

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
HANDBOOK
TO THE
EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

BY
DR. GOTTLIEB LÜNEMANN,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GÖTTINGEN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN BY

REV. MAURICE J. EVANS, B.A.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
MDCCCLXXXII.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

THIS Issue completes the Series of

**MEYER'S
COMMENTARIES ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.**

In Twenty Volumes.

ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL, 2 Vols.—ST. MARK and ST. LUKE, 2 Vols.—ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, 2 Vols.—ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, 2 Vols.—ROMANS, 2 Vols.—CORINTHIANS, 2 Vols.—GALATIANS, 1 Vol.—EPHESIANS and PHILEMON, 1 Vol.—PHILIPPIANS and COLOSSIANS, 1 Vol.—THESSALONIANS, Vol.—TIMOTHY and TITUS, 1 Vol.—HEBREWS, 1 Vol.—PETER and JUDE, 1 Vol.—JAMES and JOHN, 1 Vol.

DÜSTERDIECK ON REVELATION

will not be translated in the meantime, as the Publishers have received no encouragement from the Subscribers.

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
COMMENTARY
ON
THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY
HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, TH.D.,
OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

From the German, with the Sanction of the Author.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

BY
DR. GOTTLIEB LÜNEMANN.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
MDCCCLXXXII.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON,

HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, .

GEORGE HERBERT.

NEW YORK,

SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

PREFATORY NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.



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

It will be admitted that the commentary of Lünemann on the Hebrews—of which the first edition appeared in 1855, the second in 1861, the third in 1867, and the fourth, enlarged and greatly improved, in 1874—has claims of a very high order in a grammatical and lexicographical respect. He threads his way with a nice discrimination amidst a multitude of conflicting interpretations, and generally carries conviction with him when he finally gives his own view, or that in which he concurs. Even where, as in the case of some three or four controverted explanations, he may not have weighed the whole argument in favour of an opposite view, he has at least revealed to us the process by which his own conclusion is reached, thereby contributing to place the reader in a position for forming an independent judgment for himself.

The opinions of Dr. Lünemann, as regards the position occupied by the writer of our Epistle towards the Scriptures of the Old Testament, have been expressed with great candour. Unfortunately no one seems to have made the questions here raised a matter for any very prolonged and detailed examination since the time of John Owen. With the eventual answer which shall be given to these questions will stand or fall the claim of Barnabas to the authorship of the Epistle, and many other things besides.

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

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

M. J. E.

EXEGETICAL LITERATURE.



FOR THE GREEK FATHERS.

CRAMER (J. A.), S. T. P. : *Catena Graecorum Patrum.* Tomus vii.
8vo, Oxonii, 1844.

ON THE VULGATE TEXT.

JUSTINIAN (Benedict), † 1622 : *Explanationes in omnes Pauli Epistolas.*
Lugd. 1612.

FRANCISCO DE RIBERA : *Commentary.* 8vo, Col. Agr. 1600.

CLARIO (Isidore) [Clarius] : *Novum Testamentum Latinè, adjectis scholiis.* Authore Isidoro Clario. 8vo, Ant. 1544.

LUDOVICUS DE TENA : *Commentary.* folio, Toleti, 1611.
„ Lond. 1661.

PRIMASIUS, Bishop of Adrumetum, sixth century : *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul.* That on the Hebrews is by some attributed to Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt, † 853.

ON THE GREEK TEXT.

ABRESCH (Peter), Professor at Groningen, † 1812 : *Paraphrasis et Annotationes.* Leyden, 1786–90.
[Continued by Vitranga to end of chap. vii. 1817.]

BAUMGARTEN (S. J.), † 1757, and SEMLER : *Erklärung des Briefes.*
Halle, 1763.

- BIESENTHAL (J. H. R.): *Epistola Pauli ad Hebraeos, cum rabbinico commentario.* Berol. 1857.
- BISPING (A.): *Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Briefen des Ap. Paulus* [vol. iii.]. Münster, 1855-63.
- BLEEK (Franz), † 1859: *Der Brief an die Hebräer.* Berlin, 1828-49.
Der Hebräerbrief erklärt. Edited by Windrath. Elberfeld, 1868.
- BULLINGER (Heinrychus), † 1575: *In omnes Apostolicas Epistolas, Divi videlicet Pauli xiiii. etc. Commentarii.* [P. 639-731.] fol. Tiguri, 1549.
- CAMERON (John), Professor at Saumur, † 1625: *Annotationes in N. T.* Edited by Lewis Cappel. 1628.
- CAPPEL (Jacques), † 1624: *Observationes in Epistolam ad Hebraeos.* 8vo, Sedan, 1624.
- CARPZOV (J. B.), Professor at Helmstädt, † 1803: *Sacrae Exercitationes . . . ex Philone Alexandrino.* 8vo, Helmst. 1750.
- CRAMER (Johann Andreas), Professor at Kiel, † 1788: *Erklärung des Briefes an die Hebräer*, 2 parts. Copenh. 1757.
- DE WETTE (W. M. L.), † 1849: *Kurze Erklärung, etc. Die Briefe an Tit. Tim. und Heb.* [vol. ii. part 5]. Leipz. 1844, *al.*
- DELITZSCH: *Commentar zum Brief an d. Hebr.* Leipz. 1857.
 [Eng. transl., T. & T. Clark, 1868.]
- DICKSON (David), † 1662: *Short Explanation of the Epistle to the Hebrews.* 8vo, Aberdeen, 1649.
 [See also ROMANS.]
- D'OUTREIN (Jan.): *Zendbrief . . . aan de Ebreen, ontleidet, uitgebreed en verklaard.* 1711.
- EERARD (H. A.), Professor at Erlangen: *Commentar über den Hebräerbrief.* Königsberg, 1850.
 [Eng. transl., T. & T. Clark, 1853.]
- EWALD (G. H. A.), Professor at Göttingen, † 1876: *Sendschreiben an die Hebräer.* Götting. 1870.
- GERHARD (John), † 1637: *Commentarius super Epist. ad Hebraeos.* 8vo, Jenae, 1661.
- GOMAR (Francis), Professor at Leyden, † 1641: *Analysis Epistolae Pauli ad Hebraeos. Opera* [pp. 285-380]. Amstel. 1644.
- GOUGE (W.), D.D., † 1653: *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews.* 2 vols. fol. Lond. 1655.
 [Reprinted 1866, 1867.]
- GUERS (E.): *Etude sur l'Épître aux Hébreux.* Genève et Paris, 1862.

- HOFMANN (J. C. K. von), † 1877: Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments. Vol. v. 8vo, Nördlingen, 1873.
- HYPERIUS (Andreas), † 1564: Commentarii in Epistolam D. Pauli Apostoli ad Hebraeos. fol. Tiguri, 1584.
- JONES (W.), D.D.: Commentary on the Epistles to Philemon, Hebrews, and the First and Second Epistles of John. fol. Lond. 1636.
- KLEE (H.): Auslegung des Hebräerbriefs. Mainz, 1833.
- KLUGE: Der Hebräerbrief, Auslegung und Lehrbegriff. Neu-Ruppin, 1863.
- KURTZ (J. H.), Professor at Dorpat: Der Hebräerbrief erklärt. 1869.
- LAWSON (George), Rector of More, Shropshire: Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. fol. Lond. 1662.
- M'CAUL (J. B.), Canon of Rochester: A Paraphrastic Commentary, etc. Lond. 1871.
- MANCHESTER (George Montagu, Duke of): Horae Hebraicae [Heb. i.-iv. 11]. Lond. 1835.
- MENKEN (Gottfried), † 1831: Homilien über das 9^{te} und 10^{te} Kap., nebst einem Anhang etlicher Homilien über Stellen des 12^{ten} Kap. Bremen, 1831.
- MOLL (C. B.): Der Brief an die Hebräer [Lange's series]. Bielefeld, 1861.
[Translated by A. C. Kendrick, D.D. New York, 1871.]
- OECOLAMPADIUS (Joannes), † 1531: In Epistolam ad Hebraeos J. O. explanationes. 4to, Argentorati, 1524.
[From notes taken by some of the hearers.]
- OWEN (John), D.D., † 1683: Exercitationes on the Epistle to the Hebrews. 4 vols. fol. London, 1668-74, *al.*
- PELLICAN (Conrad), † 1556: Commentaria Bibliorum. 9 vols. fol. Tiguri, 1532-42.
[Vol. ix. "in omnes Epistolas."]
- PISCATOR (John), Professor at Herborn, † 1626: Analysis Logica Epistolae Pauli ad Hebraeos. [Commentarii in omnes libros Novi Testamenti, 3d ed. fol. p. 674-718. Herbornae, 1638.]
- REICHE (J. G.): Commentarius Criticus in Novum Testamentum. 3 vols. 4to, Göttingen, 1853-62.
[Vol. iii. In Hebraeos et Catholicas Epistolas.]

REUSS (Ed.): L'Épître aux Hébreux. Essai d'une traduction nouvelle, accompagné d'un commentaire théologique.

Strasbourg, 1862.

RIEHM (E. C. A.): Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs.

Ludwigsb. 1858, 1859.

ROLLOCK (Robert), Principal of the University of Edinburgh, † 1598: *Analysis Logica in Epistolam ad Hebraeos. Accessit brevis et utilis Tractatus de Justificatione.* 8vo, Edinburgi, 1605. [Rollock carried the work only to xi. 6, the rest was finished and edited by Robert Charteris, at Rollock's request.]

SCHLICHTING (Jonas), † 1664, and JOHN CRELL, † 1633: *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos Commentarius.* 8vo, Racoviae, 1634.

SCHMID (Chr. Fr.), † 1778: *Observationes . . . historicae, criticae, theologicae super Epistolam ad Hebraeos.* 8vo, Lips. 1766.

SCHMID (Erasmus), † 1637: *Notae in Novum Testamentum.* 1658.

SCHMIDT (Sebastian), † 1696: *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos Commentarius.* 1690.

STEWART (George): *Argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

8vo, Edin. 1872.

STIER (Rudolf), † 1862: *Der Brief an die Hebräer, in 36 Betrachtungen ausgelegt.* 2 parts. 1842.

STUART (Moses), Professor of Sacred Literature at Andover, † 1852: *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews.* 2 vols.

8vo, 1827, 1828, *al.*

THOLUCK (Andreas), Professor at Halle, † 1877: *Kommentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer.* 8vo [1836], 3d ed. Hamburg, 1850.

VALCKENAER (Lewis Casp.), Professor of Greek at Leyden, † 1785: *Selecta e Scholiis.* Edited by Wassenbergh. Tom. ii.

Amst. 1817.

WALTHER (Michael), Professor at Helmstädt, † 1662: *Gründliche, erdeutliche und ausführliche Erläuterung der . . . Ep. St. Pauli an die Hebräer.* fol. Nürnberg, 1646.

WIESELER (Karl), Professor at Greifswald: *Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief, namentlich seinen Verfasser und seine Leser.*


8vo, Kiel, 1861.

WITTICH (Christoph), Professor at Leyden, † 1687: *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebraeos.* Edited by David Hassel. 1692.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. 1.—THE AUTHOR.

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

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

¹ Comp. H. Thayer, "Authorship and Canonicity of the Epistle to the Hebrews," in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. xxiv., Andov. 1867, p. 681 ff.

an express statement as to the name of the author has come down to us, certainly assigned the epistle to the Apostle Paul. But yet it is to be observed that even he felt called to set aside an objection, which seemed to lie against the justice of this view, namely: that, contrary to the custom of Paul, the author has not, even in an address prefixed to the epistle, mentioned himself by name; whether it was that this difficulty first arose in the mind of Pantænus himself, or that, in opposition to others who had raised it, he wished to show the invalid nature thereof. (Comp. the notice of Clemens Alexandrinus on Pantænus, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 14: "Ἡδὲ δέ, ὡς ὁ μακάριος ἔλεγε πρεσβύτερος, ἐπεὶ ὁ κύριος, ἀπόστολος ὢν τοῦ παντοκράτορος, ἀπεστάλη πρὸς Ἑβραίους, διὰ μετριότητα ὁ Παῦλος, ὡς ἂν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀπεσταλμένος, οὐκ ἐγγράφει ἑαυτὸν Ἑβραίων ἀπόστολον διὰ τε τὴν πρὸς τὸν κύριον τιμὴν διὰ τε τὸ ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλειν, ἔθνων κήρυκα ὄντα καὶ ἀπόστολον.) — Clemens Alexandrinus, too, the disciple of Pantænus (end of the second and beginning of the third century), makes repeated mention of the epistle as a work of the Apostle Paul (*Strom.* ii. p. 420, iv. p. 514 sq., ed. Sylburg, Colon. 1688, *al.*). But yet he does not venture to ascribe it in its present form immediately to Paul. Not only is for him, too, the same objection, which his teacher already had undertaken to set aside, still of sufficient weight for him to attempt its removal in a new, though, it is true, equally unsatisfactory manner; but also the un-Pauline character of the language in the epistle does not escape his glance. Rather to Luke than to Paul does the garb of the letter seem to him to point. On this account he assumes that a Hebrew (Aramaic) original writing of Paul forms the substratum of the epistle, but that our present epistle is only a version or adaptation of that original writing by Luke, designed for Hellenes. (Comp. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 14: Καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους δὲ ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου μὲν εἶναί φησι, γεγράφθαι δὲ Ἑβραίοις Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ, Λουκᾶν δὲ φιλοτίμως αὐτὴν μεθερμηνεύσαντα ἐκδιδόναι τοῖς Ἑλλησιν· ὅθεν τὸν αὐτὸν χρῶτα εὕρισκεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ταύτης τε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν πράξεων μὴ προγεγράφθαι δὲ τὸ Παῦλος ἀπόστολος, εἰκότως. Ἑβραίοις

γάρ, φησίν, ἐπιστέλλων πρύλῃσιν εἰληφύσι κατ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑποπτεύουσιν αὐτὸν συνετῶς πάνν οὐκ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτοὺς τὸ ὄνομα θεός.) — Equally does Origen († 254) make the Epistle to the Hebrews stand, it is true, in some relation to the Apostle Paul, as he accordingly more than once cites passages therefrom as sayings of Paul (*e.g.* *Echort. ad Martyr.* 44, in *Joh.*, ed. Huet. t. ii. p. 56; *ibid.* t. iii. p. 64, t. x. p. 162, *al.*). But not only is he aware that in point of fact deniers of the composition of the epistle by Paul have arisen (οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς οὐ Παύλῳ γεγραμμένην, *Epist. ad African.* c. 9. Comp. also in *Matt.* xxiii. 27 sq.: Sed pone aliquem abdicare epistolam ad Hebraeos, quasi non Pauli); he too, for his own part, is not able to bring himself to recognise the epistle as a work of Paul in the narrower sense. Only the thoughts of the epistle does he ascribe to Paul; the diction and composition, on the other hand, he denies to be his. Since he admits withal that the contents of the epistle are Pauline, he regards the ancient tradition, which traces it back to Paul, as not unfounded; he has therefore no fault to find if a church looks upon the epistle as the work of Paul. By whom, however, it was in reality composed is, he thinks, known only to God. Tradition, he tells us, speaks sometimes of the Roman bishop Clement, sometimes of Luke, as the author. (Comp. the two fragments of the lost homilies of Origen on the Epistle to the Hebrews, preserved in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 25: "Ὅτι ὁ χαρακτήρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τουτέστι τῇ φράσει, ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φράσεων διαφορὰς ὁμολογήσαι ἂν πάλιν τε αὐτὸ ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσιά ἐστι καὶ οὐ δευτέρα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων, καὶ τοῦτο ἂν συμφέσαι εἶναι ἀληθὲς πᾶς ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ. . . Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἶποιμ' ἂν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικά καὶ ὡς περὶ σχολιογραφῆσαντός τινος τὰ εἰρημμένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. Εἴ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκιμεῖτω καὶ

ἐπὶ τούτῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασιν· τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας¹ τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν· ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ὑπὸ τινων μὲν λεγόντων, ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολήν, ὑπὸ τινων δέ, ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις.) — Only subsequently to the time of Origen, accordingly, was the epistle universally regarded within the Alexandrian Church, as within the Egyptian Church in general, as a writing which proceeded immediately from the Apostle Paul. Declarations thereof are appealed to, as simply the words of Paul, by the Alexandrian bishops, Dionysius, about the middle of the third century (in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 41); Alexander, about 312 (in Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 3, Opp. ed. Schulze, tom. iii. p. 736, and in Socrat. *H. E.* i. 6, ed. Vales., Paris 1686, p. 11); Athanasius († 373), in his thirty-ninth *epistola festalis*, and elsewhere; Didymus, the president of the Alexandrian school of catechetes († 395), the Egyptian monks, Macarius the elder, and Marcus Ascetes (c. 400), and others.

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

¹ That ὁ γράψας denotes the actual author, and not, as Olshausen ("De auctore ep. ad Hebr.," in his *Opusce. Theol.*, Berol. 1834, p. 100), Stenglein (*Historische Zeugnisse der vier ersten Jahrhunderte über den Verf. des Br. an die Hebr.*, Bambr. 1835, p. 35), and Delitzsch ("Ueber Verf. und Leser des Hebräerbr.," in *Rudelsbach u. Guericke's Zeitschr. f. die Luth. Theol.* 1849, p. 259), assert, with the assent of Davidson (*Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, vol. I., Lond. 1868, p. 228 f.), the mere "scriba" or "penman," is shown even by the analogy of the closing words: Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις. Wrongly does Delitzsch (in his *Kommentar*, p. xvii.) object that Origen, indeed, concedes to the apostle a part [in its composition], and that Luke also, in the Gospel and the Acts, was working up a material not of his own invention, but one ready to his hand. For the part which Origen assigns to Paul is not an active, but a passive one; that Paul exerted an immediate influence on the writing of the Epistle to the Hebrews, or was directly occupied with the same—of this Origen says nothing; the dependence upon Paul is limited in his estimation to the fact that the epistle was composed by a disciple of Paul, and in the spirit of Paul. By the consideration, however, that Luke in his two works was using a material "ready to his hand," his authorship in reference to these works is not annulled; for the notion of authorship is not destroyed by the mode in which it is exercised. Besides, if Origen had wished to denote the particular way in which the writings of Luke arose, he would have put, not ὁ γράψας, but ὁ συνταξάμενος, or something similar.

received into the Peshito, belonging to the end of the second century. But that it was so soon as this held to be a work of Paul, does not follow from this reception. On the contrary, the fact that the Epistle to the Hebrews has been placed in the Peshito not already after the letters of Paul addressed to churches, but only after those of his letters addressed to private persons, might rather be interpreted as a sign that this letter, only on account of its similar character, had been attached, as it were, by way of appendix to the Pauline Epistles, while not assigned to Paul himself. Yet the later church of North-Eastern Syria seems to have ascribed this writing to the Apostle Paul. For while Jacob, bishop of Nisibis (c. 325), cites declarations of the Epistle to the Hebrews only in general as utterances of an apostle (*Galland. Bibl. Patr.* v. pp. xvi. lxii. *al.*), and this indefinite mode of citation is also the prevalent one with Jacob's disciple Ephraem Syrus († 378); yet the latter, at any rate, seems not to have doubted the composition by Paul, since (*Opp. Græc.* tom. ii., Rom. 1743, fol. p. 203) he joins together the passages Rom. ii. 16, Eph. v. 15, Heb. x. 31, by the common introductory formula: *Περὶ ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας βοᾷ καὶ Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος*, and then abruptly separates from further citations by the words: *Βοᾷ δὲ καὶ ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος*.—In like manner in Western (Grecian) Syria, after the middle of the third century, the epistle was probably assigned to the Apostle Paul; since, in the letter issued by the Antiochian Synod (c. 264) to Paul of Samosata, Heb. xi. 26 and sentences out of the two Epistles to the Corinthians are connected together as sayings of the same apostle (comp. Mansi, *Collect. Concil.* t. i. p. 1038).

Elsewhere, too, in the Eastern Church, the opinion that Paul was the author became in subsequent times more and more general. Nevertheless, doubts as yet by no means ceased to be heard. Thus Eusebius of Caesarea (in the first half of the fourth century) often, indeed, quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews as the work of Paul, and without doubt reckons it, since he expressly accepts fourteen Pauline Epistles (*Hist. Eccles.* iii. 3), in the chief passage on the New Testament canon (*Hist. Eccles.* iii. 25),—as a constituent part of the

epistles of Paul, which are mentioned only in general,—to belong to the *Homologumena*. But yet he regards the epistle only as a version from a Hebrew original of Paul (*Hist. Eccles.* iii. 38), and can tell of Greeks who, in reliance upon the adverse judgment of the Roman Church, denied the Pauline origin of the epistle in any sense (*Hist. Eccles.* iii. 3). Nay, in another place (*Hist. Eccles.* vi. 13), himself even reckons the epistle among the ἀντιλεγόμεναι γραφαί;¹ inasmuch as he places it in one line with the Wisdom of Solomon, that of Jesus Sirach, and the epistles of Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, and Jude! On the other hand, the epistle is acknowledged as directly the work of Paul, in the sixtieth canon of the Council at Laodicea after the middle of the fourth century, by Titus of Bostra († c. 371), by Basil the Great († 379), and his brother Gregory of Nyssa; by Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem († 386); by Gregory of Nazianzus († 389), in the *Janbi ad Seleucum*, where, nevertheless, the remark has been inserted: τινὲς δὲ φασὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους νόθον; by Epiphanius († 402), Chrysostom († 407), Theodore of Mopsuestia († c. 428), and others. Yet Theodoret in his *Prooemium* to the epistle (comp. also Epiphanius, *Hæc.* 69. 37) is still engaged in polemics against those of Arian sentiments, who rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews as νόθος, denying its Pauline authorship.

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

¹ According to Delitzsch, indeed (*Komment.* p. xvii. f.), this supposition rests upon a misunderstanding of the words of Eusebius. But Eusebius' words are surely clear enough. They are as follows: κίχρηται δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ταῖς ἀπὸ πῶν ἀντιλεγομένων γραφῶν μαρτυρίαις, τῆς τε λεγομένης Σαλομῶντος σοφίας καὶ τῆς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Σιράχ καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς, τῆς τε Βαρνάβα καὶ Κλήμντος καὶ Ἰούδα.

he make express mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in order to cite from it the words vi. 4-8, and it is here evidently his endeavour to rate as highly as possible the authority of the writing cited by him. Of a composition thereof by the Apostle Paul, however, he knows nothing; instead of Paul he names Barnabas as its author, and that not in the form of a conjecture, but simply and without qualification, in such wise that he manifestly proceeds upon a supposition universally current in the churches of his native land. (Comp. *de Pudicitia*, c. 20: Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum. Exstat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, a Deo satis auctoritati viri,¹ ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore: "aut ego solus et Barnabas non habemus hoc operandi potestatem?" Et utique receptior apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum. . Hoc qui ab apostolis didicit et cum apostolis docuit, nunquam moecho et fornicatori secundam poenitentiam promissam ab apostolis norat.) — Also, in the time immediately following, the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot in Proconsular Africa have been regarded as a writing of the Apostle Paul. This is proved on the authority of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage († 258), who, with the single exception of the short Epistle to Philemon, makes citations from all the letters of Paul, and yet nowhere quotes passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews, but asserts, on the other hand, that Paul wrote only to seven churches (comp. *Testim. adv. Jud.* i. 20; *De Exhortat. Martyrii*, c. 11).

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

¹ Thus we have to read, with Oehler (*Tertull. Opp.* tom. i., Lips. 1853, p. 839), in place of *adeo satis auctoritatis viri*.

Corinthians (comp. specially cap. 36 with Heb. vi. 4, i. 3, 4, 5, 7, 13; cap. 17 with Heb. xi. 37; and in general, Lardner, *Credibility of the Gospel History*, Part ii. vol. i., Lond. 1748. p. 62 ff.; Böhme, p. lxxv. sq.). These derived expressions, however, are not introduced as citations, but are blended with his own discourse. They prove, therefore, only that Clement was acquainted with the Epistle to the Hebrews, and highly prized it, but afford no information on the question as to whom he regarded as the author. That, however, Clement believed the Apostle Paul to be the author is rendered extremely improbable by the position which the Roman Church of the subsequent period assumed towards this epistle. In the fragment on the canon of the Roman Church, discovered by Muratori, belonging to the close of the second century, it is stated that Paul wrote to seven churches; upon which follows an enumeration of our present thirteen Pauline Epistles. Besides these two, other letters are then named, which have been forged as coming from Paul; but of the Epistle to the Hebrews not even mention is made. It cannot thus in the Roman Church of that time have been invested with any canonical authority, much less have been looked upon as a writing of the Apostle Paul. — In like manner Caius, presbyter at Rome at the end of the second century and beginning of the third, recognised, in express opposition to the *περὶ τὸ συντάττειν καὶνὰς γραφὰς προπέτειά τε καὶ τόλμα*, only thirteen epistles as the work of the Apostle Paul, to the exclusion of the Epistle to the Hebrews (comp. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 20). — Even as late as about the middle of the third century the Epistle to the Hebrews was not in the Roman Church esteemed to be a work of Paul, nor indeed regarded as a canonical writing. This is evident from the fact that Novatian, in his dissertations, *De Trinitate* and *De Ubiis Judaicis* (in Gallandi, *Biblioth. Patr.* t. iii. p. 287 sqq.), although these abound in Biblical citations, and although their subject might naturally suggest the employment of the Epistle to the Hebrews, nowhere so much as makes mention of the same; an omission which, supposing its recognition as a canonical writing, and one proceeding from Paul, would be the more inexplicable,

inasmuch as Novatian could hardly have urged any passage of Scripture in favour of his severer view with regard to the receiving again into the communion of the church of those who had lapsed, with greater appearance of justification than this very text of Heb. vi. 4-6. — So likewise Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* vi. 20) expressly observes with respect to *his* age (first half of the fourth century): *καὶ εἰς δεῦρο παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισὶν οὐ νομίζεται τοῦ ἀποστόλου πηγχεῖν*. — Of Irenaeus, moreover, the representative of the Church of Southern Gaul at the end of the second century and beginning of the third, Stephanus Gobarus relates, in Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 232 (ed. Hoerschel, Rothomagi 1653, fol. p. 903), that he, equally as Hippolytus, denied that the Epistle to the Hebrews was composed by Paul. In harmony with this statement is the fact that Irenaeus, in his great work *Advers. Haereses*, often as he had occasion to cite this epistle, and frequently as he otherwise adduces proof passages from the epistles of Paul, yet nowhere appeals to the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the lost writing *βιβλίον διαλέξεων διαφόρων*, he did indeed, according to a notice in Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* v. 26), cite some passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews (just as he did from the Wisdom of Solomon); but that Irenaeus regarded the Apostle Paul as its author is not said by Eusebius either.

Only after the middle of the fourth century did the opinion that Paul was its author gradually find acceptance in the West—a change of views which, without doubt, is to be traced to the preponderating influence of the Greek Church upon the Latin. As a work of Paul it is cited by Hilary, bishop of Poitiers († 368); Lucifer of Cagliari († 371); his contemporary, Fabius Marius Victorinus; Philastrius, bishop of Brescia († c. 387); Ambrose, bishop of Milan († 397); Rufinus of Aquileia († c. 411), Jerome († 420), Augustine († 430), and others. That change of views comes out with special distinctness in the African synods at the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth. In the thirty-sixth canon of the synod at Hippo (393), as in the forty-seventh canon of the third synod at Carthage (397), in the determination of those books of the New Testament to be held as canonical, the

number of the epistles of Paul is declared to be altogether thirteen; and then is added: by the same, the Epistle to the Hebrews (Pauli apostoli epistolae tredecim; ejusdem ad Hebraeos una). This separate mention shows that at this time they did not yet venture to concede to the Epistle to the Hebrews a perfectly equal rank with that of the thirteen universally recognised letters of Paul. Presently after, however, in the twenty-ninth canon of the fifth Carthaginian synod (419), it is said, on the occasion of a similar enumeration: epistolarum Pauli apostoli numero quatuordecim. Yet, spite of this revolution of the judgments in general, doubts as to the canonicity and Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews were not entirely reduced to silence, even in this late period. Philastrius still remarks that the same was only rarely read in church among the Latins (*Haeres.* 89); and in *Haeres.* 88 mentions, among the books which, according to the appointment of the apostles and their successors, were alone to be publicly read in the assemblies, only thirteen Pauline Epistles. The commentary of Hilary (Ambrosiaster), moreover, covers indeed the whole thirteen Pauline Epistles, but not the Epistle to the Hebrews; and even Rufinus adds, on a mention of the epistle (*Invection in Hieronymum* 1, Opp. Hieronymi, ed. Martianay, t. v. p. 279), the words: si quis tamen eam receperit. With like wavering does Jerome also often express himself (e.g. on Tit. i. 5, Opp. ed. Vallars, 2, t. vii. P. 1, p. 695: Si quis vult recipere eam epistolam, quae sub nomine Pauli ad Hebraeos scripta est.—*Ibid.* on ii. 2, p. 714: Relege ad Hebraeos epistolam Pauli, sive cujuscunque alterius eam esse putas), and observes expressly, e.g. *Epist.* 125 *ad Evagrium* (ed. Martianay, t. ii. p. 571): Epistola ad Hebraeos, quam omnes Graeci recipiunt et nonnulli Latinorum.—*Comment. on Matt.* xxvi. 8, 9 (ed. Vallars, t. vii. P. 1, p. 212): Paulus, in epistola sua, quae scribitur ad Hebraeos, licet de ea multi Latinorum dubitent.—*Catalog.* c. 59 (ed. Martianay, t. iv. p. 117): sed et apud Romanos usque hodie quasi Pauli apostoli non habetur; and similarly elsewhere. In like manner Augustine also observes (*De Peccatorum meritis et remissione*, l. 27, Opp. ed. Bened. t. x., Antw. 1700, p. 18) that the Epistle to the Hebrews is *nonnullis incerta*, although he himself is decided in his judg-

ment by the *auctoritas ecclesiarum orientalium*, among whom this writing also is held in canonical repute.

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

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

¹ That the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was in a state of captivity, and was begging of the church for intercession with God in his *ἐλπίς*, Tobler ("Studien nach dem Codex Sinaiticus über den Hebräerbrief," in Hilgenfeld's *Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1864, II. 4, p. 357 f.) has nevertheless felt bound to deduce from the form of the text in the Codex Sinaiticus: *προσεύχασθε περὶ ἡμῶν ὅτι καλῶ. εἰ γὰρ ὅτι καλὴν συνίδησιν ἔχομεν ἐν πασὶν καλῶς εἰδόντες ἀνυστρέφισθαι.*

passage we may certainly conclude that the author was on terms of friendship with Timothy, the well-known assistant of Paul. But this fact could be regarded as a sign indicative of Paul himself only if Timothy were characterized as a person who occupied a subordinate position towards the author, which is not the case. As the words read, the passage is appropriate to any disciple of Paul as the writer. To this the consideration must be added, that in the passage in question the deliverance of Timothy out of his captivity is announced: the readers must thus have had a knowledge of the imprisonment itself; it could not therefore have been either insignificant or of short duration. Of an imprisonment of Timothy, however, so long as he was the assistant of Paul, there is not found the slightest trace, either in the epistles of the latter or in the Acts of the Apostles.¹ Much more probable is it, therefore, that this notice refers to an imprisonment suffered by Timothy only after the death of the Apostle Paul. The fourth passage,

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

προσευχισθε πι
μι ἡμῶν οτι καλῆ.
εἶα γαρ οτι καλην
συνιδησιν κ. τ. λ.

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

¹ That Ebrard (p. 417 ff.) is very much inclined to bring out of the construction of Phil. ii. 19, 23 an imprisonment of Timothy at Rome, at the time when Paul was held captive there, deserves to be mentioned only as a curiosity.

finally, is supposed to show that the epistle was written from Rome, and on that account probably by Paul. But from οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας the author could send salutations only if he were somewhere outside of Italy. If he had himself been present in Italy, with the Italian Christians from whom the salutations come, at the time of the composition of the epistle, he must have indicated them as οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ (comp. 1 Pet. v. 13). At most, we could only assume that the author had meant by οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας Roman Christians out of the province, in opposition to οἱ ἐν Ῥώμῃ, the Christians of the Roman capital. Then he would certainly have been dwelling in Rome. But how would it be explicable, in that case, that he should neglect to convey a salutation from these Christians of the capital? While, on the other hand, if the author was writing outside of Italy, the isolated expression of greeting from οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας is simply explained on the supposition, that in the place of his dwelling for the time being, a Christian church from which he could likewise send salutations did not yet at all exist.

Against Paul as the author argue—

(3) The style and manner of presentation characteristic of the epistle. Origen has already observed (*vid. supra*, p. 3), that every one who is a judge of the diversities of language must admit that this writing is συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως ἑλληνικωτέρα than the letters of Paul; and the same fact, even before his time, drew the attention of Clemens Alexandrinus (*vid. supra*, p. 2), as in general the widespread belief of antiquity in a Hebrew original of the epistle is based upon such divergency. But the epistle is distinguished not merely by a purer Greek,—with which are found mingled Hebraisms, for the most part only in the citations borrowed from the Old Testament,—it is also more perfectly rounded off into periods, and more rhetorical. Whereas Paul wrestles with the language in order to express in words the abundance of thoughts pouring in upon him, and irregularities of grammar, variations of structure, and *anacoluthias* are nothing rare with him, the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews always flows on in smooth facility. The harmonious symmetry of the sentences is preserved uninterrupted, even where parentheses of consider-

able extent are inserted (comp. vii. 20-22); nay, parenthesis is enclosed within parenthesis, and yet the writer steadily returns to complete the construction begun (comp. xii. 8-24). The greatest care is bestowed throughout upon euphony and musical cadence (comp. *e.g.* i. 1-4, vii. 1-3), upon the effective grouping of words (comp. *e.g.* vii. 4), and even the use of particles and participles betrays throughout an acquaintance with the art of composition and a learned rhetoric. While the Apostle Paul is everywhere concerned only about the matter itself which he is presenting, never troubles himself about a fair form of its clothing in language, and with him even the most affecting outbursts of natural eloquence are never anything but the immediate product of the moment,—in the Epistle to the Hebrews the endeavour after euphony and adornment of style extends even to the details of expression and the turns of the discourse. Where, for instance, the plain and simple *μισθός*, of which Paul regularly makes use, might have been placed without any difference of sense, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews chooses just as regularly the fuller sounding *μισθαποδοσία* (ii. 2, x. 35, xi. 26), and in accordance therewith makes use of *ὀρκωμοσία* (vii. 20, 21, 28), *αἱματεκχυσία* (ix. 22), and other sonorous compounds. Whilst, further, *e.g.*, the sitting of Christ at the right hand of God is indicated by Paul simply by *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος* (Col. iii. 1; comp. also Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20), in the Epistle to the Hebrews the majestic formulas: *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* (i. 3), *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (viii. 1), *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκάθικεν* (xii. 2), serve to express the same thought. Further, that which Paul predicates of Christ, in describing Him simply as *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ* (2 Cor. iv. 4), or as *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου* (Col. i. 15), or as *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων* (Phil. ii. 6), is expressed by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in more carefully chosen language by means of the characteristic *ὡν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ*.¹—As, however, the author of the Epistle

¹ Many further differences of language in details, in part connected with the fact that in the Epistle to the Hebrews the language is preponderantly rhetorical, with Paul preponderantly dialectic, see in Schulz, *Der Brief an die Hebr.*,

to the Hebrews surpasses the Apostle Paul in respect of this external side of the diction, and of all writers of the New Testament comes nearest to a classical perfection,—in such wise that only some portions in Luke bear comparison therewith,—yet, on the other hand, he falls considerably behind the Apostle Paul in respect of the inner character of his mode of presentation. There is wanting to his argumentation that dialectic acuteness (comp. *e.g.* xii. 25), to his sequence of thought that severe and firm connectedness (comp. *e.g.* iv. 14), to his expression that precision and definiteness (comp. *e.g.* vii. 27), which are characteristic of the Apostle Paul.

(4) Deviations from Paul are shown, further, in the doctrinal subject-matter of the epistle. Certainly in the main, and regarded as a whole, its fundamental doctrinal conception is the same as in the Pauline Epistles, as also in details it affords manifold notes of accord with the doctrinal presentation of the latter.¹ Nevertheless, this dogmatic harmony is not without peculiar, individual, independent colouring in the Epistle to the Hebrews.² The Apostle Paul regards as the most important fact in the history of salvation, the resurrection of Christ; by this did the work of salvation first receive the divine sanction and attestation; by it was Christ

Breslau 1818, p. 135 ff.; Seyffarth, *De ep. quæ dicitur ad Hebr. incole maxime peculiari*, Lips. 1821, p. 25 sqq.

¹ Comparisons of points of coincidence, which, however, stand in need of critical sifting, see in Fr. Spanhemius, *De auctore epistolæ ad Hebræos* (Opp. t. ii., Lugd. Bat. 1703, fol. p. 171 sqq.); Cramer, p. lxxix. sqq., lxxx. sqq.; Petr. Hofstede de Groot, *Disputatio, quæ epistola ad Hebræos cum Paulinis epistolis comparatur*, Traj. ad Rhen. 1826, 8.

² Yet on account of this independence to regard the epistle, with Richm (*Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs*, Ludwigsb. 1858, 1859, II. p. 261 ff.), after the example of R. Küstlin (*Theol. Jahrb.* of Baur and Zeller, 1854, H. 4, p. 463 ff.), also Ritschl (*Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche*, 2 Aufl., Bonn 1857, p. 159 ff.) and Weiss (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1859, H. 1, p. 142 ff.), as not the work of a writer of the Pauline school, but to discover in it a later stage of development of the primitive apostolic Judæo-Christianity, is a proceeding not warranted by any sufficient ground. There is the less reason for such judgment, inasmuch as a very close personal connection of the author of the epistle with Paul and his disciples and fellow-labourers is conceded; in the doctrinal conception of the epistle not only no contradiction of Paul is discovered, but, on the contrary, a higher agreement with him on all essential points; and it is, moreover, taken for granted that the epistle arose through the incitement and under the influence of Paulinism.

first by a divine deed proved to be the Son of God. Of the death of Christ, therefore, Paul speaks almost always in connection with the resurrection. This importance, however, the resurrection of Christ has not for the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Only incidentally, in the invocation xiii. 20, is it mentioned by him; in the body of the epistle, on the contrary, stress is laid exclusively upon the death of Christ and the heavenly high-priesthood, of which office the Saviour Christ, exalted to the right hand of God, is the occupant and fulfiller. In addition to this, the notion of *πίστις* is different with our author from what it is with Paul. Whereas with Paul the *πίστις* involves an opposition to the *νόμος* and the *ἔργα νόμου*, and has its object in particular in Christ, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, understands thereby in general the believing, humble confiding in God's grace and promises, in opposition to the *seeing* of their realization,—a phase of the conception which but rarely (comp. 2 Cor. v. 7) is met with in Paul. It is, moreover, a remarkable fact that no reference is made to the participation of the Gentiles in the Messianic kingdom,—although the author must have entertained the same views as Paul on this point, inasmuch as he regards Judaism only as an imperfect preparatory stage to Christianity, and demands a coming forth from the former, in order to become partakers of the blessings of the latter,—whence it seems to follow that the author found his life's task not so much in the conversion of the Gentiles, as in the conversion of his Jewish kinsmen. Peculiar to this epistle is, further, the prevailing fondness for a typico-symbolic mode of contemplation,¹ which is met with indeed in Paul's writings (e.g. Gal. iv. 21 ff.; 1 Cor. x. 1 ff.), but yet only in isolated instances; and other peculiarities besides. Comp. Richm., *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* I. p. 221 ff., 385 ff., II. p. 632 ff., 821 ff.; Davidson, *Introduction*, I. p. 241 ff.

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

¹ Comp. de Wette, "Ueber die symbolisch-typische Lehrart des Briefes an die Hebr." (in the *Theologische Zeitschrift* of Schleiermacher, de Wette, and Lücke, Heft 3, Berlin 1822, p. 1 ff.).

LXX., but is also at home in the original Hebrew text, and often independently translates this for himself, for the most part also cites with more or less freedom and from memory; the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews follows the LXX. exclusively, and generally with great exactness. He even bases an argument upon its inaccurate renderings (comp. specially x. 5-7), in such wise that he can have possessed no knowledge of the Hebrew, or at any rate but a very unsatisfactory knowledge,—a fact which even in early times was not overlooked by the opponents of the Pauline origin of the epistle (comp. Jerome on Isa. vi. 9, Opp. ed. Martianay, t. iii. p. 64: *Pauli quoque ideo ad Hebraeos epistolae contradicuntur, quod ad Hebraeos scribens utatur testimoniis quae in Hebraeis voluminibus non habentur*). The references in detail see in Bleek, *Abtheil.* 1, p. 338-369.

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

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

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

The arguments enumerated are in their totality of such constraining force that we can feel no surprise if, upon every revival of the critico-scientific spirit in the church, doubts, too, with regard to the Pauline origin of the epistle should always be excited afresh, after they had long seemed to have died out. At the time of the Reformation, Cajetan and Erasmus within the Catholic Church declared themselves against the claim of Paul to the authorship of the epistle. The former was on

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

¹ Fourth sitting of the 8th April 1546: Testamenti Novi . . . quatuordecim epistolae Pauli apostoli, ad Romanos . . . ad Philemonem, ad Hebraeos.

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

¹ Yet, while the Lutheran Church preserved in its symbols a freer position towards the canon, the Reformed Church in the *Confessio Belgica* (cap. iv. p. 171 sq., ed. Augusti. Comp. also the *Helvetica* of 1566, cap. xi. p. 25 sq., xvi. p. 43, and the *Bohemica* of 1535, art. iv. p. 281, vi. p. 286, xx. p. 323) adopted the decision that Paul wrote fourteen epistles.

² The *nova ratio* consists in the circumstantial demonstration that the Epistle to the Hebrews betrays an affinity to the writings of Seneca (!), mainly to his little book *de Providentia*, which reaches so deeply that it cannot have arisen by accident. It is thus in all probability due to a personal intercourse of the writer of the epistle with Seneca,—a fact which is applicable only in the case of Paul, who, according to a trustworthy early tradition, was brought into communication with Seneca.

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

If the Epistle to the Hebrews can thus be neither directly nor indirectly a work of the Apostle Paul, the question further arises, whether the true author is still to be discovered with any degree of probability. The decision of some has been in favour of Barnabas, others of Luke, others of Clemens Romanus, others again of Silvanus, and others, finally, of Apollos.

Barnabas has been looked upon as the author by J. E. Chr. Schmidt (*Histor.-Krit. Einleit. in's N. T.*, Abth. 1, p. 289 ff.), Twisten (*Dogmatik*, Bd. 1, 4 Aufl. p. 95), Thiersch (*De Epistola ad Hebr. commentatio historica*, Marb. 1848, p. 1¹), Wieseler, *Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters*, Götting. 1848, p. 504 ff.; *Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief, namentlich seinen Verfasser u. seine Leser*, 1 Hälfte [Schriften der Universität zu Kiel aus dem Jahre, 1860, 4, Bd. VII.; also printed separately, Kiel 1861, 8]), Adalb. Maier (*Comment. üb. d. Br. an d. Hebr.*, Freib. im Br. 1861, p. 13 ff.), Ritschl (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, H. 1, p. 89), and Renan (*L'Antechrist*, Paris 1873, p. xvii. f. 210 f.).² According to Wieseler, of all the claims to the authorship, that of Barnabas is best vouched for by the tradition of antiquity. But in reality there remains only the single testimony (certainly a very definite one) of Tertullian (*vide supra*, p. 7) in favour of Barnabas. For that it was also held in the majority of churches of the East to be a work of Barnabas, cannot be inferred, with Wieseler (comp. already Ullmann, p. 391), from the words of Jerome (Epist. 129, *ad Dardan.*, Opp. ed. Martianay, t. ii. p. 608): *Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam, quae inscribitur ad Hebraeos, non solum ab ecclesiis orientis sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Graeci sermonis scriptoribus quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi; licet plerique eam vel Barnabae vel Clementis arbitrentur, et nihil interesse, cujus sit, quum ecclesiastici viri sit et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur.* To supply a

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

² Joh. Cameron is also named as a representative of this view. Bleek (Abth. 1, p. 261, note 364) refers to Cameron's *Quaestio* ii. in *Ep. ad Hebr.*, and Ullmann (p. 389, note) to his *Myrothecium Evangelicum*. But in the latter work, at any rate, there is found no statement of this kind. In this Cameron usually speaks of the author as Apostolus, but certainly distinguishes him from the Apostle Paul. Comp. *e.g.* on Heb. vii. 18, ed. Salmur., 1677, 4, p. 270.

nostrorum to the *plerique*, with Tholuck and Delitzsch, out of the preceding *nostris*, is indeed impossible; *plerique* can receive its more precise definition only either from the last member of the sentence beginning with *ab*, or else from the two such members. But it is in an equal degree unjustifiable, in connection with the latter supposition, to assign *vel Barnabae*, in distinct separation, to the *ecclesiae orientis*, and *vel Clementis* to the *Graeci sermonis scriptores*, and then to help out the verdict thus gained—to wit, that the majority in the East traced the epistle indeed to Paul, but derived its present Greek form from Barnabas—with the conjecture “that the original tradition of those Eastern churches pointed to the sole authorship of Barnabas.” Rather is Jerome’s manner of expressing himself in the fore-cited passage in more than one respect inaccurate; inasmuch as he is, moreover, acquainted with Luke, as a third person who might be mentioned in the same category with Barnabas and Clement, and elsewhere is able to adduce only a single early authority in favour of the opinion that Barnabas composed the epistle, and this authority belonging not to the Eastern church, but to that of the West. The passage finds its corrective in the words of the *Catalogus Scriptorum*, c. 5 (Opp. ed. Martianay, t. iv. p. 103 sq.): *Epistola autem, quae fertur ad Hebraeos, non ejus creditur propter stili sermonisque distantiam, sed vel Barnabae juxta Tertullianum, vel Lucae evangelistae juxta quosdam, vel Clementis Romanae ecclesiae episcopi, quem ajunt ipsi adjunctum sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornasse sermone*,—according to which Jerome was acquainted only with Tertullian as the representative of the view that Barnabas wrote the epistle. If, further, Philastrius, *Haer.* 89, observes: *Sunt alii quoque, qui epistolam Pauli ad Hebraeos non adserunt esse ipsius, sed dicunt aut Barnabae esse apostoli, aut Clementis de urbe Roma episcopi*, it is likewise entirely unprovable that the *aut Barnabae* did not refer merely to Tertullian. In like manner it does not, of course, at all follow, from the fact that the Epistle to the Hebrews is placed after the Pastoral Epistles in the Peshito, that the early Syrian Church regarded the epistle as the work of none other than Barnabas. It is, in the last place, a mere assertion

when we are told that in the *Versus scribaturarum sanctarum*—an ancient stichometric catalogue of the sacred writings of the O. and N. T., which is preserved to us, inserted in the Codex Claromontanus between the Epistle to Philemon and that to the Hebrews (comp. *Cod. Claromontanus*, ed. Tischendorf, Lips. 1852, 4, p. 468 sq.)—the Epistle to the Hebrews bears the name of an *Epistola Barnabae*. (So first Credner in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 307 ff.; *Gesch. des N. Test. Kanon.*, Berl. 1860, p. 175 ff.) That catalogue presents only the words: *Barnabae epist. ver. DCCCL*; it simply mentions, therefore, the Epistle of Barnabas, and adds how many verses or lines (*stichoi*) it contains. The supposition is thus only natural, that the same writing is meant which elsewhere in the early church bears the name of the Epistle of Barnabas, and in the Codex Sinaiticus is bound up with the canonical books of the New Testament. Nay, this supposition is raised entirely beyond doubt by the fact that, in addition to the “Barnabae epist.,” and on the same level therewith, the *Pastor*, the *Actus Pauli*, and the *Revelatio Petri*, thus writings which in later time were just as little reckoned among the canonical books (the “*sanctae scribaturae*” of the catalogue) as the Epistle of Barnabas, are likewise enumerated and stichometrically defined in this catalogue. Moreover, the Epistle to the Hebrews, if this had been thought of in connection with the “Barnabae epist.,” must at least have been denoted by the reading *Barnabae ad Hebraeos epist.*; as also Tertullian (comp. p. 7) did not deem the addition *ad Hebraeos*, for the designation of our Epistle to the Hebrews, redundant. It is true the assertion has been made, that the number of lines mentioned points to the Epistle to the Hebrews. But we should be permitted to make a deduction from this number of lines, only in case the number of lines for the several books of the New Testament were a fixed one in the mss. It is, however, an altogether wavering and changing one. Thus the accounts of the lines for the Epistle to the Hebrews (comp. Tischendorf, N. T. ed. 7, P. ii. p. 596) vary between the numbers 703 and 830. Not one of these numbers reaches the sum of 850 mentioned in the catalogue. If, therefore, we are to make any deduction at

all from these data, we must rather suppose that the number 850 is much more favourable to the epistle otherwise known as the Epistle of Barnabas than to our Epistle to the Hebrews, since the former exceeds the latter in extent by about a third. (In the Codex Sinaiticus the Epistle of Barnabas occupies $53\frac{1}{2}$ columns, and the Epistle to the Hebrews $40\frac{1}{2}$.) It is asserted, further, that the *Barnabas epist.* of the catalogue must be regarded as the Epistle to the Hebrews, because it has obtained a place in the enumeration *before* the Revelation of John and the Acts of the Apostles, and so by the intervention of the two latter writings is separated from the *Pastor*, the *Actus Pauli*, and the *Revelatio Petri*. But this order of enumeration does not warrant such conclusion, any more than a special mark of design is to be discovered in the unusual order of mentioning the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon only after the Pastoral Epistles, which is observed in the same catalogue. The consideration that, if our view be correct, the Epistle to the Hebrews has been entirely passed over without mention in the catalogue, can present no difficulty. We need not even suppose that the mention thereof has been overlooked in consequence of a mere blunder in copying. This is indeed possible, since the Epistles to the Thessalonians and that to the Philippians have for a like reason been passed over unmentioned, and otherwise the negligence of the copyist displays itself in the catalogue, in the fact that the two Epistles of Peter, *e.g.*, bear therein the appellations *ad Petrum I.* and *ad Petrum II.* The non-mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews is rather to be explained simply from the fact, well known from other sources, that this epistle was not invested with any canonical authority in the early church of the West, from which this catalogue comes down to us.—Favourable to the claim of Barnabas might appear the historic incident of his receiving this his name (*ὄνομα παρακλήσεως*), according to Acts iv. 36, on account of his gifts of prophetic or spiritual utterance, with which the eloquent language of the Epistle to the Hebrews might be shown to accord. Nor would there be anything directly opposed to such view in the circumstance that in Acts xiii. 9 ff., 16 ff., xiv. 9 ff., not Barnabas but Paul

is described as the chief speaker, and that consequently the former is in Acts xiv. 12 compared to Zeus; the latter, on the other hand, to Hermes. For although the Epistle to the Hebrews is superior in point of diction to the Pauline Epistles, a greater facility of graceful writing does not of necessity argue a greater facility of oral discourse. In favour of Barnabas, might, further, his birth in Cyprus be supposed to plead, and consequently—since Cyprus was in various ways connected with Alexandria—the Alexandrian type of thought which appears in the epistle would not be inappropriate to him. But absolutely decisive against Barnabas is the fact that, according to Acts iv. 36, 37, he was a Levite, and must have long time dwelt in Jerusalem, since he even possessed land there. He must therefore have been more accurately informed with regard to the inner arrangements of the temple in Jerusalem at that time than was the case with the author of our epistle.¹ For the temple at Jerusalem is meant (see sec. 2), and not that at Leontopolis in Egypt, as Wieseler supposes.

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

¹ If the so-called Epistle of Barnabas were genuine, the diversity of character between that and the Epistle to the Hebrews would likewise form a decisive counter-argument against the claim of Barnabas. But the genuineness of that epistle is, to say the least, doubtful.

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

affinity, such as must of necessity admit of being traced out between works of the same author. That, namely, on which Delitzsch founds his argument is the following:—

The particle *τε*, i. 3, and frequently, is but rarely found in the N. T. save in the writings of Paul, and more especially of Luke. — The middle *ποιεῖσθαι*, i. 3, is a favourite one with Paul, and particularly so with Luke. It is here similarly used, as, *e.g.*, in *δεήσεις ποιεῖσθαι*, Luke v. 33; Phil. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1; *κοπετὸν ποιεῖσθαι*, Acts viii. 2; *ἀναβολὴν μηδεμίαν ποιεῖσθαι*, Acts xxv. 17. — *παρά*, after the comparative, i. 4, is also not foreign to Luke (Luke iii. 13). — *δέ*, i. 13, in the third place, as Luke xv. 17; Acts xxvii. 14; Gal. iii. 23. — *προσέχειν τινί*, ii. 1, like *προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις*, Acts xvi. 14. — *τὰ ἀκουσθέντα*, ii. 1, is the word of salvation, which in the Epistle to the Hebrews is nowhere called *εὐαγγέλιον*, as also Luke in his writings (with the exception of Acts xv. 7, xx. 24) loves to express the idea of *εὐαγγέλιον* by various forms of periphrasis. — *συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν*, ii. 4, is formed after the manner of *συνεπιτίθεσθαι*, Acts xxiv. 9. — *ποικίλαι δυνάμεις*, ii. 4, has its analogon in Acts ii. 22 (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 9). — *διαμαρτύρεσθαι*, ii. 6, is specially frequent in Luke, *e.g.* Acts xx. 23, xxiii. 11. — The construction *ἐν γὰρ τῷ κ.τ.λ.*, ii. 8, corresponds entirely to that of Acts xi. 15. — *ἀρχηγός*, ii. 10, xii. 2, is the name which Jesus bears also in Acts iii. 15, v. 31. — *καταργεῖν*, ii. 14, a favourite word with Paul, is found besides in the N. T. only in Luke xiii. 7. — *δήπου*, ii. 16, occurs, it is true, only here in the N. T.; but yet *δή*, which also is rare in the N. T., occurs with the greatest comparative frequency in Luke ii. 7. The colouring of the expression is thoroughly Lucan. The *ὅθεν*, which is met with six times in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is foreign to the letters of Paul, but occurs Acts xxvi. 19. *Ὁμοιωθῆναι* is employed exactly as Acts xiv. 11 in the cry of the men of Lystra. *Ἰλάσκεσθαι* has in Luke xviii. 13 its single parallel in the N. T. *Κατὰ πάντα* is, Acts xvii. 22, certainly to no less extent Lucan than Pauline. *Τὰ πρὸς θεόν* occurs, indeed, elsewhere only v. 1 and Rom. xv. 17; but at Luke xiv. 32, xix. 42, Acts xxviii. 10 (comp. also Luke xiv. 28, Acts xxiii. 30, according to the *textus receptus*), *τὰ*

πρὸς is likewise found as a current form of expression.—*δύνασθαι*, ii. 18, here, as with few exceptions throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews, construed with the infinitive *αορίστ*, just as in Luke i. 20, 22, iii. 8, v. 12, and often.—*πέπονθεν πειρασθείς*, ii. 18, has again its parallels in Luke; inasmuch as, according to Acts xx. 19, sufferings, as such, are *πειρασμοί*; and according to Luke xxii. 28, the sufferings of the Lord in particular were so.—*μέτοχοι*, iii. 1, vi. 4, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Luke v. 7.—*κατανοεῖν*, iii. 1, x. 24, is a favourite word with Luke, *c.g.* xii. 24, 27, and often; comp. especially Acts xi. 6.—The γάρ, iii. 16, accentuating the question, is equally Lucan, Acts xix. 35, viii. 31, as Pauline, 1 Cor. xi. 22.—*ἀλλ' οὐ*, iii. 16, is placed as in Luke xvii. 7 f.; comp. *ἀλλὰ τί*, Matt. xi. 7–9.—*ἐπαγγελία*, in the signification of *assurance*, *promise*, iv. 1, is of most frequent occurrence with Luke and Paul; and the combination with the bare infinitive, instead of τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν, which recurs xi. 15, is like that of Acts xiv. 5.—*εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, iv. 2, used passively of the persons to whom glad tidings are proclaimed, is common to the Epistle to the Hebrews with Luke vii. 22, xvi. 16.—*καίτοι*, iv. 3, is a particle, attested also Acts xiv. 17, xvii. 27, as well as *καίτοιγε* and *καίγε*.—*ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, iv. 3, ix. 26, is not met with in the LXX., but is found in Luke xi. 50, and often elsewhere in the N. T.—With ζῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, iv. 12, we may compare, in addition to 1 Pet. i. 23, also Acts vii. 38 (λόγια ζῶντα); and *τομώτερος ὑπέρ*, iv. 12, is construed as Luke xvi. 8.—*ἐνθυμήσεις*, iv. 12, occurs elsewhere only Acts xvii. 29; Matt. ix. 4, xii. 25.—*κρατεῖν*, iv. 14, vi. 18, with the genitive, as Luke viii. 54.—Of *ἀσθένειαι*, iv. 15, mention is made in Luke v. 15 and other places; comp. Matt. viii. 17.—*περικεῖσθαί τι*, v. 2, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts xxviii. 20.—The construction *ἐδόξασεν γεννηθῆναι*, v. 5, is similar to that of Luke ii. 1; Acts xi. 25, xv. 10; Col. iv. 6.—*καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ*, v. 6, is similar to the reading of Acts xiii. 35.—*μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων*, v. 7, reproduces the most salient features with which precisely Luke (xxii. 39–46) describes the agony of prayer in the garden, as these now force themselves upon the

mind. — In the use of *εὐλάβεια*, v. 7, and *εὐλαβεῖσθαι*, the Epistle to the Hebrews coincides in a characteristic way with the usage of Luke (apart from Acts xxiii. 10). — *ἀπό*, v. 7, is employed exactly as in Luke xix. 3, xxiv. 41; Acts xii. 14, xx. 9, xxii. 11. — On *αἵτιος*, v. 9, we have to compare *ἀρχηγός*, ii. 10; Acts iii. 15, v. 31. — *φέρεσθαι*, vi. 1, expresses the idea of external impulse and forward pressing urgency, as Acts ii. 2. — *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, iv. 1, as *ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου* or *τοῦ θεοῦ* = *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, most frequently in the writings of Luke, who hardly ever uses *εὐαγγέλιον*. — The construction *μετάνοια ἀπό*, vi. 1, is Lucan, Acts viii. 22; moreover, *πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν* or *τὸν κύριον*, which is not entirely foreign to Paul's writings, Rom. iv. 5, 24, is found with Luke, as well as *πιστεύειν εἰς*, at least more ordinarily than with any other N. T. writer, Acts ix. 42, xi. 17, xvi. 31, xxii. 19; and as to the thing intended, Acts xx. 21 is similar to Heb. vi. 1, inasmuch as in the former place *τὴν εἰς θεὸν μετένοιαν* is employed with as little apparent significance, and as really deep significance, as in the latter place *πίστεως ἐπὶ θεόν*. — With reference to the delineation of the sin against the Holy Ghost, chap. vi. and x., the Epistle to the Hebrews has its immediate parallel in Luke xii. 8–10. — *ἐπί* with a genitive, after a verb of motion, vi. 7, as Acts x. 11, and frequently. — *εὐθετος*, vi. 7, is in the N. T. a word of Luke's, xiv. 35, ix. 62. — In vi. 9 also we hear the language of Luke. For as *ἡ ἐχομένη*, Luke xiii. 33, Acts xx. 15, xxi. 26, xiii. 44, denotes the day immediately following, so too *ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας*, that which stands in immediate connection with the salvation, which has reference to the salvation. — The classic *ἔχειν* with a following infinitive, vi. 13, is Lucan, Luke vii. 42, xii. 4; Acts iv. 14, xxv. 26. Considering the Lucan form of the expression, it is doubly noteworthy that allusion is made precisely in Luke's writings, as well Luke i. 73 as Acts vii. 17, to the solemn confirmation of the promise by an oath, Gen. xxii. 16 (comp. xxiv. 7). — *καὶ οὕτως*, vi. 15, is used as Acts vii. 8, xxvii. 44, xxviii. 14, and also frequently with Paul. — The *μὲν solitarium*, vi. 16, belongs to the number of the not rare anacoluths, as well of Luke, *c.g.* Acts i. 1, as of Paul, *c.g.* Rom.

xi. 13 f. — *βουλή*, vi. 17, of God's gracious will, is an expression current with Luke, vii. 30, Acts ii. 23, and frequently. With Paul, only Eph. i. 11. — On *πράγματα*, vi. 18, we have to compare *πράγματα*, Luke i. 1. — *καταφεύγειν*, vi. 18, is found also Acts xiv. 6. — *πατριάρχης* is a Hellenistic word, and in the N. T. Lucan; it occurs elsewhere only Acts ii. 29, vii. 8, 9. — *ἱερατεία*, vii. 5, the epistle has in common with Luke i. 9 (comp. i. 8: *ἱερατεύειν*). — *τοῦτ' ἔστιν, κ.τ.λ.*, vii. 5, is a Hebraistic mode of expression, as Acts ii. 30. — *μαρτυρεῖσθαι*, vii. 8, xi. 2, is a favourite expression as well in the Acts, vi. 3, x. 22, xvi. 2, xxii. 12, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is found, besides, only once with Paul and once with John. — *ἀνίστασθαι*, vii. 11, *to be set up by God upon the theatre of history*, as Acts iii. 22, vii. 37; and according to the ordinary interpretation, also Acts xiii. 32. — *προσέχειν τινί*, vii. 13, as 1 Tim. iv. 13, comp. Acts xx. 28. — *εἰς*, vii. 14, as Acts ii. 25; Eph. v. 32. — *εἰς τὸ παντελές*, vii. 25, is found again in the N. T. only Luke xiii. 11. — The *ἀνάγκην ἔχειν* conjoined with the infinitive, vii. 27, is Lucan, Luke xiv. 18, xxiii. 17; while Luke in the Gospel and Acts employs, instead of *ἀναφέρειν* in the sense of offering, the expression *προσφέρειν*, likewise usual in our epistle. — *ἀληθινός*, viii. 2, the epistle has in common with Luke xvi. 11 and the three Johannine writings, and besides these only 1 Thess. i. 9. — *λατρεύειν*, viii. 5, is specially frequent in the writings of Luke. — The passive use of *χρηματίζεσθαι*, viii. 5, is found also in Acts x. 22, Luke ii. 26, and twice in Matt. — To the passage of Scripture cited, viii. 5, Stephen refers in Acts vii. 44. This is again to be noted as a Lucan parallel. — *ἄμεμπτος*, viii. 7, passively, as Luke i. 6, and everywhere in the N. T. — The mode of expression, *ζητεῖν τόπον*, viii. 7 (comp. *τόπον εὐρίσκειν*, xii. 17), is similar to that of *τόπον λαμβάνειν*, Acts xxv. 16; *τόπον διδόναι*, Rom. xii. 19. — *ἐπικεῖσθαι*, ix. 10, with the subsidiary idea of pressing and burdening, as Acts xv. 10, 28. — With *μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως*, ix. 10, we have to compare Acts xxiv. 3, where the text wavers between *διορθωμάτων* and *καθορθωμάτων*. — *παραγίγνεσθαι*, ix. 11, is the usual word for historic self-presentation and presence, Luke xii. 51; Matt.

iii. 1; 1 Macc. iv. 46. — οὐ χειροποιήτου, ix. 11, 24, is a word of Luke's in like connection, Acts vii. 48, xvii. 24. — Το τὸ ἴδιον αἶμα, ix. 12, xiii. 12, a parallel is presented in Acts xx. 28. — λύτρωσις, ix. 12, is, along with ἀπολύτρωσις, a word of Luke's, Luke i. 68, ii. 38; comp. ἀπολύτρωσις, Luke xxi. 28 (in the usage of Paul the only word); λυτροῦσθαι, Luke xxiv. 21; λυτρωτής, Acts vii. 35. — διά, ix. 14, of the inner principle, just as Acts i. 2, xi. 28, xxi. 4. — The mode of expression, λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, ix. 15, xi. 13, in the sense of the taking to oneself the very blessing promised, the epistle has in common with Acts ii. 33. — As to ix. 15, the most apt N. T. linguistic parallel is Acts xiii. 38 f., so also in expression and thought everything is Lucan. To be compared is Acts iii. 25; Luke xxii. 29 f. — On τοῦτο τὸ αἶμα, ix. 20, which, as seems probable, consciously or involuntarily refers to the words of the Supper, we have to observe that in these the ἐστίν is wanting only with Luke, xxii. 20; although they read similarly in Matt. and Mark. — σχεδόν, ix. 22, occurs only twice besides in the N. T., and precisely with Luke, Acts xiii. 44, xix. 26. On each occasion it stands in immediate connection with πᾶς. — ἄφεις, sc. ἁμαρτιῶν, ix. 22, commonly met with in Luke's writings. — Το αἵματεκχυσία, ix. 22, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον, Luke xxii. 20 (comp. xi. 50), forms verbally and really the most natural parallel. — ἐμφανίζειν, ix. 24, xi. 14, is a word common to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and especially Luke, who employs it as well in the signification "make known," Acts xxiii. 22, as "present oneself, appear," Acts xxiv. 1 (= ἐμφανίζειν τινὲς ἑαυτόν = ἐμφαίνεσθαι). — ἀποκεῖσθαι, ix. 27, is in the N. T. common to Luke xix. 20; with Paul, Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 8. — ἐκ δευτέρου, ix. 28, as Acts x. 15, xi. 9, and elsewhere. — The construction of παύεσθαι with the participle, x. 2, for the rest the usual one, is the same as Acts v. 42, οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες. — ἀναιρεῖν, x. 9, is a favourite word with Luke. — περιελεῖν, x. 11, as Acts xxvii. 20, περιηρῆτο πᾶσα ἐλπίς. — παροξυσμός, x. 24, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts xv. 39, there in a good sense, and here in a bad sense. — τιμωρία, x. 29, is found only here in the N. T.; to be compared, however, is Acts xxii. 5, xxvi. 11. — τὰ ὑπάρχοντα,

x. 34, with the genitive, as *c.g.* Luke xi. 21 (with the dative, *c.g.* Luke viii. 3). — *προσδέχεσθαι*, x. 34, of willing reception, as *c.g.* Luke xv. 2. — *ὑπαρξίς*, x. 34, is a word of Luke's, Acts ii. 45. — *εἶναι τινός*, x. 39, with personal subject and genitive of the property, as Luke ix. 55 (*Rec.*); Acts ix. 2. — The infinitive with *τοῦ*, xi. 5, a not unclassic form of expression, is in the N. T. specially peculiar to Luke. — *ἐκζητεῖν*, xi. 6, as Acts xv. 17; Rom. iii. 11. — The construction of *ποῦ* with the indicative, xi. 8, is as Acts xx. 18, x. 18, xv. 36, and frequently elsewhere. — *παρώκησεν*, xi. 9, is equivalent to *παροικεῖν ἦλθεν*, of which the style of Luke presents not a few examples. Apart from the most similar passage, Luke xxiv. 18, *παροικεῖς εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ*, where this reading is too ill attested, we have to compare Acts vii. 4, *εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς νῦν κατοικεῖτε*; xii. 19, *εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν διέτριβεν*; Luke xi. 7; Acts viii. 40, and xviii. 21, xix. 22, *Rec.* — *τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς*, xi. 9, is written instead of *τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαγγ.*, as elsewhere only Luke ii. 8. — Corresponding to the *καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα*, xi. 11, there is found also in Luke *καὶ αὐτός* in like position with proper names, Luke xx. 42, *καὶ αὐτὸς Δαυίδ*; xxiv. 15, *καὶ αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς*; comp. Acts viii. 13, *Σίμων καὶ αὐτός*. — For the combination *δύναμις εἰς*, xi. 11, only Luke v. 17, *δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτούς*. — The *διὸ καί*, xi. 12, xiii. 12, bringing cause and effect, means and end, reason and consequence into very close reciprocal relation, is equally Lucan (Luke i. 35; Acts x. 29, xiii. 35) as Pauline. — *ἀποθνήσκειν*, xi. 21, to lie a-dying, as Luke viii. 42. — *ἀστεῖον*, xi. 23, comp. *ἀστεῖον τῷ θεῷ*, Acts vii. 20. — *ἐπί*, xi. 30, of the space of time, as Luke iv. 25; Acts xiii. 31, xix. 10. — The mode of expression *ἐργάζεσθαι δικαιοσύνην*, xi. 33, recurs also Acts x. 35 (comp. Jas. i. 20). — The phrase *στόμα μαχαίρας*, xi. 34, is Lucan, Luke xxi. 24. — To the *ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν*, xi. 35, a parallel is presented by *τυγχάνειν ἀναστάσεως*, Luke xx. 35. — The heightening *ἔτι δέ*, xi. 36, is met with also Luke xiv. 26; Acts ii. 26. — *ὑστερούμενοι*, xi. 37, is used absolutely, as in Luke xv. 14; Phil. iv. 12, *al.* — We are reminded as well by *παράκλησις* as by *διαλέγεται*, xii. 5, of Luke in the Acts. There we meet with *παρά-*

κλησις of apostolic address, going to the heart, Acts xiii. 15, xv. 31 (comp. also 1 Tim. iv. 13); there also διαλέγεσθαι, in the inchoative sense: "to open a conversation, to enter upon it," is the constant word for the standing up of Paul among the Jews, Acts xvii. 2, 17, xviii. 4, and often besides. — On ἥτις διαλέγεται, xii. 5, we have to compare Luke xi. 49: ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν. — μεταλαμβάνειν, xii. 10, is (besides 2 Tim. ii. 6) the word common to the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Acts for "to become possessed of," i.e. to come into the enjoyment or possession of a thing. — δὲ μᾶλλον, xii. 13, as Luke x. 20 (*Rec.*). — The combination ῥίζα πικρίας, xii. 15, comp. χολή πικρίας, Acts viii. 23; and the verb ἐνοχλεῖν, Luke vi. 18 (according to A B L, *al.*), comp. ὀχλεῖν, Acts v. 16; and παρενοχλεῖν, Acts xv. 19, is Lucan. — The *accus. cum infin.* μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον, xii. 19, governed by the παρητήσαντο, employed, as ver. 25, Acts xxv. 11, in the sense of "begging off from, declining with entreaty" (pure Greek, with μὴ in the infinitive clause), resembles Luke xx. 27. — ἐντρομος, xii. 21, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts vii. 32, xvi. 29. — Ἱερουσαλήμ, xii. 22, is the form of the name with Luke, Paul, and in the Apocalypse. — ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς, xii. 23, has its parallel in Luke x. 20: τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγράφη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; and the verb ἀπογράφεσθαι, in Luke ii. 1, 3, 5. — λέγων, xii. 26, the Hebrew לֵבַשׁ, is employed as in Luke i. 63, and frequently in the N. T., specially with Luke. — The neuter plural of the subject, τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα, xii. 27, is combined with the singular of the predicate μείνη, as Acts i. 18, xxvi. 24; and the perfect is followed by the *subjunctive* (conjunctive) *aorist*, as e.g. Acts ix. 17. — ἔχειν χάριν, xii. 28, to cherish and manifest gratitude, as Luke xvii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 3. — The conception in the exhortation, xiii. 7, is out and out Lucan. For ἡγούμενοι is the Lucan appellative of the leaders of the congregation, Acts xv. 22, comp. Luke xxii. 26, elsewhere only Heb. xiii. 17, 24. Paul says similarly, προϊστάμενοι, 1 Thess. v. 12. Then λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ is the ordinary Lucanic expression for the preaching of the gospel, Acts iv. 31, viii. 25, xiii. 46, and often. The verb ἀναθεωρεῖν, of continued penetrating con-

templation, occurs again, outside of the Epistle to the Hebrews, only Acts xvii. 23. And for *ἐκβασις* (1 Cor. x. 13), of the end of life, or as it is here designedly termed, of the walk, Luke has at least the synonymous expressions *ἐξοδος*, Luke ix. 31, and *ἄφιξις*, Acts xx. 29. — *ἀλυσιτελής*, xiii. 17, does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., but *λυσιτελεῖ* is found Luke xvii. 2. — *πειθόμεθα*, xiii. 18, is Lucan, according to Acts xxvi. 26. — *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, xiii. 21, is with Luke, much more than with Paul, a favourite expression, and to the preface to the wish (ver. 20) there is no more fitting parallel than Acts xx. 28, where the church of the Lord is, as here, designated as a flock which He has purchased by His own blood. — xiii. 22 is altogether Lucan: *ἀνέχεσθαι*, to give a patient, willing hearing, Acts xviii. 14, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 4; *λόγος παρακλήσεως*, Acts xiii. 15; *ἐπιστέλλειν* (like *mittere*), to write a letter, elsewhere only Acts xv. 20, xxi. 25. — The *ἀπολύειν*, not occurring with Paul, is employed in the style of Luke, as well of release from custody or prison (apart from Luke xxii. 68, xxiii. 16 ff., *e.g.* Acts iii. 13, iv. 21), as of official delegation, Acts xiii. 3, xv. 30 (for which Paul has *πέμπειν*; *e.g.* 2 Thess. iii. 2); solemn dismissal, Acts xv. 33; and in general, dismissal, Acts xix. 41, xxiii. 22. — *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας*, xiii. 24, denotes the Italiotes, according to the usage of Luke, Acts x. 23, 38, xii. 1, xvii. 13, xxi. 27.

That which Delitzsch adduces besides (in the commentary, p. 705 f.) in favour of Luke as the penman of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in favour of a joint-participation of the Apostle Paul in the composition thereof, namely—(1) that the worldly calling of Luke as a physician (Col. iv. 14) is in striking keeping with the conformation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, inasmuch as this, so to speak, contains an anatomic (iv. 12 f.), a dietetic (v. 12–14), and a therapeutic passage (xii. 12 f.), and much besides which would seem appropriate to the pen of a physician; as, *e.g.*, the use of *νοθρός*, v. 11, vi. 12; *βρώματα καὶ πόματα* (as with Hippocrates, ed. Littré, i. 622, iv. 380), in connection with which it might perhaps be observed that *ἐπιχειρεῖν*, as employed Luke i. 1, is a favourite word of Hippocrates; (2) that it is hardly accidental that the Epistle to the Hebrews, according to its earliest

location, followed immediately upon the Epistle to Philemon, among the last words of which occurs the name of Luke; (3) that it is hardly accidental, that just where the author of the Acts begins to relate with "we" (xvi. 10), the account of the association of Timothy with Paul has preceded; and, finally, (4) that it is hardly accidental that the Epistle to the Hebrews begins in a manner so strongly alliterating on the name ΠΑΥΛΟΣ,—all these are arguments which ought not to have been found at all, in a work which lays claim to a scientific character.

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

¹ If J. N. Tiele (in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1858, H. 4, p. 753 ff.) has sought to prove from the many Hebraisms in the writings of Luke that he must have been a Jew by birth, that is altogether wide of the truth, since those Hebraisms in Luke are to be set down only to the account of the sources from which he draws. — Delitzsch also (in the commentary, p. 705) now holds that the deduction of Luke's Gentile origin, made from Col. iv. 11, 14, is by no means certain (yet without advancing his reasons for this judgment); and Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, 2 Aufl., Nördl. 1860, p. 99 f., directly disputes the soundness thereof. But neither do passages like Acts xx. 6, xxvii. 9, point to a born Jew as the author of this work, as is supposed by Hofmann; nor can, in Col. iv. 10, 11, the sense be found, with Hofmann, that while, on the one hand, Aristarchus had come to Rome with Paul and belonged to his well-known surroundings; of the number of Jewish-Christians, on the other hand, beyond those of his own company, who were teaching the word of the gospel in Rome, only Marcus and Jesus united with him in harmonious working. For of such diversity of character in the relations of the three persons mentioned, towards each other and towards Paul, neither ὁ συναγχμάλωτός μου, ver. 10,—which, as is evident from ver. 23 of the contemporaneous Epistle to Philemon, can only be understood figuratively,—nor any other expression affords a hint; οἱ ὄντες ἐν περιτομῇς οὗτοι μόνου κ.τ.λ. (ver. 11) cannot therefore be referred back simply to Μάρκος and Ἰησοῦς, but must at the same time be referred to Ἀρίστανχος, unless that which naturally belongs to one whole is to be unnaturally dislocated and rent asunder. The demonstrative force of Col. iv. 11, 14 continues accordingly to assert itself in undiminished vigour.

The claim of Clemens Romanus to the authorship has been favoured by some among the moderns. Erasmus was inclined to regard him as such; and, finally, Bisping, following the example of Reithmayr (*Einfleit. in die kanon. BB. des N. T.*, Regensb. 1852, p. 681 ff.), has decided in favour of Clement. In order, however, not to approach the declaration of the Council of Trent too nearly, Bisping assumes that Clement prepared the epistle independently as a sort of homily, only as far as xiii. 17, to which xiii. 18 ff. was then added as a brief supplement by the Apostle Paul, in order thereby to adopt the whole letter as his own. But—apart from the fact that xiii. 18 ff. can proceed from no other author than that of the whole preceding letter, inasmuch as a change of the speaking subject is nowhere indicated, but, on the contrary, the opposite clearly presupposed in ver. 22—the sentences in the first, indisputably genuine, Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, which in point of contents and composition remind of the Epistle to the Hebrews (*vid. supra*, p. 7 f.), have evidently only been taken over by him from this epistle, in consequence of a use and imitation thereof. For, as regards originality and grasp of mind, the Epistle of Clement is far inferior to the Epistle to the Hebrews. In other respects, the character of the respective writings is too greatly diverse for them to be able to proceed from one and the same author. Of the Alexandrian speculative mind, and the oratorical flight of the Epistle to the Hebrews, not a trace is found in the Epistle of Clement.

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

The opinion that Apollos was the author of this epistle was first broached by Luther. Comp. on Gen. xlviii. 20 (ed. Witeberg. 1561, t. vi. p. 710): autor epistolae ad Hebraeos,

quisquis est, sive Paulus, sive, ut ego arbitror, Apollo. — *Sermon von den Sekten*, 1 Cor. iii. 4 ff. (with Walch, Th. xii. p. 1996): "This Apollo was a highly intelligent man; the Epistle Hebraeorum is of a truth his." — *Epist. am Christtag.*, Heb. i. 1 ff. (with Walch, Th. xii. p. 204): "That is a stout, powerful, and lofty epistle, which soars high, and treats of the sublime article of faith in the Godhead of Christ; and it is a credible opinion that it is not St. Paul's, for the reason that it maintains a more ornate discourse than is the wont of St. Paul in other places. Some think it is St. Luke's, some St. Apollo's, whom St. Luke extols as having been mighty in the Scriptures against the Jews, Acts xviii. 24. It is indeed true that no epistle wields the Scripture with such force as this; that it was an excellent apostolic man, be he whosoever he may." Luther's conjecture has been accepted by Lucas Osiander, Clericus, Heumann (*Schediasma de libris anonymis ac pseudonymis*, Jenae 1711, 8, p. 38 sqq.), Lorenz Müller (*Dissertatt. de eloquentia Apollinis, viri apostolici*, Schleus. 1717), Semler (in his "Contributions to a more accurate understanding of the Epistle to the Hebrews," prefixed to Baumgarten's commentary, p. 15 f.; yet he expresses himself with hesitation), Ziegler (*Vollständ. Einleit. in den Br. an die Hebr.*, Götting. 1791, 8, p. 255 ff.), Dindorf (on *Ernesti lectt.* p. 1180); and recently by Bleek, Tholuck, Credner, Reuss, Bunsen (*Hippolytus und seine Zeit*, Bd. I., Leipz. 1852, p. 365), Henry Alford (*Greek Testament*, vol. iv. P. 1, Lond. 1859, Prolegg. p. 58 ff.), Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* II. p. 894), which last, however, only claims the same degree of probability in favour of Apollos as of Silvanus; Bäumlein (*Commentar üb. d. Ev. des Joh.*, Stuttg. 1863, p. 26), Samuel Davidson (*Introduction*, p. 255 ff.), J. H. Kurtz (*der Br. an die Hebr. erkl.*, Mitau 1869, p. 55 f.), Hilgenfeld (*Hist.-krit. Einl. in das N. T.*, Leipz. 1875, p. 356, 386 ff.), and others, even by the Catholics Feilmoser (*Einl. in's N. T.* p. 359 ff.) and Lutterbeck (*Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, Bd. II., Mainz 1852, p. 101 ff.).¹ It is, moreover, the only correct

¹ According to Lutterbeck, however, the Apostle Paul must have added the last nine verses, and Apollos, in communion with Luke, Clement, and others of the Pauline school, have issued the epistle.

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

That, if we are to fix upon a particular person as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, this can be no other than Apollos, because contents and form of the epistle are so admirably fitting to no other Christian teacher of the apostolic age as to this, is admitted also by W. Grimm (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1870, p. 74 ff.). He finds, however, an instance of decisive counter-evidence against Apollos in the passage Heb.

ii. 3 as compared with Acts xviii. 24-28. For, according to Heb. ii. 3, the message of salvation had come to the author of the epistle, equally with his readers, by the instrumentality of those who had heard the Lord Himself; whereas, according to the Acts, Apollos, as a disciple of John, had been only in the vestibule of Christianity, and had been first introduced into the sanctuary thereof by means of the Christians Aquila and Priscilla, who were converts of Paul's. But apart from the fact that—as Grimm himself acknowledges—the narrative of Acts xviii. 24 ff. is so far obscure and not free from self-contradiction, as it represents Apollos, although he knew only the baptism of John, nevertheless as *κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου*, and an *ἀκριβῶς διδάσκειν τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* is attributed to him (ver. 25),—we must remember that at Heb. ii. 3 recipients and author of the epistle are characterized only as belonging to a second generation of Christendom. Not that every single one of the persons mentioned ver. 3 had received the word of salvation at the mouth of immediate ear-witnesses, or were by these specially received into instruction, is expressed; but only that the message of salvation was handed down in a certain and trustworthy way from the original ear-witnesses to the totality of the Christian circle which is formed by the *ἡμεῖς*, and thus came to the knowledge of each single one of this totality. Even, therefore, if Apollos had not been directly brought into any intercourse with the *ἀκούσαντες*, yet the passages Acts xviii. 24 ff. and Heb. ii. 3 would not be irreconcilable the one with the other. But is it at all conceivable that such a leading Christian teacher as Apollos, who continued in such intimate association with the Apostle Paul, should come into no personal contact whatever with the original apostles?—To the further objections brought by Grimm against the Apollos-theory, he himself attaches no decisive weight. They are the following:—(1) In connection with a former disciple of John, it must appear exceedingly strange that he makes no mention, i. 1, of the distinguished position occupied by John the Baptist, as the greatest prophet (Luke vii. 28, Matt. xi. 11) and forerunner of the Lord, towards the kingdom of God; (2) Clemens Romanus, although making frequent use of the epistle, could hardly have known it as a

work of Apollos, since it would otherwise have only been natural that he should, in the 47th chapter of his Epistle to the Corinthians, have reminded the Corinthian Christians of our epistle as a work of Apollos. But that Clement *must necessarily* have so acted cannot be maintained. For a reference to John the Baptist, however, Heb. i. 1 offered no occasion whatever; because it was with the author only a question of contrasting with each other the revelations of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament as such.

SEC. 2.—THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.¹

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

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

¹ Comp. my *Whitsuntide Programm*: De literarum, quæ ad Hebræos inscribuntur, primis lectoribus, Gott. 1853.

Bengel, Ch. F. Schmid (*Observatt. super ep. ad Hebr.* p. 16 sq.), and Cramer; those in Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, by W. Wall (*Brief Critical Notes*, etc., Lond. 1730, p. 318) and Wolf; the Laodiceans, by Stein (*Komment. zu dem Ev. des Lucas*, Halle 1830, p. 289 ff.); the Galatians, by Storr and Myuster (*Kleine theol. Schriften*, Copenhag. 1825, p. 91 ff.); the Lycaonians, by Credner (*Einl. in d. N. T.*, Th. 1, Abth. 2, Halle 1836, p. 564); the Antiochians, by Böhme and Hofmann (*Die h. Schr. N. T.*, Th. 5, p. 531); the Cyprians, by Ullmann (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1828, p. 397); those in one of the numerous Greek cities on the coast of Asia Minor, or of Syria and Palestine, by Grimm (*Theolog. Literat.-Bl. to the Darmstadt Allg. Kirch.-Zeit.* 1857, No. 29, p. 660; but not decidedly); the Macedonians, specially those of Thessalonica, by Semler (in Baumgarten, p. 37 ff.) and Nösselt (*Opusce. ad interpretationem sacrarum scripturarum*, Fasc. I., Halae 1785, p. 269 sqq.); those of Corinth, by Mich. Weber (*De numero epistolarum ad Corinthios rectius constituendo*, Wittenb. 1798–1806) and Mack (*Theolog. Quartalschr.* 1838, H. 3); those of an Italian congregation, perhaps of the great city Ravenna, by Ewald (*Gött. gel. Anz.* 1863, p. 286; cf. *Gesch. Isr.*, Bd. VI. p. 638, *Das Sendschreiben an die Hebr.*, Gött. 1870, p. 6); those of Rome, by Wetstein (*Nov. Test.* II. p. 386 sq.), and recently by R. Köstlin (*Theol. Jahrb.* of Baur and Zeller, 1850, H. 2, p. 242), who, however, afterwards withdrew this opinion (*vid. infra*); by Holzmann (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1859, H. 2, p. 297 ff., in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, VIII., and in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, H. 1, p. 1 ff.), by Alford (*Greek Test.*, vol. II. part 1, Lond. 1859, *Prolegg.* p. 62 ff.), by Kurtz, p. 42 ff., by Renan (*L'Antechrist*, Paris 1873, p. xviii. ff., 211), by Mangold (in Bleek's *Einleit. in das N. T.*, 3 Aufl., Berl. 1875, p. 612 f.), and by Harnack (*Patr. Apostt. Opp.* I. p. lxxxii.); those of Spain, finally, by Nicolaus de Lyra (in the *Prooemium* to the epistle) and by Ludwig (in Carpzov's *Sacr. Exercitt. in St. P. ep. ad Hebr.*, Helmst. 1750, p. lix. sq.).

All these opinions, however, which in part rest upon the erroneous supposition that the epistle is the work of the Apostle Paul, find their refutation at once in the fact that it cannot have been addressed to so-called mixed assemblies,

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

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

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

epistle can therefore only have been addressed either to the Christian congregation in Palestine, mainly in Jerusalem, or to Egyptian, specially Alexandrian, Jewish-Christians. The latter supposition has found defenders in J. E. Chr. Schmidt (*Hist.-krit. Einl. in's N. T.*, Giessen 1804, p. 284, 293), Bunsen (*Hippolytus und seine Zeit*, Bd. I., Leipz. 1852, p. 365), Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1858, H. 1, p. 103; *Hist.-krit. Einl. in das N. T.*, Leipz. 1875, p. 385 f.), Volkmar (*Gesch. des Neutest. Kanon*, von C. A. Credner, Herausgg. v. G. V., Berl. 1860, p. 182), Ritschl (*Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1866, H. 1, p. 90), and in particular Wieseler (*Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters*, Gött. 1848, p. 481 ff.; *Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief, namentlich seinen Verfasser u. s. Leser*. Second half. [*Schriften der Universität zu Kiel aus d. J.* 1861, 4, B. VIII.; also separately printed, Kiel 1861, 8.] Comp. also *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1847, H. 4, p. 840 ff.; 1867, H. 4, p. 665 ff.), and R. Köstlin (*Theol. Jahrb.* of Baur and Zeller, 1854, H. 3, p. 388 ff.); Davidson, too (*Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, vol. I., Lond. 1868, p. 265 ff., 270), although he does not decide, gives it the preference. The prevailing opinion, on the other hand, is the first one. Within recent times it has been maintained by Bleek, Schott, de Wette, Thiersch, Stengel, Delitzsch, Tholuck, Ebrard,¹ Bisping, Bloomfield, Ritschl (*Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche*, 2 Aufl., Bonn 1857, p. 159), Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebr.-Br.* I. p. 31), Maier, Langen (*Tübing. theol. Quartalschr.* 1863, H. 3, p. 379 ff.), Moll, and others.² And rightly so.

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

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

² W. Grimm also supposes now that the epistle was addressed to a town of Palestine; only not Jerusalem, but Jamnia. Comp. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1870, p. 71 f. Nevertheless we know nothing of the existence of a Christian congregation in Jamnia.

(1) Even in ancient times the Epistle to the Hebrews bore likewise the title of a letter to the Alexandrians, and in general there is seen to be a wavering within the early church itself in the indication of the original circle of readers. Whether, indeed, the superscription *Πρὸς Ἑβραίους* proceeds from the author himself, a view to which Bleek and Credner are inclined, is doubtful. But not only is this superscription very ancient, since it is found in the Peshito, and with Tertullian, Origen, and many others; but the fact, moreover, is universally presupposed in Christian antiquity as beyond doubt that the *Ἑβραῖοι*, whose name the epistle bears at its head, were the Palestinian Christians. The evidence for this statement is afforded by Pantænus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and many others. It is now indeed supposed that we possess a testimony in favour of the Alexandrians as the original recipients of the epistle, namely, in the so-called Canon of Muratori, in which we read: *Fertur etiam ad Laudecenses (Laodicenses), alia ad Alexandrinos, Pauli nomine fictæ (fictæ) ad hæresen Marcionis, et alia plura, quæ in catholicam ecclesiam recipi (recipi) non potest (possunt). Fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit.* For that by the words *alia ad Alexandrinos* the Epistle to the Hebrews is meant must be assumed, as is supposed, since otherwise the Epistle to the Hebrews would, remarkably enough, not be even mentioned in the fragment, which, forsooth, is a list both of the genuine and spurious epistles ascribed to the Apostle Paul. Now this epistle, it is argued, not being in the early Roman Church either regarded as a work of Paul, or indeed as canonical, must have been mentioned by name precisely in this passage, in which the writer is speaking of epistles of which the authorship is falsely imputed to the Apostle Paul. But against this it must be said that the characteristics of the epistle *ad Alexandrinos*, of which the fragment makes mention, are not suitable to the Epistle to the Hebrews. For the former was a forgery, composed “Pauli nomine,” the meaning of which is too distinct for us to be able, with Wieseler, to subtilize it into the statement that the epistle had only indirectly, from its contents and general bearing, left the impression of its

proceeding from Paul; which rather can only indicate that this epistle, in a prefixed address altogether wanting to the Epistle to the Hebrews, put forth the claim to be a work of Paul. Moreover, it was fabricated "*ad haeresem Marcionis*," which can mean nothing else but that its contents were in agreement with the errors of Marcion, and were designed to wage a propaganda for the same. With Marcionite errors, however, the Epistle to the Hebrews has confessedly nothing in common; but, on the contrary, "its fundamental doctrine of Mosaism as pointing forward to Christianity, as well as the idea of the incarnation of the Divine Logos, is in glaring contrast with Marcion's Gnosis" (Grimm, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1870, p. 55), as accordingly it obtained no reception into Marcion's canon.¹ That, finally, the fragmentist *must necessarily* have mentioned the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot be asserted, inasmuch as, considering the non-currency thereof within the early Roman Church, it was quite possible that he should not be at all acquainted with it. Comp. also Fr. H. Hesse, *das Muratori'sche Fragment neu untersucht und erklärt*, (Giessen 1873, p. 201 ff.— But as it cannot be shown that the Epistle to the Hebrews passed in antiquity for an epistle to the Alexandrians, so in like manner it cannot be shown that this epistle was regarded by others in early times as an epistle to the Laodiceans. This last has been inferred from the words of Philastrius (*Haeres.* 89): *Haeresis quorundam de epistola Pauli ad Hebraeos. Sunt alii quoque, qui epistolam Pauli ad Hebraeos non adserunt esse ipsius, sed dicunt aut Barnabae esse apostoli aut Clementis de urbe Roma episcopi. Alii autem Lucae evangelistae ajunt epistolam etiam ad Laodicensens conscriptam. Et quia addiderunt in ea quaedam*

¹ This counter-moment Wieseler now, indeed, seeks to deprive of its force, by giving to the words in Muratori's fragment another punctuation than that given above, as also formerly by himself, in supposing the comma after *Marcionis* is to be deleted, and one placed after *factae*; so that the sense shall be: "There is also in circulation an epistle to the Laodiceans, another to the Alexandrians, which have been fabricated under the name of Paul; with the sect of Marcion there are also several other things current, which, etc." But what unnatural twisting and rending by such construction of that which is simply and naturally connected; and how little can it serve to the recommendation thereof, that *ad haeresem Marcionis* must be taken in the sense of *apud Marcionitas*!

non bene sentientes, inde non legitur in ecclesia; etsi legitur a quibusdam, non tamen in ecclesia legitur populo, nisi tredecim epistolae ejus et ad Hebraeos interdum. But manifestly the words *Alii autem*, etc., are only a concise expression for the declaration that others looked upon the evangelist Luke as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and not only as the author of this, but also of the Epistle to the Laodiceans. The Epistle to the Laodiceans was not at all read in the service of the church; the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, was read indeed in the service of the church, not, however, as the thirteen Pauline Epistles, regularly, but only occasionally.¹ Just as little, finally, is there any indication of a controversy with regard to the original recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when Chrysostom, in the *Prooemium* of his commentary, takes up the question: *ποῦ δὲ οὖσιν ἐπέστελλεν*; and then answers this with *ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ*. For Chrysostom perceived that the superscription of the epistle was in and of itself an ambiguous one, inasmuch as it admitted the possibility of thinking of the Jewish-Christians

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

in general as the recipients of the letter; he thought it needful, therefore, to state the limitation with which in his estimation the *Πρὸς Ἑβραίους*, of such wide signification, is to be understood.

(2) The description of the Jewish sanctuary (ix. 1–5), as well as the acts of ritual performed in the same (vii. 27, x. 11), is supposed to point to the temple at Leontopolis in Egypt. But even if it could be proved that the temple arrangements at Leontopolis furnished the standard for that description, and that the original regulations of Moses were identified with these, yet only the conclusion would be warranted with respect to the author, that he must have been by birth an Egyptian Jew, but it could not be inferred with equal necessity that his readers also were to be sought in Egypt. Nevertheless, that assertion itself by no means admits of proof. For Josephus,—to whose testimony Wieseler appeals,—where he is describing in general that *ἱερόν* at Leontopolis, designates the same as *ὅμοιον* (*Antiq.* xii. 9. 7), or as *παραπλήσιον* (*Antiq.* xx. 10) *τῷ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις*, but then observes, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 10. 3, where he is relating somewhat more exactly, as follows: *Ὀνίας τὸν μὲν ναὸν οὐχ ὅμοιον ᾠκοδόμησε τῷ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἀλλὰ πύργῳ παραπλήσιον, λίθων μεγάλων εἰς ἐξήκοντα πῆχεις ἀνεστηκότα, τοῦ βωμοῦ δὲ τὴν κατασκευὴν πρὸς τὸν οἴκοι ἐξεμιμήσατο καὶ τοῖς ἀναθήμασιν ὁμοίως ἐκόσμησε, χωρὶς τῆς περὶ τὴν λυχνίαν κατασκευῆς. Οὐ γὰρ ἐποίησε λυχνίαν αὐτὸν δὲ χαλκευσάμενος τὸν λύχνον χρυσοῦν ἐπιφαίνοντα σέλας χρυσοῦς ἀλύσεως ἐξεκρέμασεν.* Josephus accordingly relates that the temple of Onias in Egypt was indeed as to its outward form different from the temple at Jerusalem, inasmuch as it stood upon a foundation or sub-structure¹ of great stones rising sixty cubits high, and thereby acquired a tower-like appearance;

¹ If Josephus had, as Wieseler supposes, ascribed to the *ναὸς* only a total height of sixty cubits, he would neither have characterized it as tower-like, nor have designated it as unlike the *ναὸς* in Jerusalem. For the latter also had, at any rate, a height of sixty cubits. It is true Wieseler finds actually expressed by *ἀλλὰ πύργῳ παραπλήσιον* not a dissimilarity, but a resemblance to the temple erected at Jerusalem by Zerubbabel; but he reaches this result only by unwarrantably translating *ἀλλὰ* as “but yet,” and accordingly taking *ἀλλὰ* . . .

that, on the other hand, its inner arrangement, with the single exception of the golden candlestick, was constituted in the same manner as that of the temple at Jerusalem, for the altar of burnt-offering and the other sacred objects were similar in both. Now, how does it follow from these statements that the golden altar of incense in the Egyptian temple occupied the very site which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews assigns to it at ix. 4, in contradiction with the actual position thereof in the temple at Jerusalem, namely, in the Most Holy Place? Of such a difference—and surely just this point would have called for proof—Josephus says in truth not a single word, but, on the contrary, leaves the opposite impression. And then how could the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, if he had had the temple of Onias before him in his description of the sanctuary, have written ἐν ᾗ ἡ λυχνία, ix. 2, when, according to the express statement of Josephus, there was not therein a lamp-stand resting on the ground, as in the temple at Jerusalem, but a chandelier suspended by a golden chain?—In Philo, too, Wieseler has subsequently (comp. *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1867, p. 673 ff.) fancied he could discover a support for his opinion. In *de sacrificantiibus*, § 4 (ed. Mangey, II. p. 253), and *de animal. sacrific.* § 10 (ed. Mangey, II. p. 247), it is thought that Philo expressly testifies that in the temple of Onias the altar of incense, as well as the vessels mentioned Heb. ix. 4, 5, were present in the Most Holy Place. Yet how entirely unsuccessful this attempted proof of Wieseler's is, has been already convincingly shown in detail by Grimm, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1870, p. 60 ff.—But just as little do the notices, Heb. vii. 27, x. 11, lead to think of the temple of Onias. For even supposing—what is far, however, from being the case—that it could be historically proved, with regard to the Egyptian temple, that the high priest entered into the Most

ἁγιστάριον as a kind of parenthetical insertion: “Onias erected the temple not indeed equal to that one in Jerusalem, but yet tower-like, since it was built up of large stones sixty cubits high; in the construction of the altar, however, he imitated that of his native land.” That ἀλλὰ, on account of the preceding οὐχ, can signify only *but, on the contrary* [sondern], and introduces the particular point of difference by which the before-mentioned dissimilarity is evidenced, ought not to have been called in question.

Holy Place every day, yet such fact would not so much as accord with the presuppositions of the Epistle to the Hebrews. For, Heb. ix. 7, it is expressly said that the high priest went into the Most Holy Place only once in the year. Nor, as we need hardly remark, can this passage, in connection with ix. 4, vii. 27, x. 11, contain the sense which Wieseler would put into it, that the high priest entered indeed the Most Holy Place every day, but only once in the year with blood. For to εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν διὰ παντὸς εἰσίσαιν οἱ ἱερεῖς only the words εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς form the opposition, and not until after the laying down of this opposition is the nearer modality for the final member added, namely, that the high priest, in the (special) case of his entering the Most Holy Place, enters it not without blood.

The fact, however, in general, that the original recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews attached so high a value to the temple service and the sacrificial ritual, that even as Christians they regarded continual participation in the same as necessary for the attaining of salvation, is one which points not to Alexandrians, but only to Palestinians. For, quite apart from the consideration that we do not even know from other sources whether the Christian congregation of Alexandria was an unmingled Jewish-Christian one, nay, whether an organized Christian congregation existed there at all so early as the time of our letter, the Alexandrian Jews had been so greatly affected by Grecian culture and philosophy, that their whole bent of mind had become a spiritualistic one. Far from all narrow-minded cleaving to the letter of the Mosaic law, they sought by allegoric interpretation to discover and bring into recognition the deeper spiritual sense underlying the precepts and institutions of Judaism. In addition to this, the temple of Onias in Leontopolis was not able to boast even in Egypt itself of any high estimation. The Egyptian Jews were to a great extent displeased that it did not stand upon Moriah; the Egyptian Samaritans, that it did not stand upon Gerizim (comp. Jost, *Allg. Gesch. des Israel. Volks*, in 2 vols., Bd. I. p. 515 ff.). The yearly temple-gifts, too, were on that account for the most part sent not to Leontopolis, but to Jerusalem

(comp. Frankel, *Histor.-krit. Studien zu der Septuaginta*, Bd. I. Abth. 1, Leipz. 1841, p. 186, note *d*) ; and pilgrimages of Alexandrian Jews to Jerusalem, to offer prayers and sacrifices in the temple there, did not cease so long as this temple continued to exist. Even Philo vouches for this. (Comp. Opp., ed. Mangey, t. II. p. 646 : καθ' ὃν χρόνον εἰς τὸ πατρίων ἱερὸν ἐστελλόμεν ἐνξόμενός τε καὶ θύσων.)

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

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

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

(Köstlin, *l.c.* p. 402), *i.e.* a writing peculiar to Alexandrian Judaism, admits only of an inference pointing back to an Alexandrian author, but not to Alexandrian readers.

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

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

Whilst the above-mentioned arguments are common to the majority of those who dispute the Palestino-Jerusalemic destination of the epistle, Köstlin has sought to confirm his position by the following additional counter-moments peculiar to himself:—

1) The author, as is shown by his entire dependence upon the Septuagint, was acquainted only with Greek. But it results from xiii. 19 that he himself belonged to the congregation to which he is writing. If, therefore, the epistle were directed to Palestine, the author himself would have been a Palestinian Christian; as such, however, hardly of so exclusively Hellenistic culture, but without doubt familiar with the vernacular of Palestine, and notably acquainted with the original text of the Old Testament. Reply: But that the author himself was a member of the congregation to which he is writing, does not at all follow from xiii. 19. Comp. the exposition of the passage.

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

(3) If Jerusalem had been the place of destination for the epistle, the author (ii. 3) could not have omitted to remind the readers that the Lord Himself had walked, and taught, and wrought among them, had in their midst, nay, before their eyes, suffered the death of the cross, among them had found the first witnesses of His resurrection and ascension; and the more so, since during the years 60-70 there must still have

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

belonging to a second generation of Christians, just because only the character of the congregation in general, or as it presented itself in the main and on the whole, was being taken into account.

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

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

(6) From the carefully-chosen designation *τοῖς ἁγίοις*, it is evident that the *Ἑβραῖοι* are here presupposed to be a non-Palestinian community, who have aided the Palestinenses with their support. Any other congregation (!) than the primitive one could not have been thus simply designated as *οἱ ἅγιοι*, whereas the employment of this name with regard to that congregation is very frequent (1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor.

viii. 4, ix. 1; Rom. xv. 25, 31). A usage to be accounted for by the fact that, as distinguished from all the other *ἐκκλησίαι*, the Palestinian, and specially the Jerusalemic Christians, were the *ἅγιοι κατ' ἐξοχήν*, who before all others, chosen and separated from the world by Christ and His apostles themselves, became the first recipients of the divine word and of the Holy Spirit, were the first witnesses and intermediate channels of Christian truth for all other Christian communities, and were also, as such, acknowledged (specially Rom. xv. 27), until, owing to the destruction of Jerusalem and the rending progress of Gentile Christianity, this relation of dependence and filial affection was gradually dissolved of itself.—In order, however, to show the mistake in such reasoning, it suffices to point to the use of *οἱ ἅγιοι* in passages like 1 Cor. vi. 1, 2, xvi. 15; Rom. xii. 13, xvi. 2; 1 Tim. v. 10; to the addresses of the Pauline epistles; to the addition *τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ*, considered necessary in connection with *τῶν ἀγίων*, Rom. xv. 26; and many similar instances. (1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, on the other hand, there was no need of such addition,—against Kurtz,—because the collection which is the subject treated of in those passages was a business already known to the Corinthians, and before earnestly enjoined upon them; while, Rom. xv. 25, it was already apparent from *νυνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ*, and, Rom. xv. 31, from *ἡ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ*, of what *ἅγιοι* the apostle was speaking.) Yea, Köstlin has even overlooked the consideration, that by means of this argument, if it were well-grounded, he would most effectually refute himself! For what further proof, that the readers of the letter are to be sought in Jerusalem, would it then need than the utterance of our epistle itself, xiii. 24: *ἀσπιάσασθε πάντας τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους*?

(7) That the Jerusalemic congregation remained, as is clear from Acts ii. 46, iii. 1 (comp. xxi. 20), from the first in connection with the temple ritual. By the recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, all religious connection with Judaism was originally relinquished, and only now had they become involved in peril, as well through the influence of teachings which would urge the necessity of holding firmly

to the Mosaic law (xiii. 9 ff.), as also, as it seems, through the influence of enticing offers (comp. xii. 16 f.), partly also by harassing manifestations of ill-will on the part of their former Jewish fellow-believers, of being seduced into a return to the Jewish religious constitution. But the actual state of matters is by this assertion inverted into its exact opposite. For that the recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews not only still continued to occupy themselves with the Jewish temple-service and sacrificial ritual, but even regarded participation therein as a necessary requirement for the complete expiation of sins, certainly underlies the whole argumentation of the epistle as an everywhere-recurring presupposition.

SEC. 3.—OCCASION, OBJECT. AND CONTENTS.

The Epistle to the Hebrews was occasioned by the danger to which the Christians in Palestine, particularly in Jerusalem, were exposed, of renouncing again their faith in Christ, and wholly falling back again into Judaism (comp. specially vi. 4-6, x. 26 ff.). This danger had become a very pressing one, inasmuch as many had already as a matter of fact ceased to frequent the Christian assemblies (x. 25). The epistle accordingly aims, by the unfolding on every side of the sublimity of the Christian revelation as the perfect and archetypal, above that of the Old Testament as the merely preparatory and typical, as well as by setting forth the terrible consequences of an apostasy, to warn against such falling away, and to animate to a faithful perseverance in the Christian course. — Differently, but quite incorrectly, does Thiersch (*De epistola ad Hebr.*, Marb. 1848, p. 2 sqq.; *Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter*, Frankf. and Erlang. 1852, p. 188 ff.) define the object of the epistle, to the effect that it was to be a consolatory letter to the Christians of Jerusalem, on account of the exclusion from the Jewish temple with which they had been visited on the part of their unconverted compatriots at the outbreak of the Jewish war. Nothing in the epistle points to any such state of the matter; but, on the contrary, even the one passage, Heb. xiii. 13, serves to place in a clear light the erroneousness of this conjecture. For, instead of mentioning a state of exclusion,

and bestowing a word of consolation upon the occasion of an event like that, the author here assuredly summons to a coming forth out of Judaism as a voluntary act, and thus, as in his other reasoning, presupposes that the readers were still in the midst of Judaism, and adhered thereto with narrow-minded and unchristian stubbornness. A special support for his hypothesis Thiersch fancies is to be found in the eleventh chapter. All the historic instances there adduced are, he tells us, chosen by the author with a special bearing upon such a position of the readers as is assumed by him. But a glance at the paraphrase of the eleventh chapter, which Thiersch affords in proof of this assertion, shows that everything from which he derives his argument has first been imported by himself into the text.—That, finally, also Ebrard's view—according to which the epistle was designed to be “a kind of manual (*Leitfaden*)” (!) for Jerusalem “neophytes” (!), who, “out of dread of exclusion from the temple cultus,” seemed about to withdraw again from Christianity¹—is an extremely arbitrary one, needs hardly a word of further demonstration.

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

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

¹ “Hostility of the other Jews,” and “apprehension of being excluded from the temple cult,” is also assumed by v. Döllinger (*Christenthum und Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung*, Regensb. 1860, p. 84) as the cause of the tendency to apostasy; while Kluge (*der Hebräerbrief. Auslegung und Lehrbegriff*. Neukirchpin 1863, p. 203 ff.) discovers in the letter a product of the Jewish apocalypses (!) transplanted upon Christian soil, which as such has arisen only after the destruction of Jerusalem, and received its outward occasion from the final catastrophe of the Jewish people. Deriving its theme from Rom. xi. 32, it is supposed to pursue the soterio-pædagogic object of an exhortation to repentance for the chosen people, and of a warning to the Jewish-Christian readers descended from Israel against apostasy from their living hopes.

the Mosaic law, given through the ministry of angels, could not be transgressed with impunity, the culpability of slighting the Christian salvation, proclaimed by the Lord and attested by God Himself, is incomparably greater (ii. 1-4). Not to angels, but to Christ, the Son of man, is the Messianic kingdom made subject. Certainly Christ was for a little time abased beneath the angels; but thus it must be, in order that mankind might obtain salvation: He must suffer and die, and in all things become like unto men, His brethren, in order to be able, as High Priest, to reconcile them to God (vv. 5-18). Therefore consider well Jesus, the Envoy and High Priest of our confession! He is more exalted than Moses; so much higher does He stand than Moses, as the son, who is lord over the house, has precedence over the servant of the house (iii. 1-6). Take heed, therefore, in accordance with the admonition of the Holy Ghost, of unbelief and apostasy; since the fate of the fathers, who because of their disobedience became the prey of destruction, serves to you as a warning.³¹ The promise of God of an entering into His rest is still unfulfilled; to you, also, the entrance is open, if you have faith, whereas rebelliousness against the admonition which is addressed anew unto you delivers you over to the vindictory righteousness of God (iv. 1-13). The readers ought to hold fast to the Christian confession, since they possess in Jesus a High Priest who is not only highly exalted, but also is qualified to redeem mankind (vv. 14-16). The two main essential qualifications which every human high priest must possess,—namely, the capacity for having sympathy with erring humanity, and the being no usurper of the office, but one called of God to the same,—Christ also possesses. He is a High Priest after the manner of Melchisedec (v. 1-10). But before the author passes over, as is his purpose, to the more detailed presentation of the high-priestly dignity belonging to Christ after the manner of Melchisedec, and thus to His exalted rank above the Levitical high priests, he complains, in a digression, of the low stage of Christian knowledge at which the readers, who ought themselves long ago to have been teachers of Christianity, still remain. He exhorts them to strive after full manhood and maturity in the Christian life, and, in a note of warning,

reminds them that those who have already experienced, in its influence upon them, the fulness of blessing which pertains to Christianity, and nevertheless apostatize from the faith, by their own fault let slip beyond recovery the Christian blessedness; then, however, expresses the confidence he feels that it will not be so with the readers, who have distinguished themselves, and do still distinguish themselves by works of Christian love, and indicates what he desires of them, namely, perseverance to the end; while at the same time he directs their attention to the inviolability of the divine promise and the objective certainty of the Christian hope (v. 11—vi. 20). With the seventh chapter the author returns to the subject under discussion. He dwells first upon the person of Melchisedec himself, following up the hints of Scripture as he presents to his readers the exalted position of Melchisedec, and shows a threefold superiority of the same over the Levitical priests (vii. 1—10). From this relation of inferiority, however, it follows now that the Levitical priesthood, and thus consequently the Mosaic law in general, is imperfect and incapable of leading on to perfection. For otherwise there would have been no need, after the law had long been instituted, of the promise and the appearing of another priest of other descent (vv. 11, 12). That the Levitical priesthood, together with the Mosaic law, has lost its validity, is evident from the circumstance that Christ, to whom that divine utterance Ps. cx. 4 has reference, belongs as a matter of fact to a tribe which, according to Mosaic ordinance, has no part in the administration of the priestly office (vv. 13, 14); it is further evident from the consideration that the new priest who is promised is to bear a resemblance to Melchisedec, in which is implied just the particular, that his characteristic peculiarity is other than that of the Levitical priests (vv. 15—17). The end, to the bringing in of which the Levitical priesthood was wanting in power, is attained by Christ's everlasting priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec (vv. 18, 19). The pre-eminence of this over the Levitical priesthood appears further from the fact that it was constituted by God by virtue of an oath, whereas the former was constituted without an oath (vv. 20—22). The Levitical priests, moreover, die one after another:

Christ's priesthood, on the other hand,—and that forms a third point of superiority,—since He ever liveth, is an unchangeable and intransitory priesthood (vv. 23–25). A fourth point of superiority is manifested in the distinction, that while the Levitical priests are sinful men, who each successive day must offer sacrifices for their own sins and the sins of the people, Christ is the sinless Son of God, who once for all has offered up Himself as a sacrifice (vv. 26–28). But not only as regards His own person is Christ exalted far above the Levitical priests: the sanctuary, too, in which He exercises the high-priestly functions, is exalted far above the Levitical one. For Christ administers His office of high priest in the heavenly tabernacle, erected by God Himself, of which, as the prototype, the earthly tabernacle in which the Levitical priests minister is a mere copy (viii. 1–5). So much more excellent is the personal ministry of Christ, inasmuch as the covenant, whose Mediator He is, is a better covenant, because resting upon the foundation of better promises. The character of this promised new covenant is a more inner, spiritual one; and by the promise of a new covenant the old is declared to be worn out and no longer serviceable (vv. 6–13). In the disposition of the Mosaic sanctuary itself, and the ordering of the priestly ministration in conformity therewith, lies the indication on the part of God, that Mosaism is not itself the perfect religion, but only the preparatory institution for the same (ix. 1–8); as accordingly also the Levitical sacrifices, since they belong to the domain of carnal ordinance, are not in a position to make real atonement, whereas the sacrifice of Christ, presented by virtue of an eternal spirit through the efficacy of His own blood, possesses an everlasting power of atonement (vv. 9–14). In order to be the Middle Person of the New Covenant, Christ, however, *must needs suffer death*. That follows from the notion of a *διαθήκη*, since such acquires a binding character only when the death of the *διαθέμενος* has been before proved; as accordingly also the first, or Old Testament *διαθήκη*, was not consecrated without blood, and without blood-shedding there is, under the Mosaic law, no forgiveness. For the consecration of the earthly sanctuary the blood of slain animals sufficed, but for the consecration of the heavenly sanctuary there was need of a more

excellent sacrifice than these ; this Christ has offered once for all at the end of the world, by His sin-cancelling sacrificial death ; and in connection with His return, to be looked for unto the salvation of them that wait for Him, no repetition of sacrifice will be necessary (vv. 15-28). † In the imperfection of the Mosaic law is to be sought the cause that under it the expiatory sacrifice is repeated every year ; that repetition contains the reminder that there are ever sins still present, as truly a cancelling of sins by the blood of bulls and of goats is from the very nature of the case impossible (x. 1-4). Already in Scripture has it been expressed, that not by animal sacrifices, but only by the fulfilling of the will of God, deliverance from sins is to be attained. On the ground of this fulfilment of His will by Christ are we Christians sanctified (vv. 5-10). Hereupon the main distinction between the Old Testament high priest and the High Priest of the New Testament is once more brought into relief—namely, in that the former daily repeats the same sacrifices without thereby effecting the cancelling of sin ; the latter, on the other hand, by His sacrifice once offered, has wrought everlasting sanctification ; and finally, attention is drawn to the Scripture testimony, that there is no more need for further expiatory sacrifice (vv. 15-18).

The readers in possession of such an High Priest, and the blessing mediated by Him, are to cleave with resolution and constancy to the Christian faith, to incite one another to love and good works, and not, as has become a practice with some, to forsake the religious assemblies. And the more so since the Advent is now close at hand (vv. 19-25). For he who wittingly contemns recognised Christian truth, and sins against it, will not escape the avenging judgment of God (vv. 26-31). Mindful of the Christian courage they have displayed in former days, the readers are not to lose their Christian cheerfulness, but to persevere in the Christian career ; for only a short time longer will it be before the return of Christ, and the entrance into the promised fulness of blessing (vv. 32-39). The author hereupon defines the nature of the *πίστις* which he requires of the readers, and then sets before them examples of the heroism of faith from times gone by (chap. xi.). In possession of such a multitude of examples,

and with the eye fixed upon Jesus Himself, the readers are to endure with steadfastness the conflict which awaits them, and to regard their sufferings as a salutary chastisement on the part of that God who is full of fatherly love towards them (xii. 1-13). To this attaches an exhortation to concord and growth in holiness (vv. 14-17). The very constitution of the New Covenant, to which the readers have come, obliges them to the endeavour after sanctification. Whereas the Old Covenant bore the character of the sensuous, earthly, and that which awakens merely fear, the New Covenant has the character of the spiritual, heavenly, brings into communion with God and all holy ones, and confers reconciliation. The readers are therefore to be on their guard against apostatizing from the New Covenant, for their guilt and exposure to punishment would be thereby incomparably augmented. Rather should they be filled with gratitude towards God for the participation in the unshakeable kingdom of the New Covenant, and serve Him with awe and reverential fear (vv. 18-29). To this are now appended exhortations to continued brotherly love (xiii. 1), to hospitality (ver. 2), to the assistance of prisoners and oppressed (ver. 3), to chastity (ver. 4), to the eschewing of covetousness and to contentment (vv. 5, 6), to the remembering of former teachers and the emulating of their faith (ver. 7), to the avoidance of unchristian doctrines and precepts (vv. 8-15), to benevolence (ver. 16), to obedience towards the presidents of the congregation (ver. 17). There follows a call to intercession on behalf of the author (vv. 18, 19), a wish of blessing (vv. 20, 21), the petition for a friendly reception of the epistle (ver. 22), the communication of a piece of intelligence (ver. 23), the prayer for the delivery of salutations, and, at the same time, the conveying of salutations to the readers (ver. 24), and the concluding wish of blessing (ver. 25).

SEC. 4.—TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

The epistle can only have been written at a late time. For, according to ii. 3, xiii. 7 (comp. also v. 12, x. 32 ff.), the recipients belonged to a second generation of Christians.

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

one which places the date of the epistle's composition between the years 65 and 67.

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

The place of composition is indeterminable. Only thus much is clear from xiii. 24, that it is to be sought outside of Italy.

SEC. 5.—FORM AND ORIGINAL LANGUAGE.

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

In like manner, the opinion frequently expressed in ancient times,—originally broached with a view to the removal of the difficulties arising from the literary character of the book, upon the presupposition of the authorship of the Apostle Paul,—and in recent times specially advocated by Joseph Hallet, jun., and John David Michaelis, that the epistle was originally composed in the Hebrew (Aramaic) language, and only afterwards translated into Greek, is at the present time universally recognised to be erroneous. Even on account of the great freedom with which the translator must have proceeded in the remoulding of the original,—on account of the purity in the Greek expression, the skill in the formation of genuine Greek periods, such as are foreign to the Aramaic,—on account of the many compound terms, the equivalent of which could have been expressed in Aramaic only by means of periphrases (as *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*, i. 1; *ἀπαύγασμα*, i. 3; *μετριοπαθεῖν*, v. 2; *εὐπερίστατος*, xii. 1, etc.),—on account of the multitude of paronomasias, which could not possibly be in every case the work of chance (i. 1, ii. 2, ii. 3, ii. 8, ii. 10, ii. 18, iii. 13, iv. 2, v. 1, v. 8, v. 14, vii. 3, vii. 9, vii. 13, vii. 19, 22, vii. 23, 24, ix. 10, ix. 28, x. 29, x. 34, x. 38, 39, xi. 27, xi. 37, xii. 24, 25, xiii. 14),—and on account of the ambiguous use of *διαθήκη*, ix. 15 ff.,¹ this view is wanting in all probability and naturalness. Absolutely inadmissible, however, it becomes only from the fact that the author, not

¹ Nevertheless, as has already been observed by Braun, as also by Bleek, the *קְהִלָּה*, adopted by the Aramaic from the Greek and occurring in the

only in connection with his Biblical citations, but also in the conducting of his argument, bases his reasoning throughout upon the form of the text in the LXX., even when this version gives a sense entirely at variance with that of the original text. With particular distinctness does this appear x. 5 ff., where in place of the Hebrew **אֲנִימָם קָרִיתָ לִּי** the entirely diverse *σῶμα δὲ κατηγορίσω μοι* of the LXX. is adopted by our author, and then at ver. 10 the *προσφορά τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* brought into relation therewith.

Talmud, as frequently also in the Peshito; or the **קִים**, more usual with the Chaldee Paraphrasts, as also in the Peshito,—might certainly also have combined the twofold signification of a “covenant” and a “testament.”

Ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολή.

A B K Σ have merely Πρὸς Ἑβραίους. Simplest and probably earliest superscription.

CHAPTER I.

Ver. 1. ἐπ' ἐσχάτου] Elz.: ἐπ' ἐσχάτων. Against A B D E K L M Σ , most min., Vulg. Copt. *al.*, and many Fathers. The plural ἐσχάτων arose from the τῶν immediately following. — Ver. 2. In place of καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν of the *Recepta*, A B D* D*** E M Σ , 17, 37, *al.*, Vulg. It. Copt. Syr. *al.*, Patres Gr. et Lat. in. have καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας. Already recommended by Griesb. Rightly adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. In addition to the strong attestation, this position of the words is favoured by the internal ground that in this order the emphasis falls, as was required, upon ἐποίησεν, instead of falling upon τοὺς αἰῶνας. — Ver. 3. Before καὶ αὐτοῦ, Elz. Wetst. Griesb. Matth. Scholz, Bloomf. Tisch. 7, Reiche (*Commentarius Criticus in N. T.*, t. III. p. 6 sq.), with D***, almost all min. Syr. utr. (Aeth. ?) Ath. p. 362, Chrys. in text. et comm. dis., Oec. Theoph. Aug. (?) add δι' ἑαυτοῦ. But δι' ἑαυτοῦ, instead of which δι' αὐτοῦ (according to Theodoret's express observation to be read as δι' αὐτοῦ) is found with D* 137, Copt. Clar. Germ. Cyr. (semel) Didym. Theodoret, in t. et comm. Euthal. Damasc. in textu, is wanting in A B D** Σ , 17, 46* 47, 80, Vulg. Arm. Cyr. (saepe) Cyr. Hieros. pseudo-Athanas. (ed. Bened. ii. 337), Damasc. (comm.) Sedul. Cassiod. Bede. Already suspected by Mill (Prolegg. 991). Rightly deleted as a gloss by Bleek, de Wette, Lachm. Tisch. 1, 2, and 8, and Alford. For although the addition δι' ἑαυτοῦ (by Himself, *i.e.* by the offering of Himself, inasmuch as He was at the same time High Priest and Victim) is in perfect keeping with the after deductions of the epistle, it is nevertheless not indispensable; and though it is conceivable that δι' ἑαυτοῦ was taken up into the preceding αὐτοῦ, yet it is, on the other hand, hardly credible, seeing the endeavour of the author after linguistic euphony,

that he should have placed the words *αὐτοῦ, δι' ἑαυτοῦ* (*αὐτοῦ*) in immediate juxtaposition the one with the other. — Instead of *ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*, Bengel, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Alford read: *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος*. In favour of the latter decides the preponderant attestation on the part of A B D E M s, 37, 46, *al.*, Vulg. It. Cyr. Cyr. Hieros. Athan. Did. ps.-Athan. Dam. (comm.). — *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*] Elz. Matth. Scholz: *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*. But *ἡμῶν* is wanting in A B D* E* M s*, 67** *al.*, Vulg. It. Copt. Syr. Aeth. Cyr. utr. Nyss. Didym. Damasc. Aug. Sedul. Cassiod. *al.* Already suspected by Mill (Prolegg. 496) and Griesb. Rightly rejected by Lachm., Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Reiche, Alford. It was added as a dogmatic precaution, in order to guard against a referring of the words also to the own *ἁμαρτίαι* of the subject. — Ver. 8. *ῥάβδος ἐκδοῦκτητος ἢ ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου*] Instead of that, Lachm. in the edit. stereot. (as likewise Tisch. 8) read: *καὶ* (A B D* E* M s, 17, Aeth. Clar. Germ. Vulg. ms. Cyr.) *ἢ* (A B M s, Cyr.) *ῥάβδος τῆς* (A B M s** Cyr.) *ἐκδοῦκτητος ῥάβδος* (A B M s** Cyr.) *τῆς βασιλείας σου*. In the later larger edition, vol. II., on the other hand, he has adopted *καὶ ῥάβδος τῆς ἐκδοῦκτητος ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου*. The *καὶ* at the beginning is, as also Bleek and Alford decide, to be looked upon as original, but in other respects the *Recepta* is to be retained, inasmuch as the *ἢ* before the first *ῥάβδος* (in the first edition of Lachmann) would be a variation from the text presented by the LXX., such as could hardly be ascribed to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, considering the closeness with which he follows that translation in other cases, and the purity in other respects of his Greek expression. — Ver. 9. *ἀνομίαν*] A s, 13, 23, *al.*, Cyr. Chron. Alex. Eus. Chrys. ms. *ἀδικίαν*; preferred by Bleek, since it is also found in the Cod. Alex. of the LXX. Adopted also by Tisch. 8. But *ἀνομίαν* might easily be changed into *ἀδικίαν*, since the latter formed a more direct opposite to the preceding *δικαιοσύνην*. — Ver. 12. *ἐλπίεις*] Beza, Bengel, Tisch. 8: *ἀλλ' ἔλπίεις*. Only insufficiently supported by D* s* 43, Vulg. (not Harl.*) It. Tert. — *αὐτοῦς*] Lachm.: *αὐτοῦς, ὡς ἡμᾶς*, after A B D* E s, Aeth. Arm. Clar. Germ. Spite of the strong authority, an apparent gloss, explanatory of *ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον*.

Vv. 1–4. Without beginning with the ordinary salutation, with the omission even of any kind of preface, the author proceeds at once to place the revelation of God in Christ in contrast with the revelations of God under the Old Covenant, inasmuch as he characterizes the revelations under the Old Covenant as imperfect, while he shows the perfection of this

new revelation by a description of the incomparable dignity of its Mediator. With vv. 1–3 the author strikes the keynote for all that which he is subsequently to disclose to the readers. The utterances of these three verses afford the theme of his whole epistle. For the later dogmatic disquisitions are only the more full unfolding of the same; and for the later paræneses they form the motive and fundamental consideration. To ver. 4, however,—which combines grammatically with that which precedes into the unity of a well-ordered, rhetorically vigorous and majestic period,—vv. 1–3 stand related as the universal to the particular, since that which was before expressed in a more general way is in ver. 4 brought into relief on a special side, which finds in the sequel its detailed development, in such wise that then ver. 4 in turn forms, as regards its contents, the theme for the first section of the epistle (i. 4–ii. 18).

On vv. 1–3 comp. L. J. Uhland, *Dissert. Theol. ad Hebr.* i. 1–3, Pars I, II., Tubing. 1777, 4. — G. M. Amthor, *Commentatio œgetico-dogmatica in tres priores versus epistolæ ad Hebræos scriptæ* (Coburg), 1828, 8. — (J. G. Reiche), *In locum epist. ad Hebr. i. 1–3 observationes*, Gotting. (Weihnachtsprogramm) 1829, 4.

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

¹ The last-named expositor would otherwise expect an antithetical ἀπλῶς (!) or ἰσάπας at the close of the verse.

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

¹ Erroneously does Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt A. K. Z. 1857, No. 29, p. 661) raise against the above explanation, according to which *πολυτρόπως* has respect not only to the purport, but also at the same time to the form of the divine revelations, the objection that the properly understood *ἐν τοῖς προφ.* (see below) does not accord therewith, inasmuch as revelations “mouth to mouth,” or by the intervention of angels, would not have been a speaking of God in the prophets, but *to* (πρός) the same. For what is spoken of (ver. 1) is not the relation of God to the prophets in itself alone, but the relation of God to the fathers *through the medium of* the prophets. The fact, however, that the prophets, as men in whom God was present, brought to the knowledge of the fathers the revelations received, is independent of the way and manner in which those revelations were previously communicated to themselves by God. — Since, moreover, the prophets as recipients of revelation in the first rank are distinguished from the fathers as recipients of revelation in the second rank, and only an interweaving of the relation of God to both takes place, we cannot assume either, with Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 90), who in other respects rightly explains *πολυτρόπως*, that the form of the communication of the word of God to the prophets is to be taken into account only so far as a duly proportioned form corresponded to it, even as in the prophetic word the revelation of God became known to the fathers.

inner connection between the revelations of the O. T. and that of the N. T. is brought into relief, and in this way attention is tacitly drawn to the fact that the former was the divinely appointed preliminary stage and preparation for the latter. — *πάλαι*] of *old*, in long bygone times. For Malachi was looked upon as the last of the O. T. prophets, and since his appearing already from four to five centuries had elapsed. Delitzsch: *πάλαι* is not so much *antiquitus* as *antehac*, since the contrast is not between *ancient* and *recent* or *new*, but between *past* and *present*. Wrongly; for the opposition of a "*prius*" and "*post*" has certainly been already expressed by *λαλήσας* and *ἐλάλησεν*, whereas *πάλαι* still finds its special, and indeed very significant opposition in *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων*, and must accordingly be explained after the analogy of this. — *λαλεῖν*] particularly in our epistle of very frequent use, to indicate divine revelations. Comp. ii. 2, 3, iii. 5, vii. 14, ix. 19, xi. 18, xii. 24, 25. — *τοῖς πατράσιν*] *to the fathers* (forced, and needlessly; Kurtz: *τοῖς πατράσιν*, and equally so afterwards *ἡμῖν*, is *dativus commodi*), i.e. to the forefathers of the Jewish people. Comp. Rom. ix. 5. The expression in its absolute use characterizes author and recipients as born Jews. — *προφῆται*] is to be taken in the widest sense, in such wise that all holy men of the O. T. history who received revelations from God are comprehended under it. For unquestionably the aim of the discussion now begun, that of expressing the pre-eminence of the revelation contained in Christ over each and all of the O. T. revelations, demands this. But thus must Moses also, and very specially, be reckoned as belonging to the *προφῆται*, since Moses held the first rank in the series of development of the pre-Christian revelations; as, accordingly, iii. 2 ff., the superiority of Christ even over Moses is expressly asserted. Nor does the wider acceptance of *προφῆται* encounter any difficulties on the ground of Biblical usage. Comp. e.g. Gen. xx. 7, where Abraham is spoken of as a *προφήτης* (נָבִי); Dent. xxxiv. 10, where it is said of Moses: *καὶ οὐκ ἀνέστη ἔτι προφήτης ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς Μωϋσῆς*. Philo, too (*de nom. mut.* p. 1064 A, ed. Mangey, I. p. 597), calls Moses the *ἀρχιπροφήτης*. — By virtue of this wider acceptance of *προφῆται* in itself, the opinion of Ex. Schmid and Stein, that

ἐν τοῖς προφήταις signifies: "in the prophetic Scriptures," becomes an impossibility; quite apart from the consideration that this interpretation is also sufficiently refuted by the antithesis ἐν νύφ. But just as little is ἐν τοῖς προφήταις to be made equivalent to διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, as is done by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, and the majority, also Böhme, Reiche, Tholuck, Stengel, Ebrard, Bisping, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Maier, and McCaul. For the linguistic character of the Epistle to the Hebrews affords no warrant for the supposition of such a Hebraism in the interchange of prepositions. Nor is this proved by ix. 25, to which Tholuck appeals in following the precedent of Fritzsche (*Jen. Literaturzeit.* 1843, p. 59). Ἐν is of more extensive significance than διὰ. While the latter would signify the mere medium, the mere instrument, ἐν implies that God, in revealing Himself to the fathers by the prophets, was present in the latter, was indwelling in them, in such wise that the prophets were only the outward organs of speech for the God who spoke in them. Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 3; Matt. x. 20. — ἐπ' ἔσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων] Antithesis to πάλαι. Wrongly does Delitzsch, with the approval of Meier (comp. also Schneckenburger in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, II. 3, p. 557), take τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων as apposition to ἐπ' ἔσχάτου: "at the period's close, which these days form,"—for which, on account of the article before ἡμερῶν, the placing of ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔσχάτου would at least have been required,—while he then still more arbitrarily finds in ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν "the expression indicative of one idea, equivalent to אַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים," and makes τούτων belong logically to the whole idea! The ἡμέραι αὗται are identical with that which is elsewhere called ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, in opposition to ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων. The demonstrative τούτων refers to the fact that these ἡμέραι are the period of time in which the author equally as his readers lives, and of an ἔσχατον of these ἡμέραι he speaks, because like all N. T. writers—the author of the Second Epistle of Peter (iii. 4 ff.) excepted—he regards the return of Christ, for the transforming of the present order of the world and the accomplishment of the Messianic kingdom, as near at hand; comp. x. 37, ix. 26. — ἡμῖν] to us, namely, who belong

to the age just mentioned, the ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων. Antithesis to τοῖς πατράσιν. — ἐν υἱῷ] anarthrous, as vii. 28; not because υἱός has acquired the nature of a *nomen proprium* (Böhme, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 272), but for the indication of the essential property: in one (to wit, Christ) who is not merely prophet—who is more than that, namely, *Son*.

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

Ver. 2. As far as τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, ver. 3. The dignity of the Son as the premundane Logos. — Τιθέναι with double accusative, in the sense of ποιεῖν τινά τι, is no *Hebraism* (טָוַן, טָוַן), but is very frequent with the classics. Comp. e.g. Herodian, *Hist.* v. 7. 10: Ἐφ' οἷς Ἀντωνῖνος πᾶν ἡσχαλλε καὶ μετεγίνωσκε, θέμενος αὐτὸν υἱὸν καὶ κοινωνὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς; Xenophon, *Cyrop.* iv. 6. 3: ὥσπερ ἂν εὐδαίμονα πατέρα παῖς τιμῶν τιθείη; Aelian, *Var. Hist.* xiii. 6; Homer, *Odyss.* ix. 404, *al.* Comp. also Elsner *ad loc.*; Kühner, II. p. 226. — Ἐθηκεν, however, has reference not so much to the time when Christ, having completed the work of redemption, has returned to the Father in heaven (so the Greek expositors; and in like manner Primasius, Erasmus (*Paraphr.*), Calvin, Cameron, Corn. a Lapide, Grotius, Schlichting, Calov, Hammond, Braun, Limborch, Storr, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 295 ff.;¹ Maier, Moll, and others), but

¹ According to Riehm, the author first (ver. 2) glanced at the final point of the power of the Redeemer, and then at the beginning thereof, and after this (ver. 3) described the way to that final point with respect to the beginning. But however delicate and acute this conception of the subject, it is too greatly refined and artificial. In point of simplicity and naturalness it falls short of the view that at vv. 2, 3 the various phases of the life of Christ are described in their historic succession, so that only in connection with the intermediate member—ὡν . . . φέρων τε κ. τ. λ., ver. 3 (see on the verse)—there resounds throughout, in addition to the main reference to an earlier condition of the life of Christ, at the same time the subordinate reference to a later condition of His life. That which Riehm urges in support of his own view, and in refutation of the opposite one, is easily disposed of. When he thinks, in the first place, that only by his apprehension the whole structure of the period becomes thoroughly clear, this is

relates to the appointment made in the eternal decree of God before all time; thus has reference to Christ as the premundane Logos. This application is required in order to a due proportion with the declarations immediately following, and to the logical development of the well thought-out periods, in which the discourse reaches the exaltation of the incarnate Redeemer only with ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, ver. 3. The idea of the pre-existence of Christ or

already shown to be inaccurate by the fact that the simple is always more clear than the complex. For even if it be admitted in some respects that a new division of thought begins with the ἔς, ver. 3, which specially brings into relief the subject, whereas before ἐξ ἑσῆς was the subject, yet nothing is to be inferred from this, because the character of the relative statements, ver. 2, is not changed thereby, inasmuch as the reference to God assuredly appears in the third relative clause, namely, in κληρονόμηκεν, ver. 4. When Riehm further contends that in his explanation ver. 2 agrees much better with that which precedes,—inasmuch as by the νόος, ver. 1, the historic Christ is confessedly to be understood, but now an inexplicable leap in the thought would arise, if the author had first ascribed to the historic Christ a number of predicates, which were appropriate to Him only as the premundane Logos, and should only afterwards speak of His present glory,—this contention is already sufficiently refuted by the wholly parallel procedure of the Apostle Paul, Phil. ii. 5 ff., who likewise takes his departure from the historic Christ, and then, in the same order which Riehm calls an “inexplicable leap in the thought,” attaches thereto further statements with regard to the person of the Redeemer. Moreover, in our passage the order of succession censured as an “inexplicable leap in the thought” is perfectly justified, because νόος, ver. 1, is the total expression, which, as such, includes in itself all the stadia in the life of Christ; and thus from it one might proceed with equal justice immediately to the premundane Christ as to the exalted Christ. If Riehm further supposes that in connection with the appointment as heir, ver. 2, we cannot think of a destination made in the eternal decree of God, then the analogous declaration of Scripture: πατέρα πολλῶν ἰθῶν τίθεικά σε, Rom. iv. 17, already proves the opposite; and if he finds the expression κληρονόμος appropriate only to the incarnate Son, inasmuch as the name could hardly otherwise occur in connection with τίθειναι than in reference to a possession which the κληρονόμος once had not, there underlies this objection only this amount of truth, namely, that the expression κληρονόμος no doubt includes in itself a reference pointing to the future; but that which it is designed to express by the first relative clause is assuredly also only the thought that Christ was in the ideal sense before all time appointed or made something, which in the real sense He could only be in the full extent at the end of all time. When, finally, Riehm believes that ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων, ver. 2, must be understood of the dominion of the exalted Christ, for the reason that the passage i. 8, 9, bearing upon the dominion of the exalted Christ, is supposed to refer back to those words, this is altogether erroneous, since a special referring back on the part of i. 8, 9 to the opening proposition of ver. 2 is not by any means to be admitted. See below, the analysis of contents of vv. 5-14.

the Son of God as the eternal Logos with its nearer definitions, as this comes forth here and in that which immediately follows, is the same as is met with also in Paul's writings. Comp. Col. i. 15 ff.; Phil. ii. 6; 1 Cor. viii. 6, x. 4, xvi. 47; 2 Cor. iv. 4, viii. 9. Yet, in the shaping of this idea on the part of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, not only the teaching of Paul, but likewise the Logos-speculations of Philo, with whose writings the Epistle to the Hebrews has manifold points in common, have not been without influence. — *κληρονόμον πάντων*] *heir, i.e.* (future) Possessor and Lord of *all things*, namely, of the world. Chrysostom: *Τῷ δὲ τοῦ κληρονόμου ὀνόματι κέχρηται, δύο δηλῶν, καὶ τὸ τῆς υἰότητος γνησίον, καὶ τὸ τῆς κυριότητος ἀναπόσπαστον.* Comp. Gal. iv. 7; Rom. viii. 17. — *δι' οὗ*] *by whom.* Grammatically unwarranted. Grotius: *propter quem* (*δι' ὅν*). Comp. also ii. 10. — *καὶ ἐποίησεν*] The emphasis falls upon the word *ἐποίησεν*, on that account preposed, while *τοὺς αἰῶνας* only takes up again under a varying form a notion already expressed in that which precedes, and *καί* indicates no heightening of the expression (*even, or more than this*; Wolf and others), but is intended to bring out the accordance between the statement in the second relative clause and that in the first; so that the fact that by the Son the *αἰῶνες* were created is made to follow as something quite natural, from the fact that He was by God constituted *κληρονόμος πάντων* (by whom He also created, etc.). Wrongly does Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 298 f.) invert the relation of the two members indicated by *καί*, in finding out the sense: "the installation of the Son in the office of the world's dominion is in entire accordance with the fact that by the Son the world was created; in other words, from the relation of the Son to God and the world, revealed in the latter fact, His installation in the office of the world's dominion presents nothing extraordinary, but rather appears something which we could not at all expect to be otherwise." [So in substance Owen, who seeks to combine the two meanings of *τιθέναι*.] Had this been meant, then *δι' οὗ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὃν καὶ ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων* must have been written. For the *καί* of the second clause accentuates the fact that what follows is in accord with that which precedes, not

that what precedes is in accord with that which follows. Comp. Phil. iii. 20, where by means of *καί* the fact that we expect the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven as a deliverer is represented as something quite natural, since our *πολίτευμα* is in heaven; but not conversely is the fact that our *πολίτευμα* is in heaven deduced from the presupposition of our expecting Christ from thence. — *τοὺς αἰῶνας*] does not here denote the ages; either in such wise that the totality of the periods of time from the creation of the world to its close is meant (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Thomas Aquinas, Daniel Heinsius), for this thought would be too abstract; or in such wise that the two main periods in the world's history—the pre-Messianic and the Messianic—are to be understood thereby (Paulus, Stein), for in connection with the absolute *τοὺς αἰῶνας* no one could have thought of this special division into two parts. Nor must we either apprehend *τοὺς αἰῶνας* of the *Acons* in the sense of the Gnostics (Amelius in Wolf, Fabricius, *Cod. Apocryph. N. T.* I. p. 710); for at the time when our author wrote this notion of the word did not yet exist. *τοὺς αἰῶνας* is to be understood of the *worlds*, of the totality of all things existing in time (and space), so that it is identical with the preceding *πάντων* and the following *τὰ πάντα* of ver. 3. *ὁ αἰὼν*, it is true, has always with the classics the strict notion of duration of time; but, as in the case of the Hebrew *דְּבַיִן*, this notion might easily pass over into the wider notion of that which forms the visible contents of time, thus into that of the complex of all created things. This interpretation is confirmed by the reading of xi. 3, where *αἰῶνες* cannot possibly be used in any other sense. — As parallel passages to this second relative clause of ver. 2, expressing the thought of a creation of the universe by the pre-mundane Son of God, comp. in Paul's writings, Col. i. 16; 1 Cor. viii. 6; in those of John, John i. 3, 10. Philo, too, supposes the world was created by the Logos, as the earliest or first-born Son of God. Comp. *de Cherubim*, p. 129 (ed. Mangey, I. p. 162): ἴδε τὴν μεγίστην οἰκίαν ἢ πόλιν, τόνδε τὸν κόσμον· εὐρήσεις γὰρ αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸν θεόν, ὑφ' οὗ γέγονεν, ὕλην δὲ τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα, ἐξ ὧν συνεκράθη, ὄργανον δὲ λόγον θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κατεσκευάσθη, τῆς δὲ κατα-

σκευῆς αἰτίαν τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ. — *De Monarch.* lib. ii. p. 823 B (ed. Mangey, II. p. 225): λόγος δέ ἐστιν εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δι' οὗ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο. — *Legg. allegor.* lib. iii. p. 79 A (ed. Mangey, I. p. 106): σκιὰ θεοῦ δὲ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν, ᾧ καθάπερ ὀργάνῳ προσ-
χρησάμενος ἐκοσμοποίει.

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

¹ Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. p. 159 f., 2d ed.; comp. also his remarks in the Commentary, p. 64 ff.) believes that the ὦν ἀπαύγασμα κ.τ.λ. and the φέρων τὰ πάντα κ.τ.λ. must be referred exclusively to the exalted Christ, but on untenable grounds. For from the consideration that φέρων τε τὰ πάντα "forms the most unambiguous contrast to the condition of Christ's life in the flesh," nothing is to be argued in favour of this view; because this contrast is equally to be supposed, when we understand these words alike of the preponderance of the exalted Christ. The further assertion, however, that in the case of a referring of ὦν ἀπαύγασμα κ.τ.λ. to that which Christ is apart from His humanity, the declaration ver. 3 must have been connected by means of ὅς ἐστιν instead of ὦν, is lacking in all grammatical support. For, so far as concerns the sense, there is no difference whatever between ὅς ἐστιν and ὦν; only regard for rhetorical euphony and the due rounding off of the periods determined the author upon expressing himself as he did.

Cappellus, Gomar., Schlichting, Gerhard, Calov, Owen, Rambach, Peirce, Calmet, Heumann, Böhme, Reiche. Or (2) as *image*, *reflected radiance*, i.e. as a likeness formed by reflex rays, *reflection*. So Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Wittich, Limborch, Stein, Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt *M. Kirch.-Z.* 1857, No. 29, p. 661, and in his *Lexic. N. T.* p. 36), Nickel (Reuter's *Report.* 1857, Oct., p. 17), Moll, and others; so substantially also Richm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 279). In favour of the former interpretation it may be advanced that Hesychius paraphrases ἀπαύγασμα by ἡλίου φέγγος; and in *Lexic. Cyrilli ms. Brem.* are found the words: ἀπαύγασμα ἀκτὶς ἡλίου, ἡ πρώτη τοῦ ἡλιακοῦ φωτὸς ἀποβολή, as accordingly also Chrysostom and Theophylact explain ἀπαύγασμα by φῶς ἐκ φωτός, the latter with the addition τὸ ἀπαύγασμα ἐκ τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ οὐχ ὕστερον αὐτοῦ; and Theodoret observes: Τὸ γὰρ ἀπαύγασμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πυρός ἐστι καὶ σὺν τῷ πυρὶ ἐστι· καὶ αἴτιον μὲν ἔχει τὸ πῦρ, ἀχώριστον δὲ ἐστι τοῦ πυρός· ἐξ οὗ γὰρ τὸ πῦρ, ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα. But without reason does Bleek claim, in favour of this first interpretation, also the usage of Philo and Wisd. vii. 26. For in the passage of Philo, *de Spec. all. legg.* § 11 (ed. Mangey, II. p. 356), which Bleek regards as "particularly clear" (Τὸ δ' ἐμφυσώμενον [Gen. ii. 7] δῆλον ὡς αἰθέριον ἦν πνεῦμα καὶ εἰ δὴ τι αἰθερίου πνεύματος κρείττον, ἅτε τῆς μακαρίας καὶ τρισμακαρίας φύσεως ἀπαύγασμα), there is found no ground of deciding either for or against this acceptance of the word. The other two passages of Philo, however, which are cited by Bleek, tell less in favour of it than against it. For in the former of these ἀπαύγασμα is explained by ἐκμαγεῖον [*impression*] and ἀπόσπασμα [*shred*] as synonyms, in the latter by μίμημα [*copy*]. (*De Opific. Mundi*, p. 33 D, in Mangey, I. p. 35: πᾶς ἄνθρωπος κατὰ μὲν τὴν διάνοιαν ὑπεκείνεται θεῷ λόγῳ, τῆς μακαρίας φύσεως ἐκμαγεῖον ἢ ἀπόσπασμα ἢ ἀπαύγασμα γεγονώς, κατὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ σώματος κατασκευὴν ἅπαντι τῷ κόσμῳ. — *De plantat. Noë*, p. 221 C, Mang. I. p. 337: Τὸ δὲ ἁγίασμα οἶον ἁγίων ἀπαύγασμα. μίμημα ἀρχετύπου· ἐπεὶ τὰ αἰσθήσει καλὰ καὶ νοήσει καλῶν εἰκόνες.) Finally, there are found also, Wisd. vii. 26, as kindred expressions, besides ἀπαύγασμα, the words ἔσοπτρον

and εἰκόν. (Ἀπαύγασμα γάρ ἐστὶ φῶτος αἰδίου καὶ ἔσσοπτρον ἀκηλίδωτον τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνεργείας καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ.) The decision is afforded by the form of the word itself. Inasmuch as not ἀπανγασμός, but ἀπαύγασμα is written, an *active* notion, such as would be required by Bleek's acceptance, cannot be expressed by it, but only a *passive* one. Not the ray itself, but the result thereof must be intended. For as ἀπήχημα denotes that which is produced by the ἀπηχεῖν, the resonance or echo, and ἀποσκίασμα that which is produced by the ἀποσκιάζειν, the shadow cast by an object, so does ἀπαύγασμα denote that which is produced by the ἀπανγάζειν. Ἀπαύγασμα is therefore to be rendered by *reflected radiance*, and a threefold idea is contained in the word—(1) the notion of independent existence, (2) the notion of descent or derivation, (3) the notion of resemblance. — τῆς δόξης] of His (the divine) *glory* or majesty. For the following αὐτοῦ belongs equally to τῆς δόξης as to τῆς ὑποστάσεως. — καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ] and as impress of His *essential being*, so that the essential being of the Father is printed forth in the Son, the Son is the perfect image and counterpart of the Father. Comp. Philo, *de plantat. Noë*, p. 217 A (ed. Mangey, I. p. 332), where the rational soul (ἡ λογικὴ ψυχὴ) is called a coin which stands the test, οὐσιωθεῖσα καὶ τυπωθεῖσα σφραγίδι θεοῦ, ἧς ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐστὶν αἰδίδιος λόγος. In the N. T. the word χαρακτήρ is found only in this place. To interpret ὑπόστασις, however, in the sense of πρόσωπον, or "Person" (Thomas Aquinas, Cajetan, Calvin [in the exposition], Beza, Piscator, Cornelius a Lapide, Gerhard, Dorscheus, Calov, Sebastian Schmidt, Bellarmin, Braun, Brochmann, Wolf, Suicer), is permitted only by later usage, not by that of the apostolic age. For the rest, that which is affirmed by the characteristic ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, the Apostle Paul expresses, Col. i. 15, by εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, and, Phil. ii. 6 (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4), by ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων. — φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς ἐννάμεως αὐτοῦ] and as He who upholds the whole creation by the word of His power. Comp. Col. i. 17: καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν; Philo, *de Cherub.* p. 114 (ed. Mang. I. p. 145): ὁ πηδαλιούχος καὶ

κυβερνήτης τοῦ παντός λόγος θεῖος. — τὰ πάντα is not to be limited, with the Socinians, to the kingdom of grace, but is identical with πάντων; and τοὺς αἰῶνας, ver. 2, thus denotes the complex of all created things. On φέρειν in the signification: *to uphold anything*, so that its continued existence is assured, comp. Plutarch, *Lucull.* 6: φέρειν τὴν πόλιν; Valerius Maximus, xi. 8. 5: Humeris gestare salutem patriae; Cicero, *pro Flacco*, c. 38: Quam (republicam) vos universam in hoc iudicio vestris humeris, vestris inquam humeris, iudices sustinetis; Seneca, *Ep.* 31: Deus ille maximus potentissimusque ipse vehit omnia; Herm. Past. iii. 9. 14: Nomen Filii Dei magnum et immensum est et totus ab eo sustentatur orbis. — τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ] more emphatic than if τῷ ῥήματι αὐτοῦ τῷ δυνατῷ were written, to which Wolf, Kuinoel, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield would, without reason, make the words equivalent. Occumenius: ῥῆμα δὲ εἶπε δεικνὺς πάντα εὐκόλως αὐτὸν ἄγειν καὶ φέρειν. Theophylact: τηλικούτον ὄγκον τῆς κτίσεως τὸν ὑπέρμεγαν ὡς οὐδὲν αὐτὸς διαβαστάζει καὶ λόγῳ μόνῳ πάντα δυναμένῳ. — Not *the gospel*, however, is meant by ῥῆμα τῆς δυνάμεως; but as by the word of Omnipotence the world was created (comp. xi. 3), so is it also by the word of Omnipotence upheld or preserved. — αὐτοῦ] goes back to ὁς, thus to the Son, not to God (Grotius, Peirce, Reiche, Paulus). — καθαρισμόν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος] *after He had accomplished a cleansing from the sins*. Progress of the discourse to the dignity of the Son as the eternal Logos incarnate, or the Redeemer in His historic appearing on earth. The nearer defining of the sense conveyed by the declaration: καθαρισμόν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος,—with regard to the grammatical expression of which LXX. of Job vii. 21, 2 Pet. i. 9, may be compared,—was naturally presented to the readers. As the object on which the καθαρισμός was wrought was understood as something self-evident, the *world of mankind*, which until then was under the defiling stain of sins, without possessing the power for its own deliverance; as the means, however, by which the καθαρισμός was accomplished, the atoning death of Christ. [Owen compares the *lustrations*, i.e. purifications by sacrifice, and cites Lucian's ῥύψομεν μὲν αὐτὸν τοῦ κρημνοῦ καθαρισμόν τοῦ στρατοῦ ἐσόμενον, "We shall

cast him down headlong for an expiation of the army.”] To conceive of the *ἁμαρτίαι* themselves as a direct object to *καθαρισμόν*, to which Bleek and Winer, *Gramm.* 5th ed. p. 214 (differently, 6th ed. p. 168, 7th ed. p. 176), were inclined, and in favour of which Delitzsch and Alford (comp. also Hofmann *ad loc.*) pronounce themselves with decision,—in such wise that these are thought of as the disease of the human race, which is healed or put away by Christ,—is not at all warranted by the isolated and less accurate form of expression: *ἐκαθάρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα*, Matt. viii. 3. Nor is it requisite to supply *ἀπό* before *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*, and assume a pregnancy of expression, since *καθαρός* and its derived words are not only connected by *ἀπό*, but likewise, with equal propriety, by the bare genitive. See Kühner, II. p. 163. — *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς*] *sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high*. Culminating point of the description. Characteristic of the dignity of the Son *after the completed work of redemption*, in the period of His return to the Father, which followed the period of His self-abasement. The sitting at the right hand of God is a well-known figure, derived from Ps. cx. 1, in order to designate supreme honour and dominion over the world (Rom. viii. 34, *al.*). — *ἐν ὑψηλοῖς*] Comp. Ps. xciii. 4, xciii. 5; tantamount to *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, Heb. viii. 1; or *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*, Eph. i. 20; or *ἐν ὑψίστοις*, Luke ii. 14, xix. 38, *al.* The addition belongs not to *μεγαλωσύνης* (Beza, Böhme, Bleek, Ebrard, Alford),—since otherwise the article would be repeated,—but to *ἐκάθισεν*. The plural *ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* is explained from the supposition of several heavens, in the highest of which the throne of the Divine Majesty was placed.

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

has maintained the superiority of Christ, as the Son of God, over the *προφήται*, so is he now naturally further led to show the superiority of Christ over the angels also. This is done in the declaration, ver. 4, which in a grammatical sense is closely connected with that which precedes, and serves for the completing of the description of Christ's characteristic qualifications; at the same time, however, logically regarded, affords the theme for the following disquisition, which constitutes the first section of the epistle (i. 5—ii. 18).—The supposition of Tholuck, that the addition of ver. 4 "has an independent object," *i.e.* is occasioned by polemic reference to the opinion spread abroad among the Jews, in addition to other conceptions with regard to the person of the Messiah, that He was an intermediate spirit or angel,¹ is entirely erroneous. It finds no countenance whatever in the reasoning of the author, and is opposed to the whole scope of the epistle, that of showing in detail the inferiority of the Old Covenant as compared with the New, and of influencing in a corresponding manner the conduct of the readers.—The oratorical formula of comparison: *τοσοῦτω . . . ὅσῳ*, which recurs vii. 20–22, viii. 6, x. 25, is found likewise with Philo, but never with Paul.—*κρείττων*] *better*, or more excellent, namely, in power, dignity, and exaltedness; comp. vii. 19, 22, viii. 6, ix. 23, x. 34, xi. 16, 35, 40, xii. 24.—*γενόμενος*] marks the *having begun to be* in time, whereas *ὢν*, ver. 3, expressed the timeless eternal existence. *Κρείττων τῶν ἀγγέλων* did Christ become just at that time when, having accomplished the work of redemption, He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high. The *γενόμενος* thus closely attaches itself to the *ἐκάθισεν*, ver. 3, and is more fully explained by the fact that Christ, by virtue of His incarnation, and so long as He dwelt on earth, was made lower than the angels; comp. ii. 7, 9.—The comparative *διαφορώτερον*, found in the N. T. only here and viii. 6,

¹ That the defective view with regard to Christ, which saw in Him only an angel, must have called for rectification, has likewise been thought probable by Schneckenburger, who sought further to confirm this probability. Comp. the "Observations on the Epistle to the Hebrews," contributed by Riehm from Schneckenburger's remains, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, H. 3, p. 544 ff.

serves, since even the positive *διάφορον* would have sufficed for the indication of the superiority, for the more emphatic accentuating of the signification of the word. The opinion of Hofmann, that the comparative is chosen because the name *ἄγγελος* is in itself an *ὄνομα διάφορον*, when the author contrasts the spirits of God with men living in the flesh, is quite remote from the idea of the passage. — *παρά]* after a comparative is very common in our epistle; cf. iii. 3, ix. 23, xi. 4, xii. 24. Comp. also Luke iii. 13; 3 Esdr. iv. 35; Thucyd. i. 23: *ἡλίου τε ἐκλείψεις, αἱ πυκνότεραι παρὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ πρὶν χρόνου μνημονεύόμενα ξυνέβησαν*; Herod. vii. 103; Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 225. With Paul it never occurs. Similar is *ὑπέρ* with the accusative, Heb. iv. 12; Luke xvi. 8. — *ὄνομα]* must not, with Beza, Calov, Wittich, Storr, Valekenaeer, Zachariae, Heinrichs, be altered into the notion of “dignity.” For this *ὄνομα* never signifies in itself, and its substitution would in our passage, in relation to *κρείττων γενόμενος*, bring about only a tautology. The name of pre-eminence above the angels, which Christ has obtained as an inheritance, is the name *υἱός*, Son of God,—comp. ver. 5 and ver. 1,—while the angels by their name are characterized only as messengers and servants of God. Contrary to the context, Delitzsch says: the name *υἱός* suffices not to express the thought in connection with *ὄνομα*. The supra-angelic name, to which the author refers, lies beyond the notionally separating and sundering language of men. It is the heavenly total-name of the Exalted One, His *שֵׁם הַפָּאָרִיזִים*, *nomen explicitum*, which in this world has entered into no human heart, and can be uttered by no human tongue, the *ὄνομα ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτός*, Rev. xix. 12. The following words of Scripture are, he supposes, only upward pointing signs, which call forth in us some foreboding as to how glorious He is. But this is opposed to the connection. For even though it be true, as advanced by Delitzsch in support of his view, that in the following O. T. passages there occur also, in addition to *υἱός*, the wider appellations *θεός* and *κύριος*; yet, on the other hand, not merely *ἐν υἱῷ*, ver. 1, as likewise ver. 5 with its proof-giving *γάρ*, but also the antithesis *πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους* and *πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν*,

vv. 7, 8, shows that *υἱός* is the main conception, to which the words of address: *ὁ θεός* and *κύριε*, vv. 8, 10, stand in the relation of subordination, inasmuch as they are already contained in this very idea of Son. — The perfect *κεκληρονόμηκεν*, however, not the aorist *ἐκκληρονόμησεν*, is employed by the author; because Christ did not first obtain this name at the time of the *καθίζειν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλ.*, ver. 3, but had already as pre-existing Logos obtained it as an abiding portion and possession. We have not, in connection with *κεκληρονόμηκεν*, to think “quite in general of the O. T. time, in which the future Messiah received in the Word of God the name of Son,” as is asserted by Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 274), whose statement is endorsed by E. Woerner.¹ For this view is contradicted by the *δεῖ οὐ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας*, ver. 2, in its relation to *ἐν υἱῷ*, ver. 1, according to which Christ already existed as the Son before all time. The declarations of ver. 5, which Riehm has urged in favour of the construction put by him on our passage, have only the object of affording vouchers for a condition of things already existing. — The difficulty raised, for the rest, that the name of Son is here insisted on as a distinguishing characteristic of Christ, while, nevertheless, in single passages of the O. T. (Job i. 6, ii. 1, xxxviii. 7; Gen. vi. 2, 4; Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 7; Dan. iii. 25), angels too are called sons of God, is already disposed of by the reflection that this is *not* the characteristic name for the angels as such. There is no need, therefore, of the justification of the author made by Bleek, that this writer, since he was not at home in the Hebrew text of the O. T., but only in the Alexandrine version thereof, which latter freely renders the majority of those passages by *ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ*, may easily have overlooked, or perhaps have otherwise interpreted, those passages in which the literal translation is found in the LXX. (Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 7 [Gen. vi. 2, 4?]).

Vv. 5–14 follow the scriptural proof for ver. 4, and that in such form that in the first place, ver. 5, the *διαφορώτερον παρ’ αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα* is confirmed, and then, vv. 6–14, the *κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων*.

¹ *Der Brief St. Pauli an die Hebräer*, Ludwigsb. 1876.

Ver. 5. *Τίνι γὰρ εἶπέν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων*] *For to which of the angels has He ever said, i.e. to none of the angels has He ever said.* — The position of the words serves to put a strong accentuation at the same time upon *τίνι* and upon *τῶν ἀγγέλων*. — The subject in *εἶπεν* is *ὁ θεός*, as is evident alike from the passage itself which is cited, and from our context; inasmuch as both in that which precedes (vv. 1–4) *ὁ θεός* was expressly mentioned as the subject of the main proposition, and in that which follows (ver. 6) the subject of *εἰσαγάγη τὸν πρωτότοκον* can only be God. — *ποτέ*] is particle of time, *at any time, unquam*. Wrongly taken by Ch. F. Schmid, Kuinoel, and others as a mere strengthening particle, in the sense of the German *doch* or the Latin *tandem*. For then *ποτέ* must have been placed immediately after *τίνι*. — The citation *υἱὸς . . . σε* is from Ps. ii. 7, in verbal accordance with the LXX. In its historic sense the psalm relates to an Israelite king (probably Solomon), who, just now solemnly anointed in Zion as theocratic king, in the lofty feeling of his unity with Jehovah, warns the subjugated nations, who are meditating revolt and defection, of the fruitlessness of their undertaking. The author, however, sees Christ in the person addressed, even as a referring of this psalm to the Messiah was quite usual among the Jews of that period, and in the N. T. the Messianic interpretation thereof is further met with, besides ver. 5, in Acts xiii. 33. — *υἱός μου*] *my Son, i.e. in the sense of the psalm, the king of my theocracy, my representative, the object of my fatherly love and protection*. The author, on the other hand, takes *υἱός* in the sense unfolded, vv. 2, 3. — *ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*] *I have this day begotten thee, i.e. in the historic sense of the original: I have, by the anointing accomplished this day, installed thee as the theocratic prince.* In the sense of the author, *γεγέννηκα* denotes the fact of having become the Son. The question is now, how he conceived of the *σήμερον*. It is referred either to the moment in which Christ was manifested to be the Son of God, i.e. to the moment of the *Resurrection* or the *Ascension* (Hilary, *in Psalmum*; Ambrose, *de Sacram.* 3. 1; Calvin, Cameron, Grotius, Schlichting, Limborch, Jac. Cappellus, Owen, Calmet, Peirce, Storr, Bloomfield, Bisping,

Maier; comp. Delitzsch, who would have the words interpreted of "the entrance of the Son into the kingly life of supra-terrestrial glory in God, of which the resurrection is the initial point"), or to the moment of the *Incarnation* (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Eusebius, in *Psalmum*, *alii*; Piscator, Böhme, Kuinoel, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 123 f. of the 2d ed.; Woerner), or, finally, to the period before the creation of the world, thus to *eternity* (Origen in *Joh.*, t. i. c. 32; Athanasius, *de decret. Nicen. Synod.* § 13; Basil, *contra Eunom.* 2. 24; Augustine, in *Psalmum* [Ambrosius of Gaul, in *Psalmum*]; Primasius, Theophylact, Thomas Aquinas, Cornelius a Lapide, Estius, Calov, Wittich, Braun, Carpzov, Bleek [but with wavering; more decidedly in the lectures edited by Windrath¹], Stein, Alford, Kurtz, and the majority). That the author, as Bleek I., de Wette, and Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 287 f.) deem possible, attached no definite notion to the *σήμερον*, as being without significance for his demonstration, is an unexegetical supposition. Exclusively correct, because alone in harmony with the context, is the referring of the *σήμερον* to *eternity*; since, according to ver. 2, God created the world by Christ as the Son, thus Christ must already have existed as Son before the foundation of the world. With Philo, too, occurs the same interpretation of *σήμερον*, as signifying eternity. Comp. *De Profugis*, p. 458 E (with Mangey, I. p. 554): *σήμερον δ' ἐστὶν ὁ ἀπέρατος καὶ ἀδιεξίτητος αἰὼν μνηὼν γὰρ καὶ ἐνιαυτῶν καὶ συνόλως χρόνων περίοδοι δόγματα ἀνθρώπων εἰσὶν ἀριθμὸν ἐκτετιμηκότων, τὸ δ' ἀψευδὲς ὄνομα αἰῶνος ἢ σήμερον. — καὶ πάλιν* and further, serves, as frequently (e.g. ii. 13, x. 30; Rom. xv. 11, 12; 1 Cor. iii. 20; Philo, ed. Mangey, I. p. 88, 490, *al.*), for the introduction of a new passage of Scripture. The *καὶ πάλιν κ.τ.λ.* is not, however, to be taken as an assertory declaration, so that merely *εἶπεν* would have to be supplied (in accordance with which Lachmann punctuates); but the question is continued in such wise that the proposition is to be completed by *καὶ (τίνι εἶπέν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων) πάλιν*. — This second citation is derived from 2 Sam. vii. 14, in verbal accordance with the LXX. Comp. also 1 Chron. xvii.

¹ Der Hebräerbr., erklärt von Dr. Fr. Bleek, Elberf. 1868.

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

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

¹ Comp. Reuss, *L'épître aux Hébreux. Essai d'une traduction accompagnée d'un commentaire* (Nouvelle Revue de Théologie, vol. v. 4e, 5e, et 6e livraison, Strasb. et Paris 1860, p. 199).

persons (ὁ δὲ νοῦν τὸν ἴδιον ἀπολείπων and ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἀποδιδράσκων θεόν), in the latter two classes of δόξαι or opinions (ἡ μὲν τὸν ἐπὶ μέρους, τὸν γεννητὸν καὶ θνητὸν ἀπολιποῦσα and ἡ δὲ πάλιν θεὸν ἀποδοκιμάζουσα), are compared together by way of contrast, in such wise that in both πάλιν only serves for bringing the δέ into stronger relief, and in both has occupied its legitimate place. By virtue of its position, πάλιν, in our passage, can be construed only with εἰσαγάγη, in such wise that a bringing again of the First-born into the world, which is an event still belonging to the future, is spoken of. In the former member of ver. 6 the reference can accordingly be neither to the time of the Incarnation of the Son (Chrysostom, Primasius, Calvin, Owen, Calov, Bengel, Storr, Kuinoel [Stuart: or beginning of His ministry], Bleek II. *alii*); nor to the time of the Resurrection and Exaltation to heaven (Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, Wittich, Braun, Wetstein, Rambach, Peirce, Whitby, and others); nor, as Bleek I. supposed, to a moment yet preceding the Incarnation of Christ, in which the Father had, by a solemn act as it were, conducted forth and presented the Son to the beings created by Him, as the First-born, as their Creator and Ruler, who was to uphold and guide all things,¹—which in any case would be an entirely singular thought in the N. T.,—but simply and alone to the coming again of Christ to judgment, and the accomplishment of the Messianic kingdom. So, rightly, Gregory Nyssen, *contra Eunom. Orat.* iii. p. 541; Cornelius a Lapide, Cameron [Mede: for the inauguration of His millennial kingdom], Gerhard, Calmet, Camerarius, Estius, Gomar, Böhme, de Wette, Tholuck, Bisping, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. p. 172, 2d ed.), Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 306, 617), Alford, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Woerner. The objection brought by Bleek and Ebrard against this interpretation of the former member, required as it is by the exigencies of the grammar,

¹ In like manner Reuss, *l.c.* p. 201: "Il est plus naturel de songer au moment, où le monde nouvellement créé était sommé de reconnaître le Fils comme créateur. A ce moment, les anges seuls étaient les êtres formant pour ainsi dire l'Eglise du Verbe (comme xii. 22), et qui pouvaient recevoir l'ordre de Dieu d'adorer le Fils."

viz. that the discourse could not turn on the bringing again of the First-born into the world, unless an earlier bringing in of the same into the world, or at least a former being of the Son *ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ* had been explicitly spoken of, is invalidated by vv. 1, 3, where certainly the discourse was already of the historic appearing of the Son on earth, and thus of a first bringing in of the same into the world. The additional objection of Bleek, however, that the author would hardly have limited the scope of a divine summons to the angels to do homage to the First-born to a time even in his day future, is set aside by the consideration that, according to ii. 9, Christ was during His earthly life humbled to a condition beneath the angels, and only the Parousia itself is the epoch at which His majesty will be unfolded in full glory. — *τὸν πρωτότοκον*] in the N. T. only here without more precisely defining addition; comp. however, Ps. lxxxix. 28 (27). That the expression must not be regarded as equivalent to *μονογενής*, as is done by Primasius, Oecumenius (*τὸ δὲ πρωτότοκον οὐκ ἐπὶ δευτέρου λέγει ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ἐνὸς καὶ μόνου τοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐκ τοῦ πατρός*), Clarius, and even now by Stengel, is self-evident. But neither is it identical with the *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, Col. i. 15, in such wise that the temporal priority of Christ, as the eternal Logos, over all creatures, and the notion of His precedence over all creatures, necessarily resulting therefrom, should be contained in the word (Bleek, Grimm in the Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt *A. K.-Z.*, No. 29, p. 662; Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 292 f.; Kurtz, Ewald, and others). For this interpretation is excluded by the absoluteness of the expression in our passage. Rather is Christ called the First-born with respect to Christians, who are His brethren (ii. 11 f.), and therefore likewise *υἱοί* of God (ii. 10). Comp. also Rom. viii. 29. — As, for the rest, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews terms Christ the First-born Son of God; so does Philo also term the Logos the First-born Son. Comp. *de Agricultura*, p. 195 B (ed. Mangey, I. p. 308): *τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον, πρωτόγονον υἱόν*. *De Confus. Ling.* p. 329 (ed. Mang. I. p. 415): *τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ πρεσβύτατον υἱὸν ὁ τῶν ὄντων ἀνέτειλε πατήρ, ὃν ἐτέρωθι πρωτόγονον ὠνόμασεν, αἰ.* — *ἡ οἰκουμένη*] *the world*, not in the

widest sense (equivalent to οἱ αἰῶνες, Bleek ; or to ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα, Böhme) ; but, since the former member has reference to the Parousia, *the habitable earth*. — λέγει] *sc.* ὁ θεός, not ἡ γραφή (Grotius, Clericus, Böhme, and others). The *present* is chosen, because the utterance of God, which shall infallibly be made in the future, stands already noted down in the Scripture. — The citation is not derived from Ps. xcvii. 7, but from Deut. xxxii. 43. For, in the former passage, the LXX. have a reading divergent from that of our text, in the words : καὶ προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες [οἱ] ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, whereas in the Codex Vaticanus of Deut. xxxii. 43, the words occur as in our text ; while the καί, taken up by the author into his citation, manifestly points—seeing that it is without any importance for his reasoning—to the verbatim reproduction of an O. T. utterance. Now, it is true our author follows in other cases a form of the Sept. text which bears affinity less to that contained in the Codex Vaticanus than to that in the Codex Alexandrinus, and the latter displays the variation from the Cod. Vat. Deut. xxxii. 43, in so far as υἱοὶ θεοῦ is found therein in place of ἄγγελοι θεοῦ. But the Song of Moses, of which Deut. xxxii. 43 forms the conclusion, is communicated anew, in many mss. of the LXX., and so also in the Codex Alexandrinus, in a second recension, having its place after the Psalms ; and in this second recension the Codex Alexandrinus, too, reads ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, only the article οἱ has been interpolated between πάντες and ἄγγελοι. It is probable, therefore, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews did not take the citation direct from Deut. xxxii. 43, but mediately, *i.e.* from that second recension of the hymn. — It remains to be said that the words of the citation are wanting in the Hebrew ; they are found only in the LXX. — προσκυνεῖν] with the *dative* only in the case of later classic authors, whereas the earlier combine the *accusative* with this verb. Comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 463 ; Bernhardt, *Syntax*, p. 113, 266. The N. T. has both constructions, as besides them the Hebraizing turns προσκυνεῖν ἐνώπιον, or ἔμπροσθέν τινος, or τῶν ποδῶν τινος. See the Lexicons. — αὐτῷ] That this pronoun of the third person was to be referred to the Messiah naturally suggested itself, inas-

much as Jehovah is the subject speaking immediately before in the Song.

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

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

¹ Comp., as to the thought, Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, iv. 3. 14, where quite similarly lightning and winds (*κεραυνὸς* and *ἀνεμος*) are called *ὑπακούει τῶν θεῶν*.

whereas the Son abides the same for ever. — The conception of such a subjection on the part of the angels, that they must submit even to be changed into elements, is, moreover, not uncommon among the Rabbins. Comp. *e.g.* *Shemoth rabba*, sec. 25, fol. 123. 3 : “aliquando ipsos (angelos) facit ventos, q. d. qui facis angelos tuos ventos, aliquando ignem, q. d. ministros tuos flammam ignis.” *Talkut Simeoni*, part II. fol. 11. 3 : “Angelus dixit ad Manoah: nescio ad cujus imaginem ego factus sim; nam Deus singulis horis nos immutat; cur ergo nomen meum interrogas? Nonnunquam facit nos ignem, alias ventum, interdum viros, alias denique angelos.” See in general, Schöttgen and Wetstein *ad loc.* — *πνεύματα*] not: *spirits* (Luther, Erasmus, *Paraphrase*; Clarius, Piscator, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Brochmann, Bengel, Böhme), but: *winds*. — *λειτουργούς*] only another name for *ἄγγελους*.

Vv. 8, 9 derived from Ps. xlv. 7, 8 (6, 7). The psalm is an *epithalamium*, a wedding-song. But even by Rabbins like Aben Esra, Kimchi, and others, it is Messianically interpreted. — Ver. 8. The nominative *ὁ θεός* is taken by our author in the sense of the vocative (comp. *e.g.* Col. iii. 18 ff.; Luke viii. 54; Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 172; Kühner, II. p. 155), thus as an apostrophe to the Messiah.¹ In the Hebrew words: *בְּסֵאף אֱלֹהִים*, *אֱלֹהִים* is not vocative, but to be translated either after the analogy of Lev. xxvi. 42 (*חֲבִיתִי*), *אֶת־בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקֹב*, I will remember my Jacob's-covenant, *i.e.* the covenant made by me with Jacob), with Bleek, de Wette, and Kurtz: “thy throne of God,” *i.e.* “thy divine throne;” or, with Ewald (*ad loc.* and *Gramm.* § 547): “thy throne is (throne) of God or divine.” The Greek *ὁ θεός*, too, it has been thought by Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt *Allg. Kirch.-Zeit.* 1857, No. 29, p. 662) and Ewald (*das Semitschr. an d. Hebr.* p. 55), ought not to be explained in the

¹ Against the peculiar opinion of Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. p. 168 f., 2 Aufl.), that, vv. 8, 9, it is not Christ who is addressed; that, on the contrary, the author of the epistle leaves it to the reader “to take the words: *ὁ ἐρόνος σου ὁ θεός*, as an address to Jehovah, or with a right understanding of the connection *בְּסֵאף אֱלֹהִים* as an address to the king, the anointed of Jehovah,” see Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 286, Remark.

sense of a vocative. According to Grimm, the words are to be taken in the acceptation: "Thy throne, *i.e.* the foundation of Thy throne, is God;" according to Ewald, they say that "the throne of the Messiah for everlasting ages is God Himself, so that where He reigns, there God Himself is virtually ever present." But the argument urged by Grimm in favour of this construction—that, since Philo, as frequently also the Christian Alexandrians, makes a sharp distinction between *ὁ θεός* (with the article) as a designation of God, and *θεός* (without an article) as designation of the Logos, it is hardly to be regarded as probable that a man of Alexandrian culture, like our author, would have called *Christ* as to His divine nature *ὁ θεός*—would have had weight only if that designation, in place of being met with in a citation, had occurred in our author's own discourse. — *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*] *sc. ἐστίν.* So LXX., Cod. Alex.; Cod. Vatican.: *εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος.* The same (merely Hellenistic) formula, strengthening the simple *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (v. 6, and often), also Tob. vi. 18; Ps. lxxxiii. 18, *al.* In independent discourse the author uses in place thereof *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.* Comp. vii. 3, x. 1, xii. 14. — *ράβδος εὐθύτητος*] *a sceptre of uprightness, i.e. of righteousness.* *εὐθύτης*, in the N. T. only here; but comp. LXX. Ps. ix. 9, lxvii. 5, xevi. 10, xeviii. 9. Comp. also Aeschylus, *Persae*, ver. 726 f. (according to the division in Hartung's edition, Leipzig 1853):

ἐν' ἄνδρ' ἀπάσης Ἀσίδος μηλοτρόφου

ταγεῖν, ἔχοντα σκῆπτρον εὐθυντήριον.

Ver. 9. *Ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην κ.τ.λ.*] *Thou lovedst righteousness and hatedst wrong.* In the Hebrew the corresponding verbs have a *present* signification: thou lovest justice and hatest wrong. Our author, however, refers the aorists of the LXX. to the historic life of the Son of God upon earth. — *διὰ τοῦτο*] *therefore, i.e. as a reward for the ἀγαπᾶν δικαιοσύνην καὶ μισεῖν ἀνομίαν.* Comp. *διό*, Phil. ii. 9. Erroneously Augustine (*in Ps.*), Thomas Aquinas, Gerhard, Dorscheus, Brochmann, Schöttgen, and others: *for this cause*, that thou mightest love righteousness, etc. — *ἔχρισέν σε, ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός σου ἔλαιον κ.τ.λ.*] *O God, Thy God hath Thee anointed with oil of gladness above Thy companions.*

Here, too, the author takes $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ as an apostrophe,¹ whereas in the Hebrew אלהים is the subject to מִשָּׁחָה , and is taken up again into the discourse, and more nearly defined by מִשָּׁחָה . The anointing with the oil of joy in the psalm is a figurative designation of the blessing and abundance given by God. Our author, however, understands it of the anointing to be king, as a figure of the divine glory with which the Son, after His life upon earth and His exaltation to heaven, has been crowned. Comp. also Acts iv. 27, ii. 36. The sense of the author is departed from when the Fathers and earlier expositors interpret the expression of the anointing of the Son with the Holy Ghost. — On the double accusative combined with $\epsilon\chi\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$ (Rev. iii. 18), see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 212. As an analogon, comp. also Aristophanes, *Acharn.* 114: $\text{ἵνα μὴ σε βάψω βάμμα Σαρδινιακόν. — Παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου}$ refers in the original to the contemporary kings, the rulers of other lands. But what our author understood by it in the application is obscure. Kuinoel, Ebrard, Delitzsch, and Moll suppose the author, like the Psalmist, to intend the other kings; Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 306), all earthly and heavenly princes; Wittich, Braun, Cramer, the kings, high priests, and prophets of the O. T., inasmuch as they were anointed as types of Christ; Klee, all the creatures; Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Bengel, and Bisping, men in general; Theodoret, Calvin, Beza, Cameron, Piscator, Schlichting, Maier, Kurtz, the Christians specially [Owen hesitates between *all believers* and *prophets and apostles*]; Bleek, Olshausen, Alford, and Ewald finally, after the precedent of Peirce and others, *the angels*, “as beings which do not indeed appear as sitting at the right hand of God, but yet as existing in immediate proximity to the divine throne.” The last supposition is the most probable. It is true de Wette regards it as the least conceivable, because the author has “placed the angels in no other position than deeply below Christ,” and Ebrard even thinks the author

¹ On account of ver. 8 this construction is more natural than the supposition of Grimm, *l.c.* p. 602; Alford, and Ewald (to which Delitzsch also leaves the choice open), that we have to explain in accordance with the Hebrew: “God, even Thy God.”

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

Vv. 10-12. A second citation—co-ordinate with the Scripture testimony adduced, vv. 8, 9—derived from Ps. cii. 26-28 (25-27) according to the LXX. The psalm is a lamentation, belonging probably to the first century after the Captivity. The words of address refer in the original to God. The author, however, mainly indeed misled¹ by the *κύριε* in the LXX., which was the ordinary appellation of Christ in

¹ According to Delitzsch, indeed, it would be "a poor look-out" if that were "true." But when, following in Hofmann's steps, he objects against it that "we may already see from viii. 8 ff., xii. 6 ff., that the author is far from everywhere understanding *Christ* to be intended by the O. T. *κύριος*," these passages naturally prove nothing, since the usual practice is never the constant and invariable practice. When Delitzsch further adds: "such perversity originating in ignorance is not to be laid to the charge of an author who shows so deep an insight into the innermost core of the O. T.," that is a prejudiced verdict, arising from subjectivity and dogmatic partiality, to the establishing of which it would have been necessary first of all to bring forward the proof that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in reality possessed an accurate knowledge not only of the Greek text of the LXX., but also of the original text of the O. T.,—a proof which even Delitzsch has not been able to afford.

apostolic time, takes the utterance as an address to Christ, the Son of God. This interpretation must the more have appeared to him unquestionable, inasmuch as the scope of the utterance fully harmonized with his own conception of the Son of God as the premundane Logos. Comp. vv. 2, 3. When, for the rest, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. p. 169 f., 2 Aufl.) supposes that the author found no address whatever to Christ designed in the *κύριε* of the psalm, but only meant to say in the words of Scripture what was true of Jesus according to his own belief and that presupposed in the readers, this is a freak of fancy without anything to justify it, and even opposed to the context (comp. *πρὸς δὲ τὸν νύον*, ver. 8). For the author can have been concerned only about this very object of proving the higher attestation given to his assertion by the Scriptures. — *Καί*] not a constituent part of the citation, but a brief formula of connecting, when a further passage of Scripture is linked to that which precedes, comp. Acts i. 20. — *σύ κατ' ἀρχάς, κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας*] LXX. Cod. Alex.: *κατ' ἀρχὰς σύ, κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας*; Cod. Vatic.: *κατ' ἀρχὰς τὴν γῆν σύ, κύριε, ἐθεμελίωσας*. It is probable the author changed the position of the words in order to make *σύ* the more emphatic. — *κατ' ἀρχάς*] *in the beginning*. With the LXX. elsewhere only Ps. cxix. 152, instead of the more usual *ἐν ἀρχῇ* or *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, but frequently met with in Philo and the classics (see Raphel, Wetstein, and Munthe *ad loc.*). In the Hebrew stands the more general *קִדְמָה*, “formerly,” or “of old.”

Ver. 11. *Αὐτοί*] refers back not to earth and heaven, ver. 10, taken together (Kuinoel, Stuart, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Kurtz), but, as is evident from the following *πάντες*, and in particular from *ἐλίξεις*, ver. 12, only to *οἱ οὐρανοί*. — *ἀπολοῦνται*] *shall perish*. Comp. Isa. xxxiv. 4, li. 6, lxxv. 17; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xx. 11, xxi. 1. — *σὺ δὲ διαμένεις*] *but Thou abidest for evermore* (throughout all duration of time, *διά*). On account of the environment of futures, and because the future is used here in the Hebrew, Bleek, after the example of Luther, Cornelius a Lapide, Peirce, Bengel, Wetstein, *alii*, accentuates: *διαμενεῖς*. So also the Vulgate (*permanebis*). Hardly in the sense of the author. For,

since he employed only the LXX., not the Hebrew original, he surely took *σὺ δὲ διαμ.* as a parallel member to *σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ*, ver. 12, consequently also construed the former as a *present*. — *ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσονται*] *will grow old like a garment*, which by long use is worn out and laid aside, to be replaced by a new and better one. Comp. Isa. l. 9, li. 6; Ecclus. xiv. 17.

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

Ver. 13. Further citation from Ps. cx. 1, according to the LXX. The psalm was looked upon universally in the time of Christ (comp. Matt. xxii. 44 ff.; Mark xii. 35 ff.; Luke xx. 41 ff.), and also in later times by many Rabbins (see Wetstein on Matt. xxii. 44), as a prophecy relating to the Messiah; inasmuch as on the ground of the superscription *יְהוָה* David himself was regarded as the author of it, and in connection with this view the reference to the Messiah was easily proved on the ground of the words at the beginning: “to my Lord speaketh Jehovah,” according to which David acknowledges, in addition to his God, also a Lord over him. The superscription *יְהוָה*, nevertheless, indicates not the writer, but the subject of the psalm. It is in its historic sense an oracle pronounced to David, when the latter was preparing for war against his powerful foes. See Ewald on the Psalm. — *πρὸς τίνα δέ*] *δέ* in the *third* place, as often occurs after prepositional combinations. Comp. Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 378 f.; Hartung, *Partikellehre*, I. p. 190 f.; Ellendt, *Lexic. Soph.* I. p. 397; Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 519. — The sitting at the right hand, figure of the highest honour and dominion, see on ver. 3. — *ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου*] *the footstool of Thy*

fact. There lies in the expression an allusion to the custom of the victor of placing his foot upon the neck of the vanquished, in token of the complete subjection of the latter; comp. Josh. x. 24. — ὑποπόδιον] first used in the Greek of a later age. Comp. Sturz, *de dial. Alex. et Maced.* p. 199.

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

CHAPTER II.

VER. 1. Instead of the *Recepta*: ἡμᾶς προσέχειν (K L, Theodoret), Lachm. Tisch. and Alford read: προσέχειν ἡμᾶς. In favour of the latter decides the preponderating authority of A B D E s, Vulg. Athan. Aug. *alii*. — Ver. 4. αὐτοῦ] D* E*: τοῦ θεοῦ. Explanatory gloss. — Ver. 6. τί ἐστίν] Lachm. (but only in the *ed. stereot.*) Bleek, and Kurtz: τίς ἐστίν. Only insufficiently attested by C* Clar. Sangerm. Tol. Copt. Damascenus, although also A contains τίς in Ps. viii. By reason of the preceding τίς, τί might easily pass over into τίς. — Ver. 7. After ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν there is added by Elz., with A C D* E* M s, many cursives and translations, Theodoret, Sedulius: καὶ κατέστησας αὐτόν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου. Against B D*** E** K L, more than 65 min., Syr. (codices and some edd.) Slav. ms. Chrys. Damasc. *alii*. The addition already regarded as spurious by Mill (*Prolegg.* 1376, 1421). Bracketed by Lachm. and Bloomf. Rightly deleted by Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Alford, Reiche, and others. Complementary gloss from the LXX. Comp. the exposition of ver. 7. — Ver. 8. ἐν γὰρ τῷ] So A C K L, *al.* Lachm. and Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, after B D E M s, 23: ἐν τῷ γὰρ. — Ver. 9. Besides χάριτι θεοῦ (so also in the *Cod. Sinait.*, as well as A B C D E K L, *al.*), Origen,—in *Joann.* i. 1, Opp. iv. 41; in *Joann.* xi. 49, Opp. iv. 393; in *Joann. extr.* Opp. iv. 450,—Theodor. Mopsuest. (*in N. T. commentariorum quae reperiri potuerunt*, ed. Fritzsche, Turic. 1847, p. 163 f.), and Jerome, on Gal. iii. 10, know of a reading χωρὶς θεοῦ, to which the two former give the preference. Theodoret *ad loc.* and *ad Eph.* i. 10, takes notice only of the reading χωρὶς θεοῦ. In like manner do, also, Anastas. abbas Palaestin., in the 8th century, in his work, *Contra Judacos* (Latin ed. Canis.), in ant. lect. iii.; Ambrose, *de fid. ad Gratian.* ii. 8. 63, 65, v. 8. 106; Fulgentius, *ad Thrasimund.* iii. 20; and Vigilius Thapsens. *Contra Eutych.* ii. 3, cite in accordance with the same; it has also passed over into single mss. of the Peshito (sometimes in combination with the ordinary reading; so also in *Syr. Cod. Heidelbergens.*: “ipse enim excepto Deo per beneficentiam suam pro quovis homine gustavit mor-

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

Vv. 1-4. The author, in availing himself of the communicative form of speech, deduces from the superiority of the Son over the angels, set forth in chap. i., as likewise from the fact that even the Mosaic law, given through the instrumentality of angels, could not be transgressed with impunity, the imperative obligation for the readers to hold fast to the salvation revealed by Christ, securely handed down, and confirmed by God with miracles. Thus there already comes out here the paraenetic main tendency of the epistle: to animate the Hebrews, urgently exposed as they were to the peril of apostasy, to perseverance in the Christian faith, as this aim is

also manifested elsewhere in repeated admonitions (*e.g.* iii. 6, 14, iv. 14, vi. 11, x. 23); although the author has the intention of speaking further concerning the relation of Christ to the angels (comp. ver. 5 ff.).

Ver. 1. *Διὰ τοῦτο*] *therefore, sc.* because Christ, the mediator of the New Covenant, is as the Son of God so highly exalted above the angels, the intermediate agents in the giving of the Old Covenant. — *δεῖ*] indication of the inner necessity resulting of itself from the described conditions. — *περισσοτέρως*] *so much the more, sc.* than would be the case if He who proclaimed the *ἀκουσθέντα* were one of lower rank. We have not, however, to connect *περισσοτέρως* with *δεῖ* (Grotius, Bengel, Dindorf, Böhme, Kuinoel), but with *προσέχειν* as the main idea. — *προσέχειν τινὶ πρ.*] *to give heed or attention to anything, sc.* in order to hold fast to it. — *τοῖς ἀκουσθείσιν*] *to that which has been heard.* The salvation preached by the Lord and His immediate disciples is intended, of which the readers had heard. Comp. ver. 3. — *μήποτε παραρβύωμεν*] *lest haply we should be carried past it* (comp. LXX. Prov. iii. 21: *υἱὲ μὴ παραρβύῃς, τήρησον δὲ ἐμὴν βουλήν καὶ ἔννοιαν*), *i.e.* lest we lose it, fail of obtaining the salvation promised to us by the word we have heard; comp. ver. 3. The interpretation of Erasmus, Clarius, Beza, Cameron, Stuart, *al.*: *lest we forget it, or let it escape attention*, is unmeaning and almost tautological. *παραρβύωμεν* (or *παραρνύωμεν*, as Lachmann and Tischendorf 2 and 7 write it, after A B* D* L⁸), moreover, is not, as Wittich, Dindorf, and others suppose, conjunctive present active of *παραρβύω*, — for the forms *παραρβύω*, *παραρβύω*, *παραρβύημι* are mere figments of the grammarians,¹ in order to derive certain tenses therefrom, — but sec. aorist conjunct. passive from *παραρβύω*.

Vv. 2-4. Establishing of the *δεῖ περισσοτέρως προσέχειν ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἀκουσθείσιν*, ver. 1, by a warning reference to the great responsibility and culpability in the case of its neglect, and this in a conclusion *a minore ad majus*. Not justifiably does de Wette take vv. 2-4 as a “proving of the danger of the *παραρβύ*.” For not the possibility of foregoing salvation, but

¹ Without warrant Delitzsch denies this. He has not been able to adduce an instance in favour of the opposite opinion.

the culpability of losing it through neglect, forms the central thought in vv. 2-4.

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

sense (= punishment), x. 35, xi. 26, in the favourable sense (= reward).

Ver. 3. The apodosis follows in the form of a question, which for the rest extends only to *σωτηρίας*, not to the close of ver. 4. — *πῶς*] how is it possible that. — *ἡμεῖς*] has the emphasis. The Christians in general are meant, in opposition to the men once belonging to the O. T. theocracy, of whom the writer has spoken at least by implication in ver. 2. — *ἐκφενξόμεθα*] stands absolutely, as xii. 25; 1 Thess. v. 3. Needlessly do Heinrichs, Stengel, Ebrard, Bisping, Maier, and many others supplement from ver. 2: *τὴν ἔνδικον μισθαποδοσίαν*. — *ἀμελήσαντες*] Instancing of the case or condition, after the arising of which an escape or deliverance from punishment becomes an impossibility: *in case that*, or *if, we shall have neglected* (slighted). The participle *corist* is properly used, since the culpability must first have been incurred before a punishment can ensue. — *τηλικαύτης σωτηρίας*] *such a salvation*, i.e. one so great, so far surpassing in exaltedness that of the O. T. Theodorus Mopsuestenus: *ἐκείνῳ νομίμων δόσις ἦν μόνον, ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ χάρις πνεύματος καὶ λύσις ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ βασιλείας οὐρανῶν ἐπαγγελία καὶ ἀθανασίας ὑπόσχεσις· ὅθεν καὶ δικαίως τηλικαύτης εἶπεν*. — *τηλικαύτης* does not in itself contain a reference to *ἥτις* (Tholuck and others; the former will then have *ἥτις* taken in the sense of *ὥστε*), but stands there independently of any correlative; it is then, however, after the question has closed with *σωτηρίας*, enforced by the clause with *ἥτις* (*quippe quae*). — *ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη*] *which indeed, at first proclaimed by the Lord, was handed down with certainty to us by them that heard it*. Wrongly does Ebrard translate: “which was confirmed to us by the hearers, as one proclaimed by the Lord from the very first,” in supposing that *ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα* depends upon *ἐβεβαιώθη* as an “apposition of object.” For how can *ἀρχὴν λαβὸν λαλεῖσθαι* denote something proclaimed “from the very beginning,” or “from the commencement”? And how unskilfully would the author have proceeded in the choice and position of his words, if—as Ebrard supposes—he had wished to express the thought, “that the *σωτηρία*

was directly revealed by the Lord, has been transmitted to us as a certainty, and thus as a divine legitimation of the *σωτηρία* by the *ἀκούσαντες*, the ear- (and eye-) witnesses!" *Ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν*, to begin, always presupposes an opposition, expressed or understood, to a being continued, or to a being brought to an end. When thus in our passage there is mention made not only of an *ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν λαλεῖσθαι* by the Lord, but also of a *βεβαιωθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς* on the part of those who heard the Lord, it is clear that the author will have these two factors regarded as statements of two distinct but mutually corresponding periods of time. — In general, it is wrong when Ebrard, in connection with his explanation just adduced, will find in ver. 3 the twofold contrast with the law— (1) That the law was a mere word (*λόγος*); the gospel, on the other hand, a deliverance, a redemption, an act. (2) That the *σωτηρία* was manifested and proclaimed to men as at first hand, by the Lord Himself; the law, on the contrary, only at second hand, by the angels. For, as concerns the first alleged point of difference, assuredly the emphasis rests neither upon *λόγος*, ver. 2, nor upon *σωτηρίας*, ver. 3; but, ver. 2, upon *δι' ἀγγέλων*, and, ver. 3, upon *τηλικαύτης*. The second alleged point of difference falls, however, with the consideration that the author employs the preposition *διά*, as before *ἀγγέλων*, ver. 2, so also before *τοῦ κυρίου*, ver. 3; thus indicates that the supreme Author alike of the Mosaic law and of the gospel is God Himself, both consequently are proclaimed to man "only at second hand."¹ The pre-eminence of the gospel can accordingly have been discovered by our author only in the fact that in connection with this the Lord Himself was the intervening agent; in connection with the law, on the other hand, only the angels, who, according to chap. i., are

¹ I cannot bring myself to recall this remark, although Delitzsch takes so great offence at it that he finds therein "a toning down of the opposition in gross misapprehension of the sense of the author." The conception of an "immediate" speaking on the part of Jehovah in the N. T., on which Delitzsch insists, p. 49, 51, is regarded in general *unbiblical*; it is, moreover, remote from the thought of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as the whole chapter in itself shows; only by forcing upon him dogmatic notions already *a priori* determined, and entirely disregarding the laws of grammar, can it be brought out from his statements.

subordinate to the Lord. — ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων] *by them that heard it* (sc. from the Lord; παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, Chrysost.), thus by His apostles and immediate disciples. From these ἀκούσαντες the author distinguishes himself and his readers (εἰς ἡμᾶς). As well he himself as the Palestinian Christians to whom he writes must consequently have already belonged to a second generation of Christendom, and the author of the epistle cannot have been Paul (comp. *Introd.* p. 11). When Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. p. 378, 2 Aufl.) objects to this: “from εἰς ἡμᾶς is in truth evident only that the author belonged not to the number of those who could testify that they had with their own ears heard the Lord, at the time when He was upon earth proclaiming that salvation which they now preached,” this is indeed perfectly correct. But when he adds that Paul likewise had certainly only heard the word of salvation from the mouth of those who had listened to Jesus, this is—so long as the solemn asseveration of Paul himself (comp. expressly Gal. i. 12) has any value for us—decidedly false. For Paul reckons himself not among the disciples of the ἀκούσαντες, but among the ἀκούσαντες themselves. For the circumstance that the ἀκούειν was otherwise brought about in his case than in the case of the original apostles, inasmuch as these had stood in the relation of ἀκούσαντες to the Christ walking upon earth, Paul, on the other hand, stood in the relation of an ἀκούσας to the exalted or heavenly Christ, left the essence of the matter itself untouched. Nor even by the assumption of a so-called ἀνακοίνωσις, to which recourse has very frequently been had, can the conclusion resulting with stringent necessity from the words of our verse be set aside; for that which the writer of a letter says to his readers by means of an ἀνακοίνωσις is always of such nature as to be likewise true of himself; never can it stand in excluding opposition to himself. — ἐβεβαιώθη] corresponds to the ἐγένετο βέβαιος, ver. 2; and εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη is a well-known blending of the notion of rest with that of the preceding movement. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 386 f. Theophylact: διεπορθμεύθη εἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαίως καὶ πιστῶς, *it came to us in a firm, trustworthy manner*, so that it has become for us a σωτηρία βεβαία. Wrongly Heinrichs (and so

also Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Wolf, Cramer, Paulus, and others), according to whom *εἰς ἡμᾶς* signifies *ad nostra tempora*, or *usque ad nos*.

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

the other that. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. — On the un-Attic θέλησις, comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 7, 353; Pollux, v. 165: βούλησις, ἐπιθυμία, ὄρεξις, ἔρως· ἡ δὲ θέλησις ιδιωτικόν.

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

Ver. 5. The author has brought into relief the fact, ver. 3, that it was the Son of God, or the Lord, according to chap. i., highly exalted above the angels, by whom the Messianic salvation was proclaimed, and from whose immediate disciples it was handed down to Christendom. He now justifies this order of things as founded in a higher divine decree, and already foretold in the Scriptures of the Old Covenant. That order of things is, however, justified, in conformity to the comparison of Christ with the angels, which is begun with i. 4, first, *e contrario* or negatively, ver. 5, and then, ver. 6, positively. The emphasis lies in ver. 5 upon ἀγγέλοις, and this then finds its antithesis in ἄνθρωπος and υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ver. 6. For when the author first in an absolute form of expression says: For not unto the angels has He put into subjection the world to come, and then continues: But one in a certain place testifies, etc., the sense—on account of the close connectedness of ver. 6 (see on that verse) with ver. 5—is certainly this: for, *according to the testimony of Scripture*, the world to come is put in subjection, not to angels, but to Christ, the Son of man. — ἀγγέλοις] without article. For it stands generically: beings who are angels, who have the nature of angels (Bleek). [Owen: nature angelical.] De Wette supposes the reason for the anarthrous form to be in the possibility that only *a part of the angels* are to be thought of. Unsuitably, because in connection with οὐκ ἀγγέλοις already the definite antithesis: “but to the Son of man,” was present

to the mind of the author (comp. ver. 6). — ὑπέταξεν] *sc.* ὁ θεός, which naturally follows from the τοῦ θεοῦ of ver. 4. The verb expresses the notion of making dependent, or of the placing in a position of subjection, and is chosen because the same expression is employed in the citation presently to be adduced (comp. ver. 8). — τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν] *the world to come.* This mode of designating it is explained from the well-known Biblical phraseology, according to which the Messianic period was distinguished as the αἰὼν μέλλων, from the pre-Messianic as the αἰὼν οὗτος.¹ What is meant, consequently, is not something purely future (Theodoret: ὁ μέλλων βίος; Oecumenius: ὁ ἐσόμενος κόσμος; Schulz: the new order of the world which is approaching; Bleek II. the blessings of the kingdom of God which will first be manifested and conferred upon believers at the return of the Lord in glory; Grotius, Maier, and others: heaven, as the future dwelling-place of the Christians also), but *the new order of things in the Messianic kingdom, which in its first manifestations has already appeared, but as regards its completion is still a future one.* Calvin: apparet non vocari orbem futurum dumtaxat, qualem e resurrectione speramus, sed qui coepit ab exordio regni Christi, complementum vero suum habebit in ultima redemptione. τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν is itself without emphasis; on the contrary, only resumes under another form the τηλικαύτης σωτηρίας of ver. 3. It results from this, that the opinion according to which the tacit contrast is to be supplied in thought to the declaration, ver. 5: “the present world is indeed” to be regarded as “subjected to the angels, by them swayed and governed” (Cameron, Bleek, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 656, *al.*), is a baseless one. For it must then have been written οὐ γὰρ τὴν μέλλουσαν οἰκουμένην ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξεν. — περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν] does not go back to i. 6 (Theophylact, Zeger, Grotius, Schlichting, Schulz, Böhme; comp. also Delitzsch),—against which the *present* λαλοῦμεν, in place of which a preterite must have

¹ We have not to seek the origin of the addition τὴν μέλλουσαν in the fact that at the time of the Psalmist (ver. 6), that which was promised belonged as yet to the purely future (so, along with the right explanation this likewise in Bleek I.).

been expected, and not less the addition τὴν μέλλουσιν to τὴν οἰκουμένην, is decisive,—nor is λαλοῦμεν put in place of a future: “de quo in sequenti testimonio loquemur” (Vatablus); but the relative clause is to be taken quite generally: which is the subject of our discourse (our epistle). Too specially Kurtz: “of which we are speaking just now, in this section of our epistle,” which would have called for the addition of a νῦν. The plural λαλοῦμεν, moreover, has reference merely to the writer. Comp. v. 11, vi. 9, 11, xiii. 18. Without good reason does Bengel supplement *nos doctores*; while even, according to Hofmann, “all who believe the promise, the apostle *and* his readers,” are the subject of λαλοῦμεν, inasmuch as it is only a question of an “additional explanatory clause, when the apostle adds that that world to come is intended, of which the Christians speak!”

Ver. 6 attaches itself closely to ver. 5, in that the adversative δέ (different from the disjunctive ἀλλά, *but*, on the contrary. Comp. Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 171), as iv. 13, 15, ix. 12, x. 27, xii. 13, 1 Cor. vii. 15, 25 fin., and frequently, as it were correcting the preceding negative statement, now places in opposition the actual state of the question: *Some one, however* (some one, on the contrary), *testified in a certain place and said*. Quite wrongly does Heinrichs suppose an entirely new section of the epistle to begin with ver. 6. — πού τις] The wavering character of this form of citation is derived by Grotius from the consideration that the Psalms were the work of different authors, and the authors of particular psalms were often unknown. But the eighth Psalm, here cited, is, both in the Hebrew and the LXX., expressly ascribed to David. According to Koppe (*Excursus I. ad epist. ad Roman.*, 2d ed. p. 379), Dindörf, Schulz, Heinrichs (comp. also Stengel), the indefiniteness of the formula is to be explained by the fact that the author is citing from memory. But the words agree too exactly with the LXX. to be a citation from memory, and, moreover, the indefinite πού occurs again, iv. 4, in connection with the citation of Gen. ii. 2, thus in connection with an appeal to a passage of the O. T. Scripture, of which the place where it is found could not possibly escape the memory of our author. De Wette, after the precedent of

Bleek [cf. Peshito: *the Scripture witnesses, and says*], regards it as the most correct supposition that the author "was not concerned about the particular writers of Scripture, since for him God or the Holy Ghost spoke through the Scripture." Yet, if the reason for the form of expression is to be sought in this, then in general we should hardly expect the personal indication *τίς* to be added, but rather a passive construction to be chosen. According to Hofmann, finally, *πού τις* is intended to declare "that it is indeed a matter of indifference for his purpose who said this, and where it is found; that it is adduced as the utterance of *some* man, only an utterance which comes invested with the authority of Scripture!" The indefinite mode of citation has probably no other than a rhetorical ground, inasmuch as the author presupposes a universal acquaintance with the passage, without concerning himself to learn whether it is known to all or not. So substantially also Chrysostom (*τοῦτο δὲ αὐτό, οἶμαι, τὸ κρύπτειν καὶ μὴ τιθέναι τὸν εἰρηκότα τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς περιφερομένην καὶ κατὰδηλον οὖσαν εἰσάγειν, δεικνύντος ἐστίν, αὐτοὺς σφόδρα ἐμπείρους εἶναι τῶν γραφῶν*), Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Jac. Cappellus, Cornelius a Lapide [Owen: "the reason is plain; both person and place were sufficiently known to them to whom he wrote"], Calov, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, *al.* The same reticence in the mode of citation is often found with Philo. Comp. *e.g. de ebrietate*, p. 248 (ed. Mangey, I. p. 365): *εἴπε γὰρ πού τις* (*sc. Abraham*, Gen. xx. 12). Further examples see in Bleek, *Abth. II. 1 Hälfte*, p. 239. — The citation, which extends to *ποδῶν αὐτοῦ*, ver. 8, is from Ps. viii. 5–7 (4–6). The utterance in its historic sense contains a declaration with regard to man in general; but the author, on the ground of the ideal import of the passage, as likewise in particular on the ground of the expression *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, which in consequence of Dan. vii. 13 was current with the Jews as an appellation of the Messiah (comp. John xii. 34), which, too, was one often bestowed by Jesus upon Himself, finds in it a declaration concerning the Son of man *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, *i.e.* concerning Christ.¹

¹ In contradiction with the design of the whole explication, as this clearly manifests itself from the context, do Beza, Piscator, Storr, Ebrard, Delitzsch

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

Ver. 7. *Ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἁγγέλους*] Thus the LXX. translate the Hebrew *עָלָה מְעַט מֵאַנְגְּלִים*. The sense of the Hebrew is: “Thou hast made Him only a little lower than God, hast made Him only a little less than God.” The *βραχύ τι* is consequently in the original a note of degree, and the whole former member *Ἠλάττωσας . . . ἁγγέλους* con-

(p. 57, 59), Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 45, 2 Aufl.), Alford, Moll, and others, refer *ἄνθρωπος*, even in the sense of our author, and *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* to *man generally*, namely, to the man of the New Covenant, inasmuch as he *shall* receive the dominion over all things, in the possession of which Christ is already set. When Ebrard, p. 84, asserts that the “Messianic” interpretation “of the non-Messianic eighth Psalm” cannot be laid to the account of the author of the epistle, without charging him with “a downright Rabbinical misunderstanding of a psalm;” and when, in like manner, Delitzsch, p. 57, declares it “not at all conceivable that the author of our epistle should without any explanation have referred *ἄνθρωπος* and *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* of the psalm to *Christ*,” unless we are to attribute “the uttermost limitation of thought to the N. T. exposition of Scripture,” that is nothing else than a controlling of the author of the epistle by pre-conceived opinions of one's own, from which, in the face of 1 Cor. xv. 27 f., one ought to have shrunk. For the rest, against the view espoused by Ebrard, Delitzsch, and Hofmann, comp. also Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 368 ff., note.

tains in the original the same thought as the immediately following *δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν*. The author, however, takes the *βραχύ τι* of the LXX. in the *temporal* sense: "for a short time" (comp. ver. 9), and finds in the second member an opposition to the first, in such wise that in the application he refers the statement of the first clause to the *humiliation* of Christ, that of the second to the *exaltation* of Christ. — The words following these in the LXX. (as also in the Hebrew): *καὶ κατέστησας αὐτόν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου* (comp. the critical remarks), have been left out by the author as unsuitable to his presentment. For the statement that God has set the Son of man or the Messiah over the works of creation which proceeded from the hands of God, might appear to contain a contradiction to i. 10 (comp. also i. 2), where earth and heaven were designated as works created by the hands of the Son.

Ver. 8. *Πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ*] *All things didst Thou put in subjection under His feet*. In the psalm these words refer to the dominion which God has conferred upon man over the earth, and indeed specially (comp. Ps. viii. 8, 9 [7, 8]) over the whole animal world. The author of the epistle, on the other hand, taking *πάντα* in the absolute sense, understands them of the dominion over the universe which has been conferred upon Christ, the Son of man. Comp. Matt. xxviii. 18. — With *ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι . . . ἀνυπότακτον* the author still dwells on the closing words of the citation: *πάντα ὑπέταξας κ.τ.λ.*, in order by way of elucidation to unfold its contents, and thus to place in clearer light the truth of the main thought expressed vv. 5–8. *γάρ* consequently refers back to that which immediately precedes, and the supposition of Tholuck — that *ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι κ.τ.λ.*, as the clause which affords the proof, is parenthetically preposed to the *νῦν δὲ κ.τ.λ.*, as the clause which is to be proved, so that the connection would be: "but now we see not yet all things made subject to Him; for, according to the declaration of the psalm, all things without exception are subject to Him" — is to be rejected as entirely unnecessary; quite apart from the fact that no instance of such parenthetical preposing of an elucidatory clause with *γάρ*

is to be found anywhere in the N. T. (not in John iv. 44, 45 either), although not rare with classical writers (comp. Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 467; Kühner, *Gramm.* II. p. 454). Nor does γάρ stand for οὖν (Heinrichs, Stengel), but is the explicative *namely*. The subject in ὑποτάξαι, further, is not *David*, the singer of the psalm (Heinrichs), but *God*; and the emphasis rests upon the opposition between τὰ πάντα and οὐδέν. The threefold αὐτῷ, finally, relates not to *man* in general (Beza [Piscator: *the believers*], Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Whitby, Storr, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, Hofmann, Woerner, and others), but to the *Son of man*, and that not merely as regards its signification (Masch, Bleek, de Wette), but—as is shown by the Ἰησοῦν, only incidentally added, ver. 9—to the Son of man as He appeared in Christ as an historical person (Calvin, Gerhard, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Peirce, Schulz, Tholuck, Klee, Stuart, Conybeare, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 364; Kurtz, Ewald, *al.*). The sense is accordingly: by the fact, namely, that God made all things subject to Christ, the Son of man, He left nothing that is not subjected unto Him; it is thus also—this natural inference the author leaves to the readers themselves to make—to Him, the Son of man, and not to the angels, that ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα (ver. 5), which is only a part of that τὰ πάντα, is subjected; nay, the angels themselves, seeing that *all things* have been put in subjection under Him, are themselves subject to Him. — With νῦν δὲ οὕτω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα the author limits the immediately preceding declaration by an admission, by which, however, as is then further shown, ver. 9, the correctness of the former assertion as to the actual state of the matter suffers no infringement: *now*, however,—that must be conceded,—*we see not yet* all things subjected unto Him. For we are as yet in the condition of the earthly body; as yet the kingdom of God is only partially established; as yet it has to wage warfare with many enemies (comp. x. 12, 13; 1 Cor. xv. 24-27). We shall *see* that all things have been made subject to Christ by God the Father only when Christ shall have returned for the consummation of the kingdom of God.

Ver. 9. Proof that, notwithstanding the circumstances just mentioned, the matter itself which has been asserted is perfectly true. Certainly we do not, at the present moment, as yet see all things *made subject* to Christ, the Son of man; but we *do* see Him already crowned with glory and honour, in that after suffering and dying He has been exalted to the right hand of the Father. From the reality of the one, however, which we see, follows of necessity the reality of the other, which we do not yet see. For if the word of Scripture: *δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν*, has already been fulfilled in His case, there can be no kind of doubt but in like manner also the further word of Scripture: *πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ*, inseparably connected as it is with the former, has already attained its realization in Him. — The words of ver. 9 have undergone a strange misinterpretation on the part of Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 45 ff. 2 Aufl.). As Hofmann with regard to ver. 7 already denies that the two members of the sentence in that verse: *ἡλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους* and *δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν*, form in the mind of the writer an opposition to each other, so just as little is the writer in ver. 9 supposed to have had present to his mind in connection with *τὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον* the *humiliation* of Christ, and with *δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον* the *exaltation* of Christ. Ver. 9 is thought rather to refer exclusively to the Jesus "living in the flesh," and the connection is thus explained: "Far from its being the case that we see all things subjected to man, He, on the contrary, of whom that which the psalm speaks of man holds good in full truth, Jesus namely, stands before our eyes in a position of divine appointment, as such demanded by the existing calamity of death, which, according to ver. 14, makes the devil a ruler and us bondsmen." For by *βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένους* there is reference made, in the opinion of Hofmann, to the person of man, of which the psalm is treating, with regard to the dignity belonging thereto as conferred by God, — inasmuch as *βραχύ τι* is to be taken of *degree*, — but by *τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου* is indicated the misfortune consisting in death itself, and not his *suffering* of

death; and *δόξα καὶ τιμὴ* finally expresses, according to iii. 3, v. 4, 5, the glorious character of his position by virtue of his vocation. The sense of ver. 9, then, is supposed to be: "What He, in whom the wealth of human nature has appeared in full truth, *denotes* and *represents* on the part of God,—for the former is meant by *τιμὴ*, the latter by *δόξα*,—that He denotes and represents, for the reason that mankind is obnoxious to the suffering of death, and to the end that He might taste a death which should redound unto good for every one!" See, on the other hand, the remarks of Richm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 333 ff., note.—*τὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον* is the object, and *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον* the predicate to *βλέπομεν*, while *Ἰησοῦν* is the appositional nearer definition of the object brought in only at the close. The sense thus is: "*But we do indeed see the one for a time abased below the angels, namely Jesus, crowned with glory and honour.*" Wrongly others: "As the one for a time abased below the angels do we recognise Jesus, who is crowned with glory and honour." For, in order to express this thought, *Ἰησοῦν τὸν . . . ἐστεφανωμένον* must have been placed. Wrongly likewise Ebrard, with whom Delitzsch agrees in substance, who takes *Ἰησοῦν* as object, *ἡλαττωμένον* as adjectival attribute to *Ἰησοῦν*, and *ἐστεφανωμένον* as predicate to the object. The sense then is: "*mankind* is not yet exalted; but *Jesus*, who was indeed abased for a while below the angels, we see already crowned with glory and honour." This construction, which at any rate rests upon the false supposition that the subject of discourse, vv. 6–8, is *not* already Christ, the Son of man, but only man in general, and that the author of the epistle had regarded as fully identical the two utterances of the psalm: *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν*, and *πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ*, would only be permissible in the case that *Ἰησοῦν δέ, τὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον, βλέπομεν κ.τ.λ.*, or *τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον Ἰησοῦν βλέπομεν κ.τ.λ.*, had been written. By the position of the *Ἰησοῦν* after *βλέπομεν* it becomes impossible; since in consequence thereof *Ἰησοῦν* appears as entirely unaccentuated, consequently can be

regarded only as a supplementary addition by way of elucidation with regard to the question who is to be understood by the *ὁ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένος*. *Ἰησοῦν* might even have been entirely left out without detriment to the sense and intelligibility of that which the author would imply; it is nevertheless inserted, in order, by the express mention of His name, to cut off every kind of doubt upon the point that it is no other than Christ, the historic Redeemer, of whom the citation adduced, vv. 6–8, is treating. — *βλέπομεν*] *we see*, perceive; namely, with the eyes of the mind; comp. iii. 19, *al.* For it is openly testified that Christ rose from the dead, and ascended to the right hand of the Father in heaven; and Christians feel that He is reigning in power and glory by means of the Holy Spirit, which He has conferred upon them. — *διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*] *on account of His suffering of death*, belongs not to *βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον* (Origen, *in Joann.* t. ii. c. 6; Augustine, *contra Maximin.* iii. 2. 5; Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Beza, Schlichting, Cornelius a Lapide, Cameron, Calov, Limborch, Semler, *al.*), but to *δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον* (Luther, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, Wetstein, Böhmie, Bleek, Tholuck, de Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 357; Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, and many others). Only this mode of referring the clause has the merit of naturalness from the position of the words; only this is grammatically and logically justified. For not only with this construction does *διὰ* with the accusative retain its only possible signification, but the thought likewise finds its confirmation in the sequel (*διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι*, ver. 10), and accords with the view of Paul, Phil. ii. 9, according to which the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of the Father was the consequence and divine recompense of the voluntary abasement endured even to the death of the cross. Supposing the connection to be with that which precedes, *διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου* must contain a later added nearer definition to *ἡλαττωμένον*; but a second supplementary nearer definition, seeing that *Ἰησοῦν* already occupies such a position, would be extremely improbable, when we consider the carefulness with regard

to style which prevails in this epistle; it would not, like Ἰησοῦν, have a purpose to serve, but be merely an instance of linguistic negligence such as ought not to be readily laid to the charge of our author. Moreover, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου, referred to that which precedes, does not even admit of any satisfactory explanation. For, as thus combined, it is interpreted either: humbled *by reason of* the suffering of death, *i.e.* by suffering death, or: humbled *for the sake of* the suffering of death, *i.e.* in order to be able to undertake it. But in the latter case the choice of the preposition διὰ would be an exceedingly ill-judged one, since we must, at any rate, have expected εἰς τὸ πᾶσχειν τὸν θάνατον, or something similar. In the former case, on the other hand, διὰ must have been combined with the *genitive* instead of the *accusative*, quite apart from the consideration that the author can hardly be supposed to limit the humiliation of Christ to the moment of His death, but rather (comp. ver. 14), like Paul, to comprehend in general the whole period of His life in the flesh. — ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσεται θανάτου] *that He by the grace of God might taste death for every one*, does not depend upon δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον. For the enduring of death was certainly not something which was to take place only after the exaltation, but already preceded this. The contorted interpretations, however: *so that He died for all* (Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, Tena, Ribera, Morus, Valckenaer, Kuinoel), or: *in order that He may have suffered death for all* (Ebrard), or: *postquam mortem gustavit* (Schleusner), are grammatically impossible. But since a connecting of the final clause with ἡλαττωμένον (Akersloot, Bengel, Böhme, Bisping) is, considering the grammatical construction of ver. 9, quite inconceivable, ὅπως κ.τ.λ. can be only a further, but pregnant, exponent of the preceding τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου: *on account of His suffering of death*, namely, *in order that He might*, etc. — χάριτι θεοῦ] for the grace and love of God is the supreme cause of the redeeming death of Christ (comp. Rom. v. 8; Gal. ii. 21). — ὑπὲρ] *on behalf of for the well of*. — παντός] is not *neuter*, in such wise that the declaration should apply to the whole creation, including the angels (Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact; comp. Origen,

in *Joann.* t. i. c. 40);¹ for this thought comes into collision with ver. 16, and the expression thereof would be incorrect, since we must expect in that case ὑπὲρ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως, or at least ὑπὲρ τοῦ παντός. Παντός is *masculine*, and has reference only to *mankind*. The singular, however, is placed, not the plural πάντων, in order distinctly to bring out the thought that Christ died on behalf of each single individual among men (namely, who will appropriate the salvation offered him), not merely for mankind as a totality, as a compact corporation. [Piscator and Owen understand: *each and every one*, sc. of the πολλοὶ υἱοί mentioned ver. 10. Cf. *Acts* xx. 28.] — γεύεσθαι θανάτου represents the experiencing of death under the figure of a *tasting* of the same. Comp. *Matt.* xvi. 28; *Mark* ix. 1; *Luke* ix. 27; *John* viii. 52. The formula corresponds to the rabbinical נהיב עגב (see Schoettgen and Wetstein on *Matt.* xvi. 28), and has its manifold analogies in the Greek turns: γεύεσθαι μόχθων (*Soph.* *Trachin.* 1101), κακῶν (*Eurip.* *Hec.* 379; *Luc.* *Nigr.* 28), πένθους πικροῦ (*Eurip.* *Alcest.* 1069), πόνων (*Pindar.* *Nem.* vi. 41), δῖστοῦ (*Homer.* *Odys.* xxi. 98), τῆς ἀρχῆς, τῆς ἐλευθερίας (*Herod.* iv. 147, vi. 5), etc. The formula is only a more significant expression for the ordinary ἀποθνήσκειν. Neither the notion of the *brief duration* of Christ's death (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Clarius, Camerarius, Braun, Peirce, Cramer, Ch. F. Schmid), nor along with this the notion of the *reality* of that death (Beza, Bengel), nor, finally, the notion of the *bitterness* of the death sufferings (Calov, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz), lies in the expression.

REMARK.—In connection with the explanation of the reading χωρίς θεοῦ (see the critical remarks) comes forth the main diversity, that these words were either taken as closely conjoined with ὑπὲρ παντός, or regarded in themselves as an independent nearer defining of the verb. The former mode of explanation is adopted by Origen, Theodoret, Ebrard, Ewald: "in order that He might suffer death for all beings, with the exception of God alone;" further Bengel, and Chr. F. Schmid: "in order that, with a view

¹ Ebrard, too, finds the thought expressed in ὑπὲρ παντός: "that Christ by His death has reconciled absolutely all things, heaven and earth;" but in connection therewith inconsistently takes παντός as a masculine.

to purchasing or subjecting all things except God, He might suffer death." But against both acceptations is the fact that *παντός* cannot be neuter (see above), against the latter, moreover, in particular the fact that the notion: "in order to purchase to himself," cannot possibly be expressed by the mere *ὑπὲρ παντός*. As an independent addition *χωρίς θεοῦ* is taken by Theodorus Mopsuestenus, Ambrose, Fulgentius, the Nestorians, and P. Colomesius (*Observatt. Sacr.* p. 603): "that He might taste death without God, i.e. without the participation of His Godhead, with the mere sharing of His humanity in death." But that such a thought, in itself entirely alien as it is to the Biblical writers, could not have been expressed by *χωρίς θεοῦ*, is at once apparent. There must at least have been written *χωρίς τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος*. To this place further belongs Paulus, with an appeal to Matt. xxvii. 46: "as without God, as one abandoned by God, not delivered." But the added "as," by which alone the interpretation becomes tolerable, is without grammatical justification the expositor's own *additamentum*.

Ver. 10. Not without design has the author, ver. 9, added to the declaration *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον* the indication of the cause, *διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*, and then brought into relief this superadded clause by the final statement: *ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσεται θανάτου*. For the Redeemer's death of the cross, ridiculed by the Gentiles as folly, was to the Jews an offence (1 Cor. i. 23). Even to the Hebrews, to whom the author is writing, the thought of a Messiah who passed through sufferings and death might be a stumbling-block not yet surmounted, and, with other things, have contributed to shake their confidence in Christianity, and incline them to relapse into Judaism. Without, therefore, further giving express utterance to the conclusion to be expected after ver. 9 (see on ver. 9, *init.*), but rather leaving the supplying of the same to the readers, the author passes over, ver. 10 ff., at once to the justification of that fact regarded as an offence, in bringing into relief the consideration that the choice of that way, so apparently strange, of causing the Messiah to attain to glory through sufferings and death, was altogether worthy of God (ver. 10), and necessary (vv. 14-18), in order that Christ might be qualified to be the redeemer of sinful humanity. — Wrongly does Tholuck suppose that ver. 10 attaches itself to *δόξῃ ἐστεφανωμένον*, ver. 9, and

expresses the thought that the glorification of Him could not fail of its accomplishment, who became to others the author of salvation. For the centre of gravity in the proposition lies not in *τελειῶσαι*, but in *διὰ παθημάτων*, which Tholuck erroneously degrades to a mere "secondary thought." — *ἔπρεπεν*] *it was befitting*; not an expression of *necessity* (Kuinoel, Bloomfield, *al.*), but of *meekness* and *becomingness*, in relation partly to the nature of God (comp. *δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα*), partly to the ends He would attain (cf. vv. 14–18). Comp. Philo, *Legg. allegor.* I. p. 48 E (with Mangey, I. p. 53): *πρέπει τῷ θεῷ φυτεύειν καὶ οἰκοδομεῖν ἐν ψυχῇ τὰς ἀρετὰς*. — *De incorrupt.* Munli, p. 950 B (with Mangey, II. p. 500): *ἐμπρεπὲς δὲ θεῷ τὰ ἄμορφα μορφοῦν καὶ τοῖς αἰσχίστοις περιτιθέναι θαυμαστὰ κάλλη*. — *αὐτῷ, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα*] does not relate to *Christ* (Primasius, Hunnius, Königsmanu, Cramer, *al.*), but is a periphrasis for *God*. This periphrastic delineation, however, of the divine characteristics justifies the *ἔπρεπεν* in its truth and naturalness. For He who is the Supreme Cause and Creator of the Universe cannot have done anything unworthy of Himself. — *τὰ πάντα*] *the totality of all that exists*, not merely that which serves for the bringing about of salvation (Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Paulus). — *δι' ὃν*] *for the sake of whom*,¹ characterizes God as the One *for* whom, *i.e.* to accomplish whose ends, all things are designed, and corresponds to the *εἰς αὐτόν*, Rom. xi. 36, 1 Cor. viii. 6; while *δι' οὗ* characterizes Him as the One by whom all things have been effected or created, inasmuch as, according to the popular conception, the notion of the *originating* is not strictly separated from that of *effecting*, since both are summed up under the more general notion of disposing, preparing [*ποιεῖν, παρασκευάζειν, ἐτοιμάζειν*]; comp. 1 Cor. i. 9; Gal. i. 1. In the case of our author, moreover, the placing of the inaccurate *δι' οὗ* instead of the more accurate *ἐξ οὗ* (comp. Rom. xi. 36) or *ὑφ' οὗ*, may also have been occasioned with a view to the paronomasia produced by the use of the twofold *διά* with different cases. — *πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα*] is not a preposed apposition to *τὸν*

¹ Not: "at whose command or will," as Wieseler (*Comm. üb. d. Br. an die Gal.*, Gött. 1859, p. 111) will have δι' explained.

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

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

¹ For the same reason have we to reject the kindred interpretation of Kurtz, who takes the *ἄγειν εἰς δόξαν* as preceding the *τελειῶσαι*, and refers the *υἱοί* to the believing contemporaries of Jesus, with the inclusion of the believers under the *Old Covenant*.

character" of *τελειῶσαι* cannot be expressed by *ἀγαγόντα*, for the reason that the personal objects of *ἀγαγόντα* and *τελειῶσαι* are different. *ἀγαγόντα* can have no other meaning than: *since He led*, and is the indication of the *cause* from the standpoint of the writer. The participle aorist has its justification in the fact that, from the moment Christ appeared on earth as a redeemer, and found faith among men, God in reality was leading *εἰς δόξαν* those who believed, *i.e.* caused them to walk in the way to the *δόξα*. For only this notion of title to the *δόξα in reversion*, not that of the actual *possession* of the same, can be meant; inasmuch as the possession of the *δόξα* will only come in at the Parousia. The causal relation, however, of the participial clause: *πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγάγοντα*, to the main statement: *ἔπρεπε τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι*, and consequently the justification of the latter by the former, lies in the fact that the *πολλοὶ υἱοί*, just because they were not angels but men, could only be redeemed in that Christ for them became man, and for them suffered and died; even as the author himself will more fully show, ver. 14 ff. Others find the causal relation by supplying, in thought, *διὰ παθημάτων* to the first clause also. So Jac. Cappellus: "quum tot filios suos per afflictiones consecrasset, afflictionum via perduxisset ad gloriam pater coelestis, decebat sane et aequum erat, ut principem salutis eorum eadem via perduceret ad coelestem gloriam." In like manner Grotius: "quia fieri non potest, ut qui se pietati dedunt, non multa mala patiantur . . . ideo Deus voluit ipsum auctorem salutiferæ doctrinae non nisi per graves calamitates perducere ad statum illum perfectæ beatitudinis." But in this case the express addition of *διὰ παθημάτων* in the first clause could not have been omitted. — *τὸν ἀρχηγόν*] Comp. xii. 2; Acts iii. 15, v. 31. Designation of the beginner, or first in a series, to which the further notion of *author* then easily attaches, so that the word is frequently used, as here, exactly in the sense of *αἵτιος*. Instances in Bleek, Abth. II. 1 Hälfte, p. 302. — *τελειῶσαι*] *to bring to perfection*, to lead to the goal, does not here express "an inner moral perfection, which has as its consequence the attainment of the highest outward goal" (de Wette, Tholuck, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 343, 346;

and, long ago, Cameron), nor does it denote the close of the appointed course with which God has brought Jesus to the goal of that which He was to become, to the end of His earthly temporal existence (Hofmann); but resumes the notion of the *δόξη καὶ τιμῇ στεφανοῦσθαι*, ver. 9, and is identical with this.

Vv. 11–13. Elucidatory justification, in passing, of the expression *πολλοὺς υἱοὺς*, employed ver. 10; in proof of the brotherly relation existing between Christ and believers, already indicated by that expression. That this view as to the aim and signification of vv. 11–13 is the true one, is contested indeed by Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 366 f. (comp. also Kurtz, and Hofmann *ad loc.*). According to Riehm, vv. 11–13 are to be regarded not as mere accessory remarks, but as the first link in the proof for ver. 10, to which then ver. 14 f. attaches as second link; in such wise that only in the two thoughts together (vv. 11–13 and ver. 14 f.), not in ver. 14 by itself (see on the verses) alone, is a confirmation of ver. 10 to be found; and accordingly the (argumentative, not explicative) *γάρ*, ver. 11, belongs not merely to ver. 11. The following “chain of reasoning,” namely, is supposed to shape the course of thought: “it became God, etc. For—(1) Christ is brother to the Christians; it is thus not unbecoming that He should have been made like them; and (2) He must be made like them, because His suffering and death were necessary, if they were to be saved.” The untenable character of this statement of the connection of thought, as made by Riehm, is, however, sufficiently apparent from the fact—apart from the consideration that the contents of vv. 11–13 manifestly point back to the expression *πολλοὺς υἱοὺς*, ver. 10—that if the proof for the main thought of ver. 10 was designed in reality already to begin with vv. 11–13, it would surely not be the proposition: *it is not unbecoming that Christ should be made like unto the Christians* (of which there was no express mention so early as ver. 10), which must have been proved, but solely and simply the proposition: *it is not unbecoming that God should have led Christ through suffering to perfection*, in which the true central thought of ver. 10 is contained. But such proof is *not* given. — *ὁ τε γὰρ ἀγιάζων*

... πάντες] *Now He who sanctifies and those who are sanctified* (through Him, *i.e.* through His atoning sacrificial death,¹ comp. x. 10, 14, ix. 13 f., xiii. 12) *all have their origin in One*,—is a special statement concerning Christ and Christians. To take the words as a proposition of universal validity, the application of which to Christ and the Christians was left to the readers, wherein there is specially an underlying allusion to the O. T. high priest and those whose cleansing from sins he accomplished (Schlichting, Gerhard, Schöttgen, *al.*), is forbidden by the connection with that which precedes and that which follows.—The *present* participles ὁ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι are used substantively. Comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 331 f. — ἐξ ἐνὸς πάντες] *sc. εἰσίν. ἐνός is masculine.* Wrongly is it by others taken as a *neuter*, in that they either supplement in thought: σπέρματος, or αἵματος, or γένους (so Carpzov, Abresch, *al.*), or else explain: *ex communi massa* (Jac. Cappellus, Akersloot), or “of one and the same nature” (Calvin, Cameron: *eiusdem naturae et conditionis spiritualis*; Cornelius a Lapide, Owen, Whitby, Moses Stuart); for neither is the supplying of a substantive admissible, nor can ἐκ, expressive as it is of the origin, be transformed into a declaration of nature and constitution. We have, however, to understand by ἐνός, not *Adam* (Erasmus, *Paraphr.*; Beza, Estius, Justinian, Hunnius, Baumgarten, Zachariae, Bisping, Wieseler in the *Publications of the University of Kiel*, 1867, p. 26; Hofmann, Woerner) or *Abraham* (Drusius, Peirce, Bengel), but *God*. Yet the notion of fatherhood, which is in this way assigned to God, is not to be expounded in the universal sense, in such wise that God would be called Creator and Father in relation to Christians *also*, only in the same manner in which He is the Creator of every creature (so Chrysostom and the majority), but is to be referred specially to the fact that Christians are His *spiritual* children (Piscator,

¹ Delitzsch arbitrarily takes ἁγιάζων, ver. 11, as synonymous with τελειῶν, ver. 10: “In order to be crowned with δόξα καὶ τιμὴ Jesus must first be sanctified, or, as the author says, ver. 10, be made perfect through sufferings, inasmuch as the sufferings melted away that about Him which was not capable of exaltation, that He, Himself sanctified before, might be able to sanctify us, and so to raise us to like δόξα.” Of a being sanctified, on the part of Christ, there is no mention made either here or anywhere else in the epistle.

Grotius, Limborch, Paulus, Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll). Comp. John viii. 47 ; 1 John iii. 10, iv. 6, v. 19 ; 3 John 11. — πάντες] Peirce and Bengel would have taken with οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι alone. The position of the word, however, renders this impossible. Rather does πάντες, after the close connection between the ἁγιάζων and the ἁγιαζόμενοι has already been accentuated by means of the τέ . . . καί, still further lay stress upon the fact that they *all*, the Christians not less than Christ, are ἐξ ενός. — δι' ἣν αἰτίαν] *Wherefore*. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 6, 12 ; Tit. i. 13. The same formula also not rarely with Philo. — οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται] *He (sc. ὁ ἁγιάζων) is not ashamed*. For Christ is the higher one. Comp. xi. 16. — αὐτούς] *sc. τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους*.

Vv. 12, 13. Documentary proofs from Scripture for the οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται ἀδελφούς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν, ver. 11.

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

Ver. 13. *Second and third proofs*, taken from Isa. viii. 17, 18. The design of the author in dividing into two different citations, by means of καὶ πάλιν, the words which stand together in the Hebrew and the LXX., is *not* to present the relation of community between Christ and the Christians on two different sides, in that, namely, it is indicated in his first passage how the incarnate Son of God descended to the standpoint of man ; in the second, on the other hand, how redeemed men are raised by God to the standpoint of Christ (Kurtz),—all of which is subtle and far-fetched ; but only to pile up the Scripture testimonies, inasmuch as the end of ver. 17, as well as the beginning of ver. 18, seemed to him to contain each in itself an independent means of evidence for that which he would make good. The words of the first proof passage : πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ, are likewise found in the LXX. at 2 Sam. xxii. 3 and Isa. xii. 2. But that the author

was not thinking of one of these passages (according to Ebrard, of the first), but of Isa. viii. 17, is the more natural supposition, because with the LXX. and in the original the words, which here, too, are first adduced (only in partially inverted order, and augmented by ἐγώ): καὶ πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ, immediately precede the directly following passage, taken from Isa. viii. 18. In their historic sense the words cited refer to the prophet and his sons, and, indeed, with the LXX., the ἰδοὺ . . . θεός is a further unfolding of the subject in ἔσομαι. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, however, regards the words as an utterance of Christ, led thereto, as Bleek rightly conjectures, by the καὶ ἐρεῖ, interpolated by the LXX. before ver. 17, which seemed to indicate another subject than the prophet, since he spoke throughout the whole section in the first person; and other than God, since He is spoken of, by virtue of ἐπ' αὐτῷ, as the one in whom the speaker trusts. The demonstrative force of the words cited is found by our author in the fact that the person speaking, i.e. Christ, places Himself, by means of the testifying of His confidence in God, upon the same level with other men;¹ as also in that the author understands by the παιδία, not the children of the speaker, but the children of God, the children whom God the Father has given to Christ.

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

¹ Theophylact: καὶ διὰ τούτου δείκνυσιν, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν γίγνεται, ὥσπερ γὰρ ἕκαστος τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς πίσιαιβεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, τοῦτ' ἐστι τῷ πατρί.

attachment of ver. 14 to ver. 13, therefore, is effected only in so far as τὰ παῖδια, ver. 13, has given occasion for the resuming of this word in the first clause of ver. 14. In a strangely perverted fashion Heinrichs (comp. also Valckenaer): "Quod si homo fuit Christus, infans quoque primo fuerit omnemque in nativitate sua humanam naturam induerit necesse est." — κεκοινωνήκεν] here, as often in the case of the classics, combined with the *genitive*; whereas elsewhere in the N. T. the *dative* is used with κοινωνεῖν (Rom. xv. 27; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 13, *al.*). The persons with whom the communion or the common participation takes place are not the *parents* (Valckenaer, who supplies γονεῦσι), but the *children* themselves. One παιδίον with the other, one as well as the other, has part in blood and flesh, or possesses the same. The *perfect*, however, indicates the constant and definitive character of the order of nature, as this has always prevailed already, and still continues to assert its sway. — αἵματος καὶ σαρκός] The same succession of words, also Eph. vi. 12. Otherwise more ordinarily: σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Matt. xvi. 17; Eccus. xiv. 18, xvii. 31. αἷμα καὶ σὰρξ, the two main constituents of the sensuously perceptible outward nature of man. — παραπλησίως] is not: "equally" (Bleek, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Grimm in the Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt A. K. Z. 1857, No. 29, p. 663; Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 57, 2 Aufl.; Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 313 f.; Maier), or: "likewise" (de Wette),—a signification which is linguistically undemonstrable,—but: *in a manner very closely resembling*. It expresses the resemblance with the accessory notion of the diversity; in such wise that the author characterizes the human form of Christ's existence, in all its correspondence with the form of existence of other men, as still different from the latter (Cameron, Owen, Akersloot, Cramer, Böhme, Zyro, Moll, Woerner). And rightly so. For Christ was no ordinary man, but the incarnate Son of God. He was distinguished from His human brethren by His sinlessness (comp. iv. 15). As therefore Paul, Phil. ii. 7 (and similarly Rom. viii. 3), speaks of the incarnate Christ not as ἄνθρωπος γινόμενος, but as ἐν

ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, even so the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also here places not ἐξ ἑσου, but παραπλησίως μετέσχευ τῶν αὐτῶν. Comp. also ὅθεν ὥφειλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι, ver. 17. — μετέσχευ] The *aorist*. For the incarnation and the earthly course of Christ is a fact already belonging to the purely past; *now* Christ is already the glorified Son of God. — τῶν αὐτῶν] *sc.* αἵματος καὶ σαρκός. Erroneously, because without taking into account the reference imperatively required by the former clause, Bengel: *eadem*, quae fratribus accidunt, sanguine et carne laborantibus, ne morte quidem excepta. — διὰ τοῦ θανάτου] *by means of death*, the enduring of which first became possible by the taking upon Him of flesh and blood. Bengel: διὰ τοῦ θανάτου Paradoxon. Jesus mortem passus vicit; diabolus mortem vibrans succubuit. — The placing of the characteristic τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου before τὸν διάβολον is chosen, in order to gain a marked contrast to the preceding διὰ τοῦ θανάτου. — A ruler's power over death,¹ however, is possessed by the devil, inasmuch as by the enticement of the devil sin came into the world of men, and sin brings about death for man. Comp. Wisd. ii. 24: φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον; Rom. v. 12.

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

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

πάσης τῆς ζωῆς). This practice is more rare than the coupling of the infinitive with the mere preposition and article. Yet this very infinitive ζῆν is found exactly so used, as Bleek remarks, with Aesch. *Dial.* iii. 4 (ὥσπερ εἰς ἕτερον ζῆν ἐπιθανούμενος); Ignat. *Ep. ad Trall.* 9 (οὐ χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν), and *Ephes.* 3 (καὶ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν). — ἐνοχοὶ ἦσαν δουλείας] belongs together; *were held in bondage, had become subject to bondage.* We have not to construe ἐνοχοὶ ἦσαν with φόβῳ θανάτου, and δουλείας with ἀπαλλάξῃ (Abresch, Dindorf, Böhme). For against this the position of the words is decisive. On the *thought*, comp. Rom. viii. 15.

Ver. 16. The necessity for the assumption of flesh and blood on the part of the Redeemer is more fully brought to light by means of an establishing of the characteristic *τούτους ὅσοι κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 15. This assumption was necessary, since the object of this redemption was confessedly not *angels*, i.e. beings of a purely spiritual nature, but *descendants of Abraham*, i.e. beings of flesh and blood. — οὐ δήπου] or δὴ που, as it is more correctly written, does not signify: "nowhere" (Luther, Zeger, Calvin, Schlichting, Limborch, Bisping, *al.*; Vulg.: *nusquam*), in such wise that *που* should be referred to a passage in the O. T., and the sense would result: nowhere in the O. T. is it spoken of, that, etc.¹ — For such reference must at least have been indicated by the context, which is not the case. *Δὴ που* stands rather, according to purely classical usage (in the N. T., for the rest, it is found only here; with the LXX. not at all), to denote, in ironical form of expression, the presupposition that the statement to be expressed is a truth raised above all doubt, which must be conceded by every one. It corresponds to our "assuredly," "surely" (*doch wohl*), "I should think," to the Latin "opinor." Comp. Hartung, *Partikellchre*, I. p. 285; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 427. — ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι τινος] *to take a helping interest in any one* (comp. Eccles. iv. 11), here to deliver him from the guilt and punishment of sin (comp. ἀπαλλάξῃ, ver. 15; and εἰς τὸ

¹ Ebrard still finds in ver. 16 a proof from the O. T. Only he supposes the author did not here feel it needful to cite a single passage, but that it sufficed to remind of a universally acknowledged fact of the O. T.!

ἰλίσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, ver. 17; wrongly, because τούτους ὅσοι κ.τ.λ., ver. 15, stands not in reciprocal relation with ἐπιλαμβάνεται, but with the antithesis οὐκ ἀγγέλων ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, ver. 16; Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 59, 2 Aufl.: "in order that the fear of death might not in our life terrify and enslave us"). The *present*, since the ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι is something still continuing. The interpretation of Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Erasmus, Luther, Clarius, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, Beza, Calov, Wolf, and many others: not angels, but the seed of Abraham, that is to say: not the nature of angels, but *the nature of the seed of Abraham did Christ assume*, has fallen into deserved disrepute;¹ only Castellio, however, first perceived its grammatical impossibility. The proposal of Schulz to supply ὁ θάνατος from vv. 14, 15 as the subject to ἐπιλαμβάνεται: "*for certainly he (death, or the lord of death) does not lay hold of, or carry off, angels, but the posterity of Abraham does he lay hold of,*" is indeed grammatically permissible; logically, however, it does not commend itself, inasmuch as ver. 17 stands in close connection with ver. 16, but at ver. 17, as vv. 14, 15, the subject again is naturally *Christ*. — ἀγγέλων] without article, like the following σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, *generically*. The author here excludes the angels from the province of the redemption which takes place through Christ. He is thus brought into contradiction with the teaching of Paul (comp. Col. i. 20)—a position which is wrongly denied by Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 59 f.; Delitzsch, and Moll; by the first-named upon the untenable ground that "the design in this connection was not to say whom Jesus helps and whom He does not help, but what He is for those with whom He concerns Himself, for whom He exerts Himself!" — σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ] does not denote mankind in general (Bengel, Böhme, Klee, Stein, Wieseler, *Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters*, p. 491 f., *al.*), in such wise that the expression should be taken in the spiritual sense, or "the congregation of God, reaching over from the O. T. into the N. T., which goes back to Abraham's call and obedience of faith for its fundamental beginning, Israel and the believers

¹ M'Caul alone has espoused it afresh.

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

Ver. 17. Inference from ver. 16, and consequently a reverting to the main statement in ver. 14. — ὅθεν] *wherefore*, sc. on account of the essential constitution of those to be redeemed, as indicated in ver. 16. The particle ὅθεν is of very frequent occurrence in the Epistle to the Hebrews (comp. iii. 1, vii. 25, viii. 3, ix. 18, xi. 19). In Paul's writings, on the other hand, it is nowhere met with. — ὧφειλεν] *He ought*. Expression, not of the necessity founded in the decree of God (cf. ἔδει, Luke xxiv. 26), but of that founded in the nature of the case itself, comp. v. 3, 12. — κατὰ πάντα] *in all respects*. Chrysostom: τί ἐστι κατὰ πάντα ; ἐτέχθη, φησὶν, ἐτράφη, ἠυξήθη, ἔπαθε πάντα ὑπὲρ ἑχρὴν, τέλος ἀπέθανεν. Theodoret: Ὁμοίως γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ τροφῆς μετέλαβε καὶ πόνον ὑπέμεινε καὶ ἠθύμησε καὶ ἐδάκρυσε καὶ θάνατον κατεδέξατο. — ὁμοιωθῆναι] is not: "to be made the same or equal" (Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 330; Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, *al.*), but expresses, as always, the

notion of *resemblance*. Christ was in all things *similar* to men, His brethren, inasmuch as He had assumed a truly human nature; He was distinguished from them, however, by His absolute sinlessness. Comp. iv. 15. — ἐλεήμων] *merciful*, full of compassion for the sufferings of the ἀδελφοί, may be taken by itself (Luther, Grotius, Böhme, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Tholuck, Woerner [after Peshito, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions]), but also as πιστός, may be taken with ἀρχιερεύς (Owen, Bengel, Cramer, Storr, Stuart, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm, p. 330; Alford, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann). In the former case, which, on account of the position of the words, seems more natural, καὶ denotes “and in consequence thereof,” so that ἐλεήμων indicates the quality, the possession of which fits him to become a πιστὸς ἀρχιερεύς. — πιστός] *faithful*, so fulfilling His high-priestly office as to satisfy the requirements of those to be reconciled. — τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν] *with regard to the affairs of God*, or: *with regard to the cause of God*. Comp. v. 1; Rom. xv. 17. — ἰλάσκεσθαι] middle voice. — τοῦ λαοῦ] *of the people* (of Israel, xiii. 12), see on ver. 16. — The idea of the high-priesthood of Christ here first comes out in this epistle. From iv. 14 onwards it is unfolded in detail. It is disputed, however, at what point our author thought of the high-priestly office of Christ as beginning, whether *even on earth, with His death on the cross* (so Cramer, Winzer, *de sacerdotis officio, quod Christo tribuitur in ep. ad Hebr.*, Lips. 1825, Comment. I. p. vi. sq.; de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, and others), or *only after the return to the Father*; in such wise that, according to the view of the author, the offering of His own body upon the earth, and the entering with His own blood into the heavenly sanctuary, is to be regarded only as the inauguration of Christ to His high-priestly dignity, this dignity itself, however, beginning only with the moment when Christ, in accordance with Ps. cx. 1, sat down at the right hand of God the Father, Heb. viii. 1 (so Bleek and Kurtz, after the precedent of Faustus Socinus, Schlichting [Whitby], Griesbach, *Opusc.* II. p. 436 sq.; Schulz, p. 83 f., and others). It is certainly undeniable that the author in the course of his epistle very strongly accentuates the high-priesthood of Christ (comp. v. 9 f., vi. 19 f., vii. 24–26, viii. 4, ix. 24). But the polemic against readers who thought

they could not dispense with the ritual of the Jewish sacrifice of atonement for the attainment of salvation, naturally led him to insist with emphasis on the superiority of Christ as the heavenly High Priest over the Jewish high priests as the merely earthly ones. Since now, on the other side, it is equally undeniable that the author places the voluntary sacrificial death of Christ, and the entering with His blood into the heavenly Holy of Holies,—as the two inseparable acts of the same proceeding,—in parallel with the slaying of the sacrificial victim, and the entering of the earthly high priest with the sacrificial blood into the earthly Holy of Holies, and looks upon the sins of men as completely expiated by the sacrificial death of Christ itself (comp. ii. 14 f., vii. 27, ix. 11–14, 26, 29, x. 10, 12, 14, xiii. 12), there can be no room for doubt, that according to the mind of our author the investiture of Christ with the high-priestly dignity had already begun on earth, from the time of His death; and the representation of mankind in the presence of God is to be thought of as the continued administration of the high-priestly office already entered upon. So in substance also Riehm (comp. the detailed discussion by this writer, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 466–481); although it is certainly not in accordance with the view of the writer of the epistle, when Riehm afterwards (like Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 63 f., 2 Aufl.) supposes a distinction is to be made between Christ as *High Priest* and Christ as *High Priest after the manner of Melchisedec*, in that he represents Christ as having become the former by virtue of that which He did during the days of His flesh, as well as on His entrance into the heavenly Holy of Holies, and the latter only by virtue of His exaltation to God, where He ever liveth to make intercession for us.

Ver. 18. Elucidatory justification of ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται κ.τ.λ., and by means thereof corroborative conclusion to the last main assertion: ὅφειλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι. Christ, namely, became qualified for having compassion and rendering help, inasmuch as He experienced in His own person the temptations, the burden of which pressed upon the brethren He came to redeem. Comp. iv. 15, 16 — ἐν ᾧ] equivalent to ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι (comp. John xvi. 30: ἐν

τούτῳ, *propter hoc*), literally : upon the ground of (the fact) that, *in that*, i.e. *inasmuch as*, or *because*. Comp. Bernhardt, *Syntax*, p. 211 ; Fritzsche on *Rom.* viii. 3, p. 93. The interpretation “wherein,” or “in which province” (Luther, Casaubon, Valckenaer, Fritzsche, *l.c.* p. 94, *note* ; Ebrard, Bispinck Kurtz, Woerner, and others), with which construction an ἐν τούτῳ corresponding to the ἐν ᾧ has to be supplied before δύναται, and ἐν ᾧ itself is connected with πέπονθεν or with πειρασθείς, or else by the resolving of the participle into the *tempus finitum* is connected in like measure with both verbs, is to be rejected ; not, indeed, because in that case the aorist ἔπαθεν must have been employed (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 392, 2 Aufl.), nor because the plural ἐν οἷς must have been placed (Hofmann, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 320, *note*),—for only slight modifications of the sense would result in this way, the substance of the statement itself remaining untouched,—but in reality for the reason that the thought thus resulting would be unsuitable. For Christ’s capacity for conferring sympathy and help would then be restricted within the too narrow bounds of like conditions of suffering and temptations in the case of Himself and His earthly brethren. Bleek, too, understands ἐν ᾧ in the ordinary signification : “wherein,” but then—after the example of Chr. Fr. Schmid—takes the words ἐν ᾧ πέπονθεν as a kind of adverbial nearer defining to αὐτὸς πειρασθείς : “Himself tempted in that which He suffered,” i.e. Himself tempted in the midst of His sufferings. So likewise more recently Alford : “for, having been Himself tempted in that which He suffered.” Against this, however, the violence of the linguistic expression is decisive, since πειρασθείς γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν, or something similar, would have been much more simply and naturally written.—The emphasis rests not upon πέπονθεν (Hofmann), but upon αὐτὸς πειρασθείς, inasmuch as not the πάσχειν in and of itself, but the πάσχειν in a definite state, is to be brought into relief : *because He Himself suffered as one tempted*, i.e. because His suffering was combined with temptations. αὐτὸς πειρασθείς, however, was designedly placed at the end, in order to gain thereby a marked correspondence to the following τοῖς πειραζομένοις.—δύναται]

not a note of the *inclination* (Grotius: *potest auxiliari pro potest moveri ad auxiliandum*, and similarly many others), but of the *possibility*. — τοῖς πειραζομένοις] a characteristic of τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, ver. 17. The participle *present*, since the state of temptation of the human brethren is one still continuing. — βοηθῆσαι] *to come to the help, sc.* in that He entirely fills with His Spirit the suffering ones, whose necessities He has become acquainted with as a result of His own experience.

CHAPTER III.

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

gloss from ver. 14 they can hardly be regarded, inasmuch as, with regard to the object the author has in view, they are just as little without significance here as there. See, moreover, the observations of Reiche, p. 19 sq. — Ver. 9. Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomf. have ἐπείρασάν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, ἐδοκίμασάν με. Defended also by Reiche. But the only accredited reading is ἐπείρασαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ. Already preferred by Griesbach. Adopted by Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Alford, *al.* ἐπείρασαν, in place of ἐπείρασάν με, is demanded by A B C D* E* s* 17, It. Copt. Lucif.; ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ in place of ἐδοκίμασάν με, by A B C D* E M s* 73, 137, It. Copt. Lucif. Clem. Al. *protrept.* c. 9, § 84, Didym. — Ver. 10. Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomf. Reiche: τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ. More correctly, after A B D* M s, 6, 17, *al.*, Vulg. Clem. Did. Bengel, Böhme, Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Alford (recommended also by Griesb.): τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ. Deviating from the LXX., the author chose ταύτῃ, in order to make the bearing of the passage upon the readers the more palpable. — Ver. 13. The *Recepta* τις ἐξ ὑμῶν (adopted by Tisch. 8) is, with Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Scholz, Bloomf. Tisch. 1, 2, 7, Alford, *al.*, to be transposed into ἐξ ὑμῶν τις, in accordance with B D E K L, 46, 48, Theodoret, Damasc. *al.* By means of the transposition, the person of the readers, in opposition to the fathers in the wilderness, comes out more emphatically, and more in accordance with the context. — Ver. 14. Elz. Matthaei, Bloomf.: γεγόναμεν σοῦ Χριστοῦ] But the important attestation by A B C D E H M s 37, *al.*, Vulg. Clar. Germ. Cyr. Damasc. Lucif. Hilar. Hier. Ambr. Vigil. Taps. decides in favour of the order of the words σοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν; accepted by Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Scholz, Tisch. Alford, *al.*

Vv. 1–6. Even above Moses is Christ exalted. By so much higher than Moses does He stand, as the son exercising authority over his own house has precedence over the servant of the house. This new dogmatic consideration, to which the discourse now advances, was indeed already contained *implicit* as the *minus*, in the preceding argument as the *major*; it must, however, still be separately insisted on, inasmuch as, in addition to the angels as the suprahuman agents (*Vermittler*) in connection with the founding of the Old Covenant, Moses, as the human agent (*Vermittler*) in the founding of the same, could not remain unmentioned. Appropriately to the subject, however, the author treats of this new point of comparison only with brevity, blending the same with the exhortation,

derived from that which precedes, to cleave firmly unto the end to Christ and the Christian hope; and then, from ver. 7 forward, further developing this exhortation in detail,—in the form of a parallel instituted between the people of God of the present time, *i.e.* the *Christians*, and the people of God of Moses' time,—in their interest, with even a warning impressiveness.

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

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

¹ This writer finds (comp. p. 96), by dint of a long extended chain of arbitrary assertions and erroneous presuppositions, the absolutely impossible sense in the words: "(Ver. 1) From this (ii. 10–18), beloved brethren, who, delivered from death, are presented a sacrifice to God, and have your right of citizenship in heaven, perceive that the Ambassador and High Priest, who in His own person has borne our confession to the heavenly goal, and as mediator continually introduces into heaven, namely Jesus (ver. 2), is one entrusted (an organ of confidence) of Him who made Him (such), *i.e.* (comp. p. 65) called Him into existence as Jesus, as was also Moses in the house of God, *i.e.* in the limitation and subordination, as this was presupposed by his position in the house of God. (Ver. 3) For (comp. p. 87) greater glory (*i.e.* higher position of power) has been vouchsafed to this man than to Moses, in which measure, as the house (*sc.* of God), so has He who has fitted it up, greater honour (*sic!*). (Ver. 4) For every house is fitted up by some one (but to correspond to all its requirements, *no* one is able); He, however, who has fitted it up with all things (*sc.* as Jesus the house of God, for time and eternity) is omnipotent, is of divine nature. (Ver. 5) And Moses, indeed, was trustworthy in all his house, as a servant, to testify what was to be revealed (ver. 6); Jesus, however, as the Christ (comp. p. 90), trustworthy as Son (*sc.* of God) over His (*sc.* God's) house. Whose (*sc.* God's) house *we* are and remain, if at any rate we retain the joyfulness and boasting of hope to the end."

With Michaelis, to separate the two words from each other by a comma, would be permissible only if by the isolation thereof a gradation were obtained. But this is not the case; since then only two relations parallel to each other, namely, on the one side the relation of the readers to the author (ἀδελφοί), and on the other side their relation to the non-Christian world (ἄγγιλοι), would be rendered separately prominent. — ἀδελφοί] designates the readers not as brethren of *Christ* (so with an unwarranted appeal to ii. 11, 12, 17, Peirce, Michaelis, Carpzov, Pyle; comp. also Delitzsch, according to whom this is at least *also* to be thought of), nor does it express the brotherly relation in the national sense, *i.e.* the descent from the Jewish people common to the author and readers (Chr. Fr. Schmid), but has reference to the spiritual, ideal brotherly relationship, into which author and recipients of the letter have been brought towards each other by the common bond of Christianity. — κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι] *ye who are partakers of a heavenly calling.* This second direct address—to which Grotius needlessly supplies “nobiscum”—strengthens the former, and the two forms of address explain the ground of the obligation to the κατανοεῖν, by pointing to the reader’s state of grace. κλήσις stands actively. It denotes the call or invitation, which God¹ has by Christ given to the readers, to participation in the Messianic kingdom. This calling, however, is termed ἐπουράνιος, either because the blessings, the possession of which it promises, are existent in heaven and of heavenly nature (Grotius, *al.*), or, what is more probable, because they have come to men from heaven [so Owen], where God their supreme author has His throne, and whence Christ their proclaimer and procurer (*Vermittler*) was sent forth. It is possible, however, that both references are to be combined: “a calling which proceeds from heaven and leads to heaven.” So Bengel, Tholuck, Stuart, Elbrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 693; Alford, Maier, Kurtz, and others. — κατανοήσατε] *direct your view to Jesus, sc. in order to cleave firmly to Him; regard well what He is and what you have in Him!* — τὸν ἀπόστολον

¹ For *God*, as everywhere with Paul also, not *Christ*, as Delitzsch supposes, is thought of as the καλῶν.

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

Ver. 2. The discourse takes a turn, by virtue of a further alleging of reasons for the κατανοήσατε, to the comparison of Jesus with Moses, in that first of all the relation of parity between the two is brought prominently forward. The O. T. passage which the author here has under consideration is Num. xii. 7, where Moses is designated by God as faithful in all His

house. — ὄντα] characterizes the being faithful as an *inherent* property; the sense of a strict *present* is not to be asserted for the participle (with Seb. Schmidt and Bleek), according to which we should have to think only of an *exalted* Christ; rather does πιστὸν ὄντα attach itself as well to the notion Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπόστολον τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν as to the notion Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν; ὄντα embraces, therefore, equally the time from which Christ, as the incarnate Son of God, had appeared upon earth, and the time from which He, invested with the high-priestly dignity, has returned to the Father, and now continues to fulfil in heaven His high-priestly office. — τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν] Periphrasis of God: *Him who created Him*. Only this sense of the *calling forth into existence* can the word ποιεῖν have when placed absolutely; comp. LXX. Isa. xvii. 7, xliii. 1, li. 13; Hos. viii. 14; Job xxxv. 10; Ps. xcv. 6, cxlix. 2; Eccus. vii. 30, *al.* Rightly is this accepted by the early Latin translation of the codd. D E (fidelem esse creatori suo), Ambrose (*de fide*, 3. 11), Vigilinus Tapsensis (*contra Varimadum*, p. 729), Primasius, Schulz, Bleek, Alford, Kurtz, and Hofmann. Contrary to linguistic usage—for an appeal cannot be made to 1 Sam. xii. 6 (where ποιεῖν (פִּיץ) has its ordinary signification), and still less to Mark iii. 14 (where a nearer defining is given to the verb by means of ἵνα κ.τ.λ.), or to Acts ii. 36 (where a double accusative is found)—do Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Vatablus, Clarius [Calvin], Cameron, Piscator, Grotius, Owen, Wolf, Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Stuart, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 286 f.), Reuss, Maier, Kluge, Moll, McCaul, Woerner, and the majority, interpret τῷ ποιήσαντι either by: *who appointed Him thereto* (sc. Apostle and High Priest), or *ordained Him thereto*; or—what amounts to the same thing—explaining the supplementing of a second accusative to ποιήσαντι as unnecessary, by: *who set Him forth upon the stage of history*. Whether, for the rest, the author referred the notion of *having created* to the incarnation of Christ, as the above-mentioned early ecclesiastical writers suppose, or to His premundane generation as the First-born (cf. i. 5, 6), which Bleek rightly regards as at least possible, cannot be deter-

mined.¹ — ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς] *sc.* πιστὸς ἦν τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν. — ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ] does not belong to πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, in such wise that we have, with Calvin, Paulus, Bleek, Elbrard, and Hofmann, to enclose ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς within commas, but is to be comprehended with ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς (de Wette, Kurtz, and the majority). For not only, Num. xii. 7, do the words appended: ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, stand in special relation to Moses,—so that the author might very well derive from that place the same addition with the same special reference to Moses,—but also the equal reference of ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ to Christ, as to Moses, would be unsuitable to the connection with that which follows, since the author, ver. 5 and ver. 6, definitely distinguishes the place occupied by Moses, as the position of a servant ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ, from the place occupied by Christ, as a position of ruler ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον; and in harmony with this distinction, already ver. 3 characterizes Moses as merely a member of the οἶκος itself; Christ, on the other hand, as the founder of the οἶκος. — αὐτοῦ] refers neither to *Christ* (Bleek) nor to *Moses* (Oecumenius and others), but, as is also determined by the form of the expression with the LXX. (ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου), to *God*. — But the house of God is the people of God, or the kingdom of God; and ἐν denotes the province, *in the administration of which* the πιστὸν εἶναι was made manifest.

Ver. 3.² Continued alleging of reasons for the κατανοήσατε, ver. 1, in bringing into more distinct relief the exaltedness of Christ above Moses. Ver. 3 is not, as de Wette supposes,

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

² Comp. Gabler, *Dissert. exeg. in illustrem locum Heb. iii. 3-6*, Jena 1778. (Reprinted in the *Opuscul. acad.* vol. II. Ulm 1831, 8.)

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

Ver. 4. The author has spoken, ver. 2, of the house of *God*, and yet, ver. 3, has ascribed the founding and preparing of the same to *Christ*. For the justification of this apparent contradiction does the remark, ver. 4, serve. Although every house has its special preparer, yet this notwithstanding, it is *God* who has prepared all things. That special foundership of Christ does not exclude the universal higher foundership of

God. The proposition ver. 4 is incidental to the main argument. It is not, however, to be enclosed in a parenthesis, because αὐτοῦ, ver. 5, refers back to θεός, ver. 4. — In the second clause, θεός is subject, and ὁ δὲ πάντα κατασκευάσας predicate. Wrongly has θεός been ordinarily taken by others as predicate, and as subject either ὁ δὲ πάντα κατασκευάσας or merely ὁ δέ, since πάντα κατασκευάσας was taken as a defining adjunct. The second member of the proposition was then referred to *Christ*, and the statement found therein that Christ is God. So Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, Beza, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Cornelius a Lapide, Cameron, Piscator, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Braun, Akersloot, Calmet, Bengel, Cramer, Whitby, Stuart, Baumgarten, and many others; also still Woerner. But with this thought the sequel is not in keeping. For not of Christ's being God, but of His exalted relation to the house of God as the υἱός, while Moses was only a θεράπων, does the author speak, vv. 5, 6. — πάντα] denotes not the universality of all created things, thought of as a *unity*, but in general: *each and all*, that exists.

Ver. 5 as far as αὐτοῦ, ver. 6. Return to the point of comparison between Christ and Moses, ver. 2 (πιστός), and the exaltedness of the former above the latter, ver. 3 (υἱός, ἐπὶ . . . θεράπων, ἐν). — καί] is the more sharply-defining "and indeed;" whereas μέν serves to bring into relief the personal name Μωϋσῆς, and finds in Χριστὸς δέ, ver. 6, its emphatic opposition. Vv. 5, 6 *init.* does not, accordingly, contain a second proof for the superiority of Christ to Moses (Calvin, Bengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Woerner), but is only a more detailed unfolding of the thoughts, ver. 2 and ver. 3. — πιστός] *sc.* ἦν, or else ἐστίν, in connection with which latter mode of supplementing, the thought would be less of the historic fact as such, than of the fact as it still continues present in the O. T. narrative. — αὐτοῦ] refers not to Μωϋσῆς (as Ebrard assumes, since he starts with the erroneous presupposition that the author speaks of a twofold οἶκος, and that the design of vv. 5, 6 was just that of rendering clearly apparent the difference of the house entrusted to Moses on the one hand, and that entrusted to Christ on the other), but to θεός, ver. 4. — ὡς θεράπων]

in his capacity as servant, comp. Num. xii. 7. Upon this, as upon the preceding *ἐν*, rests the emphasis of ver. 5. — *εἰς μαρτύριον*] belongs to *θεράπων*. It is unnaturally referred back by Estius, Seb. Schmidt, Stengel, and others to *πιστός*. — *εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων*] *to give testimony to that which should be spoken*, or proclaimed to the people. *Τὰ λαληθησόμενα* are not the revelations afterwards to be given in Christ (Erasmus, Calvin, Cameron, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Owen, Limborch, Wolf, Wetstein, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, Ewald, M'Caul, Woerner, and others), which must have been more precisely specified; and still less does the expression indicate: "*dicenda a nobis in hac epistola de cerimoniis earumque significatione et usu*" (Pareus), but *the law* to be proclaimed by Moses, at the mandate of God, to the Jewish people is intended.

Ver. 6. *Χριστὸς δὲ ὡς υἱός*] *Christ, on the other hand, in His capacity as Son*, sc. *πιστός ἐστιν*. Upon this supplement depends *ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ* (comp. Matt. xxv. 21, 23); and as *υἱός* forms an ascent from the preceding *θεράπων*, so does *ἐπὶ* form an ascent from the preceding *ἐν*. Erasmus, *Paraphr.*; Vatablus, Piscator, Grotius, Delitzsch, Moll, and others supply to *Χριστὸς δὲ . . . αὐτοῦ* simply *ἐστίν*, whereby, however, the relation of just proportion between ver. 5 and ver. 6 is destroyed. The opening words of ver. 5, moreover, — inasmuch as they attach themselves not only to ver. 3, but also again to ver. 2, — manifestly point to the fact that the author will indicate not the mere difference between Christ and Moses, but their difference within the quality common to both. Yet others, as Bleek, de Wette, and Bisping, supply a double *πιστός ἐστιν*, the first after *Χριστὸς δέ*, the second after *αὐτοῦ*; since, as the Vulgate, Beza, Estius, Grotius, Owen, Er. Schmid, Calov, Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Baumgarten, Gabler, Valekenauer, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Tholuck, and others, they refer *αὐτοῦ* back to *υἱός*: Christ, however, is faithful, as a son is faithful over his house. But a satisfactory ground for taking *οἶκος αὐτοῦ*, ver. 6, otherwise than the same expression ver. 5, is not to be found. The house of God, or the divine kingdom, is for Moses and Christ the common sphere of operation; only by the position which the two occupy towards this

house, are they distinguished the one from the other. — As αὐτοῦ, ver. 6, so is the relative οὗ, with which the author prepares the way for a transition to the paraenesis, not to be referred to *Christ* (Oecumenius, Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Owen, Whitby, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Woerner, *al.*), but to *God* (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Calvin, Stengel, Stuart, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, and others); although as regards the matter itself even the former reference would not be incorrect, since the house of God, ver. 2, is likewise characterized as the house of Christ, ver. 3. — The article before οἶκος was not imperatively required, although the whole Christian community forms a single indivisible house of God, since the notion of the word was one sufficiently well known, and, moreover, adequately defined by that which precedes. — The *absolute* declaration: οὗ οἶκος ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, on the import of which 1 Cor. iii. 9, 16, 2 Cor. vi. 16, Eph. ii. 20 ff., 1 Tim. iii. 15, 1 Pet. ii. 5, iv. 17, is to be compared,¹ and which is taken in a strangely perverted way by Ebrard (p. 137) and Delitzsch as the logical antithesis to εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων, ver. 5, the author limits by a condition. — The fuller εἰς τὸν οἶκον is foreign to the epistles of Paul. — τὴν παρρησίαν] not the *bold confession* (Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Hammond, Limborch, Whitby, Heinrichs, and others), to which βεβαίαν κατὰσχωμεν would not be fitting, but *cheerful confidence* as a disposition. Comp. iv. 16, x. 19, 35. τὴν παρρησίαν, to which τῆς ἐλπίδος² belongs in like manner as to τὸ καύχημα (against Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 739), is the main idea, whereas καὶ τὸ καύχημα adds only an explicative subsidiary factor. That is manifest from the feminine βεβαίαν (which Stengel wonder-

¹ Philo, too, often employs the same figure, applying it to the human soul. Comp. *de Somn.* p. 587 E (ed. Mangey, l. p. 643): σπουδασον οὖν, ὃ ψυχῇ, εἰς οἶκος γινίσκῃ, ἱερὸν ἅγιον κ.τ.λ. — *De resip. Noë*, p. 282 E (ed. Mangey, l. p. 402): τίς γὰρ οἶκος παρὰ γινίσκει δύναται? ἂν ἀξιοπρεπέστερος εὐρεθῇται εἰς πλὴν ψυχῆς τιλίσως κεκααρμένης καὶ μόνον τὸ καλὸν ἡγουμένης ἀγαθόν; . . . κατοικεῖν δὲ λίγεται ἐν οἴκῳ ὁ εἰς οὐχ ὡς ἐν τότῳ (περιέχει γὰρ τὰ πάντα πρὸς μηδινὸς περιεχόμενος), ἀλλ' ὡς πρόνοιαν καὶ ἐπιμίλειαν ἐκείνου τοῦ χωρίου διαφερόντως ποιούμενος? παντὶ γὰρ τῷ διαπόζοντι οἰκίας ἢ ταύτης κατὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον ἀνήπται φροντίς.

² Both words are found combined in Josephus likewise, *Antiq.* xvi. 3. 3: καὶ διὸς ὡν τὸν τρόπον Ἀντίπατρος, ἐπειδὴ παρρησίας τινὸς τῆς οὐ πρότερον οὔσης ἐλπίδος ἀντιποιήσατο, μίαν ἔσχιν ὑπόβρισην κακοῦν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, κ.τ.λ.

fully refers back, in a *constructio ad sensum*, to ἐλπίδος). Instances of the agreement of the adjective in point of gender with the remoter substantive, in cases where this forms the principal idea, occur also with the classics. Comp. Hom. *Il.* xv. 344: τάρφρῳ καὶ σκολόπεσσιν ἐνιπλήξαντες ὀρυκτῇ; Hesiod. *Theogon.* 972 f.: ὃς εἶς' ἐπὶ γῆν τε, καὶ εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης, πᾶσαν; Xenophon, *Anab.* i. 5. 6: ὁ δὲ σίγλος δύναται ἐπτά ὀβολοὺς καὶ ἡμιοβόλιον Ἀττικούς; Thucydides, viii. 63: πυθόμενος τὰ περὶ τὴν ναυμαχίαν καὶ τὸν Στρομβιχίδην καὶ τὰς ναῦς ἀπεληλυθότα. See Bernhardy, *Syntax*, p. 431. — The ἐλπίς is the Christians' hope of the consummation of the kingdom of God, and the glorification of the Christians bound up therewith. Comp. Rom. v. 2, also Heb. vi. 11, 18, vii. 19, x. 23. — καύχημα, however, is not here either equivalent to καύχησις (Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Stengel, Bisping, Maier, and others), any more than 2 Cor. v. 12, ix. 3, which have been unwarrantably appealed to (see Meyer *ad loc.*), but denotes the subject of the boasting. Sense: *provided we shall have maintained the Christians' hope as a cheerful confidence and subject of boasting firm unto the end.* — μέχρι τέλους] not: *until the death of each individual* (Schlichting, Grotius, Kuinoel); not: "*until the final decision of the readers in favour of going over to Christianity*" (Ebrard), but as ver. 14, vi. 11, 1 Cor. i. 8, *al.*, *unto the end of the present order of the world*, intervening with the coming again of Christ, and thought of as in the near future (comp. x. 25, 37), at which time faith shall pass over into sight, hope into possession.

Ver. 7-iv. 13. The author, in detailed development of the paraenesis already contained in vv. 1, 6, warns against unbelief and apostasy, making the basis of this warning the admonitory utterance of Scripture in Ps. xcv. 7-11; and by means of a parallelizing of the people of God of the present time, *i.e.* the Christians, with the people of God of Moses' day, *i.e.* the Israelite fathers in the wilderness,—a parallelizing equally suggested by this passage of Scripture as by the preceding comparison of Christ with Moses,—he sets forth before the eyes of his readers the fate of the ancient people of God, who because of their unbelief were consigned to destruction, that the readers may earnestly ponder thereon.

Ver. 7. Διό] *Wherefore*, *i.e.* either : because Christ stands higher than Moses (so Carpzov, Zachariae, Böhme, Stuart, Kurtz, and Woerner ; comp. already Schlichting), or, which is better : because we are the οἶκος of God, only in the case that we hold fast the παρρησία and the καύχημα of the Christian hope unto the end (ver. 6). The *tempus finitum* belonging to Διό is βλέπετε, ver. 12 (Erasmus, *Annot.* ; Calvin, Estius, Piscator, Pareus, Grotius, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Bengel, Peirce, Carpzov, Wetstein, Abresch, Zachariae, Böhme, Bleek, Bisping, Alford, Kurtz, Woerner, *al.*), in such wise that καθὼς . . . κατὰπαυσίν μου forms an intervening clause. The length of the intervening clause, at which de Wette takes umbrage, decides nothing against the supposition of such construction, which at all events possesses the advantage of greater regularity and naturalness, since the author, owing to the care which he everywhere bestows upon his diction, in other cases, too, accurately fits in his discourse again to the opening words of the proposition, notwithstanding the occurrence of lengthy intervening clauses. Comp. vii. 20–22, xii. 18–24. That, moreover, which de Wette further objects, that in the intervening clause the discourse takes a new departure with διό, ver. 10, forms no valid counter-argument, since the connectedness of the preceding and following words as part of a Biblical citation follows naturally. In any case, ver. 10 connects itself with that which precedes, without a new beginning, in a simply relative fashion, if—as we are perfectly justified in doing—we write δι’ ὃ instead of διό. When de Wette, finally, discovers a difficulty in the fact that the warning, vv. 12, 13, does not appear in the form of a simple application of the passage of Scripture, but, on the contrary, begins with an analysis of the same, this also is without weight, inasmuch as the correctness of this assumed fact must itself be contested. In addition to this, if the author had conceived of the structure otherwise than has been indicated, he would assuredly have placed βλέπετε οὖν, ver. 12, instead of the disconnected βλέπετε. For neither is it permissible to appeal (with Tholuck) to the disconnected βλέπετε, xii. 25, in proof of the opposite, since this passage, on account of the rhetorical character of the description which there immediately precedes,

is totally different from ours. Others, as Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Wittich, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Stengel, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Reuss, and Hofmann, connect διό immediately with μὴ σκληρύνητε, in connection with which, however, the direct address of God, coming in ver. 9 ff., occasions a great harshness; or else, as Tholuck, de Wette, and Maier, who appeal to Rom. xv. 3, 21, 1 Cor. i. 31, ii. 9, leave the application μὴ σκληρύνετε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν to be supplied in thought from these words; or, finally, supplement διό in a somewhat free manner: *therefore conduct yourselves in accordance with that which the Holy Ghost speaks*. — τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον] *the Spirit of God in prophecy*; comp. ix. 8, x. 15. — σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε] is in the Hebrew (וְהַיּוֹם הַזֶּה אִם-תִּשְׁמָעוּ) an independent clause, and the expression of a wish: “would that you would only to-day listen to His (God’s) voice!” It is possible that the LXX. also understood the words as a wish, since elsewhere, too (*c.g.* Ps. cxxxix. 19), they render the particle of wishing, אִם, by ἐάν. Differently, however, does the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews take the words (against Hofmann). He regards ἐάν as the protasis, and μὴ σκληρύνητε as the apodosis; comp. ver. 15, iv. 7. — In the application σήμερον denotes the time of salvation which has come in with the appearing of Christ upon earth, and ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ the voice of God which through Christ sounds forth to the readers by means of the gracious message of the gospel.

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

Ver. 9. Οὐ] is taken by Erasmus Schmid, Bengel, and Peirce as attraction to πειρασμοῦ instead of ὧ, *wherewith*.

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

¹ In an unnatural manner, Hofmann: as εἶδον, so also even ἐπείρασαν finds its object in τὰ ἔργα μου.

Quamdiu durant anni Messiae? R. Akiba dixit: quadraginta annos, quemadmodum Israëlitaë per tot annos in deserto fuerunt.

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

Ver. 11. Ὡς ᾤμωσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου] *as accordingly I (as to the sense equivalent to: so that I; see Winer, Gramm., 7 Aufl. p. 431; in the Hebrew וַיִּסַּח) swore (comp. Num. xiv. 21 ff., xxxii. 10 ff.; Deut. i. 34 ff.) in (not: by) my wrath.* — εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου] *not enter, shall they, into my rest.* εἰ is an exact imitation of the negative Hebrew particle ׀ in formulas of swearing, and is to be explained from an aposiopesis of the latter clause. Comp. Mark viii. 12; Ewald, *Krit. Gramm.* p. 661; Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 466; Buttman, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr.* p. 308. — κατάπαυσις] in the sense of the psalmist, the undisturbed possession of the land of Canaan promised by God; comp. Deut. xii. 9, 10: Οὐ γὰρ ἤκατε ἕως τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν καὶ εἰς τὴν κληρονομίαν, ἣν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν δίδωσιν ὑμῖν καὶ διαβήσεσθε τὸν Ἰορδάνην καὶ κατοικήσετε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἥς κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κατακληρονομεῖ ὑμῖν καὶ καταπαύσει ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν τῶν κύκλῳ καὶ κατοικήσετε μετὰ ἀσφαλείας. Afterwards, because with the possession of the promised land the expected full repose and happiness had as yet by no means come in, the meaning of the promise was sublimated, just as that of the kindred κληρονομεῖν τὴν γῆν Ps. xxxvii. 9, into the everlasting Messianic blessedness

This reference obtains, as is evident from the following disquisition, with our author also.

Vv. 12, 13. Close of the period begun with *διό*, ver. 7. — *βλέπετε*] *beware, take heed*. — *μή ποτε ἔσται*] *μή* after *βλέπε*, *ὅρα*, and similar words, with the indicative future (comp. Col. ii. 8), expresses at the same time with the warning, the fear that the warning will be slighted. Comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 468 f.; Hartung, *Partikellehre*, II. p. 140. The enclitic *ποτε* appended to the *μή*, not: *at any time* (Beza and others), but: *haply* [ii. 1; Luke xiv. 29; Acts v. 39; Matt. iv. 6, etc.]. — *ἐν τινι ὑμῶν*] different from *ἐν ὑμῖν*. Calvin: Nec tantum in universum praecepit apostolus, ut sibi omnes caveant, sed vult ita de salute cujusque membri esse sollicitos, ne quem omnino ex iis, qui semel vocati fuerint, sua negligentia perire sinant. Comp. ver. 13, x. 24, xii. 15. — *καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας*] *an evil heart of unbelief*; comp. iv. 2, 3. Wrongly Schulz and others: of *faithlessness* or *ἀπίθεια*, iv. 6, 11, iii. 18; for the latter is only the consequence of the *ἀπιστία*. *ἀπιστίας* is either genitive of *origin*, which proceeds from unbelief (Owen, Bleek, Stengel, and others), or genitive of *result*, which leads to unbelief, renders inclined to the same (de Wette, Bisping, *al.*), or genitive of *reference* to a more precise characterization of *πονηρὰ*: a heart evil (on account) of unbelief, which is then equivalent to *καρδία πονηρίαν ἀπιστίας ἔχουσα* (so Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 183; Ebrard, Alford, Meyer, Moll, and Hofmann). The last acceptance is to be preferred, since thereby *ἀπιστίας* is more clearly brought out as the main idea (for *καρδία πονηρὰ* is only a clothing of the same attaching itself to *αἰὲ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ*, ver. 10). — *ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζώντος*] more precise definition¹ to *ἀπιστίας* for the declaration of the outward form of appearance, in which the inner unbelief comes forth: *in the falling away from the living God*, or *in such wise that a falling away from the living God takes place*. God (not Christ: Gerhard, Dorscheus, Calov, S. Schmid, Schöttgen, Carpzov, *al.*) is called *living*, not in opposition to the dead

¹ Schlichting: Duplex est enim incredulitas; una eorum, qui nunquam Deo credunt; altera eorum, qui credere desinunt, h. e. a Deo desciscunt seu apostatae fiunt.

works of the law (ix. 14, vi. 1; Bleek), nor in opposition to the idols of the heathen, similarly as 2 Kings xix. 16, 1 Thess. i. 9, 2 Cor. vi. 16, Acts xiv. 15 (Böhme and others),—both of which must have been suggested by the context,—but because He does not allow His declared will to be slighted with impunity. Comp. x. 31. That which is meant is the relapse from Christianity into Judaism. Limborch: Defectio hic intelligitur a religione Christiana; quia enim illa continetur ultima ac perfecta Dei voluntas, hinc sequitur, quod is, qui a religione Christiana deficit, ab ipso Deo deficiat. Ergo quicunque deserta fide Christiana ad Judaismum redeunt, a Deo deficiunt; licet enim Deum non abnegent, qui legis Mosaeicae auctor est, tamen, quia Deus nunc non secundum legis praecepta se coli velle testatur, sed juxta evangelium illique credentibus fidem in justitiam imputaturum, etiam, qui illud deserunt, a Deo deficere dicendi sunt. Deus enim multis ac evidentissimis signis ac miraculis se Christum misisse ostendit, et voce e caelo demissa testatus est eum esse suum filium, in quo sibi complacuit jussitque ut eum audiant. Ergo praecepta ejus sunt praecepta Dei, etc.

Ver. 13. *Ἐαυτούς*] tantamount to *ἀλλήλους*, comp. 1 Cor. vi. 7; Eph. iv. 32; Col. iii. 13; 1 Thess. v. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 8, *al.*; Kühner, II. p. 325. — *ἄχρις οὗ*] in the inclusive sense: as far as that, *i.e.* *so long as*. Cf. 2 Macc. xiv. 10: *ἄχρι γὰρ Ἰουδας περιέστικεν, ἀδύνατον εἰρήνης τυχεῖν τὰ πράγματα*. Josephus, *Antiq.* x. 2. 2: *ἤρχετο μέχρις τῆς αὐτοῦ ζωῆς εἰρήνην ὑπάρχειν*; Xenophon, *Cyrop.* v. 4. 16: *Καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἀσσύριος διώξας ἄχρις οὗ ἀσφαλὲς ᾤετο εἶναι, ἀπετράπετο*. — *ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται*] *so long as the to-day*, of which mention is made in the passage of the psalm, *is named*, or: *so long as it is still called "to-day,"* and it is thus not yet too late to be obedient to the admonition of the psalm. So Luther, Estius, Schlichting, Owen, Carpzov, Stuart, Bleek, Alford, Maier, Kurtz, *al.* Others, as Heinrichs, Dindorf, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Tholuck, Moll, Hofmann: *so long as that to-day of the psalm is called out, i.e.* *is called out, or proclaimed, to you*. — The "*to-day*" is not *the duration of the lifetime of the individuals* (Basil, Ep. 42, *Opp.* iii. p. 130: *τὸ σήμερον σημαίνει ὅλον τὸν χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν*; Theodoret, Theo-

phylact, Primasius, Erasmus, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, J. Cappellus, Dorscheus, Valekenauer), but (comp. μέχρι τέλους, vv. 6, 14) the *continued existence of the earthly world*, which, with the Parousia of Christ—thought of as near at hand (x. 25, 37)—attains its end. — ἀπάτη τῆς ἁμαρτίας] *by the deception* (the treacherous enticement or alluring) *of sin*. The ἁμαρτία is here personified, comp. Rom. vii. 11. What is meant is the allurements exerted by the seductive splendour of the ancient cultus to a relapse into the same, and therewith to an apostasy from Christianity.

Ver. 14. Warning justification of ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν τις κ.τ.λ., ver. 13, inasmuch as the fulfilling of a condition is necessary to the attainment of salvation.— μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ] *Participators in* (iii. 1, vi. 4, xii. 8) *Christ, i.e. in His treasures of blessing and in His glory*. Schulz, Delitzsch, Ewald, Hofmann, and others explain: *Associates of Christ* (i. 9), *i.e. His brethren* (ii. 11 ff.), or *His συγκληρονόμοι* (Rom. viii. 17), inasmuch as “the δόξα, into which Christ, the Anointed One existing in kingly glory, has entered as our ἀρχηγός, is, by virtue of the κλήσις ἐπουράνιος, not only *His*, but also *ours*, although as to its revelation and consummation *in hope*” (Delitzsch); against which, however, the fact is decisive that ἐάνπερ κ.τ.λ. points to a relation not of *equality*, but of *dependence*, and μετόχους τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἶναι corresponds to the notion of εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν, vv. 11, 18. Compare, moreover, against Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 719, *note*. — γεγόναμεν] *we have become*. The author does not write ἐσμέν, as ver. 6, in order to dismiss at once the thought of claim existing from the first, and, on the contrary, to represent the said prerogative as one only acquired (by faith, comp. ἐάνπερ κ.τ.λ.). — ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως κ.τ.λ.] *if so be that* (provided) *we preserve the beginning of the confidence firm to the end*, comp. ver. 6, *fin*. ὑπόστασις does not here denote *fundamentum* (Erasmus, *Paraphr.*; Seyffarth, p. 67: *prima religionis fundamenta*; Schulz: the first [anfänglichen] firm foundation; Stein and others), nor *substantia*, whether this be taken as *reality* [*Wesen*], as Luther (the reality begun), or as *that of which a thing consists* [*Bestand*], which constitutes it (Vatablus: *illud*,

per quod primum subsistimus, i. e. fidem firmam; Estius: fidem, per quam in vita hac spirituali subsistimus; Bisping: the beginning of the subsistence [of Christ in us], i.e. faith; Ewald, *al.*). The expression stands, on the contrary, in the well-ascertained signification: *confidence*, which notion is here naturally defined by the connection as *confidence of faith* (not *hope*, as Whitby and Delitzsch think). Comp. Heb. xi. 1; 2 Cor. ix. 4, xi. 17; LXX. Ps. xxxix. 8; Ezek. xix. 5; Ruth i. 12. Compare also Polybius, iv. 50. 10: Οἱ δὲ Ῥόδιοι, θεωροῦντες τὴν τῶν Βυζαντίων ὑπόστασιν, πραγματικῶς διενοήθησαν πρὸς τὸ καθικέσθαι τῆς προθέσεως; vi. 55. 2: οὐχ οὕτω τὴν δύναμιν, ὡς τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τόλμαν καταπεπληγμένων τῶν ἐναντίων; Diodorus Siculus, *Excerpta de Virt. et vit.* (Opp. ed. Wesselingius, t. ii., Amstelod. 1745, fol.) p. 557: ἡ ἐν ταῖς βασάνοις ὑπόστασις τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τὸ καρτερικὸν τῆς τῶν δεινῶν ὑπομονῆς περὶ μόνον ἐγενήθη τὸν Ἀριστογείτονα; Josephus, *Antiq.* xviii. 1. 6: τὸ ἀμετάλλακτον αὐτῶν τῆς ὑπὸ τοιούτοις ὑποστάσεως. — τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως] *the beginning of the confidence*, i.e. not: *the first confidence*, which now begins to diminish (τὴν ὑπόστασιν, ἣν ἤρξασθε ἔχειν vel ἣν εἵχετε ἐν ἀρχῇ, Cameron; τὴν ὑπόστασιν τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, Grotius, Wolf, Bloomfield; τὴν πρώτην ὑπόστασιν as τὴν πρώτην πίστιν, 1 Tim. v. 12, and as τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν πρώτην, Rev. ii. 4; Abresch, Tholuck, Stuart, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 754; Maier, Kurtz, Hofmann), but *the confidence with which we have made a beginning*, in such wise that τὴν ἀρχὴν corresponds to the following μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν. Thus, rightly, Bleek, de Wette, Alford.

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

Vv. 15, 16. With regard to the construction of ver. 15 the views of expositors greatly differ. It is assumed—(1) That ver. 15 forms an independent, complete sentence. It is then

supposed that the citation introduced by ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι embraces only the words σήμερον . . . ἀκούσητε, and that afterwards with μὴ σκληρύνετε κ.τ.λ. the author proceeds, it is true, in the following words of that Biblical citation, but appropriates them to himself, and employs them only for the clothing of the admonition to be uttered on his own part. So Flacius Illyricus, Jac. Cappellus, Carpzov, Kuinoel, Winer, *Gramm.*, 5 Aufl. p. 620, and Bloomfield; comp. also Hofmann *ad loc.* As, however, the same words: μὴ σκληρύνετε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ, had already been adduced, ver. 8, in the midst of the Biblical citation, and as a constituent part thereof, it could not possibly occur to the reader here at once to detach them from σήμερον . . . ἀκούσητε, and to understand them as words of the author addressed to themselves; and the less so, because ver. 16 ff. there follows a comment on the passage, in which ver. 16 glances back to σήμερον . . . παραπικρασμῷ, ver. 15 (ver. 7 f.); ver. 17 to the προσώχθισα κ.τ.λ., ver. 10; ver. 18, finally, to the ὁμοσα κ.τ.λ., ver. 11, so that the natural explanation can only be, that the author intended to refer back to the whole Scripture citation already previously adduced, vv. 7-11, but that — inasmuch as he might presuppose it as known from that which precedes — he expressly repeats it only to the point at which the first member of his comment could attach itself. (2) Ver. 15 is connected with that which precedes, in that ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι κ.τ.λ. is either regarded as exegesis to μέχρι τέλους, ver. 14 (Primasius, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Bisping, Reuss), or is attached to the conditional clause εἰνπερ . . . κατάσχωμεν there occurring (Erasmus Schmid, Wolf), or to all the words of ver. 14: μέτοχοι . . . κατάσχωμεν (Ebrard, Alford), or, finally, is construed with παρακαλεῖτε, ver. 13 (Cameron, Peirce, Bengel, Cramer, Baumgarten, Abresch). But in the first case one must expect ἄχρις οὗ λέγεται, or something similar, in place of ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι. In the other cases ver. 15 would drag as a feeble addition; in the last, moreover, ver. 14 would, contrary to all probability, become a parenthesis. (3) Ver. 15 is combined with that which follows. With φοβηθῶμεν οὖν, iv. 1, it is connected by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Olearius,

Wittich, Valckenaer. Vv. 16–19 must then be regarded as a parenthesis, and οὖν, iv. 1, as a particle of resumption. But of a resuming of the, as yet, incomplete thought, ver. 15, in iv. 1, there is no appearance in the form of discourse in the latter passage, notwithstanding the accuracy of style on the part of our author. On the contrary, from the tenor of iv. 1, it is indubitable that this verse is represented by virtue of οὖν as a consequence from iii. 16–19. These verses, therefore, can form no parenthesis. But thus every possibility of connecting ver. 15 with iv. 1 falls away. — There remains, therefore, no course open but to take ver. 15 with the first question of ver. 16: *τίνες γὰρ ἀκούσαντες παρεπίκραναν*; as one whole. This is done by Semler, Morus, Storr, Heinrichs, Dindorf, Böhme, Klee, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 532; Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, and Woerner. The sense is: "When it is said: 'to-day,' etc., (now, I ask:) who then were they who, although they heard (the voice), resisted? was it not all, etc.?" On ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, comp. ἐν τῷ λέγειν, viii. 13. — γὰρ serves for the strengthening of the particle of interrogation, but, at the same time, confirms the state of the fact expressed, ver. 14. See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 245 f. Comp. also Matt. xxvii. 23; John vii. 41; Acts xix. 35; 1 Cor. xi. 22. — From what has been already observed, it is evident that ver. 16 contains two questions, of which the second forms the answer to the first. This view of ver. 16, appearing only rarely in antiquity (in the Peshito, with Chrysostom and Theodoret), and only asserted afresh since the beginning of last century, is now almost universally regarded as the true one. According to the mode of interpretation formerly current, two affirmative statements were recognised in ver. 16, the first of which was limited by the second. *τινές* was accordingly written instead of *τίνες*,¹ and the thought

¹ Wrongly is it supposed by Bisping, who (equally as M'Caul) espouses afresh this interpretation formerly current, that it is a matter of indifference whether in connection therewith the two clauses be taken as questions or as absolute statements. For, in reality, οὐ has in a question, like the Latin *nonne*, always an affirmative sense. See Kühner, II. p. 579; Hartung, *Partikellchre*, II. p. 88. ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες cannot consequently signify, as Bisping maintains, "but certainly not all," but, on the contrary, only "but certainly all."

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

Vv. 17, 18. Further development of the truth, ver. 16, by means of recapitulation of the other main points of the Scripture citation. It was just this perverse totality of the Israelites with whom God was wroth on account of their sin forty years

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

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

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

CHAPTER IV.

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

with its hearers ; did not correspond, in their method of receiving it, with faithful hearers, whom it does profit ;” as, accordingly, Alford himself frankly confesses that he does not feel satisfied with this explanation, and is only driven to adopt it on the ground of critical and grammatical difficulties,—difficulties of the latter kind, nevertheless, do not exist, and those urged by Alford are easily solved. Or else a *passive* notion is substituted for the active τοῖς ἀκούσασιν. So already Theodore of Mopsuestia, who thinks τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν¹ must be read (in *Nov. Test. Commentariorum quae reperiri potuerunt Coll. O. Fr. Fritzsche*, Turici 1847, p. 166 : μηδὲ γάρ τις οἰέσθω ἀρετὴν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τῶν μελλόντων, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ἐκείνους· οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν κατὰ τὴν πίστιν τοῖς ἐπαγγελθεῖσι συνημμένοι· ὅθεν οὕτως ἀναγνωστέον· μὴ συγκεκρασμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν, ἵνα εἴπῃ ταῖς πρὸς αὐτοὺς γεγενημέναις ἐπαγγελίαις τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ Μωσέως) ; further, as it appears, Theodoret, since—although in our editions τοῖς ἀκούσασιν precedes—he makes use of the words : τί γὰρ ὤνησεν ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπαγγελία τοῖς ταύτην ὀξυζαμένους, μὴ πιστῶς δεῖξαμένους καὶ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ὀυνάμει θεοαῤῥηκτότας καὶ ὅσον τοῖς θεοῦ λόγοις ἀνακραθέντας ; and recently Bleek, who, led thereto by Noesselt’s remark on Theodoret’s exposition of Heb. iv. 2 (*Theod. Opp.* t. iii., Hal. 1771, p. 566, note 1), conjectures τοῖς ἀκούσασιν. For such alteration of the text, however, there exists not the slightest diplomatic justification. We must therefore regard the accusative plural as having arisen from a transcriber’s error, to which the preceding ἐκείνους gave occasion, and look upon the nominative singular of the *Recepta* συγκεκραμένος, which yields an excellent sense (see the exposition), as that which was originally written by the author. Rightly, therefore, is the *Recepta* defended by Mill, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Reiche (p. 24 sqq.), and others, and also received again into the text by Tisch. 2 (συγκεκραμένος), 7 (συγκεκραμένος), and 8 (συγκεκρασμένος). Nor is it by any means so badly attested that one could assert, with Bleek, that it could “claim not much more authority than as being a not improbable conjecture.” For it is supported by the testimony of the Peshito, which in antiquity surpasses any of our MSS., as well as by the Codex Sinaiticus, which has μὴ συγκεκρασμένους. It is found, besides, in the Vulg. It. Erp., as well as with Cyr. Alex. (scm.) [Theodoret (Hervet.)] Lucif. and in five cursives (17, 31, 37, 41, 114).—Ver. 3. εἰσερχόμεθα γάρ] A C : εἰσερχόμεθα οὖν. But with an exhortation, the following οἱ πιστεύσαντες is irreconcilable, instead of which πιστεύοντες or διὰ πίστεως must be placed.—Ver. 7. Elz. Wetstein, Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomf. : εἴρηται. But in favour of προσέρηται, which

¹ Also in one cursive ms. (Cod. 71) is found τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν.

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

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

Ver. 1. Exhortation to the readers, deduced from the historic fact, iii. 15–19, and softened by the form of community with the readers adopted by the author, which, however, is involuntarily abandoned again at the close of the verse. — Φοβηθῶμεν οὖν] *Let us therefore be apprehensive*. — Indication not of the mere *being afraid*, but of the *earnest endeavour*, based upon the fear of coming short of the proposed

goal. Calvin: Hic nobis commendatur timor, non qui fidei certitudinem excutiat, sed tantam incutiat sollicitudinem, ne securi torpeamus. Metuendum ergo, non quia trepidare aut diffidere nos oporteat quasi incertos de exitu, sed ne Dei gratiae desinamus. — *καταλειπομένης . . . αὐτοῦ*] is made by Cramer and Ernesti dependent on *ὑστερηκέναι*, against which, however, the anarthrous participle in itself suffices to decide. It is parenthetical, and *καταλειπομένης* with emphasis preposed: while there yet *remains* promise of entering into His rest. But a promise remains so long as it has not yet received its fulfilment. For with its fulfilment it ceases to be a promise, loses its existence—inasmuch as the character of the future essential to it has then become present. Erroneously do Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Strigel, Hyperius, Estius, Schlichting, S. Schmidt, Limborch, Braun, Semler, Carpzov, *al.*, explain: “by neglect or non-observance of the promise.” For, although *καταλείπειν* can signify that (comp. Acts vi. 2; Baruch iv. 1), yet in that case the article *τῆς* could not have been wanting before *ἐπαγγελίας*; and certainly also an active (*καταλείψας τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν*) would have been chosen in place of the passive participle. Finally, against the latter explanation, and in favour of that above given, pleads the *ἀπολείπεται*, vv. 6, 9. — *αὐτοῦ*] not of Christ (Rambach, Chr. F. Schmid), but of God. This is required by the connection, alike with that which precedes (iii. 11, 18) as with that which follows (vv. 3-5, 10). — *ἡ κατάπαυσις*] the repose and blessedness which belong to God Himself, and which shall become the portion of believing Christians in the epoch of consummation beginning with the coming again of Christ. — *δοκῇ ὑστερηκέναι*] *should appear* [be seen] *to have come short*, i.e. to have failed of attaining to the *κατάπαυσις*. The *infinitive perfect* characterizes that which, with the dawn of the Parousia, has become an historically completed, definite fact. *δοκῇ ὑστερηκέναι*, however, does not stand pleonastically in place of the bare *ὑστερῇ* or *ὑστερήσῃ* (Michaelis, Carpzov, Abresch, *al.*), nor is it placed “because, in connection with the question whether and where the *ὑστερηκέναι* exists as a concluded, and therefore irreparable, fact, the human perception does not extend

beyond a mere *videtur*" (Kurtz); for it is not here a case of a question to be decided by men still living upon earth. It serves rather, as the *videatur* often added in Latin, to give a more refined and delicate expression to the discourse. Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 16. Erroneously, however, Delitzsch, that in *δοκῇ* there is contained not only a softening, but, at the same time, also an accentuation of the expression; the sense being: "they are to take earnest heed, lest haply *it should even seem* that this or the other has fallen short." For the augmenting "even" is only arbitrarily imported. — Grotius explains *δοκῇ* by: "ne cui vestrum *libeat*," for which, however, the construction with the *dative* (*δοκῶ μοι*) would have been required, and to which, moreover, the infinitive *perfect* does not lend itself. Schöttgen finally, Baumgarten, Schulz, Paulus, Stengel, Ebrard, and Hofmann take *δοκῇ* in the sense of *opinetur*. The author is thus supposed to be warning the readers against the delusion that they were *too late*, *i.e.* that they lived at a time when all the promises had long been fulfilled, and no further means of salvation was to be expected. But the linguistic expression in itself is decisive against this interpretation. The author could not then have put *φοβηθῶμεν οὖν, μήποτε*, but must have written *μὴ οὖν φοβηθῶμεν ὑστερηκέναι*, or something similar. Moreover, the whole historic situation of the readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews is out of keeping with this view. It was not therein a question of consoling and calming those who still despaired of being able at all to attain to salvation, but of the warning correction of those who were wanting in the assurance of conviction that faith in Christ is the sufficient and only way to salvation. Only a warning to the readers, not by their own behaviour, like the fathers, to incur the loss of salvation, can therefore be contained in ver. 1.

Ver. 2 corroborates in its first half the *καταλειπομένης*, ver. 1, while the second half shows the danger of the *ὑστερηκέναι* in the example of others. The emphasis in the first half lies upon *ἐσμέν εὐηγγελισμένοι*. The sense is not: for we, too, like them, have promise (to express this the addition of *ἡμεῖς* after *καὶ γάρ* would have been called for), but: *for* promise (*sc.* of entering into the *κατάπαυσις*, cf.

vv. 1, 3) have we indeed, even as they (the fathers), *sc.* had it. — Most arbitrarily is the meaning of this and the following verse apprehended by Ebrard. According to Ebrard, ver. 2 ff. proclaims as the reason why the Jews did not attain the promised *κατάπαυσις*, not their “subjective unbelief,” but “the objective imperfection of the Old Testament revelation.” With the second half of ver. 2, namely, a gradation (!) is supposed to begin, and the progress of thought to be as follows: “The word which we have received is even infinitely better than the word which the Israelites received through Moses. For, first, the word spoken by Moses was unable to bring the people to faith—it remained external to them; it set forth a promise, it is true, and also attached a condition, but it communicated no strength to fulfil this condition (vv. 2–5, comp. vv. 12, 13); but, secondly, the promise there given was not even in its purport the true one; there, earthly rest was promised; here, spiritual and everlasting rest (vv. 6–10).” That the context affords no warrant for the bringing out of such a meaning is self-evident. For neither does the author here distinguish such twofold word of promise, nor a twofold *κατάπαυσις*, nor can *λόγος . . . μὴ συγκεκραμένος* signify a word which “could not prove binding.” — Erroneous, too, is the view of the connection on the part of Delitzsch, to whom Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 798 ff.) accedes in all essential particulars. According to Riehm, the (as yet unproved) presupposition is first provisionally expressed in the parenthesis, ver. 1, in a simply assertory manner, viz. that there is still in existence a promise of entering into the rest of God, a promise of which the fulfilment is yet outstanding, and this presupposition is then repeated, ver. 2, in other expressions of a more general bearing, no doubt, but essentially in the same way of simple assertion. Upon this, however, the author now wishes to furnish proof that such presupposition is fully warranted. Accordingly, ver. 3, he formulates that presupposition in the most definite manner, inasmuch as in the opening words of ver. 3, *εἰσερχόμεθα . . . πιστεύσαντες*, he lays down the theme which is to be proved in the sequel. This proof is afforded in the following way: the rest of God has existed long; nevertheless, in the

oath of God, mentioned in the words of the psalm, a rest of God is spoken of as yet future, and of a truth it is one and the same rest of God which, according to Gen. ii. 2—in so far as God enjoys it alone—has existed from the beginning of the world, and, according to the word of the psalm,—in so far as the people of God are to participate therein,—is one yet approaching. Although thus the long present rest of God was the aim and end of the creative activity of God, yet it is not the final aim which God has proposed to Himself. On the contrary, it is clearly apparent, from a comparison of the word of God pronounced upon the Israelites in the time of Moses, a word confirmed by an oath, with the account of the rest of God on the seventh day, that, according to the gracious designs of God, the rest, which He has enjoyed alone from the foundation of the world, should eventually become a rest of God which He enjoys in communion with His people. It is therefore indubitably certain, that even after the completion of the work of creation and the ensuing of the rest of God, there is still something outstanding [unfulfilled], an ἀπολειπόμενον, and this consists in the fact that some, received by God into communion with Himself, are made partakers of that repose of God. This view is a mistaken one, because—(1) As regards the assumed proof, the assertion that in the oath of God, spoken of in the words of the psalm, mention is made of a yet future rest of God, is entirely untrue. Not of a particular form of the rest of God, which is still future, is the discourse, but only the fact is represented as future that it is shared on the part of men who enter into it. For a rest of God which has already existed long is not opposed to a rest of God which is still future, nor is the rest of God, mentioned Gen. ii., distinguished as of another kind than that mentioned in the psalm. On the contrary, the rest of God, or—what is identical therewith—the Sabbath-rest of God, has existed in fact and without change from the time of the completion of the works of creation, and this same rest of God it is, the participation in which was once promised to the Israelites on the condition of faith, and now upon the same condition is promised to the Christians; it is a question therefore only of the Christians taking warning from the example of the

fathers, and not, like them, losing the promised blessing through unbelief. (2) That the author was desirous of still proving the *καταλείπεσθαι ἐπαγγελίαν*, cannot at all be supposed. For this was a fact which, as self-evident from that which precedes, stood in no need of a demonstration; it is therefore expressed not only ver. 1, but also ver. 6, in a mere subsidiary clause, consequently in the form of logical subordination; and even ver. 9, in which it is introduced in an apparently independent form, decides nothing against our explanation, because ver. 9, while forming a certain conclusion to that which precedes, yet contains only the logical substructure for the exhortation attaching itself afresh at ver. 11. That at which the author alone aimed, in connection with ver. 2 ff., was therefore the impressive confirmation of the paraenesis, ver. 1; and just this paraenetic main tendency of our section likewise fails of attaining due recognition in connection with the explanation of Delitzsch and Riehm. But when Delitzsch thinks he can support his view, that the *καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας*, ver. 1, is first proved in the sequel, by declaring the otherwise to be accepted "thought that the promise of entering into God's rest has remained without its fulfilment in the generation of the wilderness, and thus is still valid," to be "entirely false," and exclaims: "What logic that would be! The generation of the wilderness perished indeed, but the younger generation entered into Canaan, came to Shiloh (the place in the heart of the land, which has its name from the *rest*, Josh. xviii. 1), and had now its own fixed land of habitation, whither Jehovah had brought and planted it, and where He fenced it in (2 Sam. vii. 10);" such conclusion would be justified only if the author had not understood the promise given to the fathers in the time of Moses, of entering into God's *κατάπαυσις*, at the same time in a *higher* sense, but had regarded it as fulfilled by the occupation of Canaan under Joshua; such, however, according to the distinct statement of ver. 8, is not the case. — *καί*] after *καθάπερ*, the ordinary *καί* after particles of comparison. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 409. — *ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς*] Periphrasis of the notion *ἐπαγγελία*, ver. 1: *the word of that which is heard* (*ἀκοή* in the *passive*

sense, as Rom. x. 16; Gal. iii. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 13; John xii. 38), *i.e.* the word of promise which was heard by them, or proclaimed to them. This periphrasis is chosen in order already at this stage to point out that it was by the fault of the fathers themselves that the word of promise became for them an unprofitable word, one which did not receive its fulfilment. It remained for them a word heard only externally, whereas, if it was to profit them, they must manifest receptiveness for the same, must believingly and confidently appropriate the same. This culpability on the part of the fathers themselves is brought into direct relief by the participial clause *μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν*, containing the indication of cause to *οὐκ ὠφέλησεν*, wherein *τῇ πίστει* forms an emphatic opposition to the preceding *τῆς ἀκοῆς*. The sense is: *because it was not for the hearers mingled with faith*; the dative *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* denoting the subject, in relation to which the *μὴ συγκ.* *τῇ πίστει* took place. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 206. Thus interpret Erasmus, *translation*, Calvin, Castellio, Gerhard, Owen, Calov, Limborch, Bengel, Kypke, Storr, Stuart, Reiche, *Comm. Crit.* p. 30; Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 696, *note*; Maier, and others.¹ But that the fault of this not being mingled was not in *the word* but in *the men*, was naturally understood from the connection. *συγκεκραμένος* is not to be connected with *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν*, so that *τῇ πίστει* would have to be taken as the *dativus instrumentalis*: "because it did not, by means of faith, mingle with them that heard it, become fully incorporated with them" (Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Dorscheus, S. Schmidt, Wolf, Rambach, Michaelis, Carpzov, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Valckenaer, Klee, Paulus, Stein, Delitzsch, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner). For manifestly the centres of thought for the adversative clause lie in *τῆς ἀκοῆς* and *τῇ πίστει*, while *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* only takes up again the indication of the persons, already known to us from the *ἐκείνους*, although now as characterizing these persons in attaching itself to *τῆς ἀκοῆς*. — *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν*, however,

¹ Heinsius, Semler, Kuinoel, *al.*, take *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* as equivalent to *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων*, which is open to no grammatical objection (cf. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 206), and makes no alteration in the sense.

not the mere demonstrative pronoun, is put by the author in order thus once more to place *hearing* and *believing* in suggestive contrast. Further, the author did not write *μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ πίστει τῶν ἀκουσάντων*, because he would thereby have conveyed the impression that the Israelites in the wilderness *possessed* indeed *πίστις*, but the word of promise which was heard did not blend into a unity with the same; whereas by means of *μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* he denies altogether the presence of *πίστις* in them.

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

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

¹ The aim in *καίτοι τῶν ἔργων κ.τ.λ.* is not, as Bleek thinks, to prove: “that men had not perchance even then, after the creation of the world, entered with Him [*sc.* by the institution of the Sabbath] into the rest here intended by God;” for this was a truth which hardly stood in need of any proof.

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

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

regard to the seventh day. Comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 549; Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr.* p. 71.

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

Vv. 6, 7. The author, founding his reasoning, on the one hand, on the truthfulness of God, and on the other, on the actual state of matters declared from ἀλλά, ver. 2, to κατάπανσίν μου, ver. 5, now returns to the statements: καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας, ver. 1, and καὶ γὰρ ἔσμεν εὐηγγελισμένοι καθάπερ κἀκεῖνοι, ver. 2, in order, by means of the opening words of the psalm cited, to render clear the truth contained in these statements concerning the non-fulfilment of the promise as yet, and also the necessity for not closing the heart against the same.¹ — The sense is: *since then it still remains, i.e. is to be expected with certainty, that some enter therein* (inasmuch, namely, as God carries also into effect that which He promises), *and the earlier recipients of the promise did not enter in because of their unbelief, He marks out anew a definite day*, etc. From this relation of the first half of the protasis to the second, as that of a general postulate to a special historic fact, is explained also the indefinite τινάς in the first clause. Wrongly Delitzsch, according to whom τινάς signifies: "others than those." Some, again, find in ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολείπεται τινάς εἰσελθεῖν the meaning: *since then the promise, of entering into His rest, is still left, i.e. awaits its fulfilment.* So sub-

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

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

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

Ver. 8. Justification of the πάλιν τινὰ ὀρίζει ἡμέραν, ver. 7. If Joshua had already introduced into the rest of God, God would not still have spoken in the time after Joshua of a

term (period) of entrance into the same. — αὐτοῦς] *sc.* τοὺς πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντας, ver. 6. — καταπαύειν] here (in accordance with the classic usage) *transitive*, as Ex. xxxiii. 14, Deut. iii. 20, v. 33, *al.*: *to lead into the rest.* — ἐλάλει] *sc.* ὁ θεός. — μετὰ ταῦτα] belongs not to ἄλλης ἡμέρας (Hofmann, *al.*), but to ἐλάλει, and corresponds to the μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον, ver. 7.

Ver. 9. Deduction from vv. 7, 8, and consequently return to the first half of ver. 6. "Thus still remaining, still awaiting its advent, is a Sabbath rest for the people of God," inasmuch, namely,—what the author in reasoning with the Hebrews might presuppose as admitted,—as from David's time down to the present no one had entered into the κατάπαυσις of God. As *Sabbatic rest* the author characterizes the rest of God, in adherence to the thought of ver. 4. As a type of the everlasting blessedness do the Rabbins also regard the Sabbath. Comp. *e.g.* *Talkut Rubeni*, fol. 95. 4: *Dixerunt Israelitae: Domine totius mundi, ostende nobis exemplar mundi futuri. Respondit ipsis Deus S. B.: illud exemplar est sabbatum. R. D. Kimchi et R. Salomo in Ps. xcii.: Psalmus cantici in diem Sabbati, quod hic psalmus pertineat ad seculum futurum, quod totum sabbatum est et quies ad vitam aeternam.* See Wetstein and Schöttgen *ad loc.* — ἄρα] at the beginning of a sentence is, in prose, foreign to the classics. Comp. however, Rom. x. 17; 2 Cor. vii. 12; Luke xi. 48; Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 519; Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr.* p. 318.—The expression σαββατισμός (from σαββατίζω, *Πᾶς*, *to observe the Sabbath*, Ex. xvi. 30, *al.*) only here and with Plutarch, *De Superstit.* c. 3. — τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ] *to the people which appertains to God*, is recognised and treated by Him as His people, since it has believingly devoted itself to Him. Comp. Gal. vi. 16: ὁ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Ver. 10. There is not an establishing of the reasoning in ver. 9 by a reference to the *essence* of the Sabbatic rest (Delitzsch and Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 804), but justification of the expression σαββατισμός, employed ver. 9. For not that which constitutes the nature of the Sabbath is here brought out, but the fact that in the case supposed a

καταπαύειν can be ascribed to man, even as to God. Wrongly (because at least εἰσελθὼν γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. must have been written) does Schulz refer ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν to ὁ λαός: "and when it has entered," etc. And just as wrongly, because the context affords no point of support for the same, do Owen, Alting, Starck, Valckenaer, and more recently Ebrard and Alford, find in ὁ εἰσελθὼν a designation of *Christ*, in connection with which the ἔργα are then understood of the redemption completed, or also of the sufferings and death undergone. On the contrary, ver. 10 contains a universal proposition: *for whoever has entered into His (namely, God's) rest, has also on his part attained to rest from his works* (the burdens and toils of the earthly life;¹ comp. LXX. Gen. iii. 17: ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου; v. 29: οὗτος διαναπαύσει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λυπῶν τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ἧς κατηράσατο κύριος ὁ θεός. Comp. also Rev. xiv. 13): *even as God from His own* (works, the works of creation); for him has thus the Sabbath of everlasting blessedness set in.

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

¹ What is meant is not the works or labour "of sanctification" (Tholuck, Grimm, Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmst. A. K.-Z. 1857, No. 29, p. 664); and still less the *ritual ordinances* of Judaism (Braun, Akersloot, Cramer, Semler, and Griesbach).

Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and others. *πίπτειν ἐν* is also quite usual in classical authors; see Passow and Pape *ad vocem*. From *πίπτειν εἰς* it is distinguished only by a greater degree of significance in that it does not merely like this express the *falling into* something, but also the subsequent *lying in* the same. Others, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Vatablus, Calvin, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Wolf, Bengel, Carpzov, Schulz, Heinrichs, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bisping, Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt *A. K.-Z.* 1857, No. 29, p. 664; the last-named because the expression “to fall into an example,” instead of “to afford an example,” is supposed to be a forced one,—the expression, however, is only a concise one (see above),—and because *πίπτειν* is probably chosen with a retrospective glance to iii. 17, the passage to which reference is here made, with the difference that the word there denoted the *physical* destruction. But such intention in connection with the choice of the word is not at all to be assumed), Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 774), Maier, Kluge, Moll, Ewald, take *πέσῃ absolutely*: “*fall*, i.e. to be brought to ruin, perish.” In that case *ἐν* is explained either by *per* (Wolf, Stengel, Ewald, *al.*), or “conformably to [*gemäss*]” (Tholuck), or *propter* (Carpzov), or, what with this construction would alone be correct, of *the condition, the state in which one is* (Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, Maier, Moll): “in giving the same example.” But this whole construction is artificial. Opposed to it is likewise the position of *πέσῃ*. For had this word such emphasis as it must have so soon as it is taken in the absolute sense, it would not have been inserted in such subordinate, unaccentuated fashion between the other words, but have been introduced at the very beginning of the proposition: *ἵνα μὴ τις πέσῃ κ.τ.λ.*

Vv. 12, 13. Warning demonstration of the necessity for compliance with the exhortation uttered ver. 11.¹ — *ὁ λόγος*

¹ Ebrard's commentary here too abounds in quixotic caprice, such as disowns all linguistic basis. According to Ebrard, the preceding warning of ver. 11 is yet further enforced, ver. 12, by the reminder that in our case (!) that excuse (!) is removed, which, according to ver. 2 (!), still existed in the case of the con-

τοῦ θεοῦ] *the word of God*. By these words we have not, with many Fathers, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Thomas Aquinas, Lyra, Cajetan, Clarius, Justinian, Cornelius a Lapide, Jac. Cappellus, Gomar, Owen, Heinsius, Alting, Clericus, Cramer, Ewald, *al.*, the hypostatic word of God, or Christ, as the second person of the Godhead. For although this mode of designating Christ in the case of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, according to i. 1-3, and on account of the points of contact he displays with Philo, can present nothing strange in itself, yet the expression was too unusual for it to be employed and understood without further indication, in this special sense, where the connection did not even lead up to it. Moreover, the predicates ἐνεργής, τομώτερος κ.τ.λ., and κριτικός (instead of κριτής), seem better suited to an impersonal than a personal subject. The majority understand ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ of *the word of God*, as proclaimed and as preserved in Scripture. They refer it then either to *the gospel* (Cameron, Grotius, Wittich, Akersloot, Ebrard, *al.*), or to *the threatenings* of God (Schlichting, Michaelis, Abresch, Böhme, Heinrichs, *al.*), or, finally, to the *threatenings and promises* of God taken together (Beza, Schulz, Bisping, *al.*). ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ is to be understood quite generally: "that which God speaks," as, indeed, the whole proposition, vv. 12, 13, contains a general sentence. But that "that which God speaks" was then, in its application to the case here specially coming under notice, the call to receptivity of heart repeatedly made by God through the psalmist, and the exclusion from His κατάπαυσις threatened in the event of obstinate disobedience and unbelief, was for the reader self-evident from the connection.—The word of God is characterized in progressive enhancement. It is called ζῶν, *living*, on account of its inner *vital power* (not on account of its everlasting, intransitory continuance,

temporaries of Moses. For us nothing is wanting (!) on the part of the word of God; for (!) the word of God is living, powerful, penetrating into the soul; if we (!) should fall victims to unbelief, the guilt would rest upon ourselves alone (!). According to Ebrard, the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ forms an opposition to the first person plural σπουδάζωμεν (!), and ver. 12 a supplementary material opposition to ver. 2 (!). That "this profound and delicate connection has hitherto been overlooked by all expositors" is natural enough. Even after Ebrard has discovered it, it will still remain unnoticed.

Schlichting, Abresch; nor as "cibus ac nutrimentum, quod hominum animis vitam conservat," Carpzov; nor, in opposition to the rigid lifeless law, Ebrard); *ἐνεργής*, *effective*, on account of its asserting itself, manifesting itself vigorously in the outer world. The latter is the consequence of the former, and *both* in this connection refer to the power of punishing its contemners, which is inherent in the word of God. — The penetrating sharpness of this power of punishment is described in ascending gradation in the sequel. — *καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον*] *and more trenchant than every (any) two-edged sword*. ὑπὲρ after a comparative (Luke xvi. 8; Judg. xi. 25, LXX. Cod. Vaticanus), like παρά, i. 4. *μάχαιρα δίστομος*, a sword with twofold mouth, *i.e.* with an edge on both sides (*ἀμφοτέρωθεν ὀξεῖα*). The same expression in the LXX. Judg. iii. 16; Prov. v. 4. Comp. *ρόμφαία δίστομος*, Rev. i. 16, ii. 12; LXX. Ps. cxlix. 6; Ecclus. xxi. 3. Similarly, Eurip. *Helen*. 989: *ἐμὸν πρὸς ἡπαρ ὤσαι δίστομον ξίφος τόδε*; *Orest.* 1309: *δίπτυχα, δίστομα φάσγανα*. — The proof for the statement: *τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον*, is contained in the words: *καὶ διῖκνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν*] *and piercing to the separating of soul and spirit, joints as well as marrow*. *μερισμός* denotes the action of separating, and the separating subject is the word of God. Wrongly does Schlichting (comp. also Böhme) take it locally, or as reflexive: *to the secret spot where soul and spirit separate*. Such construction is to be rejected, as otherwise the clause following would have also to be explained in like manner: where joints and marrow separate. Joints and marrow, however, not being, in the human organization, things coming into direct contact, the thought would be inappropriate, whether we understand *ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν* in the literal or non-literal sense. Schlichting, to be sure, will make *ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν* no longer dependent upon *μερισμοῦ*, but take it as co-ordinate with *μερισμοῦ* ("... ut gladius iste penetrare dicatur ad loca in homine abditissima, etiam illuc, ubi anima cum spiritu connectitur et ab eo dividitur, itemque ubi sunt membrorum compages et medullae"). But for this distinction the repetition of ἄχρι before *ἁρμῶν* would have been necessary. An entire

failure, finally, is also the method proposed by Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. 2 Aufl. p. 297, and likewise still in his *Comm.* p. 192), in order to preserve the *local* acceptation, in making *ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος* dependent on *ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν*: "to the point at which it dissects and dissolves both joints and marrow of the inner life, the secret ligaments of its connection and the innermost marrow of its existence." For then the readers would be required to understand an arrangement of the words which has not, as Hofmann thinks, perhaps "its parallel" in Heb. vi. 1, 2, but which is, on the contrary, altogether impossible, on account of the addition of *μερισμοῦ* already to *ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος*, and therefore nowhere finds its analogon in the N. T., not to say in the Epistle to the Hebrews. All four words: *ψυχῆς, πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν, and μυελῶν*, depend upon *μερισμοῦ*, and not *a dividing of the soul from the spirit, of joinings or joints from the marrow*, is intended, nor yet *a dividing of the soul and spirit from joints and marrow* (Böhme), but a dividing of the soul, the spirit, etc., *each in itself* is meant. The two last substantives, however, are not *co-ordinate* to the two first (Calvin, Beza, Cameron, Storr, Delitzsch, *al.*), but *subordinate*. For *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, which are distinguished from each other as characterizing respectively the lower sensuous life and the higher life of the spirit, here set forth without any more special limitation the inner side of human life generally, in opposition to the *σῶμα* or body, which latter alone an earthly sword is able to pierce, and *ἁρμοί τε καὶ μυελοί* is not to be understood of the joints and marrow *of the body*,¹ but of the ligaments and marrow of the *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, is thus a figurative expression to denote the innermost, most hidden

¹ So Delitzsch still explains, who represents the author as giving expression to the grossly sensuous conception, regardless whether such conception is in harmony with the author's refined mode of thought,—that the word of God points out "to man the antitheistic forces of his bodily nature, which has become wholly, and to all the joints and marrow (cerebral marrow, spinal marrow, etc.), a seat of sin and death!" The expression is supposed to adapt itself, without itself becoming figurative, to the figure of the *μάχαιρα*. It is presupposed that the word of God has already accomplished its work of dissection (!) to the skeleton, with its bones and sinews (!), or at least presupposed that all, so far as this, is manifestly to be performed with ease. A stop, how-

depth of the rational life of man. In such transferred signification *μυελός* is used also with the classics. Comp. Themist. *Orat.* 32, p. 357: (ὁδύνη) εἰσδεδυκνῖα εἰς αὐτόν που τὸν μυελὸν τῆς ψυχῆς; Eurip. *Hippol.* 255 f.: χρῆν γὰρ μετρίας εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλίας θνητοὺς ἀνακίρνασθαι καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἄκρον μυελὸν ψυχῆς. *ἄρμός*, however, *a fastening together, uniting, joint*, could likewise be employed metaphorically, inasmuch as it receives its signification as joint of the human body only from the addition of τοῦ σώματος or from the connection, but elsewhere occurs in the most varied combinations and relations. Comp. e.g. *ἄρμός θύρας*, Dionys. Hal. v. 7; *ἄρμοι λιθῶν*, Eccles. xxvii. 2, *al.* — It is, moreover, worthy of notice that Philo also ascribes to his divine Logos a like cutting and severing power. He calls the same *τομεὺς τῶν συμπάντων*, which God has whetted to the most piercing sharpness, which on that account not only separates all sensuous things and penetrates to the atoms, but even divides the supra-sensuous, separating the soul into the rational and irrational, the reason into the true and false, the perception into the clear and the obscure. Comp. especially, *Quis rerum divinarum habet*, p. 499 (with Mangey, I. p. 491): *Εἴτ' ἐπιλέγει· Διεῖλεν αὐτὰ μέσα [Gen. xv. 10] τὸ τίς οὐ προσθείς, ἵνα τὸν ἀδίδακτον ἐννοῆς θεὸν τέμνοντα τὰς τε τῶν σωμάτων καὶ πραγμάτων ἐξῆς ἀπάσας ἡρμόσθαι καὶ ἡνώσθαι δοκούσας φύσεις τῷ τομεῖ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ· ὅς, εἰς τὴν ὀξύτην ἀκουηθεὶς ἀκμὴν, διαιρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ αἰσθητὰ πάντα· ἐπειδὰν δὲ μέχρι τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ λεγομένων ἀμερῶν διεξέλθῃ, πάλιν ἀπὸ τούτων τὰ λόγῳ θεωρητὰ εἰς ἀμυθήτους καὶ ἀπεριγράφους μοίρας ἄρχεται διαιρεῖν οὗτος ὁ τομεύς . . .* Ἐκαστον οὖν τῶν τριῶν διεῖλε μέσον, τὴν μὲν ψυχὴν εἰς

ever, is not made here, but it further separates the joints of the bones, with the sinews or tendons serving to their movement, and cuts through the bones themselves, so that the marrow they contain is laid bare. Thus, then, the word renders the whole man transparent to God and to himself, and unveils in sharpest and most rigid analysis his most psychico-spiritual and innermost physical (!) condition; whereby it is then seen that, in so far as the man has not yet given scope to the work of grace, and in so far as the latter has not yet been able to accomplish itself, the marrow of the body is as corrupt as the spirit, which is as it were the marrow of the soul, and the joints of the body as corrupt as the soul, which is as it were the joint of the spirit (!).

λογικὸν καὶ ἄλογον, τὸν δὲ λόγον εἰς ἀληθές τε καὶ ψεῦδος, τὴν δὲ αἴσθησιν εἰς καταληπτικὴν φαντασίαν καὶ ἀκατάληπτον. — *Ibid.* p. 500 (I. p. 492): Οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ἀκονησάμενος τὸν τομέα τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγον διαιρεῖ τὴν τε ἄμορφον καὶ ἄποιον τῶν ὅλων οὐσίαν, καὶ τὰ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀποκριθέντα τέσσαρα τοῦ κόσμου στοιχεῖα, etc. — Comp. also *de Cherubim*, p. 112 f. (with Mangey, I. p. 144), where Philo finds in the φλογίνη ῥομφαία, Gen. iii. 24, a symbol of the Logos, and then observes with regard to Abraham: Οὐχ ὀρέξ, ὅτι καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ὁ σοφός, ἡνίκα ἤρξατο κατὰ θεὸν μετρεῖν πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ἀπολείπειν τῷ γεννητῷ, λαμβάνει τῆς φλογίνης ῥομφαίας (i.e. of the divine Logos) μίμημα, πύρ καὶ μάχαιραν [Gen. xxii. 6] διελεῖν καὶ καταφλέξει τὸ θνητὸν ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ γλιχόμενος, ἵνα γυμνῇ τῇ διανοίᾳ μετάρσιος πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀναπτῇ. — καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας] and qualified to take cognizance of, or to judge (wrongly Heinrichs, Kuinoel, *ul.*: to condemn), the dispositions and thoughts of the heart. — ἐνθυμήσεων] Matt. ix. 4, xii. 25; Acts xvii. 29. — ἐννοιῶν] 1 Pet. iv. 1.

Ver. 13. Transition from the word of God to God Himself. That the twofold αὐτοῦ and the ὄν, ver. 13, cannot be referred to Christ,¹ follows from the correct interpretation of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 12. That, however, in general not the total notion ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (so Ebrard still) can form the subject of the pronouns, ver. 13, but only the ὁ θεός to be deduced therefrom, is evident from the expression τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, which is appropriate only to the latter, not to the former. The transition from the word of God to God Himself was, moreover, a very natural one, inasmuch as in the word of God, God Himself is present and operative. — κτίσις] as Rom. viii. 39, and frequently, in the most universal sense: *any creature*, and indeed here not merely as regards its external existence, but also as regards its inner essence. Quite mistakenly Grotius, who is followed by Carpzov: Videtur mihi hoc loco κτίσις significare opus hominis, quia id est velut creatura hominis. — δέ] *on the contrary*. See on ii. 6. — τετρα-

¹As is done even by Dorscheus, Calov, Wittich, Braun, Brochmann, and Schöttgen, although they do not explain hypostatically the word of God in ver. 12.

χηλισμένα] *laid bare*. Hesychius: *πεφανερωμένα*. *τραχηλίζειν* means: *to bend back the neck* of the victim, in the act of slaying, in order to lay bare the chest, then generally: *to lay bare, disclose, expose to view*. See the Lexicons of Passow and Pape on the word. Comp. Hom. *Il.* i. 459: *αὐτὸν ἔρυσαν*, sc. *τὸν τράχηλον τοῦ ἱεροῦ*; Orpheus, *Argon.* 311: *ταῦρον σφάζον, ἀνακλίνας κεφαλὴν εἰς αἰθέρα διαν*; P. Fr. Ach. Nitsch, *Beschreibung des häuslichen, gottesdienstlichen u. s. w. Zustandes der Griechen*, 2 Aufl. Th. I. p. 667. Others, as Elsner, Wolf, Baumgarten, Kaimoel, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, and Maier, would, after the precedent of Perizonius, *ad Aelian Var. Hist.* xii. 58, derive the signification "lay bare" to *τραχηλίζειν*, from the practice in antiquity of laying hold of transgressors by the neck when they were being led away to execution, and bending back the head, that they might be exposed to the gaze of all. Appeal is made not amiss to Suetonius in favour of this custom, *Vitell.* 17: *donec (Vitellius) religatis post terga manibus, injecto cervicibus laqueo, veste discissa, seminudus in forum tractus est . . . reducto coma capite, ceu noxii solent, atque etiam mento mucrone gladii subrecto, ad visendam praeberet faciem neve submitteret*. In like manner to Pliny, *Panegy.* 34. 3: *Nihil tamen gratius, nihil seculo dignius, quam quod contigit desuper intueri delatorum supina ora retortasque cervices*. Yet a Roman custom cannot in itself afford a standard for determining the signification of a Greek word. Yet others, as Cameron, Brochmann, and Klee, suppose the general signification: "to lay bare," for *τραχηλίζειν*, to arise from the circumstance that the verb is used also of the *wrestler*, who grasps his opponent by the throat, and hurls him down backwards, whereby the face of the latter is exposed to the full view of the spectators (Cameron: *Videtur esse metaphora petita a re palaestrica*. Nam *luctatores tum demum adversarium dicuntur τραχηλίζειν, cum obstricto collo ita versant, ut obijciant spectatorum oculis nudum conspicendum et reiectum undiquaque, id quod tum demum maxime fit, quum ejus cervicibus inequitant*). But the exposing of the face of the thrown opponent was a circumstance of no importance in the *τραχηλίζειν* of the athlete, because not at all necessarily connected therewith. Further, and not less im-

probable derivations, see in Bleek. — *πρὸς ὃν κ.τ.λ.*] is to be taken in close combination only with the *αὐτοῦ* immediately preceding, not likewise, as is done by Michaelis, Bloomfield, and Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. 2 Aufl. p. 104), with the first *αὐτοῦ*, and upon *ἡμῖν* falls no emphasis (against Ebrard and Alford). The words for the rest have too little the character of independence to justify our taking them alone, with Alford, and separating them by a colon from that which precedes. — *πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος*] *towards whom exists for us the relation, i.e. with whom we have to do.* Calvin: *vertendum erat: cum quo nobis est ratio: cujus orationis hic est sensus, Deum esse, qui nobiscum agit, vel cum quo nobis est negotium, ideoque non esse ludendum quasi cum homine mortali, sed quoties verbum ejus nobis proponitur, contremiscendum esse, quia nihil ipsum lateat.* Comp. 1 Kings ii. 14 and 2 Kings ix. 5: *λόγος μοι πρὸς σέ.* — Aristides, *Leuctr.* iv. p. 465: *ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο θανμαστὸν φαίνεται, εἴ τις τὸ μὲν Θεβαίους μόνους ἀντιπάλους ἡμῖν καταλειφθῆναι δέδιδε, τὸ δὲ πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους ἡμῖν εἶναι τὸν λόγον, οὐδενὸς ἄξιον κρίνει φόβου.* Further examples in Wetstein and Bleek. Incorrectly do Luther, Vatablus, Cameron, Schlichting, Cornelius a Lapide [Piscator hesitates between this and the rendering above given], Grotius, Calov, Wolf, Schulz, Stengel, *al.*, generally with an appeal to *πρός*, i. 7, 8, and a comparison of v. 11, take *πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος* as equivalent to *περὶ οὗ ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος*. Moreover, something entirely foreign is imported by Ewald when, with a reference to ii. 10 f., he finds in the words the sense: “to whom, as a friend and brother, we can always most confidently speak.” Finally, the Peshito, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Erasmus *Paraphr.*, Clarius, Zeger, Owen, Limborch, Michaelis, Whitby, Cramer, Stuart, Hofmann, *al.*, explain: to whom we shall have to give an account of our actions. In itself this interpretation would be admissible; but, inasmuch as the words must in consequence thereof be taken in reference to an event yet future, we should necessarily expect the addition of *ἔσται*.

Ver. 14—x. 18. The author has, in that which precedes, compared Christ with the angels and then with Moses, and proved the superiority of Christ over both. He applies him-

self now to a third point of the comparison, in that he institutes a comparison between Christ and the Levitical high priests, and develops on every side the exalted character of His high-priesthood above the Levitical high-priesthood, with regard to His person, with regard to the sanctuary in which He fulfils His office, and with regard to the sacrifice presented. The copiousness of this new dogmatic investigation—which is subservient to the same paraenetic aim as the preceding expositions, and therefore opens with an exhortation of the same nature with the former ones, and is presently interrupted by a somewhat lengthy warning-paraenetic interlude—is to be explained by the greater importance it had for the readers, who, in narrow-minded over-estimate of the temple cultus inherited from the fathers, regarded the continued participation in this cultus as necessary for the complete expiation of sin and the acquiring of everlasting salvation, and, because they thought nothing similar was to be found in Christianity, were exposed to an imminent peril of turning away from the latter and relapsing entirely into Judaism. Compare the explanation already given by Chrysostom, *Hom. viii. in it.*: 'Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐδὲν ἦν (*sc.* in the New Covenant) σωματικὸν ἢ φανταστικόν, οἶον οὐ ναός, οὐχ ἅγια ἁγίων, οὐχ ἱερεὺς τοσαύτην ἔχων κατασκευήν, οὐ παρατηρήσεις νομικαί, ἀλλ' ὑψηλότερα καὶ τελειότερα πάντα, καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν σωματικῶν, τὸ δὲ πᾶν ἐν τοῖς πνευματικοῖς ἦν, οὐχ οὕτω δὲ τὰ πνευματικὰ τοὺς ἀσθενεστέρους ἐπήγετο ὡς τὰ σωματικά, τοῦτου χάριν τοῦτον ὅλον κινεῖ τὸν λόγον.—The transition to this new section is formed by vv. 14–16.

Ver. 14. The introductory phrase: *ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα*, presupposes that the author has already had occasion to speak of Jesus as *ἀρχιερεὺς*. We are therefore led back for *οὖν* to ii. 17, iii. 1. But, since there is further added to *ἀρχιερέα* the qualification *μέγαν* and *διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς*, and thus also these characteristics must be presupposed as known from that which precedes, we have consequently not to limit *οὖν*, in its backward reference, to ii. 17, iii. 1, but to extend it to the whole disquisition, i. 1–iii. 6, in such wise that (logically, indeed, in a not very exact manner) *μέγαν*, *διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς* glances back in general to the

dignity and exaltedness of the person of Jesus, as described in these sections. — Erroneously does Delitzsch suppose that by means of οὖν the exhortation κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας is derived as a deduction from vv. 12, 13. Such opinion would be warranted only if, with the omission of the participial clause, merely κρατῶμεν οὖν τῆς ὁμολογίας had been written. For since κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας has received its own justification in the prefixed ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ., apart from that which immediately precedes, it is clear that, in connection with ver. 14, there is no further respect had to the contents of vv. 12, 13. It is not therefore to be approved that Delitzsch, in order to make room for the unfortunate reference to vv. 12, 13, will have οὖν logically attached to the verb κρατῶμεν, instead of the participle, with which it is grammatically connected, and to which, as the most simple and natural, the like passage, x. 19 ff., also points. What laboured confusion of the relations would Delitzsch require the reader to assume, when he is called to regard ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ. as being at the same time a recapitulation of that which has been said before, and continuation of the argument; and yet, spite of all this, to look upon κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας as a deduction from vv. 12, 13! In any case, the connection asserted by Delitzsch to exist between ver. 14 and vv. 12, 13: "the word of God demands obedience and appropriation, *i.e.* faith, not, however, as merely a faith locked up within the breast, but also a loud Yea and Amen, unreserved and fearless confession, ὁμολογία from mouth and heart, as the echo thereof," is in itself a baseless imagination; because the before-demanded πίστις and the here demanded ὁμολογία are by no means distinguished from each other as a *minus* and a *major*, but, on the contrary, in the mind of the author of the epistle are synonyms. It results that οὖν stands in a somewhat free relation to the foregoing argument, consequently must not at all be taken as, strictly speaking, an illative particle, with which that which precedes is first brought to a close, but as a particle of resuming, which, in the form of a return to that which has already been said before, begins a new section. — μέγαν] does not in such wise appertain to ἀρχιερέα that only in combination with the same

it should form the idea of the high priest (Jac. Cappellus, Braun, Rambach, Wolf, Carpzov, Michaelis, Stuart), but is indicative of the *quality* of the high priest, and means *exalted*, just as μέγας, x. 21, in combination with ἱερεὺς. Comp. also xiii. 20. — As the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews represents Christ the Son of God, so also does Philo (*De Somn.* p. 598 A, with Mangey, I. p. 654) represent the divine Logos as ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς. Comp. *ibid.* p. 597 (I. p. 653): Δύο γάρ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἱερὰ θεοῦ, ἐν μὲν ὁδε ὁ κόσμος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος λόγος, ἕτερον δὲ λογικὴ ψυχὴ, ἧς ἱερεὺς ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπος. — διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς] elucidatory demonstration of μέγαν. Wrongly is it translated by Luther (as also by the Peshito): *who has ascended up to heaven*; by Calvin, Peiree, Ernesti, *al.*: *qui coelos ingressus est*. It can only signify [Piscator, Owen, Bengel, Tholuck, Stuart, *al.*]: *who has passed through the heavens*, *sc.* in order, exalted above the heavens (cf. vii. 26; Eph. iv. 10), to take His seat upon the throne of the Divine Majesty (i. 3, 13). Allusion to the high priest of the Old Covenant, who, in order to make atonement for the people, passed through the courts of the Temple, and through the Temple itself, into the Most Holy Place. Comp. ix. 11. — Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ] emphatic apposition to ἀρχιερέα μέγαν κ.τ.λ., in which the characterization of Jesus as the υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (i. 1, 5, vi. 6, vii. 3, x. 29) serves anew to call attention to the dignity of the New Testament High Priest. Quite mistaken are Wolf and Böhmke in their conjecture that the object in the addition of τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ is the distinction of Jesus from the Joshua mentioned ver. 8. For the mention of Joshua, ver. 8, was, as regards the connection, only an incidental one, on which account there also not even a more precise definition was given to the name. — κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας] *let us hold fast* (vi. 18; Col. ii. 19; 2 Thess. ii. 15; wrongly Tittmann: *lay hold of, embrace*) *the confession*. ὁμολογία is not, with Storr, to be referred specially to the confession of Christ as the High Priest, but to be taken in general of the Christian confession. The expression is here too used objectively, as iii. 1, of the sum or subject-matter of the Christian's belief.

Ver. 15. Further justification of the demand, ver. 14, of steadfast adherence to the Christian confession.¹ For the High Priest of Christians is not merely a highly exalted One (ver. 14), He is also qualified, since as Brother He stands very closely related to believers, and has been tempted as they are, to have sympathy for their weaknesses. Comp. ii. 17, 18. Calvin: In nomine Filii Dei, quod posuit, subest ea majestas, quae nos ad timorem et obsequium adigat. Verum si nihil in Christo aliud consideremus, nondum pacatae erunt conscientiae. Quis enim non reformidet Filii Dei conspectum, praesertim quum reputamus, qualis sit nostra conditio, nobisque in mentem veniunt peccata nostra? Deinde Judaeis aliud ob stare poterat, quia Levitico sacerdotio assueverant: illic cernebant hominem mortalem unum ex aliis electum, qui sanctuarium ingrediebatur, ut sua deprecatione reconciliaret fratres suos Deo. Hoc magnum est, quum mediator, qui placare erga nos Deum potest, unus est ex nobis. Haec illecebra poterat Judaeos illaqueare, ut sacerdotio Levitico semper essent addicti, nisi occurreret apostolus, ac ostenderet Filium Dei non modo excellere gloria, sed aequa bonitate et indulgentia erga nos esse praeditum. Whereas *δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι* and *πεπειρασμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα* bring out the homogeneity of the New Testament High Priest with that of the Old Testament (comp. v. 2), the dissimilarity at the same time existing between the two is rendered apparent by *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*. — *συμπαθεῖν*] *to have sympathy*, compassionate feeling. Comp. x. 34. Preliminary condition to bestowing succour and redemption. — *αἱ ἀσθένειαι ἡμῶν*] the conditions of human weakness, as well moral as physical, which have been called forth by the entrance of sin into the world. — *πεπειρασμένον δέ*] contains in the form of a correction of *μὴ δυνάμενον* the proof of the capacity for having sympathy. — *κατὰ πάντα*] Comp. ii. 17. — *καθ' ὁμοιότητα*] *sc. ἡμῶν* (comp. vii. 15: *κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδέκ*), or *ἡμῖν* (comp. Polyb. xiii. 7. 2: *Ἦν γὰρ εἶδωλον γυναικείον, πολυτελέσιν ἱματίοις ἡμφιεσμένον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μορφὴν εἰς ὁμοιότητα τῇ τοῦ Νάβιδος γυναικὶ διαφόρως ἀπειργασμένον*), or even *πρὸς ἡμᾶς* (comp. Philo,

¹ Incorrectly does Ebrard take ver. 15 as elucidation of *ἔχοντες ἀρχιερίαν*.

de Profugis, p. 458 A, with Mangey, I. p. 553: *κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τὰλλα ὁμοιότητα*): *in like (similar) manner as we.* — *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*] *without sin, i.e. without sin arising out of the temptations, or more clearly: without His being led into sinning, as a result of His being tempted.* Comp. vii. 26; 2 Cor. v. 21; 1 John iii. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 22. When Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 37) and Delitzsch will discover in these words the additional indication that *in the case of Jesus temptation also found no sin present*, this is indeed true as to the fact, but open to the misconception of being supposed to imply that even the possibility of sinning on the part of Jesus is denied, whereas surely this possibility in itself must be conceived of as an essential factor in the idea of being tempted; and opposed to the context, because *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* is the continued note of modality of *πεπειρασμένον*, and thus cannot possibly specify something that was already present, even before the *πειράζεσθαι* came in. More in accordance with the context, therefore, does Alford express himself: "Throughout these temptations, in their origin, in their process, in their result,—sin had nothing in Him: He was free and separate from it." Wrongly Jac. Cappellus, Calmet, Semler, Storr, Ernesti, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others: *tempted in all things, sin excepted.* For in that case *χωρὶς τῆς ἁμαρτίας* (with the article) would be written, and this be connected immediately with *κατὰ πάντα*. Mistaken, however, is also the explanation of Oecumenius, Schlichting, Dindorf: *without having committed sin, as a guiltless one*; an interpretation which would be admissible only if *πειράζεσθαι* could be referred specially to the enduring of outward sufferings, which might be seen to be a consequence of sin. — Comp., for the rest, on *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* likewise the kindred statements concerning the divine Logos in Philo, *de Profugis*, p. 466 B (with Mangey, I. p. 562): *Λέγομεν γάρ, τὸν ἀρχιερέα οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῖον εἶναι, πάντων οὐχ ἑκουσίων μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκουσίων ἀδικημάτων ἀμέτοχον.* — *Ibid.* p. 467 C (I. p. 563): *ἀμέτοχος γὰρ καὶ ἀπαράδεκτος παντὸς εἶναι πέφυκεν ἁμαρτήματος.*

Ver. 16. Encouragement, derived from the character of the High Priest of the New Testament, as brought into relief,

ver. 15. — *προσέρχεσθαι*] *approach, draw near*, in order to have community with something. Comp. vii. 25, x. 1, 22, xi. 6, xii. 18, 22. Too specially Delitzsch, Kurtz, and Ewald, who explain: drawing near in prayer for aid or succour. — *μετὰ παρρησίας*] *with confidence* (iii. 6), inasmuch as we possess, in the very office of intercessor, a High Priest who is not only exalted, but also full of sympathy, who thus has not only *the power*, but also *the will* to help. — *θρόνος τῆς χάριτος*] not: *Christ Himself* (Gerhard, S. Schmidt, Carpzov, Ernesti, *al.*), not: *the throne of Christ* (Primasius [also Tena, arguing from the Vulgate of ii. 9], Schlichting, Limborch, Chr. Fr. Schmid, *al.*), but *the throne of God*, at whose right hand Christ is seated. Comp. viii. 1, xii. 2 [Eph. ii. 18]. It is called, however, the throne of grace, because the nature of the New Covenant has, as its presupposition, not strictly judicial retribution, according to the works of men, but compassion and grace on the part of God; the believer feels himself united to God as a loving Father, who has remitted to him the guilt and punishment of sin. A reference for the rest to the cover of the ark of the covenant, regarded as the seat of the God-head in the sanctuary (the *הַכֹּהֵן* or *ἱλαστήριον* of the Old Covenant), assumed by Piscator, Schöttgen, Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Abresch, Kuinoel, Paulus, *al.*, and still in recent times by Bloomfield and Bisping (comp. also Kurtz *ad loc.*), in connection with the expression: *ὁ θρόνος τῆς χάριτος*, is not indicated by anything in the text. — To *obtain mercy and find grace* (Luke i. 30; Acts vii. 46; comp. *יְהוָה שָׁמַר*, Gen. vi. 8, xviii. 3, and frequently) are synonymous terms. All distinctions, as that of Böhme: *ἔλεος* magis id appellat, quo indigebant calamitatibus oppressi lectores, *χάρις*, quo peccatis non carentes; of Stein, that *ἔλεος* relates to compassion towards the sinner, *χάρις* to every manifestation of grace; of Bisping, that *ἔλεος* refers more to the forgiveness of sins and deliverance from sufferings, while *χάρις* refers to the communication of higher gifts of grace; of Hofmann, that *χάριν εὐρίσκειν* means “to be brought into a state of favour with any one, to become an object of his good-will;” *λαμβάνειν ἔλεος*, on the other hand, is “a receiving of that which the kind and gracious One accords to those in need of His kindness, just on account

of their need," and many others, are untenable. — *εἰς εὐκαιρον βοήθειαν*] *for timely help*, i.e. in order that we may in this manner attain to a help which appears on the scene, while it is still the right time, before it is yet too late (iii. 13). Wrongly Tholuck, Delitzsch, Moll, Kurtz, and Hofmann: "before the one in conflict with the temptations succumbs;" and others (also Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 740): "as often as we stand in need of the *βοήθεια*."

CHAPTER V.

VER. 1. Instead of the *Recepta* δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας, Lachm. and Tisch. 1 read merely δῶρα καὶ θυσίας. But the single testimony of B (D** ?)—for nothing is here to be inferred from the Latin versions—does not suffice for the condemnation of the particle. τε is protected by A C D*** (D*: τε δῶρα) E K L 8, of, as it appears, all the cursives, Epiph. and many others. Cf. also Heb. viii. 3, ix. 9. — Ver. 3. Elz.: διὰ ταύτην. Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, *al.*: δι' αὐτήν. To be preferred on account of the better attestation by A B C* D* 8, 7, 80, *al.*, Syr. utr. Chrys. ms. Cyril. Theodoret (*alic.*). — Instead of the *Recepta* ἐαυτοῦ, there is placed in the text by Lachm., after B D*, αὐτοῦ; by Tisch. 1, αὐτοῦ. — But ἐαυτοῦ is found in A C D*** E K L 8, almost all min., and many Fathers, and is on that account to be retained, with Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, and others. — The preference over the *Recepta* ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν (supported by C*** D*** E K L, the majority of the min. Chrys. Theodoret *ad loc.*, *al.*; defended by Bleek, and more recently by Bloomfield and Reiche) is merited by the reading περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, already commended to attention by Griesbach; adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, with the assent of Delitzsch and Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 434), partly on account of the stronger attestation by A B C* D* 8, 17, 31, 47, 73, 118, Chrys. codd. Theodoret (*semel*), partly because περὶ might easily, on account of the περὶ placed twice before, be altered into ὑπὲρ, in conformity with ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, ver. 1. — Ver. 4. ἀλλὰ καλοῦμενος] So rightly already the Editt. Complut. and Plantin.; in like manner Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, after the preponderating authority of A B C* D E K 8, 23, 37, 44, *al. plur.*, Chrys. Damasc. Procop. Oecum. The article added in the *Recepta*: ἀλλὰ ὁ καλοῦμενος, is not only badly attested (C** L, Constitutt. apostoll., Theodoret, Theophylact), but also unsuitable, since not a new subject in opposition to the unemphatic τις is required by the context, but an antithetic nearer defining in opposition to the significant ὅτι

ἰαυτῶν. — Instead of the *Recepta* καθάπερ (C** D*** E K L S*** Theodoret), approved by Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Bloomfield, *al.*, Lachm., after C* (?) Chrys. Procop. reads: καθώς; Tisch., with Alford, after A B D* S* Damasc.: καθόσπερ. The last, in favour of which Delitzsch also declares himself, deserves the preference as the best attested, and as most in keeping with the predilection of the author for harmonious combinations. — The article ὁ before Ἀαρὼν in the *Recepta* was already with justice deleted in the edit. Complut., and later by Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford, and others. Against it decides the weighty authority of A B C D E K L S, many min. and Fathers. — Ver. 9. Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield: τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ πᾶσιν! But preponderating witnesses (A B C D E S, 17, 37, *al.*, Syr. utr. Copt. It. Vulg. Vigil. Cassiod. Chrys. Cyril, Theodoret, Damasc. Theophyl.) require the order: πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ. Already recommended by Griesbach. Adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Alford. Approved also by Delitzsch. The sequence of the words in the *Recepta* is a later alteration, in order to bring out the more noticeably the paronomasia of τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν with the foregoing τὴν ὑπακοήν. — Ver. 12. καὶ ὁ στερῆς προφῆς] So Elz. Lachm. Bloomfield, Alford, *al.*; while Tisch. 2, 7, and 8 has, after B** C, 17, S* Copt. Vulg. Orig. (thrice) Cyril, Chrys. ms. Aug. Bede, only ὁ στερῆς προφῆς. But καὶ is protected by A B* D E K L S*** the majority of the min., many versions, and several Fathers.

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

Vv. 1-3. *The first qualification*: the capacity, as man, who himself is subject to human weakness, to deal leniently with erring humanity. To what extent and under what modification this characteristic of the earthly high priest is applicable also to Christ, is not discussed by the author in our passage. This might appear remarkable, since with respect to the *second* necessary qualification of the earthly high priest, further added ver. 4, the parallel relation in the case of Christ is expounded in detail from ver. 5 onwards. But yet there was no need of an express application to Christ, of that which was observed vv. 1-3. What the author had had to say with regard to this was already clear to the readers from the earlier disquisitions of the epistle itself. The element of the homogeneity of Christ

with the Jewish high priest, namely, that He, like the Jewish high priest, can have sympathy with sinful man, since He had become in all points like unto men His brethren, had been fully traced out in the second chapter, and attention is called anew to it in iv. 15 by the *δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν* and *πεπειρασμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοίότητα*. The element of the dissimilarity, on the other hand, namely, that while the Jewish high priest had to offer for his own sins, Christ was without sin, is first brought prominently forward in iv. 15 by means of *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*, and, besides this, followed already from the exalted position the author had, in the opening chapters of the epistle, assigned to Christ as the Son of God.—That, in reality, also the paragraph vv. 7–10, no less than vv. 5, 6, is subordinate to the second main consideration, expressed ver. 4, has been denied, it is true, by Beza, Schlichting, Hammond, Limborch, Storr, Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, and others. They are of opinion that from ver. 5 onwards an application of all the statements, vv. 1–4, to Christ ensues; that this, however, takes place in inverse order, so that vv. 5, 6 refer back to ver. 4, vv. 7, 8 to ver. 2, and finally, vv. 9, 10 to ver. 1. The untenable character of such opinion is self-evident. For—(1) vv. 7, 8 cannot have the design of applying to Christ that which was observed ver. 2, because only the parenthetic clause of ver. 7 (*δεήσεις . . . εὐλαβείας*) adapts itself to any extent to the contents of ver. 2, and this parenthetic clause stands in logical subordination to ver. 8 as the main point of the argument, consequently just ver. 8 and ver. 2 must present a similarity of contents, which is not the case. (2) That vv. 9, 10 should be referred back to ver. 1 cannot be accepted as correct, because ver. 1 forms in itself no independent and complete statement, but stands in closest concatenation with ver. 2, so that only with this verse comes in what is for ver. 1 the all-essential point of nearer definition.—From the foregoing it results that the harmonizing view of Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 444, 447) is unwarranted. According to this view, vv. 7, 8 are indeed, “in the first place,” or “formally,” a link in the demonstration that Christ did not become high priest by an act of arbitrary self-glorification, but as regards

the "contents" or "tenor" form, "at the same time also an indication corresponding to vv. 1-3, and pointing out that Christ upon His path of suffering has passed through experiences which were adapted not only to make Him acquainted with the human *ἀσθένεια*, but also to prove in Him the capacity for the *μετριοπάθεια*." — With Tholuck, for the rest, to take vv. 1-3 still in relation to the preceding chapter, as an antithesis to ver. 15, and to begin a new section with ver. 4, is not permissible. For a comparison of the main contents of vv. 1-3 with the main contents of iv. 15, points to the fact that the author designs to bring out a relation of resemblance and affinity. We cannot possibly, therefore, attach, with Tholuck, to the particle *γάρ*, v. 1, the sense: "the distinction namely arises, that." The consideration, moreover, presents itself, that ver. 4 can only appear in relation to vv. 1-3, alike as regards tenor of contents as with regard to its lax grammatical nexus, as a further co-ordinate link in an enumeration, before begun, of the qualifications essential to the character of every earthly high priest, consequently is not appropriate to the introduction of a section entirely separated from that which precedes.

Vv. 1, 2. Justification of the *δύνασθαι συμπαθεῖν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν*, iv. 15, as a necessary qualification in the case of Christ, since it is an indispensable requirement even in every earthly high priest. *γάρ* does not glance back to iv. 16, as is maintained by Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 395) and Delitzsch. For v. 1-3 can in point of contents be taken neither as enforcement nor as elucidation of the admonition, iv. 16. The supposition of Hofmann and Delitzsch, however, that *γάρ* logically controls the whole section, v. 1-10, is arbitrary, inasmuch as ver. 4 ff. is logically and grammatically bounded off from vv. 1-3, and the assertion that the aim in the section, v. 1-10, is to enforce the exhortation, iv. 16, by a reminder "of the nature of the high-priesthood of Jesus, how on the one hand it bears resemblance to that of Aaron, and on the other hand to the priesthood of Melchisedec" (Hofmann), or of the "blending of Aaronitic humanity (tenderness) with the Melchisedecian dignity in the person of Jesus" (Delitzsch), is entirely erroneous; because, vv. 5-10, Aaron

and Melchisedec are not yet at all distinguished from each other as the lower and the higher; but, on the contrary, this relation—in which the one stands to the other—is for the present left wholly in abeyance, and all that is insisted on is the fact that Christ, even as Aaron, was called *by God* to the high-priesthood, and that a high-priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec. — *πᾶς*] refers, as is evident from *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος*, and from ver. 3, to the *earthly*, *i.e.* the Levitical, *high priest*. Wrongly, because going beyond the necessity of the case and the horizon of the epistle, Grotius (comp. also Peirce): *Non tantum legem hic respicit, sed et morem ante legem, quum aut primo geniti familiarum aut a populis electi reges inirent sacerdotium*. But neither is *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος* a part of the subject (“every high priest taken from among men, in opposition to the heavenly One;” Luther, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Akersloot, Peirce, Wetstein, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Abresch, Kuinoel, Paulus, Stengel, comp. also Tholuck). —for then the order *πᾶς γὰρ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος ἀρχιερεύς* would have been chosen,—nor is it intended “to lay stress upon the phenomenon, in itself remarkable, that the high priest has to represent men, who are thus his equals, in their relation to God” (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 396, 2 Aufl.),—for thereby a reference altogether foreign to the connection is introduced, and the thought thus presupposed is itself a singular one, because, so far from its being remarkable, it is, on the contrary, natural and appropriate that like should be represented by its like; it would be remarkable and unnatural if, for instance, a man should represent angels,—but it contains a note of cause to *ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται*. The twice occurring *ἀνθρώπων* stands full of emphasis, and presents a correspondence between the two. By the *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος* the *ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται* is explained and justified. For the very reason that the high priest is taken from among men, is he also appointed or installed in his office as mediator with God. — *καθίσταται*] not *mildly*, so that *τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν* were accusative of object thereto (Calvin: *Curat pontifex vel ordinat, quae ad Deum pertinent*; Kypke), but *passive*, so that *τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, as ii. 17, is to be taken as an accusative absolute. — *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*] *epexegetic amplifica-*

tion of *ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*. — *δῶρα* [קָדָשׁ, מִנְחָה] and *θυσίαι* are properly distinguished as gifts and sacrifices of every kind, and bloody sacrifices. The distinction, however, is not always observed. Comp. e.g. LXX. Lev. ii. 1 ff., Num. v. 15 ff., Gen. iv. 3, 5, where *θυσία* is used of unbloody sacrifices; and Gen. iv. 4, Lev. i. 2, 3, 10, *al.*, where *δῶρα* is used of bloody sacrifices. In our passage the author has, without doubt, specially the bloody sacrifices in mind; as, accordingly, in the course of the epistle he opposes the sacrifice presented by Christ to the Levitical victims in particular. — *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν* i.e. *for the expiation thereof*. It belongs not merely to *θυσίας* (Grotius, Limborch, Bengel, Dindorf) or to *δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας* (Owen, Alford), but to the whole clause of the design.

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

¹ When for the rest Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 396, 2 Aufl.) supposes that for the expression of this relation of thought only *καθίσταται* . . . *ἵνα προσφέρειν* could be chosen, and not *καθίσταται* . . . *εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν*, since the latter would "only be a declaration of the vocation" of the high priest, while the former "can take to itself the participial clause *μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος*, and thereby signify to what end it serves in the exercise of his office, that he has been in this way appointed thereto," this is grammatically altogether baseless. Either turn of discourse was equally open to the choice of the author. Only, in case the latter was chosen, the nominative *δυνάμενος* must naturally be changed into the accusative *δυνάμενον*.

but expresses a kindred notion. It is by virtue of its composition equivalent to *μετρίως* or *κατὰ τὸ μέτρον πᾶσχειν*, and is accordingly used of the moderating of one's passions and feelings, as opposed to an unbridled surrender thereto, but also as opposed to that absolute *ἀπάθεια* which the Stoics demanded of the sage. Comp. Diogen. Laert. v. 31: *ἔφη δέ* (*sc.* Aristotle), *τὸν σοφὸν μὴ εἶναι μὲν ἀπαθῆ, μετριοπαθῆ δέ*. Further instances in Wetstein and Bleek. Here the moderation or tenderness in the judgment formed upon the errors of one's neighbour is intended, as this is wont to arise from a sympathy with the unhappiness of the same which is produced by sin. Thus: *to be tenderly disposed or equitable*. — *τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν καὶ πλανωμένοις*] Dativus commodi: *in consideration of the ignorant and erring*. Lenient designation of sinners. Perhaps, however, designedly chosen (comp. also ix. 7: *ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων*) in order to bring into relief only one species of sins, the sins of precipitancy and without premeditation, inasmuch as according to the Mosaic law the sacrificial expiation extended only to those who had sinned *ἀκουσίως*; those, on the other hand, who had sinned deliberately and with forethought were to be cut off from the congregation of Jehovah, Num. xv. 22–31; Lev. iv. 13 ff. — *ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περίκειται ἀσθένειαν*] Confirmation of the *δυνάμενος*: *since he indeed himself is encircled* (as with a garment) *by weakness* (altogether beset with it). *ἀσθένεια* is to be understood, as vii. 28, of the *ethical* weakness, thus also actual sin, comprehended under this expression; comp. ver. 3. — The construction *περίκειμαί τι*, which in the N. T. occurs likewise Acts xxviii. 20, is genuine Greek; comp. Theocrit. *Idyll.* xxiii. 14: *ὑβριν τᾶς ὀργᾶς περικείμενος*; Kühner, *Gramm.* II. p. 231; Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 215.

Ver. 3. Logical consequence from the second half of ver. 2. The words form a merely incidental observation. They would be on that account better regarded as an independent statement than, with de Wette, Delitzsch, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 397), and Woerner, thought of as still dependent on *ἐπεὶ*, ver. 2. — *δι' αὐτήν*] *sc.* *ἀσθένειαν*. Quite untrue is the assertion that the feminine is used Hebraistically instead of the neuter, which even Bengel and others, with a mistaken

appeal to Matt. xxi. 42 (see Meyer *ad loc.*), still hold to be possible. — *ὀφείλει*] Reference not, as is supposed by Böhme and Hofmann, *i.e.*, to the precept in the law of Moses (Lev. iv. 3, ix. 7, xvi. 6, *al.*), but, as ii. 17, to the inner necessity arising from the nature of the case. Non-natural the view of Delitzsch and Moll, that *both alike* are intended. — *προσφέρειν*] stands, as Luke v. 14, Num. vii. 18, *absolutely*. With Rielm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 434), to look upon *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν* as definition of object to *προσφέρειν* is inadmissible, inasmuch as only the singular form *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is employed to indicate the notion of “sin-offering” with the LXX., as also in our epistle. Comp. Reiche, *Commentarius Criticus ad loc.* p. 35.

Ver. 4. *The second necessary qualification*: to be no usurper of the office, but one called of God to the same. — *καί*] Progress, not from ver. 3, nor yet from ver. 1, in such wise that *λαμβάνει*, ver. 4, should form a paronomasia with *λαμβανόμενος*, ver. 1 (Böhme, Bleek, Disping, Alford, Maier), but from vv. 1–3. — *And not to himself does any one take the honour* (here under consideration), *i.e.* not any one appropriates or arrogates to himself the high-priestly dignity on his own authority. Comp. Xiphilinus, *Gall.* p. 187: *νομίζων οὐκ εἰληφέναι τὴν ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ δεδόσθαι αὐτῷ*. — *ἀλλὰ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*] *sc.* *λαμβάνει αὐτήν*, he receives it. The *λαμβάνει* here to be supplied has consequently—what is wrongly denied by Delitzsch, Hofmann, and Woerner—another notion than the *λαμβάνει* before placed. This diversity of notion, nevertheless, comes out more strongly in German, where two different verbs must be chosen to indicate it, than in Greek, where one and the same verb combines both significations in itself. — *καθὼς περ καὶ Ἀαρὼν*] *sc.* *κληθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτήν εἰληφεν*. These words still belong to that which precedes. They are unnaturally referred by Paulus to the sequel, as its protasis. — Aaron and his descendants were, according to Ex. xxviii. 1, xxix. 4 ff., Lev. viii. 1 ff., Num. iii. 10, xvi.–xviii., called by God Himself to the high-priesthood. Comp. *Bammitbar rabba*, sec. 18, fol. 234. 4 (in Schöttgen and Wetstein): Moses ad Corachum ejusque socios dixit: si Aaron frater meus sibimet ipsi sacerdotium sumsit, recte egistis, quod contra

ipsum insurrexistis; jam vero Deus id ipsi dedit, cujus est magnitudo et potentia et regnum. Quicumque igitur contra Aaronem surgit, contra ipsum Deum surgit. Not until the time of Herod and the Roman governors were high priests arbitrarily appointed and deposed, without respect to their descent from Aaron. Comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. 10. 5; Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterb.* I. p. 591, 2 Aufl. That, however, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Abresch, and others conjecture, the author intended by the words of ver. 4 at the same time to indicate that the high priests of that period were no longer true high priests at all, since they had acquired their office at the hand of men, and in the way of venality, is not very probable, inasmuch as the author would otherwise have expressed himself more clearly with regard thereto.

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

Ver. 5. In like manner also Christ appointed not Himself to be High Priest, but God the Father has appointed Him. The main emphasis in the verse falls upon οὐχ ἑαυτὸν . . . ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας. With Hofmann for the rest (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 398, 2 Aufl.), to take the opening words of the verse: οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός, separately as an independent clause, is not warranted on any ground. οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γεννηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα] *He did not glorify* (comp. John viii. 54) *Himself* (arbitrarily encircle Himself with honour and glory) *in order to be made a high priest.* — ἐδόξασεν] is to be taken quite generally, so that it first acquires its nearer definition and completion, under the form of the intention, by means of γεννηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 298. The referring of the verb, with de Wette, specially to the glorification, mentioned ii. 9, is forbidden by the parallel relation to ver. 4, in that οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γεννηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα manifestly corresponds exactly to the foregoing statement, οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμὴν. On account of this parallel relationship in itself, clearly indicated as it is above by the οὕτως καί, is the view of Hofmann too (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 398 f. 2 Aufl.) entirely erroneous, namely, that οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν acquires its nearer defining of signification from vv. 7, 8, in that this relative clause

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

Ver. 6 now introduces the proof from Scripture that Christ, the Son of God, has also been appointed High Priest. — *καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει]* as He (*sc.* God) accordingly speaks in another place of Scripture (namely Ps. cx. 4; comp. Heb. i. 13). — *καί]* belongs not to *ἐν ἑτέρῳ*, so that we should have to assume that the author has already found in the citation, ver. 5, a Scripture proof for the high-priesthood of Christ,

and now in ver. 6 is adding thereto a second Scripture proof for the same thing (Schlichting, Ebrard, and others), but it belongs to the whole relative clause *καθὼς λέγει*, and is just the ordinary *καί* after a particle of comparison; comp. ver. 4. By means of this correct apprehension of the force of *καί* the objection is further set aside, that ver. 6, if a Scripture proof was first to be given in this place, must have been joined on to that which precedes simply with *λέγων*, as ii. 6, iv. 7, or with *μαρτυρεῖ γάρ*, as vii. 17 (Abresch), or with *λέγει γάρ*, or at least with *καθὼς* without *καί* (Ebrard). — *ἐν ἑτέρῳ*] See on *ἐν τούτῳ*, iv. 5. — *ἱερεύς*] for the author equivalent to *ἀρχιερεύς*; comp. ver. 10, vi. 20. This equalization is likewise warranted. For Melchisedec (Gen. xiv. 18 ff.), with whom the person addressed is compared, was at the same time king and priest; but with the attributes of a king the attributes of an ordinary priest are irreconcilable; the character sustained by a superior or high priest alone comports therewith. — *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ*] not: in the time of succession (Schulz), but: *after the order or manner* (על־דְּבָרָהּ) of Melchisedec, in such wise that thou obtainest the same position, the same character, as he possessed. Comp. vii. 15: *κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδέκ*. — *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*] the author combines (contrary to the sense of the original) with *ἱερεύς* into a single idea, comp. vii. 3, 8.

Vv. 7–10. Further proof—accessory to the Scripture testimony, ver. 6—that Christ did not on His own authority usurp to Himself the high-priesthood, but was invested with the same by God. Far removed from all self-exaltation, He displayed in His earthly life the most perfect obedience towards God. In consequence thereof He became, after His consummation and glorification, the Procurer (*Vermittler*) of everlasting blessedness for all believers, and was appointed by God High Priest after the manner of Melchisedec. — We have to reject the explanation—mainly called forth by the expression *προσενέγκας* (compared with vv. 1 and 3)—of Schlichting, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Limborch, Akersloot, Cramer, Baumgarten, Heinrichs, Böhme, Klee, Bloomfield, and others, according to which the design in vv. 7–10 is to show that Christ already discharged the functions of the high-

priestly office during His earthly life, in that He offered prayers as sacrifices to God. For evidently the main gist of vv. 7-10 lies in the words of ver. 8: *ἐμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν*, to which the statements vv. 9, 10 attach themselves only for the completion of the figure traced out vv. 7, 8, and for leading back to ver. 6. But by the fact that Christ manifested obedience, it cannot by any means be shown that He was already executing the office of High Priest. — Quite mistaken also is the opinion of Kurtz, that, vv. 7-10, a "third requirement of the Levitical high-priesthood, namely, *obedience to the will of Him that founded it*" (?), is shown to be satisfied in Christ. For neither does the form of the grammatical annexing of ver. 7 to that which precedes point in any way to the conclusion that the author designed to string on to the two necessary qualifications of the earthly high priest yet a third one of equal value; nor, as regards the import, is anything else to be found in vv. 7, 8 than a wider unfolding of the foregoing statement, *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδοξάσεν γεννηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα*, ver. 5.

Ver. 7. "Ὅς] refers back to the last main idea, thus to *ὁ Χριστός*, ver. 5. The *tempus finitum* belonging thereto is *ἐμαθεν*, ver. 8, in that vv. 7-10 form a single period, resolving itself into two co-ordinate statements (*ὃς ἐμαθεν . . . καὶ ἐγένετο*). To connect the *ὃς* first with *ἐγένετο*, ver. 9 (so Abresch, Dindorf, Heinrichs, Stengel, and others), is impossible, since ver. 8 cannot be taken as a parenthesis. — *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*] *in the days of His flesh*, i.e. during the time of His earthly life. Theodoret: *Ἡμέρας δὲ σαρκὸς τὸν τῆς θνητότητος ἔφη καιρόν, τουτέστιν ἡνίκα θνητὸν εἶχε τὸ σῶμα*. On the whole expression, comp. ii. 14; on *αἱ ἡμέραι*, in the more general sense of *ὁ χρόνος*, x. 32, xii. 10. False, because opposed to the current linguistic use of *σάρξ* (Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. x. 3; Phil. i. 22, 24; 1 Pet. iv. 2, *al.*), and because *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ* obtains its opposition in *τελειωθείς*, ver. 9, — whereby, in general, the period of Christ's life of humiliation is contrasted with the period of His life of exaltation, — Schlichting: what is specially meant is "*tempus infirmitatis Christi, et praesertim illud, quo infirmitas ejus maxime apparuit . . . dies illi, quibus Christus*

est passus." The note of time: ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, however, is to be construed with the main verb ἔμαθεν, not with the participles προσενέγκας καὶ εἰσακουσθεῖς, which latter form a simply parenthetic clause. — As the occasion of this parenthetic clause δεήσεις . . . εὐλαβείας, — in connection with which we have neither, with Theophylact, Peirce, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Maier, Kurtz, and others, to derive the colouring of the linguistic expression from the author's having respect to certain utterances of the Psalms (as Ps. xxii. 25 [24], *ibid.* ver. 3 [2], cxvi. 1 ff.), nor with Braun, Akersloot, Böhme, *al.*, to suppose a reference to the loud praying of the Jewish high priest on the great day of atonement; neither is there an underlying comparison, as Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 399 f. 2 Aufl.) strangely supposes, of the supplication of Jesus, which He before (:) the learning of obedience offered for Himself as a sacrifice on account of weakness (:), with the sin-offering which, according to ver. 3, the Levitical high priest had on this day to present for himself before he could yet offer on behalf of the people, — the author has present to his mind, according to the prevailing and, beyond doubt, *correct* view, the prayer of Christ in Gethsemane, as this was made known to him by oral or written tradition. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 36 ff.; Mark xiv. 32 ff.; Luke xxii. 39 ff. It is true we do not read in our Gospels that Christ at that time prayed to God μετὰ δακρύων. But, considering the great emotion of mind on the part of the Saviour, which is also described in the account given by our evangelists (comp. in particular, Matt. xxvi. 37: ἤρξατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν; Mark xiv. 33: ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν; Luke xxii. 44: καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσήυχετο· ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ ἰδρώς αὐτοῦ ὥσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν), that fact has nothing improbable about it; comp. also Luke xix. 41; John xi. 35. On account of the addition μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς, others will have us understand *the loud crying of Christ upon the cross* (Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34), either, as Calvin, Cornelius a Lapide, Piscator, Owen, Limborch, Schulz, Stein, Stuart, Delitzsch, *besides the prayer in Gethsemane*, or, as Cajetan, Estius, Calov, Hammond, Kurtz, *exclusively*, or even,

as Klee, *the last cry, with which He departed* (Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark xv. 37; Luke xxiii. 46). The supposition of such references we cannot, with de Wette (comp. also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 70 f. 2 Aufl.), characterize as "entirely unsuitable." For de Wette's objection, that the author "manifestly regarded the prayer as the preparation and condition of the *ἔμαθε*," that it must "thus precede the suffering," does not apply, since *προσενέγκας* is not to be resolved into "after," but into "in that," or "inasmuch as." Not as "preparation and condition of the *ἔμαθε*" is the prayer looked upon by the author, but rather is the historic fact of the fervent prayer of Christ mentioned by him as an evidence that Christ in reality submitted Himself to God, even in the severest sufferings. For that which Hofmann (*l.c.* p. 67) objects hereto, that the author, if he had meant this, would have written: *μαθὼν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοὴν δέησεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας προσήνεγκεν*, is devoid of sense; because, by means of such a transposition, that which is merely a secondary statement would be made the main statement. Yet the supposing of such references is not necessary, since also the plural *δέησεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας*, to which appeal has been made, is sufficiently explained by the repetitions of the prayer in the garden of Gethsemane. — To *ἱκετηρία*, which conjoined with *δέησις* further occurs LXX. Job xl. 22 [27], as also with the classic writers, *εὐλαία* or *ῥάβδος* (not *κλάδος*) is originally to be supplemented, inasmuch as it denotes the olive branch which the suppliant pleading for protection bore in his hand. Later it acquired like signification with *ἱκετεία* or *ἱκεσία*. It implies thus the prostrate or urgent entreaty of one seeking refuge. As an intensifying of *δέησις* it is rightly placed after this. — *πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου*] is most naturally referred to *προσενέγκας* (so Calvin, Abresch, *al.*). To the connecting with *δέησεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας* (Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll) we are forced neither by the position before *μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς*, nor by the fact of the combination of *προσφέρειν* with the dative being chosen elsewhere in the epistle (ix. 14, xi. 4), as it is also the more usual one with classical writers, since likewise the conjoining with

πρός is nothing out of the way. Comp. *e.g.* Polyb. iv. 51. 2: προσενεγκάμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἀχαιῶν (equivalent to τῷ Ἀχαιῷ) τὴν χάριν ταύτην. In the characteristic of God as the One who was able to deliver Christ from death, there lies, at the same time, the indication of that which Christ implored of God. σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου, however, may denote one of two things, either: *to save from death*, in such wise that it needs not to be undergone, thus to preserve from death, or: *to save out of the death* to which one is exposed, so that one does not remain the prey of death, but is restored to life. In favour of the former interpretation seems to plead the fact that Christ, according to the account in the Gospels, in reality prayed that He might be spared the suffering of death. Nevertheless what decides against this, and in favour of the second, is the consideration, in the first place, that Christ in reality still suffered death, and then the addition in our verse that the prayer of Christ was answered. And then, finally, we have to take into account the fact that, according to our Gospels also, Christ does not pray *absolutely* to be preserved from death, but makes this His wish dependent upon the will of the Father, thus entirely subordinates Himself to the Father. — καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας] *and being heard by reason of His piety*, or fear of God. In this sense is εὐλάβεια (cf. xii. 28) rightly taken by Chrysostom, Photius, Oecumenius, Theophylact, the Vulgate (*pro sua reverentia*), Vigil. Taps., Primasius, Lyra, Luther, Castellio, Camerarius, Estius, Casaubon, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Calmet, Rambach, Heinrichs, Schulz, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 327), Alford, Reuss, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others.¹ ἀπό, as an indication of the occasioning cause, is also of very frequent occurrence elsewhere; cf. Matt. xxviii. 4; Luke xix. 3, xxiv. 41; John xxi. 6; Acts xii. 14, xx. 9, xxii. 11; Kühner, *Gramm.* II. p. 270. Christ, however, was heard in His prayer, inasmuch as He was raised

¹ In this explanation Linden on Heb. v. 7-9 (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, H. 4, p. 753 ff.) likewise concurs, only he would have ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας separated by a comma from that which precedes, and taken in conjunction with that which follows. This construction, however, is not natural, inasmuch as ἑμαυτὸν already has a nearer definition before and after it, and the linguistic symmetry with the foregoing participial clause is destroyed by the εἰσακουσθεὶς standing alone.

out of death, exalted to the right hand of God, and made partaker of the divine glory. To be rejected is the explanation of the word preferred by Ambrose, Calvin, Beza, Cameron, Scaliger, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Hammond, Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Wetstein, Whitby, Carpzov, Abresch, Böhme, Kuinoel, Paulus, Klee, Stuart, Stein, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt *A. K.-Z.* 1857, No. 29, p. 665), Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 69, 2 Aufl.), and many others, according to which a pregnancy of meaning is assumed for the same, and *εὐλάβεια* is interpreted in the sense of "metus:" "*heard (and delivered) from the fear.*" There is then found expressed in it either the thought (and this is the common acceptance) that Christ was delivered from His agony of soul by the strengthening on the part of the angel, Luke xxii. 43, or *εὐλάβεια* is understood by metonymy of the object of the fear, *i.e.* death, from which Christ was delivered by the resurrection. So, among others, Calvin: "exauditum fuisse Christum ex eo, quod timebat, ne scilicet malis obrutus succumberet, vel morte absorberetur;" and Schlichting: "a metu *i. e.* ab eo, quod metuebat, nimirum morte." But against the first modification of this view pleads the fact that the being heard must refer to the same thing as that for which Christ had prayed, but from that which precedes it is evident that Christ had besought God not for deliverance from the agony of soul, but for deliverance from death. Against both modifications pleads the fact that the strong signification of *fear* is never expressed by *εὐλάβεια*. Only the mild signification of *timidity* or *awe* (whether reverential awe of the Godhead, *i.e.* piety, or shyness of earthly things), as well as the notion arising from that of timidity, namely heedfulness, discretion, circumspectness in arranging that which is adapted to the bringing about of a definite result, lies in the word; as accordingly also the Greeks themselves, particularly the Stoics, expressly distinguished from each other *φόβος* and *εὐλάβεια*, and pronounced *φόβος* to be worthy of reprobation; *εὐλάβεια*, on the other hand, to be a duty. See the instances in Bleek. Nor do the passages anew adduced by Grimm, *i.e.*, Wisd. xvii. 3, 2 Macc. viii. 16, Eccles. xli. 3, in which the word is

supposed to be used in the sense of *fear*, and the demonstrative force of which is acknowledged by Delitzsch (p. 190, and *Observv. and Correctt.*), Riehm (*l.c.*), and Moll, prove what they are thought to prove. For in the first-mentioned passage we have to understand by *κατεγέλαστος εὐλάβεια* the perverted, idolatrous, and therefore ridiculous religious awe of the Egyptian magicians; the second passage is only a dissuasive against standing in any awe of the outward superiority in force of the hostile army; and the third, finally, against feeling any awe of death, since this is the common lot of all men. The notion of mere awe, however, is, on account of the preceding strong expressions, *μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων*, unsuited to our passage.¹ In addition to this, the assumed *constructio praeognans* in connection with a verb like *εἰσακουσθῆναι* is, in any case, open to doubt, and is not yet at all justified by the alleged parallels which have been adduced, namely Ps. xxii. 22 [21] (יְהוָה יִשְׁמָעֵנִי יְהוָה יִשְׁמָעֵנִי, which, however, the LXX. did not understand, and reproduced without pregnancy); LXX. Job xxxv. 12 (ἐκεῖ κεκράζονται καὶ οὐ μὴ εὔσακούσῃ [καὶ] ἀπὸ ὕβρεως πονηρῶν, where, however, ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ., as in the Hebrew, refers back to the first verb); Ps. cxviii. 5 (καὶ ἐπήκουσέ μου εἰς πλατυσμὸν κύριος); Heb. x. 22 (ἐρβραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς). — The addition καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας contains, for the rest, logically regarded, merely a parenthetic remark, called forth only by the contents of the foregoing participial clause.

Ver. 8. *Καίπερ ὦν υἱός*] belongs together. With Heinrichs and others, to construe *καίπερ* with *ἔμαθεν*, and in this way to enclose ver. 8 within a parenthesis, is forbidden by the

¹ According to Tholuck, the author has before his mind the first petition of the Redeemer in prayer at Gethsemane, the petition with εἰ δυνατόν, in which is expressed a condition of "lingering hesitancy," of "detrectatio" (!), which also according to him εὐλάβεια exactly indicates. From this hesitancy, which with the Redeemer continued just so long as He was absorbed in an abstract manner in the greatness of the impending suffering, He was delivered. Thus, it is true, the first prayer uttered in this condition remained unfulfilled, but it was certainly annulled in the second, wherein His own will had become perfectly harmonized with the divine will. So Tholuck. But neither does εὐλάβεια ever signify "lingering hesitancy" (not even in Plutarch, *Fab. Mar.* c. 1, where it denotes nothing more than caution or wariness).

grammar, since *καίπερ* is never combined with a tempus finitum. *καίπερ ὦν υἱός*, however, is to be connected neither, by virtue of an hyperbaton, with *δεήσεις . . . προσενέγκας*, which Photius (in Oecumenius) and Clarius consider permissible, but which is already shown to be impossible by means of the addition *καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας*, nor yet with *καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας* itself (Chrysostom, Theophylact). For against the latter *καίπερ* is decisive, according to which the property of Sonship is insisted on as something in consequence of which the main statement might appear strange; it is not, however, strange, but, on the contrary, congruent with nature, if any one is heard by the Father on account of his sonship. *καίπερ ὦν υἱός* belongs, therefore, to *ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν*, and serves to bring the same into relief by way of contrast. Notwithstanding the fact that Christ was a Son, He learned from suffering (learned, in that He suffered) obedience, resignation to the will of the Father. Comp. Phil. ii. 6-8. — The article before *ὑπακοήν* marks the definite virtue of obedience. The article here cannot denote, as Hofmann will maintain (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 72, 2 Aufl.), the obedience "already present," or the obedience "in which Jesus stood." For, on the one hand, there must then have been previous mention of the obedience of Jesus, which is not the case; and then, on the other hand, we cannot any longer predicate the *learning* of a virtue of one in whom this virtue is already present. But altogether, that which Hofmann brings out as the import of ver. 8 is a wonderful *Quid pro quo*. Instead of recognising, to wit, in vv. 7, 8 the sharply and clearly defined leading statement: *ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ . . . ἔμαθεν . . . τὴν ὑπακοήν*, in itself, and in its simply confirmatory relation to *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν*, ver. 5, Hofmann will have the stress to be laid upon the subsidiary defining note *ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν*, and then, moreover, make the whole weight of the words: *καίπερ ὦν υἱός*, fall upon that same *ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν*! In this way the thought expressed in ver. 8 is, forsooth: that Jesus afterwards (!) suffered that (!) for the averting of which He had made entreaty. The special point is not that He learnt anything as Son, nor that He learnt obedience (?). He did not learn to

obey, but the obedience in which He stood, He now (!) or in a new manner (!) so learnt, as it should there (!) be exercised, where (!) it was a question (!) of suffering. And this is to be taken as the meaning, in spite of the fact—apart from all other arbitrary assumptions—that we have ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν written, and not even ἐν οἷς ἔπαθεν, which at least must be expected as a support for such an exposition as that? — ἔμαθεν] The *disposition* of obedience Christ possessed even before the suffering. But this needed, in order to become vouched for, to be tested in action. And this continued development of the disposition of obedience into the act of obedience is nothing else than a practical learning of the virtue of obedience. — ἀπό with μαρτυρεῖν, as Matt. xxiv. 32, xi. 29, denoting the starting-point. — ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν] well-known attraction in place of ἀπ' ἐκείνων ἃ ἔπαθεν. — The combination ἔμαθεν . . . ἔπαθεν is also of frequent occurrence with the classic writers and with Philo. Comp. Herod. i. 207: τὰ δέ μοι παθήματα, ὄντα ἀχάριστα, μαθήματα γέγονεν; Soph. *Trach.* 142 f.: ὡς δ' ἐγὼ θυμοφθορῶ, μήτ' ἐκμάθοις παθοῦσα; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* iii. 1. 17: πάθημα ἄρα τῆς ψυχῆς σὺ λέγεις εἶναι τὴν σωφροσύνην, ὥσπερ λύπην, οὐ μύθημα; Philo, *de speciall. legg.* 6 (with Mangey, II. p. 340): ἴν' ἐκ τοῦ παθεῖν μάθη. Many other instances in Wetstein.

Ver. 9. Καὶ τελειωθείς] *and being brought to consummation*, i.e. being crowned with glory by His exaltation to heaven (comp. ii. 9, 10), sc. in consequence of the obedience to God proved by His sufferings and death. — ἐγένετο] *He became*. Author and Mediator of everlasting blessedness for His believers, Christ certainly was even during His earthly life. But in an eminent manner, because formally and manifestly accredited by God as such, He became so first by His resurrection and exaltation. — πᾶσιν] perhaps added in order to indicate the equal claim of the believing Gentiles also, to the salvation in Christ. — τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ] The expression attaches itself in point of form to τὴν ὑπακοήν, ver. 8, with which it forms a paronomasia; in point of subject-matter it is not different from τοῖς πιστεύουσιν (iv. 3). Comp. Rom. x. 16; 2 Thess. i. 8, *al.* — The mode of expression: αὐτίον τι εἶναι σωτηρίας (comp. τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας

αὐτῶν, ii. 10), is also often met with in Philo, Josephus, and the classical writers. Instances in Wetstein, Kypke, and Bleek. — The adjective αἰώνιος with σωτηρία in the N. T. only here. Comp., however, LXX. Isa. xlv. 17.

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

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

time reminding them of the inviolability of the divine promise and the objective certainty of the Christian hope.

Ver. 11. *Περὶ οὗ*] *sc.* *Χριστοῦ ἀρχιερέως κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ.* To this total-conception, as is also recognised by Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 780), is *περὶ οὗ* to be referred back. We have to supplement not merely *Χριστοῦ* (Oecumenius, Primasius, Justinian), because that would be a far too general defining of the object, inasmuch as confessedly the discourse is not first about Christ in the sequel, but everywhere throughout the epistle. But neither is *Μελχισεδέκ* to be supplied to *οὗ* (Peshito, Calvin [Piscator hesitates between this and the following application], Owen, Schöttgen, Peirce, Semler, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford, Maier, *al.*). For even though—a fact to which Bleek appeals—the author, after having concluded the digression (vii. 1 f.), begins by characterizing this same Melchisedec, yet this description is subordinated to a higher aim, that of setting forth the high-priestly dignity of Christ; as surely also the reference of vii. 1 ff. to the close of the digression (vi. 20) clearly shows, since the former is represented by *γάρ* as only the development now begun of the main consideration: *Ἰησοῦς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, taken up anew, vi. 20. To take *οὗ* as a *neuter*, with Grotius, Cramer, Storr, Abresch, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Stengel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Kurtz, and others, and to refer it to the *high-priesthood* of Christ after Melchisedec's manner,—according to which *οὗ* would thus have to be resolved into *περὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιερέα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ*,—is possible indeed, but not so natural as when it is taken as a *masculine*, since the discourse in that which precedes was about the definite person of Christ. — *πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος*] *sc.* *ἐστίν.* Wrongly, because otherwise *ἂν εἶη* must have been added, and because a detailed development of the subject really follows afterwards; Peshito, Erasmus, Luther, and others: concerning which we should have much to speak. — *καί*] *and indeed.* — *λέγειν*] belongs to *δυσερμηνευτος*. Heinrichs erroneously joins it with *ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος*. — Even on account of the connectedness of the *λέγειν* with *δυσερμηνευτος*, but also on account of the preceding

ἡμῖν, followed by no ὑμῖν, it is inadmissible, with Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Valekenaeer, Kuinoel, and others, to suppose the difficulty of the exposition or rendering intelligible of the λόγος to exist on the part of *the readers*, and thus to interpret δυσερμηνευτος in the sense of δυσνόητος, 2 Pet. iii. 16. On the contrary, as *the author* has abundant material for discoursing on the subject announced, so is it also difficult for *the author* to render himself intelligible thereon to the readers. The ground of this difficulty which obtains for him is introduced by the clause with ἐπεὶ, which on that account is to be referred only to δυσερμηνευτος λέγειν, not at the same time (Hofmann) to πολλὸς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος. For the rest, Storr and Bleek have already rightly remarked, that in the connecting of λόγος with the two predicates πολλὸς and δυσερμηνευτος a sort of zeugma is contained, inasmuch as λόγος is to be taken in relation to the first predicate *actively*,¹ in relation to the second *passively*. On the high-priesthood of Christ after the manner of Melchisedec, the author has much *to speak*; and truly it is difficult for him to make plain to his readers the *contents* or *subject* of his discourse. — γεγόνατε] characterizes the spiritual sluggishness or dulness of the readers not as something which was originally inherent in them, but only as something which afterwards manifested itself in connection with them. Chrysostom: τὸ γὰρ εἰπεῖν ἐπεὶ νωθοὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς δηλοῦντος ἦν, ὅτι πάλαι ὑγίαινον καὶ ἦσαν ἰσχυροί, τῇ προθυμίᾳ ζέοντες, καὶ ὕστερον αὐτοὺς τοῦτο παθεῖν μαρτυρεῖ. — νωθρός] in the N. T. only here and vi. 12. — ταῖς ἀκοαῖς] *with regard to the hearing*, i.e. the spiritual faculty of comprehension. Comp. Philo, *Quis rer. divin. haeres*, p. 483 (with Mangey, I. p. 474): ἐν ἀψύχοις ἀνδριάσιν, οἷς ὦτα μὲν ἐστίν, ἀκοαὶ δὲ οὐκ ἐνεῖσιν. The plural is used, inasmuch as the discourse is of a multitude of persons. On the *dative*, instead of which the accusative might have been placed, comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 202.

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

¹ This is erroneously denied by Delitzsch and Alford. Even the two instances from Dionys. Halicarn., on which Delitzsch relies, plead against him.

the ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 10, *al.* Arbitrarily Bloomfield (ed. 8), according to whom an intermediate link is to be supplied in connection with καὶ γάρ: "[And such ye are,] for though ye ought, according to the time, to be teachers," etc. — διὰ τὸν χρόνον] *by reason of the space of time*, i.e. because already so considerable a space of time has passed since ye became Christians. In like manner is διὰ τὸν χρόνον often employed by classical writers. Comp. e.g. Aelian, *Viv. Hist.* iii. 37: οἱ πάνυ παρ' αὐτοῖς γεγενησκότες . . . πίνουσι κώνειον, ὅταν ἑαυτοῖς συνειδῶσιν, ὅτι πρὸς τὰ ἔργα τὰ τῇ πατρίδι λυσιτελοῦντα ἄχρηστοί εἰσιν, ὑποληρούσης ἤδη τι αὐτοῖς καὶ τῆς γνώμης διὰ τὸν χρόνον. — As regards that which follows, there is a controversy as to whether we have to accentuate *τίνα* or *τινά*. The word is taken as an *interrogative particle* by the Peshito and Vulgate, Augustine, *Tract.* 98 *in Joh.*; Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Wolf, Bengel, Abresch, Schulz, Kuinoel, Klec, de Wette, Tischendorf, Stengel, Bloomfield, Conybeare, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 780; Reuss, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, and the majority. As an *indefinite pronoun*, on the other hand, it is taken by Occumenius, Luther, Calvin, Peirce, Cramer, Heinrichs, Böhme, Lachmann, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, Bisping, Alford, Woerner, and others. The latter alone grammatically possible. For in the opposite case, since the subject is a varying one in the *tempus finitum* (χρεῖαν ἔχετε) and the *infinitive* (διδάσκειν), either the infinitive passive must be written, τοῦ διδάσκεσθαι ὑμᾶς, or to the infinitive active a special accusative of the subject (perhaps ἐμέ) must be further added. Nor is 1 Thess. iv. 9 decisive in opposition hereto, since there the reading of Lachmann: οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχομεν γράφειν ὑμῖν, is the only correct one. See, besides, the remarks in my *Commentary on the Thessalonians*, *ad loc.* [E. T. p. 118 f.]. As, moreover, in a grammatical respect, so also in a logical respect is the accentuation *τίνα* to be rejected. For upon the adopting thereof the thought would arise, that the readers anew required instruction upon the question: *which articles are to be reckoned among the στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ*, or else: *of what nature these are*. But manifestly the author is only complaining—as is plain also from the

explicative clause: καὶ γέγονατε κ.τ.λ.—of the fact that the readers, who ought long ago to have been qualified for instructing others, themselves still needed to be instructed in the στοιχεῖα. While, for the rest, de Wette and Riehm erroneously find in the indefinite τινά “too strong a signification,” Delitzsch is equally mistaken in characterizing it as “unmeaning” and “flat.” With justice does Alford remark, in opposition to the last-named: “So far from τινά, *some one*, being, as Delitzsch most absurdly says, ‘matt und nichtssagend,’ it carries with it the fine keen edge of reproach; *q. d.* to teach you what all know, and any can teach.” — ὑμᾶς] preposed to the τινά, in order to bring into the more marked relief the antithesis to εἶναι διδάσκαλοι. — The notion of rudimenta already existing in τὰ στοιχεῖα is made yet more definitely prominent by the genitive τῆς ἀρχῆς (Calvin: “quo plus ineutiat pudoris”). Thus: *the very first primary grounds or elements*. Analogous is the use of the Latin *prima rudimenta*, Justin. vii. 5; Liv. i. 3; *prima elementa*, Horace, *Serm.* i. 1. 26; Quintil. i. 1. 23, 35; Ovid, *Fast.* iii. 179. — τῶν λόγιων τοῦ θεοῦ] *of the utterances of God*. Comp. Acts vii. 38; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Rom. iii. 2. What is intended is the saving revelations of Christianity, which God has caused to be proclaimed as His word. To think of the Old Testament prophecies, and their interpretation and reference to the Christian relations (Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Schulz, Stengel, and others; comp. also Hofmann and Woerner *ad loc.*), is inadmissible; since the expression τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, in consideration of its generality, always acquires its nearer defining of meaning only from the context, while here, that which was, ver. 12, mentioned as τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λόγιων τοῦ θεοῦ, is immediately after (vi. 1) designated ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος. — γέγονατε] reminds anew, even as the preceding πάλιν, of the earlier more gladdening spiritual condition of the readers. — γάλακτος καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς] On the figure, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 2: γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα. Philo, *de Agricult.* p. 188 (with Mangey, I. p. 301): Ἐπεὶ δὲ νηπίοις μὲν ἐστι γάλα τροφή, τελείοις δὲ τὰ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα, καὶ ψυχῆς γαλακτώδεις μὲν ἂν εἶεν τροφαὶ κατὰ τὴν παιδικὴν ἡλικίαν, τὰ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου μουσικῆς προπαιδεύματα τέλειαι δὲ

καὶ ἀνδράσιν εὐπρεπεῖς αἱ διὰ φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀπάσης ἀρετῆς ὑφηγήσεις. *Quod omnis probus liber*, p. 889 A (II. p. 470), *ul.* — By the *milk*, the author understands the elementary instruction in Christianity; by the *solid food*, the more profound disclosures with regard to the essence of Christianity, for the understanding of which a Christian insight already more matured is called for. In connection with the former, he thinks of the doctrinal topics enumerated vi. 1, 2 (not, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Clarius, and others suppose, of the doctrine of the humanity of Christ in contradistinction from that of His Godhead, which is foreign to the context); in connection with the latter, mainly of the subject, just the treatment of which will pre-eminently occupy him in the sequel,—the high-priesthood of Christ after the manner of Melchisedec. — The statement of ver. 12 has been urged by Mynster (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, H. 2, p. 338), Ebrard, and others, in proof that the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot have been addressed to the Palestinean congregations, particularly not to the congregation at Jerusalem. The tenor of the verse might, it is true, appear strange, considering that the congregation at Jerusalem was the parent congregation of all the others, and out of its midst had proceeded the most distinguished teachers of Christianity. Nevertheless this last fact is not at all called in question by the statement of the verse. For the author has present to his mind the condition of the congregation as it was in his own time; he is addressing—in favour of which also διὰ τὸν χρόνον pronounces—a second generation of Palestinean Christianity. The narrow-minded tendency, however, which this second generation had assumed, instead of advancing in its growth to the recognition of the freedom and universality of Christianity as the most perfect religion, might well justify with regard to it the utterance of a reproach such as we here meet with. Only thus much follows from the words,—what is also confirmed by xiii. 7,—that when the author wrote, James the Lord's brother had already been torn from the congregation at Jerusalem by death, since he would otherwise certainly have written in another tone.

Nv. 13, 14. Establishing of the γεγόνατε χρεῖαν ἔχοντες

γάλακτος καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς, ver. 12. Sense: *for it is universally characteristic of him who (in a spiritual respect) has need of milk, that he is, because not of ripe age, still inexperienced in the λόγος δικαιοσύνης; and this is just your case. Solid food, on the other hand, is proper only for the τέλειοι; τέλειοι, however, ye are not yet.* In connection with this acceptance of the words, there is no occasion for finding anything out of place in the γάρ in relation to that which precedes, and either, with Storr, making it co-ordinate with the γάρ, ver. 12, and referring it back like this to ver. 11,—which on account of the figure vv. 13, 14, retained from ver. 12, is already seen to be inadmissible,—or for saying, with Bleek and Bispington, that the progress of thought would come out more naturally if the author had written: πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης μετέχει γάλακτος· νήπιος γὰρ ἐστίν. — ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος] *he who (in a spiritual respect) partakes of milk, i.e. only in this possesses his nourishment, is not in a position to take in solid food.* Bengel: Lacte etiam robusti vescuntur, sed non lacte praecipue, nedum lacte solo. Itaque notantur hoc loco ii, qui nil denique nisi lac aut capiunt aut petunt. — ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης] *sc. ἐστίν, he is still inexperienced in the word of righteousness.* Expositors have almost without exception been guided by the presupposition (as also Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Kurtz still are) that λόγος δικαιοσύνης is only a varying form of expression for the same idea as is expressed, vv. 12, 14, by στερεὰ τροφή, or, vi. 1, by τελειότης. λόγος δικαιοσύνης has then either been taken as equivalent to λόγος δίκαιος or τέλειος, and the higher, more perfect type of doctrine found indicated in the expression. So Schlichting (“sermo iustitiae videtur positus pro sermone iusto, h. e. perfecto ac solido”), Grotius (“Hic δικαιοσύνης dixit pro τελειότητος . . . et genitivus est pro adjectivo”), Abresch (“doctrina vel institutio iusta, h. e. perfecta, plena, omnia complectens, quae ad perspicuam distinctamque pertineant doctrinae Christianae intelligentiam”), Schulz (“that true [rightly so called] higher doctrine”), Kuinoel, Bispington, Kurtz, and many others. Or δικαιοσύνης has been more correctly regarded as genitive of the object. In the latter case δικαιοσύνη is taken either, as Michaelis, *ad Peire.*, with an appeal to the Hebrew נִרְיָה, in

the sense of ἀλήθεια,¹ as the doctrine of the essence of the matter itself, in opposition to the typical figures thereof; or λόγος δικαιοσύνης is understood specially, as by Occumenius, of the λόγος περὶ τῆς θεότητος τοῦ κυρίου, or, as by Carpzov, of the: “doctrina de sacerdotio Jesu Christi Melchisedeciano, quae dicitur ὁ λόγος δικαιοσύνης propterea, quia Melchisedecus, vi nominis, βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης vertitur, vii. 2, eaque appellatio ad Christum sacerdotem applicatur, ejus πρόπον fuit πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην, Matt. iii. 15;” or the words are made to refer, as by Primasius, Zeger, Bengel, de Wette, and others, to *intellectual and moral perfection in general*, as also already Chrysostom, who explains the expression by ἡ ἄνω φιλοσοφία (and after him Theophylact), leaves us the choice of understanding the βίος ἄκρος καὶ ἡκριβωμένος (according to Matt. v. 20), or τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τὸν ὑψηλὸν περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον. But the fundamental presupposition, out

¹ Delitzsch, too, with an allusion to the use of קִרְיָא, קִרְיָא, קִרְיָא, takes δικαιοσύνη as a synonym of ἀλήθεια; but will then have the genitive δικαιοσύνης looked upon not as expressing the contents, but as a defining of the quality of λόγος, and will interpret λόγος of the faculty of speech. Thus, then, λόγος δικαιοσύνης is taken to mean: “the faculty of speaking in accordance with righteousness,” i.e. the “discourse on spiritual things which is guided in strict accord with the norm of the true, and harmoniously combines all the factors of the case, proportionately regarded, without leaving one of them out of sight;” and in ver. 13 is supposed to be contained the following “most rigid connection of ideas:” “he who must still receive milk is still ignorant of rightly-constituted, i.e. right-teaching or orthodox, discourse; for he is a child only beginning to lisp, and not yet capable of speech.” This strange view, based upon the incomprehensible grounds, that “since νήπιος (from νη and ἔπος) denotes one incapable of speech, an infant, there is a presumption in favour of λόγος in ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης having the signification of faculty of speech,—and this signification is here the more probable in regard to the αἰσθητήρια occurring in the antithetic parallel clause, inasmuch as ὁ λόγος, in the sense of *language*, is met with countless times in Philo along with the αἰσθήσεις or the πάντα αἰσθήσεις, of which the organs are known as αἰσθητήρια,”—bears its refutation upon the face of it. It is not at all suitable to the connection, as Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 734) and Alford have already observed; since according to this there is no question as to the faculty for speaking on spiritual subjects, but only as to the faculty for understanding the same. — As “discourse” will Hofmann also have λόγος interpreted, in that he fully subtilizes the notion lying in δικαιοσύνη, and finds indicated by the total expression λόγος δικαιοσύνης only “correct discourse.” For, according to him, the words ver. 13 are used in their most literal sense, and allude to the fact that he who is still fed with milk at the maternal breast is as yet no judge of correct discourse!

of which all these interpretations have sprung, is an erroneous one. For the emphasis falls not upon λόγου δικαιοσύνης, but upon the ἄπειρος, on that account preposed. Not for a non-possession of the λόγος δικαιοσύνης, but only for a want of experience in the same, only for an insufficient, schoolboy's knowledge of it, does the author blame the readers. The λόγος δικαιοσύνης in itself, therefore, stands as indifferently related to the notion of the στερεὰ τροφή or τελειότης as to the notion of the στοιχεῖα, to which Ebrard reckons it. Only by the more or less exhaustive imparting of its subject-matter does it become the one or the other. For the word of righteousness is nothing more than a periphrasis of Christianity or the gospel, inasmuch as just the righteousness availing with God¹ is the central-point of its contents. Quite analogous to this mode of designation is the Pauline characterization of the gospel office of teaching by ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης, 2 Cor. iii. 9, and of the teachers of Christianity by διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης, 2 Cor. xi. 15; on which account also it is unnecessary, for the justification of the expression chosen, with Bleek, Bisping, and Maier, to assume an allusion to the exposition of the name Melchisedec, βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, given vii. 2. — νήπιος γάρ ἐστιν] *for he is still a babe, a novice in Christianity.* Setting forth of the naturalness of the ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης.

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

¹ Of the righteousness availing with God (comp. also xi. 7), have Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Peirce, Storr, Klee, Tholuck, Bleek, Stein, Ebrard, Bloomfield, and others already rightly interpreted δικαιοσύνη. — In the above exposition, Alford, Richm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 733), and Woerner have concurred; save that, according to Richm, by virtue of an over-refined distinction, the gospel is not called the word of righteousness "because the righteousness availing with God is the central-point of its contents," but "because it leads to righteousness; because, by its proclamation to man, the possibility is created and the opportunity is afforded of entering into a condition of the rightness of his relation to God, inasmuch, namely, as he assumes a believing attitude towards the word proclaimed." But why should the author, familiar as he was with Paul's manner of teaching, and attaching his own doctrinal presentation thereto,—albeit with independence of character,—have shrunk from recognising, as the central theme of the gospel, "the righteousness which avails with God," since even this was only a general notion, which did not exclude a peculiar conception and treatment, where it was a question of the development of details, and insistence thereon?

Christians, on the other hand (and only for them), is the solid food. — *τελείων* is with emphasis preposed. — *τῶν διὰ τὴν ἔξιν κ.τ.λ.*] more precise characterizing of the *τέλειοι*: *for those who*, etc. — *ἕξις*] like the following *αἰσθητήριον*, in the N. T. a *ἁπαξ λεγόμενον*. It corresponds to the Latin *habitus*, and is used in particular of the condition produced by use and wont. Here it denotes the capacity or dexterity acquired by practice. Comp. Quintil. x. 1. 1: *firma quaedam facilitas, quae apud Graecos ἕξις nominatur.* — *τὰ αἰσθητήρια*] *the organs of the senses*; transferred to that which is spiritual: *the power of apprehension*. Comp. LXX. Jer. iv. 19: *τὰ αἰσθητήρια τῆς ψυχῆς μου.* — *γεγυμνασμένα*] Predicate; literally: *as exercised*. On the whole turn of discourse, comp. Galen, *De dignot. puls.* 3 (in Wetstein): *ὃς μὲν γὰρ . . . τὸ αἰσθητήριον ἔχει γεγυμνασμένον ἱκανῶς . . . οὗτος ἄριστος ἀν εἶη γνώμων.* — *πρὸς διάκρισιν κ.τ.λ.*] *for the distinguishing of good and bad*. The words may be taken with *γεγυμνασμένα*, or they may be taken with the whole expression *γεγυμνασμένα ἔχόντων*. The *καλόν τε καὶ κακόν*, however, is to be understood of the *right* and the *wrong*, or of the *wholesome* and the *pernicious*, not, with Stein, of that which is morally good or evil. Chrysostom: *νῦν οὐ περὶ βίου αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος, ὅταν λέγῃ· πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ (τοῦτο γὰρ παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ δυνατόν εἶδέναι καὶ εὐκόλον) ἀλλὰ περὶ δογμάτων ὑγιῶν καὶ ὑψηλῶν, διεφθαρμένων τε καὶ ταπεινῶν.*

CHAPTER VI.

VER. 2. Instead of the *Recepta* διδασκῆς, Lachm. reads διδασκῆν. But the accusative has the support only of B and the Latin translation in D (doctrinam), and is a mere transcriber's error. — Ver. 3. Elz.: ποιήσομεν, after B K L S, It. Vulg. Basm. Copt. Syr. utr. Ambrose. Retained by Lachm. Tisch. and Bloomfield. Defended also by Reiche. But as more original, on account of the symmetry with φερώμεθα, ver. 1, appears the conjunctive ποιήσωμεν, already commended to notice by Griesbach; approved by Bleek, Delitzsch, and Alford. It is attested by the strong authority of A C D E, 23, 31, 39, *al. mult.*, Arm. Chrys. (codd.) Theodoret (comment.), Oecum. Damasc. — Ver. 7. ἐπ' αὐτῆς] B** 213, 219** *al.*: ἐπ' αὐτῇ. Alteration in favour of the more prevailing linguistic usage. — To the *Recepta* πολ- λάκις ἐρχόμενον, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford have preferred the order ἐρχόμενον πολλάκις. The external accrediting is for both substantially equal. The *Recepta* is attested by A C K L, Vulg.; Lachmann's reading by B D E S, 37, 116, *al.*, It. Syr. utr. Copt. *al.* But in favour of the originality of the latter pleads the greater euphony, for which the author is wont to show a predilection. — Ver. 9. The mode of writing πρεσ- σονα, followed by Bengel, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford, *al.*, after the precedent given by the Edd. Complut. and Plantin., instead of the *Recepta* πρεπτονα, is here required by A B C D*** (E) L S, *al.* Otherwise, i. 4, vii. 7, and frequently. — Ver. 10. καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης] Elz. Matthaei: καὶ τοῦ νόπου τῆς ἀγάπης. But τοῦ νόπου is wanting in A B C D* E* S, 6, 31, 47, *al.*, Syr. utr. Erp. Basm. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. Clar. Germ., with Chrys. (twice) Antioch. Theoph. Jerome. Already condemned by Beza, Mill, Bengel, *al.* Rightly deleted by Griesb. Knapp, Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. Alford, Reiche, and others. Gloss from 1 Thess. i. 3. — Ver. 14. Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2, Bloomfield, Reiche: ἡ μὲν. Instead thereof, Lachm. Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, and Alford have εἰ μὲν. The latter, approved also by Bleek and others, is, on account of the weighty authority of A B (C L** : εἰ μὲν) D (D corr.: εἰ μὲν) E S, 17, 23, *al.*, Didym. Damasc. Vulg. It. Ambrose. Bede (: nisi), to be looked upon as the original

reading. ἡ μὴν is a later conversion of the non-Greek expression of the LXX. into Greek. — Ver. 16. ἀνθρώποι μὲν γάρ] So Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, and Alford. But μὲν is wanting in A B D* 8, 47, 52, Cyril. Rightly rejected by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8. — Ver. 18. ἐς] Bleek and Tisch. 8, after A C 8*, 17, 52, Cyril, Didym. Chrys. *al.*: τὸν θέν. — Ver. 19. Instead of the *Recepta* ἀσφαλῆς, which is confirmed also by the *Codex Sinaiticus*, Lachm., in the stereotype edition, writes, after A C D*: ἀσφαλῆν (so also Tisch. 7), in the larger edition: ἀσφαλῆν. But the form is hardly to be justified. Yet comp. Winer's *Gramm.* 7 Aufl. p. 64.

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

¹ Delitzsch and Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 781 f.), to whom Maier, Kluge, Kurtz, and Woerner have given in their adhesion, have thought to be able to escape the stringency of the above *either . . . or . . .* They will have us recognise the one to the non-exclusion of the other, in that they find expressed at the same time the exhortation to the readers to strive after the τελειότης, and the design of the writer to lead forward the readers to the τελειότης. But this (comp. also Reiche, *Comment. Crit.* p. 37, note 2) is an unnatural, absolutely impossible assumption. The announcement of the author's design to advance to a more difficult section of his disquisition, and the exhortation to the endeavour after Christian maturity addressed to others, are two so mutually irreconcilable declarations, as not possibly to admit of being compressed at the same time into the φέρεσθαι ἐπί, ver. 1, and τοῦτο ποιεῖν, ver. 3. Just as little can at the same time be indicated by τελειότης, ver. 1, the condition of ripe age in Christianity, and the Christian teaching activity of another in reference to higher things. If, therefore, the author had designed to express both together,—alike an incitement of the readers, as also the carrying out of his own intention,—he must necessarily have brought under review each one separately, *i.e.* first the one and then the other. In addition to this, there is the further consideration that the view of Delitzsch and Riehm bears the character of half measures. For they do not even venture to push it to a consistent conclusion, in that surely the same two-sidedness of reference which attaches to the principal verb φερώμεθα (and to the τοῦτο ποιοῦσθαι which resumes the thought of the same), must also attach to the participles ἀφέντις and καταβαλλόμενοι; but as it is, the participles are supposed to have grammatically, it is true, the same two-sided subject as the principal verbs; logically, on the other hand, to refer *preponderantly* (*i.e.* according to the preceding remark in Delitzsch, p. 209, *init.*: *exclusively*) to the author!

Luther, Vatablus, Zeger, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Limborch, Wolf, Beugel, Peirce, Cramer, Michaelis, Morus, Storr, Abresch, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Klee, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Reiche (*Comment. Crit.* p. 36 sqq.), Conybeare, Reuss, M'Caul, Hofmann (*Komm.* p. 231), and many others; the latter, on the other hand, by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, Gennadius (in Oecumenius), Theophylact, Faber Stapulensis, Calvin, Clarius, Justinian, Jac. Cappellus, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. p. 636, 2 Aufl.), Moll, and others. The connection with the preceding and following context decides against the first acceptation and in favour of the second. The author has just now charged the readers with dulness, and complained that they are still children in Christian understanding. It is not possible, therefore, that he should now continue in the strain: "on that account he purposes, passing over the doctrines of the initial stage, to treat in his address of objects of higher, profounder Christian knowledge;" whereas, on the other hand, the exhortation to ascend to a higher stage fittingly links itself to the complaint of the lower standpoint of the readers, which still continues unchanged notwithstanding all legitimate expectation to the contrary. No wonder, then, that expositors have been forced, in connection with the first-named explanation, to have recourse to arbitrary interpretations of the *διό*, vi. 1; either in completing the idea, as Grotius, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, and others, by: "therefore, because surely no one of you wishes to remain a *νήπιος*,"—which, however, as the middle term, must have been expressly added, since no reader could divine this from that which precedes,—or in referring it, as Schlichting and Reuss, to the first words of v. 11: *περὶ οὗ πολὺς ἡμῶν ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμηνευτος λέγειν*, and regarding all that intervenes in the light of remarks appended by way of parenthesis,—which, nevertheless, is to be rejected, even on account of the intimate connection of *δυσερμηνευτος λέγειν*, v. 11, with the following *ἐπεὶ κ.τ.λ.*,—or finally, what is lexically impossible, denying to it a causal signification, and then translating it either, as Morus, by "yet" (*doch*), or, as Zachariae, by "nevertheless" (*indessen*), or as Abresch, by

vero, enimvero.—But no less does the *coherence with that which follows* decide against the first interpretation and in favour of the second. For it is quite comprehensible how the reason given, ver. 4 ff., should be able to lend emphasis to a preceding exhortation, but not how the declaration of the author, that he now intended to pass over to more difficult, more profound themes for instruction, should be explained thereby. (See on vv. 4–6.) In ἀφέντες there lies no decisive ground in favour of either the one or the other view (against de Wette, Bisping, and others), and ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα, as also θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι, is more relevant to the case of the readers than to that of the author (*vide infra*). — Διό] *therefore, i.e.* since the solid food is suited only to τέλειοι, ye, however, do not yet belong to the number of the τέλειοι. — ἀφιέναι] is not only employed by orators and historians to indicate that they intend to pass over some subject or leave it unmentioned (comp. *e.g.* Demosth. *de Falsa Legat.* p. 433, 28: πάντα τὰ ἄλλα ἀφείς, ἀ πάντες ὑμεῖς ἴστε ἐρῶ), but serves with equal frequency to denote the leaving unnoticed or leaving aside of an object in actual conduct. Comp. *e.g.* Mark vii. 8: ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων; Luke v. 11: ἀφέντες πάντα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ; Eurip. *Androm.* 393: ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀφείς πρὸς τὴν τελευτήν, ὑστέραν οὔσαν, φέρῃ; In our passage it is the leaving aside of the lesser, in order to reach beyond it and attain to the higher. Entirely akin to the ἀφιέναι τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον is that which Paul, Phil. iii. 14, denotes as ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι τὰ ὀπίσω. As in the passage named Paul speaks of a forgetting of that already attained upon the path of Christian perfection, only with a glance at the goal as yet unattained, and not in an absolute sense,—as though he would in reality deny all actual significance to that which was already attained,—quite so does the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews stir up the readers to an ἀφιέναι τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον, only inasmuch as they are called to rise, beyond that which forms a mere preliminary stage, to something higher, without in any way implying thereby that the τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος, which certainly, as a base presupposed as already present, remains

necessary for all subsequent building, should at all cease to be their possession. The objection, that ἀφέντες cannot be referred to the readers, because instead of a leaving aside (letting go) a holding fast or renewing of the τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος must rather be demanded as a means for attaining to the τελειότης, has therefore no force. Comp. Calvin: Jubet autem omitti ejusmodi rudimenta, non quod eorum oblivisci unquam debeant fideles, sed quia in illis minime est haerendum. Quod melius patet ex fundamenti similitudine, quae mox sequitur. Nam in exstruenda domo nunquam a fundamento discedere oportet; in eo tamen jaciendo semper laborare ridiculum. — τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον] *the word of the beginning concerning Christ, i.e. the Christian doctrine in its first rudiments or elements.* τῆς ἀρχῆς locks together with τὸν λόγον into a single notion, and upon this total-notion τοῦ Χριστοῦ depends. The whole expression, however, amounts to the same thing as was before (v. 12) denoted by τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ. — ἡ τελειότης] in connection with our apprehension of vv. 1-3, determines itself naturally as *perfection, i.e. manhood and maturity in Christianity*, and that in an intellectual respect, not in an ethical or practical one, in which latter sense the expression has been accepted—arbitrarily, because opposed to the connection with v. 11-14—by Chrysostom (βίος ἄριστος), Gennadius (χρηστὴ πολιτεία καὶ τῆς πίστεως ἁξία), Photius (ἡ ἐν ταῖς ἀρεταῖς προκοπή, ἡ τῶν θλίψεων καὶ διωγμῶν καὶ πειρασμῶν ὑπομονή), Oecumenius (ἡ τῶν ἔργων φιλοσοφία), Clarius (non solum superioris illius de Christo theologiae comprehensio, quantum homini fas est, verum etiam profectus in virtutes et afflictionum persecutionumque tolerantia), and others. Those who find in vv. 1-3 a statement of the author concerning his intention, must naturally understand τελειότης of the perfection of doctrine, *i.e. of the deeper disclosures with regard to Christianity.* But this is, at all events, a forced interpretation of the simple notion of the word, such as neither corresponds to the usage in other cases (comp. Col. iii. 14), nor in our passage appears in keeping with the context. For, since immediately before the discourse was of τέλειοι in opposition to νήπιοι, so here only the condition of the

τέλειοι can consistently with nature be the meaning of the τελειότης. Had the author intended the perfection of doctrine, he must at least have written ἐπὶ τὰ τῶν τελείων instead of ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα; for only in this way would he have acquired a notion corresponding to the preceding ἡ στερεὰ τροφή, v. 14. — φερώμεθα] The author includes himself in the exhortation (cf. iv. 14, *al.*), and thereby tempers the same. φέρεσθαι ἐπὶ τι, to be carried away to something, to strive with zeal after something. — θεμέλιον καταβάλλεσθαι] a formula fully current in later Greek style (Dionys. Halicarn. iii. 69; Josephus, *Antiq.* xi. 4. 4, *al.* [whereas Paul and Luke employ τιθέναι, 1 Cor. iii. 10; Luke vi. 48, xiv. 29]), to denote the laying of the foundation. Even on account of the usualness of this mode of speech, it is quite a misapprehension of the meaning when Ebrard would here vindicate for καταβάλλεσθαι the signification: "demolish." But also the position of the word decides against this, since καταβαλλόμενοι must have its place before θεμέλιον, whereas the placing of it after shows that the emphasis must fall upon θεμέλιον, not upon the verb; θεμέλιον thus stands in antithesis to the following τελειότητα. The participial clause: μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβ. κ.τ.λ., accordingly forms an elucidation to ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον. — The genitive μετανοίας, etc., indicates the material with which the foundation is laid, and, indeed, each two of the instances named belong together, so that three pairs of the first principles of Christianity are enumerated. The article before the single substantives is omitted throughout; not, as Böhme and Bleek suppose, out of a consideration for the rhythm, lest otherwise the articles should too greatly accumulate, but because the sense is: *with things such as μετάνοια*, etc. — Further, as subject in καταβαλλόμενοι we have to regard the readers of the epistle (not the author), because the same subject is presupposed for the μετάνοια and the θεμέλιον καταβάλλεσθαι; but the μετάνοια, which cannot denote the doctrine of the change of mind, — since otherwise, as with the words in ver. 2, the addition of διδασχὴ could not have been wanting, — but expresses the act of the change of mind itself, beyond doubt relates to the readers of the letter, not to the author. — Not anew are the

readers to lay the foundation by *μετάνοια ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων* and *πίστις ἐπὶ θεόν*; since this foundation has with them already been laid, it is now thus only a question of continuing to build upon the foundation laid. Not in such wise are they accordingly to behave, that the primary requirement of turning from the *ἔργα νεκρά* and having *πίστις* towards God, must ever afresh be made with regard to them. — The construction *μετάνοια ἀπό*, as with *μετανοεῖν*, Acts viii. 22; LXX. Jer. viii. 6. — *ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων*] By *νεκρά* the works are not characterized as *sinful*, and by sin occasioning death (Piscator, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Peirce, Abresch, Bisping, Stuart, and others), nor as *defiling*, as according to the law of Moses contact with a dead body defiled (Michaelis, *al.*), but as *in themselves vain and fruitless* [see on ix. 14]. Perhaps the author has—what is on no sufficient grounds contested by R. Köstlin (*Theol. Jahrb. von Baur und Zeller*, 1854, H. 4, p. 469 ff., Remark), Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 568), and Kurtz—before his mind the service of works under the Mosaic law, from which the readers had not yet been able to free themselves. A contradiction, as Riehm supposes (*l.c.* p. 335 f.), of the fact recognised, p. 16, that *πίστις* with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews does not, as with Paul, involve an opposition to the *νόμος* and the *ἔργα νόμου*, lies not in this expression. For neither in our passage is mention made of *νεκρά ἔργα* in relation to *πίστις*, but only in relation to the factor of the *μετάνοια* which precedes the *πίστις*. — *καὶ πίστεως ἐπὶ θεόν*] The positive reverse side to the negative *μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων*. The ideas conveyed by the *μετανοεῖν* and *πιστεύειν*, the *μετάνοια* and the *πίστις*, likewise associated with each other, Mark i. 15; Acts xx. 21. These words, however, are to be understood, as Abresch, Bleek, and others rightly insist, in accordance with the signification, which the author is otherwise wont to attach to *πίστις*, of the believing confidence in God, as the one who in part *has* already fulfilled the promises of salvation given in the person of Jesus Christ, in part *will yet completely fulfil* them.

Ver. 2. *Βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς*] We have not to divide by a comma, with Cajetan, Luther, Hyperius, Sykes, Semler, Morus, Heinrichs, Schulz, de Wette, Conybeare, and others

[after the Syriac], in such wise that *βαπτισμοί* and *διδασχὴ* are each separately enumerated as a particular subject for elementary instruction in Christianity. *Διδασχὴ* must in this case mean the elementary instruction in Christianity connected with baptism, imparted either before or after the same. But since, at the close of the verse, the *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* and the *κρίμα αἰώνιον* are mentioned, while the treatment of these subjects for teaching belonged equally to the first stage of instruction in Christianity, it is not easy to perceive why, in addition to that *διδασχὴ*, these two points, presupposed in the same, should be brought into special relief by the author. Then there is the consideration that all the particulars which are mentioned before and after as constituent parts of the *θεμέλιον*, are designated by a double expression. Seeing the care bestowed by the author upon the symmetrical proportions of his discourse, we should therefore naturally be led to regard *βαπτισμῶν διδασχῆς* as a corresponding double expression. But even as thus apprehended the expression is capable of a twofold explanation. The question, namely, is whether the author is speaking of *βαπτισμοὶ διδασχῆς* or of a *βαπτισμῶν διδασχὴ*. In the first case *baptisms with a view to doctrine* are meant, in the second *instruction concerning baptisms*. In the first acceptation the term is taken by Bengel, Michaelis, Maier, Kurtz, as also Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 181 (less decidedly, 5 Aufl. p. 217); in the last, by Bleek and the majority. Against the first view pleads, on the one hand, the fact that the addition *διδασχῆς* would be something too little characteristic, almost unmeaning, since a Christian baptism, not preceded, accompanied, or followed by instruction in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, would be something inconceivable; on the other hand, that in this way the erroneous secondary meaning would arise, that there were, in addition to the Christian baptisms with a view to doctrine, also other Christian baptisms. We follow, therefore, the second mode of interpretation. In connection with this the plural *βαπτισμῶν* still presents some difficulty. Gerhard, Dorscheus, Ernesti, M'Lean, Stuart, and others arbitrarily set aside this difficulty, in that they suppose just the plural to be placed for the singular.

But neither is the plural to be explained by the assumption that respect is had to the proneness of the Hebrews for often repeating the Christian baptism, in conformity with the many *βαπτισμοί* in Judaism (Occumenius, Theophylact), or, at the same time, to the outward and inner baptism (Grotius, Whitby, Braun, Brochmann; Reuss: la différence du baptême d'eau et du baptême d'esprit). Just as little by the supposition that reference is made to a plurality of baptismal candidates or baptismal acts (Theodoret, Primasius, Beza, Er. Schmid, Owen, Heinrichs, *al.*), or to a repeated immersing of the candidate. Most in its favour has the opinion of Jac. Cappellus, Seb. Schmidt, Schöttgen, Wolf, and others, in which more recently also Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Bleek, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 724), Alford, and Moll have concurred; namely, that the author is thinking not so much of Christian baptism in itself, or exclusively, as along with it at the same time of the relation of the same to the Jewish lustrations, and perhaps also to the baptism of John. This view appears at least to acquire a point of support from ix. 10, according to which the readers still continued to esteem the washings enjoined by the Mosaic law as of importance for Christians too. Yet it seems to be precarious, with Jac. Cappellus, Bleek, and others, to urge in favour of this acceptation the distinction that in the N. T. only *βάπτισμα* is used for Christian baptism in the proper sense of the term, *βαπτισμός*, on the other hand, being in the N. T. a word of wider signification (ix. 10; Mark vii. 4); precarious, because the expression *βάπτισμα* not occurring at all with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews [as also Josephus designates the *rite of John* only by *βαπτισμός*, the *action* by *βάπτισις*, *Antiq.* xviii. 5. 2], with regard to his usage in this respect thus nothing can be determined. — In close inner connection with the *βαπτισμοί* stands the *ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν*. As therefore the readers ought no longer to be in need of teaching concerning the nature of the former (and concerning its pre-eminence over the kindred institutions of Judaism), so was it also to be reasonably expected that they should experience a necessity for being instructed concerning the nature of the

latter (and concerning the eminent blessings which attend thereon). The reference is to that laying on of hands by which those previously baptized were fully received into the communion, and through which the reception of the Holy Ghost was wont to be vouchsafed to them. Comp. Acts viii. 17 ff., xix. 6. From this close inner connectedness of the ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν with the βαπτισμοί results that, also as regards the external arrangement of words, the genitive ἐπιθέσεως does not depend immediately upon θεμέλιον, but like βαπτισμῶν upon διδαχῆς. But, moreover, even the following genitives, ἀναστάσεως and κρίματος, are, as rightly apprehended by Storr, Böhme, Ebrard, Bisping,¹ Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, and Woerner, governed by διδαχῆς. For not by the resurrection of the dead, and the everlasting judgment itself, since these facts will first unfold themselves in the future, but only by the doctrine thereof can the foundation be laid in Christianity. It would, however, be arbitrary to assign to the words ἀνάστασις and κρίμα in themselves a signification which they can only have in combination with the foregoing διδαχῆς. A grammatical harshness (de Wette) is not to be discovered in this construction, on account of the close connection of the last clauses by means of τε and τε . . . καί; any more than de Wette is right in regarding βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς, in the mode of interpretation above followed, as an unnatural trajection without an example in the writings of our author; for βαπτισμῶν is preposed because the emphasis rests on that word, and an analogon in our epistle is already afforded by the πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς, ii. 4. — ἀναστάσεώς τε νεκρῶν καὶ κρίματος αἰώνιου] Two dogmas already belonging to the Jewish

¹ Wrongly, however, is it supposed by Bisping (as before his time by Gennadius in Occumenius, and Klee) that μετανοίας and πίστις, ver. 1, are already dependent upon διδαχῆς. — Just as wrongly would Calvin, who is followed by Piscator and Owen, enclose βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς, ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν within a parenthesis, “ut sit appositio . . . hoc sensu. Non jacentes rursus fundamentum poenitentiae, fidei in Deum, mortuorum resurrectionis, quae doctrina est baptismi et impositionis manuum . . . Nisi enim appositivè legas, hoc erit absurdi, quod bis idem repetet. Quae enim baptismatis est doctrina, nisi quam hic recenset de fide in Deum, de poenitentia et de judicio ac similibus?” — Both views are deprived of their support by the reflection that μετάνοια and πίστις, ver. 1, denote not a doctrine, but an act [against Stuart].

theology, which obtained by means of Christianity only their more definite, concrete signification. The expression in both these clauses is used quite generally. We have therefore no warrant for limiting, with Estius, Schlichting, Schöttgen, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, and others, the ἀνάστασις to the godly, the κρίμα to the ungodly. On the contrary, both have reference to the pious or believers, and the ungodly or unbelievers in common.

Ver. 3. Repetition of the exhortation, ver. 1, in order immediately to give thereto so much the greater emphasis by attaching the warning, ver. 4 ff. — καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσωμεν] *just this let us do.* — τοῦτο] *sc.* τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φέρεσθαι, ver. 1; Theodoret, ἀντὶ τοῦ σπουδίσωμεν, ἐπιθυμῶμεν, πάντα πόνον ὑπὲρ τῆς τελειότητος ἀσπασώμεθα. Το τοῦτο we cannot supplement from the participial clause, ver. 1: τὸ θεμέλιον καταβάλλεσθαι, as was done, on the presupposition of the reading ποιήσομεν, by Jac. Cappellus (who, however, besides this gives also the true reference, and comes to no decision), Schlichting, Grotius, Dorscheus, Wittich, Limborch, Calnet, Zachariae, Storr, Abresch, and is still done by Hofmann, as it is also regarded by Tholuck as possible; in such wise that there should issue the sense: this also, namely, the laying of the foundation, the author will do, *sc.* at another and more favourable time, if God permit. For—apart from the unsuitability of the sense resulting, according to which the author would declare his intention of treating the more difficult earlier than the more easy, which latter surely contains the preliminary condition for the understanding of the former—against such *supplementing* the fact is decisive, that the μὴ in connection with καταβαλλόμενοι, ver. 1, would be arbitrarily set aside; against the *apprehending in this sense*, the fact that for the expression of such a meaning ποιήσομεν δὲ καὶ τοῦτο must have been written. — εἰάνπερ ἐπιτρέπη ὁ θεός] *provided that God permits it* (1 Cor. xvi. 7), inasmuch, namely, as all things, even the carrying into effect of good resolutions, are subordinated to the higher decree of God. Incomprehensible, therefore, is the assertion of de Wette, who has therein followed Abresch, that the addition εἰάνπερ κ.τ.λ. is plainly irreconcilable “with the taking of our verse in the

sense of a demand." For the supposition, that in this case "the encouraging belief in God's gracious assistance" must be expressed, is an altogether erroneous assumption, since the author in the present passage is by no means aiming at the consolation of the readers, but, on the contrary—as is shown by vv. 4–8—at the alarming of them. To an encouraging and pointing to God's gracious help the discourse first advances, vv. 9, 10.

Vv. 4–8. Warning enforcement of the foregoing exhortation, by dwelling on the impossibility of leading back Christians who have already experienced the abundant blessing of Christianity, and for all that have fallen away again from the same, anew to a state of grace. Very appropriately (against de Wette) does this warning justification attach itself to the preceding demand; since the readers were not merely still far from the *τελειότης* in Christianity, but were, moreover, upon the way of entirely falling off again from Christianity. Comp. especially x. 25–31. In order, therefore, to deter them from such contemplated apostasy, there is very fitly set before the eyes of the readers the magnitude of the culpability which the completed apostasy would involve, and the terrible nature of the divine punitive judgment which it would entail. — In connection with the other view, that a declaration of the purpose of the author is contained in vv. 1–3, the connection of thought would be: Passing over the subjects of catechumenical instruction in Christianity, I shall apply myself to the subjects of deeper Christian knowledge. For it is surely impossible to convert anew Christians who have already been enlightened, and then have fallen away again. By the fruitlessness of enlarging on the initial doctrines, therefore, the author would justify his resolution. But one does not perceive the relevancy of this statement to the case of the readers. For since a preparatory transition, such as is afforded by the paraenetic *φερώμεθα*, ver. 1, and *ποιήσωμεν*, ver. 3,—in that the endeavour after Christian perfection necessarily includes the putting away of all that is opposed to it, thus also of the inclination to apostasy,—would then be entirely wanting, on the contrary, the declaration of the purpose of the author would connect itself with the censure

expressed, v. 11-14; in this way the explanation of this resolution must be found in the presupposition either that the readers already actually belonged to the number of the *παραπεσόντες*, or else that, since they must already be reckoned among the *τέλειοι*, what is said admits of no application to them. In the first case, however, the author would represent his own undertaking, for the benefit of *such* readers to pass over to the higher subjects of teaching, as a fruitless one; in the last case, having already just before blamed the readers for their *νηπιότης*, would have fallen into self-contradiction.

Ver. 4. *Γάρ*] goes back to the last main utterance,—thus to *τοῦτο ποιήσωμεν*, ver. 3, and by means thereof to *ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα*, ver. 1, not to *μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι*, ver. 1 (Whitby, de Wette, Bloomfield, Conybeare), nor yet to *ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπη ὁ θεός*, ver. 3 (Piscator, Abresch, Delitzsch, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner), still less, at the same time, to *ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπη ὁ θεός and μὴ πάλιν θεμέλ. καταβ.* (Schlichting). — *ἀδύνατον*] *it is impossible*. The import of the expression is absolute; and to weaken it into “*difficile est*” (so, after the example of the Latin translation in D and E: Ribera, Corn. a Lapide, Clericus, Limborch, Storr, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others), according to which we should have to suppose a rhetorical exaggeration, is an act of caprice. Nor are we justified in seeking to obtain a softening of the declaration, as is done by Er. Schmid, Clericus, Limborch, Schöttgen, Bengel, Cramer, Baumgarten, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Bloomfield (comp. already Ambrose, *de Pcnit.* ii. 3), by urging the force of the *infin. active ἀνακαινίζειν* as pointing to *human* activity, and thus, with a reference to Matt. xix. 26, making the impossibility to exist only on the part of men, not on the part of God. For only the impossibility of the *ἀνακαινίζειν* in itself is accentuated, without respect to the person by whom it must otherwise be effected. Instead of the infinitive active, therefore, the infinitive passive *ἀνακαινίζεσθαι* might have been chosen by the author without affecting the sense. — *τοὺς ἅπαξ . . . αἰῶνος*, ver. 5] characterizing of such as have not only become Christians, but also have already experienced the plenitude of blessing conferred upon Christians. — *τοὺς ἅπαξ*

φωτισθέντας] *those who were once illumined* (x. 32), *i.e.* had already, through the preaching of the gospel, been made participants of the light of the knowledge (*sc.* of Christianity as the perfect religion). As regards the thought, the same thing is said by μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, x. 26. — ἅπαξ belongs, as to φωτισθέντας, so also to the three following participles (against Hofmann), and finds its opposition in πάλιν, ver. 6. It does not signify “plene” or “perfecte” (Wolf), nor does it denote an act which admits of no repetition (Delitzsch); contains, however, the implication, that the once ought to have sufficed and satisfied. Comp. [ix. 26] x. 2; Jude 3. — φωτίζειν τινά, of the spiritual enlightenment effected by teaching, is purely Hellenistic. Comp. Eph. iii. 9; John i. 9; LXX. Ps. cxix. 130; 2 Kings xii. 2, xvii. 27, *al.* — γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου] *and have tasted the heavenly gift*. γεύεσθαι τινος, to taste or receive a savour of a thing, figurative indication of perception by one’s own experience. See on ii. 9. The construction of the verb with the genitive (instead of being with the accusative, as ver. 5) does not justify us, with many strict Reformed expositors, in finding a mere “gustare extremis labris” in the expression. Besides, such an interpretation would be in conflict with the design of the writer, since it cannot be within his intention to represent the culpability of the persons in question as small; he must, on the contrary, aim at bringing out the same in all its magnitude. — By δωρεὰ ἐπουράνιος, Primasius, Haymo, Estius, Michaelis, Semler, and others understand *the Lord’s Supper*; Owen, Calmet, Ernesti, Whitby, M’Lean, Bloomfield, *the Holy Ghost* (against which the following special mention of the same is decisive); Klee, *regeneration in general*, in contradistinction from the special communication of the Spirit in baptism; M’Caul, “the persuasion of the eternal life, the χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. vi. 23;” Hofmann, *righteousness*; Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, *Paraphrase*; Cameron, Hammond, Rambach, Ebrard, Maier, *the forgiveness of sins*; Justinian, Schlichting, Grotius, *the peace of mind* arising from forgiveness; Pareus, *faith*; Sel. Schmidt, Dorscheus, Peirce, Bengel, Carpzov, Cramer, Bisping, and others, *Christ*; Morus, Heinrichs, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart,

Stengel, and others, *the Christian religion or the gospel*; Abresch, Bleek, *the enlightenment* imparted to men through the preaching of the gospel, or *the heavenly light itself*, which effects the enlightenment, and by means thereof communicates itself to men. Inasmuch as τε points to a close connection between the second clause and the first, and the emphasis rests upon the foregoing γευσάμενους, ἡ δωρεά is at any rate to be taken quite generally. Most naturally, therefore, shall we think in general of the *gift of grace*, i.e. of the abundant grace of Christianity. It is called *heavenly*, inasmuch as Christ was sent forth from heaven in order to communicate it, and heaven is the scene of its full realization. — καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου] *and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost.* The consequence and seal of the gift of grace just mentioned.

Ver. 5. Καὶ καλὸν γευσάμενους θεοῦ ῥῆμα] *and have tasted the refreshing word of God.* That the author already makes use afresh in this place of the verb γεύεσθαι, after he has only just before employed it ver. 4, Bleek ascribes, not wrongly, to a certain perplexity on the part of the writer about finding for the idea to be expressed another term of the same import. For the supposition of Delitzsch, that the repetition of the same expression is to be explained from the design of bringing out so much the more strongly the reality of the experiences made and of their objects, would be admissible only if the second γευσάμενους, like the first, were placed emphatically at the beginning of its clause, and there were not already another verb inserted between the two γευσάμενους. γεύεσθαι is here, as John ii. 9, construed with the accusative, which occurs only in the Hellenistic, never with the Greek classic writers. To assume, however, a different signification in the case of the two constructions,—Bengel: “alter (genitivus) partem denotat; nam gustum Christi, doni coelestis, non exaurimus in hac vita; alter (accusativus) plus dicit, quatenus verbi Dei prae-dicati gustus totus ad hanc vitam pertinet, quanquam eidem verbo futuri virtutes seculi annectuntur;” Bloomfield: “here (ver. 4) γεύεσθαι signifies to have experience of a thing, by having received and possessed it; whereas in the clause following it signifies to know a thing by experience of its value and benefit;” Delitzsch (comp. also Moll): “with γευ-

σαμένους τῆς δωρ. τῆς ἐπουρ. is combined the conception that the heavenly gift is destined for all men, and is of inexhaustible fulness of intent; with καλὸν γευσασμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα, however, the conception that God's precious word was, as it were, the daily bread of those thus described,"—is already forbidden by the homogeneity of the statements, ver. 4 and ver. 5. — The expression ῥήματα καλά serves, LXX. Josh. xxi. 45, xxiii. 15, Zech. i. 13, for the rendering of the Hebrew לֶחֶם דְּבָרִים and is used of words of consolation and promise spoken by God or the angel of God. In accordance therewith, we shall best also here refer καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα to *the gospel*, inasmuch as God thereby gives promises, and fulfils the promises given. So Theodoret (τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν τῶν ἀγαθῶν), Estius, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Owen, Whitby, Abresch, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz. — Others, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Faber Stapulensis, Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Bengel, Peirce, Heinrichs, Alford, understand the expression of the gospel in general; in connection with which some, as Calvin and Braun, see denoted in καλόν a contrast with the Mosaic law, the characteristic of which was judicial severity. According to Bleek, finally, we have to think of a *personified attribute of God*; which is supposed to be here mentioned because the gospel, with its consolatory message, is an efflux from the same,—an interpretation, however, which finds no sort of support in the context. — δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος] *and powers of the world to come*. What is intended is the extraordinary miraculous powers wrought by the Holy Ghost, as these were called forth by the new order of the world founded by Christ. The αἰὼν μέλλον, namely (comp. οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα, ii. 5), is for the author nothing purely future,—so that we have not, with Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Böhme, Kurtz, and others, to think of the everlasting life, or of the glory coming in with the Parousia of Christ, of which believers have received a foretaste here upon earth,—but already begins, according to his view, with the appearing of Christ upon earth, in that only its consummation still belongs to the future, namely, the time of Christ's return.

Ver. 6. *Καὶ παραπεσόντας*] *and* (in spite of this) *have fallen*, *i.e.* have fallen away again from Christianity. — *πάλιν*] belongs to *ἀνακαινίζειν*. The taking of the same with *παραπεσόντας* (Heinsius, Alting, Peirce, and others) has the position of the word against it. A pleonasm, however (Grotius), is not produced by *πάλιν* along with the *ἀνα* in *ἀνακαινίζειν*. For *ἀνα* marks out the becoming new as a change ensuing, in opposition to the preceding state of the old man; whereas *πάλιν* has reference to the fact that the class of men described have already experienced that change, namely, at their first conversion. — *ἀνακαινίζειν*] *to renew*, to fashion inwardly new. To supplement an *ἐαυτούς* to the verb (Erasmus, Vatablus, *al.*), according to which the preceding accusatives of the object would be changed into accusatives of the subject, is arbitrary. — *εἰς μετάνοιαν*] not equivalent to *διὰ μετανοίας* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Zeger, Corn. a Lapide), but under the form of conception of *the result*: in such wise that change of mind or repentance should arise therefrom. — *ἀνασταυροῦντας κ.τ.λ.*] *since they*, etc. Note of cause to *ἀδύνατον ἀνακαινίζειν*. The impossibility of the renewal is explained by the magnitude of the culpability. By their action such men bear witness that the Son of God is in their estimation a transgressor and deceiver who has been justly crucified. — The compound form *ἀνασταυροῦν* occurs with classic writers only in the sense of “nailing up to the cross.” Comp. L. Bos, *Exercitatt.*, and Wetstein *ad loc.* In itself, however, the explanation is equally admissible: “crucify afresh.” Thus it is accordingly taken without questioning by the Greek interpreters, and probably was so meant by the author. — *ἐαυτοῖς*] Dativus incommodi: *to their own judgment*. Vatablus: *in suam ipsorum perniciem*. Too weak, Bleek,—to whom Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 769), and Alford give in their adhesion,—“they crucify Him to themselves, in so far as, by that crucifying again, they rob Him of themselves, who were in His possession.” False is the interpretation of Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Böhme, Bisping: *as much as in them lies, ὅσον τὸ ἐφ’ ἐαυτοῖς*; Heinrichs: *each one for himself*; Schulz: *by themselves* [by their own act]; Grotius, Abresch, Tholuck, explaining by the supposition of the so-called Dativus

localis: *in themselves*; Hofmann: *as regards their own persons*; Klee: *to their contentment*; Stengel: *to the joy and pleasure of their obdurate heart*; Kurtz: *to the gratification of their hatred or their enmity against Him*. Over refinedly Bengel and Delitzsch: *sibi*, as an opposition to *παραδειγματίζοντας*, ostentantes, *sc. aliis*. — τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ] A more palpable manifestation of the enormity of the crime than would have been the case had he written τὸν Χριστὸν or Ἰησοῦν. Comp. x. 29. — παραδειγματίζειν] to expose to scorn and insult; here, inasmuch as the death of the cross was a shameful one. παραδειγματίζειν stronger than the simple δειγματίζειν, Matt. i. 19.

Concluding remarks on vv. 4–6. — The declaration of vv. 4–6 has been of importance for the controversy of the early church, as to the question whether those who relapsed from the gospel renounced for ever the hope of salvation, or whether by means of sincere repentance they might once more attain to a state of salvation. The rigoristic view was especially maintained by the Montanists and Novatianists; and already Tertullian, *de Pudicitia*, c. 20, appeals to our passage in favour thereof. In opposition to this view, another sense was universally put upon the passage in the orthodox church from the time of the fourth century. The words were interpreted of an impossibility of imparting a second time the baptism once administered, and the consequent condemnable character of such an act, in that according to a later *usus loquendi* (first met with in Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 62, 65) they took φωτίζειν to be a designation of baptism, referred ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν to the repetition of baptism, and in ἀνασταυροῦντας κ.τ.λ. found the indication of that which such repetition would produce or involve. Comp. *e.g.* Theodoret: *Τῶν ἄγαν ἀδυνάτων, φησὶν, τοὺς τῷ παναγίῳ προσελλυθότας βαπτίσματι καὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος χάριτος μετειληφότας καὶ τῶν αἰωνίων ἡγαθῶν δεξαμένους τὸν τύπον αὐθις προσελθεῖν καὶ τυχεῖν ἑτέρου βαπτίσματος. Τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδέν ἐστιν ἕτερον, ἢ πάλιν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ σταυρῷ προσηλωσάιν καὶ τὴν γεγεννημένην ἡμιμίαν πάλιν αὐτῷ προσάψαι. "Ὡσπερ γὰρ ἅπαξ τὸ πάθος αὐτὸς ὑπέμεινε, οὕτω καὶ ἡμᾶς ἅπαξ αὐτῷ προσήκει*

κοινωνῆσαι τοῦ πάθους. Συνθαπτόμεθα δὲ αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος καὶ συνανιστάμεθα. Οὐχ οἷόν τε οὖν ἡμᾶς πάλιν ἀπολαῦσαι τῆς τοῦ βαπτίσματος δωρεᾶς. Χριστὸς γὰρ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔτι ἀποθνήσκει, θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔτι κυριεύει. Ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐξάπαξ, ὃ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ. Καὶ ἡμῶν δὲ ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι, τοῦ θανάτου τὸν τύπον δεξιόμενος.) That this interpretation, which is still followed among later expositors by Faber Stapulensis, Clarius, and Calmet, is a wrong one, is now generally admitted. The justification, however, of this passage, which furnished to Luther a determining reason for denying to the epistle canonicity in the narrower sense (see the Introduction, p. 18), is afforded by the fact that—as is also pointed out, x. 26-31—the author is speaking not of a falling away in general, but of a clearly defined falling away, *i.e.*, as is rightly urged by Calvin, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Estius, Seb. Schmidt, Peirce, Carpzov, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 341 f. 2 Aufl.), Maier, and others, those Christians are described who commit the sin against the Holy Ghost (Matt. xii. 31 f.; Mark iii. 28 f.; Luke xii. 10), or the ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον (1 John v. 16). For Christians are described who fall away, not, *e.g.*, from mere weakness, from a mere wavering of conviction, but in spite of a better knowledge, and in spite of having experienced the treasures of grace in Christianity; Christians who, according to the parallel passage, x. 26 ff., against their better consciousness and conscience, tread under foot the Son of God as though He were a deceiver, brand His blood shed for redemption as the blood of a transgressor, and scoff at the Spirit of grace as a spirit of falsehood. In regard to men of this kind, the ἀδύνατον πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν is employed in its full right, since with them there must be inwardly wanting every kind of receptiveness or receptibility for the μετάνοια. The reference of the declaration to the sin against the Holy Ghost is, moreover, so much the more unquestionable, inasmuch as the author by no means says that the readers have already committed it, but, on the contrary, only sets at once before their eyes as a terrible

warning the extreme length to which their conduct may lead them.

Vv. 7, 8. Confirmation of the ἀδύνατον κ.τ.λ. on its *objective side*; since in connection with so great culpability and such ingratitude the divine punishment cannot fail to ensue. This thought is rendered manifest by means of a similitude. The common subject for ver. 7 and ver. 8 is not merely γῆ, but γῆ ἡ πιούσα τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλὰ-κίς ὑετόν taken together. For the intention of the author is to point to the diversity of result arising from equally favourable preliminary conditions. The main point of the similitude, however, lies in ver. 8, while ver. 7 serves only by way of preparation, and as a means of bringing out into bolder relief the following opposition. — γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιούσα . . . ὑετόν] *for the field which has drunk in the rain frequently coming down upon it.* Figure of the men before described, who oftentimes have experienced God's gracious benefits, and have received the same into themselves. — The participle aorist πιούσα is chosen, while then participles present (τίκτουσα, ἐκφέρουσα) follow, because the fact already historically completed is to be emphasized, from which, then, two different effects are developed for the time present. — Ἀ πίνειν, τίκτειν, etc., is ascribed to the γῆ, because this, as in general is very frequently the case, is personified as a part of the life-displaying, assiduously productive nature. — ἐπ' αὐτῆς] The construction of ἐπὶ with the genitive, after a verb of motion, is distinguished from the more usual one with the accusative, in this respect, that the former includes in itself at the same time the notion of *tarrying*. Comp. Winer, *Gramm.* 7 Aufl. p. 352. — καὶ τίκτουσα] In place of this, merely τίκτουσα or τίκτουσα μὲν would have been more correctly written. Καί, however, does not stand in the sense of "also" (Hofmann), but is the ordinary "and." — Βοτάνη] in the N. T. only here, employed by the LXX. as a rendering of עֵשֶׂב (Gen. i. 11, 12), עֵשֶׂב (Ex. ix. 22, x. 12, 15), and יִרְצִי (Job viii. 12), denotes, according to its derivation from βόσκω, originally herbage or pasturage, but then also every kind of vegetation or produce of the field. — εὐθετος] *well-placed, fit, profitable.* Comp. Luke ix. 62, xiv. 35. — ἐκείνους]

may be referred to εὐθετον (Böhme and the majority), but it also admits of being referred to τίκτουσα (Bleek, Alford, Hofmann). — δι' οὓς] *for whose sake*. Grammatically false, the Vulgate, Zeger, and others: *a quibus*; Calvin: *quorum opera*; Erasmus, Vatablus, Heinrichs, and others: *per quos*; Luther: *for those who till it*; Schulz: *for those who labour on it*; Wieseler (*Comm. üb. d. Br. P. an die Gal.*, Gött. 1859, p. 111): *at whose command and disposal*. — καὶ γεωργεῖται] *it also (or even) is cultivated*, brings into relief the naturalness of the τίκτειν βοτάνην εὐθετον ἐκείνοις, in that the ἐκείνοι are the *proprietors* of the land, to whom the cultivation and produce of the same pertains. Incorrectly Schlichting (as likewise Böhme, Kuinoel, Hofmann): Ait autem “*et colitur*,” ut ad imbrium irrigationem etiam terrae istius diligentem accedere culturam ostendat. In the application of the figure, the ἐκείνοι, δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται are God and Christ; not God alone (Schlichting, Grotius, Cramer, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford), since in this way justice is not done to the plural. — μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ] *receives part in the blessing at the hand of God*, namely, in that its fruitfulness is progressively augmented. Comp. Matt. xiii. 12; John xv. 2. Too weak, Grotius, Wittich: it is praised or commended by God. — ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ] *from God* (as the bestower), is best connected with μεταλαμβάνει, not with εὐλογίας.

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

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

Ver. 9. Softening of the foregoing warning representation by attestation of the confidence, that this description will not be applicable to the readers. — Πεπεῖσμεθα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν] *But we are convinced in regard to you.* Comp. Rom. xv. 14. — πεπεῖσμεθα] stronger than πεποίθαμεν. — περὶ ὑμῶν] has the emphasis. It is therefore already placed here, not first

after *σωτηρίας*. — The appellation *ἀγαπητοί* only here in the epistle. Schlichting: Apposite eos sic vocat, ne putarent, eum aliquo ipsorum odio laborare, sed ut scirent, eum amore Christiano erga ipsos flagrare, qui amor facit, ut semper meliora ominemur iis, quos amamus, et, si quid severius dicimus, animo corrigendi non nocendi cupido dicamus. — *τὰ κρείσσονα*] *of that which is better*. This may refer to the subjective side, but it may also refer to the objective side of the foregoing comparison. In the first case the sense is: that your condition is a better one, than that you should be compared to a land bringing forth thorns and thistles; in the latter case: that your fate will be a better one than curse and perdition. On account of the plural *τὰ κρείσσονα* we shall do best to combine both factors together, as, indeed, the last is but the consequence of the first. When, however, Hofmann thinks that *τὰ κρείσσονα* does not at all point to the foregoing comparison, but stands by itself without any reference, in that it denotes only the good in opposition to the bad, this is not only opposed to the context, but also grammatically false, since the comparative is never placed for the positive. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 227 f. — *καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας*] *and of that which stands in contact with salvation, i.e. that you will attain to salvation*. *ἐχόμενον*, with the genitive, denotes that which is closely joined to an object, that which is either outwardly (logically or temporally) or inwardly bound up with it. Instances in Bleek, II. 2, p. 220 ff. — *εἰ καὶ οὕτως λαλοῦμεν*] Chrysostom: *βέλτιον γὰρ ὑμᾶς τοῖς ῥήμασι φοβῆσαι, ἢνα μὴ τοῖς πράγμασι ἀλγήσητε*. — *οὕτως*] *sc. as was done vv. 4–8*.

Ver. 10. Reason for the good confidence expressed ver. 9. — *οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεός, ἐπιλαθέσθαι*] *for God is not unjust, that He should forget*. God exercises retributive righteousness. Since, then, the readers have performed, and do still perform, actions worthy of Christian recognition, it is to be expected that God will be mindful thereof, and, provided they will only perform their own part fully (comp. vv. 11, 12), will conduct them with His grace and lead them to the possession of salvation. A claim to demand salvation of God, on account of their behaviour, is not conceded by the words of ver. 10;

only as a factor which God, by virtue of His retributive righteousness, will take into account in connection with the final result, is this brought forward for the consolation and encouragement of the readers; while, moreover, reference is at once made anew, ver. 11 f., to the still unsatisfactory character of their Christian state, and in general to the peril of falling again from their state of grace. — ἐπιλαθέσθαι] The infinitive aorist expresses the mere verbal notion, without respect to the relation of time. See Kühner, II. § 445, 2. It is to be taken neither in the sense of a preterite (Seb. Schmidt: ut oblitus sit) nor of a future (Bisping and others). — τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν] your work (as lying completed), *i.e.* that which you have done. The expression is quite general. A more precise limitation thereof may be found in the following καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης, by taking καὶ as the expegetic “and indeed,” “and that.” So Peshito, as also Kurtz and Woerner. But since, in any case, the passage x. 32 ff. is to be compared as a real (though not verbal) parallel to the statement ver. 10, and there, in addition to the love displayed, the steadfastness manifested by the readers under persecutions is lauded, it is most natural, with Schlichting, Grotius, and others, to suppose that just to this the general τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν in our passage also more especially alluded. — τῆς ἀγάπης] has not in itself alone the notion of love “to the brethren,” in such wise that εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ would have to be translated: “for His name” (Matt. x. 41, 42, xviii. 20), *i.e.* to His honour (Vulgate: in nomine ejus; Böhme and others: ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, Matt. xviii. 5). On the contrary, τῆς ἀγάπης acquires its object in the εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, to be construed in relation to ἧς ἐνεδέξασθε (not to διακονήσαντες κ.τ.λ., to which Beza was inclined). Thus: *the love which ye have shown to His name* (sc. God’s name, not Christ’s, Ernesti and others). This is the more general object, which only then obtains its more special reference and indication of purport by διακονήσαντες κ.τ.λ. A love exercised towards Christian brethren, inasmuch as Christians, as God’s children, bear the name of God. — διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις] in that ye have rendered service to the saints (the fellow-Christians), have aided them when they were in distress and affliction (not specially: in

poverty). But that this was not merely a virtue exercised once for all, but one still continuously exercised, is clearly brought out by the addition *καὶ διακονοῦντες*.

Vv. 11, 12. To that which the author hopes with regard to the readers, he now attaches that which he wishes to see performed by them. — *ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δέ]* *now we long*, most ardently desire. Stronger expression than *θέλομεν* or *βουλόμεθα* [to set one's heart on it, Matt. xiii. 17; Acts xx. 33; 1 Tim. iii. 1, etc.]. — *ἕκαστον ὑμῶν]* More emphatic and accentuating than the mere *ὑμᾶς* would be. There is denoted by it, on the one hand, that the heart-felt interest which the author cherishes in the readers extends to every single one of them. On the other hand, there lies in it the thought that if haply single individuals among the readers already correspond to the demand here made, it is still of supreme importance that every one of them should so comport himself as is mentioned. — In the sequel, *τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν* is not in such manner to be taken together with *ἄχρι τέλους* that the main stress should fall upon this, and *πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος* be regarded as a mere subsidiary factor. In connection with this mode of interpretation, adopted by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Grotius, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, and others, the demand of the author would amount to this, that the readers should manifest the same zeal which, according to ver. 10, they have already displayed, even to the end or in all future time. But in such manner it is assumed that the author has every reason for being satisfied with the Christian condition of the readers, and desires nothing more than a continuance of the same, whereas the whole epistle testifies that the state of things with the Hebrews was very different from this. Hence it is evident that the emphasis rests quite as much upon *πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος* as upon *ἄχρι τέλους*. The thought must thus be: the author longs for the readers to display the same zeal which they have already manifested in regard to an active love, in equal measure also in another relation, namely, in regard to the *πληροφορία κ.τ.λ.* (so Bengel, Cramer, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and

others), in connection with which, however, ἄχρι τέλους is best taken, not, as is generally the case even with this correct determination of the thought, with ἐνδείκνυσθαι, but in close juxtaposition with πρὸς τὴν πληροφориαν τῆς ἐλπίδος. — πρὸς τὴν πληροφориαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἄχρι τέλους] *in regard to the full certainty of conviction concerning the Christian's hope, unto the end, i.e. in such manner that ye cherish and preserve to the end the Christian's hope of the Messianic kingdom to be looked for at the coming again of Christ, as a firm confidence of faith, untroubled by any doubts.* Comp. iii. 6, 14. Opposite is the wavering conviction that the subject of the Christian hope is one founded in objective truth; the standing still upon the path of Christianity before the goal is reached, and the tendency to fall away again from Christianity and to relapse into Judaism. — πληροφориα] We have not, with Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, and others (after the example of the Vulgate: "ad expletionem spei"), to apprehend in the *active* sense of "perfecting, making full or complete;" but to take it, as everywhere in the N. T. (1 Thess. i. 5; Col. ii. 2; Heb. x. 22; comp. also Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5), with Erasmus, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Calov, Wolf, Abresch, Heinrichs, Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, and the majority, in the *passive* sense. — ἄχρι τέλους] *unto the end, i.e. until (at the Parousia of the Lord) hope passes over into the possession [of the kingdom] itself.*

Ver. 12. Further prosecution of πρὸς τὴν πληροφориαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἄχρι τέλους, ver. 11. — ἵνα μὴ νωθοὶ γένησθε] *that ye become not sluggish.* The γένησθε, pointing to the future, stands in no contradiction with γεγόνατε at v. 11. There, the sluggishness of the intellect was spoken of; here, it is sluggishness in the retaining of the Christian hope. There is therefore no need of the conjecture νόθοι (after xii. 8) for νωθοὶ (Heinrichs). — μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομοῦντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας] *but rather imitators of those who, through faith and perseverance, inherit the promises.* Of the two substantives πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας, the latter forms the leading idea; comp. ver. 15, where only μακροθυμίας is placed. καὶ is therefore the more nearly defining

“and indeed.” Thus : *by faith, and indeed by persevering constancy in the same.* — The *μακροθυμία*, elsewhere usually the divine attribute of long-suffering or forbearance, is likewise predicated of men, Col. i. 11 ; Jas. v. 7, 8, 10 ; LXX. Isa. lvii. 15 (*ὀλιγοψύχοις διδοὺς μακροθυμίαν*), and frequently, and in the first-named passage combined with *ὑπομονή* as a synonym. — The *ἐπαγγελίαι* are those given by God in the time of the Old Covenant, which by means of Christianity attain to their full realization. Comp. vii. 6, viii. 6, xi. 13, 17, 33 ; Rom. ix. 4, xv. 8 ; 2 Cor. i. 20, vii. 1 ; Gal. iii. 16. Comp. also the singular *ἡ ἐπαγγελία*, ix. 15, x. 36, xi. 39. — *κληρονομεῖν τὰς ἐπαγγελίας* denotes : *to enter into the heritage of these promises, i.e. to attain to the enjoyment or possession of the blessings placed in prospect by them.* That in our passage (comp. ix. 15, x. 36, xi. 39) *κληρονομεῖν τὰς ἐπαγγελίας* cannot be understood, with Schulz and Bleek, of the mere “receiving of the imparting of the promises as such, apart from their fulfilment,” is shown by the very position of the words, according to which the main force of the statement is contained not in *τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*, but in *κληρονομοῦντων*. Comp. also ver. 15, where for the same reason *ἐπέτυχεν* is placed before the substantive *τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*. Besides, it is also evident from the fact that in such case there would be nothing in ver. 12 to correspond to the conception of the ensuing *possession itself*, indicated as this is in the *ἄχρι τέλους* of ver. 11. — In connection with *τῶν κληρονομοῦντων* almost all expositors, including Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bispin, Delitzsch, Kluge, think of *the patriarchs*, especially Abraham, and of them either alone or with the inclusion of all believers of the New Covenant. This interpretation, however, to which they were without any necessity led by the consideration of ver. 13, is untenable. For, in order to harmonize with it in its first-named form, the writing of *κληρονομησάντων* would have been necessary,—for which, accordingly, many will have the participle present to be taken ; to harmonize with it in its last-named form, the writing of *κληρονομησάντων τε καὶ κληρονομοῦντων* would have been required. The characterizing *οἱ διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομοῦντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας* is, on the contrary, quite a

general one, and the participle *present* marks out that which assuredly takes place, or in accordance with a constant and fixed rule (as a rewarding of the fulfilled preliminary condition of *πίστις καὶ μακροθυμία*). The thought is therefore, not that the readers should take the patriarchs as a model, but in general that they should take as such those who manifest persevering constancy in the faith, and, on that very account, beyond doubt attain to the possession of that which is promised.

Vv. 13–15. Proof of the general truth that steadfast endurance leads to the possession of the promised blessing, from the special instance of Abraham. Calvin: *exemplum Abrahæ adducitur, non quia unicum sit, sed quia præ aliis illustre.* — τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπαγγελιάμενος ὁ θεός] *for when God had given promise to Abraham.* ἐπαγγελιάμενος we have, with de Wette, to take as in point of time anterior to ὤμοσεν. It has reference to the promises which God had already, Gen. xii. 7, xvii. 5, 6, xviii. 18, imparted to Abraham, and which were then, Gen. xxii. 16–18, not merely repeated to him by God, and confirmed by an oath, but likewise, in part at least, were fulfilled (see at ver. 15). — ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐδενὸς κ.τ.λ.] *because there was no greater or higher (οὐδενός, masculine, not, as Hofmann supposes, neuter), by whom He could swear, He swore by Himself.* Relation of the words, LXX. Gen. xxii. 16: κατ' ἐμαντοῦ ὤμοσα, λέγει κύριος, with the reason for this form of declaration inserted. Comp. Philo, *Legg. allegor.* iii. 98 E (with Mangey, I. p. 127), where, with regard to the same passage of Scripture, it is said: εὖ καὶ τῷ ὅρκῳ βεβαιώσας τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν, καὶ ὅρκῳ θεοπρεπεῖ. Ὅρῳ γὰρ ὅτι οὐ καθ' ἑτέρου ὀμνύει θεός—οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ κρείττον — ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, ὅς ἐστι πάντων ἄριστος.

Ver. 14. Εἰ μὴν κ.τ.λ.] Adducing of the declaration, Gen. xxii. 17, with the difference, that in the case of the LXX. πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου is in harmony with the original put in place of πληθυνῶ σε. This deviation is not to be explained by the supposition that the author chose σε instead of τὸ σπέρμα σου merely “for brevity’s sake” (Jac. Cappellus), or “in order to present the promise in a form as concentrated as possible” (Delitzsch), or that he cited from memory (Abresch), or that he

wished to place in the background all thought of the merely physical descendants of Abraham, and direct the glance of the reader exclusively to the spiritual or heavenly posterity of Abraham, which was appointed to him through Christ (Böhme, Bisping, and others). It has its ground simply in the fact that the author was here occupied exclusively with the person of Abraham himself (Bleek, de Wette, Maier). — εἰ μὴν] in place of the Greek ἡ μὴν, or of the εἰ μὴ, formed after the Hebrew עַד־כֵּן, is met with elsewhere in the LXX. (Ezek. xxxiii. 27, xxxiv. 8, xxxv. 6, xxxvi. 5, *al.*), not, indeed, so far as concerns our passage in the *Cod. Alex.* and *Cod. Vatic.*, but yet in other ancient MSS.; and in any case, our author found it in the copy of the LXX. used by him. — The combination of the participle with the *tempus finitum* of the same verb (εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω κ.τ.λ.) is a well-known Grecising of the Hebrew *inf. absol.*, occurring exceedingly often in the LXX., and serving generally—as here—for the augmented and solemn emphasizing of the idea contained in the verb. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 332.

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

¹ Who unaccountably advances, as an argument in support, the supposition that “then a parallel arises between the Christians, who, according to vv. 17, 18, are, on the ground of the divine oath, to hold fast the hope, and Abraham, who likewise did so.”

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

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

hope, objectively assured and undisappointing as this is, the Christians therefore must feel themselves most powerfully animated.

Ver. 16. *Γάρ*] establishes the *ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐδενὸς κ.τ.λ., ὁμοσευ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ*, ver. 13. Not, however, ver. 16 merely (against Hofmann), but the whole paragraph, vv. 16–18, is to be looked upon as an establishing of these words. For ver. 16 is only a lemma, only a preparation for ver. 17 f.; and, indeed, ver. 16 states the practice valid among men with regard to the taking of the oath, while ver. 17 f. there is shown in connection with this the object contemplated by God in His declaration upon oath. — *κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος*] *by the Higher One*. *μείζονος* is not *neuter* (McAul: “to a thing that is greater, e.g. the temple, the altar;” Hofmann), but *masculine*, and thereby *God* is intended. — With *καί* the second half of the sentence, ver. 16, is closely attached to the first: “and so,” “and consequently.” To the habitual practice of men just mentioned, the legal relation therefrom arising is joined on. — *πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαιώσιν ὁ ὅρκος*] *the oath is to them an end to every kind of* (every conceivable) *contradiction, unto establishment*. Comp. Philo, *de sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, p. 146 (with Mangey, I. p. 181): *Τοῦ τε μὴν πιστευθῆναι χάριν ἀπιστούμενοι καταφεύγουσιν ἐφ' ὅρκου ἀνθρώποι· ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ λέγων πιστὸς ἐστὶν ὥστε καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ βεβαιότητος ἕνεκα μηδὲν ὀρκῶν διαφέρειν. . . . Οὐ γὰρ δι' ὅρκου πιστὸς ὁ θεός, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτὸν καὶ ὁ ὅρκος βέβαιος*. — For *ἀντιλογία* as “contradiction” (Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Woerner), comp. vii. 7, also xii. 3; Jude 11. The signification “dispute,” “litigation,” assumed by Theophylact, Erasmus, Zeger, Cameron, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Heinrichs, Böhme, Stengel, and the majority, is certainly perfectly warranted by the usage alike of the classical writers (Xen. *Hellen.* vi. 3. 9) as of the LXX. (Ex. xviii. 6, Heb. דָּבָר; Deut. xix. 7, הָרִיב; Prov. xviii. 18, מִדְּרִיב, *al.*). But here this meaning is remote from the connection, since ver. 16 serves for the explanation of the trustworthiness of a divine declaration, but not the explanation of a contention between God and men (Bleek). The meaning “dubitatio,” “doubt,” assigned to the word by

Grotius and Cramer, it never has. — εἰς βεβαίωσιν] *unto ratification*, or the creation of an indefeasible claim. Wrongly do Jac. Cappellus, Peirce, Paulus, and others take εἰς βεβαίωσιν — which belongs to the whole second clause, not merely to πέρας (Böhme, Bleek, Bispington, Alford)—along with ὁ ὄρκος: “the oath given in confirmation,” which must have been expressed by ὁ εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὄρκος. — It results as a necessary inference from ver. 16, that the author did not regard the taking of the oath on the part of men as anything forbidden. Comp. Calvin: Praeterea hic locus docet aliquem inter Christianos jurisjurandi usum esse legitimum. . . . Nam apostolus certe hic de ratione jurandi tanquam de re pia et Deo probata disserit. Porro non dicit olim fuisse in usu, sed adhuc vigere pronuntiat.

Ver. 17. Ἐν ᾧ] *Upon the basis of which fact, i.e. in accordance with this human custom, as one valid among men.* ἐν ᾧ, namely, refers back to the whole contents of ver. 16 (not merely to ὁ ὄρκος), and coheres not with βουλόμενος ἐπιδείξαι (Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Rambach, Hofmann, *al.*), nor yet with the whole clause following (Delitzsch, Alford), but with ἐμεσίτευσεν ὄρκῳ. — περισσώτερον] is to be taken along with ἐπιδείξαι. It does not, however, signify *unto redundancy*, since this was not at all required (Beza, Schlichting, Seb. Schmidt, Carpzov, Storr, Klee, and others), but: *so much the more*, or: *more emphatically*, than would have been done by the mere imparting of the promise. — τοῖς κληρονόμοις τῆς ἐπαγγελίας] *to the heirs of the promise.* By the κληρονόμοι, Grotius, Owen, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Bispington, Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others understand *the patriarchs as well as all believers*; Tholuck and others, *only the Old Testament saints*; Morus even (notwithstanding the plural), *only Abraham*; Calvin, *the Jews*. But, as is clearly apparent from the elucidatory ἵνα ἔχωμεν, ver. 18, *only the Christians* can be meant. — τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ] *the unalterableness of His decree*, namely, to make all believers blessed through the seed of Abraham. Arbitrarily, because to the violent setting aside of the nearest circle of thought furnished by the context itself, Abresch (and similarly Michaelis, Storr, and Delitzsch): “crediderim, non juratam eam promissionem spectari, quam Abrahamo factam in superioribus dixerat, sed illud

nominatim iusjurandum, quo Christus sit pontifex creatus ad Melchisedeci rationem" (Ps. cx. 4). Neither ver. 20, nor vii. 1 ff., nor vii. 20, 21, 28, nor v. 10, contains a justification of this view. — The substantively employed adjective brings out the idea of the unchangeableness, about the accentuation of which the author was here principally concerned, more emphatically than if τὴν βουλὴν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀμετάθετον had been written. — ἀμετάθετος in the N. T. only here and at ver. 18. — ἐμεσίτευσεν ὄρκῳ] *He came forward, as an intervening person, with an oath.* As an intermediate person, *sc.* between Himself and Abraham. Men swear by God, because He is higher than they. Thus, in the case of an oath among men, God is the higher middle person [so μεσίτης, Josephus, *Antiq.* iv. 6. 7], or the higher surety, for the fulfilment of the promise. But when *God* takes an oath He can only swear by Himself, since there is no higher one above Him, and thus only Himself undertakes the part of the surety or middle person. μεσιτεύειν, in the N. T. only here, is employed transitively and intransitively; in the latter sense here. It is taken transitively by Oecumenius, who supplements τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν; and Böhme, who supplements τὴν βουλὴν.

Ver. 18. Indication of purpose to ἐμεσίτευσεν ὄρκῳ, ver. 17, and consequently parallel to the participial clause there, περισσότερον βουλόμενος ἐπιδ. τοῖς κληρονόμ. τῆς ἐπ. τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ, but no mere repetition of the same, since the divine purpose, which was there presented purely objectively in relation to Christians, is now subjectively turned in relation to them. — διὰ δύο πραγμάτων ἀμεταθέτων] *by virtue of two unalterable facts*, namely, by virtue of the promise and the oath. Against the connection (comp. vv. 13, 17) Reuss: l'une de ces choses c'est la parole évangélique apportée par Christ, l'autre le serment typique donné à Abraham. — δύο] See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 63; Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr.* p. 25. — ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι θεόν] *in which (i.e. in connection with their fulfilment) it is impossible that God should have lied (deceived).* For God is faithful. His bare word is trustworthy; how much more thus when He confirms it by an oath! To supply a ἡμᾶς to ψεύσασθαι (Heinrichs) is

inadmissible. — *παράκλησιν*] not “consolation” (Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Böhme, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, and the majority), but, as the hortatory tendency of our whole section requires: *encouragement* (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Estius, Semler, Carpzov, Stuart, Bleek, Tholuck, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others). — Upon *παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν*, not upon *οἱ καταφυγόντες* (Primasius, Erasmus, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Akersloot, Wolf, Carpzov, Abresch, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, de Wette, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 749), Alford, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, and many others), does *κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος* depend; so that *οἱ καταφυγόντες* is to be taken, with Oecumenius, Camerarius, Cameron, Seb. Schmidt, Heinrichs, Bleek, Maier, Hofmann, and others, *absolutely*. — *οἱ καταφυγόντες*] *those who have fled*, with the subordinate notion of having found refuge, thus *the sheltered, saved ones*. As regards the sense, the expression is to be thus filled up: we who have fled *out of* the sinful world, and have fled *to* God. As an analogon is compared *οἱ σωζόμενοι* (Acts ii. 47, *al.*). — *κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος*] *to hold fast* (Luther, Schulz, Stuart, Bleek, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Hofmann, and others) *to the hope lying in readiness*. To interpret *κρατῆσαι* as “to lay hold” (Wolf, Tholuck, de Wette, Alford, Kurtz, Ewald, *al.*), with a right combining with *παράκλησιν*, is forbidden by the connection; comp. ver. 11, according to which the readers already possess the *ἐλπίς*, but not as yet any *πληροφορία* thereof; comp. further the *διὰ μακροθυμίας*, ver. 12, and *μακροθυμήσας*, ver. 15. — *τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος* is not the same thing as *τῆς ἐλπίδος τῶν προκειμένων*, “to the hope of the blessings of salvation which lie before us, which await us” (Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Maier), in such wise that a mingling of the objective notion of *ἐλπίς* with the subjective notion thereof would have to be assumed. Still less are we at liberty, with Grotius, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Peirce, Limborch, Heinrichs, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Bloomfield, Alford, Hofmann, and others, to interpret *ἐλπίς* in itself alone as “*res sperata*” (comp. Col. i. 5). On the

contrary, ver. 19 points to the Christian hope in the *subjective* sense. As *προκειμένη*, however, *lying at hand*, or existing in readiness, this is characterized, since it is already infused into the Christians, has already been communicated to them as a blessing for possession, with their reception of Christianity.

Ver. 19. Description of the absolute certainty of this Christian hope.—*ἦν* *sc.* *ἐλπίδα*. The referring back to *παράκλησιν* (Grotius and others) is possible only in connection with the erroneous interpretation of this word as “solatium,” whereas, with the right apprehension of ver. 18, *παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν* serves for the mere introduction of *κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος*; *ἦν* thus most naturally links itself with *ἐλπίδος* as the last preceding leading thought. To this must be added the consideration that frequently also elsewhere in antiquity—though nowhere else in Holy Scripture—the anchor is already employed as a figure of hope, and appears also upon coins as a symbol thereof. See Wetstein, Kypke, and Kuinoel *ad loc.* — *ἦν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς*] *which we possess even as an anchor of the soul, i.e. in which we possess, as it were, an anchor of the soul, which affords it support and protection against the storms and perils of the earthly life.*—There exists no good reason for making *ἔχειν* equivalent to *κατέχειν* (Abresch, Dindorf, Bloomfield, and others). — *ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην κ.τ.λ.*] *which (sc. anchor) is sure and firm, and reaches into the interior of the veil.* Wrongly does Carpzov (and so also Reuss) construe all these words with *ἦν* (*sc.* *ἐλπίδα*). For, in order to render this possible, *ἔχομεν* must have received its place only after *τῆς ψυχῆς*, in such wise that *ὡς ἄγκυραν τῆς ψυχῆς* should admit of being separated by commas from that which precedes and follows. Equally inadmissible is it, however, when Abresch, Böhme, Bleek, Bloomfield, and others take only *ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν* along with *ἄγκυραν*, and then refer back *εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος* to *ἦν* (*sc.* *ἐλπίδα*). For although the figure of an anchor reaching on high, instead of penetrating into the depths, is an incongruous one, yet metaphors are never to be pressed, and in our passage the choice of the expression *εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τὸ*

ἐσώτερον points to the retention of the figure of the anchor, as well as the closely uniting τε . . . καὶ . . . καί to the intimate coherence of the three characteristics. — καταπέτασμα] with the LXX. *usually* (Ex. xxvi. 31–35, xxvii. 21; Lev. xxi. 23, xxiv. 3; Num. iv. 5, *al.*), in the N. T. *always* (x. 20; Matt. xxvii. 51; Mark xv. 38; Luke xxiii. 45) of the *second* (ix. 3), or innermost curtain of the temple, the curtain before the Most Holy Place (הַפְּרָכֶת). Comp. also Philo, *de vita Mosis*, iii. p. 669 B (with Mangey, II. p. 150): ἐν δὲ τῷ μεθορίῳ τῶν τεττάρων καὶ πέντε κίωνων, ὅπερ ἐστὶ κυρίως εἰπεῖν πρόναον, εἰργόμενον δυσὶν ὑφάσμασι, τὸ μὲν ἔνδον ὃν καλεῖται καταπέτασμα, τὸ δ' ἐκτὸς προσαγορεύεται κάλυμμα. *Ibid.* p. 667 C (II. p. 148): ἐκ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν τό τε καταπέτασμα καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον κάλυμμα κατεσκευάζετο· τὸ μὲν εἶσω κατὰ τοὺς τέσσαρας κίονας, ἵν' ἐπικρύπτηται τὸ ἄδυτον· τὸ δ' ἔξω κατὰ τοὺς πέντε κ.τ.λ. — τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος] *the interior of the veil*, i.e. that which is the interior with respect to the veil, or exists *within* the same, thus *behind* it. Designation of the Most Holy Place. Comp. Ex. xxvi. 33; Lev. xvi. 2, 12, 15. The Most Holy Place is spoken of as a symbol of heaven, where God is enthroned in His glory, and at His right hand is enthroned the exalted Christ.

Ver. 20. Close of the digression made from v. 11 onwards, and apt return to v. 10. — ὅπου] *whither*. Inexact, as Luke ix. 57, John viii. 21 f., and often, instead of the ὅποι, which is never used in the N. T. (see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 439); yet more significant than the latter, since it contains, in addition to the notion of *having entered*, the additional notion of *remaining*. — πρόδρομος] *as harbinger*. The expression, in the N. T. only here, characterizes Christ as the first member in a series, thus glances at the fact that those who believe in Him shall attain to the Most Holy Place. Comp. John xiv. 2, 3. — ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν] *in our interest*, or *for our eternal welfare*, namely, to obtain pardon for us (ix. 12), to represent us in the presence of God (ix. 24), and to open up for us an entrance into heaven itself (x. 19 f.). ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν is to be construed, not with πρόδρομος (Heinrichs, Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, and others), but (as

already the Peshito) with *εἰσῆλθεν*.—In that which follows the emphasis rests upon *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ* (Böhme, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Hofmann), which on that account is preposed; not upon *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (Bleek, Woerner), which latter, on the contrary, as an additional note of definition is derived only from the *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισ.*

CHAPTER VII.

VER. 1. Instead of τοῦ ὑψίστου, Elz. has only ὑψίστου. Against A B C D E K L S, 23, 44, 46, 48, *al. pl.*, Clem. Chrys. Theodoret, *al. mult.* — ὁ συναντήσας] Lachm. and Alford, after A B C (corr.) D E K S, 17, 117, *al.*: ὁ συναντήσας. Notwithstanding the strong support of authorities, manifest error, arising from the reading together of the article and the initial letter of the participle. — Ver. 4. Instead of the *Recepta* ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 read, after B D* E* Vulg. (Amiatin. Toletan.) It. Copt. Basm. Syr., merely ᾧ δεκάτην. Certainly καὶ is not indispensable, and might be regarded as a later gloss from ver. 2. But with quite as much probability it may be supposed that it was added by the author himself, the words of ver. 2 being still present to his mind. It is therefore, since it has in its favour the considerable attestation by A C D*** E** K L S, by, as it appears, all the cursives, by the Vulgate (also Demidov. and Harlej.), Syr. Philonex. *al.*, by Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. *al.*, Aug. Bede, with Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Alford, to be retained. — Ver. 6. The article τὸν before Ἀβραάμ is deleted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, and Alford, after B C D* S* 23, 57, 109, *al.* In favour of the omission pleads the very sparing use made of the article before proper names in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the article as a rule being placed only where, as in xi. 17, the perspicuity of the discourse imperatively demanded it. — Ver. 9. In place of the received Λευὶ we have here, with Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 2, to write Λευίτης, after A (λευίτης) B C* S*** (λευίτης). In the ed. vii. and viii. Tisch. writes: Λευίτης. — Ver. 10. Elz.: ὁ Μελλ-
 ζισσεῖς. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, Alford, after B C* D* S, 73, 118, *al.*, Chrys.: Μελλζισσεῖς. The rejection of the article is to be approved on the same grounds as in ver. 6. — Ver. 11. The *Recepta* ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομυῖται is (defended by Reiche) has decisive witnesses against it. Instead of ἐπ' αὐτῇ is ἐπ' αὐτῆς (approved by Grotius, placed on the inner margin by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford), required by A B C D* E* S, 17, 31, 46, *al.*, Cyril; instead of νενομυῖται is νενομυῖ-

σηται (already approved by Camerarius and Grotius, adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford), required by A B C D* s, 17, 47, 73, *al.*, Cyril. — Ver. 13. προσέσχεν] Tisch. 1, after A C, 17, *al.*: προσέσχεν. Commended to notice by Griesb. also. Rightly, however, do Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche (*Commentar. crit.* p. 56, note 9), prefer the *Recepta* προσέσχηκεν. In favour of this pleads, besides the yet stronger attestation (B D E K L s, Oecum. *al.*), the paronomasia with μετέσχηκεν, consonant with the style of the Epistle to the Hebrews. — Ver. 14. Elz.: οὐδὲν περὶ ἱερωσύνης. But A B C* D* E s, 17, 47, *al.*, It. Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Cyr. Chrys. (codd.) have: περὶ ἱερῶν οὐδὲν. Rightly adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford. περὶ ἱερωσύνης is a glossematic elucidation. — Ver. 16. Instead of the *Recepta* σαρκινῆς, Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford have adopted σαρκίνης, after A B C* D* L s (also H in the title), many min. and fathers. Rightly. σαρκίνης might easily be changed into σαρκινῆς by transcribers, since σαρκινός is an adjective of very frequent recurrence in the N. T., σάρκινος a rare one. — Ver. 17. μαρτυρεῖται] Elz.: μαρτυρεῖ. Against preponderating testimony (A B D* E* s, 17, 31, *al.*, Copt. Sahid. Basm. Slav. Cyr. Chrys. Theophyl.). — Ver. 21. After αἰῶνα Elz. Griesb. Matthæi, Scholz, Lachm. Bloomfield, Reiche add once more: κατὰ τὴν τῶν Μελχισεδέκ. Deleted by Bleek, Tisch. and Alford, after B C, 17, 80, Vulg. Sahid. Basm. Arm. Ambr. (?) Bede. Rejected also by Delitzsch. But without sufficient ground. For the words are found in A D E K L s*** It. Syr. utr. Copt. *al.*, with Chrys. Theodoret, *al.*, and the omission of them is to be explained by the fact that immediately after the same (ver. 22) the discourse is continued afresh with κατὰ; the eye of the transcriber might thus easily wander from the first κατὰ to the second κατὰ. Also for s* there was found in the twofold κατὰ the occasion for overlooking not only κατὰ τὴν τῶν Μελχισεδέκ, but in addition to this likewise εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. — Ver. 22. τοσοῦτον] So Elz. Griesb. Matthæi, Scholz, Bloomfield. But the weighty authority of A B C D* s* Athan. (cod.) *al.* decides in favour of the form of the word preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, τοσοῦτο. — Ver. 23. *Recepta*: γεγονότες ἱερεῖς. So also Tisch. 2, 7, and 8. As better attested, however (A C D E, Cyr. [twice] Chrys. [ms.]), the order of words: ἱερεῖς γεγονότες, is to be preferred, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, Delitzsch, and Alford. — Ver. 26. Elz.: ἔπρεπεν. More correctly, however, Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Scholz (?), Tisch. and Alford, after A B D E, Syr. utr. Arab. Ep. Euseb.: καὶ ἔπρεπεν.

Vv. 1-10.¹ While the author now in reality passes over to the work of developing the high-priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec, proper to Christ, and consequently of illustrating upon every side the pre-eminence of the same above the Levitical high-priesthood, he dwells first of all upon the person of Melchisedec himself, in that, following the thread of the Scripture narrative, he brings vividly before his readers the exaltedness of Melchisedec's position, and draws their attention to a threefold superiority of Melchisedec over the Levitical priests.

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

¹ C. A. Auberlen, "Melchisedek's ewiges Leben und Priesterthum Hebr. 7" (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1857, H. 3, p. 453 ff.).

tors, as Bleek and Alford, to be likewise identical with the **Σαλήμ**, Judith iv. 4. More correct, however, is the first-named view. For, besides the earlier name *Jebus* for Jerusalem (Judg. xix. 10, *al.*), occurs also the early name *Salem* (Ps. lxxvi. 3 [2]), and the narrative in Genesis (xiv. 17 ff.) points unmistakeably to the southern part of the land. Comp. specially Knobel, *Genesis*, 2 Aufl., Leipz. 1860, p. 149 f. — **ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου**] *priest of God, the Most High*. In the monotheistic sense, as in Genesis, *vid. ibid.* ver. 22. — **ὁ συναντήσας Ἀβραὰμ κ.τ.λ.**] *who went to meet Abraham when he was returning from the smiting of the kings* (Gen. xiv. 12 ff.), *and blessed him*. — **καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτόν**] Gen. xiv. 19, 20. Wrongly is it alleged by Heinrichs that **εὐλογεῖν** denotes only: *gratulari de victoria tam splendida*.

Ver. 2. *To whom also Abraham portioned out the tenth of all* (*sc.* that he had gained as booty; comp. **ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων**, ver. 4). — **πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνεύμενος βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης**] *he who first, interpreted (i.e. if one translates his Hebrew name מלך-צדק into Greek), is King of Righteousness*. Comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* i. 10. 2: **Μελχισεδέκης, σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο βασιλεὺς δίκαιος**. — *Bell. Jud.* vi. 10: **ὁ δὲ πρῶτος κτίσας (Ἱεροσόλεμα) ἦν Χανααίων δυνάστης, ὁ τῇ πατρίᾳ γλώσσει κληθεὶς βασιλεὺς δίκαιος: ἦν γὰρ δὴ τοιοῦτος**. The author of the epistle, however, following more closely the sense of the Hebrew words, renders the name by **βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης** (instead of rendering it **βασιλεὺς δίκαιος**, as Josephus does), and thereby brings out more clearly the part sustained by Melchisedec as a type of Christ, inasmuch as the latter is not only Himself righteous (comp. Zech. ix. 9; Jer. xxiii. 5), but also the mediatorial author of righteousness for others. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 30; Jer. xxiii. 6; Mal. iv. 2; Dan. ix. 24. — **ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὃ ἐστὶν βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης**] *and then also king of Salem, which is (denotes) king of peace*. Comp. with regard to Christ as our peace and peace-bringer, Eph. ii. 14, 15, 17; Rom. v. 1; also Isa. ix. 6, 7. — **ὃ ἐστὶν**] corresponds to the **ἑρμηνεύμενος** of the previous clause. — There is no reason for taking *Salem*, with Böhlme and Bleek, after the precedent given by Petrus Cunaeus, *de Rep. Hebraeorum*, iii. 3, as not being the name of a place at all, but

βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ together as forming the further name of the man, since the author of the epistle might discover a typical reference to Christ not only in the personal name of Melchisedec, but also in the name of the state over which he ruled as king and prophet. The author, for the rest, interprets the name of the place as though not εἰρήνη (peaceful) but εἰρήνη (peace) had been written in the Hebrew,—a mode of rendering in which Philo had already preceded him. Comp. *Legg. allegor.* iii. 25, p. 75 (with Mangey, I. p. 102 f.): καὶ Μελχισεδέκ βασιλέα τε τῆς εἰρήνης—Σαλήμ τοῦτο γὰρ ἐρμηνεύεται—ἱερέα ἑαυτοῦ πεποίηκεν ὁ θεός.

Ver. 3. Ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος] *without father, without mother, without pedigree, i.e.* of whom neither father, nor mother, nor pedigree stands recorded in Holy Scripture. This is the usual interpretation of the words, which has been the prevalent one in the church from early times to the present. Less natural, and only in repute here and there, is the explanation: *who possessed neither father nor mother, etc.*, according to which the sacred writer must have recognised in Melchisedec a higher, superhuman being, who had only for a time assumed a human form. The latter view was taken by Origen and Didymus, who would maintain that Melchisedec is to be regarded as an angel; in like manner the unknown authority in Jerome, *ad Evagr.*; Hilary, *Quaestt. in V. T.* quaest. 109, and the Egyptian Hieracas in Epiph. *Haer.* 67, who saw in him an ensarcosis of the Holy Ghost; as also the Melchisedecites, a section of the Theodotians, who described him as μεγάλην τινὰ δύναμιν θείαν, surpassing in exaltedness even Christ Himself, since Christ appeared after the likeness of Melchisedec; finally, single individuals in the orthodox church, in Epiphanius, *Haer.* 55. 7; as also afterwards, P. Molinaeus, *Vates*, iv. 11 sq.; P. Cunaeus, *l.c.*; J. C. Hottinger, *de Decimis Judaeorum*, p. 15; d'Outrein, Starek, and others, who supposed that in Melchisedec the Son of God Himself had appeared in human form. This whole method of interpretation has against it the fact that ἀγενεαλόγητος—for not ἀγέννητος is placed—can be understood without violence only of the neglect to cite the genealogical table of Melchisedec in the narrative of the Book of Genesis [comp.

ver. 6]; and ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ must be taken conformably with the elucidatory ἀγενεαλόγητος, thus are likewise to be explained merely of the father and mother being passed over unnamed in the historic account, not of their actual non-existence. The characteristics ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, moreover, are to be referred—since ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ cannot yet be brought into correspondence therewith—only to Melchisedec, without our being obliged to seek for them a special point of comparison with Christ, as is done by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Cornelius a Lapide, Jac. Cappellus, Bisping, *al.* (comp. also Kurtz *ad loc.*), in applying the ἀπάτωρ to Christ's humanity, the ἀμήτωρ to His divinity, and the ἀγενεαλόγητος either likewise to His divinity or to His New Testament high priesthood. Comp. *c.g.* Theodoret: Ἀμήτωρ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ὡς θεός· ἐκ μόνου γὰρ γεγέννηται τοῦ πατρός· ἀπάτωρ δὲ ὡς ἄνθρωπος· ἐκ μόνης γὰρ ἐτέχθη μητρός, τῆς παρθένου φημί· ἀγενεαλόγητος ὡς θεός· οὐ γὰρ χρήζει γενεαλογίας ὁ ἐξ ἀγεννήτου γεγεννημένος πατρός.—By means of ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, Melchisedec appears as presenting a contrast to the Levitical priests, since in the case of these scrupulous attention was paid to the descent.—The expression ἀγενεαλόγητος only here in all Greek literature.—μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων] *without beginning of days and without end of life*, namely, in that nothing is related in Holy Scripture either of his birth or his death. The statement is quite a general one. To limit it to the beginning and end of the priesthood (Cameron, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Whitby, Kuinoel, Hofmann, *al.*) is arbitrary. Nor is the meaning of the words, that Melchisedec was not born in the ordinary human way, and, something like Enoch and Elijah, was taken up to heaven without experiencing death (Hummius, Braun, Akersloot; comp. also Bleek, p. 322 ff.; Nagel: "On the significance of Melchisedec in the Epistle to the Hebrews," in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, II. 2, p. 332 ff.; Nickel in *Reuter's Repertor.* 1858, Feb. p. 102 f.; Alford), a sense which conflicts with the right apprehension of the opening words of the verse.—ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ] *on the contrary* (therein) *made entirely like unto the Son of God*, namely, as type of the

same. The words do not belong to μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές (Peshito, Grotius, *al.*). For with justice does Theodoret already observe: ἐν μέντοι τῇ ἱερωσίῃ οὐ Μελχισεδέκ μεμύηται τὸν δεσπότην Χριστόν, ἀλλ' ὁ δεσπότης Χριστὸς ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ. They form, by means of the closely combining δέ, a more precise positive defining to the negative μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων. Chrysostom: Ἀφωμοιωμένος δέ, φησί, τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ποῦ ἡ ὁμοιότης; "Ὅτι καὶ τούτου κακείνου τὸ τέλος ἀγνοοῦμεν καὶ τὴν ἀρχήν· ἀλλὰ τούτου μὲν παρὰ τὸ μὴ γεγράφθαι, ἐκείνου δὲ παρὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι. — μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές] *remains priest for ever*, in that, as of his end of life so also of the cessation of his priesthood, nothing is recorded. He remains so in the reality of his office, but only as a figure and type of Christ. Against the view of Auberlen (*l.c.* p. 497), that Melchisedec is termed an everlasting priest in no other sense than as, according to the Apocalypse, all the blessed in heaven are so, see the observations of Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 202 f., Remark. The subject, moreover, in μένει is naturally the Melchisedec of Genesis, not, as Wieseler contends (*Schr. d. Univ. zu Kiel aus d. J.* 1860, VI. 1, p. 40): "the Melchisedec of the passage in the Psalms just mentioned (vi. 20), or the true antitypal Melchisedec or Messiah." For it is not grammatically allowable, with Wieseler, to take the words βασιλεὺς Σαλλήμ . . . ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ as an apposition merely to ὁ Μελχισεδέκ, and not to the whole expression οὗτος ὁ Μελχισεδέκ, and in connection with οὗτος ὁ Μελχισεδέκ to rest the emphasis exclusively upon οὗτος. — εἰς τὸ διηνεκές] of the same import as εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, vi. 20. Comp. x. 12, 14.

Ver. 4. Θεωρεῖτε] is imperative, whereby a strain is to be put on the attention for that which follows: *but behold*, namely, inwardly, *i.e. consider*. — πηλίκος] *how great*, *i.e. how high and exalted*. — οὗτος ὁ καὶ δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν κ.τ.λ.] Resuming of the historic notice already adduced at the beginning of ver. 2, in order then further to argue from the same. By the choice and position of the words, however, the author brings out the πηλίκος in its truth and inner justice. (Choice of the words ἀκροθίνια and πατριάρχης,—the latter in place of

the elsewhere more usual *ὁ πατήρ* in regard to Abraham.—and effective placing of the characterizing title *ὁ πατριάρχης* at the close of the proposition at a far remove from the name *Ἀβραάμ*.—*καὶ δεκάτην*] *καί* is not the merely copulative “also,” as ver. 2 (Hofmann), but is used as giving intensity. It gives intensity, however, not to the *subject* (so Luther, Grotius, Owen, Carpzov: “Abraham himself also”),—for then *ὁ καὶ Ἀβραάμ δεκάτην ἔδωκεν* must have been written,—but the *predicate*: *to whom Abraham gave even the tenth*.—*ἀκροθίνια*] composed of *ἄκρος* and *θίν*, in the N. T. a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*, denotes the uppermost of the heap, the choice or best thereof. The expression is most current with regard to the first-fruits of the harvest presented to the Godhead; not seldom, however, is it used of the best, which was selected out of the spoils of war as an offering consecrated to the Godhead. In our passage, too, *ἀκροθίνια* denotes not simply the spoils acquired by Abraham (so Chrysostom: *τὰ λάφυρα*; Oecumenius: *ἐκ τῶν σκύλων καὶ λαφύρων*, Erasmus, Luther, Vatablus, Calvin, Schlichting, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Bloomfield, and the majority), but *the choicest, most valuable articles thereof*. Theophylact: *ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων τῶν κρείττωνων καὶ τιμιωτέρων*. Not that the meaning of the author is, that Abraham gave to Melchisedec the tenth part of the most choice objects among the booty acquired, but that the tithes which he presented to Melchisedec consisted of the choicest, most excellent portions of the booty.—*ὁ πατριάρχης*] *he, the patriarch*. The sonorous name of honour *πατριάρχης*, composed of *πατριά* and *ἀρχή*, designates Abraham as the father of the chosen race, and ancestor of the people of Israel. Comp. Acts ii. 29, where David is distinguished by the same title of honour, and Acts vii. 8, 9, where the twelve sons of Jacob are so distinguished.

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

Vv. 5-7. *First point of superiority*. The Levitical priests, indeed, take tithes of their brethren, although these brethren, in like manner as they, have descended from Abraham: they have thus, it is true, a pre-eminence above these; but they

are inferior to Melchisedec, since this man took tithes of Abraham himself, the common ancestor of the Jewish people, and blessed him.

Ver. 5. Admission of the relatively privileged position of the Levitical priests. — καί] the explanatory: *and certainly*. — οἱ μὲν κ.τ.λ.] preparatory to the adversative ὁ δὲ κ.τ.λ., ver. 6. — οἱ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες] *those of the sons (descendants) of Levi who obtain the office of priest*. For not all Levites, but only those of them who claimed lineage from the house of Aaron, were entitled to enter upon the priesthood. Comp. Ex. xxviii. 1 ff.; Num. iii. 10, 38, xvi., xviii. 1 ff., *al.* Mistaken is the opinion of Delitzsch, Maier, and Moll (in coinciding with Hofmann), that the ἐκ in ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ is the *causal ἐκ* of *origin*: “those who receive the priesthood from the sons of Levi, *i.e.* by virtue of their descent from Levi, in such wise that their person is not taken into account as such, but only in so far as they belong to this lineage.” If that had been intended, οἱ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ ὄντες καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες must have been written. — ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν ἀποδεκατοῦν τὸν λαόν κατὰ τὸν νόμον] *have a charge to tithe the people according to the law*. Comp. Num. xviii. 20–32; Deut. xiv. 22–29; Neh. x. 38, 39; de Wette, *Lehrb. der hebr.-jüd. Archäologie*, 3 Aufl. p. 273 f.; Delitzsch, *Talmudische Studien*, XIV. *Justification of Heb.* vii. 5¹ (in Guericke's *Zeitschr. f. d. gesammte luth. Theol. v. Kirche*, 1863, H. 1, p. 16 ff.). — κατὰ τὸν νόμον] belongs not to τὸν λαόν (Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, Starek, Böhme, Hofmann), against which even the non-repetition of the article after λαόν decides; nor yet to ἀποδεκατοῦν (Owen, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Ewald), but to ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν. — In the closing words, του-

¹ The justification consists of the attempted proof that in the post-exilian age the tenth was no longer levied in the first place by the Levites,—who had been wont only afterwards to render to the priests the portion pertaining to the same,—but the priests themselves had entered upon the right of levying the tenth, which had been originally assigned to the Levites. Nevertheless, however the matter may have stood in this respect, there was hardly any need of a justification of the words Heb. vii. 5, since no statement whatever as to the mode of receiving the tenths is contained in the same; on the contrary, these words are equally appropriate for indirect as for direct levying of the tithes.

τέστιν τοὺς ἀδελφούς αὐτῶν, καίπερ κ.τ.λ., Bleek, after the example set by Böhme, erroneously finds the sense: "that, although they are the posterity of Abraham, the lauded patriarch, who are tithed by the Levitical priests, yet they are, after all, still the brethren of the latter, *i.e.* fellow-Israelites; which cannot be so astonishing as when Abraham himself paid the tithes to Melchisedec." On the contrary, the elucidation of τὸν λαόν by τουτέστιν τοὺς ἀδελφούς αὐτῶν serves to bring into more striking relief the singularity of the ἀποδεκατοῦν; since elsewhere only the higher receives tithes from the lower, not the equal from the equal (as here an Abrahamides from an Abrahamides), and this singularity of the ἀποδεκατοῦν is then yet farther manifested by καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὁσφύος Ἀβραάμ. The author can therefore only design, by means of ver. 5, to characterize the priests as *primi inter pares*. This superiority, however, in regard to their own fellow-Israelites, the author concedes only in order immediately after, ver. 6, to oppose to the same the inferiority in regard to Melchisedec. — ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς ὁσφύος τινός] So the LXX. render the Hebrew 'עַל־הַמִּצְעָרָה', Gen. xxxv. 11: 2 Chron. vi. 9.

Ver. 6. Notwithstanding this privileged position of the Levitical priests (ver. 5), Melchisedec yet occupies a far higher position. — ὁ δέ] is not to be taken alone, as by Böhme, Kuinzel, and Klee, and then to be supplemented by τὴν ἱερατείαν λαβών from ver. 5; but ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν belongs together: *Melchisedec, on the contrary, without (μὴ) his family or descent being derived from them, received tithes of Abraham.* — ἐξ αὐτῶν] refers neither to the Israelites (Epiph. *Haer.* 67. 7; Cornelius a Lapide, Braun, Ernesti, Schulz) nor to *Levi and Abraham* (Grotius), but to the υἱοὶ Λευί, ver. 5. — The parallel clause, καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας εὐλόγηκεν] and blessed him who had the promises, serves yet further to make manifest the dignity and exaltedness of Melchisedec. For, by the fact that Abraham had received the divine promises, that his seed should be multiplied; and in him all nations of the earth should be blessed (Gen. xii. 2 f., xiii. 14 f.), he had been already most highly favoured of God. How high thus must that man stand, who imparts his blessing to

one already so highly favoured, since truly—as is immediately expressly added, ver. 7—the dispenser of the blessing is ever more exalted than the recipient of the blessing! Occumenius: ἐξῆρε τὸν Ἀβραάμ, ἵνα πλείον ἐξάρῃ τὸν Μελχισεδέκ.

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

Ver. 8. *Second point of superiority.* The Levitical priests are mortal men; but of Melchisedec it is testified that he lives. — By καὶ ὧδε μὲν, “and here,” reference is made to the Levitical priests, by ἐκεῖ δέ, “but there,” to Melchisedec, because the Levitical priesthood still continues to exist to the time of our author, thus having something about it near and present; the historic appearing of Melchisedec, on the other hand, falls in the period of hoary antiquity. — δεκάτας] The plural, on account of the plurality of tithes levied by the Levitical priests. — ἀποθνήσκοντες] as the principal notion placed before ἄνθρωποι. — ἀποθνήσκοντες ἄνθρωποι] men who die (irrevocably or successively), comp. ver. 23. — ἐκεῖ δὲ μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ] but there, one who has testimony that he lives, sc. δεκάτην ἔλαβεν. That by reason of the coherence with that which precedes only Melchisedec can be understood, and not (with Justinian, Jac. Cappellus, Heinsius, and Pyle) Christ, scarcely stands in need of mention. ζῇ, as opposition to ἀποθνήσκοντες, can be interpreted only absolutely, of the life which is not interrupted by death. That the author, in connection with μαρτυρούμενος, had before his mind a testimony contained in the Holy Scriptures of the Old Covenant, admits of no doubt. Whether, however, he derived the testi-

mony of Melchisedec's continued life from the silence of Scripture as to Melchisedec's death, or found in the declaration, Ps. cx. 4, a direct proof therefor, or, finally, combined the two facts together, and deduced his conclusion from both in common, is a question hardly to be decided. The *first* supposition is entertained by Calvin, Estius, Drusius, Piscator, Grotius, Owen, Wolf, Bengel, Stein, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, and others; the *second*, by Theodoret, Zeger, Whitby, Heinrichs, Bleek, Bloomfield, Alford, Conybeare, Kurtz, McCaul, Woerner, and others; the *third*, by Böhme, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* pp. 201, 454, and others.

Vv. 9, 10. *Third point of superiority.* In Abraham, Levi the receiver of the tithes has also already been tithed by Melchisedec. — The formula *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν*, of very common occurrence with classic writers, as likewise frequently met with in Philo, is found in the N. T. only here. It denotes either: *to say it in one word (in short)*, or: *so to say, i.e. in some sense*. Theophylact: *Τὸ δὲ ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ἢ τοῦτο σημαίνει ὅτι καὶ ἐν συντόμῳ εἰπεῖν, ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω.* In the former sense our passage is apprehended by Camerarius, Jac. Cappellus, Er. Schmid, Owen (preferably), Elsner, Wolf, Bengel, Heumann; in the latter,—and this is here the more correct one,—the Vulgate, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Carpzov, Kypke, Heinsius, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority. The author himself feels that the thought he is on the point of expressing has something singular and unusual about it. Thus he mitigates and limits the harshness thereof by *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν*, whereby he indicates that the ensuing statement is, notwithstanding its inner truth, not to be understood literally. — *δι' Ἀβραάμ*] *by Abraham*, i.e. by the fact that Abraham gave the tenth. *Ἀβραάμ* is a genitive. Mistaken; Augustine (*de Genes. ad lit.* x. 19): *propter Abraham*; Photius (in Oecumenius): *διὰ τὸν δεκατωθέντα Ἀβραάμ φησι τρόπον τινὰ καὶ ὁ ἐν τῇ ὁσφύϊ αὐτοῦ ἔτι ὢν Λεὺν δεδεκάτωται.* — *Λεὺς*] As is shown by the *participle present* in the addition *ὁ δεκάτας λαμβάνων*, we have not to think of the mere individual personality of Levi, but of him in

connection with his posterity, thus of Levi as ancestor and representative of the Jewish priests.

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

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

Ver. 11. From the inferiority of the Levitical priesthood to the priesthood of Melchisedec, just proved, it followed that the former was imperfect and incapable of leading to perfection. This fact is now presupposed by the author as a self-evident consequence, and he proceeds at once to demonstrate the truth thereof. — *οὖν*] deduces the conclusion from vv. 5–10, not from vi. 20 (de Wette, Bisping), whereby an interruption ensues in the continuity of the development begun by the author. — *εἰ*] with the *indicative preterite* (iv. 8, viii. 4), supposition of an *impossible case*: *if there were, if there existed*; in combination with *διὰ*: *if it were effected.* — *τελείωσις*] *perfection, i.e.* attainment of the highest goal of mankind in a moral and religious respect. There is included in it the obtaining of the expiation of sins and the glory to come. Comp. ix. 9, x. 1, 14, xi. 40. — *ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτῆς νομοθετήται*] *for the people on the ground thereof hath received the law.* These words can be taken only as a parenthesis (against Stein). *νομοθετεῖν τινί* signifies *to give laws to one, to pro-*

vide one with a law (here the Mosaic law). The mode of transposing this active construction into the passive ὁ λαὸς *νενομοθέτῃται* is quite the usual one; comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 244 f. — ἐπ' αὐτῆς] relates not to τελείωσις (so, upon the supposition of the reading ἐπ' αὐτῇ, Vatablus, but undecided; Seb. Schmidt, Starck, Rambach), but to τῆς Λευϊτικῆς ἱερωσύνης. ἐπί, however, denotes: upon the *ground* or *condition* of the existence of the Levitical priesthood, *i.e.* the Levitical priesthood is indissolubly conjoined with the Mosaic law which the people has received; it forms a foundation pillar upon which the latter rests, so that with the fall of the one the other also must fall (ver. 12). Erroneously,—because the statement thus arising would be too insignificant, and because ἐπί in this sense is used only with *verba dicendi* (comp. Gal. iii. 16; Heindorf, *ad Plat. Charm.* p. 62; Bernhardt, *Syntax*, p. 248),—Schlichting and Grotius [as also Whitby]: *de sacerdotio Levitico legem accepit* [an interpretation already rejected by Junius and Piscator]; as likewise Bleek I.: the people had received legal instruction *concerning* the Levitical priesthood. — But to what end the parenthesis? Its design is to indicate the ground on which one might expect to attain to the τελείωσις,—if the Mosaic law were at all capable of leading thereto,—by the intervention of the Levitical priesthood, since the Mosaic law is erected upon this very Levitical priesthood as its basis. — τίς ἔτι χρεία] *sc.* ἦν, or ἂν ἦν. The words following χρεία are not to be blended together into one thought (Faber Stapulensis, Luther, Baumgarten, Chr. Fr. Schmid), in such wise that λέγεσθαι is governed immediately by χρεία, and again all the rest (κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρών) by λέγεσθαι. The position of the words would then be contorted, and one explicable on no justifying grounds. On the contrary, the infinitive clause κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα depends at once upon the immediately preceding τίς ἔτι χρεία; and to this first infinitive clause the second καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρών λέγεσθαι forms an epexegetic parallel clause: *What need was there still then* (or: *would there then still have been*) *that another priest should arise* “after the order of Melchisedec,” *and not be called* (priest)

after the order of Aaron? — ἔτι] *sc.* after the Levitical priesthood had long been instituted, and in general the Mosaic law promulgated. — ἕτερον] in distinction from ἄλλον, brings prominently forward the *dissimilarity* of his nature and constitution as compared with that of the Levitical priests. — Το καί we have not to supplement the whole idea ἕτερον ἱερέα, but only ἱερέα. — οὐ, however, is placed, not μή as the infinitive λέγεσθαι might seem to require, because the negation extends to only a part of the clause. οὐ, namely, is closely associated with κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρών, and forms with the same merely a more precise definition to the ἱερέα which is to be supplied, so that the total expression καὶ (ἱερέα) οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρών presents an opposition to the foregoing total expression κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἕτερον ἱερέα. — λέγεσθαι] namely, Ps. cx. 4. That λέγεσθαι is not to be taken in the sense of *eligi* (Kuinoel, Stein, *al.*) is already shown by the λέγεται, ver. 13.

Ver. 12. In the parenthesis, ver. 11, the author has brought forward in general the close connectedness of the Levitical priesthood with the Mosaic law, and thereby already indicated that if the former is an imperfect and unsatisfying one, the same also is true of the latter; the perishing of the one involves also the perishing of the other. This truth the author now further specially urges, by means of a corroboration of the parenthetical remark, ver. 11. So in recent times also Alford and Woerner. Otherwise is the connection apprehended by Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 484), Maier, and Moll. They refer γάρ to the main thought in ver. 11, and find in ver. 12 an indication of the reason "why a change of the sacerdotal order would not have ensued without an urgent cause, namely, because such change would have involved also a change of the law in general." But subject-matter and form of expression in ver. 12 point back to the parenthesis, ver. 11. For in both the author is speaking of the inseparable conjunction of the Levitical priesthood with the Mosaic law; and ἐπ' αὐτῆς, ver. 11, is resumed by τῆς ἱερωσύνης, ver. 12; *νενομοθέτηται*, ver. 11, by νόμου, ver. 12. — μετατιθεμένης] denotes, like the μετάθεσις immediately following, certainly as to its verbal

signification, only a *transformation* or *change* (not specially, as Chrysostom, Piscator, Grotius, Bengel, Heinrichs, Stuart, and others suppose, a transference of the priesthood to another tribe of the Jewish people, or to a non-Aaronides). As regards the thing intended, however,—as is manifest from the parallel ἀθέτησις, ver. 18,—an actual *rendering obsolete* or *abrogation* is spoken of. The author thus still expresses himself with delicacy of feeling.—That, further, νόμος is to be limited, neither, with Beza, Pareus, Piscator, Grotius, Wittich, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Zachariae, Whitby, Schulz, to the *law of the priesthood*, nor, with Calvin, Cornelius a Lapide, Jac. Cappellus, Carpzov, Kuinoel, Klee, and others, to the *ceremonial law*, but is to be interpreted of the *Mosaic law in general*, is self-evident.

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

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

Ver. 14. Further evidencing of ver. 13.—πρόδηλον γάρ, ὅτι] *for it is clearly apparent that.* The προ in πρόδηλον is not to be taken, with Peirce (following Owen), *temporally*, according to which the sense would be, that Christ's descent from the tribe of Judah was made known beforehand, i.e. before He had yet arisen upon earth,—with which, in the first place, the perfect ἀνατέταλκεν does not harmonize,—but contains the notion of lying manifestly *before the eyes*. Theodoret: τὸ πρόδηλον ὡς ἀναντίρρητον τέθεικε. προ serves, therefore, only for the strengthening of the simple δῆλον. Comp.

1 Tim. v. 24, 25. — ἐξ Ἰούδα] *out of Judah, i.e. from the tribe of Judah* (comp. Rev. v. 5; Gen. xlix. 9, 10). With emphasis preposed. — ἀνατέταλκεν] *has arisen or sprung forth*. The figure which underlies the verb is either that of a rising star (comp. Num. xxiv. 17; Mal. iv. 2; Isa. lx. 1), or of a tender shoot coming up from the ground (Gen. xix. 25; Isa. xliv. 4; Ezek. xvii. 6; comp. also ἀνατολή, πῦρ, with reference to the Messiah, Jer. xxiii. 5; Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12). — ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν] *Jesus Christ*. — εἰς ἣν φυλὴν] *in reference to which tribe*. — περὶ ἱερέων] *sc. who should be taken out of the same*.

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

Ver. 15. Καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι κατὰ δὴλόν ἐστιν] *and the more still is it evident, namely, that with the Levitical priesthood the whole Mosaic law, too, is changed (and deprived of validity), ver. 12.* Comp. also ver. 18. Not: what difference there is between the Levitical and the N. T. priesthood (Chrysostom: τὸ μέσον τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐκατέρας, τὸ διύφορον, Clarius, Zeger, Bisping); nor yet that perfection is to be found, not in the Levitical priesthood, but in the priesthood of Christ (Jac. Cappellus, Bengel, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 551; Delitzsch); and just as little: that the priesthood is changed (Primasius, Justinian, Owen, Hammond, Rambach, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Stuart, Klee, Paulus). Quite mistakenly Elbrard: to κατὰ δὴλόν ἐστιν we have to supply from ver. 14 the clause ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν: "that Jesus descended from Judah is first in itself an acknowledged fact (ver. 14); this, however, is so much the more clear, since (ver. 15) it follows from the Melchisedecian nature of His priesthood that He could not be born κατὰ νόμον!" How then could it be inferred from the fact that Jesus could not be born κατὰ νόμον, that He must have descended precisely "from Judah"?! — κατὰ δὴλον] a similar intensifying of the simple form, as previously πρόδηλον. — εἰ . . . ἀνίσταται] *if,*

as surely is the case, there arises.¹ εἰ thus, as to the sense, equal to ἐπειδή (Oecumenius, Theophylact). — κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδέκ] as the main idea placed first, and ὁμοιότης an elucidation of the τάξις in the passage of the Psalms. — The *subject* in the conditional clause is ἱερεὺς ἕτερος (if . . . another priest arises), not merely ἕτερος (Schulz: "if . . . another is appointed as priest"), nor yet *Jesus* (if He . . . arises as another priest).

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

¹ That Stein would combine εἰ and ὅς in the sense: "It is quite clear to all that, if at any time another priest after the manner of Melchisedec arises, he then," etc., deserves to be mentioned only as a curiosity.

carnis propria est, consulens, successionis jura descripserat. Inde enim factum est, ut unum alteri succedere juberet, quo, morientibus sacerdotibus, sacerdotium tamen ipsum perpetuaretur. — κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου] i.e. inasmuch as the power of living for ever is inherent in Him. Comp. vv. 17, 24. Improperly do Cameron, Dorscheus, Calov, *al.*, refer it *as well*, or *solely*, to Christ's power of communicating intransitory life to others. But wrongly, too, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 551 f.), Delitzsch, and Alford: the ζωὴ ἀκατάλυτος is to be limited to that life of Christ which began with His resurrection. On the contrary, the ζωὴ ἀκατάλυτος is thought of as a property inherent in the ἱερεὺς ἕτερος, without respect to relation of time. Comp. also Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 458, *Obs.*

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

Vv. 18, 19. Elucidation of that which is signified by this proclamation in the psalm, of the arising of a new everlasting priest after the manner of Melchisedec (ver. 17). By virtue of that proclamation of God, the Mosaic institution of the priests, and with it the Mosaic law in general, is declared—and that with good reason—to be devoid of force; and, on the other hand, a better hope is brought in. Theodoret: Παύεται, φησὶν, ὁ νόμος, ἐπεισάγεται δὲ ἡ τῶν κρείττονων ἐλπίς. — Vv. 18, 19 contain a single proposition, dividing itself into two halves by means of μὲν . . . δέ, for which γίνεται forms the common verb, and in which οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος constitutes a parenthesis. So, rightly, Theodoret, Occumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Luther, Zeger, Camerarius, Estius, Peirce, Bengel, McLean, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Conybeare, Bispington, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 592), Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority. Others construe differently, in taking each of the two verses as an independent statement in itself. They then

vary as regards the interpretation of *ἐπεισαγωγή*, ver. 19, as this is looked upon either as predicate or as subject. As *predicate* it is taken by Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus (*Version*), Vatablus, Calvin, Humnius, Jac. Cappellus, Pyle, Ebrard, and others, in supplying *ἐστίν* or *ἦν*, and regarding as subject thereto *ὁ νόμος*. According to this, the sense would be: for *nothing* has the law brought to perfection; but it is (or its meaning consists in this, that it is) a bringing in of a better hope. But against this argues the fact that, if *ἐπεισαγωγή* δέ was intended to form the opposition to the first half of ver. 19, the author could not possibly—after having placed a verb (*ἐτελείωσεν*) in the first half, consisting as it does only of a few words—have continued in the second half otherwise than with a verb; he must have written *ἐπεισάγει δὲ κρείττονα ἐλπίδι* instead of *ἐπεισαγωγή* δὲ κ.τ.λ. Moreover, *ἐπὶ* in *ἐπεισαγωγή* would have remained without any reference upon the supposition of this construction. As *subject* *ἐπεισαγωγή* is looked upon by Beza, Castellio, Pareus, Piscator, Schlichting, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Carpzov, Whitby, Michaelis, Semler, Ernesti, Valckenaer, Heinrichs, Stuart, and others. The sense would then be: the law indeed brought nothing to perfection; but the bringing in of a better hope *did* lead to perfection. Against this view, however, the consideration is decisive, that in such case, inasmuch as the preceding *νόμος* has the article, *ἐπεισαγωγή* also must have obtained the article. — The statement of ver. 18 is to be understood in special relation to the subject in question (not, as is done by Schlichting, Heinrichs, and others, as a truth of universal import). The article before *προαγούσης ἐντολῆς* is wanting, because the design was to express the *ἐντολή* regarding the Levitical priesthood as *one which had only the character of an ἐντολή προάγουσα*. — *ἀθέτησις*] a declaring void of force, abrogation. Comp. *ἀθετεῖν*, Gal. iii. 15. The *substantive* only here and ix. 26. — *γίνεται*] results, namely, in the declaration of God, Ps. cx. 4. — The *ἐντολή*, the command, denotes not the whole Mosaic law (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Calvin, Grotius, Hammond, Owen, McLean, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Klee, Bloomfield), but the ordinance regarding the Levitical priesthood therein contained. Only with ver. 19

does the author transfer to the whole that which he here states concerning a part. — The *ἐντολή*, however, is termed *προάγουσα* (comp. 1 Tim. i. 18, v. 24), because, as a constituent part of the O. T., it preceded in point of time the institution of the New Covenant. Yet, at the same time, there lies in the emphatically preposed participle, on account of its reciprocal relation to *ἐπεισαγωγή*, ver. 19, at least the additional indication delicately conveyed, that this *ἐντολή*, since just as a mere *precursor of something future* it points beyond itself, naturally bears the character of the merely *temporary* and consequently *unsatisfactory*. — *διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές*] *on account of its weakness and unprofitableness*. The *ἐντολή* was *weak*, since it did not possess the strength to attain its object, namely, the reconciliation of men to God; but, because in such manner it did not fulfil the end of its existence, it became for that very reason something *unprofitable* and *unservicable*. On *ἀσθενές*, comp. Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 9. — *οὐδέν*] is not to be limited by means of *οὐδένα* (Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact, Schlichting, Grotius, Carpzov, Kuinoel, Bisping), but, on the contrary, is to be left in the full universality of the neuter. *Completion* in general, in whatever respect, the law was not in a position to bring about. — *ἐπεισαγωγή*] a doubly composite term. Literally: *introduction upon or in addition to*, i.e. the bringing in of something new in addition to, or over and above, an object already present (here: in addition to the *προάγουσα ἐντολή*, ver. 18). *ἐπί* in *ἐπεισαγωγή* corresponds therefore to the *πρό* in *προαγωγῆς*. — *κρίττονος ἐλπίδος*] *of a better hope*, sc. than the *προάγουσα ἐντολή* was in a position to afford.¹ Better, more excellent, is the hope founded upon the newly instituted priesthood, in that this hope is certain

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

and infallible, thus in reality leads to the desired goal. — δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ θεῷ] *by means of which we draw nigh unto God* (Jas. iv. 8). Comp. vi. 19: εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετύσματος, and x. 19 ff. In contrast with the character of the Old Covenant, since the people were not permitted to enter the Most Holy Place, where the throne of Jehovah was. Cf. ix. 6 ff.

Vv. 20-22. As one element in the superiority of the everlasting priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec, assigned to Christ, over the Levitical priesthood has been already implicitly brought forward, vv. 18, 19, namely, that the goal, for the attainment of which the strength was lacking to the Levitical priesthood, is really attained by the everlasting priesthood. A second point of superiority in the new order of things over the old follows in vv. 20-22. Of less moment than the everlasting priesthood of Jesus must the Levitical priesthood be; for the former was constituted by God by virtue of a declaration upon oath, the latter without a declaration upon oath. Vv. 20-22 form again a single period, the protasis being contained in καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας, to which then καὶ τοσοῦτο κ.τ.λ., ver. 22, corresponds as the apodosis, while all that intervenes (οἱ μὲν γάρ, to the end of ver. 21) is a parenthesis. Wrongly do Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, Calvin (in the translation), Er. Schmid, and others join καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας, too, to the closing words of ver. 19: *and, indeed, a hope which is better, inasmuch as it is not brought in without an oath.* So also Luther: "and moreover, which is a great thing, not without oath;" while, with not less violence, Lud. Cappellus, who, in enclosing vv. 18, 19 within a parenthesis, and taking καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας with ver. 17, gives as the sense: "Deus constituit Christum sacerdotem secundum ordinem Melchisedec, et quidem non sine jurejurando." — καὶ] coupling on a farther link in the chain of enumeration, as vv. 8, 9, 23. — καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας] *sc. ἱερεὺς ἐστὶν γεγονώς; and inasmuch* (ix. 27) *as He has become priest not without a declaration upon oath, i.e. He has not become so without God having sanctioned His appointment to be a priest by a declaration upon oath* (namely, by virtue of the oath, with which the

declaration, Ps. cx. 4, is introduced). Only this mode of supplementing is warranted by the connection, as is shown partly by the οἱ μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες immediately following, partly by the circumstance that the author is still engaged in the exposition of the Scripture statement, ver. 17, this statement thus containing for him the gist of the matter; as, accordingly, this declaration of Scripture is repeated anew, ver. 21, and then likewise the εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες recurs in the further member of the thought, ver. 23 f. The explanation therefore of Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Heinrichs, Böhme, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Alford, Kurtz, and others is to be rejected, when to καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας they supplement from the apodosis διαθήκης ἔγγυος γέγονεν; as also that of Storr, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch, Moll, and Hofmann, when they supply τοῦτο (sc. ἐπεισαγωγὴ) κρείττονος ἐλπίδος) γίνεται (γέγονεν). — οἱ μὲν γάρ] namely, the Levitical priests. — χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας] since nothing is related in Scripture of an oath of God, when He destined Aaron and his posterity to be priests. — εἰσὶν γεγονότες] forms one idea: *have become*. Wrongly, Paulus and Klee: are priests who have become so without an oath. Böhme (and so also Hofmann): “sunt sacerdotes, sed sine juramento (illi quidem singuli deinceps) facti”—which must have been expressed by εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς χωρὶς ὀρκωμοσίας γεγονότες. Still more widely mistaken the view of Michaelis *ad Peire.*: “*fuērunt, i.e. esse desierunt*,”—which is grammatically as well as logically impossible. The *tempus periphrasticum* εἰσὶν γεγονότες marks the fact already belonging to the past as still extending onwards into the present. — ὁ δέ] namely, *Christ*. — μεθ' ὀρκωμοσίας] sc. ἱερεὺς ἐστὶν γεγονώς. — διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς αὐτόν] i.e. in the sense of the author: *by God*, not: *by the psalmist* (Ram bach, Heinrichs), although certainly the statement, Ps. cx. 4, that God hath sworn and will not repent of this oath, forms not a constituent part of the words of God Himself, but a remark of the psalmist, with which he introduces the words of God. Yet, when in the psalm it is said that God has sworn, and of this oath He will not repent, and then there is adduced as the subject-matter of this oath the declaration: σὺ ἱερεὺς κ.τ.λ., this is tantamount

to saying that God has declared by virtue of an irreversible oath: *σὺ ἱερεὺς κ.τ.λ.* As, accordingly, the psalmist is relating the words of God, so does he also relate the oath which preceded them.

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

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

Ver. 23. *Kaí*] parallel to the *καί*, ver. 20. — *καὶ οἱ μὲν πλείονες εἰσιν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες*] *and they on the one hand have as several (or as a plurality) become priests*, i.e. of Levitical priests there is a multiplicity. Attention is not here called to the peculiarity that many priests always existed contem-

poraneously the one with the other (so Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, Braun, Delitzsch), or that "the Levitical priesthood was not given to *one*, but to a lineage" (Hofmann). That which is meant is—as is evident from the immediately following *διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν*, and from ver. 24—the *successive* plurality, in that one dies after another, and consequently the one succeeds the other. For the author in thus speaking has before his mind the *high priests*, since it is just with these that Christ is placed in parallel. Comp. ver. 26 ff., *al.* — *διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν*] *because* (wrongly de Wette: "by the fact that") *they are* (wrongly de Wette and Bisping: "were") *prevented by death from continuing*. — *παραμένειν*] not: *ἐν τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ* (so Oecumenius, who is followed by Grotius, Seb. Schmidt, Storr, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* pp. 459, 437; Alford, Maier, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and others). It denotes, as is clear from the corresponding *διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, ver. 24, *to continue in life*. Comp. also Phil. i. 25, and Meyer *ad loc.*

Ver. 24. *The other, on the other hand, because* (not "by the fact that," de Wette, Bisping) *He abides unto eternity, has His priesthood as an unchangeable one.* — *μένειν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*] must not be explained, with Estius, Seb. Schmidt, and others, of abiding for ever *as priest*. For in this way the declaration of ver. 24 becomes tautological. The expression denotes the everlasting duration *of life* (comp. John xii. 34, xxi. 22, 23; 1 Cor. xv. 6; Phil. i. 25), is thus equivalent to the *πάντοτε ζῆν*, ver. 25. — *ἀπαράβατος*] a word belonging to later Greek (comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 313), save here, foreign to the N. T., as also to the LXX. Erasmus, Schlichting, Bengel, Schulz, Böhme, Stengel, Stuart, Ebrard, Hofmann, Conybeare, and the majority, take it in the *active* signification: not passing over to another, thus *remaining with the same person*, or *unchanging*. So, as it would seem, already Theodoret (*οὗτος δὲ ἀθάνατος ὢν εἰς ἕτερον οὐ παραπέμπει τῆς ἱερωσύνης τὸ γέρας*), Oecumenius (*ἀδιάδοχον, ἀτελεύτητον*), Theophylact (*ἀδιάκοπον, ἀδιάδοχον*). More correctly, however, because more consistently with the demonstrable usage of the language (see instances in Wetstein and Bleek), does Bleek, after the pre-

cedent of Elsner, insist upon the *passive* signification: "that which may not be overstepped, transgressed; therefore: inviolable, unalterable, immutable," which then, it is true, includes likewise the notion of "unchanging."

Ver. 25. "Οθεν] *Wherefore, sc.* because His priesthood is an everlasting one. — καί] *also*, represents the statement, ver. 25, as being the natural effect of the ἀπαράβατον ἔχειν τὴν ἱερωσύνην, ver. 24, as its cause. — εἰς τὸ παντελές] means: *perfectly, completely, entirely* (comp. Luke xiii. 11), and combines with σώζειν in one idea. Theodoret: αὐτὸν γὰρ σώζειν ἡμᾶς εἴρηκεν καὶ τελείαν σωτηρίαν παρέχειν. The meaning: *in perpetuum*, attached to the word by the Peshito, the Vulgate, Chrysostom (οὐ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν μόνον, φησίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ ζωῇ), Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, Schlichting, Grotius, Heinrichs, Schulz, Stein, Stengel, and others, in joining it either with σώζειν or with δύναται, is in accordance neither with the etymology nor the usage (instances in Bleek), but arises only from the connection, and is consequently to be rejected. — σώζειν] *save*, embraces the deliverance from the misery of sin and its consequences, and, on the other hand, the communication of everlasting blessedness. Too restricted, Hofmann: the answering of prayer, and deliverance out of every assault. — τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ] *those who through Him, i.e. through faith in Him, draw near to God.* — πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν] *seeing that He evermore lives, to make intercession for them* (Rom. viii. 26, 27, 34), or *to represent them* (*sc.* in the presence of God). More precise unfolding of the notion already lying in ὅθεν. — Similarly for the rest does Philo, too, ascribe to his Logos an intercession with God. Comp. *Vit. Mos.* iii. p. 673 C (with Mangey, II. p. 155): Ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἦν τὸν ἱερωμένον τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρί, παρακλήτῳ χρήσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρετὴν υἱῷ, πρὸς τε ἀμνηστίαν ἀμαρτημάτων καὶ χορηγίαν ἀφθονωτάτων ἀγαθῶν. — *Quis rer. div. lucr.* 42, p. 509 B (with Mangey, I. p. 501): Ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἰκέτης μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦ θνητοῦ, κηραίνοντος αἰεί, πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον.

Vv. 26-28. *Fourth point of superiority of the priesthood of Christ over the Levitical priesthood*, in the form of an establishing of ver. 25. The Levitical priests are sinful men, who need

daily to offer for their own sins and the sins of the people; Christ is the sinless Son of God, who once for all has offered up Himself as a sacrifice.

Ver. 26. Proof for the actual existence of a high priest who is able in a perfect manner to procure salvation, since He ever liveth to represent in the presence of God those who believe in Him (ver. 25), derived from the *meekness* and *adaptedness to our need* of just such a high priest: *for such a high priest* (as had just been described, ver. 25) *also beseeched us.* τοιοῦτος begins no parenthesis, so that ἅγιος κ.τ.λ. were only "the continuation of a series begun with πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν" (Hofmann), nor is "οἷος ὁ Ἰησοῦς to be supplemented from ver. 22" (Woerner), nor does it serve for the introducing or preparing the way for the following predicates, ὅσιος κ.τ.λ. (Grotius, Tholuck, *al.*), but refers back to the characterization, ver. 25; while, then, with ὅσιος κ.τ.λ. a newly beginning further description of this so constituted high priest, or a further unfolding of the τοιοῦτος, follows, in such wise that the ὅσιος κ.τ.λ. thus attached is best rendered by: *He, since He is holy*, etc., *beseeched us.* — καί] *also*, *i.e.* exactly. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 408. — ὅσιος] *holy* or *pure*. In regard to the relation *towards God*. Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 10; Eph. iv. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 8; Tit. i. 8. With the LXX. for the most part translation of יָדָבָר, *c.g.* Ps. iv. 4 (3), xvi. 10 (Acts ii. 27, xiii. 35), xxx. 5 (4). — ἄκακος] *free from κακία*, from craft and malice. In regard to the relation *towards men*. Chrysostom: "Ἀκακος τί ἐστίν; Ἀπόνηρος, οὐχ ὕπουλος καὶ ὅτι τοιοῦτος, ἄκουε τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· Οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δούλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ (Isa. liii. 9). — ἀμίαντος] *unstained by any kind of impurity*. In regard to the relation *towards Himself*. Comp. Jas. i. 27; 1 Pet. i. 4. — κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν] *separated from the sinners, i.e.* not: different from them by reason of His sinlessness (so the Peshito, *separatus a peccatis*; Vatablus, Calvin, Cameron, Carpzov, Owen, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Klee, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Kurtz, and others), but—as is evident from the member immediately following—*withdrawn by His exaltation to heaven from all contact with the sinners*, so that He cannot be defiled by them. As the Levitical priests in general, so must very specially the high

priest preserve himself free from defilement (Lev. xxi. 10 ff.); before the great day of atonement he must, according to the Talmud, spend seven days in the temple, apart from his family, in order to be secured against defilement. See Tract. *Joma*, i. 1. Comp. also Schöttgen, *Horae Hebraicae*, p. 963 f. — καὶ ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος] and (not “also” or “even,” as Hofmann contends) raised above the heavens, inasmuch, namely, as He διελέλυθε τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, iv. 14. Comp. Eph. iv. 10: ὁ ἀναβὰς ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν.

Ver. 27. In the πρότερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν, ἔπειτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ there is an apparent allusion to the sacrifice of the high priest on the great day of atonement (Lev. xvi.), comp. ix. 7. We are prevented, however, from referring the words to this alone (perhaps to the including of the sin-offering prescribed, Lev. iv. 3 ff.) by καθ’ ἡμέραν, instead of which, as at ix. 25, x. 1, 3, κατ’ ἐνιαυτόν must have been placed. For καθ’ ἡμέραν can signify nothing else than “daily” or “day by day.” To foist upon it the signification: “yearly on a definite day” (“καθ’ ἡμέραν ὀρισμένην or τεταγμένην”), with Schlichting (secundum diem, nempe statam ac definitam, in anniversario illo videlicet sacrificio), Piscator, Starck, Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, M’Lean, Storr, and others; or to take it in the attenuated sense, as equivalent to “saepissime, quoties res fert” (Grotius, Owen), or “πολλάκις” (Böhme, Stein), or “διὰ παντός” (de Wette), or in the sense of “one day after another” (Ebrard, who supposes the author is overlooking a succession of centuries, and so a succession of days present themselves to his eye, in which the high priest again and again offers a sacrifice!), is linguistically unwarranted. In like manner it is a mere subterfuge and arbitrary misinterpreting of the words, when Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 438), and ~~Alford~~, concurring in the suggestion of Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 404 f., 2 Aufl.), seek to put into them the sense: that Christ needeth not to do daily that which the high priests do once every year, but which He—if He is to be a constant mediator of an all-embracing expiation of sin—must needs do day by day. For all that is expressed is the fact that Christ needs not to do daily that which the Levitical

high priests need to do daily.¹ Nor does it avail anything that Kurtz will take καθ' ἡμέραν in conjunction only with οὐκ ἔχει ἀνάγκην, since these words do not occupy an independent position alone, and only acquire their more precise definition by that which follows. For that καθ' ἡμέραν has "nothing whatever to do with the θυσίας ἀναφέρειν," is a mere assertion on the part of Kurtz; and his contention, that only the "daily renewal and daily pressing necessity," of the O. T. high priest on account of his daily sinning, the necessity, "ere (on the great day of propitiation) he could offer for the sin of the whole people, of first presenting a sacrifice for his own sins," was to be brought into relief, is a violent perversion of the words,—admitting as they do of no misapprehension,—from which even the πρότερον, ἔπειτα, expressive of a relation of *parity*, ought to have kept him; in place of which, in order to bring out the subsidiary character of the one half of the statement, πρὸ τοῦ with the infinitive, or πρίν (πρὶν ἢ), must have been written. We have therefore to conclude, with Gerhard, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Wolf, Carpzov, Bleek, and Tholuck, that the author had present to his mind, besides the principal sacrifice on the great day of atonement, at the same time the ordinary daily sacrifice of the Levitical priests (Ex. xxix. 38–42; Num. xxviii. 3–8), and by reason of an inexact mode of expression blended the two together; to which he might the more easily be led, in that, according to Josephus, the high priest—not indeed always, but yet on the Sabbaths, new moons, and other festivals (according to the Mishna tr. *Tamith*, vii. 3: in general as often as he was so minded)—went up with the other priests into the temple, and took part in the sacrificial service. Comp. Josephus, *de Bello Judaico*, v. 5. 7: 'Ο δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀνῆκει μὲν σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀεί, ταῖς δ' ἑβδομασίαι καὶ νομηνίαις, καὶ εἴ τις ἑορτὴ πάτριος ἢ πανήγυρις πάνδημος ἀγομένη δι' ἔτους. To be compared also are the words of Philo, who, *Quis rer. divin. hacr.* p. 505 A (with Mangey, I. p. 497), remarks that in the daily sacrifice the priests offered the oblation for themselves, but the lambs for

¹ The unsatisfactory character of the above exposition was afterwards acknowledged by Delitzsch himself, and the explanation retracted by him (in Rudelbach and Guericke's *Zeitschr. f. die gesammte luther. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1860, H. 4, p. 595).

the people (Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἐνδελεχεῖς θυσίας ὁρᾷς εἰς ἴσα διηρημένας, ἦν τε ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀνάγουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς διὰ τῆς σεμιδάλεως καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν δυοῖν ἀμνῶν, οὓς ἀναφέρειν διείρηται), and *de Specuall. Legg.* p. 797 E (with Mangey, II. p. 321), equally as our passage, ascribes to the high priest the offering of a daily sacrifice (οὕτω τοῦ σύμπαντος ἔθνους συγγενῆς καὶ ἀγχιστεὺς κοινὸς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐστὶ, πρυτανεύων μὲν τὰ δίκαια τοῖς ἀμφισβητοῦσι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, εὐχὰς δὲ καὶ θυσίας τελῶν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν). Recently also Delitzsch (*Talmudische Studien*, XIII., in Rudelbach and Guericke's *Zeitschr. für die luther. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1860, H. 4, p. 593 f.) has further drawn attention to the fact that likewise, *Jer. Chagiga*, ii. 4, and *Bab. Pesachim*, 57a, it is said of the high priest *that he offers daily*. — τοῦτο] namely, τὸ ὑπὲρ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίαν ἀναφέρειν. So rightly—as is even demanded by ver. 28 (comp. iv. 15)—Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, Estius, Piscator, Clericus, Seb. Schmidt, Owen, Peirce, Carpzov, Whitby, Storr, Heinrichs, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 463), Alford, Kurtz, and others. Less suitably do Beza, Jac. Cappelus, Limborch, Bengel, and Ebrard supplement τὸ θυσίας ἀναφέρειν; while, altogether wrongly, Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, and Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. pp. 405, 401 f.) refer back τοῦτο to the whole proposition πρότερον . . . λαοῦ. For in the application to Christ, to explain the ἁμαρτίαι as the “dolores, qui solent peccatorum poenae esse, et quas Christus occasione etiam peccatorum humani generis toleravit, et a quibus liberatus est per mortem” (Grotius), or as “Christi infirmitates et perpressiones” (Schlichting, Hofmann, according to which latter in connection with ἐαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας, besides Christ's suffering of death, His prayer in Gethsemane (·) is at the same time to be thought of), becomes possible only on the arbitrary supposition of a double sense to the preceding words, and is equally much opposed to the context (ver. 28) as to the linguistic use of ἁμαρτίαι. — ἐφάπαξ] once for all; comp. ix. 12, x. 10; Rom. vi. 10. Belongs to ἐποίησεν, not to ἀνενέγκας. — ἐαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας] in that He offered Himself. Christ is thus not only the High Priest of the

New Covenant, but also the victim offered. Comp. viii. 3, ix. 12, 14, 25 f., x. 10, 12, 14; Eph. v. 2.

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

CHAPTER VIII.

VER. 1. ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις] B: ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις. Explanatory gloss. — Ver. 2. *Recepta*: καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος. But καὶ is wanting in B D* E* s, 17, It. Arabb. Euseb. Already rejected by Mill. Rightly deleted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford. — Ver. 4. Elz. Matth. Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, have εἰ μὲν γάρ. Defended also by Delitzsch, Reiche (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 504, *Obs.*), and Reiche. But γάρ cannot be referred back to ver. 3, and upon the referring of it back to ver. 2 the addition, ver. 3, would become aimless and inexplicable. More in keeping logically, and better attested (by A B D* s, 17, 73, 80, 137, Vulg. It. Copt., *al.*), is the reading: εἰ μὲν οὖν, already commended to attention by Griesbach, and adopted by Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Alford, which is accordingly to be preferred. — Instead of the *Recepta* τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν προσφερόντων (approved by Bloomfield, who, however, encloses the first τῶν within brackets, and Reiche), Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford have rightly adopted merely τῶν προσφερόντων. Preferred also by Delitzsch. τῶν ἱερῶν, to the rejection of which already Grotius, Mill, and Griesbach were inclined, is an elucidatory gloss. It is condemned by the decisive authority of A B D* E* s, 17, 67** 73, 137, *al.*, Vulg. It. Copt. Aeth. Arm. — τὸν] before νόμον in the *Recepta* (recently contended for by Bloomfield and Delitzsch) is to be deleted, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, after A B s* 17, 57, 80, *al.*, Theodoret. The later addition of the article is more easily to be explained than its omission. — Ver. 5. Elz.: ποιήσῃς. But all the uncial mss., many cursives, Orig. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. Oecum. Theophyl. have ποιήσεις, which also is found in LXX. Ex. xxv. 40. Commended by Griesbach. Rightly adopted already in the edd. Erasm. 1, Ald. Stephan. 1, 2, and recently by Matthaei, Scholz, Bleek, Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. Approved also by Delitzsch and Reiche. — Ver. 6. In place of the *Recepta* νυνὶ δέ, Lachm. reads, but without sufficient authority (B D* Ath.): νῦν δέ. The more euphonious νυνὶ δέ is protected by A D** D*** E K L s, min., and many Fathers. — Instead of the *Recepta* τῆς τοῦ (B D*** s*** min. Damasc. [once] Theophyl. [cod.]), there

is found in the edd. Complut. Plantin. Genev. the peculiarly Attic form: $\tau\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta\kappa\epsilon$. This is supported by 47, 72, 73, 74, *al.*, Athan. (thrice), Bas. Antioch. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. Best attested is the form: $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\chi\epsilon\nu$ (by A D* K L S* 80, 116, 117, *al.*, Athan. Oecum. Theophylact), which is therefore rightly preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford. — Ver. 8. $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$] So Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, after B D*** E L S***, likewise, as it seems, almost all min. Chrys. Damasc. *al.* — Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 8 read $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. But the attestation of the latter (A D* K S* 17, 39, *al.*, Theodoret) is not at all decisive, and the accusative, seeing it requires the conjoining with $\mu\epsilon\mu\phi\acute{\rho}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, opposed to the context; see the exposition. — Ver. 10. $\eta\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\chi\eta$] Lachm.: $\eta\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\chi\eta\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$, after A D E. $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ is found, indeed, also with the LXX. in most mss. (but not in the *Cod. Alex.*); yet, nevertheless, since it forms a tautological addition, and does not correspond to the Hebrew original ($\text{כִּי יֹאמֶר הַכֹּהֵן}$), it probably arose only by a mechanical repetition from the preceding $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\chi\eta\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$. — Ver. 11. *Recepta*: $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\omicron\nu$. But the weighty authority of all uncial mss. (B: $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\tau\eta\nu$), most cursives, as well as that of Syr. utr. Arabb. Copt. Arm. It. *al.*, Chrys. (codd.) Theodoret, Damasc. Aug. requires the reading: $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\tau\eta\nu$, already presented by the edd. Complut. Stephan. 1, 2, *al.*, and later approved by Bengel and Wetstein, as also adopted by Griesbach, Matthaei, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche, and others. — $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\ \mu\iota\chi\rho\omicron\upsilon$] Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield: $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\ \mu\iota\chi\rho\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\tilde{\omega}\nu$. But $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\tilde{\omega}\nu$ is wanting in A B D* E* (?) K S, 17, 31, 61, 73, 80, *al.*, Copt. Arm. It. Vulg., with Cyr. Chrys. *al.* Already suspected by Griesbach. Rightly deleted by Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 1 and 8, and Alford. — Ver. 12. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\tilde{\iota}\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\tilde{\omega}\nu$] The concluding words: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\tilde{\iota}\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\tilde{\omega}\nu$, have been taken for a gloss by Bleek, Tisch. 1, 2, and 8, and Alford (comp. already Beza and Grotius); and in accordance with B S* 17, 23, Vulg. Copt. Basm. Syr. Arab. Erp. rejected. They are also declared suspected by Delitzsch. But in favour of their retention (Lachm. Bloomfield, Tisch. 7, Reiche) decides partly the preponderating authority of A D E K L S*** *al.*, partly the recurrence of the same words on the repetition of the citation x. 17. The addition might easily be overlooked on account of the homoioteleuton.

Vv. 1–13. Not merely, however, as regards His person is Christ highly exalted above the Levitical priests; the sanc-

tuary, too, in which He fulfils the office of High Priest, is highly exalted above the Levitical sanctuary. For Christ sustains His high-priestly office in the heavenly tabernacle, erected by God Himself, of which as the archetype the earthly tabernacle, in which the Levitical priests fulfil their office, is a mere copy. So much the more excellent is the priestly ministry of Christ, in proportion as the Covenant of which He is the Mediator is a better covenant, because resting upon the foundation of better promises. The character of this promised New Covenant is a more inward, spiritual one; and by the promise of a New Covenant the Old is declared to be outworn and no longer serviceable.

Vv. 1, 2. *Κεφάλαιον δέ*] *Now a main point is.* *Κεφάλαιον* is not accusative absolute (Bengel), nor yet the ordinary accusative with a *λέγω τοῦτο* to be supplemented (Ebrard), but *nominative*, and apposition to the whole ensuing proposition: *τοιούτων . . . ἄνθρωπος*, ver. 2. Comp. Rom. viii. 3. Just as *κεφάλαιον δέ* are also the kindred formulas: *τὸ δὲ μέγιστον*, *τὸ δὲ δεινότατον*, *τὸ ἔσχατον*, *τὸ τελευταῖον*, etc., very frequently prefixed to a whole clause by way of apposition. See Kühner, II. p. 146, *Obs.* 2. The expression *κεφάλαιον* itself is here understood by many expositors in the sense of “*sum*,” according to which the author would express the intention of immediately comprehending or recapitulating the substance of all his previous disquisition in a single statement. So Laurentius Valla (“*in summam autem*”), Erasmus, Clarius, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, H. Stephanus, Grotius (“*post tot dicta haec esto summa*”), Carpzov (“*ut rem summam et uno verbo complectar*”), Stengel, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 405), Conybeare, M'Caul, etc. This signification, however, although linguistically justified, is here *inadmissible*, since the author is passing over to something essentially new; a recapitulation of the previous argument accordingly does not take place at all. But neither is the anarthrous *κεφάλαιον*—although in itself this is not inadmissible—to be taken as equivalent to *τὸ κεφάλαιον*, as is done by Theophylact (*ἵνα εἶπω τὸ μέγιστον καὶ συνεκτικώτερον*), Bleek (“the essential thing, to which all else is subordinated”), Ebrard (“the key-stone”), Bisping (“the core of all”), Stuart, Delitzsch, Riehm,

Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr. pp. 464, 481; Alford, Maier, Ewald, and others. For, besides the further main point in the superiority of the N. T. High Priest over the Levitical high priests, here to be mentioned (namely, His ministering in a better sanctuary), the author has yet before his mind the elucidation of a *third* leading distinction (that of the better sacrifice presented by Christ). Comp. ix. 9 ff. — ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις] cannot be referred back specially, as is assumed by Erasmus, Clarius, Zeger, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Hammond, Carpzov, Schulz, Stein, Stengel, Ebrard, Ewald, and many others, to that which has already been said. For therewith the participle *present* λεγομένοις does not agree; εἰρημένοις must have been put instead of it. Nor, accordingly, can the sense be: “in addition to that already treated of” (Calov, Wolf, Rambach, Peirce, Storr, Ebrard, *al.*). On the contrary, ἐπὶ must be taken in the signification: “upon the supposition of,” “in the case of,” as ix. 17 and frequently, and ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις has essentially the same meaning as the genitive τῶν λεγομένων. Thus: *now a main point in the case of those things we are speaking of* (or: *in our argument*) *is the following.* — With the utmost violence does Hofmann tear the words asunder (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 406, and so still in his commentary, p. 302 f.), in that he will have κεφάλαιον δὲ separated from ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, and to the latter would supplement ἀρχιερεῦσιν, and renders: “besides those who are called high priests, we have a High Priest who has sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty.” That, moreover, the thought thus resulting would be a senseless one,—inasmuch as it would then follow that Christians have *several* sorts of high priests,—has already been pointed out by Nickel (in Reuter’s *Repertor.* 1858, Feb. p. 110). For how arbitrary it is when Hofmann seeks further to twist the statement, gained with so much toil, in the sense: “that the Christians possess a High Priest, compared with whom those who are so called have for them no significance,” hardly needs to be observed. — τοιοῦτον] is a preparation for the following ὅς ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ. Wrongly does Böhme refer it back to τοιοῦτος, vii. 26, and Carpzov to ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος in the same verse. The latter, moreover, with an erroneous

accentuation of the ἔχομεν: "*habemus omnino talem pontificem sc. ὑψηλότερον τῶν οὐρανῶν*, quippe qui adeo consedit ad dextram Dei ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς," in connection with which the progress of the discourse is lost sight of, and the fact remains unnoticed that the centre of gravity in the statement, vv. 1, 2, is contained only in ver. 2. — ὃς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλowsύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς] *who has sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven* (Ps. cx.). Comp. i. 3: ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλowsύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς. — The opinion of Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Klee, Bleek, and Alford, that the author designed by ἐκάθισεν, too, to indicate a point of superiority in Christ over the Levitical high priests,—inasmuch as the latter, when they entered the Most Holy Place, instead of sitting down were required to stand,—is far-fetched. There is nothing in the context to lead to such supposition. It is otherwise (on account of the express opposition there met with ἔστηκεν . . . ἐκάθισεν) chap. x. 11, 12. — ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς] belongs to ἐκάθισεν, not to τῆς μεγαλowsύνης (Böhme), since otherwise the article would have been repeated; still less to the opening words of ver. 2 (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 405 f.), since in that case τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς λειτουργός would have been the only natural expression, the rhythmical proportion of vv. 1, 2 would have been destroyed, and the ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, i. 3, parallel to the ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς in our passage, would have remained unnoticed as regards its coherence with that which precedes.

Ver. 2. Declaration of the capacity in which Christ has sat down at the right hand of God: as a sacrificing priest of the *true* sanctuary and tabernacle, which the *Lord* erected, not a man. Ver. 2 is to be joined without any comma to ver. 1. For only the qualification of the ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ., ver. 1, which is first added by means of ver. 2,—not merely the fact of the καθίσαι in itself, since this had already been often mentioned in the epistle,—contains the new main feature which the author aims at bringing into prominence. — τῶν ἁγίων] is not *masculine* (Oecumenius: ἀρχιερεὺς φησι τῶν ἡγιασμένων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπων ἡμῶν γὰρ ἔστιν ἀρχιερεὺς, Primasius, Cajetan, Schulz, Paulus, Stengel) but *neuter*; it

denotes, however, neither the *holy things* (Luther, Hunnius, Balduin), nor *that which is required for the priestly service* (Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Rambach, Ewald), nor “such holy things as stand in essential relation to the *σκηνή ἀληθινή*” (Kurtz), but *the sanctuary* (according to Erasmus, Jac. Cappellus, Böhme, Stuart, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 513; Alford, Maier, and others, *specially*: the Most Holy Place), *in which* (or: *in regard to which*) *the priestly service is performed*. Comp. ix. 8, 12, 24, 25, x. 19, xiii. 11. — Synonymous with τῶν ἁγίων is the τῆς σκηνῆς, added by way of elucidation; and from the adjective of the latter, τῆς ἀληθινῆς, we have also to supply in thought the corresponding adjective τῶν ἀληθινῶν (comp. ix. 24) to the foregoing τῶν ἁγίων. For even the earthly high priest was a τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός; only a τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἀληθινῶν λειτουργός he was not. — λειτουργός] Comp. λειτουργεῖν, x. 11, and λειτουργία, ver. 6, ix. 21; Phil. ii. 17; Luke i. 23. With the classic writers, λειτουργός denotes the bearer of any public office, or office of the State. In the *general* sense of a “servant” it stands i. 7; Rom. xiii. 6; Phil. ii. 25. But already with the LXX. (Neh. x. 39; cf. Eccus. vii. 30, *al.*) it is spoken specially of him who discharges priestly service. In accordance therewith it has here, too (comp. ver. 3), as well as Rom. xv. 16, the signification: *sacrificing priest*. — τῆς ἀληθινῆς] The σκηνή is called *true*, not in opposition to the *false*, but as the *archetype*¹ existing in heaven in contrast with the earthly *image of the same* (ver. 5), which latter, as is always the case with the copy in relation to the original, could be only something imperfect. — ἦν ἔπηξεν] Comp. Ex. xxxiii. 7. — ὁ κύριος] is here *God*, as elsewhere in our epistle only in the O. T. citations. — ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος] Comp. σκηνῆς οὐ χειροποιήτου, ix. 11; οὐ χειροποίητα ἅγια, ix. 24.

Ver. 3. Subsidiary remark in justification of the expression λειτουργός, ver. 2. The λειτουργεῖν, or the presenting of sacrifices, is just something essential in the fulfilment of the office of every high priest; a λειτουργός, or sacrificing priest,

¹ Comp. Wisd. ix. 8: εἶπας οἰκιστὴς οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν . . . καὶ . . . εὐστασιότατον, μίμημα σκηνῆς ἁγίας, ὅν περιτέμνεις ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.

must thus *Christ* also be. — By the statement, ver. 3, the argument itself is not interrupted. For enclosing the verse within a parenthesis, with Cameron, Stengel, and others, there exists therefore no reason. — γάρ] the explanatory *namely*. — On πᾶς γὰρ . . . καθίσταται, comp. v. 1: πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς . . . καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας. — ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον] *sc. ἦν* (Syriac, Beza, Piscator, Owen, Bengel, Bleek, de Wette, Hofmann, *Komm.* p. 306 ; Woerner), not ἐστίν (Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, Schlichting, Schulz, Böhme, Stuart, Kuinoel, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 407 ; Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 505 ; Alford, Maier, Moll, Ewald, M'Caul, *al.*). For the author knows only one single sacrificial act of Christ, an act performed once for all (not one continually repeated), as is evident partly from the parallel passages, vii. 27, ix. 12, 25, 28, x. 10, 12, 14, partly from the preterite προσενέγκη in our passage. — ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον, ὃ προσενέγκη] *that also this* (High Priest) *should have somewhat that He might offer up*. By the τί the author understands Christ's own body, which He gave up to death as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sinful world. The indefinite mode of expression by τί, however, was chosen just because the reference to the sacrifice in this place was only an incidental one, and that which was intended could the less be misunderstood by the readers, in that immediately before, vii. 27, it had been declared by means of ἐαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας in what the sacrifice of Christ consisted.

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

Ver. 4. A sacrificial priest Christ can only be, *either* in the earthly *or* the heavenly sanctuary ; for a third, besides these two, there is not. The author now proves, ver. 4, that He cannot be a priest in the earthly sanctuary, whence it then follows of itself that He must be so in the heavenly one. — εἰ ἦν] *not: if He had been* (Böhme, Kuinoel), but: *if He were*. To εἰ μὲν οὖν ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς we have, moreover, neither, with Grotius, Wolf, and others, to supply μόρον, nor, with Zeger, Bengel, Carpzov, Heinrichs, Böhme, and others, ἀρχιερεὺς or ἱερεὺς. It signifies nothing more than: if He were now on

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

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

¹ This writer with the explanation entirely foreign to the subject: “Erant, nempe quum psalmus iste scriberetur.”

umbræ tantum et exemplari illius coelestis tabernaculi servire. Not to enclose within a parenthesis (Griesbach, Schulz, Scholz, *al.*), since the same easily joins on syntactically to ver. 4, and *διαφορωτέρας*, ver. 6, points back to its subject-matter. — *οὔτινες*] *nimirum qui*. — *ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ*] *a copy and shadow*. *ὑποδείγματι* corresponds to the *δειχθέντα σοι* in the ensuing citation, and denotes here (otherwise iv. 11) that which is shown only by way of hints, or only in its general outlines (comp. *τὰ ὑποδείγματα*, ix. 23), has thus the notion of a merely imperfect sketch or copy. Yet more emphatically is the notion of imperfection brought out by means of *καὶ σκιᾷ*. For *σκιᾶ* stands not merely opposed to the *σῶμα*, as the *unsubstantial* to the *substantial* (Col. ii. 17; Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* ii. 2. 5: *σκιὰν αἰτησόμενος βασιλείας, ἧς ἤρπασεν ἐαυτῷ τὸ σῶμα*; Philo, *de confus. linguarum*, p. 348; with Mangey, I. p. 434), but also to the *εἰκόν*, as the *shadowy image* melting into obscurity, and only to be recognised in its exterior outlines to the *likeness* distinctly struck off, containing light and colour, and enabling one to recognise the original. Comp. Heb. x. 1: *σκιὰν . . . οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων*; Achilles Tatius, i. p. 47 (in Wetstein *ad* x. 1): *οὕτω τέθηκεν καὶ τῆς εἰκότος ἢ σκιᾶ*; Cicero, *de Officiis*, iii. 17: *Sed nos veri juris germanæque justitiæ solidam et expressam effigiem nullam tenemus; umbra et imaginibus utimur*. — *λατρεύουσιν*] is taken unnaturally by Calvin, Pareus, Bengel, Peirce, Schulz, and others in the *absolute* sense: "who serve God in a copy and shadow." The datives *ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ τῶν ἐπουρανίων* form the *object* of the verb (comp. xiii. 10): "who minister (as priests) to that which is but a copy and shadow of the heavenly." — *λατρεύειν* here, by virtue of the connection, entirely equivalent to *λειτουργεῖν*; in general, however, of wider signification, and differing from *λειτουργεῖν* as the Hebrew עָבַד from עָשָׂה. — *τῶν ἐπουρανίων*] not "of the heavenly things" (Luther), "of the heavenly relations and facts of redemption" (Ebrard), "of the heavenly relations and divine thoughts" (Moll), "of the ideal possessions in general, belonging to the kingdom of God" (Tholuck); but: *of the heavenly sanctuary*. Comp. the citation immediately

following, as also ver. 2 and ix. 23, 24. — *καθὼς κεχρημάτισται Μωϋσῆς*] *according to the response, or divine revelation, which Moses received.* The passive *χρηματίζεσθαι* in this sense only in the N. T. (xi. 7; Matt. ii. 22; Acts x. 22, *al.*) and in Josephus (*Antiq.* iii. 8. 8, xi. 8. 4). — *ἐπιτελεῖν*] denotes here not the completion of that which is already begun. What is meant is the execution of that which had previously only been resolved on. — The citation is from Ex. xxv. 40. The *γάρ*, even as *φησὶν*, belongs to the author of our epistle, on which account *ὄρα γάρ φησιν* is to be written without placing a comma after *γάρ*. — *φησὶν*] *sc. ὁ χρηματισμός*, the divine response, or, since in Exodus (xl. 1) God is expressly named as the speaker: *ὁ θεός* (Heinrichs, Bleek, Stengel, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Kurtz, *al.*), not *ἡ γραφή* (Böhme). — *πάντα*] is wanting with the LXX. — *κατὰ τὸν τύπον*] *in accordance with the pattern* (תבנית), *i.e.* corresponding to the archetype presented to the contemplation of Moses in the manner of a revelation, or by means of a vision. Comp. Acts vii. 44. Over-refined, indeed, although linguistically not less admissible than the other, is the interpretation of Faber Stapulensis, Rivetus, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Storr, Bleek, and Maier, that in connection with *τύπος* we have to think of a mere copy of the archetype, so that the Levitical priests served in priestly guise the copy of a copy. — *τὸν δειχθέντα*] LXX.: *τὸν δεδειγμένον*. — *ἐν τῷ ὄρει*] *upon the mount*, namely Sinai.

Ver. 6 repeats, in the form of an antithesis to vv. 4, 5, the main proposition of the new section, that Christ accomplishes His priestly service in the *heavenly* sanctuary (ver. 2); in the progress of the discourse, however, advances an additional argument in favour of this main proposition: in that the naturalness of the fact asserted *is evidenced by the superiority of that covenant* which has been brought in by Christ. As, therefore, the author (vii. 20–22) had deduced from the higher priestly rank of Christ the more excellent nature of the covenant brought in by Him; so here, conversely, from the better nature of the covenant established by Him, is inferred the higher order of His priestly ministry. *νυνὶ δέ* forms the opposition to *εἰ μὲν οὖν*, ver. 4, while *διαφορώτερας* points

back antithetically to the contents of ver. 5. Theophylact: Ἐκείνου τοῦ νοήματος ἡρτῆται ταῦτα, τοῦ Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἱερεύς· νυνὶ δὲ μὴ ὢν, φησὶν, ἐπὶ γῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔχων ἱερατεῖον, διαφορωτέρας ἐπέτυχε λειτουργίας· τουτέστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ ἡ λειτουργία τοιαύτη, οἷα ἡ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀρχιερέων ἀλλ' οὐράνιος, ἅτε τόπον ἔχουσα τῆς οἰκείας τελετῆς τὸν οὐρανόν. — νυνὶ δέ] not in the *temporal*, but in the *logical* sense: *but now*. — διαφορωτέρας λειτουργίας] inasmuch, namely, as the *σκηνή*, in which He fulfils His office, is the *ἀληθινή*, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος (ver. 2). — On the comparative *διαφορωτέρας*, see at ii. 4. — καὶ after ὅσω renders distinctly apparent the inner correspondence of the two principal members in the proposition, ver. 6. — μεσίτης] *Mediator* (ix. 15, xii. 24; Gal. iii. 19, 20; 1 Tim. ii. 5; LXX. Job ix. 33), inasmuch as He has proclaimed the *New* and better *Covenant*, and has sealed the same by His death on the cross. — ἥτις] *which, as such*. Introduction of the proof that the covenant of which Christ is made the Mediator is a *better* one (vii. 22), *i.e.* affords full satisfaction to the heart seeking salvation and deliverance, which the Mosaic covenant was incapable of pacifying. The proof for this superiority the author derives from the fact that the New Covenant has been enacted upon the ground of (ἐπὶ [cf. vii. 11; Acts xiv. 3]) better promises, *i.e.* promises more excellent with regard to their subject-matter. The expression *νενομοθέτηται* is chosen not in order to denote the similarity of nature in the two covenant-foundings, but, after the analogy of the Pauline mode of expression, Rom. iii. 27 (ix. 31), in order to oppose to the Mosaic law, hitherto in operation, the New Covenant as in some sense a new law (comp. νόμους μου, ver. 10) now come into force. — κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις] What is meant is without doubt the several factors in the contents of the passage from Jeremiah cited immediately after — to wit, the promise of the forgiveness of sins (comp. ver. 12), which the Old Covenant was not able to bring about (Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iii. 10 ff.), in connection with the character of *innerness* of the New Covenant in general (vv. 10, 11), as opposed to the *externalism* of the Old. — The explaining of the κρείττονες ἐπαγγελίαι, with Theodoret, Occumenius, Theophy-

lact, Primasius, Clarius, Bengel, Carpzov, Whitby, M'Lean, Bisping, and others, of *everlasting blessedness* and the other eternal blessings of Christianity, in opposition to the purely terrestrial and temporal promises of Mosaism (the peaceful possession of the land of Canaan, a long life upon earth, etc.), is to be rejected; because—apart from the contradiction in which this interpretation stands with the elucidation given by the author himself by virtue of the ensuing citation from Scripture—it is, as Bleek rightly observes, improbable that the author should have referred the promises deposited in the Mosaic law to merely *earthly things*, in place of referring them to the object of which he understands the promise already imparted to Abraham—the bringing in of the great salvation for the people of God in the person of Christ. — The view, too, that the ἐπαγγελίαι of the New Covenant are called κρείττονες because they are better guaranteed (Stengel and others), has the context against it.

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

Ver. 7. Justification of the κρείττονος and κρείττοσιν, ver. 6. — εἰ ἦν] *if it were* (vii. 11, viii. 4). — ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη] sc. διαθήκη. On the *superlative*, quite in keeping with the linguistic usage of the Greek, see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 229, *Obs.* 1. — ἄμempτος] *faultless* (Phil. ii. 15, iii. 6), *satisfactory, sufficient*. Theodoret: τὸ ἄμempτος ἀντὶ τοῦ τελεία τέθεικε. — οὐκ ἂν δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο τόπος] *place would not have been sought* (sc. by God, in the O. T., or in the passage of Scripture immediately adduced) *for a second* (covenant); i.e. it would not have been expressed by God Himself, that a second covenant is to come in beside the first, and replace it. In this general sense ἐζητεῖτο τόπος is to be taken, and the form of expression in the apodosis to be explained from a mingling of a twofold mode of contemplation (οὐκ ἂν δευτέρα ἐζητεῖτο καὶ δευτέρας οὐκ ἦν ἂν τόπος: a second would not be sought by God, nor would there be any place for a second). No emphasis rests upon τόπος; on which

account it is over-refining, when Bleek finds in ἐζητείτο τόπος the reference that to the New Covenant, according to ver. 10, the place was assigned in the hearts of men, while the Old was written upon tables of stone.

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

Ver. 9. Οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν] negative unfolding of the foregoing positive expression καινῇν (namely, a covenant): *not after the manner of the covenant* (לֹא כַּדִּבָּר) *which I made for their fathers*, i.e. one qualitatively different therefore, and that as being a better one. — ἣν ἐποίησα] LXX.: ἣν διεθέμην. — τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν] in the Hebrew אֲבוֹתָם, *with their fathers*. The mere dative with ἐποίησα excludes the notion of reciprocity in the covenant-

founding which has taken place, and presents it purely as the work of the disposition made by God. — ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου κ.τ.λ.] *in the day (at the time) when I took hold of their hand, to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt* (בְּיַדִּי הֵצִיִּיתִי מִן־הָאָרֶץ מִצְרָיִם). An unwieldy but not exactly incorrect construction (see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 531), in place of which Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph. Jud.* 11, in citing the same words of Scripture, has chosen the less cumbrous ἐν ᾗ ἐπελαβόμην. The note of time characterizes the covenant as the Mosaic one. — ὅτι] *for*; not: “because,” as protasis to κἀγὼ κ.τ.λ. as the apodosis (Calvin, Böhme, Hofmann, *al.*). — κἀγὼ] emphatic personal opposition to αὐτοί: *and consequently I also concerned not myself about them.* — λέγει κύριος] LXX. (*Cod. Alex.* too): φησὶ κύριος.

Ver. 10. Justification of the διαθήκην καινὴν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην κ.τ.λ., vv. 8, 9, by a definite indication of the nature of the covenant to be instituted. — ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη κ.τ.λ.] *for this (or the following) is the covenant which I will institute for the house of Israel.* αὕτη introduces with emphasis the material characterization following with διδούς κ.τ.λ. — οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ] here embraces the whole nation, while in ver. 8 it denoted one of the two kingdoms into which it had been divided. — μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας] *after those days, i.e. after the days which must first have elapsed, before the ἡμέραι mentioned, ver. 8,—in which the New Covenant is to come into existence,—begin to dawn.* Wrongly Occumenius: ποίας ἡμέρας; τὰς τῆς ἐξόδου, ἐν αἷς ἔλαβον τὸν νόμον. — λέγει κύριος] LXX.: φησὶ κύριος. — διδούς] So LXX. *Cod. Alex.*, while *Cod. Vatic.* and other mss. of the LXX. have διδὼς δώσω. In the Hebrew וְיָתֵן. διδούς does not stand for δώσω (Vatablus, Schlichting, Bengel, and others). Just as little have we to supplement it with δώσω (Heinrichs, Stengel, *al.*), or with εἰμί or ἔσομαι (Kuinoel, Bloomfield), or διαθήσομαι αὐτήν (Delitzsch). Nor have we to join it to the following ἐπιγράψω (so Böhme, but undecidedly, and Paulus), in such wise that we must render καὶ before ἐπιγράψω by “also.” It attaches itself grammatically to the preceding διαθήσομαι. In order to obviate any unevenness of construction, we may then place a colon after διάνοιαν αὐτῶν. The separation, however,

of the *καὶ ἐπιγράψω* from that which precedes is not actually necessary, since instances of a transition from the participle to the *tempus finitum* are elsewhere nothing strange. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 533. — *διάνοια*] *mind*, i.e. soul, innermost part (קִרְבִּי). Accentuation of the character of *innerness* in the New Covenant, as opposed to the *externalism* of the Old. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 3. — *καρδίας*] either *accusative* (Deut. iv. 13, v. 22, *al.*) or *genitive* (comp. Ex. xxxiv. 28; Num. xvii. 2, 3, *al.*). In favour of the latter pleads the *singular* in the Hebrew original; in favour of the former, the reading of the *Cod. Alex.*: *ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας*. We cannot take into account, in favour of the accusative, the greater conformity to the character of the Greek language, according to which, on account of the plurality of persons (*αὐτῶν*), one must also speak of *καρδίαί* in the plural. For without regard to this distinction the singular *διάνοιαν* has already been just placed, and in like manner the singular *τῆς χειρός* is placed, ver. 9. — In place of *ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς*, the *Cod. Alex.* of the LXX. has: *ἐπιγράψω αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν*, and the *Cod. Vatic.*: *ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν γράψω αὐτοὺς*. — *καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεὸν κ.τ.λ.*] Comp. already Ex. vi. 7; Lev. xxvi. 12, *al.*; also 2 Cor. vi. 16. — The Hebraizing *εἶναι εἰς* (לֵּי הָיָה) as i. 5.

Ver. 11. The consequence resulting from the *διδόναι νόμους εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 10. Comp. Joel iii. 1, 2; 1 John ii. 27. — *καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν*] *and then they shall not instruct* (Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 472; Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr.* p. 183), as regards the sense equivalent to: and then it will not be needful that they instruct each other; the reason for which is stated immediately after, in the *ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσιν με κ.τ.λ.* On the intensifying *οὐ μὴ*, see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 471 f. — *τὸν πολίτην αὐτοῦ*] *his fellow-citizen*. So in the LXX., *Cod. Vatic.*, and most mss., while *Cod. Alex.* has in the first member *τὸν ἀδελφόν*, in the second *τὸν πλησίον*. — *γυνῶθι*] in the Hebrew the plural: נָשִׁי. — *μικροῦ*] With the LXX. in most Codd.: *μικροῦ αὐτῶν*. — *ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν*] *Young and old* (בְּיָנֵי הַזָּרִיזִים). Comp. Acts viii. 10; LXX. Jer. vi. 13; Jonah iii. 5; Gen. xix. 11, *al.*

Ver. 12. The inner ground of this communion with God and this knowledge of Him. — ὅτι] not: "that" (Michaelis, *ad Peire.*), but: *for*. — ἔλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν] *I will be gracious (ἡλεῶς) to their unrighteousnesses, i.e. will forgive and forget the same.* — ἀδικίαι] in the plural, in the N. T. only here, but of frequent occurrence with the LXX. Designation of the alienation from God in its single outbreaks and forms of manifestation. — καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν] LXX. merely: καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν, in accordance with the Hebrew: תַּיַחֲוִי וְעֲוֹנוֹתָיִם אֲנִי מְחַלֵּם.

Ver. 13. The author derives the result from the Scripture testimony, vv. 8–12. — ἐν τῷ λέγειν καινὴν] *in that He (sc. God) saith: a new (covenant).* Comp. ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, iii. 15, and ἐν τῷ ὑποτάξαι, ii. 8. — πεπαλαίωκεν τὴν πρώτην] *He hath made the first old (contrary to linguistic usage, Ebrard: "relatively older"), i.e. has declared it to be out of date, outworn, and no longer serviceable.* — παλαιῶν] a word belonging to a later period of the Greek language, elsewhere ordinarily used in the intransitive sense: "to grow old," and generally in the *middle* voice (as a little below, and i. 11); is found likewise in the transitive sense, "to make old," in Lam. iii. 4; Job ix. 5. To abolish or render obsolete the word itself does not signify; but rendering obsolete is the natural consequence of pronouncing out of date or outworn. The author accordingly does not directly express notion of *abrogation* by πεπαλαίωκεν in this place,—a sense, moreover, which, on account of the following παλαιούμενον, would here be inappropriate,—but leaves the reader to divine it. — τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ] *but that which is growing ancient and is becoming infirm with years, is near to disappearing or perishing.* — γηράσκειν] ordinarily said of human beings (to become enfeebled with age, *senescere*); then, however, also of things, comp. *e.g.* Xenoph. *Ages*. xi. 14: ἡ μὲν τοῦ σώματος ἰσχύς γηράσκει, ἡ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ῥώμη . . . ἀγήρατός ἐστιν. — The author says sparingly: *near to disappearing* (comp. κατάρas ἐγγύς, vi. 8), in that he takes his standpoint at the time of the divine promises just quoted. But if God in the time of Jeremiah already designated the Old Covenant as that which is nigh unto ruin, it was therein necessarily declared by

implication, that now, after so long a time is passed and the New Covenant has already been in reality brought in, the Old Covenant, as to its essence (if not yet as to its external manifestation), must have been already entirely abrogated, must have entirely lost its force and validity.

CHAPTER IX.

VER. 1. ἡ πρώτη] Elz.: ἡ πρώτη σκηνὴ. But the addition σκηνὴ is condemned as a gloss by the fact of its being wanting in all the uncial mss., in many cursives, in Syr. utr. Basm. Aeth. Arm. It. Vulg., with Gregory Thaumaturgus, Cyril, Chrys. Damasc. Theoph. Photius, *al.* On the ground, too, of internal evidence it is to be rejected, since, on the one hand, the coherence with viii. 13, and through that with viii. 7 *ff.*, leads to διαθήκη as the main idea to be supplemented; and, on the other hand, the expression ἡ πρώτη σκηνὴ, ix. 1, would be made to denote something quite different from that which the same expression denotes in ix. 2. For, while in ver. 2 the outer division of the tabernacle is indicated thereby, in ver. 1 only the first or Old Testament, earthly tabernacle, in opposition to the New Testament, heavenly one, thus something entirely dissimilar, could be intended by this expression. — Ver. 2. After ἄρτων, B, Basmur. add καὶ τὸ χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον, and in return omit the words χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον καὶ, ver. 4. Violent intentional transposition, with a view to the removal of the archaeological difficulty. — Instead of ἄγρια, Lachm. writes ἄγρια. ἁγίων, after A (αγρια αγίων) D* E, It. But ἄγρια ἁγίων is a mere slip on the part of the copyist, occasioned by ver. 3, and is to be rejected as devoid of sense. — Ver. 5. Χερουβίμ] A: Χερουβεῖμ, B D*** (and so Lachm. Tisch. 7 and 8): Χερουβεῖν, D* S: Χερουβίν. In the case of the LXX., too, the mss. are wont equally to vary as regards the final syllable of the word. — Instead of the *Recepta* δόξης, Griesb. and Scholz have erroneously placed in the text τῆς δόξης. The article has against it all the uncial mss. and other witnesses. — Ver. 9. In place of the *Recepta* καὶ ὧν (D*** E K L, min. It. Copt. Sah. Basm. Syr. utr. Chrys. Theodoret, Theoph.), Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, Delitzsch, Alford have rightly preferred the reading καὶ ἧν, in accordance with A B D* S, 17, 23* 27, *al.*, Vulg. Slav. codd. Damasc. Occum. (comment.). Already approved by Mill, *Prolegg.* p. 1046, and placed by Griesb. upon the inner margin. The καὶ ὧν, as affording an easier mode of appending to that which precedes, is a later correction of the more difficult and

ill-understood καθ' ἑν.—Ver. 10. The *Recepta* reads: καὶ δικαιομασί σαρκός. But καὶ is wanting in A D* S* 6, 17, 27, 31, *al.*, with Cyr. (twice) in Syr. Copt. Sahid. Arm. *al.*; and in place of δικαιομασί, A B S, ten cursives, Cyril., and many versions have δικαιοματά, while in D* It. Sahid. there is found δικαίωμα. Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, Alford have therefore adopted δικαιοματά σαρκός, which was already approved by Grotius, Mill, *Prolegg.* p. 1355, and Bengel, and recommended by Griesb. Delitzsch and Reiche likewise give it the preference. This reading is in reality to be regarded as the original one. For it is more easily explicable that δικαιοματά should, on account of the foregoing datives, be changed into δικαιομασί, and joined on to them by means of καί, than that the καὶ δικαιομασί, if it already existed, should, on account of the closing word ἐπιτετέμενα, be converted into δικαιοματά.—Ver. 11. In place of the *Recepta* τῶν μελλόντων, Lachm. and Tisch. 1 read, after B D* It. Syr. utr. (yet the Syr. Philonex. has the *Recepta* in the margin) Arab. petropol. and some codd. of Chrys.: τῶν γενομένων. Defended by Ebrard. But the reading is not in keeping with the carefully chosen diction of our author, and its sense: "High Priest of the good things which have arisen," does not commend itself. It is manifestly a transcriber's error, occasioned by the presence of the foregoing παραγιγόμενος.—Ver. 12. εὐράμενος] D* (E?), 27, 44, 80, *al.*, and some Fathers: εὐρόμενος.—Ver. 13. Elz.: παύρων καὶ τράγων. With Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford, to be transposed into τράγων καὶ παύρων, in accordance with the decisive authority of A B D E S, Cyr. Theodoret, Bede, Syr. Copt. Basm. It. Vulg. *al.*—Ver. 14. πνεύματος αἰωνίου] D* S*** many cursives, Copt. Basm. Slav. It. Vulg. *al.*, Chrys. Cyr. Didym. (?) Damasc. *al.*: πνεύματος ἁγίου. Interpretative gloss.—In place of the *Recepta* συνείδησιν ὑμῶν, Bengel, Knapp, Lachm. Tisch. 1 and 2, Alford read more suitably, in accordance with A D* K, 44, 47, 67, *al.*, Syr. Copt. Arm. Vulg. ms. *al.* Athan. Cyr. Chrys. (comment.) Theodoret, Theoph.: συνείδησιν ὑμῶν. Recommended likewise by Griesb., and already placed in the text in the Edd. Complut. Genev. Plant.—To the mere εἰς ὧν in the *Recepta*, Lachm., with A, 21* 31, 66 (in the margin), Copt. Slav. Chrys. (comment.) Macar. Theoph., has added the words καὶ ἀληθινῶν. These words are, however, to be deleted. They are a gloss from 1 Thess. i. 9.—Ver. 17. μήποτε] D* S* and Isidor. Pelus. iv. 113 (... ὅτω γὰρ εὖρον καὶ ἐν παλαιότης ἀντιγράφουσιν): μὴ τότε.—Ver. 18. Instead of εἰδὲ in the *Recepta*, we have, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 2, and 7, Delitzsch, Alford, to write εἰδέ, in accordance with A C D E L,

4, 44, 52, Chrys. Theodoret, Oecum. — ἡ πρώτη] D* E* It. : ἡ πρώτη διαθήκη. Exegetical gloss. — Ver. 19. Elz. : κατὰ νόμον. But the better attestation by A C D* L s*** 21, 47, 71, *al.*, Copt. Basm. Chrys. ms. Theodoret, Theoph. requires the reading preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, and Alford : κατὰ τὸν νόμον. — In like manner is the article τῶν wanting in the *Recepta* before τράγων to be added, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, in accordance with the weighty authority of A C D E (D E, Aeth. : τῶν τράγων καὶ τῶν μύσγων) s* 80, *al. mult.* It. Vulg. Theodoret, ms. — So, in place of the *Recepta* ἐρράντισε here and ver. 21, we have, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, in accordance with all the uncials, to write ἐράντισεν. — Ver. 24. The order of the words followed by Lachm. in the stereotype edition, as well as recently by Tisch. in the ed. vii. and viii. : εἰσῆλθεν ἄγια, rests only upon the testimony of A s, 37, 118. In the larger edition of Lachm., therefore, this has rightly given place to the *Recepta* ἄγια εἰσῆλθεν. — Better attested than the *Recepta* ὁ Χριστός is the mere Χριστός (A C* D* s, *al.* [Cod. B in its original form extends only to σπειθῆσιν, ix. 14]), preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, and Alford. — Ver. 26. Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Bloomfield, Delitzsch : νῦν δέ. Better Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, in accordance with A C L (?) s, 37, 39, 40, Orig. Chrys. : νυνὶ δέ. — ἀμαρτίας] A s, 17, 73. Lachm. : τῆς ἀμαρτίας. Against C D*** E K L, almost all the min. Orig. (once) *al. mult.* — Ver. 28. οὕτως καί] Elz. has only οὕτως. Against decisive witnesses (all the uncial mss., most min., many translations and Fathers). — After εἰς σωτηρίαν, Lachm. in the stereotype edition had added, with A, 31, 47, *al.*, Syr. Philonex. Slav. codd. Damasc., the words διὰ πίστεως. Rightly, however, has he deleted them in the larger edition. The addition is a complementary gloss, which has against it the testimony of C D E K L s, many min. versions, and Fathers, and betrays its character as a gloss by its changing position (Arm. 27, 31, 57, 61, *al.*, have it *before* εἰς σωτηρίαν).

Vv. 1-14. The author has in chap. viii. insisted upon the fact, as a second main particular of the superiority of Christ as a high priest over the Levitical high priests, that the sanctuary in which He ministers is a more excellent one, namely, the heavenly sanctuary. He has made good this proposition by the consideration that no place would be found for Christ, as regards priestly service, in the earthly sanctuary ; and then has proceeded to show the naturalness

of the fact that He accomplishes His ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, by the proof that He is the Mediator of a better covenant. This train of thought is still pursued in the beginning of chap. ix., in that attention is now finally called to the fact that in the arrangement of the Mosaic sanctuary itself, and the order of the priestly service corresponding thereto, there lies an indication on the part of God that Mosaism is not itself the perfect religion, but only an institution preparatory thereto (vv. 1-8). With this, however, is then connected, by means of one of those sudden transitions of which the author is so fond, the reference to the further truth, that, indeed, the Levitical *sacrifices* also, since they belong to the domain of fleshly ordinance, are not able really to atone; whereas the sacrifice presented by Christ, by means of His own blood, possesses, by virtue of an eternal Spirit, everlasting power of atonement (vv. 9-14), and thus *a third main point in the high-priestly superiority of Christ is introduced*, the development of which occupies the author as far as x. 18.

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

Ver. 1. *Εἶχεν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη] sc. διαθήκη.* Against the supplementing of *σκηνῇ* (Cameron, Peirce, Whitby, Wetstein, Semler), see the critical remark. — *εἶχεν] had. ἔχει* is not written by the author, although the cultus of the Old Covenant was still continuing at the time when he wrote, not so much because—as is shown by ver. 2—it was his intention to describe the primitive arrangement thereof (comp. viii. 5), which is the opinion of Böhme, Kuinoel, Stengel, and Tholuck, as, what is more naturally suggested by the coherence with viii. 13, because the Old Covenant had already been declared by God in the time of Jeremiah to be feeble with age and nigh unto disappearing, and consequently now, after the actual appearance of the promised New Covenant, has no longer any valid claim to existence. Chrysostom: *ὥσεί ἔλεγε, τότε εἶχε, νῦν οὐκ ἔχει· δείκνυσιν ἤδη τούτῳ αὐτὴν ἐκκεχωρηκυῖαν· τότε γὰρ εἶχε, φησίν.* "Ὡστε νῦν, εἰ καὶ ἔστηκεν, οὐκ ἔστιν. — *μὲν οὖν] now truly.* Admission that that which the author is about to detail is indeed something

relatively exalted. The antithesis, by which again this admission is deprived of its value and significance, is then introduced by ver. 6 (not first with ver. 11, as is supposed by Piscator, Owen, Carpzov, Cramer, Stuart, Bloomfield, Bisping, Maier, McCaul, and others); yet in such wise that the material antithesis itself is first contained in the statement, ver. 8, which is connected syntactically only as a parenthetical clause. — *καί*] *also*. Indication that with the Old Covenant the New is compared, and possessions of the former are enumerated, which also (although, it is true, in a more perfect form) are proper to the latter. — *δικαιώματα λατρείας*] *legal ordinances*¹ *in regard to worship*, i.e. regulations made by virtue of divine authority respecting the cultus. — *λατρείας*] is *genitive*. To take the expression as *accusative* (Cameron, Grotius, Hammond, *al.*), according to which *δικαιώματα*, *λατρείας*, and *τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν* would as three members be made co-ordinate with each other, is untenable; because the signification of *δικαιώματα* in itself would be too extensive to fit in with the further development of ver. 1, to which the author himself at once passes over, from ver. 2 onwards. For as the statement *τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν* receives its more full explication by means of vv. 2–5, so does the discourse in vv. 6, 7 return to the unfolding of the twofold *δικαιώματα λατρείας*, blended as this is in a logical respect into a unity of idea. — *τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν*] *and the mundane sanctuary*. Since, in accordance with the *καί*, possessions of the Old Covenant are to be mentioned, such as this has in common with the New,—while to the New Covenant there pertains no mundane, earthly sanctuary,—*τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν* must be regarded as a concise mode of designation for *καὶ ἅγιόν τι, τὸ κοσμικόν*, “and a sanctuary, namely the mundane.” That such is the meaning of the author, is indicated by the fact that the article is placed before this second member, although it ought properly to have been inserted before *κοσμικόν* also. Yet the omission of the article in the case of adjectives placed after their substantives is not a thing unknown among other writers of the later period. See Bernhardt, *Synt.* p. 323; Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 126. Forced is the

¹ Wrongly Stengel: “Means of justification.”

explanation of Delitzsch, with the adherence of Kurtz and Woerner, that *κοσμικόν* as an adjectival predicate is to be taken in association with *εἶχεν*: "the first covenant had likewise *δικαιώματα λατρείας*, and its sanctuary as mundane, *i.e.* a sanctuary of mundane nature." Had the author intended the readers to suppose such a conjoining, he would also—equally as vii. 24, v. 14—have indicated the same to them by the position of the words. He must, in order to be understood, at least have written: *εἶχεν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη δικαιώματα λατρείας κοσμικόν τε τὸ ἅγιον*. Under an entire misapprehension, further, does Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 408 f., 2 Aufl.) suppose that *τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν* is not to be taken as a second *object* attaching itself to the *δικαιώματα λατρείας*, but as a second *subject* joining itself on to *ἡ πρώτη*,—a construction which, upon the presupposition of the *Receptu ἡ πρώτη σκηνή* being the correct reading, already Olearius adopted (comp. Wolf *ad loc.*), and upon the same supposition also more recently M'Caul maintained, in connection with which, however, *τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν* would limp behind in an intolerable manner, and would afford evidence of a negligence of style, such as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews would least of all have been guilty of. —The view of Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Zeger, Carpzov, and others, that *ἅγιον* is to be taken not in the *local* sense (sanctuary), but in the *ethical* sense (holiness, *ἀγιότης*, sanctitas, mundities), is altogether erroneous; since the expression chosen would be a remarkable one, the immediate sequel does not point thereto, and the more exalted seat of the cultus of the New Covenant forms the theme of the fresh train of thought opened up with the beginning of chap. viii. —Quite as much to be disapproved is the opinion of Wolf, who will have *ἅγιον* to mean "*vasa sacra totumque apparatus Leviticum*." —*κοσμικός*] means: *belonging to the world, worldly, mundanus*. Comp. Tit. ii. 12. The expression is equivalent to *ἐπίγειος*, and to it *ἐπουράνιος* stands opposed, as in general *ὁ κόσμος* in the N. T. very frequently has its tacit contrast in *ὁ οὐρανός*. *Τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν* is consequently nothing else than *ἡ σκηνή, ἣν ἔπηξεν ἄνθρωπος* (comp. viii. 2), or *ἡ σκηνή χειροποίητος, τουτέστιν ταύτης*

τῆς κτίσεως (comp. ix. 11), or τὰ χειροποίητα ἅγια (ix. 24), and a twofold idea is expressed in the adjective, first, that the sanctuary of the Old Covenant is one existing in the terrestrial world, then, that it is accordingly something only temporary and imperfect in its nature. Remote from the connection are the suppositions of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, and others: that the Jewish sanctuary was called κοσμικόν, because the access to the same stood open to the κόσμος, *i.e.* the Gentiles; a statement, moreover, which possesses historic truth only with reference to *a part* thereof, the court of the Gentiles (comp. Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* v. 5. 2; Acts xxi. 28), while here the sanctuary *as a whole* must be indicated;—of Theodorus Mopsuesten., Theodoret,¹ Grotius, Hammond, Wetstein, Böhme, Paulus, and others: because the Jewish sanctuary symbolically represented the universe; the holy place, earth; the most holy, heaven; and the curtain before the latter, the firmament;—of Kypke, because the sense is: *toto terrarum orbe celebratum* (comp. Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* iv. 5. 2, where the Jerusalem high priests, Ananus and Jesus, are represented as τῆς κοσμικῆς θρησκείας κατάρχοντες, προσκυνούμενοί τε τοῖς ἐκ τῆς οἰκουμένης), which, however, could only be said with reference to the temple, not with reference to the tabernacle itself, of which the author is here specially thinking. — Entirely baseless, finally, is the opinion of Homberg, that κοσμικόν is to be apprehended in the sense of “adorned, well-ordered.” For only κόσμος, κοσμητικός, and κοσμητής are used for the expression of this notion; never is κοσμικός put for it. See the Lexicons.

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

¹ Τὴν σκηνὴν οὕτως ἐκάλεσε, τύπον ἐπέχουσιν τοῦ κόσμου παντός. Καταπίτνασμα γὰρ μέτω διχρεῖτο διχῆ, καὶ τὰ μὲν αὐτῆς ἐκαλύπτο ἅγια, τὰ δὲ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων. Καὶ ἐμπεῖτο τὰ μὲν ἅγια τὴν ἐν τῇ γῇ πολιτίαν, τὰ δὲ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων τὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἰνδιαίτημα. Αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ καταπίτνασμα τοῦ στίβου τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τὴν χρίαν.

disposition as still preserved in the temple of his day, is manifest partly from the *present* λέγεται immediately following, partly from the proposition: τούτων δὲ οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων . . . εἰσίσαι, ver. 6. — σκηνὴ γὰρ κατεσκευάσθη ἡ πρώτη] *for a tent was prepared (set up), namely, the first or anterior one (the fore-tent).* σκηνή stands first as the general notion, and only acquires its nearer definition by the ἡ πρώτη afterwards brought in, without, however, our having, with Beza, Bloomfield, and others, to place a comma after κατεσκευάσθη. That σκηνὴ ἡ πρώτη is not to be combined immediately in one, as expressing the signification: "the fore-part of the tent" (so Valekenæer, who compares in *ultimis verbis*, and the like; also Delitzsch), is shown—although such acceptation presents no grammatical difficulty—by the corresponding σκηνὴ ἡ λεγομένη ἅγια ἁγίων, ver. 3, whence it follows that the author is regarding the two divisions of the tent separated by the veil in front of the Most Holy Place as two tents. — πρώτη] not *temporal*, but *local*. — κατεσκευάσθη] namely by Moses, at the behest of God (comp. viii. 5). — ἐν ᾗ ἡ τε λυχνία] *sc. ἐστίν* (not ἦν, Alford, Kurtz, against which λέγεται and ver. 6 are decisive): *in which there is the candlestick (or lamp-stand).* Comp. Ex. xxv. 31-39, xxxvii. 17-24; Bähr, *Symbolik des Mos. Cultus*, Bd. I., Heidelb. 1837, p. 412 ff. In the temple of Herod, too, there was, according to Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* v. 5. 5, vii. 5. 5, only *one* lamp-stand in the Holy Place, while in the temple of Solomon there were *ten* of them present; comp. 1 Kings vii. 49; 2 Chron. iv. 7. — καὶ ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων] *and the table and the setting forth of the bread (or loaves), i.e. wherein is found the table, and the sacred custom is observed of placing thereon the shew-bread.* Comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 590. Wrongly do Vatablus, Zeger, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Bengel, Bloomfield, and others explain ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων as hypallage or antiptosis for οἱ ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως. Yet more unwarrantably do Valekenæer (and similarly Heinrichs) maintain that ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων is equivalent to ἡ τράπεζα τῶν ἄρτων τῆς προθέσεως. According to Tholuck, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Kluge, and Moll, πρόθεσις is, like the Hebrew תְּרָפֶזֶת, to be taken *concretely*, *strues panum*. But πρόθεσις never has the

passive signification of *strues*. On the matter itself, comp. Ex. xxv. 23–30, xxvi. 35, xxxvii. 10–16; Lev. xxiv. 5–9; Bähr, *l.c.* p. 407 ff. — ἡ[τις] *sc.* σκηνὴ ἡ πρώτη. Not conjoined with the mere ἡ, because the fact alleged is something which is familiar to the readers. — ἅγια] *Holy Place* (ἁγίον). So (as *neuter plur.*), not, with Erasmus, Luther, Er. Schmid, Mill, Whitby, Heinrichs, and others, ἁγία (as *fem. sing.*), have we to accentuate the word. It stands opposed to the ἅγια ἁγίων, ver. 3, and denotes the Holy Place, or the outer portion of the tabernacle, in opposition to the Most Holy Place, or the more secluded, inner portion of the same. Likewise with the LXX. and with Philo, the plural τὰ ἅγια in this sense is interchanged with the singular τὸ ἅγιον. — ἅγια, however, not τὰ ἅγια, is placed, because the author was less concerned about mentioning the definite name coined for the expression thereof, than about bringing out the signification which this name has.

Ver. 3. Μετά] *after* or *behind*. Of local succession (Thucyd. vii. 58, *al.*), in the N. T. only here. — τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα] *the second veil* (פְּרֹכֶת). For before the Holy Place, too, there was a veil (מָסָךְ). On the former, comp. Ex. xxvi. 31 ff. — σκηνὴ] *sc.* κατεσκευάσθη. — ἅγια ἁγίων] *Most Holy Place*. Periphrasis of the superlative (see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 231), and translation of קֹדֶשׁ קֹדְשִׁים.

Ver. 4. Θυμιατήριον] is either interpreted as *altar of incense* or as *censer*. The latter, and indeed as a *golden censer*, which was employed by the high priest on the great day of atonement, is thought of by Luther, Grotius, de Dieu, Calov, Reland, Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Wetstein, Carpzov, Whitby, Schulz, Böhme, M'Lean, Stuart, Kuinoel, Stein, Bloomfield, Bisping, Alford, M'Caul, and others, after the precedent of the Peshito, Vulgate (*turibulum*), and Theophylact. The *altar of incense*, on the other hand (מִזְבֵּחַ הַזָּהָב or מִזְבֵּחַ הַקְּטֹרֶת), of which mention is made as a constituent part in the Mosaic tabernacle, Ex. xxx. 1–10, xxxvii. 25–28, xl. 5, 26, as a constituent part in the temple of Solomon, 1 Kings vii. 48, 2 Chron. iv. 19, and as a constituent part in the Herodian temple (Josephus, *de Bello Jul.* v. 5. 5), is understood in the case of the Latin translation in D E (*altare*), as well as by Oecumenius (*ad* ver. 7), Calvin, Justinian, Piscator, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide,

Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Owen, Gerhard, Brochmann, Mynster (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, p. 342 ff.), Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 489 f., *Obs.*), Maier, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Conybeare, Hofmann, Woerner, and others. Instances from the classical writers in favour of either reference, see in Bleek, II. 2, p. 480 f. That a censer is intended may be urged from the language of the LXX., since with them for the indication of the altar of incense the expressions: τὸ θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος (Ex. xxx. 1, 27; Lev. iv. 7), τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν θυμιαμάτων (1 Chron. vi. (vii.) 49, xxviii. 18; 2 Chron. xxvi. 16, 19), τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν (Ex. xl. 5, 26, *al.*), τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ (ὄν) ἀπέναντι κυρίου (Lev. xvi. 12, 18); and, where the altar intended is clear from the context, merely τὸ θυσιαστήριον (Lev. xvi. 20, *al.*), are regularly employed, and only in unimportant MSS. of the same θυμιατήριον presents itself in some few passages as a variation of reading. To this usage of the LXX., however, is to be opposed the equally important fact of the usage of Philo and Josephus, according to which, at their time, τὸ θυμιατήριον was quite the ordinary appellation of the altar of incense. Comp. Philo, *Quis rerum divin. haeres.* p. 511 sq. (with Mangey, I. p. 504): τριῶν ὄντων ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις σκευῶν, λυχνίας, τραπέζης, θυμιατηρίου; *De vita Mos.* p. 668 (II. p. 149): "Ἀμα δὲ τούτῳ ἐδημιουργεῖτο καὶ σκευὴ ἱερά, κιβωτός, λυχνία, τράπεζα, θυμιατήριον, βωμός. Ὁ μὲν οὖν βωμός ἱδρυτο ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ κ.τ.λ.; Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* v. 5. 5: καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον μέρος . . . εἶχεν ἐν αὐτῷ τρία θαυμασιώτατα καὶ περιβόητα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἔργα, λυχνίαν, τράπεζαν, θυμιατήριον; *Antiq.* iii. 6. 8: μεταξὺ δὲ αὐτῆς (τῆς λυχνίας) καὶ τῆς τραπέζης ἔνδον . . . θυμιατήριον, ξύλινον μὲν κ.τ.λ., *al.* Of the altar of incense, accordingly, the expression must be understood in our passage. For the manner in which the χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον is mentioned, as a parallel member to τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης, shows that the former must be an object of equally great importance as the latter. But, since that is so, something as non-essential as a golden censer cannot be meant, but only the altar of incense, which formed an essential constituent part of the tabernacle. Besides, there

is nowhere any mention in the O. T. (not Lev. xvi. 12 either) of a particular censer, which had been set apart for the service on the great day of atonement. About the existence of such a censer *at the time of the Mosaic tabernacle*, which the author after all has mainly before his mind, nothing is known with certainty. Only from the Mishna, tract. *Joma*, iv. 4,¹ do we learn something about it. Moreover, according to tract. *Joma*, v. 1, vii. 4, this censer was first fetched out of the storehouse, carried by the high priest into the Most Holy Place, and upon the completion of the service again carried forth therefrom; even as it would be *a priori* improbable in the highest degree that such instrument should be kept within the Holy of Holies. For, according to Lev. xvi. 12, 13, the high priest was first to enter with incense into the Most Holy Place, in order that through the cloud thereof the glory of God, enthroned above the cover of the ark of the covenant, might become invisible to him, to the end that he died not. And yet ἔχουσα compels us to think of an *abiding* place of the θυμιατήριον; to explain ἔχουσα of the mere *appertaining* of the θυμιατήριον to the Most Holy Place as an object of use for the latter, as is usually done by the one class of expositors (but also by some advocates of the opposite view, as Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Owen, Mynster, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Conybeare, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 490, *Obs.*; Maier, Moll, Hofmann, and Woerner, with an appeal to מִזְבֵּחַ אֶשֶׁר-לְדָבִיר, 1 Kings vi. 22), is—inasmuch as the author sharply separates from each other in his description the two main divisions of the O. T. sanctuary, as well as the objects peculiar to each of these divisions, by means of μετὰ δέ, ver. 3, and thus ἔχουσα, ver. 4, unmistakably corresponds to the ἐν ᾗ, ver. 2—altogether arbitrary. If, then, we understand θυμιατήριον of the altar of incense, as we are compelled to do, there arises the archaeological difficulty that this altar had its standing-place not in the Most Holy Place, as is here presupposed by the author, but, on the contrary, in the Holy Place (Ex. xxx. 1 ff.). This point of inconsistency with historic truth is to be admitted, and therefrom the conclusion to be drawn, that the author did not himself live in the vicinity

¹ Omnibus diebus reliquis sullitum facturus de altari accepit in turibulo argenteo . . . hoc vero die in aureo.

of the Jewish sanctuary, but had drawn his knowledge with regard to the same only from the Scriptures of the O. T., whence the possibility of an error is explicable. In favour of this possibility, Bleek rightly urges the following considerations: first, that Ex. xxvi. 35 there are mentioned as standing within the Holy Place only the table and the candlestick, but not the altar of incense also. Then, that where the standing place of this altar is actually spoken of, the form of expression chosen certainly, by reason of its indefiniteness, admitted of misconstruction. So Ex. xxx. 6: *καὶ θήσεις αὐτὸ ἀπέναντι τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦ ὄντος ἐπὶ τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῶν μαρτυρίων*; *ibid.* xl. 5: *καὶ θήσεις τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν εἰς τὸ θυμιᾶν ἐναντίον τῆς κιβωτοῦ*; ver. 26: *ἀπέναντι τοῦ καταπετάσματος*; Lev. iv. 7, xvi. 12, 18: *ἐναντίον* or *ἀπέναντι κυρίου*. Finally, that in the Mosaic law the altar of incense was brought into peculiar significance in connection with the solemnity of the atonement, since on this day it was sprinkled and cleansed by the high priest with the same blood which the high priest had carried into the Most Holy Place (Ex. xxx. 10; Lev. xvi. 18 f.). — *χρυσοῦν*] since the emphasis rests on it, is prefixed. The article, however, is wanting, because the sense is: *a golden altar, namely, the altar of incense*, in distinction from the *brazen altar* existing in the court, namely, the altar of burnt-offering. — *καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης*] *and the ark of the covenant*; comp. Ex. xxv. 10 ff., xxxvii. 1–9. — *περικεκαλυμμένην πάντοθεν χρυσῷ*] *overlaid on every side* (within and without; comp. Ex. xxv. 11) *with gold* (plating of fine gold). According to 1 Kings viii., the ark of the covenant was also brought into the temple of Solomon. On the destruction of this temple by the Chaldeans it was lost, and the second temple was without an ark. Comp. Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* v. 5. 5: *Ἐκειτο δὲ οὐδὲν ὅλως ἐν αὐτῷ, ἄβατον δὲ καὶ ἄχραντον καὶ ἀθέατον ἦν πᾶσιν, ἁγίου δὲ ἅγιον ἐκαλεῖτο. — ἐν ᾗ στάμνος χρυσῇ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα κ.τ.λ.*] *wherein was a golden pot with the manna, and Aaron's rod which had budded, and the tables of the covenant.* *ἐν ᾗ* does not refer back to *σκηνή*, ver. 3 (Ribera, Justinian, Pyle, Peirce, and others),—for to the *ἐν ᾗ*, ver. 4, the *ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς*, ver. 5, forms an opposition,—but it refers to *κιβωτός*. On the

pot of manna, comp. Ex. xvi. 32-34; on Aaron's rod, Num. xvii. 16-26 (1-11); on the tables of the covenant, Ex. xxv. 16; Deut. x. 1, 2. According to 1 Kings viii. 9, there was nothing more in the ark of the covenant, at the time of its removal into the temple, than the two tables of the law; and according to Ex. xvi. 33, Num. xvii. 25 (10), the two first-mentioned objects were not to have their place *within*, but *before* the ark of the covenant. The same opinion, however, which the author here expresses as to the place of the preservation of the pot of manna and Aaron's rod, is found likewise with later Rabbins, as with R. Levi Ben Gerson at 1 Kings viii. 9 and at Num. xvii. 10, and Abarbanel at 1 Kings viii. 9. See Wetstein on our passage.

Ver. 5. The author turns from the objects to be found *within* the ark of the covenant to that which is *above* the same. — *ὑπερίνω δὲ αὐτῆς] sc. τῆς κιβωτοῦ. — Χερουβίμ]* comp. Ex. xxv. 18 ff., xxxvii. 7 ff.; Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterb.* I. 2 Aufl. p. 262 ff.; Bähr, *Symbolik des Mos. Cultus*, Bd. I. p. 311 ff. There existed two of them, of fine gold, one at each end of the cover or lid of the ark of the covenant, upon which, with faces turned towards each other, they looked down, and which they covered with their outspread wings. In the midst of the cherubim was the glory of God enthroned (1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; 2 Kings xix. 15; Isa. xxxvii. 16), and from this place God would speak to Moses (Ex. xxv. 22; comp. Num. vii. 89). — *Χερουβίμ* is here treated as a *neuter*, as likewise generally with the LXX., with whom the *masculine* οἱ *Χερουβ.* occurs but rarely (e.g. Ex. xxv. 20, xxxvii. 7). The *neuter* is not, however, to be explained by the supposition that *πνεύματα* is to be supplied to it in thought (comp. Drusius on our passage), but from the fact that the cherubim were regarded as ζῶα. Comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* iii. 6. 5, where the Mosaic cherubim are described as ζῶα πετεινά, μορφήν δ' οὐδενὶ τῶν ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων ἑωραμένων παραπλήσια. Comp. also Ezek. x. 15: καὶ τὰ Χερουβίμ ἦσαν τοῦτο τὸ ζῶον, ὃ ἶδον κ.τ.λ. *Ibid.* ver. 20. — The cherubim are called *Χερουβίμ δόξης*. That may mean *cherubim of glory* or *brightness*, to whom glory or brightness is proper (so Camerarius, Estius, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus,

Stuart, Kuinoel, *al.*), or the *cherubim* which pertain to the divine glory, the *הַיְּהוָה בְּבוֹרָה*, *i.e.* who are the bearers of the divine glory (so the majority). Grammatically the former is easier (on account of the absence of the article before *δόξης*). But the latter is to be preferred as yielding a more appropriate thought, and the omission of the article is to be justified from the usage of the LXX. Ex. xl. 34; 1 Sam. iv. 22; Ezek. ix. 3, x. 18, *al.* — *κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλαστήριον*] *which overshadow the propitiatory* (or *mercy-seat*). *κατασκιάζειν* in the N. T. only here. Comp. *συσκιάζειν*, Ex. xxv. 20; *σκιάζειν*, Ex. xxxvii. 9; 1 Chron. xxviii. 18. A more choice verb than *περικαλύπτειν*, 1 Kings viii. 7. *τὸ ἱλαστήριον* (*תְּהִכָּה*), the cover of the ark of the covenant, which on the great day of atonement was sprinkled with the sacrificial blood for the expiation of the sins of the people. Comp. Lev. xvi. 14 f. — *περὶ ὧν*] goes back not merely to the cherubim (Ebrard, p. 294), but also to all the objects before enumerated. — *οὐκ ἔστιν*] *it concerns us not*, or: *is not the place*, or: *is impossible*. Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 20. Of the same meaning as the more definite *οὐκ ἔξεστιν*. With Kurtz to supply *τόπος* is inadmissible. — *κατὰ μέρος*] *in detail*. The author does not design to set forth the typical significance of every single object enumerated; the indication of the typical significance of the two main divisions of the Jewish sanctuary is that which he at present aims at, and to this task he now addresses himself in that which immediately follows, comp. ver. 8.

Vv. 6, 7. After the collective expression *τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν*, ver. 1, has been analyzed into its single constituent parts, vv. 2–5, and a recapitulatory reference has been made to the total result of this given analysis by means of *τούτων οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων*, — the opposition to *μέν*, ver. 1, being formally introduced by *δέ*, and then receiving its more precise material defining by means of the statement, ver. 8, which is attached in a grammatical respect as a subsidiary clause, — the discourse advances to the development of the further general idea, which is placed in the forefront, ver. 1, but has hitherto remained unnoticed, the twofold expression *δικαιώματα λατρείας*. — From the *present* *εἰσίσιν*, as from *προσφέρει*, ver. 7 (comp. also ver. 8 f.), it follows that

the Mosaic cultus was still continuing at the time when the author wrote. The participle *perfect*, *κατεσκευασμένων*, however, denotes that which is extending out of the past into the present, and is still enduring in the present (see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 254). The present hereby indicated can, of course, only be that in which the author himself is living and writing. The endeavour to explain it of a present into which the author only mentally places himself, is as little warranted grammatically as is the asserting, with Hofmann, that the present in which the discourse here moves is "not a past, nor actual, nor something still continuing, but that set forth in the word of God, where it is to be read how the sanctuary erected by Moses was constituted, and what priests and high priests do in the same;" or with Mangold (in Bleek's *Einleit. in das N. T.* p. 617), to find the Scripture picture of the tabernacle drawn in our passage as a "purely ideal magnitude, which by no means guarantees the actual continued existence of the temple worship." For, in order to render possible suppositions of this kind, the conjoining of the *presents* with a participle *aorist* would have been indispensably necessary. From the form of discourse chosen: *τούτων οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων* ("in that these objects have been in such wise regulated"), in union with the present tenses *εἰσίσιν* and *προσφέρει*, it therefore follows of necessity that the author, although here entering only upon the presentation of the typical significance of the two main divisions of the Mosaic sanctuary, nevertheless thinks of these two main divisions, together with all that appertains to them,—which he has just now enumerated,—as still preserved in being, thus also as still present in the Jewish temple of his day; by which supposition, it is true, he becomes involved in contradiction with the historic reality, inasmuch as alike the ark of the covenant as the vessel of manna and Aaron's rod were wanting in the second temple. *Vid. supra ad ver. 4.* With very little reflection does Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 491, *Obs.*) object to this conclusion, that "with just the same right one might infer from the present in xiii. 11 that the author supposed the Israelites of his time to be still dwelling in a camp." The passage xiii. 11 has nothing whatever in common with

ours, since it is here a question of the combination of a participle *perfect* with verbs in the present. That, too, which Delitzsch sets against it, that the *τούτων οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων*, pointing back to *κατεσκευάσθη*, ver. 2, certainly shows that the author has the Mosaic period before his mind, utterly collapses, inasmuch as the participle *perfect*, and not the participle *aorist*, has been employed. Phrases, however, like those met with in Delitzsch: that the author was writing for just such readers as would not have given him credit for an ignorance like this, are peremptory decisions, for which the result is already fixed before the investigation, and consequently intimidations of the grammatical conscience. — *ἡ πρώτη σκηνή*] as ver. 2, *the fore-tent* or *Holy Place*. — *διὰ παντός*] *continually*, *i.e.* day by day. Opposite *ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ*, ver. 7. — *οἱ ἱερεῖς*] opposite *μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς*, ver. 7. — *τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες*] *performing the religious actions*. Daily, morning and evening, an offering of incense was presented, and daily were the lamps of the sacred candlestick placed in readiness and kindled. Comp. Ex. xxx. 7 ff.

Ver. 7. *Ἡ δευτέρα*] *sc.* *σκηνή*, the Most Holy Place. — *ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ*] *once in the year*, *i.e.* only on a single day of the year, namely, on the tenth of the seventh month (Tisri), on the great solemnity of atonement. The supposition that the high priest on this day more than once entered the Most Holy Place is not excluded by the expression, and the disputed question as to how many times this took place has no bearing on our passage. That the high priest was obliged to enter the Most Holy Place at least twice on this day, follows from Lev. xvi. 12–16. That he entered into it as many as four times is the teaching of the Talmud (tract. *Joma*, v. 1, vii. 4) and Rabbins. — *μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς*] *sc.* *εἴσεισι*. — *προσφέρει*] is not to be explained, as by Calov and others, of the sacrifices *outside* of the Most Holy Place. For in this case we should have to expect the aorist. It is employed of the blood of the victim before slain, which blood the high priest carries into the Most Holy Place, and here in the Most Holy Place presents to God (the Socinians, Grotius, Bleek). — *ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων*] *for himself and the transgressions of the people*. To make *ἑαυτοῦ* likewise depend upon *ἀγνοημάτων*

(for his own sins and those of the people: Vulgate, Luther (?), Calvin, Piscator, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Storr, Stuart, Paulus, and others), is, although the thought is not thereby altered (comp. vii. 27), grammatically false; because in that case the article τῶν could not have been wanting before ἐαυτοῦ. — ἀγνοημάτων] see at v. 2, p. 198.

Ver. 8. Now follows (apparently as a *subordinate thought*) the main consideration, with a view to which the author has been led more fully to describe the ἅγιον κοσμικόν and the δικαιώματα λατρείας of ver. 1. — τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου] *the Holy Ghost indicating this very thing* (following). — τοῦτο] has the emphasis, and acquires its development of contents by means of μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι . . . στάσιν. — τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου] The arrangement of the sanctuary and priesthood prescribed by God to Moses is thought of by our author as carried into effect by Moses under the assistance and guidance of the Holy Ghost; the idea expressed in that arrangement might therefore very easily be represented as an indication designed by the Holy Ghost. — μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν, ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν] *that the way of the sanctuary is not yet manifested, so long as the fore-tabernacle still exists.* — τῶν ἁγίων] is erroneously apprehended by the Peshito and Schulz (comp. also Zeger) as *masculine*. It is *neuter*. Does not, however, as ver. 2, denote the *Holy Place*, but, as vv. 12, 24, 25, x. 19, xiii. 11 (comp. also τὸ ἅγιον, Lev. xvi. 16, 17, 20, *al.*), the *Most Holy Place*, and that not the *earthly* one (Kurtz),—for that would be a trifling statement; whereas surely τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου prepares the way for a deeper truth, *vid. infra*,—but the *heavenly reality*, the throne of the Godhead. — ἡ τῶν ἁγίων ὁδός signifies *the way to the Most Holy Place*. Comp. Matt. x. 5: εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν; Jer. ii. 18: τῇ ὁδῷ Αἰγύπτου, *al.*; Kühner, II. p. 176, Obs. 4; Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 176. — ἔχειν στάσιν further means: to have existence, to exist. We have not, however, with Böhme, to import into it a secondary reference to *firmness* or *legal validity*, and ἡ πρώτη σκηνή is not the one first in point of time, *i.e.* the earthly, Jewish sanctuary in opposition to the heavenly (Hunnius, Seb. Schmidt, Carpov, Semler, Baumgarten, Bloomfield, *al.*), still less the

tabernacle in opposition to the later temple (Peirce, Sykes), but the fore-tabernacle or Holy Place, in opposition to the interior tabernacle or Most Holy Place. The thought is: by the ordering that the Most Holy Place, the presence-chamber and place of manifestation of God, might not be entered, save on one single day of the year, and by the high priest alone, while the daily Levitical service of the priests is accomplished in the Holy Place, and thus approach to the former debarred and shut off by the latter, the Holy Ghost proclaims that so long as the Levitical priesthood, and consequently the Mosaic law in general, continues, the immediate access to God is not yet permitted; that thus, in order to the bringing about and rendering possible of a full and direct communion with God, the Old Testament covenant-religion must first fall, and the more perfect one brought in by Christ (ver. 11) must take its place. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 51, as also Josephus, *Antiq.* iii. 3. 7: τὴν δὲ τρίτην μοῖραν [τῆς σκηνῆς] μόνῳ περιέγραψε τῷ θεῷ διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεπίβατον εἶναι ἀνθρώποις.

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

Ver. 9. [ἤτις] is not synonymous with ἦ. It is employed argumentatively, in that it presents the following declaration as a fact, the truth of which is manifest. — We have not, however, to take ἤτις with παραβολή as a designation of the subject (Calvin, *al.*: which emblem was only for the present time; Storr, *al.*: which emblem was to continue only to the present; Zeger, Semler, de Wette, *al.*: which emblem has reference to the present time). For the verb to be supplemented would not be the mere copula; it would have a peculiar signification, and thus could not be omitted. ἤτις

alone is consequently the subject, and *παραβολή* the predicate. Yet *ἥτις* is not to be referred back to *στάσιν* (Chr. Fr. Schmid), for the expression *στάσιν* does not occupy a sufficiently independent position in the preceding context to justify this; still less—what is thought possible by Cramer—to *τὴν τῶν ἀγίων ὁδόν*, by which the idea would be rendered unmeaning. Nor have we to assume an attraction to *παραβολή*, in such wise that *ἥτις* should stand in the sense of *ὅτι* (so Bengel, who makes it point back to vv. 6–8; Maier, who makes it refer to vv. 7, 8; Michaelis, who makes it refer to *μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι κ.τ.λ.*, and others), or, what amounts to the same thing, to supplement to the phrase *ἥτις παραβολή*, comprehended together as a subject, *παραβολή ἐστίν* as a predicate: which emblem (described vv. 6–8) is an emblem for the present time (so Nickel in *Reuter's Repertor.* 1858, März, p. 188 f.). For, in the course of vv. 9, 10, respect is had just to the closing words *alone* of ver. 8: *ἐτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν*. The exclusively right construction, therefore, is the referring back of *ἥτις* to *τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς*, ver. 8. — *παραβολή εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα*] *sc. ἐστίν*. *παραβολή* in the Gospels very frequently a fictitious historic likeness. Here a likeness by means of a fact, an emblem. Not incorrectly, therefore, is it explained, on the part of Chrysostom, Occumenius, and Theophylact, by *τύπος*. — *εἰς*] *in reference to*, as regards. Instead of *εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα*, consequently, the mere *τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦ ἐνεστηκότος* might have been written. — *ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς*] *the present time*. The opposite thereto is formed by the *καιρὸς διορθώσεως*, ver. 10, by which the reader is referred to the *Christian* epoch of time, the *αἰὼν μέλλων* (vi. 5; comp. also ii. 5). *ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς* is therefore synonymous with the *αἰὼν οὗτος* elsewhere, and indicates the pre-Christian period of time still extending onward into the present.¹ The term *καιρός*, however, is chosen, instead of the more general *χρόνος* or *αἰὼν*, because

¹ Quite mistaken (as is already apparent even from the opposition to *καιρὸς διορθώσεως*, ver. 10) is the opinion of Delitzsch, with whom Alford concurs, that *ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς* denotes the present begun with the *καινὴ διαθήκη*, the present of the New Testament time, in which the parable has attained its close. See, on the contrary, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 494, *Obs.*, and specially Reiche, *Commentar. Crit.* p. 74 sq. — That, for the rest, by *ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς*

it is the thought of the author that this period of time has already reached its turning-point, at which it is to take its departure. — καθ' ἣν] *conformably to which, or in accordance with which*, applies not to παραβολή (Oecumenius, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Nickel, *i.e.*, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 495, *Obs.*; Alford, Woerner, *al.*), but to τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς, as the last preceding main notion; stands thus parallel to ἥτις. — μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα] is to be taken in close connection with δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται (against Böhme, who unwarrantably presses the force of the plural δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι). — κατὰ συνείδησιν] *as regards the consciousness, or as to the conscience* (Theophylact: κατὰ τὸν ἑσω ἄνθρωπον), *i.e.* so that the reality of being led to perfection is inwardly experienced, and the conscience in connection therewith feels itself satisfied. — τὸν λατρεύοντα] *him rendering the service* (x. 2). Not specially the priest is meant (Estius, Gerhard; comp. also Drusius), but in general, the man doing homage to God by the offering of sacrifice, whether it be a priest who offers for himself, or another who presents this offering through the medium of the priest. [Matt. iv. 10; cf. ὁ προσερχόμενος, Heb. x. 1.]

Ver. 10. Μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμ. καὶ πόμ. καὶ διαφ. βαπτισμοῖς ἐκαιώματα σαρκὸς κ.τ.λ.] *which, together with meats and drinks and divers washings, are only fleshly ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation.* Apposition to δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι, μὴ δυνάμεναι κ.τ.λ., ver. 9. — μόνον] belongs to ἐκαιώματα σαρκὸς, but is placed in advance of this on account of the addition ἐπὶ βρώμασιν κ.τ.λ.; and ἐπὶ expresses the accession to something already present (Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 367b), or the existence externally side by side. Comp. *c.g.* Hom. *Od.* vii. 120: ὄγχνη ἐπ' ὄγχνη γηράσκει, μῆλον δ' ἐπὶ μῆλῳ; Thucyd. ii. 101: ὑποσχόμενος ἀδελφὴν ἑαυτοῦ δώσειν καὶ χρήματα ἐπ' αὐτῇ. — Otherwise is it explained by others, in that they take μόνον ἐπὶ in close combination, give to ἐπὶ

only that present in which the author lived and wrote can be meant, needs not another word of explanation. When Kurtz and Hofmann deny this,—and the former will understand only an “imagined present,” into which the author “only transposed himself;” the latter, “that present in which the Holy Ghost prophesied by means of that which was written in the law,”—this is done only in the interest of their wrong interpretations of ver. 6.

the signification "in reference to," and place both words still in relation to ver. 9. They then regard *μόνον ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ.* either as nearer definition to *προσφέρονται* (so, substantially, Vatablus, Schlichting, and others), or as opposition to *κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι* (so Schulz, Ebrard, *al.*). But against the first supposition the *material* ground is decisive, that the presentation of sacrifices in reality had reference by no means exclusively to the expiation of offences against the ordinances regulative of food and lustrations; against the second, the *linguistic* ground that *ἀλλ' ἐπὶ βρώμασιν μόνον κ.τ.λ.* must have been written instead of *μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασιν κ.τ.λ.* Yet others take *μόνον ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ.* in close conjunction with *τὸν λατρεύοντα*, ver. 9. So perhaps already the Vulgate (*perfectum facere servientem solummodo in cibis*), then Luther ("him that does religious service only in meats and drink," etc.), Estius, Corn. a Lapide, Olearius, Semler, Ernesti, Ewald, Hofmann, and others. But the additional words would too greatly drag, the thought resulting would be incommensurable with *κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι*, and the formula *λατρεύειν ἐπὶ τινι* in the sense indicated without example. — The *βρώματα καὶ πόματα* are interpreted by Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Heinrichs, Maier, and others of the *sacrificial meals*; by Bleek and de Wette, of the partaking of the *paschal supper* in particular. But the mention of these practices would be, here at any rate, something too special, and the words xiii. 9 can furnish no standard for the interpretation of our passage. More correctly, therefore, is it thought in general of the meats and drinks permitted, as of those forbidden, in the Mosaic law. Comp. Col. ii. 16; Rom. xiv. 17. With regard to drinks, there are in the Mosaic law prohibitions only for special cases; comp. Num. vi. 3; Lev. x. 9, xi. 34. Comp. however, also Matt. xxiii. 24; Rom. xiv. 21. — *καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς*] Comp. Ex. xxix. 4; Lev. xi. 25, 28, 32, 40, xiv. 6–9, xv. 5 ff., xvi. 4, 24 ff.; Num. viii. 7, xix. 17 ff., *al.* — *δικαιώματα σαρκός*] *ordinances of the flesh, i.e.* ordinances that relate to the flesh, and thus bear the impress of the earthly and transitory. — *μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα*] *imposed (only) until the time of reformation.* The *καιρὸς διορθώσεως* is the *epoch* of the promised New and more

excellent Covenant (viii. 8 ff.), which has begun with the appearing of Christ. — διόρθωσις] only here in the N. T. — ἐπικείμενα] Oecumenius: βάρος γὰρ ἦν μόνον τὰ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, καθὼς φασιν οἱ ἀπόστολοι. Comp. Acts xv. 10, 28.

Vv. 11, 12. Antithesis to vv. 9, 10. *What the religion of the Mosaic covenant was unable to effect, that has been accomplished by Christ.* — παραγενόμενος ἄρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν] having appeared as High Priest of the good things to come. The verb in the same sense as Matt. iii. 1, 1 Macc. iv. 46; synonymous with ἀνίστασθαι, Heb. vii. 11, 15. Strangely misapprehending the meaning, Elbrard: παραγενόμενος is to be looked upon as an "adjectival attribute" to ἄρχιερεὺς, and the thought is, "as a present High Priest,"—an acceptance which is incompatible with the participle of the *corist*. — High Priest of the good things to come (comp. x. 1) is Christ called, inasmuch as these good things are the consequence and result of His high-priestly activity. They are the blessings of everlasting salvation, which the author, ver. 12, sums up in the expression αἰωνία λύτρωσις; and they are called *future*, inasmuch as they are proper to the αἰὼν μέλλον (vi. 5), or the οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα (ii. 5), and the full enjoyment of them will first come in at the consummation of the kingdom of God, to be looked for with the return of Christ. — διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς κ.τ.λ.] through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, which is not made with hands—that is to say, not of this world. The words belong to εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἅγια, ver. 12, and διὰ is used in the *local* sense: "through" (not instrumentally, as the διὰ, ver. 12). To join the words to that which precedes, and find in them an indication of that *by means of which* Christ became ἄρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν (Primasius, Luther, Dorscheus, Schulz, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, pp. 409, 412 f., 2 Aufl.,—which latter will accordingly also take the διὰ, ver. 12, in both cases along with ἄρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν; otherwise, however, in the *Comm.* p. 337,—Moll, and others), is erroneous, because by virtue of οὐδέ, ver. 12, the existence of an already preceding link in the nearer definition of εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἅγια is presupposed. — But to interpret the σκηνή through which Christ has entered into the Most Holy Place as *the body* of

Christ, or *His human nature* (so, on account of x. 20, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Clarius, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Piscator, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Hammond, Owen, Bengel, Peirce, Sykes, Ernesti, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Friederich, *Symbolik des Mos. Stiftshütte*, Leipz. 1841, p. 296 ff., and others; also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 415, 2 Aufl., who, however, will have us think of the *glorified* human nature of Christ), or as the *holy life* of Christ (Ebrard), or as the (militant) *church upon earth* (Cajetan, Corn. a Lapide, Calov, Wittich, Braun, Wolf, Rambach, Michaelis, *ad Peirc.*, Cramer, Baumgarten), or, finally, as *the world* in general (Justinian, Carpzov), is inconsistent with the point of comparison suggested by the comparatives *μείζονος* and *τελειότερας* in accordance with the foregoing disquisition, in general is opposed to the connection with vv. 1–10, and has against it the antithesis in which τὰ ἅγια, ver. 12, stands to σκηνή, ver. 11, as also the addition οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως. The lower spaces of the heavens are intended—corresponding to the πρώτη σκηνή of the earthly sanctuary (vv. 2, 6, 8)—as the preliminary stage of the heavenly Holy of Holies. Comp. iv. 14: διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς. — *μείζονος καὶ τελειότερας*] *sc.* than the Mosaic σκηνή. — οὐ χειροποιήτου] Comp. viii. 2: ἦν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, Acts vii. 48, xvii. 24; Mark xiv. 58; 2 Cor. v. 1. — οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως] *not belonging to the earthly created world (the earth) lying before one's eyes (ταύτης).* Wrongly Erasmus, Luther, Clarius, Vatablus, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Wolf, Bengel, Kuinoel, Friederich, *l.c.* p. 296, and others: *not of this kind of building, sc. the same as the earthly sanctuary; or: as earthly things in general.*

Ver. 12. Οὐδέ] *nor.* Οὐδέ is written by the author, misled by the foregoing notes of negation: οὐ χειροποιήτου and οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, whereas, properly, καὶ οὐ ought to have been written, since that which is introduced by οὐδέ is parallel, not to the negative expressions further characterizing the σκηνή, but to the preceding διά.— δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων] *by (by means of) blood of goats and calves*, by which the entrance of the earthly high priests into the Most Holy Place was made possible on the great day of atonement. Comp. Lev. xvi. 14, 15. — διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος] the Levi-

tical high priest entered the Most Holy Place not merely by means of the blood of animals, he entered at the same time *with* this blood (ver. 7). The author, however, has respect, with reference to the Levitical high priest also, only to the former notion, since only this, and not at the same time the latter, was suitable for application to Christ (Schlichting). If he had desired that the notion of the *μετά* should also be supplied in thought in our passage (Kurtz), he would have known how to express likewise this "somewhat gross material conception" (Bleek II.). — *ἐφάπαξ*] *once for all*. Corresponds to the following *αἰωνίαν*. — *εἰς τὰ ἅγια*] *into the inner sanctuary of heaven*. — *αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος*] *having obtained (by His sacrificial death) eternal redemption*. Incorrectly do Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, and Moll take *εὐράμενος* as something coinciding in point of time with *εἰσῆλθεν*. If it had been so intended, the participle present would have been placed instead of *εὐράμενος*. — *εὐρίσκεσθαι* signifies: *to find* (for oneself), *obtain*. The *λύτρωσις* became Christ's peculiar possession, thus—since He Himself, as the Sinless One, needed it not—to make it over to those who believe in Him. — This *λύτρωσις* is the ransoming, *i.e.* redemption from the guilt and punishment of sin, and it is called *αἰωνία*, *eternal*, or of indefeasible validity, in opposition to the sacrifices of the O. T. priests, which had to be renewed every year, since they were designed each for the [typical] expiation of the sins of a single year. — The feminine formation *αἰωνία* in the N. T. only here and 2 Thess. ii. 16.

Vv. 13, 14. Justification of *αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος*, ver. 12, by an argument *a minore ad majus*. With the *quantitative* augmentation, however, expressed by *εἰ . . . πόσῳ μᾶλλον*, there is at the same time blended a *qualitative* augmentation by means of *πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα* and *τὴν συνειδήσιν ἡμ. κ.τ.λ.*, in such wise that the two following thoughts are enfolded the one in the other:—(1) If even the blood of animals works cleansing . . . how much more the blood of Christ? (2) If that effects the purity of the flesh, this effects purity of conscience. — *καὶ σπόδος δαμάλεως*] *and ashes of an heifer*. According to Num. xix., those who by contact with a dead body had become defiled, must be

sprinkled with a mixture of water and the ashes of a spotless red heifer wholly consumed by fire, of which the ashes were preserved in a clean place without the camp (with the so-called מִי־הַזֶּהָרָה, Num. xix. 9, 13, 20, 21; LXX.: ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ), in order to become clean again. — ῥαντίζουσα τοὺς κεκοινωμένους] *sprinkling those who have been defiled*. Free mode of expression for: with which (ashes) those who have been defiled are sprinkled. — τοὺς κεκοινωμένους] belongs, since ῥαντίζουσα most requires an express addition of the object, to this verb (Erasmus, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, Woerner, *al.*), not to ἀγιάζει (Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, Bengel, Schulz, *al.*), which latter stands absolutely: *works sanctification*. — πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα] to the (producing of the) purity of the flesh. πρὸς, as v. 14. Indication of the result.

Ver. 14.¹ Incomparably more efficacious must the sacrifice of Christ be. For—(1) *Christ offered Himself*, i.e. He gave up His own body to the death of a sacrifice, while the Levitical high priest derives his material of sacrifice from a domain foreign to himself personally; then: He offered Himself from a free resolve of will, while the Levitical high priest is placed under the necessity of sacrificing, by the command of an external ordinance, and the sacrificial victim whose blood he offers is an irrational animal, which consequently knows nothing of the end to which it is applied. The Levitical act of sacrifice is then an external one wrought in accordance with ordinance, a sensuous one; Christ's act of sacrifice, on the other hand, one arising out of the disposition of the heart, thus a moral one. From this it is already evident how it could be said (2) that Christ offered Himself διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου. The ethical belongs to the province of the spirit. Christ accordingly offered Himself by virtue of spirit, because His act of sacrifice was, in relation to God, an act of the highest spiritual obedience (Phil. ii. 8), in relation to the human brethren an act of the highest spiritual love (2 Cor. v. 14, 15). Διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου, however, by virtue of *eternal* spirit did Christ offer Himself, inasmuch as the notion

¹ A. L. van der Boon Mesch, *Specimen Hermeneuticum in locum ad Hebr. ix. 14*, Lugd. Bat. 1819, 8vo.

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

¹ "L'auteur a voulu dire ici, par une tournure nouvelle, justement ce qu'il a déjà dit deux fois en d'autres termes (vii. 16, 25). La nature de Christ lui assure une vie éternelle, non sujette à la mort et par cela même seule capable de nous assurer un bienfait durable et éternel aussi."

making the *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον*, as regards the thing intended, equivalent to the *δύναμις ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου*, vii. 16, whereby the essentially *ethical* import of the expression in our passage is lost sight of; entirely false and arbitrary, however, is the interpretation of Döderlein, Storr, and Stuart, who refer *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον* to Christ's *state of glorification* after His exaltation; of Nösselt (*Opusc. ad interpret. sacr. scripturr.* fascic. I. ed. 2, p. 334),—as also van der Boon Mesch, *l.c.* p. 100,—who espouse the opinion: “*πνεῦμα* esse victimam, quam Christus se immolando Deo obtulit, eamque *αἰώνίαν* dici propterea, quod istius victimae vis ad homines salvandos perpetua atque perennis futura sit;” of Michaelis, *ad Peire.*, who finds the sense, that Christ presented Himself not according to the *letter* of the Mosaic law, but yet certainly according to its *spirit*; and of Planck (*Commentatt. a Rosenm. etc., cdl.* I. 1, p. 189), who even maintains that the spirit of prophecy in the prophets of the Old Covenant is thought of. Strangely also Occumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, and others (comp. already Chrysostom): *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου* stands in opposition to the *fire*, by which the Levitical sacrifices were offered to God. Similarly Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 420, 2 Aufl.), who is followed by Delitzsch and Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 527, *Obs.*): “the spirit by which Christ offered Himself is called an *eternal* spirit, in opposition to the fleeting spirit of the animals which the O. T. high priest presented.” Of a “spirit” of the animals the author (cf. iv. 12) can hardly have thought, inasmuch as, though in the O. T. a *πνεῦμα* is often ascribed to animals, this is understood only in the lower sense of the *ψυχή*. Needlessly, in the last place, does Reiske conjecture *ἀγνεύματος* instead of *πνεύματος*. — *διὰ* denotes not the mere *impulse* or *impelling motive* (Vatablus, Ribera, Estius, *al.*), nor yet the *condition* or *sphere* (Stengel, Tholuck, *al.*), but the higher *power*, by virtue of which the offering was accomplished and made effective. — *ἐαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν*] is understood by Bleek, with whom Kurtz concurs, after the precedent of Faustus Socinus, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, and others, in the sense that *Christ offered to God, in the heavenly Holy of Holies, His blood which was shed upon earth*; which, however, is violent on account of *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου*, since these

words appertain to the whole relative clause, and are not to be referred, with Bleek, as a nearer definition merely to ἄμωμον. The undergoing upon earth of the death of the cross is that which is meant. — ἄμωμον] *as a spotless sacrifice*, yielding full satisfaction to God. The Levitical victim must be ἄμωμος (אַמֶּתָּה), physically free from blemish. Here ἄμωμος is used of the higher, ethical spotlessness, and has reference to the sinlessness of character manifested by Christ during His earthly life. Erroneously Bleek: the expression has respect to “the condition of Christ after death and the resurrection, in which, raised above even the infirmities to which as very man He was subject upon earth, He could in particular no more fall a victim to death.” — τῷ θεῷ is to be taken along with the whole relative clause, not merely with ἄμωμον. — ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων] *forth from dead (legal) works*, so that we free ourselves from them as from something that is unfruitful and useless, rise above them. The notion of the νεκρὰ ἔργα here the same as at vi. 1.

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

Ver. 15. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν] *and just for this cause is He the Mediator of a New Covenant.* By means of καί, ver. 15 attaches itself closely to the preceding context, and διὰ τοῦτο points back to the main thought contained in vv. 9–14; just for this reason, that the sacrifice of Christ accomplishes that which the Levitical sacrifices are unable to accomplish; namely, that, presented by virtue of eternal spirit, brings in an eternal redemption, these, on the other hand, as ordinances of the flesh, are able to effect only purity of the flesh. Not specially to τὸ αἷμα,

ver. 14 (Sykes, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Maier), does *διὰ τοῦτο* glance back. For in this case *δι' αὐτό*, or rather *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος*, would more naturally have been written. Nor is *διὰ τοῦτο* to be taken together with *ὅπως*, as a mere preparation thereto (so Schlichting, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, Stengel, Ebrard, and many). For thereby ver. 15 would be torn from its connection with that which precedes.—Upon *καινῆς* there does not rest an emphasis, as is supposed by Bleek and Delitzsch. For otherwise the adjectives must have been prefixed to the substantive. On the contrary, what is to be specially emphasized is *διαθήκης*. For just the inner nexus of the N. T. *διαθήκη*, with the redemptive death of Christ as its mediating cause, is to be brought out; whereas the adjective *καινῆς* could be presupposed as familiar from the disquisition viii. 8 ff., in that there the perfect covenant promised by God was sufficiently characterized as a *new* one.—*ὅπως*] *in order that*. False the interpretation of Heinrichs: “unde sequitur.” The final clause *ὅπως κ.τ.λ.* is not designed to develop more nearly the *διὰ τοῦτο*; it depends upon *διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν*, and indicates the *goal* to which, in accordance with the decree of God, the *διαθήκη καινή* should lead, and at the same time the way and means by which the attainment of this goal should be accomplished.—*θανάτου γενομένου*] *a death having ensued*. The death of Christ is that which is meant. The author, however, expresses himself *generically*, because he has already in mind that which is to be observed, vv. 16, 17.—*Εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων*] *for redemption from the transgressions (or sins) committed under the first covenant (or at the time of the first covenant)*. Note of design to *θανάτου γενομένου*, not to *λάβωσιν*.—*τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν*] *the promise*, i.e. the promised blessing itself. With *τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν* we have to combine *τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας*, as a declaration wherein the promised blessing consists (genitive of *apposition*). By the separation of the two closely connected words, *τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν* is brought out more emphatically, and the discourse gains in point of rhythm. Less suitably, although free from objection on linguistic grounds, did the Peshito, Faber Stapulensis, Braun, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Stein,

Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 594), Moll, Ewald, and others take τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας with οἱ κεκλημένοι: those who are called to the eternal inheritance. — οἱ κεκλημένοι] Comp. κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, iii. 1. The expression is here used absolutely, and is not to be referred exclusively to the Christians. For, according to ver. 26 and xi. 39, 40, the power of the redemptive death of Christ extends retroactively likewise to the generations of the past. And just for this reason the participle *perfect* is written, and not the participle *aorist*. For not to the *historic act* of the temporal vocation, but to the *being called*, as a fact in the decree of God already completed and extending into the present, is attention to be drawn.

Vv. 16, 17. Demonstration of the necessity of the θάνατον γενέσθαι by means of a truth of universal application. That Christ might be able to become the Mediator of a new διαθήκη, His death was required. For, to the validity of a διαθήκη, it is essential that the death of the διαθέμενος be first proved. Since immediately before (ver. 15) and immediately after (ver. 18 ff.) διαθήκη was employed in the sense of "covenant," elsewhere usual in our epistle, we might naturally, on account of the conjunction of vv. 16, 17, by means of γάρ, with ver. 15, and on account of ὅθεν, by which again ver. 18 is joined to vv. 15, 16, expect this signification of the word to be found also in vv. 16, 17. This has accordingly been insisted upon, here too, by Codureus (*Critt. sacr.* t. VII. P. ii. p. 1067 sqq.), Seb. Schmidt, Peirce, Whitby [in com.], Macknight, Michaelis, Sykes, Cramer, Paulus, and others, lastly also by Ebrard. But it is altogether inadmissible. For if we take διαθήκη as covenant, ὁ διαθέμενος could only designate him who makes or institutes the covenant; to take ὁ διαθέμενος as the mediator of the covenant, as is generally done in connection with that view, and to understand this again of the sacrificial victims, by the offering of which the covenant was sealed, is pure caprice. The thought, however, that for the validity of a covenant-act the death of the author of the covenant must first ensue, would be a perfectly irrational one. Irrational the more, inasmuch as, vv. 16, 17, only an entirely general

truth is contained, passing for a norm in ordinary life. Ebrard finds expressed the thought: "Where a sinful man wishes to enter into a covenant with the holy God, the man must first die, must first atone for his guilt by death (or he must present a substitutionary ἱθύς)." But all these definings have been arbitrarily imported. For vv. 16, 17 nothing is said either about a "sinful man," or about a volition on his part, or about the "holy God," or about an "atoning for guilt," or about a "substitutionary ἱθύς." From what has been said, it follows that διαθήκη, vv. 16, 17, can be taken only in the sense, likewise very frequently occurring with the Greek authors, of "testament" or "disposition by will." It is true there arises therefrom a logical inaccuracy,¹ owing to the fact that διαθήκη is used in these two verses in another sense than before, and the formal demonstrative force of that which is advanced by the author—although the underlying thoughts are in themselves perfectly just—is thereby sacrificed. It is, however, to be observed that while for us, since we are obliged to employ a twofold expression for the reproducing of the diversity of sense, the transition from the one notion to the other appears abruptly made, this transition for the author, on the other hand, might be an imperceptible one, inasmuch as in the Greek one and the same word included within itself both significations. Thus, accordingly, it has happened that the ancient Greek interpreters explain διαθήκη, vv. 16, 17, expressly in the sense of a testament or will, then at once pass over to the declaration contained in ver. 18,

¹ For the author does not reason, as de Wette supposes, from the mere "analogy of a will or testament."—The course, moreover, pursued by Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 426 ff.), in order to manifest the non-existence of a logical inaccuracy, in that, namely, in the whole section, ver. 15 ff., he will have διαθήκη signify neither "covenant" nor "testament," but throughout the whole only "disposal" (Verfügung), is, as also Delitzsch and Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 598, *Obs.*) acknowledge, an utter breakdown. See likewise the observations of Nickel in *Reuter's Reporter*. 1858, März, p. 194 f.—Nor will it do, with Kurtz, to set aside the logical inaccuracy, at which he takes so great offence that he thinks himself obliged to designate such inaccuracy, in case it were present, an "inexcusable confusion" (!), in taking not only at vv. 16, 17, but also in like manner at vv. 15, 18, the διαθήκη in the special sense of "establishing as heir." For the connection with that which precedes (comp. vii. 22, viii. 6 ff., ix. 1, 4) leads at vv. 15, 18 exclusively to the idea of a covenant.

without so much as noticing the logical inaccuracy which presents itself. The sense consequently is: *where a testament or deed of bequest exists, there it is necessary, in order to give it validity* (comp. *ἰσχύει*, ver. 17), *that the death of the testator first be proved*. The New Covenant, therefore, which Christ has established between God and man by His sacrificial death, the author here represents—in accordance with the figure of the *κληρονομία*, ver. 15—as a testamentary disposition on the part of Christ, which, however, as such could only acquire validity, and put the heirs in possession of the blessings bequeathed to them, by means of the death of Christ. — *θάνατον*] emphatically preposed, while *τοῦ διαθεμένου*, upon which no emphasis falls, comes in at the end of the clause. — *φέρεσθαι*] *be declared or proved*. Wrongly Grotius: the verb to be regarded as equivalent to *expectari* ("est enim expectatio onus quoddam"); Wittich: it denotes the being *endured* on the part of the relatives; Carpzov, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Schulz, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Stengel, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 428), and others, that it denotes nothing more than *ensue* or *γίνεσθαι*, ver. 15.

Ver. 17. Confirmatory elucidation of ver. 16. The words of the verse are connected together as parts of a single statement. We have no right to break up the same, in such wise that *διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία* is made a parenthesis, and *ἐπεὶ κ.τ.λ.* joined to ver. 16 (Hofmann). — *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς*] *in the case of dead persons, i.e. only upon condition that the author of the διαθήκη is dead, or has died*. — *βεβαία*] *firm or inviolable* (comp. ii. 2), inasmuch, namely, as, after the death of the testator has supervened, the abrogation or alteration of the testament on his part is no longer possible. — *μήποτε*] *never*. The making of *μήποτε* equivalent to *μήπω* or *nondum* (Vulgate, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Luther, Schlichting, Böhme) is linguistically inadmissible. Occumenius, Theophylact, Lud. de Dieu, Heinsius, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Lachmann, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 429), Delitzsch, and Ewald regard the word as an *interrogative particle*, which does not alter the sense, and might appear the preferable course, since, on the supposition of an assertory statement, the objective *οὐποτε* might have

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

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

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

Vv. 19, 20. Historic proof for the assertion, ver. 18, with a free reference to Ex. xxiv. 3–8. — *κατὰ τὸν νόμον*] is taken by Schlichting, Calov, Jac. Cappellus, Seb. Schmidt, Bengel, Storr, Böhme, Bleek, Bisping, *al.*, along with *πάσης ἐντολῆς*: "every precept according to the law, *i.e.* as it was contained in the law." So already the Vulgate: *lecto enim omni mandato legis*. But against this construction the absence of the connecting article and the strangeness of the preposition *κατά*. Rightly, therefore, have Occumenius, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Vatablus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Wittich, Braun, Schulz, Kuinoel, Klee, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Hofmann, and others referred *κατὰ τὸν νόμον* to *λαληθείσης*. Only we must not explain, as is ordinarily done, "in accordance with the commandment received of God," but the sense is: after, in accordance with the law received of God, every precept had been proclaimed by Moses to the whole people. The standard for the proclamation of the *ἐντολαί* was the *νόμος*, since it contained these *ἐντολαί*. — *παντὶ τῷ λαῷ*] Ex. xxiv. 3 stands only *διηγήσατο τῷ λαῷ*. But *παντί* resulted from the *ἀπεκρίθη δὲ πᾶς ὁ λαός* there

immediately following. — καὶ τῶν τράγων] *and of the goats*. Of goats slain in sacrifice the underlying narrative of Exodus says nothing. Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Bengel, Böhme, and others therefore suppose that the author had in view the burnt-offerings mentioned before the thank-offerings of oxen, Ex. xxiv. 5; inasmuch as, according to Lev. i. 10 ff., iv. 23 ff., ix. 2, 3, Num. vi. 10, 11, vii. 27, rams and he-goats, as well as other smaller animals, might be selected for burnt-offerings. Nevertheless, it is also possible that, as conjectured by Bleek, de Wette, and Bisping, there was present to the mind of the author that sacrifice of bullocks and goats already referred to, vv. 12, 13, which the high priest was to offer on the great day of atonement. — μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου καὶ ὑσσώπου] *along with water and crimson wool and hyssop*. With regard to this also, nothing is stated in the corresponding passage of Exodus. But all three things are elsewhere mentioned in connection with legally enjoined aspersions for purification. Comp. Num. xix. 6, 17 f.; Lev. xiv. 2 ff., 49 ff. In accordance therewith, a mixture of fresh spring water in some cases with the ashes of the red heifer, in others with the blood of a slain bird, was prescribed in the case of aspersions which were appointed for the cleansing of one defiled by contact with a corpse or by leprosy. In like manner, according to the passages above referred to, *hyssop* (ὑσσ., comp. on this plant, Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterb.* Bd. II. 2 Aufl. p. 819 f.) and *crimson wool*. With the latter the hyssop stem was probably bound round, and this served as a brush for sprinkling the blood. Comp. this use of hyssop in Ex. xii. 22. — αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν ἐράντισεν] *he sprinkled as well the book itself as also the whole people*. τὸ βιβλίον is the βιβλίον τῆς διαθήκης, Ex. xxiv. 7. Of a sprinkling likewise of this book of the covenant, nothing, however, is told us in Exodus. It has therefore been proposed, by way of removing the difference, to make τὸ βιβλίον still dependent upon the preceding λαβών. So, after the precedent of the Coptic and Armenian versions, Grotius, Wittich, Surenhus, Cramer, Bengel, Michaelis, Storr, Morus, Ewald, and others. But the καὶ following βιβλίον renders this impossible. For the setting aside of this καὶ by

pronouncing it spurious (Colomesius, Valekenæer), or by the assumption of a pleonasm (so ordinarily), is an act of violence; while we are prevented from placing it, with Bengel and Ewald, in correspondence with the *καί*, ver. 21, as “et . . . et vero,” or “non modo . . . vero etiam,”—apart from the clumsiness of construction thus arising, and leaving out of consideration the inconvenient *δέ*,—*by the twice occurring of the verb ἐράντισεν*, vv. 19 and 21.—*πάντα τὸν λαόν*] LXX. ver. 8: *Λαβὼν δὲ Μωϋσῆς τὸ αἷμα κατεσκέδασε τοῦ λαοῦ*. Schlichting: *Omnem autem populum conspersisse dicitur, quia qui ex proxime astantibus conspersi fuerant, universi populi personam hac in parte gessere, ita ut totus populus conspersus fuisse censeretur.*—*ἐράντισεν*] *sc.* for consecration and purification.

Ver. 20. Ex. xxiv. 8, LXX.: *καὶ εἶπεν ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἧς διέθετο κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων τῶν λόγων τούτων.*—*ἧς ἐνετείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός*] Bengel: “*præcepit mihi, ut perferrem ad vos.*”

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

καὶ . . . δέ] *but also*. Luke ii. 35; John viii. 16, *al.* — τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας] *the vessels designed for sacred use*.

Ver. 22. Confirmation of the special historic facts adduced vv. 19-21, by the general rule, which throughout the whole domain of Mosaic law was recognised as, with hardly any exception, of binding obligation. — σχεδόν] *almost, nearly* (Acts xiii. 44, xix. 26), does not belong to ἐν αἵματι (Bengel, Böhme). Still less is it to be joined to καθαρίζεται, as is done by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, and Primasius, who, in opposition to the cohesion with that which precedes and follows, will find the thought expressed that the purification accomplished in accordance with the law is only a partial, bodily one, and thus only imperfect, since it is not able to cancel sins. It belongs logically to πάντα. The author, however, does not write καὶ ἐν αἵματι σχεδὸν πάντα καθαρίζεται, but, on the contrary, prefixes σχεδὸν to the whole clause, in order to imply that the limitation contained in this expression extends to both members of the clause. The sense is consequently: and one must almost say that all things are according to the law purified with blood, and that without the shedding of blood no remission takes place. So, rightly, Bleek, Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 514 f.; Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 500; Alford, Maier, Hofmann, and Woerner. As concerns the thought, Grotius in his day aptly refers us to the saying of the Talmud (tract. *Joma*, fol. 5. 1; *Menachoth*, fol. 93. 2): כִּדְּבָרִים אֵלֶּם פִּקְדָּן בְּדָם, non est expiatio nisi per sanguinem. The conceding, moreover, of the existence of single exceptions, by virtue of σχεδὸν, finds its justification, as regards the first half of the clause, in Ex. xix. 10; Lev. xv. 5 ff., 27, xvi. 26, 28, xxii. 6; Num. xxxi. 22-24; as regards the second half, in Lev. v. 11-13. — πάντα] *all universally* (men as well as things), which as Levitically impure has need of cleansing. Wrongly Peirce and Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 563): all the furniture and utensils of the sanctuary. — κατὰ τὸν νόμον] *in conformity with the law, i.e. so soon as the norm fixed by the Mosaic law is taken into account*. The addition κατὰ τὸν νόμον is likewise to be supplied in thought to the second member of the clause. — αἱματεκχυσία] a word not elsewhere met with in Greek literature. What is meant is

not specially *the pouring out of the blood* upon the altar (de Wette, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 435, *ol.*), but in general, *the blood-shedding* by the slaying of sacrificial animals (Bleek, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz, Hofmann, *Comm.* p. 363). — ἄφεσις] *remission*, *sc.* of the guilt incurred.

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

Ver. 23. The first of the two statements dependent on ἀνάγκη οὖν (τὰ μὲν . . . καθαρίζεσθαι) is deduced as a necessary consequence from vv. 18–22, while then the second statement (αὐτὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.) is derived as a necessary postulate from the first, and in such manner a return is effected to the necessity for the death of Christ, already shown at vv. 16, 17, in order to set forth the same on a fresh side. The necessity of the first-mentioned fact of ver. 23 is evident from the norm instanced, which is of validity in the domain of the Mosaic law; the necessity of that last mentioned, from the difference between the Christian and the Judaic. The main thought, however, lies in the second half of the clause, to which the first forms logically only the bridge. — οὖν] *sc.* because blood is so necessary a means for expiation and consecration. — ἀνάγκη οὖν] *it is then needful.* To ἀνάγκη οὖν we have to supplement ἐστίν, not, with Faber Stapulensis, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, Kurtz, and others, ἦν. For although the author has only one special fact in mind in connection with both members of the sentence, yet, as is shown by the plural *θυσίσαις*, he expresses himself universally; because he is reasoning from the inner necessity, as this is presupposed by the state of the matter itself. — τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι, αὐτὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] *that the copy, indeed, of that which is in heaven should be purified with these, but the heavenly place itself with better sacrifices than these, i.e.* for the characteristically Judaic the

means of expiation and consecration are necessarily determined in accordance with the norm specified in the Mosaic law; but since Judaic and Christian are distinguished from each other as the mere copy of the heavenly place and the heavenly place itself, so of necessity must the means of expiation and consecration in the Christian domain be a more excellent one than in the Judaic. — By τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς and τὰ ἐπουράνια we have to understand neither the heavenly possessions (Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Rambach, and others), nor yet the Christian Church and its members (Zeger, Estius, Corn. a Lapide, Calov, Böhme, Stengel, *al.*; comp. also Tholuck). Still less can these expressions denote: “that which, where God is essentially present, brings with it His relation to the Church, *i.e.* first, His dwelling with it,—namely, in that the glorified human nature of Christ is the dwelling for the whole fulness of the divine nature; secondly, the human nature, in its consecration to God, in which Christ presents and offers it up to the Father; and thirdly, the place where God’s wrath against human sin meets with expiatory satisfaction, by which it is averted,—thus Christ, who, as the propitiation for our sins, stands between the Church and its God” (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 436 ff. [comp. also Owen]). Rather is the *heavenly sanctuary* specially meant thereby, as is evident from ver. 24. For in ver. 24 the meaning of ἅγια is supposed to be already known from ver. 23; inasmuch, namely, as ἅγια is there almost accentless, while all the emphasis is laid upon the adjectives χειροποίητα, etc. In accordance with this, too, is determined the meaning of τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς as the *earthly sanctuary*, inasmuch as it was the imperfect imitation or copy of the former, as accordingly already, at viii. 5, the Levitical sanctuary had been characterized as ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιὰ τῶν ἐπουρανίων. The plural τὰ ὑποδείγματα is placed, just because the author has already before his mind, in ver. 23, the plural τὰ ἅγια, ver. 24. Thus, then, the first clause of ver. 23 has respect to the special fact already brought forward at ver. 21, whereas the second clause receives its elucidation by means of the special fact of which mention is made at ver. 24. — τούτοις] *by such things as these, i.e.* by blood of slain animals, and similar means of purifying,

which belong to the earthly sanctuary; to which general rubric, also, the ashes of the red heifer mentioned at ver. 13, but not here coming under consideration, belong. With marvellous inversion of the sense, Paulus: "to be declared pure *for these*, i.e. the Israelites." — καθαρίζεσθαι] is *passive*. Arbitrarily is it taken as a *middle* by Heinrichs, who will have ἡμᾶς supplemented as object. Against this the tenor of the foregoing verse is in itself decisive. The notion of *being purified* is not, it is true, applicable to the second clause, αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια κ.τ.λ. For the heavenly sanctuary is removed from contact with the sinful world; it has no need, therefore, of an expiation or purification.¹ We are warranted, however, in supplying in thought, without any hesitation, from καθαρίζεσθαι, a kindred verb to the second member of the sentence, by the assuming of a zeugma. But since now, in accordance with that which precedes, the καθαρίζεσθαι is an idea which entirely subordinates itself to the idea of the ἐγκαινίζειν, ver. 18, the former having only the design of the latter, we shall best extract from the notion of *being purified*, in the first clause, the notion of *being consecrated to the service of God*,

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

for the second clause, understanding this consecration of the heavenly sanctuary of the opening up of the access to the same, effected through the blood of Christ (comp. x. 19, 20). — *κρείττοσιν θυσίαις*] The *plural* is chosen, although the author is thinking exclusively of the death of Christ, on account of the universal form of discourse, ver. 23, as a plural of the category (de Wette). False the interpretation of Grotius and Stengel: in addition to the sacrificial death of Christ, *the sufferings of believers, together with their prayers and works of love* (xiii. 15, 16), are thought of; and in like manner Paulus: *the sacrifices of Jesus and all Christians for the good which pertains to duty*; but false, also, the explanation of Beza: *the fact is hinted at that the one sacrifice of Christ is instead of many*. — On *παρά* with the comparative, see at i. 4.

Ver. 24. Confirmatory justification of *αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια*, ver. 23, by the proof that in reality the *heavenly* sanctuary is that consecrated by the sacrifice of Christ. Wrongly is it assumed by Delitzsch, that at ver. 24 the indispensable requirement of better sacrifices for the heavenly world is proved from the actual nature of the one rendered and presented to God. For the argument passes over to the character of Christ's sacrifice, as offered once for all, only at ver. 25. — *οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα ἅγια εἰσῆλθεν Χριστός*] *for Christ entered not into a holy place (i.e. most holy place, see at ver. 8) made with hands* (ver. 11). — *χειροποίητα*] as the main idea emphatically preposed. — *ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν*] a copy of the true (viii. 2), *real one*. *ἀντίτυπα* denotes neither *the copy of a copy*, as is supposed by Bleek, after the precedent of Michaelis, *ad Peire.*, Cramer, Chr. Fr. Schmid, upon the presupposition that the author already thought of the *τύπος*, viii. 5, as a mere *copy of the original*; nor is it to be taken as equivalent to the simple *τύπος*, as is done by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Grotius, Wolf, Carpzov, and others. What is meant is the *corresponding image, i.e. the copy or imitation, formed after the proportions of the τύπος or pattern*, which God had shown to Moses (comp. viii. 5). The expression, therefore, is of essentially the same import as *ὑπόδειγμα*, viii. 5, ix. 23. — *ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν*] *but into heaven itself, into the heavenly Holy of Holies, where the throne of*

God itself exists, in opposition to the *earthly* Most Holy Place, not to the *heavenly fore-tabernacle*, ver. 11. — *νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*] *now to appear before the face of God on our behalf* (as our advocate, and intent upon our salvation, comp. vii. 25). — *νῦν*] *now*, after He has obtained His abiding dwelling-place in heaven. — Before the face of God. In this respect, too, a pointing to the exaltedness of Christ, the heavenly high priest. For, according to Ex. xxxiii. 20, no man could continue to live who had seen the face of God; on which account also the earthly high priest might not even enter the earthly Holy of Holies until this had first been filled with the smoke of the altar of incense, and in this way the typical presence of God there existing had been veiled from his glance. Comp. Lev. xvi. 12, 13.

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

Ver. 25. *Οὐδέ]* *now yet, sc. εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.* — *προσφέρειν ἑαυτόν*] denotes not the presentation of Himself with His blood before God in the heavenly Holy of Holies (Böhme, Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, and others; comp. also Richm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 474), but the offering of Himself as a sacrifice upon earth. The sense is: Christ entered into the heavenly Holy of Holies, not that He might presently leave it again, in order afresh to offer Himself as a sacrifice upon earth. — *ὁ ἀρχιερεύς*] *the Levitical high priest.* — *τὰ ἅγια*] *the earthly Holy of Holies.* — *ἐν αἵματι ἄλλοτρίῳ*] *with blood not his own.* — *ἄλλοτρίῳ*] opposition to *ἑαυτόν*.

Ver. 26. Proof of the necessity that Christ's sacrifice should take place only once for all, from the non-reasonableness of the opposite. For if the sacrifice of Christ sufficed not once for all for the cancelling of sin, He must oftentimes in succession—because no generation of mankind, so long as the world has endured, has been free from sin—have undergone death since the beginning of the world. But now, seeing this is contrary to reason, the matter stands in reality quite otherwise. From this reasoning it is evident that the author supposed an expiation of the sins *of all the earlier generations of mankind too*, by virtue of the sacrificial death of Christ.

An erroneous statement of the connection of thought is given by Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 441), Delitzsch, and Alford. See, on the other hand, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 552, *Obs.* — ἐπεὶ] *since otherwise, alioquin.* Comp. 1 Cor. v. 10, vii. 14, *al.* — ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν] *it were needful that He should often suffer.* — On ἔδει without αὐν, see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 266. — παθεῖν specially of the suffering of death, as xiii. 12. — ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου] *from the foundation or creation of the world onwards* (comp. iv. 3), *i.e.* here: *so long as there are men in the world.* — νυνὶ δέ] as viii. 6, in the *logical* sense: *but now.* Opposition to ἐπεὶ κ.τ.λ. — ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων] *in the end of the ages*, periods of time. Antithesis to ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, and equivalent in signification to ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, i. 1. Comp. also ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος, Matt. xiii. 40, 49. — εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ] *for the cancelling of sin by His sacrifice.* These words belong together. The conjoining of διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ with πεφανέρωται, which has been preferred by Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Carpzov, Heinrichs, Schulz, Böhme, Tholuck, and others, is, in connection with the right determination of the sense of the verb (*vid. infra*), harsh and unnatural, and not at all justified by the alleged analogon: ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος, 1 John v. 6. Tholuck's objection, however, that ἅπαξ . . . αἰώνων is antithetically opposed to the κατ' ἐναντίον, ver. 25, and πεφανέρωται διὰ τῆς θυσίας to the εἰσέρχεται ἐν αἵματι ἁλλοτρίῳ, does not apply, inasmuch as the second clause of ver. 26 forms the antithesis to the first clause of that verse, but not to ver. 25; on which account also ἐπεὶ . . . κόσμου is not, with Beza, Mill, Griesbach, Carpzov, Schulz, Bloomfield, and others, to be enclosed within a parenthesis. — No emphasis for the rest falls upon the personal pronoun employed with θυσίας, in such wise that the sense would be: *by the sacrifice of Himself* (so Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, in their translations, Piscator, Jac. Cappellus, Owen, Limborch, Schulz, Heinrichs, Böhme, Stuart, Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Conybeare, and others). It means simply: *by His sacrifice* (Bleek, de Wette), so that not αὐτοῦ, but αὐτοῦ is to be written. The contrast between His own blood and the blood of other victims was

already sufficiently brought out afresh at ver. 25. — *πεφανέρωται*] *He has been manifested, i.e.* He has appeared or come forth before the sight of men upon earth. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 20; 1 John iii. 5, 8; also Col. iii. 4; 1 John ii. 28; 1 Pet. v. 4 [1 Tim. iii. 16]. To explain the expression of the *appearing before God*, and to make it of like import with *ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ*, ver. 24 (Jac. Cappellus, Heinrichs, Schulz, *al.*), is forbidden alike by the absence of the, in that case indispensable, addition *τῷ θεῷ*, as by the *ἐκ δευτέρου ὀφθῆσεται*, ver. 28, corresponding as it does to the *πεφανέρωται*.

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

¹ According to Kurtz, the resurrection and ascension of Christ is then to be thought of as the result of the *κρίσις* on Christ's part. But where is ever in the N. T. the resurrection and ascension of Christ presented from the point of view of a judgment exercised on Him? And how could it be expected of the reader, without further indication, that he should derive so strange a conception from the words of vv. 28, 29?

has been laid aside, and so lies ready for future use. — ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν] *to die a single time, or once for all.* Comp. Sophocles in Stobaeus, ii. 120: *θανεῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔξῃστι τοῖς αὐτοῖσι δῖς.* — Calvin: Si quis objiciat, bis quosdam esse mortuos, ut Lazarum et similes (comp. Heb. xi. 35), expedita est solutio, apostolum hic de ordinaria hominum conditione disputare: quin etiam ab hoc ordine eximuntur, quos subita commutatio corruptione exuet (comp. Heb. xi. 5). — μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις] *sc. ἀπόκειται, not ἐστίν or ἔσται.* Whether, for the rest, the κρίσις is thought of by the author as ensuing immediately after the death of each individual (Jac. Cappellus, Kurtz, *al.*), or as a later act coinciding only with the general resurrection of the dead (Bengel, Bleek, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, *al.*), the elastic μετὰ τοῦτο affords us no intimation. — κρίσις] *judgment*, is to be taken quite generally. Wrongly is it understood by Schulz (and so also Böhme) specially of the judgment unto punishment or unto condemnation, in that he supposes—erroneously, because at variance with the absolute τοῖς ἀνθρώποις—two different classes of men (those to be punished and those to be blessed) to be opposed to each other in vv. 27, 28. [Yet comp. John v. 24.]

Ver. 28. Ἄπαξ προσενεχθείς] *once offered* (by the suffering of death). Chrysostom: ὑπὸ τίνος προσενεχθείς; ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ δηλονότι. Wrongly (comp. ἑαυτόν, vv. 25, 14) Delitzsch: in connection with the passive προσενεχθείς we have “to think of the violence proceeding from the human and demoniac power, which Christ endured, in order to become the προσφορά for the propitiation of mankind;” Kurtz and Hofmann: ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ is to be supplemented, which, accordingly, is interpreted by Kurtz into the signification of the “sending of the Son into the world, in behalf of the vicarious atoning for sin by means of His sacrificial death;” by Hofmann: into a “being brought to that place where He was to be at the disposal of Him who had ordained Him to be an expiatory sacrifice for sins.” The words ἅπαξ προσενεχθείς correspond to the ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, ver. 27, and προσενεχθείς forms a paronomasia with the following ἀνενεγκεῖν: *bore* as a sacrifice, that He might *bear away, dargebracht, um fortzubringen* [oblatus ut auferret]. For ἀνενεγκεῖν denotes not *the bearing up* (and

fastening) *to the cross* (Jac. Cappellus, Calov, Wolf, Bengel, and others, after 1 Pet. ii. 24, where, however, ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον is employed with it), or *the substitutionary bearing* (Augustine, *de pecc. mer.* i. 28; Estius, Seb. Schmidt, Böhme, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 544 f.; Alford, Maier, Conybeare, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, McCaul, Hofmann, and others, in accordance with the signification of the verb, Isa. liii. 12, LXX.: αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε, an utterance which certainly may have been before the mind of the author at the time of his writing this passage), or *the offering up* of the sins, as it were, as a sacrifice (Peshito, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Michaelis); but the expiation of sins, conceived under the form of the result immediately of necessity attaching itself thereto, *i.e. the putting away of sins*, in such wise that it takes up again the idea expressed by εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας, ver. 26, and becomes identical with ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας, x. 4. From a linguistic point of view this interpretation encounters no difficulty (against Delitzsch and others), since the ἀνά in ἀνενεγκεῖν was employed not otherwise than, *e.g.*, very frequently the ἀνά in ἀναιρεῖν. How easily the notion of *bearing* in φέρειν could pass over into that of *bearing away* or *doing away with*, is shown in the kindred verb βαστάζειν, which is unquestionably used, Matt. viii. 17, John xx. 15, in the sense of *auferre*. Comp. also Galen, *de compos. medicam.* 2: ψώρας τε θεραπεύει καὶ ὑπώπια βαστάζει. — πολλῶν] here too, as ii. 10 and often (see p. 122), lays stress only on the notion of *multitude* or *plurality*, without regard to the question whether this plurality constitutes the totality of mankind or not. — ἐκ δευτέρου ὀφθήσεται] *shall appear the second time* before the eyes of men, namely, at His Parousia. According to Bleek, there arises a difficulty from the words, if we explain προσενεχθεῖς of the death suffered upon earth, and not, with him, of an action accomplished in heaven, only after the resurrection, inasmuch as in the former case Christ *already* appeared in a visible form the second time after His resurrection. But such difficulty does not at all present itself in connection with that application of προσενεχθεῖς either. For ἐκ δευτέρου ὀφθήσεται can only be understood of a second appearing in a visible form

upon earth; when, however, Christ after His resurrection appeared again to His disciples, He had not yet left the earth; those manifestations of the risen Christ before His ascension belonged consequently to His first visible coming forth upon earth. — *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*] forms the opposition to *εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας*, is therefore to be interpreted after the analogy of these words. (Erroneously Bleek, according to whom *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* forms the opposition to *εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται*, ver. 26.) Christ has once offered Himself up for the expiation of the sins of men; when He returns to earth the second time, He will not once more have to do with the expiation of human sin, but *He will, apart from sin, or free from all relation to sin, appear to bring the σωτηρία to the believers.* Free from the guilt and punishment of sin, Christ *has* already rendered His believers by means of His sacrificial death at His first appearing upon earth. *Positively*, He will bless them with salvation at His return. To combine *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* with *τοῖς ἀπεκδεχομένοις* by means of an hyperbaton (so Faber Stapulensis and Grotius) is grammatically impossible. The sense, however, cannot be either, as the Irvingites will, that *Christ Himself* will be free from sin at His second appearing, in opposition to the lust which they suppose to have attached to Him during His first appearing; for that Christ during this period too, notwithstanding all the temptation to which He was subject, was free from sin, the author certainly distinctly asserts at iv. 15. Incorrectly also does Bleek—after the example of Theodore of Mopsuestia (*τὸ γὰρ χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι μὴ κρατούσης ἔτι τῆς ἁμαρτίας οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ἔξω παντὸς ἀνθρωπίνου πιάθους ὀφθήσεται τότε*) and of Theodoret (*οὐκέτι τῆς ἁμαρτίας κρατούσης, ἀντὶ τοῦ χώραν οὐκέτι ἐχούσης κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς ἁμαρτίας*)—take *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* as equivalent in signification to *μὴ οὔσης ἁμαρτίας*, so that the sense would be: “at the return of Christ sin will no longer be present, at least in the domain to which the operation of the Redeemer will relate.” Even in a grammatical respect this application of the words is inadmissible, since *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* must stand in relation to the *subject* in *ὀφθήσεται*, thus cannot be torn away from this

reference by being made equivalent to an independent participial clause. But also the thought thence arising would be enumbered with difficulty, as Bleek himself admits, by the addition of "at least," etc., although Bleek has sought to justify it. Additional misinterpretations of *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* are met with in other writers. Thus it is supposed to mean: without, again vicariously laden with the sins of men, being made sin (2 Cor. v. 21) for them (Occumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, Akersloot, Wolf, Carpzov, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Heinrichs, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 545, *Obs.*; Alford, Maier, Moll, and others), which is already refuted by the erroneousness of explaining the foregoing *ἀνενεγκεῖν* of the vicarious bearing of sins; without the punishment of sin (Klee, *al.*); without the sufferings undertaken for sin (Tholuck); sine corporis, peccato obnoxii, mortalitate (Zeger); sine sacrificio pro peccato (Jac. Cappellus, Stuart, McCaul, and many); not as a *sufferer* for the guilt of others, but as the holy *judge* of the guilt of others (Ebrard, Delitzsch; similarly Stein and others), and so forth, all of which have the plain expression of the language against them. — *εἰς σωτηρίαν*] belongs to *ὀφθήσεται*, not, as it is true, upon the retention of the *spurious* addition (see the critical remark) *διὰ πίστεως*, it must be conjoined, to *ἀπεκδεχομένοις* (so Primasius, Faber Stapulensis, Camerarius, Wolf, Klee, Paulus, Stein). For *τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις* contains a non-essential element of the statement, ver. 28; *εἰς σωτηρίαν*, on the other hand, an essential element of the same. *εἰς σωτηρίαν*, namely, is the positive nearer defining of the negative *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*, and forms consequently, like the latter, an antithesis to *εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας*. The whole clause, however, *ἐκ δευτέρου . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν*, corresponds to the second member of the clause, ver. 27: *μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις*.

CHAPTER X.

VER. 1 reads in the *Recepta*: Σκιάν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, κατ' ἑαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, αἷς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηγεῖς, οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους τελεῖν. Instead thereof, Lachm. takes the words Σκιάν . . . πραγμάτων as an independent clause, placing a full stop after πραγμάτων. He then, in the stereotype edition, omits the relative before προσφέρουσιν,—while in the larger edition he has again added the αἷς of the *Recepta* before this verb,—places a comma after προσφέρουσιν, and writes δύνανται in place of δύναται. This punctuation and form of the text given by Lachm. is in all essential respects to be unhesitatingly rejected. In connection with the breaking off of the opening words of the verse into an independent statement, ἐστίν must be supplemented to ἔχων. Such supplementing, however, would be altogether opposed to the linguistic character of the Epistle to the Hebrews; moreover, it would remain inexplicable, from the very brevity of the clause, how the participle ἔχων should come to be written for the finite tense ἔχει, which naturally suggests itself. In addition to this, the joining to that which precedes by means of γὰρ would occasion a difficulty, and the clause following would become an asyndeton. Besides, this following clause, in the absence of any connecting relative, would not even comply with the laws of grammar. The relative before προσφέρουσιν is wanting in A, 2, 7* 17, 47, Syr. utr. Arm., and A** 31, Syr. Philonex. then insert αἷ before οὐδέποτε. Instead of the *Recepta* αἷς προσφέρ., there is found, however, in D* L (?), 73, 137, in an ancient fragment with Matthaei, which Tisch., in the edit. vii. (comp. Pars I. p. exci.), has designated as N, with Theodoret, as well as in a MS. of Chrysostom and in the Latin version of D E: αἷς προσφέρ., and the latter is preferred by Bleek, Tisch. and Alford. Yet the *Recepta* αἷς, which is supported by C D*** E (?) K 8, the majority of the cursives, and many Fathers, is to be defended. Since the three words immediately preceding end in αἷς, αἷς might easily also be changed into αἷ. The *Recepta* δύναται, finally, is attested by D (* and ***) E K L, very many cursives, Vulg. It. Copt. *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret (text),

Oecum. (comm.) *al.*, while the plural *δύνανται* (preferred also by Tisch. 1, and already placed by Griesbach upon the inner margin) is presented by A C D** *ς*, about thirty cursives, Syr. *al.*, Chrys. (codd.) Theodoret (comm. ?), Damasc. Theophyl. *al.* But the plural is devoid of sense, and can on that account be regarded only as a transcriber's error, which was occasioned by the foregoing plural *προσφέρουσιν*. — Ver. 2. *Ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαιτι*] Elz.: *ἐπεὶ ἂν ἐπαύσαιτο*. Against the decisive authority of all uncial mss., of most cursives, vss. and Fathers. — The preference to the *Recepta* *νεκαθαρμένους* is deserved by *νεκαθαρισμένους* (approved by Grotius, Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Delitzsch, Alford), as better attested. In favour of *νεκαθαρισμένους* pleads not only the testimony of D E K *ς*, 23** 37, 39, *al.*, but also the form which in A C has arisen as a transcriber's error from the same *νεκαθερισμένους*, which latter Lachm. has adopted. — Ver. 6. *Recepta* here and ver. 8: *ἐδόξεσας*. Better attested, however, here (by A C D* E, the early fragment in Matth. *al.*) and ver. 8 (by A D* [E ?], *al.*, Cyr. Theodoret) is the reading, chosen by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, as also approved by Delitzsch: *ἡδόξεσας*. — Ver. 8. In place of the *Recepta* *θυσίαν καὶ προσφοράν*, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford rightly read the plural: *θυσίας καὶ προσφοράς*, in accordance with A C D* *ς** 17, 23, 57, *al.*, Vulg. It. Syr. Copt. Sahid. Arab. Eyp. Cyril. Already commended to attention by Griesbach. The singular is a later change, with a view to its conformation to ver. 5. — In like manner we have, with Lachm. and Tisch., to delete *τόν*, which the *Recepta* adds before *νόμον*, as not being found in A C, *ς*, 37, 46, 71, 73, *al.*, Sahid. Cyril, Chrys. Theodoret. The insertion of the article was more easily possible than its rejection. — Ver. 9. *τοῦ ποιῆσαι*] Elz.: *τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ θεός*. Against A C D E K *ς** 17, 39, 46, *al. mult.* It. Copt. *al.*, ὁ θεός is a complementary addition from ver. 7. Rightly deleted by Griesbach, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche. — Ver. 10. Instead of the mere *διὰ* in the *Recepta*, Matthaei and Tisch. 2 and 7 read, after the precedent of the Edd. Complutens. Erasm. Colin. Stephan.: *οἱ διὰ*. Bloomfield places *οἱ* within brackets. But *οἱ* (*sc. ἡγιασμένοι*) is wanting in A C D* E* *ς*, 31, 47, *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret, and owes its origin to an error of the eye, in that the termination *σμένοι* in *ἡγιασμένοι* gave rise to the writing of *ἐσμέν οἱ*. — In place of *τοῦ σώματος* in the *Recepta*, D* E, with their Latin translation, have *τοῦ αἵματος*. Mistaken emendation, since *τοῦ σώματος*, ver. 10, was chosen in manifest correspondence to the citation *σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι*, ver. 5. — *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*] Elz.: *τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. But the article has against it the testimony of all the

uncials, many cursives and Fathers, and is rightly rejected by Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford. — Ver. 11. Elz. Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Reiche read: $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$. Defended also by Böhme, Tholuck, and Delitzsch. The preference, however, is deserved by the reading: $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, which is furnished by A C, 31, 37, 46, *al.*, Syr. utr. (yet in the Philonex. with an asterisk) Basm. Aeth. Arn. Theodoret (text), Cyril. Euthal. *al.*, was already adopted in the Edit. Complut. Plantin. Genev., and more recently has been restored by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, and Alford. If the ordinary Levitical priests had been intended, $\text{o}\acute{\iota} \iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ would, as is rightly observed by Bleek, have been written instead of $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma \iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, since each single Levitical priest had by no means daily to offer sacrifice. Less unsuitable, on the other hand, is the statement of the daily presentation of sacrifice in regard to the high priest, since that which was true of the Levitical priests in general could indeed be ascribed to the high priest as the head and representative of the same. In any case we have here, at the close of the argument, and because of the parallel with the person of Christ, to expect not so much the mention of the ordinary Jewish priest, as the mention of the Jewish high priest. The reading: $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, is therefore to be looked upon as a later correction, made on account of the following $\kappa\alpha\theta' \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu$, since this stood in apparent contradiction to $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$. — Ver. 12. $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}$] Elz. Matthaei, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield: $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}$. But $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (recommended by Griesbach; adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Scholz, Tisch. 1 and 8, Alford, Reiche; approved also by Delitzsch) is demanded by the preponderating authority of A C D* E 8, 67** 80, 116, *al.*, Syr. utr. Arr. Copt. Basm. Aeth. Arn. It. Vulg. *al.*, Chrys. Cyr. Damasc. *al.* — Instead of the *Recepta*: $\epsilon\nu \delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\xi\iota\tilde{\alpha}$, Lachm. had written in the stereotype edition: $\epsilon\nu \alpha\tilde{\iota}\xi\iota\tilde{\alpha}$, which, however, is only feebly attested by A, 31 (8* has $\epsilon\nu \delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\xi\iota\tilde{\alpha}$, which by 8*** was changed into $\epsilon\nu \delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\xi\iota\tilde{\alpha}$). Rightly, therefore, has Lachm. returned in his larger edition to the *Recepta*. — Ver. 13. $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha} \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \tau\acute{o} \epsilon\iota\rho\eta\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$] Elz. Matth. Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, Reiche: $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha} \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \tau\acute{o} \pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$. Against decisive witnesses (A C D E 8, 17, 31, 47, *al. m.* Syr. utr. Arr. Copt. Basm. Aeth. It. Vulg. Chrys. Theoph. Ambrose, Sedul.). Already held suspected by Griesbach. — Ver. 16. Elz. Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche: $\epsilon\pi\iota \tau\tilde{\omega}\nu \delta\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\tilde{\omega}\nu$, after D** and *** E K L, most cursives and vss., Chrys. Theodoret, *al.*, Ambrose, *al.* On the other hand, A C D* 8, 17, 31, 47, *al.*, Vulg. (Amiat. Harlej.* Tolet.) have: $\epsilon\pi\iota \tau\tilde{\eta}\nu \delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\nu$. Approved by Lachm. Bleek,

Tisch. 1 and 8, and probably the original reading. — Ver. 17. Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomfield: *μνησθῶ*. More correctly, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, after A C D* E s* 17: *μνησθήσομαι*, which Griesbach has placed upon the inner margin. *μνησθῶ* was carried over from viii. 12. — Ver. 22. *Recepta*: *ἐββαντισμένοι*. After A C D* s* Lachm. writes: *βεραντισμένοι*, Tisch. and Alford: *βεραντισμένοι*. — Ver. 29. The words *ἐν ᾧ ἡ γῆιάσθη* are deleted by Lachm. in the stereotype edition; but are rightly, since they are omitted only by A and Chrysostom, retained by him in the larger edition. — Ver. 30. The addition following *ἀνταποδώσω* in the *Recepta*: *λέγει κύριος*, is rejected by Tisch. 1, 2, and 8, after D* s* 17, 23* 67** Vulg. It. Copt. Syr. Aeth. Arab. Erp. Ambr. Bede, and is regarded by Mill (*Proleg.* 496), Bengel, Griesbach, and others as probably a gloss. Bloomfield encloses it within brackets. It is nevertheless protected by A D*** E K L s*** etc., Syr. Philonex, *al.*, and many Fathers. Rightly, therefore, has it been received again by Tisch. into the edit. vii. Delitzsch, Alford, and Reiche also have lately decided in favour of its genuineness. — The *Recepta* *κύριος κρινεῖ* we have, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, after A D E K s* 31, 73, *al.*, Vulg. It. Syr. utr. Aeth. Theodoret (*semel*), to transpose into *κρινεῖ* *κύριος*. Bleek and Delitzsch read, after D E, 55, 71, Vulg. It. Theodoret (*sem.*): *ὅτι κρινεῖ κύριος*. Quite similarly, LXX. Deut. xxxii. 36; Ps. cxxxv. 14. — Ver. 34. *τοῖς δεσμίαις*] Thus we have to read, with Griesbach, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, and others, after A D* [as Cod. B breaks off at ix. 14, so also x. 24–xii. 15 is wanting in Cod. C] 47, 67** 73, *al.*, Syr. utr. Arab. Erpen. Copt. Arm. Vulg. Chrys. Antioch. Damasc. Theodoret (*comm.*), Occum. (*comm.*) Pelag. Ambrose, *al.* From *τοῖς δεσμίαις* arose, by a slip on the part of the copyist, *τοῖς δεσμοῖς*, which is found with Origen, *Echort. ad martyr.* 44, and to which the *vinculis eorum* of the Latin translation in D E corresponds; while, then, *τοῖς δεσμοῖς* was completed by means of a gloss into the *Recepta*, still defended by Matthaei, Bloomfield, M'Caul, and Hofmann: *τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου* (D*** E K L s, etc.), in that Paul was regarded as the author of the epistle, and thus was found expressed an acknowledgment of the sympathy manifested by the Palestinian Christians towards himself during his imprisonment. — In that which follows, the reading: *ἔχουσιν ἐαυτοῖς*, very strongly confirmed by D E K L, almost sixty cursives, Chrys. Theodoret, Isidor. iii. 225, Damasc. Theoph., already adopted into the Edit. Complut. Erasm. 1, Steph. 1 and 2, and later preferred by Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Kuapp, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7,

Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, is to be held the original one, inasmuch as from this reading the rise, as well of the *Recepta*: ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (which, as it would seem, rests only upon a few cursives), as also of the reading afforded by A 8, four cursives, the early fragment in Matthæi, Vulg. It. *al.*, and followed by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8: ἔχειν ἑαυτοῦς, is to be explained. — The addition: ἐν οὐρανοῖς after ὑπαρξιν in the *Recepta* is wanting in A D* 8* 17, in the early fragment with Matthæi in the text, in Copt. Aeth. Vulg. It., with Clem. Al. Bed., and stands with Theodoret only after μένουσαν. Elucidatory gloss, suspected by Mill (*Proleg.* 1208) and Griesbach, rightly rejected by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford. — Ver. 35. *Recepta*: μισθαποδοσίαν μεγάλην. With Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, Alford, we have to transpose into μεγάλην μισθαποδοσίαν, after A D E 8, the early fragment in Matthæi, 73, 116, *al.*, Clem. Al. Orig. Eus. It. Vulg. Copt. *al.* — Ver. 38. The *Recepta* omits the μου, which is found in most mss. of the LXX. after πιστεῖω. D* Syr. utr. Copt., the Latin version in D E, Eus. Theodoret (*alic.*), Cypr. Jerome have it after πιστεῖω. On the other hand, it is found after δίκαιοις in A 8, Arm. Vulg., in the early fragment with Matthæi by the first hand, with Clem. Al. Eus. (*alic.*) Theodoret (*alic.*), Proc. Sedul. Bed. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford have adopted it at this latter place, and probably the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews so read, inasmuch as it is found with the LXX. at this place in Cod. A.

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

Ver. 1. Establishment of the ἅπαξ προσερχθεῖς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας, ix. 28, as being the main thought lying in ix. 25-28, by making good the opposite state of the case in the province of the O. T. theocracy: "For since the law contains only a shadow of the future good things, not the actual likeness of the things, it is not able by means of the same sacrifices every year, which are unceasingly offered, ever to make perfect them that draw nigh." The emphasis of the proposition rests partly upon the characteri-

zation of the law as *σκιὰν ἔχων κ.τ.λ.*, partly upon *κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, ὡς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*. The author, however, cannot thereby mean, as the words at first hearing might seem to imply, that the law, in case its contents were no mere *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*, would in reality effect the *τελείωσις* by means of its ever-repeated expiatory sacrifices. For, as is shown by vv. 2 and 3, the author already bases upon the very fact of the yearly repetition of the Mosaic expiatory sacrifices the proof for their inadequacy. We must therefore suppose that two independent particulars of thought have been blended together into a single statement. One can resolve the matter either in such wise that *οὐδέποτε δύναται τελειῶσαι* is looked upon as the common predicate for both particulars: the law is *incapable* of leading to *τελείωσις*, because it contains a mere *σκιὰ κ.τ.λ.*; and certainly it is incapable, by means of its ever-repeated sacrifices, of leading to *τελείωσις*. Or in such wise that the second particular is thought of originally as an inference from the first, from which the *οὐδέποτε δύναται κ.τ.λ.* is then progressively derived: because the law contains a mere *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*, there is found in its domain an unceasing repetition of the same expiatory sacrifices; by this unceasing repetition, however, it is never able to lead to perfection. The latter analysis is to be preferred, because by means of it the opposition, required by the course of the argument, between the once offered and the oftentimes repeated expiatory sacrifice, comes out clearly and definitely in all its severity; while the characterization of the *νόμος*, on the other hand, as *σκιὰν ἔχων κ.τ.λ.*, is made only that which here, in harmony with the context, it alone can be, *i.e.* a mere subsidiary factor in the argument. — *σκιάν*] *a shadow*, which is unsubstantiated, melts away into obscurity, and only enables us to recognise the external outlines. Opposite to this is the *εἰκὼν*, the *image* or *impress*, which sets before us the figure itself, sharply and clearly stamped forth. See on viii. 5. Freely, but not incorrectly, does Luther translate: “the very substance of the good things.” — *τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*] see at ix. 11. — *τῶν πραγμάτων*] different from *τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν* only as respects the more general form of expression.

— κατ' ἐνιαυτόν] belongs neither to οὐδέποτε δύναται (Ebrard, Delitzsch, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 446; Alford) nor to ἄς προσφέρουσιν (Calvin, Er. Schmid, Wolf, Heinrichs, Bleek, de Wette, Bloomfield, and others), in which latter case the words would have to be resolved by ταῖς θυσίαις, ἡς κατ' ἐνιαυτόν τὰς αὐτὰς προσφέρουσιν, or something similar. But κατ' ἐνιαυτόν is rather to be taken in intimate combination with ταῖς αὐταῖς: *with the same sacrifices every year*. The author forebore writing ταῖς αὐταῖς κατ' ἐνιαυτόν θυσίαις, in order that he might accentuate each notion equally strongly. As, moreover, with κατ' ἐνιαυτόν in this place, so also elsewhere with adverbs which in point of meaning may be compared with it, such as αἰεί, πολλάκις, etc., a *transposing* is nothing rare. Comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 514 f. — ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις] Those meant are, as is required by κατ' ἐνιαυτόν (comp. also ver. 4), *only the sacrifices on the great day of atonement*, not also the *daily* sacrifices of propitiation (ver. 11), as Böhme, Stein, and others suppose. — προσφέρουσιν] *sc.* the Levitical high priests. Wrongly Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 446), who in general has entirely failed in his interpretation of the statement:¹ the προσερχόμενοι. — εἰς τὸ διηνεκές] Note of time to προσφέρουσιν. If we should seek, with Paulus, Lachmann, and Hofmann, *i.e.*, to conjoin εἰς τὸ διηνεκές with that which follows, the relative clause ἡς προσφέρουσιν would be deprived of all signification. — τοὺς προσερχομένους] those who approach God through the medium of the Levitical priests, thus identical with τοὺς λατρεύοντας, ver. 2, ix. 9.

Ver. 2. Proof for the κατ' ἐνιαυτόν ταῖς αὐτ. θυσ. οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι in the form of a question: *for otherwise would not their presentation have ceased? because the worshippers, so soon as they have once been really purged from sin, have no more consciousness of sins, and*

¹ Namely, in that he brings out as the sense of the same, "the propitiatory sacrifice, which is, as it were, offered by the law itself, because offered at its direction and by the high priest for the congregation," is here "convinced of its manifest incapacity for effecting real and abiding purity of conscience for the individuals. This conviction is wrought by the fact that, notwithstanding this sacrifice has been offered every year for the whole congregation, the individuals still continue throughout the year to offer sacrifices for themselves"!

thus no more need of an expiatory sacrifice. In connection with the *Recepta* ἐπεὶ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο, the sense itself would remain unchanged, only the words would then have to be taken as an assertory statement ("for their presentation would have come to an end, because," etc.); by which, however, the discourse would suffer in point of vivacity (observe also the ἀλλά, ver. 3, corresponding to the question of ver. 2). But the process is not a natural one, when Beza, edd. 1 and 2, Wetstein, Matthaei, Stein, and others (comp. already Theodoret) will have the proposition of ver. 2 regarded as an assertory statement, even with the retention of the οὐκ. They then explain either (and thus *ordinarily*): *for otherwise their presentation would not have ceased, sc.* by the coming in of the New Covenant (Beza: *alioqui non desissent offerri*; Matthaei: *non cessavissent, non sublata essent*; comp. Theodoret: *Διὰ τοῦτο τέλος ἐκεῖνα λαμβάνει, ὡς οὐ δυνάμενα συνείδησιν καθαρὰν ἀποφῆναι*), or, in that ἐπεὶ . . . προσφερόμεναι is closely attached to the main verb of ver. 1, and διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν κ.τ.λ. is regarded as belonging to the whole proposition, vv. 1, 2: the law was not able by its sacrifices to lead to perfection, since their presentation was an endless one; because those who are once purified have no longer any consciousness of sins. So Wetstein, who, however, will write—what in that case, no doubt, would be necessary and perfectly justified—οὐκ ἀνεπαύσαντο instead of οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο (. . . "quum non cessarent offerri. Ita quidem, ut haec verba, sublata distinctione majori, jungantur iis, quae praecedunt, deinde sequatur totius sententiae confirmatio: quia sacrificantes," etc.). But against the last-mentioned mode of explanation it is decisive, that the relation of the members of the sentence to each other would become obscure, and the arrangement cumbrous; against the first-mentioned, the pre-supposition, underlying the ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηγεῖς, ver. 1, as well as the epistle in general (ix. 9, *al.*), that the Jewish sacrificial ritual was still in continuance at the time of our author's writing.—ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι] *sc.* αἱ θυσίαι. The construction of παύεσθαι with the participle is the ordinary one, in classic as well as in Hellenistic Greek. Comp. Eph. i. 16; Col. i. 9; Acts v. 42, *al.*; Hermann,

ad Viger. p. 771; Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 323 f. — τοῖς λατρεύοντας] see at ix. 9.

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

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

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

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

¹ To join on the words of ver. 3 to those of ver. 1, and then to look upon ver. 2 as a parenthesis (Kurtz, Hofmann), is inadmissible, even—apart from the ἀλλά, of frequent use after a question—because ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν, ver. 3, points back to the kindred συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν, ver. 2.

subject is already placed beyond doubt by the whole connection, but not less by the pointing back of τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 10, to σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, ver. 5. According to the view of our author, Christ is speaking¹ in the person of the psalmist. The psalm itself, indeed, as is almost universally acknowledged, refuses to admit of the Messianic interpretation (comp. especially ver. 13 [12]). The *present* λέγει, moreover, might be placed, because the utterance is one extending into the present, *i.e.* one which may still be daily read in the Scripture. — εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον] *at His coming into the world, i.e. on the eve of coming* (see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 249) into the world² (*sc.* by His incarnation). This determining of time is taken from the ἦκω, ver. 7. According to Bleek, who is preceded therein by Grotius, and followed by de Wette, as more recently by Maier and Beyschlag, *die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, Berl. 1866, p. 192, the author in penning the words εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον was thinking “less of the moment of the incarnation and birth than of the public coming forth upon earth to the work assigned to Him by the Father, in connection with which His entrance into the world first became manifested to the world itself.” But in that case εἰσελθὼν must have been written, and the formula εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον (John i. 9, vi. 14, xi. 27; Rom. v. 12; 1 Tim. i. 15, *al.*) would lose its natural signification. The same applies against Delitzsch, who, bringing in that which lies very remote, will have the words explained: “incarnate, and having entered upon the years of human self-determination, signified Isa. vii. 16,”—an exposition which is not any the more rendered acceptable, when Delitzsch adds, with a view to doing justice to the participle *present*: “we need not regard the εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον as a point; we can also conceive of it as a line.”³ For the author cannot possibly

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

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

³ So, in accord with Delitzsch, also Alford, who observes: “It expresses, I

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

Ver. 6. *In burnt-offerings and sin-offerings hadst Thou no pleasure.*—LXX. Cod. Vatic.: ὀλοκαύτωμα . . . οὐκ ᾔτησας; Cod. Alex.: ὀλοκαυτώματα . . . οὐκ ἐζήτησας.—καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας] Occumenius: τούτέστι προσφορὰν περὶ ἁμαρτίας.

believe, the whole time during which the Lord, being ripened in human resolution, was in intent devoting Himself to the doing of His Father's will: the time of which that youthful question, ‘Wist ye not that I must be ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου?’ was one of the opening announcements.”

Elsewhere also occasionally (Lev. vii. 37; Num. viii. 8, *al.*) the LXX. denote the sin-offering by the mere *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, in that the additional notion of *sacrifice* is naturally yielded by the context. Stein's expedient for avoiding all supplementing of the idea, in translating *καί* by "also" ("Thou hast also no pleasure in offerings for sin"), is grammatically inadmissible. — *εὐδοκεῖν*] with the *accusative* also not rare elsewhere in Hellenistic Greek. Comp. LXX. Gen. xxxiii. 10; Lev. xxvi. 34, 41; Ps. li. 18, 21, *al.* Besides this in the Hellenistic *εὐδοκεῖν ἐν* (x. 38), with Greek writers *εὐδοκεῖν τινα*.

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

Vv. 8–10. Contrasting of the two main elements in the citation just adduced, and emphasizing of the fact that *the on-*

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

Ver. 9. *Τότε εἶρηκεν*] are words of the author, and form the apodosis to *ἀνώτερον λέγων*, ver. 8. Quite erroneously does Peirce, who, with Chrysostom, *Hom.* xvii. and the Vulgate (*tunc dixi*), instead of *τότε εἶρηκεν* will read *τότε εἶπον*, which, however, only arose from ver. 7, make the apodosis begin first with *ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον*. — *τότε*, however, not *ὑστερον*, which would more exactly accord with the *ἀνώτερον*, ver. 8, the author wrote, because the *τότε εἶπον* of the citation was still fresh in his memory. — *ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ*] *he abolishes the first, or*

deprives it of validity, *in order to establish the second* as the norm in force (Rom. iii. 31). Parenthetical insertion, so that ver. 10 attaches itself closely to τὸ θέλημα, and is to be separated therefrom only by a comma. The parenthesis serves by way of exclamation to call attention to the importance of the application to be given in ver. 10 to the ἰδοὺ ἥκω κ.τ.λ. Subject in ἀναιρεῖ is naturally here also *Christ*; not “the Spirit of God,” as Kurtz arbitrarily supposes. — τὸ πρῶτον] *sc.* τὸ προσφέρειν θυσίας καὶ προσφορὰς κ.τ.λ. — τὸ δεύτερον] *sc.* τὸ ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ. Theodoret: πρῶτον εἶπε τὴν τῶν ἀλόγων θυσίαν, δεύτερον δὲ τὴν λογικὴν, τὴν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ προσενεχθεῖσαν. Wrongly does Peirce take τὸ πρῶτον and τὸ δεύτερον adjectivally, in supplementing to each τὸ θέλημα θεοῦ. With equally little warrant Carpzov: the διαθήκη πρώτη and the διαθήκη καινὴ, or the ἱερωσύνη κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρὼν and the ἱερωσύνη κατὰ ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδέκ, are meant; as also Stein: *the O. T. and the N. T. economy*.

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

Vv. 11–14. Renewed emphasizing of the main distinction between the Jewish high priest and Christ. The former repeats day by day the same sacrifices without being able to effect thereby the cancelling of sin; Christ has by His single

sacrifice procured everlasting sanctification. This the main thought of vv. 11-14. Into the same, however, there is at the same time introduced a subordinate feature, by virtue of the opposition of the ἔστηκεν and ἐκάθισεν, by which likewise is manifest the pre-eminence of Christ over the Levitical high priests. The Jewish high priests were required to accomplish their ministration *standing* (comp. Dent. x. 8, xviii. 7; Judg. xx. 28, *al.*), were thus characterized as servants or inferiors (comp. also Jas. ii. 3); whereas in Christ's sitting down at the right hand of God, His participation in the divine majesty and glory is proclaimed.

Ver. 11. Καὶ πᾶς] καὶ is the *explanatory*: *and indeed*. It develops the ἐφάπαξ, ver. 10, and belongs equally to ver. 12 as to ver. 11. — ἀρχιερέως] comp. the critical remark. — καθ' ἡμέραν] see at vii. 27. — περιελεῖν] stronger than ἀφαιρεῖν, ver. 4. Literally: *take away round about*.

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

Ver. 13. Τὸ λοιπόν] *henceforth, sc.* from the time of His sitting down at the right hand of God. What is meant is the time yet intervening before the coming in of the Parousia. The taking of τὸ λοιπόν in the *relative* sense: "as regards the rest, concerning the rest" (Kurtz), is, on account of the close coherence with ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως, unnatural, for which reason also the passages adduced by Kurtz as supposed parallels, Eph. vi. 10, Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8, 1 Thess. iv. 1, 2 Thess. iii. 1, do not admit of comparison. — The object of the waiting is expressed by our author in the language of Ps. cx. 1. — The ἐκάθισεν . . . τὸ λοιπόν ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως . . . involves for the rest the supposition that the destruction of the enemies of Christ is to be looked for even *before* His Parousia. The author accordingly manifests here, too, a certain diversity in his mode of viewing the subject from that of the Apostle Paul, since the latter (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 22-28) anticipates

the destruction of the anti-Christian powers only after the time of Christ's Parousia. The supposition, which de Wette holds possible for the removal of this difference, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews "thought only of the triumph of the gospel among the nations, even as Paul also expected the universal diffusion of the gospel and the conversion of the Jews before the appearing of Christ," has little probability, considering the absolute and unqualified character of the expression here chosen: *οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ*.

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

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

Ver. 15. *Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*] *Moreover, also, the Holy Ghost bears witness to us*. — *ἡμῖν*] has reference to the Christians generally. Without warrant is it limited by Raphael, Wolf, Baumgarten, and others to the author of the epistle ("the Holy Ghost attests my statement"). — *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*] for it is the Holy Spirit of God who in the passage indicated speaks by the prophet. — The subject in *εἰρηκέναι* is *God*, in that the author makes his own the words *λέγει κύριος* following in ver. 16, although they form an originally constituent part of the citation, in such wise that *μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰρηκέναι . . . ἐκείνας* forms the former member of the proposition; and to this former member all the rest, from *διδούς νόμους μου* to the end of ver. 17, is then opposed by the author as a concluding member, by means of *λέγει κύριος*.

The supposition that the second, or concluding, member of the citation begins only with ver. 17, and that thus before this verse a λέγει, an εἶπ' ἐπιλέγει, a τότε εἴρηκεν, or something of the kind is to be supplemented (Primasius, Clarius, Zeger, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Limborch, Wolf, Carpzov, Stuart, Heinrichs, Alford, Conybeare, Reuss, Hofmann, and others), is to be rejected,—although the main consideration, about which the author is quite specially concerned, follows only in ver. 17,—because it is opposed to the literary accuracy elsewhere prevailing in the Epistle to the Hebrews. For the same reason, too, the ὑστερον λέγει, which several mss. (but only among those of late date) and some translations add at the close of ver. 16, is to be regarded as a gloss.

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

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

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

Ver. 19-xiii. 25. The dogmatic investigations are at an end; on the ground thereof the author now applies himself anew to exhortations to the readers. These are at first of the same kind as those before addressed to the readers, and are distinguished from the latter only by their greater copiousness of detail, afterwards, however, assume a greater generality of contents. These are followed by the close of the epistle.

Vv. 19-25. The readers, in possession of such an exalted High Priest, and of the blessings obtained by Him, are with decision and constancy to persevere in the Christian faith, to incite each other to love and good works, and not—as had become a practice with some—to forsake the assemblies for Christian worship. So much the more should they thus act, since the Parousia is near at hand. Comp. on vv. 19-25 the similar exhortation iv. 14, 16.

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

Ver. 20. “*Ἦν*] *sc. εἴσοδον*. Not as yet with *ὁδόν* (Carpzov, Stuart, and others) is *ἦν* to be combined as indication of object, in such wise that merely *πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν* would form the predicate; but still less is *παρρησίαν* (Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, *al.*) to be supplemented to *ἦν*. For against the former decides the order of the words, against the latter the manifest correspondence in which *εἴσοδον*, ver. 19, and *ὁδόν*, ver. 20, stand to each other. The *ὁδός*, namely, characterized ver. 19 as to its *goal* (as *εἴσodos τῶν ἁγίων*), is, ver. 20, further described with regard to its nature and constitution (as *ὁδός πρόσφατος* and *ζῶσα*). — *ἦν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσ-*

ἔατον καὶ ζῶσαν] *which He for us* (in order that we may walk in it) *has consecrated* (*inaugurated*, in that He Himself first passed through it) *as a new* (newly-opened, hitherto inaccessible, comp. ix. 8 ; Theodoret : ὡς τότε πρῶτον φανείσαν) *and living way*. πρόσφατος, originally : *fresh slain* ; then in general : *fresh, new, recens*. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 374 f. — ζῶσα, however, that way or entrance is called, not because it “ever remains, and needs not, like that into the earthly sanctuary, to be consecrated every year by fresh blood” (Bleek, after the precedent of Ernesti, Schulz, and others ; comp. also Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact), but because it is *living in its efficacy* (comp. ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, John vi. 51), in such wise that it leads to the goal of everlasting life. The contrast is found in the inefficaciousness of the entrance into the earthly holy of holies. — διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τούτέστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ] *through the veil, that is to say, His flesh*. As the high priest must pass through the concealing veil, in order to come within the earthly Holy of Holies, thus also the flesh of Christ formed a veil, which must first be withdrawn or removed (comp. Matt. xxvii. 51 ; Mark xv. 38 ; Luke xxiii. 45) ere the entrance into the heavenly Holy of Holies could be rendered possible. — διὰ] is to be taken *locally*,—wrongly is it understood by Stein as *instrumental*,—and is not to be combined with ἐνεκαίνισεν (Böhme, Delitzsch, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 253 ; Alford, Kluge), but is to be attached to ὁδόν, as a nearer definition, standing upon a parallel with πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν, seeing that an οὖσαν or ἄγουσαν naturally suggests itself by way of supplement. — τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ] depends immediately upon the preceding διὰ, not first, as Peirce and Carpzov maintain, upon a τοῦ καταπετάσματος to be supplied.

Ver. 21 is still governed by ἔχοντες, ver. 19. As τὰ ἅγια, ver. 19, was chosen as a general designation instead of the special τὰ ἅγια ἁγίων, so here (comp. v. 6, vii. 1, 3, *al.*) the general ἱερέα stands in the sense of the special ἀρχιερέα, and μέγαν is, as iv. 14, expression of the exaltedness of this High Priest (against Stuart, Klee, Stein, Ewald, McCaul, and others, who take ἱερέα μέγαν together as a designation of the High Priest). — ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ] *over the house of God*.

Comp. iii. 6. Theodoret, Oecumenius, Estius, Grotius, Calov, Tholuck, Stengel, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 454), Maier, Kurtz, and others understand by these words, in accordance with iii. 2, 6, *the household of God*, or the *believers*, by which, however, the unity of the figure is needlessly destroyed. The allusion is to *heaven* or the heavenly sanctuary, as the dwelling-place of God, over which Christ rules as High Priest.¹

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

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

¹ That Delitzsch—who is followed therein by Alford—will have us understand, as the *οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ* in our passage at the same time “the church” and “the heaven of glory,” can be looked upon only as an instance of manifest error.

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

¹ A third mode of combining, followed by Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, 2 Aufl. p. 178 f.), according to which *ἐρραντισμένοι* is separated by a full stop from that which precedes, and is conjoined with *κατέχωμεν*, will—since thereby the harmonic clause-formation of the whole delicately-arranged period, vv. 19-23, is rudely shattered—hardly meet with approval on any side. The period so euphoniously commenced would be lacking in the appropriate conclusion, the supposed new clause in the appropriate beginning.

illa aqua, qua suos perfundit Christus, ipsius etiam sanguine non excluso," we are forbidden by the addition of τὸ σῶμα, which implies likewise the reminiscence of an outward act. — καθαρῶ] that which is pure, and in consequence thereof also makes pure. — κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῇ] let us hold fast the confession of hope as an unbending, unswerving one. — κατέχωμεν] inasmuch as the ὁμολογία became at once, with baptism, the possession of believers. — τὴν ὁμολογίαν] may here be taken *actively* (the confessing of the hope), but it may also be taken *passively* (the confession which has as its subject the Christian's hope). — ἀκλινῇ] stronger than βεβαίαν, iii. 6, 14. — πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγελάμενος] for faithful (so that He keeps that which He promises; comp. 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13; 1 Thess. v. 24) is He who has given the promises (namely, God). Ground of encouragement for the κατέχειν.

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

Ver. 25. Μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τισίν] while not forsaking (ceasing to frequent), as

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

(comp. ver. 37), and which the readers themselves already saw drawing nigh in the agitations and commotions which preceded the Jewish war, such as had already begun to appear.

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

Ver. 26. Ἐκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας] *For if we sin wilfully (i.e. against our better knowledge and conscience) after having received the certain knowledge of the truth; so that we become recreant to Christianity (comp. ver. 29), to which the ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν αὐτῶν forms the dangerous preliminary step. The ἐκουσίως ἁμαρτάνοντες are the opposite of the ἀγνοοῦντες καὶ πλανώμενοι, v. 2,¹ and the participle present indicates the continuous or habitual character of the action. — ἡ ἀλήθεια is the truth absolutely, as this has been revealed by Christianity. The ἐπίγνωσις of this absolute truth, however, embraces, along with the recognition thereof by the understanding, also the having become conscious of its bliss-giving effects in one's own experience. Comp. vi. 4, 5. — οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία] *there remains in relation to sins, i.e. for the expiation thereof, no more sacrifice; inasmuch, namely, as the sin-cancelling sacrifice of Christ, the communion of which we then renounce, is a sacrifice which takes place only once, is not further repeated, while at the**

¹ The assertion of Kurtz, that, if this remark were true, the author would be expressing "a dogma in its consequences truly subversive, and destructive of the whole Christian soteriology," inasmuch as it would "imperatively follow therefrom, that even under the New Covenant only those who transgressed from ignorance and error could find forgiveness with God for Christ's sake, while all who had been guilty of a conscious and intentional sin must beyond hope of deliverance fall victims to the judgment of everlasting damnation," is a precipitate one, since the special limitation within which the expression ἐκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν was used was naturally afforded to the reader, quite apart from the investigation already preceding at vi. 4 ff., even from our section itself.

same time the Levitical sacrifices are unable to effect the cancelling of sins. Bengel: *Fructus ex sacrificio Christi semper patet non repudiantibus; qui autem repudiant, non aliud habent.*

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

Vv. 28, 29. That in reality the consequences of an ἐκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας are so terrible as was asserted at ver. 27, the author renders evident by a conclusion *a minore ad majus*. Apostasy from the

Mosaic law itself is punishable with death; how much greater thus must be the punishment of him who, by apostasy from Christ, has treated with contumely the Son of God, of whose redeeming benefits he has already had experience! With the conclusion in vv. 28, 29 we may compare, as regards the thoughts, ii. 2, 3, xii. 25; as regards the form, however, the utterances just noticed differ from that before us, in the respect that there the first member of the comparison appears as a hypothetical premiss, here as an independent statement. ἀθετήσας τις νόμον Μωϋσέως κ.τ.λ.] *He who has set at nought the Mosaic law, has in opposition to his better knowledge and conscience violated or broken it, dies, without any one compassionating him, upon the deposition of two or three witnesses.* Although death was imposed as the punishment for many single transgressions of the Mosaic law (Ex. xxi. 15 ff., xxxi. 14; Lev. xvii. 14; Deut. xxii. 22 ff., *al.*), yet the author certainly has reference, as is evident from the addition: ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν, and as is required also by the parallel relation to ver. 29, quite specially to the ordinance, Deut. xvii. 2-7 [cf. also Num. xv. 30, 31], in conformity with which the punishment of death was inflicted upon the man who, by idolatry, apostatized from Jehovah. Comp. *l.c.* ver. 6, LXX.: ἐπὶ δυσὶ μάρτυσιν ἢ ἐπὶ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν ἀποθανέεται. — ἐπὶ] as ix. 17: *upon condition that two or three witnesses depose against him.*

Ver. 29. *Of how much more severe punishment, think ye, will he be counted worthy, who, etc.* — With δοκεῖτε the author leaves the decision to the readers, inasmuch as on the question how this will be given, no doubt whatever can prevail. — ἀξιωθήσεται] *sc.* by God at the judgment. — τιμωρία in the N. T. only here. — ὁ καταπατήσας] *who has trodden under foot,* as though it were a contemptible, useless thing. A strong expression. Designation of the bold contemning and insulting of Him who is nevertheless the Son of God, and with whom one has become personally acquainted as the Redeemer. — τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης] *the blood of the covenant, i.e.* the blood which Christ shed for the sealing of the New Covenant for the redemption of mankind. Comp. ix. 15 ff. — κοινόν] *either: as common, ordinary blood, not distinguished in any respect*

from other blood (Peshito, Occumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, Beza, Schlichting, Bengel, Schulz, Stuart, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, and others), or—what is better, because stronger, and on that account more in accord with the other statements—as *impure* (Vulgate, Luther, Grotius, Carpzov, Michaelis, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 769; Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others), *i.e.* as the blood of a transgressor, which Christ must be, if He was not the Son of God and the Redeemer. — ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη] contrasting addition to κοινὸν ἡγῆσάμενος, and paronomasia: *by the communion with which he was nevertheless sanctified, or: the sanctifying efficacy of which he has nevertheless felt in his own person.* — καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας] and has done despite to the Spirit of Grace, *sc.* by scorn and mockery of the wondrous unfolding of that Spirit's power in the life of the Christians. The compound form ἐνυβρίζειν τινί or τί, found, apart from the poets (Soph. *Phil.* 342), only with the later Greeks. In the N. T. ἀπαξ λεγόμενον. — τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος] the Holy Spirit, who is a gift of the divine grace.

Ver. 30. The χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας, ver. 29, is a matter for the most serious consideration. This the declarations of God Himself in the Scriptures prove. — οἶδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα] *for we know Him who hath spoken, i.e.* we know what it means when God makes predictions like those which follow. — The first utterance is without doubt from Deut. xxxii. 35. It deviates from the Hebrew original (עֲשֵׂה נִקְמָה לִּי), but still more from the LXX. (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω); on the other hand, it agrees to so great an extent with Paul's mode of citing the same in Rom. xii. 19, that even the λέγει κύριος, which is wanting in Deuteronomy, is found in both these places. This agreement arises, according to Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, and Reiche, (*Comm. Crit.* p. 97 (comp. also Böhmke), from a deriving of the citation from the Epistle to the Romans; while according to Meyer (at Rom. xii. 19, 2, 3, and 4 Aufl.) the identical words: ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, are to be traced back to the paraphrase of Onkelos (עֲשֵׂה נִקְמָה לִּי) as the common source employed by Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Yet with much greater

probability is the coincidence to be explained by the supposition that the utterance, in the form adopted here as with Paul, had become proverbial. This was also the later view of Meyer (see Meyer on *Rom.* xii. 19, 5 Aufl. p. 551 f.). — The second utterance: *κρινεῖ κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ*, attached by means of *καὶ πάλιν* (i. 5, ii. 13), is found in like form, Deut. xxxii. 36 and Ps. cxxxv. 14. This *κρίνειν τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ* has, in the mind of the author of the epistle, the general signification of the holding of judgment upon His people, so that the recreant members among the same will not be able to escape punishment. Different is the sense of the original: *He shall do justice for His people*. Delitzsch, it is true, who is followed therein by Maier, Kluge, Moll, and Hofmann, will not acknowledge such diversity of the sense. But he is able to remove such diversity only, in that—manifestly led thereto in the interest of a mistaken harmonistic method—he foists upon the author of the epistle the statement: “the Lord will do justice for His church, and punish its betrayers and blasphemers;” a statement of which the first half—as opposed to the grammatical meaning of *κρίνειν*, as well as to the connection with ver. 26, since this latter leads of necessity not to the idea of rendering justice to any one, but exclusively to the idea of punitive judgment—is only arbitrarily imported.

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

Vv. 32–39. There follows after the warning an arousing. Mindful of the Christian manliness which the readers had displayed in former days, they are not to lose Christian joyfulness, but rather with patience to persevere in the Christian life; for only quite a short time will now elapse

before the return of Christ and the coming in of the promised fulness of blessing. Comp. vi. 9 ff. — Theodoret: *Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ταῦτα ἱκανὰ ἦν αὐτοὺς ἀνιᾶσαι, ὀλιγωρίαν αἰνιττόμενα καὶ τῶν θείων ἀμέλειαν, κεράννυσι τῶν εἰρημένων τὸ αὐστηρὸν τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν ἤδη κατορθωμένων. Οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως εἰς προθυμίαν διεγείρει, ὥς τῶν οἰκείων κατορθωμάτων μνήμη.* — Of the facts themselves, of which mention is made vv. 32–34, nothing further is known from other sources. That the author, as Bleek, II. 2, p. 707, thinks possible, had before his mind “the whole first period of the Christian church at Jerusalem, in which the church still held firmly together, and particularly the persecutions which preceded and followed the martyrdom of Stephen,” is hardly to be supposed. For only in a very indirect way could praise be bestowed upon the recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews for their behaviour under *these* afflictions, seeing they formed a second generation of the Palestinian Christians, who, according to xii. 4, had as yet been spared persecutions having a bloody termination.

Ver. 32. *Φωτισθέντες*] *after ye were illumined, i.e. after ye had recognised Christ as the Saviour of men, and ranked yourselves among His confessors.* Comp. vi. 4. — *ἄθλησιν*] a word of the later Greek style, in the N. T., however, a *ἁπαξ λεγόμενον*, combines with *παθημάτων* into a single idea: *contest of sufferings*. Chrysostom: *οὐχ ἀπλῶς εἶπεν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε, ἀλλὰ μετὰ προσθήκης τοῦ πολλήν. Καὶ οὐκ εἶπε πειρασμούς, ἀλλὰ ἄθλησιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐγκωμίον ὄνομα καὶ ἐπαίνων μεγίστων.* — *ὑπομένειν*] *to sustain*, here with the subsidiary notion of stedfastness and unweariedness.

Ver. 33. *Τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δέ*] *on the one hand . . . on the other; partly . . . partly.* A genuinely Greek formula (comp. Wetstein *ad loc.*). In the N. T. only here. — *τοῦτο μὲν ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσιν θεατριζόμενοι*] *in that, on the one hand, by conditions of infamy* (xi. 26, xiii. 13) *and by tribulations, ye were made a spectacle* (were exposed publicly to reviling). *ὀνειδισμοί* (belonging to the later period of the Greek language; see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 512) has reference to the assaults upon honour and good name, *θλίψεις* to assaults upon the person (the life) and outward possessions. — *θεατριζόμενοι*] comp. 1 Cor. iv. 9: *θέατρον*

ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις. The verb only here and with the Church Fathers. — τοῦτο δὲ κοινωνοὶ . . . γεννηθέντες] and, on the other hand, ye became associates (fellow-sufferers) . . . sc. by the administering of consolation, and by efforts for the alleviation of their sufferings. κοινωνοὶ γεννηθέντες is elucidated by συνεπαθήσατε, ver. 34, thus alludes equally as the first half of the sentence to historic facts. Arbitrarily therefore Ebrard: the expression indicates that the readers, “by the act of their conversion, had become once for all associates in that community, of which they knew that it thus fared, or was thus wont to fare with it.” — τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφόμενων] of those who were in such condition (sc. ἐν θλίψεσιν καὶ ὀνειδισμοῖς). Kypke, Storr, Böhme, Kuinoel, and others supplement the οὕτως from the πολλὴν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων, ver. 32: of those who thus walked, i.e. sustained with great steadfastness the contest of sufferings. In favour of this interpretation the authority of the ordinary Biblical use of ἀναστρέφεσθαι may no doubt be urged. Since, however, πολλὴν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων, ver. 32, is the general statement, which afterwards, ver. 33, separates into two special subdivisions by means of τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δέ, so οὕτως in the second member can only refer back to the immediately foregoing characterization in the first member.

Ver. 34. Confirmatory elucidation of ver. 33, and that in such form that καὶ . . . συνεπαθήσατε corresponds to the latter half of ver. 33, and καὶ . . . προσεδέξασθε to the former half thereof. — καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμίῳις συνεπαθήσατε] for ye had both compassion (iv. 15) on the prisoners, in that ye bestowed upon them active sympathy. — καὶ τὴν ἄρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.] and also accepted (comp. xi. 35) with joy the plundering of your goods, with joy, or willingly submitted to it. Wrongly Heinrichs, according to whom προσδέχεσθαι here expresses, at the same time, the idea of “expectare” and of “recipere,” so that we have to translate: “ye looked for it.” — γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς κρεῖττονα ὑπαρξιν καὶ μένουσαν] indication of motive for καὶ τὴν ἄρπαγὴν κ.τ.λ.: knowing that ye have for yourselves (as your true possession) a better property (Acts ii. 45), and that an

abiding one, namely, the spiritual, everlasting blessings of Christianity, of which no power of the earth can deprive you. Comp. Matt. vi. 20; Luke xii. 33.

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

Ver. 36. Justification of the foregoing exhortation μὴ ἀποβάλητε. It is true the readers have already distinguished themselves by Christian manliness; but what is needing to them in order to reach the goal is steadfastness and perseverance, since they are beginning to grow lukewarm in Christianity. ὑπομονῆς is therefore, as the principal notion, emphatically prefixed. — τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ] *that which God wills*, or *requires*, i.e. in accordance with the context: not merely the having become believers in Christ, but also *the steadfast continuance in faith unto the end*. Theophylact: θέλημα θεοῦ τὸ ἄχρι τέλους ὑπομεῖναι. Against the connection Bleek: τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ is "the sanctification of men by the sacrifice of the Son of God" (vv. 7, 9, 10), and consequently the ποιεῖν thereof the willing submission to be sanctified by the Redeemer. Too general the acceptance of

Tholuck (similarly Stein and others): "the regulation [*Normirung*] of the life in accordance with the divine will," without further limitation, is that which is meant. — *ποιήσαντες*] refers not to that which, according to ver. 32 ff., has already been accomplished by the readers (Bengel); nor does it denote something simultaneous with the *κομίζεσθαι*, or rather without regard to time therewith coinciding (Delitzsch, Alford); it is employed in a strictly *aoristic* sense, and points on to the future, inasmuch as the *ποιῆσαι* must already have become a completed fact, before the *κομίζεσθαι*, as yet belonging to the future, can be realized. — *τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν*] *the promise*, *i.e.* that which is promised, the promised everlasting blessedness.

Vv. 37, 38. Ground of encouragement to the *ὑπομονή*, of which the readers stood in need, expressed with a free application of the words of Hab. ii. 3, 4, according to the LXX. Continuance is necessary for the readers, and that continuance, indeed, only for a short time, since the return of Christ is to be looked for within a very short space of time, and then to those who have persevered in the faith everlasting life will be the portion conferred; the apostates, on the other hand, shall be overtaken by destruction. — The words *ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον* are not a constituent part of the citation, but proceed from the author himself. — *μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον*] is found Isa. xxvi. 20, and signifies literally: a little, how much, how much! *i.e.* a very, very little, or *a very short time*. *μικρόν* (John xiv. 19, xvi. 16 ff.) is *nominative*, — not accusative to the question *when*, as is supposed by Bleek (but only in his larger *Comm.*; otherwise in his later *Vorlesungen*, p. 417), Bisping, Alford, and Hofmann, as also Meyer on John xiii. 33, — and nothing more than *ἔστιν* is to be supplemented to the same (see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 544). The reduplication of the *ὅσον*, however, serves for the significant strengthening of the notion. To be compared Aristoph. *Vesp.* 213: *τί οὐκ ἀπεκοιμήθημεν ὅσον ὅσον στίλην*; Arrian, *Indic.* xxix. 15: *ὀλίγοι δὲ αὐτῶν σπεύρουσιν ὅσον ὅσον τῆς χάρης*. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* 726. — *ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ χρονεῖ*] *and then He that cometh will come, and will not delay*. — LXX. *i.e.* ver. 3: *διότι ἔτι ὄρασις εἰς καιρὸν*

καὶ ἀνατελεῖ εἰς πέρας καὶ οὐκ εἰς κενόν· ἐὰν ὑστερήσῃ, ὑπόμεινον αὐτόν, ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ. In the sense of the prophet, the discourse is of the certain fulfilment of the prophecy regarding the overthrow of the Chaldees. The LXX., however, wrongly translated the words, and as the ἐρχόμενος looked upon either *God* or *the Messiah*, of whom also the later Jewish theologians interpreted the passage (see Wetstein *ad loc.*). Of the *Messiah* the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also understands the expression, and therefore adds the article ὁ to ἐρχόμενος. In like manner ὁ ἐρχόμενος appears, Matt. xi. 3, Luke vii. 19, as a current appellation of the Messiah (based upon Dan. vii. 13; Zech. ix. 9; Mal. iii. 1; Ps. xl. 8 [7], cxviii. 26). Only in the instances mentioned the *first* appearing of the Messiah upon earth is intended, whereas in our passage (as also very frequently by ἔρχεσθαι elsewhere in the N. T., e.g. 1 Cor. xi. 26; Acts i. 11; Matt. xvi. 27, 28; John xxi. 22, 23) the *return of Christ*, as of the Messiah crucified upon earth and exalted to heaven, for the consummation of the kingdom of God, is that which is referred to. Arbitrarily Carpzov, Heinrichs, Bloomfield, Ebrard, and others: a coming *for the destruction of Jerusalem* is here to be thought of.

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

πίστις here closely attaches itself to the Hebrew *אֱמוּנָה*. The meaning, in harmony with the conception prevailing elsewhere in the Epistle to the Hebrews, divergent from that of Paul, is the believing, faithfully enduring trust *in God and His promises*. The second member, *καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστέλληται κ.τ.λ.*, has been misunderstood by the LXX. In the Hebrew: *וְהָיָה בְּלִבּוֹ לֹא-תָקִים*, behold, lifted up, not upright is his (sc. the Chaldean's) soul in him. — *ἐὰν ὑποστέλληται*] *if so be that he with faint heart draws back*. Comp. Gal. ii. 12. In the application: if he becomes lukewarm in Christianity, and apostatizes from the same. *ὑποστέλληται* does not stand impersonally; nor have we, with Grotius, Maier, and others, to supply *τίς*, or, with de Wette, Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 487 (less decidedly, 5 Aufl. p. 427), and Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr.* p. 117, to supplement from the foregoing *ὁ δίκαιος* the general idea *ἄνθρωπος* as subject. The subject is still the foregoing *ὁ δίκαιός μου*. This is, moreover, placed beyond doubt, since *δίκαιος* above is not to be taken in the narrower Pauline sense, but in the general sense of the devout man; he, however, who is in this sense *δίκαιος*, ceases by the *ὑποστέλλεσθαι* to be a *δίκαιος*. — *ἡ ψυχὴ μου*] *μου* has reference to *God*, not to *Christ* (Oecumenius, as likewise, but with hesitation, Theophylact, as more recently Rielm, *l.c.*), still less to the author of the epistle (Calvin: *perinde accipiendum est, ac si ex suo sensu apostolus proferret hanc sententiam. Neque enim illi propositum fuit exacte recitare prophetæ verba, sed duntaxat locum notare, ut ad propriorem intuitum invitaret lectores*).

Ver. 39. The author expresses his confidence that the readers and himself belong not to the class of men who, because they draw back from Christianity out of cowardly misgiving, fall a prey to destruction, but rather to the class of those who do not grow weary in the Christian faith, and therefore attain to life. This expression of confidence is in its essence an admonition, and indeed a more urgent one than though the direct form of exhortation had been chosen. — To *ἐσμέν* Grotius, Wolf, Carpzov, Heinrichs, and many others erroneously supplement *τέκνα* or *υἱοί*. For *εἶναι*, with the mere genitive, is a well-known genuinely Greek manner of

expressing a relation of *pertaining* to a thing. See Bernhardt, *Syntax*, p. 165; Kühner, II. p. 167. — εἰς ἀπώλειαν . . . εἰς περιποίησιν ζωῆς] Corroborative allusion to the result of the two opposite lines of action. — ἀπώλεια is everlasting perdition, and περιποίησις ψυχῆς (comp. 1 Thess. v. 9 : εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας) *gaining of the soul*, i.e. everlasting life and everlasting blessedness. Wrongly Ebrard: of the *bodily deliverance* from the judgment impending over Jerusalem, is the discourse to be understood. — Ψυχῆς, moreover, belongs simply to περιποίησιν, not already, as Böhme and Hofmann will have it, to ἀπώλειαν, since only περιποί., not also ἀπώλ., stood in need of an addition.

CHAPTER XI.

VER. 3. *μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων*] Instead thereof there is read in the Peshito: *ex illis, quae non cernuntur*; in the Vulgate: *ex invisibilibus*; in Lat. D E: *ex non apparentibus*. These translations, however, are a mere interpretative gloss, from which the actual existence of an early reading: *ἐκ μὴ φαινομένων*, cannot at all be inferred. — The preference to the *Recepta*: *τὰ βλεπόμενα*, is merited by the reading *τὸ βλεπόμενον*, commended to attention by Griesbach, adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford, approved also by de Wette, Tholuck, Delitzsch, and others. To be preferred partly on account of the better attestation by means of A D* E* 8, 17, It. Copt. Clem. Didym. Ath. Cyr. *al.*, partly because a mutation from the singular into the plural was more naturally suggested than the opposite. —

VER. 4. Elz.: *μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς ὅμοις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ*. Instead of this, A D* 8* 17 have: *μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁμοίοις αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ*. Adopted by Lachm. But the thought: "in that Abel, in regard to his offerings, gave testimony to God," would be unintelligible, and, moreover, incorrectly and unhappily expressed. Besides, since *μαρτυροῦντος* *κ.τ.λ.* is the unmistakable nearer definition to *ἐμαρτυρήθη*, the context naturally points to *God* as the subject in *μαρτυροῦντος*. Beyond doubt, therefore, *τῷ θεῷ* arose only from the eye of the copyist wandering to the *τῷ θεῷ* at the beginning of the verse. — In place of the *Recepta* *λαλεῖται*, Griesbach (who, however, attaches equal value to the *Recepta*), Bleek, Scholz, Tisch. Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche rightly read *λαλεῖ*. In favour of this is decisive, on the one hand, the important authority of A 8, 17, 23, 31, 39, *al. mult.*, Syr. utr. Arabb. Copt. Armen. Slav. rec. Vulg. Clem. Orig. Athan. Nyss. Chrys. (in comment.) Epiphani. Austerius Damasc. Chron. alex. Theodoret (in textu), Photius ms. Oecum. Theophyl., on the other hand, the *usus loquendi*. For neither in taking *λαλεῖται* in the *middle* sense, with Beza, Er. Schmid, Wolf, Carpzov, Baumgarten, nor yet in the *passive*: *praedicatur, laudatur, in omnium ore est*, with Jos. Scaliger, Lud. de Dieu, Wetstein, Heinrichs, Stengel, should we be warranted on linguistic grounds; quite apart from the fact that, in the

latter acceptance, the statement would be a very trivial one. — Ver. 5. Elz.: ἐὐρίσκειτο. Better attested, however (by A D E **8**, 109, Epiphani.), is the form ὑρίσκειτο, which is found likewise in the LXX. (Gen. v. 24, in the Cod. Alex. Rightly adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford. — In place of the *Recepta*: τῆς μεταθέσεως ἀποῶ, we have to write, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, and others, after A D* **8*** 17, 67** 80, Vulg. It. Copt., merely: τῆς μεταθέσεως, and in place of the received form ἐὐρεσθηκέναι, with Lachm. Tisch. 1, 2, and 7, Delitzsch, and Alford, the form better attested (by A K L, 46, 71, 73, *al.*, Theophyl.) : εὕρεσθηκέναι. — Ver. 8. Elz.: καλούμενος. But A D (E?) Vulg. It. Arm. Theodoret, Jer. Bed. have ὁ καλούμενος. Approved by Mill. Rightly placed in the text by Lachm. and Tisch. 1. — The article τὸν, inserted in the *Recepta* before τόπον, we have, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, and Alford, after A D* **8***, to delete; and, after A D* K, many min. Chrys. Damasc. Theophyl., with Lachm. Tisch. 1, 2, and 7, and Alford, to write ἐμῶν in place of the *Recepta* ἡμελλε. — Ver. 9. καὶ παρώκησεν, which D* E, together with their Latin translation, furnish in place of the *Recepta*: πιστεῖ παρώκησεν, is a later corruption, inasmuch as in ver. 9 a fresh evidence is given of the πιστις of Abraham. — εἰς γῆν] Elz.: εἰς τὴν γῆν. But the article is wanting in A D** K L **8**, very many cursives, with Damasc. and Occum. It is suspected by Griesbach, rightly rejected by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford. — Ver. 11. καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας] Elz.: καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας ἔτεκεν. But ἔτεκεν is a later gloss, which is condemned by A D* **8*** 17, Vulg. It. Copt. Sah. Aeth. utr. Chrys. (codd.). It was already regarded as spurious by Beza, Grotius, Mill (*Proleg.* 1355), Bengel; and is rightly deleted by Griesbach, Knapp, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Alford, and others. — Ver. 12. In place of the *Recepta* ἐγεννήθησαν, Lachm. Bleek, Delitzsch, and Alford read ἐγενήθησαν, which, on account of the stronger attestation by A D* K, 109, 219* *al.* (Vulg. It.: orti sunt), is to be preferred. — ὥς ἡ ἄμμος] So already the Editt. Complut. and Steph. 2, then Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, and others. Elz.: ὥσει ἄμμος. Against A D (* and ** and ***) E K L **8**, 23, 37, 46, 47, *al. mult.*, Chrys. (codd.) Damasc. Occum. Theophyl. — ἡ παρὰ τὸ ζῆλον] is wanting in D* E, in their Latin translation, and in Aeth. utr. The origin of the omission is to be traced back to a mere error in writing, to which the resemblance of sound of the closing letters in ἄμμος and ζῆλος gave occasion. — Ver. 13. In place of the *Recepta* μὴ

¹ D* 31: καὶ ὥς ἡ.

λαβόντες, Lachm. reads $\mu\eta\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\delta\epsilon\acute{\xi}\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$. But the *Recepta* is supported by the considerable authority of D E K L \aleph^{***} almost all the cursives, Theodoret, and others; while the reading of Lachm., probably arising from ver. 35, has only the testimony of A in its favour, and is devoid of meaning. For $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\delta\epsilon\acute{\xi}\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ could, in accordance with the usage prevailing elsewhere, only signify either the subjective *having expected* (having awaited), or the subjective *having admitted*. But neither of these meanings would be compatible with the statement of ver. 13, which would be suitably expressed only if $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\delta\epsilon\acute{\xi}\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ could be explained of the objective *having received*, what is never denoted by this verb. The reading $\mu\eta\ \kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ in \aleph^* some cursives (17, 23* 39, *al.*), and, with Chrys. (in comment.) Damasc. Theophyl. (adopted by Tisch. 8), was only called forth by the similar turn x. 36, xi. 39. — $\iota\delta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$] Elz.: $\iota\delta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. But the addition $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ has almost all the witnesses (also \aleph) against it. It is found in only two or three cursives, and is an explanatory gloss to $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\alpha\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$. Comp. Chrysostom: $\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\tau\omega\ \pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\ \eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \pi\epsilon\pi\iota\ \alpha\delta\iota\theta\omicron\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\alpha\sigma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \alpha\delta\iota\theta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$; Oecumenius: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\alpha\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\ \pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. — Ver. 15. $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$] Elz. Griesbach (who, however, has placed $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ on the inner margin), Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Bloomfield: $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$. Against A D* E* \aleph^* 17, 73, 80, Athan. (ed. Bened.; edd. *al.*: $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\eta}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$) Chron. alex. Damasc. — Ver. 16. $\nu\upsilon\nu\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\acute{\epsilon}$] Elz. Matt. Bloomfield: $\nu\upsilon\nu\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\acute{\epsilon}$. Against decisive witnesses (A D E \aleph , 44, 48, *al. perm.*, Athan. Chrys. Theodoret, Oecum.). — Ver. 19. The *Recepta* $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\nu$ has the support of D E K L \aleph , almost all min. Orig. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. *al.*; Lachm. and Tisch. 1 read, after A ($\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$), 17, 71, Cyr. Chron. alex.: $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$. — Elz.: $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$; A D** : $\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$. Adopted by Lachm. into the text. — Ver. 20. In place of the *Recepta* $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 2, 7, Alford have adopted $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota$, after A D* 17, 23, 37, *al.*, Vulg. It. Chrys. (but not in all mss. and editt.) Theodoret, Damasc. Sedul. Bede. Rightly. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ might appear superfluous, and on that account was more likely to be omitted than added. — Ver. 23. Instead of the *Recepta* $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$, Lachm. reads $\delta\acute{\omicron}\gamma\mu\alpha$. But this reading is founded only in a conjectural manner upon A, inasmuch as all the letters of the word except the $\acute{\omicron}$ have been torn away from the Codex. Apart from this, $\delta\acute{\omicron}\gamma\mu\alpha$ is found only in one cursive ms. of the twelfth century (Cod. 34). It is probably a gloss from Luke ii. 1. — At the close of ver. 23, D* E (as also their Latin translation, as well as three codd. of the Vulgate) further add the words: $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\varsigma\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\sigma\chi\epsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\iota\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\iota\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\sigma\eta\nu\ \tau\eta\ \nu\alpha\pi\tau\omega\sigma\eta\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omega\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, as to the spuriousness of which,

although Zeger and Mill (*Prolegg.* 496) held them to be genuine, no doubt can exist, even on account of the μέγας γενόμενος, ver. 24. They are a complementary addition in conformity to Acts vii. 23 ff. — Ver. 26. τῶν Αἰγύπτου] Elz.: τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ. Against D E K L **ς** (also against the later supplementer of B), 31, 44, 46, *al. plur.*, Syr. utr. Copt. *al.*, Clem. Euseb. *al.* Rejected by Griesbach, Matthæi, Knapp, Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, *al.* The τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτου, adopted by Lachm., after A and some cursives (3, 71), owes its origin to an uncompleted correction. — Ver. 28. Instead of the *Recepta* ὁλοθρύνων, A D E, Damasc. have the more correct (ὁλοθρος) form ὁλοθρύνων, which is rightly preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 2, 7, and Alford. — Ver. 29. Elz. has merely ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς. But, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, and Alford, we have to add γῆς, after A D* E **ς**, 17, 31, 47, *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret (cod.), and probably all the versions. Since γῆς was no necessary addition, it could easily get omitted. — Ver. 30. *Recepta*: ἔπασσε. But, after A D* **ς**, 17, 23, 31, *al.*, Chrys. ms., ἔπασσαν (in favour of which, also, ἔπασσον in 37, and Chrys. ms., testifies) is to be looked upon as the original reading. Adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford. Approved by Delitzsch. — Ver. 32. Elz.: ἐπιλείψει γάρ με. With Lachm. Tisch. 7 and 8, and Alford, after A D* **ς**, we have to transpose into: ἐπιλείψει με γάρ. — In that which follows, the *Recepta* reads: περὶ Γεδεὼν, Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψὼν καὶ Ἰεφθάε, Δαυὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουήλ. — Instead thereof, Lachm. reads (and so also Tisch. 1 and 8), as it also stands in the *Codex Sinaiticus*: περὶ Γεδεὼν Βαράκ Σαμψὼν Ἰεφθάε Δαυειδ τε καὶ Σαμουήλ. On internal grounds neither of these forms of the text commends itself. For, in the case of both, the persons here further mentioned would have been enumerated, in contradiction with the mode of proceeding hitherto observed, without regard to the chronology; inasmuch as, historically, Barak was to have been mentioned before Gideon, Jephthah before Samson, Samuel before David. And yet the regularity with which each time the second name designates a person earlier in a chronological respect, points to an order of succession chosen with design. Observe, further, that in the last member, Δαυὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουήλ, there is nowhere found a variation with regard to the particles. There can thus hardly be room for doubt that the foregoing names also were originally arranged in groups of two. It appears, accordingly, the better course to retain the *Recepta*, with the two modifications,—that, with D*, καὶ Βαράκ is read in place of the mere Βαράκ; and then, with A, 17, Vulg. Copt. Arm. Clem. Cyr. Al. Epiphani. Ambr. Bede, the mere Σαμψὼν is read instead of τε

καὶ Σαμψών. (The καὶ before Ἰεφθάς is supported by D E K L, almost all cursives, Syr. *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. *al.*) Thus arises the text: περὶ Γεδεών καὶ Βαράκ, Σαμψών καὶ Ἰεφθάς, Δαυὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουήλ, and the sense is: "of Gideon as well as of Barak, of Samson not less than of Jephthah, of David even as of Samuel." In connection with this form of the text, the otherwise very strange breach in the chronological order disappears, since the discourse advances historically with the addition of each new double member; while, in the double members themselves, the mention of the later person before the earlier is justified by the mention on each occasion of those who are in point of time contemporaries, as also from the consideration of rhetorical effect. — Ver. 34. After A D* 8, Lachm. has adopted μαχαίρης (and so also Tisch. 7 and 8) instead of the *Recepta* μαχαίρας, and, after A D* 8*: ἐδυναμώθησαν (so also Tisch. 8), in place of the *Recepta*: ἐνεδυναμώθησαν. — Ver. 35. γυναικες] Lachm. has, after A D* 8*: γυναῖκας, what, however, rests upon a mere error in transcribing, and is to be rejected as meaningless. — Ver. 37. μαχαίρας] D* 8, Lachm. Tisch. 7 and 8: μαχαίρης. — Ver. 38. The *Recepta* ἐν ἐρημίαις is attested by D E K L, min. Clem. Orig. (twice) Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. *al.* Lachm. and Tisch. 7 and 8 read, with A 8, 71, 73, 118, Orig. (once) Socrat.: ἐπὶ ἐρημίαις, which, however, can have arisen only from an error of the copyist. — Ver. 39. Elz.: τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. A, 80, Arab. Polygl. Lachm.: τὰς ἐπαγγελίας.

Vv. 1–40.¹ The author defines the nature of the πίστις which he requires of the readers, and then presents to them in chronological succession examples thereof from the days of old.

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

¹ P. J. L. Huët, De antiquissimorum Dei cultorum, qui in epistolae ad Hebraeos capite xi. memorantur, fide diversa eademque una. Lugd. Batav. 1824, 8, pp. 27–82.

a firm confidence in regard to that which is hoped for, a being convinced of things which are invisible." Πίστις is accordingly *subject*; ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, as well as πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων, *predicate*; and ἔστιν (which, standing at the beginning, is to be accentuated as the *verbum substantivum*, see Kühner, I. p. 72) emphatically preposed *copula*, with the design of attaching to the presupposition, expressed x. 39, of πίστις as a quality present in the readers, the statement as to the nature and essence of this πίστις. Quite similar is the use of ἔστιν in the beginning of the proposition, 1 Tim. vi. 6: ἔστιν δὲ πορισμὸς μέγας ἡ εὐσέβεια μετὰ αὐταρκείας, and Luke viii. 11: ἔστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή. Grammatically admissible indeed, but to be rejected—because in that case a thought would be expressed which is not suggested by the connection, and, moreover, a truth in regard to which no contradiction whatever was to be expected on the part of the readers—is it when Böhme (as formerly also Winer, *Gramm.*, 3 and 4 Aufl.; otherwise 5 Aufl. p. 70, 6 Aufl. p. 56, 7 Aufl. p. 58 f.) will have ἔστιν taken as a verb substantive, and ὑπόστασις, as likewise ἔλεγχος, taken as apposition to πίστις: "there is, however, a faith, a confidence," etc.—πίστις] without an article, since the author will define the notion of πίστις in general, not exclusively the notion of specifically Christian faith. — ὑπόστασις] is by many explained as "reality" (entity, *Wesenheit*), and placed on a par with οὐσία, *substantia*, *essentia*, and the like, which, however, is already proved to be inadmissible from the fact that the notion of "reality" cannot be immediately applied, but, in order to become fitting, must first be changed into that of an "endowing with reality," in such wise that one can then make out the sense: faith clothes things which are not yet at all present with a substance or real existence, as though they were already present. This mode of interpretation was followed by Chrysostom (ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίδι ἀνυπόστατα εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἡ πίστις ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῖς χαρίζεται μᾶλλον δέ, οὐ χαρίζεται ἀλλ' αὐτό ἐστιν οὐσία αὐτῶν οἷον ἡ ἀνάστασις οὐ παραγέγονεν οὐδὲ ἐστιν ἐν ὑποστάσει, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐλπίς ὑφίστησιν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ψυχῇ), Theodoret (δείκνυσιν ὡς ὑφεστώτα τὰ μηδίπω γεγενημένα), Oecumenius (πίστις ἐστὶν

αὐτὴ ἡ ὑπόστασις καὶ οὐσία τῶν ἐλπιζομένων πραγμάτων ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίσιν ἀνυπόστατά ἐστιν ὡς τέως μὴ παρόντα, ἡ πίστις οὐσία τις αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις γίνεται, εἶναι αὐτὰ καὶ παρεῖναι τρόπον τινὰ παρασκευάζουσα διὰ τοῦ πιστεῦειν εἶναι), Theophylact (οὐσίωσις τῶν μήπω ὄντων καὶ ὑπόστασις τῶν μὴ ὑφ'εστῶτων), by the Vulgate (substantia), by Ambrose, Augustine, Vatablus (rerum, quae sperantur, essentia), II. Stephanus (illud, quod facit, ut jam exstent, quae sperantur), Schlichting, Bengel, Heinrichs, Bisping, and others. — But likewise ὑπόστασις is not to be interpreted either by “fundamentum,” with Faber Stapulensis, Clarius, Schulz, Stein, Stengel, Woerner, and others, nor by “placing before one,” with Castellio (dicitur eorum, quae sperantur, *subjectio*, quod absentia nobis subjiciat ac proponat, efficiatque ut praesentia esse videantur, nec secus eis assentiamur, quam si cerneremus) and Paulus. For neither of the two affords in itself, without further amplification, a satisfactory, precise notion, quite apart from the fact that the last-mentioned signification can hardly be supported by the testimony of linguistic usage. — The alone correct course is consequently, with Luther, Cameron, Grotius, Wolf, Huët, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 702, Alford, Maier, Moll, and others, to take ὑπόστασις, as at iii. 14 (*vid. ad loc.*), as *inner confidence*. — ἐλπιζομένων] *gen. objecti*: of that (or: with regard to that) which is still hoped for, has not yet appeared in an actual form. The main emphasis in the predicate rests upon ἐλπίζομ'ων, as also upon the concluding words, corresponding in apposition thereto, οὐ βλεπομένων. — πραγμάτων] belongs to οὐ βλεπομένων. The conjoining with ἐλπίζομένων (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Estius, Böhme, Woerner, and others) deprives the two halves of the proposition of their rhythmical symmetry. — πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων] *a being convinced* (in mind or heart) of things which are invisible, i.e. a firm inner persuasion of the existence of unseen things, even as though they were manifest to one's eyes. ἔλεγχος here expresses not the active notion of the *convincing* or *assuring* (Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 703; Moll, Hofmann), but, corresponding to the notion of the forementioned

ὑπόστασις, indicates the result of the ἐλέγχειν (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 24), as λόγος that produced by the λέγειν, τύπος that effected by the τύπτειν, etc. To be rejected as unsuitable are the explanations: Proof, *argumentum* (Vulgate, Ambrose, Schlichting, Wolf, Heinrichs, and others); *indiciūm* (Erasmus); *demonstratio* (Calvin, H. Stephanus, Jac. Cappellus, Bengel, Alford, *al.*); *apprehensio* (Clarius); "a certain assurance, guarantee" (Stein), and many others. οὐ βλέπομενα, however, on account of the objective negation, combines together into the unity of notion "invisible," and is a more general characterization than ἐλπίζόμενα. While the latter is restricted to that which is purely future, the former comprehends at the same time that which is already present, and denotes in general the supra-sensuous and heavenly. — Calvin: Nobis vita aeterna promittitur, sed mortuis; nobis sermo fit de beata resurrectione, interea putredine sumus obvoluti; justi pronuntiamur, et habitat in nobis peccatum; audimus nos esse beatos, interea obruimur infinitis miseriis; promittitur bonorum omnium affluentia, prolixo vero esurimus et sitimus; clamat Deus statim se nobis adfuturum, sed videtur surdus esse ad clamores nostros. Quid fieret, nisi spei inniteremur, ac mens nostra praeclucante Dei verbo ac Spiritu per medias tenebras supra mundum emergeret?

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

venerableness. A like name of honour, as elsewhere (i. 1, *al.*) οἱ πατέρες.

Ver. 3. The author is on the point of proving out the truth of ver. 2, in a series of historic instances from the Holy Scriptures of the O. T., when the thought forces itself upon him that the very first section of that sacred book of Scripture relates a fact of which the reality can only be recognised by means of faith. He first of all, therefore, calls attention to this fact, before proceeding, in ver. 4, to the designed enumeration of those historic examples. Certainly not very aptly, since ver. 3 cannot, as ver. 4 ff., serve in proof of the assertion, ver. 2, but, on the contrary, introduces into the examination something heterogeneous in relation to ver. 4 ff. For ver. 3 shows only the necessity for πίστις on our part in regard to a fact belonging to the past and recorded in Scripture; ver. 4 ff. there are placed before our eyes as models historic persons in whom the virtue of πίστις, so constituted as the author demands it of his readers, was livingly present. This judgment, that ver. 3 forms a heterogeneous insertion, is pronounced, indeed, by Delitzsch, to whom Kluge and Moll have acceded, an "unfair one." But the counter observation of Delitzsch: "the author had already at ver. 2, in connection with οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, and particularly in connection with ἐμαρτυρήθησαν, the O. T. Scripture before his mind; so that the statement, although sounding thus personal, is equivalent to the proposition that the O. T. Scripture concedes no recognition to any mode of life which lies not within the province of faith," labours under the defect of logical deliquescence; it is a mere rationalizing of the words of ver. 2, simply and clearly preposed as the theme for that which follows. — [πίστει] *Dat. instrumentalis: by virtue of faith.* — [νοοῦμεν] *we discern.* νοεῖν is the inner perception, accomplished by means of the νοῦς. Comp. Rom. i. 20. — [κατηρτίσθαι] *has been prepared* (comp. LXX. Ps. lxxiv. 16, lxxxix. 38). More expressive than if πεποιῆσθαι had been written. It represents the *having been created* at the same time as a *having been placed in a completed or perfect condition* [xiii. 21]. — [τοὺς αἰῶνας] *the world;* see at i. 2. — [ῥήματι θεοῦ] *by the word* (or authoritative command) *of God.* Reference to the repeated:

"And God said," Gen. i. Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 5; LXX. 1s. xxxiii. 6, cxlviii. 5. Philo, *de sacrif. Abel. et Cain.* p. 140 D (with Mangey, I. p. 175): 'Ο γὰρ θεὸς λέγων ἅμα ἐποίει, μηδὲν μεταξὺ ἀμφοῖν τιθείς. The supposition of Bleek (comp. also Ewald, p. 123), that the author here too thought of the word of God as a personified property, has nothing in its favour, since the expression is sufficiently explained without it. Nor does the δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας, i. 2, compel us to adopt this supposition. For above the special mode of mediately effecting the creation of the world there indicated, stands the higher authorship of God, to which the writer here points in general by the expression ῥήματι θεοῦ. — εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγενέσθαι] not: so that, etc. (so still Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Alford, Conybeare, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Woerner, and the majority of recent expositors). εἰς τό with the infinitive preserves here, too, its ordinary *telic* signification, in that it introduces the purpose of God with regard to the ῥήματι καταρτίζειν τοὺς αἰῶνας. The sense is: *that in accordance with the decree of God, the fact should be ascertained, that from φαινόμενα the βλεπόμενον should have sprung*; consequently that the human race should from the beginning be directed to the necessity for πίστις. — μὴ] belongs to the whole object-clause. So rightly Beza, Piscator, Seb. Schmidt, Er. Schmid, Bengel, Storr, Schulz, Huët, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 58), Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, M'Caul, and Hofmann; while the Peshito, Vulgate, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Occumenius, Theophylact, and almost all later expositors, including also Stengel and Ebrard (Delitzsch is undecided), comprehend μὴ with ἐκ φαινομένων, and then interpret this in the sense of ἐκ μὴ φαινομένων.¹ The latter, in favour of which the supposed parallels which have been adduced prove nothing, is by reason of the position of the words (to say nothing of the

¹ Calvin alone forms an exception, who would have blended together with φαινόμενον into a single word, and finds the sense: "ut non apparentium fierent visa h. e. spectacula," in such wise that the "doctrina" harmonizing with that of Rom. i. 20 should result: "quod in hoc mundo conspicuam habeamus Dei imaginem."

fact that οὐ must have been written in place of μή; for neither 2 Cor. iv. 18, as Delitzsch supposes, nor Rom. iv. 17, as Maier supposes, decides against this rule. See Meyer *ad loc.*) a grammatical impossibility. — τὸ βλεπόμενον] *that which is seen*, or the outward, visible world. The singular represents the same as one complex whole. τὸ βλεπόμενον resumes under another form only the foregoing τοὺς αἰῶνας, whereas the emphasis in the negative final clause rests upon the ἐκ φαινόμενων, which is on that account preposed. — φαινόμενα] are things which appear in outward manifestation, and are perceived by the senses. The expression indicates the domain of the corporal, the material, and there underlies it the conception that the universe did not spring forth by the power of nature from earthly germs or substances, but was created by the mere word of God's omnipotence. In this is contained, it is true, the conception of the creating of the world from nothing. [Cf. 2 Macc. vii. 28.] The opinion of Estius, Schlichting, Limborch, Michaelis, Baumgarten, and others, that the author, with a reference to Gen. i. 2 (specially after the translation of the LXX.: ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος), thought of a visible arising of the worlds out of the invisible chaos already existing, has for its presupposition the erroneous transposal of the μή ἐκ into ἐκ μή, and fails to maintain itself in presence of the fact that the γεγενῆσθαι ἐκ φαινόμενων, as antithesis to the foregoing κατηρτίσθαι ῥήματι θεοῦ, must receive from this latter its nearer defining of signification. Quite untenable is consequently also the opinion of Delitzsch, who, with the assent of Kluge and Kurtz, supplements ἀλλ' ἐκ νοητῶν as opposition to μή ἐκ φαινόμενων, and in connection with the μή φαινόμενα—or if μή is combined with the verb, in connection with the tacitly assumed opposite of the φαινόμενα—imagines the author to have thought, in harmony with the Philonian doctrine, of the divine ideas, out of which the world is supposed to have sprung, in that they were called forth by means of the divine word from their seclusion within the Godhead into the outer phenomenal reality. See against this also Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 59, *Obs.*

Ver. 4. *The example of Abel.* Comp. Gen. iv. 3 ff. — Πίστει] belongs to the whole statement: πλείονα . . . θεῶ.

The conjoining of the same merely with *πλείονα* (Disping) has against it the analogy of the following instances, and would weaken the force of the emphatically preposed *πίστει*. The dative, however, indicates, as Rom. xi. 20 and frequently, the cause or occasion. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 202 f. *By reason of his faith* (or because he had faith) *Abel offered to God a greater sacrifice than Cain*; i.e. the faith of Abel, which was wanting to Cain, was the cause that in the estimation of God Abel's sacrifice had greater value than that of Cain. — *πλείονα θυσίαν*] *a greater sacrifice*, namely, in a *qualitative* respect, thus a better, more excellent one. Comp. iii. 3; Matt. vi. 25, xii. 41, 42, *al.* The *quantitative* acceptance (Valla: *plus hostiarum*; Erasmus, Clarius: *copiosiore hostiam*; Zeger: *abundantiorem*) finds no point of support in the narrative of Genesis, and would unsuitably accentuate a purely external feature. — *παρὰ Κάϊν*] is by Grotius and others made equivalent to *παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Κάϊν*, which is admissible, it is true, but not at all necessary. On *παρά* after the comparative, see at i. 4. — *δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος*] *By it he obtained the testimony that he was righteous*. — *δι' ἧς*] *sc. πίστεως*, not *θυσίας* (Cramer). For the *πίστις* is the main idea in the whole description, and *δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη* manifestly glances back at *ἐν ταύτῃ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν*, ver. 2. — *ἐμαρτυρήθη*] Of whom? Not of *Christ*, by virtue of the declaration Matt. xxiii. 35 (Primasius, Faber Stapulensis, Justinian), but of *God*; as, accordingly, the author himself adds, more nearly defining the *ἐμαρτυρήθη*: *μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ*] *in that*, namely, *God gave testimony in respect of his offerings*. What is meant is the testimony given *in the fact* that God looked with satisfaction upon Abel and his sacrifice (comp. LXX. Gen. iv. 4: *καὶ ἐπεῖδεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἀβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ*), thus, in point of fact, recognised him as a *δίκαιος* (comp. Matt. xxiii. 35: *Ἀβελ τοῦ δικαίου*, and 1 John iii. 12). — *καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ*] *and by virtue of the same* (namely: his faith, not: his sacrifice) *he yet speaks after his death*. — *ἀποθανών*] is a purely parenthetical member: *although he has died*, and forms with *ἔτι λαλεῖ* an oxymoron. Hardly is it in accordance with the intention of the author to comprehend

in one ἀποθανών and δι' αὐτῆς. In addition to the ordinary one, *this* explanation also is proposed by Oecumenius, in referring the pronoun back to the *θυσία* by which the violent death of Abel was occasioned; it is followed by Bengel, with the difference that he supplements δι' αὐτῆς by πίστεως, and will have διὰ taken in the sense of κατὰ or ἐν. — ἔτι] is not the *temporal*: still, *adhuc* (Theodoret: μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος), so that λαλεῖ would signify: he speaks to us of himself and his faith or piety (Theodoret: τὸ δὲ ἔτι λαλεῖ ἀντὶ τοῦ αἰοδιμός ἐστι μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος καὶ πολυθρύλλητος καὶ παρὰ πάντων εὐφημεῖται τῶν εὐσεβῶν; Heinsius, Bengel: loquitur de se et sui similibus contra Cainos, *al.*), or: he summons posterity to the imitation of his faith (Chrysostom: ὁ γὰρ παραινῶν τοῖς ἄλλοις δικαίοις εἶναι, λαλεῖ; Cornelius a Lapide, Valckenaer, Kuinoel, Paulus, Klee, Bloomfield, and others). Rather is ἔτι employed, as Rom. iii. 7 and frequently, in the *logical* sense, and serves for the emphasizing of the contrast: "even being dead," or: "notwithstanding he is dead, he nevertheless speaks," while λαλεῖ is to be regarded as the more vividly descriptive *praesens historicum* (Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 250), and is to be referred to the thought that the shed blood of Abel called to God for vengeance, and God, listening to this cry, was concerned about the slain Abel, as though he were still living. For manifestly, as appears also from the parallel xii. 24, there is an allusion in λαλεῖ to the words, Gen. iv. 10: φωνὴ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρὸς με ἐκ τῆς γῆς.

Vv. 5, 6. *The example of Enoch.* Comp. Gen. v. 21–24. — Πίστει Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη] *By reason of his faith Enoch was caught away*; i.e. even during his lifetime was, like Elijah (2 Kings ii.), caught up to God in heaven. Comp. Eccles. xliv. 16: Ἐνὼχ εὐηρέστησε κυρίῳ καὶ μετετέθη ὑπόδειγμα μετανόιας ταῖς γενεαῖς; *ibid.* xlix. 14: οὐδὲ εἰς ἐκτίσθη οἶος Ἐνὼχ τοιοῦτος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς; Joseph. *Antiq.* i. 3. 4: ἀνεχώρησε πρὸς τὸ θεῖον. — τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον] not consecutively [*so that*], de Wette, Bisping, *al.*, but indication of the design of God: *that he should not see or undergo death* (comp. Luke ii. 26). — καὶ οὐχ ἠύρίσκετο, διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός] derived verbally from the LXX. of Gen. v. 24, as given in the text of the Cod. Alex. — πρὸ

γὰρ . . . γίνεται, ver. 6] It is related in the Scripture concerning Enoch that he was acceptable to God. But this presupposes that he had faith. For to obtain God's approbation without the possession of faith is impossible. Chrysostom: πῶς δὲ πίστει μετετέθη ὁ Ἐνώχ; ὅτι τῆς μεταθέσεως ἡ εὐαρεσθησις αἰτία, τῆς δὲ εὐαρεστήσεως ἡ πίστις. — πρὸ τῆς μεταθέσεως] may be equally well conjoined with μεμαρτύρηται (Piscator, Owen, Huët, Bleek, de Wette, Conybeare, Delitzsch, Kurtz, Hofmann, *al.*), or with εὐαρεστηκέναι (Schlichting, Bengel, Maier, and others). In the former case the sense is: before mention is made in the Scripture of his rapture, the testimony is borne to him in the same, that he pleased God. — εὐαρεστηκέναι] By εὐηρέστησεν the LXX. translate the Hebrew *וַיִּהְיֶה עִנּוֹחַ הָלֶכְתָּה עִנּוֹחַ*: *and he walked with God, i.e. in communion with God, as His most devout worshipper.* — Ver. 6 is a truth of wholly universal application, so that only ἔστιν is to be supplemented to ἀδύνατον. With Er. Schmid, Limborch, Wetstein, and Schulz, to regard the first hemistich of the verse: χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαρεστησαι, as a special statement respecting Enoch, is grammatically inadmissible, since in that case χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον ἦν αὐτὸν εὐαρεστησαι or χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον αὐτὸν εὐαρεστηκέναι must have been written. — εὐαρεστήσαι] *sc. τῷ θεῷ*, naturally understood from that which precedes and follows. The *infin. aorist* expresses, as in the case of the immediately succeeding πιστεῦσαι, the pure verbal notion, without regard to the relation of time. See Kühner, II. p. 80. — ὁ προσερχόμενος τῷ θεῷ] *is he who approaches God, sc. to worship Him; comp. vii. 25, x. 1.* Wrongly; Luther, Calov, Wittich, Rambach, Schulz, Ebrard (transl.): *he who (as Enoch) will come (or is to come) to God.* — ὅτι ἔστιν] *that he is, or exists.* Arbitrarily importing, Jac. Cappellus: "Series sermonis suadet, ut supplicamus ὅτι ἔστιν αὐτοῦ θεός, i. e. qui accedit ad Deum, credere debet eum esse suum Deum." But also the complementing the verb by: "that He exists as one to whom man can draw near with confidence, as the truly living, personal, almighty, all-wise, all-beneficent One" (Bleek), is an unjustifiable act of reading *into* the text. The expression contains only the idea of *existence*. — καί] still dependent upon ὅτι. —

μισθαποδότης] *recompenser, sc.* for the piety manifested in the ἐκζητεῖν αὐτόν (Rom. iii. 11; Acts xv. 17).

Ver. 7. *The example of Noah.* Comp. Gen. vi. 8 ff. — Πίστει] is conjoined by Schulz, Stengel, and others with χρηματισθεῖς. But χρηματισθεῖς forms only a subsidiary element for the making up of the historic situation, whereas that by which Noah proved himself a model of faith is specified by εὐλαβηθεῖς κακεσκέυασεν. πίστει is therefore, as is also done by most, to be combined with this last. — χρηματισθεῖς περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων] belongs together (against Grotius and Hofmann, who unnaturally construe περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπ. with εὐλαβηθεῖς): *instructed by an utterance of God concerning that which was as yet invisible.* The choice of the expression was conditioned by the definition of πίστις, laid down ver. 1, and the subjective negation μηδέπω means: concerning the well-known (τῶν) events, before these were yet to be seen, or their occurrence was to be conjectured. By τὰ μηδέπω βλεπόμενα, however, is meant not only the impending flood, but also, from the use of the plural, the determined destruction of the whole corrupt race of men. With strange inversion of the sense, even “ipsa κιβωτός construenda” is reckoned by Böhme as belonging to that “qualem autē nunquam vidisse Noachum facile credi potest.” For the ark was surely something which was made by Noah himself at the command of God, whereas by τὰ μηδέπω βλεπόμενα can be only meant that which, independent of human activity, rested in the hands of divine omnipotence alone. — εὐλαβηθεῖς] *in devout precaution*, in that he reposed unconditional belief in the word of God, and on that very account took the enjoined measure of preparation in order to remain in safety under the impending destruction. Vatablus, Cornelius a Lapide, Schulz, and others explain: *in the fear of God.* But the τὸν θεόν therein to be supplemented (comp. Eccus. vii. 29; Prov. ii. 8, xxx. 5; Nah. i. 7) could hardly have been omitted. — δι’ ἧς] refers not to σωτηρίαν (Hunnius, Balduin, Pareus), nor yet to κιβωτόν (Chrysostom: ἔδειξεν αὐτοὺς ἀξίους ὄντας κολάσεως, οἳ γε οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς κατασκευῆς ἐσωφρονίζοντο; Oecumenius, Theophylact, Faber Stapulensis, Calvin, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Carpzov, Cramer, Michaelis, Bisping, *al.*), but to

πίστει (Primasius, Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Cajetan, Wolf, Bengel, and almost all modern expositors), as the foregoing main idea; and καὶ τῆς . . . κληρονόμος is the second member of the relative clause, not, however, as Bising and Delitzsch think, parallel to the κατεσκεύασεν. — ὁ κόσμος] denotes the unbelieving sinful world of men. This Noah condemned (too weak the rendering of Heinrichs: *put to shame*) by his faith, namely, by the act, in that he set forth the culpability of its conduct by the contrast of his own conduct. Comp. κατακρίνειν, Matt. xii. 41, 42, Luke xi. 31, 32, and κρίνειν, Rom. ii. 27. — καὶ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος] Allusion to the fact that Noah is the first who in the O. T. is expressly called רִיָּא or δίκαιος (Gen. vi. 9). Comp. Ezek. xiv. 14, 20; Ecclus. xlv. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 5. Philo also, *de congressu quaerendae eruditionis gratia*, p. 437 B (with Mangey, I. p. 532), lays special stress upon this particular: πρῶτος δ' οὗτος δίκαιος ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἀνερρήθη γραφαῖς. — ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη] is the *righteousness obtained in accordance with faith*, or *by the way of faith*. Since the notion of πίστις is different with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews from that of Paul, the righteousness of faith here spoken of cannot, as is still done by Böhme, Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford, and others, be regarded as identical with the righteousness of faith in the Pauline sense. Yet Bleek is perfectly right in saying that the notion: *righteousness of faith*, "here appears as one already formed, and is presupposed as one well known, a fact very easy to be explained from the relation in which the author of the epistle stood to Paul." — κληρονόμον γίνεσθαι] denotes no more than *to obtain as a possession*. We have not, with Justinian, Bengel, Huët, and many, to press the form of expression; as though the δικαιοσύνη were thought of as an actual *inheritance*, which Noah had received as coming down from the fathers, Abel, who in ver. 4 had been called δίκαιος, and Enoch.

Vv. 8-10. *The example of Abraham.*

Ver. 8. A proof of believing confidence in God it was that Abraham at God's command wandered forth without knowing whither. Comp. Gen. xii. 1, 4; also Acts vii. 2, 3. — ὁ καλούμενος] is not: "he who is called Abraham, whereas,

namely, he formerly bore the name of Abram" (Theodoret, Clarius, Zeger, Bisping, Ewald, *al.*), which would be a very tame addition. It signifies: "Abraham, who was thereto (*sc.* to the ἐξελθεῖν) called or summoned by God." That this sense could have been expressed only by καλούμενος without the article (Bleek, Delitzsch, Reiche, *Comm. Crit.* p. 108; Maier, Moll, Kurtz), can hardly be maintained. The only difference between the two modes of expression is, that *with* the article the καλεῖσθαι is merely stated as an historic fact; *without* the article, on the other hand, is at the same time represented as a cause of the ὑπακούειν. The participle *present*, moreover (not κληθείς), is chosen in order to accentuate the immediate sequence of the καλεῖσθαι and the ὑπακούειν. — εἰς τόπον ὃν κ.τ.λ.] namely, to Canaan. — ποῦ] inexactly used, instead of ποῖ. Comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 439. — On the *indicative* ἔρχεται, see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 279 f.; Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr.* p. 218.

Ver. 9. A proof of a believing confidence in God was it further that Abraham dwelt as a stranger in the land which was promised him as a possession. — παροικεῖν] in classic Greek of *dwelling beside* or *in the neighbourhood*; in Hellenistic, however, ordinarily as here: to dwell as a stranger in a land, without rights of citizenship or possession. Even in Genesis the sojourning of Abraham and his sons in the promised land of Canaan is designated as a παροικεῖν, and they themselves are characterized as πάροιχοι in the same; comp. Gen. xvii. 8, xx. 1, xxi. 23, 34, xxiii. 4, xxiv. 37, xxvi. 3, xxviii. 4, *al.* — εἰς] receives into the idea of a permanent dwelling that of a previous migration. Familiar breviloquence. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 386. — ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν] Comp. Acts vii. 5, 6. — ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας] Theophylact: ὅπερ τῶν ξένων ἐστί, τῶν ἄλλοτε εἰς ἄλλο μέρος μεταβαίνόντων διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τι ἴδιον. Comp. Gen. xii. 8, xiii. 3, xviii. 1 ff., xxvi. 25, *al.* — μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ κ.τ.λ.] which Theophylact, Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Tischendorf, and others refer to παρώκησεν, belongs, as is shown by the singular ἐξεδέχετο with which the author continues at ver. 10, to κατοικήσας. — Isaac and Jacob, however, are called heirs with him of the

same promise, because the promise was given to Abraham not for himself alone, but at the same time for his seed; comp. Gen. xiii. 15, xvii. 8.

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

Vv. 11, 12. *The example of Sarah.*

Ver. 11. *Καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα*] *even Sarah herself*, sc. although she had before been unbelieving. At first, namely, when she had received the divine promise that she should yet bear a son, she had, in consideration of her great age, laughed thereat, and thus manifested unbelief; presently afterwards, however, she was afraid, and denied her laughter, had thus passed

over from unbelief to belief. Comp. Gen. xviii. 12, 15. Erroneously is the enhancing *καὶ αὐτῇ* interpreted by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Bengel, Böhme, Stein, Tholuck (the last-named, however, undecided): *even Sarah also, the wife*, or: *although she was only a woman*; Kurtz: "Sarah herself and no other," namely, not Hagar. Just as false the interpretation of Schlichting, Schulz, and others: *even Sarah herself, although she was barren*. To the last mode of supplementing points also the gloss *στεῖρα*, or *στεῖρα οὔσα*, or *ἡ στεῖρα*, which is found, with Theophylact, in some cursives, translations (including Vulg.), and early editions. Quite wrongly will Delitzsch, followed therein by Alford and Hofmann, have no gradation whatever recognised in *καὶ αὐτῇ Σάρρα*, in that he supposes *καὶ αὐτῇ* to serve only for extending a like statement to a second subject, and consequently placing the first mother of the chosen race side by side with the first father thereof. If the author had wished to express nothing more, he would have written merely *καὶ Σάρρα*. For *αὐτός* or *αὐτή* is in the N. T. never used in the nominative for the unaccented *he* or *she*. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 141, *Obs.* — *εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος*] *for the founding of a posterity*. *καταβολή* is employed, therefore, in the same sense as in the expression *καταβολὴ κόσμου*, iv. 3, ix. 26, and *σπέρμα*, as ver. 18, ii. 16, and frequently. The words cannot denote: *she received power to conceive seed*, as is interpreted by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact (who, however, is undecided), the Peshito, Vulgate, Erasmus, Vatablus, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Er. Schmid, Grotius, L. Bos, Wolf, Bengel, Carpzov, Schulz, Heinrichs, Huët, Stengel, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, and others. For this must have been expressed by *εἰς ὑποδοχὴν (σύλληψιν) σπέρματος*.¹ Constrained and unnatural, however, is also the explanation, first mentioned by Theophylact, and subsequently adopted by Drusus, Jac.

¹ Michaelis and Storr would therefore, in writing *καὶ αὐτῇ Σάρρα*, refer the statement, ver. 11, still to Abraham, in connection with which, however, more meaning must be put into *εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος* than can lie in the expression, and which has in other respects much in the context against it. See Bleek, II. 2, p. 767 f.

Cappellus, Schlichting, Heinsius, Wittich, Rambach, and others: *she received power for the bringing forth of seed.* — καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας] *and that contrary to the favourable period of life, i.e. since the δύναμιν λαμβάνειν, on account of the youthful freshness being already lost, was opposed to all probability.* Incorrect, because in that case the *full* signification of καιρός (*opportunitas*) is not brought out, Delitzsch: “in contradiction with the time of life, namely, the ninetieth year, in which she was.” — ἐπεὶ πιστὸν ἡγήσατο τὸν ἐπαγγειλάμενον] comp. x. 23.

Ver. 12. The wondrous result of the faith displayed by Sarah. — ἐγενήθησαν] *sc. through Sarah as mother and ancestress.* γίνεσθαι, of *being born*, usual also elsewhere in classic (Xen. *Cyr.* i. 2. 1, *al.*) and Hellenistic Greek (Rom. i. 3; Gal. iv. 4, *al.*). — ἀφ’ ἐνός] *from one, namely Abraham.* Wrongly does Carpzov apprehend ἐνός as a *neuter*, in that he will have it supplemented by σπέρματος or αἵματος. Just as wrongly Zeger: “vel ab uno Abrahæ et Saræ corpore (juxta illud: Erunt duo in carne una).” Comp. already Theodoret: Ἀφ’ ἐνὸς τοῦ Ἀβραάμ· εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀμφοτέρους ἕνα νοήσαιμεν, οὐχ ἁμαρτησόμεθα· ἔσονται γάρ, φησὶν, οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. — καὶ ταῦτα] *and that too, and more than that.* According to Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 153, equivalent to καὶ τοῦτο. But the plural is, no doubt, placed because the author has in his mind, besides the νεκρωμένον εἶναι of Abraham, also that remarked in ver. 11 with regard to Sarah (her former unbelief and her advanced age). — νεκρωμένον] has reference to the dead power of generation, as Rom. iv. 19. — *Of one were born even as the stars of heaven in regard to number, i.e. of one were descendants born innumerable in multitude as the stars of heaven.* A supplementing of ἐκγονοὶ or ἄνθρωποι (so still Bleek) is, moreover, unnecessary. The comparison of the multitude of descendants to the stars of heaven, and the countless sand upon the sea-shore, is based upon the use of the same figures in the words of the promise given to Abraham; comp. Gen. xiii. 16, xv. 5, xxii. 17, xxvi. 4, xxxii. 12; Ex. xxxii. 13; Deut. i. 10. — χεῖλος] for *shore* occurs also with the classics, and that in prose equally (Herod. ii. 94; Polyb. iii. 14. 6, and frequently) as

with the poets (Hom. *Il.* xii. 52). Comp. also Plin. xxxi. 2: *Herba in labris fontis virens*; Caes. *de bello Gall.* vii. 72: *ut ejus (fossae) solum tantundem pateret, quantum summa labra distabant.*

Vv. 13–16. General observations with regard to the fore-mentioned patriarchs.

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

traveller the longed-for journey's end. Comp. Virg. *Aen.* iii. 522 sqq. :

Quam procul obscuros colles humilemque videmus
Italiam. . . . Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant.

— καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες, ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς] Reference to the utterances of the patriarchs in the Book of Genesis, particularly xxiii. 4, where Abraham says to the children of Heth: *πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος ἐγὼ εἰμι μεθ' ὑμῶν*, and xlvii. 9, where Jacob, in addressing Pharaoh, describes his own life in general as a pilgrimage: *αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ζωῆς μου, ἃς παροικῶ, ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα ἔτη*. Comp. LXX. Ps. xxxix. 13, cxix. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 11; Philo, *de Agricult.* p. 196 E (with Mangey, I. p. 310): *παροικεῖν οὐ κατοικεῖν ἤλθομεν τῷ γὰρ ὄντι πᾶσα μὲν ψυχὴ σοφοῦ πατρίδα μὲν οὐρανόν, ξένην δὲ γῆν ἔλαχεν*; *De Confus. Ling.* p. 331 C (I. p. 416): *Διὰ τοῦτο οἱ κατὰ Μωϋσῆν σοφοὶ πάντες εἰσάγονται παροικοῦντες· αἱ γὰρ τούτων ψυχαὶ στέλλονται μὲν ἀποικίαν δὴ ποτε τὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*.

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

Ver. 15. *Καί*] *and indeed*. — *μνημονεύειν*] is taken by the majority in the *intransitive* sense: *to be mindful* (xiii. 7). More naturally, however, may we understand it, with Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Moll, Kurtz, and others, *transitively*: *to make mention*, sc. in the utterances to which the author has respect. Comp. ver. 22; 1 Thess. i. 3. — *εἶχον ἄν*] *they would have had*. The imperfect of the *continuing* possibility.

Ver. 16. *Νῦν δέ*] the logical: *but now*. Comp. viii. 6. — *ὀρέγεσθαι τινος*] elsewhere in the N. T. only 1 Tim. iii. 1, vi. 10. — *διό*] *wherefore, sc.* on account of their seeking after the heavenly country. — *θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν*] Exegesis to *αὐτούς*: *God is not ashamed of them, namely, to be called their God*. Reference to Ex. iii. 6: *καὶ εἶπεν ἑγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου, θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ*. Comp. *ibid.* vv. 15, 16. — The *οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται κ.τ.λ.* presupposes the idea of an intimate communion of God with the patriarchs. Comp. also Matt. xxii. 31 f.; Mark xii. 26 f.; Luke xx. 37 f. The fact instanced in proof of this communion is added in the concluding words: *ἡτοίμασεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν*] for He has prepared for them a city. By the *πόλις* is again meant, as ver. 10, *the heavenly Jerusalem*. *ἡτοίμασεν*, however, may equally well signify: *He has prepared it for them, that they may one day possess the same as a dwelling* (Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Calov, Böhm, de Wette, Delitzsch, Hofmann), as: *He has already conferred it upon them as a possession* (so Braun and Bleek).

Vv. 17–19. The author returns once more specially to Abraham, in that he further, by way of addition, dwells on the most distinguished act of faith on the part of this patriarch, that he had not refused at God's behest to offer his only son as a sacrifice; comp. (Gen. xxii. 1 ff. — *προσενήνοχεν*] not: "he was on the point of offering," against which stands the perfect. It can only signify: *he offered* (made an offering of). The author could thus express himself, since the offering was really intended by Abraham, although it afterwards came, it is true, to a bloodless issue. Comp. Jas. ii. 21: *Ἀβραὰμ . . . ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον*. — *πειραζόμενος*] *when he was tempted, i.e.* was put to the test by God with regard to his faith. Comp. Gen. xxii. 1. *πειραζόμενος* belongs still to *προσενήνοχεν*, not, as Hofmann quite unnaturally requires, to *προσέφερεν*. — *καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ . . . σπέρμα*, ver. 18] Unfolding of the greatness of the act. It was (1) his only son whom he gave up, (2) the son whose life was necessary, if the promises given to Abraham were to receive their fulfilment. — *καὶ*] *and of a truth*. — *τὸν μονογενῆ*] No respect is had to *Ishmael*, since he was not of equal birth,

and stood outside of all relation to the divine promises. — προσέφερεν] *here* the imperfect; since the author now presents to himself, as though he were a spectator, the act of the offering itself. — ὁ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀναδεξάμενος] *he who had believingly embraced the promises.* With Schulz, Heinrichs, Bengel, Ebrard, Bisping, and others, to find indicated by ἀναδεξάμενος the mere *having received*, contradicts the ordinary use of the word, instead of which λαβών must have been placed.

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

Ver. 19 contains in its first half the motive ground of Abraham for such believing action. Abraham trusted in the omnipotence of God, by virtue of which he is able, even in presence of the actual sacrifice of Isaac, to realize the promises given to him. — λογισάμενος, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.] *since he judged that God is able to raise even from the dead.* The proposition introduced with ὅτι contains a universal truth. It is erroneous to supplement αὐτόν to ἐγείρειν (Jac. Cappellus, Huët, Kuinoel, Stein, Bloomfield, *al.*), yet more erroneous to supplement σπέρμα (Schulz, Stengel). — ὅθεν κ.τ.λ.] Declaration of the divine reward for such believing action and such believing confidence. ὅθεν means, as everywhere else in our epistle (ii. 17, iii. 1, vii. 25, viii. 3, ix. 18): *on which account, wherefore*; παραβολή, however, denotes, conformably to the well-known use of παραβάλλεσθαι (Hom. *Il.* ix. 322; Thuc. ii. 44, *al.* See the lexicons), the *imperilling*, and forms with the ἐκομίσατο an oxymoron. The sense is: *on which account he bore him away, even on the ground of (or: by means of) the giving up.* Abraham obtained Isaac as a reward, received

him back again as a possession, by the very act of setting his life at stake, giving up to the death of a sacrifice. This is the simple and only correct sense of the variously explained words. — With this exposition earlier interpretations agree in part, though by no means entirely, so far as ὅθεν and ἐκομίσατο are concerned, but all different in regard to ἐν παραβολῇ. Instead of the *causal* signification, “on which account,” Calvin, Castellio, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Lamb. Bos, Alberti, Wolf, Michaelis, Schulz, Huët, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Ewald, Hofmann, and others have asserted for ὅθεν the *locut* signification “whence, *sc.* from the dead.” In connection with this, L. Bos, Alberti, Schulz, and Stengel [as also Whitby] understand ἐκομίσατο of the *birth* of Isaac; while Calvin, Bleek, and the majority rightly understand it of the deliverance of Isaac’s life in consequence of the prevention of the sacrifice. The former explain: whence he indeed had received him, inasmuch as Isaac’s parents at the time of his conception and birth were virtually dead. The latter: as he accordingly also received him from the dead. But against the first acceptation decides the fact that in such case, because an event conceived of as possible in the future is placed in definite parallel with a past event, the *pluperfect* must necessarily have been used in place of the aorist ἐκομίσατο; and then, even apart from this, since all the emphasis would fall upon ἐκομίσατο, the order of the words must have been otherwise, namely as follows: ὅθεν ἐν παραβολῇ καὶ ἐκομίσατο αὐτόν. But also the last-named interpretation is forbidden by the order of the words. For καὶ must, in connection therewith, be referred, as is also expressly required by Schlichting, Böhme, and others, to the whole clause, whereas from its position it can only form a gradation of ἐν παραβολῇ; thus ὅθεν καὶ αὐτόν ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο must have been written. — Finally, as regards ἐν παραβολῇ, the signification “in similitudine,” or “in a resemblance,” is attached thereto by Theodore of Mopsuestia,¹ Calvin, Castellio, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Jac. Cappellus (figurate), Scaliger, Er. Schmid,

¹ Τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι ἀκολουθῶς ἔτυχεν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίστει· τῇ γὰρ ἀναστάσει πιστεύσας, διὰ συμβόλων τινῶν ἀποθανόντα αὐτὸν ἰκομίσατο. Τὸ γὰρ ἐν πολλῇ τοῦ θανάτου προσ-

Wittich, Limborch, Zachariae, Dindorf, Koppe (in Heinrichs), Huët, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Hofmann, Woerner, and others. The sense is, according to Bleek: "as accordingly he received him from thence in a resemblance; so that Isaac was indeed not really delivered out of death, but yet his deliverance was a kind of restoration from the dead, since Abraham already regarded him as the prey of death." But this "in a resemblance" is, strictly taken, nothing else than "in a manner," with which it is also exactly identified by Stengel and others; for the expression, however, of the notion "in a manner," the author would hardly have chosen the altogether unusual, and therefore unintelligible, formula *ἐν παραβολῇ*; much more natural would it have been for him to employ instead thereof, as at vii. 9, the familiar *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν*. Moreover, since that addition could only be designed to exert a softening effect upon the *ὄθεν* (sc. *ἐκ νεκρῶν*), it must also have followed immediately after this word. The author would thus have written *ὄθεν, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκομίσατο*. — Yet more untenable is the exposition akin to that just mentioned: *as a type* (Luther: *zum Vorbilde*), sc. in regard to the *resurrection in general* (Hunnius, Balduin, Michaelis, Böhme, *al.*), or specially in regard to the *sacrificial and risen Christ* (Primasius, Erasmus, Clarius, Vatablus, Zeger, Calov, Carpzov, Cramer, Ebrard, Bisping, Reuss), or in regard to *both* alike (Theodoret: *τουτέστιν ὡς ἐν συμβόλῳ καὶ τύπῳ τῆς ἀναστάσεως*. — *ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ προεγράφη καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους ὁ τύπος*). For the express indication of that which was typically represented by this event could not have been wanting. — Equally far wrong, because far-fetched and unnatural, is the supplementing of *ὢν* to *ἐν παραβολῇ* on the part of Bengel ("Abraham . . . ipse factus est parabola. . . . Omnis enim posteritas celebrat fidem Abrahæ, offerentis unigenitum"), and the explanation of Paulus: "against an equalization," i.e. in return for the ram presented as a substitute (comp. already Chrysostom: *τουτέστιν ἐν ὑποδείγ-*

δοκίᾳ γινόμενον μηδὲν παθεῖν, τοῦ ἀληθῶς ἀναστησάμεντου σύμβολον ἦν, ὅσον τοῦ θανάτου πρὸς βραχὺ γινεσάμενος, ἀνίστη μηδὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου παθὼν· τὸ γινῆναι ἐν παραβολῇ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν συμβόλοις.

ματι' ἐν τῷ κριῶ φησιν . . . ὡς ἐν αἰνίγματι ὥσπερ γὰρ παραβολὴ ἦν ὁ κριὸς τοῦ Ἰσαάκ). — To the interpretation of ἐν παραβολῇ, above regarded as correct, several expositors approach, to the extent of likewise thinking that we must make the usage with regard to the verb παραβάλλεσθαι our guide in determining the signification of παραβολή. They deviate, however, essentially from the above interpretation, in that they take ἐν παραβολῇ *adverbially*, in the sense of παραβόλως; consequently refer the expression, which above was equally referred to subject and object, to the *subject*, and that without any advantage to the peculiarity of thought. So Cammerarius, who, besides other possibilities of apprehension, suggests also this: *in that he exposed himself to danger, namely, that of losing his son*; Loesner, Krebs, Heinrichs: *in summo discrimine*, παρ' ἐλπίδα, παραδόξως; Raphel: *praeter spem praeterque opinionem*; Tholuck: *in bold venture*.

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

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

¹ How Delitzsch has been able so greatly to misunderstand the above words as to read in them the assertion, that περὶ μελλόντων is to be combined with περὶ καί instead of πρὸ λέγουσιν, I do not comprehend.

staff, i.e. in that from weakness he supported himself with his face resting upon the top of his staff. Addition from LXX. Gen. xlvii. 31 (inexactly referred to this place), for the bringing out of the solemn, devotional frame of Jacob in uttering this benediction [the same spirit being breathed in xlix. 18]. In the Hebrew the words read : *וַיִּשְׁתָּחֲוֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל־רֹאשׁ הַמֶּטֶחַ* (i.e. according to Tuch : “ *and Israel leaned back upon the head of the bed* ;” but, more correctly, according to Knobel : “ *and Israel bowed himself upon the head of the couch*, inasmuch as he had before, during his conversation with Joseph, been sitting upright upon his couch (comp. xlviii. 2), but now leaned forward to the upper end thereof, and blessed God for the granting of the last wish”). The LXX., however, read the vowels *ἡψῆ*, and their translation was followed by our author in this passage as elsewhere. Strangely does Hofmann perceive in the subordinate particular *καὶ προσεκύνησεν κ.τ.λ.*, a “second thing” adduced as proving the faith of Jacob. The first is, according to him, Jacob’s last testament, the second his departure from life (!). — The supposition that *τῷ Ἰωσήφ* is to be supplemented to *προσεκύνησεν* (so Chrysostom : *τουτέστι καὶ γέρων ὦν ἤδη προσεκύνει τῷ Ἰωσήφ, τὴν παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ προσκύνησιν δηλῶν τὴν ἐσομένην αὐτῷ* ; Theodoret, Photius in Oecumenius, Theophylact, and others), is, equally with the view akin thereto, that *αὐτοῦ* is to be referred to *Ἰωσήφ*, and *ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ* is to be regarded as the *object* to *προσεκύνησεν* (so the Vulgate : *et adoravit fastigium virgae ejus* ; Primasius : *virgae ejus i. e. virgae Jos.* ; Oecumenius : *τοσοῦτον . . . ἐπίστευσε τοῖς ἐσομένοις, ὅτι καὶ προσεκύνησε τῇ ῥάβδῳ, δοκῶν ὁρᾶν τὰ ἐσόμενα* ; Clarius, Bisping, Reuss : “ Jacob, after having received the oath of Joseph, bowed (*s’inclina*) towards the head of the latter’s staff, in token of submission, that is to say, in order solemnly to acknowledge Joseph as head of the family. The staff is the symbol of power ;” and others), to be rejected as untenable. The first-named has against it the fact, that in that which precedes, the discourse is not of Joseph himself, but of his sons ; the latter, that the making of *ἐπὶ τι* a note of *object* to *προσκυνεῖν* is opposed to all the usage of the language.

Ver. 22. *The example of Joseph.* Comp. Gen. i. 24, 25. Firm faith, that the promise already given to Abraham (Gen. xv. 13–16) should be fulfilled, was it that Joseph, when he was near to death, gave direction as to that which should be done with his bones at the time of the accomplishment of that promise. — *τελευτῶν*] the same as *ἀποθνήσκων*, ver. 21; the choice of the expression was called forth by Gen. i. 26: *καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰωσήφ.* — *περί*] in connection with *μνημονεύειν*, which as at ver. 15 signifies *to make mention*, stands instead of the bare genitive, after the analogy of *μνᾶσθαι περὶ τινος*. See Kühner, II. p. 186, *Obs.* 1. — *ἡ ἔξοδος τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ*] the (future) departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt. — *ἐμνημόνευσεν καὶ . . . ἐνετείλατο*] Form of parallel arrangement; while, as regards the matter itself, the second member as an accessory point is subordinated to the first member as the main point.

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

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

¹ Kurtz is in a position to add further particulars on this point, inasmuch as he supposes the “presupposition” is to be derived from the state of things narrated, “that a special divine admonition spoke to the parents out of the eyes of the child.”

wonderfully supposes "the mother," together with "a few concurring friends, who as it were took the place of parents," to be intended. In the Hebrew, Ex. ii. 2, the *κρύπτειν* is predicated only of the mother; the LXX., however, with whom the author agrees, have: *ιδόντες δὲ αὐτὸ ἀστείον, ἐσκέπασαν αὐτὸ μῆνας τρεῖς.* — *ἀστείον*] *fair and graceful in form.* Theophylact: *ώραῖον, τῇ ὄψει χαρίεν.* In the Hebrew stands *יִבֵּן*. — *καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως*] might, on account of the plural *οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν*, be considered, together with *εἶδον*, in opposition to the passive *ἐκρύβη*, as still dependent upon *διότι*. But more logically exact is the taking of the words, as also is mostly done, as a parallel to *ἐκρύβη*. For much more natural does it appear that the author wished to represent that *κρύπτειν* as an act from the accomplishment of which fear did not deter, than that he should think of fearlessness as the motive cause of that action. — *τὸ διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως*] *the command of Pharaoh*, to drown all new-born male children of the Israelites. Comp. Ex. i. 22.

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

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

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

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

Ver. 27 is referred either to the flight of Moses to Midian (Ex. ii. 15), or to the departure of the whole people out of Egypt. The former supposition is favoured by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Occumenius, Theophylact, Zeger, Jac. Cappellus, Heinsius, Calmet, Bengel, Michaelis, Schulz, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bouman (*Chartae theolog.* lib. II. Traj. ad Rhen. 1857, p. 157 sq.), Delitzsch, Nickel (in Reuter's *Repertor.* 1858, März, p. 207), Conybeare, Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Ewald ; the latter by Nicholas de Lyra, Calvin, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Calov, Braun, Baumgarten, Carpzov, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Huët, Böhme, Stuart, Kuinoel, Paulus,

Klee, Bleek, Stein, Bloomfield, Ebrard, Bisping, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and others. Only the opinion first mentioned is the correct one. Against it, indeed, the objection appears to be not without weight, that Ex. ii. 14 a *φοβηθῆναι* of Moses is spoken of, whereas here, by means of *μὴ φοβηθεῖς κ.τ.λ.*, the opposite is asserted. But the contradiction is only an apparent one. For in the account of Exodus a fear on the part of Moses is mentioned only in the objective relation, whereas the fearlessness, which the author of our epistle intends, belongs purely to the subjective domain. Moses was alarmed that, contrary to his expectation, the slaying of the Egyptian had already become known, and apprehended as a consequence being exposed to the vengeance of the king, if the latter should obtain possession of him. On this very account also he took steps for the saving of his life, in that he withdrew by flight from the territory of Pharaoh. With this fact, however, it was perfectly reconcilable that in the consciousness of being chosen to be the deliverer of his people, and in the confidence in God, in whose hand alone he stood, he felt himself inwardly, or in his frame of mind, raised above all fear at the wrath of an earthly king. There is therefore no need of the concession (de Wette), that the author of the epistle, when he wrote down his *μὴ φοβηθεῖς*, did not remember the words *ἐφοβήθη δὲ Μωϋσῆς*, Ex. ii. 14. But just as little is it permissible, with Delitzsch, to press the expression *κατέλιπεν*, chosen by the author, and to assert that *καταλιπεῖν* expresses the repairing hence *without fear*, whereas *φυγεῖν* would denote the repairing hence *from fear*. The author might also have written without difference of signification—what is denied by Delitzsch—*πίστει ἔφυγεν εἰς γῆν Μαδιάμ, μὴ φοβηθεῖς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως*.—The referring, on the other hand, of the statement, ver. 27, to the leading forth of the whole people, is shown to be entirely inadmissible—(1) from the consideration that, in the chronological order which the author pursues in the enumeration of his models of faith, the departure of Israel from Egypt could not have been mentioned before the fact on which he dwells in ver. 28, but only after the same; (2) that to the departure of the people out of Egypt the expression *κατέλιπεν* (*sc.*

Μωϋσῆς) Αἴγυπτον is unsuitable; (3) finally, that according to Ex. xii. 31 that departure was commanded by Pharaoh himself; in connection with the departure, therefore, any fear whatever at the wrath of the king could not arise. — τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκαρτέρησεν] *for having the invisible (God) as it were before his eyes, he was strong and courageous.* τὸν ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν belongs together, and τὸν ἀόρατον stands absolutely, without, what is thought most probable by Böhme, as also Delitzsch and Hofmann, our having to supplement βασιλία to the same. Contrary to linguistic usage, Luther, Bengel, Schulz, Paulus, Stengel (wavering), Ebrard combine τὸν ἀόρατον with ἐκαρτέρησεν: *he held firmly to the invisible one as though seeing Him*; according to Ebrard, καρτερεῖν τινα signifies: “to comport oneself stedfastly in regard to some one” (!), and the expression of our passage is supposed to acquire a pregnancy in the sense of τὸν ἀόρατον τιμῶν ἐκαρτέρησεν (!). καρτερεῖν τι can only denote: *stedfastly to bear or undergo something*; καρτερεῖν τινα, however, cannot be used in Greek.

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

1 Chron. xxi. 12, 15 (ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐξολοθρεύων); 2 Chron. xxxii. 21; Eccus. xlviii. 21; 1 Cor. x. 10 (ὁ ὀλοθρευτής). — τὰ πρωτότοκα] Ex. xii. 12: πᾶν πρωτότοκον . . . ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους. Comp. *ibid.* ver. 29. We have to construe τὰ πρωτότοκα with ὁ ὀλοθρεύων, not, as Klee, Paulus, Ebrard, and Hofmann will, with θίγῃ, since the combination of θιγγάνειν with an accusative is not usual. — αὐτῶν] namely the Israelites. This reference of the αὐτῶν was self-evident from the connection, although the Israelites are not previously mentioned. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 138 f.

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

Ver. 30. The example of faith afforded by the Israelite people in connection with the siege of Jericho, Josh. vi. — Πίστει] on the ground of faith, which, namely, the people displayed. Wrongly Grotius, who supposes πίστει is to be construed with κυκλωθέντα. — ἔπεσαν] On the plural of the verb with the neuter plur., see Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 479. — κυκλωθέντα] after they (daily with the ark of the covenant, heralded by trumpet blast) had been encircled (incorrectly

Schulz, and others: *belaguered*). — ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας] *for seven days, seven days long*. Comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 381.

Ver. 31. The example of the Gentile woman Rahab, Josh. ii., vi. 17, 22 ff. Her conduct had proceeded from the recognition that the God of the Israelites is a God in heaven and upon earth, and from the confidence thereon based, that this God would lead them to victory. Comp. Josh. ii. 9 ff. — Παῖβ ἡ πόρνη] Comp. Jas. ii. 25; Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* c. 12. The epithet ἡ πόρνη is to be left in its literal sense. To interpret it, with Jac. Cappellus, Valckenaer, Heinrichs, and others, after the precedent of the Chaldee paraphrase and the Arabian version, by *the hostess*, or, with Hofmann, *the harlots' hostess*, or, with Braun and others, *the heathen woman*, or finally, with Koppe (in Heinrichs) and others, *the idolatress*, is arbitrary. The designation of Rahab as ἡ πόρνη is an *historic* characterization, in accordance with Josh. ii. 2, vi. 17 ff., and without any ground of offence. For it has already been rightly observed by Calvin: "hoc (epitheton) ad anteactam vitam referri certum est; resipiscentiae enim testis est fides." Comp. further, Matt. xxi. 31, 32. — τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν] the inhabitants of Jericho. They had shown themselves disobedient, because they had resisted the people of God (Josh. vi. 1), although not to them either had the mighty deeds of this God remained unknown (Josh. ii. 10). — δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκόπους μετ' εἰρήνης] *seeing she had received the spies with peace, i.e. without practising acts of hostility towards them, to which she might have been incited by reason of their nationality*.

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

Ver. 32. Καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω;] *And to what end do I still speak? i.e. what need is there yet, after that which has already*

been mentioned, of a further description in detail? and what end can it serve, since, considering the abundance of the historic material, an exhaustive presentation is surely impossible? — λέγω] is *indicative*. See Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 267. — ἐπιλείπειν] only here in the N. T. — ἐπιλείπει με γὰρ διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος περὶ Γεδεὼν κ.τ.λ.] *for the time will not suffice me for relating of Gideon*, etc. Comp. Demosth. *de Corona*, ed. Reisk. p. 324: ἐπιλείπει με λέγοντα ἡ ἡμέρα τὰ τῶν προδοτῶν ὀνόματα; Julian. *Orat.* 1, p. 341 B: ἐπιλείπει με τὰ κείνου διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος. Parallel is also the Latin: *deficit me dies, tempus*, e.g. Liv. xxviii. 41: Dies me deficiat, si . . . numerare velim; Cic. *pro Rose. Amer.* c. 32, init.: tempus, hercule, te citius, quam oratio deficeret. Further instances (also from Philo) see in Wetstein and Bleek. — ὁ χρόνος] Oecumenius: ὁ χρόνος ὁ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, φησὶν, ἀρμόδιος καὶ οἶον ἡ συμμετρία; Theophylact: ποῖος; ἡ ὁ πᾶς εἴρηται δὲ τοῦτο, ὡς σύνηθες ἡμῖν λέγειν, ὑπερβολικῶς ἡ ὁ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ σύμμετρος. — περὶ Γεδεὼν καὶ Βαράκ κ.τ.λ.] *of Gideon, as well as of Barak*, etc. That here too, in connection with the correct text, the regard to chronology is not lost sight of, see in the critical remark. — On *Gideon*, comp. Judg. vi.-viii.; on *Barak*, Judg. iv., v.; on *Samson*, Judg. xiii.-xvi.; on *Jephthah*, Judg. xi. 1-xii. 7. — The last double member is yet enlarged by the addition καὶ τῶν προφητῶν to Σαμουήλ, because Samuel opened the series of the prophets; cf. Acts iii. 24.

Ver. 33. Οἱ διὰ πίστεως κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας] *who by virtue of faith subdued kingdoms*. The διὰ πίστεως with emphasis placed at the head dominates the whole description following, so that it continues equally to sound forth in connection with all the finite verbs as far as περιήλθον, ver. 37. — οἱ, however, connects in a lax manner that which follows with that which precedes, in so far as, vv. 33, 34, respect is had, in part at least, to yet other persons besides those mentioned ver. 32. As regards the subject-matter, therefore, there would have been more accurately written in place of the mere οἱ: "who with others like-minded." — καταγωνίζεσθαι further, in the N. T. a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, signifies *to get the better of or overpower*. With Böhme to attach to the same the signification: "to acquire by fighting" ("certamine sibi

paraverunt regna; quod nostra lingua succinctius ita dixeris: *sic haben sich Herrscherwürden erkämpft*"), is opposed to the *usus loquendi*. — The statement itself for the rest is true, as of David, who vanquished the Philistines (2 Sam. v. 17–25, viii. 1, xxi. 15 ff.), Moabites, Syrians, Edomites (2 Sam. viii. 2 ff.), and Ammonites (2 Sam. x., xii. 26 ff.), so also of the four judges, mentioned ver. 32, inasmuch as Gideon smote the Midianites (Judg. vii.), Barak the Canaanites (Judg. iv.), Samson the Philistines (Judg. xiv. ff.), Jephthah the Ammonites (Judg. xi.). — *εἰργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην*] wrought righteousness and justice, namely, for their subjects, in virtue of their quality as judges or kings. Comp. *ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην*, 2 Sam. viii. 15; 1 Chron. xviii. 14; 2 Chron. ix. 8, *al.* Too generally Erasmus, Schlichting, Grotius, Schulz, Stein, and others (comp. already Theodoret: *τοῦτο κοινὸν τῶν ἁγίων ἀπάντων*): they did that which was morally good or pious. — *ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν*] obtained promises, i.e. either: came into the possession of blessings which God had promised them (Piscator, Owen, Haët, Böhme, Stuart, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority), or: received words of promise on the part of God (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Primasius, Schlichting [Whitby?], Bleek, Ebrard, Kurtz, *al.*). Either interpretation is admissible. Yet in the first case, that no contradiction with ver. 39 (comp. also ver. 13) may arise, only, what the absence of the article before *ἐπαγγελιῶν* also permits, blessings and successes of earthly nature could be meant. In the first case, one may think of Judg. vii. 7 and the like, while in the second case the words are specially to be referred to the Messianic promises given to David and the prophets. — *ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων*] closed the jaws of lions. Comp. with regard to *Daniel*, Dan. vi. 22 (1 Macc. ii. 60); with regard to *Samson*, Judg. xiv. 6; with regard to *David*, 1 Sam. xvii. 34 ff.

Ver. 34. *Ἐσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρός*] Quenched the violence of fire (fire's violence). Theophylact: οὐκ εἶπε δὲ ἔσβεσαν πῦρ ἀλλὰ δύναμιν πυρός, ὃ καὶ μείζον· ἔξαπτόμενον γὰρ ὅλως δύναμιν τοῦ καίειν οὐκ εἶχε κατ' αὐτῶν. To be compared is the statement with regard to Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, the three companions of Daniel, Dan. iii. Comp. 1 Macc.

ii. 59 : 'Ανανίας, 'Αζαρίας, Μισαήλ πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν ἐκ φλογός. — ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας] *escaped the sword-points; e.g. David*, comp. 1 Sam. xviii. 11, xix. 10, 12, xxi. 10; *Elijah*, comp. 1 Kings xix. 1 ff.; *Elisha*, comp. 2 Kings vi. 14 ff., 31 ff. — ἐνεδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας] *out of weakness were made strong*. These words Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, and Theophylact refer to *the strengthening of the whole people by liberation from the Babylonian captivity*; Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Owen, Heinrichs, Huët, Böhme, Stuart, Stein, Tholuck, Ebrard, and the majority, partly exclusively, partly, among other things, to *the recovery of Hezekiah* (2 Kings xx.; Isa. xxxviii.); certainly more correct, however, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Bleek, de Wette, Hofmann, to *the reinvigoration of the weakened Samson* (Judg. xvi. 28 ff.). — ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ] *waxed valiant in battle*. Theodoret καὶ οἱ προῤῥηθέντες καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ματθαίου παῖδες 'Ιούδας καὶ 'Ιωνάθης καὶ Σίμων. That the author was thinking of the Maccabees also, in particular, in addition to the judges and David, is certainly very probable. — παρεμβολὰς ἔκλιναν ἀλλοτρίων] *Made armies of aliens flinch* or give way. Theodoret : τὸ αὐτὸ διαφόρως εἶρηκεν. — παρεμβολή, as ^ἡπληρ, in the signification of *army*; likewise Judg. iv. 16, vii. 14; 1 Macc. v. 28, 45, and frequently. With the Greeks this signification of the word is rare; comp., however, Aelian, *Var. Hist.* xiv. 46 : 'Ηνίκα δὲ ἔδει συμμίζειν, ἐνταῦθα οἱ μὲν κύνες προπηδῶντες ἐτάραττον τὴν παρεμβολήν. — κλίνειν, in the sense indicated, is found in Holy Scripture only here.

Ver. 35. Ἐλαβον γυναῖκες ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν] *Women received back their dead (their sons) through resurrection*. Those meant are the widow of Sarepta (1 Kings xvii. 17 ff.), whose son was awakened out of death by Elijah, and the Shunammite woman (2 Kings iv. 18 ff.), whose son was raised by Elisha. Far-fetched is the supposition of Biesen-thal (in Guericke's *Zeitschr. f. die ges. luther. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1866, H. 4, p. 616 ff.): reference is made to the tradition, preserved to us in the rabbinical and talmudic literature, of the cessation of the dying away of the male population in the wilderness on the 15th Ab. — Syntactically ver. 35 begins

a new proposition (against Böhme, who, as unnaturally as possible, makes the statement *ἔλαβον* . . . *αὐτῶν* still dependent on *οἷ*, ver. 33, and regards *γυναῖκες* as apposition to *οἷ*). — With *ἄλλοι δέ*, to the close of ver. 38, the discourse passes over to examples of a *suffering* faith, which remained still unrewarded upon earth. — *ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν*] *Others, on the other hand, were stretched on the rack.* Allusion to the martyr-death of Eleazar (2 Macc. vi. 18 ff.), and of the seven Maccabean brothers, together with their mother (2 Macc. vii.). *τυμπανίζεσθαι* means: to be stretched out upon the *τύμπανον* (comp. 2 Macc. vi. 19, 28), an instrument of torture (probably wheel-shaped, Josephus, *de Macc.* c. 5, 9, 10: *τροχός*), — to be stretched out like the skin of a kettledrum, in order then to be tortured to death by blows (comp. 2 Macc. vi. 30). — *οὐ προσδεξάμενοι*] *not accepting*, i.e. since the expression, by reason of the objective negation *οὐ*, blends into a single notion: *disdaining*. — *τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν*] *the deliverance*, namely the earthly one, which they could have gained by the renouncing of their faith. Comp. 2 Macc. vi. 21 ff., vii. 27 ff. — *ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν*] *that they might become partakers of a better resurrection.* Motive for the contemning of earthly deliverance. Comp. 2 Macc. vii. 9, 11, 14, 20, 23, 29, 36, as also 2 Macc. vi. 26. *κρείττονος* stands not in opposition to the resurrection of the ungodly unto judgment, Dan. xii. 2 (Oecumenius: *κρείττονος* . . . ἢ οἱ λοιποὶ ἄνθρωποι ἢ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάστασις πᾶσι κοινή, ἀλλ' οὗτοι ἀναστήσονται, φησὶν, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ οὗτοι εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον. Comp. Theophylact), neither does it form any antithesis to *ἐξ ἀναστάσεως* in the beginning of the verse (Chrysostom: *οὐ τοιαύτης, οἷας τὰ παῖδια τῶν γυναικῶν*; Theophylact, who does not, however, decide; Bengel, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Stengel, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 617, *Obs.*; Alford, Maier, Kurtz, and others), which is too remote; but corresponds to the *ἀπολύτρωσιν* immediately preceding. A much higher possession was the resurrection to the eternal, blessed life, than the temporal deliverance from death; which latter could be regarded, likewise, as a sort of resurrection, but truly only as a lower and valueless one.

Ver. 36. *Others endured mockings and scourges, yea, moreover, bonds and prison.* "Ἐτεροι, in accordance with its verbal signification, introduces a heterogeneous class of heroes of the faith, i.e. a particular species of the ἄλλοι, mentioned as the genus ver. 35. As regards the subject itself, indeed, inexact, since, ver. 35, with ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν κ.τ.λ. reference was made not merely to 2 Macc. vi., but—as the addition ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν clearly shows—at the same time to 2 Macc. vii.; the mention, however, of the scourging along with the mocking seems to admit of explanation only from the author's referring to 2 Macc. vi. 30 (μαστιγούμενος) and vii. 1 (μάστιξι καὶ νευραῖς αἰκιζομένους), as indeed the enduring of public mockery is expressly mentioned (in addition to 1 Macc. ix. 26) at 2 Macc. vii. 7 (τὸν δεύτερον ἦγον ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμπαιγμόν), and again 2 Macc. vii. 10 (μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ὁ τρίτος ἐνεπαίζετο). On the other hand, however, it seems evident that it was the intention of the writer at ver. 36 in reality to draw attention to a dissimilar class of men; from the fact, even apart from the choice of the expression ἔτεροι, that in the case of the previous ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν κ.τ.λ. we are constrained to think of a death by martyrdom, while at ver. 36 the enhancing ἔτι δέ forbids our thinking of the martyr's death, since, according to this, bonds and dungeon were a more severe trial than mocking and scourging. We must therefore suppose that the author designed further to refer to those, as forming a special category, who, without suffering actual death, were exposed to other kinds of tortures and miseries; that he still derived, however, the main colours for this new picture from the historic figure which but just now had been present to his mind in connection with the ἐτυμπανίσθησαν κ.τ.λ. — The enhancing ἔτι δέ is to be explained from the fact that ἐμπαιγμοὶ καὶ μάστιγες denotes the *more transient* suffering, in point of time more brief; δεσμοὶ καὶ φυλακή, on the other hand, the *longer enduring* sufferings. — πεῖραν λαμβάνειν] here in the passive sense: *to have experience of something.* Otherwise ver. 29. — δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῆς] Comp. 1 Macc. xiii. 12; 1 Kings xxii. 27; Jer. xxxvii., xxxviii., *al.*

Ver. 37. Ἐλιθάσθησαν] *They were stoned.* To be referred

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

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

² Reuss, too, regards ἐπυρίσθησαν [as does Conybeare ἐπυράσθησαν] as the most likely conjecture, but regards it, likewise, as possible: “que le ἐπυρίσθησαν dans le texte vulgaire ne fût qu’une conjecture très-superflue, destinée à remplacer le mot ἐπρίσθησαν (ils furent sciés), parce que l’Ancien Testament ne fournit pas d’exemple de ce dernier supplice.”

from *περίω* (?), *they were spitted, impaled*; Tanaq. Faber, *Err. crit.* ii. 14, and J. M. Gesner in Carpzov: *ἐπηρώθησαν*, *they were mutilated*; Alberti: *ἐσπειράσθησαν* or *ἐσπειράθησαν*, from *σπείρα* (?), *they were broken on the wheel*; Steph. le Moine in Gronov. *Ant. Gr.* vii. p. 301: *ἐπράθησαν*, *they were sold*. Others yet other conjectures; see Wetstein, Griesbach, and Scholz *ad loc.* Bleek, too, assumes an error in the text, in that he holds a word which signifies "to be consumed, to perish by fire," as *ἐπρήσθησαν*, which is found with Cyrill. Hieros., and in Codd. 110, 111 for *ἐπρίσθησαν*, or *ἐπυρίσθησαν*, or even one of the forms more commonly employed for the expressing of this idea,—*ἐνεπρήσθησαν* and *ἐνεπυρίσθησαν*,—to be the original reading, and then supposes the author perhaps to have thought once more of martyrs under the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes, 2 Macc. vi. 11, vii. 4 f.; Dan. xi. 33, *al.* Comp. also Philo, *ad Flacc.* p. 990 A (with Mangey, II. p. 542): *κατελύθησάν τινες* (*sc.* Alexandrine Jews, by Flaccus) *καὶ ζῶντες οἱ μὲν ἐνεπρήσθησαν οἱ δὲ διὰ μέσης κατεσύρησαν ἀγορᾶς, ἕως ὅλα τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐδαπανήθη.* Similarly Reiche, *Commentar. Crit.* p. 111 sqq., who leaves open the choice between *ἐπρήσθησαν* and *ἐπυρώθησαν*. — If *ἐπειράσθησαν* is genuine, it must have been added by the author for the sake of the paronomasia with *ἐπρίσθησαν*, and be referred to the enticements and temptations to escape a violent death by means of apostasy (comp. *e.g.* 2 Macc. vii. 24). — *ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον*] *died by slaughter of the sword.* Comp. 1 Kings xix. 10: *τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ*; Jer. xxvi. 23: *καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ* (namely, the prophet Urijah). For the expression *ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας*, comp. LXX. Ex. xvii. 13; Num. xxi. 24; Deut. xiii. 15, xx. 13. — *περιῆλθον . . . τῆς γῆς*, ver. 38, now further emphasizes the fact that the whole *life* of the last-named class of the heroes of faith was one of want and distress. — *περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν*] refers specially to single prophets. Comp. Zech. xiii. 4, also Clemens Romanus, *ad Corinth.* 17: *μιμηταὶ γενώμεθα κύκλῳ, οἵτινες ἐν δέρμασιν αἰγείοις καὶ μηλωταῖς περιεπάτησαν, κηρύσσοντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· λέγομεν δὲ Ἡλίαν καὶ Ἐλισσαῖον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰεζεκιὴλ τοὺς προφῆτας.* — *περιῆλθον*] *they went hither and thither*, without

being in possession of a fixed dwelling-place. Theophylact: τὸ δὲ περιήλθον τὸ διώκεσθαι αὐτοὺς δηλοῖ καὶ ἀστατεῖν. — ἐν] *in*, i.e. clothed with. — ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν] *in sheep-skins, in goat fells*. The latter, as designation of a yet rougher clothing, is an ascent from the former, and on that account placed last. μηλωτή, the hide of smaller cattle in general, and specially of sheep. A μηλωτή is mentioned as the garment of Elijah, which, on his being caught up to heaven, he left behind to Elisha, 1 Kings xix. 13, 19; 2 Kings viii. 13, 14. — ὑστερούμενοι, θλιβόμενοι, κακυχούμενοι] *in want* (sc. of that which is necessary for the sustenance of life), *affliction, evil-treatment* (comp. ver. 25).

Ver. 38. Ὡν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος] *Men, to possess whom the (corrupt) world (ver. 7) was not worthy*. Theophylact: Οἶκ' ἔχετε, φησὶν, εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἁμαρτωλοὶ ὄντες τοιαῦτα ἔπασχον, ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτοι, οἷοι καὶ τοῦ κόσμου αὐτοῦ τιμιώτεροι εἶναι. Calvin: Quum ita profugi inter feras vagabantur sancti prophetae, videri poterant indigni, quos terra sustineret. Qui fit enim, ut inter homines locum non inveniant? Sed apostolus in contrariam partem hoc retorquet, nempe quod mundus illis non esset dignus. Nam quocumque veniant servi Dei, ejus benedictionem, quasi fragrantiam boni odoris, secum afferunt. — ὦν] goes back to the subject in περιήλθον, ver. 37. In a forced manner Böhme (as also Kuinoel, Klee, and Stein): it points to that which follows, and the sense is: oberravisse illos in desertis tales, quibus vulgus hominum, ut esse soleat, pravum ac impium, haud dignum fuerit, quocum illi eodem loco versarentur. Not less unnaturally does Hofmann look upon ὦν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος as only a following definition of subject to περιήλθον, in that he begins a new section of the discourse with περιήλθον. To a yet greater extent, finally, has Carpzov missed the true interpretation, when, taking ὦν as a *neuter*, he supplies κακῶν (ὑστερήσεων, θλίψεων), and gives as the sense: quorum indignus malorum erat mundus. Id est: tam crudelibus affecti sunt suppliciis, ut illa mundo indigna sint; ut orbem terrarum non deceat, tam horrenda ac φοβερῶτατα de eo dici.— ἐν ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι κ.τ.λ.] *wandering in deserts and upon mountains, and in caves and the clefts [cliffs] of the earth*. Comp. 1 Kings

xviii. 4, 13, xix. 4, 8, 9, 13; 1 Macc. ii. 28, 29; 2 Macc. v. 27, vi. 11, x. 6.

Vv. 39, 40. General remark in closing. — *Καὶ οὗτοι πάντες*] *And these all*. Refers back to the totality of the persons named, from ver. 4 (not merely, as Schlichting, Hammond, and Storr suppose, to those mentioned from *ἄλλοι* δέ, ver. 35). — *μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως*] *although by virtue of their faith they received a* (glorious) *testimony* (in Scripture). — *οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν*] *did not bear away the promise* (wrongly Ebrard: the aorist stands “pro plusquamperf.”), *i.e.* attained not, so long as they lived, to the possession of that which was promised, namely, the Messianic blessedness.

Ver. 40. The ground for the *οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν* lay in the decree of God, that those believers should not apart from us attain to the consummation. — *τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν κρεῖττόν τι προβλεψαμένου*] *God having, with regard to us, foreseen* (predetermined) *something better*. — *προβλέπειν*] in the N. T. only here. — On account of the emphatically preposed *περὶ ἡμῶν*, which forms the contrast to *οὗτοι πάντες*, ver. 39, *κρεῖττόν τι* cannot be placed *absolutely*: “Something better than would otherwise have been our portion” (Schlichting, Seb. Schmidt, Huët). With this thought, moreover, *ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσιν* would not have been in keeping, since, instead thereof, *ἵνα σὺν αὐτοῖς τελειωθῶμεν* must have been written. The sense can only be: *in regard to us something better than in regard to them*. In regard to us something better, inasmuch as when they lived the appearing of the Redeemer as yet belonged to the distant future, and was an object of longing desire (Matt. xiii. 16 f.; Luke x. 23 f.); but now Christ has in reality appeared, has accomplished the redemption, and presently after a brief interval will return, to bring to full realization the Messianic kingdom with all its blessings of salvation. Comp. x. 25, 36 f. — *ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσιν*] Declaration of the *divine design*: *that they not without us should attain to the consummation*. Without us, *i.e.* without our having entered into the joint participation in the consummation, they would have attained to the consummation, if

Christ had already appeared in their time, and so they had already attained during their lifetime to the possession of the promised Messianic bliss. For then *we* should not have been born at all; since, according to the declaration of the Lord (Matt. xxii. 30; Mark xii. 25; Luke xx. 35 f.), in the consummated kingdom of God a marrying and being given in marriage will no longer take place.

CHAPTER XII.

VER. 2. *καθίστην*] Elz.: *ἐκάθισεν*. But the perfect, adopted into the Editt. Complut. Genev. Plant., as also by Bengel, Griesb. Matth. Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche, and others, has the preponderant attestation of all the uncials, most cursives, and many Fathers in its favour; and is likewise preferable on internal grounds, since it represents the having sat down as a result extending into the present time. — Ver. 3. In place of the *Recepta* *εἰς αὐτόν* or *εἰς αὐτόν*, which has the support of D*** K L, almost all the cursives and many Fathers, there is found *εἰς αὐτούς* in S***, with Theodoret (*τὸ εἰς αὐτοὺς ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς ἑαυτούς*), and in Cod. 17; *εἰς ἑαυτούς*, however, in S*, in the Peshito (*quantum sustinuerit a peccatoribus, qui fuerunt adversarii sibi ipsis*), in D* E*, together with their Latin version (*recogitate igitur, talem vos reportasse a peccatoribus in vobis adversitatem*), and in some mss. of the Vulgate; while the Sahidic and Armenian vss. entirely omit the words, and Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, de Wette write *εἰς ἑαυτόν*. The latter, which is attested by A and the Vulgate (in *semetipsum*), indirectly also by D* E*, is to be held the original reading; the plural, on the other hand, to be rejected as devoid of sense. — *ἀντιπατέστητε*] In place of this, Tisch. 2 writes, after L* 46, *al.* Chrys. ms. Theodoret, Theophyl. ms.: *ἀντιστατέστητε*. This form of the word (see on the twofold augment, Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 69 f.) must, it is true, be adopted upon strong attestation, but is not in a position here to set aside the *Recepta* *ἀντιπατέστητε*, where *ἀντιπ.* has against it the preponderating testimony of A D E L** S, etc. Rightly, therefore, has Tisch. restored *ἀντιπ.* in the editt. vii. and viii. — Ver. 5. Elz.: *τί ἐμοι*. D*, some seven cursives, as also the Latin translation in D E, have only *τί*. Bleek has on that account suspected *μοι*, and enclosed it within brackets. External authority, however, does not warrant our deleting the pronoun. The occasion for its omission might be afforded by the occurrence of a similar initial letter in the following word, or by the text of the LXX. in which it is wanting. — Ver. 7. *εἰ παροΐων ὑπομείνεις*] Instead of this, Matth. Lachm. Tisch. 1,

7 and 8, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 758), and Alford read εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, and Griesbach has placed εἰς upon the inner margin. In favour of εἰς pleads, it is true, the greatly preponderating authority of A D E(?) K L 8, of more than thirty cursives, Vulg. It. Syr. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Arm. Damasc. Procop., while εἰ is found only with Chrys. Theodoret, Theophyl. Slav. (?), and, as it seems, in many cursives. Nevertheless εἰς is inadmissible. For, whether εἰς παιδείαν is taken still with παραδίχεται, or, as Hofmann will have it, with μαστιγοῦ,—whereby, however, that which follows would become deformed,—or it be combined with ὑπομένετε, in any case παιδεία must be understood in the sense of “education,” whereas of a certainty, alike from that which precedes as from that which follows, the signification “chastisement” becomes a necessity. Consequently the *Recepta* εἰ παιδείαν ὑπομένετε is to be looked upon as that written by the author. The originality and correctness of this reading (defended also by Reiche, p. 115 sqq.) becomes manifestly apparent from the fact that upon its recognition vv. 7, 8, in accordance with the usual accuracy of diction prevailing in the Epistle to the Hebrews, are in perfect mutual correspondence as type and antitype, alike as regards the protasis as also the apodosis.—In place of the *Recepta* τίς γάρ ἐστιν, we have, with Lachm. and Tisch., after A, 8* Vulg. Sahid. Orig., to write merely: τίς γάρ.—Ver. 8. Elz.: νόθοι ἐστέ καὶ οὐχ υἱοί. With Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Delitzsch, Alford, we have to trans-
 pose into: νόθοι καὶ οὐχ υἱοί ἐστέ, after A D* and D*** [in Cod. E all the rest is wanting from πάντες, ver. 8, to the close of the Epistle] 8, 17, 37, 80, *al.*, Vulg. It. Chrys. (codd.) and Latin Fathers.—Ver. 9. Elz.: οὐ πολλὸν μάλλον. But A D* 8 (D* 8*** with the addition of δέ) have οὐ πολλὸν μάλλον. Rightly preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford.—Ver. 15. In place of the received διὰ ταύτης, we have to adopt, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 2, and Alford, after A, 17, 67** 80, 137, 238, Copt. etc., Clem. Chrys. (comment.): δι’ αὐτῆς; and in place of the *Recepta* πολλοί, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, after A 8, 47, Clem. Theodoret: οἱ πολλοί. The article was lost sight of in the homoioteleuton πολλοί.—Ver. 16. Lachm. (and Tisch. 2 and 7, as well as Alford, have followed him therein!) has placed in the text, from A C, the form of the word ἀπέδοτο; but this, although not altogether unexampled (see Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutestam. Sprachgebr.* p. 40 f.), is manifestly a corruption of the *Recepta* ἀπέδοτο, which is confirmed by the Cod. Sinait.—On the other hand, the reading ἐαυτοῦ, given by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, merits,

on account of its more decided attestation by A C D** and D*** s*, the preference over the *Recepta* αὐτοῦ or αὐτοῦ. — Ver. 18. Elz.: ψηλαφωμένω ὄρει. ὄρει, furnished by D K L, in like manner, as it seems, by almost all cursives, Vulg. (ed. Clem.) Arab. polygl. Slav. Athan. Theodoret, Damasc. Oecum., is wanting indeed in A C s, 17, 47, in many mss. of the Vulg., in Copt. Sahid. Syr. Arab. Epp. Aeth., with Chrys. (comment.), Theophyl. Mart. pap. Bed., and was already suspected by Mill (*Prolegg.* 1071) as a gloss, and then deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 8, as likewise by Alford, is, however, *indispensable*, and is naturally called for by the opposition ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιών ὄρει, ver. 22 (comp. also τοῦ ἔρους, ver. 20), as well as the confusion of idea in a πῦρ ψηλαφώμενον. Rightly, therefore, has Tisch. 2 and 7 placed ὄρει again in the text. — καὶ [ζῶφω] Elz.: καὶ σκότῳ. Against A C D* s* 17, 31, 39, *al.* Suspected by Griesb. Rightly rejected by Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford. σκότῳ was introduced from the LXX. Deut. iv. 11, v. 22. — Ver. 19. In place of the *Recepta* προσπειθῆναι, Lachm. in the stereotype edition had adopted προσθῆναι, after A. Rightly, however, has he retained the *Recepta* in the larger edition. This reading is borne out by C D K L s, by, as it seems, all the cursives and many Fathers. — Ver. 20. After λιθοβοληθήσεται, Elz. adds further: ἢ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται. Against all uncials (A C D K L M s), most min., all translations, and many Fathers. The words, deleted by Griesbach, Scholz, and all later editors, are a gloss from LXX. Ex. xix. 13. — Ver. 23. Elz.: ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀπογεγραμμένων. But the decisive testimony of A C D L M s, 37, *al. m.*, Syr. Copt. Vulg. and many Fathers demands the transposition adopted by Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford, and others: ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς. — Ver. 24. κρείττον λαλοῦντι] Elz.: κρείττονα λαλοῦντι. Against A C D K L M s, most min. Syr. Arr. Copt. Sahid. Armen. Vulg. *al.*, and many Fathers. — Ver. 25. Elz.: ἔφυγον τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς παραιτησάμενοι χρηματίζοντα, πολλὰ μᾶλλον. Instead of this, however, we have to read, with Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. (who, however, in the edit. vii. has given the preference to the verbum simplex ἔφυγον, over the verbum compositum ἐξέφυγον) Alford: ἐξέφυγον ἐπὶ γῆς παραιτησάμενοι τὸν χρηματίζοντα, πολλὰ μᾶλλον, in that ἐξέφυγον (already approved by Grotius) is demanded by A C s* 57, 118, *al.* (Vulg. D, Lat. Slav. Epiph. in cant. cantic.: effugerunt), Cyr. Chrys. Philo Carpas. Oecum.; the deleting of the article τῆς before γῆς (already omitted in the Editt. Erasmi. Complut. Colin., afterwards also by Bengel, Griesb. Matth. Scholz) is required by all

the uncial mss. (including \aleph), most min., and very many Fathers; further, the placing of the article $\tau\acute{o}\nu$ only after *παραιτησάμενοι* is required by A C D M \aleph^* Cyril. Damasc.; finally, $\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{o}$ is required by A C D \aleph^* Sahid. — Ver. 26. Elz.: $\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega$. But A C M \aleph , 6, 47, *al.*, Syr. Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Slav. Athan. Cyril. Cosm. Andr. Areth. have $\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\omega$. Approved by Grotius, recommended by Griesb., rightly adopted by Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Alford, Reiche. — Ver. 27. *Recepta*: $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\sigma\alpha\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$. Better accredited, however (by A C \aleph^*), is Lachmann's order of the words: $\tau\eta\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\sigma\alpha\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$, which on that account is to be preferred. Bleek and Tisch. 1 have entirely rejected the article $\tau\eta\nu$. It is wanting, however, only in D * and M. — Ver. 28. The reading $\xi\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, which Calvin, Mill (*Prolegg.* 750), Heinrichs, and others approve, and which Luther also followed in his translation, is unsuitable, and insufficiently attested by K \aleph , more than twenty min., most mss. of the Vulg., Aeth. Cyr. Antioch., while the reading $\xi\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ rests upon the testimony of A C D L M, etc., Copt. Syr. Aeth. *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. *al.*, as also a ms. of the Vulg. — In that likewise which follows, the indicative $\lambda\alpha\tau\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, which Griesbach has placed on the inner margin, stands in point of external attestation below the *Recepta* $\lambda\alpha\tau\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$. The former is found in K M \aleph , about fifty min., with Athan., in mss. of Chrys., with Occum. and Theophyl. On the other hand, A C D L, very many min. and many Fathers have $\lambda\alpha\tau\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$. — At the close of the verse the *Recepta* reads: $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, instead of which, however, we have, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford, to adopt the reading (recommended also by Griesb.): $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, after A C D \aleph^* 17, 71, 73, 80, 137, Copt. Sahid. Slav. ed. (*al.*: $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$. Vulg.: cum metu et reverentia. D, Lat.: cum metu et verecundia).

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

Ver. 1. Conclusion from the total contents of chap. xi.—In the animating summons expressed vv. 1, 2, the addition $\delta\acute{\iota}$ $\upsilon\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\eta\varsigma$, appended to the main verb $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, has the principal stress; comp. x. 36, xi. 1. Of the participial clauses, however, the first and third are of the same kind,

and are distinguished in equal degree from the second; as accordingly the former are introduced by participles of the *present*, the latter by a participle of the *aorist*. The first and third contain a ground of animation to the δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχωμεν; by the second, on the other hand, the historic preliminary condition to the δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχειν is stated. The euphonious τοιγαροῦν elsewhere in the N. T. only 1 Thess. iv. 8.—καὶ ἡμεῖς] *we also*, namely, like the saints of the Old Covenant described chap. xi.—τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικεείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων] *since we have so great a cloud of witnesses around us, or: since so great a cloud of witnesses surrounds us.* ἔχοντες περικεείμενον is intimately connected together, and is a periphrasis of the mere verbal notion, inasmuch as a genitive absolute: τοσοῦτον περικεείμενον ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ., might have been employed instead. νέφος is a figurative designation (also of frequent occurrence with classical writers) of a densely compact crowd. Theodoret: πλῆθος τοσοῦτον, νέφος μιμούμενον τῇ πυκνότητι. Comp. Hom. Il. iv. 274: ἄμα δὲ νέφος εἶπετο πεζῶν, *al. Eurip. Hec. 901 f.: τοῖον Ἑλλάνων νέφος ἀμφί σε κρύπτει. Phociss. 1328 ff.: πότερ' ἐμαντὸν ἢ πόλιν στένω δακρύσας, ἣν πέριξ ἔχει νέφος τοσοῦτον, ὥστε δι' Ἀχέροντος ἰέναι*; Herod. viii. 109: νέφος τοσοῦτον ἀνθρώπων. Similarly also is the Latin *nubes* employed. Comp. *e.g.* Liv. 35. 49: rex contra peditum equitumque nubes jactat.—Those meant by the τοσοῦτον νέφος μαρτύρων are the persons mentioned chap. xi. When, however, these are characterized as a cloud of witnesses, the author does not intend to imply that these witnesses are present as *spectators* at the contest to be maintained by the readers (Hammond, Calnet, Böhme, Paulus, Klee, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Hofmann), but represents them thereby as persons who have borne testimony for the πίστις which he demands of his readers,¹ and who consequently have become models for imitation to the readers as regards *this* virtue.

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

¹ The supposition of Delitzsch, Richm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 757), Alford, Maier, and Moll, that in μαρτύρων, ver. 1, the idea of "spectators"

xii. 1, attaches again the discourse to ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε *χρεῖαν* κ.τ.λ., x. 36, so also the contents of chap. xi., which stand in close connection with the latter, are recapitulated by the words: τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων. On account, however, of this close connection of the first participial clause, xii. 1, with chap. xi., μαρτύρων cannot be otherwise interpreted than after the analogy of the characterization there made: μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως, xi. 39; ἐν ταύτῃ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν, xi. 2; δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη, xi. 4; and μεμαρτύρηται, xi. 5, in that only the slight distinction is made, justified in a natural manner by the varying form of designation, that while the persons named were before represented as those to whom a laudatory testimony was given in scripture on account of the πίστις manifested by them, they now appear as those who, by their conduct, have delivered a testimony in favour of their virtue of πίστις, and consequently have become patterns of the same for others. On account of this intimate coherence of the first participial clause, xii. 1, with chap. xi., a more nearly-defining addition, τῆς πίστεως to μαρτύρων, was, moreover, superfluous. That, however, μαρτύρων is in reality employed with reference to the πίστις which the author demands of his readers, is further shown by τῆς πίστεως, xii. 2, from which it is clearly apparent that the notion πίστις is still before the mind of the writer at ver. 2. It is therefore to be supposed that the discourse turns round to the figure of the *race*—to which, indeed, περικείμενον would already be appropriate, but to which this participle is not at all of necessity to be referred—only with ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι κ.τ.λ.—ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα] *having put off every hindrance* (opposed to the context, Bengel and others: *every kind of pride or arrogance*; Hofmann: *all earthly care and sorrow*). The man contending in the race avoided, in order to keep his body light, oppressive clothing and the like. In the application, the clinging of the readers to external Judaism is certainly, in particular, thought of as the hindrance. Yet the expression is quite general, and sin in the strict

blends with that of "witnesses to the faith," bears its refutation upon the face of it. For the combining of that which is logically irreconcilable is not exegesis.

sense of the term, which is immediately after quite specially emphasized, is likewise included thereunder. For *καί* is not, with Grotius and others, to be taken *explicatively*, but further brings into relief, in the form of a parallel classification, a definite species, taken, on account of its special importance, out of the before-named genus.—Sin is termed *εὐπερίστατος*. This adjective exists only here in the whole range of Greek literature. It is most naturally derived from the middle voice: *περίστασθαι*, to place oneself round, or encompass. The sense is therefore: *sin, which easily surrounds us and takes us captive*. So the majority. Others derive *εὐπερίστατος* from the active *περίστημι*, then taking the word either in a passive or active sense. The explanation of Ernesti (*ad Hesych. gloss. sacr.* p. 140 sq.), that “as *περίστατον* denotes that which is thronged about by people who come to admire it, and *ἀπερίστατος* is said of a man about whom others do not stand, thus, who is destitute of friends; so *εὐπερίστατος* characterizes sin as rich in friends and patrons, as generally esteemed and liked,” has against it the consideration that from *εὐπερίστατος*, in this acceptation, the idea of that which is *public and manifest* is inseparable; but this idea is out of keeping with the notion of sin, which is just as often perpetrated in secret as in public. The interpretation: *sin, which is easily to be gone round, encircled, or avoided* (Chrysostom: ἡ τὴν εὐκόλως περίστασιν δυναμένην παθεῖν λέγει μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦτο· ῥᾷδιον γάρ, ἐὰν θέλωμεν, περιγενέσθαι [*get the better of*] τῆς ἁμαρτίας; Pseudo-Athanasius, *de parabol. Script. quæst.* 133: *εὐπερίστατον* εἶπε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐπειδὴν μόνιμον στάσιν οὐκ ἔχει, ἀλλὰ ταχέως τρέπεται καὶ καταλύεται; Clericus, Morus, Ewald p. 172), would yield an unsuitable thought, since it could not possibly be the design of the author to represent the power of sin as small. The active explanation: *seductive or enticing* (Carpzov, Schulz, Stein), has against it the fact that all the other derivatives from *ίστημι*, such as *στατός*, *ἄστατος*, etc., have an intransitive or passive signification. Others, again, in their explanations of *εὐπερίστατος*, follow the significations of the substantive *περίστασις*: *sin, which easily plunges us into danger* (Er. Schmid, Raphel, Bengel, Storr; comp. already Theophylact:

ἡ δὲ ἦν εὐκόλως τις εἰς περιστάσεις ἐμπίπτει οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτω κινδυνώδες ὡς ἁμαρτία); *which brings with it many hindrances* (Kypke, Michaelis, Dindorf, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Bloomfield); *which has circumstantias* (surroundings), *whereby it commends itself and seduces us* (Hammond); *quae bonis utitur rebus circumstantibus*, i.e. *quae habet suisque affert bonam fortunam atque voluptates* (Böhme).—The ἁμαρτία is sin in general; not specially: the sin of apostasy from Christianity. On account of ἀποθέμενοι, the ἁμαρτία is thought of as a burden which we bear within us as a *propensity*, or about us as an *encumbering garment*. —τρέχειν ἀγῶνα] *to run a race*. Comp. Herod. viii. 102; Dion. Hal. vii. 48; Eurip. *Orest.* 875. — δι' ὑπομονῆς] Rom. viii. 25.

Ver. 2. Second factor in the encouragement. Not only the example of the O. T. witnesses for the faith, but also the example of the Beginner and Perfecter of the faith, Christ Himself, must animate us to a persevering τρέχειν. — ἀφορών-τες] *in that we look forth* (for our encouragement and for our ardent imitation). ἀφορᾶν (as, immediately after, τελειωτής) only here in the N. T. — εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν] *to the Beginner and Perfecter of the faith, Jesus*, i.e. to Jesus, who has begun or awakened in us the Christian faith, and carries it on in us to perfection, or to the close (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, and the majority), which last particular then naturally includes the attaining of salvation. But it is going too far when one finds—as Grotius, Bloomfield, and many others—in τελειωτής the figure of the βραβευτής, the judge or umpire of the games, who, on the completion of the contest, awards the prize of victory; for the expression itself does not warrant this special application. According to Bengel, Baumgarten, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Grimm (*Theol. Literaturbl.* z. Darmst. Allg. Kirch.-Zeit. 1857, No. 29, p. 667), Nickel (Reuter's *Repertor.* March 1858, p. 208 f.), Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 326), Maier, Moll, Kurtz,—comp. also Theodoret: Κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ἀμφοτέρα τέθεικεν, — ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτὴς Ἰησοῦς has the sense: *Jesus, who in manifestation of the faith has preceded us by His example, and in the manifestation of this faith has carried on the work*

unto perfection.¹ But the *virtue* of faith the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews could not possibly predicate of Christ in like manner as he does of the Christians. From the lofty conception he had of the person of the Redeemer, he must, like the Apostle Paul, regard Him by whom the divine decrees of salvation were to be realized, as *object* of the πίστις. More than this, τελειωτής can be used only *transitively*, not also *intransitively*. ἀρχηγὸς τῆς πίστεως stands, therefore, in a sense quite analogous to that of the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας, ii. 10; and the exemplary characteristic in Jesus, to which the author directs his readers, is not already expressed by His being designated as ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτής τῆς πίστεως,—which, on the contrary, is only designed to make us aware of the assistance which Christ affords the Christians in the πρέχειν,—but first is expressed by means of the following relative clause. — ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς] *who for the* (heavenly) *joy lying ready for Him*, the obtaining of which should be the reward of His sufferings. So Primasius, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Bengel, Whitby, Schulz, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 357), Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority. ἀντί, as ver. 16. For χαρά, however, comp. Matt. xxv. 21. Comprehended under the προκειμένη αὐτῷ χαρά is also the joy over the completed work of redemption, with its blessings for mankind; yet it is erroneous, with Theodoret (χαρὰ δὲ τοῦ σωτῆρος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἢ σωτηρία), to limit it thereto. The sense is not: *instead of the heavenly glory which He already had as the premundane Logos, and which He might have retained, but which He gave up by His incarnation* (Peshito, Gregory Nazianz. in Oecum.: ὦ ἐξὸν μένειν ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας δόξης τε καὶ θεότητος, οὐ μόνον ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν ἄχρι τῆς δούλου μορφῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ σταυρὸν

¹ Inconsistently does Delitzsch adhere to this explanation (and similarly Alford and Kluge),—in reference, indeed, to the notion ὁ πᾶς πίστεως ἀρχηγός, —but rejects it in reference to the notion, necessarily combining in homogeneity therewith, ὁ πᾶς πίστεως τελειωτής. The sense is supposed to be: "Jesus is the Prince of faith: for upon the path on which faith has to run, He has gone first to open the way; He is faith's Completer: for upon this path He leads us to the goal." That Jesus Himself reached the goal upon this path, is then supposed to be an unuttered intermediate thought (!).

ὑπέμεινεν κ.τ.λ.; Beza, Nemethus, Heinrichs, Ewald). Nor is it: *instead of the earthly freedom from suffering, which, as the sinless One, He could have procured for Himself* (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Zeger, Jac. Cappellus, Calov, *al.*); or: *instead of the joys of the world, which Jesus, had He willed it, could have partaken of* (Calvin, Wolf, Carpzov, Stein, Bisping, *al.*). For the immediate concern of the author must evidently be to point to the prize which Christ was to receive in return for His sufferings, in order thereupon further to indicate that to the readers likewise, upon their persevering in the conflict, the palm of victory will not be wanting. A further consideration is, that also the closing member of the verse, which is closely attached by means of τέ to that which precedes, has for its subject-matter still the thought of the reward conferred upon Christ. — ὑπέμεινεν σταυρόν, αἰσχύνῃς καταφρονήσας] *endured the cross, in that He contemned the infamy.* For the death of the cross was crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium (Cic. Verr. 5. 64). — ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκάθικεν] *and has sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.* Comp. i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12.

Ver. 3. Γάρ] is here, on account of the imperative, the corroborative: *Yea!* (comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 415 f.); and ἀναλογίζεσθαι, in the N. T. a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, denotes *the comparing or reflecting contemplation.* Bengel: Comparatione instituta cogitare: Dominus tanta tulit; quanto magis servi ferant aliquid? — ἀντιλογία, however, denotes nothing else than *contradiction*; and what is meant is, the contending against Christ's divine Sonship and Messianic dignity. The notion of *opposition* and *ill-usage in act*, which is ordinarily assigned to it (still also by Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, and Maier) along with that of *contradiction*, this word never has. Even ἀντιλέγειν, to which appeal is made, has nowhere the sense of a hostile resistance manifesting itself in outward actions. See Meyer on Luke ii. 34; John xix. 12; Rom. x. 21. — τοιαύτην] *such*, i.e. *one so great*, sc. that He was compelled to undergo the ignominious death of the cross (ver. 2), in comparison with which your sufferings are something insignificant. — ἵνα μὴ κἀμῃτε κ.τ.λ.] *that ye may not grow weary, desponding in your*

souls. ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν is to be conjoined with ἐκλυόμενοι (Beza, Er. Schmid, Hammond, Kuinoel, Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, *al.*), not with κάμητε (Luther, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Schulz, Böhme, and others), since otherwise something of a dragging character would be imparted to the participle.

Ver. 4 ff. The sufferings which have come upon the readers are only small, and a salutary chastisement at the hand of God. — Οὐπω μέχρῃς αἵματος κ.τ.λ.] *Not yet unto blood, i.e. to such extent that bloodshed should result, that a martyr's death¹ among you should be a necessity (as such death had but just now been mentioned of the O. T. saints, chap. xi., and of Christ Himself, xii. 2), have ye offered resistance in your contest against sin.* The author has, as x. 32 ff., only the present generation of Palestinian Christians, to whom he is speaking, before his eyes. It is otherwise at xiii. 7. — πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν] belongs to ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι (against Bengel, who conjoins it with ἀντικατέστητε), and ἡ ἁμαρτία stands not in the sense of οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί, ver. 3 (Carpzov, Heinrichs, Stuart, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Maier, Kluge, Grimm in the *Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1870, p. 43, *al.*),—for there would exist no reason for the avoiding of this concrete expression,²—but is the inner sin, conceived of as a hostile power or person, which entices the man (visited with sufferings and persecutions) to an apostasy from Christianity. Comp. ἀπάτη τῆς ἁμαρτίας, iii. 13. — In

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

² At least no one will recognise as apposite that which Ebrard adduces as such,—to wit, that in ver. 3 "the whole (!) of mankind as the sinners (the class of sinners) might be opposed to Christ; whereas to the readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who were themselves ἁμαρτωλοί, the enemies of Christianity could not be opposed as the sinners.

ἀντικατέστητε ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι—both verbs in the N. T. only here—the author has, what is wrongly denied by de Wette and Maier (in like manner as Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 26), passed over from the figure of the race to the kindred one of the combat with the fists.

Ver. 5, 6. Καὶ ἐκλέλησθε κ.τ.λ.] *And have ye forgotten, etc.?* The words are most naturally to be taken, with Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Brann, Jos. Hallet, Heinrichs, Böhme, Stuart, Iachmann, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Ewald, as a *question*. If we would, as is usually done, take them as an assertory statement (“and ye have forgotten”), the reproach contained in the same would come out more strongly than is consonant with the mild character of the discourse in this section. The verb ἐκλανθάνεσθαι, as presently after ὀλιγωρεῖν, in the N. T. only here. — τῆς παρακλήσεως] *the consolation* (or else: *the animating address*). — ἥτις ὑμῖν ὡς υἱοῖς διαλέγεται] *which, of a truth, speaks to you as to sons*. By virtue of ἥτις (in place of which there is no sufficient ground for writing, with Hofmann, ἡ τις) the following consolatory utterance (Τίε . . . παραδέχεται), adduced from Prov. iii. 11, 12,—from which also Philo, *de congressu quær. crudit. gr.* p. 449 D (with Mangey, l. p. 544 f.), reasons in a similar manner,—is presupposed as one sufficiently familiar to the readers. By διαλέγεται, however, the same is personified; since διαλέγεσθαι τινι denotes *conversing with any one* (here, as it were, the answering in reply to the complaint breathed forth by the readers). — Τίέ μου] With the LXX. only: Τίέ. — μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου] *despise not chastening from the Lord, i.e. be thankful for it, when the Lord chastens thee*. — μηδὲ ἐκλύου ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος] *nor despond when thou art corrected of Him* (by means of sufferings which He imposes upon thee).

Ver. 6. Παιδεύει] *him He chasteneth*. So in the LXX. Cod. A, and fifteen other mss. The remaining manuscripts of the LXX. have, what is probably the original reading: ἐλέγχει. — μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται] *and scourges every son whom He receives* (adopts as His). According to present punctuation, the words in Hebrew read: הַיָּחִיד בְּכֹרֶתוֹ, and (He chastens) as a father the son in whom he delights. Instead of בְּכֹרֶתוֹ, the LXX., however, read בְּכֹרֶתוֹ (to cause pain).

Vv. 7, 8. Application of the word of scripture to the readers. — *Εἰ παιδεῖαν ὑπομένετε*] *If ye endure chastening*. The opposite of this is formed by the *εἰ δὲ χωρὶς ἐστε παιδείας*, ver. 8. The emphasis falls, therefore, upon *παιδεῖαν*; and to explain *ὑπομένειν* as a “stedfast” or “persevering” enduring (Theodoret, *Erasm. Paraphr.*, Stein, Ebrard, Bloomfield, *al.*) is inadmissible. — *ὡς υἱοῖς ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ θεός*] *God deals with you as with sons, treats you as sons*. By as harsh a construction as possible (comp. *ὑμῖν ὡς υἱοῖς*, ver. 5), Ebrard will have *ὡς* taken as a conjunction, and translates, — espousing the incorrect reading (see the critical obs.) *εἰς παιδεῖαν*, — “for your instruction endure manfully, even as (or when, so long as) God offers Himself to you as to sons!” — For the genuine Greek formula *προσφέρεσθαί τινι*, which does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., see examples in Wetstein. — *τίς γὰρ υἱὸς κ.τ.λ.*] *sc. ἐστίν*: *for what son is there, i.e. where is there a son, whom the father chastens not?* This comprehending together of *τίς υἱός* (Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford, Maier, Kurtz, Ewald) is more natural than that one should regard *τίς* alone as the subject: *who is indeed a son, whom, etc.* (Delitzsch, Moll, and others); or, with Böhme, as the predicate: *of what kind is a son, whom, etc.*

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

Vv. 9, 10, a second argument follows. The readers must not become disheartened at the sufferings imposed upon them. For not only is there to be seen, in the fact of their having

to struggle with afflictions, the manifestation that God treats them as His children; it is, moreover, *the heavenly Father* who visits them with this chastening, and that for the very reason that He has their own highest good in view. — *εἶτα*] then, *further, deinde*. Not to be taken as an *interrogative particle*, with Alberti, Raphel, Heinrichs, and others. For otherwise the discourse would have proceeded in the second half of the verse with *καὶ οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον*, instead of the mere *οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον*. Ingeniously, but without constraining reason, does Reiche (*Commentar. crit.* p. 121) conjecture *εἴ τε* instead of *εἶτα*, while quite unsuitably Hofmann will comprehend *εἶτα* with the closing words of ver. 8. — *τοὺς τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας*] *fathers of our flesh, i.e.* our bodily, earthly fathers. — *εἴχομεν παιδευτὰς καὶ ἐνετρεπόμεθα*] *we had as chasteners, and heeded them, i.e.* we gave heed when we had them as chasteners. Inasmuch as the author is addressing grown-up persons, the imperfects characterize the period of the bygone youth (*we used to give heed*). The combining of *ἐντρέπεσθαι*, however, with the *accusative* of the object is in later Greek style the ordinary one. With the earlier authors the *genitive* is used. — The absolute statement *εἶτα . . . ἐνετρεπόμεθα* takes the place of a hypothetical premiss (comp. x. 28 f.; 1 Cor. vii. 18, 21, *al.*), and the whole verse contains an argument *a minore ad majus*. — *οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑποταγησόμεθα τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ ζήσομεν;*] *shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and (i.e. so that we in consequence thereof) live?* By *ὁ πατὴρ τῶν πνευμάτων* naturally *God* is meant. With Hammond, to think of *Christ*, is forbidden by the connection (comp. ver. 7). *To the Father of spirits, i.e.* God, who is Father in regard to the higher spiritual domain of life. That God, as the Creator of all things, is the Final Cause also of the bodily life of man, is a fact not excluded by the expression; only that which is the main thing as concerns God's fatherly relation is here emphasized. *ὁ πατὴρ τῶν πνευμάτων* does not designate God as Creator of the *souls*, in the sense of Creatianism as opposed to Traducianism (Calvin, Estius, Justinian, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Drusius, Carpzov, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 678;

Kurtz, *al.*). Nor as the One who *makes provision for our souls* (Morus, Dindorf, Kuinoel, Böhme, and others). Just as little is *πνεύματα* to be understood of the *angels* (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact: ἡ τῶν ἁσωμάτων δυνάμεων), or the *gifts of the Spirit* (Theodoret: πατέρα πνευμάτων τὸν πνευματικὸν πατέρα κέκληκεν ὡς τῶν πνευματικῶν χαρισμάτων πηγὴν. Comp. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact). It is possible there was present to the mind of the author the characterization of God, LXX. Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16, as a θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός. — καὶ ζήσομεν] Declaration of the result of this obedience, in the form of a parallel arrangement. ζῆν of the enjoyment of the *everlasting life of bliss*, as x. 38; Rom. viii. 13, and frequently.

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

¹ Richm's objection to this (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräischer*, p. 762, Obs.), that in such case κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς must have been placed before πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, is entirely without weight. Just the preposing of πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας was, if these words were to be referred to *both* members of the sentence, the most appropriate order; because κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς and ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον then as contrasts stood in so much the more immediate opposition to each other in the two halves of the sentence.

the *παιδεύειν* at a benefit or gain merely in regard to the earthly lifetime; God, on the other hand, at a gain for eternity,—by which at any rate a false opposition would arise, since the first half of the statement could not be at all conceded as a universally valid truth. Rather do the words affirm that the chastisement on the part of the natural fathers (and not less that on the part of the heavenly Father) continued only a few days, lasted only during a brief period. In a sense quite corresponding is *πρός* employed immediately after, ver. 11, as well as 1 Cor. vii. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 17, and very frequently elsewhere. — *κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς*] *according to their judgment*, which was not always an erroneous one. — The imperfect *ἐπαιδεύουν* stands there for the same reason as the imperfects, ver. 9. — *ὁ δέ*] *sc. πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας παιδεύει*. — *ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον*] *with a view to that which is salutary* (our infallible welfare). — *εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ*] *in order that we may be made partakers of His holiness*, may become ever more free from sin, and in moral purity ever more like God Himself.

Ver. 11. *The blessing of every chastening.* Comp. Diog. Laert. v. 18 (cited by Wetstein): *τῆς παιδείας ἔφη* (*sc. Aristotle*) *τὰς μὲν ρίζας εἶναι πικράς, γλυκεῖς δὲ τοὺς καρπούς*. — *πᾶσα παιδεία*] comprises the human and the divine chastening; yet the author in connection with the second clause (*ὅστερον δὲ κ.τ.λ.*) has no doubt mainly the latter before his mind. — *πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν κ.τ.λ.*] *seems indeed for the present* (so long as it continues) *to be no object of joy, but an object of grief*; later, however (*i.e.* when it has been outlived), *it yields to those who have been exercised by it* (comp. v. 14) *the peace-fraught fruit of righteousness*. — *δοκεῖ*] characterizes the opinion of man; since the matter is in reality very different. — *δικαιοσύνης*] *Genitive of apposition: peaceful fruit*, namely *righteousness*, *i.e.* moral purity and perfection. It is called a peaceful fruit because its possession brings with it peace of soul. *δικαιοσύνης* is not to be understood as a *genitivus subjecti* (Piscator, Owen, Stuart, Heinrichs, Stein, and others): *a peaceful fruit which is yielded by righteousness*; for surely *παιδεία* is mentioned as the subject producing the *καρπὸς εἰρηνικός*.

Vv. 12, 13. Animating conclusion of the exhortation to steadfastness continued up to this point. — *διό*] *Wherefore*, *sc.* because the sufferings you have to undergo manifest to you that ye are sons of God, and are salutary for you. — *τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα ἀνορθώσατε*] *make firm again the slackened hands and the weary knees*. Comp. LXX. Isa. xxxv. 3: *ἰσχύσατε χεῖρες ἀνείμναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα*. Eccles. xxv. 23: *χεῖρες παρειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα*. Comp. also Deut. xxxii. 36: *εἶδε γὰρ παραλελυμένους αὐτοὺς καὶ . . . παρειμένους*. — Theophylact: *δεικνύων ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν κυριωτέρων μερῶν, ὅτι ὅλοι παρειμένοι εἰσὶ τῇ ψυχῇ· αἱ μὲν γὰρ χεῖρες ἐνεργείας, οἱ δὲ πόδες κινήσεως σύμβολον*. — *ἀνορθοῦν*] literally, *to make the crooked straight again*; then in general to restore anything to its original right or perfect condition. [Cf. Luke xiii. 13; Acts xv. 16.]

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

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

τροχιάς ποίει σοῖς ποσί.—ἵνα μὴ τὸ χωλὸν ἐκτραπῇ, ἰαθῇ δὲ μᾶλλον] *that not (even) that which is lame may turn aside from the way, but rather be healed.* τὸ χωλὸν denotes not the suffering member in an individual, but within the larger community, thus the member of the Christian communion who is lame or halting, *i.e.* who makes only a tottering progress in Christianity, and falls away from the same if he does not gain a support in the rest of the community advancing in a straight course [Gal. ii. 14]. On τὸ χωλόν, as figurative designation of the wavering between two different bents of belief, comp. LXX. 1 Kings xviii. 21: ἕως πότε ὑμεῖς χωλανείτε ἐπ' ἀμφωτέραις ταῖς ἰγνύαις; *how long do ye halt upon both knee-joints (sides), i.e. do ye hesitate between the service of Jehovah and that of Baal?*—To the verb ἐκτρέπεσθαι, Fr. Junius, Grotius, Wolf, Carpzov, Heinrichs, and many others, finally Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Kurtz, Ewald, on account of the opposition ἰαθῇ δὲ μᾶλλον, assign the *passive* signification: *to be dislocated.* But justified by the usage of the language (see Wetstein at 1 Tim. i. 6) is the *middle* signification alone: *bend aside* (from the way), *turn aside.* This signification is therefore to be maintained here also, and ἰαθῇ δὲ μᾶλλον continues in an abbreviated form the figure employed, in that its meaning is: *but rather through the animating example given by the whole body, may be cured of his wavering, and briskly advance with the rest.*

Vv. 14–17. *Exhortation to concord and to growth in holiness.*

Ver. 14. Μετὰ πάντων] *with all*, even the non-Christians. Comp. Rom. xii. 18. For limiting the πάντες, with Michaelis, Zachariae, Storr, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, to the members of the Christian community, there exists no reason; and it has against it the mode of expression, since we should then have expected μετ' ἀλλήλων.—καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν] the general virtue, of which the endeavour after concord is only a particular outflow. ἁγιασμός, namely, is here *sanctification* or *moral purification* in general; too restricted is the reference of Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Jac. Cappellus, Bengel, Bloomfield, and others, who explain it as—what at 1 Thess. iv. 3 (see at that place) is certainly the correct explanation—

the virtue of *chastity*. — τὸν κύριον] By this expression some understand *God* (comp. Matt. v. 8), others *Christ* (comp. ix. 28). A certain decision is impossible. The *beholding* represents in an emblematic manner the idea of innermost union, and the whole is a designation of the Messianic blessedness in the consummated kingdom of God.

Vv. 15, 16. Further amplification of διώκετε τὸν ἁγιασμόν, ver. 14. That endeavour after holiness is not only to be in active exercise in the case of each one with regard to his own person; it is also, in equal degree, to be watchful that the Christian brethren preserve themselves free from immorality. — The *subject* in ἐπισκοποῦντες consists, as in διώκετε, ver. 14, with which the participle is conjoined, of all members of the congregation, not specially the presidents thereof (xiii. 17) or ἐπίσκοποι (Böhme); and ἐπισκοπεῖν signifies: *to direct one's view to a thing with close attention or solicitude*. — μὴ τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ] is no independent clause, so that ἡ would have to be supplemented (so the majority, as also Böhme, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Ebrard, and Maier). For the choice of the *tempus periphrasticum* would be here unnatural and justified by nothing.¹ The words are a mere introducing of the subject, which is then further resumed by μὴ τις ῥίζα κ.τ.λ., in such wise that ἐνοχλῇ forms the common predicate to both parts of the sentence introduced by μὴ (Heinrichs, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, Ewald). — μὴ τις ὑστερῶν κ.τ.λ.] *that no one, in that he remains far from the grace of God, i.e. in that he turns the back upon the grace of God which was afforded him in Christ, by immorality withdraws from it, and loses it* (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10). The unusual ὑστερεῖν ἀπὸ τινος is consequently by no means equivalent in signification to the ordinary ὑστερεῖν τινος. While the latter would represent the coming short of the possession of the divine grace absolutely, as an objective result, the former includes the idea of voluntary activity or of one's own culpability. Comp. Eccclus. vii. 34: μὴ ὑστέρει ἀπὸ κλαιόντων. Analogously stands also the mere ὑστερεῖν, Num. ix. 7: μὴ οὖν ὑστερήσωμεν προσε-

¹ Hofmann will on that account have ἡ indeed added in thought, but then have this explained not as a mere copula, but in the sense: *there being present*.

νέγκαι τὸ δῶρον κυρίῳ. Num. ix. 13: ἄνθρωπος, ὃς . . . ὑστερήσῃ ποιῆσαι τὸ πᾶσχα.—μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ] *that, I say, no root (plant) of bitterness (of which the fruit is bitterness)—i.e. a man¹ in whom, in consequence of his unholy walk, the bitter fruit of everlasting perdition is ripening—growing up (as in the case of a plant, of which the root was before covered with earth) cause trouble or disquiet (to the congregation).* The words are moulded after the LXX. of Deut. xxix. 18, according to the corrupted text of the *Cod. Alexandr.*: μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ καὶ πικρία (distorted from the original text contained in the *Cod. Vatic.*: μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ). That the reading in the *Cod. Alex.* of the LXX. only arose from a regard to our passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Jos. Hallet, Wolf, Delitzsch, Hofmann, and others) is not probable, since the author elsewhere in the O. T. citations follows the form of text in the *Cod. Alex.*—πικρίας] Chrysostom: οὐκ εἶπε πικρά, ἀλλὰ πικρίας τὴν μὲν γὰρ πικρὰν ῥίζαν ἔστι καρποὺς ἐνεγκεῖν γλυκεῖς, τὴν δὲ πικρίας ῥίζαν . . . οὐκ ἔστι ποτὲ γλυκὺν ἐνεγκεῖν καρπὸν πάντα γάρ ἐστι πικρά, οὐδὲν ἔχει ἡδύ, πάντα πικρά, πάντα ἀηδὴ, πάντα μίσους καὶ βδελυγμίας γέμοντα.—ἐνοχλεῖν] in the N. T. only here (and Luke vi. 18?).—καὶ δι' αὐτῆς μιανθῶσιν οἱ πολλοί] *and by it the many (the multitude or the great mass) become defiled (namely, by infection), i.e. likewise led astray into an unholy walk.* Comp. Gal. v. 9.

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

¹ Comp. 1 Macc. i. 10: καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτῶν ῥίζα ἀμαρτωλός, Ἀντίοχος Ἐπιφανής.

earthly), *as Esau*. ὡς Ἑσαυ belongs only to βέβηλος. It is not to be referred also to πόρνος (so still Delitzsch and Alford), since nothing is related in scripture concerning a πορνεία of Esau (more, it is true, the later Rabbis have to tell us; see Wetstein at our passage), and the elucidatory relative has respect only to βέβηλος. — ὅς κ.τ.λ.] Comp. Gen. xxv. 33. — ἀντί] indication of the *price*, as ver. 2. — τὰ πρωτοτόκια] *the birthright* with its privileges. Classic writers employ for it ἡ πρεσβεία or τὸ πρεσβεῖον.

Ver. 17. Warning reference to the pernicious result of Esau's behaviour. Comp. Gen. xxvii. — ἵστε] not *imperative* (Vulgate: *scitote*; Luther: *wisset aber*), but *indicative*, since to the readers as born Jews the fact itself was a perfectly familiar one. — ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα, θέλων κληρονομήσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν, ἀπεδοκιμάσθη] *that later also, when he wished to inherit* (to receive as a possession) *the blessing, he was rejected*. καὶ accentuates the ἀπεδοκιμάσθη, as the appropriate natural consequence of the ἀπέδοτο, ver. 16. ἡ εὐλογία, however, is the blessing absolutely, *i.e.* the more excellent blessing, which was appointed to the first-born as the bearer of the promises given by God to Abraham and his seed. To ἀπεδοκιμάσθη, finally, there is naturally supplemented: *by Isaac, in consequence of the higher occasioning or leading of God*. — μετανόιας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὔρεν, καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν] *for he found no room for change of mind, although he eagerly sought it with tears, i.e.* for Esau did not succeed in causing his father Isaac to change his mind, so that the latter should recall the blessing erroneously bestowed upon the younger brother Jacob, and confer it upon himself the elder son; in this he succeeded not, though he besought it with tears. This acceptance of the words, which Beza,¹ H. Stephanus, Piscator, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Owen, Er. Schmid, Seb. Schmidt, Calmet, Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Michaelis, Storr, Schulz, Böhme, Klee, Paulus, Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, Grimm (*Theol. Literaturbl.* to the *Darmst. A. K.-Z.* 1857, No. 29, p. 677), Nickel (*Reuter's Repertor.* 1858, March, p. 210), Maier, Moll, Kurtz,

¹ Yet Beza, as likewise Er. Schmid and Bisping, then refers back, without justifying reason, αὐτὴν to τὴν εὐλογίαν instead of μετανόιας.

and others insist on, is most naturally suggested by the context itself, yields a clear, correct thought, and best accords with the narrative in Genesis. Comp. LXX. Gen. xxvii. 33: *εὐλόγησα αὐτὸν καὶ εὐλογημένος ἔσται*. Ver. 34: *Ἐγένετο δέ, ἥνικα ἤκουσεν Ἡσαὺ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰσαάκ, ἀνεβόησε φωνὴν μεγάλην καὶ πικρὰν σφόδρα καὶ εἶπεν· εὐλόγησον δὴ καὶ ἐγὼ πᾶτερ*. Ver. 35: *Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ· ἐλθὼν ὁ ἀδελφός σου μετὰ δόλου ἔλαβε τὴν εὐλογίαν σου*. (It was thus a question not of a blessing in general,—that Esau also still received afterwards, comp. ver. 39 f.,—but about the definite blessing pertaining to the first-born.) Ver. 38: *Εἶπε δὲ Ἡσαὺ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ· μὴ εὐλογία μία σοι ἔστι πᾶτερ; εὐλόγησον δὴ καὶ ἐγὼ πᾶτερ*. *Κατανυχθέντος δὲ Ἰσαάκ* (this addition, peculiar to the LXX., accentuates afresh the fact that Isaac's resolution remained inflexible, since he regarded the blessing already bestowed as *irrevocable*), *ἀνεβόησε φωνὴ Ἡσαὺ καὶ ἔκλαυσεν*. Nor is that which Bleek, de Wette, and Delitzsch have advanced against this mode of interpretation of great force. They assert (1) that there is here nowhere any mention of Isaac, so that we cannot think of him in connection with *μετανοίας* either. But a distinct allusion to Isaac, though not an express mention of him, is certainly contained in that which precedes. Partly in *τὴν εὐλογίαν*, partly in *ἀπεδοκίμασθῃ*, there is found a reference to him; since it was just he who had to bestow the blessing, and afterwards under God's disposing refused it to Esau. An addition of *τοῦ πατρὸς* to *μετανοίας* was therefore unnecessary. (2) That the formula: "he found no place or room for a change in the mind of his father," in the sense: "he could not bring about such change in him," would be a very unnatural one. But why, pray, may not *τόπον μετανοίας εὐρίσκειν* equally well and naturally signify: "to gain room for a *μετάνοια* to unfold and assert itself," as at Acts xxv. 16 *τόπον ἀπολογίας λαμβάνειν* signifies: "to obtain room for an *ἀπολογία* to unfold and maintain itself," or *τόπον διδόναι τῇ ὀργῇ*, Rom. xii. 19 (comp. Eph. iv. 27): "to give room to the divine wrath to unfold itself and make itself felt"? (3) That the expression *μετάνοια* itself is unsuitable, inasmuch as

“this word can surely only denote an inner emotion of the mind, but not the bare outward recalling of a measure or a verdict” (Bleek), or, as de Wette expresses himself, “in the N. T. is ordinarily employed of human penitence.” Nevertheless there attaches likewise to the notion of the “change of mind,” as above insisted on as its primary requisite, the notion of a proceeding in the inner or spirit-life of the man; which, however, naturally does not exclude the accessory notion that this inner process has also as its necessary consequence an external action. If, further, *μετάνοια* in the N. T. “ordinarily” serves for the designation of human penitence, this presents no difficulty to the supposition of its having on one occasion preserved its original verbal signification (comp. e.g. Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* i. 4. 4: *ἐμίσουν τὴν μετάνοιαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ τρόπου τὸ ἀνώμαλον*); specially in a passage where not an article of faith is to be expressed, but simply an historic fact to be related. (4) That the thought thus obtained would not accord with the object of the author and the parallel vi. 4–6 (de Wette). But the author’s object is no other than to show, by the warning example of Esau, that the member also of the Christian community who is *βέβηλος* may for ever come short of the attainment of salvation; that, however, ver. 17 is to be explained in accordance with the standard furnished by vi. 4–6, is an arbitrary presupposition. (5) That this interpretation did not enter into the mind of the Fathers. But this argument, added by Delitzsch, as it in like manner frequently recurs with him, is an unscientific one. For to the Greek Fathers and their expositions can only be applied that which was said of them long ago by Joh. Gerhard (tom. I. of the *Loci Theologici*, chap. v. p. 30): “sint et habeantur lumina, non autem numina.”—Others, as Theophylact, Calvin, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Bleek, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 771), Ewald, Hofmann, Röscher in Hilgenfeld’s *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1874, H. 1, p. 127 ff., and already *τινές* in Occumenius, refer *μετανοίας* to Esau himself, and then regard the words *μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὔρεν* as a parenthesis, and make *αὐτὴν* glance back to *τὴν εὐλογίαν*. The statement: *μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὔρεν*, is then understood either

objectively: he found no place for the repentance which he actually experienced, or subjectively: he found no place in his heart for the feeling of repentance; in the former sense, e.g., Calvin: "nihil profecit vel consequutus est sera sua poenitentia, etsi cum lacrymis quaereret benedictionem, quam sua culpa amiserat," and Bleek: "he found no longer any place for repentance, change of mind, inasmuch as it was too late for that, and it could avail him nothing now, however much he might regret it;" in the latter sense, e.g., Bengel: "It could no longer be awakened in Esau. Natura rei recusabat." But *against the first modification of this rendering* decides the thought which would thus arise, false at least for the application of the statement, since in the Christian domain a repentance that is worthy of the name can never be too late, never ineffectual (comp. Luke xxiii. 39-43); *against the second*, the internal contradiction in which this interpretation is involved with the concession *καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν*, since surely by this very fact the actual presence of a repentance was manifested; *against both*, finally, the harshness and unnaturalness of the grammatical construction, by which the syntactical order is forced out of its simple connection. Others, finally, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Primasius, Luther, Grotius, Nemethus, de Wette, Alford, Reuss, rightly indeed refer *αὐτήν* back to *μετανοίας*, but then understand *μετάνοια* of *Esau's* change of mind. Luther: "for he found no room for penitence, although he sought it with tears." De Wette: "For repentance (penitence, amendment, *i.e.* for the return to the theocratic union by the laying aside of his unhallowed, frivolous character) he found no room, no place, no scope (*i.e.* there was not granted him, by the delaying of the sentence of reprobation, the possibility of manifesting a more worthy spirit, and of becoming reconciled to God), although he sought it with tears." But if one takes the statement with Luther subjectively, it yields a harsh, repulsive, contradictory thought; if one takes it, with de Wette, objectively, it would be incorrectly expressed, since in that case *αὐτόν* (*sc.* *τόπον*) must of necessity have been written in place of *αὐτήν* (*sc.* *μετάνοιαν*). Moreover, for this whole mode of explanation the narrative in Genesis affords no point of support.

Vv. 18–29. To the endeavour after sanctification the readers are bound, by the constitution of that New Covenant to which they have come. While the Old Covenant bore the character of the sensuous, earthly, and that which awakens merely fear, the New Covenant has the character of the spiritual, heavenly, brings into communion with God and all saints, and confers reconciliation (vv. 18–24). Against apostasy, therefore, from the New Covenant (by an immoral walk), are the readers to be on their guard; for their guilt and culpability would be thereby incomparably enhanced. Rather are they to be filled with thankfulness towards God for the participation in the immovable kingdom of the New Covenant, and with awe and reverence to serve Him (vv. 25–29).

On vv. 18–24, comp. G. Chr. Knapp in his *Scripta varii argum.*, ed. 2, Hal. Saxon. 1823, tom. I. pp. 231–270.

Ver. 18. *Γάρ]* enforces, by a reason adduced, the exhortation to sanctification at ver. 14 ff, inasmuch as there is an underlying reference to the fact that, according to Ex. xix. 10 f., 14 f., the people of Israel in their day, before they were permitted to approach Mount Sinai in order to receive the law, had to sanctify themselves (Ex. xix. 10 : ἁγιάσων αὐτούς; ver. 14 : καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτούς), to wash their clothes, and to preserve themselves free from all defilement. — οὐ γὰρ προσελήλυθατε] *for ye did not, sc. when ye became Christians, draw near.* Comp. Deut. iv. 11 : καὶ προσήλθετε καὶ ἑστήτε ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος. — ψηλαφωμένῳ ὄρει] *to a mountain which is touched, i.e. felt, or laid hold of with hands.* That which is intended is Mount Sinai, the place of revelation of the Mosaic law, mentioned also Gal. iv. 24, 25 as the representative of Judaism. As a mountain, however, which is *touched or felt with hands* this mountain is spoken of, in order thereby to express its character of externally perceptible, earthly, in opposition to the supra-sensuous, heavenly (ἐπουράνιον, ver. 22). The form ψηλαφώμενον is not to be taken as synonymous with ψηλαφητόν, *that could be touched*, as is still done by Knapp, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Ebrard, Bisping, Kurtz, Ewald, and the majority of modern expositors. For the participle is indeed employed for the verbal adjective in the Hebrew, but never in the

Greek. Neither can *ψηλαφώμενον* signify: "touched of God by lightning, and therefore smoking" (Schöttgen, Kypke, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Heinrichs, and others; comp. Ex. xix. 18: τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινὰ ἐκαπνίζετο ὅλον διὰ τὸ καταβεβηκέναι ἐπ' αὐτὸ τὸν θεὸν ἐν πυρί; Ps. civ. 32: ὁ ἀπτόμενος τῶν ὀρέων καὶ καπνίζονται), since *ψηλαφᾶν* signifies not the contact made with the view to the producing of an effect, but only the touching or feeling (handling), which has as its design the testing of the quality or the presence of an object. Comp. Luke xxiv. 39; 1 John i. 1; Acts xvii. 27. Moreover, the participle *present* is unsuitable to this explanation, instead of which a participle of the *past* must have been chosen. — καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρί] is understood by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Knapp, Paulus, Stuart, Stengel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 114), Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, *al.*, as a new particular, co-ordinate with the *ψηλαφωμένῳ ὄρει*: "and enkindled fire." On account of the like nature of the additions, καὶ γνώφῳ κ.τ.λ., immediately following, this acceptance seems in itself the more natural; but since, in the passages of the Pentateuch which were before the mind of the writer in connection with this expression, there are found the words: καὶ τὸ ὄρος ἐκαίετο πυρί (comp. Deut. iv. 11, v. 23, ix. 15), it is more probable that the author referred *κεκαυμένῳ* still to *ὄρει*, and would have *πυρί* taken as *dativus instrum.* to *κεκαυμένῳ*: and which (mountain) was enkindled, or set on flame, with fire. — καὶ γνώφῳ καὶ ζόφῳ καὶ θυέλλῃ] and to gloom and darkness and tempest. Comp. Deut. iv. 11, v. 22: σκότος, γνώφος, θύελλα.

Ver. 19. Καὶ σάλπιγγος ἤχῳ] and to the sound of trumpet. Comp. Ex. xix. 16: φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος ἤχει μέγα. *Ibid.* ver. 19, xx. 18. — καὶ φωνῇ ῥημάτων] and clang (piercing note) of words, which, namely, were spoken by God at the publication of the law, Ex. xx., Deut. v. Comp. Deut. iv. 12: καὶ ἐλάλησε κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρὸς φωνὴν ῥημάτων, ἣν ὑμεῖς ἠκούσατε. — ἧς οἱ ἀκούσαντες κ.τ.λ.] they that heard which begged to be spared (ver. 25; Acts xxv. 11), that it should be further spoken to them (*sc.* on account of the terribleness of that already heard). Calvin: Caeterum quod dicit populum excusasse, non ita debet accipi, quasi populus

renuerit audire Dei verba, sed deprecatus est, ne Deum ipsum loquentem audire cogeretur. Persona enim Mosis interposita horrorem nonnihil mitigabat. Comp. Deut. v. 25 : καὶ νῦν μὴ ἀποθάνωμεν . . . ἐὰν προσθώμεθα ἡμεῖς ἀκούσαι τὴν φωνὴν κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἔτι ; Deut. xviii. 16 ; Ex. xx. 18, 19. — ἡς] goes back to φωνῇ, and is dependent not on λόγον (Storr), but upon ἀκούσαντες. — μὴ] after verbs of *seeking to be excused, denying, warding off*, etc., quite ordinarily. See Kühner, II. p. 410 ; Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 561. — αὐτοῖς] looks back to the Israelites (οἱ ἀκούσαντες), not to ῥημάτων.

Vv. 20, 21 form a parenthesis, and γάρ adduces a reason for the thought of the terribleness of the mode of revelation under the Old Covenant. The words οὐκ ἔφερον γὰρ τὸ διαστελλόμενον, however, contain no independent statement, in such wise that τὸ διαστελλόμενον should refer back to that which is before mentioned (Occumenius, Theophylact ; comp. Schlichting). For in that case καὶν θηρίον κ.τ.λ. would stand without connection. Rather are the words an introductory formula for the citation immediately attached. τὸ διαστελλόμενον, further, does not stand in the sense of a *middle* : *that which ordained, or the divine voice ordaining* (Storr, Schulz, Heinrichs, Delitzsch), which is constrained, but in a *passive* sense : *that which was ordained, the divine commandment*. The sense is, consequently : for they endured not the mandate, "Though only a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned." — The citation is freely reproduced from Ex. xix. 12, 13, in an abbreviated form, and one bringing out at once the gist of the narrative. In Exodus the words read : καὶ ἀφοριεῖς τὸν λαὸν κύκλῳ, λέγων· προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς τοῦ ἀναβῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ θίγειν τι αὐτοῦ· πᾶς ὁ ἀψάμενος τοῦ ὄρους θανάτῳ τελευτήσῃ. Οὐχ ἄψεται αὐτοῦ χεὶρ· ἐν γὰρ λίθοις λιθοβοληθήσεται ἢ βολιδι κατατοξευθήσεται· εἴν τε κτήνος, εἴν τε ἄνθρωπος, οὐ ζήσεται.

Ver. 21. Καί] is the ordinary conjunctive "and." It belongs not to οὕτως φοβερόν ἦν τὸ φανταζόμενον, in such wise that Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν κ.τ.λ. "is added by way of appendix, with an accentuation of the subject which renders any connecting particle unnecessary" (Hofmann), but to Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν, in such wise that οὕτως φοβερόν ἦν τὸ φανταζόμενον forms

an exclamation, inserted parenthetically within the greater parenthesis: *and—so terrible was the appearing!*—MOSES said, *I am sore afraid and tremble.* καὶ cannot be taken, with Jac. Cappellus, Carpzov, Schulz, Knapp, Böhme, Bloomfield, and others, for the enhancing “even.” For, from its position, it can only serve for the connection of the clauses, while for the indication of the sense alleged an additional καὶ immediately before Μωϋσῆς (or even an αὐτός before the same) would have been required. Yet the right feeling underlies this interpretation: that, regarded as a fact, ver. 21 contains an ascending gradation from ver. 20, inasmuch as the being seized with fear, which at ver. 20 was asserted of the people, is now in like manner predicated of Moses, the leader of the people. — τὸ φανταζόμενον] equivalent to τὸ φαινόμενον, *the appearing*, the visible covering in which the invisible God manifested Himself to the Israelites. Theodoret: φανταζόμενον δὲ εἶπεν, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ αὐτὸν ἑώρων τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν ἀλλὰ τινα φαντασίαν τῆς θείας ἐπιφανείας. — The verb φαντάζεσθαι in the N. T. only here. — ἔκφοβός εἰμι καὶ ἔντρομος] In the accounts of the promulgation of the law given in the Pentateuch, an expression of this kind on the part of Moses is not met with. According to Zeger, Beza, Estius, Schlichting, Chr. Fr. Schmid [McLean, with hesitation], Heinrichs, Stuart, Stein, and others, the author drew the same from tradition; according to Owen and Calov, he gained the knowledge even from immediate inspiration; while Carpzov will not have an actual utterance of Moses thought of at all, but, on the contrary, takes the formula: “Moses dicit: horreo et tremo,” as of the same meaning with the bare “Moses horret et tremit;” and Calvin has recourse to the not less violent expedient: “Mosem nomine populi sic loquutum, cujus mandata quasi internuntius ad Deum referebat. Fuit igitur haec communis totius populi querimonia; sed Moses inducitur, qui fuit veluti commune et omnium.” Without doubt the words of LXX. Deut. ix. 19 [cf. ver. 15] were present to the mind of the author, where in another connection Moses says: καὶ ἔκφοβός εἰμι. These words he then transferred, by virtue of an inexact reminiscence, to the time of the promulgation of the law.

Vv. 22–24. Contrast to vv. 18, 19. Positive characteriza-

tion of the communion into which the readers have entered by the reception of Christianity. The description, vv. 22-24, corresponds not in detail to the particulars enumerated, vv. 18, 19 (against Bengel, who ingeniously constructs a sevenfold antithesis; as likewise against Delitzsch, Kluge, and Ewald, who have followed the same), although we should be led to expect this from the corresponding words of commencement, vv. 18, 22. Moreover, the succession of clauses contained in vv. 22-24 is no strictly logical one, since at least *καὶ πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων* would have been more appropriately placed *before* than *after* *καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων*. — *ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιών ὅρει καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ*] but *dravni near have ye to the mountain Zion and the city of the living God, namely, the heavenly Jerusalem*. The three substantive-appellations contain a single idea, in that to the closely connected twofold expression: *Σιών ὅρει καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος*, the following *Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ* forms an explanatory apposition. As *Mount Zion* (in opposition to the Mount Sinai, ver. 18) the heavenly Jerusalem is designated, because in the O. T. the Mount Zion is very frequently described as the dwelling-place of God, and the place whence the future salvation of the people is to be looked for. Comp. Ps. xlviii. 3 [2], l. 2, lxxviii. 68, ex. 2, cxxxii. 13 ff.; Isa. ii. 2, 3; Joel iii. 5 [ii. 32]; Mic. iv. 1, 2; Obad. 17, *al.* Likewise also is the heavenly Jerusalem called *the city of the living God* (comp. too in relation to the earthly Jerusalem: *πόλις ἐστὶν τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως*, Matt. v. 35), not so much because the living and acting God is its architect (xi. 10), as because He has His throne there. — *καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων*] and *to myriads of angels*, the servants, and as it were the court of God. *καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων* belongs together (Beza, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Calov, Braun, Kyriake, Carpzov, Cramer, Baumgarten, Storr, Dindorf, Tholuck, Kurtz, Hofmann, and others), without, however, our having, with Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Clarius, Vatablus, Calvin, Corn. a Lapide, Piscator, Grotius, Tischendorf (ed. 2), Bloomfield, Conybeare, Ewald, and others, to refer likewise *πανηγύρει*, ver. 23, to the same as an apposition. For such

apposition, consisting of a bare individual word, would be out of keeping with the euphonious fulness of the whole description; and, if *this* construction had been intended, καὶ μυριάδων ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει would have been written. But just as little must we with others (also Bleek and de Wette) take καὶ μυριάσιν alone, as standing independently; whether, as Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Rambach, Griesbach, Knapp, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stengel, Bisping, Maier, Moll, we regard as apposition thereto merely ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει, or, as Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Ernesti, Schulz, Lachmann, Bleek, Tischendorf (ed. 1), Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 117), Alford, Kluge, Woerner, both the following members: ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς—in connection with which latter supposition, however, the more nearly connecting τε καί, of frequent use with the author (ii. 4, 11, iv. 12, *al.*), would have been more naturally expected than the bare καί before ἐκκλησία. For μυριάσιν is a very indefinite notion, which, where its reference is not self-evident from the connection, requires a genitival addition; besides, the accentuation of the idea of plurality alone would here be meaningless. Further, the reasons advanced against our mode of explanation, that in such case we ought, after the analogy of the following members, to expect a καί before πανηγύρει (Seb. Schmidt, Bleek, Ebrard); that πανηγύρει and that which follows would become in the highest degree dragging (Bleek); that πανηγύρει would be superfluous (de Wette),—are without weight. For καί was omitted by reason of the euphonious πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησία, into which a καί placed also before πανηγύρει would have introduced a discordant note; the charge of dragging would have been justified, only if a καί had really been added before πανηγύρει; nor, again, is πανηγύρει superfluous, since it contains a very significant notion, and one different from that of ἐκκλησία.

Ver. 23. Πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων, ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς] *to the festive assembly and congregation of the first-born, who are enrolled in heaven.* πανήγυρις, in the N. T. a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, designates the total gathering under the form of conception of *a being gathered together* in festivity

and jubilant joy [cf. Joseph. *Antt.* v. 2. 12]; whereas *ἐκκλησία* characterizes those assembled as *bound together in inner unity*. To be enrolled in heaven, however, signifies to stand recorded upon the book of heaven's citizens, or to have part in the rights and privileges of the heavenly citizens. From the connection (*προσεληλύθατε Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων*) beings must be intended, who already dwell in heaven, are actually in possession of the civil rights and immunities of heaven, not those by whom the enjoyment of the same is only to be looked for in the future. Since, then, they are by means of *πρωτότοκοι* represented as those who in point of time *first* (before others as yet) became sons of God, we have to think most naturally, with Calvin, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Woerner, and others, of *the patriarchs and saints of the Old Covenant* (comp. chap. xi.), who, it is true only upon the condition of union with Christ (xi. 40), but yet by reason of their filial relation to God, did, in a temporal respect *before* the Christians, receive a dwelling-place and rights of citizenship in heaven. According to Nösselt, Storr, Kurtz, and others, we have to understand by the *πρωτότοκοι* still the angels before mentioned, as being the earliest inhabitants of heaven; but for the designation of the angels, the characteristic *ἀπογεγραμμένοι ἐν οὐρανοῖς* is unsuitable. The majority discover in *πρωτότοκοι* a reference to the Christians; and that either, as Primasius and Grotius suppose, specially to *the apostles*—against which, however, stands *πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, which involves the idea of a great host; or, as Schlichting, J. L. Mosheim (*de ecclesia primogenitorum in coelo adscriptorum*, Helmst. 1733, 4to), Schulz, Bleek, Ebrard, and others, to *the first believers* from among the Jews and Gentiles, particularly the former, quite apart from the question of their being now dead or still living; or, as Knapp, Böhme, Kuinoel, Tholuck, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 117), Alford, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 147, 2 Aufl.), Moll, and others, specially to *the church which is still upon earth*, so that in connection with *πρωτότοκοι* we have to hold fast only to the particular fact of the dignity, while we retain no reference to time; or, as de Wette and Maier, specially to *those who have fallen asleep in the faith of Christ*, and perhaps

even were glorified by martyrdom ; or finally, as Piscator, Owen, Carpzov, Stein, Stuart, Stengel, and others, to *the members of the New Covenant in general*. But the thought of Christians in this place is a remote one ; since the mention of them, in harmony with the order of relating now chosen, would more naturally take place only later, in connection with the mention of Christ Himself, and not already here, between that of the angels and God. — καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων] *and to Him as Judge, who is God over all*. πάντων is usually construed with κριτῇ. But from its position it can depend only upon θεῷ. πάντων is masculine, and refers not merely—as Knapp and Bleek suppose—to the fore-mentioned angels and πρωτόκοι. It stands absolutely ; so that God, in delicate opposition to the Jewish particularism, is characterized as in general the God of all. The apparently unsuitable characterization of God in this connection (because one containing nothing specifically Christian), namely, *as the Judge*, is justified from the aim of the writer, to warn the readers against laxity of morals, and consequently against apostasy from Christianity (comp. vv. 25, 29). — καὶ πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων] *and to the spirits of the perfected just ones*. πνεύματα : designation of the departed spirits, as divested of the body (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 19 ; Luke xxiv. 39 ; Acts vii. 59), inasmuch as these only at the resurrection will be clothed with a new body. Most probably *the Christians fallen asleep* are those meant (Grotius, Mosheim, Bengel, Sykes, Baumgarten, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, and many). Others, as Corn. a Lapide, Schlichting, Wittich, Wolf, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Maier, think of the saints of the O. T. (chap. xi.) ; or, as Knapp, Böhm, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 122), Alford, Moll, Kurtz, alike of the departed saints of the O. T. and those of the New. The δίκαιοι, however, are called τετελειωμένοι not in the sense of the “ perfect just ones ” (Theophylact, Luther, Stengel, *al.*),—for which the expression τέλει would much more naturally have presented itself,—nor yet because they have finished their life’s course and overcome the weaknesses and imperfections of the earthly life (Calvin, Limborch, Böhm, Kuinoel, Kurtz, and others), but because they have

already been brought by Christ to the goal of consummation. Comp. ii. 10, x. 14, xi. 40.

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

Ver. 25. The author has but just now, vv. 18–24, in order to enforce with reasoning his exhortation to the *ἁγιασμός*, ver. 14 ff., described, in a comparison of the Old Covenant with the New, the exalted nature of the communion into which the readers had entered by the reception of Christianity. As a conclusion therefrom, he warns them against falling away again from Christianity through laxity of morals (comp. also ver. 28 f.), in pointing out, similarly as ii. 2 ff., x. 28 ff., that if the Israelites in old time incurred punishment by disobedience to the O. T. revelation of God, an incomparably severer judgment would overtake those Christians who should turn back again from the N. T. revelation of God. — The simple *βλέπετε*, without the addition of *οὖν*, renders the warning so much the more powerful. Entirely mistaken, Delitzsch: *οὖν* is not added, in order that one may not suppose the warning to attach itself to *οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε . . . ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε . . .*, but, on the contrary, it should be manifest that the author thinks of the One speaking,

against the refusing of whom he warns, as in most intimate connection with the speaking blood of the Mediator of the Covenant which has just been mentioned. — βλέπετε μὴ παραιτήσησθε τὸν λαλοῦντα] *take heed that ye do not beg off from Him that speaketh* (to you), that ye turn not away from Him and despise Him. ὁ λαλῶν is not *Christ* (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Vatablus, Böhme, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Bloomfield, *al.*), but that *God* who still continues to speak to the readers by means of the Christian facts of salvation. For by τὸν λαλοῦντα the same person must be designated, as subsequently by τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν, *sc.* χρηματίζοντα. By the latter, however, can be meant, on account of the οὗ referring back to it at ver. 26, and by reason of the ἐπὶγγελλται there occurring (comp. also ver. 29), only *God*. From this it follows, too, that by ἐπὶ γῆς ὁ χρηματίζων is meant, not *Moses* (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Carpzov, and others), but likewise *God*,¹ so that there is not an insisting upon a diversity of persons in connection with the O. T. and the N. T. revelation, and thence a difference of degree inferred; but the diversity of the *mode* of revelation is accentuated, and thereby the higher value of the one revelation above the other on the one hand is marked, and on the other the higher culpability of apostasy from the one than from the other. To the Jews God spake upon the palpable earthly mountain Sinai, choosing as His interpreter an earthly man, Moses; to the Christians, on the other hand, He speaks from heaven, in sending to them His own Son from heaven as His interpreter. — οὐκ ἐξέφυγον] *did not escape*, did not evade the divine punishment. Comp. ii. 3. Wrongly Delitzsch, even because the πολὺ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ. does not harmonize therewith: *were not able to withdraw, but were obliged to stand fast*. — ἐπὶ γῆς τὸν χρηματίζοντα] *the One speaking upon earth words of revelation*. Belongs together, in that ἐπὶ γῆς was placed on account of the greater emphasis *before* the article. Similarly the postposing of ἵνα, Gal. ii. 10, and the like. — πολὺ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς] *sc.* οὐκ ἐκφευξόμεθα. — ἀποστρέφεισθαί τινα] *to turn away from any one, reject his fellowship*.

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

¹ Ebrard will have us think of *Christ* as the second person of the Godhead!

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

Ver. 27. The author, arguing from the ἔτι ἅπαξ of the prophetic word of scripture just adduced, brings out as a second feature of the superiority of Christianity, that it is abiding and intransitory. — Τὸ δέ· Ἐτι ἅπαξ] *The expression, however, Yet once more, sc. and then not again*. ἔτι ἅπαξ, namely, is taken by the writer *absolutely*. — δηλοῖ τὴν τῶν σαλευομένων μετέθεσιν] declares (points to) the changing of

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

heaven is formed, and the kingdom of God attains to its consummation.

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

Ver. 29. Warning justification of the *μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους*. The words cannot, however, signify: *for our God too* (the God of Christians), even as the God of the Old Covenant, *is a consuming fire* (so still Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bisping, and others). For to this end *καὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁ θεὸς κ.τ.λ.* must have been written. Just as little may *καὶ γάρ*, with Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 60, *Obs.*), Alford, Moll, and Kurtz, be weakened into the mere notion of “*etenim*.” For *καὶ* is the enhancing “*more than this*,” and

belongs to the whole clause, in connection with which it would be a matter of indifference (against Delitzsch) whether the author should write *καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον* or *καὶ γὰρ πῦρ καταναλίσκον ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν*, since in either case the main emphasis in connection with the few words would fall upon *πῦρ καταναλίσκον*. According to the order of the words, and by reason of the intensive force of *καί*, the sense can therefore only be: *for our God is also a consuming fire, i.e.* He is not merely a God of grace, but likewise a God of punitive righteousness. A diversity, consequently, of the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New, which would also have been an unsuitable notion, the author does not by any means assert. Moreover, comp. LXX. Deut. iv. 24: *ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεός σου πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἐστίν*.

CHAPTER XIII.

VER. 4. The preference over the *Recepta* πορνούς δέ is merited on account of the better attestation (A D* D, Lat. M s, Vulg. Copt. Anton. Max. Bed.) by πορνούς γάρ. Commended to attention by Griesbach. Adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Alford, and Tisch. 8. — Ver. 8. Elz.: χθές. But A C* D* M s have ἐχθές. Rightly admitted by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. — Ver. 9. μὴ παραφίρῃς] Elz.: μὴ περιφίρῃς. Against A C D M s, the later supplementer of B, the preponderant majority of the cursives, Vulg. Copt. al., and very many Fathers. Already rejected by Grotius, Bengel, and Wetstein, then by Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Lachm. Tisch. Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, and others. Correction to accord with Eph. iv. 14. — Instead of the *Recepta* περιπατήσαντες, A D* s* present περιπατοῦντες. Placed in the text by Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 8, and probably the original reading. — Ver. 10. In place of the *Recepta* οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν, Tisch. 2 and 7 reads only οὐκ ἔχουσιν, and already Mill (*Proleg.* 1292) has condemned ἐξουσίαν as a gloss. But ἐξουσίαν is lacking only in D* Gr. and Lat., in M and with Damascen., whereas it is present in A C D** and *** K s, etc. (with Chrysostom before οὐκ ἔχουσιν). It was erroneously omitted by reason of its similarity in sound to the foregoing οὐκ ἔχουσιν. — Ver. 11. Elz. Tisch. 8: τὸ αἷμα περὶ ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὰ ἄγια. So D K M s, etc. In place of this, Lachm. and Tisch. 1 write, after C* al., Copt. Syr. al.: τὸ αἷμα εἰς τὰ ἄγια περὶ ἁμαρτίας. By means of its varying position, however, περὶ ἁμαρτίας betrays itself as a glossematic elucidation, seeing that it is entirely wanting in A, in Aeth., and with Chrysostom, and seeing, moreover, that some cursive MSS. (14, 47) present in place of the singular the plural περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν. Rightly therefore have Bleek, Tisch. 2 and 7, and Alford deleted the addition. — Ver. 17. ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν ὡς λύγον ἀποδώσουτες] Instead of which Lachm. in the stereotype ed. and Tisch. 1 chose the order: ὡς λύγον ἀποδώσουτες ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν. But the authority of A, Vulg. Bede does not suffice for the

transposing. Rightly therefore did Lachm. in the larger ed., and Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, return to the *Recepta*.—Ver. 18. Elz.: *πεποιδάμεν*. Against the preponderating testimony of A C* D* D, Lat. (*suademus*) M, 17, 67** 137, which demands the reading, commended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford: *πειθόμεθα*. To the latter points also the *κα γαρ οτι καλην* in the *Cod. Sinait.*, since in this codex *οτι καλη* has been placed immediately before, only in consequence of a manifest oversight of the copyist.—Ver. 21. To the *Recepta* *ἐν παντι ἔργῳ*, instead of which the *Cod. Sinait.* presents only *ἐν παντι* (adopted by Tisch. 8), had Lachmann in the stereotype ed. further added: *καὶ λόγῳ*, which he has yet rightly struck out again in the larger edition. The addition *καὶ λόγῳ* is found only in A, and once with Chrysostom, whereas it is twice wanting with the latter. It is a gloss from 2 Thess. ii. 17.—Instead of the mere *ποιῶν* of the *Recepta*, Lachmann reads in the *Edit. Stereotypa*: *αὐτὸς ποιῶν*; in the larger edition: *αὐτῷ ποιῶν*. But *αὐτὸς* rests only upon 71 and D, Lat. (*ipso faciente*); the alleged testimony of C in favour thereof is founded on an error of Wetstein. *αὐτῷ*, however, which has for it the authority of A C* 8* and of Gregor. Nyssen., is a disturbing addition, and manifestly arose only from a twofold writing of the *αὐτοῦ* immediately foregoing.—Elz. Lachm. Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Reiche, Tisch. 8: *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*. But *τῶν αἰώνων* is wanting in C*** D, in many cursives, in Arab. Armen., with Clem. Alex. and Theodoret. Suspected by Bengel and Griesbach; rightly rejected by Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 1, 2, 7, and Alford. For it is more probable that the simpler formula, occurring for the rest Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27, would be enlarged into the ampler formula more usual in the case of doxologies, than that the ampler would be abbreviated into the simpler one.—Ver. 22. D* 46, 57, *al.*, Vulg. Syr. Arm. have *ἀνέχεσθαι*. Adopted by Lachmann. But the imperative *ἀνέχεσθε*, presented by the *Recepta*, is to be retained, as imparting more animation to the discourse. This reading is protected by the preponderating authority of A C D*** K M 8, etc., Am. Copt. Aeth. *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret (also in the Commentary), *al.*—Ver. 23. Elz.: *τὸν ἀδελφόν*. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, de Wette, Delitzsch: *τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν*. The latter is to be preferred on account of the stronger attestation by A C D* M 8* 17, 31, 37, 39, *al.*, all vss. Euthal. Maxim. Athan.

Vv. 1–25. Concluding exhortations partly of a general nature, partly in special relation to the main purport of the

epistle, and concluding notices, followed by a twofold wish of blessing.

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

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

Ver. 2. Exhortation to hospitality. Comp. Rom. xii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8. Owing to the hatred of the Jews towards the Christians, and the almost entire absence of public places of entertainment, hospitality towards fellow-Christians on their journeys became, for the Palestinians also, an urgent necessity. — *διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες ἀγγέλους*] Enforcement of the command uttered, by calling attention to the high honour¹ which, by the exercise of this virtue, accrued to single remote ancestors of the Jewish people; for by the manifestation of hospitality some have unwittingly entertained angels. The author was certainly, in connection with this statement, thinking specially of Abraham and Lot (Gen. xviii. 19). We have, moreover, to compare the declaration of the Lord, Matt. xxv. 44, 45, according to which he who entertains one of His people, entertains the Lord Himself. — The *ἔλαθον*, written in accordance with genuine Greek praxis, but not occurring elsewhere in the N. T., forms a paronomasia with *ἐπιλανθάνεσθε*.

¹ Comp. Philo, *de Abrah.* p. 366 (with Mangey, II. p. 17 f.): *Ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ οἶδα τίνα ὑπερβολὴν εὐδαιμονίας καὶ μακαριότητος εἶναι φῶ πρὶ τὴν εἰκίαν, ἐν ᾗ καταχθῆναι καὶ ζῶντων λαχεῖν ὑπὸ μιν ἀγγέλους πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, ἱερὰ καὶ βίαι φῦσις, ὑποδιάκονοι καὶ ὑπαρχοὶ τοῦ πρώτου Θεοῦ δι' ὧν οἶα πρὸς βιωτῶν ὅσα ἂν ἐλίσσῃ τῷ γίνεσθαι ἡμῶν πρεσβυτέρους, διαγύλλαι.*

Ver. 3. Exhortation to have a care for the prisoners and distressed. — *Μιμνήσκεθε τῶν δεσμίων*] *Be mindful* (sc. in order to aid them with ministering love) *of the prisoners*. — *ὡς συνδεδεμένοι*] *as fellow-prisoners*, i.e. with as much devotion to them as though the captivity had fallen upon yourselves. For the Christians are members of the same body; as in the prosperity, so also are they to share in the sufferings one of the other. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 26. Böhme (in like manner Heinrichs too) explains: “quippe ejus naturae et conditionis homines, qui ipsi quoque pro captivis sint, nimirum in ecclesia pressa degentes.” Upon this interpretation, it is true, the twofold ὡς retains its full significance; but in order to represent the readers as “in ecclesia pressa degentes,” an addition to *συνδεδεμένοι* could not have been dispensed with. — *τῶν κακουχουμένων*] *of those who suffer evil treatment*. *τῶν κακουχουμένων* is the *genus*, under which the foregoing *τῶν δεσμίων* are ranged as a particular *species*. — *ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄντες ἐν σώματι*] *as sojourning yourselves in a body*, thus likewise still subjected to the earthly order of the world, and not secured against the like ill-treatment. According to Calvin and others, the sense is: *since ye indeed are members of the same body* (to wit, the church),—which, however, must have been indicated by *ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῷ σώματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντες*. According to Beza: *as though in your own person ye were κακουχούμενοι*,—a sense which can only with violence be put upon the words.

Ver. 4. Exhortation to chastity in the narrower sense. — *Τίμιος*] *held in estimation, honourable*, sc. ἔστω. Others supplement ἐστίν. So already the Peshito (*honoratum est connubium inter omnes*), then Beza, Grotius (*apud omnes gentes moratas honos est conjugio*), M'Caul, and others. But against this stands the addition: *καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος*, since the latter could not be asserted as a truth in point of fact. Rather might the indicative rendering thereof be preserved by taking the clauses *descriptively*: “Marriage honourable in all things,” etc., which then would not be different in sense from the direct requirement that marriage should be honourable. Nevertheless, this mode of interpretation too—recently adopted by Delitzsch—could only be justified if it were

followed by a long series of similar statements; here, on the other hand, where imperatives are placed in close proximity before and after, it is unnatural. — *ὁ γάμος*] *marriage*. In this sense the word occurs frequently with the Greeks. In the N. T. it has everywhere else the signification: *wedding, and its celebration*. — *ἐν πᾶσιν*] is *neuter*: *in all things*. The majority take *ἐν πᾶσιν* as *masculine*. There is then found expressed in it the precept, either, as by Luther and others, that marriage should in the estimation of all be held in honour, *i.e.* not desecrated by adultery; or, as by Böhme, Schulz, and others, that it should not be despised or slighted by any unmarried person (according to Hofmann, by any one, whether he live in wedlock, or he think that he ought for his own part to decline it); or finally, as by Calvin and many, that it is to be denied to no order of men (as later to the Catholic priests). In the two last cases it is generally supposed that the reference is to a definite party of those who, out of ascetic or other interest, looked unfavourably upon the married life. But for all three modes of explanation, *παρὰ πᾶσιν* would have been more suitably written than *ἐν πᾶσιν*; and a preference for celibacy on the part of born Jews in particular, to whom nevertheless the Epistle to the Hebrews is addressed, is an unexplained presupposition, because one not in accordance with the teaching of history. — *καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος*] *and the marriage bed* (against the ordinary *usus loquendi*, Valckenaer and Schulz: *the cohabitation*) *be undefiled*. — *πόρνους γὰρ καὶ μοιχοὺς κρινεῖ ὁ Θεός*] *for fornicators and adulterers will God judge* (condemn at the judgment of the world). Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 9 f., *al.* The *ὁ Θεός* placed at the close of the sentence is not without emphasis. It reminds that, though such sins of uncleanness remain for the most part unpunished by earthly judges, the higher Judge will one day be mindful of them.

Vv. 5, 6. Warning against covetousness; exhortation to contentedness. — *Ἀφιλάργυρος*] *free from greediness of money, from covetousness and avarice*, 1 Tim. iii. 3. Comp. vi. 24 ff. — *ὁ τρόπος*] *sc. ἔστω*: *let the mind and comportment, the character, be*. — *ἀρκούμενοι τοῖς παροῦσιν*] *sc. ἔστε*: *be contented with that which is present*. *τὰ παρόντα* here, as Xen.

Συμπος. iv. 42 (οἷς γὰρ μάλιστα τὰ παρόντα ἄρκει, ἥκιστα τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ὀρέγονται), and *often* with the classic writers, of the earthly possession which one has. — αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶρηκεν] *for He Himself has said*, namely, *God*, as He who is speaking in the scripture; not *Christ* (Beza, Böhme, Klee). — οὐ μὴ σε ἀνῶ οὐδ' οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω] *I will in no wise fail thee, nor by any means forsake thee.* To this citation the most similar passages are Deut. xxxi. 6 (οὔτε μὴ σε ἀνῆ, οὔτε μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπη), *ibid.* ver. 8 (οὐκ ἀνήσει σε, οὐδὲ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπη), and 1 Chron. xxviii. 20 (οὐκ ἀνήσει σε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπη); although, in these passages, instead of the first person singular the third person is used. Less corresponding in point of expression are Josh. i. 5 (οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω σε οὐδ' ὑπερόψομαί σε), Gen. xxviii. 15 (οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω), and Isa. xli. 17 (οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω αὐτούς). On the other hand, there is found a citation entirely correspondent to ours in Philo, *de Confus. Linguar.* p. 344 C (ed. Mang. I. p. 430). It is possible that, as Bleek and de Wette suppose, the author adopted the same immediately from Philo. It is, however, also possible that the utterance, in the form in which we meet with it here and in Philo, had become proverbial. According to Delitzsch and Kluge, the utterance of Deut. xxxi. 6 assumed this form in the liturgic or homiletic usage of the Hellenistic synagogue, in that reminiscences of other similar O. T. passages blended with the original passage. [According to Piscator, Owen, and Tischendorf, the reference is to Josh. i. 5.]

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

Ver. 7. Exhortation to a remembrance of the former teachers, and an emulation of their faith. — οἱ ἡγούμενοι] *the presidents and leaders of the congregation.* Comp. vv. 17, 24; where, however, those still living are indicated,

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

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

Ver. 8 is ordinarily comprehended in one with ver. 7. Expositors then find in the utterance either, as Bleek, Ebrard, Bisping, and others, an adducing of the motive for the emulation of the faithful leaders enjoined at ver. 7; or, as Zeger, Grotius, Schulz, Kurtz, and others (comp. already Theophylact), the encouraging assurance that, as to these leaders, so also to the readers, provided they only take the faith of these leaders as a model for themselves, the gracious aid of Christ—of which, however, there was no mention in ver. 7—will not

be wanting; or finally, as Carpzov,¹ the more precise information as to that in which their faith had consisted. More correctly, however, on account of the antithetic correspondence between *ὁ αὐτός*, ver. 8, and *ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις*, ver. 9, are the words, ver. 8, taken as constituting the foundation and preparation for the injunction of ver. 9. Jesus Christ is for ever the same; the Christian therefore must give no place in his mind and heart to doctrines which are opposed to Christ, His nature and His requirements. — *ἐχθὲς . . . σήμερον . . . εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*] Designation of the past, present, and future; exhaustive unfolding of the notion *ἀεί*. The expression is rhetorical; *ἐχθὲς* is consequently not to be further expounded, in such wise that we must think of *the time of the former teachers* (Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, Limborch, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Kluge, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, *al.*), or of *the time before the appearing of Christ* (Bengel, Cramer, Stein), or to *the whole time of the Old Covenant* (Calvin, Pareus, *al.*), or even to *the eternal pre-existence of Christ* (Ambrose, *de Fide*, v. 1. 25; Seb. Schmidt, Nemethus, and others). — *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* is the subject, and *ὁ αὐτός* (*sc. ἐστίν*, not *ἔστω*) the common predicate to all three notes of time. Wrongly Paulus: "Jesus is the God-anointed One; yesterday and to-day is He altogether the same"—which must have read: *Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός*. But mistaken also the Vulgate, Occumenius, Luther, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, and others, in that they *interpunctuate* after *σήμερον*: *Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day; the same also in eternity*. For that which is to be accentuated is not *the eternity of Christ*, as would be the case by means of the *ἐχθὲς καὶ σήμερον* taken alone, but *the eternal unchangeableness of Christ*.

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

¹ "Imitaminei vestrarum praefectorum fidem, nimirum hanc: Jesus Christus heri, hodie et semper *ὁ αὐτός* Deus est."

are related to the *βρώματα* mentioned immediately after as the *genus* to a *species* coming under particular notice; and, as is manifest from ver. 10 ff., both belong to the specifically *Jewish* domain. By *διδασκαί ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι*, therefore, the ordinances of the Mosaic law in general are to be understood, the observance of which was proclaimed among the readers as necessary to the attainment of salvation, while then under *βρώματα* a special group of the same is mentioned. *ποικίλαι* the same are called, because they consist in commands and prohibitions of manifold kind; *ξέναι*, however, because they are opposed to the spirit of Christianity. — *καλὸν γάρ]* *for it is a fair thing, i.e. praiseworthy and salutary.* — *χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν]* *that by grace the heart be made steadfast,* in it seek and find its support. For no other thing than the grace of God is that which determines the character of the New Covenant, as the law that of the Old, Rom. vi. 14, *al.* Erroneously, therefore, Castellio and Böhme, *χάριτι* means *by thanksgiving or gratitude towards God*; yet more incorrectly Bisping and Maier: by the Christian sacrificial food, the Holy Communion. — *οὐ βρώμασιν]* *not by meats.* This is referred by the majority, lastly by Böhme, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 158), Alford, Moll, Ewald, and Hofmann, to the Levitical ordinances concerning pure and impure food. But only of the *sacrificial meals* can *οὐ βρώμασιν* be understood. For rightly have Schlichting, Bleek, and others called attention to the fact that (1) the expression, ver. 9, is more applicable to the enjoyment of sacred meats than to the avoiding of unclean meats. Schlichting: *Cor non reficitur cibis non comestis, sed comestis. Ciborum ergo usui, non abstinentiae, opponitur hic gratia*; that (2) it is said of the Christians, at ver. 10, in close conjunction with ver. 9, that they possess an altar of which the servants of the Jewish sanctuary have no right to eat; that, finally, (3) at the close of this series of thoughts, ver. 15, the reference to the sacrifices is retained, inasmuch as there, in opposition to the Levitical sacrifices, it is made incumbent on Christians through Christ continually to offer sacrifices of praise unto God. Tholuck, it is true, objects to this reasoning:

(1) that *βρώματα* may denote "the clean, legally permitted meats, with (the mention of) which is at the same time implied the abstinence from the unclean." But this expedient is artificial and unnatural; since, if we had in reality to think of the Levitical precepts with regard to food, in the exact converse of that which happens the avoiding of unclean meats would be the main idea brought under consideration.

(2) That the connection of ver. 10 with ver. 9 would only apparently be lost, since one may warrantably assume the following line of thought: "Do not suffer yourselves to be led astray by a variety of doctrines alien to the pure truth—surely it is a fairer thing to assure the conscience by grace than by meats, by means of which no true appeasement is obtained; we Christians have an altar with such glorious soul-nourishment, of which no priest may eat." But this supposed thought of ver. 10 would be highly illogical. For how does it follow from the fact that Christians have an altar of most glorious soul-nourishment, that no priest may partake of the same? Logically correct, certainly, would be only the thought: for we Christians possess an altar with such glorious soul-nourishment, that we have no need whatever of the Levitical ordinances regarding food. Then again, at ver. 10, nothing at all is written about "glorious soul-nourishment;" but, on the contrary, the design of this verse can only be to make good the incompatibility of the Christian altar with the Jewish.

(3) That the exhortation to the spiritual sacrifices, ver. 15, may be more immediately referred back to ver. 10. But ver. 10 stands to ver. 9, in which the theme of the investigation, vv. 8–15, is expressed, in the relation of subordination. The following *οὖν*, ver. 15, may therefore serve for the introducing of the final result from the whole preceding investigation.

(4) Finally, that it cannot be perceived how the participation in sacrificial meals could have been looked upon as a means of justification. But the participation in the sacrificial meals was certainly a public avouchment of participation in the sacrifices themselves. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 18. Very easily, therefore, might the author be led finally to take up this preference of his readers for the Jewish sacrificial cultus in this particular form of manifestation, which

had hitherto remained unnoticed in the epistle.—The supports, too, which Delitzsch has more recently sought to give to the referring of οὐ βρώμασιν to ordinances regarding clean and unclean meats, are weak. For that βρώματα is a word unheard of in the sacrificial *thora*, but familiar in the legislation regarding food, and that βρῶμα is used elsewhere in the N. T. of that which is prohibited or permitted for eating, does not in any way fall under consideration; because our passage claims before everything to be intelligible *per se*, nothing thus can be determinative of its meaning which is opposed to its expression and connection. That, however, the author cannot by διδαχαὶ ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι have meant the ordinances of the law in general, because he has recognised their divine origin, and therefore could not have indicated them with so little reverence, is a mere prepossession. For the Apostle Paul, too, speaks of them, as is already shown by Gal. iv. 9 f., v. 2, with no greater reverence. We are prevented from thinking, with Delitzsch, of “erroneous doctrines invented in accordance with one’s own will, though it may be attaching themselves to the O. T. law,” by the relation in which διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις stands to βρώμασιν, ver. 9, and this again to ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες, ver. 10. — ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατοῦντες] *from which those busied therein have derived no profit*, inasmuch, namely, as by such partaking of the sacrifice they did not attain to true blessedness. — ἐν οἷς belongs to οἱ περιπατοῦντες, since these words cannot stand alone, not to ὠφελήθησαν.

Ver. 10. Justification of οὐ βρώμασιν, ver. 9, by the emphasizing of the incompatibility of the Christian altar with that of Judaism. *We possess an altar, of which they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle, i.e. he who seeks in the Jewish sacrificial meals, and consequently in the Jewish sacrificial worship, a stay and support for his heart, thereby shuts himself out from Christianity, for he makes himself a servant of the tabernacle; but he who serves the tabernacle has no claim or title to the altar of Christians.* That the subject in ἔχομεν is *the Christian*, is acknowledged on all sides. But equally little ought it ever to have been disputed that by

οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες persons must be denoted who are contrasted with the Christians. For, in accordance with the expression chosen, the author can only mean to say that the Christians possess the right to eat of the altar; those τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες, on the other hand, forego this right. Quite in a wrong sense, therefore, have Schlichting, Schulz, Heinrichs, Wieseler (*Schriften der Univ. Kiel aus d. J.* 1861, p. 42), Kurtz, and others, referred οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες likewise to the Christians,¹ in that they found expressed the thought: *for Christians there exists no other sacrifice than one of which it is not permitted them to eat.* They then suppose to be intended by οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες either, as Schlichting, “omnes in universum Christiani,” or, as Schulz, particular officers of the society, who conducted the Christian worship. But in the first case—apart from the fact that then, what would alone be natural, ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν would have been written instead of ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες—the Christians would, as Bleek has already justly observed, have been designated by a characteristic which could not possibly be predicated of them; in the second, an anachronistic separation into clerics and laity would be imputed to the author, and the sense arising would be unsuitable, since the proposition, that the warrant for eating of the Christian sacrifice is wanting, could not possibly hold good of the clergy alone, but must have its application to Christians in general. By ἡ σκηνή can thus be understood nothing other than the earthly, Jewish sanctuary, as opposed to the ἀληθινή and τελειότερα σκηνή of Christians, viii. 2, ix. 11. The τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες, however, are not specially, as Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 161), Alford, and others suppose, *the Jewish priests* (viii. 5), but the members of the Jewish covenant people universally (ix. 9, x. 2). — The θυσιαστήριον further is the altar, upon which the sacrifice of the New Covenant,

¹ So also Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 457 ff.), who will have only the twofold fact to be accentuated at ver. 10: “that we are priests,” and “that we possess a means of expiation,” and brings out as the sense of the verse: “that we, whose only propitiatory sacrifice, and one for all alike, is Christ, have no other profit from our means of expiation, than that we are reconciled.” (!)

namely, the body of Christ (comp. ver. 12), has been presented. Not "ipse Christus" (Piscator, Owen, Wolf; comp. Calvin), or the *θυσία* itself which has been presented (Limborch, Whitby, M'Lean, Heinrichs, and others), nor yet the *cultus* (Grotius), can be denoted thereby. But likewise the explaining of the *table of the Supper*, the *τράπεζα κυρίου*, 1 Cor. x. 21, with Corn. a Lapide, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Böhme, Bähr (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, H. 4, p. 938), Ebrard, Bisping, Maier, and others (comp. also Rückert, *das Abendmahl. Sein Wesen und seine Geschichte in der alten Kirche*, Leipz. 1856, pp. 242–246), is inadmissible. For then there would underlie our passage the conception that the body of the Lord is offered in the Supper, Christ's sacrifice is thus one constantly repeated; but such conception is unbiblical, and in particular is remote from the thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the presentation of the sacrifice of Christ once for all, and the all-sufficiency of this sacrifice by its one presentation, is frequently urged with emphasis; comp. vii. 27, ix. 12, 25 ff., x. 10. Exclusively correct is it, accordingly, to understand by the altar, with Thomas Aquinas, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Bengel, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Delitzsch, Rielm, *i.e.*, Alford, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Woerner, and others, the spot on which the Saviour offered Himself, *i.e.* the cross of Christ. But to eat of this altar, *i.e.* to partake of the sacrifice presented thereon, signifies: to attain to the enjoyment of the spiritual blessings resulting from Christ's sacrificial death for believers; the same thing as is represented, John vi. 51 ff., as the eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of Christ.

On vv. 11–13, comp. Bähr in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, II. 4, p. 936 ff.

Vv. 11, 12. Proof for ver. 10. The proof lies in the fact that Christ's sacrifice is one which has been presented without the camp, and consequently has been freed from all community with Judaism. Ver. 11 and ver. 12 are, as a proof of ver. 10, closely connected, and only in ver. 12 lies the main factor, whereas ver. 11 is related to the same as a merely preparatory and accessory thought (Bähr). For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest are burned *without the camp*; wherefore Jesus also, in order

that He might sanctify the people through His own blood, suffered *without the gate*. That is to say: The N. T. sacrifice of the covenant is typically prefigured by the great atoning sacrifice under the Old Covenant. Of the victims, however, which were devoted to the latter, neither the high priest nor any other member of the Jewish theocracy was permitted to eat anything. For of those animals only the blood was taken, in order to be brought by the high priest into the Most Holy Place as a propitiatory offering; the bodies of those animals, on the other hand, were burned without the camp or holy city (Lev. xvi. 27), wherein was contained the explanation in an act (comp. Bähr, *l.c.*), that they were cast out from the theocratic communion of Judaism. But thus, then, has Jesus also, in that He entered with His sacrificial blood into the heavenly Holy of Holies, made expiation for the sins of them that believe in Him; His sacrificial body, however, has, since He was led out of the camp, or beyond the gate of the holy city, in order to endure the infliction of death (comp. Lev. xxiv. 14; Num. xv. 35 f.; Deut. xvii. 5), declared by this act to be cast out from the Jewish covenant-people. Eat of His sacrificial body, *i.e.* obtain part in the blessing procured by His sacrifice, can therefore no one who is still within the camp, *i.e.* who still looks for salvation from the ordinances of Judaism. Consequently he who will eat of the altar of Christ must depart out of Judaism, and go forth unto Christ without the camp (ver. 13). — τὰ ἅγια] as ix. 8, 12, 24, 25, x. 19, *the Most Holy Place*. — The tenses in the *present* mark the practice as one still continuing. — παρεμβολή] Characterization of the dwelling-place of the Jewish people at the time of the lawgiving, while it was still journeying through the wilderness and had tents for its habitation. The camp was the complex of the tents, enclosing the totality of the people together with the sanctuary. Thus there was combined with the idea of locality the religious reference to the people as one covenant-people, and “without the camp” became equivalent in signification to “without the bounds of the Old Covenant.” But, since afterwards the city of Jerusalem, with the temple in its midst, took the place of the παρεμβολή, the ἔξω τῆς πύλης standing in ver. 12, *without the gate*, *sc.* of the city of Jerusalem, says in effect

the same thing as ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, vv. 11, 13. — διό] *wherefore*, i.e. because the sacrificial death of Jesus has been prefigured by the type mentioned, ver. 11. — ἰδίου] opposition to the animal blood in the O. T. sacrifices of atonement. — τὸν λαόν] see at ii. 16, p. 132. — ἔπαθεν] comp. ix. 26.

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

Ver. 14. Ground of encouragement to the φέρειν τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 13. — ἔχομεν] namely: *we Christians*. Not: *we men in general*. — ὧδε] *here upon earth*. Erroneously Heinrichs: *in the earthly Jerusalem*. — τὴν μέλλουσαν] *sc. πόλιν: the city to come*, which, namely, is an *abiding* one. Comp. xii. 22: Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουράνιος, and xi. 10: ἡ τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσα πόλις, ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ Θεός. Rightly, for the rest, does Schlichting observe: Futuram autem civitatem hanc vocat, quia nobis futura est. Nam Deo, Christo, angelis jam praesens est.

Ver. 15. Closing exhortation, through Christ, to offer to God sacrifices of praise. Deduced from vv. 8-14. — Δι' αὐτοῦ] is with great emphasis preposed: *through HIM* (*sc. Christ*), but not through the intervention of the Jewish sacrificial institution. Through Him, inasmuch as by the all-

sufficiency of His expiatory sacrifice once offered, He has qualified believers so to do. — *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*] *a praise-offering* (תִּשְׁבָּחָהּ תִּשְׁבָּחָהּ), thus a spiritual sacrifice, in opposition to the animal sacrifices of Judaism. — *διὰ παντός*] *continually*. For the blessings obtained through Christ are so abundant and inexhaustible, that God can never be sufficiently praised for them. — *τουτέστιν καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ*] *that is, fruit of lips which praise His name*. Elucidation of the meaning in *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*, in order further to bring into special relief the purely spiritual nature of this Christian thankoffering already indicated by those words. The expression *καρπὸν χειλέων* the author has derived from Hos. xiv. 3, LXX.: *καὶ ἀνταποδώσομεν καρπὸν χειλέων ἡμῶν* (in the Hebrew: נִשְׁבַּח לַיהוָה פִּי, let us offer for oxen our own lips). For the thought, comp. *Vajikra R.* 9. 27, in Wetstein: R. Pinchas, R. Levi et R. Jochanan ex ore R. Menachem Galilaei dixerunt: Tempore futuro omnia sacrificia cessabunt, sacrificium vero laudis non cessabit. Omnes preces cessabunt, sed laudes non cessabunt. Philo, *de Sacrificantiis*, p. 849 E (with Mang. II. p. 253): *τὴν ἀρίστην ἀνάγουσι θυσίαν, ὕμνοις καὶ εὐχαριστίαις τὸν εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτῆρα Θεὸν γεραίροντες*. — The referring of *αὐτοῦ* to *Christ* (so Sykes, who finds the sense: *confessing ourselves publicly as the disciples of Christ*) is unnatural, seeing that God has been expressly mentioned only just before as the One to whom the *θυσία αἰνέσεως* is to be presented.

Ver. 16. Exhortation to beneficence. By means of *δέ* this verse attaches itself to the preceding, inasmuch as over against the Christianly devout mind which expresses itself in words, is placed the Christianly devout mind which manifests itself in deeds. — *Τῆς δὲ εὐποιίας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε*] *Of well-doing, moreover* (the substantive *εὐποιία* only here in the N. T.; *εὖ ποιεῖν*, Mark xiv. 7), *and fellowship* (i.e. communication of earthly possession, comp. Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 13), *be not forgetful* (ver. 2). — *τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ Θεός*] *for in such sacrifices God has pleasure*. — *τοιαύταις*] refers back only to *εὐποιίας καὶ κοινωνίας*, not likewise to ver. 15 (Theophylact, Schlichting, Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Hofmann, Woerner). — The formula *εὐαρεστοῦμαι*

τινι is elsewhere foreign to the N. T. as to the LXX.; with later Greek writers, however, not unusual.

Ver. 17. Exhortation to obedience to the presidents of the assembly. Comp. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13. — Πείθεσθε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν καὶ ὑπέικετε] *Obeȳ your leaders, and yield to them.* Bengel: Obedite in iis, quae praecipiunt vobis tanquam salutaria; concedite, etiam ubi videntur plusculum postulare. The demand presupposes, for the rest, that the author knew the ἡγούμενοι as men like-minded with himself, who had kept themselves free from the hankering after defection. — αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν] *for it is they who watch for your souls, for the salvation thereof.* — ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσונτες] *as those who must give an account* (of the same), *sc.* to God and the Lord at His return. — ἵνα] is the subsequently introduced note of design to πείθεσθε καὶ ὑπέικετε. On that account, however, it is not permitted, with Grotius, Carpzov, and others, to enclose αὐτοὶ γὰρ . . . ὑμῶν within a parenthesis; because the subject-matter of the clause of design refers back to the subject-matter of the foregoing establishing clause. — μετὰ χαρᾶς] *with joy*, namely, over your docility. — τοῦτο] *sc.* τὸ ἀγρυπνεῖν. Erroneously do Owen, Whitby, Michaelis, M'Lean, Heinrichs, Stuart, and others supplement τὸ λόγον ἀποδιδόναι. For the latter takes place only in the future, whereas the conjunctive of the *present* ποιῶσιν points to that which is already to be done in the present. — καὶ μὴ στενάζοντες] *and without sighing*, *sc.* over your intractableness. — ἀλυσιτελές] *unprofitable*, inasmuch as it will bring you no gain, but, on the contrary, will call down upon you the chastisement of God. A *litotes*. — τοῦτο] *sc.* τὸ στενάζειν.

Vv. 18, 19. Summons to the readers to intercession on behalf of the author. Comp. 1 Thess. v. 25; 2 Thess. iii. 1; Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 19; Col. iv. 3. — περὶ ἡμῶν] The plural has reference exclusively to the author of the epistle. In addition to himself, to think of Timothy (Seb. Schmidt, *al.*), or of the ἡγούμενοι spoken of ver. 17 (Carpzov, Kluge), or of the fellow-labourers in the gospel in the midst of the Gentile world, remote from the Hebrew Christians (Delitzsch, comp. also Alford), or of the companions in his vocation, with regard to whom it was to be made known that they wished

to be looked upon as joint-representatives of the subject-matter of the epistle (Hofmann), is arbitrary. For—apart from the fact that no mention has been made of Timothy until now, and that the presupposition that the author wished himself to be numbered among the *ἡγούμενοι* spoken of in ver. 17 is a wholly baseless one—the singular, which in ver. 19 without any qualification takes the place of the preceding plural, is in itself decisive against this view. For, even if perchance at ver. 19 the person of the writer had to be brought into special relief, out of a plurality of persons indicated at ver. 18, a distinguishing *ἐγώ* as addition to the simple *παρακαλῶ* could not have been wanting. — *πειθόμεθα γὰρ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*] *for we persuade ourselves, i.e. we suppose or take it to be so* (comp. Acts xxvi. 26), *that¹ we have a good conscience, since we endeavour in all things to walk in a praiseworthy manner.* Indication of the reason on the ground of which the author believes he is entitled to claim an interest on the part of the readers, manifesting itself in intercession on his behalf. But in the fact that he regards such explanation as necessary, there is displayed the consciousness that the Palestinian Christians took umbrage at him and his Pauline character of teaching; to remove this umbrage is therefore the object of the justificatory clause. — *ἐν πᾶσιν*] belongs to that which follows, not still, as Oecumenius and Theophylact suppose, to *ἔχομεν*; and *πᾶσιν* is not *masculine* (Chrysostom: *οὐκ ἐν ἐθνικοῖς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν*; Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Er. Schmid, Tholuck, Hofmann, *al.*), but *neuter*.

Ver. 19. *Περисσοτέρως*] is on account of its position more naturally referred to *παρακαλῶ* than, with Seb. Schmidt, Rambach, Bengel, and Hofmann, to *ποιῆσαι*. — *ἵνα τάχιον*

¹ Bengel, Böhm, Kuinoel, Klee, and others take *ὅτι*—in reading the received *πεποιθήμεν γάρ*, and then supposing this to be put absolutely—as the *causal* “for” or “because,” which, however, even supposing the correctness of the *Recepta*, is forced and unnatural. Yet more unsuitable, however, is it when Hofmann, even with the reading *πειθόμεθα*, will have *ὅτι* taken causally. The sense is supposed to be: “if we believe that ye are praying for us, this has its ground in the fact that we have a good conscience.” But to derive the more precise indication of contents for the dependent *πειθόμεθα* from that which precedes, is altogether inadmissible.

ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν] *that I may the sooner be restored to you*, may be in a position to return to you. There is to be inferred from these words, neither that the author, at the time of the composition of the epistle, was a prisoner (Euthalius, Calov, Braun, Bisping, and others), nor yet that he belonged, as member, to the congregation of those to whom he was writing (R. Köstlin in the *Theol. Jahrb.* of Baur and Zeller, 1853, H. 3, pp. 423, 427, and 1854, H. 3, pp. 369, 406). The former not, because the notice, ver. 23: μεθ' οὗ, ἐν τάχῳ ἐρχεται, ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς, shows beyond refutation that the writer at the time of the composition of the epistle was able to dispose freely of his own person. The latter not, because it is illogical to place the general notion of a "being restored" to a community upon a level with the special notion of the "return of one who has been torn from his home." Only two things follow from the words, namely (1) from the τάχῳ, that the author was still prevented, in some way or other which had nothing to do with his personal freedom, from quitting his temporary place of residence so quickly as he could wish; (2) from ἀποκατασταθῶ, that he had already, before this time, been personally present in the midst of his readers.

Vv. 20, 21. *A wish of blessing.* Chrysostom: Πρῶτον παρ' αὐτῶν αἰτήσας τὰς εὐχάς, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτοῖς ἐπεύχεται πάντα τὰ ἀγαθά. — ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης] A designation of God very usual with Paul also. Its import may either be, as 1 Thess. v. 23 (see at that place): *the God of salvation*, i.e. God, who bestows the Christian salvation; or, as Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20, Phil. iv. 9, 2 Cor. xiii. 11: *the God of peace*, i.e. God, who produces peace. In favour of the first acceptance, which is defended by Schlichting, may be urged the tenor of the benediction itself. In favour of the latter acceptance decides, however, the connection of thought with ver. 18 f. For, since the closing half of ver. 18 betrayed the pre-supposition that the receivers of the epistle were biassed by prejudice against the person of the writer, there lies indicated in the fact, that in the following wish of blessing God is designated as the God who creates peace, the further idea, that He will also make peace between the readers and the

writer, *i.e.* will bring the Christian convictions of the readers into harmony with that of the writer. So in substance Chrysostom (τοῦτο εἶπε διὰ τὸ στασιάζειν αὐτούς. Εἰ τοίνυν ὁ θεὸς εἰρήνης θεὸς ἐστὶ, μὴ διαστασιάζετε πρὸς ἡμᾶς), Oecumenius, Theophylact, Jac. Cappellus, and others. Wrongly do Grotius, Böhme, de Wette, Bisping, and others derive the appellation "the God of peace" from the supposition that reference is made to the contentions which prevailed amongst the members of the congregation itself. For the assumption of a state in which the congregation was rent by internal dissensions, is one warranted neither by xii. 14 nor by anything else in the epistle. — ὁ ἀναγαγὼν κ.τ.λ.] Further characterizing of God as the God who, by the raising of Christ from the dead, has sanctioned and attested the redeeming work of the same. — ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν] *He who has brought up from the dead, i.e. who has raised from death.* Wrongly do Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Maier, Kluge, and Kurtz suppose that in ὁ ἀναγαγὼν is contained at the same time the exaltation into heaven. For, since ὁ ἀναγαγὼν does not stand absolutely, but has with it the addition ἐκ νεκρῶν, so must that idea also have been made evident by a special addition. There would thus have been written ὁ ἐκ νεκρῶν εἰς ὕψος ἀναγαγὼν, or something similar. Compare, too, Rom. x. 7, where in like manner, as is shown by ver. 9, by the Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν is denoted exclusively the resurrection of Christ, and not likewise His ascension. — τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν] *the exalted (comp. iv. 14) Shepherd of the sheep.* For the figure, comp. John x. 11 ff.; Matt. xxvi. 31; 1 Pet. ii. 25, v. 4 (ὁ ἀρχιποιμήν). According to Theophylact, Bengel, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, Hofmann, and others, the author had in connection with this expression present to his mind LXX. Isa. lxiii. 10, where it is said in regard to Moses: ποῦ ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων,—a supposition which, considering the currency of the figure in the N. T., may certainly be dispensed with. — ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου] *in virtue of the blood of an everlasting covenant, i.e. in virtue of the shed blood of Christ, by which the New Covenant was sealed; comp. ix. 15 ff., x. 29.* Occumenius,

Theophylact, Clarius, Calvin, Bengel, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Kluge, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and others conjoin these words with *ὁ ἀναγαγών*, but then again differ from each other in the determining of the sense. According to Bleek and Kurtz (similarly Bisping), the author intends to say: "God brought up Christ from the dead in the blood of the everlasting covenant; in such wise that He took, as it were, the shed blood with Him, in that He opened up to Himself by the same the entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, and it retained continually its power for the sealing of an everlasting covenant." But this interpretation falls with the erroneous presupposition that *ὁ ἀναγαγών* includes in itself likewise the idea of the exaltation to heaven. According to Oecumenius 2, Theophylact 2, and Calvin, *ἐν*, on the other hand, stands as the equivalent in signification to *σύν*: *who has raised Christ from the dead with the blood of the everlasting covenant*, so that this blood retains everlasting virtue; while Clarius (comp. the first interpretation in Oecumenius and Theophylact) understands the words as though *εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἡμῖν εἰς διαθήκην αἰώνιον* had been written, and Bengel, as likewise Hofmann, makes *ἐν αἵματι* the same as *διὰ τὸ αἷμα* (for the blood's sake). But all these acceptations are linguistically untenable. Equally inadmissible is it to take *ἐν*, in this combination, *instrumentally* (Delitzsch, Kluge: "by means of, by the power of, by virtue of;") Alford: "through the blood"). For if one insists on the strict signification of the instrumental explanation, there arises a false thought, since the means by the application of which the miraculous act of the resurrection was accomplished is not the blood of Christ, but the omnipotence of God. If, however, we mingle the notion of *mediately effecting* with that of *the meritorious cause*, as is done by Delitzsch and Alford, inasmuch as the former dilutes the "*kraft*" (by virtue of) into "*virtute ac merito sanguinis ipsius in morte effusi*," the latter the "*through*" into "*in virtue of the blood*," we come back to Bengel's ungrammatical equalizing of *ἐν αἵματι* with *διὰ τὸ αἷμα*. Another class of expositors combine *ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου* with the *μέγαν* immediately foregoing; either, as Sykes and Baumgarten, in taking *τὸν μέγαν* as a notion *per*

se; or, as Starck, Wolf, and Heinrichs, prolonging in connection with it the idea of the shepherd. Nevertheless, it is most natural, with Beza, Estius, Grotius, Limborch, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Stengel, Ebrard, Richm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 601), Maier, Moll, and others, to regard ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου as instrumental nearer definition to the total idea τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν; in such wise that by the addition is indicated the means by which Christ became the exalted Shepherd, with whom no other shepherd may be placed upon a parallel. Comp. Acts xx. 28: προσέχετε . . . παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου, ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου. — διαθήκης αἰωνίου] Comp. Jer. xxxii. 40, l. 5; Isa. lv. 3, lxi. 8. Theodoret: Αἰώνιον δὲ τὴν καινὴν κέκληκε διαθήκην, ὡς ἑτέρας μετὰ ταύτην οὐκ ἔσομένης· ἵνα γὰρ μή τις ὑπολάβῃ, καὶ ταύτην δι' ἄλλης διαθήκης παυθήσεσθαι, εἰκότως αὐτῆς τὸ ἀτελεύτητον ἔδειξεν.

Ver. 21. Καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ] *cause that ye become ἄρτιοι, ready or perfect, in every good work.* Oecumenius: πληρώσαι, τελειώσαι. That, for the rest, καταρτίσαι is optative, and not, as Kurtz strangely supposes, imperative aorist middle, is self-evident. — εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι] Statement of the design, not of the effect (Schlichting and others): *that ye may accomplish.* — τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ] *His will, i.e. that which is morally good and salutary.* There is certainly comprehended under the expression the faithful continuance in Christianity. — ποιῶν ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] *working in you (wrongly Böhme: among you) that which is well-pleasing in His sight, through Christ Jesus.* Modal definition to καταρτίσαι. — τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ] Comp. 2 Cor. v. 9; Rom. xii. 1, xiv. 18; Eph. v. 10; Phil. iv. 18. — διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] belongs neither to καταρτίσαι (Bloomfield) nor to τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (Grotius, Hammond, Michaelis, Storr, and others), but to ποιῶν. — ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας] *sc. ἔστω — ἡ δόξα] the glory due to Him.* — The doxology is referred by Limborch, Wetstein, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Ernesti, Delitzsch, Alford, Kluge, Woerner, and others, to God; and

in favour of this it may be urged that in the wish of blessing \acute{o} $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ forms the main subject. More correctly, however, shall we refer it, partly on account of the immediate joining of $\tilde{\omega}$ to 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ , partly on account of the design of the whole epistle, to warn the readers, who had become wavering in their faith in Christ, against relapse into Judaism, with Calvin, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Owen, Böhmke, Stuart, Bleek, Stengel, Tholuck, Bisping, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 286), Maier, Moll, and the majority, *to Christ*.

Ver. 22. Request for friendly reception of the epistle. — $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$] *hear with the word of the exhortation*, grant it entrance with you, close not your hearts against it. Mistakenly do the Vulgate, Stein, and Kluge make $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ here have the signification of "consolation." Neither the verb $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ nor the tenor of the epistle is in keeping therewith. — $\acute{o}\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$] Comp. Acts xiii. 15. Not merely the admonitions scattered here and there in the epistle (Dindorf, Kuinoel) are to be understood under this expression; and just as little is merely chap. xiii. (Semler), or the last specially hortatory sections, chap. x. 19–xiii. (Grotius, Calov, and others), thought of in connection therewith. Rather is there intended by it, as also the following $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha$ proves, the epistle in its full extent. — $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \beta\rho\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha\ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$] Argument for the reasonableness of the request on the ground of the brevity of the epistle: *for I have also (i.e. apart from the fact that, by reason of your perilous wavering in the Christian faith, the admonishing of you was laid as a duty upon my conscience), as you see, written to you only with brief words*. Theophylact: $\text{Τοσαῦτα εἰπὼν, ὅμως βραχέα ταῦτά φησιν, ὅσον πρὸς ἃ ἐπεθύμει λέγειν}$. Quite remote from the meaning is that sense which Kurtz would put upon the words: *the readers were also to take into account the fact that the epistle has, owing to its brief compass, often assumed a harsher and severer form of expression, than would be the case in connection with a more detailed amplification and a more careful limitation*. — $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \beta\rho\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon$] of the same import as $\delta\iota'\ \acute{o}\lambda\acute{\iota}\gamma\omega\upsilon$, 1 Pet. v. 12. — $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\upsilon$] in the signification "to write a letter," elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts xv. 20, xxi. 25.

Ver. 23. Communication of the intelligence that Timothy has been set free, and the promise, if the arrival of Timothy is not long delayed, in company with him to visit the readers. — *γινώσκετε*] is *imperative* (Peshito, Vulgate, Faber Stapulensis, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Junius, Owen, Bengel, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, I. p. 278; Stein, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Hofmann, Woerner, and others), not *indicative* (Vatablus, Nösselt, *Opusc.* I. p. 256; Morus, Schulz, Bleek *ad loc.*, and *Einl. in d. N. T.*, 3 Aufl. p. 583; de Wette, *al.*). For, that the author would be obliged to communicate further details concerning the liberation of Timothy in the case that the readers had not yet known of it, cannot be maintained; while, on the other hand, upon the supposition of the indicative, the whole notice would become superfluous. — *γινώσκετε ἀπολελυμένον*] *know as one released*, i.e. know that he has been released. Comp. Winer, *Gramm.*, 7 Aufl. p. 324. Wrongly will Storr, Schleussner, Bretschneider, Paulus have *γινώσκετε* taken in the sense: *hold in honour*, or: *receive with kindness*, against which, equally as against the interpretation of Schulz: "ye know the brother Timothy, who has been set at liberty," the non-repetition of the article *τόν* before the participle is in itself decisive. — *ἀπολελυμένον*] is to be understood of liberation from *imprisonment*. So Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact (all three, however, with hesitation), then Beza, Grotius, Er. Schmid, Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, Wolf, Bengel, Sykes, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Hofmann, and others. Of an imprisonment of Timothy nothing is known to us, it is true, from other sources, but the possibility of the same cannot be disputed. The suppositions, that *ἀπολελυμένον* signifies: *sent away to the Hebrews with our epistle* (Theodoret, subscription of the epistle in many cursives: *ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου*; Faber Stapulensis, *al.*), or: *sent away somewhere, and consequently absent from the author* (Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Carpzov, Stuart, and others), have the simple signification of the word against them. — *ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται*] *if he very speedily* (earlier, sooner than I leave my present

abode) *comes to me* (incorrectly Grotius, Heinrichs, Stuart, *al.*: returns). — ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς] Occumenius: ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

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

Ver. 25. Concluding wish of blessing, entirely in accord with that of Tit. iii. 15.