COMMENTARY

ON THE EPISTLES

OF TIMOTHY AND PETER

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

12.10.90

Division BS2341
Section .A512
Shelf
Number .V.6

AN

AMERICAN COMMENTARY

ON THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

EDITED BY

ALVAH HOVEY, D.D., LL.D.

PHILADELPHIA:
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
1420 CHESTNUT STREET.

COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

BY
A. C. KENDRICK, D. D.

PHILADELPHIA:
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
1420 CHESTNUT STREET.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1889, by the
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

INTRODUCTION TO THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

THREE among the New Testament Epistles may be regarded as of pre-eminent interest and importance—namely, that to the Romans, the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. They differ, indeed, widely in purpose and character. The Epistle to the Romans is an exposition, welling up from the large soul and ripe experience of the Apostle Paul, of the fundamental character, and world-wide relations of the gospel. That to the Corinthians applies the principles of the gospel to the correction of grave abuses and errors which had become rife in one of the most prominent New Testament Churches. The Epistle to the Hebrews, addressed to a body of believing Jews—whether a single church or an aggregation of churches—seeks to hold them back from a threatened apostasy to Judaism by exhibiting the transcendent superiority of the New Covenant to the symbolical and transitory system to which they were returning. The Epistle is thus more fundamental in character and scope than that to the Corinthians, and yields in depth of view and the vital importance of its teachings, only to the Epistle to the Romans. Indeed, selecting from the world's entire literature two among its most remarkable productions, we should readily designate, I think, the Epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews. To the former must be accorded the superiority in breadth, comprehensiveness, and power; it glows throughout with the fiery energy of the great Christian Demosthenes. The latter, apparently narrower in scope, makes up in depth what it lacks in breadth; in calm majesty what it lacks in vehemence; and pursues its even and tranquil course with an earnestness and intensity of purpose which are in striking contrast with the placid smoothness of the style.

But apart from style the Epistle to the Hebrews presents some aspects of striking peculiarity. The authorship, date, purpose, and destination of the Epistle to the Romans lie in the clearest sunlight; that to the Hebrews is in all these points enveloped in an almost impenetrable obscurity. It presents the singular problem of a composition written in the very blaze of the early Christian period, on a practical topic of momentous interest, by a man certainly of virtual apostolic dignity, yet over whose authorship, date, place of composition, and immediate destination hangs a mystery like that which surrounds its own Melchisedec. These successive topics I will briefly notice.

I. AUTHORSHIP.

1. CURRENT TRADITION.

Current tradition in the church has assigned this Epistle to the Apostle Paul, and the question of authorship turns largely on settling the grounds of this tradition. The evidence divides itself into two branches—external or historical, and internal. Looking first at the former, we find that in the Eastern Church the Epistle was from the first regarded as canonical, and was in some form generally attributed to Paul. Pantænus, Clement,

and Origen, the successive heads of the Alexandrian Catechetical School (180–250 A. D.), all regard it in a qualified sense as his. Pantænus, the first whom we know to have attached to it the name of the apostle, mentions as an objection to this view the absence in its opening of Paul's customary form of salutation, but explains it (fancifully, I think) from the apostle's unwillingness to put himself into seeming rivalry with his Lord, God's special apostle (Ἀπόστολος) to the Hebrews. (Eusebius' "Hist. Eccles." VI. 14, 4.) Clement, his pupil, finds a weightier objection. He sees in the style the characteristics rather of Luke than of Paul, and solves the difficulty by supposing that Paul composed it in Aramaic, and Luke, his companion, rendered it into Greek. (Eusebius' "Hist. Eccles." VI. 14, 2–4.) So Origen, while repeatedly citing the Epistle as Paul's, and declaring it worthy of him in its wonderful depth of thought, yet regards the style as quite unlike his and far more classical. "For no slight reasons," he says, "have ancient men handed down the Epistle as Paul's, though by whom it was actually written God only knows. Tradition ascribes it partly to Clement, Bishop of Rome, and partly to Luke." (Eusebius' "Hist. Eccles." VI. 25, 11.) Whether these critical doubts died away or not, the later Alexandrians, as Dionysius (about 250), Alexander (about 312), Athanasius (died 373), Didymus (died 395), etc., simply cite the Epistle as Paul's.

In Syria the admission of the Epistle into the Peshito version (in the latter half of the second century) shows its standing as canonical, though it appears as anonymous, and nothing indicates it as being considered Pauline. Yet the later Syrian Church generally held to its Pauline origin. Jacob, Bishop of Nisibis (about 325), cites it as from an apostle, presumably from Paul; and his disciple, Ephraem Syrus (died 378), refers it unhesitatingly to Paul; and in Western Syria the Synod of Antioch (264), in an Epistle to Paul of Samosata, couples citations from it with passages from the Corinthians as belonging to the same author.

Elsewhere in the Eastern Church the view became general which ascribed the Epistle to Paul. Eusebius of Cæsarea (300–350) repeatedly refers to it as his, and enumerates fourteen of his Epistles, thus clearly embracing this. ("Hist. Eccles." III. 3, 5.) Yet he speaks of those in the Roman Church who denied its Pauline origin, and he himself, like Clement of Alexandria, regards it as a translation from a Hebrew original of the apostle ("Hist. Eccles." III. 38, 23); and he elsewhere classes it along with the Wisdom of Solomon and that of Jesus, son of Sirach, and the Epistles of Barnabas, the Roman Clement, and Jude, among the works that are disputed (γραφαὶ ἀντιλεγόμεναι, VI. 13, 6). It is attributed, however, immediately to Paul in the sixtieth canon of the Council at Laodicea (about 350), by Titus of Bostra (died 371), by Basil the Great (died 379), and his brother, Gregory of Nyssa; by Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem (died 386); by Gregory Nazianzen (died 389), by Epiphanius (died 402), by Chrysostom (died 407), by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and others. Also Theodoret (died 457), in the introduction to his interpretation of the Epistle; still he does this to contend against the Arians, who rejected it as un-Pauline and uncanonical.

The Eastern Church thus early regarded the Epistle as from Paul, though not until a late period as proceeding from him in its present form. The weighty authority of the Alexandrian Fathers—Pantænus, Clement, Origen—turns, from our point of view, rather against the Pauline authorship, when we reflect that it was probably because the stamp of apostolic authority was deemed necessary by them to its canonical validity, and they could give it this authority only by assuming that Paul was, at least indirectly, its author. Their reasons for denying to the apostle its immediate, and, so to speak, *literary* author-

ship, are far weightier than those which lead them to bring it within the apostolic circle. Within that circle no name but that of Paul could be connected with the Epistle to the Hebrews; and they had the discernment to see the wide difference of style and manner between this work and the acknowledged writings of the apostle.

We turn to the history of the Epistle in the Western Church. In Rome it must have been early known and highly valued, as the Roman, Clement (about 100), employs many expressions from it in his valuable Epistle to the Corinthians, though without formal citation, or any allusion to its author. Later evidence renders it improbable that he attributed it to Paul, as the canon of Muratori, belonging to the end of the second century, reckons thirteen epistles as attributed by the Roman Church to Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews being excluded from the list, and, indeed, entirely unmentioned. So Caius, Presbyter at Rome (about 210), reckoned but thirteen epistles of Paul; and Novatian (about 250), in his works, "de Trinitate," and "de Cibis Judaicis," works abounding in Biblical citations, makes no mention whatever of our Epistle, which he could hardly have refrained from doing had he recognized it as canonical, not to say Pauline. Outside of Rome, Tertullian, of the North African Church, in the close of the second, and the beginning of the third century, knows only thirteen Pauline epistles. He cites the Epistle to the Hebrews in support of his Montanistic views, and attributes it without questioning to Barnabas. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage (died 258), leaves it wholly unmentioned. Irenæus, the celebrated Bishop of Lyons (died about 202), rarely, if at all, cited the book,—certainly not in his important work against the heretics,—and is said to have denied its Pauline authorship. Such was the state of opinion regarding the Epistle in the Latin Church as late as the time of Eusebius of Cæsarea. After the middle of the fourth century the tide turned, probably under Eastern influence. Between 368 and 400, Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer of Calaxis, C. Marius Victorinus, Philastrius of Brescia, and Ambrose of Milan, attribute it to the apostle, while Rufinus, Jerome, and Augustine (between 411 and 430) receive the opinion with hesitation. The three African Synods—of Hippo (393), and of Carthage (397, 419)—first put the express seal of the Western Church upon the canonical validity and the Pauline authorship of the Epistle; the two former, indeed, cautiously ("thirteen epistles of the Apostle Paul, and one by him to the Hebrews"); but the third decisively ("the epistles of the Apostle Paul, fourteen in number"). The decree of the councils was confirmed by the Papal See; and thence onward through the Middle Ages, with some lingering echoes of doubt among Latin writers, the voice both of the Eastern and the Western churches was unanimous down to the time of the Reformation. Of late opinions I shall speak subsequently.

2. INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

The historical testimony thus appears by no means decisive in favor of the Pauline origin of the Epistle. To the view that it came from the apostle *in its present form*, that testimony seems to me decidedly adverse. The *internal evidence*, I think, bears against it still more strongly. There is, neither in its style, nor form of doctrine, nor mode of discussion, nor historical allusions, a single feature which requires, nor, except the single allusion to Timothy (13 : 23), which would naturally lead us to attribute it to the apostle.

First. The style bears almost no similarity to that of Paul.—It has nothing of his impetuosity and abruptness, none of his favorite expressions and forms of transition; but moves on in an equable and uniform flow of quiet majesty. In his utmost intensity of

emotion the writer is never insensible to, and never sacrifices, the graces of diction. He is a rhetorician, trained in the culture of the schools, and always writing, as Paul never writes, under the habitual sway of that culture. Paul is never a rhetorician; our author is always a rhetorician. Not, indeed, that Paul does not, in the grandeur of his thought, and the native majesty and energy of his diction, often snatch spontaneously some of the highest graces of art. And not that our author, with his soul profoundly penetrated with Christian truth, does not uniformly rise above the sphere of the mere rhetorician. Yet, in his noblest flights, he neither can nor would shake off his habits of rhetorical expression—habits which are utterly alien to the mind of the apostle. Nor, while certainly inferior in finish and grace of style, can we deny to the apostle, on the whole, the superior place as a writer. His largeness and depth of view, his burning energy, his confident and majestic tread amidst the Alpine heights of divine truth, give him a Demosthenian pre-eminence in sacred oratory; and his principal epistles stand as perpetual proofs that if he often fed infantile Christians with the milk of sacred doctrine, he was able to utter among the full grown and mature a wisdom which the wisdom of this world has never transcended nor approached. The question between him and the writer to the Hebrews is not one of relative excellence, but of likeness or unlikeness. And unlike, in their native endowments and style of culture, they certainly are. The one writer would certainly never have written the opening verse of the Epistle to the Romans; still less would the other have written the sonorous and rolling periods of the opening of the Hebrews.

Second. The author of our Epistle classes himself (2 : 3) *among those who received the gospel at second hand.*—This position the Apostle Paul could never have assumed for a moment. He repels almost indignantly any lowering of himself to the second rank, and maintains that, equally with the greatest of the apostles, he stood in immediate communication with the fountain head of truth and authority. He stands on the highest level of apostolic prerogative, having seen the Lord Jesus, and received from him directly his commission.

Third. Paul was an apostle to the Gentiles.—His whole course of life kept his mind open to the world-wide scope and purpose of the gospel. Granting, then, that he might write an apostolic letter to his Jewish brethren (whom he loved, we know, with most intense and tenderest affection), it is scarcely conceivable that his discussion should not have occasionally broken over its bounds, and regarded the relations of the gospel to the world outside of Judaism. There are indeed abundant indications of our author's recognition of this universal character of the gospel. Christ tasted death for every man. He becomes the Son of man that he may share that flesh and blood of which all men are partakers, and thus, through death, deliver men from that fear of death by which universal humanity is held in bondage. Thus the idea of the all-embracing purpose of redemption certainly lies at the basis of his Christology. Yet it is presupposed and hinted at merely. In no single instance does the writer depart from the Old Testament representation of Israel as the "people of God," and declare directly its widening out to the breaking down of the separating wall, and the admission of the Gentiles to an equal standing with the Jews. The *discussion* confines itself to the Judaistic relations of the gospel almost as closely as if the Gentile world had no existence. With a concentration of view remarkable under any conditions of authorship, but wholly inconceivable in the case of the world-embracing and irrepressible spirit of the great apostle of the Gentiles, with an unswerving singleness of purpose, the writer discusses the relations

of the New Covenant to the Old almost as if the extension of that covenant to all peoples were wholly unknown to him. A discussion so conducted by one whose life and soul were absorbingly devoted to the evangelization of the Gentiles seems wholly inconceivable.

Fourth. Form of citations from the Old Testament.—Another objection to the Pauline authorship may be found in the form of the citations from the Old Testament. In his acknowledged epistles, the apostle makes his citations indifferently from the Hebrew original and from the Septuagint, translating and quoting from memory with great freedom. Our author, on the other hand, makes his citations invariably from the Septuagint, and gives no indication of even an acquaintance with the Hebrew. He quotes, too, with verbal exactness, having apparently, at least in the longer passages, the text from which he quotes before him; and Bleek has shown that in the citations from the Septuagint, wherever the readings differ, our author draws in general from the Alexandrian Codex, while Paul uses exclusively the readings of the Vatican. In their modes, too, of introducing Old Testament passages, the observing reader will find a uniform and very striking difference.

Fifth. Difference in the coloring and the prominence given to different features of the gospel.—While there is no doctrinal discrepancy, but, on the other hand, an entire harmony in the two writers' fundamental conceptions of the gospel, there is yet a wide difference in coloring, and in the prominence given to different features of it. Both hold to the pre-existence of Christ; both insist alike upon his sacrificial death. But Paul dwells much upon the resurrection of Christ, while our author makes express mention of it but once, and that in the very close of the Epistle. (13 : 20.) On the other hand, he dwells upon the ascension and the heavenly high priesthood, while Paul refers but once, and that passingly (Rom. 8 : 34), to his heavenly intercession, and in no single instance employs the designation of *high priest*, of which the name (occurring seventeen times), and the functions, are the main burden of our Epistle. So an aspect of *faith* to which Paul makes but casual allusion (2 Cor. 5 : 7) our author makes the basis of his formal definition and extended illustration (chapter 11), treating it from the Old Testament point of view, while Paul's favorite phrases, "justification," "righteousness of faith," etc. (δικαιοῦν, δικαίωσις, δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως), are entirely foreign to him. These illustrations of specific differences might be greatly extended, and, in fact, drawn from every part of the Epistle. They certainly indicate no contrariety of views in the two writers. Every doctrine that is taught explicitely by the one is, I think, implied, if not expressly affirmed, in the teachings of the other. We may, I think, in fact, detect in our author traces of Pauline companionship and influence. Yet the diversities are very wide, as might be expected from different minds, subjected to widely different modes of culture, and dealing with a range of subjects exhaustless in their contents and infinite in their variety.

Sixth. Historical reference.—Finally, there is but one historical reference in our Epistle that would seem to favor its reference to Paul—namely, the relations of our author to the apostle's favorite young companion, Timothy. (13 : 23.) This, however, on close examination, seems rather to bear a different testimony. We know of no imprisonment of Timothy during the life of the apostle, a deliverance from which could here be referred to. So far as probabilities go, it would seem likely that Timothy, summoned to Paul's side in his last imprisonment, shared that imprisonment, and was released after the death of the apostle. The most plausible conjecture, therefore, warranted by this

allusion, would point to a composition of the Epistle after the death of the apostle, and would thus exclude him from the number of possible candidates for its authorship. With any known event during the apostle's life it is wholly out of harmony; and, so far as this goes, it bears against the view which puts his name at the head of the Epistle.

Most of the above objections are equally adverse to any form of Pauline authorship, whether immediate, or by a dictation of the substance put into form by another, or through an Aramaic original translated into Greek by a friend or disciple. Indeed, we may dismiss at once, and finally, the idea that the work is a translation. Its rhetoric, its Septuagint quotations are against it, and nothing whatever in the Epistle favors it. If any New Testament work, this surely bears the impress of an original.

To whom, then, are we to assign the Epistle? Antiquity connects with it, besides the name of Paul, the names of Clement of Rome, Silas, Luke, and Barnabas. For the two former there is really no evidence whatever. The use of the Epistle by Clement, in his letter to the Corinthians, proves that it was extant in his time, but makes against, rather than in favor of, the supposition that he was its author. Guericke, Ebrard, and Delitzsch, follow Origen, in referring the substance of it to Paul and the form to Luke. But the hypothesis of such dictation is an unwarranted conjecture, made, apparently, only to save the apostolic dignity of the Epistle. The style of Luke has indeed a general superficial resemblance to that of this work, in that it bears the impress of culture beyond any other New Testament writings, and moves with a certain calm stateliness characteristic of our author; but in all radical resemblances to the style of our Epistle, it is, I think, wholly wanting. And an independent authorship by Luke is certainly out of the question. He was indeed one of those who received the gospel at second hand; but his position in the church lacked the almost apostolical dignity which clearly belongs to our author; and he was not a Jew, which the author of this Epistle certainly was.

Several modern scholars, as Twesten, Ullmann, Wieseler, Conybeare and Howson, follow Tertullian in assigning the Epistle to Barnabas. This is not without some plausible grounds. As a Levite, Barnabas might be specially interested in those priestly aspects of the gospel, which in our Epistle are so prominent; as a Cypriote, he might have stood in some special relations to Alexandria; and his title, *Son of Exhortation*—not "Son of Consolation" (υἱὸς τῆς παρακλήσεως)—might answer to some features, both of sentiment and style, of our Epistle. But nothing that we know of Barnabas warrants our expecting from him any such profound Old Testament researches, or such elaborate graces of style as characterize our Epistle; and from his residence, more or less protracted, at Jerusalem, we might expect clearer references to the temple service than are found in it. Our Epistle connects the Jewish ritual service rather with the Mosaic tabernacle than with the temple, which is not, I think, once expressly named in the Epistle. We may add that if Barnabas was the author of the writings which have come down to us under his name, then the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot be from his pen; and if it *is* from him, it is certainly an extraordinary ordering of Providence that the name of this great leader in the church should be transmitted to later ages in connection with an almost worthless forgery, and almost wholly dissevered from the work which would have placed him among the noblest instructors of the church, and in the very first rank of Biblical authorship.

The only name, I think, connected with the authorship of our Epistle, for which any strong argument can be made, is one wholly unknown in this connection to Christian antiquity—that of Apollos. The first to ascribe the Epistle to him, breaking in on the settled current of Mediæval opinion, was Luther, followed by some of his compeers of the

Reformation. This hypothesis once started has found gradually increasing favor. Clericus and Semler, Bleek, the Coryphœus among the expounders of this Epistle; more recently, Tholuck, Credner, Alford, Lunemann, Kurtz, and among the very latest, W. F. Moulton, have given in their adherence to the view which fixes the authorship upon Apollos. The grounds for a certain conclusion are doubtless wanting; but all the positive evidence tends in this direction. The author of the Epistle was certainly a Jew, and nearly as certainly an extra-Palestinian Jew. He was a person of elegant culture, and trained in the arts of rhetoric: for the Epistle is full of fine rhetorical points. He was apparently acquainted with the writings of the Alexandrian Philo (though untinctured by Philo's allegorizing and mystical tendencies); for the verbal coincidences are too numerous and striking to be the result of accident. He was, therefore, in all probability from Alexandria. He stood as a teacher on high and independent ground, and yet was not of those who had received the gospel at first hand. He differed widely from Paul in his *mode* of presenting the gospel; was a far more finished writer and commanded a more eloquent style, and yet is actuated by the same spirit, and is in all fundamental points in perfect harmony with him. He was profoundly versed in the Old Testament, and had that power of fathoming and drawing out its hidden meanings, which would enable him "with great power to convince the Jews from the Old Testament Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ," as witness his treatment of Ps. 8 : 5–7; of Ps. 109 : 4; 39 : 40, and of the Lord's Melchisedec priesthood. All these requisites to the authorship of this Epistle are fulfilled in Apollos, and we could scarcely find them more significantly summed up than in the words of Acts 18 : 24, 25. "Apollos, a Jew from Alexandria, an eloquent (or lettered) man, mighty in the Scriptures, with great power convincing the Jews from the Old Testament that Jesus is the Christ." Add to this his further training by Aquila and Priscilla, disciples of Paul, his companionship with the apostle himself, and the crowning inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and I doubt if we have much farther to seek for the man through whom the Spirit enriched the church with this precious storehouse of sacred truth.

II. DESTINATION OF THE EPISTLE.

All that is clear in regard to the destination of the Epistle is that it was directed to Hebrew Christians, who had distinguished themselves by their fidelity and Christian beneficence (6 : 10), but had declined from their steadfastness, and had ceased from their Christian progress, and were relapsing into Judaism. That they were Christians in Palestine was generally assumed by antiquity, and might naturally be inferred from there being no mention of an intermixture of Gentile believers. Yet this reason is scarcely decisive, as there may have been in many places Christian bodies preponderantly Hebrew; and assuming Apollos to be the author, it seems scarcely likely that he stood in any such relation to the churches of Palestine as this letter would imply. It would be more natural to find its first readers in Alexandria, a place swarming with Hebrews, and to which the style of thought and diction would seem more fitted than to Palestine. This hypothesis has been adopted by Credner, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Bunsen, Conybeare and Howson, and others. Yet it lacks positive support; there is no certainty that any Christian churches yet existed in Alexandria, and the entire ignorance of the Alexandrian Fathers regarding its author and history is strongly against it. Stronger reasons, I think, exist for finding, with Alford, Kurtz, and others, its original circle of readers in Rome. This view would explain the early knowledge and use of the Epistle by the Roman Clement, would harmonize with the references (10 : 32–34) to persecutions experienced by the Christians under Nero

in the year 64, and under Domitian in about 74, in which express mention is made (Eusebius' "Hist. Eccles." III. 17) of the confiscation of their goods (10 : 34), and is strongly supported by the language of the closing salutation, "those from Italy (οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας) salute you." Were the language "those of Italy" (οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας), "they that belong to Italy," it might naturally be referred to one who was writing from Italy, and was giving to foreigners the salutations of his Italian brethren. But the phrase "those from" Italy (οἱ ἀπὸ), indicates rather Italians absent from Italy, and making his letter the vehicle of their greetings to their countrymen. Or, of course, it might indicate Italian companions of the writer, addressing their greetings to friends in some other region than Italy. Yet of the suppositions the former is the more probable, and it harmonizes with the intrinsic probability that an Epistle of so great importance would be more likely to find its destination in Rome. The question stands open.

III. PLACE AND DATE OF COMPOSITION.

The *place* of composition of the letter lies in still deeper obscurity than its destination, and is indeed of less importance. According to our previous view, it was not written in Italy, and as the place where it was written contained evidently Italian residents, it may, as supposed by Bleek, Kurtz, etc., be some seaport town, as Corinth or Ephesus, easily accessible to fugitives from the Roman persecutions, especially as these towns had been the former scenes of the labors of Apollos.

As to the *time* of composition, there is a very general concurrence among all expositors in the opinion that it was written somewhere between the years 62 and 67. That the Jewish Temple was still standing cannot be inferred from chapter 10, where the present is certainly the *historical present*, and is describing under the present time the arrangements of the Mosaic tabernacle, and therefore has no necessary reference to the temple at Jerusalem. Still, if so great a blow to Judaism as the destruction of the temple had actually been experienced, it seems hardly credible that the Epistle, reticent as it is regarding historical events, should not have given some intimation of it; and it seems, on the whole, safest to fix the date of the Epistle a little before the year 70, when the flames of civil war were reddening the horizon, and giving a fearful significance to the words "and so much the more as ye see the *day* (the *dies iræ*, the day of the great impending catastrophe) approaching." (10 : 25; compare 1 Cor. 3 : 13.)

IV. PURPOSE AND CONTENTS.

The immediate object of the Epistle is to arrest the backsliding of a body of Jewish Christians who, having once distinguished themselves by their Christian activity, beneficence, and constancy under persecutions, were now relapsing into Judaism. To the attainment of this end it proceeds with a singleness and intensity of purpose which contrast strikingly with the placid smoothness of the style. It divides itself in general into a doctrinal or argumentative, and a practical or hortatory part. The argumentative part extends from the beginning to chapter 10 : 19. The practical part extends from chapter 10 : 20 to the end. In the theoretical portions, however, are interspersed hortatory passages of greater or less length, and the hortatory portion is more or less tinged with argument. Yet the general dividing line is clear and unmistakable, and the argument proceeds on a single line of discussion, aiming to show the superiority of the New Covenant to the Old by showing the measureless superiority of Him who was the Introducer, Founder, and

High Priest of the New Covenant to the corresponding classes of personages in the Old. The analysis of the Epistle is as follows:

PART I. ARGUMENTATIVE AND DOCTRINAL.

1. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO THE ANGELS.

Ch. 1. (1) *The manifold and fragmentary forms of Revelation in the Old Covenant have been replaced by one final Revelation in the Son, who, as Mediator of the New Covenant, is exalted as high above the angels* (messengers), *mediators of the Old, as his* name (*Son*) *is more excellent than theirs.* (1 : 1–4.)

(2) *Proof and illustration from the Old Testament of Christ's superiority as Son of God to the angels.* (5–14.)

Ch. 2. (3) *Brief exhortation to heed a revelation made by so extraordinary a personage. By as much as the Son is superior to the angels, by so much greater the peril of disobeying his message than theirs.* (1–4.)

(4) *Christ, though as Son infinitely superior to the angels, yet was humbled temporarily below them, that, suffering and dying as man, he might rescue and elevate his human brethren, and, as a faithful High Priest, reconcile them to God.* (5–18.)

2. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO MOSES.

Ch. 3. (1) *Christ, as Leader of the New Testament Israel and founder of the New Testament house of God, greater than Moses, leader of ancient Israel, and founder of the Old Testament house of God.* (1–6.)

(2) *Solemn warning to the readers against repeating the rebellion of their fathers and excluding themselves from God's Sabbatic rest, as the rebels under Moses forfeited the rest of Canaan.* (7–19.)

Ch. 4. (3) *The rest of God forfeited by ancient Israel, still open under its higher form, as God's Sabbatic rest, to the spiritual Israel.* (1–10.)

(4) *Renewed exhortation in view of the renewed promise of a higher rest, and based on the spiritual and searching qualities of the word; and transition, through their need of a sympathizing high priest, to the next and chief topic of the Epistle.* (11–16.)

3. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO AARON.

Christ, the High Priest of the New Dispensation, superior to Aaron, the high priest of the Old.

Ch. 5. (1) *Necessary qualities of the high priest.* (1–10.)

(*a*) He is taken from among men, that he, as man, may deal tenderly with men. (1–3.)

(*b*) Christ is not self-appointed, but called of God. (4.)

(*c*) Christ received his priestly office from God, (5, 6.)

(*d*) In his fleshly nature *as man*, Christ wrestled with the fear of death, and, learning obedience from suffering, was perfected for his saving and priestly work. (7–10.)

(2) *Long hortatory passage, suggested by the incapacity of the readers to enter on the profound discussion before them; namely, the priesthood of Christ.* (5 : 11–6 : 20.)

(*a*) Failure of the readers in that spiritual maturity which they should, by this time, have attained. (11–14.)

Ch. 6. (*b*) To this condition of spiritual maturity just described the writer exhorts his readers to hasten forward, and not linger among the elements of the religious life. He alarms them with the possibility that their backsliding may become irretrievable, but assures them of his better and brighter hope for them. (1–8.)

(*c*) The brighter aspects of the case. The author would encourage as well as alarm. He declares to his readers his confidence that under God's covenant faithfulness better things await them ; cites his oath to Abraham as a sure ground of confidence, and, reminding them of their hope which enters the heavenly sanctuary, and rests on the heavenly High Priest, thus brings his subject gracefully round to the starting point in the heavenly high priesthood of Jesus, from which he had digressed. (9–20.)

Ch. 7. (3) *The royal Melchisedec priesthood of Christ.* (1–28.)

(*a*) Summary of the Old Testament description of Melchisedec in those historical features which determine the character of his priesthood. (1–3.)

(*b*) Personal greatness of Melchisedec illustrated by his receiving tithes from Abraham, and that under extraordinary conditions. (4–10.)

(*c*) Application of these facts in regard to Melchisedec to the subject. The introduction of a new priesthood implies the failure of the Levitical, and the abrogation of the law for which it stood responsible. (11, 12.)

(*d*) This change in the law shown historically in the change of tribe to which the priest belongs. (13, 14.)

(*e*) The change is shown more clearly in the *intrinsic character* of the new priesthood, which is constituted not after a carnal ritual, but after the power of an endless life. (15–19.)

(*f*) A further proof of the superiority of the Melchisedec priesthood, is that it is instituted with the sanction of an oath. (20–22.)

(*g*) Christ's Melchisedec priesthood, unlike the Levitical succession, is a single, perpetual, everlasting priesthood, which can thus carry through to completeness its work of salvation. (23–25.)

(*h*) Exultant summing up of the qualities of Christ's Melchisedec priesthood necessary to be allied with those of the Aaronical high priest, to which topic ver. 26–28 form a transition. (26–28.)

Ch. 8. (4) *The efficient Aaronical high priesthood of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.* (8 : 1–10 : 18.)

(*a*) As a royal Melchisedec Priest, Christ has taken his seat at the right hand of God, and as Levitical High Priest, he has gone into the heavenly tabernacle. (1, 2.)

(*b*) As such a High Priest, Christ must of necessity have something to offer. (3.)

(*c*) So vitally connected are these two, the priesthood and the offering, that *on earth* there would be no place for his priesthood, as there exist already there those who make the offerings of the law, and whose prerogatives are inviolate. (4.)

(*d*) But, in fact, he *is* a High Priest, and can, therefore, make offerings, because he has the true tabernacle and the true priesthood, of which theirs were but a shadow, and a priesthood as much better than theirs as is the covenant, of which he is the Mediator, better than theirs. (5, 6.)

(*e*) For that it *is* better than the first (this subordinately and in passing) is clear from its having superseded it. For God, having found the first inefficacious, replaces it by a new, and the former one becomes antiquated and expires. (7–13.)

Ch. 9. (*f*) But that First Covenant (for to see how the New is organized, we must look back to that, its copy ; and to see what the new High Priest must offer, we must look back and see what the old one offered) had its ordinances of service, and its sanctuary consisting of two tabernacles, an outer or more common, and an inner and holier one. (9 : 1–6.)

(*g*) Now in the outer sanctuary the priests performed constant ministrations, but into

this inner sanctuary the hight priest went alone once a year, *not without blood*—he carried in there the blood of slaughtered victims, symbolically, though not really expiatory of sin. (6–10.)

(*h*) We see, then, what is demanded of our High Priest. It is *blood*. And as his is the true, and not the symbolical priesthood, as he is in the genuine, and not the copied sanctuary, he must offer blood that is really, and not symbolically, cleansing. He brings *his own*. (11–14.)

(*i*) This spiritual efficacy of the blood of Christ warrants and demands a New Covenant, inaugurated, like the First, with blood, but the blood of a nobler victim than that of the Old; for Christ has entered into the true antitypical sanctuary, not, like the earthly high priests, for repeated entrances, but once for all, never to leave it until he comes without sin unto salvation. (15–28.)

Ch. 10. (5) *Summing up of the entire high priestly argument.* (10 : 1–18.)

(*a*) Finality of Christ's voluntary *sacrifice* as opposed to the symbolical sacrifices of the law. (1–10)

(*b*) Finality of Christ's priestly ministration as opposed to the oft-repeated ministrations of the Levitical priesthood. (11–14.)

(*c*) Finality of the New Covenant, and of the sacrifice which seals it as effecting the absolute remission of sins. (15–18.)

PART II. HORTATORY.

(*a*) Exhortation to approach God boldly, to stir up each other to love, and not to forsake the Christian assemblies. (19–25.)

(*b*) The exhortation sharpened by the terrible consequences of apostasy. (26–31.)

(*c*) Encouragement from past fidelity, and exhortation not to throw away its fruits. (32–39.)

Ch. 11. (2) *Encouraging survey of the achievements of faith in Jewish history. Muster roll of the heroes of faith.* (1–40.)

(*a*) Illustrations of faith in the antediluvian believers. (1–7.)

(*b*) Example of Abraham and Sarah. (8–12.)

(*c*) Retrospective glance at the above-cited believers. (13–16.)

(*d*) Examples of the Jewish patriarchs. (17–22.)

(*e*) Example of Moses. (23–29.)

(*f*) Examples from the Exodus of Israel to the time of the Maccabees. (30–40.)

Ch. 12. (3) *Renewed exhortations, suggested chiefly by this historical survey.* (12 : 1–29.)

(*a*) Incitement to endurance from the encompassing presence of this host of witnesses, and especially of Jesus, their Leader. (1–3.)

(*b*) Their afflictions the fruits of God's chastening love. (4–11.)

(*c*) They are to resist firmly all relaxing tendencies by cultivating unity, purity, and constant watchfulness. (12–17.)

(*d*) They are to hearken to these exhortations in view of the grandeur and exalted character of the New Covenant, and the danger of disregarding its blessings and claims. (18–29.)

CONCLUSION.

Ch. 13. (1) *Practical admonitions of a general character.* (1–9.)

(2) *Renewed exhortations against apostasy.* (10–21.)

(3) *Final injunctions, personal references, and salutations.* (22–25.)

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

CHAPTER I.

GOD, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,
2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son,

1 God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers
2 manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto

PART I.

1. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO THE ANGELS.

Ch. 1. (1) *The manifold and fragmentary forms of Revelation in the Old Covenant have been replaced by one final Revelation in the Son, who, as Mediator of the New Covenant, is exalted as high above the angels* (messengers), *mediators of the Old, as his* name (*Son*) *is more excellent than theirs.* (1 : 1–4.)

1. At sundry times and in divers manners. The full sounding words of the original (πολυμερῶς, *in many parts*, and πολυτρόπως, *in many ways*) open with sonorous assonance the majestic sentence. The former, not 'at sundry times' (which in itself might show the *privileged* character of the Old Dispensation), but *in many parts, by piecemeal, fragmentarily* (μείρω, *divide*; μέρος, *a part*); the ancient revelation being made, not in one complete whole, but gradually and in fragments, as by Moses, Joshua, David, Isaiah, Malachi, etc., each in his own separate way helping to complete the slowly developed system. The 'various ways,' or *modes*, are by promise and vision, as to Abraham: by the giving of the Law and the instituting of symbolical expiations through Moses; by lyrical song through David; by oral and symbolical prediction through Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Malachi, etc. The two terms together denote the whole variety of promises, predictions, and symbols by which the divine plan was gradually unfolded under the Old Covenant, as against the one complete revelation made through the Son under the New. **Spake—***having spoken.*[1] The verb (λαλέω) in the classics, ordinarily *to talk, prattle*, is used in the New Testament habitually of dignified speaking. **Unto the fathers**—the whole body of the ancient Jewish people, as a term of affectionate reverence. **By** (*in*) **the prophets.** "In"—either Hebraistic for *by*, as instrumental, or better, strictly *in*, as denoting the *sphere* of God's speaking. He was *in* the prophets and *in* the Son; and as being *in*, spoke *through* them. (So De Wette, Lange, Lünemann, Delitzsch.) **Prophets**—not here prophets in the narrower sense, as Samuel, Isaiah, etc., but all the great men who in various ways were organs of the divine communications, as Abraham, Moses, David, Isaiah. So a prophet is not merely, perhaps not properly, a *fore*-speaker, but a *forth*-speaker, an utterer of God's thoughts.

2. In these last days, or, *at the close of these days.* 'These days.' Looking down the vista of the future, the Jewish prophets saw the then present period ('these days') bounded and succeeded by the age of the Messiah. 'These days,' therefore, as "this age" (ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος), became a sort of *terminus technicus* for the ante-Messianic period, and "the coming age" for the Messianic time which was to succeed it. Jewish prophecy, indeed, drew no clear dividing line between the first and second comings of the Anointed One. The actual unfolding of events broke this period into two portions—that which preceded and that which followed the Second Coming. The time between the First and the Second Coming became a sort of intermediate period, a transient interval before the great drama of eternity was fully inaugurated. Christians during this period were living in "the last time"; but they were already substantially in "the coming age," and had "tasted the powers of the coming age" (6 : 5), and it was at the introduction of this first section, at the "interlocking of the ages" (συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων, 9 : 26) that Christ had appeared. **Hath spoken unto us**—literally,

[1] λαλήσας, predicate participle, not *who spoke*, ὁ λαλήσας. The aorist participle is never in itself exactly equivalent to the perfect. But the Greek is fond of the aorist form, and especially prefers the aorist participle to the more cumbrous perfect (compare λαλήσας and λελαληκώς), and the difference in meaning is often not material.

whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;
3 Who being the brightness of *his* glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things

us in [1] *his* Son, whom he appointed heir of all things,
3 through whom also he made the [2] worlds; who being the effulgence of his glory, and [3] the very image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word

1 Gr. *a Son*.....2 Gr. *ages*.....3 Or, *the impress of his substance.*

spoke; but the perfect here is more idiomatic English. The verb points back to the time of the historic act. Observe that God is the common subject alike of the participle ("having spoken") and the verb ("hath spoken"). Of both Dispensations God is the author. He instituted the first, and when its purpose was fulfilled he removed it that he might establish the second. **By** (*in*) **his Son**—*in* one who was *Son.* In the original the article is omitted to emphasize, not the individual, but the *character*—in him who bears the character of *Son.* The term here refers, I think, to the historic Son of God—to that theanthropic personage, who, of both human and divine parentage, was at once "Son of Man" and "Son of God." See Luke 1 : 35; Matt. 3 : 17; 16 : 16; John 17 : 1. That Christ's Sonship involves essential equality with God is certain. The relation is grounded in his essential and eternal nature; but more commonly, in Scripture the term designates his historic manifestation. Scripture certainly does not lift the veil from the *mode* of Christ's prehistoric existence; its utmost reach of unveiling is "the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Perhaps the mystery, like that of the divine nature itself, could not be made intelligible in human language, or to the finite understanding. **Whom he hath appointed**—*placed, appointed, constituted.* (So often in the classics, as Herodian, "Hist." 5 : 7, 10; Xenophon "Cyropædia," 4 : 6, 3; Ælian, "Variæ Historiæ" 13 : 6.) This refers not to an appointment in God's eternal purpose and counsel (as Bleek, Bengel, Lünemann), but to his historical exaltation after his resurrection. (Tholuck, Ebrard, De Wette, Delitzsch, Moll.) The thought is thoroughly Scriptural. Christ's supreme authority, purposed in the eternal counsels, promised before his incarnation (Matt. 26 : 64; 28 : 18), bestowed at his ascension, which he retains until the Second Coming, when it is enhanced in glory, while restricted in sphere (1 Cor. 15 : 28), is here denoted. The term **heir** (*inheritor*) **of all things** is selected with reference to his *Sonship.* The Son inherits his Father's dominion, which is *universal* (all things). **By** (*through*) **whom** (δι οὗ). Christ, while essentially equal, appears subordinate in his working, to the Father. **He also made** (or, *had made*) **the worlds,** and might therefore properly appoint him Ruler. The present clause steps back to find in the Son's pre-incarnate relation to the universe a fitting reason for his being now appointed its Lord.[1] **Worlds** (αἰῶνας), properly *ages;* hence worlds as existing in time, as kosmos (κόσμος) is world existing in space.

3. Who (the pre-incarnate Son) **being** from eternity as the eternal Logos, or Word, who was originally with God (John 1 : 1): **the brightness**—better, *the effulgence,* raying forth, radiance (ἀπαύγασμα), a rare Philonian word, more elevated than *brightness* (λαμπρότης). It is not the abstract action of shining forth (ἀπαύγασις), but the *concrete result* of the process, the radiant and abiding *image* or reflection of the divine glory, implying at once *derivation, essential likeness, and independent existence.*[2] The word is no Pauline word—found only here in the New Testament. But the thought is a Pauline thought, for which Paul uses *image* (εἰκών), and *form* (μορφή). Compare Col. 1 : 15; Phil. 2 : 6. **And the express image of his person,** or, *substance.* 'Express image.' The Greek word rendered express image (χαρακτήρ, from χαράσσω, *sharpen, make pointed, scratch, grave*) is, properly, the person or instrument that graves, the engraver; then the *figure cut in, the stamp, the impress* answering to the die that stamps it. Thus, under a different figure, the thought is essentially the same as above. There the glory of the Deity is a permanent raying forth, *effulgent image;* here it is the divine

1 καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας is, therefore, a more appropriate as well as better attested reading than the καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν, which throws the emphasis on αἰῶνας.

2 So Wisdom of Solomon 7 : 26, where it is explained by ἔσοπτρον, *mirror,* and εἰκών, *image;* Philo "de Concupisc. Mang." p. 357, § 11; "De Opif. Mundi," M. p. 35, 1 (τῆς μακαρίας φύσεως ἐκμαγεῖον ἢ ἀπόσπασμα, ἢ ἀπαύγασμα, *an impress, or effulgence of the Blessed Nature*); "De Plantat. Noe." M. 1, 337, where it is equivalent to μίμημα and εἰκών, *the embodied imitation and image.*

by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;
4 Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

of his power, when he had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on
4 high; having become by so much better than the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent name

essence stamped upon the Son.[1] 'Substance' (ὑπόστασις, *a standing under, substantia*). The original word denotes, hence: (1) foundation, origin; (2) substance, essence; (3) ground of trust, boldness, confidence—in the New Testament, in signification (3) in Heb. 3:14; 11:1; 2 Cor. 9:4. In signification (2) only here; namely, *substance, essential being.* In the sense of *person* (persona) as marking the divine tripersonality, it belongs to later ecclesiastical writers, not to the New Testament. **Upholding** (φέρων, *bearing*), partly passively, *sustaining;* partly actively, *carrying forward, administering*, **all things**—that is, the universe. **By,** or, *with*, **the word,** the utterance or mandate (ῥήματι, not λόγῳ), **of his power**—the utterance in which his power is put forth; more forcible than "by his powerful word." The words express the absolute ease with which the Son effects his work: he *speaks*, and it is done. The same word, or utterance, which called into existence the universe, sustains and administers it. **When he had by himself purged our sins**—better, *After making a cleansing of sins.* A brief expression for making an expiatory sacrifice, which ensured the cleansing; and, again, the cleansing of sins is equivalent to the cleansing of persons from their sins. The author, at this early stage, introduces Christ's high-priestly character; the middle participle (meaning, *making for himself*) shows how closely the sacrificial act belonged to the Son. With the commencement of this verse the thought had receded from the Son's historic manifestation to his pre-incarnate and eternal relation; the last clause has stepped forward again to the historical sphere. **Sat down,** or, *Took his seat.* See Ps. 110:1. The original idea was that of *protection from an enemy* (Rev. 12:5), rather than of honor and sovereignty. Yet it came to imply this, as Matt. 26:64, "sitting at the right hand of power." The sitting marks calmness and repose; the "standing," of Acts 7:55, marks activity and protection. **At the right hand of Majesty.** 'Majesty' for the Majestic One (the abstract for the concrete), as at Matt. 26:64, 'Power' (τῆσ δυνάμεως) for the Powerful One. **On high** (literally, *In the lofty heavens*) belongs to *took his seat* ("took his seat in the lofty heavens;" heavens is understood, as at Luke 2:14, "glory to God in the highest heavens"). This connection is shown in the original by the absence of the article (τῆς) before the lofty heavens (ἐν τοις ὑψηλοῖς).[2]

4. *Becoming*, not, **being made,** as in the Common Version, nor "having become," as in the Revised Version. The meaning is, that in thus taking his seat, he *became*, etc.[3] **So much better**—that is, *mightier*, superior in position and authority. **Than the angels.** Introduced here with reference to the name *messengers*, which was derived from their function. We scarcely need say that the language implies no enhancement of the Son's intrinsic excellence, power, or dignity; but only a display or exercise of them corresponding to his nature, and to the work which he had wrought in the great redemptive system. **As he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.** He has received by inheritance as Son; the verb is adapted to the relation; 'a more excellent name,' a name transcending, surpassing theirs. Their name is *messenger; his* name is *Son.* 'Name' is here equivalent to *title.* His proper earthly name was "Jesus"; the name of his divine relation was "Son," which was gloriously confirmed when, by his resurrection and ascension, he was constituted "Son of God with power." See Rom. 1:4. The name, or title, conferred upon him in his exaltation, and to which answers the "becom-

[1] Χαρακτήρ in the New Testament only here. Compare Philo "De Plantat. Noe." M. 1, p. 332, where the rational soul is stamped with the seal of God, whose impress (χαρακτηρ) is the eternal Word (ἀίδιος λόγος).

[2] 'The Majesty on high' would require τῆς Μεγαλότητος τῆς ἐν τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς. There are many cases in the New Testament in which the absence of the article indicates a different construction from that of the Common Version. Rom. 8:2, "in Christ Jesus" belongs to "made me free" (ἠλευθέρωσεν).

[3] The aorist participle here, as not unfrequently elsewhere, though not commonly, is complementary. See John 1:14. The word *became*, not, *was made.*

5 For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?

5 than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time,
Thou art my Son,
This day have I begotten thee?
and again,
I will be to him a Father,
And he shall be to me a Son?

ing so much mightier" of our passage. The name above every name, of Phil. 2 : 9-11, was "Lord." [1]

(2) *Proof and illustration from the Old Testament of Christ's superiority as Son of God to the angels.* (5–14.)

5. Unto which of the angels said he at any time. An emphatic form of denial equivalent to "unto none," and involving an emphatic inferential affirmation that he *did* say it to another. **Thou art my Son.** Taken from Ps. 2 : 7—one of the most remarkable of the Psalms, and always regarded as either directly or indirectly (at all events, ultimately) Messianic. It points to no event in the Messiah's history so naturally as to its closing scene, his crucifixion, resurrection, and glorification. This suits the tenor of the Psalm, with its banded foes, leagued against Jehovah and his anointed; their baffled rage, and the Son, the more immediate object of the insurrection, seated in triumph above their fury on the holy hill of Zion. It evidently refers to the same scene, whether real or ideal, typical or historical, as Ps. 110 : 1: "*Jehovah* said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." The scene of the Psalm is certainly not applicable to the incarnation, but fits perfectly to the crucifixion and ascension. So the New Testament applies it (Acts 4 : 25-28; 13 : 33) where there is no hesitation in referring our passage to the death and resurrection of Jesus. To understand the full force of the "my Son" in such a connection, we may look at the next citation, **I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son.** This is from 2 Sam. 7 : 14, where the connection shows that, though uttered apparently of Solomon, it in reality applied to the great descendant of David, of whom David himself, and Solomon, and their successors, are severally types, and without whom to close and crown the succession, the royal line of Judah was "as a body without a head." The purport of the promise is shown in the angel's announcement to Mary (Luke 1 : 32, 33): "He shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father, David; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." The promise, then, of 2 Sam. 7 : 14 belonged to all the descendants of David in their theocratic and typical character. It belonged to them as representing the Messiah, and was true of them in a sense which applied to no other, either man or angel. The throne itself was invested with a new dignity and sacredness: around every successive prince gathered the Messianic hopes of the nation. Each new investiture, with its prerogatives, inspired fresh expectations; each successive prince *might* be the expected deliverer; each coronation, each marriage, each martial achievement, stood connected with these national hopes, and might call forth from Judah's minstrel some strain of prediction which *he* hoped would find fulfillment in the present prince, but whose realization the inspiring Spirit reserved to a far-distant day. Sometimes the song would pass beyond the prompting occasion to an ideal future, and sometimes, without special immediate occasion, it sprang immediately forward to the glories of the Messianic era. Thus strains immediately and exclusively Messianic, and strains secondarily and typically so, would mingle themselves in the Hebrew minstrelsy. It is most interesting to see how the great promise—at first attached generally to the seed of the woman, then narrowed to the line of Abraham—had now, under this prediction of Nathan, become centered in the line of David, from whose descendants, even after the royalty of Judah was smitten to the dust, it was unwaveringly believed that the Promised One would appear.

Returning to our first citation from the Second Psalm, we see how the author of our Epistle could find in it a Messianic significance. Who was its author and what its

[1] Διαφορώτερον παρ αὐτούς. The Greek construction involves a double comparative: "More excellent in comparison with or beyond them." The simple construction would be, διαφορώτερον τοῦ ἐκείνων (or αὐτῶν.)

6 And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.

6 [1] And when he again [2] bringeth the firstborn into [3] the world he saith, And let all the angels of God 7 worship him. And of the angels he saith,

1 Or, *And again when he bringeth in*.... ...2 Or, *shall have brought in*.....3 Gr. *the inhabited earth*.

immediate occasion we do not know. It may have sprung from some historical scene in Jewish history, or it may have been, as it most probably was, primarily and directly Messianic. Its author may have been David; but I think the lofty tone of its sentiment, and the majestic "thunder roll" of its style, gives probability to Delitzsch's conjecture, which attributes its authorship to the evangelical prophet, Isaiah. In any case, the scene of the dramatic lyric, whether primarily or typically Messianic, can, as Messianic, be laid only in the time of his ascension. At his birth was no such combined uprising of his and God's enemies; at his Second Coming all his foes have been long since put under his feet. The New Testament actually applies it to this period. Hence, in "*to-day have I begotten thee*," "to-day" is not the 'to-day' of eternity; the begetting is not spoken of the Son's eternal generation, or of his essential and eternal filial relation to the Father; but of that exaltation of Jesus at God's right hand, and investing of him with universal sovereignty, which Paul calls (Rom. 1:4) "constituting him Son of God in power." In his resurrection and ascension (they are virtually one), the rage and hopes of his enemies had been baffled, and his utmost pretensions to divine Sonship had been completely vindicated. He came into earth the "Son of man"; he re-ascended to heaven the declared Son of God.

But his superiority to the angels is to be further vindicated. In his incarnate life his glory was veiled, and he appears lower than the angels. Their ministry to him looks like a ministry of compassion, rather than of service. And now his exaltation above them, though real and transcendent, is outside the sphere of his humiliation, and beyond the limits of the inhabited universe. He is to come again in circumstances which will display the relative position of Son and angels within our visible heavens, and in the sphere of his former humiliation. The author, therefore, adds:

6. And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, etc.; we may render, *And when he shall conduct back again into the inhabited world the firstborn, he saith* (proleptic for *he will say*), **And let all the angels of God worship him.** This verse completes the picture of Christ's exaltation by pointing forward to the glory of his Second Coming, when his superiority to the angels will be signally displayed; and forms a latent contrast to the humiliation of his first appearance. His first coming was in lowliness, and placed him below the angels. His resurrection and ascension exalted him, indeed, to transcendent glory, but it was extra-mundane, and had no earthly witnesses. His next coming, the author exultingly adds, in answer to the lurking objection drawn from that former humiliation, will be after a different fashion. It will be with a retinue of adoring angels, who will hasten to anticipate the decree, 'And let all the angels of God worship him.' It has been objected that if this verse be understood of Christ's Second Coming, there must have immediately preceded a reference to his first entrance, or incarnation. But of this there is no necessity. The first coming was of so recent occurrence that it may well be assumed to have been in every one's mind, as the lurking background to the present contrast. The passage admits no other reference, and in this connection is strikingly pertinent. As to the words, the position of 'again' (πάλιν) is unfortunate in the Common Version, making the clause appear a second quotation ("And again, when he bringeth in," etc.), thus throwing great obscurity over the passage and making its reference utterly uncertain, so that Prof. Stuart and others would have had excuse for supposing it to refer to some unnamed event in Hebrew history. But the original leaves no ground of doubt; the 'again' belongs to the verb and points to a second introduction, a *bringing back* of the Son into a realm he had formerly visited. The verb "conduct into," "introduce" (εἰσάγειν) refers probably to God's introducing the Son into the *inheritance* that had been settled upon him, and to which he is *brought back*, his enemies subdued, to take formal possession. The term

7 And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.

Who maketh his angels winds,
And his ministers a flame of fire:

'firstbegotten' (or *firstborn*, πρωτότοκον) is an elegant periphrasis for Son, but used with special appropriateness to his present historical relation. As the Father's eternal Son, dwelling in his bosom (John 1:18), he was the "only begotten" (μονογενής); as the firstborn from the dead, the "first fruits of them that sleep"; the "firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. 8:29); he was the *firstborn*, the term implying heirship of all things, and pre-eminence over the whole creation. (Col. 1:15.) He descended from heaven as the only begotten of the Father, he reascended to it as the firstborn, installed, in the world of redemption, chief of the creation of God. *The world* (οἰκουμένη, *inhabited* earth or region) has probably special reference here to the inhabited portion of the universe in contrast with that extra-mundane realm into which he passed when he ascended "above all heavens" to the right hand of God. His return, led back by the Father, with a retinue of worshiping angels, will be to our inhabited world. The citation, 'And let all the angels of God worship him,' is either from Ps. 97:7, "And let all his angels worship him" (so the Septuagint; Hebrew, "Worship him all ye Gods"); or from the song of Moses (Deut. 32:43), where we have in the Vatican text of the Septuagint, and in that copy of the song which is found affixed to the Psalter in the Codex Alexandrinus, the one generally employed by our author, the precise language of our passage, "Rejoice, ye nations, with him, and let all the angels of God worship him." From this the citation is probably taken, the Septuagint translators having doubtless found the words in their copy of the Hebrew text, although they have disappeared from ours.

There may seem a difficulty in the application of this passage to Christ, inasmuch as the song of Moses has no declared reference to the times of the Messiah. But Moses himself was a type of Christ. As a prophet, he wrote and spoke of him (Luke 24:27; John 5:46), and in such passages as this song contains would such references be naturally found. In the early part of the song, Moses speaks of the corruption and apostasy of the people of God, then of their punishment and restoration, when God "will repent himself for his servants," and visit judgment on these enemies. And in view of this he calls on the heavens to rejoice, and the angels of God to worship him. But who is to do all this but he who shall sit on David's throne and give to his royal line its everlasting succession? And when shall this be, but when he comes in the consummated majesty of his kingdom? Rightly, therefore, has our author judged the purpose of the inspiring Spirit in finding this application of the passage; and looking at the whole scope of the Old Testament no other interpretation is legitimate. Unless such intimations of the Messiah are found flashing out along the Old Testament pages, both the Old Testament and the New become an unsolvable enigma. One further remark against the applying of this passage to the time of the incarnation. The angels did indeed then worship the lowly Messiah, always and everywhere, as an infant, as transfigured, on the cross. But it was no time to *challenge* their worship of him. His place, his work, was one of humiliation, and their manifested worship was occasional and sporadic. They doubtless met him behind the cloud which bore him back from earth, with all the blazing chivalry of heaven; and with even yet more resplendent pomp they will usher him back when God, his Father, conducts him back into his predestined inheritance.

7. Continued illustration of the difference of the two parties, drawn from their respective names. **And of** (that is, *in respect, indeed, to*) **the angels** (*messengers*) **he saith**—that is, God saith in the Scripture, the utterances of Scripture being the utterances of God--**Who maketh his angels spirits,** etc.; or, *his messengers winds*, not 'spirits,' as in the Common Version, and even in the margin of the Revised Version, but which is here totally out of place. The angels are brought down, by virtue of their name, to a level with the agencies of nature. It would be no disparagement of them to call them 'spirits.' **And his ministers a flame of fire.** The citation is from Ps. 104:4, after the Septuagint, except that the Codex Vaticanus (and probably, originally, also the Codex Alexandrinus; the other reading being apparently a correction from our Epistle) has "flaming fire" (πῦρ φλέγον), instead of a "flame

8 But unto the Son *he saith*, Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness *is* the sceptre of thy kingdom.

8 but of the Son *he saith*,
Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;
And the sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of
[1] thy kingdom.

1 The two oldest Greek manuscripts read *his*.

of fire." The Common Version of the Psalm reads, "who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." The Hebrew original reads most naturally, according to the scope of the context, "who maketh winds his messengers, and flaming fire (equivalent to *lightning*) his ministers." But the double accusative allows the construction, "who maketh his messengers winds, and his ministers flaming fire," which is the rendering of the Septuagint, only that by placing the article before "messengers" and "ministers" it shows that it regards them as angels. This rendering is adopted by our author as precisely fitting his purpose, who also writes "flaming fire" for a "flame of fire" (perhaps with reference to Exod. 3 : 2). Delitzsch claims, on grammatical grounds, that the Septuagint rendering is the only right one, and appeals to the Hebrew conception, which informed all things with life, as likely to mingle the mention of angels with that of inanimate agencies. One might either conceive these elemental powers, as, at the breath of God, quickened into living agents to do his will, or the living intelligencies before his throne, drawing on a vesture of wind or fire, resolving themselves into apparent elemental forces, and flying off at the divine mandate to execute his purposes. Not improbably the author conceived the law-giving of Sinai (2 : 2) as thus accomplished by God's descending on the mount in storm and lightning, which may have disguised the ministry of angels. Under any rendering the passage fits our author's purpose, which is to draw from the angelic name of messenger the mark of their inferiority, as they share the name with inanimate agencies. Two properties in the angels are probably emphasized—their subordinate and ministerial position, and their changeableness, as exchanging their properties with the elements of nature. The word 'ministers' (λειτουργοί) is not the familiar and lower Greek word for "servant" (as διάκονος, δοῦλος), but the word used in the classics for one who renders unrequited service (whether voluntary or involuntary) in the state, and then, in general, marks free and unselfish service. In the Septuagint it is the standing expression for priestly service, and so in our Epistle. The ministry of the angels here conceived, would be rendered in the great temple of the universe. They are a leading part of the grand system of agencies by which God carries forward the administration of the world.

8. But[1] (he saith) **of** (or, *in respect to*) **the Son.** (Not 'unto,' as in the Common Version, but *of, in respect of*, which the Greek preposition admits equally well (Luke 12 : 41; 20 : 19; Rom. 10 : 21), and so here the rendering should follow that of ver. 7). He saith here, as above, in Scripture: whether *to* the Son, or *of* him, it is not given as the *direct* utterance of God; but, given as of equal weight with that direct utterance, it is the author's attestation to the divinity of the Scriptures. (The correlatives, —μέν, δέ—often used with classical elegance in this Epistle, imply that the first idea is introduced to prepare the way for, and as a sort of foil to, the second, to which it is subordinate. Thus, "Of the angels indeed" (= while of the *angels*) he uses such language, of the *Son* he employs the following:[1] **Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.** The passage is from Ps. 45, apparently an epithalamium, or marriage song, perhaps on the marriage of Solomon with the daughter of Pharaoh; or, rather (as Delitzsch), of Joram with Athalia, sprung, on the mother's side, from the royal family of Tyre. The minstrel, in his congratulatory strain, addresses in the first part of the Psalm (ver. 7, 8), the bridegroom; in the

1 The concessive, μέν, conceding, but never emphatically affirming (except when used in certain cases for μήν), has generally for its correlative δέ, and the two answer to our *indeed, to be sure, but*, as σοφὸς μέν, κακὸς δέ, *wise indeed, but wicked*; θέλει μέν, οὐ ποιεῖ δέ, *he wills indeed, to be sure, but does not do*. In the New Testament its force is often disguised by omission or false translation, and in our Epistle it is rendered by *verily, truly*, implying an *emphasis*, which it never has. The peculiarity of the particle consists in its *lightness*, which often makes it too delicate to be expressed in English, except by intonation.

9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, *even* thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity;
Therefore [1] God, thy God, hath anointed thee
With the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

1 Or, *O God.*

latter part, the bride. The Psalm, however, is essentially Messianic, as the poet addresses to the royal bridegroom language that would be intolerably extravagant, except on the assumption that in him were to be realized the Messianic hopes of the nation. Whether the Psalm was originally suggested by some splendid marriage scene, in which the hope of the people regarding the great promise blazed forth enthusiastically, or, which is not improbable, was originally intended as an ideal picture of the future Deliverer in his mystical espousal of the church, in either case it was Messianic—in the latter case, primarily; in the former, secondarily so. Or, rather, in the one case it terminated but indirectly, in the other directly, on that Prince of the house of David, whose reign was to absorb and crown the glories of all preceding reigns. If an actual marriage festival called forth the exulting strain, it might easily kindle the hope that now was come the fulfillment of the promise. If it did not come now, the language did not fall to the ground; but as dealing with a typical line, every member of which stood in provisional and representative relation to the Messiah, it only passed over, and received from the unfoldings of history its full import and final application. If it be objected that this is creating a hypothesis to meet the facts, I answer that it is the principle which generally controls the prophetic utterances and divine promises of Scripture. In nearly all cases, the recipient of the promise, or the human utterer of the prediction, was mistaken, or at a loss in regard to the time. Prophets made it a subject of study (1 Peter 1:11), and apostles, under the clearer light of the New Testament, were not allowed to measure the limits of the future. The Son himself, as a human Seer, knew not the precise day or hour of his Second Coming.

Messianic, however, either directly or indirectly, this Psalm certainly was; and so was interpreted by the rabbis, and as such held its place in the temple worship. Apart from this, its language is impious or unmeaning; for only to the Messiah, under God, could its epithets be addressed. As Messianic, too, says Delitzsch, it was referred to by the prophets after Jehoshaphat. Isaiah combines the 'mighty,' of ver. 4, and the 'Elohim,' of ver. 6, in the 'mighty God,' descriptive of the Anointed One in Isa. 9:6; and at 61:3 makes the "servant of Jehovah" bestow the "oil of gladness" (ver. 7) for mourning; and Zech. 12:8 declares that "the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the Lord."

The passage is quoted from the Septuagint. The original admits either rendering: "Thy throne is a throne of God" (that is, a divine throne) for ever and ever; or, "Thy throne of God" (that is, thy divine throne) is for ever and ever; or, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.' The latter Delitzsch declares to be perfectly admissible, and Hengstenberg to be the only one admissible, and sustained by all the early versions. The passage brings out the transcendently exalted nature of the Messiah, as against the servile relation of the angels, and his immutable and eternal being, as against their changeableness.

A sceptre of righteousness (Greek, "the sceptre of rectitude," εὐθύτης, *straightness, rightness, uprightness;* not 'righteousness' (δικαιοσύνη). The word is found only here in the New Testament, but repeatedly in the Septuagint. See Ps. 9:8; 67:4, etc. Equity, rectitude was to be the characteristic of the Messiah's kingdom, which might be partially, though never perfectly, exhibited by his theocratic representative.

9. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity. The Hebrew original is rendered in the Common Version "lovest" and "hatest." The Septuagint gave "didst love" and "didst hate," which is adopted by our author, but to which "hast loved" and "hast hated" sufficiently correspond. In the writer's conception, the time is the Messiah's earthly life. "Iniquity" (ἀνομίαν, *lawlessness*) is the reading of the Codex Vaticanus and most lesser MSS; the Sinaitic and Alexandrian Codices read "unrighteousness" (ἀδικίαν). **Therefore God . . . thy God.** So also the Revised Version. But many scholars

10 And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands.

10 And,
Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth,
And the heavens are the works of thy hands:

prefer to render, as certainly the Greek original allows, "therefore, O God, thy God hath anointed thee," etc., which seems to me the most natural construction, the "O God" (ὁ θεός) corresponding to the same word in ver. 8, and the two identical words, in their two-fold application, being brought into forcible juxtaposition. We certainly need not shrink, in either passage, from rendering "O God" on account of the thought. The author of our Epistle certainly takes the Psalm as essentially, probably as immediately Messianic, and thus as ascribing to the Anointed One the attributes of Deity. **Hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness.** Many good interpreters (as Bleek, Ebrard, Alford, Lünemann), understand this as the figurative anointing of Jesus, after his accomplished earthly career, as Heavenly King, and thus, of his exaltation above the angels; others (as Moll, Kurtz), laying the stress chiefly on the gladness, sink the figure of the anointing, and make it denote simply the pouring out upon him of an overwhelming fullness of blessing. The expression, 'oil of gladness' (or, *exultation, rejoicing;* the original word is stronger than the customary Greek word for joy or gladness), seems to me decidedly to favor the latter interpretation. **Above thy fellows.** Who are these 'fellows' (μέτοχοι), *sharers, participators?* With Bleek, Lünemann, etc., *angels* — but angels were never *fellows* of Christ, either in his pre-existent, or incarnate, or post-incarnate condition; with Bengel, *all men*, as partakers of his flesh and blood, sharers of his humanity; with Delitzsch, Ebrard, Moll, *kings and princes* in general, with whom Christ shares the kingly office, while exalted immeasurably above them. "I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth." (Ps. 89 : 27.) "The first-begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth." (Rev. 1 : 5.) Others, still, make them *Christians*, Christ's human brethren, sharers at once of his human nature, and of his heavenly anointing and divine Sonship; he, as firstborn among many brethren, being pre-eminent among them. The reference of the Hebrew bard would seem, most naturally, to be to the monarch's *fellow* princes. Perhaps our author's conception did not trace it minutely —he is simply quoting; yet chapter 2 might warrant our transferring the 'fellows' to his Christian brethren.

10. And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth. The 'and' stands elliptically for *and this too*, as introducing a new quotation, descriptive of the majesty of the Son (Ps. 102 : 26-28), calling him "Lord" (κύριε, the Septuagint and New Testament equivalent of Jehovah), attributing to him the work of creation and affirming his perpetual abiding, while all created things perish. The sentiment creates no difficulty, for such is the uniform New Testament representation of Christ. Yet by the term "Lord" (κύριε), found in the Septuagint, but wanting in the Hebrew, some have supposed the author to have been misled to the applying of the language to the Messiah. Yet such a supposition is unnecessary. The author certainly makes no indiscriminating application of Old Testament passages to the Messiah; and while we need not hold that the Old Testament Scripture in speaking of God uniformly includes the Son, yet where the language, as here, points clearly to events which can only have their complete fulfillment, or indeed any proper fulfillment, through the Messiah, the Messianic reference is certainly justified. The Psalm from which this is taken belongs to a late period of the exile, and deplores, along with the writer's personal sorrows, the desolations of Zion, and the sufferings of his people. Yet her future glory breaks upon him, and the appeal for the certainty of this is to him who made the earth and heavens, and who, while they perish, will himself remain unchangeable, and whose unchangeableness guarantees the permanent abiding of his people. But this has its accomplishment only in Christ. The Being who as God's omnipotent Word made the heavens, whose breath will sweep them away (John 1 : 3; Rev. 20 : 11), and who, amidst universal change, is himself unchangeable, is none other than Christ. The whole Psalm, then, is profoundly Messianic. However dimly the Old Testament seer may have recognized its deeper import, the New Testament seer, in the triple light of proph-

11 They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment;
12 And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.
13 But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?

11 They shall perish; but thou continuest:
And they all shall wax old as doth a garment;
12 And as a mantle shalt thou roll them up,
As a garment, and they shall be changed:
But thou art the same,
And thy years shall not fail.
13 But of which of the angels hath he said at any time,
Sit thou on my right hand,
Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet?

ecy, history, and inspiration, clearly discerns it, and applies to the Son the language which, according to the whole tenor of the New Testament, belongs strictly to him, and to him alone.

11. They (the heavens with emphasis, but including doubtless the earth) **shall perish,** not of course by annihilation, but by change in their mode of existence. **But thou remainest**—continuest through all changes and convulsions. **And they all shall wax old as doth a garment.** Spread out (Isa. 40 : 22) as a curtain, they will grow old and be worn out.

12. And as a vesture (anything thrown about one (περιβόλαιον), as a vail, a mantle) **shalt thou fold them up**[1]—as a mantle is rolled up and laid aside. **And they shall be changed**—poetic Hebrew parallelism. **But thou art the same**—unchanging. (13 : 8.) **And thy years shall not fail**—again poetic parallelism, the thought being essentially the same as in the preceding clause.

13. But to which (rather, *and in respect to which*) **of the angels.** *In respect to*, or *of*, should here, as in ver. 8, take the place of 'to,' and *and* (δέ, continuative) is here better than 'but.'[2] *Hath he said* **at any time** (it is εἴρηκεν, perfect, *hath said*, not εἶπεν, *did say*, as in ver. 5). The perfect exhibits the saying as *standing before us* in its continuous result. **Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.** From Ps. 110 : 1, a psalm perhaps doubtful, whether primarily or typically Messianic. It may possibly have originated in some historical incident, as some victory of David (or one of his successors) over his enemies, which had established anew his throne upon Mount Zion. Under the influence of such a triumph there is opened to David a vision of the higher exaltation, at once royal and priestly, of his Son and Lord. And if it started as typical, it passes over into a directly Messianic character. This is attested by the nature of the Psalm itself, as (1) the Theocratic King, ruling on Mount Zion, might be properly said to be enthroned *beside* Jehovah, but scarcely at his *right hand*, which implies transcendent honor (see ver. 3); and (2) the permanent priestly functions of Melchisedek could be ascribed neither to David, nor to any of his successors. And again, (3) our Lord himself (Matt. 22 : 42-45) makes it a direct address by David to his Son and Lord. The words, "in Spirit call him" add weight to the interpretation (as showing very clearly how our Lord regarded it), and are probably suggested by the Hebrew word of the Psalm (נְאֻם), which puts it into the category of a prophecy. (See Acts 2 : 34, 35.) The military tone of the Psalm may be the echo of the recent signal victory, and is in harmony with many representations of the Messiah. Compare Ps. 2 : 9; 45 : 3-5; Rev. 6 : 2. 'On' (*out of*—ἐκ, equivalent to *close upon*) 'my right hand,' which is always the side of honor. 'Until I make' (or, *shall have made*) thine enemies thy foootstool, referring to the Oriental custom of putting the foot on the neck of conquered enemies. (Josh. 10 : 24; 1 Kings 5 : 17.) Looking, then, at the extraordinary language of this Psalm itself, at the almost unanimous interpretation of the Synagogue, certainly in New Testament times, and the probable references to it in the later prophets (as Dan. 7 : 13; Jer. 23 : 5; Zech. 6 : 12, 13), we are authorized in breaking away, in our interpretation, from all local and temporal limitations, and referring the Psalm, in its origin under the inspiring Spirit, directly to Christ. Indeed, I doubt if, with the exception possibly of the Second. there is another Psalm in the whole collection so purely Messianic. As such, it declares his

[1] So the Sinaitic and the Alexandrian Codices. The Vatican Codex reads ἀλλάξεις, *shalt change*, after the Hebrew original.

[2] Δέ almost as frequently admits of the rendering 'and' as 'but,' the slight contrastive force being too weak to be expressed in English. The Revised Version, I think, is occasionally unfortunate in preferring 'but' to 'and.'

14 Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?

14 Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to do service for the sake of them who shall inherit salvation?

CHAPTER II.

THEREFORE we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let *them* slip.

1 Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that were heard, lest haply we drift away

united kingly and priestly character, the resistless march of his empire, and, by implication, as sharing the throne of Jehovah, his supreme divinity. With his eternal kingship at the right hand of God, we find also united his eternal priesthood after the order of Melchisedek. The priestly dignity finds its rest and support in his eternal being and kingly exaltation. Thus Christ enjoys a prerogative unknown to men (except as represented in him), and utterly foreign to angels. They bow before the throne of Jehovah, encompass it with adoring homage, hasten abroad as the glad messengers of its will, but not the loftiest of them dreams of aspiring to the transcendent dignity of a partner of the throne of the Infinite.

14. The proper functions of angels as messengers, in contrast with the lofty position of the Son. **Are they not all.** 'All' (πάντες) placed here emphatically in advance—all without exception, even the highest of them. Their very *name* pledges them to this. **Ministering spirits**—with reference to ver. 7. But here there is no purpose of disparagement, and the terms are used in their utmost dignity. The angels render public and, as it were, priestly service in the divine economy; there is no reference to the heavenly sanctuary. 'Spirits'—here the angels take their proper designation (the πνεύματα are 'spirits,' not 'winds,' as at ver. 7). The emphasis is on 'ministering.' **Sent forth**—present continued partieiple (ἀποστελλόμενα, *habitually* 'sent forth')—**to minister,** for rendering service (not the elevated word used above, but the ordinary Greek word (διακονία) for helpful service; whether the 'service' here is conceived as rendered also to God, *for the benefit* of his people (as Delitzsch, Lünemann, Lange), as the structure of the sentence would seem to imply[1] (they are God's ministers for); or goes with the following—thus: service for the sake of (as Kurtz), cannot perhaps be certainly determined. At all events, the subordinate ministry is to God; the service is **for them who shall be heirs,** or, *for the sake of them that are to inherit salvation.* The Scriptures abound in records of these angelic ministrations; the service may assume many forms, but it is primarily for the heirs of spiritual salvation, not conferred by the angels, but inherited as sons of God and brethren of Christ (2:10, 12; Rom. 8:29), and as such ministered to, waited upon, by the angels.

I think we have a right to assume, apart from the question of inspiration, that the Messianic application of the Psalms and other Old Testament passages in this chapter have not been made by our author carelessly and without adequate ground. A study of the Old Testament Scriptures in question points, I think, decisively in this direction; and the entire treatment of the Old Testament in this Epistle shows a profound and far-seeing and sagacious study of these older Scriptures; and if the author of the Epistle was Apollos (to whose authorship the best modern criticism is rapidly converging), the whole Epistle is a striking commentary on the description of him as "mighty in the Scriptures," fully vindicating and explaining it. The manner of handling the Scriptures is as remote as is the style from that of the Apostle Paul, while in all fundamental views they are perfectly at one. That Paul was the wider, deeper general thinker; that our author had been a closer Old Testament student, I see no reason to doubt.

Ch. 2. (3) *Brief exhortation to heed a revelation made by so extraordinary a personage. By as much as the Son is superior to the angels by so much greater the peril of disobeying his message than theirs.* (1-4.)

1. Therefore (for this reason) **we ought,** or must; yet a logical, not a natural or moral necessity. The author has through the whole

[1] As servants διά, *on account of, for the sake of,* the διά implying the purpose of the service.

2 For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and
every transgression and disobedience received a just
recompense of reward:
3 How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salva-

2 *from them.* For if the word spoken through angels
proved stedfast, and every transgression and disobe-
3 dience received a just recompense of reward; how
shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?

Epistle a practical end in view, of which he never loses sight, to call back to the Christian faith those who were relapsing to Judaism. **To give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard**—literally, *the things which were heard* when God spoke to us through his Son.[1] The gospel revelation is called collectively the things which we have heard as corresponding to the *speaking* of the Son, in whose speaking are comprised the New Testament revelations. At 12:18, *et seq.*, the author, changing his representation, brings the spiritual Israel to the foot of the heavenly Zion (as the temporal Israel had come to the earthly Sinai), represents God as now speaking (λαλοῦντα) from heaven, as he then spake on earth; *that* earthly 'speaking' was from Sinai. **Lest at any time we should let them slip**—rather, *lest perchance we drift by or away from them*, as a stream flows by, or a vessel drifts by or aside upon a stream. 'Drift by or away from,' not so as to *lose the recollection* (a meaning too weak for the connection), but so as *to fail of the salvation* which they proffer.[2]

2. For—ground of the exhortation just given—**if the word spoken by** (*through*) **angels**—so immeasurably inferior to the Son—**was steadfast,** *proved abiding.* 'The word spoken through angels'; the law given on Sinai, assumed to have been given by the ministry of angels. In the account of the legislation of Sinai in Exodus, there is no mention of angels. But the song of Moses (Deut. 33:2), where God is said to have come forth with myriads of his holy ones (Septuagint, "angels"), and Psalm 68:17, where God appears in Sinai among thousands of angels, might justify the current tradition of the synagogue that the law was promulgated through angels. So in the New Testament (Acts 7:53): ye "received the law by the dispensation of angels"; and (Gal. 3:19) "*by being ministered through angels.*" To this testimony add our own passage. So Herod, in Josephus ("Antiquities," xv:5. 3): "Having learned the holiest things in our law through angels from God." '*Proved, abiding, valid,*' so that its authority was upheld, and its violation punished. **And every transgression and disobedience**—a descending climax: *transgression* (παράβασις), *a going beyond*, or *aside from*, a positive overstepping of the law; 'disobedience' (παρακοή), *disregard, refusal to hear.* The one, false or perverse going; the other, false or perverse hearing; the latter a more subtle, less palpable violation of the law; but both equally punished, alike the *acting* in violation, and the refusal to *give heed* to it. **Received a just** (*righteous, rightful,* ἔνδικον Rom. 3:8) **recompense of reward.** Strictly, *rendering of reward.* All know how strictly the Mosaic legislation was adhered to; its claims were inexorable.

3. How shall we escape. 'We' emphatic; who have been taught by one so infinitely superior. 'Escape,' used absolutely, as at 12:25; 1 Thess. 5:3, for escaping the judgment of God and final condemnation. "And thinkest thou, O man?" (Rom. 2:3.) **If we neglect** (after neglecting) **so great salvation.** The argument still drawn from the greatness of its author, though including, as shown by its description as *salvation*, its intrinsic superiority. The words "so great," as this must be and is; the "so great" does not look forward to the following description. The following clause is added to explicate and enforce the idea. The difference is already implied in the words employed to denote the respective communications. The revelation through angels is marked by the general term 'word'; its special nature is not indicated; if it *had* been it must have pointed to wrath. That made through the Son is specifically a *salvation.* The writer

[1] The Greek aorist (light and flexible in its use) throws back the action to the time when God spoke in his Son. In this case, as often, the English perfect is not objectionable.

[2] So Clemens Alexandrinus: "To flow aside from, to lose hold of the truth" (παραῤῥυῆναι τῆς ἀληθείας). With substantial correctness Theodore of Mopsuestia: "Lest perchance we receive a diversion, a turning aside from the better things" (μήποτε παρατροπήν τινα ἀπὸ τῶν κρειττόνων δεξώμεθα. Hesychius: ἐξολισθῶμεν, *slip, slide away.*

tion; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard *him;*
4 God also bearing *them* witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?

which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by those who heard;
4 God also bearing witness with them, both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers, and by [1]gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will.

1 Gr. *distributions.*

thus suggests a double criminality and peril in neglecting the message of the Lord; first, from the augustness of its source, the Son; second, from its intrinsic nature as a 'salvation,' the neglect of which leaves them to the ruin from which it proffers them deliverance. On both grounds the 'how' is equivalent to an emphatic negative. **Which at the first began[1] to be spoken by the Lord.** The high prerogative of this salvation is that its original announcement was not through angels, but the Lord (the name which is above every name). Both the dispensations are ultimately alike from God, but neither from him directly; and their relative excellence may be inferred from the dignity of their respective mediators. In giving the law God employed angels, in giving the gospel, his Son; in the one, servants; in the other, the Lord. The beginning, then, is here not the ultimate, but the historical origin of the two dispensations. "The Lord" is here, as often, used absolutely. It is the Septuagint and New Testament equivalent, sometimes of Jehovah, sometimes of Adonai. **And was confirmed** (transmitted with firm and reliable testimony, placed beyond all doubt) **unto** (or, *for*) **us**—the succeeding generations. **By them that heard him** (or, that heard it, that is, from him). It came to us from immediate eye and ear witnesses, the personal followers of Jesus. The writer classes himself with his readers as those who received the gospel at second-hand. This of itself would decide the authorship of the Epistle as non-Pauline. Paul claims uniformly and positively to "have seen the Lord Jesus Christ," to have received both his commission and his doctrine from the revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal. 1:12; 2:4), and admits no dependence on, or inferiority to, the other Apostles (1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 11:5). It is incredible that when opposing Judaising teachers and tendencies, he should so strenuously vindicate his apostolical prerogatives, and here so utterly ignore them. We certainly have not here the always lofty, though never arrogant, tone of the apostle to the Gentiles.

4. But the testimony of these disciples did not stand alone—**God also bearing them witness** (God along with them bearing added witness). To the testimony of their words he added that of supernatural deeds, wrought through their hands. **Both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles.** The words denote the same thing under different points of view; they are 'signs,' or *proofs*, as confirming the genuineness of the messenger or message; 'wonders,' or *portents*, as transcending the ordinary course of nature; 'miracles'—strictly, *acts of power*, mighty works, as wrought by divine power. Miracles confirmed the divine mission of our Lord and the divine origin of the infant church. *Powers* (δυνάμεις) is the name of a special charisma (1 Cor. 12:28), probably the working of miracles; here the reference is probably to the general working of miracles by the apostles. (Acts 2:43.) **And gifts of the Holy Ghost**—*impartings of the Holy Spirit.* The Holy Spirit is the genitive of the object, not of the subject; distributions, bestowments of the Holy Spirit. **According to his own will**—that is, according to God's will. The Holy Spirit is sent by Christ or the Father, as the fruit of Christ's ascension (John 16:7,8; Eph. 4:7; Acts 2:38), "who being by the right hand of God exalted." The Spirit sent of God, with almighty agency, ministered those various gifts, as prophecy, miraculous healings, speaking with tongues. From another point of view, bestowed by the sovereign pleasure of the Spirit, who acts freely, though subordinately. 'According to his own will.' They could not be taken at the option of the individual, and were legitimate objects of desire and prayer (1 Cor. 12:31; 14:13); and while God imparted them as he would, doubtless in the church they were bestowed according to special exigencies and peculiar individual endowments. All these are "powers of the world to come." (6:5.)

1 'First began'—literally, *to take a beginning:* ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν, not found elsewhere in the New Testament, but in Philo, "Vita Moses," i, 614, E.

5 For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak.

5 For not unto angels did he subject [1] the world to

1 Gr. *the inhabited earth.*

Thus closes this first hortatory passage. Each of the three grand argumentative sections of the Epistle (see Analysis) contains such a hortatory passage, being successively longer and more cogent, as the argument deepens in intensity. This is naturally the shorter of the three, yet in this is cogently put the peril of disregarding the salvation brought by the Lord, and implied that the readers are in danger of disregarding it.

(4) *Christ, though as Son infinitely superior to the angels, yet was humbled temporarily below them, that, suffering and dying as man, he might rescue and elevate his human brethren, and, as a faithful High Priest, reconcile them to God.* (5-18.)

5. For unto the angels hath he not (*For not unto angels did he*) **put in subjection the world to come** (or, *the coming age*) **whereof we speak** (*are speaking*). The practical passage just closed leads to a new stage in the discussion. It has presented the Son of God as the *Son of man*, as the *Bearer of salvation*, first publishing it in his own person, and then carrying it forward by divinely commissioned and divinely equipped human agents. The world of redemption opens upon our view, that 'future world,' which, with all its spiritual powers, its pregnant hopes, its accomplished salvation, had been the theme of prophecy, and the expectation of Israel. This also has been placed under the government of the Son. He has been exalted as its Supreme Head; but no longer as the absolute Son of God, the Eternal Logos, the Creator and Sustainer of the universe, but as the Son of man, raised, in his human nature, above every name that is named, and crowned with glory and honor. This topic then subserves a double purpose: it illustrates Christ's super-angelic dignity, and it opens the way, by an easy transition, to the fact so offensive to every Jewish mind, of Christ's humiliation and death on the cross. Why did he who was exalted infinitely above the angels appear far below them? It was to restore to man his pristine and normal dignity, to bring universal humanity into new relations to God, and, by an expiatory death, to become qualified to lead unnumbered sons of God to glory. Under this view, the course of thought of the following verses will be clear. 'For' refers not (with De Wette) back to 1 : 14, nor (with Delitzsch) does it merely take up and carry forward the general thought of the foregoing passage, but (with Moll and Kurtz) enforces the exhortation to give heed to the things which have been heard, and not neglect the Messianic salvation, inasmuch as it is not to angels, but to the Son—not now the Son of God, but the Son of man—that this coming age, this world to be, has been placed in subjection. The Old Testament law was given through angels; the New Testament salvation was brought through Christ. There may, perhaps, be also a reference to the Jewish conception that the several departments of the world were under the guardianship of angels; though this was true but of heathen nations and princes (see Deut. 32 : 8, Septuagint; Dan. 4 : 13), while the Jews are under immediate divine guidance. But at all events, angels, except as mere ministers, retire from the scene, and *man*, glorified and ideal in the person of his Representative, fills the foreground of the picture. Most beautifully appropriate becomes the following citation, which connects Christ's humiliation with his exaltation, and this again with the restoration of humanity to its ideal position: 'Not unto angels did he put in subjection.' Angels placed emphatically in advance, and without the article, to emphasize not the individuals, but the class. 'Put in subjection' might easily be suggested by the just enumerated tokens of power that marked the Messianic era, and also by that coming passage from the Psalms, which the writer already has in his mind, 'The world to come' —the world to be, the future, or coming world; here, not the "*age* to come," but the concrete inhabited (οἰκουμένην) world (as in 1 : 6), the world created good, and laid under the curse of sin and death, and now to be filled with the blessings of redemption; a world already existing in its spiritual agencies, but demanding for its full development of blessedness a new heaven and a new earth. The full gospel salvation, "the city that hath foundations," is through this Epistle (as everywhere with Paul) still in the future. As the "future age," it consists of

6 But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him?
7 Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands:

6 come, whereof we speak. But one hath somewhere testified, saying,
What is man that thou art mindful of him?
Or the son of man, that thou visitest him?
7 Thou madest him [1] a little lower than the angels;
Thou crownedst him with glory and honour,
[2] And didst set him over the works of thy hands:

1 Or. *for a little while lower*.....2 Many authorities omit *And didst . . . . hands.*

the brief ante-resurrection period and the infinite beyond; as the 'coming world,' it consists of the threshold of the temple and the infinite temple. 'Whereof we are speaking'—referring, probably, not to the entire scope of the Epistle, but to this particular section of it.

6. With the declaration 'not unto the angels,' etc., the author had doubtless in mind, "but unto the Son," or "unto the Son of man," or some such expression. But having in mind the passage in the Psalm, from which he was to draw his illustration, he overleaps the intermediate step, and lets the citation, which virtually involves the contrasted statement, take the place of the statement itself.[1] **But one in a certain place** (*somewhere*) **testified,** etc. 'But' (δε) is here slightly adversative, as introducing over against the negative statement that it is not angels to whom the world of salvation was subjected, the counter and positive doctrine that it is *man*, and especially as idealized and represented in the Son of man, the Messiah. The citation is from Ps. 8 : 4-6. The words 'some one,' 'somewhere,' do not imply ignorance or doubt of the authorship or locality of the passage. The accuracy of the citation shows that it is not from memory, and a like 'somewhere' occurs at 4 : 4, concerning a passage regarding which there could be no doubt. The use of the words is purely rhetorical. The half mysterious mode of citation lends a certain dignity and elegance to the style, and while withholding the name of the author, leaves the attention fixed on the passage.[2] Lünemann notices a similar reticence in Philo.

The passage here introduced is felicitously selected as pointing to the ideal character and natural destination of humanity, that it may be therein shown how these are realized in the glorified Jesus, and that, too, on behalf of humanity, and thus be explained the enigma of his humiliation.

What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the Son of man, that thou visitest him? Better, perhaps, *a man* and *a Son of man.* The second clause is a mere poetical parallel of the first. The theme of the Psalm (8) is the dignity of humanity and its exaltation above all inanimate nature on the ground of the utterance in Gen. 1 : 26, 28, of man's creation in the image of God, and his investiture with the lordship of this lower creation. The introduction of the Psalm points, as against the glory and magnificence of the heavens, to that littleness and apparent insignificance of *man*, which only makes more wonderful his moral elevation, and his rule over this wide creation.[3] Whether our author introduces the Psalm primarily in its earthly and natural character (as Delitzsch, Moll), or as immediately Messianic (as Bleek, Lünemann, Kurtz), I shall consider by-and-by. But having directed attention to man's littleness, he proceeds to declare his loftiness.

7. Thou madest him a little lower than the angels. The author quotes from the Septuagint: "*Thou didst lower him some little below* (in comparison with) *angels.*" The Hebrew original reads: "Thou didst lower him some little below Elohim," which without the article may very properly be rendered angels (instead of God), as the Septuagint and the Targumists and modern scholars; and the more appropriately, says Kurtz, as "the Psalmist's reference is not so much to

[1] Under the handling of Paul such a procedure would have marked the fiery energy of his style; under that of our author it marks deliberate and elegant art, as also the *some one* and *somewhere* that introduce the quotation.

[2] I doubt, indeed, if the 'somewhere,' both here and at 4 : 4, should not rather be "perhaps," "I suppose," not as implying any doubt more than above, but as a particle of modesty, a *mere mode of putting the case.* That που is frequently so used, both in δή που and alone, I need not argue.

[3] I think it worth our reflection that when we look at the mental and moral positions of man in the universe, every enlargement by science of the realm of nature only lends in our conception added majesty to man's.

8 Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing *that is* not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him.

8 Thou didst put all things in subjection under his feet.
For in that he subjected all things unto him, he left nothing that is not subject to him. But now we see

the personality as to the spiritual nature of angels which they share with God." The "little lower" is here of *degree:* in the subsequent application it becomes a "little lower" of *time.* **Thou crownedst him with glory and honour**—referring to man's original constitution; 'glory'—his intrinsic brightness, the image of the divine, and but little inferior to the angelic; 'honour'—his elevation above the earth and its creatures in dignity and authority. The two passages illustrate each other. **And didst set him over the works of thy hands.** This passage is found in the Codex Sinaiticus, but is wanting in many MSS. It was omitted by our author, as not essential to his purpose.

8. Thou hast put (or, *didst put*) **all things in subjection under his feet.** In the Psalm this clearly refers to the dominion over the earth with which man was invested at his creation. That this is man's ideal position is evident enough even amidst all the wrecking of his nature, and darkening of his glory, which has been made by sin. **For in that he put all in subjection under him,** literally, *for in subjecting to him all things.* **He left nothing that is not put under him**—*unsubjected to him.* The writer has finished his quotation, and proceeds to a logical deduction. That the passage was commonly used as Messianic may be inferred from a like mode of reasoning from it (though for a different end) in 1 Cor. 15 : 27. "But when he saith," etc. The author here, however, draws simply the natural inference from the language; he merely explicates what it contains by implication. It has declared that God has subjected to man all things (the 'to him' refers, of course, to 'man'). The expression, says the author, is absolute; it implies an unlimited and universal subjection. The writer is not stating what God did, but what the language *implies* that he did, and which yet we do not see verified in the case of actual humanity. **But now we see not yet all things put under him.** The 'now' and the 'not yet' are generally taken as temporal, not logical. I prefer to regard them, especially the 'now' (νῦν), as logical, and would give to the 'under him' (αὐτῷ) the force of its emphatic position. I would render: "But as it is, as the case stands, we do not at all see, we by no means see that to him all things have been subjected." That they will bear this rendering (especially the νῦν δέ) just as easily as the other, both by classical and New Testament usage, I need not stop to argue.[1] That this is the sense here, at least of 'now' (νῦν), I feel certain. The author is reasoning. A certain statement is made in relation to man which is not actualized in the condition of humanity, and which therefore is transferred to a Representative of that humanity in whom it is. The 'but now' and 'not yet' then as particles of time are here out of place; as far as they go they weaken the argument, for it becomes a matter of *time:* if by-and-by the realization may occur, the author need not look elsewhere for its true original. But in fact the picture is not fulfilled in man, and has no prospect of being, until a heavenly man appears on the scene, in whose exaltation he finds a precursor and pledge of the future exaltation of humanity. But that is not here in question, but simply the discrepancy between the portraiture and the supposed original, whence he argues to a true original of the portraiture itself. The temporal force of the particles[2] therefore is less relevant, and mars the purity of the reasoning. The declaration then is that the Psalmist's ascription of a universal ascendancy to man is not borne out by man's actual condition. He is a slave to a blighted and barren earth, to disordered elements, to savage beasts, and to pain, sickness, and death. Those who (as Bleek, Lünemann, Kurtz) apply the *quotation* directly to Christ take, of course, these particles temporally, and with a very modified interpretation of the passage. They distinguish expressly between being "crowned with glory and honour," and

[1] The οὔπω, properly *not at all, in no way,* is indeed, in its ordinary use, *not yet,* and has chiefly, though not exclusively, in poetry, the meaning, "by no means."

[2] The Lexicons scarcely do justice to οὔπω; yet its logical force is far less to be assumed; the combination νῦν δέ is more common in the New Testament in its logical than in its temporal sense (νῦν δέ and νυνὶ δέ).

9 But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.

9 not yet all things subjected to him. But we behold him who hath been made [1]a little lower than the angels, *even* Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace

1 Or, *for a little while lower.*

having "all in subjection under him." The former Christ has already received; the latter is in the future, awaiting him at the final judgment, when all his enemies shall have been put under him. But to this interpretation there are strong objections. (1) We can scarcely doubt that the phrases, "crowned with glory and honour" and having "all things in subjection under him," are used as substantial equivalents, the one implying all that is expressed by the other. (2) With this distinction the second thought should not come in here at all (as the purpose is to declare his present exaltation), unless perhaps as a mere subordinate proposition, with a particle (μέν), signifying, *indeed, to be sure*, simply to pave the way for the emphatic affirmative statement: "But now we do not as yet indeed (οὔπω μεν) see all things put under him; but we *do* see him crowned with glory and honor." (3) The formal and elaborate manner in which Jesus is introduced at ver. 9, in manifest contrast with the previously mentioned personage, shows unmistakably that *then first* the author bends upon him the conclusions of the preceding citation. In short, the view which makes Jesus at once the object of the entire citation destroys its coherence of thought and the clearness of the argumentation, makes inexplicable the formal opening of ver. 9, and entangles inextricably the whole passage. In contrast with the fact that all things are not yet, or, not at all, subjected to man, the author proceeds.

9. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels—or, more exactly, *But him who had been lowered for some little below the angels, Jesus, we behold.* The author elegantly puts the description before the name as more characteristic—as also elsewhere, "the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Jesus" (3:1); as in the Greek, "the Leader and Perfecter of faith, Jesus" (12:2)—and adds, thoughtfully, and, as it were, lovingly, for the first time, the earthly human name of him whom he had before styled Son, God, Lord. He here turns the passage to Christ, and shows that in him both parts of the description are substantially realized, and that he, therefore, is the true archetype and realization of the Psalmist's picture. The language of the Psalm, then, naturally modifies itself (the Holy Spirit recasting his own language) to meet the new exigencies. The "being lowered" is the Lord's own voluntary stoop; the "some little" of degree passes into a "some little" of time (and the more easily, as suggested by Delitzsch, because humanity's own subordination to the angels is rather an accident of its position, than grounded in its essential nature), and the "being crowned with glory," instead of being coincident in time with the humiliation, is at once its successor and its reward. With great skill has the writer, in addressing Hebrews, to whom the incarnation was naturally an offense, united in one the ideal condition of man with the humiliation of the Son of man, as he immediately after makes his suffering of death the condition of his glorification. **For the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour.** Rather, *On account of his suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor.* By this exacter rendering, 'the suffering of death' paves the way for his glorification, instead of being represented as the purpose of his humiliation;[1] according, also, to the more usual New Testament mode of representation. Here, where the author first expressly mentions the suffering of death, he would affect most favorably his Hebrew brethren by introducing it, not as the object of the humiliation, but as the *condition of the exaltation.* Below, when he has familiarized his readers with the idea and the purpose of his death, he may speak of his assuming flesh and blood in order to die, and by dying rescue humanity. But here it accords with the general careful strain of the Epistle, to put the first reference to the death in the most favorable light. 'Crowned with glory and honour' is here the clear equivalent of the having 'all things subjected to him,' with which it is associated in ver. 7, 8. It refers to Christ's exal-

[1] The *purpose* would have been more naturally expressed by ἕνεκα τοῦ παθεῖν, than by διὰ τὸ παθεῖν, or πάθημα.

tation after his resurrection, when God raised him above the rage of his enemies, anointed him eternal King and Priest, declared him his Son in power, and gave him all power in heaven and earth. The author, then, has reached the proof of the thesis, virtually involved in ver. 5, that not to angels, but to the Son of man, and that, as man's representative and head, God had subjected this new and opening world of redemption. With circuitous, but sure step, he has brought round his argument, till he finds in him who has had all things subjected to him, and has been crowned with glory and honor, the true ideal of the Psalmist's picture, and the One to whom this coming world has been really made subject. But into the web of his reasoning he has skillfully woven the fact of the humiliation and death of this glorious Personage, and shown the two classes of facts inseparably united. This point being established, and the humiliation and death, as it were, incidentally introduced, he passes to them as the principal objects of his picture. The glorified Messiah recedes; the suffering and dying Jesus, brought forward with exquisite art, comes into the foreground. The whole arrangement he tells us—alike the humiliation and the exaltation has been made—**that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man** —or, *In order that by the grace of God, on behalf of every man, he might taste of death.* This clause has been very variously constructed. For "in order that" (ὅπως) some render 'so that' (equivalent to ὥστε), others, 'after'—both erroneously. The particle denotes *purpose.* But with what is it connected? The construction with 'made lower' across the intervening clause is extremely harsh; that with 'crowned'—as the crowning *follows* the death—is no less so (he was crowned that he might taste, etc.); unless we either render the verb "that he might have tasted," which is scarcely possible, or throw the emphasis entirely on 'for every man' (ὑπὲρ παντός), and make the clause pregnantly equivalent to "that the death which he has tasted might be on behalf of every one" (somewhat analogously to 1 Peter 4 : 6). The passage, so explained, would yield a good sense, but would deprive the words 'taste of death' of their apparently intended emphasis. Tholuck, Lünemann and Kurtz make the clause a resumption, and a brief, but pregnant, exponent of the words, "on account of his suffering of death"; the author returning to it to add, "to wit, that by the grace of God," etc. So, pretty nearly, Delitzsch, who, however, refers it rather to the entire clause, "on account of his suffering of death, crowned," etc., making it assign the reason why Christ's glorification was made conditional upon his previous suffering of death; namely, that being *thus* exalted (passing through death to exaltation) his death might be for the exaltation of humanity. The clause seems appended rather loosely to the entire verse, to bring out the general idea that the entire arrangement —the humbling and the subsequent exaltation —was for the good of universal humanity. The humiliation was, that he might taste of death; the exaltation was, that the death might be effectual for every man—the whole was by the grace of God. The emphasis is about equally distributed on the three clauses—the less welcome being reserved to be prepared for by the other two. A humbled and dying Messiah was utterly repugnant to the Jewish notions of their expected Messiah; its mention is naturally preceded by the glories that are to crown it. *First*, is *the grace of God.* The author commends the fact about to be stated by assuring his readers that it was by the gracious purpose of God. To such an arrangement no Jew could urge objection. This fact must reconcile him to a suffering and dying Messiah, and this clause is of great significance.[1] *Secondly*, the arrangement is rec-

[1] On the other hand, the reading found in many MSS., namely, χωρὶς θεοῦ, but which, in the sixth century, had disappeared entirely, yet has found some recent advocates, is devoid of any intelligible purpose. It has been interpreted with γεύεσθαι θανάτου, "to taste of death apart from God"—that is, purely in his human nature; or, separately from—that is, forsaken of God; or, with ὑπὲρ παντός, "on behalf of every creature except God," analogously to 1 Cor. 15 : 27. But the exception in the case of God to the otherwise universal subjection so appropriate there, would be childish and unmeaning here. Man is here alone referred to; if any exceptions were in order, it would much more naturally be angels. The critics are probably right in supposing the words originally a marginal gloss on the phrase, "left nothing unsubjected to him" (that is, writes the commentator, "except God," χωρὶς θεοῦ), and this, mistaken by a careless copyist for a correction of the text (χάριτι θεοῦ) a little below, was put into its place.

10 For it became him, for whom *are* all things, and by whom *are* all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.

10 of God he should taste death for every *man*. For it became him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, [1] in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the [2] author of their salvation perfect

1 Or, *having brought*.... 2 Or, *captain*.

ommended as being "on behalf of every man." It was in the interest of individual and collective humanity; it was to *realize* the Psalmist's description of the normal condition of humanity, and thus fulfill the Old Testament Scriptures. Thus he might become the Saviour of all men, especially of them that should believe. The extension of the 'every' (παντός) beyond man—either as neuter, *every* thing, to the whole creation; or as masculine, to other beings, as angels—is without the scope of the writer. He is thinking of the effects of redemption, not on the universe generally, but on the human race; and here, not so much of the realized results in individual salvation, as of the general scope and purpose of Christ's death in bringing man into new relations to God, and in making possible to all, and actual to many, the fulfillment of their original destination. It is the inference from the passage so skillfully chosen as the text, that man, ideally placed above all, is actually so placed through his Representative and Deliverer, Jesus. *Thirdly*, and emphatically, that which Christ, by the grace of God and for the benefit of all, was to do, was to 'taste death.' It is this with which the author is familiarizing his readers in connection with, and as a means of, the exaltation of man. 'Tasting of death' is a figure familiar enough to poetry generally, and common in the Greek classics, yet here probably of Hebrew origin. It is not designed to indicate a *brief* and transient experiencing of death (as but a mere *tasting*), but is rather an emphatic and elegant periphrasis. 'Tasting of death,' as referring to a sense which tests things in their inner nature, denotes rather intimacy and depth, than superficiality of experience.

10-18. These verses expand and vindicate the sentiment of the last clause; namely, that by God's gracious arrangement Jesus Christ suffered death on behalf of every man. The passage is one of great tenderness, the terms "sons," "brethren," "children," indicating the sympathetic compassion which prompted the humiliation of the Redeemer.

10. This states in fuller form, and as leading to still further expansion, the threefold idea of the last clause, and in the same order: (1) Answering to the 'by the grace of God,' we have **For it became him, for** (διά with accusative) **whom are all things, and by** (*through*) **whom are all things.** The first preposition—*for, on account of*—as naturally applies to the Father as to the Son; for the second—*by, through*—we might have expected *from, out of* (ἐξ), or, perhaps, *by* (ὑπό), of ultimate agency, though with an intransitive verb; but the reasoning can scarcely be mistaken. God is described by those attributes which vindicate his right to arrange, unchallenged, for advancing the dignity of his creatures; and the phrase 'it became'—*was becoming, befitting*—marks an internal reason for the arrangement lying in the very nature of the case and in his relations to man. Answering to the 'for (*on behalf of*) every man,' we have next, **bringing many sons unto glory.** This indicates the largeness of God's purpose regarding the death of Christ, and vindicates his subjection to the suffering which should qualify him for the work. God is everywhere the ultimate agent in bringing sinners to salvation. Jesus Christ becomes the file-leader (ἀρχηγός) and Captain of the sacramental host. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son," etc. (John 3:16.) God saves and leads to glory his people, as he made the world, *through* his Son. 'Many sons' stands (Delitzsch) here distinguished from *one*, and in antithesis to *few*. Had God been satisfied (the writer intimates) with the eternal glory of the One and Only-begotten, he might have spared that one his path of trial and suffering. But he would have it partaken by '*many* sons,' and shrunk not from the steps required for its accomplishment. It has been questioned whether the participle "bringing" (ἀγαγόντα, *leading*) refers back to "him"—namely, God, or forward to 'Captain,' Leader; whether to the Father, or to Christ; whether the 'leading' is here supreme or subordinate. Both constructions are grammatically possible; but the former is

easier and more natural.[1] But applying the participle to God, what is its import? Not that of a contemporaneous and continued act, *while leading* (ἀγοντα), nor of purpose, *in order to lead* (ἄξοντα), nor, *in leading* (ἐν τῷ ἀγειν). It *might* be used, perhaps, here in the sense of "as leading, as one who led"; and thus belong equally well to the preceding or following, marking God's leadership, or Christ's leadership; but a construction somewhat harsh and doubtful. The two regular and natural constructions are: (1) "*after leading, having led—to perfect,*" etc.; (2) *leading, to perfect*, equivalent to, to lead and to perfect, making the participle and the infinitive co-ordinate. But in what sense the former? It might denote that God, after leading many Old Testament saints to glory, must now, at the opening of the New Testament times, perfect, through suffering, their Leader, with the unexpressed thought of his being Captain of a yet mightier host in the future. Considering the relation of this Epistle to the Old Testament, I do not think this view unworthy of consideration. If the Old Testament saints only are *mentioned*, the New Testament saints would, of course, be understood as to follow under the new and perfected conditions. Kurtz modifies this view, adopting this as the only natural construction. Answering to God as the Author of all things, the 'sons' are God's sons by creation, and thus all men; and the 'bringing to glory' thus far realized is only the bringing them on the way to that glory into which none of them had as yet entered, but which awaited them in the Messianic times.[2] The second (2) of the views above given virtually co-ordinates the participle with the verb; namely, leading many sons to perfect, etc., equivalent to, to lead many sons and to perfect. Thus the action expressed by the participle, as well as that of the infinitive, falls under the 'it became' (ἔπρεπεν). It not merely 'became' God, as one leading, or after leading,' etc., to perfect their leader by sufferings, but it became him to do the one as well as the other. The fitness consisted not merely in appointing him to die after he had undertaken a certain work, but also in undertaking the work which would require him to die. It gives more breadth and force to the argument to throw back the fittingness from the adjustment of the means to the end, to the end itself.[3] Thus I incline on the whole to render as if it were "to bring many sons to glory, and perfect through sufferings the leader of their salvation." An objection urged against connecting the participle with the following, so as to make *Christ* the one bringing the many sons to glory is that in that case they would be spoken of not as 'sons,' but as 'brethren.' This, however, would be by no means certain. In relation to him, indeed, they would be 'brethren,' but in his and their common relation to God they are sons; and it would not be unnatural that he, as Son, should be spoken of as bringing *many* sons to glory. **To make the captain** (or, *leader*) **of their salvation perfect through sufferings.** This clause answers finally to 'taste of death' in the preceding verse. It is put euphemistically, for the humiliation and crucifixion of the Son. It is conceived not in the light of a death; it is a perfecting, qualifying both by internal discipline and by outward glorification. The emphasis is generally said to lie on 'suffering'; but whether in the author's conception it quite does so may be doubted. He is softening to his readers the doctrine of the cross, exhibiting it in its most favorable, and at the same time its justest, light. Does he not therefore reserve for final and special

[1] With the second, the predicate participle (ἀγαγόντα) may be construed with the following noun, 'the Captain of their salvation,' as one leading, or having led. With the first, the participle would naturally, indeed, be ἀγαγόντι, agreeing with αὐτῷ, or might equally well, as ἀγαγόντα, agree with the accusative subject of τελειῶσαι.

[2] Hofmann's ingenious conceit that the many sons brought to glory were, Moses to the prophetic dignity, Aaron to the high priesthood, David to the kingship, etc., as the Son was now to be brought to the honor of glorifying humanity, with its strange perversion of the words 'glory' (δόξα) and 'salvation' (σωτηρία), needs no refutation. As ordinarily explained, the passage is a grand appeal to the benevolence of God on behalf of the unpalatable facts of the incarnation and crucifixion, and all that lay between. It is difficult to see what purpose Hofmann's view could subserve.

[3] This double use of the aorist participle is among the most familiar in Greek. Thus: "He bade them, opening their treasures, present gifts" (ἐκελευσεν αὐτους θησαυρους ἀνοιξαντας δῶρα δοῦναι), might be either, "He bade them, after opening their treasures, present gifts," or, "He bade them open their treasures and present gifts." The participle might equally well be an *incidental* precedent and condition of the "presenting," or a *required* condition coming under the ἐκελευσεν.

11 For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified *are* all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren,
12 Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.

11 through sufferings. For both he who sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause
12 he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying,
I will declare thy name unto my brethren,
In the midst of the [1]congregation will I sing thy praise.

1 Or, *church*.

emphasis the word 'perfect' (τελειῶσαι) as containing the whole fullness of his vindication? thus, not 'to make perfect through sufferings,' but *through sufferings to make perfect.* The sufferings are of no value except as they qualify their subject for his work; they are subordinate to the perfecting and consummating for his work the Leader of salvation. Hence, if it behooves God to lead him through sufferings, much more through these sufferings *to make him perfect.* The word is complex in meaning: the "perfecting" is partly inward, partly outward. It embraces at once the legal fitness which Christ's death imparted to him to become a Saviour, the moral fitness which it engendered to become a sympathizing high priest, and the glorified state to which it raised him; and as the Leader of his followers, it was not intrinsic, but relative perfection—perfection for his followers, that required his death. 'Through sufferings' is used pregnantly (διά), at once as a *means* and a *way.* He attained his legal and moral fitness as a Redeemer, through sufferings as a medium; he passed to his heavenly glory through sufferings as a way. The 'salvation' of this clause is the 'glory' of the preceding; it is that side of the glorification which belongs to the 'many sons,' but not to the single Son. He was glorified, but not saved (except in a very qualified sense); they were both saved and glorified, their salvation being completed and crowned by glorification. Till then they are saved but in hope (Rom. 8:24); saved but approximately. "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed." In like manner it presently appears as sanctification. 'Captain' or *Leader* (ἀρχηγός); properly *first in a series,* file leader, then Prince, Leader; then, *founder, originator,* which seems its meaning here, as at 5:9—"author (αἴτιος) of eternal salvation." Philo calls Adam the (ἀρχηγός) *head* and *file leader* of the race, conducting them on to a common goal with himself. The common Sonship to God of Christ and his people, stated above, is now further developed as ground of the fittingness (ἔπρεπεν) of God's thus humbling his Son. The following passage is not a mere incidental justification of the 'many sons' above, but a link in the chain of argument that establishes the necessity (*since therefore,* ἐπεὶ οὖν, ver. 14) of the incarnation and sufferings of the Lord.

11. For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified[1] are all of (properly, *from*) **one**—that is, from one Father, and this not from one earthly father, Adam, but from one Heavenly Father, God; and from him, not as universal Father (Creator and Preserver), but as spiritual Father and Regenerator; "sons of God, which were born not of blood, . . . but from God." See John 1:13; Rom. 8:14, seq.; 1 John 3:1. As equivalents of 'leading to glory,' 'glorified,' we have 'sanctifieth' and 'sanctified,' describing the glorification in its deeper spiritual character, the moral transformation that must precede, and be the essence of, any true outward exaltation. The verb (ἁγιάζω, *consecrate, make holy*) is doubtless chosen with reference to the "make perfect" (τελειοῦν), and denotes ritual, and then moral perfection. "For their sakes," says the Saviour, "I sanctify, consecrate, myself." (John 17:19.) He, already holy, needed but the formal and ritual sanctification; they, fallen and guilty, needed an internal and spiritual one. **For which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.** The language delicately intimates both the likeness and the unlikeness, both the parity and the disparity of the Redeemer and the redeemed. As being from one Father, they are alike sons, yet as infinitely superior to them in original glory and in moral purity, it is a condescension in him to acknowledge the fraternal tie. He *might* be 'ashamed to call them brethren,' but is not. He concedes to them at once the name of brethren, and the affection which the name implies.

12. Saying, I will declare thy name

[1] Οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι, present, not perfect participle, either as denoting those who are in process of sanctification, or the successive subjects of sanctification.

13 And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me.

13 And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold, I and the children whom God hath given

unto my brethren, in the midst of the church (*congregation*) **will I sing praise unto thee.** This is from Ps. 22 : 22, a Psalm of David which, with its many striking correspondences to the Lord's earthly history, may clearly be called typico-prophetical; in which the minstrel-prophet, already anointed by Samuel and speedily destined to the throne, yet now persecuted and in flight, pours out his complaints over the wretchedness of his condition, yet finally rejoices in the assurance of ultimate deliverance, and the universal triumph of the kingdom of God. It is one of those Psalms which, originally uttered by David, the type of Christ in respect to his own personal condition, had, in the purpose of the inspiring Spirit, a still higher application to the Son of David, while, in the days of his flesh and a subject of exile and persecution, he with strong crying and tears called upon God, and saw in the far-off distance his crown and triumph. The anointed, yet temporarily exiled David stands for the anointed, yet exiled Jesus. History unrolls the scroll of prophecy. Christ, as the antitype of Moses, of David, of Solomon, gives the true significance to their character and history, just as the Christian Church reproduces and illustrates the fortunes of the Jewish congregation; and the heavenly Canaan and the New Jerusalem furnish their "true rest" and "the city which hath foundations" to the people of God. The Messianic character of the Psalm is indicated by our Lord's borrowing its language on the cross: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" The citation is made verbally from the Septuagint, with the exchange of (διηγήσομαι), *I will recount, declare*, for (ἀπαγγελῶ), *I will report, will bring back tidings*, which, less applicable to David, is beautifully so to Christ, who brings back to his earthly brethren a report from his heavenly home. (John 3 : 11, seq.) The passage implies David's, and through him his greater Son's, recognition of Israel, here, of course, the spiritual Israel, as his brethren. A condescension in the earthly David, it was infinitely more so in the heavenly.

13. And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me. Still other citations to illustrate the community of Sonship between Christ and his people. The previous one was taken from David, who, as a type of Christ, recognizes the brotherly relation between himself and the congregation of Israel; these two are from Isaiah, also a type of Christ, whose very name means Saviour, and whose clear predictions of the Messiah constitute him the "evangelical prophet." They are taken from Isa. 8 : 17, 18, from a transaction in which Isaiah appears specially in his typical character. They occur continuously, but are separated by the author by an 'and again,' probably because they bring out different phases of the Messiah's relation to his brethren and to God. The entire passage is beyond a question typical. Isaiah, fraught with the "spirit of Jesus," typifies the Saviour; and his children, given him specially from God, having symbolical significance, betoken partly present wrath and distress, partly the deliverance which will yet break through the surrounding judgments. 'I will put my trust in him' for future deliverance, exclaims the Representative of the Messiah, and, as a pledge of that deliverance, 'Behold I and the children that God hath given to me.' The bearing of the first of these citations upon the author's purpose consists in the fact that it represents (typically) the Messiah as putting his trust in God, and thus exhibits him and his followers in a common relation of dependence, and therefore virtually on a level. The second points out this community still more directly. The speaker and the children that God gave to him are placed in the same category, and appear as brethren. In the mouth of the prophet, the type, the children are *his* children, given him by God. In the mouth of Jesus, the antitype, they are God's children, whom he gave to his Son, and of whom, therefore, he is the elder brother. (John 6 : 37; 17 : 6.) The difference in the cases is accidental; the likeness is essential. In both, the children are given to the typical and to the real Messiah, specially and marvelously by God; in both, they sustain a relation of dependence; in both, by community of nature, a virtual equality. The human father is the fleshly brother of his

children. The entire purpose of our author sends him to the Old Testament for illustrations of the character and relations of Christ. From the nature of the case, then, his illustrations must be drawn largely from its symbols, for in those are its Messianic predictions mostly contained. The merely verbal prophecies of Christ in the Old Testament are far less numerous than its *acted* prophecies, and not a whit more pertinent and satisfactory. Our author's use, therefore, of symbolical cases, like the present, was legitimate, not merely from the Jewish point of view, but from every point of view. A reference to the ninth chapter abundantly confirms here the Messianic interpretation.[1] The first step in the proof of the fittingness of God's proceeding in humbling his Son is taken in showing the relation of *brotherhood* existing between the Saviour and the saved. In this relation the author latently finds already an argument for this proceeding. They for whom the Son of God died are sons of God; they for whom the Redeemer suffered are his brethren. It may, indeed, be objected that, as they are not sons and brethren until *after* they are redeemed, their being such can be no logical ground for the redemptive sacrifice. True, in strict logic. But that which God saw that they were capable of becoming, and would become, may, without violence, be ideally transferred to their previous condition. They were sons *proleptically;* by anticipation. God saw in them sons; Christ saw in them brethren; and hence it became God to humble his Son, and Christ to humble himself, in order to lead them to glory. Kurtz avoids the proleptic view by taking, as already seen, the 'sons' to be ransomed, not as sons, by their descent from Adam, but by virtue of their creation in the image of God: and the Ransomer then becomes, not the Theanthropic Son of God, but the pre-incarnate and eternal Son of God, as the "effulgence of his glory and the impress of his substance." There can be no doubt that in this essential and eternal Sonship is laid the basis of his theanthropic relation; it is only as being the Only Begotten that he could become the First Begotten, and thus the First born among many brethren. And so in the surviving and unextinguished wrecks of that original Sonship in man is found the basis for rearing the structure of his new Christian Sonship. It is one who appears not "less than Archangel ruined" that Christ comes to clothe with more than his "original brightness." But we must still think that the common Sonship and the mutual brotherhood of our passage lie within the sphere of redemption, and that the explanation is found in the pregnant language of Rom. 8: "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son" (that is, to be brought with him into a common relation of Sonship) "that he might be a first-born among many brethren." But the argument is not finished. These sons of God and brethren of Christ must bear his nature, or, rather, he must bear theirs. As he has undertaken to make them his brethren, to all which that relation implies he must condescend, and all which that relation *demands* he must fulfill.

14. Forasmuch (or, *since*) **then the children**—children of God and brethren of Christ: but he here adopts the term from the last verse, and dwells upon it with a tender sense of the ideas of dependence and affection which cluster

[1] The superficial difficulties attending the alleged Messianic citations in the New Testament from the Old, vanish on a deeper investigation. The case, in fact, becomes reversed, and the unsolvable difficulties are found to attend the *non*-Messianic interpretation. Deny this, and the whole Old Testament becomes an inexplicable enigma. The whole significance of the Old Dispensation is its foreshadowing of, and preparation for, the New. Its whole history is a history of the preliminary stages of redemption; its whole structure a grand forecourt to the still grander Christian temple. Abraham was chosen to be the founder of the Seed, in whom all the nations should be blessed; his descendants were set apart as the birth-nation of the Messiah; all its institutions were organized on this basis, and the whole history typified that of the spiritual Israel. Bearing this in mind, we cannot be surprised or stumbled that under the clearer lights of the New Testament the pregnant hints of the Old take a new and unexpected meaning; and to find the Spirit of inspiration, interpreting his own words and symbols into a clearer development of Christ. The author of our Epistle, too, was addressing Jews—and Jews who, though Christians, were still held more or less under the traditionary trammels of the synagogue. We cannot, then, doubt that his interpretations would be scrutinized with jealous rigor, and that they must, therefore, as to their general Christological character, have coincided with its prevalent views; and there is no so rational mode of accounting for the prevalence of these views among the earlier Jews as to suppose that they were founded in truth. Their difference from the apostle's was not as to their application to Christ, but their application to Jesus.

14 Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;

14 me. Since then the children are sharers in [1] flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he [2] might bring to nought him who [3] had the power of death, that is,

1 Gr. *blood and flesh*.....2 Or, *may*.....3 Or, *hath*.

about the term (τὰ παιδία, *the little children*)—**are partakers of flesh and blood** (Greek, *blood and flesh*), **he also himself likewise took part of the same.** Here the *proleptic* character of the previous argument fully comes out. Because the children—that is, *those who were to be* children—were mortal, therefore Christ became mortal; because *those who were to be* his brethren were in the flesh, therefore he became flesh. The argument, apparently faulty, is simply so from the brevity of the statement. Christ saw in these future heirs of salvation brethren and children of God, and hastened to put himself into the position which would enable him to realize this ideal picture. Its touching beauty lies in the fact that the author disguises, holds in the background, the depraved, guilty, rebellious character of the objects of redemption. Jesus dies not for apostates, but for sons; not for aliens, but for brethren. His compassionate love already invests them with the character to which it is eventually to bring them. There is a double logic—that of the head and that of the heart; that of fact and that of feeling. The one sees in men enemies whom Christ intends to convert into friends, children, brethren, and for whom he therefore assumes human nature; the other sees in men by anticipation, brethren, children, friends, and for whom, therefore, because they are human, he assumes human nature. In the one case, he dies for them as they are; in the other case, he dies for them as they are to be.[1] *In order* **that through death he might destroy** (*bring to nought*) **him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.** In harmony with the tender strain of the preceding verses is the representation here. It is not the *guilt* of humanity that the compassionate Saviour sees, but its *wretchedness*. He takes flesh and blood, not to reclaim rebels and reconcile enemies, but to ransom brethren who were in bondage to death and its terrors. We need not say that each point of view has equally its truth, and that the gospel equally contemplates both—man's depravity, and his ruin; his wickedness, and his weakness; the criminality which has subjected him to death, and the death under whose burden and curse he groans. And, indeed, the *hereditary* character of the curse of humanity, the fact that death reigns "even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (Rom. 6:14); the fact that sin is not, as in the case of the devils, purely individual, but a matter of birth and race, renders eminently natural and proper the second point of view, and creates a presumption that God intended to provide a deliverer to open a fountain of cleansing and life, whose streams should run alongside those of pollution and death. It is as a victim of death that man is here regarded; as the subject of the penalty which was denounced upon his transgression in Eden. All that is involved in this death—the ruin of the soul, as well as the dissolution of the body—is, of course, retrieved in the deliverance. But the idea is conceived more concretely. Man is a slave, not to death, but to the devil, who has the power of death, and who, through and in death, holds dominion over the race. Satan has the power of death—not, indeed, absolutely; for absolute dominion belongs only to God, but as having originally, by his subtle arts, brought it into the world—being a homicide, a murderer from the beginning—and still, as "the god of this world," struggling to perpetuate his disastrous sovereignty. The writer, however, intends no nice distinction. The expression is figurative and far-reaching. It simply conceives Satan as monarch in the realm of death, originating, controlling it, and through it wielding his tyrannical sceptre over man. To destroy the monarch of death, then, is to destroy death; to destroy death, is to destroy its monarch (καταργεῖν, a word rare in the classics, but common in the New Testament,

[1] The Greek verb translated 'are partakers,' is in the perfect tense (κεκοινώνηκεν), meaning, *have had, and still have part in*, and denotes, properly, those whose permanent and normal condition is that of being in the flesh; the aorist μετέσχεν, 'took part of,' or, *partook*, denotes the act of entering into and putting on humanity. Παραπλησίως, *in like manner*, or, *similarly*, is used elegantly for ὁμοίως.

15 And deliver them, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.
16 For verily he took not on *him the nature of* angels; but he took on *him* the seed of Abraham.

15 the devil; and [1] might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bond-
16 age. [2] For verily not to angels doth he give help, but

1 Or, *may*.....2 Or, *For verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold of.*

render inoperative—hence, *nullify*, *overthrow*, *destroy*. (1 Cor. 15 : 24.) "When he shall have *annihilated* (Common Version, *put down*) all rule and all authority and power." It is used specifically of abolishing death. (1 Cor. 15 : 26; 2 Tim. 1 : 10.) The destruction of Satan, the lord of death, Christ accomplishes *through death*—not simply by *his* death, but by *death*, taken abstractly and absolutely; by turning the enginery which Satan wields, the forces of his kingdom against himself, and making death itself the instrument of the destruction of its lord. *How* the death of Christ accomplishes this it is not here our province to discuss. His death may be regarded in several aspects, each, no doubt, essential to a just estimate of it. In one most obvious aspect, it appears as a triumphant resistance to the *temptations* of Satan. In the beginning of our Lord's ministry, the tempter had concentrated upon him in vain his arts of seduction. He returned, at its close, with tenfold and desperate malice, and in the garden and on the cross exhausted on him his hellish fury. Jesus maintained his integrity, drank resolutely the cup which was commended to his lips, wrestled with the Potentate of death, and, even in dying, achieved a victory. Thus, as Representative Man, he triumphed over him to whom the first representative man had succumbed. Adam, in possession of life, yielded to temptation, and incurred death; Jesus, bound to death, resisted the temptation to avoid it, and in facing and enduring it, procured life both for himself and his people. Yet, more than this, our Lord's death was a strictly *expiatory sacrifice* for human guilt. His resistance of the devil was not the expiation itself, but was its indispensable condition. If the victim had not been perfect the sacrifice would have been without efficacy. He must first struggle with Satan in life; he must then struggle with Satan in death, and, as it were, with death itself; and by dying in and through holy obedience, as Adam had died in and through transgression and guilt, wrest the sting from death, and lift its curse from the soul of humanity. The destruction of death, I may add, was to be the grand feature of the Messianic era. (Isa. 25 : 8; Hosea 13 : 14.) Christ accomplishes this work — first, by delivering his people from the fear of death, and destroying within them that principle of sin which is its cause and sting; and, finally, by annihilating all its effects in the resurrection of the body. (1 Cor. 15.)

15. And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. 'Them who.' *These persons whosoever*, or, *as many as*. The phrase designates the class to whom the redemption is applicable. It at once limits the class, and declares its universality within the sphere of that class. It restricts the redemption to man, and declares—as above (ver. 9), 'for every man,' or, *on behalf of every one*—the applicability of redemption to the entire race. Not that it teaches the actual salvation of all, any more than John 1 : 9, "The light that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world," or John 12 : 32, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." The passage thus marks a peculiar and striking characteristic of humanity. As alone possessing body and soul, man alone is liable to death; and thus liable and having sinned, he groans under its perpetual dread, is in bondage to its terrors, and to the tyrant who sways its sceptre. Death is the great dread and terror of the race. Even the saints of the Old Testament stood in fear of the darkness and gloom of the grave. Hades, with his deep and dismal recesses, his silence, solitude, and corruption, they regarded with shuddering. Contrast the prayer of Hezekiah and many of the psalms with the joyous and triumphant tones of the New Testament regarding death. To the apostle, "to die is gain." He longs to be absent from the body, and at home with the Lord. He sees a house not made with hands, an undecaying, heavenly, eternal habitation, replacing the transient tabernacle of flesh.

16. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, etc., or, *For it is not*,

17 Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto *his* brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things *pertaining* to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.

17 he giveth help to the seed of Abraham. Wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to

doubtless,[1] *angels whom he rescueth, but he rescueth the seed of Abraham.* The once widely received, but now exploded, rendering, "taketh not on him the nature of angels," makes the sentence little better than a tautological platitude. The author has said that the Redeemer took part in the flesh and blood that are shared by the children. It is no advance on the thought to say that he took not on him the nature of angels; but it is a decided advance in the thought to say, in accounting for his assuming flesh and blood, that he was not coming to the rescue of angels, who possess not bodies, and are not subjects of death. The verb in this sentence (ἐπιλαμβάνεται) may be translated *layeth hold upon.* The force of the preposition *upon* (ἐπί) goes over to the person laid hold of. It is not "takes *upon* himself," but, "lays hold *upon another*" for rescue or relief, as in 8 : 9, "in the day when I took them by the hand," or, *laid hold of them.* The present tense either marks the act conceived as abiding, or is put spiritedly for the past. 'The seed of Abraham.' Not that the apostle intends to restrict the redemption to the Jews, in denial of the broader destination of the gospel; but the Epistle, in its practical scope, expressly designed for Hebrews, keeps here, as elsewhere, the Hebrew point of view. It is doubtful, perhaps, whether 'the seed of Abraham' denotes, here, Abraham's spiritual offspring,—the spiritual Israel—or rather, as I think, 'the seed of Abraham' as the predestined centre and source of salvation to the world. In Abraham's seed all the nations of the earth were to be blessed; and, therefore, in coming to the rescue of the seed of Abraham, Christ comes to the rescue of entire humanity. It stands as the representative of the race. The 'seed of Abraham' is not placed in contrast to the rest of the race of men, but to angels.

17. Wherefore . . . it behooved him— (*whence he was bound by the work of deliverance which he had undertaken:* it was what he *owed* to the nature of the enterprise) **in all things . . . to be made like unto his brethren.** 'In all things,' and, therefore, in the assumption of flesh and blood. The reasoning is elliptical. Its exact import is: Whence, *as* he was bound in all things to be assimilated to his brethren, therefore he must take human nature, with all its infirmities, including liability to temptation and death. The preceding idea of the incarnation and death is broadened by the 'all things' (κατὰ πάντα), so as to open the way for the idea—not merely of a complete and perfect Saviour in his death, but of a perfect, living High Priest. **That he might be** (*become*) **a merciful** (*compassionate*) **and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God.** The term 'become' applies not only to Christ's becoming a high priest (and, as such, compassionate and faithful), but also a *compassionate* High Priest; because, although he was previously compassionate—and, in fact, his compassion dictated his incarnation and his *becoming* a High Priest—yet we might say that the *divine* compassion evinced in originating the plan of redemption differs from the *human* compassion requisite to the priestly intercession of the glorified Jews. The writer conceives sympathy and compassion as requisite qualities of a high priesthood; and these could be possessed only by a high priest taken from among men, and who shared, or had shared, the frailties and sufferings of humanity. Hence, merciful as Christ may have been before, the peculiar form of tenderness here conceived could spring only through his incarnation. It is the compassion of the sympathizing High Priest, not the mercy of the spiritual God. The position of the original words is peculiar. It is such as to show that while the epithet 'merciful' looks back, and is an inference from the preceding, 'faithful' is an additional thought looking forward to the immediately following discussion. Such is one of the characteristics of the style of this Epistle. While reviewing, and, as it were, gathering up the results of a preceding discussion, it introduces, as if accidentally, what serves as a transition

[1] Δή που, "you know, I suppose," "doubtless," appeals to a well-known fact, and is a particle at once of emphasis, vivacity, and modesty; the που, *perhaps, I suppose,* softening the force of the δή; not implying doubt, but removing the appearance of dogmatism. It is in no way represented by "verily."

18 For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

18 make propitiation for the sins of the people. [1] For [2] in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

1 Gr. *For having been himself tempted in that wherein he hath suffered*.....2 Or, *wherein*.

to that which follows, and makes the parts of the discourse, as it were, *gripe* into each other. 'Faithful' (πιστός), not here merely 'worthy of confidence,' 'reliable'—but rather, actively faithful, evincing fidelity. The term 'in things pertaining to God' refers not merely to the term High Priest, but to the whole sentence, "that he might become, in things pertaining to God, a merciful and faithful High Priest." **To make reconciliation** (*propitiation*) **for the sins of the people.** To make propitiation for (ἱλάσκεσθαι), and hence, as means of propitiation, *to expiate, atone for.* (In classical use with the accusative, *to propitiate a person.*) 'The people,' used in conformity with the limited phrase, 'seed of Abraham,' as applicable, properly, to the Jewish people, but to them as representatives of the world for whom the expiation was equally made. Christ came as the Deliverer of Israel, but, in Israel, as the Deliverer of the world. He died to expiate the sins of the people, but, in the people, the sins of the world. The introduction of the high priesthood of Christ, at the close of this discussion of his superiority to the angels, as also of that of his superiority to Moses, has its evident purpose. It brings forward from time to time, and keeps under the reader's eye, that which was to be the central theme of the Epistle, as it was the vital feature of the New Dispensation, the intercessory high priesthood of Christ, a high priesthood commencing in his offering of himself as a spotless sin-offering to God, and consummated in his entrance, with his own blood, into the heavenly Holy of holies, there to appear in the presence of God for us.

18 For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted. The passage admits of various constructions, which, in the main, but slightly modify the sense. 'In that,' or, *wherein*, render well the Greek (ἐν ᾧ). The ideas are not very widely apart, as the one ('wherein') circumscribes his power to succor within the sphere of his experience of temptation and suffering; and the other ('in that') makes his power to succor *dependent* on that experience. The difference is but slight. Again, the first clause may be rendered (with Delitzsch), "For after being himself tempted in that he has suffered, or in his experience of suffering"; or (as Lünemann and Moll), "For in that he has suffered, being himself tempted"; or, as seems to me more natural, 'For in that he has himself suffered, being tempted, he is able,' etc. The rendering of Delitzsch makes a broader distinction between the 'suffering' and the 'temptation' than do the others, and throws greater stress on the temptation *apart from* the suffering. In this I think he errs. The suffering and the temptation seem to me to have each stood prominent in the author's mind; or, rather, I think it is only at the very close of this verse that the idea of suffering gradually passes over into that of temptation. True, again, the clause can be read, 'For in that he has suffered, *after* being himself tempted,' thus making the temptation distinctly precede the suffering, instead of being coincident with it, and mainly constituting it; but this, too, seems to me less probable. 'He is able' (δύναται) refers simply to his moral capacity, produced by his personal experience of suffering. 'Them that are tempted'—his human brethren, who are always in the condition of being subject to temptation.

---

2. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO MOSES.

Having delineated the superiority of Christ to the angels, the ministerial revealers of the Old Testament, the author proceeds to show his superiority, as founder of the New Dispensation, to Moses, the earthly founder of the Old. Next follows an extended warning and exhortation founded on this comparison. Then he shows that the rest of God, forfeited by ancient Israel, is still open, in a higher form, to the spiritual Israel. Lastly follows exhortation to heed the word of God, and transition to the high priesthood, the chief topic of the Epistle.

Ch. 3. (1) *Christ, as Leader of the New Testament Israel and Founder of the New Testament house of God, greater than Moses, leader of ancient Israel, and founder of the Old Testament house of God.* (1–6.)

CHAPTER III.

WHEREFORE, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus;

1 Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our

1. Wherefore (ὅθεν, *whence*, a favorite particle of inference with the author, and by him always—except, perhaps, 11 : 19—used logically, not locally)—that is, in consideration of the qualities thus found in Christ, his personal greatness and his admirable fitness as a Saviour. **Holy brethren.** 'Holy,' an epithet given here, perhaps, with reference to the idea (2 : 11) of Christ, as Sanctifier, making holy (ἁγιάζων), and his people the sanctified (ἁγιαζόμενοι). It also, however, grows out of the whole topic of the redemption and priestly work of Christ. It is not so much a term of individual character as of general relation, marking the characteristic of the children of God as such. In their general relation to Christ they are all 'holy' (ἅγιοι, *sacred, saints*), while having attained actual personal sanctification in very different degrees. The term 'brethren,' too, we can hardly help feeling to have here an especial significance. While they are 'brethren' immediately in their relation to the writer and to each other, the author yet seems lingering over the term so expressive of the tender relation between the sons and the Son, the redeemed and their Redeemer. The 'holy brethren,' then, is the gathering up and the echo of all that deeply touching strain in which the author has portrayed the humiliation and the redeeming sufferings of Christ. The combination, I believe, is found only here. **Partakers of the** (*a*) **heavenly calling.** As 'holy brethren' indicates the relation of believers to Christ, as Redeemer and Sanctifier, so 'partakers of a heavenly calling' refers to their relation to him as the heavenly-commissioned One, sent forth to 'call' (καλεῖν) men into his kingdom. As God's Ambassador, or Apostle,[1] he comes to call men to salvation; as incarnate Redeemer and High Priest, he sanctifies and saves them. The calling is doubly 'heavenly'—alike in its origin and destination. They are called from heaven and to heaven by One who descended from heaven to conduct them thither. As such, he exhorts them: **Consider**—or, *Contemplate* (κατανοήσατε, *fix your mind upon*, give careful heed to, treat not with indifference or neglect.) As (2 : 1) he exhorts his readers to heed the *revelations* of this Great Messenger, so now, in like manner, to heed the Messenger himself. The exhortation is no merely formal one. His readers have indicated a disposition to turn away from, and treat with indifference this great Saviour. He solemnly and impressively warns them against it, and calls them back to a steadfast contemplation of his claims. **The Apostle and High Priest of our profession** (*confession*), **Christ Jesus.** The two predicates here applied to Jesus answer *chiastically* (Delitzsch) to the two designations just given to his Christian readers. In reversed order, as 'partakers of a heavenly calling,' they are to give heed to the heavenly Messenger (ἀπόστολος), who was sent forth commissioned (ἀπεσταλμένος) to bring that calling, with all its consequences; as 'holy brethren' they are to give heed to the High Priest, who, by his sacrifice and mediation, cleansed their sins and made them sons of God. The two grand characteristics in Christ's character and work as Saviour, are, in the two epithets, pregnantly designated; his descent from heaven as God's Ambassador of salvation; his reascent to heaven as man's interceding High Priest. In the one feature he is the divine and divinely commissioned organ of the New Revelation; in the other, he is the true high-priestly Sacrifice, and Intercessor before God. In the one character, he announces salvation; in the other, he accomplishes it. The words '*of our confession*' belong to both epithets, 'Apostle' and 'High Priest.' Jesus is the Apostle and High Priest whom *we* confess or acknowledge. We see, finally, in the designations applied to Christians and the designations applied to Christ, all the grand ideas of the two preceding chapters are pregnantly summed up. The author is prepared to turn to another aspect of the Redeemer's

[1] Ἀπόστολος, *commissioned one*, rather than ἄγγελος, *messenger*, because this term has just been distinctively appropriated to an inferior class of beings, and also, perhaps, with reference to that office which had become consecrated under the New Dispensation. The Old Testament had its *messengers*, ἄγγελοι; the New has its *apostles*, ἀπόστολοι.

2 Who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses *was faithful* in all his house.

2 confession, *even* Jesus; who was faithful to him that [1] appointed him, as also was Moses in all [2] his house.

1 Gr. *made*.....2 That is, *God's house*. See Num. xii. 7.

character, already prepared for by the 'faithful' (πιστός) just above.

2. Who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house. After comparing Christ with the angels, the revealers of the law, and showing the reason of his temporary humiliation below them, that he might redeem a people and found a church of God, it is natural that he should next compare him, as the Founder of that church, with Moses, the deliverer and organizer of the ancient theocratic community. Moses and Aaron were, respectively, the apostle, or commissioned one, and the high priest, of the Israelitish confession. The people "were baptized to Moses" in the Red Sea; he was their great lawgiver and prophet; he gave them the law, and in him they trusted (John 5:45); they styled themselves, specially, his disciples (John 9:29); they gloried in their political relation to him, as in their lineal descent from Abraham. It is, hence, not arbitrary, but natural, that Christ should next be put in contrast with Moses; the apostle of *our* confession with the apostle of the confession of ancient Israel. 'Who was faithful' (τὸν ὄντα πιστόν). The phrase is predicative, *as being faithful, as one who was faithful;* and the *being* (ὄντα) by no means (as Bleek) marks, necessarily, the time now present to the writer, and thus points to Christ's present fidelity as High Priest in God's heavenly house, but simply the time indicated by the connection which, as shown by the word 'Jesus,' and by the whole train of thought, is that of our Lord's sojourn on earth. Here he came as God's 'apostle,' ambassador, to proclaim salvation, to call out his people from the spiritual Egypt, and, by his appointment and his obedience to his will, to found a new theocracy, to inaugurate a spiritual kingdom, to rear a spiritual house, over against the national theocracy, the temporal kingdom, the ritual household of ancient Israel. To this work God **appointed** (*made*, ποιήσας) him, as he appointed Moses to the founding of the old theocracy.[1] The author (as conjectured by Bleek, followed by Delitzsch) has probably in mind 1 Sam. 12:6, "The Lord that made (that is, *appointed*, ποιήσας) Moses and Aaron" (compare ver. 8), "sent (*forth*, ἀπέστειλε) Moses and Aaron." He then recurs to Num. 12:7, which was probably in his mind when he used the word 'faithful,' and which again may have suggested the passage from Samuel, and adds, **as also Moses** (*was faithful*) **in all his house.** Some interpreters put a comma after "Moses," and refer the words, "in all his house," to Christ, which the language of Numbers scarcely favors. It reads, "My servant Moses is not so, whom I have found faithful in all mine house." The citation, too, shows that the "his" refers not to Moses, but to God. The elliptical passage, then, institutes a comparison between Jesus and Moses, in their relation to the house or household over which God had respectively appointed them. The relation is, thus far, one of equality. Moses had been faithful in all God's house: so Jesus was faithful in all God's house. It is important to determine whether it is one house or two of which the author speaks, and in or over which Moses and Jesus were both faithful. Most interpreters, misled, I think, by the elliptical language, have confounded the two houses into one, to the serious darkening of the passage. The houses, it seems to me, were certainly two—Moses led out the people of God from the temporal, Christ from the spiritual, Egypt. Moses was God's ancient apostle to Israel, of temporal salvation; Christ his recent Apostle of spiritual salvation. Moses founded, by God's express appointment, the ancient household of Israel, with its laws, ritual, and ministry; Christ founded, by like divine appointment, the household of the spiritual

[1] The admissibleness of taking ποιεῖν, *make*, used absolutely, without a second accusative, as *appoint, constitute*, is questioned by many. They refer it, therefore, either to God's making, producing of the Son, in his eternal generation (as Bleek, Lünemann), or (as Athanasius, Ambrose, and Kurtz) to his human birth in his incarnation. Delitzsch applies it to a figurative creation, or constituting, on the stage of history. Many of the interpreters—taking it in the sense of appointing, establishing—have supplied a word (as ἀπόστολον, apostle) after ποιήσας. On the whole, I think we must leave it doubtful between 'making him, 'giving him his incarnate life,' and 'appointing' him.

3 For this *man* was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house.

3 For he hath been counted worthy of more glory than Moses, by so much as he that [1] built the house hath 4 more honour than the house. For every house is

1 Or, *established.*

Israel, with its laws, rites, and ministry. Each household thus founded by command of God was a house of God. Moses was faithful in all God's house, in or over which he was appointed; Christ, in like manner, in and over all God's New Testament house. I do not see how we can reasonably doubt that the reference is to two houses, and not to one; and that the comparison is between two divinely appointed earthly founders, each of his respective house. The name 'Jesus,' the words 'that appointed him,' the words 'whose house are we' (marking a new spiritual house), show the nature of the parallel. It is run between Moses and the incarnate Jesus; and any reference to the Eternal Logos, as founding "the church in the wilderness," in which Moses was a servant, is out of the question. Christ, as the Eternal Logos, was, doubtless, the God of Sinai and the Jewish Theocracy, as he was the Word of the Creation; but that is here out of the scope of the writer. He is considering not the Logos of the Old Testament, but the Jesus, the Incarnate Word of the New, and, in this relation, comparing him with Moses. In the first place, he is throughout bringing the New Dispensation alongside of the Old; Jesus, the Bringer of salvation alongside of the angels; Jesus, the New Testament High Priest, alongside of Aaron; and, therefore, assuredly Jesus, the Founder of the New Testament church, alongside of the Old Testament theocracy. To this points the name 'Jesus' that ushers in the comparison; to this the 'being faithful,' which can only refer to Jesus in his humiliation (his fidelity as pre-incarnate Logos could never come into question); to this the word *made* (ποιήσας, whether understood as *appointed* or *produced*), for of the *appointment* of the pre-existent Logos we have no trace; and, finally, to this, the house (ver. 6) which Jesus founded, a spiritual edifice of actual believers. In these two houses, they were alike faithful. Thus far the similarity and apparent equality; but afterward, the real difference, that Moses, though seemingly a head, was, in reality, but a servant, and Christ, though temporarily a servant, was, in reality, a Head, and sustained a like relation to Moses as does the head and founder to the household; which does not at all require that they be in the same household.

3. For—either explicative (as De Wette), or unfolding the last thought of the preceding verse, or better, perhaps, referring back to "consider" (ver. 1), and finding a ground for that—**this man** (*this personage*) **was** (*has been*) **counted worthy of more glory than Moses.** Not, as some, the glory which overspread the face of Moses when he descended from the mount, though we, perhaps, can scarcely avoid assuming a covert comparison between the glory which transfigured the face of Moses on Sinai, and the glory which wrapt the whole person of Jesus (in the presence of Moses) on Mount Hermon. It is safe, however, and amply sufficient, to refer it to the immeasurably higher exaltation in dignity and glory of the Founder of the New Covenant, advanced to supreme dominion, than was accorded to the founder of the Old. **Inasmuch** (*as much*) **as he who hath builded the house,** etc. (*By how much more honor than the house hath he that founded it*). From this it has been hastily concluded that Moses was the house, and Christ the Founder of the house of which Moses was the subordinate head; that Christ, therefore, appears as the Eternal Logos, and as such infinitely superior to Moses. But this mistakes the entire purpose of the author, who is comparing Moses and Jesus each in the earthly sphere in which God had placed him. In this sphere they first appear on an equality, each faithful in his allotted province. But the author now states, *in general terms*, the difference. Equal, apparently, there existed between them, in reality, the disparity which exists between a household and its founder and head. It by no means follows that they were in, or over, the same house; but that belonging to different houses, and sustaining the same, or a like, relation to each, at once of subordination and headship, there was, in reality, the utmost conceivable interval between them. How this could be is immediately stated.

4 For every house is builded by some *man;* but he
that built all things *is* God.
5 And Moses verily *was* faithful in all his house as a
servant, for a testimony of those things which were to
be spoken after;
6 But Christ as a son over his own house; whose

[1] builded by some one; but he who [1] built all things
5 is God. And Moses indeed was faithful in all [2] his
house as a servant, for a testimony of those things
6 which were afterward to be spoken; but Christ as a
son, over [2] his house; whose house are we, if we hold

1 Or, *established*.....2 That is, *God's house.* See Num. xii. 7.

4. For every house is builded (*established, founded*) **by some man** (*one*)**; but he that built** (*established*) **all things is God.** These statements remind the reader that both the New Testament and the Old Testament houses must have had an immediate, subordinate, apparent founder, as, respectively, Moses and Jesus; and one ultimate and Supreme Founder, to whom both were responsible, and toward whom fidelity could be predicated of them; namely, God. There is, then, in regard to both of the houses, a double founding—one instrumental and subordinate, the other absolute and supreme. So Moses established, instrumentally, the theocracy, the house of God, in the wilderness; but God established it supremely. So Jesus organized the New Testament theocracy, the more spiritual house of God, the church of believers; but this, again, is not *his* house—it is the house of God. God's prerogative of being the *Universal* Founder, is no more intermitted in the case of Jesus than of Moses. Almost uniformly in the New Testament, we read of the church, the house, the people, the sons—not of Christ, but of God. And to both the fidelity and the glory we have striking testimony, "I have finished the work *which thou gavest me to do;* and now, O Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." (John 17 : 4, 5.) And while it is thus shown how there could be in each case a twofold founder; how Moses and Jesus could be both at the head of their respective houses, and yet both be subordinate and both faithful; it also opens the way for affirming the above alleged inequality, in that one can be finally identified with God, the Absolute Founder, and the other *remains* a merely instrumental founder, and sinks, really, into the organization of which he is apparently the head. With this preparation, the author proceeds to draw out sharply the difference hinted at in ver. 3, and shown to be possible in ver. 4.

5, 6. And Moses verily (rather, *indeed*) **was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a Son over his own** (*his*) **house.** Each had founded a house subordinately, of which the Absolute Founder, and, therefore, the Supreme Possessor, was God. What, then, was the difference? It was one lying in the intrinsic nature of the two personages. The subordination of Moses to the Supreme Founder had been absolute, as well as apparent. Christ had founded his house in real subordination, but also in essential equality; Moses had organized the Old Testament theocracy both apparently and really as a servant. Christ had instituted the New Testament church apparently as a servant, but really as a Son. Moses, therefore, elevated as he was, chosen leader and head of ancient Israel, into whose allegiance they had undergone the profound baptism of the Red Sea, was, after all, but *in* the house of God, and *a part of it.* Christ, although sunk to the depths of humiliation, was, after all, *over* the house of God, and its real Head. Moses, apparent founder and head of the house, was but a part of the household; Christ, apparently a Servant of the servants, rises, as the Son of God into equality with the Founder, and becomes, in the last analysis, supreme, as well as subordinate, heavenly, as well as earthly, divine, as well as human, Builder of the New Testament house. He has as much higher honor than Moses as the Founder of the house has more honor than the house. The seeming paradox is explained by the double nature of the Wondrous Personage; he is at once Moses' equal and Moses' head, as he was David's Son and David's Lord. We have yet another point of contrast. Moses was in a carnal, typical house; Christ was over a living and spiritual one. Moses was faithful as 'a testimony of those things which should be spoken,' not (as, superficially, Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann) of the things to be spoken to him, the commands to be given him regarding the regulations of the Theocracy, but of the things which were to be spoken in a future time—the New Testament revelation by Christ. Thus Moses' position was merely

house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.

fast our boldness and the glorying of our hope firm

typical and preparatory—he had the shadow of which Christ brought the substance; he, like John, merely bore testimony to the great truths afterward to be uttered. The real house of God, adds the writer, **are we, if,** etc., Christian believers, the sons of God by a new and spiritual birth—these are the true house of God, living stones built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ as the chief corner stone, the whole a spiritual house, growing up into a holy temple in the Lord. So (with Ebrard and Delitzsch) I understand the two last clauses as setting over against each other the typical institutions of Moses and the spiritual church of Christ. The points of contrast, then, between Moses and Christ, are these: (1) Moses founded the house of God subordinately as a servant; Christ founded it supremely as a Son. (2) Moses was *in* it and a part of it; Christ was *over* it as its Lord. (3) Moses founded a typical house, and held a merely preparatory relation; Christ founded the true spiritual house of regenerate believers. He might have added a fourth—that Moses was imperfect in his obedience and fidelity; while Jesus, as a mere human messenger working out his Father's will, was absolute in perfection. But this the writer cared not to press. He was dealing not with the accidental, but the inherent and necessary differences between Christ and Moses; not those which depended on different degrees of fidelity, but those which no amount of fidelity in Moses could have obliterated. Moreover, while exhibiting the inferiority of Moses, he yet shows no disposition to disparage him. He deals with him tenderly and lovingly. He calls him not a *slave* (δοῦλος), or, *a household servant* (οἰκέτης), hereditary or purchased, but a *voluntary, willing attendant on another* (θεράπων). The elliptical clause, 'But Christ as a Son over his house,' is variously filled up. By some (Bleek, De Wette), 'But Christ (is faithful) as a Son over his house' (is faithful): but, as most clearly, 'his' refers to God—over God's house—this construction is inadmissible. Others construct: But Christ (is faithful) as a Son over his house; or, But Christ, as a Son (is faithful), over his house. Others (as Delitzsch, Moll), But Christ, as a Son, is *over* his house—the idea of fidelity at first suggested by his lowly position as an earthly Founder now giving place to that of *authority* as a Son in view of his higher nature. I see no ground of deciding positively between them. Either answers all the purposes of the argument.

Our explanation assumes that the house of God is not here spoken of as continuous, but as twofold. The New Testament people of God are certainly the people of God in historical continuity with the Old. The church of Mount Zion (12:22) is, in a limited sense, identical with the congregation at the foot of Mount Sinai; and the undeveloped institution of Judaism may be conceived as having blossomed forth into the full flower of Christianity; yet, in a truer and deeper sense, these households and people are widely different, and the difference was manifest when Judaism persecuted Christianity, and had to be broken up and swept out of the way before Christianity could triumph. Here it suits the author's purpose to bring out the difference; as before he contrasted the revelations made respectively through the Son and through angels, so now, the two households organized respectively by the Son and by Moses. **Whose house are we,** etc.—rather, *We are, if we maintain the boldness and the glorying*[1] *of our hope, firm unto the end.* 'Whose house'—that is, God's house, not Christ's. 'We' stands representatively here for all believers, yet intended to point his readers to their own special prerogative above their ancestors. *They,* he tells them, are that house—of course, part of that house—which this greater than Moses, this Son of God, founded and presides over—the true spiritual house in antithesis to the typical one founded by Moses, disciples of him of whom Moses was but a witness. But the writer adds a condition. New Testament believers are this spiritual house—'we,' as such, are part of it, on condition that we *prove* ourselves believers; that we establish our claim by maintaining our fidelity to the

[1] Παρρησία, *boldness, assurance, assured confidence;* καύχημα, *glorying, exultation*—not καύχησις, the *act,* but rather its result or object.

7 Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith, To day if ye will hear his voice,

7 unto the end. Wherefore, even as the Holy Spirit saith,
To-day if ye shall hear his voice,

end. The wavering condition of his readers prompts this sudden turn, while the language is suggested by the context. Ancient Israel showed itself not to be the true house of God; those who escaped from Egypt through Moses did not remain steadfast. The boldness and exultant hope with which they commenced their pilgrimage gave way; they became faint-hearted and cowardly, feared the giants in the land, and murmured against God until his patience was exhausted; and he sware, in his wrath, that they should not enter Canaan. See Numbers, ch. 14; Deuteronomy, ch. 1. It was precisely in connection with these faint-hearted terrors that God excluded his ancient people from their inheritance, and to this may be the present reference. The terms, of course, are raised to their higher spiritual meaning.

(2) *Solemn warning to the readers against repeating the rebellion of their fathers and excluding themselves from God's Sabbatic rest, as the rebels under Moses forfeited the rest of Canaan.* (7–19.)

7. This brief but decisive statement of the superiority of Christ to Moses is followed by a practical warning similar to that deduced from his superiority to the angels. The law revealed through them was held valid, and all disobedience and neglect sorely punished. How much more, neglect of the salvation revealed through Christ! So the people who had been baptized into allegiance to Moses, and organized by him into a household of God, a theocratic community, had, from their refusal to hearken to him, failed of the promised rest, and perished in the wilderness. How much more dangerous, disobedience to our greater Head, who is conducting us to the true rest of God! Such the substance; but the *form* of the exhortation is determined by a long and apposite quotation from the Psalms, which introduces some most pertinent thoughts, and is allowed to control the drift of the entire passage. **Wherefore.** With this we may suppose the writer was going on—as ch. 2 : 1 seq.—to admonish his readers of the terrible consequences of refusing to obey this greater than Moses; but the language of the Psalm occurs to him, and his warning conforms itself to it, including, however, all the substance of that thought. **As the Holy Ghost saith,** etc.—*according as saith the Holy Spirit, to-day, if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts.* The long citation (ver. 7-13) is from Ps. 95 : 7–11, in which the Psalmist of the time of David warns the Israelites against repeating the transgressions of their fathers in the wilderness. Of course, it is equally apposite to the purpose of our author, as applicable now as then. The first question is as to the mode of completing the construction. There have been suggested: (1) 'Wherefore, as saith the Holy Spirit, to-day . . . Take heed'—*See to it* (βλέπετε, ver. 12), the unswering clause to 'wherefore,' *according as* (διό, καθώς) being found in 'See to it' (βλέπετε). (2) 'Wherefore (as saith the Holy Spirit) to-day, if ye hear,' etc., 'harden not,' etc., the author thus adopting the Holy Spirit's, or the Psalmist's, exhortation as his own. (3) 'Wherefore (act, or be admonished), according as saith the Holy Spirit,' the sentence being completed by assuming and supplying an ellipsis at the outset. To neither of these constructions can I see any insuperable objection. The objection to the first, from the long *interval* between the 'according as' (καθώς) and the answering clause, 'See to it' (βλέπετε), has weight, doubtless, but is by no means decisive. A stronger objection, perhaps, is the use of 'according as' (καθώς) when we should expect 'as' (ὡς); and the abruptness of the whole construction makes it, on the whole, improbable. An objection to the second is that, as a large part of the quotation is the language of God himself, the author could hardly give it in his own name. To this we might reply that the author guards his language by introducing it with "as the Holy Spirit saith"; and, secondly, that he merely follows the changes of the Psalmist, who, beginning with an exhortation in his own name—"if ye hear his voice"—imperceptibly slides over to the language of Jehovah. To the third construction I know no valid objection, as the ellipsis is sufficiently in accordance with the usages of language, and especially of the flexible Greek; and between this and the second I see no decisive ground of choice. I incline to the third, under the belief that the language, 'as the Holy Spirit saith,'

8 Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness:
9 When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years.
10 Wherefore I was grieved with that generation, and

8 Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation,
Like as in the day of the trial in the wilderness,
9 [1] Where your fathers tried *me* by proving *me*,
And saw my works forty years.
10 Wherefore I was displeased with this generation,

1 Or, *Wherewith.*

indicates that what follows is a simple quotation, and, therefore, that the author's adoption of it must be previously understood. [The first construction is adopted by Calvin, Bleek, Lünemann; the second by Ebrard, Delitzsch; the third by Tholuck, De Wette.] 'To-day' is, with the Psalmist, probably put for the whole period which has followed upon the Mosaic Era, contemplated as another possible period of national salvation, but which our author refers specially to the time of New Testament deliverance. Indeed, the Psalm itself, under the inspiring Spirit, may have had a prophetic character; and, in its original import, as well as in its present application, have referred to the time of waiting and trial between the appearing of Christ for salvation, and his coming in vengeance to break up the Jewish polity, and destroy the nation. At all events, that 'to-day' now existed. The Jewish people, previously incorrigible, had now another chance to avert their threatened doom. 'If ye shall hear his voice' (literally, *shall have heard;* not, 'If ye *will* hear,' which totally changes the meaning, as in the Common Version). If his voice reaches your ears, and by clear implication brings you another promise, or proffer of rest and of salvation. This is evident from the following, 'harden not your hearts,' and is made still clearer by the subsequent deduction. The author finds in this (ver. 15; 4:7) a proof of a still remaining promise to enter into God's rest. The voice, then, is a voice of glad tidings and proffered salvation. It is a renewal, under a more spiritual import, of the glad promise made to ancient Israel, and assumed by the Psalmist as certain to be made, but which our author can assume to have been actually made. Christ has come and renewed to the people the proffer of the rest of God. (The Hebrew, however, expresses it as a wish, 'Might you hear his voice!' The quotation is from the Septuagint.)

8. Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness. In the original, we have, "As in Meribah (Num. 20:13), as in the day of Massah (Exod. 17:7) in the wilderness." Our author follows the Septuagint, taking the proper names in their etymological signification—'Meribah,' *embitterment, angering, provocation;* 'Massah,' *temptation*—and treats the words, 'in the day of temptation,' as fixing the time of the embitterment or provocation. He deviates in this from the Septuagint, as well as the original; but the deviation is unessential. 'Temptation' is here taken, actively, of tempting God.

9. When (properly, *Where*—in the wilderness) **your fathers tempted me, proved me** (or, *with proving*), **and saw my works**—*my miraculous works*, displays of power on their behalf, whether in bestowing mercies or in punishing their sins—(*during*) **forty years.** The author has transferred this clause from the following verb ("during forty years was I angry") to this connection, and placed after it the particle, *wherefore* (διό), making the divine anger come rather at the close of the forty years, than continue through it. He also reads '*this*' (ταύτῃ) for '*that*' (ἐκείνῃ); thus:

10. Wherefore I was grieved (*angry*) **with that** (*this*) **generation.** These changes can scarcely be without a purpose. They are probably intended to give the passage a more direct and explicit reference to his own day, and, apparently, to point to the forty years' interval between Christ's ascension and the destruction of Jerusalem, a period now, probably, just at its close. The original represents God as, during forty years, displaying his wrath toward the Israelites in the desert. It is more to the purpose of our author to point to the signal display of God's wrath impending at the close of this forty years' time of waiting. It is thus a solemn reminder to the Jews that their probation, and the time of the withholding of God's wrath, is nearly over. It is in remarkable confirmation of this view that the Talmud and the Rabbins also had —in connection with Psalm 95, and the forty years' sojourn of the Jews in the desert—assigned a period of forty years to the "days of the Messiah." The author has evidently

said, They do always err in *their* heart; and they have not known my ways.
11 So I sware in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest.
12 Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God.
13 But exhort one another daily, while it is called To

And said, They do alway err in their heart:
But they did not know my ways;
11 [1] As I sware in my wrath,
[2] They shall not enter into my rest.
12 Take heed, brethren, lest haply there shall be in any one of you an evil heart of unbelief, in falling
13 away from the living God: but exhort one another day by day, so long as it is called To-day; lest any

1 Or, *So*.....2 Gr. *If they shall enter.*

followed the synagogue in treating the forty years as typical. To sharpen the reference, he changes '*that* generation' into '*this* generation.' This warning could scarcely fall on unaffected minds. **And (I) said**—a formula implying at once the truth and the weight of the utterance—**They do always err** (*are always straying*) **in their heart.** Straying in *heart* is the fountain and essence of all disobedience. The Israelites began their murmurings against God and Moses early (Exod. 17), but constantly repeated them; proved themselves hard and intractable; and, finally, by their unbelief and cowardice, on the very border of the promised land provoked God to turn them back and destroy them. **And they,** etc.—or, *But they did not know my ways.* The Vatican text of the Septuagint reads, *And they* (καὶ αὐτοί), apparently a continuation of what God said; namely, 'And they did not know my ways.' The Alexandrian reading, 'But *they* knew not' (αὐτοὶ δέ) seems to imply this as a part of God's present utterance in regard to the conduct of ancient Israel.

11. So (*that*)[1] **I sware in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest.** The rest here spoken of is originally the earthly Canaan. It was God's rest ('my rest') in the sense of being bestowed on the people immediately by him. See Deut. 12: 9, 10: "For ye are not as yet come into the rest and the inheritance which the Lord your God giveth you; and ye shall cross the Jordan and shall dwell in the land which the Lord our God shall give you to inherit; and he shall give you rest from all your enemies round about, and ye shall dwell in security." (Septuagint.) For the solemn asseveration of God here referred to, see Num. 14: 23, seq.; Deut 1: 34, 35: "And the Lord heard the voice of your words, and was wroth, and sware, saying, Surely there shall not one of these men of this evil generation see that good land," etc.

12. Take heed (Βλέπετε, *look to it, beware*). The verb, standing with no introductory particle, is peculiarly energetic. It *may* also introduce the answering clause to 'wherefore, as' (ver. 7), but I deem it doubtful. **Brethren, lest** (*haply*) **there** (*shall*) **be in any one of you.** Emphasis on 'you,' as contrasted with the ancient unbelievers. The exhortation which the author has already given indirectly, in the words of the Holy Spirit, he now gives directly in his own. **An evil** (πονηρά, *depraved, malignant, intentionally wicked;* stronger than κακή, *bad*) **heart of unbelief.** An unbelieving heart, a heart whose quality and manifestation is *unbelief;* not unfaithfulness, nor disobedience, but that refusal to trust in God which is the parent of both. This unbelief was the great sin of the Israelites in the desert, and caused their apostasy from God. The language is probably suggested by the "always straying in *heart*" of ver. 10. **In departing from** (or, *in falling away,* ἀποστῆναι, *falling off, apostatizing*, not merely isolated acts of disobedience) **the living God.** God is here not the equivalent of Christ; but the Old Testament forms of conception are transferred to the New. God, Deity as such, is also in the New Testament regarded as the ultimate object of worship and source of authority. He sent his Son, he calls, regenerates by the Spirit, justifies, glorifies. 'The living God,' first perhaps as contrasted with *idols*, lifeless images, but subsequently evincing that he *lives* by working within us, by executing his threats, and fulfilling his promises.

13. But exhort one another daily (*day by day*). The language implies the danger in which the readers stood of apostasy; hence, their need of resorting to that powerful means of protection, mutual and *constantly repeated* exhortation. The power of the social element, and the power of *repeated* enforcement of duty are both clearly implied. **While**—that is, *so long as* (ἄχρις οὗ, *up to where*, up to the extreme

[1] Ὡς, literally *as*, but here probably, as corresponding to the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר equivalent to ὥστε, *so that.*

day; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin.
14 For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end;
15 While it is said, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation.

one of you be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin:
14 for we are become partakers [1]of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the
15 end: while it is said,
To-day if ye shall hear his voice,
Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation.

1 Or, *with*.

point of time in which) **it is called today.** Either, 'while the to-day of the Psalm is called, is named,' while that period lasts which in the Psalm is called 'to-day'; or, while the word 'to-day' is called—that is, uttered, resounds in our ears. The meaning does not vary materially. The 'to-day' of the Psalmist is clearly here applied, not to our individual life, but to the present expectant time before the return of the Messiah, when the final doom of all will be sealed. This 'to-day' had urgent force to the Jews just before the impending judgments. Christ's typical Second Coming broke over their nation as a day of doom, crushing and annihilating their Theocracy; but it survives that crisis and retains undiminished force till the real Second Coming shall settle all destinies forever. **Lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin**—*in order that from you there be none.* 'You' is emphatic, but not as contrasted with the 'fathers' (which would require 'also' (καί), but with reference to their highly favored condition, encompassed by the light and promises of the gospel. (Delitzsch, Moll.) Sin is properly, in its essence, unbelief and apostasy. It is falling away in heart from God. So the author in this Epistle generally conceives it, not in its outward form of 'transgression of the law,' but its inward essence of distrust and abandonment of God. So sin in Eden deceived our first parents and seduced them from God. That deceit which produced the first great apostasy is probably here referred to. But sin always works essentially as it worked first. It deceives and seduces. In the Epistle to the Romans the Apostle is dealing with the theoretical question of justification from the penalty of the law; and sin is a transgression of the law. Here the writer is dealing practically with those who are in danger of apostatizing from God, and sin is apostasy in heart from God.

14. For we are made (or, *have become*). The perfect present tense elegantly and forcibly assumes the result as an accomplished and existing fact. **Partakers of Christ.** The stress of the idea lies, as shown by its position in the best MSS., on 'partakers'; implying that whatever our professions and *hopes*, we have become 'partakers of Christ,' actual sharers of his salvation and kingdom, **if**—*provided that*, and only provided that (ἐάνπερ, *precisely if*, an emphatic form of the conditional particle; see 6:3)—**we hold fast** (*maintain*) **the beginning of our confidence**; that is, our original confidence, the joyful confidence with which we commenced our Christian profession. Such joyful confidence these Christians had originally shown. (6:10; 10:34, 35.) 'The beginning of our confidence,' then, here denotes not imperfection (as Ebrard), much less the 'principle, or foundation of confidence,' namely, faith, nor the 'first foundation of religion.'[1] **Steadfast** (*firm*) **unto the end.** This phrase, probably spurious at ver. 6, is genuine here. It makes a rhetorical antithesis to 'beginning' (ἀρχήν). The 'confidence' with which we *began* must be carried through to the *end*. The whole verse is elegantly and emphatically terse; we have become *participants* of Christ, provided that the beginning of our confidence we maintain steadfast until the end.

15, 16. While it is said, etc., or, *In its being said, To-day if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation. For who, when they heard, did provoke?* The connection of ver. 15 has occasioned much perplexity, and I think has not been satisfactorily settled. Some, putting ver. 14 in parenthesis, have attached it to ver. 13, connecting, however, the words 'In its being said' only with the clause, 'To-day if ye shall hear his voice,' and making the rest a continuance of the writer's exhortation. The utter harshness of this construction renders refutation unnecessary. It could be accepted but as a desperate resort, when all others had

[1] It seems impossible to doubt that ὑπόστασις has in Hellenistic Greek the not unnatural meaning of 'confidence,' and such is its most natural rendering here.

failed. Others construct the verse with that immediately preceding, as epexegetical either of 'unto the end,' or of the conditional clause, 'provided that we hold,' etc. This, too, needs but to be examined to be rejected. The best recent interpretations (as Lünemann, De Wette, Delitzsch, Moll, Kurtz) construct it, by an elliptical usage, not unfamiliar to the Greek language, with the clause immediately following. They render nearly thus: 'In its being said, To-day if ye hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, Why, who, when they heard, provoked him? In its being said thus—who now, who I pray, on hearing, provoked him?' Of the constructions thus far given, this alone can claim a favorable consideration. Its abrupt use of the *for* (γάρ) is a violence which, in many cases, the Greek language rather loves than shrinks from, and it succeeds in reducing to tolerable order a sentence which in either of the preceding constructions admits neither defense nor explanation. But even so constructed, it is harsh and unnatural. It is hard to see why the author should have re-introduced the long quotation for the purpose of commenting on the word 'provocation,' and if he did, why he should introduce the commenting clause in so abrupt and harsh a way, which transcends the ordinary limits of Greek prose and stretches the license of the language beyond anything elsewhere exhibited in this Epistle. The question, "For who, on hearing, provoked him?" *looks* very much like an after thought, as if it sprang up in the mind of the writer, suggested by the previous word 'provocation'; and it is not difficult to suppose that such is really its origin, and that it led him away for the moment from the thought with which he had commenced. Such is, on the whole, my own decided conviction. I follow the Greek interpreters, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Œcumenius, in regarding it as an unfinished construction, in which the thought, temporarily suspended, is subsequently resumed, though in a somewhat different form. Taking it as a broken construction, there are two ways in which we may fill out the ellipsis. We may suppose that the writer, having finished one form of his exhortation, was going to make a *deduction* from the words, 'To-day if ye shall hear his voice,' etc.; namely, that in its being so said, we discover that the promise of the rest of God was not exhausted upon the ancient Israelites, but that the later promise, and in a still more spiritual form, remains open to us—a thought which lies, of course, in the words, and which he proceeds in the next chapter to develop, employing there our passage as his decisive and crowning proof: or we may take Chrysostom's explanation that it is a *hyperbaton*, or reversal of the natural order; that the immediate form of the conception was hortatory, and that the thought is virtually renewed in the 'Let us fear, therefore,' of chapter 4: 1. In this case the thought is a continuation of the preceding exhortation, though the author no doubt intended to introduce the additional topic of the promised rest remaining open to us; and the conception in his mind might be: 'In its being said, To-day if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation, let us fear, lest, there remaining a promise of entering into his rest,' etc. This would be a most natural inference from the quotation, and a natural continuation of the preceding passage. And with this thought in his mind, nothing could be more natural than to pause abruptly at the word provocation, and enforce the 'Let us fear' which was in his *mind* by calling to mind *who* they were who failed of the ancient rest, and why they failed of it. This, in fact, makes the interposed verses 16–19 most strikingly and cogently appropriate, while at the same time the long break in the sentence naturally leads the writer to return to the suspended thought with *therefore* (οὖν), and thus leave our verse strictly unfinished. Let the reader look carefully at the entire passage. Suppose the author were about to say, 'In its being said, To day, if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation, let us recognize the promise which is left to us also of entering into his rest, and the danger of our failing of it,' how natural that when he reached the word which reminded him of the provocation given by ancient Israel, and of the unbelief and rebellion by which *they* forfeited the promised rest, he should pause to dwell upon it in enforcement of his exhortation (especially as it was the natural train of thought which would come in after the parallel drawn between Moses and Christ, and which had not before been explicity referred to), and then resume precisely as he does at chapter 4: 1: "Let us fear, there-

16 For some, when they had heard, did provoke: howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses.
17 But with whom was he grieved forty years? *was it* not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness?
18 And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not?

16 For who, when they heard, did provoke? nay, did
17 not all they who came out of Egypt by Moses? And with whom was he displeased forty years? was it not with them that sinned, whose [1]carcases fell in the
18 wilderness? And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that were

1 Gr. *limbs*.

fore, lest, there still remaining a promise," etc. That Chrysostom is in the main right, therefore, in his explanation, I cannot doubt; although I deem it questionable whether the form of expression, 'Let us fear, therefore,' was not suggested by the terrible examples just previously given, and whether the thought to be supplied was not of a more general character. 'In its being said,' etc., let us recognize the fact of a promise still remaining to us, and the danger of our forfeiting it, as did the ancient Israelites. Nor is the break in the construction unusually harsh or violent. It seems to me extremely natural, and the fact that Chrysostom and his fellow Grecians assume it without hesitation or difficulty, though not decisive, is strongly in its favor.

16. For some (or, *For who*), **when they had heard, did provoke** (*him*). The 'heard' and 'did provoke' are both suggested by the words of the quotation. The question is put to call to the minds of the readers the number and character of those who anciently forfeited the rest of Canaan and perished under the wrath of God.[1] **Howbeit not all,** etc. (rather, *Nay, did not all those who came out of Egypt through Moses?*) Each part of this sentence enhances the emphasis of the whole. Was it not those who 'came out from Egypt,' whom God had so highly favored by interposing in their behalf, and rescuing them from bondage? Was it not those who came out '*through Moses*,' the great leader, lawgiver, prophet, and earthly head of the Jewish theocracy, whom this distinguished servant of God had led forth? And was it not the *whole* of them? Did not the entire body commit the sin and reap the punishment? From the fate of a whole community, who had thus heard the delivering and promising voice of God, and been redeemed by his most eminent servant, his readers might well take warning. The two or three individual exceptions (as Caleb and Joshua) to the general crime and fate of the people, do not affect the substantial accuracy of the statement.

17. But with whom (or, *And with whom*) **was he grieved** (*angry*) **forty years?** The author here returns to the Septuagint construction of the 'forty years,' connecting them with the verb 'to be angry.' This shows that the change made above, though not strictly accidental, nor, probably, without a definite purpose, was yet not at all vital to his object in making the quotation. Having before drawn attention to the character of the persons who formerly incurred the divine displeasure and forfeited the promise, he now, with equal pertinence, points to the *means* by which they did it. **Was it not with them that had sinned?** Not, 'with them that are from time to time sinning,' or violating God's law. Their sin is here conceived as one collective sin (aorist participle, ἁμαρτήσασιν); namely, falling away from God, precisely that which his readers are now in imminent danger of committing. **Whose carcasses fell in the wilderness.** This clause many editors include in the previous interrogations; but they certainly are in error. It is no proper reply to the question, With whom was he angry? He was angry with them that *sinned*. And this is a natural and forcible addition to remind them of the consequences of that sin and that wrath. The 'whose' may be rendered by 'and their': 'and their carcasses[2] fell in the wilderness'; according to the threat in Num. 14 : 32. 'Fell,' by a usage equally common—of the Greek word (πιπτω), and the English, *fall—were overthrown, prostrated, destroyed.*

18. And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? 'Believed not'—more exactly, *disobeyed;* but as we thus lose the correspondence of words — the Greek 'disobedience' and 'unbelief' (ἀπείθειαν and

[1] We need write no words in defending the τίνες and τισιν, *who* and *to whom* of the critical editions, instead of τινές and τισίν, *some* and *to some*, of the Textus Receptus.
[2] Κῶλα, *members, limbs, carcasses.*

19 So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief.

19 disobedient? And we see that they were not able to enter in because of unbelief.

CHAPTER IV.

LET us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left *us* of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it.

1 Let us fear therefore, lest haply, a promise being left of entering into his rest, any one of you should
2 seem to have come short of it. For indeed we have

ἀπιστίαν) having a near etymological and phonetic relation—we, perhaps, lose more in the antithesis of ver. 18 and 19, by retaining 'disobeying,' than we gain in exactness of meaning. In the author's conception, as also in fact, 'disobedience' is but just the natural expression of unbelief. Had the sentence corresponded in form to the preceding as it does in thought, it would have run thus: And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest? Was it not to them that (disobeyed) believed not? This question advances on the preceding both in definiteness and pungency. The former declared God's *wrath* for *sin* in its most general statement; this declares the effect of that wrath in exclusion from his rest, and the sin in its principle, a 'heart of *unbelief*.' The author is bringing round the thought in his characteristic manner to the topic in his mind (as, I believe) at ver. 15, and to be formally taken up in chapter 4.

19. So we see (better, *And we behold*) **that they could not enter in because of unbelief.** There is here no Q. E. D. from a preceding argument, as held by Ebrard, with many interpreters, and implied by the erroneous 'so' of the Common Version. It simply (Delitzsch) has reference to the immediately preceding quotation and its answer, and is an emphatic statement, by a reference to what we *behold*, what is presented to our view on the page of history, of the consequences of that unbelief, in the oath of exclusion to which it led. The 'and we behold' is not logical, as concluding a train of reasoning, but simply refers us to the Old Testament record as *showing* that the awful oath of exclusion was carried into effect. It thus stands related to ver. 18 just as the last clause of ver. 17 stands related to the preceding clause. They stand in substantial parallelism thus:

And with whom was he angry during forty years?
Was it not with them that sinned?
And their carcasses fell in the wilderness!

And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest?
Was it not to them that believed not?
And we *see* that they were unable to enter in because of unbelief!

The idea that this last verse is, in some indefinable way, the winding up of a chain of reasoning, has confused many interpreters. As above analyzed (Delitzsch and Moll), it becomes perfectly clear. This passage, which has thus tersely set forth the prerogatives, the sin, and the fate of the ancient people of God, leads also, naturally, to the warning, "Let us, therefore, fear," with which the next chapter opens, and the discussion of the topic of the promised rest, forfeited by ancient Israel, being still open to the people of God, as implied in the language of the Psalmist.

Ch. 4. (3) *The rest of God forfeited by ancient Israel still open under its higher form, as God's Sabbatic rest, to the spiritual Israel.* (1–10.)

1. With the fact of the awful stumbling and fall of ancient Israel still fresh in his mind, the author commences the present chapter with an exhortation which, while it introduces a new topic, links itself closely with the preceding. The new thought is: "There is still *remaining* (while there still remaineth) a promise of entering into his rest"; the exhortation is: **Let us therefore fear** (in view of this terrible fall of Israel under Moses) **lest any of you should seem to come short of it** (or, *may seem to have come short of it*). We must bear in mind that the fact of the remaining of this promise of rest to us is here momentarily assumed. It does not follow from anything which has been previously said, except by an implication, which the author subsequently develops. It is in no way a direct inference from the unbelief and overthrow of Israel in the desert. To reason from the failure of ancient Israel

to obtain the promised rest to the continuance or transfer of that promise to a later age, is, as Delitzsch justly observes, a piece of inconsequence which we are not to charge upon our author. He does not so reason in the slightest degree. He argues it simply and exclusively from the Psalm, which he has already cited, and in which citation he finds this continued or repeated promise clearly implied. And an analysis of the passage shows how just is his conclusion, and how singularly pertinent, therefore, was the Psalm to the purpose for which he quoted it. 'To-day if ye shall hear his voice' points to a probability, or, rather, a certainty, that the Israelites of this later period *would* hear (or, *did* hear) the voice of God coming to them with the renewal of the ancient promise of rest, the like joyful message with that which came to their fathers. The warning to them against hardening their hearts after the example of their fathers, and the reminding them of the terrible penalty which their father's unbelief incurred — namely, a forfeiture of the rest of God—have no pertinence, except on the assumption that a like joyful message and promise of rest has come, or is to come, to them, and which they are in danger of forfeiting by a like unbelief. On this passage, and, for the present discussion, on *nothing else*, the author founds his assertion that a promise of rest still awaits the people of God. The 'to-day' of the Psalmist he conceives, of course, as extending indefinitely down to the next great catastrophe in Jewish history, if not as being, what it very possibly was, a direct prophecy of the proffer of spiritual rest to be made to the people by the Messiah. In this interpretation he is fully warranted. The passage cannot mean anything less, nor anything else. It requires no rabbinical subtilizing, and no ingenious or verbal sophistry. There stands out, as clearly involved in it as if it were stated in the fullest and most express terms, that the once forfeited promise of entering into God's rest stands over, or is repeated to a later age. But another thing the author assumes, and *can but assume:* In view of the fact that the people to whom this promise of rest first came disobeyed and perished, *the whole of them*, that they were not the true people of God; and in view of the fact that this promise is now repeated centuries after the Jews entered Canaan, that the real rest of the promise was a higher rest, of which the rest of Canaan was but typical. He is justified, therefore, in looking farther, and inquiring what *is* the true rest which was indicated by that pregnant and mighty phrase, the rest of God. Yet all this is but inferential from the one central, decisive passage. He plants himself on his interpretation of the Spirit's language of the Old Testament. Finding it affirmed that a promise of entering into the rest of God is renewed to later Israel, he thence simply looks back and inquires what light this sheds upon the nature of the rest of Canaan, and looks around to see what must be the rest which, at this late stage, is offered to the people of God. He finds but one explanation. He links it with the Sabbath rest of God at the close of the Creation, and into which the institution of the Sabbath for man shows that it was God's purpose that man should enter. The following verses now proceed straight forward, very elliptically and tersely, but with undeniable justice and force, to develop this line of thought. He is not, however, in ver. 1-7, going through the several steps of an argumentation to *prove* the point that there remains a rest. Planting himself on his *interpretation* of the Scriptures, he is simply developing the *inferences* from that statement, and especially the grand inference as to the spiritual and Sabbatic nature of this promised rest. 'Let us therefore fear.' This certainly is not, strictly and *in form*, the answering and continuing clause of the seemingly (and, I believe, really) unfinished 3 : 15, 'In its being said,' etc., all between being strictly parenthetical. But that the author does really proceed to develop the thought which he then had in mind, and from which he abruptly turned aside—namely, what was really implied, both of fact and of warning, in that language—I see no good reason for doubting. He approaches it, however, in a different manner, with the emphatic 'Let us therefore fear' caught from the awful examples of unbelief which he has just cited. The *then, therefore* (οὖν) reasons from those examples to our need of fear; not from their having forfeited a promise to its transfer to us. **Lest a promise being left us** (or, *there still remaining a promise*) **of entering into his rest.** Emphasis on the 'remaining,' as shown by its position, as well as the connec-

2 For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard *it*.
3 For we which have believed do enter into rest, as

had [1] good tidings preached unto us, even as also they: but the word of hearing did not profit them, because [2] it was not united by faith with them that
3 heard. [3] For we who have believed do enter into that rest; even as he hath said,

1 Or, *a gospel*.....2 Many ancient authorities read *they were*.....3 Some authorities read *We therefore*.

tion.[1] The burden of the thought now to be illustrated—namely, that the promise of entering into God's rest was not exhausted upon ancient Israel, but renewed, and remains, in a heightened form, to the Christian Israel—is contained in this clause. 'Any one of you may seem to have come short of it.' 'Of you' (ἐξ ὑμῶν, *from you*) is clearly emphatic. We may observe, too, the significant change of person, from the first person plural of the hortatory, 'Let us fear.' There the author puts himself into the category of his hearers to win their favorable hearing. But his *solicitude* is, after all, not for himself, but for them. Not *he*, but *they*, are in danger of apostasy; and the close of the sentence forgets, in its earnestness, the rhetorical modesty of the opening, and converges the whole force of the appeal upon those for whom it was properly intended. 'May seem' (δοκῇ), a word which *may* be taken as giving emphasis to the meaning, 'lest any of you may—not only not have come short, but may *seem* to have come short.' (Delitzsch.) This, however, would almost require an accompanying *even* (καί), 'may even *seem*'; and I prefer to regard it rather as softening the force of the expression. As if the writer could not bear to conceive of their having come actually short, he connects with it an unemphatic 'may seem' (δοκῇ), may be accounted, to have come short—a use of the verb not unfamiliar to classical Greek, which often puts the words "to seem," instead of "to be," the *seeming*, or *being accounted*, for the *being*. 'To have come short,' with reference, probably, to the Jews under Moses having *fallen short* of entering the promised land. Ebrard's construction of the passage (following Wahl, Bretschneider), "may think that he has arrived too late," though grammatically possible, has no other recommendation. It is inconsistent with the emphatic 'Let us fear,' which should rather have run, 'Let not any of us fear that we have arrived too late, that there is not still a promise for us,' which would have made a not inappropriate sense, though not the one required here.

2. This verse states categorically what ver. 1 had stated informally and indirectly. **For unto us was the gospel preached,** etc. It may be rendered, *For we have had the glad message, the promise of a rest, just as did also they.* The emphasis lies not on the 'us' (or *we*), but on the verb *have had*, as against a possible denial of the fact. **But the word preached** (*the word of their hearing*) **did not profit them**—'them' with emphasis, the clause being added half incidentally, but important as recalling the fact stated above and renewing to the readers the warning drawn from the failure of ancient Israel to profit by the promise, and finding in that failure a ground for the promise's renewal. Had it *fulfilled* itself in them, there could have been no room for its repetition. **Not being mixed with faith in them** (*not having mixed itself by faith with them*) **that heard it.**[2] It was merely a word of hearing (referring to the "to-day, if ye hear" above); it did not penetrate their hearts; receiving it with the *ear*, they were rebellious and forfeited it. (De Wette explains: "For the good of them them that heard it"; others, "in respect to.")

3. For we which have believed do enter into rest—that is, we enter, or are entering, into rest, as those who have believed. 'Receiving the glad tidings' is now 'entering into rest,' on which lies the primary emphasis, reaffirming our having received renewedly the promise, while a secondary emphasis lies on the *believing*, as contrasted with the unbelief

[1] Καταλείπειν, *To leave down*, to leave still remaining, and, as it were, firm. Not, 'the promise being relinquished, abandoned' (as many), which, besides being less in accordance with the context, would much more naturally take the active, instead of the passive participle, and the article with ἐπαγγελίαν (καταλείψας, or, καταλείψαντες τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν).

[2] A better *externally* attested reading, which makes the participle agree with "them" (συγκεκραμένους), makes no tolerable sense; "not having united themselves by faith with them (that is, Caleb and Joshua) that heard"; that is, *obeyed*, taking ἀκούειν here as equivalent to ὑπακούειν. But the change is violent and improbable.

he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world.

1 As I sware in my wrath,
2 They shall not enter into my rest:
although the works were finished from the founda-

1 Or, *So*.....2 Gr. *If they shall enter.*

which excluded the ancient recipients of the promise. Many interpreters rest the main emphasis on the believing, but I think that still the author's main scope is the fact of the promise being renewed to the later Israel. The 'we who have believed' marks also not *individual* faith, or the actuality of its possession; but *faith*, as the condition of our entering into rest, as against the faithlessness which excluded the original receivers of the promise. The present verb 'we enter' (εἰσερχόμεθα) may be taken in its generality, as the successive heirs of the New Testament promise, or as denoting the now incompleted act; like the Israelites in the wilderness, we are moving on toward our spiritual Canaan. (*According*) **as he** (*hath*) **said, As I have sworn** (*so that I sware*) **in my wrath, if they shall** (*they shall not*) **enter into my rest.** Quoted from the above warning to the later Israel not to repeat the disastrous unbelief of their fathers; but quoted specially for the verbal correspondence of its phrase 'enter into my rest' with the 'entering into rest' just affirmed of New Testament believers, and to lead the way to a statement of the nature of this rest, called significantly 'my'—that is, God's—'rest.' In the original declaration the 'my' is *objective*, the rest which God *bestows* (Canaan); here it is *subjective*, the rest which God *enjoys*, and into which he admits his people. This is shown by the immediately following explanation. **Although the** (*his*) **works were** (*had been*) **finished from the foundation of the world,** and thus the rest established into which God could admit his creatures. The author's procedure is justified by the Psalm from which he quotes. This proffers an entrance into the rest of God to the later Israel centuries after the elder Israel had entered Canaan. What, then, could be this rest of God again proffered them, and which they are so solemnly warned against forfeiting? The problem is a legitimate one. He is not *asserting* that the ancient Canaan was not the true rest, and then looking round for another meaning to the expression. He simply *infers* from this rest of God being offered to the Jews centuries after the Jews entered Canaan, that Canaan *could not have been the true rest*, and inquires what was so; what that typical rest prefigured. He turns back to the rest into which God entered at the creation, and this, as is shown by his instituting the Sabbath, and blessing and hallowing the day, not for himself, but for humanity. The Sabbath was made for man, and it might well be believed that when the work of redemption should be accomplished, the rest of God, of which it was now a blessed reminder, should fulfill its original purpose, and be a spiritual Sabbath for a regenerated world. With the Fall, along with the curse of death, came the curse of toil—the sweat of the brow and the unrest of the soul; and through the lips of the parents of Noah humanity uttered its longing for deliverance, "this same shall comfort us concerning (Septuagint, διαπαύσει, *shall bring us to rest from*) our work and the toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed." Meantime God had entered into his rest, not for himself (for in truth as for God there can be properly no work, so for him there can be no rest; as he can never more than exercise his omnipotence, so he can never less than exercise it), but for man. He had given to man the Sabbath, as a token of his beneficent purpose, and impressed the belief that ultimately, when the curse of death (of which the Messiah was to be the destruction) should be removed, the penalty of toil and spiritual unrest would be removed also. Of that bondage of the race, the bondage of Israel in Egypt was a type; of its deliverance, that deliverance; of Jesus, its Deliverer, Moses and Joshua, the one inaugurating, the other completing, the deliverances, were types; of that rest Canaan itself, with its milk and honey (both obtained largely without labor) was a type. Yet *but* a type, earthly, physical, temporary, for a single people. What is needed is a rest for the spirit, for mankind, forever; the rest of God, the Sabbatism of the race. It was no violence to find this Sabbatic rest under the type of Canaan; to transform the partial, earthly, transient, troubled rest of Canaan into the universal, spiritual, everlasting, perfect rest of the Messiah's kingdom, into which the great Antitype of both Moses

4 For he spake in a certain place of the seventh *day* on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works.
5 And in this *place* again, If they shall enter into my rest.

4 tion of the world. For he hath said somewhere of the seventh *day* on this wise, And God rested on the
5 seventh day from all his works; and in this *place* again,
[1] They shall not enter into my rest.

1 Gr. *If they shall enter.*

and Joshua shall ultimately lead his people. And in this view most significant is the change of the Sabbath from the day of the finished work of creation to the day of the finished work of redemption. It implies that the true Sabbatism of the race would be realized in Jesus. The author is justified, therefore,—taking for granted that the rest described is not the rest of Canaan,—in referring it back in his pregnantly elliptical language to the Sabbatic rest of God. I say elliptical, because it is equivalent to his works being finished *at*, and then his rest continuing *from*, the foundation of the world. The precise dependence of the participle in the original (γενηθέντων), translated 'were finished,' is doubtful; whether (with Kuinoel) on "hath said" (εἴρηκεν): thus, "he hath said," etc., "although his works had been finished"; and thus he could speak of a rest; or on "they shall not enter into" (εἰσελεύσονται), implying that there was a rest from which he could speak of excluding them. But it is more in accordance with the context, I think, to regard it as epexegetical of the immediately preceding phrase, and added to intimate what kind of a rest it implies;[1] that it points back really to the Sabbath rest of God. The author here commences to define, in the light of the subsequent *repetition* of the promise, the true import of that promise, which to ancient Israel was veiled under its more carnal and earthly guise, but which, with advancing time, reveals its spiritual character. That which remains, he decides, must be the promise of entering into the Sabbath rest of God. To make this more clear he adds:

4, 5. For (in confirmation of my statement that God's rest was established in the completion of his works at the foundation of the world) **he spake in a certain place,** etc., or, *hath said somewhere.* 'Somewhere' does not imply ignorance of the locality of the passage, but is simply rhetorical. **Of** (*concerning*) **the seventh day** (*the Sabbath*, the day of Sabbatic rest) **on this wise. And God did rest the seventh day from all his works.** While the passage is quoted for its general sentiment, its special emphasis is on *rested* (κατέπαυσεν), bringing it into verbal, as well as real connection, with his doctrine of the Sabbatic rest. **And in this place again, If they shall enter** (*they shall not enter*) **into my rest.** The previous verse has shown when and how God established his rest; the present renewed quotation reminds us that the rest *exists*, and by declaring the *exclusion* of some, clearly implies that it was originally *designed* to be entered by his creatures; the negative declaration, 'they shall not enter,' having no force unless on the assumption of its being under the proper conditions accessible to mortals.

6. The author now proceeds to his conclusions. Let us review the elements with which he has to deal: (1) From history he knows that ancient Israel had a promise of entering into the land of Canaan—the rest of God, as bestowed by God. (2) By disobedience they forfeited the promise, and came short of it—God, in his wrath, excluding them from it. (3) The quoted Psalm shows that the promise is renewed at a later date, about four hundred years after, in the time of David—"To-day, if ye shall hear his voice"—clearly implying that they will, or have heard it—the voice of the renewed proffer of God's rest. (4) But this renewed proffer goes over the head of the fact that though Israel under Moses did not enter the promised land, their descendants *did*; the promise was, to *them*, literally fulfilled. And yet, notwithstanding this, the voice of the promise sounded on all the same, showing that as the people under Moses had shown themselves not to be God's true people, so the rest of Canaan had been shown not to be the true rest. The congregation in the wilderness, with its elaborate organization, had proved itself to be but a typical church—the rest of Canaan had been proved to be but a typical rest. (5) By a deduction which the

[1] The somewhat vague particle καίτοι, with which the passage opens, is commonly nearly equivalent to *although*; and to this meaning here there is no objection. I think, however, it may mean, "and you see," "and in sooth," not being so much adversative as continuative.

6 Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief:

6 Seeing therefore it remaineth that some should enter thereinto, and they to whom [1] the good tidings were before preached failed to enter in because of diso-

1 Or, *the gospel was.*

whole Sabbath history justifies (and which I believe to be the Spirit of God's comment on his own word), the promised rest of God thus disengages itself from the land of Canaan, and links itself with the Sabbath rest into which God entered, and which he instituted for his creatures, from the foundation of the world. **Seeing** (or, *since*) **therefore it remaineth.** The Greek word here is not equivalent in sense to the same word in ver. 1, translated 'remaineth,' *is left behind, not taken away.* Here it means, *is left open, stands in reserve*, as a thing attainable. **That some must** (rather, *should*, or, *may*) **enter therein.** All that is needful to establish is that the rest *exists* and is *accessible;* there is no need to prove that it *must* be entered. **And they to whom,** etc.—or, *They who formerly received the glad message, did not enter in because of disobedience.* These are the conditions under which the proffer and promise could be renewed. But we may inquire, How was the overthrow of Israel in the desert a condition of its renewal? If the entrance of the next generation into the promised land did not stand in the way of its renewal, how could the disobedience and fall of the fathers be in any way a condition of that renewal? To this I answer, first, that we are not, unduly, to press the condition. The author has not in mind any intrinsic and absolute connection between the two facts, but one existing in the actual ordering of Providence. Although there was no absolute necessity, God made the final falling away of the Jews, and their breaking up as a people, the condition of the reception of the Gentiles, so that their overthrow was the riches of the Gentiles, and their stumbling the riches of the world. So, in his sovereign pleasure, God permitted the overthrow of the congregation in the wilderness, and conditioned, *in some sort*, upon their rejection of the promise, its renewal in a later age. But how "in some sort"? I answer, secondly, that the Jews who came out of Egypt stood in much the same relation to the Jewish people, that the Jewish nation, as a whole, did to the Gentiles. They were, in a peculiar and pre-eminent sense, the representative people of God; they left Egypt, the house of their bondage, under Moses, the great type of the Great Spiritual Deliverer; they knew, in a pre-eminent degree, what it was to bear the yoke of oppression; and to them came, with special emphasis, the promise of rest from toil. A few months' direct journeying across the desert would have brought them from the "house of bondage" to the home of freedom and of joy. Again, the Jews who came out of Egypt were the first organized people of God. For them was raised up Moses—the great deliverer, lawgiver, prophet, intercessor—who stood face to face with God, and offered himself as a sacrifice for the nation. To them was given the law from Mount Sinai; to them came the ordinances of the Theocracy. When, therefore, that whole body perished in the wilderness, together with their leader, Moses; when not a man of those who came out of Egypt under Moses, save Caleb and Joshua (and this is the significance of the "all," 3 : 16), survived to enter Canaan, the fact was of weightiest import. It proved that the congregation in the wilderness was not the genuine people of God, and the coming short, even of Moses, showed him to be not the true spiritual leader. And we cannot fail to remark that in allowing both the people who came out of Egypt, and their great leader, all alike to come short of the promised land, God *intended* to mark, signally, their merely typical character, and thus justified the use made of it by our author, apart, even, from the express warrant which he finds for it in the Psalm. Once more. We find a warrant for regarding the failure of ancient Israel to enter into the rest of God, as opening the way for a later renewal of the promise, in the general development of God's plans and purposes through successive stages and ages of the world's history. The promised rest of the people of God is not in the writer's conception, or that of the New Testament generally, *heaven*, as an existing place of rest for each soul as it leaves its fleshly tenement. It is a *period*, an age, farther down the track of the ages; a state into which humanity, or the

7 Again, he limiteth a certain day, saying in David, To day, after so long a time; as it is said, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.
8 For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day.

7 bedience, he again defineth a certain day, To-day, saying in David, so long a time afterward (even as hath been said before),
To-day if ye shall hear his voice,
Harden not your hearts.
8 For if [1] Joshua had given them rest, he would not

1 Gr. *Jesus.*

destined people of God, are yet to enter. On the relation of each departing individual soul to this coming state, the sacred writers bestowed comparatively little attention. The grand object of their view is not the unseen heavenly world in distinction from the earthly, but the coming age, with its glory, in distinction from the present. To the Jew, that coming age was the age of the Messiah. To the Christian, for whom the Messiah had come, and was to come again, the coming age (already present, from the Old Testament point of view) linked itself with that second appearing, when was to be realized to the church the Sabbath rest of God. Regarded as an epoch, a stage in which humanity reached its final goal, the promises must not have been earlier fulfilled and exhausted. Slow but sure is God's march down the ages.

7. Again, he limiteth (*He again fixeth*) **a certain day, saying in David**—that is, not in the Book of Psalms regarded as collectively by David (nor, analagously, to "in Elijah" (Rom. 11:2), designating a part of the Scripture treating of Elijah), but *in*, for *by*, David personally; and this the more probably, as the Septuagint attributes this Psalm to David—**after so long a time**—that is, so long a time after the early promise and its forfeiture (it belongs to 'saying'). **To day as it is** (*hath been*) **said, To day, if ye will** (*shall*) **hear his voice, harden not your hearts.** The first 'to day' may be taken separately as defining the 'certain day' (he fixeth a certain day; namely, 'to day'), or (with Delitzsch, Kurtz, etc.) as placed emphatically before 'saying,' and then repeated with the rest of the quotation. This construction seems, on the whole, more natural in the Greek.[1] As to the meaning, there is no difficulty. The parenthesis, 'as hath been said before,' is thrown in by way of half apology for the renewed repetition of the quotation from the Psalm. But in the quotation lies the kernel of the argument. The 'to day, if ye shall hear his voice,' etc., implies that they do, or will again hear, the same voice of promise, whence the inference that the rest of Palestine did not exhaust or fulfill it. The 'to day' is taken as substantially a prophecy—a prediction that the gracious voice of God would again sound in their ears, and an entreaty that they would not, under the gracious proffer, renew the disobedience of their fathers. The 'to day' is really the day of the Messianic epoch. To the Jews as a people, it is the time that shall elapse between Christ's summons to repentance and the sealing of their destinies in his typical return at the overthrow of Jerusalem. To the New Testament people of God, the spiritual Israel, it is the time intervening between his first coming to bring the gospel message of salvation, and the final coming, that shall fix all destinies.

8. For if Jesus (*Joshua*) **had given them rest,** etc.—had brought them to rest—**he** (God, or the prophet on his behalf) *would not after this be speaking*—(ἐλάλει, the writer throws the speaking into his own time)—**of another day.** An irrefragable inference on which we need not dwell. The destruction of the followers of Moses proved that the congregation in the wilderness was not the true church of God, and left room for the true spiritual church. So the promise, renewed long subsequently to Israel's entrance into Palestine, proves that the rest of Canaan was not the true rest of God. Thus the author, by implication, disposes of the claims, both of Moses and Joshua, in comparison with Christ. Moses brought the people out of Egypt, but could not bring them into the promised land. Joshua brought the nation into Canaan; but it was not the true rest of the people of God. We have but to follow the story of its fortunes to see how far was the ancient Israel from rest. Its enemies within and around, its civil strifes and foreign wars, its apostasies, its captivities, its enslavements—are anything but the record

[1] Ἐν Δαυεὶδ λέγων with the σήμερον seems more natural. Without the σήμερον we should expect λέγων ἐν Δαυείδ.

9 There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God.
10 For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God *did* from his.
11 Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief.

9 have spoken afterward of another day. There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest for the people of
10 God. For he who is entered into his rest hath himself also rested from his works, as God did from his.
11 Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest, that no man fall [1] after the same example of

1 Or, *into*. Gr. *in*.

of a nation arrived at peace. Had Israel been faithful indeed, God must have fulfilled his utmost promises. But the rebellions of Palestine repeated the rebellions of the desert, until at last the star of Judah was quenched in darkness and blood. The way is prepared for the author's final conclusion.

9. There remaineth therefore—the writer triumphantly concludes—**a rest** (*a Sabbath rest, a Sabbatism*[1]) **to** (*for*) **the people of God.** *Sabbatism*, for which the previous word "rest" (κατάπαυσις) is here exchanged, is a Hebrew-Greek word, found but once in classic Greek ("Plutarch de Superstitione," 3), but appositely used in the summing up of the argument by which the typical rest of Canaan is carried over into and identified with the Sabbath rest of God, instituted at creation; a rest as much superior to the latter as the God in whom lies the one is superior to the Canaan that vainly proffered the other; a real rest, with its heavenly Jerusalem—a city with *foundations*—from which they shall go no more out; a real Paradise, where they shall "rest from their labors," with no more curse of sin and toil. One step further by way of explaining what is implied in this Sabbatism.

10. For he that is entered, etc.; or, *he who hath entered into his* (*God's*) *rest, he also hath himself rested* (*ceased*) *from his work, as God did from his own.* God's rest was a real rest; to the apprehension of his creatures, and in every applicable sense, he entered into rest. So with his creatures who enjoy this holy Sabbatism. They rest from the toil and woe entailed by sin. Employment, activity, no matter how protracted and intense, but no toil! Some make Jesus 'he who entered into rest,' as the Forerunner of his people. The thought is not inapposite, yet less closely connected with the context, and a reference to Jesus would have been probably made more unequivocal.[2]

(4) *Renewed exhortation in view of the renewed promise of a higher rest, and based on the spiritual and searching qualities of the word; and transition, through their need of a sympathizing high priest, to the next and chief topic of the Epistle.* (11–16.)

11. Let us labour (*be zealous*) **therefore to enter into that rest;** that is, this New Testament rest of God, which, designed for all, may be forfeited by any. The author is not a fatalist. Christ suffered death for every man, but individual fidelity must appropriate its benefits. The holy Sabbath rest awaits the collective people of God; but each must make good his claim by persevering to the end. "He that endureth to the end shall be saved." (Matt. 10:22.) **Lest any man** (*that no man*) **fall after the same example of unbelief** (*disobedience*)—literally, *in* the same example, a pregnant expression, I think equivalent to after the example of the same disobedience. Luther, Alford, Lünemann, and Kurtz, understand it, of falling *into* (and then remaining *in*) the same disobedience as the Fathers, and like them becoming a warning example to others. Many others (as Chrysostom, Bengel, Bleek, De Wette, Moll) interpret 'fall' as equivalent to *perish* (πέσῃ, 3:17) *in*, or *by way of giving the same example* to others. I do not think the unemphatic position of 'fall' (πέσῃ) in the Greek decides against this; nor yet do I think that the author is thinking of them as an example to others, but rather as following the example of their ancestors. I think, therefore, the rendering of the Common and Revised Versions substantially right.[3]

[1] The Com. Ver., by substituting the word previously used, 'rest' (as if it were κατάπαυσις), has thus unfortunately taken the point out of the entire argument.

[2] The aorist, 'he who entered,' may, with the Greek partiality for the aorist, easily stand for the perfect, "he who hath entered."

[3] The word ὑπόδειγμα (*example*) is something *shown in subordination to* (ὑπό), either to imitate as a *copy*, or to be imitated as a *pattern*. Here it is generally taken as *example, pattern*, in whichever sense 'fall' (πέσῃ) be taken. It might, perhaps, here be taken as *copy;* by way of copying the same disobedience. There is no reference to the gospel in contrast with the dead letter of the law (Ebrard), nor strictly to its *enduring* character, though this follows from its inherent vitality. It has a vital force as coming from the Living God.

12 For the word of God *is* quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and *is* a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.
13 Neither is there any creature that is not manifest

12 disobedience. For the word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the
13 thoughts and intents of the heart. And there is no

12. Enforcement of this exhortation from the nature of the divine word. **For the word of God is quick** (*living*). There is probably no ground for finding, with many ancient interpreters and some more recent, a reference here to the hypostatic Logos, nor probably for the indirect and half latent reference to him assumed by Delitzsch. The context suggests the meaning. God's words of promise and threatening and command to his ancient people are ringing in our ears, as not to be trifled with. It is the intrinsic character of God's utterances (conceived here perhaps primarily as commanding and threatening) that are described first as *living*, having in them no quality of deadness, but partaking the life of the Being from whom they proceed, and hence never falling idle or vain. **And powerful** (*energetic, full of energy, effective*), **sharper** (*more cutting*) **than any twoedged sword.** A sharp sword issues (Rev. 19:15) out of the mouth of the "Word of God." A double-edged sword is not necessarily sharper than a single-edged one, but it is more cutting, as being comparatively all edge. Philo says of the power of the divine word that it is "a cutter of all things" (τόμος συμπάντων), "dividing the rational soul from the irrational"—a thought akin to, but less spiritual than, that of our Epistle. **Piercing** (*penetrating*) **even to the dividing** (μερισμός, taken actively, the dividing, so as to divide) **of soul and spirit, and of** (*both*) **the joints and marrow.** The general import of this is clear. It denotes the judicially penetrating power of God's word into the utmost depths of our nature. But the special construction is difficult. Hofmann constructs 'joints and marrow of soul and spirit,' a construction too harsh to need discussion. But whether the severing is of soul from spirit, and of joints from marrow (thus denoting its dividing power first in the spiritual, then in the bodily nature), or of soul and spirit from joints and marrow (thus dividing, as it were, between the spiritual and the bodily nature); or whether it is a dividing of the soul and a dividing of the spirit, and, if so, whether again joints and marrow are also separately divided, or whether these are added in apposition to soul and spirit (namely, soul and spirit—that is, the joints and narrow) are points not very easy to decide. Delitzsch inclines to the dividing of soul and spirit as one pair, expressing man's inmost spiritual nature; from 'joints and marrow,' another pair, expressing his inmost material nature. Others (as Bengel, Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann) take 'joints and marrow' as a sort of emphatic apposition of 'soul and spirit,' to wit: soul and spirit, even the very joints and marrow, the terms thus figuratively descriptive of soul and spirit, and added perhaps to accommodate the representation to the figure of a penetrating sword. As it is difficult to conceive a sword piercing through soul and spirit, the author gives concreteness and materiality to the idea by adding 'joints and marrow'; the 'joints' expressing the bonds of connection, the 'marrow' the most hidden and inaccessible part, and thus the whole expressing the piercing of 'the word' to the deepest recesses of the soul, and laying them open to the day. I think the 'joints and marrow' are appositional to 'soul and spirit,' and that in any case the dividing is not *between* different substances, but the cutting through each, as of successive layers. **And is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart** (κριτικός, *qualified to discern, discriminate, and judge*). The word of God rules with discriminating and judicial power within the province of man's inner nature. Penetrating our interior being, it sits in judgment on thought, purpose, and emotion. The sin of the Israelites consisted in that disobedience which originates in unbelief. The heart the author recognizes as the parent of sin, and this is reached and held under judicial cognizance and searching sway by the word of God.

13. This makes a natural transition from the word of God to him who utters it. **Neither is there,** etc.—or, *And there is no creature that is not manifest in his sight*—the 'his' (αὐτοῦ) referring to 'God,' not to the 'word.' None can escape his searching, all-penetrating eye, and his judicial and retributive action.

in his sight: but all things *are* naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.
14 Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast *our* profession.

creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and laid open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do.
14 Having then a great high priest, who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us

But all things are naked and opened—*laid open*,[1] with neck bent back, like Roman criminals, exposed publicly with bared and bent necks (Perizonius and Aelian, "Variæ Historiæ," 12 : 58); or, which I deem more probable, with head bent back, as animals slaughtered in sacrifice; or, perhaps, with no special archæological allusion, simply seized by the neck, barenecked, unveiled **unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do**—*with whom is our account or reckoning* (πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος), the *word*, *account* (λόγος) not having in this clause any reference to its use above. The whole passage is powerfully descriptive of the impression produced by a contemplation of the dealing of God with the ancient Israelites, and the danger of committing those sins of the heart in which consists the essence of apostasy.

14–16. Transition, by means of this exhortation, from Christ as Leader to Christ as High Priest.

14. The above discussion has enforced the need of religious fidelity and the danger of provoking the divine anger, and recalled our need of a High Priest who can aid our infirmities and interpose with his prevalent intercession between us and this God, whose word is so searching and whose judgments are so terrible. This furnishes an easy transition from Christ as Messenger of salvation (superior to the angels), and from Christ as Leader of salvation (superior to Moses), to Christ as High Priest of salvation (superior to Aaron). **Seeing then that we have,** etc.—better, as in the Revised Version, *Having, then, a great high priest who hath passed through* (not into) *the heavens—Jesus, the Son of God—let us hold fast our confession.* The connection of the 'then,' or '*therefore*' (οὖν) is not to the remote reference to the High Priest (2 : 17), but to what immediately precedes; and infers from that the need of holding on to their confession, while he calls up at once the only *condition* of this holding on; namely, their having an all-sufficient High Priest to intercede and to succor. The writer does not infer, from anything said before, the existence of the High Priest; but, exhorting his readers to retain their Christian fidelity, he assumes the high priesthood as an indispensable aid to its accomplishment. Still, while I do not think (with Lünemann) that the 'then' (οὖν) refers, primarily, to the 'having' (ἔχοντες), neither would I (with Delitzsch) regard it as exhausting its force on the verb, 'let us hold fast' (κρατῶμεν). It is partly (I think primarily) to be referred to the verb which exhorts them to their duty, but partly to the participle 'having' (ἔχοντες) as indicating their high prerogative in possessing this mighty spiritual ally. I may add, as a reason for the abruptness with which the writer introduces this participial clause, that in view of the terrible picture which he has just drawn, and which might well intimidate the most courageous heart, he *hastens* to present the brighter aspects of the case. He precedes the exhortation to fidelity by reminding them of the encouragement, as well as incentive, which they have to this. They have a High Priest who has atoned and can intercede for sinners—a *great* High Priest, mighty before and with God, *who hath passed through the heavens* (not *into*, but *through* them), beyond the limitations of the created universe, into heaven itself (9 : 24)—the absolute, the highest heavens; the absolute, ubiquitous presence of God; to the very right hand of God, where he sits as an equal, and thus completely competent to mediate between God and man. 'Jesus, the Son of God,' embraces both his natures—the one epithet marking his humanity, the other his divinity; the one the essential condition of his *being* a High Priest (5 : 1), the other of his High Priesthood being *availing*. As Jesus, he became lower than the angels, that he might taste of death. As Son of God, he was exalted infinitely above them, that his power might accomplish what his compassion undertook. Alike his compassion and his power, therefore, his humanity and his divinity, encourage us to 'hold fast our confession,' as against that terrible side of our relation to God presented by the fate of

[1] Τετραχηλισμένα, from τράχηλος, *a neck.*

15 For we have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as *we are*, *yet* without sin.
16 Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.

15 hold fast our confession. For we have not a high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one who hath been in all points
16 tempted like as *we are*, *yet* without sin. Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of graee, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help *us* in time of need.

the ancient Israel in the wilderness, a side which, while urging to obedience, would drive us to despair. The 'confession' stands as representative of our entire Christian character.

15. This verse illustrates the gracious aspect of this character on the side of its humanity. **For we have not a high priest**—*who cannot be touched, who is not able to sympathize with*—**our infirmities.** The negative mode of statement is more forcible, because more full and formal, than the simple affirmative (we have a high priest who is able, etc.). It contrasts our position with the assumed dark alternative. The ability to sympathize[1] is a *moral* ability, derived from community of experience, especially in suffering. **But** *has been* **in all points tempted** (*tried*) **like as we are**—that is, *proved, tempted in all things, similarly to us.* The 'in all things' (κατὰ πάντα) declares the universality of his trials, not the completeness of the resemblance.[2] **Yet without sin**—equivalent to, *apart from sin.* This belongs not to 'tempted,'—equivalent to tempted without sin, either as cause or consequence; nor to 'in all things,'—equivalent to in all things except as to sin,—but to 'like as we are' (καθ' ὁμοιότητα), declaring that his temptation was after the likeness of humanity, except as to sin. From this element his temptations were exempt. "The participation of Jesus in every form of human suffering, the actual stirring of his impulses, his complete sympathy with our weaknesses, all the stern reality of his temptations, have yet found no slumbering principle of evil to which they could attach themselves." (Delitzsch.)

16. Close of this transition-passage, with an exhortation to avail ourselves for our needs of the aid of this great High Priest. **Let us therefore come boldly,** etc.—*approach with boldness*, with joyful confidence—**unto the throne of grace**—not the throne of Christ, but the throne of God, which, since Christ took his seat by his side, has become not only the "throne of Majesty," but the "throne of Grace"—a throne where grace is exercised, and whence it descends to us. The allusion is not to the earthly mercy seat, but to God's gracious throne in heaven. To this we may come in confidence, relying on the compassionate sympathy of our interceding High Priest. **That we may obtain mercy and find grace**—(in the original, a graceful chiasm). Mercy and grace express essentially the same quality under different aspects. '*Mercy*' regards us as wretched, sinful, victims of disease, sorrow, and death; 'grace,' *favor*, as helpless and without claim, objects of gratuitous and unmerited bounty. **To help in time of need**—that is, *for seasonable succor.* Some (as Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann) refer this to succor during the present time of grace, the 'to day' of the renewed promise. Better (with Tholuck, Delitzsch, Moll) refer it to our weakness and need of help in times of temptation, as in 2 : 18. Seasonable succor is the succor which our sympathizing High Priest, who has been himself tempted, brings to our seasons of temptations. The author has now launched fairly, in this transition, on that topic of the high priesthood of Christ which was his main destined theme. Each of the former topics has terminated in the high priesthood of Christ, and these have been almost hurried over to reach the main argument of the Epistle. In this Epistle, the sacrificial and intercessory priesthood of Christ appears as the central and vital fact of the gospel.

[1] Συμπάσχειν, *to suffer with*; συμπαθεῖν, *to sympathize with*, have community of πάθος, *affection, condition, suffering.*

[2] Καθ' ὁμοιότητα, *after the likeness, by way of similarity*, an expression weightier than ὁμοίως.

CHAPTER V.

FOR every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things *pertaining* to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins:
2 Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity.
3 And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins.

1 For every high priest, being taken from among men, is appointed for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for
2 sins: who can bear gently with the ignorant and erring, for that he himself also is compassed with
3 infirmity; and by reason thereof is bound, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins.

3. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO AARON.

Christ, the High Priest of the New Dispensation, superior to Aaron, the high priest of the Old.

Ch. 5. (1) *Necessary qualities of the high priest.* (1–10.)

(*a*) He is taken from among men, that he, as man, may deal tenderly with men. (1–3.)

(*b*) He assumes the office, not self-appointed, but called of God. (4.)

(*c*) Christ received his priestly office from God. (5, 6.)

(*d*) In his fleshly nature as man, Christ wrestled with the fear of death, and, learning obedience from suffering, was perfected for his saving and priestly work. (7–10.)

(*a*) He is taken from among men, that he, as man, may deal tenderly with man. (1–3.)

1. For, introducing the *ground* of the preceding exhortation, and commencing the great priestly discussion of the Epistle by stating the necessary qualities of the high priest. **Every high priest**—all high priests without exception—(*being*) **taken from among men.** The participle here is not attributive ("who is taken," as if there might be priests that were not); but predicative, 'as being taken,' *since* he is taken. The necessity springs from the circumstances. Angels *need* no high priest, devils *can* have none, man alone needs him; and he **is ordained** (*constituted, appointed*) **for** (*on behalf of*) **men in things pertaining to God.** (The construction of the original is elegant and emphatic, "*from* men being taken *on behalf of* men is ordained") The author is not now contrasting our Lord's priesthood and Aaron's; both must be men —the Lord's incarnation is a pre-requisite to his priesthood. His office is in 'things pertaining to God.' He is middle man, mediator between man and God. **That he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins.** 'On behalf of men' is specialized into "on behalf of sins" — for their forgiveness and doing away. It is as sinners that men need a high priest, and this mainly for expiatory sacrifices. True, he offers for them, not merely bloody and expiatory victims, but thank offerings and gifts in general. This, too, is on account of the sinfulness of man, who, unfit to draw near to God, needs one who has at least a ceremonial holiness, and a special consecration to this duty. Still, no ceremonial holiness could ever be for a moment admitted, except as representing a real holiness lying in the background. 'Gifts' (δῶρα), offerings without slaughter, as drink- and thank-offerings. 'Sacrifices' (θυσίαι), slaughtered victims, involving blood and life. The offering of these appears as the substance of the high priest's mediatorial function.

2. Connected with and springing from the high priest's *human* character is his priestly qualification. **Who can have compassion,** etc., or, *deal gently*[1] *with the ignorant and erring.* A characteristic description of humanity in its twofold aspect of a darkened reason and moral depravity, and one in which the writer assumes half unconsciously the point of view of the human high priest, and gives an example of the leniency which he is describing. **For that** (*since*) **he himself also is compassed with infirmity** (περίκειται, *wears it as a garment, is clothed with it*). As knowing experimentally the infirmities of humanity, he is able to deal gently and sympathizingly with human frailty and error.

3. And—in fact, so far reaching is this infirmity—**by reason hereof he ought** (*is bound, is obliged*), **as for the people, so also for himself, to offer** (*make offering*) **for sins.** This verse, without being strictly a parenthesis, is yet parenthetical. It is added as an incidental expansion of the thought, 'is

[1] Μετριοπαθεῖν, *to moderate one's passions;* hence, "treat with moderation or indulgence," a word in common use with the later Stoics. It is not happily rendered by the Common Version, "have compassion upon."

4 And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as *was* Aaron.
5 So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have *I* begotten thee.

4 And no man taketh the honour unto himself, but
5 when he is called of God, even as was Aaron. So Christ also glorified not himself to be made a high priest, but he who spake unto him,
Thou art my Son,
This day have I begotten thee:

compassed with infirmity,' and is perhaps to be constructed with this under the influence of 'for that,' *since* (ἐπεί); "since he is compassed and is bound," etc., not as co-ordinated with 'ordained' (καθίσταται). The expression is thrown in to show how real and far-reaching was this human element in the priesthood. It went so far that the Levitical high priest had to offer sacrifice for his own sins as well as for the sins of the people. This semi-parenthetical character of the verse it is important to recognize. Make it prominent, and it presents the Levitical priesthood in contrast with that of Christ, while we look in vain for its antithesis in the delineation of Christ's priesthood. Regarded as incidental, and a merely heightening touch in the portraiture of the Levitical priesthood, whose essential humanity our Lord shared, and it needs no farther notice. It is just a momentary descent from the level on which he is here placing the Old and the New Testament priesthood; a momentary diversion from the straight line of parallel between them. No doubt, indeed, that a prerogative of Christ's priesthood is here suggested, inasmuch as he has been above declared to have been tempted in all points similarly to man apart from sin. Thus though, like the Aaronic priest, encompassed with infirmity, he had not, like him, to make expiation for his own sins.[1] **Ought** (ὀφείλει, *is bound*); both morally and legally, here perhaps there is no intended distinction.

(*b*) Christ is not self-appointed, but called of God. (4.)

4. And no man taketh, etc.; *And not to himself does any one take the honor, but [he takes it] being called by God, just as did Aaron.* Compare the Revised Version. If 'take' (λαμβάνει) has in the first clause the sense of 'arrogate,' or 'assume voluntarily,' it must be understood for the following clause in a modified sense as equivalent to receive (δέχεται). I think it has this modification. 'Aaron' is not put here for the priestly line sprung from him, but simply as its representative, as a personal, historical illustration of the statement. What was true of him was of course true of all; but it was specially proper to mention him, as in him the priestly line began, and in him the divine call stood out in special prominence. (Ex. 28:1.) This, too, like the preceding, is no arbitrary qualification. Obviously those who are to minister before the Lord on behalf of sinners must be chosen neither by themselves, nor by the guilty race that needs their intercession, but by him who is to be placated. A self-constituted, or a man-constituted, ministry before God must be without validity and without efficacy. The Being to be appeased can alone select the means and agents of the service.

(*c*) Christ received his priestly office from God. (5, 6.)

5. Having enumerated the essential qualifications of the high-priesthood, the author shows in reverse order that they are realized in Christ, and in their utmost completeness. The latter of the two is taken first. **So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest.** It is questioned here whether "glorified" (ἐδόξασεν) is equivalent to "taking the honor" of ver. 4, and is restricted to taking the priesthood, or points to that *kingly* exaltation which was the condition and accompaniment of his priestly dignity. So think many from the terms 'glory,' 'glorified,' which elsewhere describe his kingly exaltation (2:9), and from the following quotation, "Thou art my Son," etc., which points doubtless to his elevation as king, and not as priest. Yet it is hardly natural to deny Christ's assumption to himself of the priesthood by denying his assumption of the kingship, and as the term 'glorified' seems intrinsically as applicable to Christ's priestly as to his kingly dignity, the author might easily, in passing from the earthly priesthood of Aaron to the heavenly priesthood of Christ, use a more exalted term. **But he** (*glorified him*) **that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee.** This citation

[1] Περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, *concerning himself*, and περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, *concerning sins*, are substantially the same as ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων and ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, *on behalf of, in relation to*, although the prepositions are not precisely equivalent.

6 As he saith also in another *place*, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.
7 Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered

6 as he saith also in another *place*,
Thou art a priest for ever
After the order of Melchizedek.
7 Who in the days of his flesh, having offered up

does not, of course, prove the *bestowal* on Christ of the priesthood, but it most appropriately prepares the way for it. It shows that the kingship which was a condition of his priesthood was also bestowed, and thus leads to the natural inference that he received also his priesthood. By naming the bestower of the priesthood periphrastically as the one who exalted him to the heavenly Sonship, he strengthens his proof, and enhances the dignity of the personage who is the object of this double honor.

6. As he saith also in another place (Ps. 110:4), **Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.** This establishes the point. The priesthood of Christ was divinely bestowed. He did not deem the eternal priesthood, any more than the eternal filial equality with God, a thing to be rapaciously snatched or caught at (ἁρπαγμόν, Phil. 2:6), but came to them both in the path of humiliation and suffering, and he received them both as the reward of his lowly and faithful obedience. God called him to the priesthood as he called Aaron, but to a priesthood as much higher than was Aaron's as his person and work were nobler. *Where* his high-priestly work commenced, also, is not necessarily here intimated; it began, doubtless, on earth, though his formal and full high-priestly character appeared only after his exaltation. The words 'after the order' are not here to be pressed; they are explained in 7:15 by "after the likeness" (κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα). In some distinguishing points his priesthood resembled that of Melchisedec rather than that of Aaron; in fact, combining antitypically all the essential features of both.

(*d*) In his fleshly nature *as man*, Christ wrestled with the fear of death, and, learning obedience from suffering, was perfected for his saving and priestly work. (7–10.)

This priest, thus constituted by divine call, appears now invested with the *second* attribute of a true priesthood, a human experience which qualified him to sympathize with all the weaknesses and struggles of humanity. Instead of uniting this attribute with the preceding by *and* (καί), the author elegantly brings it into closer connection by the relative 'who.'

7. Who in the days of his flesh—when he had descended from his home in the bosom of his Father, when he had veiled his Deity in the garb of a true humanity. The 'days of his flesh' is an emotional and tender statement of the fact of the Redeemer's manhood. It reminds us of all the frailty, the temptation, the suffering, the death to which 'the flesh' is liable. With reference to our Lord the language has another peculiarity. With an ordinary man, 'the days of his flesh' would have a purely prospective reference; they would be relative to his subsequent spiritual condition. With our Lord they are both prospective and retrospective. They denote that *dip*, so to speak, from the level of his eternal Godhead, by which he temporarily descended from his infinite and purely spiritual height, in order to re-ascend to it with his glorified humanity. 'The days of his flesh,' then, have in the case of Christ a peculiar significance. They mark a period bounded on both sides by a high and glorious existence. With other men, being in the flesh is matter of necessity; it is the condition of their existence. With the Son of man it was purely voluntary; he *became* (not, 'was made') flesh. The author, again, does not say, '*during* the days (παρὰ τὰς ἡμέρας) of his flesh.' He is not going to portray the *course* of our Lord's earthly life, but only one single striking and representative scene in it. He selects as specially appropriate to his purpose the scene in Gethsemane, as illustrating with pre-eminent force both the conflict and the triumph by which our Lord acquired his moral perfection as high priest. **When he had offered up,** etc.—better, *offering up prayers (entreaties) and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and being hearkened to.* The terms 'entreaties' and 'supplications' have no essential difference of meaning; they are simply doubled for emphasis. The participles, 'offering up' and 'being hearkened to' (προσενέγκας εἰσακουσθείς), denote single, not habitual acts, and clearly point to a single scene. That scene is the agony of the

up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared;

prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him [1] from death, and having been heard for his godly fear,

1 Or, *out of*.

Garden. There our Saviour prayed with strong crying to 'him who was able to save him from death,' and of course, as clearly indicated by this language, prayed that he might be saved from death. The description of God, as one able to save from death, derives its pertinency from the character of the prayer. With drops of bloody sweat falling from him he thrice prayed: "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." That this was the approaching death of the cross, which, under the urgent temptation of Satan and the burden of human guilt rolled mysteriously upon him, now presented itself clothed in triple horrors, cannot, I think, be reasonably doubted. That the Evangelist does not mention 'tears' in his record of this midnight struggle constitutes no objection to our view. Such suffering could not have been without tears, and in that picture of agony and bloody sweat the mention of 'tears' would rather have weakened than heightened its effect. In the present brief reference, 'tears' form a natural element of the scene. Some, as De Wette, extend the reference to the Saviour's agonizing on the cross. But as there was then no prayer to be rescued from death, and as the words "being hearkened to" evidently point to some recorded and specific fact, it is better to limit it to the prayer in the Garden, in which Christ did actually pray for deliverance from death, and was answered with tokens of the divine approval. Besides, this scene of encounter with temptation, of wrestling with spiritual adversaries, is more pertinent to the writer's purpose than the mysterious sufferings of the dying hour. **And was heard,** etc. *Being heard from his godly fear*, or, *hearkened to from his pious reverence.* Such seems the natural force of the words, and sustained by the connection. Our Saviour prayed in perfect submission to his Father's will; his language and spirit were, "Not my will but thine be done," and therefore he was graciously listened to, and, so far as possible, his prayer was answered. Some, supposing that because he was hearkened to he could not have prayed to be delivered from dying, refer it to his being delivered from the *consequences* of death (ἐκ θανάτου, *out of* death), from remaining and going to corruption in the sepulchre, from which he *was* delivered. But we have no evidence that such was the nature of the Saviour's prayer, and the language here used does not require us to assume it. A prayer need not be literally answered to be proved acceptable to God; all that this involves is perfect submission to his will. Such was our Saviour's prayer, and though, from the nature of the case, it could not be granted, yet God testified his perfect approval of the filial and holy reverence manifested by his Son. He sent his Angel to strengthen him for the ordeal from which he could not release him; he accepted the atoning sacrifice which he made for sin, as he could not have done had it been mingled with any taint of imperfection; and crowned the demonstration by raising him from the dead and exalting him to his right hand as King and Priest forever. Here, however, the more immediate reference seems to be to the angelic aid which was vouchsafed to his filial piety, which, while fainting and almost overwhelmed by terror and temptation, yet exclaimed in absolute resignation: "Not my will but thine be done." The Father thus immediately demonstrated that the prayer was heard approvingly, and, though he did not grant the agonizing request, did all that he *could* do toward granting it by strengthening his Son for the conflict. The word used (εἰσακουσθείς, *hearkened to*), is singularly appropriate to the account in Luke; and this is one of the passages which in this Epistle remind us of that evangelist. (The use of ἀπό, *from*, equivalent to *because of*, needs no defense.) If there seems inconsistency in Christ's praying to be saved from the death which he came to suffer, in his wavering in regard to the act which was to consummate his redemptive work, we remember that he was a man; a man with all human weaknesses, except sin; a man open to temptations, and *here* pressed with such temptations as none has before or since encountered. That he could be driven thus to pray proves the

8 Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered;
9 And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him;

8 though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the
9 things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the

terrible force of the temptation; and that, driven into offering it, he still retained unfaltering submission to his Father's will, enhances to the utmost our admiration of his integrity. The billows of hell that went over him could not shake his perfect trust in God. On the other hand, to reduce his prayer to a request for what *could and would be* granted is to disembowel it of its characteristic merit. It was precisely in praying under almost resistless temptation for *what could not be granted*, and yet acquiescing completely in the divine decision, that his obedience displayed its lustre, that he earned his Father's approval; and only as thus understood does what the author proceeds to say of him in the next verse gain its full appropriateness and force.

8. Though he were a Son, etc. *Although being a Son, learned from that which he suffered obedience.* He prayed agonizingly to be delivered from the cup, yet acquiescingly drank it. The language implies a yielding to something from which his nature recoiled, and *against which he had prayed*—to the death, I think, which lay before him. The scene of the cross cannot be included in the "offering entreaties," etc., because it was in submitting to this that he learned obedience, and this lesson had been already learned. The battle had been already fought—the assaults of the devil been repelled, and the sins of men borne obediently to the cross.[1] If the Saviour prayed for deliverance from the *consequences* of death, for resurrection from the tomb, this could be granted him, and furnished no test of obedience. It was in acquieseence to the divine *thwarting* of his will that this had been learned. Rightly interpreted, then, the entire passage falls into harmony with itself and with the facts. With strong crying and tears (Mark 14 : 33, ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν; Luke 22 : 43, 44), he prayed to be delivered from the impending death with its horrors, and his filial fear and piety secured his Father's approval. Yet his prayer not being granted, he bowed to the divine will, learned obedience in his sufferings, and went cheerfully to the cross. The language, of course, is not to be taken with servile literalness. Christ was always obedient, and never had in him any taint of disobedience. Yet, like his people, he had to be tried in suffering; to submit to what revolted his nature, and to *develop* in suffering that spirit of obedience which in all other men would have in a sterner sense to be *learned*. In all respects, except sin and in the transcendent magnitude of his sufferings, he shared, and in sharing learned to sympathize with, the trials of his people. His immeasurably greater included their immeasurably less.

9. This verse closes this sketch of the *necessary* qualities of the high priest. Thus, **being made perfect**—or, *perfected:* internally, in all the attributes of a perfect high priest; externally, by going through temptation and death up to that glory to which he was to conduct his people (2:10)—**he became the author of** (*an*) **eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.** Ministering effectually in divine things, he did for men really what the Levitical priests did symbolically. There is a twofold allusion to the preceding verse. He prayed in vain to be saved from

[1] I do not believe that the scene of the crucifixion was a scene of any such convulsive outward agony as marked the struggle of Gethsemane. I greatly doubt if the 'strong crying and tears' of our author could be applicable to it. I believe that the great, terrible, decisive internal conflict was fought out in darkness and solitude. Our Lord's general subsequent manner seems to have been that of calmness and self-possession. On his way to the cross he pointed away from his trials to their own, the weeping daughters of Jerusalem. He uttered indeed one agonizing cry on the cross, "My God, my God," etc., but this in borrowed language, and, as I think, one single, simple, self-contained utterance of inward agony. Otherwise the utterances are different. He prayed for his murderers. He extended pardon to the penitent malefactor, promising him Paradise with himself. He says calmly: "I thirst." Crying with a loud voice, he committed his Spirit to his Father. The rendering of the Common Version, sanctioned, I am sorry to say, by the margin of the Revised Version, is utterly without probability—"When he had cried with a loud voice," etc., making the crying and the commending two separate acts. And this, I believe, is all the loud crying that the gospels attribute to Jesus on the cross. I cannot but believe his deportment there had a calmness and a majesty, even, that warranted the centurion's exclamation, "This was the Son of God!"

10 Called of God a high priest after the order of Melchisedec.
11 Of whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing.

10 [1] author of eternal salvation; named of God a high priest after the order of Melchizedek.
11 Of [2] whom we have many things to say, and hard of interpretation, seeing ye are become dull of hear-

1 Gr. *cause*.....2 Or, *which*.

death, and yielded obedience to the denial. On the other hand, on all who obey him he bestows eternal life. As disobedience on his part would have ruined his atoning work, so disobedience on theirs will exclude them from its benefits. Again, he bestows eternal salvation who himself could not receive a temporal salvation. The infinitely lesser boon was obliged to be denied to him, the perfectly obedient; the infinitely greater boon he secures to their imperfect obedience. ("An eternal salvation" (σωτηρία) is contrasted with the temporal salvation (σώζειν) which he vainly prayed for.)

10. The necessary qualities of the high priest being shown, and their existence in Christ fully illustrated, the author, with characteristic gracefulness, glides round on the pivot of the present verse to what is to be the next great topic of the Epistle—the Lord's Melchisedec priesthood. This he first designedly introduces, and then pauses, with that in mind, to administer his next solemn lesson of rebuke, exhortation, warning, and encouragement to his all too-unfit hearers, before formally resuming and completing the great theme. **Called of God**—or, *Being saluted by God;* that is, as God received him on his ascension into the heavenly sanctuary, meeting him on its threshold, and, we may suppose, first declaring his Sonship, "Thou art my Son," etc., and then pronouncing him **a high priest after the order of Melchisedec.** 'After the order (or, *likeness*) of Melchisedec,' Christ was strictly a Priest, a royal Priest; he was *High Priest* in another element of his priestly character. As one who had offered an expiatory sacrifice, and with its blood now entered the heavenly holy of holies, he was the high-priestly antitype of Aaron. The author, by calling him "high priest after the order of Melchisedec," unites the qualities of both the priesthoods—the regal, untransferable, abiding priesthood represented by Melchisedec, and the expiatory, interceding priesthood symbolized by Aaron. With the one, he treads the heavenly courts in kingly majesty; with the other, he brings an efficient offering. But, about to enter on this lofty theme, the author is deterred by the reflection that it lies in that higher sphere of religious truth in which the spiritual sluggishness of his readers disqualifies them for following him. It belongs to that "wisdom" which the Apostle Paul reserves for "mature" (full-grown, τέλειοι) believers. His readers are not neophytes—they are backsliders; instead of advancing on the path of Christian faith and knowledge, and thus being prepared to enter on the deeper mysteries of the gospel, they have fallen back, and need to be confirmed in its elementary doctrines.

(2) *Long hortatory passage, suggested by the incapacity of the readers to enter on the profound discussion before them; namely, the priesthood of Christ.* (5 : 11–6 : 20.)

(*a*) Failure of the readers in that spiritual maturity which they should, by this time, have attained. (11–14.)

11. Of (*concerning*) **whom**—that is, Christ as Aaronico-Melchisedec priest; or, better, *concerning which* (taking the pronoun οὗ as neuter); namely, this priesthood—**we have many things** (or, *much*) **to say,** etc.—or, *our discourse is extended* (πολύς), *and difficult of explanation.* The "who" (or, "which") can scarcely refer to Melchisedec (as by many), of whom, in fact, he has very little to say, a single sentence comprising all that he has to say of his history, and three or four sentences, of his entire personality; while the many mysteries which the fertile brain of expositors has spun out of the brief statement regarding Melchisedec are evidently not in our author. He simply takes the Old Testament record regarding Melchisedec to illustrate the import of the passage in the Psalm, and we cannot conceive it possible that he should have paused on the eve of his most solemn and profound discussion, to chide his readers for ignorance respecting some curious and recondite subtleties regarding Melchisedec. It is the double priesthood of our Lord in which our author finds the core and centre of the gospel, and which he feels demands more than the sluggish ears and

12 For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye
have need that one teach you again which *be* the first
principles of the oracles of God; and are become such
as have need of milk, and not of strong meat.
13 For every one that useth milk *is* unskilful in the
word of righteousness: for he is a babe.
14 But strong meat belongeth to them that are of

12 ing. For when by reason of the time ye ought to
be teachers, ye have need again [1] that some one teach
you the rudiments of the [2] first principles of the
oracles of God; and are become such as have need
13 of milk, and not of solid food. For every one that
partaketh of milk is without experience of the word
14 of righteousness; for he is a babe. But solid food
is for [3] full grown men, *even* those who by reason of

1 Or, *that* one *teach you which* are *the rudiments*.....2 Gr. *beginning*.....3 Or, *perfect*.

feeble intellects of spiritual infancy. The high priesthood, in which each of the two previous sections has ended, has thus made all that preceded but

"A swelling prelude to the imperial theme,"

to which he was hastening to conduct his readers. **Seeing ye are dull,** etc.—*Since ye have become sluggish in hearing.* The words refer to the last preceding epithet, *hard of explanation*, not to the *much, ample* (πολύς), as if it were the dullness of his hearers that required expansion of the topic. In itself, it would be fertile in matter, and, of course, difficult of comprehension, except to advanced believers. His readers were dull of spiritual comprehension, expressed, figuratively and Hebraistically, by *hearing*. Sharpness or dullness of *vision* naturally allies itself with more or less of spiritual perspicacity—that of *hearing* with docility or intractableness of temper. And the readers not only *were* so, but, what is worse, had *become* so. They had been not merely stationary; they had retrograded. Once flourishing in their Christian life (6:10; 10:32), they had encountered trials which, failing to withstand, they had sunk below their earlier level, and were in imminent danger of spiritual shipwreck.

12. For when for the time (*for while on account of the time of your professed Christian life*) **ye ought to be teachers.** The law of the Christian life is progress—growth in grace and spiritual knowledge. The pupil of to-day should be the teacher of to-morrow. *Ye have need* (*again*, just as at the first) *that we teach you what are* (τίνα ἐστίν)—or, that one (τινά), *teach you the first principles of the oracles of God.* Lachmann—(τινά) *some one;* Tischendorf—(τίνα) *what are.* The sense is indifferent, and in grammar they are equally allowable. *What* (τίνα) may, as often, be taken as equal to "of what sort" (ποῖα), and, of course, it is to be so taken here. These Christians need anew to have the nature of those elements unfolded to them. For "elements" (στοιχεῖα), see Gal. 4:9; Col. 2:8, 20. There, however, the term denotes the Old Testament beginnings of God's culture of humanity, as contrasted with the riper truths of the gospel; here the more elementary, as contrasted with the more advanced truths, of the gospel itself. "Oracles" (λόγια, *words, utterances*) are in Acts 7:38; Rom. 3:2, the Old Testament revelations, whether directly regarding Christ or not; here they are God's entire disclosures regarding his Son. **And are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat** (or, *solid food*). A similar figure is found in 1 Cor. 3:2, with a difference in the Greek word for 'food.' The words 'babes' (νήπιοι), and 'full grown,' 'mature,' 'perfect' (τέλειοι), are common in the New Testament. The author enumerates, a little below, some of the more rudimentary doctrines (the milk of the word), while the doctrines of Christ's high priesthood belong to the truths which need the mature to grapple with them. They are too strong for the spiritual feebleness into which these Hebrews have fallen. Of course, their incapacity is relative, not absolute; otherwise the author would not proceed with them to the discussion.

13. For every one that useth (*partaketh of*) **milk**—whose proper nourishment is milk, and who, by consequence, is unable to bear other kinds of food—such is the characteristic of infants (νήπιοι)—*is without experience of the word* (or, *in a doctrine*) *of righteousness*—that is, a doctrine (λόγος) which treats of righteousness—which is the grand scope of the New Testament: or, a word or discourse of righteousness—(referring to the capacity for its utterance) like "a word of wisdom" (λόγος σοφίας), a "word of knowledge." So Delitzsch, who finds in this a covert antithesis to the *babe* (infant, not speaking, νήπιος) of the following clause, **for he is a babe**—unable to receive and digest the higher truths of the gospel.

14. But strong meat, *solid food* (*the higher, more difficult doctrines of the gospel*), **is for full**

full age, *even* those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.

use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil.

CHAPTER VI.

THEREFORE leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God,

1 Wherefore leaving [1] the doctrine of the first principles of Christ, let us press on unto [2] perfection; not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead

1 Gr. *the word of the beginning of Christ*.....2 Or, *full growth*.

grown men (τελείων, *perfect, mature; who, because of habit* — moral state or condition acquired by use and training—ἕθος, *custom;* ἕξις, *habitus, habit*, abiding state, resulting from custom) **have their senses** (organs of sense, αἰσθητήρια, perceptive faculties, here, of spiritual perception) **exercised** (*disciplined*, trained gymnastically) **to discern both good and evil**—for the discrimination of the sound and unsound in religious teaching. The figure seems here wholly dropped.

Ch. 6. Exhortation, warning, and encouragement to the readers.

(*b*) To this condition of spiritual maturity just described the writer exhorts his readers to hasten forward, and not linger among the elements of the religious life. He alarms them with the possibility that their backsliding may become irretrievable, but assures them of his better and brighter hope for them. (1–8.)

1-3. Exhortation to quit the first principles of the gospel and advance to maturity.

1. Therefore (in view of the unsatisfactoriness of this state of spiritual infancy) **leaving the** (*first*) **principles of the doctrine of Christ** (the initial doctrine of Christ), **let us go on** (bear ourselves on, *hasten, speed onward:* such is the force of φερώμεθα) **to maturity.** It is questioned whether the advancement here urged is that of the *author*, quitting in discussion, along with his readers, the elementary doctrines of the gospel, and proceeding to the higher; or of his *readers*, leaving practically their state of spiritual infancy for the maturity so befitting their profession. Does he as an *author* exhort them to follow him to the higher points of Christian doctrine, or as a *spiritual teacher* urge *them* to higher spiritual attainments, using the plural "we" from modesty and conciliation? Partially, I believe with Delitzsch that both are implied. The words "leaving" (ἀφέντες, *letting go, quitting*), and "laying down" (καταβαλλόμενοι) as foundations, seem more especially appropriate to the course of a *discussion* in which writer and readers advance together from point to point, and lay down, or refrain from laying down, fresh foundations. But while the passage, as to form, opens in this way, its general character and connection clearly make it a practical exhortation. To this refer the words "therefore," "let us hasten," and "maturity" (τελειότης, which, used of a discussion, should be τὰ τέλεια, *the things which are mature*); the weighty "provided that God permit"—words too significantly solemn to apply to a mere discussion; and, above all, to the following verses, which show that if the writer began with some slight coloring of the *author's* exhortation to more advanced *discussion*, it is immediately merged in the teacher's and *preacher's* urgent summoning to higher practical attainments; to hasten indeed from a condition which is not only unsatisfactory, but alarming. The urgent 'let us speed on to maturity' marks danger that their present condition may become permanent, and indeed an apprehension that it may be already hopeless, and they like reprobate land given over to the burning. The appeal comes to them, like the angel's summons to Lot: "Up, get ye out of this place"; and I incline to think that ver. 8 has in mind the doom of Sodom. **Not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God.** The 'again' might apply to renewing the foundations in discussion, or renewing the foundations in practical life. The two ideas seem blended, as if he would say: "Leave these foundations of mere elementary truth; they belong to your primitive spiritual state. If they have been laid once, they need not be laid again; if they have been laid and abandoned, they *cannot* be laid again. *He*

2 Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.

2 works, and of faith toward God, [1] of the teaching of [2] baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resur-
3 rection of the dead, and of eternal judgment. And

1 Some ancient authorities read, even *the teaching of*.....2 Or, *washings*.

therefore will not stop to relay them in discussion, nor must *they* in life and practice. Not indeed are they to ignore and abandon them, but to assume them and speed forward. 'Foundation' denotes in 1 Cor. 3 : 11, Jesus, the ultimate foundation; here, the *proximate* foundation, the relatively fundamental truths of the gospel.

What this foundation, this elementary doctrine of Christ, is, the author now informs us. It is sixfold, distributed into three pairs, arranged in logical succession. The first pair is fundamental to the Christian life, 'Repentance from dead works'; not the works of the law, as dead works (Gal. 3 : 21 ; 4 : 9), but works which have in them no vitality; spiritually *dead*, and of course also *deadly*. Such, too, would be works of law when purely legal, merely formal, hollow observances. With repentance is connected "faith toward God," as its accompaniment and cause; the two, indeed, chronologically simultaneous; born together under the same quickening act of the Spirit.

2. The second pair of elementary principles pertains to rites of the church. **Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands.** There is here a somewhat difficult question of construction. A few (as Winer, Kurtz) construct "teaching" or "doctrine" after 'baptisms'; 'baptisms of teaching,' or teaching-baptisms—that is, baptisms followed by teaching (as Matt. 28 : 19, 20, baptizing, teaching). Others make 'baptisms' dependent on 'doctrine'—'the doctrine of baptisms'; while the majority, as Bleek, Delitzsch, Moll, etc., connect it equally with all the following nouns; as doctrine of *baptisms*, *of laying on of hands*, *of resurrection of the dead*, *and of eternal judgment*. I think it difficult to decide, and there may have arisen questions in the primitive church regarding baptism, as its relation to Jewish lustrations ("divers baptisms," 9 : 10), and to John's baptism, which did not arise in regard to the other points mentioned. On the other hand, all these great subjects, especially the resurrection and the judgment, may, and in fact must, often have demanded careful instruction. The plural "baptisms" refers, perhaps, to those various questions which would arise, especially with converts from Judaism or from John's baptism, as was the case with Apollos at Ephesus, where Apollos, "mighty in the Scriptures," but knowing only the baptism of John, was taught the way of God more perfectly. The imposition of hands, though not probably following regularly on baptism, had an important connection with the bestowal of spiritual gifts. The third class or pair of truths, 'Resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment,' though differing from the first in character (but more vital than the second), is equally fundamental. They evidently went deep, indeed, into the apostles' teachings and the life of the early church, as we see in the Epistles to the Corinthians and Thessalonians, and in Paul's discourse before the Athenian Areopagus. The resurrection of the dead was guaranteed by the resurrection of Christ, and stood in vital connection with it. (1 Cor. 15 : 15, 16.) The 'eternal judgment' is the final judgment, whose issues, unlike those of preceding judicial dispensations—the Flood, the overthrow of Sodom, the destruction of Jerusalem—are final and eternal. But how reconcile the declaration that these Hebrew Christians need to be taught anew the first principles of the gospel with the exhortation to leave them and hasten on to perfection. We reply that the language is in such cases relative and not absolute. They are not, on the one hand, conceived to be *totally* incapable of apprehending higher truths, nor on the other counseled to *forsake* the elementary. There is force in the present participle (καταβαλλόμενοι), *endeavoring to lay*, *busying themselves in laying* foundations. Regarded as *foundations*, they are to be laid once for all, and built upon as lying at the base of the Christian edifice. They are not disparaged, but exalted. Among these the 'laying on of hands' may with the ceasing of miracles have become of less moment. The rest retain their full primitive significance. Repentance, faith, baptism, the resurrection, and the judgment are grand pivots around which the whole Christian system revolves, in all ages, cardinal elements of Christian doctrine and life.

3 And this will we do, if God permit.
4 For *it is* impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost,
5 And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come,

4 this will we do, if God permit. For as touching those who were once enlightened [1] and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy
5 Spirit, and [2] tasted the good word of God, and the

1 Or, *having both tasted of . . . and being made . . . and having tasted, etc* .....2 Or, *tasted the word of God that it is good.*

3. And this will we do. (So Tischendorf, with Sinaitic, Lachmann. Bleek, Lünemann, Delitzsch, Moll—"Let us do," with no material difference in sense.) **If** (more emphatic, ἐάνπερ, *provided that*) **God permit.** That this is none of the commonplaces of deference to the divine will is shown both by the emphatically expressed condition, intimating that some obstacle *may* lie in the way, and by the nature of the duty to which it is affixed. A duty like that of spiritual advancement is usually urged, not *provided* that God *allows* it, but *because* God *requires* it. A condition, therefore, so emphatically expressed, appended to such an exhortation, implies something peculiar and extraordinary in the condition of the persons addressed. The writer has exhorted his readers to speed their way to the higher grounds of Christian maturity, and he sharpens his exhortation by reminding them that their effort may become soon, and has possibly become already, too late. The success, nay, the very existence, of their religious striving, depends on the divine approval and co-operation; if that be withheld, it will be unavailing. The doubt is not whether persons having apostatized from their former high religious condition could be recovered, but whether they have actually apostatized. If they are only in imminent danger of it, God will bless their and his efforts to restore them; if otherwise, their recovery is hopeless.

4-8. These verses assign the reason of the above ominous condition, 'provided that God permit'; for it is doubtful if God *will* permit, and depends on the degree to which your defection has advanced.

4. For—as to whether God will permit this advancement—**it is impossible**—not exceedingly difficult, a *quasi* impossibility, but from the inherent necessities of the case, or the laws of God's gracious economy, or both, absolutely impossible (so 10 : 26-38) — **for those who were once** (*once for all*) **enlightened**—at once brought into the light and endowed with spiritual vision. See 10 : 32, "And call to mind the former days in which, after ye were illuminated," etc., the latter passage certainly implying regeneration. **And tasted the heavenly gift.** 'Tasted,' not in contrast with a deep and full experience, but an elegant and enhanced expression of the idea of *experiencing*, enjoying, as at 2 : 9, "tasted death for every man." By transferring the idea to that bodily sense which ministers to our most vivid animal delights, the thought gains in force and vividness. 'The heavenly gift' is the boon of salvation, the saving grace of the gospel. **And were made partakers of the Holy Ghost.** Not merely of his miraculous, but of his enlightening and quickening influences (Eph. 1 : 13). "In whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise." Allusion, however, is probably made to the special and partly miraculous influences which in the early church so often followed upon conversion. (Ver. 4 may be constructed thus, "those once for all enlightened both by tasting and being made partakers," etc., the participial clauses defining instrumentally the elements of the illumination. The idea is but slightly different.)

5. And tasted the good word (*an excellent* word or utterance) **of God.** Not 'the good word of God,' as containing truth or doctrine (λόγος), but an excellent word, as something spoken (ῥῆμα), utterance, ordinance, decree, promise, very probably, here, some comforting promise of the future perfection of the kingdom of God.[1] **And the powers of the world to come** (*of the coming, or future age*, see 2 : 4; Gal. 3 : 5). Miraculous gifts and endowments mainly, which were a common characteristic of the early church, and which, in Old Testament times, were looked forward to as destined to mark the coming age (αἰὼν μέλλων), the age of the Messiah. (Acts 2 : 17, seq.) From the Old Testament point of view this coming age was already present. It had been ushered in with

[1] The genitive δωρεᾶς, of a gift *participated* in; the accusative ῥῆμα, of a word or utterance, of whatever nature received in its totality.

6 If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put *him* to an open shame.

6 powers of the age to come, and *then* fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; [1] seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God

1 Or, *the while.*

the Messiah, and those extraordinary spiritual effusions which followed his ascension. With his departure, the "coming age" divided itself, and its fullest powers were reserved for the second coming, and the kingdom then to be consummated. Of these more wondrous manifestations, the miraculous powers now exhibited were but types and presages. Both of the glorious present, however, and as foreshadowings of the still more glorious future, these Hebrew Christians had largely partaken. The above characteristics would seem to indicate Christians; and as the representation derives all its force from its applicability to the persons addressed, and as the author of the Epistle uniformly regards these as having been believers, we seem bound to suppose that such is the character here described. Whether such persons actually can or do fall away, is another question.

6. If they shall fall away—(*and have fallen away*, with emphasis on *and*), apostatized, "departed from the living God"—**to renew them again unto repentance.** Their recovery is hopeless; they have exhausted the resources of divine mercy. **Since they crucify** (temporal and causal participle, ἀνασταυροῦντας, *while and because of* crucifying) **to** (or, *for*) **themselves the Son of God afresh**—the Christ who has been crucified by others, they, after having accepted and believed in, recrucify for themselves. The present participle (ἀνασταυροῦντας) following the previous aorist participle, implies that their act of falling away, conceived as one and single, is connected with an abiding recrucifixion of the Lord. This continuousness of their act enhances its wickedness. The verb translated "to crucify again" (ἀνασταυροῦν), would, in the classics, simply mean 'to fasten up to a cross,' but the preposition (ἀνά) is exceedingly flexible and various in signification, denoting, in the same word, sometimes *up*, sometimes *back* or *over again*, and sometimes combining both. Here interpreters, from the Greek expositors down, have given to it the force of *over again.* By again turning their backs on Christ, these apostates sanction, and, as it were, renew his crucifixion; they lend their voices to swell the shout of "crucify him." They crucify him *for themselves* in that they make the national act their own, and declare their individual purpose to have nothing to do with him, and, at the same time, hold him up to the scoffing and derision of *others;* expose him to public shame and reproach (παραδειγματίζειν; *to make a public example of*).[1] This language would be especially forcible addressed to Jews whose countrymen had crucified the Messiah, and while yet the echo of that great shout of national rejection was still lingering on the ear, in which, in fact, some of those addressed may not improbably have participated. On these persons, therefore, the gospel has tried its utmost strength and failed. The only Being whose blood could redeem and sanctify them, they have discarded. There remains for them no more sacrifice for sin; and as matter both of natural necessity and judicial retribution, their recovery is impossible.[2] In

[1] See Matt. 1 : 19, Joseph . . . not willing to make a public example (παραδειγματίσαι, or, omitting παρά, δειγματίσαι) of Mary.

[2] The sin here described as scaling the ruin of its agents, is by many identified with the sin against the Holy Ghost described in the gospel. To me they seem, though equally fatal, widely different. *That* is the sin of open spurners of Christianity; of men who vent their hate and malice in words and acts of libel and outrage against the workings of the Holy Spirit; who, though they have had great external enlightenment, have made no pretence of discipleship. *This* is the sin of professed (and real) friends, who have been inwardly, as well as outwardly, enlightened, but slowly, and half unconsciously, under the deceitfulness of sin, have lapsed gradually into final, and utter apostasy. The former sin is committed more directly against the Spirit; the latter against the Son. The former is unpardonable, as being a wanton and spiteful rejection of him who *applies* the cleansing blood of Christ; the latter as exhausting and proving inefficient the resources of that blood itself. The one provokes and drives away the Spirit, and prevents him from applying his regenerating power to the soul; the other quenches his regenerating influences in the soul itself. In my opinion, there is another wide difference between them. The one can be, and is, committed; the other is, theoretically, but not practically, possible. The present passage describes, I think, a condition subjectively possible, and, therefore, needing to be held up in earnest warning to the believer, while objectively, and in the absolute purpose of God, it never actually occurs.

relation to this sin, I would remark: (1) That this, and several like passages in the Epistle, are substantially but expansions (couched in the peculiar style of our author) of similar exhortations and warnings occurring elsewhere in the epistles, emphasized, in this case, by the extremely perilous condition of the persons addressed. The Epistle to the Galatians furnishes, perhaps, the nearest parallel to their condition, though the accessories and handling are widely different. But the injunctions, "Quench not the Spirit," "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God," etc., and especially the Saviour's language in John 15:7, seq., "Abide in me," etc., "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth," etc., seem substantially of the same nature. Whatever inferences we draw from the one set of passages can be extended to the other. (2) I think it is not affirmed in any of these passages, that persons of the class here described have actually fallen away. The readers are bidden to beware of an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God, warned of the helpless condition of apostates, and reminded of the intrinsically necessary consequences of such apostasy—granting it to occur; but I am not aware that the case is put otherwise than hypothetically. Why, then, put hypothetically a case which is never to be realized? I answer: (3) The Scriptures everywhere treat men as free, moral agents, who hold their destinies in their own keeping. The sinner is commanded to repent, as if repentance lay within his independent volition; the Christian is urged to fidelity, perseverance, and growth in holiness, as if all were not ultimately the product of divine grace working within him. They are dealt with, not according to the objective facts, but their subjective, conscious obligations; and this mode of dealing with them is doubtless one of the divine means of accomplishing its sovereign purposes. As free, moral agents, they may, and ought to, repent; but through these exhortations God brings them to repentance. As conscious, free agents, Christians may either stand or fall; and if in his gracious economy he has ordained that they shall *not* fall, these warnings may be among his means of accomplishing his ordination. This with all the more propriety, as they know not as yet with absolute certainty to which category they belong. To the Eye that sees the future as the present, and the hidden as the revealed, their character and destiny are already decided; but to them in whom dwell conflicting elements of character, who are begirt by temptations, and to whom the sole decisive test is perseverance to the end, these exhortations are always timely. (4) The writer may thus include under the same general description, two widely different classes—those who are actually regenerated, and those who, not really so, have gone through an apparent Christian experience. The two will be subject to substantially the same treatment, and only in the sequel will exhibit their real intrinsic diversity. The stony ground plants spring up more speedily and luxuriantly than the offspring of the good soil; but the rising of the sun, which warms and fosters the one, scorches and withers the other. Thus the professed disciples may be described partly as they are, partly as they appear. Those who fall away were, in fact, never genuine disciples; those who were genuine disciples will never fall away. (5) The question of the possible apostasy of believers it is not my province to discuss. I can only just say that it seems to me to lie within the nature of the case that those whom the Son of God has ransomed with his blood and regenerated with his Spirit, cannot be allowed afterward completely to apostatize. It seems to me to be allowing such a triumph to Satan as is insupposable, and directly to antagonize the words of Christ, "My sheep hear my voice; and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." So the triumphant language of Paul in the eighth chapter of Romans; and such seems to me to be the prevailing tone of the New Testament. (6) But finally, it is clear that if the Christian's apostasy is possible, he can apostatize but *once*. When the record which God has written on his heart is effaced, it cannot be inscribed there again. He will have no second opportunity to offer that outrage to an atoning Redeemer and a regenerating Spirit. This, and other like passages, put an extinguisher on the hopes of him who has succeeded in wresting himself out of the arms of infinite love, and surrenders himself again to the mastery of sin, is henceforth its slave and victim to the end.

7 For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God:
8 But that which beareth thorns and briers *is* rejected, and *is* nigh unto cursing; whose end *is* to be burned.

7 afresh, and put him to an open shame. For the land which hath drunk the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them for whose sake it is also tilled, receiveth blessing from
8 God: but if it beareth thorns and thistles, it is rejected and nigh unto a curse; whose end is to be burned.

7, 8. Simile illustrating and enforcing the above warning, and pointing the condition, "provided God permit."

7. For the earth, etc.—*For land that hath drunk the rain that cometh oftentimes upon it.* This is the subject to which both the following predicates, bring forth and bear (τίκτουσα and ἐκφέρουσα), equally refer. It describes alike that which in its further culture receives the blessing of God, and that which has his curse. It is the condition of the dealing with both these classes of land that they should have drunk the rains, and had the culture of the husbandman, and shared equally the original means of productiveness. The term 'drinketh,' therefore, is not to be pressed as if it denotes a cordial, voluntary drinking, a glad reception of the rain in the one case as against a more passive reception of it in the other. The terms 'drinketh,' 'bringeth forth,' 'receiveth blessing,' 'is rejected,' all transfer to lifeless nature the life and accountability which belong to the subjects that the figure illustrates. The image is pregnant with vitality. **And bringeth forth,** etc.—*giving birth to, engendering herbage suitable for them for whose sake* (not, *by whom*) *it is tilled.* **Receiveth** (*partaketh of*) **blessing from God.** Those *for whose sake* the field is cultivated are not necessarily the workmen, but the owners (perhaps both); as in the case of Christians, the spiritual soil is tilled indeed by men, but *for* the Supreme Owner, God. The land which, having thus drunk the fertilizing rains, repays them with appropriate vegetation, receives the divine blessing. God smiles upon it, and permits and prospers its further culture. He brings the springing corn to maturity, and rewards the liberal vegetation of one year by a still richer harvest in another. The field is endowed with life, and receives in augmented beauty and verdure the reward of its fidelity. So the writer keeps steadily in view his emphatic 'provided God permit.' Its blessing is from God.

8. But that which beareth, etc.—*But when producing thorns and thistles, it is reprobate and is near to a curse, whose consummation is to be burned.* 'Bearing' (Ἐκφέρουσα), *bringing forth, producing*, though not a word of disparagement, is a term of less dignity (and intentionally chosen as such) than 'bringeth forth' (τίκτουσα, *giving birth to*) of the preceding clause. 'Thorns and thistles' are already the product of a curse (Gen. 3:18), but here appear as its occasion. The writer keeps out of sight any previous inherent difference in the quality of the land to make his figure more perfect. Let it receive the beneficent rains and yield a suitable return, and it is blessed; let it produce thorns and thistles, and it is cursed. It is *reprobate* (ἀδόκιμος), *unproved, not bearing trial;* hence, *worthless, discarded*, a term again transferred from rational to inanimate nature, and chosen as specifically appropriate. As the nations (Rom. 1:28) *disapproved* (ἀπεδοκίμασαν) to hold God in recognition, God gave them over to an *unproved*, worthless, reprobate (ἀδόκιμον) mind. Esau having discarded his birthright (12:17), when he would recover it was *reprobated*, and no divine blessing smiled on his endeavor. So the land that has made so ungracious and perverse a return for the heavenly boon is discarded, reprobrated as worthless. The appended condition, "if God permit," rings in the author's ears. 'Near to a curse' is an expression chosen in tenderness, that the author may not extinguish hope in the readers. He would alarm, but not drive them to despair. He would show their case to be critical, but not hopeless. Even while producing thorns and thistles, the field is not utterly abandoned; the curse delays; the consuming fire does not yet descend, and the doubt implied in the 'if God permit' may have a happy solution. If the word translated 'end' in the Common Version (τέλος) be rendered *consummation*, the 'whose' (ἧς), *of which*, refers to 'curse'; if 'end,' it may equally well refer to land (γῆς). In the words, "whose end is for burning," Delitzsch suggests a possible prophetic anticipation of the approaching doom of Jerusalem. The Jewish vineyard was certainly now near to its burning. The spiritual eye must have discovered lurid clouds hang-

9 But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak.
10 For God *is* not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have shewed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister.
11 And we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end:

9 But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that [1]accompany salvation, though
10 we thus speak: for God is not unrighteous to forget your work and the love which ye shewed toward his name, in that ye ministered unto the saints, and
11 still do minister. And we desire that each one of you may shew the same diligence unto the [2]fulness

1 Or, *belong to*.... 2 Or, *full assurance*.

ing heavy on the horizon. The general reference of the figure is probably to a storm of fire and brimstone from heaven, like that which descended on the cities of the plain and doomed them to perpetual sterility.

(*c*) The brighter aspects of the case. The author would encourage as well as alarm. He declares to his readers his confidence that under God's covenant faithfulness better things await them; cites his oath to Abraham as a sure ground of confidence, and, reminding them of their hope which enters the heavenly sanctuary, and rests on the heavenly High Priest, thus brings his subject gracefully round to the starting point in the heavenly high priesthood of Jesus, from which he had digressed. (9–20.)

9. But, beloved, we are persuaded—not necessarily implying doubt or reluctant belief, but a belief which springs from evidence. (Rom. 8:38; 2 Tim. 1:5.) **Of** (*concerning*) **you.** 'Beloved' is a term of endearment, applied by our author only here, and here, doubtless, in view of the fearful rebuke just administered. **Better things of you**—better to the extent of being *connected with salvation;* better intrinsically; better in their final issue. **Though we thus speak**—doubtingly and alarmingly. He has spoken with fidelity and plainness; he has inflicted "the wounds of a friend," putting the worst aspects of their case in the hope of preventing his foreboding from being realized.

10. For God is not unrighteous to forget your work. As to their work, see 10:32; their endurance of affliction and persecution, and active and close sympathy with the persecuted. The author finds grounds for the assurance that God will not permit their final apostasy in the fact that his very *justice* is enlisted in their behalf, and in some sort pledged to reward their former fidelity and devotion. The Christian's best works, of course, give him no claim to salvation. But God suffers no intrinsically good act to go unrewarded; and although it was at his pleasure originally to institute or not his gracious economy, yet it being once instituted, his veracity and justice guarantee the fulfillment of his promises both to the Redeemer and his people. He encourages, therefore, his Hebrew brethren by a reference to their former, and indeed still continued, acts of Christian service (for external may not have kept pace with internal spiritual decline), and finds in God's *gracious justice* a guarantee of their ultimate salvation. **And the love which ye have shewed toward his name**—that is, toward himself; the 'name,' as outward symbol of the person, often stands forcibly for the person. The 'work' stands collectively for *works;* it takes their Christian activity as a whole. It is completed by 'love,' ('labor,' κόπου, is wanting in the best MSS.), without which all works, even acts of charity, as giving one's goods to feed the poor and one's body to be burned, are really worthless. The work and the love had here gone together. **In that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister** (*are ministering*). They have attested, and are still attesting, their allegiance to Christ by ministering to his people; primarily, perhaps, though by no means exclusively, in charitable contributions. No inference can probably be drawn from this passage as to the residence of these Christians, whether in or out of Palestine. Whether their contributions were to their needy fellow-Christians in any part of Palestine (as Jerusalem), or among themselves or elsewhere, the reference is quite too vague to warrant any conclusion. Jewish Christians in Rome might very well have been objects of charity.

11. Renewed exhortation. **And we desire that every one of you do show** (*feel*) **the same diligence,** *zeal;* not the same with one another, but the same which ye have shown in deeds of love and charity. **To**

12 That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.
13 For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself.
14 Saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee.

12 of hope even to the end: that ye be not sluggish, but imitators of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.
13 For when God made promise to Abraham, since he could swear by none greater, he sware by him-
14 self, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and

(*in respect to*) **the full assurance of hope** (πληροφορίαν), *completion, perfection* (Bleek, De Wette), or, *full and assured confidence* (Delitzsch and others), more in accordance with the usual New Testament sense of the word. (10:22; 1 Thess. 1:5; Col. 2:2.) **Unto the end**—whether 'shew unto the end' or hope 'unto the end' seems doubtful, and the difference in meaning is not important. In either case 'the beginning of their confidence,' their original hope and fervor, are to be maintained to the final issue. This is conceived not so much as the close of life as of the waiting period before the coming of the Messiah, which was expected to break upon them soon, and did so typically in the overthrow of their city and nation. Perhaps the 'end' is here conceived as simply the close of the probationary period, in whatever way terminated.

12. That ye be not (*may not become, prove*) **slothful**—*sluggish* (νωθροί), *dull, inert* of spiritual understanding and sensibility. They have been already said (5:11) to *have* become sluggish; but such epithets are of course always relative, and besides the Greek verb (γένησθε) may signify not only to become what they are not, but to prove themselves *what they are* (ἐγένοντο ἀνδρεῖοι, *they proved themselves brave*). **But followers** (*imitators*) **of them who through faith and patience** (μακροθυμία, *long suffering*)—the very qualities which these Hebrew Christians are called on specially to display; the faith which takes cognizance of the future (11:1), and the long suffering which, nerved by faith, withstands trials and temptations. **Inherit the promises**—not the *word* of the promise, but its *substance*, its realization. The present participle (κληρονομούντων) shows that not merely the patriarchs and the ancient worthies are meant, but the whole line of the faithful down to their own day. Not until the next verse is the general thought specialized to Abraham. At 11:13 we are told that these ancient worthies died without receiving the promises—that is, their fulfillment. How, then, can they be here declared to have inherited them? We reply: The former declaration is confined within the limits of their *earthly life;* the latter takes in the whole compass of their existence. Looking simply at his earthly career, Abraham obtained the promise indeed, but not its fulfillment; looking at his whole career, he obtained both. With God, who cannot lie, making the promise is equivalent to fulfilling it, and its full import will be realized in its own due time. We may further add that the coming of Christ brings at once the believers of all times, dead and living, into a richer experience of the promised good. Whatever their previous condition, they now inherit the promises, and that through the faith and patience of their earthly life. Between 'promise' and 'promises' (singular and plural) there is no marked distinction.

13. Example of Abraham. **For** introduces an illustration, on the one hand, of the promise and of the guarantee in God's faithfulness for its fulfillment, and, on the other, of the faith and long suffering which secured its realization. **When God made promise to Abraham**—'Abraham' (in the Greek) emphatic in position (for *to Abraham in making promise, God*, etc.). Some (as De Wette, Lünemann) render the participle "after promising," thus making the promise antecedent to the oath, and referring the promise to Gen. 17:4, seq., and the oath to 22:16, 17; but the coupling of the oath with the promise is specially important to the writer, and it is much better to refer the whole to Gen. 22:16, 17, where both appear in connection. The aorist participle will admit equally well of either rendering, *when he promised* (*on* promising), or, *after promising*. I adopt unhesitatingly (with Delitzsch) the former construction, which makes the promise and oath come together, the promise preceding simply in logical conception. **Because** (*since*) **he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself.** On the part of God, Abraham's ground of faith was of the most decisive conceivable character. He left nothing undone that could assure to Abraham the sincerity and absolute reliableness of his promise, and added to it the inviolable sanctity of the oath.

14. Saying, Surely (ἦ μήν), a formula familiar to classic Greek, as accompanying and

15 And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise.
16 For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation *is* to them an end of all strife.
17 Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed *it* by an oath:

15 multiplying I will multiply thee. And thus, having
16 patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men swear by the greater: and in every dispute of
17 theirs the oath is final for confirmation. Wherein God, being minded to shew more abundantly unto the heirs of the promise the immutability of his

often taking the place of an adjuration, and always having the power of an oath; so the Septuagint.[1] The rest of the passage has the Hebrew emphasis **blessing I will bless thee**—equivalent to, I will surely bless thee, **and multiplying I will multiply thee**—equivalent to, I will surely multiply thee. The citation varies from the Septuagint 22 : 17, in substituting *thee* (σέ) for *thy seed* (τὸ σπέρμα σου) in the second clause.

15. And so, *thus*—that is, not "in this way," but (by a familiar use of the Greek οὕτως) 'under these conditions' of God's promise given and confirmed: the particle 'thus' belonging exclusively neither to the participle "patiently enduring" (μακροθυμήσας) nor to the verb "obtained" (ἐπέτυχεν), but to both as constituting one complex idea. **After he had patiently endured** (*patiently enduring*, Rom. 4 : 18-29; or, *by patiently enduring*) he **obtained the promise**—that is, its fulfillment. Not, indeed, in his earthly life time, but as fast and as soon as the promise in its various elements, the multiplication of his seed, and the Messianic salvation through his seed, could be accomplished.

16. For men, *indeed* (μέν, *indeed, to be sure*, as contrasted with God; never as the Common Version, **verily.** But the particle is wanting in the Sinaitic and some other MSS. If the particle is genuine it implies the latent thought that than God there *is* no greater.) **Swear by the greater** (τοῦ μείζονος)—either neuter, *that which is greater*, or better, masculine, "the greater Being," him by whom all men swear; namely, God. The force of the oath consists not in its appealing to *any* object greater than ourselves, but to the *one* Being who can take cognizance of our treatment of the oath The last clause may be rendered: *And of gainsaying the oath to them is a finality (a limit) for confirmation.* 'Gainsaying' (here the object in the writer's mind being the divine promise) seems a better rendering of the Greek (ἀντιλογία), than *strife, dispute*, which the word will equally well bear, and as in the Revised Version. 'Oath' is emphatic in position. 'For confirmation' belongs to 'end,' 'limit,' and not to 'oath.'

17. Wherein (*in which*); namely, matter, or state of the case as to the force of the oath. **God willing** (*wishing*) **more abundantly**—in a higher degree than by his single word, or, as is possible, *very abundantly*—**to shew unto the heirs of promise**, not merely the Old Testament saints (Tholuck), nor simply Christians as such (Lünemann), but the spiritual descendants of Abraham, the spiritual Israel who inherit all the spiritual blessings couched under the earthly promise. In the promise to Abraham were potentially contained all the blessings of the New Covenant, whence believers become 'the heirs of promise.' An emphasis, however, rests on 'heirs,' as if the author would not only signalize God's desire to assure the blessing to Abraham, the original receiver of the promise, but to his children its inheritors, by a like oath. The author's circle of vision has expanded. He embraces in thought the present time, and the more strictly spiritual import of the oath to Abraham. **The immutability of his counsel,** etc., *interposed with an oath;* 'interposed,' *mediated* (μεσιτεύω), came as mediator between himself and the objects of the promise. It may be doubted whether Delitzsch (with some others) is not right in supposing that in this renewed reference to the oath at ver. 17, the author has not in mind another oath in which the New Testament heirs of the promise are still more deeply interested, that, namely, which confirms to Christ yet more solemnly the royal and perpetual priesthood of Melchisedec. The very formal resumption of the subject: the words "wishing more abundantly to confirm" (περισσότερον) which in this case would refer to the second oath—more abundantly than by the

[1] [The reading εἰ μήν is preferred by the leading editors, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and is supported by the important MSS. ℵ A B D * E P. The meaning, however, is not affected by this change. See Thayer's Lex. of the New Testament S. V.—A. H.]

18 That by two immutable things, in which *it was* impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us:
19 Which *hope* we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the vail;

18 counsel [1] interposed with an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us;
19 which we have as an anchor of the soul, *a hope* both sure and stedfast and entering into that which is

1 Gr. *mediated.*

former: 'the immutability of his counsel,' which might be suggested by "the Lord swore and will not repent"; and finally, the close connection in which all this stands with the heavenly sanctuary, in which the believer's hope is to enter and fasten on the high priesthood of Christ, toward which the author is now rapidly hastening forward, and which already he has full in view—all might favor the idea that he has now rather in mind the oath to Christ than the oath to Abraham. That special topic and example he seems really to have left behind him. His own times and his Hebrew brethren are under his eye. To them the oath that God would bless Abraham and multiply his seed, though always of interest, is now of less immediate concern than that promise and oath of God to Christ, which form the very core and centre of the New Covenant. And although there is here no express mention of this oath, yet it might be a part of the writer's *art* to leave it to suggest itself, as it so naturally would to his readers, and reserve its express mention to a little later on. (7:20-22.) As, however, the author *has not* here made express reference to this oath, I do not feel at liberty to give this as a confident interpretation, but suggest the probability that such is here the purpose of the writer.

18. That by two immutable things—in the promise and the oath; both equally and absolutely sure: for, strictly speaking, God's promise is his oath. His promise pledges his divine veracity, and all the attributes of his nature; and his oath can do no more. He condescends, however, to human weakness, and subjects his utterances to the law of our finite limitations. The added formula of an oath *seems* to be pledging the divine veracity more completely to the fulfillment of its promises. We may add, however, that even with men the distinction between the word and the oath is only seeming. To the *faith* that utters everything under the eye of Omniscience, every word has the sanctity of an oath **—in which it was** (*is*) **impossible for God to lie** (*utter falsehood*). Both the promise and the oath equally pledge the divine veracity: it is only our finite weakness that superadds to the sanctity of the promise the sanctity of the oath. *We may have a strong encouragement* (not as in Common Version, *consolation*) **who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set** (*lying*) **before us.** So, I think, better than "that we who have fled for refuge, may have strong encouragement to lay hold of," etc. Though it is doubtful if the elliptical construction should not be thus filled up: "may have strong encouragement *to hold on* (κρατεῖν), who have fled for refuge to *lay hold of*" (κρατῆσαι, aorist). *Lay hold of* (κρατῆσαι) suits much better to the 'who have fled for refuge' (οἱ καταφυγόντες). Both the clauses stand harshly alone. The 'hope' that lies before us is here taken objectively, as the thing hoped for, not the *grace* of hope, as just below; as Rom. 8, "a hope that is seen is not hope," plays between the subjective and objective uses of the word.

19. Which [hope] **we have as an anchor of the soul.** The anchor of hope is a natural and familiar figure, perhaps suggested here by the 'fled for refuge' (καταφυγεῖν), like a tossed ship fleeing for refuge to its harbor—**both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the vail.** These predicates (on account of the connections τε, καί, καί) must all be construed together. They are generally taken with 'anchor,' to which 'sure and steadfast' are especially appropriate; 'entering,' etc., less so. This applies beautifully to the believer's hope, less naturally to the 'anchor.' The figure, indeed, is not without force and beauty which represents the anchor of hope thrown not downward into life's stormy sea, but upward into the tranquil deeps of the heavenly sanctuary, where (unlike the earthly anchor) it *lies*, holding the spiritual bark through all its stormy course. Granting freely the picturesque beauty of this figure, I yet see nothing in the *position* of the words

20 Whither the forerunner is for us entered, *even* Jesus, made a high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.

20 within the veil; whither as a forerunner Jesus entered for us, having become a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

CHAPTER VII.

FOR this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him;

1 For this Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of God Most High, who met Abraham returning from the

to prevent their being connected naturally with 'which [hope],' a figure that more easily suits to the 'entering within the veil.' In either case it forms an admirable turning point or pivot on which the author gracefully swings round to his main theme, from which he had diverged at 5 : 10, with a reference to Christ's Melchisedec priesthood, and to which through the intervening stages, by carrying the believer's hope into the heavenly sanctuary, the home of that royal High Priest, he now returns.[1] The writer adds most naturally, and returning to the topic dropped at 5 : 10—

20. Whither, etc.; *where* (ὅπου, *where*, used pregnantly for ὅποι, *whither;* equivalent to *whither* he entered and *where* he remained)—*as a forerunner on our behalf entered Jesus.* It is the presence of Jesus within the vail that emboldens our hope to penetrate that mysterious and awful place in which we "draw near to God"; and looking back from this point we feel more inclined to regard the oath, which at ver. 17 gives such strong assurance to the heirs of promise, as at least intended to call up to the mind of the reader the great Melchisedec oath and promise which, though he might reserve it for a fulier mention elsewhere, he could scarcely leave entirely unnoticed here. I think he lets it lie faintly outlined on the horizon of his thought. **For us,** *on our behalf.* In this Jesus resembled the earthly high priest, who, after slaughtering the victim in the outer court, entered with its blood on behalf of the people into the Holiest of All, the symbolical presence of God. But there the parallel ends. The earthly priest entered alone but once a year, and with none to follow. Jesus entered to *stay*, and as *Forerunner* of his people: that where he is they might be. *After the order of Melchisedec becoming a high priest forever.* This formally launches the author on his great theme. '*After the order of Melchisedec,*' in reversed order, is placed emphatically first as the topic which is to be immediately treated. After the likeness of Melchisedec he thus appears as royal, sole, perpetual Priest; after the likeness of Aaron, he becomes a High Priest; the author here again, as at 5 : 10, including the Levitical element, which gives to his priesthood completeness. As antitype of Melchisedec he would have a royal, untransferable, unending priesthood, but a 'barren scepter' and a barren priesthood, with no atoning sacrifice. As antitype of Aaron, he has a real efficacious sacrifice in the true tabernacle: and absorbing into his person the significance of both these priesthoods, he holds them both *forever.*

Ch. 7: (3) *The royal Melchisedec priesthood of Christ.* (1-28.)

(*a*) Summary of the Old Testament description of Melchisedec in those historical features which determine the character of his priesthood. (1-3.)

1. For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God. There has been much speculation regarding this mysterious personage, who in the narrative of Genesis flashes a moment on our view, as one peculiarly exalted, and then utterly disappears, except, in one brief sentence of the Psalms, as priestly type of the Son of God. There has been expended on him much idle conjecture. He has been supposed to be Shem; to be a man created for the express occasion; to be an angel—nay, as if to convict the Scripture of the folly of likening our Lord to himself, and making him a priest after his own order, to be the Son of God himself. Every such hypothesis may be summarily dismissed. There is nothing, either, in the text of Genesis, or the commentary in Hebrews, which, properly considered, countenances such assumptions. On his origin and history the vail was evidently not intended to be lifted. Raised up for a special purpose, his origin and

[1] The passage furnishes one of the instances of graceful and designed transition, so familiar to our author, and which, like numberless other rhetorical touches, mark unmistakably a hand other than that of Paul.

end shrouded in intentional obscurity, he was brought into personal contact with the father of the Jewish race, that when a change should be necessary in the Jewish priestly order their own annals might foreshadow and justify the proceeding in the exhibition of one before whom Abraham himself, and in him his priestly descendants, had bowed in homage. So at least God has *used* Melchisedec, and so we may presume he *intended* to use him, and that to this use the Old Testament narrative was adjusted. Whatever the sacred historian may have known, or not known, regarding Melchisedec's ancestry and historical relations, the Spirit of God that presided over the narrative caused just so much to be recorded as answered the purpose of his introduction. He was to be used simply as a *type*. It mattered not so much what he *was* as what he *appeared*. The mode of exhibiting him met all the purposes which he was to subserve in sacred history. His *role*, however, in the historic drama, though brief, was one of pre-eminent dignity. He was an earthly king, probably, in that city which was subsequently to be the royal city of David, and of David's royal line. He was a priest, the first priest mentioned in the sacred annals, and a priest of the Most High God. Thus he was one of the few who still preserved uncorrupted the traditionary monotheism of the ante-Noachian period. Probably, he was one of that race of Shem that, as descendants of Lud, occupied Canaan before its conquest by the Canaanites, and thus belonged to the family which had received the peculiar blessing of Noah. Inferior to Abraham in his personal (though not in his official) future, he was superior to him in the actual present. Abraham's hopes and prospects were in the bud; Melchisedec's greatness was in its full maturity. Abraham was a king in embryo, the father of kings, the father of priests, the ancestor of him with whom a typical connection should alone rescue the name of Melchisedec from oblivion. But as yet all this was not, and Melchisedec now stood before Abraham in the combined dignities of actual kingship and priesthood — two persons unconsciously confronting each other, the one the real ancestor, the other the typical representative, of that Greater One in whom each was to find all his significance and all his greatness!

The long, swelling period which opens the chapter divides itself into two parts. The first consists of clauses describing the subject, Melchisedec, and is a mere *résumé* of the facts stated in Genesis. The second (commencing with, **being first,** etc., ver. 2) consists of clauses referring to the predicate (**abideth a priest,** etc., ver. 3), and declares under what character and conditions he so abides. The first identifies the *man;* the second portrays the *priest*, and is the author's statement of those points (as deduced from the narrative), which made Melchisedec's priesthood a type of our Lord's. 'For this Melchisedec'—the 'for' connects the passage directly with the preceding, and as it terminates emphatically with "abideth a priest continually," has probably in mind the "forever" which closes the preceding chapter. 'King of Salem.' On the locality of this 'Salem' opinions differ. Many claim that the city of David did not at this time bear this appellation, but that of *Jebus*, and that some other place, probably the Salim near Enon, mentioned in John 3 : 23, is referred to; and here, according to Jerome, were pointed out extensive remains of Melchisedec's palace. This, however, may safely be attributed to the local ambition, which took advantage of the coincidence of a name, while tradition, Josephus ("Antiquities," I : 10, 2), the Targumists, and most of the Fathers, identified it with Jerusalem. The name *Salim* for Jerusalem, occurring in one of the late Psalms (76 : 2), may, as well remarked by Delitzsch, be such an archaism as poetry loves, and may be the then nearly obsolete and therefore poetic ancient name of the town. To Bleek's objection that, if our author had referred to Jerusalem, he would have urged the sacred associations of the place, we may reply that such expansion would have been inconsistent with the studied brevity of the passage, while the hint of the significance of the name might well be deemed sufficient. On the other hand, the intrinsic probabilities are all in favor of assigning the typical King of Righteousness and Peace to the locality whose name was to be associated with the typical and then with the spiritual capital (12 : 22; Gal. 4 : 26; Rev. 21 : 2) of that kingdom forever. That the author takes the word in any other sense than as the name of a place is improbable. 'Priest of the most high God.' The union of kingly and priestly offices be-

2 To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace;
3 Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but

2 slaughter of the kings, and blessed him, to whom also Abraham divided a tenth part of all (being first, by interpretation, King of righteousness, and then
3 also King of Salem, which is, King of peace; without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but

longed to the simplicity of early times, and was common among the heathen. The Homeric king officiates likewise as priest. The knowledge of the Supreme God had not, it seems, entirely disappeared, and his worship existed sporadically, even down to a much later time, although, as in the case of Balaam, often incongruously blended with idolatrous rites and errors. Melchisedec was clearly recognized by Abraham as worshiping the same God with himself. **Who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him.** The fact here mentioned is more than a mere incident recorded to complete or give definitness to the picture. It has a purpose here, as doubtless this specific conjunction of events had in the original transaction. God not only brought Melchisedec into contact with Abraham, the head of the Jewish race, rather than with any other Old Testament worthy, but with Abraham at the precise period of his history, when, having avenged five kings and conquered four, he was returning in the flush of victory, and laden with the spoils of triumph. With his feet just taken from the necks of vanquished monarchs, his recognition of Melchisedec's superiority would be doubly significant.

2. To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; namely, the spoils. Abraham did this voluntarily, and probably with an instant perception of a certain majesty attending the royal priest. The homage, however, was paid to the priest, not to the king. It was a religious offering, not a political tribute. It shows also how early and natural was the rendering of the tenth. Thus far we have a summary of the *facts* of the narrative.

The author now proceeds to comment on them in their bearing on Melchisedec's priesthood, as illustrating that of Christ. The inferences are partly positive, partly negative; partly drawn from the statements, partly from the silence of Scripture. They show under what conditions Melchisedec may be said to have had a perpetual priesthood. They are simply the author's deductions from the brief account in Genesis, and imply no knowledge of him outside of that account. He has looked to the Psalm, "Thou art a priest," etc., and then turned back to Genesis to see the features of that priesthood which had so wonderful an exaltation; what in Melchisedec's person, position, and office, would shed light on this remarkable declaration. He passes in rapid review the points. His name, the name of his city, his kingly and priestly office conjoined, his solitary personality and priesthood, both exhibiting no antecedent and no succession; thus what is told and what is suppressed alike constitute grounds of his relation to the great High Priest of the New Covenant. The author is simply *interpreting Scripture*, and his interpretation is a striking example of what spiritual insight can legitimately deduce from the language and the silence of a text. It has no analogy to the fanciful deductions of the Rabbins. **First being by interpretation King of righteousness**—that is, his name being by its interpretation, etc. Josephus explains it "righteous king"; our author probably conceives it, in its application to Christ, as 'king in the realm of righteousness.' **And then also King of Salem, which is King of peace.** Another typical feature in his portraiture, derived from the city in which he reigned. As applied to Melchisedec, it would denote simply 'peaceful king'; to the Messiah, 'king in the realm of peace,' which he first creates between man and God (Rom. 5:1); then inwardly in the soul (John 14:27); then outwardly among men, and finally universally in the world.

3. The deductions *e silentio*. The preceding points are rather incidental, and would not be pressed; the next are vital, giving the distinctive character of Christ's priesthood. **Without father, without mother, without** [*record of*] **descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life.** These epithets apply to Melchisedec, not as a priest, but as a man, and are the traits in his personal history on which rests the peculiar character of his priesthood. Because he *personally* appears before us with no records of origin or of death, therefore he can appear as having an

made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually.

made like unto the Son of God), abideth a priest continually.

unborrowed and hence untransmitted, unsuperseded priesthood. As to the import of these affirmations, they stand or fall together. If one demands an interpretation such as throws a *real* mystery about Melchisedec, all do. If one may be taken to express the impression made by the silence of the historian, all may. That this latter is the correct view, is now generally admitted, and I conceive to be beyond a doubt. The writer has no interest in involving in mystery the person of Melchisedec. He puts strongly certain points *for the use which he wishes to make of them* as illustrating certain features in the person, and hence the priesthood, of his antitype. What Christ is really, Melchisedec must be apparently; and this is all that is required. In a historical narration, which makes in general great account of parentage; in which genealogical tables are constantly given and at great length, and scarcely a sacred name is mentioned without a scrupulous record of ancestry and of end,—he, the greatest of them all, has no such mention. No father, no mother, no ancestry, no birth, no death, is recorded of him. He stands, a solitary instance of a personage whose function transcends that of every other Scripture character, type of the eternal kingship and eternal priesthood of the Son of God, yet—or rather, therefore—with not one word to shed light on his family or his nation, his reign, or his destiny. The remarkableness of the phenomenon warrants the inference that the silence is intentional and significant. Had the epithets appeared in the original *narrative*, the case would have been very different: but a commentary on the reticence of Moses is quite another matter; the question is not of a historical fact, but of an expressive symbol. Nothing turns on the question whether Melchisedec was really the miraculous person which these epithets, if pressed, would make him. The *seeming* is, for the typical use, as good as the reality; the non-appearance is equivalent to the non-existence, and here emphatically, "*de non apparentibus et de non existentibus, eadem est ratio.*" The import of the several predicates is obvious. He is one of whom no father or mother is recorded (a similar idiom is familiar to the classics—*nullo patre*), with no genealogical record (which is in fact the meaning of the word), and having in history no beginning or end of life. The words are *selected:* no "end of life"; therefore, he *liveth.* **But made like** (*assimilated*) **unto the Son of God.** This refers to the preceding clauses, especially the last, in which he appears as having neither beginning of days nor end of life. It is the summation of these statements. As one who *appears* exempt from the limitations of mortal life, from its beginning and its end, Melchisedec has been conformed, assimilated to the Son of God. This refers not to our Lord *in his human nature*, for as such he was not without parentage, genealogy, recorded beginning of days, and even end of life—at least, death; nor to him as *high priest* after his exaltation (for as such Christ was assimilated to him, not he to Christ); but to the Son of God in his eternal, pre-existent nature as the Only Begotten. The comparison, then, is not between Melchisedec as priest, and Christ as priest, but between those features in the *recorded personality* of Melchisedec, which *enable* him to *appear* as perpetual priest, and those attributes of the Son of God which enable him to *be* an eternal priest. A basis for Melchisedec's unborrowed and untransmitted priesthood is found in his appearance in the sacred page with a life which has no defined limit at either extreme, and is bound to the human race by no recorded genealogy; just as the eternal existence of the divine Logos was the basis on which could rest his absolutely untransmitted and eternal priesthood. The latent argument is: Melchisedec appears in his personality assimilated to the eternal Son of God; hence, he could have a priesthood which should typify the exalted and everlasting priesthood of the Son of God. Looking at the brief passage in the Psalm, and then at the brief passage in Genesis, the author has spelled out from the latter, with the divining sagacity of inspiration, those characteristics of Melchisedec which raised him to so exalted an office as that in which the Psalm exhibits him. Under these conditions, and by virtue of these qualities, Melchisedec **abideth a priest continually** (*perpetually*). He has, so far as appears, no successor. He had, probably, none in fact, being in no priestly line, and his

4 Now consider how great this man *was*, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils.
5 And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who

4 Now consider how great this man was, unto whom Abraham, the patriarch, gave a tenth out of the chief
5 spoils. And they indeed of the sons of Levi that re-

priesthood terminating with himself. Hence, as he does not *appear* as dying, his priesthood does not appear as terminating. That it must in reality have terminated is clear, else we have the monstrosity of two eternal parallel priesthoods, the typical and the antitypical. To suppose with some that he 'abides a priest perpetually' by his priesthood being absorbed into that of Christ is to make a vicious circle of argument; for Christ is Priest after the likeness of Melchisedec, because Melchisedec has a perpetual priesthood; and Melchisedec has a perpetual priesthood only as it is perpetuated in that of Christ. Melchisedec, then, is perpetual priest as one who has no successor, and does not appear as dying. The author, too, chooses his terms with care. He does not say of Melchisedec that he abides a priest *forever;* this absolute expression he reserves for Christ. The phrase 'perpetually' (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές) may mean 'forever' when its subject would naturally take such a predicate. The Greek, like its English equivalent, takes its extent from the subject to which it is applied.

(*b*) Personal greatness of Melchisedec illustrated by his receiving tithes from Abraham, and that under extraordinary conditions. (4–10.)

Christ as priest after the order of Melchisedec has superseded the Levitical priesthood. It becomes pertinent to inquire, especially for Jewish readers, how great a person this type was, not only typically, but personally. This section is often misconceived, as I think, by being regarded as commencing the enumeration of Christ's priestly prerogatives, as Melchisedec Priest. This point is not yet touched; we have simply the personal and official greatness of Melchisedec himself. I have already remarked on the obvious purpose of God in bringing Melchisedec into contact with Abraham in the hour of Abraham's military triumph; it is still more obvious in bringing him into contact with Abraham himself, rather than with any of his descendants, and securing for him, in *his* homage, that of all his descendants, including of course Moses.

4. Now consider how great this man was, unto whom (not 'even,' as in the Common Version, but *to whom, in addition to all his other marks of dignity, also*[1]) **the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the** (*choicest*) **spoils.** The author selects for comment that particular feature in the recorded transaction which was pertinent to his object. Abraham paid tithes to Melchisedec, evidently self-moved and in acknowledgment of his priestly character. His respect was shown by the nature of the gift: he gave a tenth not merely of all, but (ἀκροθίνια, *the top of the heap*) of the choicest spoils, and apparently not merely a tenth of the choicest, but a tenth of all, and that consisting of the choicest. Placed emphatically at the close is his designation as 'patriarch' (πατριάρχης), used in the Septuagint to denote the head of a family, but later the head of a race. It is applied, in 4 Mac. 7: 19, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; Acts 2: 29, to David; Acts 7: 8, 9, to the sons of Jacob; here, with special emphasis designating the great Founder of the race. Of course, the greater was Abraham, the greater he to whom Abraham was inferior. The general statement is now illustrated by comparison of the conditions under which Melchisedec and the Levitical priests respectively received tithes. The points of difference are four: The Levitical priests tithe by law; he without law, by voluntary bestowment; they tithe their brethren, whom only *law* could enable them to tithe, he a stranger, to whom he must be, therefore, superior; they tithe the descendants of Abraham, he Abraham himself; they tithe as dying men, he as one of whom it is testified that he *liveth.*

5. And verily, etc.—*they indeed* (or, *while they*) *of the sons of Levi that receive the priest's office:* or (with Delitzsch and Kurtz, taking (ἐκ) of *origin* and not partitively) "while they who receive from the sons of Levi the priesthood." The latter is argued by Kurtz on the ground that in the passage below (ἐξ αὐτῶν, 'deriving his lineage *from them*') the preposition (ἐξ) marks origin, and must therefore here. But

[1] Though the καί, *also*, is of doubtful genuineness.

receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham:

6 But he whose descent is not counted from them received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises.

7 And without all contradiction the less is blessed of better.

ceive the priest's office have commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though these have come out of the
6 loins of Abraham: but he whose genealogy is not counted from them hath taken tithes of Abraham,
7 and hath blessed him that hath the promises. But without any dispute the less is blessed of the better.

nothing hinders our taking it as partitive in the one case and not in the other. And I see no special difficulty in either rendering. The author is not comparing the priests of the tribe of Levi with the other Levites, but the Levitical *priests* with Melchisedec; and the fact that the tithing was made indirectly by the priests through the Levites need in this brief statement create no difficulty. Virtually and really the priests tithed the people. **Have a commandment,** etc. *Have a command, according to the law, to tithe the people, that is, their brethren.* The people were the brethren, and so the equals of the Levitical priests, and could be tithed by them therefore only by *express ordinance.* Melchisedec was of another race, and his receiving tithes, voluntarily bestowed, must be on the ground of his intrinsic and recognized superiority. The subject is a delicate one to a Jew, and but briefly touched. **Though,** etc. (*although they have issued from the loins of Abraham'*). The 'although' here is somewhat difficult. I think it is intended to intimate that these brethren as having sprung from Abraham might expect to be exempted from the tithing (which marked subordination); and thus in elevating the Levitical tithing as embracing even the descendants of Abraham, more highly to exalt Melchisedec, who, as superior to them, rose proportionably higher. If the law allowed them to tithe the descendants of Abraham, how great must he be who, without legal enactment, tithed Abraham himself! The general thought is, while the priests of Israel tithed only by special enactment those who, as their brethren, descendants in common with them from Abraham, were naturally equal, Melchisedec, a stranger, sustaining no natural affinity to Abraham, tithed him with no law that authorized the one to take and required the other to give, and stands therefore in a relation of intrinsic superiority to the Father of the race, while they but sustain a conventional and merely legal superiority to his descendants.

6. But he whose descent is not counted from them—or, *but he, while not reckoning his descent from them*[1]—a stranger of a different race, without legal enactment—**received tithes of,** etc.; or, *hath tithed Abraham*, the head of the race, father both of tithers and tithed. **And** (*hath*) **blessed him that had** (*hath*) **the promises.** Abraham is before presented as rendering homage to Melchisedec in the very flush of victory. He is now represented as receiving the priestly blessing of Melchisedec, while the bearer in himself of all the splendid potentialities, and the head of that vast system of glorious realities wrapped up in the future of his race. He stands in his noblest character at the fountain head of the world's spiritual history, in order still further to magnify Melchisedec. The blessing is solemn, formal, priestly, and prophetic. It is like the blessing which our Lord pronounced upon his disciples, when at his ascension from Olivet, "he lifted up his hands and blessed them." It fully warrants the deduction of the next verse. The historical present, "hath tithed" (δεδεκάτωκεν), makes proper also the *present* rendering of the participle "him who hath," or to give the emphasis of its position, 'him who possesseth.'[2]

7. And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better (*by the greater*). The reference is of course to formal and official blessing.[3]

[1] The ὁ δέ may be taken as subject, *but he*, with μὴ γενεαλογούμενος as predicate: or as above, ὁ γενεαλ, as subject: in neither case is ὁ δέ united as ὅδε, *this person.*

[2] The original is finely chiastic: "hath tithed Abraham, and him who hath the promises hath blessed;" "Abraham" being taken out of its naturally emphatic position, for the rhythmical balance and augmented strength of the whole.

[3] The neuter (ἔλαττον) expresses the thought in its utmost generality; as perhaps also μείζονος at 6:16.

8 And here men that die receive tithes; but there he *receiveth them*, of whom it is witnessed that he liveth.
9 And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham.
10 For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him.

8 And here men who die receive tithes; but there one, 9 of whom it is witnessed that he liveth. And, so to say, through Abraham even Levi, who receiveth 10 tithes, hath paid tithes; for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchizedek met him.

8. And here (*here, indeed,* ὧδε μέν)[1] in the case of the Levitical priesthood, in the case nearest in time and most familier to the writer and his readers: the reference is not here to the order in which the two classes have been spoken of. **Men that die** (*dying men*) **receive tithes.** 'Men that die,' either equivalent to mortal man; or, better, men dying one after another, perpetually dying. The primary emphasis is on 'dying'; but a secondary emphasis is on 'men'; otherwise we should have had simply 'those that die' (οἱ ἀποθνήσκοντες). The author thus throws a slight vail of mystery over Melchisedec; he puts purposely out of view his human personality, to emphasize that feature of his similarity to the Son of God, that he *liveth.* **But there,** in the case of Melchisedec, remoter in time and to the readers' thought.[2] **He** [*received them*] **of whom it is witnessed that he liveth.** How and where testified? Not, of course, by the author, but in the Old Testament narrative; and there, as above remarked, by the deep vail of *silence* thrown over his origin and death, a silence so exceptional to its general manner. Above, this absence of parentage and death marks Melchisedec's fitness for symbolizing the eternity of Christ's priesthood: here its more immediate purpose is to enhance the dignity of Melchisedec himself.

9. And—*as one might say, through Abraham even Levi who receiveth tithes hath paid tithes.* This is commonly (as by Alford) placed co-ordinately with ver. 5-8, as a third (or fourth) proof of the inferiority of the Levitical priesthood to that of Melchisedec. It may, indeed, be taken as another proof of the superiority of Melchisedec to the Levitical priests—the comparison of their *priesthood* comes in later—but it is, perhaps, better to carry it back to ver. 4, and regard it as an advance on the statement there made in illustration of Melchisedec's greatness; all between ver. 5-8, being a parenthetical statement of the different conditions under which Melchisedec and the Levitical priests received tithes; and the author now returning to complete the picture of ver. 4, by representing Levi as paying tithes in Abraham his ancestor. Still nothing is lost, perhaps, by regarding ver. 9, 10, as an after thought; especially as this may be indicated by the 'as one might say,' which implies that the thought is not with the author one of primary importance, and the meaning of which phrase there is no reason to question.

10. For he was yet (*still*) **in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him.** Levi, here put generically for his tribe, was potentially in Abraham. He therefore in Abraham rendered, 'as one might say,' homage to Melchisedec. 'Still (ἔτι) in the loins' stands contrasted with the 'having issued from the loins' in ver. 5. The sentiment here expressed half hesitatingly by the author, involves, doubtless, a great truth. The stream is contained in the fountain; the branches in the stock; the stock itself in the root and seed. In Adam lay the whole body of his descendants, and in his fall fell his posterity in a far deeper sense than that of any dogmatic imputation. The slender thread of a constructive transgression is a figment compared with that element of uneradicable depravity which entered the race that lay folded up in Adam when the devil met him. This principle has also eminent applicability to Abraham, because he was specially constituted the head of a *peculiar* race. He had the promises, and in him lay enfolded the destinies of the world. Nor would it in this case, I think, as it would in the case of Adam, have made a difference had Isaac already been born. The ancestor of the race stood for his posterity. As to the application of this principle to our Lord, we must remember that his entrance into the Jewish race, as well as his whole personality, was extraordinary and miraculous. Before Abraham he was; and as Alford justly

[1] The balancing of clauses so familiar to classic Greek, μέν and δέ, is more constant with our author than with any other New Testament writer.

[2] ὧδε and ἐκεῖ partly temporal, partly logical.

11 If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need *was there* that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron?
12 For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.
13 For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth

11 Now if there was perfection through the Levitical priesthood (for under it hath the people received the law), what further need *was there* that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedek, and not
12 be reckoned after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of neces-
13 sity a change also [1] of the law. For he of whom these things are said [2] belongeth to another tribe,

1 Or, *of law*.....2 Gr. *hath partaken of.* See ch. ii. 14.

says, "was never in the loins of an earthly father." On his mother's side he was the Son of man; on his father's side he was, like Adam, the Son of God. (Luke 3 : 38.)

(*c*) Application of these facts in regard to Melchisedec to the subject. The introduction of a new priesthood implies the failure of the Levitical, and the abrogation of the law for which it stood responsible. (11, 12.)

Thus far the author has dealt with the personal and priestly character of Melchisedec; not a word as yet respecting the priesthood and the law and covenant with which it stands connected. That point is disposed of in the next verse and needs afterward to be but incidentally touched by way of contrast in some of those things in which it is inferior to the Melchisedec priesthood of the Lord. Ver. 11 may be regarded as a common introduction to the entire following passage to ver. 25, though its more special relation is to the first of the four points which it includes.

11. If therefore perfection, etc.—*If indeed completion, accomplishment, was through the Levitical priesthood* (*for upon its basis the people have received the law*), *what further need was there that a different priest should arise, after the order of Melchisedec, and not be reckoned after the order of Aaron?* Here, first, it is evident that the question, 'what further need,' is equivalent to a denial of any further need. The question is an emphatic negative affirmation. Secondly, it is immaterial whether the construction be 'if perfection was, what need was there?' or (with suppressed ἄν in the apodosis, τίς ἂν χρεία), "what need would there be?" Either mode of denial is equally decisive, though in a slightly different way: "If it *was* so, then there was no need;" "if it were, or had been so, there would have been no need." Thirdly, we have the decisive argument for the inadequacy of the Levitical priesthood; namely, the divine act appointing another priest of a different order. When the Ascended Son enters the heavenly sanctuary, and is greeted with the words, "Thou art a priest after the order of Melchisedec," there is an unceremonious setting aside of the priesthood of Aaron, as stamped with the seal of incompetency. There is no occasion to reason further; the 'what need' of the passage is decisive. And, fourthly, along with the Levitical priesthood, goes the Levitical law.

12. For the priesthood being changed, there is made (*takes place*) **of necessity a change also of the law**—the whole ritual system of Judaism; the covenant, of which that priesthood was the minister and guarantee. On the basis of this priesthood, the people had received the law, and this had been made answerable to God for its efficiency. Had it fulfilled this end; had there been through it *accomplishment* (τελείωσις), it would have stood. Being found impotent for this, it must be set aside, and with it the whole system which rested upon it, and for which it was answerable. We see, then, how significant, how revolutionary in the whole system of Judaism, this removal of the priesthood. Finally, the 'if indeed, now' (εἰ μὲν οὖν) of ver. 11 implies that the author had in mind an alternative to his supposition. This, if expressed, would have been, "but if there was not *accomplishment* (τελείωσις), then there was need," etc.; but this *apodosis* of his sentence is suppressed as unnecessary, and ver. 12 proceeds, as we have seen, to state the result of the change of the priesthood in an abrogation of the law. This verse (not a mere parenthetical statement, as De Wette) is now illustrated in the following verses, showing the nature and wide-reaching extent of this change. It is first a *tribal* change, which, removing the priesthood from the tribe of Levi, would of course do away with all peculiarly Levitical arrangements (ver. 13, 14); and next, what is incomparably more important, it is a change in internal character and vital efficacy. (15-19.)

(*d*) This change in the law shown historically in the change of the priestly tribe. (13, 14.)

13. For he of whom these things are

to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar.
14 For *it is* evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood.
15 And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest,
16 Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.

from which no man hath given attendance at the
14 altar. For it is evident that our Lord hath sprung out of Judah; as to which tribe Moses spake nothing
15 concerning priests. And *what we say* is yet more abundantly evident, if after the likeness of Mel-
16 chizedek there ariseth another priest, who hath been made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an [1] endless life:

1 Gr. *indissoluble.*

spoken (*said*)—he who is the subject of this extraordinary language, "Thou art a priest," etc.; the author proceeds to illustrate the prophecy by an appeal to historical fact. **Pertaineth** (*belongeth*) **to another tribe from which no man gave** (*hath given*) **attendance at the altar.** Of course, making no account of possible irregularities, and infractions of the law.

14. For it is evident (*open to the day;* πρόδηλον, conspicuously manifest) **that our Lord sprang** (*hath sprung*) **out of Juda.**[1] **Of which,** etc., or, *as to which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests*—a softened expression to denote the fact that every tribe but that of Levi was rigorously excluded from the priesthood. These historical statements establish, of course, the actual transfer of the priesthood, which of itself would nullify the main features of the ritual law, and break up the outward economy of Judaism. But the change is much more radical; it goes, as the author proceeds to show, to the inner and essential character of the priesthood.

(*e*) The change is shown more clearly in the *intrinsic character* of the new priesthood, which is constituted not after a carnal ritual, but after the power of an endless life. (15–19.)

15. And it is yet far more evident—not with Delitzsch, that the Levitical priesthood is imperfect; this is understood, and is not now in question; nor as Ebrard, absurdly, that our Lord sprang from Judah; the original word here (κατάδηλον) is no correlative of that in ver. 14 (πρόδηλον); the verbal coincidence is merely accidental: but (as substantially Bleek, Lünemann, Alford, though scarcely in the full sense of the author) that there has become a change in the law; that the old Levitical ritual, for which the Levitical priests stood sponsors, has been swept away by the new Melchisedec priesthood of Christ, and a law of totally different character and infinitely higher efficiency has come in its stead. Here, in fact, is the *vital*, the turning point, of the whole matter. **For that,** strictly, *if*, equivalent to *in that* (the 'if' expressing simply condition, not doubt) *after the likeness of Melchisedec ariseth a different priest.* It was a small thing that the priesthood passed from one tribe to another. For weightier is the character of the new priest, indicated by the words 'after the likeness of Melchisedec,' on which word rests the emphasis, the word 'likeness' being now substituted for 'order,' to bring out the resemblance of Christ's priesthood to that of him who, on the sacred page in the Old Testament by an extraordinary reticence, in the New by profound and careful interpretation, is exhibited as *living*. Here, also, as in ver. 11, we have the original word (ἕτερος), meaning qualitatively *different*, rather than that word, signifying numerically *another* (ἄλλος), as marking a change in the kind, as well as the personnel, of the priestly office.

16. Who is (*hath been*) **made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless** (*indissoluble, imperishable*) **life.** The two clauses are carefully balanced against each other, 'law' answering to 'power' and 'carnal commandment' to 'imperishable, indissoluble, indestructible life.' This favors our taking "law" (with Chrysostom) for statute law, the law of Moses, and thus explaining "a law which consists in a fleshly ordinance." Otherwise, it seems more natural to interpret "law," as in Rom. 7 : 21, as *rule, norm, regulative principle*, and standing without emphasis. (So Bleek, Lünemann, Alford, Moll.) The substantial sense of the clause remains unaffected. The contrast lies essentially in this: the Levitical priesthood is

[1] Ἀνατέταλκεν, either *has arisen*, as the sun (ἀνατολαί; the *sunrisings, the east*, Mark 16 : 2), or *has arisen*, sprung up, as a plant. The former might be indicated by Num. 24 : 17; Mal. 4 : 2; Isa. 60; the latter by Isa. 44 : 4; Ezek. 17 : 6. The word has both meanings in the classics.

17 For he testifieth, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.
18 For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.
19 For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope *did;* by the which we draw nigh unto God.

17 for it is witnessed *of him,*
Thou art a priest for ever
After the order of Melchizedek.
18 For there is a disannulling of a foregoing commandment because of its weakness and unprofitableness
19 (for the law made nothing perfect), and a bringing in thereupon of a better hope, through which we

constituted by special, formal, as it were, arbitrary enactment, committed to fleshly, dying men, and bound to all the conditions of human imperfection and mortality (σάρκινος, *fleshen, made of flesh*). Christ's priesthood, on the other hand, modeled after that of one who *lives*, is by virtue of an inherent vital energy in him who bears it, and who, not as a member of a tribe, but in the unity of his own person, bears it *forever*. The 'indestructible life' may (with Alford, Delitzsch) be regarded as commencing strictly after his resurrection, when "death had no more dominion over him"; but the 'power' of that imperishable life was with him from the dawn of his humanity, empowering him to lay down his life and to take it again, and triumphing in his resurrection. In illustrative confirmation of this, the author again cites passingly and parenthetically the oft-quoted passage from the Psalm.

17. For he testifieth (or, *it is testified*), **Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec,** with special emphasis on the 'forever.'

18, 19. These verses state now, in plainest and most decisive terms, the full consequences of this change of priesthood; we have in it the critical and hinging point of the whole chapter. Priesthood and law, impotent and inoperative, are swept away together, and replaced by a better hope, that brings the spiritual alien *near to God*. **For there is** (*becometh*) **a disannulling** (abrogation, ἀθέτησις, stronger than the gentle μετάθεσις, *change*, of ver. 12) *of a foregoing commandment* (the participle, προαγούσης, takes the place of the article)—not merely the law of the priesthood, but the whole Mosaic ritual, that was based upon it—*because of its weakness and unprofitableness* (the adjective, according to Delitzsch, being a milder form than the noun, which would have charged weakness and inefficiency rather on its essential nature than its adjuncts.) **For the law made nothing perfect** (*brought nothing to perfection, accomplishment*). This is thrown in parenthetically, as justifying the abrogation of the old system. 'Law' is now used as covering the whole Mosaic economy, not only the ritual, but the moral law, between which the Jew made no sharp distinction. If we can distinguish them—the moral law *required* perfection, but had no power to produce it; the ceremonial law *symbolized* perfection, but had no power to turn its shadows into substance. The moral law was impotent on account of the carnal natures that received its commands; the ceremonial law was impotent on account of the carnal elements of which it consisted. The apostle, in Rom. 8 : 3, in his "impossible for the law in that it was weak through the flesh," refers to the former of these grounds of impotence, the perverseness of the nature with which it dealt. **But,** etc.; *and a bringing in thereupon* (ἐπί, *thereupon*, and, if the case requires it, *in its place*) *of a better hope*. '*A hope*,' put in the concrete as the substitute for those impotent elements that produced *no hope*. The contrast is not that of a better or mightier hope with a feebler one, but of that better and mightier thing, '*a hope*' (the construction is elliptical) with the utter hopelessness that environed the Old Economy. The Old Economy did indeed, in its significant symbols, in its prophetic foreshadowings, involve a hope for the anointed eye that could discern it. But this is not now in the author's mind, but what these were or were not in themselves. The New Testament believer's salvation is indeed as yet but in *hope*, but it is a real and living one, and one **by which we draw nigh unto God**—the very crown and climax of the whole priestly work of Christ. It was *symbolized* in the Jewish high priest's entering the Holy of Holies. The most significant and remarkable event attending the crucifixion was the rending of the vail of the temple, which was a standing symbol of *separation from God*. Christ's ascent to heaven, after his resurrection, was into the presence of God as *Forerunner* of his people.

(*f*) A further proof of the superiority of

20 And inasmuch as not without an oath *he was made priest:*
21 (For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:)
22 By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.
23 And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death:
24 But this *man*, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood.

20 draw nigh unto God. And inasmuch as *it is* not
21 without the taking of an oath (for they indeed have been made priests without an oath; but he with an oath [1] by him that saith [2] of him,
The Lord sware and will not repent himself,
Thou art a priest for ever);
22 by so much also hath Jesus become the surety of a
23 better covenant. And they indeed have been made priests many in number, because that by death they
24 are hindered from continuing: but he, because he abideth for ever, [3]hath his priesthood [4]unchange-

1 Or, *through*.....2 Or, *unto*.....3 Or, *hath a priesthood that doth not pass to another*.....4 Or, *inviolable*.

the Melchisedec priesthood, is that it is instituted with the sanction of an oath. (20-22.)

20. And inasmuch as not without (*the taking of*) **an oath** (ὁρκωμοσία, a word of more fullness and dignity than ὅρκος) [*does this take place*—that is, the appointing of the Melchisedec priest; not, the bringing in of a better hope].

21. For those priests—*For they, indeed, have been made without the swearing of an oath, but he with an oath by him that saith of him*—(periphrastic description of God, as 2: 10). **The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever.**[1]

22. By so much also was Jesus made (*hath Jesus become* **the surety of a better testament** (*covenant*). The solemnity of the oath with which this priesthood was inaugurated is the measure of its superiority or excellence. Of course, on the part of God, nothing can enhance the weight of his promise; the oath is added in accommodation to our human weakness and human usages. In the original, 'Jesus' is emphatically placed last, as if to gather up in that final word the substance of the previous less individualized statements regarding the New Testament priesthood. Here, first in this Epistle, occurs the word *covenant* (διαθήκη—primarily, *disposition, arrangement*).[2] The Old Testament Dispensation is properly a covenant, a mutual agreement between God and the people. The New Testament use of the word is probably an *echo* from the Old, a rhetorical transfer, without special appropriateness, of a word which had become familiar to the Old Economy. The New Covenant is all on one side—God is a gracious Giver, and his people grateful receivers of the inestimable boon. In 9: 16, the word slides over into *testament;* here such a rendering seems without reason. A 'surety' belongs rather to a covenant than to a will. Of this better covenant, Jesus is surety, not as *sealing* it with his death and resurrection (as Alford, Lünemann), for these *created* it, and could scarcely, therefore, be its guarantee; but as High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary, perpetual and unfailing, in emboldening his people to draw near to God, assured that the throne of justice has become a throne of grace. He is surety, not to God on behalf of his people, but to them on behalf of God.

(*g*) Christ's Melchisedec priesthood, unlike the Levitical succession, is a single, perpetual, everlasting priesthood, which can thus carry through to completeness its work of salvation. (23-25.)

23. And they truly, etc.—*And they, indeed, have been made priests many in number;* that is, not many contemporaneously, but in succession, one after another dying and leaving his office to his successor. The Levitical priesthood contained, indeed, a plurality of members; but the *high priest*, the proper prototype of our Lord, was single. **Because they were not suffered,** etc., or, *on account of their being hindered by death from abiding*—that is, in the priesthood; for so the language must be supplemented. Both the compound verb (παραμένειν, *remain with*, or, *abide with* or *beside*), demands this; and to explain it absolutely, of *abiding in life*, converts the sentence into a platitude, 'because they are hindered by death from abiding in life.'

24. But this man (*he*) **became.** etc.—

[1] "After the order of Melchisedec," of the received text, is here wanting in Codex Sinaiticus B C 17 80, and probably not genuine.

[2] The word διαθήκη is, in the classics, *testamentary disposition, will;* and there rarely equivalent to συνθήκη, covenant, agreement; but so, commonly, in the Septuagint and the New Testament (διά having probably there its frequent force in composition of marking mutual relation, as διαλέγεσθαι, *to converse with*).

25 Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.
26 For such a high priest became us, *who is* holy,

25 able. Wherefore also he is able to save [1] to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.
26 For such a high priest became us, holy, guileless,

1 Gr. *completely.*

on account of his remaining forever. 'Remaining,' not in the priesthood, but abideth in life. The verb (μένειν, by no means equivalent to παραμένειν in ver. 23) naturally indicates this, and the same law of connection which there demands that the verb denote continuing in the priesthood here points to continuing in life. There, there are numerous priests, because they are hindered by death from abiding in their priesthood; here, he, because he abides in life forever, *hath his priesthood unchangeable.* The adjective (ἀπαράβατος) is not without difficulty. If, with some of the Greek commentators (as Theophylact), we could render it *actively, not passing by, not transient*, all would be easy; but this seems scarcely admissible. It is probably better taken passively, and then to be rendered either *not to be passed by*, hence, *not to be superseded;* or better, as of a law or usage (from παραβαίνω), to *go aside from or beyond, to transgress, violate, not to be violated, not to be transgressed;* hence, *inviolable, unalterable.* In either way we come substantially to the same meaning. The consideration is clearly one of great force, and presents the Melchisedec priesthood of the Son in forcible contrast to the imperfections of the Jewish Sacerdotal order. The priests of Israel received their priesthood, exercised it, and died; the continuity of their service was perpetually broken; every link was stamped with frailty and mortality, and the whole order partook of the frailty of its individual numbers. Such a priesthood could accomplish no complete salvation; but mark in contrast the prerogative of *his* priesthood who *liveth.*

25. Wherefore also—from his abiding forever with untransmissible priesthood—**he is able to save to the uttermost** (*completely*)—thoroughly, 'to the uttermost,' though not exactly in the sense suggested by these words in the Common Version. **Them that come** (*draw near*) **unto God by** (*through*) **him.** All worship is essentially a drawing near to God. The priests of the Old Covenant sought to bring the worshipers near to God, but they were snatched away by death even from their partial work of priestly intercession. **Seeing** (*that*) **he ever liveth** (while or because of his always living) **to make** (for the purpose of making) **intercession for them** (*on their behalf*). The ever living is an emphatic iteration of the abiding forever. The phrase 'to make intercession for them' enhances the grace of Christ, as if his eternal life were for the benefit of his people. (Rom. 8:34.) His salvation, then, is a complete salvation. Through his perpetual life and perpetual priesthood, he can carry it through to the uttermost. Perfected himself, he can bring to perfection all his followers, pardoning, sanctifying, justifying, glorifying.

(*h*) Exultant summing up of the qualities of Christ's Melchisedec priesthood, necessary to be allied with those of the Aaronical high priest, to which topic verses 26–28 form a transition.

The Melchisedec priesthood introduces the elements of *royalty* and *perpetuity*, attributes of the ever living King. The Aaronic priesthood must add the element of *expiatory sacrifice* for sin. Without this the Melchisedec priesthood were magnificent, but barren. The word *high priest* introduced at ver. 26 shows all these majestic priestly qualities uniting themselves in that priesthood which, as antitype of Aaron's, makes effectual offering for sin. The priestly successor of Melchisedec appears now as the high priestly counterpart of Aaron. The saving to the uttermost implies guilt and condemnation, from which there can be no saving without expiation. Here, then, slipping in, as it were, the word *high priest* (ἀρχιερεύς), the writer shows how around him cluster the afore-described attributes, before proceeding to the express consideration of the Levitical element. It is conceived, as De Wette well remarks, in a strain of exultant joy over those all-sufficient, glorious attributes of the great High Priest.

26. For such a high priest (*also*)[1] **be-**

1 The 'also' (καί) is wanting in the Sinaitic MS., but appears in A B D E, and is forcible.

harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;
27 Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself.

undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher
27 than the heavens; who needeth not daily, like those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins and then for the *sins* of the people; for this he

came us, holy, harmless (*guileless*), **undefiled, separate** (*being, having been separated*) **from sinners, and made** (*become*) **higher than the heavens.** The artistic arrangement of the opening words cannot be reproduced in English. The elliptical 'for' involves the suppressed idea that this lay in the nature and demands of the case. 'Such' suggests the priest before described, whose attributes are here little more than gathered up, scarcely added to. 'Became us'—emphatic in position; *befitted us* as sinners. 'Became also'[1]—was (in addition to its being a fact) *also* befitting. And finally, 'high priest' comes out unexpectedly at the end of the clause (though not without amplest previous preparation in the Epistle), and emphatically merging the priest in the high priest (the ἱερεύς in the ἀρχιερεύς), and enabling the author to unite the attributes of both. 'Holy'—pious, perfect in all his relations to God (ὅσιος), positively and actively pious; not legally *sacred*, or simply *sanctified* (ἅγιος). 'Thy holy one' (ὅσιος), Ps. 16 : 10; cited of Christ, Acts 3 : 14. '*Void of evil*' (ἄκακος), *wihout evil*, denoting his character toward men, as (ὅσιος) *pious*, toward God. It marks freedom from guile, enmity, suspicion. '*Undefiled*' (ἀμίαντος), *unstained*. The Levitical high priest must be ceremonially and outwardly without stain; the true High Priest must be internally and really so, and free, not only from internal defilement, but possible contamination. Hence, *separated from sinners*, not merely from sin; withdrawn from their defiling and disturbing contact into the heavenly sanctuary, where neither their violence, nor their wickedness, can hinder his priestly work. '*Become higher than the heavens*'—here an animated and exulting expression of the transcendent exultation of the New Testament High Priest. The Levitical high priest was ceremonially clean, and withdrawn partially from sinners into the earthly sanctuary. His great Antitype and Successor is absolutely and inwardly pure, completely withdrawn from the disturbing contact of sinners, exalted above the very heavens, through which he has passed (4 : 14; Eph. 4 : 10) into the immediate and absolute presence of God, and thus beyond all finite and creature limitations.

27. This verse converges the attention more on the Levitical side of the Lord's priesthood; namely, his high priesthood. **Who needeth not,** etc.—*hath no necessity day by day, just as the high priests, to offer up sacrifices previously for his own sins, and afterward for those of the people.* The point of contrast is here really, though not in form, twofold. Christ has not need, like the Levitical priests, to offer sacrifices for his own sins at all; for he has none; nor like them to offer sacrifices for the people *day by day*, or repeatedly; for his one offering is forever sufficient. But in the second point we meet a difficulty. The expiatory offerings of the Levitical high priests are manifestly referred to; but these were offered not *daily*, but *yearly*. The solutions are various. Some have taken the original phrase (καθ' ἡμέραν) not as equivalent to *daily*, but 'on an appointed day in the year' (Schlichting, Michaelis); others as equivalent to διαπαντός, indicating annual repetition, perpetually recurring (Grotius, Böhme, De Wette, Ebrard); others as qualifying not the actual ministrations of the priests, but the supposed ministrations of Christ; not that which they *do*, but that which he *would have* to do, provided his sacrifice required repetition at all, since the same principle that would demand its repetition once a year would demand it every day and constantly (so Hofmann and formerly Delitzsch); others (as Kurtz, connecting the καθ' ἡμέραν with ἐχει ἀνάγκην), "hath daily necessity," confine its reference to the need, which the human and imperfect Levitical priest is under, on account of his daily sinning, to make daily offering for himself. Others (as Bleek, Tholuck, Lünemann, Moll) "suppose that the author, with his mind specially on the singleness and finality of *the sacrifice of Christ*, has in loose and inexact expression blended the priestly sacrifices in general with the grand high priestly sacrifice on the annually recurring Day of Atonement." This becomes the more probable, since the high priest was empowered to take part, as often as he chose, in the

[1] Καί, *also*, is found in A B D E, and is undoubtedly genuine.

28 For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, *maketh* the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.

28 did once for all, when he offered up himself. For the law appointeth men high priests, having infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was after the law, *appointeth* a Son, perfected for evermore.

daily burnt offering, and not unfrequently exercised this privilege, particularly on Sabbaths, new moons, and festal occasions (Josephus, "Jewish War," V. 5, 6), and also in the daily incense offerings to which was ascribed an atoning significance. (Lev. 17 : 11, 12; Num. 33 : 10, LXX.) But the priest's successive offerings for himself and the people have probably special reference to the great Day of Atonement. Of the above explanations the last seems far the more probable; most of them, I think, may be at once set aside. **For this he did once** (*for all*) **when he offered** (*in offering*) **up himself.** His single sacrifice in pouring out his life on the cross was the substance of all the repeated symbolical sacrifices of the ancient priesthood.[1] It will be observed that the author only glances here and there (as 1 : 3; 5 : 7, and here) at Christ as a *sacrifice* on the cross. This he takes for granted, but loves to contemplate rather his priestly life in heaven. Not Christ the *victim*, but Christ the *priest*, is the subject of discussion.

28. For the law—the Mosaic ordinances—**maketh** (*constituteth*) **men**—emphasis on *men:* Christ, though on earth a man, was even then something more than man; now his humanity is gloriously overdrawn by his divinity, the Son of man almost swallowed up in the Son of God—**high priests which have** (*having*) **infirmity.** Christ on earth, indeed, was encompassed with infirmity; he knew the weakness of humanity that he might sympathize with his brethren. But 'infirmity,' in its fullest sense, he never knew; and now, in his glorified, high-priestly state, the infirmities of his earthly condition, his liability to temptation and suffering and death, are all removed. **But the word of the oath, which was since** (*after*) **the law** (which succeeded to it and set it aside) *constituteth* **the Son**—having been perfected for evermore. Here once more we have the contrast between the priesthood of the law and the priesthood of the oath. The one constitutes men, the other constitutes the Son (the article omitted for the same reason as in 1 : 1 to emphasize not the person but the character). The one appointed men *having* infirmity, actually possessing and wearing it as a garment; the other the Son, now ascended to the right hand of God, freed from all temporary infirmity, and perfected forever, thus taking up into his glorious Melchisedec priesthood all the functions of the Levitical, and qualified to accomplish what that could only symbolize.

Ch. 8. (4) *The efficient Aaronical high priesthood of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.* (8 : 1-10 : 18.)

The author now passes formally from Christ's Melchisedec to his Aaronic priesthood, to that element of it which adapts it to *sinners*. The discussion extends to 10 : 18, and revolves mainly around *one central idea*, that of Christ offering in the heavenly tabernacle his own efficacious blood as a counterpart to the earthly high priest offering in the earthly tabernacle the blood of goats and heifers, which cannot take away sin. Every other topic, I think, will be found subordinate to this, and will derive its light from this central idea. It divides itself into two parts. From 8 : 1 to 9 : 11 the main thought is that Christ has entered as High Priest into the heavenly sanctuary with his own expiatory blood. From 9 : 11 to 10 : 18 the main thought is that the offering of the blood of Christ, unlike the symbolical and oft-repeated offerings of the earthly priests, is efficacious, final, and forever. Let us analyze from 8 : 1 to 9 : 11.

(*a*) As a royal Melchisedec Priest, Christ has taken his seat at the right hand of God, and as Levitical High Priest he has gone into the heavenly tabernacle. (1, 2.)

(*b*) As such a High Priest, Christ must of necessity have something to offer. (3.)

(*c*) So vitally connected are these two, the priesthood and the offering, that *on earth* there would be no place for his priesthood, as there exist already there those who make the offerings of the law, and whose prerogatives are inviolate. (4.)

(*d*) But, in fact, he *is* a High Priest, and can, therefore, make offerings, because he has

[1] ἀναφέρειν is used of offering up himself on the cross; προσφέρειν, of bringing his blood as an offering into the sanctuary.

CHAPTER VIII.

NOW of the things which we have spoken *this is* the sum: We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens;

1 [1]Now [2]in the things which we are saying the chief point *is this:* We have such a high priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of

1 Or, *Now to sum up what we are saying: We have, etc*.....2 Gr. *upon*.

the true tabernacle and the true priesthood, of which theirs were but a shadow, and a priesthood as much better than theirs as is the covenant, of which he is the Mediator, better than theirs. (5, 6.)

(*e*) For that it *is* better than the first (this subordinately and in passing) is clear from its having superseded it. For God, having found the first inefficacious, replaces it by a new, and the former one becomes antiquated and expires. (7-13.)

(*f*) But that First Covenant (for to see how the New is organized, we must look back to that, its copy; and to see what the new High Priest must offer, we must look back and see what the old one offered) had its ordinances of service, and its sanctuary consisting of two tabernacles, an outer or more common, and an inner and holier one. (9 : 1-6.)

(*g*) Now in the outer sanctuary the priests performed constant ministrations, but into this inner sanctuary the high priest went alone once a year, *not without blood*—he carried in there the blood of slaughtered victims, symbolically, though not really, expiatory of sin. (6-10.)

(*h*) We see, then, what is demanded of our High Priest. It is *blood*. And as his is the true, and not the symbolical priesthood, as he is in the genuine, and not the copied sanctuary, he must offer blood that is really, and not symbolically, cleansing. He brings *his own*. (11-14.)

Thus the author has advanced, by an almost straight line and with a steady step, to his object. If he has apparently deviated, it was but *apparently*. Verses 7-13 of chapter 8 are merely an incidental (incidental to the present *argument*, though vital as a part of the entire discussion) carrying out of the reason why Christ *can be* a High Priest; namely, that he has the true priesthood of the New Covenant by which the former has been superseded on account of its inadequacy. So 9 : 1-10 is a provisional examination of such features of that Old Covenant as bear directly on the high priest's function, in order to deduce thence the functions of the High Priest of the New Covenant in the true tabernacle, and especially to ascertain what it is that he must offer. Then 9 : 11-14, 15-28, declaring the cleansing efficacy of his blood, closes the second topic propounded in the author's brief triple thesis (6 : 20), 'After the order of Melchisedec,' 'high priest,' 'forever.' The third, embraced in the emphatic term '*forever*,' though certainly all along implied in every feature of Christ's work, may perhaps (with Delitzsch) be regarded as forming the special keynote to 10 : 1-18, where the formal discussion closes.

(*a*) As a royal Melchisedec Priest, Christ has taken his seat at the right hand of God, and as Levitical High Priest, he has gone into the heavenly tabernacle. (1-3.)

1. Now of the things, etc.—*And as a capital point in regard to what we are saying* (literally, *in regard to what is being said;* equivalent to, the topic under discussion). 'Chief, leading, capital point' (κεφάλαιον) is here far better than the other meaning, 'sum,' or 'summing up,' as in the Common Version. This latter meaning, indeed, would not be wholly inappropriate, inasmuch as verses 1, 2 look both backward and forward, and may be regarded as exhibiting substantially the whole doctrine of Christ's priesthood—ver. 1 in its Melchisedec, ver. 2 in its Levitical aspect. This, however, is equally embraced in the rendering, 'chief or capital point,' which is apparently what the author would express. **We have such a high priest**—that is, 'such' as I am about to describe; 'such' (τοιοῦτος) here looking forward, as at 7 : 26 it looks back—**who is set** (*took his seat*) **on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens.** Identical in meaning with 1 : 3, but intentionally more full and formal in expression. There it is stated incidentally as a fact; here it is laid down formally as a signifi-

[1] A summary of 'the things which we *have* said,' would require ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰρημένοις, not τοῖς λεγομένοις. Still less, can it be rendered, as by some, 'In addition to what has been said' (ἀρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις).

2 A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.
3 For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore *it is* of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.

2 the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of [1] the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord
3 pitched, not man. For every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is necessary that this *high priest* also have some-

1 Or, *holy things.*

cant and vital fact connected with the priesthood of our Lord. It is the more literal statement of that which is put more figuratively, and with reference to Christ's anti-Levitical priesthood, in the following verse.

2. A minister—(λειτουργός), *public servant*, or, *functionary*; in the classics, the bearer of a public office; in the Septuagint, sometimes, "one rendering *priestly* service," 'a priest to render offerings,' Neh. 10:39, so Rom. 15:16; and here the term is so applied to Christ—**of the sanctuary and of the true** (*genuine*) **tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not** (*a*) **man.** 'The sanctuary' here clearly denotes the 'holy of holies,' 'the part within the vail,' in which, in the earthly tabernacle, was the special symbol of God's presence, and which, therefore, in the archetypal, the heavenly tabernacle, denotes that immediate presence itself. As King, Christ sits at the right hand of the throne of God; as Priest, he ministers in the heavenly holy of holies, in the perpetual presence of God. Both expressions are mere figures drawn from earthly objects. His sharing God's throne denotes, symbolically, his sharing God's sovereign power; his being in the heavenly sanctuary denotes his being in the immediate and absolute, not the symbolical, presence of God. He ministers there, not as occasionally entering, but perpetually abiding. '*The genuine tabernacle*,' the real, original, archetypal tabernacle (not ἀληθής, *true*, not *false*; but ἀληθινός, *made of truth*, real, genuine, not counterfeit, and not a copy). God is the '*true* God' (ἀληθινός), in contrast with spurious gods, idols; God is *true* (ἀληθής) as a Being who will not utter falsehood. The upper sanctuary was the archetypal sanctuary, of which the earthly one was but a copy, as Christ was the true Priest whom the earthly priest but typified. The words 'true, genuine tabernacle' are here exegetical of 'sanctuary.' The Mosaic tabernacle was divided into two parts—the outer tabernacle, and the inner sanctuary; but the whole went under the general name of tabernacle; and as it would be contrary to all propriety to represent our Lord as ministering in the outer tabernacle, the word can be taken here only in its general sense, and all speculations as to what in the heavenly tabernacle corresponded to the first, or outer one of the earthly, are here, at least, entirely out of place. Only an artificial exegesis can find here any allusion to that first tabernacle, and, therefore, to any of the numerous objects which it has been distorted into symbolizing. Christ appears ministering in the true tabernacle, not the copy; in the heavenly sanctuary, not the earthly; dwelling perpetually in the real presence of God, instead of entering at distant intervals into his symbolical presence. The tabernacle which a man pitched is the material, visible tabernacle of Moses. That which the Lord pitched is the invisible, heavenly tabernacle. Like all the elements of the New Dispensation (see 12:18–27), it is purely spiritual.

(*b*) As such a High Priest, Christ must of necessity have something to offer. (3.)

3. For every high priest is ordained (*appointed*) **to offer** [*both*] **gifts and sacrifices:** *wherefore it is of necessity that also this* (*high priest*, or, *this one*) **have somewhat also to offer** (literally, *something which he may offer*). The 'For' is proleptic: the thought outruns the expression. The writer's mind is filled with the idea that Christ is in the heavenly sanctuary *to make a high priestly offering*. The 'for' responds to and generalizes this latent thought, 'For *every* high priest is constituted to offer gifts,' etc.; and then, having generalized the idea from the special case in question, the writer naturally turns round and deduces the special case from the general fact. In more strictly logical form, it would run, "And, as every high priest is constituted to offer gifts and sacrifices, therefore it is necessary," etc. But the thought is clear, and is but a repetition of the statement of 5:1, which gives the essential function of the high priest, and to which Stuart regards it as now returning. It is in some sense a return to it, but in the writer's direct course of argument. He has unfolded the Melchisedec elements of

4 For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law:
5 Who serve unto the example and shadow of

4 what to offer. Now if he were on earth, he would not be a priest at all, seeing there are those who offer the
5 gifts according to the law; who serve *that which is*

Christ's Sacerdotal office, he proceeds now to develop its Levitical element. But a more important matter is the logical connection of the verse with the context. None of the interpreters, as it seems to me, have fully apprehended it. De Wette unhesitatingly charges it with breaking in upon and disturbing the course of the thought. Lünemann regards it as an incidental remark to justify the term λειτουργός. Bengel, with others, would enclose it in a parenthesis. Tholuck regards it as introduced but to be crowded out by other ideas. Even Delitzsch fails to make the connection clear. If our analysis, previously given, is correct, it is precisely in its place. It is no disturbing, no incidental idea, nothing to be shut up in parentheses, but is really, precisely the *capital thought* of the writer, that to which the statement of the previous verse was but subsidiary, and that of which all clear on to 9 : 14, and, in fact, to 10 : 18, is only illustrative. Why is Christ minister in the heavenly sanctuary? It is that he may have *something to offer*. What makes the utility of his ministry there? It is that he *has* something to offer. *What it is* the author proceeds by gradually prepared steps to unfold. He is there to offer *his own expiatory blood*, in the conception of the Epistle, the whole pith of his priesthood, and of his work of salvation. Of course, this takes for granted the previous sacrifice as its necessary condition. We are not, then (with De Wette), to render 'It *was* necessary,' instead of the logical copula, 'It *is* necessary'; nor (with Lünemann) to render, "should have offered," making it refer to Christ's earthly sacrifice, instead of his heavenly priesthood. This is a complete perversion of the author's idea. The high priest *in the sanctuary*, and there under the necessary conditions of bringing an expiatory offering, is here his theme.

(c) So vitally connected are these two, the priesthood and the offering, that *on earth* there would be no place for his priesthood, as there exist already there those who make the offerings of the law, and whose prerogatives are inviolate. (4.)

4. For if (*indeed*)—so imperative is this necessity of his having, as High Priest, something to offer—**he were on earth, he should** (*would*) **not** [*even*] **be a priest.** There is no stress to be laid on the use of 'priest' for 'high priest' (as if the meaning were, 'so far from being a High Priest, he would not even be a priest'). The use of 'priest' here is purely incidental, the generic idea being put for the specific; the emphasis is on '*would not even be.*' The mention of the vital necessity that he, as high priest, bring offerings, suggests the inquiry, how he can be a priest at all, which of course finds its explanation in the fact that he is not on earth in the copied, but in heaven in the archetypal, tabernacle. The 'for,' then, looks back to the preceding clause, 'necessary that he have something to offer'; the particle (μέν) looks forward (as always), and finds its correlative at ver. 6, *but in fact*[1] (νυνὶ δέ), **Seeing that there are** (since there exist) **those who offer gifts according to the law.** *Being* (ὄντων = *since there are*), emphatic in position. The 'gifts' here are equivalent to 'gifts and sacrifices' of the verse preceding, which stand for the whole body of offerings required by the law. The Levitical order would not be superseded without a reason, and no reason could exist until he came who should fulfill all that it prefigured.

(*d*) But, in fact, he *is* a High Priest, and can, therefore, make offerings, because he has the true tabernacle and the true priesthood, of which theirs were but a shadow, and a priesthood as much better than theirs as is the covenant, of which he is the Mediator, better than theirs. (5, 6.)

5. Who, etc.—the Levitical priests—not only designates but characterizes them, *such persons as* (οἵτινες) *minister to a copy and shadow*

[1] The clause εἰ μὲν γάρ—οὐδ' ἂν ἦν, *for if to be sure—neither would he be*, implies that there *is* a supposition under which his thesis would not hold, which would even exclude the consideration of it. This supposition must first be disposed of. That is the supposition of his being on earth. *There* there is full provision made for offering the gifts of the law; there is a priesthood ordained, whose functions must not be encroached upon. The very form of construction, however, implies that the case thus supposed does *not* exist. Christ is *not* on earth, and therefore he *can* be a priest, and offer sacrifices without violating established institutions.

heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, *that* thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.

a copy and shadow of the heavenly things, even as Moses is warned *of God* when he is about to [1] make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern that was shewed thee

1 Or, *complete.*

of the heavenly [*sanctuary*] (ἁγίων understood with ἐπουρανίων). They are such as minister to a tabernacle which is a mere representative copy (ὑποδείγμα)[1] of the true. Their ministry is merely prefigurative, and ready to yield when the thing signified comes in place of the sign. The author accomplishes a double purpose. He shows why Christ could not be a priest on earth, and why he can be one in heaven. The earthly ranks are filled up. The earthly sphere of service is pre-occupied; but that sphere is itself merely shadowy and transitory, and there is yet room for him who realizes the significance of that priesthood, and for him alone. **As Moses was admonished,** etc.—that is, *hath been instructed of God when about to complete the tabernacle.* This is added in illustration of the character which he has just assigned to the earthly tabernacle, as being but a copy and adumbration or shadowy image of the heavenly. (Ex. 25 : 40.) **For, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to** (*after*) **the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.** The Mosaic tabernacle was made after a model. How this pattern was shown to Moses it is idle curiously to inquire; nor would there have arisen any question about it but for the rhetorical use to which the author puts it, making it very naturally, as it came from God on Mount Sinai, stand, not for the literal pattern of the tabernacle to be made, but as representative of the divine ideas which that tabernacle was to symbolize. There can really be no doubt that there was shown to Moses in vision, or with the bodily eye, an exact model of the structure which he was to rear, and which model he was precisely to imitate. This is all that seems to be meant by the passage in Exodus, and all which I suppose our author believed it to mean. He has indeed made a figurative application of the language, *as if* the tabernacle which Moses saw in the Mount was the real, original heavenly tabernacle, in which the Lord now ministers. I cannot, however, suppose either that any such thing was implied in Exodus, or that he considered it to be, or supposed himself to be doing anything more than merely accommodating a passage to which he never would have dreamed of giving the force of an argument. God made that tabernacle on Mount Sinai of which the tabernacle of Moses was an earthly and material copy. How natural, in the way of rhetorical illustration, to transfer in idea this divine original to the spiritual tabernacle, in which our Lord ministers, and which both the one and the other merely typified! How natural, I say, without supposing for a moment that the writer was doing more than merely employing an illustration, and addressing an argument to the imagination rather than to the reason! How natural to express the subordinate and copied character of the Levitical tabernacle by a reference to the direction, 'See thou make all after the pattern shewed thee in the mount'! And nothing more strikingly illustrates the routine character of much of our exegesis than the numerous endeavors of interpreters, taking this as a literal and prosaic proof, to find how this heavenly, archetypal tabernacle was revealed to Moses, and what heavenly elements corresponded to the several parts of the earthly structure. The figurative language of the author is appropriate and beautiful, so long as we hold to the figure, and do not undertake to convert rhetoric into logic. When we come to the actual facts of the case we cannot for a moment suppose that there is or was any actual outer and inner sanctuary in heaven, corresponding to the separate compartments of the tabernacle. This was expressive, not of topographical, but of moral and spiritual facts and relations. It was a figure for the time then existing. The vail hanging between the outer and inner

[1] Ὑπόδειγμα is somewhat difficult to define exactly. Ὑποδείκνυμι, to place under the eyes, or to show *in subordination* to something, as its *pattern*, for example, or *copy*; or *to show faintly.* The preposition may give either of these modifications. Hence, ὑπόδειγμα, *something placed under the eyes, a sign, token*; or something shown subserviently to another, its *pattern* or its *copy*; or something shown *faintly* (ὑπό), as an *outline, sketch, faint representation.* Either *copy* or *faint representation*, would answer here.

6 But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.

6 in the mount. But now hath he obtained a ministry the more excellent, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted

sanctuary, and excluding all but the high priest, and him at all but widely separated times, from the inner, indicated, as the author himself assures us, that the way into the Holiest of All had not yet been opened to man. It indicated simply that for man as a sinner, without atonement and pardon, there was no true access to God. It embodied an idea. It represented a state of things existing on earth, not in heaven, and a state of things which was done away in the death of Christ. The thoroughly symbolical character of the whole is shown by the description of the vail, which was, says the writer, the flesh of Christ. The meaning of this is evident. The death of Christ was necessary in order to break down the wall which separates man from God. At his crucifixion the vail of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, and the separating barrier which his offering in the flesh was necessary to remove might be easily said to consist in his flesh; for the as yet unbroken body of Christ, like the as yet unrent vail of the tabernacle and temple, was between man and God. The inner tabernacle, then, as well as the outer one, can have no other than a moral significance. And with the dying and rising of Christ, the grand idea expressed by the outer one belongs to the past. All efforts to find it in Christ's human body, in his life on earth (Ebrard), in the lower heavens (De Wette, Lünemann, etc.), in Christ's glorified body (Hofmann), in the heaven of glorified saints (Delitzsch), in Christ's mystical body (an attempted union of the two last ideas by Alford), are a waste of ingenuity. That Christ's earthly body, or his life on earth, is the outer tabernacle, needs to be refuted by no argument. That his glorified body is the outer tabernacle is worse than idle fancy; it is simply monstrous. For it is precisely in his glorified body that he dwells in the inner sanctuary, and his glorified body never existed until after the outer sanctuary had been annihilated by his vail-rending death. To convert the *lower heavens* into the outer tabernacle is to transform an important spiritual symbol into a lesson in topography. The explanation which might make nearest approach to plausibility is that of Delitzsch, which makes the outer tabernacle represent the heaven of the saints (including, perhaps, the people of God on earth), who, like the Levitical priesthood, were kept from the more immediate presence of God, and served him at an awful distance, until Christ broke down the separating barrier, and brings them into actual nearness to God. Just so soon, however, as we localize this idea, and make the outer tabernacle a part of the heavenly arrangements, we confuse and destroy the figure. The priest passed through the outer into the inner tabernacle; but Christ could not pass through the outer into the inner tabernacle on high, for that outer tabernacle had ceased to exist. It, or the great fact which it symbolized, was done away at his death. The separating vail, with its solemn and dread significance, had hung from the time of Moses to the scene of Calvary, and then it was rent in twain; and if the Jews replaced it, they performed an act of gratuitous wickedness.

6. But now—(*νυνὶ δέ*), as the case actually stands; (*νυνί*, logical), instead of being on the earth, and ministering to a copy and shadow of the true tabernacle, or being where he *could* only so minister—**hath he obtained a more excellent ministry**—higher priestly service—**by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant which was established** (*hath been instituted*) **upon better promises.** The problem, then, suggested above how Christ *could be* a priest and have something to offer without violating established institutions, is resolved. He could be so, because he comes in with a New Covenant, which supersedes the Old, and he is Priest in the heavenly archetypal sanctuary, which has replaced its earthly semblance. And now to find what he has to offer, what is the nature of his service, we must look back to that covenant which his has superseded, and see what were the typical offerings of its typical priesthood. This would naturally be the author's next topic. He would proceed to deduce from the nature of the offering of the Jewish high priest the nature of the offering brought by Christ. But this is postponed to the next chapter. The mention of Christ's better priesthood, with its better covenant and better promises, leads the

7 For if that first *covenant* had been faultless, then
should no place have been sought for the second.
8 For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the
days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new
covenant with the house of Israel and with the house
of Judah:

7 upon better promises. For if that first *covenant* had
been faultless, then would no place have been sought
8 for a second. For [1] finding fault with them, he saith,
Behold, the days come, saith the Lord,
That I will [2]make a new covenant with the
house of Israel and with the house of
Judah;

1 Some ancient authorities read *finding fault* with it *he saith unto them*.....2 Gr. *accomplish*.

author to pause a moment in the immediate train of argument to show *why* that Old Covenant has been superseded, and wherein consist the better promises of the New.

(*e*) For that the New *is* better than the first (this subordinately and in passing) is clear from its having superseded it. For God, having found the first inefficacious, replaces it by a new, and the former one becomes antiquated and expires. (7–13.)

These verses which illustrate this point might have been omitted without injury to the immediate argument; but they are vital to the general subject, and though strictly a digression, are by no means an unwarranted digression.

7. For if that first covenant, etc.—*that first one were faultless, there would not be sought a place for a second.* Here, as at 7 : 11, the author reasons to the imperfection of the first from the fact of its supersedure. Bleek somewhat fancifully finds this 'place' for the Second Covenant in the 'heart' as distinguished from the tablets of stone on which the older was engraved. But there is no necessity for such refining. The simple and obvious import of the language is that, apart from the imperfection of the First, there would have been no demand for the Second; no room would have been sought for it by the abrogation of the First. The one cannot come without displacing the other.

8–12. An extended citation of a celebrated passage from Jer. 31 : 31–34, which, connected immediately in its origin with the return from the Babylonian captivity, yet has unquestioned ultimate reference to the times of the Messiah. Like most of the Messianic prophecies, it stands originally connected with a subordinate local event, and, like them, passes beyond that event to the great theme and scope of all prophecy, the Messianic epoch and salvation. Although the passage is here subordinate to the author's immediate purpose (Christ's heavenly priesthood in connection with the better Covenant) it is too weighty in its testimony to the superiority of the New Covenant to the Old, to allow of its being passed over. The quotation is from the Septuagint, with slight verbal variations.

8. For—*finding fault* [with it] *he saith to them.* Or, "*For finding fault with them, he saith.*" Either construction has authority, and perhaps nearly equally balanced. If we read the accusative (αὐτούς),[1] the second construction, 'finding fault with them, he saith' is the only possible one. If the dative (αὐτοῖς),[2] we may render still 'finding fault with them' (constructing μέμφομαι with the dative), or more easily 'finding fault [with it] he saith to them.' This latter has slightly against it the position of the dative (αὐτοῖς), which unless emphatic would naturally follow the 'he saith' (λέγει). But, on the other hand, the correspondence between the words 'faultless' and 'finding fault with' (ἄμεμπτος and μεμφόμενος), already makes it natural to apply the 'finding fault' rather to the covenant than to the persons, and creates a strong presumption in favor of the former construction. Besides, as Stuart justly observes (after Theophylact, Grotius, etc.), the passage, in its Old Testament connection, is the one in which God is talking tenderly and graciously, rather than reproachfully, to his people, and throwing the blame of their conduct rather on the inadequacy of the covenant than on their perverseness. With some hesitation, therefore (against Delitzsch and others), I prefer the former construction. We may, indeed, render 'finding fault, he saith to them,' and leave it undecided whether the object of the censure is people or covenant. **Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make** (*accomplish*—literally, '*there come days and I will accomplish*,' by a familiar Hebraism) **a new covenant with** (*upon*) **the house of Israel and the**

1 With ℵ * A D * K P, etc., followed by Lachmann, Tischendorf (Ed. 8), Westcott and Hort.
2 With ℵ^{c} D* * * E L, etc., Chrysostom.

9 Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.
10 For this *is* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people:

9 Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers
In the day that I took them by the hand to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt;
For they continued not in my covenant,
And I regarded them not, saith the Lord.
10 For this is the covenant that [1] I will make with the house of Israel
After those days, saith the Lord;
I will put my laws into their mind,
And on their heart also will I write them:
And I will be to them a God,
And they shall be to me a people:

1 Gr. *I will covenant.*

house of Judah. The author has substituted for the Septuagint, 'I will institute with the house' (διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ), another expression, 'I will accomplish upon the house' (συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον). He has, however, merely substituted a different rendering, given elsewhere by the Septuagint for the same original expression. He has probably made the variation designedly (De Wette) in order to bring out the idea of *accomplishment* in connection with the New Covenant.

9. Negative characteristic of the New Covenant. **Not according to the covenant that I made** (ἐποίησα; Septuagint, διεθέμην) **with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand** (ἐπιλαβέσθαι, took hold of for the purpose of succoring and rescuing; see similar idea 2 : 16) **to lead them** (*forth*) **out of the land of Egypt.** This indicates clearly the Mosaic Covenant formed in the wilderness. The reference to the circumstances of its formation—when God rescued them from their Egyptian bondage—was designed, by reminding the people how much grace attended the formation of that covenant, to enhance their conception of the grace included in a covenant which shall set that aside as inadequate to answer God's gracious purposes. *That* was a covenant made in the day when he lifted them from their Egyptian bondage. How gracious, then, shall be the Dispensation which shall annul and supersede that as inoperative and worthless! **Because they continued not** (*did not abide*) **in my covenant, and I regarded them not** (*disregarded them*), **saith the Lord.** The emphasis of the original, with its emphatic pronouns, does not quite re-appear in the version: '*They* did not abide,' etc., and *I* in turn neglected *them.* This is added as showing the inadequacy of the covenant. It could not hold either of the parties, though—in each case, respectively—for different reasons. It could not enforce its obligations on the people, and, as it were, compelled God to withdraw his favor from a covenant-breaking people. Nay, with inexpressible tenderness, as if the heart of God were melting within him, he, as it were, takes part of the blame to himself, and finds fault with a covenant which left it possible for the people to disobey him, and, on the other hand, for him to neglect and disregard the people.

10. For (*because*) **this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord.** 'This' is here equivalent to *such, of such a nature;* namely, As I am about to describe. 'Because,' then, is here used in its strictly appropriate sense. God is going to justify his use of the term 'new' in its application to the covenant which he will hereafter form with the people of Israel, and to show why it really *is* a New Covenant. The remainder of the verse may be thus given: *Giving my laws into their understanding* [*will I make it*], *and upon their hearts will I inscribe them.* The above is, perhaps, the simplest mode of completing the participial construction, although it *may* be constructed as follows: 'Giving my laws,' etc., '*also* upon their hearts will I inscribe them.' This, however, makes a difference in the emphasis of the two clauses which seems foreign to the purpose of the author. The construction may be a simple *anacolouthon.* Here is one of the 'better promises' of the New Covenant—the promise of an inward spiritual influence, which shall secure obedience, and make the Covenant effective. A consequence of this immediately follows: **And I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.** (Exod. 6 : 7, 2 Cor. 6 : 16.) Here is promised the establishing of intimate and confidential relations between God and his people, which cannot be broken up, being

11 And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest.
12 For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.
13 In that he saith, A new *covenant*, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old *is* ready to vanish away.

11 And they shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen,
And every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord:
For all shall know me,
From the least to the greatest of them.
12 For I will be merciful to their iniquities,
And their sins will I remember no more.
13 In that he saith, A new *covenant*, he hath made the first old. But that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto vanishing away.

guaranteed by the living spiritual power attendant on the Covenant. The Old Covenant established this relation between God and his people *outwardly*. But it could not make it inward, and, therefore, could not make it permanent.

11. And they shall not teach every man his neighbour (*fellow citizen*), **and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for** (*because*) **all shall** (*will*) **know me, from the least to the greatest** *of them* (literally, *from the small unto the great one of them*). This is the *second* of the better promises of the New Covenant. Its import is that they shall not need to teach one another, because "they shall all be taught of God." God will write his law upon the heart, and instill it into the mind, and thus not leave them to the doubtful and unsatisfactory processes of human instruction. The Divine Spirit will impart to all his direct illuminations. This of course marks the intrinsic and essential character of the New Covenant, as promising and securing to its subjects large and immediate spiritual influence—its ideal character and tendency, which will be realized just in proportion as it accomplishes its work, and fully so when the "people shall be all righteous."

12. The *third* better promise of the New Covenant. *Because* (not γάρ *for*, giving the logical reason of the preceding statement: but ὅτι *because*, assigning the efficient cause of the preceding *fact:* as if he said, "And this shall be, *because*," etc.). **I will be merciful,** etc.—that is, *propitious, gracious toward their acts of unrighteousness, and their sins will I remember no more.* This completes the catalogue of the blessed prerogatives of the New Covenant; those better promises which give it its superiority over the Old. The inward constraining power of God's love; a universal opening of the heart to those teachings of God which will supersede the laborious teachings of men, and make divine knowledge universal; and finally a full and free remission of sins,—are the elements which make up the better promises of the better Covenant.

13. The logical inference from the designation New Covenant. **In that he saith** (*in saying a new* [*covenant*]), **he hath made the first old** (*antiquated*)—he has put it into the category of antiquated things. The logical connection is put for the efficient connection. God's using the term *new* is equivalent to *making* that old which the new displaces. **Now,** etc.; *and that which is becoming antiquated and growing old is near to disappearing*, is on the verge of extinction, is ready to vanish away. This verse puts the seal on the language which declares the imperfection of the First Covenant, and its abrogation to give place to a better, and to a better mediating priesthood. The author has disposed of the question how and under what conditions this new and glorious Melchisedec Priest could be inaugurated and perform his priestly functions. He could not be so on earth, because there is already a regularly constituted priesthood to offer the gifts and sacrifices of the law. He could be so only by taking the heavenly and antitypical instead of the merely typical priesthood, and with this the heavenly throne, instead of the earthly and shadowy sanctuary. And this he could do, because he comes in with a better Covenant which supersedes the Old, by prerogatives admirably illustrated in the citation from Jeremiah. The Old Covenant, then, has passed away, and with it the old priesthood, and the way is now prepared for returning to the thesis of ver. 3; namely, that the High Priest of the New Covenant in the heavenly sanctuary *must have something to offer*. Of this he has not in his temporary digression lost sight, and he now returns to it by inquiring into the arrangements of that priestly service under the Old Covenant, which, though imperfect and transitory, was yet typical of the higher service, and will indicate its nature. He sets forth first some general features of that antiquated Covenant with a

CHAPTER IX.

THEN verily the first *covenant* had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary.
2 For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein *was* the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary.

1 Now even the first *covenant* had ordinances of divine service, and its sanctuary, *a sanctuary* of this
2 world. For there was a tabernacle prepared, the first, wherein [1] *were* the candlestick, and the table, and [2] the shew-bread; which is called the Holy place.

1 Or, *are*.....2 Gr. *the setting forth of the loaves.*

view to showing its dignity and glory, and thus embracing the excellency of the Covenant which has superseded it. All, however, is preliminary and subordinate to the grand point brought out at 9 : 7; namely, that the high priest entered at stated seasons the inner sanctuary *not without blood*, whence also comes out (ver. 11, 12) what is the nature of the high priest's offering on high.

Ch. 9: (*f*) But that First Covenant (for to see how the New is organized, we must look back to that, its copy; and to see what the new High Priest must offer, we must look back and see what the old one offered) had its ordinances of service, and its sanctuary consisting of two tabernacles, an outer or more common, and an inner and holier one. (9 : 1–5.)

1-5. Preliminary description of the tabernacle.

1. Then verily (*now even*) **the first [covenant] had.** We might, perhaps, bring out better the emphasis of the original by rendering a little freely, "There belonged, indeed now, also to the first [covenant]." The logical particle (οὖν) connects with the preceding, and implies that to the First Covenant, though now antiquated and abrogated, we are still to look for instruction regarding the nature of the Second. Though but a copy, it resembled the original: though but a shadow, it represented the substance. The relation of the particle (μέν, which, as always, looks forward, εἶχε μέν, *possessed, indeed*) is a little difficult. It is not quite easy to decide whether it has its correlation in the particle in ver. 6 (δέ, properly "but" or "and," not "now") or of ver. 11. The general thought seems to demand the latter, and when the author commenced the chapter the contrast in his mind was apparently not between the more worldly and non-essential, and the more spiritual, elements in this Covenant, but between its arrangements and those of the New. But as he advances, this contrast between the more and less material features of the old tabernacle come more distinctly into view, making a sort of double antithesis, partly between the structure and the priestly services of the old tabernacle, and partly and still more between these latter and those of the New. Thus, with Delitzsch, I incline to regard the former particle (μέν) as having a double correlation both with ver. 6 and 11, rather than with either separately. That originally in the author's mind, however, I think was with ver. 11. *Had* (εἶχεν) not in contrast to the present actual non-existence of the Old Covenant tabernacle and services (because although the ancient tabernacle did not exist, the temple worship which succeeded to it, did), but to the fact that the Old Covenant itself has become really antiquated and superseded, and has but a tolerated, not a legitimate existence. **Ordinances of divine** (*priestly*) **service** *and its sanctuary of* (*belonging to*) *this world.* The Common Version, 'a worldly sanctuary,' gives the general idea of the latter clause, but not the more precise shade of the original, in which 'worldly' appears either as an after-thought, 'and had its sanctuary, namely, or although, a worldly one;' or simply as predicate; 'and had its sanctuary belonging to the world; namely, the sanctuary which it had belonged to the world.' It contrasts the sanctuary of the Old Covenant, the material Mosaic tabernacle, with its heavenly counterpart in which Christ ministers. The sanctuary is described immediately after, and the ordinances of priestly service in a very general way, so far as is necessary for the writer's purpose, in verses 6, 7.

2. For there was a tabernacle made (*prepared*)—constructed, fitted out, arranged. 'Tabernacle' is here used to denote the whole structure embracing two subordinate tabernacles. The name, when used absolutely however, denotes the whole, without regard to its divisions. **The first**—'the first,' *locally*, to one entering, in distinc-

3 And after the second vail, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all;
4 Which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein *was* the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant;

3 And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is
4 called the Holy of holies; having a golden [1] altar of incense, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein [2] *was* a golden pot holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the

1 Or, *censer*.....2 Or, *is*.

tion from the Holy of Holies. They were strictly two parts of the tabernacle—**wherein was** (*alike*, τε) **the candlestick** (*the candelabrum*, bearing with its six arms, including the shaft, seven candelabra, Exod. 25 : 31-39; 37 : 17-24)—**and the table** (of acacia wood, overlaid with pure gold, Exod. 25 : 23-30) **and the shewbread** (*setting forth of the loaves*)—doubtless not the mere usage of exhibiting the bread, but the bread actually exhibited, as the author is speaking of concrete objects. (Alford, Delitzsch.) **Which** [*first tabernacle*] **is called the sanctuary**—that is, Holy [things.][1]

3. And after (*behind*) **the second vail** (one vail hung in front of the door of the tabernacle, Exod. 26 : 36, 37), **the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all,** *the Holy of Holies* —a Hebraistic periphrasis for a superlative, equivalent to *the all holy*, the holiest. Our author, however, generally for brevity designates this inner sanctury simply as 'the holy,' 'the sanctuary' (ἁγια).

4. Which had, etc. (*having a golden altar of incense*), or, golden censer—for both these meanings are given to the word (θυμιατήριον), and it is difficult to decide between them.[2] There is no golden censer mentioned in the Law, only a shallow, brazen basin (called in the Septuagint πυρεῖον, not θυμιατήριον), employed by the high priest on the day of atonement, for taking incense from the altar. Later, however, we learn from the Mischna that a golden censer was employed on this day, and much importance is attached to it. Still it could hardly have been kept in the Holy of Holies, (as certainly the πυρεῖον was not), and, therefore, it could be but in a loose sense said to belong to it. But on the other hand, neither was the altar of incense in the Holy of Holies, but was one of the prominent objects of the first tabernacle, and this, therefore, it at first would hardly seem could be intended, unless we attribute (with many) to the author an ignorance of the arrangements of the sanctuary wholly incredible under the circumstances. Neither, then, of the two could the inner sanctuary be said to 'have,' in the sense of actually *containing* it. But either of them it might be said to have, in that both sustained an important relation to it. The censer was actually used to carry incense into it: the altar was to stand in front of the ark of the covenant (which was behind the vail), between the candlestick and the table, was sprinkled with blood on the day of atonement, as well as the mercy seat, and thus stands in a peculiar relation to the inner sanctuary. So also it is assigned (1 Kings 6: 22) to the Holy of Holies ("*The altar that was by the oracle*"), a passage which Keil and Delitzsch regard as explaining our passage and explained by it. Add to this that an article of so much importance would hardly be omitted in the enumeration of the leading objects in the sanctuary, while in the general rhetorical statement of the author the *local* relation is of much less importance than the *moral*, and we can hardly doubt that the 'altar of incense' and not the 'censer' is the object here spoken of. (For a fuller discussion the reader is referred to Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, Farrar.) **And the ark of the covenant** (Exod. 25 : 10, seq.; 37 : 1, seq.) **overlaid round about,** *covered round on all sides.* (within and without) **with gold.** A chest of acacia wood, contained not only in the inner sanctuary of the tabernacle, but also of the temple of Solomon, from which it disappeared when the temple was sacked by the Chaldeans. In 2 Macc. 2: 1-8, the tabernacle, the ark, and the altar of incense are classed together. **Wherein** (that is, in the ark) **was the** (*a*) **golden pot having the manna.** (Exod. 16 : 32-36.) The

[1] The adjective is not ἁγία feminine agreeing with σκηνή, but ἅγια neuter plural, *holy things*, something holy.

[2] The form θυσιαστήριον, with or without additions, is indeed used in the Septuagint for the incense altar, but on the other hand, θυμιατήριον became common in later Hellenistic writers, and is found in Philo, Josephus, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, etc., and might, therefore, well be so used by our author.

5 And over it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy seat; of which we cannot now speak particularly.
6 Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service *of God*.

5 tables of the covenant; and above it cherubim of glory overshadowing [1]the mercy-seat; of which
6 things we cannot now speak severally. Now these things having been thus prepared, the priests go in continually into the first tabernacle, accomplishing

1 Gr. *the propitiatory.*

'golden' is not in the Hebrew, but is added by the Septuagint. It is also not expressly stated in Exodus that it was to be placed *in* the ark, but laid up 'before the Lord' from which the other was inferred, and was so understood by the Rabbins. The statement (1 Kings 8:9; 2 Chron. 5:10) that nothing was found in the ark in the temple but the tables of the covenant, proves nothing in regard to the original contents of the ark under Moses, unless indeed, that something else was *expected* to be found there, and in so far it is confirmatory of our passage. **And Aaron's rod that budded** (*blossomed*). (Num. 17:1-11.) This was to be laid up "before the testimony," that is, before the tables of the covenant (Exod. 31:18), whence the natural inference that it was in the ark. **And the tables of the covenant** —the tables of stone which contained the Ten Commandments (Exod. 25:16) were to be placed in the ark, which, from its containing them, was called the ark of the covenant.

5. And over (*above*) **it**—on the massive golden cover of the ark—**the cherubim of glory,** the symbolical fourfold animal forms, at its two extremities, facing each other, and looking down upon the cover which they overshadowed with their outspread wings. They were called "cherubim of glory," not so much probably on account of their own glorious and shining forms, wrought of fine gold, as because they ministered to the glorious Being who was "enthroned between the cherubim." (1 Sam. 4:4; Ps. 99:1; Isa. 66:1.) **Shadowing the mercy seat.** Shadowing with their wings the massive covering of the ark, which covering, interposed, as it were, between the glory of God above and the tables of the covenant below, when sprinkled over with the blood of the propitiatory sacrifice, was transformed from a cover for that law which worketh the wrath of God into a symbol of propitiation, a mercy seat, and thus, as the divine footstool, became the place where the God of the covenant could and did hold converse with the people of the covenant. (Exod. 25:22; Lev. 16:2.) **Of** (*concerning*) **which things** (not the cherubim merely, but all the objects connected with the sanctuary) **we cannot now speak particularly** (*severally*). This general notice of them answered the writer's purpose. But why has he spoken of these details, which have no essential relation to the argument? We may answer that in describing the interior of the tabernacle it was *natural* to mention briefly its chief objects of interest; but the especial purpose of the mention probably was—by showing with what objects of sacred interest the earthly tabernacle was furnished, and thus with what dignity invested—to enhance the glory which must invest the upper and true, the 'greater and more perfect' tabernacle.

(*g*) Now in the outer sanctuary the priests performed constant ministrations, but into this inner sanctuary the high priest went alone once a year, *not without blood*—he carried in there the blood of slaughtered victims, symbolically, though not really expiatory of sin. (6–10.)

6. Now when these, etc., *and these things having been thus arranged, into the first tabernacle, indeed, the priests continually enter accomplishing the services.* Of what *time* is the author speaking? Of the time now actually present to himself and his readers, and of the temple worship now actually existing; or does he refer to the origin of the Levitical institutions, and to the state of things connected with the tabernacle itself? It seems to me most clearly the latter. I do not see how we can escape from the obvious, and indeed express, import of the language of this passage, "These things having been thus arranged, into the first tabernacle, indeed, the priests continually enter." It represents the one as immediately and naturally following upon the other, and the reference of the whole to the tabernacle worship is unmistakably clear. Nor can anything be more natural than that the author in describing the arrangements of the Old Covenant worship should go back to the primitive forms of the institution, and exhibit them as they originally came fresh from the prescription of Jehovah. Nor is this throwing back of himself into the past in the slightest degree uncommon or unnatural. It

7 But into the second *went* the high priest alone once | 7 the services; but into the second the high priest

is one of the most frequent of figures, and is nowhere more appropriate than precisely in the present case. I do not, then, I confess, see how able commentators (as Lünemann, Delitzsch, Alford) can suppose that the author is here speaking *chronologically* of the temple service as actually existing in his own time: *how* he can be supposed to have passed with so abrupt a bound, from his elaborate description of the Mosaic tabernacle, and that too with such a phrase as, "And these things having been thus arranged," to the temple worship of his own day. And this the more from the fact that the temple worship of his day, if existing at all (as we suppose it was), existed illegitimately. The True Priest had come and displaced the old. The true sacrifice had been offered, and nullified the office of the old sacrifices. Christ had already entered into the true tabernacle, had rent at his death the vail which separates the outer from the inner sanctuary, and had abolished forever that state of things which that vail and that tabernacle typified. To suppose then that the author has reference chronologically to the time now existing to himself and his readers, is to throw the whole passage into inextricable confusion. For nothing can be clearer than that he is describing the normal state of things under the Old Covenant, and the old priesthood. He is showing its significance and its imperfections. He is showing that it symbolized a state of things which was to be done away by the sacrifice and Priest of the New Covenant. But that sacrifice has now been offered: that Priest has now taken his place in the heavenly sanctuary; the rites of Judaism have but a waning, doubtful, and illegitimate existence. According to the interpretation which I am opposing, the Holy Spirit has not (ver. 8) even yet in the time of the author, shown the way into the Holiest of All, which, however, most assuredly was made manifest with the death and resurrection of Jesus. Verses 9, 10, also clearly point to a normal, established condition of things before the coming of Christ, and one which was to be done away by his coming. The whole passage, therefore, from ver. 1 to ver. 10 must, it seems to me, be interpreted of the tabernacle worship as originally ordained by God, and instituted by Moses; simply because the author chooses to take Judaism in its original and purest form; and to him the subsequent transfer of the service of the tabernacle to the temple is a thing of no moment. He is not dealing with the successive, chronological stages of Judaism; he simply takes it in its primitive, normal, character. To charge him with ignorance of the transfer of the tabernacle to the temple service, as Bleek and others have done; or with ignorance of the actual state of things, as not knowing that the original contents of the ark did not exist in the later temple, is simply to misconceive utterly his point of view, and then make the ignorance of the interpreter the ground for an imputation of ignorance on the author. For this oft-repeated charge against the author of ignorance regarding the arrangements of the temple at Jerusalem, there is not in this passage, carefully examined, the shadow of a ground. He has made no approach to an intimation that the actual tabernacle service existed in his own day, and far less, that the original contents of the tabernacle were still existing either in tabernacle or temple. By a natural and beautiful figure he transports himself back into the past, sketches in a few strong lines the ancient tabernacle in its material splendor, then in its priestly services, then (9, 10) in its symbolical significance; and not one word, not a hint, regarding the temple of Jerusalem, as of course every Jew would know precisely what outward but non-essential modifications that original tabernacle service had undergone. I would add, finally, that in treating the present here as simply the *historical present*, I concur with Chrysostom, Theophylact, Stein, Bengel, and others.

7. But into the second [*tabernacle*], *once in the year, alone, enters the high priest.* The lovers of fault-finding have here again charged error upon the author, because in fact, on the great day of atonement, the high priest entered the inner sanctuary at least *twice*, according to Lev. 16: 12–16, and according to Philo; and four times, according to the Talmud and the Rabbins. It would seem an obvious suggestion that the mind of the writer is on the fact that but on a *single day and single occasion* in the year did any one, and then only the high priest, enter this interior

every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and *for* the errors of the people:
8 The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing:

alone, once in the year, not without blood, which he offereth for himself, and for the [1] errors of the peo-
8 ple: the Holy Spirit this signifying, that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest,

1 Gr. *ignorances.*

tabernacle, and whether at this single time he might have occasion to go in and out once, twice, or four times was wholly immaterial to the purpose, and substantial accuracy, of the statement. Its spirit is fulfilled in the fact that his entrance into it was confined to that single day. The outer tabernacle was frequented by all the priests in their daily ministrations: the inner was entered only on one day of the year, and then by the high priest alone. **Not without blood which he offered for** (*on behalf of*) **himself and** *for* **the errors** (*offences*) **of the people.** The author here nearly reaches the point toward which, from 8: 3, he has been steadily tending. He there undertook to show what our great High Priest in the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man, *must offer*. For this purpose he has looked back to the function of his earthly type, and finds that the high priest entered the symbolical presence of God in the Mosaic tabernacle '*not without blood*'; the offering of the heavenly High Priest, he proceeds presently to state, must be blood also. He is speaking not of the previous sacrifice, but of the bringing of the blood of the sacrifice into the Most Holy Place before God. The blood of the slaughtered victims was brought in, and sprinkled once upward, and seven times downward toward the mercy seat, and over the altar of incense, and was poured out on the altar of burnt offering. The importance attached to the entering with blood, is shown by the emphatic form of the statement, '*not without blood*,' instead of the direct affirmation, *with blood*. Before proceeding to his deduction regarding the nature of Christ's offering, the author yet pauses to dwell a moment on the symbolical significance of this exclusion of all but the high priest, and of him at all ordinary times from the inner sanctuary.

8. The Holy Ghost, etc., *the Holy Spirit showing this*—by this rare and solitary entrance—*that the way into the sanctuary;* not (as Alford) the way into the heavenly sanctuary, which would make a confusion of the figure; but the way into the presence of God which this earthly sanctuary substantially denotes. It is clear that so long as only the high priest, and he only at distant intervals, can enter the sanctuary, so long the way into the sanctuary has not as yet been strictly laid open; it remains substantially hidden and closed—*hath not yet been made manifest, while the first tabernacle is yet existing.* Bengel, Stuart, and some others, regard 'the first tabernacle' here as the earlier, or Jewish tabernacle, in contradistinction from the later or true tabernacle into which Christ has entered; but without doubt, erroneously. In the first place, the author would not without a good reason depart from his previous use of 'the first' verses 2, 6, in both of which it denotes the first in locality, that which was first entered, the outer tabernacle. Secondly, according to his conception of the relation of the Mosaic and the heavenly tabernacle, he would not have called the former the first, it being, in his figurative language, but a copy of the archetypal, original heavenly tabernacle, and therefore not the first, but the second. Thirdly, the idea is equally well brought out by giving to 'the first tabernacle' its previous signification. It is indeed true, that the way into the real presence of God, the heavenly sanctuary, was not made manifest, and was not to be made manifest while the Jewish tabernacle and its successor, the temple, yet had continuance. For so long as they existed, they existed as a part and a centre of that Judaistic system which was but the shadow of the good things to come. But, on the other hand, the idea is equally well, and even more forcibly expressed by referring the "first tabernacle" to the *first part* of the Jewish tabernacle, in distinction from the second. For what made that *first* tabernacle? What made the distinction of first and second tabernacles at all? It was the vail hanging between them, and shutting out the first from the symbolical presence of God. So long as that vail hung there that first tabernacle remained. When the vail was rent at the death of Christ (the vail of the temple answering to the vail of the tabernacle), the distinction was

9 Which *was* a figure for the time then present, in | 9 while as the first tabernacle is yet standing; which

done away, the outer tabernacle was no more; the presence of God was equally unvailed to all worshipers. Finally, the ascribing of these arrangements, or rather of the revelation made by them, to the *Holy Spirit*, is in accordance with the fact that he is the recognized Author and Source of all proper spiritual teachings. Not that the Holy Spirit in distinction from the other persons in the Trinity was the Author of the Mosaic institutions, but that the *disclosure of truth* made in them, as in all other revelations of Scripture, is properly to be attributed to the Holy Spirit. God creates and governs, and God prescribed the arrangements of the Mosaic tabernacle; Christ atones, mediates, and when on earth, like the prophets, outwardly taught; but to unvail *truth* to the understanding, and write it on the heart, is the province of the Holy Spirit, and as he alone gave efficacy to the instructions of Jesus, so he was the proper Interpreter of the significance of the Mosaic institutions.

9. Which—the first or outer tabernacle: for to this, or the leading previous idea, is the more natural reference—*is* **a figure** (*or parable*, παραβολή, *a laying along side of*, a comparison, a resemblance; here a symbolical representation) *for the time now present* (or the *now existing period*)—that is, the period during which the outer tabernacle remains with its imperfect ritual, indicating that the way into the Holy of Holies has not yet been disclosed. The time called the 'existing' or 'present' time, is the same as in the remainder of the passage, and is *not* the time now present to the writer, but the time into which he has in thought transported himself; namely, the time of the Old Covenant, and of the tabernacle and temple worship. To take any other view of it is hopelessly to confuse the passage. To refer it to the actual existing time of the writer is wholly inconsistent with the facts of the case; for now the time of that symbolical service has passed away; the 'time of rectification' has actually come, and the tabernacle and temple service has lost its validity and its significance. Assuredly the author would not use such language as he employs here in verses 8, 9, 10, regarding the mere dying remains of the temple service, which dragged out a tolerated and illegitimate existence until broken up by the final overthrow of the Jewish city and temple. He clearly has reference to Judaism as a normal, divinely instituted, divinely perpetuated system: to Judaism in all its original and proper force and significance: to Judaism in contrast with that system which came in with the death and resurrection of Christ, that fulfilled and set aside its shadowy symbolical predecessor. The author lived in the 'time of rectification,' and we cannot confound this with the 'existing time' in which this merely symbolical and carnal system had sway, without violating every law of interpretation. It may indeed well be that the long existence through centuries of that old Mosaic ritual; that its actual existence, though in a dying state, in the time of the author himself—may have rendered more easy and natural the figure by which he represents the past as if it were present; but if so, he certainly has no special and primary reference to the present time, but is distinctly contrasting a system which belongs properly to the past, which had been already virtually and substantially displaced, with another system, which since the coming of Christ, or at least since his ascension to the throne and presence of God, has been fully inaugurated, and is now in full activity. The "now existing period," then, is not the actual, but the ideal now, the period into which the author has ideally transported himself, in which the Old Covenant with its symbolical sacrifices and priesthood has yet unbroken sway, and the outer tabernacle with its unremoved vail yet symbolizes the separation of man from God, which can be removed only in Christ.[1] One remark further. The signifi-

[1] It will be seen that with this interpretation, I can attach little or no value to this passage as indicating the time of the composition of the Epistle, whether before or after the destruction of Jerusalem. I grant, indeed, that the passage may more probably have been written while the old Levitical worship had yet a nominal continuance, though I concede even as much as that with hesitation, for I certainly see no reason of weight why the whole passage may not have been written after the entire temple service had passed away, and this all the more as the special *form* of the Old Covenant service upon which the author dwells,

which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience;

10 Which *stood* only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed *on them* until the time of reformation.

is a figure for the time present; according to which are offered both gifts and sacrifices that cannot, as touching the conscience, make the worshipper per-
10 fect, *being* only (with meats and drinks and divers washings) carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation.

carice assigned here to the outer tabernacle, seems entirely warranted by the fact. There was no more expressive feature of the Old Covenant arrangements than that awful vail, which perpetually symbolized an offended, unappeased, and distant God; none more calculated to keep up in the bosoms of the worshipers the sense of their need of a more efficacious sacrifice than they could bring, and of a higher priesthood than that which was itself almost utterly excluded from the presence of God, and which could not bring the people near at all. The rending of that vail, the virtual demolition of the outer sanctuary, is also the one grand accompaniment of the crucifixion. The darkness, the earthquake, the material phenomena, which attended that event are lost in that opening of graves which pointed to the resurrection, and still more in that rending of the vail, which showed that a way was now opened by which men *could draw near to God.* **In which,** etc. *According to which* [*similitude*] (καθ'ἣν), or at which time (καθ' ὅν); for either reading makes good sense, although with Lünemann, Delitzsch, etc., I prefer the former. **Were** (*are*) **offered both gifts and sacrifices,** *that cannot, as touching the conscience,* make *him who performs the service* perfect. By 'him who performs the service' is here meant, not the priest, but him who from the people renders service through the priests. This clause explains how it is that the outer tabernacle is a symbol for its period—(a symbol not *of* its period, though this would be true enough, and not, perhaps, an impossible interpretation, but a symbol *for* the existing time)—of the state of things as between God and the worshipers —a symbol of that exclusion from God which must necessarily exist when there were no sacrifices that could truly atone for sin; none that were able to perfect in the conscience him who served, and thus enable or embolden him to draw near to God. Under that state of things man dared not approach to God; would not do so until the throne of justice had really been sprinkled over with appeasing blood. Of the inefficiency of these sacrifices this outer tabernacle was a standing symbol.

10. Which stood, etc., [*conditioned*[1]] *merely on meats, and drinks, and various bathings, fleshly ordinances imposed until the season of rectification.* With this construction 'meats, drinks,' etc., express the conditions under which those 'gifts and sacrifices' are offered, denoting the whole round of ceremonial purifications and ritual prescriptions, partly such as are enjoined by the law, and partly (especially in the case of drinks, as well as many of the ceremonies of bathing and cleansing. See Matt. 23 : 24; Rom. 14 : 21; Acts 15 : 10, 28) such as had sprung up and been established by traditionary usage. There is thus no necessity (with Bleek and De Wette) to suppose a reference to the Passover, or to the feasts after the thank offerings, which would be quite insufficient for the breadth of the writer's illustration. **Carnal ordinances**—*ordinances of flesh*, then (literally equivalent to *fleshly ordinances*), refer back as an apposition to the 'gifts and sacrifices,' which, enveloped in ritualistic observances, and having large reference to outward things as eating, drinks, bathings, etc., might be denominated 'fleshly', and were 'imposed' on the people until the time of revision and rectification. **Imposed on** (ἐπικείμενα), *lying upon, laid upon*, and thus pressing heavily on the people, is a word probably purposely selected, answering to Acts 15 : 10, the *laying upon* (ἐπιθεῖναι) the necks of the disciples a yoke, etc. These observances were burdensome in their variety and frequent repetition, and still more in their utter impotence to cleanse and purify the spirit. 'The time of

that of the tabernacle, *had* long since passed away, of which fact to assume the writer to be ignorant, would be to stultify ourselves. I admit, indeed, that there are elsewhere in the Epistle indications sufficient to warrant the opinion that city and temple were yet standing, although they are not perhaps very decisive.

[1] I have adopted the reading δικαιώματα instead of δικαιώμασι (with De Wette, Lünemann, Delitzsch, Alford, etc.). To ἐπί I give the signification, '*on condition of*,' 'conditioned on' (a familiar use of ἐπί with the dative).

rectification,' of correction and setting to rights, the Messianic season, the time when the one true sacrifice sweeps away all these numerous sacrifices and the whole burdensome ceremonial in which they are imbedded;—that time begins with the coming, at least with the sacrifice and priesthood, of Christ. Then these observances, these sacrifices, along with the first or outer tabernacle with which they stand connected, and which in its expressive import declares their impotence, are swept away together. The rending of the vail has merged the first tabernacle in the second, and under the conduct of the great High Priest, opened to all the worshipers the way to the presence of God. Of course, I reject wholly the idea of Delitzsch, Alford, etc., that this time of revision and thorough setting to rights is identical with the 'existing season' (καιρὸς ἐνέστηκώς) above. I regard the two as placed in direct contrast. The one is the time present to the conception of the writer, the time of the Old Covenant and the material tabernacle, when symbol, and shadow, and fleshly ordinances had sway: the other is the now existing time, the time described in the verses following since Christ has appeared, the efficient Priest of good things to come, rending the vail, opening the way to God, substituting the heavenly for the earthly tabernacle, and his own blood in priestly sacrifice and offering for that of goats and heifers. Whatever else in the Christian's hope may be future, this is not. It has actually come. As an ideal system it has come completely in the sacrifice and mediation of Christ. To confound it, then, with that previous time of symbols and shadows is to overturn the whole doctrine of the Epistle, and all this because we fail to recognize the natural and familiar figure of the historical present for the past in verses 1–10, a figure to which his reference to the tabernacle worship absolutely forces us. I will say once more it seems to me inconceivable, that, if the writer were referring in all this to the actual present time, he would have made no single allusion to the temple; none whatever to the disappearance of so many of the objects which, although in the tabernacle, were some of them never in the first, and still fewer of them ever in the second temple. The minuteness with which he describes the Mosaic tabernacle and its arrangements; the close connection to which his language points between those arrangements and the consequent priestly service ('these things having been thus arranged, the priests enter,' etc.—show that he is speaking of the Levitical service in its normal character, as legitimated by divine appointment and sanction, not as dragging out a miserable existence after being smitten down and substantially done away in Christ. On the common hypothesis it is difficult to see how we can defend the author from those charges of carelessness or of ignorance which (be he who he might have been, Paul, Apollos, Barnabas, Luke, Clement,) are antecedently, utterly improbable, and which when we adopt the right interpretation, recoil upon those that made them.

(*h*) We see, then, what is demanded of our High Priest. It is *blood*. And as his is the true, and not the symbolical priesthood, as he is in the genuine, and not the copied sanctuary, he must offer blood that is really, and not symbolically, cleansing. He brings *his own*. (11–14.)

The author reaches now the solution of the problem proposed in 8 : 3; namely, to determine what it is that our heavenly High Priest has to offer. In the outer earthly sanctuary the priests minister daily with various offerings: into the second sanctuary the high priest goes alone once a year, *and not without blood;* this jealous exclusion showing that the way into the All-holy has not yet been disclosed; but this condition of the rare and solitary entrance showing how, when it *is* disclosed, access is to be secured; namely, by *blood:* by blood which will perform, really and effectually, what the blood of animals performs symbolically. With this comes the crown and consummation of the argument. All, from this point on to 10 : 18 (the close of the argumentative part of the Epistle) is in illustration of this one thought, as all from 8 : 1 (where the discussion of the high priesthood commences) is preparatory to it. Thus two grand ideas, Christ a Melchisedec Priest, holding a royal and perpetual priesthood, and Christ an Aaronic High Priest, bringing his efficacious blood into the heavenly sanctuary; these are the two grand points on which the doctrinal discussion of the Epistle turns. Without the priesthood which, after the type of Melchisedec, is constituted 'after the power of an indestructible life,' the high priesthood would be unavailing: without the *blood* typified in the Levitical sacrifice, the Melchisedec priesthood, though majestic, would be barren. The two united give us a High

11 But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;

11 But Christ having come a high priest of [1] the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say,
12 not of this creation, nor yet through the blood of

1 Some ancient authorities read *the good things that are come.*

Priest answering all our needs, able to commence and carry to perfection our spiritual cleansing and salvation—able to bring a guilty soul, ransomed and purified, *into the presence of God.*

11. But Christ being come (*presenting himself*) equivalent to, being raised up, appearing on the theatre of the world, not, probably, 'presenting himself at the heavenly sanctuary,' and certainly not 'becoming High Priest.'[1] It is placed, says Delitzsch, emphatically first, as marking, in his coming, the goal of Old Testament prophecy, the turning point of two periods of sacred history standing related to each other as prophecy and fulfillment. Thus again the reference is not strictly to the *incarnation* of Christ, but to his *coming forward* at the close of the Old Economy to inaugurate a New One, and coming forward in the exercise of all the functions of the High Priest. It thus marks his whole collective work as Messiah; his incarnation, sacrificial death, ascension. **A high priest of** (*the*) **good things to come.** Are the 'good things' of which Christ is the High Priest called 'to come' (μέλλοντα) from the point of view of the Old Covenant, or from the present point of view of the believer who as yet is saved only in *hope:* who awaits his full salvation at Christ's second appearing (9:28), who has here no abiding city but seeks one to come (πόλις μέλλουσα 13:14)? It would seem at first more natural to regard the author as speaking of Christ's high priesthood as the fulfillment of the good things which did not yet exist, but were only promised and symbolized under Judaism, and this idea may perhaps be secondarily in his mind. Still the second idea is (with Tholuck, De Wette, Lünemann, Delitzsch, etc.,) doubtless the true one. They are the good things future from the New Testament point of view. The Mosaic tabernacle had its sanctuary, *belonging to the world* (κοσμικόν): the system of which it was the centre consisted of meats, and drinks, and carnal ordinances, earthly, temporal, and transient. But the Christian's High Priest is a High Priest of good things *to come*, of a future, spiritual salvation, of heavenly blessings as yet possessed but in hope. Alford therefore errs in alleging that the clause 'high priest of good things to come,' describes a quality common both to the Jewish high priest and to Christ; only that the import of the phrase was much scantier in the one case, and much fuller in the other. In a certain sense, of course, such a statement might be made. The seeds of the New Dispensation were in the Old. But it would reverse all the author's habits of conception and language to designate a Jewish high priest along with Christ, "a high priest of good things to come." The very phrase which Alford cites disproves it. The law had but the *shadow* of good things to come, and therefore the priest of the law was but a priest of shadows; he ministered to that tabernacle which was but a copy and shadow of the heavenly. The author is here speaking contrastively of Christ's higher priesthood, as ministering and bestowing the spiritual blessings which were utterly beyond the reach of the Levitical: this could faintly outline and symbolize them; but could by no means bestow them. Real pardon, complete redemption, nearness and assimilation to God, promised now potentially, but fully only in the future, are the "coming good things of which Christ is High Priest."

Through a (*the*) **greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building,** *creation.* We here (as at 8:2) meet the question: "What is the tabernacle referred to by the author?" Is it the first or outer tabernacle, as distinguished from the inner or Holy of Holies, and if so (as assumed by nearly all commentators), then what did that outer tabernacle represent? Through *what* did Christ pass, as the greater and more perfect tabernacle, on his way into the heavenly Holy of Holies? I have already considered the question at some length at 8:2, and might to that refer the reader for the exclusive discussion. The importance of the topic, however, and the almost unanimous concurrence of interpreters in what seems to

1 This would require γενόμενος instead of παραγενόμενος.

me a grave error, may justify some additional observations.

I do not believe (and in this I have the authority of Moll) that the author, either here, or at 8 : 2, or anywhere in his reference to the heavenly sanctuary, makes reference to the first, or outer tabernacle, at all. I do not believe that he conceives of it as having any existence under the Spiritual Dispensation. Certainly there is nothing in the language, either at 8: 2 or here, which would lead us to suppose that he refers rather to *a part* of the tabernacle than to the whole of it. The "greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands," would *seem* to be contrasted as a whole, with the smaller, imperfect, and material earthly structure. Apart from the fact that Christ went through it into the sanctuary, none would dream of applying the description to but a *part*, and that confessedly the far inferior part of that tabernacle. Had the expression been indefinite, '*a* greater and more perfect,' etc., instead of '*the* greater,' it could be more easily referred to a part of either tabernacle. Again (with Moll), to what purpose the emphatic words, 'through the greater and more perfect tabernacle,' if it referred to but some mere passage way to the heavenly tabernacle, and not to the heavenly tabernacle itself? The application of the terms, 'greater and more perfect,' as applied to the heavenly tabernacle as a whole, in contrast with the earthly, we can easily understand; but see no reason for this emphasizing of that which was but a mere passage way to the interior sanctuary.

But the case appears still stronger when we ask, "What *is* this greater and more perfect *outer* tabernacle, through which our High Priest passes to the inner?" And we hear the responses of interpreters — "The lower and visible heavens;" "the heaven of glorified saints;" "the earthly life of Christ;" "the human body of Christ;" "his glorified body;" "his mystical body,"—these are chief among the numerous answers given to this difficult question. But however true it might be, that in some sort of sense either one of these might be the passage way to the heavenly sanctuary, neither of them has the slightest support in the language of the author; neither of them is anything better than pure conjecture: and neither of them (nor can I except that of Delitzsch, 'the heaven of glorified saints') has any support in the significance of the outer earthly tabernacle, or stands in any sort of relation to it. That outer tabernacle had one single special purpose and import. It did not represent the visible heavens, nor the heaven of the blessed, nor the human body, nor the earthly life, nor the glorified body, nor the mystical body of Christ. Its import is expressly given by the author. It was the symbol and likeness for the time then existing, in which conscious sin and guilt, united with a carnal ritual that had no expiatory and cleansing power, kept men at a distance from God. It was a symbol of imperfection. It was the grand central feature, the very core, so to speak, of the shadowy Levitical Dispensation. The Holy Ghost signified by solemn and expressive symbol so long as this 'first' or outer tabernacle 'had position,' that the way into the true sanctuary had not yet been disclosed. Its destiny then was obvious. If the way into the Holiest of All was not made manifest while it remained, a condition of the disclosing of that way must be its annihilation. And such was the fact. The high priestly sacrifice of our Lord destroyed it. His death rent the symbolical vail, and merged the outer and inner tabernacle into one. When Christ therefore ascended and entered into the heavenly Holy of Holies, he did not pass through the outer tabernacle, because he could not. It had ceased to exist. His own death had done it away forever, in doing away with that state of things which it symbolized. To refit it, and to place it in the heavens, is to ignore the cardinal imperfection of the Old, and the vital fact and prerogative of the New Economy. It is to repair and rehang the rent vail of the temple.

But are we not going directly counter to that statement of the author, in which he declares that the earthly tabernacle was a copy of the heavenly, citing in confirmation the language: "See that thou make all things after the pattern shown to thee in the mount"? In regard to this, I again reply, that the original import of this language can of course have been nothing more than that Moses should exactly copy the model which God had given to him on Sinai. Our author makes a purely figurative application of that passage, as a quasi proof or illustration of his doctrine, that the true arche-

12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us*.

goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained

typal tabernacle is in heaven and not on earth; that the true high priest is Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, and not Aaron in the earthly. But that he meant anything more by it; that he meant that there was anything in the heavenly arrangements actually corresponding to the outer or even to the inner tabernacle,—seems wholly void of probability. I can scarcely conceive that he meant anything more than that Christ has the true divine high priesthood of which the Levitical high priesthood is but the type and copy, and therefore in figurative language it is natural to say that he ministers in the true heavenly tabernacle of which that is the earthly copy and semblance. Thus, 'the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man,' and 'the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is, not of this creation,' both mean substantially the same thing, and both refer not to the outer tabernacle distinctively, but simply to Christ's spiritual priestly service in the presence of God; they belong to the heavenly Sion, and the heavenly Jerusalem, in comparison with the earthly Sinai, and the earthly Jerusalem. (12:22.) The New Testament tabernacle is among the spiritual existences of the New Covenant, and it is inconceivable that the two emphatic characterizations of its spiritual and transcendent dignity in our author should have reference, not to the whole tabernacle, or the tabernacle in its noblest features, but only to that part of it which symbolized the imperfection and powerlessness of the economy with which it stood connected.

How, then, explain the construction 'through the greater and more perfect tabernacle entered into the sanctuary'? We may construct it in either one of two ways. We may connect it (with Moll) with the preceding: 'Christ is an *high priest* (ἀρχιερεύς), through (that is, *by means of*) the greater and more perfect sanctuary.' This is explained by 8:4, 5, where we are told that if Christ were on earth he could not be a priest, there being a sacerdotal order already to perform the services of the law; and therefore *he could be a priest only* as he could minister in the heavenly and archetypal tabernacle, and thus could be a priest only *through* that tabernacle. Or there is no serious difficulty, I think, in taking the *through* (διά) *locally*, and connecting it with the following verb *entered* (εἰσῆλθεν). Regarding the heavenly tabernacle under the figure of an edifice in which is the Holy of Holies, Christ might be said in a general way to enter through that greater and more perfect tabernacle, that is, to enter through its door, through its entrance, into the sanctuary, and thus the author not mean to affirm anything in that tabernacle corresponding to the outer tabernacle on earth. Of these two constructions, we may add that the former seems favored by ver. 12, "nor through the blood," etc., which it is also quite as natural and perhaps more so, to construct with '*high priest*' (ἀρχιερεύς).

12. Neither by (*and not through*) **the blood of goats and calves, but,** *through* **his own blood.** This clause may, as just observed, be constructed (as by Moll) with the preceding 'high priest'—a high priest through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, and a high priest not through the blood, etc.—denoting the necessary conditions of Christ's high priesthood, or it may be connected with the following verb 'entered' (εἰσῆλθεν), and denote that through which, or with which, Christ as High Priest entered the heavenly sanctuary. The Levitical high priest entered the earthly one both by means of and with the blood of goats and heifers: Christ entered the heavenly one through, though not strictly with, his own blood. Probably, therefore, the preposition is carefully chosen as one applicable (as σύν *with* would not have been) both to the entrance of the typical and the antitypical High Priest. The author shrinks from the harshness of saying that Christ entered the presence of God *with* his own blood, but says *through*, or *by means of* it.

The German commentators, indeed, discuss at length the question of the way in which Christ can be said to have gone into the All-holy Place with or by his own blood. They inquire whether the blood which he shed on the cross was wasted on the ground, or gathered up, as too precious to be lost, and restored to his body; or whether those drops

were suffered to sink into the ground in expiation of the curse, and the drops remaining in his body were reanimated along with it (so Delitzsch); and whether he accordingly entered heaven with a glorified body which contains blood (Delitzsch), or without blood (Hofmann). To me, I confess, these speculations seem, if not utterly idle and vain, and an almost presumptuous prying into inscrutable mysteries, to have at least no important bearing on the passage before us. I do not see any necessity for supposing that the writer conceives of Christ as entering the heavenly tabernacle with actual *blood*. This part of the representation (if indeed it is made at all) must be purely figurative. There must be a slaughtered victim, and in the symbolical Levitical service the blood of this victim is carried into the sanctuary, and sprinkled toward the mercy seat, and poured out on the altar of burnt offering. This is a vivid reminder of the necessity of *blood*—that is, of the necessity of *death*, of a life rendered up in expiation of the sins of men. But is not all its essential significance realized when Christ pours out his life on the cross, and then ascends to appear in the presence of God for us? Does not the merely *formal* similitude end here? Was there any virtue in this blood carried into the sanctuary, except as it stood connected with the atoning death? And has not Christ performed all that it signified when he has shed his blood on the cross for man? Must he carry, in any form, actual blood into the presence of God in the discharge of his priestly functions? To demand this is to make the parallel run on all fours; to push it to quite an unwarrantable extreme. What, then, became of the spilled, or the unspilled, blood of the Redeemer's body—whether it was all, or but a part of it shed—whether what was shed sank into the ground inoperative, or with expiatory power, or was gathered up again: and, in short, what was the relation of his precious earthly blood to his present glorified body,—are questions about which I do not believe that we can profitably speculate, and which certainly I would touch with the utmost reverence; but they surely stand in no proper relation to his high priestly function. He died to atone for our sins, and lives with God to carry forward our salvation to its completion.[1]

Entered in, etc., entered *once for all into the sanctuary.* **Having obtained,** etc., *obtaining* (εὑράμενος), finding, *procuring* an eternal redemption—that is, by his entrance; not '*having* obtained[2] previously to his entrance; the clause may be resolved by, 'entered and procured.' There lies, I think, in the middle voice no such emphasis as Alford supposes. The symbolical atonement of the Levitical service was not complete until the blood of the victim was carried into the sanctuary. The expiatory work of Christ was not complete until he himself had risen from the tomb and entered in glory the heavens, *as it were*, carrying the blood of *his* sacrifice into the heavenly presence. As before said, I do not believe that Christ's carrying actual blood into his heavenly abode, whether in or out of his spiritual body, is in any way in question (except as far as it may be a speculative question whether blood is essential to a spiritual body). (1 Cor. 15:50.) He bore the fruit, the efficacy of his atoning death, into the holy presence. He appeared there as a Lamb that had been sacrificed, and taken away the sins of the world. The *eternal* redemption or ransom corresponds to the single entrance, *once for all.* The high

[1] It seems scarcely possible to avoid the conviction that the 'greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands—that is, not of this creation,' and 'his own blood,' are intended to express the two points of superiority of Christ's priestly service over that of the Levitical priesthood. A better, to wit, *spiritual*, tabernacle as against the material earthly one, and 'his own blood' as against that of irrational animals, give to his priestly ministry an incomparable prerogative. If so, then it seems equally certain that the tabernacle thus emphatically and nobly designated, is not the 'outer tabernacle,' whether the 'lower heavens' or whatever else the ingenuity of interpreters has devised, but the true upper tabernacle, in which our Lord performs his priestly service, that which the Lord pitched, and not man.

[2] So here as in many other cases the aorist participle should be rendered, not as perfect, to which it is often (virtually) equivalent, but as our present, which is very often equal to the Greek aorist (oftener, perhaps, than to the Greek present). Thus in our Epistle 1:4, κρείττων γενόμενος, not "having become," but "becoming," in the act of taking his seat; so here not "having procured," but in the very act of entering, "procuring." Examples of both usages are abundant; take as a single case of the aorist usage, Luke 23:46, φωνήσας, where even the Revised Version has, I think, very unfortunately "when he had cried," etc., instead of "crying," etc.

13 For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh;
14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

13 eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the
14 flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through [1] the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse [2] your conscience from

1 Or, *his eternal spirit*.....2 Or, Many ancient authorities read *our*.

priest entered repeatedly—that is, in connection with repeated sacrifices and repeated presentation of blood, because the redemption which he procured was but partial and temporary. Christ needs enter but once, because it is in connection with a sacrifice which is completely and finally efficacious. The price (λύτρον) of the ransom of his people—for such is the aspect under which their salvation is here presented—is paid not, as held by some Greek commentators, to Satan, but to God.

13. Confirmation of this latter statement, that his entrance procures an *eternal* redemption, by an argument from the less to the greater. This indeed may be regarded as the transition to the remaining part of the discussion of Christ's high priesthood, that; namely, which deals with the *necessity* and the *efficacy* of his offering. From the typical arrangements of the law the author inferred what must be the offering which Christ as High Priest in the true tabernacle must bring to God: He now shows that this necessity lay in the nature of the case; was foreshadowed in all the purifications of the law (15-23), and was efficacious and final. (9:23; 10:18.) He begins by setting the spiritual nature of Christ's sacrifice over against the outward and ritualistic nature of the Levitical sacrifices. **For if the blood of bulls and of goats** (Homer, "Iliad," Lib. 1, the priest of Apollo designates as his customary offerings to the God) **and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean**, *them who have been defiled.* See Num. ch. 19 for a description of the rites by which the ashes of a spotted heifer that had not borne the yoke, mingled with running water, are sprinkled upon those who were defiled by contact with a dead body, and cleanses them. 'Sprinkling them that have been defiled' is an abrupt and elliptical expression (both in Greek and English), for 'sprinkled upon them,' etc. **Sanctifieth to the purifying** (*cleanness*) **of the flesh**—that is, sanctifieth *with reference to* the cleanness of the flesh, or sanctifieth *unto*, marking the *end*, that to which the sanctification reaches. The conditional, 'If the blood sanctifieth,' implies, of course, that it does. The Levitical rites *could* go to that extent: they could cleanse the flesh really; the spirit, symbolically.

14. How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the (*an*) **eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God.** The argument is from the less to the greater, both quantitatively and qualitatively. The power of the blood of bulls and goats to do a certain work is conceded; but much more is the blood of Christ able to do a thing much greater. Such is the value attached to the blood of Christ, in comparison with that of bulls and goats, that it is far more capable of performing this incomparably higher cleansing which it undertakes, than that of these to perform their vastly inferior office. The blood of goats and heifers naturally cleanses outwardly and ceremonially; the blood of Christ naturally cleanses inwardly and spiritually. But the blood of Christ is as much more efficacious within its higher sphere of working, as that sphere itself is higher than the other.

In the difficult phrase, 'who through an eternal Spirit offered himself to God,' we may remark, first, that 'himself' is, in a degree, emphatic, and is evidently intended to contrast the conscious, voluntary, self-determining nature of the sacrifice of Christ with the unconscious, involuntary, compulsory character of animal sacrifices. The animal goes blindly, unwittingly to the slaughter, at the mere will of another; Christ, in the depths of his intelligent spiritual nature, made *himself* an offering to God. The former, then, is a merely animal act, and as such, has but a merely animal virtue; the latter is a moral, a spiritual act, and as such has a moral and spiritual efficacy. And as the one victim is offered by virtue of its perishing animal life, so the other offers himself by virtue of an eternal spirit which dwells within him; and imparts to his sacrifice a spiritual and an eternal efficacy. The 'Spirit'

here spoken of was not, then, the '*Holy Spirit*' which was abundantly shed forth upon our Lord. The term clearly points to a power and impulse acting more strictly from within, and proceeding properly from himself. It was not his purely *human spirit*, which he shared in common with other men; it was not, I think, his purely *divine nature*, which, before his incarnation, had consented to his sacrifice, and whose presence was certainly necessary to the efficacy of his offering. It involves, I conceive, that blending of his divine nature with his human personality, which forms the mystery of his being, and which gives, even to his divine acts, a certain element of humanity, and to his human acts a certain element of the divine. It is, I think, this mysterious union in which consists that "spirit of holiness," by virtue of which he was declared "the Son of God with power," on account of his resurrection from the dead. It is by virtue of this that, in contrast with the first Adam, who became a "living soul," he, the second Adam, became a "life-giving Spirit." It was thus that, though "put to death in the flesh, he was made alive in the spirit." In all these cases he is spoken of not as purely God, not as purely man. In his human spirit, as the seat of his divine nature and sharing its eternity: or in his divine nature, as having linked itself with, and drawn up into its fellowship, his human spirit, —by virtue, thus, of that spiritual nature which partook, at once, of divinity and humanity,—he offered himself to God, the sacrifice having all the efficacy which this union alone could give it. The language is strongly antithetical. The animal sacrifice, in its animal and perishable nature, can secure but a fleshly and a transient cleansing; Christ's sacrifice, through an eternal[1] spirit, can secure a spiritual and permanent purification.

I may add that here the 'offering up' is not Christ's priestly offering in the sanctuary, but his sacrificial offering on the cross. The latter is, in fact, in both the typical and the antitypical offering, the grand and essential thing. In the Levitical rite, it is true, the blood was brought into the sanctuary, and sprinkled there, but simply as *indicative* that blood—that is, death (for in the blood is the life) was demanded as an expiation for sin; and in regard to the great High Priest, we may well suppose that all, except the fact of his dying for sin, and then passing into the immediate presence of God, is a figurative accommodation to the forms of the earthly rite. In this, as in all else, the visible becomes the imperfect, but necessary, exponent of the spiritual. **Purge** (*cleanse*) **your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.** 'Your conscience'—more exactly, 'Your consciousness' (συνείδησις). The term is less abstract —it denotes more activity, a more direct and palpable relation to God than is expressed by 'conscience.' The philosophical use of the term 'conscience' as a faculty which takes cognizance of right and wrong has somewhat deadened its meaning as expressing an operative, conscious relation to God. As to '*dead* works,' all the works of unregenerate man are sinful, and as such, may be called 'dead,' springing from a nature which possesses in it no true spiritual life. Such, however, is not precisely the import of the term 'dead' here. They are probably the dead works of the law, those endeavors to fulfill both the moral and the ceremonial law, and thus work out a legal righteousness, which unrenovated humanity is ever making, but which, springing from no living principle, are devoid of life and power, and can prove no acceptable service to the *living* God. Dead works may answer for dead deities. Outward and hollow forms may satisfy the demands of idol worship. But the God who lives himself demands living worshipers and living worship; he who is spiritual, demands a spiritual, not a carnal service, and a carnal service was all that the Levitical rites proffered, and that the Old Covenant could insure.

(*i*) This spiritual efficacy of the blood of Christ warrants and demands a New Covenant, inaugurated, like the First, with blood, but the blood of a nobler victim than that of the Old; for Christ has entered into the true antitypical sanctuary, not, like the earthly high priests, for repeated entrances, but once

[1] This adjective naturally suggests that the word 'Spirit' refers to the higher and divine nature of Christ. His truly human nature, on its spiritual side, was indeed eternal as to the future, but so also is the spirit of every man. The unique and superlative value of Christ's self-sacrifice seems to have been due to the impulse of the divine side of his nature.—A. H.

15 And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions *that were* under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

15 dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of a new [1] covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the trangressions that were under the first [1] covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise

1 The Greek word here used signifies both *covenant* and *testament*.

for all, never to leave it until he comes without sin unto salvation. (15–28.)

15. And for this cause; namely, because he is able to perform such a spiritual, not merely ceremonial purification,—the clause looks backward, not forward,—**he is the mediator of the** (*a*) **new testament** (*covenant*). Emphasis (with Alford) not merely on *New*, but also partly on *Covenant;* Mediator of a Covenant; namely, a New One. A covenant, or testament, requires to be sealed with blood, and, in that respect, his death fits him for the purpose; and, as the Old Covenant had but a carnal ritual and carnal promises, had but the blood of bulls and goats, and was *adapted* to such a merely outward ritual, his blood, having such spiritual efficacy, may well connect itself with a New Covenant, or testament, whose demands and promises shall be proportionate to the preciousness and power of the blood which mediates it—in other words, the new and better sacrifice demands a New and better Covenant. The new wine cannot be put into old bottles; this cleansing blood cannot ally itself with the animal sacrifices of the Old Covenant, and advantage must be taken of it to secure to the heirs of promise blessings such as the Old Covenant was unable to furnish; namely, **that by means,** etc.—literally, *that a death taking place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the First Covenant.*

The Old Covenant had had plenty of deaths, but they had all been of those irrational victims that could sanctify only to the cleanness of the flesh. The transgressions of the worshipers they had no power to remove. But here is a victim of a different order—a Being who, through an eternal Spirit, has made of himself a voluntary and spiritual offering to God. It is meet that, with the seal and sanction of such cleansing blood, a New Covenant should be formed; that, the victim dying, his blood may be efficacious for the redemption and cleansing away of those sins under the First Covenant which that had only symbolically, never really, expiated; which had been passed over and winked at rather than really removed. ('Death,' although referring specifically to the death of Christ, is spoken of indefinitely as 'a death,' in order to fix attention on the abstract principle, rather than the particular application of it. 'The redemption of the transgressions' is redemption of men from their transgressions, although Hofmann explains it of the redeeming, buying off, as it were, of the transgressions themselves which, having become obnoxious to the judgments of God, involve those who commit them.) **They which are** (*that have been*) **called**—not merely the called of the New Testament, but of the Old—**might** (*may*) **receive the promise**—that is, the fulfillment, the realization of the promise—**of the eternal inheritance.**

The author has his eye, of course, on the ancient people of God, and, as in chapter 3, looks on the history of the Old and New Covenants as constituting one continuous chain. The New Covenant replaces the Old; the expiation of the New Covenant removes the sins which could not be removed by the Old. The 'eternal inheritance' of the one succeeds to the temporal inheritance of the other. The land of Canaan, the inheritance and rest of ancient Israel, as it was not the true and Sabbath rest of the people of God, so was not the true and eternal inheritance. This it was left for the New Covenant under Christ to give.

But here, briefly, two questions: First, why is the redeeming effect of the blood of Christ restricted by the author to the sins committed under the Old Covenant, and thus seemingly confined to the Jewish people? Did not all sins in all nations, from Adam down, need to be forgiven by the blood of Christ? And was there any where remission, except through his blood? Certainly not. But, to the mind of the author, the Jewish people here (as 2 : 16) represent universal humanity. It was to them immediately, on behalf of the race, that God had revealed himself; to them the promises had come; with them alone God had directly dealt. The rest of the world *seemed*, for the time being, to be without his jurisdiction; its

ignorance and its wickedness had, in a manner, been overlooked and passed by; and, as the Jewish people had been exclusively the recipients of his law, his promises, his covenant, so they would appear as primarily interested in the New Covenant, which replaces the Old. As mankind at large had no direct concern in the Sinaitic Covenant, so, apparently, not in the one which supersedes it. In fact, however, the death of Christ is equally necessary for the remission of all transgressions among all nations.

But, secondly, was there no real forgiveness of sins under the Old Covenant? Was there only that *passing by* (πάρεσις, instead of ἄφεσις, *remission*), which is spoken of in Rom. 3 : 25, so that, in reality, all sins remained unforgiven until the coming of Christ? Again, I suppose not. In the case of all the pious of the Old Testament, there was a real forgiveness of sins, but one based not, in the slightest degree, on the efficacy of the Old Testament offerings. God, in view of the atonement, always could, and always did, forgive sins, in the case of the exercise of faith, although, so far as concerned the Old Testament ritual and any power which lay in its symbols, the pardon could be only provisional, and was rather a passing over than a remission. The repetition of the sacrifices of the Old Testament was not because the sins of the really pious had not, once for all, been remitted, nor because, on the other hand, these sacrifices had the slightest power, really, to cleanse away any sins. But as they were purely typical, it was necessary, by means of them, to keep constantly before the worshiper the need of an expiation, and show at once the significance and the impotence of the rites which he was performing. The reason why the rites were so constantly repeated was not because there was any efficacy in them, but *because there was not*—because they were strictly and absolutely symbolical. They did not procure a partial pardon, or a temporary pardon, or any pardon whatever; they only pointed forward to him whose cleansing blood could take away *all* sin just because it could take away *any*. But while holding that the pious of the Old Testament were already actually forgiven, I by no means believe that they had that full *sense* of forgiveness, and with this those richer joys and hopes, which belong to the clearer light and fuller spiritual influences of the gospel. Their perceptions were dimmer and their aspirations unsatisfied. They saw through a vail, instead of a glass, and thus doubly darkly. God did not intend to make them perfect in advance of the believers of the New Testament; and thus, probably, their condition, both this side of and beyond the grave, was one of less privilege than has been allotted to believers since the coming of Christ. Finally, however, it is proper to speak of Christ's death as being for the redemption of transgressions committed under the First Covenant, as if they were not already forgiven, because their forgiveness has been conditioned entirely upon his death.

16. The idea of an 'inheritance,' so prominent in the Old Testament, and just mentioned, suggests a transition from a 'covenant' to a 'testament.' This transition is made all the more easily, and, indeed, almost imperceptibly, as it is but a gliding over to the more common meaning of the word before rendered 'covenant.' This word (διαθήκη) means, primarily, '*disposition, arrangement*,' and then a testamentary disposition, a *testament*, and, secondarily, though rarely in the classics, an arrangement with a second party (διά in composition often having this force, as διαλέγομαι, *discourse continuously* and *discourse with*; διάλογος, *dialogue*), an 'agreement,' or '*covenant*.' As then the blessings bestowed by God upon his people are spoken of both as matters of agreement and of inheritance; and, as in both cases, a *death* was equally essential to the validity of the arrangement, it is not strange that the author should slide in his usage from one to the other. In the one case, it is true, the arrangement was sealed by the death of a victim; in the other, by that of the testator. But Christ being, in the uniqueness of his character, both, and alike dying as the ratifying victim of a covenant and living as its Mediator, and also dying as the condition of his bestowing the gift of the eternal inheritance on his people, he could with equal propriety be represented under either character. Here the mention of 'inheritance' suggests his death—not as the seal of a covenant, but as the condition of the validity of a testament. The gifts, indeed, were of God; but he placed them in the hands of Christ, whose death is essential to their being made available to his people. I may add that the transition, which

16 For where a testament *is*, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.
17 For a testament *is* of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.
18 Whereupon neither the first *testament* was dedicated without blood.
19 For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people,

16 of the eternal inheritance. For where a [1] testament is, there must of necessity [2] be the death of him who
17 made it. For a [1] testament is of force [3] where there hath been death: [4] for it doth never avail while he
18 who made it liveth. Wherefore even the first *cove-*
19 *nant* hath not been dedicated without blood. For when every commandment had been spoken by Moses unto all the people according to the law, he took the blood of the calves and the goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both

1 The Greek word here used signifies both *covenant* and *testament*....2 Gr. *be brought*.....3 Gr. *over the dead*....4 Or, *for doth it ever . . . liveth?*

seems harsh in our language, which has not a common word, attracts no special notice from the Greek interpreters, who take it as a matter of course. That the transition is actually made I see no sufficient grounds to deny. Without it, verses 16 and 17 are extremely harsh, and almost unmeaning.

For where a testament is—referring to the previous statement that Christ is the Mediator of a New Covenant (διαθήκη), in order that, a *death* occurring, he might, by the spiritual efficacy of his death, bestow on the heirs of promise the blessings which the ritual sacrifices of the Old Covenant never could bestow. When he spoke of 'death' in the preceding verse, he probably thought of it in the light of a seal of a covenant; he now almost insensibly changes the point of view to that of the condition of a testament. **There must of necessity be the death of the testator.** 'Also,' of the Common Version, is to be omitted. Ebrard, denying a change from the previous meaning of 'covenant,' refers 'the testator' (διαθέμενος) to the man who, as one of the parties to the covenant, must die, either in his own person, or that of a substitute; for on no other condition can man enter into covenant with God. But it seems nearly certain that the author has here no exclusive reference to a covenant between man and God, but is rather making a general, and, as it were, axiomatic statement. **Must be** (φέρεσθαι, *be borne abroad, alleged, declared*) has here no emphasis.

17. For a testament is of force (*valid*) **after** (*when*) **men are dead**—literally, *over* (on condition of) *the dead*, of persons as dead (νεκροῖς), dead men, not dead animals. A testament never goes into force until the testator has died. It is essential to the very *idea* of a bequest. A will or testament is that which disposes of property *after death*. Property actually alienated by a person while living, no matter what the form, cannot be by testament.

Otherwise, etc.—*inasmuch as it scarcely is in force while the testator liveth.*[1]

18. Wherefore, etc.—*Whence neither has the first covenant been inaugurated without blood.* ' The author relapses here to the former idea of 'covenant,' turning easily on the pivot of a word common to both significations. 'Inaugurated,' introduced in a formal and valid manner.

19. For when Moses, etc.—*For after every command had been spoken by Moses to all the people according to the law.* 'According to the law'—that is, which he had received on Sinai. **He took the blood of** (*the*) **calves** (*heifers*) **and of** (*the*) **goats.** The account is taken from Exod. 24: 3–8, with, however, some marked deviations. There is in Exodus no mention of 'goats,' but only of heifers, the sacrifice of goats as a sin offering being not yet established. The author, however, citing from memory, and aiming at no minute exactness, unites the two classes of heifers and goats by which he was accustomed to designate the collective sacrifices of the law. **With water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop.** These are

[1] 'Scarcely is in force,' μήποτε ἰσχύει, not the same, I think, as οὔποτε ἰσχύει, *never is in force;* but having the doubting, delicately *suggestive* import so common to the μή and μήποτε, *lest, whether, perchance.* The author thus elegantly puts the case, *ex gratiâ modestiæ*, not as admitting that the doctrine is really questionable, but preferring to hold back his own affirmation, and leave it to be supplied by his hearers. So in Longinus "De Sublimitate," ὄγκοι * * * μήποτε περιίσταντες ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὐναντίον, "*the false sublime—perchance* (look whether not) *producing in us the opposite effect.*" Probably an elliptical construction, equivalent to ὅρα μήποτε ἰσχύει, *look whether it be in force.*

20 Saying, This *is* the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you.
21 Moreover he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry.

20 the book itself, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the [1]covenant which God commanded to
21 you-ward. Moreover the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry he sprinkled in like manner

1 The Greek word here used signifies both *covenant* and *testament.*

not mentioned in the above passage, but are found elsewhere in the Mosaic purifying lustrations, as Num. 19 : 6, 7; Lev. 14 : 2, seq., 49 seq., where they appear as employed in connection with purification from contact with a dead body, or from the leprosy. A mixture of living spring water, partly with the ashes of a red cow, partly with the blood of a slain bird, was in these cases prescribed. For this purpose hyssop was employed, wound with purple wool. The use of the water, and of the scarlet wool and hyssop as an instrument for sprinkling, needed perhaps no special voucher in the text; it was understood of itself. **And sprinkled both the book and all the people.** Exodus simply informs us that he sprinkled the people—substantially identical with 'all the people.' Nothing is said of the sprinkling of the book or scroll, which is of course the "book of the covenant," the scroll of papyrus or skin containing the record of the covenant. In introducing this, as also in the sprinkling of "the tabernacle and the vessels of the service," the author probably follows Jewish tradition.

20. Saying, This is the blood of the testament (*covenant*), **which God hath enjoined unto you.** The exact language of Exod. 24 : 8 is: "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." The slight changes are occasioned, partly perhaps by citing from memory, partly in half unconscious allusion to the corresponding language of the Saviour at the institution of the Sacred Supper: "This is my blood in the New Covenant," etc., which would seem to have an unquestionable reference to these words of Moses. The expression 'enjoined,' 'commanded' (ἐνετείλατο) is also substituted for 'made,' 'instituted' (διέθετο), in accordance with the frequent usage of the Septuagint.

21. Moreover he sprinkled, etc.—*And the tabernacle too and all the vessels of the service he sprinkled in like manner with the blood.* This refers to another and later occasion, as the tabernacle was not in existence when Moses thus solemnly inaugurated the covenant. It is brought into this connection for the sake of completeness, and of showing how extensively the use of blood marked the inauguration of the several parts of the Levitical worship. Of such a sprinkling, however, of the tabernacle when completed (see Exod. 40), the Mosaic account is silent. It informs us that the tabernacle was anointed with *oil*, and thus consecrated to the Lord, while Lev. 8 : 15, 19, 24, informs us of the sprinkling of the altar with blood, and Josephus ("Antiquities," 3 : 8, 6) informs us expressly that the garments of Aaron, the tabernacle, and its vessels, were all sprinkled with the blood of slaughtered victims. Such, therefore, was probably the Jewish tradition, in accordance with which is the language of our passage. On the literal exactness of every statement nothing specially depends. It would be enough that the author follows in the several particulars either the Mosaic narrative or accredited Jewish traditions. His language immediately following shows that the use of blood as an expiatory rite through almost all departments of the service was the point specially in his mind. This extensive use of blood in the Mosaic ritual had a deep significance. It marked not merely cleansing, purification; for that, *water* would have been the more natural symbol. It marked *expiation, atonement.* Before Jehovah could enter into covenant with his people, his displeasure must be either really or symbolically appeased. He could not allow them to come into relation with him as on terms of moral equality. He could not allow them to forget the interval between his holiness and their sinfulness; and thus blood must be shed, the life of the animal taken (for the life was in the blood), that by the life of the victim that of the people might be spared. (Kurtz, "History of the Old Covenant," V. 3, p. 143.) The connection, then, was direct and close between the blood shed in inaugurating the Old, and that shed in inaugurating the New Covenant. The one *reminded* the

22 And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.

22 with the blood. And according to the law, I may almost say, all things are cleansed with blood, and apart from shedding of blood there is no remission.

people of what was needed that God might be reconciled and enter into covenant relation with his people; the other *furnished* it. And for a similar reason the sanctuary and its utensils—nay, even the book of the covenant—must undergo a like sprinkling. Though consecrated to Jehovah, they had been wrought in their material parts by human hands; they had on them the contamination of sin. The very Holy of Holies, before God could dwell in it, must be cleansed from that stain of impurity and guilt which human hands had left upon it. It needed not only consecrating oil, but expiatory blood.

22. And almost all things, etc.—*And one might say, in blood are all things cleansed.* The original word, rendered 'almost' in the Common Version (σχεδόν, *one might say, about, pretty nearly*), is employed not like our *almost* (ὀλίγου δεῖν) to intimate that the statement is positively liable to some exception or abatement, but simply to qualify its absolute positiveness. It does not (like ὀλίγου δεῖν) commit the author to the fact that his statement is *not* unqualified, but simply refuses to commit him to the statement that it *is*. It is added regarding an assertion that may or *may not* be precisely accurate. It differs from "so to say" (ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, with which it in certain cases might be interchanged), in that the latter softens a statement in itself harsh or exaggerated; the other simply throws over the expression (in itself not necessarily in any way improbable) a slight shade of uncertainty.[1]

And without shedding of blood there is no remission. The name (αἱματεκχυσία) may denote either the *shedding* of the blood of the victim in sacrifice (so Bleek, Lünemann, Delitzsch), or the *pouring out* of the blood of the victim on the altar, and the sprinkling of it (so De Wette, Tholuck, Hofmann). The latter seems more in harmony with the immediate context, in which, not the shedding of the victim's blood, but its subsequent pouring forth, is spoken of, while the analogy of the language of Christ, who says at the Sacred Supper, "My blood, which is shed for you" (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον), as well as the general analogy of Christ's death, in that his blood was shed, but not afterward poured out, is urged by Delitzsch, on the other side. To this, however, it might be replied that our author himself speaks of the 'blood of sprinkling' (12:24), evidently referring to the blood of Christ under the Old Testament figure, and it may still, therefore, remain questionable which precise idea is intended. The essential meaning is, of course, the same in either. For the pouring out or sprinkling of the blood implies the previous shedding of it in the death of the victim as its necessary condition, while conversely under the Old Covenant the symbolical expiation was not completed until the subsequent sprinkling. Still the *death*, the taking the life, is in both cases the essential matter. What was symbolized, was that sin could not be expiated without death. Under the Old Testament formula, a legal remission stood connected with the ritual shedding of blood. *Real* remission was then, as always, through the atonement of Christ, which was thus symbolized.

23-28. Inference, now, from the earthly to the heavenly sanctuary; in other words, from the ceremonial and carnal to the purely spiritual Dispensation. As the former demanded the symbol, this demands the reality; as that the blood of animal sacrifices, this the blood of Christ; and his entrance *once for all* with a complete and final expiation, as High Priest, into the heavenly sanctuary.

[1] Thus Plato, "Phaedo," 2. Σχεδόν οὗτοι παρεγένοντο. "I should think that about these were present"—there may have been one or two others, and may not. It seems singular that Chrysostom, whom we must admit to have known his own language, refers σχεδόν to the verb, καθαρίζεται. It is less singular, though not less erroneous, that Bengel and Böhme refer it to ἐν αἵματι. Its proper and unquestionable reference is to 'all,' πάντα. The modifying shade of σχεδόν is not thrown on the verb, as if there were any doubt about the *cleansing;* not on 'in blood,' ἐν αἵματι, as if there were any doubt about its being in blood; but simply upon 'all,' πάντα, implying that the writer will not quite commit himself to the unqualified assertion that *everything* was cleansed with blood. '*In blood*'—that is, in the sphere of blood, equivalent to by or with blood.

23 *It was* therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.
24 For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, *which are* the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us:

23 It was necessary therefore that the copies of the things in the heavens should be cleansed with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sac-
24 rifices than these. For Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before

23. It was (*is*)[1] therefore necessary that the patterns (*copies*) of (*the*) things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves [*be cleansed*] with better sacrifices than these. Resumption of the imagery drawn from the language: "See thou make all things after the pattern shown to thee in the mount." The earthly tabernacle is represented as a sort of shadowy representation of the greater and more perfect tabernacle, in which Christ, the great High Priest, ministers, and the objects grouped around it as having their archetypes in heaven. Thus, therefore, he continues in figurative language, as the earthly copies are cleansed with rites like these, their heavenly archetypes demand a nobler element of cleansing. But we need not be led astray by a figure, nor suppose for a moment that anything actually in heaven demands the cleansing of Christ's blood. The old tabernacle expressed relations: the old ritual was symbolical. Unable to accomplish any purification itself, it pointed forward to a purification to be accomplished by a Victim of infinite preciousness. While thus the symbolical purifications of the law are accomplished with sacrifices like these, the cleansings which they prefigure demand sacrifices far more costly and efficacious. A typical expiation may be made with the blood of bulls and goats; but a *real* expiation must be made with more precious blood; namely, that of Christ. The 'heavenly things' is especially the 'sanctuary,' and this perhaps would be better supplied. 'Sacrifices' in the plural, simply in analogy with the many Levitical sacrifices; not that here more than one is demanded.

24. For Christ is not entered, etc., *for not into a sanctuary made with hands*—and therefore not into one which could admit the carnal and outward purifications of that old material sanctuary, the earthly Holy of Holies—*did Christ enter.* The 'for' (γάρ), not (with Bleek, Lünemann) indicating the proof that Christ has really gone into the heavenly sanctuary; nor exactly (with Delitzsch) establishing the position that better sacrifices were demanded for the heavenly world from the fact of that one which has been actually offered, and then gone to God; but rather reasserting the reason why better sacrifices are demanded; namely, from the transcendent and spiritual character of the sanctuary into which Christ is gone, and the real, not the symbolical, presence of God into which he has entered.

Which are the figure, etc.—*the counterpart of the genuine one.* 'Counterpart' (ἀντίτυπος) is here clearly equivalent to *copy, shadowy representation* (ὑπόδειγμα, 8:5). Bleek, supposing the model (τύπος, 8:5) shown to Moses in the Mount to be itself a copy of the real, heavenly tabernacle, regards the 'counterpart' (ἀντίτυπος) here as a *copy of a copy.* Yet nothing could be more alien from the conception of the author. He does *not* regard that model shown to Moses as a copy, but it is expressly pointed to by him as the original of that constructed by Moses. Only we must rightly understand, and avoid unduly pressing, the figurative language of the author. Of course, he is merely using the model shown to Moses, issuing from the divine hand, as *standing for* the great moral and spiritual truths which the earthly tabernacle shadowed forth. That earthly tabernacle indicated *relations, facts, spiritual truths;* and these facts and truths it is exceedingly natural should, in figurative language, be gathered up and expressed in the pattern which came directly from the divine hand. If we take the material structure reared by Moses as symbolizing

[1] Delitzsch, Moll, etc., supply ἦν, there *was* necessity, making a temporal reference. With Lünemann and De Wette, I decidedly prefer ἐστίν, *is*, making the statement general and absolute. Had the author *intended* a past tense, he would have been much more likely to have expressed it. The *present* is easily understood of itself. Nor is the past required by the past (εἰσῆλθεν) of the following verse, for there the past tense is purely subordinate, the resolution of the clause being: "For it is into no sanctuary made with hands that Christ entered," etc.

25 Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others;

25 the face of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often; as the high priest entereth into the holy place year by year with blood not his own;

great truths, it is natural to put the model which God showed to him as answering to the truths themselves. It seems extraordinary that language so manifestly figurative, and really so obvious in its import, should have so puzzled and misled intelligent and acute minds. **But into heaven itself.** In the use of the word 'heaven,' the conception would naturally and easily vary. Sometimes Christ has passed *through* the heavens, and become higher than the heavens; at other times he is in the lofty heavens (so probably we are to supply 1 : 4), here 'in heaven itself.' In regard to a term so vague as that of 'heaven,' of course the language is not to be pressed. In reference to the lower, visible heavens, or even heaven as representing the highest part of the created universe, Christ has passed beyond and above the heavens. In another relation the heavens are themselves beyond the created universe, are the immediate dwelling place of God, conceived apart from conditions of space and time, and in such a sense the phrase is employed here. 'Heaven itself' is the heaven of heavens, the highest heaven, the seat of God's presence and glory, whether regarded locally or otherwise.

Now to appear, etc.—*be manifested before the face of God in behalf of us.* 'Now,' not as equivalent to continually, now and forevermore; but 'now,' *at last*, after so long a reign of shadow and copy and symbol, *Now* he is manifested before the face of God. He *now* accomplishes that actual drawing near, coming into the real presence of God, which the earthly high priest could do only in the most partial and imperfect manner. The earthly high priest entered the sanctuary amid a cloud of incense which half enveloped him and the mercy seat itself. He was half hidden from even the symbol of God. God appeared to him but in symbol, and even that symbol was but dimly visible. The awe-struck priest must have felt, under this near contact with Jehovah, as the collective Israelites felt at Sinai, and rejoiced perhaps that his entrance into that awful presence was at so wide intervals, and then so nearly vailed. But Christ has gone not into the symbolical, but the real and absolute presence of God. He is fully manifested before the fully manifested Deity. Father and Son, the Propitiated and the Propitiator, come into full communion, confronting, as it were, each other with open face. "Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

25. Nor yet, etc.—*And not that he may frequently offer himself, as the high priest entereth into the holy place year by year with the blood of others.* Our author's use of offer (προσφέρειν) might allow its reference either to Christ's sacrificial offering of himself on earth (9 : 14, 28; 10 : 1, 2. etc.), or to his high priestly offering in heaven (8 : 3). Many interpreters (as Tholuck, De Wette, Ebrard, Lünemann) understand it of the former; others (as Hofmann, Delitzsch, Moll, Alford) of the latter. In favor of the latter is the immediately following comparison with the Jewish high priest, not as repeating his sacrifices, but as repeating his entrances into the sanctuary. The more exact verbal analogy, therefore, would refer the language to Christ's priestly offering on high. But this argument is by no means decisive, for in the author's mind (as in the actual fact) the two stand in inseparable connection. An entrance into the sanctuary supposes a preceding sacrifice; a sacrificial offering supposes the subsequent entrance. The spirit of the comparison, therefore (if not precisely its letter), is equally preserved by referring this "offering of himself" to Christ's previous sacrifice on earth. And as the added 'himself' seems to suggest rather the earthly than the heavenly offering, we may easily conceive that the author has, in this case, chosen the former as the representative act, and set over against the Levitical high priest's repeated entrances into the sanctuary (which involved repeated deaths), the hypothesis of Christ's repeated deaths (which involved repeated entrances into the heavenly sanctuary). And this idea of offering himself in death the language favors. It is natural to speak of 'offering himself' in death on the cross (as at ver. 14), and 'being offered,' which is close akin (ver. 28), but less so to speak of his 'offering himself' (whatever the precise import of the expression) in heaven. As we have thus warrant for the one and not for the other—for

26 For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

26 else must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once at the [1] end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin [2] by

1 Or, *consummation*.... 2 Or, *by his sacrifice.*

what Christ is to offer as Heavenly Priest (8:3) is not 'himself,' but (9:3) 'his own blood'—I prefer, with most interpreters, this signification here. The ellipsis is easily supplied: "And [he has entered] not that he may frequently offer himself [in sacrifice, and thus frequently leave it and return to it], just as the high priest," etc. And in this interpretation we do not, I think, lay the author liable to De Wette's taunt of not being quite sure of his own meaning. We add that there is an implied argument in the contrast of Christ's offering *himself*, and the Levitical priests entering the sanctuary with *alien blood.*

26. For then, etc.—*since* [*then*] *he must have frequently suffered since the foundation of the world; but, as it is, once for all, at the end of the world, he has been manifested.*

The clause 'since the foundation of the world,' has by many former editors been enclosed in parentheses; but this is now generally, and rightly, expunged, and the clause taken in connection with the following. They thus present the two opposites of an alternative. In case that Christ had entered heaven, to offer himself repeatedly he must have frequently suffered since the foundation of the world; but in fact, as the case stands, he has *not* done so—he has manifested himself once for all in the consummation of the ages.

The passage is thus an *argument* against the supposition of this entrance for repeated offerings. But what kind of an argument? Is it from the intrinsic proprieties of the case, from the unnaturalness of Christ's having thus, many times in former ages, descended from heaven to suffer, and re-ascended for priestly mediation? If so, then why does the author dwell upon what must have been done in the past, rather than what this hypothesis would require in the future? Why not rather say that it would not be necessary that he should repeat his suffering many times in the ages to come? The only reply that can be made to this is that the world is conceived as having nearly run its appointed cycle, and there would be, in the future, no space left for such offerings.

The view above given is the ordinary one; but I cannot conceive it to be the just one, which seems to me much more simple and obvious. This is to take "*it was necessary*" (ἔδει), simply, of *logical necessity* (equivalent to "it could not but have been the case that") not of that which would have been required by the *fitness* of the case, but of that which would have actually happened, but which, as it is, *has not* happened. Had the priestly intercession of Christ, says the author, been like the services of the Levitical priests, requiring perpetual repetition, it would have involved, like theirs, repeated descents and sufferings on earth, and repeated re-ascensions and entrances into the heavenly sanctuary. No such thing has occurred; no such repetition of the victim's sufferings has been made—all has been deferred for one single, final, all-sufficient offering, both on earth and in heaven. This explanation, I think, is all sufficient. It accounts for the placing of this supposed repetition in the past and not in the future. Had Christ's priestly ministry, is the thought, been like the Levitical ministry, it would, like theirs, have demanded constant repetitions, and we should have witnessed the spectacle of a recurrence of his sufferings during the past ages. It relieves us, too, from another inquiry; namely, from answering the question, Why this repetition of the sufferings of Christ should not have actually occurred? Christ has actually descended from heaven and died once. Who is competent to assert that, granting the necessity, he should not have descended and died again? How can we be sure that the same exigency would not have led anew and repeatedly to the same sacrifice? Upon this and other like questions, we are not required to turn our minds. The author simply reminds us, as incontrovertible proof of the finality of this sacrifice, that the hypothesis of its non-efficiency and finality would have involved in the past ages its frequent repetition. *No such repetition has occurred.* As matter of fact, the whole mighty display of love and power has been reserved for and precipitated, as it

were, upon one decisive moment in the interlocking of the ages.

There is, indeed, another view, proposed by Hofmann (and followed by Delitzsch, Moll, and Alford), which may require a brief notice. It assumes that Christ's offering himself (ver. 25) refers to the priestly offering in heaven, not to his sacrificial offering on earth, and that the repetition of those heavenly self-presentations is denied on the ground that it would involve the necessity of his repeatedly suffering death on earth. But the peculiarity of the view lies in its denying that the author contemplates, along with these repeated heavenly oblations, correspondingly repeated descents and sufferings on earth. The author plants himself, this view maintains, on the heavenly entrance and priesthood of Christ as a finality. He does not once contemplate the withdrawal of Christ from the heavenly Holy of Holies, into which he has once entered, that he may re-descend and suffer, but only declares that, being there, he has not to make repeated offerings of himself, because this would involve the necessity that before he ascended there he should have gone through a series of sufferings corresponding to the number of his entrances into the heavenly sanctuary. This, they say, explains the reason of the limitation of his sufferings to past times. If he had now entered heaven to make *repeated* priestly oblations, then (as in the Levitical service there must be for every entrance into the sanctuary a separate sacrifice) he must, on earth in previous times, have undergone a corresponding number of deaths, and thus have suffered many times since the foundation of the world.

Ingenious as is this view, I think it is only the eminent ability of the men who have adopted and defended it that would require for it any serious notice. The explanation which we have adopted above is perfectly natural and simple, and makes equally clear the reference to the previous suffering. It is undoubtedly clear that the author plants himself on the singleness and finality of Christ's priestly entrance into the heavenly sanctuary; but why? Is it not because he conceives his single entrance into heaven as corresponding to one single, efficacious sacrifice on earth? And if the efficacy of that sacrifice is denied, would not the singleness and sufficiency of the heavenly presentation fall along with it? And why is it less easy to suppose Christ repeatedly dying, and making with each death a new priestly entrance into the Holy of Holies, than to suppose him first undergoing a series of deaths in successive ages, and then finally entering heaven to make a corresponding series of high-priestly oblations? This latter idea could never have suggested itself to a Jewish mind familiar with the Levitical sacrifices. The Levitical high priest entered, year by year, the Mosaic sanctuary; and with every successive entrance there was, of course, a fresh sacrifice. The idea of the Levitical priest entering repeatedly the inner tabernacle on the strength of a series of former sacrifices, would, it seems to me, have been simply monstrous. And not less monstrous is the supposition that Christ should, by a series of former deaths, have accumulated the material for a series of oblations after assuming the heavenly priesthood. One efficacious and final sacrifice followed by one final and permanent entrance, or a series of sacrifices followed by a series of entrances, is all that the analogy of the Levitical service could suggest. And surely the writer would not for a moment conceive of the absoluteness and finality of Christ's priestly offering, except as dependent on the absoluteness and finality of the previous sacrifice. Unfix the one, and you unfix the other; and then, according to the whole analogy of the Levitical priesthood, you make it necessary for him to descend and perform a new sacrifice. And the renewal of these ascents and descents is as supposable as the renewal of the deaths with which they are connected; and that these successive deaths should be supposed to have taken place after the analogy of the Jewish priestly rites, in connection with successive entrances into the sanctuary, is as easy as to suppose them to have taken place somewhere and somehow in former ages, and then their collective effect gathered up and made available in a succession of priestly offerings before God.

The only end gained by this hypothesis—namely, that it explains the phrase "Must have suffered many times from the foundation of the world"—is equally well gained by one which argues the sufficiency and finality of Christ's entrance and suffering, from the fact that he has not (as otherwise he would have)

27 And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment:
28 So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of

27 the sacrifice of himself. And inasmuch as it is [1] appointed unto men once to die, and after this *cometh*
28 judgment; so Christ also, having been once offered

1 Gr. *laid up for.*

suffered many times—and, of course, brought many priestly offerings—from the foundation of the world. As to his other argument, that the author ought otherwise to have said, "suffered and entered into the sanctuary," it is sufficient to say that the ellipsis is perfectly easily supplied (if requisite), every expiatory death supposing a subsequent entrance into the sanctuary with the blood, and every such entrance implying a previous expiatory sacrifice. Either, therefore, in this fixedness of their connection, may stand for both.

The 'consummation of the ages' (συντέλεια αἰώνων) is equivalent to, 'the end of these days'—that is, 'the end of the world,' or, 'the ages' (τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων), 1 Cor. 10 : 11, etc. It marks the point at which the pre-Messianic age terminates, and the coming, or 'future age' (αἰὼν μέλλων) commences. 'Manifested' here clearly not 'before God (as some) in the heavenly sanctuary,' but on earth in his incarnation. So 1 Tim. 3 : 16, "God was manifested in the flesh"; 1 John 1 : 2, "The life was manifested"; 1 Peter 1 : 20, "was manifested in the last times for you." Elsewhere the word is applied to Christ's second coming. (1 John 2 : 28.)

To put away sin, etc. — *For the doing away of sin by his sacrifice.* 'Doing away,' annulling, abrogation (ἀθέτησις), as of a law (7 : 18), of the sin, as well for past ages as for the generation in which he appeared. The expiation was good for all times, as shown by its being made at the close of the great historical eras. 'His sacrifice,' not, 'the sacrifice of himself' (αὐτοῦ), but 'the sacrifice which he offers,' which is indeed, of course, the sacrifice of himself, and need not be expressed.

27-28. A sort of argument from analogy for the single, unrepeated death of Christ. His case, says the author, stands in general relation to that of man, with whom he shares humanity, and to whose destiny his might be expected to bear a resemblance. In man's history there are two grand epochs: first, death; then, at a greater or less interval, a judgment. Each of them is for itself single and final. So there are two corresponding epochs in the history of Christ: first, his death to sin; then his coming to judgment. And as *one* death, once for all, is man's allotment until the final fixing of his destiny in the judgment, so *one* death for sin is Christ's allotment until his final coming to the judgment that shall fix the destiny of the world. The two epochs, then, in case of each, stand severally related to each other; their death once for all *through* sin to his death once for all *for* sin; and their appearing, as the next thing, at the tribunal of the final judgment, to his appearing as the next thing to rear and ascend that tribunal. There is thus, not merely the statement of a fact, but a sort of latent argument for the absolute finality, the decisive and abiding consequences of his atoning death.

27. And as it is appointed, etc.—*And in so far as it is reserved.* 'Reserved,' not exactly, as in the Common Version, 'appointed.' Also, not merely, as in our version, '*as*' (ὡς), or 'according as' (καθώς), but 'inasmuch as,' 'in so far as' (καθ' ὅσον), the words implying not merely a likeness, but a ground or reason. The author argues from the uniqueness of man's death and its relations to the next and great epoch in his destiny to a like uniqueness of Christ's death and a like relation to his Second Coming. **Once** (*for all*) **to die** (to die a death which has no repetition), **and after this the** (*a*) **judgment**—not necessarily immediately after. The reference is to the final judgment, and the interval may be greater or less. Nor does the 'judgment' here (as 10 : 2, 'a fearful looking for of judgment') necessarily imply condemnation. It is simply that adjudication which will take place for all men in righteousness (Acts 17 : 31), and of which the results, as stated in Matt. 25, will be eternal life or punishment, according to the characters of those judged.

28. So (*also*) **Christ,** etc. The latent ground of the inference here is Christ's participation in *humanity.* We may reason from men in general to him, because he also was *man (being) offered once for all.* Here, clearly, 'offered upon the cross,' in expiatory sacrifice, the passive being used (not the active, 'offering himself') simply because the author would express the mere passive act of suffering,

many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.

to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for him, unto salvation.

without regard to the agent. Hence, we need neither, with Chrysostom, supply 'by himself,' nor 'by man or by God'; but may leave the thought in its absolute generality. **To bear the sins of many.** 'Many' here is used not as opposed to 'all,' and as limiting the extent of the purpose and applicability of the sacrifice. It is rather in contrast to the *single* dying; he died but *once*, but it was to bear the sins of *many*. A more disputed point is the precise meaning of 'bear' (ἀνενεγκεῖν). By many (with Chrysostom, Theophylact, etc.) it is understood of bringing the sins as a sacrifice to be immolated; by others (as Luther, Bleek, Hofmann, Lünemann), of 'taking away' (ἀφαιρεῖν) sins; by others (as Bengel) of carrying them to the cross; by others (as Böhme, De Wette, Delitzsch, Moll) of *substitionary* or vicarious bearing, of taking upon *himself* the sins of many. On the first and third of these meanings we need not dwell. Of the second, it is enough to say that it is more than doubtful whether the verb (ἀνενεγκεῖν) can be used in the sense of 'removing,' or 'taking away.'[1] It is more probable that, with allusion to Isa. 53 : 12, 'he bore (ἀνήνεγκε) the sins of many,' where, by comparison with 53 : 4, it clearly denotes substitutionary bearing—that is, *taking upon himself* (see also Matt. 8 : 17: he 'took (ἔλαβεν) our sins and bore (ἐβάστασεν) our diseases'), such is also the import of the word here, and that the author describes Christ as being offered in order to bear upon himself the burden of human sin, and thus take it away. **The** (*a*) **second time** (1 : 6) **without** (*apart from*) **sin**—not, without the contamination of sin, for that he never had; not, without temptation to sin, although this will be true; but here, in apparent contrast to 'bearing the sins of many,' he will come without the burden of sin upon him: that burden which made him a man of sorrows, which compelled him to endure temptation in the wilderness, agonize in the garden, and shed his blood on the cross. **Unto them that look for** (*await*) **him** (ἀπεκδεχομένοις, 1 Cor. 1 : 7; Phil. 3 : 20, and elsewhere in Paul)—to believers who, having trusted him, now while he is gone to God look anxiously and believingly for his reappearing. **Shall he appear** (ὀφθήσεται)—*will he be seen*. His coming will be visible, manifest to all. Acts 1 : 11, "will he come as ye *behold* him go up into heaven." See Matt. 24 : 27. **Unto** (*for*) **salvation.** Before, he came to render their salvation possible; now he will come to accomplish it. Before, he came to bear the burden of their sins; now he will come to bestow on them the blessed consequences of expiated and forgiven sin. Before, he appeared in sorrow and death, that they might live; now he will appear triumphant and glorious, that they may appear with him in glory.

Ch. 10. (5) *Summing up of the entire high priestly argument.* (10 : 1–18.)

Finality of the work of Christ, answering, perhaps, to the third point in the general thesis: First, after the order of Melchisedec; second, Christ becoming a High Priest; third, a High Priest forever.

Chapter 7 discusses Christ's priesthood after the order of Melchisedec. Chapters 8 and 9, his High Priesthood, as the antitype of Aaron, ministering, through his own blood, in the heavenly sanctuary, and by this office introducing a New Covenant. Chapter 10 : 1–18 may (with Delitzsch) be regarded as especially emphasizing the idea of 'forever.' It divides itself into three parts:

(*a*) Finality of Christ's voluntary *sacrifice*, as opposed to the symbolical sacrifices of the law. (1–10.)

(*b*) Finality of Christ's priestly ministration, as opposed to the oft-repeated ministrations of the Levitical priesthood. (11–14.)

(*c*) Finality of the New Covenant, and of the sacrifice which seals it as effecting the absolute remission of sins. (15–18.)

—

(*a*) Finality of Christ's voluntary *sacrifice*, as opposed to the symbolical sacrifice of the law. (1–10.)

[1] That ἀναιρεῖν is so used furnishes no sufficient ground for affirming the same of ἀναφέρειν, the fundamental meaning of the two verbs (the one 'to raise,' 'take up,' the other 'to bear') being so different.

CHAPTER X.

FOR the law having a shadow of good things to come, *and* not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect.
2 For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins.

1 For the law having a shadow of the good *things* to come, not the very image of the things, [1] can never with the same sacrifices year by year, which they offer continually, make perfect them that draw nigh.
2 Else would they not have ceased to be offered, because the worshippers, having been once cleansed,

1 Many ancient authorities read *they can.*

1. For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, *and* not the very image of the things. 'The law' is the Mosaic law, with its priestly institutions and rituals; not, of course, properly, the moral law (though that, in the mind of a Jew, was never sharply distinguished from the ceremonial), but more especially the ceremonial. The apostle, in Romans, generally has in view the law under its moral aspects; our author, in Hebrews, the law under its ritual aspects. The one regards it as requiring holiness; the other as symbolizing redemption. The one finds it impotent from the spirituality of its demands; the other from the carnality of its provisions. The "coming good things" are here, as at 9 : 11, not the blessings of the gospel regarded from the point of view of the law, but the blessings yet future to the believers—complete salvation, remission of sins, conformity and nearness to God. Of these blessings, the law had but the *shadow;* the gospel has their very *image.* In the law these great spiritual blessings are exhibited in mere symbol; it imparts nothing of their *substance.* The gospel, although not as yet giving them in their fullness and perfection, yet gives their substantial verity, gives their very image. The term 'image' is chosen designedly, because the contrast is not between the shadow of these things, contained in the law and the heavenly things themselves, but between their *shadow* as contained in the law, and their *image* as contained in the gospel. The relation of the Jewish ritual to the unseen and spiritual good things, is that of the shadow to the reality. The relation of the gospel sacrifice and expiation to them is that of an image which substantially embodies and represents, which gives their essential nature and glory, as 'speech is the image of thought'; as the Son is 'the image of the invisible God.' The law but represents these things in faint outlines; the gospel brings them home in a fruition which grasps their substantial blessedness, and in a hope which leaves them still 'good things to come.'

Year by year can never, etc.—*Never with the same sacrifices, year by year, which they offer perpetually.*

'Year by year' (κατ' ἐνιαυτόν), some (as Lünemann) connect with 'sacrifices,' the phrase thus equivalent to, 'with the same yearly sacrifices'; but with 'year by year' emphatically placed, Delitzsch gives it its most natural grammatical construction (but harsh as to the thought), 'year by year can never'—that is, can never as often as they are repeated. Others connect it, by a virtual transposition, with the verb 'offer'—'which they offer year by year.' It is difficult to decide between them, and the idea is substantially the same in all. 'They,' the subject of 'offer,' refers to the priests. 'Perpetually' (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές), not the absolute 'forever' (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), but a qualified forever, *in perpetuum*, as 7 : 3, of Melchisedec's priesthood.

Make the comers, etc.—*Render perfect them that approach* to the sacrifices, or to God through them. They that 'approach' are the worshipers, not the priests. The 'perfecting' is cleansing spiritually the conscience, giving remission of sin and conscious reconciliation with God.

2. For then, etc. (*for otherwise*), **would they not have ceased to be offered?** Would not a single sacrifice have answered the purpose, the reality of expiation being secured? The interrogative construction is an emphatic form of affirmation. I may remark that, although the present tenses here (ver 1-11) seem to be based on the actual present existence of these sacrifices, yet the verb here employed—'would they not *have* ceased'—seems to throw doubt on this, if not to render it decidedly improbable. If the writer had distinctly in his mind the actual present time, one sees not why he should not have said,

3 But in those *sacrifices there is* a remembrance again *made* of sins every year.
4 For *it is* not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.
5 Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me:

3 would have had no more conscience of sins? But in those *sacrifices* there is a remembrance made of
4 sins year by year. For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins.
5 Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith,
Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,
But a body didst thou prepare for me;

'would they not cease' (οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύοντο). I am inclined to the opinion that the use of the present tense, wherever employed here, has no express reference to the actual existence of the Jewish ritual, but simply follows the principle by which we conceive that which has existed for many ages as *always present*, and that the use of the present here neither proves nor disproves the existence of the ritual in the time of the writer.

Because that the worshippers, etc.—*Because that those who serve* (not the priest, but the private worshiper), *would have no longer a consciousness of sins, having once for all been cleansed.* Forgiveness, although it does not leave the believer without sin, leaves him henceforth in a state of pardon. The forgiveness of one sin is a guarantee for the forgiveness of all sins. Pardon is a *state*, and though the believer must come to the Advocate and Mediator with his fresh sins for the fresh application of the cleansing blood, yet, having received it once, he is certain of it ever after. The doctrine, therefore, here stated, holds without involving the consequences of instant sanctification.

3. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance (*a calling to mind*) **of sins year by year.** The Jewish sacrifices can accomplish, in the language of Philo, "not an oblivion of sins, but a calling them to remembrance." They quicken the conscience, but cannot lull it to repose. Their office is not to expiate, but to remind the soul of its need of expiation. Thus they really produce precisely the reverse effect to that for which they are resorted to. And this from the nature of the case:

4. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. The proposition needs no proof; the more naked the statement, the more palpable its truth. 'The blood of bulls and of goats,' which here represent any and all animals that may be offered in sacrifice, may suggest the need of an atoning death, but can do nothing more.

5-10. Proof from Ps. 40 : 7-9 that not animal sacrifices, but a conscious, voluntary, offering in obedience to the will of God, are acceptable to him. By virtue of this we are sanctified.

5. Wherefore (considering the utter inefficiency of all these sacrifices) **when he cometh into the world, he saith.** The author here introduces Christ as adopting the language of David (Ps. 40 : 7, seq.), uttered by him after his anointing; and when now, after many dangers and deliverances, he is in near prospect of the throne. On the final rending of the kingdom from Saul, in consequence of his disobedience, and its being given over to another, God says, through Samuel, to the unfaithful king (1 Sam. 15 : 22), "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." In the spirit of this language, the predestined child of royalty utters the words of the Psalm. As one escaped from hate and persecution, and passing through dangers and trials on his way to exaltation and triumph, and especially as the great ancestral type of Christ on his way to the throne, which was to find in Christ its true Occupant and its true stability and glory, the language may well be regarded as typical of his great Son and Successor, who, like himself, hunted by persecution, like himself, divinely rescued and guarded, also, like himself, though in an incomparably higher degree, recognized the insufficiency of animal sacrifices, and unconditionally devoted himself as the one acceptable sacrifice. The language, applied primarily to David, is applicable, typically, to Christ, and, indeed, is put directly into his mouth, as if the Psalmist were but the mere mouthpiece of the Messiah, as expressing the spirit and significance of his earthly mission, and as indicating the foreshadowing in the Old Testament of the grand, essential feature in the New. The author quotes somewhat freely (and apparently from memory) from the Septuagint, which again differs strikingly, though,

6 In burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou hast had no pleasure.
7 Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.
8 Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and *offering* for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure *therein;* which are offered by the law;

6 In whole burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou hadst no pleasure:
7 Then said I, Lo, I am come
(In the roll of the book it is written of me)
To do thy will, O God.
8 Saying above, Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein (the which are

after all, not essentially, from the original Hebrew. The Hebrew text runs literally thus:

Sacrifices and meat offerings thou desirest not,
Ears hast thou wrought (hollowed out, bored) for me;
Burnt offerings and sufferings thou demandest not,
Then said I; Lo I come
With the roll of the book which is written regarding me
(Or, In the roll of the book it is written regarding me),
I delight to do thy will, O God,
And thy law is in my heart.

The Septuagint, literally rendered, runs thus:

Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,
But a body didst thou prepare for me;
Holocausts and sin offerings thou didst not require:
Then I said, Lo I come.
In the volume of the book it is written concerning me;
I desired to do thy will, O God,
And thy law in my inmost heart.

The deviations of the Septuagint from the original are less important than they at first seem. The most striking one substitutes 'a body didst thou prepare for me,' for, "ears didst thou hollow out (or open) for me." The meaning of both clauses is substantially the same, and probably the Greek translators, to avoid the harshness of a literal rendering, which, in Greek, would have been nearly unintelligible, simply generalized the expression, and instead of the more special symbol of obedience, 'the ears,' as the organs with which we hearken and obey, put the 'body' as the general instrument of accomplishing God's will; and thus represent God, instead of hollowing out for him ears with which he might hearken, as framing for him a body with which he might execute his will. That the Divine Spirit may have presided over the Septuagint translation, and made the language more expressly adapted to the work of David's Antitype, we cannot, perhaps, affirm, yet certainly not deny.

The other passage, 'In the volume of the book,' etc., admits of either rendering, and is rendered by Hengstenberg in accordance with the Septuagint. The "scroll of the book" is, of course, the book of the law, and especially Deuteronomy, which (Deut. 17:18, 19) was to be the inseparable *vade mecum* of the kings of Israel. 'With this law in my hands, which is written in regard to me'; or, 'In which rules are prescribed for me'; or, 'In the scroll of the law rules are prescribed for me,' or, 'It is written concerning me'—either of these may be the rendering of the original, and either would be perfectly suited to the mouth of David at this juncture of his life. Either, also, would be suited to the Messiah, although the former (given in the Septuagint) referring rather to a prophecy than a precept, seems, in his case, more eminently applicable. But it cannot be denied (with Delitzsch) that the whole passage bears a unique and almost mysterious character, which points it out as having a typical, and even prophetic, significance, especially when brought into comparison with some utterances of our Saviour which seem, in some sort, echoes of it, as John 8:29. 'Because I always do the things which are pleasing to him'; see 17:4. 'When coming into the world' may be understood, in a general way, not of any particular period, as his incarnation; still less, either of his entrance on his public ministry, or arriving at the age of manhood, or at the age of mature and clear perception regarding the nature of his mission. Rather, I think, it has reference to his pre-existence, and looks to the general spirit and purpose with which he submits to be clothed with flesh, and make his appearance among men.

I come to do thy will, O God, is an abbreviation, designed or undesigned, of the Septuagint, 'I come—I desire to do thy will, O God.' The alteration is in no way material, yet in its form, as expressing emphatic purpose, it applies with special appropriateness to the Messiah.

8. Recapitulation and inference. **Above when he said** (*when saying*), **Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither** (*nor*) **hadst pleasure in; which are offered by**

9 Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.
He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.
10 By the which will we are sanctified through the
offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all*.
11 And every priest standeth daily ministering and
offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never
take away sins:

9 offered according to the law), then hath he said, Lo,
I am come to do thy will. He taketh away the first,
10 that he may establish the second. [1]By which will
we have been sanctified through the offering of the
11 body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every [2]priest
indeed standeth day by day ministering and offer-
ing oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can

1 Or, *In*.....2 Some ancient authorities read *high priest*.

(*according to*) **the law.** The latter clause is the author's characterization of these various offerings, bringing them into relation to his purpose of showing the inadequacy of the law. 'Which' (αἵτινες) rather characterizes than individualizes the objects offered.

9. Then said he, etc.—*Then hath he said, Lo, I am come to do thy will.* **He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.** An inference from the whole passage, and a proof of his doctrine of the insufficiency of the Old Covenant sacrifices. Christ's obedience to God's gracious will is put in place of the sacrifices of the law. From this it follows that God's 'will' represents the deepest elements of his character. His 'will' stands as the expression of all those moral attributes of which the will is the executive exponent, and thus points to no merely arbitrary purpose or decision. Animal sacrifices are only superficial. Blind, involuntary, without moral nature, they can in no way touch the deeper springs of the divine character, nor truly propitiate it; there must be something that touches his essential spiritual attributes, that meets substantially the claims of his moral law. This the offering of Christ does. It is a spiritual holocaust, offered through an eternal spirit as against a perishable animal life, as a conscious, intelligent, voluntary sacrifice to the will of God. It consists in a perfect, unswerving obedience to the will of God, and finally in freely rendering up, in submission to that will, the body which God had prepared for him. The Son of God comes on the path of obedience. He learns obedience in the school of suffering, and submits, with a resignation which meets perfect approval, to the death from which, under the stress of sore temptation, he yet prays to be delivered. He becomes obedient unto death, even the death on the cross. The passage is interesting as intimating (as many others) the Father's agency in the work of redemption. It is not the merciful Son, placating the angry Father. It is God, so loving the world as to give his only begotten Son for its redemption, and the Son cheerfully concurring in and fully executing his allotted part. The 'will of God,' then, is the broader element which takes in the sacrifice of the Son as the mode of reaching its end.

10. By (*in*) **the which will**—in the sphere of which will; not that of Christ, but of God; this the higher and all encompassing element, under whose auspices, within whose ordering scope, the whole transaction takes place. **We are** (*have been*) **sanctified**—here referring not to internal, subjective, progressive sanctification, which gradually ripens the believer for heaven, but to the outward, formal, legal sanctification; the once for all setting apart, the consecrating, the instituting of the new and divine relation, out of which the sanctifying process (2 : 11, οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι) springs. **Through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.** 'The *body* of Jesus Christ' is inserted here with allusion to the clause, 'a body didst thou prepare for me.' It intimates that the Saviour carried out the purpose for which his body had been formed and given him, in offering it up a free-will sacrifice to God.

So much for the *first* part of this emphatic recapitulation — *the earthly offering.* The offerings of the law were animal, blind, involuntary on the part of the victims, having no inherent excellence or power; that of Christ was voluntary, spiritual, self-determined, an act of *obedience.* It is efficient, therefore, and final.

(*b*) Finality of Christ's priestly ministration as opposed to the oft repeated ministrations of the Levitical priesthood. (11-14.)

The high priestly self-presentation and offering of the royal and eternal Antitype of Melchisedec is in like manner as the offering of his body, final.

11. And every priest, etc.—*every priest indeed standeth ministering day by day, and offering frequently the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins.* The 'priest' here

12 But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for
sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;
13 From henceforth expecting till his enemies be
made his footstool.
14 For by one offering he hath perfected for ever
them that are sanctified.
15 *Whereof* the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us:
for after that he had said before,
16 This *is* the covenant that I will make with them
after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws
into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them;
17 And their sins and iniquities will I remember no
more.
18 Now where remission of these *is, there is* no more
offering for sin.

12 never take away sins; but he, when he had offered
one sacrifice for [1]sins for ever, sat down on the right
13 hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his
14 enemies be made the footstool of his feet. For by
one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are
15 sanctified. And the Holy Spirit also beareth witness
to us: for after he hath said,
16 This is the [2]covenant that [3]I will make with
them
After those days, saith the Lord;
I will put my laws on their heart,
And upon their mind also will I write them;
then saith he,
17 And their sins and their iniquities will I remem-
ber no more.
18 Now where remission of these is, there is no more
offering for sin.

1 Or, *sins, for ever sat down, etc*.....2 Or. *testament*.....3 Gr. *I will covenant.*

stands clearly for the 'high priest,' with whom Christ comes properly into comparison. 'Standeth'—in contrast with the royal Melchisedec Priest who 'took his seat' at the right hand of God. 'Which can never take away sins.' 'Which' (αἵτινες), as above, ver. 9, not merely enumerates, but *characterizes—of a kind which.* On this clause Delitzsch remarks: "The author does not mean to say that the sins for whose expiation the offerings were brought remained unforgiven to the worshiper, but that the offerings could produce no perfect peace of conscience, no assured certainty of a gracious state, no actual internal cleansing, and foundation of a new spiritual life." What I suppose the author means properly to say is, that the offerings themselves had no power to produce forgiveness of sin, or to work any new spiritual life. That all this might have existed, and in the case of all genuine worshipers really *did* exist, I suppose he would by no means deny. There was piety, there was true spiritual life, there was consciously forgiven sin under the Old Testament ritual. But it was not the product of that ritual. That symbolized salvation: it had the shadow of the good things to come; but it never *created* the first holy emotion, nor inspired the first breath of spiritual joy.

12. But this man, etc.—*He himself* (or emphatic *he*) *after offering one sacrifice for sins took his seat forever at the right hand of God.* A royal Priest, after the order of Melchisedec, with an untransferable priesthood.

13. From henceforth, etc—*henceforth awaiting till his enemies be made his footstool.* According to the promise made him at his exaltation, Ps. 110:1: "Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." (Matt. 22:44; 1 Cor. 15:25.)

14. For by (*with*) **one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified**—and therefore needs not renew that offering, as the victims slain under the law, which could bring no perfection, and required constant renewal.

(*c*) Finality of the New Covenant, of the sacrifice which seals it as effecting the absolute remission of sins. (15–18.)

And finally, to all this the Holy Spirit sets his seal by declaring that under the New Covenant, ratified by the blood of Christ, a work of inward regeneration is wrought, and the sins of the believer are effaced from his consciousness forever, and thus sets aside all possible need of any further offering.

15-17. The Holy Ghost (*Spirit*) **also is a** (*beareth*) **witness to us.** The Holy Spirit, as the special Inspirer of Scripture, and thus, so to speak, responsible for all which Scripture contains, and giving to it his sanction, is referred to by the author, 3:7. See also 9:8. **For after that he had said** (*having said*), **This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord**—*giving my laws on their hearts, and upon their mind also I will write them, and their sins and their iniquities I will remember no more.* The point of the quotation lies in ver. 17. Yet the others are also important as showing that true and proper forgiveness stands only in connection with a system which can reach and renovate the spiritual nature. We have now the final inference.

18. Now where remission of these is, there is no more (*no longer*) **offering for sin.** Whether 'no longer' (οὐκ ἔτι) be taken here as logical or temporal (either, equally accordant with Greek usage), it matters little; the conclusion is the same. The complete,

unconditional forgiveness of sin renders unnecessary any further expiatory sacrifice, and the system which actually imparts that must supersede forever the system which could only point to it.

With this triple reiteration of the *forever*—the absoluteness and finality of the work of Christ closes this brief, but striking epilogue. Let us again glance back over it. That work is final.

First. In substituting a free, voluntary, obedient sacrifice of the body of Christ, in place of the animal sacrifices of the law.

Second. In substituting the royal, untransferable Melchisedec high priesthood of Christ, with its single high-priestly oblation, for the ineffectual and therefore oft-repeated ministrations in the sanctuary of the Levitical priests.

Third. In introducing a new, spiritual *covenant*, which engraves its record on the heart, and in effacing the guilt of the conscience renders further offering unnecessary.

In each of these divisions our ear catches the echo of that 'forever' (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), which at 6 : 20 forms the closing topic of his grand thesis: 'AFTER THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDEC'—'A HIGH PRIEST'—'FOREVER.'

The argument is completed. The three grand sections of the discussion proper are closed. Jesus, the Apostle of a New Covenant, greater than the angels, the messengers and ministers of the Old; Jesus, the Founder of the New Testament house of God, the spiritual Israel, greater than Moses, the founder and lawgiver of the household of ancient Israel; and finally and especially—for this was the grand topic to which the author was hastening, and all that precedes was but subordinate and introductory—Jesus, the great High Priest of the New Covenant, comprising in his own person the regal and eternal dignity symbolized in Melchisedec, and the power really to expiate, forgive, and bring near to God, symbolized in Aaron—all these topics have passed successively before us, and each has been touched briefly, grandly, weightily, as befitted the weighty theme.

But the author's aim was practical, not theoretical. This sublime discussion, like all other portions of Scripture, had its origin in immediate spiritual necessities. Its purpose was to re-establish the waning faith of converts from Judaism, who were in imminent danger of lapsing back to their old worship and apostatizing from the living God. With a view to this, he has already thrice broken the thread of the discussion, in order to give to his doctrine a most impressive, practical turn, and now, the argument proper being completed, the whole remainder of the Epistle assumes a hortatory character, and that, too, never for a moment forgetting the one leading purpose of warning its readers against apostasy. Until its very last chapter, it never so far loses sight of this as to turn to those general exhortations which belong to the Christian life. The keynote struck at the beginning is, with a marvelous concentration and intensity of purpose, carried through to the end. With the skill, too, which marks its general structure, the author so manages as to take up the thread of exhortation here precisely where he had dropped it at 4 : 16, where he first formally entered on the subject of Christ's priesthood. There the injunction is: 'Let us approach with boldness to the throne of grace'; here, 'Having therefore boldness, let us approach with a true heart,' in full assurance of faith.

PART II. HORTATORY.

Exhortation to the readers, in view of their having such a High Priest, and access to the heavenly throne, to draw near with boldness and maintain their fidelity to their Christian profession; and this enforced by the terrible consequences of apostasy, and by an appeal to them to secure by steadfastness, until the now near end, the fruits of their former sufferings and fidelity. (19–39.)

(*a*) Exhortation to approach God boldly by the new and living way into the sanctuary opened in Christ, to stir up each other in love, and not forsake the Christian assemblies. (19–25)

(*b*) Enforcement of this exhortation by setting forth (as at 6 :3–8) the fearful consequences of apostasy. (26–31.)

(*c*) The author reminds them encouragingly of their former sacrifices for Christ, and urges them not to lose the reward of their labors, but to endure with faith and patience during the brief interval until the Second Coming. (32–39.)

19 Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus,
20 By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh;
21 And *having* a high priest over the house of God;

19 Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into
20 the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way,
21 through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and *hav-*

Another of the numerous triplets into which the divisions of this Epistle naturally falls.

(*a*) Exhortation to approach God boldly, to stir up each other to love, and not to forsake the Christian assemblies. (19-25.)

19. Having therefore, brethren, boldness, etc.—*for the entering into;* literally, 'for the entrance of the sanctuary'—that is, the heavenly Holy of Holies, figurative for the immediate presence and communion of God. **By (*in*) the blood of Jesus.** The connection of this clause is variously given. By many (with Bleek), "an *entrance* in or by the blood of Jesus," to which Delitzsch objects that entering in or with blood is strictly a high-priestly act. But *is* not the believer's entrance into the sanctuary conceived as strictly in or by the blood of Jesus? Jesus goes in by his own blood, but as Forerunner, leading his people after him, who thus enter in or by his blood. By Delitzsch the construction is given, '*boldness*, or confidence in the blood of Jesus'; 'boldness or confidence,' that is, which rests on the sacrifice of Jesus. By others, as Lünemann, it is connected with the previous clause as a whole: 'having boldness for the entrance . . . in the blood of Jesus.' Perhaps there is not much choice in the constructions. In either case the "blood of Jesus," shed in sacrifice on the cross, and figuratively borne into the heavenly Holy of Holies, there to be sprinkled on the mercy seat, is the efficient means of realizing that approach to God which the blood of Old Testament victims only symbolized.

20. By a new and living way, etc.—*Which he dedicated for us, as a new and living way.* 'Which' (*entrance*, εἴσοδος) is described as 'new,' because hitherto unopened and unknown; 'living,' not because it leads to life, not as equivalent to life-giving, but in contrast with the natural and lifeless 'way' of stone, that led the high priest into the earthly sanctuary; a living, spiritual path, which brings to the true heavenly goal. This entrance Christ dedicated by himself passing over it. **Through the vail, that is to say, his flesh.** The flesh or body of Christ is compared to the vail which hung before the earthly Holy of Holies, because as long as his body remained uncrucified, an entrance into that sanctuary was impossible, In the crucifixion the body of Christ and the vail of the sanctuary were rent simultaneously. The figure, however, is here merely accidental. We are not to suppose that the author regarded the vail of the tabernacle as symbolizing properly the body of Christ. It is only so conceived for the moment, with perhaps an allusion to the 'living way' that took its place. The vail partakes of that character of life. The vail of the old tabernacle was dead matter; the living (though dead) body of Christ takes its place.

But shall we construct the 'through' (διά) with the 'way' (*locally*, "through the vail," as Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann, Kurtz), or with 'dedicated,' taking it *instrumentally* "by means of" (as Delitzsch, who says that the idea is not that *for us* the way leads through the vail, since this was done away by Christ)? Though this is true, yet as the means by which Christ entered the Holy of Holies was his own broken body, and he entered as the Foreruuner of his people, and it is not unnatural to conceive that through which we pass instrumentally as also that through which we pass locally, I think the local construction with 'way' (ὁδόν) more natural.[1]

21. And having a (*great*) priest over the house of God. Our first ground of encouragement for drawing near to God is that our great Forerunner has passed through the vail and opened a path by which we may follow him, so that the vail no longer exists, except rather as a means of, than an exclusion from, entrance. Our second is, that in that awful sanctuary, that house of God, we have a Great Priest to make intercession for us, and shield our weakness under the blaze of the Divine Majesty. 'Great Priest' is not here a synonym for 'High Priest,' but rather designates Christ as exalted in kingly and priestly majesty. The 'house of God' seems here to be the heavenly house, the abode of God, and

[1] With the verb we should have expected an added εἰσελθών.

22 Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.
23 Let us hold fast the profession of *our* faith without wavering; for he *is* faithful that promised;

22 *ing* a great priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in [1]fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil [2]conscience:
23 and having our body washed with pure water, let us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver

1 Or, *full assurance*.....2 Or, *conscience, and our body washed with pure water: let us hold fast.*

the predestined dwelling place of his children. The 'house of God' (3:2) was God's house on earth (and, perhaps, also in heaven), the organized community of his people, the New Testament 'house of Israel.' Here, it is rather that 'house of my Father in which are many mansions,' where God dwells, and where Jesus has gone to prepare a place for his disciples.

22. Let us draw near—that is, to God, to the heavenly sanctuary—**with a true heart**—with a real, genuine heart (ἀληθινῆς), a heart that answers to the name; hence, not false, not hypocritical—**in full assurance of faith.** At 6:11 he exhorts the readers to strive after the 'full assurance (πληροφορία) of hope'; here, with very similar idea, to come in 'the full assurance of faith.' Hope looks forward to the end; faith lays hold of the means. Hope fastens on the anticipated glories; faith on him and his work, by whom they are to be realized. By faith we dismiss all doubts of our right to enter the path previously trod by the Redeemer, and of the efficacy of his atonement and intercession.

Having (*had*) **our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.** This clause, I think, stands immediately, and most naturally, connected with the preceding. It completes the statement of the subjective moral conditions under which we can draw near to God, and assigns the ground on which we may have the 'true heart' and the 'full assurance of faith'; namely, that our hearts have been sprinkled from an evil conscience. Until the 'blood of sprinkling,' instead of being sprinkled over our bodies, falls upon our *hearts*, and cleanses away the sense of guilt, replacing it with conscious reconciliation, pardon, and spiritual peace, there can be no 'true heart,' no real confidence of faith. As then the people of the Old Covenant were sprinkled outwardly by Moses with the blood of the unconscious victims, so let us come with boldness, having had *our hearts* sprinkled with the blood of him who, through an eternal spirit, offered himself to God. This participial clause (as also the following), is not a part of the exhortation, but is the *basis* of the exhortation. These clauses express the ideal condition of the believers. He *has had* his heart sprinkled from an evil conscience, and his body washed in pure water. These are the conditions of his entrance on the Christian life. The sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience is the distinguishing feature of the gospel—it is the primary gift of Christ; and, as *having had* this sprinkling, and the subsequent and corresponding external washing of baptism, the disciples are exhorted to all Christian confidence and fidelity.

23. And **having** (*had*) **our bodies washed with pure water, let us hold fast** (*maintain*) **the** *confession of our hope unwavering*). Calvin and some others have found in this first clause a reference (Ezek. 36:25) to the outpouring of the Spirit; but such a reference is forbidden alike by the use of the term 'body,' showing a material application of water, and the connection of the passage. The purifying rites of the Old Covenant were partly with blood and partly with water. *Expiation* was symbolized by blood—simple *cleansing*, and moral purity, by water. The New Covenant meets the Old at every point. For the sprinkling of the blood of beasts upon the body it has the sprinkling of the blood of Christ upon the heart. For the lustrations with water, by which the priests cleansed themselves when entering on their duties, and especially for that complete bathing of the body which the high priest underwent before entering the inner sanctuary (Lev. 16:4), the Christian priesthood, before following Christ within the vail into the presence of God, must also submit to the same symbolical cleansing, though vastly more significant. This is clearly baptism—"not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." Thus the author unites the outward and the inward; the efficient and the sacramental elements of the Christian life; deliverance from the guilt and power of sin wrought by the Holy Spirit on

24 And let us consider one another to provoke unto
love and to good works:
25 Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together,
as the manner of some *is;* but exhorting *one another*:
and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching.

24 not; for he is faithful who promised: and let us con-
sider one another to provoke unto love and good
25 works; not forsaking our own assembling together,
as the custom of some is, but exhorting *one another;*
and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing
nigh.

the application of the blood of Christ to the soul, and then this moral renovation and purity—a death to sin and a resurrection to holiness—symbolized in the bath of baptism. As the preceding clause naturally connects itself with what goes before, so this connects itself with what succeeds—with baptism associates itself 'confession' (ὁμολογία), an acknowledgment of devotion to Christ. Only by thus separating the clauses do we avoid a very abrupt transition. *Unwavering, unbending*, is the predicative qualification of 'confession.' Let us hold our confession unbending, so that it shall not waver. The author proceeds to assign a reason: **For faithful is he that promised.** God, who made the promise, is faithful and true (1 Thess. 5:24; 1 Cor. 1:9), "he gives by covenant and by oath" (6:13-18); and by both, alike, it is impossible for him to deceive.

24. Verse 22 exhorts believers to come in full confidence of *faith;* verse 23 to hold unwavering the confession of *hope;* the present verse completes the triad of Christian graces. **And let us consider one another to provoke** (*stir up*) **unto love and to good works.** The idea is not (as the original might be possibly construed), 'let us contemplate one another, for the purpose of finding in our common example a stimulus to love and good works,' but, 'let us give heed to one another, that we may stimulate one another,' etc. As Christian brethren, members of the same great household, having access to the same heavenly sanctuary, and fellow-worshipers, let us regard one another's interests, and each strive for the good of all.

25. Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together—the gathering together for Christian communion and worship. This, of course, does not mean not abandoning altogether the Christian assemblies, which, of course, would be a token of final apostasy, and to which the language, 'as the manner of some is,' would be inapplicable; but that failure, frequently and statedly, to gather themselves in Christian assemblages, whether from indifference or fear or doubt, which would endanger their Christian steadfastness, and certainly check their spiritual growth. **As the manner of some is.** Some had already given this token of indifference and half-heartedness in the Christian profession, and thus laid themselves liable to just rebuke. The language does not mark formal apostates, but those who might be on the road to apostasy. **But exhorting one another**—as, by clear implication, they could do most effectually in their assemblies, where they could be fired by a common zeal. **And** (*by*) **so much the more, as ye see the day approaching** (*drawing nigh*). 'The day' is the day of Christ, the day of the Lord's return, which, according to his prediction, was supposed to be near, which, in fact, *was* near, and of which the tokens were already visible. That, according to the whole scheme of Hebrew prophecy, our Lord puts his symbolical and anticipatory coming in the breaking up of the Jewish state, and the final extinction of the old theocratic system, in place of that final and greater coming, which the former but foreshadowed, and that, according to this principle, we are to interpret the numerous New Testament prophecies on this point, seems well nigh certain. Two things are clear: First, that our Lord repeatedly gave his disciples to understand that his return was to be speedy and before the passing away of that generation, and that, accordingly, such an expectation existed in the church; secondly, that, in fact, this coming was only figurative, while that for which it stood—the *Parousia*, in its absolute sense—was far in the future, and was known to be so by the Spirit that presided over the whole scheme of prophecy. Indications of the coming day of wrath about to break over devoted Jerusalem were doubtless already visible. The emphasis lies not on 'day' or 'approaching,' but on 'see.' It is by how much his readers *see* the day of the Lord approaching, by how much its lurid light is already breaking along the horizon of the future, that they are exhorted to fidelity.

(*b*) The exhortation sharpened by the terrible consequences of apostasy. (26–31.)

26 For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins,
27 But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.

26 For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no
27 more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and a [1] fierceness of fire which

1 Or, *jealousy*.

26. For if we sin wilfully (*voluntarily*). The sin is clearly that of apostasy—that is, as denoted by the present participle (ἁμαρτανόντων), that *abiding* in sin, that yielding ourselves permanently to its power, which marks an evil heart of settled unbelief. And the sin itself is not so much sinful indulgences, which spring up in consequence of departing from God, as those internal acts which constitute that departure itself. It is not sin, in its incidental effects, in its blossoms, that is struck at; but sin, in its essential nature, and in its deepest root; unbelief, with its natural concomitants. Similarly John uses the term (1 : 39), "Every one that is begotten of God does not commit sin; because his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is begotten of God." To 'sin voluntarily' or 'wilfully,' then, is voluntarily to renounce the faith which we have reposed in Christ, and make a formal return to the beggarly elements which we had abandoned. **After we have received** (*receiving*) **the knowledge of the truth**—after being 'enlightened' and 'tasting the good word of God.' 'Knowledge' (ἐπίγνωσις), here equivalent to 'recognition,' 'acknowledgment,' not merely a passive illumination (γνῶσις), but one which had been accompanied by a positive movement, and a full and ratifying assent of the mind; thus a stronger and more emphatic word than the latter (γνῶσις).

On the question whether this marks a true child of God, and, if so, whether it is possible for him actually so to sin, see the remarks at 6 : 3–5. I would here simply repeat: (1) There is not, in all the Epistle, I think, a positive declaration that the persons in question do fall away. The only thing positively stated is the desperate *consequence* of such falling, in case it may happen. The power of divine grace has been exhausted, and the case, therefore, is hopeless. (2) There are repeated statements made throughout the New Testament that the truly regenerated cannot fall away. Such, among others, is the passage (1 John 3 : 9) quoted above; such John 10 : 28, 29; Rom. 8 : 35–39. It is difficult to see how passages like these could be written, if it were a fact that many who had been regenerated by the grace of God, did actually fall again under the final power of the devil. (3) In the whole New Testament, apostasy is regarded as *subjectively* possible. The apostle, who probably had no doubt of his final salvation, yet says, "I keep my body under, lest after preaching to others I myself prove reprobate." And so every where he treats the perseverance and final salvation of believers as resting instrumentally on their efforts; and, subjectively, they are always in danger of falling away. The Epistle to the Hebrews only puts this general doctrine, which pervades the entire New Testament, in a stronger and more solemn light, by how much the case was more pressing, and the danger more imminent. But neither here nor elsewhere is there an explicit declaration of the possibility of that falling away of believers, which, if admitted, revolutionizes the New Testament doctrine of salvation, and goes far to take away the sacredness and divinity of a heavenly birth.

There remaineth no more (*a*) **sacrifice for sins.** Either, there will be no repeated offering for sin; Christ will not die again; or, the benefits of that offering which has been made will be no longer available to them. So far as the language may refer to the objectively impossible falling away of true believers, it is the former; so far as to the lapse of the highly enlightened, but not really regenerate, it is the latter. If Christians fall away, the entire resources of salvation are exhausted; the blood of Christ has proved its utmost power and been inefficacious. If others fall away who have reached a very high grade of spiritual enlightenment, who have experienced all of divine influence *but* regeneration, their recovery is morally impossible. God will not bless the efforts for their renewal, but, like the field that has answered the rains and sunshine only with thorns and thistles, will give them over to the burning.

27. The last verse gave the negative side of their punishment; the present gives its positive. **But** (*there remaineth*) **a certain**

28 He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses:
29 Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?

28 shall devour the adversaries. A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without compassion on
29 *the word of* two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, [1] an unholy thing, and

1 Gr. *a common thing.*

fearful looking for of judgment. By an elegant metaphor the epithet 'fearful' is transferred from the 'judgment' to the expectation of it, the nature of the judgment being thus inferable from that of the foreboding of it. 'Judgment' (κρίσις) is here, as occasionally elsewhere, equivalent to condemnation (κατάκρισις), 'a certain' (τις), giving a certain vagueness to the representation, and implying it as indescribable, heightens its fearful character. **And fiery indignation** (*a wrath of fire*), **which shall** (*is about to*) **devour the adversaries.** The two clauses give the entire elements of their condition. Their present allotment is an inward, fearful anticipation of vengeance; their future is an outward 'wrath of fire' that will devour them at the final judgment which they shudderingly anticipate. 'Wrath of fire' (πυρὸς ζῆλος), not 'fiery indignation,' as in the Common Version. The fire itself in which that day shall be revealed (1 Cor. 3 : 13, "For the day shall disclose it because it is revealed in fire"), is personified and represented as putting forth its wrath. 'About to' (μέλλοντος) refers to the *speediness* of the coming wrath. They could *see* the day approaching in which Christ would come to be glorified in his saints, and to take vengeance on his enemies. It is not always near in precisely the sense in which it was then; for then, in awful symbol, it *was* just at hand; but it is always near to the eye of faith which reckons that "the Lord is not slack concerning his promise as men count slackness." The language clearly alludes to Isa. 26 : 11; Septuagint, 26 : 11 : "Wrath (ζῆλος) shall seize an ignorant people, and now fire will devour the adversaries" (πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδεται).

28. An emphatic repetition of the sentiment expressed in 2 : 2, 3, and of the *sentiment* (though more indirectly expressed) of 3 : 7-19. What is stated hypothetically (though not doubtingly) in chapter 2 is here stated positively. **He that despised** (*any one setting at nought;* ἀθετήσας, doing away with, annulling, abrogating, so far as in his power; see ἀθέτησις, 7 : 18) **the law of Moses died without mercy** (*compassion*) **under two or three witnesses.** Many minor violations of the Mosaic law were punished with death; but the special reference here seems (as is natural) to cases of blasphemy (Lev. 24 : 11-16), idolatry, and instigation thereto (Deut. 17 : 2-7), especially, perhaps, the latter, as here the condition of two or three witnesses is especially prescribed. This falling away from Jehovah was more than a mere ordinary transgression. It was a virtual annulling (ἀθέτησις) of that law; a renunciation of its authority, and thus stands in a like category to falling away from Christ. The argument proceeds from the less to the greater.

29. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose (*think*) **ye, shall he be thought worthy.** In this 'think ye' the author leaves the case to the judgment and conscience of his hearers. They, in view of the relative degrees of guilt, may decide for themselves on the relative degrees of punishment in the two cases. 'Deemed worthy'—namely, by God in the final judgment. As there can be no worse earthly punishment than death, that here spoken of must of course be after death. **Who hath trodden under foot the Son of God.** 'Trod down,' 'trampled' (καταπατεῖν, as Matt. 6 : 9, "they will trample them under their feet"), the strongest expression of contempt and act of insult. Of course, it is not intended to affirm that these apostates treat with wanton contempt and contumely the Saviour whom they abandon, but that they virtually do so; such is a fair interpretation of their act of desertion. In turning their backs on Christ they, as it were, deny and crucify him afresh, and ratify the rejection of him by their fathers. This is written, we must remember, to those whose fathers and nation had but recently, with reviling and blasphemy, rejected the Messiah. **And hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith** (*in which*) **he was sanctified, an unholy thing** (*impure*). The blood of

30 For we know him that hath said, Vengeance *belongeth* unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people.
31 *It is* a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

30 hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him who said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense. And again, The Lord shall judge
31 his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

Christ shed in ratification of the New Covenant is the blood of the Covenant. *In* this blood—in its sphere, through it, by it—the believer had been sanctified, had been made *holy* (ἅγιος), here referring not so much to that process of personal sanctification, which each believer inwardly undergoes, as to the formal outward relation of saints, holy or consecrated ones, into which all are brought by virtue of their faith in Christ. The blood of Christ, by which this sacred cleansing has been wrought, the apostate from him thus decides to be unclean; whether *impure* as opposed to *pure* (as Tholuck, Ebrard, Lünemann, etc.), or *common* as opposed to *sacred* (as De Wette, Delitzsch), it is difficult to decide. Perhaps both conceptions are substantially included in it. **Hath done despite unto** (*outraged, treated contumeliously*) **the Spirit of grace.** All gracious influences which had wrought upon him were the product of the Spirit. It was the Spirit that had *enlightened* him (John 16 : 13, "he shall lead you into all truth"), that had *quickened* him, that had applied to him the sanctifying efficacy of the blood of Christ. As all spiritual life is the product of the Spirit, religious apostasy, as it is a trampling on the blood of Christ as its formal and legal author, so is heaping contumely on the work of the Spirit, as its efficient, internal author. The one is not intended to mark the unpardonable sin, or the sin against the Holy Ghost, more than the other. Both are different aspects of the same act. The Spirit of grace is either the Spirit, as the *gift of grace* (as Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann), or, better (with Böhme, Delitzsch, Moll), as the *efficient principle* of grace.

30. For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall (*will*) **judge his people.** These citations indicate the punishment which may be expected to fall upon these willful transgressors. God is not only a God of grace, but a God of judgment. 'We know him that hath said' is at once an elegant and an emphatic mode of saying, "We know what is implied in the language of him who says," etc. It points to our knowledge of the rectitude and truthfulness of him who makes the utterance. The citations are, the first from Deut. 32 : 35, the second from Deut. 32 : 36, repeated in Ps. 135 : 14. The first deviates in form alike from the Hebrew original ("vengeance is mine and recompense"), and still more from the Septuagint ("In the day of vengeance I will recompense"), but accords with the form of quotation in Rom. 12 : 19. Whether influenced in its form by that of Romans, or both founded on some current and familiar mode of expressing the sentiment, is doubtful. Nor does it matter, as the thought is unaffected. In the former passage there is in the original a direct declaration of God's judicial severity in dealing with his enemies, and it is obviously and directly in point. In the second, there is a seeming discrepancy between the original import of the passage and the use to which the author applies it. But it is only seeming. The Lord will judge his people by interposing mercifully in their behalf. But this merciful interposition in their favor involves the infliction of vengeance on their enemies. The judgment of God *for* Israel in Egypt was a judgment *upon* and *against* the Egyptians.

31. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God. This closes and puts the seal on this terrible passage of warning. It is the sentiment which spontaneously rises to the mind in view of the crime and him against whom it is committed. The willful transgressor throws himself into the hands of an avenging God. David, when offered a choice between punishments, chose pestilence rather than war, on the ground that it was better to fall into the hands of God than of man. David's choice was made in faith, but even so he found this alternative sufficiently terrible. God's chastising and correcting judgments are fearful; how much more then his punitive! If he scourges so severely those whom he will save, how much more those whom he will destroy! If the cup of mercy is often mingled with so bitter ingredients, how when "the wine of his wrath is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation!"

32 But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions;
33 Partly, whilst ye were made a gazing-stock both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, whilst ye became companions of them that were so used.
34 For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.

32 But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were enlightened, ye endured a great
33 conflict of sufferings; partly, being made a gazing-stock both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, becoming partakers with them that were so used.
34 For ye both had compassion on them that were in bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your possessions, knowing [1] that ye have for yourselves a better

1 Many ancient authorities read *that ye have your own selves for a, etc.*

(*c*) Encouragement from past fidelity, and exhortation not to throw away its fruits. (32-39.)

The author, as before in chapter 6, follows his awful threat (4:8) by words of encouragement, so here again 'changes his voice' (Gal. 4:20), and presents considerations of a more cheering character. He will not overwhelm, but alarm. He will not drive them to despair, but stir up by all possible means any smoldering embers of spiritual life. He turns to the brighter side of the picture.

32. But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after *being* **illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions** (*a conflict of sufferings*). Whether 'illuminated' here refers to their being enlightened as to the deficiencies of Judaism and the nature of Christianity, or, as elsewhere, is simply a term for coming to the knowledge of Christ, spiritual enlightenment in general, is perhaps doubtful. I think it is the latter. The language here, as noticed by Chrysostom, is the carefully chosen language of commendation. They 'endured' (ὑπομένειν), implying resolution and firmness. They endured not trials or temptations, but a struggle, a wrestling, a conflict (ἄθλησιν), which called forth their voluntary and active powers, and a great (πολλήν) struggle—no ordinary one—of suffering and affliction. To what *facts* this refers, whether the early history of the Christian Church in Palestine, including all its various persecutions, or possibly (with Alford) more recent persecutions in Rome, it is impossible to determine. The fact that it was a second generation, and not the early members of the Jerusalem Church, that would be now addressed, is against (yet not decisively) the former supposition.

33. Partly, whilst ye were made, etc. *On the one hand, being made a gazing stock (a spectacle).* **Both by reproaches and afflictions** (θεατρίζεσθαι, equivalent to θέατρον γενηθῆναι, 1 Cor. 4:9: "To be made a spectacle to the world and to angels and men"). Through reproaches and afflictions heaped upon them, they were held up, as it were, to the contemptuous gaze of the world. *On the other hand, becoming partakers with them who found themselves so situated;* namely, in affliction and reproach. '*So*' not referring back to endured, and denoting the firmness with which they endured the struggle, but to the 'being a gazing stock by afflictions and reproaches,' and indicating that these Christians had not only themselves borne affliction and obloquy for the cause of Christ, but had also attached themselves to those who, amid persecution and reproach, had maintained the Christian faith, and bestowed on them sympathy and succor. The Acts is full of the names of eminent leaders in the Church, as Stephen, Peter, James the First, Paul, etc.—objects of hate and persecution, and many of them losing their lives for the sake of Christ. It is to sympathy and aid extended to such as these that this probably refers.

34. This expresses the same thought as the preceding in reverse order. **For ye had,** etc.—*ye both sympathized with them that were in bonds, and ye received with joy the plundering of your goods.* The expression is emphatic, and indicates a record of the most satisfactory character. They took the plundering of their property, not only with resignation, but with joy. They 'rejoiced and were exceeding glad' when they suffered, knowing that 'great was their reward in heaven.' (Matt. 5:11.) *Knowing that ye have for yourselves a better and an enduring possession.* The added 'in heaven' of the Textus Receptus is probably a gloss. With or without it, the 'possession' is obviously the heavenly inheritance—the 'incorruptible' and 'undefiled' inheritance of 1 Peter 1:4. 'Have for yourselves' contrasts emphatically the treasure which is their own with the earthly goods which they held at the pleasure of others.

35 Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward.
36 For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise.
37 For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry.
38 Now the just shall live by faith: but if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.

35 possession and an abiding one. Cast not away therefore your boldness, which hath great recompense of
36 reward. For ye have need of [1] patience, that, having done the will of God, ye may receive the promise.
37 For yet a very little while,
He that cometh shall come, and shall not tarry.
38 But [2] my righteous one shall live by faith:
And if he shrink back, my soul hath no pleasure in him.

1 Or, *steadfastness*.....2 Some ancient authorities read *the righteous one*.

35. The verse, in view of this noble record of the past, renews the exhortation. **Cast not away therefore** (μὴ ἀποβάλητε)—either, 'Lose not with an involuntary loss,' or, 'Throw not away voluntarily.' The verb will admit either signification. The latter seems, here, preferable, as it is also more strictly the meaning of the word. **Your confidence**—your joyful assurance—**which hath a great recompense.** Their joyful Christian confidence is not to be wantonly thrown away, or lightly parted with. It has an intrinsic value. God acknowledges, approves, and will reward it, in the fulfillment of all the hopes which it involves. This fulfillment God, although strictly as a matter of mere grace, yet in some sort as a *record* (similarly as at 6 : 10) for their firm and glad confidence, will bestow upon them.

36. For ye have need of patience (*steadfast endurance*), in order that, doing the will of God, ye may obtain the promise. The two last clauses may be resolved either temporally; 'that, *after* doing the will of God, ye may obtain,' etc.; or, instrumentally, 'that by doing the will ye may obtain'; or, both, regarded as parts of our complex idea; 'doing ye may obtain,' equivalent to 'ye may do and obtain.' The idea is, then, you need steadfastness that ye may do the will of God, and, so doing, obtain the promise. At all events, the idea is not that, having *already*, in time past, done the will of God, ye may in the future obtain the promise. Both the doing and the obtaining are yet in the future, and both conditioned upon steadfast endurance. Of course, the doing of God's will is not attributed to the Christian in the same absolute and perfect sense as in ver. 7 (I come to do thy will) to Christ. *That* indicates a voluntary obedience taking the place of a mere animal sacrifice, as the ground of an efficacious atonement; this indicates conformity to God's will and law, not as a ground, but as a condition, of salvation. To 'receive or obtain the promise' here, as often elsewhere, its fulfillment. They have been saved, as yet, only or mainly in hope. The fulfillment, the 'enduring substance,' comes when Christ shall return to those who look for him without sin unto salvation. So the next verse.

37, 38. A free quotation from Hab. 2 : 3, 4, introduced by a phrase from the Septuagint of Isa. 26 : 20. **For yet a little while** (*how little!*) This from Isa. 26 : 20, where God calls his people to enter into their chambers, and hide them a very little until the storm be overpast. **And he that shall come** (*cometh*) **will come, and will not tarry. Now** (*but*) **the just,** etc.—*On account of his faith shall he live, and if he shrink back, my soul hath no pleasure in him.* The words are freely quoted from a passage in Habakkuk, which has primary reference to the coming overthrow of the Chaldean dominion, and looks from thence, according to the habitual shortening of prophetic perspective, forward to the coming of the Messiah. The Septuagint version runs thus: "Because the vision is yet for a time, and it will appear at last, and will not come to nought. If he be tardy, wait for him; for he will surely come, and will not tarry. If (one) shrink back, my soul hath no pleasure in him; but the just, he, by his faith, shall live." In the Hebrew original, the 'vision'—namely, the revealed destruction of the Chaldean power—is still the subject of the following verb, 'will come and will not delay.' The Septuagint translators have given it a personal reference to God as the Messiah, and our author applies it definitely to Christ and to his second coming. He has also, in citing, reversed the order of the two last clauses, perhaps accidentally, perhaps to make the verb 'shrink, draw back' (ὑποστείληται) refer more definitely to the 'past' as its subject. In the original (Septuagint), the subject of the verb is clearly indefinite, 'if he,' that is, 'any one draw back'; and there is no gram-

39 But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.

39 But we are not [1] of them that shrink back unto perdition; but of them that have faith unto the [2] saving of the soul.

1 Gr. *of shrinking back . . but of faith*.....2 Or, *gaining*.

matical reason why it may not be so in our Epistle. Looking at the Old Testament passage, I am strongly inclined to render, as in the English version, "and if any man draw back," and this not so much on theological as philological grounds. So far as the *sense* is concerned, it is entirely in harmony with the uniform tone of this Epistle to put, hypothetically, the case of the believer's falling away, and then to declare the hopelessness of his condition. Granting that the verb 'shrink, or draw back' refers to 'the just,' it makes just such a supposition as is repeatedly elsewhere made; and, as in all the other passages, does not commit the author to the positive doctrine that the really just man ever does fall away. The original again reads, either, "My (God's) just man shall live by faith," or, "The just man shall live by my faith"—that is, "faith in me." The text in Hebrew is uncertain; but, with Delitzsch, etc., we give it as cited in Rom. 1 : 17, where Paul makes it the starting point and text of his elaborate and noble exposition of the gospel doctrine of justification. Of course, as the author has not made a formal quotation, he has not studied a precise adherence to the original text. He has rather accommodated it to his purpose than strictly cited it as proof. Still, there can be no just doubt that he has, in the spirit of an enlarged and just interpretation, transferred the Old Testament picture to the New. All the lines of the Old Testament prophecy converge on the Messiah, and, with the progress of historical development, on his first coming, as the beginning, and on his second coming, as the crown and consummation of his work. The Old Testament faith changes its outward form, but not its essential character, as it fixes itself definitely on a revealed Messiah, and a Messiah yet again to be revealed in glory. So the just shall live in consequence of his trust in God, but at no time since the fall could this trust have been a mere confidence in the integrity, purity, and justice of God without a felt need of atonement and forgiveness; and since the appearing of Christ, it can take no other specific direction than toward his expiatory and interceding work. In this alone, the sin- and guilt-stricken soul of man finds its needs met. We may not know who, or how many, from the Gentile world have been saved without the proclamation of the gospel, but we hazard nothing in saying that whoever have, have been saved through the intercession of Christ, and so saved that their first glimpse of him and his redemption, wherever obtained, was welcomed by them as precisely adapted to their spiritual needs, as "all their salvation and all their desire." 'My soul,' Hebrew for 'I'—that is, God, whose language the writer is citing—'hath no pleasure in him'; that is, abhors and rejects him.

39. But again the writer's kindly feeling induces him to hope for the best in regard to his wavering brethren, and to let them feel that he has not lost confidence in their steadfastness. **But we are not of them that** (*such as*) **shrink back unto perdition, but of them that believe** (*are of faith*) **to the saving of the soul.** "Are not of shrinking back"—that is, we belong not to, are not the children of, shrinking back; are not such as to shrink back. 'Unto perdition'—that is, so that our course should end in perdition, in eternal destruction. 'Unto perdition' expresses the natural and inevitable result of the drawing back, as 'unto the gaining, or saving of the soul' expresses the natural result of faith. They are not added as that which the recreant on the one hand and the believer on the other *seeks* as his goal, but as the writer's statement of the necessary consequence of either course respectively. 'Perdition' is the losing of the soul; the 'gaining of the soul' is eternal life.

CHAPTER XI.

NOW faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.

1 Now faith is [1] assurance of *things* hoped for, a [2] conviction of things not seen. For therein the elders

1 Or, *the giving substance to* .....2 Or, *test.*

Ch. 11. (2) *Encouraging survey of the achievements of faith in Jewish history. Muster roll of the heroes of faith.* (1–40.)

Illustrations from Old Testament and ancient Jewish history of the power of that faith which is inculcated on the readers. The author uses the term 'faith' not in its narrower—more strictly, New Testament—sense, for faith in Jesus Christ as the condition of salvation, but in its broader character, as that principle within us which passes out of the visible and the present into the sphere of the invisible and the future, which thus postpones sensible objects to spiritual realities, and the evanescent present to the abiding future. Inasmuch as this faith exists only in hearts which God has touched by his grace,—a grace bestowed only through the atonement of Christ, either past or prospective,—there is no contradiction between the doctrine of this Epistle and the prevailing New Testament doctrine in regard to faith. Paul, in Romans, and our author, in Hebrews, are contemplating the subject from different points of view. The one has his eye on the moral law, and on the need of a righteousness appropriated by faith to cover our sin and guilt; the other is looking at the manner in which this in-dwelling principle of faith would evince itself in all ages, even when there was as yet no clear revelation of Christ. Paul himself, on other occasions, uses the word in the same sense; as 2 Cor. 5 : 7, 'We walk by faith, not by sight.'

(*a*) Illustrations of faith in the antedeluvian believers. (1–7.)

1. Now faith is, etc.—*But faith is confidence in things hoped for, a conviction of the things that are not beheld.* Some, from the position of "is" (ἐστιν) and the absence of the article from 'faith' (πίστις) have supposed they must construct 'and there *is* a faith,' making it a verb of *existence*, instead of a copula, and thus affirming emphatically that there *is* such a grace as faith, with the following nouns in apposition: A faith—to wit, a confidence, etc. But this without necessity. Such apposition of 'is' (ἐστιν), as copula, and such an absence of the article with the subject, are among the familiar usages of the language. The advanced position of the verb simply throws emphasis on it. 'But faith *is*,' etc.—equivalent to, But that which faith *is*, is this. We have thus a *definition* of faith, and a definition adapted to the purpose of the writer. He considers it in its two elements as related to *the future* and as related to *things unseen.* It seems now to be the author's purpose not to state, rhetorically, what faith may *prove* to those who possess it, but strictly what is its *nature* as a subjective exercise. The word 'substance' (ὑπόστασις), therefore, which means, primarily, *a standing under*, and then a *foundation*, *substance*, but which then comes in later Greek to mean *confidence* (see 3 : 14; 2 Cor. 9 : 4), seems to have much more naturally this meaning here (so Luther, and most recent interpreters); and, again, for 'evidence,' or, proof (ἔλεγχος), we understand here naturally the *conviction* furnished by the proof, the clear assurance of things not seen. We thus have a beautiful and complete definition of faith applicable to all the cases to which the author proceeds to apply it. The statement that 'Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen,' is indeed, rhetorically, just and beautiful, but less pertinent to the author's purpose than that which looks at this grace in its strictly subjective nature. This answers the question which we naturally ask, "What was faith, as exercised by those saints of the elder time?" It was an abiding confidence in anticipated good, and a clear conviction of unseen realities. It seems uncertain whether 'things' (πραγμάτων) belongs to the preceding clause or the following. The Greek interpreters construct it mostly with the preceding; the modern, mainly on rhythmical grounds, with the following. I incline to the earlier construction. It seems to me that while, perhaps, mere rhythm would favor the later construction, rhetorical force would point to the other. But it matters little.

2. For by it (*in this*) **the elders**—they of the elder time, elders not merely on the

' For by it the elders obtained a good report.
3 Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.

3 had witness borne to them. By faith we understand that the [1] worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of

1 Gr. *ages.*

ground of age, but of dignity; looking upon them far back in the past, we naturally associate them with the dignity and venerableness of age—**obtained a good report** (*were attested*) received a good attestation, alike from God, who approved them, and history, that has recorded their deeds. 'In this' is probably to be constructed directly with the verb —not, "Being in this, they were attested," but, "they were attested in this," 'they received their attestation in this.'

The author passes now to a catalogue of the ancient heroes of the faith. He would naturally begin with Adam; but as what is recorded of him is rather a lamentable lapse from faith than an illustration of it, and as he leads the mind back to the very scene of creation, our author commences by illustrating the operation of faith in connection with this great, prime fact of history and article of belief.

3. By faith we understand that the worlds were (*have been*) **framed by the word of God**—*In order that not from things which are apparent should have sprung that which is seen.*

It may be objected to the author's statement that our recognition *by faith* of the creation of the world by the word of God, is inconsistent with the fact that this creation is matter of express record, and that we acquire the knowledge from that record. True; but in reply, we say that this record itself appeals to the principle of faith within us, without which we could not appreciate, and should not accept, the record. Faith is that general principle of our nature which, according to the definition (ver. 1) enables us to pass from the visible to the invisible, to rise above the phenomenal into the realm of spiritual reality and spiritual truth. Faith, then, accepts the testimony which God gives concerning creation; it establishes reason, *intellect* (νοῦς) upon its throne in opposition to sense; it enables us to discover the evidences that the universe has sprung from the power and wisdom of God, instead of having its origin in material and sensible causes. *We understand* (νοοῦμεν), we have an intellectual, rational perception, as Paul, in Romans, declares that the invisible things of God are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood (νοούμενα) from his works. So reason, under the influence of faith, recognizes God as the Author and Controller of the universe. 'The worlds' (αἰῶνας) —that is, the whole system of created things, the created universe. Moll makes these æons (αἰῶνες) to be the laws and potencies of the spiritual world, out of which have sprung, secondarily, the things which are seen, and which thus form the contrast to the 'things which appear.' But as it seems to me without reason, and to the great detriment of the simplicity and justness of the thought. 'The word of God' is not here the Logos, the hypostatic Word, but (as 1 : 4) the *utterance*, the decree or fiat of God (ῥῆμα) referring, probably, to the language, 'And God said.' 'In order that' (εἰς τό, implying purpose, not result).[1] This arrangement was made, and we made to discern rationally by faith the truth that the world has been framed by the word of God, in order that [to our apprehension] what is seen should not have sprung from what appears, in order that we might clearly see that the objects and phenomena which we behold have a higher than merely sensible origin. While man in his original constitution was made to see God in nature, by the fall he has lost that power, at least, that disposition. He now naturally banishes or ignores God in creation; he rests in material causes; he refers back the things which are seen to sensible causes and phenomena. Sin has cut the bond which, to the eye of man, unites the universe with the Creator. Faith restores that bond. It reunites the severed links of the great chain; it enables man to rise above the sphere of sensible causes, and once more see in the universe, with all its phenomena, a product of spiritual power. This is the simple teaching of the passage. It gives to faith its place as the grand power that binds the creation to the Creator. It is an exemplification, then, of that second element

[1] The εἰς τό here, and the τοῦ μή of verse 5, may, indeed, denote simple result.

4 By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.

4 things which do appear. By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, through which he had witness borne to him that he was righteous, [1]God bearing witness [2]in respect of his gifts: and through it he being dead yet speaketh.

1 The Greek text in this clause is somewhat uncertain.....2 Or, *over his gifts.*

of faith; namely, that it is a 'conviction of things which are not seen.' The creation wrought by the word of God, by a spiritual agency, is an unseen, spiritual fact, which experience has shown can only be apprehended by faith. The wisdom of Greek philosophy never attained to it, hardly dreamed of it.

As to the construction. Many have taken the phrase μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων as equivalent to ἐκ τῶν μὴ φαινομένων, *from the things which do not appear*, and regarded this as equivalent to *nothing*, thus making the sentence signify "that that which is seen may [in their estimation] have sprung from nothing." But this would be totally to mistake the purpose of the writer. He has no wish or design to exalt *nothing*. It is not *nothing*, but God, from whom he declares all things to have sprung. This construction of 'not' (μή) is, indeed, barely possible; but even then we are under no necessity of supposing that the writer has made use of so awkward a periphrasis to express 'nothing'; on the contrary, it is much more natural to understand 'the things which do not appear' as spiritual powers and agencies.

But a far more natural construction of the 'not' (μή), and that now generally adopted, is with 'sprung' (γεγονέναι), "in order that not from things which appear may have sprung that which is seen." The inquiry, then, arises, "What is the antithesis to the 'things which appear,' and from which faith *does* recognize them to have sprung?" Moll declares it to be the æons before mentioned—spiritual laws and potencies; but, as it seems to me, with nothing to justify his intepretation, either in the thought or the language. Delitzsch contrasts with "*things which appear*" (φαινομένων) "intelligible things" (νοητά), invisible archetypes or patterns, after which, as existing in the divine mind, sensible and material things were constructed. This Platonic turn of the thought nothing in the passage warrants. It would seem that the antithesis to the "things which appear" lies on the very face of the passage, and in the natural drift and exigencies of thought. The writer is illustrating his definition of faith as a conviction of unseen things. What are these things? Simply God, with that system of truth of which he is the centre. By faith, then, we recognize that the universe has been framed *by the word of God*, in order that that which is seen, the phenomenal world on which we look, may be seen to have sprung, not from things which appear, but from what?—clearly from the word and power of God. Faith raises us from phenomenal to spiritual causes; from second and inefficient causes to the Supreme, the one great First Cause. Nothing can be simpler; and the passage thus interpreted is luminous and eloquent with a beautiful and fundamental truth.

4. By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent (πλείονα, *more, larger*—that is, qualitatively, in all the true attributes of a sacrifice; hence, *better*) **sacrifice than Cain.** In what respect better? Abel was a shepherd; Cain a husbandman; Abel brought of the first fruits of his flock; Cain of the first fruits of his field. Both were probably ostensibly thank offerings; neither of them ostensibly propitiatory. Yet Abel brought a *bloody* sacrifice, such as might befit a guilty person needing expiation before God. As each, however, brought the offering which belonged naturally to his vocation, it might seem that the difference was accidental, and that Abel brought his offering with as little consciousness of guilt and of a need of atonement as Cain. Our author, however, expressly declares that Abel brought his better offering by faith; thus, while he brought an intrinsically more appropriate sacrifice for a guilty being—a sacrifice of blood—the choice was not accidental, but was dictated by faith. In other words, there was already a recognition of man's need of an atonement, and a dim premonition and greeting in this very dawn of time, of the great oblation of Calvary. His faith embraced both elements; it embraced a conviction of unseen realities, and confidence in anticipated good. **By** (*through*) **which he obtained witness that he was**

5 By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God.

5 By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and he was not found, because God translated him: for [1] he hath had witness borne to him that before his translation he had been well-pleasing

[1] Or, *before his translation he hath had witness borne to him.*

(*he was attested to be*) **righteous.** 'Through which' (ἧς) may refer either to 'faith' or 'sacrifice.' Grammatically, from its position, it would refer rather to the latter, and this makes a perfectly good sense, as in fact it was his sacrifice which, at least for history, produced the attestation. Still, as 'faith' is the prevalent idea, it is better, perhaps, to take it as referring to faith, and the 'through which he was attested' as corresponding to the 'were attested in this' of ver. 2. The testimony referred to is here not that of Christ (see above Matt. 23 : 35), but the testimony of God at the time, as borne both in his reception of the offering, and his subsequent avenging of the murder of the offerer. **God testifying of his gifts.** This refers to the declaration (Gen. 4 : 4) that 'God had respect to,' looked with approval upon, Abel and his offering, and undoubtedly signalized his acceptance by an outward sign, probably by consuming the victim with lightning. Some such manifest expression must be assumed, in order to account for the outburst of envy and wrath in Cain.

And by it (that is, clearly, by faith) **he being dead**—*after dying, though dead*—**yet** (*still*) **speaketh.** It seems extraordinary that the Greek interpreters, Chrysostom, Theodoret, with many more recent, should have taken the *still* here temporally, of the time of the author, and the verb 'speaketh' (λαλεῖ), also of the then present time; making the passage declare that through faith Abel still speaks to all after ages, exhorting them to faith (Chrysostom), or, *is spoken of* (equivalent to λαλεῖται, *is celebrated*, Theodoret). This, indeed, is a proper thing to say of Abel, as of any other ancient worthy, and no more of him *than* of any other, unless, perhaps, the author may choose to regard that voice with which after death Abel cries to God as still sounding on through the ages. But *that* voice was not an exhortation to faith, nor is it a voice of eulogy on the martyr. There can be no reasonable doubt, I think, that the passage refers to the crying of Abel's blood in the ears of God, immediately after his murder. The word *still* (ἔτι) is logical, not temporal, and by familiar Greek usage refers back to the participle; the verb 'speaketh' is the historical present, the two forming a sharp contrast to the preceding participle, 'upon dying, he still speaks'—he speaks even after he dies. 'The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground.' It was Abel's faith that caused God to hear, as it were, the cry of his blood as it sunk into the ground and to bring to account him who shed it. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." Faith gives a voice to their wrongs in the ear of God.

5. By faith Enoch was translated—here elliptically; *by faith Enoch was enabled so to live that he was translated.* 'Translated'—that is, removed, from this world to God. "Withdrew to the divinity" (Josephus, "Antiquities 1 : 3, 4). We have here the inspired comment on the brief statement, Gen. 5 : 21. **That he should** (*might*) **not see death.** The Greek naturally means, *in order that he might not see*, rather than, 'so as not to see.' Nor is there any difficulty in this. God did not merely take Enoch, so that he *did* not, but with the purpose that he *should* not, 'see death.' He designed to snatch him away from the clutches of death, and thus vindicate his extraordinary piety, and perhaps give to that elder time a token of a future existence. **And he was not found, because God translated** (*removed*) **him.** The phrase is the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew, "and was not because God took him." **For before his translation he** (*has*) **had witness borne to him that he** (*has been attested to have*) **pleased God.** The phrase 'pleased God' (εὐαρεστεῖν τῷ θεῷ) is again the Septuagint for the Hebrew "walked with God," and expresses its substantial meaning, denoting that intimacy, that walking with God, which is the result and reward, as well as the process, of a life of piety. The passage admits one or two different constructions. If we take the 'before his removal' with 'has been attested'—that is, 'he has been attested before his removal'—then probably the preposition 'before' is to be taken *locally*, and the words 'his removal'

6 But without faith *it is* impossible to please *him:* for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and *that* he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.
7 By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.

6 unto God: and without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing *unto him:* for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and *that* he is a rewarder of
7 them that seek after him. By faith Noah, being warned *of God* concerning things not seen as yet, moved with godly fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; through which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is

for the passage which records his removal. Thus we have: "For before the record of his removal he has had the testimony borne to him that he pleased God," as in fact the declaration that he pleased God immediately precedes the statement that he was not found because God took him. If, on the other hand, we take the clause 'before his removal' with the verb 'to have pleased,' then the preposition is to be taken *temporally*, and we have, "for he stands attested previously to his removal to have pleased God." The perfect, 'he has been attested' (μεμαρτύρηται), probably denotes that the fact of the attestation stands before our eyes.

6. The author proceeds with his usual deliberation. He has not yet given his proof, only collected the materials for it. We have found that Enoch enjoyed the extraordinary prerogative of escaping death. But this was because 'he pleased God;' and the author now draws his inference. **But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God**—not (as some), "he who goes to God as did Enoch," but, as in former chapters, "he who approaches God in sacrifice and worship" (4:16; 7:24; 10:22) **must believe that he is**—must have that element of faith which is a conviction of unseen realities, of spiritual truth. **And that he is** (*proves*) **a rewarder of them that diligently** (*earnestly*) **seek him**—must have that other element of faith which consists in confidence in future blessings, as the result and reward of present fidelity. Thus faith always looks into the unseen and forward to the future. We cannot truly believe that God *is*, without also believing that he exists as a Being who cares for and will reward virtue. The *must* (δεῖ), *it is necessary*, expresses, however, rather a logical than a moral necessity. It behooves, indeed, every one to believe that God is; but here the author is establishing a point, and the 'must' marks simply the necessary connection between his premise and his conclusion.

7. We pass from Enoch to the hero of the flood. **By faith Noah, being warned of God**—*concerning things not seen as yet;* that is, of God's purpose to destroy the world by a deluge. Of that deluge there were not as yet the slightest sensible indications. The declaration of God, communicated we know not how, was Noah's only evidence in the case, and his act therefore was an act of pure faith in a Being unseen, and an event wholly beyond the sphere of sense. Noah's faith, too, was doubtless sorely tried. He built the ark slowly before an unbelieving and mocking world. Often must he have been sorely tempted to abandon the work which they stigmatized as foolish and fanatical, and join them in that careless revelling, that utter disregard of everything beyond the present (Matt. 24:37-40), which characterized them—"they knew not till the flood came and destroyed them all"—but he persevered in faith. **Moved with fear** (*in reverent fear or foresight*), **prepared an ark to the saving** (*safety*) **of his house.** 'Moved with fear' is not a very happy rendering of the verb (εὐλαβηθείς). Either 'in reverent fear' or 'in reverent foresight.' I prefer the former: 'giving reverent heed to the divine declarations.' **By** (*through*) **which he condemned the world.** 'Through which' might (as Chrysostom and many) agree with 'ark'; he condemned the world through the ark which he built; or, with salvation, 'safety'; he condemned the world through the salvation which he obtained by building the ark. Neither of these meanings is entirely inapposite. Yet it is better, doubtless, in conformity with the controlling idea of the chapter, to refer it to faith. By faith he condemned the world. His long, patient, believing, waiting upon God, while the ark was preparing and the world was scoffing, itself pronounced condemnation on an unbelieving and scoffing world, *and he*, on the other hand, **became heir** (*inheritor*—that is, *possessor*) **of the righteousness which is by** (*according to*) **faith.** The expression has reference, probably, to the fact that Noah is the first who in the Old Testament is expressly

8 By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went.
9 By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as *in* a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise:

8 according to faith. By faith Abraham, when he was called, obeyed to go out unto a place which he was to receive for an inheritance; and he went out, not
9 knowing whither he went. By faith he became a sojourner in the land of promise, as in a *land* not his own, [1]dwelling in tents, with Isaac and Jacob, the

1 Or, *having taken up his abode in tents.*

called 'righteous.' (Gen. 6 : 9; compare Ezek. 14 : 14, 20.) Some have supposed, but with no sufficient reason, that Noah is called 'heir' or 'inheritor' of the righteousness of faith, as entering into and, as it were, inheriting that righteousness which had already belonged to Abel and Enoch. It has probably a single and absolute reference to Noah. Noah was a righteous man and a 'preacher of righteousness'; but as in the author's conception (or in the fact of the case) there could be no righteousness that did not rest upon faith in invisible and spiritual realities, his righteousness is called, in conformity with the main tenor of the chapter, 'the righteousness according to faith.' There could be no other, for none could be righteous who did not please God, and without faith it is impossible to please him. I do not see the necessity of supposing any polemical reference to Paul's doctrine of the 'righteousness of faith.' The standing point of the two writers is entirely different. Paul is discussing the principle of justification in view of the claims of the moral law, and the atonement of a manifested and crucified Saviour. Our author considers that principle as operating long ages before there was any distinct exhibition of the atonement. Paul's mode of stating the doctrine of faith in relation to Abraham (Rom. 4) will be found on examination to coincide precisely with that of our author. Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Just so according to this chapter, Noah, Abraham, Moses, etc. Every act of faith in the saints of the Old Testament involved the *generic* character of that faith which in the gospel concentrates itself upon the person and finished work of Jesus Christ. They trusted God, they took him at his word; they felt a sense of unworthiness and a need of forgiveness, and discerning dimly, very dimly, the rudiments of a gracious economy, cordially and savingly embraced it.

(*b*) Example of Abraham and Sarah. (8-12.)

8. By faith Abraham, when he was called—*being called*—that is, *being summoned* (Gen. 12 : 1-4); not "he who was called Abraham," as some, led by the present participle, have supposed. The present participle is finely used to denote that, not '*upon* being called' (κληθείς), but '*while* being called' (καλούμενος) he obeyed. His obedience responded instantly and half anticipatingly to the call. **Obeyed**—hearkened obediently to the call (ὑπακούω, the word being selected as corresponding to καλεῖν). The call of Abraham was to abandon his country and go forth into a region which God should show him; he hastened **to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance**—this place was Canaan. **And he went out, not knowing whither he** *cometh*—historical present for *went*. Abraham's trust was absolute and extraordinary. It was not until he reached Canaan that he knew even his place of destination. But his faith embraced the elements of a conviction of the unseen, and confidence in future good. Like a child, he placed his hand in the hand of this unseen Father, to be led whither he himself knew not.

9. By faith he sojourned in (παρῴκησεν, in classic Greek, *dwelt along side;* in Hellenistic Greek, dwelt as stranger or sojourner); 'sojourned into' (εἰς), a pregnant construction for '*went into and sojourned there*,' as is common in Greek. **The land of promise**—the land which God promised to give to his posterity, Acts 7 : 5. **As in a strange** (*an alien*) **country**—as, though promised to his posterity, yet belonging to another people, and himself as having in it no right of possession. "God did not give to him of the land so much as to put his foot on." In what, then, did Abraham's faith consist? Was it in his sojourning in a land which did not belong to him, on the strength of the promise that his posterity should receive it? Or was it in his dwelling in a land which his posterity were to receive, and which thus was by anticipation his, as if it belonged to strangers, and thus declaring himself a pilgrim on the earth? Doubtless

10 For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker *is* God.
11 Through faith also Sarah herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she

10 heirs with him of the same promise: for he looked for the city which hath the foundations, whose
11 [1] builder and maker is God. By faith even Sarah herself received power to conceive seed when she

1 Or, *architect.*

his faith embraced both elements. He sojourned, under the promise of God, in a land of strangers, on the strength of God's promise that it should belong to his posterity. Again, although it was thus in some sort his own, he sojourned in it *as* belonging to strangers, and thus, neither returning to his old home, nor having any present home, he lived in a state of voluntary exile, seeking a country and a city to come. It is then his sojourning in this land, *as an alien land*, that the writer has now specially in view, as in so doing he renounced all earthly inheritance, and declared his trust in a higher spiritual and future good. Both the elements of faith entered largely into his —a conviction of unseen realities, confidence in future good.

Dwelling in tabernacles with (not σύν, *together with*, implying accompaniment, but μετά, *in common with*, implying participation). Isaac, to be sure, dwelt in tents *in company* with Abraham, but Jacob did not. **Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise.** Abraham, though rich in herds and flocks and servants, was prohibited from building or occupying any town, or even permanent dwelling house. His mode of life, as well as that of his sons, was primitive and nomadic; he lived in tents, which enabled him easily to transport himself from one place to another. Something of this may be due to the migratory habits of an Oriental nomad chief, but much more, we may be sure, to that divine dispensation which made the life of Abraham, in its perpetual demand for and exercise of faith, a pre-eminent pattern for the believers who were to be his spiritual offspring.

10. For he looked for a (*was awaiting the*) **city which hath foundations** (or, *the foundations*). Not (with Grotius and some) the earthly Jerusalem—a reference so inapposite that it seems inexplicable how any should have so understood it—but the Jerusalem which is above (Gal. 4 : 26), "the heavenly Jerusalem, the city of the living God" (12 : 22), which hath foundations (see Rev. 21 : 14, for the foundations of the Jerusalem descended from God out of heaven), and which is thus stable and abiding, as against the changing and temporary character of tent life. That Abraham was with a distinct consciousness looking for the heavenly Jerusalem as his future home, we need not assert nor suppose. The latent elements of the Old Testament faith come first to clear consciousness in the New, and in the light of its clearer revelations the New Testament writers can both interpret the dark hints of the Old and the real nature and objects of the faith of the early saints. But that such was the real essence of that faith we may infer from those traditions of the Synagogue and articles of Jewish belief which gradually explicated themselves out of the Old Testament records, and prepared the way for the fuller revelations of the gospel. Martha's declaration to our Lord that her brother should rise again at the resurrection at the last day seems but the more articulate utterance of the faith of those ancient worthies (see ver. 35 and compare 2 Macc. 7) who laid down their lives in hope of 'a better resurrection,' thus assuring us that even the doctrine of the resurrection was not without its Old Testament foreshadowings. So the heavenly, as contrasted with the earthly Jerusalem, is a Jewish doctrine before the coming of Christ and its descent to earth after the Second Coming, as in Revelation, is in harmony with Jewish belief respecting what should happen in the times of the Messiah.

Whose builder and maker (*whose architect and builder*) **is God**—(as *planner* of this city God is its τεχνίτης; as its actual *founder and builder*, its δημιουργός).

11. Through faith also Sarah herself. This emphasis on Sarah either as contrasted with her husband, who, as the head of the woman and as being pre-eminent in faith, would naturally in this relation be alone noticed; or, as having been previously barren; or (with Lünemann, Delitzsch, Moll, etc.) because she had at the first been unbelieving as to God's promise (Gen. 18 : 12, 15), whence her transition to a state of faith was the more remarkable. **Received strength to conceive**

was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised.
12 Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, *so many* as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable.
13 These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced *them*, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.
14 For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country.

was past age, since she counted him faithful who
12 had promised: wherefore also there sprang of one, and him as good as dead, *so many* as the stars of heaven in multitude, and as the sand, which is by the sea shore, innumerable.
13 These all died [1]in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were
14 strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things make it manifest that they are seek-

1 Gr. *according to.*

seed (*for the founding of an offspring*), or with many (as Chrysostom, Theophylact, etc.), 'for the reception and conceiving of seed.' **When she was past age** (*and that contrary to the period of her life*), as she was now past the age at which offspring might have been expected, even had she previously had children. **Because** (*since*) **she counted him faithful who had promised.** Thus Sarah, like Abraham, her lord, staggered not at the promise through unbelief, believing that what God had promised he was able to accomplish. "Against hope"—that is, against all rational ground of probability she believed in hope.

12. Therefore sprang there, etc.— *Wherefore also there were begotten from one* (Abraham), *and that, too, when become as dead* (νενεκρωμένον, *deadened*, having lost his reproductive power. The same epithet is applied to Abraham's body (Rom. 4 : 19), as also to the like condition of Sarah); [*a seed*]; *as the stars of the sky in multitude, as the sand which is along the border of the sea, the innumerable.* Such are the terms of the promise to Abraham. (Gen. 13 : 16; 15 : 5; 22 : 17, etc.) And the promise has been, and will be fulfilled, alike in Abraham's natural and his spiritual seed.

(*c*) Retrospective glance at the above-cited believers. (13–16.)

13. These all (*Abraham 'and the patriarchs, not the antediluvian worthies*) **died in faith**—not, 'by faith,' as before, because faith was not the *cause* of their death—**not having received the promises** (that is, *the fulfillment of them*), **but seeing and greeting them** (ἀσπασάμενοι, not, 'embracing,' but, 'saluting,' as one salutes the harbor and shore which he is approaching). That is, their death of faith corresponded to their life of faith. The declaration is not that they died in faith, because they had not received the promises, but had seen them, etc. (this would require οὐ κομισάμενοι instead of μή); but their death was a death in accordance with faith, as being a death of those who had not received the promise, but who saw and greeted them; that is, the author does not tell us that these men died in faith, not in sight, and then assign as the reason that they had not received, etc. But he tells us that their death had the character of faith in that without receiving the fulfilled promises, they yet saw and greeted them from afar. **And confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims** (*sojourners*) **on the earth.** This was part of their dying in faith, that though they had not received the promises, they yet saw and greeted them; and were thus willing, in view of the higher and greater blessings which these promises held out, to regard themselves as strangers and pilgrims on the earth. The language refers to that of Abraham. (Gen. 23 : 4.) They thus showed that they had that faith which rises above the sensible, and passes beyond the present, and takes hold of unseen and enduring good.

14. For they that say such things declare plainly (*show*) **that they seek** (*are seeking*) **a** (equivalent to *their*) **country** (*a fatherland*). The man who styles himself a sojourner and an exile, clearly implies that he has in view somewhere a country which shall be to him his country, a fatherland, of which he can use that endearing language, 'my country.' The English language is unfortunate in having no single word which (without the prefix of the possessive pronoun) expresses the difference between the Greek *region, territory* (χώρα), and *native land, fatherland* (πατρίς), country as the home of one's ancestors and the place of his citizenship. This is the force of the term here. The Germans render it adequately and beautifully by "Fatherland"; we have to leave its most essential idea unexpressed and dependent on explanation. It is not natural for man to be a mere

15 And truly, if they had been mindful of that *country* from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned.
16 But now they desire a better *country*, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

15 ing after a country of their own. And if indeed they had been mindful of that *country* from which they went out, they would have had opportunity to
16 return. But now they desire a better *country*, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

cosmopolite, a rover. As his heart demands a home, so his inextinguishable sentiments demand a 'country.' The reasoning of the author is just: the very fact of these patriarchs styling themselves pilgrims and sojourners pointed to a demand of their heart and their faith for a land which they could call their country.

15. And truly, if, etc.—*And if, indeed* (when they were thus styling themselves), *they had had in mind* (were making mention of) *that* [fatherland] *from which they came forth.* If Abraham, for example, when (Gen. 23 : 4) he calls himself a sojourner and a pilgrim, had referred to his present residence as compared with the land of his birth, **they might** (*would*) **have had opportunity to return**—and return assuredly they would, argues the author, if they had had no higher and better hope in the future. No man loves to be an alien and exile; but they consented to spend a life of estrangement from country, city, and home, and the only ground and justification of their procedure is their faith that laid hold, as the reward of their earthly disfranchisement, on a future and better country.

16. But now (*as it is*, νῦν, logical, *now, as the case stands, in fact*) **they desire** (*are seeking for*) **a better country, that is, a heavenly.** If there were doubt about 'the city that hath foundations' (ver. 10), whether, that is, it refers to the earthly (as Ebrard), or to the heavenly Jerusalem, this language would seem to settle it. If they were seeking a heavenly *country*, they would surely seek the heavenly *city*—the metropolis of the country. As to the sentiment, we may well admit that our author has *explicated* more from the language of the patriarchs than was distinctly in their consciousness. They may have acquiesced in their own disfranchised and alien condition consciously on the ground of the entrance of their posterity into an inheritance which was withheld from them. But the author has not drawn more from their language and conduct than, in the light of the New Testament, was implicitly contained in them. The whole interpretation hangs together. If the lineal descendants of Abraham were not the true people of God, but only typified them; if the rest of Canaan was not the true rest, but only symbolical of the Sabbath rest into which the real Israel shall enter; if all this was actually wrapped up in these promises—then the faith of the patriarchs, which led them to submit, in view of the promises, to a long life of earthly expatriation, contained precisely that element, though half latent to themselves, which is here ascribed to it. The whole gist of the matter is involved in that remarkable language of Christ: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad." (John 8 : 36.)

Wherefore God is not ashamed (*of them*) **to be called their God.** God revealed himself specially as the 'God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob' (Exod. 3 : 6; Acts 3 : 13, etc.), which indeed became his familiar designation. The extraordinary faith of these patriarchs, their lifelong expatriation in simple reliance on his promise—a promise which in their day never seemed to have advanced a step toward realization—earned for them this eminent prerogative. On the other hand, that it was still an act of *condescension* in God; that, extraordinary as was their faith, it could lay him under no obligation so to honor them, is here (as at 2 : 11, where the like term is applied to the Redeemer's entering into brotherly relations with his people) beautifully implied in the 'not ashamed' (αἰσχύνεται). God *has* to humble himself in allowing himself to be so designated.

For he hath prepared for them a city. This again not the earthly, but the heavenly Jerusalem, the city of the living God, which is here represented as prepared for the patriarchs. This is in conformity with the typology of the context. God gave their natural seed the earthly Canaan; he gave to their spiritual seed, along with them, the heavenly Canaan. He built, or had built for their literal seed, the earthly Jerusalem; he built himself ('whose architect and builder was God') for their spir-

17 By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten *son*.
18 Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called:

17 By faith Abraham, being tried, [1] offered up Isaac; yea, he that had gladly received the promises was
18 offering up his only begotten *son*; even *he* [2] to whom
19 it was said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called: ac-

1 Gr. *hath offered up*.....2 Or, *of*.

itual seed, and of course for them in an eminent degree, the heavenly Jerusalem. The city is, of course, again placed in contrast with the movable tent, which marked their migratory and shifting life. [The logical 'for' (γάρ) states the ground on which we *know* that he was not ashamed, etc. It states a single point as illustrative of that truth.]

(*d*) Examples of the Jewish patriarchs. (17-22.)

17. Another feature illustrative of faith in the life of the 'father of the faithful.' As Abraham was indebted to his own faith and Sarah's for the birth of Isaac, so his faith received another extraordinary trial in regard to him. Many have taken offense at the incipient offering of Isaac, but I do not see on what just grounds. He who gives life has a right to take it in what manner he pleases, and it lies as much in his sovereign pleasure to commission a father to plunge the sacrificial knife into the bosom of a child as to commit the taking of life to the agencies of nature, or to the ministers of civil justice. The only thing required to justify the command on the one hand, and the implicit obedience on the other, is the evidence that there are, or may be, sufficient intrinsic grounds for the proceeding. These, I think, can be discovered in the present case. Looking upon Isaac as the heir of promise, this command to put him to death was perhaps the severest test to which Abraham's faith in God could possibly be put. Looking again at him as a type of Christ, and at the probable place of the transaction as the scene of the great substitutionary sacrifice of the ages, we see reason for God's selecting precisely this form of trial; and it no more indicates a barbarous age than does his demand for the expiatory blood of Christ as the only salvation of humanity, or his committing to human tribunals the universal right to take life for adequate offenses. So long as sin is in the world, death will reign in every form in which the righteous Moral Ruler sees fit to inflict it.

By faith Abraham, when he was (*being*) **tried,** (*hath*) **offered up Isaac.** The perfect tense, instead of the aorist, represents the act as performed and on record before the eyes of man. The perfect brings it into relation to the present time. It is here also spoken of as done; "he has offered him up," because in fact the entire act was contemplated in his faith, and the failure to consummate it was, so far as concerned Abraham's faith, a mere accident. He intended when he bound Isaac on the altar to slay him; any mental reservation would have vitiated his faith. When the writer, however, throws the act back into the past he states the case more exactly. **And he that had received** (*accepted*) **the promises.** Abraham had not merely 'received' (δέχομαι) the promises; he had 'accepted' them (ἀναδέχομαι), i.e. had appropriated them, acted on them, and thus seemingly exposed his whole plan and course of life to utter subversion and overthrow by this act of obedience. **Offered** (*was offering*) **up** (*started to offer up, commenced offering up*—here the author, in resuming, is more exact) **his only begotten.** The epithet 'only begotten' sharpens the conception of the faith involved in the act. It does so doubly, since to slay his only begotten would be doubly wounding to the parental heart, and since after this 'only begotten' there was no one left in whom the great promises to which he had sacrificed his earthly life could be realized. The latter is here probably the point mainly in view.

18. Of (*in relation to*) **whom it was said.** The rendering "to whom" referring "whom" to him 'who had accepted the promises' to Abraham, is more generally adopted, but I believe erroneously. The preposition (πρός with the accusative) will bear equally well the rendering 'in relation to' (see 1 : 7, 8), and the 'whom' then refers to the 'only begotten' Isaac. Either construction is possible, but with the latter the quotation becomes more forcible and of more pregnant import. **That in Isaac shall thy seed be called.** (Gen. 21 : 12.) This again is added as heightening our impression of his faith, by showing how com-

19 Accounting that God *was* able to raise *him* up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure.

counting that God *is* able to raise up, even from the dead; from whence he did also in a figure receive

pletely his obedience was to subvert the promise.

19. Accounting (*estimating*, coming to a rational conclusion) **that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead**—or better, as a general truth, *That God is able even to raise from the dead.* This consideration might seem at first view to detract from the faith of Abraham. If he reflected that God could, and thought it very possible that he would, raise Isaac from the dead, the difficulty and heroism of putting him to death seem greatly diminished. But here is precisely the pith of the writer's argument. He has not in mind the struggle of Abraham's feelings in yielding up his only begotten son, his heroism in performing a difficult and dreadful act, but the *implicitness and absoluteness* of that faith which enabled him to do it. For Abraham to have proceeded to slay Isaac in accordance with the divine command, but with the conviction or the fear that the promise was thus to be nullified, would have been an act of obedience indeed, but by no means distinctively an act of faith. His faith consisted in reconciling the great seeming contradictions in the circumstances of the case. He had received promises guaranteed by the veracity of Jehovah, whose fulfillment required the life of Isaac, and he was now commanded to perform an act which, to the eye of sense, extinguished those promises forever. Abraham did not seize either one horn of the dilemma. He did not either cling to the promise and refuse the sacrifice, or yield obedience and abandon the promise. His obedience did not hesitate, and his faith did not falter. He believed that God could and would fulfill his promise, and that in this fulfillment he would raise Isaac from the dead. Thus it is not mere *moral heroism*, the sacrifice of paternal affection, despairing obedience, that the author is here celebrating; but *faith*, confidence in spiritual realities—a belief that God *is*, and that he will accomplish his promises and reward his servants. It is faith in its double aspect of confidence in what is hoped for, and conviction of what is unseen.

From whence also he received him in a figure (*back*). Of all the interpretations put on this much disputed clause, this is, on the whole, perhaps liable to the least objection. It lies naturally in the words, takes 'figure' (παραβολῇ) in its usual New Testament sense, and makes an unexceptionable and appropriate meaning. We must be careful, however, not to reduce the meaning of 'in a figure' (ἐν παραβολῇ) to a mere 'as it were' or 'so to speak' (ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν), which deprives it of all its force. We must give it, on the contrary, its full signification. Abraham considered that God was able to raise Isaac from the dead, and from the dead he symbolically received him. Isaac, stretched upon the altar, lay in a typical death. He did not really feel the power of death, but lay in its likeness or image; and in a likeness or symbol, as one who had been devoted to death and subject to its power, his father received him back. It can scarcely be doubted that the author regards Isaac here as a type of Christ, and that in this latent view lies the real explanation. Isaac was to be put to death, and underwent all the outward forms involved in dying; but finally, when God's purpose was accomplished, he was raised without actually tasting of death. He thus typified our Lord, who indeed was not only bound and condemned, but actually drank the cup of death. Still his death, after all, in comparison with ordinary human death, was as the death of Isaac; it was but a seeming, a parabolic death. Death, in the very act of striking, lost his hold upon his victim. He had over Christ no real power. The Saviour laid down his life, but he took it again; snatched himself from the mortality and corruption of the grave, and thus, like Isaac, died but in a figure (ἐν παραβολῇ). The points of resemblance then are greater than the points of contrast. Abraham received Isaac from the dead in a figure, just as the Father received his Son who was crucified. Both were condemned to death, both stretched out upon the altar; but over neither had death any power; over the one, because the slaughtering knife was arrested in its descent; over the other, because, although it fell and his blood flowed, yet it could not reach his essential vitality, nor prevent him from speedily and triumphantly emerging from the realm of death. The raising of Isaac, then, was an acted parable. It stood along-

20 By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things to come.
21 By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph: and worshipped, *leaning* upon the top of his staff.
22 By faith Joseph, when he died, made mention of

20 him back. By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau,
21 even concerning things to come. By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph; and worshipped, *leaning* upon the top of his
22 staff. By faith Joseph, when his end was nigh, made

side of, symbolized, represented, an actual raising from the dead. And the special propriety of so representing it here is that it thus points forward to a similar, but far more momentous transaction, occurring on this very spot, in which ages after, the great Son of Promise, the spiritual Isaac, in whom the seed of Abraham were to be called, was thus by his death for a moment to darken the hopes of his followers, and apparently defeat the promises, but in reality to rise again essentially untouched by its power.

To enumerate all the explanations of this difficult passage would be almost endless. I will add a few. They have turned on the different meanings given, partly to the adverb '*whence*' (ὅθεν), partly to the verb *received*, or '*recovered*' (ἐκομίσατο), but chiefly to the words 'in a figure' (ἐν παραβολῇ). In regard to the first, it has been doubted whether the adverb (ὅθεν) was to be taken locally '*from whence*,' or logically, as everywhere else in this Epistle, '*whence*,' *from which cause*. As to the second, it has been doubted whether the verb (ἐκομίσατο) meant *received*, *bore off to himself*, *obtained*, referring to the original obtaining of Isaac, or *received back*, *recovered*, referring to his present receiving him as from the dead. The meanings of the phrase 'in a figure' (ἐν παραβολῇ) are much more various. It has been read 'in a figure or symbol' (equivalent to εἰς παραβολήν); namely, of the resurrection of the dead, or of the resurrection of Christ, or of both. It has been rendered as an adverb (equivalent to παραβόλως), *unexpectedly*, *wonderfully*: 'in the way of substitution,' by the substitution of the ram; 'in his presenting or delivering him up'; 'in a bold venture,' etc.

20. By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things to come. Things still in the future, and which, therefore, he could predict only in faith in a Being at once omniscient and omnipotent. Apart from faith, all forecasting of the future is but shrewd conjecture, and all prediction is fanaticism or knavery. Isaac foretold the mutual relations of Jacob and Esau (Gen. 27 : 22-29), giving to Jacob, the younger, the preference, as is indicated also by the first place being given to him here.

21. By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both (*each of*) **the sons of Joseph.** Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen. 48 : 20) here again also, as in the blessing of Jacob and Esau, reversing the natural relations of the two, and putting the younger before the elder —a feature which made the element of faith more marked and conspicuous. Here, as in the preceding case, confidence in God, the Unseen Ruler, and the conviction that he was speaking under his inspiration, vindicated to his blessing the character of faith. **And worshipped** (*bowed in worship*), **leaning upon the top of his staff.** The Hebrew is supposed to mean "And prostrated himself in worship upon the head of his bed"—that is, turned himself in worship so as to bring his face to the pillow. The Septuagint adopted a different pointing from the Masoretic (reading מַטֶּה, *staff*, for מִטָּה, *bed*), having in mind, perhaps (Gen. 32 · 10), "With my staff I crossed over the Jordan." The difference between the Hebrew and Septuagint was, however, of slight consequence to the author, and it was not necessary to correct the version. A more serious difficulty, perhaps, is found in the fact that this worshiping of Jacob is recorded not in connection with the blessing of the sons of Joseph, but with his directing Joseph concerning his burial. (Gen. 47 : 31.) Here, again, we may simply say that the author selected that event from the closing life of Jacob, which best—or, at least, sufficiently—illustrated the patriarch's faith; and, in connection with this, introduced the equally pertinent fact of his 'worshiping' as also illustrative of his faith. The close connection in which the two events stand render the transfer easy. He might have mentioned that just alluded to, or the blessing pronounced in the spirit of prophetic faith on all his sons (Gen. 49), but he lets one example stand for the whole.

22. By faith Joseph, when he died—*when dying* (τελευτῶν); *ending his life* (Gen. 50 : 26, ἐτελεύτησε)—**made mention of the departing of the children** (*sons*) **of Israel; and gave**

the departing of the children of Israel; and gave commandment concerning his bones.
23 By faith Moses, when he was born, was hid three months of his parents, because they saw *he was* a proper child; and they were not afraid of the king's commandment.
24 By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter;
25 Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season;

mention of the departure of the children of Israel;
23 and gave commandment concerning his bones. By faith Moses, when he was born, was hid three months by his parents, because they saw he was a goodly child; and they were not afraid of the king's com-
24 mandment. By faith Moses, when he was grown up, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter;
25 choosing rather to be evil entreated with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a sea-

commandment concerning his bones. Though early transported to Egypt, and there having flourished through a long period of prosperity and power, and though his family were now all happily, and, apparently, permanently located there, Joseph yet remembered the promise, and his heart and his faith turned to the true home of Israel. His command concerning his bones was made in the full faith that, against all present appearances, the promise would yet be fulfilled, and with firm trust, therefore, in the being and the veracity of the unseen but Omnipotent Promiser. His dying request was complied with. (Ex. 13:19.) His bones were placed (Josh. 24:32) in Shechem, in the field purchased by his father.

(*e*) Example of Moses. (23–29.)

From the patriarchs of Israel, the writer passes to its great leader, Moses.

23. By faith Moses, when he was born, was hidden three months of (*by*) **his parents** (*πατέρων*—literally, *fathers;* put here for father and mother) **because they saw he was a proper child**—or, *that the child was fair* (Acts 7:20), a child 'divinely fair' (*ἀστεῖον τῷ θεῷ, fair for God*). It was no mere human admiration of its beauty that moved the parents to save the life of the child; but something in the character of its beauty, which marked it for a higher destiny, for the fulfillment of some divine purpose. Their faith consisted apparently in this—that, recognizing the child as born for some special mission, they disobeyed the mandate of the king for his destruction. Without a divinely infused spiritual element in their motive, God would not have given them the faith for its execution. Nor did their hiding of Moses indicate a lack of faith. Precisely the reverse. Their purpose to *save* Moses in disregard of the royal edict, indicated faith, and led to their using the necessary means of saving him. Without the using of those means, faith would not have been faith, but presumption. It is not audacity, nor mere courage, that the author celebrates, but faith—the divinely inspired principle that believes in the future and beholds the unseen.

24. By faith Moses, *when he was grown up—being grown* to manhood; literally, *becoming large, or grown* (Exod. 2:11); according to Acts 7:23, about forty years old; not, as some, "becoming great in reputation and power"—**refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter.** The absence of the article before 'daughter' may be accidental; or it may be intended to turn attention from the person to the rank—a daughter of the royal family of Egypt. This refusal (or, denial) may not have been made on any specific occasion. His refusal was a practical one; it first evinced itself outwardly, and, perhaps, to his own consciousness, in the *acts* by which he showed that his heart and his allegiance were with his people and their God, perhaps by his slaying the Egyptian, and his flight to Midian. (Exod. 2:12, 15.)

25. Choosing (not, *having chosen*, as the tense of the participle allows, but does not require; the 'refusing' and the 'choosing' appear as coincident) **rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season** (*have a temporary enjoyment from sin*).

'*To suffer affliction*' (*κακουχεῖσθαι, to be ill-treated*), to meet treatment such as the Jews were then experiencing from Pharaoh, who knew not Joseph. When Moses made his choice the people were in ignominious and degrading bondage. He chose to share their fortunes, yet, in a divinely inspired faith (Acts 7:25) that through his hand God would work their salvation. We must remember that throughout this catalogue it is not natural courage or patriotism that is celebrated, but the faith that apprehends alike both the unseen and the future. 'The people of God'—the standing name of the Jews in the Old Testament, not as necessarily involving a spiritual character, but marking their divine

26 Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward.

26 son; accounting the reproach of [1] Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he looked

[1] Or, *the Christ.*,

selection. God had chosen the patriarchs, and they had expanded into 'a people.' Under Moses they were to become an organized community—the Old Testament 'people of God.' 'The temporary enjoyment of sin'—not exactly equivalent to our phrase, "The pleasures of sin for a season." The reference is not to what are strictly called sinful pleasures. The 'enjoyment' which Moses renounced might have been, under other circumstances, perfectly legitimate. It *was* legitimate in the case of David and Solomon—the power and splendor of a throne. Moses could purchase them only by that apostasy from God in which the author (led partly, perhaps, by the peculiar circumstances of his readers) finds the essence of all sin (3:12, 13; 10:26); and called, as was Moses, to the deliverance of his enslaved countrymen, he could purchase this earthly rank and greatness only by turning his back on his calling, his people, and his God. He could have purchased it only by 'sin.' 'Sin,' here, is not the genitive of the object, but of the subject. It is not the enjoyment which consists in sin, but the enjoyment which would have arisen from sin.

26. Esteeming (*accounting*) **the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt**—which as sovereign of Egypt he would have enjoyed, but which would have brought to him less true happiness, and therefore less real wealth, than 'the reproach of Christ.' Of this brief phrase it is difficult to reach the exact meaning. Moses' choice had of course reference to the condition of the Israelites when he made it. They were suffering outrage, indignity, reproach. This Moses chose to suffer along with them. This 'reproach' and contumely endured by the people, into which Moses entered, was 'the reproach of Christ.' It is not, then, merely such reproach as Christ endured, or such reproach as his service imposes. The 'reproach,' the shame of the people, were the reproach, the shame of Christ, which Moses took upon himself in casting in his lot with the people of God. In what sense, then, were the wrongs and outrages inflicted on the chosen people the reproach of Christ? In a *typical* sense, says Hofmann, in that Israel in Egypt was a type of Christ in the flesh, and its bondage and sufferings, in its spiritual calling, as the predestined fountain of salvation, not merely in its natural relations, prefigured the indignities heaped on him in whom Israel's spiritual calling found its consummation. In a *mystical* sense, says Stier, in that the people of God in all times have a vital bond of union. The Old Testament believers were already members of the as yet unrevealed Head. In the *pre-existent presence* of Christ, as Logos in the Old Testament Israel, say De Wette and Tholuck; "the reproach which Moses took on himself is called the 'reproach of Christ,' as Paul calls the sufferings of Christians the sufferings of Christ—that is, Christ struggling and suffering in his church, as in his body. But this reproach is referred to him here, in view of the oneness of the Old and the New Testaments, and the Eternal Logos ruling in the former." Delitzsch unites all these ideas, with the added thought of a certain preparation for the incarnation and sufferings of Christ running through the history of ancient Israel, and thus finding it dimly pointed to in this ignominy and reproach of the people of God in Egypt.

A moment's survey of Moses' peculiar position may reconcile us to this complex conception. Beyond all preceding believers, Moses typified Christ. He was the Old Testament apostle, the commissioned one of God. He was the Old Testament deliverer, the rescuer of God's people from bondage. He was the human founder of the Old Testament household of God. And in all these capacities he was the direct antitype of our Lord. He wrote and prophesied of Christ. In him the Messianic promise arose on the world with a fullness and clearness which it had not assumed before. The typical character of the Old Testament history was deepening, and all the relations of Moses were pregnant with Messianic significance. In a sense, therefore, which could be attributed to none of his predecessors, the shame and reproach into which

27 By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible.
28 Through faith he kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the firstborn should touch them.

27 unto the recompense of reward. By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he en-
28 dured, as seeing him who is invisible. By faith he [1]kept the passover, and the sprinkling of the blood, that the destroyer of the firstborn should not touch

1 Or, *instituted*. Gr. *hath made*.

Moses entered were the shame and reproach of Christ.

27. By faith he forsook (*quitted*) **Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king.** Interpreters have widely differed on this passage, whether it refers to Moses' first leaving of Egypt for the Land of Midian, or his second and final quitting of it for Canaan. The early expositors generally referred it to the former; Calvin and many succeeding scholars (as Böhme, Bleek, Ebrard) to the latter; while Bengel, De Wette, Tholuck, Lünemann, Delitzsch, Moll, espouse the older view. It seems to me that the older view is almost certainly right. As to the relative importance of the two events, while the later one assumes the greater formal magnitude, yet really the flight into Midian was intrinsically not less significant, as decisive of Moses' whole subsequent career. It was pre-eminently in this that he turned his back on Egyptian royalty, and sealed his adherence to the fortunes of his people. It may have been this flight which declared his emphatic refusal to be called the son of a daughter of Pharaoh. The term applied to his leaving, *quitted, abandoned* (κατέλιπεν), though it might indeed be applied to the Exodus, seems here "to point to something personally and exclusively pertaining to Moses." Also the phrase "not fearing the wrath of the king" is, on the whole, I think, more favorable to this view. In the later Exodus there was no immediate question of the wrath of the king (though he did finally pursue with his army the retreating Israelites); but in his first withdrawal he fled directly from the wrath of the king. But this is no real impeachment of the author's accuracy. Moses fled from the wrath of the king, because he would not succumb to his will, and because he had chosen a course which defied his power. The immediate act of flight was (like his parents' hiding him when he was an infant) an act of prudent fear; the general decision and course which rendered that flight necessary was a practical defiance, in faith, of Egypt's sovereignty, and a turning of his back on all the greatness it could offer him. Moses' course in either of the two departures was determined and pursued in practical and open defiance of the wrath of the king;[1] but the language seems more especially applicable to the first, besides its chronological relation to the subsequently mentioned passover and crossing of the Red Sea.

For he endured, as seeing him (*the King*) **who is invisible.** As before he evinced that feature of faith which has confidence in hoped-for good, so here that element of it which believes in unseen realities. He could defy the sovereign whom he saw, because his believing eye was fixed on the Sovereign—such is evidently the ellipsis—whom he saw not, and whom none sees.[2] The unseen King was the King of kings.

28. Through faith he kept (Gr., *has made*) **the passover.** '*Made*' here, probably not *instituted*, but *performed, celebrated*, although the perfect tense *has made* may be used, with reference to the results of that celebration having continued down to the then present time—'he has performed that paschal rite which is the foundation of the permanent institution. **And the sprinkling** (*pouring forth*) **of blood**—the pouring or smearing of blood on the doorposts and thresholds. (Exod. 12 : 7, 22, et seq.) At this time the act was rather a sprinkling or smearing than strictly pouring, the language, perhaps, being drawn from later usage, when the blood was poured out at the foot of the altar. **Lest,** etc.—*that he who destroyed the first born might not touch them.* (Exod. 12 : 23.) Moses and the Israelites performed this paschal rite at the command of God, sprinkling the blood of the victim on the doorposts, and

[1] The faith of Moses lay in his decision, and its spiritual grounds. Having this faith and acting upon it, he would do whatever acts his choice thus made involved—to face Pharaoh, or to flee from him. When the time came to *face* him, God nerved him to do it.

[2] A like paradox and paranomasia, and in regard to a like subject (τὰ ἀόρατα καθορᾶται, there mediated by νοούμενα, see ver. 3) in Rom. 1 : 20; one of the occasional points of contact between two minds "wide as the poles asunder" in constitution and culture.

29 By faith they passed through the Red sea as by dry *land:* which the Egyptians assaying to do were drowned.
30 By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they were compassed about seven days.
31 By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace.
32 And what shall I more say? for the time would

29 them. By faith they passed through the Red sea as by dry land: which the Egyptians assaying to do
30 were swallowed up. By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they had been compassed about for
31 seven days. By faith Rahab the harlot perished not with them that were disobedient, having received
32 the spies with peace. And what shall I more say?

eating with loins girded, shoes on their feet, and staff in hand. Thus there was a double symbol and a twofold exercise of faith. Their sprinkling the blood of the lamb as a security against the Destroying Angel marked their trust in God, who had instituted means in themselves so impotent for the result; and their eating the passover girded and equipped for travel, showed their confidence that the long-delayed hour of deliverance, in spite of the king of Egypt, had come at last.

29. By faith they passed through the Red Sea as by (*through*) **dry land.** The transition to the plural, 'Israelites,' is entirely natural. It is, of course, not affirmed that faith was individually exercised by all the vast company. The act as a whole was one which demanded, and was made in, faith. Nothing but miraculous power could cause the waters to retire, and open a safe passage for the multitude through the bared bosom of the sea. And as divine power could alone produce the result, so faith in, at least, the leader of Israel, was the condition of its exercise. When Moses was bid to stretch out his rod over the sea, had he unbelievingly refused, or unbelievingly performed the act, the result would not have followed. God opened the miracles of his power, as he does those of his grace, to the call of faith. The faith which moved the arm of Moses moved also the arm of Omnipotence. Nor need this fact stumble us, for the faith itself was an inspiration of the Almighty—was the first act of the miracle. The faith that upheld the walking, and the arm that sustained the sinking, Peter, were alike the Lord's. **Which the Egyptians,** etc.—*Of which the Egyptians, making trial, were swallowed up.* "Of which"; namely, either 'dry land' (ξηρᾶς scil. γῆς), or, 'sea' (θαλάσσης), with either of which the pronoun equally well agrees; or, possibly, 'crossing' (διαβάσεως, supplied from διαβαίνω), 'of which crossing or passage,' etc. 'Swallowed up,' a forcible metaphor from the verb '*to drink up*' (καταπίνω).

(*f*) Examples from the Exodus of Israel to the time of the Maccabees. (30–40.)

30. By faith the walls of Jericho fell, etc.—*being encompassed about seven days.* 'By faith,' of the people and priests, with Joshua at their head; not necessarily a vital faith in all, though the recent wonders must have made it well nigh universal. This faith led them to perform an act not having the slightest intrinsic power or tendency to accomplish the result; and God, in reward of their faith and obedience, miraculously accomplished it. Faith here, as elsewhere, implies, as conditions of the act and result, a quality in the actor. The inhering quality leading to the result is expressed elliptically by 'By faith the walls of Jericho fell.' The faith induced the compassing, which was the outward, as faith was the inward, condition of the overthrow.

31. By faith Rahab, the harlot, perished not with them that disobeyed. (Josh. 2:6; 7:22, seq.) Rahab had been, in her previous life, like Mary Magdalene, a disreputable woman; but she was a chosen vessel of mercy, and selected to be in the ancestral line of David and of Jesus; for the like reason, I think, with the selection of Ruth, the Moabitess, and of the son of Bathsheba, to foreshadow the broadness of the coming redemption. **When she had** (*having*) **received the spies with peace.** When the Israelitish spies entered Canaan, she received them hospitably, saved them from capture, and dismissed them in peace (Josh. 2:11); and this from no treachery to her country, but from a divinely wrought conviction, founded on the wonders God had wrought, that Jehovah was God in heaven and earth, and had given them the land. For this so remarkable faith, she perished not when her people (Josh. 6:21) were consigned to destruction.

32. And what, etc.—*And why do I speak further?* or, as many, '*And what shall I say farther?*' with little difference in the sense. The author finds it vain to attempt an enu-

fail me to tell of Gideon, and *of* Barak, and *of* Samson, and *of* Jephthah: *of* David also, and Samuel, and *of* the prophets:

33 Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions,

34 Quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.

for the time will fail me if I tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah; of David and Samuel and the
33 prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped
34 the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, from weakness were made strong, waxed mighty in war, turned to flight

meration of all the ancient heroes of faith. In fact, he has just reached the period of history when they swarm thickly upon him. **For the time would** (*will*) **fail me** *in recounting concerning Gideon, Barak, Samson* — three among the judges of Israel, Gideon put before the earlier, Barak, because, perhaps, a more notable example of faith. Barak needed to be spurred on by Deborah, but still exemplified, though not in the most striking manner, the Old Testament faith. Samson, too, displays in sacred history no specially elevated character; yet, chosen and raised up by God, he wrought deliverance for his country in his name. The humblest of these Hebrew believers still stood in bright contrast with the great ones of the Gentiles. Their standard of moral action was, in many points, low; but they had a *principle* of belief and trust in the living God which *tended* to the development of all virtue. That principle, as yet wrought but imperfectly through the limited bestowment of the Spirit, whose fuller effusion was to signalize a later age. **Of Jephthah; of David also, and Samuel, and of the prophets.** David again is put before Samuel, in order, probably, to bring the latter into connection with the prophets, of whose order he might be almost regarded as the founder. 'The prophets' are Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, etc., down through the long ages of the Old Testament history.

33. Who through faith subdued kingdoms—as Gideon the Canaanites, Jephthah the Ammonites, Samson the Philistines, David many kings and kingdoms. **Wrought righteousness**—either, as kings and judges and prophets executed righteousness and judgment for the people, or in their own persons performed acts of righteousness. Of Samuel and David, and of Elijah, Elisha, and Isaiah, and many of the later prophets, this was eminently true; some earlier ones, whose lives do not shine on the page of history, still, judged by the standard of their times, doubtless often exercised high virtues. **Obtained promises** —*Realized the fulfillment of promises.* This is true, doubtless, of many earlier heroes. God promised them success, and bestowed it in response to their faith. It is, perhaps, still more emphatically true of many later ones. Joel obtained the promise of the removal of the locusts and the drought; Isaiah, of the deliverance of Jerusalem by the annihilation of the hosts of Assyria; Daniel, of the end of the Chaldean captivity. And, as they obtained the promises, so they obtained their fulfillment. **Stopped** (*shut*) **the mouths of lions.** Samson and David both fought with lions and overcame them (Judg. 14:6; 1 Sam. 17:34-36); but the reference seems specially to Daniel in the lions' den, "Who shut the mouth of the lions" (Septuagint). (Dan. 6:18.)

34. Quenched the violence (*power*) **of fire.** Expressive; not merely the *flames*, but the *power*. Reference to the three youths who (Dan. 3:1-30), for their refusal to bow to the idol of Nebuchadnezzar, were thrown into a fiery furnace, and came forth without even the 'smell of fire on their garments.' **Escaped the edge of the sword**—as David that of Saul (1 Sam. 18:11), Elijah that of Jezebel, Elisha the encompassing hosts of Syria; Jeremiah, Baruch, Ebedmelech, Gedeliah, in Chaldean times. **Out of** (*from*) **weakness were made strong.** Samson was restored from his helplessness; David often was brought up from the depths of despair; Hezekiah, brought to the verge of the grave, had his life lengthened fifteen years. **Waxed** (*became*) **valiant in fight**—proved themselves *mighty in war*—Joshua, the judges, David, and many believing and victorious heroes in the time of the kings. **Turned,** etc., *to rout armies of foreigners.* Gideon, Jonathan, and many others. Perhaps, however (with Delitzsch), in several of these latter specifications, as 'escaped the edge of the sword,' and thence on, the author has in mind, along with the earlier acts, the times of the Maccabees: "The escape of Mattathias and his sons to the mountains, the trustful uprising of the small and increasing

35 Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection:
36 And others had trial of *cruel* mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment:
37 They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented;

35 armies of aliens. Women received their dead by a resurrection: and others were [1] tortured, not accepting [2] their deliverance; that they might obtain a
36 better resurrection: and others had trials of mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and im-
37 prisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they were slain with the sword: they went about in sheepskins, in goat-

1 Or, *beaten to death*.....2 Gr. *the redemption.*

host, the first victories of Judas Maccabeus over Apollonius, Seron, etc., the formal victorious wars of the Hasmonæan heroes with the Syrians and neighboring nations. It has been alleged, indeed, that the mighty inspiration of the Maccabean period was rather human than divine, rather patriotically popular than theocratically national; but the Book of Daniel shows, in prophetic delineation of that time, a holy people of the Most High struggling with the impious, anti-Christian world-power, and claims for their struggles the greatest conceivable significance in the march of sacred history." Hence, Delitzsch regards these declarations as pointing specially to the Maccabean times.[1] This seems the more probable, as some of the immediately following examples seem, almost beyond doubt, to be taken from the Maccabees.

35. Women received their dead—*by a resurrection.* As the woman of Sarepta (1 Kings 17 : 17), her son restored by Elijah; that of the Shunamites (2 Kings 4 : 17) by Elisha. **And others were tortured** (*stretched on the wheel*), as the aged Eleazar and the seven brothers with their mother (2 Macc. 6 : 18-31 : 7, 8, seq.) tortured on the *tympanum*, a wheel-formed instrument of torture, on whose spokes the victims had their limbs extended, and were thus barbarously maltreated. **Not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection.** These Maccabean martyrs are probably placed in contrast with the women above named, whose faith serves but as a foil to that of the others. These women had faith which enabled them to receive their sons to earthly life by resurrection; the heroes of Maccabees had faith which enabled them, when their earthly life was offered them at the expense of their religion, to sacrifice it for a still better resurrection—a resurrection, not to their transitory earthly life, but of the glorified body, to life eternal. "The King of the world," said the second of the sons (2 Macc. 7 : 9), "will awaken us, dying on behalf of his laws, to a life eternal." It is an interesting question how far the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead had developed itself out of the hints of the Old Testament (as Dan. 12 : 2), so that our Saviour had not so much to announce the *fact* of the resurrection as *himself* as its author, and so that when he said to Martha, "Thy brother shall rise again," she was prepared from her antecedent teaching to reply: "I know that he shall rise in the resurrection, in the last day."

36. And others had (*received*) **trial of mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover** (*further*), **of bonds and imprisonment.** Still the heroes of the Maccabean times (1 Macc. 9 : 26; 2 Macc. 6 : 30; 7 : 37, in which the terms here used are found).

37. They were stoned. Zechariah, son of Jehoiada (2 Chron. 24 : 20-22), and, according to tradition, Jeremiah, the author turning back now to inspired history. **They were sawn asunder**—perhaps Isaiah, who is said to have experienced this fate from Manasseh. **Were tempted**—a declaration in this place, between the preceding and following verbs, unnatural and unaccountable. It is probably either a careless transcription and corruption of the preceding word ('sawn asunder, ἐπράσθησαν; 'tempted,' ἐπειράσθησαν), or a corruption of some word of kindred form (as ἐπρίσθησαν, or ἐπρήσθησαν, or ἐνεπρήσθησαν, *were burnt*). **They were slain with** (literally, *died by slaughter of*) **the sword.** The martyrdom of prophets was common in Israel, as by Ahab, Omri, etc. (1 Kings 19 : 10.) See in general Matt: 23 : 37: "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee!" **They wandered** (*went*) **about in sheepskins**—more especially Elijah, who lived a wandering, solitary, almost savage

1 It is especially worthy of note that the words παρεμβολάς, ἀλλότριοι, are favorite words in the Maccabean records.

38 Of whom the world was not worthy: they wandered in deserts, and *in* mountains, and *in* dens and caves of the earth.
39 And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise:

38 skins; being destitute, afflicted, evil entreated, (of whom the world was not worthy), wandering in deserts and mountains and caves, and the holes of
39 the earth. And these all, having had witness borne to them through their faith, received not the promise,

life, clothed in sheepskins, and still more coarsely, **in goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented** (*maltreated*). The lives of Elijah and many of those prophets of God were a perpetual succession of destitution, of affliction, and of persecution and outrage.

38. Of whom the world was not worthy—a sort of abrupt and unexpected turn. Instead of saying, 'being deemed unworthy by the world,' which would naturally stand in connection with the world's rejection of them, he adds, as it were unexpectedly, the *real* fact that the world was not worthy of them. The world repudiated as unworthy of it those of whom itself was not worthy. **They wandered** (*wandering*) **in deserts, and in mountains, and in** *caves and clefts* **of the earth.** As persons of whom the world was not worthy, God withdrew them from the world to solitary sojourn. These statements were eminently true of the Maccabean times, when, alike for leaders and followers, deserts, mountains, and caves were common places of refuge; but the author has more probably in view the Old Testament prophets; as Elijah, who fled from the rage of Jezebel into a cave of Mount Horeb, and who, as well as his successor Elisha, frequented the solitudes of Carmel; the hundred prophets whom Obadiah concealed by fifties in two caves.

The author here breaks off his enumeration, but glances back for a general summary. All these persons received their attestation through faith; all obtained an honorable record. It will be seen at a glance that the cases are of the widest diversity, and there seems at first view almost an incongruity in bringing cases so utterly unlike as the heroic sacrifices of Abraham and Moses, the resolute endurance of the Maccabean martyrs, the life-long wanderings and self-exile of patriarchs and prophets, into connection with cases such as that of Jacob blessing the sons of Joseph, and Joseph in dying giving command concerning his bones, or Moses by faith celebrating the passover. But a deeper glance shows us that they are all perfectly congruous with each other and pertinent illustrations of the principle the author is exemplifying. That which he has undertaken to commemorate is *faith*—simple trust in invisible realities, in the being and declaration and veracity of God. To this single and specific object he is entirely faithful. It matters not what external form of development it assumes, whether that of active courage, of passive endurance, of sacrifice of the affections, of prophetic utterance on the couch, of a sacrificial offering. The simple point is the *trust in God* which the act exhibits; the rising above the domain of sense into that of spirit; the clear perception, the firm conviction of spiritual realities. This may be as fully evinced by a prophetic utterance of a dying patriarch as by the warrior going forth to encounter death. In fact, it may imply completer and purer faith by how much human and earthly elements are less likely to mingle with it. The courage which rushes into battle may derive part of its inspiration, even in the son of faith, from human impulses and passions; the courage that plunges out into the unknown future, that dares unhesitating to predict what, yet hidden in its womb, no sagacity can foresee and no human power bring about, is matter of pure and absolute faith. Thus faith is contemplated in its single character of restoring the sundered tie between the soul and God, of recognizing his being, promise, power, and veracity, and the more practical form which it assumes in legitimately working itself out, is of secondary importance.

39. And these all, having obtained (*though obtaining*) **a good report through faith**—the concessive participle (μαρτυρηθέντες), *though being attested*, emphatically placed. **Received not the** (*fulfillment of the*) **promise.** The promise certainly they received, and believed, but their faith was not rewarded with possession. Far down the ages they caught a glimpse of the glorious inheritance, but did not enter into it. Abraham, who received the promise that in his seed all nations should be blessed, and who rejoiced in a vision of the day of Christ, yet saw but dimly, and

40 God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.

40 God having [1] provided some better thing concerning us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect.

1 Or, *foreseen.*

went down to the grave in faith. Prophets and kings in long succession desired to see his day, but did not see it. The Desire of the nations, the Light that was to enlighten the nations and be the Glory of Israel, did not visit them. The more immediate reference is to the present life. They lived and died in the hope, but not the possession, of the spiritual blessings vouchsafed to the days of the manifested Messiah and of the Better Covenant.

40. God having provided (*providing*) **some better thing for** (*concerning*) **us.** God withheld from them his highest gift, and reserved it for us of the Spiritual Economy. This is put encouragingly and comfortingly, *as if* God looked down the ages and had such regard for us of the later time that he held back from them his richest gifts that they and we might enter into perfection together—a gracious and perfectly legitimate way of putting the simple truth that the purposes of God are developed gradually; that he does not bring humanity at a bound to the goal of its hopes and its destinies; and that the inheritance that former ages sighed for has come to us at last.

True, these blessings are in a measure future to us as well as to them. The Sabbath rest of God, the spiritual Canaan, the eternal inheritance, are ours also, still in hope. But with immense differences in degree. We have the image (εἰκών) where they had the shadow (σκιά) of the heavenly things. We have the manifested Saviour, the outpoured Spirit, the full revelation. John, the harbinger, amid the very breaking light of the new day, and more privileged than the greatest of the Old Economy, its Davids and Isaiahs, was inferior to the humblest of the New. The perfecting (τελείωσις) that was to come with the Messiah is still indeed in the future, but the perception of it is so clear and the foretaste so rich that, compared with what is given, almost nothing seems withheld.

That they without (*apart from*) **us** *may not be perfected.* They and we are together to enter perfection; together to enter the Sabbath rest of God, and sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb. But as this is still in the future, have they as yet received no benefit from the death of Christ? Undoubtedly, they have. Whatever was their place and condition, they could not but await anxiously the development of the promises that had sustained and cheered them on earth. They could not be indifferent spectators of the grand drama of the Incarnation and the Crucifixion, of the Resurrection and the Ascension, nor fail to realize in their own immediate condition great results from those events. All Hades must have thrilled with the great fact of accomplished redemption; its gates sprang back on their hinges, and its righteous occupants rose into a hitherto unknown freedom and salvation. The boundary line between the saints of the two Dispensations was obliterated. Whatever blessedness belonged "henceforth" to the dead that died in the Lord, belonged equally to their Old Testament predecessors. It is among the prerogatives of Christian believers that they have come to the "heavenly Jerusalem, and to the spirits of the just made perfect." This must point to a different state of facts from what had existed before. Ancient men of God had died and gone into Sheol, to the spirits of the just, indeed, but not of the "just made perfect." Now, not absolutely indeed, they are still relatively perfected. All the privileges accorded to the New Testament believers are theirs. They are represented by the elders that in the vision of the Apocalypse encircle the throne of the Lamb. They dwell in the heaven of the Saints, and with all the believing dead will accompany the glorified Son of man in his Second Coming.

CHAPTER XII.

WHEREFORE, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset *us*, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us,

1 Therefore let us also, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside [1]every weight, and the sin which [2]doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that

1 Or, *all cumbrance*.....2 Or, *doth closely cling to us.* Or, *is admired of many.*

Ch. 12 : (3) *Renewed exhortation, suggested chiefly by this historical survey.* (12 : 1-29.)

(*a*) Incitement to endurance from the encompassing presence of this host of witnesses, and especially of Jesus, their Leader. (1-3.)

The preceding examples of faith have been intended, as they were eminently calculated, to inspire with fresh courage the wavering Hebrew believers. This grand procession of their believing ancestors, passing before their eyes, must have rekindled their expiring enthusiasm. The example of those old heroes and martyrs must have been as a trumpet call to the spiritual conflict. Alike what they did and what they suffered in behalf of the truth, and in confidence in unseen realities, might strengthen the feeble disciples. The apostle proceeds, however, to a direct personal application.

1. Wherefore, etc., *therefore* (emphatic deduction: τοιγαροῦν, elsewhere in the New Testament only in 1 Thess. 4 : 8) *let us also* (as well as they), *having encompassing us so great a cloud of witnesses.* The author now transfers his readers to a Grecian race course, along whose sides are grouped as spectators the whole long line of distinguished confessors and champions of the faith, whom he has just enumerated. Instead of coldly appealing to the memory and the reason, he by a magic sweep of his pen brings the whole body of them around his readers, and thus brings to bear upon them not only the force of their example, but of their ideal presence. They are exhorted to fidelity, not only by the remembrance of these illustrious heroes of faith, but also by the consciousness that they themselves are acting in the immediate presence and under the eye of the men who have wrought these deeds. Nor is this in mere figure. From their home in the clouds, from their heavenly rest, they are actually bending down to behold us. Witness (μάρτυς) is therefore to be taken here apparently in both senses; namely, that of witnesses to the faith, and witnesses, spectators of those who have now succeeded to their struggles. That the word will easily bear either signification is certain, and it seems hardly doubtful that by a sort of *usus pregnans* the author has them both in mind here. **Lay aside every weight** (ὄγκον, *bulk, inflating pride*); here, however, not probably taken in the latter ethical significance, as by Bengel, but every bulky encumbrance, everything that impedes the lightness and fleetness of our movements, as all burdens of Jewish and legal observances, all that obstructs the free spirit and action of the gospel. **And the sin which doth so easily beset us**—*the easily encompassing sin*—(εὐπερίστατον, easily standing round, readily encompassing and besetting our way) in the sense probably intended by the 'beset' of the Common Version; ready at any moment to spring upon us and arrest us in or draw us from our course. This seems, on the whole, the most natural and easy of all the manifold meanings which have been put upon this word. It is adapted to the figure of the runner who is able to be encompassed, clung to, set upon at every moment by sin, that lurks by his side or lies crouched in his path. 'Sin' is probably here as elsewhere in the Epistle conceived in the form of 'unbelief,' which shows itself in departing, falling away, from the living God. It was this unbelief and attendant disobedience by which sin deceived and slew our first parents, causing their apostasy from God; it was this, "the deceitfulness of sin," which destroyed the Israelites in the wilderness; it is the opposite of this which in the form of faith draws the soul back to God; and it is this malignant, deceitful, ever-active principle that the Christian athlete is to regard as specially impeding his course.[1] **And let us run,** etc., *let us in*

[1] Εὐπερίστατον (except in passages in Chrysostom referring to this Epistle) is found nowhere but here, and we are thrown back for its meaning on its etymology and the connection. From the active περιστάναι *to bring round, to transform*, it might be *easily transforming us*, but in no very appropriate sense. From middle

2 Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of *our* faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.

2 is set before us, looking unto Jesus the [1] author and perfecter of *our* faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of

1 Or, *captain.*

patient endurance run the race (literally, *the struggle, the contest*) *that lies before us.*[1]

2. Looking unto, *looking away from ourselves, to the Leader and Perfecter of our faith, Jesus.* Not 'author and finisher,' as one that originally produces faith in us, and then brings it to perfection. 'Leader' (ἀρχηγός) is our Conductor, the one who has preceded us on the path of faith, the great Captain of our faith as he is the Captain of salvation. Keeping in view the author's definition of faith, confidence in anticipated and unseen good, and readiness to sacrifice all for this, the meaning becomes perfectly clear. Christ led the way for his people, he set the great example of this clear-sighted faith. In view of the promised reward, of the spiritual seed that was to be given him ("Thine they were and thou gavest them me," etc.: read the whole of John 17), he renounced the heavenly glory, he did not consider even his equality with God a thing to be violently seized upon (but rather, as it were, earned by sacrifice and suffering), and yielded himself up with unshrinking and unwavering fidelity to obedience, temptation, toil, and death. He thus is the Captain, the Pioneer, the great Leader of his people on this path of faith. And as he is the Leader in this career of faith, so he is its Perfecter. As he sets to his people the great example of faith, and puts them on the path, so he brings them to the goal. As he leads his people into the trials and conflicts of faith, so he leads them out into its victory and rewards. As he entered the perilous and toilsome path to be followed by his people, so he emerges from it into triumph and glory for a like result to them. Perfected himself, he becomes the Author of eternal salvation to all that obey him. He is the Perfecter of our faith as he leads it to the enjoyment of its objects. The two terms 'Leader' and 'Perfecter' are explained in the two following clauses.

Who for the joy that was set before him endured the (*a*) **cross, despising** (*disregarding*) **the shame.** Here, then, was the grand exemplification of that principle which Moses exemplified in an humbler way, of submitting to present sacrifice and suffering in view of future good. Christ submitted even to a *cross* (the absence of the article turns attention from the individual thing to the *kind*, such a thing as a cross), making light of the shame, and all in view, like Moses, of the recompense of reward, the joy that was proposed to him in the salvation of a purified and grateful people, and here, perhaps, more particularly in his exaltation at the right hand of God. The prospect of the reward bore him up in all his depths of agony. Some translate, "*instead* of the joy set before him"—that is, instead of the continued joy which lay before him as dwelling in the bosom of the Father; but this, although easily found in the words, is less in harmony with the writer's purpose. 'For' (ἀντί) is here 'in exchange for,' as 'a compensation for,' as 'the price of.' He was willing to pay the price of his humiliation and sufferings for the glory that was in reserve (2:9); "on account of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor." **And is set down** (*hath taken his seat*) **at the right hand of the throne of God.** This was the joy set before him, the reward and crown of his sufferings. In this he was 'perfected' himself, and in this too he became the Perfecter of the faith and hope of

περιίστασθαι *to transform oneself*, it might be, as Matthäi explains here, *changeable, inconstant*, equivalent to εὐμετακίνητον: but this meaning also is here not very appropriate. The kindred words περίστατος, ἀπερίστατος, εὐκατάστατος, generally have a passive or middle signification, *surrounded*, or *standing round, well constituted, easily changed*, etc. Εὐπερίστατος, then, might be *easily stood around*, equivalent to *avoided, shunned*, and so here Chrysostom; or possibly, *easily, gladly stood around*, equivalent to *universally loved, prized*, as Ernesti: or (middle) *easily, standing round, encompassing*, and this either as a garment which clings to us and impedes our way, as De Wette, Lünemann, etc., or (as Valcknaer, Delitzsch, Ebrard,) *lurking round us*, ready to beset, entangle, ensnare us. This meaning we have adopted above, as on the whole most probable.

[1] The special ἀγών, however, here as in 1 Cor. 9:25, being the race (δρόμος). Τρέχειν δρόμον, 'to run a race,' would be more natural than τρέχειν ἀγῶνα; the latter, however, is not harsh; English, *to run in the contest.*

3 For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds.
4 Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin.

3 God. For consider him who hath endured such gainsaying of sinners against [1] himself, that ye wax
4 not weary, fainting in your souls. Ye have not yet

1 Many ancient authorities read *themselves*.

his people. His exaltation had no selfish end, but stood inseparably coupled, as did his humiliation, with the exaltation of humanity. It is clear, then, why we should look away to him who, as the Leader of our faith, entered before and for us on his path of believing obedience and suffering, and as its Perfecter, perfected himself, has taken his seat at the right hand of God to give eternal redemption to all who follow in his path of faith and suffering.

3. For consider him that (*hath*) **endured such contradiction** (*gainsaying*) **of sinners against himself,** *that ye may not weary, fainting in your souls.* The construction is equivalent to, 'for considering him, ye will not faint,' etc., again equivalent to, 'considering the gainsaying of sinners which he endured, ye will not,' etc. The thought, however, receives depth and vitality from the personality of the Lord. It is not the abstract suffering, but the concrete sufferer that is to stimulate and sustain us. 'Gainsaying' 'contradiction' (ἀντιλογία) doubtless here stands as the representative (as taken by the Greek interpreters) of all the varied forms of opposition and hostility which our Lord encountered. The *word*, says Delitzsch, precedes and represents the act. Our Lord was charged as a revolutionist because he, as was alleged (John 19:12), "speaketh against Cæsar" (ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καίσαρι). He himself was to be (Luke 2:34) "a sign spoken against" (σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον), an expression evidently summing up all forms of hostility. In 'fainting,' 'becoming relaxed' (ἐκλυόμενοι), we have still the figure of the race.

(*b*) Their afflictions the fruits of God's chastening love. (4–11.)

4. Ye have not yet, *not yet have ye withstood* **unto blood,** *contending* **against sin.** There seems here a transition from running to boxing, as in 1 Cor. 9:24–27. "running (*so run I*) and boxing (*so box I*, not as Common Version 'so fight I') are coupled together." 'Sin' is here represented as an opponent in boxing, to whom resistance must be made, if necessary, even unto blood. In this, says Delitzsch, there is no charge upon them that they have not offered all needed resistance, but that the pressure of sin upon them has not yet been such as to demand the extreme of resistance: it is only implied that they have not yet been called to the supreme trial of faith. But does not the connection with what follows, "and ye have forgotten," imply a censure, and lead us to suppose that in this precisely the author blames them; namely, that they have *not* resisted unto blood, struggling against sin? Had he said: 'struggling against sinners,' the case would have been different. They could not be required to shed their blood under persecution until persecution arose. But in the contest with sin it is otherwise. They were bound to contend against it unto blood rather than yield; and as these Hebrew Christians *had* yielded, had allowed themselves to be driven to the very point of apostasy—the sin of sins—the presumption is that their failure to resist unto blood was charged on them as a crime. As a mere intimation of a privilege—of their exemption thus far from bloody persecution—the passage seems wholly out of place, and its connection with ver. 5 most unnatural. I therefore believe, with Lünemann, that the 'sin' which they had not as yet resisted unto blood was the internal temptation to apostasy: that the 'unto blood' is to be taken figuratively, marking their failure to make the extreme and desperate resistance which they ought against its might; and considering the immediate connection with our Lord, I think there is a reference to his bloody sweat in the Garden, in his agony of resistance to the violent assaults of temptation. This would give the passage a peculiar force and tenderness: but if we do not adopt this, there is at least no difficulty in taking the 'unto blood' figuratively of the utmost extremity of spiritual resistance: and indeed to mix up real bloodshed with figurative running and boxing is most unnatural. In every point of view it is better to take it figuratively: and hence all the questions about the Hebrews of Palestine, or Rome, or Alexandria, having or not having

5 And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him:
6 For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.
7 If ye endured chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not?

5 resisted unto blood, striving against sin: and ye have forgotten the exhortation, which reasoneth with you as with sons,
My son, regard not lightly the chastening of the Lord,
Nor faint when thou art reproved of him;
6 For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth,
And scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.
7 [1]It is for chastening that ye endure; God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is there whom

1 Or, *Endure unto chastening.*

suffered bloody persecution become quite irrelevant to this passage. It has to do with another matter, the Christian combatant's struggle against sin, even unto blood.

5. And ye have forgotten the exhortation *which holds converse with you as sons.* Many interpreters read this as a question; and even Delitzsch, while not formally, yet does so virtually. This is almost necessary, so long as we take the preceding verse as a mere declaration that the Hebrew Christians had not as yet *been called* to assert their fidelity by their blood; for the incongruousness of coupling this with a strong declaration of censure, 'and ye have forgotten,' is obvious. But, on the other hand, to connect it as a question with the preceding declaration, is intolerably harsh. The explanation above given removes all the difficulty. They have failed of that last and extreme resistance which they ought to have made to sin; they have allowed themselves to relax and faint (ἐκλύεσθαι); and have forgotten the exhortation, etc. All is easy and natural, both in thought and expression; and the thought suggested by the 'fainting, relaxing yourselves' (ἐκλυόμενοι), is naturally carried out; and, indeed, it is not improbable that the quotation following was suggested by its containing the word for 'nor faint, be relaxed' in soul when reproved (ἐκλύεσθαι). **My son, despise not** (*make not light of*) **the chastening of the Lord.** (Prov. 3 : 11, 12.) The declaration here made in Proverbs may point back to the Book of Job; at all events, we have in that book a striking example of paternal chastisement—chastisement outwardly severe, but intended in love, and working the fruits of righteousness, as it causes the virtues of a pious character to shine out with augmented lustre. **Chastening** (παιδεία) here, evidently, that form of discipline which consists in chastisement. To this chastisement these Christians had been more or less subject; that they had endured outward persecution is not denied nor improbable; but whatever it was, whether open persecution, or the seductive temptations of Judaism, and perhaps reproach, they had failed to meet it firmly, and very nearly given way to apostasy. This is clearly implied in ver. 12, which fully confirms our view. There is no need of the interrogative form, in order to soften the language; the author does not *intend* to soften it here more than elsewhere in the severe, and even terrible, rebukes scattered through the Epistle. **Nor faint** (ἐκλύου) —*relax thyself*, give up the tension of endeavor and struggle, and abandon all resistance; a clear allusion to ver. 3—**when thou art rebuked** (*corrected*, ἐλεγχόμενος), probed, sifted, convicted; and thus *shewn up to oneself*, commonly in classical Greek, by searching words and arguments; here, by searching providential inflictions.

6. For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth. Emphasis on 'loveth.' Chastisement is a mark of love. The withholding of corrective discipline marks abandonment of God. "He is joined to his idols; let him alone." **And scourgeth every son whom he receiveth** (*accepteth*)—as his own, in whom he has pleasure. The scourging is not the scourging of punishment, but of discipline; not the token of judicial wrath, but of correcting love. The author gently says that the Hebrews had *forgotten* so to take the discipline to which they had been subjected, and receiving it as if it came in wrath, not in love, had sunk under it. In stating plainly the fact, he yet displays his usual tenderness in treating leniently its cause. They had *forgotten* the exhortation.

7. Application of the preceding citation. **For if ye endure chastening.** Emphasis on 'chastening,' not on 'endure'—referring to *what* they endure, not the mode of enduring

8 But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.
9 Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected *us*, and we gave *them* reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live?
10 For they verily for a few days chastened *us* after

8 *his* father chasteneth not? But if ye are without chastening, whereof all have been made partakers,
9 then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore, we had the fathers of our flesh to chasten us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of [1]spirits, and live?
10 For they verily for a few days chastened *us* as

1 Or, *our spirits.*

it.[1] **God dealeth with you as with sons**—more exactly, '*As toward sons, God beareth himself toward you.*' **For what son is he whom the** (*a*) **father chasteneth not?**—that is, Who can be properly called a son whom a father, etc.? Others (as Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Lünemann), "For what son is there whom a father chasteneth not?" with substantially the same sense, but the construction less forcible and less elegant. The article is designedly omitted, both with 'son' (υἱός) and 'father' (πατήρ). The sentiment is obvious. It assumes the fact that ours is a world of imperfection and sin, and the grand law that character is developed and virtues are born in trial. (1 Peter 1 : 6, 7; James 1 : 2, 3.)

8. But (or, *and*, δέ, slightly disjunctive) **if ye be without chastisement**—*of which all have become partakers;* which all the pious of former ages have been called to share, and in which their graces have been developed—**then** (ἄρα, *so then*, particle of inference; but, in the classics, never standing first, as here), as the logical consequence from the preceding—**are ye bastards, and not sons**—*illegitimate*, not genuine and acknowledged children. Ye lack one necessary condition and token of the filial character. In granting temporal, God withholds spiritual, prosperity. In leaving you to the full enjoyment of your portion here, he shows that he has no portion in reserve for you hereafter. The ore that is not worth refining is not worth preserving. See Luke 16 : 25, "Thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and similarly Lazarus evil things; and now he is comforted, but thou art tormented."

9. We have had fathers, etc.—*Then while the fathers of our flesh* (our fleshly fathers) *we had as chasteners, and gave them reverence, shall we not much rather be subject to the Father of our spirits, and live?* I take the 'then' (εἶτα), with the old commentators, as introducing a question of surprise and displeasure, as *then* is not infrequently used in English. *Then* did we do this, and shall we not do that? So the particle is familiarly used in the classics, and so may it naturally be in this Epistle, which in so many instances employs the elegant classical constructions.[2] God is here called the "Father of our spirits," as contrasted with "fathers of our flesh." The passage probably involves no special teaching respecting the origin of spirits. Physiologically, probably in the same sense in which man is father of the body he is father of the soul; our entire humanity descends by propagation. But man is the father of our flesh, as his discipline reaches mainly our outward and temporal interests. God is the Father of our spirits, as his care extends to, and his power quickens, our spiritual natures. The reasons, then, for acquiescing in and profiting by the discipline of our Heavenly Father, are incomparably stronger than those for a like submission to that of our fleshly parents. 'We had.' He is addressing men and women *once* subject to human parents, but subject to them no longer.

10. For they—*They indeed were chastening us for a few days*, 'with reference to' (πρός) a few days—the brief period of our earthly life; or, perhaps, only for the few days during which their discipline lasted (in which case we may, with Delitzsch, give to πρός a double reference to time and purpose, '*for* a few

[1] Many editors (as already Chrysostom) read εἰς παιδείαν, instead of εἰ παιδείαν = perhaps, endure for the purpose of discipline, endure in accordance with, and as matter of, discipline—but very harsh.

[2] To the objection that in that case the answering clause should have been καὶ οὐ or οὐ δὲ πολὺ μᾶλλον, "and shall we not much rather," it is sufficient to reply that the μέν (εἶτα τοὺς μέν) shows sufficiently that such a construction was actually in the writer's mind, but that he accidentally, or carelessly, abandoned it. We may properly construct εἶτα according to what was obviously the intended construction. The other rendering of εἶτα (*furthermore, in the next place*) may be the true one, but it is comparatively weak and inelegant.

their own pleasure; but he for *our* profit, that *we* might be partakers of his holiness.
11 Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby.
12 Wherefore lift up the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees;

seemed good to them: but he for *our* profit, that *we*
11 may be partakers of his holiness. All chastening seemeth for the present to be not joyous, but grievous: yet afterward it yieldeth peaceable fruit unto them that have been exercised thereby, *even*
12 *the fruit* of righteousness. Wherefore [1]lift up the

1 Gr. *make straight.*

days,' and, '*with reference to* a few days'). Thus their discipline is confined, *as such*, within the limits and interests of this earthly life. Except as coupled with and subordinate to divine discipline, it cannot reach beyond that. And it has another limitation: These earthly parents chastised us *according to their own pleasure*—better, 'according to that which seemed good to them.' Human discipline is, at best, in a measure, and especially as contrasted with the divine, arbitrary and capricious. Neither the knowledge nor the moral state of an earthly parent, regarded as an earthly parent,—and so soon as we regard him in a higher light, his discipline takes its sanction and coloring from the divine,—enables him to rise into pure and enlightened regard for the welfare of the child. More or less of earthly passion vitiates the best human chastisement.

But he for our profit, that we might be partakers (*partake*) **of his holiness.** These two clauses relate *chiastically* to the two preceding. They chastise at their pleasure, arbitrarily and capriciously; he purely for our profit, and with no alloy of evil passion. They, again, chastise us for our temporal, fleshly interests; he, that we may become partakers of his holiness, and thus may secure spiritual and eternal good. We need not, then, and ought not (with Lünemann) to refer 'for a few days' to both parents, our earthly and heavenly. The discipline of our earthly parents has respect, properly, to but a few days; it comprehends in itself no vital and permanent interests—that of God being designed to bring us to participate in his purity, has, thus, reference to our everlasting welfare.

11. Now no chastisement—literally, *all chastisement* (not, alike that of God and of man, of our heavenly and our earthly parents; the comparison with our earthly parents is finished, and the reference is exclusively to the discipline of our Heavenly Father. It refers to his chastisement in every form in which it may come) *seemeth, for the present indeed, to be matter not of joy, but of pain.* In itself, and, therefore, in its immediate consequences, chastisement is not agreeable, but painful. *Yet afterward* (in its ultimate effects) *it yieldeth* (ἀποδίδωσι, *renders back*, pays in requital, like the earth rendering back the rewards of tillage) *to them that have been disciplined by it.* Trained, disciplined (γεγυμνασμένοις) by exercise and conflict. The word the same as 5 : 14, "who have their perceptions exercised" or disciplined. Here, however, the discipline is of sterner character. There it is a discipline of exercise and use; here of struggle and conflict. And the fruit produced by this discipline is through the grace, and in accordance with the benevolent purpose, of God. **The peaceable**—*a peaceable fruit of righteousness.* It is 'a fruit of righteousness' through the gradual overcoming of evil, and the purification of the heart; a *peaceful* fruit, as against the struggles and griefs of the period of chastisement, and the still stormier commotion of the reign of sin. It produces early an incipient inward peace, and by-and-by, subduing every conflicting and disorderly element, brings one into perfect peace—"the peace of God, which passeth understanding."

(*c*) They are to resist firmly all relaxing tendencies by cultivating unity, purity, and constant watchfulness. (12-17.)

12. The preceding delineation of the nature and excellence of divine chastisement is in the author's highest style of elegance and dignity. The selection of words is remarkably felicitous, and the sentences are harmoniously balanced. It is a sort of 'rhetorical commonplace' on the nature of chastisement in the finest style of rhetoric, while it is perfectly clear, from its being so elaborately carried out, that the persons in mind had been heavily chastened, and from ver. 4, 5, and 12 that as yet this chastening had not wrought in them its legitimate effects. They had not nerved themselves up in the arena of conflict, but

13 And make straight paths for your feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way; but let it rather be healed.
14 Follow peace with all *men*, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord:

13 hands that hang down, and the palsied knees; and make straight paths for your feet, that that which is lame be not [1]turned out of the way, but rather be healed.
14 Follow after peace with all men, and the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord:

1 Or, *put out of joint.*

suffered themselves to become faint, relaxed, exhausted. They needed this eloquent and forcible presentation of the nature and purpose of divine chastisement, and the forcible exhortation which follows.

Wherefore (in view of the fact that trial and discipline are but modes of parental love) **lift up the hands which hang down** (*have became enfeebled*), *and the knees that have become relaxed*—still carrying forward the figure of the race, or the agonistic struggle, and quoting freely from the lofty strains of Isaiah (35:3), whose language harmonizes with the elevated diction of the author. "The whole twelfth verse," says Delitzsch, "is a long-continued trumpet blast," and the elegant flow of the previous diction, and finally the lofty character of the quotation from Isaiah culminates in a fine dactylic line which very probably exemplifies the inspiration that spontaneously and almost unconsciously swells into the cadence of song.[1]

13. Rendered simply into plain English, it runs: **And make straight paths for your feet.** So better than "with your feet" (as by many commentators), as there is no special relation between the tracks of the feet and the straight or level paths, and this added clause becomes in fact a mere superfluity; for provided the paths be made straight, it can be of no sort of consequence *with what* they are made so. To make straight paths *for* their feet, on the other hand, is a thought entirely pertinent and natural, harmonizing perfectly with what follows.

Lest—*that what is lame may not be turned out of the way;* not 'dislocated,' or put completely out of joint (for which there is scarcely any authority in the word ἐκτραπῇ), but turned aside, turned out of its course; and thus 'that which is lame' (τὸ χωλόν) means not the lame part of the body, the lame limb, but, abstract for concrete, the lame person, the lame element in the church—the members who, deficient in spiritual vitality and strength, and enfeebled and corrupted by Judaistic influences, go haltingly in the Christian path. The church is exhorted to make straight and level courses for their feet, to remove every incumbrance that may lie along the spiritual race course that the lame and more halting may not be completely stopped and thrown out of their course. **But rather be healed**—that those inclined to Judaism may not be left to total apostasy, but rather cured of all their Judaizing tendencies, and brought once more fully into the path of Christian faith and duty. The 'halting' is doubtless mainly the wavering between Judaism and Christianity. The plain and straight path avoids all unnecessary turnings, elevations, depressions, roughnesses, everything which could easily ensnare a weak conscience or disturb an unsettled faith.

14. Follow (*follow after, pursue*) **peace with** (*among*) **all men**—here, not among all men indiscriminately, but among all the members of the church. The author's immediate anxiety is for the fidelity and steadfastness of the *church*, and for the avoidance of everything which may threaten it. He is too much absorbed in reclaiming the church from its incipient and threatened apostasy, to allow of

[1] Καὶ τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν. Imitated from Septuagint, Prov. 4:26. The more flexible German can here attain something of the stately elegance of the Greek. Delitzsch renders it:

"Und gradspürige Gleise bereitet für euere Füsse."

Böhme thus:

"Und für euere Füsse bereitet euch ebene Bahnen."

In simple English, "And make straight paths for your feet," the poetical rhythm, as well as the special elegance of the diction, is entirely lost. It might be rhythmically rendered:

"And for your feet prepare ye level pathways."

Nor does the poetical impulse immediately exhaust itself. Besides a certain poetical coloring over the whole, we have a little below two complete iambic trimeters:

Οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον
Ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ.

15 Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble *you*, and thereby many be defiled;

15 looking carefully [1] lest *there be* any man that [2] falleth short of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble *you*, and thereby the

1 Or, *whether*.....2 Or, *falleth back from*.

his deviating into general directions regarding their Christian work and character. The first thing is to assure their Christianity, their Christian discipleship. Peace among all the members is to be sought by avoiding all impure and foreign elements, by removing every unnecessary ground of dissension and offense. **And holiness**—a consecrating of themselves to the Lord, sanctification—**without which no man shall see the Lord.**[1] Whether by 'the Lord' is intended here God or Christ seems difficult to decide. 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God,' would point to the one, while passages like "Ye shall die in your sins, and where I am ye cannot come," would indicate the possibility of the other. As to the essential thought, it is of course immaterial; as to see God is to see Christ, and the converse.

15. Looking diligently (watching, ἐπισκοποῦντες, overseeing, having watchful oversight, but with no reference to official action), giving careful heed and attention. **Lest any man** (*one*), *fall short of the grace of God.* Whether this is to be taken with the verb (ᾖ) understood, as a complete construction, 'be falling short,' equivalent to 'fall short,' or as a participial clause, subject of *trouble* (ἐνοχλῇ), *harass*, with a broken construction, is doubtful. The latter (with Lünemann, De Wette, Delitzsch, etc.) seems preferable. The construction of the Greek (ὑστερῶν ἀπό), which (more than the mere ὑστερῶν) marks voluntary and guilty delinquency, leads to the impression that the writer already had it in his mind to put them on their guard, not against failing, coming short of the grace of God, but against the *pestilent influence* of persons who might stand aloof from, or fall willfully short of that grace. This, I think, is also pointed to in the verb to 'watch' (ἐπισκοπεῖν). I think, therefore, that the writer intended to write, 'lest any one, falling short,' etc., may harass you, or may prove a root of bitterness; but continuing the discourse by a reference to Deut. 29 : 18, was led to abandon his construction, and take it up, and, **lest**—I say—**any root of bitterness springing up trouble you.**[2] The passage in Deut. 29 : 18 reads, 'Lest there be among you a root springing up in gall and bitterness' (Septuagint, μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ); English Version: 'Lest there be among you a root that beareth gall and wormwood.' The 'root of bitterness' in the Old Testament is a source of corruption, temptation, and apostasy; heathen men and women, dwelling among the Israelites, and alienating them from the worship of the living God. So here the 'root of bitterness' is a person 'failing of the grace of God,' with heart untouched by the spirit of Christian faith, and sowing among the disciples the seeds of doubt, heresy, and utter alienation from the doctrines of Christianity; a person who, like Esau in the family of Isaac, has no spiritual affinities with the children of the promise, and whose sensual mind will both itself be drawn away and draw away others from their Christian steadfastness. The danger of apostasy, and of the influences which seduce into apostasy, is apparent in the author's mind. The bitter and poisonous root, then, denotes here primarily persons, not doctrines or dispositions, as Antiochus Epiphanes is called 1 Macc. 1 : 10, 'a sinful root' (ῥίζα ἁμαρτωλός).

And thereby (*through it*) (*the*) **many** (οἱ πολλοί, Lachmann, Tischendorf; Textus Receptus, πολλοί, *many*) **be defiled.** "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." One poisonous plant may infect the whole atmosphere, and destroy many.

[1] Οὗ χωρίς for χωρὶς οὗ shows that the iambic rhythm is here not unintentional.

[2] Whether the ἐνοχλῇ, *trouble, harass*, was in the text of the Septuagint employed by the author is doubtful. The Alexandrian Codex, which he usually follows, has it, but so awkwardly introduced that it looks more like a correction from this passage (μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ καὶ πικρία), in which the text has been clearly tampered with in an endeavor to unite incompatible readings. The use of ἐνοχλῇ may very probably, as suggested by Delitzsch, be occasioned by its affinity in sound to ἐν χολῇ, making a sort of verbal correspondence not unfamiliar to the New Testament.

16 Lest there *be* any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright.
17 For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears.

16 many be defiled; [1]lest *there be* any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one mess of meat
17 sold his own birthright. For ye know that even when he afterward desired to inherit the blessing, he was [2]rejected; for he found no place for a change of mind *in his father*, though he sought it diligently with tears.

1 Or, *whether*.... .2 Or, *rejected* (*for he found no place of repentance*), etc. Or, *rejected; for . . . of repentance*, etc.

16. An illustration of this defiling and poisoning root of bitterness is found in Esau, and his relations to the Abrahamic family. **Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau.** Whether fornicator (πόρνος) should be referred here as so commonly in the Old Testament (though rarely in the New) to spiritual whoring, going after strange gods, seems doubtful. The connection of the above quoted passage, which has reference to allurements to that idolatry which constitutes spiritual harlotry, as well as the natural requirements of the passage itself, would seem to point to this interpretation. The general absence of this use of the word in the New Testament is, on the other hand, though not decisively, against it. With Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, etc., I incline to the spiritual view, as it seems out of place to select literal fornication out of the whole catalogue of sins as one to be specially guarded against. The general drift of the passage certainly seems against it. Still either makes a not inapposite sense, and if the author had Esau in mind, his selection of traits may have been determined by the well-known or traditional character of Esau, whose marriage with a Canaanitish woman grieved his parents, and showed both his sensuality and his profaneness—that is, his willingness to sacrifice his high theocratic relations, as one of the chosen family and by birth an heir of promise, to worldly impulses and sensual desires. Esau contaminated himself and the pure stock of Abraham by intermixture with idolatries, and by encountering the temptations of such a connection. And again, in throwing away his birthright for relief from a paroxysm of hunger, he showed himself 'profane' (βέβηλος), not inspired with the spirit and principles of the Abrahamic family, not heeding the covenant relations which God had entered into with it, but ready to cast his lot with the sectaries of the world outside. His 'fornication' may have been spiritual or natural, as we may well suppose would accompany one of his violent fleshly appetites and unspiritual temper. Or very possibly, the word here may fluctuate between fleshly and spiritual fornication, each being intimately connected with the other. The case of Esau, then, is admirably in point as applied to those who, failing of the grace of God, sensual, out of sympathy with the spiritual nature and hopes of the gospel, may seek to draw back the disciples into the worldly elements of Judaism. In accordance with the general spirit of the Old Testament, Esau is presented here, not so much in his personal character as in his theocratic relations. In the gospel, however, the distinction between the two entirely ceases. Man is legally what he is personally.

Who for one morsel of meat (*a single meal*) **sold his birthright.** (Gen. 25:31.) Esau manifested his contempt for his birthright, and his indifference to the high spiritual blessings which belonged to the descendants of Abraham, by his readiness to barter away the prerogatives of the first born in that family. It is not necessary wholly to approve the conduct of Jacob; we certainly cannot but condemn that of Esau. He manifested, with whatever principles of native and merely worldly generosity, a total insensibility to the peculiar and extraordinary prerogatives of his house. With those prerogatives he could not have been unacquainted; he could not have been unaware of the extraordinary history and destination of his family. He was a 'profane' person, in that he voluntarily threw himself outside of the sphere of those high blessings wrapped up in the Abrahamic Covenant. And persons of corresponding character, unspiritual, sensual, unsusceptible to the pure truths of Christianity, were equally dangerous to the purity and steadfastness of the spiritual offspring of Abraham. Moral Esaus among them would be poisonous and bitter roots.

17. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected. His case is analogous,

intimates the writer, to that of those who have been admitted to the privileges and hopes of the gospel and have abandoned them. He had been heir to the blessings promised to Abraham, and had lightly esteemed and thrown them away. The case was then decided. He had no chance of recovering them; they were gone forever beyond his reach. His case was like that of those who had been once enlightened, and have fallen away; like that of the land, which, having drunk in the rains of heaven, and yielded but thorns and briers, receives no 'blessing,' but is reprobate, discarded (ἀδόκιμός), just as Esau was *reprobated* (ἀπεδοκιμάσθη). The verb means more than 'rejected'—it implies the *ground* of the rejection, and, consequently, its finality. He is *tried, proved* (δοκιμάζω), and is given up as not standing the trial, as worthless, reprobate (ἀδόκιμός). We have but a repetition, then, in another form, of the—in this Epistle—oft-repeated assertion of the hopeless condition of the apostate. He is to the church of Christ what Esau, after selling his birthright, was to temporal Israel. 'Rejected,' discarded—by whom? Some say, by God; others, by his father—more truly, by both, his father acting simply as the organ of the divine will. God had inspired Isaac's blessing of Jacob, and Isaac felt that, if he would, he could not revoke it. Esau's efforts, then, for recovering the lost blessing, were *necessarily* vain—**for he found no place of** (*for*) **repentance though he sought it carefully with tears.** It is commonly supposed that the repentance for which Esau found no place, was in his father. But this ignores both the construction and the connection. Had the author referred to the change in Isaac's mind, perspicuity required that he should say so, or give some hint of it. As it is, the language naturally refers the repentance to himself. And this harmonizes with the connection. The writer illustrates the case of the reprobate Christian by that of the reprobate Esau. But the former cannot be renewed to repentance. When fairly and completely backslidden, his case is hopeless, and there is no place for repentance. This character Esau symbolizes. He had turned his back on the theocratic blessing, and it were now but a mere platitude in the connection to say that he found no place for change in the mind of his father. *He found no place for repentance in himself;* no chance of undoing the mischief which his sensuality and unbelief had wrought; no chance of cherishing a repentance which should produce the legitimate fruits of repentance. He was *reprobated;* his error, and its results, were irretrievable. That Esau was absolutely and finally rejected in his personal relations to God; that he may not have so repented as to be personally accepted of him—I do not believe to be necessarily implied. His case is viewed in its typical aspect; he is presented to us in his theocratic relations. As Isaac's first born, the blessing promised to Abraham had naturally descended to him; and now, by his sensuality and unbelief, by his want of faith precisely in its double element of believing in the invisible and looking forward to the future, he had lost it for himself and his offspring irrecoverably. He found no place for an effectual repentance.

I have, with many (as the Revised Version, margin), put this clause in a parenthesis, and thus made the following, 'sought it with tears,' refer back to the 'blessing.' This is most natural in thought, and makes, at least, an equally easy and elegant construction, and a parenthetical construction of which this Epistle presents cases enough amply to justify the present.[1] I adopt this construction, however (with Delitzsch), not because I deem it strictly *necessary*, but simply much more easy and natural. It is more natural to say that Esau sought for the blessing with tears, than that he sought for repentance with tears. This latter construction I should not (with Delitzsch) reject as contrary to the historical fact, but simply as less natural. A writer might say that Esau, in seeking the blessing, sought for that repentance which should bring it back—that is, he sought the fruits of repentance, and thus might, in a sense, be said to seek for repentance itself. Still, the construc-

[1] How Moll can affirm that the assumption of such a parenthesis is against the genius of the Epistle I can scarcely comprehend—7 : 11, 19, 21; 10 : 8, 24 are ample to prove the contrary. I believe there are many cases in the New Testament where the assumption of a parenthesis will alone clear up the construction, as John 1 : 14. I take Rom. 9 : 3 (ηὐχόμην—χριστοῦ) as a case in which a parenthesis is almost certain, and essentially illuminates the passage.

18 For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest,
19 And the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which *voice* they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more:
20 (For they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart:
21 And so terrible was the sight, *that* Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake:)

18 For ye are not come unto [1] *a mount* that might be touched, and that burned with fire, and unto black-
19 ness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which *voice* they that heard intreated that no word more should be
20 spoken unto them: for they could not endure that which was enjoined, If even a beast touch the
21 mountain, it shall be stoned; and so fearful was the appearance, *that* Moses said, I exceedingly fear and

1 Or, *a palpable and kindled fire.*

tion is awkward, and it seems to me far simpler, and liable to no objection, to throw the clause, "he found no place," etc., into parenthesis, and refer back the 'it' (αὐτην) to 'blessing.' Thus all becomes easy.

(*d*) They are to hearken to these exhortations in view of the grandeur and exalted character of the New Covenant, and the danger of disregarding its blessings and claims. (18-29.)

We have here the final summing up of the whole exhortation, or rather, perhaps, of the whole preceding discussion, in one magnificent comparison and solemn appeal. The passage is in an almost epical strain of sublimity--it is a long, loud trumpet peal from Sinai reechoed in softened notes from Sion, the heavenly Jerusalem, exhorting the readers by all the richer prerogatives of the New Covenant, and by all the sharper woes of spurning it, to Christian steadfastness and fidelity. As if the writer would bring into comparison that passage of the spiritual Israel into its Sabbath rest mentioned (3:3), with the desert sojourn of ancient Israel, he proceeds:

18. For ye are not come—*have not drawn near to a mountain that is handled;* that is, to an earthly, material mountain, which is palpable to sense; namely, Mount Sinai, before which ancient Israel was brought in the wilderness. **And that burned**—*and to kindled fire.* Most commentators take the participle (κεκαυμένῳ) as attributive of 'mount' (ὄρει)[1] 'and burning with fire'; but the position of 'mount' (ὄρει) is adverse to it, and Deut. 4:36 mentions the great fire separately. It seems more natural, therefore, to take it as above. **Nor unto blackness** (*cloud gloom*) **and darkness and tempest.** Such is the language in Deut. 41:11.

19. And the sound—*And to a blast of a trumpet* (Exod. 19:16)—**and the** (*a*) **voice of words** (Deut. 4:12, φωνὴ ῥημάτων) **which they that heard**—the Israelites at the foot of the mountains—**begged** (παρητήσαντο, begged off, *entreated against*) *that no further word should be spoken to them;* referring to Deut. 5:25, where the terrified people entreat that God may not speak further to them directly.

20. For they could not endure—*could not bear that which was enjoined.* "*If even a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned,*" cited from Exod. 19:12, 13, but not with verbal exactness.[2]

21. And—*so fearful was the appearance* (*spectacle*) **that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake** (*I am terrified and trembling!*). The punctuation of the passage here given,—I mean a pause after 'And,'—one imparting much elegance to the construction, is due to Beza. The language here attributed to Moses does not occur in the Old Testament narrative in this connection. But, subsequently, when on the mount he learned of the idolatry of the Israelites, he exclaimed, '*I am in terror!*' (Ἔκφοβός), and in Acts 7:32 it is said of him, when he saw the burning bush, that, *being filled with trembling, he did not venture to contemplate it* (ἔντρομος δὲ γενόμενος οὐκ ἐτόλμα κατανοῆσαι). Either, therefore, tradition put into the mouth of Moses this language at the time of God's descending (which seems not improbable), or the author combines different and scattered elements into one picture. It matters little, perhaps, which, though I confess I incline (against Delitzsch, Moll, etc.) to the former. Moses may at first have well shared the terror of the people. Verses 20, 21 are parenthetical, illustrating, in passing, the terrific majesty of the divine appearance.

[1] Ὄρει, rejected by Westcott and Hort, but retained by Tischendorf, and inserted in the Revised Version. I regard it as almost certainly genuine.

[2] "Or thrust through with a dart" (ἢ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται), read by Erasmus, and belonging to the Textus Receptus, is rejected by all critical editions, and greatly weakens and mars the passage.

22 But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels,
23 To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect,

22 quake: but ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,
23 [1] and to [2] innumerable hosts of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to

1 Or, *and to innumerable hosts, the general assembly of angels, and the church, etc*.....2 Gr. *myriads of angels.*

Thus ancient, temporal Israel came, in its journey, to a material, visible mountain, from which they were yet to stand at a distance, and behold and hear with terror the tokens of the Divine Presence. It was at once sensible and terrible, repelling from God rather than attracting toward him. The spiritual Israel, on its way to its Sabbath rest, has a different experience. The earthly seems to have disappeared, and the heavenly has opened. A spiritual world, the heavenly Sion and the heavenly Jerusalem, with God its King, angels and glorified spirits its inhabitants, Jesus, through whose mediation it is accessible, appears, at once infinitely higher in its prerogatives, and correspondingly more terrible in its penalties.

22, 23. But ye are come unto mount Sion—not the earthly Zion, the mountain of the city of David, but the heavenly Zion of which is the throne of God and his glorified Son: 'Yet have I set my king on Zion, the mountain of my holiness.' It is no mountain that can be touched, but spiritual. (Rev. 14 : 1.) John saw the Lamb standing on Mount Zion. It is the seat of the **city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,** and thus at once the counterpart of the earthly Sinai, and the antitype of the earthly Zion. In this city, on this mountain, God has fixed his throne, and here the Son of David is to hold the seat and capital of his dominion and reign forever in glory over the spiritual Israel. The distinction which in the earthly city of David existed between Mount Zion and Mount Moriah, the more immediate locality of the temple, is now to be entirely done away, and palace and temple, king and great high priest will together fill with majesty and glory this heavenly city. In Rev. 21, this heavenly Jerusalem appears descending to earth to make earth again the scene of the consummated, as it has been of the nascent and growing, glories of the kingdom. **And to an innumerable company.** *And to myriad ones, a festal host of angels, and a congregation of firstborn ones, who are registered in heaven.* Such is, perhaps, the best construction of these difficult and disputed words. A festal, joyous company (πανήγυρις) of exulting angels, in full chorus of song and dance, jubilant before the throne. After angels, who, as ministering spirits, are subordinated to the heirs of salvation, come the heirs of salvation themselves, the congregation of the faithful, the church of the 'firstborn,' not the saints of the Old Testament, not the earliest believers or martyrs of the New, but the whole body of believers who are registered and enrolled in heaven, whose citizenship is there, and who as heirs of its prerogatives and glory are *firstborn* (πρωτότοκοι). The firstborn is, as such, the natural heir to the estate. Christians are *all* equally heirs: they are all firstborn; all enrolled and destined to the full prerogatives of heavenly citizenship. There seems a covert relation to the case of Esau. There the inheritance was confined to *one*. There could be but one temporal firstborn; here is a "congregation of firstborn ones." It is to this goodly fellowship of angels and saints that the New Testament Israel has come.[1]

And to God—*and as their judge, to the*

1 I follow Delitzsch constructing this passage. Some construst:

'And to myriads of angels, a festal company, and to the church of the firstborn,' etc., in which the isolated position of 'a festal company' (πανήγυρις) seems awkward.

Others:

'And to myriads, a festal company of angels, and to the church,' etc., making 'a festal company' (πανηγύρις) an apposition with μυριάσιν, but again making 'myriads' (μυριάσιν) awkwardly solitary.

Others:

'And to myriads of angels, the festal company and church,' etc.; but then we miss the 'and' (καί) before 'a festal company' πανήγυρις, which we have with all the other members of the polysyndeton, and which it seems unaccountable should have been omitted. The above construction avoids all these difficulties and brings together the angels and the church into a union entirely corresponding to that in which they appear throughout the New Testament.

24 And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than *that of* Abel.

24 the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better [1] than *that of* Abel.

1 Or, *than Abel.*

God of all. They are come to this church universal, and with it to that God of all things, who will judge it—'the Lord shall judge his people'—who will vindicate its members against all their foes and persecutors, and on whose righteous fidelity they can rely with implicit confidence. As the God of all, more probably, of all things, he is *able* to execute that needed work of judgment for his church, always struggling, always suffering, always oppressed. Hence we see (with Delitzsch) why 'God' is introduced precisely here in the enumeration, and why in his character of Judge. **And to the spirits of just men** (*righteous ones*) **made perfect.** The righteous who have already gone to heaven, who have finished their testimony and sealed it, some by their blood, all by their death. These are perfected; they have reached the goal of their destiny and their striving. This includes alike the Old Testament saints who have since the death and resurrection of Christ entered into the glory of the New Testament believers, and all the New Covenant saints, who have died in the Lord. In a comparative sense these are all perfected, although it is yet true that a higher stage of glory, a more entire perfection awaits them with the resurrection of their bodies at the Second Coming.

24. And to Jesus the mediator of the (*a*) **new covenant**—and a covenant by so much better than the Old, as its Mediator and its High Priest, and its sanctions, are all higher than those of the Old. That Old Covenant was inadequate to secure obedience: it was necessary to replace it by a New; and to such a New one, and to its Mediator, Jesus, they have come. The author here is not thinking of the glorified and reigning Christ, but of the atoning and interceding Jesus; hence the name of tenderness, the name of the suffering, dying man, and the emphatic pre-position of that character under which and for the sake of which he is here mentioned. To a New Covenant, to a Mediator of that New Covenant, and to Jesus as that Mediator they have come. Following naturally on the 'Covenant' (διαθήκη) is the blood that consecrated it.

And to the blood of sprinkling (*to sprinkled blood*)—blood sprinkled upon the people of old in symbolical expiation, but since the great sacrifice sprinkled upon the heart in effectual cleansing from an evil conscience. Moses sprinkled the people with blood at the foot of the mount, at the receiving of the Law; signifying that cleansing and expiation could be made only with blood. **That speaketh better** (*more mightily*) **than** (*did*) **that of Abel.** This refers not to the blood of Abel's sacrifice, but his own blood which, sinking into the ground, called to God for vengeance. This vengeance cry which God heard and could not but hear, represented all the cry of outraged and unappeased justice which went up from our guilt-stained earth to God: a cry which could never be silenced or denied but by the mightier pleading of a better blood. That blood was shed by Christ. It not merely speaks better things then did Abel or the blood of Abel,—that follows from the different nature of the two sacrifices,—but it speaks more *mightily* than did Abel. The plea for mercy in the blood shed by the righteous victim of the New Covenant overpowers and swallows up the vengeance plea of the righteous victim of the earlier time. It speaks more mightily, and thus mercy rejoices against vengeance.

We have reached the end of the parallel. It will be observed that the author studiously omits the article in the second as in the first series of the antithesis. It is difficult to give the full force of this in English, but it is much more elegant and forcible in Greek. By omitting the article he designates not the particular things, as known, but the kind or class of things, as if now first spoken of. Ye have come to a mountain, Zion, to a city of the living God, to a festal company, to a congregation of first-born ones, to a Judge, the God of all, to spirits of righteous men perfected, etc.

Again, Delitzsch, with some others, finds not perhaps a strictly designed, but, after all, not an accidental correspondence in the number of members constituting the parallel, each containing the perfect number seven. On the one hand—(1) the material mountain, (2) the

25 See that ye refuse not him that speaketh: for if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more *shall not* we *escape*, if we turn away from him that *speaketh* from heaven:
26 Whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven.
27 And this *word*, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things

25 See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not, when they refused him that warned *them* on earth, much more *shall not* we *escape*, who turn away from him [1]that *warneth* from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more will I make to tremble not the earth only, but also the heaven.
27 And this *word*, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things

1 Or, *that is from heaven.*

burning fire, (3) cloud gloom, (4) darkness, (5) tempest, (6) the trumpet blast, (7) voice of words. On the other—(1) Mount Zion, (2) the heavenly Jerusalem, (3) the myriad host of angels and believers, (4) God, the Judge, (5) the spirits of the perfected righteous, (6) the mediator Jesus, (7) the blood of sprinkling. Without attempting, with some, to carry out the antithesis, and place the different members one against each other, it is certain that with Mount Sinai is contrasted Mount Zion, and not improbably with the 'voice of words' which drove off the listening and affrighted multitudes, the still more loudly and mightily speaking blood of sprinkling. Thus the first and last members of the parallel, seem placed in designed, or certainly in real correspondence to each other.

25. See that ye refuse not, *beg off from, deprecatingly decline to hear* (παραιτήσησθε same as ver. 19, παρητήσαντο, *deprecated, begged off*), **him that speaketh** (λαλοῦντα, perhaps with reference to λαλοῦντι, just preceding, ver. 24)—that is, apparently God, who of old spoke through angels on Sinai, and now speaks through his Son from the heavenly Zion. God is ultimately the speaker in both cases (as see 1 : 1) then on earth, now from heaven. **For if they escaped not** out of reach, but were compelled to *abide the hearing, when they refused to hear* (παραιτησάμενοι) *him that warned them* (or, *uttered his oracles*) *on earth*, locally and in a limited manner, so that it was possible to withdraw from the sound of his voice, as also looking at the lessened dignity of one who spoke on earth. **Much more,** etc. *Much less shall we* [escape] *who turn away from him that speaketh from heaven.* If the endeavor to escape from the hearing of that limited, local, earthly utterance on the summit of Sinai was vain, how much more vain the endeavor to get out of the reach of that voice which is uttered from the heavens. God once spake on Sinai through his angels; he again speaks on earth through his Son. This latter is not now adverted to, but rather the voice which he now utters through his Son glorified and exalted at his right hand in the heavens. This voice from the heavenly Zion, to which the marching church has come, and at the foot of which she now, as it were, lies—this voice of God through the Mediator, promising where he once threatened, forgiving where he once condemned—this voice sent down to men, speaking of pardon and reconciliation, and eternal life, uttered from its exalted place, whence it can ring out over all the earth, exempted from those limitations of space and matter which circumscribed and hemmed in that, but from the opened heavens speaking into the spiritual ear of humanity,—this we cannot escape from. This voice, like a trumpet blast, echoes over all the world, and this calls up the thought of the final and grand scene in which that voice is yet more fully to reveal its power.

26. Whose voice then shook the earth—at the descent on Sinai were thunderings and lightnings and earthquake—**but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more** (*once for all*) **I shake not the earth only, but also heaven.** Cited from Haggai 2 : 6, from the Septuagint, referring to the future reign of the Messiah. One final concussion is to overthrow all things which can be overthrown, and leave only those inherently imperishable, to remain forever; because, of course, as there is to be no subsequent shaking, the things which *then* survive, are eternal. The kingdoms of the world, all that is purely temporal, will then be convulsed and buried in ruins; while the spiritual kingdom of Christ will emerge and stand unshaken.

27. And this word (*language*) **yet once more** (*once for all*) **signifieth the removing** (*the displacement*) **of those things that are shaken.** The 'once for all' implies that the world will be thrown down finally and forever; that there can be no need of any

that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain.

28 Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear:

that have been made, that those things which are
28 not shaken may remain. Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us have [1]grace whereby we may offer service well-pleasing to God

1 Or, *thankfulness*.

renewed shaking, as the purpose of the shaking will be accomplished. But the purpose of the shaking can only be to test the durability and permanence of the elements subjected to it; and, of course, everything that can be shaken is shown to be void of permanence, and will be removed, to leave place for the permanent and everlasting. **As of things that are** (*have been*) **made**—and, of course, changeable and perishable. What has been made by hands can in like manner be destroyed. **That those things which cannot be** (*are not*) **shaken may remain.** It may be asked, how the removal of the things which are shaken can produce the permanency of those that are not shaken. *Their* abiding cannot be *caused* by the shaking and removal of the others. True, not strictly. But the shaking which shows the perishable to be perishable, and causes its removal, and which shows the imperishable to be imperishable, may be easily conceived as causing it to abide. That which tests and determines the abiding quality of an object it is easy to look upon as the cause of its abiding. Or we may easily take the expression as elliptical, 'in order that the things which are unshaken [and they only] may remain.' The transient is to give way to the permanent, the mutable to the immutable, the temporal to the eternal. Earth and heaven will be shaken and pass away. But a new heaven and a new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness, and connected with Christ's spiritual kingdom, will take their place and be forever. Delitzsch, with some others, constructs "as having been made, in order that the things which are not shaken may remain." They consider the use of 'made' (πεποιημένων), standing absolutely in the sense of 'formed, created,' without any complementary clause, as harsh and unwarrantable. It may, perhaps, be somewhat harsh; but is not, I think, liable to any serious objection; while, on the other hand, it seems not very easy to see in what sense the things which are shaken can be said to have been made, in order that those which are not shaken may remain. At least, it is a very harsh way of expressing the thought that the temporal and changeable are but images and types of the unchangeable and eternal, out of which these latter are to be developed, to say that the former have been made, in order that the latter may abide. Nor do I believe, with Delitzsch, that the declaration "this word yet once for all," signifies the removal of the things shaken, demands some such complementary expression as this. Rather, the language "yet once for all I shake," clearly implying that there is to be no further shaking, must naturally imply, therefore, that the proper purposes of shaking will be then accomplished; and, of course, we can, strictly speaking, see no object in shaking things, except for their removal. If they are to remain, and, of course, to relapse back into their previous condition, why shake them? A shaking which is declared to be final, *must*, then, unless it is an idle display of power, result in the removal of all that can be shaken. If it be said that the unremovable things, as the new heavens and the new earth, are also said to be 'made,' we may reply, True, this may be said in special instances, but, speaking generally, they belong to the category of spiritual and eternal things which are not conceived as being made. The natural rule is that that which has been made may be unmade.

28. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom that cannot be moved (*shaken*). This is here taken for granted. He has no occasion now to prove that the kingdom of God and of Christ is one of the things—or, rather, the one thing—which shall not be shaken. The old-world monarchies had passed away; the last of them, with the earth itself, was destined to pass away, and then (Dan. 7:18), 'The saints of the Most High would receive the kingdom (καὶ παραλήψονται τὴν βασιλείαν ἅγιοι ὑψίστου). This kingdom we are to receive not as a dominion or empire united under one Prince, of which we are to be subjects merely, but as a glorious dominion of which we are to be participants. Christians are represented not as subjects in a glorious kingdom, but *rulers* in a glorious

29 For our God *is* a consuming fire.

29 with [1] reverence and awe: for our God is a consuming fire.

CHAPTER XIII.

LET brotherly love continue.
2 Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.

1 Let love of the brethren continue. Forget not to show love unto strangers: for thereby some have

[1] Or, *godly fear.*

kingdom. *Let us cherish gratitude* is better here than **let us have grace** (which would require χάριν ἔχωμεν); *let us retain, hold on to grace* (would require κατέχωμεν χάριν). **Whereby** (*through which;* namely, gratitude) **we may serve God acceptably** (Codex Sinaiticus, λατρεύομεν, *we do serve*, etc.), as ministers or worshipers of God in his spiritual sanctuary, like those who took literal part in the ancient ritual; service, not merely in the general sense of rendering obedience—though obedience is, of course, the essence of the service—but with specific allusion to the service of the sanctuary—*with pious reverence and godly fear;* filial reverence (εὐλαβεία, 5:7), which will lovingly heed his transcendent greatness and authority; '*fear*' of the punishments that await disobedience.

29. For our God is (*also*) **a consuming fire.** A ground of the fear and devoutness which are the mark of our service. The thought is not, "for also *our* God, as well as the God of the Old Testament" (which would require (ἡμῶν ὁ θεός, or, still better, ὁ γὰρ ἡμέτερος θεός), but, "for also is our God"—that is, not only a God of grace and benignity, but also (καί) a consuming fire. He speaks in power as well as in love. He proffers grace and salvation, and bestows an everlasting kingdom; but he also destroys those who ungratefully and unbelievingly reject his proffers. Delitzsch supposes that the expression points to the double quality of fire—its power to illumine, as well as to burn; its benignant, as well as its wrathful nature. The language is cited from Deut. 4:24 (κύριος ὁ θεός σου πῦρ κατανάλισκον ἐστί, θεὸς ζηλώτης).

CONCLUSION. (13:1-25.)

For the first time in the entire Epistle the author's tone now relaxes. There has previously been almost no word, apparently, said that did not bear upon the one single purpose of rescuing his readers from incipient and threatened apostasy, of preserving them on the foundation of the gospel. There has been scarcely a single exhortation, or argument, that has not been directed to this end. The dreadful consequence of falling away from God has hitherto been the keynote of the entire Epistle. The tone now changes. Some general exhortations addressed to Christians as such, and on more general points of Christian duty, are now introduced. The author has done his work so elaborately, so thoroughly, that he can now afford to turn for a few moments to what may be termed the commonplaces of Christian exhortation, although so full is his mind of the one grand theme that he yet again returns to it before concluding his Epistle.

Ch. 13. (1) *Practical admonitions to various Christian duties.* (1-9.)

1. Let brotherly love continue. From 6:10; 10:33 it is clear that the Christians addressed had been formerly eminent for this virtue. From this passage, it is evident that, however weakened by the lowered tone of their Christian life, it still existed among them. In their Judaizing inclinations, they would be tempted to restrain their fraternal intercourse with Gentile Christians, and, indeed, with each other as disciples. Hence the special importance of reminding them to revive and cherish this grace, and also the putting first of the noun rather than of the verb is a delicate intimation that there was some slackening in this respect. He says, 'Let *brotherly love* continue'; not, 'Let brotherly love *continue*,' as if its present existence were no matter of doubt, and the only question was of its continuance.

2. Be not forgetful, etc. (*do not forget the entertainment of strangers*). This is one specific and very important form which brotherly love might assume. When the lines are as sharply drawn as between Jews and heathen, and between both and Christians, the latter being objects of common hatred, the enter-

3 Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; *and* them which suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body.
4 Marriage *is* honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.
5 *Let your* conversation *be* without covetousness; *and be* content with such things as ye have: for he hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.

3 entertained angels unawares. Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; them that are evil entreated, as being yourselves also in the body.
4 *Let* marriage *be* had in honour among all, and *let* the bed *be* undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God
5 will judge. [1]Be ye free from the love of money; content with such things as ye have: for himself hath said, I will in no wise fail thee, neither will I

1 Gr. Let *your turn* of mind be *free*.

tainment of traveling Christians by their brethren would become an urgent duty, and upon Jewish Christians some cogent inducements to it might be drawn from their earlier annals. **For thereby some have entertained angels unawares.** Abraham, Lot, etc., would readily occur as illustrations of this statement. The pith of the thought is that in entertaining Christians in the name of Christ, we are *always* entertaining angels, or rather him who is exalted infinitely above the angels. "I was a stranger, and ye took me in." Hospitality to his people is recognized as hospitality to their King.

3. Remember (that is, with kindness and active aid) **them that are in bonds, as bound with them**—those who, for their fidelity to Christ, are subjects of persecution and imprisonment. This phenomenon was too common in the primitive church to justify us in making it any clue to the destination of the Epistle. The measure of their kindly remembrance is to be 'as bound with them,' as sharing their imprisonment. Enter into their bondage as if it were your own; bring it as near to your sympathies as if you were actual participants in it. "I was in prison, and ye came unto me." **Them which** (*who*) *suffer outrage*, **as being yourselves also in the body**—and consequently liable to the same abuse. The consciousness of being ourselves exposed to any particular form of suffering will enhance our sympathy for those who are already enduring it, especially when precisely the same causes exist in us which have brought indignity and outrage upon them. The appeal is not purely to our natural sympathies; it involves the idea that we may experience the same sufferings for the same cause. The distinction which Delitzsch draws between our sympathy in the two different cases as springing, the one from spiritual, the other from natural fellowship of suffering, seems scarcely tenable. We need not exclude the natural element from the former, nor the spiritual from the latter.

4. Marriage is, etc.—*Let marriage be in all things held in honor, and the bed undefiled.* That the passage is *in spirit* hortatory cannot be doubted. It is better, therefore, to render it so, I think, even though we may grant the actual supplying of the imperative (ἔστω) unwonted, and perhaps not strictly in the author's mind. The exhortation seems to strike at the incipient gnostic asceticism (1 Tim. 4:3) on the one hand, and on the other at the licentiousness which, while seemingly hostile, is really its natural accompaniment. Whether marriage is to be held in honor, and hence not disowned by a transcendental and spurious piety, or held in honor, and hence not violated by adulterous passion, might be doubtful. The latter might seem rather to harmonize with the connection, but the former, as observed above, seems also to have been in the writer's mind. And the two are closely allied; for when marriage as an institution is, *for any reason*, thought light of, it will soon be violated by lustful passions.[1] **But whoremongers** (*fornicators*) **and adulterers God will judge**—in a sense different from that in which he will 'judge his people'; he will judge the latter for vindication, the former for punishment. He will pronounce sentence upon and condemn them. 'God' (ὁ θεός) placed emphatically last.

5. Let your conversation—*Let your disposition be free from avarice, being contented with what ye have.* Free from that love of money which is a root of all evil (1 Tim. 6:10), and drowns men in destruction and perdition. 'What ye have' (τὰ παρόντα), *the present, existing things*, those which are present to us, with which we are to be content, without, however, relaxing our labor, and feeling an honest desire to better our condition. Man is false to

[1] Γάμος, elsewhere in the New Testament, *the marriage festival*; here, *the marriage relation*.

6 So that we may boldly say, The Lord *is* my helper,
and I will not fear what man shall do unto me.
7 Remember them which have the rule over you,
who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose
faith follow, considering the end of *their* conversation.
8 Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and
for ever.
9 Be not carried about with divers and strange doc-

6 in any wise forsake thee. So that with good courage
we say,
The Lord is my helper; I will not fear:
What shall man do unto me?
7 Remember them who had the rule over you, who
spake unto you the word of God; and considering
8 the issue of their [1]life, imitate their faith. Jesus
Christ *is* the same yesterday and to-day, *yea* and [1]for
9 ever. Be not carried away by divers and strange

1 Gr. *manner of life*.....2 Gr. *unto the ages.*

his reason if he does not acquiesce in the present; he is false to his aspirations and capacities if he does not seek for better in the future.

For he hath *himself* **said,** *I will not fail thee, nor will I abandon thee.* An excellent argument, but where has God said this? In various passages the Old Testament gives half of it. "I will not leave thee, nor neglect thee' (Josh. 1 : 5); 'I will not abandon thee' (Gen. 28 : 15); 'I will not abandon' (Isa. 41 : 17), are passages which express the idea, and the words in part, but not wholly. But on the other hand, Deut. 31 : 6 gives us almost exactly this language; namely, 'He will not leave thee, nor will he abandon thee,' but not as spoken by the Lord, but as spoken of the Lord through Moses. That, however, which God inspires his people to say of him may well be regarded as said by himself. There seems, therefore, no objection to taking this as substantially the direct utterance of God. The passage, transformed into the form which it assumes here, occurs also in Philo. It is not impossible that it has been modified a little from Deuteronomy as part of a liturgical service, and thence taken by our author. In any case, his statement is true, as that which God has inspired his servant to say regarding his relations to his people, he may be justly said to say himself. The same language, however, applied in the same way by Philo, may indicate that it had passed into current use in this form. For the sentiment, see Matt. 6 : 28: "And why take ye thought for raiment," etc.

6. So that we may boldly (*confidently*) **say, The Lord is my helper;** *and I shall not fear. What shall man do unto me?* From Ps. 118 : 6, one of the songs of praise of the Jewish festivals. The sentiment, generalized so as to indicate the sufficiency of God for us in all respects, and reminding the readers of God as a helper against the violence of man, prepares the way for the mention of those Christian leaders who have attested their fidelity by a violent death.

7. Remember *them that had the rule over you* (*your leaders*)—here, apparently, those who are dead—*which spake unto you the word of God.* 'To speak the word of God' (λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ), an expression used by Luke. (Acts 4 : 31; 8 : 25; 13 : 46.) *Considering* (*contemplating*) *the issue of their walk*—the end of their earthly life, which the author avoids designating directly by death, or the end of life, but the termination of their Christian walk (ἀναστροφή, as often elsewhere; see ἀναστρέφεσθαι, 10 : 33). The reference is perhaps chiefly, though not exclusively, to martyrs (as, if the readers lived in Palestine, Stephen, James the Apostle, James the brother of our Lord, etc.); at any rate, such as had crowned a Christian life with a happy and blessed death. *Imitate their faith*, and like them be faithful unto death.

8. Jesus Christ (*is*) **the same yesterday, and to day and forever.** Christ from his ascension is forever unchangeable; a practical truth referring, not to his eternal Sonship, but to his unchangeable nature as Redeemer and Head of the church. As such his claims upon his people are the same for every age. "The same obligation which lay on the martyrs to follow him with fidelity, even to death, rests on you," says the writer, "will rest on his people for all time; and the rewards also are sure and abiding." The absolute unchangeableness of the Head of the church suggests the permanent character of Christian obligation and reward. Hence, also, the following injunction.

9. Be not carried about (*led aside*) *by manifold and strange teachings.* Not probably, as understood by many, teachings or doctrines regarding the sacrificial rites and festivals of the law, and especially the passover, which, however, now superseded by the gospel, would still be hardly designated as

trines: for *it is* a good thing that the heart be established with grace; not with meats, which have not profited them that have been occupied therein.
10 We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.
11 For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp.

teachings: for it is good that the heart be stablished by grace; not by meats, wherein they that
10 [1] occupied themselves were not profited. We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat who
11 serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the holy place [2] by the high priest *as an offering* for sin, are burned without

1 Gr. *walked*.....2 Gr. *through*.

'manifold and strange doctrines.' These experiences point rather to subtle and casuistical innovations, and in all probability to those precepts of a false and spurious asceticism, which in the later period of the Apostolic Epoch were already creeping into the church, and which, even earlier, required Paul to declare that the kingdom of God consists not in "meat and drink, but in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." (Rom. 14:17.) The allusions in Paul's Epistles to those casuistical and hair-splitting distinctions to the "ordinances and commandments of men," "Touch not, taste not, handle not" (Col. 2:20), to the rising up of false, corrupt teachers, who should "command to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving" (1 Tim. 4:3, 4), show what symptoms of half Judaizing, half gnosticising heresies were already developing themselves in the church. And to these it seems in the highest degree probable (Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Moll, etc.) that the writer alludes. **For it is a good** (*excellent*) **thing that the heart be established with** (*by*) **grace**—it is grace with which the heart should be grounded and confirmed in the Christian life. **Not with** (*by*) **meats** *by which they that were conversant with them were not profited.* They drew from these meats (βρώματα, *things eaten*, food in which they sought an outward and ritual justification) no real profit. No outward ceremonies could avail; not the food which goes into a man, but the thoughts which issue from him, have power to defile or purify. Grace alone, working efficiently in the soul, can truly establish it in the Christian life.

(2) *Renewed exhortations against apostasy.* (10–21.)

10. We have an altar (emphasis on *have*, ἔχομεν)—'an altar,' not Christ himself; not that of the Lord's Supper (as Ebrard, etc.), but the *cross* on Golgotha, on which Christ was offered up. **Whereof** (*from which*) **they have no right** (*privilege*) **to eat who serve the tabernacle.** The mention of *meats* (βρώματα) suggests the old Levitical rites, the clean and unclean animals under the law, and thus prepares for the mention of that spiritual food which Christians are permitted to take from that victim which was offered upon the Christian altar. This victim was Christ; this altar was his cross. Of this food every Christian may and must eat; his flesh and his blood are the nourishment of his people.

11. For the bodies of those beasts (*animals*) **whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin** (*as an atonement for sin*) **are burned without the camp** (*encampment*). Of the sin offerings which were offered by the Jewish priests, Delitzsch enumerates several of which certain portions were allotted to the priests, as the he-goat brought by the prince, and the goat or sheep of the private person, etc. But from these the priests of the law were excluded, as the sin offering of the high priest for himself, that of the congregation in several cases of unwonted transgression, and especially the combined sacrifice of the high priest and the congregation on the great Day of Atonement. In these cases the blood of the victims was borne by the high priest into the sanctuary; in the last one, into the inner sanctuary; and the fattest pieces were consumed on the altar, and all the rest, instead of being, so far as might be, eaten by the priests, was carried without the camp into the desert, and there given to the flames. It is to the latter of these cases, probably, that reference is here specially made. The burning of the sacrificial animal is regarded as typical, and as the Jewish priest had no right to follow the victim that had been offered for sin out into the desert, so Christ, having been rejected from the walls of Jerusalem (answering to the ancient encampment), and having there died as a sin offering, those who still abide in the tabernacle, who still adhere to Judaism, have nothing to do with

12 Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.
13 Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach.
14 For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come.
15 By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of *our* lips, giving thanks to his name.

12 the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered
13 without the gate. Let us therefore go forth unto
14 him without the camp, bearing his reproach. For we have not here an abiding city, but we seek after
15 *the city* which is to come. Through him [1] then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his

1 Some ancient authorities omit *then*.

him, and no participation in him. As the priest who remained in the temple had no right to follow the victim without the pale of the encampment, and there feast on its flesh, so those who abide in Judaism, and who thus sanction and ratify the sentence of condemnation and anathema which expelled Christ from the city and made him a sin offering, have no privilege to follow him forth and partake the life-giving banquet of his flesh. Their adherence to Judaism cuts them off from this right. The propriety of the author's comparison may be easily traced. The blood borne by the high priest into the Holy of Holies symbolizes the high-priestly blood which Christ bears into the heavenly sanctuary; while the slaughter of the victim in the outer court, its being offered on the altar, and the final burning of the carcass beyond the precincts of the camp, all find their concentrated representation in the one offering on Golgotha. The richness of the antitype enables it to gather and express in itself the fullness of various types.

12. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with (*by*) **his own blood, suffered without the gate.** The 'wherefore' is, of course, not to be taken as if Jesus suffered in this way in order to conform to this symbol. In fact, the symbol was pre-adapted to the great fact which it was to illustrate. The 'wherefore' is really logical and elliptical, and is equivalent, perhaps, to this; "for which reason we may find in this a parallel to the case of our Lord," etc. As the sin offering of the day of atonement was finally carried without the camp to be burned, so Jesus suffered without the gate of the city of Jerusalem, which answers to the ancient Jewish encampment. And as that victim, in its sacrifice and burning, effected for the people a ceremonial cleansing, so the sacrificed body and the sprinkled blood of Jesus secures for his people a real purification.

13. Therefore—inasmuch as Jesus suffered without the gate, and inasmuch as we cannot share the rich benefits of his atoning death so long as we abide in the precincts of Judaism **—let us go forth to him without the camp** —let us quit the camp of Judaism, the service and the ritual by which so long as we abide we cannot share the benefits of his sacrifice, cannot feast upon that passover which has been slain for us, but which we continue to regard as an accursed thing; that camp, to remain in which is rejection of Christ, to go back to which is denial of Christ, and to go forth from which brings us into participation and union with Christ. **Bearing his reproach**—the reproach which we share in common with him, indignities heaped upon him, and which, borne by us, bring us into near relation to him. The reproach which we bear thus becomes his reproach. Of course, the reproach here has special reference to the reproaches and insults which they would suffer in turning their backs on Judaism. The writer thus turns back once more to that subject of which his mind and heart are full, the warning of his brethren against relapsing into Judaism. With this the next sentence beautifully connects itself.

14. For here have we—*For we have not here an abiding city, but we seek after that which is to be.* Why linger in the earthly Jerusalem? It is not our true and permanent residence. The Jerusalem which is above, which hath foundations, the city of the living God, the mother of us all—this is that which we seek, and the present Jerusalem, ther fore, shall not detain us. The language is, of course, symbolical. The earthly Jerusalem represents the Judaistic system, of which it had been so long the seat; the heavenly Jerusalem represents the freedom and spiritual blessings of the gospel. The capital of the Old Testament Theocracy is not the capital of that kingdom in which is our citizenship, and which is to remain unshaken.

15. By him therefore—*through him, then* (with a special emphasis on *him;* through him,

16 But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.
17 Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that *is* unprofitable for you.

16 name. But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.
17 Obey them who have the rule over you, and submit *to them:* for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account; that they may do this with joy, and not with [1]grief: for this *were* unprofitable for you.

1 Gr. *groaning.*

as the great sacrifice and High Priest of the New Covenant, not through the rites of Judaism—*let us offer a sacrifice of praise to God* 'continually,' and not at distant intervals. 'A sacrifice of praise,' spiritual, however, and not an animal sacrifice, like the thank- or praise-offerings (θυσία αἰνέσεως, Lev. 7 : 12–15) of the Old Testament ritual. In the Psalms (116 : 17; 50 : 14) this praise- or thank-offering is the symbol of the gratitude of the heart and of the lips; and among the traditionary maxims of the synagogue (Delitzsch) is one that, 'In future all other sacrifices cease; but the sacrifice of praise (the thank-offering) ceases not.'

The author explains this sacrifice of praise, this spiritual thank-offering—*that is, the fruit of lips which make confession* (acknowledgment) *of his name.* Hosea 14 : 2 probably suggests the language here used, "And we will render to him in return the fruit of our lips" (Septuagint, καὶ ἀνταποδώσομεν κάρπον χείλεων ἡμῶν). The fruit of the lips means the words, which have their roots, so to speak, in the heart, which spring up and germinate in thoughts, as the branches, and burst forth through the lips in words, as the flowers and fruits.

But along with our sacrifices of praise, the utterance of our lips, we must render other offerings also; namely, beneficence and liberality.

16. But to do good, etc.—*But doing good and communicating, forget not.* "I will have mercy;" that is, I desire the exercise of mercy, says God, "and not sacrifice." The sacrifices of God are a broken and a contrite heart and penitent feelings, expressing themselves in acts of love and beneficence. **For with such sacrifices God is well pleased.** The blood of victims is valued by him only as an act of obedience and as a symbol; beneficence and mercy are intrinsically excellent, and always well pleasing.

17. Obey them, etc. — *Yield obedience to those who lead you, and be submissive* (submit) *to them.* The rulers of the church or churches addressed probably stood firm in the faith, and very possibly deplored the symptoms of half-heartedness and apostasy which disclosed themselves in their brethren. It is not, however, necessary to assume anything in regard to the character of these particular spiritual leaders. Submission to spiritual as to temporal authority; respect and deference to age and authority—were the general duties enjoined on the New Testament churches; and the present injunction may only be in the spirit of that general obligation. They were exhorted to *obey* (πείθεσθε), and to *concede,* yield to them, even when their requirements may cross their own views or feelings. **For they** ('they'—emphatic, αὐτοί—they are the ones who, they as a class; thus not designating so much the character of the individual leaders, but the obligations and functions of the office) **watch**—exercise sleepless vigilance (ἀγρυπνοῦσι)—**for** (*on behalf of*) **your souls**—for their well being and salvation; *as having to render in an account.* The classical phrase (λόγον ἀποδοῦναι), to render a reason, or render an account of one's opinions or one's conduct. When the Great Shepherd shall appear, these under shepherds will be expected and required to render to him an account of the flock committed to their charge.

That they may do it, etc.—*In order that with joy they may do this and not grieving.* This 'in order that' assigns a motive for their obedience; namely, that they may (not, render their account, but) exercise their watchful care —for to this the 'do this' refers; 'with joy'—that is, in view of the success of their ministry, and not sighing over its unfruitfulness. Disobedience and refractoriness on the part of the church, would tend to frustrate all the faithful labors and watchcare of their spiritual overseers. *For this is unprofitable for you*—that is, changing the negative into the positive idea; *injurious,* productive of evil. The ex-

18 Pray for us: for we trust we have a good conscience, in all things willing to live honestly.
19 But I beseech *you* the rather to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner.
20 Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant,

18 Pray for us: for we are persuaded that we have a good conscience, desiring to live honourably in all
19 things. And I exhort *you* the more exceedingly to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner.
20 Now the God of peace, who brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep [1] with the

1 Or, *by*. Gr. *in*.

pression is a *litotes*, designedly saying less than is meant.

18. Pray for us. Whether the author here uses the plural for the singular (Bleek, Lünemann, etc.), or includes with himself his fellow laborers among the Hebrew Christians, it is not easy to decide. Perhaps the latter is more probable. **For we trust we have a good conscience.** On this ground he can confidently ask for their prayers; as, knowing that they have honest and upright purposes in the sight of God, they furnish the moral conditions required for hoping for the divine blessing, and under which the prayers of the saints for them may prove effectual. A hypocrite cannot otherwise than hypocritically ask others to pray for him. The 'trusting' that we have a good conscience is the language of that proper self-distrust, which, aware of the deceitfulness of the heart, will not take its own moral consciousness as final and positive proof of rectitude. 'We *trust* we have a good conscience.' God *may* judge us more deeply and correctly. **In all things willing** (*wishing*) **to live honestly** (*conduct ourselves honorably*). The natural emphasis on 'wishing' (θέλοντες) implies a certain modest spirit of self-defense, as if he and his fellow-laborers had to encounter suspicion and reproach on the part of the Hebrew churches. 'We *trust*,' says he, 'we have a good conscience'—it is our wish in all things to deport ourselves honorably. Imperfect as may be our action, we have, at least, upright and honorable aims. The specific idea may be that they have no desire to trample on Jewish prejudices, to break away from Jewish restraints, but to proceed in all things, as between Jews and Gentiles, with caution and due consideration.

19. But I beseech you the rather (*the more abundantly* — more earnestly) **to do this**; namely, to pray for us; and, more especially, of course, for me—**that I may be** *the more quickly* **restored to you.** From this some have inferred that the author was now in prison, though by no means with certainty. Innumerable other hindrances besides this may have demanded their prayers; and were he in prison, we might naturally expect (though this, also, in the great brevity of personal reference, is by no means certain) that he would be more explicit regarding it. The most which we can infer with confidence, is that the writer has stood in important, and still stood in kindly relations, to the church or churches addressed; that he was consciously a person of consideration among them, and was either expecting or expected to rejoin them at some distant period. On the whole, the allusion is too slight and vague to furnish any satisfactory clue, either to the author or to the recipients of the Epistle.

20, 21. A beautiful and magnificent form of benediction: one whose exceeding solemnity might suggest the idea that the author regarded himself as near his departure from earth.

Now (*and may*) **the God of peace**—appropriately so designated with reference to his desire that they may be delivered from the turmoil and conflicts of false doctrine, and be established in the calm and peaceful faith and doctrines of the gospel—**who brought again** (*back*) **from the dead the Great Shepherd of the sheep,** and as he thus dissolved the bands of death to bring up the Great Shepherd and restore him to his church, can rend asunder any bands which hold the under shepherds away from their folds. (1) Here only in the Epistle the writer alludes to the resurrection of the Lord. Elsewhere his view has alternated between his humiliation in the flesh, and atoning sacrifice on the cross, and his heavenly exaltation and high priesthood in the upper sanctuary. Here the fact of the resurrection comes in naturally and beautifully between these two, and completes the recognition in the Epistle of all the grand epochs or periods in the Redeemer's life; his pre-existent, eternal Sonship, his creative agency, his incarnation, his suffering life, his death, his resurrec-

21 Make you perfect in every good work to do his
will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his
sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom *be* glory for ever
and ever. Amen.
22 And I beseech you, brethren, suffer the word of
exhortation: for I have written a letter unto you in
few words.

blood of an eternal covenant, *even* our Lord Jesus,
21 make you perfect in every good [1] thing to do his
will, working in [2] us that which is well-pleasing in
his sight through Jesus Christ; to whom *be* the
glory [3] for ever and ever. Amen.
22 But I exhort you, brethren, bear with the word of
exhortation: for I have written unto you in few

1 Many ancient authorities read *work*.....2 Many ancient authorities read *you*.....3 Gr. *unto the ages of the ages.*

tion and ascension (for really both of these are contained in the bringing back, ἀναγαγών), and his glorification. (2) The expression here may perhaps be referred back to Isa. 63 : 11: "Where is he who brought up out of the sea the shepherd of the sheep?" (Septuagint, ποῦ ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων.) As Moses, then, the shepherd of the flock of Israel, was brought up out of the Red Sea, so Christ, the Great Shepherd, is brought up out from the dead. (3) The clause also reminds the readers of the one Shepherd, from whose fold they are not to stray.

Through (*in*) **the blood of the** (*an*) **everlasting covenant.** Whether this is dependent on the participle 'brought back' (ἀναγαγών), or the adjective 'great' (μέγας), and thus whether it declares that Christ was brought back in the blood, etc., or is a Great Shepherd in the blood, is a point on which expositors are divided. Each is grammatically possible, and each is unexceptionable in sense. It was 'in' (here equivalent to, by virtue of, so better than 'with,' Calvin, Bleek, etc., 'in' as denoting *accompaniment*), the blood of an eternal covenant, that Christ became a spiritual Head and and the Shepherd of his people: it was in virtue of that same blood that God brought him back from among the dead. I scarcely see a ground of deciding between them. Our Lord Jesus—Jesus is his name as dying, or as ascending and rejoicing. The one is the designation of affection, the other of reverence. The one points to his love in dying for his people, the other to his power to protect and glorify them.

Make you perfect[1] **in every good work,** *in order that ye may do his will.* The doing of God's will is dependent on his fashioning and perfecting them in every good work. God works in advance of man. As he chooses his people before they choose him, so he must work in them the work of faith with power, before they will work to do his will. **Working** (*accomplishing*) **in you that which is well pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ**—transforming your natures, bestowing on you those gifts of his grace which work renovation in your hearts, and this through Jesus Christ, through whom all spiritual influences are bestowed, and all sanctifying work wrought.

To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen. To whom; namely, to Christ the subject immediately preceding; or to God the principal subject of the entire period? Either reference is grammatical, either would be in accordance with the doctrine of the Epistle, as of the entire New Testament. "To him who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." The sentence, however, is certainly better rounded and more complete in its rhetorical structure if the thought returns at the close to its original starting point, and if making a somewhat fuller pause after Christ, we refer the 'to whom,' back to 'God.'

(3) *Final injunctions, personal references and salutations.* (22–25.)

22. And I beseech you, brethren, suffer (*bear with*) **the word of exhortation.** This is the second instance (see ver. 19) of the author's use of the first person singular in the entire Epistle. This is so totally at variance with the universal character of the acknowledged Pauline epistles, that of itself it goes far to decide against the Pauline authorship of this. It is difficult to conceive how that full, overflowing, impetuous nature, everywhere else breathing out so lavishly and warmly its individual feelings and sentiments, could here have put upon them so strict a rein. The reference here is undoubtedly, not merely to the more strictly hortatory parts of the Epistle, but to the entire discussion, which is itself one grand exhortation. The Epistle has a strictly practical purpose throughout. Its argument is closely interwoven with its admonitions, and all alike are intended to rescue its readers from impending apostasy. For the phrase 'word of exhortation,' see Acts 13 : 15. **For I have written**—*for also with brevity have I writ-*

[1] Καταρτίζω *to frame, construct, fit, fashion.*

23 Know ye that *our* brother Timothy is set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.
24 Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you.
25 Grace *be* with you all. Amen.
¶ Written to the Hebrews from Italy by Timothy.

23 words. Know ye that our brother Timothy hath been set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.
24 Salute all them who have the rule over you, and all the saints. [1]They of Italy salute you.
25 Grace be with you all. Amen.

1 Or, *The* brethren *from*.

ten to you. 'For also' (καὶ γάρ) designating here perhaps an additional reason, besides the weighty intrinsic considerations, why they should favorably receive his Epistle. "Much as I had to say I have written with all possible brevity; I have condensed my matter, in order not to be burdensome, into the smallest possible compass." None can read this Epistle carefully without being sensible of the entire justness of this statement. Considering the number and magnitude of the topics treated, it is a marvel of brevity and condensation. This of itself, placed alongside of the diffusiveness of the post-apostolic writers, indicates the inspiration of the Epistle. Nothing can exceed its pregnant and most suggestive conciseness. Every clause might be expanded into a chapter, every chapter into a volume.

23. Know ye that our brother Timothy is (*hath been*) set at liberty. Some, instead of 'know,' render as indicative, 'ye know,' but probably incorrectly. De Wette urges that if it were imperative, the author, wishing to give information, would have been more explicit; but this is pure conjecture. He might only wish to say exactly this, assuming that what else might appertain to the matter was either already known, or soon would be, as he anticipates a speedy visit to them, both of Timothy and himself. 'Hath been set at liberty.' From this we may infer that Timothy had been probably imprisoned, though of this we elsewhere know nothing. If this imprisonment was at Rome, then the writer of this could scarcely be at Rome, unless we take the 'if he come quickly,' of Timothy's coming to them (which, indeed, I think very possible) rather than of his coming to him. It would seem to mark an epoch in the life of Timothy later than any of Paul's epistles, and therefore, I think, after the death of the great apostle. If, as Alford supposes, the Epistle was sent to Jewish Christians in Rome, then Timothy could not have been imprisoned there.

Some render, instead of 'set at liberty' (ἀπολελυμένον), 'sent away,' 'despatched'—as Luke uses the word (Acts 13:3; 15:30), of official sending forth—that is, either with this letter to you, or elsewhere; and in accordance with this supposition is the traditionary subscription of the letter, "Written to the Hebrews from Italy through Timothy." As the word will bear this meaning, then, on the supposition that Timothy had not been imprisoned, and that he had now gone as the bearer of this Epistle, the word would be its own interpreter, and nothing more would be needed. If Timothy was sent in any other direction, something would seem necessary to be added, in order to make its import clear. Under these circumstances, while 'set at liberty' is the more natural rendering, yet it seems impossible to arrive at any certain conclusion. That, however, Timothy could not have been now sent with this Epistle to them, seems to follow from the next. **With whom, if he come shortly (*quickly*), I will see you.** This certainly would seem unnatural, though not impossible, to be said, in case Timothy was now gone on a mission to the churches with this Epistle. It therefore much more probably refers to an imprisonment from which Timothy had now been released, and in consequence of which, coming to the writer, they were together to visit these Christians. I think, therefore, that the evidence, slight as it is, tends to show that the Epistle is post-Pauline. Nothing more, however, and not even that can with certainty be drawn from it. The 'if he shall come very quickly,' is, probably, 'if he come to me,' and not, 'if he come to you'; and yet this latter is very possible. But in either case, how the speediness of Timothy's coming was to affect the movements of the author, remains entirely in the dark.

24. Salute all them that have the rule over (*lead of*) you, and all the saints—alike officers of the church and private brethren; the whole body of Christians with whom they might stand in any connection. **They of (*from*) Italy salute you.** This phrase again fails to give any decisive clue to the

locality either of the writer or receivers of the Epistle. The phrase 'those from Italy' (οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας) most naturally denotes those who belong to a certain place or country, but are now distant from it, as "the Jews from Asia" — οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι (Acts 21 : 27)— namely, the Jews who belonged to, and came from, Asia. It may, however, be equivalent to 'those who belong to Italy' (οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας) and dwell there; as Acts 17 : 12, "those of Thessalonica" (οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης). Thus, then, here the phrase would most naturally mean, judged simply by itself, 'those from Italy,' who are in another country; and this would mark the locality of the writer as out of Italy, and the probable destination of the Epistle as to Italian Christians, to whom their distant countrymen send greeting. But it may also denote those that belong to Italy and dwell there; and thus mark the writer as now dwelling in Rome, or some other part of Italy, and sending their greetings to churches elsewhere. Thus the utmost that it certainly proves is that either the writer of the Epistle was in Italy, or its recipients were; and judging the phrase simply by itself, the latter would be the more probable; but if it could be made out with any certainty that it was addressed to Christians in Palestine or elsewhere, then it would be pretty clear that the Epistle originated in Italy. This is made much more probable by the fact that the Epistle was so long unknown to the Western churches, which seems inexplicable if it had been originally addressed to Roman or Italian Jewish Christians.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

TRANSLATION.

A. C. Kendrick, D. D.

1 Fragmentarily and diversely [1] God, having of old spoken unto our fathers
2 in the prophets, hath in the close of these days spoken unto us in his Son,[2] whom
3 he hath appointed inheritor of all things: by whom also he made the worlds;[3] who,
being the effulgence of his glory, and the express image of his substance, and
sustaining all things with the mandate of his power, after making a cleansing of
4 sins, took his seat at the right hand of Majesty in the lofty [4] [heavens], becom-
ing [5] so much superior to the angels, as he hath inherited a name transcending
5 theirs. For unto which of the angels said he at any time,

Thou art my Son;
To day have I begotten thee?

and again,

I will be to him a Father,
And he shall be to me a Son?

6 And when he shall bring back into the inhabited world the Firstborn, he
7 saith,[6] And let all the angels of God worship him. And while in respect to the
angels he saith,

Who maketh his angels (messengers) winds,
And his ministers a flame of fire:

8 [He saith] in respect to the Son,

Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever;
The sceptre of rectitude is the sceptre of thy kingdom.
9 Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity;
Therefore, O God, thy God [7] hath anointed thee
With the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

10 And,

Thou, Lord, in the beginning didst lay the foundations of the earth,
And the works of thine hands are the heavens.

---

1 *Fragmentarily*, as to substance: *diversely*, as to mode. Or, in many portions and many modes.

2 Greek, Ἐν Υἱῷ. The absence of the article emphasizing the character.

3 Or, *ages*.

4 Ἐν ὑψηλοῖς belongs in construction to ἐκάθισεν.

5 Γενόμενος, not, *being made*, as Common Version, nor, *having become*, as Revised Version, nor, *having proved himself*, as Farrar: but *becoming* (the simplest and most natural rendering of the participle); *i. e.*, thus in his outward exaltation reaching the position that corresponded with his measureless intrinsic dignity. He thus became outwardly and entirely what he was already in his essential nature.

6 Proleptic, equivalent to, *will say*.

7 Or, *God, thy God*.

11 They shall perish, but thou continuest:
And they all as a garment will grow old;
And as a vesture shalt thou roll them up,
And they shall be changed.[1]
12 But thou art the same,
And thy years shall not fail.
13 And in respect to which of the angels hath he said at any time,
Sit thou at my right hand,
Until I shall make thine enemies thy footstool?[2]
14 Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to render service for the sake of them that are to inherit salvation?

2 For this cause we ought the more earnestly to give heed to the things which
2 have been heard,[3] lest, perchance, we drift away from them. For if the word which was spoken through angels proved stedfast, and every transgression and
3 neglect received a rightful recompense, how shall *we* escape after neglecting so great a salvation? which having at the beginning been spoken through the
4 Lord, was by them that heard him confirmed unto us, God bearing them joint attestation alike with signs, and portents, and various acts of power, and impartings of the Holy Spirit, according to his will.
5 For not unto angels did he put in subjection the coming world concerning
6 which we are speaking. But one in a certain place testified, saying,
What is a man that thou art mindful of him;
Or a son of man that thou regardest him?
7 Thou didst lower him some little below the angels;
With glory and honor didst thou crown him;
[Thou didst set him over the works of thy hands;]
8 Thou didst subject all things beneath his feet.
For in subjecting to him all things, he left nothing unsubjected to him. But
9 as it is, we do not yet see all things subjected to him. But him who hath been for some little made lower than the angels, even Jesus, we behold, because of his suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that, by the grace of God,
10 he might, on behalf of every man,[4] taste of death. For it was befitting him, because of whom are all things, and through whom are all things to render, as

[1] So Tischendorf, Ed. 8. Westcott and Hort, after ℵ A B read, "As a garment, and they shall be changed." Or, "As a garment also shall they be changed." The reading would seem to be from some MS. error.

[2] Literally, *The footstool of thy feet.*

[3] Τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσι, literally, *the things which were heard*, answering to, οἱ λαληθέντες, *which were spoken.*

[4] Pregnant construction apparently equivalent to, that the death which he had tasted might be for the benefit of every man—that is, of universal humanity. So somewhat similarly 1 Peter 4 : 6. "The gospel was preached to the dead, that they might be judged, indeed," equivalent to, "although they had been judged, etc., they might live, etc."

one bringing many sons unto glory, the Leader of their salvation perfect through
11 sufferings. For both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all
12 from One:[1] for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying,

I will announce thy name unto my brethren;
In the midst of the congregation I will sing praise to thee.

And again,

I will put my trust in him:

13 And again,

Behold, I and the children that God gave to me.

14 Since therefore the children have shared in blood and flesh, he himself also similarly took part in the same; that through death he may destroy him that
15 hath the dominion of death, that is, the devil; and may deliver those who
16 through fear of death are, through all their lifetime, subjects of bondage. For it is not, in sooth,[2] angels of whom he cometh to the rescue, but he rescueth the
17 seed of Abraham. Whence it behooved him to be in all things assimilated to his brethren, that he may prove himself merciful and a faithful high priest in
18 things relating to God, to make expiation for the sins of the people. For wherein he hath himself suffered being tempted,[3] he is able to succor them that are tempted.

3 Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling, contemplate the
2 apostle and high priest of our confession, Jesus, as one who was faithful to him
3 that made him,[4] as was also Moses in all His house. For he hath been deemed worthy of more glory than Moses, by how much more honor than the house
4 hath he who established it. For every house is established by some one;[5] but
5 he who established all things is God. And Moses, indeed, was faithful in all His house as a servant, for a testimony to that which was hereafter to be
6 spoken; but Christ as a Son over His house; whose house are we, if we hold fast unto the end our confidence, and the glorying of our hope.

7 Wherefore, according as saith the Holy Spirit,

8 To-day, if ye shall hear his voice,
Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation;
In the day of the temptation in the wilderness:

9 Where your fathers tempted me in making proof of me,
And saw my works during forty years:

10 Wherefore I was angry with this generation;

[1] 'One,' that is, Father.

[2] Δή που, a light and often slightly ironical particle of affirmation, "*You know doubtless*," "*you know I suppose*," "*in sooth*."

[3] Or, *wherein he hath suffered by being himself tempted.*

[4] Or, *appointed him.* Compare 1 Sam. 12: 6. It refers, doubtless, either to his human birth or his mediatorial exaltation.

[5] Has some subordinate and earthly founder, while the universal and supreme founder is God, to whom all are responsible, alike Moses and Jesus.

And I said, They always go astray in their heart;
But they did not know my ways:
11 So that I swore in my wrath,
They shall not enter into my rest.
12 Look to it, brethren, lest in any of you there shall be an evil heart of unbelief
13 in falling away from the Living God. But exhort one another, day by day, so long as it is still called 'to-day,'[1] that of you there be no one hardened by
14 the deceitfulness of sin. For we have become participants of Christ, provided
15 that we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end. In its being said,

To-day if ye shall hear his voice,
Harden not your hearts as in the provocation.—

16 For who,[2] when they heard, provoked him? Nay, did not all they that came
17 out of Egypt through Moses? And with whom was he angry during forty years? Was it not with them that sinned? And their carcasses fell in the
18 wilderness! And to whom did he sware that they should not enter into his
19 rest, but to them that disobeyed him? And we *see* that they were not able to enter in because of unbelief!—

4 Let us fear, therefore, lest haply, though there remaineth a promise of
2 entering into his rest, any of you may seem to have come short of it. For we have, indeed, received the glad message just as did also they; but the word of their hearing did not profit them, not having united itself by faith with them[3]
3 that heard it. For we enter into his rest as those who have believed; according as he hath said,[4]

So that I sware in my wrath,
They shall not enter into my rest;

And this, indeed, his[5] works having been accomplished [and thus his rest
4 established] from the foundation of the world. For he hath said in a certain place concerning the seventh day thus, And God rested in the seventh day
5 from all his works. And in this place again [he hath said], They shall not
6 enter into my rest. Since therefore it remaineth[6] that some may enter into it, and they who formerly had the glad message did not enter in because of

---

[1] Or, *so long as the "to-day" is still called* [in your ears].

[2] For who, etc. Abrupt break in the preceding thought and construction, in order to sharpen the appeal he is about to make by reminding them *who* they were that thus sinned and perished.

[3] Or, *not having united itself with faith in them*, etc. Or, συγκεκερασμένους, not being united by faith with them that heard, as, perhaps, with Caleb and Joshua. But the idea is exceedingly harsh.

[4] The quotation seems made to prove by the fact that some are now excluded from it, that the rest did actually exist as a possibility for some.

[5] 'His': the article being here, I think, as often in Greek, equivalent to the pronoun.

[6] 'Remaineth': as a logical conclusion from the language.

7 disobedience, he again fixeth a certain day; namely, 'To-day;' saying in David
so long a time afterward (as hath been said before),

To-day, if ye shall hear his voice,
Harden not your hearts.

8 For if Joshua had brought them to their rest, he would not after this be
9 speaking of another day. So then there remaineth a sabbatic rest for the people
10 of God. For he who hath [1] entered into His rest hath also himself rested from
his works even as God did from his own.

11 Let us be earnest, therefore, to enter into that rest, in order that none may fall
12 after the same example of disobedience. For the word of God is living and
effective, and sharper than a two-edged sword, and penetrating even to the
severing of soul and spirit—both joints and marrow—and sits in judgment on
13 the reflections and thoughts of the heart. And there is no created thing that
is not manifest in his presence; but all things are naked and laid bare to His
eyes with whom is our account.

14 Having, therefore, a Great High Priest who hath passed through the heavens,
15 Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession. For we have not an high
priest who cannot sympathize with our infirmities, but who hath been tried in all
16 respects like as we are, apart from sin. Let us approach, therefore, with boldness
to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace for seasonable
succor.

5 For every high priest, being taken from among men, is constituted in behalf
of men in things relating to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for
2 sins; being able to deal tenderly with the ignorant and erring, since he is him-
3 self also encompassed with infirmity, and because of it is bound, as for the
4 people, so also for himself, to bring offerings for sins. And not unto himself
doth any one take the honor, but being called of God, even as was Aaron.
5 So also Christ did not glorify himself to be made a high priest; but he [glori-
fied him] who said unto him,

Thou art my Son,
To day have I begotten thee;

6 even as he also saith in another place,

Thou art a priest forever,
After the order of Melchisedec.

7 Who, in the days of his flesh,[2] offering up[3] entreaties and supplications, with

[1] Κατέπαυσεν. If we refer this to Christ we should give to the aorist its stricter rendering, "He who rested," "rested also himself:" but if, as is more natural, to the believer, we render more idomatically "he who hath entered," "hath himself rested."

[2] Affirmation, by a striking example (the agony of Gethsemane), of the first essential priestly quality, his humanity (λαμβανόμενος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων).

[3] 'Offering up': on a single occasion (προσενέγκας, aorist participle); namely, in the Garden.

strong outcry and tears, to him who was able to save him from death, and being
8 hearkened to from his filial piety, although he was a Son, learned from that
9 which he suffered obedience; and being perfected, became to all who prove
10 obedient to him the author of an eternal salvation, being saluted by God as
high priest after the order of Melchisedec.
11 Concerning which matter[1] our discourse is long and hard of explanation,
12 since ye have become dull in your hearing. For when, on account of the time,
ye ought to be teachers, ye again have need that one teach you[2] the rudi-
mentary principles of the oracles of God, and have come to have need of milk,
13 and not of solid food. For every one who partaketh milk is without experience
14 in the doctrine of righteousness:[3] for he is an infant. But solid food is for
the mature, who, on account of habit, have their perceptions disciplined for the
discriminating of good and evil.

6 Wherefore passing from the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us
hasten on to maturity, not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead
2 works and faith toward God, of a teaching of baptisms and laying on of
3 hands, and of resurrection of the dead and an eternal judgment. And this will
4 we do, *provided that God permit.* For as to those who have been once for all
enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift and been made partakers of
5 the Holy Spirit, and tasted an excellent word[4] of God, and the powers of the
6 Coming World, and have fallen away, it is impossible to renew them again to
repentance, since they re-crucify for themselves the Son of God, and put him to
7 an open shame. For land that hath drunk the rain that cometh frequently
upon it, and bringeth forth herbage suitable for those for whose sake it is being
8 cultivated, partaketh in a blessing from God; but when it beareth thorns and
briars, it is rejected[5] and nigh unto a curse; of which the end is for burning.
9 But we are persuaded of the better alternative concerning you, beloved, and
10 things akin to salvation, although we are thus speaking. For God is not
unrighteous to prove forgetful of your work, and the love which ye exhibited
11 toward his name in that ye ministered to the saints, and still minister. But we
desire that each of you display the same zeal for the full perfection of his hope
12 unto the end, that ye may not prove sluggish, but imitators of them who
13 through faith and patient endurance inherit the promises. For God, in making
promise to Abraham, since he could swear by none greater, sware by himself,
14 saying, 'Assuredly, blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply
15 thee': and thus by patient endurance he obtained the promise. For men

---

[1] Either Christ's priesthood, or specially his Melchisedec priesthood I think the former. Certainly not Melchisedec himself.

[2] Or, *that we teach you what are* (τίνα for τινά).

[3] Or, *in a discourse of righteousness.*

[4] Ῥῆμα,, *utterance, ordinance;* not λόγος, *word* as properly vehicle of *thought, speech.*

[5] Τίκτουσα, ἀδόκιμος, *disapproved, discarded;* the figure is that of life and responsibility.

16 indeed swear by the greater, and to them in every dispute a confirmatory limit
17 is the oath. In respect of which God, wishing to display more abundantly to
the heirs of the promise the unchangeableness of his counsel, interposed with
18 an oath; that by two unchangeable things in which it is impossible that God
should prove false, we may have strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge
19 to lay hold upon the hope that lies before us, which, as an anchor of the soul,
we have both sure and stedfast, and entering to the region within the veil,
20 where, as Forerunner on our behalf, Jesus entered, BECOMING, AFTER THE
ORDER OF MELCHISEDEC, A HIGH PRIEST FOREVER.[1]

7 For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the Most High God, who met
Abraham as he was returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed
2 him; to whom also Abraham opportioned a tithe of all; being first by interpre-
tation King of Righteousness, and then also King of Salem, which is, King of
3 Peace; without father, without mother, without record of descent, having neither
beginning of days, nor end of life, remaineth a priest in perpetuity.
4 And observe how great is this man to whom also Abraham gave a tithe of
5 his choicest spoils—the patriarch. And while they who of the sons of Levi
receive the priesthood, have a command, according to the law, to tithe the
people—that is, their brethren, and that though they have issued from the loins
6 of Abraham—he who does not derive his descent from them has tithed Abraham,
7 and hath blessed the man who had the promises. And beyond all contradiction
8 the less is blessed by the greater. And here, indeed, dying men receive tithes;
9 but there, he of whom it is testified that he liveth. And, as one might say,
10 through Abraham also Levi, who receiveth tithes, has been tithed; for he was
still in the loins of his father when Melchisedec met him.
11 If indeed, therefore, *accomplishment* was[2] through the Levitical priesthood
(for on its basis the people have had their legislation) what need was[2] there that
after the order of Melchisedec a different priest should arise, and not be called
12 after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being transferred, there becometh
13 also of necessity a transference of the law; [but it has been transferred]; for
he of whom these things are said, is member of another tribe, from which none
14 hath given attendance at the altar. For it is conspicuously evident that our
Lord hath arisen out of Judah, in respect to which tribe Moses spake nothing
15 concerning priests. And [the transfer] is still more abundantly evident if
16 [equivalent to, *in that*], after the likeness of Melchisedec, there ariseth a differ-
ent priest, who is made not after the law of a fleshly commandment, but after
17 the power of an indissoluble life. (For it is testified,

---

[1] As the author enters more fully on the subject of the priesthood, he repeats formally and solemnly its three grand features: After the order of Melchisedec—high priest—forever.

[2] Or, *were—were there.*

Thou art a Priest *forever,*
After the order of Melchisedec)—
18 For there follows a disannulling of the preceding commandment because of
19 its impotence and unprofitableness—(for the law brought nothing to perfection)
—and the introduction in its stead of a better hope by which we draw near
to God.
20 And inasmuch as *it is* not without the swearing of an oath—for they indeed
21 have been made priests without an oath; but he with an oath through him
that saith in respect of him,
The Lord sware and will not repent,
22 Thou art a priest for ever;—
23 by so much also hath Jesus become the surety of a better covenant. And they,
indeed, have in numbers been made priests because of their being hindered by
24 death from abiding [in the priesthood]; but he, because of his continuing for-
25 ever, hath his priesthood untransmissible: whence also he is able to save unto
completeness[1] those who come to God through him, since he always liveth to
make intercession on their behalf.
26 For such a High Priest was [also] befitting us—holy, innocent, undefiled,
27 being separated from sinners, and become higher than the heavens! who hath
not necessity day by day, as those high priests, previously, on behalf of their
own sins, to offer sacrifices, then for those of the people; for this he did once
28 for all in offering up himself. For the law constitutes men high priests, having
infirmity: but the word of the oath, which succeedeth to the law, the Son, who
is perfected for evermore.

8 And as a chief point in the things which we are saying,[2] we have such an
High Priest, who took his seat at the right hand of the throne of Majesty in the
2 heavens, as minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle, which the
3 Lord pitched, not man. For every high priest is appointed for offering both
gifts and sacrifices: whence it is necessary that also this one *have something*
4 *which he may offer.* For if, indeed,[3] he were on the earth he would not even be
5 a priest, since there exist those who offer gifts according to the law, who[4]
minister to a copy and shadow of the heavenly, according as Moses hath been
divinely admonished when about to construct the tabernacle; for look, saith
He, that thou make all things after the model which was shown to thee in
6 the mount. But as it is, he hath obtained a more excellent ministry by how
much also he is Mediator of a better covenant, that hath been enacted upon
7 better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless there would not

[1] Εἰς τὸ παντελές, *absolutely, completely, to perfection.*
[2] Literally, *which are being said.*
[3] Εἰ μὲν γάρ: other authorities read, εἰ μὲν οὖν, *if indeed now*, which seems less fitting to the connection.
[4] Οἵτινες, *such persons as.*

8 have been sought a place for a second. [But is not faultless.] For finding fault [with it], he saith to them:[1]

Behold the days come, saith the Lord,
That I will accomplish over the house of Israel and the house of Judah a new covenant,
9 Not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers,
In the day that I took them by the hand to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt:
Because they did not abide in my covenant,
And I disregarded them, saith the Lord.
10 Because this is the covenant which I will institute[2] with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord;
Putting my laws into their understanding,
Also upon their hearts will I inscribe them,
And I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people:
11 And they shall not teach each one his fellow-citizen, and each his brother, saying,
Know the Lord: because all shall know me, from the least of them unto the greatest:
12 Because I will be merciful to their iniquities, and of their sins I will make mention no more.

13 In his saying "a new [covenant]" he hath rendered antiquated the first; and that which is becoming antiquated and old is near to extinction.

9 Now the first [covenant] had ordinances of worship, and its sanctuary
2 belonging to this world. For a tabernacle was erected, the foremost one, in which was both the lampstand and the table, and the setting forth of the loaves
3 [shew bread]; which is called sanctuary [the Holy place]. And after the second
4 veil, the tabernacle which is called Holy of holies; having a golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid all around with gold, wherein was a golden pot holding the manna, and the rod of Aaron that budded, and the tables of the
5 covenant; and above it cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy seat; of which things we cannot now speak severally.

6 And these things having been thus arranged, into the foremost tabernacle
7 indeed, the priests enter[3] continually, accomplishing their sacred services; but into the second one, once in the year the high priest alone, *not without blood*,
8 which he offers for himself and the errors of the people: the Holy Spirit show-

[1] Some texts read αὐτούς, which requires "finding fault with them"; but the whole connection implies fault in the covenant, and the reading αὐτοῖς, attested by B, seems decidedly preferable.

[2] Διαθήσομαι, *I will covenant, institute, accomplish.*

[3] Εἰσίασιν, 'enter continually'; historical present; the author transports himself back into the time of the tabernacle and its service.

ing this, that the way into the holiest of all hath not yet been manifested,
9 while the foremost tabernacle still hath position; which is a parable for the
[then] present time, in accordance with which [parable] are offered both gifts
and sacrifices that cannot render perfect in the conscience him who offereth
10 service, [consisting] only in meats and drinks, and various immersions—fleshly
ordinances imposed until the season of reformation.
11 But Christ making his appearance, a High Priest of the good things that are
to come, by[1] the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands—
12 that is to say, not of this creation; and not through the blood of goats and
heifers, but through his own blood, entered once for all into the holy place,
13 procuring[2] [for us] an eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and of
bulls, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling them that are defiled, sanctifieth
14 unto cleanness of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who,
through an eternal spirit, offered himself blameless unto God, cleanse our con-
science from dead works unto the serving of the living God.
15 And for this cause he is Mediator of a new covenant, in order that by a
death taking place for the redemption of the transgressions committed under
the first covenant, they who have been called may receive the promise of the
16 eternal inheritance. For where there is a testament,[3] there must be necessarily
17 adduced the death of the testator. For a testament becometh valid in the case
of the dead, since [look] whether it, perchance, hath any force while the
18 testator liveth. Whence neither hath the first covenant been inaugurated with-
19 out blood. For when every commandment had, according to the law, been
spoken by Moses to all the people, taking the blood of the heifers and the
goats with the water and scarlet wool and hyssop, he sprinkled both the book
20 itself and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the covenant which God
21 commanded unto you. And the tabernacle too, and all the vessels of the
22 service, he in like manner sprinkled with blood. And, as one may say, all
things are, according to the law, sprinkled with blood, and apart from the
23 shedding of blood there is no remission. It is necessary, therefore, that while
the copies of the things in the heavens are cleansed with these, the heavenly
24 things themselves be cleansed with better sacrifices than these. For into no
material sanctuary did Christ enter, the antitype of the true, but into heaven
25 itself, now to be manifested in the presence of God for us; and not that he may
oftentimes make an offering of himself, even as the high priest entereth into the

---

[1] 'By', that is, *through, by means of.*

[2] Εὑράμενος, not, *having procured*, but *procuring*, which he formally and fully accomplished by the actual entrance.

[3] Διαθήκη, *a testamentary disposition, a will, a covenant.* The word here slips for a moment half insensibly from the meaning of *covenant* to that of *testament*, turning on the pivot of a common word (διαθήκη), through a common element of meaning (dispensation, arrangement), and related by a common demand for a *death*, as *seal* of the covenant and *condition* of the testament.

26 holy place year by year with alien blood (since thus he must have necessarily
suffered many times since the foundation of the world), but as it is,[1] once for
all, in the consummation of the ages he hath been manifested through his sacri-
27 fice for the doing away of sin. And inasmuch as for men it is reserved once
28 to die, and after this a judgment, so also Christ, being once for all offered to
bear the sins of many, shall a second time, apart from sin, unto those who look
for him, appear for salvation.

10 For the law, having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image
of the things, can never with the same sacrifices year by year, which they offer
2 in perpetuity, make perfect those that engage in them. Since then would they
not have ceased to be offered, because that the worshipers, having once for all
3 been cleansed, would have no longer any consciousness of sins? But there is
4 in them year by year a renewed remembrance of sins. For it is impossible that
5 the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins. Wherefore as he entereth
into the world, he saith,

6 Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not;
But a body didst thou prepare for me;
In holocausts and sin offerings thou didst not have pleasure.
7 Then said I, Lo, I am come,
(In the roll of the book it stands written concerning me),[2]
To do thy will, O God.

8 Above while saying, Sacrifices and offerings and holocausts and sin offerings
thou wouldest not, nor didst have pleasure in (such as are offered according to
9 the law), then hath he said, Lo, I am come to do thy will. He taketh away
10 the first that he may establish the second. By which will we have been
sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.
11 And every priest, indeed, standeth ministering day by day, and offering many
12 times the same sacrifices, such as never can take away sins. But this one, after
offering one sacrifice for sins forever, took his seat[3] at the right hand of God,
13 henceforth awaiting till his enemies be placed as a footstool of his feet. For
14 by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.
15 And the Holy Spirit also testifieth for us. For after having said before,
16 This is the covenant which I will establish with them
In those days, saith the Lord;
Giving my laws upon their heart,

---

[1] Νυνὶ δέ, *but as it is;* doubtful, perhaps, whether this is the antithesis of ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ, ver. 25 (ἐπεὶ ἔδει-κόσμου being then thrown into parenthesis), or of πολλάκις παθεῖν, ver. 26, which in that case is released from the parenthesis. In any case the ἐπεὶ ἔδει is merely logical, *inferring* the singleness and finality of his entrance from the *fact* that it is the *first* and only one.

[2] Or, *it is prescribed to me.*

[3] Or, *took his seat forever.*

17 Even upon their understanding will I inscribe them,
And of their sins and their iniquities I will no longer have remembrance.
18 But where there is remission of these there is no longer an offering for sin.
19 Having therefore, brethren, boldness for our entrance into the sanctuary in
20 the blood of Jesus, by a way new and living, which he consecrated through
21 the vail, that is to say, his flesh; and [having] a great priest over the house
22 of God; let us approach unto him with a true heart, in full assurance of faith,
23 having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience. And having our bodies
washed with pure water, let us hold fast the confession of our hope unwaver-
24 ing—for he is faithful who promised—and let us regard closely one another
25 for incitement unto love and good works; not abandoning the assembling of
ourselves together, as is the custom of some; but exhorting one another, and by
so much the more as ye behold the day drawing near.
26 For if we voluntarily sin, after receiving the recognition of the truth, there
27 remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins; but a certain fearful expectancy of
28 judgment. and a fiery indignation[1] that is to devour the adversaries. One who
has violated the law of Moses, dies without compassion under two or three wit-
29 nesses: of how much sorer punishment, think ye, will he be deemed worthy who
has trampled under foot the Son of God, and counted unclean the blood of the
covenant with which he was consecrated, and done outrage to the Spirit of
30 grace. For we know him who said, Retribution is for me: I will recompense.
31 And again, 'The Lord will judge his people.' A fearful thing is it to fall into
the hands of the living God!
32 But call to mind the former days in which after being enlightened, ye endured
33 a great conflict of sufferings; on the one hand being made a gazing stock by
reproaches and afflictions; and on the other by being made participants with
34 them that were thus treated. For ye sympathized with the bondmen, and
received with joy the plundering of your possessions, knowing that ye had for
35 yourselves[2] a better and an abiding possession. Fling not away then your
36 boldness which hath a great recompense. For ye have need of endurance, in
order that by doing[3] the will of God ye may gain the promise.
37 For yet a little—how little!
He that cometh will come, and will not linger.
38 But my righteous one will live from faith:
And if he shrink back, my soul hath no pleasure in him.
39 But we belong not to them that shrink back unto perdition, but to them that
are of faith unto the gaining of the soul.

11 But Faith is the assurance of what is hoped for; a conviction of things which

[1] Πυρὸς ζῆλος, *jealousy or wrath of fire.* Fire being personified.
[2] Or, *knowing that ye had yourselves as a better*, etc. (So ℵ A.)
[3] Or, *after doing.*

are not seen. For in this the elders received their attestation. By faith we
recognize that the worlds have been framed by the utterance of God, so that not
out of things apparent hath sprung that which is seen. By faith Abel offered
unto God a nobler sacrifice than Cain, through which he was testified to be
righteous, God bearing testimony over his gifts, and through it, after dying,
he still speaketh. By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death;
and he was not found, because God had translated him. For before the
translation he hath had the testimony borne to him that he hath pleased God.
But without faith it is impossible to please him; for he who cometh to God
must have faith that he is, and becometh a rewarder to them that seek for him.
By faith Noah, being divinely warned concerning things that were not as yet
beheld, filled with pious fear, constructed an ark for the saving of his house,
through which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness
which is according to faith. By faith Abraham, being called that he should go
forth into the place which he was destined to receive for an inheritance, obeyed,
and went forth, not knowing whither he was going. By faith he sojourned in
the land of promise, as an alien land, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob,
heirs with him of the same promise. For he was looking for the city that hath
the foundations, whose architect and builder is God. By faith also Sarah her-
self received power for the conception of seed,[1] even when past age, since she
counted faithful him who had promised. For which reason also there were
begotten from one, and him, too, as good as dead, even as the stars of heaven
in multitude, and as the sand which is along the margin of the sea, the innu-
merable.

In accordance with faith did all these die, not receiving the promises, but
seeing them from afar, and greeting them, and acknowledging that they were
strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that use such language show
clearly that they are seeking a country of their own.[2] And if, indeed, they had
had in mind that country from which they had gone forth, they would have had
opportunity to return to it. But as it is, they yearn for a better [fatherland],
even a heavenly. For which reason God is not ashamed to call himself their
God; for he hath prepared for them a city.

By faith Abraham, being put to trial, hath offered up Isaac; and he who
had accepted the promises was offering up his only-begotten son, in respect to
whom it was said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called; reckoning that God is
able to raise even from the dead; whence also he received him in a figure.[3]
By faith also Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning the things which were
in the future. By faith Jacob, when dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph,
and bowed in worship upon the top of his staff. By faith Joseph, in dying,
made mention of the departure of the sons of Israel, and gave commandment

[1] Or, *for the founding of an offspring.* [2] Πατρίδα, *a fatherland;* Alford, *a home.* [3] Or, *similitude.*

23 concerning his bones. By faith Moses, when he was born, was hidden during
three months by his parents, because they saw that the child was fair, and they
24 did not stand in fear of the command of the king. By faith Moses, on being
25 grown up, refused to be called the son of the daughter of Pharaoh, choosing
rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to have a temporary
26 enjoyment from sin, accounting as greater riches than the treasures of Egypt
the reproach of Christ; for he was looking away to the rendering of the reward.
27 By faith he quitted Egypt, not standing in fear of the wrath of the king; for
28 he endured as seeing [the king] that is unseen. By faith he hath observed [1] the
passover and the sprinkling of the blood, in order that he who destroyeth
29 the firstborn may not touch them. By faith they passed through the Red Sea
as through dry land, which the Egyptians attempting to do, were swallowed
30 up. By faith the walls of Jericho fell after being encircled for seven days.
31 By faith Rahab, the harlot, did not perish with them that had proved disobedient, having received the spies with peace.

32 And what shall I say farther? For the time will fail me recounting con-
33 cerning Gideon, and Barak, and Samson, and Jephthah; David, and Samuel,
and the prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness,
34 obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire,
escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were rendered mighty, proved
35 valiant in war, turned to flight embattled hosts of aliens. Women received
36 their dead by resurrection: and others were broken on a wheel, not accepting
37 deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection. And others bore
trial of mockings and scourgings; and, yet further, of bonds and imprisonment:
they were stoned, they were tempted,[2] they were sawn asunder, they died by
slaughter of the sword; they went about in sheepskins, in goatskins; being
38 destitute, afflicted, maltreated—of whom the world was not worthy—wandering
39 in deserts and mountains and caverns and the hollows of the earth. And these
40 all being witnessed to through their faith, received not the promise, God providing something better concerning us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect.

12 Therefore[3] let also us, since we have so great a cloud of witnesses encompass-
ing us, laying aside every weight, and our easily besetting sin,[4] run enduringly
2 the race[5] that lieth before us, looking away unto the Leader and Perfecter of
our faith, even Jesus, who, in view[6] of the joy that lay before him, endured a

---

[1] Or, instituted (πεποίηκεν).

[2] Ἐπειράσθησαν; but far more probable, would seem alike in the rhetorical and historical connection, ἐπρήσθησαν, *they were burned;* a change which may have been easily made, though the reading is without MS. authority.

[3] Τοιγαροῦν, *therefore;* a long, weighty, emphatic particle (τοί, γέ, ἄρα, οὖν, *by this, that is to say, then, now*), 1 Thess. 4 : 8.

Or, *clinging, enfolding.*

[5] Ἀγών, literally, *contest, struggle.*

[6] Ἀντί, *in face of, in exchange for.*

cross, making light of shame, and hath taken his seat at the right hand of the
3 throne of God. For consider earnestly him who hath endured such contradiction at the hands of sinners against himself,[1] that ye be not wearied out and
4 utterly fainting in your souls. Ye have not yet[2] resisted unto blood in your
5 struggle against sin; and ye have forgotten the exhortation which discourseth with you as with sons,

My son, regard not lightly the chastening of the Lord,
Nor faint when thou art reproved by him:
6 For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth,
And scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.

7 It is for discipline that ye endure; God is dealing with you as sons; for what
8 son is he whom his father chastiseth not? And if ye are without chastisement, of which all [sons] have become partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.
9 *Then*,[3] did we have the fathers of our flesh as chasteners, and give them heed, [and] shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of our spirits, and
10 live? For they indeed chastened us with reference to a few days, according to their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we may be partakers of his
11 holiness. And all chastening for the present, indeed, seemeth to be not matter of joy, but of pain; yet afterward it yieldeth a peaceful fruit of righteousness to them that have been disciplined thereby.
12 Wherefore right ye up the relaxed hands and the palsied knees.
13 And for your footsteps make ye level pathways; that what is lame be not turned out of the way, but rather be healed.
14 Pursue after peace with all, and sanctity, without which none shall look
15 upon the Lord. Watching carefully lest there be any falling short of the grace of God;[4] lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and by means of
16 it the many be defiled; lest [there be] any fornicator or profane one, like Esau,
17 who for one meal sold his own birthright. For ye know that afterward, when he would fain inherit the blessing, he was rejected (for he found no place[5] for repentance), although he sought it earnestly with tears.
18 For ye have not drawn near to a palpable [and material] mountain,[6] and to
19 enkindled fire,[7] and to darkness and gloom and tempest, and to the sound of a trumpet, and a voice of uttered words, which they who heard refused, entreating

---

[1] Or, *themselves*, ἑαυτούς, a ℵ D E.

[2] Probably here of internal and spiritual struggle.

[3] Εἶτα, more commonly explained here as *furthermore;* but, I think, erroneously. I take it as the familiar Greek particle of surprise and emotion; *then*, emphatic as often in English. To τοὺς μέν, οὐ πολὺ (δέ) μᾶλλον would regularly correspond.

[4] Or, *lest any one* [be] *lacking the grace of God—lest any root*, etc. The μή τις perhaps takes up the broken construction.

[5] *For effectual repentance;* his regret was too late and unavailing. 'It'; namely, the blessing of the birthright.

[6] Ὄρει, read by Tischendorf, and apparently demanded by the antithesis.

[7] Or, *to a palpable mountain and burning with fire.*

that no further discourse be addressed to them. For they endured not the injunction, Even if a beast touch the mountain it shall be stoned; and, so fearful was the spectacle, Moses said: I am terrified and trembling! But ye have approached unto Mount Sion, and the city of the Living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of angels, a festal company,[1] and to a congregation of first-born ones who are registered in heaven, and as judge to the God of all, and to the spirits of righteous ones made perfect, and to Jesus, Mediator of a New Covenant, and to a blood of sprinkling that speaketh more mightily than that of Abel.[2] See that ye refuse not him who is speaking. For if they escaped not when they refused [to listen] to him who uttered the divine warning on earth, much rather [shall not] we who turn away from him who [uttereth it] from the heavens. Whose voice then shook the earth, but now he hath promised, saying: Yet once for all I will shake not only the earth, but also heaven. And this 'yet once for all' shows the removal of the things which are shaken, as things that have been made, that the things which are not shaken may remain. Wherefore, let us, since we receive a kingdom that is unshaken, cherish thankfulness, through which we may acceptably serve God with reverent awe and fear. For also our God is a consuming fire.

13 Let brotherly love continue. Be not forgetful of the entertaining of strangers: for thereby some have unawares entertained angels. Remember those in bonds as bound with them; them that are ill treated as being yourselves also in the body. Be marriage held in honor among all, and its bed undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God will judge. Be your disposition without avarice, satisfied with your present goods; for he himself hath said, I will in no wise leave thee, nor in any wise abandon thee. So that with confidence we may say,

The Lord is a helper unto me, and I will not be afraid;
What shall a man do unto me?

Bear in memory those who were your leaders, such as spoke to you the word of God; and surveying the issue of their course of life, imitate their faith. Jesus Christ is yesterday and to-day the same, and forever. Be not drawn aside by various and strange teachings. It is an excellent thing that our hearts be established with grace, not with meats with which they that were conversant, were not benefited. We have an altar from which they have no license to eat who serve the tabernacle. For of whatever animals the blood is borne into the sanctuary by the high priest, of these the bodies are burned outside of the encampment. Wherefore also Jesus, that he might by his own blood sanctify the people, suffered without the city. Therefore let us go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach: for we have not here an abiding city,

[1] Or, *and to myriads, a festal host of angels.* [2] Or, *more mightily than Abel.*

15 but we seek that which is to come. Through him, therefore, let us offer up always a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips making acknowledg-
16 ment to his name. And of doing good and of communicating be not forgetful;
17 for with such sacrifices God is well pleased. Obey those that have the leadership of you, and submit to them. For they themselves watch sleeplessly for your souls, as having to render an account; that they may do this with joy, and not with sighing: for this were unprofitable to you.
18 Pray for us: for we persuade ourselves that we have a good conscience, wish-
19 ing in all things to conduct ourselves becomingly. And I the more exceedingly exhort you to do this, that I may the sooner be restored to you.
20 And may the God of peace, who brought back from the dead, in the blood
21 of an eternal covenant, the Great Shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus, perfect you thoroughly in every good work unto the doing of his will, working in you[1] that which is well pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.
22 And I beseech you, brethren, bear with my word of exhortation; for I have
23 written to you in all brevity. Know that our brother Timothy has been set at liberty; with whom, if he come quickly, I shall see you.
24 Salute all them that have the guidance of you, and all the saints. Those from Italy salute you.
25 Grace be with you all.

[1] Ὑμῖν: a somewhat better attested reading, ἡμῖν, *us*. But the two words, becoming alike in sound, were often confounded in the MSS., and here ὑμῖν seems far more probable.

Date Due

[illegible] 20 [illegible]			
[illegible] 5 '36			
MAR 4 '57			

BS2341 .A512 v.6
Commentary on the Pastoral epistles,
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00056 0674