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I
INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. The Mission to Thessalonica.—The Christian inhabitants of Thessalonica were mainly Greeks by birth and training (i. 9, cf. ii. 14; Acts xiv. 15, xv. 19), who had been won over from paganism by the efforts of Paul, Silvanus (Silas), and Timotheus (Timothy), during an effective campaign which lasted for a month or two. It had opened quietly with a three weeks' mission in the local synagogue. Luke, who by this time had left the trio, enters into no details about its length or methods, adding merely that some of the Jews believed, while a host of devout Greeks and a considerable number of the leading women threw in their lot with the apostles. Luke is seldom interested in the growth or fortunes of individual churches. But, as the subsequent membership of the church, its widespread influence and fame, its inner condition, and the resentment caused by the success of the Pauline mission (continued from the house of Jason, Acts xvii. 5) all imply, a considerable interval must have elapsed before the time when the apostles were forced prematurely to quit the place. Their stay was prolonged to an extent of which Acts gives no idea; for Paul not only supported himself by working at his trade but had time to receive repeated gifts of money¹ from his friends at Philippi, a hundred miles away, as well as to engage perhaps in mission work throughout Macedonia (i. 7) if not as far west as Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19, cf. Lightfoot's Biblical Essays, 237 f.). Two or three months possibly may be allowed for this fruitful mission at Thessalonica.

When the local πολέμος, at the instigation of Jews who were nettled at the Christians' success, finally expelled Paul and his companions, the subsequent movements of the latter were governed by a desire to keep in touch with the inexperienced and unconsolidated Christian community which they had left behind them. The summary outline of Acts xvii. 10-15 requires to be supplemented and

¹ Probably this was one of the reasons which led to the imputation of mercenary motives (ii. 5, 9).
corrected at this point by the information of 1 Thess. ii. 17-iii. 6. According to Luke, Silas and Timotheus remained at Beroea, under orders to rejoin Paul as soon as possible. They only reached him at Corinth (Acts xviii. 5), however. Now since Timotheus, as we know from Paul, visited Thessalonica in the meantime, we must assume one of two courses. (a) Leaving Silas at Beroea, Timotheus hurried on to Paul at Athens, was sent back (with a letter?) to Thessalonica, and, on his return, picked up Silas at Beroea; whereupon both joined their leader, who by this time had moved on suddenly to Corinth. This implies that the plural in iii. 1 is the *pluralis majestaticus* or *auctoris* (see on iii. 5), since Silas was not with Paul at Athens. But the possibility of that plural meaning both Paul and Silas, together with the silence of Acts, suggests (b) an alternative reconstruction of the history, *viz.*, that Timotheus and Silas journeyed together from Beroea to Athens, where they met Paul and were despatched thence on separate missions, Silas¹ perhaps to Philippi, Timotheus at an earlier date to Thessalonica, both rejoining Paul eventually at Corinth. In any case the natural sense of iii. 1, 2 is that Paul sent Timotheus from Athens, not (so e.g., von Soden, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1885, 291 f.) that he sent directions from Athens for his colleague to leave Beroea and betake himself to Thessalonica (*E. Bi.*, 5076, 5077).

From no church did Paul tear himself with such evident reluctance. His anxiety to get back to it was not simply due to the feeling that he must go on with the Macedonian mission, if at all possible, but to his deep affection for the local community. The Macedonian churches may almost be termed Paul’s favourites. None troubled him less. None came so near to his heart. At Thessalonica the exemplary character of the Christians,² their rapid growth,
their exceptional opportunities, and their widespread reputation, moved him to a pardonable pride. But, as he learnt, they had been suffering persecution since he left, and this awakened sympathy as well as concern for its effects on their faith. Unable to return himself, he had at last sent Timotheus to them; it was the joyful tidings (iii. 6) just brought by him which prompted Paul to send off this informal letter, partly (i.) to reciprocate their warm affection, partly (ii.) to give them some fresh instructions upon their faith and conduct.

§ 2. The First Epistle.—This two-fold general object determines the course of the letter, which was written from Corinth (Acts xviii. 11). It begins with a hearty thanksgiving for the success of the mission at Thessalonica (i. 2-10), and this naturally passes into an apologia pro vita sua (ii. 1-12) against the insinuations which he had heard that local outsiders were circulating vindictively against the character of the apostles. The Thessalonian church knew better than to believe such sordid calumnies! The second reason for thanksgiving is (ii. 13 f.) the church's brave endurance of hardship at the hands of their townsfolk. "Would that we could be at your side! Would that we could uphold you and share the good fight! But we cannot. It is our misfortune, not our fault." Paul now gives a detailed apologia pro absentia sua (ii. 17 f.), which ends with praise for the staunchness of his friends during his enforced absence. The latter part of the letter (iv. 1 f.) consists of a series of shrewd, kindly injunctions for the maintenance of their position: περὶ ἀγασμοῦ (iv. 3-8), περὶ φιλαδελφίας (9 f.) περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων (13-18), περὶ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καρών (v. 1-11). With a handful of precepts upon social and religious duties, and an earnest word of prayer, the epistle then closes. Its date depends on the view taken of Pauline chronology in general; that is, it may lie between 48 and

1 "Nature has made it the capital and seaport of a rich and extensive district" (Finlay, Byzantine Empire, book ii., chap. i. 2). One of its great streets was part of the famous Via Egnatia, along which Paul and his companions had travelled S.W. from Philippi; thus Thessalonica was linked with the East and with the Adriatic alike (cf. i. 7, 8), while its position at the head of the Thermaic Gulf made it a busy trading centre for the Egean. Hence the colony of Jews with their synagogue. It was a populous, predominantly Greek town, of some military importance, with strong commercial interests throughout Macedonia (cf. i. 8) and even beyond. On the far horizon, south-west, the cloudy height of Mount Olympus was visible, no longer peopled by the gods, but, as Cicero put it, occupied merely by snow and ice (cf. i. 9).

2 This is proved not by ἐν Ἀθήναις (iii. 1, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 32, xvi. 8) but by the reference to Achaia in 1 Thess. i. 7, 8.
53 A.D., probably nearer the latter date than the former. The epistle itself contains no reference to any year or contemporary event, which would afford a fixed point of time. An ingenious attempt has been made by Prof. Rendel Harris (Exp. viii. 161 f., 401 f.; cf. B. W. Bacon’s Introd. to N.T., 73 f. and his Story of St. Paul, 235 f.) to show that Timotheus had previously taken a letter from Paul to the church, and that the canonical epistle represents a reply to one sent from the church to Paul; the hypothesis is tenable, but the evidence is rather elusive. The use of καλ, e.g., in ii. 13, iii. 5, is not to be pressed into a proof of this: ἀδικαί is not an infallible token of such a communication (= “you have admitted in your letter,” which Timotheus brought), and δασαγγελεῖ is an unsupported conjecture in i. 9.

§ 3. The Position of the Local Church.—The occasion and the significance of this epistle to the Christians of Thessalonica thus become fairly clear.

(a) Paul and his friends had left them the memory and inspiration of a Christian character. The epistle came to be written because the legacy had been disputed.

The insinuations of some local Jews and pagans against Paul’s character were like torches flung at an unpopular figure; they simply served to light up his grandeur. Had it not been for such attacks, at Thessalonica as at Corinth, we should not have had these passages of indignant and pathetic self-revelation in which Paul opens his very heart and soul. But this is the compensation derived by a cool and later age. At the moment the attack was more than distasteful to Paul himself. He resented it keenly on account of his converts, for his enemies and theirs were trying to strike at these inexperienced Christians through him, not by questioning his apostolic credentials but by calumniating his motives during the mission and his reasons for not returning afterwards. To discredit him was to shake their faith. To stain his character was to upset their religious standing. The passion and persistence with which he finds it needful to repudiate such misconceptions, show that he felt them to be not simply

1 The ordinary reading gives quite a good sense: & γὰρ ἀφοῦ ἔχῃς παῖς Ἰππότην, τά δέ τι προλαβάλλεις λέγως (Chrysostom). It is both arbitrary and fanciful of Zahn (Einleitung, § 13) to mould such allusions into a theory that the news had reached Asia, and that Paul was now in personal touch with envoys from the churches of Galatia, to whom he wrote Galatians before Silvanus and Timotheus rejoined him at Athens.

2 It is unreal to confine the calumnies to the one or to the other, particularly to the pagans (so e.g., von Soden, pp. 306 f.; Clemen, Paulus, ii. 181 f.).
a personal insult but likely to prove a serious menace to the interests of his friends at Thessalonica. The primary charge against the Christian evangelists had been treason or sedition; they were arraigned before the local authorities for setting up βασιλεία ἔτερον (Acts xvii. 6-8). But during his enforced absence (thanks to the success of this manœuvre), further charges against Paul's personal character were disseminated. He was just a sly, unscrupulous, selfish fellow! He left his dupes in the lurch! And so forth. Naturally, when he comes to write, it is the latter innuendoes which occupy his mind. The former charge is barely mentioned (ii. 12, God's own kingdom, cf. II., i. 5).

Paul's vindication of his character and conduct, which occupies most of the first part of the epistle, is psychologically apt. He was the first Christian the Thessalonians had ever seen. He and his friends practically represented the Christian faith. It had been the duty of the apostles to give not only instruction but a personal example of the new life to these converts; thus their reputation formed a real asset at Thessalonica. καὶ ἃμειμομητε ἡμῶν ἐγκριθείη καὶ τοῦ κυρίου.1 If the local Christians were to lose faith in their leaders, then, with little or nothing to fall back upon, their faith in God might go (cf. iii. 5). It was this concern on their behalf2 which led Paul to recall his stay among them and to go over his actions since then, with such anxious care (see notes on i. 4 f., ii. 1-11, 17 f., iii. 1-13).

(b) In addition to this, the Thessalonian community possessed definite παραδόσεις, in the shape of injunctions or regulations as to the faith and conduct of the Christian life (ii. 11, iv. 1, 12; cf. 2 Thess. ii. 5, 15, iii. 6). These were authoritative regulations,3 as the other epistles indicate (cf. e.g., 1 Cor. iv. 17) which had the sanc-

1On the ethical function of this self-assertion, as a means of inspiration and education, see Exp. Ti., x. 445 f. The young Italian patriots who died, as they had lived, confessing their faith in "God, Mazzini, and Duty," are a modern case in point. The example of τοῦ κυρίου implies that the Thessalonians were familiar with the earthly trials and temptations of Jesus.

2The language of ii. 1-10 must not be taken as if Paul had been blaming himself for having appeared to leave his friends in the lurch. It is not the sensitiveness of an affectionate self-reproach but the indignant repudiation of local slanders which breathes through the passage. The former would be a sadly post factum defence.

3The epistle itself (cf. v. 27) takes its place in the series; this verse (see note) is perfectly intelligible as it stands and need not be suspected as the interpolation of a later reader to emphasise the apostolic authority of the epistle (so Schmiedel and others), much less taken (as e.g., by Baur, van der Vies, 106 f., and Schräder, der Apostel Paulus, 36) to discredit the entire epistle. There is no hint of any clerical organisation such as the latter theory involves.
tion of apostolic tradition, and must have been based, in some cases, upon definite sayings of Jesus. It is the Christian halacha of which the later epistles give ample if incidental proof.

This suggests a further question. To what extent do the Thessalonian epistles reveal an acquaintance on the part of Paul and the local church with the sayings of the Lord? The evidence cannot be estimated adequately except in the light of the corroborative facts drawn from an examination of the other epistles, but it is enough to bear the general consideration in mind, that no preoccupation with the risen Christ and his return could have rendered Paul absolutely indifferent to the historical data of the life of Jesus. When he told the Thessalonians that Jesus was the Christ, they could not believe without knowing something of Jesus. The wrath of God they might have reason to fear. But δὲ ἐρχόμενος? Who was He to exercise this wonderful function? Where had He lived? Why had He died? Had He risen? And when was He to return? Some historical content had to be put into the name Jesus, if faith was to awaken, especially in people who lived far from Palestine. The Spirit did not work in a mental vacuum, or in a hazy mist of apocalyptic threats and hopes. Hence, a priori, it is natural to assume that such historical allusions to the life and teaching of Jesus may be reflected in Paul’s letters, as they must have been present in his preaching. This expectation is justified.

The coincidence of ii. 7 and Luke xxii. 27 is not indeed sufficient to warrant any such inference, while the different meanings of καὶ εἶν in ii. 12 and in the parable of Luke xiv. 15 f. (cf. ver. 24) prevent any hypothesis of a connection. On the other hand ii. 14-16 certainly contains a reminiscence of the logia preserved in a passage like Luke xi. 48 f. = Matt. xxiii. 32-34 (see the full discussion in Resch’s Parallel Texte, ii. 278 f., iii. 209 f.), and, while the thought of iii. 3b-4 (cf. i. 4-6) only resembles that of Luke ix. 22-24, just as iii. 13 may be derived from an O.T. background instead of, necessarily, from synoptic logia like those of Mark viii. 38 = Matt. xvi. 27, a sentence such as that in iv. 8 distinctly echoes the saying in Luke x. 16 (“I’ allusion

1 This idea dominates von Soden’s brilliant essay in Theol. Abhandlungen C. von Weissächer gewidmet (1892), pp. 113-167. More balanced estimates are to be found in Keim’s Jesus of Naasara, i., pp. 54 f.; Titus, der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit (1900), pp. 10-18, and M. Goguel, L’Aphotre Paul et Jesus Christus (1904), pp. 67-99. The English reader may consult Sabatier’s Paul, pp. 76 f., and Dr. R. J. Knowling’s Witness of the Epistles (1892) where, as in his Testimony of St. Paul to Christ (1905), the shallows as well as the depths of the relevant literature are indefatigably dredged.

2 Cf. Prof. Denney in DCG, ii. 394 f.
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est d'une nette parfaite," M. Goguel, p. 87). The well-known λόγος
Kupiow of iv. 16 f. cannot be adduced in this connection without hesi-
tation (see note). But no possible doubt attaches to the evidence of
v. 1-3. The saying of Jesus which is echoed here has been preserved
in Luke xii. 39 (δ κλέπτης ἡκτεινα) 1 and xxi. 34 (μη ποτε . . . ἐπιστη-
μὴ ὑμᾶς ἐφαίνω δέ ήμερα ἐκεῖνη ὡς παγίς), but the common original
seems to have been in Aramaic or Hebrew (so Prof. Marshall, Exp.
ii. 73 f.), since Paul's διστερ ἡ δίδυμ and Luke's ὡς παγίς must reflect a
phrase like ἐλέγοντο (spoken) which might be rendered either as ἔλλη
η (snare) or as ἔλεγον (travail), the latter echoing the well-known conception of
ἀρχή ἔκδοσις (cf. Mark xiii. 8). A further echo of the primitive evan-
gelic tradition is to be heard possibly in v. 6 (Matt. xxiv. 42), cer-
tainly in v. 13 (cf. Mark ix. 50). But the connection of v. 21 with
the agraphon, γίνοντο δόκιμοι τραπεζίται, is curious rather than vital.

In the second epistle, apart from coincidences like i. 5 (= Luke
xx. 35) and iii. 3 (= Matt. vi. 13), the allusions to the teaching of
Jesus are less numerous, although Resch hears the echo of a logion
in iii. 10 (Paulinismus, 409 f.), on most inadequate grounds. The
apocalyptic passage, ii. 1-10, contains several striking parallels to the
language of Matt. xxiv. (cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, St. Paul's Conception
of the Last Things, 55 f., 96 f.), but no literary relationship can
be assumed.

(d) Finally, before Paul left, he arranged for a kind of informal
organisation. An ordination of πρεσβύτεροι is not to be thought of,
but probably the earliest converts, or at any rate those who had
natural gifts, assumed an unofficial superintendence of the com-
munity, arranged for its worship and internal management, and
were careful that the sick and poor and young were looked after.
Otherwise, the movement might have been dissipated. Wesley, in his
journal (Aug., 1763), writes: "I was more convinced than ever that
the preaching like an apostle, without joining together those that are
awakened, and training them up in the ways of God, is only begetting
children for the murderer. How much preaching has there been for
these twenty years all over Pembrokeshire! but no regular societies,
no discipline, no order or connection; and the consequence is, that
nine in ten of the once-awakened are now faster asleep than ever." Paul
was alive to the same need. He was a practical missionary,

1 With Luke's πέντε καὶ μεθόσιος (45) and μή (xxi. 34) compare the οἱ
μεθσώκόμοι of 1 Thess. v. 7. Contrast also the ἔκφυς of xxi. 36 with Paul's
οἱ μὴ ἐκφύσσεσθαι (v. 3). The phrase sons of light may well have been common
among the early Christians (cf. Abbott's Φωκονινε Vocabulary, 1782-1783).
and, as these epistles show (cf. I., v. 12 f., II., iii. 6 f.), he knew better than to leave his young societies with nothing more than the vague memory of pious preaching. The local organisation was, as yet, primitive, but evidently it was sufficient to maintain itself and carry on the business of the church, when the guiding hand of the missionary was removed (cf. Clem. Rom. xlii.), though the authority of the leaders still required upon occasion the support and endorsement of the apostles (see on v. 12).

§ 4. The Character and Setting of the Second Epistle.—In the second and shorter epistle, after congratulating the local Christians especially on their patient faith (i. 1-4), Paul explains that the trials and troubles which called this virtue into exercise were but the prelude to a final relief and vindication at the ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ κυρίου ἀγίου (4-12). As the ardent expectation of this had, however, produced a morbid excitement in some quarters, he sets himself (ii. 1-12) to weed out such mistakes and mischiefs by reminding the church of his previous warning that the end could not come until the μυστήριον τῆς ἀφωγής attained its climax in a supernatural and personal embodiment of evil, which would vainly challenge the authority and provoke the interposition of the Lord. He then concludes (ii. 13-17) with an expression of confidence in them, an appeal for loyalty to his teaching, and a brief prayer on their behalf. Asking their prayers, in return, for himself, he renews his expression of confidence and interest (iii. 1-5); whereupon, with a word upon the maintenance of discipline and industry, the epistle ends (iii. 6-18).

Assuming both epistles to have come from Paul, we may unhesitatingly place 2 Thess. after 1 Thess. The evidence for the opposite order, advocated by Grotius in his Annotationes (ii. 715 f., based on an antiquated chronology), Ewald (Jahrb. für bibl. Wiss. 1861, 249 f., Sendschreiben des Paulus, 19 f.), Laurent (Studien u. Kritiken, 1864, pp. 497 f., N.T. Studien, 49 f.), and J. S. Chamberlain (The Epp. of Paul the Apostle, 1907, 5 f.), breaks down upon examination. It is unnatural to find a reference to II. iii. 6-16 in I. iv. 10-11; besides, as Bornemann points out (p. 495), if 2 Thess. is held to betray all the characteristics of a first letter (Ewald), what about II. ii. 15? There is no reason why such a criterion of genuineness

1 On the hypothesis that both are post-Pauline, Baur (Paulus, Eng. tr., ii. 336 f., and van der Vies (de beiden brieven aan de Th., 1865, pp. 128-164) argue for the priority of 2 Thess., the latter separating the two by the fall of Jerusalem; van Manen (Onderzoek naar de Echtheid van P. tweede Brief aan de Thess., 1865, pp. 11-25) refutes both critics. The arguments for the canonical order are best stated by von Hofmann (365), Lünemann (160 f.), and Bornemann (492 f.) in their editions.
as that of II. iii. 17, should have occurred in the earliest of Paul's letters; in view of ii. 3, its appearance, after the composition of 1 Thess. and even of other letters, is psychologically valid. The comparative absence of allusions in 2 Thess. to 1 Thess. (cf. however, II. ii. 1 = I. iv. 17, etc.) is best explained by the fact that in the second letter Paul is going back to elaborate part of his original oral teaching in the light of fresh needs which had emerged since he wrote the first epistle. In this sense, and in this sense only, 2 Thess. anticipates the other letter. Finally, while I. ii. 17-iii. 6 does not absolutely exclude the possibility of a previous letter, it cannot be taken to presuppose one of the character of 2 Thess., least of all when the letter is dated from Beroea (Acts xvii. 10, Ewald and Laurent).

§5. Its Authenticity.—Since Paul Schmidt's edition (see below) and von Soden's essay (Studien u. Kritiken, 1885, pp. 263-310), with which the English reader may compare Jowett's proof (vol. i., pp. 4-17), it is no longer necessary to discuss the authenticity of the first epistle, or even its integrity. Almost the only passage where a marginal gloss may be reasonably conjectured to have crept into the text is ii. 16. The second epistle, however, starts a real problem, both on the score of its resemblance to the first epistle and of its divergence from the style and thought of that or indeed of any other Pauline letter. Paul is still with Silvanus and Timotheus (i. 1) at Corinth (iii. 2, reff.; 1 Thess. ii. 15 f.), writing presumably not long after the despatch of the former epistle (ii. 15). Fresh information has reached him (iii. 11), and his aim is to repudiate further misconceptions of his teaching upon the Last Things, as well as to steady the church amid its more recent ana-baptist perils. Hence he writes in substantially the same tone and along the same lines as before; anything he has to communicate is practically a restatement of what he had already taught orally (ii. 5, 15), not a discussion of novel doubts and principles. If any change has taken place in the local situation, it has been in the

1 The terminus ad quem for the composition of the epistle, if it is genuine, is his next visit to Thessalonica (Acts xx. 1, 2); most probably it was despatched before Acts xviii. 12. Corinth is the only place where we know the three men were together at this period.

2 How, we are not told. Possibly Paul had been asked by the local leaders to exert his influence and authority against pietistic developments in the community (iii. 14). The situation demanded an explicit written message; probably no visit of Silvanus or Timotheus would have sufficed, even had they been able to leave Corinth. Spitta's theory (see below) implies that Timotheus had been in Thessalonica since 1 Thess. was written (fru, ii. 5), but of this there is no evidence whatever.
direction of shifting the centre of gravity from fears about the dead to extravagant ideas entertained by the living. Hence, for one thing, the general similarity of structure and atmosphere in both epistles, and, upon the other hand, the sharper emphasis in the second upon Paul's authority.

Both features have raised widespread suspicion and elicited a variety of reconstructions of the epistle's date and object (cf. Historical New Testament, 142-146). The common ground of all such theories is the postulate that 2 Thess. is the work of a later Paulinist, during the age of Nero or of Trajan, who has employed 1 Thess. in order to produce a restatement of early Christian eschatology, under the aegis of the apostle, or to claim Paul's sanction for an onslaught upon Gnostic views. This is a fair hypothesis, which at first sight seems to account adequately for several of the variations and resemblances between the two writings. When it is worked out in detail, however, it becomes rather less convincing. Some chastening facts emerge. Why, e.g., should such a writer fix on 1 Thess., and laboriously work on it? Then (i.) one serious preliminary obstacle is that while pseudonymous epistles addressed ostensibly to individuals (e.g., the pastorals) or to Christendom in general (e.g., 2 Peter) are intelligible enough, the issue of such an epistle, addressed to a definite church which had already a genuine letter of the apostle, involves very serious difficulties. These are not eased by the light-hearted explanation (so Schmiedel and Wrede *) that the epistle was really meant not for Thessalonica at all, but for some other community! This is to buttress one hypothesis by another. Furthermore (ii.) the style and vocabulary offer no decisive proof of a post-Pauline origin. Of the ἄνωθεν ἐφημένα, which are comparatively few, one or two, like ἀποστασία (ii. 3), δική (= punishment, i. 9, cf. Sap. xviii. 11, etc. Jude 7), ἄνθρωποι (i. 10, 12), ἐκκαινισθεῖ (i. 4 Pss.), τίνων (i. 9), περιεργάζομαι (iii. 2, cf. Sir. iii. 23), σφασμα (ii. 4, cf. Sap. xiv. 20), and σφασίωσθαι (iii. 14), may be fairly ascribed to the influence of the LXX 2 upon

1 In pp. 38 f. of his able pamphlet on Die Echtheit des zweiten Th. (1903). Wrede knocks on the head (pp. 96 f.) the earlier theories (best represented by Schmiedel) which dated the epistle in the seventh decade of the first century, but he does not succeed better than Holtzmann or Hollmann in presenting any very satisfactory theory of its origin c. 100 A.D. His essay is carefully reviewed by Wernle (Gött. Gelehrte Anzeigen, 1905, 347 f.), who adheres to the Pauline authorship, as does Clemen (Paulus, i., pp. 115-122). Klöpper's article in defence of the epistle against the older attacks (Theol. Studien u. Skizzen aus Ostpreussen, 1889, viii., pp. 73-140) is almost as difficult to read as it is to refute.

2 The absence of any explicit quotation from the LXX only throws into relief the extent to which, especially in i. 5 f., O.T. language and ideas have been woven into the tissue of the epistle (Acts xvii. 2, 3, ἄνω τῶν γραφῶν).
the writer’s mind. Similarly with ἐπάνω (ii. 13) and ἰσχύς (i. 9). The occurrence of ἔπηκτά εἰς (ii. 8), elsewhere only in the pastorals, is certainly striking, and were there more of these words, the case for a later date would be reinforced. But there are not. Besides, the construction of ἔπηκτά here is different from those which occur in the pastorals, and the latter are as likely to have copied 2 Thess. as vice-versa, if any literary relationship has to be assumed. The vocabulary thus, as is generally recognised, permits of no more than a non liquet verdict. The style, upon the whole, has quite a Pauline ring about it; and, while this may be due to imitation, it would be uncritical to assume this result without examining (iii.) the internal relation of the two epistles. It is on this aspect of the problem that recent critics are content to rest their case (so e.g., Wrede, 3-36, H. J. Holtzmann, in Zeitschrift für die neueste Wissenschaft, 1901, 97-108, and Hollmann, ibid., 1904, 28-38). The so-called (a) discrepancies need not detain us long. The different reasons given by Paul for having supported himself (cf. on I. ii. 9; II. iii. 7) are not contradictory but correlative; both are psychologically credible, as expressions of a single experience. Greater difficulty attaches to the apparent change of front towards the second advent. In I. v. 2, the advent is unexpected and sudden;¹ in II. ii. 3 f., it is the climax of a development. But this discrepancy, such as it is (cf. on I. v. 3), attaches to almost all the early Christian views of the end; to be instantaneous and to be heralded by a historical prelude were traits of the End which were left side by side not only by Jesus (cf. Matt. xxiv. 3 f., 23 f., 32 f.)² but by later prophets (cf. Rev. iii. 3 = vi. 1 f.). In any case, Paul was more concerned about the practical religious needs of his readers than about any strict or verbal consistency in a region of thought where Christian expectation, like the Jewish tradition to which it generally went back, was as yet far from being homogeneous or definite. The inconsistencies of the two Thessalonian epistles are at least as capable of explanation when they are taken to be variations of one man’s mind at slightly different periods as when they are

¹ Not simply for unbelievers, but for Christians. It is hardly fair to explain the difference between the two epistles by confining the suddenness of the advent to the former. Hollmann is right in maintaining this against Jülicher and others, but the pseudonymity of 2 Thess. is by no means a necessary inference from it (see note on v. 3).

² This argument is not affected by the recognition of a small synoptic apocalypse in this chapter; even so, the primitive and genuine tradition of the words of Jesus on the end presents the same combination as the Thessalonian letters show. On the general attitude of Paul to the political and retributory elements in the current or traditional apocalyptic, cf. Titus, der Paulinismus (1908), pp. 47 f.
held to denote the revision and correction of Paul's ideas by a later writer who had to reconcile the apparent postponement of the Advent with the primitive hope. This Baur himself is forward to admit (Paulus, Eng. Tr., ii. 93). "It is perfectly conceivable that one and the same writer, if he lived so much in the thought of the παρουσία as the two epistles testify, should have looked at this mysterious subject in different circumstances and from different points of view, and so expressed himself regarding it in different ways." This verdict really gives the case away. Such variations are hardly conceivable if both epistles emanated from a later writer, but they are intelligible, if Paul, living in the first flush and rush of the early Christian hope is held to be responsible for them. (b) The numerous and detailed similarities between the two epistles might be explained by the hypothesis that Paul read over a copy of 1 Thess. before writing 2 Thess., or that his mind was working still along the lines of thought voiced in the former epistle, when he came to write the latter. The first hypothesis is not to be dismissed lightly. The second can be illustrated from any correspondence. It is true that apart from ii. 1-12 the fresh material of 2 Thess. consists mainly in i. 5-12, ii. 15, iii. 2, 13, 14 f., and that there is throughout the letter a certain poverty of expression, a comparative absence of originality, a stiffness in part, and a stereotyped adherence to certain forms. But in the treatment of a subject like this it was inevitable that some phrases of self-repetition should recur, e.g., the θλιψις-group (i. 4-6), the πίστεις-group (i. 4, 10, 11, ii. 11-13, iii. 2, 3), ἐργαίζεσθαι, etc. Parts of the letter are unlike Paul. That is practically all we can say. But parts are fairly characteristic of him, and these not only outweigh the others, but dovetail into the corresponding data of 1 Thess. Such incidental agreements are too natural and too numerous to be the artificial mosaic of a later writer.

The internal evidence of ii. 3-12 is no longer adduced as a crucial proof of the un-Pauline origin of 2 Thess. Indeed most recent critics have given up this argument as primary. Fresh investigations into the origins of gnosticism and of the semi-political variations in primitive eschatology have undermined the older hypothesis which relegated this prophecy to the latter part of the first or the opening part of the second century, and it is only necessary to determine which of the possible reconstructions is most suitable to the age of Paul himself. On the whole, no solution of the apocalyptic prophecy

1 The severer tone (iii. 6-15), as well as the more official tinge, of the letter were as necessary now for the Thessalonians as they were soon to be for the Corinthians (1 Cor. iv. 21, v. 3-5).
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in ii. 3 f. fits in with the data so well as the early theory that δεκατάχρονοι  and τὸ δεκατάχρονον denote, not the episcopate as a restraint against gnosticism (Hilgenfeld and others), but the Emperor and imperial power of Rome ("quid nisi Romanus status?" Tertullian, de Resurr., xxiv.). Paul had ample experience of the protection afforded by the polity of the empire against the malevolence of the Jews, and he apparently anticipated that this would continue for a time, until the empire fell. But how could the fall of the empire be expected? The answer lies not so much in any contemporary feelings of panic and dismay, as in the eschatological tradition, derived from a study of Daniel, which was evidently becoming current in certain Jewish and early Christian circles, that the empire represented the penultimate stage in the world's history. "And when Rome falls, the world." Hence the tone of reserve and cryptic ambiguity with which Paul speaks of its collapse, "ne calumniam incurreret, quod Romano imperio male optauerit, cum speraret e terum" (Aug., Civ. Dei., xx.; so Jerome on 2 Thess. ii. 6). The idea of Rome's downfall could not be spoken of, or at least written about, openly. All that a Christian prophet could do was to hint that this future Deceiver or pseudo-Messiah would prove too strong even for the Restraining Empire, and that King Jesus would ultimately intervene to meet and to defeat him. An entire change came over the spirit of the dream, when, nearly half a century later the imperial cultus in Asia Minor stirred the prophet John to denounce Rome as the supreme antagonist of God. The empire, on this view, was no providential restraint on τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας, but was herself μυστήριον (Rev. xvii. 5), loathsome and dangerous and doomed. This altered prospect lay far beyond the horizon of Paul. The imperial worship had not yet become formidable, and to him the empire, with its administrative justice, stood for a welcome, even though a temporary, barrier against the antagonistic forces of Judaism. The kingdom of God was not the opponent of the empire, but simply the final conqueror of a foe who would prove too strong even for the restraining control of Roman civilisation.

This interpretation of the restraining power implies that the supernatural antagonist issues from Judaism (so especially Weiss, N.T. Theologie, § 63). Here again patristic tradition seems to cor-

1 Cf. Neumann's Hippolytus von Rom (Leipzig, 1902), pp. 4 f. The κατάχρονος is not to be associated with any special emperor, not even with Claudius, whose name has a curious resemblance to it. The theories which identify the Restrainer with Vespasian (as a check on Nero Redivivus), Antichrist, or Domitian, depend on a priori conceptions of the epistle's origin and aim.
roborate it. Both Irenæus (adv. Haer., v. 25, i. 30, 2) and Hippolytus (de Antichristo, vi., xiv.) expressly state that antichrist is to be of Jewish descent, and the later echoes of the tradition are as pronounced (cf. Bousset’s Antichrist, pp. 24 f., 127 f., 182 f.; E. Bi., 179 f.).\(^1\) Antichrist is to set up his kingdom in Judah; his reign is from Jerusalem, and the Jews are the dupes of his miraculous influence.\(^2\) The ἀποστασία, which Paul anticipates, implies a relationship to God which could not be postulated of Christians, much less of pagans in general who, ex hypothesis, “knew not God” (i. 8). The only deliberate anti-Christian movement, which Paul and his friends had already experienced (τῇ σιγῇ ἐκγένεσις), was Jewish fanaticism; its professed zeal for the Law was really ἀσυμία, as the apostle puts it with a touch of scathing irony.

Paul is plainly operating with a Beliar(l)-saga\(^3\) in this passage. If one could only be certain that Sibyll. iii. 63-73 represented a pre-Christian Jewish fragment, as its context indicates, or that any Christian interpolations were confined to minor phrases like ἐκ δὲ σεβασμὴν̄ων, we should have one clear trace of this saga. Belial there works many signs (as in Sibyll. ii. 37, καὶ βελίαρ θ’ ἔσει καὶ σηματα πολλὰ ποιήσει ἀνθρώποις), seduces many even of elect believers within Judaism (πολλοὶς πλανήσει, πιστοὺς τ’ ἐκλεκτοὺς θ’ ἐβραίους, ἀνάμως τὲ καὶ ἄλλους ἄνθρας, οἵτινες οὓς θεὸς λόγον εἰσήκουσας), and is finally burned up, together with his adherents. The suspicions of this passage’s Jewish character seem unjustified; it may be taken, without much hesitation, as one reflection of the tradition which was in

---

1 Bousset often exaggerates the independence of patristic eschatological tradition; he fails to allow enough for the luxuriant fancies of a later age, which applied the N.T. text arbitrarily to contemporary life. But on this point the evidence is fairly decisive, viz., that the early fathers were not merely building on the text of 2 Thess. ii. 3-6, when they spoke of Antichrist being a seducer whose false worship was set up within a reconstructed temple at Jerusalem.

2 Professor Warfield (Expos. 3 iv. 40 f.) regards the Jewish state as the divine restraint upon the revelation of Rome’s self-deification. This view is more sensible than that of the Restrainer as Christianity or the church (cf. Reimpell, Studien u. Kritiken, 1887, 711-736), but it is difficult to see how Judaism could be said to impose any check upon the imperial cultus; besides, is it likely that Paul would have subtly combined a polemic against the obstinate antagonism of the Jews with a theory of their unconscious protective services to the church?

3 See R. H. Charles’ edition of Ascensio Isaiae (pp. ixii.-lxiii.) and M. Friedländer’s Religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu (1905, pp. 50 f.). This would be corroborated if Beliar were shown to be, as the latter writer argues (in his Der Antichrist, 1901), a pre-Christian embodiment of the Jewish antinomian sect.

4 For a possible source of such traditions in Paul’s case cf. 2 Tim. iii. 8.
Paul's mind when he wrote 2 Thess. ii. 2 f. Belial is not indeed named here, as he is in 2 Cor. vi. 15. But he is the opponent of Jesus the true messiah. He appears in human form (cf. Asc. Isa., iv. 2: "Beliar the great ruler, the king of this world will descend . . . in the likeness of a man, a lawless king") as the arch-emissary or agent of Satan. The latter, whom Paul here as elsewhere (in consonance with Jewish tradition) keeps in the background, is the supreme opponent of God; but as God's representative is the Lord Jesus Christ, so Satan's active representative is this mysterious figure, whose methods are a caricature of the true messiah's (see notes below on the passage). This is borne out by the contemporary sense of Belial as ἄγγελος τῆς ἀνομίας (Asc. Isa., ii. 4, etc.) or ἀνομία (ἀποστασία) in LXX. The man of lawlessness, whom Paul predicts, is thus one of whom Belial is a prototype. Only, the apostle fuses this παράνομος with the false messiah, originally a different figure, who is represented as the incarnation of Satan, the devil in human embodiment. That he expected this mysterious opponent to rise within Judaism is not surprising under the circumstances. He was in no mood, at this moment of tension, to think hopefully of the Jews. They were a perpetual obstacle and annoyance to him, ἀποστόλος καὶ πονηρός. He had already denounced them as θείς μὴ ἄρεσκότως (I., ii. 15), and from this it was but a step to the position, suggested by the tradition perhaps, that their repudiation of God's final revelation in Jesus would culminate in an ἀποστασία, which welcomed the last rival of Jesus as God's messiah. His prophecy thus embodies a retort.1 “You Jews hate and persecute us as apostates from God; you denounce our Jesus as a false messiah. But the

1 In Dan. viii. 23 f. when the cup of Israel's guilt is full (πληρωμήνων τῶν ἀμαρτών αὐτῶν), the climax of their punishment came in the person of Antiochus Epiphanes, the presumptuous (ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ὑψωθήσεται, cf. 2 Thess. ii. 4) and astute (τὸ φυσίς ἐν χερσίν αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ δόλῳ ἀψαλάει πολλοῖς, cf. 2 Thess. i. 9, 11). Paul, like the rest of the early Christians, still looked for some immediate fulfilment of this prophecy. In the contemporary malevolence of the Jews towards the gospel he saw a sign of its realisation, as the allusion in 1 Thess. ii. 16 (eis τὸ ἀναπληρῶμαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας) indicates. The penal consequence of this attitude must have also formed part of his oral teaching at Thessalonica, but he does not mention it till local circumstances drew from him a reminder of the final Deluder who must soon come (2 Thess. ii. 3 f.). It is important to notice this underlying tradition, or application of tradition, in the apostle's mind, on account of its bearing upon the general harmony of the eschatology in the two epistles. Furthermore, since the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, the book of Daniel had made self-deification an issue of the final enemy. Any vivid expectation of the End, such as that cherished by a Jewish Christian of Paul's temperament, instinctively seized upon this trait of the false messiah.
false messiah will come from you, and his career will be short-lived at the hands of our Christ." To the Christian the prophecy brought an assurance that, while the coldest and darkest hour must precede the dawn, the dawn was sure to come, and to come soon. Thus in both epistles, but particularly in the second, the reader can see the torch of apocalyptic enthusiasm, streaming out with smoke as well as with red flame, which many early Christians employed to light up their path amid the dark providences of the age. Paul is prophesying—none the less vividly that he does so εκ μεθοζν.

Attempts have also been made, from various sides, to solve the literary problem of the writing by finding in it (a) either a Pauline nucleus which has been worked over, (b) or a Pauline letter which has either suffered interpolation or (c) incorporated some earlier apocalyptic fragment, possibly of Jewish origin. (a) According to Paul Schmidt (Der erste Thess. nebst einem Excurs über den zweiten gleichn. Brief, 1885, pp. 111 f.), a Paulinist in 69 A.D. edited and expanded a genuine letter = i. 1-4, ii. 1-2a, ii. 13-iii. 18. But, apart from other reasons, the passages assigned to Paul are not free from the very feature which Schmidt considers fatal to the others, viz., similarity to 1 Thess. And the similarities between ii. 3-12 and the apocalypse of John are very slight. The activity assigned to the editor is too restricted; besides, ii. 3-12 is so cardinal a feature of the epistle, that the latter stands or falls with it—so much so that it would be easier, with Haurath, to view the whole writing as a scaffolding which rose round the original Pauline nucleus of ii. 1-12. Finally, the literary criteria do not bear out the distinction postulated by both theories. (b) The strongly retributive cast, the liturgical swing, and the O.T. colouring, of i. 6-10 have suggested the possibility of interpolation in this passage (McGiffert, E. Bi., 5054, Findlay, p. lvii.), either as a whole or in part. This is at any rate more credible than the older idea that ii. 1-12 embodies a Montanist interpolation (J. E. C. Schmidt, Bibliothek für Kritik u. Exegese der N.T., 1801, 385 f.) or ii. 1-9 a piece of Jewish Christian apocalyptic (Michelsen, Theol., Tijdschrift, 1876, 213 f.). Finally (c) the large amount of common ground between the Jewish and the primitive Christian conceptions of eschatology is enough (see on ii. 5) to invalidate Spitta’s lonely theory (Offenbarung des Joh., 497 f., and Zur Gesch. und Litt. des Urchristentums, i. 139 f.) of a Caligula-apocalypse, due in part to Timotheus,¹ in ii. 2-12, or the idea of Pierson

¹ Cf. Prof. G. G. Findlay’s refutation in Expos. vii. 255 f., and Bornemann’s paragraphs (pp. 492, 529 f.).
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and Naber (Verismilia, 1886, 21 f.) that a pre-Christian apocalypse (i. 5-10, ii. 1-12, iii. 1-6, 14, 15) has been worked up by the unknown Paul of the second century whom the Holland critics find so prolific and indispensable.

The second epistle is inferior, in depth and reach, to the first, whatever view be taken of its origin, but both are especially valuable as indications of the personal tie between Paul and his churches, and as samples of the new literary form which the religious needs of early Christianity created in the epistle. Dryden has hit this off in his well-known lines upon the apostles and their communities:—

As charity grew cold or faction hot,
Or long neglect their lessons had forgot,
For all their wants they wisely did provide,
And preaching by epistles was supplied.

So great physicians cannot all attend,
But some they visit and to some they send.
Yet all those letters were not sent to all,
Nor first intended, but occasional—

Their absent sermons.

The Thessalonian epistles were written to supply the lack of further personal intercourse and to supplement instruction already given. They were not treatises designed to convey the original teaching of the apostles; they imply that, and they apply it along special lines, but they are not protocols of doctrine (cf. note on 1 Thess. iv. 4). At the same time, “occasional” must not be taken to mean casual or off-hand. Paul dictated with some care. His ideas are not impromptu notions, nor are they thrown out off-hand; they represent a prolonged period of thought and of experience. Even these, the least formal of his letters, though written for the moment’s need, reflect a background of wide range and fairly matured beliefs. Nevertheless, they are hardly “absent sermons”. “Letters mingle souls,” as Donne remarked, and 1 Thessalonians in particular is the unpremeditated outpouring of a strong man’s tender, firm, and wise affection for people whom he bore upon his very heart. It is the earliest of Paul’s extant letters, and it delivers the simpler truths of the Christian faith to us with all the dew and the bloom of a personal experience which not only enjoined them but lived to impart them. Both epistles show, as Jowett puts it, how Paul was “ever feeling, if haply he may find them, after the hearts of men”. “He is not a bishop administering a regular system, but a person dealing with other persons out of the fulness of his own mind and nature. . . . If they live, he lives; time and distance never snap the cord of
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sympathy. His government of them is a sort of communion with them; a receiving of their feelings and a pouring forth of his own."

§ 6. External Evidence, Text, and Literature of both Epistles.— As both epistles are included not only in the Muratorian canon but in Marcion's strictly Pauline collection (Tert. adv. Marc. v. 15; Epiph., Haer. xiii. 9), they must have been known and circulated by the first quarter of the second century, although quotations (mainly of the eschatological sections) do not emerge till Irenæus and Tertullian. Both Clement of Alexandria and Origen used them, and other evidence of their existence will be found in any text book of the N.T. Canon. But the so-called allusions to 1 Thess. in the earlier apostolic fathers are, for the most part, scanty and vague; e.g., of i. 5 and iv. 2 in Clem., Rom. xiii. 3. Hermas, Vis. iii. 9, 10 (αφημενείς ἐν αὐτοῖς) might go back to Mark as easily as to Paul (cf. on v. 13), though there is a similarity of context, while the general correspondence of outline between iv. 14-16 and Did. xvi. 6 (revelation of the Lord, trumpet, resurrection) may imply no more than a common use of tradition, if not of Matt. xxiv. The use of the epistle in the correspondence of Ignatius is probable, but far from certain; e.g., i. 6 in Eph. x. 3 (μιμητι αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου σπονδάξωμεν εἰναι, different context); ii. 4 in Rom. ii. 1 (οὐθέν ὁ δῆμος ἀνθρωποποιήσει, ἄλλα Θεοί), and v. 17 in Eph. x. 1 (ἀδικείτως προσέχεσθε, si vera lectio). There is but one parallel in Barnabas, iv. 9 = Barn. xxi. 6 (γένοι αὐτὸς τῷ θεό-διδάκτῳ, different context). This scarcity of allusions is not surprising. The comparative lack of doctrinal interest in the first epistle, and its personal, intimate contents, would prevent it from being so often read and cited as the other Pauline letters. The second epistle, however, was evidently known to Justin Martyr (Dial. xxxii., cx., cxvi.) as well as to Polycarp who not only alludes to iii. 15 (in xi. 4, "et non sicut inimicos tales existimetis") but misquotes i. 4 (in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus, qui estis in principio epistulæ eius, de uobis enim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis) as if it were addressed to the Philippians (cf. Wrede, 92 f.); and such data prove the circulation of 1 Thess. as well. The echoes of 2 Thess. in Barnabas (2 Thess. ii. 6 = Barn. xviii. 2; ii. 8, 12 = xv. 5) indicate rather more than a common basis of oral tradition (so Rauch in Zeitschrift für die Wissensch. Theologie, 1895, 458 f.), and, like the apocalypse of John, it appears to have been circulated in Gaul before the end of the second century (cf. letter from churches of Lyons and Vienne, Eus. H. E., v. 1).

The text printed in this edition agrees generally with that of most critical editors. To save space, all textual notes have been cut out,
except where a variant reading bears directly on the exposition, or possesses some independent interest. Since Alford published his edition, the chief foreign commentaries have been those of von Hofmann (1869), Reuss (1878-9), Lünemann (Eng. tr., 1880) and Bornemann (1894) in Meyer’s series, Schäfer (1890), Zöckler (1894), Zimmer’s Theologischer Commentar (1891), Schmiedel (Hand Commentar, second edition, 1892, incisive and thorough), S. Goebel (second edition, 1897), B. Weiss (second edition, 1902), Wohlenberg (in Zahn’s Kommentar, 1903; sec. ed. 1908), and Lueken (in Die Schriften des N.T., 1905); in English, those of Eadie (1877), Alexander (Speaker’s Comm., 1881), Dr. Marcus Dods (Schaff’s Comm., iii., 1882), Dr. John Hutchinson (1884), Dr. J. Drummond (Internat. Hdbk. to N.T., ii., 1899), and Dr. Adeney (Century Bible, n. d.), with three recent and able editions of the Greek text by Lightfoot (Notes on Epp. of St. Paul, 1895, pp. 1-92), Prof. G. G. Findlay (Cambridge Greek Testament, 1904), and Dr. G. Milligan (1908). Of the older works, the editions of L. Pelt (1830), H. O. Schott (1834), and A. Koch (on the first epistle, second edition, Berlin, 1855), in German, together with those of Ellicott (fourth edition, 1880) and Jowett (third edition, 1894), deserve special notice. Dr. Denney’s terse exposition (Expositor’s Bible, 1892), Lightfoot’s essay (Biblical Essays, 251-269), and E. H. Askwith’s Introduction to the Thessalonian Epistles (1902), together with the articles of Lock (Hastings’ D.B., iv. 743-749) and A. C. McGiffert (E. Bi., 5036-5046), and Dr. W. Gunion Rutherford’s translation (1908), will furnish the English student with all necessary material for a general study of the epistles. Zimmer’s monograph (Der Text der Thess. Briefe, 1893) and article on 2 Thess. (Zeits. f. wiss. Theol., xxxi. 322-342) give a competent survey of the textual data.

The abbreviations are for the most part familiar and obvious; e.g., Blass = Neutest. Grammatik, Burton = Moods and Tenses (1894), Deissmann = D.’s Bible Studies (Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1901), DCG = Hastings’ Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels (1907-1908), E. Bi. = Encyclopaedia Biblica, Field = Otium Norvicense, part iii. (1899), Moulton = J. H. Moulton’s Grammar of N.T. Greek, vol. i. (1906), Viteau = Viteau’s Étude sur le grec du N.T. (1893, 1896), Win. = Schmiedel’s edition of G. B. Winer’s Grammatik (Göttingen, 1894 f.). With regard to the references to Sap. (i.e., The Wisdom of Solomon), it must be remembered that Paul in all likelihood knew this writing at first hand.
CHAPTER I.—Ver. 1. Greeting.—As any trouble at Thessalonica had arisen over Paul's character more than his authority, or rather as his authority had been struck through his character, he does not introduce his own apostolic rank or that of his colleagues (ii. 6) in the forefront of this letter, which is intimate and unofficial throughout. Silvanus is put before Timothy as an older man and colleague, and also as Paul's special co-adjuror in the local mission. Acts never mentions Timothy in the Macedonian mission till xvii. 14, where he appears beside Silvanus. This does not mean (Bleek) that Timothy took no part in the work at Thessalonica; his intimate relations with the church forbid this supposition. Probably he is left unnoticed as being a junior subordinate, till the time comes when he can act as an useful agent of his leader.—ἐκκλ. a pagan term appropriated by Christianity. An implicit contrast lies in the following words (so in ii. 14): there were ἐκκλησίαι at Thessalonica and elsewhere (cf. Chrysostom and Orig., Cels. III. xxix.-xxx.) which had not their basis and being ἐν...Χριστῷ. The latter phrase is a suggestive and characteristic periphrasis for "Christian," and the omission of the ἐν before κυρίῳ, as of τῇ before ἐν, is enough to show that the seven words form a unity instead of a double antithesis to "pagan" and "Jewish" respectively.—κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, a new κύριος (= dominus) for people like the Thessalonians who were hitherto familiar with the title as applied to Claudius (cf. Wilcken's Griechische Ostroha, 1899, s.v.) the emperor, or to the God of the Jews (cf. Knowling's Witness of the Epistles, 260 f.). See the ample discussion in Kattenbusch, das Apost. Symbol, ii. 596 f., with his note (pp. 631 f.) on ἐκκλησία. The hope and help of God implied that Christians must hold together, under their κύριος. "No Christian could have fought his way through the great dark night of idolatry and immorality as an isolated unit; the community was here the necessary condition for all permanent life" (Wernle, Beginnings of Christianity, i. 180).

vv. 2-10. Thanksgiving for the origin and achievements of the church.—Ver. 2. Whenever Paul was at his prayers, he remembered his friends at Thessalonica; and whenever he recalled them his first feeling was one of gratitude to God (see iii. 9) for the Christian record which, as individuals and as a church (ἐκκλησία), they displayed of active faith (i. 4-10, i. 13-16), industrious love (iv. 9 f.), and tenacious hope (v. 1-11). And not Paul alone. The plural implies that all three missionaries prayed together.—αὐτοῖς ἑαυτοῖς. The greeting is followed, as in ordinary letters of the period, by a word of gratitude and good wishes. ἐν is common in votive inscriptions, in connection with thanksgiving to a god. But while Paul, in dictating his letter, starts with a conventional epistolary form, the phrase immediately expands loosely into μηδὲ...θεόν (μουεῖν w. as frequently in ethnic phraseology).

Ver. 3. Αἵρεσις. Neither distance nor fresh interests make any difference to his
affection; his life is bound up with their welfare; his source of happiness is their Christian well-being (cf. ii.17-20, iii.7-10). The adverb (a late Greek formation, cf. Expous., 1908, 59) goes equally well with the preceding or with the following words; better with the former, on the whole, as the participles then open the successive clauses in 2, 3 and 4.—

Ver. 4. The practical evidence of the Spirit in their lives showed that God had willed to enrol them among His chosen people (note the O.T. associations of beloved by God and election), just as the same consciousness of possessing the Spirit gave them the sure prospect of final entrance into the Messianic realm—an assurance which (ver. 6) filled them with joy amid all their discomforts. The phenomenon of the Spirit thus threw light backwards on the hidden purpose of God for them, and forwards on their prospect of bliss.—Recollections depend on knowledge; to be satisfied about a person implies settled convictions about his character and position. The apostles feel certain that the Thessalonian Christians had been truly chosen and called by God, owing to (a) the genuineness and effectiveness of their own ministry at Thessalonica, where they had felt the gospel going home to many of the inhabitants, and (b) the genuine evidence of the Thessalonians' faith; (a) comes first in ver. 5, (b) in vv. 6 f. In ii. 1 f. Paul reverts to (a), while in ii. 13-16 (4) is again before his mind. As the divine άληθή manifested itself in the Christian qualities of ver. 3, Paul goes back to their historical origin.

Ver. 5. οτί = "inasmuch as".—ο ἐναγγ. ἡμῶν, the gospel of which the apostles, and by which their hearers, were convinced. As the νομιζώ clause in duc. indicates, πεπείσματο must here denote personal conviction and unfaltering confidence on the part of the preachers. The omission of the λέον before πεπείσματο throws that word and πεπείσματο together into a single conception, complementary to δυνάμει, which here has no specific reference to miracles, but to the apostles' courage (ii.2), honesty and sincerity (4, 5), devotion (7, 8), earnestness (9), and consistency (10). The effect of the Spirit on the preachers is followed up (in ver. 6) by its effect on the hearers; and this dual aspect recurs in ver. 9 (we and you). ομ. Βlass) άναμενόμενον = "among you".

Ver. 6. Θλίψει . . . χαράς, cf. for this paradox of experience, Mazzini's account of his comrades in the Young Italy movement: "We were often in real want, but we were light-hearted in a way and smiling because we believed in the future". The gladness of the primitive Christian lay in the certainty of possessing soon that full salvation of which the Spirit at present was the pledge and foretaste. In view of Ps. li. 13, 14 it is hardly correct to say, with Gunkel (Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, 71), that this connection of joy and the Spirit was entirely foreign to Judaism.
Philemon 5: “the fact of your faith in God”.

Ver. 8. πιστεύεις... ἐκλέλοντο (Rom. x. 18), by -nanathron, reiterates for emphasis ἄφοι... κεφάλα (5 λόγος τ. K. depending for its effectiveness on the definite testimony of Christians). Paul is dictating loosely but graphically. The touch of hyperbole is pardonable and characteristic (cf. Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. iv. 17; Col. i. 6); but the geographical and commercial position of Thessalonica see Introd., p. 5) must have offered ample facilities for the rapid dissemination of news and the promulgation of the faith, north and south, throughout European Greece (Encyc, Bibl., i. 32). The local Christians had taken full advantage of their natural opportunities. Through their imitation of the apostles (see Introd., p. 7) and of Christ (here as in 1 Peter ii. 19-21, in his sufferings), they had become a pattern for others. The ἐν τῇ is omitted before Ἀχαΐᾳ here because M. and A. are grouped together, over against ἐν τῷ... γάρ, the reputation of the apostles rested upon solid evidence.

Ver. 9. The positive and negative aspects of faith: “Videndum est ut ruinam errorum sequatur aedificium fidelium” (Calvin).—Διδόντας = “real” as opposed to false in the sense of “counterfeit” — ξένοι, as opposed to dead idols (see above, p. 5) important to help their worshippers. Elsewhere the phrase (cf. τι Τιμ. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 12) “implies a contrast with the true God made practically a dead deity by a lifeless and rigid form of religion” (Hort, Christian Ecclesias, 173). Nothing brings home the reality of God (i.e., as Father, vv. 1-3) to the Christian at first so much as the experience of forgiveness.

Ver. 10. In preaching to pagans, the leaders of the primitive Christian mission put the wrath and judgment of God in the forefront (cf. Sabatier’s Paul, 98 f.), making a sharp appeal to the moral sense, and denouncing idolatry (cf. Sap., xiv., 12 f.; 22 f.). Hence the revival they set on foot. They sought to set pagans straight, and to keep them straight, by means of moral fear as well as of hope. Paul preached at Thessalonica as he did at Athens (Acts xvii. 29-31; see Harnack’s Expansion of Christianity, i. 108 f.) and the substance of his mission-message on the wrath of God is preserved in Rom. i. 18—ii. 16. The living God is manifested by His raising of Jesus from the dead, His awakening of faith in Christians, and His readiness to judge human sin in the hereafter. Seeberg (der Kathchismus der Urchristentum, 82-85) finds here an echo of some primitive Christian formula of faith, but his proofs are very precarious. —τὸν οὖν ἀνωτέρω. This marked them out from Jewish proselytes, who might also be said to have turned from idols to serve the living God. The quiet combination of monotheism and a divine position of Jesus is striking (cf. Kattenbusch, op. cit., ii. 550 f.). —ἐν τῷ... κεφάλα, both the hope and the historical fact lay outside the experience of the Thessalonians, but both were assured to them by their experience of the Spirit which the risen Jesus had bestowed, and which guaranteed His final work. Were it not for touches like the
II. 1. Αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὁσίατε, ἀδελφοί, τὴν εἰσοδον Ἰησοῦ τὴν πρὸς ὅμας, ὧν τὴν ἐπομονήν, ἡμῶν τὴν πρὸς ὅμας, ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμῶν. 2. Ἀλλὰ προσδείκτες καὶ ἀρθροδείκτες, καθὼς ὁ ἡμῶν πρὸς ὅμας, ἐν ὑπηρεσίᾳ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν ἔκκαμμένοι, ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν λαβόμεθα πρὸς ὅμας τὸ εὐαγγελίον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πολλῷ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. 3. ὁ γὰρ παράκλητος ἡμῶν ὃς ἐκ πλάνης, ὡσεὶ ἀκαθαρσίας, ὡσα ἐν δόλῳ. 4. ἀλλὰ καθὼς καθεκομίσαμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πιστευόμεθα.

The second ov8 «(ΝΑΒCD*GP, min., etc., edd.) [c/.II.iii.7-8] is preferable to the v. i. o8t (Pelt, Hofm., Wohl.) ; for aic8ap-o-tac, Bentl. conj. “forte εξ ἀνθρωπερίας” (i.e. αὐθρωποπερίας).

The second ov8 «(ΝΑΒCD*GP, min., etc., edd.) [c/.II.iii.7-8] is preferable to the v. i. o8t (Pelt, Hofm., Wohl.) ; for aic8ap-o-tac, Bentl. conj. “forte εξ ἀνθρωπερίας” (i.e. αὐθρωποπερίας).

Deeper sense of ὑμαίων, the celestial origin of Jesus, and the eschatological definition of ἄργη, one might be tempted to trace a specious resemblance between this two-fold description of Christianity at Thessalonica and the two cardinal factors in early Greek religion, viz., the service of the Olympian deities (θεαπώνεων) and the rites of aversion (διοπώρησις) which were designed to deprecate the dark and hostile powers of evil. Paul preached like the Baptist judgment to come. But his gospel embraced One who baptised with the Spirit and with the fire of enthusiastic hope (cf.1 Cor.i.7). The second ov8 «(ΝΑΒCD*GP, min., etc., edd.) [c/.II.iii.7-8] is preferable to the v. i. o8t (Pelt, Hofm., Wohl.) ; for aic8ap-o-tac, Bentl. conj. “forte εξ ἀνθρωπερίας” (i.e. αὐθρωποπερίας).


Ver. 1. αὐτοί, as opposed to the a. of i. 9.—γέγονεν αὐτ. λ., our mission was a vital success, as its results still show. For its motives and methods were genuine (2-12).

Ver. 2. “Though we had suffered—aye and suffered outrage” in one town, yet on we went to another with the same errand; a practical illustration of Matt. x. 23.

Ver. 3. γὰρ: Our mission (whatever that of others may be) is not the outcome of self-seeking, otherwise it would readily be checked by such untoward circumstances. Our confidence is in God, not in ourselves; our work is not self-appointed but a sacred trust or commission, for which we are responsible to Him (4). Hence, discouragement and hesitation are impossible. Paul argues that the very fact of their cheerful perseverance at Thessalonica, after their bad treatment at Philippi, points to the divine source and strength of their mission; what impelled them was simply a sense of lasting responsibility to God, upon the one hand, and an overpowering devotion to men upon the other (cf. the δι᾽ ὄμας of i. 5), for the gospel’s sake. Had the apostles yielded to feelings of irritation and despondency, giving up their task in Macedonia, after the troubles at Philippi, or had they conducted themselves at Thessalonica in such a way as to secure ease and profit; in either case, they would have proved their mission to be ambitious or selfish, and therefore undivine. As it was, their courage and sincerity were at once the evidence and the outcome of their divine commission.—πλάνης, “error” (cf. Armitage Robinson on Eph. iv.14). Their preaching did not spring from some delusion or mistake. Paul was neither fool nor knave, neither deceived nor a deceiver (δεικτες). Nor was his mission a sordid attempt (δικαθαρσίας) to make a good thing out of preaching, the impure motive being either to secure money (cf. πλανετάς ver. 5, and ver. 9), or to gain a position of importance (ver. 6) and popularity (Cf. Tacit., Annal., vi, 21 (of Tiberius’ attitude to astrologers)”si unicitatis aut fraudum suspicio incesserat”. Both features were only too familiar in the contemporary conduct of wandering sophists, ἀρσενάγια, and thaumaturgists (e.g., Acts xiii.10, and Clemen’s article in Neue Kirchl. Zeitschrift, 1896, 151 f.) whose practices would also explain the literal interpretation of δεικτές (= sensuality). But the context favours the associations of greed (cf. Eph. v. 3), as in the case of πλανετασ. On the persuasiveness of sincerity in a speaker, i.e., the extent to which his effectiveness depends upon his hearers’ conviction of his own earnestness and honesty, see Aristotle’s analysis of ἄρεως πλατις (Rhet., ii. 1) and Isocrates’ description of ἀνθρωπερίας (Orat., xv. 278, 279).
The important variant γνῶις, which is even better attested (cf. WH ii. 138), and is adopted, e.g., by Bentley, Lachm., Schrader, Jowett, Zimmer, Btiapi, WH, LITG., and Wohl, probably arose from a not uncommon ditthography of the final N in the preceding word: γνῶις "properly implies the kindness of a superior" (Liddell and Scott s.v.), whereas γνῶσις has usually associations of immaturity in Paul.

...entrenched with the gospel," a characteristic play on the word. The definite commission of the gospel excluded any weak attempt to flatter men's prejudices or to adapt oneself to their tastes. Hence the thought of the following verse. Ver. 5, "Never did we resort to words of flattery." (in order to gain some private end): cf. Arist., Eth. Nik., iv. 6. As self-interest is more subtle than the desire to please people (which may be one form of self-interest), the appeal is changed significantly from κ. ω. to θέει πάρτιν (Rom. i. 9): "aeraria aut ambitio, duo sunt isti fontes ex quibus manat totius ministerii corruptio" (Calvin). Cf. Introduction, § 1—on διός and ὑπὲρ, cf. Kattenbusch, das Apost. Symbol, ii. 515 f.

Ver. 6. To put a full stop after διός, and begin a new sentence with διός (so e.g., Wunderlich, Galvin, Köpper, Weitzäcker, H. J. Gibbins, Exp. Ti., xiv. 527), introduces an awkwardly asymmetric, makes διός follow a concessive participle very awkwardly, and is unnecessary for the sense. Ver. 7. ἐὰν βάρει εἶναι = "be men of weight," or "be a burden on your funda. Probably both meanings are intended, so that the phrase (cf. Field, 199) resumes the ideas of κληρον. and δὲν δόξα (self-interest in its mercenary shape and as the love of reputation) which are reiterated in v.v. 7-12, a defence of the apostles against the charges, current against them, evidence in some circles (probably pagan) at Thessalonica, of having given themselves airs and undoubtedly asserted their authority, as well as of having levied or at any rate accepted contributions for their own support.—ἀνδρούλαι were known to any of the local Christians who had been Jews (cf. Harnack's Expansion of Christianity, i. 66 f., 400 f.), since agents and emissaries (ἀνδρού- λαι) from Jerusalem went to and fro throughout the synagogues: but ἄρστος was a new conception. The Christian ἀνδρόλαι had their commission from their heavenly messiah.—ὑπὲρ (2 Tim. ii. 24); as Bengel observes, there was nothing ex cathedra about the apostles, nothing selfish or crafty or overbearing. All was tenderness and devotion, fostering and protecting care, in their relations to these Thessalonian Christians who had won their hearts. To eschew flattery (g) did not mean any indifference to consideration and gentleness, in their case; they were honest without being blunt or masterful.—προ- φόρα, a nursing mother (cf. Hor., Ep. i. 4, 8). "In the love of a brave and faithful man there is always a strain of paternal tenderness; he gives out again those beams of protecting fondness which were shed on him as he lay on his mother's knee" (George Eliot). Rutherford happily renders: "On the contrary, we carried ourselves among you with a childish simplicity, as a mother becomes a child again when she fondles her children".

Ver. 8. ἄμερόμενοι (cf. Job iii. 21, LXX; Ps. lxxii. 2, Symm.) = "yearning
for, or, over". εδοκ., for absence of augment cf. W. H., ii. 161, 162.—δοτι causal ("for as much as"), almost = γιὰρ (as in Modern Greek).

Ver. 9. "Paul means by the phrase, night and day, that he started work before dawn; the usage is regular and frequent. He no doubt began so early in order to be able to devote some part of the day to preaching" (Ramsay, Church in Roman Empire, p. 85). Paul, to the very last (cf. Acts xx. 29 f.), seems to have been sensitive on this point of independence.

Ver. 10. "We made ourselves yours" (cf. 8), the dative going closely (as Rom. vii. 3) with the verb, which is qualified (as in 1 Cor. xvi. 10) by the adverbs; so Born., Findlay. θυελλειμα στοιχεία (dative of possession). Paul had met other people at Thessalonica, but only the Christians could properly judge his real character and conduct.

Ver. 11. καθαρτις, sharper than καθεστως. Viteau (ii. 111) suggests that καθαρτις is a parenthesis, and as a causal introductory particle for the participles ("heartening" the adverb), which in their turn depend on θυελλελειμα, but the likelihood is that in the rush of emotion, as he dictates, Paul leaves the participial clause without a finite verb (so e.g., 2 Cor. vii. 5).—οὐθεν πατηρ κ.τ.λ. (cf. ἢδον τροφοῦ, 7). The figure was used by Jewish teachers of their relationship to their pupils. Cf. e.g., the words of Eleazar b. Aza'rija to his dying master, "Thou art more to Israel than father or mother; they only bring men into this world, whereas thou guidest us for this world and the next". Catullus, lxxii. 4 (dilexit ut non tantum ut uulgus amicam, sed pater ut natos diligit et generos).

Vv. 13-16. Further thanksgiving for their endurance of trial.

Ver. 13. "And for this we also render thanks, viz., that," the καὶ, by a loose but not unusual (cf. iii. 5; Rom. iii. 7, v. 3, etc.) construction, goes not with the pronoun but with the verb, or simply emphasises the former (e.g., Soph., Οἶνος, 53, 520, etc.)—τοῦ Θεοῦ comes in so awkwardly that one is tempted to regard it, with Baljon and some other Dutch critics, as a scribal gloss.
9—17. ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Ἔ

"ἠνεγκαίαν ἐν ὦμῖν τοὺς πιστεοῦντες. 14. ὡμεῖς γὰρ μηταῖας ὡς "Is made
dενυγηθὲς, ἀδελφοί, "τῶν ἐκκλησίων τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν ὀσίων ἐν τῷ
"Ιουδαίοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτα τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπάθητε καὶ ὡμεῖς ἐπὶ τῶν
ἰδιῶν ἃ συμφέροντο, καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Ιουδαίων, 15. τῶν καὶ
tῶν Κύριον ἀποκτεινόντων Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἀποφήγησαν 1 καὶ ἠμᾶς ἀκ-
dιαβάζει τοὺς καὶ θέσι μὴ ἀρεσκόντων καὶ τὰν ἀνθρώπους ἐναντίον,
16. κυρίων ὡμῶν ἡμῶν ἡ Φίλος λαλῆσαι ὡς ἴδαν συνεχῆς, ἐπὶ τὸ
ἐκπληρώσετε αὐτὸν τὰς ἀμαρτίας πάντως. ἦ δὲ ἀργὴ ἐγὼ τῆς
17. ἡμεῖς δὲ, ἀδελφοί, ἀποφανθείη σφόν ὡμῶν πρὸς καὶ ὑστοῖ
ἀρα ("προσώπων ὁδός καρδίας") περισυστεροθήσασον τὸ πώς
49 (Acts xvii. 5-14). Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 24, 26. b 1 Cor. x. 33. C. Cf. on Eph. ii. 12.
c Lk. xi. 53; Acts xvii. 5, xxii. 21. d Cf. Burton, M. T. 411 and Mount. i. 419.
2 Macc. vi. 14. Cf. 2 Macc. vi. 14. i. 419. e J. Phil., iii. 16, etc. f 2 Cor. 
7 and Gen. xv. 16. g Lk. xv. 23, etc. h "Utterly, completely" (Pa. 
Sol. i. 1, ii. 5; Joseph. B. J. vii. 8, 1, al. "to the bitter and"
k 1 Cor. v. 3. l 2 Cor. v. 12. m 1 Gal. i. 14; 2 Cor. i. 14.
1 Om. the Syrian interpolation ὧν with ΜΑΣΔ*GP (min.), sah., cop., arm.,
aeth., Orig., Euth., edd., as an insertion by Marcion (Tert., cf. Nestle's Einl. 253)
before ἐν προφητείς.

Ver. 14. μηταίας, and soon helpers
(Rom. xv. 26). The fact that they
were exposed to persecution, and bore
it manfully, proved that the gospel was
a power in their lives, and also that
they were in the legitimate succession
of the churches. Such obstacles would
as little thwart their course as they
had thwarted that of Jesus or of his
immediate followers. συμφ. might in-
clude Jews (Acts xvii. 6), but Gentiles
predominate in the writer's mind. —The
παύς after καθὼς simply emphasises the
comparison (as in iv. 6, 13). As Calvin
suggests, the Thessalonians may have
wondered why, if this was the true re-
ligion, it should be persecuted by the
Jews, who had been God's people. ς
is racial rather than local, but the local
persecution may have still been due in
part to Jews (cf. Zimmer, pp. 16 f.).

Ver. 15. "The Lord, even Jesus" (cf.
Acts ii. 36). προφ. may go either with
ἐπίκεισθαι or with ἐκδιαβάζει.

Ver. 16. κυρίων κ. τ.λ., defining
(Luke xi. 52) from the Christian stand-
point that general and familiar charge
of hatred to the human race (κωμόποιοι
κ. τ.λ.), which was started by the ex-
clusiveness of the ghetto and the synagoge.
—ἐκδοτας κ. τ.λ., "the Wrath has come
upon them," apparently a reminiscence
of Test. Levi. vi. 11. This curt and
sharp verdict on the Jews sprang from
Paul's irritation at the moment. The
apostle was in no mood to be concilia-
tory. He was suffering at Corinth from
persistent Jewish attempts to wreck the
Christian propaganda, and he flashes
out in these stern sentences of anger.
Later on (Rom. ix.-xi.) he took a kinder
and more hopeful view, though even this
did not represent his final outlook on the
prospects of Judaism. Consequently, it
is arbitrary to suspect vv. 14 (15)-16 as a
later interpolation, written after 70 A.D.
(cf. the present writer's Hist. New Testa-
ment, pp. 625, 626). But the closing sen-
tence of ver. 16 has all the appearance of
a marginal gloss, written after the tragic
days of the siege in 70 A.D. (so e.g.,
Spitta, Pfeiderer, Primitive Christianity,
i. 128, 129, Schmiedel, Teichmann, die
Paul. Vorstellungen von Auferstehung
u. Gericht, 83, Drummond, etc.). The
Jews, no doubt, had recently suffered,
and were suffering, as a nation in a way
which might seem to Paul, in a moment of
vehement feeling, a clear proof of con-
dign punishment (so e.g., Schmidt, 86-
90). But neither the edict of Claudius
nor the bloody feuds in Palestine quite
bear out the language of this verse. And
ἀργὴ is surely more than judicial har-
dening (cf. Dante's Paradiso, vi. 88-93);
it's eschatological significance points to
a more definite interpretation.

Ver. 17—CHAPTER III. Ver. 13. Paul's
apologia pro absentia sud.

Ver. 17. πρὸς κ. κ., as we both ex-
pected, but, as it turned out, for much
longer. προσ. εἰς κ., "not where I
breathe; but where I love, I live’ (Southwell, the Elizabethan Jesuit poet, echoing Augustine’s remark that the soul lives where it loves, not where it exists); cf. Eurip., Ion, 251. The next paragraph, ii. 17-iii. 13, starts from a fresh imputation against the apostles’ honour. Paul, it was more than hinted by calumniators at Thessalonica, had left his converts in the lurch (cf. 18); with him, out of sight was out of mind: fresh scenes and new interests in the South had supplanted them in his affections, and his failure to return was interpreted as a fickle indifference to their concerns. The reply is three-fold. (a) Paul’s continued absence had been unavoidable (17 f.); he had often tried to get back. In proof of this anxiety (b) he had spared Timothy from his side for a visit to them (iii. 1-5), and (c) Timothy’s report, he adds (iii. 6 f.) had relieved a hearty concern on his part for their welfare; he thus lets them see how much they were to him, and still prays for a chance of re-visiting them (11). He was not to blame for the separation; and, so far from blunting his affection, it had only whetted his eagerness to get back.

Ver. 18. ‘We did crave to reach you,’ ἄπείρου = because not being required with the English stress on did.

The whole verse is parenthesis, syntactically. — καλ . . . Σαραυα. The mysterious obstacle, which Paul traced back to the ultimate malice of Satan, may have been either (a) an illness (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 7, so Simon, in Psychologie des Apostels Paulus, 63, 64), (b) local troubles, (c) the exigencies of his mission at the time being (Grotius), or (d) a move on the part of the Thessalonian politearchs who may have bound over Jason and other leading Christians to keep the peace by pledging themselves to prevent Paul’s return (Ramsay’s St. Paul the Traveller, 230 f., Woodhouse, E. Bi., 5047, Findlay). Early Christian thought referred all such hindrances to the devil as the opponent of God and of God’s cause. The words ἐν Ἀθήναις (iii. 1) rule out Zimmer’s application of (b) to the emergency at Corinth, while the silence of Acts makes any of the other hypotheses quite possible, though (a) hardly fits in with the ordinary view of the Empire in II. ii. 2 f. and renders it difficult to see why the Thessalonians did not understand at once how Paul could not return. The choice really lies between (a) and (c). Kabisch (27-29), by a forced exegesis, takes ver. 20 as the explanation of this satanic manoeuvre. Satan prevented us from coming, in order to rob us of our glory and praise on the last day, by wiping your Christian faith; he was jealous of our success among you.

Ver. 19. Of course we wanted to come back, for (γιὰρ), etc. The touch of fine exaggeration which follows is true to the situation. Paul’s absence from the young church was being misinterpreted in a sinister way, as if it implied that the Achaian Christians had ousted the Thessalonians from his affections. You it is, he protests, who but you (καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν) superfluous after all, as in Epict. i. 6. 39; Rom. xiv. 10, but really heightening the following word, as in Rom. v. 7; almost the same construction is “indeed” or “even”—you are my pride and delight and στέφανος, of a public honour granted (as to Demostenes and Zeno) for distinguished public service. The metaphor occurs often in the inscriptions (cf. also Firke Aboth, iv. 9). Paul coveted no higher distinction than the arrival of the Lord than the glory of having won over the Thessalonian church. Cf. Crashaw’s lines to St. Teresa in heaven:

‘Thou shalt look round about, and see
Thou hundreds of crown’d souls thron’d to be Themselves thy crown’.

Παπωρός = royal visit (cf. Wilcken’s Gnech. Ostraka, i. 274 f.), and hence applied (cf. Matt. xxiv.) to the arrival of the messiah, though the evidence for the

PROΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΣ Ἄ

II. 18—19.
III. i—5. ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Ἀ

III. i. Πεπερασμένος ἕως ὅσον 

use of the term in pre-Christian Judaism is scanty (Test. Jud. xxvii. 3; Test. Levi. viii. 15; for the Jewish mine "coming") cf. Slav. Εν., xxiii. 1. xliii. 5). This is the first time the term is used by Paul, but it was evidently familiar to the readers. Later on, possibly through Paul's influence, it became an accepted word in the second advent in early Christianity.

CHAPTER III.—Ver. 1. μην μην, instead of οὐκ, to bring out the personal motive. —πέτων "able to bear" (cf. Philo, Πλάτων, § 9, μην μην πέτων δύναμεν οὖς καὶ ψυχὰς, sim. the anxiety of ii. 11 f.—ν Ἐν Ἡμῶν. Paul shrank from loneliness, especially where there was little or no Christian fellowship; but he would not gratify himself at the expense of the Thessalonians. Their need of Timothy must take precedence of his.


Ver. 5. Resuming the thought of iii. 1-34, after the parenthetical digression of 36, 4, but adding a fresh reason for the mission of Timothy, εἶπον, the apostle's desire to have his personal anxiety about the Thessalonians relieved. It is needless to suppose (with Hofmann and Spitta) that iii. 5 refers to a fresh messenger or a letter (Wohl.) despatched by Paul on his own account. As in ii. 18, Paul passes to the singular, to emphasise his personal interest in the matter; the change of number, especially after the generic use of the plural in 3, 4, does not necessarily prove that the plural of ver. 5 means Paul alone. The dominating anxiety of Paul was about their faith (5-10). He was overjoyed to hear that they retained "a kindly remembrance" of himself, and he reciprocates their desire for another meeting; but, while this undoubtedly entered into their general Christian position, it is the form on which unsatisfactorily he dwells (cf. the transition in 10a and 10b).
PROS THESSALONIKEIS Ἀ

III. 6—13.

κ.τ.λ. "Initium omnium malarum ten-

tationum inconstantia animi est et parua
ad Deum confidentia" (De Imit. Christi,
i. 13, 5).—Προσφέραμεν, with success, it is
implied.

Ver. 8. The news put life and spirit

into him—στόχησαν, for construction cf.
Mark xi. 25 and Abbott’s Johann. Gramm.,
2515 (f).

Ver. 10. Another adaptation of ethnic
phraseology, cf. Griechische Urkunden,
i. 246, 12, καὶ ἡμάς ἑπικοίνων ἦν τῷ
θεῷ σῷρ̣ ὑμῶν (a pagan papyrus from
second or third century, A.D.). The
connection of δεόμενος κ.τ.λ. with the
foregoing words is loose, but probably may
be found in the vivid realisation of the
Thessalonians called up before his mind
as he praised God for their constancy.

Timothy had told him of their loyalty,
but had evidently acquainted him also
with some less promising tendencies and
shortcomings in the church; possibly the
Thessalonians had even asked for guidance
on certain matters of belief and practice
(see below). Hence Paul’s eagerness to be on
the spot again, not merely for the sake of
happy fellowship (Rom. i. 11), but to educate and guide his friends,
supplying what was defective in their
faith. As this was impracticable in the
meantime, he proceeds to write down some
kindly admonitions. Thus 10θ forms the
transition to the second part of the
letter; Paul, as usual, is wise enough to
convey any correction or remonstrance on
the back of hearty commendation. In the
prayer which immediately follows, 10α is echoed in 11, 10θ in 12, 13, for the
maturity of the Thessalonian’s faith does
not depend on the presence of their
apostles. Whatever be the answer to
the prayer of 11, the prayer of 12, 13 can
be accomplished.

Ver. 11. κατευθύναται (optative), as al-
ready (Acts xvi. 8-10, xvii. 1). The
singular (cf. II., ii. 16, 17) implies that
God and Jesus count as one in this con-
nexion. The verb is common (e.g., Ep.
Arist., 18, etc.) in this sense of providence
directing human actions.

Vv. 12, 13. The security and purity of
the Christian life are rested upon its
brotherly love (so Ep. Arist., 229); all
breaches or defects of ἀγάπης, it is im-
plied, are hence failures there (cf. iv. 3,
6); even sensuality becomes a form of
selfishness, on this view, as much as in-
patience or resentment. This profound
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IV. i—3. ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Ἄ

IV. 1. *Λοιπῶν οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐρωτήμαν ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλῶμεν ἵνα καθὼς παρελαβεῖτε παρ' ἡμῖν τὰ πόνι ὑμῶν, τῶν δὲ ὑμῶν περιπταῖτε ἐκ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα καθὼς παρελαβεῖτε παρ' ἡμῖν, ἵνα περιπταῖτε ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον. 2. οἴδατε γὰρ τίνας παραγγελίας ἔδωκαν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. 3. τούτο γάρ ἔστι, ἡ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅπως ἔσται κατὰ τὸ ἔλεημα τοῦ Θεοῦ.
ments, Paul taught as here that the experience of the Spirit guaranteed the believer's vindication at the end (cf. 1.9, 10) and also implied his ethical behaviour during the interval. The comparative lack of any allusion to the forgiveness of sins (cf. e.g., iii. 5, 10, 13) does not mean that Paul thought the Thessalonians would be kept sinless during the brief interval till the parousia (so Wernle, *der Christ u. die Sünde bei Paulus*, 25-31); probably no occasion had called for any explicit teaching on this commonplace of faith (1 Cor. xv. 3, 11).

Ver. 4. Paul demands chastity from men; it is not simply a feminine virtue. Contemporary ethics, in the Roman and Greek world, was often disposed to condone marital unfaithfulness on the part of husbands, and to view prenuptial unchastity as *adiaphoros* or at least as a comparatively venial offence, particularly in men (cf. Lecky's *History of European Morals*, i. 104 f., ii. 314 f.). The strict purity of Christ's gospel had to be learnt (*elidwv*). _στρεψον* (lit. "vessel") = "wife;" the rendering "body" (cf. Barn. vii. 3) conflicts with the normal meaning of _καταφεύγω* ("get," "acquire," "of marriage, LXX. Ruth iv. 10; Sir. xxxvi. 29, Xen., Symph. ii. 10). Paul views marriage on much the same level as he does in 1 Cor. vii. 2, 9; in its chaste and religious form, it is a remedy against sensual passion, not a gratification of that passion. Each of you (he is addressing men) must learn (elidwv = know [how to], cf. Phil. iv. 12) to get a wife of his own (when marriage is in question), but you must marry in _agapē* (as a Christian duty and vocation) _καὶ τῷ* (with a corresponding sense of the moral dignity of the relationship). The two latter words tend to raise the current estimate, presupposed here and in ver. 6, of a wife as the _σύζυγος* of her husband; this in its turn views adultery primarily as an infringement of the husband's rights or an attack on his personal property. Paul, however, closes by an emphatic word on the religious aspect (6-8) of the question; besides, as Dr. Drummond remarks, "is it not part of his greatness that, in spite of his own somewhat ascetic temperament, he was not blind to social and physiological facts?" It is noticeable that his eschatology has less effect on his view of marriage here than in 1 Cor. vii. Even were _καταφεύγω* taken as = "possess," a usage not quite impossible for later Greek (cf. Field, 72), it would only extend the idea to the duties of a Christian husband. The alternative rendering ("acquire mastery of," Luke xxii. 19) does not justify the "body" sense of _σύζυγος*.

Ver. 6. Compare the saying of rabbi Simon ben Zoma (on Deut. xxiii. 25): "Look not on thy neighbour's vineyard; if thou hast looked, enter not; if thou hast entered, regard not the fruits; if thou hast regarded them, touch them not; if thou hast touched them, eat them not. But if thou hast eaten, then thou dost exert thyself from the life of this world and of that which is to come." (quoted in Bacher's *Agada der Tannaßen*, 2nd ed., 1903, i. 430). There is no change of subject, from licentiousness to dishonesty. TheAsynceton and the euphemistic _νὸς τῇ πράγματι* (not _νὰ τῇ_ , Win. § 48) show that Paul is still dealing with the same moral question now as a form of social dishonesty and fraud. The metaphors are drawn from trade, perhaps as appropriate to a trading community. While _εὐπέρβαιναί* may be intransitive (in its classical sense of "transgress"), it probably governs _ἄδελφον* in the sense of "get the better of," or "overreach;" _πλαστεύεσθαι* similarly = "overreach," "defraud," "take advantage of" (2 Cor. vii. 2, xii. 17, 18; Xen., *Mem.*, iii. 5, 2; Herod. viii. 114). Compare _ἀδελφόροι* _πάντα* _ἐν πλούσιε* (Eph. iv. 19). The passage (with ver. 8) sounds almost like a vague reminiscence of Test. Asher, ii. 6: ἀ _πλαστεύοντον* τὸν...
καθότι καὶ προείπαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ διαμαρτυρομέθα. 7. οὕτω γὰρ εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἀλλὰ ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. 8. θεὸς ὁ τυφλὸς ἄρετος ἄδετος ἀδέτῳ τὸν θεὸν τὸν δικαίοτα τὸν πνεύμα αὐτοῦ τὸ Ἁγίον ἡμᾶς. 9. περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδέλφιας οὖ ἐρείται ἐξέκαστε ἁγαίρεσιν ὑμῖν. 10. καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὕτη ἡ πάντας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἐν δόξῃ τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ. παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοῖ, περισσεύει μᾶλλον 11. καὶ φιλοτημοῖοθεὶς ἁγιοῖς καὶ πράσινοι "Sexual vice" (as Col. iii. 5, Eph. v. 3). Test. Jos. iv. 6.

w = εἰς (t Cor. vii. 15; Eph. iv. 4; Wn. § 50, 3). x Heb. xii. 1. y As in Ezek. xxviii. 14 (LXX). z See on Rom. xii. 10. a Blass, § 50, 3. b Elaborated in Rom. v. 5; z Cor. v. 14, cf. Barn. xxii. 6; Isa. liv. 13. c Ps. Sol. xvii. 35. e Epexegetic infinitive, (Moul. 218-219) of object. d Philippi, Hesek. etc. e Active side of. f See on 2 Cor. v. 9 and Rom. xv. 20. — be distinguished for a quiet life," "strive to be quiet". g Cf. II. iii. 12. h = "attend to your own business," cf. Dem. Olym. ii. 16.

1. οὖν εἴτε γραφέων μιᾷς (ıyla AD, etc., edd.), an irregular but not uncommon turn ("you have no need of anyone to write you"), corrected in WNDG, vg., Chrys., etc., to εἴχομεν κ.τ.λ. (so Lüem., Lachm., Blass, cf. i. 8), and in B to εἴχομεν κ.τ.λ. (Weiss, Bahnsohn), as in H to γραφεῖν κ.τ.λ. (from v. 1).

πλείονοι παραρτύειν τοῖς θεοῖς τὸν ἐντολά τοῦ νόμου Ἐρίων ἄντεκτε. Only τὸν ἀνθρώπον here is not the wrongly party but the apostles who convey God's orders. — διότι κ.τ.λ. = "since (cf. ii. 8) the Lord is the avenger (from Deut. xxi. 33: cf. Sap. xii. 12; Sir. xxx. 6; i Mac. xiii. 6, ἑπιθύμης περιδρ. 4 Mac. xv. 20) in all these matters" (of impurity). How, Paul does not explain (cf. Col. iii. 5, 6). By a premature death (1 Cor. xi. 30)? Or, at the last judgment (i. 10)? not in the sense of Sap. iii. 16, iv. 6 (illegitimate children evidence at last day against their parents) at any rate.

Ver. 8. Elsewhere (i. 5, 6) άγιον simply denotes the divine quality of πνεῦμα as operating in the chosen διελθεῖν of God, but here the context lends it a specific value. Impurity is a violation of the rights of God between Himself and Christians at baptism, when the holy Spirit is bestowed upon them for the purpose of consecrating them to live His life (cf. i. Cor. iii. 16, vi. 19). The gift of the Spirit here is not regarded as the earnest of the future kingdom (for which immorality will disqualification) so much as the motive and power of the new life. — διδοῦμαι = "the giver of," not implying continuous or successive impartation; present as in ch. v. 24; Gal. v. 8. He not only call-, but supplies the atmosphere and energy requisite for the task.—διδοῦμαι κ.τ.λ. (cf. ii. 13) = contemns by ignoring such injunctions (2-6) in practical life, deliberately sets aside their authority. Cf. Isa. xxiv. 16, 17 f., ὅσα τούτων ἀδετούτων οἵ "the giver of," not implying continuous or successive impartation; present as in ch. v. 24; Gal. v. 8. He not only call-, but supplies the atmosphere and energy requisite for the task.—διδοῦμαι κ.τ.λ. (cf. ii. 13) = contemns by ignoring such injunctions (2-6) in practical life, deliberately sets aside their authority. Cf. Isa. xxiv. 16, 17 f., ὅσα τούτων ἀδετούτων οἵ
moron). The prospect of the second advent (iv. 13 f., v. 1-10) seems to have made some local enthusiasts feel that it was superfluous for them to go on working, if the world was to be broken up immediately. This feverish symptom occupies Paul more in the diagnosis of his second letter, but it may have been present to his mind here. For instances of this common phase in unbalanced minds compare the story of Hippolytus (Comm. Dan., iv. 19) about a Pontic bishop in the second century who misled his people by prophesying the advent within six months, and also a recent outbreak of the same superstition in Tripoli (Westminster Gazette, Nov., 1899) where "the report that the end of the world will come on November 13" produced "an amazing state of affairs. The Israelites are sending their wives to pray in the synagogues, and most workmen have ceased work. Debtors refuse to pay their debts, so that trade is almost paralysed."

Paul uses similar expressions in his Republic, 486 D (ὅπως ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ κατὰ ἔος ἑρμηνεύω); but of the philosopher who withdraws in despair from the lawlessness of a world which he is impotent to help (see also Thompson's note on Gorg., 525 f.).

Vv. 13-18. πέρι τῶν κοιμηθέντων.

Ver. 13. δι', after ὅλομον as a single expression.—Affection for the living has another side, viz., unselfish solicitude for the dead. Since Paul left, some of the Thessalonian Christians had died, and the survivors were distressed by the fear that these would have to occupy a position secondary to those who lived until the advent of the Lord, or even that they had passed beyond any such participation at all. At Corinth some of the local Christians felt this anguish so keenly, on behalf of friends and relatives who had died outside the church, that they were in the habit of being baptised as their representatives, to ensure their final bliss (1 Cor. xv. 29). The concern of the Thessalonians, however, was for their fellow-Christians, in the intermediate state of Hades. As the problem had not arisen during Paul's stay at Thessalonica, he now offers the church a reasonable solution of the difficulty (13-18). — ὁλομον δι' ὅμως ἀγωνίας, contrast the σιδήνα of iv. 2, v. 2, and compare the ordinary epistolary phrases of the papyri (Expos., 1908, 55) such as γεγονότα. The phrase is not needed (cf. 15) to limit τ. κ. to Christians (so Chrys., Calvin), for the unbelieving dead are not before the writer's mind, and, even so, it would have been the natural preposition (cf. 16); nor does it mean martyrdom. In the light of v. 9 (cf. Rom. v. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 21), it seems to connect less awkwardly with ζησθείσαι, though not = "at the intercession of Jesus"
(Rutherford). Jesus is God’s agent in the final act, commissioned to raise and muster the dead (cf. Stahelin, Ἰάκρ. ἔρ. δευτ. Θεολ., 1874, 189 f., and Schettler, Jesus, οἱ ἀγ. τῆς κεραυνοῦ τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ τῆς ἐπίλυσις τῆς ἀμαρτίας, 1907, 57 f.). The divine mission of the Christ, which is to form the climax of things, involves the resurrection of the dead who are His (v. 10). Any general resurrection is out of the question (so Did., xvi. 6: "ἀναπτυξία ἡ μετά τῶν νεκρῶν, ἐν τῇ ἑτεροειδίᾳ ἐν τῇ Κρίσει καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπίλυσιν τῆς ἀμαρτίας").

Ver. 15. κύριον. On the tendency of the N.T. writers to reserve κύριον, with its O.T. predicates of divine authority, for Jesus, cf. Kattenbusch, op. cit., ii. 522. Paul’s use of the term goes back to Christ’s own claim to κύριον in the higher sense of Mark xii. 35 f.—λέγειςνα. Contrast the οὖναν of v. 2 and the language of iv. 1. Evidently Paul had not had time or occasion to speak of such a contingency, when he was with them.—ἐν λόγῳ κύριον may mean either (a) a quotation (like Acts xx. 35) from the sayings of Jesus, or (b) a new “parable revelation” vouchsafed to Paul himself, or to Silvanus (cf. Acts xx. 32). In the former case (so, among modern editors, Schott, Ewald, Drummond, Wohlf.), an ἀγγέλου is cited (Cauint, Koch, Weizsäcker, Resch, Paulinismus, 238 f.; Kopp, die Sprache Jesu, 153 f.; M. Goggin; v. Soden, 15 f.; O. Holtzmann, Life of Jesus, 10; von Soden) but it is evidently given in a free form, and the precise words cannot (even in ver. 16) be disentangled. Besides we should expect πρὶς to be added. Unless, therefore, we are to think of a primitive collection (Lake, Amer. Journ. Theol., 1906, 108 f.) or of some oral tradition, (b) is preferable. The contents of Matt. xxiv. 31 (part of the small apocalypse) are too dissimilar to favour the conjecture (Pelt, Zimmer, Weiss) that Paul was thinking of this saying as current perhaps in oral tradition, and the O.T. analogy of λόγῳ Κυρίου (= God’s prophetic word), together with the internal probabilities of the case (Paul does not remind them of it, as elsewhere in the epistle) make it on the whole more likely that Paul is repeating words heard in a vision (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 9; so Chryst., Theod., etc., followed by Alford, de Wette, Ellicott, Dods, Lünemann, Goe, Faret: Paulus und Jesus, 53 f., Simon: die Psychologie des Ap. Paulus, 100, Findlay, Lightfoot, Milligan, Lueken). Cf. the discussion in Knowling’s Witness of the Epistles, 408 f., and Feine’s Jesus Christus u. Paulus, 178, 179. Later in the century a similar difficulty vexed the pious Jew who wrote Fourth Ezra (v. 47: 42: I said, But lo, O Lord, thou hast made the promise to those who shall be in the end: and what shall they do that have been before us ...? And He said to me, I will liken my judgment to a ring; as there is no slackness of those who are last, so shall there be no swiftness of those who are first). His answer is that the previous generations of Israel will be as well off as their posterity in the latter days. Further on (xiii. 14 f.) he raises and answers the question whether it was better to die before the last days or to live until they came (the phrase. those that are left, “qui relieti sunt,” vii. 28 = Paul’s of περιπλανομένους). His solution (which Steck, in Ἰάκρ. ἕρ. δευτ. ἐπ. Θεολ., 1883, 509-524, oddly regards as the λόγος κ. of 1 Thess. iv. 15; see Schmidt’s refutation, pp. 107-110) is the opposite of Paul’s: those who are left are more blessed than those who have died. If this difficulty was felt in Jewish circles during the first half of the century, it may have affected those of the Thessalonian Christians who had been formerly connected with the synagogue, but the likelihood is that Paul’s language is coloured by his own Jewish training (cf. Charles on Ἰάκ. ἐπ., iv. 15). The misunderstanding of the Thessalonians, which had led to their sorrow and perplexity, was evidently due to the fact that, for some reason or another, Paul had not mentioned the possibility of any Christians dying before the second advent (so sure was he that all would soon survive it), coupled with the fact that Greeks found it hard to grasp what exactly resurrection meant (cf. Acts xvii. 32) for Christians.
Ver. 16. κελεύσματι = the loud summons which was to muster the saints (so in Philo, De praem. et poen., 19: καθέστωρ κ.κ. in 1 Cor. iv. 11, in δέκατη γενικομε-
edous báthos ἐν κελεύσματι συμναγών ἐπὶ θεοῦ ἀπὸ παρών εἰς τὸ ἐν διάλειξi χρόνον), forms, as its lack of any genitive shows, one conception with the φ. α. φ. α. and the σ. θ. (cf. DCG, ii. 766). The archangel is Michael, who in Jewish tradition not only summoned the angels but sounded a trumpet to herald God's approach for judgment (e.g., in Ἀποκ. Μοῖσης, xxii.). With such scenic and realistic details, drawn from the heterogeneous eschatology of the later Judaism, Paul seeks to make intelligible to his own mind and to that of his readers, in quite an original fashion (cf. Stähelin, Jahrb. f. d. eut. Theol., 1874, pp. 199-218), the profound truth that neither death nor any cosmic crisis in the future will make any essential difference to the close relation between the Christian and his Lord. Οὕτω πάντως σὺν κυρίῳ έσυνάβη (cf. Phil. i. 20): this is all that remains to us, in our truer view of the universe, from the naïve λόγος κυρίου of the apostle, but it is everything. Note that Paul says nothing here about any change of the body (Teichmann, 35 ff.), or about the embodiment of the righteous dead (cf. W. M. Burton, M. T., 1837). The archangel's trump is the ordinary method of sudden rapture or ascension to heaven (Acts i. 11; Rev. xi. 12; Slav. En. iii. i, 2.), ἑραγγελσθείσα. So in Ἱερομ. τύπος τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Thess. iv. 1) γενόμενος ἑρα-
γγέλθη (1 Thess. i. 4), is caught up (ἑραγγάη).— ἀρ α ὀιοῦν αὐτούς... σοιν Κυρίῳ, the future bliss is a re-union of Christians not only with Christ but with one another. — ἡ ἀνάπτυγνη, a pre-Christian phrase of the koine (cf. e.g., ἔνθαμεν ἐν τῷ άλλῳ, Rec. 11, i. 7, 15; παραγενώμενοι εἰς ἀνάπτυγγν, κ.τ.λ., and Moulton, i. 14), implying welcome of a great person on his arrival. What further functions are assigned to the saints, thus incorporated in the retime of the Lord (iii. 13; cf. 2 Thess. i. 10),—whether, e.g., they are associated with the Son at the judgment (3ap. i., 8; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; Luke xxii. 30)—Paul does not stop to state here. His aim is to reassure the Thessalonians about the prospects of their dead in relation to the Lord, not to give any complete programme of the future (so Matt. xxiv. 31; Did. x., xvi.). Plainly, however, the saints do not rise at once to heaven, but return with the Lord to the scene of his final manifestation on earth (so Chrysost., Aug., etc.). They simply meet the Lord in the air, on his way to judgment—a trait for which no Jewish parallel can be found.— καὶ οὕτως ἐστιν, ἡ ἀνάπτυγνη (no more sleeping in him or waiting for him).

Ver. 18. ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις. Paul had an intelligible word upon the future, unlike the Hellenic mysteries which usually made religion a matter of feeling rather than thinking. See Hardie's Lect. on Classical Subjects, pp. 53 f.). A pagan letter of consolation has been preserved from the second century (Οξυρ. Παπύρι, i. 115): "Eirene to Taonnophris and Philon good cheer! I was as griefed and wept as much as over Eunomos as over Didymas, and I did all that was fitting, as did all my family. . . . But still we can do nothing in such a case. So comfort yourselves. Goodbye." One of Cicero's pathetic letters (ad. Fam., xiv. 2.), written from Thessalonica, speaks doubtfully of any re-union after death ("haec non sunt in manu nostrae").
CHAPTER V.—VV. I—III.

Ver. 1. The times and periods are not "simply the broad course of time, of which the ημέρα Κυρίου constitutes the closing scene (Baur); καιρός denotes a section of time more definitely than χρόνος, in Greek usage. "No nation has distinguished so subtly the different forms under which time can be logically conceived. Χρόνος is time viewed in its extension, as a succession of moments, the external framework of action. . . . Καιρός, a word, which has, I believe, no single or precise equivalent in any other language . . . is that immediate present which is what we make it; time charged with opportunity" (Butcher, Harvard Lect. on Gk. Subjects, pp. 117-119). In the plural, especially in this eschatological outlook, the phrase is little more, however, than a periphrasis for "when exactly things are to happen". Paul thought he needed to do no more than reiterate the suddenness of the Last Day. But, not long afterwards, he found that the Thessalonians did require to have the χρόνος και καιρός explained to them in outline (II. ii. 2 f.).

Ver. 2. "Esteems, referring to the teaching of Jesus on this crucial point, which Paul had transmitted to them (see Introduction)."

Ver. 3. οτι ο θεός, when the very words, "All's well," "It is all right," are on their lips.—αυτότατον, of an enemy suddenly appearing (Iscrat. Evag., § 58 τo τo βασιλείον αυτότατον, Herod. iv. 203).—αυτότατον, i.e., while the Day comes suddenly to Christians and unbelievers alike, only the latter are surprised by it. Christians are on the alert, open-eyed; they do not know when it is to come, but they are alive to any signs of its coming. Thus there is no incompatibility between this emphasis on the instantaneous character of the advent and the emphasis, in II. ii. 3 f., on the preliminary conditions.

Ver. 4. From the sudden and unexpected nature of the Last Day, Paul passes, by a characteristic inversion of metaphor in καιρός τός, to a play of thought upon the day as light. A double symbolism of ημέρα, as of καιρός, thus pervades 4-8. Lightfoot cites a very striking parallel from Eur., Iph. Taur., 1025-1026.

Ver. 5. The present age is utter night (τόκης καὶ ομοθυμία), as contemporary rabbis taught; the age to come is all day. Meantime faith is to be held fast through this night (cf. passages quoted in Schllter's die Sprache u. Heimat des vierten Evangelisten, 17, 18).
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ἡμέρας. οὖξ ὥρμην νυκτὸς *οὖξ ὥρμην νυκτὸς καθ φήμης. 6 "Αρα 'οὖξ μῆ καθ- εὑρίσκεται δύο ὥρμην νυκτὸς καθ φήμης. 7. οἱ γὰρ καθαύνιοις νυκτὸς καθαύνιοις οἵτινες φήμημεν, καὶ οἱ μεθυσκόμενοι νυκτὸς μεθυσκόμενοι, 8. ἡμέρας δὲ ἡμέρας ὁποῖες φήμημεν, 9. ἡμέρας δὲ ἡμέρας ὁποῖες φήμημεν. "θάρακα πίπτει καὶ ἀγάθης καὶ περικεφαλαίαν ἄλλα ἔσχατα σωτηρίας. 9. διὰ οὖξ μῆ καθ φήμης ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἑφηγήμεν ἀλλ' εἰς περιτευίςας σωτηρίας διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἑμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 10. τὸ ἀποθανόν- τος ὅπερ ἑμῶν. 11. εἶτε γρηγορῶμεν, εἶτε καθαύνιοις, 12. ἅμα σῦν ἀυτῷ ἔσχατιν. 11. διὰ τὸ παρακαλεῖν ἄλλους καὶ οἴκος δομείται, εἰς τὸν ἔνα, καθὼς καὶ ποιεῖται. 11 Λ.

Ver. 6. To be alert, in one's sober senses, is more than to be merely awake. ... faith and love are a unity; where the one goes the other follows. They are also not merely their own coat of mail, requiring no extraneous protection, but the sole protection of life against indolence, indifference and indulgence. They need simply to be used. If they are not used, they are lost, and with them the Christian himself. The transition to the military metaphor is mediated (as in Rom. xiii. 12, 13) by the idea of the sentry's typical vigilance.


Ver. 8. ἐνδυσάμενοι ἀνθρώποι κ.τ.λ., the thought of ii. 12, 13; the mutual love of Christians, which forms the practical expression of their faith in God, is their true fitness and equipment for the second advent. Faith and love are a unity; where the one goes the other follows. They are also not merely their own coat of mail, requiring no extraneous protection, but the sole protection of life against indolence, indifference and indulgence. They need simply to be used. If they...
even while stirring them up to further efforts.

Ver. 12. These προστάταις are not officials but simply local Christians like Jason, Secundus, and perhaps Demas (in whose houses the Christians met), who, on account of their capacities or position, had informally taken the lead and made themselves responsible for the welfare and worship of the new society. The organisation is quite primitive, and the triple description of these men's functions is too general to permit any precise delineation of their duties (cf. Lindsay’s The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries, pp. 122 f). κοινωνία denotes the energy and practical interest of these people, which is further defined by προστάταις (a term with technical associations, to which εἰς κυρίας is added in order to show that their authority rests on religious services) and νομοθέταις (= the moral discipline, perhaps of catechists, teachers and prophets). An instinct of rebellion against authority is not confined to any one class, but artisans and tradesmen are notorious for a tendency to suspect or depreciate any control exercised over them in politics or in religion, especially when it is exercised by some who have risen from their own ranks. The community at Thessalonica was largely recruited from this class, and Paul, with characteristic penetration, appeals for respect and generous appreciation towards the local leaders.

Ver. 13. “Regard them with a very special love for their works' sake” (so thorough and important it is). “Be at peace among yourselves” (instead of introducing divisions and disorder by any subordination or caring).

Ver. 14. The particular form of subordination at Thessalonica was idleness (for the contemporary use of εἰς in this sense, see Oxyrh. Pap. ii. 1901, p. 275). Similarly, in Olynth. iii. 11, Demosthenes denounces all efforts made to shield from punishment those ἀνακτορεῖς, i.e., those citizens who shirk active service and evade the State's call for troops.—Διλυγφύης = “faint-hearted” (under trial, i. 6, see references), ἀντίθετο (i.e., not in health only but in faith or position, Acts xx. 35), ἀντίθετος (i.e., not in health only but in faith or position, Acts xx. 35), ἀντίθετος (i.e., not in health only but in faith or position, Acts xx. 35). The mutual services of the community are evidently not to be left to the προστάταις, for Paul here urges on the rank and file the same kind of social duties as he implies were incumbent upon their leaders (cf. Phil. v. 12, 14). If ἀντίθετος here meant the προστάταις, it would have been more specifically defined. An antithesis between 12 and 14 would be credible in a speech, not in a letter.

Ver. 15. The special circumstances which called for forbearance (ver. 14) were likely to develop a disposition to retaliate upon those who displayed an ungenerous and insubordinate spirit (ἐχθροί, ἐχθροί); but the injunction has a wider range (ἐλεός, including their fellow-countrymen, ii. 14).

Ver. 16. To comment adequately upon these diamond drops (16-18) would be to outline a history of the Christian experience in its higher levels. προσευχηθείς, cf. Epict. i. 66 (“Had we understanding, ought we to do anything but sing hymns and bless the Deity and tell of His benefits?... What else can I do, a lame
old man, than sing hymns to God? ... I exhort you to join in this same song. "I
There is a thread of connection with the
foregoing counsel. The unswerving aim
of being good and doing good to all men,
is bound up with that faith in God's un
failing goodness to men which enables
the Christian cheerfully to accept the
disappointments and sufferings of social
life. This faith can only be held by
prayer, i.e., a constant reference of all
life's course to God, and such prayer must
be more than mere resignation; it im-
plies a spirit of unfailing gratitude to
God, instead of any suspicious or rebel-
ilious attitude.

Ver. 17. "Pray always, says the
Apostle; that is, have the habit of prayer,
turning your thoughts into acts by con-
necting them with the idea of the redeem-
ing God" (Coleridge, Notes on the Book
of Common Prayer), cp. iii. 11, v. 23.

Ver. 18. Chrysostom, who wrote: "οὐλο-
νον ἐγκαλομένου ἐνόχαριτε, τοῦτο φιλοσ-
φον ψυχή, gave a practical illustration
of this heroic temper by repeating, as he
died in the extreme hardships of an en-
faced and painful exile, δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ
τῶν ἁνακε. For thanksgiving even in
bereavement, cf. Aug., Conf., ix. 12;
and further, ibid., ix. 7 (tune hymni et
psalmi ut canentur, secundum morem
Orientalium partium, ne populus macrons
taxio contabesceret, institutum est).

Ver. 19. τοῦτο κ.τ.λ. The primary
reference is to ἐγκαλομένου, but the pre-
ceding imperatives are so closely bound
up with this, that it is needless to exclude
them from the scope of the Θεοῦ.—ἐν
Χ'. 4. This glad acceptance of life's rain
and sunshine alike as from the hand of
God, Jesus not only exemplified (cf. con-
text of μυμπαλ... τοῦ Κυρίου, i. 6)
but also enabled all who keep in touch
with him to realise. The basis of it
is the Christian revelation and expe-
rience; apart from the living Lord it is
neither conceivable nor practicable (cf.
R. H. Hutton's Modern Guides of English
Thought, pp. 122 f.).

Ver. 20. As ραξαπατο- was a special
function of the prophets in early Chris-
tian worship (cf. Did. x. 7), the transition
is natural. The local abuses of ecstatic
prophecy in prediction (2 Thess. ii. 2) or
what seem to be exaggerated counsels
of perfection (ver. 16 f.) must not be al-
lowed to provoke any reaction which
would depreciate and extinguish this vital
gift or function of the faith. Paul, with
characteristic sanity, holds the balance
even. Such enthusiastic outbursts are
neither to be despised as silly vapouring
nor to be accepted blindly as infallible
revelations. The true criticism of ἐρο-
τομάτων comes (ver. 21) from the Christian
conscience which is sensitive to the κα-
πρότερον, the οἶκοςδομή, or the
ἀνάλογα τῆς πίστεως (cf. Weizsäcker's
Apost. Age, ii. 270 f.). But this criticism
must be positive. In applying the stand-
ard of spiritual discernment, it must sift,
not for the mere pleasure of rejecting the
erroneous but with the object of retaining
what is genuine.

Ver. 22. A further general precept,
added to bring out the negative side of
κατέχετε, κ.τ.λ.—ποιητικος neut. abstract
= "of wickedness," as Gen. ii. 9 (τοῦ
εἰδώλων γυναικών καλατι καὶ ποιητοὶ).
ποιητικος κ.τ.λ., perhaps an allusion to the
manifold ways of going wrong (Arist.,
Νικ. Εϊκ., ii. 6. 14, τοῦ μεν ἀρατῆνεν
τικήν . . . τοῦ δὲ κατορθυνόν
μοναγάν).—

Ver. 23. ἀφίσση, with a special allu-
sion to the breaches of harmony and
charity produced by vice (cf. connection
of iii. 12, 13 and iv. 3 f.), indolence, im-
patience of authority or of defects in one
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25. 'Aδέλφοι, *προσέχεσθε περί ἡμῶν. 26. δισάσσασθε τοὺς

27. ἀνορκίζει* ὑμᾶς τὸν Κύριον, ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν ἁπατολὴν υπάρχεται ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν.

28. ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἑρωθοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν.

w As Num. xxxii. 19; Ps. xxxvii. 5 (LXX.). x Ver. 17. ii. iii. 1. y See on Rom. vii. 16; Cor. xxxvi. 20; and Justin's Apol. i. 65. z Clem. Alex. Pæd. III. ii. 81. a For constr. cf. Acts xii. 13. b Lk. iv. 18; Acts xv. 81; c Cor. iii. 15; Col. iv. 16. d II. ii. 15.

1 Read ἀνορκίζει [only here. N. T., = "adjure," strengthened form of ἀνορκίζω] with ABD*, min., Euth., Dam. (edd.). But omit ἀγωνία before ἀδελφοῖς with Ν*BDG, min., δ, ε, μ, μετ., Euth., Amb., Cassiod. (edd., exc. de Wette, Koch, Ellic., Weiss); the addition of ἀγωνία, like the omission of Πασερίς, "entrepants..." (Zimmer).

another (v. 13 f.), retaliation (v. 15), and differences of opinion (v. 19 f.) Such faults affect the σῶμα, the ψυχή and the νομιμά, respectively, as the sphere of that pure and the divine outcome is ἐλεήμονας, unemphatic genitive (as in iii. 10, 13, cf. Abbott's Johannine Grammar, 2559a) throwing the emphasis on the following word or words. τοῦ τῆς is put first, as the element in human nature which Paul held to be most directly allied to God, while ὑμῖν denotes as usual the individual life. The collocation of these terms is unusual but of course quite untechnical. ἀδελφοῖς has almost a proleptic tinge = "preserved entire, (so as to be) blameless at the arrival of," which has led to the substitution, in some inferior MSS., of ἀγωνία for τοῦ σωμάτος (cf. textual discussion in Amer. Jour. Theol., 1903, 453 f.). The construction is rather awkward, but the general sense is clear. With the thought of the whole verse compare Ps. Sol. xviii. 19: καθερισάμεν ἄθεοι Ἰσραήλ...ἐπὶ ἱμαῖν ἐκλογής ἔν ἀνδαί αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ, also the description of Abraham being preserved by the divine σωμα in Sap. x. 5 (ἐπερέασαν αὐτὸν ἐμμούς ὑπό).

Ver. 24. The call implies that God will faithfully carry out the process of ἀνορκίζει and τοῦτοις (cf. Phil. i. 6), which is the divine side of the human endeavour outlined in the preceding verse. Vv. 25—27. Closing words of counsel and prayer.

Ver. 26. Neither here, nor above at ver. 14, is there any reason to suppose that Paul turns to address the leaders of the local church (so e.g., Bornemann, Ellicot, Alford, Askwith, Zimmer, Light-foot, Weiss, Findlay) as though they were, in the name of the apostle(s), to convey the holy (i.e. not of convention or human passion) kiss, which betokened mutual affection (cf. Renan, S. v. 262, DCG. i. 935, and E. Bi. 4254) in the early Christian worship. This greeting by proxy is not so natural as the ordinary sense of the words; the substitution of τ. ἃ. τ. for the more common ἀλλήλων is intelligible in the light, e.g., cf. Phil. iv. 21; and it would be harsh to postulate so sharp a transition from the general reference of v. 25 and v. 28. Even in ver. 27 it is not necessary to think of the local leaders. While the epistle would naturally be handed to some of them in the first instance, it was addressed to the church; the church owned it and was held responsible for its public reading at the weekly worship.—τισιν, like the τῶν σας of ver. 26, simply shows Paul's desire to prevent the church from becoming, on any pretext, a clique or coterie. But the remarkable emphasis of the injunction points to a period when such public reading of an apostolic epistle was not yet a recognised feature in the worship of the churches. Paul lays stress upon the proper use of his epistle, as being meant not for a special set, but for the entire brotherhood (i.e., at Thessalonica, not, as Platt thinks, in Macedonia). See that every member gets a hearing of it at some meeting or other (ἀφετ., timeless aor.), and thus knows exactly what has been said. So Apoc. Bar. Barc. lxxvi.: "when therefore ye receive this my epistle, read it in your congregations with care. And meditate thereon, above all on the days of your fasts."
Chapter I.—Vv. 1-8. The address (i. 1, 2) is followed first by a thanksgiving (3-10) which passes into a prophetic piece of consolation, and then by a brief prayer (11, 12).

Ver. 3. περι ὑμῶν: Your thankless situation (4 f.) only throws into more brilliant relief your personal character and bearing under adverse circumstances. ἐστι is best represented by our colloquial "because," which includes both the causal and the objective senses of the word; what forms matter for thanksgiving is naturally the reason for thanksgiving. 

Ver. 4. The single article groups ἡμῖν and μαρτίος as a single conception = faith in its special aspect of patient endurance (cf.on Rev. xiii.10), faithful tenacity of purpose. M. Gebhardt, in his L'Italie Mystique (pp. 318 f.), observes that "the final word of Dante's belief, of that 'religion of the heart' which he mentions in the Convito, is given in the 24th canto of the Paradiso. He comes back to the very simple symbol of Paul, faith, hope and love; for him as for the apostle faith is at bottom simply hope." Faith is more than that to Paul, but sometimes hardly more. The Thessalonians are not to fear that they are holding a forlorn outpost. Neither man nor God overlooks their courage (cf. Plato's Theat., xxv., ἁθρόκεια δειονεῖται καὶ μὴ ἀνθρώπως φαῖγμα). Their founders and friends at a distance are watching with pride their resolute faith; while in God's
The text is a page from a book, likely a religious or spiritual work, discussing various points related to faith, hope, and the providence of God. It seems to be a translation or commentary on a passage from the New Testament, possibly Romans, given the references and content. The text is written in Greek and contains references to other passages in the Bible. It discusses the relationship between faith, hope, and the providence of God. The page contains verses from Romans and other books of the New Testament, such as 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, and Hebrews. The text also references other works for further study and interpretation.
gospel are, as the repetition of the article suggests, a different class of people, perhaps drawn both from Jews and pagans. But as Paul never seems to contemplate the idea of any Jew failing to hear the gospel (cf. Rom. x. 16 f.), the description here applies principally to them. — In τελειος φλογα, one of the most favourite realistic traits of the last judgment, in apocalyptic Judaism (cf. passages in Volz's Ἰουδαία Ἐσχατολογία, 285, 286); here it is simply a descriptive touch, which Paul does not pause to elaborate (cf. 1 Cor. iii.13). The rather " broad and inflated" language (Weizsacker) of the whole passage is probably due to the subject, more than to Paul's employment of Silvanus, himself a prophet (cf. Acts xv. 32 and 1 Thess. ii.12-16), as his amanuensis.

Ver. 9. The overwhelming manifestation of the divine glory sweeps from before it (pregnant 6.7th) into endless ruin the disobedient (Ps. lxxvi. 7) men who (see Moulton, 91 f.) shall pay the penalty of (see Prov. xxvii. 12, LXXX eternal destruction (the common apocalyptic belief, see Volz, Ἰουδαία Ἐσχατολογία, 286 f.).

Ver. 10. ἐπιστέφω, like the variant ἐπιστηθής, is suggested by πιστεύοντι (cf. a similar instance in iii. 3). The abrupt parenthesis ("you included—for") shows how Paul was thinking of the Thessalonians especially, while he depicted the bliss of the saints in general.— ἐνδοεῖ, in one sense they were to be a credit and honour to their apostles (1., ii. 19 f.); in another, they were a glory to Christ Himself, by their ripened character—a Johannine touch (cf. John xvii.10, and ver. 12 of this chapter; the parallel between τοῦτο πληρώμενον and John vi. 29 is verbal).—θεώρατο, = to be wondered at (by whom? cf. Ezek. xxxix. 21, Eph. iii. 10 ?) in (i.e., by reason of, on account of) believers; for a partial parallel to the phrase see Isa. lxii. 6 (καὶ ἐν τῷ πληρώματι αὐτῶν θαυμάσθησον). If ἀλλά . . . ῡμᾶς had been meant to give the reason for θαυμάσθησον (so Zimmer, Wohl.), Paul would probably have put God's witness instead of our witness, and expressed the idea unambiguously; the transition from the ἐπιστέφω to the special case of the Thessalonians becomes, on this construction, an anti-climax. The rhythmical swing of 7b-10 suggests a reminiscence or quotation of some early Christian liturgical hymn, perhaps one of the prophetic ἀράμα which he had heard at Corinth (τ Cor. xiv. 15, 26).

Ver. ii. καὶ κ.τ.λ., we pray as well as render thanks (ver. 3) for you. Unable any longer to give the Thessalonians their personal example and instructions—the time for that had passed (ἐπιστρεφόμενοι)—Paul and his colleagues can still pray for them. The duties of a preacher or evangelist do not cease with the utterance of his message. ἐπιστρεφόμενοι: one proof that God deemed them worthy of His kingdom lay in the discipline of
suffering by means of which He developed their patient faith (4, 5), but Paul here finds another proof of it in their broader development of moral character and vital religion (cf. 10). "πάθος" includes "πάθον" as well as "πάθος"; the prayer is for success to every practical enterprise of faith as well as for the satisfaction of every aspiration and desire after moral excellence. Compare Dante's "Paradiso", xviii. 58-60.

Ver. 2. "οὐ δὲ ἡμῖν, " purporting to come from us," goes with ἑπιστολὴ αὐτοῦ alone, for, while ἑπιστολὴ (Lünemann) every aspiration and desire after moral excellence might be grouped under it, πάθος can not. A visionary would claim personal, not borrowed, authority for his revelation. If ὅς ἦν, went with the preceding verbs (so Dods, Askwith, 92 f., Wohl. = "we are the true interpreters of Paul's meaning"), an active (as in ver. 3) not a passive turn might have been expected to the sentence. ἐν δὲ οὖν ἦν ὦτ Féναντίων: were already present". The cry was, δόρυς πάρασιτοι. The final period had already begun, and the Thessalonians were probably referred to their sufferings as a proof of this. Paul could only guess the various channels along which such misconception had flowed into the local church; either, ἀπελευθέρωσε, the hallucination of some early Christian prophet at Thessalonica; or ἱγνον, oral statement, based in part perhaps on some calculation of contemporary history or on certain logia of Jesus; or ἑπιστολή, i.e., the misinterpretation of some passage in the Thess. or in some lost letter of Paul. Possibly Paul imagined an epistle had been forged purporting to come from him or his companions, but we have no means of knowing whether his suspicion was well-founded or not. In any case the allusion is quite credible within his life-time. Such expectations may have been excited in a more or less innocent fashion, but Paul peremptorily (ver. 3) ranks them all as dishonest; he is concerned not with their origin but with their mis-
chievous effects upon the church (cf. Matt. xxiv. 4). Probably his suspicions of misinterpretation were due to his recent experiences in Galatia, though the Macedonian churches seem to have escaped any infusion of the anti-Pauline propaganda which soured Corinth not long afterwards.

Ver. 3. καλ. In any case, the apostasy and the appearance (so of Beliar, Asc. Isa., iv. 18) of the personal anti-Christ or pseudo-Christ form a single phenomenon. From the use of ἀποστασία as a Greek equivalent for Belial (LXX of 1 Kings xxii. 13, A, and Aquila), this eschatological application of the term would naturally flow, especially as it might well be represented by ἀντιδρομος τῆς ἀνομίας on the analogy of 2 Sam. xxii. 5. (LXX) = Ps. xviii. (xviii.). 4. Lawlessness was a cardinal trait in the Jewish figure of Belial, as was persecution of the righteous (l. 4, ii. 7, see Asc. Isa., ii. 5, etc.). The very order of the following description (ἀποστασία set between ἀνομίας and ἀντικαιμονίους, etc., unchronologically, but dramatically) suggests that this incarnation of lawlessness was a doomed figure, although he challenged and usurped divine prerogatives.

He is another Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. xi. 36, καὶ ὄψεται ἐν τῶν θεῶν καὶ στὴ τῶν δικαιωμάτων θρόνον λαλῆσαι; though Paul carefully safeguards himself against misconception by inserting λεγόμενον in his quotation of the words). This conception of a supernatural antagonist to Jesus Christ at the end is the chief element of novelty introduced by Paul, from Jewish traditions, into the primitive Christian eschatology. The recent attempt of Caligula to erect a statue of himself in the Temple at Jerusalem may have furnished a trait for Paul's delineation of the future Deceiver; the fearful impiety of this outburst had sent a profound shock through Judaism, which would be felt by Jewish Christians as well. But Paul does not identify the final Deception with the Imperial cultus, which was far from a prominent feature when he wrote. His point is that the last pseudo-Messiah or anti-Christ will embody all that is profane and blasphemous, every conceivable element of impiety; and that, instead of being repudiated, he will be welcomed by Jews as well as pagans (cf. Acts xii. 21, 22).

Ver. 5. It was no after-thought, on Paul's part (the singular rules out Spitta's idea that Timothy wrote this apocalyptic piece). Nor is it an unsynchrony of his teaching. Especially since the days of Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. vii., xi.; cf. Gunkel's Schöpfung u. Chaos, 221 f.), a more or less esoteric and varied Jewish tradition had pervaded pious circles, that the last days would be heralded by a proud uprising against God. The champion of this movement was no longer the Dragon or cosmic opponent of God, as in the older mythology (though traces of this belief still linger), but an individual (ὁ ἄνωμος) who incorporates human wickedness (τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας) and infernal cunning in his own person to sow dissension and suppress the worship of the true God, by claiming divine honours for himself.
He is Satan's messiah, an infernal caricature of the true messiah. Cf. Asc. Isa., iv. 6, where it is said that Belial "will do and speak like the Beloved and he will say, I am God and before me there has been none." Ver. 6. Well now, you know what restrains him from being manifested (coming fully into play and sight) before his appointed season. Now probably goes with ὑπάρχειν, not with τὸ κατέχειν (as e.g., in John iv. 18, so Olshausen, Bisping, Wieseler, Zahn, Wrede), and καὶ ὑπάρχει not temporal, but "a mere adverb of passage" (Lunemann, Alford) in the argument (so with ἀλλὰ in Acts iii. 17). Were ὑπάρχει temporal, it would mean (a) that during the interval between Paul's teaching and the arrival of this letter fresh circumstances (so Zimmer) had arisen to throw light on the thwarting of the adversary. But of this there is no hint whatsoever in the context. Or (b), preferably, it would contrast with the following ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ καιρῷ, as an equivalent for "already" (Hofmann, WohI., Milligan, etc.).

Ver. 7. γὰρ, explaining ὑπάρχειν. The κατέχειν is a fact of present experience and observation, which accounts for the ἀναγκαία being as yet a μυστήριον, operating secretly, and not an ἀποκάλυψις. Paul does not say by whom (the ἀποκάλυψις himself?) the restraint is removed.—μόνον, the hiatus must be filled up with some phrase like "it cannot be manifested". Its real character and full scope are not yet disclosed. For ἀπρέα = ὑπάρχει, cf. Nügeli's note in der Wortwelt des Apostels Paulus (36, 37), and for omission of ὑπάρχει, Blase, § 65, 10.

Ver. 8. δι', κ.τ.λ., his career is short and tragic. The apparition (cf. 1 Tim. vi. 14, etc., Thieme, Die Inschriften von Magnesia, 34 f.) of Jesus heralds his overthrow.—ἐμφανίζεσθαι = sudden appearance of a deity at some crisis (cf. Diod., Siculi, i. 23), as the god in 2 Macc. ii. 21, iii. 24, etc. "In hieratic inscriptions the appearing of the god in visible form to men is commonly expressed by the same word" (Ramsay, Exp. Ti., x. 208). This passage, with its fierce messianic anticipation of the adversary's doom interrupts the description of his mission which is resumed (in ver. 9) with an account of the inspiration (κατά), method (ἐν) and results (ver. 10), of this evil advent.

Galen (de facult. nat., 1. 2, 4-5) physiologically defines ἐνεργεῖα as the process of activity whose product is ἐνέργεια. The impulse to ἐνεργεῖα is ἐνέργεια. The δύναμις of this supernatural delusion is especially manifested in signs and wonders. The power of working miracles in order to deceive people (ver. 11) was an accepted trait in the Jewish and early Christian ideas of such eschatological opponents of God (cf. on Rev. xiii.13, and Friedländer's Geschichte d. jud. Apolog., 493 f.).

Ver. 10. ἀγάπη (cf. ver. 12) here, as Luke xi. 42, with obj. gen. Cf. Asc. Isa., iv. 15, 16: "And He will give rest [above, ch. i. 7] to the godly whom He shall find in the body in this world, and to all who because of their faith in Him have executed Beliar and his kings". ἀλήθεια, not = "truth" in the general sense of the term (Lünemann, Lightfoot, Zimmer) but = "the truth of the gospel" (as usual in Paul) as against ἀξίωσις (Rom. i. 15 f., ii. 8). The apostle holds that the refusal to open one's mind and heart to the gospel leaves life a prey to moral delusion; judicial infatu-
tion is the penalty of disobedience to the truth of God in Christ.

Ver. 11. An echo of the primitive Semitic view (still extant, cf. Curtis's *Prim. Sem. Religion To-Day*, pp. 69 f.), that God may deliberately lead men astray, or permit them to be fatal-ly infatuated, as a penal discipline (cf. Ps. Sol. viii. 15; Test. XII. Patr. Dan. ix.). A modern world would view the same pheno-menon as willful scepticism issuing in super-stition, or in inability to distinguish truth from falsehood. Delusions of this kind cannot befall believers (cf. Mark xiii. 22; Test. Issachi. iii.). In Test. Napht. iii. 30 has *πνεῦμα καλής* (cf. Test. Levi. iii. 3, etc.).

Ver. 12. Like the prophet John half a century later (xiii. 2 f.), Paul distinguishes his anti-Chris-tian or anticritic hero from the Satan whose campaign he executes; but, unlike John, the apostle has nothing to say about the fate of Satan. The tools and the victims of Satan are destroyed, and they alone.— *εὐθὸς* not with *ἐν* as usual, but with the less common (cf. e.g., 1 Macq. i. 43, καὶ ἐντὸς Ἰσραήλ ἐδειρνάτω τὸν λαὸς ἀνδρός) dative. "And the greater number of those who shall have been associated together in order to receive the Beloved he [i.e., Beliar] will turn aside after him" (Asc. Isa., iv. 9).

Ver. 13. God has chosen you (*ἐξάπτω*, another LXX expression, implying that Christians had now succeeded to the cherished privileges of God's people) to be saved, instead of visiting you with a deadly delusion (10, 11) which ends in judgment (12); your discipline is of sanc-tification (contrast 128) and belief in what is true (contrast 11, 12a), these forming the sphere and the scope (cf. 1 Tim. ii. 15, and for *ἐν ἐνέσχωμι* in this sense Ps. Sol. viii. 33) for salvation being realised. Those who are sanctified and who truly believe shall be saved. Cf. ver. 14 and *Apol. Bar.*, liv. 21: "in fine enim saeculi uincti erit de iis qui improbe egerunt, iuxta improbatitatem eorum, et glorificabis fideles iuxta fidem eorum".— *πνεῦμα θεόν* may be either (a) = "wrought by the (holy) Spirit" (cf. 1 Peter i. 2), the divine side of the human *πνεῖμα, or (b) = "of the spirit" (cf. I. v. 23; 2 Cor. vii. 1), as of the heart (i., iii. 13). The absence of the article in *πνεῦμα* against the former rendering, but the latter is more probable in view of the context; the process of *ἐνέσχωμι* involves a love of the truth and a belief in it (i.e., in the true gospel) which is opposed to religious delusions (cf. ii. 2).

Ver. 14. To be saved ultimately (12) is to possess or rather to share the glory of Christ (cf. i., ii. 12).

Ver. 15. The divine purpose does not work automatically, but implies the co-operation of Christians—in this case, a resolute steadfastness resting on loyalty to the apostolic gospel. In view of passages like I Cor. xi. 23, xv. 5, it is gratui-tous to read any second-century passion for oral apostolic tradition into these words or into those of iii. 6.
III. 1. *Τὸ λογικὸν, *προσευχῆσθαι, ἀδελφοί, περὶ ἕμων, ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ *Κυρίου *τρέχῃ καὶ *δοξάζηται καθὼς καὶ *πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 2. καὶ ἵνα ἐμφανίζηται ἀπὸ τῶν *ἀνώτατων καὶ τοῦ ποιμένος ἀνθρώπων. Ο ἀγαθὸς ὁ πάντων ἡ *πίστις. 3. *πιστὸς ὑμᾶς ἢ διὸν ὁ Κύριος, *ηρεμήσετε ὑμᾶς καὶ *φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιμένος. 4. *πεποίημεν δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ τῇ *εὐφ. ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ἡ παραγγέλλων τοιετε ἤ καὶ τοῖσι θετε. 5. ὁ δὲ τῆς ἱερ νομοθετήτου πεπραγμένος, ὁ ἀντιφαίρετος τοῦ ποιμένος. 6. τοῦ ὑμῶν. 7. ὁ πόρος τῶν ἐφεσίων ὡς ὁ πέμπτος ὄντως, τὸ ἐπιτιθήμα τοῦ ποιμένος. 8. Πλούτω ὑμῖν ἡ ἡπείρνα τὰ *παρακαλῶν ὑμᾶς. 9. καὶ ὅτι ἡ παραγγέλλων τοιετε ἤ καὶ τοῖσι θετε. 10. ὁ δὲ τῆς ἱερ νομοθετήτου πεπραγμένος, ὁ ἀντιφαίρετος τοῦ ποιμένος.
q: 1 Chron. Kūp(ov) tone and the crisp detail of the following paragraph. Παραγγελία, like ἀπαραγγελία, has a military tinge (cf. on I. iv. 2, and Dante’s Paradiso, xii. 37-45). στελαν, for his own sake (ver. 14), as well as for yours: a service as well as a precaution. The collective action of his fellow-Christians, besides preserving (1 Cor. v. 6) themselves from infection—and nothing is so infectious as an insubordinate, indolent, interfering spirit—will bring home to him a sense of his fault. Light-footedly cites the παράγγελμα of Germanicus to his mutinous troops: “dis- cede a contact, ac diutiae turbidos: id stabile ad paenitentiam, id fidei vinculum erit” (Tacit. Annal., i. 43).—The ἀπαραγγελίαι of 6-12 are excitable members who "break the ranks" by stopping work in view of the near advent, and thus not only disorganise social life but burden the church with their maintenance. The apostles had not been idle or hare-brained enthusiasts, and their example of an orderly, self-supporting life is held up as a pattern. Insubordination of this kind is a breach of the apostolic standard of the Christian life, and Paul deals sharply with the first symptoms of it. He will not listen to any pious pleas for this kind of conduct.

Ver. 8. Paul’s practice of a trade and emphasis upon the moral discipline of work are quite in keeping with the best Jewish traditions of the period. Compare e.g., the saying of Gamaliel II. (Kiddush. i. 11): “He who possesses a trade is like a fenced vineyard, into which no cattle can enter, etc.”—Supo ev = “for nothing, gratis”.

Ver. 9. The apostles had the right to be maintained by the church, but in this case they had refused to avail themselves of it. The Thessalonians are not to misconstrue their action.

Ver. 10. Precept as well as example (DCG, ii. 2). As is perhaps implied in ἔτι, an . . . διδότω is a maxim quoted by the apostle, not from some unwritten saying of Jesus (Resch) but from the Jewish counterparts, based on Gen. iii. 9, which is cited by Weiss, especially Beresch. rabba, xiv. 12: “ut, si non laborat, non manducet”. Cf. Carlyle’s Chartism, chap. iii ("In all ways it needs, especially in these times, to be proclaimed
the disturbing effect of persecution, (b) the tension produced by the thought of the advent of Christ, and (c) as an outcome of the latter, irregularity and social disorganisation in the community.

Ver. 13. ἐπίσκοποι ἰδιοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν συνοικίων, whoever else drops out of the ranks of industrious, steady Christians.—μὴ ἐγκαθίστατε, implying that they had not begun to grow slack (Moulton, 122 f.). Perhaps with a special allusion to the presence of people who abused charity; generous Christians must not forego liberality and help, arguing that it is no use to succour any because some will take advantage of the church's largess.

Ver. 14. ἐπιτίμησις, implying that the matter ends with this letter (Weiss); Paul has spoken his last word on the subject. With this and the following verse, cf. Did. xv. 3 (Ἀπαγγέλτω ἡ ἡγεμόνια μὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ἀνάμεσα συγκροτοῦσιν μὴ τοῦ γένους μηδὲ τῷ ἡμῶν μὴ ἑτοιμάσῃ, οὐκ ἐν συνεργασίᾳ) — ἐπιτίμησις, "be ashamed" (= αἰδεύεσθαι as often).

Ver. 15. Disapproval, as a means of moral discipline, loses all its effect if the offender does not realise its object and reason (γνωστέον), or if it is tainted with personal hostility.—ὁ δέηλητος. Compare the fine saying of Rabbi Chanan ben Gamaliel on Deut. xxv. 3, that after the punishment the offender is expressly called brother, not sinner.

Ver. 16. ἀπειθεῖτε, as opposed to these fears and troubles of the church. Κύριος is probably, in accordance with Paul's usual practice, to be taken as = Jesus Christ, but the language of ver. 5 and of


k Only here in N.T. 1 i.e., not 1 Thess.(so Lünemann, Schmiedel, Schäfer) but (so Pelt, Lag., Findlay, etc.) the present, Win. § 13, 4. a Only here in N.T. o Cf. 1 Cor. v. 9.f. o Cf. Tit. ii. 8. p Cf. Job xix. 11 (XXII). q Cf. 1. v. 14, 1 Cor. iv. 14, and 2 Cor. ii. 7. 1 Opt. without Δ, as in 1 Peter i. 21; Hellenistic opt., Win. § 14. 10. 1 s ὁ = "continually" Lk. xxiv. 53. Ps. Sol. ii. 40, etc.
t Emphatic: ὁ Κύριος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.

17. ὁ ἀναπαύγω τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου, ὁ ἐστὶ σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ

the steady epistolē ὁ oútw γράφω.

members.

18. η χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἡσυχίου Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.

Cf. on 1 Cor. xvi. 21, and 2

Cor. xiii. 13. V Autograph as means of recognising authenticity, cf. Abbott, John Gram. 2691, and Cicero's Catil. iii. 5. Plautus, Bacch. iv. 4, 78, etc.

I., v. 23, makes the reference to God quite possible.

Vv. 17, 18. Conclusion. Paul now takes the pen from his amanuensis, to add the salutation in his own handwriting for the purpose of authenticating the epistle (otherwise in 1 Cor. xvi. 21). This, he observes, is the sign-manual of his letters (cf. ii. 2), i.e., the fact of a personal written greeting at the close, not any form of words (like ver. 18), or the use of the word "grace," or "certum quendam nexum litterarium" (Grotius).

The precaution is natural, in view of his suspicion about unauthorised communications. Compare "the σημεῖον (generally contracted into σεμ.) with which so many of the Egyptian papyrus-letters and ostraca close" (Milligan, p. 130), or the postscript in one's own handwriting (ἔγγραφον) which guaranteed an ancient letter (Deissmann: Licht vom Osten, 105). μετὰ (cf. ver. 16), the divine presence is realised through the experience of Christ's grace.
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INTRODUCTION TO THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

PRELIMINARY.

Those who propose to read this exposition of the Pastoral Epistles may find it convenient to be apprised at the outset of the conclusions assumed in it concerning the genuineness and integrity of the Letters. After a careful review of the arguments adduced by the traditionalists and the anti-traditionalists, and after the devotion of considerable thought to a minute study of the Epistles themselves, the present writer finds it easier to believe that St. Paul was the author of them, as they have come down to us, than that a Paulinist (assuming that there ever was a special school of Pauline thought), sometime between 90 and 120 A.D., worked up a few fragments of genuine letters of his master into 2 Timothy and Titus, and then composed 1 Timothy in imitation of his own style. This second alternative represents, broadly speaking, the theory of the anti-traditional school of critics.

The only serious difficulties which preclude an unhesitating acceptance of these letters, as they stand, as the composition of St. Paul, lie in (1), the style, which, although fundamentally not un-Pauline, presents undeniably certain obvious peculiarities which are not found in any of the ten other Pauline letters, and (2) in the writer's outlook on religion—in particular, the relations of God and Christ respectively to man's salvation, and the place of faith and works in the spiritual life—which seems to be that of one who had travelled on the Pauline road (assuming that there was a public highway that could be so described), further than we should have deemed it possible in the years—few at most—which separate the close of St. Paul's life from the date of the Epistles of the first Roman captivity. The main features of the landscape are the same, but the distances are different.

On the other hand, this altered theological outlook, as well as the writer's concern about Church institutions, is responsible for the
peculiar religious phraseology in so far as it does indeed differ from features common to the earlier groups of letters; so that whatever considerations help us to account for the former change will also aid in the solution of the problem of style and vocabulary.

The other arguments against the Pauline authorship, based on: (3) the impossibility of fitting into the Acts of the Apostles the personal and local references in the Pastorals, (4) the alleged marks of the second century in the heresy which is combated, and (5) the allegation that the details of Church organisation reflect the policy of the dominant party of the early second century—are, it is believed, assumptions for which there is no foundation. And, in fact, (4) and (5) are not now insisted on by many of the anti-traditional school, and will not be dealt with in this introduction.

Before passing on to a brief discussion of the style and the historical setting of the Epistles, it will not be amiss to suggest some considerations which may help, not indeed to solve the problem before us, but to enable us to believe that it would not be a problem at all could we only know a little more about the personal history of St. Paul, and of the inner life of the Christian Church in the first century. In the first place, we must remember that it was a period of intensely vigorous and rapidly developing Church life. We are so much accustomed to regard as normal Christian communities in which nine-tenths of the professed adherents are spiritually only half alive, that we find it difficult to realise what manner of thing Church life was when everyone took a keen interest in his religion, and the spiritual life of every Church member was full and strong, even if not always consistent. The years that elapsed between Pentecost and 100 A.D. represent the infancy of the Church; and we all know how momentous in their after consequences are a child's experiences during the first five or six years of its life. But the first century was even more significant for the subsequent history of the Church than is infancy in the case of a human being. The development of the Church, as we experience it, at least in Europe, is slow; looking back thirty years we can indeed perceive some change; but in the first century a year wrought what it now takes a generation to effect. What we know of the rapid development in applied science in our own day supplies us with an experience somewhat analogous to the growth of the Christian Church—doctrinally and institutionally—in the first century. We have seen in the space of ten, or even five, years a complete revolution in men's notions as to what is possible and reasonable in the rate of travel on the high road or in the air.
It was while the Church was thus rapidly taking shape that St. Paul came into it; and, if we may judge from the extant evidence, he quickly became the most powerful constructive force in it. But there were other agencies at work, human, as well as Divine and divinely inspired, and St. Paul was himself wrought on and shaped as much, or more, than he shaped others. Always a student but never a recluse, he shared to the full the common life of the un-exclusive early Church. He did not "dwell apart," though always conscious that his innermost life was "hid with Christ in God." And not only did his life move with the Church's life, but it was brought into close touch with every possible human experience—except those of domestic life—to a degree rarely equalled by any other man. The label that correctly describes the contents of a given human personality to-day may be, in some cases, not misleading five or ten years hence; but St. Paul was not one of these constant quantities. His personality was not that of a Milton, self-determining, holding on its course "like a star," unaffected by the storms of the lower atmosphere; he was as sympathetic, and therefore open to impressions from without, as if he had been a weak man. Of this impressionableness and craving for sympathy we have abundant evidence in the Epistles that are universally acknowledged to be genuine. Such a man is likely to undergo changes in mental outlook, to become possessed by fresh ideals and conceptions, so as to bewildер less agile minds; and, of course, new thoughts require for their expression words and phrases for which the man had no use before. In the case of St. Paul, this is no imaginary supposition. The difference between the Paul of Philippians and the Paul of 1 Timothy is not greater than, perhaps not as great as, between the Paul of Thessalonians and the Paul of Ephesians. The fact just noticed should put us on our guard against the easy assumption that the normal Pauline presentation of the relations between God and man is that found in the central group of his Epistles: Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians.

There is, however, a difference between the Pastorals and the earlier letters for which the lapse of time alone cannot account, and that is a diminution in force. The letters to Timothy and Titus are certainly of apostolic quality; the ordinary reader, and still more the student, who compares them with the best of the sub-apostolic literature, can at once perceive the difference between what is inspired and what is merely interesting, edifying, and even noble. Nevertheless, we miss in the Pastorals the exuberant vigour, the reserved strength of the earlier letters. The explanation of this may well be
that before St. Paul wrote these letters he had ceased to be an elderly, and had, perhaps rapidly, become an old man. There is nothing impossible in this supposition. The surprising thing is that it has not been more generally recognised as a probable factor in the solution of the problem presented by the Pastorals. When we think of the intensity with which St. Paul had lived his life—always at high pressure—and what a hard life it had been, it would be a marvel indeed if old age with its diminished powers had not come suddenly upon him.

We hold then that the author of the Pastorals was Paul; but "Paul the aged"; much more aged, and more truly so, than when he penned his note to Philemon. We may observe, as a sign of old age, a certain inertia which makes him satisfied to express his meaning in habitual, almost stereotyped, words and phrases; words and phrases which are only open to the objection—in itself unreasonable—that we have heard them quite recently. The brain no longer responds to the will to utter "words that burn"; and it seems as fitful in the origination of "thoughts that breathe". It is not that St. Paul is not truly inspired in the Pastorals. These letters satisfy the practical test of inspiration, viz., their yield of matter for thought is never exhausted by study. There are, moreover, several passages in them that have touched the hearts of Christians in every age as nearly as anything the apostle ever wrote. But even in these, perhaps more in these than in less striking paragraphs—for ordinary details of Church life must be dealt with in ordinary language—we detect a failing of power in comparison with the Paul of the earlier letters: the inspiration is as true, but it is not as strong; the heart and arteries and veins do their duty, but the blood does not course so quickly as in the days of youth. To put it quite plainly: the difficulties that meet the student of the Pastoral Epistles lie rather in the logical connexion of the paragraphs than in the profundity of the thoughts expressed in them; and whatever obscurity there may be in some of the expressions used is due in nearly every case to the meagreness of our information concerning the circumstances of the writer and of the Church.

In the earlier epistles, on the contrary, it often happens that the apostle's thoughts and conceptions are too great for expression. He does not, indeed cannot, formulate them precisely; he gives them the most adequate expression he can; and the Holy Spirit has ever since been leading the Church to a constantly increasing comprehension of them. But in the Pastorals we do not meet any such struggles between thought and language. We are never conscious
that we are present at the birth of some mighty principle which can reach maturity only at the end of time. Great theological statements concerning man's salvation—not of the relation of Christ to the universe—are formulated, not daringly sketched; the conceptions of the mutual relations of God and man which are involved in these statements are not new to the author; he has mastered them completely, and presents them with a finished expression which leaves the reader satisfied. Take, for example, the statement of the width of God's saving purposes in 1 Tim. ii. 4-6; the summary of the working out of the Incarnation in 2 Tim. i. 9, 10; the analysis of the saving process in Tit. iii. 4-7. Here we have theological principles in their classical expression; they do not need exegesis, they only demand to be "marked, learned, and inwardly digested".

Again, the apostle, in these letters is not only not creative; he is displayed to us as receptive of the thoughts of other makers of Christian theology, his contemporaries. When St. Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles, his own work as an originating constructive theologian had come to an end; and there comes into clear view—what had been hitherto veiled—the effect on him of the action of the religious life of the communities in which he lived. It is a truth, obvious when stated, yet sometimes ignored, that the thoughts about religion current in the Christian Society of the first century, had not been generated only by St. Paul, but by St. John and St. Peter and others whose names and achievements we can only conjecture. When we were young, we used to picture the Palestine of the patriarchs as a land in which no person or thing except Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and their flocks were of any significance; they dominated the landscape as do the saints in medieval pictures. When we grew older, it was almost disturbing to one's faith to realise that to the busy merchants and peasants of Palestine, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were not persons of unusual importance. Yet, as always happens, the truer account, unpalatable at first, is found to be more suggestive and helpful than the older fancy. In like manner, a realisation that St. Paul did not dominate the Church of his time, as his history in the Acts and his epistles so largely dominate the New Testament, will be found a helpful consideration.

The Church is a greater thing than the greatest saint or theologian in it; and St. Paul could not have helped, even if he would, being influenced by the Christianity, as actually lived, of the men and women around him; and that in three ways at least. (1) His own theology came back to him not quite the same as it had come from his brain. It is not only the elements of matter that are subject to
reaction in consequence of fusion; the same natural law operates in the interaction of the thoughts of a thoughtmaker with the minds of those to whom his thoughts are communicated. And, if we may carry on the same analogy, the Church of St Paul's time was unable to take up, to hold in solution, the whole of the Pauline theology; a considerable amount of it was held in suspension to be absorbed gradually by the Church in the course of the ages. (2) Again, as has just been pointed out, the religious thought of the Christian Society in which St. Paul lived was fed and stirred by other apostles, of whom we can name St. John and St. Peter. It is surely not unreasonable to suppose that these apostles spoke before they wrote, that what they published was the most perfect expression attainable by them of what they had been speaking about during the whole of their ministry; that, in fact, Johannine literature was, for the Church of the first century, the final presentation, not the origination, of Johannine thought and expression. Is it too much to expect that those who study the writings contained in the New Testament should cease to think of the authors of them as solitaries who had no other means but books of acquiring ideas or a vocabulary, and who, in turn, only influenced the thought and phraseology of the men of their time by books or treatises composed at the close of their lives. It is strange that men cannot see the Church, the Society which conditioned, was not conditioned by, St. Paul, St. John and St. Peter. This consideration is intended to prepare the reader to be not astonished or perplexed by the occasional Johannine turns of phrase that occur in the Pastorals, and which are noted in the course of the exposition. (3) Furthermore, it must not be thought strange that the Providence of God, the Holy Spirit Who guides the Church, should have called the apostle Paul almost wholly away from thoughts of the Church's place in history and in the universe to the administration of, and provision for, the daily needs of the Church as actually experienced by man. Our own generation has not been without examples of men summoned from the library of the "great house" into less obviously inspiring chambers, which serve the more material, but not less necessary, needs of the household. Christians who think of the Church as a visible Divine Society with a life on earth continuous to the end of time, cannot think that St. Paul as reflected in the Pastorals is less worthy of admiration than St. Paul as reflected in Romans. Nor will they be offended if they find that his new preoccupation with ordinary Church life has left a trace on his idiom; if, it may be, he has caught some of the current
phrases of ordinary religious society. He is not less intelligible to Timothy, or less truly himself.

**THE STYLE OF THE LETTERS.**

It was noticed in the beginning of this Introduction that the consideration of most weight against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is the style of the composition, which differs from that of any of the groups of the other ten Pauline letters—the genuineness of which is here assumed—by (a) the recurrence in them of certain, almost stereotyped, forms of expression, (b) by a general difference in the structure of sentences, and (c) by the absence from them of alleged characteristic Pauline words. These three sorts of variation are here enumerated in the order of their importance. No fair-minded traditionalist will be disposed to minimise the gravity of the problem presented by these indisputable facts. On the other hand, these acknowledged peculiarities must not be allowed to obscure the equally undoubted fact that the Epistles present not only as many characteristic Pauline words as the writer had use for, but that, in the more significant matter of turns of expression, the style of the letters is, as has been stated before, fundamentally Pauline. This will be evident from an inspection of the references. Perhaps it is true to say that the positive stylistic peculiarities of the letters—the large number of unusual words, the recurrent phraseology—deprive of its just weight the counter argument based on its admittedly Pauline element, just because this is normal, and does not strike the eye. It is at least a strong argument on the traditionalist side, that the un-Pauline style of the Pastorals was not commented on by the early Greek Christian critics, as was the un-Pauline style of Hebrews, and the un-Johannine style of the Apocalypse. On the other hand, the peculiarities of expression are not such as a clever imitator of St. Paul's style would introduce.

Taking up, in the first place, the recurrent words, terms and phrases, it will be convenient to divide them into three categories.

A. Terms, or phrases, of the religious life of the Christian Society.
B. Polemical phraseology in reference to false teaching.
C. Favourite terms, or expressions, of the author's.

It is not pretended that this classification can be carried out consistently; but it seemed to be worth attempting. In particular it

1 Dean Bernard, *Past. Ep.*., p. xxxvi., notes that the ἀποκληρονομεῖσα amount to 176, a number “proportionately twice as great as in any other of St. Paul's letters.”
may deserve consideration whether we have not presented to us, in
the style of the Pastorals, a new, but not the less true, aspect of St.
Paul as a writer, no longer creating a Christian terminology, but
freely making use of the phraseology he heard around him, towards
the formation of which he had been a principal, but not the only, con-
tributor. On the other hand, in so far as this supposition is true it
precludes our making use of the occurrence of certain phrases and
words in extant early writings, as proofs that the authors of those
writings had read the Pastoral Epistles.

In the following list of terms and phrases, a = 1 Timothy; b = 2
Timothy; c = Titus; the numbers indicate the number of occurrences
of the term or phrase in the epistle. When the term or phrase is
not peculiar to the Pastorals, a reference is given to its occurrence
elsewhere, or “etc.” is added.

**Terminology of the Christian Society.**

a, b, c.

- ἡ ἀλήθεια, in a technical sense: a, 3; b, 4; c (2 Cor. iv. 2, etc.).
- ἡ διδασκαλία: A, The body of doctrine; absolutely, or with epithets
  (see ἡ ἀλήθεια): a, 4; b, 2; c, 3.
- ἡ διδασκαλία: B, The act of teaching: a, 3; b, c (Rom. xii. 7).
- πίστες, fides quae creditur: a, 8; b, 2; c, 3.
- πίστες [κ.], ἀγάπη: a, 4; b, 2; c (1 Thess. iii. 6, v. 8).
- πίστες, ἀγάπη, ὀπομοί: a, [b], c.
- ἡ ὁμιλίουσα διδασκαλία: a, b, c, 2. ὁμιλίουσα λόγος: a, b. ὁμιλί-
- ἐνίγμωσις ἀληθείας and ἐπιγινώκειν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ: a, 2; b, 2; c
  (Heb. x. 26; cf. Philem. 6).
- [κ.] εὐσέβεια: a, 7; b. κατ' εὐσέβειαν: a, c. εὐσέβεις ἔξιν: b, c.
  εὐσέβειν: a (Acts, 4; 2 Pet. 5).
- σωφρονίς: a, c, 3. σωφρονίσων: c (Mark v. 15; Rom. xii. 3; 2 Cor. v.
  (Acts xxvi. 25).
- οὐν αὐτῶν: a, b, c.
- ἐπιφάνεια: a, b, 3; c (2 Thess. ii. 8) (ἐπιφάνειαν: c, 2; Luke i. 79;
- ὠφλιμος: a, 2; b, c.
- διάβολοι, adj.: a, b, c.
- δρείτεθαι: a, b, 4; c, 2, etc., but not Paul.

a, b.

**συνείδησις καθάρα: a, b (συνείδ. ἀγάθη: a, 2; Acts xxiii. 1; 1 Pet.
  iii. 16, 21).**
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καθαρὰ καρδία: a, b.
pίστις αυτόκριτος: a, b.
pίστις κ. ἀγάπη ἢ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: a, b.
pίστις ἢ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: a, b; etc.
καλὸς: qualifying adj. (not incl. καλὸν ἔργον): a, 9; b, 3 (esp.
kαλῇ στρατείᾳ, a, or στρατιώτης, b, καλὸς ἄγων, a, b); etc., but not
Paul.
pαγὶς: a; τοῦ διαβόλου: a, b.
φεύγε· διώκε· δικαιοσύνη... πίστιν ἀγάπην: a, b.
ἀγωνίζομαι τὸν καλὸν ἄγων: a, b.
παραθήκην φιλάσσειν: a, b, 2.
παρακολουθεῖν διδασκαλία: a, b.
ἀνθρώπος [τ.] Θεοῦ: a, b.
a, c.
καλὸν ἔργον, καλὰ ἔργα: a, 4; c, 4; etc., but not Paul.
σεμνὸς: a, 2; c (Phil. iv. 8); or σεμνότης: a, 2; c.
σωτήρ (of God the Father, not incl. Tit. ii. 13): a, 3; c, 3.
b, c.
eἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἄγαθον ἡτοιμασμένον: b.
pρὸς... ἐξηρτισμένος: b.
... ἀδόκιμοι: c.
... ἐτοίμους: c.

PECULIAR TO ONE LETTER.

ἀπόδεκτον ἐνόπλον τ. Θεοῦ: a, 2.
μᾶς γυναικὸς ἁρπή: a, 2 (ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή: a,).
ἐπιλαβέσθαι τῆς ζωῆς: a, 2.
μακάριος (of God): a, 2.
τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως, οὐ τῆς εὐσεβείας: a, 2.
pίστις κ. ἀγάπη κ. ἀγασμός, οὐ δικαιία: a, 2.
ἐπαιχύνεσθαι τι οὐ τιμά: b, 3 (Rom. i. 16, and five other ins.).
ἐκείνη ἢ ἡμέρα (Last Day): b, 3 (Matt. 2; Luke, 3; 2 Thess. 1).
καλὸν ἔργων προστασθαι: c, 2.

POLEMICAL PHRASEOLOGY.

ἀλθεία: ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀλθείας: a. περὶ τῆς ἀλθείαν ἡσόχησαν:
b. μετάροιαν εἰς ἐπίγραμμα ἀλθείας: b. μηδέποτε εἰς ἐπίγραμμα ἀλθ.
ἀλθείαν ὑπάρχειν: b. ἀνάλυσται τῇ ἀλθείᾳ: b. ἀπὸ τῆς ἀλθείας τ.
ἀκοὴν ἀποστρέφωσιν: b. ἀποστρεφομένων τῆς ἀλθείαν: c.

VOL. IV.
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θησαν ἀπὸ τ. πιστεῖς: a. Cf. 1 Tim. i. 5, 19.
ἀστοχεῖν: a, 2; b. See ἀλήθεια and πιστὶς.
ἀνατρέποντι τινὲς πιστὶν: b. δήλος ὅλους ἀνατρέποντι: c. Cf. ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ τῶν ἀκούστων, b.
βεβηλὸς: a, 3; b (Heb. xii. 16). (βεβηλοὶ κενοφωνία: a, b).
geυναλογία: a, c.
ἐκζητήσεις or ζητήσεις: a, 2; b, c. (μοραὶ ζητήσεις: b, c.)
λογομαχεῖν and λογομαχία: a, b.
ματαιολογία and ματαιολόγος: a, c. Cf. ζητήσεις . . . μάταιος, c.
ἐρις: a, c.
μάχη: b, c.
μόδος: a, 2; b, c (2 Pet. i. 16).
τόμος: a, 2; νομικός: c; νομοθετῶν: a.
ἐπὶ πλείον προκόψωσιν δισεβείας: b. οὗ προκόψωσιν ἐπὶ πλείον: b.
προκόψωσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χείρον: b.

Author’s Favourite Terms.
a, b, c.

πιστῶς ὁ λόγος: a, b, c.
πιστῶς ὁ λόγος κ. πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος: a, 2.
παραιτοῦ: a, 2; b, c.
oίκος (household): a, 5; b, 2; c (1 Cor. i. 16, etc.).
περὶ with accusative: a, 3; b, 2; c (Phil. ii. 23, etc.).
a, b.
χάριν ἔχω: a, b (Luke xvii. 9; Heb. xii. 28).
διαμαρτύρομαι ἐν ὑπὸ τ. θεῷ, ὁ τ. Κυρίου: a; b, 2.
eἰς ὃ ἐνέθηκαν ἐγὼ κήρυκ. κ. ἀπόστολος . . . διδάσκαλος: a, b.
χάρις, εὐδοκία, εὐθυγ: a, b.
ἐν ἑστίν: a; b, 2.
a, c.

ἀσκῶτας: a, 4; c, 2.
δ. ἐπιστευόμαι ἐγώ: a, c.
καρποῦ ἑδος: a, 2; c.
διαβεβαιοῦμαι περὶ τινὸς: a, c.
προσέχειν: a, 5; c. (προσέχειν μύθοις: a, c.)
The second difference in style by which the Pastoral Epistles are marked off from the earlier letters may be given in the words of Lightfoot.

The Syntax.

(a) "It is stiffer and more regular than in the earlier Epistles, more jointed and less flowing. The clauses are marshalled together, and there is a tendency to parallelism."

e.g., 1 Tim. i. 9, ii. 1, 2, iii. 16, iv. 12, 13, 15, v. 10, vi. 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18; 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12, iii. 1-8, 10-13, 16, iv. 2, 4, 5, 7; Tit. i. 7, 8, 9, ii. 7, 12, iii. 1-3.

(b) "There is a greater sententiousness, an abruptness and positiveness of form. Imperative clauses are frequent.

e.g., 1 Tim. iv. 11, 15, 16, v. 7, 8, 22-25, vi. 2, 6, 11, 20; 2 Tim. i. 13, 14, ii. 1, 3, 7, 8, 14, 19, 22, 23, iii. 1, 5, 12, 16."

(Biblical Essays, p. 402.)

These differences in syntax are not unconnected with the small variety and paucity of particles which are a negative feature of the Pastoralts. But neither characteristic is very astonishing, since in point of fact, the Epistles are of the nature of episcopal charges, authoritative, not argumentative; enforcing disciplinary regulations, not unfolding theological conceptions, or vindicating personal claims.

We come, in the last place, to state and consider the problem presented by the purely negative characteristic of the style of the Pastoral Epistles, the fact that we do not find in them certain alleged characteristic Pauline words. Those who urge this as a serious argument against the traditional belief as to the authorship of these letters do not seem to make allowance for the fact that they are ex hypothesi dealing with a real man—not a machine; a man who had travelled much, and had read much; who was constantly coming into contact with fresh people, constantly confronted with fresh problems of practical life. The vocabulary of such a man is not likely to remain unaffected in its contents or use. Add to this,
that each of the other letters which are ascribed to him arose out of special circumstances, and deals almost exclusively with those special circumstances, and that the circumstances which called forth the letters to Timothy and Titus were, confessedly, quite different from those out of which any of the other Pauline letters arose. When these obvious facts are considered, it is difficult to treat seriously an argument which assumes that St. Paul was provided with only one set of words and terms; unalterable, no matter to whom, or on what subject, he was writing.

It is not thus that non-Biblical compositions are critically examined. We do not demand that Shakespeare's Sonnets or Cymbeline should exhibit a certain percentage of Hamlet words. And the argument becomes all the more unreasonable when one thinks how very small in extent is the extant literary work of St. Paul: less than 150 small octavo pages in Westcott and Hort's edition, and of these the Pastorals occupy only fifteen. If we had been privileged to hear St. Paul's sermons, or to listen to his conversation, how many Pauline words, as shown in a concordance, should we have heard?

Antecedently, we should not expect that an author's favourite expressions would be distributed over the pages of his book like the spots on a wall-paper pattern; nor is this notion confirmed when we examine the list of Pauline words missing from the Pastorals, as given by Holtzmann (Pastoralbriefe, p. 98, sqq.) and less fully by von Soden (Hand-Commentar, p. 177 sqq.).

In the complete list of verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs, fifty in all, as printed below, each group of cognate words, bracketed together, is for argument's sake, treated as a unit. And the numbers indicate the number of times the word occurs in St. Paul's Epistles. The words that are spaced are those, which after an examination of a concordance, can be plausibly claimed as characteristically Pauline; that is to say, they are of comparative frequent occurrence, and are found in at least three groups of his Epistles. It must be allowed that the absence of all of these is surprising. The simplest explanation is that some of them had passed out of St. Paul's ordinary vocabulary; and that, in the case of others, the subject matter of the Pastorals did not demand their use. Some of them, obviously, belong to the vocabulary of certain theological conceptions, others to that of a writer's temperament and temper.

For the purpose of analysis, it will be convenient to think of the other ten epistles of St. Paul as falling into four groups,
(i.) 1 and 2 Thessalonians.
(ii.) Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Gal.
(iii.) Eph., Col., Philem.
(iv.) Philippians, which though it is one of group iii., as being one of the epistles of the first Roman captivity, yet inasmuch as it was written somewhat later, may be considered apart.

Of the fifty characteristically Pauline words no less than eleven do not occur in groups i., iii., iv., viz., δικός, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, εἴηστιν, εἴρηγα νόμον, μείζων, μικρός, μωρία, δρούσι, πείδευε, οἱ πολλοί. Of these, δικός is not found in 2 Cor. or Gal.; δικαιοσύνη not in 2 Cor. though twice in the Pastoral; while δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ not in 1 Cor. or Gal.; εἴηστιν not in Rom. or Gal.; ἐργα νόμον not in 1 Cor. or 2 Cor.; μείζων not in 2 Cor. or Gal.; μικρός not in Rom.; μωρία only in 1 Cor. (while μωρία, also in 1 Cor. (4), occurs in the Pastoral twice); δρούσι not in 2 Cor. or Gal.; πείδευε not in Rom. or 1 Cor.; οἱ πολλοί not in Gal., but five times in Rom. It is obvious, from these facts, that these eleven words are not characteristically Pauline.

Of the others, four do not occur in groups i. and iii., viz., δοκεῖν, κρεῖσσον, δρούσι, ταπείνος. Of these, δοκεῖν not in Rom.; κρεῖσσον not in Rom., 2 Cor. or Gal.; δρούσι not in 1 Cor., 2 Cor. or Gal.; and ταπείνος not in 1 Cor. or Gal.

Seven do not occur in groups i. and iv., viz., ἀκροβυστία, ἀπολογτροσία, διαθήκη, ἐλευθερία, νιόθεσις, φύσις, χρηστός. Of these, ἀκροβυστία not in 2 Cor.; ἀπολογτροσία not in 2 Cor. or Gal. Of the ἐλευθερία
group, ἀλευθερος and ἀλευθερών are not in 2 Cor., and ἀλευθερών is not in 1 Cor. ἀνθελονία not in 1 Cor. or 2 Cor.; φώσι not in 2 Cor.; χρηστός not in 2 Cor. or Gal.; leaving διαθήκη (once in iii.) and ἀλευθερία (twice in iii.) as the only words that are evenly distributed in group ii.

Among those which do not occur in group i., viz., γνωρίζειν, κατεργάζεονται, στελαγγια, τέλειος, φρονεῖν, χαρίζεονται, we notice that of the twenty instances of κατεργάζεονται seventeen occur in Rom. and 2 Cor.; στελαγγια, not found in Rom., 1 Cor. or Gal., occurs three times in Philem.; none of the τέλειος group is found in 2 Cor. or Gal., while τελεοῦν and τελεύτης are absent from Rom. and 1 Cor. Of the thirty-four instances of the φρονεῖ group, one of which is 1 Tim. vi. 17, Rom. and Phil. account for twenty-five; φρόνημα is only found in Rom., φρόνησις only in Eph., φρόνιμος only in Rom., 1 Cor., and 2 Cor.; leaving γνωρίζειν and χαρίζεονται fairly representative words.

It remains to notice a few of the characteristically Pauline words which are not found in Philippians, viz.: ἀκαθαρσία, καταργέω, ὑπάνω, παράδοσις, πλεονεκτέω, and ὑνίς τ. Θεοῦ. ἀκαθαρσία is not found in 1 Cor.; καταργέω does, in point of fact, occur in 2 Tim.; ὑπάνω, found in 1 Tim. iii. 16, does not occur in 2 Cor. or Gal., παράδοσις not in Rom. or 2 Cor.; none of the πλεονεκτέω group is found in Gal., while πλεονεκτέω and πλεονεξία are both absent from 1 Cor., and πλεονεξία from 2 Cor. Of the seventeen places where our Lord is called ὑνίς [τ. Θεοῦ] eleven are found in Rom. and Gal.

In the whole list, then, there are twenty-seven words, or more than half, the absence of which from the Pastorals obviously need call for no remark. The following facts with regard to the distribution of some of the others are suggestive; and diminish, if they do not wholly remove, the difficulty of the problem before us. ἐκαστός (42) occurs twenty-two times in 1 Cor.; of the ἐνέργεια group (29) three members are not found in Rom., 2 Cor., or Gal., i.e., ἐνέργεια, ἐνέργημα, ἐνέργης; neither is ἐνέργεια found in 1 Cor. Of the twenty-seven occurrences of θάνατον, more than half, nineteen, are found in 1 Cor. and 2 Cor. Of the καυχάσθαι group (55) more than half, twenty-nine, occur in 2 Cor.; παραλαμβάνειν (11) is not found in Rom. or 2 Cor. πατὴρ ἕμων, apart from its common use in salutations, is found three times in 1 Thess., twice in 2 Thess., and once each in Gal. and Phil. Of the περισσεῖα group (39), none is found in Gal.; three not in 1 Cor., i.e., περισσεῖα, περισσός and περισσεμα; two not in Rom., i.e., περισσεμα and περισσότερος. On the other hand, nearly half, seventeen, of the total is found in 2 Cor. (which has also περισσο-
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τῆς seven times), seven occur in 1 Cor. and five in Phil. Neither πεποίθησα nor πεποίθησις occurs in 1 Cor.; πεποίθησις not in Rom. or Gal. Here again seven cases belong to 2 Cor. and seven to Phil. Of the πράγμα group (25), thirteen belong to Rom., which has ten out of the eighteen occurrences of πράγμα. Neither of the συνεργεῖν group (15) occurs in Gal.; yet its distribution is otherwise fairly even. The distribution of σῶμα (91) is remarkable. Just more than half, forty-six, of its occurrences are found in 1 Cor.; chap. vi. having eight, chap. xii., eighteen, chap. xv., nine. Neither ἐπανωθεῖν nor ἐπανωθεῖν occur in 1 Cor. or Gal.; ἐπανωθεῖν not in 2 Cor.

An analysis of the list of Pauline particles that are not found in the Pastoral Epistles yields the same general result; that is to say, the great majority of them are confined to group ii. of the Epistles; and that is explained by the fact that that group is the most argumentative and controversial, and the subject matter demands the employment of inferential and similar particles. Thus ἐγὼ (15), ἐγέρω (6), ἔσῃ (1) ἐστι (9, of which 6 are in 2 Cor.), ποι (10, 8 of which are in 1 Cor.), παρέχει, acc. (14), are not found outside group ii.; ἔρχεται (11, 7 of which are in 1 Cor.), μὴν μέλει (10), ὅτε (34, of which 22 are in 4 verses), are only in group ii. and in 1 Thess. The following also do not occur in groups i and iii: ἔχει (ii. 12, iv. 2), ἐπιτεύχει (ii. 2, iv. 1) πᾶλιν (ii. 25, iv. 3). The following do not occur in group iii. ἰδὼν (10: i. 3, ii. 6, iv. 1), ἐμπροσθεν (7: i. 4, ii. 2, iv. 1), ἔτει (15: i. 1, ii. 13, iv. 1). The distribution of the others is as follows: ἀναίρετο (5: i. 2, ii. 2, iii. 1), ἐγὼ ὅν (12: i. 2, ii. 9, iii. 1), ἔπεσον (27, i. 2, ii. 18, iii. 6, iv. 1), ἔρχεται (9: i. 1, ii. 7, iii. 1), ὅπερται (15: i. 13, iii. 2), ἐν παρεῖ (16: i. 1, ii. 11, of which 10 are in 2 Cor.; iii. 2, iv. 2), πᾶρεῖ (does occur in Tit., otherwise 19: i. 1, ii. 8, iii. 9, iv. 1), ἂν (14: i. 1 ii. 13), ὅν (38: i. 4, ii. 21, iii. 9, iv. 4). There are twenty-four characteristically Pauline particles in the above enumeration. Of these, ten are not found in group i., fifteen are not found in group iii., and in fact, in the epistles of the first Roman captivity (groups iii. and iv.), which are about half as long again as the Pastoral Epistles, particles are very sparingly used; ἔπεσε, ἐν παρεῖ and ὅν alone being at all common. It may be proper to note here in connexion with the absence of ὅν from the Pastoral, that twice, in 2 Tim. iv. 11 and Tit. iii. 15, μετα is used where the other Pauline letters have ὅν; otherwise the usage of μετα in the Pastoral does not differ from that of St. Paul elsewhere. Another noteworthy feature in the Pastoral is the absence of the article, especially before common Christian terms. This peculiarity, and also the deficiency in particles, may be possibly due to the amanuensis employed by St. Paul at this
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HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE EPISTLES.

It is altogether unnecessary for any one now to restate the arguments which prove that the references to persons and places in the Pastorals cannot be accommodated to the history of St. Paul and of his companions as given in the Acts. The "historical contradictions" are marshalled with crushing force by Lightfoot in his Biblical Essays, p. 403 sqq. Critics of the anti-traditional school who accept, as genuine Pauline fragments, those sections of the Pastorals in which the personal and local references occur are obliged to allocate these references to different parts of the Acts; and, even so, the explanations given are forced and unconvincing. It must then be clearly understood that our claim of the Pastorals for St. Paul is based on the assumption that his ministry was prolonged for at least two years beyond the date of the close of the Acts. If St. Paul was martyred immediately, or very soon, after the expiration of the two years' confinement mentioned in Acts xxviii. 30, then he did not write the Pastoral Epistles or any portion of them. This is a vital point; and demands at least a brief discussion of the main arguments in favour of the traditional opinion. Supposing that the Pastorals were not in our hands, and the question were asked, Was the two years' confinement in Rome mentioned in Acts xxviii. 30, followed by St. Paul's execution, or by his release?—the answer must be that all the positive evidence available is in favour of the latter alternative. There are three lines of argument: (1) the way in which the Acts ends; (2) the evidence of the epistles written during, or towards the end, of those two years; (3) external testimony.

(1) It ought to be unnecessary to observe that the author of the Acts knew what happened at the end of those two years. We can only guess why he stopped where he did; yet some guesses have more probability than others. There were limits to the size of books in those days. On the supposition that St. Luke knew of a subsequent ministry of his master's, the close of the Roman captivity would be a suitable point at which to bring vol. i. of the Acts to a conclusion, whether regard be had to considerations of space, or of literary fitness; the arrival at Rome being the fulfilment of the apostle's intention announced in Acts xix. 21. On the other hand, if St. Luke knew that St. Paul's two years' confinement had been followed at once by his execution, the historian's omission to mention
it cannot be accounted for. A brief record would have been all that was necessary, and this would not have added unduly to the length of the book.

Salmon’s explanation (Introduction, p. 312) that “why St. Luke has told us no more is, that he knew no more; and that he knew no more, because at the time nothing more had happened—in other words, that the book of the Acts was written a little more than two years after Paul’s arrival at Rome,” will not commend itself to many scholars. It seems more natural to suppose that both the Gospel and the Acts were published after St. Paul’s death. Literary men do not always succeed in completing their designs before they die; and the later the date we assign to Acts, the greater is the probability that St. Luke died before he had reduced to literary form his memories of the Apostle’s post-Roman-captivity history.

Passing now to an examination on this point of the third group of St. Paul’s Epistles, the evidence afforded by them is distinctly favourable to the supposition that St. Paul was released after the two years of Acts xxviii. 30. We must of course avoid the error into which some fall, of imagining that every foreboding or declared intention recorded in a narrative, or preserved in a published letter, would have been suppressed by the editor if it had not been realised. And accordingly we can only infer from the tone of Philippians and Philemon that, in St. Paul’s judgment, when he wrote these letters, the prospect of his release was favourable. No other inference can be drawn from “I know that I shall abide, yea, and abide with you all, for your progress and joy in the faith” (Phil. i. 25); “I trust in the Lord that I myself also shall come shortly” (ii. 24); “Prepare me also a lodging: for I hope that through your prayers I shall be granted unto you” (Philem. 22). Contrast with these passages the tone of 2 Timothy, which is that of a man who knew that his days were numbered, and that the end was not far off.

What seems to be a natural conclusion from the internal evidence of Acts xxviii. and of Philippians and Philemon is confirmed by the tradition of the early Church as it is expressed by Eusebius, H. E., ii., 22: “Paul is said (λέγεται ἐκεῖνος), after having defended himself to have set forth again upon the ministry of preaching, and to have entered the same city a second time, and to have there ended his life by martyrdom. Whilst then a prisoner, he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy, in which he both mentions his first defence, and his impending death.” It is to be noted that there is no contrary tradition; nor is it easy to see what end could have been served by the invention of this one.
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There are two passages in earlier writers which are adduced as proof that St. Paul at one time visited Spain. Since it is impossible to find room for such a journey within the period covered by the Acts, these passages, if accepted as proofs of the expedition to Spain, are therefore proofs of a missionary activity of St. Paul subsequent to the date of the close of the Acts. In the Letter of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, § 5, the writer speaks of Peter and Paul as contemporary martyrs; and Paul he describes as κηρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει . . . δικαιοσύνην διδάξας διὸν τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθὼν.

It is difficult to believe that a native of Rome, writing from Rome, would speak of the world's capital as ἡ δύση or τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως; nor did Corinth lie so far to the east of Rome as to justify such a rhetorical expression (see Lightfoot's note in loc.). Nor can we argue from the opening of the following chapter—"Unto these men of holy lives was gathered (συμμαχήθη) a vast multitude"—that Clement meant to date the fury of Neronic persecution as subsequent to the martyrdom of St. Paul. Writing about thirty years after "the great tribulation," he mentions the martyrs in order of dignity. In any case, he mentions Peter's death before that of Paul; yet this was never considered an argument against the tradition that the two apostles were martyred together; nor would it be felt as a serious objection to the recent theory that St. Peter outlived St. Paul by many years.

The following passage from the Muratorian Canon, in its obscure simplicity, reads like a fragment of a genuine tradition rather than a literary figment based on Rom. xv. 28: "Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt. Lucas optime Theophilo comprehendit, quia sub praesentia eius singula gerebantur, sicuti et semote passionem [perh. semota passione] Petri eidinter declarat, sed et profectionem [perh. profectione] Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscencesis" (text as given by Westcott, Canon. N.T., p. 535). The argument is unaffected even if the words from "passionem" be derived from the early second century Actus Petri cum Simone. See James, Apocrypha Anecdota, ii., xi., and Dean Bernard, Pastoral Epp., p. xxx. These considerations force us to the conclusion that the assumption that St. Paul's life ended where St. Luke's history terminates is arbitrary, and contrary to the evidence that is available. It remains to present to the reader a conjectural outline (based on Lightfoot's Biblical Essays, p. 223) of St. Paul's movements between his release and his second Roman imprisonment.

(1) A journey from Rome to Asia Minor. It is natural to suppose
that he visited Philippi and Colossae, in accordance with the intimations cited above from Phil. and Philem. Perhaps he now visited Crete.

(2) A journey to Spain; perhaps passing through Dalmatia and Gaul (?) (2 Tim. iv. 10). Possibly on this journey he became aware of the convenience of Nicopolis in Epirus as a centre for work.

(3) Last journey Eastward. Visits Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 3). The dispute with Hymenæus and Alexander the smith, and the services of Onesiphorus (1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14) perhaps now took place. Leaves Timothy in charge of the Church at Ephesus. Visits Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3).

[1 Timothy.]
Visits Crete; leaves Titus in charge; returns to Asia (as hoped in 1 Tim. iii. 14, iv. 13).

[Titus.]
Passes through Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20), Troas (2 Tim. iv. 13), where perhaps he was arrested, Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20). In any case he never reached Nicopolis as anticipated in Tit. iii. 12. It is here assumed that the winter mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 21, is the same as that of Tit. iii. 12.

[2 Timothy.]

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

With regard to the external attestation to the Pastoral Epistles, it must be acknowledged that some early heretics, who acknowledged the genuineness of the other letters attributed to St. Paul, rejected these. Basilides, who flourished in the reign of Hadrian (117-138 A.D.), is the first who is said to have done so. Clement Al. (Strom. ii. 11) states that some, Gnostics apparently, were actuated in this decision by dislike of the expression ἡ γενωσθήσεσθαι τῆς φωτῆς in 1 Tim. vi. 20: ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν αἵρεσεων τὰς πρὸς Θεόν ἀθετοῦσιν ἐπιστολάς. On the other hand, the extant fragments of another Gnostic, Heracleon, contain an allusion to 2 Tim. ii. 13: ἀμφισβητεῖ ταύτων οὐδέποτε δύναται (Clem. Al., Strom. iv. 9). The Canon of Marcion, which contained only his own edition of the Gospel according to St. Luke and ten of St. Paul's epistles, of course did not include the Pastorals; but Tatian (died about 170) did not wholly follow him in this, since he regarded Titus as certainly genuine. "Hanc vel maxime Apostoli pronuntiantam credidit, parvi pendens Marcionis, et aliorum qui cum eo in hac parte consentiunt, assertionem" (Jerome, Prol. in Tit.). In the same context, St.
Jerome declares that these adverse judgments were not critical in any true sense, but merely arbitrary: "cum haeretica auctoritate pronuntient et dicant, Illa epistola Pauli est, haec non est". However that may be, there is at least no trace in the writings of the Church controversialists of arguments of a critical nature; whereas in the dispute as to the authorship of Hebrews, Clement Al. and Origen were compelled to discuss the problem presented by its un-Pauline style. In any case, the fact that the rejection of the Pastorals by some heretics was noted amounts to a positive testimony in their favour by the contemporary Church.

From the time of Irenæus, Clement Al. and Tertullian—that is, practically from the time that N.T. books are quoted by their author's names—until the year 1804, when Schmidt in his Introduction denied the genuineness of 1 Timothy, no one, Christian or non-Christian, doubted that the Pastoral Epistles were genuine letters of the Apostle Paul. They are included in all MSS., Versions and Lists of the Pauline Epistles without exception, and in the same order (i.e., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit.). An interesting exception as regards the order meets us in the Muratorian Fragment: "Uerum ad Philemonem unam, et ad Titum unam, et ad Timotheum duas pro affectu et dilectione; in honore tamen ecclesiae catholicae in ordinatione ecclesiasticae disciplinae sanctificatae sunt". The composer of this catalogue here arranges the groups of four personal letters of St. Paul in rough chronological order. As 2 Tim. was obviously the last letter that St. Paul wrote, the two to Timothy are placed last, Titus being joined to them as evidently dealing with kindred topics.

It remains that the reader should have placed before him the traces, more or less distinct, of the Pastoral Epistles in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, and of the pre-Irenæus period.

Clement of Rome. Ad Cor. 1. (a.d. 95.)

§ 1 (1 Tim. vi. 1). Ὅστε τῷ . . . δῖναι θυμὸν μεγάλως θαυματεύματος τοῖς . . . πρεσβυτέροις.

§ 1 (1 Tim. v. 17). τιμήν τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀπονόμωσις τοῖς . . . πρεσβυτέροις.

§ 1 (1 Tim. ii. 9, 11; Tit. ii. 4). γυναικίν . . . στεργοῦσας καθήκοντως τούς ἀνδρας ἐαυτῶν ἐν τῇ κανὼν τῆς ὑποταγῆς ὑπαρχοῦσας τὰ κατὰ τὸν οἶκον σεμνῶς οἰκουργεῖν ἑδίδοσκετε, πάνω σωφρονοῦσας.

1 e.g., Irenæus, Haer. Praef.; i. 16, 3; ii. 14, 7; iii. 3, 3; iv. 16, 3.
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§ 2 (1 Tim. vi. 8). τοὺς ἐφοβούς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρκοῦμενοι.

* § 2 (Tit. iii. 1). ἐτοιμοί εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἁγαθόν.

§ 7 (1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7). ὁ λατρεύων ἡμῖν ἀγίων ἐπίκειται.

§ 7 (1 Tim. ii. 3, v. 4). ἔμειν... τι προσέκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς.

* § 26 (Tit. ii. 10). αὐτῷ δουλευόμενον ἐν πεποιθήσει πίστεως ἁγαθός.

§ 29 (1 Tim. ii. 8). προσέκτομεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν δεισίδητι ψυχῆς, ἁγίας καὶ ἀμάντων χείρας αἵροντες πρὸς αὐτόν.

* § 32 (Tit. iii. 5-7). πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν... οὐ δὲ αὐτῶν ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἢ τῆς δικαιοσυναγίας ἢ κατεργάσατο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτῶν.

* § 37 (1 Tim. i. 18). στρατευσόμεθα οὖν... ἐν τοῖς ἀμώμοις προστάγμασιν αὐτῶν.

§ 42 (1 Tim. iii. 10). καθίστανον τὰς ἀρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκίμασας ἀρτές τῇ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους.

* § 45 (2 Tim. i. 3). τῶν ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει λατρευόντων.

§ 47 (1 Tim. vi. 1). οὐτε καὶ βλασφημίας ἐπιφέρεσθαι τῷ θύμῳ του Κυρίου.

§ 55 (2 Tim. ii. 1). γυναῖκες ἐνδυναμωθείσαι διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

§ 55 (1 Tim. i. 17). θεαν τῶν αἰώνων.

§ 61 (1 Tim. i. 17). βασίλευτον αἰώνων.

To these we may add, perhaps, the prayer for Kings in §§ 60, 61, in conformity with the direction given in 1 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. iii. 2, and in those places only of the N.T.

On a review of these passages, it must in candour be admitted that those marked with an asterisk seem to be the only ones that suggest a literary dependence on the Pastorals. The others, it may be plausibly maintained, are simply illustrations of that current religious phraseology which the Pastorals themselves reflect. Taken all together, they prove that Clement's mind was at home in the religious world to which the Pastorals belong; but while the present writer believes that Clement was as familiar with these letters as he was with 1 Cor., he cannot affirm such a position to be wholly free from uncertainty.

IGNATIUS (circ. A.D. 110).

* Magn. § 8 (Tit. i. 14, iii. 9). μη πλανάσθη τοῖς ἐπερωτούσι μηδὲ μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνωφελέσιν οὕσιν... εἰ γὰρ μέχρι τῶν κατὰ οὐδαίσμον ζώμεν, ὄμολογούμεν χάριν μὴ εἰληφάναι.
§ 11 (1 Tim. i. 1). πεπληροφόρησε ἐν τῇ γεννήσει κ. τ. πάθει κ. τ. ἀναστὰτε ἐν τῇ γενσει ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἤγερμοκάς Ποντίου Πιλάτου: πραξάθετα ἄλθόσες κ. βεβαίας ὑπὸ τῆς σοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν.

Tall. Inscr. and § 2 have also Τιτ. 3. It is peculiarly worthy of remark that in this letter, which was admittedly a personal communication from Ignatius to Polycarp, the writer passes from exhortations to Polycarp himself—and those too of a very delicate nature—to general exhortations addressed to the whole Church. Contrast e.g. § 5 with § 6; and in the middle of a section addressed to the whole Church he interposes a personal appeal to Polycarp. This illustrates admirably a feature in the Pastorals which has been alleged as a serious objection to their acceptation as genuine letters; i.e. the intermingling of personal matter with directions and exhortations addressed to the Church.

POLYCARP. Ad Phil. (circ. A.D. 110).

%§ 4 (1 Tim. vi. 10, 7). ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων Χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία. εἰδὸς εἰς ὄν τι ὀδὸν εἰς ἄρτος ἕγκαμπεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ὀδὸς ἑξενεγκεῖν τι ἔχομεν.

§ 5 (2 Tim. ii. 12). ἐὰν πολιτευόμεθα ἄξιος αὐτοῦ, καὶ συμβαινεῖσθαι αὐτῷ, καὶ συμβαινεῖσθαι αὐτῷ.
INTRODUCTION

* § 9 (2 Tim. iv. 10). oδ γὰρ τὸν νῦν ἡγάπησαν αἰῶνα.

* § 12 (1 Tim. ii. 2, iv. 15). Orate etiam pro regibus et potentatibus et principibus . . . ut fructus vester manifestus sit in omnibus.

The Acts of Martyrdom of Polycarp (a.d. 155 or 156).

§ 10 (1 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. iii. 1). δεδόμεθα γὰρ ἀρχαῖς καὶ εὐσωτερικῶς ἀπὸ Θεοῦ τετειγμένας τιμήν . . . ἀποκάλυψιν.

There can be no question that in the Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians we have express citations from 1 and 2 Timothy. It is, to say the least, difficult to believe that a man like Polycarp, who had been a disciple of the Apostle John, and who, when he wrote this letter, was bishop of Smyrna and in full vigour of life, would have made such honourable use of letters which had been compiled by an unknown Paulinist a few years before. We regard the evidence of Polycarp as a fact of capital importance; for it removes any possible doubt that may hang over inferences drawn from Ignatius; and it supports us in our belief that the Pastoral Epistles were also known to Clement of Rome. For the sake of completeness, we may add echoes of the Letters in other extant second century Christian Literature. The three passages cited from the Epistle of Barnabas are not of necessity based on our Letters; and the same may be said of the four quotations from Justin Martyr, with the possible exception of that from Dial. § 47.

The So-called Second Epistle of Clement of Rome (circa 120-140 A.D.).

§ 7 (2 Tim. ii. 4, 5). ἀγωνισμένα, εἰδότες δὴ . . . ὥσπερ πάντες στεφανοῦνται, εἰ μὴ οἱ πολλὰ κατισχούσας καὶ καλῶς ἀγωνισμένοι . . . ἐκ τῶν φθορῶν ἁγίων ἀγωνιζόμενοι, ἓν εὐρέθη φθείρων . . . ἐδώ βάλλεται τοῦ σταδίου.

§ 8 (1 Tim. vi. 14, 12). τῷ ἁγίῳ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τὴν σφραγίδα ἀσπίδον, ἵνα τῇ Ζωῷ ἅπαλαβόμεν.

§ 17 (Tit. ii. 12). ἡ ἀνθρωπολογία ἀπὸ τῶν κοσμικῶν ἐπιθυμίας.

§ 20 (1 Tim. i. 17). τῷ μόνῳ Θεῷ ἀνάξιο, . . . ἡ δύσε κ.τ.λ.

The So-called Epistle of Barnabas (a.d. 70-132).

§ 7 (2 Tim. iv. 1). εἰ οὖν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Κύριος καὶ μείλιμν κρίνειν ἱώτας καὶ νεκρούς, ἐπειδή.

§ 12 (1 Tim. iii. 14). χαράβασις διὰ τοῦ δόξου ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἰδιότητο.

§ 12 (1 Tim. iii. 16). υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς.
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THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS (CIRC. A.D. 150).

* § 4 (1 Tim. iii. 16). τὸ δὲ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτῶν θεοσεβείας μυστήριον μὴ προεδροκείσθη δύνασθαι παρὰ ἀνθρώπου μαθεῖν.

* § 9 (Tit. iii. 4). ἄλλο εἰς τὸν καρός ὅν Θεὸς προέδροτο λοιπὸν φανερώσαι τὴν ἐαυτοῦ χρῆσεως τῇ καὶ δύναμιν (ὅ τις ὀπερβαλλόμενος φιλανθρωπίας καὶ ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ), ὅτι ἐφιάσας ἡμᾶς... ἐκεῖνων αὐτῶν τὰς ἡμετέρας ἀμαρτίας ἀνεβάζομεν, αὐτῶν τὸν θεὸν ἐνυόν ἀπέθανον λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

§ 11 (1 Tim. iii. 16). [μαθηταῖς] οὐς ἐφανέρωσεν ο λόγος φανείς. Τhis and the following section do not really belong to the Epistle.

JUSTIN MARTYR (CIRC. 140 A.D.).

Dial. § 7 (1 Tim. iv. 1). τὰ τῆς πλάνης πνεύματα καὶ δαιμόνια δοξολογοῦσιν.

§ 35 (1 Tim. iv. 1). ἐν τούτῳ τοιουτοί τινες εἰσάγοντες θεοσεβείας εἰσάγοντες Χριστιανοῦς καὶ... ἢςοιν οἰκονομοῦσιν... καὶ τὰ ἐκείνου διδάχας διδάσκοντος ἀλλὰ τὰ απὸ τῶν τῆς πλάνης πνεύματων.

* § 47 (Tit. iii. 4). ὅ γαρ χρῆσεως καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὸ ἀμετρον τοῦ πλοῦτον αὐτοῦ τὸν μετασκούντα... ὁ δὲ δικαίων... ἔχει.

§ 118 (2 Tim. iv. 1). διὶ κρίτης ᾠντιν καὶ νεκρῶν ἀπάντων αὐτῶς ὁ Θεὸς, εἰπόν ἐν πολλοῖς.

THE ACTS OF PAUL AND THECLA (NOT LATER THAN 170 A.D.).

* § 14 (2 Tim. ii. 18). λέγει ὁ θεὸς ἀνάστασιν γενέσθαι, διὶ ἡ γέγονεν ἐφὶ οἷς ἐχομεν τέκνοις. Note also the use in this work of the names Demas and Hermogenes as ὄποκρίσεως γέμοτες, § 1, and Onesiphorus as seeking Paul, § 2.

ATHENAGORAS (CIRC. 176).

Legatio, 16 (1 Tim. vi. 16). πάντα γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἐστιν αὐτῶς αὐτῷ, φῶς ἀπρόσιτον.

* § 37 (1 Tim. ii. 2). τοῦτο δ᾽ ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, διὸ ἡ ρεμον καὶ ἡ σοφίαν βίον διάγομεν.

THEODOTUS (EXCERPTA EX SCRIPTIS THEODOTI, CLEM. AL. P. 350).

(1 Tim. vi. 16). καὶ ὁ μὲν φῶς ἀπρόσιτον εὑρηταί.

THE EPISTLE OF THE CHURCHES OF VIENNE AND LYONS (CIRC. 180).

* Buseb. H.E. v. i. (1 Tim. iii. 15). ἐνέκαθην ἡ ὀργὴ... εἰς Ἀτταλον Περγάμην τῷ γένει, στύλον καὶ ἔδραίμωµα τῶν ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτῆς.
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* (1 Tim. vi. 13). ὁ δὲ ... Ποθεῖνος ... ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα ἐσύρετο ... ὡς αὐτῷ ὄντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀνεῖδηδο τῆν καλὴν μαρτυρίαν.

Euseb. H.E. v. 3 (1 Tim. iv. 3, 4). ὁ Ἀλκιβίδης, μὴ χρωμενός τοῖς κτίσμασι τοῦ Θεοῦ ... πεισθείς δὲ ὁ Ἀλκιβίδης πάνων ἀνθὴν μετελάμβανε καὶ ἦξαρίστευ τῷ Θεῷ.

Theophilus of Antioch (circ. 181).

* ad Autol. i. 1 (2 Tim. iii. 8). φράσεις ἑκατέρας τῆς παρέξει ... ἀνθρώποις ἔχουσι τῶν ρουὲν κατεφθάρμενον.

* ad Autol. ii. 16 (Tit. iii. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 4 (?)). ἔτι μὴν καὶ εὐλογηθεὶς ὅπο τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ἐκ τῶν θεάτων γενόμενα, δπως ἦν καὶ τοῦτο εἰς τεῖχιμα τοῦ μὲλλειν λαμβάνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μετάνοιαν καὶ ἀφενὶ ἀμαρτίαις διὰ ὦτάτος καὶ κοινοῦ παλιγγενεσίας πάντας τοὺς προσιόντας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

ad Autol. iii. 14 (Tit. iii. 1; Tim. ii. 2). ἔτι μὴν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὅπω-τάσεσθαι ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις, καὶ εὐχεσθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν κελευθήμασ ὁ Θεὸς λόγος, δπως ἤρεμον καὶ ἐσύχιον βίων διάγνωμεν.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE LETTERS.

It is scarcely too much to say that but for the difficulty presented by their style, and the assumption that St. Paul never left Rome alive, no one would have suspected these letters of being a compilation. But inasmuch as no one has been found to deny the bona fide Pauline character of some sections of them—at least in 2 Timothy—those who impugn the genuineness of the letters as they have come down to us have been compelled to exercise much ingenuity in attempts to apportion the matter of the letters between St. Paul and the compiler or compilers. For an account of their schemes the student is referred to the articles on these epistles in Hastings D. B., and the Encyclopaedia Biblica, and for a fuller account, to Moffatt's Historical N. T.

To those who agree that the problem presented by the style and the historical setting of the Pastorals is unsolved, but not insoluble, all attempts to decompose these letters will seem unprofitable. There is sound sense in the old scholastic maxim: "Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem". The case of the Pastorals is not like that of 2 Corinthians, in which plausible reasons may be alleged for theories of dislocation. There is no difficulty in presenting such an outline of 1 Tim. or 2 Tim. or Tit. as will show it to be a single letter, with as much unity of purpose as a bona fide letter—not a college essay—can be expected to have.

VOL. IV.
But even were we to grant, one moment, that the style and historical considerations must preclude a Pauline authorship for them, yet, the next moment, we find ourselves confronted by more serious objections to the theory of compilation. To begin with, the historical difficulty presented by the personal and local references in the admittedly Pauline sections is insurmountable, on the hypothesis that the whole of St. Paul's history is contained in the Acts.

Again, without using violent language about "forgery," it is not easy to explain why the alleged compiler should pretend to be St. Paul. The ascription of a book to an honoured name was not a precedent condition to its acceptance or acceptability in the primitive Church. Hebrews, and the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, and the Epistle to Diognetus do not claim anyone as their authors. Whoever it was that produced the Pastorals, he was just as good a practical Christian as St. Paul himself; and he had no compelling reason to hide his identity. The case of 2 Peter is different. That epistle, whoever wrote it, was always reckoned a disputed book.

Again, how are we to explain the honourable use, certainly by Polycarp, and probably by Clement of Rome and Ignatius, not to mention other later second century writers, of a work which only appeared, ex hypothesi, not earlier than 90 A.D.? And, further, if these epistles are due to a compiler, he must have been an extraordinarily clever man, and quite capable not only of supplementing the Pauline fragments, but of editing them. Now by the year 90 A.D. Timothy's name had become venerated in the Church. Is it likely that a Churchman of that time, writing too, as is alleged, with an ecclesiastical bias, would have permitted the publication of letters which certainly give the impression of Timothy as a not very heroic person? The treatment of Linus (2 Tim. iv.21) raises a similar question. A tradition, which no one has ever questioned, names Linus as the first bishop of Rome; the subordinate position he occupies in this letter is, as Salmon has noted (Introd. N.T. p. 411), quite intelligible if St. Paul was the author of it. It is, on the other hand, extremely unlikely that an editor of the year 90 A.D., who had no scruple in writing in St. Paul's name, would not have given Linus a more prominent place.

These are a few of the difficulties which may be urged on the traditional side in this "contest of opposite improbabilities".
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ANALYSIS OF 1 TIMOTHY.

"Guard the Deposit."

A. i. 1, 2. Salutation.

B. i. 3-20: The Crisis, and the Men—Paul and Timothy.

(a) The Crisis: 3-11.

(1) 3-7. The motive of the letter is to provide Timothy with a memorandum of previous oral instructions for the combating of those who mischievously and ignorantly endeavour to oppose the Law to the Gospel.

(2) 8-11. This opposition is really factitious; inasmuch as the Law and the Gospel are, both of them, workings of law, God's law, the final cause of which is right conduct.

(b) The Men: 12-20.

(1) 12-17. Paul's own spiritual history illustrates the fundamentally identical moral basis of the Law and the Gospel. Paul had been "faithful," trustworthy, while under the Law; therefore Christ pardoned his violent opposition to the Gospel, because it was due to ignorance, though a sinful ignorance. Moreover, this whole transaction—the triumph of Christ's long-suffering over Paul's sinful antagonism—has an enduring value. It is an object lesson to encourage to repentance sinners to the end of time. Glory be to God!

(2) 18-20. The present charge to Timothy, although its immediate exciting cause is the recent action of Hymenæus and Alexander and their followers, ought not to be new in its substance to Timothy. It is practically identical with what the prophets gave utterance to at his ordination.

C. ii., iii. The foundations of Sound Doctrine.

False teaching is most effectually combated indirectly; not by controversy, with its negations, but by quiet, positive foundation work on which true views about God and Man can be based. We begin then with:—

(a) ii. 1—iii. 1 a. Public Prayer.


(2) ii. 8—iii. 1 a. The Ministers of Public Prayer: men, not women; with a judgment as to the true function of Woman in the Church and in Society.

(b) iii. 1 b-16. The Ministry of the Divine Society.

(1) 1 b-7. The qualifications of the episcopus.

(2) 8-10, 12, 13. The qualifications of the deacons.

(3) 11. The qualifications of women Church-workers.

(4) 14-16. Caution to Timothy lest he should be tempted to think these details trivial, in comparison with more obviously spiritual things. The importance of rules depends on the importance of that with which they are concerned. The Church, for whose ministers rules have been just laid down, is the greatest Society in the world: human, yet divinely originated and inspired; the House of God; an extension of the Incarnation.
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D. iv. A fresh word of prophecy (see i. 18) addressed to Timothy in his present office.

(a) 1-5. The false teaching more clearly defined as a spurious asceticism. This is condemned, a priori, by considerations (1) of the declared character and object of the material creation, and (2) of the purifying effect of benedictions.

(b) 6-16. The spurious asceticism, however, as it manifests itself in practice, is best combated (1), 6-10, by the Church teacher showing an example in his own person of genuine holiness, and (2), 11-16, by active pastoral care, courageous outspokenness and the diligent cultivation of all God-given ministerial graces.

E. v. 1—vi. 19. This naturally suggests the specification of directions for administration of the Church by a Father in God.

(a) v. 1, 2. He must not deal with his people en masse, but individually. He cannot treat alike old men and young men, elder women and younger women.

(b) v. 3-16. There is one class of the laity in particular which, because they have a special claim on the Church, need a discriminating care: the widows. The Church cannot afford to support all widows, nor would it be right to relieve their relatives, if they have any, of responsibility for them. Consequently, none can be entered on the list for relief but those over a certain age, and who have a good record for consistent Christian lives. Young widows had better marry again.

(c) v. 17-25. The questions of Church finance and discipline, as they concern widows, suggest recommendations on the same subjects, as they concern the presbyters: (1) 17, 18, finance; (2) 19-25, discipline, with, 23, a parenthetical personal counsel to Timothy, suggested by the word pure in 22.

(d) vi. 1, 2. Ruling principles for the conduct of Christians who are slaves, towards heathen and Christian masters respectively.

(e) vi. 3-19. A right judgment in all these matters which affect our daily life depends on right basal convictions as to the true values of things material and spiritual.

(1) 3-10. The false teachers reverse the true order: they regard religion as a sub-section of the world; whereas the world has its own place—an honourable place—as subordinate to religion.

(2) 11-16. A solemn adjuration to Timothy to adhere to the principles just laid down; and

(3) 17-19. To urge the observance of them upon the well-to-do members of the Christian Society.

F. vi. 20-21. Final appeal, summing up the perennial antagonism between character (the natural fruit of the faith) and mere intellectualism.

ANALYSIS OF 2 TIMOTHY.

Sursum Corda.

A. i. 1, 2. Salutation.

B. i. 3—ii. 13. Considerations which should strengthen Timothy's moral courage (a, b, c, d, e), interspersed with appeals to his loyalty (a, b, γ, δ, ε).
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(a) 3-5. Paul’s thoughts of, and prayers for, him; and Paul’s recognition of Timothy’s faith.

(b) 6, 7. An objective fact in Timothy’s own spiritual history: his ordination; since when there is available for his use, Power, Love, and Discipline, the gifts of God.

(a) 8-10. An appeal based on thoughts of the Gospel, as the power of God.

(c) 11, 12. Paul’s own steadfastness.

(b) 13, 14. Appeals based on loyalty to the human teacher, and to the Divine Spirit.

(d) 15. The deterrent example of the disloyal of Asia.

(e) 16-18. The stimulating example of Onesiphorus.

(f) ii. 1, 2. An appeal for the provision of a succession of loyal teachers.

(g) ii. 3-13. An appeal based on “the Word of the Cross”; i.e., Suffering is the precedent condition of glory. This is exemplified in the earthly analogies of the soldier, the athlete, and the field-labourer; in the actual experiences of Jesus Christ Himself, and of Paul.

C. ii. 14-26. General exhortations to Timothy as a Church teacher, as regards

(a) 14-18, the positive and negative subject-matter of his instructions; (b) 19-21, the true and optimistic conception of the Church in relation to all teachers, true and false; (c) 22-26, the personal equipment of the true teacher, and his treatment of the erring.

D. iii. 1—iv. 8. A word of prophecy setting forth—

(a) iii. 1-9. The practical shortcomings of the false teachers.

(b) iii. 10-17. A recalling of Timothy’s past spiritual history: (1) 10-13, the conditions under which his discipleship began; (2) 14-17, the holy persons by whom, and the sacred writings on which, his youth had been nourished.

(c) iv. 1-8. A concluding solemn adjuration to play the man while there is time. As for Paul, the contest is over, the crown is in sight; there is a crown for Timothy, too, if he takes Paul’s place.

E. iv. 9-22. Personal details: Instructions, 9, 11, 13, 21; News about other members of the Pauline comradeship. 10, 11, 12, 20; A warning, 14, 15; A reminiscence and a confident hope, 16-18; Salutations and greetings, 19, 21; Final benediction, 22.

ANALYSIS OF TITUS.

"Maintain Good Works."

A. i. 1-4. Salutation.

B. i. 5-16. The position of affairs in Crete, which (a), 5-9, necessitates that the foundation of Church organisation—the presbyterate—be well and truly laid; in view of (b), 10-16, the natural unruliness and bad character of the people, aggravated by Jewish immoral sophistries.

C. ii. 1—iii. 11. Heads of necessary elementary moral instruction for the Cretan folk.

(a) ii. 1-10. For aged men and aged women; for young women and young men—and what is said about these latter applies also to Titus—and slaves.
(b) ii. 11-15. The eternal sanction for this insistence on the practice of elementary virtues is the all-embracing scope of the Gospel of God's Grace; which has been visibly manifested, with its call to repentance, its assurance of help, and its certain hope.

(c) iii. 1, 2. Obedience to the civil authority is also a Gospel virtue.

(d) iii. 3-7. These instructions are not given in a spirit of superiority. We ourselves were once in as bad moral condition as are the Cretans, if not worse, until we came to know, and test the love of God, unmerited and saving.

(e) iii. 8-11. In conclusion, the sum of all is: Let the people maintain good works, and shun useless speculations. Let Titus not be lax in dealing with leaders of the false teaching.

D. iii. 12, 13. Personal instructions.


F. iii. 15. Final salutation.

THE TEXT.

The text which is printed above the exposition is in the main that of Westcott and Hort. In a very few cases other readings have been adopted in this text (see e.g. 1 Tim. ii. 8; Tit. ii. 4, iii. 9); and in some places their punctuation has been modified.

The apparatus criticus is based on that of Tischendorf's eighth edition. The readings of the Old Latin fragments, r, Cod. Frisingensis, have been added, and the references to m (Speculum) have been given according to the edition by Weihrich in the Vienna Corpus Script. Eccles. Lat. Of the uncial MSS. cited by Tisch., B, (Cod. Petropolitanus, or Sangermanensis, ix. or x.) has not been noted, since it is merely a transcript of D. On the other hand, it has been thought best to cite both P and G, since it is not certain that the latter is a copy of the former, though both are derived from one exemplar.

Only the most important cursives are mentioned in these notes. The reader will understand that the attestation of KLP carries with it, in most cases, that of the great bulk of the cursive MSS. Neither has it been thought advisable to cite the more obscure versions. Even if their readings were critically ascertained they would not carry much weight. For a similar reason patristic citations are sparingly used. Subjoined is a list of the authorities cited in the critical notes.

A, Cod. Sinaiticus, iv. St Petersburg.


C, Cod. Ephraemi rescriptus, v. Paris. It does not contain 1 Tim. i. 1-iii. 9, μουρη | που.
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F (F2), Cod. Augiensis, ix. Trinity College, Cambridge.
G (G3), Cod. Boernerianus, ix. Dresden.
H (H3), Cod. Coislinianus, vi. Fragments. Those that contain portions of the Pastorals are in Paris and Turin. It only contains: 1 Tim. iii. 7-13, vi. 9-13; 2 Tim. ii. 1-9; Tit. i. 1-3, 15—ii. 5, iii. 13-15.
K (K4) Cod. Mosquensis, ix. Moscow.

Of the Old Latin MSS. cited, d, e, f, g are the Latin portions of the bilingual uncial s, D, E, F, and G respectively. m is the treatise entitled Speculum, practically a catena of texts or testimonia, formerly ascribed to St Augustine. r is the Cod. Frisingensis, v. or vi. (Munich) fragments, containing inter alia, 1 Tim. i. 12—ii. 15; v. 18—vi. 13.

The only MSS. of the Vulgate cited are Cod. Amiatinus (am.), a.d. 716, Florence, and Cod. Fuldensis (fuld.) a.d. 541-546, Fulda in Germany.

The other versions are indicated as follows:—
syr* (Tisch., sy*01) = Peshitto Syriac.
syr* (Tisch., sy*0) = Harkleian Syriac.
syr = both Syriac Versions.
boh (Tisch., cop.) = Bohairic Egyptian.
sah = Sahidic Egyptian.
arm = Armenian.
go = Gothic.

For a complete bibliography of the Pastoral Epistles the reader is referred to the articles, “Timothy, Epistle to,” and “Titus, Epistle to,” by W. Lock, in Hastings’ D.B., vol. iv., pp. 775, 785, and the articles “Timothy and Titus (Epistles),” by J. Moffatt, in the Encyclopaedia Biblica. To the articles themselves—the former temperately conservative, the latter, uncompromisingly anti-traditional—the present writer is much indebted. Diligent use has also been made of the labours of the following commentators on the continuous text: St. Chrysostom’s Homilies, full of good sense and practical wisdom; Bengel, pithy, direct and spiritual; Ellicott, a sound grammarian from the classical Greek standpoint, and therefore useful as a warning against possible pitfalls, but very dry; Alford, still most serviceable as the variorum edition of a.d. 1865; J. H. Bernard (Cambridge Greek Testament) whose notes on the ethical language of the Epistles
are most illuminating, and H. von Soden, in the *Hand-Commentar*, remarkable for subtle verbal analysis; but his exegesis is vitiated by his critical position as to the authorship and date of the letters. Suspicion and half-heartedness do not make for profound exposition.

Plummer's large treatment of certain sections, in the *Expositor's Bible*, has been found helpful and suggestive. Field's *Notes* (alas, too few!) on *Trans. N.T.* are indispensable; and H. P. Liddon's analysis of 1 Timothy is masterly.

On the general subject of the Epistles, Salmon's *Introduction N.T.* (p. 397 sqq.), Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays* (xi., xii.), Wace's Introduction in the *Speaker's Commentary*, J. H. Bernard's Introduction (*Cambridge Greek Testament*), Holtzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, and Hort's *Judaistic Christianty and Christian Ecclesia* have been largely made use of. It has not, however, been thought necessary, especially when space had to be considered, to specify in every case the authority for the sentiment expressed, or the explanation adopted. In any case, the Church, in the long run, acts on the counsel of Thomas à Kempis: "Non quaeras quis hoc dixerit: sed quid dicatur attende" (*De Imit. Christi*, i. 5).

*September, 1909.*
Chapter I.—Vv. 1-2. Salutation.—

Ver. 1. ἐπίσκοπος Ἰησοῦ. The use of this official title is an indication that the Pastoral Epistles were not merely private letters (cf. Παύλου ἐξελομος Χρ.) Phil. 1), but were intended to be read to the Churches committed to the charge of Timothy and Titus respectively. The phrase means simply one sent by Christ, not primarily one belonging to Christ (cf. Phil. ii.25, where Epaphroditus is spoken of as άνδρος, and 2 Cor. viii.23, άνδρος). Χρ. Ἰησοῦς is also found in 2 Cor. i.1, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 1, 2 Tim. i. 1; ἐπίσκοπος Ἰησοῦς in 1 Cor. i. 1, Tit. i. 1. The difference in the use Jesus Christ and Christ Jesus seems to be this: in each case the first member of the compound name indicates whether the historical or the notional idea of the Person is chiefly in the writer's mind. Jesus Christ briefly expresses the proposition, "Jesus is the Christ"; it embodies the first theological assertion concerning Jesus; it represents the conception of the historical Jesus in the minds of those who had seen Him. St. John, St. Peter and St. James employ this name when speaking of our Lord. But in Christ Jesus, on the other hand, the theological conception of the Christ predominates over that of the actual Jesus Who had been seen, felt and heard by human senses. Accordingly we find Christ Jesus in every stage of the Pauline Epistles; and, as we should expect, more frequently in the later than in the earlier letters. In almost every instance of the occurrence of Jesus Christ in the Pastoral Epistles the thought of the passage concerns the humanity, or historical aspect, of our Lord. Thus in Tit. i. 1, "a servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ," we could not substitute Christ Jesus without weakening the antithesis. See note there. St. Paul, here as elsewhere, claims to have been as truly sent by Christ as were those who were apostles before him.

κατ' ἐπιταγήν: in obedience to the command. The full phrase κατ' ἐπιταγήν θ. άν. ήμών occurs again (τοῦ ἐπιτ. θ. οντος) in a similar context in Tit. i. 3; κατ' ἐπιτ. τοῦ γεγονός θ. in Rom. xvi. 26. In 1 Cor. vii. 6, 2 Cor. viii. 8, κατ' ἐπιταγήν is used in a different sense.

St. Paul more commonly refers the originating cause of his mission to the will of God (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1). He would hardly say through the will of Christ, θλήμα being used of the eternal counsel of the Godhead; but inasmuch as the command is the consequent of the will, he can speak of his apostleship as being due to the command
of Christ Jesus, as well as of God the Father. In this matter Jesus Christ is co-ordinated with God the Father in Gal. i. 1; while in Rom. i. 4, 5, Paul's apostles' is an inchoate Jesus Christ our Lord" only. On the other hand, in Tit. i. 3, St. Paul says he was intrusted with the message "according to the commandment of God our Saviour". Here it is to be noted that the command proceeds equally from God and Christ Jesus. This language could hardly have been used if St. Paul conceived of Christ Jesus as a creature. Moulton and Milligan (Expositor, vii., viii. 379) compare St. Paul's use of εὐαγγελία as a Divine command with its technical use in heathen dedicatory inscriptions. We cannot, with Chrys., narrow the "commandment of God" to the specific date of St. Paul's commission by the Church, whether in Acts xii. 2 or on an earlier occasion. St. Paul claimed that he had been "separated from his mother's womb" (Gal. i. 15).

οὖν σωτῆρος ἡμῶν: Westcott on 1 John iv. 14 has an instructive note on the Biblical use of the term σωτῆρ. "The title is confined (with the exception of the writings of St. Luke) to the later writings of the N.T., and is not found in the central group of St. Paul's Epistles." It may be added that in the later writings of St. Luke (Acts xxi. 31, xliii. 23, of Christ) the term σωτήρ has not primarily its full later evangelical import, and would be best rendered deliverer, as in the constant O.T. application of the term to God. Perhaps the same is true of Phil. iii. 20, and Eph. v. 23, where it is used of Christ. On the other hand, apart from δὲ σωτήρ τ. κόσμου (John iv. 42; 1 John iv. 14), the conventional evangelical use is found: of God the Father in (a) 1 Tim. i. 1, Jude 25, θεὸς σωτῆρ ἡμῶν; (b) 1 Tim. ii. 3, Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4, θεὸς σωτῆρ ἡμῶν; (c) 1 Tim. iv. 10, ἡμῶν in apposition to θεός in the preceding clause; of Christ, in (a) 2 Tim. i. 10, δὲ σωτήρ ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ζησόμεθα; (b) Tit. i. 4, iii. 6, Ἱερός σωτήρ ἡμῶν; (c) 2 Pet. i. 11, ii. 20, iii. 18, δὲ Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρ ἡμῶν. (d) 2 Pet. iii. 3, δὲ Κύριος καὶ σωτήρ. To the (c) class belong, perhaps, Tit. ii. 13, 2 Pet. i. 1, δὲ [μετὰ] θεὸς [ἡμῶν] καὶ σωτήρ [ἡμῶν] ἡμῶν. Ἱερ. Ἱερ.; but see note on Tit. ii. 13.

In the text, there is an antithesis between the offices of God as our Saviour and of Christ Jesus as our hope. The one points to the past, at least chiefly, and the other to the future. In speaking of the saving action of God, St. Paul uses the assist: 2 Tim. i. 9, Tit. ii. 11, iii. 4, 5. He saved us, potentially. See further on ch. ii. 3. God, as the Council of Trent says (Sess. vi. cap. 7), is the efficient cause of our justification, while Jesus, "our righteousness", besides being the meritorious cause, may be said to be the formal cause; for "the righteousness of God by which He maketh us righteous" is embodied in Jesus, Who "was made unto us ... righteousness and sanctification" (1 Cor. i. 30). We advance from salvation to sanctification; and accordingly we must not narrow down the conception Christ Jesus our hope to mean "the hope of Israel" (Acts xxiii. 6, xxviii. 20); but rather the historical manifestation of the Son of God as Christ Jesus is the ground of our "hope of glory" (Col. i. 27). Our hope is that "the body of our humiliation will be conformed to the body of Christ by God" (Phil. ii. 20, 21). See also Eph. iv. 13. Our hope is that "we shall be like Him" (1 John iii. 2, 3). See also Tit. ii. 13, προσδεχομενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἀμετάβλητα. For this vivid use of an abstract noun compare Eph. iv. 14, αὐτῶν γὰρ τῶν ἑκατέρων ἡμῶν. Ignatius borrows this noble appellation: Magn. ii; Trall. inscr., "Jesus Christ Who is our hope through our resurrection unto Him"; Trall. 2, "Jesus Christ our hope; for if we live in Him, we shall also be found in Him". See also Polycarp, 8.

Ver. 2. γυναῖκα qualifies the compound τὴν ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ σὺν ἑµαῖς, just as in Tit. i. 1. it qualifies τὸν κατὰ κοµήν τὸν; As in the relation of the heavenly Father to those who are His children by adoption and grace, some are "led by the Spirit of God," and so are genuine sons of
God, so in the filial relationships of earth—physical, spiritual, or intellectual—some sons realize their vocation, others fail to do so. γινόμενοι (and γνωρίζοντο, Phil. ii. 20) is only found in the N.T. in Paul. See reff. It might be rendered lawful, legitimate, as γνωρία means "lawful wife" (Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii. vii. 382). Dean Bernard (comm. in loc.) cites an interesting parallel from Philo (de Vit. Cont. p. 482, ed. Mangey), where "the young men among the Therapeutae are described as ministering to their elders καθὼς ποιοῦν γνωρίαν." ἀδικίαν ἐν πίνακε: The parallel from Tit. i. 4 quoted above proves that πίνακες here is the faith, as A.V. Absence of the article before familiar Christian terms is a characteristic of the Pastoral. Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 15, "In Christ Jesus I begat you through the gospel". See also Gal. iv. 19, Phil. 20; and, for the term πίνακας as applied to Timothy, see reff. St. Paul "begat him through the gospel" on the first missionary journey. He was already a disciple in Acts xvi. 1. Nothing can be safely inferred from the variation αὐτ' εἰς in 2 Tim. i. 2 for γνωρίαν. The selection from among these semi-conventional terms of respect is conditioned by passing moods of which the writer is not wholly conscious; but a pseudopigraphic author would be careful to observe uniformity.

Θεός as an element in the salutation in addition to χάριν and εἰλήφη is only found, in the Pauline Epistles, in 1 and 2 Timothy. See reff. "Mercy" is used in an informal benediction, Gal. vi. 16, "Peace be upon them, and mercy". Bengel notes that personal experience of the mercy of God makes a man a more efficient minister of the Gospel. See vv. 13, 16, 1 Cor. vii. 25, 2 Cor. iv. 1, Heb. ii. 17. Ce also Tobit vii. 12 (ii) δι' ἐρήμου ... παρακάλει τῷ ἡμῖν εἰλήφθαι κ. εἰλήφθην and Wind. iii. 9, iv. 15, χάριν ἐπὶ θεοῦ τοῖς ἑλκείσις αὐτῶ. If one may hazard a conjecture as to what prompted St. Paul to wish mercy to Timothy rather than to Titus, it may be a subtle indication of the apostle's anxiety as to Timothy's administrative capacity. Another variation in the salutation in Titus is the substitution of Saviour for Lord. This calls for no comment.

Note the anarthrous θέλω σαρκί as in all the Pauline salutations, with the exception of 1 Thess., where we have simply χάρις ἐμαυτῷ κ. εἰλήφη. In Colossians the blessing is only from God the Father. ημῶν is added to παράσχει except in 2 Thess. and the Pastoral.

Vv. 3-7. The Motive of this Letter: to provide Timothy with a written memorandum of previous verbal instructions, especially with a view to novel speculations about the Law which sap the vitality of the Gospel; the root of which is sincerity, and its fruit, love.

Ver. 3. καθὼς: The apodosis supplied at the end of ver. 4 in the T. V., so do I now, is feebler than the so do of the A.V. We need something more vigorous. St. Paul was more anxious that Timothy should charge some, etc., than that he should merely abide at Ephesus. This is implied in the A.V., in which so do = stay there and be a strong ruler.

An exact parallel occurs in Mark i. 2. Similar anacolutha are found in Rom. v. 12, Gal. ii. 4, 5, 6, Eph. iii. 1.

παρακάλεισθαι: It is far-fetched to regard this word as specially expressive of a mild command, as Chrys. suggests. παρακαλεῖσθαι constantly occurs, and with very varying meanings, in the Pauline Epistles. διατάξασθαι is used in the corresponding place in Tit. i. 5, because there the charge concerns a series of injunctions.

προσμενεῖν: ut remanesceris (Vulg.). The word (see Acts xviii. 18) naturally implies that St. Paul and Timothy had been together at Ephesus, and that St. Paul left Timothy there as vicar apostolic. προσνομηθεῖται refers to St. Paul, not to Timothy, as De Wette alleged. The grammatical proof of this is fully gone into by Winer-Moulton, Gram. p. 404, "If the subject of the infinitive is the same as that of the finite verb, any attributes which it may have are put in the nominative".

It is unnecessary here to prove that it is impossible to fit this journey of St. Paul to Macedonia, and Timothy's stay at Ephesus connected therewith, into the period covered by the Acts.

τῶν: τῶν is intentionally vague. The writer has definite persons in his mind, but for some reason he does not
choose to specify them. To do so, in this case, would have had a tendency to harden them in their heresy, "render them more shameless" (Chrys.). The introduction of the personal element into controversy has a curiously irritating effect. For this use of τήνως see 1 Cor. iv. 18, 2 Cor. iii. 1, x. 2, Gal. i. 7, ii. 12, 1 Tim. i. 6, 19, v. 15, vi. 10, 21, 2 Tim. ii. 18.

μή ἐπεροτισκάλειν: This compound occurs again in 1 Tim. vi. 3, and means to teach a gospel or doctrine different from that which I have taught. ἐπεροτο certainly seems to connote difference in kind. Gal. i. 6, ἐπεροτε ἐναγιγνόν, 8 σαρακέναλλο, and 2 Cor. xi. 4 illustrate St. Paul's language here. The heresy may have been of recent origin, and not yet completely systematised—heresy of course does not aim at finality—but St. Paul does not mean to deal gently with it. It was to him false and accursed (cf. Gal. i. 8, 9). "His forebodings for the church in Ephesus (Acts xx. 29, 30) were being fulfilled now. Hort (Judaistic Christianity, p. 134) compares the διδάχαις ποικίλαις καὶ ἔναντις of Heb. xiii. 9.

St. Paul elsewhere uses compounds with ἐπερετο, e.g., 2 Cor. vi. 14, ἐπεροτυγκῶν: and more remarkably still, when quoting Isa. xxviii. 11 in 1 Cor. iv. 21, he substitutes ἐν ἐπεροτισκόων for διὰ γλώσσης ἐπερετον of the LXX. The word is found in Ignat. ad Polyc. 3, οὗ δοκοῦτες ἐξωτικοττοῦ εἶναι καὶ ἐπεροτισκαλούτης.

Ver. 4. μηδὲ προσέχειν: nor to pay attention to. This perhaps refers primarily to the hearers of the ἐπεροτισκαλοί rather than to the false teachers themselves. See ref.

μῆδοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἄπεραντος: "Polybius uses both terms in similarly close connection, Hist. ix. 2, 11" (Ell.). Two aspects of, or elements in, the one aberraion from sound doctrine.

Some light is thrown upon this clause by other passages in this group of letters (1 Tim. i. 6, 7, iv. 7, vi. 4, 20; 2 Tim. ii. 1, 14, 16, 23, iv. 4; Tit. i. 10, 14, iii. 9). The myths are expressly ca and Jewish (Tit. i. 14), and this affords a good argument that γνωμοδιδασκαλοῖς καὶ γνώμον, in 1 Tim. i. 7, 8 and Tit. iii. 9, refer to the Mosaic Law, not restricting the term Law to the Pentateuch. Now a considerable and important part of the Mosaic legislation has relation only to Palestine and Jerusalem; it had no practical significance for the devotional life of the Jews of the Dispersion, with the exception of the community that worshipped at Hierapolis in Egypt. There is a strong temptation to mystics to justify to themselves the continued use of an antiquated sacred book by a mystical interpretation of whatever in it has ceased to apply to daily life. Thus Philo (De Vit. Contempl. § 3) says of the Therapeutaes, "They read the holy Scriptures, and explain the philosophy of their fathers in an allegorical manner, regarding the written words as symbols of hidden truth which is communicated in obscure figures". Those with whom St. Paul deals in the Pastoral Epistles were not the old-fashioned conservative Judaisers whom we meet in the Acts and in the earlier Epistles; but rather the promoters of an eclectic synthesis of the then fashionable Gentile philosophy and of the forms of the Mosaic Law. μῆδοι, then, here and elsewhere in the Pastoral (see ref.), would refer, not to the stories and narrative of the O.T. taken in their plain straightforward meaning, but to the arbitrary allegorical treatment of them. γενεαλογίαι may similarly refer to the genealogical matter in the O.T. which is usually skipped by the modern reader; but which by a mystical explanation of the derivations of the nomenclature could be made to justify their inclusion in a sacred book, every syllable of which might be supposed antecedently to contain edification. This general interpretation, which is that of Weiss, is
supported by Ignat. Magn. 8, "Be not seduced by strange doctrines nor by antiquated fables (ὑπερβολικοί μη ἐμπνευσμένοι τοὺς παλαιοὺς), which are profissions. For if even unto this day we live after the manner of Judaism (εὐθεία λειτουργίαν λαμβάνειν), we avow that we have not received grace." Hort maintains that ἀφιλοθέεις here has a derived meaning, "all the early tales adherent, as it were, to the births of founders" (see 'Judaistic Christianity, p. 135 sqq.). On the other hand, Irenæus (Haer. Prae. 3; de Præscript. 33) suppose that the Gnostic groupings of ἄνθρωπος in genealogical relationships are here alluded to. It was natural that they should read the N.T. in the light of controversies in which they themselves were engaged.

αἰτίαν: qualitative, they are of such a kind as, the which (R.V.).

ἀποτύπωσις: Questionings to which no answer can be given, which are not worth answering. Cf. vi. 4. Their unpractical nature is implied by their being contrasted with ὁλοκοντραθείς τὸν θεόν. Life is a trust, a stewardship, committed to us by God. Anything that claims to belong to religion, and at the same time is prejudicial to the effectual discharge of this trust is self-condemned.

It will be observed that ὁλοκοντραθεῖς is used here as in the phrase κόκων παράσχω. It will be observed that ὁλοκοντραθεῖς is here taken subjectively and actively (the performance of the duty of an ὁλοκοντραθείς entrusted to a man by God; so also in Col. i. 25); not objectively and passively (the dispensation of God, i.e., the Divine plan of salvation). The Western reading ὁλοκοντραθεῖς or ὁλοκοντραθεῖς, εὐκονομία, is easier; but the text gives a deeper meaning.

ἐπίστευσιν: This is best taken as in the faith; cf. ver. 2, ii. 7, Tit. iii. 15. The trust committed to us by God is exercised in the sphere of the faith.

The apostolos at the end of ver. 4 is due to an imperative need felt by St. Paul to explain at once, and develop the thought of, ὁλοκοντραθεῖς τὸν θεόν. The true teaching—that of the apostle and of Timothy—would be the consequence of the charge given by Timothy and would issue in, be productive of, an ὁλοκοντραθεῖς τὸν θεόν. This ὁλοκοντραθεῖς is the object aimed at, τὸν ἀποτύπωσιν, of the charge; and is further defined as ὁριζόμενον, etc.

This is the only place in Paul in which ἀποτύπωσις means the final cause. In every other instance it means termination, result, i.e., consequence. 1 Peter, i. 9 is perhaps an instance of a similar use.

The charge is referred to again in ver. 18. See also 1 Thess. iv. 2. The expressed object of the charge being the comprehensive virtue, love, it is strange that Elicott should characterise this exegesis as "too narrow and exclusive". Bengel acutely observes that St. Paul does not furnish Timothy with such arguments with which to refute the heretics, because the special duty of a church ruler is concerned with what is positively necessary. The love here spoken of is that which is "the fulfilment of the law" (Rom. xiii. 10); and its nature is further defined by its twofold source. Heart, conscience, faith, mark stages in the evolution of the inner life of a man. Heart, or disposition, is earlier in development than conscience; and faith, in the case of those who have it, is later than conscience.

καθαρὰ καθιστά is an O.T. phrase. See ref. σαφέστερον is καθαρὰ in 1 Tim. iii. 9, 2 Tim. i. 3; it is ἀγαθόν in ref.; καλή in Heb. xiii. 18; it occurs without any epithet in 1 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. i. 15. πίστις ἀνυφράκτως occurs again 2 Tim. i. 5; and the adj. is applied to ἀγαθόν, Rom. xii. 9, 2 Cor. vi. 6. See other ref.

It is evident that no stress can be laid on the choice of epithets in any particular passage.

Ver. 6. ἀν: i.e., the disposition, con-
science, and faith as qualified. τινὸς...see note on ver. 3. ἀντικατάστατος: (aberrantes, Vulg.; recedentes, m7; excedentes, m6). In the other passages where this word occurs the A.V. and R.V. have erred; here swerved. They missed the mark in point of fact. It may be questioned whether they really had aimed at a pure heart, etc. But having missed, being in fact "corrupted in mind" vi. 5; "branded in their conscience," iv. 2; and "reprobate concerning the faith," 2 Tim. iii. 8, they did not secure as their own love, practical beneficence, but its exact opposite, empty talking, vaniloquium, Tit. i. 10. The content of this empty talking is analysed in Tit. iii. 9.

It is more natural to suppose that τῶν is governed by ἀντικατάστατος (Huther, Grimm, Alf.) than by ἤτοι... The latter in vi. 20. Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii., vii. 373, quote examples of ἀντικατάστατος from papyri (ii. e.c. ii, a.d.) in the sense "fail" or "forget," e.g., ἀντικατάστατος τοῦ καλοῦ γοντος. ἤτοι...introduces a new metaphor: they had turned aside out of the right path—παταριολογία: Here only; but παταριολογία occurs, Tit. i. 10. See vi. 20: "Vanitas maxima, ubi de rebus divinis non vere disseritur, Rom. i. 21." (Bengel).

Ver. 5. τῶν νομοδίδασκαλον: The Mosaic or Jewish law is meant. See Tit. iii. 9. The term is used seriously, of official teachers of the law, in reff. μη νοούτες...κ.τ.λ.: Though they understand neither, etc. The participle is concessive, and μη is here subjective, as usual, expressing St. Paul's opinion about them. For the sentiment cf. vi. 4, 1 Cor. viii. 2. λέγοντων refers to the substance of their assertions, while διαβεβαιώνουσα (affirmant; see Tit. iii. 8) is expressive of the confident manner (R.V.) in which they made them. They did not grasp the force either of their own propositions (hence resulted ἐβηθαν...κενοφάνεια), or the nature of the great topics—Law, Philosophy, etc.—on which they dogmatised, hence their inconsistencies, ἀντιδιάθεσις τοῦ ψυχωδοῦμον γνώσεως (vi. 20). On the combination of the relative and interrogative pronouns in one sentence, see Winer-Moulton, Grammar, p. 211.

Ver. 8. οἱ δὲ...as in Rom. vii. 14. ἧ...introduces a concession in the argument. δώσας was a concession made by St. Paul, Rom. vii. 16, also Rom. vii. 12, ὁ μὲν νόμος ἡγεμόν. It is possible that it had been objected that his language was inconsistent with his policy. It may be questioned whether καλὸς, in St. Paul's use of it, differs from ἄγαθος, as meaning good in appearance as well as in reality. For the use of καλὸς in the Pastoral, see notes on i. 18 and iii. 1. τις has no special reference to the teacher as distinct from the learner. The law is καλὸς in its own sphere; but Corruptio optimi pesima; "Sweetest things turn sourest by their deeds". νομίζω here means in accordance with the spirit in which the law was enacted. It does not mean lawfully in the usual acceptance of that term. St. Paul impresses the word into his service, and does it violence in order to give an epigrammatic turn to the sentence. In 2 Tim. ii. 5, νομίζω has its ordinary meaning in accordance with the rules of the game. χρήσατα: In Euripides, Hipp. 98 νόμοις χρήσατα means "to live under laws".

Ver. 9. εἶδος refers to τις, as knowing this (R.V.). For the expression cf. οἶδας τοῦτον, 2 Tim. i. 15 and Eph. v. 5. νόμος: Although νόμος when anarthrous may mean the Mosaic Law, the statement here is perfectly general (so R.V.). The Mosaic Law does not differ in the range of its application, though it may in the details of its enactments, from law in general, of which it is a subdivision. Law is not enacted for...
a naturally law-abiding man (dative of reference). δίκαιος is used here in the popular sense, as in "I came not to call the righteous". It is unnecessary to suppose that St. Paul had his theory of justification in his mind when writing this; though of course those who "are led by the Spirit" are δίκαιοι of the highest quality, κατὰ τῶν τουτοῦ ὑστὸν ἠτύχον (Rom. vi. 14). The enumeration of those whom legislators have in view when enacting laws naturally begins with ἄνομος, of whom the ἀνωτάτους, usually, those who deliberately rebel against restriction of any kind, are the extreme type. There is no special class or quality of crime involved in the terms ἄνομος and ἀνωτάτους. As the series advances, the adjectives indicate more definite and restricted aspects of lawlessness: the first three pairs represent states of mind; then follow examples of violations of specific enactments. Since St. Paul is here dealing with the law of natural religion, it is not safe to deepen the shade of ἄνεσθης, κ.τ.λ. by looking at the conceptions they express in the light of the Lord.

δ' ἄνεσθης καὶ ἀμαρτωλός is a pair of epithets familiar from its occurrence in Prov. xi. 31 (quoted 1 Pet. iv. 18. See also Jude 15). The ἄνεσθης is one whose mental attitude towards God Himself is that of deliberate irreverence; the βεβηλός acts contumeliously towards recognised expressions or forms of reverence to God.

Alford and Ellicott, following a hint from Bengel, suppose that in the series commencing παρελθόντας St. Paul is going through the second table of the Decalogue. It is an argument against this that when St. Paul is unquestionably enumerating the Commandments, Rom. xii. 9, he places the command against adultery before that against murder (so Luke xviii. 20; Jas ii. 11; Philo, De Decalogo, xxiv. and xxxii.; Tert. de Pudic., v., all following LXX (B) of Deut. chap. v.). There is therefore no necessity to give παρελθόντας the weak rendering "smiler of a father" (R.V. m.) in order to make the word refer to normal breaches of the Fifth Commandment. It can, of course, both by derivation and use, be so rendered. The Greek word, like parricide in Latin and English, may be applied to any unnatural treatment of a parent.

The apostle is here purposely specifying the most extreme violations of law, as samples (καὶ οἱ τις παροικοῦν) of what disregard of law may lead to. The healthy, wholesome teaching of Christ is of course in opposition to such enormities; it is also in opposition to the false teachers; these teachers have failed to attain to a pure heart, etc. Consequently, although professing to teach the Law, they find themselves in opposition to the essential spirit of law. Let them, and those who listen to them, take care lest their teaching inevitably issue in similar enormities.

Ver. 10. αὐθανατωδοτικαι, plagiaristae (Vulg.), includes all who exploit other men and women for their own selfish ends; as τόροις and ἀριστοκρατοῦσαι include all improper use of sexual relations.

διδασκαλία means the body of doctrine, the apostolic Summa Theologiae. The noun is used absolutely, 1 Tim. vi. 1, or with varying epithets: ἡγιασμός, sana (here, 2 Tim. iv. 3; Tit. i. 9, ii. 1); καλή, bona (1 Tim. iv. 6); κατ' εὐθυμίαν, secundum pietatem (1 Tim. vi. 3); παρευρείται (2 Tim. iii. 10); τῷ σωτήροι υἱῶν θαυματουργῶν (Tit. ii. 10).

It means the act of teaching in Rom. xii. 7, xv. 4, 1 Tim. iv. 13, 16, v. 17, 2 Tim. iii. 16, Tit. ii. 7. The term occurs four times in the Pastoral Epistles in a technical Christian sense. This is in the writer's mind even in 1 Tim. iv. 1, διδασκαλίας διαμωμένων. It is found four times in the other Pauline Epistles. Of these Rom. xii. 7 is the nearest approach to the special connotation here.

With ἡγιασμόν (see reff.) compare
The image is peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles; but it is not therefore un-Pauline, unless on the assumption that a writer never enlarges his vocabulary or ideas. Healthy, wholesome admirably describes Christian teaching, as St. Paul conceived it, in its complete freedom from casuistry or quibbles in its theory, and from arbitrary or unnatural restrictions in its practice. The terms нёпов as applied to false teaching (1 Tim. vi. 4), and possibly γεγραμμένον (2 Tim. ii. 17) were suggested by contrast. See Dean Bernard's note on this verse.

Ver. 11. кατά τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, κ.τ.λ., refers to the whole preceding sentence and is not to be connected with διδακτικά only, which would necessitate γιὰ κατὰ, κ.τ.λ. This reading is actually found in D,* d, f, g, Vg., Arm., quae est secundum, etc. Von Soden connects with Σικτοῦν Χριστοῦ. Inasmuch as unsound teaching had claimed to be a εὐαγγέλιον (Gal. i. 6), St. Paul finds it necessary to recharge the word with its old force by distinguishing epithets. εὐαγγέλιον had become impoverished by heterodox associations. The gospel with which St. Paul had been entrusted was the gospel of the glory of the blessed God. Cf. "the gospel of the glory of Christ," 2 Cor. iv. 4. The gospel concerning the glory, etc., which reveals the glory. And this glory, although primarily an attribute of God, is here and elsewhere treated as a blessed state to which those who obey the gospel may attain, and which it is possible to miss (Rom. iii. 23. v. 2, xv. 7. See Sanday and Headlam on Rom. iii. 23). The phrase is not, as in A.V., an expansion of "the gospel of God," Mark i. 14, etc., "the gospel of which God is the author," the δόξα being a genitive of quality=glorious. (Compare Rom. viii. 21, 2 Cor. iv. 6; Eph. i. 6, 18; Col. i. 11, 27; Tit. ii. 13).

μακαρίου: Blessed as an epithet of God is only found here and in vi. 15, where see note. Grimm compares the μάκαρις θεοῦ of Homer and Hesiod. But the notion here is much loftier. We may call God blessed, but not happy; since happiness is only predicated of those whom it is possible to conceive of as unhappy.

δ ἐνεργεῖ: This phrase occurs again Tit. i. 3. Cf. Rom. iii. 2, 1 Cor. ix. 17, Gal. ii. 7, 1 Thess. ii. 4. St. Paul does not here allude to his particular presentation of the gospel, as in Gal. ii. 7; nor is he thinking specially of God's goodness to him in making him a minister, as in Rom. xv. 16, Eph. iii. 8, Col. i. 25; he is merely asserting his consistency, and repudiating the charge of antinomianism which had been brought against him.

Vv. 12-14. I cannot mention my part in the furtherance of the gospel without expressing my gratitude to our Lord for His forgiveness of my errors and His confidence in my natural trustworthi-ness, and His grace which gave me strength to serve Him.

Ver. 12. This parenthetical thanksgiving, which is quite in St. Paul's manner, is suggested by δ Λατίνην ἠγιασμένον. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 9 sqq., Eph. iii. 8. γέρνε γένεσις: see note on 2 Tim. i. 3. ἑνεργεῖ: The aor. is used because the writer's thoughts pass back to the particular time when he received inward strength increasingly, Acts ix. 22. In Phil. iv. 13 the present participle is appropriate, because he is describing his present state. The word ἑνεργεῖσθαι is only found in N.T. in Paul and Acts ix. 22. Is it fanciful to suppose that Luke's use of it in Acts was suggested by his master's account of that crisis? διδός: because.

πιστόν: trustworthy, as a steward is expected to be, 1 Cor. iv. 2. See ref. There is, as Bengel remarks, a touch of ἐνθρωπομοσία, of anthropomorphism or accommodation, in πιστόν με γύρωσα.
The Divine Master knew that His steward Paul would be trustworthy. Paul, not unnaturally, speaks as if God's apprehension of him were of the same relative nature as his own hope of final perseverance.

οἶδαν ἐς διακονοῦν: The fact that Christ employed Paul in His service was a sign of His approbation of him. διακονοῦν and διακονία are used in a general sense of St. Paul's ministry also in Rom. xi. 13, Col. iii. 5, 2 Cor. iii. 6, iv. 1, v. 18, vi. 3, Eph. iii. 7, Col. i. 23, 25. Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 6, 2 Tim. iv. 5, 11. The nature of it is exactly defined in Acts xx. 24. Here only, cf. 1 Cor. mo v. 9, Gal. li. 13, 2 Pet. iii. 8, 6, not LXX. c a Tim. i. 8, Heb. vii. 14, 2 Pet. iii. 15, Rev. xi. 15. c a Col. i. 4, 1 Thess. iii. 6, v. 8, 2 Tim. ii. 15, vi. 11, 2 Tim. ii. 1, Tit. ii. 15. cf. Gal. v. 6, Eph. vi. 23, 1 Tim. iv. 18, Rev. ii. 19. 1 Tm. iii. 1, iv. 9, 2 Tim. ii. 11, Tit. iii. 8, cf. Tit. i. 9, Rev. xxii. 5, xxii. 6.

1 So MAD*PGP, 17, 47, 67**, 80, three others; τῷ D-kl.

2 Ins. μα A, 73; 8 g.

3 HUMANS r, Latin MSS. known to Jerome, Ambrost., Julian pel., Aug.

The saying of the Scribes recorded in Luke xxi. 34, 46 γὰρ ὢν ὁδήγησαν τόν λαόν, may possibly be a reminiscence of the saying of the Screen recorded in Matt. xxi. 39, 42. But the saying of the Screen differs from the saying of the Scribes in the omission of ὅτι and the insertion of καὶ. It is therefore probable that the saying of the Screen is the more ancient of the two. But it is also probable that the saying of the Screen is the more ancient of the two, and that the saying of the Scribes is a reminiscence of the saying of the Screen. In this case, the saying of the Screen would be the oldest, and the saying of the Scribes would be the more recent.

Vv. 25-17. The dealings of Christ with me, of course, are not unique. My ex-
experience is the same in kind, though not in degree, as that of all saved sinners. Christ's long-suffering will never undergo a more severe test than it did in my case, so that no sinner need ever despair. Let us glorify God therefore.

Ver. 15. πιστὸς ὁ λόγος: The complete phrase, πιστὸς . . . ἄξιος recurs in 1 Tim. iv. 9; and πιστὸς ὁ λόγος in 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2 Tim. ii. 11, Tit. iii. 8.

The only other places in the N.T. in which πιστὸς is applied to λόγος in the sense of that can be relied on are Tit. i. 9, ἀνομίας τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδακτὴν πιστοῦ λόγου; Rev. xii. 5, xxii. 6, οὗτος ὁ λόγος πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός.

In Tit. i. 9 the πιστὸς λόγος cannot mean an isolated saying, but rather the totality of the revelation given in Christ. Of the other five places in which the phrase occurs there are not more than two in which it is possible to say with confidence that a definite saying is referred to, i.e., here, and perhaps 2 Tim. ii. 11. In the other passages, the expression seems to be a brief parenthetical formula, affirmative of the truth of the general doctrine with which the writer happens to be dealing. See notes in each place.

πᾶς ἁπαθοχήματος ἄξιος: Field (Notes on Transl. N.T. p. 203) shows by many examples from Diodorus Siculus and Diog. Laert. that this phrase was a common one in later Greek. He would render ἁπαθοχήματος ἄξιος by approbation or admiration. See also Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii., vi. 185. ἁπαθοχήματος occurs in 1 Tim. ii. 3, v. 4; ἁπαθοχήματος in Luke and Acts.

Other examples in the Pastorals of the use of ὄν = (summis) with abstract nouns (besides ch. iv. 9) are 1 Tim. ii. 2, xi. 4, v. 2, vi. 1, 2 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. ii. 10, 15, iii. 2.

Χρ. ἵνα ἴδητε—σοῦσαι: This is quite evidently a saying in which the apostolic church summed up its practical belief in the Incarnation. ἱστομένας εἰς τὸν κόσμον, as used of Christ, is an expression of the Johannine theology; see ref. It is the converse of another Johannine expression, ἀπότελεσθαι ὁ θεὸς . . . (οὗ ἰδοὺ); John iii. 17, x. 36, xvii. 18, 1 John iv. 9. εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον is used in the same association, Heb. x. 5. εἰσορθοσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον is used of sin, Rom. v. 12; ἱστομένας εἰς τ. κ. of false prophets in 1 John iv. 1, 2 John 7.

When we say that this is a Johannine expression, we do not mean that the writer of this epistle was influenced by the Johannine literature. But until it has been proved that John the son of Zebedee did not write the Gospel which bears his name, and that the discourses contained in it are wholly unhistorical, we are entitled, indeed compelled, to assume that what we may for convenience call Johannine theology, and the familiar expression of it, was known wherever John preached.

With ἴδε ἔτη . . . σοῦσαι cf. Luke xix. 10, ἴδεν . . . σοῦσαι τὸ ἀποκάλυψις. For the notion expressed in ἀμαρτολεῖς σοῦσαι cf. Matt. i. 21, ix. 13; see also John xii. 47, ἴδεν . . . ἐν σώμα τοῦ κόσμου; John i. 29, ἰδοὺ τὸν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου; and 1 John ii. 2.

The pre-existence of Christ, as well as His resistless power to save, is of course assumed in this noble summary of the gospel.

ἐν πρώτῳ ἐλήμ. ἵνα: In the experiences of personal religion each individual man is alone with God. He seeks nought but the Holy One and his own sinful self (cf. Luke xviii. 13, μοι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ). And the more familiar a man becomes with the meeting of God face to face the less likely is he to be deceived as to the gulf which parts him, limited, finite, defective, from the Infinite and Perfect. It is not easy to think of anyone but St. Paul as penning these words; although his expressions of self-depreciation elsewhere (1 Cor. xv. 9, Eph. iii. 8) are quite differently worded. In each case the form in which they are couched arises naturally out of the context. The sincerity of St. Paul's humility is proved by the fact that he had no mock modesty; when the occasion compelled it, he could appraise himself; e.g., Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16, 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11, Gal. ii. 6.

Ver. 16. ἀλλά: This is not adversative, but rather continues from ver. 13, and develops the expression of self-depreciation. The connexion is: "I was such a sinner that antecedently one might doubt
whether I could be saved or was worth saving. But Christ had a special object in view in extending to me His mercy."

1 So AD, 17, 47, 80, six others, d, f, r, vg., go., sah.; ″ yap. Χριστ. ΝKL, 37, syr., boh., arm.

2 ἀθανάτου D, immortal d, f, r, vg., syrhc-eng; FG, g, r (incorruptibili) add ἀθανάτῳ after ἀποθανοῦσα.

3 Ins. ἔσος Ν-Db=KLP, go., syrb (from Rom. xvi. 27); om. ἔσος N-AD*FG, 17, 37, one other, Latt., sah., boh., syrbsh.
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18. Τάδην τὴν "παραγγελίαν" παρα-
λήκανον, κατὰ τὸς "προαγούσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφη-
τήν, ὅποιοι δότην, μένεν, are co-ordinate ep-
ithets of θεός, to God immortal, invisible, unique.

ἀνθρωπός, immortal, as an epithet of
God, occurs Rom. i. 23 (cf. Wisd. xii. 1,
τὸ γὰρ ἀνθρώπου σου ... πνεύμα ἐστὶν ἐν πάσιν, and Moulton and Milligan,
Expositor, viii. vii. 376). It is expanded in
vi. 15 sq., who only hath immortality,
just as ἀνθρώπος becomes whom no man
hath seen, nor can see (for the thought,
see John i. 18, Col. i. 15, Heb. xi. 27,
John iv. 12), and μόνος becomes the
blessed and only potentate. For the
epithet μόνος, used absolutely, see refl.
and also Ps. lxxvi. 10, John xvii. 3;
Rom. xvi. 27.

τιμὴ καὶ δόξα: This combination in a
doxology is found Rev. iv. 9, δόξαν σοι...
δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν; v. 13, ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δόξα.
In St. Paul's other doxologies (Gal. i. 5,
Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27, Phil. iv. 20, Eph.
iii. 21, 1 Tim. vi. 16, 2 Tim. iv. 18), with
the exception of 1 Tim. vi. 16 (τιμὴ καὶ
δόξαν), τιμὴ is not found; and he
always has ἡ δόξα (see Westcott, Addi-
tional Note on Heb. xiii. 21).

Vv. 18-20. The charge that I am giving
you now is in harmony with what you
heard from the prophets at your ordi-
nation. It only emphasises the funda-
mental moral relations of man to things
unseen and seen. The rejection of these
principles of natural religion naturally
issues in a perversion of revealed religion,
such as caused the excommunication of
Hymenaeus and Alexander.

Ver. 18. ταυτὴν τὴν "παραγγελίαν"
is partly resumptive of ver. 3; it is the
positive aspect of what is there nega-
tively expressed; but as it concerns
Timothy directly, it has a reference for-
ward to ἡ στρατευμα, κ.τ.λ., and to the
general contents of the epistle. Bengel
refers it to παραγγελίας, ver. 5. Peille
τὸ πιστὸν ἰ λόγον, κ.τ.λ.

παραπτήματι σοι: The use of this
word, as in Luke xii. 48, 2 Tim. ii. 2,
suggests that the παραγγελία is no
more than an injunction of temporary urgency,
that it is connected with, if not the same
as, the παραθετή (depositum) of 1 Tim.
vi. 20, etc.

τέκνον Τίμωθε: There is a peculiar
affectionate earne-
tness in this use of
the personal name, here and in the con-
x. 41, Martha, Martha; xii. 34, Peter;
John xiv. 9, Philip; xx. 16, Mary. For
τέκνον see note on ver. 2.

κατὰ τὸς ... προφητείας, κ.τ.λ.: By
the prophecies, etc., are meant the utter-
ances of the prophets, such as Silas (and
not excluding St. Paul himself) who
were with St. Paul when the ordination
of Timothy became possible; utterances
which pointed out the young man as a
person suitable for the ministry, led
the way to him (R.V.m.). So Chrys.
There is no need to suppose that any
long interval of time elapsed between
the first prophetical utterances and the
laying on of hands. In any case, similar
prophecies accompanied the act of ordi-
nation. This explanation agrees best
with the order of the words, and is in
harmony with earlier and later references
to the extraordinary function of prophets
in relation to the ministry in the apos-
tolic church. Thus in Acts xiii. 1, 2, the
imposition of hands on Paul and Bar-
nas—whether for a special mission or to
a distinct order it matters not—was at
the dictation of prophets. And Clem.
Alex. (Quis Dives, 42) speaks of the
Apostle John, κλήρων ἡν γὰρ τὸν κλη-
ρῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ Πνεύματος συμμο-
ρόν. In the same sense may be under-
stood Clem. Rom. ad Cor. i. 42: ἐφ
ἀνόστολοι ... καθηκότων τὰς ἀπαρ-
χάς αὐτῶν, δοκιμασάντας τῷ πνεύματι,
αὐτὴς ἐπισκόπους καὶ δικαίων.

It is evident from iv. 14 that the pro-
phesy accompanying the laying-on of
hands was considered at least contribu-
tory to the bestowal of the charisma; it
is natural to suppose that it was of the
nature of a charge to the candidate. St.
Paul here says that his present charge
to Timothy is in accordance with, in the
spirit of, and also in reinforcement of
ἡ στρατευμα in αὐτῶν) the charge he
had originally received on an occasion of
peculiar solemnity. This is a stimulat-
ing appeal like that of 2 Tim. iii. 14,
"knowing of whom thou hast learned
them ".

Ellicott disconnects προαγούσας from
ἐπὶ σὲ; but "forerunning, precursory,"
is pointless as an epithet of predictions,
though quite appropriate as applied to
ἐντολή in Heb. vii. 18; and the notion
of "prophecies uttered over Timothy at his ordination...for forecasting his future zeal and success" is unnatural.

Ina στρατεύομαι...τὴν καλὴν στρατεύομαι: The ministry is spoken of as a warfare, militia, "the service of a στρατεύομαι in all its details and particulars" (Ell.). See ref., and an interesting parallel in 4 Macc. x. 23, ἵνα τὴν παρεδώκησαι ἐπὶ τῆς εἰρήνης.

ἐν αὐτοῖς: in them, as in defensive armour. (Winer Moulton, Grammar, p. 484). Cf. Eph. vi. 14, 16, for a similar use of ἵνα.

καλὸν is characteristic of the Pastorals, in which it occurs twenty-four times as against sixteen times in the other Pauline Epistles. It has a special Christian reference in such phrases as the present, and as qualifying στρατεύομαι, in all its details and particulars" (Ell.). See ref., and an interesting parallel in 4 Macc. x. 23, ἵνα τὴν παρεδώκησαι ἐπὶ τῆς εἰρήνης.

Moreover, the use of the word in these epistles is also different from that found in the earlier epistles: (a) it is used as a qualifying adjective twelve times in the Pastorals (excluding καλὸν ἔργον, καλὰ ἔργα) εἰς, in addition to the ref. already given, 1 Tim. iii. 7, 13, vi. 19. This use is not found in the other Pauline Epistles. (b) As a predicate it occurs twice, εἰς, 1 Tim. i. 8, iv. 4, as against once elsewhere in Paul, Rom. vii. 16. On the other hand, τὸ καλὸν is not found in the Pastorals, though five times elsewhere (Rom. vii. 18, 21; 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Gal. vi. 9; 1 Thess. v. 21); nor καλὰ (Rom. xii. 17; 2 Cor. vii. 21); nor καλῶν (Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. v. 6, vii. 1, 8, 26, ix. 13; Gal. iv. 18); but τὸν καλὸν occurs chap. ii. 3 (Tit. iii. 8) as well as in 1 Cor. vii. 26. See also note on chap. iii. 1.

Ver. 19. ἰδίων: It is best perhaps to suppose that the metaphor of warfare is not continued beyond στρατεύομαι; else we might render, holding faith, as a shield, cf. Eph. vi. 16. But ἐν αὐτοῖς implies that the prophecies included every piece of defensive armour. So ἰδίων here simply means possessing, as in 1 Tim. iii. 9, 2 Tim. i. 13, iii. 5, Rom. ii. 20, 1 Cor. xv. 34, 1 Pet. iii. 16, συνείδησις: see note on ver. 5.

τίνες: see note on ver. 3.

ἀνισομερεῖς: The indictment against the moral standard of the false teachers is here expressed more severely than above in ver. 6. There they are said to have "missed" or "neglected" faith, etc.; but here that they thrust it from them (R.V., cf. Acts xiii. 46) when it importuned for admittance into their hearts. "Recedit invita. Semper dicit, Noli me laedere" (Bengel).

τὴν πίστιν ἐνακαίνισαν: Another change of metaphor: they suffered moral shipwreck, so far as the faith is concerned. "When the life is corrupt, it engenders a doctrine congenial to it" (Chrys.). We are not justified in interpreting suffered shipwreck as though it meant that they were lost beyond hope of recovery. St. Paul himself had suffered shipwreck at least four times (2 Cor. xi. 25) when he wrote this epistle. He had on each occasion lost everything except himself. For the construction, cf. περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἀλληλείπ. ἐνακαίνισαν, 1 Tim. vi. 21, 2 Tim. ii. 18; ἀδίκους περὶ τὴν πίστιν, 2 Tim. iii. 8. περὶ with acc. is used in a somewhat similar sense in Mark iv. 19, Luke x. 40, 41, Acts xix. 25, Phil. ii. 23 (the only instance in Paul outside the Pastorals) 1 Tim. vi. 4, Tit. ii. 7.

Hymenaeus and Alexander were the ringleaders of those who had suffered shipwreck. There is no sufficient reason to suppose that this Hymenaeus is different from the heretic of the same name in 2 Tim. ii. 17, where his error is more precisely defined. The identification of Alexander with Alexander the smith of 2 Tim. iv. 14 is more precarious.

Ver. 20. ὑπερβαίνει χρόνος τῷ Σατανᾶ: I have delivered (A.V.) expresses more
accurately than I delivered (R.V.) the force of the aorist followed by the subjunctive: they were still under sentence of excommunication (see Field in loc.). The theory of the relation of the Church to non-Christians which underlies this phrase is expressed in 1 John v. 19, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσμέν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος διόν ἐν τῷ θυρώματι, κεῖται. The ἐξουσία τοῦ Σατανᾶς is “the darkness” over against “the light” of the Kingdom of God (Acts xxvi. 18). The conception is not popular among modern Christians. The two kingdoms, if there are two, have interpenetrated each other. The phraseology, here and in the parallel, 1 Cor. v. 5, is based on Job ii. 6, κατὰ παραβολὰς σεβαιμον. The name Σατανᾶς also occurs in chap. v. 15 and in eight other places in the Pauline Epistles.

Πάντες λαλοῦν: The apostolic severity was not merely punitive; it was also corrective. The intention, at least, of excommunication was Πάντες λαλοῦν, 1 Cor. v. 5. So Chrys. We must not therefore regard here the sarcastically, that they may learn, A.V., but that they might be taught or instructed. At the same time, it is un natural to assume with Bengel that the παρακαλεῖ was intended to keep them from blaspheming at all; St. Paul hoped that it might prevent a repetition of the sin. The term has more of the association of discipline here and in 1 Cor. xi. 32, 2 Cor. vi. 9, than in the other references.

Πλασμοῖν: It is absurd to suppose that St. Paul here refers to a railing disparagement of his own apostolic claims.

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-7. In the first place, let me remind you that the Church's public prayers must be made expressly for all men, from the Emperor downwards. This care for all becomes those who know that they are children of the Father of all, and the best for all His children. He is one and the same to all, and the salvation He has provided in the Atonement is available for all. My own work among the Gentiles is one instance of God's fetching home again His banished ones.

Ver. 1. Παρακαλῶ οὖν: This is re-
2. ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν "ὑπέροχοι ὅτινς", ἵνα ἡμέρας ἱ παρέσχεται καὶ 'συνομνητής... 

is made up with special reference to the circumstances of the early Church by Polycarp, Phil. 12; Tert. Apol. § 30; ad Scapulam, § 2; Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 17; Dial. 35. "No one can feel hatred towards those for whom he prays... Nothing is so apt to draw men under teaching, as to love and be loved" (Chrys.).

Ver. 2. ὑπὲρ βασιλέων: Prayer for all men must be given intensity and directness by analysis into prayer for each and every sort and condition of men. St. Paul begins such an analytical enumeration with kings and all that are in high place; but he does not proceed with it. This verse 2 is in fact an explanatory parenthesis, exemplifying how the prayer "for all men" is to begin. The plural kings has occasioned some difficulty; since in St. Paul's time, Timothy and the Ephesian Church were concerned with one king only, the Emperor. Consequently those who deny the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals suppose that the writer here betrays his consciousness of the associated emperors under the Antonines. But, in the first place, he would have written τῶν βασιλέων: and again, the sentiment was intended as a perfectly general one, applicable to all lands. St. Paul knew of kingdoms outside the Roman empire to which, no doubt, he was sure the Gospel would spread; and even within the Roman empire there were honorary basileis whose characters could seriously affect those about them. The plural is similarly used in Matt. x. 18 and parallels.

On the duty of prayer for kings see Jer. xxix. 7, Ezra vi. 10, Bar. i. 11, i Macc. vii. 33, Rom. xiii. 1, Tit. iii. 1, i Pet. ii. 13.

Such prayer was a prominent feature in the Christian liturgy from the earliest times to which we can trace it (e.g., Clem. Rom. ad Cor. i. 61). It is specially noted in the Apologies as a proof of the loyalty of Christians to the Government, e.g., Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 17; Tert. Apol. 30, 31, 39; Athenagoras, Legatio, p. 39. Origen, Cont. Cels. viii. 12.

ἐν ὑπέροχοι: in high place (R.V.). The noun occurs in an abstract sense, καθ᾽ ὑπέροχον λόγον ἡ σοφίας, i Cor. i. 1; but the verb is found in this association: Rom. xiii. 1, ἡ μοιραία ὑπέροχος...; i Pet. ii. 13, βασιλείᾳ ὡς ὑπέροχον. The actual phrase τῶν ἐν ὑπέροχοι ὅτινς is found in an inscription at Pergamum "after 133 B.C." (Deissmann, Bible Studies, trans. p. 255).

ἵνα ἡμέρας: This expresses not the reason why prayer was to be made for kings, but the purport of the prayer itself. Cf. Tert. Apol. 39, "Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministeriis eorum ac potestatibus, pro statu seculi, pro rerum quiete". So Clem. Rom. ad Cor. i. 60, ὡς ἄξιονας καὶ ἄγνωστας ἡμῖν... [δοῦντα σοφίας ἡμῖν] ἐμπορίας γινομένως... τοῖς ἄνθρωποι καὶ γονιμόνων ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ γῇ... and esp. 61. Von Soden connects ἵνα, κ.τ.λ., with παρακάλει.

ἣμερας and ἡμέρας, tranquil and quiet (R.V.), perhaps refer to inward and outward peace respectively. See Bengel, on i Pet. iii. 4. ἡμέρας also has an external reference where it occurs in N.T., Acts xxii. 2, 2 Thess. iii. 12, i Tim. ii. 11, 12. ἡμέρας is found in a papyrus of ii. A.D. cited by Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii., vii. 471.

διάκονος is used in the sense of passing one's life, absolutely, without η ὑπέροχον εὐσεβεία. It and its cognates were "familiarterms in the religious language of the Imperial period" (Deissmann, Bible Studies, trans. p. 364). συμνόμηρα is rather gravi
tas, as Vulg. renders it in Tit. ii. 7, than castitas (Vulg. here and 1 Tim. iii. 7) just as σεμνός is a wider term than judi
cus as Vulg. always renders it (Phil. iv. 8; i Tim. iii. 8, 11; Tit. ii. 2). The
m: Cor. vii. — 3.  **προς Τιμοθεόν**  — 3. **προς Τιμοθεόν**

**3. προς Τιμοθεόν**  — 4. **προς Τιμοθεόν**

1. A.V. honesty is an older English equivalent for seemliness. It connotes gravity which compels genuine respect. 

Ver. 3. **προς Τιμοθεόν** 

**καλόν** not to be joined with **αποδέκτον** but taken by itself, as in ref. See note on i. 18. **αποδέκτον** occurs again, v. 4. Prayer for all men approves itself to the natural conscience, and it is also in accordance with the revealed will of God. 

**θεοῦ** is almost epexegetical of **οὐράνιον**. Our Saviour, if it stood alone, might mean Christ; but it is God the Father that is the originating cause of salvation. See note on i. 1. 

Ver. 4. “The grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men” (Tit. ii. 11) as was foreshadowed in the O.T.; e.g. Ps. lxvii. 2, “Thy saving health among all nations”. God is, so far as His inclination or will is concerned, “the Saviour of all men,” but actually, so far as we can affirm with certainty, “of them that believe” (1 Tim. iv. 10). These He saved, **ἐλάφια** (a Tim. i. 9; Tit. iii. 5), i.e., placed in a state of being saved. But here St. Paul does not say **ἐλάφια σώσας**, but **ἐλάφια σώθησα**; for by His own limitation of His powers, so far as they are perceived by us, the salvation of men does not depend on God alone. It depends on the exercise of the free will of each individual in the acceptance or rejection of salvation (so Wiesinger, quoted by Alf.; and, as Bengel notes on **ἐλάφια**, *non cognitum*), as well as on the cooperation of those who pray for all men; and, by so doing, generate a spiritual atmosphere in which the designs of God may grow. 

It is also to be observed that since salvation means a state of being saved, there is no difficulty in the knowledge of the truth following it in the sentence, as though it were a consequence rather than a precedent condition. This is indeed the order indicated in the Last Commission: “baptising them ... teaching them” (Matt. xvi. 19, 20). So that there is no need to suppose with Ell., that **οὐράνιον** was “suggested by ... the enunciation of the great truth which is contained in the following verse”. 

**ἐλάφια** This whole phrase recurs in 2 Tim. iii. 7. For **ἐλάφια** see ref. In Heb. x. 26 both words have the article. It has been shown by Dean Armitage Robinson (Ephesians, p. 248 sqq.) that **ἐλάφια** is not maior exactiorque cognitio; but, as distinguished from **γνῶσις** “which is the wider word and expresses ‘knowledge’ in the fullest sense, **ἐλάφια** is knowledge directed towards a particular object, perceiving, discerning, recognising”. Cf. 2 Macc. ix. 11, ἡρακλῆ... **ἐλάφια** θρησκευτός. **ἐλάφια** occurs fourteen times in the Pastoral; and often with a special Christian reference, like **δόκεοι** and **εἰσέβαλε**. See e.g. in addition to this place, 1 Tim. iii. 15, iv. 3, vi. 5, 2 Tim. ii. 15, 18, iii. 8, iv. 4, Tit. i. 4. It is a term that belongs to the Johannine theology as well as to the Pauline. 

Ver. 5. This emphatic statement as to the unity of the Godhead is suggested by the singular **σωτήρος** just preceding. The εἰς neither affirms nor denies anything as to the complexity of the nature of the Godhead; it has no bearing on the Christian doctrine of the Trinity; it simply is intended to emphasise the uniqueness of the relations of God to man. The use of one, with this intention, is well illustrated by Eph. iv. 4-6, ἐν σώμα, κ.π.λ. The current thought of the time was conscious of many **σωτήρες**. In contrast to these, St. Paul emphasises the uniqueness of the **σωτήρ** and **θεός** worshipped by Christians. The contrast is exactly parallel to that in 2 Cor. viii. 6, **εἰς ἑαυτόν** ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἰς θέαν ὑπάρχει ... καὶ εἰς κόσμος ἑαυτοῦ. The question as to the
mutual relations of the Persons of the Godhead had not arisen among Christians, and was not present to the writer's mind. Indeed if it had been we could not regard the epistle as a portion of revealed theology. Revealed theology is unconscious. The primæ facie distinction here drawn between καὶ θεὸς and καὶ μαρτυρίων would have been impossible in a sub-apostolic orthodox writer.

Again, the oneness of God has a bearing on the practical question of man's salvation. It is possible for all men to be saved, because over them there are not many Gods that can exercise possibly conflicting will-power towards them, but one only. See also Rom. iii. 10. One Godhead stands over against one humanity; and the Infinite and the finite can enter into relations one with the other, since they are linked by a μαρτυρίων who is both God and man.

It is noteworthy that μαρτυρίων θεοῦ κ. ἀνθρώπων is applied to the archangel Michael in The Test of the Twelve Patriarchs, Dan. vi. 2.

Διδάσκει ἡμᾶς ὡς ἔχει τὸν θεοῦ κ. ἀνθρώπους. The Evangelists record our Lord's own declarations that His death was a spontaneous and voluntary sacrifice on His part, Matt. xx. 28 = Mark x. 45. οἱ δὲ ἀνθρώποι τὴν ζωὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πάντων. Cf. John x. 18, and St. Paul affirms it, Gal. i. 4, 5.

1 Om. τὸ μαρτυρίων Α.; καὶ μαρτυρίων Χ.**; οὐ τὸ μαρτυρίαν καὶ ἰδιότητα D*Fed G, δ, g, Ambrst., datum est; 67**, 80, 115 ina. ob. [Lucas Brug.: "Testimonium temporibus suis. His verbis nec praeponeendum est cuius, nec postpostendum confirmatum est: haec enim consulta noti omissa sunt". One at least of MSS. of vg. reads confirmatum est.]

τοῦ δόγματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμαρτητῶν ἤμων; Tit. ii. 14, 15; εἰς ἑαυτόν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπάνω ἢ μαρτυρίον κ.τ.λ. χαρακτικῶς is used in Gal. ii. 20, Eph. v. 2, 25. We may note that this statement necessarily implies not only the pre-existence of our Lord, but also His co-operation in the eternal counsels and purpose of the Father as regards the salvation of man.

Alford is probably right in saying that δεῦμα αὐτοῦ, as St. Paul expresses it, suggests more than δεῦμα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. The latter might naturally be limited to the sacrifice of His death; the former connotes the sacrifice of His life-time, the whole of the humiliation and self-emptying of the Incarnation. The soundness of this exegesis is not impaired by the probability that τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ may be nothing more than a Semitic peripheral for αὐτῶν. See J. H. Moulton, Grammar, vol. i. p. 87, who compares Mark viii. 36. Συμμετέχειν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, with Luke ix. 25, αὐτῶν δὲ ἀπολογεῖται ἢ ἀφίλεται.

Διδάσκει ἡμᾶς ὡς ἔχει τὸν θεοῦ κ. ἀνθρώπους. If we are to see any special force in the τὸν, we may say that it expresses that the λύτρον is equivalent in value to the thing procured by means of it. But perhaps St. Paul's use of the word, if he did not coin it, is due to his desire to reaffirm our Lord's well-known declaration in the most emphatic way possible. λύτρον δὲ merely implies an exchange; ἀντι- λύτρον ἄντι implies that the exchange is decidedly a benefit to those on whose behalf it is made. As far as the suggestion of vicariousness is concerned, there does not seem to be much difference between the two phrases.

τὸ μαρτυρίων, as Ellicott says, "is an accusative in apposition to the preceding sentence," or rather clause, δὲ δεῦμα ἀνθρώπων. So R.V. Bengel compares ἦλθεν, 2 Thess. i. 5; cf. also Rom. xi. 1. The great act of self-sacrifice is timeless; but as historically apprehended by us, the testimony concerning it must be made during a particular and suitable
period of history, i.e., from the descent of the Holy Spirit to the apostolic company (Acts i. 8) until the Second Coming (2 Thess. i. 10). The temporal mission of the Son of God took place "when the fulness of the time came" (Gal. iv. 4); it was an oikonomia tou pleromastos ton kairon (Eph. i. 10). The testimony is of course borne by God (1 John v. 9-11), but He uses human agency, the preachers of the Gospel.

καιροῖς ἔδει: See ref. The analogy of Gal. vi. 9, καὶ ἐν τῷ θερμαίῳ, suggests that we should render it always in due season. The plural expresses the fact that the bearing of testimony extends over many seasons; but each man reaps his own harvest only once. In any case, the seasons relate both to the Witness and that whereof He is a witness: "his own times" and "its own times" (R.V.).

The dative is that "of the time where-in the action takes place," Ell., who compares Rom. xvi. 25, χρόνοις αἰωνίων σταγιείμνου.

Ver. 7. εἰς δὲ ἐν τῷ μαρτύρωμα, or εἰς τὸ εὐαγγελίου, as in the parallel passage, 2 Tim. i. 11. The phrase εἰς δὲ ἐν τῷ κύριῳ κ. ἄνωτολος kal διδασκάλος is repeated in 2 Tim. i. 11, 28 ἄλλησαν . . . ψευδόμαι occurs again Rom. ix. 1; but there we have the significant addition [λέγω] εἰς Χριστό. For similar asseverations of the writer's truthfulness see Rom. i. 9, 2 Cor. xi. 10, xii. 19, Gal. i. 20.

There is nothing derogatory from the apostle in supposing that the personal struggle in which he had been for years engaged with those who opposed his gospel made him always feel on the defensive, and that his self-vindication came to be expressed in stereotyped phrases which rose to his mind whenever the subject came before him, even in a letter to a loyal disciple.

κύριοι is used in the N.T. of a preacher here, and twice elsewhere; see ref. But κύριοις and κυρίων are constantly used of Christian preaching. Cf. esp. Rom. x. 15. τινὸς δὲ κυρίως εἶναι τὴν ἀνοστάλλησίν; Bengel takes it in the sense of ambassador; cf. 2 Cor. v. 20.

διδασκάλος: διδασκαλοί, in the technical Christian sense, are mentioned in Acts xiii. 2, 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, Eph. iv. 11. Here and in 2 Tim. i. 11 the term is used in a general signification. St. Paul does use διδασκαλία of his own ministerial functions: 1 Cor. iv. 17, Col. i. 28, 2 Thess. ii. 15.

In πιστεῖ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ: It is best to take both these words in connexion with διδασκαλος, and objectively, in the faith and the truth (see on ch. i. 2). It is no objection to this view that the article is not expressed; the anarthrousness of common Christian terms is a feature of these epistles. Others, with Chrys., take both terms subjectively, faithfully and truly. Ellicott "refers πιστεῖ to the subjective faith of the apostle, ἀληθοῦς, to the objective truth of the doctrine he delivered." This does not yield a natural sense.

Harnack notes that the collocation of ἄνωτολος, διδασκαλος is peculiar to the Pastoral and Hermas (Sim. ix. 15, 16, 25; Vis. iii. 5, "The apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons"). Harnack opines that "Hermas passed over the prophets because he reckoned himself one of them." But the opinion of Lietzmann, which he quotes, seems sounder: Hermas "conceives this ροφητευτείναι as a private activity which God's equipment renders possible, but which lacks any official character" (Mission and Expansion of Christianity, trans. vol. i. p. 340).

Vv. 8—iii. la. The ministers of public prayer must be the men of the congregation, not the women. A woman's positive duty is to make herself conspicuous by good works, not by personal display. Her place in relation to man is one of subordination. This is one of the lessons of the inspired narratives of the Creation and of the Fall. Nevertheless this does not affect her eternal position. Salvation is the goal alike of man and woman. They both attain supreme blessedness in the working out of the primal penalty imposed on Adam and Eve.

Ver. 8. ψευδόματα. ὃν: ὃν is resumptive of the general topic of public worship.
from which the writer has digressed in vv. 3-7. ὑπολείπεσθαι ὁ θεός is found again in v. 14. In both places, ὑπολεύσεσθαι has the force of a practical direction issued after deliberate thought. See also ref. On the contrary, ὑπολεύσεσθαι is used only in reference to abstract subjects. See Rom. xvi. 19, 1 Cor. vii. 7, 32, xiii. 4, xiv. 5. ὑπολεύσεσθαι τοις ἀνδραῖς: that the men should conduct public worship. Perhaps Bengel is right in understanding 1 Peter iii. 7 in the same sense. See ref. for ὑπολεύσεσθαι in this special signification. τοις ἀνδραῖς: the men of the community as opposed to the women, ver. 9 (R.V.). There is no specific restriction of the conduct of worship to a clergy.

ἐν πάντι τόπῳ: to be connected with what precedes: the directions are to apply to every Church without exception; no allowance is to be made for conditions peculiar to any locality; as it is expressed in 1 Cor. xiv. 33, 34. ὥσιν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἄνω, ἐν γυναικές ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις συγγείρων. The words do not mean in any place, as though fixed places for worship were a matter of indifference; neither is there any allusion, as Chrys. explain it, to the abolition by Christ of the restriction of worship to one place, Jerusalem, as in John iv. 21. ἑναίρεσις ὑπολεύσεσθαι: This is not directly intended to enjoin a particular gesture appropriate to prayer, but merely avoids the repetition of ὑπολεύσεσθαι. To uplift the hands in prayer was customary: 1 Kings viii. 22, Ps. xcviii. 2 etc., Isa. i. 15, Clem. Rom. ad Cor. i. 29. The men that are to have the conduct of the public worship of the Church must See ref. On the contrary, ὑπολεύσεσθαι is used only in reference to abstract subjects. See Rom. xvi. 19, 1 Cor. vii. 7, 32, xiii. 4, xiv. 5. ὑπολεύσεσθαι τοις ἀνδραῖς: that the men should conduct public worship. Perhaps Bengel is right in understanding 1 Peter iii. 7 in the same sense. See ref. for ὑπολεύσεσθαι in this special signification. τοις ἀνδραῖς: the men of the community as opposed to the women, ver. 9 (R.V.). There is no specific restriction of the conduct of worship to a clergy.

The essential parts of the sentence are ὑπολεύσεσθαι γυναικές ... κουσμῆναι δαντές ... ὥσιν ἐν γυναικῶν. Both ὑπολεύσεσθαι and κουσμῆναι δαντές depend on ὑπολεύσεσθαι, as does ὑπολεύσεσθαι, which introduces another regulation laid down by the apostle. In the Christian Society, it was St. Paul's deliberate wish that the men should conduct public worship, and that the women should adorn the Society and themselves by good works. This verse has no reference to the de meaour of women while in Church. It is inconsistent with the whole context to supply ὑπολεύσεσθαι after γυναικές.

The connexion of ἐν κατασταλή - συγγείρων has been disputed. Elliott takes it as "a kind of adjectival phrase to be appended to γυναικές," stating what is the normal condition of women, who are to superadd the adornment of good works. But it is more natural to
connect it directly with κοσμεῖν, with which ἐν πλήγμασιν κ.τ.λ. is also connected as δι' ἐργῶν ἐγγαθῶν: the change of preposition being due to the distinction between the means employed for adornment and the resultant expression of it. The effect of the practice of good works is seen in an orderly appearance, etc.

καταστάλη, as Ellicott says, “conveys the idea of external appearance as principally exhibited in ἐξοπλισμός. It is “ deportment, as exhibited externally, whether in look manner or dress”. The commentators cite in illustration Josephus, Bell. jud. ii. 8, 4, where the καταστάλη κόσμιος of the Essenes is described in detail. The Latin habitus is a good rendering, if we do not restrict that term to dress, as the Vulg. here, habitus ornato, seems to do. But ordinato (r) hits the meaning better.

κόσμος is applied to the episcopus in iii. 2. It means orderly, as opposed to disorderliness in appearance. κοσμεῖν (ṣupr. crit.) would be a ἐνακλη λέγει both in Old and New Testament. μετὰ ἀλλοθείνους: with shamefastness and self-control or discreetness: the inward characteristic, and the external indication or evidence of it.

For συμφωνεῖν, see Trench, Synonyms, N.T. The cognate words συμφωνεῖνς, Tit. ii. 4; συγκοινώνω, 2 Tim. i. 7; συμφωνίας, Tit. ii. 12; σύφωνα, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 8, ii. 2, 5, are in N.T. peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles; but συμφωνεῖν, Tit. ii. 6, is found also in Mark, Luke, Rom., 2 Cor. and 1 Pet. See Dean Bernard's note here.

ἐν πλήγμασιν, κ.τ.λ.: The parallel in 1 Pet. iii. 3, δ' ἐργῶν ἐπλαινεῖ τρίχαν καὶ μεταλαμβάνεις ἐν κόσμῳ, is only a parallel. The two passages are quite independent. The vanities of dress—of men and women—is common topic.

Ver. 10. ἀλλ' ἐπέφευξε: It has been assumed above that δ' ἐργῶν ἐγγαθῶν is to be connected with καταστάλη. In this case δ' ἐπέφευξε—θεουργία is a parenthetical clause in apposition to the sentence. It is, however, possible, though not so natural, to connect δ' ἐργῶν ἐγγαθῶν with ἐπιγγέλθη θεος. So Vulg., promittentes pieta tem per bona opera. Then δ would mean καὶ δ', or ἐν τούτῳ δ' (Math.), and the whole clause, ἀλλ' δ'—ἀγαθῶν, would be an awkward periphrasis for, and repetition of, ἐν καταστάλη—συμφωνεῖν. 

ἐπιγγέλθησθαι usually means to promise as in Tit. i. 2; but here and in vi. 21 to profess.

θεουργία: ἔστω λεγεί, but the adj. θεουργή occurs in xii. 46.

ἐκατεροτεθήκει, as in iv. 5, 2 Tim. i. 6, 10, 14, iii. 15, iv. 17, Tit. iii. 5, 6, not of accompanying circumstances, as in 1 Tim. ii. 15, iv. 14, 2 Tim. ii. 2. ἐργῶν ἐγγαθῶν: see note on chap. iii. 1.

Ver. 11 sqq. With these directions compare those in 1 Cor. xiv. 33-35.

ἐν πάνη ὀντοτε: with complete subjection [to their husbands]. Cf. Tit. ii. 5.

Ver. 12. θερατεύων: This refers of course only to public teaching, or to a wife's teaching her husband. In Tit. ii. 3 St. Paul indicates the natural sphere for woman's teaching. In 1 Cor. women are forbidden λαός in the Church. The choice of terms is appropriate in each case.

ἀδ νόμος ἀδνόμος: dominari in virum, to have dominion over (R.V.). "The adj. ἀθετευόμενος is very well established in the vernacular. See Nägeli, p. 49
... the Atticist warns his pupil to use abotovs because aboevs was vulgar (κοινώτερον) ... abotovs is properly one who acts on his own authority, hence in this context an autocrat" (Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii., vi. 374).

Ver. 13. It would not be fair to say that St. Paul's judgment about the relative functions of men and women in the church depended on his belief as to the historicity of the Biblical story of the Creation. He certainly uses this account in support of his belief as to the historicity of the Biblical story of the Creation. He certainly uses this account in support of his conclusions; yet supposing the literal truth of the early chapters of Genesis, it would be possible to draw quite other inferences from it. The first specimen produced of a series is not always the most perfect. The point in which Adam's superiority over Eve comes out in the narrative of the Fall is his greater strength of intellect; therefore men are better fitted for the work of public instruction. "The woman taught once, and ruined all" (Chrys.). Eve's reasoning faculty was at once overcome by the allegation of jealousy felt by God, an allegation plausible to a nature swayed by emotion rather than by reflection. The Tempter's statement seemed to be supported by the appearance of the fruit, as it was rendered attractive by hopes of vanity to be gratified. Adam's better judgment was overcome by personal influence (Gen. iii. 17, "Thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife"); he was not deceived. But the intellectual superior who sins against light may be morally inferior to him who stumbles in the dusk.

"Adam πρωτος ἐπλάθη: The elder should rule. A more profound statement of this fact is found in 1 Cor. xi 9, ὡς ἵκτορθ ἄγρι ἡ τῆς γνωσεῖς, ἄλλα γνή ἐκ τῆς ἄρθρα. πλάτσων is the term used in Gen. ii. 7 and expresses the notion of God as a potter, Rom. ix. 20. (am here has figuratus.)

Ver. 14. ἣ δὲ γυνὴ: St. Paul says ἡ γυνὴ rather than Ἐδώ, emphasizing the sex rather than the individual, because he desires to give the incident its general application, especially in view of what follows. So Chrys.

ἐξαναγέννησα: It is doubtful if we are entitled to render this, as Ell. does, being completely deceived. In 2 Cor. xi. 3 St. Paul says ἤ δῆκεν ἐξαναγέννησαν Ἐδώ, where there is no reason why he should not have used the simple verb. St. Paul uses the compound verb in five other places, the simple verb only once (see ref.). So that the simplest account that we can give of his variation here, and in 2 Cor. xi. 3, from the ἤ δῆκεν ἐξαναγέννησαν μα of Gen. iii. 13, is that the compound verb came naturally to his mind.

ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν: Inasmuch as παραβάσει is used of Adam's transgression in Rom. v. 14, it may be asked, What is the force of St. Paul's apparent restriction here of the phrase to Eve? Might it not be said of Adam as well, that he ἐν παραβ. γέγονεν? To which St. Paul would perhaps have replied that he meant that it was woman who first transgressed, in consequence of having been deceived. ἤν γνωρίσας ἐς ἄμαρτη, καὶ δι' αὐτὴν ἀποθέωσαν πάντας. Ecclus. xxv. 24. This notion of cming into a state of sin at a definite point of time is well expressed by γέγονεν. For γέγοναν ἐν cf. ἡ διακοινία ... ἐγενόθεν ἐν ὑμῖν (2 Cor. iii. 7); ἐν λόγῳ καταγίζεται ἐγενόθεν (1 Thess. ii. 5).

Ver. 15. συνάγεται ἐκ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας: The penalty for transgression, so far as woman is concerned, was expressed in the words, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children" (Gen. iii. 16). But just as in the case of man, the world being as it is, the sentence has proved a blessing, so it is in the case of woman. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" expresses man's necessity, duty, privilege, dignity. If the necessity of work be "a stumbling-block," man can "make it a stepping-stone" (Browning, The Ring and the
Here are some notes on the document:

1. The emphasis of St. Paul's argument had led him to emphasize the man's part in the first transgression, he might have said, "He shall be saved in his toil," his overcoming the obstacles of nature.

2. So St. Paul, taking the common-sense view that childbearing, rather than public teaching or the direction of affairs, is woman's primary function, duty, privilege and dignity, reminds Timothy and his readers that there was another aspect of the story in Genesis besides that of woman's taking the initiative in transgression: the pains of childbirth were her sentence, yet in undergoing these she finds her salvation. She shall be saved in her childbearing (R.V. "nearly").

3. That is her normal and natural duty; and in the discharge of our normal and natural duties we all, men and women alike, as far as our individual efforts can contribute to it, "work out our own salvation".

4. The subject of salvation is usually taken to be ἵνα σωθησθαι, and preserves the natural and obvious meaning of σωθήσεσθαι, and gives its force to τίς. ἵνα here has hardly an instrumental force (as Vulg. per filiorum generationem); it is rather the ἵνα of accompanying circumstances, as in 1 Cor. iii. 15, σωθήσεται... ἵνα πώς. It remains to note three other explanations:

   (1) She shall be "preserved in the great danger of child-birth"

   (2) Women shall be saved if they bring up their children well, as if τεκνογονεῖσθαι = τεκνογονία, So Chrys.

   (3) She shall be saved by means of the Childbearing of Mary, which gave to the world the Author of our Salvation" (Liddon). "The peculiar function of her sex (from its relation to her Saviour) shall be the medium of her salvation" (Ellicott). The R.V., saved through the childbearing, is possibly patient of this interpretation. No doubt it was the privilege of woman alone to be the medium of the Incarnation. This miraculous fact justifies us perhaps in pressing the language of Gen. iii. 15, "thy seed," and in finding an allusion (though this is uncertain) in Gal. iv. 4, γενομένον ἐκ γυναικός; but woman cannot be said to be saved by means of a historic privilege, even with the added qualification, "if they continue," etc. See Luke xi. 27, 28, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee... Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God," etc.

   (1) μεταφέρεται: This use of μεταφέρειν with ἐν and an abstract noun is chiefly Johannine, as the reff. show.

   (2) The subject of μεταφέρεται is usually taken to be γυναικείος; but inasmuch as St. Paul has been speaking of women in the marriage relation, it seems better to understand the plural of the woman and her husband. Compare 1 Cor. vii. 36 where γενομένον συμφέρεται to the παρθένος and her betrothed, whose existence is implied in the question of her marriage. See chap. iv. 12 where these three virtues are again combined. See ver. 9 for σωθήσεται.

Chapter III.—V. 1. τινὸς σωθήσεται λόγος: This refers to the exegesis of Genesis which has preceded. (So Chrys.). We may compare Barnabas, § 9, where, after an allegorical explanation of Abraham's 318 servants, the writer exclaims, ὁ θεός ἀνθρώπων ἐμαθὼν ἐν ἑαυτῷ λόγον... ἄλλα οὖν ἔπει òντος ἐμαθὼν λόγον. See note on i. 15.

Vv. 1 b-13. The qualifications of the men who are to be ministers; and first (a) of the episcopus (1 b 7) secondly (6) of the deacons (8-13) with a parenthetical instruction respecting women church-workers (11).
Having given 
elementary directions concerning the 
scope of public prayer, and the ministers 
thereof, St. Paul now takes up the 
matter of Church organisation. He 
begins with the office of the episcopus, 
or presbyter, because that is of the very 
outermost order. On the ques-
tion as to the terms presbyter and 
episcopus, it is sufficient here to state 
my own conclusion, that they represent 
slightly different aspects of the same 
office, pastoral and official; aspects which 
came naturally into prominence in the 
Jewish and Greek societies respectively 
which gave birth to the names. This 
seems the obvious conclusion from a 
comparison of Acts xx. 28; Phil. i. 1; 
Tit. i. 5, 7; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2, 4, 5, v. 17; 
1 Pet. v. 1, 2; Clem. Rom. i Cor. 44; 
Polyarp, 5; Clem. Al. Quis Dives, § 42. 
δρηγεταὶ . . . φιλεῖματε: The R.V. 
(seeketh . . . desireth) indicates to the 
English reader that two distinct Greek 
words are used; a fact which is con-
cealed in the A.V. (desire . . . desireth). 
So Vulg. has desiderat in both places; 
but mē, cupit . . . desiderat. δρήγεται, 
which occurs again in vi. 10 of teaching 
a worthy example, is not used in any 
deprecatory sense. Field (in loc.) notes that 
it has a special application to such 
objects as a man is commonly said to 
aspire to”. The sanity of St. Paul’s 
judgment is nowhere better seen than in 
his commendation of lawful ambition. 
A man may be actuated by a variety of 
motives; yet it is not inevitable that 
those that are lower should impair the 
quality of the higher; they need not in-
terpenetrate each other. In any case, 
St. Paul credits the aspirant with the 
noblest ideal: He who aspires to be an 
episcopus desires to perform a good work, 
"Est opus: negotium, non oium. Acts 
xx. 38, Phil. ii. 30” (Bengel).

καλὸν ἔργον: καλὸν ἔργον and καλὰ 
ἔργα (see reff.) are not peculiar to the 
Pastorals (Matt. v. 16, xxvi. 10 = Mark 
xiv. 6; John x. 32, 33); but, as the refer-
ences show, the phrase is found in 
only the Pauline Epistles. On 
the other hand, ἔργα ἄγαθα occurs six 
times in the Pastorals. See reff. on 
chap. ii. 10. We perceive in the use of 
it a qualification of the earlier de-
preciation of the works of the Law, 
induced by a natural reaction from the 
abuse of that teaching.

Ver. 2. With the qualifications 
of the episcopus as given here should be com-
pared those of the deacons, ver. 8 sqq., 
and those of the episcopus in Tit. i. 
8 sqq.

διὰ τὸν . . . ἀντιλήμματος ἐν εἰρ. The 
ἐπίσκοπος being essentially a good work, 
"bonum negotium bonis committendum” 
(Bengel). The episcopus is the persona 
of the Church. It is not enough for 
him to be not criminal; he must be one 
against whom it is impossible to bring 
any charge of wrong doing such as could 
stand impartial examination. (See 
Theodoret, cited by Alf.). He must be 
without reproach (R.V.), irreprehensible 
(Trench), a term which involves a less 
extacting test than blameless (A.V.); the 
deacon (and the Cretan episcopus) must 
be ἄνεγκριτον, one against whom no 
charge has, in point of fact, been brought.

No argument can be based on the 
singular τὸν ἑπισκόπον, here or in Tit. 
i. 7, in favour either of the monarchical 
episcopate or as indications of the late-
date of the epistle; it is used generically 
as ἐπίσκοπος, ch. v. 5; τοῦ πατρός Κυρίου, 2 
Tim. ii. 24.

The better to ensure that the episcopus 
be without reproach, his lead ng charac-
teristic must be self-control. In the first 
place—and this has special force in the 
East—he must be a man who has— 
natural or acquired—a high conception 
of the relations of the sexes: a married 
man, who, if his wife dies, does not 
marry again. Men whose position is less 
open to criticism may do this without 
discredit, but the episcopus must hold up 
a high ideal. Second marriage, which 
is mentioned as a familiar practice (Rom. 
vii. 2, 3), is expressly permitted to Chris-
tian women in 1 Co. vii. 39, and even 
recommended to, or rather enjoined upon, 
young widows in 1 Tim. v. 14.

μίας γυναικὸς ἄδεη, of course, does not 
mean that the episcopus must be, or have 
been, married. What is here for-
bidden is digamy under any circum-
stances. This view is supported (a) by 
the general drift of the qualities required 
here in a bishop; self-control or temper-
ance, in his use of food and drink, pos-
sessions, gifts, temper; (b) by the corresponding requirement in a church widow, v. 9, ἀνήλικος γυνή, and (c) by the practice of the early church (Apostolic Constitutions, vi. 17; Apostolic Canons, 16 (17); Tertullian, ad Uxorem, i. 7: de Monogam. 12; de Exhort. Castitatis, cc. 7, 13; Athenagoras, Legat. 33; Origen, in Lucam, xvii. p. 953, and the Canons of the councils, e.g., Neocaesarea (A.D. 314) can. 7. Quinisext. can. 3). On the other hand, it must be conceded that the patristic commentators on the passage (with the partial exception of Chrysostom)—Theodore Mops. Theodore, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Jerome—suppose that it is bigamy or polygamy that is here forbidden. But commentators are prone to go too far in the emancipation of their judgments from the prejudices or convictions of their contemporaries. In some matters “the common sense of most” is a safer guide than the irresponsible conjectures of a conscientious student.

τυγκρατής: temperate (R.V.). A.V. has vigilant here, following Chrys.; sēber in ver. 11, and Tit. ii. 2, with vigilant in margin. As this quality is required also in women officials, ver. 11, and in aged men, Tit. ii. 2, it has in all probability a reference to moderate use of wine, etc., and so would be equivalent to the μεταβολής that is here forbidden. But commentators are prone to go too far in the emancipation of their judgments from the prejudices or convictions of their contemporaries. In some matters “the common sense of most” is a safer guide than the irresponsible conjectures of a conscientious student.

σωφρόνος: soberminded (R.V.), serious, earnest. See note on ii. 9. Vigil, prudent here and in Tit. ii. 2, 5; but sobrius in Tit. i. 8. Perhaps σωφρόνος (ver. 8) is the quality in deacons that corresponds to σωφρόνος and κόσμος in the episcopus.

κάσμος: orderly (R.V.), perhaps dignified in the best sense of the term, ordinatum (m47). “Quod sōφrōn est inus, id κόσμος est extra” (Bengel). The word is not found in Titus.

παροιμία: This virtue is required in the episcopus also in Tit. i. 8, but not of the deacons, below; of Christians generally, 1 Peter iv. 9, 1 Tim. v. 10 (q.v.), Rom. xii. 13, Heb. vi. 10, xiii. 2, 3 John 5. See Hermas, Sim. ix. 27 (“Bishops, hospitable persons (φίλοθεος), who gladly received into their houses at all times the servants of the Lord.”) This duty, in episcopi, “was closely connected with the maintenance of external relations,” which was their special function. See Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire, p. 368.

διακονία, as a moral quality, would involve not merely the ability, but also the willingness, to teach, such as ought to characterise a servant of the Lord, 2 Tim. ii. 24. The notion is expanded in Tit. i. 9. The deacon’s relation to theology is passive, ver. 9.

Ver. 3. μὴ πάροιμος (no brawler, R.V., quarrelsome over wine, R.V.m.), and μὴ πλάκτης are similarly coupled together in Tit. i. 7. παροιμία means violent temper, not specially excited by overindulgence in strong drink. In the time of Chrysostom and Theodoret manners had so far softened that it was felt necessary to explain the term πλάκτης figuratively, of “some who unseasonably smite the consciences of their brethren.” But see 2 Cor. xii. 20.

Ἀλλὰ ἡ δέον, ἡμαχία: gentle, not contentious. This pair, again, of cognate adjectives is repeated in the general directions as to Christian conduct, Tit. iii. 2. Compare 2 Tim. ii. 24 (of the servant of the Lord). The corresponding episcopal virtues in Titus (i. 7) are μὴ αὕτη δηλοὶ, μὴ ἀμφιθῇ, ἐπισκόπων.

φίλοθεος: In Titus the corresponding episcopal virtue is μὴ αὐχεροκορήθη. See note on ver. 8 and Tit. i. 7.

Ver. 4. τοῦ ἱδίου ὄνομα: Although ἱδίος commonly retains in the N.T. the emphatic sense own, yet there can be no doubt that examples occur of the later weakened sense in which it means simply ὅπως, e.g., 1 Cor. vii. 2. We are not therefore justified in insisting on the emphatic sense, own, here or in ver. 12,
\[\text{Here only, N.T.}\]
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"προστήμαι,—5. εἴ δὲ τοῦ ἵδιον οἶκου ἤπειρον τοὺς ἀδελφούς τις καὶ τοὺς οὐκολόγητας νεόφυτον τις εὐκαλλεῖται. —6. μὴ τ νεόφυτον, ἵνα μὴ τ συνανόησις. \]

Here, in superbiām status.
κρίμα ἐπιβολή τοῦ διαβόλου: κρίμα is best taken in the sig. condemnation, as in Rom. iii. 8, Rev. xvii. 1, and τοῦ διαβόλου as objective genitive: "Lest he be involved in the condemnation which the devil incurred," or, the judgment pronounced on the devil, whose sin was, and is, pride. See Ecclus. x. 13, 2 Pet. ii. 4. So most commentators, especially the ancients. On the other hand, τοῦ διαβόλου in ver. 7 is the subjective genitive, a snare laid by the devil; and it is possible to render κρίμα τ. διαβ. the accusation brought by the devil, or a judgment effected by the devil, who may succeed in this case, though he failed in that of Job. This is however not a natural translation; and it is to be observed that ἡμιτονοῦν in reff. expresses a final doom, not a trial, such as that of temptation or probation. Dean Bernard takes τοῦ διαβόλου as subjective genitive in both verses; and in the sense of slanderer: the judgment passed by the slanderer; the snare prepared by the slanderer.

tοῦ διαβόλου: St. Paul uses this name for the Evil Spirit three times in the Pastoral and twice in Eph. (see reff.); ὁ ἄγγελος in Eph. vii. 16; ὁ Σατανᾶς elsewhere eight times. διαβόλος, without the article, means slanderer in ver. 11 and reff. there.

Ver. 7. τῶν ἐξουσιῶν: αἱ ἐξουσίαι in Mark iv. 11 (Ἑβρ. W.H. m.) means those who came into contact—more or less close—with Jesus, but who were not His disciples. In the Pauline use (see reff.) it means the non-Christian Society in which the Church lives. St. Paul’s attitude towards them that are without is one of the many proofs of his sanity of judgment. On the other hand, they are emphatically outside the Church; they have no locus standi in it, no right to interfere. On the other hand, they have the law of God written in their hearts: and, up to a certain point, their moral instincts are sound and their moral judgments worthy of respect. In the passage before us, indeed, St. Paul may be understood to imply that the opinion of “those without” might usefully balance or correct that of the Church. There is something blameworthy in a man’s character if the consensus of outside opinion be unfavourable to him; no matter how much he may be admired and respected by his own party. The vox populi, then, is in some sort a vox Dei: and one cannot not safely assume, when we are in antagonism to it, that, because we are Christians, we are absolutely in the right and the world wholly in the wrong. Thus to defy public opinion in a superior spirit may not only bring discredit, ἀνιθυμητός, on oneself and on the Church, but also catch us in the devil’s snare, viz., a supposition that because the world condemns a certain course of action, the action is therefore right and the world’s verdict may be safely set aside.

We cannot infer with Alford and von Soden, from the absence of another preposition before ἐπιφύλασσε, that ἐπιφύλασσε also depends on τοῦ διαβόλου. It would not be easy to explain satisfactorily ἐπιφύλασσε τ. διαβόλου.

Ver. 8. ἔσχατον ἐσχάτως: s.c. ἢ ἐλευθερία. For ἐσχάτως, see on ii. 9.

σεμνούς: grave. “The word we want is one in which the sense of gravity and dignity, and of these as inviting reverence, is combined” (Trench). See note on ver. 2. The term is used in reference to women workers and old men.

μὴ διλογίους: Persons who are in an intermediate position, having in the same department chiefs and subordinates, are exposed to a temptation to speak of the same matter in different tones and manner, according as their interlocutor is above or below them. So Theodoret, ἑτερα μὲν τούτων, ἑτερα δὲ ἑκείνην λέγοντες. Polycarp (§5) has the same phrase of deacons. Lightfoot there suggests the rendering tale-bearers. Perhaps insinuere. Cf. διλογίον, Prov. xi. 13, etc.
It was not the function of a deacon to teach or preach; it was sufficient if he were a firm believer. In the case of the episcopus, a similar direction is given about women, Tit. ii. 3: not osiv. pol. deevoukemnai.

This negative qualification is demanded of the episcopus in the closure. Not greedy of filthy lucre is unnecessarily strong; the alogxrotia consists, not in the source whence the gain comes, but in the setting of gain before one as an object in entering the ministry. Not greedy of gain expresses their meaning. The alogxrotia becomes alogxrotia when a man makes the acquisition of it, rather than the glory of God, his prime object. On the other hand, the special work of deacons was Church finance; and no doubt they had to support themselves by engaging in some secular occupation. They would thus be exposed to temptations to misappropriate Church funds, or to adopt questionable means of livelihood. If such circumstances were contemplated, not greedy of filthy lucre might be an allowable rendering. In Crete, the episcopus would seem to have also performed the duties of the deacon; consequently he is required to be alogxrotia.

The revelation given in Christ, the Christian creed in fact. See Dean Armitage Robinson, Ephesians, p. 234 sqq., and Lightfoot on Col. i. 26.
view it should be noted that *εὐαγγελίζω* is used in introducing a second or third member of a series. See on ii. 9. The series here is of Church officials. Again, the four qualifications which follow correspond, with appropriate variations, to the first four required in deacons, as regards demeanour, government of the tongue, use of wine, and trustworthiness. And further, this is a section dealing wholly with Church officials. These considerations exclude the view that *women in general*, as R.V. apparently, are spoken of. If the wives of the *deacons* or of the clergy were meant, as A.V., it would be natural to have it unambiguously expressed, e.g., by the addition of *εὐαγγελίζω*.

*διάβαλλον*: *slanderers*. While men are more prone than women to be *διάβαλλον*, double-tongued, women are more prone than men to be slanderers. See Tit. ii. 3. The term is predicated in 2 Tim. iii. 3, not of men, but as characterising the human race, *διάβαλλον*, in the last days.

*νηφαλίον*: see note on ver. 2.

*πιστὰς ἐν πάσῃ*: It may be that, as Ell. suggests, this has a reference to the function of deaconesses as almoners, a possible inference from Const. Apost. iii. 16. But more probably it is a comprehensive summary with a general reference, like *πιστὰς ἐν πάσῃ ἐνδικεφαλλόν* ἄνδρον, Tit. ii. 10.

Ver. 12. As the episcopate were naturally drawn from the ranks of the deacons, the diaconate was a probation time, in the course of which the personal moral qualifications for the εἰς εἰκόνα might be acquired. See notes on vv. 2 and 4.

Ver. 13. From what has been noted above on St. Paul's teaching in relation to men's lawful aspirations, it will appear that it is not necessary to explain away the obvious meaning of this clause in accordance with a false spirituality which affects to depreciate the inducements of earthly rewards. The parable of the talents (Matt. xxv. 21), implies Christ's approval of reasonable ambition. Nor is this to be answered by a statement that *the recompense of reward* to which we are permitted to look is heavenly and spiritual. For the Christian, there can be no gulf fixed between the earthly and the heavenly; at least in the category of things which are open to him, as a Christian, to desire. The drawing of such distinctions is akin to the Manichaean disparagement of matter.

*The βαβδόν καλὸν* which the man may acquire who has served well as a deacon is *advancement* to the presbyterate or episcopate. So Chrys. The R.V., *gain to themselves a good standing*, does not necessarily imply an advance in rank, but an assured position in the esteem of their fellow-Churchians. We know that among the many who possess the same rank, whether in church or state, some from their character and abilities gain a standing that others do not.

Some modern commentators follow Theodoret in giving a purely spiritual force to *βαβδόν*, *i.e.*, ἐν πᾶσιν διὰ τῆς κράτουσας, "a good standing place, vis. at the Great Day" (Alf.); *"the step or degree which a faithful discharge of the διακονία would gain in the eyes of God"* (Ell.). Alf. lays emphasis on the aor. part. as viewing the διακονία from the standpoint of the Day of Judgment; but it is equally suitable if the standpoint be that of the day on which they receive their advancement. There is more force in his emphasis on the present, *περιποιοῦνται*, they are acquiring. This interpretation does not seem to be in harmony with the context. The qualifications that are noted in ver. 12 have relation to the effectual administration of the Church on earth. It would be harsh to affirm that one who was a digamist and who could not keep his household in order would suffer for it in the Day of Judgment, however unsuitable he might be for office in the church.

*πολλὴν παρηγορίαν*: a Pauline phrase. See ref. In these passages παρηγορία means *confidence*, without reference to *speech*.

Although Ell. renders the clause "great boldness in the faith that is in Christ Jesus," he explains the boldness as resting on faith in Christ Jesus, and as descriptive of the believer's attitude in regard to, and at, the Day of Judgment. See 1 John iv. 17. If we reject his explanation of βαβδόν, it would be natural to interpret παρηγορία, κ.τ.λ., of a
confident public expression of the faith, such as would belong to an experienced Christian who had gained a good standing, and had, in consequence, no temptation to be ἔλεγχος. Von Soden connects ἐν πίστει with περιποιοῦμαι, cf. 2 Tim. i. 13.

Ver. 14. This verse makes it clear that Timothy’s position was a temporary one; he was acting as St. Paul’s representative at Ephesus to “put them in remembrance of his ways which be in Christ” (1 Cor. iv. 17).

Ver. 15. ἐν ἀλλήλοις... ἀναπτρόφεσθαι: It is a matter of indifference whether we render how men ought to behave themselves (R.V.), or how thou oughtest to behave thyself (A.V.; R.V. m.). It was Timothy’s duty to carry out the apostle’s directions, directions relating to the life, ἀναπτρόφεσθαι, of the Church. He ἀναπτρόφεσθαι would necessarily react on that of the Church. See the Western interpolation in apparat. crit.

οἰκός Θεοῦ: the household, perhaps, rather than the house, of God. In view of the prevailing paucity of articles in these Epistles, one cannot lay stress on the absence of τοῦ before οἰκός, so as to render, a house of God such as is the Church, etc. οἰκός τοῦ Θεοῦ is always found elsewhere. The Church is God’s οἰκός, Heb. iii. 6; God’s κατοικία, Eph. ii. 22; a ναός θεοῦ, Eph. ii. 21; ναός θεοῦ, 1 Cor. iii. 16, 2 Cor. vi. 16; a μνήμη οἰκία, of which God is the διακόνη, 2 Tim. ii. 20; an οἰκός πνευματικός, 1 Pet. ii. 5.

The body of the Church, to σῶμα ἐδωκαν, is a ναός ἐγενομένος (1 Cor. vi. 19); and the human body of Jesus was a ναός (John ii. 21); but it is not in accordance with Scriptural language to describe the body of any individual Christian.

οἰκυς... ξάνθης: “The noun which forms the predicate in a relative sentence, annexed for the purpose of explanation (ὁ... ἐκ τῶν), sometimes gives its own gender and number to the relative, by a kind of attraction” (Winer-Moulton, Grammar, p. 206).

θεοῦ ἱάτος: A constant phrase, occurring again iv. 10.

στήλης καὶ ἱδραίας κ.τ.λ.: The view of Gregory Nyssen and Greg. Naz. that στήλης here refers to Timothy does not need refutation, although an early reference to this passage in the Letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (Eus.
H. E. v. 1) applies στόλος καὶ ἱδραίωσις to the martyr Attalus. στόλος has of course a personal reference at Gal. ii. 9; cf. also Rev. iii. 12; but it is childish to suppose that metaphors have a constant value in the Bible. Holtzmann's suggestion that στόλος is in apposition to θεσον is rightly rejected by von Soden.

The clause is, of course, in apposition to ἐκκλησία which is by a kindred metaphor called in 2 Tim. ii. 19 δεόμενος ἐκκλησίας τῷ θεῷ. This latter passage suggests that we should here render ἱδραίωσις ground or basis rather than stay (K.V. m.). ἱδραίωσις is rendered steadfast elsewhere. See ref. and especially Col. i. 23 (ναόμετρον καὶ ἱδραίωσις), cfr. Hort, Christian Ecclesia, p. 174.

The truth, ἡ ἐλλεῖψις, has, as has been already stated, a technical Christian connotation in the Pastors, and has not a wider reference than the Christian revelation, which is the truth in so far as it is revealed. The Church, of the old covenant or of the new, is the divinely constituted human Society by which the support and maintenance in the world of revealed truth is maintained. Truth if revealed to isolated individuals, no matter how numerous, would be discredited. But the Church, the Divine Society, in which it is given an objective existence, at once compels the world to take knowledge of it, and assures those who receive the revelation that it is independent of, and external to, themselves, and not a mere fancy of their own.

Bengel puts a full stop at στόλος and removes it after ἱδραίωσις, making τὸ ... μυστηρίου the subject of the sentence, and στόλος ... μέγα the predicate.

The mystery, etc., is the pillar, etc., and confessedly great, μέγα being used as in 1 Cor. ix. 11, 2 Cor. xi. 15, the whole expression being equivalent to ἡμέρας καὶ παρουσίας ἐκεῖνος. He quotes from Rabbi Levi Barcelona and Maimonides parallel expressions concerning precepts of the Law, "funda-mentum magnum et columna valida legis," and a striking phrase from Irenaeus, Haer. iii. 11, 8, "Columna aetern et firmamentum ecclesiae est evangelium, στόλος et στὰ σημεία ἐκκλησίας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

Ver. 16. The connexion of thought lies in a feeling that the lofty terms in which the Church has been just spoken of may demand a justification. The truth of which the Church is στόλος καὶ ἱδραίωσις is not a light thing; an irrevocable fabric; the truth is, more expressly, τὸ τῆς εὐαγγελίας μυστηρίου, the revelation to man of practical religion; and, beyond yea or nay, this truth, this revelation, is great. Whether you believe it or not, you cannot deny that the claims of Christianity are tremendous.

μέγας is rare in Paul: (Rom. ix. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 11, xvi. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 15; Eph. v. 32; 1 Tim. vi. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 20; Tit. ii. 13). The nearest parallel to the present passage is Eph. v. 32, τὸ μυστηρίον τοῦτο μέγα εὐαγγέλιον. See note on ver. 9. On εὐαγγέλιον, see chap. ii. 2.

If we assume that 85 is the right reading, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that what follows is a quotation by St. Paul from a primitive creed or summary of the chief facts to be believed about Jesus Christ. And one is tempted to conjecture that another fragment of the same summary is quoted in 1 Pet. iii. 18, ἡμετέρωσις μὲν σπαρκεῖ ἡμοῦ εὐαγγελίον διὰ τοῦ ἤμετρον. δὲ, then, does not form part of the quotation at all; it is simply intro-
ductory, and relative to the subject, Jesus Christ, whose personality was, in some terms, expressed in an antecedent sentence which St. Paul has not quoted.

As the passage stands, there are three pairs of antithetic thoughts: (1) (a) the flesh and (b) the spirit of Christ, (2) (a) angels and (b) Gentiles—the two extremes of the rational creation, (3) (a) the world and (b) glory. In another point of view, there is a connexion between 2 a and 3 b, and between 2 b and 3 a. Again, we may say that we have here set forth (2) the Incarnation in itself, (3) its manifestation, (3) its consequence or result, as affecting man and God.

The antithesis between the σαρξ and πνεῦμα of Christ is drawn, in addition to 1 Pet. iii. 18, also in Rom. i. 3, 4. τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπερμάτων Δανίη κατὰ σαρκόν, τῆς ἰδίας ἐξουσίας νῦν θεοῦ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κατὰ πνεῦμα ἐγγυητήν. We cannot leave out of account in discussing these passages the parallel in 1 Pet. iv. 6, ἔστιν γάρ καὶ νεκροὶ εὐφημισθῇ ἐν κρίσει μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπων σαρκὸς καὶ κατὰ θεοῦ πνεύματος. The πνεῦμα of Christ, as man, in these passages means His human spirit, the naturally permanent spiritual part of a human personality. See also 1 Cor. v. 5.

ὁφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί: He who had been from all eternity "in the form of God" became cognisable by the limited senses of human beings, ἐν δομομασίᾳ σαρκί ἡμαρτα (Rom. viii. 3), became manifest in the flesh, σαρξ ἔγενετο (John i. 14). ἕφανεν or ἐφανερώθη is used in connexion with Christ in four associations in the N.T.

(1) as here, of the objective fact of the Incarnation: John i. 31 (?), Heb. ix. 26, i Pet. i. 20, i John i. 2 (bis), iii. 5, 8.

(2) of the revelation involved in the Incarnation: Rom. xvi. 26, Col. i. 26, iv. 4, 2 Tim. i. 10, Tit. i. 3. N.B. in Rom. and Col. the verb is used of a ἐνεργείας. (3) of the post-resurrection appearances of Christ, which were, in a sense, repetitions of the marvel of the Incarnation, as being manifestations of the unseen: Mark xvi. 12, 14, John xxii. 1 (bis), 14.

(4) of the Second Coming, which will be, as far as man can tell, His final manifestation: Col. iii. 4, 1 Pet. v. 4, i John ii. 28, iii. 2.

ἐβδομαδιά ἐν πνεύματι: proved or pronounced to be righteous in His higher nature. The best parallel to this use of ἐβδομαδιά is Ps. i. (ii.) 6, ὡς ἐν ἐβδομαδίᾳ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου, also Matt. xi. 19 = Luke vii. 35. We are not entitled to assume that the ἐν has the same force before πνεύματι that it has before σαρκὶ; the repetition of the preposition is due to a felt need of rhythmic effect. If we are asked, When did this ἐβδομαδία take place? we reply that it was on a review of the whole of the Incarnate Life. The heavenly voice, ἐν σοὶ ἐφανερώθη, heard by human ears at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration, might have been heard at any moment during the course of those "sinless years". He was emphatically ὁ θεός (Acts iii. 14, xxii. 14; 1 John ii. 1. See also Matt. iii. 15; John xvi. 10.) It is enough to mention without discussion the opinions that πνεύματι refers (a) to the Holy Spirit, or (b) to the Divine Personality of Christ.

ἐφή ἐγγυή: Ellicott points out that in these three pairs of clauses the first member of each group points to earthly relations, the second to heavenly. So that these words ἐφή ἐγγυή refer to the fact that the Incarnation was "a spectacle to angels" as well as "to men"; or rather, as Dean Bernard notes (Comm. in loc.), ἐφή and ἐφανερώθη mark the difference in the communication of the Christian Revelation to angels—the rational creatures nearest to God—and to the Gentiles—farthest from God. "The revelation to Gentiles is mediate, by preaching...; the revelation to the higher orders of created intelligences is immediate, by vision." It was as much a source of wonderment to the latter as to the former. See 1 Pet. i. 12. The angels who greeted the Birth (Luke ii. 13), who ministered at the temptations (Matt. iv. 11, Mark i. 13), strengthened Him in His agony (Luke xxii. 43), proclaimed His Resurrection and stood by at the Ascension, are only glimpses to us of "a cloud of witnesses" of whose presence Jesus was always conscious (Matt. xxvi. 53).

ἐφή is usually used of the post-resurrection appearances of Christ to men. See reff.

ἐπιστρέφεται ἐν κόσμῳ: This was in itself a miracle. See 2 Thess. i. 10, John xvii. 21.
Chapter IV.—Vv. 1-5. Over against the future triumph of the truth, assured to us by the finished work of Christ, we must set the opposition, grievous at present, of the Spirit of error. His attacks have been foreseen by the Spirit of holiness. They are just now expressed in a false spirituality which condemns God's good creatures of marriage and food.

Ver. 1. to 81 irvevpa: The Apostle here passes to another theme, the manifestation of religion in daily life. The connexion between this section and the last is as indicated above. There is a slightly adversative force in the connecting sc.

The Spirit is the Holy Spirit Who speaks through the prophets of the New Dispensation, of whom St. Paul was one. Here, if the following prophetical utterance to be his own, he speaks as if Paul under the prophetic influence had an activity independent of Paul the apostle.

in stórēvo kairopiō: The latter times, of course, may be said to come before the last days, ἅγησεται ἡμέρας (Isa. ii. 2, Acts ii. 17, Jav. v. 3, 2 Pet. iii. 3; καιρός ἡγησάται, 1 Pet. i.5, ἡχός, χρόνος, Jude 18).

But a comparison with 2 Tim. iii. 1, a passage very similar in tone to this, favours the opinion that the terms were not so distinguished by the writers of the N.T. In this sort of prophetical warning or denunciation, we are not intended to take the future tense too strictly. Although the prophet intends to utter a warning concerning the future, yet we know that what he declares will be hereafter he believes to be already in active operation. It is a convention of prophetical utterance to denounce sins and sinners of one's own time (τινες) under the form of a predictive warning. Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 3, οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, κ.α. It gives an additional impressiveness to the arraignment, to state that the guilty persons are partners in the great apostasy, the culmination of the world's revolt from God.

τινες is intentionally vague. See note on 1 Tim. i. 3. It is not used, as in Rom. iii. 3, of an indefinite number.

πνεύματα πλάνων: As the Church is guided aright by the Spirit of truth, He is opposed in His beneficent ministeries by the Spirit of error, to πνεύμα τῆς πλάνης (1 John iv. 6), who is to πνεύμα τοῦ κόσμου, whose agents work through individuals, the "many false prophets who have gone out into the world" (1 John iv. 1).

The phrase does not here mean doctrines about demons, demonology. Still less are heresiarchs here called demons. This is the only occurrence of δαιμόνιον in the Pastorals. In Acts xvii. 18 the word has its neutral classical meaning, "a divine being," see also ver. 22; but elsewhere in the N.T. it has the LXX reference to evil spirits. For δαιμωνία see note on chap. i. 10.

Ver. 2. in ὑπόκρισιν πνευμολόγων: The three genitives: πνευμ. καινοτ. καθ. are coordinate, and refer to the human agents of the seducing spirits and demons. In ὑπόκρισιν depends on πνεύματα and δαιμονίαι. The spirits' work, and the teachings are exhibited, in the hypocrisy of them that speak lies; and this hypocrisy finds detailed expression in regulations suggested by a false asceticism.
Although the ψευδολογία are included in the τιμωρίαι...φρονοσεΐται, yet there is a large class of persons who are merely deceived; who are not actively deceiving others, and who have not taken the initiative in deceit. These latter are the ψευδολογία. For this reason it is better to connect εν ψευδολογίαι with προσώπους (Ell., von Soden) rather than with αὐτοτιθουσιν (Bengel, Alf.), though no doubt both verbs refer to the same class.

εν ψευδολογίαι of course is not adverbial as A.V., speaking lies in hypocrisy. This could only be justified if ψευδολογίαι referred to δαμασκ. The absence of an article before ψευδολογίαι need cause no astonishment.

Ψευδολογία: This word expresses perhaps more than ψεύδω the notion of definite false statements. A man might be on some occasions and on special points a ψευδολογία, a speaker of that which is not true, and yet not deserve to be classed as a ψέυδω, a liar.

καικοστηριασμένος τῷ ἱδίῳ συνεδρίῳ. This sentence has been disposed of by some (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 25-40; see especially 38, δὲ μὴ γαστρονόμον κρατίσσων τιφτερα; but similar views are condemned in Col., see especially Col. ii. 16, 21, 22. See also Heb. xiii. iv. St. Paul had come to realise how tyrannous the weak brother could be; and he had become less tolerant of him.

διέφθαρε: The positive καθὼς, commanding, must be supplied from the negative καθὼς μη, commanding not καθὼς τῶν ψευδολογίων.

d. f. g. Vulg. preserve the awkwardness of the Greek, προχείρισμα ποιεῖν, abstinear a cibus. But Faustus read abstinentes, and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνεται. But Faustus read which is not true, and yet not deserving to abstinentes and Origen int. et abstinentes se a cibus. Epiphanius inserts παρεγγέλλοντος after βραχίων, and Isidore inserts κατ' αὐτούς καθὼς κρίνε...
metèlèmpnivn metà eìghôraìtias is one complex conception. This expresses the ideal use, truly dignified and human, of food. See Rom. xiv. 6, ἐκδοθέν κυριότερον εὐχορεύειν ἐκδοσίαν eìghôraìtiai γάρ τῷ θεῷ; and i Cor. x. 30, εἰ ἔχω χάριν μετέχων, τί βλασφημεῖαι τῆς ἀναπάρασι τὸ ἐκδοθέν ἐκδοσίας; St. Paul of course does not mean that believers only are intended by God to partake of food. His argument is an a fortiori one. "Those that believe," etc., are certainly included in God's intention. He who makes His sun to rise on the evil is certainly well pleased to make it rise on the good.

Again, St. Paul does not merely desire to vindicate the use of some of God's creatures for them that believe, but the use of all of God's creatures, so far as they are not physically injurious. "God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good," καλά Λευν (Gen. i. 31).

For the association of μεταλαμβάνων compare the phrase μεταλαμβάνων τροφῆς, Acts ii. 46, and reff. on 2 Tim. ii. 6. τοῖς πιστοῖς: dai. commodi, as in Tit. i. 15, where see note.

Now ἄγιασμα means, as elsewhere in these epistles, the Gospel truth in general, not the truth of the following statement, τῶν κτισμάτων, κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 4. διὰ τῶν κτισμάτων: This is the proof of the preceding statement, consisting of (a) a plain reference to Gen. i. 31, (b) a no less clear echo of our Lord's teaching, Mark vii. 15 (Acts x. 15), also re-echoed in Rom. xiv. 14, Tit. i. 15.

λαμβανόμενον: This verb is used of taking food into one's hand before eating (in the accounts of the feeding of the multitudes, Matt. xiv. 19 = Mark vi. 41; Matt. xv. 36 = Mark viii. 6, also Luke xxiv. 30, 43) as well as of eating and drinking. See reff. Perhaps it is not fanciful to note its special use in connexion with the Eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 23; Matt. xxvi. 26 (bis) 27; Mark iv. 22, 23; Luke xxii. 19).

καὶ οὖν ἀπέβλητον: The statement of Gen. i. 32 which is summed up in Every creature of God is good might be met by the objection that nevertheless certain kinds of food were, in point of fact, to be rejected by the express command of the Mosaic Law. St. Paul replies that thanksgiving disannuls the Law in each particular case. Nothing over which thanksgiving can be pronounced is any longer included in the category of things tabooed. It is evident, from the repetition of the condition, metà eìghôraìtias λαμβανέω, that St. Paul regarded that as the only restriction on Christian liberty in the use of God's creatures. Is it a thing of such a kind that I can, without incongruity, give thanks for it?

Field regards οὖν ἀπέβλητον here, as a proverbial adaptation of Homer's saying (Il. Ι. 65): οὖν ἀπέβλητον ἄγιασμα τῶν ἐρυθρών ἔριπον ἐδόθη. For κτισμά see reff. κτισμα is found in Rom. (7), 2 Cor. (1), Gal. (1), Col. (2); but in these places creation is the best or a possible rendering. κτισμα means unambiguously thing created.

Ver. 5. ἀγίασται: The use of the present tense here supports the explanation given of ver. 4, and helps to determine the sense in which λόγος θεοῦ is used. The food lying before me at this moment, which to some is ἀπέβλητον, is sanctified here and now by the eìghôraìtia. See i Cor. x. 30.

λόγος θεοῦ and ἄγιασμα (see note on ii. 1) are in some sense co-ordinate (almost a hendiadys), and together form elements in a eìghôraìtia. If St. Paul had meant by λόγος θεοῦ, the general teaching of Scripture, or the particular text, Gen. i. 32, he must have said φυλασσεῖν. At the same time, the written word was an element in the notion of the writer. λόγος θεοῦ has not here merely its general sense, a divine communication to man; it rather determines the quality of the ἄγιασμα, as a scriptural prayer; a prayer in harmony with God's revealed truth. The examples that have come down to us of grace before meat are, as Dean Bernard notes here, "packed with scriptural phrases."

The best commentary on this verse is the action of St. Paul himself on the ship, when, having "taken bread, he gave thanks to God in the presence of all; and he brake it, and began to eat" (Acts xxvii. 35).

Although there is not here any direct
reference to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, it is probable that thoughts about it have influenced the language; for the Eucharist is the supreme example of all benedictions and consecrations of material things. And if this be so, the passage has light thrown on it by the language of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus about the Prayer of Consecration; e.g., Justin, Apol. i. 66. "As Jesus Christ our Saviour, by the word of God (Βαπτισμός Θεοῦ) made flesh, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so we have been taught that the food over which thanks have been given by the word of prayer which comes from him (τὸ ἐν τῷ ἐνθύμησιν τοῦ πατρὸς εὐχαριστηθέντων τρόφιμον)—that food from which our blood and flesh are by assimilation nourished—is both the flesh and the blood of that Jesus who was made flesh". Similarly Irenaeus (Haer. v. 2, 3). "Both the mingled cup, and the bread which has been made, receives upon itself the word of God, and the Eucharist becomes the body of Christ" (ἐνθυμεῖται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ γίνεται η ἐνθυμηθεῖσα σῶμα Χριστοῦ). Perhaps by the word of prayer which comes from him Justin means a formula authorised by Christ. It must be added that the Prayer Book of Serapion, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, circ. a.d. 380, contains an epiclesis in which we read, "O God of truth, let thy Holy Word come to sojourn on this bread, that the bread may become Body of the Word, and on this cup, that the cup may become Blood of the Truth" (Bishop J. Wordsworth's trans.).

A comparison of these passages suggests an association in the thought of the primitive Church of the Holy Spirit and the λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Vv. 6-10. The spread of these mischievous notions among the brethren is most effectively discouraged by a demonstration in the person of the minister himself of the positive teaching of the Gospel as to practical life. We are assured, and declare our confidence by our lives, that Christianity differs essentially from theosophy in that it has respect to the eternal future, as well as to the passing present.

Ver. 6. τῶν: repeated in ver. 11, refers to all the preceding directions, but more especially to the warnings against false asceticism.

τιμέων: (remind, suggest) is a somewhat mild term, as Chrys. points out; but in some circumstances suggestion is more effectual than direct exhortation.

διάκονος Χρ. "ηπ. seems emphatic, a deacon, not of the Church, but of Christ Jesus, who is the Chief Pastor.

ὑπαυσκόμε: The present tense is significant, "meaning to imply constancy in application to these things" (Chrys.), "ever training thyself" (Alf.). "The present . . . marks a continuous and permanent nutrition" (Ell.). The process begun from his earliest years, 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15, was being still maintained.

ἡ πίστις and ἡ διδασκαλία denote respectively the sum total of Christian belief, conceived as an ideal entity, and the same as imparted little by little to the faithful. See note on i. 10.

τιμέων: There is a similar use of this verb in 2 Tim. iii. 10, where see note. Alford attempts to give the word here the same force as in Luke i. 3, by rendering the course of which thou hast followed. The A.V., wherewith thou hast attained, expresses also the sense of achievement which we find in Luke i.e. It seems better, however, to associate the word with the notion of discipleship; so R.V., doctrine which thou hast followed until now.

Ver. 7. W. H. place a comma after τιμέων and a full stop after ὑπαυσκόμε, and a full stop after ὑπαυσκόμε; so R.V. nearly. But as ὑπαυσκόμε is an imperative, as in reff. in Pastoral, it is best taken as antithetic to γυμναί.

ὑπαυσκόμε: The μῦθος, in addition to their profane nature, as impeaching the
goodness of the Creator, were absurd, unworthy of a grown man's consideration. See note on chap. i. 4. Hort's view (Judaistic Christianity, p. 138) that θεοματια here merely means "the absence of any divine or sacred character" does not seem reasonable.

Ver. 8. προς δύναμιν: This is προς as in Luke xv. 9. For a slight extent; as contrasted with πρὸς τὴν ζωὴν. The R.V., for a little means for a little while in Jas. iv. 14. This notion is included in the other. The R.V., for a little is ambiguous; perhaps intentionally so. In view of the genuine asceticism of St. Paul himself, not to mention other examples, it is unreasonable to think him inconsistent in making this concession.

πρὸς δύναμιν: There is here an intentional paradox. Timothy is to meet the spurious asceticism of the heretics by exercising himself in the practical piety of the Christian life. See chap. ii. 2. The paradox is comparable to πρὸς τὴν ζωὴν of 1 Thess. iv. 11. The true Christian asceticism is not essentially ἠμαρτησιμός, although the body is the means by which the spiritual nature is affected and influenced. Although it brings the body into subjection (1 Cor. ix. 27), this is a means, not an end in itself.

Ver. 9. παρατάσσει: This is parenthetical and retrospective. The teaching of ver. 8 is the λόγος. So Chrys.

Ver. 10. γὰρ, as in the parallel 2:
Tim. ii. 11, introduces a statement in support of the judgment, περιτόν δὲ λόγον.

εἰς τὸτε: i.e., with a view to the obtaining the promised blessings of life. The best commentary on this is what St. Paul said in an earlier epistle, "As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things" (2 Cor. vi. 10).

εἰς τὸτε καὶ ἀγνοέμενα ἔχει πάντα τὸν πνεύμονα τῆς προσκυνήσεως. This was at once an incentive to exertion, and thus correlative to ἐνεργέω, and in itself a part of the thing promised, the ἐνεργεία. A consciousness that we are in an harmonious personal relation with the living God lifts us into a sphere in which labour and striving have no power to distress us.

ἀφίκεσθαι: we have our hope set on (R.V.). The same use of the perfect of this verb, "expressing the continuance and permanence of the ἐνεργεία" (Ellicott), is found in the ref. In addition, ἐνεργεία is also followed by ἐπὶ with the dat. in Rom. xv. 12 (Isa. xi. 10) and 1 Tim. v. 17; by ἐπὶ with the acc. in 1 Tim. iv. 5, 1 Pet. i. 13; by ὑπὸ with the acc. in John v. 45, 2 Cor. i. 10, 1 Pet. iii. 5; and by ὑπὸ followed by the dat. in 1 Cor. xv. 19.

δὲ ἂν: As indicated above, this is said in relation to ἐνεργείαν ἑνώς. To know the living God is life eternal (John xvii. 3).

δὲ ἂν: ὑπὸ τὸν πνεύμονα, κ.τ.λ.: Saviour of all (τὸν πνεύμονα σωτῆρα) occurs in Wisd. xvi. 7. Cf. Saviour of the world, John iv. 42.

The prima facie force of μάλιστα certainly is that all men share in some degree in that salvation which the πνεύμονα enjoy in the highest degree. Compare the force of μάλιστα in Acts xxv. 26, Gal. vi. 10, Phil. iv. 22, 1 Tim. v. 8, 17, 2 Tim. iv. 13; Tit. i. 10.

The statement is more unreservedly universalist in tone than chap. ii. 4 and Tit. ii. 11; and perhaps must be qualified by saying that while God is potentially Saviour of all, He is actually Saviour of the πνεύμονα. It is an argument a minori ad majus (as Bengel says); and the unqualified assertion is suitable. If all men can be saved, surely the πνεύμονα are saved, in whose number we are included. It is better to qualify the statement thus than, with Chrys. and Bengel, to give to σωτῆρα a material sense of God's relation to all men, as the God of nature; but a spiritual sense of His relation to them that believe, as the God of grace. See notes on ch. i. 3; ii. 4.

Vv. 11-16. Silent example or mild suggestion will not do in every case. There are many occasions when it will be necessary for you to speak out, with the authority given to you at your ordination. At the same time, do not forget that the charismatic gift will die if it be neglected. Give yourself wholly to the cultivation of your character; so will you save yourself and those committed to your charge.

Ver. 11. ἐνεργεία: In point of time, teaching precedes commanding. The tone of command can only be used in relation to fundamentals which have been accepted, but are in danger of being forgotten. Similar directions recur in v. 7 and vi. 3.

Ver. 12. παράγγελλε: In point of time, teaching precedes commanding. The tone of command can only be used in relation to fundamentals which have been accepted, but are in danger of being forgotten. Similar directions recur in v. 7 and vi. 3.
gel). Many, probably, of the Ephesian presbyters were older than Timothy. For μέγας in this position, cf. 1 Cor. iii. 18, x. 24; Eph. v. 6; Col. ii. 18; Tit. ii. 15; Jas. i. 13. καταφρονέω connotes that the contempt felt in the mind is displayed in injurious action. (See Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, viii. 432). The meaning of this direction is qualified by the following δόθην γίνοντα, κ.τ.λ. It means, Assert the dignity of your office even though men may think you young to hold it. Let no one push you aside as a boy. Compare the corresponding direction Tit. ii. 15, μέγας σου περιφρονέων. On the other hand, St. Paul shows Timothy "a more excellent way" than self-assertion for the keeping up of his dignity: Give no one any ground by any fault of character for despising thy youth.

σου depends on τῆς νεότητος. Field supports this by an exact parallel from Diodorus Siculus. The two genitives do not, in strict grammar, depend on καταφρονέω, despise thee for thy youth. τῆς νεότητος: St. Paul had met Timothy on the second missionary journey, dated by Harnack in a.d. 47, and by Lightfoot in a.d. 51. About the year 57, St. Paul says of Timothy, "Let no man despise him" (1 Cor. xvi. 11). 1 Tim. may be dated not more than a year before St. Paul's martyrdom, which Harnack fixes in a.d. 64, and Lightfoot in a.d. 67. The question arises, Could Timothy's νεότητα have lasted all that time, about fifteen or sixteen years? We must remember that we have no information about Timothy's age when he joined St. Paul's company. But if he had been then fifteen or sixteen, νεότητα here need cause no difficulty. Lightfoot (Apostolic Fathers, Part II. vol. i. p. 448) adduces evidence from Polybius and Galen to show that a man might be called νίκος up to the age of thirty-four or thirty-five. In any case, the terms "young" and "old" are used relatively to the average age at which men attain to positions in the world.

Forty is reckoned old for a captain in the army, young for a bishop, very young for a Prime Minister. In an instructive parallel passage, Ignatius commends the Magnesienses (§ 3) and their presbyters for not presuming upon the youth of their bishop. For Timothy's comparative youth, cf. 2 Tim. ii. 22. τῶν γίνοντάς τεσσαράκης ἔφη βίων: For the sentiment, compare v. 7, 10, 11, 15, John xxi. 22, 23.

ἀποτύπωσις, παράστασις, διδασκαλία are the three elements in the ministry of the word: (a) reading aloud of Scripture (Luke iv. 16; Acts xii. 15; 2 Cor. iii. 14, see Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, viii. v. 262); (b) exhortation based on the reading, and appealing to the moral sense (2 Tim. iv. 2; Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 67); (c) teaching, appealing to the intellect, see note on chap. i. 10. Exhortation and teaching are similarly joined in Rom. xii. 7, 8, and 1 Tim. vi. 2.

Ver. 14. μή ἄμελει: J. H. Moulton (Grammar, vol. i. p. 122 sqq.), distinguishes (a) μή with the pres. imperat, "Do not go on doing so and so," e.g., 1 Tim. x. 22, 23, from (b) μή with the aor. subjunctive, "Do not begin to do it" (1 Tim. v. 1; 2 Tim. i. 8). In this case, μή ἄμελει is equivalent to ταύτης μελέτα. Timothy's χάρισμα lay in his commission to rule and in his powers as a preacher. The χάρισμα was given by God; in this particular case the formal and solemn assumption of its use was accompanied by the indication of prophecy addressed to the ear, and by the
laying on of hands addressed to the eye. See Acts xiii. 1-3.

Winer-Moulton notes, p. 471, that the instrument, as such, is never expressed by μέτα in good prose. Here, with, amid imposition of hands (conjointly with the act of imposition), μέτα is here equivalent to διὰ in the sense given above, i.e., of accompanying circumstances.

2 Tim. i. 6 is usually reconciled with this passage by saying that the body of presbyters was associated with St. Paul in the laying on of hands. But there is no reason to suppose that the same transaction is referred to in both places. Here the charismata refer to preaching and teaching; but in 2 Tim., to the administrative duties committed to Timothy, as it is reasonable to suppose, by St. Paul alone, when he appointed him his representative. Note that διὰ is used of St. Paul's imposition of hands (2 Tim. i. 6), μέτα of that of the presbyters, here. This suggests that it was the imposition of hands by St. Paul that was the instrument used by God in the communication of the charisma to Timothy.

προσβύνεων: elsewhere in N.T. (Luke xxii. 66; Acts xxii. 5) means the Jewish Sanhedrin; but Ignatius uses the term, as here, to indicate the presbyters in a local Church (Trall. 7, 13; Philadelph. 7, etc.).

Ver. 15. ταύτα: i.e., reading, exhortation, teaching. μέλέτα: practice, exercise thyself in, rather than meditari. So R.V., Be diligent in. (Bengel compares ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ μελετήσας, "In his law will he exercise himself," P.B.V., quoted by Prof. Schoefield.

ἐν τούτοις ἑσθο: To the parallels cited by Wetstein, ἐν τούτοις ὁ Καὶσαρ... ἐν (Plut. Pomp. p. 656 b), "Omnis in hoc sum" (Horace, Epistles, i. 1, 12) and Alford: "Totus in illis" (Horace, Sat. i. 9, 2), we may add ἐν φόρῳ Κυρίου ἑσθο, Prov. xxiii. 17. Timothy's progress manifest to all would secure his youth from being despised: cf. Matt. v. 16.

μανερά: This expression is quite Pauline; see ref.; but St. Paul more frequently has φανερά γενέσθαι, 1 Cor. iii. 13, x. 19, xiv. 25, Phil. i. 13.

Ver. 16. ἔπειτα σαντοφ, κ.τ.λ.: The teacher must needs prepare himself before he prepares his lesson. A similar thought is conveyed by the order of the words in Gen. iv. 4, "The Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering". ἔθεκαν (see ref. and Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii., vii. 377) has a quite different signification in Phil. ii. 16. Cf. Acts xx. 28, προσεύχετε ἑαυτοῖς.

τῇ διδακτικῇ: Thy teaching (R.V.). The doctrine (A.V.) can take care of itself. See note on i. 10. αὐτός is neuter, referring to the same things as ταύτα; not masc., "Remain with the Ephesians," as Grotius supposed, a view tolerated by Bengel.

σαντοφ σώσεις: cf. Ezek. xxxiii. 9.

Chapter V.—Vv. 1-16. The wise Church ruler must understand how to deal with his people individually. Each age and condition needs separate treatment: old men, young men; old women, young women. Widows in particular need discriminating care; since some of them may have to be supported by the Church; and we must not let the Church be imposed on, nor give occasion for scandal. Accordingly Church widows must be at least sixty years old, and be of good character.

Ver. 1. προσβύνεων is best taken as a term of age, seniorem (Vulg.). This view is supported by the ὑδ σαντα, προσβύνεων, νυνίσασ. The term νυνίσασ might possibly refer to a subordinate Church officer. In Acts v. 6 it is susceptible of that meaning; but in the subsequent narrative (Acts v. 10) at νυνίσασ who are in attendance on the Apostles are merely νυνίσασ.
Here only, νευτέρως ὃς ἀδέλφους, 2. ἐπεξεύθετας ὃς μητέρας, νευτέρως ὃς N.T.

See 1 Tim. ἀδελφός ἐν πάσῃ ἀγαθίᾳ. 3. Χήρας τίμα τᾶς ὅπως χήρας. 4. Ἰερ. 12.

Mark xi. 1. εἴ ὅπου τῇ χήρᾳ τέκνα ἢ ἐκγεννᾶ ἢ ἐκεύον ἢ ἐκέντρων ἢ πρότων τῶν 5. ἢ ὅπου τῇ χήρᾳ τέκνα ἢ ἐκγενναῖ ἢ ἐκέντρων ἢ πρότων τῶν 3. τιμᾶς ἢ ἕκαστος ἢ ἐνώπιον ἢ τοῦ ἢ τιμᾶς ἢ τοῦ ἢ τιμᾶς N.T.

Here only, τούτῳ γὰρ ἴστιν ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ πρότων ἢ πρότων N.T.

Here only, τούτῳ γὰρ ἴστιν ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ πρότων ἢ πρότων.

Here only, τούτῳ γὰρ ἴστιν ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ πρότων ἢ πρότων 5. ἢ ὅπου τῇ χήρᾳ τέκνα ἢ ἐκέντρων ἢ πρότων τῶν ἢ πρότων.

Here only, τούτῳ γὰρ ἴστιν ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ πρότων ἢ πρότων.

Here only, τούτῳ γὰρ ἴστιν ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ πρότων ἢ πρότων.

Here only, τούτῳ γὰρ ἴστιν ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ ἐποδέκτων ἢ πρότων ἢ πρότων.

Tivli: Treat harshly. The more usual ἵναι ἕξει occurs 2 Tim. iv. 2.

ταξιτάπαιρται ἢ τοῖς τιμᾶς: Respect for age must temper the expression of reproof of an old man's misdemeanours, νευτέρως and the following accusatives in ver. 2 are governed by some such verb as treat, behave towards, deal with, implied in ἵναι ἕξει and ταξιτάπαιρται.

Ver. 2. ἵναι ἕξει: with the strictest regard to purity, or perhaps propriety. Christians, Athenagoras tells us (Legat. 32), considered other Christians, according to their age, as sons and daughters; brothers and sisters; fathers and mothers. Ellicott quotes Jerome's maxim, "Omnes puellas et virgines Christi aut aequaliter ignora aut aequabiliter dilege" (Epist. 52, 5, p. 259). Compare de Imitatione Christi, i. 8, "Be not a friend to any one woman, but recommend all good women in general to God".

Ver. 3. τίμα: It is difficult to fix precisely the force of τίμα in this connexion. On the one hand, the passage (vv. 3-8) is a part of the general directions as to Timothy's personal relations to his flock. Respect, honour, would, then, render the word adequately. On the other hand, vv. 4 and 8 show that the question of widows' maintenance, as a problem of Church finance, was in the apostle's mind; and he goes on, in ver. 9, to lay down regulations for the admission of widows to the number of those who were entered on the Church register for support. Perhaps respect was first in the writer's mind, while the term used, τίμα, easily lent itself to the expression of the notion of support, which immediately suggested itself. Similarly Chrys. (τὸς τῶν ἀναγκαίων τροφής), comparing ver. 17, where τίμα has the sense of pay, cf. Ecles. xxviii. 1, Matt. xv. 4-6, Acts xxviii. 10. Honora beneficis is Bengel's comment.

τὰς ὅπως: Those who really deserve the name of widows are (1) those who have no younger relatives on whom they have a claim for support, (2) those who conform to certain moral and spiritual requirements detailed below.

Ver. 4. ἐκγονα: offspring ought to be the best rendering of this. It has a wider connotation than children and narrower than descendants.

προαντίστασις: It ought not to be necessary to say that the subject of this verb is ἐποδέκτων, only that Chrys. Theod. Vulg. and d agree in referring it to the class χήρᾳ. ('Require them in their descendants, repay the debt through the children," Chrys.; "Discat primum domum suam suam regere." See critical note.) Similarly Augustine says of his mother Monica, "Fuerat enim unius viri uxor, mutuam vicem parentibus reddiderat, domum suam pie tractaveiat" (Confessions, ix. 9). This can only be regarded as a curiosity in exegesis.

ἐποδέκτων: The first duty of children is filial piety. οἰκον, which is usually correlative to parents rather than children, is used here "to mark the duty as an act of family feeling and family honour" (De Wette, quoted by Ell.). οἰκον (domum pie tractare, m.) with a direct accusative is also found in ref. Ellicott supplies an appropriate illustration from Philo, de Decalogó, § 23, "where storks are similarly said cvecBctiv and cipicctiv".

τιμᾶς: When the term occurs again, 2 Tim. i. 3, it has its usual meaning forefather. It is usually applied to forbears that are dead. Here it means parents, grandparents, or great-grandparents that are living; and this use of it was probably suggested by ἐκγονα, a term of equally vague reference. Plato, Laws, xi. p. 932, is quoted for a similar application of the word to the living.

τὸν ὅπως: Besides being enjoined in the O.T., our Lord taught the same duty, Mark vii. 16-13 = Matt. xv. 4-6. See also Eph. vi. 1, 2.

Ver. 5. ἐκείνη ἥπερ ἦν: καθ' ἥπερ ἦν set on. See on iv. 10, the analogy of
which favours the omission of the article here.

prosomenai: She is like Anna, γνησιαι καὶ δεσποτὴν λατρευμα νυκτὰ καὶ ημέραν (Luke ii. 37). prosocratetai is more usual in this connexion, e.g., Rom. xii. 12, Col. iv. 2.

Ell. notes that Paul always has the order ννετ., ημ., as here. Luke has also this order, with the acc., but ημ., καὶ ννετ., with the gen. In Rev. the order is ημ., καὶ ννετ.,

Ver. 6. σωκαλλωσα: The modern term fast, in which the notion of prodigality and wastefulness is more prominent than that of sensual indulgence, exactly expresses the significance of this word. The R.V., she that giveth herself to pleasure, is stronger than the A.V. A somewhat darker force is given to it here by the associated verb in ver. ii. οικουμεναίων. The Vulg. is felicitous, Quae in deliciis est, vivens mortua est. The expression is more terse than in Rev. iii. 1, "Thou hast a name that thou livest and thou art dead". Cf. Rom. vii. 10, 24, Eph. iv. 18. Wetstein quotes in illi from Stobaeus (338), as descriptive of a poor man's life of anxiety, πάντα ἀποθανόντων φροντίσαντι ἀπελλαγήν, ἵνα γὰρ τύθησαι.

Ver. 7. ταῦτα is best referred to ver. 4, with its implied injunctions to the younger generation to support their widows.

άνεπελημμένος: i.e., all Christians whom it concerns, not widows only.

Ver. 8. The Christian faith includes the law of love. The moral teaching of Christianity recognises the divine origin of all natural and innocent human affections. The unbeliever, i.e., the born heathen, possesses natural family affection; and though these feelings may be stunted by savagery, the heathen are not likely to be sophisticated by human per-versions of religion, such as those denounced by Jesus in Mark vii. Ell. says. It is worthy of notice that the Essenes were not permitted to give relief to their relatives without leave from their άνεπελημμένος, though they might freely do so to others in need; see Joseph. Bell. Ιωδ. ii. 8, 6.

The Christian who falls below the best heathen standard of family affection is the more blameworthy, since he has what the heathen has not, the supreme example of love in Jesus Christ. We may add that Jesus Himself gave an example of providing for one's own, when He provided a home for His mother with the beloved disciple.

ol θου are near relatives: oI oλεκους, members of one's household. One of the most subtle temptations of the Devil is his suggestion that we can best comply with the demands of duty in some place far away from our own. Jesus always says, Do the next thing; "Begin from Jerusalem". The path of duty begins from within our own house, and we must walk it on our own feet.

ολεκους: The omission of the article in the true text before oλεκους precludes the possibility of taking the word here in the allegorical sense in which it is used in Gal. and Eph.: "the household of the faith"; "the household of God".

Ver. 9. καταληγεῖσθαι: St. Paul passes naturally from remarks about the duty of...
Church members to their widowed relatives to specific rules about the admission of widows to the roll of Church widows (see Acts vi. 1). The χήρα of this ver. is ἡ ἑτερα χήρα of vv. 3 and 5, who was to receive consideration and official recognition. These widows had no doubt a ministry to fulfill—a ministry of love, prayer, intercession, and giving of thanks (Polycarp, 4); but it is difficult to suppose that St. Paul, or any other practically minded administrator, would contemplate a presbyteral order of widows, the members of which would enter on their duties at the age of 60, an age relatively more advanced in the East and in the first century than in the West and in our own time. We may add that the general topic of widows' maintenance is resumed and concluded in ver. 16.

In the references to widows in the earliest Christian literature outside the N.T. (with the exception of Ignatius Smyrn. 13) they are mentioned as objects of charity along with orphans, etc. (Ignatius, Smyrn. 6, Polyc. 4; Polycarp, 4; Hermas, Vis. ii. 4, Mand. viii., Sim. i. v. 3, ix. 25, 27; Justin, Apol. i. 67). None of these places hints at an order of widows. The subject cannot be further discussed here; but the evidence seems to point to the conclusion that the later institution of widows as an order with official duties was suggested by this passage. The history of Christianity affords other examples of supposed revivals of apostolic institutions.

Ell., who follows Grotius in seeing in this verse regulations respecting an ecclesiastical or presbyteral widow, objects to the view taken above that it is "highly improbable that when criteria had been given, ver. 4 sq., fresh should be added, and those of so very exclusive a nature: would the Church thus limit her alms?"

But ver. 4 sq. does not give the criteria, or qualifications of an official widow; but only describes the dominant characteristic of the life of the "widow indeed," viz., devotion; and again, the Church of every age, the apostolic not less than any other, has financial problems to deal with. Charity may be indiscriminating, but there are only a limited number of widows for whose whole support the Church can make itself responsible; and this is why the limit of age is here so high. At a much younger age than 60 a woman would cease to have any temptation to marry again.
explained, the el is not so much dependent on κατατηρησάων as explanatory of ἐν ἐργοις καλ. μαρτ. The rendering of the Vulg., d, f, g, Amb., filios educavit, is better than that of mi, nutriivit, or Ambst. enutrivit. It is not child-birth so much as the "Christianly and virtuously bringing up of children," her own or those entrusted to her charge, that St. Paul has in his mind. Tert. de Virg. v. 9, alluding to this passage, says, "Non tantum univirae, id est nuptae, aliquando eliguntur, sed et matres et quidem educatrices filiorum, scilicet ut experimentis omnium affectuum structae facile nonint ceteras et consilio et solatio iuvare, etut nihilominus ea decucurrerint, per quae femina probari potest". The later Church widows, among other duties, had the care of the Church orphans (cf. Hermas Mand. viii.; Lucian, de morte Peregrini, 12).

ξενοδόχησεν: Hospitality is a virtue especially demanded in a condition of society in which there is much going to and fro, and no satisfactory hotel accommodation. The episcopus must be φιλάνθρωπος (iii. 2, where see note). ἐν ἐγνώμονι πιθῶν ἐγνώμον: If the strangers were also "saints," members of the Christian Society, they would naturally receive special attention. The mistress of the house would act as servant of the servants of God (cf. Gen. xviii. 6; x Sam. xxiv. 41). Unless we assume the unhistorical character of St. John's Gospel, it is natural to suppose that the story told in John xiii. 5-14, and the Master's command to do as He had done, was known to St. Paul and Timothy. The absence of an article before πώς "is due to assimilation to ἐγνώμον" (Blass, Grammar, p. 155, note 3).

κατατηρησάων cuts short any further enumeration of details, if in short, she has devoted herself to good works of every kind. There is an exact parallel to this use of ἐνακολουθεῖν in Josh. xiv. 14, ὡς τὸ αὐτὸν [Caleb] ἐνακολουθήσατε τῷ πρὸς τόμῳ Κυρίου θεοῦ ισχαρία. The word also means to "check" or "verify" an account. In Mark xvi. 20, "the signs 'endorse' the word" (Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii., viii. 376). So here it may connote sympathy with, and interest in, good works, without actual personal labour in them.

Ver. 11. There are two main factors in the interpretation of this verse: (1) a general Church regulation—not laid down by St. Paul but found in existence by him—that a widow in receipt of relief should be ὑποδιδόντος γυνῆ; and (2) his determination to make provision that no scandal should arise from broken vows. The notion was that there was a marriage tie between Christ and the Church widow. This would be her first faith, her earliest and still valid plighted truth. Cf. Rev. ii. 4, τὴν ἐγνώμον τὴν πρώτην ἀρχήν (of the Church at Ephesus). μαρτίρομαι may be rendered positively, young. παραιτοῦ: reject. This verb is used of "profane and old wives' fables" (iv. 7), of "foolish and ignorant questionings" (2 Tim. ii. 23), of "a man that is heretical" (Tit. iii. 10); so that, at first sight, it seems a harsh term to use in reference to "young widows". But the harshness is explained when we remember that St. Paul is speaking, not of the widows in themselves, but as applicants for admission to the roll of specially privileged Church widows. In a Church still immature as to its organisation and morals the authorities would be only courting disaster were they to assume the control of young widows, a class whose condition gave them independence in the heathen society around them.

κατατηρησάων: Cum enim luxuriatiae fuerint [in deicitis egrediti, m.110] in Christo (Vulg.). The word denotes the particular character of their restiveness. It was understood with this sexual reference in Pseud. Ignat. ad Antioch. ii, αἱ χήραι μὴ σταταλάτωσιν, οὐ μὴ κατατηρησάωσιν τοῦ λέγουν. στρήνος (over-strength), wantonness or luxury occurs Rev. xviii. 3; στρήναω, Rev. xviii. 7, 9, to wax wanton, live wantonly, or luxuriously. The preposition κατά, with the genitive, has the sense against, of opposition, as in καταβραβεῖων, καταγελῶν, καταπλεκέω, κατακαμάμαι, κατακρίνω, etc.
For οὖν with the subjunctive or indicative, see Winer Moulton, Grammar, p. 388. The subjunctive, as in the text, is the normally correct way of expressing a contemplated contingency.

τοῦ Χριστοῦ: Here only in the Pastors.

γεμιέν ὁ λόγος: ὁ λόγος has here an emphatic sense, as in John vii. 17; and its association here supports the view that "designates the will which proceeds from inclination," as contrasted with θεολογεία, "the will which follows deliberation" (Thayer's Grimm, s.v.).

γαρ εἰς τὸν θεὸν: used of the woman also, ver. 14, Mark x. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 25, 34.

Ver. 12: ἔχουσαι κρίμα ἢ περιρχόμενον τὰς οἰκίας: These last words may possibly refer to the house to house visitation, going about (R.V.), which might be part of the necessary duty of the Church widows; but which would be a source of temptation to young women, and would degenerate into wandering (A.V.).

ὁ μᾶς δὲ... ἀλλὰ καὶ is a Pauline use of constant occurrence. See Rom. v. 3, 11, vii. 23, ix. 10; 2 Cor. vii. 7, viii. 19; Phil. ii. 27 (οὐ... δὲ μᾶς); 2 Tim. iv. 8. Also in Acts xix. 27, 3 Macc. iii. 23.

δραγαῖ, φλαυροὶ, περιργαῖ: A series of natural causes and consequences. The social intercourse of idle people is naturally characterised by silly chatter which does not merely affect the understanding of those who indulge it, but leads them on to mischievous interference in other people's affairs.

φλαυροὶ: φλαροῖν is found in 3 John 10, prating. δραγαῖ is an epithet of φιλοσοφία in 4 Macc. v. 10; and in Prov. xxiii. 29 (ὁς) φλαροῖς δηλάει ἐνεφλαυρωμένας are among the consequences of excessive wine-drinking.

περιργαῖ: See 2 Thess. iii. 11, μὴ πάντα δραγαῖοι εἰς ἀλλὰ περιρχομένους. In Acts xix. 19 τὰ περιργαῦ, curious arts, means the arts of those who are curious about, and pry into, matters concealed from human knowledge, imperious to man's lawful needs.
λολοῦμαι τὰ μὴ δεόντα expresses the positively mischievous activity of the φλεμαροῖ, as πειραμα. Compare Tit. i. 11, διδάσκοντες καὶ μὴ οἶδα. In both passages μὴ is expressive of the impropriety, in the writer's opinion, of whatever might conceivably be spoken and taught; whereas τὰ σιδέρα would express the notion that certain specific improper things had, as a matter of fact, been spoken. See Winer-Moulton, Gram. p. 603.


τευτερασ: The insertion of χαράς before τευτερασ in about 30 cursives, Chrys. Theodoret, John Damasc, Jerome, is a correct gloss (so R.V.). The whole context deals with widows, not with women in general, as A.V. and von Soden.

γαμέν: There is nothing really inconsistent between this deliberate injunction that young widows should marry again, and the counsel in Tit. vii. 8, that widows should remain unmarried. The widows here spoken of would come under the class of those who "have not continency"; not to mention that the whole world-position of the Church had altered considerably since St. Paul had written 1 Cor.

συνεκαθορισμένος: well rendered in Vulg., matres-familias esse. The verb is only found here in the Greek Bible, but συνιστασται frequently occurs in the Synoptists. It is the equivalent of οἰκονομεῖν, Tit. ii. 5.

τοῦ ἀντικειμένου: The singular (see ref.) does not refer to Satan, but is used generically for human adversaries. The plural is more usual, as in the other refs. Cf. ἡ ἀντικαταστάσα, Tit. ii. 8.

λαβορίαν χαρίν is connected of course with ἀφομία, not with σολομαί, as Mack suggests, "I will . . . on account of the reproach which might otherwise come on the Church'.

For the sentiment cf. vi. 1, Tit. ii. 5, 8, Tit. ii. 12, sso. In all these places the responsibility of guarding against scandal is laid on the members of the Church generally, not specially on the Church rulers. The construction χαρίν here is not quite the same as in Gal. iii. 19, Tit. i. 11, Jude 16. Here it is an appendage to the sentence, explanatory of ἀφομία διδόναι.

Ver. 15. τευτερασ: See note on 1. 3.

ἐξετράπησαν ὅσιον τοῦ Σ.: This is a pregnant phrase, meaning They have turned out of the way [of life and light] and have followed after Satan'. "The prepositional use of ὅσιον, which is foreign to profane writers, takes its origin from the LXX (Hebr. יִתְנָה)" (Blass, Gram. p. 129). The primary phrase is ἐκαθορίσα (also συνεκαθορίσαι or περικαθορίσαι) ὅσιον τοῦ. For ὅσιον in an unfavourable sense cf. Luke xxi. 8, John xii. 19, Acts v. 37, xx. 30, s Peter ii. 10, Jude 7, Rev. xiii. 3. The phrase, no doubt, refers to something worse than a second marriage.

Ver. 15. aud πιστῇ: This is one of those difficulties that prove the bona fide character of the letter. We may explain it in either of two ways: (1) It not unfrequently happens that the language in which we express a general statement is unconsciously coloured by a particular instance of which we are thinking at the moment. St. Paul has some definite case in his mind, of a Christian woman who had a widow depending on her, of whose support she wishes the Church to relieve her, or (2) the verse may be an afterthought to avoid the possibility of the ruling given in vv. 4, 7, 8 being supposed to refer to men only. Von Soden explains it by the independent position
of married women indicated in ver. 14 and Tit. ii. 5. The phrase ἀπὸ χῆρας may be intended to include dependent widowed relatives, aunts or cousins, who could not be called ἀργυροὶ.

βαρεῖνυς. Compare the use of βάρος, 1 Thess. ii. 6, δυνάμενοι εἰς βάρει εἰσέν; of ἐπιβαρέω, 1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8; καταβαρέω, 2 Cor. xii. 16; ἀβαρῆς, 2 Cor. xi. 9.

This verse proves that the κατάλογος of widows here in view was primarily at least for poor relief.

Vv. 17-25. What I have been saying about the support of widows reminds me of another question of Church finance: the payment of presbyters. Equity and scriptural principles suggest that they should be remunerated in proportion to their usefulness. You are the judge of the presbyters; in the discharge of this office be cautious in accusing, and bold in rebuking. I adjure you to be impartial. Do not absolve without deliberation. A lax disciplinarian is partner in the guilt of those whom he encourages to sin. Keep yourself pure. I do not mean this in the ascetic sense; on the contrary, your continual delicacy demands a stern test. But, to resume about your duties as a judge, you need not distress yourself by misgivings; you will find that your judgments about men, even when only instinctive, are generally correct.

Ver. 17. The natural and obvious meaning of the verse is that while all presbyters discharge administrative functions, well or indifferently, they are not all engaged in preaching and teaching. We distinguish then in this passage three grades of presbyters: (1) ordinary presbyters with a living wage; (2) efficient presbyters (κοινωνίας, 1 Thess. v. 12); (3) presbyters who were also preachers and teachers. Cf. Cyprian (Epist. 29), presbyteri doctores. It must be added that Hort rejects the distinction between (2) and (3) (Christian Ecclesia, p. 196).

ὁ διδάσκαλος and ὁ παρακάτων were possessors of distinct and recognised charismata (Rom. xii. 7; 1 Cor. xii. 8, 28, 29, xiv. 6).

προστάτες: See note on 1 Tim. iii. 4. 

τιμή: Remuneration is a better rendering of τιμή than pay, as less directly expressive of merely monetary reward. Liddon suggests the rendering honorarium. On the one hand, τιμή certainly warrants us in concluding that presbyters that ruled well were better paid than those that performed their duties perfunctorily. Bengel justifies the better pay given to those that "laboured in the word, etc.," on the ground that persons so fully occupied would have less time to earn their livelihood in secular occupations. On the other hand, we must not press the term double too strictly (cf. Rev. xviii. 6, διδωμένος τὰ διδλά). οἰκονομος τιμῆς (Theod.) is nearer the meaning than "double that of the widows, or of the deacons, or simply, liberal support" (Chrys.). The phrase is based, according to Grotius, on Deut. xxi. 17; in the division of an inheritance the first-born received two shares, cf. 2 Kings ii. 9. The custom of setting a double share of provisions before presbyters at the love feasts (Const. Ap. ii. 28) must have been, as De Wee says, based on a misunderstanding of this passage.

ἄνωτέρων implies that what they were deemed worthy of they received. 

κοινωνίας: There is no special stress to be laid on this, as though some preachers and teachers worked harder in the exercise of their gift than others.

λέγει: The omission of the article, characteristic of the Pastorals, obscures the reference here to the constant phrase speak, or preach the word, or the word of God.

διδασκαλία: See note on chap. i. 10.

Ver. 18. If this verse is read without critical prejudice, it implies that in the writer's judgment a quotation from Deut. xxv. 4 and the Saying, ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ. might be coordinated as ἀξιότατον just as in Mark vii. 10, Acts i. 20, and Heb. i. 10, two O.T. quotations are coupled by a καί. For this formula of quotation, in addition to the ref., see John xix. 37; Rom. iv. 3, xi. 2; Gal. iv. 30; Jas. ii. 23, iv. 5.

The question then arises, ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ. a proverbial saying carelessly or mistakenly quoted by St. Paul as ἀξιότατον? or, Was St. Paul familiar with its presence in a written document, an early gospel, the subject of which was so sacred as to entitle it to be called ἀξιότατον?
The question has been prejudged by supposed necessary limitations as to the earliest possible date for a gospel; and many have thought it safest to adopt Stier's statement that ἐξίως, κ.τ.λ. was a common proverb made use of both by our Lord (Luke x. 7; Matt. x. 10), and by St. Paul. In that case, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that St. Paul forgot that it was not ἐγραφή; for here it is not natural to take ἐξίως, κ.τ.λ., as a supplementary or confirmatory statement by the writer in the words of a well-known proverb. The proverb, if it be such, is rather the second item in τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, just as in 2 Tim. ii. 19, the "seal" consists of (a) "The Lord knoweth them that are his," and (b) "Let every one that nameth," etc. Our Lord no doubt employed proverbs that were current in His time, e.g., Luke iv. 23, John iv. 37. In both these cases He intimates that He is doing so; but He does not do so in Matt. x. 10, or Luke x. 7. Besides, while the variation here between Matt. (τῆς ἐγραφῆς) and Luke (τοῦ μισθοῦ) is of the same degree as in other cases of varying reports of Sayings from Q common to Matthew and Luke, yet such variation in wording is not likely in the case of a well-known proverb. We may add that it is difficult to know what meaning of Christ reference is made in 1 Cor. ix. 14 if it be not this Saying. Critical opinion has recently inclined to believe that much of the gospel material which underlies the Synoptists was put into writing before our Lord's earthly ministry closed. (See Sanday, The Life of Christ in Recent Research, p. 172.) The only question, therefore, is not, Could St. Paul have read the Evangelic narrative? but, Could he have coordinated a gospel document with the written oracles of God, venerated by every Hebrew as having a sanctity all their own? The question cannot be considered apart from what we know to have been St. Paul's conception of the person of Jesus Christ. We may readily grant that it would be a surprising thing if St. Paul thought of the writings of any contemporary apostle as "Scripture," as 2 Pet. iii. 16 does; but since he believed that Christ was "the end of the Law" (Rom. x. 4), it would be surprising were he not to have esteemed His words to be at least as authoritative as the Law which He superseded.

The order in Deut. xxv. 4 is ὑπὸ φύ. βοῶν ἄλο. The same text is quoted, 1 Cor. ix. 9 in the form ὑπὸ γεννᾷ βοῶν ἄλο. (B*D*FG). St. Paul's treatment of the command, as pointing to an analogy in the life of human beings, does not need any defence. Our just repudiation of the spirit in which he asks in 1 Cor., "Is it for the oxen that God careth?" must not blind us to the large element of truth in his answer, "Yea, for our sake it was written".

Ver. 19. The mention of καλὸς προσευτός προσβέτερος, and of what was due to them, naturally suggests by contrast the consideration of unsatisfactory presbyters. Yet even these were to be protected against the possibility of arbitrary dismissal. They were to have a fair trial in accordance with the provisions of the Old Law, Deut. xix. 15 (see also Deut. xvii. 6, Num. xxxv. 30. This requirement of two or three witnesses is used allegorically in 2 Cor. xiii. 1. Cf. John viii. 17, Heb. x. 28.) It has been asked, Why should this, the ordinary rule, be mentioned at all? The solution is to be found in a consideration of the private, unofficial, character of the Christian Church when this epistle was written. The Church was altogether a voluntary society, unrecognised by the state. The crimes of which its governors could take cognisance were spiritual; or if they were such as were punishable by the ordinary state law, the Church was concerned only with the spiritual and moral aspect of them, that is to say, so far as they affected Church life. There were then no spiritual courts, in the later sense of the term. No Church officer could enforce any but spiritual punishments. In these circumstances, the observance of legal regulations would not be a matter of necessity. Indeed a superintendent who was jealous for the purity of the Church might feel himself justified in acting even on suspicion, when the question arose as to the dismissal of a presbyter.

διὰ τῆς ἐλιμ.: This phrase arises from a
blend of el μή and ἐκτὸς el. Examples of its use are cited from Lucian. Alford notes that similar "pleonastic expressions such as χωρὶς el, or el μή, are found in later writers such as Plutarch, Dio Cassius, etc." Deissmann cites an instructive example for its use in the Cilician Paul from an inscription of Mopsuestia in Cilicia of the Imperial period (Bible Studies, trans. p. 118). See ref. εὐλογία...μαρτύρων: This seems an abbreviation for εὐλογία στόματος μαρτύρων. So R.V. Cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 1, Hebr.

It is a different use from εὐλογία in the sense of before (a judge), Mark xiii. 9, Acts xxv. 9, 10. See Blass, Gram. p. 137.

Ver. 20. τοῦ ἀμαρτάνοντας: It cannot be certainly determined whether this refers to offending presbyters only or to sinners in general. In favour of the first alternative, is the consideration that it seems to be a suitable conclusion to ver. 19; and the vehemence of the adjuration in ver. 21 receives thus a justification. It demands greater moral courage to deal judicially with subordinate officials than with the rank and file of a society.

On the other hand, the sequence of thought in these concluding verses of the chapter is not formal and deliberate. Although it has been shown above that vv. 17-25 form one section, marked by one prominent topic, the relation of Timothy to presbyters, it cannot be maintained that the connexion is indisputably obvious; and the use of the present participle suggests that habitual sinners are under discussion. One is reluctant to suppose that such men would be found amongst the presbyters of the Church.

ἐνώπιον πάντων: At first sight this seems opposed to the directions given by our Lord, Matt. xviii. 15, "Shew him his fault between thee and him alone"; but the cases are quite different: Christ is there speaking of the mutual relations of one Christian with another, as brothers in the household of God; here St. Paul is giving directions to a father in God, a Christian ruler, as in 2 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. i. 13, ii. 15. Moreover, as Ell. points out, Christ is speaking of checking the beginning of a sinful state, St. Paul is speaking of persistent sinners.

Ver. 21. διαμαρτύρομαι: It is easy to see that St. Paul had not perfect confidence in the moral courage of Timothy. He interjects similar adjurations, vi. 13, 2 Tim. iv. 1. In 1 Thess. iv. 6 we can understand διηκένδονται to mean that purity had been the subject of a strong adjuration addressed by the apostle to his converts.

tοῖς ἐλεκτοῖς ἄγγελοι: The epithet elect has probably the same force as holy in our common phrase, The holy angels. Compare the remarkable parallel, cited by Otto and Krebs, from Josephus, B. J. ii. 16, 4, μαρτύρωμαι διὰ τῶν μὴν ἠμαρτανόμεν τῶν θεῶν καὶ πατρίδα τὴν κοινήν, and Testament of Levi, xix. 3, μάρτυρες τῶν κύριων, κ. μάρτυρες τῶν ἄγγελον ἀδύνατον, κ. μάρτυρες ὑμῖν. The references to angels in St. Paul's speeches and letters suggest that he had an unquestioning belief in their beneficent ministrations; though he may not have attached any importance to speculations as to their various grades. We are safe in saying that the elect angels are identical with "the angels which kept their own principality" (Jude 6), "that did not sin" (2 Pet. ii. 4).

Ellicott follows Bp. Bull in giving ἐνώπιον a future reference to the Day of Judgment, when the Lord will be at-
PROS TIMOHEON

22. χείρας ... ἐπιτίθεις: Here only, not LXX. μὴ δὲν τοιών κατὰ πρόσκλησιν. 1

H. 2. u s John ii. v Rom. xiv. 4, xv. 20, 2 Cor. x. 13, 16, Heb. ix. 25.

1 So ἩΠΚ, 47**, 67**, many others, d, f, g, r, vg.; προσκλησιν ADLP, 17, 31, 37, 47*, 80, more than fifty-four others.

It is to be noted that the mention of the phrase "by invitation, i.e., the invitation or summons of those who seek to draw you over to their side" (Thayer’s Grimm, H. E., vii. 2), speaking of reconciled heretics, is omitted in this verse; and the topic of ministerial treatment of sin is resumed and continued in ver. 24 sq. We can hardly doubt that St. Paul had in mind Lev. xix. 17, "Thou shalt surely rebuke thy neighbour and not bear sin because of him," καὶ οὗ ἡμᾶς ἐκ αὐτὸν ἀμαρτίαν. To witness in silence an act of wrong-doing is to connive at it. If this is true in the case of private persons, how much more serious an offence is it in the case of those to whom government is committed?

Ver. 22. Our best guide to the meaning of χείρας ... ἐπιτίθεις is then best referred to imposition of hands on reconciled offenders, on their re-admission to Church communion. Eusebius (H. E., 506) is cited: "Poenitentes tempore quo poenitentiamentum petunt, impositionem manuum et cinctum super caput a sacerdote consequuntur." The antiquity of the custom may be argued from the consideration that imposition of hands was so prominent a feature in ordination, that it is not likely that its use would have been extended to anything else if such extension could not have claimed unquestioned antiquity in its favour. If the explanation of this verse given above—which is that of Hammond, De Wette, Ellicott, and Hort—be accepted, we have here the first distinct allusion to the custom of receiving back penitents by imposition of hands.

tended by "ten thousands of His holy ones" (Jude 14). But this seems an evasion due to modern prejudice. οὕτων implies that the solemnity of the charge or adjuration is heightened by its being uttered in the actual presence of God, Christ, and the angels. Perhaps one may venture to suppose that these are thought of as in three varying degrees of remoteness from human beings, with our present powers of persuasion. God the Father, though indeed "He is not far from each one of us," "dwells in light unapproachable"; Christ Jesus, though in one sense He dwells in us and we in Him, is for the most part thought of as having His special presence at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens; but the angels, though spiritual beings, are akin to ourselves, creatures as we are, powers with whom we are in immediate and almost sensible contact, media perhaps through which the influences of the Holy Spirit are communicated to us.

ταῦτα refers to all the preceding disciplinary instructions. προκριματος: dislike, praedictum. προσκλησιν: partiality (nihil faciens in altum partem declinando, Vulg.). Clem. Rom., ad Cor. 21, has the phrase κατὰ προσκλησιν. The reading προσκλησιν is almost certainly due to itaeism. It should be remembered that, i.e., "by invitation, i.e., the invitation or summons of those who seek to draw you over to their side" (Thayer’s Grimm).

Ver. 22. Our best guide to the meaning of χείρας ... ἐπιτίθεις is in the context, and more especially the following clause, μὴ δὲν ... ἀλλοτρίας. μὴ δὲν constantly introduces an extension or development of what has immediately preceded; it never begins a new topic. Now the injunction Be not partaker of other men’s sins is certainly connected with the disciplinary rebuke of sin, and refers of course to definite acts of sin committed in the past, as well as to their consequences or continuation. The whole procedure is outlined: we have the accusation in ver. 19, the conviction and sentence in ver. 20, and—in the true Pauline spirit—repentance and reconciliation in
Timothy is bidden to restrain by deliberate prudence the impulses of mere pity. A hasty reconciliation tempts the offender to suppose that his offence cannot have been so very serious after all; and smooths the way to a repetition of the sin. "Good-natured easy men" cannot escape responsibility for the disastrous consequences of their lax administration of the law. They have a share in the sins of those whom they have encouraged to sin. Those who give letters of recommendation with too great facility fall under the apostolic condemnation.

On the other hand, the ancient commentators—Chrys., Theod., Theoph., Occumen.—refer to irirrih to hasty ordinations; and in support of this, the generally adopted view, it must be granted that πωςεως χωρίων undoubtedly refers to ordination in iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6. If we assume the same reference here, the intention of the warning would be that Timothy will best avoid clerical scandals by being cautious at the outset as to the character of those whom he ordains. The clause in iii. 10, καὶ εὐθυς δικαιοσύνον πρώτον, would, in this case, have the same reference; and we should explain ἀμαρτίας ἀλλάτριας as possible future sins, for the commission of which a man's advancement may give him facilities, and responsibility for which attaches, in various degrees of blameworthiness, to those who have rendered it possible for him to commit them.

Ver. 24. The connexion of this general statement is especially with ver. 22. The solemn warning against the awful consequences of an ill-considered moral judgment on those condemned was calculated to overwhelm a weak man with anxiety. Here the apostle assures Timothy that in actual practical experience the moral diagnosis of men's characters is not so perplexing as might be supposed antecedently. The exegesis of προδοσίαν and ἐκκλησίων depends on the view we take of κρίσις; viz., whether it refers to a judgment passed by man in this world, or to the final doom pronounced by God in the next. Κρίσις is used of such a judgment as man may pass, in John vii. 16, 2 Peter ii. 11, Jude 9; though the
word is more frequently used of the Great final Judgment. If, as is generally allowed, these verses, 24 and 25, are resumptive of ver. 22, the πράξεις here indicated is that of the Church ruler, Timothy in this case, deciding for or against the admission of men to communion (or to ordination). It is evident that the final Judgment of God, which no one can certainly forecast, cannot help or hinder a decision made in this life by one man about another. The meaning, then, of the clause is as follows: In the case of some men, you have no hesitation as to your verdict; their sins are notorious and force you to an adverse judgment. With regard to others, your suspicions, your instinctive feeling of moral disapproval, comes to be confirmed and justified by subsequent revelation of sins that had been concealed. This is, in the main, the explanation adopted by Alford.

πράξεις: Not open beforehand (A.V.), but evident (R.V.), manifesta just (Vulg.) as in Heb. vii. 14 (neut.). The πράξεις is not indicative of antecedence in time, but of publicity, as in προδοσία, Gal. iii. 1.

πράξεις: It is best to take this in a transitive sense, as in Acts xii. 1, xvii. 5, xxv. 26, of bringing a prisoner forth to trial. Here the object of the verb is understood out of τῶν ἀδικίων. The men are in the custody of their sins, which also testify against them. In the other case, the witnesses—the sins—do not appear until the persons on trial have had sentence pronounced on them. We supply εἰς πράξεις after εἰς πράξεις.

Ver. 25. ἐκκόπων here, as in chap. ii. 9, naturally introduces an antithesis to what has gone before; and this determines the meaning of τὰ ἄλλα ἔχουσα; not as ἔχει which are not καλά, but as ἔχει καλά which are not πράξεις; and justifies the R.V. rendering, There are good works that are evident. The next clause is parallel to the corresponding part of ver. 24: Sins and good works alike cannot be successfully and indefinitely concealed; they follow—are disclosed some time or other in justification of—the πράξεις of men. The literal rendering in R.V. m., The works that are good are evident; could only be defended by laying emphasis on καλά, "good in appearance as well as in reality"; but καλὰ ἔργα is of frequent occurrence in these epistles without any such special significance; see on iii. 1; and this rendering deprives ἐκκόπων of any force. Von Soden thinks that we have here a reference to the sayings in Matt. v. 14-16.

Chapter VI.—Vv. 1-2. The duty of Christian slaves to heathen and Christian masters respectively.

Ver. 1. The politico-social problem of the first ages of Christianity was the relation of freemen to slaves, just as the corresponding problem before the Church in our own day is the relation of the white to the coloured races. The grand truth of the brotherhood of man is the revolutionary fire which Christ came to cast upon earth. Fire, if it is to minister to civilisation, must be so controlled as to be directed. So with the social ethics of Christianity; the extent to which their logical consequences are pressed must be calculated by common sense. One of the great dangers to the interests of the Church in early times was the teaching of the gospel on liberty and equality, crude and unqualified by consideration of the other natural social conditions, also divinely ordered, which Christianity was called to leaven, not wholly to displace. The slave problem also meets us in Eph. vi. 5, Col. iii. 22, Tit. ii. 9, Phil. i. Pet. ii. 18. In each place it is dealt with consistently, practically, Christianly. The difficulty in this verse is ἐκκόπων.
VI.

1. Scott, seems to prove that a τοῦτος belongs to a heathen master. The R.V. is consistent with this view, Let as many as are servants under the yoke. The heathen estimate of a slave differed in degree, not in kind, from their estimate of cattle; a Christian master could not regard his slaves as τοῦτος.

2. The force of ISios was so much weakened in later Greek that it is doubtful if it amounts here to more than avtiv. See on iii.4. 

3. τοῦτος is more strictly the correlative of τοῦτος than is Κυρίος, and is used in this sense in ref. except Luke ii.29.

4. St. Paul has Κυρίος in his other epistles (Rom. xiv.4; Gal. iv.1; Eph. vi.5,9; Col. iii.22, iv.1); but, as Wace acutely remarks, in all these passages there is a reference to the Divine κύριος which gives the term a special appropriateness.

5. θέλητε τηρήσετε, worthy of the greatest respect.


7. The corresponding passage in Tit. ii.10, ἵνα τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ κοινωνίαν, supports Alford's contention that the article here is equivalent to a possessive pronoun, His doctrine.

8. On the other hand, the phrase does not need any explanation; the doctrine would be quite analogous to St. Paul's use elsewhere when speaking of the Christian faith. For διδασκαλία, see note on i.10.

9. Ver. 2. A Christian slave would be more likely to presume on his newly acquired theory of liberty, equality and fraternity in relation to a Christian master than in relation to one that was a heathen. The position of a Christian master must have been a difficult one, distracted between the principles of a faith which he shared with his slave, and the laws of a social state which he felt were not wholly wrong; 1 Cor. vii.22 and Phil. 16 illustrate the position.

10. μᾶλλον δουλεύσωσαν: serve them all the more, magis serviant (Vulg.).

For this use of μᾶλλον cf. Rom. xiv.
to help, as in ref.; and the Harcian Syriac gives that sense here. Like our English word apprehend, it passes from an association with the sense of touch to an association with the other senses or faculties which connect us with things about us. Field (in loc.) gives examples of the use of ἀντιλαμβάνομαι as expressive of a person being sensible of anything which acts upon the senses, e.g., the smell of a rose. The Peshitta agrees with this. Alford renders mutually receive, by which he seems to intend the same thing as Ell., who suggests that ὥστε has a formal reference to the reciprocal relation between master and servant. Field rejects this because "receive in exchange" is ἀντιλαμβάνειν, and the examples cited by Alf. are middle only in form.

να χειρακει: See note on iv.13.

Ver. 3-21. Thoughts about the right use of wealth are suggested by the slave problem, a mischievous attitude towards which is associated with false doctrine. If a man possesses himself, he has enough. This possession is eternal as well as temporal. This is my lesson for the poor, for you as a man of God (and I solemnly adjure you to learn and teach it), and for the rich.

Ver. 3. ἐπιθυμο νακαλεί: See note on i. 3.

καὶ χή: Blass (Gramm. p. 514) notes this case of χή following εἰ with the indicative (supposed reality) as an abnormal conformity to classical use. The usual N.T. use, εἰ ... χή, appears in 2 Tim. iii. 5, v. 8. In these examples, however, the χή is in the same clause as εἰ, not separated from it, as here, by a καί.

προσέχεται: signifies, which seems to derive support from the use of προσέχεω, i. 4, Tit. i. 14, has not exactly the same force; "to give heed," or "attend to," a doctrine falls short of giving in one's adhesion to it.

ψυχιώντων λόγοις: See on i. 10.

τοῖς τοῦ Κυρίου: This is in harmony with St. Paul's teaching elsewhere, that the words spoken through the prophets of the Lord are the Lord's own words. It is thus we are to understand Acts xvi. 7, "The Spirit of Jesus suffered them not," and 1 Cor. xi. 23, "I received of the Lord," etc. The words of Jesus, "He that heareth you heareth me" (Luke x. 16) have a wider reference than was seen at first.

τῇ καὶ εὐδείμονει διδασκαλίᾳ: See ref. and notes on i. 10, ii. 2.

Ver. 4. τετυφωται: in flatus est (d, m86, 1); superbus est (Vulg.). See on iii. 6. vocōw: morbidly busy (Liddon), langūs (Vulg.), aegrotans (m60). His disease is intellectual curiosity about trifles. Both doting and mad after (Alf.) as translations of vocōw, err by excess of vigour. The idea is a simple one of sickness as opposed to health. See on i. 10.

πειρά: For this use of πειρά see on i. 19.

ἐνθητος: See on i. 4.

λογομαχίαι: It is not clear whether what is meant are wordy quarrels or quarrels about words. The latter seems the more likely. There is here the usual antithesis of words to deeds. The heretic spoken of is a theorist merely; he wastes time in academic disputes; he does not take account of things as they actually are. On the other hand, it is interesting and suggestive that to the heathen, the controversy between Christianity and Judaism seemed to be of this futile nature (see Acts xvii. 15, xxiii. 29, xxv. 19).

φθόνος, ἡρί are similarly juxtaposed Rom. i. 29, Gal. v. 20, 21, Phil. i. 15.

The plural ἡρί is a well-supported variant in Rom. xiii. 13, Gal. v. 20. In Tit. iii. 9 it is the true reading; but in other lists of vices (1 Cor. iii. 3,
VI.

Here only, ἂν γίνεται φθόνος, εἰς ἁπλοῦμα, ἢ ὑπόνοια τοντραία. 5. N.T.

Here only, διαπαρατριβαί 1 διεφθαρμένων αθρόων τὸν νοῦν καὶ ἀπεστηρι- not LXX.

Here only μένων τῆς ἀληθείας, νομίζοντων ποιμανίαν εἰναι τὴν ἑσθείαν. 2

Metaph.


Cor. iv. 16, Rev. viii. 9, xi. 18. u Mark x. 19, 1 Cor. vii. 8, viii. 5, Jas. v. 4 (?). v Matt. (3), Acts (7), 1 Cor. vii. 26, 36. w Wisd. xiii. 29, xiv. 2 only; verb, Wisd. xv. 12 only. x See ver. 5.

Add ἀδίσταστο ἀντὶ τῶν τωτότων Disc. c KLP, mso, Disciplo ab eiusmodi, synt., arm.

2 Cor. xii. 20, Phil. i. 15) the singular is found.

βλασφημία also occurs in a list of sins, Eph. iv. 31, Col. iii. 8.

ὑπόνοια τοντραία ὑπόνοια (only here in N.T., but ὑπόνοια in Acts xii. 25, xxv. 18, xxvii. 27, all in neutral sense, ὑπόνοια, or ἄνθρωπον sometimes the sense of sus- picion. See examples given by Ell. The phrase here does not mean wicked or unworthy thoughts of God—the class of mind here spoken of does not usually think about God directly, though an unworthy opinion about Him underlies their life—but malicious suspicions as to the honesty of those who differ from them.

Ver. 5. διαπαρατριβαί The force of the δία is expressed in the R.V., wranglings, which denotes protracted quarrelings, perconfricationes (r), conflictationes (d, Vulg.). Field (in loc.) comparing διαμάχεσθαι, διαφιλοτιμώμεθα, etc., prefers the sense of reciprocity, mutual irritations, galling one of another (A.V.m.), "as infected sheep by contact communicate disease to the sound" (Chrys.). παραπαρατριβαί (T.R.), perverse disputings, is given a milder sense by Winer-Moulton, Gram. p. 126, "misplaced diligence or useless disputing".

διεφθαρμένων τὸν νοῦν: cf. καιστεφ- αρμάνων τὸν νοῦν, 2 Tim. iii. 8, the acc. being that of the remote object. Cf., for the notion, τὸν τελειούν ἰδρύματον τὸν φθινόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀντίτις, Eph. iv. 22, also 1 Cor. xv. 33, 2 Cor. xi. 3, Jude 10.

αὐτεστρεψόνων: privati. αὐτοτεστρεπόνων conveys the notion of a person being deprived of a thing to which he has a right. See ref. This is expressed in R.V., bereft of. The truth was once theirs; they have disinherited themselves. The A.V., destitute of, does not assume that they ever had it.

ποιμανίας, κ.τ.λ.: since they sup- pose. For this use of the participle Bengel compares Rom. ii. 18, 20, 2 Tim. ii. 21, Heb. vi. 6. τοπομέναι: a means of gain, quaestus. The commentators quote Plutarch, Cato Major, § 25, θυμία κεφαρθέντα μνούς ποιμάνεις, γνώμης καταστάσεως τῆς σωτηρίας: not godliness in general, pietatem (Vulg.), but the profession of Christianity, culturam Dei (mso). See ii. 2. Allusions elsewhere to those who supposed that the gospel was a means of making money have usually reference to self-interested and grasping teachers (2 Cor. xi. 12, xii. 17, 18; Tit. i. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 3). Here the significance of the clause may be that the false teachers de- moralised slaves, suggesting to slaves who were converts, or possible converts, that the profession of Christianity in- volved an improvement in social position and worldly prospects. The article before εἰς, shows that the A.V. is wrong, supposing that gain is godliness.

Ver. 6. The repetition of τοπομέναι in a fresh idealised sense is parallel to the transfigured sense in which νομίζω is used in i. 8.

αὐταρκείας: not here sufficientia (Vulg.), though that is an adequate ren- dering in 2 Cor. ix. 8. St. Paul did not mean to express the sentiment of the A.V. of Eccles. vii. 11, "Wisdom is good with an inheritance": Contentment does not even give his meaning. Contentment is relative to one's lot; αὐταρκεία is more profound, and denotes independence of, and indifference to, any lot; a man's finding not only his resources in himself, but being indifferent to everything else besides. This was St. Paul's condition when he had learnt to be αὐταρκής, Phil. iv. 11. "Lord of him- self, though not of lands" (Sir. H. Wot-
oddv yap eisqinekamev eis tov kósmou,1 ὅτι oddv ἐθενεγκειν τι: Maccev-
dunámeva. 8. ἔχοντες δὲ ἰατροφές 2 καὶ σκεπάσματα, τοῦτοι δὲ ἀγαθον-
αρκεοσθομένα. 9. οἱ οἱ βουλόμενοι πλοτεῖν ἐς ἐμπτύων εἰς Luke iii. ἔνω-
περοσμάν καὶ παγίδα 3 καὶ ἐπίθυμια τολλάς ἀντοῦτος 4 καὶ 
βλαβεράς, αὐτίνη 5 νυνίζοντο τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰς ἐδραύνον καὶ 

ii. 6. a Luke xxiv. 25, Rom. i. 14, Gal. iii. 1, 3, Tit. iii. 3. g Prov. x. 26 only. 
b Luke v. 7 only. i Cor. v. 3, i Thess. v. 3, 2 Thess. i. 9 only, N.T. 

1 Ins. δῆλον Μ-DbKLP; ins. ἀλήθεια D, verum (quoniam) d, verum (quia) m98, 
hand dubium (quia) f, vg., [kaut dubium, verum tamen fulld., verum Cyp., go., syr.; 
om. δῆλον Μ-AFG, 17, g, r, vgome MSS, sah., boh., arm. 
2 So MAL, f, vg.; ἰατροφήν DFGKP, d, g, m98, (vicium). 
3 Ins. τοῦ διαβέλου D*PG, 37ms, 238, d, f, g, m98 (not r), vg. (not am.), go. 
4 ἀνάρτουσα 2, two others, d, f, g, vg., Cyp., Ambst. insutilia) m98 (quae nihil 
prosunt) r (stulta). 

Ver. 7. The reasoning of this clause 
depends on the evident truth that since a 
man comes naked into this world (Job. i. 
21), and when he leaves it can “take 
nothing for his labour, which he may 
carry away in his hand” (Eccles. v. 15; 
Ps. xlix. 17), nothing the world can give 
is anything addition to the man himself. He is 
a complete man, though naked (Matt. vi. 
25; Luke xii. 15; Seneca, Ep. Mor. ii. 25, 
4 ἐκατοντάως, two others, d, f, g, vg., go., Cyp., Ambst. insutilia) m98 (quae nihil 
prosunt) r (stulta). 

Ver. 8. L. Bos adds but one example of this 
ellipse, 1 John iii. 20: ὅτα δὲν κατα-
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IIP02 TIM09E0N A

k Matt vii. k ἀπολέσσαν. 10. μία γὰρ πάνω τῶν κακῶν ἄστιν ἢ ἑνὸς καὶ τούτο ἐστὶν "ὑπερληθῆσαν ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἡμετέρους πρεπεῖν καὶ ἄνθρωποι θεοῦ, x xx. Rev. xii. 8, 11.

(14 Macc. i. 22. ii. 23 (?), cf. 2 Tim. iii. 2. m See 1 Tim. iii. 1. n Mark. viii. 22. o Here only, not LXX. p Rom. ix. 3 only, N.T. q Rom. xi. 17, 20, xiv. 10, x Tim. iii. 10, 14, iv. 1. Tit. ii. 1. 

multa incidimus" (Ep. 87). Cf. also Jas. i. 2, περισσοίτεροι περιτέλεστε ποιεῖτε. παραιτούμενον refers rather to the consequences of one's money-grubbing spirit on others, παραίτεσθαι to its disastrous effect on one's own character.

ἄνθρωποι καὶ βλαβερά: The desires in question are foolish, because they cannot be logically defended; they are hurtful, because they hinder true happiness. See Prov. xxiii. 4, "Weary not thyself to be rich."

όχι: In sense the relative refers to ὄφρωσιν, understood out of φιλαιργυρία, with which it agrees in grammar. The meaning is clear enough; but the expression of it is inaccurate. This occurs when a man's power of grammatical expression cannot keep pace with his thought. All cites as parallels, Rom. viii. 24, ἀδελφεῖς, and Acts xxiv. 15, ἱλατία ... ὑπὲρ καὶ αὐτοῦ σπέρμα προσδόξουται.

tivos: See note on ch. i. 3. 

δρεγμόνιος: reaching after (R.V.) expresses the most defensible aspect of coveting (A.V.).

 apoptληθῆσαν: περεγραμματίζονται (r) errassent (d, Vulg.). The faith is a very practical matter. Have been led astray (R.V.) continues the description of the man who allows himself to be the passive subject of temptation. Chrys. illustrates the use of this word here from an absent-minded man's passing his destination without knowing it.

περιεβαίνων: inseruerunt se. The force of ἐπεβαίνοντο in this compound is intensive, as in περιήλθον, περικαλύπτον, περικρατεῖ, περικράτον, περιλάβοντος.

παραίτεσθαι: There is a touch of pity in this clause, so poignantly descriptive of a worldling's disillusionment. 

Vv. 11-16 are a digression into a personal appeal. Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 1, iii. 10, iv. 5.

Ver. 11. οὗτοι νυμφίαι: It argues a very inadequate appreciation of the fervour of the writer to suppose, as Theod. does, that this is an official title. The apostrophe is a personal appeal, arising out of the topic of other-worldliness which begins in ver. 5. Timothy, as a Christian man, had been called to a heavenly citizenship. He was a man of God, i.e., a man belonging to the spiritual order of things with which that which is merely temporal, transitory and perishing can have no permanent relationship. The term occurs again, with an admitted general reference, in 2 Tim. iii. 17. In any case Man of God, as an official title, belonged to prophets, the prophets of the Old Covenant; and we have no
proof that Timothy was a prophet of the New Covenant, though he was an evangelist (2 Tim. iv. 5), and possibly an apostle (1 Thess. ii. 6).

ταύτα: i.e., φιλαργυρία and its attendant evils. Love of money in ministers of religion does more to discredit religion in the eyes of ordinary people than would indulgence in many grosser vices. It is to be noted that ἄγων, ἀγαθόν recurs in 2 Tim. ii. 22. The phraseology is based on Prov. xv. 9, ἄγων ἀγαθόν, and is thoroughly Pauline, as the ref. prove. The six virtues fall perhaps into three pairs, as Ell. suggests: "ἐκκλησίας, ἐστιφθήσθησι, have the widest relations, pointing to general conformity to God's law and practical piety [cf. συμφοράς κ. κολλάς κ. ἐκφυγές, Tit. ii. 12]; πιστεῖς and ἀγαθοί are the fundamental principles of Christianity; ὀφεῖλε, and ἀφέτηρες the principles on which a Christian ought to act towards his gain-sayers and opponents". As a group, they are contrasted with the group of vices in vv. 4 and 5; but we cannot arrange them in pairs of opposites. We may add that πιστεῖς results in ἀφείλεται ὥστε ὑποτεθαιμα. ἀφείλεται in sustinētia (r here, and Vulg. in 1 Thess. i. 3) rather than παθηται (d and Vulg. here).

πιστεῖς, ἀγαθοί, and ἀφείλεται are also combined in Tit. ii. 2; cf. 2 Tim. iii. 10, also 2 Pet. i. 5-7, where ἐστιφθήσθη, with other virtues, forms part of the group.

Ver. 12. ἀφείλεται . ἄγων: There is evidence that ἄγων ἐκφυγές ἄγων had become a stereotyped expression, perhaps from the line of Eupirides: καλὸς καλὸς 

In the primitive Church the baptism of an individual was a matter in which the Church generally took an interest and part. The rule laid down in The Didache,
shows this: “Before the baptism let him that baptizeth and him that is baptized fast, and any others also who are able”. Also Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 61, ἵππων συνεχομένων καὶ συνηστεωτών αὐτοῖς. These passages explain “the many witnesses” of Timothy's good confession. It is not so natural to refer the good confession to a crisis of persecution, or to his ordination. The epithet καλήν here and in the following verse does not characterise the particular act of confession made by Timothy or by Christ, but refers to the class of confession, its import, as Ell. says.

Ver. 13, ἔφαγεν ἀλλὰ: St. Paul passes in thought from the past epoch in Timothy's life, with its human witnesses, among whom was the apostle himself, to the present probation of Timothy, St. Paul far away; and he feels impelled to remind his lieutenant that there are Witnesses of his conduct whose real though unseen presence is an encouragement as well as a check. See on v. 21.

ὁμογενώτος: This word has the sense preserve alive, as R.V. m. See ref. A good example from O.T. is 1 Sam. ii. 6, Κυρίως θαυματοῦ καὶ ὁμογενεῖ. The word has here a special application. Timothy is stimulated to exhibit moral courage by an assurance that he is in the hands of One whose protective power is universal, and by the example of One who, as Man, put that protective power to a successful test, and was “saved out of death” (Heb. vi. 7).

ἡν καὶ τὸν ἰδρυμανίαν must have the same reference here as in the preceding verse. We have seen that in the case of Timothy, it means his baptismal profession of faith in God as revealed by Jesus Christ. In the case of Jesus Himself it is best understood of His habitual sense of His heavenly Father's presence and protection, which found its supreme expression on the Cross (Luke xxii. 46).

μαρτυρήσαντος: Although Jesus, as Man, and His followers make the same δραματικαί, yet their respective relations to it are different. μαρτυρία indicates a power of originiation and authentication which δραματικαί does not. The utterances and acts of Jesus, as Man, are human; yet He spoke and acted as no other man ever did. Matt. xviii. 27 (“That take, and give unto them for me and thee,” not “for us”) and John xx. 17 (“I ascend unto my Father,” etc. not our Father or our God) illustrate very well this difference between Jesus and His brethren in relations which they share alike. This is why St. Paul does not here use δραματικαί διηθέντας of Christ, but employs instead the unusual μαρτυρήσαντος διηθέντας. Jesus is διὰ πατρός καὶ πάντων, Rev. i. 5, διὰ ματρός καὶ πάντων, Rev. iii. 14. Bengel suggests that the two verbs indicate the attitudes of the bystanders in each case: “confessus est, cum assensione testium: testatus est, non assentiente Pilato”. The Vulg. treats τὴν καὶ διηθέντα as an acc. of closer specification, qui testimonium reddidit sub Pontio Pilato, bonam confessionem.

Ἠς Ποντίου Πιλάτου: With the explanation of the δραματικαί of Jesus which has just been given, it would be natural to render this, with the Vulg., under Pontius Pilate; and this view is favoured by the change from ἐνότον, ver. 12, to ἐν, and by the likelihood that this is a fragment of a creed. Yet the rendering before Pontius Pilate (Chrys., etc.), is not inconsistent with the notion that the δραματικαί in one sense was made all during our Lord's ministry; for under oath from one point of view it was when Jesus' life was hanging in the balance, depending on the decision of Pontius Pilate, that His trust in the protective love of His Father was most tried. His calm repose of soul on the assurance of God's wise and good disposition of the case is well illustrated by His words as recorded in John xix. 11, “Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above”. Until it has been proved that the Fourth Gospel is not a record of facts, it is reasonable to suppose that St. Paul and his contem-
poraries were acquainted with the general account of the trial of Jesus as therein described.

Ver. 14. τηρήσαι κ.τ.λ.: The phrase τηρείν τινὰ ἄνθρωπον, ταῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑπέρ τινος ἱερατευμονῆς, is a common one; found in Matt. xix. 17, and especially in the Johannine writings; but wherever it occurs it means to obey or observe a command or a saying; whereas here it means to preserve intact. Perhaps the two meanings were present to the apostle's mind, and no doubt in actual experience they merge one into the other; for a tradition is only preserved by obedience to the demand which it makes for observance. This use of the verb and the similar τὴν πίστιν τετήρησα, 2 Tim. iv. 7, mutually illustrate each other. τὴν ἁγιασμόν τοῦ ἄνθρωπος is probably equivalent to τὴν παραδοσίαν φιλάνθρωπος, understanding the tradition or deposit in the most comprehensive moral and spiritual sense, in which it is nothing else than "the law of the Gospel (cf. τὰ παραγεγραμμένα, i. 5), the Gospel viewed as a rule of life" (so Ell. and Altaft). St. Paul would not have invented this from the charge given to Timothy at his baptism. Cyril Jer. (Cat. v. 13), in quoting this passage, substitutes ταύτην τὴν παραδοσίαν τῆς πίστεως for ἁγιασμόν. This interpretation is permissible so long as we do not divorce creed from character.

Διώκων ἀνεκπλήκτως: These epithets present a difficulty somewhat similar to that presented by τηρήσας. Διώκων is a personal epithet (though applied to ἀνθρώπος, Job. xvi. 15, Symm.); and so is ἀνεκπλήκτως. See reff. on both. Alford shows, after De Wette, by examples from Philo and Plato, that ἀνεκπλήκτως may be applied to impersonal objects, such as τέχνην, τὸ λεγόμενον. Nevertheless although it would be intolerably awkward to refer the adjectives to σὲ—the ordinary construction with τηρεῖν ἄνθρωπον being that the qualifying adj. should belong to its object (cf. xi. 22; 1 Cor. xiii. 15 (A.F.)—yet St. Paul had the personal reference to Timothy chiefly in his mind when he chose these words as qualifying ἁγιασμόν; and the R.V., which places a comma after commandment, possibly is intended to suggest a similar view. The man and the word are similarly identified in the parable of the Sower (Matt. xiii. 19, etc.). If Timothy "keeps himself unspotted" (1 Pet. i. 27) and "without reproach," the ἁγιασμόν so far as he is concerned, will be maintained flawless.

The Ancient Homily which used to be attributed to Clem. Rom. contains a sentence written in a similar tone (§ 8), τηρήσατε τὴν σάρκα ἀγνήν καὶ τὴν σοφροσύνην ὁμολογοῦντες, ἣν τὴν ἡμᾶς ἀνακοινώσαν. Then we find the close of our probation state; but we shall not render the account of our stewardship until the ἔπαθαν. When the Pastorals were written the ἔπαθαν had in men's thoughts of it receded beyond each man's death. At an earlier period Christians set it before them as men now set death. In 2 Thess. ii. 8 the compound phrase occurs ἔπαθαν τὴν παρασκευήν αὐτοῦ. ἔπαθαν is the term used in the Pastoral Epistles (see reff.); but the Second Coming of Christ is called παρασκευή in 1 Cor. xv. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 13, iv. 15, v. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 1. In 2 Tim. i. 19, ἔπαθαν includes the first manifestation of Christ in the flesh; and this application of the term is in exact correspondence with its use in heathen sacred associations, where it denoted "a conspicuous appearance or intervention of the higher powers on behalf of their worshippers". The title ἔπαθαν, assumed by the Seleucidæ, meant a claim to be worshipped as an incarnation of Zeus or Apollo, as the case might be (see Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii., ii. 380).

Ver. 15. καροίς ἰδίοις: See note on ii. 6. In due season may refer primarily either to the appropriateness of the occasion of the ἔπαθαν or to the supreme will of the ἐνότητα. The wording of the discouragement given by Jesus, in Acts i. 7, to those who would pry into the future makes it natural to suppose that this latter notion chiefly was in St. Paul's mind here (καροίς οὗ τὰ φάντασμα ἐν τῇ ἑδρᾷ ἰδεινον). We may perhaps put it thus: A devout mind recog-
nises the providential ordering of past events as having taken place at the time best fitted for them, and shrinks from the presumption of guessing the appropriate time for future events. Thus there is no presumption in saying “When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son”; and when the time is ripe, He will send Him again (Acts iii.20).

Sci£ct: Ell. well explains the force of this verb from John ii. 18, rl o-t)u«iov cWikvvuc, T|(iiv; The lastiirifyavua will be the final proof offered by God to the human race.

The terms of this magnificent characterisation of God are an expansion of the epithets in the doxology in i. 17 q.v. (lapcdpios: See on i. 11. Philo (de Sacrific. Abelis et Caini, p. 147) has the remarkable parallel, irepl 0cov tov cVycvviJTov, Kal aqSOdpTov, koA aTp£rrT0i>, icalayiav, Kal povov po.Ka.piov.

Svvao-TT|«is found as a title of God in the Apocrypha. See reff., esp. 2 Mace. iii. 24, o . . . 8vv. here was perhaps suggested by the thought of His absolute and irresponsible power in arranging the times and seasons for the affairs of men. It is unnecessary to seek any special polemical object in uoVoc,, as exclusive of dualism. As has been already suggested (on i. 17), the predications of glory to God that occur in these epistles are probably repeated from eucharistic prayers uttered by St. Paul in the discharge of his prophetic liturgical functions.

Ver. 16. o uoVot <x<iv iiavavlav: God the Father is the subject of this whole attribution; and it is the Catholic doctrine that He alone has endless existence as His essential property. (ovo-Coo.a8ava.Tos ov piTovo-Ca, Theod. Dial. iii. p. 145, quoted by Ell.). God the Son and God the Holy Spirit are co-eternal with the Father; but Their life is derived from and dependent on His. This is expressly declared by Christ of Himself, “As the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself” (John v. 26). On this Westcott notes: “The Son has not life only as given, but life in Himself as being a spring of life... The tense (grave) carries us back beyond time”. Accordingly, the creed of Caesarea, which formed the basis of that adopted at Nicea, spoke of the Son as Zwt|V Ik Zujjs; a doctrine sufficiently expressed in the other phrase, •is €K "Pwto's, which has survived.

<pwiXevs, k.t.X.: The Vulg. renders rather inconsistently, Rex regum et Dominus dominantium. So also in Rev. xix. 16. It is not quite obvious why the phrase is varied from the usual pwiXevs (2 Macc. xiii. 4; Rev. xvii. 14, xix. 16) and KpCuv, [tov] KvpCuv (Deut. x. 17; Ps. cxxvi. 3; Enoch ix. 4). Perhaps the participle gives new vigour to a phrase that had lost its freshness.

Ver. 17. en "t" "νυν "αισθ. paradxegyie hyro "δθη-

Here only

N.T., Wisd. (5), 4 Macc. (a), t Rom. (4), t Cor. (3). u Here only, not LXX. v 1 Pet. iv. 11 v. 11, Jude, Rev. i. 6, v. 13. w a Tim. iv. 10, Tit. ii. 13. x See 1 Tim. i. 3. y Here only, not LXX. cf. Rom. xii. 20, xii. 10.
had at Corinth when St. Paul wrote, "Not many mighty, not many noble, are called" (1 Cor. i. 26). It is to be observed that the expression 
\[\text{ο\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \] is only found in N.T. in the Pastoral Epistles (see ref.). \[\text{ο\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \] is the expression elsewhere in N.T. (Matt. xii. 32; Luke xvi. 3, xx. 34; Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6 (bis), 8, iii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. i. 21). Both represent the Rabbinic \[\text{πατάμα} \], the present age, as contrasted with the age to come. St. Paul also has 
\[\text{ο\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \] in 1 Cor. iii. 19, v. 10, vi. 31, and 
\[\text{ο\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \] in Rom. iii. 26, viii. 18, xi. 5, 2 Cor. viii. 14. See Dean Armitage Robinson's note on Eph. i. 21. It does not follow that because these are renderings of the same Hebrew expression, they meant the same to a Greek ear. In the three places in which 
\[\text{ο\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \] occurs it has a definite material physical sense; whereas 
\[\text{ο\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \] has a more notionally ethical force.

\text{πεπληρωθηναι \textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{τώρα} \text{πληθυνος} \text{; cf. Acts xiv. 17.}

\text{δι\textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{άποφασαι}: This is a greater concession to the sensuous view of life than the 
\[\text{δι\textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{μεταβαθμισιν} \] of iv. 3. It approaches the declaration of the Preacher that for a man to "eat and drink, and make his soul enjoy good in his labour . . . is from the hand of God" (Eccles. ii. 24), "the gift of God" (Eccles. iii. 13, v. 19). No good purpose is served by pretending that God did not intend us to enjoy the pleasurable sensations of physical life. After all, things that have been enjoyed have served their purpose; they have "perished" yet "with the using" (Col. ii. 22). Obviously, they cannot take God's place as an object of hope.

\text{Ver. 18. \textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{διαφερεραι}: corrects any possible misunderstanding of 
\[\text{δι\textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu}\text{αποφασαι}\text{;} \text{πληθυνος \textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{έργων καλοις} \text{; see note on iii. i.} \text{ Cf. \textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{εις \textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{πλευραν, Luke xii. 21.}

\text{δι\textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{μεταβαθμισιν}: \text{facile tribuere} (Vulg.), \text{ready to impart} (cf. the use of 
\[\text{μεταβαθμισιν} \] in Luke iii. ii; Rom. i. ii, xii. 8; Eph. iv. 28; 1 Thess. ii. 9).

\text{κοινωνικώς}: This does not mean \text{social} (A.V. m.), \text{ready to sympathize} (R.V. m.), as Chrys. and Thdt. explain it, but 
\[\text{τωσ \textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{των \textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{καινοις κουνωντες, Rom. xii. 13} \text{ (cf. Gal. vi. 6; Phil. iv. 15).} \]

A good illustration of the general sentiment is Heb. xiii. 16, \text{τις \textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{κοινωνως \textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{εξ ινακων αι \textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{και \textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{εξ ινακων} \text{; Von Soden notes that the thought in 
\[\text{κοινωνως} \] is of the need of others, in 
\[\text{κοινωνικώς} \] of the imparting of one's own.

\text{Ver. 19. \textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{δι\textsp\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu\texttup\textn\textmu} \text{αποφασαι}: The true hoarding produces, as its first result, a 
good foundation, which will entitle a man to grasp the prize, which is true life, the only life worth talking about.
Stability is the essential characteristic of a foundation. There is a contrast implied between the shifting uncertainty of riches, as a ground of hope, and the firm and permanent foundation of a Christian character. (So, nearly, Theod.)

Ingenious conjectures have been suggested for θημλιον; but it is safe to say that the nature of metaphors—due to the condensation of language—does not distress those who read in a devout rather than in a critical spirit. For the sentiment cf. Matt. vi. 19, 20. There is some support given to the conjecture of Lamb-Bos, θεία λαός, by the parallel from Tobit iv. 8 sq. cited by Bengel, μη φοβοῦ τινιν ελπισμόνιν· θέμα γὰρ ἀγαθὸν ἄθροισμεν σωτηρία νεκρῶν θημλιον ἠμάκρινων. θημλιον is used metaphorically also in rev. It is to be observed that in 2 Tim. ii. 19 there is again a confusion of imagery: the foundation has a seal.

εἰς τὸ μηλῖον is found in a slightly different sense (thenceforth), Luke xiii. 9. ἐνλαβηται: See on ver. 12.

τὴν δότιν καὶ τὸ δότιν: the life which is life indeed, an expression which is one of the precious things of the R.V. It is "the life which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. i. 12). For δότιν see v. 3.

Ver. 20. As Ell. points out, this concluding apostrophe, like the last paragraph in 2 Cor. (xiii. 11 sq.), is a summary of the whole epistle.

On the intensity of the appeal in the use of the personal name see on i. 18.

τὴν παραθήκην: depositum. The term occurs in a similar connexion with φυλάσσω, 2 Tim. i. 14, and also in 2 Tim. i. 12, where see note. Here, and in 2 Tim. i. 14, it means, as Chrys. explains, ἀ παραθήκης, τῶν ἔχων; so Vincent of Lerins, from whose Commonitorium (c. 22) Al. quotes. "Quid est depositum? id est, quod tibi creditum est, non quod a te inventum; quod accepi, non quod ex cogitasti; rem non ingenii, sed doctrinae; non usurpationis privatae, sed publicae traditionis... catholicae fidei talentum inviolatum illibatumque conserva... Aurum accepi, aurum redeo: nolo mihi pro aliis alia subijicias: nolo pro auro aut impudenter plumbum, aut fraudulenter aeramenta supponas." That the "deposit" is practically identical with the "charge," ch. i. 5, 18, "the sound doctrine," i. 10, "the commandment," vi. 14, is indicated by the use of the cognate verb παραθηκαί in i. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 2, and the correlative παραθαλάσσει, Col. iv. 17, and even more by the contrast here between it and "the knowledge falsely so called".

παρακαταθήκης many cursives.

καὶ παραθηκάς FG, a few cursives, d, e, f, g, mso, vg. (vocum novitates).

In 2 Tim. ii. 16 the Vulg. has vaniloquia. The rendering vocum novitates found here in Vulg. and O.L. represents the variant καινοφωνίας. The term does not differ much from πατασσαλογία, i. 6, which is also rendered vaniloquium.

ἀντίλογος: In face of the general anarthrous character of the Greek of these epistles it is not certain that the absence of an article before ἀντίλογος proves that it is qualified by βηθλέους. The meaning of ἀντίλογος is partly fixed by καινοφωνίας, to which it is in some sort an explanatory appendix; but it must finally depend upon the signification we attach to τῆς ψευδώνυμης γνώσεως. The epithet ψευδώνως is sufficient to prove that γνώσεως was specially claimed by the heretics whom St. Paul has in his mind. That it should be so is in harmony with the other notices which we find in these epistles suggestive of a puerile and profitless intellectual subtlety, as opposed to the practical moral character of Christianity. We are reminded of the contrast in 1 Cor. viii. 1: "Knowledge puffeth up, but love buildeth up."—Hort (Judaeasitic Christianity, p. 139 sqq.) proves that γνώσεως here and elsewhere in N.T. (Luke xi. 52; Rom. ii. 20 sqq.) refers to the special lore of those who interpreted mystically the O.T., especially the Law. Knowledge which is merely theoretical, the knowledge of God professed by those who "by their works deny Him." (Tit. i.
γνώσεως, 21. ἐν τοις ἐπαγγελλόμενοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἡστῶ—w i Tim. ii.
χρησιν.

Ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν.  

1 So MAFGEP, 17, g (vobiscum t tecum) boh.; metā σου DKL, d, e, f, vg., syr., arm.; sah. om. ἡ χάρι—ἐμῶν; add ἑμῶν NYdOKLP, e, f, vg., syr., boh.

21. M, 17 add πρὸς Τιμόθεον ᾧ. To this D adds, ἐκληρόθη ἐρχεται πρὸς Τιμόθεον ᾧ, similarly FG. A, etc., have πρὸς Τιμόθεον ᾧ ἔγραψιν ἀπὸ Λαοδικεᾶς; to which K adds, ἢ ταὶ ἡμῶν ὑπὲρφασιν Φρυγίας τῆς Πακινανῆς, similarly L. P has a subscription like that of A, substituting Νικοπόλεως for Λαοδικεᾶς.

16), is not real knowledge. The ἀντιθέσεις then of this spurious knowledge would be the dialectical distinctions and niceties of the false teachers. Perhaps inconsistencies is what is meant. For an example of ἀντιθέσεις in this sense, see Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii., v. 275. Something more definite than (a) oppositions, i.e., objections of opponents (so Chrys. Theoph. and von Soden, who compares ἀντιδιαταγµένα, 2 Tim. ii. 25) is implied; but certainly not (b) the formal categorical oppositions between the Law and the Gospel alleged by Marcion.

Ver. 21. τινες: See note on i. 3. 
ἐπαγγελλόμενοι: See note on ii. 10. 
περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἡστῶν: See note on i. 6, 19, and ref.

μεθ' ὑμῶν: An argument in support of the metā σου of the Received Text is that μεθ' ὑμῶν is indisputably the right reading in the corresponding place in 2 Tim. and Tit., and might have crept in here by assimilation. Ell. has reason on his side when he maintains that the plural here is not sufficient to prove that the epistle as a whole was intended for the Church. "The study of papyri letters will show that the singular and the plural alternated in the same document with apparently no distinction of meaning" (Moulton, Expositor, vi., vii. 107). The colophon in the T.R., "The First to Timothy was written from Laodicea, which is the chiefest city of Phrygia Pacatiana," has a double interest: as an echo of the notion that this is the Epistle from Laodicea (Col. iv. 16), a notion sanctioned by Theophyl.; and the mention of Phrygia Pacatiana proves that the author of the note lived after the fourth century, towards the close of which that name for Phrygia Prima came into use.
CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1, 2. Salutation.

Ver. 1. Δαπόστολος Χρ. Ἰησ. See note on 1 Tim. i. 1.

Διδάσκαλος Θεού: This formula is found also in 1 and 2 Cor. Eph. and Col. See note on 1 Tim. i. 1, where it is pointed out that while the same εὐαγγελία may be said to be issued by God the Father and God the Son, Ἐλίκυμα is always used of the Father's eternal purpose as regards the salvation of man (Rom. ii. 16, xii. 2; 2 Cor. viii. 5; Gal. i. 4; Eph. i. 5, 9, 11; Col. i. 9, iv. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 18, etc.). St. Paul believed that his own commission as an apostle was a part of God's arrangements to this end, one of the ways in which the Will manifested itself.

καὶ εὐαγγελία τῆς ζωῆς, κ.τ.λ.: See note on 1 Tim. i. 2. The expression of thanksgiving in the exordium of an

Ver. 2. Δαπόστολος Χρ. Ἰησ. See note on 1 Tim. i. 1.

Διδάσκαλος Θεού: This formula is found also in 1 and 2 Cor. Eph. and Col. See note on 1 Tim. i. 1, where it is pointed out that while the same εὐαγγελία may be said to be issued by God the Father and God the Son, Ἐλίκυμα is always used of the Father's eternal purpose as regards the salvation of man (Rom. ii. 16, xii. 2; 2 Cor. viii. 5; Gal. i. 4; Eph. i. 5, 9, 11; Col. i. 9, iv. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 18, etc.). St. Paul believed that his own commission as an apostle was a part of God's arrangements to this end, one of the ways in which the Will manifested itself.

καὶ εὐαγγελία τῆς ζωῆς, κ.τ.λ.: See note on 1 Tim. i. 2. The expression of thanksgiving in the exordium of an
I. 1—5. ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ  B

1 καθαρὲς: Compare the claim he makes, Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 4; 2 Cor. i. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 10; and for the language here see note on 1 Tim. i. 5. διό is best rendered as (Winer-Moulton, Gram. p. 561, where Matt. vi. 12, Gal. vi. 10 are cited in illustration). The R.V. how (so Alf.) implies that the cause for thankfulness is the unceasing nature of St. Paul’s remembrance of Timothy; the A.V. that (quod, Vulg.) refers the cause to the remembrance itself. Rom. i. 9 is not a parallel instance of διό.

2 ἀδιάκλειτον—δηθεν εἰσὶν: A regular epistolary formula, as is evidenced by the papyri; though no doubt in St. Paul’s case it corresponded to reality. See his use of it in ref. and Dean Armitage Robinson, Ephesians, pp. 37 sq., 275 sq. esp. p. 279 sq. on the formula μεταφορείτε, from which this passage is a remarkable variation.

3 νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας is connected by the R.V. with ἐπιτομῆς. In 1 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 10, the phrase unquestionably is connected with what follows. On the other hand, in 1 Tim. v. 5 it comes at the end of a clause; and in this place the A.V. connects it with ταξινὸς δηθεν εἰσὶν. This is certainly right, on the analogy of 1 Thess. iii. 10, where see Milligan’s note. Alf. and Ell. connect it with ἀδιάκλειτον διό.

4 ἐπιτομῆς: For πληρωθεῖσα with a genitive, cf. Rom. xv. 13, 14. It takes a dat., Rom. i. 29, 2 Cor. vii. 4, cf. Eph. v. 18; an acc., Phil. i. 11, Col. i. 9.

5 μεταφορεῖτε: Having been reminded. Not to be connected

epistle is usually prefaced by St. Paul with ἐκ τῆς ἵππου (Rom. i. 8, 1 Cor. i. 4, Phil. i. 3, Phil. i. 4, εἰκάριοτομοῦν Col. i. 3, 1 Thess. i. 2, οὗ ταπεινοὶ εἰκάριοτοι, Eph. i. 16, εἰκάριευτέν ὄλος, 2 Thess. i. 3). A comparison of these passages makes it evident that χάριν ἐκ λαβοῦν is to be connected with ἐν τοῖς λαβών, καὶ λαβών; ἀδιάκλειτον—δηθεν εἰσὶν being a parenthetical account of St. Paul’s state of mind about his absent friend, while μεταφορεῖτε—δηθεν εἰσὶν also is a parenthetical clause. The thanksgiving is for the grace of God given to Timothy (cf. esp. 1 Cor. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3); and the expression of thankfulness is called forth whenever St. Paul calls him to mind, unceasingly in fact. The use of χάριν ἐκ λαβοῦν in 1 Tim. i. 12 is not a parallel case to this. The phrase is quoted from the papyri by Dean Armitage Robinson, Ephesians, p. 283.

ἀδιάκλειτον—δηθεν εἰσὶν: Two thoughts are in St. Paul’s mind: (a) the inheritance of his religious consciousness from his forefathers, and (b) the continuity of the revelation of God; the same light in the New Covenant as in the Old, only far brighter.

If St. Paul had not said, When did you first serve God? he would have answered, Even before God separated me from my mother’s womb for His service. St. Paul was conscious that he was the result of generations of God-fearing people. His inborn, natural instincts were all towards the service of God. (See Acts xxii. 3, xxiv. 14; Rom. xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5).

Moreover St. Paul always maintained that the Gospel was the divinely ordained sequel of Judaism; not a new religion, but the fulfilment of “the promise made of God unto our fathers” (Acts xxvi. 6; see also xxiii. 6, xxiv. 14).

διό καθαρὲς: Compare the claim he makes, Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 4; 2 Cor. i. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 10; and for the language here see note on 1 Tim. i. 5. διό is best rendered as
with the clause immediately preceding, as R.V.m. ἐνεχθεσθα, a reminder, i.e., an act of recollection specially excited by a particular person or thing, thus differs from ἐνεχθεσθα, which is self-originated (so Ammonius Grammaticus, quoted by Bengel). Ell. compares for the thought Eph. i. 15. For this use of λαβάναι, cf. Rom. vii. 8, 11 (ἀφορμή λ.), Heb. ii. 3 (ἀφιγ. λ.), xi. 29, 36 (ἐφορμή λ.), 2 Pet. i. 9 (καταθ. λ.). The fact that St. Paul received this reminder of Timothy's faith suggests that there were other aspects of his conduct—possibly as an administrator—which were not wholly satisfactory. His unfeigned faith made up for much.

 перевод для "οὐκεῖον κ.λ.: τὸ νόστος ἐν ῥήματι ἐνεξεχθεσθα is used in Rom. viii. 11 and 2 Tim. i. 14 of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; and in Col. iii. 16 of the Word of Christ. In 2 Cor. vi. 16, οὐκεῖον is added in the quotation from Lev. xxvi. 12 to ἐνεχθεσθα. Tisch. and W.H. read ἐνεχθεσθα for ὑποκρίνεται in Rom. vii. 17. Timothy's faith was hereditary as St. Paul's was. But does not mean that Lois was the first of her family to have faith, but that it dwelt in her, to St. Paul's knowledge, before it dwelt in Timothy. It is to be observed that it is implied that the faith of God's people before Christ came is not different in kind from faith after Christ has come.

See also Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii., viii. 56.

Since Timothy's father was a Greek, and his mother a Jewess (Acts xvi. 1), we may conclude that Lois was the mother of Eunice (see art. in Hastings' D. B.).

The expression refers to the salvation of the soul by God's grace, in Rom. vi. 23, xi. 29. The narrower signification, as here, of a gift given to us to use to God's glory is χάρισμα, as in 1 Cor. vii. 7, or more usually simply χάρισμα. The particular nature of the gift must be determined by the context. In this case it was a charisma that was exercised in a spirit not of fear-
fulness. We can scarcely be wrong, then, if we suppose the charisma of administration and rule to be in St. Paul's mind rather than "the work of an evangelist" (ch. iv. 5). So Chrys., "for presiding over the Church, for the working of miracles, and for every service".

πᾶν τούτων—μόνον: See note on 1 Tim. iv. 14, where it is pointed out that we have no right to assume that hands were laid on Timothy once only. Thus Acts ix. 17 and xiii. 3 are two such occasions in St. Paul's spiritual life. There may have been others.

7. ὡς γὰρ εἴδωκεν ημᾶς: The γὰρ connects this statement with the exhortation preceding in such a way as to suggest that God's gift "to us" of a spirit of power is in the same order of being as the charisma imparted to Timothy by the laying on of St. Paul's hands. The question is, then, To whom is reference made in ἡμᾶς? We can only reply, The Christian Society, represented by the apostles on the Day of Pentecost. (The aor. εἴδωκεν points to a definite occasion.) Then it was that the Church began to receive the power, δύναμις, which had been promised (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 8) by the Lord, and realised by the apostles collectively (Acts iv. 20, w. 4), and individually (Acts vi. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 7, xii. 9). Whatever special charismata are bestowed on the ministers of the Church at ordination, they are a part of the general stream of the Pentecostal gift which is always being poured out by the ascended Lord.

πνεύμα βεβαια: It is simplest to take πνεύμα here as a comprehensive equivalent to πνεύμα, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 12, ζητοῦτι τοις πνευμάτων. God did not confuse us fearfulness, etc. The gen. after πνεύμα, in this and similar cases, Rom. viii. 15 (βουλέας, νεοτέρον), xi. 8 (σοφίας, οἰκονομίας), 1 Cor. ii. 1 (πρᾶξιν), 2 Cor. iv. 13 (πνεύματα), Eph. i. 17 (σοφίας, κ.τ.λ.), expresses the prominent idea, the term πνεύμα adds the notion that the quality spoken of is not self-originated. The personal Holy Spirit is not meant unless the context names Him unambiguously, as in Eph. i. 13.

βεβαια: fearfulness, timidity, timor. This is the right word here, as βουλέας is the right word in Rom. viii. 15. It is curious that in Lev. xxvi. 36, where B has βουλέας A &c. have βεβαια. See apparatus. crit. There was an element of βεβαια in Timothy's natural disposition which must have been prejudicial to his efficiency as a Church ruler. For that position is needed (a) force of character, which if not natural may be inspired by consciousness of a divine appointment, (b) love, which is not softness, and (c) self-discipline, which is opposed to all easy self-indulgence which issues in laxity of administration. σωφροσύνη: sobrietas. Better active, as R.V., discipline, first of self, then of others. See Blass, Gram. mar, p. 61.

Vv. 8—ii. 2. The leading thoughts in this section are (a) the Day of reward and judgment which is surely coming (12, 18), (b) the unreasonableness therefore of cowardly shame (8, 12, 16), and (c) the necessity that Timothy should guard the deposit and hand it on (14—ii. 2).

Be not ashamed, therefore, of the Gospel to which our Lord was not ashamed to testify; nor be ashamed of me, who am in prison because of testimony borne to Him and it. Share our sufferings in the strength given by God, whose power is displayed in the Gospel of life of which I was appointed a preacher. This is the direct cause of my present lot; but I am not ashamed; for I know the power of Him to whom I have committed myself in trust. Do you imitate His faithfulness: guard the deposit committed to you. I am not asking you to do more than some others have done. You know Onesiphorus and his work as well as I do. When all turned their backs on me, he was not ashamed to make inquiries for me; and, finding me in prison, he con-
stantly cheered me by his visits. May God bless him and his! Do you, then, welcome the strengthening grace of Christ, and provide for a succession of faithful teachers to preserve intact the sacred deposit of the faith.


τὸ μαρτυρίων τ. Κυρίου: Testimony borne by our Lord, His words, His ethical and spiritual teaching, by which Christianity has influenced the ideals and practice of society. The gen. after μαρτυρίων is best taken as subjective. See 1 Cor. i. 6, ii. 1; 2 Thess. i. 10.

τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν: See note on 1 Tim. i. 14.

καὶ τὸν δομοῦν αὐτοῦ: This does not mean one made prisoner by the Lord, but one who belongs to the Lord and is a prisoner for His sake. There is nothing figurative about δομοῦν. St. Paul calls himself δόμος. χρ. Ἰησοῦς. in Eph. iii. 1, δομ. χρ. Ἰησοῦς. Phil. i. 9. The idea is more clearly expressed in δόμος. τ. Κυρίου. Eph. iv. 1. He is a prisoner; he is also “in Christ”. The expression also suggests the thought that his earthly imprisonment is ordered by the Lord, not by man. The present captivity is alluded to again in ver. 16 and ii. 9. It is not the same figure as in 2 Cor. ii. 14, “God which always leadeth us in triumph in Christ” as His captives.

See Lightfoot on Col. ii. 15.

συναγγελθήσων τοῦ εὐαγγελίου: Join us [the Lord and me] in our sufferings for the Gospel’s sake. More than once in this epistle St. Paul declares that he is suffering for the Gospel (ver. 16; καυχάμεθα, ii. 9). He has said, “Be not ashamed . . . of me”; but he has just coupled the testimony of the Lord with his own; and further on (ii. 8) Jesus Christ is noted as the great illustration of the law, “No cross, no crown”. See note there. It is best then to give a wider reference than μει to the συν συναγγελθήσων. The R.V., Suffer hardship with the gospel is needlessly harsh. The dat. τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is the daínavs commodi.

καὶ τὸ δόμον τοῦ Θεοῦ: must be connected with συναγγελθήσων; and this suggests that the power of God here means power given by God, as in 2 Cor. vi. 7, 1 Pet. i. 5, “the power that worketh in us” (Eph. iii. 20), the assured possession of which would brace Timothy to suffer hardship. Alf. and Ell., following Bengel, take it simply: “God displayed in our salvation” (as in Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18, 24, ii. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 4). But St. Paul could scarcely exhort Timothy to display a degree of fortitude comparable to God’s active power. The next verse, τὸ σωτήριον, κ.τ.λ., is not a detailed description of God’s power to save, but a recalling of the fact that Timothy had actually experienced God’s saving grace in the past. This consideration would stimulate Timothy to play the man.

Ver. 9. τοῦ σωτήριον, κ.τ.λ.: The connexion, as has been just remarked, is that our recognition at our baptism of God’s saving and calling grace—He saved us and called us at a definite point of time (aor.)—ought to strengthen our faith in the continuance in the future of His gifts of power to us. On the insistence in this group of epistles on God’s saving grace, see notes on 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 4, καλλιάριστον κλησίν ἄγια: To a holy calling, i.e., to a life of holiness, is less ambiguous than with a holy calling, which might mean “a calling uttered by a Holy One,” or “in holy language”. κλησίν does not here mean the institution (as in Rom. xii. 20), but, when qualified as here by an adj., it means the condition into which, or the purpose for which, we have been called (οἱ ἀγιοί κλ., Phil. iii. 14, κτοράματα κλ., Heb. iii. 1; and cf. 1 Cor. vii. 20). We have been “called to be saints,” Rom. i. 7, “called into the fellowship of God’s Son,” Col. i. 24, “called to the gospel” (οἱ κατὰ τὴν εὐαγγελίαν). The sentiment is more clearly expressed in Tit. iii. 5, οὐκ ἔστε εὐαγγελισμένοι... ἐπιστήμους ἡμῖν. There is an echo in both places of the controversy, now over, concerning works and grace. Perhaps κατά is used in this.


πρὸς Τιμοθέουν Ἐ

κατάργησάτος: We cannot, because of the absence of an article before the participles, safely translate, when he brought to nought, rather than as when he brought to nought. Abolished does not express the truth. Christians all “taste of death” as their Master did (John viii. 52, Heb. ii. 9), though they do not “see” it; and they are confident that they too will be “saved out of death” (Heb. v. 7). Death for them has lost its sting (Heb. ii. 14, 15). It need not cause any difficulty that here the undoing of death is spoken of as past, whereas in 1 Cor. xv. 26, 54, it is “the last enemy that shall be abolished” (see Rev. xx. 14). We have a parallel in John xvi. 11, “The prince of this world hath been judged”.

τὸν δάνατον: Alf., following Bengel, sees a special force in the art. “as if he had said Orcum illum”.

φωτίζοντος: To be connected with διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγέλιον. The Gospel is that light by which the presence of Christ, the light, is apprehended. That light does not create life and incorruption: it displays them.

ζωὴ καὶ αἰῶνα ἐπληρώτω: Immortality or Incorruption defines the life more clearly.

Ver. 10. φανερώθησαν: See note on 1 Tim. ii. 16. Bengel calls attention to the fit juxtaposition of ἔννοια σεβασμοῦ: φανερώθησαν, ἐπιφανεῖας, φωτίζοντος.

διὰ τὴς ἐπιφανείας, κ.τ.λ.: See on 1 Tim. vi. 14. The ἐπιφανεία here must not be referred to the Incarnation, considered as having taken place at a particular moment in time. It includes it; the ἐπιφανεία began then; and will be more brightening and clearer, until its consummation, to which the term ἐπιφανεία is elsewhere restricted.

κατάργησάτος: We cannot, because of the absence of an article before the participles, safely translate, when he brought to nought, rather than as when he brought to nought. Abolished does not express the truth. Christians all “taste of death” as their Master did (John viii. 52, Heb. ii. 9), though they do not “see” it; and they are confident that they too will be “saved out of death” (Heb. v. 7). Death for them has lost its sting (Heb. ii. 14, 15). It need not cause any difficulty that here the undoing of death is spoken of as past, whereas in 1 Cor. xv. 26, 54, it is “the last enemy that shall be abolished” (see Rev. xx. 14). We have a parallel in John xvi. 11, “The prince of this world hath been judged”.

τὸν δάνατον: Alf., following Bengel, sees a special force in the art. “as if he had said Orcum illum”.

φωτίζοντος: To be connected with διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγέλιον. The Gospel is that light by which the presence of Christ, the light, is apprehended. That light does not create life and incorruption: it displays them.

ζωὴ καὶ αἰῶνα ἐπληρώτω: Immortality or Incorruption defines the life more clearly.

Ver. 10. φανερώθησαν: See note on 1 Tim. ii. 16. Bengel calls attention to the fit juxtaposition of ἔννοια σεβασμοῦ: φανερώθησαν, ἐπιφανεῖας, φωτίζοντος.

διὰ τὴς ἐπιφανείας, κ.τ.λ.: See on 1 Tim. vi. 14. The ἐπιφανεία here must not be referred to the Incarnation, considered as having taken place at a particular moment in time. It includes it; the ἐπιφανεία began then; and will be more brightening and clearer, until its consummation, to which the term ἐπιφανεία is elsewhere restricted.
keeping. Cf. the story of St. John and the robber from Clem. Alex. Quis Dives, § 42, quoted by Eus. H. E. iii. 23, the θεραπασβησην άντιδος ἡμιν. Here it means "my soul" or "myself," cf. Ps. xxx. (xiii.) 6, εἰς χείρας σου παραθήσαται τό πνεύμα μου, Luke xxii. 46, 1 Pet. iv. v. 23, 1 Thess. v. 23. This explanation of παραθήσησα harmonizes best with ἡ ταυτοχώρα, πατητικά, and φιλάξα. The whole verse has a purely personal reference. Nothing but a desire to give παραθήσησα the same meaning wherever it occurs (1 Tim. vi. 20, q.v.; 2 Tim. i. 14) could have made Chrys. explain it here as "the faith, the preaching of the Gospel," So R.V.m., that which he hath committed unto me. " Paulus, decessui proximus, duo deposita habebat : alterum Domino, alterum Timotheo committendum," Bengel. This exegesis compels us to refer τῷ θεῷ the Father.

εἰς ἑκάστην τὴν ἡμέραν: The day of judgment and award, i Cor. iii. 13.

Ver. 13. ὑπότηταις εἰς: A resumption of the exhortation which was broken off in ver. 9. This command is strictly parallel to that which follows: ὑπὸν ὑποτησίαν.— ἡκοσιασά corresponds to, and is the external expression of, τὴν καλὰ παραθήσαν; εἰς corresponds to φιλάξαι; and ἐν πιστεῖ— ήμιν to διὰ— ἡμῖν.

ὑποτησίας ὑποτησίων λόγων: The gen. is that of apposition: a pattern, sc. of faith, expressed in sound words. The phrase marks an advance on the μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως (Rom. ii. 20) or μόρφῳ εὐσεβείας (2 Tim. iii. 5). It happily suggests the power of expansion latent in the simplest and most primitive dogmatic formulas of the Christian faith. Χείρ has the same strengthened signification as in 1 Tim. i. 19, where see note.

ὑποτησίων λόγων: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

ἐν ... ἡκοσιασά: Alf. notes that the use of ἐν rather than ἦν shows that ἡκοσιασά, λόγῳ, and not ὑποτησία, is the chief thing in St. Paul's mind. It is obvious that Timothy could not have heard the ὑποτησίας, which is a concept of the mind expressed in many sound words heard on various occasions. As to the translation, von Soden agrees with Hort, who insists on "the order, the absence of τίνς, and the use of ἐκείν" as compelling us to render, "Hold as a pattern," etc. This rendering would favor Hort's conjecture that "ΟΝ is a primitive corruption for ΟΝ," i.e., "Hold as a pattern of sound words the word which thou hast heard," etc. But the absence of the article is such a marked feature in the Pastorals that no argument can be based on it here.

Bengel calls attention to the change in order in ii. 2. Here, παρ' θεοῦ ἡκοσιασά, the emphasis being on St. Paul's personal authority; there, ήκοσιασά παρ' ἠμοί, because of the antithesis between ήκοσιασά and παραθήσησα.

ἐν πίστει, κτλ.: See note on 1 Tim. i. 14. This clause must be joined with Χείρ, not with ήκοσιασά, nor with ἡμῖν. λόγῳ, only: as given in faith, etc. (von Soden).

Ver. 14. τὴν καλὰ παραθήσησαν: The faith, which is a τοιτοτύπωσις in relation to the growing apprehension of it by the Church, is a παραθήσησα, deposit, in the case of each individual. On the constant epithet καλὰ see 1 Tim. i. 18, and on παραθήσησα 1 Tim. vi. 20. There is a special force in καλὰ here, as distinguishing the precious faith from τὴν παραθήσησαν μοι of ver. 12. Φιλάξαν διὰ Πνευματοῦ Ἁγίου: φιλάξαν is more than Χείρ: it implies here final perseverance; and that can only be attained through the Holy Spirit. God must co-operate with man, if man's efforts are to be successful. Cf. "Work out your own salvation . . . for it is God which worketh in you." (Phil. ii. 12, 13). Πνευματοῦ Ἁγίου: This verse and Tit. iii. 5 are the only places in the Pastorals in which the Holy Spirit is mentioned.

Ver. 15. οἴδας τοῦτο: There is a personal appeal for loyalty in this reminder. The whole paragraph, with its examples cited of disloyalty and loyalty, was intended as an object lesson to Timothy.
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πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ ἦν ἔτι Φίλεος καὶ Ἐρμογήνη. 16. ἦν δὲ ἐρήμων ἔλεος ὁ Κώριος τῷ Ἐνσύσσιον ὤλει: δὲ τοιούτῳ μὲ ἀνέφεβον καὶ τῷ ἐν ἕλυσιν μοι ὄλει ἐπαυξύθη. ὡς 17. ἄλλα γενόμενον ἐν "Ρώμῃ ἡ στουδαίας ἡ ἔμνησθεν καὶ εἰδρῦν. —18. ὡς ἀπό τῷ Ἡ

vii. 20. h Here only, N.T. 1 Eph. vi. 20. k See ver. 8. Ἡ Luke vii. 4, Phil. ii. 28, Tit. iii. 13.

ἀνεστράφησαν μὲ: The reff., with the exception of chap. iv. 16, are parallel to this use of the verb. ἡ πάντες must not be pressed: it is the sweeping assertion of depression. If it had been even approximately true, Timothy would have had no church to administer. On the other hand, something less serious than apostasy from the faith may be alluded to, such as personal neglect of the apostle (cf. iv. 16, πάντες μὲ ἐγκαινιάσαν, and the contrast of Onesiphorus' conduct with theirs in the next verse), a thing which we see St. Paul through the halo of centuries of veneration seems painfully hard to understand. But it is abundantly plain that apostles did not during their lifetime receive that universal and unquestioning reverence from their fellow-Christians which we would have antecedently supposed could not have been withheld from them. Cf. 3 John 9.

οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ: Asia means the Roman province, which included Mysia, Lydia, Caria, great part of Phrygia, the Troad, and the islands off the coast.

This statement is most naturally explained of a defection in Asia of natives of Asia. Plummer conjectures that St. Paul had applied by letter from Rome for help to some Asian Christians, and had been refused. Of course it is possible that St. Paul refers to something that had taken place in Rome (so Bengel, who compares chap. iv. 16). But all who are in Asia would be a strange way of referring to some Asiatics who had been in Rome and had returned to Asia; and though ἐλάχιστον πρῶτο is naturally understood as mentioning something of which Timothy had knowledge only by report, we cannot be sure that St. Paul intended here to distinguish ἐλάχιστον from γινόμενας. Perhaps the defection had taken place during an absence of Timothy from Asia. Nothing else is known certainly of Phygellus and Hermogenes.

Ver. 16. ὡς ἔλεος, κ.τ.λ.: διδάσκω ἔλεος, like διδάσκω ἔλεος, is a Hebraism. See reff. The correlative, λαμβάνω εἴλος occurs Heb. iv. 6. πουέν εἴλος μετὰ πιπός (Luke i. 72, x. 37; Jas. ii. 13) is a similar phrase. Here, we should say, May God bless so and so. ἔλεος does not correspond to any special sin.

τῷ ὄνειμι: This household is saluted in iv. 19. It is most natural to suppose that Onesiphorus himself was dead, both from this expression and from the pious wish in ver. 18. Prayer for living friends is normally and naturally in regard to objects which will be realised here in earth. The evidence of 2 Macc. xii. 44, 45, proves that an orthodox Jew of our Lord's time could have prayed for the dead. A full discussion of the question must embrace a consideration of the final cause of prayer, and of the nature of that which we call death. See reff. to recent literature on this subject in Miligan's art. Onesiphorus in Hastings' D. B.

ἀνέφεβον: The comprehensive term refresh expresses the notion admirably. They are "the blessed of God the Father" to whom the King shall say, "I was in prison, and ye came unto me" (Matt. xxv. 36. See Heb. x. 24, xii. 3). For St. Paul's appreciation of the pleasures of friendly intercourse, see Rom. xvi. 2, 2 Cor. xvi. 18, 2 Cor. vii. 13. Phil. iv. 20.


Ver. 17. γενόμενον ἐν "Ρώμῃ: The reference is most likely to the apostle's first Roman imprisonment, Eph. vi. 20. Whichever it was, πολλάκις implies that it had lasted some time.

Ver. 18. It is immaterial whether we explain ὁ Κύριος, in this verse, of God the Father, the source of judgment, or of God the Son, the instrument of judgment. It is far-fetched to suppose that the repeated Κύριος ... Κύριον refer to different divine Persons. Huther's expl., followed by ALF, seems the best, that ὡς ἐν Ἐρμογὴ ἐν Ἐρμογήνη ἔβλεπον had become so completely a for-
mula that the recurrence did not seem harsh.

καὶ δὲν κ. τ. λ.: This clause is an afterthought.

ὁμοίωσις: The verb is used with a perfectly general reference here, as in Heb. vi. 10.

ὁμοίωσις: The comparative here is intensive or elative. See Blass, Grammar, pp. 33, 141, 142. Other examples are in 1 Tim. iii. 14 (Tischendorf) and in the Received Text of ver. 17 of this chapter.

CHAPTER II.—Ver. 1. σὲ: emphatic, as in 1 Tim. vi. 11 and ch. iii. 10; but the appeal is not primarily that Timothy should imitate Onesiphorus, or learn by the example of Phygellus and Hermogenes, but rather marks the intensity of the apostle's anxiety for the future conduct of Timothy in the Church; and similarly σὲν is resumptive of all the considerations and appeals for loyalty in chap. i.

τὰ κρατεῖ: See note on 1 Tim. i. 2.

ἀναθεματίζεσθαι κ. τ. λ.: The thought is resumed from i. 8, 9, and expanded in vv. 3-13. The closest parallel is that in Eph. vi. 10, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι κ. τ. λ. See note on 1 Tim. i. 12 and ref., esp. Rom. iv. 20, Phil. iv. 13. Although the verb is passive, as indicated in the R.V., those who are, or who are exhort to be, strengthened are not merely passive recipients of an influence from without. The act of reception involves man's co-operation with God.

τὸ γὰρ κ. τ. λ.: The two passages, 2 Cor. xii. 9, and Eph. vi. 10, alluded to in the last note, explain this. Grace here has its simplest theological meaning, as the divine help, the unmerited gift of assistance that comes from God.

Ver. 2. St. Paul is here contemplating an apostolical succession in respect of teaching rather than of administration. It is natural that in the circumstances of the primitive Church the building up of converts in the faith should have occupied a larger place in the Christian consciousness than the functions of an official ministry; but the historical continuity of the ministry of order is of course involved in the direction here. St. Paul would have been surprised if any other conclusion had been drawn from his words. In any case, the Providence of God sees further than do His servants.

δὲ καὶ σὰρξ κ. τ. λ.: See note on i. 12.

Βία τολμών μαρτύρων: not per multis testes (Vulg.), but coram multis testibus (Tert. de Praescript. 25). The usual Greek for "in the presence of witnesses" is ἐν μαρτύρων; but διὰ τῶν μαρτύρων is quoted from Plutarch (see Field, in loc.).

The διὰ is that of accompanying circumstances. The reference is to a solemn traditio of the essentials of the faith on the occasion of Timothy's ordination, rather than his baptism. The former reference seems clear from the parallel drawn between St. Paul's commission of the faith to Timothy and Timothy's committal of it to others. On the other hand, a comparison of 1 Tim. vi. 12 favours the view that this refers to a formal public instruction at baptism. Reasons have been already suggested against the identification of the laying-on of hands of 1 Tim. iv. 14 with that of 2 Tim. i. 6. Otherwise it would be natural to suppose that the many witnesses were the members of the presbytery who were joined with St. Paul in the ordination of Timothy. But there is no reason why the reference should be thus restricted. The action was a public one, "in the face of the Church". So Chrys., "Thou hast not heard in secret, nor apart, but in the presence of many, with all openness of speech". The view of Clem. Alex.
3. *Συνηκακαπαθήσον* ὁ χάλας ἵππος άτρατης
4. οὐδέπερ ἵπποκαμπάμενος ἐμβλέπεται ταῖς τοῦ Μωτίου ἤπειρος
5. δὲ ἤπειρος ἵππος
d Φωτιαίας Μαρίνιος
καὶ ἢ ἵππος, ὁ ἵππος άτρατης ἐν μήνῃ, γεννημένος ἢ ἴππος, ἢ ἢπειρος ἤπειρος
τῶν κοπτῶν ἔχοντι καὶ πρῶτον τῶν καρπῶν, μεταλαμβάνειν.

**Ver. 1.** εὐδίκτερα κατακελεύσας. See note on 1 Tim. 18.
**Ver. 2.** ἔντεκα: See note on 1 Tim. 18.
**Ver. 3.** ἔντεκα: See note on 1 Tim. 18.

(Hypot. vii. ed. Potter, ii. p. 1015) that the ἔντεκα μαρτυρίες mean testimonies from the Law and the Prophets is only a curiosity of exegesis.

**Ver. 7.** ἔντεκα: See note on 1 Tim. 18.
**Ver. 6.** ἔντεκα: See note on 1 Tim. 18.

**Ver. 5.** The sequence of images here—the soldier, the athlete, the field-labourer—affords an interesting illustration of repetition due to association of ideas. The soldier and the field-labourer are combined in 1 Cor. ix. 7-10; the athlete appears in 1 Cor. ix. 24 sqq. And the present passage has light thrown upon it from the earlier epistle, in which the various figures are more fully developed.

The connexion between the thought of the soldier and the athlete lies in the word νομίμους (see note on 1 Tim. 1: 8); and the exact force of νομίμους will appear from a reference to 1 Cor. ix. 25, “Every man that striveth in the games is temperate in all things.” No one can be said to comply with the rules of the contest who has not undergone the usual preliminary training. One illustration from those cited by Wetstein will suffice, that from Galen, comm. in Hippocr. i. 15: οἱ γυμνάσται καὶ οἱ νομίμους ἀθλοῦσι, ἕπτα μὲν τοῦ ἄθλου τοῦ ἄθλου μόνον ἀθλοῦσιν, ἕπτα δὲ τοῦ καλλίτου τὸ χρόνος.

**Ver. 3.** συνηκακαπαθήσον: Take thy part in suffering hardship (R.V.m.). This general reference is better than to supply μαρτυρίαν, as R.V. See note on i. 8. ἱππατης: cf. συνηκακαπαθήσον, Phil. ii. 25, Phil. iv. 2.

**Ver. 4.** στρατευμένος: millitians Deo (Vulg.). Soldier, in the sense of a person belonging to the army, not soldier on service, as R.V., which makes the same error in Luke iii. 14 marg. (See Expositor, vii. vii. 120).

**Ver. 5.** σύμβλησα: implicit is (Vulg.). The verb is used in a similar metaphor, 2 Pet. ii. 20, but in a more adverse sense than here. A soldier, who is bound to go anywhere and do any thing at the bidding of his captain, must have no ties of home or business. The implied counsel is the same as that given in 1 Cor. viii. 31-34, with its warnings against distraction between the possibly conflicting interests of the Lord and of this life. Note the use of ἰππατήσεως in 1 Cor. vii. 32-34.

**Ver. 6.** The difficulty in this verse is that the principle here laid down seems to be employed in 1 Cor. ix. 7, 9, as an argument from analogy in support of the liberty of Christian ministers to enjoy some temporal profit from their spiritual labours; whereas here St. Paul is urging a temper of other-worldliness. It is sufficient to say that there is no practical inconsistency between the two passages; “each man hath his own gift from God, one after this manner, and another after that.” There is a time to insist on one’s liberty to “use the world,” and there is a time to warn ourselves and others that self-repression is necessary to keep ourselves from “using it to the full.” The main connexion here lies in the word κοινωνία, which is emphatic; while ἰππατήσεως,
which is also emphatic, expresses in the illustration from the γεωργός the idea corresponding to τῷ στρατ. ἄρσην, and to στεφανοῦσαι in the others respectively. The labourer receives his hire, no matter how poor the crop may be: his wages are the first charge on the field. Cf. γη... τοῦ γεωργοῦ ἐκπέμπειν... τῷ κόσμῳ (Heb. vi. 7); his reward is sure, but then he must really labour. "The fruits are the reward of faithful labour in the Lord's vineyard, the "well done!" heard from the Captain's lips, "the crown of glory that faeth not away". We must not press all the details of an allegory.

Ver. 7. δέ ἐν λέγω: Intellige quae dico (Vulg.), Grasp the meaning, cautionary and encouraging, of these three similes. The labourer receives his hire, no matter how poor the crop may be: his wages are the first charge on the field. Cf. "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say" (1 Cor. x. 15), and the use of the verb in 1 Tim. i. 7.

ἀδίκον, κ.τ.λ.: If you have not sufficient wisdom to follow my argument, "ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally" (Jas.i.5).

μημονένευ τοῦ γεωργοῦ—Δανίη: These words form rather the conclusion of the preceding paragraph than the beginning of a new one. St. Paul in pressing home his lesson, passes from figures of speech to the great concrete example of suffering followed by glory. And as he has, immediately before, been laying stress on the certainty of reward, he gives a prominent place to ἐγγερμένων ἐκ νεκρῶν. Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, "Himself man" (1 Tim. ii. 5), is the ideal soldier, athlete, and field-labourer; yet One who can be an example to us. It is not the resurrection as a doctrinal fact (A.V.) that St. Paul has in mind, but the resurrection as a personal experience of Jesus Christ, the reward He received, His being "crowned with glory and honour, because of the suffering of death" (Heb. ii. 9). It is not τῶν ἴσων καὶ τῆς ἀνάστασεως (Acts xviii. 19), but ἴσων ἐγγερμένων, the perfect (as in 1 Cor. xv. 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20) preserving the notion of the permanent significance of that personal experience of Jesus. In the other passage, Rom. i. 3, in which St. Paul distinctly alludes to our Lord's human ancestry, the phrase τοῦ γεωργοῦ ἐκ στεφανοῦσαι has a directly historical and polemical intention, as expressing and emphasising the human nature of Christ in antithesis to His Divinity. Here ἐν σφέρα... Δ. merely expresses the fact of His humanity. We cannot affirm with certainty that the phrase has the Messianic import that Son of David has in the Gospels.

κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγελιαν μου: The Gospel preached by me. See ref., and τῷ εὐ. τὸ εὐαγγελισθην ἐν ἑμῶν (Gal. i.11; 1 Cor. xv. 1), which of course is identical in substance with τῷ εὐ. τὸ ἐνεργείην ἔγω (1 Tim. i. 11). The verity both of Christ's humanity and of His resurrection was emphasised in the Gospel preached by St. Paul. This is brought out by the punctuation of R.V.

Ver. 9. ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ: in which sphere of action, cf. Rom. i. 9, 2 Cor. x. 14, Phil. iv. 2. The connexion seems to be that St. Paul is now indicating that he himself, in his degree, is an imitator of Jesus Christ.

ἡ δικαιονομία (see ref.): malefactor (R.V.). Estil doer (A.V.) does not so vividly express the notion of criminality implied in the word. Ramsay notes that the use of this word here marks "exactly the tone of the Neronian period, and... refers expressly to the flagitia, for which the Christians were condemned under Nero, and for which they were no longer condemned in A.D. 112" (Church in the Roman Empire, p. 249). Compare 1 Pet. iv. 15.

ἀλλὰ—οὐ διδάσκαλος: We have the same contrast between the apostle's own restricted liberty and the unconfinable range of the Gospel in Phil. i. 12, 14, and 2 Tim. iv. 17. There is no reference, as
Chrys. supposes, to the liberty permitted to St. Paul to preach the kingdom of God in his prison, as during the first imprisonment (Acts xxviii. 30, 31). The clause here is a natural reflective parenthetical remark.

Ver. 10. διὰ τῶν: The knowledge that others had been, and were being, saved through his ministry was regarded by St. Paul as no small part of his reward. Thus, the Churches of Macedonia were his crown, “as well as his” “joy” (Phil. iv. 1, 1 Thess. ii. 10). He had already in sight his “crown of righteousness”. This consideration suggests that we should refer διὰ τῶν to what follows rather than to what immediately precedes (δόγμα... δόθη). So Alfr., who cites in illustration Rom. iv. 16, 2 Cor. xiii. 10, 1 Tim. i. 16, Philm. 15. On this view, we have completely displayed the conformity of Jesus Christ and of St. Paul to the conditions of success exemplified in the soldier, the athlete, and the field-labourer.

τὰντα υπομνῆν: as Love does, 1 Cor. xiii. 7. Ellicott rightly points out that Christian endurance is active, not passive: pain is felt as pain, but is recognised as having a moral and spiritual purpose.

διὰ τῶν ἐλέητων: St. Paul was much sustained by the thought that his labours and sufferings were, in the providence of God, for the benefit of others (2 Cor. i. 6, xii. 15; Eph. iii. 1, 13; Phil. ii. 17; Col. i. 24; Tit. i. 1). “The elect” are those who, in the providence of God’s grace, are selected for spiritual privileges with a view directly to the salvation of others, as well as of themselves. The absolute phrase as here is found in Matt. xxvii. 22, 23 = Mark xiii. 20, 22; 1 Cor. xii. 18 = Mark xiii. 32 = Mark xii. 37 (?). Luke xvii. 7; ἐλέηται θεοῦ in Rom. viii. 33, Col. iii. 12, Tit. i. 1; ἐλέηται ἐν Κυρίῳ in Rom. xvi. 13.

καὶ αὐτῶν: they also (as well as 1). It would be no Paradise to St. Paul “to have peace alone”. Compare also his supreme expression of selflessness in Rom. ix. 3.

Ver. 12. ἐὰν ὑπομνῆμεν καὶ συνήθωσομεν: The two verbs are coupled also in 2 Cor. vii. 3; but the actual parallel in thought is found in Rom. vi. 4, 5. It is introduced (as 1 Pet. v. 17) with Christ at our baptism (Rom. vi. 5; Col. iii. 3), which, as normally administered by immersion, symbolises our burial with Christ and our rising again with Him to newness of life (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 13). The future, συνήθωσομεν, must not be projected altogether into the resurrection life: it includes and is completed by that; and no doubt the prominent notion here is of the life to come; but here, and in Rom. vi. 8, it is implied that there is a beginning of eternal life even while we are in the flesh, viz. in that newness of life to which we are called, and for which we are enabled, in our baptism.
II.
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e Tit. iii. 1. 14 ἄρνεται ἡμᾶς: 13. εἰ ἀποτρέπομεν, ἀκείνος πιστὸς μὲν εἰρή

κος xiv. sολεῖ γὰρ ἄνωτὸν οὐ δύναται.


5. 4. 14. Ταῦτα διαμαρτυρόμενος ἐνάπτυκτον ἐν τῷ θεῷ, 3 διαμαρτυρόμενος ἐνάπτυκτον ἐν τῷ θεῷ, 3

διαμαρτυρόμενος ἐνάπτυκτον ἐν τῷ θεῷ, 3

See 1 Tim. v. 21.


καταστροφῆς τῶν

g See 1 Tim. i. 3.

h Here only, not LXX., cf. i Tim. vi. 4. i Here only, N.T. k See Pet. ii. 6 only, N.T.

1 Om. γὰρ Ν.: K, d, e, vg., syrbl., arm.

* So NFCFG, 37, 6*, 80, 238, and about thirteen other cursives, f. g. boh.,

syrbcl.-mz., arm.-ap.-Gb., Chrys., Taphyl., Amb., Palag.; Kyplov ADKL, most
cursives, d, e, vg., syrpes et hel.-ti., arm.-ap.-Treg., Chrysa., Ethal., Thdrt.,

Dam., Taphyl., Ambst., Prim.

καταστροφῆς τῶν

g See 1 Tim. i. 3.

λογομαχίας AC*, d, e, f, g, vg. 4 So Ν.:DKL.

λογομαχίας: See Matt. xxv. 34; Luke xxii. 28, 29; Acts xiv. 22; Rom. viii. 17; 2 Thess. i. 5; Rev. i. 6, 14, 4.

τὰ ἀρνητικά, κ.τ.λ.: An echo of our Lord's teaching, Matt. x. 33. See also 2 Pet. ii. 1; Jude 4. "The future conveys the ethical possibility of the action"

(El.)

Ver. 13. τὰ ἀρνητικά: It is reasonable to hold that the sense of ἀρνητικά in this place must be determined by the antithesis of πιστὸς μὲν. Now πιστὸς, as applied to God, must mean faithful (Deut. vii. 9); one who "keepeth truth for ever" (Ps. cxlvii. 6; 2 Cor. i. 18; i Thess. v. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 3; Heb. x. 23; xi. 3). There is the same contrast in Rom. iii. 3. "Shall their want of faith (ἀρνητικά) make of none effect the faithfulness (πιστὸς τοῦ) of God?" But while we render ἀρνητικά, with R.V., are faithless, we must remember that unreliability and disbelief in the truth were closely allied in St. Paul's conception of them.

ἀρνητικά: being essentially the unchanging Truth, He cannot be false to His own nature, as we, when ἀρνητικά, are false to our better nature which has affinity with the Eternal. A lie in word, or unfaithfulness in act, is confessedly only an expedient to meet a temporary difficulty; it involves a disregard of the permanent element in our personality. The more a man realises the transitory nature of created things, and his own kinship with the Eternal, the more unnatural and unnecessary does falsity in word or deed appear to him. It is therefore inconceivable that God should lie (Num. xxiii. 19; 1 Sam. ii. 29; Rom. x. 19; Tit. i. 2; Heb. vi. 18). The application of the clause here is not that "He will not break faith with us" (Alf.), but that the consideration of our powerlessness to affect the constancy

of God our Father should brace us up to exhibit moral courage, as being His "true children".

Vv. 14-26. Discourage the new false teaching by stinging it with the example. There is no need, however, that you should despair of the Church. It is founded upon a rock, in spite of appearances. Take a broad view of the case: the Church is not the special apartment of the Master from which things unseenly are banished; it is a great House with places and utensils for every need of life. This great House differs from those of earth in that provision is made for the promotion of the utensils from the basest use to the Master's personal service.

Ver. 14. τὰ ἀρνητικά: An echo of our Lord's teaching, Matt. x. 33. See also 2 Pet. ii. 1; Jude 4. "The future conveys the ethical possibility of the action"

(El.)

Ver. 13. τὰ ἀρνητικά: It is reasonable to hold that the sense of ἀρνητικά in this place must be determined by the antithesis of πιστὸς μὲν. Now πιστὸς, as applied to God, must mean faithful (Deut. vii. 9); one who "keepeth truth for ever" (Ps. cxlvii. 6; 2 Cor. i. 18; i Thess. v. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 3; Heb. x. 23; xi. 3). There is the same contrast in Rom. iii. 3. "Shall their want of faith (ἀρνητικά) make of none effect the faithfulness (πιστὸς τοῦ) of God?" But while we render ἀρνητικά, with R.V., are faithless, we must remember that unreliability and disbelief in the truth were closely allied in St. Paul's conception of them.

ἀρνητικά: being essentially the unchanging Truth, He cannot be false to His own nature, as we, when ἀρνητικά, are false to our better nature which has affinity with the Eternal. A lie in word, or unfaithfulness in act, is confessedly only an expedient to meet a temporary difficulty; it involves a disregard of the permanent element in our personality. The more a man realises the transitory nature of created things, and his own kinship with the Eternal, the more unnatural and unnecessary does falsity in word or deed appear to him. It is therefore inconceivable that God should lie (Num. xxiii. 19; 1 Sam. ii. 29; Rom. x. 19; Tit. i. 2; Heb. vi. 18). The application of the clause here is not that "He will not break faith with us" (Alf.), but that the consideration of our powerlessness to affect the constancy

of God our Father should brace us up to exhibit moral courage, as being His "true children".

Vv. 14-26. Discourage the new false teaching by stinging it with the example. There is no need, however, that you should despair of the Church. It is founded upon a rock, in spite of appearances. Take a broad view of the case: the Church is not the special apartment of the Master from which things unseenly are banished; it is a great House with places and utensils for every need of life. This great House differs from those of earth in that provision is made for the promotion of the utensils from the basest use to the Master's personal service.

Ver. 14. τὰ ἀρνητικά: An echo of our Lord's teaching, Matt. x. 33. See also 2 Pet. ii. 1; Jude 4. "The future conveys the ethical possibility of the action"

(El.)
between καθαρόν and ὁλιγοδομος in 2 Cor. xiii. 10.

It should be added that ἐκκόσμιον is connected closely with λογοφάγειν (or λογομάχεις) by Cyr. Alex., Clem. Alex., and the Bohairic version. The Clementine Vulg. renders unambiguously, ad nihil enim utile est; so B.G. and vdp. In addition to the weight of adverse textual evidence against the reading λογομάχεις, it is open to the objections that TO.VTO,— 8€o«, disconnected with what follows, is a feeble sentence; and that ἑλκύρομαι and διαμερτύρομαι in Paul are always followed and completed by an exhortation, e.g., Eph. iv. 17; 1 Tim. v. 22; 2 Tim. iv. 1.

Ver. 15. σουδασιαν: Give diligence to present thyself (as well as thy work) to God, approved.

ἀσταλαυχτόν: Chrys. takes this to mean a workman that does not scorn to put his hand to anything; but it is better explained as a workman who has no cause for shame when his work is being inspected. In any case, the word must be so explained as to qualify ἐμπρός naturally; and therefore it cannot be interpreted by a reference to i. 8 (mὴ ἑναπεκολυφόμενον), of the shame that may deter a man from confessing Christ.

δρομοτύμων: δρομοτύμω is found in reff. as the translation of ἀνά (Fiel) direct, make straight, make plain. "He shall direct thy paths," "The righteousness of the perfect shall direct his way."

This use of the word suggests that the metaphor passes from the general idea of a workman to the particular notion of the minister as one who "makes straight paths" (τραγίας ὁδοὺς) for the feet of his people to tread in (Heb. xii. 13). The word of truth is "The Way" (Acts ix. 2, etc.). Theodoret explains it of a ploughman who drives a straight furrow. Similarly R.V. m. (1). Holding a straight course in the word of truth. Chrys., of cutting away what is spurious or bad. Alf. follows Huther in supposing that the idea of cutting has passed out of this word, as it has out of καυσοματιν, and renders, rightly administering, as opposed to "adulterating the word of God" (2 Cor. ii. 17). Other examples of words which have wholly lost their derivational meaning are πρόβατος and σκόνουσθαι. The imagery underlying the A.V., R.V.m. (2), rightly dividing, is either that of the correct cutting up of a Levitical vic (Beza), or a father (Calvin), or steward (Vitringa), cutting portions for the food of the household. The R.V., handing right, follows the Vulg., recte tractantem, and gives the general sense well enough. The use of ἐργοθεία in the sense of orthodoxy, in Clem. Al. Strom. vii. xvi., and Eus. H. E. iv. 3, is probably based on this passage.

Ver. 16. καυσοματις: See on 1 Tim. vi. 20. Here, as Bengel suggests, καυσοματις is contrasted with ἀληθείας, ἐνωμικος with λόγον.

περιστηρισμος: shun, devita, "Give them a wide berth" (Flummer), also in Tit. iii. 9. In these places περιστηρισμος has the same meaning as ἑπτρέπωναι, 1 Tim. vi. 20. In fact Ell. cites from Lucian, Hermot. § 86, ἑπτρέπομαι καὶ περιστήρισμοι, where the two verbs are evidently used as indifferent alternatives. Where περιστηρισμος elsewhere occurs (N.T.), viz., John xi. 42, Acts xxv. 7, it means "to stand around."

ἐπὶ πλείον, κ.τ.λ.: Those who utter "babblings" (subject of ἑρπόμενον) are not, as is sometimes supposed, merely negatively useless; they are positively and increasingly mischievous. In iii. 9, ὅπως ἐρπόμενοι ἐπὶ πλείον, the situation is different. When a man's ἐνεμα has become manifest to all, he has lost his power to do mischief to others; on the other hand there is no limit to the deterioration of "evil men and impostors" in themselves, περιστηρισμος ἐπὶ το χθεῖον (iii. 13).

ἀναβελέας: genitive after ἐπὶ πλείον.

The commentators compare Joseph. Bell. Ἰουδ. vi. 2, 3. προσκοινων ἐν τοιούτων
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i Tim. vi. 19 that in the two places in which θυμίαμα occurs in the Pastorals, there is a condensation of expression resulting in a confusion of metaphor. Here the apostle passes rapidly from the notion of the Church collectively as a foundation, or a building well founded, to that of the men and women of whom it is composed, and who have been sealed by God (see ref. and also Ezek. ix. 4; John vi. 27; 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30; Rev. vii. 3, 4, 5-8). They are marked by God so as to be recognised by Him as His; and this mark also serves as a perpetual reminder to them that "they are not their own," and of their consequent obligation to holiness of life (1 Cor. vi. 19, 20). There is no allusion to the practice of carving inscriptions over doors and on pillars and foundation stones (Deut. vi. 9, xi. 20; Rev. xxi. 14). The one seal bears two inscriptions, two mutually complementary parts or aspects: (a) The objective fact of God's superintending knowledge of His chosen; (b) the recognition by the consciousness of each individual of the relation in which he stands to God, with its imperative call to holiness.

Ver. 20. Although the notional Church, the corpus Christi verum, is unaffected by the vacillation and disloyalty of its members, nevertheless (θαῦμα) the Church as we experience it contains many unworthy persons, the recognition of whom as members of the Church is a trial to faith. The notional Church is best figured as a foundation, which is out of sight. But the idea of the superstructure must be added in order to shadow forth the Church as it meets the eye. It is a house, a Great House too, the House of God (1 Tim. iii. 15), and therefore containing a great variety of kinds and quality of furniture and utensils. On οἶκος, a whole house, as distinguished from οἶκος, which might mean a set of rooms only, a dwelling, see Moulton in Expositor, vi., vii. 117. There are two thoughts in the apostle's mind, thoughts which logically are conflicting, but which balance each other in practice. These are: (1) the reality of the ideal Church, and (2) the providential ordering of the actual Church. Until the drag-net is full, and drawn up on the beach, the bad fish in it cannot be cast away (Matt. xiii. 47, 48). This is the view of the passage taken by the Latin expositors, e.g., Cyprian, Ep. iv. 25. The explanation of the Greek commentators, that by the "great house" is meant the world at large, is out of harmony with the context. It is to be observed that St. Paul expresses here a milder and more hopeful view of the unworthy elements in the Church than he does in the parallel passage in Rom. ix. 21, 22. There "the vessels unto dishonour" are "vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction". Here they are all at least in the Great House, and all for some use, even if for less honourable purposes than those served by the vessels of gold and silver; and the next verse suggests that it is perhaps possible for that which had been a "vessel unto dishonour" to become fit for honourable use in the Master's personal service. We are reminded of the various qualities of superstructure mentioned in 1 Cor. iii. 12, "gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay,
stubble". See also Wisd. xv. 7. Field, Notes, in loc., suggests that δεσποτής here is best rendered the owner. See notes on 1 Tim. iii. 15 and vi. 1.  

Ver. 21. St. Paul drops the metaphor. The general meaning is clear enough, that a man may become "heaven's consummate cup," σκέπης ἀκρούντων (Acts ix. 15), if he "mistake not his end, to slake the thirst of God". When we endue the vessels with consciousness, it is seen that they may "rise on stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things". The τις has been, it is implied, among the "vessels unto dishonour". "Paul was an earthen vessel, and became an earthen one" (Chrys.). Bengel supposes that the δια τις is an exhortation to Timothy himself. This is suggested in R.V. of ver. 22, "But flee," etc. The reference in τοῦτων is not quite clear. It is best perhaps to except of the multitude of teachers themselves, "vessels unto dishonour," rather than of their teaching or immoral characteristics, though of course this is implied. The thoroughness of the separation from the corrupting environment of evil company is expressed by the διά and ἀπείρω. Where δικαίωθη occurs again, 1 Cor. v. 7, the metaphor (leaven) also refers to the removal of a corrupting personal element. There the person is to be expelled; here the persons are to be forsaken. ἐγγισθηκέναι is the equivalent in actual experience of the simile σκέπης τῶν τιμών, as εἰς ταῖς ἀκρούντων τῆς ἀνθρώπων. Compare 1 Cor. vi. 11. "And such were some of you: but ye were washed [lit. washed yourselves], but ye were sanctified" (ἡγίασθητοί). ἔγιασθηκέναι: "Even though he do not do it, he is fit for it, and has a capacity for it" (Chrys.). Cf. Eph. ii. 10, κατακλίσεις... "εἰς ἑργος ἀγαθὸν τῷ θεῷ ἐκ τοῦ ἁμαρτίαν..." τοῦ ἔργου αὐτοῦ τῆς κατακλίσεως, and ref.  

Ver. 22. ... εἰς τοὺς ἄστατους. "Every inordinate desire is a youthful lust. Let the aged learn that they ought not to do the deeds of the youthful". (Chrys.). This is sound exegesis; yet it is reasonable to suppose that Timothy was still of an age to need the warning in its natural sense. See 1 Tim. iv. 12. He has just been cautioned against errors of the intellect; he must be warned also (διὰ) against vices of the blood. 

εἰς τοὺς ἄστατους. See note on 1 Tim. vi. 11. εἰς τοὺς ἄστατους: to be joined closely with the following words, cf. Heb. xii. 14. While avoiding the company of evil men, he is to cultivate friendly relations with those who are sincere worshippers of the same God as himself. εἰς τοῦτον ἄνθρωπον τοῦ Κόσμου, i.e., Christ, is almost a technical term for Christians. See ref. It comes ultimately from Joel ii. 32 (iii. 5). 

ἐκ καθαράς καρδίας is emphatic. See Tit. i. 15, 16.  

Ver. 23. ἀναιδεύοντες: ignorant. An ignorant question is one that arises from a misunderstanding of the matter in dispute. Misunderstandings are a fruitful source of strife. Cf. 1 Tim. vi. 4. 

παρατίθεν: refuse, i.e., Such questions will be brought before you: refuse to discuss them. The A.V., avoid might mean merely, Evade the necessity of meeting them. 

γενέσθαι: There is no other instance of the metaphorical use of this word in the N.T. μέτα: in the weaker sense of contention, quarrel, as in 2 Cor. vii. 5, Tit. iii. 9; but not Jas. iv. 1.
Ver. 24. δοῦλον ὑπὸ Κυρίου: here is used in its special application to the ministers of the Church. On the general teaching, see 1 Thess. ii. 7, 1 Tim. iii. 3, Tit. iii. 2. 1

Ver. 25. τῶν ἀντιδιατιθέμενων: They who err from right thinking are to be dealt with as tenderly and considerately as they who err from right living. Cf. Gal. vi. 1, καταρείζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτησος. See also chap. iv. 2, and reff. Field takes αντιδιατίθεσθαι as equivalent to ἀντίθεσθαι διατίθεσθαι, "to be contrariwise or adversely affected". Similarly Ambrosiaster, eos qui diversa consentiunt. Field notes that "the other only example of the compound verb is to be found in Longinus περὶ ἐφών, xvii. 1". The A.V. and R.V. take the word here as middle, them that oppose themselves, eos qui resistunt [veritati] (Vulg.). von Soden finds in this word the key to the meaning of ἃντιθεται, 1 Tim. vi. 20.


Ver. 26. ἀνασφαλέως is to be connected with εἰς τὸ ἑκεῖνον δόλημα. Compare ἐκάθισε δικαίως, 1 Cor. xv. 34. ἑκαίων then refers to ὑπὸ κυρίου, and δόλημα will have its usual force as the Will of God (see 1 Pet. iv. 2): That the who had been taken captive by the devil may recover themselves (respicient, Vulg.) out of his snare, so as to serve the will of God. This is Beza's explanation and that of von Soden (nearly), who compares αἰχμαλωτιζόμενος, 2 Cor. x. 5. It has the advantage of giving a natural reference to αὐτὸν and ἑκαίων respectively, which are employed accurately in iii. 9. The paradoxical use of ἔξωθημι in Luke v. 10 must not be taken as determining the use of the word elsewhere. Of the other explanations, that of the A.V. and Vulg., which supposes an inelegant but not impossible reference of both αὐτὸν and ἑκαίων to τοῦ διαβόλου, is preferable to the R.V., following Wetstein and Bengel, which refers αὐτὸν back to δοῦλον ὑπὸ Κυρίου, and dissociates ἔξωθημιν from παγίδος, with which it is naturally connected. The reference of αὐτὸν and ἑκαίων to the same subject, as given in the A.V., is paralleled by Wied. i. 16, συνήθην θετον πρὸς αὐτὸν, ὅτι ἂν ἠκούσω τὴν ἑκαίων μερίδος ἐλναί. Chapter III.—Vv. 1-9. Evil times are upon us; we have indeed amongst us specimens of the perennial impostor, worthy successors of Jannes and Jambres. The shortlived nature of their success, will be, however, patent to all. Ver. 1. ἐπὶ ἠχαίταις ἡμέραις ἀνασφαλέως: Although St. Paul had abandoned his once confident expectation that the Lord would come again during his own lifetime, it is plain that here, as in 1 Tim. iv. 1, he regards the time now present as part of the last days. See ἀνασφαλέως ... ἐκαίων ἐκδόντως, vv. 5, 6. The prophetic formula of the sentence is a
rhetorical way of saying that things are going from bad to worse. The same account is to be given of 2 Pet. iii. 3; Jude 18. St. John says plainly, "It is the last hour" (1 John ii. 18). See note on 1 Tim. iv. 1.

Ver. 2. oiiavSpwiroi: mankind in general, not oi avpoioi. This list of human vices should be compared with that given in Rom. i. 29 sqq.; δαλαγμος, υπερήφανος, γονευσιν αντειδυς, αστοργοι are common to both passages. φιλαντροποι appropriately heads the array, egoism or self-centredness being the root of almost every sin; just as love which "seeketh not its own" (1 Cor. xiii. 5) is "the fulfilment of the law" (Rom. xiii. 10). φιλαντροπia is used favourably by Aristotle in the sense of self-respect (Nic. Eth. ix. 8, 7). But "once the sense of sin is truly felt, self-respect becomes an indispensable basis for moral theory. So Phil. de Prof. 15 speaks of those who are φιλαντροποι ὡς μάλλον ὡς φιλόνοι" (Dean Bernard, in loc).

φιλάφρους: covetousness (πλούσιες, Rom. i. 29) naturally springs from, or is one form of, selfishness; but we cannot suppose with Chrys. that there is a similar sequence intended all through.

Other compounds of φιλαντροπoies in the Pastoral, besides the five that occur here, are φιλάγαθος, Tit. i. 8, φιλάνθρωπος, φιλάντρωπος, Tit. ii. 4, φιλάνθρωπως, Tit. iii. 4, φιλανθρωπός, Tit. iii. 3, Tit. i. 8.

δαλαγμος, υπερήφανος: elati, superbi. The δαλαγμος, boastful, betrays his character by his words; the υπερήφανος, haughty, more usually by his demeanour and expression.

βλαφίημοι: abusive, railers (R.V.); not necessarily blasphemers (A.V.).

γονευσιν αντειδυς and αστοργοι naturally go together; since, as Bengel observes, gratitude springs from filial duty.

Ver. 3. αστοργοi: without natural affection, sine affectione. This and the three preceding adjectives appear to have reference to domestic relations.

αστοργομαι: immoveable, sine pace (absque foedere, Rom. i. 31); not truce-breakers (A.V.), which would be ανιματιστος. Rom. i. 37; the αστοργοι refuses to treat with his foe at all.

αδικος: A.V. in the present passage and in Tit. ii. 3, has makebates. See note on 1 Tim. iii. 11.

απαθεια: without self-control (R.V.) rather than incontinence (A.V.). The latter word has a purely sexual reference, whereas απαθεια, as Chrys. notes, is used "with respect both to their tongue, and their appetite, and everything else". It is naturally coupled with ανημεροι, fierce, immates. "Simul et molles et duri" (Bengel).

φιλάγαθος: No lovers of good (R.V.), the good being "things true, honourable, just, pure, lovely, and of good report" (Phil. iv. 8). The positive φιλάγαθος, Tit. i. 8, has the same reference. It is a characteristic of the heavenly Wisdom (Wisd. vii. 22). The A.V. in both places narrows the reference to persons: Despisers of those that are good; A lover of good men. The Vulg. sine benignitate, benignum, does not express the active positive force of the Greek. φιλάγαθος and φιλάφρους are applied to the Emperor Antoninus in a papyrus of ii. a.d. which also uses the term φιλοκαναθία (perh. = φιλοκατακαθία) of Marcus Aurelius (Moulton and Milligan, Expositors, vii. 376).

Ver. 4. προδοται: has no special reference to persecution of Christians.

tετυφωμένοι: See note on 1 Tim. iii. 6.

Ver. 5. εχόντες (see note on 1 Tim. i.
2—8. ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ Β

Προς τιμόθεαιν την θεί δύομαν αὐτής ἠγιμένους καὶ τοῦτος ἅπας γε καὶ τοῦτος ἔτης θεοῦ γε καὶ τοῦτος (τ. 1. Cor. ii. 3, 5, iv. 10, 20, 21, 2 Thess. i. 3, Heb. vii. 18, 19). ἀληθείας ἀληθείας ἀληθείας ἀληθείας. 8. δ. τρόπον δὲ διὰ ἵνας (τ. 1. Tim. vi. 8). Ν.Τ., 4 Μακ. l. 13, etc. c Here only, N.Τ. d Luke xxii. 34, Rom. viii. 23, 2 Cor. x. 5. e Here only, not LXX. f Prov. xxv. 22, Judith xi. 11, Rom. xii. 80. g Rom. li. 4, vi. 14, 1 Cor. xii. 9, Gal. v. 18. h Tit. iii. 3. i Matt. iv. 24 (π. ἓνος) = Mark i. 34 = Luke iv. 10. k See 1 Tim. ii. 4. λ An exact parallel in Tit. i. 16, ὥστε ἤρθων ἐνδεικτικοῖς τοῖς ἐρρηκοῦσιν ἐπειδὴ, τούτω δὲ ἐργοῦσι συνεὐφράντηκαν. They were professing Christians, but nothing more; genuine Christians must also be professing Christians. The consideration removes any difficulty that may be felt by a comparison of this passage with Rom. ii. 20, where it is implied that it is a point in the Jew's favour that he has the μόρφωσις τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. The μόρφωσις, embodiment, is external in both cases, but not unreal as far as it goes. The ineffectiveness of it arises from the co-existence in the mind of him who "holds" it of some other quality that neutralises the advantage naturally derivable from the possession of the μόρφωσις in question. In this case, it was that of them whom St. Paul is speaking had a purely theoretical, academic apprehension of practical Christianity (εἰς ὑπαίτειας, see 1 Tim. ii. 2), but a positive disbelief in the Gospel as a regenerating force. Compare what St. John says of the rulers who believed on Jesus but did not confess Him (John xxi. 42, 43). They too were φιλοδέον καὶ φιλοδέον. In Romans the case is similar: the possession of an admirable moral code did not make the Jew's moral practice better than that of the Gentile (see Sanday and Headlam on Rom. ii. 20). There is therefore no necessity to suppose with Lightfoot that "the termination -ονις denotes the aiming at or affecting the μορφή" (Journal of Class. and Sacr. Philol. (1837), iii. 115).

θυσίας: the opposition between μόρφωσις and δύναμις here is the same as that between δύναμις and σφιγξ in 1 Cor. ii. 5, or λέγον, 1 Cor. iv. 19, 20, 1 Thess. i. 5; see also Heb. vii. 16. ἠγιμένου: To deny a thing or a person involves always more than an act of the mind; it means carrying the negation into practice. See on 1 Tim. v. 8. καὶ: perhaps refers back to ii. 22, 23. Ver. 6. ἐνδονότατος: who insinuate themselves into houses (which they overthrow), Tit. i. 11. "Observe how he shows his impudence in this expression, their disabused ways, their deceitfulness" (Chrys.). παραποιηθέντων (Jude 4) and παραποιηθέν (Gal. ii. 4) are similar expressions.

γνωσθείτω: Multierculas. Chrys. acutely implies that the victims of the crafty heretics were "silly women" of both sexes: "He who is easy to be deceived is a silly woman, and nothing like a man; for to be deceived is the part of silly women." St. Paul, however, refers to women only. παραποιηθέντων ἀμαρτίας: overwhelmed, rather than burdened (βαρβαρσίας) (Field). Is there any contrast implied between the diminutive, indicating the insignificance of the women, and the load of sins which they carry? De Wette (quoted by Alfr.), notes that a sin-laden conscience is easily tempted to seek the easiest method of relief.

μαρτύρια: There is no great difficulty in diverting them from the right path, for they are inconsistent even in vice. Ver. 7. πάντως μαθόντας: They have never concentrated their attention on any spiritual truth so as to have learnt it and assimilated it. They are always being attracted by "some newer thing," (τι καυτότερον (Acts xvii. 21), and thus their power of comprehension becomes atrophied.

μαρτύρια: For negatives with the participle, see Blass, Grammar, p. 255. εἰς εἰς ἱδείας: See on 1 Tim. ii. 4. Ver. 8. The apostle now returns from the γνωσθείτω to their seducers, whom he compares to the magicians who withstood Moses and Aaron, both
in their hostility to the truth and in their subsequent fate. St. Paul is the earliest extant authority for the names; but of course he derived them from some source, written (Origen), or unwritten (Theodore), it is immaterial which. But the former theory is the more probable. The book is called by Origen (in Matt. p. 916, on Matt. xxvii. 8), *Jannites et Mambres liber,* and is perhaps identical with *Panentiad* "Jannites et Mambres" condemned in the *Decretum Galasii.* Pliny, whose *Natural History* appeared a.d. 77, mentions Jannes along with Moses and Lotapis (or Jotapis) as Jewish Magi posterior to Zoroastes (Hist. Nat. xxx. 1). He is followed by Apuleius, *Apol.* c. 90. Numenius (quoted by Eusebius *Prep. Ev.* ix. 8) mentions Jannes and Jambres as magicians who resisted Moses. In the Targ. of Jonathan on Ex. vii. 11, the names are given as <Jan'8 and Jamberes; but in the Talmud as נֵבָלִים וַאֲנָשִׁים, Jehoan and Mamre. It is generally agreed that Jannes is a form of Jehoanan (Johannes), and that Jambres is from the Hiphil of וּבְלִים to rebel. For the legends associated with these names, see art. in Hastings' *D. B.*

**ἀντιτιθήμενοι:** The same word is used of Elymas the Sorcerer, Acts xii. 8. The ἀντιθέσις refers rather to the degree of their hostility than to the manner in which it was expressed, i.e., by magical arts. At the same time, it is possible that magic was practised by the false teachers; they are styled impostors, γώντες, in ver. 13; and Ephebus was a home of magic. See Acts xix. 19.

κατέφθασαν τῶν νόμων: cf. 1 Tim. vi. 5, διαφθάσαντο τῶν νόμων. This is the Pauline equivalent for the Platonic "lie in the soul"; κατεφθάνον is not coordinate with ἀδικός; the latter is the exemplification of the former.

See 1 Tim. iv. 6. *Thou didst follow* (R.V.)
is susceptible of the meaning "Thou wilt be attracted as a disciple to me on account of". It is not necessarily implied that Timothy had copied his master in all these respects. The A.V., Thou hast fully known, follows the A.V. of Luke i. 3. This translation fails to bring out the appeal to Timothy's loyalty, which underlies the passage. The word is appropriate here, because St. Paul is recalling to Timothy's recollection the definite occasion in the past when the youth cast in his lot with him. He is not thinking, as in 1 Tim. iv. 6, of "consistent discipleship up to the moment of writing. Bengel quotes aptly 2 Macc. ix. 27, παρακολουθοῦντα τῷ φίλῳ προφήτα. (So cod. Venetus: A has συνταξάται for παρακολ."

This limitation of the reference explains why St. Paul mentions only the places in which he suffered on his first missionary journey.

διασκαλέω: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

ἐνέγγυς: conduct (R.V.). The A.V., manner of life has perhaps reference to guiding principles of conduct rather than to the external expression of them, which is meant here.

τρόπος: For τρόποις in this sense of human purpose see reff. Here it means what St. Paul had set before himself as the aim of his life. In Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11, Eph. i. 11, iii. 11, 2 Tim. i. 9 the word is used of God's eternal purpose for man.

ἀνθρωπόμορφος: See on 1 Tim. vi. ix.


ὁ Πόνος διἀγγέλου: There is no necessity to supply, with Alf., "Thou sawest".

καὶ: and yet. The verse is an echo of Ps. xxxiii. (xxxiv.) 18, ὁ Κύριος . . . ὑμᾶς των θλίψεων αὐτῶν ἐκόμισεν αὐτοῖς. See also reff.

Ver. 12. This verse is an interesting example of the effect of association of ideas. St. Paul's teaching after his persecutions at Antioch, etc., had strongly emphasised this topic. St. Luke (Acts xiv. 23) actually repeats the very words used by the preachers, "Through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God". Consistency in the life in Christ must necessarily be always opposed by the world. ἔλαυντες is emphatic, as Ell. notes, "whose will is". Cf. Luke xiv. 28, John vii. 17.

εὐθυμῶν of course qualifies ὑπήρξε, as in Tit. ii. 12. There is a similar extension of thought, from self to all, in iv. 8.

Ver. 13. τοποθετεῖ: The antithesis seems to be between the apparent discomfort of those who wish to live in Christ (their persecution being after all almost a means conditional to their attaining their desire), and the paradoxical success of evil men; they advance indeed; but only in degradation; proficient in peius (Vulg.). See notes on ver. 9 and ii. 16.

γεροντες, impostors (R.V.), seductores, exactly expresses the term. γεροντες occurs 2 Macc. xii. 24, where it means trickery.
The exhortation is illustrated by 2 John 9, "τὰ δὲ προάγματα, καὶ μὴ μὴν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θεω ὅσον ἦκα.

The conservatism here enjoined concerns more especially the fundamental ethical teaching common to the Old Covenant and the New. For the idiom, see note on 1 Tim. ii. 15.

"ἐπεράτωσεν" and προάγγελον of ver. 13. The exhortation is illustrated by 2 John 9, "τὰ δὲ προάγματα, καὶ μὴ μὴν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θεω ὅσον ἦκα."

The conservatism here enjoined concerns more especially the fundamental ethical teaching common to the Old Covenant and the New. For the idiom, see note on 1 Tim. ii. 15.

"ἐπεράτωσεν" and προάγγελον of ver. 13. The exhortation is illustrated by 2 John 9, "τὰ δὲ προάγματα, καὶ μὴ μὴν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θεω ὅσον ἦκα."

The force of the peculiar phrase is that Timothy's A B C lessons had been of a sacred nature. The usual N.T. equivalent for the Holy Scriptures (A.V.) is ἀληθείας or ἡ γραφή (once γραφή άνω, Rom. i. 2); but St. Paul here deliberately uses an ambiguous term in order to express vigorously the notion that Timothy's first lessons were in Holy Scripture. τὰ ἑρεμεῖα is found in Josephus, Antiq. Proem 3 and x. 10, 4, and elsewhere. Cf. κανονιακῶς τοις ἱλατί βιβλίον (2 Macc. viii. 23). There may be also an allusion to γραμματάς of the false teachers which were not ἑρεμεῖα. See on next verse.

"εἰσερχομαι" and προάγγελον of ver. 13. The exhortation is illustrated by 2 John 9, "τὰ δὲ προάγματα, καὶ μὴ μὴν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θεω ὅσον ἦκα."

The conservatism here enjoined concerns more especially the fundamental ethical teaching common to the Old Covenant and the New. For the idiom, see note on 1 Tim. ii. 15.

The force of the peculiar phrase is that Timothy's A B C lessons had been of a sacred nature. The usual N.T. equivalent for the Holy Scriptures (A.V.) is ἀληθείας or ἡ γραφή (once γραφή άνω, Rom. i. 2); but St. Paul here deliberately uses an ambiguous term in order to express vigorously the notion that Timothy's first lessons were in Holy Scripture. τὰ ἑρεμεῖα is found in Josephus, Antiq. Proem 3 and x. 10, 4, and elsewhere. Cf. κανονιακῶς τοις ἱλατί βιβλίον (2 Macc. viii. 23). There may be also an allusion to γραμματάς of the false teachers which were not ἑρεμεῖα. See on next verse.

Ver. 15.  ἐνα παρά πρώτων ἡμῶν: It has to be remembered that St. Paul is speaking of moral, not intellectual, authority. The truths for which St. Paul is contending were commended to Timothy by the sanction of the best and noblest personalities whom he had ever known or heard of. The characters of Timothy's revered parent and teachers—of Eunice, Lois, the prophet, and Paul, to enumerate them in the order in which they had touched his life—had been moulded in a certain school of morals. Their characters had admittedly stood the test of life. What more cogent argument could Timothy have for the truth and reasonableness of their moral teaching?

Ver. 15. καὶ ὅτι: dependent on εἰσερχομαι. For the change of construction, von Soden compares Rom. ix. 22, 23; 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Timothy's knowledge of things divine was derived not merely from persons, but from sacred writings; and, perhaps, as Theophylact notes, the two points are emphasised: (a) that the persons were of no ordinary merit, and (b) that his knowledge of Scripture was conterminous with the whole of his conscious existence. He could not recall a period when he had not known sacred writings. This is the force of the hyperbolic ἐπάνω βρέφος. ἐπάνω γραμματάς: sacras litteras, sacred writings (R.V.). For this use of γραμμάτα see John vii. 15, and Moultoun and Milligan, Expositor, viii. 383. The force of this peculiar phrase is that Timothy's A B C lessons had been of a sacred nature. The usual N.T. equivalent for the Holy Scriptures (A.V.) is ἀληθείας or ἡ γραφή (once γραφή άνω, Rom. i. 2); but St. Paul here deliberately uses an ambiguous term in order to express vigorously the notion that Timothy's first lessons were in Holy Scripture. τὰ ἑρεμεῖα is found in Josephus, Antiq. Proem 3 and x. 10, 4, and elsewhere. Cf. κανονιακῶς τοις ἱλατί βιβλίον (2 Macc. viii. 23). There may be also an allusion to γραμματάς of the false teachers which were not ἑρεμεῖα. See on next verse.

Ver. 15. καὶ ὅτι: dependent on εἰσερχομαι. For the change of construction, von Soden compares Rom. ix. 22, 23; 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Timothy's knowledge of things divine was derived not merely from persons, but from sacred writings; and, perhaps, as Theophylact notes, the two points are emphasised: (a) that the persons were of no ordinary merit, and (b) that his knowledge of Scripture was conterminous with the whole of his conscious existence. He could not recall a period when he had not known sacred writings. This is the force of the hyperbolic ἐπάνω βρέφος. ἐπάνω γραμματάς: sacras litteras, sacred writings (R.V.). For this use of γραμμάτα see John vii. 15, and Moultoun and Milligan, Expositor, viii. 383. The force of this peculiar phrase is that Timothy's A B C lessons had been of a sacred nature. The usual N.T. equivalent for the Holy Scriptures (A.V.) is ἀληθείας or ἡ γραφή (once γραφή άνω, Rom. i. 2); but St. Paul here deliberately uses an ambiguous term in order to express vigorously the notion that Timothy's first lessons were in Holy Scripture. τὰ ἑρεμεῖα is found in Josephus, Antiq. Proem 3 and x. 10, 4, and elsewhere. Cf. κανονιακῶς τοις ἱλατί βιβλίον (2 Macc. viii. 23). There may be also an allusion to γραμματάς of the false teachers which were not ἑρεμεῖα. See on next verse.

Ver. 15. καὶ ὅτι: dependent on εἰσερχομαι. For the change of construction, von Soden compares Rom. ix. 22, 23; 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Timothy's knowledge of things divine was derived not merely from persons, but from sacred writings; and, perhaps, as Theophylact notes, the two points are emphasised: (a) that the persons were of no ordinary merit, and (b) that his knowledge of Scripture was conterminous with the whole of his conscious existence. He could not recall a period when he had not known sacred writings. This is the force of the hyperbolic ἐπάνω βρέφος. ἐπάνω γραμματάς: sacras litteras, sacred writings (R.V.). For this use of γραμμάτα see John vii. 15, and Moultoun and Milligan, Expositor, viii. 383. The force of this peculiar phrase is that Timothy's A B C lessons had been of a sacred nature. The usual N.T. equivalent for the Holy Scriptures (A.V.) is ἀληθείας or ἡ γραφή (once γραφή άνω, Rom. i. 2); but St. Paul here deliberately uses an ambiguous term in order to express vigorously the notion that Timothy's first lessons were in Holy Scripture. τὰ ἑρεμεῖα is found in Josephus, Antiq. Proem 3 and x. 10, 4, and elsewhere. Cf. κανονιακῶς τοις ἱλατί βιβλίον (2 Macc. viii. 23). There may be also an allusion to γραμματάς of the false teachers which were not ἑρεμεῖα. See on next verse.

Ver. 15. καὶ ὅτι: dependent on εἰσερχομαι. For the change of construction, von Soden compares Rom. ix. 22, 23; 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Timothy's knowledge of things divine was derived not merely from persons, but from sacred writings; and, perhaps, as Theophylact notes, the two points are emphasised: (a) that the persons were of no ordinary merit, and (b) that his knowledge of Scripture was conterminous with the whole of his conscious existence. He could not recall a period when he had not known sacred writings. This is the force of the hyperbolic ἐπάνω βρέφος. ἐπάνω γραμματάς: sacras litteras, sacred writings (R.V.). For this use of γραμμάτα see John vii. 15, and Moultoun and Milligan, Expositor, viii. 383. The force of this peculiar phrase is that Timothy's A B C lessons had been of a sacred nature. The usual N.T. equivalent for the Holy Scriptures (A.V.) is ἀληθείας or ἡ γραφή (once γραφή άνω, Rom. i. 2); but St. Paul here deliberately uses an ambiguous term in order to express vigorously the notion that Timothy's first lessons were in Holy Scripture. τὰ ἑρεμεῖα is found in Josephus, Antiq. Proem 3 and x. 10, 4, and elsewhere. Cf. κανονιακῶς τοις ἱλατί βιβλίον (2 Macc. viii. 23). There may be also an allusion to γραμματάς of the false teachers which were not ἑρεμεῖα. See on next verse.
is best taken as a repetition and expansion of that which has just preceded: ὅπως γραφᾶται, κ.τ.λ., to Ἴδη, and γραφέω, κ.τ.λ., to συνήθεια, κ.τ.λ.: Every writing which is inspired by God is also profitable. γραφῆς of course has exclusive reference to the definite collection of writings which St. Paul usually designates as ἡ γραφή or αἱ γραφαί; but it is used here in a partitive, not in a collective sense. A parallel case is John xix. 36, 37, ἡ γραφὴ . . . ἐτέρα γραφὴ. Hence the rendering writing or passage is less free from ambiguity than scripture (R.V.). The nearest parallel to this ascensive use of καὶ, as Ellicott terms it, is Gal. iv. 7, καὶ ὅπως, καὶ κληρονόμος. See also Luke i. 35, Acts xxvi. 26, xxviii. 28, Rom. viii. 29.

omite: If there is any polemical force in this adj., it is in reference to heretical writings, the contents of which were merely intellectual, not edifying. In any case, the greatest stress is laid on ᾠδικός. St. Paul would imply that the best test of a γραφὴ being ὅπως γραφᾶται would be its proved serviceableness for the mental and spiritual needs of man. See Rom. xv. 4, 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. This, the R.V. explanation of the passage, is that given by Origen, Chrys., Thdrt., syryr., the Clementine Vulg., Omnis scriptura divinæ inspirata utiliss est ad docendum etc. [The true Vulg. text, however, is insp. div. et utilis ad doc.] The other view (A.V., R.V.m.), which takes καὶ as a simple copula, Every Scripture is inspired and profitable, is open to the objection that neither in the antecedent nor in the following context is there any suggestion that the inspiration of Scripture was being called in question; the theme of the passage being the moral equipment of the man of God. For this view are cited Greg. Naz., Ath. It is to be added that it is possible to render πᾶσα γραφὴ, the whole of Scripture, on the analogy of Matt. ii. 3, πᾶν ἱερόσωλον (Eph. ii. 21 cannot be safely adduced as a case in point); but it is unnecessary and unnatural.

is best taken as a repetition and expansion of that which has just preceded: ὅπως γραφᾶται, κ.τ.λ., to Ἴδη, and γραφέω, κ.τ.λ., to συνήθεια, κ.τ.λ.: Every writing which is inspired by God is also profitable. γραφῆς of course has exclusive reference to the definite collection of writings which St. Paul usually designates as ἡ γραφή or αἱ γραφαί; but it is used here in a partitive, not in a collective sense. A parallel case is John xix. 36, 37, ἡ γραφὴ . . . ἐτέρα γραφὴ. Hence the rendering writing or passage is less free from ambiguity than scripture (R.V.). The nearest parallel to this ascensive use of καὶ, as Ellicott terms it, is Gal. iv. 7, καὶ ὅπως, καὶ κληρονόμος. See also Luke i. 35, Acts xxvi. 26, xxviii. 28, Rom. viii. 29.

Verse 17. δικαιοσύνη: a ῥαβδια which is exercised in righteousness. Compare the dissertation on the ῥαβδα Κυρίου, Heb. xii. 5 sqq. ῥαβδα in reff. is used in relation to children only.

Ver. 17. δικαιοσύνη: a ῥαβδια which is exercised in righteousness. Compare the dissertation on the ῥαβδα Κυρίου, Heb. xii. 5 sqq. ῥαβδα in reff. is used in relation to children only.

Verse 17. δικαιοσύνη: a ῥαβδια which is exercised in righteousness. Compare the dissertation on the ῥαβδα Κυρίου, Heb. xii. 5 sqq. ῥαβδα in reff. is used in relation to children only.

Verse 17. δικαιοσύνη: a ῥαβδια which is exercised in righteousness. Compare the dissertation on the ῥαβδα Κυρίου, Heb. xii. 5 sqq. ῥαβδα in reff. is used in relation to children only.

**Chapter IV.**—Vv. 1-5. I solemnly charge you, in view of the coming judgment, to be zealous in the exercise of your ministry while the opportunity lasts, while people are willing to listen to your admonitions. Soon the craze for novelty will draw men away from sober truth to fantastic figments. Do you stand your ground. Fill the place which my death will leave vacant. My course is run, my crown is awaiting me. "My crown" did
IV.

**See 1 Tim.**

to μελλόντος κρίνειν

1 ἱεροσολύμου·

καὶ νεκροὶς, καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν

d Luke (9), αὐτῶν·

καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτῶν.·

2. κήρυξον τὸν λόγον,·

ἐπιστήθη·

Acts (11),

v. 11.·

1 Thess.·

εὐκαίρως·

ἀκαίρως, πληγεῖν,·

ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον,·

ἐν ἑκάστῃ

v. 3.·

Tim. iv. 6.·

μακροθυμία καὶ διδακτὴς.·

3. ἐστιν γὰρ καίρος ἐν τῇ ὁ 

ὁγιανοῦσης·

v. 11.

εἰς Εὐκλείαν·

καὶ παρακάλεσον.·

N̄ACD̄KL̄P, syrh., arm.

ἐπιτελεῖν.·

παρακάλεσον.·

N̄ACD̄KL̄P, syrh., arm.;

παρακαλεῖν.·

ὁγιανοῦσης·

v. 11.

εἰς ἑκάστῃ.

f Eccl. iv. (xxxv.) 4, only. cf. Phil. iv. 10.·

m Matt. 10 (και Χριστοῦ·)

six others.

1xptvai FG, 17, 67"", six others.


τιμήν.·

παρακάλεσον.·

N̄ACD̄KL̄P, syrh., arm.;

παρακαλεῖν.·

ὁγιανοῦσης·

v. 11.

εἰς ἑκάστῃ.

τιμήν.·

παρακάλεσον.·

N̄ACD̄KL̄P, syrh., arm.;

παρακαλεῖν.·

ὁγιανοῦσης·

v. 11.

εἰς ἑκάστῃ.

In saying: Nay, there is a crown for you,

too, and for all who live in the loving

longing for the coming of their Lord.

Ver. 1. Αἰκαίρως: See on 1 Tim. v. 21.

As the adjuration follows immedi-

ately on warnings against a moral
degeneration which had already set in

and would increase, it is appropriat-
et that it should contain a solemn assurance of

judgment to come.

Χριστοῦ·

τοῦ μελλόντος κρίνειν: This was a prominent topic in St. Paul's

preaching (Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 16;

v. 21.

Rom. ii. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 5).

κρίνω: In the Creeds, as in 1 Pet. iv. 5. (Tisch.

R.V.). See apparat. crit.

τοῦ μελλόντος κρίνειν: To be understood

literally. See 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.

τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν: per adventum ipsius (Vulg.). The acc. is that of the thing

by which a person adjoins, as in the case of ὁμολογεῖν (Mark v. 7; Acts xix. 11; cf.

1 Thess. v. 27). The use of διαμαρτύρωμαι

with an acc. in Deut. iv. 26, xxxi. 28, is

different, διαμαρτύρω μαὶρα σήμερον τὸν τε

σώραν καὶ τὴν γῆν. "I call heaven and

earth to witness against you." Heaven and earth can be conceived as

personalities, cf. Ps. 1. 4; not so the

appearance or kingdom of Christ. On

ἐπιφάνεια see note on 1 Tim. v. 14.

Βασιλείαν: The perfected kingdom,

the manifestation of which will follow

the second ἐπιφάνεια.

Ver. 2. κήρυξον: In 1 Tim. v. 21

diæmartỵṛ̣ is followed by ἐνα with the

subj.; in 2 Tim. ii. 14 by the inf. Here

the adjuration is more impassioned;

hence the abruptness; this is heightened

also by the aorists.

ἐπιστήθη: Ἰστα, Be at hand, or Be

ready to act. ἐπίστηθι. ἐνα, ἑκάριον.

qualifies adverbially κῆρυξον; while the follow-
ing imperatives, ὁγιανοῦσης, κ.τ.λ., are various

departments of "preaching the word".

ἐκαίρως ἀκαίρως: opportune, impor-
tune (Vulg.). So few καιροὶ remain

available (see next verse), that you must

use them all. Do not ask yourself, "Is

this a suitable occasion for preaching?"

Ask rather, "Why should not this be a

suitable occasion?" "Have not any

limited season; let it always be thy sea-

son, not only in peace and security and

when sitting in the Church" (Chrys.).

Similar expressions are cited by Ben-
geł, e.g., digna indigna; praesens absens;

te le mos volens. We need not ask whether

the reasonableness, etc., has reference to

the preacher or the hearers. The direc-
tion is to disregard the inclinations of

both.

ὁγιανοῦσης: Taking this in the sense

convict, Chrys. comments thus on the

three imperatives, "After the manner of

physicians, having shown the wound,

he gives the incision, he applies the

plaster".

ἐπιτίμησον: "The strict meaning of

the word is 'to mete out due measure,'

but in the N.T. it is used only of cen-
sure". So Swete (on Mark i. 25), who

also notes that with the exceptions of

this place and Jude 9, it is limited to the

Synoptists.

παρακάλεσον: See on 1 Tim. iv. 13.

ἐν πάση μακροθυμία καὶ διδακτῇ: This

qualifies each of the three preceding

imperatives; and πάση belongs to διδακτῇ as well as to μακρ., with the utmost

patience and the most painstaking in-

struction.

διδακτῇ: "(teaching) seems to point

more to the act, διδασκαλία (doctrine)
to the substance or result of teaching"

(ElI.). In the only other occurrence of

διδακτῇ in the Pastorals, Tit. i. 9, it

means doctrine

Ver. 3. ὁγιανοῦσης διδασκαλίας: See

note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

ἱδίας: ιδίος here, as constantly, has

merely the force of a possessive pronoun.

See on 1 Tim. iii. 4.
He shews the indiscriminate multitude of the teachers, as also their being elected by their disciples" (Chrys.).

The same general idea is expressed in πάντοτε μαθάντανα (iii. 7).

Their notion of a teacher was not one who should instruct their mind or guide their conduct, but one who should gratify their aesthetic sense. Cf. Ezek. xxxiii. 32, "Thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, &c." The desire for pleasure is insatiable, and is increased or aggravated by indulgence; hence the heaping up of those who may minister to it. Ell. quotes appropriately from Philo, Quod Det. Pot. 21. αρρηκτος νου [ει σοφισταν] ἢμων τὰ δότα.

Ver. 6. The ears serve as a passage through which the truth may reach the understanding and the heart. Those who starve their understanding and heart have no use for the truth, and do not, as they would say, waste hearing power on it.

μάθοις: See note on 1 Tim. i. 4.

Ver. 5. νῆφα: Be sober (R.V.). Sōbris esto (d). vigilia (Vulg.) [but Vulg. Clem. inserts sōbris esto at end of verse]. So A.V. watch, and Chrys. Sōber is certainly right in 1 Thess. v. 6, 8; but in 1 Pet. i. 13, iv. 7, and perhaps v. 8, to be watchful or alert seems more appropriate.

ἔργον εὐγενείας: The office of evangelist is mentioned Acts xxi. 8, Eph. iv. 11. The evangelist was an itinerant preacher who had not the supervising functions of an apostle, nor the inspiration of a prophet; though both apostle and prophet did, inter alia, the work of evangelist. This was in all likelihood the work to which Timothy had originally been called. St. Paul here reminds him that in the faithful perform-

ance of what might seem to be subordinate duties lies the best preservative of the Church from error. Note, that the office of an episcopus is also an εὐργον, 1 Tim. iii. 1, cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 10, Phil. ii. 30, Eph. iv. 12, 1 Thess. v. 13. τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον: fulfi. According to Chrys., this does not differ from πληροφόρων. See Col. iv. 17, Acts xii. 25. For διακονία, ministry or service in general, see 1 Tim. i. 12.

Ver. 6. The connexion from ver. 3 seems to be this: The dangers to the Church are pressing and instant; they can only be met by watchfulness, self-sacrifice, and devotion to duty on the part of the leaders of the Church, of whom thou art one. As for me, I have done my best. My King is calling me from the field of action to wait for my reward; thou canst no longer look to me to take initiative in action. This seems to be the force of the emphatic εὖ and the connecting γάρ.

ἡδη στένωμα: jam delibor (Vulg.). The analogy of Phil. ii. 17, στενωθʰ ἐὰν τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λατρευών (where see Lightfoot's note), is sufficient to prove that St. Paul did not regard his own death as a sacrifice. There the θυσία is the persons of the Philippian converts (cf. Rom. xii. 1, xv. 16) rendered acceptable by faith, and offered up by their faith. Here the nature of the θυσία is not determined, possibly not thought of, by the writer. The reason alleged by Chrys. for the absence here of the term θυσία is ingenious: "For the whole of the sacrifice was not offered to God, but the whole of the drink-offering was." It is immaterial to decide whether the imagery is drawn from the Jewish drink-offerings, or from heathen libations. Lightfoot quotes interesting parallels from the dying words of Seneca: "stagnum calidae aquae introitus rever-
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x See iTim. "
ySee ver. 2. 7 ἐφέστηκεν. 7. τὸν σκλῆρον ἄγωνα 1 ἡγάνεμα, τὸν ἀβρόμον
τοῦ νεκροῦ. τῆς πίστεως τῆς πεμπήκα. 8. λουτρόν ἄποκειται μοι ὁ
tῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς στέφανος, ὃν ἀποδώσει μοι ὁ Κύριος ἐν ἑκείνη
tῇ θερμῇ. δ' δίκαιος κρίνῃς ὃς μόνον δέ ἔρω ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν
tούς ἀγαπητὸς τῆς ἐπιφάνειας αὐτῶν.

16. Luke
23. Acts xx. 31, xxii. 37, John xiv. 28, 30, Acts xvi. 9, etc. d See Tim. v. 22
and vi. 14. e 2 Cor. xiii. 11, 1 Thess. iv. 1. f Col. i. 5, etc. g 1 Cor. ix. 24, Jan. i. 12, 1 Pet. v. 4, Rev. ii. 10. h See a Tim. i. 12. i Ps. vii. 11, x Mac. iii. 41. k See Tim. vi. 14.

gens proximos servorum, addita voce, 
līberare sc liquortm ilium ὁφοιLiberatori "
(Tac. Ann. xv. 64), and from Ignatius,
" Grant me nothing more than that I be
poured out a libation (ὀλυμποστία) to
God, while there is yet an altar ready"
(Rom. 2).

τῆς ἀναλώσιμης: There is no figure of
speech, such as that of striking a tent or
unmooring a ship, suggested by ἀνα-
λώσις. It was as common a euphemism
for death as is our word departure.
See the verb in Phil. i. 23, and, besides the
usual references given by the commenta-
tors, see examples supplied by Moulton
and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., v. 266.
The Vulg. *resolutionis* is wrong. Dean
Bernard calls attention to the *verbal
similarities of expression* between this
letter to Timothy and Philippians, writ-
ten when Timothy was with St. Paul,
viz., σωθησόμαι, ἀναλώσιμαι here and
ἀναλώσιμαι, Phil. i. 23, and the image of
the race; there (Phil. iii. 13, 14) not
completed, here finished, v. 7.

Ἀφίεναι: initiat (Vulg.), is come
(R.V.), is already present, rather than is
at hand (A.V.), which implies a post-
pommentation. For similar prescience of
approaching death compare 2 Pet. i. 14.

Ver. 7. τὸν καλὸν ἄγωνα ἡγάνεμα:
See note on 1 Tim. vi. 12. The follow-
ing τὸν ἀβρόμον, ἀπ.Λ., makes this refer-
cence to the games hardly doubtful.

τὸν ἄβρομον τετέλεκα: *cursum consum-
marsi* (Vulg.). What had been a purpose
(Acts xx. 24) was now a retrospect. To
say "My race is run," is not to boast,
but merely to state a fact. The figure is
also found in 1 Cor. ix. 24, Phil. iii. 12.
The course is the race of life; we must
not narrow it, as Chrys. does, to St.
Paul's missionary travels.

τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα: As in ii. 21, St.
Paul passes from the metaphor to the
reality. For the force of τῆρω here,
see note on 1 Tim. vi. 14; and cf. Rev.
xiv. 12, αἱ τρισαριστεῖς τὰς ἄνθρωπος τοῦ
θεοῦ καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἤφειος. The faith is
a deposit, τεραπέθηκεν, a trust which the
Apostle is now ready to render up to
Him who entrusted it to him. There is
no real inconsistency between the tone
of this passage and that of some in
earlier epistles, e.g., Phil. iii. 12, sqq.
St. Paul is merely stating what the grace
of God had done for him. A man does
well to be distrustful as regards his use
of the years of life that may remain to
him; but when the life that he has lived
has been admittedly lived "in the faith
which is in the Son of God" (Gal. ii.
20), mock modesty becomes mischievous
ingratitude.

Ver. 8. λουτρόν: *For what remains.
The R.V. renders it besides in 1 Cor. i.
16, moreover in 1 Cor. iv. 2. The notion
of *duration of future time* is not in
the word any more than in the French du
reste. St. Paul means here "I have
nothing more to do than to receive the
crown." λουτρόν has the sense of in
*conclusion* in 2 Cor. xiii. 11, 1 Thess.
iv. 1, and does not differ from τὸ λουτρόν
as used in Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8, 2 Thess. iii. 1;
or τοῦ λουτρόν as used in Gal. vi.
17, Eph. vi. 10. The meaning of τὸ λουτρόν
in 1 Cor. vii. 29, Heb. x. 13 is *henceforth.*
ἀδεία: τε τόπος τῆς λειτουργίας
ὅτι ἐν τοῖς σφαίρασι, and, for the senti-
ment, 1 Pet. i. 4.

δ' τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος: The
whole context demands that this should
be the possessive genitive, *The crown
which belongs to,* or is the due reward of,
rightness, the incorruptible crown
of 1 Cor. ix. 25. The verbal analogies of
στέφω. τῆς ἡμέρας, James i. 12, Rev. ii. 10,
and στέφω. τῆς δόξης, 1 Pet. v. 4, sup-
port the view that it is the gen. of
apposition; but it is difficult on this sup-
position to give the phrase an intelligible
meaning. "Good works, which are the
fruits of Faith and follow after Justification... are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ" (Art. xii.). It is to be noted that o-Tca).rfjsSix. is applied to the golden fillet worn by the high priest in the Tests. of Twelve Patriarchs, Levi, vii. 2.

αποθέως: reddet (Vulg.). As long as we agree to the statement that Moses ἀνέβλεψεν εἰς τὴν μυστανοθοδοσίαν (Heb. xii. 26), it seems trifling to dispute the retributive force of ἀνόο- in this word. Of course "the reward is not reckoned as of debt, but as of grace". St. Paul could say, "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense (ἀνόοςοὐνα)... to you that are afflicted rest with us" (2 Thess. i. 6, 7), see also Rom. ii. 6.

In ἀκάνθα τῇ ἱμέρᾳ: see on i. 12.

δικαιοκριτής: The notion expressed in this phrase goes back to Gen. xviii. 25. For the actual words, see ref. The aorist points to a definite past occasion now in St. Paul's mind.

αὐτής τὸν νῦν αἰώνα: See i Tim. vi. 17. It is just possible that Bengel is right in seeing an intentional deplorable contrast ("luctuosum vide antitheton") between this expression and ver. 8.

τὸς δεκατάδος τοῦ τάξαν αἰῶνα: See i Tim. vi. 17. It is just possible that Bengel is right in seeing an intentional deplorable contrast ("luctuosum vide antitheton") between this expression and ver. 8.

αὔτος εἰς Γαλατίαν: sc. ἔτερωσθή. Crescens and Titus are not reproached for their absence. This passage, with the variant Γαλατίαν (see apparat. crit.), is the source of all that is said about Crescens by later writers.

Γαλατίαν: This means the Roman province, or the region in Asia Minor (so Const. Apost. vii. 46) is favoured by the consideration that all the other places mentioned in this context are east of Rome. On the other hand, if we assume that St. Paul had recently visited Spain (Clem. Rom. i Cor. 5; Muratorian Canon), it would naturally follow that he had visited Southern Gaul en route; and Crescens might plausibly be supposed to have gone to confirm the Churches there. So Euseb. H. E. iii. 4, Epiph. Harres. li. ii, Theodore and Theodoret, h. 1.

Τίτος εἰς Δαμασκίαν: This statement suggests that Titus had only been a temporary deputy for St. Paul in Crete. On the spelling of the name Dalmatia in apparat. crit., see Deissmann, Bible Studies, trans. p. 182.

Ver. 11. Βούλη: Nothing can be more natural than that "the beloved
physician" and historian should feel that he of all men was in his place beside St. Paul when the end was so nearly approaching. The μόνος is relative to fellow-labourers in the gospel. St. Paul had many friends in Rome (ver. 21).

Márkoς: St. Paul was now completely reconciled to John Mark who had, before Col. iv. 10 was written, vindicated and justified the risk Barnabas had run in giving him a chance of recovering his character (see Acts xiii. 13, xv. 38).

ζητεῖν: assume (Vulg.). Take up on your way. Assume is also the Latin in Acts xx. 14, xiii. 31, but suscipere in xii. 19. It is implied that Mark was somewhere on the line of route between Ephesus and Rome; but we do not know the precise place.

αὐτῷ: This phrase is illustrated from the papyri by Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii., v. 57.

ἐφημεριστὸς ἢ διακοινωνᾶς: As Mark was the ἐφημεριστής of St. Peter, rendering his Aramaic into Greek, so he may have helped St. Paul by a knowledge of Latin. θαυμασία, however, does not necessarily include preaching. It is characteristic of St. Paul that he should not regard the ministry which he had received from the Lord Jesus as "accomplished" so long as he had breath to "testify the gospel of the grace of God" (Acts xx. 24).

Ver. 12. ἡμέρας ὤμι: The ὤμι does not involve a comparison of Tychicus with Mark, as both εὐρεστοῦ (so Ell.); but rather distinguishes the cause of Tychicus' absence from that of the others. Demas had forsaken the apostle; and Crescens and Titus had gone, perhaps on their own initiative; Tychicus had been sent away by St. Paul himself. For Tychicus, see Acts xx. 4, Eph. vi. 21, 22, Col. iv. 7, Tit. iii. 12; and the art. in Hastings' D. B.

τὸς Ἐφέσου: If the emphasis in the clause lies on ἀπόστασις, as has been just suggested, the difficulty of harmonising τὸς Ἐφεσου with the common belief that Timothy was himself in chief authority in the Church at Ephesus is somewhat mitigated. St. Paul had mentioned the places to which Demas, etc., had gone; and even on the supposition that St. Paul knew that Tychicus was with Timothy, he could not say, "I sent away Tychicus" without completing the sentence by adding the destination. This explanation must be adopted, if we suppose with Ell. that Tychicus was the bearer of First Timothy. If he were the bearer of Second Timothy, ἀπόστασις can be plausibly explained as the epistolary aorist. On the other hand, there is no reason why we should assume that Timothy was at Ephesus at this time. Other local references, e.g., i. 15, 18, and iv. 13 are quite consistent with a belief that he was not actually in that city. Perhaps "Do the work of an evangelist" (iv. 5) is an indication that he was itinerating.

Ver. 13. I want my warm winter cloak and my books. ημέρας: The cληρον τεκνίας, or λευκόσιφα, from which it is derived, a circular cape which fell down below the knees, with an opening for the head in the centre (So Chrys. on Phil. ii. 30; Tert. De orat. xii.). The Syriac here renders it a case for writings, a portfolio, an explanation noted by Chrys., τὸ γλυκόσκομον ἔμα τὰ βιβλία λείπειο. But this is merely a guess suggested by its being coupled with βιβλία and μαθήματα.

ἀργός: Even if Timothy was not in Ephesus, he was in Asia, and travellers thence to Rome usually passed through Troas. Perhaps St. Paul had been arrested at Troas, and had not been allowed to take his cloak, etc. This is a more plausible supposition than that he was making a bad flight from Alexander, as Lock conjectures, Hastings' D. B., iv. 775, a.
more costly Μηβέναν contained, in all likelihood, portions of the Hebrew Scriptures, hence μάλαντα (see Kenyon, Textual Crit. of N. T. p. 22). We know that St. Paul employed in study the enforced leisure of prison (Acts xxvi. 24). We may note that, like Browning's Grammarian, he did not allow his normal strenuous life to be affected or diverted by the known near approach of death.


Ver. 14. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ χαλκεύς: It is probable that this is the Alexander mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20, and it is possible that he may be the Jew of that name who was unwillingly prominent in the riot at Ephesus (Acts xix. 33, 34).

χαλκεύς: does not mean that he worked only in copper. The term came to be used of workers in any kind of metal (see Gen. iv. 22, LXX).

Πολλά μοι κακά ἑπεθέθη:. Μulta mala mihis ostendit (Vulg.). His odium theologicum expressed itself in deeds as well as in words. For this use of ἔθεσεν, compare reff. Moulton and Milligan (Expositor, vii. viii. 262) cite from a papyrus of ii. a.D. πάθων υπόθεσιν μετ' ἐπίθεσεν.

ἀνοδόντα: The future indicative is certainly attested by a greater weight of external evidence than the optative. The moral question raised by the clause is quite independent of the mood and tense used: it is, Was the future punishment of Alexander, which St. Paul considered equitable, a matter of more satisfaction than distress to the apostle? The answer would seem to be, Yes. And, provided that no element of personal spite intrudes, such a feeling cannot be logically condemned. If God is a moral governor if sin is a reality; those who know themselves to be on God's side cannot help a feeling of joy in knowing that evil will not always triumph over good. The sentiment comes from Deut. xxxii. 35, as quoted in Rom. xii. 19, ἰδικόν ἀνταμίσθην. The exact wording is found in Ps. ixi. (lxiii.) 13, σύ ἀνταμίσθης ἐκατότητα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. Cf. Ps. xxvii. (xxviii.) 4; Prov. xxiv. 12.

Ver. 15. Φιλάδερφος: For this sense of φιλάδερφος with a direct object, see reff. We infer that Alexander was in Timothy's vicinity.

Ὑμετέροις λόγοις: The λόγοι were expressions of doctrine common to all Christians with St. Paul; hence ὑμετέροις.

Vv. 16-18. I have spoken of my present loneliness. Yet I have no justification for depression; for since I came to Rome I have had experience, at my preliminary trial, that God is a loyal protector when earthly friends fail. And so I have good hope that He will bring me safe through every danger to His heavenly kingdom.

Ver. 16. The reference in my first defence seems at first sight somewhat uncertain, since ver. 17 states the issue of that "defence" to have been that "the message was fully proclaimed, and all the Gentiles heard it". This would agree with the circumstances of the trials before Felix and Festus, a direct result of which was that Paul was enabled to "bear witness also at Rome" (Acts xxiii. 11). On this view, the apostle would be recalling a signal past instance in which God had overruled evil for good. On the other hand, it is a fatal objection to this reference of the phrase that when he was at Caesarea he seems to have been kindly treated by his friends as well as by the officials. And, moreover, the sentence reads like a piece of fresh information. This latter consideration is also an argument against referring it to the first Roman imprisonment (as Euseb. H. E. ii. 22), though the very similar sentiments of Phil. i. 12, 13, render the identification...
plausible. But in this latter case again
the language of Philippians has no traces
of forsakenness. We decide therefore
that St. Paul is here referring to the
preliminary investigation (prima actio)
which he underwent after he arrived at
Rome a prisoner for the second time,
and which resulted in his remand. He
was now writing to Timothy during the
interval between his remand and the
second, and final trial. But if we thus
explain "my first defence," how are we
to interpret iv. 8, &c.? The
explanation will be suggested by a com-
parison of such passages as Rom. xv. 10,
"From Jerusalem, and round about even
unto Illyricum, I have fullypreached the
gospel of Christ"; Col. i. 23, "The
gospel which . . . was preached in all
creation." We annex a territory by
the mere act of planting our country's flag
on a small portion of its soil; so in St.
Paul's thought a single proclamation of
the gospel might have a spiritual, almost
a prophetical, significance, immeasurably
greater than could be imagined by one
who heard it. "Una saepe occasio max-
imi est momenti" (Bengel). It is to be
noted too that παραστάσις and ἀνευνήμασθαι
refer to the occasion of the "first de-
fence," and St. Paul does not say that
the Lord set him free; so that we are
obliged to explain iv. 8, &c., p.t.l. of
St. Paul's bold assertion of his faith in
Christ on that occasion, which however
was a public one, not like his previous
private teaching to those who came to
him "in his own hired dwelling" (Acts
xxviii. 30).

− τάρασσα: adlius (Vulg.), supported
me as "advocatus". The verb is used of
appearing in a court of justice in reff. It
simply means to come or arrive in i Cor.
xxvi. 3. This complaint is difficult to
reconcile with ver 21. Perhaps here St.
Paul is referring to old friends on whom
he had a special claim.

Ver. 17. θηρίσθη: The Lord was my
"patronus," cf. Rom. xvi. 2. But the
word is used in a purely local sense of
the felt presence of a Divine Being in reff.
in Acts.

− ἀνευνήμασθαι: See note on 1 Tim. i.
12.

− πληροφορηθή: impleatur (Vulg.). As
long as there had been no public procla-
mation of the gospel by Paul himself in
Rome, the function of κηρυκτείν had not
been completely fulfilled by him.

− ἐρείσθη ἐκ στόματος λόγος: This is
most naturally understood as an echo of
Ps. xxii.(xxiii.) 22, σῶθ'έκ στόματος
λόγος. But occurs in the verse pre-
ceding. And what follows in the LXX
seems to point to the most satisfactory
explanation of the apostle's meaning,
καὶ ἀπὸ κηρυκτείν τὴν ταπείνωσον μου.
Βοηθήσομαι τὸ δημοῦ
οὐς θυσίν θυσίν τοῖς ἄθλασιν
μου. If St. Paul had not been strengthened to com-
plete his κηρυκτείν, his failure would have
been his ταπείνωσον. As it was, he was
delivered from that calamity, and enabled
to declare God's name to the Gentiles.
It is impossible, in view of ἡς σωθῶμαι
(ver. 6), to suppose that delivery from
death is implied. πρώτη (ver. 16) proves
that the apostle was aware that a second
trial was awaiting him, the issue of
which he knew would be his execution.
It is still more impossible to suppose
that literal wild beasts are meant. Paul's
Roman citizenship secured him from that
degradation. The Greek commentators
take "the lion" to mean Nero, "from his
ferocity" (Chrys.). Cf. Esth. xiv. 13, of
Ahasuerus; Joseph. Antiq. xviii. 6, 10, of
Tiberius. It is no objection to this
exegesis that the article is omitted before
λόγος, since, as we have seen, there is
none in the Psalm. But deliverance
from that lion's mouth would be equiva-
lent to acquittal by the Roman govern-
ment; and it is evident that St. Paul
was well aware that his sentence had
been only deferred.

Ver. 18. ἐρείσθη ποληρος: The form of
the clause may be modelled on the peti-
tion in the Lord's Prayer,  "the mouth of the lion". Failure to be receptive of the strengthening grace of the Lord would have been, in St. Paul's judgment, an "evil deed," though others might easily find excuses for it. Chrys. takes a similar view of \( \text{τοῖς ἔργοις τοῦ πονηροῦ,} \) but gives it a wider application: "He will yet again deliver me from every sin, that is, He will not suffer me to depart with condemnation". This view is also supported by what follows, \( \text{καὶ οὐ κρίνων,} \). At one moment the apostle sees the crown of righteousness just within his grasp, at another, while no less confident, he acknowledges that he could not yet say "to have apprehended".

**Verse 19.** \( \text{ἐπικράσιον Ἠρακλῆς} \): The same unusual order, the wife before the husband, is found in Rom. xvi. 3, Acts xviii. 18, 26, but not in Acts xviii. 2, 1 Cor. xvi. 19. "Probably Prisca was of higher rank than her husband, for her name is that of a good old Roman family [the Cicilian gens]. Aquila was probably a freedman. The name does indeed occur as cognomen in some Roman families; but it was also a slave name, for a freedman of Maecenas was called (C. Cilnius) Aquila" (Ramsey, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 268, 269; see also Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 118 sqq.).

**Verse 20.** \( \text{Ἐραστῷ ἡμῶν ἐν Κορίνθῳ} \): The name Erastus is too common to make probable the identification of this companion of St. Paul's and the \( \text{oikovódas,} \) treasurer, of Corinth, who joins in the apostle's salutation in Rom. xvi. 23. It is not antecedently likely that a city official could travel about as a missionary. On the other hand, it is probable that this Erastus is the same as the companion of Timothy mentioned in Acts xix. 22. It is to be observed that St. Paul here resumes from ver. 12 his explanation of the absence from Rome of members of his company whose presence with their master at this crisis would have been natural. It is possible that Erastus and Trophimus were with St. Paul when he was arrested the second time, and that they remained in his company as far as Miletus and Corinth respectively.

**Verse 21.** \( \text{ἐπὶ προῖς ἡμῶν:} \) "That thou
be not detained," sc. by storm (Chrys.). This seems less urgent than τεχνέως of ver. 9, and we may infer that St. Paul did not expect his final trial to take place for some months.

Εὐθους: Nothing else is known of this good man.

Ποιήσας καὶ Λύνος καὶ Κλαυδία: Lightfoot (Apostolic Fathers, part i. vol. i. pp. 76-79) has an exhaustive discussion of the various ingenious theories which, starting with the assumption that Pudens and Claudia were man and wife—a supposition opposed by the order of the names—have identified them with (1) Martial’s congenial friend Aulus Pudens, to whom the poet casually “imputes the foulest vices of heathenism,” and his bride Claudia Rufina, a girl of British race (Epigr. iv. 13, xi. 53), (2) “a doubtful Pudens and imaginary Claudia” who have been evolved out of a fragmentary inscription found at Chichester in 1722. This appears to record the erection of a temple by a Pudens with the sanction of Claudius Cogidubnus, who is probably a British king who might have had a daughter, whom he might have named Claudia, and who might have taken the name Rufina from Pomponia, the wife of Aulus Plautius, the Roman commander in Britain. This last supposition would identify (1) and (2). It should be added that in Const. Apost. vii. 46 she is mother of Linus. See also art. Claudia and Pudens in Hastings’ D. B.

Linus is identified by Irenæus with the Linus whom SS. Peter and Paul consecrated first Bishop of Rome (Haer. iii. 3). See also art. in Hastings’ D. B.

Ver. 22. μετά τοῦ πνεύματος σου: This expression, with υμῶν for σου, occurs in Gal. vi. 18, Phil. 25; but in both those places it is “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with,” etc. Here a very close personal association between the Lord and Timothy is prayed for. Dean Bernard compares the conclusion of the Epistle of Barnabas, δόξας τῆς δόξης καὶ πάσης χάριτος μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος διώκων. See note on 1 Tim. vi. 21.
CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-4. Salutation, in which the place of the Gospel in eternity and in time is largely expressed.

Ver. 1. δοῦλος Θεοῦ: The only parallel to this phrase in the opening formula of any other epistle in the N.T. is James i.; but there it is, “James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ.” It is no less obvious than necessary to note that this variation from St. Paul’s formula ἴησος Χριστοῦ (Rom. i.1; Phil. i.1) would not be likely in a pseudepigraphic writing.

ἀπόστολος ἴησος Ἐρινυς: See note on 1 Tim. i. 1. The ἴης is not merely copulative, as in Jude i.; but marks the antithesis between the two aspects of Paul’s relationship to the Supreme: between God as known to his fathers, and as recently manifested in the sphere of history.

κατὰ πίστιν κ.ρ.λ.: to be connected with ἀπόστολος only. It is natural to suppose that κατὰ has the same force here as in 2 Tim. i.1, κατ’ ἐπιγγέλλαν ζωῆς, where see note. His apostleship was for the confirmation of the faith of God’s elect, and for the spreading of the knowledge, etc., etc. We take κατὰ as = for or in regard to; and expand it according to the exigencies of the context. Here God’s elect does not mean those whom God intends to select; but those who have been externally selected, and who consequently possess faith. See ref. and Acts xiii. 48. They do not need that it should be generated in them, but that it should be fostered. See note on 2 Tim. ii. 10. Contrast ἀπόστολος εἰς ἄνωθεν πίστεως καὶ πάσιν τοῖς ἴησοιν, Rom. i. 5, where the Gospel-propagation function of his apostleship is indicated.

The rendering here of the Vulg. and of the English versions, according to the faith, etc., secundum fidem, preserves the common meaning of κατὰ, but does not stand examination. St. Paul’s office as apostle was not dependent in any way on the faith or knowledge of human beings, as it was on the will or command of God or Christ. The final cause of it was the faith and knowledge of men.

ἐπίγγελαι ἀληθείας: See on 1 Tim. ii. 4.

ἐπιστείμα: See on 1 Tim. ii. 2.

Ver. 2. ἐν ὑπατία κ.ρ.λ.: This is best taken in connexion with the preceding clause, κατὰ πίστιν . . . ἐπιστείμα. The faith and the knowledge there spoken of have as their basis of action, or energy, the hope of eternal life. Cf. 1 Tim. i. 16. Compare the use of ἐν ὑπατία in Acts xxvi. 6; Rom. iv. 18, viii. 20; 1 Cor. ix. 10. On the other hand, we must not exclude a remoter connexion with ἀπόστολος. A comparison of the parallel passage in 2 Tim. i. 1 suggests that the succession of clauses here, κατὰ πίστιν . . . ἐπιστείμα, is a full and detailed expansion of κατ’ ἐπιγγέλλαν . . . ἐν Xρ. ἴης.

ἀψυνδής: qui non mentitur. See note on 2 Tim. ii. 13.

ἐπιγγέλαιατο: See Rom. i. 1, iv. 21; Gal. iii. 19.

ἐπιγγέλαιατο . . . πρὸ χρόνων οἰκείων, ἰδαμέρωσιν ἔδ.: The same antithesis is expressed in 2 Tim. i. 9, 10 (q.v.)
From different points of view, one may say that eternal life was promised, and given, to man in Christ before times eternal; though the revelation of this purpose and grace could not be made until man was prepared to receive it, καιροῖς, at seasons, occasions, epochs of time as relative to man's comprehension.

Ver. 3. ἐφανερώσων τῶν λόγων: For φανερώσω see note on 1 Tim. iii. 16. We must observe that no N.T. writer speaks of a manifestation of the gift of eternal life (1 John i. 2 refers to the personal Incarnate Life). God's message concerning it, which is the revelation of a divine secret purpose, is manifested. See Col. iv. 4 in addition to the last refl. given on ἐπιγνωσμόν. περὶ τῶν ἐφανερώσων (von Soden).

καιροῖς ἰδίοις: See on 1 Tim. ii. 6 and vi. 15. The rendering his own seasons suits the context here.

τῶν λόγων ἀπὸ τῶν κηρύματι: Note the distinction here indicated between the substance of the revelation (λόγος) given by God, and the form of it as expressible (κηρύμα) by the human preacher. It is parallel to the use of λόγος and λαλεῖν in John viii. 43.

δὲ ἐκτικτοθῆναι ἐγὼ has τὸ εὐαγγελίον κ.τ.λ. as its antecedent in 1 Tim. i. 11, where see note.

καὶ ἐπιτυγχάνῃ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεόν: See note on 1 Tim. i. 1. There the order is θεόν σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. Here θεόν is epekegetical of σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, as Χριστός ἡγοῦν in chap. ii. 13, καὶ ἐπιτυγχάνῃ is to be taken with δὲ ἐκτικτοθῆναι ἐγὼ, which is another way of expressing the notion of ἀποτυγχάνειν. On σωτὴρ as a title of God, see notes on 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 4.

Ver. 4. γνωσθείς τέκνον: See note on 1 Tim. i. 2.
continue the organisation of presbyters (episcopi) and deacons which was already in full working order. It is significant that καθολικά is used of the institution of a new order of ministry in Acts vi. 3, and introduces the chief point in the ἐπιδιδοσμος.

κατὰ πᾶν, in every city. See ref. The number of presbyters is not specified; the meaning is that the order of presbyters should be established all over the island.

σοι διεταμήμεν: dispasi tiba (Vulg.), appropriately used of a number of specific directions on one general subject. Compare Acts xxiv. 23, where the verb is used in reference to three distinct instructions given to the centurion in reference to Paul.

Ver. 6, ἀνέγκλητος: See notes on 1 Tim. iii. 2, 10.

μᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνηρ: See on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

πάντα πιστά: It must be supposed that a Christian father who has unbelieving children is himself a recent convert, or a very careless Christian. The fact that Paul did not think it necessary to warn Timothy that such men were not eligible for the presbyterate is a proof that Christianity was at this time more firmly established in Ephesus than in Crete.

μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ διστασίας ἢ ἀνευτακτα: It is significant that the moral requirements of the pastor's children are more mildly expressed in 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12. There it is the father's power to keep order in his own house that is emphasised; here the submission of the children to discipline and restraint.

Ver. 7, τοῦ ἐπισκόπου: On the use of the singular as a generic term see on 1 Tim. iii. 2. Here, where the thought is of the various official functions of the minister, the official title is appropriate.

ἀνέγκλητον: See notes on 1 Tim. iii. 2, 10.

θεὸς ἐξοικομόν: a steward appointed by God (Luke xii. 42; 1 Cor. ix. 17), in the house of God (1 Tim. iii. 15), to dispense His mysteries and manifold grace (1 Cor. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 10). Theos is emphatic, suggesting that the stewardship of such a Lord should conform to the highest ideal of moral and spiritual qualifications.

αὐθαίρη: self-assertive, arrogant. Vulg. has here superbum, but more accurately in 2 Pet. ii. 10, sihi placitum. ὁργαί: passionate, irascibilum (Vulg.). The ὁργαί is one who has not his passion of anger under control.

πάροικον, πάλικτω: See on 1 Tim. iii. 3.

ἡ ἀλεξοχρηστη: This negative quality is required in deacons, 1 Tim. iii. 8. Persons who are concerned in the administration of small sums must be such as are above the commission of petty thefts. There are no regulations here laid down for deacons; so we are entitled to conclude that in Crete, at this time, presbyters performed the duties of every Church office. Hence they should have the appropriate diaconal virtue. See note on 1 Tim. iii. 8. On the other hand, it may be objected against this inference that in 1 Pet. v. 2 ἡ ἀλεξοχρηστη is used of the spirit of the ideal presbyter.

Ver. 8, φιλάξσον: See on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

φιλάξσον: In Wisd. vii. 22, the πνεῦμα which is in σοφία is φιλάξσον, loving what is good. The epithets which immediately precede and follow φιλάξσον in Wisd. have no reference to persons, with the exception of φιλάθρων. It seems best, with the R.V., to give the words as wide a reference as possible; see on φιλάγαθον, 2 Tim. iii. 3.
σώματα: See notes on 1 Tim. ii. 9 and iii. 2.

The noun σώματα occurs Acts xxiv. 25; Gal. v. 23; 2 Pet. i. 6, where to the rendering temperance the R.V.m. gives the alternative self-control. The verb σώματος in 1 Cor. vii. 9 is to have continency, but in 1 Cor. ix. 25 to be temperate generally. The word differs from σώματος as having a reference to bodily appetites, while σώματα has reference also to the desires of the mind. σώματα concerns action, σώματα thought.

Ver. 9. ἀντικείμενον: holding firmly to. Ἀντικείμενον is stronger than ἐπιστρέφει, as used in a similar connexion, 1 Tim. i. 19, etc., etc. The R.V. holding to correctly suggests the notion of withstanding opposition, which is not so clearly felt in the A.V. holding fast. “Having care of it, making it his business” (Chrys.).

ἀντικείμενον: See note on 2 Tim. ii. 2. τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδακὴν πιστοῦ λόγου: the faithful word which is in accordance with the teaching. It is indicative of the weakening of the phrase πιστοῦ λόγου that St. Paul strengthens it here by κατὰ τὴν διδακήν. It was noted on 1 Tim. i. 15 that πιστοῦ λόγου here means the totality of the revelation given in Christ; and ἡ διδακή is to be taken passively, as equivalent to ἡ διδασκαλία, as employed in these epistles. It is tautological to take it actively, the word which is faithful as regards the teaching of others; for that is expressed in what follows.

παρακάλεσις—ἐλέγχειν: Cf. 2 Tim iv. 2 for this combination. The shepherd must be able to tend the sheep, and to drive away wolves.

See on 1 Tim. i. 10. διδασκαλία here, as frequently, is a body of doctrine. So R.V., in the sound doctrine. The A.V., by sound doctrine, would refer to the faith as applied in its various parts to particular needs.

tοὺς ἀντιλεγόντας: It is only a coincidence that where this word occurs in Acts it is in reference to Jewish opponents of the Gospel.

Vv. 10-16. I have just mentioned rebuke as a necessary element in a presbyter's teaching. This is especially needful in dealing with Cretan heretics, in whom the Jewish strain is disagreeably prominent. Alike in their new-fangled philosophy of purity, and in their pretensions to orthodoxy, they ring false. Purity of life can only spring from a pure mind; and knowledge is alleged in vain, if it is contradicted by practice.

Ver. 10. The persons spoken of here were Christian Jews. οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς (without τῆς, see crit. note) has this meaning in ref. (in Acts x. 45 it is qualified by the addition of ἡ Σαρακέντος). Rom. iv. 12, is not really an instance of the phrase. That they were at least nominally Christians is also implied by the epithet ἀνεπόντακτοι. We cannot call those persons unruly on whose obedience we have no claim.

ματαιολογοί: ματαιολογία occurs in 1 Tim. i. 6. ἡμεταρρύθμωσις: seductores. The verb occurs in Gal. vi. 3.

μάλιστα: it is probable that there were very few teachers who were not “of the circumcision.”

Ver. 11. οἱ δὲ ἀνεπόντακτοι: quos oraret redargui, whose mouths must be stopped by the unanswerable arguments of the orthodox controversialist. This is the result hoped for from the “conviction,” of ver. 9.

ὑμεῖς οίκον ἀνατρέποντων: perturbing whole families (Alf.). Moulton and Milligan give an apt illustration from a papyrus of second cent. B.C., τῆς παρ-
The rendering upset. The whole family would be upset by the perversion of one member of it.

It is possible that St. Paul applies this title to the author of the following hexameter line because the Cretan false teachers were self-styled prophets. There was a Cretan prophet once who told plain truths to his countrymen. The whole line occurs, according to Jerome, in the Hymn to Zeus by Epimenides, a native of Cnossus in Crete. The first three words are also found in the Hymn to Zeus by Callimachus, who is the prophet meant according to Theodoret; and the rest has a parallel in Hesiod, Theogon. 26.
nature of the μνάθει referred to in these epistles. See on 1 Tim. i. 4.

ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφόμενων: We are naturally reminded of Mark vii. 7, 8, with its antithesis between the ἐντολάματα ἀνθρώπων and ἐντολάματα ταῦτα καθαρά, where the same passage of Isaiah (xxix. 13) is echoed. But here the antithesis is not so strongly marked. The commandments are deprecated, not because their authors are men, but because they are men who turn away from the truth, impure men (In 1 Tim. iv. 3 “they that believe and know the truth” are men whose thoughts are pure). The truth here, as elsewhere in the Pastorals, is almost a Christian technical term. It can hardly be doubted that the ἐντολαῖς referred to were of the same nature as those noted in Col. ii. 22, arbitrary ascetic prohibitions.

Ver. 15. ἐν ἀπεικόνισιν: This is best understood as a maxim of the Judaic Gnostics, based on a perversion of the Saying πάντα καθαρά ὑμῖν ἐστίν (Luke xi. 41. Cf. Rom. xiv. 20; Mark vii. 18.). St. Paul accepts it as a truth, but not in the intention of the speaker; and answers, τοïς δὲ μεμαρμάροις κ.τ.λ. This passage is thus, as regards its form, parallel to 1 Cor. vi. 12 sqq., where St. Paul cites, and shows the irrelevancy of, two pleas for licence: “All things are lawful for me,” and “Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats”. τοïς καθαροῖς is of course the dat. commodi, for the use of the pure, in their case, as in the parallels, Luke xi. 41. 1 Tim. iv. 3; not in the judgment of the pure, as in Rom. xiv. 14.

τοïς δὲ μεμαρμάροις, κ.τ.λ.: The order of the words is to be noted: their moral obliquity is more characteristic of them than their intellectual perversion. The satisfaction of natural bodily desires (for it is these that are in question) is, when lawful, a pure thing, not merely innocent, in the case of the pure; it is an impure thing, even when lawful, in the case of “them that are defiled”. And for this reason: their intellectual apprehension (ὡς) of these things is perverted by defiling associations; “the light that is in them is darkness”; and their conscience has, from a similar cause, lost its sense of discrimination between what is innocent and criminal. That any action with which they themselves are familiar could be pure is inconceivable to them. “When the soul is unclean, it thinks all things unclean” (Chrys.). The statement that the conscience can be defiled is significant. While conscientious scruples are to be respected, yet, if the conscience be defiled, its dictates and instincts are unreliable, false as are the song-efforts of one who has no ear for music.

Ver. 16. τοῖς ἔργοις ἐργοῦντα: “We know God”; that was their profession of faith. They “gloried in God,” Rom. ii. 17. This is an allusion to the Jewish pride of religious privilege. Weiss points out that this phrase alone is sufficient to prove that the heretics in question are not the Gnostics of the second century (Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 133). See the use of the phrase in Gal. iv. 8, 1 Thess. iv. 5. Compare 2 Tim. iii. 5, “Holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof”; also 1 John ii. 4. There is here the constant antithesis between words and deeds.

tοïς δὲ ἔργοις ἐργοῦντα: Their lives give the lie to their professions; “They acted as if this Supreme Being was a mere metaphysical abstraction, out of all moral relation to human life, as if He were neither Saviour nor Judge” (J. H. Bernard comm. in loc.).
Chapter II.—Vv. 1-10. In the face of this immoral teaching, do you constantly impress the moral duties of the Gospel on your people of every age and class. There is an ideal of conduct appropriate to old men and old women respectively—the latter have moreover special duties in the training of the young women—and young men. Enforce your words by personal example. Slaves, too, must be taught that they share in responsibility for the good name of the Gospel.

Ver. 1. ο-νήΣ: See reff., and note on 1 Tim. vi. 11. Titus is to be as active in teaching positive truth as the heretics were in teaching evil.

Ver. 2. The heads of moral instruction which begin here are more unmistakably intended for the laity than are the similar passages in Tim. That it should devolve on the apostle’s legate to give popular moral instruction is perhaps another indication of the less-developed state of the Church in Crete than in Ephesus and its neighbourhood.

Ver. 3. προσβύτας: correlative to προσβύτας, as προσβύτας is to προσβύτας in 1 Tim. v. 1, 2.

Ver. 4. σωφροσύνη: see note on 1 Tim. iii. 2. For σωφρονίζεσθαι followed by dat. see i. 13. πιστεύειν, ἀγαπεῖν, ὑπομονῆν are constantly grouped together (see on 1 Tim. vi. 11); and this suggests that πιστεύειν here is subjective, not objective, as in the similar phrase i. 13. See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

Ver. 5. ὑπομονή: See on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

Ver. 6. ιεροπρεπείας: The A.V., not given to much wine, makes no difference between this and προσβύτας, which is the verb in the corresponding phrase, in the list of moral qualifications of deacons, 1 Tim. iii. 8. It is proved by experience that the reclamation of a woman drunkard is almost impossible. The best parallel to this use of ὑπομονή is 2 Pet. ii. 19, ὑπὸ τῆς ἀπειλῆς τοῦ ἐνθολήτων. Cf. also the other reff. καλοδιδασκάλους: Not only "by discourse at home," as Chrys. explains, but by example.

Ver. 7. συνεργοίς: The only other examples of ἰνα with a pres. indic.
in Paul are 1 Cor. iv. 6 (ψυζευούση) and Gal. iv. 17 (φησίν). These may be cases of an unusual formation of the subj., both being verbs in -ow συζευ-κοινεῖν, 1 John v. 20, is another instance. 

Train is the excellent rendering of the R.V. The A.V., teach ... to be sober, although an adequate rendering elsewhere, leaves φυλάνθροπος εἶναι disconnected. Timothy is bidden (1 Tim. v. 2) παρακαλεῖν ... νεώτερας himself; but this refers to pastoral public monitions, not to private training in domestic virtues and duties, as here.

tὸς νέος: There is no other instance in the Greek Bible of νέος, in the positive, being applied to a young person; though it is common in secular literature. There is possibly a certain fitness in the word as applied here to recently married women, whom the apostle has perhaps exclusively in view. 

φιλάνθροπος: "This is the chief point of all that is good in a household" (Chrys.). One of the three things in which Wisdom "was beautified" is "a woman and her husband that walk together in agreement" (Ecclus. xxv. 1). 

φιλοτέκνων: "She who loves the root will much more love the fruit" (Chrys.). φιλάνθρωπος καὶ φιλοτέκνων is cited from an "epitaph from Pergamum about the time of Hadrian" by Deissmann, who gives other references to secular literature. (Bible Studies, trans. p. 255 sq.). 

Ver. 5: οἰκουργῶν: workers at home. Ficci says that "the only authority for this word is Soranus of Ephesus, a medical writer, not earlier than the second century," οἰκουργῶν καὶ καθαρίσκων διάγνωσίν ἔχων; but the verb is found in Clem. Rom., ad Cor. i. 1, γνώσεις ... τὰ κατὰ τὸν οἶκον σεμνῶς οἰκουργῶν ἤδη διακοσμεῖ ῥα. οἰκουργῶν, keepers at home, domum custodientes (d m81) domus curator habentis (Vulg.), though constantly found in descriptions of virtuous women, is a less obviously stimulating epithet. Mothers who work at home are usually find it a more absorbing pleasure than "going about from house to house" (1 Tim. v. 13). But the "worker at home" is under a temptation to be as unsparing of her household as of herself; and so St. Paul adds ἀγάπας, benignas, kind (R.V.), rather than good (A.V.). For this force of ἀγάπας, see ref. 

Ἰδίος: Ιδίος (see on 1 Tim. iii. 4) is not emphatic: it is simply, their husbands. The Ἰδίος merely differentiates husband from man. 

Ina μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ βλασφημῆται: For λόγος, as used here, the more usual word is διάμα (from Isa. lli. 5). See ref. on 1 Tim. vi. 13; and also Jas. ii. 7, Rev. xiii. 6, xvi. 9. ἦς ἡ ἐκ τῆς ἐλπιδοθέτας, in 2 Peter ii. 2, is equivalent to ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ here. The practical worth of a religion is not unfairly estimated by its effects on the lives of those who profess it. If the observed effect of the Gospel were to make women worse wives, it would not commend it to the heathen; "for the Greeks judge not of doctrines by the doctrine itself, but they make the life and conduct the test of the doctrines" (Chrys.). See note on 1 Tim. v. 14. 

Ver. 6. σωφρόνως: see on 1 Tim. ii. 9.

Ver. 7. ἡ πρότερος is joined with the preceding words by Jerome and Lucifer (ut pudici [sobrii] sint in omnibus), followed by Tischendorf and von Soden. For this use of ἡ πρότερος, see on 1 Tim. i. 19. St. Paul's usual phrase is ἡ πρότερος (fifteen times in all; ten times in 2 Cor.; not in Pastoralis), or ἡ πρώτισ (ten times, five of which are in the Pastoralis: I Tim. iii. 5).
The exhortation, following ἐρωτήσας τοῦτον, also ver. 15, suggests that Titus was comparatively young.

Σασακακία here is not doctrine (A.V.), but teaching; thy doctrine (R.V.), including the person of the teacher as well as what he says. See note on 1 Tim. i.10.

Ver. 8. ἀκατάγνωστον: to which no exception can be taken. See Deissmann, Bible Studies, trans. p. 200. ἄγαθος implies the conformity of the doctrine taught with the Church's standard (see note on 1 Tim. i.10), while ἀκατάγνωστον has reference to the manner of its presentation to the hearer.

ὁ ἐν ἀντάξει is the heathen opponent, official or unofficial, ὁ ἀντικεχαλών (1 Tim. v. 14), ὁ ἀντιπατριδικός (2 Tim. ii. 25), not the Devil himself (Chrys.).

ἀντρατη: vercurat (Vulg.); but confundatur, as in 2 Thess. iii. 14, would be a better rendering here. An antagonist who finds that he has no case "looks foolish," as we say.

φαίλον: usually applied to actions. See reff. The clause means having nothing evil to report concerning us: not, as the English versions, having no evil thing to say, which might be explained as, "being unable to abuse us."

Ver. 9. θαυμάσιος: sc. τακτακάμε, ver. 6. For the general topic, and the term ἐστάτικα, cf. 1 Tim. vi. 1.

ἐν πάσιν: joined as in text by Jerome, Ambrosiaster and m89 with ὑποτάσσεσθαι. It is in favour of this that ἐν πάσιν elsewhere in the Pastoral epistles (see note on ver. 7) is at the end of a clause; also that in similar contexts we have ἐν πάσιν (Eph. v. 24) and κατὰ πάντα (Col. iii. 22) joined with ὑποτάσσεσθαι and ἄρακακος.

ὑπαραστός: A Pauline word. Alf. notes that it is a servant's phrase, like the English "to give satisfaction." This acute remark brings the present passage into harmony with St. Paul's usage in the reff., in which it is used of persons, of men in their relation to God.

This acute remark brings the present passage into harmony with St. Paul's usage in the reff., in which it is used of persons, of men in their relation to God. τὸ ἀντίπατριδικός is used of a sacrifice, "acceptable," in Rom. xii. 1, Phil. iv. 18; cf. Heb. xii. 28; το ἐντρατη, "that which is well pleasing," in Rom. xii. 2, Eph. v. 10, Col. iii. 20, Heb. xii. 21. Jerome's view that ἀντρατη is passive, "contented with their lot," is not satisfactory.

κατὰ ἀντιλέγοντας; non contradicentes (Vulg.). Ell. thinks that more is implied than pert answers (A.V. answering again); rather "thwarting their masters' plans, wishes, or orders". See ch. i. 9. This is the connotation of gainsaying (R.V., A.V.m.).

Ver. io. κατὰ νοσοφικομένους: non fraudantes (Vulg.), not purloining. The particular form of theft implied is the abstraction or retention for oneself, of a part of something entrusted to one's care.

πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνευκριμένους ἀγαθὴς: displaying the utmost trustworthiness. There is a similar phrase in ch. iii. 2,


See note on 2 Tim. iv. 14. On this use of τάς, see on 1 Tim. i. 15. πίστις has a qualifying adj. elsewhere, e.g., ἀνωτάτης (1 Tim. i. 5); 2 Tim. i. 5. Cf. ch. i. 4. 2 Pet. i.; Jude 20, but the addition of another adj. in the middle is unusual, in Clem. Rom. i Cor. 26 πίστεως γὰρ is rendered by Lightfoot honest faith; but honest fidelity would be an odd expression. Von Soden would give γὰρ here the sense of kind, wishing well, as in ver. 5, and as a contrast to ἀνθρωπεῖα, as πίστις is to νοσι. W.H. suggest that the original reading here was πᾶσιν ἀνθρωπονομέναν ἀγάπην. See apparatus crit.

2 Tim. iii. 11. Θεοῦ refers to God the Father. See i. 3. Von Soden takes it here as objective genitive, the διδασκαλία being set forth in vv. 11-14.

corrigendum: cf. I Tim. ii. 9. κοσμοί ἑαυτῶν . . . δὴ ἐργαν ἀγάπην. The διδασκαλία, though really practical, can be plausibly alleged to be mere theory; it must then, by good works, be rendered attractive to them that are without. Cf. Matt. v. 16, Phil. ii. 15.

Vv. 12-15. The justification of this insistence on the universal necessity for right conduct is the all-embracing scope of the saving grace of God, which has visibly appeared as a call to repentance, a help to amendment of life, and a stimulus to hope. Christ's gift of Himself for us constrains us to give ourselves wholly to Him. Insist on these things, as authoritatively as possible, in every department of your teaching.

Ver. 11. The emphatic word is τὰσ. The connexion is with what has immediately preceded. No rank or class or type of mankind is outside the saving influence of God's grace. Chrys. concludes a striking picture of the adverse moral environment of slaves with, "It is a difficult and surprising thing that there should ever be a good slave".

ἐπεφάνης: See note on 1 Tim. vi. 14. The grace of God (also iii. 7) is His kindness and love of man (iii. 4). It appeared (I Cor. 26), (a) as a revelation, in the Incarnation, and also (b) in its visible results; and so it is both heard and recognised (Col. i. 6). Accordingly Barnabas could see it at Antioch (Acts xii. 25). It is possible to stand fast in it (1 Pet. v. 12), and to continue in it (Acts xxii. 33). Here it is described in its essential power and range, σωτήριον πᾶσιν ἀνθρ., . . . appeared, bringing salvation to all men (so R.V.; A.V.m). This connexion of the words is favoured by the fact that εἰρεφάνη is used absolutely in iii. 4.

Ver. 12. ταῦτα δοκιμασούσα, erudiens (Vulg.), corripiens (d). Grace is potentially σωτήριον as regards all men; actually its efficacy is seen in the disciplining of individuals one by one; ἡμᾶς, to begin with. See notes on 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 4, iv. 10. So Chrys. makes ἡμᾶς depend on ἐπεφάνη more directly than on ταῦτα: "Christ came that we should deny ungodliness." The connexion, then, is ἐπεφάνη . . . ἡμᾶς . . . ίδον. "The final cause of the Revelation in Christ is not creed, but character" (J. H. Bernard). It is of course possible (and this is the view usually held) to join ταῦτα δοκιμασούσα ἡμᾶς; the ἡμᾶς introducing the object (instructing us, to the intent that, denying, etc., R.V.), not the content (teaching us that denying, etc., A.V.) of the ταῦτα.
The references represent three successive stages in the Christian life. The force of the aorist participle must not be lost sight of, though it may be pedantic to mark it in translation. ἀρνηταίοι k.t.l., synchronises with the "death unto sin" which precedes the definite entry on newness of life, while προσδεχόμενοι expresses the constant mental attitude of those who are living that new life.

This indicates the renunciation of the Devil, of the vanity of this world, and of all the sinful lusts of the flesh. ἄρνημα means here to repudiate, renounce all connexion with. Cf. ἀποκρίσιμον, 1 Pet. iii. 1. See on 1 Tim. v. 8.

σερφονέω: The reference of the three adverbs is well explained by St. Bernard: "sobrie erga nos; juste erga proximos; parvi erga Deum." Ver. 13. προσδεχόμενοι k.t.l., as already stated, describes the glad expectancy which is the ruling and prevailing thought in the lives of men looking for their Lord's return (Luke xii. 39), προσδεχόμενος τοῦ θείου την θείαν ἁμαρτίαν (Jude 21). Cf. Rom. viii. 19; 1 Cor. i. 7; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Thess. i. 10; Heb. ix. 28; 2 Pet. iii. 12. Isa. xxxv. 9 is the basal passage. Cf. Acts xxiv. 15, ἐλπίζω ἐμοὶ εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ὥς καὶ ὅσιος προσδεχόμενος. In this quotation ἐλπίζω is the mental act, while the relative ὡς is the realisation of the hope. ἐλπίς is also passive—the thing hoped for—in Gal. v. 5; Col. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 1.

ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης: The Second Coming of Christ will be, as we are assured by Himself, "in the glory of His Father" (Matt. xvi. 27; Mark viii. 38).

"We rejoice in the hope of the glory of God" (Rom. v. 2, a passage which supports the view that δόξη here is dependent on ἐλπίς as well as on ἐπιφάνειας), von Soden takes ἐπιφάνειας as expegeitical of δόξη. The Second Coming of Christ may, therefore, be regarded as an ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης Θεοῦ, even though we should not speak of an ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ Πατρὸς, while ἐπιφάνεια Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is normal and natural (see on 1 Tim. vi. 14). The ἐλπίς having then an intelligible meaning, we are not entitled to treat it as merely adjectival, the glorious appearing (A.V.). The genital relation does not differ in this case from τῇ ἐπιφάνειᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ in 2 Thess. ii. 8. See also note on 1 Tim. i. 11. Again, there does not seem any reason why τοῦ σωρῆρος, k.t.l., here should not depend on ἐπιφάνειας, on the analogy of 2 Tim. i. 10. This may be thought too remote. In any case, the conception of the Second Coming as an occasion of manifestation of two δόξαι, that of the Father and of the Son, is familiar from Luke ix. 26, ἦς ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς, k.t.l. On the whole, then, we decide in favour of the R.V.m. in the rendering of this passage, appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. The grammatical argument—"the identity of reference of two substantives when under the vinculum of a common article"—is too slender to bear much weight, especially when we take into account not only the general neglect of the article in these epistles but the omission of it before σωρῆρα in 1 Tim. i. 1, iv. 10. Elliott says, "megálos would seem uncalled for if applied to the Father." To this it may be answered that (a) the epithet is not otiose here; as marking the majesty of God the Father it is parallel to the δόξην παρθένου, k.t.l., which recalls the self-sacrificing love of the Son; both constituting the double appeal—to fear and to love—of the Judgment to come. (b) Again, St. Paul is nowhere more emphatic in his lofty language about God the Father than in these epistles; see 1 Tim. i. 17, vi. 15, 16. This is the only place in the N.T. in
which μέγας is applied to the true God, although it is a constant predicate of heathen gods and goddesses, e.g., Acts xix. 28. (See Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, vii., viii. 563). In view of the fact that the most probable exegesis of Rom. ix. 5 is that δὲ ἐν τῷ πάντων, θέσεως εἰλικρίνειας, κ.τ.λ. refers to Christ, it cannot be said that δὲ μέγας θεός, as applied to Him, is un-Pauline. But the proofs that St. Paul held Christ to be God Incarnate do not lie in a few disputable texts, but in the whole attitude of his soul towards Christ, and in the doctrine of the relation of Christ to mankind which is set forth in his epistles. St. Paul's "declarations of the divinity of the Eternal Son" are not studied, as Ellicott admits that this would be if the R.V. rendering (our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ) be adopted. To this it may be added that the Versions, with the exception of the Aethiopic, agree with R.V.m. Ell. cites on the other side, of ante-Nicene writers, Clem. Alex., Protrept. § 7, and Hippolytus,—quoted by Wordsworth—besides the great bulk of the post-Nicene fathers.

The text is one which would strike the eye of a reader to whose consciousness the Arrian controversy was present; but it is safe to say that if it had read τοῦ σωτήρος, the μεγάλον would have excited no comment. Consequently the papyri (all vii. a.d.) cited by J. H. Moulton (Grammar, vol. i. p. 84) "which attest the translation our great God and Saviour as current among Greek-speaking Christians" are too late as guides to St. Paul's meaning here. The similar problem in 2 Peter 1 must be discussed independently. At least, even if it be granted that the R.V. there is correct, and that 2 Peter 1 is an example of the transference to Christ of the language used of deified kings "in the papyri and inscriptions of Ptolemaic and Imperial times," it does not follow that the same account must be given of Tit. ii. 13.

Ver. 14. διὸ ἐκεῖνοι ἐκατόν κ.τ.λ.: see note on 1 Tim. ii. 6. As already observed, this is an appeal from the constraining love of Christ to the responding love of man. 

λυτρώσειται: deliver. The language is borrowed from Psalm cxxix. (cxxx). 8 αὐτῶν λυτρώσεται τὸν Ἰσραήλ ἐκ παθῶν τῶν ἄνωμῶν αὐτοῦ. The material supplied by this passage for a discussion of the Atonement is contained in ἢμῶν... ἢμῶν, not in λυτρώσειται. See Dean Armitage Robinson's note on Eph. i. 14.

ἀνόμλα: Lawlessness is the essence of sin (I John iii. 4), self-assertion as opposed to self-sacrifice which is love. Love, which is self-sacrifice, is a dissentient of self-assertion or sin. And to what degree soever we allow the love of Christ to operate as a controlling principle in our lives, to that degree we are delivered from ἁμαρτία, as an opposing controlling principle.

καθαρισθεὶς ἐκεῖνος λαὸς: This is a pregnant expression for "purify and so make them fit to be his people". St. Paul has in mind Ezek. xxxvii. 23, "I will save them out of all their dwelling places, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God", ἑως ἀποκαθαρισθήσεται ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν δὲ ἀποκαθαρισθήσεται ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ καθαρισθήσεται καὶ ἐσται μια ἡ γάτῃ, κ.τ.λ. There is in καθαρισθησθαι an allusion to Holy Baptism, which is explicit in iii. 5. Cf. Eph. v. 26, ἵνα αὕτη τὴν ἄγαθον καθαρισθῇ τῷ λυτρῷ τοῦ θετός ἐν ἁμαρτία. λαὸς περιοικίας: populum acceptabilem (Vulg.). A people for his own possession (R.V.) is the modern equivalent of a peculiar people (A.V.). λαὸς περιοικίας is the LXX for πολιτικὸς λαός: πολιτικός means "a valued property, a peculiar treasure" (peculium), and occurs first in Exodus xix. 5, "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me." Here the LXX inserts λαός, possibly from the references in Deut., in which the combination πολιτικὸς λαός is found. πολιτικὸς λαός alone occurs in Malachi iii. 17 (ἐλαχιστὸς πολιτικός) and in Ps. cxxv. 4 (ἐλαχιστοποιατός). The LXX of Mal. iii. 17 is echoed in Eph. i. 14, εἰς ἀποκαθαρισμὸν τῆς περιοικίας, (where see Dean Armitage Robinson's note) and 1 Pet. ii. 9, λαός εἰς περιοικίαν, in which λαός is a reminiscence of the
14—15. III. 1-3.
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amples of this latter sense in the N.T.

τοικλαια: See note on 2 Tim. iii. 6. 

διάγοντες: ης θλεω, as in 1 Tim. ii. 2. 

στυγνοτο ΚΕ.Α.: odibiles, odientts invicem (Vulg.). This marks the stage of degradation, before it becomes hopeless: when vice becomes odious to the vicious, stands a self-confessed failure to produce happiness.

Ver. 4. 

χριστόρης και φιλανθρωπία: (benignitas . . . humanitas) is a constant combination in Greek. See many examples supplied by Field. Here it expresses the notion of John iii. 16, προς τον τον [όντος] αλλιώς ἤθελε τῶν κόσμων κ.τ.λ. and of Eph. ii. 4-6. Perhaps also, as von Soden suggests, the kindness of God is here contrasted with the unkindness of men to each other; cf. Eph. iv. 31, 32. 

χριστότης is a Pauline word, used of God also in ref. φιλανθρωπία is especially used of the benevolent feelings of divine beings towards men; more rarely of the relations between man and man, as in Acts xxviii. 2. 

Ver. 5. The τόν . . . ἡμᾶς to which the works were done, and to which they are related.

κατὰ . . . ἡμᾶς: The phraseology is borrowed from Ps. cviii. (cix.) 26, 31, 32, is the representative of such words. 

Ver. 5. The ημᾶς and ημᾶς refer to the same persons as those mentioned in verse 3, i.e., the apostles and those who have had a similar experience. The verse may be paraphrased as a statement of fact thus:—God saved us by Baptism, which involves two complementary processes, (a) the ceremony itself which marks the actual moment in time of the new birth, and (b) the daily, hourly, momentarily renewing of the Holy Spirit, by which the spiritual life is supported and fostered and increased. And the moving cause of this exceeding kindness of God was not any merits of our own, but His mercy.
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1 See 1Tim. i.15. m See 1Tim. ii.8.

mechanics, we do not confuse the beginner's mind by making allowances for friction, etc. Here, as in Rom. vi. and 1 Pet. iii. 21, it is assumed that man co-

operates with God in the work of his own salvation. On the force of the aorist,€o-uo-cv,see note on 1 Tim. ii.4.

XovTpov : the washing. XovTpov may mean the water used for washing, or the process itself of washing. The R.V.m. laver would be Xovrrjp. See Dean Armitage Robinson's note on Eph. v. 26.

ταλιγγενείας : This defines the nature of the λωτρόν which God employs as His instrument in effecting the salva-
tion of man; not any λωτρόν whatever, but that of new birth. It is sufficient to observe here that much of the con-
troversy about regeneration might have been avoided had men kept before them the analogy of natural birth, followed as it is immediately, not by vigorous man-
hood, but by infancy and childhood and youth.

ἀνακαινώσεως: The genitive ἀνακαι-

νώσεως depends on βία (which is actually inserted in the Harcian Syriac; so R.V.m., and through renewing), not on λωτρόν, as apparently Vulg., per lavacrum regenerationis et renovationis Spiritus Sancti, f. Boh. Arm., fol-

lowed by R.V. The λωτρόν, the wash-
ing, secures a claim on the Holy Spirit for renewing, just as birth gives a child a claim on society for food and shelter; but unless we are compelled to do other-

wise, it is best to keep the two notions distinct. Birth, natural or spiritual, must be a definite fact taking place at a par-
ticular moment; whereas renewing is necessarily a subsequent process, constantly operating. Without this renew-

ing the life received at birth is at best in a state of suspension. The references to ἀνακαινώσεως and ἀνακαινών, and the similar passage, Eph. iv. 23, show that the terms are always used of those who are actually living the Christian life.

Ver. 6. οὗ ἔξεχες : Joel iii. x (ii. 28) is the passage alluded to. Cf. in addition to reff. given above, Acts x. 45, Rom. v. 5, Gal. iv. 6. The οὗ refers of course to πνεύματ. ἀγ. by attraction, not to ἀνακαινώσεως. All gifts of the Holy Spirit that come through Jesus Christ are a continuation of the Pentecostal out-
pouring. The aorist is due to the Apostle's thought of that occasion, although the ἡμᾶς shows that the im-
mediate reference is to the experience of St. Paul and other Christians.

διὰ Ἡπόνοι Χριστοῦ : to be connected with ἐξέχες. See John xv. 26, Act i. 33. The finished work of Jesus Christ was the necessary pre-condition to His effusion of the Holy Spirit.

Ver. 7. ἔνα, κ.τ.λ.: It is not quite certain, whether this expresses the object of ἔξεχες or of ἐξοσών. The former connection brings out best the climax of the passage. ληπρόνωμαι marks the highest point to which man can attain in this life. See reff. The two pre-
ceding stages are marked by λωτρόν ταλιγγενείας and ἀνακαινώσεως, while δικαιοθέτησε... χάριτι is an expression in theological language of the simpler κατά τὸ αὐτόν ἰδέα ἐσωτήρησεν ἡμᾶς. The grace by which man is justified is usually spoken of as that of God the Father, Rom. iii. 24; and so ἐκεῖνος, not αὐτός, is used as referring to the remoter antecedent.

κληρονόμοι: According to the analogy of the other passages where it occurs, this word is best taken absolutely; or, if the notion must be completed, we may understand θεός. The term would not need any elucidation to one of St. Paul's company. It is also an argument against connecting κληρ. ίδεις αἰωνόν (R.V.m) that ἐλεύθερος αἰωνόν occurs in i. 2; and Gal. iii. 29, κατ' ἐπαγγελλαν κληρ., is parallel.

Vv. 8-11. To sum up what I have been saying: Belief in God is not a matter of theory or of speculation, but of practice; it must be accompanied by good works. This true religion unites the beautiful and the profitable. On the other hand, foolish speculations and con-
troversies about the law are profitless
and unpractical. Do not parley long with a confirmed schismatic. If he does not yield to one or two admonitions, reject him altogether. It is beyond your power to set him right.

Ver. 8. Τυποῖς ὁ λόγος. Here it is evident that ὁ λόγος does not refer to any isolated Saying, but to the doctrinal statement contained in verses 4-7 regarded as a single concept—as we, when we speak of The Incarnation, sum up in one term a whole system of theology—while τοστὸν refers to the various topics indicated in that statement, not to the practical teaching of ii. 1—iii. 7.

ἔφοδος: see note on 1 Tim. ii. 8.

διὰ βεβαιωθῆναι: Here the Vulg. has conformare; δ has affirmed, as in 1 Tim. i. 7, where see note.

εἰναι: It is most significant and suggestive that the apostle held that good works were most certainly assured by a theology which gives special prominence to the free unmerited grace of God. This is made more evident in the R.V. (to the end that), than in the A.V. (that).

φρονίζων: current (am.), curam habeant (fuld).

καλῶν ἑργῶν προστασθήσαται: occupy themselves in good works, bonis operibus præcessæ (Vulg.). Prostasæ would have been a better translation, since the πρὸδα in this use of προστασθῆσαι is derived from bodily posture rather than from superiority in station. "From the practice of the workman or tradesman standing before his shop for the purpose of soliciting customers ... we arrive at the general meaning of conducting or managing any matter of business." So Field, who also points out that the R.V. m. profess honest occupations (similarly A.V.m on ver. 14) is open to the serious objection that καλα ἑργα everywhere else in N.T., as well as in secular authors, means "good works" in the religious or moral sense. Also, the simple phrase is used designedly in order to express the notion that profession of the recently revealed Gospel is indeed merely a logical consequence and natural development of the older simple belief in God.

ταύτα: The antithesis in the following μόρφῳ ὁ λόγος proves that these things refers to the subject-matter of Titus' pronouncements (διαβεβαιωθῆναι), and means this enforcement of practical religion.

καλά: is to be taken absolutely, as in the parallel 1 Tim. ii. 3, and is not to be connected with τοῖς ἄνθρωποις.

Ver. 9. ἡ λόγος and γενεαλογίας are associated together in 1 Tim. i. 4 (where see notes). Here they are co-ordinated; there the γενεαλογίας are one of the sources whence ἡ λόγος originates. The nature of the ἡ λόγα here deprecated is determined by the context. ἡ λόγα indicate the spirit of contentiousness; μάχαι the conflicts as heard and seen. On μάχαι, see 2 Tim. ii. 23. The μάχαι γομμάκα are no doubt the same as the ἀρτοφατίαι of 1 Tim. vi. 4. Speaking broadly, the controversy turned on the attempt to give a fictitious permanence to the essentially transient elements in the Mosaical Law.

περίστασις: See note on 2 Tim. ii. 16.

μάχαι: Here, and in James i. 26, μάχαι is an adjective of two terminations; yet μάχαι occurs 1 Cor. xv. 17; ἀρτοφατίαι, 1 Peter i. 18.

Ver. 10. ἀνεστάλην ἐνθρώπων: St.
Paul passes from the reprehensible opinions to the man who propagates them. He is the same kind of man as the φιλόνιμος of 1 Cor. xi. 16; or "he that refuseth to hear the church" of Matt. xviii. 17; he is of "them which cause divisions and occasions of stumbling," Rom. xvi. 17. The term αἵρεσις is applied in a non-offensive sense to the sects of Judaism, Acts v. 17, xv. 5, xxvi. 5. St. Luke represents the Jews as so speaking of the Christian Church (Acts xxiv. 5, xxvii. 22), and St. Paul as resenting this application of the term (Acts xxiv. 14). The Apostle himself uses the word in an unfavourable sense (1 Cor. xi. 19; Gal. v. 20), as does 2 Pet. ii. 1. A comparison of 1 Cor. xi. 19 with 1 John ii. 19 suggests that αἵρεσις involved the formation of a separate society (so R.V.m. here, faction), not merely the holding of aberrant opinions, or the favouring a policy different from that of the Church rulers. The νοθεύεις addressed to a member of such an αἵρεσις would be of the nature of a verbal remonstrance, pointing out the essentially unchristian character of needless separation. It is evident that the αἵρεσις αἵρεσιών would be beyond any Church discipline. The permission of a second attempt at reconciliation is probably not unconnected with our Lord's counsel, Matt. xviii. 15.

παρατηρέω: Have nothing to do with him. See note on 1 Tim. iv. 7. The word does not necessarily imply any formal excommunication. Such procedure would be unnecessary. Excommunication has no terrors for those who deliberately separate themselves. "Monere desine, quid enim iuvat? laterem laveares" (Bengel).

Ver. 11. εἰδὼς δὲι: since thou mayest know. Argument with a man whose basal mental convictions differ from your own, or whose mind has had a twist, is mere waste of breath.

αὐτοκατάκριτος: proprio iudicio condemnatus (Vulg.). He is self-condemned because his separation from the Church is due to his own acknowledged act. He cannot deny that his views are antagonistic to those which he once accepted as true; he is condemned by his former, and, as St. Paul would say, his more enlightened self.

Vv. 12-14. Come to me, as soon as you can be spared. Forward Zenas and Apollos. Let our friends in Crete remember that fruitfulness in good works is the one thing needful for them.

Ver. 12. οἵτινεσ πέμψας ἀρτέμιαν πρὸς ἑ αὐτοῦ τοῖς θυμοῖς, καὶ σπούδασον ἑλθείν πρὸς με εἰς Νικόπολιν: έκέι γάρ η κέρικα τα παραχειμάσατο. 13. οἵτινεσ ότι μόνη, not LXX. g See 2 Tim. xxvii. 12, xxviii. 11, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, not LXX.

νομιμός: In the absence of
any example of this word being used as the equivalent of legisperitus (Vulg.), jurisconsultus or jurisperttus, it seems best to assume that Zenas was a vopixos in the usual N.T. sense, an expert in the Mosaic Law.

'Απολλών: For Apollos, see article in Hastings' D. B.

πρόφυλόμενον: set forward on their journey, praemittit; but deduco is the rendering where the word occurs elsewhere. See reft.

Ver. 14. The δέ does not mark an antithesis between οἱ ἥρετεροι and the persons who have just been mentioned, but is rather resumptive of verse 8; repeating and emphasising at the close of the letter that which St. Paul had most at heart, the changed lives of the Cretan converts. οἱ ἥρετεροι of course means those of our faith in Crete.

καὶ τὰς ἄναγκασας χρήσις: The best commentary on this expression is in Thess. iv. 9-12. Although καὶ τὰς ἄναγκασας χρήσις does not mean to profess honest occupations, yet it is plain from St. Paul's letters that he would regard the earning one's own bread respectably as a condition precedent to the doing of good works. The necessary wants to which allusion is made are the maintenance of oneself and family, and helping brethren who are unable to help themselves (Acts xx. 35; Rom. xii. 13; Eph. iv. 28). This view is borne out by the reason which follows, τὰ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. See John xv. 2, Phil. iv. 17, Col. i. 10, 2 Pet. i. 8.

Ver. 15. Final Salutation.

οἱ μὲν ἡμῶν: The preposition is different elsewhere in Paul: οἱ σὺν ἡμῶν πάντες ἄδελφοι, Gal. i. 2; οἱ σὺν ἡμῖν ἄδελφοι, Phil. iv. 21. οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν is a constant phrase in the Synoptists. There is a similar use of μετὰ in Acts xx. 34 (a speech of St. Paul's), and in 2 Tim. iv. 11.

τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει: The faith (see note on 1 Tim. i. 2) is that which binds Christians together more or less closely. Timothy and Titus were St. Paul's tēs τῆς ἐν πίστει; others were more distantly related to him, though of the same family, "the household of faith".

Dean Armitage Robinson (Ephesians, p. 281) gives several examples from papyri of similar formulas of closing, especially two, which read, Ἀντίπαθος... τοὺς φιλοῦντας σε (or ἡμᾶς) ἀκούσητε. This suggests the rendering here, those who love us truly.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO

PHILEMON
INTRODUCTION.

§ I. Authorship, Place and Date.—The external evidence for the authenticity of this Epistle is sufficiently strong; it is included among the Pauline writings in the collection of Marcion; Tertullian mentions this in his Adv. Marc. v. 42. It is also mentioned, in connexion with the Pastoral Epistles, in the Muratorian Fragment. Origen ascribes it to St. Paul (Hom. in Matth. xxxiii., xxxiv.); Eusebius reckons it among the ὅμολογούμενα (H. E. iii. 25); Jerome, in his commentary on the Epistle, mentions the fact that its genuineness was disputed by some because it did not treat of doctrinal matters; he holds that it would not have been received by the Church from the beginning unless it had been St. Paul's. The fact that it is not mentioned in the sub-apostolic literature cannot excite suspicion, for its shortness and the character of its contents sufficiently account for this non-mention. The internal evidence is equally strong; the Epistle bears the impress of the Pauline spirit throughout; and one has only to compare the vocabulary and style with those of the other Pauline Epistles to be convinced at once that St. Paul wrote it. Very few among modern scholars reject its Pauline authorship; van Manen, for example, finds a difficulty in the "surprising mixture of singular and plural both in the persons speaking and in the persons addressed. This double form points at once to some peculiarity in the composition of the Epistle. It is not a style that is natural to any one who is writing freely and untrammelled, whether to one person or many" (Encycl. Bibl. col. 3695). Such a futile objection is self-condemnatory; but he continues: "Here, as throughout the discussion, the constantly recurring questions as to the reason for the selection of the forms, words, expressions adopted, find their answer in the observation that the Epistle was written under the influence of a perusal of 'Pauline' epistles, especially of those to the Ephesians and Colossians" (ibid.). That is as much as to say that the fact that a writer is writing in his usual style is presumptive evidence that his style is being imitated by someone else! The minute verbal comparisons which van Manen tabulates between this and the other
Pauline (he would write 'Pauline') Epistles constitutes a strong proof of identity of authorship between them. Objectors like the writer mentioned are, of course, exceptional; as Jülicher says, "the all but universal judgment is that Philemon belongs to the least doubtful part of the Apostle's work" (Intr. to the N. T. p. 127).

The Place of writing and the Date of the Epistle are mutually determining; St. Paul was in prison when he wrote it, therefore the Epistle must have come either from Caesarea (Acts xxiv.-xxvi.), or from Rome (Acts xxviii. 30); the time of these two imprisonments was A.D. 58-63; the vast majority of writers are agreed that the group of Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians and to Philemon were written from Rome (see, for the reasons for this view, Lightfoot's Philippians, pp. 30 ff.); this would narrow the date of our Epistle down to somewhere between A.D. 60-63. As to the question whether Philemon was written early or late within this period, this depends upon the answer to the question as to whether the Epistle to the Philippians should be placed early in the Roman captivity and the three other Epistles later, or vice versa, for it is generally allowed that the Epistle to the Philippians stands alone, the other three were written and despatched at or about the same time. For a full discussion of these questions reference must be made to Lightfoot's Philippians, pp. 30-46; here it will have to suffice to say that the most probable year for the date of Philemon is A.D. 62.

§ II. Occasion and Contents.—Although the Epistle is not the only one of St. Paul's addressed to an individual which has come down to us, it is the only one of a, mainly, private character; for although in the opening salutation Apphia, Archippus and the Church in Philemon's house are addressed as well as Philemon himself, nevertheless the contents of the Epistle deal with a personal matter. The nearest parallel in the N.T. is 3 John, addressed to "Gaius the beloved". The Epistle is an appeal made by St. Paul to Philemon on behalf of the runaway slave, Onesimus. Philemon was a citizen of Colossae (cf. Col. iv. 17, Philem. 2, 10-12, and see Col. iv. 9); the Word was most likely preached here during the period which St. Paul spent at Ephesus, from which centre his influence extended widely (see Acts xix. 26, 1 Cor. xvi. 19); Philemon was among the converts made by St. Paul himself (see Philem. 19), and he evidently became a zealous worker, since St. Paul applies the title συνεργός to him; that he was loving and hospitable is clear from vv. 5-7.

Onesimus, the immediate cause of the Epistle, who had run away from his master, also became a convert of St. Paul's (ver. 10); from ver. 18 it would almost seem as though he had committed a theft;
if so, the reason of his having run away would have been fear of punishment. St. Paul's influence upon him must have been strong to have induced him to return. The name Onesimus, like Philemon, is Phrygian; for some reason or other Phrygian slaves were regarded with contempt: ὁ δὲ ἄρας πληγεὶς δεμένον καὶ διάκονότερον (mentioned by Vincent as being quoted by Wallon, Hist. de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité, ii. 61, 62). The name was very commonly given to slaves, and appears over and over again on inscriptions as the name of a slave or a freedman.

The letter in which St. Paul intercedes for Onesimus was sent by Tychicus, who was going to Colossæ and Laodicæa with other letters from him to the churches there. Nothing could exceed the affectionate tactfulness displayed in the Epistle; the delicate way in which St. Paul combines the appeal to all that is best in Philemon with a gentle, yet distinct assertion of his own authority (see vv. 8, 9, 21) is very striking. The Epistle is a witness to the high demands which Christianity makes upon men; and the way in which it teaches the universal brotherhood of man together with the eternal truth that one man is better than another—or worse—and that therefore class distinctions lie within the nature of things; this is another side of its permanent value. The power of the Gospel and the noble character of St. Paul are the two notes sounded throughout; or, as Lightfoot so well expresses it, the special value of the Epistle lies in the fact that "nowhere is the social influence of the Gospel more strikingly exerted, nowhere does the nobility of the Apostle's character receive a more vivid illustration than in this accidental pleading on behalf of a runaway slave".

§ III. Slavery, Jewish and Roman.—The question of slavery so obviously suggests itself in connexion with this Epistle that a short section on the subject seems called for. It is not enough to refer only to Roman slavery, although Onesimus was a slave and Philemon a master under the Roman régime; for St. Paul was a Hebrew, and the Hebrew conception of slavery must, therefore, be taken into account as well. "Slavery was practised by the Hebrews under the sanction of the Mosaic law, not less than by the Greeks and Romans. But though the same in name, it was in its actual working"—and, we may add, in its whole theory and conception—"something wholly different" (Lightfoot, Philemon, p. 319). The Hebrew laws regarding slavery were exceedingly humane, for Hebrew slaves belonged to the Covenant people, for which reason also they were regarded as members of their owner's family; they therefore had their social, as well as their religious rights. A Hebrew slave could not be kept
as such for more than six years at the outside, unless he himself wished it; the laws concerning the redemption of a slave are very explicit. But owing to the conditions of society in ancient times there can be no doubt that a slave was, as a rule, much better off in a servile condition than if he were free; it was for this reason that the Hebrews had a special law laying down the procedure in the case of those who desired to continue bondmen "for ever". According to Jer. xxxiv. 8-24, however, permanent enslavement of Hebrew men and women is strongly denounced as a sin which will bring about national disaster. According to Lev. xxv. 45, 46, the Hebrew was permitted to buy Gentile slaves, who became personal property and were inherited by the owner's children. But the owner's power over his slaves was strictly limited by the law; if he punished a slave in such a way as to cause permanent bodily injury the slave gained his freedom as compensation; if a master chastised his slave so as to cause his death, he was treated as a murderer. Then, again, according to Hebrew law, a slave who had escaped was not to be delivered up again to his master. St. Paul cannot, of course, be accused of having broken this law in the case of Onesimus, since the latter returned voluntarily; but it is, however, possible that when St. Paul wrote, "For perhaps he was therefore parted from thee for a season, that thou shouldest have him for ever," he had in mind the law of the slave's voluntary return to his master in order to remain his "bondman for ever" (Deut. xv. 16, 17), and thought of how that law had been "fulfilled" by the teaching of Christ (see Matt. v. 17).

Much ancient traditional matter is contained in Talmudical writings; it is, therefore, interesting to note one or two data in these on the subject of slaves; it is said, for example, that the master of a Hebrew slave (man or woman) must place him on an equality with himself "in meat and drink, in lodging and bed-clothes, and must act towards him in a brotherly manner," so that a saying is preserved in Kiddushin, 20a that, "whosoever buys a Hebrew slave buys a master for himself". Again, the law concerning the escaped slave, referred to above, is in the Talmud construed as applying to one who flees from a place outside the Holy Land into it; but the slave must give the master from whom he has fled a bond for his value; if the master refuses to manumit the slave by deed, the court protects the former bondman in his refusal to serve further (Gittin, 45a). According to Rabbinical teaching a runaway slave who is recaptured must make good the time of his absence; if this is traditional and ancient law, which is very probable, it throws an interesting side-light upon our Epistle; in the first place, it may, in part, have been the reason for St. Paul's
insistence on the return of Onesimus to his master; and in the second place, it may have some bearing on the words in vv. 18, 19, “But if he hath wronged thee at all, or oweth thee aught, put that to mine account; I Paul write it with mine own hand, I will repay it”; these last words are perhaps meant literally, the reference being to manual labour, or the like, which St. Paul was prepared to undertake in order to make up for the time lost by Onesimus, this lost time having presumably occasioned loss to Philemon. For the above see further Exod. xxi. 2-11, Lev. xxv. 39-54, Deut. xv. 12-18, xxiii. 16, 17 (15, 16 R.V.); Hamburger, Real-Encycl. des Judenthums i. p. 947; Jewish Encycl. xi. 404 ff.

These few data are sufficient to show the spirit of mercy and fellow-feeling which characterised Jewish slavery.

Utterly different from this was the Roman system; this is well described in Lightfoot’s Colossians and Philemon, pp. 320 ff., and with great minuteness in Wallon’s Hist. de l’esclavage dans l’antiquité (2nd ed.), which is the chief authority on the subject. For details concerning slavery in the Roman empire recourse must be had to these works; and for a description of the appalling moral effects of the institution upon both masters and slaves, see Vincent’s Commentary, pp. 163 ff. While there were undoubtedly exceptions, cp., e.g., the letter written by the younger Pliny (Ep. ix. 21), quoted by Lightfoot, op. cit. p. 316, the general rule was that the Roman system was, practically, the antithesis of the Jewish.

St. Paul’s attitude towards slavery must be understood in the light of the Jewish system; this contained within itself the germs of the Christian conception of man, which was bound sooner or later to prove fatal to slavery. “When the Gospel taught that God had made all men and women upon earth of one family; that all alike were His sons and His daughters; that, whatever conventional distinctions human society might set up, the supreme King of Heaven refused to acknowledge any; that the slave, notwithstanding his slavery, was Christ’s freedman, and the free, notwithstanding his liberty, was Christ’s slave; when the Church carried out this principle by admitting the slave to her highest privileges, inviting him to kneel side by side with his master at the same holy table; when, in short, the Apostolic precept that ‘in Christ Jesus is neither bond nor free’ was not only recognised, but acted upon, then slavery was doomed” (Lightfoot, op. cit. p. 325).

§ IV. Literature:

Lightfoot, Colossians and Philemon, 1884.
Von Soden, “Philemon,” in Holtzmann’s Hand Kommentar, 1891.
INTRODUCTION


The articles on Philemon in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible* and Cheyne's *Encycl. Biblica*.

For the abbreviations in the Apparatus Criticus see the Introduction to *St. James*. The Greek text is that published by Nestle, 1907.
ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΗΜΟΝΑ


ητουτολη πρ. φιλ. KCL. ἂποστολος D. E. Δουλος 33a. + ἀδελφὸς D.E. 


Ver. 1. ἄδειμος Χρ. ἰ. ν.: to St. Paul an even more precious title than the usual official ἄποστολος Χρ. ἰ. ν.; cf. v. 13, ἐν τοῖς δικαιούμενοι τοῦ οὐαγγ. "they were not shackles which self had riveted, but a chain with which Christ had invested him; thus they were a badge of office . . . " (Lightfoot) This title of honour is chosen, and placed in the forefront of the Epistle, not with the idea of touching the heart of Philemon, but rather to proclaim the bondage in which every true Christian must be, and therefore also the "beloved fellow-worker" Philemon. The title is meant, in view of what follows in the Epistle, to touch the conscience Colorer than the heart.—Τιμόθεος: associated with St. Paul in Acts xix. 22, 2 Cor. i. 1, Phil. i. 1, Col. i. 1; his mention here points to his personal friendship with Philemon.—ὁ ἀδελφὸς: often used by the Apostle when he desires to be especially sympathetic; here, therefore, the emphasis is intended to be upon the thought of the brotherhood of all Christians; this is significant in view of the object of the Epistle.—Προς Φιλήμων: See Intr., § II. —ἐκνεργη: when they had worked together cannot be said with certainty; perhaps in Ephesus or Colossae. Probably what is meant is the idea of all Christians being fellow-workers.

Ver. 2. ἄποστολος τῆς ἀδελφῆς: A Phrygian name, often occurring on Phrygian inscriptions. It is most natural to suppose that she was the wife of Philemon; but she must have occupied also, most likely, a quasi-official position in the Church; τῆς ἀδελφῆς, coming between ἐκνεργης and ἐκπρατησιω, suggests this, especially when one remembers the important part the ministry of women played in the early Church, cf. the labours, e.g., of Mary, Tryphaena and Tryphosa, Persis, in connection with whom the semi-official term κυριακος is used (see i. Thess. v. 12, 1 Tim. v. 17, for the use of this word), and Prisca; on the whole subject see Harnack, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity, i., pp. 122 f., 101 f., 365 f. (1908).—Ἀρχετῆς: there is nothing to show that he was the son of Philemon, rather the contrary, for why should the son be addressed in a letter which dealt with one of his father's slaves? The inclusion of his name must be due to the fact that he occupied an important position in the local church (cf. the words which follow in the text), which was thus, in a certain sense, included in the responsibility with regard to Onesimus. Archippus occupied, apparently, a more important position than Philemon (see Col. iv. 17, ἐλικεν τῆς διανοίας ἀναφέρων ἐν Κύριῳ, ἰσα αὐτῆς πληροῖς)—if Philemon had occupied any such official position mention would certainly have been made of it), but this would be most unlikely to have been the case if the latter had been the father of the former. It is more
natural to regard him as the head of the local Church, who lived in the house where the members met for worship (cf. Theodoret's words, quoted by Lightfoot: ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ ζῶντι την διακονίαν αὐτῶν ἐφεξῆς). — συναγήσεως: only elsewhere in N.T., Phil. ii. 25, but for the metaphor cf. 2 Cor. x. 3, 4, 1 Tim. i. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 3, 4; — καὶ τῷ κατ’ οἶκον εὐφρατεῖς . . . . : Cf. Acts xii. 12, Rom. xvi. 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 19, Col. iv. 15. Up to the third century we have no certain evidence of the existence of church buildings for the purposes of worship; all references point to private houses for this. In Rome several of the oldest churches appear to have been built on the sites of houses used for Christian worship; see Sanc and Headlam, Romans, p. 421, who quote this interesting passage from the Acta Martyrum, s. 2 (Rulart): "Quaesitum Praefectus, quem in locum Christianum convenirent. Cui respondit Justinus, eo unumquecumque convenire quod vellet ac possisset. An, inquit, existimas omnes nos in eundem locum convenire solitos? Minime res ita se habet . . . . Tunc Praefectus: Age, inquit, dicas, quem in locum conveniatis, et discipulos tuos congreges. Respondit Justinus: Ego prope domum Martini cujusdam, ad balneum cognomento Timiotinum, hactenus mansi." — Ver. 3. χαίρει . . . εἰλήφην: Cf. Rom. i. 7, the usual Pauline greeting (exc. 1. 2 Tim.); it is a combination of the Greek salutation, χαίρετω, and the Hebrew one, יָשָׂר. In the N.T. the word εἰλήφην expresses the spiritual state, which is the result of a right relationship between God and man. According to Jewish belief, the establishment of peace, in this sense, was one of the main functions of the Messiah (cf. Luke ii. 14), it was herein that His mediatorial work was to be accomplished. — συμφέρει: see note on Jas. iii. 9. The phrase ἐν τῷ Θεῷ . . . Χριστῷ expresses the essence of Judaism and Christianity.

Ver. 4. πάντες: belongs to εἰλήφην, cf. Eph. i. 16, Phil. i. 3, Col. i. 3, 4. — Ver. 5. ἀκούω: probably from Επάφρας, see Col. i. 7, 8, iv. 12 (Lightfoot). — τὴν ἀγάπην . . . : i.e., the faith which thou hast towards the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love which thou bowest to the all the saints. "The logical order," says Lightfoot, "is violated, and the clauses are inverted in the second part of the sentence, thus producing an example of the figure called chiasm; see Gal. iv. 4, 5. This result here from the apostle’s setting down the thoughts in the sequence in which they occur to him, without paying regard to symmetrical arrangement. The first and prominent thought is Philemon’s love. This suggests the mention of his faith, as the source from which it springs. This again requires a reference to the object of faith. And then, at length, comes the deferred sequel to the first thought—the range and comprehensiveness of his love." — πιστίν: not "faithfulness," but "faith" (belief), cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 13, Gal. v. 6, 1 Thess. i. 3.— ἀγαθῶς . . . αἰτία: the difference in these propositions is noteworthy, ἀγαθώς refers to the "faith" to Christ-ward (cf. 1 Thess. i. 8), to the love to the saints; both are developed in vv. 6, 7.— τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ: St. Paul intends Onesimus to be thought of here. The original significance of the title ἀγαθός, as applied to men, may be seen in such a phrase as, "Ye shall be holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy" (Lev. xix. 2). To the Jew, like St. Paul, the corresponding root in Hebrew connoted the idea of something set apart, i.e., consecrated to the service of God (cf. e.g., Exod. xxi. 21 [29]). The ἂγαθος constituted originally the ἔκκλησια; and just as the meaning underlying the Hebrew equivalent of the word ἅγιος, separation for God’s service was the main conception, so, according to the root-meaning of ἔκκλησια, it connoted the idea of the body of those "called out," and thus separated from the world.
Ver. 6. δικαίος: belongs to μιαν...σας τοιούτους...v. 5 is, as it were, in brackets. It would be more usual to have it here—ἐκείνης i.e.: the reference is to identity of faith; the fellowship among the saints, cf. Phil. i. 5. The word is used of a collection of money in Rom. xv. 26, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13; cf. Heb. xiii. 16.—ISO: see 2 Cor. i. 6, Col. i. 20. —ἐπιθυμεῖν: the force of this word is seen in Phil. i. 9—σκέψεις Διακοίνων: cf. Rom. xii. 2, xvi. 19, Col. i. 9.—Διεστρακίστηκα: Xp: it is not only a question of men who benefit by “every good thing,” but also of the relationship to Christ; cf. Col. iii. 23.

Ver. 7. ἐναράκτησιν: the aorist expresses for St. Paul the moment of joy which St. Paul experienced when he heard this good news about Philemon.—τὰ στάσεις: regarded as the seat of the emotions.—Ἀνεπαναστάσις: the compound “expresses a temporary relief, the simple ἀνεπαναστάσις expresses a final cessation” (Vincent).—ἐνδοικήσεθαι: the place of the word here makes it emphatic, cf. Gal. vi. 18, Phil. iv. 11.

Ver. 8. Αὐτὸ: i.e., because of the good that he has heard concerning Philemon; he must keep up his reputation.—ἐνεπιθυμεῖν: “to enjoin,” or “command”; the word is used “rather of commanding which attaches to a definite office and relates to permanent obligations under the office, than of special injunctions for particular occasions” (Vincent).—τὸ διδάκτου: the primary meaning of the verb is that of “having arrived at,” or “reached”; and, ultimately, that of fulfilling a moral obligation. The word occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Ephes. v. 4, Col. iii. 18.

Ver. 9. τοιούτως ἄσω ὅσος: “τοιούτως can be defined only by a following adjective, or by ὅσοι, ὅσος, or ὅστις with the infinitive; never by ὅσος” (Vincent). It seems, therefore, best to take τοιούτως ἄσω as referring to...πάλλει...παρακλητό, which is taken up again in the next verse; ὅσοι... PasoioV...Παύλου...It would then mean “one who beseeches.”—προσβήσεως: this can scarcely be in reference to age, for which ἐπίδευσ᾽ would be more likely to have been used; besides, in Acts vii. 58, at the martyrdom of St. Stephen, the term παρακλήσεως is applied to St. Stephen. Lightfoot in his interesting note on this verse, says: “There is reason for thinking that in the common dialect προσβήσεως may have been written indirectly for προσβεβήσεως in St. Paul’s time; and if so, the form here may be due, not to some comparatively late scribe, but to the original autograph itself or to an immediate transcript;” and he gives a number of instances of the form προσβήσεως being used for προσβεβήσεως. If, as seems very likely, we should translate the word “ambassador” here, then we have the striking parallel in the contemporary usitio to the Ephesians, vi. 20, ὡς ἐπὶ προσβεβήσεως ἐν Ἀδριατον. Deissmann (Licht vom Osten, p. 273) points out that both the verb προσβεβήσεως, and the substantive προσβεβήσεως, were used in the Greek Orient for expressing the title of the Legatus of the emperor. Accepting the meaning “ambassador” here, the significance of
the passage is much increased; for Christ's ambassador had the right to command, but in merely exhorting he throws so much more responsibility on Philemon. The word "ambassador" would be at least as strong an assertion of authority as "apostle"; to a Greek, indeed, more so.—διασέγουσα: perhaps mentioned for the purpose of hinting that in respect of bondage his position was not unlike that of him for whom he is about to plead; cf. the way in which St. Paul identifies himself with Onesimus in v. 12 ... αὐτόν, τούτων διότι τα ἐμα πέλαγχα, and 17 ... ὕπειμι.—Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ: belongs both to προσέβεντος and to διασέγουσα, cf. v. i, Eph. iii. 1, iv. 1, 2 Tim. i. 8.

Ver. 10. διὰ τὴν νησίν: cf. Sanhedrin, xix. 2 (Jer. Talm.), "If one teaches the son of his neighbour the Law, the Scripture reckons this the same as if he had begotten him" (quoted by Vincent).—Οὖν ζημίον: one would expect ζημίας οὖν it is attracted to διὰ ... instead of agreeing with τοῦ ἱματίου τέκνου. He is to be διασεγουμένος in future, no longer διασέγουσα. —Διὰ χρηστοῦ: cf. Matt. iv. 18. The Septuagint, Hos. viii. 8, 2 Macc. vii. 5, Wisd. ii. 11, iii. 11, Sir. xvi. 1, xxvii. 19. As applied to Onesimus the reference must be to something wrong done by him; the fear of being punished for this was presumably his reason for running away from his master.—γινώσκει: a thoroughly Pauline expression, cf. v. 9, Rom. vi. 22, vii. 6, 17, xv. 23, 25, 1 Cor. v. 11, etc.—εὐχαριστοῦ: only elsewhere in N.T. in 2 Tim. ii. 21, iv. 11.

Ver. 12. διὰ αἵταμέμψα σοι: the aorist, in accordance with the epistolary style. It is clear from these words that Onesimus himself was the bearer of the letter, cf. Col. iv. 7-9. On St. Paul's insistence that Onesimus should return to his master, see Intr. III.—Χριστοῦ: note the emphatic position of this word, cf. Eph. i. 22.—μα: again emphatic in thus preceding the noun.

Ver. 13. γινώσκει: a further emphatic mode of expression.—μυὴ τοῦς: μυὴ τοῦς connotes the idea of purpose, ἵνα simply that of willing. The differences between the tenses—μυὴ τοῦς (ver. 14)—is significant; "the imperfect implies a tentative, inchoate process; while the aorist describes a definite complete act. The will stepped in and put an end to the inclinations of the mind" (Lightfoot).—κατεξίπτυ: "to detain," directly opposed to οὖν τοῦτον πάντας, etc., etc., see Deissmann's important remarks on pp. 205, 241 ff. of his work already quoted.—σύνοημεν: used in the Pauline Epistles both of Christian ministration generally (Rom. xii. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 5; Eph. iv. 12) and in special reference to bodily wants, such as alms can supply (1 Cor. xvi. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 4).—ἐν τὸ τοῦς ἔσχατος ἀλὼν: only elsewhere in N.T. in 2 Tim. ii. 21, iv. 11.
Phil. iv. 18. 

Philad. 5, 8 (Sandy, Bampton Lectures, p. 319).

Ver. 14. With the thought of this verse cf. 2 Cor. iv. 2–10; Phil. iv. 25; Col. iii. 17. In this instance to become altered. — ἔχωρίθη: a very delicate way of putting it. — ὑπὲρ ὅραν: cf. 2 Cor. vii. 8, Gal. ii. 5. — ἀλλὰν: there is no reason why this should not be taken in a literal sense, the reference being to Onesimus as ἀδελφὸν ἀγαπητὸν, not as ὁ ἰδίος. — ἐπιπλέκει: cf. Phil. iv. 18, although the idea of restitution is prominent here, that of complete possession seems also to be present in view of ἀδελφὸν and ἀδελφὸν ἀγαπητὸν, but see further Intr., § III.

Ver. 16. οὐκ ἔστι οὐκ ὅσιον: no longer in the character of a slave, according to the world's acceptation of the term, though still a slave (see, however, the note on v. 21); but the relationship between slave and master were in this instance to become altered. — οὗτος ἐν μᾶλλον . . . : i.e., more than most of all (which he had been to St. Paul) to thee. — With the thought of the verse cf. 1 Tim. vi. 2.

Ver. 17. ἔχω . . . : for this use of ἔχω cf. Luke xiv. 18, Phil. ii. 29.— ξυπολαβόω: for the idea see Rom. xii. 13, xv. 26. — ἔλαγγελος οὗτος: cf. τὰ ἐν σπλάγχνα in v. 12. An interesting parallel (given by Deissmann, op. cit. pp. 128 f.) occurs in a papyrus of the second century, written in Latin by a freedman, Aurelius Archelaus, to the military tribune, Julius Domitian: "Al ready once before have I commended unto thee my friend Theon. And now again, I pray thee, my lord, that he may be in thy sight as I myself" (ut eum ant' oculos habeas tanquam me).

Ver. 18. ἐὰν δὲ ταῖς: as Lightfoot says, the case is stated hypothetically, but the words doubtless describe the actual offence of Onesimus, — ἐλάγγελος: only elsewhere in N.T. in Rom. v. 13; it occurs on the papyri (Deissmann, op. cit., p. 52), "to reckon unto"; here, in the sense: "put it down to my account".

Ver. 19. ἐγὼ Παύλος: "The introduction of his own name gives it the character of a formal and binding signature, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 21, Col. iv. 18, 2 Thess. iii. 17" (Lightfoot). — ἐγραφαὶ ὁμοίως ἐπιστολικὸς οἰκονομὸς, cf. 1 Pet. v. 12, 1 John ii. 14, 21, 26. Deissmann (op. cit., p. 239) calls attention to the large number of papyri which are acknowledgments of debt (Schuldhandschrift); a stereotyped phrase which these contain is, "I will repay," usually expressed by ἐκστοράω; in case the debtor is unable to write a representative who can do so expressly adds, "I have written this for him." The following is an example: "... which we also will repay ... besides whatever else there is (ἐλάγγελον ὅσιον) which we owe over and above . . . I, Papas, write it for this because he cannot write." See also Deissmann's Neue Bibelstudien, p. 67, under χαράγματος. It seems certain from the words ἐγραφαὶ . . . (cf. also v. 21) that St. Paul wrote the whole of this epistle himself; this was quite exceptional, as he usually employed an
amanuensis; the quasi-private character of the letter would account for this. See further, Lightfoot's note on Gal. vi. 11.— 

Ver. 21. ὁ ἐκπατήριον: see note on v. 7.

Ver. 22. ἡ ἡγεμονία: St. Paul refers to the real source from which the ἀποστασία gets its strength.

Ver. 23. ἐν τῷ ἐπίσκοπῳ: a hint regarding the authority which St. Paul has a right to wield.— ἐπισκόπημα: see note on v. 19.— ἐκκλησία: as it stands this is quite indefinite, but there is much point in Lightfoot's supposition that the thought of the manumission of Philemon was in St. Paul's mind; "throughout this epistle the idea would seem to be present to his thoughts, though the word never passes his lips. This serve is eminently characteristic of the Gospel. Slavery is never directly attacked as such, but principles are inculcated which must prove fatal to it."— λέγω: note the tense here, a very vivid touch after ἐγραφαία.

Ver. 24. Ἅγιοι ἀποστόλοι: only here and in Acts xxvii. 23, in the N.T.
25. **ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΗΜΟΝΑ**

*Δημᾶς, Ἀουκᾶς, οἱ συνεργοί μου. 25. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἤπειρος ἡ πνευματικὸς δύναμις.*

1 Col. iv. 18. 2 Gal. vi. 18. Phil. iv. 23. 2 Tim. iv. 22.

1 + ημῶν Vulg., rec. 2 + ἀμην ΝC, m, Vulg., rec.

Subscr.: πρὸς Φιλήμωνα (καὶ Αρταχάν δεσπότας Οὐσίμου καὶ πρὸς Ἀρισταρχον το ιοβικὸν της ἐν Κολοσσαίω εκκλησίαις) εγραφή απὸ Ρωμῆς (διὰ Οὐσίμου σικετοῦ). [Ἀλλα δὲ καὶ μαρτυρὶς Χριστοῦ γεγενησε ο μακαρίος Ὀὐσίμος ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαιῶν πολεί στῷ Τερτουλλίου ηγιασία τῆς εὐαρέστης εἰσοπτείς διέσπειτο τῇ των σπέλα θαλοῦς τῆς ψεύδων υπομείνας τοῦ μαρτυρίου].

and Aristarchus were Jewish-Christians (Col. iv. 11).—Δημᾶς, Αουκᾶς: Gentile Christians (cf. Acts xvi. 10, xx. 5, 6, xxx. 15, xxvii. 2); the former name is a contraction of Δημήτριος (Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 10).

Ver. 25. Ἡ χάρις: cf. Gal. vi. 18, 2 Tim. iv. 22.—ὑμῶν: the reference is both to those addressed by name in the opening of the Epistle, as well as to the members of the local Church, see verse 2. This final verse is a reiteration of the grace pronounced in verse 3.
THE EPISTLE
To the
HEBREWS
INTRODUCTION.

HISTORY OF THE EPISTLE. The early history of this Epistle has already been so fully narrated in various accessible volumes, that a bare outline may here suffice. Its chief interest is the illustration it gives of the difficulties which an anonymous book had to overcome before it won for itself a place in the Canon. The significance of the story of its fortunes may be gathered from the statement of Eusebius:1 “Paul’s fourteen Epistles are well known and undisputed. It is not indeed right to overlook the fact that some have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, saying that it is disputed by the Church of Rome on the ground that it was not written by Paul.” The Church, that is to say, looked with suspicion, or at any rate hesitation, on any candidate for canonical honours which had not the authentication of apostolic authorship. And although the Epistle to the Hebrews really won for itself a place in the Canon by its intrinsic merit, by its cardinal importance as the final adjustment of the Jewish and Christian dispensations, as well as by its marked ability and felicitous style, yet it had to steal into its place under the cloak of an apostle, and it is doubtful whether it would have won universal acceptance had it not been attached, loosely enough it is true, to the collection of Paul’s Epistles. Even though there was no certainty regarding its authorship in any part of the church, and in some parts a distinct and expressed conviction that it was not from the hand of Paul, yet obviously it was too rich a treasure to lose; and because it was not unworthy of the great apostle nor wholly alien from his way of thinking, it was allowed to attach itself to his Epistles, and so, happily, found a place in the Canon.

The difficulty to which Eusebius alludes, as experienced by the Western or Latin Church, was of ancient date. For although the earliest traces of the use of the Epistle are found in Clement of Rome (c. 96 A.D.) who betrays familiarity with it, yet no Western writer of the second century acknowledges it as canonical. It was not included in the collection of Pauline Epistles which Marcion

1 H. E., iii. 3.
formed in the first half of that century, and Tertullian, though objecting to his omission of the Pastoral Epistles, makes no remark upon his rejection of Hebrews. In the latter half of the century Roman opinion is represented by the Muratorian canon, which makes no mention of the Epistle at all, unless, as some have fancied, it is alluded to as that "ad Alexandrinos". The prevalent Roman opinion is represented by the presbyter Caius who did not accept the Epistle as Pauline. According to Photius, Hippolytus also denied the Pauline authorship; and in the earliest Old Latin Version the Epistle was omitted.

In the North African branch of the Latin Church not only was the Pauline authorship denied, but the Epistle was definitely ascribed to Barnabas. Tertullian (De Pudic., c. 20) in citing Hebrews vi. 4-8 claims for the Epistle only a subordinate authority ["idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum"] because it was written not by an apostle, but by a "comes apostolorum," whom he unhesitatingly speaks of as Barnabas.

Meanwhile, however, in the Eastern Church the Pauline authorship was maintained. The Syrian Church accepted the Epistle into its earliest canon; and even if translated by a different and later hand than the other Epistles, this cannot be ascribed to any reluctance to receive it as canonical. In Alexandria towards the close of the second century it is accepted as Pauline by Pantaenus and Clement. But as criticism was cultivated with some diligence in this Church, it could not escape notice that both in its anonymity and in its style this Epistle differed from those of Paul. The absence of the usual Pauline address Pantaenus explained as due to the modesty of the Apostle, who would not even seem to usurp the place which belonged to the Lord Himself as Apostle of the Hebrews. Clement accounted for the difference in style by the supposition that the Epistle was originally written by Paul in Hebrew and afterwards translated by Luke, while the absence of signature is referred to the natural fear lest the name of the Apostle of the Gentiles might repel Hebrew readers. The opinion in which the Church of Alexandria in general rested may be gathered from the words of Origen: "If I..."
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gave my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are those of the Apostle, but the phrasing and composition are those of some one who remembered what the teacher had said. If then any church holds this Epistle to be Paul's, let it be commended for this. For not without reason (εἰκῆ) have our predecessors (οἱ δραχαιοὶ ἀδερπεῖς) handed it down as Paul's. But who wrote the Epistle, in truth God knows. The account that has reached us is, that some say it was written by Clement who became bishop of the Romans, while others ascribed it to Luke, the author of the Gospel and Acts."

Unsatisfactory as such a decision was, the idea that the Epistle was Paul's generally prevailed over the whole Church, so that from the fifth century to the reformation, there were few who took the trouble to inquire. The conversion of the Latin Church to this opinion was mainly due to the influence of Augustine and Jerome. The formulæ under which the latter writer cited the Epistle reveal his personal dubiety. "The Epistle which, under the name of Paul, is written to the Hebrews." "He who writes to the Hebrews." "The Apostle Paul, or whoever else wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews." "The Apostle Paul in the Epistle to Hebrews, which the Latin custom does not receive." He mentions that the Greek writers accept it as Paul's, although many ascribe it either to Barnabas or Clement. It would apparently, have taken little to persuade Jerome that the latter opinion was well-grounded, for he had himself noticed a striking similarity between the Epistle of Clement and that to the Hebrews. In short, we find that Jerome acted in regard to this Epistle on the principle he carried through his formation of the Vulgate canon, the principle that it was better to include than to exclude a good book and that prevalent opinion must be allowed a great weight.

Instructive also is Augustine's treatment of the Epistle. Sometimes he reckons it among Paul's, sometimes he cites it anonymously ["epistola quae ad Hebraeos inscribitur," or "est"]; sometimes he calls attention to the doubts entertained regarding it by others, but professes that for his part he is moved by the authority of the Eastern Churches. The facile and uncritical spirit of the time is conspicuous in the manner in which the councils of North Africa dealt with this

1 For exceptions in the Western Church, see Westcott On the Canon, p. 401.
2 "Licet plerique eam vel Barnabae vel Clementis arbitrentur," Ep. ad Dardanum.
3 "Clemens scripsit . . . utilem epistolam . . . quae mihi videtur characteri epistolae, quae sub Pauli nomine ad Hebraeos fertur, convenire," De Vir. Illus., c. 15.
Epistle. In the council of Hippo in 393, while Augustine was still a presbyter, and in the third council of Carthage, held in 398, the prevalent dubiety regarding the authorship of Hebrews found expression in the enumeration of the New Testament books, "of the Apostle Paul, thirteen Epistles, of the same to the Hebrews, one". But in the fifth council of Carthage, in 419, where Augustine was also present, this feeble and meaningless distinction is abandoned and the enumeration boldly runs, "of the Epistles of Paul in number fourteen".

It is not easy to determine how much or how little we are justified in concluding from these early opinions and traditions. That the ecclesiastical voice gradually settled upon the great name of Paul, if it does not do much credit to the critical sagacity of the Early Church, at least shows that no other name was satisfactory. That Clement should have been mentioned as a possible author, naturally results from the abundant and free use he makes of the Epistle, as well as from his friendship with Paul, and his position as a writer of repute. That Paul's still more prominent ally, Barnabas, should have been credited with the Epistle was possibly the result of its quite superficial resemblance to the well-known and widely-read but spurious Epistle of Barnabas. Evidently, however, it is the Epistle itself which must divulge the secret of its authorship if we are at all to ascertain it.

Authorship. The bare reading of the Epistle suffices to convince us that the Pauline authorship may be set aside as incredible. The style is not Paul's, and this Apostle although using an amanuensis, undoubtedly dictated all his letters. The Epistle to the Hebrews reveals a literary felicity not found elsewhere in the New Testament. The writer is master of his words, and perfectly understands how to arrange each clause so that every word shall play its full part in conveying with precision the meaning intended. He knows how to build up his sentences into concise paragraphs, each of which carries the argument one stage nearer to its conclusion. He avoids all irrelevant digressions. His earnestness of purpose never betrays him into carelessness of language, but only serves to give edge and point to its exact use. In all this he markedly and widely differs from the tempestuousness of Paul. As Farrar says: "The writer cites differently from St. Paul; he writes differently; he argues differently; he thinks differently; he declaims differently; he constructs and connects his sentences differently; he builds up his paragraphs on a wholly different model. St. Paul is constantly mingling two constructions, leaving sentences unfinished, breaking
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into personal allusions, substituting the syllogism of passion for the syllogism of logic. This writer is never ungrammatical, he is never irregular, he never personal, he never struggles for expression; he never loses himself in a parenthesis; he is never hurried into an anacoluthon. His style is the style of a man who thinks as well as writes in Greek; whereas St. Paul wrote in Greek but thought in Syriac." The same difference was felt by those who themselves used the Greek language. Thus Origen says: "That the verbal style of the Epistle entitled 'to the Hebrews' is not rude like the language of the Apostle who acknowledged himself 'rude in speech,' that is, in expression; but that its diction is purer Greek, any one who has the power to discern differences of phraseology will acknowledge." 2

But if the style puts it beyond question that Paul cannot have been the immediate author of the Epistle is it not possible to believe with Origen that "the thoughts are those of the Apostle"? This also must be answered in the negative. There is in the Epistle nothing discordant with Pauline doctrine, but its argument moves on different lines and in a different atmosphere from those with which the Apostle to the Gentiles makes us familiar. This is most readily discerned when we consider the attitude held by the two authors respectively to the fundamental idea of Jewish religion, the Law. Paul views the Mosaic economy mainly as a law commanding and threatening. The writer to the Hebrews views it rather as a vast congeries of institutions, observances and promises. To the one writer the Law is mainly juridical; to the other it is ceremonial. To the ardent spirit of Paul athirst for righteousness, the Law with its impracticable precepts had become a nightmare, the embodiment of all that barred access to God and life. The grace of Christianity throwing open the gates of righteousness was the antithesis and

1 Euseb., H. E., vi. 25.
2 "Diversity of style is more easily felt by the reader than expressed by the critic, without at least a tedious analysis of language; one simple and tangible test presents itself, however, in the use of connecting particles, inasmuch as these determine the structure of sentences. A minute comparison of these possesses therefore real importance in the differentiation of language. Now in the Epistles of St. Paul et ἐπὶ occurs fifty times, ἐπὶ sixty-three, ἡ ἐπὶ (in affirmative clauses) nineteen, ἡ ἐπὶ (in enumerations) six, ἔτι ἐπὶ kal, four, ἐπὶ ἐτι five, ἔτι ἐπὶ μὴ three, ἔτι four, μὴ ἐπὶ twelve, μὴ ἐπὶ ten, μὴ ἐπὶ ἐπὶ three, ἐπὶ eighty-eight times, while none of them are found in the Epistle except ἐπὶ and that only once (or twice), except in quotations. On the other hand, ἐπὶ which occurs six times and ἐπὶ which occurs three times in the Epistle are never used by St. Paul." Rendall's Theol. of Hebrew Christianity, p. 27.
abolition of the law. But to this writer, brought up in a more latitudinarian school and of a quieter temperament, the law was not this inexorable taskmaster, but rather a system of type and symbol foreshadowing the perfect fellowship with God secured by Christianity and revealed in Him. Both writers have the same question before them: What gives Christianity its power to bring men into harmony with God and thus constitutes it the universal, permanent religion? What precisely is the relation of this new form of religion to that out of which it sprang and which it superseded? Paul boldly enounces the incompatibility of faith and works, of grace and merit, of Christianity and the Law. This writer, adopting a method and a view more likely to conciliate the Jew, aims at exhibiting the work of Christianity as that towards which the previous economy had been striving, that the two are essentially connected, and that without Christianity Judaism remains imperfect.\(^1\)

So that Pfleiderer's remark is justified, when he says, "this is a thoroughly original attempt to establish the most essential results of Paulinism upon new presuppositions and in an entirely independent way—a way which proceeds upon lines of thought regarding the constitution of the universe which were widely spread amongst the educated people of that time, and which necessarily had far greater power of diffusing enlightenment than the dialectic of the old Pauline system which was so highly wrought up to an individual standpoint."\(^2\)

Here and there the ideas and expressions of Paul seem to be coloured by the Alexandrian system and manner of thought, which, as Pfleiderer says, influenced the entire educated world of the time; but in the mind of Paul there lay a deeper soil in which had been sown the governing ideas of Palestinian or Pharisaic theology. The work and person of Christ are presented under different categories by the two writers: the priestly function, which is absent or almost so from the letters of Paul, dominates the thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In keeping with this, the idea of sacrifice which colours the whole of the latter Epistle, only occasionally emerges in the Pauline writings. So too it is the kingly state of the risen Christ which occupies the one writer, while in the mind of the other it is a priestly exaltation that is conspicuous. And thus the δικαιοσύνη of Paul becomes in Hebrews ἁγιάζειν, or καθαρίζειν or τελεῖσθαι; and the leading religious terms "faith" "grace" and so forth have

\(^{1}\) Cf. Ménégas (Théol. de l'ép. aux Heb., 190) "L'un abolit la Loi, l'autre la transfigure"; and p. 197, the one was revolutionist, the other evolutionist. See also Holtzmann, N.T. Thcol., ii., p. 286 ff. Verhältniss zum Paulinismus.

\(^{2}\) Paulinism, B. Tr., ii., 63.
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one meaning in Paul and another in this Epistle. Evidently the suggestion that Luke was on this occasion Paul’s interpreter is quite insufficient to satisfy the conditions.1

If the Epistle cannot be ascribed to Paul, must we fall back upon Tertullian’s statement,2 and accept Barnabas as the author? This solution cannot be said to have ever been prevalent in the early Church, notwithstanding the meagre references unearthed by Prof. Bartlet and Mr. Ayles. Over against these references may be set the significant words of Jerome, who designates this ascription of authorship as “juxta Tertullianum,” apparently implying that in all his vast store of information he had found no one else holding this opinion. Origen, too, knows nothing of such a tradition. It was, however, revived in the seventeenth century by the Scottish scholar, Cameron, and in more recent times has found supporters in Ritschl, Weiss, Renan, Salmon and Vernon Bartlet.3 Zahn, who formerly advocated the same authorship, is now less certain. The claims of Barnabas are also urged with fulness and force by Mr. Ayles in an essay devoted to this object.4 There can be no doubt that Barnabas answers many of the requirements which must be met by any presumed author of the Epistle. He belonged to the circle of Paul and was a man of character and of capacity; he was a Levite and as such predisposed to consider the Christ and His work in its bearing on the Old Testament ritual;5 he was a native of Cyprus where good Greek was spoken, and at the same time was well known and influential in the Church at Jerusalem. The tradition that Mark, his nephew, introduced the Gospel into Alexandria, might be pressed to indicate some connection with that centre of thought. This, however, tells also against his authorship, for it is unaccountable that Barnabas’ name should have been lost in the Church where his nephew presided. It must also be kept in view that the association

1 The similarities to the usage of Luke in the vocabulary of the Epistle have been examined with final thoroughness by Prof. Frederic Gardiner in the Journal of Soc. of Bibl. Lit. and Exegesis for June 1887. See also Alexander’s Leading Ideas of the Gospels, 3rd ed., pp. 302-324; and W. H. Simcox in the Expositor for 1888.

2 De Pudicitia, c. 20. “Extat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, adeo satis auctoritati viri, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore (1 Cor. ix. 6); et utique receptor apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum.”

3 Expositor, 1902.

4 Destination, Date and Authorship of Ep. to Heb. (Cambridge, 1899).

5 For supposed mistakes regarding the Temple and its service, cf. Zahn, ii., 55,156.
of Barnabas with the Church at Jerusalem only tells in his favour if that be considered the destination of the Epistle. It is, of course, a mere accident that his designation, ὁς παρακλήτων (Acts iv. 36) should correspond with the description of this Epistle as a λόγος παρακλήτων (Heb. xiii. 22).

Harnack, who had previously considered it probable that Barnabas was the author, has recently in a forcible and brilliant manner urged the claims of Prisca and Aquila. In their favour are such points as these: that the letter proceeds from a highly cultured teacher, answering to the description given in Acts xviii. 26 of Aquila and Prisca; that it was written by one who belonged to the Pauline circle, as there is no doubt that this couple did (Rom. xvi. 3 συμμαθηταί); that the writer was associated with Timothy, as Aquila and Prisca were for eighteen months in Corinth as well as in Ephesus (cf. 2 Tim. iv. 19); that he belonged to one of the house-churches in Rome (to which presumably the Epistle was addressed) and that he had taught there—which corresponds with what we know of Aquila and Prisca (see Acts xviii. 2, Rom. xvi. 3); that behind the writer of the Epistle there is some one or more with whom he associates himself in a common “we,” for in the letter there are not merely the literary “we” and the “we” which includes writer and readers, but a third use of the pronoun embracing some unnamed person or persons as uniting with the writer in what he says. “If on the ground of these arguments it be considered probable that the Epistle to the Hebrews is to be referred to this couple, it may then be asked whether Prisca or Aquila wrote it. And if the predominant position of the woman, witnessed by both Paul and Luke, be considered, as well as the incontestable fact that she was foremost in winning Apollos, the balance must incline in favour of her authorship.” It is thus he accounts for the most paradoxical feature in the history of the Epistle, the loss of the author’s name. This disappearance is at once accounted for, if Prisca was even partly the author, for Paul’s prohibition of female teaching in the Church had taken deep root.

That there is in these arguments not merely ingenuity, but much that deserves consideration, will not be denied. Indeed, so careful and sound a scholar as Bleek almost convinced himself that Aquila was the author of the Epistle, and expresses surprise that his claims should not have been urged. But there are grave difficulties in the

1 Chronologic, p. 477-479.
2 Preuschen’s Zeitschrift, vol. i., 18-41.
3 Hebräer-brief, i., 421, 422. Harnack’s claim to originality [niemand an sie gedacht hat] is valid only so far as Prisca is concerned.
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double, predominantly feminine authorship advocated by Harnack. A single authorship is unquestionably demanded by certain expressions in the Epistle, as τι ἐν λέγω, xi. 32; ἵνα τὰς παρακατασταθή ὁμῶ, xiii. 19; and the singulars in xiii. 22, 23. It is not possible to construe these singulars as referring to more than one writer: but it is quite possible to construe the plurals of the Epistle as referring to the single writer or to the writer uniting himself with his readers. And that this one writer should have been Prisca is certainly improbable, both on account of Paul’s prohibition which so good a friend as Prisca would observe, and because the writer seems to have been one of the ἄγος ἐμυλος, which Prisca could not have been. The impression made by the Epistle is that it proceeds from a masculine mind; and if the Epistle is due to either we should suppose Aquila was more likely to undertake such a task. The familiarity which existed between this couple and Apollos might be supposed to account for the Alexandrian colouring of the Epistle.

The name of Apollos was suggested by Luther¹ who apparently had either heard or read that this authorship had been advocated by others. It has received the suffrages of scholars so competent as Bleek, Tholuck, Hilgenfeld, Lüemmann, Reuss, Pfleiderer, Alford, Farrar and Plumptre. In Acts xviii. 24 Apollos is described as an Alexandrian Jew, a learned man, mighty in the Scriptures, who had been instructed in the way of the Lord and who spoke and taught with accuracy the things concerning Jesus. Passing from Ephesus, where he first appears in Christian history, to Achaia “he helped them much who had believed through grace, and powerfully confuted the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ”. Paul also testifies to his influence as a teacher and probably indicates that his special function was that of carrying to maturity those who had already received the truth. The words “Paul planted, Apollos watered” bear this interpretation, and agree with what is said in Acts of his peculiar work. Certainly all this remarkably corresponds with the characteristics of the writer to the Hebrews, who certainly was a Jew of the Alexandrian school, a man of marked ability and culture, whose special training fitted him to build up in the faith and to find in the Scriptures

¹“Autor Epistolae ad Hebraeos, quisquis est, sive Paulus, sive, ut ego arbitror, Apollo” (Com. on Gen.); and in his sermon on 1 Cor iii. 4 “the Bp. Heb. is certainly his” [Apollos’]. In another sermon he says “Some suppose the Epistle to be Luke’s, some refer it to Apollos” [“etliche meinen, sie sei S. Lucas, etliche S. Apollo”]. The most thorough presentation of the claim of Apollos is that by Plumptre in the first vol. of the Expositor.
proof that Jesus was the Christ. This, plainly, does not prove that Apollos was the author, but it lends plausibility to the hypothesis.

**Destination.** Here, again, however, we find the authorship implicated with the destination of the Epistle. The only places with which we know Apollos to have been connected are Ephesus, Corinth, and Crete. The first named city was swarming with Jews and was also impregnated with Alexandrianism. Corinth resembled it in the former and possibly also in the latter characteristic, for the preaching of Apollos had certainly found in that city a very responsive hearing; and it is the only place in which we have any positive reason to believe that he resided for any length of time. But evidently he was a man who moved about (Tit. iii. 13); and it is not improbable that he may have visited Rome. Evidently, however, if we are to come any nearer to a determination of the authorship, we must first of all try to ascertain the destination of the letter.

We may put aside the idea that it was not addressed to any particular Church but was a homily written for all whom it might concern. This idea has been plausibly stated by Reuss. "The Epistle to the Hebrews," he says, "is not a letter properly so called written in view of a local necessity; and the few personal and circumstantial details added on the last page were certainly not the reasons which prompted the author to write. This book may have been already penned and actually concluded when occasion offered to make it useful to a particular circle of Christians and in reference to whom he may have added the 13th chapter. The 'Hebrews' whose name is inserted by the care of a later reader (also truly inspired) are not, as has been imagined, the members of some isolated community, as e.g., the Church at Jerusalem; they are Jewish Christians in general, considered from a theoretical point of view." This view has been adopted by Lipsius and others, and at the first blush it may seem to have something to say for itself, for letters do not usually begin without giving the name of the writer and of his correspondents. But the idea that the entire document is a treatise written in the study without definite reference to any particular group of Christians, is contradicted not merely by the personal references of the 13th chapter, but by the occurrence throughout the Epistle of expressions which have no meaning if not so addressed. Indeed, no Epistle more exclusively concentrates itself upon a definite and actual condition, nor more definitely recognises that its readers have passed through and are passing through well-marked experiences.
The writer's references in v. 12; vi. 9; x. 32; xii. 4; could only have been made to a definite group of Christians.1

This consideration is sufficient to prove that the title πρὸς Ἑβραῖους without further designation is too indefinite to have been affixed to his letter by the author himself. Weizsäcker, indeed, is extravagant when he brands the inscription as “the unhappy conjecture of a later time,” but we may unhesitatingly adopt Robertson Smith's language, and say that it is “hardly more than a reflection of the impression produced on an early copyist”. The suggestion of Prof. Nestle² that it may indicate that the Epistle was addressed to the συναγωγὴ Ἀλβρῶν or Ἑβρῶν in Rome is interesting, but obviously if the writer of the Epistle had himself addressed it to a synagogue of Jewish Christians in Rome, he could not have written merely “to Hebrews,” but must have more definitely identified them by some further designation. In short, we cannot from this address derive any assistance in determining the Church to which the Epistle was addressed.

But that the inscription is right in so far as it declares that the letter was destined for Hebrew Christians has generally, though not universally, been acknowledged. The scope of the Epistle presupposes a profound attachment to the Mosaic dispensation. Not only is the Old Testament the common ground from which material can be drawn and on which the discussion can proceed, but the argument is one which can scarcely be conceived as addressed to Gentiles. It may almost be said with Dr. Bruce: “If the readers were indeed Gentiles, they were Gentiles so completely disguised in Jewish ideas and wearing a mask with so pronounced Jewish features that the true nationality has been successfully hidden for nineteen centuries”. Or more summarily we may say with Reuss: “For this writer there are no Gentiles”. To Gentile ears some of the expressions used in the Epistle would be unintelligible, others would be offensive. To the former class belong such exhortations as, “Let us go forth unto Him without the camp”; to the latter, “Not of angels doth He take hold, but of the seed of Abraham He taketh hold”.

In spite of this, however, many eminent critics in recent times have reached the persuasion that the letter was addressed not to Hebrew, but to Gentile Christians. Schurer, Weizsäcker, von Soden, Jülicher, McGiffert are of this opinion. They are chiefly influenced by the consideration that the list of rudimentary doctrines

---

1 See Burggaller's criticism of Wrede's “Das literarische Rätsel des Hebräerbrieves” in Preuschen's Zeitschrift for 1908.
2 Expository Times for June, 1899.
given in chap. vi. are such as would rather be taught to Gentile catechumens than to Jewish converts. No doubt the doctrines there mentioned would be taught to Gentiles, but surely the contrast between faith in God and faith in dead works is peculiarly appropriate to Jews; and it was also the Jew rather than the Gentile who required explanation regarding the relation of Christian baptism to other lustrations. Besides, it must not be overlooked that the doctrines here enumerated are the "rudiments of Christ," and therefore nothing specifically Jewish could be mentioned. They are that common ground or "foundation" which underlay the specially Christian teaching.

Difficulty has also been found in the phrase ἄνωτέρως ἡ ὑπὸ θεοῦ ἔργον (iii. 12). This expression, it is felt, is more appropriate to a relapse to idolatry than to Judaism. But the very point of the whole Epistle is that an abandonment of Christianity is an abandonment of God; that in it God has finally spoken and that to neglect this revelation is to neglect God. In using this particular phrase the writer has not in view the end to which unbelief may lead them, but the fact that unbelief is apostasy from the living God, whether the unbeliever be Jew or Gentile.

These difficulties then are not insuperable, although they are possibly too cavalierly treated by Westcott, who pronounces that "the argument of von Soden, who endeavours to show that the Epistle was written to Gentiles, cannot be regarded as more than an ingenious paradox by any one who regards the general teaching of the Epistle in connection with the forms of thought in the Apostolic age".

Where, then, were these Jewish Christians resident? The places most generally approved are Jerusalem, Antioch, Caesarea, Rome. In favour of the Jewish metropolis there is not much to be urged. To no Church on earth would it be so inappropriate to say that they had received the Gospel at second-hand (ii. 3). Many of its members must have been in direct communication with the Lord. Neither could it with any truth be said of the Church of Jerusalem that she had not been instrumental in teaching others (v. 12). This Church was also a poor community which itself required rather than afforded aid: whereas the society addressed in the Epistle had been conspicuous for charity (vi. 10; x. 34). It also seems most unlikely that if the Church at Jerusalem was addressed, no allusion should be made to the Temple. Neither is it probable that any one, himself a member of the Church at Jerusalem, should prefer Greek to Aramaic as his medium of communication.

As Antioch was the scene of a considerable part of the labours of
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Barnabas it naturally suggests itself as the destination in connection with his supposed authorship of the Epistle. The Hebrew Christians in that city must have been very much in his care, and certainly they required some such exposition as is given in the Epistle, of the relation of Judaism to Christianity. And some critics, even while dismissing the claims of Barnabas, are inclined to find in Antioch the group of Jewish Christians to which the Epistle was addressed. Thus Mr Rendall\(^1\) sums up his inquiry in the following terms: “To one of these great Syrian cities, perhaps to Antioch itself, I conceive the Epistle to have been addressed; for there alone existed flourishing Christian Churches, founded by the earliest missionaries of the Gospel, animated with Jewish sympathies, full of interest in the Mosaic worship, and glorying in the name of Hebrews; who nevertheless spoke the Greek language, used the Greek version of the Scriptures and numbered amongst their members converts who had, like the author, combined the highest advantages of Greek culture with careful study of the Old Testament and especially of the sacrificial Law.” But could a Church which had actually started the great mission of Paul and Barnabas and in which other teachers abounded be open to the rebuke of chap. v. 11 ff.?

Recently critical opinion has decidedly veered towards Rome as the only possible destination. First suggested by Wetstein it is now advocated by Alford, Holtzmann, Zahn and many others. The clause in the Epistle which inevitably suggests this destination is the greeting in xiii. 24, ἀνασήματε ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας “they of Italy (the Italians) salute you”. This clause shows that the Epistle was either written from or to Italy. But it is difficult to believe that the words were intended to convey a greeting from Italians in their own country to the writer’s correspondents. For if the writer was in Italy, he was in some particular locality, and this place he would more naturally have named instead of using the general term “Italy”. Certainly the more natural and satisfactory interpretation of the words is that which supposes that the writer who himself is a member of the Church he addresses is surrounded by those who also recognise Italy as their home and who seek to send greetings to their friends in Rome.

Nor does anything in the Epistle contradict this idea. That there was a large Jewish element in the Roman Church appears both from Acts and Romans, and is not denied. It has sometimes been thought that Jewish Christians in Rome could not be expected

\(^1\) Epistle to Hebrews, p. 69.
to take so much interest in the Temple-worship or be so concerned about its observance as this Epistle requires; but, as Principal Fairbairn long ago pointed out, colonists idealise the institutions of their mother-country more than its resident population, and it is an idealised, not an actual worship that is here described. It is also to be considered that it was in Rome both in the time of Paul and in the second century that in many subtle ways Judaism sought to assert itself and to absorb or expunge Christianity. The fact too that it is in Rome we find the first traces of the use of the Epistle (by Clement) has some weight.

Zahn still further narrows the destination and identifies the recipients of the letter as a small circle of Christians in a large city, a house-church alongside of which there was another or several other such churches in the same city. They have an assembly of their own (xiv. 25), perhaps also rulers of their own (xiii. 17), although the rulers of the whole Church of the city are also their rulers, and therefore greetings are sent to all the rulers and to all the Saints (xiii. 24). He is not aware of any place which so well answers to these requirements as one of the house-churches in Rome mentioned in the Epistle of Paul to that Church (chap. xvi). To one of these, possibly to that mentioned in Romans xvi. 14, this Epistle was probably addressed.

The Roman destination may seem to carry with it the authorship of Aquila, for this Jew who was himself so well instructed that he was able to instruct Apollos was intimately associated with Rome and with one of the house-churches there (Romans xvi. 3-5). And indeed all that we know of Aquila seems to fit the conditions as well as any other name that has been suggested.

It is impossible then to dogmatise regarding the authorship of this Epistle, and at present it is best frankly to confess our ignorance. But we may adopt the language of Prof. Rhys Roberts in dealing with the similar case of Longinus on the Sublime and say that “while it is good science to refuse to hazard any conjecture which our information does not warrant, it is good science also to decline to follow some critics in abandoning all hope of ever seeing a solution of this knotty problem. Let us rather recognise that we are confronted with one of those stimulating and fruitful uncertainties which classical research so often presents to its votaries—uncertainties which are stimulating because there is some possibility of removing them, and fruitful because in any case they lead to the more thorough investigation of the obscurer bye-ways of history and literature.” Or we may adopt the words of Dr. Davidson in dealing
with the similar problem of the authorship of the Book of Job:

"There are some minds that cannot put up with uncertainty, and are under the necessity of deluding themselves into quietude by fixing on some known name. There are others to whom it is a comfort to think that in this omniscient age a few things still remain mysterious. Uncertainty is to them more suggestive than exact knowledge. No literature has so many great anonymous works as that of Israel. The religious life of this people was at certain periods very intense, and at these periods the spiritual energy of the nation expressed itself almost impersonally, through men who forgot themselves and were speedily forgotten in name by others."

And if we cannot name, we can at least partially describe the author. For his letter reveals a man who was not an Apostle but a scholar of the Apostles; a man of the second Christian generation (genealogisch nicht chronologisch, as Harnack says); a Hellenist yet a member and teacher of a Jewish Christian church; a Paulinist with some tincture of Alexandrian culture, though his treatment of Scripture differs toto coelo from Philo's; a friend of Timothy and at the time of writing in the company of Italian Christians.

Aim. But it is not the locality so much as the condition of the readers that chiefly concerns us. And as we read the Epistle it becomes apparent that the danger which roused the writer to interpose was not such definite and grave heresy as evoked the Epistle to the Galatians or that to the Colossians, nor such entangling heathen vices and difficult questions of casuistry as imperilled the Corinthian Church, but rather a gradual, almost unconscious admission of doubt which dulled hope and slackened energy. They had professed Christianity for some time (v. 12); and the sincerity of their profession had been proved by the manner in which they had borne severe persecution (x. 33, 34). They had taken joyfully the spoiling of their possessions; they had endured a great conflict of sufferings. But they found the long-sustained conflict with sin (xii. 4) and the day-by-day contempt and derision they experienced as Christians (xiii. 13), more wearing to the spirit than sharper persecution. Consequently their knees had become feeble to pursue the path of righteous endurance and activity, their hands hung limply by their side as if they were defeated men (xii. 12). They had ceased to make progress and were in danger of falling away (vi. 1-4, iii. 12) and were allowing an evil heart of unbelief to grow in them. No doubt this listless, semi-believing condition laid them open to the incursion of "divers and strange teachings" (xiii. 9) and in itself was full of peril.

To restore in them the freshness of faith the writer at every
part of the Epistle exhorts them to steadfastness and perseverance. "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering" (xi. 23). "Cast not away your confidence" (x. 35). "If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him" (x. 38). Or, what may be taken as the hortatory motto of the Epistle, "We are become partakers of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end" (iii. 14). That they may have encouragement to do so, he shows them at large the good ground they have for confidence. The fruits of faith in their fathers are recapitulated in the eloquent eleventh chapter. But especially is Jesus exhibited as the great leader in faith. "Consider Him lest ye be weary and faint in your souls" (xii. 3). His supremacy and trustworthiness are expounded in detail, and especially the eternal sufficiency of His sacrifice and intercession is dwelt upon.

Evidently, then, the persons addressed were in the mental and spiritual condition common in every age of the Christian Church, a condition of languor and weariness, of disappointed expectations, deferred hopes, conscious failure and practical unbelief. They were Christians but had slender appreciation of the glory of their calling, misconstrued their experience, and had allowed themselves to drift away from boldness of hope and intensity of faith. Dr. Bruce describes them as persons who never had "insight into the essential nature and distinctive features of the Christian religion"; and if by "insight" he means such perception of the greatness of Christ as causes men to rejoice in serving and suffering for Him, his description is correct. But he seems less exact when he goes on to say "No greater mistake, I believe, can be committed (though it is a common fault of commentators) than to assume that the first readers were in the main in sympathy with the doctrinal views of the writer". Some points, no doubt, which the writer adduces were new to the readers. The manner in which the paragraph regarding Melchizedek is introduced proves this. But we cannot therefore conclude that the whole conception of Christ as Priest was new to them; nor can we suppose that they had never thought of Christ as the Son through whom the final revelation was made and the eternal covenant mediated. Rather they had failed to consider what these great truths involved. Hence the writer bids them give "the more earnest heed to the things they have heard" (ii. 1), and throughout the Epistle he returns to his favourite admonition "Consider Him," let your minds penetrate more deeply into His significance. They had ceased to have that keen interest in truth which prompts contemplation and inquiry, and they now held what
they had been taught so externally that they were in danger of wholly losing their faith and becoming practical apostates. They had fallen under the power of the present and visible, and were giving to appearance and shadow the value that belonged only to the eternal reality.

The aim of the writer then was to open up the true significance of Christ and His work, and thus to remove the scruples, hesitations and suspicions which haunted the mind of the Jewish Christian embarrassing his faith, lessening his enjoyment, and lowering his vitality. The Jew who accepted Jesus as the Christ had problems to solve and difficulties to overcome of which the Gentile knew nothing. A transition of equal moment and encompassed by so much obscurity men have rarely, if ever, been summoned to make. It is easy for those who look back upon it as an accomplished fact to see that there was no real breach of continuity between the old religion and the new; but that was not readily perceived by those whose whole life and experience were marked by the turmoil and instability which accompanied the abandonment of old forms, the acceptance of new ideas, the building on other foundations. Brought up in a religion which he was persuaded was of Divine authority the Jew was now required to consider a large part of his belief and worship as antiquated. Accustomed to pride himself on a history marked at various stages by angelic visits, Divine voices, and miraculous interventions, he is now invited to shift his faith from institutions and venerable customs to a Person, and this a Person in whom earthly glory is suggested only by its absence and in whom those apparently most qualified to judge could discover nothing but imposture which merited a malefactor's death. Cherishing with extraordinary enthusiasm, as his exclusive heritage, the Temple with all its hallowed associations, its indwelling God, its altar, its august priesthood, its complete array of ordinances, he is yet haunted by the Christian new-born instinct that there is an essential lacking in all these arrangements and that for him they are irrelevant and obsolete. A blight has suddenly fallen on what was brightest in his religion, a blight he can neither dissipate nor perfectly justify.

For the Jewish Christian must have found it quite beyond his power to understand the relation of the old to the new. Already indeed it had become apparent that in Jesus prophecy had been fulfilled. He had been accepted as the predicted Messiah partly because it was beyond dispute that in Him a correspondence was found to the figure more or less clearly defined in the Old Testament. This no doubt hinted that there was some strong and vital
connection between the two faiths. But what relation did this Messiah hold to the Mosaic institutions? That was a more difficult problem. The difficulty of it is appreciated when we consider that a large section of the Christian Church judged the old to be irreconcilable with the new, and went so far as to maintain that the God of the Old Testament was antagonistic to the God who revealed Himself in Christ. And even the more moderate section of the Church found difficulty in answering the questions: What was to be thought of the Jewish ordinances and of the Jewish Scriptures which enjoined them? If the ordinances were set aside, could the Scriptures which contained them be retained? In what sense had Christ fulfilled the law, the ceremonial? He had not been a Priest. He had not assumed the Priest's function, but the Rabbi's. He had not been born in a priestly family. A sacrifice, perhaps, in some sense, He had been.

To the Jew, in short, Christ must have created as many problems as He solved. The unquestioning faith that is guided by healthy instincts and can relegate to the future all intellectual explanations and reconcilements is not given to every one; and many a Jewish Christian must have passed those first days in painful unrest, drawn to trust Jesus by all that He knew of His holiness and truth and yet sorely perplexed and hindered from perfect trust by the unexpected spirituality of the new religion, by the contempt of his old co-religionists, by the enforced relinquishment of all outward garnishing and glory, and by the apparent impossibility of fitting the gorgeousness of the old and the bareness of the new into one consistent whole. To this miserable and weakening condition of spirit the writer appeals and aims at removing it by giving them a fuller insight into the relation of Christianity to Mosaism, and especially by illustrating the unique supremacy of Christ and the finality of His work. He makes it his aim to show that every name, every institution, every privilege, which had existed under the old economy survived in the new, but invested with a higher meaning and a truer glory—a meaning and a glory, new indeed in themselves, but yet for the first time fulfilling the great purpose of God which from the first had been dimly shadowed forth. "The first was taken away only in order that the second might be introduced."¹

To this task he necessarily brought his own philosophical presuppositions. Trained in Alexandrian thought he cherished the Platonist conception of the relation of the seen to the unseen. It

¹ "Das Christenthum bringt nichts, was nicht schon im A. T. angelegt, verheissen und vorgebildet gewesen wäre" (Holtmann, N. T. Theol., ii., 287).
² Timæus, 28 c.; Ref. 597; Philo, Mundi Op., 4; De Vita Mosis, p. 148.
was his inalienable conviction that the visible world is merely phenomenal, the temporary form or manifestation of the invisible, archetypal world which alone is real and eternal. In the Epistle these two worlds are continually related by contrast. The unseen world \([\piερ\delta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha \ o\ o\ βλε\π\δ\μ\α\tau\alpha \ x\ i. \ 1]\) is the eternal counterpart of this present order of things \([ά\υ\τ\η \ \kappa\i\i\o\s \ x\ i. \ 11]\); the reality, of which earthly things are but the shadow \([σκί\a \ viii. \ 5]\). The visible heaven and earth are one day to pass away, “as things that have been made” \([ος \ πεποιημένων \ x\ ii. \ 27]\), but this only in order that the eternal things which cannot be removed may remain alone existent.

On this broad philosophical basis, itself unshakable as the eternal things, the writer builds his argument. Here he finds the key to the essential distinction between Mosaism and Christianity, as well as the proof of the superiority and finality of the latter. The Mosaic dispensation belongs to the seen and temporal, the Christian to the unseen and eternal. In the one there is a tabernacle “made with hands”; a sanctuary of this world, equipped and furnished with material objects; the sacrifices are of bulls and goats; the rest appointed cannot be eternal, because it is in a visible earthly land; their holy city is one which can be profaned by Roman armies; above all, their priesthood is dependent on the flesh. How manifest that all these things belong to the earthly temporal order. The whole dispensation is involved with things visible, tangible, material, evanescent.

But Mosaism was not wholly useless. It was a shadow of the good things to come: and to these real, eternal things Christ introduces men. Christ Himself, being Son of God, belongs to the eternal order. In Him we have throughout to do not with external ceremonies and temporal arrangements, but with what is spiritual; in Him we come into touch not with imperfect revelations of God made through symbol and human medium, but with the very image of God. He mediates between God and man in virtue of His connection with both. He leads men into the true relation to God by Himself perfectly fulfilling the human life of obedience to God's will. His priesthood or power to carry His human brethren with Him into the heavenly life, springs out of His personal worth wrought by discipline to a perfected condition. He is priest in virtue not of what is of the flesh, not by inherited office, but by virtue of His sympathy with men and His personal stainlessness. He enters the presence of God not in an earthly tabernacle nor with the blood of bulls and goats but with His own blood, bringing men and God together by the pure and perfect surrender of Himself to God. This sacrifice though made on earth was yet made in the eternal order,
because made in spirit, in a spirit which necessarily belongs not to
this visible and transitory order of things but to the eternal and real,
or as the writer says, "through eternal spirit".

That which this writer finds common to the new and the old
forms of religion is the purpose of God to bring men into fellowship
with Himself, or, in other words, the covenant idea. With this
writer religion is the harmony of God and man. He thinks of God,
not like Paul, as a Judge before whose bar man must somehow be
cleared of guilt, but as entering into covenant with man and provid-
ning for the maintenance of this covenant by sacrifice. In history
he sees two great epochs in the promotion of this fellowship distin-
guished by the efficacy with which it is effected. For the covenant
being between the holy, heavenly God and His unholy creature, it
will not be quite easy to form or to maintain. It involves at any
rate two things, that the will of God in the matter be made known,
and that man be separated from his sin. It involves, that is to
say, that the covenant be effectively mediated and especially in this
respect that it be secured that man shall be cleansed from his sin
and fitted for true and lasting fellowship with God. So essential
is this, that each form of the covenant may be judged by the effi-
ciency with which it accomplishes this. If the arrangements for
bringing man into real and abiding union with God are imperfect,
then this colours with imperfection the covenant to which these
arrangements belong; if, on the other hand, such arrangements are
made as actually cleanse the conscience and renew the character
then this determines the perfectness of the covenant in which these
arrangements are comprised.

Hence the importance which this writer attaches to priesthood
and sacrifice. It is by these the nature and efficacy of every
covenant between God and man must be determined. If one cove-
nant only provides for a ceremonial purification and a symbolic
introduction to God, this of itself stamps that covenant as inferior
to one which provides for a spiritual cleansing and a real union
If with one of the covenants there is identified a priesthood which
is merely hereditary and therefore fleshly and professional, while
the other rests on a natural and spiritual priesthood that offers a
real spiritual sacrifice, the sacrifice of self, in contrast with the
sacrifice of bulls and goats, there can be little hesitation in deter-
mining whether of these two is the eternal covenant. It is the
writer's aim to exhibit this distinction. He knows that if only his
readers can once see the real glory of Christ and His religion all
their doubts will vanish, and accordingly he proceeds to send them
such an exposition of that glory as is in point of fact a magnificent apologetic for Christianity from the Jewish point of view.

The relation thus established between the former and the latter dispensation may tend to an undervaluing of the old, and lead to the idea that "the Jew was simply the keeper of a casket which he could not unlock, an actor in a symbolical representation which to him conveyed little or no meaning". It must be borne in mind, therefore, that the arrangements of the Old Testament were primarily for the religious use of the Jews themselves. Their religion was not devised for the intellectual employment or diversion of persons who can now look back upon it, nor altogether for the religious edification of such persons, but primarily for the religious edification of the Jews themselves. They needed a religion as much as we do. They needed assurance of God and His favour, and some means of access to Him and this they found in their religion of type and symbol. To them as to us a gospel was preached (iv. 2). Through the symbolic arrangements of their earthly tabernacle they learned real truth and were brought into fellowship with the eternal. Not that they understood what the physical arrangements of their religion typified, but that they did understand what they symbolised. The Old Testament ritual was instructive not in so far as it was typical, but in so far as it was symbolical. A symbol is an embodied idea, or what we nowadays call an "object lesson"; an idea rendered visible in a material sign or in an external action. A type not only expresses an idea, but looks forward to a time when this idea shall receive its perfect expression. As Mr. Litton1 defines it "a type is a prophetic symbol". "Every true type is necessarily a symbol, that is, it embodies and represents the ideas which find their fulfilment in the antitype; but every symbol is not necessarily a type; a symbol may terminate in itself, and point to nothing future; it may even refer to something past." Now it cannot be supposed that the contemporaries of Moses or Moses himself understood what was prefigured by their ritual. But if they did not understand their ritual as a collection of types, they certainly did understand it as a system of symbols. The tabernacle itself was both a symbol and a type. It was a symbol that God dwelt with men, ever in their midst, sharing their fortunes, forgiving their sin, and bestowing blessing. This symbol every child could read. But it was also a type, a symbol with a prophecy wrapped up in it, a symbol giving promise that the truth taught in it would one day find its perfect, eternal manifestation. This could at the best be but imperfectly understood.

1 Bampton Lectures, p. 82.
But the writer to the Hebrews looking back upon the preparation for Christ can see how this and that prefigured Him who was to come. Every Old Testament institution, ceremony, person or thing in which a principle or idea was embodied which was afterwards embodied in Christ and His Kingdom may legitimately be called "typical". To the Jews themselves these types were helpful not because they threw light upon the person and work of Christ, but because they then and there communicated those very ideas which were subsequently expressed in their reality in Jesus. The institution of sacrifice, e.g., was useful to them not because it taught them to look for a Messiah who should die for their sins—for it had no such effect—but because it then and there communicated the very ideas and the very hopes which the death of Christ expressed—in a dim and unsatisfactory way no doubt, as this writer is careful to show, but still adequately as a first lesson in the holiness and forgiveness of God.

Keeping in view the aim of the writer to convince his readers that the new Christian order of things is an advance on the old Mosaic order, and is indeed the final and universal form of religion, the course of thought is easily followed. The Mediator of the new covenant is first of all compared with the Mediators of the old, with prophets, angels, Moses, Joshua, Aaron, and this comparison occupies the first seven chapters. The writer then proceeds to exhibit the evanescence of the old covenant and the superiority of the new (viii. 6-13), and of the true God-pitched tabernacle and its sacrifice to the first man-made tabernacle with its arrangements and offerings (ix. 1-x. 18). On this demonstrated superiority and finality of the covenant which Christ has mediated the writer founds a forcible appeal and exhorts his readers to hold fast their profession and to use the access to God provided for them (x. 19-25). This exhortation he enforces by warnings (x. 26-31), by awakening remembrances of better times (32-39), by the rapid, suggestive and eloquent presentation of their predecessors in faith (xi.), and especially of Him whose example in faith and endurance is perfect (xii. 1-4), and by illustrating the reasonableness of hopefully submitting to present trouble as discipline sent by the heavenly Father (xii. 5-13). They are further urged to diligence in sanctification by the consideration that awful as were the sanctions of the old law, those of the new covenant are immensely more awful, that indeed our God is a consuming fire (xii. 14-29). The closing chapter contains miscellaneous but relevant admonitions.

**Date.** The chief index to the date of the Epistle is its relation
to the destruction of the Temple. The impression one receives from its perusal is that the sacrifices and other services of the Temple were still being performed. If particular passages are examined, this impression is deepened. It is quite true that the use of the present tense (as in Heb. ix. 6, viii. 4, etc.) does not always imply an actual present. The use of this tense by Clement (Ep. c. 41) in describing ordinances which in his day were certainly obsolete puts this beyond question. But of course the use of the present generally implies the existence of the object spoken of at the time of the speaker; and it is not easy to suppose that if the Temple and its worship had already been abolished, this writer could use such language as we find in c. x. 1, 2; "they can never with the same sacrifices year by year which they offer continually make perfect them that draw nigh. Else would they not have ceased to be offered?" And as Ménégoz \(^1\) says: "C'est précisément l'existence du culte levitique qui offrait des dangers pour la fidélité des chrétiens. Après la destruction du Temple ce danger avait disparu, du moins en majeure partie." Besides, it is impossible to suppose that a writer wishing to demonstrate the evanescent nature of the Levitical dispensation, and writing after the Temple services had been discontinued, should not have pointed to that event as strengthening his argument. It would appear, then, that the Epistle must have been written while the Temple was yet standing, that is, prior to the year A.D. 70.

Accordingly Salmon dates the Epistle in 63; Ménégoz places it in 64-67. The year 66 or thereabouts is adopted by Riehm, Lünenmann, Hilgenfeld, Weiss, Beyschlag, Schürer, Godet, Westcott. Bleek prefers the year 68 or 69. Harnack, Pfeiderer, von Soden, Holtzmann and McGiffert bring it down to some date between A.D. 81 and 96.

Commentaries. Full lists of commentaries on the Epistle are easily accessible in Bible Dictionaries or in Delitzsch's Commentary. A selection is given by von Soden in the Hand-commentary. Here it must suffice to name the most outstanding. Among the patristic commentators Chrysostom is unquestionably the most valuable, always sensible and well expressed. Of mediæval writers Primasius, Atto Vercellensis and Herveius may be consulted with advantage.\(^2\) Calvin, Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Bengel will inevitably be used in the study of this Epistle, as of any part of the New testament.

\(^1\) La Thiol. de l'ép. etc., p. 40.

\(^2\) On these and others see Riggenbach's Die ältesten lateinischen Komm.: Zum Hebräerbrief in Zahn's Forschungen.
Testament. At the foundation of all more recent elucidation of the Epistle lies Bleek's great work, *Der Brief an die Hebräer erläutert* (1828-1840), the most comprehensive and scholarly, and in all respects one of the best commentaries on any book of the New Testament. Of almost equal value is Weiss' contribution to the revised Meyer. Delitzsch though not so exact is generally suggestive and always rich in material, while his knowledge of the Old Testament enables him to enter into the author's point of view. Westcott, largely indebted to Bleek, is, as always, full and accurate. Vaughan is of great use for ascertaining the precise meaning and biblical usage of words. Davidson (Clark's Bible-class Hand-books) penetrates to the meaning of the writer better than any other commentator. Peake (Jack's Century Bible) rivals him in this and has a rare gift of compact lucidity. No better book could be conceived or is needed for English readers. Nothing better has been written on the Epistle than his chapter on its teaching.

Other works such as those by Owen, Peirce, Moses Stuart, Tholuck, Hofmann, McCaul, Lowrie and von Soden will be found helpful, and each has a merit of its own. And naturally the great collectors of illustrative material, Wetstein and Schoettgen, Kypke, Elsner and Raphel will be used. The parallels from Philo have been carefully collected by Carpzov. Where Anz is named, the reference is to his *Subsidia ad cognoscendum Graecorum sermonem vulgarem e Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina repetita* in the Dissertations Philologicae Halenses, vol. xii., part ii. (1884).

Riehm's *Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes* is a classic, a monument of German industry and comprehensiveness, full of detail but never wearisome, always lighting up old meanings with fresh flashes of insight. Bruce's presentation of the substance of the Epistle (*The Ep. to the Hebrews*, Clark) is characteristically vigorous and full of elevated thought and enriching ideas. An excellent book on *The Theology of the Epistle* has also been issued by Dr. George Milligan. And quite indispensable to the student is *La Theologie de l'Epitre aux Hebreux*, by Eugène Ménéguz.

AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT.

I. GREEK UNEALS.

\[ \text{Sinaiticus Petropolitanus, Saec. iv. Complete.} \]
\[ \text{Alexandrinus Londinensis, Saec. v. Complete.} \]
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C Ephraemi Parisiensis, Saec. v. Wants i. τονεμεσαν —πνευματος αγιου ii. 4. vii. 26 αμαντος —μησητας ix. 15. x. 24 της και καθω —μιανδουν πολλοι xii. 15.

D Claromontanus Parisiensis Nationalis 107, Graeco-Latinus. ["Latina inprimis in epistula ad Hebraeos errores multos praebent"] Gregory. Saec. vi. Heb. xiii. 21-23 is lost. Beza, to whom we owe the earliest notice of this Codex describes it as of equal antiquity with his copy (D) of the Gospels, and tells us it was found at Clermont, near Beauvais. Many hands have revised it.

E Petropolitanus, Graeco-Latinus, Saec. ix. Wants Heb. xii. 8 πας —υμων, xiii. 25. A faulty copy of D after it had been more than once corrected.


H Coislinianus Parisiensis nationalis 202, Saec. vi. The leaves of this MS. are still scattered, some at Paris, some at Moscow, some at St. Petersburg, some at Mt. Athos, others elsewhere. It contains of Hebrews, chapters ii., iii., iv., x.

K Moscuensis, Saec. ix. Complete.

L Angelicus Romanus, Saec. ix. Complete to xiii. 10 έξωσιαν.


N Petropolitanus, Saec. ix. Contains v. 8-vi. 10.

O Fragmenta Mosquensia, Saec vi. (?) Contains x. 1-3, 3-7, 32-34, 35-38. Scrivener.

P Porfirianus Chiovensis, Saec. ix. Complete. xii. 9, 10 illegible.

The first verse of the Epistle has been edited by Messrs. Grenfell & Hunt from a fragment in Lord Amherst’s collection of papyri. It is in a small uncial hand of the early fourth century. It reads ηυμων after πας πας.

II. Greek Cursives.

Of the large number of cursives cited by Tischendorf, it may suffice to mention the Codex Colbertinus of the Imperial Library of Paris, collated by Tregelles, and cited as 17 [33 of the Gospels]. It belongs to the eleventh century, and is of great value. Another MS. which was collated by Tregelles and highly valued by him is the Codex Leicesterensis of the fourteenth century, and cited under the sign 37. Gregory also marks 47, Oxon. Bodl. Roe, as "bonae notae". It also was collated by Tregelles.

III. Versions.

The Old Latin and the Vulgate, the Peshitto and Harklean Syriac, the Coptic and fragments of the Sahidic and Bashmuric versions, together with the Armenian and Ethiopic are available for the ascertainment of the text of the Epistle. [For remarks on these versions, see Westcott’s Com., Introduction.]
CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-3. The aim of the writer is to prove that the old Covenant through which God had dealt with the Hebrews is superseded by the New; and this aim he accomplishes in the first place by exhibiting the superiority of the mediator of the new Covenant to all previous mediators. The Epistle holds in literature the place which the Transfiguration holds in the life of Christ. Former mediators give place and Christ is left alone under the voice "Hear ye Him". With this writer, Jesus is before all else the Mediator of a better Covenant, viii. 6. But 'Mediator' involves the arranging and accomplishing of everything required for the efficacy of the Covenant; the perfect knowledge of the person and purposes of Him who makes the Covenant with men and the communication of this knowledge to them; together with the removal of all obstacles to man's entrance into the fellowship with God implied by the Covenant. This twofold function is in these first three verses shown to be discharged by Christ. He as Son speaks to men for God and thus supersedes all previous revelations; while, instead of appointing a priest who can only picture a cleansing, and accomplish a ceremonial purity, He becomes Priest and actually cleanses men from sin, and so effects their actual fellowship with God.

Ver. 1. In sonorous and dignified terms the writer abruptly makes his first great affirmation: "God having spoken... spoke". 
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understood. One aspect of God’s nature, one element in His purposes, reflected from the conditions of their time, the prophets could know; but in the nature of things it was impossible they should know the whole. They were like men listening to a clock striking, always getting nearer the truth but obliged to wait till the whole was heard. Man can only know in part, ἡ μνήμη, 1 Cor. xiii. A fine illustration will be found in Browning’s Cleop, in lines beginning: “those divine men of old time have reached, thou sayest well, each at one point the outside verge,” etc...] The “speaking” of God to the fathers was conditioned by the capacity of the prophets. His speaking was also παλαιρτάντες [cf. Οδυς. 1. 1, “Ἀνάπα μοι εἰςθεῖν, Μοῦδα, παλαιρτάντες] not in one stereotyped manner but in modes varying with the message, the messenger, and those to whom the word is sent. Sometimes, therefore, God spoke by an institution, sometimes by parable, sometimes in a psalm, sometimes in an act of righteous indignation. For, as Peake says, “the author is speaking not of the forms in which God spoke to the prophets, but of the modes in which He spoke through them to the fathers. The message took the form of law or prophecy, of history or psalm; now it was given in signs, now in types.” So Hofmann. These features of previous revelations, so prominently set and expressed so grandiloquently, cannot have been meant to disparage them, rather to bring into view their affluence and pliability and many-sided application to the growing receptivity and varying needs of men. He wins his readers by suggesting the grandeur of past revelations. But it is at the same time true, as Calvin remarks, “varietatem fuisse imperfectionis notam”. So Bengel, “Ipsa prophetarum multitudo indicat, eos ex parte prophetasse”. These characteristics, while they encouragingly disclosed God’s purpose to find His way to men, did yet discredit, as inadequate for perfect achievement, each method that was tried. The contrast in the new revelation is implied in the word χρόνος, indicating that the work was once for all accomplished.

The next note of previous revelations is found in παλαι “of old,” not merely “in time past” as A.V.; marking the time referred to in καλλήρως as contrasted with the writer’s present, and gently suggesting that other methods of speaking might now be appropriate. Already in a Cor. iii. 14 the Mosaic covenant is spoken of as ἡ παλαιά διαθήκη cf. viii. 13. Here παλαι is contrasted with ἐν ιοράκυτον τῶν γνώμων, “at the last of these days,” “Aufs Ende dieser Tage,” Weizsäcker, i.e., in the Messianic time at the close of the period known to the Jews as “this present time or age”. The expression is used in the LXX indifferently with ἐν ιοράκυτον τῶν γνώμων or ἐν ταῖς ιοράκυταις γνώμαις to translate הָיוֹם הָזִּיִּים (see Isa. ii. 2; Gen. xlix. 1; Num. xxiv. 14), which was used to denote either the future indefinitely or the Messianic period, “the latter days” in which all prophecy was to find its fulfilment. Bleek quotes Kimchi as saying: “Ubicumque leguntur ‘Beairith Hayamin’ ibi sermo est de diebus Messiae”. And Wetstein quotes R. Nachman: “Extremum diorum consensus omnium doctorum sunt Dies Messiae”. It was this Jewish usage which the N.T. writers followed in speaking of their own times as “the last days;” ἐν ιοράκυτον τ. χρόνον (Jude 18); ἐν ιοράκυτον τ. γνώμαν (2 Pet. iii. 3); ἐν ιοράκυτον τ. χρόνον (1 Pet. i. 20); and in this Epistle, ix. 26, Christ is said to have appeared ἐν ὑπερτάλειῳ τῶν αἰώνων. The first Advent as terminating the old world and introducing the Messianic reign was considered the consummation. The introduction of the word τῶν ιοράκυν is suggested by the Jewish division of the world’s course into two periods: “This Age” (Ha-Olam Hazzeh) and The Coming Age (Ha-Olam Habbah). The end of “this age” or “these days” was signalled by the coming of the Messiah, the new revelation in Christ. More effectually than the Jews themselves expected has the Advent of the Messiah antiquated the old world and opened a new period.

The temporal contrast is further marked by the words τῶν εἰς παλαι χρόνων (ver. 1) and ἡ μνήμη (ver. 2). Former revelations had been made to “the fathers,” i.e., of the Jewish people, as in John vii. 22; Rom. ix. 5, xv. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 4. More frequently “ου “your” “their” is added, as in Acte iii. 13, 25; Luke vi. 53. But it is idle to urge, with von Soden, the absence of the pronoun as weighing against the restriction of the term in this place to the Jewish fathers. ἡ μνήμη “to us” of these last days, of the Christian dispensation. The determining contrast between the
PROS EUBAIIOUS

...two revelations is found in this, that in the one God spoke in His prophetic words, while in the other He spoke in His own. "The prophets" stand here, not for the prophetic writings as in Jo. vi. 45; Acts xiii. 40, etc.; but for all those who had spoken for God, and especially for that great series of men from Abraham and Moses onwards who had been the organs of revelation and were identified with it (cf. the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen). The prep. lv is not used in its instrumental sense (cf. Habak. ii. 1), nor is it = διά, it brings God closer to the hearers of the prophetic word, and implies that what the prophets spoke, God spoke. So Hofmann and Weiss. ["Ipse in cordibus eorum dixit quicquid illis oras vel dictis vel factis locutis sunt hominibus," Herveius.] The full significance of lv is seen in lv viii. lv are without the article must be translated "in one who is a son," indicating the nature of the person through whom this final revelation was made. The revelation now consisted not merely in what was said [ἐρωτάρετα] but in what He was [ὑπέρ]. This revelation was final because made by one who in all He is and does, reveals the Father. By uttering Himself He expresses God. A Son who can be characteristically designated a son, carries in Himself the Father's nature and does not need to be instructed in purposes which are also and already His own, nor to be officially commissioned and empowered to do what He cannot help doing. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him" (cf. John i. 18). The whole section on "The Son of God" in Dalman's Dis Worte Jesu should be read in this connection. "Son" is here used in its Messianic reference, as the quotations cited in vv. 5, 6 prove. The attributes ascribed to the Son are at the same time Divine attributes. [So Baur and Pfeiferer. Ménégex denies this.] The writer apparently experiences no difficulty in attaching to one and the same personality the creating of the world and the dying to cleanse sin.

The Son is described in six particulars which illustrate His supremacy and His fitness to reveal the Father: (1) His destination to universal lordship (δι᾽ οὗ ὄνομα ἄνθρωπος); (2) His agency in creation (δι᾽ οὗ ἀνακοίνωσε τὰ ἀνάλογα); (3) His likeness to God (δι᾽ ἀνακοίνωσε μ.τ.λ.); (4) His relation to the world (ὁμιλητικός ἐκ τοῦ πατρός); (5) His redemptive work (ὁμιλητικός ἐκ τοῦ πατρός); (6) His exaltation (ὁμιλητικός ἐκ τοῦ πατρός). Cf. Vaughan. δι᾽ οὗ ὄνομα ἄνθρωπος "whom He appointed heir of all". Davidson, Weiss and others understand this of the actual elevation of Christ, on His ascension, to the Lordship of all. ["Dass der Verfasser bei diesen Worten an den erhöhten Christus gedacht habe, halten wir für unzweifelhaft," Riehm, p. 295]. But the position of the clause in the verse and the subsequent mention of the exaltation in ver. 3 rather indicate that οὗ has here its ordinary meaning (see Elsner and Bleek) of "appointed," and that the reference is to Ps. ii. 8 δὲ οὗ θεός τινα τὸ ἄνθρωπον σὸν κ.τ.λ., so Hofmann. Through this Son God is to accomplish His purpose. The Son is to reign over all. The writer lifts the thought of the despondent to Christ's triumph and Lordship. In the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen Christ speaks of Himself as Heir. It is involved in the Sonship; Gal. iv. 7. It is not simply possessor but possessor because of a relation to the Supreme. The Father could not be called ἄνθρωπος. Dalman shows that the 2nd Psalm "deduces from the filial relation of the King of Zion to God, that universal dominion, originally proper to God, is bequeathed to the Son as an inheritance," Worte Jesu, p. 220, E. Tr. 268. Cf. also Matt. xi. 27, πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου. [Chrysostom says the use of the term brings out two points τὸ τῆς ἐνδεχόμενος γνώσης, καὶ τὸ τῆς κυρίευσίν ἀνασκαφώσαν.] The inheritance is not fully entered upon, until it can be said...
that "the kingdom of the world is become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ," Rev. xi. 15. Cf. Heb. ii. 8. But by His incarnation He came into touch with men and poured His life into human history, at once claiming and securing His great inheritance.  

81* 01 k a i eito it)a ev Toil ali-vat 'through whom also He made the world,""perquernfecitetsecula" (Vulg.), " durch Welchen er auch die Weltzeiten gemacht hat' (Weissäcker). "Secula et omnia in its decurrentia" (Bengel). Weiss thinks it quite improbable that so pure a Greek writer should use αλωνεις in the rabbinical sense as = "world," and he believes that the Greek interpreters are right in retaining the meaning "world-periods". But in xi. 3 it becomes obvious that this writer could use the word as virtually = κοσμος.

"Who being effulgence of His glory and express image of His nature." The relative δε finds its antecedent in αλωνεις and the interposed participles prepare for the statement of the main verb by disclosing the fitness of Christ to be the revealer of God, and to make atonement. The two clauses, δε . . . φανερω τε, are closely bound together and seem intended to convey the impression that during Christ's redemptive activity on earth there was no kenosis, but that these Divine attributes lent efficacy to His whole work. [On the difficulty of this conception see Gore's Bampton Lec., p. 266, and Carpenter's Essex Hall Lec., p. 87.] αναγνωσαμαι της διαθήκης . . . ἀναγνωσαμαι may mean either what is flashed forth, or what is flashed back: either "ray" or "reflection".

Calvin, Beza, Thayer, Menégez prefer the latter meaning. Thus Grotius has, "repercussus divinae majestatis, qualis est solisin nube ". The Greek fathers, on the other hand, uniformly adopt the meaning "effulgence". Thus Theodoret to χειρ αναγνωσαμαι καλ ἐν τοι τυφέ καλ σοι τω τυρι διατηρηματων μη δει το τυρι, ἄρωσιν δε ἐντω τοι τυφέ . . . κα τω τυρι δι ὁμοφυει τω ἀναγνωσαμαι : οικουν καλ α τις τω τυρι. So in the Nicene Creed φως ἐν φωτε. "The word 'effulgence' seems to mean not rays of light streaming from a body in their connection with that body or as part of it, still less the reflec-

tion of these rays caused by their falling upon another body, but rather rays of light coming out from the original body and forming a similar light-body themselves" (Davidson). So Weiss, who says that the "Strahlenglanz ein zweites Wesen erzeugt". Philo's use of the word lends colour to this meaning when

1 T.R. in deEKLM al pler, d, c, Syrau ; omit 8t. sauton with N*ABDbP, 17, 46.  
2 Omit ημων with N*ABD*E*MP.
he says of the human soul breathed into man by God that it was ἀντὶ τῆς ἀναπαράσεως καὶ τρισμεραρίας φόρτωσεν ἰδανίγαμα. So in India, Chaitanya taught that the human soul was like a ray from the Divine Being; God like a blazing fire and the souls like sparks that spring out of it. In the Arian controversy this designation of the Son was appealed to as proving that He is essentially generated and exists not by an act of the Father's will but essentially. See Suicer, s.v. As the sun cannot exist or a lamp burn without radiating light, so God is essentially Father and Son. τὸς δόξης αὐτοῦ. God's glory is all that belongs to him as God, and the Son is the effulgence of God's glory, not only a single ray but as Origen says: δόξης τῆς δόξας. Therefore the Son cannot but reveal the Father. Calvin says: "Dum igitur audis filium esse splendorem Paternae gloriae, sic apud te cogita, gloriam Patris esse invisibilem, donee in Christo refulget ". As completing the thought of these words and bringing out still more emphatically the fitness of the Son to reveal, it is added καὶ χαρακτήρ 
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the seal, the mirror and the wax have not the same nature as that which they represent. And Philo more than once speaks of man's rational nature as νόημα καὶ χαρακτήρ ἀνάμνεσις και ἰδανίγαμα of that blessed nature, see Quod deter. insid., c. xxiii.; De Opif. Mundi, c. li. All that he means by this is, that man is made in God's image. But while no doubt the primary significance of the terms used by the writer to the Hebrews is to affirm the fitness of Christ to reveal God, the accompanying expressions, in which Divine attributes are ascribed to Him, prove that this fitness to reveal was based upon community of nature. The two clauses, δόξης αὐτοῦ, have frequently been accepted as exhibiting the Trinitarian versus the Arian and Sabellian positions; the Sabellians accepting the ἰδανίγαμα as representing their view of the modal manifestation of Godhead, the Arians finding it possible to accept the second clause, but neither party willing to accept both clauses—separate or individual existence of the Son being found in the figure of the seal, while identity of nature seemed to be affirmed in ἰδανίγαμα. ἰδανίγαμα was derived from the Stoics who used it as the equivalent of ounia, that which formed the essential substratum, τὸ ὑποκατημένον, of all qualities. The Greek fathers, however, understood by it what they termed πρόσωπον ἄρωμα, and affirmed that there were in the Godhead three ὑποκατημένα. The Latin fathers translating ὑποκατημένα by substantia could not make this affirmation. Hence arose confusion until Gregory Nazianzen pointed out that the difference was one of words not of ideas, and that it was due to the poverty of the Latin language. See Suicer, s.v.; Bleek in loc.; Biggs's Christian Platonists, p. 164-5; Dean Strong's Articles in J.T.S. for 1901 on the History of the Theological term Substance; Calvin Inst., i, 13, 2; Loofs' Leitfaden, p. 109 note and p. 134.]

ἐφιμοῦ τι τὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ . . . "and upholding all things by the word of His power". The meaning of ἐφιμοῦ is seen in such expressions as that of Moses in Num. xi. 14 ὁ δύναμις ἐγώ μόνος ἐφιμοῦ τῶν τῶν λαῶν τουτων, where the idea of being responsible for their government and guidance is involved. So in Plutarch's Lucullus, 6, ἐφιμοῦ τὴν τῶν κυβερνῶν τόπων, where his judges " sustinetis rempublicam humeris vestris ". See Bleek. In Rabbinic literature, as
Schoettgen shows, God is commonly spoken of as “portans mundum,” the Hebrew word being בְּמֵדַיִם. In Philo, the Logos is the helmsman and pilot of all things (De Cherub.) as the channel, by the expression of His power, by making His will felt in all created nature. The present, φωτισμ, seems necessarily to involve that during the whole of His earthly career, this function of upholding nature was being discharged. Probably the clause is inserted not merely to illustrate the dignity of the Son, but to suggest that the whole course of nature and history, when rightly interpreted, reveals the Son and therefore the Father. The responsibility of bringing the world to a praiseworthy issue depends upon Christ, and as contributing to this work His earthly ministry was undertaken. For the notable thing He accomplished as God’s Son, the use He made of His dignity and power, is expressed in the words, καθαρισμὸν. καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος “having accomplished purification of the sins.” This was as an essential to the formation of the covenant, as the ability rightly to represent God’s mind and will. This itself was the supreme revelation of God, and it was only after accomplishing this He could sit down at God’s right hand as one who had finished the work of mediating the eternal covenant. The word suggests, the mid. voice, supersedes the necessity of διά νεανίσκονα. The aorist part. implies that the cleansing referred to was a single definite act performed before He sat down, and in some way preparatory to that Exaltation. The word receives explanation in subsequent words of the 2. 27, ix. 14-16. καθαρισμός as used in LXX suggests that the cleansing referred to means the removal of guilt and its consciousness. The worshippers were fitted by cleansing to appear before God.

The διά νεανίσκον ἀπὸ διά νεανίσκον... “sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high”. καθαριστήριον seems to denote that the work undertaken by the Son was satisfactorily accomplished; while the sitting down ἐν διά νεανίσκον κ.τ.λ. denotes entrance upon a reign. The source of the expression is in Ps. cx. 1 (cited v. 11)where the Logos says to Messiah καθαριστήριον ἐν διά νεανίσκον μου, and this not only as introducing Him to the place of security and favour, but also of dignity and power. “The King’s right hand was the place of power and dignity, belonging to the minister of his authority and his justice, and the Mediator in short between him and his people” (Rendall). Cf. Ps. lxxx. 17. In contrast to the ever-growing and never complete revelation to the fathers, which kept the race always waiting for something more sufficient, there came at last that revelation which contained all and was achieved all. But the expression not only looks backward in approval of the work done by the Son, but forward to the result of this work in His supremacy over all human affairs. μεγαλοπρέπεια is ascribed to God in Jude 25 and in Deut. xxxi. 3 δόθη μεγαλοπρέπεια τῷ υἱῷ ἡμῶν. Cf. also I Clem. x, 17. Here it is used to denote the sovereign majesty inherent in God (cf. xiii. 2; Mk. xiv. 62). The words ἐν διά νεανίσκον are connected by Westcott and Vaughan with διά νεανίσκον. It is better, with Beza and Bleek, to connect them with μεγαλοπρέπεια, and the majesty which it expresses, that is, majesty in which it is said He sat down on the throne of God, no further designation is needed; in viii. 1, as here, where it is said that He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty, it is felt that some further designation is needed, and ὁ τετίμημα ἐπιφανείας is added. No less important is the teaching that God’s power is not only a means but also an end. The word means both a present and a future, but supreme spiritual influence, mediation between God, the supreme love, wisdom and sovereignty, and this world. This writer and his contemporary fellow-Christians, had reached the conviction here expressed, partly from Christ’s words and partly from their own experience of His power.

Vv. 4—ii. 18. The Son and the Angels. Ver. 4, although forming part of the sentence 1-3, introduces a subject which continues to be more or less in view throughout chaps. i. and ii. The exaltation of the Mediator to the right hand of Sovereignty is in keeping with His designation as Son, a designation which marked Him out as superior to the angels. Proof is adduced from the O.T. To this proof, in accordance with the writer’s manner, a resulting admonition is attached, ii. 1-4. And the remainder of chap. ii. is occupied with an explanation of the reasonableness of the
incarnation and the suffering it involved; or, in other words, it is explained why if Christ is really greater than the angels, He had to be made a little lower than they.

The form of comparison here used, "having become as much superior to the angels as He has obtained a more excellent name than they", is found also, vii. 20-22, viii. 6, x. 25; also in Philo, κριτων is one of the words most necessary in an Epistle in which comparison is never out of sight. The Son became (γενόμενος) greater than the angels in virtue of taking His seat at God's right hand. This exaltation was the result of His earthly work. It is as Mediator of the new revelation, who has cleansed the sinful by His death, that He assumes supremacy. And this is in keeping with and in fulfilment of His obtaining the name of Son. This name κτισμον, He has obtained, not "von Anfang an" as Bleek and others say, but as Riehm points out, in the O.T. The Messiah, then future, was spoken of as Son; and therefore to the O.T. reference is at once made in proof. The Messianic Sonship no doubt rests upon the Eternal Sonship, but it is not the latter but the former that is here in view.

In support of this statement the writer adduces an abundance of evidence, no fewer than seven passages being cited from the O.T. Before considering these, two preliminary objections may first be removed. (1) To us nothing may seem less in need of proof than that Christ who is so exalted by Himself on mankind is superior to the angels who are little more than a picturesque adornment of earthly life. But when this writer lived the angels may be said to have been in possession, whereas Christ had yet to win His inheritance. Moreover, as Schoettgen shows (p. 905) it was usual and needful to make good the proposition, "Messias major est Patriarchis, Mose, et Angelis ministerialibus". Prof. Odersg, too, has shown (Proceedings of Soc. of Hist. Theol., 1895-6) that quite possibly the writer had in view some Jewish Gnostics who believed that Christ Himself belonged to the angelic creation and had, with the angels, a fluid personality and no proper human nature. In any case it was worth the writer's while to carry home to the conviction of his contemporaries that a mediation accomplished by one who was tempted and suffered and wrought righteousness, a mediation of an ethical and spiritual kind, must supersede a mediation accomplished by physical marvels and angelic ministries. (2) The passages cited from the Old Testament in proof of Christ's superiority although their immediate historical application is disregarded, are confidently adduced in accordance with the universal use of Scripture in the writer's time. But it must not be supposed that these passages are culled at random. With all his contemporaries this writer believed that where statements were made of an Israeliish king or other official in an ideal form not presently realised in those directly addressed or spoken of, these were considered to be Messianic, that is to say, destined to find their fulfilment and realisation in the Messiah. These interpretations of Scripture were the inevitable result of faith in God. The people were sure that God would somehow and at some time fulfil the utmost of His promise.

The first two quotations (ver. 5) illustrate the giving of the more excellent name; the remaining quotations exhibit the superiority of the Son to angels, or more definitely the supreme rule and imperishable nature of the Son, in contrast to the perishable nature and servile function of the angels.

Ver. 5. τίνι γὰρ εἶπεν πατερί τῶν ἄγγον... "For to which of the angels did he ever say My Son art Thou, I this day have begotten Thee? τίνι to what individual; πατερί in the whole course of history. The angels as a class are called " Sons of Elohim" in the O.T. (Gen. vi. 2; Ps. xxix. 1, lxxix. 7; Job i. 6). But this was not used in its strict sense but merely as expressive of indefinite greatness, nor was it addressed to any individual. πατερί, the subject unexpressed, as is common in citing Scripture (2 Cor. vi. 2; Gal. iii. 16; Eph. iv. 8, etc.). Winer and Blass supply ἀδελφοι, others ἔναντι. Warfield, who gives the fullest treatment of the subjectless use of ἄδελφοι, ἔναντι, and such words.
holds that either subject may be supplied, because "under the force of their conception of Scripture as an oracular book it was all one to the N.T. writers whether they said 'God says' or 'Scripture says,'" Here, however, the connection involves that the subject is διό. The words cited are from Ps. ii. 7 and are in verbal agreement with the LXX, which again accurately represents the Hebrew. The psalm was written to celebrate the accession of a King, Solomon or some other; but the writer, seeing in his mind's eye the ideal King, clothes the new monarch in his robes. The King was called God's Son on the basis of the promise made to David (2 Sam. vii. 14) and quoted in the following clauses: The words γεγυμένας σε do not seem to add much to the foregoing words, except by emphasising them, according to the ordinary method of Hebrew poetry. σήμερον is evidently intended to mark a special occasion or crisis and cannot allude to the eternal generation of the Son. In its original reference it meant "I have gotten Thee to the kingly dignity". It is not the beginning of life, but the entrance on office that is indicated by γεγυμένας, and it is as King the person addressed is God's Son. Thus Paul, in his address to the Pisidians (Acts xiii. 33), applies it to the Resurrection of Christ; cf. Rom. i. 4. The words, then, find their fulfilment in Christ's Resurrection and Ascension and sitting down at God's right hand as Messiah. He was thus proclaimed King, begotten to the royal dignity, and in this sense certainly no angel was ever called God's Son.

This is more fully illustrated by another passage introduced by the usual καὶ πάλιν (see x. 30, and Longinus, De Subl., chap. iv, etc.). "Εγώ λέγω, ἱλικίας αὐτῷ ἑαυτῷ πατέρα . . . words spoken in God's name by Nathan in reference to David's seed, and conveying to him the assurance that the kings of his dynasty should ever enjoy the favour and protection and inspiration enabling them to rule as God's representatives. This promise is prior in history to the previous quotation, and is its source; see 2 Sam. vii. 14. λέγω is Hellenistic after a Hebrew model. See Blass, Gram., p. 85.

And when He shall again have brought the first-born into the world of men, He says, "And let all God's angels worship Him". Having shown that "Son" is a designation reserved for the Messiah and not given to any of the angels, the writer now advances a step and addsuce a Scripture which shows that the relation of angels to the Messiah is one of worship. It is not easy to determine whether πάλιν merely indicates a fresh quotation (so Bleek, Bruce, etc.) as in ver. 5; or should be construed with ἵσαναγάγω. On the whole, the latter is preferable. Both the position of πάλιν and the tense of εὐσεβήσαντο seem to make for this construction. The "bringing in" is still future. Apparently it is to the second Advent reference is made; cf. ix. 28. To refer εὐσεβήσαντο to the inauguration, with Chrysostom, Calvin, Bengel, Bruce (see esp. Schoettgen); or to the resurrection with Grocius; or to an imagined introduction of the Son to created beings at some past period, with Bleek, is, as Weiss says, "sprachwidrig".

Rendall remarks: "The words bring in have here a legal significance; they denote the introduction of an heir into his inheritance, and are used by the LXX with reference to putting Israel in possession of his own land both in the time of Joshua and at the Restoration (Exod. vi. 8, xv. 17; Deut. xxx. 5)." This throws light not only on εὐσεβήσαντο but also on πρωτότοκος and ἵσαναγάγω, and confirms the interpretation of the clause as referring to the induction of the first-born into His inheritance, the world of men. πρωτότοκος is used of Christ (1) in relation to the other children of Mary (Luke ii. 7; Matt. i. 23); (2) in relation to other men (Rom. viii. 29; Col. i. 18); (3) in relation to creation (Col. i. 15). Nowhere else in N.T. is it used absolutely; but cf. Ps. lxxxix. 27. "I will make him first-born," i.e., superior in dignity and closer in intimacy. Μέγες, the present is used because the words recorded in Scripture and still unfilled are meant. These words, καὶ πρωτότοκοτος, occur verbatim in Moses' song (Deut. xxxii. 43). In the Alexandrian text, from which this writer usually quotes, we find πρωτότοκον, not πρωτότοκος (cf. Swete's LXX), but in a copy of the song subjoined to the Psalter this MS. itself has δυγγλαυ. The words are not represented in the Hebrew, and...
are supposed by Delitzsch to have been added in the liturgical use of Moses' song. The part of the song to which they are attached represents the coming of God to judgment, a fact which further favours the view that it is the second Advent our author has in view.

Ver. 7. Kai irpos μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει... The πρὸς μὲν of this verse is balanced by πρὸς δὲ in ver. 8; and in both πρὸς is to be rendered "with reference to," or "of" as in Luke xx. 10; Rom. x. 21; Xen., Mem., iv. 2-15. Cf. Winer, p. 505; and our own expression "speak to such and such a point". δ τοῖν κ.τ.λ. cited from Ps. civ. 4, Lünnemann and others hold that the Hebrew is wrongly rendered "who maketh winds his messengers" not "who maketh His angels winds". Calvin, too, finds no reference to angels in the words. He believes that in this Hymn of Creation the Psalmist, to illustrate how God is in all nature, says "who maketh the winds his messengers," i.e., uses for his purposes the apparently wildest of natural forces, and "flaming fire his ministers," the most rapid, resistless and devouring of agents controlled by the Divine hand. Cf. Shakespeare, "thought-executing fires". The writer accepts the LXX translation and itserveshis purpose of exhibiting that the characteristic function of angels is service, and that their form and appearance depend upon the will of God. This was the current J ewish view. Many of the sayings quoted by Schoettgen and Weber suggest that with some of the Rabbis the belief in angels was little more than a way of expressing their faith in a spiritual, personal power behind the forces of nature. "When they are sent on a mission to earth, they are wind: when they stand before God they are fire." The angel said to Manoah, "I know not after what image I am made, for God changes us every hour; why, then, dost thou ask after my name? Sometimes He makes us fire, at others wind; sometimes men, at others angels." Sometimes they appear to have no individual existence at all, but are merely the light-radiance or halo of God's glory. "No choir of angels sings God's praises twice, for each day God creates new hosts which sing His praises and then vanish into the stream of fire from under the throne of His glory whence they came." Cf. also the Book of Jubilees, ii. 2. "On the first day He created the heavens which are above and the earth and the waters and all the spirits which serve before Him—the angels of the presence, and the angels of sanctification, and the angels of the spirit of the winds, and the angels of the spirit of the clouds, and of darkness, and of snow and of hail, and of hoar frost, and the angels of the voices of the thunder and of the lightning, and the angels of the spirits of cold and of heat, and of winter and of spring, and of autumn and of summer, and of all the spirits of His creatures which are in the heavens and on the earth, the abysses and the darkness, eventide and the light, dawn and day which He hath prepared in the knowledge of His heart." One thing all these citations serve to bring out is that the angels were merely servants: like the physical forces of nature they were dependent and perishable. In contrast to these qualities are those ascribed to the Son.

Ver. 8. πρὸς δὲ τὸν οἶδα... the quotation being from Ps. xlv. in which the King in God's kingdom is described ideally. The points in the quotation which make it relevant to the writer's purpose are the ascription of dominion and perpetuity to the Son. The emphatic words, therefore, are θρόνος, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, δόξας, and παρὰ τοῖς μετέχοντις σοι. It does not matter, therefore, whether we translate "Thy throne is God" or "Thy throne, O God," for the point here to be affirmed is not that the Messiah is Divine, but that He has a throne and everlasting dominion. Westcott adopts the rendering "God is thy throne," and compares Ps. lxxi. 3; Isa. xxvi. 4; Ps. xc. 1, xci. 1, 2; Deut. xxx. 27. He thinks it scarcely possible that "God" can be addressed to the King. Vaughan, on the other hand, says: "Evidently a vocative. God is thy throne might possibly have been said (Ps. xlv. 1): thy throne is God seest an unnatural phrase. And even in its first (human) application the vocative would cause no difficulty (Ps. lxxii. 5; John x. 34, 35)." Weiss strongly advocates this construction, and speaks of the other as quite given up. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τ. αἰῶνος, "to the age of the age," "for
ever and ever," "to all eternity." Cf. Eph. iii. 21, ἐκεῖνος τ. γενέσεως τ. αἰῶνος τ. αἰῶνων, and the frequent ἐκεῖνος τ. αἰῶνος τ. αἰῶνων. See others in Vaughan or Concordance. "The aim of all these varieties of expression is the same; to heap up masses of time as an approximation to the conception of eternity" (Vaughan). The less strongly attested reading [see notes] gives the better sense: The sceptre of thy kingdom is a sceptic of uprightness. The well-attested reading gives the sense: "The sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. The everlasting dominion affirmed in the former clause is now declared to be a righteous rule. An assurance of this is given in the further statement.

Ver. 9. ἡγάπησας δικαιοσύνην... "Thou lovedst righteousness and didst hate lawlessness, therefore God, thy God, anointed thee with oil of gladness above thy fellows." The quotation is verbatim from LXX of Ps. xlv. 8 [the Alexand. text reads ἀδικίαν in place of ἁμοίαν, so that the author used a text not precisely in agreement with that of Cod.: Alex. v. Weiss]. The anointing as King is here said to have been the result [καὶ τοῦτο] of his manifestation of qualities fitting him to rule as God's representative, namely, love of right and hatred of iniquity. [ἁμοία is used in 1 John iii. 4, as the synonym and definition of ἁμορτία. ἡ ἁμορτία ἀναπλήρωσε ἡ ἁμοία. It is contrasted with ἁμαρτία in 2 Cor. vi. 14, τὰς γὰρ ἁμορτίας δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἁμοίαν:] It is the Messiah's love of righteousness as manifested in His earthly life which entitles Him to sovereignty. ὁ Θεὸς is taken as a vocative here, as in ver. 8, by Lünemann, Weiss and others; and ὁ Θεὸς σου as the direct nom. to ἐξάρχῃ. Westcott thinks that the ἐλαίον ἀγάλλα refers "not to the solemn anointing to royal dignity but to the festive anointing on occasions of rejoicing." So Alford. Davidson, on the other hand, says: "As Kings were anointed when called to the throne, the phrase means made King". So, too, Weiss and von Soden. But the psalm is not a coronation ode, but an epiphalmium; the epiphalmium, indeed, of the ideal King, but still a festive marriage song (vv. 10-17), to which the festal ἐλαίον ἀγάλλλ is appropriate. The oil of exultation is the oil expressive of intense joy (cf. ver. 15 of the psalm). The only objection to this view is that God is said to be the anointer, but this has its parallel in Ps. xxiii. 5; and throughout Ps. xlv. God is considered the originator of the happiness depicted (cf. ver. 2). Whether the marriage rejoicings are here to be applied to the Messiah in terms of vv. 16 and 17 of the psalm is doubtful. The verse is cited probably for the sake of the note of superiority contained in παρὰ τούς μετόχους σου. In the psalm the μετόχοι are hardly other Kings; rather the companions and counsellors of the young King. In the Messianic application they are supposed by Bleek, Pierce, Alford, Davidson, Peake, etc., to be the angels. It seems preferable to keep the term indefinite as indicating generally the supremacy of Christ (cf. Ps. xlv. 2).

Ver. 10. In vv. 10-12 the writer introduces another quotation from Ps. 102 (in LXX ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀποκάλυψιν). The quotation is verbatim from the LXX except that ω is lifted from the fifth to the first place in the sentence, for emphasis, and that a second ὅ ἐμφατικάν is inserted after ἐπαύσασθαι in ver. 12. With the introductory kal Weiss understands τὸ πρὸς τὸν ὑμνὸν ἔλγαμ, as in ver. 8. He is also of opinion that the writer considers that the words were spoken by Jehovah and that κύριος, therefore, must be the Messiah.
This is possible, but it is not necessary for the justification of the Messianic reference. This follows from the character of the psalm, due to this and manifestation (of Jehovah as the Saviour of His people, even though this may only be in the far future (see ver. 13: "Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Zion. . . . So the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, etc.") Prof. B. W. Bacon of Yale has investigated this matter afresh and finds that, so far from the application of these verses to the Messiah being an audacious innovation, or even achieved, as Calvin says, "pia deflectione," the psalm itself was a favourite resort of those who sought in even pre-Christian times for proof-texts of Messianic eschatology"; also that "we have specific evidence of the application of vv. 23, 24 to the Messiah by those who employed the Hebrew or some equivalent text" and finally that by the rendering of πάντες εἰς λειτουργία πνεύματα, εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ that of the angels in human Redemptive history. This contrast is connected by the form of its statement with ver. 5 ("to which of the angels, etc."). There it was the greater name that was in question, here it is the higher station and function. πάντες τίνα δὲ κτλ. "But to which of the angels has He at any time said . . . .?" implying that to the Son He has said it, as is proved by the citation from Ps. cx. On this psalm (see note on ver. 9), Tisch. with KLMP omits as a gloss. It has the appearance of a homoioteleuton.
with its cognates has come to play a large part in ecclesiastical language. It is originally "a public servant"; from λειτουργος, an unused adjective connected with λαος, meaning "what belongs to the people," and ἁγιος. It occurs frequently in LXX, sometimes denoting the official who attends on a king (Josh. i. 1), sometimes angels (Ps. ciii. 21), commonly the priests and Levites (Neh. x. 39), 10 λειτουργος 11 λειτουργος 12 λειτουργος, and Is. lx. 5. In N.T. it is used of those who render service to God or to Christ or to men (cf. Lepine's Ministers of Jesus Christ, p. 126). 

Ver. 1. "On this account," because God has now spoken not through prophets or angels, but through a Son. ἢμας: "we must give more excessive heed". "Alli utitur verbo ὡμολογουμεν ὑπερ ὑμων: hic ὡμολογουμεν. Illud dicit obligationem: hoc, urgens periculum"; Bengel, who also remarks on 1 Cor. xi. 10, ὡμολογουμεν. notat obligationem: ἢμας necessitatem; illud morale est, hoc quasi physicum; ut in vernacula, wir sollen und mühsen". Here then it is the logical necessity that is prominent. ημας is to be joined not with ὡμολογουμεν as in Vulg. (and Bengel), "abundius oportet observare," but with ὡμολογουμεν. The adverb occurs in xiii. 19 and six times in 2 Cor.; the adj. frequently in N.T. περισσοτερος [περιστερος] occurs in Diod. Sic., xiii. 108, τὰ περ. ἡγεμονες; also in Athenaeus, v., p. 192 F. περισσοτερος. The comparative is here used with reference to the greater attention due to the revelation than if it had been delivered by one of less position. Atto Vercell. suggestively, "Quare abundantius ... Nonne et illa Dei sunt et ista? " His answer being that those who had been brought up to reverence the O.T. might be apt to despise the new revelation. περισσοτερος never in N.T. and only once in LXX (Job vii. 17) has the added τον νου usual in classics. As περισσοτερος is commonly used of bringing a ship to land, this sense may have suggested the παραβιβαζωμεν. ἢμας, including himself, but meaning to indicate all who in these last days had heard the revelation of Christ. τοις ἄκουσθησιν: "the things heard," the great salvation first preached by the Lord, ver. 3; cf. Acts viii. 6, xvi. 14. He means to disclose the significance of what they have already heard, rather than to bring forward new truth. κατο τοις παραβιβαζωμεν: "lest haply we drift away"; κατο τοις, as Hoogeveen shows, occurs in N.T. as = ne quando and also as = ne forte; but
in clauses expressing apprehension, as here, it can always be rendered "lest perchance." ["In Hellenistic Greek μήτεν in a principal clause means 'perhaps,' in a dependent clause 'if perchance,' 'if possibly,'" Blass, p. 212.] 

Ver. 3. τῶι ημεῖς... "How shall we"—to whom God has spoken through the Son, i. 2—"escape (ἐνδικω μεθεμ. prob. in final judgment, as in x. 7). We have neglected the διελέψειστes suggesting that life is looked at as a whole) so great a salvation?"—the salvation which formed the main theme of the new revelation. The meaning of διελέψειστes is best illustrated by Matt. xxii. 5, where it is used of those who were regarded, or treated with contempt, the invitation to the marriage-supper. The guilt and danger of so doing are in proportion to the greatness of the announcement, and this is no longer of law but of life, cf. 2 Cor. iii. The word now spoken is vastly more glorious and more fully expressive of its Author than the Law, "Non erat tanta salus in V.T., quanta est in gratia quam Dei filius nobis attulit" (Atto Vercell.:). The "greatness" of the salvation is involved in the greatness of Him who mediates it (i. 4), of the method employed (ii. 10), of the results, many sons being brought to glory (ii. 10). But one relevant aspect of its greatness, the source and guaranteed truth of its proclamation is introduced by ἄνωτε, which here retains its proper qualitative sense and may be rendered "inaequate as it...". "Its object is to introduce the mention of..." characteristics of the thing in question" (Vaughan). It was the trustworthiness of the new revelation of salvation which the Hebrews were beginning to question. The Law had proved its validity by punishing transgressors but the majesty and certainty of the recent proclamation were doubtful. Therefore the writer insists that it is "very great," and illustrates its trustworthiness by adding these three features: (1) its original proclamation by the Lord, (2) its confirmation by those who heard Him, (3) its miraculous certi-
fication by God. [This is not contradicted by Bleek's "Das τηλίκη, tante talisque salutis, verweist an sich wohl nicht auf den nachfolgenden relativen Sats," nor by Weiss' "Das ἡνίκα hängt weder sprachlich noch sachlich mit τηλίκη zusammen."] ἐκχύνθη λαβοῦσα λαλισθαί, lit.: "having received a beginning to be spoken" = "having begun to be spoken," or "which was first proclaimed". ἐκχύνθη λαβῆ, a common phrase in later Greek, see Stephanus and Wetstein. In Polybius of a war "taking its rise". In Ἁλίαν, Ὀ. Ἡ., ἱ. 28. καὶ τὴν ἐκχύνθη ἐξαιτήθη διὰ τοὺς ἐφύγει. ἐρωτ. It is used here to indicate with precision the origin of the proclamation of the revelation about which they are feeling uncertain. λαλισθαί refers back to ver. 2 and also to i. 3, ἀδὰ ἄλλα ἔστω because God is throughout viewed as the ultimate source of revelation. τοῦ Κυρίου, "the Lord" supreme over angels, and whose present exaltation reflects dignity and trustworthiness on the revelation He made while on earth. The salvation which they are tempted to neglect was at first proclaimed not by angels sent out to minister, not by servants or delegates who might possibly misapprehend the message, but by the Lord Himself, the Supreme. The source then is unquestionably pure. Has the stream been contaminated? God testifies to its purity. There is only one link between the Lord and you, they that heard Him delivered the message to you, and God by witnessing with them certifies its truth. The main verb is καὶ προφητεύουσα, which looks back to βεβαιος of ver. 2, and compares the inviolability of the one word or revelation with that of the other. We must not, he argues, neglect a gospel of whose veracity and importance we have assurance in this, that it was first proclaimed by the Lord Himself and that we have it on the authority of those who themselves heard Him, and who therefore were first-hand witnesses who had also made experimental verification of its validity. For αἰτωράτων though without an object expressed, plainly means those who heard the Lord, cf. Luke i. 1. ἡμᾶς is rendered by Theophylact διαστραφέντως ἠ' ἡμᾶς βεβαιος, it has been conveyed to us in a trustworthy manner. To their testimony was added the all-convincing witness borne by God, καὶ προφητεύουσα τοῦ Θεοῦ τοις σημείοις τα καὶ τέρασι καὶ πνεύματος δυνάμεως, και Πνεύματος Ἁγίου μερισμοι, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θλίψιν.
made κατὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην θελήσας "according to His [God's] will." In 1 Cor. xii, 11 the will is that of the Spirit. "Non omnibus omnia dabat Deus, sed quae et quantum vellet, Eph. iv. 7." (Grotius). θέλησαν only here in N.T., but ten times in LXX. Pollux calls it a "vulgarism" θελητικόν. On the substitution of nouns in -μα for nouns in -σως, see Jannaris' Hist. Gram., p. 1024, and cf. x. 7, ix. 36, xiii. 21, so that in the present passage the choice of the active form is deliberate.) The clause is added to enforce the writer's contention that all the Charismata with which his readers were familiar were not mere fruits of excitement or in any way casual, but were the result of a Divine intention to bear witness to the truth of the gospel.

Vv. 5-18. Having sufficiently brought out the permanence and sovereignty of the Son by contrasting them with the fleeting personality and ministerial function of angels, the author now proceeds to bring the supremacy of the Son into direct relation to the Messianic administration of "the world to come," the ideal condition of human affairs; and to explain why for the purposes of this administration it was needful and seemly that "the Lord" should for a season appear in a form "a little lower than the angels". The world of men as it was destined to be [ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα] was a condition of things in which man was to be supreme, not subject to any kind of slavery or oppression. And if this be the case, then raising this about, the appearance of the Son in so apparently inglorious a form was necessary; if he asked why suffering and death on His part were necessary, the answer is, that it was God's purpose to bring, not angels, but many human sons to glory and that as there is but one path, and that a path of suffering, by which men can reach their destiny, it was becoming that their leader should act as pioneer in this path. His path to glory must be a path in which men can follow Him; because it is from the human level and as man that He wins to glory. More particularly His sufferings accomplish two objects: they produce in Him the sympathy which qualifies Him as High Priest, while His death breaks the power which kept them enslaved and in fear. [On this section Robertson Smith's papers in the Expositor, 1881-2, should be consulted.]

Ver. 5. ὥσπερ ἀγγέλων... "For not to angels". With ὥσπερ the writer proceeds to clinch the exhortation contained in vv. 1-4, by exhibiting the ground of it. Under the old Covenant angels had been God's messengers, but this mode of mediation has passed away. The οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα is not subject to them. It is the Son as man who now rules and to whom attention must be given. ὅτε οὖν... "did He"—that is God—subject the world to come of which we are speaking, η οἰκουμένη, not ἀσώματος, but the inhabited world. So used in Diod. Sic., 1, 8 kαθ' ἐμαυτόν τ. οἰκουμένην, wherever there were men. From the O.T. point of view "the world to come" meant the world under Messianic rule, but in this Epistle the Messianic Kingdom is viewed as not yet fully realised. The world to come is therefore the eternal order of human affairs already introduced and rendering obsolete the temporary and symbolic dispensation. Calvin accurately defines it thus: "Non vocari orbem futurum duntaxat, qualem e resurrectione speramus, sed qui coepit ab exordio regni Christi. Complementum vero suum habebit in ultima redemptione." It is the present world of men regenerated, death and all that is inimical to human progress abolished; a condition in which all things are subject to man. The repudiation of angels as lords of the world to come implies the admission that the obsolete dispensation has been abrogated and does not apply to them. So in Deut. xxxii. 8: θεός μου δεξιόν κατὰ δόξαν ἐγγενεῖ σου, cf. Dan. x. 13-21 and Book of Jubilees, xv. 31. Cf. the pages in which Robertson Smith expands the topic of this section. In the Vails, Hermes (Vis., iii. 4, 1) represents the Church as being built by six angels whom he describes as being the first created ὅλα παράδειγμα καὶ παράδειγμα τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ, ἄβαιντες καὶ ἐκδοταίνες καὶ δεσπόταις ἐν εἰρήνῃ μεταξύ τινας.

Ver 6. διεμαρτύρατο δὲ τοις τις λέγων: "but some one in a certain place solemnly testifies, saying". The indefinite formula of quotation is used not because doubt existed regarding the authorship of the psalm, nor because the writer was citing
from memory, but rather as a rhetorical mode of suggesting that his readers knew the passage well enough. So Chrysostom: δεικνύειν ἑαυτόν, αὐτὸν ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ ὁμολογία πάντων ἐναντίον τῶν γραφῶν. Philo frequently uses an indefinite form of quotation: this identical form in De Ἐβρείτ., 14 (Wendland, ii.181) εἰσέπεσεν ἐφυλάκας ἡμᾶς. Here only in the Epistle is a quotation from Scripture referred to its human author. διὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἡμῶν... The quotation is from Ps. viii. and extends to τῶν ἀνθρώπων αὐτοῦ in ver. 8. It illustrates the greatness of man in three particulars. 1. ἡ λάτρεια αὐτῶν ἡ βραχὺ τι παρ' ἄνγγλων. 2. δοξα καὶ τιμὴ ἀπεφάνωσα αὐτῶν. 3. τέκνα ὑπάτα ὑποκάτω τῶν ποιῶν αὐτοῦ.

And the author goes on to say that in Jesus the two former elements of man's greatness are seen to be fulfilled (He is made a little lower than the angels, and He is crowned with glory and honour), while the third is guaranteed because Jesus has tasted death for every man and so subdued even it, the last enemy, and therefore all things, under his feet. In Ps. viii. as in so many other poets and prose writers (see Pascal's chapter on The Greatness and Littleness of Man, A. R. Wallace's Man's Place in the Universe and Fisk's Destiny of Man), it is the dignity put upon man which fills the writer with astonishment. When Sophocles in the Antigone celebrates man's greatness, πολλὰ δὲ διὰ κοῦν ἄνθρωπον δείκνυτον πάντας, he excepts death from subjection to man, Αἰδα μόνον φθορὰν οὐκ ἔστησεν. Here the Hebrew poet excepts nothing. But only by Christ was he justified. Man's real place is first won by Christ. ὁ ἡρῴδης ἡ ὁμολογία τούτον ὑμῖν μή τις ἡμῖν αὐτὸν "Thou art mindful of him" for good as in xiii. 3. Man, the subject of satire and self-contempt, is the object of God's thought. τις ἄνθρωπος = ἀνθρώπος of the first clause. In the Heb. יָשָׂר and יָשָּׂר הַיָּסָר. וְיָשָּׂר "visit," generally as a friend (Mat. xxv. 36, James i. 27) frequently of physician visiting sick; in judgment, Jer. v. 9, 29. "The day of visitation," ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπησίας, in good sense, Luke xix. 44; for chastisement, Isa. x. 3; cf. x Pet. ii. 12. In Jer. xv. 15 we have the two words μνήσθητε μοι καὶ ἐπισκέψατε με... Ver. 7. That God has been mindful of man and visited him is apparent in the three particulars now mentioned. ἡ βραχὺ τι εἰσὶ "a little," either in material, or in space, or in time. In x Sam. 20, ἐγνώσαμεν ἡ βραχὺ τι τις, μετανοεῖ. In Isa. lii. 17, of time, ἡμᾶρταν ἡ βραχὺ τι ὑπάτη αὐτοῦ. So in N.T., of aerial, Joh. vi. 7; of space, Acts xxvii. 28; of time Acts, v. 34. So in classics, v. Bleek. The original of the psalm points to the translation: "Thou didst make him little lower than the angels" [in the Heb. הָיָשָׂר כָּן "than God"]. There seems no reason to depart from this meaning either in this verse or in ver. 9. So Alford and Westcott, but Davidson and Weiss and several others are of opinion that as the words are in ver. 9 applied to the Messiah, whose superiority has been so insisted upon, an allusion to His inferiority would be out of place; "and that the phrase should be used of degree in one place and time in another, when the point of the passage lies in the identity of the Son's history with that of man, is an idea only puerile" (Davidson). But on any rendering the inferiority of Jesus to angels so far as dying goes is granted, and there is no reason why the sense of degree should not be kept in both clauses. δοξα καὶ τιμή frequently conjoined, Rev. xxi. 26; 1 Tim. i. 17; Thucyd., iv. 86; Flut., Num., 51; Lucian, Somn., 13. Ver. 8. „Τάντα ὑπάτας...“ Thou didst put all things under his feet." In the psalm "all things" are defined as "all sheep and oxen, yea and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passes through the paths of the sea". But to our author the scope of the "all" has...
been enlarged by the event. His argument requires an absolutely universal subjection, so that everything obstructive of man's "glory" may be subdued. And having seen this achieved by Christ, he is emboldened to give to "all" this fullest content. The one point he seeks to make good is that "in subjecting all things to him, he has left nothing, and therefore not the οἰκουμένη μιλέως, unsubjected to him". The "world to come" is under human dominion and administration. The angels are left behind; there is no room for angelic government. But this very sovereignty of man is precisely that which we do not see visibly fulfilled: "for the present (νῦν) we do not yet see all things subjected to him". True, says the author, but we do see Jesus who for the suffering of death (or that He might suffer death) has been made a little lower than angels, crowned with glory and honour that by God's grace He might taste death for every man. In other words, we see the first two items of man's supremacy, as given in the psalm, fulfilled, and the third guaranteed. Jesus was (1) made a little lower than angels; (2) was crowned with glory and honour; and (3) by dying for every man has removed that last obstacle, the fear of death which kept men in slavery and hindered them from supreme dominion over all things. The construction of the sentence is much debated. But it must be admitted that any construction which makes the coronation subsequent to the tasting death for every man, is unnatural; the ξυπόλευρος depends upon ἐστεφανωμένου. And the difficulty which has been felt in giving its natural sense to this clause has been introduced by supposing that δόθη καὶ τιμή ἀντίφως refers to the heavenly state of Jesus. On this understanding it is of course difficult to see how it could be said that Jesus was crowned in order to taste death. But as undoubtedly the first clause, ἐστεφανώμενος βλέπωμεν, refers to the earthly life of Jesus, it is natural to suppose that the second clause, which speaks of his being crowned, also refers to that life. The tenses are the same. But if so, what was the crowning here referred to? It was His recognition as Messiah, as the true Head and King of men. He was thus recognised by God at His baptism and at the Transfiguration [in connection with which the same words δόθη καὶ τιμή are used, 2 Pet. i. 16-18] as well as by His disciples at Caesarea Philippi. It was this crowning alone which enabled Him to die a representative death, the King or Head for His people; it was this which fitted Him to taste death for every man. He was made a little lower than the angels that He might suffer death; but He was crowned with glory and honour that this very death might bring all men to the glory of supremacy which was theirs when the fear of death was removed; see v. 14, 15. For a fuller exposition of this view of the verse, see Expository Times, April, 1896. χριστιανστι, "by God's grace," to men, not directly to Jesus. It is remarkable that Weiss, an expert in textual criticism, should adopt the reading χριστιανστι "apart from God" finding in these words a reference to the cry on the cross "My God, My God, etc.". The other meaning put upon the words, "except God," needs no comment. The Nestorians used the reading to prove that Christ suffered apart from His Divinity ("divinitate tantisper deposita oculos et theostis") but such a meaning can hardly be found in the words. ὒπερ πάντος, these are the emphatic words, bringing out the writer's point that Christ's victory and supremacy were not for Himself alone, but for men. [Chrysostom strikingly says: ἐκστάσεως πάντων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς οἰκουμενίτης ἀνάπτυξις: αὐτῷ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνέθαυσε· τί δε, εἰ μὴ πάντες ἐκστάσεως πάντως ἀνέθαυσας, αὐτὸς τὸ ἰαντὸν ὑπνολόρμους.] οὐσίας θανάτου "he might taste death," i.e., actually experience death's bitterness. The Greek commentators suppose the word is chosen to bring out the shortness of our Lord's experience of death, μερικῶς ἐν αὐτῷ ποιεῖσα διάστημα. This seems incorrect. [The rule, sometimes laid down, that γενεσθαι followed by an accusative means to partake freely, and by a genitive sparingly, cannot be universally applied. The ordinary distinction observed in the use of verbs of sense that they take the
accusative of the nearer, the genitive of the remoter source of the sensation is much safer.] The expression γεύσασθαι τονατοῦ does not occur in the classics, although we find γεύν. μόχθον in Soph., Trach., 1103, where the Scholiaest renders by οὕτως μάλης, in Antig., 1005, where Jebb renders μάλης τιτων. The writer, in Soph., Hecuba, 375, with κακῶν and in Plato, Rep., 475 with πάντως καθήμενος.

Vv. 10-18. The humiliation of the Son justified; "a condensed and pregnant view of the theory of the whole work of Christ, which subsequent chapters develop, elucidate, and justify dialectically, in contrast or comparison with the O.T. . . . The ultimate source of all doubt whether the new dispensation is superior to the old is nothing else than want of clear insight into the work of Christ, and especially into the significance of His passion, which, to the Jews, from whom the Hebrew Christians of our Epistle were drawn, was the chief stumbling-block in Christianity. Here, therefore, the writer has at length got into the heart of his subject, and, leaving the contrast between Christ and the angels, urges the positive doctrine of the identical Son of God, whom He sanctifies—as the best key to that connection between the passion and glorification of Christ which forms the cardinal point of N.T. revelation" (Robertson Smith). To this it may only be added that in order to prove man's supremacy and justify Psalm viii., it was essential that the writer should show that Christ was man, identified with humanity.

In justification then (justification introduced by ἤμερος) the attestation of Jesus to the ἐκβάλλει παντοτεν, the writer proceeds to say ἐστίν ἢμερος "it befitted Him". The expression, says Carpzov, is "frequentissima Philoni phrasing"; but in Scripture, at least in this sense, it stands alone: cf. Jer. x. 7; Ps. lxi. 1. Aristotle (Nic. Eth., iv. 2:3; Burnet, p. 273) says that what is befitting is relative to the person, the circumstances and the object (τὸ πρὸσον ἢμερος αὐτόν, καὶ ἐν ὧν καὶ περὶ δ). The object here in view, the "bringing many sons to glory," needs no justification. As Tertullian (adv. Marcion, ii. 27) says: "nihil tam dignum Deo, quam salus hominis". But that the meaning is the trial of," in other words, that Christ's humiliation and death were in accordance with the Divine nature, is the point the writer wishes to make good. "The whole course of nature and grace must find its explanation in God, and not merely in an abstract Divine arbitrium, but in that which befits the Divine nature." This matter of Christ's suffering has not been isolated in God's government but is of a piece with all He is and has done; it has not been handed over to chance, accident, or malevolent powers, but is part of the Divine rule and providence; it is not exceptional, unaccountable, arbitrary, but has its root and origin in the very nature of God. God acted freely in the matter, governed only by His own nature. "Man has not wholly lost the intuitive power by which the fitness of the Divine action, its correspondence to the idea standard of right which his conscience certifies and his reason approves, may be recognised" (Henson, Disc. and Law, p. 56). "It is worth noting that the chief value of Anselm's view of the Atonement lies in the fitness of the Divine adeology of the idea of what befits God— the idea, as he puts it, of God's honour. Anselm fails, however, by thinking rather of what God's honour must receive as its due than of what it is seemingly for God in His grace to do, and thus his theory becomes shallow and inadequate" (Robertson Smith). The writer does not say ἐστίν ἢμερος but ἐστίν ἢμερος δι' ἢν τα πάντα καὶ δι' αὐτὸν τα πάντα "Him on account of whom are all things and through whom are all things," who is the reason and the cause of all existence; in whom, there-
fore, everything must find its reason and justification. "Denn wenn um seinewillen das All ist, also Alles seinen Zwecken dienen muss, und durch ihn das All ist, also nichts ohne sein Zutun zu Stande kommt, so muss man bei Allem, was geschicht, und somit auch bei dem Todesleiden fragen, wie fern es ihm angemessen ist" (Weiss). The purpose of God is expressed in the words: πολλοὶς υἱοῖς ἐς δόξαν ἀγαθόντα "in bringing many sons to glory". The accusative ἀγαθόν (although referring to υἱοὶ) does not require us to construe it with ἀρχηγόνιον. That is a possible but clumsy construction. The use of υἱοὶ implies that the Father is the subject and leads us to expect that the action of God will be mentioned. And this construction, in which the dative of the subject becomes an accusative when an infinitive follows, is not unknown, but is merely a species of attraction—the infinitive drawing the noun into the case appropriate. Cf. Acts xi.12, xv.22; Luke i.74. Examples from the classics in Matthiae, 535. The aorist participle has led the Vulgate to translate "qui multos filios in gloriam adduxerat," needlessly, for "the aorist participle is sometimes used adverbially in reference to an action evidently in a general way coincident in time with the action of the verb, yet not identical with it. The choice of the aorist participle rather than the present in such cases is due to the fact that the action is thought of, not as in progress, but as a simple event or fact (Burton, M. and T., 149). πολλοὶς υἱοῖς "many" is not used with any reference to the population of the world, or to the proportion of the saved, but to the one Son already celebrated. It was God's purpose not only to have one Son in glory, but to bring many to be partakers with Him. Hence the difficulty: hence the need of the suffering of Christ. But it is not merely πολλοὶς but πολλοῖς υἱοῖς suggesting the relationship dwelt upon in the succeeding verses. τῶν ἀρχηγῶν τῆς σωτηρίας the author [pioneer] of their salvation indicating that feature of Christ's relation to the saved which determined His experience, "the Captain of their salvation". R.V. has "author" following Vulg. Chrysostom has ἀρχηγὸν τοῦ σωτηρίας, and so Robertson Smith, "it is hardly necessary to put more meaning into the phrase than is contained in the parallel expression of v. 9". So Bleek, Kübel and von Soden. But the word is select, and why select, if not to bring out precisely this, that in the present case the cause is also the leader, "that the Son goes before the saved in the same path". He is the strong swimmer who carries the rope ashore and so not only secures His own position but makes rescue for all who will follow. "The ἀρχηγός himself first takes part in that which he establishes" (Westcott). One of the chief points in the Epistle is that the Saviour is also ἀρχηγός. The word is commonly used of founders of tribes, rulers and commanders, persons who begin anything in become the source of anything, but or this Epistle (xii. 2) it has over and above the sense of "pioneer", διὰ ταθμάτων τελείωσα, "to perfect through sufferings". τελείωσα is to make πάλιν, to bring a person or thing to the appropriate πάλας, to complete, perfect, consummate. In the Pentateuch it is regularly used to denote the consecration of the priests. In the N.T. this consecration is no formal setting apart to office, but a preparation involving ethical fitness. So that here the word directly denotes making perfect as leader of salvation, but indirectly and by implication making morally perfect. And this moral perfection, requisite in one who was to cleanse sinners (note σωτηρίας and lead the way to glory, could only be proved and acquired through the sufferings involved in living as man, tempted and with death to face. Therefore διὰ ταθμάτων, "a plurality of sufferings" not merely as in ver. 9 τῶν σωτηρίας τοῦ θανάτου. Cf. ver. 18. The glory indeed to which this captain of salvation leads is the glory of triumph over temptation and all that tends to terrify and enslave men.

Ver. 11. In the eleventh verse the writer proceeds to explain where in consisted the fittingness (τῆς ἁπάντης) of perfecting the ἀρχηγόν through sufferings. It lies in the fact that He and those He leads are brothers. In vv. 11-13 it is shown that this is so, and in the succeeding verses the writer points out what is involved in this brotherhood. ὁ ἀγιόν and ὁ ἀγιασμένον are to be
taken as present participles, so usually are, in the timeless substantive sense. ἀνέχθης means (1) to set apart as belonging to God, in contradistinction to κοινός, belonging to every one. So in Gen. ii. 3, of the seventh day, and in Exodus of the mountain, the tent, the altar. It is especially used of persons set apart to the priesthood or to any special work (Exod. xxx. 30; Jer. i. 5; John x. 36). Through the O.T. ceremonial the whole people were thus ἀνέχθηναι, set apart to God, admitted to His worship. In this Epistle the word is used with much of the O.T. idea cleaving to it, and is often rather equivalent to what we understand by “ justify” than to “sanctify”. Cf. x. 10. It signifies that which enablesthat approach God. But (2) it is in N.T. more and more felt that it is only by purification of character men can be set apart for God, so that this higher meaning also attaches to the word. In the present verse ἀνέχθης introduces the priestly idea, enlarged upon in ver. 17.

Ver. 12. In proof that He is not ashamed to take his place among men as a brother three passages are adduced from the O.T. in which this relationship is implied. These passages are so confidently assumed to be Messianic that they are quoted as spoken by Christ Himself, Μους. The fact that words of Jesus spoken while He lived on earth are not quoted can scarcely be accepted as proof that the Gospels were not in existence when this Epistle was written, for even after the middle of the second century, the O.T. was still the Scripture of the Christian Church. The first quotation is from the twenty-second Psalm applied to Himself by our Lord on the cross. The I.XX Μους is altered to Μους. The significant words in the first clause are τοις ἀνέχθης μου; and the significance of the second clause consists in the representation of the Messiah as taking part in the worship of God in the congregation. This is one particular form in which His brotherhood manifests itself. For the passages cited not merely affirm the brotherhood, but also exhibit its reality in the participation by the Messiah of human conditions.
usual καὶ ψάλλει, because they shall serve to bring out two distinct points. In the first, the Messiah utters his trust in God, and thereby illustrates His sonship and brotherhood with man. Like all men, He is dependent on God. As Calvin says: "since He depends on the aid of God His condition has community with our own.

In the second part, οὐδὲν not only calls attention to Himself as closely associated with the παῖδια; but also, as Weiss thinks, intimates His readiness to obey, as if "Here am I". This obedience He shares with those whom God has committed to His care, God's παῖδια and His brothers. Cf. Jo. vi.37, 39, xvii.11.

Vv. 14-16. This saving brotherhood involved incarnation and death. For, as it has ever been the common lot of the παῖδια to live under the conditions imposed by flesh and blood, subject to inevitable dissolution and the shrinkings and weaknesses consequent, He also, this Son of God, Himself (καὶ οὗτος) shared with them in their identical nature, thus making Himself liable to death; His intention being that by dying He might render harmless him that used death as a terror, and thus deliver from slavery those who had suffered death to rule their life and lived in perpetual dread. ἔτηνος: ... ἕβαλλε. He took flesh that He might die, and so destroy not death but him that had the power of death, and deliver, etc. The double object may be considered as one, the defeat of the devil involving the deliverance of those in bondage. The means He used to accomplish this object was His dying. ἐν διά τοῦ θανάτου...

How the death of Christ had the result here ascribed to it, we are left to conjecture; for nowhere else in the Epistle is the deliverance of man by Christ's death stated in analogous terms. We must first endeavour to understand the terms here employed. καταργήσας: "might render inoperative" (αὐτος), "bring to nought". Sometimes "destroy" or "put an end to" as in 1 Cor. xv.26 ὦκοτος ἐνθαρρύνας τὰ κράτος, τὸν δὲ κράτος ἐκκεντὴν τοῦ θανάτου, "him who has the power of death, that is, the devil," τὸν διὰ βολόν (βαβάλλει) I set aside, put at variance) used by LXX to render ὄψις in Job i.ii. and Zach. iii., etc.; ἔκας is used in I Kings xi. In N.T. both designations occur frequently. But the significance for our present passage lies in the description "him who has the power of death", ἔκας τὸ κράτος, which is classical, and κράτος with the genitive denotes the realm within which or over which the rule is exercised, as Herod., iii.14, τὴν ἐκκεντὴν τοῦ θανάτου. In connection with this universal human experience of death He uses his malign influence, and the striking vision of Zech. iii. shows us how he does
so. He brings sin to remembrance, he appears as the accuser of the brethren, as the counsel for the prosecution. Thus he creates a fear of death, a fear which is one of the most marked features of O.T. experience. Both Schoettgen and Weber produce rabbinical sayings which illustrate the power of a legal religion to produce servility and fear, so that the natural expression of the Jew was, “In this life death will not suffer a man to be glad”. Life, in short, with sin unaccounted for, and with death viewed as the punishment of sin to look forward to, is a θεωρία unworthy of God’s sons. This indeed is expressly stated in ver. 15.

The θεωρία which contradicts the idea of sonship and prevents men from entering upon their destiny of dominion over all things is occasioned by their fear of death (φόβος, the dative of cause) as that which implies rejection by God. Among the races whose conscience was not educated by the law, views of death varied greatly. These will be found in Geddes’ Phaedo, pp. 217, 223; and cf. the opening paragraphs of the third Book of the Republic, as well as pp. 330 and 486 B. Aristotle with his usual straightforward frankness pronounces death φοβορρατων. On the other hand, many believed τεθνάμενεν βέλτων οί θανασωτος; Hesiod was styled ὁ πειρακάτως, and by his persuasions and otherwise suicide became popular; and death was no longer reckoned an everlasting ill, but “optum potius paratum nobis et perfugium”. Wholly applicable to the present passage is Spinoza’s “homo liber de nihil manipum de morte cogitat”. Cf. Philo, Omn. sap. liber, who quotes Eurip., τὸ ἐντὸς θαυμὸς οὗ θανάτῳ ἀφαίρεται ἢ.; This then was the bondage which characterised the life (ἡ παράδος τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ) of those under the old dispensation; the bondage in which they were held (ἐντὸς ἡθοῖς, “held” or “bound”, “subject to,” see Thayer, s.v.), and from which Christ delivered τούτους δοτι, not as if it were a restricted number who were delivered, but on the contrary to mark that the deliverance was coextensive with the bondage. ἀπαλλάσσω, used especially of freeing from slavery [ex. from Philo in Carpzov, and cf. Isocrates ὁδος ἀπαλλάσσων αὐτοῦ τοῦ διόν θεοῦ. In the Phaedo frequently of soul emancipated from the body.] How the Son wrought this deliverance ὁ διὸς θανάτων can now be answered; and it cannot be better answered than in the words of Robertson Smith: “To break this sway, Jesus takes upon Himself that mortal flesh and blood to whose infirmities the fear of death under the O.T. attaches. But while He passes through all the weakness of fleshly life, and, finally, through death i.-self, He, unlike all others, proves Himself not only exempt from the fear of death, but victorious over the accuser. To Him, who in His sinlessness experienced every weakness of mortality, without diminution of his unbroken strength of fellowship with God, death is not the dreaded sign of separation from God’s grace (cf. ver. 7), but a step in his divinely appointed career; not something inflicted on Him against His will, but a means whereby (καὶ with genitive) He consciously and designedly accomplishes His vocation as Saviour. For this victory of Jesus over the devil, or, which is the same thing, the fear of death, must be taken, like every other part of His work, in connection with the idea of His vocation as Head and Leader of His people.” In short, we see now what is meant by His tasting death “for every man,” and how this death guarantees the perfect dominion and glory depicted in Psalm viii. All the humiliation and death are justified by the necessities of the case, he concludes, “For, as I need scarcely say, it is not angels (presumably sinless and spiritual beings, πνεύματα, i. 14) He is taking in hand, but He is taking in hand Abraham’s seed (the dying children of a dead father; ‘also der gleichen sterblichen und durch Todesfurcht in Knechtschaft befangene Wesen, Bleeck). Διον αὐτοῦ: frequently in classics, as Plato, Protagoras, 309 C. οὐ γὰρ διον ἐντύπως, “for I may take it for granted you have not met” (Apol., 21 B), τί νοντες λέγει ὁ θεός . . . φάναιν ἡμὶ σοφατάτον δίκα; οὐ γὰρ διον ὑποτεθαί για, for, at any rate, as need hardly be said, he is not saying what is untrue”, ἐπιλαμβάνεται: “lays hold to help” or simp’y “succours,” with the idea of taking a person up to see him through. Cf.
Sir., iv. 11. οὐ τοις οὐτοίς, and the Scholiast on Aesch., Pers., 742, states that the speech was made by the Greek fathers, and the succeeding clause it is more likely that this affirmation is made of Him. It is certainly remarkable that instead of saying “He lays hold of man to help him,” the writer should give the restricted sense of “A.B. Von Soden, who supposed the Epistle is addressed to Gentiles, thinks the writer intends to prepare the way for his introducing the priesthood of Christ, and to exhibit the claim of Christians to the fulfillment of the prophecies made to Abraham (cf. Robertson Smith), but this Weiss brands as “eine leere Aussicht.” Perhaps we cannot get further than Estius (cf. this note), and, by Bleek: “gentium vocationem tota hac epistola prudenter dissimulat, sive quod illius mentio Hebræis parum grata esset, sive quod instituto suo non necessaria.” Or, as Bleek says, “es erklärt sich aus dem Ziele des Briefes.”

Ver. 17. οὐδὲ [six times in this Epistle; not used by Paul, but cf. Acts xxvi. 19] “wherefore,” because He makes the seed of Abraham the object of His saving work, ἐπείθην, “He was under obligation,” ἐπείθην is “used of a necessity imposed either by law and duty, or by reason, or, by the times, or by the nature of the matter under consideration” (Thayer). Here it was the nature of the case which imposed the obligation κατὰ τὰ ἄντων τοῖς ἀπελθοῖς ὄνομαθήσεται “to be made like His brothers in all respects,” and therefore, as Thayer says, ἐπείθην, ἐπείθην, ἐπείθην, ἐπείθην, ἐπείθην, ἐπείθην. He must be a real man, and not merely have the appearance of one. He must enter into the necessary human experiences, look at things from the human point of view, take His place in the crowd amidst the ordinary elements of life. It introduces one purpose which this thorough incarnation was to serve. It would put Christ in a position to sympathize with the tempted and thus incline Him to make propitiation for the sins of the people. [Τοῦ λαοῦ, also a restricted Jewish designation.] The High-Priesthood is here first mentioned, and it is mentioned as an office with which the readers were familiar. The writer does not now enlarge upon the office or work of the Priest, but merely points to one radical necessity imposed by priesthood, “making propitiation for the sins of the people”; and he affirms that in order to do this (ὅταν τα) he must be merciful and faithful. ὦσμοι as well as πτιδότις is naturally construed with ἀρχηγεῖν, and has its root in Exod. xxii. 27. ἀρχιμόν γέρ ἐμ, the priest must represent the Divine mercy; he must also be προπλάστος, primarily to God, as in iii. 2, but thereby faithful to men and to be trusted by them in the region in which he exercises his function, τὸ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, the whole Godward relations of men. The expression is directly connected with ἀρχηγεῖν, by implication with πτιδότις, and it is found in Exod. xviii. 19. γίνον ὦ τὸ λαὸ τὸ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν. For neat analogies cf. Wetstein, εἰς τὸ ἅπαντα. E. N. ἁπαντάτι, “for the purpose of making propitiatory;” εἰς indicating the special purpose to be served by Christ’s becoming Priest. ἁρανιστός (ὁ Κύριος is not used with), from ἁράνος, Attic ἁράνος “propitiatory,” “merciful,” means “I render propitiatory to myself.” In the classics it is followed by the accusative of the person propitiated, sometimes of the anger felt. In the LXX it occurs twelve times, thrice as the translation of ἐπείθην. The only instance in which it is followed by an accusative of the sin, as here, is Ps. lxiv. (lxv.) 3, τὰς ἁρανισθέντας ἱμάτίας σου ἅρανος. In the N.T., besides the present passage, it only occurs in Luke xviii. 13, in the passive form ἁράνωσοι μοι τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, cf. 2 Kings v. 18. The compound form ἁρανιστομαί, although it does not occur in N.T., is more frequently used in the LXX than the simple
verb, and from its construction something may be learnt. As in profane Greek, it is followed by an accusative of the person propitiated, as in Gen. xxxii. 20, where Jacob says of Esau διαλάσσωμεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς δάροις κ.τ.λ.; Zech. vii. 2, διαλάσσωμεν τὸν Κόρου, and viii. 22, τὸ πρόσωπον Κυρίου, also Matt. i. 9. It is however also followed by an accusative of the thing on account of which propitiation is needed or which requires by some rite or process to be rendered acceptable to God, as in Ecclus. iii. 3, iii. 30, v. 6, xx. 28, etc., where it is followed by διαλάσσωμεν, and διαρίματα; and in Lev. xvi. 16, 20, 33, where it is followed by τὸ ἐνιαύθια τοῦ θυσίατος, and in Ezek. xlv. 20 ἐν τοῖς οἴνοις. At least thirty-two times in Leviticus alone it is followed by ἐνιαυθία, defining the persons for whom propitiation is made, πρὸς τὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔναντις συναγωγῆς, or πρὸς τὸ ἀναμετράτα ὄνομα. In this usage there is apparent a transition from the idea of propitiating God (which still survives in the passive ἔλαθμεν) to the idea of exerting some influence on that which was offensive to God and which must be removed or cleansed in order to complete entrance into His favour. In the present passage it is τὰς ἀναμετρας τοῦ λαοῦ which stand in the way of the full expression of God's favour, and upon those therefore the propitiatory influence of Christ is to be exerted. In what manner precisely this is to be accomplished is not yet said. "The present infinitive ἔλαθμεν must be noticed. The one (eternal) act of Christ (c. x. 12—14) is here regarded in its continuous present application to men (cf. c. v. 1, 2)," Westcott. (See further on ἔλαθμεν in Blass, Gram., p. 88; Deissmann's Neue Bibelstud., p. 52; and Westcott's Epistle of St. John, pp. 83-85) τοῦ λαοῦ the historical people of God, Abraham's seed; cf. Matt. i. 21; Heb. iv. 9, xiii. 12.

Chapter III. 1—Chapter IV. 13.—

Chapters iii. and iv. as far as ver. 13, form one paragraph. The purpose of the writer in this passage, as in the whole Epistle, is to encourage his readers in their allegiance to Christ to save them from apostacy by exhibiting Christ as the final mediator. This purpose he has in the first two chapters sought to achieve by compar-
ing Christ with those who previously mediated between God and man,—the prophets who spoke to the fathers, and the angels who mediated the law and were supposed even to regulate nature. He now proceeds to compare Jesus with him round whose name gathered all that revelation and legislation in which the Jew trusted. Moses was the ideal mediator, faithful in all God's house. Underlying even the priesthood of Aaron was the word of God to Moses. And yet, free channel of God's will as Moses had been, he was but a servant and in the nature of things could not so perfectly sympathise with and interpret the will of Him whose house and affairs he administered as the Son who Himself was lord of the house.

He therefore bids his readers encourage themselves by the consideration of His trustworthiness, His competence to accomplish all God's will with them and bring them to their appointed rest. But this suggests to him the memorable breakdown of faith in the wilderness generation of Israelites. And he forthwith strengthens his admonition to trust Christ by adding the warning which was so legibly written in the fate of those who left Egypt under the leadership of Moses, but whose faith failed through the greatness of the way. It was not owing to any incompetence or faithlessness in Moses that they died in the wilderness and failed to reach the promised land. It was “because of their unbelief” (iii. 19). Moses was faithful in all God's house, in everything required for the guidance and government of God's people and for the fulfilment of all God's purpose with them: but even with the most trustworthy leader much depends on the follower, and entrance to the fulness of God's blessing may be barred by the unbelief of those who have heard the promise. The promise was not mixed with faith in them to whom it came. But what of those who were led in by Joshua? Even they did not enter into God's rest. That is certain, for long after Joshua's time God renewed His promise, saying "To-day if ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts". Entrance into the land, then, did not exhaust the promise of God; there remains over and above that entrance, a rest for the people of God, for "without us," i.e., without the revelation of Christ the fathers were not perfect, their best blessings, such as their land, being but types of better things to come. Therefore let us give diligence to enter into that rest, for the word of God's promise is searching; and, by offering us the best things in fellowship with God, it discloses our real disposition and affinities.

The passage falls into two parts, the former (iii. 1-6) exhibiting the trustworthiness of Christ, the latter (iii. 7-iv. 13) emphasising the unbelief and doom of the wilderness generation.

Ver. 1. "OINTV, "wherefore," if through Jesus God has spoken His final and saving word (i. 1), thus becoming the Apostle of God, and if the high priest I speak of is so sympathetic and faithful that for the sake of cleansing the people He became man and suffered, then "consider, etc.". The τωρύς of ver. 17 strikes the keynote of this paragraph. Here for the first time the writer designates his readers, and he does so in a form peculiar to himself (the reading in 1 Thess. v. 27 being doubtful) δείκταντος, “Christian brethren,” literally “brethren consecrated,” separated from the world and dedicated to God. Bleek quotes from Primasius: " Fratres eos vocat tam carne quam spiritu qui ex eodem generare antent". But there is no reason to assign to δείκταντος any other meaning than its usual N. T. sense of “fellow-Christians,” cf. Matt. xxiii.8. But there is further significance in the additional καλλιεργητὴς έκτόπος μέτοχοι, “partakers of a heavenly calling” (cf. 1 Cor. xii.27) suggested by the latent comparison in the writer's mind between the Israelites called to earthly advantages, a land, etc., and his readers whose hopes were fixed on things above. "In the word 'heavenly' there is struck for the first time, in words at least, an antithesis of great importance in the Epistle, that of this world and heaven, in other words, that of the merely material and transient, and the ideal and abiding. The things of the world are material, unreal, transient; those of heaven are ideal, true, eternal. Heaven is the world of realities, of things themselves (ix. 23) of which the things here are but 'copies'" (Davidson), κατα- νοήσατε, “consider,” "bring your mind to bear upon," "observe so as to see the significance," as in Luke xii.24, κατανοήσατε τούθεν κόρησας, though it is sometimes, as in Acts xi.6, xxvii.39, used in its classical sense "perceive". A "confession" does not always involve that its significance is seen. Consider then ἠγαπητε... "the Apostle and high priest of our confession, Jesus," the
single article brackets the two designations and Bengel gives their sense: “τὸν άνωτέρα, eum qui Dei causam apud nos agit. τὸν ἄρχ. qui causam nostram apud Deum agit.” These two functions embrace not the whole of Christ’s work, but all that He did on earth (cf. i. 1–4). The frequent use of ἀνωτέρας by our Lord to denote the Father’s mission of the Son authorises the present application of ἀνωτέρας. It is through Him God has spoken (i. 1). Moses is never called ἀνωτέρας (a word indeed which occurs only once in LXX) though in Exod. iii. 10 He is so described of God. Schottgen quotes passages from the Talmud in which the high priest is termed the Apostle or messenger of God and of the Sanhedrim, but this is here irrelevant. καὶ ἀρχιερέα, a title which, as applicable to Jesus, the writer explains in chaps. v.–viii. τῇ διαλογίᾳ ἡμῶν, “of our confession,” or, whom we, in distinction from men of other faiths, confess; chiefly no doubt in distinction from the non-Christian Jews. διαλογία, as the etymology shows, means “of one speech with,” hence that in which men agree as their common creed, their confession, see ref. As Peake remarks: “If this means profession of faith, then, the readers already confess Jesus as high priest, and this is not a truth taught them in this Epistle for the first time.” [Carpzov quotes from Philo (De Somn.): ὁ μὲν δὲ μέγας Ἀρχιερεύς τῆς διαλογίας, but here another sense is intended.] ἤτοι is added to preclude the possibility of error. ἤτοι occurs in this Epistle nine times by itself, thrice with Χριστοῦ.

Ver. 2. The characteristic, or particular, qualification of Jesus which is to hold their attention is His trustworthiness or fidelity. πιστῶν δύνα might be rendered “as being faithful.” The fidelity here in view, though indirectly to men and encouraging them to trust, is directly to Him who made Him, sc., Apostle and High Priest. τῷ ποιησαντὶ αὐτόν. The objection urged by Bleek, Lünemann and Alford that τοιχώς can mean “appoint” only when followed by two accusatives is not valid. The second accusative may be understood; and in i Sam. xii. 6 we find Κύριος ὁ ποιήσας τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ τὸν Ἀαρών, words which may have been in the writer’s mind. The Arian translation, “to Him that created Him,” is out of place. Appointment to office finds its correlative in faithfulness, creation scarcely suggests that idea. The fidelity of Jesus is illustrated not by incidents from His life, nor by the crowning proof given in His death, nor is it argued from the admitted perfection of His character, but in accordance with the plan of the Epistle it is merely compared to that of Moses, and its superiority is implied in the superiority of the Son to the servant. He was faithful “as also Moses in all His house,” this being the crowning instance of fidelity testified to by God Himself, ὁ θεράπων μου Μωυσῆν ἐν δλῳ τῷ οἶκῳ μου πιστῶν ἐστι (Num. xii. 7), where the context throws the emphasis on δλῳ. “The ‘house of God’ is the organised society in which He dwells” (Westcott), cf. i Tim. iii. 15. Weiss says that the words ἐν δλῳ τῷ οἶκῳ αὐτοῦ “necessarily belong” to πιστῶν δύνα. This is questionable, because the writer’s point is that Jesus is faithful not “in” but “over” the house of God (ver. 6).

Ver. 3. The reason is now assigned why Jesus and His fidelity should eclipse in their consideration that of Moses. The reason is that “this man” (ὁτος, “the person who is the subject of our consideration”) “has been and is deemed worthy of greater glory (‘amploios gloriae,’ Vulg. πλείονος, qualitative as in xi. 4) than Moses, in proportion as he that built the house has more honour than the house.” The genitive follows the comparative πλείονα. The “greater glory” is seen in the more important place occupied by Him in the fulfilment of God’s purpose of salvation. This glory of Jesus is as much greater than that of Moses, as the cause is greater than the effect, the builder than the house. [The principle is stated by Philo (De Plant.,]
all," whether old or new, is God. The present development of this divine house as well as its past condition and equipment is of God. And Christ, the Son, naturally and perfectly representing God or the builder, and by whose agency God created all things (i. 2) is therefore worthy of more honour than Moses. The argument is not so much elliptical as incomplete, waiting to be supplemented by the following verses in which the relation of Jesus to God and the relation of Moses to the house are exhibited. "It is argued that a household must be established by a householder; now God established the universe, and therefore he is the supreme householder of the universal household or Church of God, and in that household Jesus, as His perfect representative, is entitled to receive glory corresponding"

(Rendall).

Ver. 5. καὶ Μωϋσῆς... Another reason for expecting to find fidelity in Jesus and for ascribing to Him greater glory. Moses was faithful as a servant in the house (b), Christ as a Son over (ἐν) his house. θεράπων denotes a free servant in an honourable position and is the word applied to Moses in Num. xii. 8. ["Apud Homerum nomen est non servile sed ministros significat voluntarios, nec raro de viris dictur nobiliti genere natis" (Stephanus). It is especially used of those who serve the gods. See Findar Olym. iii. 29.] Both the fidelity and the inferior position of Moses are indicated in the words which occur like a refrain in Exodus: "According to all that the Lord commanded, so did Moses." Nothing was left to him to do but the least initiative; he had to be instructed and commanded; but all that was entrusted to him, he executed with absolute exactness. The crowning proof of his fidelity was given in the extraordinary scene (Exod. xxxvii.), where Moses refused to be "made a great nation" in room of Israel. He is said to have been faithful εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων. The meaning is, the testimony to his faithfulness which God had pronounced was the guarantee of the trustworthiness of the report he gave of what the Lord afterwards spoke to him. This meaning seems to be determined by the context in Numbers xii. "My servant Moses...
... is faithful in all my house. I will speak to him mouth to mouth, apparently and not in dark speeches." Grotius says "ut pronuntiare populo ea quae Deus ei dicenda quoquo tempore mandabat". Bleek and Davidson refer the μαρτύριον to Moses not to God. "He was a servant for a testimony, i.e., to bear testimony of those things which were to be revealed, from time to time revealed. Reference might be made to Barnabas viii. 3, εἰς μαρτ. τῶν φυλῶν. The meaning advocated by Calvin, Delitzsch, Westcott and others is attractive. They understand the words as referring to the things which were to be spoken by Christ, and that the whole of Moses' work was for a testimony of those things. Thus Westcott translates "for a testimony of the things which should be spoken by God through the prophets and finally through Christ". This gives a fine range to the words, but the context in Numbers is decisively against it. The idea seems to be that Moses being but a ὸχρός needed a testimonial to his fidelity that the people might trust him; and also that he had no initiative but could only report to the people the words that God might speak to him. In contrast to this position of Moses, Χριστός ὦ υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, Christ's fidelity was that of "a Son over his house". It was not the fidelity which exactly performs what another commands and faithfully enters into and fulfils His will. It is the fidelity of one who himself is possessed by the same love and conceives the same purposes as the Father. The interests of the house and family are the Son's interests. "We are His house" and in Christ we see that the interests of God and man, of the Father and the family are one. [Grotius quotes the jurisconsults: "etiam vivente patre filium quodam modo dominum esse rerum paternarum." But this house so faithfully administered by the Son Himself is the body of Christian people, εἰς οἶκος ὧν ἡμεῖς, we are those on whom this fidelity is spent. The relative finds its antecedent in αὐτοῦ. The "house of God" is, in the Gospels, the Temple; but in 1 Pet. iv. 17 and 1 Tim. iii. 15 it has the same meaning as here, the people or Church of God. "Whose house are we, but with a condition... προφητευον... κατάσχεται... "if we shall have held fast our confidence and the glorying of our hope firm to the end". For, as throughout the Epistle, so here, all turns on perseverance. ταραστήσια originally "frank speech," hence the boldness which prompts it. Cf. iv. 16, x. 35; so in Paul and John. καύχημα, not as the form of the word might indicate, "the object of boasting," but the disposition as in 1 Cor. v. 6: οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὧμων and 2 Cor. v. 12: ἀφορμὴν διδόστε ὧμιν καύχηματος. [Cf. the interchange of βρῶσις and βρῶμα in Jo. iv. 32, 34, and Jan-naris, Hist. Gr. Gram., 1021 and 1155.] Whether ἱερός belongs to both substantives is doubtful. The Christian's hope of a heavenly inheritance (ver. 1), of perfected fellowship with God, should be so sure that it confidently proclaims itself, and instead of being shamefaced glories in the future it anticipates. And this attitude must be maintained until difficulty and trial are past and hope has become possession. βεβαιόν in agreement with the remoter substantive, which might give some colour to the idea that the expression was lifted from ver. 14 and inserted here; but Bleek shows by several instances that the construction is legitimate.

Chapter III. 7—IV. 13. The great instance in history of the disaster which attends failure of faith is adduced as a warning to the faltering Hebrews. Διὰ, "wherefore," since it is only by holding fast our confidence to the end,
that we continue to be the house of Christ and enjoy His faithful oversight, cf. ver. 14. Δια was probably intended to be immediately followed by βλέπετε (ver. 12) and it would be a form of citation not found elsewhere in exactly the same terms, but in x. 5 we find the similar form μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα τὸ δόγμα. Cf. also ix. 5. Agabus uses it of his own words (Acts xxii. 11). In 1 Tim. iv. 1 we have τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ῥήματι λέγου καθὼς Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγαθόν. Cf. also the Divine Author, not to the human instrument (Westcott). The Psalm (95) is ascribed to David in iv. 7 as in the LXX it is called αὐτὸς ῥήμα τῷ Δαυίδ, although in the Hebrew it is not so ascribed. The quotation contains vv. 7-11.

Σήμερον, “to-day” is in the first instance, the “to-day” present to the writer of the psalm, and expresses the thought that God's offers have not been withdrawn although rejected by those to whom the promise was made. But Delitzsch adds passages which show that σήμερον in this psalm was understood by the synagogue to refer to the second great day of redemption. “The history of redemption knows but of two great turning points, that of the first centurion and that of the new man” (Davidson). And what the writer to the Hebrews fears is that the second announcement of promise may be disregarded as the first. Force is lent to his fears by the fact that the forty years of the Messiah's waiting from 30-70 a.d., when Jerusalem was to be destroyed, when the temple was to be destroyed, was put out. The fate of the exasperating Israelites in the wilderness received an ominous significance in presence of the obduracy of the generation which had heard the voice of Christ Himself.

This stands in the psalm as the translation of the Hebrew which might be rendered: “[Harden not your hearts] as at Meribah, as on the day of Massah in the wilderness.” Meribah being represented by παραπετασμόνως and Massah by παραπετασμός. The tempting of God by Israel in the wilderness is recorded in Exod. xvii. 1-7, where the place is called “Massah and Meribah”. This occurred in the first year of the wanderings. παραπετασμός is found only in this passage (although παραπετασμένως is frequent) its place being taken by λοιδόρησιν in Exod. xvii. 7 and by ἄπτιγησιν in Num. xx. 12. It means “embitterment,” “exasperation,” “exasperation”. κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν is rendered by the Vulgate “secundum diem” rightly. It means “after the manner of the day”. Westcott, however, prefers the temporal sense.

Ver. 9. ὁ παρείρασάν με... “where your fathers tempted me,” i.e., in the wilderness. Others take ὁ as “with which,” attracted into genitive by παραπετασμόνως. ὅ τε ἡμέραν ἐν ποιμήν ἔτοι, “and saw my works forty years,” the wonders of mercy and of judgment. In the psalm τέσσαρα ἡμέραν are joined to προσώπησαν, διό being omitted. The same connection is adopted in ver. 17.
Ver. 10. δὶ δὲ πρὸ σοφίας θεταμ,- "wherefore I was greatly displeased". In the psalm the Hebrew verb means "I loathed," elsewhere in the LXX it translates verbs meaning "I am disgusted with," "I spue out," "I abhor," cf. Lev. xxvi. 30, [from δυσθή a bank, as if from a river chafing with its banks; or related to δυσθῆ and δυσθομα as if "burdened "]

εὐσεβεῖς τοῖς νησίοις, The insertion of a εὐσεβεῖς shows that this clause is not under εὐσεβεῖς, but is joined with the preceding πρὸς τὸν θεόν. I was highly displeased,—but yet they did not recognise my ways."

Ver. 11. ὡς ἔμμοσα. "As I swore," i.e., justifying my oath to exclude them from the land. εὐσεβεῖς τοῖς νησίοις, the common form of oath with εὐσεβεῖς that some such words as "God do so to me and more also" have preceded the "if". The oath quoted in Ps. xcvi. is recorded in Num. xiv. 21-23.

Ver. 12. Λήπετε δὲ καθαρές καὶ δείξατε τὸν θεόν, "Exhort one another daily". Λήπετε is equivalent to δέλεροι, see Eph. iv. 32; Col. iii. 13. θέσθαι τὸν θεόν καθαρά, "as long as that period endures which can be called 'to-day'". θέσθαι denotes a point up to which something is done; hence, the term during which something is done as here. τὸν θεόν = the word "to-day". Bengel says, "Dum Psalmus iste auditur et legitur"; but this is less likely. The meaning is, So long as opportunity is given to hear God's call. "... ou apóthesis, "lest any of you be rendered rebellious through sin's deceit"; perhaps the meaning would be better brought out by translating "lest any of you be rendered rebellious by sin's deceit". [On sin's deceit cf. "Nemo repentet pessimus esatis"]; and the striking motto to the 35th chap. of The Fortunes of Nigel.] Sin in heart or life blinds a man to the significance and attractiveness of God's offer.

Ver. 14. μετ' ὑμῶν ὑπ' ὑμᾶς... In ver. 6 the writer had adduced as the reason of his warning (δήλωνε) that participation
in the salvation of Christ depended on continuance in the confident expectation that their heavenly calling would be fulfilled; and so impressed is he with the difficulty of thus continuing that he now returns to the same thought, and on the same reason for his warning: "For we are become partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence firm to the end". Delitzsch, Rendall, Bruce and others understand by μέτοχοι, "partners" or "fellows" of Christ, as if the faithful were not only the house of Christ (ver. 6) but shared His joy in the house. It may be objected that μέτοχοι in this Epistle (ii. 14, iii. 1, v. 13, vi. 4, vii. 13, xii. 8) is regularly used of participators in something, not of participators with someone. In i. 9, however, it is not so used. The idea of participating with Christ finds frequent expression in Scripture. See Matt. xxv. 21; Rev. iii. 21. τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the article may link this mention of Christ's name with that in ver. 6; and, if so, μέτοχοι will naturally refer to companionship with Christ in His house. This companionship we have entered into and continue to enjoy [γεγόναμεν] on the same condition as above (ver. 6) δάντες τὴν ἀρχήν ... "if at least we maintain the beginning of our confidence firm to the end". ὑποστάσεις is used by LXX twenty times and represents twelve different Hebrew words [Hatch in Essays in Bibl. Greek saves eighteen times representing fifteen different words, but cf. Concordance].

In Ruth i. 12, Ps. xxxix. 8, Ezek. xix. 5 it means "ground of hope" [its primary meaning being that on which anything is based], hence it takes the sense, "hope" or "confidence" as the given examples of its use in later Greek. Polyb., iv. 50, 61 Ἀτρόβιος ἑξορύσσει τὴν τῶν Βασιλείων ἐπίστασιν, so vi. 55 of Horatius guarding the bridge. It also occurs in the sense of "fortitude," bearing up against pain, v. Diod. Sic., De Viro p. 557, and Josephus, Ant., xviii. i. Confidence the Hebrews already possessed [ἀρχήν]; their test was its maintenance to the end [τέλος], i.e., till it was beyond trial, finally triumphant, in Christ's presence.

Ver. 15. ἐν τῇ λέγεσθαι ... "While it is said to-day, etc." The construction of these words is debated. Bleek, Delitzsch, von Soden and others construe them with what follows, beginning at this point a fresh paragraph. The meaning would thus be: "Since it is said, 'To-day if ye hear his voice, harden not, etc.,' who are meant, who were they who heard and provoked?" This is inviting but the γὰρ of ver. 16 is decidedly against it. Davidson connects εὐ ποίησις, with what immediately precedes: "'if we hold fast ... unto the end, while it is said,' i.e., not during the time that it is said, but in the presence and consciousness of the saying, Harden not, etc., with this divine warning always in the ear." Similarly Weiss. Wescott connects the words with ver. 13, making 14 parenthetical. Either of these constructions is feasible. It is also possible to let the sentence stand by itself as introductory to what follows, taking μὴ σκληρὸν as directly addressed to the Hebrews, not as merely completing the quotation: "While it is being said To-day if ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation." The λέγεσθαι thus contains only the clause ending with ἀκούσατε.

Ver. 16. τίνες γὰρ ἀκούσαντες παρενεκραπαν: "For who were they who after hearing provoked?" He proceeds further to enforce his warning that confidence begun is not enough, by showing that they who provoked God and fell in the wilderness had begun a life of faith and begun it well. For the answer to his question is "Nay did not all who came out of Egypt with Moses?" They were not exceptional sinners who fell away, but all who came out of Egypt,
the whole mass of the gloriously rescued people whose faith had carried them through between the threatening walls of water and over whom Miriam sang her triumphal ode. ἀλλὰ adds force to the answer, as if it were said, It is asked who provoked, as though it were some only, but was it not all? πᾶντες, for it is needless excepting Joshua and Caleb. Ver. 17. ἀν ὑπό τοῦ θεοῦ προκατάλησαν πάντες. "And with whom was He angry forty years?" taking up the next clause of the Psalm, v. 10. Again the question is answered by another "Was it not with them that sinned?" [ἀμαρτήσαντες: "This is the only form of the aorist participle in N.T. In the moods the form of ἂμαρτάνω is always used except Matt. xviii.15, Luke xvii.4, ἂμαρτάνω: Rom. vi. 15," Westcott, cf. Blass, p. 43.] It was not caprice on God's part, nor inability to carry them to the promised land. It was because they sinned [see esp. Num. xxxii.23] that their "cases fell in the wilderness". καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ ἐστίν ἤμεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἐρήμων. These words are taken from Num. xiv. 29, 32, where God utters the doom of the wilderness generation. κόλπος, a limb or member of the body [Aesch., Prom., 81; Soph., O.C., 19, etc.]; hence a clause of a sentence (and in English, the point which marks it). Used by the LXX to translate τὸν καταπέμπτων, cadaver. Setting out from Egypt with the utmost confidence, they left their bones in the desert in unnamed and forgotten graves; not because of their weakness nor because God had failed them but because of their sin.

Ver. 18. καὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθαν... "And to whom said He that they should not enter into His rest, but to them that obeyed not?" The real cause of their exclusion from the rest prepared for them was their disobedience. Cf. especially the scene recorded in Num. xiv, where Moses declares that as ἁμαρτάνων Κυπρών they were excluded from the land. At the root of their disobedience was unbelief.

Ver. 19. They did not believe God could bring them into the promised land in the face of powerful opposition and so they would not attempt its conquest when commanded to go forward. They were rendered weak by their unbelief. This is pointed out in the concluding words καὶ θέλομεν... where the emphasis is on οὐκ ἤνεγκριν, they were not able to enter in, the reason being given in the words θεωρήσαν. The application to the Hebrew Christians was sufficiently obvious. They were in danger of shrinking from further conflict and so losing all they had won. They had begun well but were now being weakened and prevented from completing their victory; and this weakness was the result of their not trusting God and their leader.

Between chapters iii. and iv. there is no break. The unbelief of the wilderness generation is held up as a warning, and its use in this respect is justified by the fact that the promise made to them is still made, and is a "living" word which reveals the inmost purposes of the heart and is inevitable in its judgment.

Ver. 1. θεωρήσαν, "let us then fear," the writer speaks in the name of the living generation, "lest haply, there being left behind and still remaining a promise to enter [ἐκεινοὺς οὖν εἰσελθέντας]," and its use in this respect is justified by the fact that the promise made to them is still made, and is a "living" word which reveals the inmost purposes of the heart and is inevitable in its judgment.
cuted Christians who had expected to find the fulfillment of all promise in Christ, found it hard to believe that "rest" was attainable in Him. The writer proceeds therefore to prove that this promise is left and is still open. "For indeed we, even as also they, have had a gospel preached to us." We should have expected an expressed "tijcicis," but its suppression shows us that the writer wishes to emphasize "tijcicis." To us as to them it is a gospel that is preached; and the "kathéter käkéitai," "even as they also had," brings out the fact that under the promise of a land in which to rest, the Israelites who came out of Egypt were brought in contact with the redeeming grace and favour of God. The expression reflects significant light on the inner meaning of all God's guidance of Israel's history. They received this rich promise laden with God's intention to bless them, "but the word which they heard did them no good, because in those who heard, it was not mixed with faith." [For "svyKCKpao'pcvov" see the Phaedo, p. 95a. The accusative is best attested (see critical note), but the sense "not mixed with faith" is most improbable.]. Belief, then, is everything. In proof of which our own experience may be cited: "For we are entering into the rest, we who have believed." This clause confirms both the statements of the previous verse: "we have the promise as well as they," "for we are entering into the rest" [note the emphatic position of "eis eisvXOeiai"]; and "the word failed them because of their lack of faith," for it is our faith [eis eisvXOeiai] which is carrying us into the rest. This fact that we are entering in by faith is in accordance with the utterance quoted already in iii. 11, "kathéter svyKCKpao'pcvov...". "I swears in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest, although the works were finished from the foundation of the world." This quotation confirms the first clause of the verse, because it proves two things: first, that God had a rest, and second, that He intended that man should rest with Him, because it was "in His wrath," justly excited against the unbelieving (cf. iii. 9, 10), that He swears they should not enter in. Had it not been God's original purpose and desire that men should enter into His rest, it could not be said that "in wrath" He excluded some. Their failure to secure rest was not due to the non-existence of any rest, for God's works were finished when the world was founded. This again is confirmed by Scripture, "tijcicis...". viz., in Gen. ii. 2 (cf. Exod. xx. 11, xxvi. 17), where it is said that after the six days of creation God rested on the seventh day from all His works. That God has a rest is also stated in the ninety-fifth Psalm, for these words "they shall not enter into my rest" prove that God had a rest. The emphasis in this second quotation (ver. 5) is on the word "tijcicis."
not believed by those who formerly heard it, neither was it exhausted in the bringing in of the people to Canaan. For had it been so, it could not have been renewed long after, as it was. It remains, therefore, to be now enjoyed. "Since, therefore, it remains that some enter into it and those who formerly heard the good news of the promise did not enter, owing to disobedience." arbo apoleitetai saββatiasmos to laφ tos theou. io. & yap elieλdων eis της κατάπαυσιν αυτού, καί αυτός κατάπαυσαν από των

"Therefore there remains a Sabbath-Rest for the people of God." saββατισμός, though found here only in Biblical Greek, occurs in Plutarch (De Superstit., c. 3). The verb saββατισθείν occurs in Exod. xvi.30 and other places. The word is here employed in preference to κατάπαυσις in order to identify the rest promised to God’s people with the rest enjoyed by God Himself on the Sabbath or Seventh Day. [So Theophylact, cii. 13. To explain and justify the introduction of this word, the writer adds & yap elieλdων . . . as if he said, I call it a Sabbatism, because it is not an ordinary rest, but one which finds its ideal and actual fulfilment in God’s own rest on the Seventh Day. [So Theophylact, & yap elieλdων, whoever has entered, not to be restricted to Jesus, as by Alford, elis τ. κατάπαυσιν αυτού, into God’s rest, καί αυτός εκ της εκ τος, himself also rested from his (the man’s) works as God from His."

The salvation which the writer has previously referred to as a glorious dominion is here spoken of as a Rest. The significance lies in its being God’s rest which man is to share. It is the rest which God has enjoyed since the creation. From all His creative work God could
not be said to rest till, after what cannot but appear to us a million of hazards, man appeared, a creature in whose history God Himself could find a worthy history, whose moral and spiritual needs would elicit the Divine resources and exercise what is deepest in God. When man appears God is satisfied, for here is one in His own image. But from this bare statement of the meaning of God's rest it is obvious that God's people must share it with Him. God's rest is satisfaction in man; but this satisfaction can be perfected only when man is in perfect harmony with Him. His rest is not perfect till they rest in Him. This highly spiritual conception of salvation is involved in our Author's argument. Cf. the grand passage on God's Rest in Philo, De Cherubim, c. xxvi., and also Barnabas xv., see also Hughes' The Sabbatical Rest of God and Man.

Ver. 11. The exhortation follows naturally, "Let us then earnestly strive to enter into this rest, lest anyone fall in the same example of disobedience". The example of disobedience was that given by the wilderness generation and they are warned not to fall in the same way. *πατήρ* in is commonly construed "fall into," but it seems preferable to render "fall by" or "in"; *πατήρ* being used absolutely as in Rom. xiv. 4, στάσις ἢ πατήρ. Vaughan has "lest anyone fall [by placing his foot] in the mark left by the Exodus generation". *στάσις* is condemned by Phrynichus who says; ὁ θεὸς τούτῳ δρόμῳ λέγεται. Phrynichus was never used except in its natural sense of show by implication; but in Herodotus and Xenophon it signifies to mark out, set a pattern." Rutherford's Phryn., p. 62. Cf. viii. 5 of this Epistle with John xiii. 15 for both meanings. It is used in James v. 10 with the genitive of the thing to be imitated: "let this be done to you who have set a pattern for the faithful". In vv. 12 and 13 another reason is added for dealing sincerely and strenuously with God's promises and especially with this offer of rest, ὅν γὰρ ὁ θεός τοῦ θεοῦ, "for the word of God is living," that word of revelation which from the first verse of the Epistle has been in the writer's mind and which he has in chaps. iii., iv. exhibited as a word of promise of entrance into God's rest. Evidently, therefore, ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ is not, as Origen and other interpreters have supposed, the Personal Word incarnate in Christ, but God's offers and promises. Not only is the γὰρ, linking this clause to the promise of rest, decisive for this interpretation; but the mention of ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς in ver. 2 and the prominence given in the context to God's promise make it impossible to think of anything else. To enforce the admonition to believe and obey the word of God, five epithets are added, which, says Westcott, "mark with increasing clearness its power to deal with the individual soul. There is a passage step by step from that which is most general to that which is most personal." It is, first, ὅν, "living" or, as A.V. has it, "quick". Cf. i Pet. i. 23, ἀγαπητῶν μου ... διὰ λόγου σου ἡ θεότης καὶ μένοντος, and ver. 24 τὸ βῆμα Κύριου μὲν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. The meaning is that the word remains efficacious, valid and operative, as it was when it came from the will of God. "It is living as being instinct with the life of its source" (Delitzsch). It is also ἐνεργής, active, effective, still doing the work it was intended to do, cf. Isa. 55:11. τομή τοι ἰσοτροφός ἐκεῖν πᾶσαμ μάχαιραν διστομοῦ, "sharper than any two-edged sword". τομή is a more formidable weapon than a single-edged, offering less resistance and therefore cutting deeper (see Judges iii. 16 where Ehud made for
himself ἀκάρπαν δότησον αὐτὸν, a span long, and cf. Eurip., Helena, 983), but it was a common simile for sharpness as in Prov. v. 4, ἡσυχμένον μᾶλλον μικράρια διοσφάσας, whetted more than a two-edged sword; and Rev. i. 16, Ἰωάννου δότησον ἀκάρπον. The same comparison is used by Isaiah (xlii. 2) and by St. Paul (Eph. vi. 17); but especially in Wisdom xviii. 15, "Thine Almighty Word leaped down from heaven ...", and brought thine unconquered commandment as a sharp sword. The sharpness is illustrated by its action, διεικυνθέω ἐξὶ κατειργασμένοις ψυχὴς καὶ πνεύματος, ἀρμόνετε καὶ μελῶν, an expression which does not mean that the word divides the soul from the spirit, the joints from the marrow, but that it pierces through all that is in man to that which lies deepest in his nature. "It is obvious that the writer does not mean anything very specific by each term of the enumeration, which produces its effect by the rhetorical fulness of the expressions" (Farrar). For the expression cf. Eurip., Hippol., 335 τειχομένης μὲν ἐν ψυχῇ, but it is in the succeeding clause that the significance of his description appears; the word is Κριτικός ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν κατειργάσας "judging the conceptions and ideas of the heart". The word of God coming to men in the offer of good of the highest kind tests their real desires and inmost intentions. When fellowship with God is made possible through His gracious offer, the inmost heart of man is sifted; and it is infallibly discovered and determined whether he truly loves the good and seeks it, or shrinks from accepting it as his eternal heritage. The terms in which this is conveyed find a striking analogy in Philo (Quis. Rer. Div. Haer., p. 401) where he speaks of God by His Word "cutting asunder the constituent parts of all bodies and objects that seem to be coherent and united. Which [the word] being whetted to the keenest possible edge, never ceases to pierce all sensible objects, and when it has passed through them to the things that are called atoms and indivisible, then again this cutting instrument begins to divide those things which are contemplated by reason into unctold and indescribable portions." Cf. p. 506. In addition to this (καὶ), the inward operation of the word finds its counterpart in the searching, inevitable inquisition of God Himself with whom we have to do, "No created thing is hidden before Him (God) but all things are naked and exposed to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do." τετραχῆλισμα has created difficulty. τραχύληα is a word of the games, meaning "to bend back the neck" and so "to overcome". In this sense of overmastering it was in very common use. In Philo, e.g., men are spoken of as τετραχηλισμοί τοῖς ἐπιστήμοις. This meaning, however, gives a poor sense in our passage where it is followed by νοεῖν ἀκάρπον. Chrysostom says the word is derived from the skinning of animals, and Theophylact, enlarging upon this interpretation, explains that when the victims had their throats cut, the skin was dragged off from the neck downwards exposing the carcase. No confirmation of this use of the word is given. Perizonius in a note on Elian, Var. Hist., xii. 58, refers to Suetonius, Vitell., 17. Vitellius is described as being dragged into the forum, half-naked, with his hands tied behind his back, a rope round his neck and his dress torn; and we are further told that they dragged back his head by his hair, and even pricked him under the chin with the point of a sword. But are we wont to do to criminals, that he might let his face be seen and not hang his head. (So, too, Eisner, who refers to Perizonius and agrees that the word means resupinala, manifesta, eorum quasi service ac facie reflexa, atque adeo intuitum oculis expers, quos specie loquendi ab ii petito, quorum capsas reclinatur, ne intuentium oculos fugiant et lateant; quod hominibus qui ad suppliantum ducuntur, usu olim accidetur." Cf. "Sic fatus galeam laeva tenent, atque reflexa Cervice orantes capulo tenuis apparentes esse lassissimae, Virgil, Aen. x. 535." Certainly this bending back of the head to expose the face gives an excellent and relevant sense here. The reason for this emphasis is the penetrating and inscrutable gaze of God is given in the description appended in the relative
13—15.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ

14. Ἐχοντες οὖν ἁρχιερεῖα μέγαν, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, εἰς τὸν θεόν, κρατοῦν τὴς ὁμολογίας. 15. Οὐ γὰρ ἐχομεν ἁρχιερεῖα μὴ δυνάμενον συμπαθήσας τοῖς ἀνθρεπνείαις ἡμῶν.

Esa. iii. 9; Luc. xxii. 28; 2 Cor. vii. 21; Phil. ii. 7; 1 Peter ii. 22; 1 John. iii. 5.

clause; it is Ἡ εἰς 

δὲ ἡμῖν δὲ 

λόγος, which, so far as the mere words go, might mean "of whom we speak" (cf. i. 7 and v. 12), but which obviously must here be rendered, as in A.V., "with whom we have to do," or "with whom is our reckoning," cf. xiii. 17.

From iv. 14 to x. 15 the writer treats of the Priesthood of the Son. The first paragraph extends from iv. 14—v. 10, and in this it is shown that Jesus has the qualifications of a priest, a call from God, and the sympathy which makes intercession hearty and real. The writer's purpose is to encourage his readers to use the intercession of Christ with confidence, notwithstanding their sense of sinfulness. And he does so by reminding them that all High priests are appointed for the very purpose of offering sacrifice for sin, and that this office has not been assumed by them at their own instance but at the call of God. It is because God desires that sinful men be brought near to Him that priests hold office. And those are called to office, who by virtue of their own experience are prepared to enter into cordial sympathy with the sinner and heartily seek to intercede for him. All this holds true of Christ. He is Priest in obedience to God's call. The office, as He had to fill it, involved much that was repugnant. With strong crying and tears He shrank from the death that was necessary to the fulfilment of His function. But His godly caution prompted as His ultimate prayer, that the will of the Father and not His own might be done. Thus by the things He suffered He learned obedience, and being thus perfected became the author of eternal salvation to all that obey Him, greeted and proclaimed High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

Ver. 14. "Ἐχοντες οὖν ... "Having then a great high priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession." εἰς τὸν θεόν is now added, as in x. 21, xiii. 20, that they may the rather hold fast the confession they were in danger of letting go. The μέγαν is explained and justified by two features of this Priest: (1) He has passed through the heavens and entered thus the very presence of God. For δυνάμενον cannot mean, as Calvin renders "qui coelos ingressus est". As the Aaronic High Priest passed through the veil, or, as Grotius and Carpzov suggest, through the various fore courts, into the Holiest place, so this great High Priest had passed through the heavens and appeared among eternal realities. So that the very absence of the High Priest which depressed them, was itself fitted to strengthen faith. He was absent, because dealing with the living God in their behalf. (2) The second mark of His greatness is indicated in His designation ἡμῖν τὸν θεόν, the human name suggesting perfect understanding and sympathy, the Divine Sonship acceptance with the Father and pre-eminent dignity. κατ' ὑπάρξειν τῶν ὁμολογιῶν. "Our confession" primarily of this great High Priest, but by implication, our Christian confession, cf. iii. 1.

Ver. 15. Confirmation both of the encouragement of ver. 14 and of the fact on which that encouragement is founded is given in the further idea: οὐ γὰρ ἐχομεν ... "for we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but has been tempted in all points like us, without sin". He repels an idea which might have found entrance into their minds, that an absent, heavenly priest might not be able to sympathise. συμπαθεῖν [to be distinguished from συνμαθεῖν which occurs in Rom. viii. 17 and 1 Cor. xii. 26, and means to suffer along with one, to suffer the same ills as another] means to feel for, or sympathise with, and occurs also in x. 34, and is peculiar in N.T. to this writer but found in Aristotle, Isocrates and Plutarch, and in the touching expression of Acts of Paul and Thekla, 17, ἔσται τοῖς συνμαθίσαντι πλακατίζων κατασκοιλεῖτε. Jesus is able to sympathise with our
infirmities," the weaknesses which underlie our resistance to temptation and make it difficult to hold fast our confession: moral weaknesses, therefore, though often implicated with physical weaknesses. Jesus can feel for these because πεπιστευκέντος κατά πάντα καθ' ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν, He has been tempted in all respects as we are. καθ' ὑμεῖς, classical, "in all respects," cf. Wetstein on Acts xvii. 22; and Evagrius, 4 of Christ incarnate, δεισιδαιμονεῖν κατά πάντα χωρὶς ἁμαρτιάς, cf. ii. 17. καθ' ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν may either mean "according to the likeness of our temptations," or, "in accordance with His likeness to us". The latter is preferable, being most in agreement with ii. 17. See Theophylact, καθ' ὑμεῖς τὴν ἄμεραν, τούτων παρασκευῆσαι ήμιν, cf. Gen. i. 11, 12; and Philo, De Proph., c. 9, καθ' τὴν πρὸς ἀλλά δεισιδαιμονεῖν. The writer wishes to preclude the common fancy that there was some peculiarity in Jesus which made His temptation wholly different from ours, that He was a mailed champion exposed to toy arrows. On the contrary, He has felt in His own consciousness the difficulty of being righteous in this world; has felt pressing upon Himself the reasons and inducements that incline men to choose sin that they may escape suffering and death; in every part of His human constitution has known the pain and conflict with which alone temptation can be overcome; has been so tempted that had He sinned, He would have had a thousandfold better excuse than ever man had. Even though His divinity may have ensured His triumph, His temptation was true and could only be overcome by means that are open to all. The one difference between our temptations and those of Jesus is that His were χωρὶς ἁμαρτιάς. Riehm thinks this expression is not exhausted by declaring the fact that in Christ's case temptation never resulted in sin. It means, he thinks, further, and rather, that temptation never in Christ's case sprang from any sinful desire in Himself. So also Delitzsch, Weiss, Westcott, etc. But if Theophylact is right in his indication of the motive of the writer in introducing the words, then it is Christ's successful resistance of temptation which is in the foreground; διὸ δύναται καὶ ημεῖς ἐν τοῖς ὑλίσσον χωρὶς ἁμαρτιάς διαγνωσθῆναι.

Ver. 16. προσερχόμεθα οὖν... "Let us, therefore [i.e., seeing that we have this sympathetic and victorious High Priest] with confidence approach the throne of grace." προσερχόμεθα is used in a semi-technical sense for the approach of a worshipping to God, as in LXX frequently. Thus in Lev. xxi. 17 it is said of any blemished son of Aaron οὗ προσερχόσθαι πρὸς θέρατον λέγεται ὁ Θεόν αὐτοῦ, and in the 23rd ver. ἐγγύεται is used as an equivalent, cf. Heb. vii. 19. The word is found only once in St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 3, and there in a peculiar sense; but in Heb. it occurs seven times, and generally in its more technical sense, vii. 25, x. 1,22, xi. 6. It had become so much a technical term of divine worship that it can be used, as in x. 1,22, without an object. Here, as in vii. 25, it is followed by a dative τῆς ἁμαρτίας, the seat of supreme authority which by Christ's intercession is now characterised as the source from which grace is dispensed. Premonitions of this are found in O.T.; for although in Ps. xcvi. (xcvii.) 2 and elsewhere we find διακοσμών καὶ κῆρια κατέρθωσεν τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, yet in Isa. xvi. 5 we read διακοσμήσεται μετὰ ἑλέων θρόνος. Philo encourages men to draw near to God by representing "the merciful, and gentle, and compassionate nature of Him who is invoked, who would always rather have mercy than punishment" (De Exser., c. ix). There is also something in Theophylact's remark : Αὐτὸ γὰρ θρόνον ἐδώκε, ὁ μὲν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν... ὁ δὲ τῆς συνεργίας παρασκευῆς τῆς ἃ ἁμαρτά... ἀλλὰ κρίνεται. Similarly Atto : "Modo tempus est donorum : nemo de se ipso desperet". They are to approach μετὰ παρασκευῆς, as for Philo says (Quis. Rer. Div. Haer., 4) : φιλοσοφίτους ἀναγκαίωταν ἡ παρασκευή κατέρθω; and in c. 5. παρασκευὴ φιλίας συνεργεῖ. The purpose of the approach is expressed in two clauses which Bleek declares to be "ganz synonym". This, however, is scarcely correct. As is apparent from the next verse, the "obtaining mercy" refers to the pardon of sins, while the "finding grace" implies assistance given. So Primasius,
Quoted by Westcott "ut misericordiam consequamur, id est remissionem peccatorum, et gratiam donorum Spiritus Sancti"

"The exx. of interchange of -os masc. Decl. ii., and -os neut. Decl. iii., have somewhat increased in number [in N.T. Greek] in comparison with those in the classical language" (Blass, Gram., p. 28, E. Tr.).

"Quoted by Westcott "ut misericordiam consequamur, id est remissionem peccatorum, et gratiam donorum Spiritus Sancti". ... be for timely help; assistance in hours of temptation must be timely or it is useless. For  or term, like our "offer"; not so used in the classics. Supd to with combination is found in ver. 3 and x. 12. So Bleek and Weiss against Grotius and others; e.g., Westcott, who says: "The clause"
2. μετροπαθεῖν δυνάμενος: τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανημένοις, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτῶς περίκειται ἀπαθεῖαις. 3. καὶ διὰ ταῦτην ὁφείλει, καθὼς
vii. 27; Lev. ix. 7, περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, οὕτω καὶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ προσφέρειν ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτιῶν. cit. xvi. 3, etc.
4. καὶ οὐκ ἦσαν τὶς λαμβανεῖ τὴν τιμήν, ἀλλά δὲ καλομένους

Ver. 2. μετροπαθεῖν δυνάμενος: As one who is able to moderate his feeling". The Vulgate is too strong: "qui con
dolere poscit"; Grattius has: "non in
clementer affici"; Weizsäcker: "als
der billig fühlen kann"; and Peirce: "we
cannot feel". As the etymology shows, it means "to be moderate in one's passions". It was
opposed by Aristotle to the ἀπάθεια of the Stoics. [Diog. Laert. Arist.; ἐξ ἔτος ἠ τὸν σοφὸν ἐκ
μὴ εἶναι μὲν ἀπαθῇ μετροπαθῇ ὄν: not without feeling, but feeling in moderation; and Peirce, Tholuck, and Weiss conclude that the word
was first formed by the Peripatetics; Tholuck expressly; and Weiss, "stammt aus dem philosophischen Sprachge
brauch". Cf. the chapter of Philo (Leg. Allegor., iii., 45; Wendland's ed., vol. i., 143) in which he puts ἀπάθεια first and
μετροπαθεῖα second; and to the numerous exx. cited by Wetstein and Kypke, add, Nemesis, De Natura Hominis, cxix.,
where the word is defined in relation to grief. Josephus (Ant., xii. 3, 2) remarks upon the striking self-restraint and mod
eration (μετροπασχοῦντι) of Vespasian and Titus towards the Jews notwithstanding their many conflicts.) If the
priest is cordially to plead with God for the sinner, he must bridle his natural
disgust at the loathsomeness of sens
uality, his impatience at the frequently recurring fall, his hopeless alienation from the hypocrite and the superficial, his
indignation at any confession he hears from the penitent. This self-repression he must exercise τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ
πλανημένοις: "the ignorant and err
ing". The single article leads Peirce and others to render as a Hendiadys = τοῖς ἀγνοούσι καὶ πλανη
μένοις, ἐπεὶ καὶ οὐκ ἦσαν τὶς λαμβανεῖ τὴν τιμήν, ἀλλὰ δὲ καλομένους. In LXX, but in Ezek. xiii. 13, and
also in chaps. xlv. and xlvii., it translates ὶνν, but in Lev. v. 18 and in Eccles.
tion of the stop at the end of ver. 2. The law which enjoined that the high priest should on the Day of Atonement sacrifice for himself and his house (εἰς ἁλλὰν ἐκ τοῦ ὁλου ἠπελθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν) before he sacrificed, is given in Lev. xvi. 6, 15.

Ver. 4. καὶ οὐκ ἐνταῦθες λαμβάνει τὴν τιμήν. "And no one taketh to himself this honourable office." embroidery introduces a second qualification of the priest, important in itself, but now emphasised. An additional reason for trusting in the priest is that he has not assumed the office to gratify his own ambition but to serve God's purpose of restoring men to His fellowship. All genuine priesthood is the carrying out of God's will. The priest must above all else be obedient, in sympathy with God as well as in sympathy with man. God's appointment also secures that the suitable qualifications will be found in the priest. The office is here called τιμή, best translated by the German " Ehrenamt" or "office for himself and his house," meaning an office see Eurip., Helena, i. 15; Herodot., ii. 65, παντεῖ παρὰ τηῇ ἐκδίκητα τὴν τιμὴν; and especially Aristotle, Pol., iii. 10, τιμᾶ τὰς, ἀλλαὶ ἱσόμεναι τὰς ἄρχοντες. Cf. Hor. i. 1, 8 "tergeminis honoribus." Frequently in Josephus τιμή is used of the high priesthood, see Antiq., ii. 2-5, iv. 1, etc.; and the same writer should be consulted for the historical illustration of this verse (Antiq., iii. 8-1). In this remarkable passage he represents Moses as saying ἐνναὶ ἐκ τῆς τιμῆς ἀντίτης ἄνθρωπον. The πολος πισιγαρι implied in the words is amply illustrated in the case of Augustine, of John Knox, and especially of Anselm who declared he would rather have been cast on a stack of blazing faggots than set on the archiepiscopal throne, and continued to head his letters "ToDate Bishop of Canterbury by violence." On the other hand, see also the account of the appointment of his own act (προτάχθησι) of the priest king in

Aricia, in Strabo v. 3-12 and elsewhere. ἄλλα καλοῖμενοι. . . . καθότερον καὶ Αραων. "But when called by God as in point of fact even Aaron was." If this article is retained before καὶ, we must translate "but he that is called," καλοῖμενοι "in diesem amtlichen Sinne nur hier," says Weiss, but see Matt. iv. 21, Gal. i. 15. For Aaron's call, see Exod. xxviii. 1 ff. Schöttgen and Wetstein appropriately quote from the Bammidbar Rabbi "Moses said to Korah and his associates of Aaron's brother Aaron took to himself the priesthood, then ye did well to rebel against him; but in truth God gave it to him, whose is the greatness and the power and the glory. Whosoever, then, rises against Aaron, does he not rise against God?" It is notorious that the contemporary priesthood did not fulfil the description here given.

Ver. 5. ὅτι καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς. . . . "So even the Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest." "So hat auch der Christus nicht sich selbst die Herrlichkeit des Aaron was." If he mean that He who said, Thou art My Son, I this day have begotten Thee; as also in another place He says, Thou art a priest for ever after the order Melchisedek", the question here is: Why does the writer introduce the quotation from the 2nd Psalm at all? Why does he not directly prove his point by the quotation from the Messianic 110th Psalm? Does he mean that He who said, Thou art my Son, glorified Christ as priest for ever after the order Melchisedek? Apparently he does, otherwise the καὶ in καθότερον καὶ Αραων would be unwarranted. By introducing the former of the two quotations and designating
God as He that called Christ Son, or nominated him to the Messianic dignity, which involved the priesthood, he shows that the greater and more comprehensive office of Messiahship was not assumed by Christ at His own instance and therefore that the priesthood included in this was not of His own seeking, but of God's ordaining; cf. Weiss. Bleek says the reference to Ps. ii. ii. is made to lessen the marvel that God should glorify Christ as priest. Similarly Riehm “dass Christus in einem so unvergleichlich innigen Verhältnisse zu Gott steht, dass seine Berufung zum Hochpriesteramt nicht befriedend sein kann”; and Davidson, “It is by no means meant that the priesthood of Christ was involved in His Sonship (Alford), an a priori method of conception wholly foreign to the Epistle, but merely that it was suitable in one who was Son, being indeed possible to none other (see on i. 3).” Bruce thinks the writer wishes to teach that Christ's priesthood is coeval with His Sonship and inherent in it, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν “after the order;” among its other meanings τάξις denotes a class or rank, “ordo quâ dicitur qui habet eundem ordinem”. Thus in Demosthenes, οὐκ ἂν ἔλευθερον παῖς ἔχων, in Diod. Sic., iii. 6, οἱ περὶ τὸν τῆς τεσσάρων θείων ἐπάρκειας διατριβοῦντες ἵπποι, μεγάλως καὶ κυριωτάτην τάξιν ἔχοντες. In the subsequent exposition of the Melch. priesthood it is chiefly on εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα that emphasis is laid.

Ver 7. ὅτι ... εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπίγειον. In these verses the writer shows how much there was in the call to the priesthood repugnant to flesh and blood; how it was through painful obedience, not by arrogant ambition he became Priest. The main statement is, He learned obedience and became perfect as Saviour. ἂν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ “who in the days of His flesh,” and when therefore He was like His brethren in capacity for temptation and suffering; cf. ii. 14. ἐπάνω ... προσευχῆς ... ἐξανάγεται “offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death”. Προσευχής ἄλλος ἔχει sometimes been supposed to refer to the προσευχή of ver. 3, and to have a sacrificial sense. It was such an offering as became His innocent θυσία. As the ordinary high priest prepared himself for offering for the people by offering for himself, so, it is thought, Christ was prepared for the strictly sacrificial or priestly work by the offering of His own blood. There is truth in this. Weiss' reason for excluding this reference is “dass ein Opfer mit starkem Geschrei und θράνα εν eine unvollziehbare Vorstellung ist”. Cf. Davidson, p. 113, note. προσφ. is used with δέσοι in later Greek writers: instances in Bleek. δέσοι τε καὶ ἵερτα, these words are elsewhere combined as in Isocrates, De Pace, 46; Polybius, iii. 112, 8; cf. Job. xl. 22. The relation of the two words is well brought out in a passage from Philo quoted by Carpzov: γραφή ἔτε μνημονεύων τὴν δέσοιν ἄν ἰδού ἵερτα προσφοράς. Cf. Eurip. Iph. Aul., 1216. ἱερτεία [from ἱερός come, ἱερεύς one who comes as a suppliant] is originally an adjective = fit for suppliants, then an olive branch (cf. ἱερεῖα, or ἱεροθέσια) bound with Wool which the suppliant carried as a symbol of his prayer. “The προσφορά of ver. 3 in this verse is for emphasis. These supplications were accompanied μετὰ κραυγῆς ἱερτείας καὶ δέσοιν “with strong crying and tears,” expressing the intensity of the prayers and so the keenness of the suffering. The “strong crying” is striking. Schöntgen quotes: “There are three kinds of prayers, each loftier than the preceding: prayer, crying, and tears. Prayer is silent, crying with raised voice, tears overcome all things.” It is to the scene in Gethsemane reference is made, and although “tears” are not mentioned by the evangelists in relating that scene, they are implied, and this writer might naturally thus represent the emotion of our Lord. The prayer was addressed πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σωτῆρα αὐτοῦ ἐκ θανάτου “to Him that was able to save Him from death,” which implies that the prayer was that Christ might be saved from death (“possible that this cup pass from me’) but also suggests that the prayer was not formally answered —else why emphasise that God had power to answer it? σωτῆρα ἐκ θανάτου. The
kai δικρύων προσενέγκας, καὶ εἰσακουσθείς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, 8. λοις και τελειω. etc.

prayer recorded in Mark xiv. 36, and the anticipation of Gethsemane alluded to in John xii. 57 [Πάντες σωτόν με ἐν τῇ δραconti ταύτης] are sufficient to show that it is deliverance from dying that is meant. Milligan, however, says: "Christ in this sense prayed that His death may be averted, but that He may be saved 'out of it,' when it comes." Westcott thinks the words cover both ideas and that in the first sense the prayer was not granted, that it might be granted in the second. It is preferable to abide by the simple statement that the passion of Christ's prayer to escape death was intensified by the fact that He knew God could deliver Him by twelve legions of angels or otherwise. His absolute faith in the Father's almighty power and infinite resource was the very soul of his trial. καὶ εἰσακουσθείς ἀπὸ τῇ δραconti ταύτης τελειωθείται... prayer as determined by anticipation of Gethsemane alluded to in Mark xiv. 36, and the of the clause is further determined by what follows.

Ver. 8. καὶ πέφερ ἐν πίστει ἐμαθεν ἀφ' ἐν ἐπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν ([having been heard . . . ] although He was a son He learned obedience from the things He suffered. The result of his being left was that He therefore that He suffered, but in the suffering He learned obedience, perfect union with the will of God for the salvation of men so that He became a perfected Priest. He learned obedience καὶ πέφερ ἐν πίστει: "this is stated to obviate the very idea of assumption on his part." (Davidson). Perhaps, therefore, we should translate, with a reference to ver. 5, "although He was Son". Although Son and therefore possessed of Divine love and in sympathy with the Divine purpose, He had yet to learn that perfect submission which is only acquired by obeying in painful, terrifying, God-revealed circumstances. He made deeper and deeper experience of what obedience is and costs. And the particular obedience [θην υπακ.] which was required of Him in the days of His flesh was that which at once gave Him perfect entrance into the Divine love and human sympathy. The child is told to do something which pains him, and which he shrinks from, that he learns obedience, learns to submit to another will. And the things which Christ suffered in obeying God's will taught Him perfect submission and at the same time perfect devotedness to man. On this obedience, see Robertson Smith in Expositor for 1881, p. 424. καὶ πέφερ is often joined with the participle to emphasise its concessive use [see Burton, 437]. As in Diod. Sic., iii. 17. υποτε στὶς αἱ σκότος καὶ ταῖς παρεξήγησις εἰσακουσθεῖν ἀφ' ἐν πίστει, a common form of expression and also a common proverbial saying, of which Weststein gives a number of instances; Herodot. i. 207; Aesch., Agam., 177, τάδ' χαῖς, Dém., 1322 τοι ἂν ματή το πάθη ματήν. Carpzov also quotes several from Philo, as from the De Som., ἐν πάθην ἀκροβατεῖ οἱ ἁμαρτῶν, and De Proph., 25. ἐμαθεν ἀφ' ἐν πίστει. see also Biass, Gram., p. 299 E. Tr.

Ver. 9. καὶ τελειωθείς . . . αἰωνίων "and having [thus] been perfected became to all who obey Him the source [originator] of eternal salvation". τελειωθείς (v. ii. 10) having been perfectly equipped with every qualification for the
priestly office by the discipline already described. Several interpreters (Theodoret, Bleek, Westcott) include in the word the exaltation of Christ, but illegitimately. The word must be interpreted by its connection with ἑκατον ὑπατον; and here it means the completion of Christ's moral discipline, which ended in His death. He thus became αὐτοῖς σωφροσύνης αὐτοῦ author, or cause of eternal salvation, in fulfilment of the call to an eternal priesthood, ver. 6 εἰς τὸν ἄλογον and ver. 10. αὐτοῖς frequently used in a similar sense from Homer downwards, as in Diod. Sic., iv. 82, αὐτὸς ἑκατον τῷ σωφρόνε. Aristoph., Clouds, 85, οὖντι γὰρ ὁ θεός αὐτῶι καὶ τῶν κατών Philo, De Ap., 22, πάντι τοῖς ὑπατου τοῖς ὑπατοῦνῳ καὶ ὑπατοῦνῳ with a reference to the ἔργῳ of ver. 8. The saved must pass through an experience similar to the Saviour's. Their salvation is in learning to obey. Thus they are harmonised to the one supreme and perfect will. This is reversedly given in ii. 10.

Ver. 10. προσαγορευθέναι ... Μελ- χισεδέκ "styled by God High Priest after the order of Melchizedek": "προσαγορευθέναι expresses the formal and solemn ascription of the title to Him to whom it belongs ('addressed as,' 'styled ')" (Westcott). "When the Son ascended and appeared in the sanctuary on High, God saluted Him or addressed Him as an High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, and, of course, in virtue of such an address constituted Him such an High Priest" (Davidson). Originally called to the priesthood by the words of Ps. cx., He is now by His resurrection and ascension declared to be perfectly consecrated and so installed as High Priest after the order of Melchizedek. It may be doubted, however, whether the full meaning of προσαγορευθέναι "address" should here be found. The commoner meaning in writers of the time is "named" or "called". Thus in Plutarch's Pericles, iv. 4, Anaxagoras, ὁ Νοῦ προσαγορευθέναι, xxvii. 2, λαυτοίς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης προσαγα, xxiv. 5, ὁς ἦ όποιος ἢμερας προσαγα, xxiv. 5, of Aspasia, ὁμοίω προσαγορευθέναι. and viii. 2 of Pericles himself, Οικουμενί τοίς προσαγο- ρευθέναι. So in Diod. Sic., i. 51, of the Egyptians, τάφων διδέων ἄλογον προσαγορευθήνων. It cannot be certainly concluded either from the tense or the context that this "naming" is to be assigned to the date of the ascension and not to the original appointment. The emphasis is on the words ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρχιερεύς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελ- χισεδέκ.

II. Περὶ οὖν πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερυθευτος λέγει, ἐπεὶ
null

null
only receive the simplest nourishment. Milk represents traditional teaching, that which has been received and digested by others, and is suitable for those who have no teeth of their own and no sufficiently strong powers of digestion. This teaching is admirably adapted to the first stage of Christian life, but it cannot nourish the Christian. For this, 

Ver. 13. ἐπιλογία γὰρ ὑμῶν γὰρ ἐστι. "For every one who partakes of milk [as his sole diet] is without experience of the word of righteousness; for he is a babe." The reference of ὑμῶν is on, and not of course. It seems intended to substantiate the last clause of ver. 12: "Ye cannot receive solid food, for you have no experience of the word of righteousness." But he softens the statement by generalising it. Every one that lives on milk is necessarily unacquainted with the higher teaching, which is now λάγος δικαιοσύνης, δίκαιος having no experience of, ignorant; as καλότερον δίκαιος, Empedocles in Fairbanks, Phil. of Greece, p. 202. δίκαιος ἰγνόσεως, Babrius, ix. 2; et τὸ ἀγνωστικοῦ, Antiphon, Jebb, p. 8. λάγος δικαιοσύνης, with teaching of righteous conduct the suņing has nothing to do; he cannot act for himself, but can merely live and grow; he cannot discern good and evil, and must take what is given him. Righteousness is not within the suckling's horizon. He cannot as yet be taught; still less can he be a teacher of those who are next to him; for he cannot even speak [ἡγοῦνται = infans], he is an infant. The infant can neither understand nor impart teaching regarding a life of which he has no experience, and whose language he does not know. Indirectly, this involves that the higher instruction the writer wished to deliver was important because of its bearing on conduct. [Other interpretations abound. Chrysostom and Theophylact understand the reference to be either to the Christian life or to Christ Himself and the knowledge of His person. Others, as Beza, Lachmann, many others, take it as "a paraphrase for Christianity or the Gospel, insomuch as the righteousness which avails with God is precisely the contents of the Gospel". Riehm also thinks that the Gospel is meant, "because it leads to righteousness". Westcott understands it of the "teaching which deals at once with the one source of righteousness in Christ, and the means by which man is enabled to be made partaker of it". The view of Carpzov, and also that of Bleek, is governed by the connection of Melchizedek with righteousness. 

Ver. 14. τελείαν δι.'... "But solid food is for the mature, those who, by reason of their mental habits, have their senses exercised to discern good and evil." τελεία commonly opposed in classical and Biblical Greek to νόησις, as in Plato, Laws (p. 666), τὸν ἄγνωστον τὸν νόησιν. Also, p. 96. Aristophanes γὰρ τὸ τόνωμα τῶν ἀνθρώπων λέγει ἡμῖν. Aristotle (Nic. Eth. ii. 5) determines that virtue is neither a δύναμις nor a πάθος, but a ἡμισ, a faculty being something natural and innate, while virtue is not. Plutarch (Moral., 443), following him, defines ἡμίς as καπνοί, ἡμίς ἡμίσσυμον, which resembles Quintilian's definition (x. 1, 1), "firma quaedam facilitas, quae apud Graecos ἡμίσσυμον nominatur". Aristotle (Categor., viii. 1) distinguishes ἡμίς from διάθεσις, τῷ τοῦτο ρυθμωτέρον εἶναι καὶ μορφωτέρον, but elsewhere he uses the word as equivalent to a ἡμίς. Also, he uses it of faculty. ἡμίς, then, is the habitual or normal condition, the disposition or character; and the expression in the text means that the mature, by reason of their maturity or mental habit, have their senses exercised, etc. 

Bleek quotes the definition of the Greek lexicographers and of Damascene ἡμίς to μήλη δι' ἐν ἀλοιθηρίῳ. So Galen in Wetstein, "organs of sense". Here the reference is to spiritual faculties of perception and taste. γνώμηματα ... ἐν θείῳ δοκεῖσθαι ... "exercised so as to discriminate between good and evil," i.e., between what is wholesome and what is hurtful in teaching. [Wetstein quotes from Galen, Di Dignot. Puls., δι μὴ γὰρ τὸ ἀλοιθηρίῳ ἔχει
The child must eat what is given to it; the boy is warned what to eat and what to avoid; as he grows, his senses are exercised by a various experience, so that when he reaches manhood he does not need a nurse or a priest to teach him what is nutritious and what is poisonous. The first evidence of maturity which the writer cites is ability to teach; the second, trained discernment of what is wholesome in doctrine. The one implies the other. Cf. Isa. vii. 16, περὶ γνώσεως τὸ παιδιόν ἄγαθόν ἡ καινή, and Deut. i. 39. Chrysostom says σας ἂν περὶ βίων τῶν λόγων ... ἀλλὰ τὸ διὰ δεῖξεν τοῖς θεράπουσι διὰ διεσθήσεως τα καλα ταπείνων: the whole passage should be consulted.

Chapter VI.—Ver. 1. Aii "wherefore," i.e., because beginnings belong to a stage which ought long since to have been left behind (v. 12), διδότας ... let us abandon [give up] the elementary teaching about Christ and press on to maturity. [01 the use of Αίδων in similar connections Bleek gives many instances of which Eurip., Androm., 393 may be cited: AXXatt|v
[X'I'TT'TpistIT|VTeXcVTr|VftvTO*OVO-OV4>^pTJ*<iriTi|VTlXll^T1|TO
4<pu|ii9a is an expression which was in vogue in the Pythagorean schools. [Westcott and Weiss press the passive. "The thought is not primarily of personal effort ... but of personal surrender to an active influence." But φέρομαι is used where it is difficult to discover a passive sense. It is questioned whether the words are merely the expression of the teacher's resolution to advance to a higher stage of instruction, or are meant as an exhortation to the readers to advance to perfection. Davidson advocates the former view, Peake the latter. It would seem that the author primarily refers to his own teaching. The context and the use of λόγον favour this view. He has been chiding them for remaining so long "babes," able to receive only "milk"; let us, he says, leave this rudimentary teaching and proceed to what is more nutritious. But with his advance in teaching, their advance in knowledge and growth in character is closely bound up. What the writer definitely means by τὸν τ. ἀρχής τ. Χριστοῦ λόγον, he explains in his detailed description of the "foundation," which is not again to be laid. It consists of the teaching that must first be given to those who seek some knowledge of Christ. Westcott explains the expression thus: "the word, the exposition, of the beginning, the elementary view of the Christ"; although he probably too narrowly restricts the meaning of "the beginning of Christ" when he explains it as "the fundamental explanation of the fulfilment of the Messianic promises in Jesus of Nazareth," Weiss thinks the writer urges abandonment of the topics with which he and his readers had been occupied in the Epistle ("also des bisherigen Inhalts des Briefes"). θεματικὰ διεσθήσεων τα καλα ταπείνων: the whole passage should be consulted.

Chapter VI.—Ver. 1. Aii "wherefore," i.e., because beginnings belong to a stage which ought long since to have been left behind (v. 12), διδότας ... let us abandon [give up] the elementary teaching about Christ and press on to maturity. [01 the use of Αίδων in similar connections Bleek gives many instances of which Eurip., Androm., 393 may be cited: AXXatt|v
[X'I'TT'TpistIT|VTeXcVTr|VftvTO*OVO-OV4>^pTJ*<iriTi|VTlXll^T1|TO
4<pu|ii9a is an expression which was in vogue in the Pythagorean schools. [Westcott and Weiss press the passive. "The thought is not primarily of personal effort ... but of personal surrender to an active influence." But φέρομαι is used where it is difficult to discover a passive sense. It is questioned whether the words are merely the expression of the teacher's resolution to advance to a higher stage of instruction, or are meant as an exhortation to the readers to advance to perfection. Davidson advocates the former view, Peake the latter. It would seem that the author primarily refers to his own teaching. The context and the use of λόγον favour this view. He has been chiding them for remaining so long "babes," able to receive only "milk"; let us, he says, leave this rudimentary teaching and proceed to what is more nutritious. But with his advance in teaching, their advance in knowledge and growth in character is closely bound up. What the writer definitely means by τὸν τ. ἀρχής τ. Χριστοῦ λόγον, he explains in his detailed description of the "foundation," which is not again to be laid. It consists of the teaching that must first be given to those who seek some knowledge of Christ. Westcott explains the expression thus: "the word, the exposition, of the beginning, the elementary view of the Christ"; although he probably too narrowly restricts the meaning of "the beginning of Christ" when he explains it as "the fundamental explanation of the fulfilment of the Messianic promises in Jesus of Nazareth," Weiss thinks the writer urges abandonment of the topics with which he and his readers had been occupied in the Epistle ("also des bisherigen Inhalts des Briefes"). θεματικὰ διεσθήσεων τα καλα ταπείνων: the whole passage should be consulted.
of repentance and faith.” But Dr. Bruce returns to the idea that six articles are mentioned as forming the foundation, and Westcott, although adopting the reading διδαχὴς, makes no use of it. Balfour (Central Truths) in an elaborate paper on the passage suggests that only four articles are mentioned, the words, "εὐάγγελον . . . χειρῶν" being introduced parenthetically, because the writer cannot refrain from pointing out that repentance and faith were respectively taught by two legal rites, baptism and laying on of hands. The probability, however, is, as we shall see, that six fundamentals are intended, and that they are not so non-Christian as is sometimes supposed. These six fundamentals are arranged in three pairs, the first of which is μετανοεῖν . . . Θεῷ “repentance from dead works and faith toward God”. Repentance and faith are conjoined in Mark i.15; Acts xx. 21; cf. 1 Thess. i.9. They are found together in Scripture because they are conjoined in life, and are indeed but different aspects of one spiritual act. A man repents because a new belief has found entrance into his mind. Repentance is here characterised as ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἐργῶν. Many explanations are given. ["Hanc vero phrasin apud scriptores Judaicos mihi nondum occurrisselubens fateor" (Schoettgen).] The only other place where works are thus designated is ix.14, where the blood of Christ is said to cleanse the conscience from dead works and thus to fit for the worship of the living God; on which Chrysostom remarks καὶ ητατώδες ἐν Θεῷ, as ifsins were called “dead” simply because they defile and unfit for God’s worship. [On this view Weiss remarks, “wenigstens etwas Richiges zu Grunde.”] Others think that “dead” here means “deadly” or “death-bringing”; so Peirce; or that it is meant that sins have no strength, are “devoid of life and power”; so Tholuck, Alford; or are “vain and fruitless” (Lüdemann). Hofmann says that every work is dead in which there is not inherent any life from God. Similarly Westcott, who says: “There is but one spring of life and all which does not flow from it is ‘dead’. All acts of a man in himself, separated from God, are ‘dead works’.” Davidson thinks that this is “hardly enough,” and adds “they seem so called because being sinful they belong to the sphere of that which is separate from the living God, the sphere of death (ii. 14, etc.).” Rather it may be said that dead works are such as have no living connection with the character but are done in mere compliance with the law and therefore accomplish nothing. They are like a dead fleece laid on a wolf, not a part of his life and growing out of him. Cf. Bleek and Weiss. Such repentance was especially necessary in Jewish Christians. καὶ πίστεως ἐν Θεῷ, the counterpart of the preceding. The abandonment of formal, external righteousness results from confidence in God as faithful to His promises and furnishing an open way to Himself. What is meant is not only faith in God’s existence, which of course had not to be taught to a Jew, but trust in God. Faith is either εἰς, πρὸς, ἢ, or ἐν as union, relation, rest, or direction is meant (Vaughan).

2. The next pair, βαπτίσματα διδαχῆς εὐπνεούσα τε χειρῶν “instruction regarding washings and laying on of hands”. “The historical sequence is followed in the enumeration”. Some interpreters make all three conditions directly dependent on διδαχῆς, “foundation of baptisms, teaching, and laying on of hands”. Bengel makes διδαχῆς dependent on πραγματεία. He says: “πραγματεία διδαχῆς erant baptismi, quos qui suscipiebant, doctrinae sacrae Judaeorum sese addicebant. Itaque adjecto διδαχῆς doctrinae distinguuntur a lotoenum ceteris leviticis.” Similarly Winer (Gramm., p. 240): “If we render βαπτίσματα διδαχῆς of doctrine or instruction, as distinguished from the legal baptisms (washings) of Judaism, we find a support for this designation, as characteristically Christian, in Matt. xxviii.19, βαπτίσματα αὐτοῦ . . . διδακτομετὰ αὐτοῦ.” It is better to take the words as equivalent to διδαχῆς περὶ βαπτίσματος. In N.T. βαπτίσματα is regularly used of Christian baptism or of John’s baptism, while βαπτίσμα is used of ceremonial washings as in ix. 10 and Mk. vii. 4. [Cf. Blass, Gramm., p. 62. Josephus,


(27, 16) uses βαπτίσματος of John's baptism. Probably, therefore, "teaching about washings" would include instruction in the distinction between the various Jewish washings, John's baptism and that of Christ (cf. Acts xix. 2); and this would involve instruction in the cleansing efficacy of the Atonement made by Christ as well as in the work of the Holy Spirit. It was necessary for a convert from Judaism to understand the difference between symbolic and real effusion. The reference of the plural must, therefore, not be restricted to the distinction of outward and inward baptism (Grotius), nor of water and spirit baptism (Reuss) nor of infant and adult baptism, nor of the threefold immersion nor, as Primasius, "pro varietate accipientium." And because the "laying on of hands" was the accompaniment of baptism in Apostolic times. "As through baptism the convert became a member of the House of God, through the laying on of hands he received endowments fitting him for service in the house, and an earnest of his relation to the world to come (vi. 5)" (Davidson, cf. Delitzsch). The laying on of hands was normally accompanied by prayer. Prayer was the essential element in the transaction, the laying on of hands designating the person to whom the prayer was to be answered and for whom the gift was designed. Cf. Acts xix. 1-6; viii. 14-17; xiii. 3; vi. 6; and Lepine's The Ministers of Jesus Christ, p. 143-4. In Apostolic times baptism apparently meant that the baptised believed in and gave himself to Christ, while the laying on of hands meant that the Holy Ghost was conferred upon him. In baptism as now administered both these facts are outwardly represented. "εἰσοδέμνους νεαρούς καὶ κρύπτας αἰωνίου: "restitution of the dead and eternal judgment," "constituting the believer's outlook under which he was to live" (Davidson). The genitives depend on διδαχή, not on διδασκαλία.

Ver. 3. καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν: "and this will we do," that is, we will go on to perfection and not attempt again to lay a foundation. So Theoph.: τὰ αὐτὰ τὴν τελειωτὴν ἔργωσιν. And Primasius: "et hoc faciemus, i.e., et ad majora nos ducemus, et de his omnibus quae enumeravimus plenissime docebimus nos, ut non sit iterum necessis ex toto et a capite ponere fundamentum". Hofmann refers the words to the participial clause, an interpretation adopted even by von Boden ["nämlich abermal Fundament Einsenken"] which only creates superfluous difficulty. The writer, feeling as he does the arduous nature of the task he undertakes, adds the condition, ἵππερ ἐπηρέατη Ὀθαν. This clause is added not as if the writer had any doubt of God's willingness, but because he is conscious that his success depends wholly on God's will. Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 7.

Vv. 4-6 give the writer's reason for not attempting again to lay a foundation. It is, he says, to attempt an impossibility. The statement falls into three parts: (1) A description of a class of persons τούτων, φυλακήν . . . καὶ παραθε-νώτρος. (2) The statement of a fact rejected by Tr., WH and Weiss.

1 τά in NACD'EKL, vg.; omitted in BD gr. P, and rightly rejected by Tr., WH and Weiss.

2 T.R. in BKLN, d, e, f, vg., etc.; ποιησωμεν in ACDEP, Arm. The indicative agrees better with λαττερ, k.t.l.

(27, 5) uses βαπτίσματος of John's baptism. Probably, therefore, "teaching about washings" would include instruction in the distinction between the various Jewish washings, John's baptism and that of Christ (cf. Acts xix. 2); and this would involve instruction in the cleansing efficacy of the Atonement made by Christ as well as in the work of the Holy Spirit. It was necessary for a convert from Judaism to understand the difference between symbolic and real effusion. The reference of the plural must, therefore, not be restricted to the distinction of outward and inward baptism (Grotius), nor of water and spirit baptism (Reuss) nor of infant and adult baptism, nor of the threefold immersion nor, as Primasius, "pro varietate accipientium." And because the "laying on of hands" was the accompaniment of baptism in Apostolic times. "As through baptism the convert became a member of the House of God, through the laying on of hands he received endowments fitting him for service in the house, and an earnest of his relation to the world to come (vi. 5)" (Davidson, cf. Delitzsch). The laying on of hands was normally accompanied by prayer. Prayer was the essential element in the transaction, the laying on of hands designating the person to whom the prayer was to be answered and for whom the gift was designed. Cf. Acts xix. 1-6; viii. 14-17; xiii. 3; vi. 6; and Lepine's The Ministers of Jesus Christ, p. 143-4. In Apostolic times baptism apparently meant that the baptised believed in and gave himself to Christ, while the laying on of hands meant that the Holy Ghost was conferred upon him. In baptism as now administered both these facts are outwardly represented. "εἰσοδέμνους νεαρούς καὶ κρύπτας αἰωνίου: "restitution of the dead and eternal judgment," "constituting the believer's outlook under which he was to live" (Davidson). The genitives depend on διδαχή, not on διδασκαλία.

Ver. 3. καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν: "and this will we do," that is, we will go on to perfection and not attempt again to lay a foundation. So Theoph.: τὰ αὐτὰ τὴν τελειωτὴν ἔργωσιν. And Primasius: "et hoc faciemus, i.e., et ad majora nos ducemus, et de his omnibus quae enumeravimus plenissime docebimus nos, ut non sit iterum necessis ex toto et a capite ponere fundamentum". Hofmann refers the words to the participial clause, an interpretation adopted even by von Boden ["nämlich abermal Fundament Einsenken"] which only creates superfluous difficulty. The writer, feeling as he does the arduous nature of the task he undertakes, adds the condition, ἵππερ ἐπηρέατη Ὀθαν. This clause is added not as if the writer had any doubt of God's willingness, but because he is conscious that his success depends wholly on God's will. Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 7.

Vv. 4-6 give the writer's reason for not attempting again to lay a foundation. It is, he says, to attempt an impossibility. The statement falls into three parts: (1) A description of a class of persons τούτων, φυλακήν . . . καὶ παραθε-νώτρος. (2) The statement of a fact rejected by Tr., WH and Weiss.

1 τά in NACD'EKL, vg.; omitted in BD gr. P, and rightly rejected by Tr., WH and Weiss.

2 T.R. in BKLN, d, e, f, vg., etc.; ποιησωμεν in ACDEP, Arm. The indicative agrees better with λαττερ, k.t.l.
garding these persons ἁδένατον πάλιν ἀνεβαίνειν εἰς τῆς πάρενθεος. (3) The cause of this fact found in some further characteristics of their career ἀνεσπνούμενοι ἐπειδή." 

Ver. 4. First, the description here given of those who have entered upon the Christian life is parallel to the description given in vv. 1, 2 of elementary Christian teaching; although the parallel is not carried out in detail. The picture, though highly coloured, is somewhat vague in outline. "The writer's purpose is not to give information to us, but to awaken in the breasts of his first readers sacred memories, and breed godly sorrow over a dead past. Hence he expresses himself in emotional terms such as might be used by recent converts rather than in the colder but more exact style of the historian" (Bruce). ἁδένατον γάρ: The γάρ does not refer to the immediately preceding clause (Delitzsch) but points directly to τούτῳ ποιήθηκεν and through these words to ἐπὶ τῆς τελ. φημής, the sense being "Let us go on to perfection and not attempt to lay again a foundation, for this would be vain, seeing that those who have once begun and found entrance to the Christian life, but have fallen away, cannot be renewed again to repentance, cannot make a second beginning. 

τῶν ἑκατὸν φωτισθέντων, "those who were once enlightened". τῶν includes all the participles down to παρακολουθότας, which therefore describe one class of persons; and it is governed by ἀνακυκλώνωμεν ἐκείνοις: "once for all" semel (not πάντα = quondam) may be taken as remotely modifying the three following participles as well as φωτισθήσαται. Its force is that "once" must be enough; no πάντα can find place; and it refers back to πάλιν of ver. 1. As forward to πάλιν of ver. 2. φωτισθέντως is used in this absolute way in x. 32 where a comparison with ver. 26 indicates that it is equivalent to τὸ λαβικὸν τῆς ἐπιβίωσες τῆς ἀλληλείας. Cf. also 2 Cor. iv. 4 and Eph. i. 18. The source of the enlightenment is τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ δ φωτιζει πάλιν ἔνθρωπον, the result is repentance and faith, ver. 1. Hatch refers to this passage in support of his contention that the language and imagery of the N.T. are influenced by the Greek mysteries (Hibbert Lect., pp. 295-6). "So early as the time of Justin Martyr we find a name given to baptism which comes straight from the Greek mysteries—the name 'enlightenment' (φωτισμός, φωτιζόμεθα). It came to be the constant technical term." But as Anrich shows (Das antike Mysterienwesen, p. 125) φωτισμός was not one of the technical terms of the mysteries ("Der Ausdruck und Vorstellung und alttestamentlichen"). Of course it is the fact that φωτισμός was used by Justin and subsequent fathers to denote baptism (side Suicer, s.v.), and several interpret the word here in that sense. So the Syrian versions; Theodoret and Theophylact translate by βάπτισμα and λυτρόν. For the use made of this translation in the Montanist and Novatian controversies see the Church Histories, and Tertullian's De Pudic., c. xx. The translation is, however, an anachronism. (In this connection, the whole of c. vi. of Clement's Paedagog. may with advantage be read. ἐφορτίσθησαν τὸ δ' ἐδρῶν ἐνεργοῦν τὸν θεόν. . . . Βαπτισθέντων φωτισθέντων νεοπολισθέντων νεοπολισθέντων τελευτήσαντων.) γενομένους ταὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐννομοῦ "and tasted the heavenly gift" γενομένους here as elsewhere, to know experimentally; cf. ii. 9; Matt. xvi. 29. The heavenly gift, or the gift that comes to us from heaven and partakes of the nature of its source, is according to Chrys. and Glcum: "The forgiveness of sins"; and so, many moderns, Davidson, Weiss, etc.; others with a slight difference refer it to the result of forgiveness "pacem conscientiae quae consequitur peccatorum remissionem" (Grotius). Some finding that ἰδωρά is more than once (Acts ii. 38, x. 45) used of the Holy Spirit, conclude that this is here the meaning (Soden, etc.); while Bengel is not alone in rendering, "Dei filius, ut exprimitur (ver. 6.) Christus, qui per fidem, nec non in sacra ipsius Coena gustatur". Bleek, considering that this expression is closely joined to the preceding by τα, concludes that what is meant is the gift of enlightenment, or, as Tholuck says, "the ἰδωρά is just the Christian <p>
made known as freely bestowed, to the "enlightened". Cf. Rom. v. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 15. καὶ μετάξους γεννήτορας Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost; a strong expression intended to bring out, as Westcott remarks, "the fact of a personal character gained; and that gained in a vital development". The bestowal of the Spirit is the invariable response to faith. The believer is πνευματικός. In chap. x. 29, where the same act ofpersuaded is described, one element of their guilt is stated to be their doing despite to the Spirit of grace. Grotius and others refer the words to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; rather it is the distinctive source of Christian life that is meant. It is customary to find a parallel between the two clauses of ver. 2, βαπτ. ὁ ἅγιος, το χρῖτος, and the two clauses of this verse γενναμ. καὶ μετάχως. There are, however, objections to this idea.

Ver. 5. καὶ καλὸν γενναμένους . . . "and tasted God's word that it is good", βήματα καλά in LXX (vide Josh. xxii. 43) are the rich and encouraging promises of God, cf. Zech. i. 13, βήματα καλά καὶ λόγους παρακλητικοὺς. Here it probably means the Gospel in which all promise is comprehended; cf. 1 Pet. i. 25, βήμα κυρίου. . . τοῦτο δὲ ἐστι, το βήμα τὸ ἀναγεννηθέν εἰς ὄμη. Perhaps the descriptive use of the twotwo cases in LXX and N.T. arises from the tendency of the accusative in later Greek to usurp the place of the other cases. Yet it is not likely that so careful a stylist as our author should have altered the case without a reason. That reason is best given by Simcox (G.l. 4, p. 8), "ἐνεργεία in Heb. vi. 4, signifies the genitive, where it is merely a verb of sense, the accusative where it is used of the recognition of a fact—καλὸν being (as its position shows) a predicate". With this expression may be compared Prov. xxxi. 18, ἄγωντο δὲ καλὸν ἄνυ τῷ ἄργῳ θεοῦ. Bengel's idea that the genitive indicates that a part, while accusative that the whole was tasted, may be put aside. Also Hofmann's idea, approved by Weiss, that the accusative is employed to avoid an accumulation of genitives. δυνάμεις το μελλόντος αὐτο- νομ "and [tasted] the power that was to come" [that they were good, for καλὰ may be supplied out of the καλὸν of the preceding clause; or the predicate indicating the result of the tasting may be taken for granted]. δυνάμεις is so frequently used of the powers to work miracle imparted by the Holy Spirit (see ii. 4, 1 Cor. xii. 28; 2 Cor. xii. 12; and in the Gospels passim) that this meaning is generally accepted as appropriate here. See Lünemann. ἄλων μέλλαν is therefore here used not exactly as in Matt. xii. 32, Eph. i. 21 where it is contrasted with this present age or world, but rather as the temporal equivalent of the ὁλοκληρωμένος of chap. ii. 5. cf. also ix. 11, x. i.; and Bengel's note. It is the Messianic age begun by the ministry of Christ, but only consummated in His Second Advent. A wider reference is sometimes found in the words, as by Davidson. "Though the realising of the promises be yet future, it is not absolutely so; the world to come projects itself in many forms into the present life, or shows its heavenly beauty and order rising up amidst the chaos of the present. This it does in the powers which the world to come, which are like laws of a new world coming in to cross and by and by to supersede those of this world. Those "powers," being mainly still future, are combined with the good word of promise, and elevated into a distinct class, corresponding to the third group above, viz., resurrection and judgment (ver. 2)." The persons described have so fully entered into the spirit of the new time and have so admitted into their life the powers which Christ brings to bear upon men, that they can be said to have "tasted" or experienced the spiritual forces of the new era.

Ver. 6. καὶ παρατεταγμένης, "and fell away," i.e., from the condition depicted
by the preceding participles; "grave verbum subito occurrens" (Bengel). The word in classical Greek has the meaning "fall in with" or "fall upon"; in Polybius, "to fall away from," "to err," followed by τ. δοσι, τ. ἀλήθεια, τ. καθήκοντος; also absolutely "to err." In the Greek fathers the lapsed are called οἱ παραπτωτοί κύριοι οἱ παραπτωτοί. The full meaning of the word is given in ἄποστολής εἰς ἁπέλασιν of x. 39. The translation of the A.V. and early English versions "if they shall fall away," although accused of dogmatic bias, is justifiable. It is a hypothesis that is here introduced. Thus far the writer has accumulated expressions which present the picture of persons who have not merely professed the Christian faith but have enjoyed rich experience of its peculiar and characteristic influence, but now a word is introduced which completely alters the picture. They have enjoyed all these things, but the last thing to be said of them is that they have "fallen from" their former state. The writer describes a condition which he considers possible. And of persons realising this possibility he says ἰδὼν τῆς ἀνακαίνης εἰς μετάνοιαν, "it is impossible to renew [them] again to repentance," "impossible," not "difficult" [as in the Graeco-Latin Codex Claromontanus, "difficile"]: impossible not only to a teacher, but to God, for in every case of renewal it is God who is the Agent. (Bengel says "hominibus est impossible, non Deo," and that therefore the ministers of God must leave such persons to Him and wait for what God may accomplish "per singulares afflictiones et operationes". But cf. x. 26-31.) ταλίν ἀνακαίνης, ταλίν is not pleonastic, but denotes that those who have once experienced ἀνακαίνης cannot again have a like experience. It suggests that the word ἀνακαίνης involves, or naturally leads on to, that all is expressed in the participles under ἄνακαίνητος to ἀλώνοις of ver. 5. A renewed person is one who is enlightened, tastes the heavenly gift, and so on. But as the first stone in the foundation was μετάνοια (ver. 1), so here the first manifestation of renewal is in μετάνοια. The persons described cannot again be brought to a life-changing repentance—a statement which opens one of the most important psychological problems. The reason this writer assigns for the impossibility is given in the words ἀνακαίνητος . . . παραπτώτων, "crucifying [or seeing that they crucify]" to themselves the Son of God, and putting Him to open shame." Edwards understands these participles as putting a hypothetical case, and renders "they cannot be renewed after falling away if they persist in crucifying, etc". This, however, reduces the statement to a vapid truism, and, although grammatically admissible, does not agree with the σήμερα of the parallel passage in x. 26. The mitigation of the severity of the statement is rather to be sought in the enormity and therefore rarity of the sin described, which is equivalent to the deliberate and insolent rejection of Christ alluded to in x. 26, 29, and the suicidal blasphemy alluded to in Mk. iii. 29. On the doctrine of the passage, see Harless, Ethics, c. 29. In classical and later Greek the word for "crucify" is not σταυρόν (of which Stephanus cites only one example, and that from Polybius); but ἀνασταύρων, so that the ἀνασταύρων does not mean "again" or "afresh," but refers to the lifting up on the cross, as in ἀναστάσις or ἀναστάντος. In the N.T. no doubt ἀναστάσις is uniformly used, but never in this Epistle; and it was inevitable that a Hellenist would understand ἀνασταύρων in its ordinary meaning. There is no ground therefore for the translation of the Vulg. "rursum crucifigentes," although it is so commonly followed. Besides, any crucifixion by the Hebrews [ενασώμενος] must have been a fresh crucifixion, and needs no express indication of that feature of it. The significance of ἀναστάσις seems to be "so far as they are concerned," not "to their own judgment" or "to their own destruction." The apostate crucifies Christ on his own account by virtually confirming the judgment of the actual crucifiers, declaring that he too has made trial of Jesus and found Him not true Messiah but a deceiver, and therefore worthy of death. The greatness of the guilt in so doing is aggravated by the fact that apostates thus treat τὸν τ. Ἰησοῦς, cf. x. 29. καὶ τὸν καυσιμωτήρα, the verb is found in Numb. xxv. 4, where it implies ex-
posing to ignominy or infamy, such as was effected in barbarous times by exposing the quarters of the executed criminal, or leaving him hanging in chains. Archilochus, says Plutarch (Moral., 520), rendered himself infamous, δανόν παρεδίψα, by writing obscene verses. The verb is therefore a strong expression; "put Him to open shame" excellently renders it. "This was the crime the Hebrew Christians were tempted to commit. A fatal step it must be when taken; for men who left the Christian Church and went back to the synagogue became companions of persons who, thought they did the meanest service in cursing the name of Jesus" (Bruce).

Vv. 7 and 8 present an analogy in nature to the doom of the apostate.

Ver. 7. γη γάρ ἡ πισταία. . . . ὅτι, "For land which drank in the rain that cometh oft upon it"; this whole clause is the subject of vv. 7 and 8; the subject remains the same, the results are different. It might almost be rendered, in order to bring out the emphasis on γη, "For, take the case of land". Such constructions are well explained by Green (Gram., 34): "The anaarthrous position of the noun may be regarded as employed to give a promissium to the peculiar meaning of the word without the interference of any other idea, while the words to which the article is prefixed, limit by their fuller and more precise description the general notion of the anaarthrous noun, and thereby introduce the determinate idea intended." The comparison of human culture with agriculture is common. Cf. especially Plut., De Educ. Puer., c. 3; and the remarkable lines of the Hecuba, 590-590. To make the comparison with the persons described in vv. 4, 5 apt, the advantageous conditions of the land are expressed in ἡ πισταία κ.τ.λ. The abundant and frequently renewed rain represents the free and reiterated bestowal of spiritual impulse; the enlightenment, the good word of God, the energetic impulse of the Holy Spirit, which the Hebrews had received and which should have enabled them to bring forth fruit to God. πισταία, as in Anacreon's ἣ γη μέλαινα πισταία, and Virgil's (Ec. iii. 3) "sat prata biberunt". Bengel's note, "non solum in superficie" brings out the meaning. The aorist expressing a completed past contrasts with τίτουσα and ἐκφέρουσα continuous presents. καὶ τίτουσα . . . γεωργία, "and produceth herbage meet for those on whose account it is tilled". This is one of the possible results of the natural advantage. τίτουσα βοτάνη are found in classic Greek. See examples in Wetstein and Bleek. ἐβδένων originally "conveniently situated" and hence "suitable" "sit" as in Luke ix. 62. ἐκεῖνος follows ἐβδένων, not τίτουσα. The measure of a field's value is its satisfying the purpose of those on whose account it is tilled. δὲ οὖς, "for whose sake" or "on whose account," not, as Calvin, "quorum opera"; not the labourers, but the owners are intended or those whom the owners mean to supply. καὶ γεωργία, καὶ introduces a consideration which "brings into relief the naturalness of the τίτανεν βοτάνην ἐβδόμον ἐκεῖνοις" (Lünemann). Westcott seems to lean to Schlichting's explanation: "The laborious culture of the soil seems to be contrasted with its spontaneous fruitfulness". Cf. the "justissima tellus" of Vergil, Georg., ii. 460. Land so responding to the outlay put upon it μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπ' τοῦ Θεοῦ, "partakes of a blessing from God". God's approval is seen in the more and more abundant yield of the land. The reality here colours the figure.

Ver. 8. ἐκφέρουσα δὲ . . . "but if it brings forth thorns and thistles it is rejected and nigh unto a curse and its end is burning". The other alternative, which corresponds to the possible state of the Hebrews, is here introduced. With all its advantages, the land may prove disappointing, may not stand the sole test (ἀδύκημος) of land, its production of a harvest. ἀδύκημα καὶ πρίβ. frequently conjoined in LXX, Gen. iii. 17, Hos. x. viii, and expressive of useless and noxious products. [πρίβαλος, frequently πρίβλα, three, originally meaning a caltrop]. ἀδύκημος is used under the influence of the personal reference rather than of the
figure. κατάρας ἐγένετο with a reference to Gen. iii. 18 ἐπικαταράσεως καὶ γῆς, and suggested by the εἰσοδίας of the previous verse. Wetstein quotes from Aristides the expression κατάρας ἐγένετο, and from the ἐγένετο Chrys. and Theophyl. conclude, rightly, that the curse is not yet in action. ἀναλύειν κατάρας δύνησθαι καὶ μαραθὸν γεννήθη, ἣ τὸ τέλος; What is the antecedent? γῆς say, the Greek commentators, Bengel, Riehm, Delitzsch, Lüthenmann, Allord; κατάρας, say Stuart, Bleek, Weiss, von Soden. The former seems distinctly preferable. Cf. Phil. iii. 19, ἐν τῷ τῆς ἐπάλειμος. But here it is ἐκ καρδίας instead of καταράς "for burning," it serves for nothing else, and is thus contrasted with the use served by the productive land. The burning has with an excess of literality been ascribed to the soil itself, and therefore the example of Sodom and Gomorrah has been added. But Grotius is right who finds a metonymy: "de terra dicitur quod propriè iis rebus convenit quae terrae superstant," Reference may be made to Philo, De Agric. c. 4: τὰ ἐπικαταράς καὶ τὰς μῆλα αὐτῶν ἐστειλάτος ἐκεῖ τῶν ὄσιτών τῆς γῆς ἐκλεγόμενως. Cf. John xv. 6. Certainly it points not to a remedial measure, but to a final destructive judgment.

Verses 9-12, sudden transition, characteristic of the author, from searching warning to affectionate encouragement. "Startled almost by his own picture" he hastens to assure the Hebrews that he is convinced it does not represent their present condition. On the contrary he recognises in their loving care of Christ's people a service God cannot overlook and which involves "salvation." They have only to abound in hope as already they are rich in love, and they will no longer be slothful and inanimate but will reproduce in their lives the faith and endurance which have brought others into the enjoyment of the promised and eternal blessing.

Ver. 9. πεπείγομαθα ἡλπίζομαι ἀλλά... "But of you, beloved, we are persuaded things that are better and associated with salvation, though we thus speak." "Alarm at the awful suggestion of his own picture (vv. 4-8) causes a rush of affection into his heart" (Davidson). He hastens to assure them that he does not consider them apostates, although he has described the apostate condition and doom. "This is very like St. Paul's way of closing and softening anything he had said that sounded terrible and dreadful" (Pierce). Cf. a Thess. i. 13; Eph. iv. 20; Gal. v. 10. "The form [πεπείγομαθα] implies that the writer had felt misgivings and overcome them" (Westcott). ως εἰς ὁμολογίας introduced to reassure them and as the natural expression of his own reaction in their favour. κατάρας "things better" than those he has been describing (neither limiting the reference to the condition, although necessarily it is mainly in view, nor to the doom, although the σωτηρία indicates that it also is in view); and things indeed that so far from being καταράς ἐγένετο are ἐκμάκρος σωτηρίας closely allied to salvation. [Cf. Hamlet's "no relish of salvation in it."] ἐκμάκρος = next, from ἐκμακροί. I hold myself to, adhere. So locally Mark i. 36, εἰς τὸν ἐκμάκρους κομψόδολος: temporarily, Acts xxii. 26, τὸ ἐκμάκρους ἑμὸν, here, as in Herodotus, Plato, and Lucian, "pertaining to," so Herod., i. 120, τὰ τῶν ἐνεργῶν ἐκμάκρος, εἰ καὶ καὶ εἰ generally retain in N.T. their distinctive meanings.

Ver. 10. οὗ γὰρ ἄδικος... "For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and the love which ye shewed toward His name in that ye ministered and still do minister to the saints." He recognises in their Christian activities (ἐργόν ὑμῶν) and in their practical charities (τὰς ἐξέπεμπες) things that are associated with salvation, because God's justice demands that such service shall
not be overlooked. God will bless the field which already has yielded good fruit. He will cherish Christian principle in those that have manifested it. To him that hath shall be given. Cf. especially Phil. i. 6. On the doctrinal bearing of the words, see Tholuck in loc.

Ver. 11. ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ ἡκαστὸν ὁμοὶ τὴν αὐ̃θεν ἐνδείκνυσαι σπουδὴν πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐκπίστευ σέ ἀρχή τελῶν. 12. Ινα μὴ νισθοῖ γένησθε, μμηται δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομοῦντων τῶν ἐπαγγελίας.

The translations should therefore be "But we desire": ἡκαστὸν ὁμοίον, "each one of you," not merely as Chrysostom interprets ἔκαστον ὁμοίον, because the love ele to ἄνομα ἀποκρίνεται, because it was prompted not by natural relationship or worldly association but by the consideration that they were God's children and people.

Ver. 11. ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ... You have manifested earnest love, cultivate as earnestly your hope; that is what I desire. The translation should therefore be "But we desire". ἡκαστὸν ὁμοίον, "each one of you," not merely as Chrysostom interprets ἔκαστον ὁμοίον, because the love ele to ἄνομα ἀποκρίνεται, because it was prompted not by natural relationship or worldly association but by the consideration that they were God's children and people.

Ver. 12. Ina μὴ νισθοῖ γένησθε: "that ye become not sluggish," "be not, misses the fine delicacy of the writer" (Alford).

Others before them had crossed it, and found solid land on the other side. There are many who are fairly described as πληροφορία. Whether alive or now dead, they have entered on possession of that good thing which they could not see but which God had promised. Alford, apparently following Peirce, denies that χληρονομοῦντος can mean "who are inheriting," says, "who are inheritors". To this conclusion he is led, as also Peirce, by the consideration that in c. xi. it is said of
Abraham and the other heroes of faith that they did not receive the promise.

But it is also indicated in the same passage that by the coming of Christ the fulness of the promise was fulfilled. It was only "without us" of the Christian period that the patriarchs were imperfect. Those who are presently enjoying the promises attained their present victory and joy, διὰ πίστεως καὶ μαρτυρίας. Necessarily, they first had to believe the promises, but for this to follow up by patient waiting, Alford translates μαρτυρία by "endurance," but this word rather represents ὄργανη, while μαρτυρία indicates the long-drawn-out patience which is demanded by hope deferred.

Vv. 13-20. Reasons for diligently cultivating hope and exercising patience, thus becoming imitators of those who have patiently waited for the fulfilment of the promises, the reasons being that God has made the failure of the promises impossible, and that already Jesus has passed within the veil as our forerunner.

Ver. 13. ὑπὲρ Ἀβραὰμ. ... "For when God made promise to Abraham, since he could swear by none greater, He swear by Himself, saying, etc." Abraham is introduced because to him was made the fundamental and comprehensive promise (cf. Luke i. 73, and Gal. iii.) which involved all that God was ever to bestow. And in Abraham it is seen that the promise is secure, but that only by patient waiting can it be inherited. It is secure because God pledged Himself to perform it. The promise referred to in ἐπαγγελμάτων seems to be that which was confirmed by an oath, and which is recorded in Gen. xxii. 16-18, κατ' ἡμετέρου ὡμοσα μ.τ.λ. But Westcott prefers to consider that previous promises are referred to, as in Gen. iii. 7, xiii. 14, xv. 5, xvii. 5. The aorist participle ἐπαγγ., admits of either construction, ἐπεκάτ' οὔδενος ... ὡμοσα followed by κατά as frequently in classics (Arist., Fros., 94) and LXX, Isa. xiv. 23, Amos iv. 2, viii. 7, Zeph. i. 5, Matt. xxvi. 63. See references. ἐπεκάτ' ... ὡμοσα, a classical use of ὡμοσα from Homer downwards, "to have means or power to do," "to be able". The greater the Being sworn by, the surer the promise. Cf. Longinus, De Subl., c. 16, on swearing by those who died at Marathon. ὡμοσα καθ' ἡμετέρου, how this oath was given, and how the knowledge of it was conveyed to men, this writer does not say. But it was somehow conveyed to the mind of Abraham that the fulfilment of this promise was bound up with the life of God; that it was so implicated with His purposes that God could as soon cease to be, as neglect the fulfilment of it. Lying as it did at the root of all further development, and marking out as it did the true end for which the world exists, it seemed to be bound up with the very being of God. Paul's way of expressing a similar idea is more congruous to our ways of looking at things, cf. 2 Cor. i. 20. Cf. Philo's discussion in De Leg. Allegor., iii. 72, 3.

Ver. 14. The oath runs ἐπεκάτ' ἡμετέρου, ... "Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee." "Sentences which denote assurance ... are in classical Greek introduced by ἐπεκάτ' ἡμετέρον, which in the Hellenistic and Roman period is sometimes written in the form of ἐπεκάτ' (accent ?) ἡμετέρον; so in the LXX and in a quotation from it in Heb. vi. 14" (Blass, Gram., p. 260; and cf. Jannaris, Hist. Greek Gram., 2055.) ἡμετέρον is used to strengthen asseveration, suitably therefore in oaths. On the emphatic participle in imitation of the Hebrew absolute infinitive, see Winer, sec. 45, 8, p. 445. The oath here cited was a promise to bless mankind, a promise that through all history God's gracious purpose should run; that, let happen what might, God would redeem and bless the world.

Ver. 15. καὶ οὖν ἡμετέρον μαρτυρίας ... "and thus having patiently waited he
[Abraham] obtained the promise ". . . in these circumstances; that is, thus upheld by a promise and an oath. The oath warned him of trial. It would not have been given had the promise been a trifling one or had it been destined for immediate fulfilment. Having long kept up his courage and his hope, delay followed delay; disappointment followed disappointment. He was driven out of the promised land, and a barren wife mocked the hope of the promised seed, but he waited expectant, and at length "obtained the promise, for although it was true of him, as of all O.T. saints, that he did not obtain the promise, (for keep up the promise, xi. 39), but could only wave his hand to it and salute it at a distance, yet the initial fulfilment he did see and was compensated for all his waiting by seeing the beginnings of that great history which ran on to the consummate performance of the promise in Christ. Bleek and Rendall understand by " obtained from God a promise of future blessing," and not the thing itself. But in this case would be irrelevant. He had not to wait for the promise, but for its fulfilment. 

Ver. 16. "For men swear by the greater." The procedure of God in confirming His promise by an oath is justified by human custom, and the confident hope which God's oath justifies is the fact that even a human oath ends debate. The oath having among men this convincing power, God disregards the insult implied in any doubt of His word and descending to human infirmity confirms.
His promise by an oath. **ἀμετάφρητον** neuter adjective for adverb (ii. 1) is to be construed with ἐνάθεσις, the meaning of the comparative being "abundantius quam s e juramento factum videretur" (Bengel). Carpzov renders by "ex abundanti," and cites Philo, De Abrahamo c. 46 where the word of God is said to become an oath, ἵνα τὸν θεὸν εὐπορίαν διδοὺ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐκεῖνοι ἐκπροφέροντο ἐπειδή τοις ἐλπισμοῖς, not exclusively, the OT nor exclusively the N.T. heirs, neither Jews nor Gentiles, but all; see ix. 3, and Gal. iii. 29. τὸ ἀμετάφρητον τῆς βουλῆς ἀντί, the unchangeable character of His purpose. (ὁμοθέτως 3 Macc. v. 1, 12; ἤθεν τὸν ἵσεαν ἐπιθυμίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις διδάσκειν.) For use of adjective see Rom. ii. 4, viii. 3; 1 Cor. i. 25, etc. Winer, p. 294.) ἄμεταφρητον δρᾶς, μετονομαζόμενον, belonging to later Greek, "to act as mediator," but sometimes used transitively "to negotiate," as in Polybius xi. 34, 3. Carpzov, De Abrahamento c. 46. Here, however, it is used intransitively as in Josephus, Ant., vii. 8, 5. So the margin of A.V. "interposed himself by an oath," improved in R.V. "interposed with an oath." Cf. Josephus Ant., iv. 6, 7; τοῦτο τὸ αἴτιον ἐλεγον καὶ θεὸν μετείχετο ἐν ὑπηρεσίᾳ οὐκομάνου ἐπιφάνειας. "God descended, as it were, from His own absolute exaltation, in order, so to speak, to look up to Himself after the manner of men and take Himself to witness; and so by a gracious condescension confirm the promise for the sake of its inheritors" (Delitzsch). He brought upon Himself the character of the Mediator; He mediated or came in between men and Himself, through the oath by Himself" (Davidson).

Ver. 18. The motive of this procedure on God's part has already been indicated in βουλέω, but now it is more fully declared: "οὐκ ἔδω ἡ δύο ἀκολούθουσαν τὴς ἀληθείας " that by two immutable things in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement, who fled for refuge to hold fast the hope set before us". The two immutable things are God's promise and His oath. It is impossible for God to break His promise, impossible also for Him to falsify His oath. Both of these were given that even weak men might have strong encouragement. The emphasis is on ὑπαρχον, no ordinary encouragement. Interpreters are divided as to the construction of ἡπαρχον, Bleek, Lünemann, and others maintaining its dependence on παράκλησιν, encouragement to hold fast the hope; while others, as Beza, Tholuck, Delitzsch, Weisse, construe it with καταφύγοντες as in A.V. "who have fled for refuge to the hope". If this latter construction be not adopted, καταφύγειν is left undefined and must be taken in an absolute sense, which is unwarranted. It is the word used in the LXX (Deut. iv. 42, xix. 5; Josh. xx 9) for fleeing from the avenger to the asylum of the cities of refuge. So here Christians are represented as fleeing from the threatened danger and laying hold of that which promises safety. καταφύγειν (sor. of single act) must therefore be rendered "to lay hold of" and not, as in iv. 14, "hold fast". The former meaning is much more frequent than the latter. The προκειμένη ἡπαρχον, the hope, that is, the object of hope is set before us as the city of refuge was set before the refugee and it is laid hold of by the hope it excites. προκειμένη is used of any object of ambition, "de praemiss laboribus accertaminum" (Weststein, with examples). Cf. Col. i. 5, την ἡπαρχήν τὴν ἀπεκτείνουσαν ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς σφάλμασις.

Ver. 19. "καὶ θεοφυλάκια χορον..." "which [hope] we have as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast, and entering into that which is within the veil". As a symbol of God's faithfulness and sureness, it was in ancient times the symbol of hope; see Aristoph., Knights, 1224 (1207) λεπτή τις ἡπαρχής οὕτως ἢ ἢ ἡπαρχή της. "A slender hope it is at which we ride," and Esch., Ag., 488: βροχον θεωρόντος ἡπαρχον many hopes being torn away to the flukes of the anchor). Cf. Paley in loc. Kyphi quotes a saying attributed to Socrates: ὅτι ταυτά ἢ ἢν ἡπαρχεῖν ὅτι ταυτά ἢ μᾶς ἡπαρχεῖν δραμάτων. The symbol appears on ancient coins. ἄφαλής τε καὶ βεβαιάς, unfailing and firmly fixed; negative and positive, have the same confidence reposed in it but will hold firm. ἄφαλής καὶ βεβαιάς, Wisdom, vii. 23. Cebet. Tab., 31. Bleek, Vaughan, Westcott, and
others refer these adjectives to τὐν, not to ἀγκυραν. It seems much more natural to refer them with Chrys., Theoph., etc. to ἀγκυραν. Cf. Vulg.: "Quam sicut anchoram habemus animae tutam ac firmam, et incedentem," and Weizsäcker "in der wir einen sicheren, festen Anker der Seele haben, der hineinreicht," etc. καὶ ἀγκυροφύμην . . . The anchor has its holding ground in the unseen. Some interpreters who refer the former two adjectives to the anchor, find so much strangeness or awkwardness in this term if so applied that they understand it directly of the hope itself. But as Davidson and Weiss show, the eleventh gives the ground of the two former adjectives; it is because the anchor enters into the eternal and unchangeable world that its shifting or losing hold is out of the question. (But cf. also ver. 10). No doubt the figure is now so moulded to conform to the reality that the physical reference is obscure, unless we think of a ship being warped into a harbour on an anchor already carried in. Cf. Weiss. That to which the figure points is obvious. It is in the very presence of God the anchor of hope takes hold. The Christian hope is fixed on things eternal, and is made sure by God's acceptance of it. [Alford quotes from Estius: "sicut ancora navalis non in aquis haeret, sed terram intrat sub aquis haeret, sed terram intrat sub aquis latentem, eique insignitur; ita ancora animae spes nostra non satis habet in vestibulum pervenisse, id est, non est contenita bonis terrenis et visibilibus; sed penetrat usque ad ea, quae sunt intra velum, videlicet in ipsa sancta sanctorum; id est, Deum ipsum et coelestia bona apprehendit, atque in sua figitur." τὸ ἀγκύρον τοῦ καταστάματος, the holy of holies, the very presence of God. καταστάματα (in non-biblical Greek παραστάσιμα) is used in LXX of either of the two veils in the Temple (ὃν δὲ οἱ Παρθανοὶ, Exod. xxvi. 37; Num. iii. 26; and Exod. xxvi. 31; Lev. iv. 6) but καταστάματα, according to Philo, De Vit. Mæs., iii. 5, was the proper designation of the outer veil, καταστάματα being reserved for the inner veil; and in this sense alone it is used in N.T. as ix. 3; Matt. xxvii. 51. See Carpzov in loc. and Kennedy's Sources of N.T. Greek, 113. τὸ ἀγκύρον τ. κ. is therefore the inmost shrine into which the Jewish worshipper could not enter but only the High Priest once a year. For the expression see Exod. xxvi. 33, etc. Ver. 20. The holding-ground of the anchor of hope, the real presence of God, is further described in the words ὅποιον πρόδρομον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεκάκη ἀχριστῷ γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. "whither as forerunner for us entered Jesus" ὅποιον does not occur in N.T. or LXX, διὸν taking its place, as in English "where" often stands for "whither"; see Matt. viii. 19, Luke ix. 57, James iii. 4. So, too, occasionally, in Attic; examples in Bleek. πρὸς ἄρης as an adjective, "running forward with headlong speed," see Jebb's note on Soph., Antig., 107; as a substantive "scouts" or "advanced guard" of an army, Herodot., i. 60, and Wisdom xii. 8, ἀποστείλας τὰ πρόδρομα τοῦ στρατού ὑμῶν σφήμα. The more general meaning is found in Num. xiii. 21, ἥμερας ἐν σφήμα πρόδρομοι στρατοῦ, Isai. xxviii. 4. The idea may be illustrated by ii. 10, Col. i. 18, i Cor. xv. 23. ὅποιον goes better with πρόδρομος— which requires further definition—than with ἀγκυραν, although Bleek, Weiss and others prefer to join it to the verb. Ἰησοῦς, the human name is used, because it is as man and having passed through the whole human experience that Jesus ascends as our forerunner. His superiority to the Levitical priest is disclosed in the word πρόδρομος. When the Levitical High Priest passed within the veil he went as the representative, not as the forerunner of the people. Hence indeed the veil. In Christ the veil is abolished. He enters God's presence as the herald and guarantee of our entrance. The ground of this is given in the concluding clause, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν . . . αἰῶνα, "having become [becoming] an High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek". Jesus carries our hope with Him to the realities which lie within the veil, because it is as our High Priest who has made atonement for sin that He is now at God's right hand. By His death He secured for us power to enter, to follow where He has gone before. The parti-
a Gen. xiv. VII. I  ΟΥΤΟΣ γάρ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ, βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ιερέας τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑδίστου, δὲ συναντήσας Ἀβραὰμ ὁμοτρέφωται ἀνὰ τῆς

1 T.R. only in C*L.P, marked "suspected" by WH; ες in ABCDEK, 17, apparently arising from the following, "ein für unser Verf. unmögliches, völlig unmotivirtes Anakoluth" (Weiss). Alford accepts ες with the anacoluthon.

Chapter VII. The subject of Christ’s priesthood is resumed; the interpolated admonition (v. 11-vi. 20) having been skilfully brought round to a second mention of Melchizedek. The chief reason for introducing the priesthood of Melchizedek as the type of Christ’s priesthood was that it was “for ever.” The Aaronic priesthood was successional, this single; and in this sense “for ever”. There were, however, other reasons. The first question with a Jew who was enjoined to trust to Christ’s priestly mediation, would be, What are His orders? He belonged to a tribe “of which Moses had spoken nothing concerning priesthood”. He might or might not be the true heir to David’s throne; but if He was, did not this very circumstance exclude him from the priestly office? Was it credible that the nation had been encouraged rigorously to exclude from the priesthood every interloper, only in order that at last this rigidly preserved order should be entirely disregarded? This writer seizes upon the fact that there was a greater priest than Aaron mentioned in Scripture—a priest more worthy to be the type of the Messianic priesthood, because he was himself a king, and especially because he belonged to no successional priestly order but was himself the entire order. This idea of a priesthood superseding that of Levi’s sons found its way into Scripture through the hymn (Ps. cx.) which celebrated the dignity (as priest-king) of Simon the Maccabee. Bickell has shown that the first four verses of the Psalm are an acrostic on the name Simon. מִשְׁמַרְתָּם.

When the Maccabees displaced the Aaronic priesthood, they found their justification in the priestly dignity of Melchizedek, and assumed his style, calling themselves “priests of the Most High God”. Cf. Charles, Book of Psalms, pp. lxx. and 191. The chapter may be divided thus:

I. Characteristics of Melchizedek, 1-10.
   1. In himself as depicted in Scripture, 1-3.
   2. In his relation to Levi and his line, 4-10.

II. Inadequacy of Levitical priesthood in comparison with the Melchizedek priesthood of Christ, 11-25.
   1. Levi being provisional, Melchizedek being permanent, 11-14.

III. Summary of the merits of the new Melchizedek Priest, Jesus.

Vv. 1-3. Description of Melchizedek as he appears on the page of Scripture, in five particulars with their interpretation.

Ver. 1. ΟΥΤΟΣ γάρ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ . . . μένει ιερέας αὐτὸ τὸ διανόησε. γάρ closely connects this passage with the immediately preceding words ἀπὸ . . . τὸ ἀλέων and introduces the explanation of them. “For this Melchizedek [mentioned in Ps. cx. and who has just been named as that priest according to whose order Christ is called to be Priest] remains a priest continually.” This is the statement on which he wishes to fix attention. It is the “for-everness” of the priesthood which he means especially to insist upon. The whole order is occupied by himself. This one man constitutes the order. He succeeds no one in office and no one succeeds him. In this sense he abides a priest for ever. Between the subject Melchizedek and the verb μένει, there are inserted five historical facts taken from Gen. xiv., with their interpretation. [On the historicity of Gen. xiv., see Buchanan Gray in Expositor, May, 1898, and Driver, Authority and Archaeology, pp. 45 and 73. See also Beazley’s Dawn of Modern Geography, ii. 189; and esp., Boscawen’s First of Empires, c. vi.] βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, the description given in this verse is taken verbatim [with the needed
Whether Salem stands for Jerusalem or for Salim in the vale of Shechem, John iii. 23, has been disputed from Epiphanius downwards. See Bleek, who contends that Jerusalem cannot be meant because Jebus was its old name. This, however, is now denied, see Moore, Judges, p. 413, who says that the common opinion that Jebus was the native name of the city, has no real ground in O.T. In the Amarna tablets Urusalim is used and no trace is found of any name corresponding to Jebus. But it is not the locality that is important, but the meaning of Salem, Ἱεροῦσαλίμ, "priest of the Most High God". According to Aristotle (Pol., iii. 14), the king in heroic times was general, judge and priest. Cf. Virgil (Aen., iii. 80) "Rex Anius, rex idem hominum, Phoebique sacerdos," and see Gardner and Jevon's Greek Ant., 200, 201. The ideal priesthood is also that of a king. τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ψεφτοῦ. In N.T. "the Most High God" is found in the mouth of Democedes, Mark v. 7; Luke viii. 28; cf. also Acts xvi. 17 and vii. 58, also Luke i. 32, 35, 70, vi. 35. It was a name known alike to the Canaanites, Phoenicians and Heb-ews. See Fairbairn, Studies in the Philosophy of Religion, p. 317. ὑιοὺς was also a title of Zeus, Pind., vi. 2. Cf. also Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 198; and especially Charles' edition of Book of Jubilees, pp. 192, 213, who shows that it was the specific title chosen by the Maccabean priest-kings. ἄρα τῆς κοπῆς "from the slaughter," rather than "overthrow"; "Niederwerfung" (Weissacker); "clades rather than caedes" (Vaughan) translating in Genesis xiv. 17, ἠλέητος, τῶν βασιλέων "the kings"; well-known from Gen. xiv., viii.: Amraphel, Arioch, Chedorlaomer and Tidal, i.e., Khammurabi, Eriaku, Kudur-lagum and Tuchdula. But Boscawen (First of Empires, p. 179) disputes the identification of Amraphel with Khammurabi. The monuments show us that these kings were contemporaries of the second millennium b.c., and furnish many interesting particulars regarding them; see Driver in Authority and Archaeology, pp. 39-45.

καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἐκκατάγα τὸν πάντων ᾿Αβραάμ: πρῶτον μὲν ᾿Ερμηνευόμενον βασιλεὰς δικαιοσύνης, ἕπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλείας Σαλίμ, οὐ δέ τι βασιλείας εἰρήνης.

17, 18, 19. Whether Salem stands for Jerusalem or for Salim in the vale of Shechem, John iii.23, has been disputed from Epiphanius downwards. See Bleek, who contends that Jerusalem cannot be meant because Jebus was its old name. This, however, is now denied, see Moore, Judges, p. 413, who says that the common opinion that Jebus was the native name of the city, has no real ground in O.T. In the Amarna tablets Urusalim is used and no trace is found of any name corresponding to Jebus. But it is not the locality that is important, but the meaning of Salem, Ἱεροῦσαλίμ, "priest of the Most High God". According to Aristotle (Pol., iii. 14), the king in heroic times was general, judge and priest. Cf. Virgil (Aen., iii. 80) "Rex Anius, rex idem hominum, Phoebique sacerdos," and see Gardner and Jevon's Greek Ant., 200, 201. The ideal priesthood is also that of a king. τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ψεφτοῦ. In N.T. "the Most High God" is found in the mouth of Democedes, Mark v. 7; Luke viii. 28; cf. also Acts xvi. 17 and vii. 58, also Luke i. 32, 35, 70, vi. 35. It was a name known alike to the Canaanites, Phoenicians and Heb-ews. See Fairbairn, Studies in the Philosophy of Religion, p. 317. ὑιοὺς was also a title of Zeus, Pind., vi. 2. Cf. also Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 198; and especially Charles' edition of Book of Jubilees, pp. 192, 213, who shows that it was the specific title chosen by the Maccabean priest-kings. ἄρα τῆς κοπῆς "from the slaughter," rather than "overthrow"; "Niederwerfung" (Weissacker); "clades rather than caedes" (Vaughan) translating in Genesis xiv. 17, ἠλέητος, τῶν βασιλέων "the kings"; well-known from Gen. xiv., viii.: Amraphel, Arioch, Chedorlaomer and Tidal, i.e., Khammurabi, Eriaku, Kudur-lagum and Tuchdula. But Boscawen (First of Empires, p. 179) disputes the identification of Amraphel with Khammurabi. The monuments show us that these kings were contemporaries of the second millennium b.c., and furnish many interesting particulars regarding them; see Driver in Authority and Archaeology, pp. 39-45.
3. ἀπάτωρ, ἀμίτωρ, ἀγεναλόγητος: μήτε ἀρχὴν ἁμερῶν, μήτε ᾿Ζωὴς τέλος ἔξων. ἀφομοίωμαν δὲ τῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μένει εἰρεύς.

V. 20. CIS TO Ὀλυτικοῖς, ΟΕῷ ἰκτίκοις οὕτως, ὡς Κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐπωνομαζόντα. Εὐφραίνως ἐν Φετσίν τοῖς, ΞΥΡ., ΑΡΜ.; οἴτινι καὶ θεῳ ΣΥΡ., ΚΩΠ. Αποκεφαλίζω τὸ ἑαυτὸν κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐπωνομαζόντα. Εὐφραίνως ἐν Φετσίν τοῖς, ΞΥΡ., ΑΡΜ.; οἴτινι καὶ θεῳ ΣΥΡ., ΚΩΠ. Ἀποκεφαλίζω τὸ ἑαυτὸν κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐπωνομαζόντα. Εὐφραίνως ἐν Φετσίν τοῖς, ΞΥΡ., ΑΡΜ.; οἴτινι καὶ θεῳ ΣΥΡ., ΚΩΠ. Ἀποκεφαλίζω τὸ ἑαυτὸν κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐπωνομαζόντα. Εὐφραίνως ἐν Φετσίν τοῖς, ΞΥΡ., ΑΡΜ.; οἴτινι καὶ θεῳ ΣΥΡ., ΚΩΠ. Ἀποκεφαλίζω τὸ ἑαυτὸν κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐπωνομαζόντα. Εὐφραίνως ἐν Φετσίν τοῖς, ΞΥΡ., ΑΡΜ.; οἴτινι καὶ θεῳ ΣΥΡ., ΚΩΠ. Ἀποκεφαλίζω τὸ ἑαυτὸν κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐπωνομαζόντα. Εὐφραίνως ἐν Φετσίν τοῖς, ΞΥΡ., ΑΡΜ.; οἴτινι καὶ θεῳ ΣΥΡ., ΚΩΠ. Ἀποκεφαλίζω τὸ ἑαυτὸν κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐπωνομαζόντα. Εὐφραίνως ἐν Φετσίν τοῖς, ΞΥΡ., ΑΡΜ.; οἴτινι καὶ θεῳ ΣΥΡ., ΚΩΠ. Ἀποκεφαλίζω τὸ ἑαυτὸν κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐπωνομαζόντα. Εὐφραίνως ἐν Φετσίν τοῖς, ΞΥΡ., ΑΡΜ.; οἴτινι καὶ θε其它问题 well-posed. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii.64. ἀπατωρικῶς εἰς τῶν κατωρικῶς ἐν αἰεικωνικοῖς εὐχαριστεῖ.
points are emphasised by several details. The first evidence of greatness is that it was no less a man than Abraham who gave him a tithe of the spoils. Abraham is in emphatic place, but the emphasis is multiplied by the position of δέκατά, δέκατην, κ.τ.λ. Not their fellow-Levites, although it is true that the Levites tithed the people, and the priests tithed the Levites (Num. xviii. 21-24 and 25-28), but the words are added in explanation of λαὸς in order to emphasise the fact that the priests exacted tithes not in recognition of any personal superiority. Those who paid tithes were Abraham's descendants equally with the priests; it was merely the law which conveyed the right to tithe their brethren that was greater. It is as if he heard some of his readers saying, "He must be mistaken, or must refer to some other Abraham and not the fountain of all our families and of Levi and Aaron." He adds δειπροτρικίαν to indicate that it is precisely this greatest of men to whom the people owe even their being, of whom he says that Melchizedek was the greatest of men.δειπροτρικίαν is perhaps chosen also for the purpose of magnifying the gift. The Greeks after a victory gathered the spoils in a heap, ἔδρον, and the top or best part of the heap, ἔδρων, was presented to the gods. Cf. Frazer's Pausanias, v. 251.

Ver. 5. The significance of this tithing is perceived when it is considered that, although the sons of Levi take tithes of their brethren, this is the result of a mere legal appointment. Those who pay tithes are, as well as those who receive them, sons of Abraham. Paying tithes is in their case no acknowledgment of personal inferiority, but mere compliance with law. But Abraham was under no such law to Melchizedek, and the payment of tithes to him was a tribute to his personal greatness, καὶ αὐτὸν ἀνεπαύθη Δαβίδ, adds a fresh aspect of the matter. οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἄνδρων Λευτ. . . . "those of the sons of Levi who receive the priestly service have an ordinance to tithe the people in accordance with the law, that is, their brethren, although these have come out of the loins of Abraham." Not all the tribe of Levi, but only the family of Aaron received (cf. v. 4) the ἱεραρχία (also in Lk. i. 9), which Bleek shows to have been used by classical writers of priestly service, while ἱεραρχία was used of the priestly office. See vv. 11, 12, 24, 410. "The best MSS. make the infinitive of verbs in -ων to end in -ῶν" (Westcott and Hort, G., T. ii., sec. 410, and cf. Jannaris, Greek Gram., 851). The verb occurs only in Biblical Greek, the classical form being διδακτιοῦμαι, κατὰ τὸν νόμον follows ἀντοδέκατον. Tοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῶν ἁγίων, κ.τ.λ. Not their fellow-Levites, although it is true that the Levites tithed the people, and the priests tithed the Levites (Num. xviii. 21-24 and 25-28), but the words are added in explanation of λαὸς in order to emphasise the fact that the priests exacted tithes not in recognition of any personal superiority. Those who paid tithes were Abraham's descendants equally with the priests; it was merely the law which conveyed the right to tithe their brethren that was greater. It is as if he heard some of his readers saying, "He must be mistaken, or must refer to some other Abraham and not the fountain of all our families and of Levi and Aaron." He adds δειπροτρικίαν to indicate that it is precisely this greatest of men to whom the people owe even their being, of whom he says that Melchizedek was the greatest of men.δειπροτρικίαν is perhaps chosen also for the purpose of magnifying the gift. The Greeks after a victory gathered the spoils in a heap, ἔδρον, and the top or best part of the heap, ἔδρων, was presented to the gods. Cf. Frazer's Pausanias, v. 251.

Ver. 5. The significance of this tithing is perceived when it is considered that, although the sons of Levi take tithes of their brethren, this is the result of a mere legal appointment. Those who pay tithes are, as well as those who receive them, sons of Abraham. Paying tithes is in their case no acknowledgment of personal inferiority, but mere compliance with law. But Abraham was under no such law to Melchizedek, and the payment of tithes to him was a tribute to his personal greatness, καὶ αὐτὸν ἀνεπαύθη Δαβίδ, adds a fresh aspect of the matter. οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἄνδρων Λευτ. . . . "those of the sons of Levi who receive the priestly service have an ordinance to tithe the people in accordance with the law, that is, their brethren, although these have come out of the loins of Abraham." Not all the tribe of Levi, but only the family of Aaron received (cf. v. 4) the ἱεραρχία (also in Lk. i. 9), which Bleek shows to have been used by classical writers of priestly service, while ἱεραρχία was used of the priestly office. See vv. 11, 12, 24, 410. "The best MSS. make the infinitive of verbs in -ων to end in -ῶν" (Westcott and Hort, G., T. ii., sec. 410, and cf. Jannaris, Greek Gram., 851). The verb occurs only in Biblical Greek, the classical form being διδακτιοῦμαι, κατὰ τὸν νόμον follows ἀντοδέκατον. Tοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῶν ἁγίων, κ.τ.λ. Not their fellow-Levites, although it is true that the Levites tithed the people, and the priests tithed the Levites (Num. xviii. 21-24 and 25-28), but the words are added in explanation of λαὸς in order to emphasise the fact that the priests exacted tithes not in recognition of any personal superiority. Those who paid tithes were Abraham's descendants equally with the priests; it was merely the law which conveyed the right to tithe their brethren that was greater. It is as if he heard some of his readers saying, "He must be mistaken, or must refer to some other Abraham and not the fountain of all our families and of Levi and Aaron." He adds δειπροτρικίαν to indicate that it is precisely this greatest of men to whom the people owe even their being, of whom he says that Melchizedek was the greatest of men.δειπροτρικίαν is perhaps chosen also for the purpose of magnifying the gift. The Greeks after a victory gathered the spoils in a heap, ἔδρον, and the top or best part of the heap, ἔδρων, was presented to the gods. Cf. Frazer's Pausanias, v. 251.

Ver. 5. The significance of this tithing is perceived when it is considered that, although the sons of Levi take tithes of their brethren, this is the result of a mere legal appointment. Those who pay tithes are, as well as those who receive them, sons of Abraham. Paying tithes is in their case no acknowledgment of personal inferiority, but mere compliance with law. But Abraham was under no such law to Melchizedek, and the payment of tithes to him was a tribute to his personal greatness, καὶ αὐτὸν ἀνεπαύθη Δαβίδ, adds a fresh aspect of the matter. οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἄνδρων Λευτ. . . . "those of the sons of Levi who receive the priestly service have an ordinance to tithe the people in accordance with the law, that is, their brethren, although these have come out of the loins of Abraham." Not all the tribe of Levi, but only the family of Aaron received (cf. v. 4) the ἱεραρχία (also in Lk. i. 9), which Bleek shows to have been used by classical writers of priestly service, while ἱεραρχία was used of the priestly office. See vv. 11, 12, 24, 410. "The best MSS. make the infinitive of verbs in -ων to end in -ῶν" (Westcott and Hort, G., T. ii., sec. 410, and cf. Jannaris, Greek Gram., 851). The verb occurs only in Biblical Greek, the classical form being διδακτιοῦμαι, κατὰ τὸν νόμον follows ἀντοδέκατον. Tοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῶν ἁγίων, κ.τ.λ. Not their fellow-Levites, although it is true that the Levites tithed the people, and the priests tithed the Levites (Num. xviii. 21-24 and 25-28), but the words are added in explanation of λαὸς in order to emphasise the fact that the priests exacted tithes not in recognition of any personal superiority. Those who paid tithes were Abraham's descendants equally with the priests; it was merely the law which conveyed the right to tithe their brethren that was greater. It is as if he heard some of his readers saying, "He must be mistaken, or must refer to some other Abraham and not the fountain of all our families and of Levi and Aaron." He adds δειπροτρικίαν to indicate that it is precisely this greatest of men to whom the people owe even their being, of whom he says that Melchizedek was the greatest of men.δειπροτρικίαν is perhaps chosen also for the purpose of magnifying the gift. The Greeks after a victory gathered the spoils in a heap, ἔδρον, and the top or best part of the heap, ἔδρων, was presented to the gods. Cf. Frazer's Pausanias, v. 251.
from the moment of speaking by an interval, it is impossible to render it into English adequately". The point which the writer here brings out is that, although Abraham had the promises, and was therefore himself a fountain of blessing to mankind and the person on whom all succeeding generations depended for blessing, yet Melchizedek blessed him; and as the writer adds:

Ver. 7. χωρίς δὲ πάσης δυνατούς ἐχει λογοτεχνίαν ὅτι ὁ προφήτης τὸν καὶ τὸν άριστον τὸς ἐπιγγέλοντος εὐλογεῖ. "And without any dispute the less is blessed of the greater." Therefore, Abraham is the less, and Melchizedek the greater. The principle [expressed in its widest form by the neuter] applies where the blessing carries with it not only the verbal expression of goodwill, but goodwill achieving actual results. But man blesses God in the sense of praising Him, or desiring that all praise may be His. So God is ἐκλογητός, Mk. xiv. 61. Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 31, etc.

Ver. 8. Another note of the superiority of Melchizedek. καὶ δὲ μὴν δεκάτας ... ὑποτελεῖται. "And here men that die receive tithes, but there one of whom it is witnessed that he liveth." ἤδη "here," i.e., in this Levitical system with which we who are Hebrews are familiar, "there" in that system identified with that ancient priest. Προβοδοστοι, "dying men," who therefore as individuals passed away and gave place to successors, and were in this respect inferior to Melchizedek, who, so far as is recorded in Scripture, had no successor. Giving to the silence of Scripture the force of an assertion, the writer speaks of Melchizedek as μαρτυρούμενος δι' ἑαυτοῦ, a person of whom it is witnessed; note absence of article. So Theoph., of ἡμῖν μη μηκομημονδεῖ τῇ τελευτηι τοῦ παρὰ τῇ γραφῇ. Westcott distinguishes between the plural of this verse, δεκάτας, appropriate to the manifold tithings under the Mosaic system and the singular, δεκάτην, of ver. 4, one special act.

Ver. 9. καὶ ὡς ἔστω εἰσέλθην, "And, I might almost say," adding a new idea with a phrase intended to indicate that it is not to be taken in strictness. It is frequent in Philo, see examples in Carpozov and add Quis rer. div. her., 3. Adam's note on Plato, Apol. Soc., 174, is worth quoting "ὡς ἔστω εἰσέλθην ἵνα πανε ἀλλήλων χωρὶς οὐκ ἔστω εἰσέλθην ἵνα πάντως ἔστω ἐν λαῷ. "A significant use occurs in the Republic, p. 341b, where Socrates asks Thrasymachus whether in speaking of a "Ruler" he means τὸν ὡς ἔστω εἰσέλθην ἓν ἄνθρωπον and not ἑν οὐκ ἔστω εἰσέλθην τοῖς ἅπασι δικαίοις. The phrase is discussed at great length by Raphael. The further idea is, that "through Abraham even Levi, he who receives tithes, has paid tithes," the explanation being ἐν γὰρ ἐν τῇ τουτοτιστι παρὰ τῇ ἀρμοδίᾳ, ... for he [Levi] was yet in the loins of his father [Abraham] when Melchizedek met him," Isaac not yet having been begotten. There was a tendency in Jewish theology to view heredity in this realistic manner. Thus Schoettigen quotes Ramban on Gen. v. 2 "God calls the first human pair Adam [man] because all men were in them potentially or virtually [virtualiter]." And so some of the Rabbis argued "Eodem peccato, quod peccavit primus homo, peccavit totus mundus, quoniam hic erat totus mundus." Hence Augustine's formula "peccare in lombis Adam," and his explanation "omnes fuimus in illo uno quando omnes fuimus ille unus" (De Civ. Dei, xiii. 14). On Traducianism see Loofs' Leitfaden, p. 194.

Vv. 11-14. The imperfection of
the Levitical priesthood, and by implication of the whole Mosaic system, proved by the necessity of having a priest of another order.

Ver. 11. εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις διὰ τῆς λευτερικῆς ἱεροτύνης ἐν τῷ λαῷ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ ¹ νεομοβέτητος ² τὸς ἁπάντως, "κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελημευδέκα" ἔτερον ἀνυποτάσσας ἰερέα, καὶ οὐ "κατὰ τὴν τάξιν ἀραβῶν" λέγεσθαι; 12. μετατάξεται γὰρ τῆς ἱεροτύνης, ζε ἀνάγκης καὶ κόμῳ μετάθεσις γίνεται. 13. εἰ δὲ γὰρ

¹ T.R. in DeE*KL, Chrys., Thdrt.; ἐπ αὐτῆς in ΣΕΤΟΠΕΠ, 17, 31, 37, 46, 73, 118.

² T.R. in DeEKL; νεομοβέτητος in ΣΕΤΟΠΕΠ.

Exod. xxiv. 12, τὰς ἄντολας δὲ ἐγράψα, νομοθετήσαι αὐτοῖς. Sometimes it is followed by accusative of that which is ordained by law. The use of the passive here is peculiar, cf. also viii. 6. The νόμος contained in the word, and expressed separately in ver. 12, is not the bare law contained in commandments, but the whole Mosaic dispensation. τὸς ἁπάντως, this use of ἁπάντως is justified by an instance from Sextus Empiricus quoted by Wetstein: τὸς ἁπάντως ἄνθεκτοιναῦτα, ἔτερον, not ἄλλων, but another of a different kind. ἀνεπαρθενωθεὶς so Acts xvii. 18, ἀνεπάρκεια βασιλείων ἐτέρος and cf. the intransitive use in Acts ii. 24, 32, iii. 22, 26, vii. 37. καὶ οὐ ... λέγεσθαι. The negative belongs rather to the description κ. τ. τάξιν 'Α., than to the verb and Burton's rule (481) applies. "When a limitation of an infinitive or of its subject is to be negatived rather than the infinitive itself, the negative οὐ is sometimes used instead of μὴ."

Ver. 12. μετατάξεται γὰρ ... "For if the priesthood is changed, there is of necessity a change also of the law" (Davidson). On the rendering of ᾧ see Sonnenschein's Greek Gram., 355. Obs. 3. οὐλύθη γὰρ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νομοθετήτα, the omitted clause is "and we are justified in demanding perfectness from the priesthood," because it is the soul of the legislation. All the arrangements of the law, the entire administration of the people, involves the priesthood. If there is failure in the priestly service, the whole system breaks down. It was idle to give a law without providing at the same time for the expiation of its breaches. The covenant was at the first entered into by sacrifice, and could only be maintained by a renewal of sacrifice. The priesthood stood out as the essential part of the Jewish economy, νομοθετήσιν to be a νομοθέτης used in classics sometimes with dative of person, as in LXX, Sextus Empiricus quoted by Wetstein: τὸς ἁπάντως ἄνθεκτοιναῦτα, ἔτερον, not ἄλλων, but another of a different kind. ἀνεπαρθενωθεὶς so Acts xvii. 18, ἀνεπάρκεια βασιλείων ἐτέρος and cf. the intransitive use in Acts ii. 24, 32, iii. 22, 26, vii. 37. καὶ οὐ ... λέγεσθαι. The negative belongs rather to the description κ. τ. τάξιν 'Α., than to the verb and Burton's rule (481) applies. "When a limitation of an infinitive or of its subject is to be negatived rather than the infinitive itself, the negative οὐ is sometimes used instead of μὴ."

Ver. 13. This enormous change is in fact being made. ἐπ' δὲ γὰρ λέγομεν ταῦτα ... "For He with reference to whom this [xv. Ps. 4] is said hath partaken of another tribe from which no man hath given attendance at the altar". Here for the first time definitely in this chapter the writer introduces the fulfilment of the Psalm. It was spoken of the Messiah, and He did not belong to the tribe of Levi, but
VII.

I have been characterised by this, that from it αφ', ἀφ' issuing from which, not έξ, [as in ver. 14] no one has given attendance at the altar. [Cf. Ι. Τim. iv. 13; Acts xx. 28; Hdt., ix. 33, γυμνασίως; Thuc., i. 15, τοις ναντικίοις; and the equivalent in Ι. Cor. ix. 13, οί τῷ θυσιαστήριῳ προσε- ερέωντες.] It is doubtful whether the perfect υπερχάρακτος can bear the meaning put upon it by Vaughan: "a striking suggestion of the identity of Christ in heaven with Christ upon earth." So Weiss. It might seem preferable to refer it with Burton (88) to the class of perfects which in the N.T. have an aorist sense, ήπερχάρακτος. So Weizsäcker "gehörte"; the Vulgate, however, has "de alia tribu est," and cf. ανατελέσκειν of ver. 14. But the perfects are best accounted for as referring to the statement of the previous verse. This great change is being made, for he of whom the 110th Psalm was spoken has actually become a member of another tribe. The result reaches to the change of priesthood.

Ver. 14. He now proceeds to name the tribe έρημών γάρ δι; . . . "For it is evident that out of Judah our Lord has sprung, concerning which tribe Moses said nothing about priests." With έρημών may be compared δήσεων of ii. 16. The facts of our Lord's birth were so far known that everyone connected Him with Judah. The accounts of Matthew and Luke were accepted (cf. Rev. v. 3). This fact of his origin would naturally militate against His claims to be Priest; but this writer here skilfully reconciles them with Scripture. Weizsäcker translates by "längst bekannt" giving to έπρο τό τῷ τον θυσιαστήριῳ προμηθέων τό διραμένα ἀνεβάζεται, αμφότεροι, and from Polyænus τι καὶ ἐξωθόνη τοις ἀνατελέσκειν is possibly a reminiscence of Zech. vi. 12, ἰδοὺ ἄνευ Ἀνατολή δυναμῶν αὐτῷ· καὶ ἰποκατάθεντι αὐτὸν ἀνατελέσκειν, a passage referred to by Philo, see Carp. in loc. έξ έν έν πολλάκιας that is applied to the direction of the thought, as Acts ii. 25. Διὰ τὸ λέγει έν εὐθύνοις, aiming at Him, E. i. 10, v. 32." Winier, 49, and so in Dion. Hal., πόλλαλλά λέξεσσαν εν τότε λέγοι, and cf. our own expression, "He spoke to such and such points." Vulg. translates "in qua tribu". Whatever Moses spoke regarding priests was spoken with reference to Judah. Weiss says, It is, that an alteration of the priesthood has been made. Similarly Vaughan, "And this insufficiency and consequent supersession of the Levitical priesthood is still more conclusively proved by the particular designation of the predicted priest (in Ps. cxix. 4) as a priest, etc."

Vv. 15-19. Imperfection of the Levitical priesthood more abundantly proved by contrast with the nature of the Melchizedek priest.

Ver. 15. καὶ περισσότερον έτι κατάδρομον ἀστιν. "And more abundantly still is it evident" [Weizsäcker excellently "Und noch zum Ueberfluss weiter liegtdie Sache klar". What is it that is more abundantly evident? Weiss says, It is, that an alteration of the priesthood has been made. Similarly Vaughan, "And this insufficiency and consequent supersession of the Levitical priesthood is still more conclusively proved by the particular designation of the predicted priest (in Ps. cxix. 4) as a priest, etc." So too Westcott. But from the twelfth verse the argument has been directed to show that there has been a change of law, and this argument is continued in ver. 15. This change of law is evident from the fact that Jesus belongs to the non-Levitical tribe of Judah, and yet more superabundantly evident from the nature of the new priest who is seen to be no longer "after the law of a carnal commandment." So Bleek after Ecumenius, Davidson, Farrar and others. κατάδρομον, quite evident, as in Xen., Mem., i. 4, 14, οὐ γάρ τάν κατάδρομον έτι λέγεται; Weststein quotes from Hippocrates, ζητεῖ δὲ μᾶλλον κατάδρομον γίνεται. In έρημών the preposition has the force of "ob" in "obvious"; in
Melchizedek, in the preposition strengthens, 

κατὰ τὸν τέμνον τοῦτον, "who has become such not after the law of a fleshly ordinance but after the power of an indissoluble life". This relative clause defines the "likeness to Melchizedek," and brings out a double contrast between the new priest and the Levitical: the Levitical priesthood is κατὰ τὸν νόμον, the other κατὰ τὸν τάξιν, of previous verses changed now into κατὰ τὸν τάξιν, because attention is directed to the similarity of nature between Melchizedek and this new priest.

Ver. 16. δὲ οὗ κατὰ τὸν νόμον... ἀκατάλληλον, "who has become such not after the law of a fleshly ordinance but after the power of an indissoluble life". This relative clause defines the "likeness to Melchizedek," and brings out a double contrast between the new priest and the Levitical: the Levitical priesthood is κατὰ τὸν νόμον, the other κατὰ τὸν τάξιν, of previous verses changed now into κατὰ τὸν τάξιν, because attention is directed to the similarity of nature between Melchizedek and this new priest.

Ver. 17. That Jesus carries on His work perennially is proved by Scripture. "For it is witnessed Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek," not merely as in ver. 16, κατὰ τὸν τάξιν, although this itself involves the perpetuity of the priesthood, but expressly and emphatically κατὰ τὸν τάξιν. Vv. 18 and 19 taking up the idea of ver. 16 affirm the negative and positive result of the superseding of the fleshly ordinance by the power of an indissoluble life. On the one hand there is an ἄλλην ἀνάλογον ἀνάλογον, "a setting aside of a foregoing enactment," that namely which is referred to in ver. 17, and on the other hand, there is "a further bringing in of a better hope".

1 T.R. in CorDcEK; σαρκίζεις in ΧΑΒCD*LP.
2 T.R. with CDcE**KL; μαρτύρεται in ΧABD*E*P.
behalf of bringing men to God. The

μὲν ... δὲ indicate that the sentence
must thus be construed, and not as
rendered in A.V. The reason of this
replacement of the old legal enactment
is given in the clause, διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς
ἀδερφῆς καὶ ἀνωφελῆς "on account of
its weakness and uselessness". This
arrangement depending on the flesh was
helpless to achieve the most spiritual of
achievements, the union of man with
God, the bringing together in true
spiritual fellowship of sinful and earthly
man with the holy God. So Paul found
that arrangements of a mechanical and
external nature were ἄρᾳ ὁμοίως ἑξοσμένων
"in that proportion uselessness" (unhelplessness) of the priesthood was
proved by its inability to aid men in
that ἐγγίζειν τῷ Θεῷ, which is their
one want" (Vaughan). The ordinance
regulating the priesthood failed to ac-
complish its object; and indeed this
characterised the entire system of which
it was a characteristic part. οὐδὲν
γὰρ ἐπέλευσεν ὁ νόμος, "for
nothing was brought to perfection by
the law". The law made beginnings,
taught rudiments, gave initial impulses,
hinted, foreshadowed, but brought no-
ting to perfection, did not in itself pro-
vide for man's perfect entrance into God's
fellowship. Therefore there was intro-
duced that which did achieve in perfect
form this reconciliation with God, viz.:

a better hope, which is therefore defined
as διὰ τῆς ἐγγίζειν τῷ Θεῷ, "by which
we draw near to God". The law said
(Exod. xix. 21) διαμάρτυραὶ τῷ λαῷ
μὴ ἡμῖν ἐγγίζωσιν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν. The
"better" hope is that which springs
from belief in the indestructible life of
Christ and the assurance that that life is
still active in the priestly function of
intercession. It is the hope that is
anchored within the veil fixed in Christ's
person and therefore bringing us into
God's presence and fellowship.

Vv. 20-22. Another element in
the superiority of the covenant estab-
lished upon the priesthood of Jesus is
that in the very manner of the institution
of His priesthood it was declared to be
permanent. The long parenthesis of
ver. 21 being held aside the statement
of 20-22 reads thus: "And [in reduc-
ing a fresh consideration] in proportion as
not without an oath [was He made
priest]... in that proportion better is
the covenant of which Jesus has become
the surety". The parenthesis of ver.
21 is inserted to confirm by an appeal to
Scripture [Ps. cx. 4] the fact that by the
swearing of an oath the Melchizedek priest
was appointed, and to indicate the
significance of this mode of appointment,
περιτ.: that repentance or change of plan
is excluded. That is to say, this
priesthood is eternal. And the
superiority of the priesthood involves
the superiority of the covenant based
upon it. The oath signifies therefore
the transition from a provisional and
temporary covenant to that which is
eternal. καθ' ὅσον. This form of
argument is frequent in Philo, see Quis.
Rev. Div. H., 17, etc. οὐ χαρίς
ἀρχηγοίς, "not without oath-
swearing"; the clause may be completed
from that which follows, "has he been
made priest," as in A.V., although
Weiss maintains that this is "sprach-
widrig" and that the broken clause
"kann natürlich nur aus dem Vorigen
ergänzt werden". But it is most natural
and grammatical to complete it from
the sentence in which it stands: "As
not without an oath, so of a better
covenant has Jesus become surety".
The parenthesis thus furnishes the
needed ground of this statement. He
became surety by becoming priest, and
as priest he was constituted with an
oath, οὐ μὴν γὰρ "For the one [that
is, the Levitical priests] ἐστὶν ἱερεῖς
γεγονότες "have been made priests"
Vaughan renders "are having become
priests—are priests having become so".
So Delitzsch, Weiss and von Soden.
Westcott says: "The periphrasis marks
the possession as well as the impartation
of the office;" and on the "periphrastic
conjugation" see Blass, sec. 62; Ste-
phanus Thesaurus s.v. εἰλικρίνεια, and cf. Acts
xxi. 29, ἐπὶ γὰρ προσκομίσατε... δὲ εἰς μετὰ ὀρκ.; "but the other [the new priest] with an oath," metà of course not being instrumental, but "interposito jurejurando"; where and how this oath is to be found is next explained, it is δὲ τὰ ἀνέγγυστα... "through Him that saith to him. The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art," etc. There is no call to translate πρὸς αὐτὸν "in reference to Him"; neither is there any difficulty in referring the words Ἰωσε... μεταμ. to God. "Though the words are not directly spoken by the Lord, they are His by implication. The text is His" (Westcott). On the distinction between μετανοεῖ and μεταμελεῖ see Trench, Synonyms, 241. "He who has changed his mind about the past is in the way to change everything; he who has an after care may have little or nothing more than a selfish dread of the consequences of what he has done." This, however, does not apply to the LXX (from which the quotation of this verse is taken) where both words are used to translate πάρος. Cf. I Kings xv. 29 and 35. καὶ τὸ τοσοῦτο "by so much," that is, the superiority of the new covenant to the old is in the ratio of eternity to time, of what is permanent and adequate to what is transitory and provisional. ΠΡΩΣ ἘΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ 315

18—22.

1 T.R. in ΝΔΕΚΛP, d, e, Copt., Syriut, Aeth.; om. καὶ τὸ ταξίν Μέλχ. with ΝΧBC, 17, 80, f, vγ, Sah., Basm., Arm.

2 T.R. ΝΔΕΚΛ; τοσοῦτον with ΝΧABC, 17, 23, 39, 115. Both forms found in Attic though τοσοῦτον is more frequent. See Blass, Gram., p. 36.

Ver. 22. ἵππος in classical Greek means a disposition (διαθήκη) of one's goods by will; frequent in the orators and sometimes as in Aristoph., Birds, 439, a covenant. In the LXX it occurs nearly 280 times and in all but four passages it is the translation of μεταμ. "covenant". (See Hatch, Essays in Bibl. Greek, 47.) It is used indifferently of agreements between men and of contracts or engagements between God and man. See Introduction and on ix. 16 and Thayer s.v. Of this "better covenant" Jesus "has become and is:" [γενόμενον] γεγονὸς "surety". Γεγονός is explained in the Greek commentators by γεγονήσις, which is the commoner of the two forms, at least in later Greek. Γεγονὸς occurs several times in the fragments from the second century b.c. given in Grenfell and Hunt's Greek Papyri, series ii.; also in the fragments from first century a.d. given in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. It is not the exact equivalent of μεταθέτως (found in a similar connection viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24) which is a more comprehensive term. It has been questioned why in this place γεγονὸς is used, and Peirce answers: "I am apt to think he was led to this by his having just before used the word γεγονός, and that he did it for the sake of the paronomasia". And Bruce says: "There is literary felicity in the use of the word as playfully alluding to the foregoing word γεγονός. There is more than literary felicity, for the two words probably have the same root, so that we might render γεγονός, the one who insures permanently near relations with God." More likely he chose the word because his purpose was not to exhibit Jesus as negotiating the covenant, but especially as securing that it should achieve its end. It has been debated whether it is meant that Jesus was surety for men to God, as was held by both Lutheran and Reformed writers, or with others (Grotius, Peirce, etc.), that He was surety for God to men ["His being a surety relates to His acting in the behalf of God towards us and to His assuring us of the divine favour, and to His bestowing the benefits promised by God" (Peirce)] or, with Limborch, Baumgarten and Schmid (see Bleek) that he was surety for both
parties. There is no reason to suppose that the writer particularised in any of these directions. He merely wished to express the thought that by the appointment of Jesus to the priesthood, the covenant based upon this priesthood was secured against all failure of any of the ends for which it was established.

Vv. 23-25. Another ground of the perfection of the new priesthood is found in the continued life of the priest, who ever lives to make intercession and can therefore save completely, whereas the Levitical priests were compelled by death to give place to others.

Ver. 23. καὶ, as above, ver. 20, introducing a new element in the argument. οἱ μὲν, as in ver. 21, the Levitical priests, πλείονες . . . “have been made priests many in number,” not many at one and the same time [Delitzsch], although that also is true, but many in succession, as is shown by the reason assigned in τὸ θανάτῳ καμίνως θανατοῦ. παραμένειν “because of their being prevented by death from abiding” “in their office,” Peirce, as Οἰκονόμιος, ἐν τῇ ἑρμηνίᾳ διδομένη. Others think that remaining in life is meant. Possibly πλείονες is used instead of πολλοί, because there is a latent comparison with the one continuing priest, or with those already priests; always more and more. He, on the contrary, ὁ δὲ, by reason of his abiding for ever ἀπάραβατον ἐξει τῇ ἑρμηνίᾳ “has his priesthood inviolable,” that is, no other person can step into it. The form of expression is similar to that used by Epiphanius of the Trinity, ὁ δὲ ἀπάραβατον ἐξει τῆς φύσεως. The meaning of ἀπάραβατον is contested, some interpreters (Weiss, etc.) supposing that it signifies “indefeasible,” or “untransmitted” or “non-transferable.” Indeed, Οἰκονόμιος and Theophylact translate it by ἄδδονον. But in every instance of its occurrence given by Stephanus and Wetstein it has a passive sense, as νόμος, δόγμα, etc., ἀπάραβατον, and means unalterable or inviolable. This suits the present passage perfectly, and returns upon the thought of ver. 3, that the new priest is sole and perpetual occupant of the office, giving place to no successor. δὲν, “whence,” i.e., because of His having this absolute priesthood; His saving power depends upon His priesthood. He is able καὶ σωζεῖν εἰς τὸ τοιοῦτον, “even to save to the uttermost,” not to be referred merely to time as in Vulgate “in perpetuum,” and Chrysostom, οὐ πρέπει τὸ παρόν μόνον φυσικὲν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ μελλοντίᾳ τιμίᾳ, if referred to time, it might mean either ability to save the individual eternally, or to save future generations. Peirce joins it with διὸ τοῦτον, and renders “whence also he is perpetually able to save.” But the phrase uniformly means “completely,” “thoroughly,” as in Luke xiii. 11 of the woman, μὴ δυναμένη ἀνακάθιστα εἰς τὸ τοιοῦτον and in the examples cited by Wetstein. This, as Riehm shows (p. 613, note), includes the idea of perpetuity. The Levitical priests could not so save: no παλαιός was achieved by them; but everything for which the priesthood existed, everything which is comprised in the great [v. 3] and eternal [v. 9] salvation, the deliverance [v. 15] and glory [v. 10] which belong to it, are achieved by Christ. The objects of this saving power are τοὺς προσεχομένους δι’ αὐτοῦ τῇ Θείᾳ, “those who through Him approach God”; “through Him” no longer relying on the mediation of Levitical priests, but recognising Jesus as the “new and living way.” x. 19-22. This complete salvation Jesus can accomplish because κατότον ὅ ἐστιν . . . τοῦτον, “ever living to intercede on their behalf.” The particular meaning in which His eternal priesthood applies itself to those who through Him approach God is that He intercedes for them, thus effecting their real introduction to God’s presence and their acceptance by Him, and also the supply of all their need out of the Divine fulness. ἀνυπνόητον, “to meet by chance,” “to light upon,” takes as its second meaning, “to converse


with " (followed by dative), hence "to entreat one to do something" (Plut., Pompt., 55; Ages., 25), and when followed by περι (Polyb., iv. 76, 9) or by ὑπὲρ (Plut., Cato Maj., 9) "to intercede". (See Liddell and Scott.) It is not the word itself, but the preposition following, that gives the idea of intercession. The word with a different preposition can be used in the sense of appealing against, as in Rom. xi. 2, ὡς ἐντυγ. τ. Θεῷ κατά τ. Ἰσραήλ, see also 1 Mac. xi. 25. With ὑπὲρ it occurs in Rom. viii. 27, 34, and with περὶ in Acts xxv. 24. Christ, then, treats with God in our behalf, and He lives for this. As His life on earth was spent in the interests of men, so He continues to spend Himself in this same cause. He ever lives, and being "the same yesterday, to-day and for ever" (xiii. 8) His present fulness of life is devoted to those ends which evoked His energies while on earth. He secures that the fulness of Divine resource shall be available for men. "All things are ours." This intercession is not the same as the Atoning sacrifice and its presentation before God, which was accomplished once for all (ix. 26, x. 18); but it is based upon the sacrifice which is also to men the guarantee that His intercession is real, and comprehensive of all their needs. [Cf. Sir Walter Raleigh’s Pilgrimage.]

Vv. 26-28. A summary description of the Melchizedek ideal priest, drawn in contrast to the Levitical High Priest, and realised in the Son who has been perfected as Priest for ever. Melchizedek is here dropped, and the priesthood of the Son is now directly contrasted with that of the Aaronic High Priest.

Ver. 26. Τοιούτως γὰρ... ἀρχιερεύει. "Such seems to refer to the Melchizedek character delineated in the preceding part of the chapter, or to all that was said of the nature and character of the Son from iv. 14 onward. The sense will not differ if it be supposed to refer to the epistles and statements that follow, for these but summarise what went before" (Davidson and others). But it must not be overlooked that ἀγας (ver. 27) is one of the usual relatives after τοιοῦτος (cf. viii. 1, and Soph., Antig., 631, λόγος τοιοῦτος οἶο; cf. also Longinus, De Sublim., ix. 2. So that Farrar’s statement on chap. viii. i, "τοιοῦτα is prospective, τοιοῦτος is retrospective," is incorrect), and that the adjectives ἄγας, κτλ. prepare for and give the ground of the statement made in the relative clause. The sentence therefore reads: "So great a high priest as need not daily, etc., became us," ἐκ τῆς προς τετελειωμένην, not, as in viii. 1, τοιοῦτον ἀρχιερεία (cf. iv. 14, 15), because the writer wishes to draw attention to the needs of those for whom the priest was appointed (ἢν emphatic) and his suitableness to those needs. We, being what we are, sinful and dependent on the mediation of others, need a priest in whom we can wholly trust, because He Himself is holy, separate from sinners, without human weakness. Westcott’s distribution of the terms is neat, although of doubtful validity. "Christ is personally in Himself holy, in relation to men guileless, in spite of contact with a sinful world, undefiled. By the issue of His life He has been separated from sinners in regard to the visible order, and, in regard to the invisible world, He has risen above the heavens". ἄγας frequently in the Psalms, where it translates ἡγεῖται denotes personal holiness, while ἄγας and λεπός express the idea of consecration. [See Trench, Synon.] Weiss, however, says: "ἱερὸς, ein Synonym von ἄγας" (Vulg., Ps. iv. 4, xvi. 10) "bezeichnet die religiöse Weihe des Gottangehörigen" (Tit. i. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 8). Peirce understands that here the word means "merciful". But this is scarcely consistent with N.T. usage. ἁγας, "innocent," and frequently with the idea of inexperienced which attaches to the English word [cf. the definition which Trench, Synon., p. 197, quotes from Basil; and see also the use of ἀγας in Ps. xxxvi. 37, and of ἀκακος in Ps. xxiv. 21. Its use in Jer. xi. 19 is significant, ἰδω δὲ ὁ ἄρνιον ἀκακον ἀγάμενον τοῦ θεοῦςι. Here the word seems to point to that entire absence of evil thought and slightest taint of malice
which might prompt disregard of human need. ἔσος denotes His oneness with God, His oneness with His fellow-men. He is not separated from them, or rendered indifferent by any selfishness. Neither has His contact with the world left any soil; He is ἄμαντος, "stainless," and so fit to appear before God. Cf. the stringent laws regarding uncleanness and blemish laid down for the Levitical priests in Lev. xxii. 1, xxii. 9. And as the high priest in Israel was not permitted to go out of the sanctuary nor come near a dead body, though of his father or mother (Lev. xxii. 11, 12), and as the later law enjoined a seven-days' separation of the high priest before the day of Atonement (Schoetgen in loc.), so our Lord fulfilled this symbolic isolation by being in heart and life καθαρισμόν ἂν τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν. If there is anything in the symbol, then this separation occurred before the sacrifice was made, and as a preparation for it, but almost all modern interpreters (Grotius, Bengel, "separatus est, relicito mundo," Peirce, Tholuck, Bleek, Alford, Davidson, Rendall, von Soden, but not Milligan) refer the separation to His exaltation. "In virtue of His exaltation He is now for evermore withheld from all perturbing contact with evil men" (Delitzsch). Being co-ordinate with the previous adjectives, while the ψηλοτέρος γεν. is added by καλ., it would seem that καθαρ. refers to the result achieved by His earthly life with all its temptations. By the exclusion of the high priest it was hinted that before entering God's presence the priest must be isolated from the contamination of human intercourse: there must be a period of quarantine; but our High Priest has carried through all the confusion and turmoil and defilement and exasperation of life an absolute immunity from contamination or stain. He was with God throughout, and throughout was separated by an atmosphere of His own from sinners. 

1 T.R. with BDEKLP; προσενεγκας in ἹΑ, 17, 73, 80, Curtius 93.
Weiss renders this interpretation more probable by pointing out that the words have a reference to ταύτατον οις οἱ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνναίματι of ver. 25. His intercession is continuous, from day to day, but in order to accomplish it He does not need day by day to purify Himself and renew His sacrifice. Cf. also the seven days' purification of the high priest on entering his office, Exod. xxix. 13-8. οὐάσις αὐτοφέρει, a phrase resulting from the carrying up of the sacrifice to the raised altar, and only found in Hellenistic, frequently in LXX. The more usual word in this Epistle (twentieth times and frequently in LXX) is προσφέρειν. ἀναφέρει properly describes the ministerial action of the priest, of the reception of the offerer (Lev. ii. 14, 16, vi. 33, 35), but distinction is not observed universally; thus ἀναφέρει is used of the people (Lev. xxvii. 5), and προσφέρει of the priests (Lev. xxi. 21) (Westcott). προτέρου . . . ἐστίν, as in v. 3, "they must first offer for themselves, because they may not approach God sin-stained; they must also offer for the people, because they may not introduce a sin-stained people to God." (Weiss). τοῦτο γάρ τῇ ἑ τοῖσιν . . . This, i.e., offering for the sins of the people. But it must be borne in mind that this writer keeps in view that Christ also had a preparation for His priestly ministry in the sinless temptations and sufferings He endured, vv. 7-10. The emphasis is on ἐκ τούτων, in contrast to the καθ' ἡμέραν, and the ground of the ἐκ τούτων is given in τοὺς ἄνευ πάντων, an offering which by the nature of the case could not be repeated, ix. 27, 28, and which by its worth rendered repetition superfluous. This difference between the new priest and the old is based upon their essential difference of nature: "For the law appoints as high priests men who have weakness," which especially gives the reason, as in v. 3, why they must sacrifice for themselves. In v. 3 the weakness is ascribed to the same source as here; the high priest is εἰς ἀνθρώπων λαθημάτων. In c. 5, however, the fact that the high priest is taken from among men is introduced chiefly for the sake of illustrating his sympathy: here it is introduced in contrast to κατα τοῦ of the next clause, which is thus raised to a higher than human dignity. For had this contrast not been intended, τοῖς would have been used, and not εἰς ἀνθρώπων. The law only made provision for the appointment of priests who had human weakness: the word of the oath (already explained in vv. 20-22), τῆς μετὰ τοῦ νόμου, "which [oath-swearing] came after the law," and therefore showed that the law needed revisal and supplementing ["Debent posterioria in legibus esse perfectiora" (Grotius)]. It might have been argued that the Law coming after Melchisedek introduced an improved priesthood. It is therefore worth while to point out that the adoption of the Melchizedek priesthood as the type of the Messianic priesthood was subsequent to the Law, and consequently superseded it. ἤλθεν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τῆς θεολογίας [appoints], "a son who has been made perfect for ever." ἦλθεν, without the article, because attention is called to the nature of the new priest, as in i. 1. "Son," in the fullest sense, as described in i. 1-4, and in contrast to ἀνθρώπων. He also, though a Son, became man, and was exposed to human temptations, but by this experience was "perfected" as our Priest. Cf. vv. 7-10. "For ever perfected" is directly contrasted with the sinful yielding to infirmity exhibited by the Levitical priests, and must therefore be referred to moral perfecting, as explained in chap. v. This perfection of the Son is confirmed and sealed by His exaltation; He is forever perfected in the sense, as Grotius says, "ut nec morti nec ullo adversis subjacent." Cf. ix. 27, 28. The A.V. translates "consecrated," which Davidson denounces, with Alford, as "altogether false." But this translation at any rate suggests that it is Perfectness of the Son with which the writer has in view; and the use of τελείωμα in Lev. xxii. 10 and other passages cannot be thus lightly set aside.

Chapter VIII.—Vv. 1-6. The idea of Christ's priesthood, merely suggested in i. 3, expressly affirmed in ii. 17, has been from iv. 14 onwards enlarged upon and illustrated. It has been shown that Christ is a priest, called by God to this office and proclaimed by God as High Priest. The superiority of His orders as belonging not to the hereditary Aaronic line, but as being "after the order of Melchisedek," has also been exhibited. Passing now from the person and qualifications of the Priest, the author proceeds in chap. viii. to illustrate his greatness from a consideration of the place of His ministry. It is in heaven. He is seated, a minister of the real tabernacle, not of that which had been pitched by Moses as an image and
symbol of it. The priesthood to which
God called Him must be a heavenly
ministry, for were He on earth He would
not even be a priest, not to say a High
Priest. His ministry, therefore, being in
the heaven of eternal realities, is a
"better ministry," in accordance with
the fact that he is mediating a "better
covenant".

Ver. 1. θεολογίαν ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγόμενοις,
not, as A.V., "Now of the things
which we have spoken this is the sum"
(cf. Grotius "post tot dicta haec esto
summa"), but with Field "Now to
crown our present discourse" or with
Rendall "Now to crown what we are
saying." κεφάλαιον is used to denote
either the sum, as of numbers added up
from below to the head of the column
where the result is set down, and in this
sense it is here understood by Erasmus,
Calvin and A.V.; or, the chief point as
of a cope-stone or capital of a pillar, as
in Thucyd., vi. 6. λέγωτε έλλα τα
τότε καὶ κεφάλαια, οἱ ἡγεμόνες,
κ.τ.λ. Other examples in Field's O.N.,
which add Plutarch, De Educ. Puer.,
8, ἐν πρώτων καὶ μέσων καὶ τελευταίων
ἐν τούτοις κεφαλάχ ήγης στοιχεῖα.
This latter sense alone satisfies the
present passage, and also agrees better
with συν τοῖς λεγόμενοις for τοῦ ἐπὶ
must here be taken in a quasi-local sense, as
Vaughan paraphrases "as a capital
where the argument—we add
this". Cf. Luke xvi. 26 καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς
τοῖς. That λεγόμενοι is in the
present is manifestly no objection
to this rendering. The absence of the
article before κεφαλ. does not involve, as
Lüemmann supposes, that the writer means
"a main point" among others, for such
words do not in similar situations require
the article, cf. Demosth., p. 924, τεκμηρίων
ἐν τούτοις. κεφάλαιον is most easily
construed as a nominative absolute (cf.
Buttmann, p. 381) not, as Bruce, "an
accusative in apposition with the follow-
sentence". τοῦτον ήξομεν ἀρχιερεῖα
so great a High Priest have we
as took His seat (or, is set down)
on the right hand of the throne of
the Majesty in the heavens", τοῦτον, not,
as Farrar and Rendall, "retrospective,"
although as contrasted with τούς ἐπὶ
is its proper meaning; but here, as
frequently in classics [Soph., Antig., 691,
λόγους τοῦτον οἰς ἐν μὴ τίμητε κλήνων,
and Demosth., p. 713, followed also by
οὕτων] it finds its explanation in "ἐπὶ
διδάσκοντες τοῦτον weist natürlich nicht
rückwärts sondern vorwärts auf den
dasselbe Erläuternden Relativsatz. Weiss.)
The greatness of the High Priest is
manifested by the place where He
ministers. His greatness is revealed in
his sitting down at the right hand of
the Majesty in the heavens. Westcott
thinks that the thought of a High Priest
who . . . "I, King as well as priest is
clearly the prominent thought of the
sentence". And Moulton on x. 12
says: "The words 'sat down' (Ps. cx.
11, add to the priestly imagery that of
kingly state". But undoubtedly Weiss
is right in saying "Durch den Relativsatz
soll nicht auf die königliche Herrlichkeit
Christi hingewiesen werden". The
writer means to magnify Christ's priest-
hood by reminding his readers that it
is exercised "in the heavens"; as he says
in ix. 24 he has passed εἰς ὑπὸν τοῦ
σωμάτων into heaven itself, the very
presence of God and eternal reality, the
ultimate, highest possible. On the
words cf. note on i. 3. ικάνον is con-
sidered by Buttman to be one of those
aorists which stand for the perfect (see
his instructive remarks on the aversion
to the perfect, Gram., p. 198); but this
may be doubted, as the sitting is not
mentioned as the permanent attitude,
but merely as suggesting the exaltation
of the High Priest, and the finality of
His purification of sins, as in i. 3.
Augustine, De Fide et symbolo, 7, warns
against the suggested anthropomorphism
of the words "sitteth at the right hand"
and says "ad dextram intelligendum est
dictum esse, in summa beatitudine,
ubi justitia et pac et gaudium est". Here,
however, it is rather Christ's majesty
that is suggested, and as Pearson on this
clause of the Creed says, "The belief of
Christ's glorious session is most neces-
sary in respect of the immediate con-
sequence which is his most gracious
intercession," rather his availing in-
55.
1—4. ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ

οδηγοί, 2. τῶν ἁγώνων λειτουργῆς, καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἵνα ἔτυχεν ὁ Κύριος, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος. 3. τὸ προσφέρων δώρα τε καὶ φυσικάς καθίσματα: δὲν ἀναγκαίων εἶχεν τι καὶ τούτον δ ἐπιπεπέκυκρ. 4. εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐδὲ ἦν ἰερεὺς, ἵνα τῶν ἱερέων τῶν προσφέρων κατὰ τὸ νόμον τὰ δώρα,

1 ADE**KL, f, vg., Copt., insert καὶ; NABD**E* 17, d, e, omit καὶ.
2 T.R. in DÆKL Syr., Arm.; οὐν in ΝABD**E*P, 17, 73, 80, 137, d, e, f, vg.
3 T.R. in DÆ**KL Syr., Chrys.; NABD**E*P, 17, 73, 137, d, e, f, vg. omit τῶν ἱερέων.

Ver. 2. τῶν ἁγώνων λειτουργῆς . . . "a minister of the [true] holy place and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, not man". τῶν ἁγώνων not ἁγῶνων, and ἔγγαιον not ἔγγαιον, as Ecumenius translates, but as in ix. 8, 12, 22; x. 19; xiii. 11 = ἅγια ἁγίων of ix. 3. In ix. 2, 3, the outer part of the tabernacle is called ἁγία, the inner ἅγια ἁγίων, but ver. 8 is conclusive proof that ἅγια without addition was used for the holiest place. λειτουργῆς cf. note on i. 14, καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, the ideal, anti typal tabernacle; ἅλθεοι, used as in the fourth gospel in contrast not to what is false, but to what is symbolical. It is to be taken with ἅγια as well as with σκηνῆς. Cf. Bleek; and see ix. 11, τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειότερα σκηνῆς ὑπὸ χειροτονίων, which is the equivalent of the clause added here, ἵνα διηθήνετε ὁ Κύριος, οὐκ ἀνθρώπος. See also Mark xiv. 56 and the striking words of Wisdom ix. 8. In a different sense in Numb. xxiv. 6, ἄγια σκηναὶ δὲ ἐγείρης Κύριος. According to the fifth verse, man pitched a tabernacle which was a shadow of the true, and the very words in which was uttered the command so to do, might have reminded the people that there was a symbolic and a true tabernacle.

Ver. 3. τὰς γὰρ ἀρχέρες . . . "And indeed if He were on earth He would not even be a priest, since there are those who according to law offer the gifts”. μάν ὸν = et quidem (Devarius, p. 125) or, it might be rendered "If however," see Hermann's Viger, p. 442. Vaughan says: "The ὸν is (as usual) in accordance with the above statement; here, namely, that He must have something to offer". The apodosis in ver. 6. vocat ὧσ. The argument is, given or assumed as already proved that Christ is our High Priest, it must be in Heaven He exercises His ministry, for if He were on earth, He would not even be a priest, not to say, a High Priest. [As Bleek has it, 'er würde nicht einmal Priester sein,— geschweige denn Hohe priester"]. He could not be a priest, because the priestly office on earth is already filled. The law [κατὰ νόμον], which can not be interfered with, regulates all that concerns the earthly priesthood (vii. 12), and by this law He is excluded from priestly office, not being of the tribe of Levi (vii. 14). τὰ δώρα “the gifts” further
emphasises the rigorous prescriptions of the law. The absence of the article before νὸμον does not necessitate though it suggests the translation "according to law".

Ver. 5. οἱ εὐθείαμαται ... "priests who serve a suggestion and shadow of the heavenly things, even as Moses when about to make the tabernacle was admonished, for 'See,' He says, 'that thou make all things after the pattern shown thee in the Mount'". οἱ εὐθείαμαται, with its usual classifying and characterising reference, priests distinguished by the fact that they serve a shadow, λατρεύων, originally to work for hire, from λατρεύω, a hired servant (Soph., Track., 70, etc.), but used especially in classics, LXX, and N.T. of service of God. It is followed by the dative of the person served (see ref.). Heb. ix. 14, xii. 28, and xiii. 10 as here of τῇ σκιᾷ λατρεύωντος. ὑποδείγματα, Phrynichus notes, ὑποδείγμα τοῦ τούτου ὁρθῶς λέγειν παράδειγμα λέγειν. To which Rutherford adds, "In Attic ὑποδείγματα was never used except in its natural sense of show by implication; but in Herodotus and Xenophon it signifies to mark out, set a pattern". The meaning of ὑποδείγματα accordingly is "a sign suggestive of anything," "a delineation," "outline," perhaps "suggestion" would satisfy the present passage. σκιᾶς, "an adumbration of a reality which it does not embody" (Vaughan). A shadow has no substance in itself, no independent existence. It merely gives assurance that there is a reality to cast it, but itself is nothing solid or real. So the tabernacle gave assurance of the existence of a real dwelling of God which itself was not. Cf. x. 1, and Col. ii. 17, τῶν ἄνω θε- τήν τίναλάνω, as in ix. 23 τῶν ὑποδείγματων τῶν ἐν τοῖς σαβανασί ... ὁταῦτα ἐκ τῶν ἄνω- τῶν, heavenly things, in a comprehensive sense. καθὼς κεκρημάτισται ... καθὼς, i.e. the description of the Mosaic tabernacle as a shadow of the heavenly accords with the directions given to Moses in its erection. κεκρημάτισται, ἤμελτος (from ἤμηθος), originally means "to transact business," "to advise" or "give answer to those asking advice"; hence "to give a response to those who consult an oracle"; then, dropping all reference to a foregoing consultation, it means "to give a divine command" and in passive to be commanded; see Thayer. The perfect tense is explained by Delitzsch thus: "as thou Moses hast received (in our Scriptures) the divine injunction (which we still read there)". But cf. Burton, M. and T., 82. εὐθείαμα, not, to complete what was already begun; but to realise what was determined by God; cf. Num. xxiii. 23, and Heb. ix. 6; so that it might be rendered "to bring into being". ὅπως γὰρ φησιν ... He now cites the authoritative injunction referred to and which determines that the earthly tabernacle as but a copy of the heavenly. γὰρ of course belongs to the writer, not to the quotation, and φησιν has for its nominative the Θεὸς implied in κεκρημάτισται. τοῖς ἐν χειρὶ τοίος ... The words are quoted from Exod. xxv. 40 (adding κατά τόν θυσίαν and substituting διαίρεστοι for διαίρεσιν) and are a literal rendering of the Hebrew, so that nothing can be gathered from them regarding N.T. usage. The future indicative being regularly used as a legal imperative (an unclassical usage) it naturally occurs here. κατά τὸν τόπον, a stamp or impression (ῥύθμος) struck from a die or seal; hence, a figure, draft, sketch, or pattern. How or in what form this was communicated to the mind of Moses we do not know. "In the Mount," i.e., in Sinai where Moses retired for communion with God, he probably pondered the needs of the people to such good purpose that from suggestions received in Egypt, together with his own divinely guided conceptions, he was able to contrive the tabernacle and its ordinances of worship. It is his spiritual insight and his anticipation of his people's wants which give him his unique place in history. And it is both to trifle and to detract from his greatness to say with some of the Rabbis (vide Schoettgen) that models of the Ark and the candlestick and the other equipment descended from heaven, and that Gabriel in a workman's apron showed him how to reproduce the articles shown.
Ver. 6. νυν δα ... "But, as it is, He hath obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much He is also mediator of a better covenant, which has been enacted upon better promises." νυν δα, i.e., He not being on earth, the δα pointing back to μαν in ver. 4. For νυν δα in its logical significance, cf. ix. 26; xi. 16; I Cor. xiv. 20; Arist. Ethics, I. iv. 4. διαφωτισμα λειτουργιας, more excellent, as what is heavenly or real is more excellent than what is earthly and symbolic. διαφωτισμα λειτουργιας, the ministry being a part of the work of mediating the better covenant, it must participate in the superior excellence of that covenant. And the superiority of the covenant consists in this, that it has been legally based on better promises. Had Paul so connected the law and the promises, a quip might have been supposed; but this writer uses νυνας in its ordinary sense without any allusion to its etymology. What these "better promises" are he shows in vv. 8-12. ητης introduces the explanation of the κρατησιν, almost equivalent to "inasmuch as it has been,", from the τητην (cf. xii. 24) is more comprehensive than the διαφωτισμα of vii. 22, although μεσητης is Hellenistic for the Attic μεσητης, and in Diod. Sic. iv. 54 μεσητης has exactly the sense of διαφωτισμα. The full title in I Tim. ii. 5 μεσητης θεου και ανθρωπων presents the mediator as one who negotiates for both parties, and is something more than a guarantor. Moses was μεσητης of the first covenant (Gal. iii. 17; Exod. xx. 19); so that as already intimated in iii. 1, Christ absorbed in His ministry the work of both Moses and Aaron.

Vv. 7-13. A justification of the establishment of a better covenant, on the grounds (1) that the first covenant was not faultless; (2) that Jeremiah had predicted the introduction of a new covenant (a) not like the old, but (b) based upon better promises; and (3) that even in Jeremiah's days the first covenant was "new" ascribed to that which was then promised.

Ver. 7. εγαρ η πρατη ... "For if that first had been faultless, no place would have been sought for a second." η πρατη of course is διαβολη, πρατη for προτερα as in Acts i. 1; I Cor. xv. 47, and this epistle passim. The covenant did not accomplish the purpose for which it was enacted; it did not bring men into spiritual and permanent fellowship with God. Cf. vii. 11, 19; Gal. iii. 20. ουκ αν δευτερας εισητητο των. "There would not have been—as we know there was—any demand for a second" (Parra). Probably, however, εισητητο refers to God's purpose, ("Quam Deum locum et tempus opportunum" [Herennius]) not to man's craving; although necessarily the two must concur. των is frequently used in the sense of "room" "opportunity" in later Greek, Rom. xv. 23; Luke xiv. 19; and cf. specifically Rev. xx. 11. τωνος συν ερωτη αυτοις. μεμορισμενος εγαρ ... "For finding fault with them He says, Behold, there come days, etc." The yap obviously refers to διαμονα and justifies it, "It is with fault finding, etc." But now the object of the blame is slightly changed. "There is a subtle delicacy of language in the insensible shifting of the blame from the covenant to the people. The covenant itself could hardly be said to be faultless, seeing that it failed to bind Israel to their God; but the true cause of failure lay in the character of the people, not in the law, which was holy, righteous and good" (Rendall). This is the simplest construction and agrees with the ascription of blame in ver. 9. Thayer says "it is more correct to supply αυτην, i.e., διαβολης, which the writer wishes to prove was not faultless, and to join αυτοις with η μεσητης. No doubt this would be more logically consistent, but the question is, What did the writer say? He seems not to distinguish between the covenant and the people who lived under it. The old covenant was faulty because it did not provide for enabling the people to live up to the terms or conditions of it. It was faulty inasmuch as it did not sufficiently provide against their faulti- ness. Ιδον, κ.τ.λ. The quotation which here occupies five verses is taken from
Jeremiah xxxviii. 31-34 in LXX, xxxi. 31-34 A.V. ἡμέραν ἀφελέων is a frequent formula in Jeremiah, as "The ubiquitous Hebrew and, serving here the purpose of the δόθων which might have been expected" (Vaughan). The LXX has διαβρόσωμά, and Augustine (De Spir. et Lit. xix.) thinks this word (consummabo) is chosen for the sake of emphasising the sufficiency of the New Covenant. So Delitzsch: "Our author seems here to have purposely selected the διαβρόσωμα to express more clearly the conclusive perfecting power of the new covenant of the gospel." So, too, Weiss, who also calls attention to the fact that it is followed by καί, as in the expression συντελέσας, τ. ἀφελόν ἡ... But in the face of the occurrence in Jer. xxxiv. 8, (LXX, xli. 8) of the expression συντελέσας διαβρόσωμα ἡμέραν... it is precarious to maintain that our author in selecting this word meant more than "complete a covenant", ἡμέραν αἰών οὐρανοῦ καί... comprehensive of the whole people of God. Their blameworthy rupture had not severed them from God's grace and faithfulness. διαθήκης καὶ κατά, the expression first occurs in our Lord's institution of the sacrament, τοῦτο τὸ σεντίμιον ἡ κατά διαθήκη αὐτῶν τ. ἀφελόν μου, repeated in 1 Cor. xi. 25. In 2 Cor. iii. 6, the κατά διαθήκη is contrasted with τ. παλαιὸς διαθήκη of ver. 14. The new covenant is also called κατά in xii. 24; κατά properly meaning new in character, νέον young or new in date. As in ver. 7 the condemnation of the old implied a promise of the new; so in ver. xiii., the promise of the new is considered as involving the condemnation of the old. Ver. 9, τ. κατά τὴν διαθήκην... "Not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers." These words express negatively wherein the κατά of the covenant consists. It was not to be a repetition of that which had failed. It was to be framed with a view to avoiding the defects of the old. It must not be such a covenant as dealt in symbols and externals. That former covenant is further defined in the words ἡμέραν... a clause which is intended to remind the readers that it was through no lack of power or grace on God's part that the covenant had failed. His intention and power to fulfil His part was put beyond doubt by the deliverance from Egypt. iv ἐμπλήξας μου... "sicut nutrix apprehendit manum parvuli, vel qui de fovea per manum attrahit aliquem sive secum ducit" (Hervaeus). The construction determined by the Hebrew, which, however, has the infinitive not the participle, is, according to Winer (11o) "perhaps unusual, but not incorrect." Buttmann, however, (316) condemns it as "a perfectly un-Greek construction" and "nothing more than a thoughtless imitation of the original Hebrew, of which no other similar example is to be found in the N.T." Cf. Baruch, ii. 28 in ἡμέραν ἡνωματώνμενον, n. n. Cf. Viteau, Gram. p. 209-10. On ἐκκαθάρισθη see ii. 16. διαθήκης κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην... because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord." Both parties abandoned the covenant and so it became null. Bengel's note on this clause is this: "Correlata, ut ver. 10, ex opposto: διαθήκης τινός... "For this is
the covenant which I will covenant with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord." The δεικνύω justifies the differentiation of this covenant from the Sinaitic, and the ascription to it of the term "new". It also introduces the positive aspect of the newness of the covenant. This consists in three particulars. It is inward or spiritual; it is individual and therefore universal; it is gracious and provides forgiveness.

Ver 11. καὶ σῶται ἐκλείονται. "And they shall not teach, each man his fellow-citizen and each man his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord,' for all shall know me from small to great among them." This second "better" promise follows on the first as its natural consequence. The inward acceptance of God's will involves the knowledge of God. In the new covenant all were to be "taught of God" (Isa. liv. 13, Jo. vi. 45) and independent of the instruction of a privileged class. Under the old covenant, none but the educated scribe could understand the minutiae of the law with which religion was identified. The elaborate ritual made it impossible for the private individual to know whether a ram or a pigeon was the appropriate sacrifice for his sin, or whether his sin was mortal or venial. A priest had to be consulted. Under the new covenant intermediaries were to be abolished. The knowledge of God was to lie in the heart alongside of the love of parent or friend, and would demand for its expression no more external instruction than those primal, instinctive and home-grown affections. οὐ μὴ διδάσκων. "The intensive of μὴ (of that which in no wise will or shall happen) is sometimes—indeed most commonly—joined with the conjunctive aorist, sometimes with the conjunctive present, sometimes also with the indicative future". Winer, p. 634, who also discusses Hermann's canon and Dawes' regarding this form.
Chapter IX. Ver. 1. *ΕΙΣΕ μὴ οὖν καί ἡ πρότη σκηνή τὰ δικαιώματα λατρείας.

1 Rom. xi. 67. 11 ἀπέχει τῶν μεγάλων αὐτῶν 12 ἀδικίας αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν αμώμων αὐτῶν ὡς μὴ μακροθεύον ἑταί. 13 ἐν τῷ λέγειν "Καυνη,” πατηλαίως τὴν πρώτην, τὸ δὲ παλαιομένου καὶ γηράσκου, ἐγγὺς ἀφανσμοῦ.

a Exod. xxv. 8. IX. 1. *ΕΙΣΕ μὴ οὖν καί ἡ πρότη σκηνή τὰ δικαιώματα λατρείας.

καὶ in ΝΑΔΕΚΛP, d, e, f, vg., SyrP, Arm. ; om. in B, 3, 38, 52, Syrach, Copt., Thphyl.

σκηνή omitted in ΝΑΒΔΕΚΛP, f, vg., and by T., Tr., WH, R.; found in 47, 73, 74, 80, 137, Thdrt.

this form of the future Veitch (p. 216) quotes Homer, Theognis, Herodotus, Isocrates. ἀκτὸς μικροῦ ἐστὶς μεγάλου, an expression commonly used in LXX to denote universality, Gen. xix. 11, where possibly it is equivalent to ἀκτὸς πανίσχυν ὡς προεβεβηροῦν of ver. 4; 1 Sam. xxx. 19, where it is used of spoils of war. Gesenius (117, 2) understands the adjectives as superlatives.

Ver. 12. *ΕΙΣΕ μὴ οὖν καί ἡ πρότη σκηνή τὰ δικαιώματα λατρείας... “For I will be merciful to their iniquities, and their sins will I remember no more.” This third better promise is united to the former by δειν., showing that the forgiveness of sins or God’s grace is fundamental to any possible renewal and maintenance of covenant.

Ver. 13. ἐν τῷ λέγειν Καυνην. “In saying ‘New,’ He hath antiquated the first; and that which is antiquated and growing old is near extinction [lit. disappearance].” That is to say, by speaking in the passage quoted, ver. 8, of a new covenant, God brands the former as old. Thus even in Jeremiah’s time the Mosaic covenant was disparaged. The fact that a new was required showed that it was insufficient. It was condemned as antiquated. And that which is antiquated and aged has not much longer to live. πεταλαίωσεν, the active is found in LXX, Job. ix. 5; xxxii. 15, etc.; the mid. is common, in Plato and elsewhere in the sense of “growing old”. ἐγγὺς δὲ ἀφανσίαν, cf. ἐγγὺς κατάφυςν, vi. 8. ἀφανσίας, is suggestive of utter destruction, abolition; thus in Polyb. v. 11, 5 it is joined with ἄπωλεν. Cf. Diod. Sic. v. 32, ἀποκτένωσεν, ἡ καταλαύσωσιν, ἡ πυρῖ ἀλλὰ τηρῶσιν ἐφανείωσον.

Chapter IX. Ver. 1-14. The insufficiency of the first covenant is further illustrated from the character of its ordinances. For it was not devoid of elaborate and impressive appointments and regulations for worship, but these only pictured their own inefficiency. Especially did the exclusion from the holiest place of all but the High Priest, who himself could only enter once a year, and with blood, signify that so long as these ordinances remained there could be no perfect approach of the worshipper to God. But this approach was achieved by Christ who ministered in the tabernacle not made with hands, and by His own blood cleansed the conscience and thus brought men into true fellowship with God.

Chapter IX. Ver. 1. ΕΙΣΕ μὴ οὖν καί ἡ πρότη σκηνή... “Even the first covenant, however, had ordinances of worship and the holy place suitable to this world,” i.e., as hinted in viii. 2, a tent pitched by man, constructed with earthly materials, “of this creation,” ver. 11, and thus appealing to sense. Farrar renders “ and its sanctuary—a material one”. οὖν is continuous, and might almost be rendered “to resume”. μὴ find its correlative δὲ in ver. 6; the first covenant had, indeed, a sanctuary with elaborate arrangements, but after all it was only a symbol. That διαβαίησι, not σκηνή, is to be understood after πρώτη, is demanded by the context and is now universally recognised. So Chrysostom, ἡ πρώτη, τίς; ἡ διαβάθμις. Of the reading σκηνή Calvin says, "nec dubito, quin aliquis inductus, pro sua inscitia... perperam addiderit." ΕΙΣΕ at first sight seems to require us to date the epistle after the destruction of Jerusalem, but it is quite possible that, as Delitzsch says, the writer is looking back upon the old from the platform of the new covenant. "The author in saying had merely looks back from his own historical position to the Mosaic tabernacle and its ordinances, which are everywhere assumed as the standard of the O.T. things; the past 'had' no more implies that the O.T. ministry had passed away in fact or even in principle, than the present 'go in' (ver. 6) implies the reverse" (Davidson.) δικαιώματα λατρείας. δικ-
PROS EPHRAIOUS
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τότε ἄγιον κοσμικῶν — 2. Ἠκην γὰρ κατασκευάσθη, ἡ πρώτη, ἐν ἐξω.

γὰρ τῇ λυχνίᾳ καὶ τῇ πράσινῃ τῶν ἄρτων· ἦτις λέγεται ἅγια. 3. μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα σκηνὴ ἢ

Add στίχον AD*E, d, e.

αἰώνια is used, because the writer wishes to draw attention to the fact that the ritual of the first covenant was divinely appointed. He does this because he means to point out (vv. 8, 9) that the Holy Spirit intended these arrangements to be a parable of their own incompetence and transitory nature. κοσμικῶν is best illustrated in Rendel Harris' Teaching of the Apostles, p. 71 ff. He has collected a number of passages from early Christian writers which show that a "cosmic" mystery or symbol was "a symbol or action wrought upon the stage of this world to illustrate what was doing or to be done on a higher plane". His quotation from Athanasius is especially convincing: "Διδασκαλία ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτασσόμενη τῷ κυρίῳ, σύντομα καὶ γενειακῶς τοὺς ἀκολούθησαν ἐν παντὶ. ἀν ἀυτοῦ γὰρ τῶν χρησμῶν, ἐν ἀλήθεια, καὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ νοεώμενον. This significant word standing at the close of the sentence sufficiently indicates the incompetence of the whole. The first covenant had its holy place but it was κοσμικῶν. For the same reason he goes on to enumerate the articles contained in the στίχον. He wishes to bring before us the care with which all its arrangements were made: nothing was haphazard and meaningless. The succeeding verses are indeed the resumption of viii. 5, "See that you make all things according to the type shown thee in the mount".

Ver 2. Ἠκην γὰρ κατασκευάσθη, στίχον ... "For a tent was constructed, the fore-tent, in which were its appropriate contents. Ἠκην, a tent. "Observandum est in primis hanc descriptionem non ad templum sed ad tabernaculum accommodari; quia nimirum noster hie scriptore ad propriam quae Moses secundum exemplar ipsi in monte propositionem fabricavit, cum rebus ipsius coelestibus comparat" (Bess). On the construction in which the noun is first conceived indefinitely and is then more clearly defined by the attributive, whose import thus receives special prominence, see Winer, p. 174. Ἠ πράσινη, the outer, that into which anyone first entered, twice the size of the inner and entered from the east (see Macgregor on Exodus, and appendix by Gillies on construction of tabernacle). Large tents were usually divided into an outer and an inner, a first and a second. And a tent being windowless, ἡ λυχνία was a necessary article of furniture; the lamp-stand, or "candlestick" reminding men that the light of day, the light common to all, was not sufficient to guide to God. Cf. Exod. xxv. 31-39; and Zech., c. iv. καὶ ἡ τράπεζα for the making of the table instructions are recorded in Exod. xxv. 23-30, concluding with the injunction "Θαυμα σετ upon the table shrowbread before me alway." In Lev. xxiv. 5 it is called "the pure table," because made of "pure" gold. καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων "and the setting forth of the loaves" called in Exod. xiv. 32 (P.) "loaves of the setting forth". In Exod. xxv. 30 the command is given ὁμορρομαίων ἐν τῇ τράπεζα ἄρτου ἐνσωματωμένον ἐν σωματίων μου, the loaves here being called ἔλευθερός ἄρτος of the face or presence. In Lev. xxiv. 5-9 minute instructions for their composition are given and for their "setting forth," and it is added ἐνσωματωμένον ἐς ἄρτους ἐς ἄνθρωπον προσκυνεῖν τῷ Κυρίῳ. In 1 Chron. the loaves are called τὰ προσκυνήμαta translating ἔλευθερός ἄρτος of the row. On the meaning of the "show bread" see Robertson Smith's Religion of the Semites, 207 ff. "The table of show bread has its closest parallel in the lectisternia of ancient heathenism, when a table laden with meats was spread beside the idol." "But the idea that the gods actually consume the solid food that is deposited at their shrines is too crude to subsist without modification beyond the savage state of society; the ritual may survive, but the sacrificial gifts ... will come to be the perquisite of the priests'. Cf. Warde Fowler's Roman Festivals, 215-20. "Ὑπὸ λέγεται ἡ ἁγια. "The qualitative relative directs attention to the features of the place which determine its name as 'Holy'" (Westcott). ἁγια is neuter plural, as in ver. 3. So Theodoret rejecting the reading ἡ ἁγια. For this name see Lev. x. 4; Num. iii. 22; but in LXX always with the article, here omitted, possibly, to bring out more prominently the holy character of the place.

Ver 3. μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον
And after the second veil the tent which is called 'Holy of Holies,' not, as Westcott, "a tent [was prepared] which is called," for "when attributives are placed after with the article, the article before the substantive is dropped" (Buttmann, p. 92). The participle with the article as usual takes the place of a relative clause, μετὰ in a local sense (non-classical, Blase, p. 133), which is here closely akin to the temporal = after the entrant has passed the second veil. The second veil separated the Holy place from the Holy of Holies, and as being the significant veil was sometimes spoken of without Καταστήματα, see chap. vi. 19; Mat. xxvii. 51, etc. Instructions for making and hanging it are given in Exod. xxvi. 31-35; and in ver. 36 the outer veil is described. The outer veil is sometimes called Καταστήματα but more commonly Ἴδρυμα, Exod. xxvi. 36, xxxv. 15 etc. The inner tent was called the ἅγια ἅγια, translating Θυμιάτηριον which in Hebrew idiom is equivalent to a superlative.

Ver. 4. Χρυσόν άγια θυμιάτηριον άγιος. The inner tent is characterised by its furnishings, a golden altar of incense and the ark of the covenant. Θυμιάτηριον is rendered both in A.V. and R.V. by "altar of incense" following the Vulgate, "aureum habens thuribulum," Grotius "θυμιανικὸν non est mensa, sed impositum mensae batillum;" and others. In doing so the usage of the LXX is followed, for in 2 Chron. xxvi. 19, Ezek. viii. 11, 4 Mac. vii. 11—the only instances of its occurrence—it renders ἵδρυμα = censer; while "altar of incense" is rendered by θυμιάτηριον, see Lev. iv. 7, 1 Chron. vii. 49, etc. But Philo (p. 512 A, 668, C), Josephus Ant., iii. 6, 8, and the versions of Symmachus and Theodotion in Exod. xxxi. use θυμιάτηριον for "altar of incense." Besides, the form of the word indicates that it could be used of anything on which incense is offered. It was, therefore, understood of the "altar" by Clement Alex. and other fathers; by Calvin, who says, "quo nomine alte
4-6.

The LXX also has the same variants.

1. the Cherubim are here called "of glory," probably because closely attached to and, as it were, attendant upon the place of the manifestation of the divine glory. ["Als Träger der Herrlichkeit, in welcher die göttliche Gnadenegenwart sich kündigt" (Weiss).] Τὸ λαόστριον. In Exod. xxv. 17 Moses is instructed to make a golden cover for to be laid upon the lid of the ark, and this instruction the LXX renders by the words τοιούτου λαόστριον εινήμα χρυσοῦ καθάρου. The word είνημα alone, without any qualifying adjective, would have been an inadequate translation of γῆς, for both words mean "a cover." But είνημα is nowhere else used in the LXX to translate γῆς, which is regularly translated by λαόστριον, although this word does not express the idea of a material covering. [Philom. more than once remarks upon this. In De Profug., 19, in speaking of symbols, he says τῆς ἡλεῖ δυνάμεις τὸ έντύμα τῆς κιβουτοῦ, καλεί δὲ αὐτὸ λαόστριον. And in Vit. Mos. iii. 68, ἐς έντύμα διαυδέ τιμά τὰ ἐκάμενα ἐν ἱεραῖς βιβλίοις λαόστριον.] The reason of this usage is to be found in the fact that this "cover" was sprinkled with blood on the day of atonement, and came, therefore, to be associated with the covering of sin. Indeed, the Hebrew word which denotes the material covering is that which is regularly used to express the covering of sin. The original είνημα thus became λαόστριον είνημα and finally λαόστριον. (See Deissmann, Bibehtud. p. 121-132.) περι ὡς τοῦ... μὲρος "of which we cannot now speak in detail." δυτικ, as commonly in classical Greek = δικτοι κατὰ μέρος = one by one. Examples in Wetstein and Bleek (see especially Plato, Theaet. 157b, where it is opposed to διαρκεία). Vv. 6-10. Significance of these arrangements.

Ver. 6. τοῖς διάτετματος... "And after these things had been thus furnished, into the fore-tent, indeed, the priests enter con
continually in the performance of their services, but into the inner the High Priest alone once a year not without blood." This is the particular δικαίωμα λαον. (ver. 1) to which he wishes to direct attention, the inaccessible sacredness of the inner chamber, as revealed in the constant openness of the outer-tent, the mysterious closeness of the inner, κατακλευσμένον perfect; the arrangements were made with a view to the abiding service of the first covenant. θησαυρός, continuously, opposed to αἰράνθε. ver. 7. c ιο-λαξιάς present tense, as in Homer, Aristoph., Plato, Xenophon. It is not easy to determine whether this present implies the contemporaneous continuance of the services referred to. Tholuck thinks Bleek very "unreasonable" in concluding that it involves that the services connected with it were extant; but Bleek after reconsideration, finds himself unable to yield the point to "Freund Tholuck". Davidson says, "The present 'go in' does not imply that the Levitical service still continued when this was written; the present is that of the record in Scripture." The Vulgate shows its preference by tendering "introibant". The truth seems to be that although the temple services were yet upheld, the use of the present tense here and in w. 7, 11, etc., does not involve that. τά λατρείας διπτεροπλούντες, not, as Vulg., "sacrificiorum officia consummantes," for these rather belonged to the court of the priests; but "performing their services" of trimming the lamp and offering incense; see Edersheim, The Temple; Its ministry, etc., p. 130-140. ἡσύχαιε is used in Herod. and in Diod. Sic., and in Philo, for the accomplishing of religious services but it is not so used in the LXX.

Ver. 7. εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν δόξα τοῦ ἱναντοῦ ... The law is given in Lev. xvi., both negatively and positively; negatively in ver. 2 μὴ ελεημονεύων ταχανάν ἔρων εἰς τὸ ἄγνωστον τοῦ κατακλευσμένον—promiscuous or continuous, daily entrance was forbidden; and positively, in ver 34 ἐπέκτω τοῦ ἱναντοῦ, i.e., one day each year, viz., on the day of Atonement, the tenth of the seventh month the High Priest is to enter. On that day the High Priest was to enter the Holiest at least thrice, first with the incense, then with the blood of the bullock which atoned for his own sins and those of his house, and finally with the blood of the goat for the sins of the people. μάνος ὁ ἄρχειρον in contrast with οἱ λεπτοὶ of ver. 6. This point is also emphasised by Philo, De Mon., p. 821 E., where he says that the things inside the veil were hidden from everyone πλην ἐν τῷ ἄρχειρῳ, and by Josephus (Bell. Jud. v. 5, 7) εὑρηκεν ἄρχειρος καὶ ἑιναντον μάνος. See also Lev. xvi. 17. The law was emphasised by the destruction of Nadab and Abihu, Lev. x. 1. The Holiness of the Presence and the difficulty of access was further illustrated and enforced by the demand that sacrifice should open the way ω χρυσίς αἰματος. This blood was offered, i.e., sprinkled with the finger on the ἑλευσίματι, first, the blood of the calf to cleanse from his own sins, and then, the blood of the goat to atone for the people's sins. ἔλευσις is manifestly under the direct government of άμφηρ and does not follow αἵματα. This word does not occur in Lev. xvi.; on the contrary the strongest words are, ἄνωμα, ἀμαρτία, ἀδίκησις, but cf. v. 2.] These three points, then, bring out the impossibility of free access to the Presence; not διαπαντός but ἐπέκτω τ. ἱναντοῦ; not οἱ λεπτοὶ promiscuously, but μάνος ὁ ἄρχειρος; not freely, but ω χρυσίς αἰματος. This was the δικαίωμα λατρείας which could not be neglected under pain of death. What did it signify? τοῦτο διαλούστοι τ. περιστέραις ... "this the Holy Spirit signifying, that the way into the Holy of Holies has not yet been made manifest, while the fore-tent has still a place". διαλούστοι, the Holy Spirit is viewed as the author of the ritual and as meaning to teach by every part of it. Vaughan compares 1 Pet. i. 11 and adds, "As there O.T. prophecy, so here O.T. ritual, is ascribed to the Holy Spirit," τοῦτο διαλούστοι, "the way into the Holiest" as in viii. 2. Access to the Holy of Holies being thus barred was an intimation that the true access to God had not yet been furnished and that therefore worship and fellowship with God (that is, religion) were not yet perfect. [Cf. Theoph. ἀ. τ. ἄγνωστος δῶς, τοποθετήν ἐκ τ. ὑπαρχόντων οἰκοδομοίος. Weiss, "der Weg zum himmlischen Heilighum."] So long as the fore-tent (ἡς πρώτης σημείας) has an appointed
place as part of the Divine arrangements for worship (ἐξούσια στάσιν as in Polyb. v. 5, 3) this signifies that the very Presence of God is inaccessible. The very object of the division of the Tabernacle into two rooms, an outer and an inner, was to impress men with the fact that the way of access had not actually been disclosed (πεφανερωθεί). Hence the appropriateness of the rending of the veil as the symbol that by the perfected work and sacrifice of Christ the new and living way (x.20) was opened.

Ver. 9. οἱ παραβολὴ ἐστὶν... "for this is a parable for the time [then] present," for the contemporary period. οὗτος has for its antecedent ὁ Κτύπος. This is the simplest construction (Cf. Winer, p. 207). That suggested by Primasius and Vaughan—"Which thing (the fact of there being a ἱερός στήματι separate from the Holy of Holies) was a parable"—is grammatically admissible. ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ τῶν ἱερευνητῶν, "for the time being". In the usual division of time into past, present and future, the present was termed ἡ ἑορτή. But present to whom? Several interpreters reply, To those living under the Christian dispensation. So especially Delitzsch and Alford. But N.T. usage, and especially the usage of this Epistle which speaks of the Christian dispensation as "the coming age" (vi. 5), "the future world" (ii. 5), indicates that "the present time" must refer to the O.T. period. Besides, the opposition to κατὰ συνεδριάδα points in the same direction; as also does the clause under καθ᾽ ἑαυτόν (ἡ εἰς here "with reference to"). And the meaning is, that the outer tent which did not itself contain God's presence, but rather stood barring access to it, was a parable of the entire dispensation. In other words, this Tabernacle arrangement was a striking symbol of the Mosaic economy which could not of itself effect spiritual approach and abiding fellowship with God. The Levitical δικαιώματα themselves, on the ground of which all these arrangements proceed, emphatically declared their own inadequacy. Wrapped up in them was the truth that they could not bring the worshipper into God's presence. καθ᾽ ἑαυτόν... "in accordance with which [parable] are offered both gifts and sacrifices that cannot perfect him that doth the service as regards conscience, being only ordinances of the flesh resting upon meats and drinks and divers washings, imposed until a time of rectification". καθ᾽ ἑαυτόν referring to παραβολὴ; it is in accordance with the parabolic significance of the Tabernacle and its arrangements, that gifts and sacrifices were offered which could only purge the flesh, not the conscience. μὴ δυνάμεναι, Winer's note (p. 508) is misleading. Cf. Jebb's Appendix to Vincent and Dickson's Modern Greek, p. 340. "In later Greek, è... tended to usurp the place of ἐστὶν," especially with participles. Cf. Blass, 255. κατὰ συνεδρίαν τελειώσαν means, to give to the worshipper the consciousness that he is inwardly cleansed from defilement and is truly in communion with God; to bring conscience finally into peace.

Ver. 10. μόνον ἔως ἐβραίσαν... "... μόνον evidently introduces the positive aspect of the virtue of the "gifts and sacrifices," thus more closely defining μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνεδρίαν τελειώσαν... the gifts and sacrifices are not able to bring the worshipper into a final rest as regards conscience, only having effect so far as regards meats and drinks and divers washings—ordinances of the flesh, not of the conscience, imposed until a time of rectification. The change of preposition from κατὰ to ἐν... need excite no surprise (cf. Aristotle's frequent change of preposition, e.g., Eth. Nic., iv. 3, 26); and here there is a slight distinction in the reference. ἐν... has frequently the meaning "in connection with," "with regard to" as in Luke xii. 52; John xii.
IX.

Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος

καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενος.  

τῶν μελλόντων ἄγαθων, διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτῆτος.

μελλόντων ἐν ΜΑΔΕΚΛΠ, f, vg., Copt., Basm., Συρ. ms.; γενόμενων in BD*, d, e, Syr. text. But the former was more likely to be changed into the latter reading than vice versa.

16: Acts xxi. 24 [see especially Donaldson's excellent treatment of this preposition (Greek Gram., p. 518) showing that with the dative it signifies absolute superposition, i.e., rest upon, or close to; hence addition, subsequence and succession, then "that which is close by us as a suggesting cause, accompaniment, motive, or condition". ἐν τούτῳ φιλοῦν ἄγαθος φανερὸς γνώριμος, "we are cheerful on account of the prosperity of our friends". ἐνομάζοις δὲ πάντα ταῦτα ἐπὶ ταῖς δέξεσι τοῦ μεγάλου ζωῆς but were to give all these things names from in accordance with) the opinions of the great monster" (Plato, Rep. 493, c.)] The meaning then is that the virtue (δυνάμεως) of the gifts and sacrifices is only in relation to defilements occasioned by eating and drinking or neglecting the enjoined purifications. διακόματα στερεός may either be construed as a contemptuous exclamation appended, or it may be softened by ὀφθαλμοῦ "which are", μῆκος καιροῦ διορθώσεως "usque ad tempus correctionis". διάφθορας is a making straight or right; used by Hippocrates of reducing a fracture, by Aristotle of repairing roads and houses, by Polybius of paying debts, of education, etc. It means, putting things right, bringing matters into a satisfactory state, and is thus used of the introduction of the new covenant, in confirmation of viii. 8. No term could better express this writer's view of the characteristic of Messianic times.

Ver. 11. Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος... "But Christ having arrived a High Priest of the good things that were to be, He, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is, not of this creation, nor yet through blood of the goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered once for all into the Holy of Holies, and obtained eternal redemption." The main thought of the verse is that Christ has obtained eternal redemption; the διὰ, therefore, which introduces it, refers to the inability of the Levitical gifts and sacrifices to perfect the worshipper. The greater efficiency of Christ's ministry results from its being exercised in a more perfect tabernacle and with a truer sacrifice. παραγενόμενος, scarcely, as Vulg, "assistens" rather "having arrived," as in Matt. ii. 1, iii. 1, 13; and frequently in Luke and Acts. Cf. Isa. lix. 11. ἐν τῷ σωτηρίῳ παραγίνεται... Here it is in fulfilment of the expectation aroused by μῆκος διαφθοράς τῶν μελλόντων. "The genitive gives the subject of the high priestly action. High Priest, concerned about, ministering in, securing and applying by His ministry τὰ μελλόντα... The genitive here is nearly equivalent to the accusative τῶ ἁπάντων ἔθνων in ii. 17" (Vaughan). The good things that were to be under the new covenant are specified in viii. 10-12; they surpassed all expectation, however. "The High Priest" of the good things coming is only in a local (Weiss, etc.) but an instrumental sense, "by means of". It was because He was High Priest not in the earthly but the heavenly tabernacle that He was able to secure these great results. No doubt διὰ in a similar connection in iv. 14 and x. 20 is used locally. But this sense is not so applicable here. Christ is represented here as the High Priest ministering in the tabernacle, not passing through it (Cf. Davidson and Westcott). τὰ μελλόντα καὶ τὰ σφυγνά, the tabernacle greater and more perfect than that which has been described in the preceding verses, and which has itself been mentioned as the scene of Christ's ministry, viii. 2. This tabernacle is "not made with hands" oὐ χειροποιητὸν, as in ver. 24; equivalent to ἄν εἰσέβαλεν δ Κύριος σὺν ἀρχαίοις, viii. 2. Our Lord characterised the temple as χειροποιητὸν, Mark xiv. 58. Being of human manufacture, viii. 2, it could be only a symbolic dwelling for God and a symbolic worship was appropriate. The words οὐ τοῖς τῆς κτίσεως are added in ex-
planation, although, as Bleek remarks, they are certainly no clearer than the words they are meant to explain. They are, however, more significant; for they point out that the tabernacle in which Christ ministers does not belong to this world at all, has no place among created things and is thus in striking contrast to the ἡμῶν κοσμὸν of ver. 1. It must, however, be acknowledged that Field (Ovisión Norv., p. 229) has shown reason for believing that we should translate "not of ordinary erection". "By ταύτης I understand vulgāris, quae vulgo dicitur"; and εἰρήνεια he sees no occasion to take in any other sense than that in which εἰρήνεια is commonly applied to a city (3 Esd. iv. 53) or to the tabernacle itself (Lev. xvi. 16). This meaning of ταύτης, though warranted by the LXX cited by Field is, however, rare; and the sense is a little flat, whereas the other interpretation is full of significance.

Ver. 12. οὐδὲ δι' αἷματος τράγων... Not only was the place of ministry different, the sacrifice offered also was different. "Not without blood," could the High Priest make his annual entry (ver. 7), but it was with the blood of a calf for himself and of a he-goat for the people. In LXX of Lev. xvi. the ῥαγος is uniformly called χρισμός but in Aquila's version ῥαγος is used in ver. 8 and in Symmachus in vv. 8 and 10. δι' αἷματος τράγων. "So only could He enter for us. As the Eternal Son He has a right there; as the High Priest of man, He enters in virtue of the sacrifice of Himself" (Vaughan).

Ver. 13. ἵνα τῷ αἷμα... "For if the blood of goats and bulls and an heifer's ashes sprinkling the unclean purify as regards the cleanness of the flesh, how much rather shall the blood of the Christ, who through eternal spirit offered Himself without blemish to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God" The writer thus justifies the affirmation of ver. 12 that by offering His own blood Christ obtained eternal redemption. ἐξ αἵματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (not used in LXX) is replaced by καθάρσεα, "made common," i.e., profane, ceremonially unclean. Deftlement was contracted by touching a dead body, or entering into a house in which a corpse was lying, or touching a bone or a tomb; and to enter the Tabernacle while thus defiled was to incur the penalty of being cut off from Israel. The water in which lay the ashes of the burned heifer was therefore provided for purification (καθάρσις) and by using it the worshipper was again rendered fit for entrance to the worship of

God's power governs events, and is not to be translated as if it were a passive; so Vulg., "aspersus inquinatos sanctificat" (cf. Calvin and Bengel). 

v. 11. The meaning is determined by its use in Num. xix., where it signifies the removal of ceremonial defilement: the taking away of that which rendered the person "common" or "profane," and the qualifying him for again worshipping God. This ἁγιάζως extended πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρσίαν, "in the direction of" (vi. 11) or "in relation to" (ii. 17, v. 1) (cf. Weiss). The flesh is here opposed to "the conscience" of ver. 4. It was only the flesh that was defiled by attending to the dead; and only the flesh that was cleansed by the prescribed sprinkling. Defilement and cleansing were alike symbolic. It was within a well-defined ceremonial limit these sacrifices and washings availed. What kind of water, no matter how mixed with heifer's ashes, could reach and wash the soul?

Ver. 14. τὸ δὲ μάλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. . . . The Levitical sacrifices had their congruous effect, the sacrifice of Christ must also have its appropriate result. The blood offered was not of bulls and goats but of "the Christ," it was not with another's blood (vicarious, ver. 25) but with His own He entered God's presence. His was not a bodily sacrifice but διὰ πνεύματος αἰματοῦ. διὰ δὲ πνεύματος αἰματοῦ . . . Θεοῦ. This clause is inserted to justify the efficacy of the blood of Christ in cleansing the conscience. It had virtue to cleanse the conscience because it was the blood of one "who through eternal spirit offered Himself blameless to God". How are we to understand διὰ πν. αἰματοῦ? Riehm considers it a parallele expression to that of vii. 16, κατὰ δύναμιν ζώης ἀκαταλήπτου, and that it is here used to bring out the idea that Christ having an eternal spirit was thereby able to perform the whole work of atonement, not merely dying on the cross but passing through that death to present Himself before God. So too Davidson, Weiss and others. This involves that προσήγγεσθαι refers not to the cross but to the appearance before God, subsequently to the death. And it does not account for the absence of the article. It seems more relevant to the passage and more consistent with the purpose of the clause (to show the ground of the efficacy of the blood of Christ) to understand the words as expressing the spiritual nature of the sacrifice which gave it eternal validity. It had superior efficacy to the blood of bulls and goats because it was not of the flesh merely, but was expressive of the spirit. It is the spirit prompting the sacrifice and giving it efficacy, which the writer seeks to indicate. Over against the "ordinances of the flesh" which made the slaughter of a flesh offering an arbitrary and a mere matter of letting material blood, he sets this wholly different sacrifice which was prompted and inspired by spirit and belonged wholly to the sphere of spiritual and eternal things. [Spiritus opponitur conditioni animantum ratione carentium (ver. 13, Bengel); "bezeichnet das Lebensprinzip, in dessen Kraft, von dem beseelt und angetrieben Christus sich opferte" (Kubel)]. It was the spirit underlying and expressed in the sacrifice which gave it all its potency. Spirit is eternal and can alone be efficacious in eternal things. ἀναθίνω. The Levitical High Priest, as stated in ver. 25, entered the holy place ἐν αἷματι ἄλλω των ἑαυτοῦ, but Christ ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ αἷματι. Also goats and calves were of no great value, but what Christ offered was of infinite value. Two points are brought out by ἀναθίνω.

1. He offered not a vicarious victim; but, as Priest, offered the only true sacrifice, Himself. Therefore His blood had cleansing efficacy. (2) He offered not a cheap animal, but the most precious of sacrifices. προσήγγεσθαι, i.e., on the cross; for the clause is an explanation of the value of the blood. Cf. ver. 28. ἐμίσον without blemish, perfect, as required in the Levitical sacrifices, but now with an ethical significance, and therefore possessing an ethical validity. This explains how the blood of Christ should not merely furnish ceremonial cleanliness but καθαριζει τὴν συνειδησιν υμῶν ἐπάνω νεκρῶν ἡγε

, a characterisation of sins suggested by the context. Works that defile; as the touching of a dead body defiled the
worshipper. Works from which a man must be cleansed before he can enter God's presence. A pause might be made before εργῶν, from dead—not bodies but works. [καθαρίσας, Hellenistic; see Anz. Subsidia, 374. In class. καθαρίσαι is used, as in Herod. i. 44, τῶν αὐτῶν φῶν ἐκάθισεν, and Æsch. Choeph. 72.] This cleansing is preparatory to the worship of the living God εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ἀνευμένον. The living God, who is all life, can suffer no taint of death in His worshippers. Death moral and physical cannot exist in His presence. λατρεύειν "ad servendum, in perpetuum, modo beatissimo et vere sacerdotali" (Bengel).

Ver. 15. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, "And on this account," that is to say, because, as stated in ver. 14, Christ's blood cleanses the conscience from dead works and thus fits men to draw near to God, διαθέτει· καὶ ἡμέρα τετελεσμένη δεσμών, "He is mediator of a new covenant ". The old covenant with sacrifices which could only cleanse the flesh allowed sins to accumulate. But Christ, as above stated, obtained cleansing from sins, and so laid the essential foundation of a new covenant, viii. 12. ἐν θανάτω τούτω χωρομένῳ . . . "that a death having taken place for deliverance from the transgressions [committed] under the first covenant, those who have been called might receive the promised eternal inheritance ". Even under the old covenant this inheritance had been promised. A gospel had been preached to them, and they had been invited, iv. 2. God being during that period the covenant God of the people, this involved eternal good. But until their transgressions were atoned for they could not receive the inheritance. The sacrifices under the old covenant could not atone for sin, therefore a new covenant with a death which could atone was necessary; in order that such a death having taken place and their sins being removed they might receive fulfillment of the promise. The retrospective reference of the death of Christ is here affirmed; as in xi. 40 it is stated that without us, i.e., without the Christian dispensation, the O.T. believers could not be perfected, the words of κεκλημένοι, therefore, include not only the Hebrews addressed but all who had lived under the O.T. dispensation. ἀπολύτρωσις . . . παραβάσεως, the genitive is of the object from which redemption is achieved, and εἶναι is scarcely "against" as in Vaughan, but rather "in the time of," as in ix. 26, Phil. i. 3.

Ver. 16. τοῦτο γὰρ διαθήκη . . . The meaning of these words is doubtful. In the LXX διαθήκη occurs about 280 times and in all but four instances translates νομός, covenant. In classical and Hellenistic Greek, however, it is the common word for "will" or "testament" (see especially The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Grenfell and Hunt, Part I., 105, etc., where the normal meaning of the word appears also from the use of διάθέσεως for "intestate" and μεταδιάθεσις for "to alter a will"). Accordingly it has been supposed by several interpreters that the writer, taking advantage of the double meaning of διαθήκη at this point introduces an argument which applies to it in the sense of "will" or "testament," but not in the sense of "covenant"; as if he said, "where a testamentary disposition of property is made, this comes into force only on the decease of the testator". ὅταν τάτων ἀνάγκη φησεῖσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου "it is necessary that the death of him who made the disposition be adduced". On the very common omission of the copula in the third singular indicative see Butt- mann, p. 136. φησίναι, "necesse est afferti testimonia de morte testamentori" (Wetstein). For passages establishing its use as a term of the courts for the production of evidence, etc., see Field in loc. and especially Appian, De Bel. Civil. ii. 143, διαθήκης δι' τοῦ Καλαραγός ἕφησον φηρόμενον. (See also Eisner in loc.) φησίν is apparently even used for "to register" in the Oxy. Papyri, Part ii. 244. The reason of this necessity is given in ver. 17. διαθήκης γὰρ ἐπιλεγμένοις βεβαία . . . "for a testament is of force with reference to dead people, since it is never of any force when the testator is alive". On this interpretation the
words mean that before the inheritance, alluded to in ver. 15, could become the possession of those to whom it had been promised, Christ must die. He is thus represented as a testator. The illustration from the general law relating to wills or testaments extends only to the one point that Christ's people could inherit only on condition of Christ's death. The reason of Christ's death receives no illustration. He did not die merely to make room for the heir. The objections to this interpretation are (1) the constant Biblical usage by which, with one doubtfulexception in Gal. iii., deixe\(\)t\(\) stands for "covenant," not for "will". On this point see the strong statement of Hatch, Essays in Bibl. Greek, p. 48. "There can be little doubt that the word must be invariably taken in this sense of "covenant" in the N.T., and especially in a book which is so impregnated with the language of the LXX as the epistle to the Hebrews". (2) His argument regarding covenants receives no help from usages which obtain in connection with testaments which are not covenants. The fact that both could be spoken of under the same name shows that they were related in some way; but presumably the writer had in view things and not merely words. To adduce the fact that in the case of wills the death of the testator is the condition of validity, is, of course, no proof at all that a death is necessary to make a covenant valid. (3) The argument of ver. 18 is destroyed if we understand v. 16, 17 of wills; for in this verse it is the first covenant that is referred to.

But is it possible to retain the meaning "covenant"? Westcott, Rendall, Hatch, Moulton and others think it is possible. To support his argument, proving the necessity of Christ's death, the writer adduces the general law that he who makes a covenant does so at the expense of life. What is meant becomes plain in the 18th verse, for in the covenant there alluded to, the covenanting people were received into covenant through death.

That covenant only became valid \(\varepsilon\varrho\varphi\iota\varphi\iota\iota\varepsilon\ \varphi\varepsilon\kappa\rho\omega\iota\sigma\varsigma\) over the dead bodies of the victims slain as representing the people. Whatever this substitutionary death may have meant, it was necessary to the ratification of the covenant. The sacrifices may have been expiatory, indicating that all old debts and obligations were cancelled and that the covenanters entered into this covenant as clean and new men; or they may have meant that the terms of the covenant were immutable; or that the people died to the past and became wholly the people of God. In any case the dead victims were necessary, and without them, \(\chi\nu\pi\rho\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\mu\rho\varsigma\varsigma\), the covenant was not inaugurated or ratified. Great light has been thrown on this passage by Dr. Trumbull in his Blood Covenant, in which he shows the universality of that form of compact and the significance of the blood. The rite of interchanging blood or tasting one another's blood, indicates that the two are bound in one life and must be all in all to one another. On the whole, this interpretation is to be preferred. Certainly it connects much better with what follows. For having shown that by dead victims all covenants are ratified, the writer proceeds: \(\psi\varepsilon\nu\ \alpha\xi\tau\varsigma\ \iota\upsilon\pi\tau\varsigma\ \chi\nu\pi\rho\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\mu\rho\varsigma\varsigma\ \varepsilon\upiota\kappa\alpha\kappa\iota\iota\upsigma\iota\varsigma\iota\iota\varsigma\), "wherefore not even the first,—although imperfect and temporary—" was inaugurated without blood,"i.e., without death." [The perfect here as elsewhere in Hebrews is scarcely distinguishable from the aorist.] Proof that this statement regarding the first covenant is correct he forthwith gives in vv. 19-20.

Ver 19. \(\lambda\alpha\nu\theta\varepsilon\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\varsigma\varsigma\ \iota\nu\tau\alpha\lambda\varsigma\). . . . "For when Moses had spoken to the people every commandment of the law," this being the needful preliminary, that the people might clearly understand the obligations they assumed on entering the covenant, he then took the blood of the calves and the goats, etc. In Exod. xxiv. 3 ff., an account is given of the inauguration of the first covenant. To that narrative certain
additions of no importance are here made. In Exodus no mention is made of goats, only of ποιεόμενα. (See Westcott on this discrepancy.) Probably this addition is due to the fact that the σαρκός was added to the blood to prevent coagulation or possibly as a symbol of cleansing; (cf. Jo. xix. 34; i Jo. v. 6) scarlet wool, κόκκινος, so called from κόκκος "the grain or berry of the ἰξες κοσσιφορά" used in dyeing (cf. Lev. xiv. 4) and so by Winer. Not that it was by Moses but by Aaron the tabernacle and the altar were sprinkled with blood and so cleansed on the day of Atonement. When first erected his σημεία καὶ πάντα τὰ σημεία αὐτῶν were anointed with oil (Exod. xi. 9) but Josephus records a tradition that it was consecrated not only with oil but also with blood (Ant. iii. 8, 6). It seems that the author adopts this tradition, and ascribes to Moses at the original consecration of the tabernacle the cleansing rites which afterwards were annually performed by Aaron on the day of Atonement.

Ver. 22. καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἷμα πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ χωρίς

Ver. 21. καὶ τῆς σημαίνεται δὲ... "And he also in like manner sprinkled with the blood the tabernacle and all the instruments of the service". The tabernacle, however, was not yet erected when the covenant was instituted. Delitzsch supposes that a subsequent though kindred transaction is referred to; and colour is given to this supposition by the separation of this verse from ver. 19. But against it is the article in τῷ αἷμα, "the blood," apparently the blood defined in vv. 19 and 20; although it is just possible the writer may have meant "the blood" which formed part of the means of cleansing of goats but not of Aaron the tabernacle and the altar were sprinkled with blood and so cleansed on the day of Atonement. When first erected καὶ σημεία καὶ πάντα τὰ σημεία αὐτῶν were anointed with oil (Exod. xi. 9) but Josephus records a tradition that it

was consecrated not only with oil but also with blood (Ant. iii. 8, 6). It seems that the author adopts this tradition, and ascribes to Moses at the original consecration of the tabernacle the cleansing rites which afterwards were annually performed by Aaron on the day of Atonement.

Ver. 22. καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἷμα πάντα... "And one may almost say that according to the law all things are cleansed with blood, and without blood-shedding is no remission". σχεδὸν qualifies the whole clause and not only πάντα. Whether it qualifies both clauses, as Bleek, Weiss and others suppose, is more doubtful. Westcott and Delitzsch confine its reference to the first clause. ἐν αἷμα... "with blood" the usual instrumental ἐν πάντες, all things, especially, of course, those that were used in God's worship or brought into His tabernacle. Water was used for cleansing from certain pollutions. κατὰ τὸν νόμον, it was not only a contrivance of man but the law of God which enacted that cleansing must be by blood. καὶ χωρίς αἷμα τε ἔχουσεν, "without blood-shedding," a word which occurs only here in Bibl. Greek. See Stephanus s.v. In all the instances cited in Stephanus it means the shedding of blood. Rendall, then, is quite wrong in maintaining (after Tholuck and Dr. Watts) that it means, not the shedding but the outpouring of the blood at the foot of the altar. "The essential idea attached to the one act was destruction of life, of the other devotion of the same life to God. Hence the typical significance of the two acts was also quite distinct; outpouring of blood typified in fact, not physical death, but spiritual martyrdom by the surrender of a living will to God in perfect obedience 'even unto death'". Weiss is strictly accurate in his remark, "αἷμα kann ohne eine lokale Nähерbe stimmung die des Blutes am Altare bezeichnen". The evidence is furnished by Bleek. The words, if not suggested by, inevitably recall our Lord's words (Matt. xxvi. 28) τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα μοῦ τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκκυννόων.
Cleansing was required of everything connected with God's worship, because it was stained through contact with men. And that this stain was guilt is implied in the use of ἁφεσις. It is by remission of sin the stain is removed. And according to the great law of Lev. xvii. 11, this remission was attained by the shedding of blood to 

Ver. 23. " It was necessary, therefore, that the copies indeed of the heavenly things be cleansed with these, but the heavenliesthemselves with better sacrifices than these." ἁφεσις is used absolutely only here and in Mark iii. 29; elsewhere it is used with ἀπορριμματος to be cleansed. And so our heavenly relations with God, and all wherewith we seek to approach Him, need cleansing. The earthly tabernacle, as God's dwelling, might have been supposed to be hallowed by His presence and to need no cleansing, but being also His meeting-place with men it required to be cleansed. And so our heavenly relations with God, and all wherewith we seek to approach Him, need cleansing. In themselves things heavenly need no cleansing, but as entered upon by sinful men they need it. Our eternal relations with God require purification.

Ver. 24. " Better sacrifices" were needed, for it is not into a holy place constructed by man that Christ has entered, but into heaven itself. Others prefer to connect this verse with κρατατος θυσιας. " Better sacrifices" were needed, for not into, etc. The humanly constructed tabernacle, being made after the divine pattern, viii. 5, is here called ἀντί των ἁγιασμων. According to viii. 5 a ἀντιτι των of the heavenly realities was shown to Moses, and what he constructed from that model was an ἀντί των ἁγιασμων. According to viii. 5 the heavenly realities were contrasted with τῶν θυσιῶν, heaven itself (in agreement with ἁγιασμα) must mean what we usually speak of as a type, that which corresponds to and prefigures. In the only other instance of its occurrence, 1 Pet. iii. 21, it has the converse meaning, the reality of baptism which corresponds to or is the antitype of the deluge. The ἁγιασμα is contrasted with αὐτὸν τῶν θυσιάς, heaven itself (in contrast to the mere likeness or copy) the ultimate reality, the presence of spiritual and eternal things. " Coelum in quod Christus ingressus est, non est ipsum coelum creatum quodcumque fuerit, sed est coelum in quo Deus est etiam quando coelum creatum nullum est, ipsa

1 ἡμῶν in ΝΑΚΡ, 37, 39, 47, 73; νῦν in DEΚ.

2 T.R. CD=ΕΚŁ; insert τῆς with ΝΑΚΡ, 17, 73.

gloria divina" (Seb. Schmidt in Delitzsch). νῦν ἐπίθετος... "now to appear openly before the face of God in our behalf," νῦν "now," after His completed work on earth, and as his present continuous function; in contrast both to the past ministries, in which face to face communion was impossible, and to Christ's reappearance to men, ver. 28. ἐπίθετος τοῦ ἀλληρίου. The meaning of ἀλληρίου is most clearly seen from such passages as Exod. xxxiii. 18, Jo. xiv. 21. In the passive it means "to show oneself" or "to appear openly" or "clearly," "to show oneself," as in Mat. xxvii. 53 of the bodies of the saints, ἐπίθετος πολλάκις. The infinitive is the designative of the defined result common in N.T., as in classics, especially after verbs of motion, cf. Mat. ii. 2, xi. 6, etc. The aorist may here be used to denote that "the manifestation of Christ, in whom humanity is shown in its perfect ideal before the face of God is 'one act at once';" but this is doubtful. The force of ἐπίθετος, is strengthened still more by the emphatic τοῦ ἀλληρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ. The earthly sanctuary the law was ἐπίθετος ἐν τῷ καλῷ (Exod. xxxiii. 23) but ἐπίθετος ἐπιπλεγμάτων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (Lev. xvi. 2). In Ps. xlii. 2 we find indeed πάντα ἐν ἐκεῖνον κελ ἐπίθετος ἐπιπλεγματών τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ; but this is the non-literal expression of a poet. In the present passage the words are not the loose expression of the ordinary worshipper but are meant to be taken literally. And the intentionally emphatic character of the whole phrase is best accounted for by the fact that the darkness and clouds of incense in the old sanctuary were meant as much to veil the unworthiness of the priest from God as the glory of God from the priest. Now Christ appears before God face to face with no intervening cloud. Perfect fellowship is attained by His perfect and stainless offering of Himself. All is clear between God and man. For it is ὅπως ἡμῶν "for us" He enters this presence and fellowship; not that He alone may enjoy it, but that we may enter into the rest and blessedness that He has won for us.

Ver. 25. ὃθ᾽ ἴνα πολλάκις... "Nor yet [did He enter in] in order to offer Himself repeatedly," that is, He did not enter in for a brief stay from which He was to return to renew His sacrifice. Westcott holds that the "offering" corresponds with the offering of the victims upon the altar, not with the bringing of the blood into the Holy of Holies. He refers to ver. 14 ἀναπληρ. προσήνεγκεν, to ver. 28, and also to x. 10. Similarly Weiss and others. But in ix. 7 προσήνεγκεν distinctly refers to the bringing in and application of the blood in the Holy of Holies, and the context of the present passage seems destined to make for the same interpretation. The sequence of the ἐν clause after ἐνεργείᾳ; the analogy presented in the clause under ἀλληρίῳ; and the consequence stated under ἐπίθετος (ver. 26) all come in favouring this meaning. The High Priest enters the Holiest annually, but Christ's entering in was of another kind, not requiring repetition. The reason for the reiterated entering in of the High Priest, as well as the possibility of it, is given in the words ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἀλληρίῳ. The High Priest was, as it were, surrounded, enveloped, in the life sacrificed and symbolically communicated" (Westcott). It is safer to take ἐν in its common instrumental sense: the blood was the instrument which enabled the High Priest to enter. The reason why the entrance had to be annually renewed is given in x. 12. The same contrast between ἀληθείᾳ ἀλληρίῳ and ἀληθείᾳ ἐπίθετος is found in ix. 12. A sacrifice of blood not one's own is necessarily imperfect, Christ's entrance to God being ἐν τῷ ἐπίθετῳ ἁμαρτών and ἐν ἐπίθετος ἐπανεύθυνες had eternal efficacy.

Ver. 26. ἐπίθετος... "Since in that case he must often have suffered since the creation." If Christ's one offering of Himself were not eternally efficacious, if it required periodical renewal, then this demanded periodical sacrifice. It was "not without blood"
the entrance was made, and if the entrance required repetition, so must the sacrifice be repeated. And as sin prevailed κατὰ καθολὴν κόσμον, the entrance must also date from the first. The contrast is with the one offering ἤν τοῦ θυσιαστήρα, "If his offering of Himself were not independent of time and valid as a single act, if it were valid only for the generation for which it is immediately made, then in order to benefit men in the past, He must have suffered often, indeed in each generation of the past" (Davidson). ἐντὰς ἐν τῷ ἡμερῶν "But now once at the consummation of the ages He has been manifested for sin’s abolition by His sacrifice." ὅσα ὡς τὰ ἀνθρώπους, "as things are," in contrast to the case supposed in ver. 25, the possibility of His repeated entrance and sacrifice. For the word, see viii. 6. θανάτος not ἐκκλησίας, vv. 25, 26; and this, ἐνεργεία τῶν αἰῶνων [for ἐν ἐν this use see Winer, p. 489] at that period of history in which all that has happened since the foundation of the world (ἄνευ καθολοῦ κόσμου) finds its interpretation and adjustment. If there was to be one sacrifice for all generations, the occurrence of that sacrifice itself marked the period as the consummation. It closes the periods of symbolism, expectation and doubt, suggesting, perhaps, the word πεφανερώθη for Christ’s appearance, as that which was dimly fore-shadowed, blindly longed for. εἰς ἀποκατάστασιν τῆς ἀμαρτίας. The object of Christ’s appearance, the abolition of sin, made the repetition of His sacrifice unnecessary. In vii. ἀποκατάστασις is used of permanent displacement, removal, or setting aside, that is, abolition. τῆς ἀμαρτίας of sin, in its most general and comprehensive sense, all sin. This was the great object of Christ’s manifestation, the annulling of sin, its total destruction, the counteraction of all its effects. This was to be accomplished διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ "through His sacrifice," the simple subjective genitive. The sentence draws attention not to the nature of the sacrifice, but to its three characteristics, that it was made once for all, in the consummation, for sin’s abolition.

Ver. 27. Καὶ καθ’ ἄνθρωπον... "And inasmuch as it is reserved for men once to die and, after this, judgment, so, also, Christ, etc." To confirm his statement that Christ’s sacrifice was “once for all,” he appeals to the normal conditions of human death. To men generally, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, it is appointed once to die, men are not permitted to return to earth to compensate for neglect or failure, but immediately succeeding upon death, if not in time, yet in consequence, follows judgment. The results of life are entered upon. So Christ died but once and the results will be apparent in His appearing the second time without sin unto salvation. ἄντίκειται "is reserved" as in Longinus’ De Subl. ix. 7, ἦν᾽ ὑποθαλυμοῦσιν ἀντίκειται λίμνη κατὰ τὸν θάνατον, cf. iii. 5; also Dion. Hal. v. 8, ὀς τοῖς κακοτρόφοις ἀντίκειται παθοῦν, and especially 2 Tim. iv. 8. What is destined for all men is not simply death, but ἐπιλέγεται τοῖς αὐτοῖς διότι ἔτη τοῦ τε καθίσταται "after this," but how long, the author does not say. "Man dies once, and the next thing before him is judgment." So Christ died once and the next thing before Him is the Advent" (Vaughan).

Ver. 28. ὡς ὁ εἰς. The comparison extends to both terms, the once dying and the judgment. [Cf. Kübel, “die Korrespondenz ist nicht bloss die der gleichen Menschennatur, sondern das, dass mit dem Tod das, was das Leben bedeutet, abgeschlossen, fertig ist.”]. The results of the life are settled. And in Christ’s case the result is that He appears the second time without sin unto salvation, the sin having been destroyed by His death. ἡ ἀποκατάστασις corresponds to ἐπιλεγέται of ver. 27. The passive is used to be more in keeping with the universal law expressed in ἄντίκειται of ver. 27. Though the "offering" as we have seen includes both the death and the entrance into the Holiest with the blood, it is the death which is here prominent. εἰς τὸν πολλὴν ἀνεκατατεθήκην ἀμαρτίας, "to bear the sins of many". Westcott
X. 1. “ΧΙΙΑΝ γὰρ ἰχνὼν τῶν μελλόντων ἤγαθὼν, οὐκ εἰς ἡς εἰκών τῶν πραγμάτων, κατ’ ἐπιμυϊν ταῖς ἀυταῖς θυσίας 1 ὡς προσφέρων εἰς τὸ διηνέκες, οὐδέποτε δύναται 2 τοὺς προσφέροντας

1 ἔππ add anton.
2 T.R. in D*, etc., EHL, d, c, f, vg., Basm., Copt.; διαναι in ἩΑCDDP.

... says, “the burden which Christ took upon Him and bore to the cross was ‘the sins of many’ not, primarily, or separately from the sins, the punishment of sins.” But in what intelligible sense can sins be borne but by bearing their punishment? In Numbers xiv. 33, e.g., it is said “your sins shall be fed in the wilderness forty years καὶ ἀνειλθοῦν τὴν τορπελέα ὄμως, where the same verb is used as here to express the idea of suffering punishment for the sins of others. ἔπλεθ, although it was the death of but one, cf. Rom. v. 17, but probably only a reminiscence of Isa. lviii. 13, ἐπλέθαν ἀνθρώπους, εἰς διπλήν οὖν... a second time He shall appear, ἐφεξῆς, visible to the eye. The word is probably used because appropriate to the appearances after the resurrection, cf. Luke xxiv. 34, Acts ix. 17, xiii. 31, i Cor. 5, 6, 7, 8 where ἔφθας is regularly used. But on this “second” appearance His object is different. He will come not εἰς τὸ πολ. ἄνεμ. ἀμαρτίας, but χρεὶ ὡς εἰς σωτηρίαν irrespective of sin, not to be a sin offering but to make those who wait for Him partakers of the great salvation, ii. 3, cf. x. 37-39; and ix. 12. τοῖς ἀφ᾽ ἐν ἀνεκδοτοῦσι “There may be an illusion to the reappearance of the High Priest after the solemn ceremonial in the Holy of Holies on the day of atonement to the anxiously waiting people” (Vaughan). Cf. Luke i. 21. The word is used in x Cor. i. 7 and Phil. iii. 20 of the expectation of the second advent, and in 2 Tim. iv. 8 is varied by the beautiful expression “they that have loved His appearing”.

Chapter X.—Vv. 1-18. Finality of Christ’s one sacrifice. The law merely presents a shadow of the essential spiritual blessings and does not perfect those who seek God through it. Its sacrifices therefore must be continually repeated and the consciousness of sins is annually revived, for animal blood cannot take sins away. Accordingly, when Christ comes into the world He says, “Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldst not, I am come to do Thy will”. He proclaims the uselessness of O.T. sacrifices, that He may clear the ground for “the offering of the body of Christ”. This is the great distinction between Christ and all other priests. They stand daily ministering, He by one offering has perfected those who approach God through Him.


Ver. 1. Σκιάν γὰρ ἰχνὸν... The γὰρ intimates that we have here a further explanation of the finality of Christ’s one sacrifice (ix. 28) and therefore of its superiority to the sacrifices of the law. The explanation consists in this that the law had only “a shadow of the good things that were to be, not the very image of the things”. Σκίας is in the emphatic place, as that characteristic of the law which determines its inadequacy. “A shadow” suggests indefiniteness and unsubstantiality; a mere indication that a reality exists. ἔσκεω suggests what is in itself substantial and also gives a true representation of that which it images. “The ἔσκεω brings before us under the conditions of space, as we can understand it, that which is spiritual” (Westcott).

That the law possessed no more than a shadow of the coming good was exhibited in its constantly renewed sacrifices. κατ᾽ ἐπιμυϊν belongs to ταῖς ἀυταῖς θυσίαις, “with the same annually repeated sacrifices,” further explained and emphasised by the relative clause, δὲ προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνέκες, “which they perpetually offer”. ὡς ἐφεξῆς δύναται... the law can never with these perpetually renewed offerings perfect the worshippers”. “No repetition of the shadow can amount to the substance” (Davidson). The proof is given in the following words, ver. 2: ἐντελώς ὡς ἐν ἐσκεω...
offering was inefficacious, for had the worshippers once been cleansed they would have had no longer any consciousness of sins and would therefore have sought no renewal of sacrifice. It is, "since," if the O.T. sacrifices had perfected those who used them, to correspond to the consciousness of sin as barring approach to God. The sinner once cleansed may, no doubt, be again defiled and experience a renewed consciousness of guilt. But in the writer's view this consciousness is at once absorbed in the consciousness of his original cleansing. Cf. John xiii. 10. It was when incarnate he used the words. Neither is it merely meant that by his conduct Christ showed that these words were a true expression of his mind. Rather, the words are considered prophetic, depicting beforehand the mind of Christ regarding O.T. sacrifice, and His own mission. In several O.T. passages God's preference for obedience is affirmed (1 Sam. xv. 11, Ps. 1. 8, Micah, Isa. i. 11, Hosea, vi. 6) but this psalm is here selected because the phrase "a body hast thou prepared for me" lends itself to the writer's purpose. In the Psalm, indeed, sacrifice is contrasted with obedience to the will of God. A body is prepared for Christ that in it He may obey God. But it is the offering of this body as a sacrifice in contrast to the animal sacrifices of the law, which this writer emphasises (ver. 10).
Christian sacrifice and meal offering. Cf. Ephes. v. 2. oik hēlēsas "thou didst not will," a contrast is intended between this clause and to hēlēsas sou of the last clause of ver. 7. σάμαν κατ
ηρτσώμοι "but a body didst Thou prepare for me," implying that in this body God's will would be accomplished. Cf. ver. 10. The words are the LXX rendering of γραμματα τῆς βιβλίου, "ears didst Thou dig [or open] for me". The meaning is the same. The opened ear as the medium through which the will of God was received, and the body by which it was accomplished, alike signify obedience to the will of God. διοκατωματα καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτιάς representing ἧλιον ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, whole burnt offering and sin-offering. περὶ ἀμαρτια occurs frequently in Leviticus to denote sin-offering, θυσία being omitted. oik θυσίας "thou didst not take pleasure in". tōte elpion. "Then," that is, when it was apparent that not by animal sacrifices or material offerings could God be propitiated, "I said, Lo! I am come to do Thy will, O God," to accomplish that purpose of Thine which the sacrifices of the O.T. could not accomplish. That this is the correct construction is shown by ver. 9. For construction, cf. Burton, M. and T., 397; and Prof. Votaw, Use of Infin. in N. T. ἐν καπελαί βιβλίον γέγραπται περὶ ἤμων "in a book [lit. in a roll of a book] it has been written concerning me," κεφαλις denoting "a little head" was first applied to the end of the stick on which the parchment was rolled, and from which in artistically finished books two corina proceeded. [See Bleek, Rich's Dict. of Antiq., and Hatch's Concordance]. In the Psalm the phrase is joined with the previous words and might be read, "Lo! I am come, with a roll of a book written for me," in other words, with written instructions regarding the divine will as affecting me. The words can hardly mean that in Scripture predictions have been recorded regarding the writer of the Psalm. This, however, may be the meaning attached to the words as cited in the epistle, although it is quite as natural and legitimate to retain the original meaning and understand the words as a parenthetical explanation that Christ acknowledged as binding on Him all that had been written for the instruction of others in the will of God. But the likelihood is that if the writer was not merely transcribing the words as part of his quotation without attaching a definite meaning to them, he meant that the coming of the Messiah to do God's will had been written in the book of God's purpose. (Cf. Ps Iv. 9.) Ver. 8. The significance of the quotation is now explained. "He takes the first away, that he may establish the second." He declares the incompentence of the O.T. sacrifices to satisfy the will of God, in order that he may make room for that sacrifice which is permanently to satisfy God. ἀνεταρσεν, "Higher up," here meaning "in the former part of the quotation," corresponding to and contrasted with τῷ τῷ in ver. 9. λέγει, i.e., Christ, the subject of ἔρημον and ἀναμετρ. This is necessitated by λέγει in ver. 3. Yet it is not Christ directly, but the mind of Christ uttered by God in Scripture. ἔρημον, perfect, as expressing that which
1. o θεός omitted in Ν'ACDEKP, 17, d, e, Sah., Copt.
2. οι omitted in Ν'ACD*E*P, 17, 47, 73.
3. T.R. in Ν'DEKL, 17, 47, d, e, f, vg.; αρχιερεῖν in ACP, Syr* et p, Basm., Arm.

permanently fulfills the will of God. ἄναπτειν is used in classic Greek of the destruction or abolition or repeal of laws, governments, customs, etc.

Ver. 10. ἐν τῷ θελήματι... "in which will," that is, in the will which Christ came to do (ver. 9), "we have been made fit for God's presence and fellowship by means of the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all". The will of God which the O.T. sacrifices could not accomplish was the "sanctification" of men, that is, the bringing of men into true fellowship with God. This will has been accomplished, we have been cleansed and introduced into God's fellowship through the offering of the body of Christ. By the use of the word προσφέρων the writer shows that it was not a mere general obedience to the will of God he had in view, but the fulfilment of God's will in the particular form of yielding Himself to a sacrificial death. His obedience in order to become an atoning sacrifice took a particular form, the form of "tasting death for every man". [For a different view see Bruce in loc. and Gould's N.T. Theo., p. 169. On the other hand see Riehm and Macdonell's Donelson Lectures, p. 49-59.] τὸν θελήματος ὧν ἡ χριστιανή ἐφάνεται, the offering of the body must of course be taken in connection with ix. 14, διὰ πνεύματος αλονίου and also with the defining words ἡ χριστιανή ἐφάνεται is added in contrast to the note of inferiority attaching to the O.T. sacrifices, as given in ver. 1, their need of continual renewal.

Vv. 11-14. That Christ's one sacrifice has accomplished its end of bringing men to God is illustrated by His sitting down at God's right hand.

Ver. 11. καλ introduces a new aspect of the finality of Christ's sacrifice, to wit, that "whereas every priest stands daily ministering and often offering the same sacrifices,—inasmuch as they are such as never can take sins away—this man having offered one sacrifice for sins for ever sat down on God's right hand, henceforth waiting till his enemies be set as a footstool for his feet." For by one offering He hath perfected for ever the sanctified." The argument is in this statement advanced a step. For although the three points urged in vv. 1-4 are here still in view, viz., that "the Levitical service consists of repeated acts (καθ' ἡμερὰς, κατ' εἰναιντόν) and these the same (αὐτὰ εἴναιντα) and essentially ineffective (οὖσαν τὸ δωματία, κ.τ.λ.), yet it is now the action of the priest rather than the nature of the sacrifice that comes to the front, and the finality of Christ's offering is argued from the historical fact that He was not any longer standing ministering but had sat down as one who had quite finished His work. Therefore in ver. 14 τετελείωκεν ἔλεγχο ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ διδασκάλου takes the place of ἡμιζω ריו in ver. 10. Nothing further requires to be done to secure in perpetuity the fellowship of man with God. In the one sacrifice of Christ there is cleansing which fits men to draw near to God, to enter into covenant with Him, and there is also ground laid for their continuance in that fellowship. The future (ἐτὸς τοῦ διδασκάλου) is provided for as well as the past. Limborch quoted by Bleck says "perficit, i.e., perfecte et plene a peccatorum reatu liberavit, ita ut in perpetuum sanctificati sint et ulteriore aut nova oblatione non indigent". "His one offering gathers up into itself both the sacrifice that inaugurates the covenant, and all the many sacrifices offered year by year to maintain it and to realise it; it reaches the idea which they strove towards in vain, and by reaching it for ever sets them aside" (Davidson).

In ver. 11 the more expressive περιπλέκων replaces ἀφαίρειν of ver. 4. It means "to take away something that is all
round" as δέρμα, a garment, the covering of a letter. In Gen. xli. 42 it is used of Pharaoh taking off his ring. The phrase therefore suggests that man is enveloped in sin; or if this is to press too hard the etymological meaning, it at least suggests complete deliverance.

1. cf. i. 3 and viii. 3. 

2. To say of the Levitical priests that they προσφέροντες εἰς τὸ διηνέκεια (ver. 1) is appropriate; to say of Christ that He προσφέρεται εἰς τὸ διηνέκεια is almost a self-contradiction" (Vaughan). 

3. cf. especially i. 3. No doubt the usual position of εἰς τὸ διηνέκεια is after the word it qualifies, x. 1-14 and vii. 3. τὸν ἄνω, has no time reference, cf. ii. 11.

Vv. 15-18. From Scripture that the one sacrifice of Christ, the mediator of the new covenant is final.

Ver. 15. μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν . . . "And the Holy Spirit also bears witness to us," that is, that the one offering of the Son is final, for under the new covenant there is no further remembrance of sins. ἡμῖν is more naturally construed as a dative commodi than as the object of μαρτυρεῖ μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. "For after saying . . . " we expect the apodosis to begin and the sentence to be concluded by an introductory εἰς τὴν προσφοράν (cf. ver. 9), but ver. 17 is not so introduced. The sense, however, is unmistakable. After defining the covenant in its inwardness and spirituality (v. c. viii. 10), the writer introduces that feature of it which specially serves his present purpose καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν . . . οὐ μὴ μνησθοῦσα ἡμῖν ποτε ἐστι. "And I will never any more remember their sins and their transgressions". The conclusion is obvious, "But where there is remission of these, there is no longer offering for sin". For the terms of the new covenant see viii. 8-12. μνημοσύνησις is here used instead of μνημόσυνα of LXX and of viii. 12, because the writer emphasizes the extension of the forgetting to all futurity.

Chaps. X. 19—XII. 29. Exhortation to use the access to God opened by Christ and to maintain faith in Him in spite of all temptation to fall away.

Chap. X. 19-25. Exhortation to draw near to God, to hold fast the Christian hope, and to encourage one another.

Ver. 19. "Εἰσούσιον εὖλετόν. . . . "Having then, brethren, confidence for the entrance into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, a way which He inaugurated for us fresh and living, through the veil, that is, His flesh." For the form of the sentence cf. iv. 14. Εἰσοδος εἰς τὴν προσφοράν καὶ τὴν προσωγγήν. ἐσοδος may either mean an entrance objectively considered, or the act of entering. Weiss adopts the former meaning, compelled as he supposes by the διὰ which follows in apposition and referring to Jud. i. 24 and Ezek. xxvii. 3. He would therefore
translate “boldness as regards the entrance”. The objection to this interpretation is the meaning put upon the object or end towards which the παραστασις is directed, entering in, not merely the object about which the παραστασις is exercised. Cf. 2 Cor. vii. 10, μετανοεσθα εις σωτηριαν. But cf. Winer on εις. The expression in ix. 8, την των ἄγων ἄνω, also favours Weiss's interpretation. τῶν ἄγων as the Greek commentators remark, here means “heaven”. ἐν τῷ αἵματι ἡ σωτηρία, on the whole, it is better to join these words not with παραστασις but with ἀισθομον. Bleek sees a reference to ix. 25, οἱ μετανοεσθαι εἰς τὰ δόμα ἐν σαλβητωσιν τῷ θεῷ, εἰς παραστασιν ἣν ἄνω ἄνω ... “The new and living way which He inaugurated [or dedicated] for us.” The antecedent of the clause is ἀισθομος, and this way into the holiest is here further described as first used by Christ that it might be used by us. For ἄγων means to handel, to take the first use of a new thing. See Deut. xx. 5. He has entered within the veil as our πρώτοβομος (vi. 19, 20) and has thus opened a way for us. It is πρόσόφατον, recent, fresh. The lexicographers are agreed that, originally meaning fresh-slain and applied to νεκρός, πρόσφατος came to be used of flowers, oil, snow, misfortune, benefits, in Sirac. ix. 10, of a friend; in Eccles. i. 9 σωτήρ προσφατος. It was a way recently opened. Christ was the first who trod that way. Wetstein, who gives many examples of the use of the word, cites also from Florus, i. 15, 3, an interesting analogy: “Alter [Decius Mus] quasi monitu deorum, capite velato, primam ante aciem diis manibus se devoverit, ut in conferentissima saeculo tecta iaculatus, novum ad victoriam iter sanguinis sui semita aperiret”. καὶ ἄγων, not as a way that abides (Chrys., etc.) nor as leading to life eternal (Grotius, etc.), nor as a way which consists in fellowship with a Person (Westcott), but as effective, actually bringing its followers to their goal. Cf. iv. 12. So Davidson and Weiss. ἐν τούτῳ καταστάσματος, a further characteristic of the way, it passed through the veil, that is, His flesh, which must first be rent before Christ could pass into the holiest. “This beauti-
Ver. 23. A second branch of the exhortation is given in the words κατ'εξώμενα τὴν ὁμολογίαν... "Let us hold fast and unbending the confession of our hope," as in iii. 6. Cf. also vi. 11. For as yet in this life the fulness of blessing which comes of fellowship with God is not experienced, the perfected salvation and the heavenly country (xii. 22-23) are yet to be reached. But these are the contents of the Christian hope, and this hope is confessed and maintained in presence of a commonplace, scoffing and alluring world. It is to be maintained for the best of all reasons: τῷ γὰρ ἐν ἔπαγγελματι. The promises of God are necessarily the ground of hope, v. vi. 12. These promises cannot fail, because God cannot lie, vi. 18.

Ver. 24. To the exhortation to faith and hope he adds an exhortation to love: καὶ κατανωμένοι ἄλληλους, "and let us consider one another," taking into account and weighing our neighbour's circumstances and especially his risks, but this with a view not to exasperating criticism but εἰς παρεξεγερίαν ἀγάπης, "with a view to incite them to love and good works," acknowledging honest endeavour and making allowance for imperfection. παρεξεργασία is "stimulation" either to good or evil. In Acts xv. 39 it is used of angry irritation, as in LXX, Deut. xxix. 28, Jer. xxxix. 37. So in medical writers of a paroxysm. But frequently in classics the verb is used of stimulating to good as in Plato, Epist. iv. p. 321 and in Xen. Cyrop. 6, 2, 5, τότες ἐπαινῶν παρέξησε. Isocrates, ad Demon., etc. The writer, in vi. 9-10, has set his readers a good example of this considerate incitement. In order to fulfil his injunction they must not neglect meeting together for Christian worship and encouragement μὴ ἐγκαταλειπόντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν. Delitzsch suggests that the compound word is used instead of the simple συναγωγή in order to avoid a word with Judaic associations; but συναγωγή might rather have suggested the building and formal stated meetings, while ἑαυτῶν ἑαυτῶν denotes merely the meeting together of Christians. That these meetings were for mutual edification is shown by the ἐκκλησία παρεξεργασίας. Some made a practice of neglecting these meetings, whether from fear of persecution or from scorn or from business engagements. Cf. Jude, 18-20, and Moberly's Minist. Priesthood, p. 14. This good custom of meeting together and mutually exhorting one another was to be all the more punctually and zealously attended to, κατὰ παρακαλοῦντες. Some made a practice of neglecting these meetings, whether from fear of persecution or from scorn or from business engagements. Cf. Jude, 18-20, and Moberly's Minist. Priesthood, p. 14. This good custom of meeting together and mutually exhorting one another was to be all the more punctually and zealously attended to, διὸ κατά παρακαλοῦντες. Some made a practice of neglecting these meetings, whether from fear of persecution or from scorn or from business engagements. Cf. Jude, 18-20, and Moberly's Minist. Priesthood, p. 14. This good custom of meeting together and mutually exhorting one another was to be all the more punctually and zealously attended to, διὸ κατὰ παρακαλοῦντες. Some made a practice of neglecting these meetings, whether from fear of persecution or from scorn or from business engagements. Cf. Jude, 18-20, and Moberly's Minist. Priesthood, p. 14. This good custom of meeting together and mutually exhorting one another was to be all the more punctually and zealously attended to, διὸ κατὰ παρακαλοῦντες.
the Romans which heralded the great war.

Vv. 26-39. Dreadful result of falling from faith.

Ver. 26. "Εκοινωσίας γὰρ ἀμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν..." For if we go on sinning wilfully after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no more remains a sacrifice for sins, but a certain dreadful waiting for judgment and a fury of fire which is to devour the adversaries..." yap, introducing an additional reason for the preceding exhortation. The emphasis is on ικονοσύνη; and the present tense of απατ. must not be overlooked. Cf. τῶν ἀκονίων ἀμαρτημάτων καταφυγῆς εἶναι τῶν βασιλείων, Thuc. iv. 98. Wilful sin, continued in, means apostasy, repudiation of the covenant. Cf. vi. 6, καὶ παραπεσόντας, and v. 2, τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν, and iii. 12. Apostasy can only occur μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν... a condition which is explained in detail in chap. 6. Without this preceding knowledge of the covenant its wilful repudiation is impossible. Those spoken of in ver. 25, as having abandoned meeting with their fellow Christians, and possibly as having neglected, if not renounced, the confession of their hope, were perhaps alluded to here, as on their way to apostasy. They are warned that they are drifting into an irredeemable condition, for to those who have repudiated and keep repudiating the one sacrifice of Christ, οὐκ εἰς περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν ἀπολυταιρία θυσία. The only sacrifice has been rejected, and there is no other sacrifice which can atone for the rejection of this sacrifice. "The meaning is not merely that the Jewish sacrifices to which the apostate has returned have in themselves no sin-destroying power, nor even that there is no second sacrifice additional to that of Christ, but further that for a sinner of this kind the very sacrifice of Christ itself has no more atoning or reconciling power" (Delitzsch). That this is the meaning is shown by the positive assertion of what the future does contain, a terrifying prospect of waiting for inevitable judgment. The expression is not equivalent to φοβεράς ἀποθέτησις, which, as Bleek remarks, would not be so impressive. φοβερὸς means either "causing fear" or "feeling fear", "scaring" or "affrighted". Here it is used in the former sense. ἀποθέτησις occurs elsewhere only in the sense of receiving something or of the acceptance or interpretation of a word; but ver. 13 and ix. 28 guide to the meaning given by the Vulg. expectatis. The τὰς by leaving the expectation indefinite heightens the terror of it. The expression is a natural figure used by Homer and others. ἀποθέτησις general, but immediately suggests τῶν ἕλπιδων μᾶλλοντος, the destined fire; for which see 2 Thess. i. 8-10. "Fiery indignation" very well renders ἑλπίς, an anger which expresses itself in fire. The expression is derived from such O.T. phrases as Ps. lxxxix. 5 ἐκακουθήσεται ἐὰν πῦρ ἔλπίς σου. Cf. Zeph. i. 18 and Deut. iv. 21. This fiery anger is destined to devour the adversaries; as in Isa. xxvi. 11 ἔλπις λήψαι λαὸν ἐπικαθήσεται, καὶ τὸν τοὺς ὑπεντάγων ἐπιθέται, and lxxv. 2 κατακαυεῖ τοὺς ὑπεντάγους. Cf. also Isa. xxx. 27 ἕργη τοῦ θυμοῦ ὡς πῦρ ἐπιθέται, a natural figure used by Homer and others. ὑπεκατάγων, see Lightfoot on Col. ii. 14, who shows that it means "direct, close, persistent opposition".

Ver. 28. άποθέτησις τῆς νόμου... "Any one who has set aside Moses' law dies without mercy on the evidence of two or three witnesses," in accordance with the law laid down in Deut. xvii. 6 regarding apostasy; although capital punishment was not restricted to this sin. For διεστείλαν cf. I Thess. iv. 8; and Isa. xxviii. 16, οὗτος διεστινθή, οὐ διεστινθή τὸν νόμον, also Ezek. xxvi. 26. Διεστίησις is used absolutely in I Sam. xxviii. 12... "Any one who has set aside Moses' law dies without mercy on the evidence of two or three witnesses," in accordance with the law laid down in Deut. xvii. 6 regarding apostasy; although capital punishment was not restricted to this sin. For διεστείλας cf. i Thess. iv. 8; and Isa. xxix. 16, οὗτος διεστινθή, οὐ διεστινθή τὸν νόμον, also Ezek. xxvi. 26. Διεστίησις is used absolutely in i Sam. xxviii. 12...
law and the inevitable character of the doom. Cf. Josephus, c. Apion, ii. 30, 6 & Wets, aip.a τους τας τραπεζοντας, και τας αιμα της διαθημα του ηγησαμενος εν τη ηγιασθη, και το πνευμα της χαριτος νεφελισαι; 30. οιοι δε τον ειποντα, ¿Εμοι εκδικησας, έγω ο εν της ανταποδοσεως, λεγεξ μετα τους, "Κυριως κριναι τον λαιον αποτου". 31. Φοβεραν το ιμπεσιν εις χειρας Θεου ιδιωτος. 32. "Αναμμηνευθει δε τας προτερον ημερας, εν αις φωτισθετες πολλην Pauline but the universal antithesis to the law. To have blasphemed this gracious Spirit, who brings the assurance of God's presence and pardon, and gifts suited to each believer, is to renounce all part in things spiritual. Cf. vi. 4, ii. 4; Eph. iv. 7.

Ver. 29. τον τι σοι πεσει και την εξωθησαν... "Of how much sorer punishment, think ye, will he be counted worthy, who, etc." The argument of ii. 1-4 and xii. 25. By the parenthetically interjected δοκειν he appeals to their own sense of proportion and fitness; although the judgment alluded to in εκδικησαι is not theirs but God’s, δ... καταστασις... The guilt of the apostate which justifies this sorer punishment is detailed in three particulars. He has trampled on the Son of God. The highest of Beings who has deserved best at his hands is spurned with outrageous scorn: και τα αυτα... ευπλοσθη "and has reckoned the blood of the covenant with which he was sanctified, a common thing". “The blood of the covenant” is the blood of Christ (cf. ix. 15 ff., xiii. 20); here it is thus designated because repudiation of the covenant is in question. This blood is the purifying agent by which men are fitted for the fellowship and service of God, and so brought within the covenant. Cf. εγιασθη with δαναιη of ix. 13 and καθαρις of ix. 14. This sole means of purification, the sanctifying virtue of which the supposed apostate has experienced, he now counts καινον, common or unclean. [The Vulg. has “pollutum,” the Old Latin “communem.” Chrysostom δακτυλον η το μυθον πλων έχειν των λωμον; and so Kübel, “which has no more worth than the blood of other men.” All these meanings lie close to one another. Cf. Mark vii. 2, Acts x. 14. What is “common” is unsanctified, ceremonially unclean.] The third point in the heinousness of the sin of apostasy is τη χειρ αποστας λειψαν. “and has insulted the spirit of grace.” This seems the direct antithesis to “Moses’ law” of ver. 28. The spirit of grace is the distinctive gift of Christian times, and is not only the
But recall the former days, in which after being enlightened ye endured much wrestling with sufferings. Let not this present day cause ye to be slack. ... But in the next generation came to mean "martyrdom," as in Mart. of S. Ignatius, chap. 4. For the genitive cf. "certamina divitiarum," Hor. Epp., 1. 58. What these sufferings were is described in two clauses, they were partly in their own persons, partly in their sympathy and voluntary sharing in the suffering of others, as in vi. 10, and as they are in xiii. 3 exhorted still to do. Cf. Mat. xxv. 36, which probably formed a large factor in the production of that care for the persecuted which characterised the early Church. They had also suffered the loss of their goods. The true reading is covtois then the meaning is easy "knowing that you have for yourselves." If we read Javrovi, this may mean, as Davidson, Westcott and others suppose, "knowing that you have yourselves a better possession." But this seems not very congruous with the writer's usual style. It is more likely that the writer uses the emphatic "you yourselves" in contrast to those who had robbed them and now possessed their goods. So von Soden. Or it may mean "ye yourselves" in contrast to the possession itself of which they have been deprived, ye yourselves however stripped of all earthly goods.

Ver. 35. Cast not away, then, your
confidence, for it has great recompense of reward. The exhortation begun in ver. 19 is resumed, with now the added force springing from their remembrance of what they have already endured and from their consciousness of a great possession in heaven. A reason for holding fast their confidence is now found in the result of so doing. It has great reward.

μισθώσασθε, do not throw it away as a worthless thing you have no further need of. Retain it, υπομόνη γὰρ ἔχετε χρείαν, "for ye have need of endurance," of maintaining your hopeful confidence to the end under all circumstances. Without endurance the promise which secures to them the enduring possession cannot be enjoyed, for before entering upon its enjoyment, the whole will of God concerning them must be done and borne. έν τῷ θελήμα τῷ θεοῦ ποιήσασθε καμίσθησθαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, Davidson and Weiss agree in thinking that "the will of God is His will that they should hold fast their confidence". Rather, that accepting all privation, as they once did (ver. 32) and recognising all they were called to endure as God's will concerning them, they should thus endure to the end (cf. iii. 6) and so receive the promised good (ἐπαγγελία = the thing promised as in vi. 13, 15), καμίσθησθαι, the verb properly means to carry off or to recover what is one's own. See Mat. xxv. 27; 2 Cor. v. 10; Heb. xi. 13, 19, 39. And their entrance on the reward of their endurance will not long be delayed ἐν γὰρ μεγάλῳ δόσων δόσων... "For yet a little—a very little—while and He that cometh will have come and will not delay." ['Es ist noch ein Kleines, wie sehr, wie sehr Klein" (Weiss), "noch eine kleine Zeit, ganz Klein" (Weissäcker). "Adhuc enim modicum aliquantulum" (Vulg.). "For yet a little—ever so little—while" (Hayman)]. The phrase μεγάλων δόσων δόσων is found in Isa. xxi. 20, "Go, my people... hide thyself for a very little, till the indignation be overpast". The double δόσων is found in Aristoph. Waspis, 213, where however Rogers thinks the duplication due to the drowsiness of the speaker. Literally it means "a little, how very, how very". The following words from ὅρθριμον to ἐν αὐτῷ are from Heb. ii. 3-4, with some slight alterations, the article being inserted before ἐρχόμενος, σαιριὶς instead of the less forcible words in Hebrews, and the two clauses of ver. 4 being transposed. In Habakkuk the conditions are similar. God's people are crushed under overwhelming odds. And the question with which Habakkuk opens his prophecy is ἐστιν ἡ χειρὶς... The Lord assures him that deliverance will come and will not delay. By inserting the article, the writer of Hebrews identifies the deliverer as the Messiah, "the coming One". Cf. Mat. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19; Jo. vi. 14. ὁ δὲ δίκαιος... "And the just shall live by faith," i.e., shall survive these troublous times by believing that the Lord is at hand. Cf. Jas. v. 7-9. καὶ ἐὰν ἐποτιστῆλθαι, "and if he withdraw himself" or "shrink". The verb, as Kypke shows, means to shrink in fear, and it is thus used in Gal. ii. 12. It is the very opposite of ἰστριῆς. Accordingly it is thoroughly displeasing to God, whose purpose it is to bring me to Himself in confident hope. But the idea that any of the "Hebrews" can be in so ignominious and dangerous a position is at once repudiated. ἐὰν δὲ... "But as for us we are not of those who shrink (literally of shrinking) to perdition but of faith to the gaining of the soul". That is, we are not characterised by a timid abandonment of our confession (ver. 23) and confidence. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 5. What such timidity leads to (εἰς ἀπώλειαν, cf. Acts viii. 20; Rom. ix. 22) is hopeless perdition. Cf. M. Aurelius on the δραπέτης, x. 25. δ ἰστριῆς...
ROMANS VIII. 35—XI. 1.

We are of faith whose end is the acquisition of one's soul. Very similar is Luke xxi. 19, "By your endurance win your souls." See also James v. 20, and 1 Thess. v. 9. Like our word "acquisition" sometimes means the acquiring as in 1 Thess. v. 9 and 2 Thess. ii. 14; sometimes the thing acquired, as in Eph. i. 14. [In Isocrates, 2nd Ep., occurs the expression διὰ τὰ περιποιηθέντα τὴν αὐτοῦ ψυχήν (Wetstein)].

CHAP. XI. 1—XII. 3. That the Hebrews may still further be encouraged to persevere in maintaining faith the writer exhibits in detail its victories in the past history of their people and especially in the life of Jesus. (Cf. Sirach, 44-50.)

Ver. 1. ἰσθιν δὲ πίστις ἡ πρώτη αὐτοῦ εἰς προσκοπῆς... "Now faith is assurance of things hoped for, proof [manifestation] of things not seen". When ἰστι stands first in a sentence it sometimes means "there exists," as in John v. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 44. But it has not necessarily and always this significance, cf. 1 Tim. vi. 6; Luke viii. 11; Wisdom vii. 1. There is therefore no need to place a comma after ἱστιοῖ as some have done. The words describe what faith is, although not a strict definition. "Longe falluntur, quijustam fidcinaturam hie poni existimant: neque enim hie de tota fidcinatura dissent Apostolus, sed partem elegit suo instituto congruentem, nempe quod cum patientia semper conjuncta sit" (Calvin). ἰστιοῖ, literally foundation, that which stands under; hence, the ground on which one builds a hope, naturally gliding into the meaning "assurance," "confidence," as in iii. 14; 2 Cor. ix. 4; 17; Ruth i. 12; Ps. xxxix. 7, ἰστιοῖ εὐδοκεῖσθαι μοι παρὰ σοι ῥᾳτῶν. "Elæghos regularly means "proof". See Demonstrenes, passim; especially Ael. Androtion, p. 600, ἐλαχεος, ἐν δὲ εἰπῇ καὶ ταλαδίης ὁμοί διήλ. It seems never to be used in a subjective sense for "conviction," "persuasion"; although here this meaning would suit the context and has been adopted by many. To say with Weiss that the subjective meaning must be given to the word that it may correspond with ἱστιοῖ is to write the Epistle, not to interpret it. Theophylact renders the clause φανερώσεις ἔδηλων πραγμάτων. Faith is that which enables us to treat as real the things that are unseen. Hatch gives a different meaning to both clauses: "Faith is the ground of things hoped for, i.e., trust in God, or the conviction that God is good and that He will perform His promises, is the ground for confident hope that the things hoped for will come to pass. . . . So trust in God furnishes to the mind which has it a clear proof that things to which God has testified exist, though they are not visible to the senses." The words thus become a definition of what faith does, not of what it is. Substantially the words mean to faith gives to things future, which as yet are only hoped for, all the reality of actual present existence; and irresistibly convinces us of the reality of things unseen and brings us into their presence. Things future and things unseen must become certainties to the mind if a balanced life is to be lived. Faith mediating between man and the supersensible is the essential link between himself and God, "for in it lay the commendation of the men of old," ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἔκμαρτυρίσθησαν οἱ προσβυτέροι. That is, it was on the ground of their possessing faith that the distinguished men of the O.T. received the commendation of God, being immortalised in Scripture. It might almost be rendered "by faith of this kind," answering to this description. ἐν ταύτῃ has an exact parallel in 1 Tim. v. 10, the widow who is to be placed on the Church register must be ἑν ἐργοις καλοὶς μαρτυρουμένη, well-reported of on the score of good works. οἱ προσβύτεροι, those of past generations, men of the O.T. times; as Papias [Euseb., H.E., iii. 39] uses the term to denote the "Fathers of the Church" belonging to the generation preceding his own. The idea that faith is that which God finds pleasure in (x. 38) and is that which truly unites to God under the old dispensations as well as under the new is a Pauline thought, Gal. iii. 6. This general statement of ver. 2 is exhibited in detail in the remainder of the chapter; but first the writer shows the excellence of faith in this, that is it is by it that we recognise that there is an unseen world and that out of things unseen this visible world has taken
rise. This idea is suggested to him because his eye is on Genesis from which he culs the succeeding examples and it is natural that he should begin at the beginning. "Before exhibiting how faith is the principle that rules the life of men in relation to God, down through all history, as it is transacted on the stage of the world, the author shows how this stage itself is brought into connection with God by an act of faith" (Davidson). By faith we perceive, with the mental eye νοοῦμα, Matt. xxiii. 35, cf. Luke xi. 20; the visible world existing in time, the temporary manifestation of the unseen is meant, see i. 10, 11) have been framed (κατηρτιζα, as in x. 5, σώμα δι κατηρτίους μοι). In xiii. 21 κατηρτίσαντος, "perfect you" as in Luke vi. 40; 2 Cor. xiii. ii.; i Thess. iii. 10. The word is perhaps used in the present connection to suggest not a bare calling into existence, but a wise adaptation of part to part and of the whole to its purpose) by God's word, ἡματι Θεοῦ. This is the perception of faith. The word of God is an invisible force which cannot be perceived by sense. The great idea which lies at the source of all that is does not itself come into observation; we perceive it only by faith which is (ver. 1) "the evidence of things not seen". The result of this creation by an unseen force, the word of God, is that "what is seen has not come into being out of things which appear"; εἰς τὸ . . . γεγονέναι. εἰς τὸ with infinitive, commonly used to express purpose, is sometimes as here used to express result, and we may legitimately translate "so that what is seen, etc." Cf. Luke v. 17; Rom. xii. 6; Gal. iii. 17; i Thess. ii. 16. Cf. Brooke, M. and T., 411. τὸ δὲ θελητικόν, the Vulgate renders "ex invisibilitus," and the Old Latin "ex non apparentibus" having apparently read ἐκ μὴ φαινομένον the singular in place of the plural of T. R. and Vulgate, presents all things visible as unity. Had the visible world been formed out of materials which were subject to human observation, there would have been no room for faith. Science could have traced it to its origin. Evolution only pushes the statement a stage back. There is still an unseen force that does not submit itself to experimental science, and that is the object of faith. To find in this verse an allusion to the noemal and phenomenal worlds would be fanciful.

Ver. 4. πιστεύεις πλεονέα Θυσίαν. ... "By faith Abel offered to God a more adequate sacrifice than Cain," πλεονέα literally "more," but frequently used to express "higher in value" "greater in worth," as in Mat. xii. 41, 42. πλεον ἐνα ὑπε, Luke xii. 23; Rev. ii. 19. Does the writer mean that faith prompted Abel to make a richer sacrifice, or that it was richer because word is perhaps used in the present connection to express purpose, is sometimes as here used to express result, and we may legitimately translate "so that what is seen, etc." Cf. Luke v. 17; Rom. xii. 6; Gal. iii. 17; i Thess. ii. 16. Cf. Brooke, M. and T., 411. τὸ δὲ θελητικόν, the Vulgate renders "ex invisibilitus," and the Old Latin "ex non apparentibus" having apparently read ἐκ μὴ φαινομένον the singular in place of the plural of T. R. and Vulgate, presents all things visible as unity. Had the visible world been formed out of materials which were subject to human observation, there would have been no room for faith. Science could have traced it to its origin. Evolution only pushes the statement a stage back. There is still an unseen force that does not submit itself to experimental science, and that is the object of faith. To find in this verse an allusion to the noemal and phenomenal worlds would be fanciful.

Ver. 4. πιστεύεις πλεονέα Θυσίαν. ... "By faith Abel offered to God a more adequate sacrifice than Cain," πλεονέα literally "more," but frequently used to express "higher in value" "greater in worth," as in Mat. xii. 41, 42. πλεον ἐνα ὑπε, Luke xii. 23; Rev. ii. 19. Does the writer mean that faith prompted Abel to make a richer sacrifice, or that it was richer because word is perhaps used in the present connection to express purpose, is sometimes as here used to express result, and we may legitimately translate "so that what is seen, etc." Cf. Luke v. 17; Rom. xii. 6; Gal. iii. 17; i Thess. ii. 16. Cf. Brooke, M. and T., 411. τὸ δὲ θελητικόν, the Vulgate renders "ex invisibilitus," and the Old Latin "ex non apparentibus" having apparently read ἐκ μὴ φαινομένον the singular in place of the plural of T. R. and Vulgate, presents all things visible as unity. Had the visible world been formed out of materials which were subject to human observation, there would have been no room for faith. Science could have traced it to its origin. Evolution only pushes the statement a stage back. There is still an unseen force that does not submit itself to experimental science, and that is the object of faith. To find in this verse an allusion to the noemal and phenomenal worlds would be fanciful.
death. His death was not the end of him as Cain expected it to be. Abel's blood cried for justice. The words of xii.24 are at once suggested, αματι παρεισαγωγον κρειττον λαλοντι παρελανλαν, where the blood of sprinkling is said to speak to better purpose than the blood of Abel. This again takes us back to Gen. iv.10. "The voice of thy brother's blood cries to me from the ground." The speaking referred to, therefore, is not the continual voice of Abel's example but the voice of his blood crying to God immediately after his death. Cf. Ps. ix.12 and cxvi.15. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints." In the case of Abel, then, the excellence of faith was illustrated in two particulars, it prompted him to offer a richer, more acceptable offering, and it found for him a place in God's regard even after his death.

Ver. 5. Πιστευειν τε ενως μετετηρηθη... "By faith Enoch was translated so that he did not see death; and be was not found, because God had translated him. For before his translation he had witness borne to him that he had pleased God well; but without faith it is impossible to please Him well." In the dry catalogue of antediluvian longevities a gem of faith is detected. What lay at the root of Enoch's translation? Faith, because before he was translated he was well-pleasing to God, which implies that he believed in God, or as Chrysostom neatly puts it: ποιει δι' ευφεαν μετετηρηθε ο 'Ενωξ; δι' αυτοσ της μεταβολης η ευαρεστηση αυτη, η της ευαρεστησης η πιστεισ. In Ecclus. xlv. 16 he is expressed as ενδειχεμαι μετατιθεμενη ταις γενεαίς. μετετηρηθη "was transferred," removed from one place to another, as in Acts vii. 16, cf. also Gal. i. 6, Jude 4. In Ecclus. lxix. 14 it is represented by ανελθεσαν οποια της γης. The succeeding clauses imply that his body disappeared. How the tradition arose we have no means of knowing, cf. Suicer, i. 130, and the Bible Dictionaries. του μη ιδεω may either imply purpose or result. For the former see Mat. ii. 13, Luke ii. 24, Phil. iii. 10; for the latter, Mat. xxi. 32, Acts vii. 19. Rom. vii. 3, Heb. x. 7. The use of the passive μετετηρηθη favours the supposition that result is here expressed, and throughout the sentence it is the translation that is prominent rather than the escape from death, which is introduced rather as an explanation of μετετηρηθη. καλ ευθηναι... These words are verbatim from the LXX of Gen. v. 24, and are quoted for the sake of bringing out clearly that God was the author of the translation. (Cf. the misquotation in Clem. Ep., chap. 9, ευλαβεθαι αυτου θανατος.) God translated him, and this is proved by the fact that preceding the statement of his translation Scripture records that he pleased God well, where the Hebrew has "he walked with God". χρωμεi δι' ευφεαν μετετηρηθησαν... "But without faith it is impossible to please Him well." The ground of this proposition is given in the following words: υπερειναι γαρ δει τα προσερχεσθαι... "For he who cometh to God must believe that He exists and that to those who seek Him He turns out to be a rewarder." To please God one must draw near to Him (τοις προσερχεσθαιν in the semi-technical sense usual in the Epistle), and no one can draw near who has not these two beliefs that God is and will reward those who seek Him. So that Enoch's faith, and the faith of every one who approaches God, verifies the description of ver. 1: the unseen must be treated as sufficiently demonstrated, and the hoped for reward must be considered substantial.
the preceding words. τῶν μηδέν ἔλθων, εὐλαβθέοις, κατεσκεύασε κυβόν εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, δι' ἑαυτῆς κατέκρινε τὸν κόσμον, καὶ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο θληρόνιος. 8. "Πίστευ καλούμενος Ἀβραὰμ. "Ἀβραὰμ ὑπήκουσεν εξελθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦμελλε λαμβάνειν εἰς αὐτοῦ, τῷ θεῷ ἐπηρεάσθη. Νῦν. Cf. Wisdom x. 4. In Genesis the warning of God is communicated to Noah because he was already righteous; in Hebrews a somewhat different aspect is presented, Noah "became" righteous by building the ark in faith. He was one of those who διὰ πίστεως ἥργαντο δικαιοσύνην, ver. 33.

From ver. 8 to ver. 22 the faith of the patriarchs is exhibited, cf. Eccles. xiv. 19.

Ver. 8. "Πίστευ καλούμενος Ἀβραὰμ. . . . "By faith Abraham received a place which he was to receive as an inheritance, obeyed and went out not knowing whither he was going." καλούμενος, as in Mark i. 20 and Isa. ii. 2, ἔμπληκτα Ἀβραὰμ . . . δύτε ὑμῖν, καὶ ἐξέλθετε αὐτῶν. The present, not ἔκλεισε, expresses the idea that no sooner was the call given than it was obeyed ("dass er, so wie der Ruf an ihn ging, gehorsamte" (Bleek)). The same idea is expressed by the immediate introduction of ἄρθρους, which more naturally would come at the end of the clause, and thus allow ἔκλεισε (cf. Gen. xii. 1; Acts vii. 2) to follow καλούμενος. The faith of Abraham appeared in his promptly abandoning his own country on God's promise of another, and the strength of this faith was illustrated by the circumstance that he had no knowledge where or what that country was. He went out μὴ ἔσπερας ἡμέρας. The terms of the call (Gen. xii. 1) were ἔξελθε . . . καὶ δύτοι ἐν τῷ γῆς, ἶν ἐν σοὶ δεῖσαι. It was, therefore, no attractive account of Canaan which induced him to forsake Mesopotamia, no ordinary emigrant's motive which moved him, but mere faith in God's promise. The terms of the call are not that the life of faith must be entered on in ignorance of the way to the inheritance, or even what the inheritance is. The experience that the way will bring. This is true even of ordinary life" (Davidson). This did not exhaust the faith of Abraham. Further πίστευ παραγινάτων . . . "By faith he became a sojourner in a land [his] by the promise as if it belonged to another, dwelling in tents, along with
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αληθονομίαν, καὶ ἐξήλθε μὴ ἐπιστάμενος ποῦ ἔρχεται. 9. Πίστει
παρῆκαν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ὡς ἄλλοτριαν, ἐν σκηναῖς
κατοικηθέντας μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ τῶν συγκληρονόμων τῆς ἐπαγ-
γελίας τῆς αὐτῆς. 10. ἐξέβεβλητο γὰρ τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν
μὲν, τὸ δὲ ἐνθισμὸν ὁ Θεὸς.

Isaac and Jacob, co-heirs with him of the
same promise. 9. The promise was not of
their own making, but was received through
faith. 10. The foundation of the promise
was as good as if it had belonged to some
other person; neither did he make a
permanent settlement in it but dwelt in tents,
shifting from place to place, as the symbol of
what is temporary, see Isa. xxxviii. 12; 2 Cor.
v. 4. The presence of his son and grandson
must continually have prompted him to
settle. They were included in the promise,
but they too were compelled to move with
him from place to place. But how did this
evince faith? It did so by showing that he
had given a wider scope and a deeper
significance to God's words. He was content
to dwell in tents, because he looked for
"the city which has the foundations".

πόλιν. "For he expectantly waited for
the city." ἐξεβεβλητό γὰρ τὴν . . .
πόλιν. "For he expectantly waited for
the city." ἐξεβεβλητό γὰρ τὴν . . .
πόλιν. "For he expectantly waited for
the city." ἐξεβεβλητό γὰρ τὴν . . .
πόλιν. "By faith Sarah herself also received
power to become a mother even when past
the age, since she counted Him faithful
who had promised." nai a.

Ver. 11. Ἐν αὐτῇ Ἰακὼβ . . .
Calls Abraham's wife Sarah. 11. "To
Sarah also was given power to become a
mother, even when past the age, since she
counted Him faithful who had promised." 12.
"By faith Sarah herself also received
power to become a mother even when past
the age, since she counted Him faithful
who had promised." nai a.
bedürfte, wenn dasselbe für sie wirksam werden sollte". Cf. also Gen. xviii. 12. Her faith was further illustrated (kal = and this indeed) by the circumstance that she was now para kairop, filiæs, the competence of the patriarchs in this Epistle. For a woman who in her prime had been barren, to believe that in her decay she could bear a son was a triumph of faith. Cf. Gen. xviii. 12-13, εὐγενρήτω. But she had faith in the promise (cf. vi. 13-18), "wherefore also there were prepared unto him of good omen, of the same as dead—issue as the stars of heaven in multitude and as the sand by the seashore innumerable". Probably the kal is to be construed with δω as in Luke i. 35; Acts x. 29, etc. δϕ' εὐνοεῖ, that is, Abraham (cf. Isa. ii. 2, καὶ υπάρχει; καὶ πάντες, a classical expression, see Xenophon, Mem., ii. 3, and Blass, Gram., p. 248. ἐπερεμακρύνων, "dead" so far as regards the begetting of offspring, cf. Rom. iv. 19. καθὼς τὰ δοστρα, a nominative to ἐγὼ, may be supplied, δειγμά τοῦ στῆρια. For the metaphors cf. Gen. xxii. 17. εὐγενεία is properly a constellation, but used commonly "a star", "night"; found in the classics in same connection. Ver. 13. Not only in life was the faith of the patriarchs manifested, it stood the test of death, κατὰ πιστῶν ἐπιθέματος, in keeping with their faith (see 2 Tim. iii. 5), who all (that is, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, and Jacob) died, and the strength of their faith was seen in this that although they had not received the fulfillment of the promises (ver. 39 and x. 36) they yet had faith enough to see and hail them from afar. As Moses endured because he saw the innumerable host of the Jews were not daunted by death because they saw the day of Christ (John viii. 56), that is to say, they were so firmly persuaded that God's promise would be fulfilled that it could be said that they saw the fulfillment. They hailed them from afar, as those on board ship hailed the print of the vessels, and of a recognition. Wetzstein cites from Appian, De Bell. Civ., ver. 46, p. 110 where it is said that the soldiers of the Holy Land, having been invited to come to their feast, which they should enjoy, and which had been held from their descendants, but that their Promised Land (ἡ γῆ) was Canaan they were pilgrims and foreigners. This confession was made no doubt by their whole conduct, but as the aorist indicates it was made verbally by Abraham on the occasion of Sarah's death (Gen. xxiii. 4), and it was, καὶ παρατίθημι ἐνίαλος ἑως ἡμῶν, cf. xlviii. 9, etc. The article before γῆ, together with the sense of the passage, shows that the land of promise, Canaan, was meant. ἡ γῆ in the same connection is used for "the earth," cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 15. Philo (De Agricult., p. 196) refines upon the same idea, ταρσεῖς οὐ κατοικεῖσθαι ἤλιον, ταρσεῖς οὐ πᾶσα μὴ χυστή σοφοῦ πατρίδα μὲν ὄραμα, ἥξιν ἰην ἴον ἡλεκτρον. Cf. De Conf. Ling., p. 331. But such a confession implies that those who make it (οἱ γεροτιανεῖς λεγόντες) have not yet found but are in search of a fatherland, ταρσεῖς ἐντυπώσεως. [Cf. Rom. ii. 7. οὐκ εἰπώτα τοῦτο πάντως ὑπέτανεν. Frequent in N.T., to seek, search for. "The νέως is that of direction, as the ξύν in ξύνεται (ver. 6) is that of explanation" (Vaughan.)] The acknowledgment, cheerful or sad, that such and such a land is not the home-country may be made (ὀμφασιστών, Jo. xiv. 21, Acts xxi. 15) that they think of and have in view and are making for a land which they can call their own. ("Si hic peregrinatur, alibi patria est ac fixa sedes" (Calvin.) And that this home-country of their desire is not that from which Abraham and the patriarchs were really derived (Mesopo-
tamia) and which they had abandoned, (ἀνεξίσης εἰσιμένων) is also evident, because had they cherished fond memories of it they would have had opportunity (εἰσκόμενοι δὲ καὶ πορεύονται) to return, to their old home they were seeking, (κριτήριον δέχονται τῷ θεῷ εἰσινεξίσης εἰσιμένων) it is a better, that is, a heavenly they aspire after. That which in point of fact provoked in the patriarchs the sense of exile was that their hearts were set on a better country and firmer settlement than could be found anywhere, but in heaven. And because they thus proved that they were giving to God credit for meaning by His promises more than the letter indicated, because they measured His promises by the spirit of the promises rather than by the thing promised, (εἰς γαρ μνημοσύνης) He is not ashamed of them, not ashamed to be called their God; and the proof that He is not ashamed of them is, that He prepared for them a city. The patriarchs showed that they understood that in giving these promises God became their God; therefore God was not ashamed of them, and this showed itself especially in His naming Himself “the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob” (Exod. iii. 13). Cf. with this verse, vii. 10 and Mat. xxii. 31. 32. And that He was truly their God He showed by preparing for them a city which should justify the expectations which they had based upon His power and goodness.

Ver. 17. Πίστει προσενήνοχεν ἀβραὰμ... “By faith Abraham when tried offered up Isaac, yea he who had accepted the promises, to whom it had been said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called, offered his only son.” The perfect προσενήνοχεν, Blass (Gram., 300) says “can only be understood as referring to the abiding example offered to us”. Similarly Alford, Westcott, Weiss, etc. Surely it is better to have regard to Burton’s statement, “The Perfect Indicative is sometimes used in the N.T. of a simple past fact where it is scarcely possible to suppose that the thought of existing result was in the writer’s mind”. And in Jebb’s Appendix to Vincent and Dickson’s Gram. of Mod. Greek (p. 327, 8) it is demonstrated that “later Greek shows some clear traces of a tendency to use the Perfect as an Aorist”. τὸν is probably here intended not merely to indicate the case of the indeclinable ἐπισυνήνοχος, (Vaughan), cf. vv. 18, 20, but to call attention to the importance of Isaac; and this is further accomplished in the succeeding clause which brings out the full significance of the sacrifice. It was his only son whom Abraham was offering (προσένεσθαι imperfect in its proper sense of an unfinished transaction) and therefore the sole link between himself and the fulfilment of the promises to which he had given hospitable entertainment (ἀποκαλύφθης, 2 Mace. vi. 19). “The sole link,” because, irrespective of any other children Abraham had had or might have, it had been said to him (πρὸς ὑμῖν, denoting Abraham not Isaac), In Isaac shall a seed be named to thee (Gen. xxi. 12); that is to say, it is Isaac and his descendants who shall be known as Abraham’s seed. Others are proud to count themselves the descendants of Abraham but the true “seed” (καὶ οὐκ ἑκάστου, cf. Gal. iii. 16, 29) to whom along with Abraham the promises were given was the race that sprang from Isaac, the heir of the promise. No trial (πειρατόμενος as in Gen. xxiii. 1), ὁ θεὸς ἐπισυνήνοχος τὸν ἀβραὰμ and cf. Gen. xxii. 12) could have been more severe. After long waiting the heir had at last been given, and now after his hope had for several years rooted itself in this one life, he is required to sacrifice
that life and so break his whole connection with the future. No greater test of his trust in God was possible. He conquered because he reckoned (Xoyio-dpevoe 
"expresses the formation of an opinion by calculation or reasoning, as in Rom. viii. 18; 2 Cor. x. 7" (Vaughan)), that even from the dead God is able to raise up — a belief in God's power to do this universally, see John v. 21. This belief enabled him to deliver his only son to death. " Whence (διαν, i.e., δια ναρκήν, although several commentators, even Weiss, render it 'wherefore') also he received him back (ικομισμοὺ, for this meaning see Gen. xxxviii. 20 and passages in Wetstein) in a figure (το χειροποίημα, not actually, because Isaac had not been dead, but virtually because he had been given up to death. He had passed through the likeness of death, and his restoration to Abraham was a likeness of resurrection. (Whoever wishes to see how a simple expression may be tortured should consult Alford's long note on this place.)

Ver. 20. Πίστει περὶ μελλόντων . . . . "By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau in regard to things future," as is recorded in the well-known passage, Gen. xxvii. Isaac thus in his turn exhibited a faith which could be described as ἐκλογισμένων ὑπότασις. "By faith Jacob when dying (ἀποθνῄσκων cf. καλύψατον, ver. 8, and πειραβοῦναι, ver. 17: the participie illustrates ver. 13 and also reminds the reader that Jacob before he died saw his children inheriting the promise ("thy two sons are mine," Gen. xlviii. 5) blessed each of the sons of Joseph. ἔκαστον τ. πέπλων, that is, he gave each an individual blessing, crossing his hands, laying his right on the head of Ephraim the younger, his left on Manasseh, thus distinguishing between the destiny of the one and that of the other and so more abundantly illustrating his faith. καὶ προσευχόμενον ἐν τ. ἐκρότου τ. βαβδοῦ αὐτοῦ, "and worshipped leaning upon the top of his staff". The words are from the LXX rendering of Gen. xlvi. 31 where after Joseph had sworn to bury his father in Canaan, "Israel worshipped, etc.". His exacting this promise from Joseph was proof of his faith that his posterity would inherit the land of promise. The LXX translating from an unpointed text read τῆς σταυροῦ the staff and not as it is now read τῆς στέβανος the bed, (as in xlvi. 3). The meaning in either case is that in extreme bodily weakness, either unable to leave his bed or if so only able to stand with the aid of a staff, his faith was yet untouched by the slightest symptom of decay. "The idea of προσκυνεῖν is that of reverence shown in posture" (Vaughan). Here Jacob "worshipped" in thankful remembrance of the promise of God and that his son had accepted it.

Ver. 22. Similarly Joseph when he in his turn came to the close of his life (τελευταία, from Gen. 1. 26, καὶ τελευτάνθης ισραήλ) made mention of the exodus of the children of Israel ("God will surely visit you and will bring you out of this land to the land concerning which God spake to our fathers," Gen. 1. 24) and gave commandment concerning his bones ("ye shall carry up my bones hence with you," Gen. 1. 25. For the fulfilment of the command see Josh. xxiv. 32).

Vv. 23-31. The writer passes from the patriarchal age to the times of Moses and the Judges.
First the faith of the parents of Moses (τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ), in Stephanus' Thesaur, several examples are given of the use of πατέρας for "father and mother," parents; and consider Eph. vi. 4 and Col. iii. 21) is celebrated. This faith was shown in their concealing Moses for three months after his birth and thus evading the law that male children were to be killed, called in Wis. xi. 20 νηστείαν διάταγμα. They did not fear this commandment of the king. It did not weigh against the child's beauty which betokened that he was destined for something great. Their faith consisted in their confidence that God had in store for so handsome a child an exceptional career and would save him to fulfil his destiny. In Acts vii. 20 Stephen calls him ἄτεκτος τῷ θεῷ, extraordinarily beautiful (cf. Jonah iii. 3) or as Philo, De Mos., p. 83, ἐκείνον ἀτεκτέραν ἢ κατ' ἔθνος, indicating that he had a corresponding destiny. Moses himself when he had grown up (μεγάς γενόμενος, as in Exod. ii. 11 paraphrased by Stephen (Act ii. 23) ὡς ἐκλήρωσεν αὐτῷ τῆς πατροκατακλυστήρια γρόνος,) refused to be called a son of a daughter of Pharaoh. The significance and source of this refusal lay in his preferring to suffer ill-usage with God's people rather than to have the short-lived enjoyment of sin. 

νευμαικ., the simple verb in ver. 32, also xiii. 3; the compound here only. τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, it was because they were God's people, not solely because they were of his blood, that Moses threw in his lot with them. It was this which illustrated his faith. He believed that God would fulfil His promise to His people, little likelihood as at present there seemed to be of any great future for his race. On the other hand there was the ἀμαρτίας ἀπόκλισιον, the enjoyment which was within his reach if only he committed the sin of denying his people and renouncing their future. This was promised by God: "the enjoyment to be reaped from sin" does not refer to the pleasure of gratifying sensual appetite and so forth, but the satisfaction of a high ambition and the gratification of his finer tastes which he might have had by remaining in the Egyptian court. Very similarly Philo interprets the action of Moses, who, he says, "esteemed the good things of those who had adopted him, although more splendid for a season, to be in reality spurious, but those of his natural parents, although for a little while less conspicuous, to be true and genuine." (De Mos., p. 86). That which influenced Moses to make this choice was his estimate of the comparative value of the outcome of suffering with God's people and of the happiness offered in Egypt. 

μεγάς πληθὺς . . . εἰς τὴν μεσανυφωρίαν, "since he considered the reproach of the Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; for he steadily kept in view the reward." The reproach or obloquy and disgrace, which Moses experienced is called "the reproach of the Christ" because it was on account of his belief in God's saving purpose that he suffered. The expression is interpreted by our Lord's statement that Abraham saw his day. It does not imply that Moses believed that a personal Christ was to come, but only that God would fulfil that promise which in point of fact was fulfilled in the coming of Christ. The writer uses the expression rather with a view to his readers who were shrinking from the reproach of Christ (xiii. 13), than from the point of view of Moses. Several interpreters (Delitzsch, etc.) suppose that in virtue of the mystical union Christ suffered in his people. But, as Davidson says, "this mystical union cannot be shown to be an idea belonging to the Epistle, nor is this sense pertinent to the connection." (So Weiss, "die vorstellung liegt unserem Briefe fern.") Weiss' own interpretation is ingenious: "The O.T. church was created by the pre-existent Messiah, Jesus, who was destined to introduce through Him perfect salvation; therefore each maltreatment of this people was contempt of
Him as unable to avenge and deliver His people. To say that it means merely "the same reproach that Christ bore" scarcely satisfies the expression. The "treasures of Egypt" must be supposed to include all that had been accumulated during centuries of civilisation. And Moses, he habitually kept in view the reward. Cf. Deut. vii. 19. Also Philo, Isag. v. 3, 4, and the perfect is used on account of the Passover being "a still enduring Feast". But it is Moses' celebration of it that the perfect represents as enduring. The classical treatment of the question, Has πώειν a sacrificial meaning in the N.T.? will be found in Prof. T. K. Abbott's Essays. πώειν is regularly used of "keeping" a feast; and this is a classical usage as well. Cf. Exod. xii. 48, xxiii. 16, xxxiv. 22; 2 Chron. xxxv. 17-19. to πάσχα originally the paschal lamb, Exod. xii. 21, καὶ θύσιν τῷ πάσχα, Mark xiv. 12 τῷ πάσχα θύσον, hence the feast of Passover as in Luke xxii. 1. It is written φασιν throughout 2 Chron. xxxv., also in Jer. xxxviii. 8, καὶ τὴν πρόσκρυσιν τοῦ αἵματος, "and the sprinkling of the blood" the sprinkling of the blood on the door posts as commanded in Exod. xii. 7, 22, the object being that the destroyers of the first-borns might not touch them. As φυγάω is followed by a genitive in xii. 20 it is probable that the writer here also meant it to govern αὐτῶν while πρωτότοκοι follows ἄλογαρχοι. So R.V. ὁ ἀλογαρχὸς is taken from Exod. xii. 23. πρωτότοκοι, first-borns of man and also of beasts, Exod. xii. 12. αὐτῶν is naturally referred to "the people of God," ver. 25. It was a noteworthy faith which enabled Moses confidently to promise the people protection from the general destruction. On their part also there was the manifestation of a strong faith. Συνέβησαν τὴν ἵππον τὰ ἁλέωναν... "they passed through the Red sea as if on dry land." The nominative must be taken out of αὐτῶν. Συνέβησαν, the usual term for crossing a river or a space. The Red sea is in Hebrew "the Sea of [red weeds]."
Exod. xiv. 29 ἀποτελέσθησαν δὲ ἡμέρας ἐν μέσῳ τὴς βασάνης, also xv. 10; and cf. the various impressions in the Psalms which celebrate the great deliverance. The greatness of the people's faith is accentuated by the fate of the Egyptians, whose attempt to follow was audacity and presumption not faith. Ti κατερχόμενοι τοῦ ἱπποτοῦ σατάνας ἐν τῇ δολίσει. Another instance of the faith of the people and its effects is found in the fall of the walls of Jericho. The greatness of their faith was further exhibited in their continuing to compass the city day after day, for in the promise (Josh. vi. 1-5) no mention is made of any delay in its fulfilment and the natural inference would be that the walls would fall on the first day. That none should have felt foolish marching day after day round the solid walls is beyond nature. οὕτως εἶχεν, see Josh. vi. 6, 14 and for ἔτι ἐπέπεμψαν, Josh. vi. 14. "When applied to time, ἔτι denotes the period over which something extends, as Luke iv. 25, ἔτι ἦτα τρία, during three years" (Winer, p. 508). The fall of Jericho and the extermination of its inhabitants suggest the escape of Rahab. ἡ πόρυς, in its strict meaning ("ista meretrix" (Origen), "fornicaria" (Irenaeus)), is introduced to emphasize the power of faith; she did not perish along with the disobedient (iii. 18); ἐτελεσθαράν, they knew that the Lord had given the land to Israel (Josh. ii. 9, 10) but did not submit themselves to the acknowledged purpose of Jehovah. Rahab acted upon her belief in this purpose and instead of delivering up the spies as enemies of her country "received them with peace," that is, as friends, risking her life because of her faith.

Vv. 32-40. Summary of the achievements of faith in the times subsequent to Joshua.

Ver. 32. At this point the writer sees that he cannot pursue the method he has been following and give in detail all the signal manifestations of faith, which are recorded in the annals of his people. ἐγὼ δέ λέγω, "what shall I further say?" deliberative subjunctive (cf. Rom. i. 15, etc.) the writer questioning how he is to handle the numberless instances that rise before his mind. He cannot give them all, ἐπιλέψας με γάρ ... "for time will fail me if I recount in detail". (Julian, Orat., i. p. 34). ἐπιλέψας με διαγνώσαν εἶπον τὸ χρόνον διαγνώσαν. ἐπιλέψας με ἡ ἡμέρα is frequent, see many examples in Wetstein. Cf. Virgil, Aen., vi. 121, quid Thesea magnum, quid memorem Alciden? "a favourite device for cutting short a long list" (Page). διαγνώσαν means to relate with particularity, see Luke viii.39, ix. 10; Acts xii. 17; Gen. xxix. 13. On Gideon see Judges vi.-viii; Barak chronologically earlier, chap. iv, v; Samson, xiii-xvi; Jephthah, who also preceded Samson, xi, xii. Samuel is considered as the first of the prophets as in Acts iii.24 and xiii.20. of covers vv. 33, 34, although not every particular cited, while διὰ ποίησις refers to all the verbs to end of 38. This expression supplants the persistent πεπελευθέρωσεν of vv. 3-31, mainly for euphony. κατακτήσαντος βασιλείας, "subdued kingdoms," as is recorded of the Judges and David, who also ἐπέκεισαν βικαυσίαν, which seems to refer to their righteous rule, although the same expression is never used in the LXX except of personal righteousness (Ps. xv. 2) but of David it is thrice said that he was τοιοῦτον κράτη καὶ βικαύσαν, 2 Sam. viii. 15; 1 Chron. xviii. 14; Jer. xxxii. 5; and of Samuel testimony is borne that he judged righteously, 1 Sam. xii. 3. ἐπέκεισαν ἐπαγγελλόντας, "obtained promises" not "the promise" of Messianic salvation (cf. ver. 39) but promises given on special occasions, cf. Josh. xxii. 45; Judges vii. 7, xiii. 5; 1 Kings viii. 56. θράσσαν στόματα λαότων, cf. Daniel vii. 22, ἔνθρασεν τὰ στόματα τῶν λαότων, also Judges xiv. 5, 6; 2 Sam. xvii. 34, xxiii. 20. ἐπισκεύασαν δύναμιν περισσότερον, probably the rescue of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego was suggested by the allusion to Daniel. ἐπέκεισαν is explained by the words of Dan. iii. 22, ἡ καμάτων ἔκκαθη ἐκ παρευσίᾳ. ἐφε-
32—36. ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ

καὶ τῶν προφητῶν· 33. οἱ δὲ πίστεως κατηγοροῦσαν βασιλείας, αἱ Judic. xiv. 6; 1 Sam. xvii. 34; 2 Sam. 1, et x. 19, et zii. 29; Dan. vi. 22. 34. εἰργάσατο δικαίωσιν, ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελίων, ἔφρασαν στόματα ἱεράτων. 35. Ἐξῆκαν δύσμα πυρὸς, ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαίριας, εἰνωθυμαθήσαν ἅπας θυσίαις, ἑγερθήσαν ισχυρὸν ἐν πολέμῳ, παραμβάλοντο ἐκλινοῦν ἀλληλοί. 35. ἐλαβον γυναίκες ἡ διὰ τῆς στάσεως τοῦ μεροῦς αὐτῶν· ἑλοὶ δὲ ἔστησαν ἁκάστως, οὐ προσ- δέχοντο τὴν ἀπολογίαν, ἣν κρίτηνος ἀνατάσεως τύμουν. 36. ἢτεροί δὲ ἐμπαιγμὸν καὶ μαστίγων πείραν ἐλαβον, ἐπὶ δὲ δει- 

7; 1 Par. xlii. 10; Ps. vi. 8, et lixiv. 20, etc.; Est. xxxviii. 21; Dan. iii. 25; 1 Reg. xvii. 23; 2 Reg. iv. 36; 2 Mac. vi. 19, 28, et vili.; Acts xxii. 25. c Jer. xx. 28.

ἡγομένοιν ἐν Ἡνεδρών 47.

μαχαίρας ΝΑΔ; μαχαίρας (more classical) in DeEKLP.

γυναίκα εἰς ΝΑΔ.

γόν στόματα μαχαίρια, "escaped the edge of the sword" of which there are many instances recorded, as 1 Sam. xviii. 11; 1 Kings xix. 2; 1 Mac. ii. 28. ἐνατίσησαν αὐτῶν ἁπάν 

"out of weakness became strong, waxed mighty in battle, routed the armies of aliens," having in view, possibly, the deliverance recorded in Judges iv. by Deborah, where παραμβάλλω (ver. 16, etc.) is used of the army. Reference may also be made, as von Soden suggests, to the Maccabean deliverances. [παραμβάλλω, 1 Mac. iii. 3, 15, 17, etc.; ἄλλος, ii. 7.] On several occasions in Israel's history the three clauses received abundant illustration.

Ver. 35. ἐλαβον γυναίκες...

"Women received their dead by resurrection," as is narrated of the widow of Sarepta, 1 Kings xvii. 17-24, and the Shunamite, 2 Kings iv. 34. ἠλλοι δὲ ἐπηρεασθήσαν...

"others were beaten to death," τύμωνον (εὐ τύμωνον from τύμω, strike) a drum, τύμπανον, I beat. From the expression in 2 Mac. vi. 17, 28, ἕτο τὸ τύμωνον, it might be supposed that some instrument more elaborate than a rod was meant and Josephus speaks of "a wheel" as being used. But that it was substantially a beating to death is proved by what is said of Eleazar (2 Mac. ii. 30), μᾶλλον τοῖς παγνείης τελευταίς, etc. That Eleazar and the seven brethren (2 Mac. vii.) are alluded to is obvious, for it was characteristic of them that they died ὃ προσ- δέχαντο τῇ ἀπολύσεωι, not accepting the offered deliverance. Eleazar was shown a way by which he could escape death (2 Mac. vi. 21), and the seven brethren also were first inter-

rogated and would have escaped death had they chosen to eat polluted food. They endured martyrdom, not accepting the escape that was possible, ἣν κρίτηνος ἀνατάσεως τύμουν, "that they might obtain a better resurrection," "unto eternal life"—better 'than that spoken of in the beginning of the verse, to a life that again ended" (Davidson, Weiss, von Soden). How fully the resurrection was in view of the seven brethren is shown in the saying of the second: "the King of the world shall raise us εἰς ἀλώνον ἀνα- 

βλέφαν [λέφαν; of the third who when his hands were cut off declared that he would receive them again from God; of the fourth, who in dying said, "It is good, when put to death by men, to look for hope from God to be raised up again by Him;" and the youngest said of them all, "they are dead under God's covenant of everlasting life".

Ver. 36. ήτεροι δὲ... introducing a different class of victories achieved by faith, although ἐμπαιγμὸν καὶ μαστίγων, "mockings and scourgings" were en-

Surely by the martyrs who have just been mentioned (2 Mac. vii. 7 and vii. 1). τίμωνον διατέθηκαν ἐκπιστίς, see ver. 20. ἐν τῇ διά 

σιμιαίμον... "yes, moreover of bonds and prison"; as the examples in Bleek prove, διὸ δὲ is commonly used to express a climax (cf. Luke xiv. 26); and such imprisonment as was inflicted, e.g., on Jere-

miah (xxxviii. 9) was certainly even more to be dreaded than scourging. ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ, "they were stoned," as was Zechariah, son of Johoaida, 2 Chron. xxiv. 20 (Luke xi. 51). There was also a tradition that Jeremiah was stoned at Daphne in Egypt. ἑνδοκιμασίᾳ, "they were seen asunder," a cruel death some-
times inflicted on prisoners of war (2 Sam. xii. 31; Amos i. 3, iVolov apri-
put). The reference is probably to
Isaiah who according to the Ascensio Is.
(i. 9, v. 1) was sawn asunder by Man-
asseh with a wooden saw. Cf. Justin,
Trypho, 120, (apri oivXivw apri-av)
and Charles' Ascension of Isaiah. Within
our own memory some of the followers of
the Bab suffered the same death, iv 4>6vup-
paxaipt)s airtoWov, "died by sword-
slaughte." For iv 6>v see Exod. xvii.
13; Num. xxi. 24, etc.; and for <v see
Jer. xi. 22, xxi. 9. Examples of this
death abounded in the Maccabean period.
iv pifjXfiov cv pT|X«Taif, "they
wandered about in sheepskins," (as the
mantle of Elijah is called in 2 Kings ii. 8,
<i>Haiv aXiou tiV fjXwT|v avTov), or
event "in goatskins," a still rougher
material. This dress they wore not as a
professional uniform, but because " desti-
14. avXioi oapri; Phil. iv. 12 and
vpiEtxaiiv a|ppor|v|v, "hard-
pressed," as in 2 Cor.
iv. 8 alMjpo|v|v all' oiv av|
pap|v|v, a, "maltreated," see ver.
25. 1 T.R. in AD<EK d, e, f, vg., Copt., Arm. In other MSS. the order varies. "Pos-
sibly a]pi-o|v|v only a reduplication of {apri-o|v|v... but it may with at
least equal probability be a primitive corruption of some other word" (Hort).

Ver. 39. kal ov|voi avXioi, "of
whom the world was not worthy", "The
world drove them out, thinking them un-
worthy to live in it, while in truth it was
unworthy to have them living in it" (Davidson). Vaughan aptly compares
Acts xxii. 22. After this parenthetical
remark the description is closed with
another participial clause, apri oiv-
wplaivei, "were tempted." Alford
says, "I do not see how any appropriate
meaning can be given to the mere endur-
ing of temptation, placed as it is between
being sawn asunder and dying by the
sword." He would therefore either omit
the word as a gloss on apri-o|v|v or
substitute a|pi-o|v|v. That is a tempt-
ing reading because not only was one of
the seven brothers (2 Mac. vi. vii. 5) tried,
but those who sought to keep the Sabbath
in a cave (2 Mac. vi. 11) were all burned
together by order of Philip, Antiochus'
governor in Jerusalem. At the same
time, the reading, "were tempted" gives
quite a good sense, for certainly the most
fiendish element in the torture of the
seven brothers was the pressure put on
each individually to recant, iv pifjXfiov
paxaipt)s airtoWov, "died by sword-
slaughter," for iv <v see Exod. xvii.
13; Num. xxi. 24, etc.; and for apiv. <v see
Jer. xi. 22, xxi. 9. Examples of this
death abounded in the Maccabean period.
iv pifjXfiov cv pT|X«Taif, "they
wandered about in sheepskins," (as the
mantle of Elijah is called in 2 Kings ii. 8,
<i>Haiv aXiou tiV fjXwT|v avTov), or
even "in goatskins," a still rougher
material. This dress they wore not as a
professional uniform, but because " desti-
14. avXioi oapri; Phil. iv. 12 and
vpiEtxaiiv a|ppor|v|v, "hard-
pressed," as in 2 Cor.
iv. 8 alMjpo|v|v all' oiv av|
pap|v|v, a, "maltreated," see ver.

1 T.R. in AD<EK d, e, f, vg., Copt., Arm. In other MSS. the order varies. "Pos-
sibly a]pi-o|v|v only a reduplication of {apri-o|v|v... but it may with at
least equal probability be a primitive corruption of some other word" (Hort).
been expected "apart from the Son," but χαρίς Ἰησοῦ, because the writer has in view the history of the Church, the relation of the people of God in former times to the same people in Messianic times.

Chapter XII.—Ver. 1. "Therefore, as we have so great a cloud of witnesses encompassing us, let us likewise lay aside every encumbrance and sin that clings so close and run with endurance the race that is set before us, looking to the leader and perfecter of faith, even Jesus, who for the joy set before him endured a cross despising shame and has sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." "Therefore then" more formal and emphatic than the usual, τοι—ἀπο. Kal τῆς.

Toiyapovv, and we in our turn, we as well as they, and with the added advantage of having so many testimonies to the good results of faith. νόμος used frequently in Homer and elsewhere, as "nubes" in Latin and "cloud" in English to suggest a vast multitude. uaprvpuv, "witnesses," persons who by their actions have testified to the worth of faith. The cloud of witnesses are those named and suggested in chap. xi.; persons whose lives witnessed to the work and triumph of faith, and whose faith was witnessed to by Scripture, cf. xi. 2, 4, 5. This cloud is περικείμενον, because, as the writer has just shown, look where they will into their history his Hebrew readers see such examples of faith. It is impossible to take τάρταρας as equivalent to θεαταὶ. If the idea of "spectator" is present at all, which is very doubtful, it is only introduced by the words τρέχομεν. . . . ἀγώνα. The idea is not that they are running in presence of spectators and must therefore run well; but that their people's history being filled with examples of much-enduring but triumphant faith, they also must approve their lineage by showing a like persistence of faith. διὸ καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ κάθαρος. . . . ἠλέητος, a mass or weight or burden (= φόρτος), hence a swelling or superfluous flesh [cf. especially Longinus, iii. 9, κακὸς καὶ ἐν τῷ σώματι καὶ λόγῳ, and from Hippocrates in Wetstein, καὶ γῆρ ὑπὸ ταχέως, καὶ γυμνότερο ὑπάτῃ, σαρκῶν δέντον καθαρέως.] The allusion therefore is to the training preparatory to a race by which an encumbering superfluity of flesh is reduced. The Christian runner must rid himself even of innocent things which might retard him. And all that does not help, hinders. It is by running he learns what these things are. So long as he stands he does not feel that they are burdensome and hampering. καὶ τὴν εὐπρεπίστατον ἀμαρτίαν. Of the difficult word εὐπρεπή. Chrysostom gives two interpretations; "which is easily avoided," and "which easily encompasses or surrounds us." In the sense of "avoid" the verb περικείμενος occurs in 2 Tim. ii. 16 and Tit. iii. 9, but it is scarcely credible in the present context such an epithet could be applied to sin. The second interpretation has been generally accepted ["circumstant nos peccatum" (Vulg.); "qui nos enveloppe si aisément"; "die Sünde, die immer zur Hand ist" (Weizäcker)]. This meaning suits the context and the action enjoined in διόςλευκοὶ, suggesting, as it does, the trailing garment that encumbers the runner. The article τῆς does not point to some particular sin, but to that which characterises all sin, the tenacity with which it clings to a man. We might suppose from the word itself that it alluded to sin as an enemy encompassing from well-chosen points of vantage, but this does not suit the figure of the race nor the διόςλευκοί. [Porphyry, de Abstin., says νομισμὸν ὡς καὶ ἀριθμοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ στάδιον ἀναβείνωμεν ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς Ὀλυμπίας ἀγωνισμόν. "Ut cursores vestimenta non solam abjiciunt, nudique currunt, verum etiam crebris exercitacionibus, ne corpus nimis obesum et ineptum redditur, efficient: ita et vos omnia impedimenta in studio virtutis, et tarditatem vestram crebris meditationibus vincite" (Wetstein).] ἀποκορυφή, after the negative preparation comes the positive demand for endurance, cf. x. 36. τρέχομεν. . . . ἀγώνα, as in Herod. viii. 102, πολλὰ ἀγάπατα δραμάτοι οἱ Ἑλληνες. προκείμενον. [Frequent with ἀγών, as in Arrian's Epict., iii. 25, ὅπως ὑπὸ τῆς πάλης καὶ παχυρήτου ὁ ἄγων προκείμενος. Cf. Orestes of Eurip., 845, and Ignatius to Eph., c. 17. τοῦ προκείμενον [ἐπ.] appointed, lying before us as our destined
This let us run, not waiting for a pleasanter, easier course, but accepting that which is appointed and recognising the difficulties as constituent parts of the race. Success depends on the condition attached, viz., fixing our gaze on Him who sets us the example (ἀρχήν) of faith, and exhibits it in its perfect form (τελειώτητι), who leads us in faith and in whom faith finds its perfect embodiment. ἄρχην properly means one to whom anything owes its origin (cf. ii. 10), but here it rather indicates one who takes the lead or sets the example most worth following. Jesus is the ἄρχην τῆς πίστεως because he is its τελειώτητι. In Him alone do we see absolute dependence on God, implicit trust, what it is, what it costs, and what it results in. (Hence the human name Ἰησοῦς.) On Him therefore must the gaze be fixed if the runner is to endure, for in Him the reasonableness, the beauty, and the reward of a life of faith are seen. Faith manifested itself in Jesus, especially in His endurance of the cross in virtue of His faith in the result, though it was not without pain. The shame is mentioned at II. 26, as a καταφρονήσας, because His despising of it manifests a mind fixed on the glory that was to follow and filled with it.

Ver. 4. Ὅπως μέχρις αἵματος. ... "Not yet unto blood have ye resisted in your contest with sin." Bengel says: "a cursu venit ad pugilatum." Cf. I Cor. ix. 24-27. But this is doubtful.
and that despondency and failure of faith under suffering are inappropriate, for trials are not evidence of God's displeasure, but on the contrary tokens of His love, the uniform discipline to which every son must be subjected, δυτικαδικασται...the emphasis falling on δυτικα...the words, "whom He takes to Him as a veritable son, receives in his heart and cherishes" (Alford). The word is similarly used in Polystrian, xxviii. 1, 8. [The same passage from Proverbs is cited by Philo (De Cong. Erud. gratia, p 544) who adds, οὕτως ἢ ἐνίκηλαι καὶ νοθεύει καθὼς νοθεύεται, διότι δὲ αὐτὸς ἡ πρὸς θεὸν ἀμαρτία συγκέντρωται...τί γὰρ ὀλεθρίωτον νῦν πατρὸς ἤ ἐνδον πατρός]. Cf. Menander's δ μὴ ἔρειν ἀνθρώπος σοὶ παῖδεσθε, and Seneca's De Providentia where the same comparison is elaborated, and the great principle laid down "non quid, sed quemadmodum feras, interest." [Bleek.]

Ver. 7. The inference from the passage cited is obvious, εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, "it is for training ye are enduring (are called to endure), as sons God is dealing with you". ἐποιεῖται is common; as in Xenophon, ὅ γὰρ ὁ φίλος προσφέρετο ἡμῖν; and in Josephus, ὃς ἐταξαίη προσφέρατο;) Their sufferings are evidence that God considers them His sons and treats them as such; for what son is there whom his father does not correct? τὶς γὰρ νῖν...similar in form to Matt. vii. 9, τὶς νῖν ἐμὸν ἀνθρωπὸν—εἰ δὲ χρῆ... Whereas did they receive no such treatment, were they free from that discipline of which all (God's children) have become partakers (as illustrated in chap. xi.) then in this case they are bastards and not sons; their freedom from the discipline which God uniformly accords His children would prove that they were not genuine sons.
Ver. 9. With ἐν ἀναφαίνει a fresh phase of the argument is introduced. [Raphel in loc. is of opinion that ἐν ἀναφαίνει here as frequently in the classics is "nota interrogantis cum vehementia et quasi indignatione quadam"; but it gives a better construction if we take it in the sense of "further" as in 1 Cor. xii. 5, 7, and Mark iv. 28, πρῶτον χρόνον, ἐντα στάχγον, ἐν τῇ πλήρεις εὕτε.] The argument is, "the fathers of our flesh we used to have as trainers, and we had them in reverence; shall we not much rather be subject to the Father of our spirits and live?" The article before ἐντα ὑποτασσόμεθα makes it probable that there is no reference to angels but only an antithesis to τῇ σαρκί ἡμῶν. The position of the two words σαρκίς and πνεύματα confirms this. καὶ ἔσομαι is unexpected, and is inserted to balance καὶ ἐντα ὑποτασσόμεθα on this verb see Anz. p. 269 in the rhythm of the sentence. The thought is that only by subjection to the Father of our spirit can we have life. Delitzsch maintains that this verse strongly favours the theory of Creationism and quotes Hugo de S. Victore, "Nota diligenter hanc authoritatem, per quam manifeste probatur, quod animae non sunt ex traduce sicut caro". It is safer to say with Davidson, "It is as a spirit, or on his spiritual side, that man enters into close relation with God; and this leads to the conception that God is more especially the Author of man's spirit, or Author of man on his spiritual side, and to designations such as those in Num. xvi. 22". Modern science scorns Creationism; although if Wallace's idea of the evolution of man be accepted it might find encouragement.

Ver. 10. οὐ μὴ γὰρ... The reasonableness of the appeal of ver. 9 is further illustrated by a comparison of the character and end in the earthly and heavenly fathers' discipline respectively. The earthly fathers exercised discipline for a few days in accordance with what commended itself to their judgment as proper; a judgment which could not be infallible and must sometimes have hindered rather than helped true growth; but the heavenly Father uses discipline with a view to our profit that we may partake of his holiness. Two notes of imperfection characterise the discipline of the fathers of our flesh. (1) It is πρὸς ἀλλαγαὶς ἡμῶν, "for a few days," i.e., during the brief period of youth. It must cease when manhood is attained, whether or not it has attained its end. (2) It is κατὰ τὸ δόκων αὐτῶν, subject to misconception both of the end to be reached and the means by which it can be attained. In contrast to this second feature the discipline of the Father of our spirit is without fail ἕπεις ὑποτασσόμεθα, "for our advantage," which is defined in ἐν τῇ μεταλαβαῖν τῇ ἀγίαττην τῇ ἀναφαίνει, "that we may partake of His holiness," in which the contrast to the incomplete

Ver. 11. τὰ σά σὺ παῖδεια... Another encouragement to endure chastening: if it is allowed to do its work righteousness will result. "Now all chastisement for the present indeed seems matter not of joy but of grief, afterwards however it yields, to those who are disciplined by it, the peaceable fruit of righteousness." [τὰ σά... έτελεύτητα καὶ η ἀνθρωπίνη καὶ η πνευματική.] πρὸς τὰ παρόν, see Thucyd., ii. 22. οὐ δοκεῖ... λύτης, Chrys. καλῶς εἴην το δοκεῖ. οὐδὲ γὰρ ὕστερ δοκεῖ λύτης ἡ παῖδεια, ἀλλὰ μόνον δοκεῖ, see Bleek. Chastisement is here viewed as an opportunity for cultivating faith and endurance and to those who use the opportunity and are exercised and trained by it, διὰ αὐτής...
The document contains a passage from the book of Hebrews, with the text discussing the significance of trials in one's life. It emphasizes the importance of using trials as a discipline to emerge victorious and highlights the peace that can be attained through this process. The passage also touches on the need for the church to maintain unity and peace, particularly amidst conflicts among its members. Overall, it advocates for a peaceful approach to resolving disputes and maintaining unity within the community.
The oversight" (thoroughly scrutinising as in the case of sick persons," Chrys.) addressed not to the teachers or rulers but to all. The object of this supervision is to prevent the defection of any one of their number. "As if they were travelling together on some long journey, in a large company, he says, Take heed that no man be left behind; I do not seek this only, that ye may arrive yourselves, but also that ye should look diligently after the others" (Chrys.), and cf. M. Arnold's *In Rugby Chapel*. μὴ τίς ὑπάρξων... may be construed either by supplying τοι, or by supposing a break at ὑπάρξων (so Davidson), or by carrying on the τίς ὑπάρξων to ἐνοχῇ. The simplest seems to be the first: "lest any be failing (= fail) of the grace of God," i.e., lest he never reach the blessings which the grace of God offers. Cf. iv. 1.

Another contingency to be guarded against by careful watching is expressed in μὴ τίς ( ἔρχομαι... words borrowed from Deut. xxxii. 18, μὴ τίς ἐν ὑμῖν μία ὄψιν ἐν χόλῃ καὶ τυρφῇ, "lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you". As in Deuteronomy so here the bitter root which might spring up and bring forth its poisonous fruit among them, was one of their own members who might lead them astray or introduce evil practices and so the whole community [ὃ τολλαί] might be defiled [μακαρισμὸς], i.e., rendered unfit for that approach to God and fellowship with Him to which they were urged in the preceding verse. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, Gal. v. 9, where also it is a person that is referred to.

Ver. 16. μὴ τίς πάροιν... specific forms in which roots of bitterness might appear among them. πάροιν is to be taken in its literal sense and not as signifying departure from God [but cf. Weiss]. Neither is it to be applied to Esau, in spite of the passages adduced by Wetstein to show that he was commonly considered a fornicator, and of Philo's interpretation of "hairy" as "intemperate and licentious"; v. Delitzsch. From xiii. 4 it appears that fornication was one of the dangers to which these Hebrews were exposed. ἡ βήβης ἡ γὰρ ἡμεῖς, a profanity which was especially betrayed in his hating for a single meal [ἂν συμφώνησεν] his own rights of primogeniture. Esau lightly parting with his religious privileges and his patrimony for a present gratification is an appropriate warning to those who day by day were tempted to win comfort and escape suffering by parting with their hope in Christ. The warning is pointed by the fate of Esau. τοῦ γὰρ δεῖ τα καὶ ματέσαται..."for ye know that even though he was afterwards desirous to inherit the blessing he was rejected, though he sought it with tears; for he found no place of repentance". "The term 'repentance' is here used not strictly of mere change of mind, but of a change of mind undoing the effect of a former state of mind" (Davidson).

In other words, his bargain was irrecoverable. The words must be interpreted by the narrative in Genesis (xxvii. 1-41), where we read that some time after the sale of the birthright (υπάρχων) Esau sought the blessing with tears (xxvii. 38, ὑπάρχων ἡγοῦμαι ἡμεῖς καὶ καλανεστώ) but found his act was unalterable. The lesson written on Esau's life as on that of all who miss opportunities is that the past is irreparable, and however much they may desire to recall and alter it, that cannot be. It was this which the writer wished to enforce. If now, through any temptation or pressure, you let go the benefits you have in Christ, you are committing yourself to an act you cannot recall. It must also be observed that the author is confining his attention to the one act of Esau, not pronouncing on his whole life and ultimate destiny. [μετανοιαὶ τῶν. So Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 97, "poenitentiae locus;" and *Ulpian, Digest*, x. Tit. 7, "poenitentiae haeredis is locum non esse" (Weitstein)].
16—19. ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ

Vv. 18-29. In this paragraph we have the climax of the Epistle. Its doctrine and its exhortation alike culminate here. The great aim of the writer has been to persuade the Hebrews to hearken to the word spoken by God in Christ (i. 1, ii. 1-4). This aim he still seeks to attain by bringing before his readers in one closing picture the contrast between the old dispensation and the new. The old was characterised by material, sensible transitory manifestations; the new by what is supersensible and eternally stable. The old also rather emphasised the inaccessible nature of God, His unapproachable holiness, His awful majesty, and taught men that they could not come near; the new brings men into the very presence of God, and though He be "Judge of all" yet is He surrounded with the spirits of perfected men. But as the writer seeks to quicken his readers to a more zealous faith He shows also the awful consequences of refusing Him that speaketh from heaven. Not the fire and smoke of Sinai threaten now to consume the disobedient, but "our God is a consuming fire"; not a symbolic and material element threatened, but the very Eternal and All-pervading Himself. And, returning to the idea with which he commenced the Epistle and so making its unity obvious, the writer contrasts the voice that shook the earth with the infinitely more terrible voice that shakes the heavens also, that terminates time and brings in eternal things.

Ver. 18. Οὐ γὰρ προσελθήσατε... "For ye have not approached," assigning a further reason for the previous exhortation. Your fathers drew near [Deut. iv. 11, προσήλθατε καὶ εὗρον ὅτῳ τὸ δρόμον] to hear God's word. The word is used in its general sense, and the idea of drawing near as an accepted worshipper is not intended. ζηλωθήσατε... As MS. authority renders the construction is doubtful. The R.V. renders "the mount that might be touched," indicating that "the mount" is not in the text. This is justified by the antithetic clause, ver. 22, ἀλλὰ προσελθήσατε Σαίλον δρόμον, which already was in his mind. Others translate "ye are not come to a palpable and kindled fire," which is grammatically possible, but open to the objection that "a palpable fire," a fire that can be touched is precisely what this fire was not, and it is an awkward mode of expressing a "material" fire. A third rendering is "Ye are not come to that which can be touched and is kindled with fire," κατακαίνησαν τοὺς, "that burned with fire," is in agreement with Deut. iv. 19, ὁ θεὸς ἐκεῖνος τὸν ἱλικόντος τοῦ φωτός τοῦ φωτός, γνίφοντες, θυελλὰ; see also Deut. v. 22, 23, ix. 15; Exod. xix. 18. The "gloom and mist and tempest (or hurricane) and the blast of trumpet (Exod. xix. 16, φωνὴ τῆς σαλπιγγοῦ ἡσυχαί) and voice of words" (Deut. iv. 12, καὶ θύελλης Κύριος πρὸς θύελλης ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρός φωτοῦν ἡμᾶς) are enumerated to accentuate the material and terrifying character of the revelation on which the O.T. dispensation was founded. The regularly recurrent καὶ gives emphasis to this enumeration; all the features of the manifestation were of the same character. The article is omitted before each particular, because each is introduced not for its own sake but for the general effect.

From ἐκ τοῦ ἑτρομοῦ (ver. 21) describes the terror induced by these manifestations, (1) first in the people (αἱ ἀκούσατε) who begged that not a word more should be added to them (προσταθημένη suggested by Deut. v. 25 and xviii. 16, ὁ προστέθησαν ἀκούαντες τῆς φωνῆς Κύριου, "we will not any more hear, etc.") for they could not endure that which was being commanded, "If even a beast touch the mountain it shall be stoned" (Exod. xix. 12, 13); and (2) also in Moses, for, so terrifying was the appearance that Moses said, "I am extremely afraid (Deut. ix. 9) and tremble.

τερμάτωσα ἐμα at the burning bush.)
Ver. 22. The Christian standing and attainment are now described in contrast with the Jewish. Ye are brought into the fellowship of eternal realities. ἀλλὰ προσεληνύθητε, "but ye have drawn near" (already you have entered into your eternal relation to the unseen) to Σιὼν ὑμεῖς, "in the twenty-three passages in the LXX where the two words are combined the order is uniformly ὑμεῖς Σιὼν and not Σιὼν ὑμεῖς. Evidently here the 'Zion mountain' is mentally contrasted with another, the 'Sinai mountain'. And thus the omission of ὑμεῖς in the revised text of ver. 18 is virtually supplied" (Vaughan). The ideal Zion is the place of God's manifestation of His presence (Ps. ix. 11, lxxvi. 2) but also of His people's abode (Ps. cxlvii. 10; Isa. i. 27 and passim). It is therefore impossible to find another particular of the enumeration in τάλαι θεοῦ ζώντος ἵππος Σιὼν as if the former were "the transcendent sphere of God's existence where He is manifested only to Himself," and the latter "the place where His people gather and where He is manifested to them". (Cf. Isa. ix. 14, κλήθητε πάλις Κυρίων, Σιὼν; the mount and the city are viewed together as the meeting-place of God and His people, where the "living God" manifests fully His eternal fulness and sufficiency. It is "the heavenly Jerusalem" (cf. Gal. iv. 26, ἢ ἐν τῇ ἱερουσαλημ καὶ τῇ παρασκευῇ, and Rev. xii. 1, τό τις Ιερουσαλήμ καὶ τό παντελῆ τῆς Ἐλλάδος) as being not the earthly and made with hands but the ultimate reality [cf. the beautiful description in Philo, De Som., ii. 38, and the Republic, i. p. 592, where after declaring that no such city as he has been describing exists on earth Plato goes on to say, ἀλλ' οὔπω σφαντά λεγεῖν παράδειγμα ἀνάκειται τῷ βουλαμνῷ θράν καὶ ὀργῇ εὐαντών κατασκευαῖς. Also the fine passage in Seneca, De Otto, chap. 31, on the two Republics.] καὶ μνημεῖαν ἄγγελων, and to myriads of angels, the usual accompaniment of God's glory and ministers of His will, as in Deut. xxxii. 2; Rev. v. 11; and Dan. vii. 10, μετα μυρὶς μνηματίκων αὐτῷ. The construction of the following words is much debated. (1) πανηγύρια καὶ ἐκκλησία may be construed in apposition with μυρ. ἄγγελων, to myriads of angels, a festal gathering and assembly of the first-born enrolled in heaven; or, (2) a new particular may be introduced with καὶ ἐκκλησία; or, (3) a new particular may be introduced with πανηγύρια, "to myriads of angels, to a festal gathering and assembly of the first-born." On the whole, the first seems preferable. For although angels are not elsewhere called the "first-born" of God, they are called "sons of God" (Job. i. 6, ii. 1, xxviii. 7; Gen. vi. 2, 4; Ps. lxxxi. 6) and the designation is here appropriate to denote those who are the pristine inhabitants of heaven. Cf. the first choir of Angelicals in the "Dream of Gerontius," who sing:—

"To us His elder race He gave
To battle and to win,
Without the chastisement of pain,
Without the soil of sin";

and Augustine in De Civ. Dei, x. 7, "cum angelis sumus una civitas Dei . . . cujus pars in nobis perigrinatur, pars in illis opulatur". πανηγύρις, meaning a festal gathering of the whole people, and ἐκκλησία meaning the assembly of all enrolled citizens, seem much more applicable to angels. They are enrolled as citizens (καὶ κατασκευαίς see the Fayum and Oxyrhynchus Papyri, passim) in heaven, and welcome the younger sons now introduced. The myriads of angels which on Sinai had made their presence known in thunders and smoke and tempest, terrifying the people, appear now in the familiar form of a well-ordered community in the peaceable guise of citizens rejoicing over additions to their ranks (Luke xv. 10). καὶ κρίτης θεοῦ πάτερ, "and to a Judge who is God of all," and by whose judgment you must therefore stand or fall (cf. x. 27, 30, 31). Among the realities to which they had been introduced this could not be omitted. He who is God of all living is the ultimate
The authors, having been brought near not only to His city with its original inhabitants, but to Himself; and to Himself as allottting without appeal to its destiny, and to spirits of just men made perfect, as in 1 Pet. iii. 19, of those who have departed this life and not yet been clothed with their resurrection body. 

Siccatttvtiti-Xcittplvw is largely illustrated by Wetstein who quotes many examples of “justi perfecti” from the Talmud. It is perhaps more relevant to refer to ex. 4 and to the whole strain of the Epistle whose aim it is to perfect the righteousness of the Hebrews, see chap. vi. Of course O.T. and N.T. saints are referred to. But as without us, i.e., without sharing in our advantages, they could not be perfected, xi. 40, there is at once introduced the recent covenant (ἀνακόσμητος “new in time,” not, as usual, καθαρὸς “fresh in quality,”) because the idea first in the writer’s mind is not the opposite of the old but the recent origin of the new. (But cf. Col. iii. 9; 1 Cor. v. 7.) It is remarkable that the Mediator of this covenant is here called by his human name “Jesus”. The reason probably is that already there is in the writer’s mind the great instrument of mediation, αἵματί δανυτήρου, “blood of sprinkling”. In mediati ng the old covenant Moses, λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα κατασκευάζει τοῦ λαοῦ, Exod. xxvii. 8. [αἷμα δανυτήρου, however, does not occur in LXX, though δεξωρ δανυτήρου is found four times in Numbers]. But in ix. 19 this writer replaces κατασκευάζει with the more specific κατασκεύασεν, cf. ix. 13. In 1 Pet. i. 2 we have δανυτήρου ἀλματος ἴησον Χριστοῦ. The “blood of sprinkling” is therefore the blood by which the new covenant is established, see xxii. 20, αἷμα διαθήκης αἰωνίων, this blood having the power to cleanse the conscience, ix. 14, x. 22. It cleanses because it speaks better than Abel’s, κατασκευάζει τοῦ λαοῦ, for while that of Abel cried for vengeance [Gen. iv. 10, φωνῇ ἀματος τοῦ αδαμου] the other πρὸς με τὴν γῆν] that of Jesus is a message of salvation, the κατασκευάζει τοῦ λαοῦ.

Ver. 25-29. A final appeal. The readers are warned against being deaf to God’s final revelation, for it even the revelation at Sinai could not with impunity be disregarded, much less can the revelation which has reached them and which discloses to them things eternal and God in His essential majesty. Ver. 25. ἀλήθεια (in the same sense and in a similar connection in iii. 12) μὴ παρατηρήσῃς, “See that you refuse not”—as those mentioned in ver. 19 did —τὸν λαόν, “Him that speaketh,” i.e., God as in i. 1 and the close of this verse; “for if those did not escape (punishment) when they refused Him that made to them divine communications on earth, how much less shall we who turn away from Him who does so from heaven”? The argument is the same as in ii. 3. Those who at Sinai begged to be excused from hearing did so in terror of the manifestations of God’s presence. But this is taken both as itself rooted in ignorance of God and aversion, and also as the first manifestation of a refusal to listen which in the history of Israel was often repeated. Punishment followed both in the Sinai generation, iii. 7-19, and in after times. The speaking ἐκ γῆς, i.e., at Sinai (and through the prophets? i. 1) is contrasted with speaking ἐκ ὀφρανῶν, which can only mean speaking from the midst of and in terms of eternal reality, without those earthly
symbols which characterised the old revelations, vv. 18, 19. The revelation in the Son is a revelation of the essential Divine nature in terms that are eternally true and valid. Cf. ix. 14, διὰ πνεύματος αληθίνου. The difference between the two revelations is disclosed in their results or accompaniments; of the former, ἡ λέγων, it is said ἡ φωνὴ τῆς γῆς ἄδελφοιν, "the voice shook the earth," even that symbolic and earthly manifestation was well fitted to convey just impressions of God's holiness; [Ἰδεῖς φωνήν αὐτοῦ, Ἱεραλαμίθῃ ἡ γῆ Ps. xvi. 5, also Ps. xviii. 7 and in Ps. lxvii. 8, γὴ ἀληθεοῦ; Jud. v. 4, 5, sometimes as in Ps. cv. 7 more explicitly κατὰ προφητείαν Κυρίου ἢσαλαθήθῃ ἡ γῆ.] The expression sets forth not only the majesty of God who speaks, but also the effects that follow in agitation and alteration (cf. the Antigone line 163, τὰ μὲν δὲ πόλεος θεὸς πολλὰ σάλπε συνάρρευτες). νῦν δὲ ἐνθηγελεταί, "But now he has promised"—the passive used in middle sense as in Rom. iv. 21—the promise is in Hag. ii. 6, 7, where under this strong figure the new order of things introduced by the rebuilding of the temple is announced. (Cf. Sir. xvi. 18, 19) λέγων, "Ετι δὲναξ . . . saying, "Yet once (or, Once more) I will shake not only the earth but also the heaven." And what the writer especially sees in this promise is declared expressly in ver. 27, τὸ δὲ Ἠτὲναξ δηλοὶ . . . the expression 'once more' indicates the removal of what has been shaken as of what has been made (created), that what is not shaken may abide". The δηλοὶ indicates the finality of this predicted manifestation of God—only once more was he to reveal Himself. This revelation has made known to us and put us in possession of that which is eternal, so that when all present forms of existence pass away (cf. i. 11, 12), what is essential and eternal may still be retained. Underlying the interpretation which the writer gives to δηλοὶ is the belief that some time things temporal must give place to things eternal; else he could not have argued that the final 'shaking' was to be equivalent to a removal, (μετὰ τῶν ἀστερῶν, change of place in xi. 5; but in vii. 12 removal, displacement; and so here) or destruction of the heavens and the earth. The words δὲ πνεῦμα τοῦ Πνεύματος ἢσαλαθήθῃ show that he considered that all that had been made might or would be destroyed, as in i. 10, "the works of God's hands shall perish". (Cf. γένος φθορὰς ἔρχοντας). Isa is dependent on μεταβευντ, transitory things are removed that the things that are eternal may appear in their abiding value. διὰ, seeing that these perishable things must pass away "let us who are receiving a kingdom (a realm in which we shall be as kings, Luke xii. 32, xiii. 29; Rev. i. 6) that is immovable and inalienable have grace" (iv. 16, xii. 15). Many interpreters (Weiss, Westcott, Weizsäcker, Peake) render διὰ χάρις χάριν as in Luke xvi. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12, "let us feel and express thankfulness" which is a very suitable inference to draw from "our receiving an immovable kingdom" and is relevant also to the following clause. But as χάρις is used by this writer in iv. 16 of God's helping favour, and as the τῆς χάριτος ἄνω τῶν θεῶν of ver. 15 is still in view, it seems simpler and more adequate to render as πάνω. It is God's grace, διὰ τῆς λατρείας . . . "by means of which we may acceptably serve God (λατρείας as in ix. 14, possibly in a broader sense than mere worship) with reverence (v. 7) and fear". An additional or recapitulating reason is given in the closing words, "For indeed our God is a consuming fire," words derived from Deut. iv. 24. The fire and smoke which manifested His presence at Sinai (ver. 18) were but symbols of that consuming holiness that destroys all persistent inexcusable evil. It is God Himself who is the fire with which you have to do, not a mere physical, material, quenchable fire.
Chapter XIII. In this chapter we find exhortations apparently springing out of a desire to arrest symptoms of a tendency to hide their Christian profession disowning their teachers and fellow Christians and resenting the shame and hardship incident to the following of Christ.

Vv. 1-6. Exhortations to social manifestation of their Christianity. "Let love of the brethren continue"; it existed (vi. 10) and so, as Chrys. says, he does not write "Let love of the brethren continue," but "Let love exist among you." In the general decay of their faith tendencies to disown Christian fellowship had become apparent, x. 24, 25. This might also lead to a failure to recognize the wants of Christians coming from a distance, therefore hospitality is urged; not as a duty they did not already practice, but gently, as that which they might omit through forgetfulness and as that which might bring them a message from God: "Entertainment of strangers do not neglect; for thus some have entertained angels unawares," as in Gen. xviii.-xix.; Jud. vi. 11-24, xiii. 2-23. For testimonies to the hospitality of Christians Bleek refers to Lucian, De Morte Peregrin., chap. 16 and to the 49th Epistle of Julian, On the hospitality of the East see Palgrave’s Essays, p. 246-7. Westcott gives from early Christian documents a collection of interesting prayers for those suffering imprisonment.

Ver. 4. "Is there or is there to be supplied?" Probably the former, as in ver. 5, "Let marriage be held in honour among all." As a natural result of holding marriage in honour, its ideal sanctity will be violated neither by the married nor by the unmarried. Therefore the κακοσεμών, in which the early Christians obeyed these admonitions may be found in the Apology of Aristides: ξένων ἔναν ἱερούς, ὡς στενά σειώμενοι καὶ καλούοντας ἐν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐπὶ ἄδελφος ἐλπιζόμενος οὐ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ἀδελφοίς ἐναντίον καλούοντο, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ψυχήν. The Syriac Apology adds "If they hear that any of their number is imprisoned or oppressed for the name of their Messiah, all of them provide for his needs." Accordingly in the Martyrdom of Perpetua we read that two deacons were appointed to visit her and relieve the severity of her imprisonment. It is interesting to find that Philo claims for Moses a φιλαδελφία towards strangers, enjoining sympathy, "as being all one living creature though in diverse parts; and in De Spec. Legg. 30 he has οὐ ἐν τοῖς ἐπίροις συμφέρειν αὐτοί κακοσεμών. Westcott gives from early Christian documents a collection of interesting prayers for those suffering imprisonment.

Ver. 3. "Be mindful of those in bonds." (Matt. xxv. 36). This also they had already done (x. 34). The motive now urged is contained in the words "as having been bound with them," as fellow-prisoners. The ὡς ἐν σφαίραι of the next clause might invite the interpretation, "for we are also bound as well as they," and colour might be given to this by the Epistle to Diognetus, chap. 6. χριστιανοὶ κατέχονται μᾶς ὡς ἐν φρουρᾷ τῷ κόσμῳ; but more likely the expression is merely a strong way of saying that all the members of Christ’s body suffer with each, 1 Cor. xii. 26. τῶν κακοσεμών, "the maltreated," cf. xi. 37; you must be mindful of these "as being yourselves also in the body," i.e., not emancipated spirits, and therefore liable to similar ill-usage and capable of sympathy. [A striking illustration of the manner in which the early Christians obeyed these admonitions may be found in the Apology of Aristides: ξένων ἔναν ἱερούς, ὡς στενά σειώμενοι καὶ καλούοντας ἐν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐπὶ ἄδελφος ἐλπιζόμενος οὐ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ἀδελφοίς ἐναντίον καλούοντο, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ψυχήν. The Syriac Apology adds "If they hear that any of their number is imprisoned or oppressed for the name of their Messiah, all of them provide for his needs." Accordingly in the Martyrdom of Perpetua we read that two deacons were appointed to visit her and relieve the severity of her imprisonment. It is interesting to find that Philo claims for Moses a φιλαδελφία towards strangers, enjoining sympathy, "as being all one living creature though in diverse parts; and in De Spec. Legg. 30 he has οὐ ἐν τοῖς ἐπίροις συμφέρειν αὐτοί κακοσεμών. Westcott gives from early Christian documents a collection of interesting prayers for those suffering imprisonment.

Ver. 4. "Is there or is there to be supplied?" Probably the former, as in ver. 5, "Let marriage be held in honour among all." As a natural result of holding marriage in honour, its ideal sanctity will be violated neither by the married nor by the unmarried. Therefore the κακοσεμών, in which the early Christians obeyed these admonitions may be found in the Apology of Aristides: ξένων ἔναν ἱερούς, ὡς στενά σειώμενοι καὶ καλούοντας ἐν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐπὶ ἄδελφος ἐλπιζόμενος οὐ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ἀδελφοίς ἐναντίον καλούοντο, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ψυχήν. The Syriac Apology adds "If they hear that any of their number is imprisoned or oppressed for the name of their Messiah, all of them provide for his needs." Accordingly in the Martyrdom of Perpetua we read that two deacons were appointed to visit her and relieve the severity of her imprisonment. It is interesting to find that Philo claims for Moses a φιλαδελφία towards strangers, enjoining sympathy, "as being all one living creature though in diverse parts; and in De Spec. Legg. 30 he has οὐ ἐν τοῖς ἐπίροις συμφέρειν αὐτοί κακοσεμών. Westcott gives from early Christian documents a collection of interesting prayers for those suffering imprisonment.

Ver. 4. "Is there or is there to be supplied?" Probably the former, as in ver. 5, "Let marriage be held in honour among all." As a natural result of holding marriage in honour, its ideal sanctity will be violated neither by the married nor by the unmarried. Therefore the κακοσεμών, in which the early Christians obeyed these admonitions may be found in the Apology of Aristides: ξένων ἔναν ἱερούς, ὡς στενά σειώμενοι καὶ καλούοντας ἐν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐπὶ ἄδελφος ἐλπιζόμενος οὐ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ἀδελφοίς ἐναντίον καλούοντο, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ψυχήν. The Syriac Apology adds "If they hear that any of their number is imprisoned or oppressed for the name of their Messiah, all of them provide for his needs." Accordingly in the Martyrdom of Perpetua we read that two deacons were appointed to visit her and relieve the severity of her imprisonment. It is interesting to find that Philo claims for Moses a φιλαδελφία towards strangers, enjoining sympathy, "as being all one living creature though in diverse parts; and in De Spec. Legg. 30 he has οὐ ἐν τοῖς ἐπίροις συμφέρειν αὐτοί κακοσεμών. Westcott gives from early Christian documents a collection of interesting prayers for those suffering imprisonment.
... words are to be taken. William Penn's saying must also be kept in view: "If a man pays his tailor but debauches his wife, is he a current moralist?" For marriage as a preventative against vice, cf. 1 Cor. vii. and 1 Thess. iv. 4. Weiss gathers from the insertion of this injunction that the writer is not guided in his choice of precepts by the condition of those to whom he is writing but by "theoretical reflection". But in the face of xii. 16, this seems an unwarranted inference. Τώρας... δὲ θέσεις. Fornicators may escape human condemnation, but God (in emphatic position) will judge them.

Ver. 5. As in Eph. v. 5 and elsewhere, impurity and covetousness are combined, so here the precepts of ver. 4 lead on to a warning against love of money: ἀφίλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος,"let your turn of mind [disposition] be free from love of money, content with what you have". [ὁ τρόπος frequently in classical writers in this sense, as Demosthenes, p. 683, ἀληθερεδής ὁ τρόπος αὐτοῦ ἄσωμ. Other examples in Kypke. ἀρετήθαι τοῖς παρασκ. was also commonly used to denote contentment with what one has. Examples in Raphel and Wetstein.] This contentment has the firm foundation of God's promise; αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶπεν,"for Himself hath said," i.e., God. Οὗ μὴ σε ἀφυ. The quotation is from Deut. xxxi. 5, where however the third person is used. Similar promises, similarly expressed, occur in Gen. xxviii. 15; Deut. xxxi. 8; Josh. i. 5; 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. Philo (De Conf. Ling., chap. 32, not 33 as in Bleek and Davidson) gives the quotation literal as in the text here. ἐν δὲ θαρρώνται ἡμᾶς θέασιν, "κύριος ἔμοι βοήθος, καὶ οὐ φοβηθοῦμαι τι ποιήσῃ ἅμα τίραννος". 7. Μημονεύετε τῷ ἰησοῦν μοῖραν, ὑπότες ἐλα. λησαν ὑμᾶν τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ἀναθεωροῦσιν τὴν ἐκβάσιν τῆς ἀνατροφῆς, μεμείητε τὴν πίστιν.

8. ηγεσίας εὐσεβείας καὶ μὴ περιφέρεσθε. The quotation is from Deut. xxxi, 5, where however the third person is used. Similar promises, similarly expressed, occur in Gen. xxviii. 15; Deut. xxxi. 8; Josh. i. 5; 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. Philo (De Conf. Ling., chap. 32, not 33 as in Bleek and Davidson) gives the quotation literal as in the text here. ἐν δὲ θαρρώνται ἡμᾶς θέασιν, "κύριος ἔμοι βοήθος, καὶ οὐ φοβηθοῦμαι τι ποιήσῃ ἅμα τίραννος". 7. Μημονεύετε τῷ ἰησοῦν μοῖραν, ὑπότες ἐλα. λησαν ὑμᾶν τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ἀναθεωροῦσιν τὴν ἐκβάσιν τῆς ἀνατροφῆς, μεμείητε τὴν πίστιν.

9. ηγεσίας εὐσεβείας καὶ μὴ περιφέρεσθε. The quotation is from Deut. xxxi, 5, where however the third person is used. Similar promises, similarly expressed, occur in Gen. xxviii. 15; Deut. xxxi. 8; Josh. i. 5; 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. Philo (De Conf. Ling., chap. 32, not 33 as in Bleek and Davidson) gives the quotation literal as in the text here. ἐν δὲ θαρρώνται ἡμᾶς θέασιν, "κύριος ἔμοι βοήθος, καὶ οὐ φοβηθοῦμαι τι ποιήσῃ ἅμα τίραννος". 7. Μημονεύετε τῷ ἰησοῦν μοῖραν, ὑπότες ἐλα. λησαν ὑμᾶν τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ἀναθεωροῦσιν τὴν ἐκβάσιν τῆς ἀνατροφῆς, μεμείητε τὴν πίστιν.

10. ηγεσίας εὐσεβείας καὶ μὴ περιφέρεσθε. The quotation is from Deut. xxxi, 5, where however the third person is used. Similar promises, similarly expressed, occur in Gen. xxviii. 15; Deut. xxxi. 8; Josh. i. 5; 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. Philo (De Conf. Ling., chap. 32, not 33 as in Bleek and Davidson) gives the quotation literal as in the text here. ἐν δὲ θαρρώνται ἡμᾶς θέασιν, "κύριος ἔμοι βοήθος, καὶ οὐ φοβηθοῦμαι τι ποιήσῃ ἅμα τίραννος". 7. Μημονεύετε τῷ ἰησοῦν μοῖραν, ὑπότες ἐλα. λησαν ὑμᾶν τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ἀναθεωροῦσιν τὴν ἐκβάσιν τῆς ἀνατροφῆς, μεμείητε τὴν πίστιν.

11. ηγεσίας εὐσεβείας καὶ μὴ περιφέρεσθε. The quotation is from Deut. xxxi, 5, where however the third person is used. Similar promises, similarly expressed, occur in Gen. xxviii. 15; Deut. xxxi. 8; Josh. i. 5; 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. Philo (De Conf. Ling., chap. 32, not 33 as in Bleek and Davidson) gives the quotation literal as in the text here. ἐν δὲ θαρρώνται ἡμᾶς θέασιν, "κύριος ἔμοι βοήθος, καὶ οὐ φοβηθοῦμαι τι ποιήσῃ ἅμα τίραννος". 7. Μημονεύετε τῷ ἰησοῦν μοῖραν, ὑπότες ἐλα. λησαν ὑμᾶν τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ἀναθεωροῦσιν τὴν ἐκβάσιν τῆς ἀνατροφῆς, μεμείητε τὴν πίστιν.

12. ηγεσίας εὐσεβείας καὶ μὴ περιφέρεσθε. The quotation is from Deut. xxxi, 5, where however the third person is used. Similar promises, similarly expressed, occur in Gen. xxviii. 15; Deut. xxxi. 8; Josh. i. 5; 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. Philo (De Conf. Ling., chap. 32, not 33 as in Bleek and Davidson) gives the quotation literal as in the text here. ἐν δὲ θαρρώνται ἡμᾶς θέασιν, "κύριος ἔμοι βοήθος, καὶ οὐ φοβηθοῦμαι τι ποιήσῃ ἅμα τίραννος". 7. Μημονεύετε τῷ ἰησοῦν μοῖραν, ὑπότες ἐλα. λησαν ὑμᾶν τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ἀναθεωροῦσιν τὴν ἐκβάσιν τῆς ἀνατροφῆς, μεμείητε τὴν πίστιν.

13. ηγεσίας εὐσεβείας καὶ μὴ περιφέρεσθε. The quotation is from Deut. xxxi, 5, where however the third person is used. Similar promises, similarly expressed, occur in Gen. xxviii. 15; Deut. xxxi. 8; Josh. i. 5; 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. Philo (De Conf. Ling., chap. 32, not 33 as in Bleek and Davidson) gives the quotation literal as in the text here. ἐν δὲ θαρρώνται ἡμᾶς θέασιν, "κύριος ἔμοι βοήθος, καὶ οὐ φοβηθοῦμαι τι ποιήσῃ ἅμα τίραννος". 7. Μημονεύετε τῷ ἰησοῦν μοῖραν, ὑπότες ἐλα. λησαν ὑμᾶν τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ἀναθεωροῦσιν τὴν ἐκβάσιν τῆς ἀνατροφῆς, μεμείητε τὴν πίστιν.
suggested in the following clause, 'in


in 1 Cor. x. 18 has the meaning "escape"; but in Wisd. ii. xvii., as here, it denotes the end of life with a distinct reference to the manner of it, as illustrating the man's relation to God. The leading men among the Hebrew Christians had, whether by martyrdom (as Weiss, etc.) or not, sealed their teaching and exhibited a faith worthy of imitation. Ver. 8 gives force both to ver. 7 and to ver. 9. Imitate their faith, for the object of faith has not changed nor passed away. "Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day is the same, yea and for ever." o avrof exactly as in Plutarch's Pericles, xv. 2, where in describing the influence of success upon Pericles it is said οὖν ὁ αὐτὸς ὁ αὐτὸς ἦν, he was no longer the same. ξύστας is the proper Attic form, χριστιανικὸς the old Ionic, see Rutherford's New Phryn., 370. "Yesterday and to-day," in the past and in the present Jesus Christ is the same, and He will never be different. Therefore, διὰ διακαίως ποικιλαία καὶ ξίναις μὴ παραφερθέντο. "Be not carried away by teachings various and unheard of, and foreign." παραφέρ. is used in Diodorus and Plutarch of being swept away by a river in flood; cf. παραφέρων of ii. 1. The teachings against which the Hebrews are here warned are such constructions of Old Testament institutions and practises as tended to loosen their attachment to Christ as the sole mediator of the New Covenant. These teachings were "various," inasmuch as they laid stress now on one aspect, now on another of the old economy ("bald in der Schriftgelehrsamkeit, bald in peinlicher Gesetzserfahrung, bald im Opferkult, bald in den Opfermahlzeiten" [Weiss]). They were ξίναι both as being novel and as being irreconcilable with pure Christian truth. "For it is good that by grace the heart be confirmed, not by meats." The present wavering unsatisfactory condition of the Hebrews is to be exchanged for one of confidence and steadfastness not by listening to teachings about meats which after all cannot nourish the heart, but by approaching the throne where grace reigns and from which it is dispensed, iv. 16. From the following verse (ver. 10) in which sacrificial food is expressly mentioned, it would appear that the reference in οὖν προς the is not to asceticism nor to the distinction of clean and unclean meats, but to sacrificial meals. These are condemned by experiment as useless, τῶν οὐδὲν ἔδωκε ξύστας οὐκ... "which were of no avail to those who had recourse to them" (Moffatt). Cf. the ξίναις of vii. 18. Sacrificial meals are also shown to be irreconcilable (ξίναις) with the Christian approach to God, for our (the Christian) altar is one from which neither worshippers nor priests have any right to eat. The point he wishes to make is, that in connection with the Christian sacrifice there is no sacrificial meal. As in the case of the great sacrifice of the Day of Atonement the High Priest carried the blood into the Holy of Holies, while the carcase was not eaten but burned outside the camp; so the Christian altar is not one from which food is dispensed to priest and worshipper. οἱ τῷ θυσιαστήριον λατρεοῦσαι refers to the Christian worshippers. The figure introduced in θυσιαστήριον is continued in these words. To refer them to the O.T. priests is to shatter the argument. Literally the words mean "they who serve the tabernacle," that is,
17. "According to their numbers, and so on, and so forth. And so it is even with the bodies of those animals, whose blood is brought into the holy place by the High Priest as an offering for sin, are burned outside the camp." Cf. Lev. iv. 12, 21. In conformity with this type (ὅσον ἀνάφημαί) Jesus, that He by His own blood might purify the people from their sins, was led as an offering to the gate.

"The burning of the victim was not intended to sublimate but to get rid of it. The body plays no part in the atoning act, and has in fact no significance after the blood has been drained from it. The life, and therefore the atoning energy, resides in the blood and in the blood alone. On the writer's scheme, then, no function is left for the body of Jesus. It is 'through his own blood,' that he must sanctify the people'. It is thus inevitable that while the writer fully recognises the fact of the Resurrection of Christ (ver. 20), he can assign no place to it in his argument or attach to it any theological significance" (Peake).

The suffering ἀπό τῆς τάλας is equivalent to the ἀφοίνη of xii. 2; the ignominy of the malefactor's death was an essential element in the suffering. The utmost that man inflicts upon criminals he bore. He was made to feel that he was outcast and condemned. But it is this which wins all men to Him. τόλον ἄρρητον αὐτόν... "let us therefore go out to him outside the camp bearing his reproach". Cf. xi. 26. Do not shrink from abandoning your old associations and being branded as outcasts and traitors and robbed of your privileges as Jews. This is the reproach of Christ, in bearing which you come nearer to Him. And the surrender of your privileges need not cost you too much regret, "for we have not here (on earth) an abiding city, but seek for that which is to be," that which has the foundations, xii. 10, the heavenly Jerusalem, xii. 22. That which is spiritual and external satisfies the ambition and fills the heart. Cf. Mark iii. 35; Phil. iii. 20. The want of recognition and settlement on earth may therefore well be borne.

Ver. 15. Κατ' αὐτὸν οὖν ἀνάφημαν... "For the bodies of those animals, whose blood is brought into the holy place by the High Priest as an offering for sin, are burned outside the camp." Cf. Lev. iv. 12, 21. In conformity with this type (ὅσον ἀνάφημαί) Jesus, that He by His own blood might purify the people from their sins, was led as an offering to the gate.

"The burning of the victim was not intended to sublimate but to get rid of it. The body plays no part in the atoning act, and has in fact no significance after the blood has been drained from it. The life, and therefore the atoning energy, resides in the blood and in the blood alone. On the writer's scheme, then, no function is left for the body of Jesus. It is 'through his own blood,' that he must sanctify the people'. It is thus inevitable that while the writer fully recognises the fact of the Resurrection of Christ (ver. 20), he can assign no place to it in his argument or attach to it any theological significance" (Peake).

The suffering ἀπό τῆς τάλας is equivalent to the ἀφοίνη of xii. 2; the ignominy of the malefactor's death was an essential element in the suffering. The utmost that man inflicts upon criminals he bore. He was made to feel that he was outcast and condemned. But it is this which wins all men to Him. τόλον ἄρρητον αὐτόν... "let us therefore go out to him outside the camp bearing his reproach". Cf. xi. 26. Do not shrink from abandoning your old associations and being branded as outcasts and traitors and robbed of your privileges as Jews. This is the reproach of Christ, in bearing which you come nearer to Him. And the surrender of your privileges need not cost you too much regret, "for we have not here (on earth) an abiding city, but seek for that which is to be," that which has the foundations, xii. 10, the heavenly Jerusalem, xii. 22. That which is spiritual and external satisfies the ambition and fills the heart. Cf. Mark iii. 35; Phil. iii. 20. The want of recognition and settlement on earth may therefore well be borne.

Ver. 17. "Obey your rulers and submit; for they watch for your souls, knowing they are to give account, that they may do this with joy not with lamentation—for this would be profitless to you." Having exorted the Hebrews to keep in mind their former rulers and adhere to their teaching, the writer now admonishes them, probably in view of a certain mutinous and separatist spirit (x. 25) encouraged by their reception of strange doctrines, to obey their present leaders, and yield themselves trustfully.
to their teaching—an admonition which, as Weiss remarks, shows that these teachers held the same views as the writer. The reasonableness of this injunction is confirmed by the responsibility of the rulers and their anxious discharge of it. They watch, like wakeful shepherds (ἀνωτάτους), or those who are nursing a critical case, in the interest of your souls (ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἑαυτοῦ) to which they may sometimes seem to sacrifice your other interests. They do this under the constant pressure of a consciousness that they must one day render to the Chief Shepherd (ver. 20) an account of the care they have taken of His sheep (ὃς λόγον ἀποδίδοντες). Obey them, then, that they may discharge this responsibility and perform these kind offices for you (πάντα) referring not to λόγον ἀποδίδοντες as Vaughan, etc., which would require a much stronger expression than ἀλυστέλλες, but to ἀφροντούντες) joyfully and not with grumbling (στενάκοιτες, the grumbling with which one resumes a thing done) confirmed by the responsibility with which he contemplates unappreciated and even opposed (work). And even for your own sakes you should make the work of your rulers easy and joyful, for otherwise it cannot profit you. Your unwillingness to listen to them means that you are out of the way, not of your rulers but of your good. And it can do you no good (ἀλυστέλλες γὰρ ἣν τοῦτο).

Ver. 18. προσέχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν. Both the next clause and the next verse seem to indicate that by ἡμῶν the writer chiefly, if not exclusively, meant himself. He could not vouch for the conscience of any other person; the next verse because one principal object or result of their prayer was his restoration to them. Request for prayer is common in the Epistles, 1 Thess. v. 25; 2 Thess. iii. 1; Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 18; Col. iv. 2. The reason here annexed is peculiar. "The allusion to his purity of conduct, and strong assertion of his consciousness of it, in regard to them and all things, when he is petitioning for their prayers, implies that some suspicions may have attached to him in the minds of some of them. They would naturally refer to his great freedom in regard to Jewish practices" (Davidson). But notwithstanding ver. 23 it may be that he was under arrest and shortly to be tried and naturally adds to his request for prayer a protestation of his innocence of all civil offence. [καλὸς ἀνωτάτης occurs in Piny. Inscrip., v. Deissmann, p. 104, E. Tr.] The writer was conscious of a readiness and purpose to live and conduct himself rightly in all circumstances. This gives him confidence and will lend confidence to their prayers. He is more urgent in this request (περισσοτέρος παρακατάλειπε) because he is anxious to be quickly restored to them; implying that he in some sense belonged to them and that the termination of his present exile from them would be acceptable to them as well as to him. [The verb ἀνώτατης first occurs in Xenophon, see Anz. p. 338.]

While asking their prayers for himself the writer prays for them: ὅ δέ ἐσμὲν τής ἐρήμης... He prays to the God of peace (cf. 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 9) because this attribute of God carries in it the guarantee that a termination shall be put to all misunderstanding, disturbance, and inability to do His will. His love of peace is shown in nothing more than in His concluding an eternal covenant with men. This covenant was sealed when "our Lord Jesus," having laid down his life for the sheep, was brought up from the dead in virtue of the perfect and accepted sacrifice (ἐν ἁλματι διαθήκης). Elsewhere in the Epistle the blood is spoken of as giving entrance to the presence of God, here as delivering from that which prevented that entrance. As Vaughan says: "The arrival in the heavenly presence for us in virtue of the atoning blood is here viewed in its start from the grave... It was in virtue of the availing sacrifice that Christ either left the tomb or reentered heaven." ἐν ἁλματι διαθήκης is therefore more naturally connected with ἀφαγώσω, for ἀφαγώσω is natural in connection with ἐναποτιθήματος, although the two connections are closely related. It was as the Great Shepherd that Jesus gave His life for the sheep and by this act established in ever His claim to be the Shepherd of His people. It is this claim also that guarantees that He will lose none but will raise them up at the last day (cf. John xv.). [It is probable that the phrasing of this verse was influenced by Zech. ix. 7, σὺ ἐν ἁλματί διαθήκης σου ἐξαιρε-
22. Parakalēte dhōmas, adelphoi, anēkheiste toú logou tís parakelesewís: kai gár did braxeión epistēmela òmwn. 23. Gineskete tón adelphón Timótheos, apostelamēn, metá oú, dën tòvōn òpprēs, metá dhōmas

1 WD*, d, f, vg. omit ergo; CD:KMP, Syrsh, Arm., Aeth. insert ergo. A has ergo kai logon agátho.
2 M*AC*, 17* read auton tois; 71 reads autón tois. T.R. is found in ΝΕΟΚΜ. [WH say that "there can be little doubt that autón tois is the true reading."]
3 òmwn is found in ΝΑΚΚΜ, 17, 37, 47, 71, vg.
Δίφομαι ὡμᾶς. 24. Ἀσπάσασθε πάντας τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὡμᾶς, καὶ
pάντας τοὺς ἁγίους. Ἀσπάζομαι ὡμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. 25. ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὡμῶν. ἀμήν.
Πρὸς Ἐβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου.

In them. The form of expression is that which is ordinarily used to denote natives of a place, as in Luke xxiii. 50; John i. 44, xi. 1; Acts xvii. 13, etc. Winer says (p. 785): "A critical argument as to the place at which the Epistle was written should never have been founded on these words." Vaughan is certainly wrong in saying that the more natural suggestion of the words would be that the writer is himself in Italy and speaks of the Italian Christians surrounding him. The more natural suggestion, on the contrary, is that the writer is absent from Italy and is writing to it and that therefore the native Italians who happen to be with him join him in the salutations he sends to their compatriots.

The Epistle closes with one of the usual formulae, "Grace be with you all."
THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES
INTRODUCTION.

I. Authorship and Date.—§ 1. External Data. That parts, at all events, of this Epistle were known and cited by very early Church writers seems certain. It is, however, precarious to build too much upon the fact that similarities of thought and expression are found between this Epistle and other early writings. Such similarities do not necessarily prove anything more than that the thought-movements of the times were exercising the minds of many thinkers and writers. If, that is to say, it is found that various writings belonging to the early ages of Christianity contain thoughts, words, and even sentences which are also seen to occur in this Epistle, it would be arbitrary to assume that this fact necessarily proved the influence of the latter upon the former, or vice-versa; and it would, moreover, be dangerous to use this assumption as a basis upon which to found conclusions regarding the date and authorship of the Epistle. We are far from denying that the similarities referred to may denote indebtedness on the part of the writer of our Epistle to the writings in question, or vice versa—as, for example, in the case of Sirach—but in such cases there must be no doubt as to whether the particular writing is earlier or later than our Epistle. A concrete example will make our meaning clear. Some writers regard the similarity of language between the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and St. James as evidence that the latter influenced the former, and this is regarded as evidence in favour of an early date of our Epistle. Thus Lightfoot (Galatians, p. 320, note), says that the language of the writer of the Testaments on the subject of the law of God is “formed on the model of the Epistle of St. James,” and he refers to Ewald, who makes a similar remark; again, on p. 221, note, he says in reference to this pseudepigraph: “On the whole, however, the language in the moral and didactic portions takes its colour from the Epistle of St. James.” So, too, Mayor (The Epistle of St. James, p. iv.) speaks of the writer of this work as one “who seems to have been much influenced by the teaching and example of St. James,” and a large number of quotations are given to prove this contention.
Now, Charles, who may justly be claimed as our leading authority on all that concerns the Pseudepigrapha, has shown conclusively in his edition of the Testaments (1908) that this work was written originally in Hebrew in 109-106 B.C.; the Jewish additions he regards as belonging to the years 70-40 B.C., and in its Greek form it appeared “at the latest” in 50 A.D.; the thirty Christian interpolations (approximately) belong probably to different dates, but scarcely any of these come into consideration in the present connection (see pp. l.-lxv.); instances of St. James probably utilising the Testaments are given on p. xc. Or, to mention another instance, the similarities between St. James and the Epistle to the Corinthians of Clement of Rome are likewise pointed to as a proof of the early date of St. James, because Clement (end of first century and beginning of second century) was influenced by it; but the most striking part of this similarity is the way in which each deals with the subject of faith and works. This subject was, however, one of the fundamental causes of difference between Jews and Christians at all times (indeed, the minds of thinking Jews were exercised by it before the Christian era), and it is dealt with in a number of other works of various dates—Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Testament of Abraham, Apoc. of Baruch, 2 (4) Esdras, Book of Enoch, and often in the later Jewish literature;—therefore it is difficult to see why St. James necessarily influenced Clement on a subject which was so much in evidence in a large variety of writings; and the statement of Mayor, that “the fact that Clement balances the teaching of St. Paul by that of St. James is sufficient proof of the authority he ascribes to the latter” (p. lii.), seems a little too strong, especially as St. James is not mentioned by name in Clement. Similarities are also found between St. James and pseudo-Clement, the Didache, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistles of Ignatius, Hermas, Justin Martyr, the Epistle to Diognetus, Irenæus, Theophilus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and the Clementine Homilies; all these authorities, ranging from the first century to the former half of the third, are often pointed to as showing their recognition of our Epistle, because they show the marks of its influence upon them. The possibility of such indebtedness is not denied, but in the majority of cases it cannot be said that the similarities prove it; nor do they necessarily prove the canonicity, and still less the authorship of our Epistle, especially as not in one single instance is the Epistle mentioned by name in the authorities mentioned above. The earliest writer, as far as is known, who refers to the Epistle definitely as Scripture, and as having been written by St. James, is Origen
(d. 254 A.D.). His testimony is as follows: In his commentary on St. John xix. 6 he refers to our Epistle in the words, . . , δε ἐν τῇ
φερομένῃ ἵστασιν ἑτερολόγῳ ἀνέγγυμα, a phrase which obviously sug-
gests doubt as to its authorship, though apparently it is quoted as
Scripture. On the other hand, passages from our Epistle are quoted
as the words of “James the Apostle” on at least five occasions; and
besides this, there are a number of cases in which direct quotations
from it are clearly regarded as Scripture. This is, moreover,
definitely asserted in his Comm. in Ep. ad Rom., iv. 1, and in
Hom. in Lev., ii. 4. On four occasions St. James is mentioned by
name, once as the “brother of the Lord”. Further, quotations, more
or less distinct, from our Epistle are found in the Constitutiones
Apostolicae (fourth century, but containing earlier material), and in
Lactantius (c. 300 A.D.). The next important writer who gives direct
evidence on the subject is Busebius (c. 270-340 A.D.). In speaking of
the Catholic Epistles, and after referring to the martyrdom of James
the Just, he says: “The first of the Epistles styled Catholic is said
to be his. But I must remark that it is held to be spurious (ῥοδειντα).”
Certainly not many old writers have mentioned it, nor yet the Epistle
of Jude, which is also one of the Epistles called Catholic. But
nevertheless we know that these have been publicly used with the rest
in most churches” (H.E., ii. 23). Then, again, in enumerating the list
of New Testament books (H.E., iii. 25), he says: “Among the contro-
verted books (ἀντιλεγόμενα), which are nevertheless well known and
recognised by many (γνωρίζων δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς), we class the Epistle
circulated under the name of James”. In spite of this, however,
Busebius prefaces a quotation from the Epistle (v. 13) with the
words, λέγει γον ὁ λεπός ἀπόστολος (Comm. in Ps. i.), and later
on in the same work he refers to another passage from the Epistle
(iv. 2) as Scripture ( . . . τῆς γραφῆς λεγοῦσης . . . ). At the same time
it will be wise not to build too much upon these last two references.
In a case like this, where the writer would, if anything, be biased
in favour of ascribing Apostolic authorship to the Epistle, a passage
which casts doubt upon its genuineness is really more weighty
evidence than one in the opposite direction; moreover, a book which
went by a certain name might well be quoted by Busebius in accor-
dance with the common acceptation, without his adding, each time
he mentioned it, his doubts concerning the correctness as to its title.
Upon the whole, the evidence of Busebius, though uncertain, seems
to point to our Epistle as being genuine Scripture, but not as having
been written by St. James. This uncertain testimony is repeated
by Jerome (born c. 330-350 A.D.), who says in his De Viris
Illustr., ii.: "Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini . . . unam tantum scripsit epistolam, quae de septem Catholicis est, quae et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita assetur, licet paulatim tempore procedente obtinuerit auctoritatem" (quoted by Westcott* Canon of the N.T., p. 452); elsewhere, however, Jerome quotes from the Epistle as from Scripture. This evidence, therefore, runs on somewhat the same lines as that of Eusebius; and when it is remembered that these two writers stand out as the two greatest authorities of antiquity on the subject of the Canon, it must be conceded that their witness ought almost to be regarded as final. It is worth recalling that recently Jerome's status as a reliable witness has been greatly strengthened by the discovery of a gospel-fragment¹ which in the MS. in which it has been discovered forms a part of the Longer Ending of the canonical Gospel of St. Mark. "Writing against the Pelagians in 415-416 (C. Pelag., ii. 15), Jerome quoted a passage which 'in some copies [of the Latin Gospels] and especially in Greek codices' followed immediately after St. Mark xvi. 14 [the words are then given]; hitherto Jerome's statement has been entirely without support; now at length it has been recovered in the Greek . . ."² Three other facts of importance must be recorded regarding the external data as to authorship; they concern the question of canonicity, and therefore indirectly that of authorship. The Muratorian Fragment, which "may be regarded on the whole as a summary of the opinion of the Western Church on the Canon shortly after the middle of the second century" (Westcott, op. cit., p. 212), omits St. James in its list of canonical writings. Secondly, our Epistle is not included in the Syriac version of the N.T. brought to the Syrian Church by Palût, bishop of Edessa, at the beginning of the third century; "the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse formed no part of the old Syriac version. In the Peshitta this defect is partially supplied by a translation of James, 1 Peter and 1 John, in agreement with the usage of Antioch as represented by Chrysostom" (Burkitt in Encyc. Bibl. iv. col. 5004); Prof. Burkitt quotes Addai, 46: "The Law and the Prophets and the Gospel . . . and the Epistles of Paul . . . and the Acts of the Twelve Apostles—these writings shall ye read in the Churches of Christ, and besides these ye shall read nothing else"; and adds, "Neither in Aphraates nor in the genuine works of Ephraim are there any quotations from the Apocalypse or the Catholic Epistles." And thirdly, our Epistle

¹ See the Biblical World, pp. 138 ff. (1908).
² Swete in the Guardian, 1st April, 1908; see also Swete, Zwei neue Evangelien-fragmente, p. 9 (1908); Gregory, Das Freer-Logion, pp. 25 ff. (1908).
does not figure in the "Cheltenham List". The first time that the Epistle appears to have been officially recognised as canonical was at the council of Carthage 397 A.D.\(^1\)

The balance of the historical evidence of the first three and a half centuries is thus distinctly against St. James having been the author of this Epistle. If we had external evidence alone to go upon we should assuredly be compelled to follow what seems to have been the opinion of Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome; that is to say that, while on the whole regarding the Epistle as canonical, it is difficult to believe that St. James can have been the author.

If the Epistle was written by St. James, it is almost universally granted that it must have been the St. James who presided at the council of Jerusalem—"James the Lord's brother"—who was the author (see § 2 below), the claims of any other of this name being too inconsiderable to be seriously thought of; but in this case it is difficult to account for the fact that doubt was thrown upon the canonicity of the Epistle for so long, and still more difficult is it to account for the fact that the name of St. James was not connected with it from the beginning. The position of authority which the Apostle held in the early Church (Acts xii. 17; Gal. i. 18, 19), the important fact of his having already inspired an Epistle (Acts xv. 19, 20), and the traditions concerning him in later times (see Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. ix. 1; Eusebius, *H.E.* II. 23), all lead to the supposition that if the Epistle had really been written by him it would have been accepted as genuine and canonical from the first, in which case the doubtful expressions of Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, and the adverse testimony of the Old Syriac Version and the Muratorian Fragment would have been impossible.

On the other hand, it must be allowed that there are strong *a priori* arguments in favour of St. James' authorship. The position held by him in the early Church compels one to expect writings from him; the head of the mother-Church of Christendom would, of all people, be the most obvious one from whom one would look for communications of one kind or another to daughter-churches. Still more within the natural order of things would be an Epistle of a general character—something in the form of an encyclical—addressed not to any particular local Church, but to the whole body of believers; the fact that this one is addressed to the Dispersion only strengthens the argument, because, in the earliest days, the nucleus of the

\(^1\) It was also accepted by the somewhat earlier but much less important Council of Laodicea, about 363 A.D.
Christian congregations was formed by those who were Jews by race. Secondly, there is the analogy of the Epistle inspired by him at the Council of Jerusalem; this fact proves that the Apostle recognised it to be within his province to inspire—if nothing more—communications to distant Churches; this particular epistle was addressed to Gentiles, whose conversion lay more particularly within the province of St. Paul, the more reason, therefore, that Jewish converts should also be written to by the head of the Church of Jerusalem, the city which these had always looked upon as their “Mother”. And then, thirdly, although, as we have already seen, the early patristic evidence is not in favour of St. James’ authorship, we are bound to recognise the fact that there was a tradition as early as the beginning of the third century which brought the name of St. James into connexion with this Epistle.

It is fully realised—and the point needs emphasis—that weighty arguments can be adduced against both sets of considerations mentioned above; it is just the most perplexing thing regarding this Epistle that whether an early or a late date be contended for, whether the authorship of St. James be insisted on, or that of some other, unknown, writer, no conclusive argument can be put forth on either side; nothing has yet been said on either side which has forced conviction on the other. It must be allowed, further, that the objections raised against the contentions on either side are, in almost every instance, strong, and are not to be brushed aside offhand. Considerations of space forbid even an enumeration of the many arguments which are urged on either side, recourse must be had to the more comprehensive Commentaries for this; but the fact is certainly noteworthy that, no matter how strong the arguments put forth on either side, valid objections can be urged against one and all; either position taken up seems so strong from one point of view, and is yet so weakened from another point of view. The one positive conclusion to be drawn from this seems to be the paradoxical one that both are right; that is to say, that an Epistle, which is embodied in our present one, was originally written by St. James, and that to it were added subsequently other elements. This is a procedure which could be paralleled by other examples, spurious additions made to authentic documents, in perfect good faith, being not unknown—e.g., the Longer Ending of St. Mark’s Gospel. Proof for this contention is as little forthcoming as for the various other theories that have been suggested, but it would at least account for the conflicting evidence of Origen, Eusebius and Jerome; and when we come to deal with the internal evidence of the Epistle, it will be seen to account for
more than one perplexing feature. It is at best a faute de mieux and, for the present, does not profess to be anything more.

§ 2. Internal Data.—The writer of the Epistle calls himself James, and in addressing the "twelve tribes of the Dispersion" shows himself to have been a man of more than ordinary authority. According to the evidence of the New Testament, there was only one James who occupied a position of authority such as is implied in this Epistle, namely, "James, the Lord's brother"; thus in Gal. i. 18, 19, St. Paul tells of how after the three years' retirement which followed after his conversion, he went and saw St. Peter and "James the Lord's brother"; in Acts xii. 17 we read that when St. Peter had been released from prison he said to his friends: "Tell these things unto James, and to the brethren"; again, in Gal. ii. 9 St. Paul recounts the action of "James, and Cephas, and John, who were reputed to be pillars," and who, on seeing that grace had been given to him, offered to him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, "that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision"; and further, in the same passage, ver. 12, the mention of certain men "who came from James" marks him out as a leader. Then, and perhaps most important of all, there is the account in Acts xv. 4-29 of the council at Jerusalem, at which the leading part is taken by St. James.¹ Once more, in Acts xxi. 18 the position of importance which St. James occupied is again clearly seen in that when St. Paul and his companions had returned to Jerusalem after their missionary journey they were first received, apparently informally, by the brethren, and then on the following day "they went unto James, and all the elders were present"; these words plainly imply something in the nature of an official, formal reception. Lastly, in 1 Cor. xv. 7, St. Paul speaks of the special appearance of our Lord after His resurrection to St. James. It is certainly worth particular notice that among these references to St. James the most important are supplied directly or indirectly by St. Paul; this fact should of itself be sufficient to show the improbability of any conscious antagonism between the teaching on the subject of faith and works as contained respectively in the Pauline Epistles and that of St. James—assuming the latter to be authentic. At all events, the leading position held by St. James which these passages reveal, makes it in the highest degree probable that the James mentioned in the opening verse of our Epistle is to be identified with "James the Lord's brother".

¹ Note how his very words in Acts xv. 20 are incorporated in the letter which he sent (verse 29).
The next point in the internal evidence to emphasise is the similarity to be observed between the letter inspired by St. James, together with his speech, at the council of Jerusalem, and certain parts of the Epistle which bears his name. The most important of these are as follows:—

(i.) The salutation, χαίρειν, Acts xv. 23, Jas. i. 1; this form is found elsewhere in the New Testament only in Acts xxiii. 26.

(ii.) The words, το καλλίν δύομα το ἐπικληθέν εφ' ὁμᾶς, in Jas. ii. 7, which can only be paralleled in the New Testament by those in Acts xv. 17: ἐφ' οὖς ἐπικληθηται τὸ δύομα μου ἐν αὐτοῖς.

(iii.) The occurrence of the word δύομα in a specially pregnant sense, Jas. ii. 7, v. 10, 14, and Acts xv. 14, 26; this is not used elsewhere in the New Testament in quite the same sense.

(iv.) The pointed allusions to the Old Testament, which are characteristic of St. James' speech, vis., Acts xv. 14, 16-18, 21, also play an important part in the Epistle, or at least in certain parts of it.

(v.) The affectionate term ἀδελφός, which occurs so often in the Epistle (i. 2, 9, 16, 19; ii. 5, 15; iii. 1; iv. 11; v. 7, 9, 10, 12, 19), is also found in Acts xv. 13, 23; especially noticeable is the verbal identity between Jas. ii. 5, ἄκοςατε ἀδελφοί μου, and Acts xv. 13, ἀδερες ἀδελφοι ἄκοςατε μου.

(vi.) Other verbal coincidences are: ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, Jas. i. 27, Acts xv. 14; τιμεῖν and διατηρεῖν, Jas. i. 27, Acts xv. 29; ἐπιτρέφειν, Jas. v. 19, 20, Acts xv. 19; ἀγαπητός, Jas. i. 16, 19, ii. 5, Acts xv. 25. In some of these cases too much stress must not be laid upon the similarities; but it is certainly striking that in the rather restricted scope which the short passage in Acts offers there should, nevertheless, be so many points of similarity with portions of the Epistle. The fact almost compels us to recognise the same mind at work in each, though this does not necessarily apply to the whole of the Epistle ascribed to St. James.

Further internal evidence as to authorship is afforded by indications which point to the writer as having been a Jew. And the first point that strikes one here is the copious use of the O.T. which is characteristic of the writer. There are, it is true, only five direct verbal quotations, vis., i. 11 from Isa. xl. 7; ii. 8 from Lev. xix. 18; ii. 11 from Exod. xx. 13,14; ii. 23 from Gen. xv. 6; iv. 6 from Prov. iii. 34; but the atmosphere of the O.T. is a constituent element of the Epistle; for over and above the O.T. events which are mentioned, there is an abundance of clear references to it, which shows that the mind of the writer was saturated with the spirit of the ancient
Scriptures. Some of the most obvious of these references are the following: i. 10, see Ps. cii. 4-11; ii. 21, see Gen. xxii. 9-12; ii. 23, see Isa. xii. 8, 2 Chron. xx. 7; ii. 25, see Josh. ii. 1 ff.; iii. 6, see Prov. xvi. 27; iii. 9, see Gen. i. 26; iv. 6, see Job xxii. 29; v. 2, see Job xiii. 28; v. 11, see Job i. 21-22, ii. 10; v. 17-18, see 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 41-45. Further, there is the use of the specifically Israelite name for God, "Jehovah Sabaoth" (v. 4), and the references to Law (Torah) in ii. 8-12, iv. 11; this use of νόμος, i.e., without the article, is in accordance with the extended use of the word Torah among the Jews, meaning as it does, not only the Law given on Mount Sinai, not only the whole of the Pentateuch, but also the entire body of religious precepts in general (see especially ii. 12, where right speaking and acting in general are included under proper Torah-observance). The reference to γίνοντα in iii. 6, is also a distinct mark of Jewish authorship; and the way in which the prophets are spoken of in v. 10 points in the same direction. It is to be observed that the use of the O.T. is wide, all three of the great divisions of the Jewish Canon—Law, Prophets, and Writings—being represented.

But what speaks still more for Jewish authorship is the accumulation of many small points indicative of Hebrew methods of thought, expression, and phraseology; examples of this abound in the Epistle; indeed its "Hebraic" colouring is one of its most pronounced characteristics. While it will not be necessary to give exhaustive lists, some examples of the different categories of the small points just referred to must be offered.

(i.) There are a number of instances in which the Greek is reminiscent of Hebrew phraseology; it is not meant by this to imply that a Hebrew text was the original form of such passages and phrases, but only that the Greek form of the expression of thought seems to be moulded from a Hebrew pattern, i.e., that the mind of the writer was accustomed to express itself after the manner of one to whom Hebrew ways of thinking were very familiar, and who in writing Greek, therefore, almost unconsciously reverted to the Hebrew mode. The point of what has been said will perhaps be best realised when it is seen how naturally, in a number of instances, a Hebrew equivalent of the Greek suggests itself, e.g.: ii. 7 . . . τὸ καλὸν δόμομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐστὶν ὡμᾶς, it will be seen that the Hebrew equivalent of this sounds more natural: Αἱ δέδωκεν δόμομα τῷ ποιότερῳ κατὰ πολλὰς ἐρήμων . . . ; iii., 18 . . . ἐν εἶρήμα 

σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήμα, although there is no fault to find with the Greek, a Hebrew equivalent suggests itself almost spontaneously:
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...; the same may be said of the following: i. 12, ... τὸν στέφανον τῆς ἱωθῆς; i. 19 ... βραδὸς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι βραδὸς εἰς ὑπηγ. ... καὶ δὲ βραδὸς τὸν ἱματισμὸν τῆς ἱονίας ἡμέρας; ii. 12, οὕτως λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε; ii. 23, ἀλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαίωσίαν, ἦσαν ἤδη ἐκφόρμου ἡ πρὸς τῷ τόβης; iii. 13, ἵνα γίνη τοῖς λαγοτέσσερα ... v. 1, ἵνα γίνη τὰ πλοῦτον, for this mode of address cf. Am. vi. 1, ὁ Ἰσραήλ ἡ αἰλιμός ὡς φίλος τοῦ κυ[ρίου]; v. 8, στηρίζετε τῶν καρδιῶν ὑμῶν, ... καὶ κεραυνὸς κυρίου, ἡ κατάκτησις τῶν λαοῦ; v. 17, προσθέτατο τοῦ μὴ βρέθαι ... λαλήθη ὧν θόρυ βος ... It is not suggested that in these, as well as in a number of other cases, the Greek is a translation from the Hebrew; but it will not be denied that the form of the Greek does suggest the Hebrew idiom, and therefore that the writer was a Jew.1

(ii.) Secondly, the well-known predilection for assonance on the part of Hebrew writers appears in this Epistle, and is further illustrative of the “Hebraic” colouring of it; this is noticeable both in the repetition of the same words or roots, as well as in the tendency to alliteration; so marked a feature of the Epistle is this that it is met with in almost every verse, and therefore only a few examples need be given: i. 4, ἢρον τελείου ἐχεῖται ὡς ἢ τέλειον. i. 13, μηδεὶς πειραζόμενος λέγεται ὡς ἢ πειραζόμενος ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστιν κακῶν. i. 19, ... βραδὸς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι βραδὸς εἰς ὑπηγ. ... iii. 6, καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν προχόν τῆς γενεσεως καὶ φλογίζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γενεσίας. iii. 7, πάσα γὰρ φύσις ... δομαζέται ... τῇ φύσει. iii. 18, ... ἐν εἰρήνῃ σκεπάσατο τοῖς ποιοῦσι εἰρήνῃ. iv. 8, ἔγγισατε τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἔγγισατε ὑμῖν. iv. 11. μὴ καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων ἀδελφοί. ὁ καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ ... κρίνου τὸν ἀδελφόν αὐτῶν καταλαλεῖ νόμον καὶ κρίνει νόμον. εἰ δὲ νόμον κρίνεις οὖν εἰ ποιήτης νόμον ἀλλὰ κρίτης ... v. 7-8, μακροθυμήσατε οὖν ἀδελφοί ... 1

1 We are not forgetting Deissmann’s very true words: “We have come to recognise that we had greatly over-estimated the number of Hebraisms and Aramaisms in the Bible. Many features that are non-Attic and bear some resemblance to the Semitic and were therefore regarded as Semiticisms, belong really to the great class of international vulgarisms, and are found in vulgar papyri and inscriptions as well as in the Bible” (The Philology of the Greek Bible, pp. 62 f., 1908); but it is not the language so much as the mode of thought, which, when expressed in Hebrew, is so often reminiscent of O. T. phraseology, to which we refer.
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The following are some good instances of alliteration: i. 2, πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἠγίσθωσεν οὖν πειρασμὸς περιπέτειητε ποικίλοις. iii. 5, μικρὸν μέλος ἐστιν καὶ μεγάλα αὐξεί. iii. 8, τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν ὀδέσις διαμάζῃ δύναται. iv. 8, καθαρίσατε χεῖρας ... ἀνίσατε καρδίας. How thoroughly in the Hebrew fashion this repetition of words and alliterative tendency is may be seen by observing a few examples, taken quite at random, from the O.T., e.g., Am. vi. 7, 13; Isa. ix. 5; Nah. i. 2; Ps. cxix. 13, cxxii. 6, etc., etc.

(iii.) Instances of pleonastic phraseology in the Epistle must also be regarded as witnessing to Jewish authorship; among such are the following: i. 8, ἀνὴρ δίψυχος, corresponding to the Hebrew שֶׁלֶגֶן; the same is seen in i. 12, μακάριος ἄνηρ δὲ ... Cf. Ps. i. 1, רְשֵׁי מַעְרְשֵׂי שֶׁלֶגֶן; i. 19, ἐστώ δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος; i. 7, μὴ γὰρ οἰκεῖον ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ...; i. 23, ὁ δὲ ἐσείκεν ἄνδρι κατανοοῦντι ...; ii. 2, ἀνὴρ χρυσοδακτύλιος. Suggestive of Hebrew phraseology, again, are such passages as iii. 7, τῶν ἵππων τοὺς χαλινοὺς εἰς τὸ στόματα βδόλωμεν εἰς τὸ πείθομα αὐτῶν ἡμῖν; iv. 2, οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὅμας. Reminiscent of Hebrew thought are also the words in i. 15, ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβώσα τίκτει ἄμαρτίαν; for the similar idea see Ps. vii. 14, Behold he travaileth with iniquity, yea he hath conceived mischief, and brought forth falsehood; so, too, the words in ii. 7, βλασφημοῦν τὸ ὅμα ...; here, moreover, the omission of the preposition should be noticed; then also, in v. 7, the familiar πρόδομον καὶ δριμον (cf. Jer. v.,24, יְרָעֲר וּמָלָלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל); and in v. 17, the regular Hebraism προσευχὴ προσηφάτο (הַעֲבֵר לְרָעֲר וּמָלָלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל).

(iv.) The Hebraic character of the Epistle is further illustrated by a certain terse and forcible way of putting things, reminding one often of the prophetic style, e.g., ii. 3, Sit thou here in a good place, and in the same verse, Stand thou there; iv. 2 ff., Ye lust and have not; ye kill, and covet, and cannot obtain; ye fight and war; ye have not because ye ask not. ... Ye adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity against God? iv. 7, Be subject, therefore, unto God; but resist the devil. v. 1, Go to now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries which are coming upon you. Then, again, the way in which vivid pictures are presented in few but pregnant words is also illustrative of the same prophetic style, e.g., in i. 6, the picture of the man who doubts; in ii. 2, of the rich man and the poor man entering the synagogue; and in v. 4, of the defrauded labourers. Under this heading must also be mentioned the distinctive way in which the writer of the Epistle
frames many of his sentences; generally speaking they are short and simple, which points, perhaps, to a natural habit of forming them on the Hebrew or Aramaic pattern; indirect statement is never expressed by the infinitive, but only by ἵνα with the indicative; the simple structure will be seen from the following instances: i. 3, γινώσκετε ὅτι . . . καταργάζεται ὑπομονήν. i. 7, μὴ γὰρ οἴδατε . . . ὅτι λήμφεται . . . ii. 20, θέλεις δὲ γνῶμαι . . . οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς χεριν τῶν ἐργῶν ἀργῆ ἔστιν; ii. 24, ὅταν ὅτι εὐ ἐργαν δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος. ii. 19, οὐ πιστεύεις ὅτι ἐὰς θεὸς ἔστιν. i. 19, εἰδέτες ὅτι μείζων κρίμα λημφόμεθα. iv. 5, δεικνύει ὅτι κενὸς ή γραφὴ λέγει . . . ; v. 11, εἰδέτε ὅτι πολύς πλαγχών ἔστιν ο Κύριος. This fact of there being no subordination of sentences, but only co-
ordination is very suggestive of the simple Hebrew construction of sentences. Mention should also be made of the entire absence of the optative mood in the Epistle. On the other hand, we have in-
stances of the prophetic perfect, in v. 2, σέοσευν and γέγονεν, in v. 3, κατίσαται; and also of the gnomic aorist, e.g., i. 2, ἀνείπει, where the Hebrew idiom is imitated, see Isa. xl., 7, . . . בֵּשׁ הָדִיוֹר בִּלְלֵת. Further, the extended use of the word ποιεῖν is extremely sug-
gestive of Hebrew usage, e.g., ii. 13, ὧν καὶ πρὶς ἄνελος τῷ μὴ ποιήσατε θεός, the phrase sounds more natural in Hebrew: . . . לָשׁוּר לְבָדָשׁ הָדוּר; i. 22, γίνεται δὲ ποιεῖται λόγου, Hebrew: לְשׁוּר עֵשֶׁת הָדוּר, cf. i. 25; ii. 8, καὶ ποιεῖτε, Hebrew: לְשׁוּר עֵשֶׁת דָּרָה; cf. ii. 19; iii. 12, μὴ δύναται συκῷ ἐλαίῳ ποιῆσαι, Hebrew: δύναται σύ μη ἐλάσσων λύσατε γιρόμεν; iii. 18, τούτο ποιοῦσιν ἐπεὶ ὤνα ἤθῃς Hebrew: λύσασθαί σκότων ήθης; iv. 13, καὶ ποιήσωσιν ἐκεῖ ἐπουράνιον . . . Hebrew: ῥυθμίσθησθαι σκότων . . . And, once more, the extended use of διδόναι in v. 18, is also in accordance with the Hebrew idiom. Lastly, there are a few other minor points which seem to betray greater familiarity with Hebrew than with Greek idiom; among these are: the use of the genitive of quality, e.g., i. 15, ἀξιοτήτης ἐπιληψιοῦν, ii. 4, κρατᾷ διάλογισμῶν πονηρῶν, iii. 6, κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας (See Vorst, Heb. . . . pp. 244 ff.); the lax use of number, e.g., ii. 15, ἐὰν ἄδελφος ἢ ἄδελφη γνωμοὶ ὑπάρχουσιν . . . ; iii. 14, εἰ ἐρείπων ἔχετε ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὧμοι . . . ; iii. 10, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος ἐξέρχεται εἰλογία καὶ κατάρα; the use of the article is inconsistent; and the disregard of cases is, in some instances, irregular, e.g., iii. 9, καταρώμεθα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους (acc. instead of dat.), v. 6, κατεδικάσατε τὸν δίκαιον (acc. instead of gen.) cf. Mayor in loc. While allowing due weight to "international vulgarisms," one cannot help feeling that many of these features
From all that has been said, therefore, it must be clear that the author of our Epistle was a Jew; as far as it goes, this evidence is in the direction of favouring the authorship of St. James; though it is, of course, far from being in any sense conclusive. But while the internal evidence, so far, speaks distinctly in favour of St. James being the writer of the Epistle, there are some other weighty considerations which point in the opposite direction. Firstly, one might reasonably have expected in an Epistle written by St. James that the fact of his having been the brother of the Lord would have been specially mentioned; this, one might think, would have been insisted on for its own sake, quite apart from the authority and prestige which the mention of it would have conferred upon the writer. Though the fact would have been well known in his immediate surroundings, or even throughout Palestine, and would therefore not have necessitated mention in an Epistle addressed to Palestinian congregations, it was different when, as in the present case, the scattered churches of the Dispersion were being written to; the more authoritative the name of the person who addressed them, the more effective would be the influence of the Epistle upon them. The occurrence of the Lord's name in the opening verse of the Epistle—"a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ"—offered a natural and obvious opportunity for the mention of the writer's close tie to Him. In reply to this it may well be said that after the resurrection of Christ, and the consequent proclamation of His Divinity to all the world, there would be a natural and very seemly hesitation, on the part of those who were His relations after the flesh, to assert this tie; but this argument is to some extent weakened by the words in John xix. 25-27, which were written later than our Epistle (on the assumption of St. James' authorship): "But there were standing by the Cross of Jesus His mother and His mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore saw His mother, and the disciple standing by whom He loved, He saith unto His mother . . ."; if St. John could record thus distinctly the relationship between our Lord and the Blessed Virgin so long after, there does not seem sufficient reason why St. James should not have referred to his own relationship with our Lord. Apart, however, from the non-mention of this relationship, one might, at any rate, have expected a reference to apostleship in the opening verse of the Epistle; for that St. James was regarded as an apostle in the early Church is clear from 1 Cor. xv. 7, Acts xv. 22, Gal. ii. 8, 9. A second reason
for questioning the authorship of St. James is the absence of any references to the great outstanding events connected with our Lord's Person—His manner of life on earth, His sufferings and death, His resurrection and ascension. There are special reasons for expecting to find such references in this Epistle—assuming it to have been written by St. James. It is almost impossible to believe that one who had known Christ, and had been an eye-witness of His doings and a hearer of His teaching, should maintain such absolute silence on these things when addressing a letter to fellow-believers which touches otherwise on such a large variety of subjects. If there was one thing of paramount importance in the early days of Christianity it was that the fact of Christ's resurrection should be proclaimed; one has but to remember how often reference is made to this in the Acts—about twenty-five times—how it is mentioned or implied in all the Pauline Epistles, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as in 1 Peter and 1 and 2 John, to realise the conviction and practice of the other apostles in this; and yet St. James, to whom had been vouchsafed a special manifestation of the risen Lord, can write an Epistle to Jewish-Christians who were scattered abroad without the slightest reference, implicit or explicit, to this cardinal tenet of the faith! The fact of the Epistle being addressed to the Dispersion makes this omission all the more strange; for on the assumption that St. James wrote it, i.e., that it was probably the earliest in date of all the books of the New Testament, there must have been many among those addressed who would require strengthening in their belief, or who would possibly have heard of the resurrection for the first time from a "pillar" of the Church, supposing it had been mentioned; and, therefore, one might reasonably have expected to have found it occupying a central position in the Epistle. It is fully realised that to argue from omissions is not always safe; it is, however, impossible not to be struck by the omissions referred to if the Epistle was written by St. James. On the assumption of a late date, at all events for the bulk of the Epistle, when the main tenets of the faith, such as the resurrection, were regarded as "first principles" and were meant rather for "babes" in faith (cf. Heb. vi. 1 and context), these omissions would not cause surprise; but they would be very difficult to account for on the assumption of St. James' authorship, which would imply a date prior to c. 63 a.d. for its composition. In reply to this it may well be urged that in Acts xv. we have an instance of an Epistle written in the earliest ages of Christianity in which no references to the cardinal tenets of the faith are found; but in an Epistle like this (Acts xv. 23 ff.), written for one specific
purpose, and therefore of small scope, such references cannot well be expected. The possibility is conceivable that a similar letter, though addressed to a different class of hearers, may have constituted the original form of the Epistle that now bears the name of St. James; in this case the absence of the references spoken of above would be quite comprehensible.

Another omission which is likewise difficult to account for on the assumption of the authorship of St. James, is that of any direct reference to Christ as the Messiah of Old Testament prophecy. For a Jew writing to Jewish-Christians in the earliest ages of Christianity such an omission is incomprehensible. The insistence on the Messiahship of our Lord would be the first step in the propagation of the faith among Jews; and if an Epistle of this length and comprehensive character in the subjects touched upon had been written by St. James he could scarcely have omitted some reference, though but a passing one, to the Messiah Whom he had seen and known. The question as to whether our Lord was the promised Messiah or not was one which was naturally surging in the minds of Jews in those early days; the question, "Art Thou He that should come?" perplexed the minds of many others long after the time of the Baptist; for Jews it was all-important, for everything depended upon it. The fact, therefore, that the Messiahship of Jesus is taken for granted in the Epistle (see i. 1, ii. 1) proves that these Jews of the Dispersion regarded this truth as axiomatic; and this would be almost impossible to understand among Jews of the Dispersion in the earliest ages of Christianity, if the conditions of the time are taken into consideration; the only way whereby this could be brought within the bounds of probability would be to restrict the meaning of Dispersion, but this would be arbitrary and without justification, seeing that in our Epistle the word is used without qualification, and, therefore, evidently intended to mean what was ordinarily understood by it.

A further objection urged against the authorship of St. James is the improbability of one in such a humble walk in life as a Galilean peasant, the son of Mary and Joseph, being able to pen an Epistle of this kind in Greek. The writer of the Epistle displays a considerable knowledge of the Greek Wisdom literature, of various N.T. books, and of other Greek writings. It may be said in reply that opportunities for learning Greek were not wanting in Palestine, and the fact of humble birth was certainly no hindrance to the acquiring of knowledge among the Jews. But in a case like this, in which proof either for or against is not forthcoming, one must to a large extent be guided by a balance of probabilities. As far as our knowledge goes
there was really nothing to induce St. James to learn Greek; there is no evidence for supposing that he extended his evangelistic efforts beyond the confines of Palestine; on the contrary, the evidence is in the other direction; as overseer of the Church in Jerusalem his activity must have been almost, if not altogether, exercised among those of his own race. Moreover, it is certain that the Palestinian Jewish teachers altogether discouraged everything that tended to the spread and influence of the Greek spirit, for they rightly (from their point of view) regarded it as a menace to orthodox Judaism (see Bergmann, *Jüdische Apologetik im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, p. 80, etc.); and for a Jew to go to heathen assemblies to learn was, to say the least, improbable in Palestine. As an apostle of the circumcision (Gal. ii. 9) in Palestine the various dialects of the Palestinian vernacular were amply sufficient for St. James’ purposes. It must also be confessed that, even granting that St. James knew Greek, the large acquaintance with some of the Pauline Epistles which the writer of our Epistle shows is against the authorship of St. James; for how was St. James to gain such an intimate knowledge of these without having them before him? It is certain that in those early days there were not many copies of them, and what ever copies there were would be needed outside of Palestine rather than inside; nor is it quite clear why St. James should have required them at all. These Epistles must have been treasured by the Churches addressed as their special possession; copies of them are not likely to have been circulated generally until they had become authoritative documents in the Church at large, and this can scarcely have been the case until close upon the end of the first century at the earliest. The two Epistles that come into consideration are Romans, written from Corinth in c. 58 A.D., and Galatians, probably slightly earlier, perhaps from Antioch (or Ephesus?); these are the earliest dates that can be assigned to them, and as St. James was martyred probably in 63 A.D., there certainly does not appear to have been sufficient time for them to have reached that stage of importance in the eyes of Christians generally for copies to have been circulated outside of the particular congregations addressed. This argument does not appeal, of course, to those who hold that St. Paul was indebted to St. James’ Epistle. On the other hand, the analogy of the letter inspired by St. James in Acts xv. suggests the possibility that something of the same kind may have been repeated; but in this case we should look for something more homogeneous than the Epistle (in its entirety) which at present bears his name.
Turning now more specifically to the question of date, we have, firstly, the entire absence of any reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. This can either imply that the Epistle was written some time before that event, or else some considerable time after. It is an argument which is conclusive neither for an early nor for a late date, and can only be used to emphasise the correctness of a result, concerning the date, reached on other grounds. There is, however, one consideration which suggests (though it certainly cannot be said to amount to proof) an early date; the words in v. 7-9, especially "establish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord is at hand," are, in view of such a passage as Mark xiii. 14-37—see especially verses 28 ff.—more natural from one who was writing before the Fall of Jerusalem. Again, the silence in our Epistle regarding the great controversy on the question of the admission of Gentiles into the Church may well be used as an argument in favour of an early date, though it may also imply the opposite. Silence on this subject, which clearly agitated the Church to such an extent as to shake the very pillars (cf. Gal. ii. 11 ff.) can only be satisfactorily explained on one of two hypotheses; either the Epistle was written before this controversy arose, or else it was not written until so long after that there was no occasion to refer to it. It is, therefore, an argument which can be used both in favour of an early and a late date, and is thus, like that just referred to, inconclusive. But see further on this below. In the next place, the data to be gathered from the Epistle as to the order and constitution of the Church are important in seeking to fix an approximate date. The meeting-place for worship of the Jewish-Christians to whom the Epistle is addressed is called the "Synagogue"; from this it has been argued that the Epistle was written at a time when Christian and Jewish places of worship had not yet become differentiated; if, it is said, the Epistle had been written, say, during the first half of the second century, such place of meeting would have been termed ἑκκλησία. In reply to this, however, it can be urged that συναγωγή is used of a distinctively Christian assembly, e.g., by Hermas in Μανδ., xi. 9. Again, in iii. 1 mention is made of "many teachers," and in v. 14 of the "elders (or presbyters) of the Church" (τῆς ἑκκλησίας); that no reference is made to "bishops" or "deacons" points to an undeveloped constitution of the Church, and therefore to an early date for the Epistle; moreover, the expression "many teachers" may imply a time when regular church officers for this purpose had not yet been ordained. But, on the other hand, it can be argued that the existence of "elders of the Church" does point to an organised system, and that
the "many teachers" is better understood at a time when the number of Christians had greatly increased. Here, again, the argument on either side is inconclusive. Once more, the condition of the Churches to which the Epistle is addressed has not unnaturally been pointed to as not suggestive of the very early years of Christianity; the earnestness and zeal which one might expect in those of the first generation of Christians is conspicuously lacking among those addressed; the impression gained as to the characteristics of these is disappointing—the unbridled tongue, worldliness, quarrelling, jealousy, a mercenary spirit, despising of the poor, flattering the rich, lust, and an entire absence of the wisdom that is from above, with the virtues which this brings in its train. This argument is extremely well answered by Mayor (pp. cxxviii. ff.), who gives a number of examples showing that a similar state of morals was exhibited in other newly-formed Christian communities; but his answer is not conclusive, for some of the examples cited—Ananias and Sapphira, Simon—are so obviously exceptional; others, such as the murmuring of Hellenistic Jews against the Hebrews because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration, and the jealousy between Jews and Gentiles mentioned in Acts xv., and the case of those who had not heard "whether there be any Holy Ghost," are not, strictly speaking, analogous. Moreover, a difference must be made between recently converted Jews and those among the Gentiles who became Christians; among the former there had always been a previous training in moral discipline, which was not the case with the Gentiles; the characteristics, therefore, alluded to above, which are spoken of in reference to Jewish-Christians sound stranger than if Gentile-Christians were in question. If, on the other hand, the Epistle—or those parts of it which come into consideration in this connection—was written after Christianity had been established for two or three generations, the conditions described would be more comprehensible.

The conditions just referred to must, in part, have been the cause of the predominantly ethical character of the Epistle; morals rather than religion sound the dominant note, and for an Epistle like this to have been written during the Apostolic age, when religious fervour was so pronounced, is certainly a little difficult of explanation. The attempts to solve this problem which have been made only bring into relief the incongruousness of the need of such a tone in an Epistle written in the middle (or shortly after the middle) of the first century; for it differs utterly in this respect from other Apostolic writings. It is, of course, true to say that "no Apostolic writing fails to exhibit
the moral interest as the consistent aim of all doctrine and instruction; the appeal for conduct corresponding to the new teaching is the regular conclusion of all doctrinal exposition";¹ but the Apostles, as the same writer truly observes, always start from "the new revelation of the nature of man's dependence on God and God's work in man, which was contained in the Life, the Death, the Resurrection of the Lord Jesus,"² and this is just what is left aside—or perhaps, more correctly, taken for granted—in our Epistle; but in an Apostolic writing we legitimately look for the foundation-truths to be at least as prominent as the ethical standard which is based upon them. The argument based on this fact speaks for a late date. Next, a subject already dealt with, namely, the Judaic tone of the Epistle, is sometimes put forward in favour of an early date; but this characteristic could be used in support of any date from 200 B.C.-200 A.D., to give the narrowest margin; the argument, therefore, is wholly inconclusive. More to the point is that based upon the mention of the Diaspora. For the "twelve tribes of the Dispersion" to be addressed presupposes a widely-spread Christianity, such as would require many years to permit it to have developed itself, so that the use of the phrase in reference to Jewish-Christians almost compels one to postulate a late date for the bulk of the Epistle. The only reply forthcoming to refute this contention is to restrict the meaning of the term "Dispersion"; but, as already pointed out above, the Epistle gives us no authority for this, and what the Jews meant by the twelve tribes of the Dispersion is so well known that this reply ought scarcely to be considered. Then, on the other hand, the absence of all reference to the Temple and its worship has been used as an argument that the Temple no more existed, and that therefore the Epistle must at any rate be later than the year 70 A.D. This argument, however, seems quite inconclusive, for, unless for some specific purpose, why should it be mentioned in an Epistle to Jewish-Christians?

Finally, it is worth inquiring whether the silence of the Epistle concerning the two great distinctive marks of Judaism—viz., Circumcision and the Sabbath—throws any light upon the question of date. The opinion had been directly expressed by St. James that circumcision was unnecessary for Gentile-Christians (Acts xv. 19, cf. xv. 5); on the other hand, Jewish-Christians would, of course, have been circumcised, in the first generation; but there must have arisen at an early stage the question as to whether the children of Jewish-Christians should be circumcised or not; it can hardly be doubted

¹ Parry, A Discussion of the General Epistle of St. James, p. 93.
² Ibid.
that the congregations in the Dispersion to whom our Epistle was addressed comprised a certain number of Gentile as well as Jewish-Christians, and the latter must have known that the former were not circumcised, neither they nor their children, and therefore the question must have arisen as to which was the right course; it was a subject with which St. Paul had had to deal (1 Cor. vii. 18); as soon as the two classes of Christians began to associate, it must have become necessary to have some uniformity in this matter; it concerned the children more especially. On the assumption of an early date for the Epistle one might almost have a right to expect some reference to the question on account of its importance in the eyes of Jews, whereas on the assumption of a late date, when the usage of non-circumcision had been in vogue for some time, the silence on the subject would be natural. It is, perhaps, worth while pointing out that the question was probably to some extent complicated by the fact that baptism, as well as circumcision, was practised among the Jews, as regards proselytes, both before and after the founding of Christianity; during the first centuries of Christianity it became a burning question among the Rabbis whether circumcision without baptism was sufficient; some maintained that baptism alone sufficed. These were things concerning which the scattered congregations of the Dispersion must, in these early years of the planting of the faith, have needed guidance. As regards the Sabbath, some authoritative expression of opinion would also seem to have been demanded if the Epistle were of early date; those who had only comparatively recently become Christians might be expected to have required some guidance as to the observance of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day; even if both were observed, as was probably the case among the early Jewish-Christians, questions as to the relative importance of each can scarcely have been wanting when one remembers the punctiliousness in all that concerns observances which is so characteristic of the Jew. The silence on these two subjects is, of course, inconclusive as to date; all that can be said is that, assuming an early date for the Epistle, some reference to them might reasonably be expected, while if it were written about 125-130 A.D. this silence would be natural.

The net result, then, of these considerations as to authorship and date appears to be as follows: A great deal is to be said in favour of St. James' authorship, and, therefore, in favour of an early date; at least as much is to be said in favour of a late date (say the first or second quarter of the second century), and, therefore, against the authorship of St. James. Against every argument adduced in favour of either view serious objections can be urged; but then these
objections, again, can for the most part be upset by counter-arguments. In view of such a perplexing state of affairs it is extremely difficult, perhaps impossible, to reach a satisfactory conclusion; one thing is quite clear, and that is, that the advocates of either contention have a great deal to urge in support of their position, and that, therefore, dogmatic assertion regarding either is precarious, and belittling of the adversaries' arguments uncalled for. Any conclusion reached must, for the present, be tentative; and, therefore, the view here held is provisional—the view, that is to say, that the name of St. James attaching to the Epistle is authentic, but that, in the first instance, the Epistle was a great deal shorter than as we now possess it; sections being added from time to time, probably excerpts from other writings, or adaptations of these. Indeed, it is possible that we have here something in the shape of text and commentary, the latter being enlarged as time went on. If one remembers how, on an infinitely larger scale, of course, the comments of the words of Scripture by degrees became the Mishna, the comments on these the Gemara, and how ultimately the ponderous mass known as the Talmud came into being, the possibility of this intensely Jewish Epistle having grown by a process of comments, which ultimately came to be regarded as part of the Epistle itself, will be realised. One or two tentative examples of the supposed process will be given in III. on the analysis of the Epistle. This view does not profess to be anything more than theory, it is probably incapable of proof; but it has, at least, the merit of justifying the position both of those who advocate an early as well as those who believe in a late date for the Epistle.

II. LITERARY CHARACTERISTICS.—These have to a large extent been already dealt with; but a brief reference to three other points is demanded on account of their special importance.

(i.) One of the most striking features of the Epistle is the extended acquaintance with the Wisdom literature which it exhibits. Many instances of this will be found in the Commentary, here it must suffice to indicate by references some of the more important and striking examples; the following passages should be compared together: i. 8, Sir. i. 1, 26, Wisd. vi. 14, vii. 14, 15; i. 8, Sir. i. 28, ii. 12, v. 9; i. 12, Wisd. v. 16; i. 13, Sir. xv. 11-15 (especially in the Hebrew original), xv. 20; i. 19, Sir. v. 11 (the words "and let thy life be sincere," which are inserted by A.V., are found neither in the Hebrew nor the Greek; their absence makes the agreement between the words in Jas. and this passage closer), i. 29, iv. 29, v. 13; i. 27, Sir. vii. 34-36, cf. iv. 10; ii. 6, Wisd. ii. 10 (in the Greek); iii. 2,
Sir. xiv. 1, xix. 16, xxv. 8, xxxvii. 18; iii. 5, 6, Sir. v. 13, 14, viii. 3
xxvii. 11; iii. 8, Sir. xxvii. 16-18; iii. 10, Sir. xxvii. 12 (see also context); iii. 13, 17, Wisd. vii. 22-24; v. 4, Sir. iv. 1-6, xxxiv. 22;
v. 7, Sir. vi. 19; v. 16, Sir. iv. 26; v. 17, Sir. xlvi. 3 (cf. context).
These are very far from being exhaustive, and only two books of the
Wisdom literature have been referred to, whereas points of contact
are to be found in several others. This knowledge and sympathy
with the Wisdom literature suggest a Hellenistic rather than a Palestin-
inian Jew.

(ii.) A second literary characteristic, and one which is further
indicative of Hebraic colouring (see above), is to be found in the
large number of parallelisms which the Epistle contains. This well-
known Hebrew literary characteristic appears sometimes more clearly
than at others in the Epistle, but a few of the most obvious examples
are the following:—

i. 9, 10. Let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate;
And the rich in that he is made low.

i. 15. Then the lust, having conceived, beareth sin;
And the sin, being full-grown, bringeth forth death.

i. 17. Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above,
Coming down from the Father of lights,
With Whom can be no variation,
Nor shadow that is cast by turning.

i. 19, 20. But let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow
to wrath;
For the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of
God.

i. 22. Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only,
Deluding your own selves.

iii. 11, 12. Doth the fountain send forth from the same opening
sweet and bitter water?
Can a fig tree, my brethren, yield olives, or a vine figs?

See, further, iv. 7, 10, v. 4, 5, 9. This, too, is in the style of much of
the Wisdom literature, and reminds one often of the Book of Proverbs
especially.

(iii.) Lastly, one cannot fail to be struck by the number of words
—a large number when the shortness of the Epistle is considered—which are either &y. xey. in the New Testament, or very rarely found,
outside the Epistle, in the Septuagint or New Testament; this de-
notes a knowledge of Greek literature and of the Greek language
generally, which is very noticeable; attention is drawn to such words
in the Commentary whenever they occur. For other literary characteristics see I. § 2.

III. Analysis of the Epistle.—The vast majority of commentators are agreed that no consistent scheme is presented in this Epistle, but that it contains rather a number of unconnected sayings which are for the most part independent of one another. The analysis of the Epistle shows the correctness of this view in the main.\(^1\) In some cases it is possible that a thought-connection of a secondary character exists which is not at once apparent; by a thought-connection of a secondary character is meant, when in two succeeding sections a subordinate, not the main, thought of the earlier is taken up and dealt with in the later; an example may be seen in the two sections i. 2-4, i. 5-8; the main thought in the former is the being joyful in temptations, the subject of patience is a subordinate thought, and still more so, that of lacking in nothing; but it is this last which is taken up in the succeeding section and attached to the thought of lacking in wisdom; so that, although it is perfectly true to say there is no genuine connection between these two sections, yet there is a secondary connection. It is improbable that the two sections come from the same writer, because they are lacking in real mental sequence; and yet a semblance of sequence is apparent; if both came from the same writer one would either expect a genuine sequence of thought if the two were intended to be connected, or else a clear indication of each being self-contained. As they stand, it looks as though the former were a text, and the latter a comment upon it, very much like the similar process which occurs incessantly in the *Mishna*.\(^2\) The next section, i. 9-11, deals with the subject of rich and poor; it stands in an isolated position here, but is intimately connected with the later section, ii. 1-13. With i. 12-16 we have another instance of what looks like text and comment; the subject is that of temptation, and comes most naturally after i. 4; the text is contained in ver. 12, the following verses then comment on the nature of temptation. This is an instructive instance illustrative of the theory of the authorship of the Epistle here tentatively advocated (see above); for on comparing the simple, straightforward character of ver. 12 with the intricate chain of thought in the two following verses, it is almost impossible to postulate identity of authorship.

\(^1\) Parry’s attempt to show that the Epistle is “a very careful and logical exposition of a single theme” (*op. cit.* p. 6) is ingenious, but much too artificial to carry conviction.

\(^2\) Catch-words, it would seem, played their part in the formation and grouping of sections.
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i. 17 belongs to the preceding, possibly (see IV. § 1), and i. 18 seems to be a comment on the "Father of lights". i. 19b-20 forms an isolated saying. A self-contained section on the subject of practical religion follows in i. 21-25, to which vv. 26, 27 form an addition. ii. 1-13 has already been referred to; it is followed by a section (ii. 14-26) of deep interest on the subject of faith and works, to which iii. 13-18 belong, according to the subject-matter. iii. 1-12 is a self-contained passage dealing with the subject of self-control as regards the tongue. If these first three chapters show a want of homogeneity, the last two do so in an even more pronounced way; the various sections are clearly divided off, showing no connection with each other, the whole forming a collection of extracts, apparently; thus, iv. 1-10 contains warnings and exhortations concerning the practical religious life; iv. 11, 12 is a short section on the need of observing the second great commandment of the Law; iv. 13-17 lays stress on the uncertainty and fleeting character of earthly life; v. 1-11 is an eschatological section, and extremely practical; v. 12, which prohibits swearing, is almost a quotation from the Sermon on the Mount; v. 13-18 gives directions concerning the visitation of the sick; and the abrupt ending v. 19, 20 speaks of the reward of those who convert sinners from their evil ways.

It will thus be seen that the Epistle is for the most part a collection of independent sections; some of these were evidently originally intended to be comments on the Apostle's words, possibly added by one or more of the elders of the churches addressed for the benefit of the members; others seem to be wholly independent, and not to have had anything to do with the Epistle in the first instance. The various elements of which the Epistle is now composed have to a large extent become so intermingled that the attempt to differentiate between them seems hopeless. But, generally speaking, we should look for the simplest, most direct and straightforward parts as being those which would be the most likely words of the Apostle; so that such parts as i. 13-16 and ii. 14-26 can hardly be regarded as from the same hand as, e.g., ii. 1-13 (in the main).

IV. SOME JEWISH DOCTRINES CONSIDERED.—As is often mentioned in the notes, there are some points of Jewish theology which figure rather prominently in this Epistle; there are above all two subjects, specifically Jewish, which play an important part, and therefore a brief consideration of these will not be out of place here:

(i.) The Jewish doctrine of the Yetser hara'.—Speculations as to the origin of sin were rife among Jewish thinkers at all times; the perplexity which is so plainly apparent in the words of St. Paul
(Rom. vii. 22-23), For I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members, had been felt by many long before his day. The origin of the existence of the "law of sin in the members," which asserted itself in spite of the ardent desire of men to be free from its power, was the great problem which had to be solved. The result was the theory, based upon the observed facts of experience, that within man, as part of his created being, there were two tendencies: the tendency towards good, Yetser ha-tob (יֵאֵר הָדּוֹבָר), and the tendency towards evil, Yetser hara' (יֵאֵר הָרָע). But whence originated these two tendencies? If they both formed part of man's nature from the beginning, it followed that their creation was due to God; there was, of course, no difficulty about ascribing the creation of the good tendency to Him, but that He should have created anything evil was obviously a difficulty. The varying thoughts and speculations on the subject will perhaps best be seen by giving a few illustrations as examples. In Sir. xv. 14, 15, we have these interesting words, according to the Greek Version: "He made man from the beginning, and left him in the power of his will" (ἐν χειρὶ διαβολίων αὐτοῦ); "if thou willest, thou wilt observe the commandments, and to exhibit faithfulness is a matter of thy good pleasure" (καὶ πίστιν ποιήσαι εὐδοκίας); the significance of these words is only realised when they are read in the Hebrew, viz., "God [this is the reading of the Syriac and Latin as well] created man from the beginning; and He delivered him into the hand of him who took him for a prey (זְרֵר מַעֲלָה); and He gave him over into the power of his will (זְרֵר חֵי); here it is clear that the second clause is an explanatory gloss (it is wanting in the Greek), the object being to indicate that to be in the power of the Yetser (which is here clearly used in reference to the evil tendency) is equivalent to being in the power of Satan. This is important as showing that the evil tendency is not ascribed to divine creation, but that over against the good which God created in man there is an opposition of evil which is due to the activity of Satan. This thought of opposing tendencies is apparent elsewhere in the same book, e.g., xxxiii. 15: "Good is set against evil, and life against death; so is the godly against the sinner. So look upon all the works of the Most High; there are two and two, one against another" (the Hebrew of these verses is not extant); here the writer comes perilously near ascribing the creation of evil to God; but in another passage the question is left
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open, xxxvii. 3: “O evil tendency (נייר), why wast thou made to fill the earth with thy deceit?” It is, at all events, not directly ascribed to God; these pathetic words remind one of those of St. Paul in Rom. vii. 24. The same hesitation to assert that God created evil is observable in a curious passage from the pseudepigraph called The Life of Adam and Eve (Apocalypse of Moses), § 19;¹ this describes the origin of evil, and tells of how in the garden of Eden Satan took the form of an angel, but spoke “through the mouth of the Serpent,” and aroused within Eve the desire to eat of the fruit of the tree that stood in the middle of the garden; first of all, however, we are told that he made her swear that she would give of the fruit to Adam as well; then the text goes on: “When he (i.e., the Serpent) had, then, made me swear, he came and ascended up into it (i.e., the tree). But in the fruit which he gave me to eat he placed the poison of his malice, namely, of his lust; for lust is the beginning of all sin. And he [other authorities read “I”] bent down the bough to the earth, then I took of the fruit and ate.” Here the origin of evil in man is satisfactorily accounted for; its existence in Satan is taken for granted, and no attempt is made to follow it up further back. Noticeable here, too, is the way in which lust is brought into connection with the origin of sin; this is an idea which seems to have been widely prevalent in Jewish circles, the lust of Satan towards Eve being described as the beginning of sin in the world (See Sanhedrin, 59 b; Sotah, 9 b; Ἰεβαμοθ, 103 b; Abodah Zara, 22 b; Bereshith Rabba, c. 18, 19); so that it is very interesting to read in our Epistle, after i., 13, 14 (which will be referred to presently), in which the impulse to sin in man is dealt with, the words: “... when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed. Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin; and the sin, when it is full grown, bringeth forth death”. This thought of a relationship between sin and death is graphically illustrated in the Jerusalem Targum to Gen. iii. 6, where it is said that at the moment in which Eve succumbed to temptation she caught sight of Sammael, the angel of death. Other theories as to the origin of sin were that it was brought into existence by man, e.g., Enoch xcviii. 4, “Sin has not been sent upon the earth, but man himself has created it,” this is the teaching, apparently, in Jas. i. 14; in ch. lxxxv. of the same book it is taught that fallen angels were the originators of sin (cf. Bereshith Rabba, c. 24; Yalkut Shim. Beresh., 42). None of these theories was,

¹ The two works run parallel to a large extent.
however, satisfactory; none really gave the answer to the problem that was constantly presenting itself; if, for a moment, the contention was put forth that man himself originated sin, a very little thought showed that this, too, was untenable, for the very nature of the "evil tendency" forbade the idea that man could have created it. Therefore, at a very early period, comparatively speaking, the teaching which afterwards became crystallised in Rabbinical writings, must have been put forth,—the logical, if dangerous, doctrine, that God, as the Creator of all things, must have also created the Yetser hara', the "evil tendency"; thus in Bereshith Rabba, c. 27, it is definitely stated that God created the Yetser hara'; in Yalkut Shim. Beresh., 44-47, the Almighty is made to say: "I grieve that I created man of earthly substance; for had I created him of heavenly substance he would not have rebelled against me"; again ibid. 61: "It repenteth me that I created the Yetser hara' in man, for had I not done this he would not have rebelled against me"; and in Kiddushin, 30b, we read: "I created an evil tendency (Yetser ra'). I created for him (i.e., for man, in order to counteract this) the Law as a means of healing. If ye occupy yourselves with the Law, ye will not fall into the power of it (i.e., the Yetser ra'). Once more, according to Bammidbar Rabba, c. 22, we are told of how God created the good and the evil tendencies: the former was placed in man's right side, the latter in his left side. In other passages it is pointed out that the Yetser tov is Wisdom and Knowledge of the Law (Weber, Jüdische Theologie, p. 218). The danger of such a doctrine is obvious, a danger which could not be more vividly illustrated than in the words of St. Paul, Rom. vii. 15-24: "... but if what I would not, that I do, I consent unto the Law that it is good. So now it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. ... but if what I would not, that I do, it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me, ... "; that teaching like this, taken with the belief that the evil tendency was created by God, would be perverted was almost inevitable; it was the existence of such perversions which must have called forth the words in i. 13 f. of our Epistle: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, and He Himself tempteth no man ..."; then, possibly, the words in verse 17 of the same chapter, "Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above ..." refer to the Yetser ha-tov, and are intended to exclude the belief that the Yetser hara', whereby men were tempted, came from God.

(ii.) The Jewish Doctrine of Works.—There are, according to
Rabbinical teaching, two categories of good works: i. Mitzvot ( מצוות ) lit. "commandments"; these consist in observances of the Torah; ii. Works of love, of which the most important is almsgiving, indeed so high does this stand that it has the technical name of ḥesed (חסד ) (" righteousness"); these two categories comprise the whole body of melasim tobim ( המלאים טובים ) (" good works"), the former representing man's duty to God, the latter His duty to His fellow-creatures; cf. Matt. xxii. 36-40, "... Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hangeth the whole law and the prophets." According to Jewish teaching, there are certain works of obligation; good works done over and above these are of free-will, and by these justification in the sight of God is attainable. There are two classes of men, those who do a sufficient number of good works to be justified in the sight of God—these are the נדדיסים , "the righteous"—and those who do not—these are the לא נדדיסים , "the wicked"; these two are differentiated on earth, for it is said in Sanhedrin, 47 a, that a righteous may not be buried by the side of a זרעים. But besides these two classes, there is an intermediate one, the "ones between" (יבנים ביניהם ), who are half good and half bad; these can, by adding one good work, become reckoned among the "righteous" on the Day of Atonement (Rosh hashshana, 16 b). The נדדיסים —the "righteous"—were regarded as being in a state of זכאות (וַחֲדָא), which meant that their accumulation of good works was great enough to enable them to stand justified in the sight of God. In addition to this there was also the doctrine of נחרא אביהו ("merit of the fathers"), according to which the works of supererogation of departed ancestors went to the account of their descendants. The being in a state of זכאות entitled a man, per se, to what was technically known as הַנַּחַל פְּלַר אָדָם, lit. "the gift of reward" (cf. Debarim Rabba, c. 2); and this applied to earthly reward as well as to reward hereafter. So that good works demanded reward from God; thus it is said in Yalkut Shim. Beresh., 109, that it is by right that a man is rewarded with the good things in the Garden of Eden, because he has won them for himself. Justification by faith comes only so far into consideration in that it is reckoned among the melasim tobim (" good works"), which, like all others, goes to swell the list of a man's חכמים cf. Jas. ii. 24, "Ye see that by works a man is justified and not only by faith". 
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There is, at bottom, an intimate connection between the doctrine of the good and evil "tendency," dealt with above, and the doctrine of works; for it was by man's free-will that the good tendency was put into action which resulted in the accomplishment of good works; and it was by man's free-will that the evil tendency was resisted, and this constituted per se a mitzvah; cf. Kiddushin, 39 b, 40 a, where it is taught that the desire to do a mitzvah (i.e., the calling of the good Yetser into action) is reckoned as though it were actually accomplished; and the temptation to do a sinful act (i.e., the motion of the evil Yetser) if resisted likewise constitutes a mitzvah. It was, perhaps, almost inevitable that the danger would arise of taking merit for good deeds, i.e., for exercising the good tendency, while repudiating responsibility for the often involuntary assertion of the evil tendency; that, however, the danger did arise does not admit of doubt; it was naively illogical, for while the exercise of the good tendency, resulting in good works, was regarded as solely due to human initiative—such a thing as "prevenient grace" did not come into account, cf. Eph. ii. 8-10—the evil tendency came to be looked upon as a human misfortune, and not of the nature of guilt in man, cf. Jas. i. 13, where this is combated.

These facts should be taken into consideration in seeking to realise the significance of some passages in our Epistle; thus, in i. 2-4, 12, we have Jewish teaching pure and simple, and the fact goes to substantiate the opinion that these verses, at all events, must be very early; one could not conceive them in the mouth of St. Paul, cf. 1 Cor. x. 13, Rom. ii. 4, whose teaching on this subject, though apparently more developed, is really fully in accordance with that of Christ; on the other hand, we have in ii. 10 ("For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all") a principle which is certainly not that of normal Jewish teaching. On the very important section, ii. 14-26, see the notes in the Commentary, and what has been said above. Lastly, in v. 19, 20, we have again a thought which is especially Jewish; that a man should be able to "cover a multitude of sins" by virtue of his good deed is directly anti-Christian, because it makes the forgiveness of sins a matter which a man can effect, and thus wholly antagonistic to the doctrines of Grace and Atonement. On the word "to cover," the English equivalent for the Hebrew יָבֵן see Church and Synagogue, April 1908, pp. 43-45.

1 As an example of this see the writer's article, "The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard," in the Expositor, April, 1908.
V. THE APPARATUS CRITICUS.—The following are the authorities, together with their abbreviations, which have been utilised:

1. UNTIALS:

N Cod. Sinaiticus (iv. cen.).
R Cod. Patiriensis (v. cen.), containing only iv. 14-v. 20.
A Cod. Alexandrinus (v. cen.).
B Cod. Vaticanus (iv. cen.).
C Cod. Ephraemi (v. cen.), wanting from Jas. iv. 3 to the end.
K2 Cod. Mosquensis (ix. cen.), cited as K.
L Cod. Angelicus Romanus (ix. cen.), cited as L.
P Cod. Porfirianus (ix. cen.), cited as P; much illegible in Jas. ii. 13-21.

2. CURSIVES:

Cited by their numbers, but only when they offer readings of interest; curss = the consensus of a number of cursives.

3. VERSIONS:

The Old Latin:

m the pseudo-Augustinian Speculum (viii. or ix. cen.).
ff Cod. Corbeiensis (vi. cen.).
s Frag. Vindobonensis (vi. cen.); wanting in v. 11-20.

The Vulgate:

The two most important MSS. are:

VulgA Cod. Amiatinus (viii. cen.).
VulgF Cod. Puldensis (vi. cen.).
Latt = the consensus of the Latin versions.

The Syriac Versions:

Pesh = Peshitta (belongs to the first half of the v. cen.).
Syrxx = A Syriac Lectionary written in the dialect most probably used by our Lord (vi. cen.). Of Jas. it contains only i. 1-12.
Syrkk = The Harklean Syriac (vii. cen.).
Syrr = the consensus of the Syriac versions.
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The Armenian Version (v. cen.).
The Coptic (Bohairic) Version (vi.-vii. cen.).
The Ethiopic Version (iv. cen.).
The Sahidic Version (iii. cen.).

4. Church Fathers:
Cyr = Cyril of Alexandria (v. cen.).
Dam = John Damascene (viii. cen.).
Did = Didymus of Alexandria (iv. cen.).
Oec = Oecumenius (xi. cen.).
Orig = Origen (iii. cen.).
Thl = Theophylact (xi. cen.).

5. Printed Editions:
rec = Textus Receptus.
Ti = Tischendorf.
Treg = Tregelles.
WH = Westcott and Hort.
W = Weiss.

The Greek text used in the following pages is that published by Nestle, 1907.

VI. Literature.—The following selected list of Commentaries, etc., only takes account of the more recent works; for a full bibliography recourse must be had to Mayor’s enumeration:

Pfleiderer, Urchristenthum, 1887.
Beyschlag, Der Brief des Jacobus, 1888.
Plummer, St. James, in the “Expositor’s Bible,” 1891.
Weiss, Die Katholischen Briefe . . . 1892.
Spitta, Der Brief des Jakobus, 1898.
,, Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums, ii., 1896.
Von Soden, Hand-Commentar . . . 1899.
Parry, A Discussion of the General Epistle of St. James, 1903.
Grafe, Die Stellung und Bedeutung des Jakobusbriefes in der Entwickelung des Urchristenthums, 1904.

*These dates refer to the century in which the versions were probably first made, not to any extant MSS. of them.
Patrick, *James, the Lord's Brother*, 1906.
See also the *Introductions* of Salmon, Scrivener, Weiss, Zahn, Holtzmann, and Gregory.

The following is a selection of some valuable articles:—

Brückner, in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1874.
Cone, in *Encycl. Bibl.* art. "James (Epistle)".
Fulford, in Hastings' *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, art. "James".
Mayor, in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, artt. "James," "James, General Epistle of".
Sieffert, in Herzog's *Realencyclopadie*, art. "Jacobus".
Von Soden, in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1884.
Weiss, in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, May, June, 1904.

But perhaps of the greatest help of all are the many side-lights to be gathered from the study of such works as the following:—

Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 1903.¹

" *The Book of Enoch*, 1893.
Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 1895.

" *Neue Bibelstudien*, 1897.
Fiebig's series of *Ausgewählte Mischnatractate*, 1905, etc.

¹ A new edition of this book has appeared.

Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (Engl. trans. by Macpherson, Taylor, and Christie), 1890, etc.\(^1\)


Taylor’s edition of *Pirqe Aboth*, “Sayings of the Jewish Fathers,” 1897.


The Talmudical works of Wünsche, Bacher, Strack, Piebig, etc.

\(^1\) A new edition of this work has appeared.
IAKΩBOT.1

CHAPTER I.—Ver. 1. *IAKΩΒΟΣ Θεού καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* 2 *δοῦλος ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ καὶ ἱκανεὶν.*

*Φιλ. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Jude i. 1; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 16; 2 Tim. ii. 24. clauke xxii. 30; Acts xxvi. 17; cf. Matt. xix. 28. d Deut. xxiii. 26; 1 Pet. i. 1; John vii. 35; cf. Acts ii. 5-11, viii. 1, xv. 23, xxiii. 6. e 2 Macc. ix. 19; Acts xv. 23.*

1 Inscr. + εὐστολή ΒΚΡ, curs., om. Ν εὐστολή καθολικὴ τοῦ αἵμαν αὐτοτολοποιών λακαβοῦ L, Epistola Catholicæ beati Jacobi Apostoli Vulg. (Epistulae Catholicæ Vulgæ), ct. τοῦ εὐ. λακαβοῦ Πεσ. 2 Ἱλευρὸν Πεσ., Syriac.

Add Ἱλευρὸν Πεσ., Syriac.

Matt. viii. 25, Κύριε, σώσον, ἀπολαμβάνω, and in xx. 33, Κύριε, ἵνα δόξην ὑμῶν ἐφαυλώσῃ; both instances of divine power being exercised. Χριστοῦ: the use of this title, applied to Jesus without further comment, speaks against an early date for the Epistle; in a letter written to Jews during the apostolic age it is inconceivable that the Messiah should be referred to in this connection without some justification; Jewish beliefs concerning the Messiah were such as to make it impossible for them to accept Jesus as the Messiah without some teaching on the subject; this would be the more required in the case of Jews of the Dispersion who could not have had the same opportunities of learning the truths of Christianity as Palestinian Jews. The way in which the title is here applied to our Lord implies that the truth taught was already generally accepted. The absence of the article also points to a late date. *δοῦλος: Generally speaking, to the Jew *δοῦλος* (*δωλο*, when used in reference to God, meant a *worshipper*, and when used with reference to men a *slave*; as the latter sense is out of the question here, *δοῦλος* must be understood as meaning worshipper, in which case the deity of our Lord would appear to be distinctly implied.*

*Φιλ. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Jude i. 1; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 16; 2 Tim. ii. 24. clauke xxii. 30; Acts xxvi. 17; cf. Matt. xix. 28. d Deut. xxiii. 26; 1 Pet. i. 1; John vii. 35; cf. Acts ii. 5-11, viii. 1, xv. 23, xxiii. 6. e 2 Macc. ix. 19; Acts xv. 23.*

Chapter I.—Ver. 1. *ΙΑΚΩΒΟΣ: A very common name among Palestinian Jews, though its occurrence does not seem to be so frequent in pre-Christian times. Some noted Jewish Rabbis of this name lived in the earliest centuries of Christianity, notably Jacob ben Korshai, a "Tanna" (i.e., "teacher" of the Oral Law) of the second century. The English form of the name comes from the Italian Giacomo. Θεού καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: Only Κυρίου here can refer to Christ; in Gal. i. 1 the differentiation is made more complete . . . διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατέρα τοῦ ἐγερθέντος αὐτοῦ ἐν νεκρῶν. On the other hand, in John xx. 28, we have ἄ Κύριος μου καὶ ἄ Θεός μου. But the disjunctive use of καὶ in the words before us does not imply a withholding of the divine title from our Lord, for the usage of Κύριος in the N.T., especially without the article, when connected with Χριστοῦ, is in favour of its being regarded as a divine title, see e.g., x Cor. i. 1-3, etc. Hellenistic Jews used Κύριος as a name for God; the non-use of the article gains in significance when it is remembered that ἄ Κύριος, "Dominus," was a title given to the early Roman Emperors in order to express their deity, cf. Acts xxv. 26, where Festus refers to Nero as ἄ Κύριος. The Palestinian Syriac Lexiconary (containing, as generally conceded, the dialect which our Lord spoke), as well as the Pesahit & read "Our Lord," the expression used in the Pesahit in
distinction between the Jews of the Dispersion and the Palestinian Jews. The latter were for the most part peasants or artisans, while the former, congregated almost wholly in cities, were practically all traders (cf. iv. 13). In each case there was a restricted circle of the learned. The connection of the Diaspora-Jews with Palestine became less and less close, until at last it consisted of little more than the payment of the annual Temple dues; with very many one visit in a lifetime to Jerusalem sufficed, and this was of course entirely discontinued after the Destruction, when the head-quarters of Jewry became centred in the Rabbinical academy of Jabne. From the present point of view, it is very important to bear in mind, above all, two points of difference between Palestinian and Diaspora-Jews, (1) Language, (2) Religion. (1) Among the former, Aramaic had displaced Hebrew; Aramaic was the language of everyday life, as well as of religion (hence the need of the Methurgeman to translate the Hebrew Scriptures in the Synagogues); among the latter Greek was spoken. It is not necessary to insist upon the obvious fact that this difference of language brought with it a corresponding difference of mental atmosphere; the Jew, to the Greek, was a Jew, but his way of thinking became modified. (2) Their contact with other peoples brought to the Diaspora-Jews a larger outlook upon the world; at the same time, they could not fail to see the immeasurable superiority of their faith over the heathen cults prevailing among others. This resulted on their laying greater stress on the essentials of their faith: the ethical side of their religion received greater emphasis, the spirituality of belief became more realised, and it therefore followed of necessity that universalistic ideas grew, so that proselytism became, at one time, a great characteristic among the Diaspora-Jews; Judaism contained a message to all peoples, it was felt; and thus the particularistic character of Palestinian Judaism found no place among the Diaspora-Jews. But, at the same time, the Bible of these Jews, which exercised an immense influence upon their thought and literature, was Hebrew in essence though clothed in Greek garb; hence that extraordinarily interesting phenomenon, the Hellenistic Jew. In view of what has been said it is interesting to note that two outstanding characteristics of the Epistle before us are: Hebraic thought and diction expressed in Greek form, and the emphasis laid on ethics rather than on doctrine. The meaning of ı̇στινύνα (Moulton says: "we have every reason to expect it in the N.T., and its rarity there is the only matter of surprise") (Ibid.). The Peshitta and Syriac have the Jewish form, Shalom.

Ver. 2. ἀλαὶ τῷ μέταπιστοὶς Ἰουδαίοις: the rendering in Syriac, which is rather a paraphrase than a translation, catches the meaning admirably: "With all joy be rejoicing my brethren," ηγεμόνος: the writer is not to be understood as meaning that these trials are joyful in themselves, but that as a means to beneficial results they are to be rejoiced in; it is the same thought as that contained in Heb. xii. 11: πάντα μὲν παθεῖται πρὸς τὸ παθὸν σὺν δοκέι τῷ μέταπιστοὶς εἶναι ἄλλα λύτης, διὸ τὸ καρδιῶν εἰρημένον τοὺς δι' αὐτῆς γεγονωμένους ἀποδίδοντο δίκαιως.
δικαίωσεν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· τὸ δὲ τὸ δικαίωμα ἐστὶν ζωὴν καὶ ἀπόκτησις.

Ver. 3. ἵνα ἦσαν τίλεοι καὶ ἄλλοκλήροι, ἐν μιᾷ λευκῇ ἄνοιξῇ: τὸ δὲ τὸ δικαίωμα ἐστὶν ζωὴν καὶ ἀπόκτησις.

Ver. 4. ἢ δὲ ὑπομονῆ τῆς ἡμέρας: θυμόσιν ἅματος θυμόσιν ἔχετε. Προσέρχεσθε δὲ πρὸς τὸν Κυρίον προσευχὴν προσευχὴν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἡμέρας.
of losing heart is contemplated, which would result in something being lacking; the words recall what is said in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Jos. ii. 7, "For endurance (μαραθωμιός) is a mighty charm, and patience (σωφροσύνη) gives a man a good thing". Cf. Rom. v. 3.—Θεωρείν: Cf. Matt. v. 48, xix. 21; see Lightfoot's note on the meaning of this word in Phil. iii. 15, "the θεωρεῖν are in fact the same with πνευματικά (Ep. to the Philippians, p. 153). That in the passage before us it does not mean perfect in the literal sense is clear from the words which occur in iii. 2 (assuming that the same writer wrote both passages), πωλεῖ ταξιαμεν διανοεῖν. "The word θεωρεῖν is often used by later writers of the baptised (Mayor).—διάδωκαρ: Cf. Wisd. xiv. 3; in its root-meaning διάδωκαρ means one who fulfils his lot; here it would mean 'those who fully attain to their high calling'.—ἐνθεολέγοντος: this is merely explanatory of διάδωκαρ.

Ver. 5. There is no thought-connection between this verse and what has preceded, it is only by supplying something artificially that any connection can be made to exist, and for this there is no warrant in the text as it stands (see Introduction III.). In ver. 4 ὑπομονή has as its full result the making perfect of men, so that they are lacking in nothing; when, therefore, the next verse goes on to contemplate a lacking of wisdom, there is clearly the commencement of a new subject, not a continuation of the same one. The occurrence of λειτομένων and λειτομάτων, which is regarded by some as a proof of connection between the two verses, denotes nothing in view of the fact that the subject-matter is so different; moreover, there is a distinct difference in the sense in which this word is used in these two verses; coming behind in what one ought to attain to is far different from not being in possession of the great gift of wisdom; this difference is well brought out by the Vulgate rendering: "... in nullo deficientes. Si quis autem vestrum indiget sapientia..."—ἐνθεολέγοντος λειτομένων: Cf. iii. 13-17; the position assigned to Wisdom by the Jews, and especially by Hellenistic Jews, was so exalted that a short consideration of the subject seems called for, the more so by reason of the prominence it assumes in this Epistle. It is probable that the more advanced ideas of Wisdom came originally from Babylon; for, according to the Babylonian cosmology, Wisdom existed in primeval ages before the creation of the world; it dwelt with Ea, the god of Wisdom, in primeval ages (Proverbs viii. 22-30); Ea the creator was therefore guided by Wisdom in his creative work (see Jeremias, Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients, pp. 29, 80); in Biblical literature Wisdom became the all-discerning intelligence of God in His work of Creation; as it was needed by God Himself, how much more by men! Hence the constant insistence on its need which is so characteristic of the book of Proverbs. This laid the foundation for the extensive ἡσυχία (or Wisdom) literature of the Hellenistic Jews, which exercised also a great influence upon the Jews of later times. Under the influence of Greek philosophy Wisdom became not only a divine agency, but also assumed a personal character (Wisd. vii. 22-30). According to the Jerusalem Targum to Gen. i. 1 Wisdom was the principle whereby God created the world. Generally speaking, in the later Jewish literature Wisdom refers to worldly knowledge as distinct from religious knowledge which is all comprised under the term Ἰσραήλ ("Law"); and therefore Wisdom, unlike the Torah, was not regarded as the exclusive possession of the Jews, though these had it in more abundant measure, e.g., it is said in Kiddushin, 49 b: "Ten measures of wisdom came down from heaven, and nine of them fell to the lot of the Holy Land". On the other hand, Wisdom and the Torah are often identified—αὐτήν as for the prayer of the Sibyl, Ps. ii. 3 f.; Wisd. vii. 7, ix. 4; Sir. i. 10, l. 13; in the Epistle of Barnabas xxii. 5, it says: ἦς ἔσθε δόξα τῆς σοφίας... οὕτως—καὶ τοῦ διδάσκοι, ὥς τὸν κύριον ἀντίκειται: there is an in
teresting parallel to this thought in the opening treatise of the Talmud, Beracoth, 586: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, Who hast imparted of Thy wisdom to flesh and blood"; the point of the words "flesh and blood" is that the reference is to Gentiles as well as Jews, corresponding thus to the πίστις in the words before us. The force of ἐκάρδιος lies in its sense of "singleness of aim," the aim being the imparting of benefit without requiring anything in return; the thought is the same as that which underlies Isa. iv. 1, 

Ho, every one that thirsteth . . . come, buy wine and milk without money and without price, i.e., it is to be had for the asking. — μὴ ἐκάρδιος: the addition of this is very striking; it is intended to encourage boldness in making petition to God; many might be deterred, owing to a sense of unworthiness, from approaching God, fearing lest He should resent presumption. The three words which express the method of Divine giving — τράπαντα, ἐκάρδιο, προσεύχεσθαι — must take away all scruple and fear; cf. Heb. iv. 16, Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace. . . . — καὶ δοξησται αὐτῷ: Cf. Matt. vii.7.

Ver. 6. ἐν πίστει: πίστις, as used in this Epistle, refers to the state of mind in which a man not only believes in the existence of God, but in which His ethical character is apprehended and the evidence of His good-will towards man is acknowledged; it is a belief in the beneficent activity, as well as in the personality, of God; it includes reliance on God and the expectation that what is asked for will be granted by Him. The word here does not connote faith in the sense of a body of doctrine. This idea of faith is not specifically Christian; it was, and is, precisely that of the Jews; with these Ἐμίτις (Emuna) is just that perfect trust in God which is expressed in what is called the "Creed of Maimonides," or the "Thirteen principles of faith"; it is there said: "I believe with perfect faith that the Creator, blessed be His name, is the Author and Guide of everything that has been created, and that He alone has made, does make, and will make all things." In Talmudical literature, which, in this as in so much else, embodies much ancient material, the Rabbis constantly insist on the need of faith as being that which is "perfect trust in God"; the meehzase 'amanah, i.e., "those who are lacking in faith," (cf. Matt. vi. 30, ἐλήψαστοι = ἠδύνατο ἔχειν) are held up to rebuke; it is said in Matt. xxi. 21 that the appearance of "men of faith" will bring about the downfall of the world. Faith therefore, in the sense in which it is used in this Epistle, was the characteristic mark of the Jew as well as of the Christian. In reference to αἰτεῖν τὰ ἐν πίστει knowing draws attention to Hermas, Mand., ix. 6, 7; Sim., v. 4, 3 — μὴ ὅσον ἔκαρδιος ἔχετε: Ekaardios means to be in a critical state of mind, which is obviously the antithesis to that of him who has faith; it excludes faith ipso facto; cf. Matt. xxii. 21, If ye have faith and doubt not (μὴ ἐκάρδιος) . . . ; Aphraates quotes as a saying of our Lord's: "Doubt not, that ye sink not into the world, as Simon, when he doubted, began to sink into the sea". — θαλάσσῃ: a very vivid picture; the instability of a billow, changing from moment to moment, is a wonderfully apt symbol of a mind that cannot fix itself in belief. — ἰδεῖν τὸν ἰδέαν: a number of verbs are used in this Epistle ending in -ίστω, viz., ἰδού, διαλέγομαι, ὑπαίτις, ἐγγίζω, καθαρίζω, ἀνέρχομαι, ἐκκαθαρίζω, ὀρθοδόξης, πεπάλαινος, ὑπάρχω, σπηλιά, μεγαλείω; the word before us is one of the sixteen used in the Epistle which do not occur elsewhere in the N.T., nor in the Septuagint. — ἐκάρδιος: from ἐκάρδιος πίστις: πίστις a "fan"; it occurs here only in the N.T., but cf. Dan. ii. 35 (Septuagint), καὶ ἔρρυσαν αὐτὰ ὁ θεὸς; the word is not used in Theodotion's version. With the verse before us cf. Eph. iv. 14. . . . ἐκαρδίως καὶ φαρσαλάζων παντὶ ἄνω τῆς διάνοιας. — πίστις: πίστις πίστις. . .

Ver. 7. μὴ γὰρ εἰσέρχεται, etc.: γὰρ
almost in the sense of διὰ τοῦ. The verb occurs very rarely, see John xxii. 25; Phil. i. 17. There is a ring of contempt in the passage at the idea of a man with halting faith expecting his prayer to be answered. δόγματος is used here in reference to men in general; δόγμα in the next verse is more specific; in this Epistle δόγμα occurs usually with some qualifying word—τοῦ Κυρίου: obviously in reference to God the Father on account of the τοῦ διὰ. Θεος above.

Ver. 8. διψυχος: Although this word is not found in either the Septuagint or elsewhere in the N.T. (excepting in iv. 8) its occurrence is not rare otherwise; Clement of Rome, quoting what he calls οἱ προφανείς λόγοι, says: ταλαπωροῦσιν οἱ διψυχαί, οἱ διδακτοι τῷ καρδίᾳ... (Resch., Agrapha, p. 325 [2nd ed.]); the word occurs a number of times in Hermas, e.g., Mand., ix. 1, 5, 6, 7; xi. 13; so too in Barn., xix. 5, and in Did., iv. 4, as well as in other ancient Christian writings and in Philo. The frame of mind of the δόγμα διψυχος is equivalent to a "double heart," see Sir. i. 25, καὶ προσφέρων αὐτῷ (i.e., the fear of the Lord) εἰς καρδία διστορί; this is precisely the equivalent of the Hebrew בַּל בַּל in Ps. xii. 3, which the Septuagint unfortunately translates literally, εἰς καρδία καὶ εἰς καρδία. In Enoch xci. 4 we have: "Draw not nigh to uprightness with a double heart, and associate not with those of a double heart"; as the Greek version of this work is not extant it is impossible to say for certain how "double heart" was rendered. On the construction here see Mayor.—ἀκατάστατος εἰς τέσσαρες ταῖς δύοις αὐτῷ: this is severe, and reads as if the writer had some particular person in mind. The double-hearted man is certainly one who is quite unreliable. Ἀκατάστατος, which occurs only here and in iii. 8 (but see critical note) in the N.T., is found in the Septuagint, though very rarely; in Isa. liv. ii we have Ταπεινὴ καὶ ἄκατάστατος οὗ παρεκλήση, where the Hebrew for ἄκατάστατος (τὰστατο) means "storm-tossed". In the verse before us the word seems to mean unreliability, the man who does not trust God cannot be trusted by men; this probably is what must have been in the mind of the writer.

Ver. 9-11. An entirely new subject is now started, which has no connection with what has preceded; such a connection can only be maintained by supplying mental links artificially, for which the text gives no warrant. Vv. 9-11 deal with the subject of rich and poor; they may be interpreted in two ways; on the one hand, one may paraphrase thus: let the rich brother glory in his humiliation as a Christian (Mayor)—taking ταπεινωμένον, however, as having the sense of self-abasement which the rich man feels on becoming a Christian. This interpretation has its difficulties, for it is the rich man, not merely his riches, who "passes away"; so, too, in ver. 11; moreover, if it is a question of Christianity, εἰς and ταπεινωμένος cannot well both refer to it, since they are placed in contrast; this seems to have been felt by an ancient scribe who altered ταπεινωμένον to πλεονεκτήσει in the cursive 137 (see critical note above), thinking, no doubt, of ii. 5, ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἔχειλεν τοῦ ποιεῖν τῷ κυρίῳ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν πίστει. . . . It seems wiser to take the words as they stand, and to
seek to interpret them without reading in something that is not there, especially as the writer (or writers) of this Epistle is not as a rule ambiguous in what he says; in fact, one of the characteristics of the Epistle is the straightforward, transparent way in which things are put. Regarded from this point of view, these verses simply contain a wholesome piece of advice to men to do their duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call them; if the poor man becomes wealthy, there is nothing to be ashamed of, he is to be congratulated; if the rich man loses his wealth, he needs comfort,—after all, there is something to be thankful for in escaping the temptations and dangers to which the rich are subject; and, as the writer points out later on in ii. 1 ff., the rich are oppressors and cruel,—a fact which (it is well worth remembering) was far more true in those days than in these.

Ver. 9. καύχασθε: it is noticeable that this word is only used in the Pauline Epistles, with the exception in this verse and in iii. 14, iv. 16; it is used, generally, in a good sense, as here and iii. 14, though in iii. 14 it is in the plural: see note on ver. 2.—ταπεινός: cf. Luke i. 52, refers to the outward condition of a man, and corresponds to the Hebrew שִׁיָּם and סֶפֶל, which like ταπεινός, can refer both to outward condition and character; the aorist, the meaning attaching to ταπεινός in iv. 6. In Sir. xi. 1 we read: σοφία ταπεινοῦ ἀνύψωμα κεφαλῆς, καὶ ἐν μνήμῃ μεγάλων καθιστή αὐτῶν. Cf. Sir. x. 37 (Hebrew).

Ver. 10. ὁ πλοῦσις: equally a "brother"; cf. the whole section ii. 1-13 below.—ὁ σάρξ χόρτον...: these words, together with ἔχουσαν τῶν χόρτων, etc., in the next verse, are adapted from the Sept. of Isa. xl. 5-8, ... καὶ σέβεται τὸ βοσκεῖν; Πάσα σάρξ σάρξ, καὶ τύμα δόξα ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἄνθρωπος χόρτον ἔχει γεννητος ὁ χόρτος καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἔχει γεννητος, τὸ δὲ ρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, which differs somewhat from the Hebrew. It is an interesting instance of the loose way in which scriptural texts were made use of without regard to their original meaning; the poet refers to πάσα σάρξ, whereas in the verse before us the writer makes the words refer exclusively to the rich, cf. the words at the end of the next verse, οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλοῦσις ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ μαραθήσεται. To the precise Western mind this rather free use of Scripture (many examples of it occur in the Gospels) is sometimes apt to cause surprise; but it is well to remember that this inexactness is characteristic of the oriental, and does not strike him as inexact; what he wants in these cases is a verbal point of att'chment which will illustrate the subject under discussion; what the words originally refer to is, to him, immaterial, as that does not come into consideration. χόρτος in its original sense means "an enclosure" in which cattle feed, then it came to mean the grass, etc., contained in the enclosure, cf. Matt. vi. 33—ἐπάθεται: equally true of rich and poor, cf. Mark xii. 31 for the transient character of all things, see also iv. 14 of this Epistle.

Ver. 11. ταπεινόν: the "gnomic" aorist, i.e., expressive of what always happens; it gives a "more vivid statement of general truths, by employing a distinct case or several distinct cases in the past to represent (as it were) all possible cases, and implying that what has occurred is likely to occur again under similar circumstances" (Moulton, p. 135, quoting Goodwin); he adds, "the gnomic aorist...need not have been denied by Winer for Jas. i. 11 and 1 Pet. i. 24". The R.V. gives the present, in accordance with the English idiom, but clearly the Greek way is the more exact; the same applies to Hebrew, though this particular verb does not occur in the corresponding passage in either the Septuagint or the Masoretic text; an example may, however, be seen in Nah. iii. 17. ὁ ἰλίος ἀντέλευς, καὶ ἄσφαλτο, καὶ σύκο ἡγεῖται τῶν τόπων αὐτῆς (see R.V.).—ὕπτως τῇ καύχασθε: the east wind which came from the Syrian desert, it was a hot wind which parched the vegetation and blighted the foliage of the trees; the Hebrew name שֵׁרֶך מַן the wind of the east, or simply שֵׁרֶך, expresses the quarter whence it comes,
the Greek καύσων, "burner," describes its character, see Hos. xiii. 15; Ezek. xviii. 10; it became especially dangerous when it developed into a storm, on account of its great violence, see Isa. xxvii. 8; Jer. xviii. 17; Ezek. xxvii. 26.—εἰδώμενον: the equivalent Hebrew word is בְּנֵי, which like the cognate root in other Semitic languages, contains the idea of dying, cf. Isa. xxiv. 4, xxvii. 10.—εὐρέπτεια τῶν προσώπων αὐτῶν: pleonastic; προσώ, is used mostly in reference to persons, e.g., in Sir. it occurs twenty-eight times, and only in two instances to things other than persons, viz., xxxviii. 8, καὶ ἐπλήξεν παρ' ἀυτῶν ἐστιν ἐκ προσώπων τῆς γῆς [Hebrew marg., however reads πριγ. ἐστιν ἐκ προσώπων τῆς γῆς]. xi. 6 . . . καὶ προσώπων τολμήματος [Hebrew text, however, בְּנֵי יְרֵסָל]. εὐρέπτεια does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.; see Sir. xviii. 10, its only occurrence, and there in a different construction. ταῖς περαιάσις αὐτῶν: see above ver. 8.—μαραθνητάτα: only here in N.T.

Vv. 12 ff. The section vv. 12-16 is wholly unconnected with what immediately precedes; it takes up the thread which was interrupted at i. 4. In i. 2-4 the brethren are hidden to rejoice when they fall into temptations because the purifying of their faith which this results in engenders προσωπία, and if προσωπία holds sway unimpeded they will be lacking in nothing. But it is, of course, a prime condition here that those who are tempted should not succumb; the rejoicing is obviously only in place in so far as temptation, by being resisted, strengthens character; therefore the writer goes on to speak (ver. 12) of the blessedness of the man who fulfils this first condition, who endures (δέ προσωπία) temptation, for he shall receive the crown of life, the reward of those in whom θρόνον has had its perfect work. It is this intimate connection between i. 2-4 and i. 12 ff. which induces one to hazard the conjecture that they were not originally separated by the intervening verses, which deal with entirely different subjects, and which therefore interrupt the thought-connection clearly existing between the two passages just mentioned.—In ver. 13 the occurrence of the words: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God," show that this view was actually held, indeed the belief was very widely prevalent and had been for long previously, e.g., in Sir. xv. 11 ff. it is said: "Say not thou, It is through the Lord that I fell away; for thou shalt not do the things that he hateth. Say not thou, It is he that caused me to err; for he hath no need of a sinful man . . . . He himself made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his own counsel . . . ;" to say, with some commentators, that there is no reference here to any definite teaching and that the words only express a natural human tendency to shift the blame for evil-doing in a man from himself to God, is an extraordinary position to take up; the tendency to shift blame is certainly natural and human, but it is not natural to shift it to God, to other men, or on to Satan, but not on to God! But besides this, nobody conversant with the teaching of Judaism during the centuries immediately preceding the commencement of the Christian era, and onwards, could for a moment fail to see what the writer of the Epistle is referring to; a writer who in a number of respects shows himself so thoroughly au fait with the thought-tendencies of his time (i. 5, iii. 13-18, ii. 14-26, ver. 19-20 besides the passage before us) was not likely to have been ignorant of the fact that among all the thoughtful men of his day the great question of the origin of evil was being
constantly speculated upon. The words with which this section concludes—"Be not deceived, my beloved brethren"—show that there was a danger of those to whom the Epistle was addressed being led astray by a false teaching, which was as incompatible with the true Jewish doctrine of God as it was with the Christian; indeed, on this point, Jewish and Christian teaching were identical. The subject referred to in this section, vv. 12-16, is dealt with more fully in the Introduction IV., § 1, which see.

Ver. 12. Μακάριος ἄνδρα: this pleonastic use of ἄνδρα is Hebraic; cf. Ps. i. 1, where the expression τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ("O, the blessedness of the man . . .") is rendered μακάριος ἄνδρα by the Septuagint.—ἐφικτός: carries on the thought of ἐφικτός in ver. 4; the absence of all reference to divine grace entirely accords with the Jewish doctrine of works, and is one of the many indications in this Epistle that the writer (or writers) had as yet only imperfectly assimilated Christian doctrine, see further Introduction IV., § 2.—ἐστε: see note on i. 2; cf. Luther's rendering: "nachdem er bewahret ist," which contains the idea of something being preserved, i.e., the genuine part, after the dross (as it were) has been purged away.—ὅτι στέφανον τῆς ἱλάσης: Wisdom and the Law (Torah) are said to be an ornament of grace to the head (Prov. i. 9), and Wisdom "shall deliver unto thee a crown of glory" (Prov. iv. 9); in Pseudepigrapha vi. 7 this is said of the Torah, of which it is also said in the same section, "She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her" (Prov. iii. 18); in Sir. xv. 6 it is said that a wise man shall "inherit joy, and a crown of gladness (there is no mention of a crown in the Hebrew), and an everlasting name," cf. xxxii. (xxxi). 2. In the Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Lev. iv. 1, we read: "Be followers of his com-passion, therefore, with a good mind, that ye also may wear crowns of glory"; cf. Asc. of Isaiah, vii. 22, viii. 26, ix. 10-13. The Hebrew ἡ ἐβάλω is used both in a literal and figurative sense (for the latter see, e.g., Job xix. 9) it is probably in a figurative sense that the word is here used.—δόξη: τοις ἄγαθοις: the insertion of ὁ Θεός or ὁ Κύριος is found only in authorities of secondary value. The words λήφθησαν τὸν στέφανον τῆς ἱλάσης . . . ., introduced by διὰ (cf. in next verse ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν . . . .) refer to a saying of our Lord's which has not been preserved elsewhere; the thought seems to be present in such passages as 2 Tim. ii. 5, iv. 8; 1 Pet. v. 4; Rev. ii. 10, iii. 11, iv. 4, vi. 2; cf. i Cor. ix. 25, which makes it all the more probable that the words were based ultimately on some actual "Logion" of Christ (cf. Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30; cf. too, the following words which occur in the Acta Philippi: . . . μακάριος ὁ λόγος τοῦ δικαίου λιτωμένος· ἀκούεις τὸν λόγον ἀσκήτου τοῦ ἅγιον καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς καθήκοντος αὐτοῦ, see Resch, Agraphe(s), p. 280). Against this it might be urged that mention would probably have been made of the fact if the words were actually those of our Lord, in the same way in which this is done in Acts xx. 25, where St. Paul directly specifies his authority in quoting a saying of Christ. There is an interesting passage in the History of Barlaam and Josaphat, quoted by James in "The Revelation of Peter," p. 59, which runs: "And as he was entering into the gate, others met him, all radiant with light, having crowns in their hands shining with unspeakable beauty, and such as mortal eyes never beheld; and when Josaphat asked: 'Whose are the exceeding bright crowns of glory which I see?' 'One,' they said, 'is thine'."

Ver. 13. Μηδεὶς πειρασμὸν λέγεται: In view of the specific doc-
trine which is being combated in these verses, it is probable that the verb πειράζω is here used in the restricted sense of temptation to lust, and not in the more general sense (πειρασμὸν πειρᾶλα) in which πειρασμός is used in i. 2. This view obtains support from the repeated mention of ἐπιθύμησις in vv. 14, 15. The tendency to a sin which was so closely connected with the nature, the lower nature, of man (cf. Rom. vii. 23) would, on this very account, be regarded by many as in the last instance referable to the Creator of man; that this belief was held will be seen from the authorities cited in the Introduction IV., § 1. On this view πειρασμός refers to temptation of a special kind, ἐπιθύμησις; cf. Matt. v. 28, πᾶς ὁ βλάστημα γυναικῶν πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμήματός . . . ; 1 Pet. ii. 11, Ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ . . . ἀντίχειας τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἰτίας στρατιωτοῦ κατὰ τῆς φύσεως: iv. 2-3 . . . εἰς τὸ μακρὸν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίας ἀλλὰ ἀπελευθερώθη Θεοῦ. . . . — 51: Cf. the parallel use of יִרְצָא in Hebrew.—ἀντικατάστασις ἐκτιμήσας: "Untenable of evil"; see Mayor's very interesting note on ἄντικαταστάσις; the word does not occur elsewhere in N.T., nor in the Septuagint. If the interpretation of this passage given above be correct, the meaning here would seem to be that it is inconceivable that the idea should come into the mind of God to tempt men to lust; the "unstemptableness" has perhaps a two-fold application: God cannot be tempted to do evil Himself, nor can He be tempted with the wish to tempt men. The word in its essence is really an insistence upon one of the fundamental beliefs concerning the Jewish doctrine of God, viz., His attribute of Holiness and ethical purity; the teaching of many centuries is summed up in the third of the "Thirteen Principles" of Maimonides: "I believe with perfect faith that the Creator, blessed be His name, is not a body, and that He is free from all the accidents of matter, and that He has not any form whatsoever". The Peshitta rendering of this clause, from which one might have looked for something suggested, is very disappointing and entirely loses the force of the Greek.—πειράζει, etc., see Introduction IV., § 1. Ver. 14. Ἐκατός δὲ πειράζεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἔπιθυμίας ἐπιθηκομένως καὶ πειράζω: according to this the evil originates in man himself, which would be the case more especially with the sin of lust; with regard to temptation to sin of another character see 1 Thess. iii. 5 . . . μή τοῦ ἐπιθετον ὕματ φειραβον, who is doubtlessly to be identified with Satan.—ἐπιθηκομένως καὶ ἐπιθηκομένως: describes the method of the working of ἐπιθυμία, the first effect of which is "to draw the man out of his original repose, the second to allure him to a definite bait" (Mayor). ἡπιθυμία is in its original meaning used of fishing, δελεάζω, of hunting, and then of the wiles of the harlot; both the participles might be transferred, from their literal use in application to hunting or fishing, to a metaphorical use of alluring to sensual sin, and thus desire entices the man from his self-restraint as with the wiles of a harlot, a metaphor maintained by the words which follow, 'conceived,' 'beareth,' 'bringeth forth'; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 14, 18, where the same verb is found, and Philo, Quod omn. prob lib., 22, 'driven by passion or enticed by pleasure' (Knowling). Ver. 15. ἔτη: continuing the description of the method of the working of ἐπιθυμία; ἣ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἄμαρτιάν: With this idea of personification, cf. Zech. v. 5-11, where the woman "sitting in the midst of the ephah" is the personification of Wickedness; and for the metaphor see Ps. vii. 15 (Sept.), ἰδίαν δύναμιν ἀνυπόκτουν, συνίηδεσιν τόνον καὶ ἰδίκην ἄνδρα. Since ἐπιθυμία is represented as the parent of ἄμαρτια it can hardly be regarded as other than sinful itself; indeed, this seems to be taught in the Targum of Jonathan (a Targum which had received general recognition in Babylonia as early as the third century A.D., and whose elements therefore go back to a much earlier time) in the paraphrase of Isa. lxii. 10,
where it says that the *imagination of sin* is sinful, cf. Jer. Targ. i. to Deut. xxiii. 11; this is evidently the idea in the words before us.—ἐνυπηκοοσθείσα: this word does not occur elsewhere in the N.T., and only very rarely in the Septuagint, cf. 1 Esdras, v. 7. σαφέστατον τώ ἀνυπηκοοσθησθημένῳ (A reads ἐνυπηκοοσθήθη) τῇ ἀπατηρίᾳ: 2 Macc. xvi. 39. . . . εἶνας ἀποτελεσμάτως ἐκείνης ἐπὶ ἁπατηρίᾳ τῇ ἁρπαὶ ἀπεταλεί . . . ; it refers here to sin in its full completeness, Vulg., cum consummatione fuerit. The passage recalls Rom. vi. 28, τὰ γὰρ δύνατα τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἄνωθεν. Mayor quotes the appropriate passage from Hermas, Mand., iv. 17; cf. 2 Macc. xvi. 39. . . . ἁμαρτία μεγάλη: ἐὰν τίς ἐργάσῃ τῷ ἐργῷ τον πονηρὸν τοῦτο, ἄνωθεν ἄντων κατεργάζεται. Just as ἐνυπηκοοσθείσαι and ἄνωταν belong together, and the latter testifies to the existence of the former, so πατινεῖ and ἐργα belong together, and the latter proves the existence of the former; see ii. 32, ἐκ τῶν ἐργῶν ἡ πατινεῖ ἐνυπηκοοσθησθῆ—ἐνυπηκοό: only here and in ver. 18 in the N.T., it only occurs once in the Septuagint, 2 Macc. xv. 17, ἤ μένη γὰρ τῇ ἐνυπηκοοσθείᾳ ἑλεκτρον ἀποκαταστάσεως: ἄνωθεν: in Tanchuma, Bereshith, 8, it is taught that Adam's sin was the means of death entering into the world, so that all generations to the end of time are subject to death; this teaching is, of course, found in both early and late Jewish literature; but it probably is not this to which reference is made in the passage before us. In seeking to realise what the writer meant by death here one recalls, in the first place, such passages as Rom. v. 21: *As sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord*; cf. vi. 21, vii. 24; John v. 24: *He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgement, but hath passed out of death into life*; cf. viii. 51, 52; 1 John iii. 14: *We know that we have passed from death unto life*; see also Rom. vii. 24; 2 Cor. i. 9, 10; 2 Tim. i. 10; and Jas. v. 20 . . . *shall save a soul from death*. . . ; it seems clear that
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(Septuagint): it is rendered ἡ δόξα περὶ ὄντων τῆς σκοτεινοῦ ἑως ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἔστιν οὐσία: only here in the N.T., and in 4 Kings ix. 20

in the Peshitta, a word which is used variously of “change,” “caprice,” and even “apostasy” (see Brockelmann, Lex. Syr., s.v.). In Greek, according to Mayor, the word may be taken “to express the contrast between the natural sun, which varies its position in the sky from hour to hour and month to month, and the eternal source of all light”._—τροπῆς ἀποσκλίσεως: neither of these words is found elsewhere in the N.T., and the latter does not occur in the Septuagint either; the former is used in the Septuagint of the movements of the heavenly bodies, Deut. xxxiii. 14: καλένθαρας γενετέων ἡλίου τροπών . . .; cf. Job xxxvii. 33. The meaning of the latter part of the verse before us is well brought out by Luther: “Bei welchem ist keine Veränderung noch Wechsel des Lichts und Finsterniss”. If, as hinted above, there is a connection between this verse and the section i. 5-8, the meaning may perhaps be expressed thus: When, in answer to prayer, God promises the gift of wisdom, it is certain to be given, for He does not change; cf. for the thought, Rom. xi. 29, ἀμέτακτης γὰρ ἡ χάρισμα καλ ἡ κληρονομία του Θεοῦ.

Ver. 18. Again we have a verse without any connection between what precedes or follows; the words ὅτιν καὶ ἀποτυγκώτοι του μοι φως γέγονεν of ver. 19 seem to belong to ver. 18. As we have seen, ver. 17 most probably contains a quotation; the possibility of ver. 18 being also a loose quotation, from some other author, should not be lost sight of; it would ex-

Cf. on the one hand, Sir. xiii. 9, ἐλλήνες αὐταντοι, δόξας ἀποτυγκώσεις ἀποτυγκώσεις, ἐν φιλοτοῦ Κύριος; and, on the other, John i. 5, ἦν Θεός φῶς ἦστε καὶ σπέρμα ἐν αὐτῷ ὥστε ὄστιν ὄσπερ. There can be no doubt that in the passage before us this double meaning of light, literal and spiritual, is meant.—πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ: it is a question whether one should read: “Every good gift . . . from above” (Knowling).—ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν αὐτῷ: it is a question whether one should read: “Every good gift . . . from above” (Knowling).—ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν αὐτῷ: it is a question whether one should read: “Every good gift . . . from above” (Knowling).—ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν αὐτῷ: it is a question whether one should read: “Every good gift . . . from above” (Knowling).
plain, as in the case of ver. 17, the abrupt way in which it is introduced; the ὄτος, taken as an indicative, might well imply that the writer is referring his readers to some well-known writing, much in the same way as St. Paul does in Acts xvii. 28, ἡ ἀρχὴ γὰρ ἔχειν καὶ κυνομένα καὶ ἐπιμένει ὡς καὶ τινὲς τῶν καθ᾽ ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν ἀνθρώπων. For the general thought of the verse cf. 1 John iii. 9.—παρακατάγεις ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀληθίνοις: this is strongly suggestive of an advanced belief in the doctrine of Grace, cf John xv. 16. οὕς ὦμεν μὲ ἀδελφοῖς, ἢς ἡμέν ἀδελφῶν ἡμᾶς. The rare word ἀπαντήσας is, strictly speaking, only used of the mother. "It seems clear that the phrase has particular reference to the creation of man, εἰς ἐλεόνα ἠμέθαν καὶ καθ᾽ ὑμᾶς. This was the truth about man which God's will realised in the creation by an act, a λόγος, which was the expression at once of God's will and man's nature." (Parry). —ἀπαρχὴν τῆς τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων. —ἀπαρχὴ = πρότερον used in the Torah in She'moth Rabba, chap. 33; see further below; the picture would be very familiar to Jews; just as the new fruits which ripen first herald the new season, so those men who are begotten λόγοι ἀληθινοί proclaim a new order of things in the world of spiritual growth; they are in advance of other men, in the same way that the first-fruits are in advance of the other fruits of the season. Rendel Harris illustrates this very pointedly from actual life of the present day in the East: "When one's soul desires the vintage or the fruitage of the returning summer, chronological advantage is everything. The trees that are a fortnight to the fore are the talk and delight of the town" (Present Day Papers, May, 1901, "The Elements of a Progressive Church").

Vv. 19-20. Another isolated saying, strongly reminiscent of the Wisdom literature; the frequent recurrence (see below) of words of this import suggests that here again the writer is recalling to the minds of his hearers familiar sayings.

Ver. 19. ταχύς εἰς τὸ ἀκούειν βραδύς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι: Cf. Sir. v. 11, γίνον ταχύς εἰς ἀκοράζειν σοι καὶ ἐν μακρόθυμῳ φθέγγου ἀνακριθείς; see iv. 29, xx. 7. A similar precept is quoted in Qoheleth Rabba, v. 5 (Wünsche): "Speech for a shekel, silence for two; it is like a precious stone"; cf. Taylor's ed. of Pirke Aboth, p. 25.—βραδύς εἰς ἀργήν: Cf. Eccles. vii. 10 (R.V. 9), μὴ σταντάτη σε πτέρνητα σου τοῦ θυμοῦσβαι. τι θυμάσθης ἐν καλόν ἄρον ἀναπάντηται; see, too, Prov. xvi. 32. Margoliouth (Expos. Times, Dec. 1893) quotes a saying which, according to Mohammedan writers, was spoken by Christ: "Asked by some how to win Paradise, He said: 'Speak not at all'. They said: 'We cannot do this'. He said then: 'Only say what is good.'" It must be remembered that the Arabs are the most foul-mouthed people on earth.

Ver. 20. ἁγίον γὰρ, etc.: Man's wrath is rarely, if ever, justifiable; even "just indignation" is too often intermixed with other elements; and frequently the premisses on which it is founded are at fault. Man, unlike God, never knows all the circumstances of the case. On the subject of anger, see Matt. v. 21, 22, and cf. the Expositor, July, 1905, pp. 28 ff.

Vv. 21-25 form a self-contained section. By putting away all impurity the "implanted word" can influence the heart; but it is necessary not only to hear the word but also to act in accordance with it. Ver. 21. ἀποθέμενοι: used in
Heb. xii. 1 of putting off every weight preparatory to "running the race that is set before us"; the metaphor is taken from the discarding oneself of clothes—παραλλαγά: not elsewhere in the N.T. or Septuagint; the Syriac has which is the same word used in Ezek. xlv. 6 for the Hebrew "abomination," meaning which is abhorrent to God; usually it has reference to idolatrous practices, but it occurs a number of times in the later literature in reference to unchastity, this more especially in Proverbs. The adjective is used in Zech. iii. 4 of garments, and cf. Rev. xxi. 11, where the meaning is "filthy". The word before us, therefore, probably means "filthiness" in the sense of lustful impurity.—περισσεύειν κακίας: not merely "excess" in the sense of the A.V. "superfluity" and the R.V. "overflowing," because κακία in the smallest measure is already excess. The phrase seems to mean simply "manifold wickedness"; this has to be got out of the way first before the "implanted word" can be received.—ἐν προστίθητι: this must refer to the meekness which is the natural result of true repentance. Cf. Matt. iv. 17, "Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."—ἐν ἐκφύσει λόγου: φύσεως occurs only here in the N.T.; in Wind. xii. 10 we have, ὅσα λόγων ἔτι πωρηλα ἡ γίνεσσα αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκφύσεως ἡ κακία αὐτῶν. Mayor holds that the expression must be understood as "the rooted word," i.e., a word whose property it is to root itself like a seed in the heart, cf. Matt. xiii. 21, ὃς ἐχει δὲ ἑαυτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ; and Matt. xv. 13, πώς φυτεύει ἵνα ὁ φυτεύων δὲ τοῦτον μὲν τὸ σταύρωμα ἀνεξαρτήτως; and cf. iv. Esdr. ix. 31, "Ecce enim seminum in vos legem meam, et faciet in vos fructum et glorificationem in eo per saeculum". The meaning "rooted word" agrees admirably with the root of the word. Sid seems to give the best sense, see further below.——ἐν ἐκφύσειν σώσας τὰς ψυχὰς ἐνμέν: Cf. 1 Pet. i. 9, τὸ πᾶς τὰς πώτεραν σωτηρίαν ψυχαν. The words before us leave the impression that those to whom they were addressed could not yet be called Christians; ἔκφυσον ἐκφύσεως ἡ κακία αὐτῶν, which they are enjoined to put off, implies a state far removed from even a moderate Christian ideal; and the "rooted word," which is able to save their souls, has evidently not been received yet. On the subject of the "rooted word" being able to save souls, see further under ver. 22.

Ver. 22. γίνεσθαι: perhaps best expressed by the German "Werden," though Luther does not render it so.—ποιτείον λόγον, καλ. etc.: Taylor quotes an appropriate passage from the Babylonian Talmud: "On Exod. xxiv. 7 which ends (lit.), We will do and we will hear, it is written (Shabbath, 88a) that "when Israel put we will do before we will hear, there came sixty myriads of ministering angels, and attached to each Israelite two crowns, one corresponding to we will do, and the other to we will hear; and when they sinned there came down a hundred and twenty myriads of destroying angels and tore them off" (quoted by Mayor, p. 67). The duty of doing as well as hearing is frequently insisted upon in Jewish writings. See, further, Matt. vii. 24, etc. As to the precise meaning to be attached to λόγος opinions differ; but the mention twice made of hearing the word makes it fairly certain that in the first instance—whatever further meaning it connoted—reference is being made to the reading of the Scriptures in the synagogue; further, the mention, also twice made, of the doing of the word makes it a matter of practical certainty that the reference is to the Torah, the Law; the fact that Jews are being addressed only emphasises this. For the attitude of the Jews towards the Torah during the centuries immediately preceding Christianity and onwards, see Oesterley and Box, The Religion and Worship of the Jews, pp. 137-153; here it must suffice to say that it was regarded as the final revelation of God for all time, that it was the means of salvation, and that its practice was the
highest expression of loyalty towards God. Jews who had from childhood been taught to regard the Torah in this light would have found it very difficult to discard the time-honoured veneration accorded to it, and there was no need to do so, seeing the place that Christ Himself had given to it (Matt. v. 17-18, vii. 12, xii. 5, xiii. 17, xxiii. 3; Luke x. 26, xvi. 17, 29), and provided that its teaching in general was regarded as preparatory to the embracing of Christianity. The intensely practical writer of this passage realised that those to whom he was writing must be drawn gently and gradually, without unduly severing them from their earlier belief, which, after all, contained so much which was identical with the new faith. The Torah, which had been rooted in their hearts and which was to them, in the most literal sense, the word of God, was the point of attachment between Judaism and Christianity; it was utilised by the writer in order to bring them to Christ, the "Word" of God in a newer, higher sense. All that he says here about the λόγος was actually the teaching of the Jews concerning the Torah, the revealed word of God; and all that he says was also equally true, only in a much higher sense, of the teaching of Christ, the "Word" of God,—this latter, higher conception of the "Word of God," the ἄριστος, was one with which Hellenistic Jews were quite familiar;—what has been said can be illustrated thus:—

In ver. 18 it is said, "Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth"; the Jews taught that they were the children of God by virtue of the Torah. In ver. 21 it is said, "Wherefore putting away all filthiness . . . receive the rooted word"; according to Jewish ideas, purity and the Torah were inseparable, it was an ancient Jewish belief that the Torah was the means whereby lust was annihilated in a man. In the same verse, the expression ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ λόγος can have a two-fold meaning in reference to the Torah; either it contains an allusion to the belief that the Torah was implanted, like Wisdom, in God Himself from the very beginning, hence the expression ἄριστος ("beginning") used of the Torah; or else the writer is referring to the teaching of the Torah which was implanted, and therefore rooted, in every Jew from the earliest years. Once more, it is said that this word is able to save souls. Among the Jews it was an axiom that the Torah was the means of salvation; to give but one quotation illustrative of this ancient belief, in Wajjikra Rabba, 29 it is written:

("Torah is the only way that leadeth to life"). And finally, as already remarked, the necessity of being doers as well as hearers of the Torah is a common place in Jewish literature. For many illustrations showing the correctness of what has been said, see Weber, "Jüdische Theologie" (2nd Ed.), pp. 14-38, Bousset, "Die Religion des Judenthums" (1st Ed.), pp. 87-120, the various editions of Midrashim translated by Wünsche in "Bibliotheca Rabbinica," and the handy collection being issued under the editorship of Fiebig, entitled "Ausgewählte Mischnaentexte". It will have been noticed that all that the writer of this passage says about λόγος as applicable to the Law, or Torah, is equally applicable, only in a much higher sense, to Christ; this will be obvious and need not be proved by quotations. But it is interesting to observe that apparently precisely the same thing was done by our Lord Himself, as recorded by St. John in the fourth Gospel; He adapted Jewish teaching on the Torah and applied it to Himself; for details of this, see Oesterley and Box, op. cit., pp. 139 ff.

It will be noticed that in our Epistle the writer presently goes on to substitute γνώσεως (Torah) for λόγος, ver. 25; this is very significant; the "perfect law of liberty," and the "royal law," both refer to the Torah as perfected by the "King of the Jews."—παραδοσεως λατωτος: i.e., deceiving the heart, as it is expressed in ver. 26; the rebuke shows the intimate knowledge on the part of the writer of the spiritual state of those to whom he is writing.

Ver. 23. οὕτως οἰκείως άνδρι. . . . έν ἰσότρυπο: With the thought here
contained, cf. Pseudo-Cyprian in *De duobus monti*, chap. 13: "Ita me in evis videte, quonodqua vestrum vestrum in aquam aut in speculum" (Resch., op. cit., p. 35), cf. 1 Cor. xii.12; 2 Cor. iii.18.—

If *πρόςων* is here used in the sense of "personality" (as in Sir. iv. 22, 27, vii. 6, x. 5, xiii. 1, etc.) then the reference would perhaps be to a man looking into his conscience, i.e., "the personality at its birth," before he had become sin-stained; this being what he was originally meant to be. The Peshittah simplifies the matter by omitting *της γενεσεως*, and is followed in this by some minor authorities. —

See above ver. 22.—

---

*ο&nu:ptov*: only here in the N.T., cf. Sir. xix. 18 (20 in Greek), iratrao-o&nu:ptou, kal iratrao-o&nu:ptou (B& read &nu:ptou) &nu:ptou, (this clause does not exist in the Hebrew, and is probably a doublet); cf. Sir. xvi. 26.

**Ver. 24.** κατανε&nu:pt&exph;ενεν: gnomic acrostics, see note on άνάπηλαν, ver. 11.

**Ver. 25.** παρακ&nu:π&exph;ας: in Sir. xiv. 20 ff. we read, Μακάρος άν&nu:π&exph;ας ιν ςφ&nu:λη τελευτ&nu:τες... δια των θυμάντων α&nu:τί&exph;. The word means literally to "peep into" with the idea of eagerness and concentration, see Gen. xxvi. 8; Mayor says that the παρακ&nu:π&exph;ας "seems to imply the bending of the upper part of the body horizontally"; if this is so the word would be used very appropriately of a man poring over a roll of the Torah.

---

See above ver. 22.—

---


---

*κί&nu:vς* : does not occur elsewhere in the N.T., and only very rarely in the Septuagint; see Sir. xi. 27, θανατοις έρας ένθλησ&nu:μην τω&nu:τ&nu: τρ&nu:φ&nu:ια:—

---


---

Ver. 26, 27. Although these verses are organically connected with the preceding section, they are self-contained, and deal with another aspect of religion. While the earlier verses, 19b-25, emphasise the need of doing as well as hearing, these speak of self-control in the matter of the tongue. At the same time it must be confessed that these verses would stand at least equally as well before iii. i ff.—

---

*δοκι:ς* : the danger of regarding the appearance of religion as sufficient was the greater inasmuch as it was characteristic of a certain type of "religious" Jew, cf. Matt. vi. 1, 2, 5, 16; it must not, however, be supposed that this represented the normal type; the fact that the need of
reality in religion is so frequently insisted upon by the early Rabbis shows that their teaching in this respect was the same as that of this writer. — θρησκεία: Hatch, as quoted by Mayor, describes θρησκεία as "religion in its external aspect, as worship or as one mode of worship contrasted with another"; this agrees exactly with what has just been said. θρησκεία does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. nor in the Septuagint.—

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-13 take up again the subject of the rich and poor which was commenced in i. 9-11.

Ver. 1. μὴ ἀπελθῇς: the imperative, which is also found in all the versions, seems more natural and more in accordance with the style of the Epistle than the interrogative form adopted by WH.—ἐν πρωτοφανείᾳ λόγῳ: the plural form is due to Semitic usage, like εἰς ἄλματον in John i. 13; cf. Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25.—τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Κυρίου: the mention of the "faith of Christ" is brought in in a way which shows that this was a matter with which the readers were well acquainted. The phrase must evidently mean the new religion which Christ gave to the world, i.e., the Christian faith.—τὴν δέξη: the intensely Jewish character of this Epistle makes it reasonably certain that the familiar Jewish conception of the Shekinah is what the writer is here referring to. The Shekinah (from the root Ἰinged "to dwell")
denoted the visible presence of God dwelling among men. There are several references to it in the N.T. other than in this passage, Matt. ix. 7; Luke ii. 9; Acts vii. 2; Rom. ix. 4; cf. Heb. ix. 5; so, too, in the Targums, e.g., in Targ. Onkelos to Num. vi. 25 ff. the "face (in the sense of appearance or presence) of the Lord" is spoken of as the Shekinah. A more materialistic conception is found in the Talmud, where the Shekinah appears in its relationship with men as one person dealing with another; e.g., in Sota, 36, it is said that before Israel sinned the Shekinah dwelt with every man severally, but that after they sinned it was taken away; cf. Sota, 17a, where it is said: "Man and wife, if they be deserving, have the Shekinah between them."; so, too, Pirge Aboth, iii. 3: "Rabbi Chananiah ben Teradyon [he lived in the second century, A.D.] said, Two that sit together and are occupied in words of Torah have the Shekinah among them" (cf. Matt. xviii. 20); see further Oesterley and Box, Op. cit., pp. 191-194. The Shekinah was thus used by Jews as an indirect expression in place of God, the localised presence of the Deity. "In the identification of the Shekinah and cognate concepts with the incarnate Christ, 'a use is made of these ideas,' as Dalman says, 'which is at variance with their primary application'. It marks a specifically Christian development, though the way had certainly been prepared by hypothesising tendencies" (Box, in Hastings' D.C.G., ii. 622a). That Christ was often identified with the Divine Shekinah may be seen from the examples given by Friedländer, Patriarchtisch und Talmudische Studien, pp. 62 ff. If our interpretation of δύναμις here is correct, it will follow, in the first place, that the meaning of the phrase 'in the power of Christ' is free from ambiguity, i.e., "... Have faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Shekinah" (literally "the glory"); this is precisely the same thought that is contained in the words, "... who being the effulgence of his glory. (Heb. i. 2-3). And, in the second place, this rendering shows that the words are an expression of the Divinity of our Lord; cf. Bengel's note: "τὴν δύναμιν: est apposito, ut ipse Christus dicatur ἡ δύναμις". [Since writing the above the present writer finds that Mayor, p. 78, refers to his own comment on this verse, where the same interpretation is given, together with a number of O.T. quotations; it seems scarcely possible to doubt that this interpretation is the correct one.]

Ver. 2. "Συναγωγήν ὑμῶν: as the Epistle is addressed to the twelve tribes of the Dispersion no particular synagogue can be meant here; it is a general direction that is being given. In the N.T. the word is always used of a Jewish place of worship; but it is used of a Christian place of worship by Hermas, Mand., xi. 9. ... εἰς συναγωγὴν ἄνδρων ἡσυχασμοῦ... καὶ δοξάζων γενέσθαι τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν ἄνδρων ἐκκλησίαν." Harnack (Expansion ... i. 60) says: "I know one early Christian fragment, hitherto unpublished, which contains the expression: Χριστιανοῦ τα καὶ ἱσοδίων Χριστοῦ διαλογίσθητε". This later may have been used in a Christian place of worship in which converted Gentiles and Jewish-Christians met together. And this is probably the sense in which we must understand the use of the word in the verse before us. The Jewish name for the synagogue was "בִּבְלָשׁ ("house of assembly"); according to Shabbath, 32a, the more popular designation was the Aramaic name מֶשֶׁכֶת ("house of the people"); Hellenistic Jews used the term προσευχή = οἰκος προσευχῆς as well as συναγωγή.—ἐν τῷ ἔρχομαι. ... ἐκκλησίας: C.F. Sir. xi. 2, μὴ ἀλώνια ἀνέβασαν αὐτούς καὶ μὴ βιβλιοθήκη ἄνθρωπον ἐν ἀράσι αὐτού. For ἀνέβασα see note on ver. 7. χρυσοβακτύλιος does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. nor in the Septuagint; cf. Luke..."
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1. δε is rendered "autem" by ff.
2. και is rendered "autem" by ff.
3. Add autem KLP, Vulg., Oec.
4. Pon post καθου 2°β, ff, WH marg.
5. Pr. ως Κς KLP, curs., Thl., Oec., rec.
6. ως BIP, 13, 29, a, c, d, Pesh., Arm., Sah.
10. του κοσμου ΑΚς KLP, a, Pesh.; του κοσμου του του Aeth., Oec.; τν τω κοσμω των 29, Vulg.; pr. ev 27, 43, 64, om. i13.
in the same spirit, the frequent ἀλληλομοιοῦν, and especially, ἀλληλος, νῦν, ἐξελάφετο: a very significant term in the mouth of a Jew when addressing Jews; cf. Deut. xiv. 1-2; Yal. ἔστιν Κυρίων τοῦ θεοῦ οὗν ... δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἔγινε εἰ Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ σου, καὶ συν ἐξελάφετο Κυρίων ἐς θέαν σου γενόμενοι σε αὐτῷ ἐκεῖνον ἀναπερνών ... cf. Acts. xiii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 27. There is an interesting saying in Chag. 96 where it is said that poverty is the quality most befitting Israel as the chosen people.—τοῦ χρόνου τῶν κόσμων: i.e., poor, in the estimation of the world; the reading τῶν κόσμων σοι ἐκ τῶν κόσμων τῶν ψυχῶν loses this point; cf. Matt. x. 9; Luke vi. 24; Acts i. 13; rux μιν πίστειν: “Oblique predicate” (Mayo). In the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Gad. vii. 6 we read: “For the poor man, if, free from envy, he pleaseth the Lord in all things, is blessed beyond all men” (the Greek text reads πλοῦτος which Charles holds to be due to a corruption in the original Hebrew text which reads πλουτος = μακροσ-τὸς ὦτις). See, for the teaching of our Lord, Matt. vi. 19; Luke xii. 21. Πλοῦς is used here rather in the sense of trust than of wealth, as is always the case in ii. 1. κηρυγμόν τῆς βασιλείας: the Kingdom must refer to that of the Messiah, see v. 7-9, and Matt. xxv. 35, δεῖτον αἱ ἐν πολλοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου κηρυγματίζεται τὴν ἑπομένην ὑπὸν βασιλείαν ἀνὰ καταβολὴν κόσμου, but not Matt. v. 3 which treats of a different subject. It is of importance to remember that the Messiahian Kingdom to which reference is made in this verse was originally, among the Jews, differentiated from the “future life” which is apparently referred to in l. 12, ... ἱχθυόν τοῦ στόμου τῆς ζωῆς, ὃν ἐπηγεγείλατο ποιμὴν ἀναπέρνων. There was a distinction, fundamentally present, though later on confused, in Jewish theology, between the “Kingdom of Heaven” over which God reigns, and that of the Kingdom of Israel over which the Messiah should reign. An integral part of the Messianic hope was the doctrine of a resurrection (cf. Isa. xxv. 10; Dan. xii. 2). This first assumed definite form, apparently, under the impulse of the idea that those who had suffered martyrdom for the Law (Torah) were worthy to share in the future glories of Israel. In the crudest form of the doctrine the resurrection was confined to the Holy Land—those buried elsewhere would have to burrow through the ground to Palestine—and to landsites. And the trumpet-blast which was to be the signal for the ingathering of the exiles would also arouse the sleeping dead (cf. Berachoth, 15b; 4 Esdras iv. 23 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16). According to the older view, the Kingdom was to follow the resurrection and judgment; but the later and more widely held view was that a temporary Messianic Kingdom would be established on the earth, and that this would be followed by the Last Judgment and the Resurrection which would close the Messianic Era. This was to be followed by a new heaven and a new earth. In the eschatological development which took place during the first century B.C. Paradise came to be regarded as the abode of the righteous and elect in an intermediate state; from there they will pass to the Messiahian Kingdom, after the final judgment they enter heaven and eternal life. In our Epistle there are some reflections of these various conceptions and beliefs, but they have entered into a simpler and more spiritual phase. That the reference in the verse before us is to the Messiahian Kingdom seems indubitable both on account of the mention of the "Lord Jesus Christ" (Messiah) with which the section opens, showing that the thought of our Lord was in the mind of the writer, and because of the mention of the "Kingdom," and also on account of the direct mention of the coming of the Messiah as Judge, later on in v. 7-9. And if this is so then we may perhaps see in the words ἐξελάφετο a reference to Christ.

Ver. 6. ἀληθεύετο: Cf., though in an entirely different connection, Sir. x. 23, ὅτι ἐκεῖνον ἐπηγεγείλα τοῖς συνε-τόν (Messian is absent in the Hebrew);
the R.V. "dishonoured" accurately represents the Greek, but the equivalent Hebrew word would be better rendered "disprised," which is the reading of the A.V. has. "Dishonouring" would imply the withholding of a right, "despising" would be rather the contempt accorded to the man because he was poor. There can be little doubt that it is the former which is intended here, but the idea of the latter must also have been present. — OVK 1. 9. ...
... the R.V. renders (incorrectly): "which are called by my name," it should be: "Over whom my name was called," as rendered by the Septuagint, excepting that it repeats itself unnecessarily, λεγομενοι τον Παπαντα τον Δικαιον, etc., is in accordance with the frequent usage of the Septuagint, where καταβαθμων often takes an accusative instead of the genitive. — αυτω: "The pronoun αυτω is used in the nominative, not only with the meaning 'self' when attached to a subject, as in classical Greek, but also when itself standing for the subject, with a less amount of emphasis, which we might render 'he for his part,' or 'was he who,' as in the next clause; it is disputed whether it does not in some cases lose its emphatic force altogether, as in Luke xix. 2, xxiv. 31" (Mayor). Καταβαθμων: See Matt. x. 7, 18. Cf. Acts xvi. 19,
so also different peoples were ranged under the names of special gods; this usage was the same among the Israelites, who stood under the protection of Jahwe—the name and the bearer were of course not differentiated. This, too, is the meaning here; it does not mean the name that they bore, or were called by, but the name under whose protection they stood, and to which they belonged. Parallel to it was the marking of cattle to denote ownership. (See, in reference to what has been said, Deut. xxviii.10; 2 Sam. xii.28; Jer. vii.10). In the passage before us there is not necessarily any reference to Baptism, though it is extremely probable that this is so; Mayor quotes Hermas, Sim. ix.16, πρὶν φρονεῖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸ δομά τοῦ θεοῦ νεκρῶς ἔστιν: ἵπτων δὲ λάβῃ τὴν σφαγήν (baptism) ἀποκάλυπτη τὴν ἐκείνην καὶ ἀναλαμβάνῃ τὴν ἱεράν. Resch (op cit. p. 193) quotes a very interesting passage from Agathangelus, chap. 73, in which these words occur: ... καὶ εἶπεν ὅτι τὸ δομά μου ἐπικαλέσται ἰδ' ἱμάτιο, καὶ ἱμάτιο ἐστὶν ναός τῆς διαθήκης μου. In the passage before us, the omission of all mention of the name, which would have come in very naturally, betrays Jewish usage; as Taylor truly remarks (Pirae Aboth., p. 66): “A feeling of reverence leads the Jews to avoid, as far as possible, all mention of the Names of God. This feeling is manifested ... in their post-canonical literature, even with regard to less sacred, and not incommunicable Divine names. In the Talmud and Midrash and (with the exception of the Prayer Books) in the Rabbinic writings generally, it is the custom to abstain from using the Biblical names of God, excepting in citations from the Bible; and even when Elohim is necessarily brought in, it is often intentionally misspelt ...” It should be noted that this phrase only occurs once elsewhere in the N.T., and there in a quotation from the O.T., quoted by St. James in Acts xv. 17.

Ver. 8. μέντοι: “nevertheless”; there is a duty due to all men, even the rich are to be regarded as “neighbours,” for the precept of the Law, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” (Lev. xix. 18), applies to all men.—νόμον βασιλικὸν: “There is no difficulty in the anarthrous νόμος being used (as below, iv. 11) for the law of Christ or of Moses on the same principle that βασιλεῖα could be used for the King of Persia, but the addition of an anarthrous epithet should not have been passed over without comment, as it has been by the editors generally” (Mayor). The reference is to the Torah, as is obvious from the quotation from Lev. xix. 18, and therefore βασιλικὸν—if this was the original reading—must refer to God, not (in the first instance) to Christ; the Peshitta reads: “the law of God”.—κτέιες: in Rom. ii. 27 we have the phrase νόμον κτέιες—τὴν γραφήν: cf. 1 Cor. xv. 3 κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς. On a papyrus belonging to the beginning of the Christian era, the phrase κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν is used in a legal sense in reference to a contract, i.e., something that is binding (Deissmann, Neue Bibelst., p. 78). When used in reference to the Torah, as here, it was of particular significance to Jews who, as the “people of God” were bound by the Covenant.—κατὰ τὸν νόμον: cf. Acts xv. 29; 2 Pet. i.19.

Ver. 9. προσωπολημπτεῖτε: see note on ii. 1; the word does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. nor in the Septuagint; cf. Lev. xix. 15; Deut. xvi. 19.—ἀμαρτιάν ἐργάζεσθε: the strength of the expression is intended to remind his hearers that it is wilful, conscious sin of which they will be guilty, if they have this respect for persons on account of their wealth. It is well to bear in mind that the conception of sin among the Jews was not so deep as it became in the light of Christian teaching.—ἀληθεύονται: the verb ἀπεβάλειν
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10. ὑπὲρ τοῦ νόμου δὲ παραβατέω. Ἡ παραβάσις ἡ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

12. ὁ ἄνδρας ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔχει σύννεφον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοιχοῦ ὁ παραβάτης.

precisely expresses the Hebrew "to cross over"; cf. Rom. ii. 25, 27; Gal. ii. 18; Heb. ii. 2, ix. 15, and see Matt. xv. 2, 3. To cross over the line which marks the "way" is to become a transgressor.

Ver. 10. τιμορία: τιμορία is used here with a force precisely corresponding to the Hebrew "to stumble over" something; the picture is that of a παραβάτης stumbling over the border which marks the way; cf. the oft-used expression in Jewish writings of making a "hedge" or "fence" around the Torah, e.g., Pirke Aboth, i. 1. With the verse before us cf. Sir. xxxvii. 12, ... ὁ ἐπισκόπων συντρουπά ἐν τοιαίδα... καὶ ἐπὶ τακτικὰ συναλγά τοῦ, and ver. 15 καὶ ἐπὶ τακτικὰ συναλγά τοῦ ἐπισκόπων ἐν δίκαιον ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τῆς ἀδικίας τοῦ... ἐν ὑπάρξει: used in a pregnant sense, "in one matter" or "in any single point";—γένον πάντων ἑνοχῶν: While there are a certain number of passages in Rabbinical writings which are in agreement with this teaching (e.g., Bemidbar Rabb., ix. on Num. v. 14; Shabbath, 70b; Pesikta, 50a; Haraioth, 8b; quoted by Mayor), there can be no doubt that the predominant teaching was in accordance with the passage quoted by Taylor (in Mayor, op. cit., p. 89) from Šemos Rabb., xxiv. τῆς ἀδικίας τῆς ἁμαρτίας; as Taylor goes on to say: "If they kept it, they were to be reckoned as having done all; if they profaned it, as having broken all".

Rashi teaches the same principle. This is quite in accordance with the Jewish teaching regarding the accumulation of παραβάσις ("commandments," i.e., observances of the Law); a man was regarded as "righteous" or "evil" according to the relative number of παραβάσις or evil deeds laid to his account; the good were balanced against the bad; according as to which of the two preponderated, so was the man reckoned as among the righteous or the wicked (see the writer's article in the Expositor, April, 1908, "The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard").—παραβάσις is equivalent to all the precepts of the Torah. For ἑνοχή cf. Matt. xxvi. 66; x Cor. xi. 27; Gal. iii. 10; see also Deut. xxvii. 26, and Resch, op. cit., p. 47.

Ver. 11. η λεπτὸν εἰκόνα, etc.: for the order of the seventh commandment preceding the sixth, cf. the Septuagint (Exod. xx. 13, 14), and Luke xviii. 20; Rom. xiii. 9. With this mention of adultery and murder together shored up are compared §§ 9, 10 of the Apoc of Peter; in the former section the punishment of adulterers is described, in the latter that of murderers, while in § 11 mention is made of the children who were the victims of murder. Possibly it is nothing more than a coincidence, but the fact is worth drawing attention to that in the Apoc. of Peter (or, more strictly, in the extant remains of this) the punishment is described only of those who had been guilty of evil speaking (blasphemy), adultery, murder, and the wealthy who had not had pity upon widows and orphans. These are the sins upon which special stress is laid in our Epistle; other sins receive only incidental mention.

Ver. 12. οὕτως λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε: When one thinks of
the teaching of our Lord in such passages as Matt. v, 22, 28, where sinful feelings and thoughts are reckoned as equally wicked with sinful words and acts, it is a little difficult to get away from the impression that in the verse before us the teaching is somewhat inadequate from the Christian, though not from the Jewish, point of view.

Ver. 13. *γάρ κρίσις ἀνελεός* etc.: Cf. Matt. v. 7, vii. 1, xviii. 28 ff., xxv. 41 ff. For the form ἀνελεός see Mayor, in loc. The teaching occurs often in Jewish writings, e.g., Sir. xxviii. 1-3: “Have, therefore, yourselves also, my children, compassion toward every man with mercy, that the Lord also may have compassion and mercy upon you.” Because also in the last days God will send His compassion on the earth, and whosoever He findeth bowls of mercy He dwelleth in him. For in the degree in which a man hath compassion upon his neighbours, in the same degree hath the Lord also upon him.” (Charles); cf. also vi. 4-6. Shabbath, 127b: “He who thus judges others will thus himself be judged.” Ibid., 116b: “He that hath mercy on his neighbours will receive mercy from heaven; and he that hath not mercy on his neighbours will not receive mercy from heaven.” Cf. also the following from Ephraem Syrus, Opf., i. 108 (quoted by Resch. Op. cit., p. 107): “καὶ μάρτυραὶ οἱ ἡλπίοντες, δι’ αὐτῶν ἡλπίσεται; καὶ οὐκ ἦλπίσεται τοῖς μὴ ἡλπίσοντες, καὶ οὐκ ἡλπίσεται.” ποιοῖς: This use of ἡλπίσεως is common in the Septuagint and corresponds to the Hebrew חֵן; it is often used with רְפָא (“kindness”).

Vv. 14-26. On this section see Introduction IV., § 2. There are a few points worth drawing attention to, in connection with the subject treated of in these verses, before we come to deal with the passage in detail: (1) πίστις here means nothing more than belief in the unity of God, cf. ver. 20 τὰ δεδομένα πιστεύοντες . . . ; this is a very restricted use of the word, both according to Hebrew and Greek usage. The Hebrew פְּתַחַיָּה means primarily “faithfulness,” “steadfastness,” “reliability,” and is used in reference to God quite as much as in reference to men. This is also the force of the verb פְּתַחַיָּה; it is only in the Hiph’al that the meaning “to believe in,” in the sense of “to trust,” arises. The use of πίστις in the Septuagint varies; mostly it corresponds to פְּתַחַיָּה, but not infrequently this latter is rendered φθορά, e.g., Psa. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 34, 50, lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 3, though in each of these cases Aquila and Quinta render πίστις. In Sir. xii. 16, πίστις is the rendering of the Hebrew פְּתַחַיָּה (“truth”), while in xiv. 4, xvi. 15 it corresponds to פְּתַחַיָּה in the sense of “reliability.” In Sir. xxxvii. 26 the Greek is obviously corrupt. פְּתַחַיָּה stands there for the Hebrew פְּתַחַיָּה (“glory”), which is clearly more correct. But the most interesting passage on the subject in Sir. from our present point of view is xv. 15: “かれ ὁ λόγος, συντριβομένος τεταρτάκις, καὶ πίστις καὶ ἰδία ἐκκοιμήθη; of which the Hebrew is: יִתְנָה לְהוּא לְפְתַחַיָּה כָּל הַיָּמִים ("If it be thy will thou dost observe the
commandment, and it is faithfulness to do His good pleasure;" the context shows that it is a question here of man's free-will. Here πιστίς is used in a distinctly higher sense than in the passage of our Epistle under consideration. In so far, therefore, as πιστίς is used in the restricted sense, as something which demons as well as men possess, it is clear that the subject is different from that treated by St. Paul in Romans; and therefore the comparison so often made between the two Epistles on this point is not de professo. (2) That which gave the occasion for this section seems to have been the fact that, in the mind of the writer, some of the Jewish converts had drifted into one extreme and another on the subject of works. Too much stress had been laid upon the efficacy of works in their Jewish belief; when they became Christians they were in danger of losing some of the excellences of their earlier faith by a mistaken supposition that works, not being efficacious per se (which so far was right) were therefore altogether unnecessary, and that the mere fact of believing in the unity of God was sufficient. Regarded from this point of view, there can, again, be no question of a conflict with Pauline teaching as such. The point of controversy was one which must have agitated every centre in which Jews and Jewish-Christians were found. In this connection it is important to remember that the "faith of Abraham" was a subject which was one of the commonplaces of theological discussion both in Rabbinical circles as well as in the Hellenistic School of Alexandria; regarding the former, see the interesting passage from the Midrashic work, Mechilta, quoted by Box in Hastings' D.C.G., ii. 568b. The error of running from one extreme into another, in matters of doctrine, is one of those things too common to human nature for the similarity of language between this Epistle and St. Paul's writings in dealing with the subject of faith and works to denote antagonism between the two writers. (3) The passage as a whole betrays a very strong Jewish standpoint; what it would be too much to say that it could not have been written by a Christian, it is certainly difficult to understand how, e.g., ver. 25 could have come from the pen of a Christian. (4) It is necessary to emphasise the fact that this passage cannot be properly understood without some idea of the subject of the Jewish doctrine of works which has always played a supremely important part in Judaism; for this, reference must be made to IV., § 2 of the Introduction, where various authorities are quoted.

Ver. 14. τὸ τὸ δεῖ πρᾶξειν: A stands almost alone in omitting τὸ here; in 1 Cor. xv. 32, the only other place in the N.T. where the phrase occurs τὸ is inserted. A somewhat similar phrase occurs in Sir. xli. 14, τὸ δεῖ πρᾶξειν καὶ δοθῆλαν; the abruptness of the words betrays the preacher. ἀρετῆς πρᾶξεως: a characteristic mode of address in this Epistle. With ἀρετῆς of ἀρετηῆς in Rabbinical literature. — ἰπράα: = the Hebrew יְרָא (literally "command; ments," i.e., fulfilling of commandments): see Introduction IV., § 2. ὁσιότης: i.e., as expressed in the Shema (Deut. vi, 4 ft.): "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One . . ."; this was the fundamental tenet of the Jewish faith, and that it is this to which reference is made, and not the Christian faith, is obvious from ver. 19 which contains the essence of the Shema. — ἀρετῆς: the belief in the efficacy of works among the Jews has always been very strong; the following quotations express the traditional teaching of Judaism on the subject: "He that does a good work in this world, in the world to come his good work goes before him;" Sota, 3b, in Kethuboth, 67b we have the following: "When Mar Ukba lay a-dying, he asked for his account; it amounted to 7000 Zuzim (i.e., this was the sum-total of his almsgiving). Then he cried out: 'The way is far, and the provision is small' (i.e., he did not think that this sum would be sufficient to ensure his justification in the sight of God, and thus gain him salvation); so he gave away half of his fortune, in order to make himself quite secure.' Again, concerning a righteous man who died in the odour of sanctity, it is said in Tanchuma, Wayyakel, i. 1: "How much alms did he give, how much did he study the Torah, how many Mitzvot (i.e.,
'commandments,' see above) did he fulfill! He will rest among the righteous." It is also said in Baba Bathra 10a, that God placed the poor on earth in order to save rich men from Hell; the idea, of course, being that opportunities for doing Mitzvot were thus provided. In a curious passage in the Testament of Abraham, chap. vii., it is said that Thanatos met Abraham and told him that he welcomed the righteous with a pleasant look and with a salutation of peace, but the sinners he confronted with an angry and dark countenance; and he said that the good deeds of Abraham had become so strong that he had plucked upon his (Thanatos') head. In Wisdom, iv. 1 we have, "... Abraham, a sister... and the wise... (Proverbs), to whom... and knowledge and..." (Isaiah 28:28). The passage here is noteworthy; It is the point in this passage which suggests a distinctively Christian influence. This is apparently the only place in the Bible in which "sister" is mentioned in this special connection. — ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ πατρὸς: Cf. Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Zeb. vii. 1-3; "I saw a man in distress through nakedness in winter-time, and had compassion upon him, and stole away a garment secretly from my father's house (another reading is 'my house'), and gave it to him who was in distress. Do you, therefore, my children, from that which God bestowed on you, show compassion and mercy without hesitation to all, and give to every man with a good heart. And if you have not the wherewithal to give to him that needeth, have compassion for him in bowls of mercy" (Charles). Of course it is not literal nakedness that is meant in the passage before us; in the case of men the Hebrew דלוי (= γυναῖκα), while often used in a literal sense, is also frequently used in reference to one who was not wearing a γυναῖκα (= γυναῖκα) and thus appeared only in ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ πατρὸς, "under-garments," see Am. ii. 6; Isa. xx. 2 f.; Job xxii. 6, xxiv. 7-10. In the case of women, the reference is likewise to the ἡ γυνὴ, though in this case the garment was both longer and fuller than that of men; at the same time, it is improbable that the "sister" would have appeared without a veil, unless, indeed, we are dealing with a σουήδον which is altogether more Western; this is a possibility which cannot be wholly excluded. — λειτουργεῖν: must be taken with ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ πατρὸς as the addition of ἡ γυνὴ is poorly attested. — ἔφημερον τρόφιμόν: "the food for the day"; the words express the dire necessity of those in want. Cf. Matt. vii. 11, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἄστεσιν δέχεται, and Nestle's note on ἐντοίχοις in Hastings' D.C.G., ii. 58a. ἐφθαίρεται does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. or the Septuagint.

Ver. 15. ἤταντες, θεραπευτάσθηντας, ἡγούμενοι: these words do not seem to be spoken in irony; this is clear from the τί τὸ διάλογος. They are spoken in all seriousness, and it is quite possible that those whom the writer is addressing were acting upon a mistaken application of Christ's words in Matt. vi. 25 ff. Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. ... Be not therefore anxious, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the Gentiles seek; for your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. It was entirely in accordance with their idea of πιστιν that these people should leave to their Heavenly Father what, according to both Jewish and Christian teaching, it was their duty to do. — ἔφημερον τρόφιμόν: "The plural is often used after an indefinite singular" (Mayor). — τῶν ἐντοίχων τῶν σώματων: only here in the N.T., but often found in classical writers; Mayor gives instances. — τί τὸ διάλογος: in the earlier passage in which
this phrase occurs there is no question of irony, it is a direct fallacy which is being combated; in this verse, too, the writer is correcting a mistaken idea, this comes out clearly in the next verse.

Ver. 17. _οὐτῶς καὶ ἡ πίστις_ . . .: just as faith without works is dead, so this spurious, quiescent charity, which is content to leave all to God without any attempt at individual effort, is worthless.

— _καθ' ἐαυτὺν_: the Vulgate in _semel ipsa_ brings out the force of this; such faith is, in its very essence, dead; cf. the Peshitta.

Ver. 18.— _ἀλλ' ἢ ρεῖ τις_: these words, together with the argumentative form of the verses that follow, imply that a well-known subject of controversy is being dealt with. " _Ἀλλ' ἢ ρεῖ τις_ is a regular argumentative phrase, used of an objection. "Instead of the future with _ἐω_ would be more common in classical Greek, but the latter form is rather avoided by the Hellenistic writers, occurring only eight times in the N.T.—thrice in Luke, five times in Acts " (Mayor).— _ἐκεῖνς_: the interrogative here suggested by WH does not commend itself, as the essence of the argument is the setting-up of two opposing and definite standpoints.— _καθ' ὑμᾶς_: In the N.T. καθʼ "often coalesces with _ὑμεῖς_ (and its oblique cases), _ἑαυτῷ, ἑαυτῷν, ἑαυτοῦ_, and _ἐν_; but there are many exceptions, and especially where there is distinct coordination of _ὑμεῖς_ with another pronoun or a substantive. There is much division of evidence" (WH, _The N.T. in Greek_, II. App., p. 145).— _διείσδον μοὶ ἣ τὴν_ πίστις . . .: πίστις is not used quite consistently by the writer; faith which requires works to prove its existence is not the same thing which is spoken of in the next verse as the possession of demons; the difference is graphically illustrated in the account of the Gadarene demoniac; in Luke viii. 28 the words, _What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God_, express a purely intellectual form of faith, which is a very different thing from the attitude of mind implied in the words which describe the whilom demoniac, as, _sitting, clothed and in his right mind, at the feet of Jesus_ (ver. 35).—With the whole verse cf. Rom. iii. 28, iv. 6.

Ver. 19. _οὐ πιστευούσα ὁτὶ εἰς ἰστίν ἔθεος_; _ Cf. Mark xii. 29, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6; Eph. iv. 6._ The reading varies, see critical note above; the interrogative is unsuitable, see note on _ἐκεῖνς_ in the preceding verse. Somewhat striking is the fact that the regular and universally accepted formula (whether Hebrew or Greek) among the Jews is not adhered to; the Septuagint of Deut. vi. 4, which corresponds exactly to the original, runs: _Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν_ _Κύριος_ _εἶ_ _ἔστιν_, and this is also the exact wording in Mark xii. 29. The stress laid on _Κύριος_ (= _πρῶτος_) in the original is very pointed, the reason being the desire to emphasise the name of Jahwe as the God of Israel (note the omission of the article before _Κύριος_); it sounded a particularistic note. The elimination of _Κύριος_ in the verse
before us, and the emphatic position of μοίας, is most likely intentional, and points to a universalistic tendency, such as is known to have been a distinctive characteristic of Hellenistic Judaism. To Jews of all kinds in belief in the Unity of God formed the basis of faith; this unity is expressed in what is called the Shema1 (Deut. vi. 4 ff.), i.e., “Hear,” from the opening word of the passage referred to; strictly speaking, it includes Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21; Num. xv. 37-41, though originally it consisted of the one verse, Deut. vi. 4. From the time of the Exile, according to Berachoth, i. 1, the recitation of the Shema1 every morning and evening became the solemn duty of all true Jews. To the present day it is the confession of faith which every Jew breathes upon his death-bed. It is said of Rabbi Akiba, who suffered the martyr’s death, that he breathed out at the last the word “One” in reference to the belief in the Unity of God as contained in the Shema1 (Ber., 61b). A few instances may be given from Jewish literature in order to show the great importance of and honour attaching to the Shema1: “They cool the flames of Gehinnom for him who reads the Shema1” (Ber., 15b); “Whoever reads the Shema1 upon his couch is as one that defends himself with a two-edged sword” (Meg., 3a); it is said in Ber., i. § 2, that to him who reads the Shema1 after the prescribed time no harm will come; in Suk., 42a, it is commanded that a father must teach his son to read the Shema1 as soon as he begins to speak. The very parchment on which the Shema1 is written is efficacious in keeping demons at a distance. The single personality of God is frequently insisted upon in the O.T., Targums, and later Jewish literature; in the latter this fundamental article was sometimes believed to be impugned by Christian teaching concerning God, and we therefore find passages in which this latter is combated (see, on this, Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 155); in the Targums all anthropomorphisms are avoided, since they were considered derogatory to the Divine Personality. We must suppose that it was owing to this intense jealousy wherewith the doctrine of the Unity of God was guarded that in the passage before us there are no qualifying words regarding the Godhead of Christ; when St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 7) enunciates the same doctrine, ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐκπέσω λίρα, he is careful to add, καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Χριστός. Such an addition might well have been expected in the verse before us; its omission must perhaps be accounted for owing to the very pronounced Judaistic character of the writer—καὶ ὁ θεὸς ποιεῖ: it is impossible to think that there is anything ironical about these words; as far as it went this belief was absolutely right; the context, which is sometimes interpreted as showing the irony of these words, only emphasises the inadequacy of the belief by itself. — ἡμῖν ἡμῶν ἡμῶν: one is, of course, reminded of the passage, Luke viii. 26 ff. (= Matt. viii. 28 ff.), already alluded to above: διότι σου, μη με βαράνα, or, more graphically, in the parallel passage, ἤρεμων λεγομένων, τι ημῖν καὶ σοι, τι θεοῦ; ἠθέλη δὲν πρὸ καμνόν βοώταται ἵματι; cf. Acts xix. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 13. On demons see the writer’s article in Hastings’ D.C.G., i. 438 ff.—Mayor gives some interesting reminiscences of these words in other early Christian writings, e.g., Justin, Trypho, 49, etc.—φίλος οὐσίων: ἐν τῷ θεῷ, in the N.T.; literally “to bristle, cf. Job iv. 35; the very materialistic ideas concerning evil spirits which is so characteristic of Jewish Demonology would account for an expression which is not, strictly speaking, applicable to immaterial beings. One of the classes of demons comprised the ἄγριοι ἡρῴι ("hairy ones"), in reference to these the word φίλος οὐσίων would be extremely appropriate (see further, on Jewish beliefs concerning demons, the writer’s articles in the Expositor, April, June, August, 1907).

Ver. 20. The words of this and the following verses, to the end of ver. 23, belong to the argument commenced by a supposed speaker—Διὰ θεοῦ τιν—; it is all represented as being conducted by...
Ver. 21. *καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔχει ἐργαὶ ἱδίκαιαν.* A stereotyped phrase in Jewish literature. The writer of the Epistle again speaks in his own name, and, as it were, sums up the previous argument. ἄρας ἐδὲ γνῶναι: "Dost thou desire to know," i.e., by an incontrovertible fact; the writer then, like a skilful disputant, altogether demolishes the position of his adversary by presenting something which was on all hands regarded as axiomatic. As remarked above, the question of Abraham's faith was a subject which was one of the commonplaces of theological discussion in the Rabbinical schools as well as among Hellenistic Jews; this is represented as having been forgotten, or at all events, as not having been taken into account, so that the adversary, on being confronted with this fact, must confess that his argument is refuted by something that he himself accepts. It is this which gives the point to *τὸ δὲ ἄργον κεν.* For κενόν the Peshitahas ἄνευς "feeble," in its primary sense, but also "ignorant," which admirably expresses what the writer evidently intends. Both Mayor and Knowling speak of κενόν as being equivalent to Raca (Matt.v.22), but the two words are derived from different roots, the former from a Grk. root meaning "to be empty," the latter from a Hebr. one meaning "to spit" (see the writer's article in the Expositor, July, 1905, pp. 28 ff.); κενόν has nothing to do with Kaca.—ἀργὴ: the reading νεκρῆ is strongly attested; the Corbey MS. makes a pun by reading "οἱ ἴδιοι vacua." Ἀργὴ is not so strong as νεκρῆ; cf. Matt. xii. 36, Ἰὰ ἐγὼ ἄγγελον. Ver. 21. *Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔχει ἐργαὶ ἱδίκαιαν.* A stereotyped phrase in Jewish literature. The writer is referring to the well-known Jewish doctrine of Πτεραθ (Zecath), on this subject see Introduction IV., § 2.— ἄνευγκας Ἰσαὰκ: on this subject an example of Jewish haggadic treatment may be of interest: "When Abraham finally held the knife over his beloved son, Isaac seemed doomed, and the angels of heaven shed tears which fell upon Isaac's eyes, causing him blindness in later life. But their prayer was heard. The Lord sent Michael the archangel to tell Abraham not to sacrifice his son, and the dew of life was poured on Isaac to revive him. The ram to be offered in his place had stood there ready, prepared from the beginning of Creation (Aboth, v. 6). Abraham had given proof that he served God not only from fear, but also out of love, and the promise was given that whenever the *'Akedah [= the "binding," i.e., of Isaac] chapter was read on New Year's day, on which occasion the ram's horn is always blown, the descendants of Abraham should be redeemed from the power of Satan, since Michael, owing to the merit of him whose ashes lay before God as though he had been sacrificed and consumed," Pesikh. R., § 40 (quoted in Jewish Encycl., i. 87a). It is interesting to notice that even in the Talmud (e.g., Ta'anit, 4a) the attempted sacrifice of Isaac is regarded also from a very different point of view, such words as those of Jer. xix. 5; Mic. vi. 7, being explained as referring to this event (see further Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Arch., xxxiv. pp. 235 ff.).

Ver. 22. *βλέπεις ὅτι ἤκρυβεν 1 τοῖς ἐργαῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν 17. 1 σωμή Να, Ti., Treg., communicat ff.*

...: as these words are the deduction drawn from what precedes, it is better to take them in the form of a statement, and not as interrogative.—ἡ ποτὴρ συνήργει: this implies a certain qualification, with regard to ποτὴρ, of the earlier position taken up by the writer, for in ver. 21 he says: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works?" no mention being made of faith; while here faith is accorded an equal place with works; cf. Gal. v. 6, ποτὲ δὲ ἀγάπης ἐνεργεῖν, concerning which words Lightfoot says that they "bridge over the gulf which seems to separate the language of St. Paul and St. James. Both assert a principle of practical energy, as opposed to a barren, inactive theory". On συνήργει see Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Gad., iv. 7, "But the spirit of love worketh together with the law of God . . ." (Charles).—καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐργαίν ἡ ποτὴρ 1 σωμή Να: it is obvious that "faith" is used here in the highest sense, not merely as an attitude of mind,
but as a God-given possession. It must, however, be further remarked that if the Judaism of the Jewish-Christian writer of this part of the Epistle had been somewhat less strong, the words under consideration would probably have been put a little differently; for according to the purely Christian idea of faith, works, while being an indispensable proof of its existence, could not be said to perfect it, any more than the preaching of the faith could be said to perfect the preacher's belief; though works are the result and outcome of faith, they belong, nevertheless, to a different category.

Ver. 23. There is some little looseness in the way the O.T. is used in these verses; in ver. 21 mention is made of the work of offering up Isaac, whereby, it is said (ver. 22), faith is perfected; then it goes straight on (ver. 23) to say that the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, "Abra..."; this reads as though the quotation were intended to refer to the offering up of Isaac,— the proof of perfected faith; but as a matter of fact the quotation refers to Abraham's belief in Jehovah's promise to the effect that the seed of Abraham was to be as numerous as the stars of heaven. In the O.T., that is to say, there is no connection between the quotation from Gen. xv. 6 and the offering-up of Isaac. This manipulation of Scripture is strongly characteristic of Jewish methods of exegesis. Ver. 23. There is some little looseness in the way the O.T. is used in these verses; in ver. 21 mention is made of the work of offering up Isaac, whereby, it is said (ver. 22), faith is perfected; then it goes straight on (ver. 23) to say that the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, "Abraham believed..."; this reads as though the quotation were intended to refer to the offering up of Isaac,— the proof of perfected faith; but as a matter of fact the quotation refers to Abraham's belief in Jehovah's promise to the effect that the seed of Abraham was to be as numerous as the stars of heaven. In the O.T., that is to say, there is no connection between the quotation from Gen. xv. 6 and the offering-up of Isaac. This manipulation of Scripture is strongly characteristic of Jewish methods of exegesis. The phrase φιλός Θεοῦ ("the merit of faith, i.e., "trustfulness") occurs in Beresh. Rabba, chap. 74, where it is parallel to דְּרוֹרְו בְּשַׁנְתָּא ("the merit of [keeping] the Law"); merit, that is to say, is acquired by trusting God, just as merit is acquired by observing the precepts of the Torah; the man who has acquired sufficient merit is in a state of Zeuth, i.e., in that state of righteousness, attained by good works, wherein he is in a position to claim his reward from God. Very pointed, in this connection, are the reiterated words of Christ in Matt. vi. 5, 18, "Verily, I say unto you, they have received their reward." 

"works" must refer, most likely, to the "friend," not to God; the Syriac runs: "They that fear God show genuine friendship, for as He Himself is, so are His friends, and as is His name, so are His works." In the Book of Jubilees, xix. 9, it says in reference to Abraham: "For he was found faithful (believing), and was written down upon the heavenly tablets as the friend of God"; this is repeated in xxx. 20, but from what is said in the next verse it is clear that all those who keep the covenant can be inscribed as "friends" upon these tablets. Deissmann (Bibelstudien, pp. 159 f.) points out that at the court of the Ptolemies φιλός was the title of honour of the highest of the royal officials. In Wisd. vii. 27 the "friends of God" is an expression for the "righteous". The phrase φιλός Θεοῦ, therefore, while in the first instance probably general in its application, became restricted, so that finally, as among the Arabs, "the friend of God," Khalil Allah, or simply El Khalil, became synonymous with Abraham. Irenæus, iv. 16, iv. 34. 4, refers to Abraham as "the friend of God," but he does not mention our Epistle; if a reference to this was intended it is the earliest trace of an acquaintance with it. See, further, an interesting note of Nestle's in the Expository Times, xv. pp. 46 f.; cf. Gen. xviii. 17 where the Septuagint
Ver. 24. **δράσε: The argument between the two supposed disputants having been brought to a close, the writer addresses his hearers again, and sums up in his own words.** — ἀλογον: the writer, by using this word, allows more importance to faith than he has yet done; there is not necessarily any inconsistency in this, the exigencies of argument on controversial topics sometimes require special stress to be laid on one point of view to the partial exclusion of another in order to balance the one-sided view of an opponent.

Ver. 25. **Ῥαββ ἡ πόρη: It must probably have been the position already accorded to Rahab in Jewish tradition that induced the writer to cite an example like this. In **Mechilta, 646a, it is said that the harlot Rahab asked for forgiveness of her sins from God, pleading on her own behalf the good works she had done in releasing the messengers. The attempts which have been made to explain away the force of πόρη are futile.**

Ver. 26. **τρείματος: Spitta's suggested reading, κινηματος, is very ingenious, but quite unnecessary; γιγνησία is often used of 'breath,' and the Greek equivalent, κινητος, is also used in the same way in the Septuagint.**

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-18 form a self-contained section; the subject dealt with is the bridling of the tongue, see above i. 19, 26, 27.
that the Synagogue of the Alexandrians (mentioned in Acts vi. 9), which was called "the Synagogue of those of Tar- sus," i.e., the followers of St. Paul, was bought up by a Tannaite ("teacher") and used for private purposes (see Bergmann, *Jüdische Apologetik im neutestamentl. Zeitalter*, p. 9). Like the Athenians (Acts xvi. 21), many inquiring Jews were always ready to hear some new thing, and welcomed into their houses of learning teachers of all kinds (cf. Acts xv. 24; 1 Tim. i. 6, 7). The following would not have been said unless there had been great danger of Jews being influenced by the doctrines condemned: "All Israelites have their part in the world to come, . . . but the following (Israelites) have no part therein,—he who denies that the Resurrection is a doctrine the foundation of which is in the Bible, he who denies the divine origin of the Torah, and (he who is) an Epicurean" (Sanh., xi. 1; cf. where the custom of Jews, and especially of Hellenistic Jews, of permitting teachers of various kinds to enter their Synagogues and ex- pound their views, was not likely to have been abrogated when they became Chris- tians, which was in itself a sign of greater liberal-mindedness. The *βαβερασμός*, therefore, in the verse before us, must, it is held, be interpreted in the sense of what has been said. The whole passage is exceedingly interesting as throwing detailed light upon the methods of contro- versy in these Diaspora Synagogues; feeling seems to have run high, as was natural, mutual abuse was evidently poured forth without stint, judging from the stern words of rebuke which the writer has to use (ver. 5). On the *βαβερασμός* in the early Church see Harnack, *Expansion* . . . i. pp. 420-462. — 186. —
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1 Lat. KLP, curs., sumitis Vulg. (accipiemus ff).
2 Non erat ff.
3 Add erit ff.
4 *Autem autem* KLP, curs., Cyr., Thl.; add in Cud.
5 *eic. non (om. Inap NUPLE); b CP, curs., Syr.; add Thl.; Στίς NUPLE Pesh.
6 ὁ τοῦ τούτος Α, curs., Pesh., Syr.; Arm.
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tὸ σῶμα αὐτῶν μετάγωμεν, 1 4. ἰδοὺ 2 καὶ τὰ πλοῖα, τηλεκαθά 3 h Acts xxvii. 40. δότα καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων σκληρῶν 4 Ἐλαυνόμενα, μετάγωμεν ὡς κλαθοῦσών i Acts xiv. 4. ἰπδαλλιοῦ 5 ὅποιον 6 ἢ ἵ ὀρκὴ 7 τοῦ εὐθύνοντος βουλεύεις 8. 5. οὐ- τῶς 9 καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα μικρὸν μέλος ἐστιν καὶ 10 μεγάλα 11 αὐχεῖ. 10 ἰδοῦ ἡλίκος 11 πῦρ ἡλίκην διήν ἀνάπτει· 6. καὶ 12 ἡ γλῶσσα 13 πῦρ, 14 ἐὰν 1 Cf. i. 26; 2 Prov. xvi. 27; Sir. viii. 8; cf. Prov. xii. 18, xv. 1, 2.

1 μεταγόμεν αὐτῶν A, 13. 2 ἐδει. 24. 3 Pr. τα B.

4 Pr. tam ff; σκλῆρων αὐτῶν AL, cursa.
5— 5 Et ubicumque diriguntur volumptate eorum qui eas gubemant ff.
6 Add aν ACKLP, cursa., Thl., Oec., Tregmg, rec.
7 Ὁμ. τὴν ὁρκὴ τ. 8 βουλεύεις ACKP; βουλεύθης 13.
8 ὁσαντες A, 5. 10—16 μεγαλανχεῖς ΝCKL, cursa., Thl., Oec.
10 Ὁμ. Ν1. 13 Ti. punctuates thus: ἀνάπτει ἡ γλῶσσα.
11 Weiss punctuates: πῦρ.

τὸν χαλλων τοῦ Ιησου, Zech. xiv. 20. Cf. Ps. xcviii. 9" (Mayor). Knowing draws attention to Philo who "speaks of the easy way in which the horse, the most spirited of animals, is led when bridled, De Mundi Opif., p. 198".— καὶ δὲ το σμα . . . Cf. what was said in the preceding verse.

Ver. 4. τὴλεκαθά: Cf. 2 Cor. i. 10; Heb. ii. 3; Rev. xvi. 18, the only other N.T. passages in which the word occurs.—πῆθαλον: only elsewhere in N.T. in Acts xxvii. 40.—διὶ ὁ: only elsewhere in the N.T. in Acts xiv. 5, used there, however, in the sense of a rush of people. The graphic picture in this verse gives the impression that the writer gives the result of personal observation.

Ver. 5. η γῆς . . . For this idea of the independent action of a member of the body taken as though personality were attached to it see Matt. v. 29, 30, xv. 19; it is quite in the Hebrew style, cf. in the O.T. the same thing in connection with anthropomorphic expressions. Moffatt (Expository Times, xiv. p. 568) draws attention to Plutarch's essay, De Garrulitate, 10, where the union of similar nautical and igneous metaphors (as in Jas. iii. 4-6) is found; "the moralist speaks first of speech as beyond control once it is uttered, like a ship which has broken loose from its anchorage. But in the following sentence, he comes nearer to the idea of James by quoting from a fragment of Euripides these lines:—

Μικρὸς γὰρ ἐκ λαμπτῆρος ἰδαίων λέγεις Πρῶτον ἐν τιν· καὶ πρὸς ἄνθρωπον εὐθὺς ἐστίν. Πῶς εἶσιν ἐν αὐτοὶ πάντες."—

καὶ μεγάλα αὔχει: ἐν. λεγ. in N.T.; the same would apply to the alternative reading (see critical note above) μεγαλανχεῖ. In Sir. xlivii. 18 we have, καὶ μεγαλανχεῖσον ὑπερήφανεν αὐτῶν. Mayor most truly remarks: "There is no idea of vain boasting, the whole argument turns upon the reality of the power which the tongue possesses"; this fully bears out what has been implied above, that this section has for its object the attempt to pacify the bitterness which had arisen in certain Synagogues of the Diaspora owing to controversies aroused by the harangues of various "teachers".—ἰδοὺ ἡλίκος πῦρ ἡλίκην διήν ἀνά- πτει: at the risk of being charged with fancifulness the surmise may be permitted as to whether this picture was not suggested by the sight of an excited audience in some place of meeting; when an Eastern audience has been aroused to a high pitch, the noise of tongues, and gesticulation of the arms occasioned by the discussion following upon the oration which has been delivered, might most aptly be compared to a forest fire; the tongue of one speaker has set ablaze all the inflammable material which controversy brings into being. The possibility that the writer had something of this kind in his mind should not be altogether excluded.—ἀνάπτει occurs in the N.T. elsewhere only in Luke xii. 49; Taylor (quoted by Mayor) says: "On fires kindled by the tongue see Midr. Rabb. on Lev. (xiv. 2) xvi. where the words are almost the same as those in St. James, quanta incendia lingua excitat!" 

Ver. 6. See critical note above for suggested differences in punctuation.—
In this Epistle κόσμος is always used in a bad sense, i.e., iv. 4. In the Septuagint δ κόσμος is several times the rendering of the Hebrew הים, "host" (of heaven, i.e., the stars, etc.), see Gen. ii. 1: Deut. iv. 19, xvii. 3; there is no Hebrew word which corresponds to κόσμος, properly speaking; and it would therefore be no matter of surprise if a Jew with a knowledge of Hebrew should use κόσμος in a loose sense. In the N.T. αλευρόν is often used in the same sense as κόσμος, e.g., Matt. xlii. 32; Mark iv. 19; Eph. i. 21, of this world; here again it is mostly in an evil sense in which it is referred to, whether as αλευρόν or κόσμος. It is, therefore, possible that κόσμος might be used in the sense of αλευρόν, by a Jew, but as referring to a sphere not in the present world, Schegg (quoted by Mayor) interprets the phrase, "the sphere or domain of iniquity," and though this is not the natural meaning of κόσμος, this cannot be urged as an insuperable objection to his interpretation; we are dealing with the work of an Oriental, and a Jew, in an age long ago, and we must not look for strict accuracy. If κόσμος may be regarded as being used in the sense of αλευρόν, which is applicable to this world or to the world to come, then Schegg's "domain of iniquity" might refer to a sphere in the next world. When it is further noticed that the tongue is called "fire," and that this fire has been kindled by η γένες, the place of burning, it becomes possible to regard the words δ κόσμος τής ἐδικαίας as a symbolic expression of Gehenna (see further below, under τής γένες).—καθίσταται: "is set," i.e., "is constituted," "place"; in the Septuagint τής γένες means a "stain," cf. Jude 23. —κοιλία: "nether," in N.T., cf. Wisd. iii. 28. —δοχεῖα: "victims," "the wheel of nature," i.e., the whole circle of innate passions; the meaning is that this wrong use of the tongue engenders jealousy, and faction, and every vile deed, cf. ver. 16. For the different interpretations of the phrase see Mayor. —παραδοξος: "contradictory," "the wicked" in Jewish theology two ideas regarding the fate of the wicked hereafter existed, at one time, concurrently; according to the one, Hades (Sheol) was the place to which the spirits of all men, good as well as bad, went after death; at the resurrection, the good men arose and dwelt in glory, while the wicked remained in Sheol. According to a more developed belief, the place of the departed was not the same for the good and the bad; the former went to a place of rest, and awaited the final resurrection, while the latter went to a place of torment; after the
resurrection the good enter into eternal bliss, the wicked into eternal woe, but whether these latter continue in the same place in which they had hitherto been, or whether it is a different place of torment, is not clear. A realistic conception of the place of torment arose when the “Valley of Hinnom” (ὴ τῆς ἕλμος), was pointed out as the place in which the spirits of the wicked suffered; but very soon this conception became spiritualised, and there arose the belief that the Valley of Hinnom was only the type of what actually existed in the next world. The fire which burned in the Valley of Hinnom was likewise transferred to the next world; hence the phrases: γῆνα τοῦ πυρός, κάμνον τοῦ πυρός, etc. Cf. iv. Esdr. vii. 36; Rev. ix. 1, etc.

Ver. 9. ἐν ἀντιό: this is Hebrew usage, cf. εἰ πατέρας εἰ μεγαλή<

To be distinguished from the “Abinu Malkenu” prayer used in the penitential portion of the Jewish Liturgy.
Πιστεύεται γνωστά ότι ο θείος αυτός στόματος έχεται ευλογία και κατάρα. Ο χρήματι Αβελάκος μου, ταύτα ούτως γενέσθαι. Η μάτι της προφητείας της Αόριστης "Αν θυσία κατά το γλυκό καί το πικρόν; 12. Η μάτι άνθρωπος, Αβελάκος μου, συκή άλλοις τούς ή αμφοτέροις σώκα; 1 ούτε Αλυσίδος έναλυκόν έντονης Ιδιωτικά.


* Ομ. K., cursus; pr. σ. 7, cursus.

Πιστεύεται γνωστά ότι ο θείος αυτός στόματος έχεται ευλογία και κατάρα. Ο χρήματι Αβελάκος μου, ταύτα ούτως γενέσθαι. Η μάτι της προφητείας της Αόριστης "Αν θυσία κατά το γλυκό καί το πικρόν; 12. Η μάτι άνθρωπος, Αβελάκος μου, συκή άλλοις τούς ή αμφοτέροις σώκα; 1 ούτε Αλυσίδος έναλυκόν έντονης Ιδιωτικά.

Ver. 10. Εκ τού αυτού στόματος: Η αναγκαιότητα αυτής στομάτων έργομαι ευλογία και κατάρα. Ο χρήματι Αβελάκος μου, ταύτα ούτως γενέσθαι. Η μάτι της προφητείας της Αόριστης "Αν θυσία κατά το γλυκό καί το πικρόν; 12. Η μάτι άνθρωπος, Αβελάκος μου, συκή άλλοις τούς ή αμφοτέροις σώκα; 1 ούτε Αλυσίδος έναλυκόν έντονης Ιδιωτικά.

Ver. 11. Η μάτι της προφητείας "Αν θυσία κατά το γλυκό καί το πικρόν; 12. Η μάτι άνθρωπος, Αβελάκος μου, συκή άλλοις τούς ή αμφοτέροις σώκα; 1 ούτε Αλυσίδος έναλυκόν έντονης Ιδιωτικά.

Ver. 12. Η μάτι της προφητείας "Αν θυσία κατά το γλυκό καί το πικρόν; 12. Η μάτι άνθρωπος, Αβελάκος μου, συκή άλλοις τούς ή αμφοτέροις σώκα; 1 ούτε Αλυσίδος έναλυκόν έντονης Ιδιωτικά.

Ver. 13. Τα "σφόδρα και επιπλώμενοι έν οίμοί; Η δε οίκτοτα πεί της καλής
to the self-respect of his hearers. σοφός and ἐνυπνήμον (the latter does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.) are connected in Deut. i. 13, where in reference to judges it is said, δόθη αὐτοῖς ἄνδρα σοφοῦ καὶ ἐνυπνήμονα καὶ συντονίσαο, cf. Deut. iv. 6; v. 17. — Deucal καλής ἡ ἀναστροφή: cf. 1 Pet. ii. 12. ἀναστροφή is literally a "turning back," but later connotes "manner of life." Cf. a quotation from an inscription from Pergamos (belonging to the second century B.C.) given by Deissmann, in which it is said concerning one of the royal officials: ἐν τῷ καλῷ ἄνδρῳ ἄνδρασ καὶ ἄνδρας ἄναστροφον (op. cit., p. 83). — ἐν πραΰτητι σοφίας: cf. with the whole of this verse Sir. iii. 17, 18, Τάκτων, ἐν πραΰτητι τὰ ἔργα του διδάσκων, καὶ ὡς ἄνδρον διδόντος ἄνδρος πράττων. "Οὐν μέγας εἶ, τοποῦτοι τεκνινοὶ σπονδαρίων καὶ ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων διδόντος ἄνθρωπον χάριν. The pride of knowledge is always a subtle evil, cf. 1 Cor. viii. x.

Ver. 14. ις δὲ Ἰησοῦς πικρὸν ἐχετε καὶ ἐρίθεαι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν: This makes it quite clear that what has been referred to all along is controversy, not the use of the tongue which the writer has been reproving is the personal abuse which had been heaped upon one another by the partisans of rival schools of thought. Ἰησοῦς is mostly used in a bad sense in the N.T., though the opposite is sometimes the case (e.g., 2 Cor. xi. 2; Gal. i. 14); the intensity of feeling which had been aroused among those to whom the Epistle was addressed is seen by the words Ιησοῦς πικρόν, with the latter word in an emphatic position; they form a striking contrast to πράΰτητι σοφίας. The word ἐρίθεαι, derived from ἐρίθω "a hireling," means "party-spirit." — ἡ κατακαυχάσθη: the malicious triumphing at the least point of vantage gained by one party was just the thing calculated to embitter the other side; this was a real "lying against the truth," because such petty triumphs are often gained at the expense of truth.

Ver. 15. οὐκ ἐστιν ἀβία ἡ σοφία ἐνθεωρητὴ: The wisdom referred to,—acute argument, subtle distinctions, clever controversy, methods which took small account of truth so long as a temporary point was gained, skillful dialectics, bitter sarcasms, the more enjoyed and triumphed in if the poisonous shaft came home and rankled in the breast of the opponent,—in short, all those tricks of the unscrupulous controversialist which are none the less contemptible for being clever,—this was wisdom of a certain kind; but, as expressed by the writer of the Epistle with such extraordinary accuracy, it was earthly (ἐνθεωρήμα) as opposed to the wisdom which came down from above, it was human (φυσικὴ ἢ παρθένου ἡμῶν, the domain wherein all that is essentially human holds sway) in that it pandered to self-esteem, and it was demoniacal (δαίμονις ἡμῶν) in that it raised up the "very devil" in the hearts of both opposer and opposed. Nowhere is the keen knowledge of human nature, which is so characteristic of the writer, more strikingly di-played than in these vv. 15, 16.

Ver. 16. τῶν φαύλων τράγυμα: this sums up the matter; cf. John iii. 20, τῷ γὰρ ἐφαύλιοι πράσσον μισεῖ τὸ φῶς, and with this one might compare again the words in our Epistle, i. 17, τῶν δόξας ἐγαθία... ἐνθεωρήτων καταβαλόν τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φῶν.
III. 17—18. IV.

I AKΩBOY

17. ἂ δὲ ἀνωθεν ἑσοφία πρῶτον μὲν ἀγάθῃ ἔστιν, ἐπειτα ἐφίλημα, ἐπικείμην, ἐπικείμην, μετῆς ὁδόν, καὶ καρτῶν ἄγαδων, ἀδικεῖται, ἀνκάκερτος, ἀνκάκερτος. 18. ἀκραῖα δὲ δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' ἐφίλημα στείρεται τοῖς πεζοῦσι εἰρήνην. 1

IV. 1. ΠΟΘΕΝ ἡ πόλεμοι καὶ πόδες μᾶχαι εἰς ὀμίων; οὐκ ἐστε- 2

1 Dei ff. + Bonis consentiens Vulg. (om. Vulg.).
2 Pr. καὶ KL, cursus., Thl., Oec., rec.; pr. inexplorabiliis ff.
4 Om. KL, cursus., Vulg., rec.

Ver. 17. ἂ δὲ ἀνωθεν ἑσοφία: the divine character of wisdom is beautifully expressed in Wisd. vii. 25, ἀγάθη ἔστιν τῆς τῶν Θεοῦ πνεύματος, καὶ ἀνωθεν ἐστιν τῆς τῶν παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰκαρθύ. the prayer is uttered that God would send forth wisdom "out of the holy heavens . . ."; of that which is thus holy the first characteristic would be purity, the two ideas are inseparable; it is also possible that in the mind of the writer there was the thought of the contrast between purity and the sin which he knew some of his hearers to be guilty of (see above, the notes on i. 12 ff., iv. 3, 4). the only elsewhere in the N.T. in Heb. xii. 11; cf. Prov. iii. 17, where it is said of wisdom that "all her paths are peace". The word is evidently chosen to emphasise the strife referred to in an earlier verse; the word is meant as a contrast to unfair, unreasonable argument, cf. Ps. of Sol. v. 14,—ἔπειθής: this word, again, implies a contrast to the unbending attitude of self-centred controversialists; it does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.—ποταμῷ: the exact reverse of the cursing and bitterness of which some had already been convicted; in Wisd. vii. 22, 23, wisdom is spoken of as having a spirit which is: ψευδάρχον . . . ψευδάρχον.—ἀνωθεν ἑσοφίας: Cf. εὐαγγελισμοι above (i. 6, ii. 4) which, as Mayor points out, makes it probable that we must understand the adjective here in the sense of "single-minded"; perhaps one might say that here it means almost "generous," in contrast to the unfair imputations which might be made in acrimonious discussion; the word occurs here only in the N.T.—ἀνωθεν ἑσοφίας: Cf. 1 Pet. i. 22; "genuine," as contrasted with the spurious "earthly" wisdom.

Ver. 18. The keynote of this verse is peace, as contrasted with the jealousy, faction and confusion mentioned above; peace and righteousness belong together, they are the result of true wisdom, the wisdom that is from above; on the other hand, strife and "every vile deed" belong together, and they are the result of the wisdom that is "earthly, ψευδάρχον, demoniacal."

Chapter IV.—Vv. 1 ff. These verses reveal an appalling state of moral depravity in these Diaspora congregations; strife, self-indulgence, lust, murder, covetousness, adultery, envy, pride and slander are rife; the conception of the nature of prayer seems to have been altogether wrong among these people, and they appear to be given over wholly to a life of pleasure. It must have been terrible for the writer to contemplate such a sink of iniquity. On the assumption, therefore, of unity of authorship for this Epistle, it is absolutely incomprehensible how, in view of such an awful state of affairs, the writer could commence his Epistle with the words: Hebrews ii. 1: "For he which saith, Do not commit adultery, said also Do not kill . . ." as figurative also? And i. 14, 15? Cf. Acts xx. 20, 29. Moreover, it is one of
the characteristics of the writer that he speaks straight to the point. It is true that in the O.T. adultery is sometimes used in a figurative sense, meaning unfaithfulness to Jahwe; but it is well to remember that such a use is quite exceptional; out of the thirty-one passages in which adultery is spoken of, in only five is a figurative sense found. In the N.T. there are only two possible cases of a figurative use apart from the verse before us (Matt. xii. 39 = xvi. 4, Mark viii. 38). The word "to commit fornication" (πορνεύομαι) occurs often, in the O.T., in a figurative sense; but in comparison with the vasty larger instances of a literal sense, the former must be regarded as exceptional. But even granting that this particular word is figuratively used, there is still a terrible list of other sins, the meaning of which cannot be explained away; these are more than sufficient to bear witness to the truly awful moral condition of those to whom the Epistle is addressed. On the assumption of an early date for our Epistle, the low state of morals here depicted is extremely difficult to account for. In a community which had recently received and accepted the new faith, with its very high ideals, one would naturally look for some signs of a new moral seal, some conception of the meaning of Christianity, some reflex of the example of the Founder; religious strife, owing to a mistaken zeal, one can understand; isolated cases of moral delinquency are almost to be expected; but the collective wickedness of a newly born Christian community,—this would be quite incomprehensible; and it is clear from the verses before us that the writer is not singing out exceptions. In a second or third generation the community living among heathen surroundings might conceivably become so contaminated as to have lost its genuinely Christian character; with the lapse of years there is an inevitable tendency to deteriorate, until a new spirit of discipline is infused. It seems more in accordance with known facts, and with common-sense, to regard the people to whom this Epistle (or part of it) was addressed as those who had deteriorated from the high ideal set by their fathers and grandfathers, and to see in the writer one who sought to inspire a new sense of discipline and morals into the hearts of this Jewish-Christian brethren.—Vv. 1-10 form a self-contained whole, dealing with the general state of moral depravity in the community (presumably the writer has more particularly one community in view), and ending with a call to repentance. Vv. 11-12 form another independent section, belonging in substance to ii. 1-13. Vv. 13-17 form again a separate section without any reference to what precedes or follows.

Ver. 1. πάλιμπος καὶ μάχαιρα: the former refers to the permanent state of enmity, which every now and then breaks out into the latter; like war and battles. — ἐν ἐλπίδι: comprehensive. — ἄπωθαίνειν: lays special stress on the place of origin, which is seen in the following words: εἰ τὸν φθονὸν φιλοῦν: φθονός is sometimes used of the lusts of the flesh, e.g., in the Letter of Aristæus (Swete, Intro. to O.T. in Greek, p. 567), in answer to the question: "Why do not the majority of men take possession of virtue?" it is said: "Οὔτε φυσικῷς ἐκπαινεῖται ἀκρατείας καὶ τῷ τῶν ἤλθαν τρεπόμενον γεγονόταν. Cf. 4 Macc. vi. 35; Luke viii. 14; Tit. iii. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 13. — τὸν στρατηγοῦν 

Vv. 2, 3. ἐπιθυμεῖτε καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε...: It must be confessed that these verses are very difficult to understand; we have, on the one hand, lustings and coveting, murdering and fighting; and, on the other hand, praying. Murdering and fighting are the means used in order to obtain that which is coveted; yet in the same breath it is said that the reason why the coveted things are not...
obtained is because they are not asked for! Is it intended to be understood that this lust (in the sense, of course, of desiring) and covetousness are not gratified only because they had not been prayed for, or not properly prayed for? This is what the words mean as they stand; but can it ever be justifiable to pray for what is evil? There is something extraordinarily incongruous in the whole passage, which defies explanation if the words are to be taken in their obvious meaning. Only one thing seems clear, and that is a moral condition which is hopelessly chaotic.—Carr says that "these two verses are among the examples of poetical form in this Epistle"; perhaps this gives the key to the solution of the problem. It may be that we have in the whole of these verses 1-10 a string of quotations, not very skillfully strung together—a kind of "Stromateis"—taken from a variety of authorities, in order to make this protest against a disgraceful state of affairs more emphatic and authoritative.—ΦΩΝΕῖΤΕ: the reading ΦΩΝΕῖΤΕ cannot be entertained if any regard is to be paid to MS. authority; even if accepted it would not really simplify matters much.—δὲ ΛΟΥΣΤΑ: refers rather to persons, ἀνθρώπων, to things.

Ver. 3. ἀληθεῖτε... ἀλήθεια: There does not seem to be any difference in meaning between the active and middle here: "If the middle is really the stronger word, we can understand its being brought in just where an effect of contrast can be secured, while in ordinary passages the active would carry as much weight as was needed" (Moulton, op. cit., p. 160); cf. Mark vi. 22-25, x. 35-38; i John v. 15; Χαλαρωθήσετε: Cf. Luke xv. 14, 30; Acts xxii. 24.
"Scripture" is analogous to the transition from the "Bible" to the "Scripture" (ibid., pp. 147 f.). In the present instance the distinction between the O.T. and the "Scripture" is nowhere to be found in the O.T.; it is, however, reflected in some passages of the Epistle of Polycarp (St. Paul, i. 12 = 2 Tim. iv. 8; iv. 5 = Gal. v. 17). But that which is conclusive against the interpretation is the fact that the doctrine of the Spirit is nowhere found in the developed form in which it is represented elsewhere; the pronounced personality of the Spirit as here used is never found in the O.T. The reference here must be to the N.T., and this is one of the many indications which point to the late date of our Epistle, or parts of it. As early a document as the Epistle of Polycarp (St. Paul, i. 12 = 2 Tim. iv. 8; iv. 5 = Gal. v. 17) refers once to the N.T. quotations as "Scripture"; and in the Epistle of Barnabas (about 98 A.D. according to Lightfoot, but regarded as later by most scholars) a N.T. quotation is prefixed by the formula "It is written."—πρὸς θάνον ἔπιστολον εἰπώσθη: on this very difficult text see, for a variety of interpretations, Mayor's elaborate note; the best rendering seems to be that of the R.V. margin: "That Spirit which He made to dwell in us yearneth for us even unto jealous envy". The words witness to the truth that the third Person of the Holy Trinity abides in our hearts striving to acquire the same love for Him on our part which He bears for us. It is a most striking passage which tells of the love of the Holy Spirit, as (in one sense) distinct from that of the Father or that of the Son; in connection with it should be read Rom. viii. 26-38; Eph. iv. 30; I Thess. v. 19.

Ver. 6. μείζονα εἰς διάδοσιν χάριν: these words further emphasise the developed doctrine of the Spirit referred to above; they point to the nature of divine grace, which is almost illimitable. These verses, 5, 6, witness in a striking way to the Christian doctrine of grace, and herein breathe a different spirit from that found in most of the Epistle.—διὰ θεοῦ F. Θεός: Cf. Sir. x. 7, 12, 18; Pet. of Sol. ii. 25, iv. 28; the quotation is also found in 1 Pet. v. 5; taken with the preceding it teaches the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Ephrem Syrus quotes this as a saying of Christ's (Off. iii. 93 E., ed. Assemani; quoted by Resch, op. cit., p. 199).

Ver. 7. ὑπατάγητε οὖν τῷ Θεῷ: Cf. Heb. xii. 9; ov ἀλλὰ ἀλλήλον ὑποταγηματίαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ ἠγίασαν: It is not a question of subjection either to God or the devil, but rather one of the choice between self-will and God's will; it is the proud spirit that has to be curbed.—δέσμη τῆς διαδοχῆς καὶ φυσική τῆς φύσεως: the two ideas contained in these words are very Jewish; in the first place, the withholding of the devil is represented as being within the competence of man; the more specifically Christian way of putting the matter is best seen by comparing the words before us with the two following passages: Luke x. 17, Υποτεθείμενος διὰ ... λέγωντες κύριο, καὶ τὰ σωματία ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ ἐνόμισά σοι. And the passage in 1 Pet. v. 6 ff. which is parallel to the one before us, is prefaced by the words, "Casting all your anxiety upon Him, because He careth for you," and followed by the words, "And the God of all grace ... shall Himself perfect, establish, strengthen you".
difference between the Jewish and Christian doctrines of grace and free will here cannot fail to be observed. It is useless to cite the words, "Be subject unto God," as indicating divine assistance in withstanding the devil, because the subject of thought in either passage is quite independent; the meaning is not that ability to withstand the devil is the result of being subject to God; but two courses of action are enjoined, in each of which man is represented as able to take the initiative. In the second place, the representation of Satan (the devil) here is altogether Jewish; the Hebrew root from which "Satan" comes (.ToInt) means "to oppose," or "to act as an adversary"; the idea is very clearly brought out in Num. xxii. 22, where the noun is used: And the Angel of Jahwe placed himself in the way for an adversary (literally "for a Satan"). This is precisely the picture represented in the words before us; the ancient Hebrew idea of something in the way is to some extent present in the Greek σατανάς, from διαβάλλα, "to throw across," i.e., the pathway is impeded (cf. Eph. iv. 27, vi. 11). Jewish demonology was full of intensely materialistic conceptions; the presence of demons in various guise, or else invisible, was always feared; primarily it was bodily harm that they did; the idea of spiritual evil, as in the passage before us, was later, though both conceptions existed side by side. The words under consideration are possibly an inexact quotation from Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Naphth. viii. 4. "If ye work that which is good my children . . . and the devil shall flee from you." Knowing quotes an interesting parallel in Hermas, Mand., xi. 5, 2, where in connection with the devil it is said, "If ye resist him he will be vanquished, and will flee from you disgraced."

Ver. 8. θείος, καὶ ἀγάπης ὑμῖν: here, again, we have what to Christian ears sounds rather like a reversal of the order of things: we should expect the order to be that expressed in such words as, "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you" (John xiv. 16). The words before us seem to be a quotation (inexact) from Hos. xii. 6 (Sept.), . . . ἐγγίζει τῷ Θεῷ σὺν δυνάμει ὑμῶν. The Hebrew phrase is a technical term for approaching God for the purpose of worship, e.g., Exod. xix. 22; Jer. xxx. 21; Ezek. xiv. 13. There is an extraordinary passage in Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Dan. vi. 1, 2 which runs, "And now fear the Lord, my children, and beware of Satan and his spirits. Draw near unto God and to the angel that intercedeth for you, for he is a mediator between God and man" (the latter part here is not a Christian interpolation).—καθάριστε ἐκτός τῶν διψῶν σου δεν παντοτές. The Hebrew phrase is a technical term for approaching God for the purpose of worship, e.g., Exod. xix. 22; Jer. xxx. 21; Ezek. xiv. 13. There is an extraordinary passage in Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Dan. vi. 1, 2 which runs, "And now fear the Lord, my children, and beware of Satan and his spirits. Draw near unto God and to the angel that intercedeth for you, for he is a mediator between God and man" (the latter part here is not a Christian interpolation).
and in addition to the passages referred to above, i. 8, cf. Barnabas xix. 5, ό δο τε διψυχήσθη, τότε είτε ήπιον είτε κακόν, and the identical words in Did. iv. 4.

Ver. 9. ταλαιπωρήσατε: Δε. lin. J. T. cf. Myr. xvi.; Jer. iv. 13: "undergo hardship"; it was a recognised tenet in Jewish theology that self-inflicted punishment of any kind was a means of reconciliation, e.g., in Mechilta, 70a, the words of Ps. lxxxix. 32 (33 in Heb.), I will visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes, are interpreted to mean that the pain suffered under liberal chastisement is one of the means of reconciliation with God; for instances of how chastisement has reconciled men to God, see Baba mezia, 84 a b.—ιρεψφρετε καὶ φωστερεία: these words are found together in 2 Esdras xviii. 9 (= Neh. viii. 9); and in Luke vi. 25 we have, οὐαί εἰς τοὺς γηραίους τοῖς μέμποροι καὶ καλούστατα. Repentance (καθάρισμα) was, according to Jewish teaching, also in itself another of the means of reconciliation.—ό γάλα τῆς άγνοιας τῶν πάντων μετατραπής: μετατραπ. in N.T.; cf. Am. viii. 10, καὶ μετατρέψας τὰς δορὰς τῶν ἑαυτῶν καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸι καθάρισμα: Cf. Jer. xvi. 9; Prov. xiv. 13; the words express the contrast between the loud unseemly gaiety of the pleasure-seeker, and the subdued mien and downcast look of the penitent. Καθάρισμα occurs only here in the N.T.; it is often found in Philo.

Ver 10. ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ψέψεις ἡμᾶς: Cf. Sir. ii. 17, οἱ φθοροῦντες Κυρίου ἐφομένους, καὶ καθαρίζοντες καὶ τινίτων αὐτῶν τὴν ψυχήν αὐτῶν, and cf. iii. 18; in the Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Jos. xviii. 1, we read, "If ye also, therefore, walk in the commandments of the Lord, my children, He will exalt you there (i.e., on high), and will bless you with good things for ever and ever". Although the actual word is not mentioned in these vv. 7-10, it is obvious that they constitute a call to repentance. Both as establishing a proper relationship towards God, and as a means of bringing about that relationship, the need of repentance had always been greatly insisted on by Jewish teachers; in Pirke Aboth, e.g., iv. 15, it is said, "Repentance and good works are as a shield against punishment"; and Taylor quotes Berachoth, 17a, "It was a commonplace in the mouth of Raba that, The perfection of wisdom is repentance," cf. Bereshith Rabba, lv.; Nedarm, 32b, etc., etc.

Vv. xi, xii. The subject of these verses, speaking against and judging others, is the same as that of the section ii. 1-13; they follow on quite naturally after vv. 7, 13 of that chapter, while they have nothing to do with the context in which they now stand. They constitute a weaving together of several quotations, much after the style of the section which precedes.

Ver. xi. Μὴ καταλαλείπετε ἀληθέους, αδελφοῖς, etc.: this speaking against one another must be taken together with the judging of one another; it is a question of deciding who is and who is not observing the Torah; some of the brethren were evidently arrogating to themselves the right of settling what did and what did not constitute obedience to the Torah, and those who, according to the idea of the former, were not keeping the Torah, were denounced and spoken against. Difficulties of this kind were bound to be constantly arising in a community of Jewish Christians; if unnumbered differences of opinion with regard to legal observances was characteristic,
as we know it to have been, of Rabbinism, it was the most natural thing in the world for Jewish-Christians to differ upon the extent to which they held the Torah to be binding. The writer of the Epistle is finding fault on two counts; firstly, the fact of the brethren speaking against one another at all, and secondly, their presuming to decide what was and what was not Torah-observance. —

Ver. 12. etc ουκ είπεν τοις μιλούντος καὶ κρίνει τόμον: the reason why speaking against and judging a brother is equivalent to doing the same to the Law is because the Law has been misinterpreted and misapplied; the Law had, in fact, been maligned; it had been made out to be something that it was not. It is not a general principle, therefore, which is being laid down here, but a specific case, which is referred to here. —

Ver. 13. etc Αὐγε ὦι οἱ λέγοντες: οὐχ οἱ κρίνοντες οὐκ οἱ πορευόμενοι ἐν καθαρτίᾳ: a good instance of the Diaspora-Jew going from city to city occurs in Josephus, Anticf., xii. 2-5 (160-185), though the period dealt with is far anterior to that of our Epistle. Egypt was, of course, the greatest centre of attraction, and many wealthy Jews were to be numbered among the large Jewish population of
Alexandria: Philo speaks of Jewish shipowners and merchants in this city (in Placitum, viii.). When such Jews embraced Christianity there would be, obviously, no reason for them to give up their calling. It must, however, be confessed that both this section and the following read far more naturally as addressed to Jews than to Jewish-Christians.

Ver. 13.—Ἀγέ: this expression of disapproval occurs only here and in v. 1 in the N.T.; although it is used here and there in the Septuagint, it is the rendering of different Hebrew words; one may compare, though it is not the equivalent of דנה, the Aramaic expression of disapproval מיתaleza (“Ah you!” literally “Woe unto you”). ἀγέ is used with either a singular or a plural subject, cf. Jud. xix. 6; 2 Kings iv. 24.—ἐπομαθεὶς ἂν αὐτοῖς ἕρμηνευτὰ: Cf. Prov. xxvii. 1, τί κανέναι τὰ εἰς αὐτόν, οὗ γὰρ γνωστὰ τί τέσσαρα, ἢ ἐπιστήμων. There is a Rabbinical saying, in Sanhed., 106b, which runs: “Care not for the morrow, for ye know not what a day may bring forth. Perhaps he may not be [alive] on the morrow, and so have cared for a world that does not exist for him” (quoted by Ederheim, Life and Times, ii. 539); cf. Luke xii. 16 ff.; xiii. 32, 33.—ἀπορευόμεθα: 2 Pet. ii. 3 is the only other passage in the N.T. in which this word occurs; it means primarily “to travel,” then to travel for the purpose of trading, and finally “to trade” simply.—κερδησομεν: a rare form; “the Attic is κερδόναι, with soror κερδόνιον. Ion. and late Attic κερδοσοκεναι, soror κερδοσοκίον; the latter occurs often in the N.T.” (Mayor).

Ver. 14. οἰνικες οὐκ ἐπιστάσαι: the reading ἐπιστάσαι is not the equivalent of ἔπιστασε, 1 Thes. i. 10; Job vii. 7; Ps. xxxii. 6, 12; xlii. 5; Luke xii. 20; 1 Cor. vii. 31.

1 ἐμπορονσωμεθα KL, curs. 2 κερδησομεν KL, curs. 3 ἐπιστάσαιται P, 68.
5 Add ἀν Ν3AKLP, curs.; Tregmg (WH altern. reading); add autem ff.
6 Om. B. 7 ἢμνων 13, 69, Syrhk, THl; ff runs on without the interrogative.
8 Om. αὐτς γὰρ εστι Ν; om. γαρ A, Vulg., Cop.; momentum enim est ff. Vulg., Cop., Thl. read estiv; AKP, curs. read estai.
9 Om. ν. BP, WH.
10 Pr. & ΛΠ, curs.; & Sah., Thl., Oec.; om. 36, 38, 69, Syrhk, Cop.
m Acts xviil 31; cf. Dan. y 9.  
 1 a Rom. i. 30: 2 Tim. iii. 2: 1 Jeu. ii. 16.


1 ἐλθὼν ΒΡ, 69, α, d, Treg., WH.  
2 ἐστιν ἔξω κ. ἐστιν ἔξω, curss., Cyril., Thl., Oec.; pr. si Vulg. (om. s Vulg).  

4 ἐστιν ἔξω κ. ἐστιν, curss., Thl., Oec. 5 Totum comma deest s.
5 ἐστιν ἔξω κ. ἐστιν, curss., Thl., Oec. 6 ἐστιν ἔξω κ. ἐστιν, curss., Thl., Oec. 7 ἐστιν ἔξω κ. ἐστιν, curss., Thl., Oec.

Ver. 16. νῦν δὲ: "but now," i.e., as things are; cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 6, νῦν δὲ, ἐπειδὴ η λένδα ἔτεις ἐν ταῖς ἐλαζέοντας τῷ θεῷ: those vaunting were, of course, not on account of the thoughts of the divine will, but because of the thoughtlessness which did not take God's will into account, and therefore boasted of the ability of following one's own bent. Both are bad, but conscious opposition to the will of God would, of the two, be worse. ἐλαζέωντας comes from ἐλαζεῖν which is literally a "wanderer," then it comes to mean one who makes pretensions. Cf. Prov. xxvii. 1, μή καταβάνῃ ἐς κύριον, ὁ γὰρ γινώσκει τι τί δέσμευσι ἡ ἐνέστεια: the word occurs only here and in 1 John ii. 16 (ἡ ἐλαζέωντας τοῦ βλέματος) in the N.T.—πάντα κακοχρήστας τοιαύτης: boasting of this kind must be evil because it forgets God, and unduly exalts self.

Ver. 17. Although this verse may be regarded as standing independent of what has preceded, and as being in the form of a more or less inexact quotation, it is quite permissible to take it with what has gone before. Those to whom the words have been addressed had, to some extent, erred through thoughtlessness; now that things have been made quite plain to them, they are in a position to know how to act; if, therefore, in spite of knowing now how to act right, the proper course is neglected, then it is sinful. This seems to be the point of the words of this verse.—The words are perhaps an echo of Luke xii. 47, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ δύο δολοὺς ἅ γενος τὸ δέλμα τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ ἔτιονέρας ἡ ποιεῖσι πρὸς τὸ δέλμα αὐτοῦ διαρθοῦσαι πολλάς. With καλὸν ποιεῖν cf. Gal. vi. 9, τὰ δὲ καλὰ ποιεῖν μὴ ἐνέκαθηρής.—ματρία αὐτῆς ἐν ἑαυτῇ: for the converse of this, namely, doing what is wrong in ignorance—in which case it is excusable—see Acts iii. 17, "And now, brethren, I woit that in ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers": 1 Tim. i. 13, "... and the mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief"—It is, however, quite possible that we have in these words the enunciation of the principle that sins of omission
are as sinful as those of commission; when our Lord says, "... these things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone" (Matt. xxii. 23), it is clear that the sins of omission are regarded as wilful sin equally with those of commission, cf. Matt. xxv. 41-45. There is always a tendency to reckon the things which are left undone as less serious than actually committed sin; this was certainly, though not wholly so, in Judaism. It is exceptional when we read, for example, in 1 Sam. xii. 23, "God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you"; as a rule sins of omission are regarded as venial, according to the Jewish doctrine, and are not punishable. The conception of sin according to Rabbinical ideas is well seen in what is called the 'Ai Chitt (i.e., "For the sin," from the opening words of each sentence in the great Widdui ("Confession") said on Yom Kippur ("the Day of Atonement"); in the long list of sins here, mention is made only of committed sins. In the Jerusalem Talmud (Yoma, viii. 6) it is said that the Day of Atonement brings atonement, even without repentance, for sins of omission; in Pesikta, 78 the words in Zeph. i. 12, "I will search Jerusalem with candles, and I will punish the men . . .", are commented on by saying, "not by daylight, nor with the torch, but with candles, so as not to detect venial sins," among these being sins of omission. Although this is, in the main, the traditional teaching, there are some exceptions to be found, e.g., Shabbath, 54b; "Whosoever is in a position to prevent sins being committed by the members of his household, but refrains from doing so, becomes liable for their sins." The same rule applies to the governor of a town, or even of a whole country" (see Jewish Encycl., xi. 378).

Having regard to the very Jewish character of our Epistle, it is quite possible that in the verse before us the reference is to this subject of sins of omission. Escatological thought comprises five distinct sections; of great interest is the fact that the first two—1-6, 7-11—deal respectively with Jewish and Christian Eschatology; this subject will be dealt with presently; ver. 12 is a short section containing an adaptation of some words from the "Sermon on the Mount"; 13-18 deals with the subject of the visitation of the sick in the early Church; while vv. 19, 20 bring the Epistle to an abrupt termination with a very pronounced utterance upon the Jewish doctrine of works. Each of these sections is self-contained, and it would be impossible to have a clearer or more pointed illustration than this chapter offers of the "patchwork" character of our Epistle.

It will not be necessary, in dealing with the very large subject of Jewish Eschatology, to do more than indicate very briefly its connection with the section vv. 1-6 of this chapter; at the same time, a slight reference to its leading ideas is essential, as some of these are referred in this passage; one of these is the punishment about to overtake the wicked—who are often identified with the rich—in the "last days." Jewish Eschatology, or the "Doctrine of the last things," is based on the teaching of the O.T. prophets regarding the "Day of the Lord," or, as the phrase runs, the "last day," or "last time"; another formula which occurs frequently is "in those days." By the time of the New Testament period Judaism was in possession of most, if not all, of its eschatological ideas. These had been developed during the two eventful centuries that immediately preceded the rise of Christianity. It was these centuries which saw the rise of the Apocalyptic Movement with its vast eschatological developments that were essentially bound up with the doctrine of a future life, and a belief in a judgment after death, with rewards and punishments" (Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 212). The four outstanding subjects that the doctrine of the last things comprises are: (1) The signs of the approach of the "Messianic Era"—this latter took the place of the "Day of the Lord" in the development of eschatological thought, (2) the actual advent of the Messiah, together with the great events that should then come to pass, viz., the ingathering of Israel and the resurrection of the dead; (3) The judgment upon the wicked; (4) The blessedness of the righteous (Cf. the writer's The Doctrine of the Last Things). In
the passage before us (vv. 1-6) three of the above are referred to, viz., the Messianic Era; the punishment of the wicked, and (implicitly) the blessedness of the righteous. In ver. 3 the phrase ἐν ἁμαρτίαις points indubitably to the times of the Messiah; the language is that of Jewish Eschatology based on prophetic teaching (cf. Isa. iii. 2; Mic. iv. 1; Hosea iii. 5; Joel iii. 1; Am. viii. 11, ix. 11; Zech. viii. 23). In vv. 1, 3 the punishment of the wicked is referred in the words, ἀλάλογον ἀλάλογον ἐν ταῖς ἀπερισκήμενας τοῖς ἄγαθοις... thus illustrating this cf. Book of Enoch xcvii. 8, "Woe unto you mighty who violently oppress the righteous, for the day of your destruction will come; in that time many happy days will come for the righteous, then shall ye be condemned"; xcvii. 8, 9, "Woe to those that build their houses with sin...; and those who acquire gold and silver will perish in judgment suddenly. Woe to you, ye rich, for ye have trusted in your riches... Ye have committed blasphemy and unrighteousness; we become ready for the day of slaughter and the day of darkness and the day of the great judgment"; xcvii. 7, "Woe to you sinners, for ye persecute the righteous...; xcvii. 4, "Woe unto you, ye sinners, for your riches make you appear like the righteous... and this world goeth against you"; many other similar quotations could be given, the striking resemblance in thought and language with our passage cannot fail to be observed; see further below, ver. 1. And lastly, in ver. 6, there is an implicit reference to the happiness of the righteous, in the words, ἐξήγησαν ἰδίος ἡμῶν...; that is to say, the righteous can afford to suffer such ill-treatment because he knows that the time of blessedness is coming for him; this is also frequently referred to in the Book of Enoch, e.g., xcvii. 1. "Be hopeful, ye righteous; for suddenly will the sinners perish before you, and ye will have lordship over them according to your desires; 3. Wherefore, fear not, ye that suffer; for healing will be your portion". The non-mention in our passage of the actual advent of the Messiah by name was characteristic of Jewish usage at certain periods, and is significant here. On the other hand, the section comprising vv. 7-11 is wholly Christian; the utterly different tone and language of this, as compared with the sectional change, be accounted for by saying that the one is addressed to the wicked, the other to the righteous; because in the latter there is a distinct reference to those who are in danger of being judged on account of murmuring against one another (ver. 9). But there are one or two points whereby the respectively Jewish and Christian form of Eschatology may be clearly discerned. (1) The language on which Jewish eschatological ideas are based is that of the prophets; the section vv. 1-6 is steeped in O.T. phraseology; on the other hand, the actual references to the Advent in vv. 7-11 are in N.T. language; the O.T. references in this section have nothing to do with the Advent. (2) It is characteristic of Jewish Eschatology that, generally speaking, there is indefiniteness as to when the Messianic Era will be inaugurated; it differs herein somewhat from the Christian teaching, as a matter of fact, to the rise of apocalyptic conceptions: on the other hand, the Christian, like the prophetic, view of the Advent is that it will take place in the very near future ("... behold the judge standeth at the door"). (3) In Jewish eschatology there is no direct reference to the person of the Messiah; whereas in the Christian section there is frequently depicted without any reference to the personality of the Messiah; on the other hand, in the N.T., it is the rule that when the second Advent is referred to Christ is mentioned under the titles of the "Son of Man" or the "Lord" (cf. Matt. x. 23, xiii. 41, 42, xvi. 27, 28, xix. 28, xxviii. 31-33, etc., Phil. iv. 5, ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἁγίας ἡγγανίζεται, ἡ ἐποίησις τῆς ἑκάστης, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἡμῖν, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐποίησις τῆς ἑκάστης, μεταφοραῖς ὁ καιρὸς ἡγγανίζεται, ἕν τῷ καιρῷ, μεταφορά ἡ ἑγγάνισιν). (4) Besides there being no reference to the personality of the Messiah in the Jewish eschatological section there is the further contrast between it and the Christian section that in the latter the distinctively Christian expression ἡ ἑγγάνισι ποτέ ἡμῶν twice occurs; against this the Jewish section
makes use of the distinctively Jewish title for God, the "Lord of Sabaoth".

It is thus difficult to resist the conclusion that we have here, in the section vv. 1-6, a passage which did not originally belong to the Epistle at all, but was taken or adapted from some Jewish eschatological work; it will be generally acknowledged that this section has absolutely nothing specifically Christian about it. That the writer (compiler?) should have incorporated this in his Epistle is quite natural, seeing that he was writing to Jews; equally as natural is it that he should, as a Christian writer, have developed a Christian form of the same subject, interpersing it with O.T. references for the sake of his hearers [see further, Bk. of Jubilees, i. 29, v. 12, xxiii. 26-30; Enoch, x. 13, xvi. 1; Ass. of Moses, i. 18, x. 13; Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Reuben, vi. 8; Apoc. Bar. xvii. 15, xxix. 8, lvi. 2; 4 Esr. ix. 5].

Ver. 1. "Ayt vvv: See above iv. 13.—καταπνωσές δὲλοΰσσοτες καὶταῖς τακαπνωσαίς ὕμνοι ταῖς περὶχορισμῶναι: according to the original prophetic conception these "signs" which were to overtake the wicked, were to come to pass in the "Day of the Lord," i.e., during the Messianic Era; this belief became extended during the development of ideas which took place during the two centuries preceding the Christian Era. Whatever the reasons were which brought about the belief, it is certain that the expression "those days" came to be applied to a certain period which was immediately to precede the coming of the Messiah; without doubt a number of prophetic passages were regarded as suggesting this (see below). The descriptions given of these "days," which are to foretell the advent of the Messiah, belong to apocalyptic conceptions; their general outline the "signs" of these times are identical. Prophetic passages such as the following laid the foundation: "The iniquity of Ephraim is bound up; his sin is paid for, i.e., the suffering of a travelling woman shall come upon him . . ."; then, on the other hand, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death . . ." (Hos. xiii. 12-14); again, " . . . The day of thy watchmen, even thy visitation, is come; now shall be their perplexity. Trust ye not in a friend, put ye not confidence in a guide . . . for the son dishonoureth the father, the daughter riseth against her mother, . . . a man's enemies are the men of his own house" (Mic. vii. 4-6); another characteristic which played a great part in the later apocalypse is contained in Joel ii. 10 ff., "the earth quaketh before them; the heavens tremble; the sun and the moon are darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining. . . . Cf. Zech. xiv. 6 ff.; Dan. xii. 1, etc., etc. Throughout the immense domain of apocalyptic literature these themes are developed to an enormous extent; they are familiar to us from the Gospels, Matt. xxiv., xxv.; Mark xiii. 24-27; Luke xxi. 9-19. In Jewish literature references to them also occur with frequency; this period is called the time of "travail," and more specifically, the "birth-pangs," or "sufferings" of the Messiah—Cheble ha-Meshiach, or Cheblo shel Mashiach, see Pesikta rab., xxii. 34; Shabbath, 118a; Sanhedrin, 96b, 97a, etc., etc. See further Oesterley, The Doctrine of the Last Things, chap. vii. The great diffusion and immense popularity which the apocalyptic literature enjoyed makes it certain that the writer of our Epistle was familiar with the subject; the "miseries," therefore, referred to in the passage before us may quite possibly have reference to the sufferings which were to take place in the time of travail preceding the actual coming of the Messiah.—δολούσσοτες: only here in the N.T., but fairly frequent in the Septuagint, Isa. xiii. 6; Joel i. 5, 13; Jer. iv. 8, etc.; in the first of these passages the connection is the same as here, . . . ἔγρανεν γὰρ ἔμερα κυρίων, and see Luke vi. 24, "Woe unto you rich . . .," which is strongly reminiscent of the verse before us.

Ver. 2. The use of the Hebraic prophetic perfects in this passage is another mark of Jewish authorship. ἔλεημον ἵνα τίμησι γενήσεται: this cannot refer to wealth in the abstract because this would be out of harmony with the rest of the verse which
speaks of literal destruction; we have here precisely the same idea, as to actual destruction, as that which occurs in the eschatological passage Enoch, xcviii. 1 ff., where in reference to foolish men "in royalty, and in grandeur, and in power, and in silver and in gold, and in purple..." it says that "they will perish thereby together with their possessions and with all their glory and their splendour."—σεσήκων: δεικτικὴ λεγ. in N.T., cf. Sir. xiv. 19, τῶν ἐργαν τομημάτων ἑκάστου.—στήβοτα: δεικτικὴ λεγ. in N.T., cf. Job xiii. 28, διάλογος διὰ τῶν συνθηβρώματων; Sir. xliii. 13, ἀπὸ γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐκτρέφονται σφίξ. For the form of the word cf. συμπληθήσωμεν in Acts xii. 23.

Ver. 3. Κατέστη: in Sir. xii. 11 we have κατέστη διό όσα τὸ τέλος κατέστησαν in reference to a mirror; the Hebrew, which is followed by the Syriac, is corrupt, but evidently read κατέστη which is the same word used in the preceding verse (κατέστη); the Hebrew word may perhaps be used in the sense of "filth" (see Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, s.v.), and possibly this more general term is what was originally intended in the verse before us, since gold cannot strictly be said to rust. The word occurs in one other passage viz., in Sir. xxix. ro, but unfortunately the Hebrew for this is wanting. The force of the κατέστη is intensive.—ὁ λόγος: used in iii. 8 of the poison of the tongue, in a figurative sense; the meaning "rust" is secondary.—ἐλασμένοις δὲ μιν ζήταται: this metaphor is quite in the Hebrew style: יְדִידָם ( = מַעַרְפֵּי) though generally used of persons, is in a pair number of instances used of inanimate things in the O.T.; cf. in the N.T. Mark vi. 11; Luke ix. 5.—φαγεῖται: a Hellenistic form, unclassical, cf. Sir. xxxiii, 23 (Sept.) τῶν βρῶμα φαγεῖται κολλε, cf. xi. 19, xiv. 21 (Sept.).

—τὰς σφακες ὁμῶν: "The plural σφακες is used for the fleshy parts of the body both in classical and later writers ... while the singular σφέξ is used for the whole body" (Mayor); in the Septuagint we meet with a similar phrase in a number of cases, e.g., Mic. iii. 3, καταφέγων τὰς σφακες τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου; 2 Kings ix. 36; in these and other instances the Hebrew תֵּית ( = σφέξ) is always in the singular (unlike "blood", which is often used in the plural).—ὅς τε πῦρ: this comparison must probably have been suggested by the fact that fire, in a literal sense, often figures in apocalyptic pictures, cf., e.g., Enoch, cii. 1, "And in those days when He brings a grievous fire upon you, whither will ye flee, and where will ye find deliverance?" xcviii. 3, where mention is made of "the furnace of fire," x. 13, "the abyss of fire"; this idea arose originally because "Gehenna" was conceived of as the place of torment, and a fire in the literal sense was constantly burning in the valley of Hinnom; the fire in the place of torment is referred to in Matt. xxv. 41 τὸ πῦρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, Mark ix. 44 διὸν ὁ σκότος αὐτῶν ὁ τελευταῖος ταῖς τῶν πυρὸς ἐφοδιασθεῖσι, Jude 7 πυρὸς αὐτῶν ... So Carr's interesting note on ὁ πῦρ εἰς αὐτούς ἐφοδιασθεῖσιν.—ἐν ἡμέραις ἡμέρας: see prefatory note to this chapter.

Ver. 4. Ἐστώ: this interjection, though good Attic, is used by some N.T. writers with a frequency which is unclassical, (Mayor e.g.,) in this short Epistle it occurs six times, while on the other hand St. Paul uses it only nine times (once in a quotation) in the whole of his writings; its frequent occurrence is a mark of Jewish authorship, as Jews were accustomed to the constant use of an equivalent interjection (יוֹרַנֶּר) in their own tongue. —ὁ κύριος τῶν ἐργατῶν: μισθὸς occurs several times in Sir. in the sense
of reward, but not in that of wages due; in the same book ἐργάτης occurs twice (xix. 1, xli. 18), but in neither case with the meaning “agricultural labourer,” which is its usual meaning in the N.T., cf. Matt. ix. 37, but on the other hand Luke x. 7, ἄνθρωπον ἐργάτη τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ. — ἐν ἐργασίαν: ἔντ. ἡγ. in N.T.; whatever difference of meaning there may have been originally between ἐρῶν and ἐργαζόμενος they are used as synonyms in the Septuagint, and the same is true, according to Mayor, of classical Greek.

— τὰς καρπὰς ἑαυτῶν: often, as here, used in the restricted sense of “fields,” cf. for the variety of meaning which it can bear the three instances of its occurrence in Sir. x. 16, xliii. 3, xlvii. 17; for its meaning of “fields,” both in singular and plural, see Luke xii. 16, xli. 21; John iv. 35.— ἄν ἐφραζόμενος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς: “which is kept back by you,” “on your part,” or as Mayor renders as an alternative, “comes too late from you”; the ἐφ' ὑμᾶς is not really required, it is omitted by ff. The withholding of wages due was evidently a sin of frequent occurrence, see Lev. xix. 13; Deut. xxiv. 14, 15; Job xxiv. 10; Mic. iii. 10; Jer. xxii. 13; Prov. iii. 27, 28; Mal. iii. 5; Sir. xxxii. (xxxiv.) 22; Tob. iv. 14.— ἐφερατοχρόνος: only here in N.T.—κρατεῖ: a thoroughly Hebraic idea which occurs several times in the O.T., cf. for the “crying out” of inanimate things, Gen. iv. 10; Job xxiv. 12; Ps. hxxiv. 2; Prov. vii. 1; Lam. ii. 18; Hab. ii. 11.— αἰτιαλοθ: only here in N.T.; cf. Exod. xi. 23; ἐν τὰ ἄτα κυρίου σάββατο: quoted from Isa. v. 9; one of the many marks in this section, vv. 1-6, which suggest that it did not originally belong to the N.T.; it is certainly extraordinary that the usual Septuagint rendering, Κύριος παντοκράτωρ or Χριστός τῶν ὑγίων, is not used here; though it is true σάββατον is sometimes transliterated, it is nevertheless exceptional. “Jahwe Sabaoth” was the ancient Israelite name of Jehovah as war-god.

Ver. 5. ἐφραζόμενος: Ὑπν. ἡγ. in N.T.; it occurs in Sir. xiv. 4 for the Hebrew יְבָרָא which means “to revel,” followed by מ. Luther translates: Ihr habt wohlgefebet, “Ye have lived well”; but the German word “schwelgen” so exactly describes the Greek that one wonders why he did not adopt it; the English “to revel” comes nearest to it, and this is the R.V. rendering of the word in the Sir. passage referred to. ἐφρασίων with its compounds is used in a good as well as in a bad sense; for the former see Ps. xxxvii. 4, 11; Isa. iv. 2, lvii. 11; Neh. ix. 25.— ἄν ἐφρατήθη ἡ γῆ: the contrast is between their enjoyment of the good things of the earth and what their lot is to be hereafter; cf. Luke xvi. 25, “Remember that thou in thy lifetime receivest thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art in anguish”. — ἐφφατοχρόνος: only elsewhere in N.T. in 1 Tim. v. 6; it occurs in Ezek. xvi. 49 of the women of Jerusalem who are compared to those of Sodom; see also Sir. xxi. 15; the compound κατορθάω occurs in Am. vi. 4; Prov. xxix. 21; neither the word itself nor its compound is used in a good sense, expressing as it does the living of a life of wanton self-indulgence. — ἐφραζόμενος τὸς καρπὸς ἑαυτῶν: this use of καρπὸς is thoroughly Hebraic, ἐν being used in a very wide sense in Hebrew, cf. Ps. civ. 15, “... and bread
that strengtheneth man's heart” (םיהמ̄ ימָהֲל), which does not differ from בָּלַע in meaning), cf. Jud. xix. 5. — 4 υποθέσατε το δίκαιον: this expresses what must oftentimes have taken place; the prophetic books often refer to like things; there is no reason for regarding this as some specific case of judicial murder. Cf. Am. ii. 6, 7, v. 12; Wisd. ii. 10 ff. The antithesis between the righteous ("righteous") and the wicked ("wicked") is a commonplace in Jewish theology. — οὐκ ἀντιδιστάσεται ἡμῖν: the statement of fact here, instead of the interrogative as read by some authors, is more natural, and more in accordance with the prophetical style which is so characteristic of this whole passage. This picture of patient acquiescence in ill-treatment is really a very vivid touch, for it shows, on the one hand, that the down-trodden realised the futility of resistance; on the other, that their hopes were centred on the time to come.

With the whole of this section of the words in The first book of Clement, which is called The Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, 12: "The harvest is come, that the guilty may be reaped and the Judge appear suddenly and confront them with their works”. Vv. 7-11. This section 7-11 is a Christian adaptation of the earlier Jewish conception of the Messianic Era; in place of αἱ ἁμαρτίαι τῆς Γης there is ἡ ἁμαρτία τοῦ Κυρίου, the one a specifically Jewish, the other a specifically Christian expression; the two expressions, which represent, as it were, the titles of Jewish and Christian Eschatology respectively, are sufficient to show the difference of these regarding these two sections. It is characteristic of one type of apocalyptic literature that the central figure of the Messiah is not mentioned, while another type lays great emphasis on the Messianic Personality; vv. 1-6 represents the former of these; that it contains no trace of Christian interpolation is the more remarkable in that it is utilised by a Jewish-Christian writer and is incorporated in Christian literature. The fact is additional evidence in favour of its being a quotation.—one of several which our Epistle contains. It is christianised by the addition to the title of vv. 7-11, which, though interspersed with O.T. reminiscences, is specifically Christian. A similar christianising of Jewish material by adding to it is found, though on a much smaller scale, in Rev. xxii. 30, Ἄμην ἡ ἀρχή καὶ ἡ ἐπίστασις, which forms a response to the preceding καὶ ἡ ἐπίστασις. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy (in Encycl. Brit., art. "Mishna") discovered that the Hebrew equivalent of the words "Ἄμην ἡ ἀρχή" indicated acrostically a primitive hymn, which still appears in all the Jewish prayer books, and is known from its opening words as "En Kelohenu ("There is none like our God"); see Singer's The Authorised Daily Prayer
This hymn consists of five verses of four lines each; the first word of each line in the first verse begins with Ν, of the second verse with Ι, of the third with Ι, of the fourth with Ν, and of the fifth with Ο, thus making a four-fold repetition of the formula Ν ὑπὸ 

("Amen, Come"). This formula is the short title of the hymn referred to and it is actually written instead of the hymn in the place where it is to be used after the Additional Service for the New Year, and again towards the conclusion of the additional service for the eighth day of Solemn Assembly... at the end of the Feast of Tabernacles" (Taylor, The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, pp. 78 ff., and see Box in Church and Synagogue, iii., pp. 47 ff.). The formula "Amen Bo" belonged to Jewish Eschatology, and possibly took its origin from the phrase ἐλεϊν ἑρμῆνεια (= "The age to come," a common expression for the Messianic Era); it is Christianised by the Jewish-Christian writer in the Apocalypse by the addition of κρύον ἑρμῆνεια, just as in the passage before us the second, obviously Christian, section v. 7-11, is added on to the former, quite as obviously Jewish, in order to make the whole Christian.

Ver. 7. Μακροθυμεῖ τοῖς αὐτῶν: the verb, as well as the adjective, is used both of God and man, e.g., Rom. ii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 6; it expresses the attitude of mind which is content to wait; when used of God it refers to His long-suffering towards men (e.g., Sir. xviii. 11); it is possible that in the present connection this is also implied in view of ver. 9.— Perhaps οὖν was added in order to join it on to the preceding section; it is omitted by the OL MS. 5— ἐρατοσείων τοῦ Κυρίου: see above, introductory words to this section. Παρουσία does not occur in the Septuagint, being (with τοῦ Κυρίου) specifically Christian; but with τοῦ Θεοῦ, instead of τοῦ Κυρίου, it occurs in Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Jud. xxii. 3, ἐπαρουσία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς λαμπρότητα (the words are omitted in the Armenian Version).— ἐπαρουσία: Cf. Sir. vi. 18; Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Liasch. v. 3 ff.—κρύον: used in the sense of "produce of the soil".— ἔστω λάβη: the context shows that the subject must be "the earth," not "the fruit," for the simple reason that the fruit is not in existence when the "former" rains descend; the great importance of the "former" rains (called both ἀργαλεῖς and ἀργαλεία) was that they moistened the earth (commencing about the month of October) after it had been hardened by the blazing summer sun, and thus enabled it to receive the seed; without the "former" rains to moisten the earth one might as well sow seed on rocks. The subject might possibly be "the husbandman" as he may be said in a certain sense to receive the rain, but the most obvious subject, and that upon which the meaning of the verse most naturally depends, is the earth.—προφίλον καὶ δύσμον: Cf. Deut. xi. 14, and often, ἀργαλεῖα.
The rendering "endurance" has support from the papyri, see Deissmann, *Neue Bibelkritik*, pp. 92 f. — ἡ τοῦ ὑμέρου: although this use of the phrase is paralleled by its use in the papyri (see Deissmann, *Bibellkritik*, pp. 143-5; *Neue Bibelkritik*, pp. 25, 26), it is more probable that in this case it comes through the Septuagint from the Hebrew שָׂפָּה; cf. above ii. 7.

Ver. 11. μακραπίζομεν: Cf. 4 Macc. xviii. 13, used in reference to Daniel.—Ἰδοὺ: Job occupies a high place of honour in post-biblical Jewish literature, cf. the pseudographical work "The Testament of Job".—τοῦ τῶν Κυρίων: the final purpose of Jehovah with regard to Job; it could not refer to Christ, for the whole passage is dealing with O.T. examples.—πολύστηλαγγέλω: ἡ λέγ. in N.T.—οὐδέρρειν: only elsewhere in N.T. in Luke vi. 36; cf. Sir. ii. 11 and often in the Septuagint.

Ver. 12. Πρὸ τῶν...: The most natural way of understanding these words would be to take them in connection with something that immediately preceded, but as there is not the remotest connection between this verse and the section that has gone just before, this is impossible here; the verse must be regarded as the fragment of some larger piece. It is not the only instance in this Epistle of a quotation which has been incorporated, only in this case the fragmentary character is more than usually evident. That it is not a quotation from the Gospel, as we now have it (Matt. v. 33-37), must be obvious, for if it were this, it would unquestionably approximate more closely...
to the original; on the other hand, its general similarity to the Gospel passage proves that there must be a relationship of some kind between the two. Probably both trace their origin to a saying of our Lord's which became modified in transmission, assuming various forms while retaining the essential point. An example of this kind can be seen by comparing together Matt. x. 26; Luke viii. 17 and the fourth of the New Oxyrhynchus Sayings: 

αὐτόν ἔτσι ἔστιν κρίνειν ὅσον τὸ μὴ ἐξουκράνης τῆς δόξης σου καὶ τὸ κεκρυμμένον ἄτομόν σου ἀποκαλυφθέντα,

οὐ γὰρ ἄτομν κρίνειν ὅσον φαινεῖν γίνονται καὶ τομαμάν ὅσα ἐγράφθησαν (Grenfell and Hunt's restoration). In any case the verse before us must originally have been preceded by a context which contained various precepts of which this was regarded as the most important, on account of the words ἑως τῶν πάντων.—μὴ δὲ λαλέσθε . . . : this was a precept enjoined by many of the more devout Jews: Pharisees avoided oaths as much as possible, the Essenes never swore; a very good pre-Christian example of this same precept is contained in Sir.xxiii. 9-11, "Αγρεύο τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς τοῦ θεοῦ, συνεκκλησία, Δέντρα τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἀποκαλύφθησαν . . . Περὶ τῆς ἐπανακατασκευάσεως τῆς ἐκκλησίας . . . —τοιαύτης, Justin Martyr, Ixvii..."; he also quotes Lactantius, Div. Inst., vi. 12: "Aegros quoque quibus defuerit qui ad sistat, curandos fovendosque suscipere summae humanitatis et magnae operationis est" (Expansion . . . l. 147 f. first English ed.). A like care was characteristic of the Rabbis, who declared it to be a duty incumbent upon every Jew to visit and relieve the sick whether they were Jews or Gentiles (Git., 61 a, Sofah, 14 a); "the Haberim, or Hasidic associations, made the performance of this duty a special obligation" (Jewish Encycl., xi. 327).—τοιαύτης: both the words "presbytery" (= "priest") and "ecclesia" were taken over from the Jews, being the Greek equivalents for הַבָּרוֹם and ἡ ἐκκλησία. While, however, the word ἐπισκοπής was, without question, in the Christian Church taken over from the הַבָּרוֹם in the Jewish Church, it is well to recall the extended use which attached to it according to the evidence of the papyri. The phrase ἐπισκοπής τῆς Κυπρίας occurs on a papyrus belonging to the time of the Ptolemies, and is evidently an official title of some kind; τῶν ἐπισκόπων is found together with λεπίς of an idola-
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13. Ἐκαστάθης p 2 Cor. i. 17, 18. 14. Ἑρμ. xiv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 15; Eph. v. 19;

Acts xi. 30. 1 Mark vi. 13; cf. xvi. 18.

11. pr. et ff. 2 Om. τὰ t|ον τοιούτος. 3 Add autum ΝΑΚΛ, cursas. Treg.
trous worship (c. 40 B.C.); and in the second century A.D. the word occurred in reference to "elders" of villages in Egypt. The Septuagint translators were therefore probably using in this case a word which had a well-known technical sense. Deissmann believes it possible, therefore, that the Christian congregations of Asia Minor got the title of presbyteros from the minor officials who were so called, and not necessarily from the Jewish prototype (cf. xi. 22, pp. 153 f.). This might well be the case in various centres, though not all (as for example, Babylonia), of the Diaspora, but not in Palestine. It is, of course, an open question as to whether our Epistle was written from Palestine or not; see, further, Deissmann (Neue Bibelst. pp. 60 ff.). As regards ἐκκλησία, Harnack remarks that "originally it was beyond question a collective term (i.e., ἡ ἐκκλησία); it was the most solemn expression of the Jews for their worship as a collective body, and as such it was taken over by the Christians. But ere long it was applied to the individual communities, and then again to the general meeting for worship... Its acquisition rendered the capture of the term 'synagogue' a superfluity, and once the inner cleavage had taken place, the very neglect of the latter titles served to distinguish Christians sharply from Judaism and its religious gatherings even in terminology... Most important of all, however, was the fact that ἐκκλησία was conceived of, in the first instance, not simply as an earthly but as a heavenly and transcendental entity" (op. cit., pp. 11 ff.); "ἐκκλησία (usually rendered ἐκκλησία in LXX) denotes the community in relation to God, and consequently is more sacred than the properer γραφή (regularly translated by συναναγγελλω in the LXX)... Among the Jews ἐκκλησία lagged far behind συναναγγελλω in practical use, and this was all in favour of the Christians and their adoption of the term" (ibid.). In the verse before us it is the combination of these two terms, ὁ πρεσβύτερος τῆς ἐκκλησίας which points to a developed organisation among the communities of the Diaspora, and therefore to a late date for this part of the Epistle. — ἄμαρτια ἡ πίστεως: a common Jewish usage, see Isa. l. 6; Mark vi. 13; Luke x. 34. As oil was believed to have the effect of curing bodily sickness, so it became customary to use it preparatory to Baptism, possibly with the idea of its healing, sacramentally, the disease of sin; that it was joined to Baptism as an integral part of the sacrament is certain. Prayer was, of course, an indispensable accompaniment. — ι᾿τός: Cf. Mark xvi. 17; Luke x. 17; Acts iii. 6, 16, iv. 10, xvi. 18; and on the formula, the note above, ii. 17.

Ver. 15. ἐγέρσει: for this sense cf. Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 23; John xi. 12. — κάμνοντα: in this sense only here in the N.T., though it is used in a somewhat similar sense in Hebrew xii. 3. — ἀγάπη: it seems most natural to take this as referring to the sick man being raised up from his bed of sickness, though the use of ἀνέβαιν in Heb. xii. 3 suggests the possibility of spiritual comfort being also included. — ὁ κύριος: this must probably refer to Christ, though the O.T. reference in the context would justify the contention that Jehovah is meant. — και: Cf. Mark xvi. 18; Luke xiii. 9, as showing that this does not necessarily mean "even if." — ἐμνήσθησα πρὸς τοὺς ἐκκλησίας ἀφεθήσεται: Cf. Sir. xxxviii. 9, 10, Τίκνον, ἐν ἀριστηματι σου μὴ παρέβλεπε, ἀλλ᾿ ἐνώπιον Κυρίῳ, καὶ κατίστα τον θεοπο άλλον φωλυμέλιαν καὶ συνόν χείρας, καὶ ἄμε τῆς ἀμαρτίας καθόρισον καθαλιν. The Jewish belief on this subject may be illustrated by the following: in Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Simeon, ii. 11 ff., because Simeon continued wrathful against Reuben, he says, "But the Lord restrained me, and withheld from me the power of my hands; for my right hand was half withered for seven days"; in Gad. v. 9 ff. the patriarch confesses that owing to his hatred against Joseph God brought upon
hime a disease of the liver, "and had not the prayers of Jacob my father succoured me, it had hardly failed but my spirit had departed". That sin brings disease was, likewise in the later Jewish literature, an article of faith, indeed here one finds specified what are the particular sicknesses that particular sins bring in their train. According to Rabbinical teaching there are four signs by means of which it is possible to recognise the sin of which a man has been guilty: dropsy is the sign that the sin of fornication has been committed, jaundice that of unquenchable hatred, poverty and humiliation that of pride, liver complaint (?) (חלב) that of back-biting. In Shabbath, 55a, it says: "No death without sin, no chastisement without evil-doing," and in Nedarim, 47a it says: "No recovery without forgiveness". Leprosy may be due to one of eleven sins, but most probably to that of an evil tongue (see Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, pp. 245 f.).

Ver. 16. ἐξομολογίον ... ἀμφιέλας: see critical note above. Confession of sins has always played an important part in Judaism: the O.T. word for confession of sins is ἔφαβην, the later term, which denotes more particularly the liturgical form of confession, is Εἴλας. Private as well as public confession was enjoined, and many forms of confession, both general and particular, exist, among others one for the sick: it was the duty of the Rabbis to urge the sick person to confess his sins. Confession is regarded as a meritorious act: according to Sanhedrin, 103a, it has the effect of enabling the worst sinners to inherit everlasting life (see, among other authorities, Hamburger's *Realencycl. des Judentum*, article "Sündenbekennnisses"). For the custom of the early Church cf. Didache, iv. 14, xiv. 1—προσεύχηθε σέ ὑπὲρ ἄλλων: the need of intercessory prayer is strongly emphasised in O.T., N.T. and the later Jewish literature, see above and the next note.—

Ver. 17. Εἴλας: Elijah plays an immense part in the later Jewish literature, see Hamburger, *cit.*, article "Elias". With his mention here cf. Sir. xlviii. 1 ff.—προσεύχη προσογίαν: Hebraism cf. Luke xxii. 15; John iii. 29, etc., etc.

Ver. 18. With this and the preceding

*This word is sometimes used as meaning praise given to God by the act of confession of sins, cf. Ryle, *Ezra* . . ., p. 132.
verse cf. Ta'anith, 24 b, where we are told of how Rabbi Chaninah, on being caught in a shower of rain, prayed: "Master of the Universe, the whole world is pleased, while Chaninah alone is annoyed"; then the rain immediately ceased. On arriving home he prayed: "Master of the Universe, shall all the world be grieved while Chaninah enjoys his comfort?" Whereupon the rain came down again (see Jewish Encycl., vi. 215).

Ver. 19. Ψάλνθέα: "The passive aorist is used with a middle force in classical writers, as well as in the LXX, Deut. xxxii. 1; Ps. cxix. 176; Ezek. xxxiv. 4." (Mayor). — ἐπιστεύεις: Cf. Mark xii. 14; ... ἀλήθεια, this seems to be the way in which ἀλήθεια is here used, cf. John iii. 32; viii. 32. — ἐπιστεύεις: excepting here (and in the next verse) and Luke i. 16, 17 this word is always used intransitively in the N.T. (cf. however Acts xxvi. 18).

Ver. 20. γινερεστεία: taking this as an indicative one may regard the words that follow as a quotation, a course which commends itself owing to the comparatively large number of quotations with which the Epistle abounds; at the same time it must be remembered that the weight of MS. evidence is in favour of γινερεστεία. — καλέσεστε ... (Hebrew קָלַעַס) cf. x Pet. iv. 8, one of the strongest of the many marks of Jewish authorship which the Epistle contains; according to Jewish doctrine good works balance evil ones; the good work of converting a sinner is reckoned here as one of the most efficacious in obliterating evil deeds; on the whole subject see Introduction IV. § 2.