Rambach, and others), nor the Christian Church and its members (Zeger, Estius, Corn. a Lapide, Calov, Böhme, Stengel, al.; comp. also Tholuck). Still less can these expressions denote: "that which, where God is essentially present, brings with it His relation to the Church, i.e. first, His dwelling with it,—namely, in that the glorified human nature of Christ is the dwelling for the whole fulness of the divine nature; secondly, the human nature, in its consecration to God, in which Christ presents and offers it up to the Father; and thirdly, the place where God's wrath against human sin meets with expiatory satisfaction, by which it is averted,—thus Christ, who, as the propitiation for our sins, stands between the Church and its God" (Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 436 ff. [comp. also Owen]). Rather is the heavenly sanctuary specially meant thereby, as is evident from ver. 24. For in ver. 24 the meaning of ἁγία is supposed to be already known from ver. 23; inasmuch, namely, as ἁγία is there almost accentless, while all the emphasis is laid upon the adjectives χειροποιητά, etc. In accordance with this, too, is determined the meaning of τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς as the earthly sanctuary, inasmuch as it was the imperfect imitation or copy of the former, as accordingly already, at viii. 5, the Levitical sanctuary had been characterized as ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιὰ τῶν ἐπουρανίων. The plural τὰ ὑπο- δείγματα is placed, just because the author has already before his mind, in ver. 23, the plural τὰ ἁγία, ver. 24. Thus, then, the first clause of ver. 23 has respect to the special fact already brought forward at ver. 21, whereas the second clause receives its elucidation by means of the special fact of which mention is made at ver. 24. — τούτων] by such things as these, i.e. by blood of slain animals, and similar means of purifying,
which belong to the earthly sanctuary; to which general rubric, also, the ashes of the red heifer mentioned at ver. 13, but not here coming under consideration, belong. With marvellous inversion of the sense, Paulus: "to be declared pure for these, i.e. the Israelites." — καθαρίζεσθαι is passive. Arbitrarily is it taken as a middle by Heinrichs, who will have ἡμᾶς supplemented as object. Against this the tenor of the foregoing verse is in itself decisive. The notion of being purifed is not, it is true, applicable to the second clause, αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια κτ.λ. For the heavenly sanctuary is removed from contact with the sinful world; it has no need, therefore, of an expiation or purification.¹ We are warranted, however, in supplying in thought, without any hesitation, from καθαρίζεσθαι, a kindred verb to the second member of the sentence, by the assuming of a zeugma. But since now, in accordance with that which precedes, the καθαρίζεσθαι is an idea which entirely subordinates itself to the idea of the ἐγκαυίζεναι, ver. 18, the former having only the design of the latter, we shall best extract from the notion of being purifed, in the first clause, the notion of being consecrated to the service of God,

¹ Otherwise, indeed, do Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 542 ff.), Alford, Moll, and Kurtz decide. According to Delitzsch, the meaning of the author is: "The supra-terrestrial Holy of Holies, i.e. the uncreated eternal heaven of God, although unsullied light in itself, had need of a χυλίζεται, in so far as the light of love towards mankind had there been, so to speak, out-glowed and eclipsed by the fire of wrath at that which was sinful; and the heavenly tabernacle, i.e. the place of His glorious self-manifestation in love, a self-manifestation for men and angels, had need of a χυλίζεται, in so far as men had rendered this spot, from the beginning designed for them, too, inaccessible on account of sin, and thus had first to be transformed into the accessible place of manifestation of a God graciously disposed towards men. As well with regard to τὰ ἄγας as with regard to τὴν οἰκουμένην, thus to τὰ ἐπουράνια altogether, there was need of a taking away of the action of human sin upon it, and a taking away of the divine reaction against sin, the wrath, or, what is the same thing, a changing of the same into love." [Similarly also Whitby, M'Lean, and Stuart.] — Not less far-fetched and forced upon the context is that which Bleck, following the precedent of Akersloot, regards as probable. According to this view, to which Woerner assents, an objective καθαρίζεται of the heavenly sanctuary, after the analogy of the passages Luke x. 18, John xii. 31, Acts xii. 7-9, was thought of, "in accordance with which Satan with his angels is, after the death and exaltation of the Saviour, cast forth out of heaven, and thus deprived of all influence which he might exert there as accuser of men in the presence of God, or for the destruction of the blessedness of the inhabitants of heaven."
for the second clause, understanding this consecration of the heavenly sanctuary of the opening up of the access to the same, effected through the blood of Christ (comp. x. 19, 20).

— κρείττοσιν θυσίαις] The plural is chosen, although the author is thinking exclusively of the death of Christ, on account of the universal form of discourse, ver. 23, as a plural of the category (de Wette). False the interpretation of Grotius and Stengel: in addition to the sacrificial death of Christ, the sufferings of believers, together with their prayers and works of love (xiii. 15, 16), are thought of; and in like manner Paulus: the sacrifices of Jesus and all Christians for the good which pertains to duty; but false, also, the explanation of Beza: the fact is hinted at that the one sacrifice of Christ is instead of many. — On παρά with the comparative, see at i. 4.

Ver. 24. Confirmatory justification of ἀυτά τὰ ἑπονυμάνα, ver. 23, by the proof that in reality the heavenly sanctuary is that consecrated by the sacrifice of Christ. Wrongly is it assumed by Delitzsch, that at ver. 24 the indispensable requirement of better sacrifices for the heavenly world is proved from the actual nature of the one rendered and presented to God. For the argument passes over to the character of Christ's sacrifice, as offered once for all, only at ver. 25. — οὗ γὰρ εἰς χειροποιήτα ἄγνω εἰσήλθεν Χριστός] for Christ entered not into a holy place (i.e. most holy place, see at ver. 8) made with hands (ver. 11). — χειροποίητα as the main idea emphatically proposed. — ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν] a copy of the true (viii. 2), real one. ἀντίτυπα denotes neither the copy of a copy, as is supposed by Bleek, after the precedent of Michaelis, ad Peirc., Cramer, Chr. Fr. Schmid, upon the presupposition that the author already thought of the τύπος, viii. 5, as a mere copy of the original; nor is it to be taken as equivalent to the simple τύπος, as is done by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Grotius, Wolf, Carpzov, and others. What is meant is the corresponding image, i.e. the copy or imitation, formed after the proportions of the τύπος or pattern, which God had shown to Moses (comp. viii. 5). The expression, therefore, is of essentially the same import as ἵπτερωμα, viii. 5, ix. 23. — ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανὸν] but into heaven itself, into the heavenly Holy of Holies, where the throne of
God itself exists, in opposition to the earthly Most Holy Place, not to the heavenly fore-tabernacle, ver. 11. — νῦν ἐμφανίσθημι ἐπὶ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν] now to appear before the face of God on our behalf (as our advocate, and intent upon our salvation, comp. vii. 25). — νῦν] now, after He has obtained His abiding dwelling-place in heaven.— Before the face of God. In this respect, too, a pointing to the exaltedness of Christ, the heavenly high priest. For, according to Ex. xxxiii. 20, no man could continue to live who had seen the face of God; on which account also the earthly high priest might not even enter the earthly Holy of Holies until this had first been filled with the smoke of the altar of incense, and in this way the typical presence of God there existing had been veiled from his glance. Comp. Lev. xvi. 12, 13.

Vv. 25-28. Renewed (comp. vii. 27, 28, ix. 12). emphasizing of the manifestation once for all (and thus the full sufficiency) of the sacrifice of Christ.

Ver. 25. Οὐδὲν ἐν ζωή, sc. εἰσήλθεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. — προσφέρειν ἐαυτὸν] denotes not the presentation of Himself with His blood before God in the heavenly Holy of Holies (Böhme, Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, and others; comp. also Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 474), but the offering of Himself as a sacrifice upon earth. The sense is: Christ entered into the heavenly Holy of Holies, not that He might presently leave it again, in order afresh to offer Himself as a sacrifice upon earth.— ὁ ἄρχιερεὺς] the Levitical high priest. — τὰ ἁγία] the earthly Holy of Holies. — ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἁλλοτρίῳ] with blood not his own. — ἁλλοτρίῳ] opposition to ἐαυτόν.

Ver. 26. Proof of the necessity that Christ's sacrifice should take place only once for all, from the non-reasonableness of the opposite. For if the sacrifice of Christ sufficed not once for all for the cancelling of sin, He must oftentimes in succession—because no generation of mankind, so long as the world has endured, has been free from sin—have undergone death since the beginning of the world. But now, seeing this is contrary to reason, the matter stands in reality quite otherwise. From this reasoning it is evident that the author supposed an expiation of the sins of all the earlier generations of mankind too, by virtue of the sacrificial death of Christ.
An erroneous statement of the connection of thought is given by Hofmann (Schriftenw. II. 1, p. 441), Delitzsch, and Alford. See, on the other hand, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 552, Obs. — ἐπεὶ] since otherwise, alioquin. Comp. 1 Cor. v. 10, vii. 14, al. — εἴδει αὐτῶν πολλάκις παθεῖν] it were needful that He should often suffer. — On εἴδει without ἄν, see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 266. — παθεῖν specially of the suffering of death, as xiii. 12. — ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου] from the foundation or creation of the world onwards (comp. iv. 3), i.e. here: so long as there are men in the world. — νῦν δὲ] as viii. 6, in the logical sense: but now. Opposition to ἐπεὶ κ.τ.λ. — ἐπὶ συντελεῖν τῶν αἰώνων] in the end of the ages, periods of time. Antithesis to ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, and equivalent in signification to ἐπὶ ἐγκαταστάσεως τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῖτων, i. 1. Comp. also ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος, Matt. xiii. 40, 49. — εἰς αθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ] for the cancelling of sin by His sacrifice. These words belong together. The conjoining of διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ with πεφανέρωται, which has been preferred by Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Carpzov, Heinrichs, Schulz, Böhme, Tholuck, and others, is, in connexion with the right determination of the sense of the verb (vid. infra), harsh and unnatural, and not at all justified by the alleged analogon: ὃ ἐλθὼν δὲ ὕδατος καὶ αἷματος, 1 John v. 6. Tholuck's objection, however, that ἀπαξ... αἰῶνων is antithetically opposed to the κατ' ἐναυτόν, ver. 25, and πεφανέρωται διὰ τῆς θυσίας to the εἰσέρχεται ἐν αἷματι ἀλλότριῳ, does not apply, inasmuch as the second clause of ver. 26 forms the antithesis to the first clause of that verse, but not to ver. 25; on which account also ἐπεὶ... κόσμου is not, with Beza, Mill, Griesbach, Carpzov, Schulz, Bloomfield, and others, to be enclosed within a parenthesis. — No emphasis for the rest falls upon the personal pronoun employed with θυσίας, in such wise that the sense would be: by the sacrifice of Himself (so Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, in their translations, Piscator, Jac. Cappellus, Owen, Limborch, Schulz, Heinrichs, Böhme, Stuart, Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Conybeare, and others). It means simply: by His sacrifice (Bleek, de Wette), so that not αὐτοῦ, but αὐτοῦ is to be written. The contrast between His own blood and the blood of other victims was
already, sufficiently brought out afresh at ver. 25. — \( \text{πεφανέρωται} \) He has been manifested, i.e. He has appeared or come forth before the sight of men upon earth. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 20; 1 John iii. 5, 8; also Col. iii. 4; 1 John ii. 28; 1 Pet. v. 4 [1 Tim. iii. 16]. To explain the expression of the appearing before God, and to make it of like import with \( \text{ἐμφανισθήναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ} \), ver. 24 (Jac. Cappellus, Heinrichs, Schulz, al.), is forbidden alike by the absence of the, in that case indispensable, addition \( \text{ἐκ δευτέρου ὀφθησεται,} \) ver. 28, corresponding as it does to the \( \text{πεφανέρωται}. \)

Vv. 27, 28. Further (\( \kappaαί \)) enforcement of the \( \text{ἀπαξ,} \) ver. 26, by means of an analogy. As death is appointed to men once for all, they, after having once suffered death, do not need to die again, but after death nothing more follows for them but the judgment; so also Christ has once for all offered up Himself for the cancelling of sin; at His return He will not again have to offer Himself for the cancelling of sin, but He will return once again, only to put the believers in possession of the everlasting salvation. — \( \kappaαθ' ὅσον \) inasmuch as [cf. vii. 20], is not entirely synonymous with \( \kαθός, \) which one might have expected on account of the following \( \text{ὁσιοσάμενος}, \) and which Grotius and Braun conjecture to have been the original reading; for, whereas \( \kαθός \) would express the bare notion of comparison, this contains at the same time an indication of cause. The indication of cause, however, has reference merely to \( \text{ἀπαξ ὁσιοσάμενος,} \) to which then the \( \text{ἀπαξ προσευχὴς,} \) ver. 28, corresponds; but not likewise, as Kurtz maintains,\(^1\) to the addition \( \text{μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις}, \) since to this an element of dissimilarity is opposed at ver. 28. The sense is: inasmuch as men, regarded generally, have only once to undergo death, so also Christ, since He was herein entirely like unto His brethren, could not die more than once. — \( \text{ἀποκειται} \) is appointed (in the decree of God). Comp. Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 8. The verb originally of that which

---

\(^1\) According to Kurtz, the resurrection and ascension of Christ is then to be thought of as the result of the \( \text{μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις} \) on Christ’s part. But where is ever in the N. T. the resurrection and ascension of Christ presented from the point of view of a judgment exercised on Him? And how could it be expected of the reader, without further indication, that he should derive so strange a conception from the words of vv. 28, 29?
has been laid aside, and so lies ready for future use.— ἀπαξ ἀποθανεῖν] to die a single time, or once for all. Comp. Sophocles in Stobaeus, ii. 120: θανεῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔξεστι τοῖς αὐτοῖς διό. — Calvin: Si quis objiciat, bis quosdam esse mortuos, ut Lazaratum et similes (comp. Heb. xi. 35), expedita est solutio, apostolum hic de ordinaria hominum conditione disputare: quin etiam ab hoc ordine eximuntur, quos subita commutatio corruptione exuet (comp. Heb. xi. 5). — μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις ἡ ἀπόκειται, not ἐστίν οὐ ἐσταί. Whether, for the rest, the κρίσις is thought of by the author as ensuing immediately after the death of each individual (Jac. Cappellus, Kurtz, al.), or as a later act coinciding only with the general resurrection of the dead (Bengel, Bleek, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, al.), the elastic μετὰ τοῦτο affords us no intimation.— κρίσις] judgment, is to be taken quite generally. Wrongly is it understood by Schulz (and so also Böhme) specially of the judgment unto punishment or unto condemnation, in that he supposes—erroneously, because at variance with the absolute τοῖς ἀνθρώποις—two different classes of men (those to be punished and those to be blessed) to be opposed to each other in vv. 27, 28. [Yet comp. John v. 24.]

Ver. 28. "Ἀπαξ προσενεχθεῖς] once offered (by the suffering of death). Chrysostom: ἵπτε τίνος προσενεχθεῖς; ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ δηλονότι. Wrongly (comp. ἑαυτόν, vv. 25, 14) Delitzsch: in connection with the passive προσενεχθεῖς we have "to think of the violence proceeding from the human and demoniac power, which Christ endured, in order to become the προσφορά for the propitiation of mankind;" Kurtz and Hofmann: ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ is to be supplemented, which, accordingly, is interpreted by Kurtz into the signification of the "sending of the Son into the world, in behoof of the vicarious atoning for sin by means of His sacrificial death;" by Hofmann: into a "being brought to that place where He was to be at the disposal of Him who had ordained Him to be an expiatory sacrifice for sins." The words ἀπαξ προσενεχθεῖς correspond to the ἀπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, ver. 27, and προσενεχθεῖς forms a paronomasia with the following ἀνενεγκεῖν: borne as a sacrifice, that He might bear away, dargebracht, um fortzubringen [oblatus ut auferret]. For ἀνενεγκεῖν denotes not the bearing up (and
fastening) to the cross (Jac. Cappellus, Calov, Wolf, Bengel, and others, after 1 Pet. ii. 24, where, however, ἐπὶ τὸ κληρον is employed with it), or the substitutionary bearing (Augustine, de pecc. mer. i. 28; Estius, Seb. Schmidt, Böhme, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riem, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 544 f.; Alford, Maier, Conybeare, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Hofmann, and others, in accordance with the signification of the verb, Isa. liii. 12, LXX.: ἀνθρῶπος ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήμερε, an utterance which certainly may have been before the mind of the author at the time of his writing this passage), or the offering up of the sins, as it were, as a sacrifice (Peshito, Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact, Michaelis); but the expiation of sins, conceived under the form of the result immediately of necessity attaching itself thereto, i.e. the putting away of sins, in such wise that it takes up again the idea expressed by εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας, ver. 26, and becomes identical with ἀφαίρεται ἁμαρτίας, x. 4. From a linguistic point of view this interpretation encounters no difficulty (against Delitzsch and others), since the ἀνά in ἀγογὴν was employed not otherwise than, e.g., very frequently the ἀνά in ἀναιρεῖν. How easily the notion of bearing in ἀποκριθεῖν could pass over into that of bearing away or doing away with, is shown in the kindred verb βαστάζει, which is unquestionably used, Matt. viii. 17, John xx. 15, in the sense of auferre. Comp. also Galen, de compos. medicam. 2: θεραπεύει καὶ ὑπόται βαστάζει. — πολλῶν] here too, as ii. 10 and often (see p. 122), lays stress only on the notion of multitude or plurality, without regard to the question whether this plurality constitutes the totality of mankind or not.—ἐκ δευτέρου ὁφθάσειται] shall appear the second time before the eyes of men, namely, at His Parousia. According to Bleek, there arises a difficulty from the words, if we explain προσευχθῆναι of the death suffered upon earth, and not, with him, of an action accomplished in heaven, only after the resurrection, inasmuch as in the former case Christ already appeared in a visible form the second time after His resurrection. But such difficulty does not at all present itself in connection with that application of προσευχθῆναι either. For ἐπὶ δευτέρου ὁφθάσει can only be understood of a second appearing in a visible form
upon earth; when, however, Christ after His resurrection appeared again to His disciples, He had not yet left the earth; those manifestations of the risen Christ before His ascension belonged consequently to His first visible coming forth upon earth. — χωρίς ἀμαρτίας] forms the opposition to εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἀμαρτίας, is therefore to be interpreted after the analogy of these words. (Erroneously Bleek, according to whom χωρίς ἀμαρτίας forms the opposition to εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἀμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται, ver. 26.) Christ has once offered Himself up for the expiation of the sins of men; when He returns to earth the second time, He will not once more have to do with the expiation of human sin, but He will, apart from sin, or free from all relation to sin, appear to bring the σωτηρία to the believers. Free from the guilt and punishment of sin, Christ has already rendered His believers by means of His sacrificial death at His first appearing upon earth. Positively, He will bless them with salvation at His return. To combine χωρίς ἀμαρτίας with τῶν ἀπεκδεχόμενοις by means of an hyperbaton (so Faber Stapulensis and Grotius) is grammatically impossible. The sense, however, cannot be either, as the Irvingites will, that Christ Himself will be free from sin at His second appearing, in opposition to the lust which they suppose to have attached to Him during His first appearing; for that Christ during this period too, notwithstanding all the temptation to which He was subject, was free from sin, the author certainly distinctly asserts at iv. 15. Incorrectly also does Bleek—after the example of Theodore of Mopsuestia (τὸ γὰρ χωρίς ἀμαρτίας τούτῳ λέγει, ὅτι μὴ κρατούσης ἔτι τῆς ἀμαρτίας οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξῳ παντοὶ ἀνθρωπίνου πάθους ὄφθησεται τότε) and of Theodoret (οὐκέτι τῆς ἁμαρτίας κρατούσης, ἀντι τοῦ χωριαν οὐκέτι ἐχώνης κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς ἁμαρτίας) —take χωρίς ἀμαρτίας as equivalent in signification to μὴ ὁμοίας ἀμαρτίας, so that the sense would be: "at the return of Christ sin will no longer be present, at least in the domain to which the operation of the Redeemer will relate." Even in a grammatical respect this application of the words is inadmissible, since χωρίς ἀμαρτίας must stand in relation to the subject in ὄφθησεται, thus cannot be torn away from this
reference by being made equivalent to an independent participial clause. But also the thought thence arising would be encumbered with difficulty, as Bleek himself admits, by the addition of "at least," etc., although Bleek has sought to justify it. Additional misinterpretations of χωρίς ἀμαρτίας are met with in other writers. Thus it is supposed to mean: without, again vicariously laden with the sins of men, being made sin (2 Cor. v. 21) for them (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, Akersloot, Wolf, Carpzov, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Heinrichs, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 545, Obs.; Alford, Maier, Moll, and others), which is already refuted by the erroneousness of explaining the foregoing ἀνενεγκεῖν of the vicarious bearing of sins; without the punishment of sin (Klee, al.); without the sufferings undertaken for sin (Tholuck); sine corporis, peccato obnoxii, mortalitate (Zeger); sine sacrificio pro peccato (Jac. Cappellus, Stuart, M'Caul, and many); not as a sufferer for the guilt of others, but as the holy judge of the guilt of others (Ebrard, Delitzsch; similarly Stein and others), and so forth, all of which have the plain expression of the language against them. — eἰς σωτηρίαν] belongs to ὄφθησεται, not, as it is true, upon the retention of the spurious addition (see the critical remark) διὰ πίστεως, it must be conjoined, to ἀπεκδεχομένως (so Primasius, Faber Stapulensis, Camerarius, Wolf, Klee, Paulus, Stein). For τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἀπεκδεχομένους contains a non-essential element of the statement, ver. 28; eἰς σωτηρίαν, on the other hand, an essential element of the same. eἰς σωτηρίαν, namely, is the positive nearer defining of the negative χωρίς ἀμαρτίας, and forms consequently, like the latter, an antithesis to eἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἀμαρτίας. The whole clause, however, ἐκ δευτέρου . . . eἰς σωτηρίαν, corresponds to the second member of the clause, ver. 27: μετὰ δὲ τούτῳ κρίσις.
CHAPTER X.

VER. 1 reads in the Recepta: Σχιάν γὰρ ἐχων ὁ νῦμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὗ ἀυθὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, κατ' ἐναυτόν ταῖς αὐταίς, θυσίαις, ἂς προσφέρουσι εἰς τὸ δικαίων, οὐδέτερο δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους τίλισσαι. Instead thereof, Lachm. takes the words Σχιάν ἐ... πραγμάτων as an independent clause, placing a full stop after πραγμάτων. He then, in the stereotype edition, omits the relative before προσφέρουσι,—while in the larger edition he has again added the ἂ; of the Recepta before this verb,—places a comma after προσφέρουσι, and writes δύναται in place of δύναται. This punctuation and form of the text given by Lachm. is in all essential respects to be unhesitatingly rejected. In connection with the breaking off of the opening words of the verse into an independent statement, ιονίς must be supplemented to ἐχων. Such supplementing, however, would be altogether opposed to the linguistic character of the Epistle to the Hebrews; moreover, it would remain inexplicable, from the very brevity of the clause, how the participle ἐχων should come to be written for the finite tense ἔχω, which naturally suggests itself. In addition to this, the joining to that which precedes by means of γὰρ would occasion a difficulty, and the clause following would become an asyndeton. Besides, this following clause, in the absence of any connecting relative, would not even comply with the laws of grammar. The relative before προσφέρουσι is wanting in A, 2, 7* 17, 47, Syr. utr. Arm., and A** 31, Syr. Philonex. then insert αι before οὐδέτερο. Instead of the Recepta ἂς προσφέρ. there is found, however, in D* L (?), 73, 137, in an ancient fragment with Matthaei, which Tisch., in the edit. vii. (comp. Pars L p. cxxi.), has designated as N, with Theodoret, as well as in a ms. of Chrysostom and in the Latin version of D E: αἰς προσφέρ., and the latter is preferred by Bleek, Tisch. and Alford. Yet the Recepta ἂς, which is supported by C D*** E (? K N, the majority of the cursive, and many Fathers, is to be defended. Since the three words immediately preceding end in αἰς, ἂς might easily also be changed into αῖς. The Recepta δύναται, finally, is attested by D (α and *** E K L, very many cursive, Vulg. It. Copt. al., Chrys. Theodoret (text),
Oecum. (comm.) al., while the plural διαντας (preferred also by Tisch. 1, and already placed by Griesbach upon the inner margin) is presented by A C D E*, about thirty cursives, Syr. al., Chrys. (codd.) Theodoret (comm. ?), Damasc. Theophyl. al. But the plural is devoid of sense, and can on that account be regarded only as a transcriber's error, which was occasioned by the foregoing plural προφητους. — Ver. 2. ἐπει νῦν ἐν ἑπαύσαιν Elz.: ἑπει ἐν ἑπαύσαντα. Against the decisive authority of all uncial mss., of most cursives, vs. and Fathers.— The preference to the Recepta κικαβαρικόνως is deserved by κικαβαρικόνως (approved by Grotius, Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Delitzsch, Alford), as better attested. In favour of κικαβαρικόνως pleads not only the testimony of D E K K, 23* 37, 39, al., but also the form which in A C has arisen as a transcriber's error from the same κικαβαρικόνως, which latter Lachm. has adopted.— Ver. 6. Recepta here and ver. 8: ἱδύκησας. Better attested, however, here (by A C D* E, the early fragment in Matth. al.) and ver. 8 (by A D* [E?] al., Cyr. Theodoret) is the reading, chosen by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, as also approved by Delitzsch: ἱδύκησας. — Ver. 8. In place of the Recepta δυσία καὶ προφοράς, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford rightly read the plural: δυσίας καὶ προφοράς, in accordance with A C D E* K* 17, 23, 57, al., Vulg. It. Syr. Copt. Sahid. Arab. Erp. Cyril. Already commended to attention by Griesbach. The singular is a later change, with a view to its conformity to ver. 5.— In like manner we have, with Lachm. and Tisch., to delete ὅν, which the Recepta adds before νῆμον, as not being found in A C, K, 37, 46, 71, 73, al., Sahid. Cyril, Chrys. Theodoret. The insertion of the article was more easily possible than its rejection.— Ver. 9. τοῦ τοιχου] Elz.: τοῦ τοιχου, ὅ θες. Against A C D E K K* 17, 39, 46, al. mult. It. Copt. al., ὅ θες is a complementary addition from ver. 7. Rightly deleted by Griesbach, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche. — Ver. 10. Instead of the mere διὰ in the Recepta, Matthaei and Tisch. 2 and 7 read, after the precedent of the Edd. Complutens. Erasm. Colin. Stephan.: οἱ διὰ. Bloomfield places ω within brackets. But οἱ (sc. ἡγιασμοὶ) is wanting in A C D* E* K, 31, 47, al., Chrys. Theodoret, and owes its origin to an error of the eye, in that the termination σιν in ἡγιασμοὶ gave rise to the writing of ἡμιν οἱ.— In place of τοῦ σώματος in the Recepta, D* E, with their Latin translation, have τοῦ αἵματος. Mistaken emendation, since τοῦ σώματος, ver. 10, was chosen in manifest correspondence to the citation σώμα δὲ καιρησίων μοι, ver. 5. — ἵσιον Χριστοῦ] Elz.: τοῦ ἵσιον Χριστοῦ. But the article has against it the testimony of all the
uncials, many cursive and Fathers, and is rightly rejected by Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford. — Ver. 11. Elz. Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Reiche read: πας μίν ἵπτις. Defended also by Böhme, Tholuck, and Delitzsch. The preference, however, is deserved by the reading: πας μίν ἄρχησπος, which is furnished by A C, 31, 37, 46, al., Syr. utr. (yet in the Philonex. with an asterisk) Basm. Aeth. Arm. Theodoret (text), Cyril. Euthal. al., was already adopted in the Editt. Complut. Plantin. Genev., and more recently has been restored by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, and Alford. If the ordinary Levitical priests had been intended, οἱ ἰπτῖς would, as is rightly observed by Bleek, have been written instead of πας ἵπτις, since each single Levitical priest had by no means daily to offer sacrifice. Less unsuitable, on the other hand, is the statement of the daily presentation of sacrifice in regard to the high priest, since that which was true of the Levitical priests in general could indeed be ascribed to the high priest as the head and representative of the same. In any case we have here, at the close of the argument, and because of the parallel with the person of Christ, to expect not so much the mention of the ordinary Jewish priest, as the mention of the Jewish high priest. The reading: πας μίν ἵπτις, is therefore to be looked upon as a later correction, made on account of the following καθ' ἡμέραν, since this stood in apparent contradiction to — Ver. 12. οὗτος δὲ] Elz. Matthaei, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield: αὐτὸς δὲ. But οὗτος δὲ (recommended by Griesbach; adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Scholz, Tisch. 1 and 8, Alford, Reiche; approved also by Delitzsch) is demanded by the preponderating authority of A C D* E N, 67**, 80, 116, al., Syr. utr. Arr. Copt. Basm. Aeth. Arm. It. Vulg. al., Chrys. Cyr. Damasc. al. — Instead of the Recepta: ἵπτεῖσα, Lachm. had written in the stereotype edition: ἵπτεῖσα, which, however, is only feebly attested by A, 31 (N* has ἵπτεῖσα, which by Ν*** was changed into ἵπτεῖσα). Rightly, therefore, has Lachm. returned in his larger edition to the Recepta. — Ver. 15. μετὰ γὰρ τὸ σημεῖον] Elz. Matth. Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, Reiche: μετὰ γὰρ τὸ σημεῖον. Against decisive witnesses (A C D E N, 17, 31, 47, al. m. Syr. utr. Arr. Copt. Basm. Aeth. It. Vulg. Chrys. Theoph. Ambrose, Sedul.). Already held suspected by Griesbach. — Ver. 16. Elz. Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche: ἵπτεῖσα, after D** and *** E K L, most cursive and vss., Chrys. Theodoret, al., Ambrose, al. On the other hand, A C D* N, 17, 31, 47, al., Vulg. (Amiat. Harlej.* Tolet.) have: ἵπτεῖσα. Approved by Lachm. Bleek,
Tisch. 1 and 8, and probably the original reading. — Ver. 17.
The words ἐν ὤ ἡγιάσθη are deleted by Lachm. in the stereotype edition; but are rightly, since they are omitted only by A and Chrysostom, retained by him in the larger edition. — Ver. 30. The addition following οὐχασσάδων in the Recepta: γίγας κυρίος, is rejected by Tisch. 1, 2, and 8, after D Ν 17, 23 Ν Vulg. It. Copt. Syr. Aeth. Arab. Erp. Ambr. Bede, and is regarded by Mill (Prolegg. 496), Bengel, Griesbach, and others as probably a gloss. Bloomfield encloses it within brackets. It is nevertheless protected by A D Ν Κ L Ν etc., Syr. Philonex. al., and many Fathers. Rightly, therefore, has it been received again by Tisch. into the edit. vii. Delitzsch, Alford, and Reiche also have lately decided in favour of its genuineness. — The Recepta κύριος κρινεῖ we have, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, after A D Ν 31, 73, al., Vulg. It. Syr. utr. Aeth. Theodoret (semel), to transpose into κρινεῖ κύριος. Bleek and Delitzsch read, after D E, 55, 71, Vulg. It. Theodoret (sem.): δι κρινεῖ κύριος. Quite similarly, LXX. Deut. xxxii. 36; Ps. cxxxv. 14. — Ver. 34. τοῖς δεσμοῖς.] Thus we have to read, with Griesbach, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, and others, after A D [as Cod. B breaks off at ix. 14, so also x. 24—xii. 15 is wanting in Cod. C] 47, 67 73, al., Syr. utr. Arab. Erpen. Copt. Arm. Vulg. Chrys. Antioch. Damasc. Theodoret (comm.), Oecum. (comm.) Pelag. Ambrose, al. From τοῖς δεσμοῖς arose, by a slip on the part of the copyist, τοῖς δεσμοῖς, which is found with Origen, Exhort. ad martyr. 44, and to which the vinculis eorum of the Latin translation in D E corresponds; while, then, τοῖς δεσμοῖς was completed by means of a gloss into the Recepta, still defended by Matthaei, Bloomfield, M'Caul, and Hofmann: τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου (D Ν Κ L Ν, etc.), in that Paul was regarded as the author of the epistle, and thus was found expressed an acknowledgment of the sympathy manifested by the Palestinian Christians towards himself during his imprisonment. — In that which follows, the reading: ἐκεῖν ἱαυτοῖς, very strongly confirmed by D E K L, almost sixty cursives, Chrys. Theodoret, Isidor. iii. 225, Damasc. Theoph., already adopted into the Editt. Complut. Erasm. 1, Steph. 1 and 2, and later preferred by Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7,
Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, is to be held the original one, inasmuch as from this reading the rise, as well of the Reception: ἰἀ ντωτος (which, as it would seem, rests only upon a few cursive), as also of the reading afforded by A, four cursive, the early fragment in Matthaei, Vulg. It. al., and followed by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8: ἰἀ ντωτος, is to be explained. — The addition: ἰν ὁμονοιας after ἰἀρξεν in the Reception is wanting in A D* N* 17, in the early fragment with Matthaei in the text, in Copt. Aeth. Vulg. It., with Clem. Al. Bed., and stands with Theodoret only after μίνουσαν. Elucidatory gloss, suspected by Mill (Prolegg. 1208) and Griesbach, rightly rejected by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford. — Ver. 35. Reception: μισθαποδοσιας μυγάλην. With Lachm. Bleek, Tisch., 1, 7, and 8, Alford, we have to transpose into μυγάλην μισθαποδοσιας, after A D E N, the early fragment in Matthaei, 73, 116, al., Clem. Al. Orig. Eus. It. Vulg. Copt. al. — Ver. 38. The Reception omits the μιν, which is found in most MSS. of the LXX, after πίστις. D* Syr. utr. Copt., the Latin version in D E, Eus. Theodoret (alic.), Cypr. Jerome have it after πίστις. On the other hand, it is found after δίκαιος in A N, Arm. Vulg., in the early fragment with Matthaei by the first hand, with Clem. Al. Eus. (alic.) Theodoret (alic.), Proc. Sedul. Bed. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford have adopted it at this latter place, and probably the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews so read, inasmuch as it is found with the LXX. at this place in Cod. A.

Vv. 1–4. Presentation in a clearer light of the necessity for Christ's offering Himself only once for the expiation of sins (ix. 25–28), by pointing to the ineffectiveness of the expiatory sacrifices continually repeated within the domain of Judaism. This constant repetition attests that sins are still ever present, as indeed a cancelling of sin by the blood of bullocks and of goats is impossible.

Ver. 1. Establishment of the ἀπαξ προσευχηθείς εἰς τὸ πολλὸν ἀνενεγκείν ἁμαρτίας, ix. 28, as being the main thought lying in ix. 25–28, by making good the opposite state of the case in the province of the O. T. theocracy: “For since the law contains only a shadow of the future good things, not the actual likeness of the things, it is not able by means of the same sacrifices every year, which are unceasingly offered, ever to make perfect them that draw nigh.” The emphasis of the proposition rests partly upon the characteri-
zation of the law as σκιάν ἐκων κ.τ.λ., partly upon εἰς ἑναυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, ἄς προσφέροντες εἰς τὸ διηνεκές. The author, however, cannot thereby mean, as the words at first hearing might seem to imply, that the law, in case its contents were no mere σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, would in reality effect the τελείωσις by means of its ever-repeated expiatory sacrifices. For, as is shown by vv. 2 and 3, the author already bases upon the very fact of the yearly repetition of the Mosaic expiatory sacrifices the proof for their inadequacy. We must therefore suppose that two independent particulars of thought have been blended together into a single statement. One can resolve the matter either in such wise that οὐδέποτε δύναται τελείωσις is looked upon as the common predicate for both particulars: the law is incapable of leading to τελείωσις, because it contains a mere σκιὰ κ.τ.λ.; and certainly it is incapable, by means of its ever-repeated sacrifices, of leading to τελείωσις. Or in such wise that the second particular is thought of originally as an inference from the first, from which the οὐδέποτε δύναται κ.τ.λ. is then progressively derived: because the law contains a mere σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, there is found in its domain an unceasing repetition of the same expiatory sacrifices; by this unceasing repetition, however, it is never able to lead to perfection. The latter analysis is to be preferred, because by means of it the opposition, required by the course of the argument, between the once offered and the oftentimes repeated expiatory sacrifice, comes out clearly and definitely in all its severity; while the characterization of the νόμος, on the other hand, as σκιὰν ἐκων κ.τ.λ., is made only that which here, in harmony with the context, it alone can be, i.e. a mere subsidiary factor in the argument. — σκιὰν, a shadow, which is unsubstantiated, melts away into obscurity, and only enables us to recognise the external outlines. Opposite to this is the εἰκών, the image or impress, which sets before us the figure itself, sharply and clearly stamped forth. See on viii. 5. Freely, but not incorrectly, does Luther translate: “the very substance of the good things.” — τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν] see at ix. 11. — τῶν πραγμάτων] different from τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν only as respects the more general form of expression.
— κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν] belongs neither to οὐδὲποτε δύναται (Ebrard, Delitzsch, Hofmann, Schriftenow. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 446; Alford) nor to δὲ προσφέρωναι (Calvin, Er. Schmid, Wolf, Heinrichs, Bleek, de Wette, Bloomfield, and others), in which latter case the words would have to be resolved by ταῖς θυσίαις, δὲ κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς προσφέρωναι, or something similar. But κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν is rather to be taken in intimate combination with ταῖς αὐταῖς: with the same sacrifices every year. The author forebore writing ταῖς αὐταῖς κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν θυσίαις, in order that he might accentuate each notion equally strongly. As, moreover, with κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν in this place, so also elsewhere with adverbs which in point of meaning may be compared with it, such as ἀεὶ, πολλάκις, etc., a transposing is nothing rare. Comp. Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 514 f.— ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις] Those meant are, as is required by κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν (comp. also ver. 4), only the sacrifices on the great day of atonement, not also the daily sacrifices of propitiation (ver. 11), as Böhme, Stein, and others suppose.— προσφέρωναι] sc. the Levitical high priests. Wrongly Hofmann (Schriftenow. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 446), who in general has entirely failed in his interpretation of the statement: 1 the προσερχόμενοι.— εἰς τὸ διηνεκές] Note of time to προσφέρωναι. If we should seek, with Paulus, Lachmann, and Hofmann, ı. e., to conjoin εἰς τὸ διηνεκές with that which follows, the relative clause δὲ προσφέρωναι would be deprived of all signification. — τοῖς προσερχόμενοι] those who approach God through the medium of the Levitical priests, thus identical with τοῖς λατρεύοντας, ver. 2, ix. 9.

Ver. 2. Proof for the κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐτ. θυσ. οὐδὲποτε δύναται τοῖς προσερχόμενοι τελείωσαι in the form of a question: for otherwise would not their presentation have ceased? because the worshippers, so soon as they have once been really purged from sin, have no more consciousness of sins, and

1 Namely, in that he brings out as the sense of the same, “the propitiatory sacrifice, which is, as it were, offered by the law itself, because offered at its direction and by the high priest for the congregation,” is here “convinced of its manifest incapacity for effecting real and abiding purity of conscience for the individuals. This conviction is wrought by the fact that, notwithstanding this sacrifice has been offered every year for the whole congregation, the individuals still continue throughout the year to offer sacrifices for themselves”!
thus no more need of an expiatory sacrifice. In connection with the *Recepta* ἐπετεὶ ἄν ἐπαύσαντο, the sense itself would remain unchanged, only the words would then have to be taken as an assertorystatement ("for their presentation would have come to an end, because," etc.); by which, however, the discourse would suffer in point of vivacity (observe also the ἀλλά, ver. 3, corresponding to the question of ver. 2). But the process is not a natural one, when Beza, add. 1 and 2, Wetstein, Matthaei, Stein, and others (comp. already Theodoret) will have the proposition of ver. 2 regarded as an assertorystatement, even with the retention of the οὐκ. They then explain either (and thus ordinarily): *for otherwise their presentation would not have ceased*, sc. by the coming in of the New Covenant (Beza: alioqui non desiissent offerri; Matthaei: non cessavissent, non sublata essent; comp. Theodoret: Αἰδ τοῦτο τέλος ἔκεινα λαμβάνει, ὡς οὐ δυνάμενα συνείδησιν καθαραν ἀποφήναι), or, in that ἐπετεὶ . . . προσφέρομεναι is closely attached to the main verb of ver. 1, and διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν κ.τ.λ. is regarded as belonging to the whole proposition, vv. 1, 2: the law was not able by its sacrifices to lead to perfection, since their presentation was an endless one; because those who are once purified have no longer any consciousness of sins. So Wetstein, who, however, will write—what in that case, no doubt, would be necessary and perfectly justified—οὐκ ἀνεπαύσαντο instead of οὐκ ἄν ἐπαύσαντο ( . . . "quum non cessarent offerri. Ita quidem, ut haec verba, sublata distinctione majori, jungantur iis, quae praecedunt, deinde sequatur totius sententiae confirmatio: quia sacrificantes," etc.). But against the last-mentioned mode of explanation it is decisive, that the relation of the members of the sentence to each other would become obscure, and the arrangement cumbrous; against the first-mentioned, the presupposition, underlying the ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, ver. 1, as well as the epistle in general (ix. 9, al.), that the Jewish sacrificial ritual was still in continuance at the time of our author's writing. — ἐπαύσαντο προσφέρομεναι] sc. αἱ θυσίαι. The construction of παύεσθαι with the participle is the ordinary one, in classic as well as in Hellenistic Greek. Comp. Eph. i. 16; Col. i. 9; Acts v. 42, al.; Hermann,

Ver. 3. Contrast to τὸ μηδεμίαν ἐχειν ἐτι συνειδήσειν ἀμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας. In such wise, however, that the offerers should have no more consciousness of guilt, the matter does not stand; on the contrary, there lies in the yearly repetition of the sacrifices the yearly reminder that sins are still remaining, and have to be expiated.¹ Comp. Philo, de Victim. p. 841 A (with Mangey, II. p. 244): Εἴθετε γερ τὰς θυσίας μὴ λήθην ἀμαρτημάτων, ἀλλ' ἱπόμηναν αὐτῶν κατασκευάζειν. — De plantat. Noé, p. 229 B (I. p. 345): αἱ ... θυσίαι ... ἱπομνήσκουσα τὰς ἐκάστων ἀγνοιάς τε καὶ διαμαρτίας. — Vit. Mos. iii. p. 669 E (II. p. 151): Καὶ γὰρ ὄποτε γνεσθαί δοκοῦσιν (sc. the θυσίαι and εἰνχαί of the impious), οὐ λύων ἀμαρτημάτων ἀλλ' ἱπόμηναι ἐργάζονται. — ἐν αὐταῖς] sc. ταῖς θυσίαις. —ἀνάμνησις] not: commemoratio (Vulgate, Calvin, Clarius, al.) or commemoratio publica (Bengel and others), so that we must think of the confession of sin (tract. Jom. iv. 2, iii. 8, vi. 2) which the high priest made on the great day of atonement with regard to himself and the whole people (Schlichting, Grotius, Braun, al.); but: reminding, recalling to memory. Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25; Luke xxii. 19.

Ver. 4. Proof that it cannot be otherwise, drawn from the matter itself which is under consideration. By a rudely sensuous means we cannot attain to a high spiritual good.

Vv. 5–10. Scripture proof, from Ps. xl. 7–9 [6–8], that deliverance from sins is to be obtained, not by animal sacrifices, but only by the fulfilling of the will of God. On the ground of this fulfilment of God’s will by Christ are we Christians sanctified.

Ver. 5. Αἰῶ] Wherefore, i.e. in accordance with the impossibility declared at ver. 4. — λέγει] He saith. As subject thereto is naturally supplied Christ, although He was not mentioned again since ix. 28. This determination of the

¹ To join on the words of ver. 3 to those of ver. 1, and then to look upon ver. 2 as a parenthesis (Kurtz, Hofmann), is inadmissible, even—apart from the ἀλλ', of frequent use after a question—because ἀνάμνησις ἀμαρτίων, ver. 3, points back to the kindred εἰσιδήναι ἀμαρτίων, ver. 2.
subject is already placed beyond doubt by the whole connection, but not less by the pointing back of τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 10, to σώμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, ver. 5. According to the view of our author, Christ is speaking in the person of the psalmist. The psalm itself, indeed, as is almost universally acknowledged, refuses to admit of the Messianic interpretation (comp. especially ver. 13 [12]). The present λέγεται, moreover, might be placed, because the utterance is one extending into the present, i.e. one which may still be daily read in the Scripture.— εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον] at His coming into the world, i.e. on the eve of coming (see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 249) into the world (sc. by His incarnation). This determining of time is taken from the ἁκος, ver. 7. According to Bleek, who is preceded therein by Grotius, and followed by de Wette, as more recently by Maier and Beyschlag, die Christologie des Neuen Testaments, Berl. 1866, p. 192, the author in penning the words εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον was thinking "less of the moment of the incarnation and birth than of the public coming forth upon earth to the work assigned to Him by the Father, in connection with which His entrance into the world first became manifested to the world itself." But in that case εἰσελθὼν must have been written, and the formula εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον (John i. 9, vi. 14, xi. 27; Rom. v. 12; 1 Tim. i. 15, al.) would lose its natural signification. The same applies against Delitzsch, who, bringing in that which lies very remote, will have the words explained: "incarnate, and having entered upon the years of human self-determination, signified Isa. vii. 16,"—an exposition which is not any the more rendered acceptable, when Delitzsch adds, with a view to doing justice to the participle present: "we need not regard the εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον as a point; we can also conceive of it as a line." 3 For the author cannot possibly

1 Arbitrarily does Kurtz place in λέγεται a double sense, in that he will have it understood on the part of the psalmist of a speaking in words, on the part of Christ of a speaking by deeds.

2 Without reason do Delitzsch and Alford object against this interpretation, that the following εἰμι κατηρτίσω μοι is not in harmony therewith. See the exposition of the words.

3 So, in accord with Delitzsch, also Alford, who observes: "It expresses, I
have thought of Christ's εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον, and His λέγειν temporally therewith coinciding, as something constantly repeated and only progressively developed.—Θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἡθέλησας] sacrifice and offering (bloody and unbloody sacrifices) Thou didst not will. Kindred utterances in the Old Testament: Ps. 1. 7-15, li. 18 ff. [16 ff.]; Isa. i. 11; Jer. vi. 20, vii. 21-23; Hos. vi. 6; Amos v. 21 ff.; 1 Sam. xv. 22. That, however, the author founded his Scripture proof precisely upon Ps. xxl., was occasioned principally by the addition, very important for his purpose: σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, which is found there. —σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι] but a body hast Thou prepared me, sc. in order to be clothed with the same, and by the giving up of the same unto death to fulfil Thy will. Comp. ver. 7. Thus, without doubt, the author found in his copy of the LXX. But that the Hebrew words: פְּתַחְיָה יָבִיא (the ears hast Thou digged to me, i.e. by revelation opened up religious knowledge to me), were even originally rendered by the LXX. by σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, as is contended by Jac. Cappellus, Wolf, Carpzov, Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, and others, is a supposition hardly to be entertained. Probably the LXX. rendered the Hebrew words by άτία δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, as they are still found in some ancient mss. of that version, and σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι arose, not "from the translator being unable to attach any satisfactory meaning to the words 'the ears hast thou digged to me,' and therefore altering them with his own hand" (Kurtz); but only from an accidental corruption of the text, in that Σ, the final letter of the ἡθέλησας immediately preceding, was wrongly carried over to the following word, and instead of ΤΙ the letter Μ was erroneously read.


believe, the whole time during which the Lord, being ripened in human resolution, was in intent devoting Himself to the doing of His Father's will: the time of which that youthful question, 'Wist ye not that I must be in τοι ἐσσε αἱ παρ' μοι!' was one of the opening announcements.
Elsewhere also occasionally (Lev. vii. 37; Num. viii. 8, al.) the LXX. denote the sin-offering by the mere περὶ ἁμαρτίας, in that the additional notion of sacrifice is naturally yielded by the context. Stein's expedient for avoiding all supplementing of the idea, in translating καὶ by "also" ("Thou hast also no pleasure in offerings for sin"), is grammatically inadmissible.— εὐδοκεῖν] with the accusative also not rare elsewhere in Hellenistic Greek. Comp. LXX. Gen. xxxiii. 10; Lev. xxvi. 34, 41; Ps. li. 18, 21, al. Besides this in the Hellenistic εὐδοκεῖν ἐν (x. 38), with Greek writers εὐδοκεῖν τινι.

Ver. 7. Τὸτε ἐστων] then said I. In the sense of the writer of the epistle: then, when Thou hadst prepared for me a body. In the sense of the composer of the psalm: then, when such deeper knowledge was revealed to me. Contrary to the usage of the language, Carpzov, Stein, and others take τὸτε as equivalent to ἰδεω, propter eam, while just as capriciously Heinrichs makes it redundant as a particle of transition.— ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίων γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ] is a parenthesis; so that τοῦ ποιήσασι depends not on γέγραπται, as Paulus thinks, but upon ἥκω: Lo, I come to do, O God, Thy will. Comp. ver. 9. Otherwise truly with the LXX. (and in the Hebrew), where τοῦ ποιήσασι is governed by the closing verb ἠβουληθήνη, which is omitted in the Epistle to the Hebrews (τοῦ ποιήσασι τὸ βῆλμα σου, ὁ θέως μου, ἠβουληθήνη: to do Thy will, O God, is my delight).— ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίων γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ is in the Hebrew differently connected and applied. In the sense of our author: in the prophecies of the O. T. it is written of me.— κεφαλίς, little head, then the knob at the end of the staff, around which the manuscript roll was wound in antiquity. κεφαλίς βιβλίων consequently denotes the book-roll, volume. Elsewhere also the LXX. translated the Hebrew קֵיתֶן (volumen), with and without the addition of βιβλίον, by κεφαλίς. Comp. Ezek. ii. 9, iii. 1-3; Ezra vi. 2.— τὸ βῆλμα] in the sense of our author: the obedient presentation of the body as a sacrifice for the redemption of mankind.

Vv. 8–10. Contrasting of the two main elements in the citation just adduced, and emphasizing of the fact that the one
element, upon which God lays no stress, is represented by Judaism; the other, to which value is attached in God's sight, is represented by Christianity. — ἄνωτερον] above, in the opening words of the declaration. — λέγων] sc. ὁ Χριστός. The participle present, in place of which Schlichting, Grotius, Bleek, de Wette expect that of the aorist, is employed here, even as λέγει, ver. 5, because the utterance, as being recorded in Scripture, is one still enduring. Only the author makes manifest, by the fact that he writes λέγων, not εἰπόν or λέξας, that less importance is to be attached to the indication as to the relation of time, in which the two statements are placed to each other, than to the contrasting of these two statements themselves; thus: while He saith above, etc., He has then said, etc.— δὲ recitative particle, as vii. 17, xi. 18. — τοιαύτης καὶ προσφοράς] The plural appropriately serves for the generalization of the utterance. — αὐτίνες κατὰ νόμον προσφέρονταί as those things which are presented by virtue of legal precept. Suggestive reference to the imperfection and ineffectiveness of Judaism, since this makes salvation dependent precisely upon those ordinances of external sacrifice which God willed not, and in which He has no pleasure. The words are no parenthetic clause, as is still maintained by Bleek and Kurtz, but an addition essential to the argument of the writer, which does not interrupt the construction. They form the application, thus emphatically appended, of the first half of the thought in the Scripture citation, to Judaism, to which the parallel is formed in ver. 10 by the application of the second half to Christianity. — αὐτίνες] refers back to the whole of the preceding substantives.

Ver. 9. Τότε εἰρήκεν] are words of the author, and form the apodosis to ἄνωτερον λέγων, ver. 8. Quite erroneously does Peirce, who, with Chrysostom, Hom. xvii. and the Vulgate (tunc dixi), instead of τότε εἰρήκεν will read τότε εἶπον, which, however, only arose from ver. 7, make the apodosis begin first with ἀναγρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον. — τότε, however, not ὃστερον, which would more exactly accord with the ἄνωτερον, ver. 8, the author wrote, because the τότε εἶπον of the citation was still fresh in his memory. — ἀναγρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ] he abolishes the first, or
deprives it of validity, in order to establish the second as the norm in force (Rom. iii. 31). Parenthetic insertion, so that ver. 10 attaches itself closely to τὸ θέλημα, and is to be separated therefrom only by a comma. The parenthesis serves by way of exclamation to call attention to the importance of the application to be given in ver. 10 to the ἰδοὺ ἡκὼ κ.τ.λ. Subject in ἀναφέρει is naturally here also Christ; not "the Spirit of God," as Kurtz arbitrarily supposes. — τὸ πρῶτον] sc. τὸ προσφέρειν θυσίας καὶ προσφορὰς κ.τ.λ. — τὸ δεύτερον] sc. τὸ ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ. Theodoret: πρῶτον εἰπε τὴν τῶν ἅλόγων θυσίαν, δεύτερον δὲ τὴν λογικὴν, τὴν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ προσενεχθεῖσαν. Wrongly does Peirce take τὸ πρῶτον and τὸ δεύτερον adjectivally, in supplementing to each τὸ θέλημα θεοῦ. With equally little warrant Carpzov: the διαθήκη πρώτη and the διαθήκη καινή, or the ἑρωτήσει κατὰ τὴν τάξιν 'Αραβῶν and the ἑρωτήσει κατὰ ὁμοιότητα Μελ-χισεδέκ, are meant; as also Stein: the O. T. and the N. T. economy.

Ver. 10. Ἐν δὲ θελήματι] upon the ground of which will (more exactly: of which fulfilment of His will), and in conditioning connection with that will. What is meant is the will of God, of which the author has before spoken. — ἡγομοσύνῃ ἐσμὲν] we (Christians) have been sanctified (delivered from sins). ὑγιείας ἐσθαν correlative to the notions τελειοθεία, ver. 1, and καθαρίζεσθαι, ver. 2. — By the προσφορὰ τοῦ σώματος Ἰσοῦ Χριστοῦ cannot be meant "the self-presentation of Christ in the heavenly Holy of Holies" (Kurtz), but only (comp. ix. 28) Christ's death upon the cross on earth. For the indication of the former idea the expression τοῦ σώματος would be altogether unsuitable. Comp. also Riehm, Lehrbdgr. des Hebräerbr. p. 475 f. — εὐφάντα] belongs to ἡγομοσύνῃ ἐσμὲν, not, as Oecumenius, Theophylact, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Stein, Bloomfield, Alford, and others conjoin, to διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰσοῦ Χριστοῦ, because otherwise the article τῆς must have been repeated.

Vv. 11–14. Renewed emphasizing of the main distinction between the Jewish high priest and Christ. The former repeats day by day the same sacrifices without being able to effect thereby the cancelling of sin; Christ has by His single
sacrifice procured everlasting sanctification. This the main thought of vv. 11–14. Into the same, however, there is at the same time introduced a subordinate feature, by virtue of the opposition of the ἐστηκεν and ἐκάθισεν, by which likewise is manifest the pre-eminence of Christ over the Levitical high priests. The Jewish high priests were required to accomplish their ministration standing (comp. Deut. x. 8, xviii. 7; Judg. xx. 28, al.), were thus characterized as servants or inferiors (comp. also Jas. ii. 3); whereas in Christ’s sitting down at the right hand of God, His participation in the divine majesty and glory is proclaimed.

Ver. 11. Καὶ πᾶς] καὶ is the explanatory: and indeed. It develops the ἰδραθεῖ, ver. 10, and belongs equally to ver. 12 as to ver. 11.—ἀρξειρεύων] comp. the critical remark.
—καθ’ ἡμέραν] see at vii. 27.—περιελείθ] stronger than ἀφαίρειν, ver. 4. Literally: take away round about.

Ver. 12. Οὕτι] comp. iii. 3.—εἰς τὸ διηνεκές] belongs to ἐκάθισεν.—With that which precedes is it conjoined by Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Bengel, Böhme, Stein, Ewald, and others; whereby, however, the manifest antithesis, which εἰς τὸ διηνεκές ἐκάθισεν forms to ἐστηκεν καθ’ ἡμέραν, ver. 11, is destroyed, and the symmetry of the proposition, ver. 12, is lost.

Ver. 13. Τὸ λουτρόν] henceforth, sc. from the time of His sitting down at the right hand of God. What is meant is the time yet intervening before the coming in of the Parousia. The taking of τὸ λουτρόν in the relative sense: “as regards the rest, concerning the rest” (Kurtz), is, on account of the close coherence with ἐκδεχόμενος ἔως, unnatural, for which reason also the passages adduced by Kurtz as supposed parallels, Eph. vi. 10, Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8, 1 Thess. iv. 1, 2 Thess. iii. 1, do not admit of comparison.—The object of the waiting is expressed by our author in the language of Ps. cx. 1.—The ἐκάθισεν...τὸ λουτρόν ἐκδεχόμενος ἔως...involves for the rest the supposition that the destruction of the enemies of Christ is to be looked for even before His Parousia. The author accordingly manifests here, too, a certain diversity in his mode of viewing the subject from that of the Apostle Paul, since the latter (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 22–28) anticipates
the destruction of the anti-Christian powers only after the
time of Christ's Parousia. The supposition, which de Wette
holds possible for the removal of this difference, that the
author of the Epistle to the Hebrews "thought only of the
triumph of the gospel among the nations, even as Paul also
expected the universal diffusion of the gospel and the con-
version of the Jews before the appearing of Christ," has little
probability, considering the absolute and unqualified character
of the expression here chosen: οἱ ἐξ θρόν ἀλτοῦ.

Ver. 14. Proof of the possibility of the εἰς τὸ διονεκὲς
ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 12, from the needlessness for
a fresh sacrifice, since Christ has already, by the sacrifice once
offered, brought in perfect sanctification for His believers.—
The accentuation: μὴ γὰρ προσφορά, merits the preference
tο μὴ γὰρ προσφορά, to which Bengel is inclined, and which
has been followed by Ewald, since by the former the words
acquire an immediate reference to Christ.—τὸν ἁγιασμένον
them that are sanctified, sc. as regards the decree of God. The
participle present is used substantively, as ii. 11, without
respect to time.

Vv. 15-18. That there is no need of any further expiatory
sacrifice, the Scripture also testifies. This Scripture proof
the author derives from the declaration, Jer. xxxi. 31-34,
already adduced at viii. 8 ff., in that he here briefly com-
prehends the same in its two main features.

Ver. 15. Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ημῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον] More-
over, also, the Holy Ghost bears witness to us.— ημῖν] has
reference to the Christians generally. Without warrant is it
limited by Raphael, Wolf, Baumgarten, and others to the
author of the epistle ("the Holy Ghost attests my statement ").
— τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον] for it is the Holy Spirit of God who in
the passage indicated speaks by the prophet.—The subject in
εἰρηκέναι is God, in that the author makes his own the words
λέγει κύριος following in ver. 16, although, they form an
originally constituent part of the citation, in such wise that
μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰρηκέναι . . . ἐκεῖνας forms the former member of
the proposition; and to this former member all the rest, from
διδοῦ νόμοις μοι to the end of ver. 17, is then opposed by
the author as a concluding member, by means of λέγει κύριος.
The supposition that the second, or concluding, member of the citation begins only with ver. 17, and that thus before this verse a λέγει, an εἰτ' ἐπιλέγει, a τότε ἐληκέν, or something of the kind is to be supplemented (Primasius, Clarius, Zeger, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Limborch, Wolf, Carpzov, Stuart, Heinrichs, Alford, Conybeare, Reuss, Hofmann, and others), is to be rejected,—although the main consideration, about which the author is quite specially concerned, follows only in ver. 17,—because it is opposed to the literary accuracy elsewhere prevailing in the Epistle to the Hebrews. For the same reason, too, the διήλεγεν, which several MSS. (but only among those of late date) and some translations add at the close of ver. 16, is to be regarded as a gloss.

Ver. 16. Instead of τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ, viii. 10, the author here places πρὸς αὐτοῦς. Certainly not unintentionally. By means of the more general πρὸς αὐτοῦς, the more definite reference to the natural descendants of the patriarch as the recipients of the New Covenant receded into the background. — διήλεγεν attaches itself here also only to ἧν διαθήσομαι; here it is true, with yet greater grammatical ruggedness than at viii. 10.

Ver. 17. The καί at the beginning of the verse is held by Böhm and Kuinoel to be a further particle of citation on the part of the author; while Hofmann will have it translated by "also." Better, however, because more naturally and simply, is it taken as a constituent part of the Scripture citation.

Ver. 18. Τοῖτων is not a neuter (Böhm: "ut, quicquid esset peccati, in universum designaretur"), but feminine, inasmuch as it refers back to ἀμαρτίων and ἀνομίων, ver. 17.—οὐκέτι sc. ἐστὶν, there expiatory sacrifice no longer takes place, sc. because in connection with such a state it has become unnecessary.

Ver. 19-25. The dogmatic investigations are at an end; on the ground thereof the author now applies himself anew to exhortations to the readers. These are at first of the same kind as those before addressed to the readers, and are distinguished from the latter only by their greater copiousness of detail, afterwards, however, assume a greater generality of contents. These are followed by the close of the epistle.
Vv. 19-25. The readers, in possession of such an exalted High Priest, and of the blessings obtained by Him, are with decision and constancy to persevere in the Christian faith, to incite each other to love and good works, and not—as had become a practice with some—to forsake the assemblies for Christian worship. So much the more should they thus act, since the Parousia is near at hand. Comp. on vv. 19-25 the similar exhortation iv. 14, 16.

Ver. 19. Ὑπὲρ] Conclusion from the investigations made chap. v. onwards.— ἀδελφοί[ iiii. 1, 12, xiii. 22.— παρήγησιν] not: freedom or authorisation (Vatablus, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Ernesti, Schulz, Böhme, Stengel, al.), but: firm, joyful confidence.— εἰς τὴν εἰσόδου τῶν ἀγίων] in respect to entrance into the sanctuary, i.e. of entering into the sanctuary, or heavenly Holy of Holies (τῶν ἁγίων, of the same import as εἰς τὰ ἁγία, comp. ix. 8). Arbitrarily would Heinrichs refer the words to the entering of Jesus, in that he regards εἰς τὴν εἰσόδου τῶν ἁγίων. ἐν τῷ αἵμα. Ἰησοῦ as equivalent to εἰς τὴν εἰσόδου Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, which is impossible.— ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ] upon the ground, or by virtue of the blood of Jesus. Belongs to the whole proposition: ἐχοντες παρήγησιν εἰς τὴν εἰσόδου τῶν ἁγίων, not merely to εἰσόδου (Akersloot, Storr, Schulz, Böhme, Klee, Paulus, Bleek, Bisping). The passage, ix. 25, by no means pleads in favour of the latter mode of apprehending it, since at ix. 25, but not in the present passage, ἐν can be understood in the material sense: “with;” the reference of the ἐν αἵματι in the two places is an entirely different one.

Ver. 20. Ἡ] sc. εἰσόδου. Not as yet with ὅδων (Carpzov, Stuart, and others) is ἡ to be combined as indication of object, in such wise that merely πρόσφατον καὶ ἡ ἡσαν would form the predicate; but still less is παρήγησιν (Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, al.) to be supplemented to ἡ. For against the former decides the order of the words, against the latter the manifest correspondence in which εἰσόδου, ver. 19, and ὅδων, ver. 20, stand to each other. The ὅδως, namely, characterized ver. 19 as to its goal (as εἰσόδου τῶν ἁγίων), is, ver. 20, further described with regard to its nature and constitution (as ὅδως πρόσφατος and ἡ ἡσα). — ἡν ἐγεναινοσαν ἡμῖν ὅδων πρόσ-
which He for us (in order that we may walk in it) has consecrated (inaugurated, in that He Himself first passed through it) as a new (newly-opened, hitherto inaccess- ible, comp. ix. 8; Theodoret: ὥς τότε πρῶτον φανεῖσαν) and living way. πρόσφατος, originally: fresh slain; then in general: fresh, new, recens. See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 37 ff. — ζῶσα, however, that way or entrance is called, not because it “ever remains, and needs not, like that into the earthly sanctuary, to be consecrated every year by fresh blood.” (Bleek, after the precedent of Ernesti, Schulz, and others; comp. also Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact), but because it is living in its efficiency (comp. ὁ ἁρτος ὁ ζῶν, John vi. 51), in such wise that it leads to the goal of everlasting life. The contrast is found in the inefficaciousness of the entrance into the earthly holy of holies. — διὰ τοῦ κατα- πετάσματος, τούτεστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ] through the veil, that is to say, His flesh. As the high priest must pass through the concealing veil, in order to come within the earthly Holy of Holies, thus also the flesh of Christ formed a veil, which must first be withdrawn or removed (comp. Matt. xxvii. 51; Mark xv. 38; Luke xxiii. 45) ere the entrance into the heavenly Holy of Holies could be rendered possible. — διὰ] is to be taken locally,— wrongly is it understood by Stein as instrumental,— and is not to be combined with ἐνεκαίνωσεν (Böhme, Delitzsch, Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 253; Alford, Kluge), but is to be attached to ὅδων, as a nearer definition, standing upon a parallel with πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν, seeing that an ὄνασαν or ἀγονασαν naturally suggests itself by way of supplement. — τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ] depends immediately upon the preceding διὰ, not first, as Peirce and Carpzov maintain, upon α τοῦ καταπετάσματος to be supplied.

Ver. 21 is still governed by ἔχοντες, ver. 19. As τὰ ἁγία, ver. 19, was chosen as a general designation instead of the special τὰ ἁγία ἁγίων, so here (comp. v. 6, vii. 1, 3, al.) the general ἱερία stands in the sense of the special ἀρχιερία, and μέγαν is, as iv. 14, expression of the exaltedness of this High Priest (against Stuart, Klee, Stein, Ewald, McCaull, and others, who take ἱερία μέγαν together as a designation of the High Priest). — ἐπὶ τῶν ὀίκων τοῦ θεοῦ] over the house of God.
Comp. iii. 6. Theodoret, Oecumenius, Estius, Grotius, Calov, Tholuck, Stengel, Hofmann (Schriftenver. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 454), Maier, Kurtz, and others understand by these words, in accordance with iii. 2, 6, the household of God, or the believers, by which, however, the unity of the figure is needlessly destroyed. The allusion is to heaven or the heavenly sanctuary, as the dwelling-place of God, over which Christ rules as High Priest.  

Ver. 22. Προσερχόμεθα] let us then draw nigh, sc. to this ἄγα, ver. 19, and this ἱερεύς μέγας, ver. 21, or, what is, as regards the matter itself, not different, to God; in such wise that προσερχόμεθα is here, like τοὺς προσερχόμενους, ver. 1, used absolutely, or else receives its supplementation from the τοῦ θεοῦ immediately preceding. Comp. vii. 25, xi. 6; also iv. 16.— μετ' ἀληθινῆς καρδίας] with true, i.e. sincere heart, so that we are really in earnest about the προσερχόμεθα.— εν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως] in firm conviction of faith, firm inner certainty of faith. Comp. vi. 11. Epexegeesis of μετ' ἀληθινῆς καρδίας, for the clearer defining of the contents thereof. — ἐρραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνείδησεως πονηρᾶς] inasmuch as our hearts have been sprinkled from an evil conscience, so that we have been delivered from the same (see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 577). Indication of the subjective qualification for the προσερχόμεθα, while vv. 19—21 contains the objective qualification for the same. What is meant, is the justification of Christians through Christ's bloody sacrificial death (ix. 14), after the analogy of the sprinkling with blood, whereby the first Levitical priests were consecrated and qualified to approach God. Comp. Ex. xxix. 21; Lev. viii. 30.

Ver. 23. The words: καὶ λέλουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὑδατί καθαρό, are, by the Peshito, by Primasius, Faber Stapulensis, Luther, Estius, Wolf, Baumgarten, Storr, Kuinoel, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehn (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 741, Obs.), Alford, Maier, Kluge, and others, combined in one, and referred still to προσερχόμεθα, ver. 22, as

1 That Delitzsch—who is followed therein by Alford—will have us understand, as the ἄγα τοῦ θεοῦ in our passage at the same time "the church" and "the heaven of glory," can be looked upon only as an instance of manifest error.
a second participial clause. Better, nevertheless, shall we conjoin καί with κατέχωμεν; so that λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὑδατί καθαρφ becomes a parenthetic clause, which specifies the subjective qualification to the κατέχειν, exactly as ἐφρατομένοι κ.τ.λ., ver. 22, brought out the subjective qualification to the προσέρχεσθαι. In connection with the first-named construction,¹ the rhythmical symmetry of the members, vv. 22, 23, would be needlessly sacrificed, and κατέχωμεν stand there too much torn from the context. For the supposition that καί might have been wanting before κατέχωμεν, since a third verb (κατανοῶμεν) follows at ver. 24, the placing of the καί was thus necessary only before this last, is erroneous; inasmuch as the author could hardly, from the very outset, comprehend ver. 24 in thought with ver. 22, and ver. 23, on the contrary, only brings in later that which is observed at ver. 24 as a new and independent exhortation, while προσερχόμεθα . . . καὶ κατέχωμεν stands together in the closest inner relation (as a decided approaching to the communion with God opened up by Christ, and a persevering maintenance of the same). — λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὑδατί καθαρφ inasmuch as our body has been washed with pure water [washed as regards the body with pure water]. Reference to the sanctifying of Christians by Christian baptism. Comp. Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5. Analogon in the Levitical domain the washings, Ex. xxix. 4, xxx. 19 ff., xl. 30 ff.; Lev. xvi. 4. To find denoted in a merely figurative sense (to the exclusion of baptism), with Calvin [Owen] and others, in accordance with Ezek. xxxvi. 25: the communication of the Holy Ghost; or, with Limborch, Ebrard, and others: the being cleansed from sins; or, with [Piscator and] Reuss: the blood of Christ (“Il s'agit ici, comme dans toute cette partie de l'épître, du sang de Christ. C'est ce sang, qui nous lave mieux que l'eau des Lévites”); or, with Schlichting: “Christi spiritus et doctrina, seu spiritualis

¹ A third mode of combining, followed by Hofmann (Schriftbew. II. 2, 2 Aufl. p. 178 f.), according to which ἵηματιμε ρίμ is separated by a full stop from that which precedes, and is conjoined with κατέχωμεν, will — since thereby the harmonic clause-formation of the whole delicately-arranged period, vv. 19-23, is rudely shattered — hardly meet with approval on any side. The period so euphoniously commenced would be lacking in the appropriate conclusion, the supposed new clause in the appropriate beginning.
illa aqua, qua suos perfundit Christus, ipsius etiam sanguine non excluso," we are forbidden by the addition of τὸ σῶμα, which implies likewise the reminiscence of an outward act. — καθαρό] that which is pure, and in consequence thereof also makes pure. — κατέχομεν τὴν ὄμολογίαν τῆς ἐκπίθος ἀκλίνη] let us hold fast the confession of hope as an unswerving one. — κατέχομεν] inasmuch as the ὄμολογία became at once, with baptism, the possession of believers. — τὴν ὄμολογίαν] may here be taken actively (the confessing of the hope), but it may also be taken passively (the confession which has as its subject the Christian's hope). — ἀκλίνη] stronger than βεθαίαν, iii. 6, 14. — πιστῶ γὰρ ὃ ἐπαγγειλαμένος] for faithful (so that He keeps that which He promises; comp. 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13; 1 Thess. v. 24) is He who has given the promises (namely, God). Ground of encouragement for the κατέχεων.

Vv. 24, 25. Progress from that which the Christian has to do with regard to himself, to that which he has to do with regard to his fellow-Christians. — καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλοις] and let us direct our view to each other (comp. iii. 1), so that we may endeavour to emulate the good and salutary which we discover in our neighbour, and, on the other hand, to put away the bad and hurtful in ourselves and him. For limiting the expression, with Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Michaelis, ad Pietro, Bleek, and others, to the first-named particular, no reason exists; since the positive εἰς παροξυσμὸν κ.τ.λ. is yet followed by the negative μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες κ.τ.λ. — εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων] that incitement to love and good works may arise therefrom. — παροξυσμὸς] Acts xv. 39; Deut. xxix. 38; Jer. xxxii. 37, and elsewhere in the bad sense: irritation, i.e. embittering. Here, however, as occasionally with the classic writers, the verb is used (comp. Xen. Mem. iii. 3, 13: Ἐπὶ ἀλλὰ μὴν οὕτω εὐφωνίᾳ τοσοῦτον διαφέρονσιν Ἀθηναῖοι τῶν ἄλλων, οὕτε σωμάτων μεγέθει καὶ ρόμη, οὕτως φιλοτιμίᾳ, ἤπερ μᾶλλον παρεξύνει πρὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ ἔντιμα; Thucyd. vi. 88, al.) in the good sense. — ἀγάπη] brotherly love, and καλὰ ἔργα, the single manifestations thereof.

Ver. 25. Μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τισῶν] while not forsaking (ceasing to frequent), as
is the custom with some, our own assembly, and thereby, in connection with the already prevalent tendency to apostasy from Christianity, setting a pernicious example. — τὴν ἐπισυναγωγήν ἑαυτῶν] is taken by Calvin, Böhme, Bleek, and others as designation of the Christian congregation or Christian religious society itself. But in this case the only signification which could be attached without violence to ἐγκαταλείπειν would be that of apostasy from Christianity; to understand the expression, in that case, of the leaving to its fate of the Christian church, sunk in poverty, peril, and distress, by the refusal of acts of assistance (Böhme), or of the escape from the claims of the church to the cherishing and tending of its members, by the neglecting of the common religious assemblies (Bleek); would not be very natural. We are prevented, however, from thinking of an actual apostasy from Christianity by the addition καθώς θὸς τισὶν, according to which the ἐγκαταλείπειν was an oft-recurring act on the part of the same persons. τὴν ἐπισυναγωγήν ἑαυτῶν, therefore, is best explained as: the assembling of ourselves, in order to be united together (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 1), i.e. our own religious assemblies. — ἑαυτῶν] has great emphasis; for otherwise the simple ἑαυτῶν would have been written. It has its tacit opposition in the alien, i.e. Jewish religious assemblies, and contains the indication that the τῶν gave the preference to the frequenting of the latter. — ἅλλα παρακαλοῦντες] sc. ἑαυτοὺς (comp. iii. 13) or ἅλληκους, which is easily supplemented from the foregoing ἑαυτῶν: but animating one another, namely, to the uninterrupted frequenting of our own Christian assemblies. Quite unsuitably, Hofmann (Schrifthev. II. 2, 2 Aufl. p. 379) would supply in thought to παρακαλοῦντες, as its object: τὴν ἐπισυναγωγήν. — καὶ τοσοῦτον μᾶλλον ὅσο βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν] and that so much the more, as ye see the day itself drawing nigh. Reinforcing ground of obligation to the παρακαλεῖν. — βλέπετε] The transition from the first to the second person plural augments the significance of that which has been remarked, since the author can appeal to the verdict of the readers themselves for the truth thereof. — The ἡμέρα is the day καὶ ἔξοχήν, the day of the coming in of the Parousia of Christ, which the author thinks of as quite near at hand.
(comp. ver. 37), and which the readers themselves already saw drawing nigh in the agitations and commotions which preceded the Jewish war, such as had already begun to appear.

Vv. 26–31. In the ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐπισωπαγογήν ἑαυτῶν, ver. 25, there was manifested a lukewarmness in Christianity, which might lead to apostasy therefrom. In warning notes, therefore, the author points out that the man who knowingly slights recognised Christian truth, and sins against it, will infallibly be overtaken by the punitive judgment of God. To be compared vi. 4–8.

Ver. 26. Ἐκουσίως γὰρ ἀμαρτάνοντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἁληθείας For if we sin wilfully (i.e. against our better knowledge and conscience) after having received the certain knowledge of the truth; so that we become recreant to Christianity (comp. ver. 29), to which the ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐπισωπαγογήν ἑαυτῶν forms the dangerous preliminary step. The ἐκουσίως ἀμαρτάνοντες are the opposite of the ἀγνοοῦντες καὶ πλανώμενοι, v. 2, and the participle present indicates the continuous or habitual character of the action. — ἡ ἁληθεία is the truth absolutely, as this has been revealed by Christianity. The ἐπίγνωσις of this absolute truth, however, embraces, along with the recognition thereof by the understanding, also the having become conscious of its bliss-giving effects in one's own experience. Comp. vi. 4, 5.— οὐκέτι περὶ ἀμαρτίων ἀπολειπέσται θυσία] there remains in relation to sins, i.e. for the expiation thereof, no more sacrifice; inasmuch, namely, as the sin-cancelling sacrifice of Christ, the communion of which we then renounce, is a sacrifice which takes place only once, is not further repeated, while at the

1 The assertion of Kurtz, that, if this remark were true, the author would be expressing "a dogma in its consequences truly subversive, and destructive of the whole Christian soteriology," inasmuch as it would "imperatively follow therefrom, that even under the New Covenant only those who transgressed from ignorance and error could find forgiveness with God for Christ's sake, while all who had been guilty of a conscious and intentional sin must beyond hope of deliverance fall victims to the judgment of everlasting damnation," is a precipitate one, since the special limitation within which the expression ἐκουσίως ἀμαρτάνων was used was naturally afforded to the reader, quite apart from the investigation already preceding at vi. 4 ff., even from our section itself.
same time the Levitical sacrifices are unable to effect the cancelling of sins. Bengel: Fructus 'ex sacrificio Christi semper patet non repudiantibus; qui autem repudiant, non aliud habent. 

Ver. 27. φοβερά δὲ τις ἕκδοξήν κρίσεως] sc. ἀπολείπεται: but there remains indeed, etc. The ἀπολειτόμενον is of two kinds, something subjective (φοβερά . . κρίσεως) and something objective (πυρὸς . . ὑπεναντίους).— φοβερά ἕκδοξήν κρίσεως] denotes not “a terrible banquet of judgment,” as Ewald strangely translates it, nor is it any hypallage in the sense of ἕκδοξήν κρίσεως φοβερᾶς, as Jac. Cappellus, Heinrichs, and Stengel suppose, and to which the choice is left open by Wolf. The terribleness is transferred to the subjective domain of the expectation. For one who has sinned against better light and knowledge, even the expectation of the divine judgment is something terrible.— φοβερά τις] an exceedingly terrible one. On the τις, added with rhetorical emphasis to adjectives of quality or quantity, comp. Kühner, II. p. 331; Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 160.— κρίσις] is used here, too, as ix. 27, quite without restriction, of the divine judgment in general. That this will be a punitive judgment is not indicated by the word; it only follows from the connection.— In the second member the emphasis rests upon the preposed πυρὸς, on which account also the case of the following participle conforms itself to this, not to ζῆλος. We cannot, therefore, with Luther and others, combine together πυρὸς ζῆλος in a single notion ("fiery zeal," sc. of the divine wrath). The πῦρ is personified, and in such way a ζῆλος, a fury, ascribed to the same. There was probably present to the mind of the author in connection with the last member, LXX. Isa. xxvi. 11: ζῆλος λήψεται λαόν ἀπαλευτον καὶ νῦν πῦρ τον ὑπεναντίους ἔδεται. — τοὺς ὑπεναντίους] the adversaries. The empiric usage of the term forbids our attaching to it, with Braun and Paulus, on account of the ὑπό, the notion of secret foes. See Meyer on Col. ii. 14, 4 Aufl. p. 331.

Vv. 28, 29. That in reality the consequences of an ἐκοινώσων ἀμαρτάνειν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἑπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας are so terrible as was asserted at ver. 27, the author renders evident by a conclusion a minore ad majus. Apostasy from the
Mosaic law itself is punishable with death; how much greater thus must be the punishment of him who, by apostasy from Christ, has treated with contumely the Son of God, of whose redeeming benefits he has already had experience! With the conclusion in vv. 28, 29 we may compare, as regards the thoughts, ii. 2, 3, xii. 25; as regards the form, however, the utterances just noticed differ from that before us, in the respect that there the first member of the comparison appears as a hypothetical premise, here as an independent statement. 

HE who has set at nought the Mosaic law, has in opposition to his better knowledge and conscience violated or broken it, dies, without any one compassinating him, upon the deposition of two or three witnesses. Although death was imposed as the punishment for many single transgressions of the Mosaic law (Ex. xxxi. 14; Lev. xviii. 14; Deut. xxii. 22 ff., al.), yet the author certainly has reference, as is evident from the addition: ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν, and as is required also by the parallel relation to ver. 29, quite specially to the ordinance, Deut. xvii. 2–7 [cf. also Num. xv. 30, 31], in conformity with which the punishment of death was inflicted upon the man who, by idolatry, apostatized from Jehovah. Comp. l.c. ver. 6, LXX.: ἐπὶ δυσὶν μάρτυσιν ἢ ἐπὶ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν ἀποθανεῖται.—ἐπὶ] as ix. 17: upon condition that two or three witnesses depose against him.

Ver. 29. Of how much more severe punishment, think ye, will he be counted worthy, who, etc.—With δοκεῖτε the author leaves the decision to the readers, inasmuch as on the question how this will be given, no doubt whatever can prevail. — ἀξιωθησαν] sc. by God at the judgment. — τιμωρία in the N. T. only here. — ὁ καταπατήσας] who has trodden under foot, as though it were a contemptible, useless thing. A strong expression. Designation of the bold contemning and insulting of Him who is nevertheless the Son of God, and with whom one has become personally acquainted as the Redeemer. — τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης] the blood of the covenant, i.e. the blood which Christ shed for the sealing of the New Covenant for the redemption of mankind. Comp. ix. 15 ff. — κοινόν] either: as common, ordinary blood, not distinguished in any respect
from other blood (Peshito, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Claris, Beza, Schlichting, Bengel, Schulz, Stuart, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, and others), or—what is better, because stronger, and on that account more in accord with the other statements—as impure (Vulgate, Luther, Grotius, Carpzov, Michaelis, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 769; Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others), i.e. as the blood of a transgressor, which Christ must be, if He was not the Son of God and the Redeemer. — ἐν δὲ ἡμᾶςθην] contrasting addition to κοινὸν ἡγεσάμενον, and paronomasia: by the communion with which he was nevertheless sanctified, or: the sanctifying efficacy of which he has nevertheless felt in his own person.— καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυψισάς] and has done despite to the Spirit of Grace, sc. by scorn and mockery of the wondrous unfolding of that Spirit's power in the life of the Christians. The compound form ἐνυψισίζων τινι or τί, found, apart from the poets (Soph. Phil. 342), only with the later Greeks. In the N. T. a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον.—τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος] the Holy Spirit, who is a gift of the divine grace.

Ver. 30. The χείρονος ἄξιοβήσεται τιμωρίας, ver. 29, is a matter for the most serious consideration. This the declarations of God Himself in the Scriptures prove.— οἴδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπτόντα] for we know Him who hath spoken, i.e. we know what it means when God makes predictions like those which follow.— The first utterance is without doubt from Deut. xxxii. 35. It deviates from the Hebrew original (יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל), but still more from the LXX. (ἐπὶ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδῶσεως); on the other hand, it agrees to so great an extent with Paul's mode of citing the same in Rom. xii. 19, that even the λέγει κυρίος, which is wanting in Deuteronomy, is found in both these places. This agreement arises, according to Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, and Reiche, Comm. Crit. p. 97 (comp. also Böhme), from a deriving of the citation from the Epistle to the Romans; while according to Meyer (at Rom. xii. 19, 2, 3, and 4 Aufl.) the identical words: έγώ ἀνταποδῶσω, are to be traced back to the paraphrase of Onkelos (דבר נחום) as the common source employed by Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Yet with much greater
probability is the coincidence to be explained by the supposition that the utterance, in the form adopted here as with Paul, had become proverbial. This was also the later view of Meyer (see Meyer on Rom. xii. 19, 5 Aufl. p. 551 f.). — The second utterance: κρινει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, attached by means of καὶ πάλιν (i. 5, ii. 13), is found in like form, Deut. xxxii. 36 and Ps. cxxxv. 14. This κρινει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ has, in the mind of the author of the epistle, the general signification of the holding of judgment upon His people, so that the recreant members among the same will not be able to escape punishment. Different is the sense of the original: He shall do justice for His people. Delitzsch, it is true, who is followed therein by Maier, Kluge, Moll, and Hofmann, will not acknowledge such diversity of the sense. But he is able to remove such diversity only, in that—manifestly led thereto in the interest of a mistaken harmonistic method—he foists upon the author of the epistle the statement: "the Lord will do justice for His church, and punish its betrayers and blasphemers;" a statement of which the first half—as opposed to the grammatical meaning of κρινει, as well as to the connection with ver. 26, since this latter leads of necessity not to the idea of rendering justice to any one, but exclusively to the idea of punitive judgment—is only arbitrarily imported.

At ver. 31 the whole train of thought, vv. 26–30, is briefly summed up, and with this the warning brought to a close. Fearful is it to fall into the hands of the living God, i.e. to fall a victim to the divine punitive judgment. Comp. Matt. x. 28; Luke xii. 4, 5. — ἐμπίπτειν εἰς χείρας κυρίου occurs also with the LXX. 2 Sam. xxiv. 14, 1 Chron. xxi. 13, Ecclus. ii. 18, but is there used in the mild sense, in that it is opposed to falling into the hands of men. Bengel: Bonum est incidere cum fide; temere terrible.— θεοῦ ξῶντος] see at iii. 12.

Vv. 32–39. There follows after the warning an arousing. Mindful of the Christian manliness which the readers had displayed in former days, they are not to lose Christian joyfulness, but rather with patience to persevere in the Christian life; for only quite a short time will now elapse
before the return of Christ and the coming in of the promised fulness of blessing. Comp. vi. 9 ff.—Theodoret: Ἐπειδή δὲ ταῦτα ἰκανὰ ἦν αὐτῶς ἁνίᾶσαί, ὑλογρίαν αἰνητόμενα καὶ τῶν θείων ἀμέλειαν, κεράννυσι τῶν εἰρημένων τὸ αὐστηρόν τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν ἱδή κατορθωμένων. Οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως εἷς προθυμίαν διεγείρει, ὡς τῶν οἰκείων κατορθωμάτων μνήμη. — Of the facts themselves, of which mention is made vv. 32–34, nothing further is known from other sources. That the author, as Bleek, II. 2, p. 707, thinks possible, had before his mind "the whole first period of the Christian church at Jerusalem, in which the church still held firmly together, and particularly the persecutions which preceded and followed the martyrdom of Stephen," is hardly to be supposed. For only in a very indirect way could praise be bestowed upon the recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews for their behaviour under these afflictions, seeing they formed a second generation of the Palestinian Christians, who, according to xii. 4, had as yet been spared persecutions having a bloody termination.

Ver. 32. Φωτισθέντες] after ye were illumined, i.e. after ye had recognised Christ as the Saviour of men, and ranked yourselves among His confessors. Comp. vi. 4.—ἀθλητῶν] a word of the later Greek style, in the N. T., however, αἴανξ λεγόμενον, combines with παθημάτων into a single idea: contest of sufferings. Chrysostom: οὐχ ἄπλάς εἴπεν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε, ἀλλὰ μετὰ προσθήκης τοῦ πολέμου. Καὶ οὐκ εἰπεν πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ἀθλησιν, ὅπερ ἑστιν ἐγκομίων ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπαληθῶν μεγίστων.—ὑπομένειν] to sustain, here with the subsidiary notion of stedfastness and unweariedness.

Ver. 33. Τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δὲ] on the one hand . . . on the other; partly . . . partly. A genuinely Greek formula (comp. Wetstein ad loc.). In the N. T. only here.—τοῦτο μὲν ὁνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψειν θεατρίζομεν] in that, on the one hand, by conditions of infamy (xi. 26, xiii. 13) and by tribulations, ye were made a spectacle (were exposed publicly to reviling). ὁνειδισμοῖ (belonging to the later period of the Greek language; see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 512) has reference to the assaults upon honour and good name, θλίψεις to assaults upon the person (the life) and outward possessions.—θεατρίζομενοι] comp. 1 Cor. iv. 9: θεατρον
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εγενθήμεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις. The verb only here and with the Church Fathers.—τοῦτο δὲ κοινωνοὶ 
...γενηθέντες] and, on the other hand, ye became associates (fellow-sufferers) . . . sc. by the administering of consolation, 
and by efforts for the alleviation of their sufferings. κοινωνοὶ 
γενηθέντες is elucidated by συνεπαθήσατε, ver. 34, thus 
alludes equally as the first half of the sentence to historic 
facts. Arbitrarily therefore Ebrard: the expression indicates 
that the readers, "by the act of their conversion, had become 
once for all associates in that community, of which they 
knew that it thus fared, or was thus wont to fare with it." 
—τῶν οἴνωσ ἀναστρέφομένων] of those who were in such 
condition (sc. ἐν θλίψεως καὶ ὀνειδισμοῖς). Kypke, Storr, 
Böhme, Kuinoel, and others supplement the οἴνωσ from the 
πολλὴν ἀθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων, ver. 32: of those who 
thus walked, i.e. sustained with great stedfastness the contest 
of sufferings. In favour of this interpretation the authority 
of the ordinary Biblical use of ἀναστρέφομαι may no doubt 
be urged. Since, however, πολλὴν ἀθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε 
παθημάτων, ver. 32, is the general statement, which after 
wards, ver. 33, separates into two special subdivisions by 
means of τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δέ, so οἴνωσ in the second 
member can only refer back to the immediately foregoing 
characterization in the first member.

Ver. 34. Confirmatory elucidation of ver. 33, and that in 
such form that καὶ . . . συνεπαθήσατε corresponds to the 
latter half of ver. 33, and καὶ . . . προσεδέχασθε to the former 
half thereof.—καὶ γὰρ τῶν δεσμῶν συνεπαθήσατε] for ye 
had both compassion (iv. 15) on the prisoners, in that ye 
estowed upon them active sympathy.—καὶ τὴν ἀρπαγήν 
tῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.] and also accepted (comp. xi. 35) 
with joy the plundering of your goods, with joy, or willingly 
submitted to it. Wrongly Heinrichs, according to whom 
προσεδέχεσθαι here expresses, at the same time, the idea of 
"exspectare" and of "recipere," so that we have to translate: 
"ye looked for it."—γινώσκοντες ἐχειν ἐαυτοῖς κρείττων 
ὑπαρξία καὶ μένουσαν] indication of motive for καὶ τὴν 
ἀρπαγήν κ.τ.λ.: knowing that ye have for yourselves (as your 
true possession) a better property (Acts ii. 45), and that an
abiding one, namely, the spiritual, everlasting blessings of Christianity, of which no power of the earth can deprive you. Comp. Matt. vi. 20; Luke xii. 33.

Ver. 35. Exhortation deduced from vv. 32–34. The self-sacrificing zeal for Christianity displayed in the past ought to animate the readers to a joyful maintenance of the same likewise in the present, since of a truth this very stedfastness in zeal leads to the longed-for goal.— ἀποβάλλειν] here not the involuntary losing (Jac. Cappellus, Lösner, and others), but the voluntary casting from one, or letting fall away (comp. Mark x. 50), as though it were a question only of a worthless, useless thing; μὴ ἀποβάλλειν thus the same as κατέχειν, ver. 23, iii. 6, 14, and κρατεῖν, iv. 14, vi. 18.— τὴν παρθησίαν ὑμῶν] your joyful confidence, sc. towards Christ as your Saviour. The free, courageous confession of Christianity before the world, of which Beza, Grotius, and others understand the expression, is only the consequence of the παρθησία, which here, too, as ver. 19, iii. 6, iv. 16, denotes a frame of the mind.— ἦτε] which of a truth. Introduction of a well-known, indisputable verity.— μεγάλην μυσθαποδοσίαν] great rewarding retribution (see at ii. 2), namely, the promised everlasting blessedness (ver. 36).— The present ἐχει, although the μυσθαποδοσία is as yet something future, of the undoubted certainty of its containing in itself, or having as a consequence.

Ver. 36. Justification of the foregoing exhortation μὴ ἀποβάλλετε. It is true the readers have already distinguished themselves by Christian manliness; but what is needing to them in order to reach the goal is stedfastness and perseverance, since they are beginning to grow lukewarm in Christianity. ὑπομονῆς is therefore, as the principal notion, emphatically prefixed.— τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ] that which God wills, or requires, i.e. in accordance with the context: not merely the having become believers in Christ, but also the stedfast continuance in faith unto the end. Theophylact: θέλημα θεοῦ τὸ ἄρχει τέλους ὑπομείναι. Against the connection Bleek: τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ is “the sanctification of men by the sacrifice of the Son of God” (vv. 7, 9, 10), and consequently the ποιεῖν thereof the willing submission to be sanctified by the Redeemer. Too general the acceptance of
Tholuck (similarly Stein and others): "the regulation [Normirung] of the life in accordance with the divine will," without further limitation, is that which is meant.—ποιήσαντες refers not to that which, according to ver. 32 ff., has already been accomplished by the readers (Bengel); nor does it denote something simultaneous with the κομίζεσθαι, or rather without regard to time therewith coinciding (Delitzsch, Alford); it is employed in a strictly aoristic sense, and points on to the future, inasmuch as the ποιήσαι must already have become a completed fact, before the κομίζεσθαι, as yet belonging to the future, can be realized.—τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν the promise, i.e. that which is promised, the promised everlasting blessedness.

Vv. 37, 38. Ground of encouragement to the ὑπομονή, of which the readers stood in need, expressed with a free application of the words of Hab. ii. 3, 4, according to the LXX. Continuance is necessary for the readers, and that continuance, indeed, only for a short time, since the return of Christ is to be looked for within a very short space of time, and then to those who have persevered in the faith everlasting life will be the portion conferred; the apostates, on the other hand, shall be overtaken by destruction.—The words ἐτὶ γὰρ μικρὸν δοσον δοσον are not a constituent part of the citation, but proceed from the author himself.—μικρὸν (δοσον δοσον) is found Isa.xxvi. 20, and signifies literally: a little, how much, how much! i.e. a very, very little, or a very short time. μικρὸν (John xiv. 19, xvi. 16 ff.) is nominative,—not accusative to the question when, as is supposed by Bleek (but only in his larger Comm.; otherwise in his later Vorlesungen, p. 417), Bisping, Alford, and Hofmann, as also Meyer on John xiii. 33,—and nothing more than ἐστὶν is to be supplemented to the same (see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 544). The reduplication of the δοσον, however, serves for the significant strengthening of the notion. To be compared Aristoph. Vesp. 213: τι οὐκ ἀπεκοιμήθημεν δοσον δοσον στίλην; Arrian, Indic. xxix. 15: δὲλγόι δὲ αὐτῶν σπείροσαν δοσον δοσον τῆς χώρης. See Hermann, ad Viger. 726. — ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἦξει καὶ οὐ χρονίει and then He that cometh will come, and will not delay.—LXX. i.e. ver. 3: διότι ἐτὶ δρασίς εἰς καιρὸν
In the sense of the prophet, the discourse is of the certain fulfilment of the prophecy regarding the overthrow of the Chaldees. The LXX., however, wrongly translated the words, and as the ἐρχόμενος looked upon either God or the Messiah, of whom also the later Jewish theologians interpreted the passage (see Wetstein ad loc.). Of the Messiah the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also understands the expression, and therefore adds the article ὁ to ἐρχόμενος. In like manner ὁ ἐρχόμενος appears, Matt. x. 3, Luke vii. 19, as a current appellation of the Messiah (based upon Dan. vii. 13; Zech. ix. 9; Mal. iii. 1; Ps. xl. 8 [7], cxviii. 26). Only in the instances mentioned the first appearing of the Messiah upon earth is intended, whereas in our passage (as also very frequently by ἐρχονται elsewhere in the N. T., e.g. 1 Cor. xi. 26; Acts i. 11; Matt. xvi. 27, 28; John xxii. 22, 23) the return of Christ, as of the Messiah crucified upon earth and exalted to heaven, for the consummation of the kingdom of God, is that which is referred to. Arbitrarily Carpzov, Heinrichs, Bloomfield, Ebrard, and others: a coming for the destruction of Jerusalem is here to be thought of.

Ver. 38. Continuation of the citation, yet so that the author adduces the two clauses of Hab. ii. 4 in inverted order. For in the O. T. passage the words read: ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, ὦν εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως μου [ὁ δὲ δίκαιος μου ἐκ πίστεως] ζήσεται. The transposition is intentional, in order to avoid the supplying of the subject ὁ ἐρχόμενος τὸ ὑποστείληται. — ὁ δὲ δίκαιος μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται] my (of God, not of Christ: Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerd. p. 621, Obs.) righteous one (the devout man belonging to me), however, shall live by faith. ἐκ πίστεως, namely, is, in the sense of the author of the epistle, to be referred to ζήσεται. To conjoin it here, too, as Rom. i. 17 and Gal. iii. 11, with δικαιος (so Baumgarten, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Stengel, al.), is inadmissible, because, according to the connection, the design is not to state by what any one becomes δίκαιος, but by what he will obtain the επαγγελία, or, what is the same thing, the ζωή αἰώνιος. The notion of the

Meyer.—Heb. 2 B
πίστις here closely attaches itself to the Hebrew רפה. The meaning, in harmony with the conception prevailing elsewhere in the Epistle to the Hebrews, divergent from that of Paul, is the believing, faithfully enduring trust in God and His promises. The second member, Καὶ εἰς ὑποστείληται κ.τ.λ., has been misunderstood by the LXX. In the Hebrew: הָדְנָנָיָרָי וַּיְּשַׁיְּרִי, behold, lifted up, not upright is his (sc. the Chaldean's) soul in him. — εἰς ὑποστείληται] if so be that he with faint heart draws back. Comp. Gal. ii. 12. In the application: if he becomes lukewarm in Christianity, and apostatizes from the same. υποστείληται does not stand impersonally; nor have we, with Grotius, Maier, and others, to supply τίς, or, with de Wette, Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 487 (less decidedly, 5 Aufl. p. 427), and Buttman, Gramm. des neuest. Sprachgeb. p. 117, to supplement from the foregoing ὁ δικαῖος the general idea ἀνθρωπός as subject. The subject is still the foregoing ὁ δικαῖος μου. This is, moreover, placed beyond doubt, since δικαῖος above is not to be taken in the narrower Pauline sense, but in the general sense of the devout man; he, however, who is in this sense δικαῖος, ceases by the ὑποστείλεσθαι to be a δικαῖος. — ἦς ψυχή μου] μου has reference to God, not to Christ (Oecumenius, as likewise, but with hesitation, Theophylact, as more recently Riehm, l.c.), still less to the author of the epistle (Calvin: perinde accipendum est, ac si ex suo sensu apostolus proferret hanc sententiam. Neque enim illi propositum fuit exacte recitare prophetae verba, sed duntaxat locum notare, ut ad propriorem intuitum invitatet lectores).

Ver. 39. The author expresses his confidence that the readers and himself belong not to the class of men who, because they draw back from Christianity out of cowardly misgiving, fall a prey to destruction, but rather to the class of those who do not grow weary in the Christian faith, and therefore attain to life. This expression of confidence is in its essence an admonition, and indeed a more urgent one than though the direct form of exhortation had been chosen. — To εἰςμέν Grotius, Wolf, Carpzov, Heinrichs, and many others erroneously supplement τέκνα or νιόι. For εἰμι, with the mere genitive, is a well-known genuinely Greek manner of
expressing a relation of *pertaining to* a thing. See Bernhardy, *Syntax*, p. 165; Kühner, II. p. 167. — *eis ἀπώλειαν . . . eis περιποίησιν ζωῆς* Corroborative allusion to the result of the two opposite lines of action. — ἀπώλεια is everlasting perdition, and περιποίησις ψυχῆς (comp. 1 Thess. v. 9: *eis περιποίησιν σωτηρίας*) gaining of the soul, i.e. everlasting life and everlasting blessedness. Wrongly Ebrard: of the bodily deliverance from the judgment impending over Jerusalem, is the discourse to be understood. — Ψυχῆς, moreover, belongs simply to περιποίησιν, not already, as Böhme and Hofmann will have it, to ἀπώλεια, since only περιποίησις, not also ἁπώλη, stood in need of an addition.
CHAPTER XI.

VER. 3. μη ix φανομίνων] Instead thereof there is read in the Peshito: ex illis, quae non cernuntur; in the Vulgate: ex invisibilibus; in Lat. D E: ex non apparentibus. These translations, however, are a mere interpretative gloss, from which the actual existence of an early reading: ix μη φανομίνων, cannot at all be inferred.— The preference to the Recepta: τὰ βλεσίμενα, is merited by the reading τὰ βλεσίμενον, commended to attention by Griesbach, adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford, approved also by de Wette, Tholuck, Delitzsch, and others. To be preferred partly on account of the better attestation by means of A D* E* N, 17, It. Copt. Clem. Didym. Ath. Cyr. al., partly because a mutation from the singular into the plural was more naturally suggested than the opposite.— Ver. 4. Elz.: μαρτυρούντος ἵπτι τοῖς δύροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. Instead of this, A D* N* 17 have: μαρτυρούντος ἵπτι τοῖς δυροῖς αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ. Adopted by Lachm. But the thought: “in that Abel, in regard to his offerings, gave testimony to God,” would be unintelligible, and, moreover, incorrectly and unhappily expressed. Besides, since μαρτυρούντος ο. ο. is the unmistakable nearer definition to ἵμαρτυρθεί, the context naturally points to God as the subject in μαρτυροῦντος. Beyond doubt, therefore, τῷ θεῷ arose only from the eye of the copyist wandering to the τῷ θεῷ at the beginning of the verse.— In place of the Recepta ἀληθείαι, Griesbach (who, however, attaches equal value to the Recepta), Bleek, Scholz, Tisch. Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche rightly read ἀληθεία. In favour of this is decisive, on the one hand, the important authority of A N, 17, 23, 31, 39, al. mult., Syr. utr. Arab. Copt. Armen. Slav. rec. Vulg. Clem. Orig. Athan. Nyss. Chrys. (in comment.) Epiph. Austerius Damasc. Chron. alex. Theodoret (in textu), Photius ms. Occum. Theophyl., on the other hand, the usus loquendi. For neither in taking ἀληθείαι in the middle sense, with Beza, Er. Schmid, Wolf, Carpzov, Baumgarten, nor yet in the passive: praedicatur, laudatur, in omnium ore est, with Jos. Scaliger, Lud. de Dieu, Wetstein, Heinrichs, Stengel, should we be warranted on linguistic grounds; quite apart from the fact that, in the
latter acceptation, the statement would be a very trivial one.

Ver. 5. Elz.: ἔρισσετα. Better attested, however (by A D E N, 109, Epiphani.), is the form ἔρισσετε, which is found likewise in the LXX. Gen. v. 24, in the Cod. Alex. Rightly adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch, and Alford. — In place of the Receptra: τὴς μεταβίσεως αὐτοῦ, we have to write, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, and others, after A D N 17, 67* 80, Vulg. It. Copt., merely: τῆς μεταβίσεως, and in place of the received form εὐρεστηκίναί, with Lachm. Tisch. 1, 2, and 7, Delitzsch, and Alford, the form better attested (by A K L, 46, 71, 73, al., Theophyl.): εὐρεστηκίναι. — Ver. 8. Elz.: καλοῦμενος. But A D (? Vulg. It. Arm. Theodoret, Jer. Bed. have ὁ καλοῦμενος. Approved by Mill. Rightly placed in the text by Lachm. and Tisch. 1. — The article τοῦ, inserted in the Receptra before τόσον, we have, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, and Alford, after A D* N*, to delete; and, after A D* K, many min. Chrys. Damasc. Theophyl., with Lachm. Tisch. 1, 2, and 7, and Alford, to write ἡμιλέων in place of the Receptra ἡμιλλε. — Ver. 9. καὶ παρὼχησεν, which D* E, together with their Latin translation, furnish in place of the Receptra: πιστει παρὼχησεν, is a later corruption, inasmuch as in ver. 9 a fresh evidence is given of the πίστει of Abraham. — σικ γὰν] Elz.: σικ τὴν γὰν. But the article is wanting in A D** K L N, very many cursive, with Damasc. and Oecum. It is suspected by Griesbach, rightly rejected by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford. — Ver. 11. καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλίξιας] Elz.: καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλιξιας ἵτικεν. But ἵτικεν is a later gloss, which is condemned by A D* N* 17, Vulg. It. Copt. Sah. Aeth. utr. Chrys. (codd.). It was already regarded as spurious by Beza, Grotius, Mill (Prolegg. 1355), Bengel; and is rightly deleted by Griesbach, Knapp, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Alford, and others. — Ver. 12. In place of the Receptra ἰγνώνθησαν, Lachm. Bleek, Delitzsch, and Alford read ἰγνώνθησαν, which, on account of the stronger attestation by A D* K, 109, 219* al. (Vulg. It.: ous sun), is to be preferred. — ὡς ἦ ἀμμος.] So already the Editt. Complut. and Steph. 2, then Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, and others. Elz.: ὡςι ἀμμος. Against A D (* and **) E K L N, 23, 37, 46, 47, al. mult., Chrys. (codd.) Damasc. Oecum. Theophyl. — ἦ παρὰ τῷ χιλός] is wanting in D* E, in their Latin translation, and in Aeth. utr. The origin of the omission is to be traced back to a mere error in writing, to which the resemblance of sound of the closing letters in ἀμμος and χιλός gave occasion. — Ver. 13. In place of the Receptra μη
λαβόντες, Lachm. reads μὴ προσδιέξάμενοι. But the Recepta is supported by the considerable authority of D E K L, almost all the cursives, Theodoret, and others; while the reading of Lachm., probably arising from ver. 35, has only the testimony of A in its favour, and is devoid of meaning. For προσδιέξάμενοι could, in accordance with the usage prevailing elsewhere, only signify either the subjective having expected (having awaited), or the subjective having admitted. But neither of these meanings would be compatible with the statement of ver. 13, which would be suitably expressed only if προσδιέξάμενοι could be explained of the objective having received, what is never denoted by this verb. The reading μὴ χορμόσαμενοι in B, some cursives (17, 23, 39, al.), and, with Chrys. (in comment.) Damasc. Theophyl. (adopted by Tisch. 8), was only called forth by the similar turn x. 36, xi. 39. — ἰδόντες] Elz.: ἰδόντες καὶ πιστικὲς. But the addition καὶ πιστικὲς has almost all the witnesses (also B) against it. It is found in only two or three cursives, and is an explanatory gloss to χορμάμενοι. Comp. Chrysostom: οὗτοι πιστεύομεν ἥταν τερι αὐτῶν ὡς καὶ ἀσπάσασθαι αὐτάς; Oecumenius: καὶ ἀσπάσαμενοι πιστικεῖς. — Ver. 15. ἰξιθησα] Elz. Griesbach (who, however, has placed ἰξιθησα on the inner margin), Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Bloomfield: ἰξηλθοῦν. Against A D E Κ 17, 73, 80, Athan. (ed. Bened.; edd. al.: ἰξιθησασαί) Chron. alex. Damasc. — Ver. 16. οὐ δὲ] Elz. Matt. Bloomfield: οὐν δὲ. Against decisive witnesses (A D E, 44, 48, al. perm., Athan. Chrys. Theodoret, Occum.). — Ver. 19. The Recepta ἴγνερειν has the support of D E K L, almost all min. Orig. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. al.; Lachm. and Tisch. 1 read, after A (ευρισκ.), 17, 71, Cyr. Chron. alex.: ἴγνερειν. — Elz.: δυνατὸς; A D**: δύναται. Adopted by Lachm. into the text. — Ver. 20. In place of the Recepta πίστει, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 2, 7, Alford have adopted πίστει καὶ, after A D 17, 23, 37, al., Vulg. It. Chrys. (but not in all ms. and editt.) Theodoret, Damasc. Sedul. Bede. Rightly, καὶ might appear superfluous, and on that account was more likely to be omitted than added. — Ver. 23. Instead of the Recepta διάγαμμα, Lachm. reads δόγμα. But this reading is founded only in a conjectural manner upon A, inasmuch as all the letters of the word except the δ have been torn away from the Codex. Apart from this, δόγμα is found only in one cursive ms. of the twelfth century (Cod. 34). It is probably a gloss from Luke ii. 1. — At the close of ver. 23, D E (as also their Latin translation, as well as three codd. of the Vulgate) further add the words: πιστεὶ μεγάς γενομένος μονος αἰτείν τον αἰγίνησιν κατανοοῦν την ταχυωσιν των αδελφῶν αυτού, as to the spuriousness of which,
although Zeger and Mill (Prolegg. 496) held them to be genuine, no doubt can exist, even on account of the μήνας γενόμενος, ver. 24. They are a complementary addition in conformity to Acts vii. 23 ff. — Ver. 26. τὰν Ἀγνύστου | Elz.: τῶν ἐν Ἀγνύστῳ. Against D E K L N (also against the later supplemener of B), 31, 44, 46, al. plur., Syr. utr. Copt. al., Clem. Euseb. al. Rejected by Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Bleek, Tisch, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, al. The τῶν ἐν Ἀγνύστου, adopted by Lachm., after A and some cursives (3, 71), owes its origin to an uncompleted correction. — Ver. 28. Instead of the Recepta ὀλοθρεύων, A D E, Damasc. have the more correct (ολοθρεύω) form ὀλοθρεύων, which is rightly preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 2, 7, and Alford. — Ver. 29. Elz. has merely ως διὰ ξηράς. But, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, and Alford, we have to add γῆς, after A D* E N, 17, 31, 47, al., Chrys. Theodoret (cod.), and probably all the versions. Since γῆς was no necessary addition, it could easily get omitted. — Ver. 30. Recepta: ἐσσος. But, after A D* E N, 17, 23, 31, al., Chrys. ms., ἐσσων (in favour of which, also, ἐσσων in 37, and Chrys. ms., testifies) is to be looked upon as the original reading. Adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford. Approved by Delitzsch. — Ver. 32. Elz.: εἰπείσψει γάρ με. With Lachm. Tisch. 7 and 8, and Alford, after A D* E N, we have to transpose into: εἰπείσψει με γάρ. — In that which follows, the Recepta reads: περὶ Γαῦδων, Βαράχ τι καὶ Σαμψών καὶ Ἰσράηλ, Δαυίδ τι καὶ Σαμουὴλ. — Instead thereof, Lachm. reads (and so also Tisch. 1 and 8), as it also stands in the Codex Sinaiticus: περὶ Γαῦδων Βαράχ Σαμψών Ἰσράηλ Δαυίδ τι καὶ Σαμουὴλ. On internal grounds neither of these forms of the text commends itself. For, in the case of both, the persons here further mentioned would have been enumerated, in contradiction with the mode of proceeding hitherto observed, without regard to the chronology; inasmuch as, historically, Barak was to have been mentioned before Gideon, Jephthah before Samson, Samuel before David. And yet the regularity with which each time the second name designates a person earlier in a chronological respect, points to an order of succession chosen with design. Observe, further, that in the last member, Δαυίδ τι καὶ Σαμουὴλ, there is nowhere found a variation with regard to the particles. There can thus hardly be room for doubt that the foregoing names also were originally arranged in groups of two. It appears, accordingly, the better course to retain the Recepta, with the two modifications,—that, with D*, καὶ Βαράχ is read in place of the mere Βαράχ; and then, with A, 17, Vulg. Copt. Arm. Clem. Cyr. Al. Epiphani. Ambr. Bede, the mere Σαμψών is read instead of τι
Vv. 1–40. The author defines the nature of the πίστις which he requires of the readers, and then presents to them in chronological succession examples thereof from the days of old.

Ver. 1. The definition. This is no scholastic, exhaustive one, but brings out only that element as the essence of the πίστις, with which the author was here alone concerned; inasmuch as, according to x. 35 ff., just the inner certainty of conviction with regard to the Christian hope, and the steadfast continuance in the same dependent thereon, was that which was lacking to the readers. The words: ἐστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιδομένων ὑπόστασις, are to be taken together as a single statement, and πραγμάτων ἐλεγχὸς οὐ βλεπομένων forms an apposition to ἐλπιδομένων ὑπόστασις: "faith, however, is

1 P. J. L. Huët, De antiquissimorum Dei cultorum, qui in epistolas ad Hebrews capite xi. memorantur, sive diversa eademque una. Lugd. Batav. 1824, 8, pp. 27–82.
a firm confidence in regard to that which is hoped for, a being convinced of things which are invisible." Πίστις is accordingly subject; ἐπικεφαλήσεως ἢπόστασις, as well as πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλέπομένων, predicate; and ἔστιν (which, standing at the beginning, is to be accentuated as the verbum substantivum, see Kühner, I. p. 72) emphatically proposed copula, with the design of attaching to the presupposition, expressed x. 39, of πίστις as a quality present in the readers, the statement as to the nature and essence of this πίστις. Quite similar is the use of ἔστιν in the beginning of the proposition, 1 Tim. vi. 6: ἔστιν δὲ πορισμὸς μέγας ἡ εὐσέβεια μετὰ αὐταρκείας, and Luke viii. 11: ἔστιν δὲ αὐτὴ ἡ παράβολή. Grammatically admissible indeed, but to be rejected—because in that case a thought would be expressed which is not suggested by the connection, and, moreover, a truth in regard to which no contradiction whatever was to be expected on the part of the readers—is it when Bohme (as formerly also Winer, Gramm., 3 and 4 Aufl.; otherwise 5 Aufl. p. 70, 6 Aufl. p. 56, 7 Aufl. p. 58 f.) will have ἔστιν taken as a verb substantive, and ὑπόστασις, as likewise ἔλεγχος, taken as apposition to πίστις: "there is, however, a faith, a confidence," etc.—πίστις without an article, since the author will define the notion of πίστις in general, not exclusively the notion of specifically Christian faith.—ὑπόστασις is by many explained as "reality" (entity, Wesenheit), and placed on a par with οὐσία, substantia, essentia, and the like, which, however, is already proved to be inadmissible from the fact that the notion of "reality" cannot be immediately applied, but, in order to become fitting, must first be changed into that of an "endowing with reality," in such wise that one can then make out the sense: faith clothes things which are not yet at all present with a substance or real existence, as though they were already present. This mode of interpretation was followed by Chrysostom (ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίδι ἀνυπόστατα εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἡ πίστις ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦς χαρίζεται: μᾶλλον δέ, οὐ χαρίζεται ἀλλὰ αὐτό ἐστιν οὐσία αὐτῶν· οὗ ἀνύποστας οὐ παραγέονει, ἀλλὰ ἡ ἐπίς υφιστάσιν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ψυχῇ), Theodoret (δείκνυσιν ὡς υφεστῶτα τὰ μηδέπω γεγενημένα), Oecumenius (πίστις ἔστιν
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αὐτή ἡ ὑπόστασις καὶ οὐσία τῶν ἐλπιζομένων πραγμάτων ἐπείδη γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίδι οὐνομάσα τὰ ἐστὶν ὡς τέως μὴ παρόντα, ἡ πίστις οὐσία τις αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις γίνεται, εἶναι αὐτά καὶ παρείναι τρόπον τινα παρασκευάζομαι διὰ τῶν πιστεύειν εἶναι), Theophylact (οὐσίωσις τῶν μῆτω δινάν καὶ ὑπόστασις τῶν μὴ ὑφεστῶτων), by the Vulgate (substantia), by Ambrose, Augustine, Vatablus (rerum, quae sperantur, essentia), H. Stephanus (illud, quod facit, ut jam existent, quae sperantur), Schlichting, Bengel, Heinrichs, Bisping, and others. — But likewise ὑπόστασις is not to be interpreted either by "fundamentum," with Faber Stapulensis, Clarius, Schulz, Stein, Stengel, Woerner, and others, nor by "placing before one," with Castello (dictitur eorum, quae sperantur, subjectio, quod absentia nobis subjiciat ac proponat, efficiatque ut praesentia esse videantur, nec secus eis assentiamur, quam si cerneremus) and Paulus. For neither of the two affords in itself, without further amplification, a satisfactory, precise notion, quite apart from the fact that the last-mentioned signification can hardly be supported by the testimony of linguistic usage. — The alone correct course is consequently, with Luther, Cameron, Grotius, Wolf, Hüb, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehn, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 702, Alford, Maier, Moll, and others, to take ἐν ὑπόστασις, as at iii. 14 (vid. ad loc.), as inner confidence. — ἐλπιζομένων] gen. objecti: of that (or: with regard to that) which is still hoped for, has not yet appeared in an actual form. The main emphasis in the predicate rests upon ἐν ὑπόστασις, as also upon the concluding words, corresponding in apposition thereto, οὐ βλεπομένων. — πραγμάτων] a being convinced (in mind or heart) of things which are invisible, i.e. a firm inner persuasion of the existence of unseen things, even as though they were manifest to one's eyes. ἐλεγχός here expresses not the active notion of the convincing or assuring (Delitzsch, Riehn, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 703; Moll, Hofmann), but, corresponding to the notion of the forementioned
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troo-Taais, indicates the result of the ἐλέγχειν (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 24), as λόγος that produced by the λέγειν, τύπος that effected by the τύπτειν, etc. To be rejected as unsuitable are the explanations: Proof, argumentum (Vulgate, Ambrose, Schlichting, Wolf, Heinrichs, and others); indicium (Erasmus); demonstratio (Calvin, H. Stephanus, Jac. Cappellus, Bengel, Alford, al.); apprehensio (Clarius); "a certain assurance, guarantee" (Stein), and many others. οὐ βλεπόμενα, however, on account of the objective negation, combines together into the unity of notion "invisible," and is a more general characterization than ἔλπιζόμενα. While the latter is restricted to that which is purely future, the former comprehends at the same time that which is already present, and denotes in general the supra-sensuous and heavenly.— Calvin: Nobis vita aeterna promittitur, sed mortuis; nobis sermo fit de beata resurrectione, interea putredine sumus obvoluti; justi prontumiamur, et habitat in nobis peccatum; audimus nos esse beatos, interea obruimus infinitis miseriis; promittitum bonorum omnium affluentia, prolixum vero esurimus et sitimus; clamat Deus statim se nobis adfuturum, sed videtur surdus esse ad clamores nostros. Quid fieret, nisi spei inniteremur, ac mens nostra praelucente Dei verbo ac Spiritu per medias tenebras supra mundum emergeret?

Ver. 2. Justification of the characteristics mentioned, ver. 1, as those that are essential to the faith. Just this quality of faith was it by which the Old Testament saints were distinguished, and on that account became objects of the divine satisfaction and the divine favour.— ἐν ταύτῃ] not equivalent to διὰ ταύτης (Luther, Vatablus, Calvin, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Bengel, Böhme, and the majority; comp. vv. 4, 39), or: ob eam (Wolf and others), or: touching faith, in point of faith (de Wette, Tholuck, Moll); but: in possession of a faith so constituted (Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 362, Obs.; Bleek, Bloomfield, Kurtz).— μαρτυρεῖσθαι] to obtain a testimony, and that according to the connection, a good, commendatory testimony, whether by words or deeds. Oecumenius: ἐμαρτυρήσαν ὑπὸ θεοῦ εὐπρεστηκέναι αὐτῷ.— οἱ πρεσβύ-τεροι] the ancients (Schulz: the early ancestors), i.e. the forefathers under the Old Covenant; with the accessory idea of
venerableness. A like name of honour, as elsewhere (i. 1, al.)
oi πατέρες.

Ver. 3. The author is on the point of proving out the truth
of ver. 2, in a series of historic instances from the Holy Scrip-
tures of the O. T., when the thought forces itself upon him
that the very first section of that sacred book of Scripture
relates a fact of which the reality can only be recognised by
means of faith. He first of all, therefore, calls attention to
this fact, before proceeding, in ver. 4, to the designed enumera-
tion of those historic examples. Certainly not very aptly,
since ver. 3 cannot, as ver. 4 ff., serve in proof of the assert-
tion, ver. 2, but, on the contrary, introduces into the exa-
mination something heterogeneous in relation to ver. 4 ff.
For ver. 3 shows only the necessity for πίστις on our part in
regard to a fact belonging to the past and recorded in Scrip-
ture; ver. 4 ff. there are placed before our eyes as models
historic persons in whom the virtue of πίστις, so constituted
as the author demands it of his readers, was livingly present.
This judgment, that ver. 3 forms a heterogeneous insertion, is
pronounced, indeed, by Delitzsch, to whom Kluge and Moll
have acceded, an "unfair one." But the counter observation
of Delitzsch: "the author had already at ver. 2, in connec-
tion with οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, and particularly in connection with
ἐμαρτυρήθησαν, the O. T. Scripture before his mind; so that
the statement, although sounding thus personal, is equivalent
to the proposition that the O. T. Scripture concedes no recog-
nition to any mode of life which lies not within the province
of faith," labours under the defect of logical deliquescence; it
is a mere rationalizing of the words of ver. 2, simply and
clearly preposed as the theme for that which follows.—
πίστει] Dat. instrumentalis: by virtue of faith.— νοεῖν] wc
discern. νοεῖν is the inner perception, accomplished by means
of the νοῦς. Comp. Rom. i. 20.— κατηγορίζει] has been
prepared (comp. LXX. Ps. lxxiv. 16, lxxxix. 38). More
expressive than if πεποιηθήθατι had been written. It repre-
sents the having been created at the same time as a having been
placed in a completed or perfect condition [xiii. 21].— τοὺς
αἰῶνας] the world; see at i. 2.— ῥήματι θεοῦ] by the word
(or authoritative command) of God. Reference to the repeated:
And God said," Gen. i. Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 5 ; LXX. Ps. xxxiii. 6, cxlviii. 5. Philo, de sacrif. Abel et Cain. p. 140 D (with Mangey, I. p. 175): 'Ο γὰρ θεὸς λέγων ἀμα ἐσταίει, μὴ δὲν μεταξὺ ἀμφοῖν τιθεῖς. The supposition of Bleek (comp. also Ewald, p. 123), that the author here too thought of the word of God as a personified property, has nothing in its favour, since the expression is sufficiently explained without it. Nor does the δὲ οὐ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας, i. 2, compel us to adopt this supposition. For above the special mode of mediatelly effecting the creation of the world there indicated, stands the higher authorship of God, to which the writer here points in general by the expression ῥήματι θεοῦ. — εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι] not: so that, etc. (so still Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Alford, Conybeare, Kurtz, Ewald, M’Caul, Woerner, and the majority of recent expositors). εἰς τὸ with the infinitive preserves here, too, its ordinary telic signification, in that it introduces the purpose of God with regard to the ῥήματι καταρτίζειν τοὺς αἰῶνας. The sense is: that in accordance with the decree of God, the fact should be averted, that from φανερῶν the βλεπόμενον should have sprung; consequently that the human race should from the beginning be directed to the necessity for πίστις. — μὴ] belongs to the whole object-clause. So rightly Beza, Piscator, Seb. Schmidt, Er. Schmid, Bengel, Storr, Schulz, Huët, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 58), Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, M’Caul, and Hofmann; while the Peshito, Vulgate, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, and almost all later expositors, including also Stengel and Ebrard (Delitzsch is undecided), comprehend μὴ with ἐκ φαινομένων, and then interpret this in the sense of ἐκ μὴ φαινομένων. ¹ The latter, in favour of which the supposed parallels which have been adduced prove nothing, is by reason of the position of the words (to say nothing of the

¹ Calvin alone forms an exception, who would have ἐκ blended together with φαινομένων into a single word, and finds the sense: "ut non apparentium sierent via h. e. spectacula," in such wise that the "doctrina" harmonizing with that of Rom. i. 20 should result: "quod in hoc mundo conspicuam habeamus Dei imaginem."
fact that φίλι must have been written in place of μὴ; for neither 2 Cor. iv. 18, as Delitzsch supposes, nor Rom. iv. 17, as Maier supposes, decides against this rule. See Meyer ad loc.) a grammatical impossibility.— τὸ βλεπόμενον] that which is seen, or the outward, visible world. The singular represents the same as one complex whole. τὸ βλεπόμενον resumes under another form only the foregoing τῶν αἰώνων, whereas the emphasis in the negative final clause rests upon the ἐκ φανο-μένων, which is on that account preposed. — φανώμενα] are things which appear in outward manifestation, and are perceived by the senses. The expression indicates the domain of the corporal, the material, and there underlies it the conception that the universe did not spring forth by the power of nature from earthly germs or substances, but was created by the mere word of God's omnipotence. In this is contained, it is true, the conception of the creating of the world from nothing. [Cf. 2 Macc. vii. 28.] The opinion of Estius, Schlichting, Limborch, Michaelis, Baumgarten, and others, that the author, with a reference to Gen. i. 2 (specially after the translation of the LXX. : ἲ δὲ γῆ ἤν ἄφρατος καὶ ἄκατασ-κεῦαστος), thought of a visible arising of the worlds out of the invisible chaos already existing, has for its presupposition the erroneous transposal of the μὴ ἐκ into ἐκ μὴ, and fails to maintain itself in presence of the fact that the γεγονέναι ἐκ φανομένων, as antithesis to the foregoing κατηρισθαί ῥήματε θεοῦ, must receive from this latter its nearer defining of signification. Quite untenable is consequently also the opinion of Delitzsch, who, with the assent of Kluge and Kurtz, supplements ἀλλ' ἐκ νοτῶν as opposition to μὴ ἐκ φανομένων, and in connection with the μη̂ φανώμενα—or if μη̂ is combined with the verb, in connection with the tacitly assumed opposite of the φανώμενα—imagines the author to have thought, in harmony with the Philonian doctrine, of the divine ideas, out of which the world is supposed to have sprung, in that they were called forth by means of the divine word from their seclusion within the Godhead into the outer phenomenal reality. See against this also Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 59, Obs.

Ver. 4. The example of Abel. Comp. Gen. iv. 3 ff.— Πίστει] belongs to the whole statement: πλείονα . . . θεῷ.
The conjoining of the same merely with πλείονα (Bisping) has against it the analogy of the following instances, and would weaken the force of the emphatically preposed πιστεύει. The dative, however, indicates, as Rom. xi. 20 and frequently, the cause or occasion. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 202 f.

By reason of his faith (or because he had faith) Abel offered to God a greater sacrifice than Cain; i.e. the faith of Abel, which was wanting to Cain, was the cause that in the estimation of God Abel's sacrifice had greater value than that of Cain. — πλείονα θυσίαν] a greater sacrifice, namely, in a qualitative respect, thus a better, more excellent one. Comp. iii. 3; Matt. vi. 25, xii. 41, 42, al. The quantitative acceptation (Valla: plus hostiarum; Erasmus, Clarus: copiosiorem hostiam; Zeger: abundantiorem) finds no point of support in the narrative of Genesis, and would unsuitably accentuate a purely external feature. — παρὰ Καίν] is by Grotius and others made equivalent to παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Καίν, which is admissible, it is true, but not at all necessary. On παρὰ after the comparative, see at i. 4. — δι' ἦς ἐμαρτυρήθη ἦναι δίκαιος] By it he obtained the testimony that he was righteous. — δι' ἦς] sc. πιστεύε, not θυσίας (Cramer). For the πίστις is the main idea in the whole description, and δι' ἦς ἐμαρτυρήθη manifestly glances back at ἐν ταύτῃ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν, ver. 2. — ἐμαρτυρήθη] Of whom? Not of Christ, by virtue of the declaration Matt. xxiii. 35 (Primasius, Faber Stapulensis, Justinian), but of God; as, accordingly, the author himself adds, more nearly defining the ἐμαρτυρήθη: μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ] in that, namely, God gave testimony in respect of his offerings. What is meant is the testimony given in the fact that God looked with satisfaction upon Abel and his sacrifice (comp. LXX. Gen. iv. 4: καὶ ἐπείδεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ 'Αβέλ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ), thus, in point of fact, recognised him as a δίκαιος (comp. Matt. xxiii. 35: 'Αβέλ τοῦ δίκαιου, and 1 John iii. 12). — καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἦτε λαλεῖ] and by virtue of the same (namely: his faith, not: his sacrifice) he yet speaks after his death. — ἀποθανὼν] is a purely parenthetic member: although he has died, and forms with ἦτε λαλεῖ an oxymoron. Hardly is it in accordance with the intention of the author to comprehend
in one ἀποθανόν and δι' αὐτῆς. In addition to the ordinary one, this explanation also is proposed by Oecumenius, in referring the pronoun back to the θυσία by which the violent death of Abel was occasioned; it is followed by Bengel, with the difference that he supplements δι' αὐτῆς by πίστεως, and will have διά taken in the sense of κατά or ἐν. — ἤτι is not the temporal: still, adhuc (Theodoret: μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος), so that λαλεῖ would signify: he speaks to us of himself and his faith or piety (Theodoret: τὸ δὲ έτι λαλεῖ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀοίδιμος ἐστι μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος καὶ πολυθρόλητος καὶ παρὰ πάντων εὐφημείται τῶν εὐσεβῶν; Heinsius, Bengel: loquitur de se et sui similibus contra Cainos, al.), or: he summons posterity to the imitation of his faith (Chrysostom: ὥ γὰρ παραϊμὸν τοῖς ἄλλοις δικαίοις εἵματι, λαλεῖ; Cornelius a Lapide, Valckenæer, Kuinoel, Paulus, Klee, Bloomfield, and others). Rather is ἤτι employed, as Rom. iii. 7 and frequently, in the logical sense, and serves for the emphasizing of the contrast: "even being dead," or: "notwithstanding he is dead, he nevertheless speaks," while λαλεῖ is to be regarded as the more vividly descriptive præcens historicum (Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 250), and is to be referred to the thought that the shed blood of Abel called to God for vengeance, and God, listening to this cry, was concerned about the slain Abel, as though he were still living. For manifestly, as appears also from the parallel xii. 24, there is an allusion in λαλεῖ to the words, Gen. iv. 10: φωνῇ αἰώνας τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρὸς με ἐκ τῆς γῆς.

Vv. 5, 6. The example of Enoch. Comp. Gen. v. 21—24. — Πίστει Ἐνώξ μετετέθη] By reason of his faith Enoch was caught away; i.e. even during his lifetime was, like Elijah (2 Kings ii.), caught up to God in heaven. Comp. Ecclus. xliv. 16: Ἐνώξ εὑρέστηκε κυρίως καὶ μετετέθη ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας τοῖς γενεαῖς; ibid. xlix. 14: οὐδὲ εἰς ἐκτίσθη οἶνος Ἐνώξ τοιοῦτος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς; Joseph. Antiq. i. 3. 4: ἀνεκώρφησε πρὸς τὸ θείον. — τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῶν θανάτον] not consecutively [so that], de Wette, Bisping, al., but indication of the design of God: that he should not see or undergo death (comp. Luke ii. 26). — καὶ οὐχ ἡψίσκετο, διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς] derived verbally from the LXX. of Gen. v. 24, as given in the text of the Cod. Alex. — πρὸ
It is related in the Scripture concerning Enoch that he was acceptable to God. But this presupposes that he had faith. For to obtain God’s approbation without the possession of faith is impossible. Chrysostom: πῶς δὲ πιστεύει μετετθῇ ὁ Ἑνώχ; οὗ τῆς μεταβοσι ἢ εὐαρέστησις αἰτία, τῆς δὲ εὐαρεστήσεως ἢ πίστει. — πρὸ τῆς μεταβοσι [may be equally well conjoined with μεμαρτύρηται (Piscator, Owen, Huét, Bleek, de Wette, Conybeare, Delitzsch, Kurtz, Hofmann, al.), or with εὐαρεστηκέναι (Schlichting, Bengel, Maier, and others). In the former case the sense is: before mention is made in the Scripture of his rapture, the testimony is borne to him in the same, that he pleased God. — εὐαρεστηκέναι] By εὐρέστησεν the LXX. translate the Hebrew δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ: and he walked with God, i.e. in communion with God, as His most devout worshipper. — Ver. 6 is a truth of wholly universal application, so that only ἐστὶν is to be supplemented to ἄνωντον. With Er. Schmid, Limborch, Wetstein, and Schulz, to regard the first hemistich of the verse: χωρὶς δὲ πίστεις ἄνωντον εὐαρεστηκέναι, as a special statement respecting Enoch, is grammatically inadmissible, since in that case χωρὶς δὲ πίστεις ἄνωντον ἢν αὐτῶν εὐαρεστηκέναι or χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἄνωντον αὐτῶν εὐαρεστηκέναι must have been written. — εὐαρεστηκέναι] sc. τῷ θεῷ, naturally understood from that which precedes and follows. The infinit. aorist expresses, as in the case of the immediately succeeding πιστεύει, the pure verbal notion, without regard to the relation of time. See Kühner, II. p. 80. — ὁ προσερχομένος τῷ θεῷ is he who approaches God, sc. to worship Him; comp. vii. 25, x. 1. Wrongly; Luther, Calov, Wittich, Rambach, Schulz, Ebrard (transl.): he who (as Enoch) will come (or is to come) to God. — οὗ ἐστὶν] that he is, or exists. Arbitrarily importing, Jac. Cappellus: “Series sermonis suadet, ut suppleamus οὗ ἐστὶν αὐτῶν θεός, i. e. qui accedit ad Deum, credere debet eum esse suum Deum.” But also the complementing the verb by: “that He exists as one to whom man can draw near with confidence, as the truly living, personal, almighty, all-wise, all-beneficent One” (Bleek), is an unjustifiable act of reading into the text. The expression contains only the idea of existence. — καὶ] still dependent upon οὗ. —
Ver. 7. The example of Noah. Comp. Gen. vi. 8 ff.—πίστει] is conjoined by Schulz, Stengel, and others with χρησιμοθείσης. But χρησιμοθείσης forms only a subsidiary element for the making up of the historic situation, whereas that by which Noah proved himself a model of faith is specified by εὐλαβηθεὶς κακοσκεύασεν. πίστει is therefore, as is also done by most, to be combined with this last. — χρησιμοθείσης περὶ τῶν μηδὲνω βλεπομένων] belongs together (against Grotius and Hofmann, who unnaturally construe ἵππευσιν with ἴππα ἱππα): instructed by an utterance of God concerning that which was as yet invisible. The choice of the expression was conditioned by the definition of πίστει, laid down ver. 1, and the subjective negation μηδὲνω means: concerning the well-known (τῶν) events, before these were yet to be seen, or their occurrence was to be conjectured. By τὰ μηδὲνω βλεπόμενα, however, is meant not only the impending flood, but also, from the use of the plural, the determined destruction of the whole corrupt race of men. With strange inversion of the sense, even "ipsa μετάμετρα" is reckoned by Böhme as belonging to that "qualem ante nunquam vidisse Noachum facile credi potest." For the ark was surely something which was made by Noah himself at the command of God, whereas by τὰ μηδὲνω βλεπόμενα can be only meant that which, independent of human activity, rested in the hands of divine omnipotence alone. — εὐλαβηθείς] in devout precaution, in that he reposed unconditional belief in the word of God, and on that very account took the enjoined measure of preparation in order to remain in safety under the impending destruction. Vatablus, Cornelius a Lapide, Schulz, and others explain: in the fear of God. But the τῶν θεῶν therein to be supplemented (comp. Ecclus. vii. 29; Prov. ii. 8, xxx. 5; Nah. i. 7) could hardly have been omitted. — δὲ ἦν] refers not to σωτηρίαν (Hunnius, Baldwin, Pareus), nor yet to κυβιστῶν (Chrysostom: εἶδειξεν αὐτοὺς ἄξιοις διὸν κολάσως, οἷς οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς κατασκευῆς ἐσωπρονίζοντο; Oecumenius, Theophylact, Faber Stapulensis, Calvin, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Carpzov, Cramer, Michaelis, Bisping, al.), but to
Trio-ret (Primasius, Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Cajetan, Wolf, Bengel, and almost all modern expositors), as the foregoing main idea; and καὶ τῆς ... κληρονόμος is the second member of the relative clause, not, however, as Bisping and Delitzsch think, parallel to the κατεσκευασεν. — ὁ κόσμος] denotes the unbelieving sinful world of men. This Noah condemned (too weak the rendering of Heinrichs: put to shame) by his faith, namely, by the act, in that he set forth the culpability of its conduct by the contrast of his own conduct. Comp. κατακρίνειν, Matt. xii. 41, 42, Luke xi. 31, 32, and κρίνειν, Rom. ii. 27. — καὶ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος] Allusion to the fact that Noah is the first who in the O. T. is expressly called Πράγματευτής (Gen. vi. 9). Comp. Ezek. xiv. 14, 20; Ecclus. xlv. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 5. Philo also, de congressu quaerendae eruditionis gratia, p. 437 B (with Mangey, I. p. 532), lays special stress upon this particular: πρῶτος δ' σώτος δίκαιός ἐν ταῖς ιεραῖς ἀνεφρήθη γραφαῖς. — ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη] is the righteousness obtained in accordance with faith, or by the way of faith. Since the notion of πίστις is different with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews from that of Paul, the righteousness of faith here spoken of cannot, as is still done by Böhme, Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford, and others, be regarded as identical with the righteousness of faith in the Pauline sense. Yet Bleek is perfectly right in saying that the notion: righteousness of faith, "here appears as one already formed, and is presupposed as one well known, a fact very easy to be explained from the relation in which the author of the epistle stood to Paul." — κληρονόμον γίνεσθαι] denotes no more than to obtain as a possession. We have not, with Justinian, Bengel, Huet, and many, to press the form of expression; as though the δικαιοσύνη were thought of as an actual inheritance, which Noah had received as coming down from the fathers, Abel, who in ver. 4 had been called δίκαιος, and Enoch.

Vv. 8-10. The example of Abraham.

Ver. 8. A proof of believing confidence in God it was that Abraham at God's command wandered forth without knowing whither. Comp. Gen. xiii. 1, 4; also Acts vii. 2, 3. — ὁ καλοῦμενος] is not: "he who is called Abraham, whereas,
namely, he formerly bore the name of Abram" (Theodoret, Clarius, Zeger, Bisping, Ewald, al.), which would be a very tame addition. It signifies: "Abraham, who was thereto (sc. to the ἐκείθεν) called or summoned by God." That this sense could have been expressed only by καλοῦμενος without the article (Bleek, Delitzsch, Reiche, Comm. Crit. p. 108; Maier, Moll, Kurtz), can hardly be maintained. The only difference between the two modes of expression is, that with the article the καλεῖσθαι is merely stated as an historic fact; without the article, on the other hand, is at the same time represented as a cause of the ἵππακοιεῖν. The participle present, moreover (not κληθεῖν), is chosen in order to accentuate the immediate sequence of the καλεῖσθαι and the ἵππακοιεῖν. — εἰς τόπον δὲ κτ.λ.] namely, to Canaan.—ποι] inexacty used, instead of ποι. Comp. Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 439. — On the indicative ἔρχεται, see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 279 f.; Buttmann, Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 218.

Ver. 9. A proof of a believing confidence in God was it further that Abraham dwelt as a stranger in the land which was promised him as a possession.—παροικεῖν] in classic Greek of dwelling beside or in the neighbourhood; in Hellenistic, however, ordinarily as here: to dwell as a stranger in a land, without rights of citizenship or possession. Even in Genesis the sojourning of Abraham and his sons in the promised land of Canaan is designated as a ἐποικία, and they themselves are characterized as ἐποικοῦν in the same; comp. Gen. xvii. 8, xx. 1, xxi. 23, 34, xxiii. 4, xxiv. 37, xxvi. 3, xxviii. 4, al.—ἐίς] receives into the idea of a permanent dwelling that of a previous migration. Familiar breviloquence. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 386.—ὡς ἀλλοτριαν] Comp. Acts vii. 5, 6. — ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας] Theophylact: ὅπερ τῶν ἐγνω ἐστι, τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐπὶ ἀλλο μέρος μεταβαίνοντος διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τι ἴδιον. Comp. Gen. xii. 8, xiii. 3, xviii. 1 ff., xxvi. 25, al. — μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ κτ.λ.] which Theophylact, Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Tischendorf, and others refer to παροικησεῖν, belongs, as is shown by the singular ἐκείθετο with which the author continues at ver. 10, to κατοικήσας. — Isaac and Jacob, however, are called heirs with him of the
same promise, because the promise was given to Abraham not for himself alone, but at the same time for his seed; comp. Gen. xiii. 15, xvii. 8.

Ver. 10. Inner motive for the πίστει παρώνησεν, ver. 9. His believing expectation was directed not so much to earthly possession, as to the possession of that which was higher and heavenly. His true home he thought not to find upon earth, but only in heaven.—τὴν τούς θεμελίων ἐχουσαν πόλιν] the city which has the foundations, firm and enduring city. The opposite to the tents, which form only a temporary lodging, and may be easily broken up and carried away. What is meant is not the earthly Jerusalem (Grotius, Clericus, Dindorf), to which the author, considering the excessive attachment of his readers to the earthly city of God and the earthly sanctuary, could only have alluded most unsuitably, but the archetype of the same: the heavenly city of God, the heavenly Jerusalem, of which the possession for the Christians also is as yet something future, since they will obtain a dwelling therein only at the epoch of the consummation of the Messianic kingdom. The idea of a heavenly Jerusalem was already current among the Jews; its descent to earth was expected on the arising of the Messiah. See Schöttgen, de Hieros. coelesti, in his Hor. Hebr. p. 1205 ff.; Wetstein, N. T. II. p. 229 ff.; Ewald, Comm. in Apocal. pp. 11, 307. From the Jews this conception passed over to the Christians, in so far as that which the Jews expected at the first arising of the Messiah was placed by the latter in the time of the return of Christ. Comp. further vv. 13–16, xii. 22, xiii. 14; Gal. iv. 26; Rev. iii. 12, xxi. 2 ff., 10 ff.—ἡς τεχνίτης καὶ δὴμιουργὸς ὁ θεός] of which the designer and artificer (creator) is God. δὴμιουργὸς in the N. T. only here, as in the O. T. only 2 Macc. iv. 1.

Vv. 11, 12. The example of Sarah.

Ver. 11. Ὅλα ἄνει Ἑλιπά] even Sarah herself, sc. although she had before been unbelieving. At first, namely, when she had received the divine promise that she should yet bear a son, she had, in consideration of her great age, laughed thereat, and thus manifested unbelief; presently afterwards, however, she was afraid, and denied her laughter, had thus passed
over from unbelief to belief. Comp. Gen. xviii. 12, 15. 
Erroneously is the enhancing \( \kappa \alpha \iota \ \alpha \nu \tau \eta \) interpreted by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Bengel, Böhme, Stein, Tholuck (the last-named, however, undecided): even Sarah also, the wife, or: although she was only a woman; Kurtz: “Sarah herself and no other,” namely, not Hagar. Just as false the interpretation of Schlichting, Schulz, and others: even Sarah herself, although she was barren. To the last mode of supplementing points also the gloss \( \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha \), or \( \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \varphi \alpha \ \omega \sigma \alpha \), or \( \eta \ \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha \), which is found, with Theophylact, in some cursives, translations (including Vulg.), and early editions. Quite wrongly will Delitzsch, followed therein by Alford and Hofmann, have no gradation whatever recognised in \( \kappa \alpha \iota \ \alpha \nu \tau \eta \ \varepsilon \varrho \varrho \alpha \), in that he supposes \( \kappa \alpha \iota \ \alpha \nu \tau \eta \) to serve only for extending a like statement to a second subject, and consequently placing the first mother of the chosen race side by side with the first father thereof. If the author had wished to express nothing more, he would have written merely \( \kappa \alpha \iota \ \varepsilon \varrho \varrho \alpha \). For \( \alpha \nu \tau \omega \varsigma \) or \( \alpha \nu \tau \eta \) is in the N. T. never used in the nominative for the unaccented he or she. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 141, Obs.— \( \varepsilon \varsigma \ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \alpha \beta \omega \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha \varsigma \) for the founding of a posterity. \( \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \omega \lambda \lambda \eta \) is employed, therefore, in the same sense as in the expression \( \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \omega \lambda \lambda \eta \ \kappa \omicron \omicron \mu \omicron \nu \), iv. 3, ix. 26, and \( \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha \varsigma \), as ver. 18, ii. 16, and frequently. The words cannot denote: she received power to conceive seed, as is interpreted by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact (who, however, is undecided), the Peshito, Vulgate, Erasmus, Vatablus, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Er. Schmid, Grotius, L. Bos, Wolf, Bengel, Carpzov, Schulz, Heinrichs, Huët, Stengel, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, and others. For this must have been expressed by \( \varepsilon \varsigma \ \iota \rho \omicron \delta \omicron \chi \omicron \nu \ (\sigma \nu \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \nu \nu \) \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha \varsigma \).1 Constrained and unnatural, however, is also the explanation, first mentioned by Theophylact, and subsequently adopted by Drusius, Jac.

1 Michaelis and Storr would therefore, in writing \( \kappa \alpha \iota \ \alpha \nu \tau \omega \varsigma \ \zeta \psi \zeta \varsigma \), refer the statement, ver. 11, still to Abraham, in connection with which, however, more meaning must be put into \( \varepsilon \varsigma \ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \alpha \beta \omega \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha \varsigma \) than can lie in the expression, and which has in other respects much in the context against it. See Bleek, II. 2, p. 767 f.
Cappellus, Schlichting, Heinsius, Wittich, Rambach, and others: she received power for the bringing forth of seed.—καὶ παρὰ καιρόν ἡλικίας] and that contrary to the favourable period of life, i.e. since the δύναμιν λαμβάνειν, on account of the youthful freshness being already lost, was opposed to all probability. Incorrect, because in that case the full signification of καιρός (opportunitas) is not brought out, Delitzsch: “in contradiction with the time of life, namely, the ninetieth year, in which she was.”—ἐπεὶ πιστῶν ἡγήσατο τῶν ἐπαγ-γείλαμενον] comp. x. 23.

Ver. 12. The wondrous result of the faith displayed by Sarah.—ἐγενήθησαν] sc. through Sarah as mother and ancestress, γενεαθαν, of being born, usual also elsewhere in classic (Xen. Cyr. i. 2. 1, al.) and Hellenistic Greek (Rom. i. 3; Gal. iv. 4, al.).—αὑ' ἐνός] from one, namely Abraham. Wrongly does Carpzov apprehend ἐνός as a neuter, in that he will have it supplemented by σπέρματος or αἵματος. Just as wrongly Zeger: “vel ab uno Abraham et Sarae corpore (juxta illud: Erunt duo in carne una).” Comp. already Theodoret: 'Αφ' ἐνός τοῦ 'Αβραάμ' εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀμφότερον ἕνα νοήσαμεν, οὐχ ἁμαρτησόμεθα: ἔσονται γάρ, φησίν, οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. —καὶ ταῦτα] and that too, and more than that. According to Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 153, equivalent to καὶ τοῦτο. But the plural is, no doubt, placed because the author has in his mind, besides the νενεκρωμένου εἶναι of Abraham, also that remarked in ver. 11 with regard to Sarah (her former unbelief and her advanced age).—νενεκρωμένου] has reference to the dead power of generation, as Rom. iv. 19.—Of one were born even as the stars of heaven in regard to number, i.e. of one were descendants born innumerable in multitude as the stars of heaven. A supplementing of ἐκγυνον or ἀνθρώπος (so still Bleek) is, moreover, unnecessary. The comparison of the multitude of descendants to the stars of heaven, and the countless sand upon the sea-shore, is based upon the use of the same figures in the words of the promise given to Abraham; comp. Gen. xiii. 16, xv. 5, xxii. 17, xxvi. 4, xxxii. 12; Ex. xxxii. 13; Deut. i. 10.—χελῶν] for shore occurs also with the classics, and that in prose equally (Herod. ii. 94; Polyb. iii. 14. 6, and frequently) as
with the poets (Hom. Il. xii. 52). Comp. also Plin. xxxi. 2: Herba in labris fontis virens; Caes. de bello Gall. vii. 72: ut ejus (fossae) solum tantundem pateret, quantum summa labra distabant.

Vv. 13—16. General observations with regard to the forementioned patriarchs.

Ver. 13. Κατὰ πίστιν] is ordinarily (by Bleek, too, in the larger commentary) conjoined exclusively with ἀπέθανον. According to this, the dying conformably to faith, in distinction from the faith already manifested during life, would become the main idea of the verse, and the participial clauses would be made to contain the proof for the κατὰ πίστιν ἄποθανεῖν. The sense would be: "they died in faith (not in sight), since they had not received the promises, but only saw them from afar," etc. (Bleek). Against this apprehension of the words, however, decides the subjective negation μὴ before λαβόντες, instead of which (particularly in the case of the opposition following with ἀλλά, see Kühner, II. 408) the objective negation οὐ must have been placed. We have therefore, with Schulz, Winer (Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 376), Moll, Bleek, Vorles. p. 434, Kurtz, Ewald, to refer κατὰ πίστιν to ἄπεθανον in close comprehension of the latter with the participles. The sense is: In accordance with faith these all died without having received the promises, but as those who, etc.; i.e., it was conformable to the nature of faith that they, without having attained to the possession of the promised blessings themselves, beheld them only from afar and greeted them, and witnessed the confession that they are strangers and pilgrims upon earth.— οὗτοι πάντες] is referred by Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Ribera, Justinian, Drusius, and Bloomfield to all the before-mentioned persons, from Abel onwards, with the single exception of Enoch. Nevertheless, as is evident from the contents of the following verse, only those among them can have been thought of to whom promises were given, thus Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, and Jacob. Comp. specially ver. 15. — μὴ λαβόντες] see at vi. 15.— τὰς ἐπαγγελίας] in the objective sense, as τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, ix. 15. — πόρρῳ θεόν] belongs equally to ἄσπασάμενοι as to ἰδόντες.— ἄσπαζεθαι] joyfully greet or welcome, as the
traveller the longed-for journey's end. Comp. Virg. *Aen.* iii. 522 sqq.:

Quum procul obscuros colles humilemque videmus
Italianam . . . Italiana laetoci clamores salutant.

—καὶ ὠμολογήσαντες, ὅτι ἔνοι καὶ παρεπίθημοι εἰσὶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς] Reference to the utterances of the patriarchs in the Book of Genesis, particularly xxiii. 4, where Abraham says to the children of Heth: πάροικος καὶ παρεπίθημος ἐγὼ εἰμί μεθ' ὑμῶν, and xlvi. 9, where Jacob, in addressing Pharaoh, describes his own life in general as a pilgrimage: αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ζωῆς μου, ἂς παροικῶ, ἐκατὼν τρίακοντα ἔτη. Comp. LXX. Ps. xxxix. 13, cxix. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 11; Philo, *de Agricult.* p. 196 E (with Mangay, I. p. 310): παροικεῖν οὐ κατοικεῖν ἥλθομεν τῷ γὰρ ὑπὲρ πᾶσα μὲν ψυχῆ σοφοὶ πατρίδα μὲν οὐρανὸν, ξένην δὲ γῆν ἔλαχεν; *De Confus. Ling.* p. 331 C (I. p. 416): Αἰών τὸ τώτῳ ὁ κατὰ Μωυσῆν σοφοὶ πάντες εἰσώγονται παροικοῦντες. αἱ γὰρ τούτων ψυχαὶ στέλλουται μὲν ἀποκιάν ὅπερ ποτε τὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.

Ver. 14 ff. That the patriarchs are ξένοι καὶ παρεπίθημοι, they have themselves confessed; that they were so ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, the author has added by way of more nearly defining. The legitimacy of this exposition of their words he now proves (ver. 14 . . . ἐπουρανίου, ver. 16). By those utterances the patriarchs declare that they have not already a country, they are only seeking it. If, now, they had set their hearts upon an earthly country, they would certainly have had time and opportunity enough to have returned to that which they had left, but this they did not; they must thus have longed for a heavenly country. — ἐμφανίζουσιν] Theodoret: δηλοῦσιν. Oecumenius and Theophylact: δεικνύουσιν. — ἐπιζητεῖν] ardently to seek or desire something.

Ver. 15. Kal] and indeed. — μνημονεύον] is taken by the majority in the intransitive sense: to be mindful (xiii. 7). More naturally, however, may we understand it, with Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Moll, Kurtz, and others, transitively: to make mention, sc. in the utterances to which the author has respect. Comp. ver. 22; 1 Thess. i. 3. — εἰχόν ἄν] they would have had. The imperfect of the continuing possibility.
Ver. 16. Nων δὲ [the logical: but now. Comp. viii. 6. — ὀρέγεσθαι τίνος] elsewhere in the N. T. only 1 Tim. iii. 1, vi. 10.— διό] wherefore, sc. on account of their seeking after the heavenly country. — θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν] Epexegesis to αὐτοῖς: God is not ashamed of them, namely, to be called their God. Reference to Ex. iii. 6: καὶ εἶπεν ἐγὼ εἰμί ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου, θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ. Comp. utid. vv. 15, 16.— The οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται κ.τ.λ. presupposes the idea of an intimate communion of God with the patriarchs. Comp. also Matt. xxii. 31 f.; Mark xii. 26 f.; Luke xx. 37 f. The fact instanced in proof of this communion is added in the concluding words: ἡτοίμασεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν] for He has prepared for them a city. By the πόλις is again meant, as ver. 10, the heavenly Jerusalem. ἡτοίμασεν, however, may equally well signify: He has prepared it for them, that they may one day possess the same as a dwelling (Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Calov, Böhme, de Wette, Delitzsch, Hofmann), as: He has already conferred it upon them as a possession (so Braun and Bleek).

Vv. 17—19. The author returns once more specially to Abraham, in that he further, by way of addition, dwells on the most distinguished act of faith on the part of this patriarch, that he had not refused at God’s behest to offer his only son as a sacrifice; comp. Gen. xxii. 1 ff.— προσενήνωσέν] not: “he was on the point of offering,” against which stands the perfect. It can only signify: he offered (made an offering of). The author could thus express himself, since the offering was really intended by Abraham, although it afterwards came, it is true, to a bloodless issue. Comp. Jas. ii. 21: Ἀβραὰμ . . . ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ τὸν νῦν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον. — πειραζόμενος] when he was tempted, i.e. was put to the test by God with regard to his faith. Comp. Gen. xxii. 1. πειραζόμενος belongs still to προσενήνωσέν, not, as Hofmann quite unnaturally requires, to προσέφερεν. — καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ . . . σπέρμα, ver. 18] Unfolding of the greatness of the act. It was (1) his only son whom he gave up, (2) the son whose life was necessary, if the promises given to Abraham were to receive their fulfilment. — καὶ] and of a truth. — τὸν μονογενῆ] No respect is had to Ishmael, since he was not of equal birth,
and stood outside of all relation to the divine promises. — προσέφερεν] here the imperfect; since the author now presents to himself, as though he were a spectator, the act of the offering itself. — ο τας επαγγελιας αναδεξάμενος] he who had believingly embraced the promises. With Schulz, Heinrichs, Bengel, Ebrard, Bisping, and others, to find indicated by αναδεξαμενος the mere having received, contradicts the ordinary use of the word, instead of which λαβων must have been placed.

Ver. 18. Προς δυ] not: “of whom” (more accurately: “in relation to whom,” comp. i. 7). in such wise that it should be referred to Isaac (Faber Stapulensis, Luther, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Carpzov, Michaelis, Chr. Fr. Schmid, and others), but: to whom, sc. Abraham. — εν Ισαακ κληθησεται σοι σπέρμα] In Isaac shall a seed be named (called) to thee, i.e. through Isaac shall the posterity, whose forefather thou shalt be called, be founded. The emphasis falls upon εν Ισαακ, and the citation is from Gen. xxi. 12. εν, however, which has there causal significance, the author takes as a recitative.

Ver. 19 contains in its first half the motive ground of Abraham for such believing action. Abraham trusted in the omnipotence of God, by virtue of which he is able, even in presence of the actual sacrifice of Isaac, to realize the promises given to him. — λογισάμενος, δυ κ.τ.λ.] since he judged that God is able to raise even from the dead. The proposition introduced with δυ contains a universal truth. It is erroneous to supplement αυτων to εγειρεν (Jac. Cappellus, Huët, Kuinoel, Stein, Bloomfield, al.), yet more erroneous to supplement σπέρμα (Schulz, Stengel). — δευ κ.τ.λ.] Declaration of the divine reward for such believing action and such believing confidence. δευ means, as everywhere else in our epistle (ii. 17, iii. 1, vii. 25, viii. 3, ix. 18): on which account, wherefore; παραβολη, however, denotes, conformably to the well-known use of παραβαλλεθαι (Hom. II. ix. 322; Thuc. ii. 44, al. See the lexicons), the imperilling, and forms with the εκομισατο an oxymoron. The sense is: on which account he bore him away, even on the ground of (or: by means of) the giving up. Abraham obtained Isaac as a reward, received
him back again as a possession, by the very act of setting his life at stake, giving up to the death of a sacrifice. This is the simple and only correct sense of the variously explained words. — With this exposition earlier interpretations agree in part, though by no means entirely, so far as ὅθεν and ἐκομίσατο are concerned, but all different in regard to ἐν παραβολῇ. Instead of the causal signification, “on which account,” Calvin, Castellio, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Lamb. Bos, Alberti, Wolf, Michaelis, Schulz, Huet, Böhm, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Ewald, Hofmann, and others have asserted for ἀκοὴν the local signification “whence, sc. from the dead.” In connection with this, L. Bos, Alberti, Schulz, and Stengel [as also Whitby] understand ἐκομίσατο of the birth of Isaac; while Calvin, Bleek, and the majority rightly understand it of the deliverance of Isaac’s life in consequence of the prevention of the sacrifice. The former explain: whence he indeed had received him, inasmuch as Isaac’s parents at the time of his conception and birth were virtually dead. The latter: as he accordingly also received him from the dead. But against the first acceptation decides the fact that in such case, because an event conceived of as possible in the future is placed in definite parallel with a past event, the pluperfect must necessarily have been used in place of the aorist ἐκομίσατο; and then, even apart from this, since all the emphasis would fall upon ἐκομίσατο, the order of the words must have been otherwise, namely as follows: ἀκοὴν ἐν παραβολῇ καὶ ἐκομίσατο αὐτῶν. But also the last-named interpretation is forbidden by the order of the words. For καὶ must, in connection therewith, be referred, as is also expressly required by Schlichting, Böhm, and others, to the whole clause, whereas from its position it can only form a gradation of ἐν παραβολῇ; thus ὅθεν καὶ αὐτῶν ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο must have been written. — Finally, as regards ἐν παραβολῇ, the signification “in similitudine,” or “in a resemblance,” is attached thereto by Theodore of Mopsuestia,1 Calvin, Castellio, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Jac. Cappellus (figurate), Scaliger, Er. Schmid,

1 Ἐντὸς λόγου, ἦν ἀκολούθως Ἴσχυς ἡς ἑαυτῷ πίστις ὑπὲρ ἀντεχθῆναι συνειδήματα, λαμπρὸν προτότο κατακατάνειν αὐτῶν ἰδιώτης. Ἡ γὰρ ἐν παλεί τῷ ἐπικάτω τρισ
The sense is, according to Bleek: "as accordingly he received him from thence in a resemblance; so that Isaac was indeed not really delivered out of death, but yet his deliverance was a kind of restoration from the dead, since Abraham already regarded him as the prey of death." But this "in a resemblance" is, strictly taken, nothing else than "in a manner," with which it is also exactly identified by Stengel and others; for the expression, however, of the notion "in a manner," the author would hardly have chosen the altogether unusual, and therefore unintelligible, formula \( \varphi \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta \sigma \lambda \nu \eta \); much more natural would it have been for him to employ instead thereof, as at vii. 9, the familiar \( \omega \varepsilon \varphi \sigma \varepsilon \iota \pi \varepsilon \iota \nu \). Moreover, since that addition could only be designed to exert a softening effect upon the \( \delta \theta \nu \) (sc. \( \varepsilon \kappa \nu \kappa \rho \omega \nu \)), it must also have followed immediately after this word. The author would thus have written \( \delta \theta \nu, \omega \varepsilon \varphi \sigma \varepsilon \iota \pi \varepsilon \iota \nu, \alpha \iota \tau \nu \kappa \alpha \iota \varepsilon \kappa \omega \mu \iota \sigma \alpha \tau \).—Yet more untenable is the exposition akin to that just mentioned: as a type (Luther: zum Vorbilde), sc. in regard to the resurrection in general (Hunnius, Balduin, Michaelis, Böhme, al.), or specially in regard to the sacrificed and risen Christ (Primasius, Erasmus, Clarius, Vatablus, Zeger, Calov, Carpzov, Cramer, Ebrard, Bisping, Reuss), or in regard to both alike (Theodoret: τουτόστιν \( \omega \varepsilon \) \( \varsigma \mu \chi \beta \omega \lambda \nu \kappa \alpha \iota \) \( \tau \iota \pi \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \iota \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \o \sigma \iota \). For the express indication of that which was typically represented by this event could not have been wanting.—Equally far wrong, because far-fetched and unnatural, is the supplementing of \( \delta \vartheta \) \( \varepsilon \nu \) \( \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta \sigma \lambda \nu \eta \) on the part of Bengel ("Abraham ... ipse factus est parabola ... Omnis enim posteritas celebrat fidem Abrahae, offerentis unigenitum"), and the explanation of Paulus: "against an equalization," i.e. in return for the ram presented as a substitute (comp. already Chrysostom: τουτόστιν \( \varepsilon \nu \) \( \nu \pi \omicron \delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \iota \nu\)).
To the interpretation of ἐν παραβολῇ, above regarded as correct, several expositors approach, to the extent of likewise thinking that we must make the usage with regard to the verb παραβαλλεσθαι our guide in determining the signification of παραβολῇ. They deviate, however, essentially from the above interpretation, in that they take ἐν παραβολῇ adverbially, in the sense of παραβόλως; consequently refer the expression, which above was equally referred to subject and object, to the subject, and that without any advantage to the peculiarity of thought. So Camerarius, who, besides other possibilities of apprehension, suggests also this: in that he exposed himself to danger, namely, that of losing his son; Loesner, Krebs, Heinrichs: in summo discrimine, παρ’ ἐπίθετα, παραβάλως; Raphel: praeter spem praeterque opinionem; Tholuck: in bold venture.

Ver. 20. The example of Isaac. Comp. Gen. xxvii. — Πίστευ καὶ καὶ is the more nearly defining: and in truth, and in sooth. A faith was manifested in the imparting of the blessing, by the very circumstance that this benediction extended with inner confidence to facts as yet belonging to the future.¹ Comp. Theodoret: Οὖ γὰρ ἐν τὰς οὖν ὁρομένας ἑδωκεν εὐλογίας, εἰ μὴ τοῖς λόγοις ἀκολουθήσεων τὸ ἔργον ἐπιτεθεσθαι. — περὶ μελλόντων] concerning things as yet future, i.e. concerning the future lot of his two sons, and the pre-eminence of the younger son over the elder. — Jacob, the younger son, is here first mentioned, since he was first blessed by Isaac, and was altogether of greater significance for the history of the people.

Ver. 21. The conduct of Jacob, Gen. xlviii., analogous to the fact adduced ver. 20. Here, too, the blessing related to the future, and in like manner as ver. 20, to the pre-eminence of the younger son (Ephraim) over the elder (Manasseh). — ἀποθνῄσκω] when he was dying. Reference to Gen. xlvii. 31: ἔδω ἐγὼ ἀποθνῄσκω. — καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς βάσεως αὐτοῦ] and he worshipped (bowing) upon the top of his

¹ How Delitzsch has been able so greatly to misunderstand the above words as to read in them the assertion, that μελλόντω is to be combined with καὶ instead of πριν, I do not comprehend.
staff, i.e. in that from weakness he supported himself with his face resting upon the top of his staff. Addition from LXX. Gen. xlvi. 31 (inexactly referred to this place), for the bringing out of the solemn, devotional frame of Jacob in uttering this benediction [the same spirit being breathed in xlii. 18]. In the Hebrew the words read: נַתַּן בָּאָרָי לָצָא בָּאָרָי (i.e. according to Tuch: “and Israel leaned back upon the head of the bed;” but, more correctly, according to Knobel: “and Israel bowed himself upon the head of the couch, inasmuch as he had before, during his conversation with Joseph, been sitting upright upon his couch (comp. xlvii. 2), but now leaned forward to the upper end thereof, and blessed God for the granting of the last wish”). The LXX., however, read the vowels נַתַּן, and their translation was followed by our author in this passage as elsewhere. Strangely does Hofmann perceive in the subordinate particular καὶ προσεκύνησεν κ.τ.λ., a “second thing” adduced as proving the faith of Jacob. The first is, according to him, Jacob’s last testament, the second his departure from life (!). — The supposition that τῷ Ἰαοκήφ is to be supplemented to προσεκύνησεν (so Chrysostom: τοὐτό εἶναι καὶ γέρων ἄν ἦδη προσεκύνησε τῷ Ἰαοκήφ, τήν παντός τοῦ λαοῦ προσεκύνησιν δηλῶν τήν ἐσομένην αὐτῷ; Theodoret, Photius in Oecumenius, Theophylact, and others), is, equally with the view akin thereto, that αὐτῷ is to be referred to Ἰαοκήφ, and ἔπι τῷ ἀκρόν τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ is to be regarded as the object to προσεκύνησεν (so the Vulgate: et adoravit fastigium virgae ejus; Primasius: virgae ejus i.e. virgae Jōs.; Oecumenius: τοσοῦτον ... ἐπίστευε τοῖς ἐσομέ- νοις, διὶ καὶ προσεκύνησε τῇ ῥάβδῳ, δοκῶν ὀρᾶν τὰ ἐσομένα; Clarius, Bisping, Reuss: “Jacob, after having received the oath of Joseph, bowed (s’inclina) towards the head of the latter’s staff, in token of submission, that is to say, in order solemnly to acknowledge Joseph as head of the family. The staff is the symbol of power;” and others), to be rejected as untenable. The first-named has against it the fact, that in that which precedes, the discourse is not of Joseph himself, but of his sons; the latter, that the making of ἔπι τι a note of object to προσκυνεῖν is opposed to all the usage of the language.
Ver. 22. The example of Joseph. Comp. Gen. 1. 24, 25. Firm faith, that the promise already given to Abraham (Gen. xv. 13–16) should be fulfilled, was it that Joseph, when he was near to death, gave direction as to that which should be done with his bones at the time of the accomplishment of that promise.—τελευτῶν] the same as ἀποθνῄσκων, ver. 21; the choice of the expression was called forth by Gen. 1. 26: καὶ ἐκτελεύτησεν Ἰωσήφ. —περὶ] in connection with μνημο- νεύειν, which as at ver. 15 signifies to make mention, stands instead of the bare genitive, after the analogy of παραφθασάντων. See Kühner, II. p. 186, Obs. 1.—ἡ ἔξοδος τῶν νεωτέρων Ἰσραήλ] the (future) departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt.—ἐμμημονεύσαν καὶ ... ἐνετείλησαν] Form of parallel arrangement; while, as regards the matter itself, the second member as an accessory point is subordinated to the first member as the main point.

Vv. 23–29 the author passes over from the patriarchs to Moses, dwelling upon a series of facts in the history of the latter which bear a typical character. First—

Ver. 23 he points to the faith manifested by the relatives of Moses at the time of his birth. Comp. Ex. ii. 2. The special beauty of the new-born child awakened in them the belief¹ that God had chosen him for great things and would be able to preserve his life, and in this belief they hid the child in opposition to the commandment of the Egyptian king. —ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων] i.e. by his parents. For this elsewhere unusual employment of πατέρων, Wetstein aptly directs the reader to Parthenius, Brot. 10: Κνώμππος εἰς ἐπιθυμίων Ἱερεύνων ἑλθόν, παρὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτής ἡγάγετο γυναῖκα, as well as to the Latin patres, Stat. Theb. vi. 464: Incertique patrum thalami. Bengel understands πατέρων of the still living ancestors of Moses (“a patribus, id est a patre [Amram] et ab avo ... paterno, qui erat Kahath”), and he is followed by Chr. Fr. Schmid, Böhme (yet with wavering), and others; while Stein, who expressly rejects both explanations,

¹Kurtz is in a position to add further particulars on this point, inasmuch as he supposes the “presupposition” is to be derived from the state of things narrated, “that a special divine admonition spoke to the parents out of the eyes of the child.”
wonderfully supposes "the mother," together with "a few concurring friends, who as it were took the place of parents," to be intended. In the Hebrew, Ex. ii. 2, the κρύπτεω is predicated only of the mother; the LXX., however, with whom the author agrees, have: ἰδ潟ντες δὲ αὐτὸ ἀστεῖον, ἐσκέ-πασαν αὐτὸ μῆνας τρεῖς. — αὐστεῖον] fair and graceful in form. Theophylact: ὦπαρον, τῇ ὠφει χαρίειν. In the Hebrew stands בִּי. — καὶ οὖν ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως] might, on account of the plural οὖν ἐφοβήθησαν, be considered, together with εἴδον, in opposition to the passive ἐκρύβη, as still dependent upon διώτα. But more logically exact is the taking of the words, as also is mostly done, as a parallel to ἐκρύβη. For much more natural does it appear that the author wished to represent that κρύπτεω as an act from the accomplishment of which fear did not deter, than that he should think of fearlessness as the motive cause of that action. — τὸ διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως] the command of Pharaoh, to drown all new-born male children of the Israelites. Comp. Ex. i. 22.

Vv. 24—26. Progress from the child Moses to the adult Moses. μέγας γενόμενος, namely, corresponds (comp. Ex. ii. 11) to the γεννηθέλει, ver. 23, and μέγας is to be understood not of worldly power and honour (Schulz, Bretschneider), but of being grown up. Comp. viii. 11; LXX. Gen. xxxviii. 11, 14; Hom. Od. ii. 314, xviii. 217, xix. 532. — ἡρψατο λέγεσθαι] refused or disdained to be called. — θυγατρός] not τής θυγατρός is placed (as Ex. ii. 5 ff.), since the author combines θυγατρός with Φαραώ into one single (more general) notion: of a Pharaoh's daughter, i.e. of an Egyptian royal princess.

Ver. 25. Justificatory explanation of the ἡρψατο, ver. 24: in that he preferred to suffer evil treatment with the people of God, in place of possessing a temporary sinful enjoyment. — μᾶλλον αἱρεῖσθαι ἦ] in Holy Scripture a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον; in profane literature, on the other hand, of very frequent occurrence. Instances in Wetstein. — The compound συγκακοκακισθαι only here; the simple form κακοκακισθαι alone (ver. 37, xiii. 3) is found elsewhere. — τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ] see at iv. 9. — πρόσκαρον ἀπόλαυσιν] an enjoyment only temporary, of brief duration, sc. of the earthly joys of life. Contrast to the enjoyment of everlasting blessedness. — ἀμαρτίας] not

Meyer.—Hebr.
.genit. objecti (Theophylact, Schlichting, Schulz, Stein, Stengel, al.), but genit. auct.: Enjoyment, such as (the committing of) sin affords. By ἀμαρτία is meant apostasy from God, by the abandoning of the communion with the people of God.

Ver. 26. Indication of cause for ver. 25, in such wise that ἡγησάμενος, ver. 26, is subordinated to the μᾶλλον ἑλόμενος, ver. 25. — τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ] the reproach of Christ. That signifies not: the reproach for Christ's sake, which he endured, namely, by virtue of the hope in the Messiah (Castellio, Wolf, Carpzov, Böhme, Kuinoel, Bloomfield, and others). For by the mere genitive this notion cannot be expressed. The sense is: the reproach, as Christ bore it, inasmuch, namely, as the reproach, which Moses took upon him to endure in fellowship with his oppressed people at the hand of the Egyptians, was in its nature homogeneous with the reproach which Christ afterwards had to endure at the hands of unbelievers, to the extent that in the one case as in the other the glory of God and the advancement of His kingdom was the end and aim of the enduring. Comp. τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες, xiii. 13, and τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2 Cor. i. 5; as also τὰ ὀστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Col. i. 24. — ἀπέβλεπτεν γὰρ εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν] for he looked steadfastly to the bestowment of the reward. The determining ground for his action. — ἀποβλέπειν in the N. T. only here. — ἡ μισθαποδοσία is the promised heavenly reward, the everlasting salvation; comp. vv. 39, 40. Unsuitably does Grotius limit the expression to the promised possession of the land of Canaan.

Ver. 27 is referred either to the flight of Moses to Midian (Ex. ii. 15), or to the departure of the whole people out of Egypt. The former supposition is favoured by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Zeger, Jac. Cappellus, Heinsius, Calmet, Bengel, Michaelis, Schulz, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bouman (Chartae theolog. lib. II. Traj. ad Rhen. 1857, p. 157 sq.), Delitzsch, Nickel (in Reuten's Repertor. 1858, März, p. 207), Conybeare, Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Ewald; the latter by Nicholas de Lyra, Calvin, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Calov, Braun, Baumgarten, Carpzov, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Huët, Böhme, Stuart, Kuinoel, Paulus,
Klee, Bleek, Stein, Bloomfield, Ebrard, Bisping, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and others. Only the opinion first mentioned is the correct one. Against it, indeed, the objection appears to be not without weight, that Ex. ii. 14 a φοβηθήναι of Moses is spoken of, whereas here, by means of μὴ φοβηθεὶς κ.τ.λ., the opposite is asserted. But the contradiction is only an apparent one. For in the account of Exodus a fear on the part of Moses is mentioned only in the objective relation, whereas the fearlessness, which the author of our epistle intends, belongs purely to the subjective domain. Moses was alarmed that, contrary to his expectation, the slaying of the Egyptian had already become known, and apprehended as a consequence being exposed to the vengeance of the king, if the latter should obtain possession of him. On this very account also he took steps for the saving of his life, in that he withdrew by flight from the territory of Pharaoh. With this fact, however, it was perfectly reconcilable that in the consciousness of being chosen to be the deliverer of his people, and in the confidence in God, in whose hand alone he stood, he felt himself inwardly, or in his frame of mind, raised above all fear at the wrath of an earthly king. There is therefore no need of the concession (de Wette), that the author of the epistle, when he wrote down his μὴ φοβηθεὶς, did not remember the words ἑφοβῆθη δὲ Μωυσῆς, Ex. ii. 14. But just as little is it permissible, with Delitzsch, to press the expression κατέλυτεν, chosen by the author, and to assert that καταλυτεῖν expresses the repairing hence without fear, whereas φυγεῖν would denote the repairing hence from fear. The author might also have written without difference of signification—what is denied by Delitzsch—πίστει ἐφυγεν εἰς γῆν Μαδιάμ, μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως.—The referring, on the other hand, of the statement, ver. 27, to the leading forth of the whole people, is shown to be entirely inadmissible—(1) from the consideration that, in the chronological order which the author pursues in the enumeration of his models of faith, the departure of Israel from Egypt could not have been mentioned before the fact on which he dwells in ver. 28, but only after the same; (2) that to the departure of the people out of Egypt the expression κατέλυτεν (sc.
MaCarj*;)Atyvn-Top is unsuitable; (3) finally, that according to Ex. xii. 31 that departure was commanded by Pharaoh himself; in connection with the departure, therefore, any fear whatever at the wrath of the king could not arise. — τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὀραῶν ἐκατέρθησεν] for having the invisible (God) as it were before his eyes, he was strong and courageous. τὸν ἀόρατον ὡς ὀραῶν belongs together, and τὸν ἀόρατον stands absolutely, without, what is thought most probable by Böhme, as also Delitzsch and Hofmann, our having to supplement βασιλεία to the same. Contrary to linguistic usage, Luther, Bengel, Schulz, Paulus, Stengel (wavering), Ebrard combine τὸν ἀόρατον with ἐκατέρθησεν: he held firmly to the invisible one as though seeing Him; according to Ebrard, καρπετεῖν τίνα signifies: “to comport oneself stedfastly in regard to some one” (?), and the expression of our passage is supposed to acquire a pregnancy in the sense of τὸν ἀόρατον τίμων ἐκατέρθησεν(!). καρπετεῖν τί can only denote: stedfastly to bear or undergo something; καρπετεῖν τίνα, however, cannot be used in Greek.

Ver. 28. Comp. Ex. xii.— Πίστει] in believing confidence, sc. in the word of God, at whose command he acted, that the blood of the paschal lambs would become the means of delivering the Israelites. — τὸν πάσχα] he ordained the Passover. In the perfect there lies the characterization of the regulation then adopted as something still continuing in force even to the present. With the notion of the meet ordering of the Passover blends consequently the idea of the institution thereof; although it is true only τὸ πάσχα, not likewise the addition καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἰματος, is suitable thereto. — καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἰματος] and the affusion of the blood. What is intended is the sprinkling or anointing of the door-posts and lintels of the Israelite houses with the blood of the slain paschal lambs, enjoined by Moses at the command of God, Ex. xii. 7, 22 f. — πρόσχυσιν] in Holy Scripture only here. — ἵνα μὴ ὁ ὀλοθρεύων τὰ προσότοκα θίγῃ αὐτῶν] that the slayer of the first-born might not touch them. By ὁ ὀλοθρεύων, the destroyer, the LXX. at Ex. xii. 23 have translated the Hebrew μασχ, the destruction, thinking in connection therewith of an angel of destruction sent forth by God. Comp.
1 Chron. xxii. 12, 15 (ἄγγελος κυρίων ἔξολοθρεύων); 2 Chron. xxxii. 21; Ecclus. xl. 21; 1 Cor. x. 10 (ὁ ὀλοθρευτής).

— τὰ πρωτότοκα] Ex. xii. 12: πάν πρωτότοκον . . . ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου οὐς κτίσαν. Comp. id. ver. 29. We have to construe τὰ πρωτότοκα with ὁ ὀλοθρεύων, not, as Klee, Paulus, Ebrard, and Hofmann will, with θύγη, since the combination of θυγγάνειν with an accusative is not usual. — αὐτῶν] namely the Israelites. This reference of the αὐτῶν was self-evident from the connection, although the Israelites are not previously mentioned. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 138 f.

Ver. 29. Comp. Ex. xiv. 22 ff. — Πίστει] Oecumenius: ἐπιστεύσαν γὰρ διαβήσεσθαι καὶ διέβησαν τοσοῦτον οἶδεν ἡ πόλις καὶ τὰ ἄδυνατα ἄνωτα ποιεῖν. — διέβησαν] namely, the Israelites under Moses. — ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς γῆς] as through dry, firm land. The less usual διά with the genitive, alternating with the ordinary accusative in connection with διαβάλειν, was probably occasioned by the reading of the LXX. Ex. xiv. 29 (οἱ δὲ νῦν Ἰσραὴλ ἔπορεύθησαν διὰ ξηρᾶς ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης). — ἦς πείραν λαβόντες οἱ Ἀγνύπτωτοι καταπόθησαν] in the essaying of which the Egyptians were drowned. — ἦς refers back to τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν, not, as Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Stengel, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Kurtz suppose, to ξηρᾶς γῆς. For the former is the main thought, of which the readers are reminded anew by καταπόθησαν, whereas ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς contains only a subsidiary feature, attached by way of comparison. — πείραν λαμβάνειν τινὸς stands here in the active sense. Otherwise ver. 36. — καταπίνεσθαι, however (comp. Ex. xv. 4), is a more general expression for the more definite καταποτίζεσθαι, which latter (καταποτίζεσθαι) is found also in our passage, in some cursives, as likewise with Chrysostom and Theodoret.

Ver. 30. The example of faith afforded by the Israelite people in connection with the siege of Jericho, Josh. vi. — Πίστει] on the ground of faith, which, namely, the people displayed. Wrongly Grotius, who supposes πίστει is to be construed with κυκλωθέντα. — ἔπεσαν] On the plural of the verb with the neuter plur., see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 479. — κυκλωθέντα] after they (daily with the ark of the covenant, heralded by trumpet blast) had been encircled (incorrectly
Ver. 31. The example of the Gentile woman Rahab, Josh. ii., vi. 17, 22 ff. Her conduct had proceeded from the recognition that the God of the Israelites is a God in heaven and upon earth, and from the confidence thereon based, that this God would lead them to victory. Comp. Josh. ii. 9 ff. — ʼPadβ η πόρνη] Comp. Jas. ii. 25; Clem. Rom. ad Cor. c. 12. The epithet η πόρνη is to be left in its literal sense. To interpret it, with Jac. Cappellus, Valckenaer, Heinrichs, and others, after the precedent of the Chaldee paraphrase and the Arabian version, by the hostess, or, with Hofmann, the harlots' hostess, or, with Braun and others, the heathen woman, or finally, with Koppe (in Heinrichs) and others, the idolatress, is arbitrary. The designation of Rahab as η πόρνη is an historic characterization, in accordance with Josh. ii. 2, vi. 17 ff., and without any ground of offence. For it has already been rightly observed by Calvin: "hoc (epitheton) ad anteaectam vitam referri certum est; resipiscentiae enim testis est fides." Comp. further, Matt. xxi. 31, 32. — τοὺς ἀπειθήσασσον] the inhabitants of Jericho. They had shown themselves disobedient, because they had resisted the people of God (Josh. vi. 1), although not to them either had the mighty deeds of this God remained unknown (Josh. ii. 10). — δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκόπους μετ’ εἰρήνης] seeing she had received the spies with peace, i.e. without practising acts of hostility towards them, to which she might have been incited by reason of their nationality.

Vv. 32-40. On account of the multitude of models of faith which are still to be found in the O. T., the author must abandon the attempt of presenting them singly to the readers. He relinquishes, therefore, the previous description in detail, and briefly sums up that to which he could further call attention. He mentions first, at ver. 32, another series of heroes of the faith; and then portrays in general rubrics their deeds of faith, and that in such form that ver. 33 ... ἀλλοι, ver. 35, deeds of victorious faith are brought into relief, and thence to the end of ver. 38 deeds of suffering faith.

Ver. 32. Καὶ τί ἐνὶ λέγω;] And to what end do I still speak? i.e. what need is there yet, after that which has already
been mentioned, of a further description in detail? and what end can it serve, since, considering the abundance of the historic material, an exhaustive presentation is surely impossible? — λέγω, is indicative. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 267. — ἐπιλείψεω] only here in the N. T. — ἐπιλείψει με γὰρ διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος περὶ Γεδεῶν κ.τ.λ.] for the time will not suffice me for relating of Gideon, etc. Comp. Demosth. de Corona, ed. Reisk. p. 324: ἐπιλείψει με λέγοντα ἡ ἡμέρα τὰ τῶν προδοτῶν ὄνόματα; Julian. Orat. 1, p. 341 B: ἐπιλείψει με τάκεινον διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος. Parallel is also the Latin: deficit me dies, tempus, e.g. Liv. xxviii. 41: Dies me deficiat, si ... numerare velim; Cic. pro Rose. Amer. c. 32, init.: tempus, hercule, te citius, quam oratio deficiet. Further instances (also from Philo) see in Wetstein and Bleek.— ὁ χρόνος] Oecumenius: ὁ χρόνος ὁ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, φησίν, ἀρμόδιος καὶ οἶνον ἡ συμμετρία; Theophylact: ποίος; ἢ ὁ πᾶς: εἰρηναῖ δὲ τούτῳ, ὡς σύνηθες ἡμῖν λέγειν, ὑπερβολικῶς ἢ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ σύμμετρος. — περὶ Γεδεῶν καὶ Βαρακ κ.τ.λ.] of Gideon, as well as of Barak, etc. That here too, in connection with the correct text, the regard to chronology is not lost sight of, see in the critical remark. — On Gideon, comp. Judg. vi.—viii.; on Barak, Judg. iv., v.; on Samson, Judg. xiii.—xvi.; on Jephthah, Judg. xi. 1—xii. 7. — The last double member is yet enlarged by the addition καὶ τῶν προφητῶν ὁ Σαμουὴλ, because Samuel opened the series of the prophets; cf. Acts iii. 24.

Ver. 33. ὁ δὲ πίστεως κατηγονίσαντο βασιλείας] who by virtue of faith subdued kingdoms. The δὲ πίστεως with emphasis placed at the head dominates the whole description following, so that it continues equally to sound forth in connection with all the finite verbs as far as ἕποιμι. There is a further, however, connects in a lax manner that which follows with that which precedes, in so far as, vv. 33, 34, respect is had, in part at least, to yet other persons besides those mentioned ver. 32. As regards the subject-matter, therefore, there would have been more accurately written in place of the mere ὁ δὲ: "who with others like-minded." — καταγωνίζεσθαι further, in the N. T. a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, signifies to get the better of or overpower. With Böhme to attach to the same the signification: "to acquire by fighting" ("certamine sibi
paraverunt regna; quod nostra lingua succinctius ita dixeris: sie haben sich Herrschervürden erkämpft," is opposed to the usus loquendi.—The statement itself for the rest is true, as of David, who vanquished the Philistines (2 Sam. v. 17-25, viii. 1, xxi. 15 ff.), Moabites, Syrians, Edomites (2 Sam. viii. 2 ff.), and Ammonites (2 Sam. x., xii. 26 ff.), so also of the four judges, mentioned ver. 32, inasmuch as Gideon smote the Midianites (Judg. vii.), Barak the Canaanites (Judg. iv.), Samson the Philistines (Judg. xiv. ff.), Jephthah the Ammonites (Judg. xi.). — εἰργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην wrought righteousness and justice, namely, for their subjects, in virtue of their quality as judges or kings. Comp. τοιείν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην, 2 Sam. viii. 15; 1 Chron. xviii. 14; 2 Chron. ix. 8, al. Too generally Erasmus, Schlichting, Grotius, Schulz, Stein, and others (comp. already Theodoret: τοῖς κοιμὸν τῶν ἄγιων ἀπάντον): they did that which was morally good or pious.—εὐτυχώς εὐαγγελίων obtained promises, i.e. either: came into the possession of blessings which God had promised them (Piscator, Owen, Huët, Böhme, Stuart, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority), or: received words of promise on the part of God (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Primasius, Schlichting [Whitby ?], Bleek, Ebrard, Kurtz, al.). Either interpretation is admissible. Yet in the first case, that no contradiction with ver. 39 (comp. also ver. 13) may arise, only, what the absence of the article before εὐαγγελίων also permits, blessings and successes of earthly nature could be meant. In the first case, one may think of Judg. vii. 7 and the like, while in the second case the words are specially to be referred to the Messianic promises given to David and the prophets.—ἐφράξαν στόματα λειώνων] closed the jaws of lions. Comp. with regard to Daniel, Dan. vi. 22 (1 Macc. ii. 60); with regard to Samson, Judg. xiv. 6; with regard to David, 1 Sam. xvii. 34 ff.

Ver. 34. Ἐσβησαν δύναμιν πυρός] Quenched the violence of fire (fire's violence). Theophylact: οὐκ εἶπε δὲ ἐσβησαν πῦρ ἀλλὰ δύναμιν πυρός, δ καὶ μείζον ἐξαπτόμενον γὰρ ὅλως δύναμιν τοῦ κατειν οὐκ εἶχε κατ' αὐτῶν. To be compared is the statement with regard to Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, the three companions of Daniel, Dan. iii. Comp. 1 Macc.
ii. 59: 'Ananias, 'A̱zarías, Mísas̱, πιστεύοντες ἐσώθησαν ἐκ φλογὸς. — ἐφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας] escaped the sword-points; e.g. David, comp. 1 Sam. xviii. 11, xix. 10, 12, xxi. 10; Elijah, comp. 1 Kings xix. 1 ff.; Elisha, comp. 2 Kings vi. 14 ff., 31 ff. — ἐνενυμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας] out of weakness were made strong. These words Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, and Theophylact refer to the strengthening of the whole people by liberation from the Babylonian captivity; Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Owen, Heinrichs, Huët, Böhme, Stuart, Stein, Tholuck, Ebrard, and the majority, partly exclusively, partly, among other things, to the recovery of Hezekiah (2 Kings xx.; Isa. xxxviii.); certainly more correct, however, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Bleek, de Wette, Hofmann, to the reinvigoration of the weakened Samson (Judg. xvi. 28 ff.). — ἐγνήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ waxed valiant in battle. Theodoret: το ἀυτὸ διαφόρως ἔρηκεν. — παρεμβολῆ, as ἀλλοτρίων] Made armies of aliens flinch or give way. Theodoret: τὸ αὐτὸ διαφόρως ἐρήκε. — παρεμβολῆ, in the signification of army; likewise Judg. iv. 16, vii. 14; 1 Macc. v. 28, 45, and frequently. With the Greeks this signification of the word is rare; comp., however, Aelian, Var. Hist. xiv. 46: Ἡνίκα δὲ ἐδει συμμίξαι, ἐντάθαι οἱ μὲν κύνες προπηδουτες ἐτάραττον τὴν παρεμβολήν. — κλίνειν, in the sense indicated, is found in Holy Scripture only here.

Ver. 35. Ἔλαβον γυναίκες ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τὸν νεκρὸν αὐτῶν] Women received back their dead (their sons) through resurrection. Those meant are the widow of Sarepta (1 Kings xvii. 17 ff.), whose son was awakened out of death by Elijah, and the Shunammite woman (2 Kings iv. 18 ff.), whose son was raised by Elisha. Far-fetched is the supposition of Biesenthal (in Guericke's Zeitschr. f. die ges. luther. Theol. u. Kirche, 1866, H. 4, p. 616 ff.): reference is made to the tradition, preserved to us in the rabbinical and talmudic literature, of the cessation of the dying away of the male population in the wilderness on the 15th Ab. — Syntactically ver. 35 begins
a new proposition (against Böhme, who, as unnaturally as possible, makes the statement ἐλαβον... αὐτῶν still dependent on οἷ, ver. 33, and regards γυναικεῖς as apposition to οἷ).

— With ἄλλοι δὲ, to the close of ver. 38, the discourse passes over to examples of a suffering faith, which remained still unrewarded upon earth. — ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανισθησαν] Others, on the other hand, were stretched on the rack. Allusion to the martyr-death of Eleazar (2 Macc. vi. 18 ff.), and of the seven Maccabean brothers, together with their mother (2 Macc. vii.). τυμπανιζεθαι means: to be stretched out upon the τύμπανον (comp. 2 Macc. vi. 19, 28), an instrument of torture (probably wheel-shaped, Josephus, de Macc. c. 5, 9, 10: τροχύς), — to be stretched out like the skin of a kettledrum, in order then to be tortured to death by blows (comp. 2 Macc. vi. 30).

— οὐ προσδέξαμεν] not accepting, i.e. since the expression, by reason of the objective negation οὐ, blends into a single notion: disdaining. — τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν] the deliverance, namely the earthly one, which they could have gained by the renouncing of their faith. Comp. 2 Macc. vi. 21 ff., vii. 27 ff. — ἐν κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχασι] that they might become partakers of a better resurrection. Motive for the contemning of earthly deliverance. Comp. 2 Macc. vii. 9, 11, 14, 20, 23, 29, 36, as also 2 Macc. vi. 26. κρείττονος stands not in opposition to the resurrection of the ungodly unto judgment, Dan. xii. 2 (Oecumenius: κρείττονος... ὡς λοιποὶ ἀνθρώπου ἡ μὲν ἡδύ ἀνάστασις πάσης κοινῆ, ἄλλη ὡς τῆς ἀναστήσουσαι, φησίν, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ οὕτως εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον. Comp. Theophylact), neither does it form any antithesis to ἐξ ἀναστάσεως in the beginning of the verse (Chrysostom: οὐ τοιαύτης, οἷς τὰ παιδία τῶν γυναικῶν; Theophylact, who does not, however, decide; Bengal, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Stengel, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 617, Obs.; Alford, Maier, Kurtz, and others), which is too remote; but corresponds to the ἀπολύτρωσιν immediately preceding. A much higher possession was the resurrection to the eternal, blessed life, than the temporal deliverance from death; which latter could be regarded, likewise, as a sort of resurrection, but truly only as a lower and valueless one.
VER. 36. Others endured mockings and scourges, yea, moreover, bonds and prison. "Eteroi, in accordance with its verbal signification, introduces a heterogeneous class of heroes of the faith, i.e. a particular species of the ἄλλοι, mentioned as the genus ver. 35. As regards the subject itself, indeed, inexact, since, ver. 35, with ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν κ.τ.λ. reference was made not merely to 2 Macc. vi., but—as the addition ἰδα κρείττωνος ἀναστάσεως τίχωσιν clearly shows—at the same time to 2 Macc. vii.; the mention, however, of the scourging along with the mocking seems to admit of explanation only from the author's referring to 2 Macc. vi. 30 (μαστιγούμενος) and vii. 1 (μάστιξι καὶ νευραῖς αἰκίζομένως), as indeed the enduring of public mockery is expressly mentioned (in addition to 1 Macc. ix. 26) at 2 Macc. vii. 7 (τὸν δεύτερον ἤγγον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐμπανημόνων), and again 2 Macc. vii. 10 (μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ὁ τρίτος ἐνεπαίξετο). On the other hand, however, it seems evident that it was the intention of the writer at ver. 36 in reality to draw attention to a dissimilar class of men; from the fact, even apart from the choice of the expression ἐτεροί, that in the case of the previous ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν κ.τ.λ. we are constrained to think of a death by martyrdom, while at ver. 36 the enhancing ἢτι δὲ forbids our thinking of the martyr's death, since, according to this, bonds and dungeon were a more severe trial than mocking and scourging. We must therefore suppose that the author designed further to refer to those, as forming a special category, who, without suffering actual death, were exposed to other kinds of tortures and miseries; that he still derived, however, the main colours for this new picture from the historic figure which but just now had been present to his mind in connection with the ἐτυμπανίσθησαν κ.τ.λ.—The enhancing ἢτι δὲ is to be explained from the fact that ἐμπανημόνω καὶ μάστιγες denotes the more transient suffering, in point of time more brief; δέξαμοι καὶ φυλακῇ, on the other hand, the longer enduring sufferings.—πείραν λαμβάνειν] here in the passive sense: to have experience of something. Otherwise ver. 29.—δέξαμον καὶ φυλακὴν] Comp. 1 Macc. xiii. 12; 1 Kings xxii. 27; Jer. xxxvii., xxxviii., al.

VER. 37. Ἁλθάσθησαν] They were stoned. To be referred
to Zechariah, son of Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiv. 20–22; comp. Matt. xxiii. 35; Luke xi. 51), and probably also to Jeremiah, of whom at least later tradition reports death by stoning. Comp. Tertull. Scorpiac. 8; Hieronym. adv. Jovinian. ii. 37; Pseudo-Epiph. (Opp. ii. p. 239), al. Less suitably do Oecumenius, Theophylact, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, and others think also of Naboth, 1 Kings xxi. — ἐπιλάθησαν were sawn asunder. Death by sawing asunder (comp. 2 Sam. xii. 31; 1 Chron. xx. 3) was, according to early tradition, that suffered by Isaiah at the hands of Manasseh, king of Judah. See Ascens. Jes. vat. v. 11–14; Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph. 120; Tertull. de Patient. 14, Scorpiac. 8; Origen, Epist. ad African.; Lactant. Instit. iv. 11, al.; Tr. Jeramoth, f. 49. 2; Sanhedrin, f. 103. 2. — ἐπιλάθησαν were tempted. This general statement has about it something strange and inconvenient, inasmuch as it occurs in the midst of the mention of different kinds of violent death. Some, therefore, have been in favour of entirely deleting ἐπιλάθησαν (Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Marloratus, Grotius, Hammond, Whitby, Calmet, Storr, Valckenaer, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Delitzsch, Maier, al.), in doing which, however, we are not justified by external evidence;¹ while others have thought that ἐπιλάθησαν is a corruption, in itself early, of the original text, which latter must be restored by conjecture. It has been conjectured by Beza, edd. 3, 4, 5, that we have to read ἐπιλαθησαν; Gataker, Miscell. 44, Colomesius, Observ. 5, Moll, and Hofmann: ἐπιλαθησαν; Fr. Junius, Parav. lib. iii., and Piscator: ἐπιλαθησαν; Sykes and Ebrard: ἐπιλαθησαν, they were burned.² Further, Luther (transl.), Beza, edd. 1 and 2, Knatchbull, Fischer, Protuss. de vitiis Lexic. N. T. p. 538; Ewald, p. 171, read ἐπάρθησαν (?), from πείπα, they were pierced, transfixed; Wakefield, Silv. crit. ii. 62: ἐπιλαθησαν,

¹ It is wanting only in some cursives, in the Peshito,— whose daughter, the Arabian version in Erpen., also omits it,— in the Aethiopic version, which also omits Ἰωάννης, with Origen (once, as compared with four times), Euseb. and Theophyl.

² Reuss, too, regards Ἰωάννης [as does Conybeare Ἰωάννης] as the most likely conjecture, but regards it, likewise, as possible: "que le Ἰωάννης dans le texte vulgaire ne fut qu'une conjecture très-superflue, destinée à remplacer le mot Ἰωάννης (ils furent sciés), parce que l'Ancien Testament ne fournit pas d'exemple de ce dernier supplice."
from τεράω (?), they were spitted, impaled; Tanaq, Faber, Epp. crit. ii. 14, and J. M. Gesner in Carpzov: ἐπηρώθησαν, they were mutilated; Alberti: ἐπειράθησαν ὡς ἐπειράθησαν, from σπείρα (?), they were broken on the wheel; Steph. le Moyne in Gronov. Ant. Gr. vii. p. 301: ἐπάθησαν, they were sold. Others yet other conjectures; see Wetstein, Griesbach, and Scholz ad loc. Bleek, too, assumes an error in the text, in that he holds a word which signifies “to be consumed, to perish by fire,” as ἐπηράθησαν, which is found with Cyrill. Hieros., and in Codd. 110, 111 for ἐπιράθησαν, or ἐπυρώθησαν, or even one of the forms more commonly employed for the expressing of this idea,—ἐνεπηρήσθησαν and ἐνεπυρώθησαν,—to be the original reading, and then supposes the author perhaps to have thought once more of martyrs under the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes, 2 Macc. vi. 11, vii. 4 f.; Dan. xi. 33, al. Comp. also Philo, ad Flacc. p. 990 A (with Mangey, II. p. 542): κατελώθησάν τως (sc. Alexandrine Jews, by Flaccus) καὶ δίνοντες οἱ μὲν ἐνεπηρήσθησαν οἱ δὲ διὰ μέσης κατεσύρησαν ἁγώνας, ἡς δὲ τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐδαπανήθη. Similarly Reitze, Commentar. Crit. p. 111 sqq., who leaves open the choice between ἐπηράθησαν and ἐπυρώθησαν. — If ἐπειράσθησαν is genuine, it must have been added by the author for the sake of the paronomasia with ἐπηράθησαν, and be referred to the enticements and temptations to escape a violent death by means of apostasy (comp. e.g. 2 Macc. vii. 24). — ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον] died by slaughter of the sword. Comp. 1 Kings xix. 10: τοὺς προφήτας σοι ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ; Jer. xxvi. 23: καὶ ἐπάταξαν αὐτὸν ἐν μαχαίρα (namely, the prophet Urijah). For the expression ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας, comp. LXX. Ex. xvii. 13; Num. xxi. 24; Deut. xiii. 15, xx. 13.— περιῆλθον ... τῆς γῆς, ver. 38, now further emphasizes the fact that the whole life of the last-named class of the heroes of faith was one of want and distress. — περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταίς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν] refers specially to single prophets. Comp. Zech. xiii. 4, also Clemens Romanus, ad Corinth. 17: μηλωταὶ γενόμεθα κάκεινοι, οίτινες ἐν δέρμασιν αἰγείοι καὶ μηλωταῖς περισπάθησαν, κηρύσσοντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγομεν δὲ Ἡλίαν καὶ Ἑλισσαίον, ἕτε δὲ καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ τῶν προφήτας. — περιῆλθον] they went hither and thither, without
being in possession of a fixed dwelling-place. Theophylact: τὸ δὲ περιήλθον τὸ διώκεσθαι αὐτοὺς δῆλοι καὶ ἀστατεῖς. — ἐν in, i.e. clothed with. — ἐν μηλαταῖς, ἐν αἰγελοις δέρμασιν in sheep-skins, in goat fells. The latter, as designation of a yet rougher clothing, is an ascent from the former, and on that account placed last. μηλατή, the hide of smaller cattle in general, and specially of sheep. Α μηλατή is mentioned as the garment of Elijah, which, on his being caught up to heaven, he left behind to Elisha, 1 Kings xix. 13, 19; 2 Kings vii. 13, 14. — οὐστερούμενοι, θλιβόμενοι, κακοχρώμενοι in want (sc. of that which is necessary for the sustenance of life), affliction, evil-treatment (comp. ver. 25).

Ver. 38. Ἐν οὖν ἦν ἄξιος οὐ κόσμος] Men, to possess whom the (corrupt) world (ver. 7) was not worthy. Theophylact: Ἐν οὖν ἦχετε, φεισίω, εἶπεν ὅτι ἀμαρτωλοί οὗτε τουαντά ἐπάσχον, ἀλλὰ τουλάχιο, οἷοι καὶ τὸ κόσμῳ αὐτὸν τιμωτερὸν εἶναι. Calvin: Quum ita profugi inter feras vagabantur sancti prophetae, videri poterant indigni, quos terras sustineret. Qui fit enim, ut inter homines locum non inveniant? Sed apostolus in contrariam partem hoc retorquet, nempe quod mundus illis non esset dignus. Nam quocunque veniant servi Dei, ejus benedictionem, quasi fragrantiam boni odoris, secum afferunt. — ὅ] goes back to the subject in περιήλθον, ver. 37. In a forced manner Böhme (as also Kuinoel, Klee, and Stein): it points to that which follows, and the sense is: oberravisse illos in desertis tales, quibus vulgus hominum, ut esse soleat, pravum ac impium, haud dignum fuerit, quocum illi sese loco versarentur. Not less unnaturally does Hofmann look upon ὅν οὖν ἦν ἄξιος οὐ κόσμος as only a following definition of subject to περιήλθον, in that he begins a new section of the discourse with περιήλθον. To a yet greater extent, finally, has Carpzov missed the true interpretation, when, taking ὅν as a neuter, he supplies κακῶν (οὐστερήσεων, θλίψεων), and gives as the sense: quorum indignus malorum erat mundus. Id est: tam crudelibus affecti sunt suppliciiis, ut ills mundo indigna sint; ut orbem terrarum non deceat, tam horrenda ac φοβερῶτατα de eo dici.— ἐν ἐρημίαις πλαγίαις κ.τ.λ. wandering in deserts and upon mountains, and in caves and the cliffs of the earth. Comp. 1 Kings
Ver. 39, 40. General remark in closing.—Kai otiou pantes] And these all. Refers back to the totality of the persons named, from ver. 4 (not merely, as Schlichting, Hammond, and Storr suppose, to those mentioned from ἄλλοι δέ, ver. 35).—μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως] although by virtue of their faith they received a (glorious) testimony (in Scripture).—οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελλαν] did not bear away the promise (wrongly Ebrard: the aorist stands "pro plusquamperf."). i.e. attained not, so long as they lived, to the possession of that which was promised, namely, the Messianic blessedness.

Ver. 40. The ground for the οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελλαν lay in the decree of God, that those believers should not apart from us attain to the consummation.—τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν κρείττον τι προβλεψαμένον] God having, with regard to us, foreseen (predetermined) something better.—προβλέπειν] in the N. T. only here. —On account of the emphatically preposed περὶ ἡμῶν, which forms the contrast to οὕτωι πάντες, ver. 39, κρείττον τι cannot be placed absolutely: "Something better than would otherwise have been our portion" (Schlichting, Seb. Schmidt, Huët). With this thought, moreover, ἵνα μὴ χαρίς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσιν would not have been in keeping, since, instead thereof, ἵνα σὺν αὐτοῖς τελειωθῶμεν must have been written. The sense can only be: in regard to us something better than in regard to them. In regard to us something better, inasmuch as when they lived the appearing of the Redeemer as yet belonged to the distant future, and was an object of longing desire (Matt. xiii. 16 f.; Luke x. 23 f.); but now Christ has in reality appeared, has accomplished the redemption, and presently after a brief interval will return, to bring to full realization the Messianic kingdom with all its blessings of salvation. Comp. x. 25, 36 f.—ἵνα μὴ χαρίς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσιν] Declaration of the divine design: that they not without us should attain to the consummation. Without us, i.e. without our having entered into the joint participation in the consummation, they would have attained to the consummation, if
Christ had already appeared in their time, and so they had already attained during their lifetime to the possession of the promised Messianic bliss. For then we should not have been born at all; since, according to the declaration of the Lord (Matt. xxii. 30; Mark xii. 25; Luke xx. 35 f.), in the consummated kingdom of God a marrying and being given in marriage will no longer take place.
CHAPTER XII.

Ver. 2. ξειδόσεως] Elz.: ξειδοσίων. But the perfect, adopted into the Editt. Complut. Genev. Plant., as also by Bengel, Griesb. Matth. Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche, and others, has the preponderant attestation of all the uncials, most cursives, and many Fathers in its favour; and is likewise preferable on internal grounds, since it represents the having sat down as a result extending into the present time.—

Ver. 3. In place of the Recepta sīς αὐτῶς or sīς αὐτόν, which has the support of D*** K L, almost all the cursives and many Fathers, there is found sīς αὐτός in Η***, with Theodoret (το sīς αὐτός ἀντὶ τού sīς αὐτός), and in Cod. 17; sīς αὐτός, however, in Η*, in the Peshito (quantum sustinuerit a peccatoribus, qui fuerunt adversarii sibi ipsis), in D* E*, together with their Latin version (recogitate igitur, talem vos reportasse a peccatoribus in vobis adversitatem), and in some ms. of the Vulgate; while the Sahidic and Armenian vss. entirely omit the words, and Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, de Wette write sī; αὐτός. The latter, which is attested by A and the Vulgate (in semetipsum), indirectly also by D* E*, is to be held the original reading; the plural, on the other hand, to be rejected as devoid of sense.—

Ver. 5. Elz.: τιί μου. D*, some seven cursives, as also the Latin translation in D E, have only τιί. Bleek has on that account suspected μου, and enclosed it within brackets. External authority, however, does not warrant our deleting the pronoun. The occasion for its omission might be afforded by the occurrence of a similar initial letter in the following word, or by the text of the LXX. in which it is wanting.—

Ver. 7. τι παίδειαν ἵππαστι] Instead of this, Matth. Lachm. Tisch. 1,
7 and 8, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 758), and Alford read τες παιδιαν ὑπομίνης, and Griesbach has placed τες upon the inner margin. In favour of τες pleads, it is true, the greatly preponderating authority of A D E (?) K L κ, of more than thirty cursive, Vulg. It. Syr. Cop. Sahid. Aeth. Arm. Damasc. Procop., while τε is found only with Chrys. Theodoret, Theophyl. Slav. (?), and, as it seems, in many cursive. Nevertheless τες is inadmissible. For, whether τες παιδιαν is taken still with παραδίκται, or, as Hofmann will have it, with μαστίγοι,—whereby, however, that which follows would become deformed,—or it be combined with ὑπομίνης, in any case παιδία must be understood in the sense of "education," whereas of a certainty, alike from that which precedes as from that which follows, the signification "chastisement" becomes a necessity. Consequently the Recepta τες παιδιαν ὑπομίνης is to be looked upon as that written by the author. The originality and correctness of this reading (defended also by Reiche, p. 115 sqq.) becomes manifestly apparent from the fact that upon its recognition vv. 7, 8, in accordance with the usual accuracy of diction prevailing in the Epistle to the Hebrews, are in perfect mutual correspondence as type and antitype, alike as regards the protasis as also the apodosis.—

In place of the Recepta τες γάρ Ἰςιν, we have, with Lachm. and Tisch., after A κ* Vulg. Sahid. Orig., to write merely: τες γάρ. — Ver. 8. Elz.: νόθοι Ἰσιν καὶ ὁ χ. τιν. With Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Delitzsch, Alford, we have to transpose into: νόθοι καὶ ὁ χ. τιν. Ἰςιν, after A D* and D*** [in Cod. E all the rest is wanting from τάντα, ver. 8, to the close of the Epistle] κ, 17, 37, 80, αλ., Vulg. It. Chrys. (codd.) and Latin Fathers. — Ver. 9. Elz.: ὅ τελλο φ. μᾶλλον. But A D* κ (D* κ*** with the addition of δί) have ὅ τελλο μᾶλλον. Rightly preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch, Alford. — Ver. 15. In place of the received διὰ ταύτης, we have to adopt, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 2, and Alford, after A, 17, 67* 80, 137, 238, Cop. etc., Clem. Chrys. (comment.): δί′ αὐτῆς; and in place of the Recepta σολλοί, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, after A κ, 47, Clem. Theodoret: οἰ σολλοί. The article was lost sight of in the homoioteleuton σολλοί. — Ver. 16. Lachm. (and Tisch. 2 and 7, as well as Alford, have followed him therein!) has placed in the text, from A C, the form of the word ἁγίασα; but this, although not altogether unexampled (see Buttmann, Gramm. des neutestam. Sprachgebr. p. 40 f.), is manifestly a corruption of the Recepta ἁγίασον, which is confirmed by the Cod. Sinait. — On the other hand, the reading ιαυροῦ, given by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, merits,
on account of its more decided attestation by A C D* and D**, the preference over the Recepta αὐτῷ or αὐτῇ.—

Ver. 18. Elz.: ἡ ἡγαφωμίνῳ ὑπεν. ὑπεν. furnished by D K L, in like manner, as it seems, by almost all cursives, Vulg. (ed. Clem.) Arab. polygl. Slav. Athan. Theodoret, Damasc. Occum., is wanting indeed in A C, 17, 47, in many mss. of the Vulg., in Copt. Sahid. Syr. Arab. Erp. Aeth., with Chrys. (comment.), Theophyl. Mart. pap. Bed., and was already suspected by Mill (Prolegg. 1071) as a gloss, and then deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 8, as likewise by Alford, is, however, indispensable, and is naturally called for by the opposition ἀλλὰ προσηλύτας τινὰ ὑπεν. ὑπεν. ver. 22 (comp. also τοῦ ὑπεν. ver. 20), as well as the confusion of idea in a τῷ ἡγαφωμίνῳ. Rightly, therefore, has Tisch. 2 and 7 placed ὑπεν. again in the text. — καὶ ζῷῳ] Elz.: καὶ αὐξῳ. Against A C D* 17, 31, 39.

al. Suspected by Griesb. Eightly rejected by Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford. αὐξῳ was introduced from the LXX. Deut. iv. 11, v. 22.— Ver. 19. In place of the Recepta προσπεθῆαι, Lachm. in the stereotype edition had adopted προσπεθῆαι, after A. Rightly, however, has he retained the Recepta in the larger edition. This reading is borne out by C D K L, by, as it seems, all the cursives and many Fathers. — Ver. 20. After λιθοβολήσεται, Elz. adds further: θ' βολ' ἵνα παντεξευθήσεται. Against all uncials (A C D K L M W), most min., all translations, and many Fathers. The words, deleted by Griesbach, Scholz, and all later editors, are a gloss from LXX. Ex. xix. 13. — Ver. 23. Elz.: εἰν οὐρανὸς ἀπογραμμάτων. But the decisive testimony of A C D L M W, 37, al. m., Syr. Copt. Vulg. and many Fathers demands the transposition adopted by Griesb. Scholz. Lachm. Bleek. Alford, and others: ἀπογραμμάτων εἰν οὐρανοῖς. — Ver. 24. κρίττον λαλοῦντι] Elz.: κριττοια λαλοῦντι. Against A C D K L M W, most min. Syr. Arr. Copt. Sahid. Armen. Vulg. al., and many Fathers. — Ver. 25. Elz.: ἔφυγον τῶν ἵππων γῆς παραπταμένοι χρηματίζοντα, παλύρῳ μᾶλλον. Instead of this, however, we have to read, with Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. (who, however, in the edit. vii. has given the preference to the verbum simplex ἔφυγον, over the verbum compositum ἔφυγον) Alford: ἔφυγον ἵππῳ ἱππαρπταμένοι τῶν χρη- 

matίζοντα, παλύρῳ μᾶλλον, in that ἔφυγον (already approved by Grotius) is demanded by A C W 57, 118, al. (Vulg. D, Lat. Slav. Epiph. in cant. cantic.: effugerunt), Cyr. Chrys. Philo Carpas. Occum.; the deleting of the article τῆς before γῆς (already omitted in the Edit. Erasm. Complut. Colin., afterwards also by Bengel, Griesb. Matth. Scholz) is required by all
the uncial mss. (including K), most min., and very many Fathers; further, the placing of the article τοῦ only after παραγωγῆσαν is required by A C D M N* Cyril. Damasc.; finally, τοῦ is required by A C D* K, Sahid. — Ver. 26. Elz.: οἷα. But A C M K, 6, 47, al., Syr. Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Slav. Athan. Cyril. Cosm. Andr. Areth. have οὖσαν. Approved by Grotius, recommended by Griesb., rightly adopted by Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Alford, Reiche. — Ver. 27. Recepta: τῶν σαλινομίσης τῆς μετάβασις. Better accredited, however (by A C N*), is Lachmann's order of the words: τῆς τῶν σαλινομίσης μετάβασις, which on that account is to be preferred. Bleek and Tisch. 1 have entirely rejected the article τῆς. It is wanting, however, only in D* and M. — Ver. 28. The reading ἐκχωμι, which Calvin, Mill (Prolegg. 750), Heinrichs, and others approve, and which Luther also followed in his translation, is unsuitable, and insufficiently attested by K, more than twenty min., most mss. of the Vulg, Aeth. Cyr. Antioch., while the reading ἐχωμι rests upon the testimony of A C D L M, etc., Copt. Syr. Aeth. al., Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. al., as also a ms. of the Vulg. — In that likewise which follows, the indicative λαμβάνωμεν, which Griesbach has placed on the inner margin, stands in point of external attestation below the Recepta λαμβάνωμεν. The former is found in K M N, about fifty min., with Athan., in mss. of Chrys., with Oecum. and Theophyl. On the other hand, A C D L, very many min. and many Fathers have λαμβάνωμεν. — At the close of the verse the Recepta reads: μετὰ αἰΔοῦς καὶ εὐλαβείας, instead of which, however, we have, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford, to adopt the reading (recommended also by Griesb.): μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δίους, after A C D* K* 17, 71, 73, 80, 137, Copt. Sahid. Slav. ed. (al.: μετὰ δίους καὶ εὐλαβείας. Vulg.: cum metu et reverentia. D, Lat.: cum metu et verucandia).

Vv. 1–13. In possession of such a multitude of examples, and with the eye uplifted to Jesus Himself, are the readers with stedfastness to maintain the conflict which lies before them, and to regard their sufferings as a salutary chastisement on the part of that God who is full of fatherly love towards them.

Ver. 1. Conclusion from the total contents of chap. xi. — In the animating summons expressed vv. 1, 2, the addition δι’ ὑπομονῆς, appended to the main verb τρέχωμεν, has the principal stress; comp. x. 36, xi. 1. Of the participial clauses, however, the first and third are of the same kind,
and are distinguished in equal degree from the second; as accordingly the former are introduced by participles of the present, the latter by a participle of the aorist. The first and third contain a ground of animation to the δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχωμεν; by the second, on the other hand, the historic preliminary condition to the δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχειν is stated. The euphonious τονγαρόν elsewhere in the N. T. only 1 Thess. iv. 8.—καὶ ἡμεῖς] we also, namely, like the saints of the Old Covenant described chap. xi.—τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων] since we have so great a cloud of witnesses around us, or: since so great a cloud of witnesses surrounds us. ἔχοντες περικείμενον is intimately connected together, and is a periphrasis of the mere verbal notion, inasmuch as a genitive absolute: τοσοῦτον περικείμενον ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ., might have been employed instead. νέφος is a figurative designation (also of frequent occurrence with classical writers) of a densely compact crowd. Theodoret: πλῆθος τοσοῦτον, νέφος μιμούμενον τῇ πυκνότητι. Comp. Hom. Π. iv. 274: ἀμα δὲ νέφος εἶπετο πέζων, al. Eugr. Heg. 901 f.: τοῖν Ἐλλάνων νέφος ἀμφι σε κρύπτει. Phoeniss. 1328 ff.: πότερ' ἐμαυτὸν ἢ πάλιν στένω δακρύσας, ἢ πέριε ἔχει νέφος τοσοῦτον, δοκεῖ δὲ Ἀχέροστος ἴναι; Herod. viii. 109: νέφος τοσοῦτον ἀνθρώπων. Similarly also is the Latin nubes employed. Comp. e.g. Liv. 35. 49: rex contra peditum equitumque nubes jactat.—Those meant by the τοσοῦτον νέφος μαρτύρων are the persons mentioned chap. xi. When, however, these are characterized as a cloud of witnesses, the author does not intend to imply that these witnesses are present as spectators at the contest to be maintained by the readers (Hammond, Calmet, Böhme, Paulus, Klee, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Hofmann), but represents them thereby as persons who have borne testimony for the πίστις which he demands of his readers,¹ and who consequently have become models for imitation to the readers as regards this virtue.

To this signification of μαρτύρων points with necessity the whole reasoning immediately foregoing. For as δι' ὑπομονῆς,

¹ The supposition of Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 757), Alford, Maier, and Moll, that in μαρτύρων, ver. 1, the idea of "spectators"
xii. 1, attaches again the discourse to ἵπομονῆς γὰρ ἐνετε χρείαν κ.τ.λ., x. 36, so also the contents of chap. xi., which stand in close connection with the latter, are recapitulated by the words: τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῶν νέφος μαρτύρων. On account, however, of this close connection of the first participial clause, xii. 1, with chap. xi., μαρτύρων cannot be otherwise interpreted than after the analogy of the characterization there made: μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως, xi. 39; ἐν ταύτῃ ἐμαρτυρήσαν, xi. 2; δι' ἦς ἐμαρτυρήση, xi. 4; and μεμαρτύρηται, xi. 5, in that only the slight distinction is made, justified in a natural manner by the varying form of designation, that while the persons named were before represented as those to whom a laudatory testimony was given in scripture on account of the πίστεις manifested by them, they now appear as those who, by their conduct, have delivered a testimony in favour of their virtue of πίστεις, and consequently have become patterns of the same for others. On account of this intimate coherence of the first participial clause, xii. 1, with chap. xi., a more nearly-defining addition, τῆς πίστεως, to μαρτύρων, was, moreover, superfluous. That, however, μαρτύρων is in reality employed with reference to the πίστεως which the author demands of his readers, is further shown by τῆς πίστεως, xii. 2, from which it is clearly apparent that the notion πίστεως is still before the mind of the writer at ver. 2. It is therefore to be supposed that the discourse turns round to the figure of the race—to which, indeed, περικείμενον would already be appropriate, but to which this participle is not at all of necessity to be referred—only with δικαν ἀποθέμενοι κ.τ.λ.—δικαν ἀποθέμενοι πάντα] having put off every hindrance (opposed to the context, Bengal and others: every kind of pride or arrogance; Hofmann: all earthly care and sorrow). The man contending in the race avoided, in order to keep his body light, oppressive clothing and the like. In the application, the clinging of the readers to external Judaism is certainly, in particular, thought of as the hindrance. Yet the expression is quite general, and sin in the strict blends with that of "witnesses to the faith," bears its refutation upon the face of it. For the combining of that which is logically irreconcilable is not exegesis.
sense of the term, which is immediately after quite specially emphasized, is likewise included thereunder. For \textit{kai} is not, with Grotius and others, to be taken \textit{explicitly}, but further brings into relief, in the form of a parallel classification, a definite species, taken, on account of its special importance, out of the before-named genus.—\textit{Sin} is termed \textit{εὐπερίστατος}. This adjective exists only here in the whole range of Greek literature. It is most naturally derived from the middle voice: \textit{περίστασθαι}, \textit{to place oneself round}, or \textit{encompass}. The sense is therefore: \textit{sin, which easily surrounds us and takes us captive}. So the majority. Others derive \textit{εὐπερίστατος} from the active \textit{περίστημι}, then taking the word either in a passive or active sense. The explanation of Ernesti (\textit{ad Hesych. gloss. sacr.} p. 140 sq.), that "as \textit{περίστατον} denotes that which is thronged about by people who come to admire it, and \textit{ἀπερίστατος} is said of a man about whom others do not stand, thus, who is destitute of friends; so \textit{εὐπερίστατος} characterizes sin as rich in friends and patrons, as generally esteemed and liked," has against it the consideration that from \textit{εἰνρήπιατραίας}, in this acceptation, the idea of that which is \textit{public and manifest} is inseparable; but this idea is out of keeping with the notion of sin, which is just as often perpetrated in secret as in public. The interpretation: \textit{sin, which is easily to be gone round, encircled, or avoided} (Chrysostom: \textit{ἡ τὴν εὐκόλως περίστασιν ὑμνάμενη παθεῖν λέγει μᾶλλον δὲ τούτο ῥᾴδιον γάρ, ἐὰν θέλωμεν, περγενόσθαι [get the better of] τῆς ἀμαρτίας; Pseudo-Athanasius, \textit{de parabol. Script. quaest.} 133: \textit{εὐπερίστατον εἰσε τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, ἐπειδὴ δὲν μόνον στάσιν οὐκ ἔχει, ἀλλὰ ταχέως τρέπεται καὶ καταλύεται}; Clericus, Morus, Ewald p. 172), would yield an unsuitable thought, since it could not possibly be the design of the author to represent the power of sin as small. The \textit{active explanation}: seductive or enticing (Carpzov, Schulz, Stein), has against it the fact that all the other derivatives from \textit{ὁπτήμι}, such as \textit{στατός, ἀστατός}, etc., have an intransitive or passive signification. Others, again, in their explanations of \textit{εὐπερίστατος}, follow the significations of the substantive \textit{περίστασις}: \textit{sin, which easily plunges us into danger} (Er. Schmid, Raphael, Bengel, Storr; comp. already Theophylact: \textit{...}}
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which brings with it many hindrances (Kypke, Michaelis, Dindorf, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Bloomfield); which has circumstances (surroundings), whereby it commends itself and seduces us (Hammond); quae bonis utitur rebus circumstantibus, i.e. quae habet suisque affect bonam fortunam atque voluptates (Böhme).—The ἁμαρτία is sin in general; not specially: the sin of apostasy from Christianity. On account of ἀποδέμενοι, the ἁμαρτία is thought of as a burden which we bear within us as a propensity, or about us as an encumbering garment. — τρέχειν ἄγωνα] to run a race. Comp. Herod. viii. 102; Dion. Hal. vii. 48; Eurip. Orest. 875. — δι’ ὑπομονής] Rom. viii. 25.

Ver. 2. Second factor in the encouragement. Not only the example of the O. T. witnesses for the faith, but also the example of the Beginner and Perfecter of the faith, Christ Himself, must animate us to a persevering τρέχειν. — ἀφορέω-τες] in that we look forth (for our encouragement and for our ardent imitation). ἀφορᾶν (as, immediately after, τελεωτής) only here in the N. T. — εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἄρχην καὶ τελεωτὴν Ἰησοῦν] to the Beginner and Perfecter of the faith, Jesus, i.e. to Jesus, who has begun or awakened in us the Christian faith, and carries it on in us to perfection, or to the close (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, and the majority), which last particular then naturally includes the attaining of salvation. But it is going too far when one finds—as Grotius, Bloomfield, and many others—in τελεωτής the figure of the βραβευτής, the judge or umpire of the games, who, on the completion of the contest, awards the prize of victory; for the expression itself does not warrant this special application. According to Bengel, Baumgarten, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. z. Darmst. Allg. Kreutz-Zeit. 1857, No. 29, p. 667), Nickel (Reuter's Repertor. March 1858, p. 208 f.), Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 326), Maier, Moll, Kurtz,—comp. also Theodoret: Κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ἀμφότερα τέθεικαν,—ο τῆς πίστεως ἄρχην καὶ τελεωτής Ἰησοῦς has the sense: Jesus, who in manifestation of the faith has preceded us by His example, and in the manifestation of this faith has carried on the work
unto perfection. But the virtue of faith, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews could not possibly predicate of Christ in like manner as he does of the Christians. From the lofty conception he had of the person of the Redeemer, he must, like the Apostle Paul, regard Him by whom the divine decrees of salvation were to be realized, as object of the πίστις. More than this, τελειωτής can be used only transitively, not also intransitively. ἀρχηγὸς τῆς πίστεως stands, therefore, in a sense quite analogous to that of the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας, ii. 10; and the exemplary characteristic in Jesus, to which the author directs his readers, is not already expressed by His being designated as ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτής τῆς πίστεως,—which, on the contrary, is only designed to make us aware of the assistance which Christ affords the Christians in the τρέχειν,—but first is expressed by means of the following relative clause. — ἀντί τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς] who for the (heavenly) joy lying ready for Him, the obtaining of which should be the reward of His sufferings. So Primasius, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Bengel, Whitby, Schulz, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 357), Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority. ἀντί, as ver. 16. For χαρά, however, comp. Matt. xxv. 21. Comprehended under the προκειμένη αὐτῷ χαρά is also the joy over the completed work of redemption, with its blessings for mankind; yet it is erroneous, with Theodoret (χαρά δὲ τοῦ σωτήρος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ σωτηρία), to limit it thereto. The sense is not: instead of the heavenly glory which He already had as the premundane Logos, and which He might have retained, but which He gave up by His incarnation (Peshito, Gregory Nazianz. in Oecum.: ὁ ἐξὸν μένει ἐπὶ τῆς θεοτητος τῷ καὶ θεότητος, οὐ μόνον ἐκείνου ἐκένωσεν ἄμετρα τῆς δούλου μορφής, ἀλλὰ καὶ σταυροῦ

1 Inconsistently does Delitzsch adhere to this explanation (and similarly Alford and Kluge),—in reference, indeed, to the notion ὁ τελειωτής ἀρχηγός,—but rejects it in reference to the notion, necessarily combining in homogeneity therewith, ὁ τελειωτής τοῦ πιστοῦ. The sense is supposed to be: "Jesus is the Prince of faith: for upon the path on which faith has to run, He has gone first to open the way; He is faith's Completer: for upon this path He leads us to the goal." That Jesus Himself reached the goal upon this path, is then supposed to be an unuttered intermediate thought (!).
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Nor is it: instead of the earthly freedom from suffering, which, as the sinless One, He could have procured for Himself (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Zeger, Jac. Cappellus, Calov, al.); or: instead of the joys of the world, which Jesus, had He willed it, could have partaken of (Calvin, Wolf, Carpzov, Stein, Bisping, al.). For the immediate concern of the author must evidently be to point to the prize which Christ was to receive in return for His sufferings, in order thereupon further to indicate that to the readers likewise, upon their persevering in the conflict, the palm of victory will not be wanting. A further consideration is, that also the closing member of the verse, which is closely attached by means of \(\text{re} \) to that which precedes, has for its subject-matter still the thought of the reward conferred upon Christ. — \[\text{endured the cross, in that He contemned the infamy. For the death of the cross was crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium (Cic. Verr. 5. 64). — \(\text{ev de} \) \text{tou} \text{brônou tou theou kekáthke} \] and has sat down at the right hand of His throne of God. Comp. i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12.

Ver. 3. \(\text{Tap}\) is here, on account of the imperative, the corroborative: \(\text{Yeal} \) (comp. Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 415 f.); and \(\text{analogixes} \text{thai} \), in the N. T. a \(\text{apat} \text{leumeno} \), denotes the comparing or reflecting contemplation. Bengel: Comparatione instituta cogitate: Dominus tanta tulit; quanto magis servi ferant aliquid? — \(\text{antilologia} \), however, denotes nothing else than contradiction; and what is meant is, the contending against Christ's divine Sonship and Messianic dignity. The notion of opposition and ill-usage in act, which is ordinarily assigned to it (still also by Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, and Maier) along with that of contradiction, this word never has. Even \(\text{antilegein} \), to which appeal is made, has nowhere the sense of a hostile resistance manifesting itself in outward actions. See Meyer on Luke ii. 34; John xix. 12; Rom. x. 21. — \(\text{touaiteru} \) such, i.e. one so great, so that He was compelled to undergo the ignominious death of the cross (ver. 2), in comparison with which your sufferings are something insignificant. — \(\text{ina m} \) \(\text{kámpte k.t.l.} \) that ye may not grow weary, desponding in your
souls. ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν is to be conjoined with ἐκλυνομενοῖ (Beza, Er. Schmid, Hammond, Kuinoel, Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, al.), not with καμμάτη (Luther, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Schulz, Böhme, and others), since otherwise something of a dragging character would be imparted to the participle.

Ver. 4 ff. The sufferings which have come upon the readers are only small, and a salutary chastisement at the hand of God. — Ὅσπο μέχρις αἴματος κ.τ.λ. Not yet unto blood, i.e. to such extent that bloodshed should result, that a martyr's death among you should be a necessity (as such death had but just now been mentioned of the O. T. saints, chap. xi., and of Christ Himself, xii. 2), have ye offered resistance in your contest against sin. The author has, as x. 32 ff., only the present generation of Palestinian Christians, to whom he is speaking, before his eyes. It is otherwise at xiii. 7. — πρὸς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν belongs to ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι (against Bengel, who conjoins it with ἀντικατέστητε), and ἡ ἀμαρτία stands not in the sense of οἱ ἀμαρτωλοὶ, ver. 3 (Carpzov, Heinrichs, Stuart, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Maier, Kluge, Grimm in the Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1870, p. 43, al.), — for there would exist no reason for the avoiding of this concrete expression, — but is the inner sin, conceived of as a hostile power or person, which entices the man (visited with sufferings and persecutions) to an apostasy from Christianity. Comp. ἀπάτη τῆς ἀμαρτίας, iii. 13. — In

1 Wrongly is it supposed by Holtzmahn (Stud. u. Krit. 1859, H. 2, p. 301; Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1867, p. 4) that a reminder of a martyrdom not yet endured is remote from the connection. The discourse is said to be of a resistance ἀργο ἀμαρτίαν. Sin, in this conflict with the flesh, would not allow it to be continued unto blood. For this very reason it is necessary to resist sin μέχρις αἰματες, ever anew to reanimate the weary limbs for the continuance of the conflict (xii. 12). In the same manner, too, does Kurtz find only a proverbial figurative expression for an earnest, decided, and unsparking resistance to the sinful desire in μέχρις αἰματες. But though in German “bis auf's Blut” (even to blood) has proverbial figurative acceptance in the sense of “to the very uttermost,” yet assuredly neither αἷμα nor yet sanguis is anywhere else employed in this proverbial sense.

2 At least no one will recognise as apposite that which Ebrard adduces as such,— to wit, that in ver. 3 “the whole (!) of mankind as the sinners (the class of sinners) might be opposed to Christ; whereas to the readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who were themselves ἀμαρτωλοί, the enemies of Christianity could not be opposed as the sinners.
And have ye forgotten, etc.? The words are most naturally to be taken, with Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Braun, Jos. Hallet, Heinrichs, Böhme, Stuart, Lachmann, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Ewald, as a question. If we would, as is usually done, take them as an assertory statement ("and ye have forgotten"), the reproach contained in the same would come out more strongly than is consonant with the mild character of the discourse in this section. The verb eklel̄eseθai, as presently after ὀλυγρωπεῖν, in the N. T. only here.—τῆς παρακλήσεως; the consolation (or else: the animating address).—ητίς ὑμῖν ὡς νίος διάλεγεται which, of a truth, speaks to you as to sons. By virtue of ητίς (in place of which there is no sufficient ground for writing, with Hofmann, ὑ τέ) the following consolatory utterance (Τίε ... παραδέχεται), adduced from Prov. iii. 11, 12,—from which also Philo, de congressu quaer. erudit. gr. p. 449 D (with Mangey, I. p. 544 f.), reasons in a similar manner,—is presupposed as one sufficiently familiar to the readers. By διαλέγεται, however, the same is personified; since διαλέγεσθαι τινι denotes conversing with any one (here, as it were, the answering in reply to the complaint breathed forth by the readers).—Τίε μου] With the LXX. only: Τίε.—μη ὀλυγρωπεῖ παιδείας κυριοῦ] despise not chastening from the Lord, i.e. be thankful for it, when the Lord chastens thee.—μηδὲ εἰλίνου ἐν' αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενον] nor despise when thou art corrected of Him (by means of sufferings which He imposes upon thee).

Ver. 6. Παιδεεῖς] him He chasteneth. So in the LXX. Cod. A, and fifteen other mss. The remaining manuscripts of the LXX. have, what is probably the original reading: ἐλεγχεῖν.—μαστυγοὶ δὲ πάντα νίον δι' παραδέχεται] and scourges every son whom He receives (adopts as His). According to present punctuation, the words in Hebrew read: נְזֵה לִפְנֵי בְּנֵי, and (He chastens) as a father the son in whom He delights. Instead of בְּנֵי, the LXX. however, read בְּנֵים (to cause pain).
Vv. 7, 8. Application of the word of scripture to the readers.— *Εἰ παίδειαν ἰρομένην* *If ye endure chastening.* The opposite of this is formed by the *εἰ δὲ χωρὶς ἑστε παίδειας,* ver. 8. The emphasis falls, therefore, upon *παίδειαν*; and to explain *ὑπομένειν* as a "steadfast" or "persevering" enduring (Theodoret, Erasm. Paraphr., Stein, Ebrard, Bloomfield, al.) is inadmissible.— *ὡς νίοις ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ θεός* God deals with you as with sons, treats you as sons. By as harsh a construction as possible (comp. *ὑμῖν ὡς νίοις,* ver. 5), Ebrard will have *ὡς* taken as a conjunction, and translates,—espousing the incorrect reading (see the critical obs.) *εἰς παίδειαν,—"* for your instruction endure manfully, even as (or when, so long as) God offers Himself to you as to sons!" — For the genuine Greek formula *προσφέρεσθαι τινι,* which does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., see examples in Wetstein.— *τίς γὰρ νίος κ.τ.λ.* [sc. ἐστιν: for what son is there, i.e. where is there a son, whom the father chastens not? This comprehend- ing together of *τίς νίος* (Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford, Maier, Kurtz, Ewald) is more natural than that one should regard *τίς* alone as the subject: *who is indeed a son, whom,* etc. (Delitzsch, Moll, and others); or, with Böhme, as the predicate: *of what kind is a son, whom,* etc.

Ver. 8. *Εἰ δὲ χωρὶς ἑστε παίδειας* *If, on the other hand,* ye are free from chastisement (have been spared it). Wrongly Theodoret: *εἰ τοίνυν καὶ υμεῖς τὴν παίδειαν ἐκκλίνετε.— ἧς μέτοχοι γεγόνασιν πάντες* of which all (sc. whom God—like the saints of the O. T. enumerated chap. xi.—has really ac- knowledged as His sons) have become partakers. That the relative clause contains no statement of entirely universal import, applicable also to the relation towards the *earthly fathers* (Camerarius, Beza, Limborch, al.), but, on the contrary, one affecting exclusively the relation towards God, is clear from the parallel with ver. 7, as well as from the perfect *γεγόνασιν.—νόθοι] bastards, begotten out of wedlock, for whose weal or woe their father is not wont to be greatly concerned.

Vv. 9, 10, a second argument follows. The readers must not become disheartened at the sufferings imposed upon them. For not only is there to be seen, in the fact of their having
to struggle with afflictions, the manifestation that God treats them as His children; it is, moreover, the heavenly Father who visits them with this chastening, and that for the very reason that He has their own highest good in view.— *eíta*] then, further, deinde. Not to be taken as an interrogative particle, with Alberti, Raphael, Heinrichs, and others. For otherwise the discourse would have proceeded in the second half of the verse with *καὶ οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον*, instead of the mere *οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον*. Ingeniously, but without constraining reason, does Reiche (Commentar. crit. p. 121) conjecture *εἴ τε* instead of *eíta*, while quite unsuitably Hofmann will comprehend *eíta* with the closing words of ver. 8.— *τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας* fathers of our flesh, i.e. our bodily, earthly fathers.— *ἐκχομεν παιδευτάς καὶ ἐντερπόμεθα* we had as chasteners, and heeded them, i.e. we gave heed when we had them as chasteners. Inasmuch as the author is addressing grown-up persons, the imperfects characterize the period of the bygone youth (we used to give heed). The combining of *ἐντερπόμεθα*, however, with the accusative of the object is in later Greek style the ordinary one. With the earlier authors the genitive is used.— The absolute statement *eíta . . . ἐντερπόμεθα* takes the place of a hypothetical premiss (comp. x. 28 f.; 1 Cor. vii. 18, 21, al.), and the whole verse contains an argument *a minore ad majus.*— *οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑποταγμόμεθα τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ ξύνομεν*] shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and (i.e. so that we in consequence thereof) live? By *ὁ πατὴρ τῶν πνευμάτων* naturally God is meant. With Hammond, to think of Christ, is forbidden by the connection (comp. ver. 7). *To the Father of spirits, i.e. God, who is Father in regard to the higher spiritual domain of life. That God, as the Creator of all things, is the Final Cause also of the bodily life of man, is a fact not excluded by the expression; only that which is the main thing as concerns God's fatherly relation is here emphasized. ὁ πατὴρ τῶν πνευμάτων does not designate God as Creator of the souls, in the sense of Creatianism as opposed to Traducianism (Calvin, Estius, Justinian, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Drusius, Carpzov, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 678;
Kurtz, al.). Nor as the One who makes provision for our souls (Morus, Dindorf, Kuinoel, Böhme, and others). Just as little is πνεύματα to be understood of the angels (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact: ἡ τῶν ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεων), or the gifts of the Spirit (Theodoret: πατέρα πνευμάτων τῶν πνευματικῶν πατέρα κέκληκεν ὡς τῶν πνευματικῶν χαρισμάτων πηγὴν. Comp. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact).

It is possible there was present to the mind of the author the characterization of God, LXX. Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16, as a θεός τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός. — καὶ ζήσωμεν]

Declaration of the result of this obedience, in the form of a parallel arrangement. ζῆν of the enjoyment of the everlasting life of bliss, as x. 38; Rom. viii. 13, and frequently.

Ver. 10. Justification of the πολὺ μᾶλλον, ver. 9, by presenting in relief the diversity of character borne by the disciplinary correction of the earthly fathers from that of the heavenly Father. The emphasis falls upon κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς and upon ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον, while πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας is an unaccentuated addition, which belongs equally to both members of the sentence.¹ For if πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας belonged only to the first member, and served for the indication of a further particular of diversity, an antithetic addition corresponding to the same could not have been wanting in the second member. But to find such antithesis, with Bengel, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Hofmann, and others, in εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν κ.τ.λ., is inadmissible, since these words are only an expository amplification of ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον. Πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας denotes, therefore, not the period of the earthly life, brief in comparison with eternity (Calvin, Estius, Justinian, Cornelius a Lapide, Schlichting, Limborch, Er. Schmid, Bengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bisping, Maier, Kluge, al.), in such wise that the thought would be expressed, that the earthly fathers aimed in connection with

¹ Riehm's objection to this (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 762, Oub.), that in such case κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς must have been placed before πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, is entirely without weight. Just the preposing of πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας was, if these words were to be referred to both members of the sentence, the most appropriate order; because κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς and εἰς τὸ συμφέρον then as contrasts stood in so much the more immediate opposition to each other in the two halves of the sentence.
the παιδείαν at a benefit or gain merely in regard to the earthly lifetime; God, on the other hand, at a gain for eternity,—by which at any rate a false opposition would arise, since the first half of the statement could not be at all conceded as a universally valid truth. Rather do the words affirm that the chastisement on the part of the natural fathers (and not less that on the part of the heavenly Father) continued only a few days, lasted only during a brief period. In a sense quite corresponding is πρὸς employed immediately after, ver. 11, as well as 1 Cor. vii. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 17, and very frequently elsewhere. — κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αἰττοῖς] according to their judgment, which was not always an erroneous one. — The imperfect ἐπαιδεύον stands there for the same reason as the imperfects, ver. 9. — ὁ δὲ] sc. πρὸς ὅλων ἡμέρας παιδεύει. — ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον] with a view to that which is salutary (our infallible welfare). — εἰς τὸ μετα- λαβεῖν τῆς ἀγιότητος αἰττοῦ] in order that we may be made partakers of His holiness, may become ever more free from sin, and in moral purity ever more like God Himself.

Ver. 11. The blessing of every chastening. Comp. Diog. Laert. v. 18 (cited by Wetstein): τῆς παιδείας ἐφ'] (sc. Aristotle) τὰς μὲν ρίζας εἶναι πικράς, γλυκεῖς δὲ τοὺς καρποὺς. — πᾶσα παιδεία] comprises the human and the divine chastening; yet the author in connection with the second clause (ὑστερον δὲ κ.τ.λ.) has no doubt mainly the latter before his mind. — πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν κ.τ.λ.] seems indeed for the present (so long as it continues) to be no object of joy, but an object of grief; later, however (i.e. when it has been outlived), it yields to those who have been exercised by it (comp. v. 14) the peace-fraught fruit of righteousness. — δικαίωσιν] genitive of opposition: peaceful fruit, namely righteousness, i.e. moral purity and perfection. It is called a peaceful fruit because its possession brings with it peace of soul. Δικαίωσιν is not to be understood as a genitivus subjecti (Piscator, Owen, Stuart, Heinrichs, Stein, and others): a peaceful fruit which is yielded by righteousness; for surely παιδεία is mentioned as the subject producing the καρπὸς εἰρηνικὸς.
Vv. 12, 13. Animating conclusion of the exhortation to stedfastness continued up to this point.— διὰ Wherefore, sc. because the sufferings you have to undergo manifest to you that ye are sons of God, and are salutary for you.— τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα ἀνορθώσατε] make firm again the slackened hands and the weary knees. Comp. LXX. Isa. xxxv. 3: ἵσχύσατε χεῖρες ἀνειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα. Ecclus. xxv. 23: χεῖρες παρειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα. Comp. also Deut. xxxii. 36: εἰδὲ γὰρ παραλελυμένους αὐτοὺς καὶ . . . παρειμένους.— Theophylact: ἰκεῖνοι τῶν κυριωτέρων μερῶν, ὅτι ὅλοι παρειμένοι εἰσὶ τῇ ψυχῇ αἱ μὲν γὰρ χεῖρες ἐνεργείας, οἱ δὲ τόδες κινήσεως σύμβολον.— ἀνορθώσαν] literally, to make the crooked straight again; then in general to restore anything to its original right or perfect condition. [Cf. Luke xiii. 13; Acts xv. 16.]

Ver. 13. Καὶ τροχὰς ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε τοῖς ποσίν ὑμῶν] and make straight tracks with your feet, i.e. advance with straight course upon the Christian path of life you have once entered upon, without bending aside to the right or to the left; that is to say, without mingling up that which is Jewish with that which is Christian, or suffering yourselves to be enticed to a relapse into Judaism. Incorrectly do Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 789), Alford, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, McCaul, Hofmann, and others explain τοῖς ποσίν ὑμῶν: for your feet. For, apart from the fact that this interpretation destroys the harmony with the figure employed at ver. 12, that of the παρειμέναι χεῖρες and παραλελυμένα γόνατα, the author cannot possibly intend to say that the readers themselves have first to prepare the way for themselves. The way has already been prepared for them by Christ (x. 20), and it is now only a question of their making advance upon the same in the right way. — For the expression, which accidentally forms a hexameter¹ (see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 595), comp. LXX. Prov. iv. 26: ὀρθᾶς

¹ Quite improbable is the supposition of Ewald (pp. 139, 172), that the words consist of a verse which “was derived from some one of the many Hellenistic poets (?) whose books were at that time greatly read even by Christians.”

2 F

Vv. 14-17. Exhortation to concord and to growth in holiness. Ver. 14. Meri pavnov] With all, even the non-Christians. Comp. Rom. xii. 18. For limiting the pavnes, with Michaelis, Zachariae, Storr, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, to the members of the Christian community, there exists no reason; and it has against it the mode of expression, since we should then have expected μετ' ἀλλήλων. — KAI TON ΑΝΙΑΣΜΟΝ] THE GENERAL VIRTUE, OF WHICH THE END-EVOUR AFTER CONCORD IS ONLY A PARTICULAR OUTFLOW. ΑΝΙΑΣΜΟΣ, NAMELY, IS HERE SANCTIFICATION OR MORAL PURIFICATION IN GENERAL; TOO RESTRICTED IS THE REFERENCE OF CHrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Jac. Cappellus, Bengel, Bloomfield, and others, who explain it as—what at 1 Thess. iv. 3 (see at that place) is certainly the correct explanation—
the virtue of chastity.— τὸν κύριον] By this expression some understand God (comp. Matt. v. 8), others Christ (comp. ix. 28). A certain decision is impossible. The beholding represents in an emblematic manner the idea of innermost union, and the whole is a designation of the Messianic blessedness in the consummated kingdom of God.

Vv. 15, 16. Further amplification of διώκετε τὸν ἁγιασμόν, ver. 14. That endeavour after holiness is not only to be in active exercise in the case of each one with regard to his own person; it is also, in equal degree, to be watchful that the Christian brethren preserve themselves free from immorality.

—The subject in ἐπισκοποῦντες consists, as in διώκετε, ver. 14, with which the participle is conjoined, of all members of the congregation, not specially the presidents thereof (xiii. 17) or ἐπισκοποῦ (Böhme); and ἐπισκοπεῖν signifies: to direct one's view to a thing with close attention or solicitude.— μὴ τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ] is no independent clause, so that ὃ would have to be supplemented (so the majority, as also Böhme, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Ebrard, and Maier). For the choice of the *tempus periphrasticum* would be here unnatural and justified by nothing. The words are a mere introducing of the subject, which is then further resumed by μὴ τις ὁρᾶ κ.τ.λ., in such wise that ἐνοχλή forms the common predicate to both parts of the sentence introduced by μὴ (Heinrichs, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, Ewald).—μὴ τις ὑστερῶν κ.τ.λ.] that no one, in that he remains far from the grace of God, i.e. in that he turns the back upon the grace of God which was afforded him in Christ, by immorality withdraws from it, and loses it (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10). The unusual ὑστερεῖν ἀπὸ τινὸς is consequently by no means equivalent in signification to the ordinary ὑστερεῖν τινος. While the latter would represent the coming short of the possession of the divine grace absolutely, as an objective result, the former includes the idea of voluntary activity or of one's own culpability. Comp. Ecclus. vii. 34: μὴ ὑστερεῖ ἀπὸ κλαιόντων. Analogously stands also the mere ὑστερεῖν, Num. ix. 7: μὴ οὖν ὑστερήσομεν προσε-

1 Hofmann will on that account have ὃ indeed added in thought, but then have this explained not as a mere copula, but in the sense: there being present.
that, I say, no root (plant) of bitterness (of which the fruit is bitterness)—i.e. a man\(^1\) in whom, in consequence of his unholy walk, the bitter fruit of everlasting perdition is ripening—growing up (as in the case of a plant, of which the root was before covered with earth) cause trouble or disquiet (to the congregation). The words are moulded after the LXX. of Deut. xxix. 18, according to the corrupted text of the Cod. Alexandr.: μη τις ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν ρίζα πικρίας ἀνω φύσουσα ἑνοχλή καὶ πικρία (distorted from the original text contained in the Cod. Vatic.: μη τις ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν ρίζα ἀνω φύσουσα ἐν χολή καὶ πικρία). That the reading in the Cod. Alex. of the LXX. only arose from a regard to our passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Jos. Hallet, Wolf, Delitzsch, Hofmann, and others) is not probable, since the author elsewhere in the O. T. citations follows the form of text in the Cod. Alex.—πικρίας] Chrysostom: οὐκ ἐστι πικρά, ἀλλὰ πικρίας τὴν μὲν γάρ πικρὰν ρίζαν ἐστὶ καρποὺς ἔνεγκείν γλυκεῖς, τὴν δὲ πικρίας ρίζαν . . . οὐκ ἐστι ποτὲ γλυκῶν ἐνεγκείν καρποῦ πάντα γάρ ἐστι πικρά, οὐδὲν ἔχει ἥδι, πάντα πικρά, πάντα ἀγδῆ, πάντα μίσους καὶ βδελυγμάς γέμοντα. —ἔνοχλεὶς] in the N. T. only here (and Luke vi. 18?). —καὶ δὲ αὐτὴς μανθώσων οἱ πολλοὶ and by it the many (the multitude or the great mass) become defiled (namely, by infection), i.e. likewise led astray into an unholy walk. Comp. Gal. v. 9.

Ver. 16. Μή τις πόρνος] sc. ἑνοχλή (comp. ver. 15): that no fornicator trouble you. Yet we may, with Grotius, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford, Maier, Kurtz, and the majority, supplement merely ἕ: that no one be a fornicator. πόρνος is to be taken in the natural sense, as xiii. 4. The taking of it as a figurative designation of one who is unfaithful to Christ, in order to hold unlawful intercourse with Judaism (Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 155, and others), is unsuitable, because ver. 16 is nothing else but the continued amplification of the διώκετε τῶν ἀγαμομένων, ver. 14.—ἡ βέβηλος ὡς Ἡσαΐ] or a profane person (a man of unhallowed, common mind, centred upon the

\(^{1}\) Comp. 1 Macc. i. 10: καὶ ἡξῆλθεν ἵνα αὐτῶν μίζα ἀμαρτωλῆς, Ἄντιχρις Ἐσφαλέως.
earthly), as Esau. ως ἡσαύ belongs only to βέβηλος. It is not to be referred also to πόρνος (so still Delitzsch and Alford), since nothing is related in scripture concerning a ἀπορφελα of Esau (more, it is true, the later Rabbis have to tell us; see Wetstein at our passage), and the elucidatory relative has respect only to βέβηλος. — δς κ.τ.λ.] Comp. Gen. xxv. 33. — ἄντι] indication of the price, as ver. 2. — τὰ πρωτοτόκια] the birthright with its privileges. Classic writers employ for it ἡ πρεσβεία or τὰ πρεσβείαν.

Ver. 17. Warning reference to the pernicious result of Esau's behaviour. Comp. Gen. xxvii. — ιστε] not imperative (Vulgate: scitote; Luther: wisset aber), but indicative, since to the readers as born Jews the fact itself was a perfectly familiar one. — ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα, θέλων κληρονομήσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν, ἀπεδοκιμάσθη] that later also, when he wished to inherit (to receive as a possession) the blessing, he was rejected. καὶ accentuates the ἀπεδοκιμάσθη, as the appropriate natural consequence of the ἀπεδότο, ver. 16. ἡ εὐλογία, however, is the blessing absolutely, i.e. the more excellent blessing, which was appointed to the first-born as the bearer of the promises given by God to Abraham and his seed. To ἀπεδοκιμάσθη, finally, there is naturally supplemented: by Isaac, in consequence of the higher occasioning or leading of God. — μετανοιάς γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὗρεν, καλπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐνήρ] for he found no room for change of mind, although he eagerly sought it with tears, i.e. for Esau did not succeed in causing his father Isaac to change his mind, so that the latter should recall the blessing erroneously bestowed upon the younger brother Jacob, and confer it upon himself the elder son; in this he succeeded not, though he besought it with tears. This acceptation of the words, which Beza, H. Stephanus, Piscator, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Owen, Er. Schmid, Seb. Schmidt, Calmet, Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Michaelis, Storr, Schulz, Böhme, Klee, Paulus, Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmst. A. K.-Z. 1857, No. 29, p. 677), Nickel (Reuter's Repertor. 1858, March, p. 210), Maier, Moll, Kurtz,

Yet Beza, as likewise Er. Schmid and Bisping, then refers back, without justifying reason, αὕτω to τὴν εὐλογίαν instead of μετανοίας.
and others insist on, is most naturally suggested by the context itself, yields a clear, correct thought, and best accords with the narrative in Genesis. Comp. LXX. Gen. xxvii. 33: ἐνόοηςα αὐτῶν καὶ ἐνοοημένος ἦσται. Ver. 34: 'Εγένετο δὲ, ἣνικα ἦκουσεν Ἡσαΐα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰσαάκ, ἀνεβόησε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ πικρᾶν σφόδρα καὶ εἶπεν εὐλογησον δὴ καὶ πάτερ. Ver. 35: Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ἐλθὼν ὁ ἄδελφος σου μετὰ δόλου ἔλαβε τὴν εὐλογίαν σου. (It was thus a question not of a blessing in general,—that Esau also still received afterwards, comp. ver. 39 f.,—but about the definite blessing pertaining to the first-born.) Ver. 38: Εἶπε δὲ Ἡσαΐα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ μὴ εὐλογία μια σοι ἐστι πάτερ; εὐλόγησον δὴ καὶ πάτερ. Κατανυχθέντος δὲ Ἰσαάκ (this addition, peculiar to the LXX., accentuates afresh the fact that Isaac's resolution remained inflexible, since he regarded the blessing already bestowed as irrevocable), ἀνεβόησε φωνῇ Ἡσαΐα καὶ ἔκλαυσεν. Nor is that which Bleek, de Wette, and Delitzsch have advanced against this mode of interpretation of great force. They assert (1) that there is here nowhere any mention of Isaac, so that we cannot think of him in connection with μετανοιας either. But a distinct allusion to Isaac, though not an express mention of him, is certainly contained in that which precedes. Partly in τὴν εὐλογίαν, partly in ἄπεδοκιμάσθη, there is found a reference to him; since it was just he who had to bestow the blessing, and afterwards under God's disposing refused it to Esau. An addition of τοῦ πατρὸς to μετανοιας was therefore unnecessary. (2) That the formula: "he found no place or room for a change in the mind of his father," in the sense: "he could not bring about such change in him," would be a very unnatural one. But why, pray, may not τοῦ πατρὸς μετανοιας εὑρίσκειν equally well and naturally signify: "to gain room for a μετάνοια to unfold and assert itself," as at Acts xxv. 16 τοῦ ἀπολογίας λαμβάνεις signifies: "to gain room for an ἀπολογία to unfold and maintain itself," or τοῦ ἄπολον διδόναι τῇ ὀργῇ, Rom. xii. 19 (comp. Eph. iv. 27): "to give room to the divine wrath to unfold itself and make itself felt"? (3) That the expression μετάνοια itself is unsuitable, inasmuch as
"this word can surely only denote an inner emotion of the mind, but not the bare outward recalling of a measure or a verdict" (Bleek), or, as de Wette expresses himself, "in the N. T. is ordinarily employed of human penitence." Nevertheless there attaches likewise to the notion of the "change of mind," as above insisted on as its primary requisite, the notion of a proceeding in the inner or spirit-life of the man; which, however, naturally does not exclude the accessory notion that this inner process has also as its necessary consequence an external action. If, further, μετάνοια in the N. T. "ordinarily" serves for the designation of human penitence, this presents no difficulty to the supposition of its having on one occasion preserved its original verbal significance (comp. e.g. Josephus, de Bello Jud. i. 4. 4: εμβόησεν τήν μετανοιαν αυτοῦ καὶ τοῦ τρόπου τὸ ἀνώμαλον); specially in a passage where not an article of faith is to be expressed, but simply an historic fact to be related. (4) That the thought thus obtained would not accord with the object of the author and the parallel vi. 4–6 (de Wette). But the author's object is no other than to show, by the warning example of Esau, that the member also of the Christian community who is βήβηλος may for ever come short of the attainment of salvation; that, however, ver. 17 is to be explained in accordance with the standard furnished by vi. 4–6, is an arbitrary presupposition. (5) That this interpretation did not enter into the mind of the Fathers. But this argument, added by Delitzsch, as it in like manner frequently recurs with him, is an unscientific one. For to the Greek Fathers and their expositions can only be applied that which was said of them long ago by Joh. Gerhard (tom. I. of the Loci Theologici, chap. v. p. 30): "sint et habeantur lumina, non autem numina."—Others, as Theophylact, Calvin, Bengal, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Bleek, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebraerbr. p. 771), Ewald, Hofmann, Rönsch in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1874, H. 1, p. 127 ff., and already τινες in Oecumenius, refer μετανολας to Esau himself, and then regard the words μετανολας γὰρ τότον οὐχ εὑρεν as a parenthesis, and make αὐτὸν glance back to τὴν εὐλογίαν. The statement: μετανολας γὰρ τότον οὐχ εὑρεν, is then understood either
objectively: he found no place for the repentance which he actually experienced, or subjectively: he found no place in his heart for the feeling of repentance; in the former sense, e.g., Calvin: "nihil profecit vel consequutus est sera sua poenitentia, etsi cum lacrymis quaceret beneficientem, quam sua culpa amiserat," and Bleek: "he found no longer any place for repentance, change of mind, inasmuch as it was too late for that, and it could avail him nothing now, however much he might regret it;" in the latter sense, e.g., Bengel: "It could no longer be awakened in Esau. Natura rei recusabat." But against the first modification of this rendering decides the thought which would thus arise, false at least for the application of the statement, since in the Christian domain a repentance that is worthy of the name can never be too late, never ineffectual (comp. Luke xxiii. 39–43); against the second, the internal contradiction in which this interpretation is involved with the concession καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκφθάσας αὐτήν, since surely by this very fact the actual presence of a repentance was manifested; against both, finally, the harshness and unnaturalness of the grammatical construction, by which the syntactical order is forced out of its simple connection. Others, finally, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Primasius, Luther, Grotius, Nemethus, de Wette, Alford, Reuss, rightly indeed refer αὐτήν back to μετάνοια, but then understand μετάνοια of Esau's change of mind. Luther: "for he found no room for penitence, although he sought it with tears." De Wette: "For repentance (penitence, amendment, i.e. for the return to the theocratic union by the laying aside of his unhallowed, frivolous character) he found no room, no place, no scope (i.e. there was not granted him, by the delaying of the sentence of reprobation, the possibility of manifesting a more worthy spirit, and of becoming reconciled to God), although he sought it with tears." But if one takes the statement with Luther subjectively, it yields a harsh, repulsive, contradictory thought; if one takes it, with de Wette, objectively, it would be incorrectly expressed, since in that case αὐτήν (sc. τόπον) must of necessity have been written in place of αὐτήν (sc. μετάνοια). Moreover, for this whole mode of explanation the narrative in Genesis affords no point of support.
Vv. 18–29. To the endeavour after sanctification the readers are bound, by the constitution of that New Covenant to which they have come. While the Old Covenant bore the character of the sensuous, earthly, and that which awakens merely fear, the New Covenant has the character of the spiritual, heavenly, brings into communion with God and all saints, and confers reconciliation (vv. 18–24). Against apostasy, therefore, from the New Covenant (by an immoral walk), are the readers to be on their guard; for their guilt and culpability would be thereby incomparably enhanced. Rather are they to be filled with thankfulness towards God for the participation in the immovable kingdom of the New Covenant, and with awe and reverence to serve Him (vv. 25–29).


Ver. 18. Πρὶς οὖν ἐπιτίµησιν ἔφησεν, by a reason adduced, the exhortation to sanctification at ver. 14 ff., inasmuch as there is an underlying reference to the fact that, according to Ex. xix. 10 f., 14 f., the people of Israel in their day, before they were permitted to approach Mount Sinai in order to receive the law, had to sanctify themselves (Ex. xix. 10: ἁγνοσον αὐτοῖς; ver. 14: καὶ ἁγιασεν αὐτοῖς), to wash their clothes, and to preserve themselves free from all defilement. — οὖ γὰρ προσεληνύθατε for ye did not, sc. when ye became Christians, drew near. Comp. Deut. iv. 11: καὶ προσήλθετε καὶ ἔστητε ὑπὸ τὸ δρος. — ζηλαφωμένω δρει to a mountain which is touched, i.e. felt, or laid hold of with hands. That which is intended is Mount Sinai, the place of revelation of the Mosaic law, mentioned also Gal. iv. 24, 25 as the representative of Judaism. As a mountain, however, which is touched or felt with hands this mountain is spoken of, in order thereby to express its character of externally perceptible, earthly, in opposition to the supra-sensuous, heavenly (ἔσκουράνοι, ver. 22). The form ζηλαφωμένων is not to be taken as synonymous with ζηλαφητόν, that could be touched, as is still done by Knapp, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Ebrard, Bisping, Kurtz, Ewald, and the majority of modern expositors. For the participle is indeed employed for the verbal adjective in the Hebrew, but never in the
Greek. Neither can ψηλαφώμενον signify: "touched of God by lightning, and therefore smoking" (Schöttgen, Kypke, Bengal, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Heinrichs, and others; comp. Ex. xix. 18: τὸ δρος τὸ Σιων ἐκατυβίζετο δίον διὰ τὸ καταβεβηκέναι ἐπ’ αὐτὸ τὸν θεὸν ἐν πυρὶ; Ps. civ. 32: ο ἀπτόμενος τῶν ὀρέων καὶ κατυβίζονται), since ψηλαφάν signifies not the contact made with the view to the producing of an effect, but only the touching or feeling (handling), which has as its design the testing of the quality or the presence of an object. Comp. Luke xxiv. 39; 1 John i. 1; Acts xvii. 27. Moreover, the participle present is unsuitable to this explanation, instead of which a participle of the past must have been chosen. — καὶ κεκαυμένον πυρί] is understood by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bengal, Knapp, Paulus, Stuart, Stengel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 114), Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, al., as a new particular, co-ordinate with the καπρακομένῳ δρέα: "and enkindled fire." On account of the like nature of the additions, καὶ γνόφος κ.τ.λ., immediately following, this acceptance seems in itself the more natural; but since, in the passages of the Pentateuch which were before the mind of the writer in connection with this expression, there are found the words: καὶ τὸ δρος ἐκαίετο πυρί (comp. Deut. iv. 11, v. 23, ix. 15), it is more probable that the author referred κεκαυμένος still to δρέα, and would have πυρι taken as dativus instrumentum to κεκαυμένος: and which (mountain) was enkindled, or set on flame, with fire. — καὶ γνόφος καὶ ζόφος καὶ θυελλή] and to gloom and darkness and tempest. Comp. Deut. iv. 11, v. 22: σκότος, γνόφος, θυελλά.

Ver. 19. Καὶ σάλπιγγος ἠχῷ] and to the sound of trumpet. Comp. Ex. xix. 16: φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος ἠχεῖ μέγα. Ιδιά ver. 19, xx. 18. — καὶ φωνὴ ῥημάτων] and clang (piercing note) of words, which, namely, were spoken by God at the publication of the law, Ex. xx., Deut. v. Comp. Deut. iv. 12: καὶ ἐλάλησε κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρὸς φωνὴ ῥημάτων, ἦν ὑμεῖς ἠκούσατε. — ἢς οἱ ἠκούσαντες κ.τ.λ.] they that heard which begged to be spared (ver. 25; Acts xxv. 11), that it should be further spoken to them (sc. on account of the terribleness of that already heard). Calvin: Caeterum quod dicit populum excusasse, non ita debet accipi, quasi populus
renuerit audire Dei verba, sed deprecatus est, ne Deum ipsum loquentem audire cogeretur. Persona enim Mosis interposita horrorem nonnihil mitigabat. Comp. Deut. v. 25: καλ ὃν μὴ ἀποθάνωμεν... ἐὰν προσθόμεθα ἡμεῖς ἀκούσαι τὴν φωνὴν κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐτί; Deut. xviii. 16; Ex. xx. 18, 19. — ἔσ] goes back to φωνή, and is dependent not on λόγον (Storr), but upon ἀκούσατες. — μὴ] after verbs of seeking to be excused, denying, warding off, etc., quite ordinarily. See Kühner, II. p. 410; Winer, Gramm. 7 Aufl. p. 561. — αὐτοίς] looks back to the Israelites (οἱ ἀκούσατες), not to ἤματον.

Vv. 20, 21 form a parenthesis, and γὰρ addsuces a reason for the thought of the terribleness of the mode of revelation under the Old Covenant. The words οὐκ ἐφερον γὰρ τὸ διαστέλλομεν, however, contain no independent statement, in such wise that τὸ διαστέλλομεν should refer back to that which is before mentioned (Oecumenius, Theophylact; comp. Schlichting). For in that case καὶ θηρίον κ.τ.λ. would stand without connection. Rather are the words an introductory formula for the citation immediately attached. τὸ διαστελλόμενον, further, does not stand in the sense of a middle: that which ordained, or the divine voice ordaining (Storr, Schulz, Heinrichs, Delitzsch), which is constrained, but in a passive sense: that which was ordained, the divine commandment. The sense is, consequently: for they endured not the mandate, "Though only a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned."

— The citation is freely reproduced from Ex. xix. 12, 13, in an abbreviated form, and one bringing out at once the gist of the narrative. In Exodus the words read: καὶ ἀφορισῦ τὸν λαὸν κύκλῳ, λέγοντι προσέχετε ἑαυτοὺς τοῦ ἀναβήναι εἰς τὸ θρός καὶ θύγει τι αὐτοῦ· πᾶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θρόνου διανύσῃ τελευτήσει. Οὐχ ἀπέστη αὐτοῖς χεῖρ· ἐν γὰρ λίθοις λιθοβοληθήσεται ἥ βολίδη καταταξαθήσεται· εὰν τε κτήνος, εὰν τε ἄνθρωπος, οὐ δίστησεν.

Ver. 21. Καὶ] is the ordinary conjunctive "and." It belongs not to οὕτως φοβερῶν ἢν τὸ φανταζόμενον, in such wise that Μούσῆς εἶπεν κ.τ.λ. "is added by way of appendix, with an accentuation of the subject which renders any connecting particle unnecessary" (Hofmann), but to Μούσῆς εἶπεν, in such wise that οὕτως φοβερῶν ἢν τὸ φανταζόμενον forms
an exclamation, inserted parenthetically within the greater parenthesis: and—so terrible was the appearing!—Moses said, 
I am sore afraid and tremble. καὶ cannot be taken, with Jac. 
Cappellus, Carpzov, Schulz, Knapp, Böhme, Bloomfield, and 
others, for the enhancing “even.” For, from its position, it 
can only serve for the connection of the clauses, while for the 
indication of the sense alleged an additional καὶ immediately 
before Μωϋσῆς (or even an αὐτὸς before the same) would 
have been required. Yet the right feeling underlies this 
interpretation: that, regarded as a fact, ver. 21 contains an 
ascending gradation from ver. 20, inasmuch as the being seized 
with fear, which at ver. 20 was asserted of the people, is now 
in like manner predicated of Moses, the leader of the people. 
— τὸ φαντασμένον] equivalent to τὸ φανόμενον, the appear- 
ing, the visible covering in which the invisible God manifested 
Himself to the Israelites. Theodoret: φαντασμένον ἐκ εἴπεν, 
ἐπειδὴ οὐκ αὐτὸν ἔφαρεν τὸν τῶν ὄλων θεῶν ἄλλα τινὰ φαν- 
tασιαν τῆς θείας ἐπιφανεῖας. — The verb φαντάζεσθαι in the 
N. T. only here. — ἐκφοβός εἶμι καὶ ἐντρομος] In the accounts 
of the promulgation of the law given in the Pentateuch, an 
expression of this kind on the part of Moses is not met with. 
According to Zeger, Beza, Estius, Schlichting, Chr. Fr. Schmid 
[M’Lean, with hesitation], Heinrichs, Stuart, Stein, and others, 
the author drew the same from tradition; according to Owen 
and Calov, he gained the knowledge even from immediate 
inspiration; while Carpzov will not have an actual utterance 
of Moses thought of at all, but, on the contrary, takes the 
formula: “Moses dicit: horreo et tremo,” as of the same 
meaning with the bare “Moses horret et tremit;” and Calvin 
has recourse to the not less violent expedient: “Mosem 
nomine populi sic loquistum, cujus mandata quasi internuntius 
ad Deum referebat. Fuit igitur haec communis totius populi 
querrimonia; sed Moses inducitur, qui fuit veluti commune et 
omnia.” Without doubt the words of LXX. Deut. ix. 19 
[cf. ver. 15] were present to the mind of the author, where in 
another connection Moses says: καὶ ἐκφοβός εἶμι. These 
words he then transferred, by virtue of an inexact reminiscence, 
to the time of the promulgation of the law. 
Vv. 22–24. Contrast to vv. 18, 19. Positive characteriza-
tion of the communion into which the readers have entered by the reception of Christianity. The description, vv. 22–24, corresponds not in detail to the particulars enumerated, vv. 18, 19 (against Bengel, who ingeniously constructs a sevenfold antithesis; as likewise against Delitzsch, Kluge, and Ewald, who have followed the same), although we should be led to expect this from the corresponding words of commencement, vv. 18, 22. Moreover, the succession of clauses contained in vv. 22–24 is no strictly logical one, since at least καὶ πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων would have been more appropriately placed before than after καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων. — ἀλλὰ προσευχῆλθατε Σιὼν δρει καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ξῶντος, Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ but drawn near have ye to the mountain Zion and the city of the living God, namely, the heavenly Jerusalem. The three substantive-appellations contain a single idea, in that to the closely connected twofold expression: Σιὼν δρει καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ξῶντος, the following Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ forms an explanatory apposition. As Mount Zion (in opposition to the Mount Sinai, ver. 18) the heavenly Jerusalem is designated, because in the O. T. the Mount Zion is very frequently described as the dwelling-place of God, and the place whence the future salvation of the people is to be looked for. Comp. Ps. xlviii. 3 [2], l. 2, lxxviii. 68, cx. 2, cxxxii. 13 ff.; Isa. ii. 2, 3; Joel iii. 5 [ii. 32]; Mic. iv. 1, 2; Obad. 17, al. Likewise also is the heavenly Jerusalem called the city of the living God (comp. too in relation to the earthly Jerusalem: πόλις ἐστὶν τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλεῶς, Matt. v. 35), not so much because the living and acting God is its architect (xi. 10), as because He has His throne there. — καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων] and to myriads of angels, the servants, and as it were the court of God. καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων belongs together (Beza, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Calov, Braun, Kypke, Carpzov, Cramer, Baumgarten, Storr, Dindorf, Tholuck, Kurtz, Hofmann, and others), without, however, our having, with Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Clarus, Vatablus, Calvin, Corn. a Lapide, Piscator, Grotius, Tischendorf (ed. 2), Bloomfield, Conybeare, Ewald, and others, to refer likewise πανγύρει, ver. 23, to the same as an apposition. For such
apposition, consisting of a bare individual word, would be out of keeping with the euphonious fulness of the whole description; and, if this construction had been intended, καὶ μυριάδων ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει would have been written. But just as little must we with others (also Bleek and de Wette) take καὶ μυριάδων alone, as standing independently; whether, as Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Rambach, Griesbach, Knapp, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stengel, Bisping, Maier, Moll, we regard as apposition thereto merely ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει, or, as Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Ernesti, Schulz, Lachmann, Bleek, Tischen-dorf (ed. 1), Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 117), Alford, Kluge, Woerner, both the following members: ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς — in connection with which latter supposition, however, the more nearly connecting τε καὶ, of frequent use with the author (ii. 4, 11, iv. 12, al.), would have been more naturally expected than the bare καὶ before ἐκκλησία. For μυριάδων is a very indefinite notion, which, where its reference is not self-evident from the connection, requires a genitive addition; besides, the accentuation of the idea of plurality alone would here be meaningless. Further, the reasons advanced against our mode of explanation, that in such case we ought, after the analogy of the following members, to expect a καὶ before πανηγύρει (Seb. Schmidt, Bleek, Ebrard); that πανηγύρει and that which follows would become in the highest degree dragging (Bleek); that πανηγύρει would be superfluous (de Wette), — are without weight. For καὶ was omitted by reason of the euphonious πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησία, into which a καὶ placed also before πανηγύρει would have introduced a discordant note; the charge of dragging would have been justified, only if a καὶ had really been added before πανηγύρει; nor, again, is πανηγύρει superfluous, since it contains a very significant notion, and one different from that of ἐκκλησία.

Ver. 23. Πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων, ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς] to the festive assembly and congregation of the first-born, who are enrolled in heaven. πανήγυρις, in the N. T. a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον, designates the total gathering under the form of conception of a being gathered together in festivity.
and jubilant joy [cf. Joseph. Antt. v. 2. 12]; whereas ἐκκλησία characterizes those assembled as bound together in inner unity.

To be enrolled in heaven, however, signifies to stand recorded upon the book of heaven's citizens, or to have part in the rights and privileges of the heavenly citizens. From the connection (προσελθόντες Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ καὶ μυριάσιν ἄγγελοι) beings must be intended, who already dwell in heaven, are actually in possession of the civil rights and immunities of heaven, not those by whom the enjoyment of the same is only to be looked for in the future. Since, then, they are by means of πρωτότοκοι represented as those who in point of time first (before others as yet) became sons of God, we have to think most naturally, with Calvin, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Woerner, and others, of the patriarchs and saints of the Old Covenant (comp. chap. xi.), who, it is true only upon the condition of union with Christ (xi. 40), but yet by reason of their filial relation to God, did, in a temporal respect before the Christians, receive a dwelling-place and rights of citizenship in heaven. According to Nösselt, Storr, Kurtz, and others, we have to understand by the πρωτότοκοι still the angels before mentioned, as being the earliest inhabitants of heaven; but for the designation of the angels, the characteristic ἀπογεγραμμένοι ἐν οὐρανοῖς is unsuitable. The majority discover in πρωτότοκοι a reference to the Christians; and that either, as Primasius and Grotius suppose, specially to the apostles—against which, however, stands ἰδίακινος, which involves the idea of a great host; or, as Schlichting, J. L. Mosheim (de ecclesia primogenitorum in coelo adscriptorurn, Helmst. 1733, 4to), Schulz, Bleek, Ebrard, and others, to the first believers from among the Jews and Gentiles, particularly the former, quite apart from the question of their being now dead or still living; or, as Knapp, Böhme, Kuinoel, Tholuck, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 117), Alford, Hofmann (Schrifteu. II. 2, p. 147, 2 Aufl.), Moll, and others, specially to the church which is still upon earth, so that in connection with πρωτότοκοι we have to hold fast only to the particular fact of the dignity, while we retain no reference to time; or, as de Wette and Maier, specially to those who have fallen asleep in the faith of Christ, and perhaps
even were glorified by martyrdom; or finally, as Piscator, Owen, Carpzov, Stein, Stuart, Stengel, and others, to the members of the New Covenant in general. But the thought of Christians in this place is a remote one; since the mention of them, in harmony with the order of relating now chosen, would more naturally take place only later, in connection with the mention of Christ Himself, and not already here, between that of the angels and God. — καὶ κριτὴ θεὸ πάντων] and to Him as Judge, who is God over all. πάντων is usually construed with κριτή. But from its position it can depend only upon θεό. πάντων is masculine, and refers not merely—as Knapp and Bleek suppose—to the fore-mentioned angels and πρωτότοκοι. It stands absolutely; so that God, in delicate opposition to the Jewish particularism, is characterized as in general the God of all. The apparently unsuitable characterization of God in this connection (because one containing nothing specifically Christian), namely, as the Judge, is justified from the aim of the writer, to warn the readers against laxity of morals, and consequently against apostasy from Christianity (comp. vv. 25, 29). — καὶ πνεύμασιν δῴκαςν τέτελεσμένοι] and to the spirits of the perfected just ones. πνεύματα: designation of the departed spirits, as divested of the body (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 19; Luke xxiv. 39; Acts vii. 59), inasmuch as these only at the resurrection will be clothed with a new body. Most probably the Christians fallen asleep are those meant (Grotius, Mosheim, Bengel, Sykes, Baumgarten, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, and many). Others, as Com. a Lapide, Schlichting, Wittich, Wolf, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Maier, think of the saints of the O. T. (chap. xi.); or, as Knapp, Böhme, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 122), Alford, Moll, Kurtz, alike of the departed saints of the O. T. and those of the New. The δίκαιοι, however, are called τέτελεσμένοι not in the sense of the “perfect just ones” (Theophylact, Luther, Stengel, al.), — for which the expression τέλεοι would much more naturally have presented itself,—nor yet because they have finished their life’s course and overcome the weaknesses and imperfections of the earthly life (Calvin, Limborch, Böhme, Kuinoel, Kurtz, and others), but because they have
already been brought by Christ to the goal of consummation. Comp. ii. 10, x. 14, xi. 40.

Ver. 24. *Néas*] characterizes the covenant as new in regard to the time of its existence (*foedus recens*), whereas *kaiwv*, viii. 8, 13, ix. 15, described it as new in respect of its quality (*foedus novum*). Wrongly Böhme, Kuinoel, and others (de Wette likewise wavers): *néas* is here to be taken as of the same import with *kaiwv*.— *kal álmati parrasmoi*] Jesus' atoning blood is called blood of sprinkling, inasmuch as those who believe in Him, in spirit sprinkled therewith, are cleansed from their sins and sanctified to God. Comp. ix. 13 f., x. 22, xiii. 12.— *kpeitton*] is an adverb. Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 38. Needlessly will Kurtz have it taken as a substantive adjective. Better does the blood of Christ speak than Abel with his blood; since the latter calls for the divine vengeance, the former, on the other hand, for God's grace upon sinners.— *παρά*] See at i. 4.— *παρά τὸν Ἄβελ*] may be looked upon as a well-known brachylogy for *παρά τὸ álma tōν Ἄβελ*. This is not, however, at all necessary, seeing that, at xi. 4 likewise, Abel himself is represented as speaking after his death (by means of his blood which was shed).

Ver. 25. The author has but just now, vv. 18–24, in order to enforce with reasoning his exhortation to the διάφιλοι, ver. 14 ff., described, in a comparison of the Old Covenant with the New, the exalted nature of the communion into which the readers had entered by the reception of Christianity. As a conclusion therefrom, he warns them against falling away again from Christianity through laxity of morals (comp. also ver. 28 f.), in pointing out, similarly as ii. 2 ff., x. 28 ff., that if the Israelites in old time incurred punishment by disobedience to the O. T. revelation of God, an incomparably severer judgment would overtake those Christians who should turn back again from the N. T. revelation of God. — The simple *βλέπετε*, without the addition of *οὖν*, renders the warning so much the more powerful. Entirely mistaken, Delitzsch: *οὖν* is not added, in order that one may not suppose the warning to attach itself to *οὐ γὰρ προσελκυθάτε* . . . *ἀλλὰ προσελκυθάτε* . . ., but, on the contrary, it should be manifest that the author thinks of the One speaking,
against the refusing of whom he warns, as in most intimate connection with the speaking blood of the Mediator of the Covenant which has just been mentioned. — βλέπετε μὴ παρατήσησθε τὸν λαλοῦντα] take heed that ye do not beg off from Him that speaketh (to you), that ye turn not away from Him and despise Him. ὁ λαλῶν is not Christ (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Vatablus, Böhme, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Bloomfield, al.), but that God who still continues to speak to the readers by means of the Christian facts of salvation. For by τὸν λαλοῦντα the same person must be designated, as subsequently by τὸν ἀπ’ οὐρανῶν, sc. χρηματίζοντα. By the latter, however, can be meant, on account of the οὗ referring back to it at ver. 26, and by reason of the ἐπήγγελται there occurring (comp. also ver. 29), only God. From this it follows, too, that by ἐπὶ γῆς ὁ χρηματίζων is meant, not Moses (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Carpzov, and others), but likewise God, so that there is not an insisting upon a diversity of persons in connection with the O. T. and the N. T. revelation, and thence a difference of degree inferred; but the diversity of the mode of revelation is accentuated, and thereby the higher value of the one revelation above the other on the one hand is marked, and on the other the higher culpability of apostasy from the one than from the other. To the Jews God spake upon the palpable earthly mountain Sinai, choosing as His interpreter an earthly man, Moses; to the Christians, on the other hand, He speaks from heaven, in sending to them His own Son from heaven as His interpreter. — οὐκ ἔξεφυγον] did not escape, did not evade the divine punishment. Comp. ii. 3. Wrongly Delitzsch, even because the τοῦλ οὐρανῶν ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ. does not harmonize therewith: were not able to withdraw, but were obliged to stand fast. — ἐπὶ γῆς τὸν χρηματίζοντα] the One speaking upon earth words of revelation. Belongs together, in that ἐπὶ γῆς was placed on account of the greater emphasis before the article. Similarly the postposing of ἵνα, Gal. ii. 10, and the like. — τοῦλ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς] sc. οὐκ ἐκφευγόμεθα. — ἀποστρέφεσθαν τινα] to turn away from any one, reject his fellowship.

Ver. 26. Like as the author has stated the fact, ver. 25,

1 Ebrard will have us think of Christ as the second person of the Godhead!
as a sign of the inferiority of Judaism to Christianity, that God in connection with the former was One ἕν τὸ κριτηρίον, in connection with the latter, on the other hand, One ἕν τῶν κριτηρίων, so does he now in like manner urge, as a further proof of that inferiority, the circumstance that God then only shook the earth, but now in accordance with the prophecy will shake not only the earth, but at the same time also the heavens.— καὶ ἐσελευσθήσατε] is to be understood in the literal sense, not, with Estius and others, in the figurative.— τότε] then, sc. at the promulgation of the Mosaic law. Comp. Ex. xix. 18 (where, however, the LXX., probably in reading ἐσόταί οὐρανον, translate: καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα); Judg. v. 4 f.; Ps. lxviii. 9 [8], cxiv. 7: ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου ἐσαλεύθη ἡ γῆ.— νῦν δὲ ἐπῆγγελται λέγων] who now, on the other hand, has promised as follows. A construction ad sensum, since the words form the second member of the relative clause; but, notwithstanding that, a bound is suddenly made from the preceding subject ἡ φωνή to the subject contained in the ὅ, namely, God Himself.— νῦν] now, has certainly the sense: in regard to the present Christian period (more exactly: in regard to the epoch of the consummation of the divine kingdom by the coming again of Christ). Grammatically, however, νῦν κ.τ.λ. has arisen from the contracting of two statements in one, and is to be resolved, with Schlichting, into: nunc vero commovebit non solum terram sed etiam coelum, sicut promisit apud prophetam, dicens, etc.— ἐπῆγγελται] in the middle sense, as Rom. iv. 21. See Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 246. — The citation is from Hag. ii. 6, but reproduced in a free and abbreviated form (LXX.: ἔτι ἄπαξ ἐγὼ σελασκὼ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θαλάσσαν καὶ τὴν ξηράν). — ἔτι ἄπαξ] Faulty rendering of the LXX. instead of: yet a little while.

Ver. 27. The author, arguing from the ἔτι ἄπαξ of the prophetic word of scripture just adduced, brings out as a second feature of the superiority of Christianity, that it is abiding and intransitory.— Τὸ δὲ ἄπαξ The expression, however, Yet once more, sc. and then not again. ἔτι ἄπαξ, namely, is taken by the writer absolutely.— δηλοῖ τὴν τῶν σαλανομένων μετἀθεσιν] declares (points to) the changing of
that which is being shaken, sc. the earth and the (visible) heavens, inasmuch as it is a well-known matter (τὴν) that, at the epoch of the consummation of the kingdom of God, the present earth and the present heavens will be transformed into a new earth and new heavens (comp. Isa. lxv. 17 ff., lxvi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1); the shaking, however, of the heavens and the earth predicted by the prophet will be the only one, and consequently the last one, which will take place at all.— ὡς πεποιημένων] because they are created, i.e. visible, earthly, and transitory, things. The words draw attention to the constitution of the σαλευόμενα, thereby to make it appear as something natural that these should undergo a change or transformation. They are not to be taken together with the following ἵνα; in connection with which construction we have either the explanation: which namely has been made, to the end that that which is immovable may remain (Grotius, Bengel, Tholuck, Delitzsch, Riehm, Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 130, Obs.; Kluge, Moll, Woerner, al.),—which, however, without more precise indication, yields arbitrary variations of the meaning, but no clear thought,—or: which was made indeed only for the purpose of awaiting that which is immovable, and giving place to the same when this comes in (Bauldry in Wolf, Storr, Böhme, Kuinoel, Hofmann, al.). Grammatically there is nothing to be alleged against this acceptation of the words, although the expression μενεσθεῖν is not elsewhere employed by the author in the sense of “to await anything;” nor even against the thought in itself can any objection be raised. But then it appears unsuitable to the connection; since upon this interpretation that which the author will derive from the ἐτι ἀπαξεῖ, namely, the coming in of that which is eternal and intransitory, is brought out in much too subordinate a form. ἵνα is therefore to be taken as dependent on τὴν τῶν σαλευομένων μετάδοσιν, inasmuch as it addsuce the higher design of God in the transformation of the present earth and the present heavens: in order that there may then abide (have a permanent existence) that which cannot be shaken, sc. the eternal blessings of Christianity, into the full enjoyment of which the Christian will enter so soon as a new earth and new
heaven is formed, and the kingdom of God attains to its consummation.

Ver. 28. Exhortation to be thankful to God, and to serve Him in an acceptable manner. — Ἀιώνιον infers from the concluding words of ver. 27: Wherefore, because that which will have an everlasting existence is no other than the kingdom of God, in which we Christians have obtained part. The author himself expresses this thought in the participial clause elucidatory of the διὸ, βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον παραλαμβάνοντες: since the kingdom which we Christians obtain (which becomes the possession of us Christians) is an immovable, intransitory one. The participle present παραλαμβάνοντες, of that which is indeed future, but which with certainty comes in. Erroneously do Calvin, transl., Schlichting, Limborch, Bengel, and others understand the participial clause as a constituent part of the exhortation: “let us receive the immovable kingdom, appropriate it to ourselves by faith,” which is already rendered impossible by the anarthrous βασιλείαν in itself. — ἔχομεν χάριν] let us cherish thankfulness, sc. towards God. Comp. Luke xvii. 9. Wrongly Beza, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Carpzov, Bisping, and many others: let us hold fast the grace. For in that case the article could not be wanting in connection with χάριν, and instead of ἔχομεν must stand κατέχομεν (comp. iii. 6, 14, x. 23) or κρατάωμεν (comp. iv. 14). — διὰ ἂν λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ and by the same serve God in an acceptable manner. τῷ θεῷ belongs to λατρεύωμεν. — μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους] with reverence and fear (in that we watch against that which is displeasing to God) and fear. Amplification of the εὐαρέστως.

Ver. 29. Warning justification of the μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους. The words cannot, however, signify: for our God too (the God of Christians), even as the God of the Old Covenant, is a consuming fire (so still Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bisping, and others). For to this end καὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁ θεὸς κ.τ.λ. must have been written. Just as little may καὶ γάρ, with Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 60, Obs.), Alford, Moll, and Kurtz, be weakened into the mere notion of “eternim.” For καὶ is the enhancing “more than this,” and
belongs to the whole clause, in connection with which it would be a matter of indifference (against Delitzsch) whether the author should write καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον or καὶ γὰρ πῦρ καταναλίσκον ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, since in either case the main emphasis in connection with the few words would fall upon πῦρ καταναλίσκον. According to the order of the words, and by reason of the intensive force of καὶ, the sense can therefore only be: for our God is also a consuming fire, i.e. He is not merely a God of grace, but likewise a God of punitive righteousness. A diversity, consequently, of the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New, which would also have been an unsuitable notion, the author does not by any means assert. Moreover, comp. LXX. Deut. iv. 24: ὁ θεὸς σου πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἔστιν.
CHAPTER XIII.

Ver. 4. The preference over the Recepta πορνοὺς δি is merited on account of the better attestation (A D* D, Lat. M κ, Vulg. Copt. Anton. Max. Bed.) by πορνοὺς γάρ. Commended to attention by Griesbach. Adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Alford, and Tisch. 8.— Ver. 8. Elz.: χιδίς. But A C* D* M κ have ἰχίδις. Rightly admitted by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford.— Ver. 9. ὑπαρφίσσαθεν Elz.: ὑπαρίφρησθε. Against A C D M κ, the later supplementer of B, the preponderant majority of the cursives, Vulg. Copt. al., and very many Fathers. Already rejected by Grotius, Bengel, and Wetstein, then by Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Lachm. Tisch. Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, and others. Correction to accord with Eph. iv. 14.— Instead of the Recepta περιπατήσαντες, A D* κ* present περιπατοῦντες. Placed in the text by Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 8, and probably the original reading.— Ver. 10. In place of the Recepta οὐχ ἰχουσίων ἰχουσίων, Tisch. 2 and 7 reads only οὐχ ἰχουσίων, and already Mill (Prolegg. 1292) has condemned ἰχουσίων as a gloss. But ἰχουσίων is lacking only in D* Gr. and Lat., in M and with Damascen., whereas it is present in A C D** and *** K κ, etc. (with Chrysostom before οὐχ ἰχουσίων). It was erroneously omitted by reason of its similarity in sound to the foregoing οὐχ ἰχουσίων. — Ver. 11. Elz. Tisch. 8: τὸ αἷμα περὶ ἀμαρτίας εἰς τὰ ἄγα. So D K M κ, etc. In place of this, Lachm. and Tisch. 1 write, after C* al., Copt. Syr. al.: τὸ αἷμα εἰς τὰ ἄγα περὶ ἀμαρτίας. By means of its varying position, however, περὶ ἀμαρτίας betrays itself as a glossematic elucidation, seeing that it is entirely wanting in A, in Aeth., and with Chrysostom, and seeing, moreover, that some cursive mss. (14, 47) present in place of the singular the plural περὶ ἀμαρτίων. Rightly therefore have Bleek, Tisch. 2 and 7, and Alford deleted the addition.— Ver. 17. υπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὕμων ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσετε] Instead of which Lachm. in the stereotype ed. and Tisch. 1 chose the order: ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσετε ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὕμων. But the authority of A, Vulg. Bede does not suffice for the
transposing. Rightly therefore did Lachm. in the larger ed., and Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, return to the Recepta.— Ver. 18. Elz.: πεποίθαμεν. Against the preponderating testimony of A C* D* D, Lat. (suademus) M, 17, 67** 137, which demands the reading, commended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford: πεποίθησα. To the latter points also the ἐκ γὰρ οὖν καλὴν in the Cod. Sinait., since in this codex οὖν καλῇ. has been placed immediately before, only in consequence of a manifest oversight of the copyist.— Ver. 21. To the Recepta ἐν παντὶ ἐργῷ, instead of which the Cod. Sinait. presents only ἐν παντὶ (adopted by Tisch. 8), had Lachmann in the stereotype ed. further added: καὶ λόγῳ, which he has yet rightly struck out again in the larger edition. The addition καὶ λόγῳ is found only in A, and once with Chrysostom, whereas it is twice wanting with the latter. It is a gloss from 2 Thess. ii. 17.— Instead of the mere κοινοῦ of the Recepta, Lachmann reads in the Edit. Stereotypa: αὐτὸς κοινὸς; in the larger edition: αὐτῷ κοινὸς. But αὐτός rests only upon 71 and D, Lat. (ipso faciente); the alleged testimony of C in favour thereof is founded on an error of Wetstein. αὐτῷ, however, which has for it the authority of A C* N* and of Gregor. Nyssen., is a disturbing addition, and manifestly arose only from a twofold writing of the αὐτοῦ immediately foregoing.— Elz. Lachm. Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Reiche, Tisch. 8: εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῷ αἰῶνων. But τῶν αἰῶνων is wanting in C*** D, in many cursives, in Arab. Armen., with Clem. Alex. and Theodoret. Suspected by Bengel and Griesbach; rightly rejected by Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 1, 2, 7, and Alford. For it is more probable that the simpler formula, occurring for the rest Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27, would be enlarged into the ampler formula more usual in the case of doxologies, than that the ampler would be abbreviated into the simpler one.— Ver. 22. D* 46, 57, al., Vulg. Syr. Arm. have ἀνίχθεσαν. Adopted by Lachmann. But the imperative ἀνίχθεσθαι, presented by the Recepta, is to be retained, as imparting more animation to the discourse. This reading is protected by the preponderating authority of A C D*** Κ M Ν, etc., Am. Copt. Aeth. al., Chrys. Theodoret (also in the Commentary), al.— Ver. 23. Elz.: τῶν ἀδιάσφοτῶν. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, de Wette, Delitzsch: τῶν ἀδιάσφοτων ἡμῶν. The latter is to be preferred on account of the stronger attestation by A C D* M Ν* 17, 31, 37, 39, al., all vss. Euthal. Maxim. Athan.

Vv. 1–25. Concluding exhortations partly of a general nature, partly in special relation to the main purport of the
epistle, and concluding notices, followed by a twofold wish of blessing.

Ver. 1. Exhortation to enduring brotherly love. — 'Η φιλαδελφία] The love of the brethren, i.e. love to the fellow-Christians. Comp. Rom. xii. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 9; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. i. 7. — μενετε] abide, cease not. For, according to vi. 10, x. 33, the readers had already exercised this virtue before, and were still exercising it. Yet in their case, since they had become doubtful regarding the absolute truth of Christianity, and in part already sought to withdraw from the outward fellowship of Christians (x. 25), and, moreover, in particularistic prejudice closed their hearts against a brotherly intercourse with the Gentile Christians, the renewed inculcation of this virtue was of special importance.

Vv. 2, 3. Summons to two particular forms of expression of the general virtue, ver. 1.

Ver. 2. Exhortation to hospitality. Comp. Rom. xii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8. Owing to the hatred of the Jews towards the Christians, and the almost entire absence of public places of entertainment, hospitality towards fellow-Christians on their journeys became, for the Palestinians also, an urgent necessity. — διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ἐκλαθὸν τινες ξενιστέως ὀγγίζον] Enforcement of the command uttered, by calling attention to the high honour which, by the exercise of this virtue, accrued to single remote ancestors of the Jewish people; for by the manifestation of hospitality some have unwittingly entertained angels. The author was certainly, in connection with this statement, thinking specially of Abraham and Lot (Gen. xviii. 19). We have, moreover, to compare the declaration of the Lord, Matt. xxv. 44, 45, according to which he who entertains one of His people, entertains the Lord Himself. — The ἐλαθον, written in accordance with genuine Greek praxis, but not occurring elsewhere in the N. T., forms a paronomasia with ἐπιλαυθάνεσθε.

1 Comp. Philo, de Abrah. p. 386 (with Mangey, II. p. 17 f.): Ἔγὼ δὲ εἰς ἄλλα οὔτως ἐκάτερον ὑπάρχειν ἡγαμεναῖοι καὶ μακραίνοντος ἵνα φω πρὶ τὸν δικαίον, ἵνα σωτηρίαν καὶ ἐξεισηφεῖται ὑπάρχειν ὑπάρχειν τεράστως, ἵνα καὶ ἕλθε χόριον, ὑπενθυμοῦντες καὶ ὑπερχεῖν τῷ ἐρήμῳ θεῷ· δὶς ἔν τις ἕξαμεν, ἡς ἔν τῇ τῆς γενέσθαι ἄρgife.
Ver. 3. Exhortation to have a care for the prisoners and distressed.—*_Mνωσάκεσθε τῶν δεσμῶν_* Be mindful (sc. in order to aid them with ministering love) of the prisoners.—_ός συνδεδεμένοι_* as fellow-prisoners, i.e. with as much devotion to them as though the captivity had fallen upon yourselves. For the Christians are members of the same body; as in the prosperity, so also are they to share in the sufferings one of the other. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 26. Böhme (in like manner Heinrichs too) explains: "quippe ejus naturae et conditionis homines, qui ipsi quoque pro captivis sint, nimirum in ecclesia pressa degentes." Upon this interpretation, it is true, the twofold _ός_ retains its full significance; but in order to represent the readers as "in ecclesia pressa degentes," an addition to _συνδεδεμένοι_ could not have been dispensed with. —_τῶν κακουχουμένων_* of those who suffer evil treatment. _τῶν κακουχουμένων_ is the genus, under which the foregoing _τῶν δεσμῶν_ are ranged as a particular species. —_ός καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄντες ἐν σώματι_ as sojourning yourselves in a body, thus likewise still subjected to the earthly order of the world, and not secured against the like ill-treatment. According to Calvin and others, the sense is: since ye indeed are members of the same body (to wit, the church),—which, however, must have been indicated by _ός καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῷ σώματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντες_. According to Beza: as though in your own person ye were κακουχουμένοι,—a sense which can only with violence be put upon the words.

Ver. 4. Exhortation to chastity in the narrower sense.—_Τίμως_* held in estimation, honourable, sc. ἐστώ. Others supplement _ἐστίν_. So already the Peshito (honoratum est connubium inter omnes), then Beza, Grotius (apud omnes gentes moratas honos est conjugio), M'Caul, and others. But against this stands the addition: _καὶ ἤ κοίτη ἄμαντος_, since the latter could not be asserted as a truth in point of fact. Rather might the indicative rendering thereof be preserved by taking the clauses _descriptively_: "Marriage honourable in all things," etc., which then would not be different in sense from the direct requirement that marriage should be honourable. Nevertheless, this mode of interpretation too—recently adopted by Delitzsch—could only be justified if it were
followed by a long series of similar statements; here, on the other hand, where imperatives are placed in close proximity before and after, it is unnatural.— ὁ γάμος] marriage. In this sense the word occurs frequently with the Greeks. In the N. T. it has everywhere else the signification: wedding, and its celebration.— ἐν πάσιν] is neuter: in all things. The majority take ἐν πάσιν as masculine. There is then found expressed in it the precept, either, as by Luther and others, that marriage should in the estimation of all be held in honour, i.e. not desecrated by adultery; or, as Böhme, Schulz, and others, that it should not be despised or slighted by any unmarried person (according to Hofmann, by any one, whether he live in wedlock, or he think that he ought for his own part to decline it); or finally, as by Calvin and many, that it is to be denied to no order of men (as later to the Catholic priests). In the two last cases it is generally supposed that the reference is to a definite party of those who, out of ascetic or other interest, looked unfavourably upon the married life. But for all three modes of explanation, παρὰ πάσιν would have been more suitably written than ἐν πάσιν; and a preference for celibacy on the part of born Jews in particular, to whom nevertheless the Epistle to the Hebrews is addressed, is an unexplained presupposition, because one not in accordance with the teaching of history. — καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἁμαρτωλοῦ] and the marriage bed (against the ordinary usus loquendi, Valckenaer and Schulz: the cohabitation) be undefiled.— πόρνους γὰρ καὶ μοιχοὺς κρεῖει ὁ Θεός] for fornicators and adulterers will God judge (condemn at the judgment of the world). Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 9 f., al. The ὁ Θεός placed at the close of the sentence is not without emphasis. It reminds that, though such sins of uncleanness remain for the most part unpunished by earthly judges, the higher Judge will one day be mindful of them.

Vv. 5, 6. Warning against covetousness; exhortation to contentedness.— Ἀφιλαργυροῦ] free from greediness of money, from covetousness and avarice, 1 Tim. iii. 3. Comp. vi. 24 ff. — ὁ τρόπος] sc. ἐστι: let the mind and comportment, the character, be. — ἀρκεούμενοι τοῖς παρόντωι] sc. ἐστε: be contented with that which is present. τὰ παρόντα here, as Xen.
Sympos. iv. 42 (οὐς γὰρ μάλλον τὰ παρόντα ἀρκεῖ, ἥκιστα τῶν ἄλλων ὁμοίων ὑπόγονταί), and often with the classic writers, of the earthly possession which one has. — αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶπεν] for He Himself has said, namely, God, as He who is speaking in the scripture; not Christ (Beza, Böhme, Klee). — οὐ μὴ σε ἀνώ οὔδ' οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλείπω] I will in no wise fail thee, nor by any means forsake thee. To this citation the most similar passages are Deut. xxxi. 6 (ούτε μή σε ἀνή, οὔτε μή σε ἐγκαταλείπη), ibid. ver. 8 (οὐκ ἀνήσει σε, οὐδὲ μή σε ἐγκαταλείπη), and 1 Chron. xxviii. 20 (οὐκ ἀνήσει σε καὶ οὐ μή ἐγκαταλείπη); although, in these passages, instead of the first person singular the third person is used. Less corresponding in point of expression are Josh. i. 5 (οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω σε οὔδ' ὑπερφομαί σε), Gen. xxviii. 15 (οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλείπτα), and Isa. xli. 17 (οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω αὐτῶν). On the other hand, there is found a citation entirely correspondent to ours in Philo, de Confus. Linguar. p. 344 C (ed. Mang. I. p. 430). It is possible that, as Bleek and de Wette suppose, the author adopted the same immediately from Philo. It is, however, also possible that the utterance, in the form in which we meet with it here and in Philo, had become proverbial. According to Delitzsch and Kluge, the utterance of Deut. xxxi. 6 assumed this form in the liturgic or homiletic usage of the Hellenistic synagogue, in that reminiscences of other similar O. T. passages blended with the original passage. [According to Piscator, Owen, and Tischendorf, the reference is to Josh. i. 5.]

Ver. 6. "οὔτε θαρρῶντας ἡμᾶς λέγειν κ.τ.λ. σοι so that we boldly say (namely, in the words of Ps. cxviii. 6): the Lord is my helper, and I will not fear; what can a man do to me! — τι ποιήσει μοι ἄνθρωπος;) is an independent direct question. Grammatically false is the construction of the Vulgate (so also Jac. Cappellus and others), which takes the words as dependent on οὐ φοβηθήσομαι: non timebo, quid faciat mihi homo.

Ver. 7. Exhortation to a remembrance of the former teachers, and an emulation of their faith.—οἱ ἔγγονοι the presidents and leaders of the congregation. Comp. vv. 17, 24; where, however, those still living are indicated,
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while here we have to think of those already fallen asleep. By virtue of the characteristic ωτίνες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ they appear as identical with the persons mentioned ii. 3, the immediate disciples of Christ, from whom the readers had received the gospel. — òν has reference equally to τὴν ἐκβασίν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς and τὴν πίστιν. — ἀναθεωρεῖν] the prolonged, closely observing contemplation. Comp. Acts xvii. 23. — τὴν ἐκβασίν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς] not: the course or path of development of their walk (Oecumenius, but without deciding, and Lud. de Dieu)—which is opposed to linguistic usage; nor yet: the result for others of their believing walk, inasmuch as many were thereby converted to Christianity (Braun, Cramer)—which must have been more precisely defined by means of additions; just as little: the result of their believing walk for the ἡγούμενοι themselves, as regards their rewarding in heaven (Storr, Bloomfield, and others), for an ἀναθεωρεῖν of the latter, to which the author is supposed to exhort, would not have been possible; but: the outlet or end of their walk on earth [1 Cor. x. 13]. Comp. τὴν ἔσοδον, Luke ix. 31, 2 Pet. i. 15, and τὴν ἀφίξειν, Acts xx. 29. That which is intended, seeing that in combination with the ἀναθεωρεῖν τὴν ἐκβασίν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς a μιμεῖσθαι τὴν πίστιν is spoken of, is beyond doubt the martyr's death, endured by the earlier leaders and presidents of the Palestinian congregations, Stephen, James the elder, James the brother of the Lord, and Peter, whereby they had manifested the strength and immovable stedfastness of their faith.

Vv. 8-15. Exhortation to hold aloof from unchristian doctrines and ritual observances.

Ver. 8 is ordinarily comprehended in one with ver. 7. Expositors then find in the utterance either, as Bleek, Ebrard, Bisping, and others, an adducing of the motive for the emulation of the faithful leaders enjoined at ver. 7; or, as Zeger, Grotius, Schulz, Kurtz, and others (comp. already Theophylact), the encouraging assurance that, as to these leaders, so also to the readers, provided they only take the faith of these leaders as a model for themselves, the gracious aid of Christ—of which, however, there was no mention in ver. 7—will not
be wanting; or finally, as Carpzov, the more precise information as to that in which their faith had consisted. More correctly, however, on account of the antithetic correspondence between ὁ αὐτός, ver. 8, and ποικίλως καὶ ξένως, ver. 9, are the words, ver. 8, taken as constituting the foundation and preparation for the injunction of ver. 9. Jesus Christ is forever the same; the Christian therefore must give no place in his mind and heart to doctrines which are opposed to Christ, His nature and His requirements.—εὐθείᾳ...σήμερον...εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας] Designation of the past, present, and future; exhaustive unfolding of the notion Αἰών. The expression is rhetorical; εὐθείᾳ is consequently not to be further expounded, in such wise that we must think of the time of the former teachers (Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, Limborch, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Kluge, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, al.), or of the time before the appearing of Christ (Bengel, Cramer, Stein), or to the whole time of the Old Covenant (Calvin, Pareus, al.), or even to the eternal pre-existence of Christ (Ambrose, de Fide, v. 1. 25; Seb. Schmidt, Nemethus, and others).—Τῇ οὖν Χριστῷ is the subject, and ὁ αὐτός (sc. ἐστίν, not ἐστω) the common predicate to all three notes of time. Wrongly Paulus: “Jesus is the God-anointed One; yesterday and to-day is He altogether the same”—which must have read: Τῇ οὖν ὁ Χριστός. But mistaken also the Vulgate, Oecumenius, Luther, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, and others, in that they interpunctuate after σήμερον: Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day; the same also in eternity. For that which is to be accentuated is not the eternity of Christ, as would be the case by means of the εὐθείᾳ καὶ σήμερον taken alone, but the eternal unchangeableness of Christ.

Ver. 9. The exhortation itself, for which preparation was made at ver. 8, now follows.—Διδαχαί εἰς ποικίλως καὶ ξένως μὴ παραφέρεσθε] By manifold and strange doctrines do not be seduced, borne aside from the right path. As is shown by the connecting of the two halves of the verse by the γάρ, expressive of the reason or cause, the διδαχαὶ ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι.

1 "Imitamin vestrorum praefectorum fidem, nimium hanc: Jesus Christus heri, hodie et semper i aevis Deus est."
are related to the **βρώματα** mentioned immediately after as the *genus* to a *species* coming under particular notice; and, as is manifest from ver. 10 ff., both belong to the specifically Jewish domain. By **διδαχαί ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι**, therefore, the ordinances of the Mosaic law in general are to be understood, the observance of which was proclaimed among the readers as necessary to the attainment of salvation, while then under **βρώματα** a special group of the same is mentioned. **ποικίλαι** the same are called, because they consist in commands and prohibitions of manifold kind; ξέναι, however, because they are opposed to the spirit of Christianity. — καλῶν γάρ] for it is a fair thing, i.e. praiseworthy and salutary. — χάρινι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν] that by grace the heart be made steadfast, in it seek and find its support. For no other thing than the grace of God is that which determines the character of the New Covenant, as the law that of the Old, Rom. vi.14, al. Erroneously, therefore, Castellio and Böhme, χάριν means by thanksgiving or gratitude towards God; yet more incorrectly Bisping and Maier: by the Christian sacrificial food, the Holy Communion. — οὐ βρώματι not by meats. This is referred by the majority, lastly by Böhme, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 158), Alford, Moll, Ewald, and Hofmann, to the Levitical ordinances concerning pure and impure food. But only of the sacrificial meals can οὐ βρώματι be understood. For rightly have Schlichting, Bleek, and others called attention to the fact that (1) the expression, ver. 9, is more applicable to the enjoyment of sacred meats than to the avoiding of unclean meats. Schlichting: Cor non reificetur cibis non comestis, sed comestis. Ciborum ergo usui, non abstinentiae, opponitur hic gratia; that (2) it is said of the Christians, at ver. 10, in close conjunction with ver. 9, that they possess an altar of which the servants of the Jewish sanctuary have no right to eat; that, finally, (3) at the close of this series of thoughts, ver. 15, the reference to the sacrifices is retained, inasmuch as there, in opposition to the Levitical sacrifices, it is made incumbent on Christians through Christ continually to offer sacrifices of praise unto God. Tholuck, it is true, objects to this reasoning:
(1) that μυστήρια may denote "the clean, legally permitted meats, with (the mention of) which is at the same time implied the abstinence from the unclean." But this expedient is artificial and unnatural; since, if we had in reality to think of the Levitical precepts with regard to food, in the exact converse of that which happens the avoiding of unclean meats would be the main idea brought under consideration. (2) That the connection of ver. 10 with ver. 9 would only apparently be lost, since one may warrantably assume the following line of thought: "Do not suffer yourselves to be led astray by a variety of doctrines alien to the pure truth—surely it is a fairer thing to assure the conscience by grace than by meats, by means of which no true appeasement is obtained; we Christians have an altar with such glorious soul-nourishment, of which no priest may eat." But this supposed thought of ver. 10 would be highly illogical. For how does it follow from the fact that Christians have an altar of most glorious soul-nourishment, that no priest may partake of the same? Logically correct, certainly, would be only the thought: for we Christians possess an altar with such glorious soul-nourishment, that we have no need whatever of the Levitical ordinances regarding food. Then again, at ver. 10, nothing at all is written about "glorious soul-nourishment;" but, on the contrary, the design of this verse can only be to make good the incompatibility of the Christian altar with the Jewish. (3) That the exhortation to the spiritual sacrifices, ver. 15, may be more immediately referred back to ver. 10. But ver. 10 stands to ver. 9, in which the theme of the investigation, vv. 8–15, is expressed, in the relation of subordination. The following οὖν, ver. 15, may therefore serve for the introducing of the final result from the whole preceding investigation. (4) Finally, that it cannot be perceived how the participation in sacrificial meals could have been looked upon as a means of justification. But the participation in the sacrificial meals was certainly a public avouchment of participation in the sacrifices themselves. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 18. Very easily, therefore, might the author be led finally to take up this preference of his readers for the Jewish sacrificial cultus in this particular form of manifestation, which
had hitherto remained unnoticed in the epistle.— The supports, too, which Delitzsch has more recently sought to give to the referring of νῦν βρῶμαςν to ordinances regarding clean and unclean meats, are weak. For that βρῶματα is a word unheard of in the sacrificial thora, but familiar in the legislation regarding food, and that βρῶμα is used elsewhere in the N. T. of that which is prohibited or permitted for eating, does not in any way fall under consideration; because our passage claims before everything to be intelligible per se, nothing thus can be determinative of its meaning which is opposed to its expression and connection. That, however, the author cannot by διδαχαὶ ποικιλαὶ καὶ ξέναι have meant the ordinances of the law in general, because he has recognised their divine origin, and therefore could not have indicated them with so little reverence, is a mere prepossession. For the Apostle Paul, too, speaks of them, as is already shown by Gal. iv. 9 f., v. 2, with no greater reverence. We are prevented from thinking, with Delitzsch, of "erroneous doctrines invented in accordance with one's own will, though it may be attaching themselves to the O. T. law," by the relation in which διδαχαὶς ποικιλαὶς καὶ ξέναις stands to βρῶμαςν, ver. 9, and this again to ἐξ ὦν φαγεῖν ὦ ν ἔχουσιν ἔχονταν ὦν τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες, ver. 10. — ἐν ὦς ὦ ν ὦ ὠφελήθησαν ὦν περιπατοῦντες from which those busied therein have derived no profit, inasmuch, namely, as by such partaking of the sacrifice they did not attain to true blessedness. — ἐν ὦς belongs to ὦν περιπατοῦντες, since these words cannot stand alone, not to ὠφελήθησαν.

Ver. 10. Justification of νῦν βρῶμαςν, ver. 9, by the emphasizing of the incompatibility of the Christian altar with that of Judaism. We possess an altar, of which they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle, i.e. he who seeks in the Jewish sacrificial meals, and consequently in the Jewish sacrificial worship, a stay and support for his heart, thereby shuts himself out from Christianity, for he makes himself a servant of the tabernacle; but he who serves the tabernacle has no claim or title to the altar of Christians. That the subject in ἔχομεν is the Christian, is acknowledged on all sides. But equally little ought it ever to have been disputed that by
oi τῷ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες persons must be denoted who are contrasted with the Christians. For, in accordance with the expression chosen, the author can only mean to say that the Christians possess the right to eat of the altar; those τῷ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες, on the other hand, forego this right. Quite in a wrong sense, therefore, have Schlichting, Schulz, Heinrichs, Wieseler (Schriften der Univ. Kiel aus d. J. 1861, p. 42), Kurtz, and others, referred oi τῷ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες likewise to the Christians, in that they found expressed the thought: for Christians there exists no other sacrifice than one of which it is not permitted them to eat. They then suppose to be intended by oi τῷ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες either, as Schlichting, "omnes in universum Christiani," or, as Schulz, particular officers of the society, who conducted the Christian worship. But in the first case—apart from the fact that then, what would alone be natural, εξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχομεν ἔξουσίαν would have been written instead of εξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχονσιν ἔξουσίαν oi τῷ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες—the Christians would, as Bleek has already justly observed, have been designated by a characteristic which could not possibly be predicated of them; in the second, an anachronistic separation into clerics and laity would be imputed to the author, and the sense arising would be unsuitable, since the proposition, that the warrant for eating of the Christian sacrifice is wanting, could not possibly hold good of the clergy alone, but must have its application to Christians in general. By ή σκηνή can thus be understood nothing other than the earthly, Jewish sanctuary, as opposed to the ἄληθινή and τελειωτέρα σκηνή of Christians, viii. 2, ix. 11. The τῷ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες, however, are not specially, as Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 161), Alford, and others suppose, the Jewish priests (viii. 5), but the members of the Jewish covenant people universally (ix. 9, x. 2).—The θυσιαστήριον further is the altar, upon which the sacrifice of the New Covenant,  

1 So also Hofmann (Schriften. II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 457 ff.), who will have only the twofold fact to be accentuated at ver. 10: "that we are priests," and "that we possess a means of expiation," and brings out as the sense of the verse: "that we, whose only propitiatory sacrifice, and one for all alike, is Christ, have no other profit from our means of expiation, than that we are reconciled." (!)
namely, the body of Christ (comp. ver. 12), has been presented. Not "ipse Christus" (Piscator, Owen, Wolf; comp. Calvin), or the θυσία itself which has been presented (Limborch, Whitby, M'Lean, Heinrichs, and others), nor yet the cultus (Grotius), can be denoted thereby. But likewise the explaining of the table of the Supper, the τράπεζα κυρίου, 1 Cor. x. 21, with Corn. a Lapide, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Böhme, Bähr (Stud. u. Krit. 1849, H. 4, p. 938), Ebrard, Bisping, Maier, and others (comp. also Rückert, das Abendmahl. Sein Wesen und seine Geschichte in der alten Kirche, Leipz. 1856, pp. 242-246), is inadmissible. For then there would underlie our passage the conception that the body of the Lord is offered in the Supper, Christ's sacrifice is thus one constantly repeated; but such conception is unbiblical, and in particular is remote from the thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the presentation of the sacrifice of Christ once for all, and the all-sufficiency of this sacrifice by its one presentation, is frequently urged with emphasis; comp. vii. 27, ix. 12, 25 ff., x. 10. Exclusively correct is it, accordingly, to understand by the altar, with Thomas Aquinas, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Bengel, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Delitzsch, Richm, l.c., Alford, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Woerner, and others, the spot on which the Saviour offered Himself, i.e. the cross of Christ. But to eat of this altar, i.e. to partake of the sacrifice presented thereon, signifies: to attain to the enjoyment of the spiritual blessings resulting from Christ's sacrificial death for believers; the same thing as is represented, John vi. 51 ff., as the eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of Christ.


Vv. 11, 12. Proof for ver. 10. The proof lies in the fact that Christ's sacrifice is one which has been presented without the camp, and consequently has been freed from all community with Judaism. Ver. 11 and ver. 12 are, as a proof of ver. 10, closely connected, and only in ver. 12 lies the main factor, whereas ver. 11 is related to the same as a merely preparatory and accessory thought (Bähr). For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest are burned without the camp; wherefore Jesus also, in order
that He might sanctify the people through His own blood, suffered without the gate. That is to say: The N. T. sacrifice of the covenant is typically prefigured by the great atoning sacrifice under the Old Covenant. Of the victims, however, which were devoted to the latter, neither the high priest nor any other member of the Jewish theocracy was permitted to eat anything. For of those animals only the blood was taken, in order to be brought by the high priest into the Most Holy Place as a propitiatory offering; the bodies of those animals, on the other hand, were burned without the camp or holy city (Lev. xvi. 27), wherein was contained the explanation in an act (comp. Bähr, l.c.), that they were cast out from the theocratic communion of Judaism. But thus, then, has Jesus also, in that He entered with His sacrificial blood into the heavenly Holy of Holies, made expiation for the sins of them that believe in Him; His sacrificial body, however, has, since He was led out of the camp, or beyond the gate of the holy city, in order to endure the infliction of death (comp. Lev. xxiv. 14; Num. xv. 35 f.; Deut. xvii. 5), declared by this act to be cast out from the Jewish covenant-people. Eat of His sacrificial body, i.e. obtain part in the blessing procured by His sacrifice, can therefore no one who is still within the camp, i.e. who still looks for salvation from the ordinances of Judaism. Consequently he who will eat of the altar of Christ must depart out of Judaism, and go forth unto Christ without the camp (ver. 13). — τὰ ἄγαν as ix. 8, 12, 24, 25, x. 19, the Most Holy Place. — The tenses in the present mark the practice as one still continuing. — παρεμβολὴ Characterization of the dwelling-place of the Jewish people at the time of the lawgiving, while it was still journeying through the wilderness and had tents for its habitation. The camp was the complex of the tents, enclosing the totality of the people together with the sanctuary. Thus there was combined with the idea of locality the religious reference to the people as one covenant-people, and "without the camp" became equivalent in signification to "without the bounds of the Old Covenant." But, since afterwards the city of Jerusalem, with the temple in its midst, took the place of the παρεμβολὴ, the ἐξω τῆς πύλης standing in ver. 12, without the gate, sc. of the city of Jerusalem, says in effect
the same thing as ἐξογγυώσας, vv. 11, 13. — διό] wherefore, i.e. because the sacrificial death of Jesus has been prefigured by the type mentioned, ver. 11. — ἵστο] opposition to the animal blood in the O. T. sacrifices of atonement. — τὴν λαοῦ] see at ii. 16, p. 132. — ἐπαθέν] comp. ix. 26.

Ver. 13. Deduction from vv. 10—12, in the form of a summons: Let us then no longer seek salvation for ourselves within the bounds of Judaism, but come forth from the camp of the Old Covenant and betake ourselves to Christ, untroubled about the reproach which may fall upon us on that account. Theodoret: ἐξογγυώσας ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐξογγυώσας κατὰ νόμον γενώμεθα πολιτείας. False, because opposed to all the connection, is it when Chrysostom 1, Theophylact, Primasius, Erasmus, Paraphr., Clarius, and others find in ver. 13 the exhortation to renounce the world and its delights; or Chrysostom 2, Limborch, Heinrichs, Dindorf, Kuinoel, Bloomfield: willingly to follow the Lord into sufferings and death; or Schlichting, Grotius, Michaelis, Zachariae, Storr: willingly to submit to expulsion by the Jews from their towns and fellowship; or Clericus: to forsake the city of Jerusalem on account of its impending destruction (Matt. xxiv.). — τοῦ] as the commencement of a sentence only rare. Comp. LXX. Isa. iii. 10, v. 13, xxvii. 4, xxxiii. 23; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 342 sq. — τοῦ οἰκείου οὐτοῦ] See at xi. 26.


Ver. 15. Closing exhortation, through Christ, to offer to God sacrifices of praise. Deduced from vv. 8—14. — Δι' οὗτοῦ] is with great emphasis preposed: through Him (sc. Christ), but not through the intervention of the Jewish sacrificial institution. Through Him, inasmuch as by the all-
sufficiency of His expiatory sacrifice once offered, He has qualified believers so to do. — θυσίαν αἰνέσεως [a praise-offering (θυσίαν ἁμαρτίαν]), thus a spiritual sacrifice, in opposition to the animal sacrifices of Judaism. — διὰ παντός continually. For the blessings obtained through Christ are so abundant and inexhaustible, that God can never be sufficiently praised for them. — τοιτέων καρπῶν χειλέων ὑμῶν τῷ ὄνομαί αὐτοῦ] that is, fruit of lips which praise His name. Elucidation of the meaning in θυσίαν αἰνέσεως, in order further to bring into special relief the purely spiritual nature of this Christian thank-offering already indicated by those words. The expression καρπῶν χειλέων the author has derived from Hos. xiv. 3, LXX.: καὶ ἀνταπόδωσομεν καρπῶν χειλέων ἡμῶν (in the Hebrew: קִפְתֵּפָנִי בְּאִלְפֵּי בְּנֵי בְרִית, let us offer for our own lips). For the thought, comp. Vajikra B. 9. 27, in Wetstein: R. Pinchas, R. Levi et R. Joacham ex ore R. Menachem Galilaei dixerunt: Tempore futuro omnia sacrificia cessabunt, sacrificium vero laudis non cessabit. Omnes preces cessabunt, sed laudes non cessabunt. Philo, de Sacrificantibus, p. 849 E (with Mang. II. p. 253): ηδὲ ἄριστην ἀνάγομεν θυσίαν, ὑμῶν καὶ εὐχαριστοῦμεν τὸν ευεργέτην καὶ σωτήρα Θεὸν γεραλούμε. — The referring of αὐτοῦ to Christ (so Sykes, who find the sense: confessing ourselves publicly as the disciples of Christ) is unnatural, seeing that God has been expressly mentioned only just before as the One to whom the θυσία αἰνέσεως is to be presented.

Ver. 16. Exhortation to beneficence. By means of δὲ this verse attaches itself to the preceding, inasmuch as over against the Christianly devout mind which expresses itself in words, is placed the Christianly devout mind which manifests itself in deeds. — Τῆς δὲ εὐποίας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλαμβάνοντες [Of well-doing, moreover (the substantive εὐποία only here in the N. T.; εὐ ποιεῖν, Mark xiv. 7), and fellowship (i.e. communication of earthly possession, comp. Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 13), be not forgetful (ver. 2). — τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίων εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ Θεὸς] for in such sacrifices God has pleasure. — τοιαύταις] refers back only to εὐποίας καὶ κοινωνίας, not likewise to ver. 15 (Theophylact, Schlichting, Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Hofmann, Woerner). — The formula εὐαρεστεῖται
Ver. 17. Exhortation to obedience to the presidents of the assembly. Comp. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13. — 

Πείθεσθε τοὺς ἡγούμενοις ὑμῶν καὶ ἰπείκητε

Obey your leaders, and yield to them. Bengel: Obedite in iis, quae praecipient vobis tanquam salutaria; concedite, etiam ubi videntur plusculum postulare. The demand presupposes, for the rest, that the author knew the ἡγούμενοι as men like-minded with himself, who had kept themselves free from the hankering after defection. — 

αὐτῶι γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν ὑμῶν] for it is they who watch for your souls, for the salvation thereof. — 

ὦς λόγου ἀποδίδοντες) as those who must give an account (of the same), sc. to God and the Lord at His return. — 

тин] the subsequently introduced note of design to ἰπείκητε καὶ ἰπείκητε. On that account, however, it is not permitted, with Grotius, Carpzov, and others, to enclose αὐτῶι ... ὑμῶν within a parenthesis; because the subject-matter of the clause of design refers back to the subject-matter of the foregoing establishing clause. — 

μετὰ χαρᾶς] with joy, namely, over your docility. — 

tοῦτο] sc. τὸ ἀγρυπνεῖν. Erroneously do Owen, Whitby, Michaelis, M'Lean, Heinrichs, Stuart, and others supplement 

tὸ λόγου ἀποδίδοναι. For the latter takes place only in the future, whereas the conjunctive of the present ποιήσας points to that which is already to be done in the present. — καὶ μὴ στενάγων] and without sighing, sc. over your intractableness. — 

ἀλκυτελές] unprofitable, inasmuch as it will bring you no gain, but, on the contrary, will call down upon you the chastisement of God. A litotes. — 

tοῦτο] sc. τὸ στενάξειν.

Vv. 18, 19. Summons to the readers to intercession on behalf of the author. Comp. 1 Thess. v. 25; 2 Thess. iii. 1; Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 19; Col. iv. 3. — περὶ ἡμῶν] The plural has reference exclusively to the author of the epistle. In addition to himself, to think of Timothy (Seb. Schmidt, al.), or of the ἡγούμενοι spoken of ver. 17 (Carpzov, Kluge), or of the fellow-labourers in the gospel in the midst of the Gentile world, remote from the Hebrew Christians (Delitzsch, comp. also Alford), or of the companions in his vocation, with regard to whom it was to be made known that they wished
to be looked upon as joint-representatives of the subject-matter of the epistle (Hofmann), is arbitrary. For—apart from the fact that no mention has been made of Timothy until now, and that the presupposition that the author wished himself to be numbered among the ἥγούμενοι spoken of in ver. 17 is a wholly baseless one—the singular, which in ver. 19 without any qualification takes the place of the preceding plural, is in itself decisive against this view. For, even if perchance at ver. 19 the person of the writer had to be brought into special relief, out of a plurality of persons indicated at ver. 18, a distinguishing ἐγώ as addition to the simple παρακαλῶ could not have been wanting.—πεποιθεῖσθαι γὰρ δὴ κ.τ.λ.] for we persuade ourselves, i.e. we suppose or take it to be so (comp. Acts xxvi. 26), that¹ we have a good conscience, since we endeavour in all things to walk in a praiseworthy manner. Indication of the reason on the ground of which the author believes he is entitled to claim an interest on the part of the readers, manifesting itself in intercession on his behalf. But in the fact that he regards such explanation as necessary, there is displayed the consciousness that the Palestinian Christians took umbrage at him and his Pauline character of teaching; to remove this umbrage is therefore the object of the justificatory clause.—ἐν πᾶσιν] belongs to that which follows, not still, as Oecumenius and Theophylact suppose, to ἐγὼ μεν; and πᾶσιν is not masculine (Chrysostom: οὐκ ἐν ἐθνικοῖς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν υἱῶν; Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Er. Schmid, Tholuck, Hofmann, al.), but neuter.

Ver. 19. Περισσοτέρως] is on account of its position more naturally referred to παρακαλῶ than, with Seb. Schmidt, Rambach, Bengal, and Hofmann, to παντισαι. — ἵνα τάξιον

¹ Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, and others take ἵνα—in reading the received ἵνα γάρ, and then supposing this to be put absolutely—as the causal “for” or “because,” which, however, even supposing the correctness of the Recepta, is forced and unnatural. Yet more unsuitable, however, is it when Hofmann, even with the reading ὑπήρξα, will have ἵνα taken causally. The sense is supposed to be: “if we believe that ye are praying for us, this has its ground in the fact that we have a good conscience.” But to derive the more precise indication of contents for the dependent ὑπῆρξα from that which precedes, is altogether inadmissible.
chap. XIII. 20, 21. A wish of blessing. Chrysostom: Προῦτον παρ' αὐτῶν αἰτήσας τὰς εὐχὰς, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτῶις ἐπείδηται πάντα τὰ ἀγαθά. — ο Θεός τῆς εἰρήνης] A designation of God very usual with Paul also. Its import may either be, as 1 Thess. v. 23 (see at that place): the God of salvation, i.e. God, who bestows the Christian salvation; or, as Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20, Phil. iv. 9, 2 Cor. xiii. 11: the God of peace, i.e. God, who produces peace. In favour of the first acceptation, which is defended by Schlichting, may be urged the tenor of the benediction itself. In favour of the latter acceptation decides, however, the connection of thought with ver. 18 f. For, since the closing half of ver. 18 betrayed the presupposition that the receivers of the epistle were biased by prejudice against the person of the writer, there lies indicated in the fact, that in the following wish of blessing God is designated as the God who creates peace, the further idea, that He will also make peace between the readers and the
writer, i.e. will bring the Christian convictions of the readers into harmony with that of the writer. So in substance Chrysostom (τὸντο εἰπε διὰ τὸ στασιάζειν αὐτούς. Εἴ τοίνυν ὁ θεὸς εἰρήνης θεὸς ἐστι, μὴ διαστασιάζετε πρὸς ἡμᾶς), Oecumenius, Theophylact, Jac. Cappellus, and others. Wrongly do Grotius, Böhme, de Wette, Bisping, and others derive the appellation “the God of peace” from the supposition that reference is made to the contentions which prevailed amongst the members of the congregation itself. For the assumption of a state in which the congregation was rent by internal dissensions, is one warranted neither by xii. 14 nor by anything else in the epistle.—ο ἀναγαγών κ.τ.λ.] Further characterizing of God as the God who, by the raising of Christ from the dead, has sanctioned and attested the redeeming work of the same.—ο ἀναγαγών ἐκ νεκρῶν] He who has brought up from the dead, i.e. who has raised from death. Wrongly do Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Maier, Kluge, and Kurtz suppose that in ὥ ἄναγαγών is contained at the same time the exaltation into heaven. For, since ὥ ἄναγαγών does not stand absolutely, but has with it the addition ἐκ νεκρῶν, so must that idea also have been made evident by a special addition. There would thus have been written ὥ ἄναγαγών ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐν ψυχή ἄναγαγών, or something similar. Compare, too, Rom. x. 7, where in like manner, as is shown by ver. 9, by the Χριστόν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἄναγαγέων is denoted exclusively the resurrection of Christ, and not likewise His ascension.—τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τῶν μέγαν] the exalted (comp. iv. 14) Shepherd of the sheep. For the figure, comp. John x. 11 ff.; Matt. xxvi. 31; 1 Pet. ii. 25, v. 4 (ὁ ἀρχιποιμὴν). According to Theophylact, Bengel, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, Hofmann, and others, the author had in connection with this expression present to his mind LXX. Isa. lxiii. 10, where it is said in regard to Moses: ποῦ ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης τῶν ποιμένα τῶν προβατών,—a supposition which, considering the currency of the figure in the N. T., may certainly be dispensed with.—ἐν αἷματι διαθήκης αἰώνιον] in virtue of the blood of an everlasting covenant, i.e. in virtue of the shed blood of Christ, by which the New Covenant was sealed; comp. ix. 15 ff., x. 29. Oecumenius,
Theophylact, Clarius, Calvin, Bengel, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Kluge, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and others conjoin these words with \(\delta \ \alpha να\gammaαγ\omega\nu\), but then again differ from each other in the determining of the sense. According to Bleek and Kurtz (similarly Bisping), the author intends to say: “God brought up Christ from the dead in the blood of the everlasting covenant; in such wise that He took, as it were, the shed blood with Him, in that He opened up to Himself by the same the entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, and it retained continually its power for the sealing of an everlasting covenant.” But this interpretation falls with the erroneous presupposition that \(\delta \ \alpha να\gammaαγ\omega\nu\) includes in itself likewise the idea of the exaltation to heaven. According to Oecumenius 2, Theophylact 2, and Calvin, \(\epsilon\nu\), on the other hand, stands as the equivalent in signification to \(\sigma\nu\): who has raised Christ from the dead with the blood of the everlasting covenant, so that this blood retains everlasting virtue; while Clarius (comp. the first interpretation in Oecumenius and Theophylact) understands the words as though \(\epsilon\iota\epsilon \ \delta\ \epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\ \alpha\nu\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\iota\mu\iota\nu\): had been written, and Bengel, as likewise Hofmann, makes \(\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\iota\) the same as \(\delta\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\) (for the blood’s sake). But all these acceptations are linguistically untenable. Equally inadmissible is it to take \(\epsilon\nu\), in this combination, instrumentally (Delitzsch, Kluge: “by means of, by the power of, by virtue of;” Alford: “through the blood”). For if one insists on the strict signification of the instrumental explanation, there arises a false thought, since the means by the application of which the miraculous act of the resurrection was accomplished is not the blood of Christ, but the omnipotence of God. If, however, we mingle the notion of mediately effecting with that of the meritorious cause, as is done by Delitzsch and Alford, inasmuch as the former dilutes the “\(k\rho\alpha\tau\iota\)” (by virtue of) into “virtute ac merito sanguinis ipsius in morte effusi,” the latter the “through” into “in virtue of the blood,” we come back to Bengel’s ungrammatical equalizing of \(\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\iota\) with \(\delta\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\). Another class of expositors combine \(\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\iota\chi\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\) \(\alpha\iota\nu\iota\nu\omicron\) with the \(\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\nu\) immediately foregoing; either, as Sykes and Baumgarten, in taking \(\tau\omicron\nu\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\nu\) as a notion per
se; or, as Starck, Wolf, and Heinrichs, prolonging in connection with it the idea of the shepherd. Nevertheless, it is most natural, with Beza, Estius, Grotius, Limborch, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Stengel, Ebrard, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 601), Maier, Moll, and others, to regard έν αἰματι διαθήκης αἰωνίων as instrumental nearer definition to the total idea τῶν ποιμένα τῶν προβατῶν τῶν μέγαν; in such wise that by the addition is indicated the means by which Christ became the exalted Shepherd, with whom no other shepherd may be placed upon a parallel. Comp. Acts xx. 28: προσέχετε ... παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν δὲ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίον ἑστει ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου, ἢ περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἰματος τοῦ Ιδίου. — διαθήκης αἰωνίων] Comp. Jer. xxxii 40, L 5; Isa. lv. 3, lx. 8. Theodoret: Αἰματίον δὲ τὴν καωμὴν κέκληκε διαθήκην, ὡς ἐτέρας μετὰ ταύτην οὐκ ἑσομένης· ἵνα γὰρ μὴ τις ὑπολάβῃ, καὶ ταύτην δὲ ἄλλης διαθήκης παυθήσεται, εἰκότως αὐτῆς τὸ ἀτελεύτητον ἐδείξειν.

Ver. 21. Καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἁγαθῷ] cause that ye become ἄρτιοι, ready or perfect, in every good work. Oecumenius: πληρώσας, τελεύσας. That, for the rest, καταρτίσας is optative, and not, as Kurtz strangely supposes, imperative aorist middle, is self-evident. — εἰς τὸ ποιήσαι] Statement of the design, not of the effect (Schlichting and others): that ye may accomplish. — τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ] His will, i.e. that which is morally good and salutary. There is certainly comprehended under the expression the faithful continuance in Christianity. — τοιῶν ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνόπτων αὐτοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] working in you (wrongly Böhme: among you) that which is well-pleasing in His sight, through Christ Jesus. Modal definition to καταρτίσαι. — τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνόπτων αὐτοῦ] Comp. 2 Cor. v. 9; Rom. xii. 1, xiv. 18; Eph. v. 10; Phil. iv. 18. — διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] belongs neither to καταρτίσαι (Bloomfield) nor to τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνόπτων αὐτοῦ (Grotius, Hammond, Michaelis, Storr, and others), but to τοιῶν. — ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνιας] sc. έστω. — ἡ δόξα] the glory due to Him. — The doxology is referred by Limborch, Wetstein, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Ernesti, Delitzsch, Alford, Kluge, Woerner, and others, to God; and
in favour of this it may be urged that in the wish of bless-
ing ὁ θεός forms the main subject. More correctly, however, shall we refer it, partly on account of the immediate joining of φ to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, partly on account of the design of the whole epistle, to warn the readers, who had become wavering in their faith in Christ, against relapse into Judaism, with Calvin, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Owen, Böhme, Stuart, BLEEK, Stengel, Tholuck, Bisping, Riehm (Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. p. 286), Maier, Moll, and the majority, to Christ.

Ver. 22. Request for friendly reception of the epistle. — ἀνέχεσθε τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως] bear with the word of the exhortation, grant it entrance with you, close not your hearts against it. Mistakenly do the Vulgate, Stein, and Kluge make παράκλησις here have the signification of “consolation.” Neither the verb ἀνέχεσθε nor the tenor of the epistle is in keeping therewith. — ὁ λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως] Comp. Acts xiii. 15. Not merely the admonitions scattered here and there in the epistle (Dindorf, Kuinoel) are to be understood under this expression; and just as little is merely chap. xiii. (Semler), or the last specially hortatory sections, chap. x. 19—xiii. (Grotius, Calov, and others), thought of in connection therewith. Rather is there intended by it, as also the following ἐπέστειλα proves, the epistle in its full extent. — καὶ γὰρ διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν] Argument for the reasonableness of the request on the ground of the brevity of the epistle: for I have also (i.e. apart from the fact that, by reason of your perilous wavering in the Christian faith, the admonishing of you was laid as a duty upon my conscience), as you see, written to you only with brief words. Theophylact: Τοσαύτα εἰπὼν, ὅμως βραχέα ταῦτα φησιν, διὸν πρὸς & ἐπεθύμει λέγειν. Quite remote from the meaning is that sense which Kurtz would put upon the words: the readers were also to take into account the fact that the epistle has, owing to its brief compass, often assumed a harsher and severer form of expression, than would be the case in connection with a more detailed amplification and a more careful limitation. — διὰ βραχέων] of the same import as δι’ ὀλγον, 1 Pet. v. 12. — ἐπιστέλλειν] in the signification “to write a letter,” elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts xvi. 20, xxi. 25.
Ver. 23. Communication of the intelligence that Timothy has been set free, and the promise, if the arrival of Timothy is not long delayed, in company with him to visit the readers. — ἔγνωσκετε is imperative (Peshito, Vulgate, Faber Stapulensis, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Junius, Owen, Bengel, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, I. p. 278; Stein, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Hofmann, Woerner, and others), not indicative (Vatablus, Nösselt, Opusc. I. p. 256; Morus, Schulz, Bleek ad loc., and Einl. in d. N. T., 3 Aufl. p. 583; de Wette, al.). For, that the author would be obliged to communicate further details concerning the liberation of Timothy in the case that the readers had not yet known of it, cannot be maintained; while, on the other hand, upon the supposition of the indicative, the whole notice would become superfluous. — ἔγνωσκετε ἀπολελυμένον] know as one released, i.e. know that he has been released. Comp. Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 324. Wrongly will Storr, Schleussner, Bretschneider, Paulus have ἔγνωσκετε taken in the sense: hold in honour, or: receive with kindness, against which, equally as against the interpretation of Schulz: “ye know the brother Timothy, who has been set at liberty,” the non-repetition of the article τόν before the participle is in itself decisive. — ἀπολελυμένον] is to be understood of liberation from imprisonment. So Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact (all three, however, with hesitation), then Beza, Grotius, Er. Schmid, Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, Wolf, Bengel, Sykes, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Hofmann, and others. Of an imprisonment of Timothy nothing is known to us, it is true, from other sources, but the possibility of the same cannot be disputed. The suppositions, that ἀπολελυμένον signifies: sent away to the Hebrews with our epistle (Theodoret, subscription of the epistle in many cursives: ἐγράφη ἀνδρὶ Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθεοῦ; Faber Stapulensis, al.), or: sent away somewhither, and consequently absent from the author (Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Carpzov, Stuart, and others), have the simple signification of the word against them. — ἐὰν τάχιον ἐρχυται] if he very speedily (earlier, sooner than I leave my present
abode) comes to me (incorrectly Grotius, Heinrichs, Stuart, al.: returns).—ὁσομαί ὑμᾶς] Oecumenius: ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

Ver. 24. Request for the delivering of salutations, together with the conveying of salutations to the readers.—πάντας τῶν ἑγουμένων ὑμῶν καὶ πάντας τῶν ἀνδρῶν] This designation of persons has about it something surprising, since according to it the letter would have the appearance of being addressed neither to the presidents of the assembly, nor to the whole congregation, but to single members of the latter. Probably, however, the meaning of the author is only that those to whom the epistle is delivered, for reading to the congregation, should greet as well all the presidents as also all the other members of the congregation.—οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας] is not to be explained from the absorption of one local preposition into another; in such wise that it should stand for οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, which is thought possible by Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 584. It signifies: those from Italy, i.e. Christians who have come out of Italy, and are now to be found in the surroundings of the writer. The general expression: οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, seems to point to a compact number of persons already known to the readers. It is highly probable, therefore, that those referred to are Christians who, on the occasion of the Neronian persecution, had fled from Italy, and had settled down for the time being at the place of the author's present abode. The expression shows, moreover, that the epistle was written outside of Italy. See p. 13.

Ver. 25. Concluding wish of blessing, entirely in accord with that of Tit. iii. 15.
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tholuck (Professor)</td>
<td>Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. 8vo, 10s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ullmann (Dr. Carl)</td>
<td>Reformers before the Reformation, principally in Germany and the Netherlands. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urwick (W., M.A.)</td>
<td>The Servant of Jehovah: A Commentary upon Isaiah lii. 13-liii. 12; with Dissertations upon Isaiah xi.-lxvi. 8vo, 6a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinet (Professor)</td>
<td>Studies on Blaise Pascal. Crown 8vo, 5a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker (Rev. Norman L.)</td>
<td>Scottish Church History. (Bible Class Handbooks.) Crown 8vo, 1a. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuttke (Professor)</td>
<td>Christian Ethics. Two vols. 8vo, 12a. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**T. and T. Clark’s Publications.**

**COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL’S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.**

By FRIEDRICH ADOLPH PHILIPPI

Translated from the Third Improved and Enlarged Edition.

*‘A serviceable addition to the Foreign Theological Library.’—Academy.*

*‘A commentary not only ample for its critical stores, but also valuable for its sober exegesis.’—John Bull.*

In Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s.

**HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND CHIEFLY.**

By DR. K. R. HAGENBACH

Translated from the Fourth Revised Edition of the German.

*‘Dr. Hagenbach has produced the best history of the Reformation hitherto written.’—British Quarterly Review.*

*‘The work before us will have a distinct sphere of usefulness open to it, and be welcome to English readers.’—Church Quarterly Review.*

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.

**THE TRUTH OF SCRIPTURE, IN CONNECTION WITH Revelation, Inspiration, and the Canon.**

By REV. PROFESSOR GIVEN, Magee College.

*‘This, the latest work upon the subject, is eminently fitted to prove of service to inquirers. The statements of truth are clear and well defined.’—Daily Review.*

*‘A really able treatise on the much assailed, but fundamental themes of human inquiry mentioned in the title. The discussion is searching, thorough, and completely up to date.’—General Baptist Magazine.*

**WORKS OF JOHN CALVIN.**

**Institutes of the Christian Religion, 8 vols.**

**Tracts on the Reformation, 3 vols.**

**Commentary on Genesis, 2 vols.**

**Harmony of the Last Four Books of the Pentateuch, 4 vols.**

**Commentary on Joshua, 1 vol.**

" on the Psalms, 5 vols.

" on Isaiah, 4 vols.

" on Jeremiah and Lamentations, 5 vols.

" on Hosea, 4 vols.

" on Daniel, 2 vols.

" on Job, 4 vols.

" on Joel, Amos, and Obadiah, 1 vol.

" on Jonah, Micah, and Nahum, 1 vol.

" on Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Haggai, 1 vol.

" on Zechariah and Malachi, 1 vol.

**Harmony of the Synoptical Evangelists, 8 vols.**

**Commentary on John’s Gospel, 2 vols.**


" on Romans, 1 vol.

" on Corinthians, 2 vols.

" on Galatians and Ephesians, 1 vol.

" on Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians, 1 vol.

" on Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, 1 vol.

" on Hebrews, 1 vol.

" on Peter, John, James, and Jude, 1 vol.

A Selection of Six Volumes (or more at the same proportion) for 21s., with the exception of the *Institutes, 8 vols.; Psalms, vol. 5; Habakkuk, and Corinthians, 3 vols.*

Any separate Volume (with the above exceptions), 6s.

The Letters, edited by Dr. Bonnet, 2 vols., 10s. 6d.

The *Institutes, 2 vols., translated, 14s.*

The *Institutes, in Latin, Tholuck’s Edition, 2 vols., (Subscription price) 14s.*
Just published, in demy 8vo, price 8s. 6d.,

SYNTAX OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By HEINRICH EWALD.

Translated from the Eighth German Edition

By JAMES KENNEDY, B.D.

'The work stands unique as regards a patient investigation of facts, written with a profound analysis of the laws of thought, of which language is the reflection. Another striking feature of the work is the regularly progressive order which pervades the whole. The Author proceeds by a natural gradation from the simplest elements to the most complex forms.'—British Quarterly Review.

'To more advanced students of Hebrew the translation of Ewald's Syntax will be a great boon. . . . We hope the translation will do much to advance the higher, more thorough study of Hebrew.'—Watchman.

'It is well known that Ewald was the first to exhibit the Hebrew Syntax in a philosophical form, and his Grammar is the most important of his numerous works.'—Athensum.

'The book is the product of genuine work, and will fill a gap in our theological literature.'—Daily Review.

Recently published, in demy 8vo, Fifth Edition, price 7s. 6d.,

AN INTRODUCTORY HEBREW GRAMMAR;

With Progressive Exercises in Reading and Writing.

By A. B. DAVIDSON, M.A., LL.D.,

Professor of Hebrew, etc., in the New College, Edinburgh.

In One large 8vo Volume, Ninth English Edition, price 15s.,

A TREATISE ON THE GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK,

Regarded as the Basis of New Testament Exegesis.

Translated from the German of Dr. G. B. WINER.


'This series is one of great importance to the biblical scholar; and, as regards its general execution, it leaves little or nothing to be desired.'—Edinburgh Review.

KEIL AND DELITZSCH'S INTRODUCTION TO AND COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

In 27 Volumes, demy 8vo.

MESSRS. CLARK have resolved to offer complete sets of this work at the Original Subscription Price of £7, 2s. 0d. Single volumes may be had, price 10s. 6d.
Just published, in crown 8vo, price 4s. 6d.,

**THE WORLD OF PRAYER; Or, Prayer in relation to Personal Religion.**

By Bishop MONRAD.

Translated from the Fourth German Edition.

"English readers are greatly indebted to Mr. Banks for his translation of this work: he has rendered available to them a book of devotional reading which admirably combines the truest Christian mysticism with the soundest and healthiest practical teaching."

—London Quarterly Review.

"One of the richest devotional books that we have read."—Primitive Methodist Magazine.

"An excellent manual on prayer in its relation to spiritual life and character."—British and Foreign Evangelical Review.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

**HISTORY OF THE PASSION AND RESURRECTION OF OUR LORD,**

Considered in the Light of Modern Criticism.

By Dr. F. L. STEINMEYER,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, BERLIN.

"Our readers will find this work a most valuable and suggestive help for their thoughts and teaching during Passion-tide and Easter."—English Churchman.

"Dr. Steinmeyer's work will well repay earnest study."—Weekly Review.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

**THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN.**

A Contribution to Biblical Theology.

By ERICH HAUPT.

"The Author has rendered the Church a good service by his work. Whoever accompanies him on the path of his well-grounded researches, will find he has made good speed in the understanding of the apostolic epistles."—Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung.

"We recommend it especially to the use of ministers, and are sure that they will find in it such scientific penetration, and far deeper and more suggestive preparation for sermons and Bible lectures, than in the expositions which are written specially for ministers for homiletical use."—Neue Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung.

In crown 8vo, price 5s.,

**MESSIANIC PROPHECY:**


Translated from the German (with the Approbation of the Author) of

DR. EDWARD RIEHM.

"Undoubtedly original and suggestive, and deserving careful consideration."—Literary Churchman.

"Its intrinsic excellence makes it a valuable contribution to our biblical literature."—British and Foreign Evangelical Review.
In Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s.,

GROWTH OF THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY,
FROM THE FIRST CENTURY TO THE DAWN OF THE LUTHERAN ERA.

BY THE REV. GEORGE MATHESON, M.A., D.D.,
AUTHOR OF 'AIDS TO THE STUDY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY.

"Fresh, vigorous, learned, and eminently thoughtful."—Contemporary Review.
"This work is a contribution of real value to the popular study of Church History."—
Pall Mall Gazette.
"The work of a very able and pious and cultured thinker."—Church Quarterly Review.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

In crown 8vo, Third Edition, price 4s. 6d.,

AIDS TO THE STUDY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY.

"A work of much labour and learning, giving in a small compass an intelligent review of a very large subject."—Spectator.

Just published, in Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 12s. each,

A HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH TO A.D. 429.

FROM THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.
TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF C. J. HEFELE, D.D., BISHOP OF ROTTENBURG.

"This careful translation of Hefele's Councils."—Dr. Pusey.
"A thorough and fair compendium, put in the most accessible and intelligent form."—
Guardian.
"A work of profound erudition, and written in a most candid spirit. The book will be a standard work on the subject."—Spectator.
"The most learned historian of the Councils."—Père Gratry.
"We cordially commend Hefele's Councils to the English student."—John Bull.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 12s.,

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE,

BY ALFRED CAVE, B.A.,
PRINCIPAL OF, AND PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, ETC., HACKNEY COLLEGE, LONDON.

"We have nothing but praise for its clearness, its method, its thoroughness, and its tolerance. We most warmly commend Dr. Cave's book to the study of the clergy, who will find it full of suggestiveness and instruction."—English Churchman.
"A thoroughly able and erudite book, from almost every page of which something may be learned. The Author's method is exact and logical, the style perspicuous and forcible—sometimes, indeed, almost epigrammatic; and, as a careful attempt to ascertain the teaching of the Scripture on an important subject, it cannot fail to be interesting even to those whom it does not convince."—Watchman.
Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

THE INCARNATE SAVIOUR.
A LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST.
By Rev. W. R. Nicoll, M.A.

"It commands my warm sympathy and admiration. I rejoice in the circulation of such a book, which I trust will be the widest possible."—Canon Liddon.

"There was quite room for such a volume. It contains a great deal of thought, often penetrating and always delicate, and pleasingly expressed. The subject has been very carefully studied, and the treatment will, I believe, furnish much suggestive matter both to readers and preachers."—Rev. Principal Sanday.

In crown 8vo, Eighth Edition, price 7s. 6d.,

THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR;
OR, MEDITATIONS ON THE LAST DAYS OF THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.
By F. W. Krummacher, D.D.

"The work bears throughout the stamp of an enlightened intellect, under the teaching of the Holy Spirit, and of a profound study of the Word of God."—Record.

"The reflections are of a pointed and practical character, and are eminently calculated to inform the mind and improve the heart. To the devout and earnest Christian the volume will be a treasure indeed."—Wesleyan Times.


BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Just published, Second Edition, in crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

DAVID, THE KING OF ISRAEL:
A PORTRAIT DRAWN FROM BIBLE HISTORY AND THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

At the close of two articles reviewing this work, the Christian Observer says: 'Our space will not permit us to consider more at large this very interesting work, but we cannot do less than cordially commend it to the attention of our readers. It affords such an insight into King David's character as is nowhere else to be met with; it is therefore most instructive.'

In demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

SERMONS TO THE NATURAL MAN.
By William G. T. Shedd, D.D.,
Author of 'A History of Christian Doctrine,' etc.

"Characterised by profound knowledge of divine truth, and presenting the truth in a chaste and attractive style, the sermons carry in their tone the accents of the solemn feeling of responsibility to which they owe their origin."—Weekly Review.

In One Volume, crown 8vo, price 5s., Third Edition,

LIGHT FROM THE CROSS:
SERMONS ON THE PASSION OF OUR LORD.
Translated from the German of A. Tholuck, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University of Halle.

"With no ordinary confidence and pleasure, we commend these most noble, solemnizing, and touching discourses."—British and Foreign Evangelical Review.
T. and T. Clark's Publications.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 2s. 6d.,

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN MAN.
Discourses,
BY PASTOR G. TOPHEL,
GENTEA

'These pages are replete with clear, mellow, tender, beautiful, elevating thoughts, eminently instructive to inquiring minds, and such as the devout must delight contemplatively and prayerfully to linger upon.'— Baptist Magazine.

'An admirable book on a subject of the deepest importance. We do not remember a work on this theme that is more impressive, or seems more fitted for general usefulness.'— British Messenger.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 4s. 6d.,

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY OF REDEMPTION.
BY PROFESSOR DELITZSCH.
TRANSLATED FROM MANUSCRIPT NOTES BY PROFESSOR S. I. CURTISS.

'This manual of Old Testament History is one of Professor Delitzsch's four courses of University Lectures on Biblical Theology. As such it has never been published in Germany. . . . I have found these Lectures so stimulating and helpful in my own study of the Old Testament, that I venture to offer my rendering of them to the public.'

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 4s. 6d.,

THE CHRIST.
Seven Lectures,
BY ERNEST NAVILLE,
AUTHOR OF 'THE PROBLEM OF EVIL,' ETC.
TRANSLATED BY THE REV. T. J. DESPRÉS.

'The work is distinguished by great breadth of view and religious sympathies, and is written in an interesting and agreeable style.'— Scotsman.

'They are masterly productions.'— Methodist Recorder.

'We look upon these Lectures as a valuable contribution to Christology; and to young ministers and others interested in the grand and exhaustive subject, they will be found to be highly stimulating and helpful.'— Literary World.

'We know very few books which we had rather put into the hands of a thoughtful reading young man.'— Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.

WORKS BY THE LATE WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, D.D.,
PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.
COMPLETE IN FOUR VOLUMES 8VO, PRICE £2, 2s.

In Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s., Second Edition,
HISTORICAL THEOLOGY:
A REVIEW OF THE PRINCIPAL DOCTRINAL DISCUSSIONS IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH SINCE THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d., Second Edition,
THE REFORMERS AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE REFORMATION.

In One Volume, demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,
DISCUSSIONS ON CHURCH PRINCIPLES: POPISH, ERASTIAN, AND PRESBYTERIAN.
In Four Volumes, imperial 8vo, handsomely bound, price 18s. each,
COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.
WITH ILLUSTRATIONS AND MAPS.
EDITED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

Volume I.
THE SYNOPTICAL GOSPELS.
By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., AND MATTHEW B. RIDDLE, D.D.

Volume II.
ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.
By W. MILLIGAN, D.D., AND W. F. MOULTON, D.D.
THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.
By the Very Rev. Dean HOWSON and Rev. Canon SPENCE.

Volume III. (Just published.)

Volume IV.

Maps and Plans—Professor Arnold Guyot.
Illustrations—W. M. Thomson, D.D., Author of 'The Land and the Book.'

From the Right Rev. the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.
'A useful, valuable, and instructive Commentary. In all the interpretation is set forth with clearness and cogency, and in a manner calculated to commend the volumes to the thoughtful reader. The book is beautifully got up, and reflects great credit on the publishers as well as the writers.'

From 'The London Quarterly Review.'
'The second volume lies before us, and cannot fail to be successful. We have carefully examined that part of the volume which is occupied with St. John—of the Acts we shall speak by and by, and elsewhere—and think that a more honest, thorough, and, in some respects, perfect piece of work has not lately been given to the public. The two writers are tolerably well known; and known as possessing precisely the qualities, severally and jointly, which this kind of labour demands. We may be sure that in them the highest Biblical scholarship, literary taste, and evangelical orthodoxy meet.'

From 'The Record.'
'The first volume of this Commentary was warmly recommended in these columns soon after it was published, and we are glad to be able to give a favourable testimony to the second volume. . . . The commentators have given the results of their own researches in a simple style, with brevity, but with sufficient fulness; and their exposition is, all through, eminently readable. . . . The work is one which students of even considerable learning may read with interest and with profit. The results of the most recent inquiries are given in a very able and scholarly manner. The doctrines of this Commentary are evangelical, and the work everywhere exhibits a reverence which will make it acceptable to devout readers.'
PROFESSOR GODET'S WORKS.

In Three Volumes, 8vo, price 3ls. 6d.,

A COMMENTARY ON

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

By F. GODET, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, NEUCHATEL.

'This work forms one of the battle-fields of modern inquiry, and is itself so rich in spiritual truth that it is impossible to examine it too closely; and we welcome this treatise from the pen of Dr. Godet. We have no more competent exegete, and this new volume shows all the learning and vivacity for which the Author is distinguished.'—Freeman.

In Two Volumes, 8vo, price 21s.,

THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.


'Marked by clearness and good sense, it will be found to possess value and interest as one of the most recent and copious works specially designed to illustrate this Gospel.'—Guardian.

In Two Volumes, 8vo, price 21s.,

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

'We have looked through it with great care, and have been charmed not less by the clearness and fervour of its evangelical principles than by the carefulness of its exegetes, its fine touches of spiritual intuition, and its appositeness of historical illustration.'—Baptist Magazine.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

DEFENCE OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

TRANSLATED BY THE

HON. AND REV. CANON LYTTELTON, M.A.,

RECTOR OF HAGLEY.

'This volume is not unworthy of the great reputation which Professor Godet enjoys. It shows the same breadth of reading and extent of learning as his previous works, and the same power of eloquent utterance.'—Church Bells.

'Professor Godet is at once so devoutly evangelical in his spirit and so profoundly intelligent in his apprehension of truth, that we shall all welcome these contributions to the study of much debated subjects with the utmost satisfaction.'—Christian World.

Just published, in demy 8vo, Fourth Edition, price 10s. 6d.,

MODERN DOUBT AND CHRISTIAN BELIEF.

A Series of Apologetic Lectures addressed to Earnest Seekers after Truth.

BY THEODORE CHRISTLIEB, D.D.,

UNIVERSITY PREACHER AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT BONN.

Translated, with the Author's sanction, chiefly by the Rev. H. U. Weitbrecht, Ph.D., and Edited by the Rev. T. L. Kingsbury, M.A.

'We recommend the volume as one of the most valuable and important among recent contributions to our apologetic literature... We are heartily thankful both to the learned Author and to his translators.'—Guardian.

'We express our unfelted admiration of the ability displayed in this work, and of the spirit of deep piety which pervades it; and whilst we commend it to the careful perusal of our readers, we heartily rejoice that in those days of reproach and blasphemy so able a champion has come forward to contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.'—Christian Observer.
DR. LUTHARDT'S WORKS.

In Three handsome crown 8vo Volumes, price 6s. each.

'We do not know any volumes so suitable in these times for young men entering on life, or, let us say, even for the library of a pastor called to deal with such, than the three volumes of this series. We commend the whole of them with the utmost cordial satisfaction. They are altogether quite a specialty in our literature.' — Weekly Review.

APOLOGETIC LECTURES ON THE

FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Fifth Edition.


'From Dr. Luthardt's exposition even the most learned theologians may derive invaluable criticism, and the most acute disputants supply themselves with more trenchant and polished weapons than they have as yet been possessed of.' — Bell's Weekly Messenger.

APOLOGETIC LECTURES ON THE

SAVING TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.


'Dr. Luthardt is a profound scholar, but a very simple teacher, and expresses himself on the gravest matters with the utmost simplicity, clearness, and force.' — Literary World.

APOLOGETIC LECTURES ON THE

MORAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Third Edition.

'The ground covered by this work is, of course, of considerable extent, and there is scarcely any topic of specifically moral interest now under debate in which the reader will not find some suggestive saying. The volume contains, like its predecessors, a truly wealthy apparatus of notes and illustrations.' — English Churchman.

In Three Volumes, 8vo, price 31s. 6d.,

ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL DESCRIBED AND EXPLAINED ACCORDING TO ITS PECULIAR CHARACTER.

'Full to overflowing with a ripe theology and a critical science worthy of their great theme.' — Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.,

ST. JOHN THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

By Professor C. E. LUTHARDT,

Author of 'Fundamental Truths of Christianity,' etc.

Translated and the Literature enlarged by C. R. GREGORY, Leipzig.

'A work of thoroughness and value. The translator has added a lengthy Appendix, containing a very complete account of the literature bearing on the controversy respecting this Gospel. The indices which close the volume are well ordered, and add greatly to its value.' — Guardian.

'There are few works in the later theological literature which contain such a wealth of sober theological knowledge and such an invulnerable phalanx of objective apologetical criticism.' — Professor Guericke.

Crown 8vo, 5s.,

LUTHARDT, KAHNIS, AND BRÜCKNER.


'A comprehensive review of this sort, done by able hands, is both instructive and suggestive.' — Record.
T. and T. Clark's Publications.

WORKS BY THE LATE

PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D.,

PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.


In crown 8vo, price 6s.,

This treatise on the office and duties of a Christian pastor, by the late Professor Fairbairn, is well deserving thoughtful perusal. Throughout the volume, however, there is a tone of earnest piety and practical good sense, which finds expression in many profitable counsels, embodying the result of large experience and shrewd observation. Much of the volume is devoted to the theory and practice of preaching, and this part we can most heartily commend; it is replete with valuable suggestions, which even those who have had some experience in the ministry will find calculated to make them more attractive and efficient preachers.—Christian Observer.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. The Greek Text and Translation. With Introduction, Expository Notes, and Dissertations.

We cordially recommend this work to ministers and theological students.—Methodist Magazine.

We have read no book of his with a keener appreciation and enjoyment than that just published on the Pastoral Epistles.—Nonconformist.

THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE, viewed in connection with the whole Series of the Divine Dispensations.


PROPHECY, viewed in its Distinctive Nature, its Special Functions, and Proper Interpretation.


THE REVELATION OF LAW IN SCRIPTURE, considered with respect both to its own Nature and to its Relative Place in Successive Dispensations. (The Third Series of the 'Cunningham Lectures.'
Just published, Second Edition, demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.,

THE HUMILIATION OF CHRIST,
IN ITS PHYSICAL, ETHICAL, AND OFFICIAL ASPECTS.

By A. B. BRUCE, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

'Dr. Bruce's style is uniformly clear and vigorous, and this book of his, as a whole, has the rare advantage of being at once stimulating and satisfying to the mind in a high degree.'—British and Foreign Evangelical Review.

'This work stands forth at once as an original, thoughtful, thorough piece of work in the branch of scientific theology, such as we do not often meet in our language. . . . It is really a work of exceptional value; and no one can read it without perceptible gain in theological knowledge.'—English Churchman.

'We have not for a long time met with a work so fresh and suggestive as this of Professor Bruce. . . . We do not know where to look at our English Universities for a treatise so calm, logical, and scholarly.'—English Independent.

By the same Author.
Just published, Second Edition, demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.,

THE TRAINING OF THE TWELVE;
OR,
Exposition of Passages in the Gospels exhibiting the Twelve Disciples of Jesus under Discipline for the Apostleship.

'Here we have a really great book on an important, large, and attractive subject—a book full of loving, wholesome, profound thoughts about the fundamentals of Christian faith and practice.'—British and Foreign Evangelical Review.

'It is some five or six years since this work first made its appearance, and now that a second edition has been called for, the Author has taken the opportunity to make some alterations which are likely to render it still more acceptable. Substantially, however, the book remains the same, and the hearty commendation with which we noted its first issue applies to it at least as much now.'—Rock.

'The value, the beauty of this volume is that it is a unique contribution to, because a loving and cultured study of, the life of Christ, in the relation of the Master of the Twelve.'—Edinburgh Daily Review.
LUENEMANN, Georg Conrad 531
Gottlieb M614
Critical and exegetical v.12
handbook to the Epistle 1882
to the Hebrews.