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## PREFACE.

This little book, of scarcely more than three hundred pages, is yet the fruit of much toil. It marks the fulfilment (in some sense) of a hope expressed more than thirty years ago in the Preface to an Edition of St Paul's Epistle to the Romans, that I might live 'to carry a similar process into another Epistle'-I said, 'of St Paul,' for I did not then contemplate the selection of the particular Epistle before us.

A new work on the Epistle to the Hebrews ought on all accounts to be modest and even apologetic. When Delitzsch, on the conclusion (in 1859) of his own work, drew up his long list of previous interpreters, his catalogue of English commentators was meagre in the extreme; and of the few English annotators mentioned by him scarcely one has retained a permanent hold upon the attention of his countrymen. The case is altered now. And it is at least a noticeable coincidence, that within the last seven years there have been (including the v. H.
present volume) no less than four commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews by four ex-Fellows of one great College, who were all, some thirty years ago, Masters in one great School. When it is added that one of these is the Bishop of Durham-stepping at this moment, as if 'baptized for the dead,' into the place of the lamented Bishop Lightfootit does indeed seem as though commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews ought to stop with his, at least until a new generation shall have added something to the theological learning, and something to the spiritual insight, of that to which he has ministered. Bishop Westcott's work on the Epistle to the Hebrews appeared too recently to permit me to make use of it. Indeed it is more than probable that, had I seen his work in time, it would have led me to give up my own. When he reaps his field, he leaves no corners of it for the gleaner.

But every man has his proper gift of God. Every man who has devoted time and thought to the study of Scripture has something to say which another has not said and cannot say for him. The apology which I would make for this little offering to the beloved Church of England is simple and perhaps sufficient. This publication is just the record of the latest thoughts upon the sacred book in question of one whose time has been largely
given, for the last thirty years, to the work of explaining the Greek Testament to a long succession of students for Ordination, who have accepted his help at that critical period of their life, and have given back to him more than they can have received in the stimulus thus applied to his own study of the Bible.

In writing upon the Epistle to the Romans I claimed the position of an independent suggester. Without affecting an originality which can scarcely belong to any one, and the ambition of which has so often been the cankerworm of exegesis, I did profess an independent work and the exercise of an independent judgment, and $I$ thought that in doing so I gave the only reason why I should write at all. The same independence I would assert once again, in offering to my readers this commentary upon an Epistle scarcely second in importance even to that.

But there is one qualification. Common honesty requires its avowal.

In reading the Epistle again and again during these thirty years with my students, I have made great use of Delitzsch. My copy of the English translation of his Commentary is disfigured, almost defaced, by pencil notes in its margin, often of approval, sometimes of dissent, always of respectful appreciation; and I can wish nothing better for my own work than that some traces of his profound
knowledge, something of his deep insight, something (above all) of his invincible faith, may be found impressed upon the pages which are here given to the reader.

When I wrote upon the Epistle to the Romans (a work first published in 1859) I was indebted to my beloved and revered friend, then my colleague at Harrow, the present Bishop of Durham, for the text of my Edition. Textual criticism was then an untrodden field to me: it is almost so now. But in the interval what was then a personal privilege has become the property of the Public. The text of Dr Westcott and Dr Hort, however sharply or even rudely criticized on its first appearance, is quietly (I think) winning its way to the same general acceptance which it commanded in the Jerusalem Chamber from the Revisers of the Authorized Version. Here and there one may venture to think that internal considerations might be allowed a voice, though a faltering one, amidst the higher authorities of the new criticism; but one bows before the profound learning, the lifelong experience, above all the devout reverence, which have guided each separate decision and breathe unmistakably in the whole. In the Epistle to the Hebrews there are scarcely more than two or three passages involving any textual question of serious importance.

It has been my earnest effort to catch the plain
sense, and to trace the developing thought, of each clause and sentence and paragraph. Wherever there seemed to be any ambiguity, I have confessed it, I have sometimes offered an alternative, but I have generally expressed a preference. If in some cases earnestness of conviction has led to an overpositiveness of assertion, I can but express once for all my deep sense of the fault. 'He must be a man of boundless hardihood who could imagine himself to have sounded the depths of a single book or a single sentence of Scripture.'

It has been said that the time for such commentaries as the present is gone by. Verbal criticism, verbal illustration, verbal examination of any kind, is pronounced to have had its day. The time is now come, we are told, for something larger, something bolder, more philosophical, at all events more startling. We are reminded that there is progression in all things, and not least in the interpretation of Scripture. Scripture itself, if it expects still to be listened to, must be made to say something new : ' one generation passeth away, and another generation cometh'-each, we are told, must have its own Bible, or it will look elsewhere than to Revelation for its 'lively oracles.' Still less can we expect permanence for the work of any individual toiler: he may carry the lamp for one stage of the race, but it is only that he may relinquish and hand it on.

Not with the hope of arresting the course of such changes of taste in divine things, but under a strong conviction of the truth of what I say, let me write it down-that I have never known the application of the microscope to one phrase or one word of holy Scripture, which did not discover something not only interesting to the expositor, but profitable also spiritually to the student.

Some impatience has been expressed, in recent reviews, of an accumulation of parallel passages in illustration of the phraseology of the Greek Testament. Any one, it is said, can write out a column of his Bruder or his Trommius. If this were all, the impatience would be just and might be salutary. But this is not all. It is no mechanical process, but one of great nicety and delicacy, which examines and weighs, chooses and refuses, among the endless apparent parallels of which only one in ten or one in a hundred may be real. The expenditure of eyesight and of brainwork demanded by this part of the task is at once severe and for the most part thankless. Even the decision between passages to be only mentioned for reference and passages demanding full quotation is often perplexing, little as it may impress or even be noticed by the reader. But he who would interpret Scripture by Scriptureand this alone deserves the name of interpretationmust gird himself for the effort, and if but one
thoughtful reader follows him the effort is not made in vain.

I have added in an Appendix a very few longer comments than the notes admitted upon special texts and topics. It was scarcely possible to avoid altogether the great question of Inspiration. The one postulate of the Epistle to the Hebrews is the Inspiration of the Old Testament. How much this involves, and what it does not involve, seemed to require a few suggestions, negative and affirmative. It is the glory of this great Epistle to be in many senses the Gospel of the Old Testament. To assert the presence and influence of 'the breath of God' in the whole structure and composition of the Bible; to see an intention in its dark sayings, a meaning in its types, and a sequence in its arrangement; to show that, although 'the testimony of Jesus is (throughout) the spirit of prophecy,' the education of the world nevertheless required that the revelation should be made gradually, 'in divers parts and ways,' leading up to a 'dispensation of the fulness of times' in which God should at last manifest Himself in His Son; this is the special office of the Epistle before us-Epistle, treatise, and homily in one: no generation needed it more than our own, and the growing attention paid to it shows that the need is felt.

I leave to larger works and more learned writers
the discussion of the still unanswered questions, who was the writer, and who were the first readers, of the Epistle. These are interesting and important enquiries. But the authorship in this case is not vital to the authority. And as to the authority, which is in other words the canonicity, of the Epistle, the brief summary of fact is unchallenged, (I) that, although it suffered an eclipse lasting for two centuries (not the first, however, after its writing) in the Latin half of the Church, yet from earliest times it was accepted as inspired Scripture by that other half of the Christian world to which it first spoke, and which had a nearer access to its witnesses and its credentials; and (2) that a time came, before the fourth century ended, when, under the judicial guidance of the two greatest of the Latin fathers, the authoritative verdict of the third Council of Carthage stamped it with that seal of canonical sanctity which the Church of all later generations has recognized as final.

The question of authorship is secondary to that of authority. It was not usual with the very earliest fathers to name authors in their quotations. As soon as the Epistle before us is ascribed to any author, it is ascribed to St Paul. No adverse testimony to this authorship is found before Tertullian. The great Alexandrian fathers, Clemens and Origen, impressed by its unlikeness in style to St

Paul's acknowledged writings, account for this discrepancy, the one by the supposition of a Hebrew original translated by St Luke, the other by that of a composition of which the thoughts are St Paul's but the words those of St Luke or Clement of Rome. The very conjectures should reprove the arrogance which imputes to the early Church either haste or credulity in the formation of the sacred Canon. Neither candour nor intelligence had its birth, as some would persuade us, in the opening years of the century now closing. The criticism of Alexandria was as keen and as outspoken as that of this day in Germany or England : and the particular criticism of which we are speaking has taken no step, certainly no stride, towards finality since the age of Clement and Origen.

It is easy to make a long list of resemblances and differences between the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews and that of the undoubted letters of St Paul. There are passages in the Epistle in which we might seem to hear his very voice. Such are the closing words, telling of the release of Timothy, and of the prospect of the writer's visiting with him the Church addressed. Like, yet not too much like, the passage in Phil. ii. 19-24, in which he purposes presently to send Timothy, and hopes that he also himself shall come shortly. The second chapter of our Epistle gives us a quotation used by St Paul
himself in writing to the Corinthians, and comments upon it almost to the same purpose. The argument of the fourth chapter recalls, at least by its ellipses, that of the third chapter of the letter to the Galatians; and the reproofs of the sixth and tenth chapters rival in their severity, and not less in their alternations of severity and tenderness, those of the fourth and fifth chapters of the same Epistle to Galatia. To say that there is no indication in the Epistle of any other doctrine than the Evangelical system of St Paul is to say little more than that both are Scripture; but the Scripture of both alike differs widely in expression from the Scripture of St James or of St John. Even passages of which the first reading suggests the comment, 'This cannot be St Paul,' may find their parallels somewhere, if not in his written words, yet in records of his speeches by St Luke: as, for example, the grand opening of the Epistle before us in the main paragraph of his address at Athens (Acts xvii. 24); and the clause most unlike him of all, 'confirmed unto us by them that heard Him' (Heb. ii. 3), in his own argument at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 31), 'He was seen many days of them which came up with Him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are His witnesses unto the people.'

Nevertheless, and in the face of all resemblances and parallels, we echo the voice of Clement and

Origen in declaring that, however Pauline, the Epistle as we possess it is not St Paul's. Those who have lived for long years in the study of the Epistles can scarcely err in their instinctive perception of $\alpha$ something here which is not there. The position is altogether unlike that, for example, of the Pastoral Epistles. In them we have many more words, and many more topics, new to St Paul since he wrote even to the Colossians, than we have in this letter. But the living man is there, in those letters, and the living man, his very self, is not here. New words are nothing, new topics are nothing: a man lives and learns, a man lives and changes; but a man whose differentia of thought and speech was of one kind, a man whose whole method of treatment and dealing was of one kind, does not turn, in either respect, into another kind as life advances; least of all can we imagine a change into the different kind followed by a change back again-in other words, the Paul of the Romans and the Ephesians changed into the Paul of the Hebrews, and changed back again into the Paul of the Pastoral Epistles. We feel instinctively that such characteristics as we notice in this Epistle-inversions, transpositions, effects artistic rather than natural-belong to another personality than that of St Paul, whose own words (even if we demur to their rendering, or count the words themselves needlessly self-depreciatory) make him 'rude
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in speech,' while the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews everywhere presents himself as an 'eloquent man' as well as ' mighty in the Scriptures.'

The last reference might suggest the name of Apollos in connexion with the authorship of this Epistle. It is a plausible guess, but the silence of antiquity is unfavourable if not fatal to it. Many similarities of style and language suggest the name of St Luke: they are indeed striking and abundant, and the conjecture of Clement and Origen gives some weight to the inference. Still we could not safely go beyond the position of those great men, which assigns to St Luke not the ideas or the arguments, but at most the shape and the dress. There is no reason to suppose St Luke to have been of Hebrew parentage, and no Hellenist, certainly no proselyte, could have been imbued and saturated, like the author of the Epistle, with all the symbolical mysteries of the Tabernacle. More might be said for Tertullian's ascription of the authorship to the Apostle Barnabas. Barnabas was a Levitebut a Levite whose country was Cyprus, far away from the central home of Judaism, and possessing no recorded connexion with any Church to which it is natural to imagine the Epistle before us to have been addressed.

There are many things which we would know, and which we know not. The authorship of the

Epistle to the Hebrews is one of them. Even the Church to which it was addressed is uncertain. Certain indeed it is that it was one Church, local and definite. A man cannot be 'restored' to a 'dispersion,' such as would be the 'Hebrews' if Jewish birth or Jewish speech were the definition of the 'title. Scarcely could he be 'restored' to the Churches of a nation or district, such as those of Palestine or of Syria collectively. The Church of Alexandria, as such, does not seem to justify the application of the term 'Hebrews' to it distinctively: nothing but the conjectural authorship of Apollos lends any probability to this view, and Apollos himself, so far as history tells, was an Alexandrian by birth only, not by permanent residence, certainly not by ministerial charge.

We come back to the belief that the Church of Jerusalem was the community addressed in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It alone could enter with full appreciation into the imagery and the typology of the letter. Living in the very focus and centre of Levitical and Rabbinical Judaism, it could feel, as no other Church could feel, the force of every allusion, every argument, every appeal of the absent but (to it) not anonymous writer. The dangers predicted in the great Prophecy were already gathering around Jerusalem. On the very eve of the dreadful catastrophe, the charge laid upon the disciples to recognize the
hand of God in the overthrow of the City and Temple was becoming more and more repugnant to flesh and blood. To the Israelite patriotism and religion were one. His was the nation chosen out of all the earth to be God's people. His was the city in which God had set His Name: outside of it there was but the waste howling wilderness of heathenism and the world. Can we wonder that the Voice from the far past sounded more and more faintly in the JewishChristian ear, 'When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains?' How strong must have been the temptation to say, 'Christ and country, if both can be-at all events, country first, and, if both cannot be, then country alone.'

It was to guard the imperilled Church from this fatal apostasy that a voice from Italy, sympathetic but uncompromising, spoke in this Epistle. Evidently the supremacy of Christ is its key-note. And not the supremacy only, as of one having authority. Rather the thought of Christ as embodying all that the old Dispensation could but prefigure and foretell; the substance of which Sinai was the shadow, the Antitype of Legislator and Priest, of Sabbath and Altar, of Sacrifice and Sanctuary. To have Him is to have all, to lose Him is to lose all. Meanwhile to sit loose to Him is to risk the loss of Him. Stagnation is retrogression, retrogression is towards
apostasy, apostasy is perdition, only a resolute faith can 'win the soul.'

This may suffice to enable us to enter upon the exposition. It will have been seen, in these few sentences, that the Epistle has a direct bearing upon many burning questions of our own day; involving as it does the fulfilment of all earlier Dispensations in the Faith of Jesus Christ, and the supersession of all precedents of Priesthood and Ritual-unless indeed it shall have pleased Him who is 'the end of the Law' to reenact old things as ordinances of the new, by a precept as peremptory as it would be reactionary.

Llandaff,
$\quad$ May $10,1890$.
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## 

I. 1. По $\lambda_{\nu \mu є \rho \hat{s} \kappa а і ~}^{\pi о \lambda \nu-}$ т $\boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\prime} \pi \omega$ с] The opening of the Epistle is characteristic of the whole. (r) It is a homily rather than a letter. Only in the closing verses does it adopt the epistolary style. (2) It is an anonymous composition ; thus leaving entirely open the question of its authorship. It is no forgery, whoever be the writer. The question is altogether different from that of the genuineness (for example) of the and Epistle of St Peter, where the name is incorporated in the composition.
(3) Yet the author was known as such to the readers. This, implied throughout, is asserted at the close. (4) The style is oratorical, marked by artistic inversion and antithesis.

Подгрєрю今ऽ] In many parts or portions (Rev, xvi: 19, тpía $\mu$ е́p $\eta$. John xix. 23, т́є $\sigma \sigma a \rho a$


 $\kappa . т . \lambda$., where the English Version renders it manifold. The prophetic revelations were made in
portions, like the $\lambda$ óqtov Kvpíov of Isai. xxviii. Із, ёть $\mu \kappa \kappa \frac{1}{v}$,
 and indivisible, like the $\chi \iota \tau \grave{\nu}$
 xix. 23), because it is the revelation of God in a Person.
$\pi \Omega \lambda \tau \tau \rho о ́ \pi \omega \varsigma]$ In many ways or modes. 4 Macc. iii. 21, mo ${ }^{2} y-$
 баито борфорaîs. It is the opposite of $\mu \circ$ о́тротоя, uniform, simple; and is found in combination with such words as moukílos and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau o ́ s$, in the sense of versatile, multifarious, \&c. The revelations of God to the prophet were various in the manner of their communication (I) to him, as well as (2) by him. (I) Num. xii. 6-8:






 typical acts of Ezekiel or Hosea with the visions of Zechariah and the evangelical predictions of Isaiah. The Gospel is of one

mode and form，because in it God reveals Himself èv víw．
rádac］A somewhat rare word in Scripture．The only appropriate reference is Jude 4， where，as here，it is applied to Scripture utterances．In 2 Cor．
 $\theta_{i j} \kappa \eta$ ，and in connexion with its àvá $\mathbf{v}$ vests．

גa入j；${ }^{2}$ ］Having spoken． The aorist sums up the whole series of patriarchal，Mosaic， and prophetic revelations in a single past act．The word $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon i v$ is used（as here）of God＇s utter－ ances in Luke i．55，кatcis è $\lambda a ́ \lambda \eta$－ $\sigma \epsilon \nu$ т $\rho$ òs тоѝs татє́pas $\dot{\eta} \mu \mu \omega \bar{\omega}$ ．John


 $\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \ldots \pi \rho о ф \eta \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ ．vii．44，каө̀ेs
 I Cor．xiv． 21 （varied from Isai． xxviii．II，12，LxX．）$\lambda a \lambda \eta^{\prime} \sigma \omega \tau \bar{\omega}$ $\lambda \alpha \hat{̣}$ тои́тє．．．$\lambda \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \in \iota$ Kúpıos．Heb．



тoís $\pi a \tau \rho a ́ \sigma L v]$ In its wider sense；the ancestors of this gene－ ration；then of old time．Thus

 with $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega v, \dot{v}^{\dot{j}} \omega \nu$ ，or aủ $\hat{\omega} v$ ，as iii 9．Matt．xxiii．3o，32，द̀ $\gamma$

 Luke vi．23，26．John vi． 49. Acts vii．45，5I，52，tiva


 ßaotáral．xxviii．${ }^{25}$ ．I Cor． x．I．Elsewhere in the more restricted meaning of the patri－ archs；（I）Abraham，Isaac，and Jacob；as in Deut．i．8， $\bar{\eta} v \gamma^{\gamma} \gamma$

 ＇Іакш＇$\beta$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．；or（2）the twelve sons of Jacob；as in Acts vii．



$\varepsilon \nu$ tois］The contrast with $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{v} v i \hat{\omega}$ suggests the sense of in the persons of rather than in the ucritings of．The latter might be supported by Mark i．2，ка． cus
 фйтg．John vi． 45 ，ëcт兀v $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a \mu-$ $\mu$ ย́vov èv tois mpoфй́rous．Acts

 тòv vórov каì toís èv $\tau 0 i ̂ s ~ \pi \rho о ф \eta '-~$ татs $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a \mu \mu$＇́voss．Elsewhere the phrase is $\delta$ cú $^{\prime}$（Matt．i．22．ii．5， ${ }^{15}$ ．viii $17 . \& c ., \& c$ ．），$\delta \dot{\alpha}$ бто́ $\mu a-$ tos（Luke i．70．Acts i．i6．iii． 18,2 r．iv．25），or $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\beta} \beta^{\prime}(\beta \lambda \omega$（Acts vii．42）．Here the idea of speak－ ing in seems more suitable than that of speaking by．
rois $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta{ }^{2} \tau a s$ ］Not in the more technical sense in which oi $\pi \rho \circ \phi \hat{\eta}$ тal form one division of the OldTestament（as Lukexxiv．




## $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \alpha ́ \tau о \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \bar{\omega} \nu \quad \tau о и ́ \tau \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\mu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$

 $\phi \bar{\eta} \tau a()$, but in the wider use, including all God's 'utterers' prior to the Gospel, whether writers of Books of Scripture, or representatives of Him to their generation. In Luke xiii.
 каi тárтаs rò̀s трофйтаs) it might seem to include even the Patriarchs themselves. At all events the title is expressly given in the New Testament to Moses (Acts vii. 37), to Samuel (Acts xiii 20. \&c.), to David (Acts ii. 30), to Elisha (Luke iv. ${ }^{27}$ ), to Isaiah (Matt. iii. 3. \&c.), to Jeremiah (Matt. ii. I7. \&c.), to Daniel (Matt. xxiv. 15), to Joel (Acts ii. 16), to Jonah (Matt. xii. 39. \&c.), to John the Baptist (Matt. xi.9.\&e.). Compare Matt. v. I2, тov̀s $\pi \rho о \phi$ ท́tas

 iठєі้ ä $\beta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$. Luke i. 70 , $\tau \omega \nu$
 ix. 8, І $9, \pi \rho о ф \eta \dot{\tau} \tau \boldsymbol{}$ xaiwv. John viii. 52, 'А $\beta \rho a \alpha \mu$
 v. ıo. i Pet. i. ıo. \&c. \&c.
 text bas é $\sigma \chi \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$. And so in

 a third passage, 2 Pet. iii. 3, the received text had ' $\sigma \chi$ átov, where we now read $\overline{\epsilon \lambda \epsilon u ́ \sigma o v t a l ~ ' ~} \epsilon \pi^{\prime}$ ' $\epsilon \sigma$ $\chi^{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\tau} \omega \nu \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$. The difference is scarcely appreciable.

The one ( $\left.{ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi^{\alpha} \chi^{\alpha} \tau o v\right)$ is at a latest point of these days; the other
 the latest (days) of these days. The one suggests an epoch, the other an era. Compare Matt.
 ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \kappa \rho \omega \nu$ avं $\omega \hat{\nu}$, where however an alternative reading inserts $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ before the second äxp $\omega v$ ) with


$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \in \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ тои́т $\omega \nu]$ These days, as contrasted with those days. The pre-Messianic in contrast with the Messianic period. In such phrases the interval between the two Advents is left out of view (as generally in the prophecies of the Old Testament), and the days of the Messiah begin with the first Epiphany, regarded as a single manifestation, though including the several stages of the Incarnation, Ministry, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, \&c. When the fact of the long interval between the first and the second Advent began to reveal itself, the phrase modified its meaning accordingly. Even in this Epistle we shall find recognitions of the postponement of that world, those days, into a period still future though the Messiah is come. The exact expression, ai $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \iota$ avitat, does not occur elsewhere; but it is implied in the opposite


## 

xxxi. 31, lxx., quoted in Heb. viii. 8 , \&c. The common form is that of $\delta$ aiav ovitos, $\dot{\delta}$ ขथ̂v aióv, \&e. contrasted with ó aicuv
 to which the above remark is equally applicable. See Matt.


 Luke xvi. 8. xviii. 30. xx. 34,
 énévov. Rom. xii. 2. I Cor. i. 20. ii. 6, 8. iii. I8. 2 Cor. iv. 4 .
 тоvпрои̃. Eph. i. 2 I. 1 Tim. vi. 17. 2 Tim, iv. 10 . Tit. ii. 12. The idea of the text is otherwise expressed in Gal. iv.
 хро́vov. Eph. i. 1о, єis oiкоvoцíav
 $\chi$ póvos of the one passage, the kaupoi of the other, are equivalent to the $\dot{\eta} \mu$ '́pac of the text; and the $\pi \lambda \eta^{\prime} \rho \omega \mu a$ of those passages is (in effect) the ${ }^{\boldsymbol{6}} \sigma \times \chi a r o v$ of this. Compare also I Cor. x.

 the $\dot{\eta} \mu$ épal here, the ages of the pro-Messianic time; and the $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta$
 of these $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a c$.
$\left.{ }^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \sigma \epsilon \tau\right]$ Spake, As in $\lambda a-$ $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$ above, the whole utterance is gathered into one moment of past time, though the reference is not to one discourse, or one action, or one event, but
to the entire revelation of God in the Incarnate Son. For the thought compare Mark xii. 6 , ${ }^{\text {ét }}$ t




Ev view] In One who is (not Prophet, but) Son. The absence of the article lays stress upon the quality of the Person. It says not, one of many sons; but it says, One whose characteristic it is to be, in an emphatic and distinctive sense, Son of God. Matt. xiv. 33, 'A $\lambda \eta \theta$ जिs $\Theta \epsilon 0 \hat{v}$ viòs


 oítos. Luke i. 32, 35. Acts xiii. 33, Yíós $\mu$ ov єí $\sigma$ ú Rom. i. 4 ,


$\left.{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \theta_{\eta \kappa \epsilon \nu}\right]$ Set, appointed, constituted. John xv. 16, $\quad$ өө $\quad$ ка $\dot{v} \mu \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}$ iva к.т. $\lambda$. The reference is, not to the original glory, but to
 (Eph. i. 9) as the Christ.
$\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o v o ́ \mu o v ~ \pi a ́ v \tau \omega v] ~ R o m . ~$
 ham or his seed) єivat кórpov. The figure appears in the Parable of Matt. xxi., Mark xii.,
 $\mu a s$. It is involved in the Son.

 viós, каi к入ךроvó $\mu o s$. But the vioi are $\kappa \lambda_{\text {mpovó } \mu \text { ot only }}$ in the viós. They are клдроvórot $\mu$ ย̀v

 The fulfilment of the heirsbip is in the consummation of the great day: Rev. xi. I5, ধ́үє́vєтo そ̀ $\beta a \sigma L \lambda \epsilon i ́ a ~ \tau o \hat{v}$ кóб $\mu$ оv тov̂ Kupíov

$\delta_{i}^{\prime}$ ov кai] John i. 3, 10 ,


 viii. $6, \delta \iota^{2}$ ov тà тávтa. Col. i.



 $\pi a ́ v \tau \alpha$ тà є่v aưтoîs. xiv. I5.


 moner word in this sense is $\kappa \pi i\} \epsilon t \nu$. The two are combined in Matt. xix. 4, ó ктía $\alpha \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \dot{a}^{\prime} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$

tov̀s aîvas] The thought of duration is never wholly lost in the Scripture use of akiv, though in this place, and in xi. 3 ( $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$

 The world as material is кó $\mu_{0}$, the world as temporal is aicuy. Once the two are combined in one phrase: Eph. ii. 2, ката̀ тòv ainva тoū кó $\sigma \mu$ оч тov́тov (the timestate of this matter-world). The phural, peculiar (in this sense) to these two passages of this Epistle, seems to suggest the idea not of continuous but of aggregate duration; the world as marked by
successive periods of existence.
3. ös $\omega v$ ] Six points may be distinguished in this grand summary of the doctrine of the Divine Son: (r) the original glory (Åv ȧтav́ $\alpha \sigma \mu a$ к.т. $\lambda$. ); (2) the destined empire (of
 the creative action ( $\delta \dot{c}$ ov $\kappa \alpha i$ émoín $\sigma \in \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$.); (4) the sustaining operation (фєє $\rho \boldsymbol{\nu}$ тє к.т. $\lambda$. ); (5) the redemptive work ( $\kappa \alpha \theta \alpha-$ $\rho \iota \sigma \mu o ̀ v \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ á $\mu a \rho \tau \iota \omega \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$.$) ; (6)$ the mediatorial exaltation (Éкá$\theta \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu \in \mathcal{\epsilon} \nu \delta \epsilon \xi \iota \underset{c}{a} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.$) . The paral-$ lel passages are John i. I, \&c., where we have the first, third, and fifth of the above points enlarged upon; Phil. ii. 6, dec., dwelling upon the first, fifth, and sixth; and Col. i. 15, \&e., embracing all the particulars of the above enumeration.
$\dot{\omega} v]$ The place of $\stackrel{\omega}{\omega}$ gives it emphasis. This is what the Son is essentially. John i. I,
 каi Өєòs $\dot{\eta} v . \quad$ Phil. ii. 6, ${ }^{2} v$ $\mu \circ \rho \phi \hat{\eta} \Theta \epsilon \sigma \hat{v}$ írá $\rho \chi \omega v$. Col. i. 15, ö̀s є̇ $\sigma \tau \iota v$ єikç̀ тov̂ ©eov̂.
$\left.\dot{\alpha}_{\pi}^{\prime} \alpha \tilde{\prime} \gamma a \sigma \mu a\right]$ Wisdom vii.
 áiòiov. From ámavүá\}єc, to beane or flash forth (light), comes the passive noun à $\pi \alpha \dot{\gamma} \gamma \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha$, a thing beamed forth, a substance formed by the emission of splendowr; differing just so far from $\alpha^{\prime} \pi \alpha v-$ $\gamma \alpha \sigma \mu o ́ s$ that it expresses the result, not the act, of shining, and

is therefore the more suitable word for the Person in whom all the rays of the divine glory are concentrated for communi－ cation．Effulgence may be the nearest English word，but it lacks the characteristic idea of the embodiment of the emitted
 the Person in whom $\theta \epsilon \omega \mu є \theta$ a

$\tau \hat{\eta} s$ סóg $\bar{\prime}]$ Glory is the forthshining of light．The
 тク̀v к $\lambda(i v \eta v$（Mark iv．2I）has no＇glory：＇the $\delta o \xi_{\alpha}$ begins
 тíg $\quad \sigma \epsilon$（Luke xi．36）．The glory of God is His self－mani－ festation，John i．14．xi． 40 ，
 41．Rom．i．23．vi．4， $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho \theta \eta$ ．．．
 2 Cor．iii．s8．Eph．iii．I6．\＆c．\＆c． The text seems to speak of a self－ manifestation，not to created beings only，whether angelic or human，but also prior even to creation，and having place in the mysteries of the divine Trinity itself；intimated in the

 i． 13 ，in the o $\dot{\omega} v$ eis tòv кó $\lambda \pi o v$ тov̂ Marpós of John i．18．Com－ pare also John xvii．5，24，$\hat{\imath}$




$\pi \rho o ̀ ~ к \alpha \tau a \beta o \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ ко́б $\mu$ ои．
 to mark，or engrave，as the image and superscription upon a coin（Ecclus．l．27，$\pi \alpha \downarrow \delta \dot{\delta} i^{\alpha}$

 Tj $\rho$ ，（ 1 ）the agent or instrument for engraving；but commonly （2）the stamp or impress so made， the engraven or incised letter or figure；（3）the characteristic and distinctive form，whether of person，disposition，speech， style，\＆c．Lev．xiii．28，ó yà Характウ̀（distinctive mark）той катакаи́paтós є̇ $\sigma \tau \iota .2$ Macc．iv．
 $\chi$ хаакт $\eta$ ра（characteristic style） тov̀s о́ $\mu$ офй $\lambda$ ous $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \epsilon \sigma т \eta \sigma \epsilon$ ．These passages show that the idea of exact likeness，characteristic re－ presentation，is involved in the word，in Hellenistic as well as classical usage，and may in－ cline us to the rendering of the English Version，express（or exact）image，in preference to the vaguer term impress．The lat－ ter suggests rather the wax than the seal．For the general idea，compare 2 Cor．iv． 4 ，ös

 тov．But $\chi$ арактip is more de－ finite than eiк凶iv as to the exact－ ness of the likeness．
 тával，to set or place under， passes in the middle voice and

## 

the intransitive tenses into two chief uses：（I）with a dative，to stand under so as to support（Zech．ix．8，vinoort $\eta^{-}$
 accusative，to stand（instead of giving wey）under，to withstand （Prov．xiii．8，$\pi \tau \omega \chi$ òs $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \alpha^{3} \chi$
 40．\＆c．\＆c．）：（2）absolutely，to stop（ I Sam．Xxx．ro，vinć
 take up a position（Num．xxii．


 one＇s ground（Psalm cxlvii．17， катà тро́owiov 廿úxous aủrồ tís iтоотjшєєаи；\＆c．\＆c．）．The substantive ن́ró⿱宀丁兀aбıs（occur－ ring sixteen times in the Sep－ tuagint，as the rendering of almost as many Hebrew words） takes the colour of this twofold use，and means（i）support


 supporting the weight of you．





 ota．ais orov，thy sustenance，the manna）；and so confidence （sometimes we find $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau a \sigma t y$ каi тúd $\mu \alpha v$ ）regarded as an act of the mind supporting，instead
of sinking under，a weight laid upon it（Ruth i．12，白 $\sigma \tau i$
 ${ }^{\alpha} v \delta \rho i ́$ ．Psalm xxxix．7， $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ vinó－

 avir $\hat{\mathrm{s}} .{ }_{2}$ Cor．ix．4， $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} v \tau_{\hat{\eta}}$

 $\sigma \epsilon \omega \varsigma$ ．Heb，iii． $14, \tau \dot{\eta} v$ à $\rho \chi \grave{\eta} \nu$

 （2）a position（I Sam．xiv．4，
 фú $\lambda \omega v$ ）；a firm standing（Psalm
 and hence，finally，substance，in all senses，whether of wealth

 $\mu a \dot{\jmath} \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ катафа́үєтає $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ ．Jer．
 бтa⿱iv $\sigma o v$ ），bodily frame（Psalm


 $\gamma \hat{n}$ ），or essential being（Psalm xxxix．5，$\dot{\eta}$ ข́тóvtacís $\mu \circ v$

 $\sigma t s)$ ．This last is the meaning of the word here；substance or essence．We are not to import the theological distinction be－ tween ítóvtavis（person）and ovoia（substance）：that distinc－ tion would carry us into subtle－ ties which have no place in Scripture．The statement is， that the Son is the $\chi^{\alpha} \rho \alpha \kappa \tau \eta \rho$ of

## 

God＇s essence；the Person in whom the essential nature of Deity is so embodied that the Gospel sayings are true，＇$O$
 （John xiv．9），and＇＇E $\theta \in a \sigma \alpha^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a$


$\phi \epsilon \rho \omega v \tau \epsilon]$ From the com－ moner use of $\phi$ ¢ $\rho \in \tau$ ，to carry as a burden（Num．xi．14，ov่
 тòv $\lambda$ aòv тồтov．Isai．xxx．6，
 avirôv．\＆c．\＆c．），is derived that of the text，to support or uphold a moving object or system．In this last point（the thought of a universe in motion）the figure of the text differs from the （otherwise equivalent）phrase of


$\left.\tau \hat{\varphi} \rho \dot{\rho}{ }^{\prime} \mu a \tau \iota\right]$ The dative ex－ presses the instrument of the upholding．The $\phi$＇$\rho \omega v$ ，like the èmoínocr，js by a word of com－ mand．Compare xi．3，ríarє

 creation passes into the ${ }^{\text {en }} \sigma \tau \omega$ of the sustentation．For $\dot{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu a$ ， always（conceptionally at least） a single thing said，compare its first use in the Septuagint，Gen．


 peculiarity is never lost，even where the whole Gospel（for
example）is the $\hat{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ in ques－ tion，as in Rom．x．8，$\tau \grave{o} \dot{\rho} \tilde{\eta} \mu \mathrm{a}$
 v．26，év p̊ ṕparı．vi．17，каi


 I Pet．i． 25 ，tov̂ro $\delta$ 白 éctur tò

 ing to，characteristic of，His power（potency）．Luke vi． 19 ， öт $\tau$ र́v 2 Cor．xii． $9, \dot{\eta} \delta \dot{v} v a \mu \iota s ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ X \rho t \sigma-$
 $\zeta \omega \hat{\eta}$ аंкатади́тоv． 2 Pet．i．$\quad$ 6，


 Job vii． $21, \delta i a ̀$ tí ov̀ $\lambda i_{i}^{\prime}$

 The peculiarity of the expres－ sion is the simple genitive；puri－ fication，not from，but of sins． So in Exod，xxx．10，ámò тov̄
 $\tau \omega \hat{\omega} \nu .2$ Pet．i．$\rho, \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu \lambda a \beta \omega \nu$
 ај $\alpha \rho \tau \eta \mu$ áт $\omega \nu$ ．The same abbre－ viation is involved in the tran－ sition from the $\lambda \in \pi \rho o l$ ка $\alpha a p i-$ Govtal of Matt．xi．5，to the
 Matt．viii． 3 ．
 2．Rev．iii． 2 I，каі éкর́ $\theta_{\iota \sigma \alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a}$
 rov．The origin of the expression is found in Psalin ex．I，eimev ó

## 


 Mark xii. $3^{6}$. Luke xx. 42. Acts ii 34. Heb. i. I3.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \delta \in \xi t \hat{q} \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \mu \epsilon \gamma a \lambda \omega \sigma v ́ v \eta s]$ On the right hand of majesty. Like Matt. xxvi. 64. Mark

 $\mu \epsilon \omega$. Majesty here, as power there, is used as a name for God

 The word $\mu \epsilon \gamma a \lambda \omega \sigma v \nu \eta$ occurs also in Jude 25 as an attribute of God. In the Septuagint it is more frequent. Deut. xxxii.
 I Chron. xxix. it, $\sigma \dot{o}^{\prime}, \mathrm{K}_{\dot{\prime}}{ }^{\prime} \rho \in \epsilon, \dot{\eta}$ $\mu \epsilon \gamma \sigma \lambda \omega \sigma v ́ v \eta$. Psalm cxlv. 3,

 form $\mu \in \gamma^{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon$ tót $\eta \mathrm{s}$ also occurs three times in the New Testament; Luke ix. 43. Acts xix. 27. 2 Pet. i. i6. For the figure $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \epsilon \xi(\hat{a}$, compare 1 Kings ii, 19 , ó ßacilcìs...éká $\theta \iota \sigma \in V$ è $\pi i \quad$ тô̂

 є́к $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta} \xi t \omega \hat{\nu}$ aùrove. Psalm xlv. io,
 oov. Zech. vi. г3, каi каөtєîraı




$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \dot{u} \psi \eta \lambda o i s]$ Not to be connected with $\mu \kappa \gamma a \lambda \omega \sigma$ vivps, but

oujavoîs in viii. 1. Compare Eph. i. 20, кai кa日íras $\dot{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} v} \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \xi_{\xi}$
 ív $\dot{v} \psi \eta \lambda o i ̂ s, ~ s e e ~ P s a l m ~ x c i i i . ~ 4, ~$
 peos. exiii. 5, tís ws Kúpıos ó
 An equivalent phrase is $\epsilon^{v} \boldsymbol{v} \dot{v} \psi i \sigma-$ tous. Job xvi. 19, èv oủ-



 ї $\psi$ íators.
4. тобои́т@ крєítт $\omega \nu$ ] Introduction of the first great topic of the Epistle. The object of the whole book is to keep the Hebrew Christians true to Christ amidst the temptations of the last struggle of Judaism. The preeminence of Christ (Col.
 $\left.\pi \rho \omega \tau \epsilon v^{\prime} \omega v\right)$ is therefore the general subject. This is shown in a series of comparisons: (r) Christ and the Angels (chapters i. and ii.) ; (2) Christ and Moses (iii. and iv.); (3) Christ and Aaron ( v . to x.). Each topic is introduced as it were incidentally, almost allusively; here in a participial clause, as also in iii. 2 and v. Io. It is only by study that we detect the transitions: there is no formal scheme: sometimes a coming topic casts its shadow before it upon the earlier: see áp $\chi^{\iota} \epsilon \rho \in ́ a$ in iii. 1 , and $M \epsilon \lambda \nless \iota \sigma \epsilon$. $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ in v .5.

## 

тобои́тழ．．．ঠ̈бч］An idiom peculiar（in Scripture）to this Epistle．See x．25，каì тобои́тя $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o v \stackrel{\circ}{\sigma} \omega \varphi$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Also vii．20， 22，ка日’ öбоу．．．ката̀ тобоиิто． In Rev．xviii． 7 there is an ap－
 ．．．тобои̂то立 бо́тє к．т．入．
$\kappa \rho \epsilon i \tau \tau \epsilon \nu]$ This word occurs thirteen times in this Epistle， and only seven times elsewhere in Scripture（ 1 Cor．vii．9， 38. xi．17．xii． 3 I．Phil．i． 23. ${ }^{1}$ Pet．iii．17． 2 Pet．ii．21）． In the Septuagint，it is chiefly found（2 2 times）in the Book of Proverbs．
$\left.\gamma \epsilon \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mu} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon v o s}\right]$ Mark the con－ trast with $A v$ above．We reach now the exaltation of the Son， not as God，but as the God－ Man．Compare Eph．i．20，dc．
 $\rho a ́ v \omega \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta s$ á $\rho \chi \bar{\eta} s$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Phil．

 тò $\mathfrak{v} \pi \grave{p} p \pi \hat{a} \nu$ ờvoдa．Col．i．18，


 סógav aủтê dóvta．ïi．22，ös $\grave{\sigma} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$

 к．т．$\lambda$ ．
$\left.\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad{ }^{\boldsymbol{a} \gamma \gamma^{\prime}}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu\right]$ The promi－ nence given to this topic，the exaltation of Christ above the Angels，is accounted for by the place ascribed in Scripture to the ministry of Angels，whether
generally（as Gen．xvi．7．xxiv． 7．xxviii 12 ．xxxii．I．I Kings xix．5．Psalm xxxiv． 7. xci．$x$ ．Dan．iii． 28. vi． 22. dc．）or specially．（I）In the giv－ ing of the Law on Mount Sinai． Acts vii．53，ö̈tves è $\lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \beta \epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau$ òv vó $\mu$ оv єis $\delta \iota a \tau \alpha \gamma$ às à $\gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ ．Gall． iii．19，o vó $\mu$ оs．．．סcarayєis $\delta i^{\prime}{ }^{\text {a }}{ }^{\prime} \gamma-$

 yos．Compare Deut．xxxiii．2，
 $\xi \iota \omega \nu$ aủroû ä $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda o \iota \quad \mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime}$ av่тov． Psalm lxviii． ı $_{7}$ ，тò à ${ }^{\prime} \rho \mu \alpha$ той

 áyíc．The phenomena of wind and fire，of voice and trumpet （Exod．xix 16，dc．Deut．iv． 11, \＆c．v．22，\＆c．），even the preparation and engraving of the tables of stone（Lxod，xxiv． 12．xxxii．16），were doubtless assigned to angelic ministry：
 גous aủtov̀ $\pi v \in \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau a$ ，каì тov̀s $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \tau 0 v \rho \gamma o v ̀ s ~ a u ̀ \tau o u ̂ ~ \pi \hat{v} \rho ~ \phi \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o v$. （2）In connexion with the march of Israel into Canaan．






 xxxiii．2．Num．xx．16，каi



## 

 Kvpíov, vvvi тараүє́ $\gamma о v a$.
$\stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \sigma \Phi$ ठıaфори́тєрог] The achual exaltation of Christ above Angels is proportioned to the prophetic. The Name defined in Scripture is the measure of the superiority actually attained. (I) The adjective Soádopos occurs also in ix. 10, and in Rom. xii. 6, in the sense of different; as also in Deut. xxii. g. Dan. vii. 19. Here the sense is excellent; diffenent by superiority; as in viii.
 fías. The same twofold meaning is seen in the verb doa申'fetv (to differ, Dan. vii. 3. \&c.; to excel, Matt. x. 31. \&c. : in Rom. ii. 18 and Phil. i. 10 , it may be either). (2) The comparative §caфopótepos occurs only here and in viii. 6. (3) The use of mapá after a comparative is peculiar to this Epistle (ii. 7, 9. iii. 3. ix. 23. xi. 4. xii. 24) and Luke iii. 13, $\pi$ גéov $\pi a \rho a ̀$ rò

$\kappa є \kappa \lambda \eta \rho о v o ́ \mu \eta \kappa є \nu]$ The Son, manifested in the fuluess of time, has entered upon the inheritance of the predicted Messiah. Scripture has marked out the boundaries of the great ©ैvoua in many passages of promise: the Divine Son, as the Christ, has entered upon its possession. The word $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o v o \mu \hat{\epsilon} \hat{v}$ occurs more than 125 times in the Septuagint; generally with an
accusative of the thing ( $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\eta} v \gamma \hat{\gamma}_{v}$, ràs módєıs, \&c.): sometimes $a b$ solutely (Num. xviii. 20. \&c.); sometimes with an accusative of the person (to be a man's
 $\mu \epsilon \ldots$ оv кдทроро $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \quad \sigma \epsilon$ к.т.д.). In the New Testament it is found 18 times ( $\tau \dot{\eta} v \gamma \eta \eta \nu, \zeta_{\omega \eta}^{\eta} \nu$


övoua] The name of a person is that which sets him before the mind as that which he is. In Scripture, the name of God, or the name of Christ, is the sum of His attributes, the whole of His revealed nature, character, work, \&c. See Exod. xxxiii. 19.


 ноs каì тодขє́̀єоs к.т.д. John



 мข่тоิ. Acts iii. 16, тоиิтоข...



 к.т.入. The name is the designation, the description, in Scripture, of what the Messiah would lee.
5. Tivo $\gamma^{\prime}$ p] Upon the quotations which follow it may be remarked in general, that the Epistle is addressed to persons

## 

(1) who believe in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, (2) who believe in the inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures, and in their Messianic reference. It cannot be expected of those who are destitute of this twofold belief, that they should appreciate the argument of this passage. On the other hand, there is nothing arbitrary in the selection of the texts adduced. It is not that, wherever the name of God occurs in the Old Testament, the name of Christ may be substituted for it. The principles of the selection are two: (I) God in manifestation, whether for mercy or judgment, is always God in Christ; (2) where that is written of a man, which no mere man can satisfy (as, for instance, universal dominion, everlasting existence, \&c.), there always lies in the background that one Person, divine as well as human, of whom alone these things can be spoken with literal truth. To be assured of this is the only postulate of this section. Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world (Acts xv. 18): God, purposing to reveal Himself in Christ, keeps that purpose in view throughout His Dispensations. The human writer is never obliterated, but there is a voice within his voice, a prophecy in
his history, and a type in his life. To say otherwise is to deny, not verbal inspiration alone, but inspiration in any sense.

Tivc $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \ldots \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \bar{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu]$ To which one of the Angets, dc. Whom did God ever single out from among the Angels to address him as His Son? The argument is not shaken by the application of the title sons of God to Angels collectively (Job i. 6. ii. I. xxxviii. 7 ; in all which places however the Septuagint has not viol but ${ }^{2} \gamma \gamma \in \lambda o l$ ), any more than by the application of the same title to Israelites of old (Exod.iv. 22, viós
 xxxi. 9, 'Ефраї $\mu$ тршто́токо́s $\mu$ о́
 vioi © $\Theta$ ế ( (âvoos), or to Christians now (Luke vi. 35. Rom. viii.


 Ovyaт́́pas. Gal. iii. 26, $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \epsilon s$


 The whole stress lies on the $i n$ dividualization of the name.
 We know not with what human hopes the words were first written. History is the key of Prophecy; and as the earthly kings of David's line successively fell on sleep, till at last



the line itself was dethroned and effaced, it became plain that only in a Divine Person could the prediction be fulfilled, whatever shadows of fulfilment might be thrown before Him.
 its first meaning ofj $\mu \epsilon \rho \frac{0}{}$ must have been the time of the decisive establishment of the throne of David; his recognition as the head of the theocracy against all rivals and antagonists


 $\kappa \cup ́ \kappa \lambda \omega \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ aưTovì). In its application, it is the day of Christ's Resurrection, and the Psalm was rightly selected for Easter Sunday. Compare Acts xiii. 33, ávaनt $\dot{\eta} \sigma a s^{\prime}$ 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v} v$, wis каi... $\gamma \epsilon \in \gamma \rho a \pi \tau a \iota$, Yiós pov $\epsilon^{i}$


 Heb. v. 5, where the same text is quoted in proof of the Priesthood of Christ, with which Resurrection virtually invested Him, as Ascension actually. There is no direct reference in the passage either ( $\mathbf{r}$ ) to the Eternal Sonship, or (2) to the Incarnation.
 The subject is the promised seed
of David (verse 12, àva $\sigma \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma$ тò

 it is said, ávop $\theta \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$ тòv $\theta \rho \rho^{\prime} v o r$ aủrov̂ $\epsilon \omega 5$ єis tòv aîwva (verse I ${ }_{3}$ ). The very phrase made preparation for one greater than man. No earthly throne can be everlasting. The seed of David was evidently identifying itself (in such predictions) with the seed of $A b r a h a m$ in whom all nations should be blessed (Gen. xxii. 18), and with the seed of the woman which should bruise the serpent's head (Gen. iii. 15).
 the Hebraism, compare Matt. xix. 5. Mark x. 8. Luke iii. 5 . I Cor. vi. 16. 2 Cor. vi. 18. Eph. v. 3r. Heb. viii. 工о. James v. 3 .
 of $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota v$ makes its sense ambiguous. Is it, like the $\pi \dot{\text { áder}}$ of verse 5 and ii. 13 (twice) and x. 30 , the again of quotation; And when, again, Ile bringeth in, \&cc.? Or is it to be read with єioayáyn, And when He again bringeth in, \&c.; making the clause refer to the second Advent, the second introduction of the Son into the visible universe? (r) There is perhaps no precisely parallel instance of a transposed or parenthetical $\pi a^{\prime}$ -

## 

גcv．But this Epistle deals much in metorical transpositions；and there is something easy and natural（in English at all events） in an again thus thrown in． （2）On the other hand，the par－ ticular word $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ т́токоs is more evidently suitable to the Risen Christ than to the Eternal Son． It suggests，if it does not com－ pel，the thought of sons later born；a thought inappropriate altogether to the Second Person in the Trinity as such，but most suitable to the Incarnate Son alive again from the dead（see references in the note on tò тршто́токог）．And the quotation
 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. ，though appropriate to either Advent，or to the Advent as a whole，cannot but be espe－ cially suitable to the Advent in glory．
 He shall have brought in，He saith．That is，He saith in the foreview of His bringing in． The passage which follows has reference to the（then future） introduction．For the con－ struction，see 1 Cor．xv．27，28，

 то́тє айто̀s ó viós víтотаүŋ́бєтає к．т．入．When He shall have said the word，All things are sub－ jected（marifestly excepting Him that subjeeted them）－when，I say，all things shall have been
subjected，then shall the Son also Himself，de．Compare verses 24，
 таи．xvi． $2,3,5$ ，ё $\lambda \epsilon$ и́борає $\pi$ ро̀s
 2 Cor．x．6．Col．iii．4．iv． 16 ． \＆c．\＆c．
ròv тршто́токоу］Here alone absolutely．In Luke ii． 7 with tòv viòv av̉rȳs．Rom．viii．29， єis tò єival aữòv тритótoкоン èv то $\lambda \lambda 0$ îs áde $\lambda \phi$ ois．Col．i． 15,18 ，

犬̀ тршто́токоя $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu є \kappa \rho \omega \hat{\nu} v$ ．See note on ōtav $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi a ́ \lambda c v$ ．If the cioayár刀 refers to the first Ad－ vent（or to the Advent generally， without marking the difference）， then the тршто́токоs will mean simply the Eternal Son，the viods of verse 2．If to the second， there may be an allusion to the Resurrection，as in the $\gamma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\omega} \sim \eta \kappa \alpha$ of verse 5 ，and as in the above quotations from Col．i．I8 and Rev．i． 5 ．
$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ оікоч $\mu \epsilon \subset \nu \nu]$ The word occurs almost forty times in the Septuagint，in the wider sense of the inhabited earth（Psalm xxiv．I，тои̂ Kupiov $\dot{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta}$ каі̀ тò

 And so Matt．xxiv．14．Luke iv．5．xxi．26．Acts xvii．3r． xix． 27 （a rhetorical hyperbole）． Rom．x． 18 （from Psalm xix． 4）．Rev．iii．1o．xii． 9 ． xvi．14．In Heb．ii． 5 it has
$\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa \nu \nu \eta \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega \sigma \alpha \nu \alpha \dot{\tau} \dot{\tau} \hat{\omega} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~s} \quad{ }^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \dot{\circ} \dot{\iota}$


the peculiar sense given it by the addition of $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \mu$ é $\lambda \lambda o v \sigma a \nu$ (see note there). In Luke ii. I and Acts xi. 28 the context limits it to the Roman Empire. Here it is equivalent to кó $\sigma \mu$ оs, and the parallel passages are those of St John in which the Incarnation is spoken of as $a$ coming into the кór $\mu$ оs (John i. 9. iii. 17,19 . vi. 14 . ix. 39 : x. $3^{\text {6. xi. } 27}$. xii 4 . xvi. 28. xvii. I8. xviii. 37. I John iv. 9). The Eternal Son is outside

 brings Him into it (John xvi.

 sion again withdraws Him from
 ко́троу каі' торєі́онас тро̀s то̀v Пaтє́ $a$ ). The Advent brings Hinn back into it (John xiv. 3,
 The peculiarity of the expression here is the ciráyecv instead of the usual $\pi \epsilon \prime \mu \pi \epsilon \epsilon$ or $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \hat{\epsilon} \lambda-$ $\lambda_{\epsilon \iota v}$ of the Gospels. Even of the second Advent we have $\mathrm{a}^{3} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu$ in Acts iii. 20. The nearest approach to the $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \mathrm{c}$ here is the ${ }^{a} \gamma \epsilon c \mathrm{of}$ of Thess. iv. 14 (ó @eòs тoùs кот $\mu \eta \theta$ évтas $\delta$ ıà


Kai $\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa v v \eta \sigma a ́ t \omega \sigma \alpha v]$ The кai is part of the quotation.

This, and the third person, point to Deut. xxxii. 43 (каі̀ $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma-$
 [B, vioi A] $\Theta \in \sigma$ ) rather than to Psalm xcvii. 7 ( $\pi \rho о \sigma к \nu v \eta^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon$
 the intended reference. In both passages, however, the subject is God's self-manifestation in judgment ; and therefore the application to Christ is at once justified by the principle stated in the note on verse 5, tív yáp. The Angels themselves are bidden in prophecy to worship God manifested in the Son. The word $\pi \rho o \sigma \kappa v \nu \epsilon i v$ is only once used by St Paul (r Cor. xiv. 25).
7. каì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \mu \epsilon ́ v]$ The $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ and $\delta \bar{\epsilon}$ have the effect of subordinating the first clause to the second. And whereas the language of Scripture concerning the Angels is this...the language concerning the Son on the contrary is, de.
$\left.\pi \rho{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}\right]$ The towards of $\pi \rho$ òs varies according to the context between of (with regard to) and to. The one is the mental, the other the plysical, looking to. Here, of the Angels ...to the Son. Compare, for example, Rom. x. 2 ( $\pi$ foòs $\delta \grave{\text { è }}$ т̀̀ $\nu$ $\left.{ }^{2} I \sigma \rho a \eta \eta \lambda ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \epsilon\right)$ with Heb. vii.

$\left.{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{O} \pi 0 \omega \omega \bar{\omega}\right]$ Psalm civ. 4.

## 

（1）In the Psalm itself，which is a hymn of praise to the God of creation，the evident idea of the verse is，Who maketh His Angels winds，\＆c．The natural phenomena of wind and fire are traced up to an Angelic ministry．（See note on verse 4，т $\left.\hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{\alpha} \gamma \gamma{ }^{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu.\right)$（2）The se－ condary application is，Who maketh His Angels（swift as） winds，（penetrating，pervasive， \＆c．）as fire．（3）The third sense，assigned to the words here，and more expressly in verse 14，is evidently a de－ rived one；Who maketh His Angels spirits，\＆c．：they are spirits，by nature and essence． The same ambiguity，between wind and spirit，lying neces－ sarily in the word $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ ，is felt even in the great passage，
 $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{i}$, к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．（4）The rendering， Who maketh winds His messen－ gers，and a flaming（or flame of） fire His ministers，is obviously impossible in the Greek，and involves，besides，a solecism in language as well as grammar， by combining（in the latter clause）a singular subject with a plural predicate．

入etrovpyoús］From its ori－ ginal sense of a people＇s work－ man，a public servant（入eízos， from $\lambda \epsilon \omega^{\prime}$ s，and $\left.{ }^{*} \rho \gamma o v\right)$ ，the word גetrovpyos passes into that of minister generally．It is speci－
ally applied in the Septuagint （where，with its kindred forms， $\lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \tau o v \rho \gamma \epsilon i v, ~ \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau o v \rho \gamma i ́ a, ~ a n d ~}^{\lambda \epsilon t-}$ тovpүккós，it occurs about 140 times）to the sacred offices of the Priests and Levites（Neh．$x$ ．
 oi iepeîs oi $\lambda$ ectoupyoi．Isai．lxi． 6，iepeis Kupiov к $\lambda \eta \theta \eta j \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，$\lambda \epsilon-$ точрүoì ©єov．dec．，\＆c．）．The at－ tendant upon a prophet or king is called his $\lambda$ eitovpyós，as in
 $\lambda \epsilon \iota \tau \circ v \rho \gamma \hat{\varphi}(\dot{A}, \dot{v} \pi \sigma v \rho \gamma \hat{\varphi} \dot{B}) M \omega v \sigma \tilde{\eta}$.
 $\gamma \epsilon \iota$ av̉тஸ̂．x．5，каì $\tau \dot{\eta} \dot{v} \sigma \tau a ́ \sigma t v$

 тои́pyє九 aùrê． 2 Kings vi． 15 ，
 divaotîvat．In Psalm ciii． 21 the word is applied，as here，to the Angels（ $\epsilon \dot{v} \lambda o \gamma \epsilon i \tau \epsilon$ ті̀v Kúpoov， $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \iota$ aî $\delta v v \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \iota s$ av̉rô，$\lambda \in \iota \tau o v \rho-$
 aủtoû）．In the New Testament the use is equally various．It includes service rendered by man to God（Luke i．23．Rom． xiii．6，入єстovp Phil．ii．17．Heb．ix．21）or Christ（ $\epsilon i s$ tò єivaí $\mu \mathrm{E}$ גєıтovpyòv
 man to man（ 2 Cor．ix． 12 ． Phil．ii．${ }^{25}$ ，${ }^{0}$ ，каї $\lambda_{\text {eitovpyòv }}$
 גeutoupyias）；or by Christ to God（Heb．viii．2，6，$\tau \hat{\omega} v$ à $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime} \omega \nu$ גєєтоv $\rho \gamma$ о́s．．．סєафорютє́раs тє́тєv－ $\left.\chi^{\epsilon \nu} \lambda \in \iota \tau o v \rho \gamma i a s\right)$.



## i. 8. Or omit too alûvos.

$\pi \nu$ òs $\left.\phi \lambda{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\alpha}\right]$ In the Septuagint it is $\pi \hat{v} \rho \phi \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \gamma 0 v$.
8. 'O Opóvos vov] Psalm xlv. 6, 7 . The occasion of the Psaim is apparently a royal marriage. But it contains expressions, like those of the text, involving an immense hyperbole in their application to any human sovereign. (See again the note on verse 5 , tín $\gamma$ áo.)
ó ©cós] Evidently a vocative. God is thy throne might possibly have been said (Psalm
 каi Súvaus. \&c., \&c.): thy throne is God seems an unnatural' phrase. And even in its first (human) application the vocative would cause no difficulty (Psalm Ixxxii. 6, ধ̇ $\mathbf{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ єitra, $\theta$ өoí
 John x. 34, 35, éкєivovs $\epsilon 7 \pi \epsilon \nu$
 є́ $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon ́ v є \tau о)$.

єis $\tau o ̀ v ~ a i \hat{\omega} \nu a \quad \tau 0 \hat{0}$ aiêvos] Amongst the multitude of like combinations found in the Sep-


 єis tov̀s aị̂vas, єis tòv aièva каì

 Xpóvov, єis ròv aî̀va roû aiĉvos, $\epsilon i s$ aî̂va ai $\omega v o s$, tòv aî̀va каi
 aicov $\omega v$ ) the precise form of the
text seems to occur only in the Book of Psalms (lxxxiii. 17. lxxxix. 29. xeii. 7. civ. 5. cxi. 3,8 , 10. cxii. 3, 9). In the New Testament we have only (of the above) cis rov aîva, cis toùs aievvas, and (peculiar to it) єis aî̂va (Jude), єis $\pi a ́ v \tau a s$ тov̀s aìwras (Jude), єis aịuyas aíw $\nu \omega \nu$ (Rev.), єis tò̀s aî̀vas $\tau \omega \hat{v}$ aīivov (Gal, Phil., I Tim., 2 Tim., I Pet., Rev.), $\epsilon$ is $\pi a^{\prime} \sigma a s$
 (Eph.). The aim of all these varieties of expression is the same; to heap up masses of time as an approximation to the conception of eternity. The age of the age is that vast expanse of duration which has itself for its only definition. Without entering into controverted matters, it may be said that, where such expressions occur, they must be read according to the subject matter. If an earthly kingdom or a human lineage is in question, infinite duration is precluded not by the language but by the context. If the terms are applied to spiritual existences, or to a world beyond death, we have at least no limit fixed by our knowledge of the nature of the case.

каì $\dot{\eta}$ pá $\beta \delta \mathrm{\delta os}$ ] (I) The каi is not in the Septuagint; but,



i. 8. Or $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \beta$. a

as the clause which it introduces follows immediately upon the former, it seems better to regard the кai as an accidental , addition, than as the preface to

- a separate quotation. (2) In the Septuagint the article stands before the second (not before the first) $\rho^{\prime} \dot{\beta} \beta \delta_{o s,}$ just inverting the subject and the predicate. Here it is, The sceptre of uprightness is (the) sceptre of Thy kingdom. (3) The most doubtful point is the reading of the last word. There is very considerable authority for av่roû instead of $\sigma o v$. This reading may have been occasioned by missing the vocative use of ${ }_{0}$ Ocós above (see note on o © ©tós). If avirov̂ is read, we must suppose the direct address of the former clause to be changed into the third person in the latter.
póápoos] ( 1 ) $A$ staff, for support.' Matt. x. io. Mark vi. 8. Luke ix. 3. Heb. xi. 21.

 B) $\mu \epsilon \pi а р є к \dot{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \sigma a v$. (2) A staff, of office.' Heb. ix. 4. Exod. vii.

 тò ч́ $\delta \omega \rho$. (3) $A$ rod, for measuring.' Rev. xi. 1. Psalm lxxiv.
 бov, öpos $\Sigma \iota \omega \dot{\nu}$ к.т.入. (4) A rod,
for chastising.' I Cor. iv. 21. Psalm lxxxix. 32, éтьккé $\psi o \mu a l$

 B) avtติ. (5) A sceptre.' Here, and in Rev. ii. 27. xii. 5. xix. 15. Psalm ii. 9. cx. 2, $\hat{\rho}{ }^{\alpha} \beta \delta \delta_{0}$


 oov.
eंधvíntros] Combined with Sıa.oovivy' in Josh. xxiv. I4. Psalm ix. 8. With акккіа'in Psalm xxxvii. 37. With à $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime}{ }^{-}$ $\theta \varepsilon_{\iota} \alpha$ in Psalm cxi. 8. Eccles. xii. ro. Compare I Kings iii.


 44, àvactij



 $\eta^{2}$ Baбincía к. $\tau . \lambda$. From Matt. iii 2 onwards the figure recurs perpetually in the New Testament.

9. Sıкашоवúvqv...ảvopíav] Contrasted' as in 2 Cor. vi. I4,
 avo ${ }^{3}{ }^{2}$; Compare/Matt. xxiii. 28, $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \omega \theta \in \nu$ щı̀v фаívє $\theta \in$ тоîs


avopíav] The Alexandrine Septuagint has aidcíar. The dis-

## 

tinctive idea of ${ }^{\prime} v o \mu i \alpha$ is insub－ ordination．St John makes it the synonym of ajaptia（ 1 John




 xxiv．12．Rom．iv． 7 （from Psalm xxxii．1），$\dot{\omega} v$ à $\phi \in ́ \theta \eta \sigma a v$
 ai ápaptial． 2 Thess．ii．3，8，
 $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ àvouías（with alternative reading áнартіая）．．．атокалиф－
 $\delta_{1 a}$ roû̀o ］The Divine ap－ probation of the character is made the reason of the anoint－ ing．In its application to the human subject，this approba－ tion（whether of David，or Solomon，or Hezekiah）could be but comparative and partial． In its application to the Mes－ siah，this is one of the texts which speak of the perfect obedience，in action and suffer－ ing，as the procuring cause of the exaltation．The anointing is the investiture with universal sovereignty，cousequent upon

 viлйкоos $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota ~ \theta a v a ́ t o v, ~ \theta a v a ́ t o v ~$





$\boldsymbol{\sigma \epsilon} \boldsymbol{v \tau} \hat{\omega}$ к．т．$\lambda$.
$\left.{ }^{\epsilon} \chi \rho \iota \sigma \epsilon ́ v \sigma \epsilon\right]$ In other places the anointing is connected with the entrance of our Lord upon His earthly Ministry．Luke iv．

 үрафѝ аข̃テך к．т．$\lambda$ ．Acts iv．27，

 каі̆ Пóvтlos Пı入ăтоя к．т．д．х．
 $\mu a \tau \iota$ à $\gamma \dot{\prime} \varphi$ каi $\delta v \nu a \dot{\mu} \mu \iota$ ，ôs $\delta \iota \eta ̄ \lambda \theta \epsilon$ $\epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \tau \omega ้ \nu$ к．т．入．Here the re－ ference is evidently to a later anointing（see last note）．And although the figure would apply to the prophetic（i Kings xix． лб，хоícєıs єis $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta^{\prime} \tau \eta \nu$ ）or

 consecration as well as to the royal，yet this last is clearly the subject here．I Sam．xvi．12，



 In other passages of the New Testament，$\chi \rho i \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ and $\chi \rho \hat{\sigma} \sigma \mu \alpha$ are applied to the gift of the Holy Spirit to Christians． 2 Cor． i ． 21．I John ii．20， 27.
$\delta$ © $\Theta$ ós $\sigma o v]$ The Person ad－ dressed is God（verse 8）；and yet God is Ilis God．Compare John xx． 17 （ $\lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon_{i}$＇I $\eta \sigma o v ̂ s . .$. ＇Avaßaive трòs тòv．．．© ©óv $\mu \mathrm{ov}$ ） with verse 28 （ $0 \omega \mu \hat{a} S$ єincv avu－ $\tau \hat{,},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \ldots$ ．．＠cós $\left.\mu o v\right)$ ．See Eph．i．

## Є́ $\lambda \alpha \iota \frac{\nu}{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \alpha ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ т $\alpha \rho \alpha$ тov̀s $\mu \epsilon \tau о ́ \chi o u s$

 X риттoи．In the frequently oc－ curring phrase，ó © $\epsilon$ с̀s каì тaтѝp то仑̂ кчрíov ท̂ $\mu \hat{\omega} y$＇${ }^{\prime} \eta \sigma \sigma \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \sigma \hat{v}$ ， it is not quite certain that the genitive depends on both nomi－ natives．
énatov］Elsewhere रóiciv has the dative．Num．xxxv．25，öv

 ćv． 2 Sam．i． 2 I．Psalm lexxix． 20．Ezek．xvi．9，каì è $\chi \rho \iota \sigma$ á $\sigma \varepsilon$ èv è̉ $\lambda a i ́ \omega$ ．Ecclus．xlv． 15 ．Or é $\xi$ ．Exod．xxx．25，26，Ẽגaıov


 tuagint，this form is peculiar to the Book of Psalms．See，for instance，Psalm xxx．5，к $\lambda \alpha$ av $\theta$ uós


 тov̂ owrtpiov $\sigma o v . ~ e x v i i i . ~ 15, ~$ фшvخ̀ à $\gamma a \lambda \lambda \iota a ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ каì бшт $\quad$ pías èv $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu a i s$ Sıкаíwv，cxxvi．2， 5,

 form á ${ }^{\prime}$ a $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu a$（a subject of ex－ ultation）is frequent in Isaiah and elsewhere．In the New Testament áad入íaocs is found in Luke i．I4，44，дара́ боь каì áүa入入íáıs к．т．入．Acts ii． 46. Jude 24．The verb ${ }^{2} \gamma a \lambda \lambda_{1} \hat{a} v$ occurs in Luke i．47．Rev．xix． 7：$a^{3} \gamma_{a} \lambda \lambda_{\ell}\left(\hat{\sigma} \theta a_{t}\right.$ in Matt．v． 12. Lukex． 2 I．Johnv．35．viii． 56. Acts ii． 26 （from Psalm xvi．9）．
xvi．34．I Pet，i．6，8．iv．I3． The genitive here expresses the characteristic．What is often in Scripture called the Exacov
 \＆c．）is here an é $\lambda$ ato ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \gamma a \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime}$ $\sigma \epsilon \omega s$, a chrism of exultation，for the dignity which it confers； thus raising into a higher sphere the words of Psalm civ．15，rov ì $\alpha \rho \hat{v} v a \iota ~ \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi$ ov èv édaị́．
$\pi a p a$ ］From the sense of （1）beside，parallel to，comes that of（z）in comparison with；and so（3）in advantageous compari－ son with，more than，beyond． Luke xiii．2，4，¢ $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda o \grave{~} \pi \alpha \rho \alpha^{\prime}$ тávtas тò̀s $\mathrm{\Gamma} a \lambda_{\iota} \lambda a i ́ o v s . . . o ́ \phi \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon ́ \tau a \iota$
 катоккойvтаs＇Iєроиоалй $\mu$ ．Rom．
 тò̀ ктібалта．iv． 18 ．хі． 24 ．
 $\dot{\eta} \mu, \dot{\epsilon} \rho a v$ ．For the use of $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha$ with a preceding comparative，see note on verse 4 ，$\overline{0} \sigma \omega$ © $\delta \iota a \phi o \rho \omega \dot{-}$ тfpov．
roùs $\mu \epsilon$ тóxous $\sigma o v]$ Thy part－ ners；partakers with thee in the dignity of royalty．（I）Com－ pare 1 Kings x．23，каì ѐ $\mu є \boldsymbol{\jmath}$ a－

 $v v^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon$ ．In the application to Christ，only the general idea can be maintained；other poten－ tates，whether earthly or angelic． Compare Rom．xiv．9．Eph．i．


 $\dot{\epsilon} \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda i \omega \sigma \alpha \mathrm{~s}, \kappa \alpha i$ ' $\epsilon \rho \gamma \alpha$ т㐫 $\nu \quad \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ бои́

тая к.т. . Phil. ii. II. Col. i. 16-18. I Pet. iii. 22, vimota-
 каì $\delta v \nu \dot{\mu} \mu \epsilon \omega \nu$. Rev. i. 5, ó $\pi \rho \omega-$ то́токоs $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu$ vєк $\rho \hat{\nu}$, каі̀ ò ă $\rho \chi \omega \nu$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta a \sigma \lambda \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} . \quad$ xix. 16 ,
 кขрícu. A more exclusive (or even explicit) reference to the Angels as $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \tau 0 \chi$ o of the Messiah seems out of place in a passage of which the object is rather to disparage than to exalt them. (2) The word $\mu$ '́тoхos is pecnliar (in the New Testament) to this Epistle, excepting only Luke v. 7, where, as here, it is used absolutely (катéveveav roís $\mu \epsilon \tau$ óxois). In the four other places of its occurrence it has a genitive (Heb. iii. I, $\mathrm{I}_{4}, \kappa \lambda \eta_{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$


 रóvarty $\pi$ ávt $\epsilon$ ). In the Septuagint it is always absolute, as here; partner, not partaker. I Sam. xx. 30, $\mu$ évoXos $\epsilon \mathfrak{i t} \sigma \dot{v} \tau \hat{\omega}$ viê ' ${ }^{\prime}$ I $\sigma \sigma a i ́$. Psalm cxix. 63 . Eccles. iv. ıo, ó $\epsilon \hat{i} \bar{s}$ é $\gamma \epsilon \rho \in \hat{\imath}$ tò̀ $\nu$ $\mu$ ќтoXov aùzoù. Hos. iv. 17, $\mu$ é-

10. кaí, इ $u$ ] Psalm cii. 26 -28. The only departures from the Alexandrine Septuagint are (1) a chauge of order (from кat'

 the insertion of a second ws
ipátoov after aủroús. There is nothing in the Psalm itself to mark its application to Christ. But (1) the principle above stated fully justifies this use of it. Its subject is the interposition of God to avenge His people; and this interposition means to a Christian reader His interposition in Christ. (2) There is also, in the quotation itself, a rehearsal of the work of Creation; and it is a first principle of the Gospel,

 үє́ $\gamma$ оуєv (John i. 3).

кал' $\left.{ }^{\prime} \rho \rho \chi^{a} s\right]$ Psalm exix. I52,

 aừá.

ті̀ $\nu \hat{\eta} \nu \quad \dot{\theta} \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda i \omega \sigma a s] \quad J_{o b}$ xxxviii. 4, $\pi$ ой $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \theta a$ ӧтє $\bar{\epsilon} \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon-$ $\lambda_{i \omega \sigma a}^{\tau} \hat{\eta}^{v} v \hat{\eta} v ;$ Psalm xxiv. 2.

 बข̀̀ $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda i \omega \sigma a s . \quad$ civ. 5. cxix. 90. Prov. iii. 19. Isai. xlviii. 13. li. i3, 16 . In the New Testament $\theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda c o v y$ is used once in the Gospels (Matt. vii. 25) and twice (figuratively) in the Epistles (Eph. iii 17. Col. i. 23).

 бov. Heb. iv. 3, 4, 1о, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }_{\epsilon}{ }_{\rho}-$
 $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ к.т.入.




11. avirot] Always emphatic in the nominative. Either they themselves, or even they, or they indeed.
aंподоиิขта1] $\quad 2$ Pet. iii, 6, 7,



 $\pi \omega \nu$.
$\left.\delta_{1 a \mu}{ }^{\prime} \nu \in \epsilon s\right]$ It is the word applied by the scoffers, in 2 Pet, iii. 4, to the permanence of mat-
 $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ ктí $\sigma \omega \mathrm{c}$. Here it expresses the everlastingness of God in contrast with all else. In Psalm cxix. 89,90 , the two thoughts are combined; the permanence of matter is made dependent upon the permanence of the upholding word: eis tòv aiciva,


 каì $\delta$ баре́vé. In the New Testament, סoapéyecy is found (besides) only in Luke i. 22. xxii. 28. Gal. ii. 5 .


 $\beta a \lambda \lambda a ́ v t ı a \mu \grave{\eta}$ тàacoú $\mu \in v a$. Compare Deut. xxix. 5, oviк ह̇ $\pi a \lambda a \ldots \omega^{\prime}-$

${ }^{v} \mu \omega \bar{\nu} \nu$. Josh. ix. $5,{ }^{1} 3$, каì $\tau \dot{a}$
 ávш $\alpha \cup \mathfrak{v} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Neh. ix. 2 I. Job xiii. 28, ò $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha \_\hat{\text { ital... }}$ шотєр í $\mu a ́ \tau \iota o v ~ \sigma \eta \tau o ́ \beta \rho \omega т o v . ~ I s a i . ~$ 1. 9. li. 6 , ó ov́pavòs wis калvòs $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \dot{\theta} \eta \eta$, каì $\dot{\eta}(\mathrm{A}, \dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mathrm{B})$
 Ecclus. xiv. 17.
12. $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota$ ßódacov] Psalm civ. 6, äßuraos wis í íáтcov тò $\pi \epsilon \rho \ell \beta$ ólalov aủrồ. Isai. lix. 17 ,
 каi тò $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota$ ßó $\lambda a t o v ~ \zeta$ そ́ $\lambda о v$ ( A , aúrô̂ B). \&c. \&c. I Cor. xi. 15.

ÉAígecs] Isai. xxxiv. 4, кà
 Rev. vi. 14, каі̀ ò oupavòs àre-
 vov.
wis i $\mu a \dot{\sigma} \tau o v]$ The insertion seems ungraceful, as well as redundant, But the above quotation from Psalm civ. 6 (see note on $\pi \epsilon \rho(\beta o ́ \lambda a c o v)$ gives a striking parallel. It seems best to connect ws ipaitoo with the preceding clause, thus: and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, even as a garment; and they shall be changed.
à入ауи́боитаl Gen. xxxv.
 xli. 14. 2 Sam, xii. 20, каì


 $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho o v ́ s ~ \sigma o u ~ \dot{v} \pi o \pi o ́ \delta \iota o \nu ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \pi o \delta \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma o v ;$

$\ddot{\eta} \lambda \lambda a \xi \in \tau \grave{̀}$ ¿ $\mu a ́ \tau \iota a$ aủrov̂. Jer. lii.

 word occurs also in Acts vi. I4. Rom. i. 23 (from Psalm vi. 20). I Cor. xv. 51, 52. Gal. iv. 20.
${ }^{\circ}$ aữòs $\left.\epsilon t\right]$ xiii. 8, 'I $\eta \sigma o v ̄ s$
 каi iss roves aiêvas.
 Bios gov adv $\theta$ pémivos; $\hat{\eta}$ тà ext
 in B) adv $\delta$ oós; Psalm lxi. 6, rad
 $\gamma \in \nu \epsilon \hat{a s} . \quad$ iii. 24, èv $\gamma \in \nu \in a ̣ ̂ ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \omega \hat{\nu}$ $\tau \grave{̀} \stackrel{\iota}{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \eta \eta \sigma o v$.

 $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \epsilon i \psi \epsilon \epsilon .8 c . \& c$. In the New Testament ex $\lambda \epsilon i ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$ occurs only in Luke xvi. 9. xxii. 32.
13. єïрךкшข] The perfect of Scripture. That which is written is written, and changes not. Compare iv. 3, 4. vii. 6, 9. viii. 5. x. 9. xiii. 5. Luke


 $\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.

Kádov] Psalm ex 1. See notes on verse 3 , द̇ка́ $\theta / \sigma \epsilon \nu$, \&c.
v́тoாódoov] Psalm xcix. 5,

$\pi<\delta \hat{\omega} \nu$ av่̉тov. Isai. lxvi. I. Lam. ii. r. Matt. v. 35. Acts vii. 49. James ii. 3 .
14. oủx̀ пáv res] Is not this what Scripture makes them? 'not possessors (like the Son) of royal dignity, but spirits whose very office is service; not occu'pants (like the Son) of a throne in heaven, but ministers, in per-- petal mission, for the sake of those who shall hereafter inherit salvation?
$\left.\pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \in s\right]$ In contrast to the rive above. All, alike "and equally," without distinction" or selection' of any.
$\lambda_{\text {trove }}^{\text {cкá }}$ ] Belonging to, existing only for that $\lambda$ etrovoria, divine and human, by which the above quotation (verse 7) describes them. The adjective' occurs only here in the New Testament. But compare Exod.
 тоvрүıка́s' 'Aaро́v. xxxix. 1, 41.


入єєтоуруккג $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{S} \sigma \kappa \eta \nu \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ тои̂ $\mu$ арtupióv. 2 Chron. xxiv. I4,
 $\tau \omega \nu$.
cis Slanoviav] Acts xi. 29.
 $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho о \nu о \mu \epsilon i ̄ \nu$ бштпрíav;

1 Cor. xvi. 15 I Tim. i. 12. 2 Tim. iv. II.
$\left.\dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda о{ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \mathrm{\varepsilon} \mathrm{a}\right]$ The present participle expresses a repeated or continuous mission. Psalm ciii. 20, 21 , $\pi 0$ olov̂v av̉rov̀... $\pi o l o u ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ тò $\theta$ é̀ $\lambda \eta \mu a$ ( A , тà̀ $\theta$ є $\lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \mu \alpha \tau a$ B) aưtoû. Johni. 5 I,
 vovтаs каі ката $\beta$ аivovтая к.т. $\lambda$.

Stà тoùs] For the sake of. The ministry of Angels has the good of individual men for its object: This is implied in the

 штоv тô̂ Matoós pov. Psalm xci. 11,12 , тô̂s à $\gamma \gamma^{\text {éndois aùtrô }}$



бштпрiav] The verb $\sigma$ wícıv has the two senses, to keep safe and to make safe, to preserve and to save, according to the subject and context. In classical Greek owr ${ }^{2} \mathrm{i}$ ia is most often safety or welfare, whether bodily or mental, personal or public. And the same general idea is seen in such places as Acts xxvii. 34, тойтo үà̀ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$


 Sıкаíwr. exix. 155. \&c. The more definite sense, of spiritual well-being, the sound and healthy
condition of the whole man in his relation to God and eternity, is the commoner one in Scripture. And inasmuch as this condition is represented as having been lost through sin, the context generally gives to $\sigma \omega \tau \eta$ pia the idea of rescue, restoration to well-being, rather than that of preservation in it. Acts xiii.


 pias. And so throughout the Epistles. The adjective $\sigma \omega \tau \eta^{-}$ plos (saving) occurs in Tit. ii. II : owotypor ( (tó) in Luke ii. 30. iii. 6 (from Isai, xl. 5). Acts xxviii. 28. Eph. vi. I7 (from Isai. lix. 17), and often in the Septuagint: $\sigma \omega \tau \bar{\eta} \rho t a(\tau \alpha ́)$, thankofferings for safety, peace-offerings, Exod. xx. 24, тà ó òoкav-
 к.т. $\lambda_{\text {. }}$; and so about 70 times in Leviticus, Numbers, \&c.
II. 1 -4. $\Delta l a ̀$ то̂̀to $\delta \in i]$ Inference from the foregoing contrast. If such is the Scripture doctrine of the exaltation of the Son, in right of person, work, and office, above all angelic being, how far must the Gospel of our salvation, introduced by the ministry of the Son, transcend in dignity, and in the awfulness of its sanctions, that


Mosaic Dispensation which was inaugurated by the ministry of Angels．

I．$\Delta \dot{a}$ тov̂тo］Because of that which has been said in the first chapter as to the place occupied by the Son in the nature of things and in the counsels of God．Especially， because of the comparative place of the Son and of the Angels．
$\pi \epsilon \rho \ell \sigma \sigma o \tau \epsilon \rho \omega 5]$ This form is peculiar（with the exception of this place and xiii．19）to St Paul＇s Epistles，especially the Second to the Corinthians（i．ir． ii． 4 ．vii． 13,15 ．xi． 23 ．xii． 15 ． Gal．i．14．Phil．i．I4．i Thess． ii．17）．The adjective $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o{ }^{\prime}$ s （from $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ in its sense of over and above）means remaining over（Exod．x．5，rò тєрtaróv， т̀̀ $\kappa a \tau \alpha \lambda \epsilon(\phi \theta \epsilon \nu)$ ；and so either （1）abuindant（John x．ıо，кaì $\pi є \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o ̀ \nu$ ё $\chi \omega \sigma \iota r)$ ，superior，excel－ lent（Dan．v．12，14，$\pi \ell є \overline{\mathrm{~T}} \mu \mathrm{a}$ $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o ̀ \nu . . . \sigma \circ \phi\left(\alpha \quad \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \eta^{\prime}\right)$ ，or （2）redundant，superfluous，ex－ cessive（ 2 Cor．ix．I，$\pi \in \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o ́ v$
 times with a genitive，exceeding， more than（Matt．v． 37 ，tò $\delta_{\bar{\epsilon}}$ $\pi \epsilon \rho \sigma \sigma \neq \grave{\nu} \tau \sigma \sigma^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$ к．$\tau . \lambda$. ．）．
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon \tau]$ Acts viii．6，$\pi \rho \sigma \sigma-$
 $\pi \rho о \sigma$ е́хєьv тois 入adovpévors． 2

 Elsewhere with a dative of the person（Luke xvii．3，$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \dot{\chi} \epsilon \tau \epsilon$
éavooîs．xxi． 34 ．Acts v． 35 ． viii．10，11．xx．28），or with ả̉ò（Matt．vii． 15 ．X．17．xvi． 6，II，12．Luke xx．46，$\pi \rho 0 \sigma$－ є́ $\chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{a} \pi \grave{o}$ т $\bar{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma \rho a \mu \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon(\omega \nu)$ ，or with both（Lukexii．x，тробе́ $\chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$
 $\sigma a^{\prime}(\omega v)$ ．It is a favourite word with St Luke．St Paul uses it only in the Pastoral Epistles（I Tim．i．4．iii．8．iv．I，I3． Tit，i．14）．
 which were heard；which were taught us in our first instruction as Christians．Eph．i．I3，áкoú－




入iov oṽ ท่кои́батє． $2 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{i}$ ． 13 ． ii．2．I John ii． 7,24 ，号 $\vec{a}^{\prime} r^{\prime}$
 6.
$\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon]$ The temporal sense， lest at any time，would not be unsuitable here，nor in Luke xxi．34，and a few other pass－ ages．But the other sense，lest haply，is so clearly required in most places（see，for instance， Matt．xiii．29．xv．32．xxv． 9．Luke xiv．8，29）that it may be with some confidence adopted here．
$\pi а р а р v \omega \overline{\mu \epsilon v}]$ The verb $\pi \alpha$－ раро́є $\omega$ ，applied first to a river flowing by a place，is also used absolutely，in the sense of flow－

##  

ing aside instead of flowing along; as a river escaping from its channel through chinks and fissures in the banks, and so losing its proper volume of water. In classical Greek the word is used, for example, of a thing which has slipped from the memory, or a person who has slipped from his senses. It is used once in the Septuagint exactly as here. Prov. iii. 21,

 that of Psalm lviii. 7 , $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi=v \delta \in v \omega-$
 (let them fall away like water that runneth apace). Lest haply we be found to have leaked or ebbed away. The aorist expresses the possible suddenness as well as completeness of the defection. (The passive form $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \rho \tilde{v}^{\prime} \eta v$ is the usual aorist of $\rho \dot{\rho} \epsilon \in$.)
2. $\left.\epsilon^{i} \gamma^{\text {áp }}\right]$ I say $\pi \epsilon \rho \omega \sigma^{-}$

${ }_{o} \delta i^{\top} \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \bar{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu \lambda$. dóyos] The $^{\prime}$ word which was spoken by means (by the instrumentality, with the attendant ministry) of Angels. The Law of Moses. See note on i. $4, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \gamma \gamma \dot{\hat{c}} \lambda \omega \nu$.

Nóyos] John x. 35, $\pi \rho$ òs


є̀үє́vєто] Became, came to be; proved or showed itself, by its penalties and its judg- ments.

Bє́ßaros] Stedfast, firm to the tread (from $\beta^{\prime} \omega, \beta$ aivo. Thuc. iii. 23, крv́ata入los ov
 word occurs five times in this Epistle (iii. 6, 14. vi. r9. ix. 17), and only four times besides in the New Testament (Rom. iv. 16. 2 Cor. i. 7. 2 Pet. i.
 $\pi \rho о ф \eta \tau \div \kappa 0 v$ 入ó $\gamma o v$ ). In the Septuagint it is found only in Wisdom vii. ${ }^{2} 3, \pi v \epsilon \hat{\mu} \mu a . . . \beta$ éßatov
 verb $\beta \epsilon \beta a \iota o v ̃$, see verse 3. And for $\beta \in \beta a i \omega \sigma u s$ vi. 16.
$\pi \hat{a} \sigma a]$ Every. None too trilling to be regarded. See Exod. xxi. xxii. Lev. xxiv. Num. xxxv. Deut. xix. xxi. xxv.
 transgression and disobedience. The substantive rapáßãıs (with rov̂ vó $\mu \mathrm{v}$, Rom. ii. 23 ; or absolutely, Rom. iv. 15 . v. I4. Gal. iii. 19. r Tim. ii 14. Heb. ix. 15) occurs but once in the Old Testament,

 $\nu \epsilon \tau \nu)$ is very common, with to $\nu$


 idea is that of going by the side of instead of walking in the prescribed path. (2) We find

## 



таракой but twice elsewhere； Rom．v．19． 2 Cor．x．6．It is properly mishearing，indiffer－ ent or rebellious hearing，in opposition to $\frac{\text { úmaкои́，submissive }}{}$ hearing．The contrast is ex－ pressed（in the two verbs）in

 тарךкои́батє．Elsewhere тара－ kovety occurs only in the Book of Esther：iii．3，8，тà $\lambda \in \gamma \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma_{,}$ тต̂v ขó $\mu \omega \nu$ ．iv．I4，đ̀̀̀v таракои́－ $\sigma a \sigma a(A$ ，omitted in B）$\pi a \rho a-$


ต゙vókov］Rom．iii． 8 （only）． $\mu \sigma \theta a \pi$ обокiav］A word peculiar to this Epistle：x．35，

 $\mu \iota \sigma \theta a \pi о \delta o \sigma i a v . ~ A l s o ~ \mu \sigma \theta a \pi \sigma-$ סót $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{xi} .6$ ．We have the elements of the word in Deut．

 13．Wisdom x．I7．Matt．xx． 8，ánóסos tòv $\mu \sigma \theta \theta$ óv．The classical form is $\mu \omega \sigma \theta_{0} \delta_{o \sigma i ́ a}$ ．
 If the Law，with its interposition of Angels，was thus formidable in its self－assertion，judge ye if it can be safe to tritle with the Gospel，which has the Son Him－ self for its Mediator．This is the direct inference．But a further suggestion follows，in－ volved in the word salvation． The superior greatness of the

Mediator is the leading thought． The opposite character of the Dispensation－a Dispensation of mercy，not of judgment－is the subordinate．The danger of neglecting the Gospel has thus two measures，each in the way of comparison with the Law．

 $\lambda_{0 \nu}^{\eta} \mu \mathrm{\epsilon is}$ ．
 an accusative of the thing to be escaped：Luke xxi．36，тâ̂тa та́гта．Rom．ii．3，тò крíца той ©eov．Here the thing to be dreaded is left in mysterious silence．So in r Thess．v．3， $\kappa a i ̀ ~ o v ं ~ \mu \grave{\eta}$ éкфúy


тท入ıкаúтทร］So great，（ r ）by reason of the majesty of the Introducer，（z）in its own cha－ racter．The word $\tau \eta \lambda_{\text {coốtos }}$ occurs only（besides）in $z$ Cor． i．1o．James iii．4，$\tau$ à $\pi$ 入oîa тך入ıкаиิта ồvта．Rev．xvi．ェ8，
 $\left.{ }_{a} \mu \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma\right]$（1）The tense expresses，if，in the retrospect of the life，as one whole，from the judgment，we be found to have neglected．（2）It is the word used of the invited guests in Matt．xxii．5，oi $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mathfrak{e}^{\mu} \mu \in \lambda \dot{\eta}^{\prime}-$
 Compare Jer．xlviii．Io，èmı－
 $\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$ ．The danger is that of

## 

slighting rather than of refusing.
$\left.\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho_{i \alpha}{ }^{5}\right]$ Here made a synonym of the Gospel. This is its gracious import and purport as a whole. Acts xiii. 26,
 See note on i. 14, $\sigma \omega t \eta$ píav.
 Gospel had Christ Himselffor its original Preacher. (2) We received it on the sure testimony of its first hearers. (3) That testimony was not luman only: God bore witness with it in all manner of supernatural gifts.
$\left.\tilde{\eta}^{7} \mathrm{cs}\right]$ One which. 4 salvation which, having, \&c. Compare viii. 5, 6. ix. 2, 9. x. 8, I I, 35. xii. 5. xiii. 7. It is a classifying relative; but often, as here, rhetorical in its use, and conveying no intimation of there being others of the same class. Its object is to introduce the mention of a characteristic quality which explains or emphasizes the thing in question.
$\dot{a} \rho \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \nu \lambda . \lambda a \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} \theta \theta a \iota]$ Literally, having received a beginning to be spoken. Not implying an imperfect, partial, or inceptive speaking; but simply equivalent to having been first spoken. Compare Acts i. I,

 Jesus did and taught as a beginning of the new Dispensation).

Gen. ii. 3, катє́ $\pi \alpha v \sigma \epsilon \nu$ àmò $\pi \alpha^{2} v-$
 @єòs пой $\sigma a t$.

סuà тồ Kvpiov] Through the Lord. By (íто') would have been equally true: but $\delta$ ca better suits the $\delta_{i}^{\prime} \dot{a} \gamma \gamma \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ of verse 2 , as well as the thought that of both Dispensations God is the Origi-


 $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon$ тoís vioís 'I $\sigma \rho a \eta \eta \lambda$ evaj-
 X ки́рооя к.т. $\lambda$.

тov̂ Kupíou] The Lord (absolutely) as a title of Christ is characteristic of St Luke. See Luke vii. 13. x. r. xi. 39 . xii. 42. xiii. 15 . xvii. $5,6$. xviii. 6. xix. 8, 34. xxii. 61. xxiv. 34. Acts v. I4. ix. I, 10, 11, 15, 17, 27, 35, 42. \&e., \&c. Of the other Evangelists, St Matthew uses it in xxi. 3, and St Mark in xi. 3 (as St Luke in xix. 31), in the phrase, The Lord hath need of him (or of them) ; and the propriety of the title there speaks for itself. In Matt. xxviii. 6 the reading is disputed: and Mark xvi. 20 cannot be confidently quoted as a part of that Gospel. St John uses it six times in his last two chapters (xx. 2, 18, 20,25 . xxi. 7, 12), as also in iv. I. vi. 23. xi. 2. It is found in St Paul's Epistles frequently

(Rom. xiv. 8. I Cor. iv. 5 . vi. 13 , \&c. vii. 10, \&c. ix. 5 , 14. xi. $23,26,27$. 2 Cor. v. 6,8 viii. 5. x. 8. xii. 8. xiii. ıo. Gal. i. 19. Eph. v. 22. vi. 7. Phil. iv. 5. Col. iii. 23. I Thess. i. 6, 8. iv. 15, 16. 2 Thess. i. 9. ii. 2. iii. I. 2 Tim. i. r8. iv. 8, 17) ; but in most cases there is an evident reason in the context for the choice of the title.


 And in Acts x. 4 r, мápтvact...

 aưтòv éк vєкри̂̀. Compare John xiv. 26, viто $\mu v \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ víâs $\pi a ́ v т a ~$


 $\mu \epsilon \nu$ каі̀ $\eta^{\prime} к о \dot{\sigma} а \mu \epsilon \nu$.
 certified unto us (so as to reach us; like 1 Thess. ii. 9, ėк $\eta \rho \dot{\prime} \xi \alpha-$

 Cor.i. 6, тò $\mu a \rho \tau$ úplou tov̂ Xptatov̂ $\dot{\epsilon} \beta \epsilon \beta a \iota \epsilon \theta \eta$ е̇̀ $\boldsymbol{\imath} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$, For $\beta \epsilon \beta a \iota-$ oûv, see also Mark xvi. 20, тòv入óүov $\beta \epsilon \beta$ aıov̀ттos. Rom. xv. 8. I Cor. i. $8 . \quad 2$ Cor. i. 2 I. Col. ii. 7. Heb. xiii. 9. This reference to the testimony of the original hearers of Christ is exactly


it is most unlike St Paul, who every where claims to be himself an original witness ( I Cor. ix. I , oủxi' 'I рака; xi. 23. xy. 8. Gal. i. I,


 Eph. iii. 3), and could scarcely be supposed for any reason to waive or dissemble his direct authority.
4. $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho o v ̂ \nu \tau o s]$ This double compound is only here used in Scripture. But we have $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho \epsilon \bar{v}$ in I Pet. v. 12, and бv $\mu \mu a \rho т v \rho \epsilon i v ~ i n ~ R o m . ~ i i . ~ 15 . ~ v i i i . ~$ 16. ix. I. The émi might seem to mean further testimony; but the examples, classical and scriptural, suggest rather the sense of attesting, bearing witness to something. God bearing witness to it (the $\sigma \omega \pi \eta \rho i a)$ along with them (the human witnesses). Acts



 avirūv. Compare I Cor. i. 6, where the $\mu a p \tau u ́ p l o v ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ X p \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ (the thing testified about Christ) is said, as here, to have been confirmed by the supernatural gifts of the Spirit to the hearers. Also I Thess. i. 5, tò


 к.т. $\lambda$.

## 

б $\eta \boldsymbol{\mu}$ кiots $\boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon$ ] Afourfold description is here given of the supernatural evidences. Elsewhere we have ( I ) опиєі́a and ŕ́pata, Matt. xxiv. 24. Mark xiii. 22. John iv. 48. Acts ii. 19, 43. iv. 30 . v. 12. vi. 8 . vii. 36 . xiv. 3. xv. 12 ; (2) опнєia and $\delta v v a \mu \epsilon \epsilon$, Acts viii. I3; (3) $\delta$ úva-
 г 9 ; (4) б $\eta \mu \epsilon i a, ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a \tau a$, and $\delta \nu \nu \alpha ́-$ $\mu \in$ cs (or $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu t s$ ), Acts ii. 22.2 Cor. xii. 12. 2 Thess. ii. 9. Of these various terms, tépas (miracle) denotes the marvellousness; $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{i o v}$ (sign) points to the object of miracle, as a signal of something or some one ; ďvya$\mu \mathrm{s}$ (power) marks the superhuman agency involved; while the fourth particular, found only here in this combination, traces up the phenomena of Christian miracle to their source in the Pentecostal gift.
$\sigma \eta \mu$ eioss Found in this sense in all the Gospels, but especially characteristic of St John.

 $\theta$ Ø'бєтац. \&c. \&c. John ii. II, I8,


 2, 26, 30. \&c. dec. Acts iv. 16, 22, $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau$ оे б б $\eta \mu \hat{1} 0 \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. viii. 6. \&e. \&e. 2 Cor. xii. 12, $\tau$ à б $\eta \mu \epsilon i ̂ a ~ \tau о \hat{v}$ áтобтódov.
$\tau \epsilon \rho a \sigma \iota v]$ Rarely found alone.

 Өavuaorròs èv סógats, motwv tépata 1 Kings xiii. 3, 5, тô̂to
 2 Chron. xxxii. 3I. Psalm xlvi. 8 .

тоикídacs] From the literal sense, variegated, many-coloured
 $\pi \rho o ́ \beta a \tau \alpha$ токкіла. xxxvii 3,

 comes that of various or manifold in all applications. Matt. iv. 24, токкí $\lambda a \iota s$ vócoıs. Marki. 34. Luke iv. 4c. 2 Tim. iii. 6, ї $\pi \iota \theta v \mu i ́ a \iota s ~ \pi о к к i \lambda a t s . ~ T i t . ~ i i i . ~ 3, ~$
 Heb. xiii. 9, סidaxaîs moккídaıs каí द́ध́vaus. James i. 2, $\pi \in \iota \rho a \sigma-$ $\mu o i ́ s$ токкìıs. i Pet. i. 6. iv.

 тоทิ @ย๐v̂.

סvvá $\mu \epsilon \sigma เ v]$ Powers; exercises of power. Matt. vii. 22, $\delta v$ vá $^{-}$
 21,23 , aii $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \iota ~ \delta v v \dot{a} \mu \epsilon \iota S ~ \alpha u ̉ \tau o v ̄$




 Luke x. 13. xix 37 , $\mathfrak{\omega} v$ eioiov $\delta v v a ́ \mu \epsilon \omega v$. Acts xix. 1 I, $\delta v v a ́-$ $\mu$ ess ov tàs tuxováas. 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29. Gal. iii. 5, каi
 John does not use the word $\delta \dot{v} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \mathrm{t}$ s.

## 

 $\alpha u ̛ \tau o \hat{v}$ Ө́́入 $\eta \sigma \iota \nu$. is wanting, as it usually is when the communication of the Holy Spirit is the point in view. The Holy Spirit personally is rò á $\gamma$ ıov
 Examine Matt. xii. 32. xxviii. ig. Mark xiii. ir. Luke ii. 26. iii. 22. xii. 10 , 12. John xiv. 26. Acts i. 8, 16 . ii. 38. v. 3, 32. vii. 5I. ix. 3I. x. 44 , 45, 47. xi. 15. xiii. 2, 4. xv. 8, 28. xvi. 6. xix. 6. xx. 23, 28. xxi. it. xxviii. 25. I Cor. vi. 19. 2 Cor. xiii. 13. Eph. iv. 30. Heb. iii. 7. ix. 8. x. 15 . A communication of the Holy Spirit, whether in gift or grace, is $\pi v \epsilon \hat{\mathrm{v}} \mu \mathrm{a}$ a $\boldsymbol{q}_{10 \nu}$. Compare, for example, (I) Luke ii. 25 with
 (there was upon him a Holy Spirit; that is, an inspiration of the Holy Spirit); каі $\bar{\eta} \nu \alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\omega}$
 tos tov̂ ayíov (and it had been communicated to him by the Holy Spirit, who is the Author of inspiration) к.т.入. (2) John vii. 39 with xiv. 26 : oünc $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \vec{\eta} \nu$ $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\mu} \mu a{ }^{a} \gamma \mathrm{cov}$ (for not yet was there a Holy Spirit; that is, an effusion of the Holy Spirit upon the Church according to the pro-
 $\psi \in \varepsilon$ o $\pi a \pi \eta$ (the sending of the Holy Spirit is equivalent to the existence of a Holy Spirit). (3) Acts xix. 2 with 6: $\epsilon i \pi \nu \in \hat{\jmath} \mu a$
${ }_{\square}^{\text {ä }} \boldsymbol{y}$
 ceive a Holy Spirit on becoming believers? We did not even hear whether there is a Holy Spirit: that is, in either case, an effusion of the Holy Spirit in the sense of the great promise) ; $\dot{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \tau$ тo
 Holy Spirit came upon them, and that coming of the Holy Spirit is equivalent to the receiving, or the existence, of $a$ Holy Spirit). The seven Spirits of God (Rev. i. 4. iii. 1. iv. 5. v. 6), meaning the one Holy Spirit in diffusion, might be said to be, each one, a Holy Spirit.
$\mu \epsilon \rho \sigma \sigma \mu \hat{\imath} \mathrm{s}]$ Josh. xviii. 10,

 $\tau \hat{\omega} v$ (clause omitted in B). The noun occurs (in the New Testament) only here and in iv. 12. But the verb is frequent. Mark vi. 4 I. Rom. xii. 3, éкá-
 $\pi i \sigma \pi \epsilon \omega$. 1 Cor. vii. 17. 2 Cor. x. ı3. Heb.vii. 2. For the sense,


 communication of the Holy Spirit, whether ordinary, in grace, or (as here) extraordinary, in gift, is a distribution: see the Parables of Matt. xxv. 14, \&c., and Luke xix. it, de.



place of aỉrov̂ makes it empha－ tic；His own will．Compare Rom．iii．24， 25 （ $\tau \hat{\eta}$ aưtov̂ $\chi^{\alpha}$－ $\rho \iota \tau \iota \ldots \epsilon \in \tau \hat{\varphi}$ av่าov̂ aĩ $\mu a \tau \iota)$ with

 The avirov̂ probably refers to $\tau o \hat{v}$
 It would be a straining of the parallel to argue the latter from


 $\lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha$. For there the personality of the Spirit is as clearly pro－ minent as here it is subordinate． （3）The form $\theta$ é $\lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$（volition， the act of willing）is found only here in the New Testament．But see 2 Chron．xv． 1 5．Psalm xxi．2，
 $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \nu(\mathrm{A}, \delta \dot{\epsilon} \eta \sigma \omega \mathrm{B}) \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \chi^{\epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu}$ aưrồ．Prov．viii．35． 2 Macc． xii．$\tau 6, \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \sigma \hat{v} \oplus \epsilon \sigma \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \eta_{\sigma} \epsilon \mathrm{L}$ ．

5－18．Oủ $\gamma$ à $\rho$ к．т．入．］It must be so．Christ must be above the Angels．For thus only can the Scripture be fulfilled．Scrip－ ture bears witness to the destined supremacy，not of Angels，but of man，over the world that shall be． All things are put under him． This universal subjugation we see not in the present．But we see preparation made for it．We see Jesus crowned．Crowned after，and as the result of，suffer－ ing．This experience of suffer－
ing was necessary．So only could there be that conscious brother－ hood between the Saviour and the saved，which is the predicted relationship．The incarnation was necessary to the death，and the death was the condition of the salvation．So only could the power of the devil be broken，and the fear of death be taken away． Not Angels，brit men，are the ob－ ject of the interposition：and He who would mediate for men must first be made like them；He who would succour the tempted must first have been Himself tempted．

5．vinє́ $\tau \alpha \xi \in \nu$ ］The nomina－ tive is evidently $\delta$ © ©ós，not un－ derstood from $\tau \circ \hat{\text { ® }}$ € $\epsilon \hat{v}$ above， but rather as the universal no－ minative to providences and to Scriptures．
 For oikováv́v，see note on i． 6 ． The peculiarity here is the addi－ tion of $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \mu \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda$ dovoav．Compare vi．5，$\mu$ élioutos aièvos．The contrast is between the world of the present，with its predomi－ nant $\sin$ and suffering，and the new heaven and earth wherein dwelleth righteousness（2 Pet．iii． 13）．
$\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ifs $\lambda a \lambda o v \hat{\mu} \mu v]$ The real subject，when we speak of the exaltation of the Son，is the world not yet seen，the $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a$ àdadevtos which waits for the

## 

 xii. 26 - 28 ).
6. Sıємарти́рато] The forms
 the strengthened form $\delta$ oajap$\tau$ ú $\rho \in \sigma \theta a i$ ) are always kept distinct. The former is to bear witness, as in Num. xxxv. 30 ,
 $\psi v x \neq v$. dc., \&c. The latter is to call to witness, as in Jer. xxxii. 1о, каі $\delta є є \mu а \rho т и р а ́ \mu \eta \nu ~ \mu а ́ \rho т v-~$ pas. \&c., \&c. (r) To this accusative of the witness appealed to may be added a dative of the person addressed, or for whose information, warning, \&c., the appeal is made; as Deut.iv. 26,
 ov̀pavòv кaì $\tau \dot{\eta} v \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu$ (I call heaven and earth to witness against you).
(2) Often, the accusative of the witness being dropped, there remains the dative of the person to or for whom, dc.; as Gen. xliii.

 $\theta \rho \omega \pi \mathrm{os}, \lambda$ '́ $\gamma \omega \nu$ (the man did solemnly protest unto us, saying). Psalm lxxxi. 8, äкоvбоv, גaós $\mu$ ои,
 popaí B) wol. (3) To this dative is often added an accusative of the subject spoken of; as Deut. xxxii. 46, zoùs $\lambda$ ójous toútous oũs
 (declare solemnly, as if with an appeal to witnesses). Acts xx.


av к.т.入. (4) Or, by a slight variation, the dative of the person is exchanged for $\pi$ pós with an accusative; as Zech. iii. 6, $\delta \iota \epsilon \mu a \rho-$ ти́рато ó ắ ауєдоs Kvpíov тро̀s 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v} v, \lambda$ '́ $\gamma \omega \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. (5) Or the accusative of the subject is turned into a clause with ört, iva, or the infinitive ; as Acts x. 42,


 аѝто̀̀ $\grave{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. I Tím. v. 21 ,
 Errs. Acts xviii. 5, סıацартиро́$\mu$ evos toîs ’Iovóaious eival tòv

 (6) Finally, the dative of the person isdropped, and the accusative of the subject (or some equivalent for it, as $\lambda$ ' $\gamma_{\omega \nu}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$ here) alone retained; as in Acts xx.


 pectal occurs three times in the New Testament (Acts xx. 26. Gal. v. 3. Eph. iv. 17), and not once in the Alexandrine Septuagint. The compound dıapaptú$\rho \in \sigma \theta a r$ is found 26 times in the Alexandrine Septuagint, and in I 5 places of the New Testament, of which ten are in St Luke's Gospel and the Acts.
$\pi a v(\tau s]$ The indefinite form of expression is characteristic of therhetorical style of the Epistle; avoiding the stiffness and bald-


ness of quotation by name and

 к. $\tau . \lambda$.
tí évtiv] Psalm viii. 4-6, Septuagint. The Psalm bears on its surface only the marvelling adoration of the human writer as he contemplates the glory of the celestial bodies, sun, moon, and stars, and contrasts with it the ascendancy of frail and feeble man over God's irrational creatures. But there is a sense within this sense, to which the $\pi$ ávта vimétagas of verse 6, taken in its literal meaning, bears witness. Universal dominion can be asserted for Him alone who is not man only. Yet it is not of the Son as God of God, but of the Son as the God-Man, that this deeper meaning of the Psalm speaks. It is not to the original glory, but to the Mediatorial exaltation, of Christ, that the language is applicable.
 Psalm cxliv. 3, Kúpıc, тí éqтìv

 But the whole tone and context there are opposite to those of Psalm viii.
$\left.{ }_{a}^{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \sigma \varsigma \ldots v i o ̀ s ~ \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi o v\right]$ In the first meaning of the Psalm , a man...a son of man; any human being. See, for instance,

Jer. xlix. 17, 18, каì ếataц $\eta^{2}$




 ${ }^{\alpha}{ }^{2} \theta$ өшттог. The idea of man collectively is not in the word; still less that of the Son of Man distinctively. Indeed the introduction of the latter thought is unsuitable even to the application of the passage; for the point is, not Christ as distinct from man, but Christ as man.
$\left.\mu \mu \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \eta\right]$ xiii. 3, $\mu \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma-$ $\kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta \in \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu i \omega \nu$. The present tense is rare. Isai. xii 4. xlviii. I, кaì (A, omitted in B) © $\epsilon \hat{v}$ 'І $\sigma \rho a \eta ̀ \lambda \mu ц \nu \nu \sigma к о ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о$. lхіi. 6.
 $\chi^{\text {ará }}$ бov. I Macc. vi. I2, $\mu \mu \nu \eta^{\prime}-$
 xii. II. The usual forms are $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta \mu a<$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.

є $\bar{\epsilon} \iota \sigma \kappa \epsilon \in \pi \tau \eta]$ A verb of frequent use in the Septuagint, both in the judicial and the merciful sense. For the former, see Jer.

 mov; \&c. \&c. For the latter,
 є̇тíлкєчаí $\mu \epsilon$. dc. \&c. It is used in eleven passages of the New Testament, of which seven are St Luke's. The nouns èmiбкє$\psi / s$ and $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \kappa о \pi \eta$ are both com-

$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \alpha ́ \nu \omega \sigma \alpha s$ $\alpha \dot{v} \tau o ́ v, \kappa \alpha i \quad \kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \alpha s ~ \alpha \dot{u}-$
ii. 7. Or omit кal к. aú. є. т. द. т. $\chi$. бov.
mon in the Septuagint; the latter only is found in the New Testament (Luke xix. 44. I Pet. ii. 12).
7. $\left.\dot{\eta} \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \tau \tau \omega \sigma \alpha \varsigma\right]$ (1) The He brew is given literaliy thus: Thou madest him to lack but little of God; that is, to be little less than God. But the quotation is made from the Septuagint, which renders Elohim á $\gamma$ $\gamma^{\prime}$ dous (as also in Psalm xcvii. 7 , and cxxxviii. 1). For ${ }^{2} \lambda a \tau-$

 Num. xxvi. 54, тoîs è̀д́́тtoacu


 \&c. \&c. (2) The tense of $\eta^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime}$ -
 following) expresses the act of divine volition in the eternity of the past, to which is due both (a) that supremacy of man over the irrational creation, which is the first meaning of the passage, and (b) the universal sovereignty of the Man in the future, which is its deeper and fuller purport.

Bpaxú Tt] In Acts v. 34 $\beta_{\rho \alpha \chi}{ }^{\prime}$ (for there the $\tau c$ is to be omitted) is clearly used of time:
 $\pi o v s \pi o r \hat{\eta} \sigma a L$. And so in Luke
 i $\delta \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ к.т.入. In Acts xxvii. 28 it is ambiguous: $\beta \rho a \chi^{\prime} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \delta, a-$

बrท́ravtes (having interposed a little space or time). And so in Isai. Ivii. ı $_{7}, \delta \iota a ̀$ á $\mu \alpha \rho \tau i ́ a y ~ \beta \rho a \chi u ́$ ть è $\lambda \dot{\prime} \pi \eta \sigma a$ av่тóv, though the contrast with eis tòv aieiva and סcanartos (verse 16) makes the temporal sense the more probable. In 2 Sam. xri. I ( $\kappa a i ̀ \Delta a v i \delta$ $\pi \alpha \rho \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta_{\epsilon} \beta \rho a \chi^{\dot{v}} \boldsymbol{\tau \iota} \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{o}$ к.т. $\left.\lambda.\right)$ the local use is clear. Here the temporal sense (fora little while) would well suit the application in verse 9 ; but in the original passage it must be taken rather of degree. Thou didst diminish him a little (and but a little) beyond Angels. For mapá, see note on i. 4 , ӧ $\sigma \omega$ дсафорќтєроv.

סós $\left.\xi_{\eta} \kappa a i \not \tau \mu \hat{\eta}\right]$ Rev. xxi. 26,


 тро̀s тицй̀ каi $\delta o ́ \xi \alpha v$. Add Exod. xxviii. 2, 40 . Job xl. 10, $\delta$ ס́gav
 r. xevi. 7. In all other instances of the combination of $\delta o \xi_{a}$ and $\tau \tau \mu \eta$, there is an addition of some other word or words to them.
égreфávoras] Of the two senses of ot'申аvos, a king's croum, and a victor's wreath, the latter is clearly intended in 1 Cor.
 $\beta_{\omega \sigma \nu \nu}$ к.т. $\lambda$. 2 Tim. ii. 5, oú
 $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta$. г Pet. v. 4, концєї $\theta \epsilon \epsilon$ ло̀v



 ii. 8. Or omit $\mathrm{s} s t \operatorname{avi} \hat{\varphi}$.

The former is indicated here, and in the $\dot{\alpha}$ кáv $\theta$ vos $\sigma \tau$ t́quvos of Mark xv. 17 (and the parallel passages), and in the oréqavou xpuctos of Rev. iv. 4. In other passages the alternative is open; but, as a rule, in St Paul's Epistles the wreath of victory is the probable allusion, whereas in the Book of Revelation (as in the Septuagint) the idea of the royal crown is predominant. The verb occurs only here (and in verse 9), and in 2 Tim. ii. 5 . Psalmv. i2. ciii. 4. Song iii. if.

каì катє́ $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma a s]$ The retention of this clause of the Psalm as a part of the quotation must remain in doubt In number, the authorities for it preponderate: but there is the obvious counterprobability of its having been inserted by copyists to complete the quotation.

 cases: (1) Matt. xxiv. 45. xxv.
 Luke xii. 42. Acts vi. 3. vii. 27. (2) Matt. xxiv. 47. Luke xii. 44, èmi $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota v$ roîs v̀máp
 xii. 14, $\tau$ ís $\mu \epsilon \kappa а \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu ~ к \rho \iota \tau \grave{\nu}$
 48 we have both (1) and (3):

pas...èmi mávtas toìs बoфoús. Compare I Sam. viii. 5 with x .

 Also 1 Kings iv. 7 with v. 16 ,
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \bar{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega v$. And so throughout the Septuagint. The dative seems to be rare.
 also in 1 Cor. xv. 27 and Eph. i. 22 ( $\mathfrak{v} \pi \grave{o}$ रoùs $\pi$ ódas av̉roû). The thought here is thoroughly that of St Paul; but the length of the quotation, and the rov ris of its introduction, suggest a different writer.

บ่лока่тш] Mark vi. If. vii. 28. Luke viii. 16. John i. 5 o. Rev. v. 3, 13. vi. 9. xii. 1. Always with a genitive. In form and sense it is the direct opposite of $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{a}^{\prime} v \omega$ (Eph. i. 2 I. iv. 1o. Heb. ix. 5). In neither case does the compound seem to differ materially from the simple form ( ${ }_{u} \nu \omega$, кá $\tau \omega$ ), except in turning the adverb into a preposition.
 $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \boldsymbol{q}^{2} \alpha$. The suljugation spoken of is absolutely wiversal. It leaves room for no exception. Literally, For in the having subjected to him (man) the all things (the mivia of the quotation) He



(God) left nothing ansubject to him. The $\dot{\cup} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \alpha \xi a s$ of the Psalm has in it (sंv) the exclusion of any exception whatsoever.
$\dot{\alpha} \phi \bar{\eta} \kappa \in \nu]$ vi. $\mathbf{~}, \dot{a} \dot{\alpha} \phi \in ́ v \tau \epsilon s$. Acts
 $\dot{u} \dot{\eta} \kappa \in \nu$. The tense is adapted to

àvто́тактог] Here used in a strictly passive sense. Elsewhere it occurs only in St Paul's Pastoral Epistles, and in the sense of insubordinate, unruly: r Tim. i. 9. Tit. i. 6 , 10.

оขँт $\omega$ ] xii. 4. St Paul uses out $\pi \omega$ once only, 1 Cor. iii. 2. It is found oftenest in St John.
ó $\omega \bar{\omega} \mu \omega]$ A comparatively rare word in Scripture (except in the imperative). 1 Cor, ix. I. Col. ii. i, i8. St John, however, uses it no less than 28 times in his Gospel and Epistles.
aúcu] Throughout this verse avंт $\varphi$ is man. The application to Christ does not begin till verse 9 .
9. tòv $\left.\delta_{6}\right]$ But, though we see not yet the fulfilment of the saying, we see thos much accomplished towards it. The universal reign is not yet: but the destined King is already crowned.
 has been diminished a little beyond Angels. That which is represented in the Psalm as man's
glory, that he has a position assigned him just below that of the Angels, becomes, in the application to Christ, an act of humiliation, by reason of the (original) glory that excelleth. It is not necessary, therefore, to vary the sense of $\beta \rho a \chi^{v}$ ть into for a little while (see note on verse 7). The point is, the condescension of Christ to man's position below the Angels, when He, as the Eternal Son, was high above them.
'Inбoiv] The position of the word gives it this meaning. Man, who has been placed (as the Psalm says) below the Angets, we behold, in the person of Jesus, crowned (as the Psalm further says) with glory and honour.
$\delta_{\iota a}^{a}$ тò $\pi \alpha ́ \theta \eta \mu a$ тov̀ $\left.\theta a v a ́ r o v\right] ~$ The place of these words makes them somewhat ambiguous. If
 they give the motive of the $h u$ miliation. If connected with
 cause of the exaltation. Either connexion is defensible. (I) For the former, see verse 14, where the-ability to die is made the object of the Incarnation. He partook of flesh and blood, that through death He might, d\&c. Also the difficult clause, ${ }^{\circ} \pi \omega$ s

## 

$\chi^{\text {á } \rho \iota т ь ~} \Theta \epsilon о \hat{v}$ к.т. $\lambda .$, might thus be taken as explanatory of $\delta \iota$ à tò $\pi \mathrm{a} \theta \eta \mu a$ тои $\theta_{\text {avátov, the words }}$
 having been thrown in, out of their strict order, to prevent too long a suspension of the principal statement. IIim who luad been made a little lower than the Angels, even Jesus, for the sake of suffering death-in otherwords, that by the grace of God He might taste death for every man-Him we now behold crowned with glory and honour. The chief objection to this arrangement of the construction is its interrupted and dislocated order. Also $\pi \dot{a} \theta \eta \mu a$ seems rather to point to a suffering already endured, than to a suffering intended and future. (2) For the latter, we have the $\delta$ to of Phil. ii. $g$, making the death the cause of the exaltation. Him who had been made a little lower than the Angels, even .Jesus, we behold now, because of His having suffered death, crowned with glory and honour. This would be unquestionably the right interpretation, were it not for the clause
 But, to make this last clause intelligible, we have then to render it, that by the grace of God He may have tasted death for every man; or, that by the grace of God the death which He tasted may be for every man (available
for the sins of the whole world). This represents the exaltation of Jesus as essential to the efficacy of His death. It is like
 $\delta_{\iota \kappa a i \omega \sigma \iota v} \dot{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \hat{\omega} \nu$. The death requires the resurrection (and all that follows upon the resurrection) to make it justifying. The chief objection to this second interpretation lies in the $\delta \pi \omega$, $\gamma \in \dot{v} r \eta_{\tau} a$, to which it would be difficult to find a clear parallel, in the sense of that He may have tasted.
$\left.\delta_{i d}\right]$ See the foregoing note. If ( I ) is adopted, compare (for
 Xptaroû (for the sake of doing Christ's work) $\mu$ '́ $\chi \rho$ с $\theta$ aváтov $\ddot{\eta}^{\gamma} \gamma$ $\gamma_{e} \sigma \in v$. If (2), I Thess. v. I 3 ,

 their work done).
$\pi \alpha ́ \theta \eta \mu a]$ (1) For $\pi \alpha ́ \theta \eta \mu a$ in the general sense of a thing suffered, compare x. 32 . Rom. viii. 18. 2 Cor. i. 6. CoI. i, 24. 2 Tim. iii. 1 r. I Pet. v. 9 . In application to Christ, ii. Io. 2 Cor. i. 5. Phil. iii. 10. I Pet. i. II. iv. 13. v. r. (2) The genitive tov̀ もavárou is peculiar, defining the $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \theta \eta \mu$ (suffering consisting of death). In Rom. viii. 18 , the genitive $\frac{10 \hat{v}}{} v \hat{v} \nu$ кацpov expresses that to which the sufferings belong. In the other examples, the genitive is that of the person ( $\quad$ ov X pıcтov,


\&c.). (3) In two instances (Rom. vii. 5. Gal. v. 24) $\pi \dot{d} \theta \eta \mu \alpha$ runs into the sense of $\pi \dot{\alpha} \theta$ os.
ö $\pi \omega \mathrm{s} \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau \iota$ © $\left.\oplus \rho \bar{y}\right]$ See note on $\delta \iota \alpha$ tò $\pi \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta_{\eta \mu a}$. The curious reading $\chi \omega \rho i s$ © $\Theta \sigma \hat{v}$ (sanctioned by Origen, \&c.) was variously understood as (I) apart from. His Divine Nature (a Nestorian perversion), or (2) apart (in separation) from God (Matt. xxvii. 46), or (3) except God (as a caution against a too inclusive interpretation of $\dot{\boldsymbol{v} \pi \grave{\ell} \rho \pi a v-~}$ cós, and perhaps suggested by I Cor. xv. 27, $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o v$ д̈ть є̇кто̀s то̂̀ ข̀ ขัoтágavтos к.т. $\lambda$.).
$\chi$ व́pıть © $\epsilon \hat{v}]$ The exact phrase occurs only in 1 Cor. xv. ro,
 dative is that of the instrument. Compare I Cor. x. 30 , $\epsilon i \notin \notin \omega$ $\chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau \iota \mu \in \tau \in ́ \chi \omega$. Eph. ii. 5. de. \&c. From the first sense of $\chi^{\alpha} \rho / s$, free favour, the opposite alike of ó $\rho \gamma \eta^{\prime}$ (Eph. ii. 3, 5, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \mu \in \theta a$
 $\left.\sigma \varepsilon \sigma \omega \sigma \mu \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \nu o t\right)$ and of $\dot{\delta} \phi \epsilon \grave{\lambda} \lambda \eta \mu$ (Rom. iv. 4, ov̉ кuтà $\chi \dot{a} \rho \iota v, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ $\kappa \alpha \tau a ̀ ~ o ̀ \phi \in i \lambda \eta \mu a)$, comes that of free favour exercised and manifested (as in 2 Cor. xii. 9, á $\rho \kappa \in \hat{i}$
 к.т.入. \&c. \&c.).
vitẹ $\pi a v \tau o ́ s]$ (I) We have vitè $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ áv $v \omega \nu$ in 2 Cor. v. 14, 15 , єîs $\dot{v} \boldsymbol{i} \grave{\varphi} \rho \pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega v . ~ I ~ T i m . ~ i i . ~ 6, ~$
 singular is peculiar to this place,
and suggests the idea of the $i n-$ dividual object of the Atonement. Other phrases with vinèp in reference to the death of Christ are $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ (Mark
 (Eph. r. 25), vitèp $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ (Rom. v. 8. Gal. iii. 13. Eph. v. 2. Tit. ii. 14. I Pet. ii. 2 r. 1 John iii. 16), $\mathfrak{v} \pi \grave{c} \rho \vec{\epsilon} \mu 0 \hat{v}$ (Gal. ii. 20),

 Of the three prepositions found in this connexion, vim $\epsilon, \pi \varepsilon \rho \rho^{\prime}$, and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i, v i \pi \epsilon\rangle$ is simply in behalf of (with no definition of the mode), $\pi \epsilon \rho i ́ c o n c e r n i n g$ (Matt. xxvi. 28. I John ii. 2. \&c. with a special reference to the sin-offering, the $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\text { á }} \mu a \rho \tau i a s$ of Leviticus, \&c., and thence deriving a definiteness beyond its inherent meaning), àví in exchange for (Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45, גútpov $\dot{a} \nu \tau \dot{i} \pi o \lambda \lambda(\hat{\omega} \nu)$. Only the last of these contains any idea of vicariousness, and even this can scarcely be confidently pressed beyond the idea of an equivalent price.
 28. Mark ix. I. Luke ix. 27. John viii. 52, where the Jews quote the $\theta$ úvatov ov $\mu \eta_{\eta} \theta \epsilon \omega \rho \eta^{\prime} \sigma \eta$ of verse $5^{1}$ in the form ou $\mu \dot{\eta}$


 dec. It was so, and it ought so

## 

to be. Such an arrangement was suitable to the character of God, and to the purpose of the interposition. The avivê here is God.

еп $\pi \rho \in \pi \epsilon V$ ] Matt. iii. 15, oü-

 Heb. vii. 26 there is a personal

 in 1 Tim. ii. 10 and Tit. ii. 1 a neuter nominative ( $o$ and ${ }^{\circ}$ ). Here the infinitive following serves as the nominative.
$\left.\delta c^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} \nu \ldots \delta c^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} v^{\circ}\right]$ (I) The former might be either because of whom, or for whose sake. The two ideas, of the first cause and the final cause, are equally admissible. But, considering the use elsewhere of cis in the second of these senses (Rom. xi. 36, eis aủrò̀ $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ тáv $\tau a$. I Cor. viii. 6, $\hat{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ єis av̉тóv ), it will be better to render $\delta i{ }^{\prime}$ ov because of whom, owing to whom. Between $\delta i^{\circ}$ 出 and the (commoner) é $^{\xi}$ ov (Rom. xi. 36. I Cor. viii. 6) there is the difference of the two ideas, cause and origin. (2) The $\delta i^{\prime}$ ov, through whom, by whose agency, is more commonly the attribute of Christ. See 1 Cor. viii. 6,

 Compare John i. 3. Rom. i. 5 . v. 2, 9, 11, 17, 21. \&c. \&c. But it is used, as here, of God the Father in Rom. xi. 36 , ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ ot $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \xi$ aưrov̂ каì $\delta \hat{l}$ aùrov̂ ка̀̀ єìs aủròv

тà mávoa (God is the Origin, the Agent, and the Object, of all things). Compare Gal. i. 1, סù

 interchange of attributes between Christ and God is one of the incidental evidences of our Lord's Divinity. To Him is assigned, in common with the Father, the $\delta i^{\circ}$ ov and the cis of 0 (Col. i. 16), and even (in one relation) the $\bar{\epsilon} \xi$ ov ( Eph . iv. I6. Col. ii. 19). Of the $\delta c^{3}$ of $y$ we have no instance but this one.
mod 0 ov̀s viov́s] This clause is rendered-very difficult by the past tense of $a^{\prime} \gamma^{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\sigma} \dot{v} \tau a$. On the whole, it may best be taken thus. It became Him (God)... that, having (in His eterual counsels, which foresee the end from the beginning, and in which the thing purposed is the thing as good as done) brought many sons to glory, He should perfect through sufferings the Author of their salvation. No evasion of the aorist must be attempted. The bringing of many sons to glory is (conceptionally) prior to the perfecting of Christ through sufferings. And the explanation is not helped by making ajayóvza agree with $\tau$ òv apXpyóv. It was not the Incarnation, it was the Resurrection, which saved: and to speak of Christ as having lrought sons to glory before He actually suf-

fered is far harsher than to regard the bringing to glory as done because purposed in God's counsels from the beginning. There is the same anticipative glorifying in the great passage in Rom. viii. 29, 30, oüs $\pi \rho 0^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \gamma-$
 pare also Eph. i. 3 , \&c., $\delta$ є ब $\lambda \lambda o \gamma \eta^{-}$


 2 Thess. ii. 13.
$\pi \mathrm{o} \lambda \mathrm{\lambda}_{\text {ov̀s vioús] ( }}$ (1) Rom. viii. 29, єis т̀̀ єivac aüтò̀ трато́токоу द̀ve $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o i ̂ s ~ a ́ \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o i ́ s . ~ R e v . ~ v i i . ~$
 Rom. viii. 14, г9, ті̀ а̀тока́лv-
 vi. 18 . Gal. iii. 26. iv. 6, 7.
$\left.\delta_{0} \xi_{\alpha \nu}\right]$ From the idea of the forthshining of liyht, as, for instance, the Shechinah in the tabernacle or temple ( x Kings
 tìv otкov), is derived the figurative sense of the manifestation of excellence; (1) whether of God Himself, His power, wisdom, love, \&c. (John xi. 4,




 Пaтрós. \&c. \&c.); or (2) of His people in the world to come, when they shall be seen as His, perfected alike in character and in condition (Rom. viii. 18, 21 ,

 троұтоíдабєє єis $\delta$ ósav. I Cor.
 iv. 17 , aíuvoov $\beta$ ápos $\delta o ́ s \eta s$. Eph. i. 18. Col. iii. 4, $\phi a v \epsilon \rho \omega \theta \not \eta \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ $\dot{\epsilon} v \delta \delta_{\xi} \xi_{\eta}$. 2 Thess. ii. 14. 1 Pet. v. I, 4, io. \&c. \&c.).
á $\left.\gamma \alpha \gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} v \tau a\right]$ See note on $\pi о \lambda$ -入oùs vioús.
apXYүóv] The meaning of
 between the ideas of beginning and rule; of principium and principatus. Thus (1) the sense of author, originator, is clearly intended in such places as Mic.


 in Heb. xii. 2, where it is expressly contrasted with $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \omega$ tris. But (2) the idea of leader, ruler, prince, is more common. Exod. vi. 14, ov̌ $\pi a \tau \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$ aข่т $\omega \nu . ~ N u m . ~ x i v . ~ 4, ~$




 And so in Acts v. 3 I, tov̂tov ó
 к.т. д. Here, and in Acts iii. 15
 varc), the appended genitive causes some ámbiguity. The prince of life seems more natural in the one place, and is favoured by the only other instance of its

occurrence in that Book of Scripture (Acts v. 31). On the other hand, the author of their salvation seems slightly more appropriate here, and the only other use of the word in this Epistle (xii. 2, $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{S} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \bar{s}$
 allowed to decide in favour of it.
$\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a s]$ See note on i. 14, $\sigma \omega т \eta \rho_{i}{ }^{2}$.
$\pi a \theta \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega v]$ See note on verse 9, пát ${ }^{2} \mu a$.
$\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \alpha]$ The verb $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \hat{v} v$ (occurring nine times in this Epistle, and fourteen times elsewhere in the New Testament) means to make ré $\mathrm{\lambda}_{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{Iov}$, to complete, perfect, consummate, \&c. according to the nature of the thing or person spoken of. Thus (1) with an accusative of the thing: Luke ii. 43 ( (às ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mu \boldsymbol{f}$ -
 v. $3^{6 .}$ xvii. 4 . xix. 28 ( $\eta^{\dot{\eta}} \gamma \rho \Omega \phi \eta^{\prime}$ ). Acts xx. 24 (тò дिó $_{\mu}$ оv $\mu$ оv каі $\tau \dot{\eta} v \delta_{\text {akoviav }}$. Heb. vii. 19. James ii. 22 ( $\dot{\eta} \pi i ́ \sigma \pi t s)$. I John ii. 5 ( $\dot{\eta} \dot{\text { ááán }} \boldsymbol{\eta})$. iv. 12, I7. And so I. Kings vii. 22. 2 Chron. viii. 16 (tò otкov). Neh. vi. 3 . \&c. \&c. (The peculiar expression of Exod. xxix. g, \&c. Lev. viii. 33, dc. Num. iii. 3, द̀тє $\lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \omega \sigma \epsilon$
 forms a transition to the personal use of $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \hat{v} v$ in the sense of consecrating.) (2) With an
accusative of the person: (a) in the general sense of moral or spiritual perfecting (John xvii. 23. Phil. iii. 12. I John iv. 18); (b) in the more special sense of absolving, or freeing from guilt (Heb.ix. 9. x. 1, 14); (c) of bringing into a state of entire blessedness (Heb. xi. 40.
 In three remaining passages of this Epistle the word is applied to Christ Himself. In vii. 28 the gencral idea of consummating is defimed by the context into that of consecrating (avopé-
 cis тòv aî̀va тєтєдєє $\omega \mu \epsilon ́ v o v)$. Compare Lev. xxi. го, каі тєтє-
 баб $\theta a r$ тà ímátıa aùtov. Here, and in v. 9 ( $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \theta \epsilon$ 's), the idea is that of perfectly qualifying for the office undertaken.
II. ö $\boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \gamma$ ¢áp] A reason for the $\begin{gathered}\pi \\ \pi\end{gathered} \epsilon \pi \epsilon v$. There ought to be an identity of experience because there is an identity of parentage. Christ and His people have a common Father. The Christ of prophecy is the brother, the fel-low-worshipper, the fellow-believer, as well as the parent, of His people. This entire incorporation presupposes an incarnation; demands a fellowship of flesh and blood; a body in which He can suffer, a body in which He can die.

 äyos，belonging to God（the op－ posite of kovós，belong̈ing to any one）the verb derives the sense of making to belong to God， whether by consecration，which is the act，or by sanctification， which is the process．The latter gives reality to the former，by bringing the consecrated person into harmony of life and charac－ ter with the consecration．Some－ times the one thought predomi－ nates，sometimes the other． （I）Thus，（i）where the subject is a thing，the idea of $a$ acuá $\xi \in \nu$ is the act of consecrating．See Gen．

 tグ̀ то̀ ôpos，каі àүǘau aitó．xl．9，

 бєабтйрьо к．т．入．Lev．xxv．го，

 ．．．тòv äyọ̀v aütồ к．т．A．Jud．



 oas．Matt．xxiii． $17,19, \delta$ vaós


 रou ©єой каi èvтeígews．And so （ii）with a person，where（ （a）office is in view（Exod．xxx．30，áyáa－ otets aủroùs ieparévev moh．Jer．





 $\theta a \rho o ́ t \eta r a)$ ，or（c）derived sanctity

 к．т．．．），or（d）initiation into the Christian life（as is the case wherever the past or perfect tenses of the verb are used with regard to the living；as y Cor．




 （that of consecration）belong the places where aydátev is applied to Christ Himself（John x．36，
 $\lambda \in \nu$ єis tòv кóf $\mu$ ov．xvii．19，
 I consecrate myself wholly to God bya self－devotion even unto death．

 $\dot{\mu} \mu \hat{\omega v}$ ），or even to God（Matt．vi．
 Name，that which Thou art，be hatloved，or consecrated，in the thoughts，words，and acts of Thy creatures．Isai．viii．${ }^{13}$ ，

 $\phi$ óses）．（z）On the other hand， sanctification is the prominent idea wherever（a）a gradual pro－ cess is implied（as in Heb．x．14，



тov̀s áyıa̧ouévous）or（b）a work still to be clone（as John xvii． 17 ，

 $\kappa$ к．$\lambda$ ．Eph．v．26，iva aútウ̀r ájıárg к．т．入．I Thess．v．23，áy ${ }^{\text {ááal }}$

 suggests the idea of sanctifying， though in fact the articles make the phrase equivalent to two nouns，the Sanctifier and the sanctified．
$\vec{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \in \in \operatorname{cós}]$ Out of（sprung from， originating in）one Person，even God．（I）Matt．vii．II，21，ó

 voîs．John xx．17，ávaßaíve
 $\dot{\boldsymbol{\imath} \mu \omega \nu}$ к．т．入．（2）For $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \xi$ ，compare


 ©єой áкои́єl．I Cor．i． $30, \hat{\epsilon} \xi$ av̀－

návtcs］He and they．The plural oi áriaco $\mu \in \nu=\tau$ prevents the use of the dual $b o t h$ ，which would otherwise be clearer．

ס＇ìv aitial］Because He and they have one Father．The phrase $\delta c^{\circ}$ 能 aitian is only found in 2 Tim ．i．6， 12 ．Tit．i． 13. Its construction in Luke viii． 47 is different．
 ashamed，counts it no disparage－ ment of Himself．Compare xi．


aं $\delta \in \lambda \phi$ ои＇s aúrov̀s ка $\lambda \epsilon \in \nu]$ Matt．
xii． 50 ，aữós $\mu 0 v$ á $\delta \in \lambda \phi o ́ s$ ．xxv．

 фoîs $\mu$ ov．Mark iii．35．Luke viii． 2 1．John xx．17，topev́ov tiò̀s тov̀s á $\delta \in \lambda \phi$ oús $\mu$ ov．Rom．viii． 29 ，


12．$\left.\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \omega v,{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}\right]$ Psalm

 Psalm，which opens with the $E l o i, E l o i$ ，and contains the awráte autóv，and the wpvğav

 well be quoted with confidence as full of Christ．The depth of the humiliation expressed in it， the height of the exaltation，are
 ouly find their fulfilment in the God－Man．The clause quoted is from the triumphant reverse which begins with it，and which contains the words rò $\sigma \pi \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \rho \mu a$ Mov $\delta 0 v \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \quad$ ait $\hat{\omega}$（verse 30 ）． The statement is，that the suf－ fering and now glorified Person， who is the speaker within the human speaker，will carry back the tidings of God＇s Name，of that which God is，to certain other persons whom He calls His brethren，and in the midst of a congregation of worship－ pers will sing God＇s praise．

## 

$\left.a^{\prime} \pi a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \omega\right]$ Of the various compounds of $\boldsymbol{a}^{3} \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau \nu$ (to
 (Mark, John, Acts, Rom., 2 Cor., i Pet., I John) and кaгarүé $\lambda$ $\lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon}$ (Acts, Rom., I Cor., Phil., Col.) are scarcely distinguish-
 (Matt., Mark, Luke, John, Acts, I Cor., I Thess., I John) has the special idea of bringing back, and Siayjédicıy (found only three times, Luke, Acts, Rom.) that of spreading abroad, and $\pi a \rho a \gamma-$
 Acts, I Cor., I Thess., 2 Thess., I Tim.) that of conveying along (as a word of command passed down the ranks), the tidings or
 $\lambda_{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a t$ (used in the middle voice only) has the two senses, both classical, of professing, and promising.

тò òvopá oov] That which Thou art. See note on i. 4 , övo $\mu$ a. Év $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega]$ Used by St Paul in I Thess. ii. 7 only. Frequent in St Luke's Gospel and Acts.
 second clause of the quotation introduces a new particular. The glorified Saviour is not only the Church's brother, revealing to it the Father; He is also the Church's precentor, leading its worship. So entire is the unity between Christ and Ilis people, as set forth in prophetic Scripture.
éккл $\eta \sigma$ ias] From the original sense, of a body called out from a larger body (as, for example, an assembly of qualified citizens from amidst a promiscuous population of women and children, slaves and aliens), èk$\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a$ becomes the congregation of God's people, gathered out of the world by His summons, whether in occasional or permauent session. The former is its common use in the Septuagint.
 т $\hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ѐ $\kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ iás. I Kings viii. I4,




 $\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i \alpha$ то $\lambda \lambda \eta$ خे $\sigma \phi o ́ \delta \rho a$. Neh. v. 13, каі̀ єiтє $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma a \quad \dot{\eta}$ ढ̀кк $\lambda \eta \sigma i a$, 'A $\mu \eta^{\prime} v$. \&c. \&c. The latter is the Christian application of the word; whether to (1) the Church universal, as in Matt. xvi. i8,








 23, \&c., ǐva $\pi \alpha \rho a \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta$ aviò̀s
 Col. i. I $8,24, \& c . ~ \& c$. ; or (2) the Church local, as in Acts xiv. 23,



 к．т．ג．Rom．xvi．1，4，5，סıá－


 $\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i ́ a v . \quad$ I Cor．i．2．vii． 17 ．

 ＇Arias． 2 Cor．viii．i，év taîs

 \＆c．；or（3）the Church in con－ gregation，as in Matt．xviii．17，




 \＆c．\＆c．
$\dot{v} \mu \nu \dot{\prime} \sigma \omega \sigma \epsilon]$ Acts xvi．25，
 シ̈uvovv tòv Oeóv，Compare 2 Chron．xxix．30，它 $\mu$ veiv tò̀ K Kú－ prov èv dójous $\Delta a v i ́ \delta$ ．Isai．xii． 4，iuveite Kúpoov．Elsewhere with a dative：Isai．xlii．Io，


13．каї $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda c v$ ，＇E $\gamma \omega$＇］A fur－ ther proof from Scripture of the entire unity between Christ and His people．The Messiah of prophecy is not only the brother， and the fellow－worshipper，of the Church：He is also its fellow－ believer．He can say of Himself that．He is one who puts His trust in God．The quotation may be either from 2 Sam．xxii．



 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. ），or Isai．xii． 2 （ißoú，$\delta$ © $\epsilon$ és

 The first of these is recommend－ ed by the occasion and by the writer：king David is review－ ing the whole course of God＇s dealing with him，and in terms both of grandeur（such as è єapá－ $\chi \theta \eta \kappa \alpha \grave{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon i \sigma \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta}, \kappa \alpha i ̀ \tau \grave{\alpha} \theta \epsilon-$ $\mu c ́ \lambda ı a ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ o u ̀ p a \nu o v ̀ ~ e ̀ r a \rho a ́ \chi \theta \eta \sigma a v ~$

 $\sigma a ́ v \mu_{0}$ к．$\tau . \lambda$. ．），and of self－asser－


 ย̀vavtiov $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\partial} \phi \theta a \lambda \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ avivoû к．т．入．），which would involve an immense hyperbole as applied to the human author．The second （Isai．viii．${ }^{7}$ ）might seem to be recommended by its standing （in the original）immediately before the next quotation here （ioiov̀ दे $\gamma \dot{\prime}$ к．т．д．）：but the separ－ ation of it from that by another каì жád $\lambda^{\prime}$ is rather against this reference．On the whole，it is best to regard it as coming from 2 Sam．xxii． 3 ．

каì тálıv，＇Iסov］As the Messiah is the brother，and the fellow－worshipper，and the fellow－


believer, so $H$ is also (in another Scripture phrase) the parent, of His people. In all possibls aspects the unitybetween Him and the Church is the subject of Scripture prophecy. The quotation is from Isai. viii. 18. As David was a typical king, so Isaiah was a typical prophet, and the children spoken of (see Isai. vii. 3. viii. 3) were, even in their names, typical children. See the rest of the verse: кai écrat

 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. Thus the way was prepared for the transfer of the passage to Christ.


 © ¢ós.
14. $̇ \pi \pi \epsilon \grave{l}$ ov̀ $]$ The figure has changed from brotherhood to sonship; but the inference is the same. Such union with the human implies incarnation. And the further thought follows, $I n$. camation is necessary to death, and death is necessary to redemption. The combination ètec̀ ơv occurs only here and in iv. 6. Of the forms $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \dot{i}$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$, the former occurs in each of the four Gospels, the latter in the first and third: the former twice as often as the latter in St Paul's Epistles: the former alone in
the Hebrews, the latter alone in the Acts.

тà тaioía] Quoted from the last quotation. As an appellation of Christians, maıiia is peculiar to St John (John xxi. 5 . I John ii. 14, 18), as indeed тexvía also, with the more than doubtful exception of Gal. iv. 19 . But the idea is not far distani in the wis tà madía and év malסíov toooûtov of Matt. xviii. 3, 5 , the $\tau \omega \nu$ тобо́т $\omega v$ of Matt. xix. r4, and the parallels in St Mark and St Luke.
 partakers...took part. The one is the perfect, the other the aorist. (I) The proper sense of кouvevєiv is to go shares with another ( $\tau \iota v^{\prime}$ ) in something( (ıvós). Sometimes the dative is omitted; as here, and in Prov. i. it, è $\lambda \theta \hat{\epsilon}$ $\mu \epsilon \theta^{\dot{\eta}} \dot{\eta \mu \omega े \nu, ~ к о \iota \nu \omega ́ v \eta \sigma o v ~ а і ̈ \mu а т о s . ~}$
 Sometimes the genitive is omitted; as Wisdom vi. 25, oviros ov $\kappa$ кшш $\omega \in \hat{i}$ (has no fellowship with) $\sigma o \phi i ́ q . ~ E c e l u s . ~ x i i i . ~ 2, ~ \pi \lambda o v \sigma t \omega-~$

 трíals. 1 Pet. iv. 13 , коиขшvєitт
 John 1 I , коьшшขєî тoîs ếpyous av̉rồ тoîs mornpoîs. Lastly, the going shares with divides into the two senses, of partaking in (Rom. xv. 27, тоîs $\pi \nu$ ечратькоîs

 imparting to (Rom. xii. ${ }_{13}$, tais
 Gal. vi. 6, коншшveíт ó кат $\overline{\chi o v i}-$ $\mu \in \nu \circ \varsigma \ldots \tau \hat{̣}$ кит $\eta \chi^{\circ} \hat{v} \nu \tau \iota$. Phil. iv.
 $\nu \eta \sigma \epsilon v$ ). (2) For $\mu \epsilon \tau \in ́ \chi \epsilon \nu \nu$ (тıvós)
 $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \sigma \chi \eta \kappa \epsilon 1$ I Cor. ix. 12 . x . 21 . Absolutely (to be partaker),

 рıтц $\mu \in \tau \in ́ \chi(\omega)$.
aíдатоs каi баркós] Matt. xvi. ${ }_{17}$, $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \xi$ каì aí $\mu$. 1 Cor. xv. $50, \sigma \alpha{ }_{0} \xi$ каi аîma. Gal. i. 16, баркі̀ каi аiщать. Eph. vi. 12, аїда каі ба́рка.
$\pi a p a \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i \omega 5]$ From the idea of close alongside comes that of in precisely like manner. The adverb occurs only here in Scrip-

 nigh unto, close alongside of, death), explained in verse 30 , $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota$ өaváтоv ${ }^{\eta} \gamma \gamma \ell \sigma \epsilon \nu$.
$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu a \dot{v} \tau \hat{\nu}]$ That is, aipaтos каі̀ барко́я.
¿va $\delta \mathrm{cà}$ tov̂ gavátov] IIe must partake of fiesh and blood, that He may be capable of dying. It is by dying that He can alone conquer death, first in its personal head, and then in its individual action. The sting of death is $\sin$ ( I Cor. xv. 56). Sin is the tyranny of a usurper, who must be personally vanquished if his suljects are to be
freed. The whole work of Christ is a conflict with the devil (Luke xi. 21, 22). Every instance of successful ministry was an omen of final victory (Luke x. 18). But His death was the decisive battle (John xii. 31, 32). His death as our atonement, His resurrection to be our life, IIis ascension to be our Lord, defeated, despoiled, dethroned the devil, making death no longer the terror of those who believe, and securing for them the eventual reversal of death in the resurrection at the last day (John xvi. ri. Rom. v. io. viii. 3, 1 I. Col. ii. r5. Rev. xii. 5, 7-1r). Sià тov̂ Gavátov] Rom. v. so, $\kappa \alpha \tau \eta \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \gamma \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{̣}$ @ $\Theta \epsilon \hat{Q}$ ठ $\delta \dot{a}$ тоиิ өavátov tov̂ vioû aủrov̂. Eph. i.
 тоv̂ aịaтos av̉тồ. ii. 16, каi
 otavpovi. Col. i. 20, 22, єipquo


 Өavátov. Heb. ix. 12, 26, $\delta_{c a}$
 Өvoias avitov̀. x. Io, $\delta i a ̀ \tau \hat{\eta} s$
 $\mathrm{X} \rho$ итtoû xiii. 12.

ката, $\left.\gamma \eta \eta_{\eta} \sigma_{n}\right]$ The word кarapyeiv (not found in the Septuagint except in four places in Ezra) occurs 27 times in the New Testament, of which 25 are in St Paul's Epistles, and is rendered in our Version by

## 

no less than 17 phrases; to cumber, loose, deliver, abolish, destroy, do away, put away, put down, make void, make without effect, make of none effect, bring to nought, besides five paraphrastic renderings of the passive. The original idea, to render idle, inactive, inoperative, is clearly seen in the passages in Erra (iv. $2 \mathrm{I}, 23$. v. 5. vi. 8) where it is applied to the compulsory making to cease from the labour of building. In Luke xiii. 7 (îva $\tau i ́ \kappa a i \tau \eta े \nu \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu \kappa a \tau a p \gamma \hat{\imath} ;$;) the barren tree is said to render inactive the ground which it occupies. The same idea is prominent in Rom. iii. 3, 3I, $\tau \dot{\partial े \nu} \boldsymbol{\pi i ́ \sigma \tau c \nu} \tau о \hat{v} @ \epsilon \in \hat{v} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \rho \gamma \eta \sigma^{\sigma} \epsilon \ldots .$.


 In the remaining passages the making inoperative passes on into a stronger idea of annulling or destroying. Rom. vi. 6,
 тías. I Cor. i. 28. ii. 6. vi. 13. xiii. 8 , Io, II. xv. 24,26 ,
 vatos. 2 Cor. iii. 7, II, 13, 14. Gal. v. it, äpa кати́pүqтац тò ткávסàov $\tau 0 \hat{v} \sigma \tau a v \rho o \hat{v}$. Eph. ii. 15. 2 Thess. ii. 8. And so here. In three places (Rom. vii. 2, 6. Gal. v. 4) the passive of кarapүє̂̀ is followed by ${ }^{2} \pi \sigma^{\prime}$, in the sense of abolished from, cut off from ( $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ vó $\mu o v, ~ \tau o \hat{~ X ~} \mathrm{X} \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ ).

тòv тò кра́тоs éхоита т. $\begin{aligned} & \text {.] }]\end{aligned}$ The possessor of the power of death. In what sense? Not that of the power over death. Not that in which Christ is said (Rev. i. 18) é $\chi \in \epsilon \nu \tau$ às $\kappa \lambda$ eís тov̂ $\theta a v a ́ \tau o v . ~ T h e ~ g e n i t i v e ~ e x-~$ presses the power belonging to death; death's power. The devil possesses this (see note above, iva $\delta \dot{a}$ тои $\theta a v a ́ \tau o u)$ as being the personal spiritual head of the empire of sin, which gives death its sting (I Cor. xv. 56), its real and reasonable terror for the mind and heart of the fallen.

кр́́̃os] The rarest (in Scripture) of the various words for power. It stands by itself in
 Beaxiovl aữov̂. i Pet. v. 1 I (revised text), aùrệ tò крátos. Elsewhere it is found in combination; as ( I ) in the doxologies of 1 Tim. vi. $16, \tau \mu \eta$ каi крátos aicívtov. i Pet. iv. iI, $\dot{\eta}$ Sója каì тò крátos. Jude 25,
 бía. Rev. i. 6, $\dot{\eta}$ סóğa каì тò кра́тоs. v. 13, $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ єv̉̀оүі́а каì $\eta^{2}$
 к.т.入.; (2) with a connected genitive, as in Eph. i. 19, кала



 It may be added that, $\delta \underline{v} v a \mu t s$ being the most general word for power (potency), i $\sigma \chi$ is is speci-


ally might (possession of power), кра́ros strength (force of power), '́' ${ }^{\prime}$ ovoía authority (legality of power), év́́pyєa operation (exercise of power).
 x. 20. xi. 16. xiii. 15 .
tòv $\delta \iota a ́ \beta o \lambda o v]$ The word $\delta c a$ $\beta$ odos (originally perhaps $\delta \iota a \beta o ́$ dos, one who sets at variance, but by usage a slanderer) is the Septuagintrendering of the Hebrew Satan, an adversary ( 1 Chron. xxi. I. Job i. 6, 7, 9, 12. ii. 1-4, 6, 7. Zech. iii. I, 2). The original form Earà is found in the Septuagint only in a Kings xi. 14, 23 , where it is applied to Hadad and Rezon in the general sense of adversary (diviкєípevos, verse 25); and ó इaravâs (the devil) in Ecclus. xxi. 27. In the New Testament इaravás and $\delta u \alpha^{\prime} \beta$ odos occur with almost equal frequency; each writer, except St Mark, using $\delta$ ódßodos, and each writer, except St James, St Peter, and St Jude, using Zatavâs. St Paul uses इatavấs ten times, and $\delta$ cá ${ }^{\prime}$ olos (as a proper name) five times. In Rev. xii. 9 and xx. 2 the two words are combined: © к калоú-

 $v a ̂ s$. The idea of $\delta a a^{\prime} \beta$ odos as the traducer seems to be modified in its use as a translation
of Saráv. But that it is not obliterated appears, on the one side, in such passages as Gen. iii, 1 - 5 ; on the other, in Job i. 9. ii. 5; Rev, xii. ro.
15. $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \lambda \lambda a ́ \xi \eta]$ From $\dot{a} \lambda$ $\lambda_{\text {áogectv, to alter (Acts vi. 14, }}$
 51, 52. Gal. iv. 20, каì ả $\lambda \lambda a ́ g a \iota$ Tìv $\phi \omega \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu o v$. \&c. See note on Heb. i. $12, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda a \gamma \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma o v \tau \alpha l)$, various compounds are formed with prepositions; $\mu \epsilon \pi a \lambda \lambda \dot{a} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \epsilon, \pi a-$ $\rho a \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \nu, к а \tau а \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota$, dc. Of these, $\mathfrak{a} \pi a \lambda \lambda{ }^{2} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$ is properly to change away; and so (1) to remove (Jer. xxxii. 3 r ,
 нои к.т.. ), and (2) to deliver

 Might deliver from the life-long bondage of a fear of death, and from the reality of the apprehended consequences.

тoútous ö $\sigma 01]$ These as many as. All those who. There is no limitation intended. It is descriptive of mankind generally, prior to the redemption. The exact phrase is peculiar: it is
 $36,37 . \& \mathrm{c}$.), or ö $\sigma o c . .$. оvtot (Rom. viii. 14. Gal. vi. 12. \&c.).

фó $\beta \omega$ gaváтov] Psalm 1v. 4,


$\delta \dot{a}$ тavròs rov̀ $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu]$ This

lengthened form of $\delta \iota^{\alpha}$ паитòs does not seem to occur elsewhere in Scripture. Equivalent phrases are those of Josh. iv. 14, ö $\sigma o v$

 Rom. vii. I and I Cor. vif. 39,

 of note on $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \xi_{\eta}$ above. The fear of death makes the life one long bondage. A man feels himself not his own. He is at the mercy of a coming event, certain in fact, uncertain in time, uncertain in its circumstances and preliminaries, which must stop all his activities, defeat all his plans, and usher him into an unknown future upon which the "conscience of sins' (x. 2) casts a deep shadow. The construction of ëroxos, holden in or under, is ( $\mathbf{I}$ ) with a dative of the penalty, crime, charge, court, or law, to which a person is liable; as Deut. xix. 10, aïдait ëvoxos. Josh. ii. 19, ढ้̈oरos éavtê (as his own accuser). Job xv. 5, "ैoरos
 crime). Matt. v. 21, 22 , Eैozos
 a genitive in the same senses; as 2 Macc. xiii. 6, тòv iepoovdías


 paros. xiv. 64. I Cor. xi. 27,
 James ii. 10: (3) with eis, Matt.
 $\pi v \rho o{ }^{\prime}$ (to the eatent of) : (4) absolute; as Exod. xxii. 3, èvoxós è $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$, ảvтaпо $\theta a \nu$ eital xxxiv. 6. Lev. xx. 9. \&c. Here Ëvoxoc Souncias is the exact equivalent of Gal. v. i, ̧̧vyû $\delta o u \lambda \epsilon i \alpha s \dot{\epsilon}^{-} \boldsymbol{y}^{-}$ $\dot{\epsilon}_{\chi \in \sigma} \theta \in$. The sense is, holden of, subject to, as a penal condition. It is the description of all mankind, as fallen, and not yet redeemed, or not yet conscious of redemption.

Souncías] Is the $\delta o u \lambda \epsilon i ́ a ~(I) ~$ a servitude to death, or (2) a slavish feeling towards God, or (3) a servile condition of mind and life generally? The first of these senses would be tautology, after $\phi o ́ \beta \varphi$ өavárov above. The second would find a parallel in Rom. viii. 15 and Gal. iv. 7. But in those places the contrast with viot $\epsilon \sigma$ ia and vios (severally) expressly defines the meaning. The more general idea of servitude seems the most suitable here.
16. oú yáp] This participation of flesh and blood was rendered necessary by the very object of His intervention. Not Angels, but men, are those whom He comes to save.

ठخंтov] Surely. Of course. I may assume. Used here only in Scripture.

є́ть入«« $\beta$ ávєтаı] Lays hold upon. Sometimes є̀ $\pi \iota \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{a} \nu \epsilon \sigma-$ Gat is used literally, to lay hold
$\pi о \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \dot{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \mu \alpha \tau о s$

of; as Jud. xvi. 3, каì є́тєла́ßето $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta v \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma \pi \tilde{\lambda} \lambda \eta \varsigma \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \varsigma$.

 є́ $\pi v \nu \theta$ дуєто к.т. $\lambda$. Or in a mental or spiritual sense, to apply oneself to, to grasp; as Prov. iv.
 ád $\hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$. I Tim. vi. $12,19, \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \lambda a \beta o \hat{v}$
 $\tau \alpha \iota ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s{ }_{\delta \nu}^{\nabla} \tau \omega s \xi_{\omega} \hat{\eta} s$. Sometimes the context gives a clear intimation of a purpose; whether( r ) unfriendly, as Isai. v. 29, каi é $\pi$ -
 B) ws $\theta$ \#piov. Luke xx. 20, 26,

 Acts xvi. 19. xvii. 19, xviii. 17. xxi. 3 о, каі є̇ $\pi \iota \lambda a \beta$ о́ $\mu \in \nu о \iota \tau$ о७̂ Паv́-
 к.т. $\lambda$; or (2)gracious, for helping, healing, leading, or saving; as
 $\mu \in ́ v o v ~ \mu o v ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \chi є \iota \rho o ̀ s ~ a u ̀ \tau \hat{\omega} v, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \xi$
 Matt. xiv. 3r. Mark viii. 23 . Luke ix. 47. xiv. 4, каї є̇ $\pi \iota \lambda a-$


 is the sense here given to it by the context: $H e$ comes to the help, not of Angels, but of men. Of the ig times of its occurrence in the New Testament 12 are in St Luke's writings.

ттє́ $\left.\rho \mu а т о s^{\prime} A \beta \rho a \alpha ́ \mu\right]$ The ob-
ject of Christ's interposition is here described as Abraham's seed, in the sense of that expression in Gal. iii. 29, $\epsilon t \quad \delta \hat{E}$
 $\sigma \pi \epsilon \in \rho a \operatorname{\epsilon } \sigma \tau \epsilon$, not in that of John viii. 33, \&c. In other words, Christ is said to come to the rescue of such as believe. Elsewhere the redemption is spoken of as world-wide. John iii. 17 ,
 contrast between the two modes of expression is seen in a comparison of Matt. xx. 28 ( $\lambda$ vípov

 one speaks of the result, the other of the scope. The virtue of the Atonement is infinite, but its efficacy is in those that accept it. These last are described as Abraham's true offspring, like him in his faith. It is to the help of these, how many soever they be, in all lands and in all ages, that Christ comes, and in order to help He must take upon Him their human nature.
17. $\left.{ }^{\circ} \theta_{\epsilon 1}\right]$ Whence. As the consequence of which factnamely, that $\mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{e}}$ comes to the help of human beings. This use of $\delta \theta \in v$ is confined to the Epistle to the Hebrews (iii. i. vii, 25. viií. 3. ix. 18) with the exception of Matt. xiv. 7.



Acts xxvi. 19, ${ }^{\circ} \theta \in \nu, \beta \alpha \sigma u \in \hat{v}$
 ovjpavíw ónтaбía. I John ii. 18 . $\left.{ }^{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon\right]$ He incurred the obligation. The relation which He had assumed required it of Him in consistency. See Luke

 $\pi \epsilon \pi о \neq \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha \mu \epsilon v$. John xiii. 14, $\epsilon i$

 ข $\mu \epsilon \hat{\varsigma}$ ód $\phi \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ (by reason of your relation to $m e) \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu \nu i \pi \tau \epsilon \nu$ tò̀s róóas. Rom. xv. 27. 2 Cor. xii. 14. Eph.v. 28. I John ii. 6 . iii. 16 . iv. If.

катવ̀ тávтa] It is not enough that He should become incarnate. He must also be assimilated to us in all the circumstances, liabilities, trials, temptations, sufferings even unto death, of us whom He came to save.

тoîs $\mathfrak{a} \delta \bar{\delta} \in \lambda \phi$ oîs] See verse 11 , and note on áde $\lambda$ ¢ov̀s avirovis калєiv.
o $\mu$ ot $\omega$ Ө̂रral] Acts xiv. 1 I, oi


 for entering upon the office of, \&c.
$\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \omega \nu$ ] Only here, and in
 In the Septuagint it occurs frequently; (r) alone, as in Exod.



Kúpros к. т. ., or (2) in combination with other attributes, as in Exod. xxxiv. 6, оіктіринә каi

 17. Psalm lexxyi. 15 . ciii. 8. cx]v. 8. Joel ii. I3. Jonah iv. 3. \&c. \&c. In the New Testament oiктipuev also occurs but twice(Luke vi. 36. James v. II). The difference between the two is that between pity (oiktos) and mercy ( $\left.{ }^{(4 \lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\sigma}\right)$ ) the one, simple compassion; the other, kindness to the undeserving.
$\pi \iota \sigma \tau o ́ s]$ I John i. 9, revoós
 ràs apaprias. Trustworthy; one who can be relied upon to fulfil His engagements. See iii. 2, 5 . x. 23. xi. II. Deut. vii. 9, ${ }^{\circ}$

 $\pi \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ a

 ớotos Kípıos. 1 Sam. ii. 35, каì

 $\pi \rho o \phi \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \nu \quad \tau \hat{\omega}$ Kขpíu. Psalm lxxxix. 37, каì ó $\mu$ ápros $\grave{\epsilon} v$ oủpavê тı $\iota \tau$ ós. Isai. xlix. 7 , o̊ ó $\pi \iota \sigma \tau o ́ s$

apxucpevis] The word occurs here for the first time in the Epistle, and for the first time in Scripture in application to Christ. It is characteristic of

the Epistletogive in this manner an intimation of what is to be afterwards a leading topic．It is a shadow cast before from the great section of chapters v ．－x． Yet it is no sudden or prema－ ture obtrusion of the topic．It is prepared for by i． 3 ，ка $\theta a \rho \iota \sigma-$



 vot．

тà $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{̀} \nu$ © ©óv］As to those things which are towards God．In reference to all man＇s relations with God．For $\tau$ à $\pi$ رós，



 For the whole phrase，v．r．Rom．


cis tò $i \lambda a ́ \sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta a l]$ The tense shows that it is not the one sa－ crifice of propitiation which is spoken of，but the exercise of the perpetual priesthood．To the end that He may continually secure the forgiveness of the con－ tinually recurring sins of the people．The verb iג́áкєбӨaı occurs（in the New Testament） only here and in Luke xviii． 13 ，
 In the Septuagint，it is always used（as in this latter passage） in a middle sense，though often in a passive form，to become
propitious（ỉdaos，ì ǐcos），favour－ able or gracious（compare Exod．
 какía тô̂ خaov̂ $\sigma o v$. Jer．xxxi．
 aư $\omega \bar{\nu}$ ．Matt．xvi．22，ì $\lambda \epsilon \omega$ s rot， Kvplє），（ I ）with $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ，as Exod． xxxii．i $4, i \lambda \omega \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta$ Kúptos $\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{i} \pi \hat{\eta} s$
 aủ̃ô̂ к．т．入．；or（z）with a dative， （a）of the person，as 2 Kings $\mathbf{v}$ ．
 $\sigma o v . . . i \lambda a \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ 市 Kùpoos $\tau \hat{\omega}$ סoúdu бov к．т．д．；（b）of the thing，as Psalm xxv． 11 ，indón $\tau \hat{a} \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i a ́ \mu o v . ~ l x x i x . ~ 9, ~ i \lambda a ́ \sigma . ~$
 （3）absolutely，as Lam．iii． $4^{2}, \eta^{\eta}-$

 $\mathbf{K} \dot{v} \rho \iota \epsilon, ~ і \lambda а ́ \sigma \theta \eta \tau я, К \dot{v} \rho \iota \epsilon, \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \chi \epsilon \varsigma$, Kúpıє к．т．$\lambda$ ．The peculiarity of the text is the accusative，not （as in classical usage）of the Deity to be propitiated，but of the sin to be expiated．The scriptural usage avoids the ex－ pression，rendering God gracious to the sinner（though there is a sense in which this might be made consistent with true doc－ trine），as tending to obscure the divine love which originates redemption．John iii．16，oṽ $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ s
 Шбт к．т．$\lambda$ ．Thus，although the literal rendering of i $\lambda{ }^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \kappa \sigma \theta$ al $\tau$ às ${ }^{\text {á }} \mu \alpha \rho$－ rias might seem to be，to render God gracious as to our sins，this
 $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha \zeta$ ¢оє́voıs $\beta$ оп $\theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$.
would be an unscriptural phrase． The real thought is，to secure the forgiveness of sins，from day to day and from howr to hour， by His presence with God as the Propitiation first and then the Intercessor． 1 John ii． I ，каì


 $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\tau} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.

тov̂ $\lambda a o \hat{v}]$ The expression suits the thought of the $\alpha^{\alpha} \rho \chi^{\prime \epsilon}$－

 iepé $\omega v$ ．To the Hebiew readers it would express that transfer－ ence of the term people of God from the natural to the spiritual Israel which is so often marked in the New Testament．See iv． 9 ，$\tau \hat{\varphi} \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ то仑̂ $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{v} . ~ v i i i . ~ г о . ~$

 к．т．入．Also Matt．i． 2 I，aviò̀s $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$
 $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i \omega \hat{\nu}$ au่тิेv．Acts xv． 14 ， $\lambda a \beta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \omega \bar{\nu} \lambda a \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \hat{\omega}$ oे $\nu o ́ \mu a \tau \iota$


 I Pet．ii．9，vícís סé．．．גaòs eis $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi o i \eta \sigma \iota v$ ．CompareGal．vi．i 6 ， каì èmì тò̀＇I $\sigma \rho a \eta ̀ \lambda ~ \tau о v ̂ ~ @ \epsilon о \hat{v .}$ Phil．iii．3，并 $\mu \hat{\imath} \mathrm{s} \quad \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \in \nu \dot{\eta}^{\dot{\prime}}$ $\pi \epsilon р \iota т о \mu \dot{\eta}$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．
 for the кат $\dot{\pi} \pi \dot{\alpha} v \tau a$ ，and for the ＇i $\lambda \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \dot{\jmath} \mu \omega \nu$ ，of verse 17．For in
that He Himself has suffered by having been subjected to all man－ ner of bodily，mental，and spiri－ tual trial，He is able，\＆c．The alternative construction，$\pi \epsilon \rho \rho \sigma$－
 tempted（or tried）in that which He has suffered，is excluded by the tense of $\pi \epsilon \pi \frac{1}{\pi} \theta \theta v$ ，which would have been（in that case） ${ }_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \alpha} \pi \epsilon \boldsymbol{c}$ ，as in verse 8．In fact
 have been the more natural phrase for that construction．
$\dot{\epsilon} v \dot{\psi}]$ In that．The phrase is contracted from év rovícu（or
 which．Compare $\boldsymbol{z}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime} \dot{\Phi}$, Rom．v． 12． 2 Cor．v．4．The $\boldsymbol{e} v$ says that His ability to help is con－ tained（or involved）in the fact that He has Himself suffered．
$\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \sigma \nu \theta \epsilon \nu]$ For $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \chi \in \epsilon \nu$ with． out an accusative，compare I






 19.
$\pi \epsilon i \rho a \sigma \theta$ cis］The two senses， tried and tempted，are scarcely separable here．Both spring out of the idea of piercing（ $\pi \in i^{-}$ $\rho \in \iota \nu$ ）for discovery of the con－ tents of a thing，and so for as－ certainment of character；and

## 

the difference between the two is made by the context. The agent and object distinguish them. God tries, thedevil tempts. To tempt is malevolent, to try is for discipline. Compare James i. 2 and 13 : in the former verse the thought of trial, in the latter that of temptation predominates. To rejoice in temptations is impossible: to say that trial cannot be from God is untrue. Our Lord was both tried and tempted, and so is it with His people.

Súvazal] Compare iv. 15,


 $\nu \omega \mu \epsilon$ vots. The ability spoken of belongs to Him as God, and waited not for any experience to acquire it for Him. But its exercise requires that its possession should be known and felt by those whom it is to aid; and this assurance can only be inspired in them by His having actually suffered like them and with them.

тois $\pi \in \iota \rho a\}$ ouévots] Those who are undergoing trial. It is a description of life. Each day of life is an exploration of character. God tries, and the devil tempts. (1) Circumstances of difficulty, thwartings of the will, dispensations of sorrow, severely try the patience and faith of the man. (2) Good and evil are presented to him, and the choice
lies between them. Nor is that choice unbiassed. A fallen nature, and a busy tempter, combine to influence it in favour of evil.
$\beta o \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota]$ Illustrations of the versatility of this helping abound in Scripture. Matt.


 Mark ix. 22, 24, єì $\tau \iota \delta v i v \eta, \beta o \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta-$


III. I. "O $\theta_{\epsilon \nu}$ ] Asan inference from all which. Such being the incomparable greatness of Christ, (1) as the eternal Son, (2) as the glorified Man; in both aspects high above the highest of angelic beings. Thus the preceding argument is summed up, and made the starting-point of a new departure. The exaltation of Christ above Moses the mediator of the Law Dispensation is the next topic, and it occupies chapters iii. and iv. For ${ }_{\sigma} \theta_{\epsilon \nu}$, see note on ii. 17, $\dot{\delta} \theta_{\epsilon \tau}$.
 nation is peculiar to this place. St Paul usually employs á $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi$ ò alone; not infrequently with $\mu o v$ added. St Peter, St John, and St Jude prefer àjart $\quad$ roí. St James commonly uses $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \in \lambda$ фò̀ or ádè $\phi$ oí $\mu o v$, sometimes combining the latter with dya$\pi \eta \tau o i$.
äytot] The idea of conse-

## 

cration predominates over that of sanctification (as commonly understood) in the use of this word. The thought is of the setting apart by God for God, in contrast with that of the unclaimed or secularized being.



 poc. Thus I Pet. ii. 9, in two
 єis $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi o i \eta \sigma \iota v$, a holy race, a people unto acquisition (that is, whom God has willed to make His own).
$\kappa \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ є̇точрaviou] Compare Phil. iii. $14, ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu \omega$
 'Incoû. The call is from heaven

 $\sigma \tau a \lambda \in ́ v \tau \iota \dot{\alpha} \pi^{\prime}$ oùpavov̂) and to heaven (I Thess. ii. I2, toū
 €́avтov̂ $\beta$ aoldeíav кaì đógav), but it is also, and principally, above, or heavenly, because God is (always in Scripture) the Caller. See Rom. viii. 30 , oûs $\delta$ غ̀ $\pi \rho \circ \omega \rho \rho \sigma \epsilon$, то⿱́тovs каї éкádєбєv. I Cor.


 Meós. Gal. i. I5. I Thess. iv. 7. The figure has many illustrations in Scripture. But the predominant idea is that of an invitation (Matt. xxii. 3, \&c.

Luke xiv. 7 , \&c.). In its applied sense, it was once a literal call to the discipleship and companionship of Christ (Matt. iv. 21). It is now the announcement of the Gospel, by whatever means made audible to the particular person. For $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$, compare Rom. xi. 29, тà үapíruata $\kappa \alpha i ̀ \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma t s \tau 0 \hat{\nu} \Theta \in \sigma \hat{v} . ~ I ~ C o r . i . ~ 26 . ~$ Eph. i. 18. iv. I, 4.2 Thess. i. 1 I. $\quad 2$ Tim. i. 9 , каі̀ кале́-
 1о, $\beta \epsilon \beta a i \alpha \nu \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega \nu} \tau \eta े \nu \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota \nu \kappa \alpha \grave{\imath}$
 used (as here) nine times by St Paul, and once by St Peter.
írovpaviov] In one passage, Eph. i. ro, the revised text gives the combination $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad$ (for $\dot{\epsilon} v$ ) roîs ovjpavoîs. Hence the adjective ėmovpávos, xi. 16. xii.




 víwv. 2 Tim. iv. 18, єis т $\boldsymbol{i} \nu$
 Often we find $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\text { ém }}$ тovpávia, the heavenlies (in a predominantly local sense), as in viii. 5. ix. 23 (where тà érovoávia is the equivalent of $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} v$ тoîs ovipavoîs above). Eph. i. 3, 20. ii. 6. iii. ro. vi. 12. Sometimes as a title of God, as in Psalm lxviii.

 2 Macc. iii. 39, ó тク̀v катоккı́av

èmovoáveov ${ }^{\circ} \chi \boldsymbol{\chi} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ），or of Christ， I Cor．xv．48，49，otos ó è érovpá－ vlos．．．tク̀v єíkóva тoû èmovpavíov．
$\mu$ ย́тохоt］See note on i．9，


катаvойбатє］Set your minds upon．Fasten your attention up－ on．Thus x．${ }^{24}$ ，к $\alpha \tau \alpha \nu о \omega \mu \mu \epsilon \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta^{-}$ גous к．т．R．Gen．xlii．9．Exod． ii．I I，катаvớбаs $\delta \grave{\text { è }}$ тòv $\pi$ óvov av̉－ $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ ò $\rho \hat{\imath}$ ă $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \tau \nu$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Psalm xxxvii．32，катаขоє̂̀ ó á $\mu$ артш－入òs tòv Síkatov．cxix．18，áno－

 omits $\sigma o v$ ）ह̉к tồ vópov $\sigma o v$. Matt．vii．3．Luke vi．41．xii． 24，27，катауойбатє тоѝs ко́ракая
 Acts vii．31，32．xi．6， eis ${ }_{\eta} v$
 xxvii．39．Rom．iv．19．James i，


 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．It is noticeable that，of the fourteen places of its occur－ rence in the New Testament， eight are in St Luke＇s writings．

тò à áóctodov］The two titles here given to our Lord，
 be said to contain in them two whole sections of the Epistle， the comparison with Moses，and the comparison with Aaron． The latter is postponed till chapter $v$ ．The former is at once entered upon．The word ánó⿱宀тодos is not elsewhere ap－
plied either to Moses or to our Lord．In the Old Testament it occurs but once（ I Kings xiv．
 $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o ́ s)$ ．But the verb áro－ $\sigma \tau_{\epsilon}(\lambda \epsilon \iota v$ is frequently thus ap－ plied．See（r）Exod．iii．10，


 v．22，ivaтíảт́́vта入кás $\mu \epsilon$ ；Num． xvi．28．Deut．xxxiv．II．Josh． xxiv．5．I Sam．xii．8，ánt́́r－
 ＇Аарш́v．\＆c．\＆c．（2）Matt．xxi．


 $\mu \epsilon$ ．John iii．17，34．v．36， 38．xvii． $3,8,18,21,23,25$ ． I John iv．9，io，14，tòv viòv







 genitive depends upon both the accusatives，ámóorodov and d $\rho$－ хєєрє́a．The Apostle and High Priest belonging to（that is，who is the subject of ）our opodoyia．
 of one speech with（ $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ vi＇），holding the same language with（öдо́дo－

 consent to another＇s statement；
 $\alpha \cup \mathfrak{\tau} \tau 0 \hat{u}$. $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ ío
iii. 2. Or omit $0 \lambda \downarrow$.
and so, to acknowledge, in all senses, whether a thing (as I John i. 9, $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\sigma} \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ т $\dot{\alpha} \varsigma$

 (as I John ii. 23, ó ó $\mu о \lambda \sigma \omega \hat{\nu}$ ròv vióv). Sometimes, to make oper acknowledgment to (Heb. xiii. 15) or on the subject of ( $\epsilon \mathrm{y}$, Matt. x. 32) a person. And thus $\eta \dot{\boldsymbol{o}} \mu \mathrm{o} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{i a}$ (without any defining genitive) is the acknowledgment, or open confession, of the faith, or of the Object of faith, by the Church or the Christian; as here, and iv. i4. x. 23. 2 Cor. ix. $13, \tau \hat{\eta} v^{i} \pi o \tau \alpha \hat{\eta}$
 of your confession, that is, the obedience shown by you to the faith which you profess). 1 Tim.
 opodoyiav. In $x$ 'Tim. vi. 13 it is applied to the avowal made by Christ Himself before Pilate of His own Person and Mission.
2. $\pi เ \sigma \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \nu \tau \alpha]$ As being faithful. Fix your thoughts upon Him in this particular aspect, namely, His faithfulness. It is thus that the new topic (the comparison of Christ with Moses) is introduced, in that incidental manner which is characteristic of the Epistle. See i. 4. v. 6.
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi o t \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \iota]$ For this use of roitiv, to make or create an
official person, compare I Sam. xii. 6, $\mu$ áptus Kúplos ó roıท́бas тòv M $\omega v \sigma \hat{\eta} \nu$ ка̀ тòv 'A $\alpha \rho \omega$ 'v. The choice of the word here, in instituting a comparison between Christ and Moses, may have been suggested by its occurrence in connexion with Moses in this very verse of the Septuagint. See also Mark iii.

 36, каì Kv́pıov aủròv каì Xpıбтòv є́тоónбєข ó ©єós, tov̂tov tòv 'I $\eta$ боข้ข к.т. $\lambda$.
$\omega$ 的 каi $M \omega v \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ ] The reference is to Num. xii. 7 , ovं $\chi$ oṽt


oüк $\omega$ ] The two senses of oinos, house and household, run into one another in many passages, nor does катаокєvábeıv (below) absolutely fix the sense here, though it best suits the former. The two metaphors, building and family, are applied to the Church in various places: the former, for example, in i Cor. iii. 9. Eph. ii. 21. 2 Tim. ii. 20 ; the latter in 1 Tim. iii. 15.
avioô] God's: see the quota-

3. $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ íovos $\gamma \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho$ ] Isay, катаvoy, $\sigma a \tau \varepsilon$ - for, \&c. There is cause for this exhortation to fasten your thoughts upon the




if they escaped not who made light of the divine mission of Moses，how shall we escape if we neglect the mission of One who is greater than he？Compare ii．2，3．x．28， 29.
 тоі̂тov к．т．入． X ． 12 ，ov̀tos $\delta$ غ̀ $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ． ทुछictal］The perfect ex－ presses the permanence of the estimate．He was，and is， counted worthy，dec．For astoiv， compare x．29，xєipovos $\dot{\alpha} \xi t \omega \theta \dot{\eta}^{-}$ бєтаи tipepias． 2 Thess．i． 11 ，


 where with accusative and in－ finitive，as Luke vii．7，ov่ס̀
 （And so kara ${ }^{\circ} \circ \hat{v} v$ ，in both con－ structions：as（1） 2 Thess．i． 5 ． （2）Luke xx．35．Acts v．44．） Or with infinitive alone（to count a thing worthy，to think fit），as
 ．．．$\mu$ خ̀ бข $\mu \pi \alpha р а \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v \epsilon \iota \nu$ тои̂тоv．

 ка $\theta^{*}$ Ï $\sigma$ ov］Moses，though officially charged with an $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \mathrm{t}$－ бкотì in the house，is personally a part of the house，and，as such， is essentially the inferior of its maker．The following verse ex－ plains and completes the argu－ ment．

катабкєчáacs］The classical shade of difference between к $\alpha$－ $\tau \alpha \sigma \kappa є \cup a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota v$ and $\pi \alpha \rho a \sigma \kappa \epsilon v a ́ \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ （the latter being used of the less permanent kinds of prepar－ ation）is noticeable in Scrip－ ture also．Compare Acts x．Io，
 $\tau \omega \nu$ дє̀ aviт凶̀v к．т．$\lambda$ ．，with Heb．ix． 2，$\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta ̀ ~ \gamma \grave{a} \rho \kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \cup a ́ \sigma \theta \eta$ к．т．$\lambda$. xi．7．I Pet．iii．2o．See Wis－

 ${ }^{2} v \theta_{\rho \omega \pi} \rho \nu$ ．In its application to a house，катабкєvá̧єцv may in－ clude the three functions，of the architect，builder，and furnisher． See I Chron．xxix．19，каì тồ
 тov̂ oüкov สov．

4．Tâs $\gamma$ à̀ oíkos］$I$ say，
 For，as every house has a maker， so the house universal，the house which is the universe，has God for its maker—and Moses was a part of it．It was not needful to add，for Christian readers， that God made this house which is the universe by Jesus Christ， who is of one substance with the Father．The whole force of the argument lies in this； but so obviously，that the writer can leave the readers to supply it． There seems to be no reason for limiting the $\pi \dot{\alpha} v \tau a$ to the Church




universal : the larger sense given above is equally true, and at least equally to the purpose.
 $\mu \grave{v} \nu$ and $\delta_{\hat{\epsilon}}$ have their usual effect in subordinating the first clause of the sentence to the second. And, while Moses was faithful in ( $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{v}$ ) God's house, and as a servant, Christ was faithful over ( $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ ) Gods house, and as Son. The former point of contrast was between the house (or one individual part of it) and its maker. The present point of contrast is ( I ) between in and over, (2) between servant and Son.
$\theta \in \rho a ́ \pi \omega \nu]$ The word occurs only here in the New Testament. It is quoted from the passage in Numbers, which is the text of the paragraph. It is applied to Moses in other passages of the Septuagint. Exod.

 aưrô. Num. xi. í. Deut.iii. 24. Josh. i. 2, M тєтєגєúт $7 \kappa \epsilon$. viii. 31, 33. The other chief appropriation of the word is to Job: Job i. 8. ii. 3 . xlii. 7,8 .
tis $\mu a \rho \tau 0 \dot{\rho} \iota o v]$ In evidence of. So as to supply a testimony to the then future revelations of
the Gospel. The Law, in both its parts, the moral and the ceremonial, was a testimony borne to the need and the hope of a Saviour: the moral, acting as an experimental revelation of $\sin$ (Rom. vii. 7, \&c); the ceremonial, as a perpetual prophecy of atonement (Heb. x. 3, \&c.) The distinction between дартирía (testatio) and $\mu a \rho \tau$ úpıov (testimonium) is never obliterated, though in many cases either would be suitable. St John uses $\mu$ aptupía only (a seeming exception in Rev. xv. 5 is not really such). For $\mu$ aprúpeov see Acts iv. 33, áre $\dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} o v v$ тò

 dered, exhibited, presented, their great subject of testimony, namely, the resurrection). I Cor. i. 6. 2 Oor. i. $12, \tau o ̀ \mu \alpha \rho \tau u ́ p \iota o v$
 is borne witness of by our conscience). 2 Thess. i. ıo. I Tim. ii. 6, тò $\mu \alpha \rho \tau$ и́pıov каироїs ibiots (which was to be the subject of testimony, \&c.).
$\tau \omega ิ \nu \lambda a \lambda \eta \theta \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu \omega \nu]$ See i.

6. ws viós] And therefore of one rank and order with ó катабкєvá $\sigma a s$. The contrast here with $\theta \epsilon \rho \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \pi \omega v$ is like that in
 $\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$. iii. 6. Or omit $\mu \epsilon \in \rho \iota \tau$. $\beta \epsilon \beta a t a v$.
i. I, 2 , with oi $\pi \rho o \phi \hat{\eta} \tau \alpha$. Compare John v. 18, 23, $\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ i ́ \iota \iota v$



$\left.\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i i^{\prime}\right]$ The change from év to $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ cannot be accidental. The Son is not in the house, whether $\kappa \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu о s$ or $̇$ éкк $\lambda \eta \sigma i ́ a$. John xvi. 28, áфíquи тòv ко́б ноу каì торєú-

 Compare Acts xx. 28, $\pi \alpha \nu \tau i$

 human shepherd is in, not over, the flock: but of Christ it is said (x. 2 I ), к кi iєрє́ $\alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \alpha \nu$ ध่ $\pi i$ тòv oíkov тov̂ ©eov̂.
avंтồ...ov̀] As before, God's. The rendering of the Authorized Version, His own house, carries us away from the true antithesis, which lies in the $\epsilon \pi i$ andthe viós.
$\left.\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \in \nu \ldots \mathcal{E}^{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \nu\right]$ The combination is peculiar, and most suggestive. We are God's housenot, we shall be, or may be: and yet there is no place for that kind of confidence which would be carelessness : there is a condition ( ${ }^{\prime}\left(u u^{\prime}\right)$, that of perseverance. Such is the teaching of Scripture-quietness and confulence, yet with the undersong of warning.
$\pi \alpha \rho p \eta \sigma i \alpha v]$ The idea of freedomof speech ( $\pi \alpha v-\rho \eta \sigma i ́ a)$ is never
lost in the use of this word. But it is a sincere and a reverent freedom, suggesting, as the full thought of the word, frankness of speech, toward ( I ) God and (2) man, springing out of freedom of heart-a heart enlarged or set at liberty (Psalm cxix, 32) by faith and grace. For (I) see iv. I6, $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ oviv $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha^{\prime}$


 $\tau \hat{\omega}$ al̈ $\mu a \tau \iota$ 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v} . \quad$ Eph. iii. 12. I John ii. 28 . iii. 2 I. iv. 17. v. 14. For (z) see Acts iv. 29, 3 r. xxviii. 3 1. 2 Cor. iii. 12. vii. 4. Eph. vi. 19.

каv́ $\eta \mu a]$ Between каv́ $\eta \mu a$ and каú $\chi \eta \sigma e s$ there is the obvious difference between subject and act, between boast and boasting. The word кav $\chi \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta a u$, with both its derivatives, is almost exclusively St Paul's, who uses kav$\chi^{\hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha_{\ell}} 34$ times(St James twice), каи́ $\chi \eta \sigma \iota 5$ eleven times (St James once), and кaú $\chi \eta \mu a$ ten times.
 subject of glorying belonging to (contained in) our great hope. That which our Christian hope gives us to glory in. It is doubtful whether $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi \dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} o s$ belongs to both accusatives, or only (perhaps better) to тò каúхךна.

MéXpı тédous $\beta \in \beta a i a v] \quad$ In verse 14 these three words are


found again, and are there unchallenged by varieties of reading. It seems unlikely that so careful and so eloquent a writer should have repeated himself within so short a series of verses. The words are omitted by the Vatican manuscript here, and may have come in (as an appendage to ката́ $\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\chi \omega \mu}(\boldsymbol{v})$ from verse 14 .

ката́ $\chi \propto \mu \epsilon \nu]$ The aorist expresses, if we shall have held fast: if, when the great day comes, we shall be found to have held fast, \&c.
7. $\Delta t 0]$ Wherefore. Considering the superiority of Christ to Moses, and in the same degree the greater danger of trifing with Him. Thus the quotation is aptly introduced, which speaks of the $\sin$ of those who disobeyed Moses and fell in the wilderness. Compare the $\pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma o \tau \epsilon \rho \omega s$ of ii. I , and the $\pi о ́ \sigma \varphi$ хєipovos of $\mathbf{x} .29$.
 struction of the sentence thus begun? Is it (I) $\delta_{\iota} \partial^{2} \ldots \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta$ рúvŋrtє к.т.入. (verse 8)? Is it (2)
 (verse 12)? Or is (3) a suppressed imperative to be supplied mentally from the general sense of the quotation? Against (r) is the first person (God being the speaker) of verses 9-ıi; тà с̈рүа $\mu о v \ldots \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega ́ \chi \theta \iota \sigma \alpha \ldots \tau \dot{\varsigma}$
ódovis $\mu$ оv к.т. $\lambda$. Against (2) is the long suspension of the sentence by the interposition of so many verses of quotation. On the whole therefore (3) is to be adopted. The quotation begins parenthetically, but the long extension of it loses the thread of the sentence, and the practical resumption in verse 12 may better be regarded as (in form) a fresh start.
$\lambda^{\prime} \hat{\gamma} \epsilon \iota$ тò $\left.\pi v \in \hat{\imath} \mu a\right]$ A strong testimony to the inspiration of Old Testament Scripture. Com-

 єiр $\eta \kappa$ ќval к.т. $\lambda .2$ Tim. iii. 16 , $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha$



 The authorship of the Psalm is ascribed to David in iv. 7, but nothing turns upon it, and the argument of that verse ( $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a}$ тобov̂тov $\chi \rho o ́ v o \nu$ ) would be rather strengthened than weakened by the supposition of a later author. There is no reason, however, to doubt the obvious inference that it is a Psalm of David.
 (or should) hear His voice. The will of the Authorized and Prayer-Book Versions is a clear mistake. If ye will hear would make the harden not a tauto-

##  

logy: if ye will listen, do listen. The point is, If God should be pleased, after so much inattention on our part, to speak again, see that ye give heed to Ilim.
8. $\left.\mu \eta \eta^{\sigma} \kappa \lambda \eta \rho v v^{\prime} \eta \tau \epsilon\right]$ The tense (aoristsubjunctive) expresses the prohibition in a lively and forcible way, as that of $a$ single act of hardening. The figure is from the stiffening, by cold or disease, of what ought to be supple and pliable. It is applied in Scripture ( x ) to the man's own action in refusing grace, and (2) to the judicial sentence which at last endorses it. (i) Exod. xiii. 15,
 $\sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{\lambda} \lambda a \iota ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}$. Deut. $\mathbf{x}$. 16, каì
 єітє єॄтт. 2 Kings xvii. 14, каì
 Chron. xxx. 8. xxxvi. I3. Neh. ix. 16, 17, 29. (2) Exod. iv. 21 ,
 Síav. vii. 3. ix. 12. x. 20, 27. xi. ro. xiv. 4, 8 , I7. Deut. ii.
 тò $\pi v \in \hat{v} \mu a$ av̇rov. Isai. lxiii. 17 ,

 the passive is used, leaving the agency ambiguous. Exod. vii.

 viii. 19. ix. 35 .

тàs карбias] The word карdia is not restricted in Scripture
to our common use of heart as denoting the affections only, but includes the whole inner man, will, judgment, understanding, as well as feeling. See, for ex-
 èv таîs карסíals aủ $\bar{\omega} v$. Rom. ii.

 alternative following (кaлךүорои́vтшу $\hat{\eta}$ каі $\left.\alpha^{2} \pi о \lambda о \gamma о ข \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu\right)$ shows that understanding rather than affection is the prominent thought. I Cor. vii. 37 , є́̃тт
 though the hardening of the heart may seem to lie in the region of affection rather than of intellect, yet the whole man moves together. See Eph. iv. 18, where $\delta \Delta \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\partial} \nu \pi \omega^{\prime} \rho \omega \sigma \tau \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ kapoías is made a parallel and equivalent clause to $\delta i a ̀$ $\tau \grave{\eta}$

$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \iota \kappa \rho \alpha \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \ldots \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha \sigma \mu \hat{v}]$ These words are the translation in the Septuagint of the Hebrew Meribah and Massal. As at Meribah, as the day of Massah. The reference may thus be special and local, to two signal murmurings, one near the close, the other at the opening, of the long wandering in the wilderness. But the quotation follows the Septuagint in generalizing the illustration. The noun $\pi a \rho a$ -



тıкра⿱㇒日勺̀s（exacerbation）is found only here．（In Exod．xvii． 7 Meribah is rendered $\lambda o \iota \delta \iota ́ \rho \eta \sigma \iota s$ ， and in Num．xx．i2 ávidocía．） But rаралткраívecy occurs often in this application；as in Deut． xxxi．27．Psalm lexviii．8， 17 ， 40，тоба́кєs тарєтікрагау av̀тòv
 $\gamma \hat{n}$ avú $\delta \rho \underline{s}$（the following verse
 as further equivalents）．Ezek． ii．3，5－8．\＆c．\＆c．For $\pi \epsilon-$ parرós see note on ii．18，тєєра－ otcís．For its use here，as the trial of God by men，the ex－ perimenting upon His power or forbearance，compare Exod． xvii．7．Deut．vi．i．6．ix． 22 （in all which places it is the render－ ing of Massal）．And so the
 7．Num．xiv．22．Psalm lxxviii． 41， 56 ．evi．14．\＆c．

кага̀ тウ̀̀ $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \nu]$ According to，after the likeness of，the day， doc．The Hebrew（as the day） suggests this rendering，and the sense of on the day is scarcely borne out by such uses of катà as Acts xii．1．xvi．25．xix． 23. xxvii． 27 ，in all of which the idea may be that of about rather than of at definitely．

9．ovi］Either（1）where， referring to $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \eta \eta \mu \varphi$ above； or（2）wherewith，by attraction of the regular o 0 （cognate accu－

V．H．
sative）to the genitive $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \sigma \sigma \rho \hat{v}$ preceding．The latter is the more probable．
ov̀ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \dot{\prime} \rho \alpha \sigma a \nu$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．］The text （verses 9 and to）varies from the Septuagint（ I ）in the omis－ sion of $\mu \epsilon$ after $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i ́ p a \sigma \alpha v$ ，which nevertheless must be mentally supplied，（2）in the substitution
 （ B omits $\mu \epsilon$ ），（3）in the inser－ tion of $\delta t 0^{\circ}$ after $\dot{I} T \eta$ ，thus con－
 with verse $10,(4)$ in the substi－ tution of rav́rqu for èкéviv．
oi $\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \in s ~ \dot{j} \mu \omega \nu]$ See note on

$\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ठоксдасіа］The mode of the tempting．In putting me to the proof，（ I ）as to my power to help，or（2）as to the extent of my longsuffering．Thus（I） Exod．xvii．7，ठ८a tò $\pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\alpha} \dot{\zeta} \epsilon \iota v$ aủroves（ B omits aùtovis）Kúpoov，
 $\hat{\eta}$ ouv ；（z）Isai．lxiii． 10 ，av่тot $\delta$ é

 noun סoкс $\mu$ acia occurs in Eeclus．


 סoк $\left.\mu \mu^{\prime}\right)$ in the sense of to prove， is common in both Testaments： as Prov．xvii．3，Ф̈̈ттє бокс $\mu a^{\prime}-$
 aós．Zech．xiii．9，$\pi$ vpórow av̀－ тov̀s wis $\pi v \rho o \hat{v} \tau a z$ tò àp



 xpuriov. Luke xiv. 19. i Cor. iii. I3. I Pet. i. 7 . \&c. In its other sense, to approve, it appears only in the New. In its application to the proving of God by men, it seems to be found only here.
 may seem to point to God's works of judgment rather than of mercy. They tempted me, and (as the consequence of that tempting) witnessed my acts of righteous punishment. Isai.

 But the more inclusive sense is better. Compare Num. xiv. 22,


 є $\rho \eta \eta_{\varphi} \varphi \tau \alpha v ́ \tau \eta$ (B omits $\tau \alpha u ́ t \eta$ ), каì

10. $\left.\pi \rho \circ \sigma \omega_{\chi} \theta_{\iota} \sigma a\right]$ A postclassical form of the Homeric
 noting a burden of grief or displeasure at, towards, or against ( $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ ) a thing or person (with
 First in Gen. xxvii 56 , $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma-$
 $\tau \in ́ \rho a s . L e v i t . x v i i i .25,28, \pi \rho o \sigma-$



 Num. xxi. 5. xxii. 3, $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma-$
 vi $\omega$ v 'I $\sigma \rho a \eta$ '人. I Chron. xxi. 6,

 \&c. And so $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \sigma_{\chi} \theta_{\tau} \sigma \mu a$, ( I ) displeasure, disgust, as Deut. vii. 26, тробох $\theta$ í $\mu a \pi \iota ~ \pi \rho о \sigma о \chi \theta i-~$
 au̇tó ( B omits auvồ and av่тó) к.т. $\lambda$. (2) an object of displeasure, anabomination, as 2 Kings


 For the application of $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \sigma-$ $\chi^{0 i \zeta \epsilon \iota v(a s ~ h e r e) ~ t o ~ G o d ~ H i m-~}$ self, compare Levit. xxvi. 44, ov̉X vi $\pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \overline{\text { îdov }}$ aủroùs oủ $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho \rho \sigma \omega^{\prime}-$
 aưroús.
raviry] This which is under review. The sense is not affected by the change of reading from èкeív.
$\pi \lambda a v \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a l]$ Sometimes the passive of $\pi$ ravâv is strongly emphasized, as in the $\pi \lambda a v \omega \bar{\varphi} \tau \epsilon 5$
 and (by implication) in the $\mu \eta$ $\delta \in i s ~ \pi \lambda a v a ́ \tau \omega ~ \dot{u} \mu a ̂ s ~ o f ~ I ~ J o h n ~ i i i . ~ . ~$
7. Here the middle is more suitable. The thought is expanded, and the latent idea of


influence is expressed，in 2 Pet．

 т̂̂ ơợ̂ тov̂ Bàać $\mu$ ．
$\tau \hat{1}$ карסía］The dative（of the part affected，as，for ex－ ample，in Eph．iv．18，完кот $\omega$ $\mu e ́ v o l, ~ \tau \hat{\eta}$ סcavoía ồ ovt $\epsilon$ ）makes the roving imputed a heart－roving， （I）not literal but metaphorical， （2）not superficial but heart－ deep．
aviroi $\delta 6]$ The pronoun avirò （always emphatic in the nomi－ native）suggests the colon at kapoia，and the antithetical ren－ dering of the clause aviroi $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．But，though I was thus displeased，and though I thus characterized their conduct，yet they refused to take knowledge of my dealings with them，so as to give effect to my purpose．




 John i．ro．Rom．iii． 17 ，ódòv
 21 ．dc．
$\tau$ às óoov＇s $\mu \mathrm{ov}]$ My proceed－ ings，my methods of acting．Isai．


 plos．Rom．xi．33，каі̀ ave $\xi_{1}{ }^{2 i ́}$




11．wis whoral As I sware． Their conduct was in accord－ ance with（explaining and justi－ fying）my oath of exclusion．

Eicícè $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma o v \tau a l]$ A Hebra－ istic form of strong negation； the clause ov $\zeta_{\omega} \omega$（or the like） being understood before $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ．

 $\mu \epsilon \hat{i} o v . ~ F o r ~ a n ~ o p p o s i t e ~ p h r a s e, ~$ expressing strong assertion，see

 к．$\tau . \lambda$ ，where the original passage in the Septuagint（Isai．xlv．23，
 к．т．入．Compare 2 Cor．i． 18. xi． 10.

тウ̀v катámavбiv $\mu 0 v]$ The literal rendering might seem to be the transitive form，My rest－ ing of them，my causing them to rest．See Exod．xxxiii，14， av̉тòs тооторєи́бодаí боv каі ка－ татаи́ $\sigma \omega$ бє．Deut．xii．го，каì
 $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho \omega \hat{\nu} \dot{v} \mu \omega \nu$. Josh．i． 13.2 Chron． xxxii．22．\＆c．But in usage the intransitive sense（of verb and noun）is equally common． Gen．ii．2，3，каì катétavaє тरी
 хххі． 17,18 ，е̇паи́бато каі̀ кате́－
 тavaє $\lambda a \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$. Ruth ii．7．I







12. $\beta \lambda \epsilon \bar{\pi} \epsilon \tau \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\delta} \lambda \phi \circ \ell]$ A new sentence. See note on verse 7 , doó, кaOu's. For the abruptness of the appeal (without connecting particle) compare xii. $25, \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$
 $\pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \mu \eta^{\prime} \tau \iota \varsigma \kappa$ к.т. $\lambda$.
$\left.\mu \eta^{\prime} \pi o \tau \epsilon\right]$ See note on ii. r, $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi о т \epsilon$.
érral] The indicative implies a strong impression that the apprehension ( $\beta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon_{\epsilon} \pi \tau \epsilon \mu \eta$ ) is well founded. Gal. iv. in, фо-
 ті́ака. Col. ii. 8, $\beta \lambda є ́ т є т є ~ \mu \eta ' ~$

$\ddot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{v}$ тve $\left.\tilde{v}^{\mu} \omega \bar{\omega}\right]$ In any one of you. The singular individualizes the need of watchfulness. Compare the $\tau \iota \varsigma \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \dot{v} \mu \omega \nu$ of verse 13 .
 bad heart of (characterized by) unbelief. Compare x. 22, ovvet-



 aข่тนิ.
$\dot{a} \pi \iota \sigma$ ías $]$ Of the two groups,


former is found $I_{4}$ times in St Paul's Epistles and four times in the Hebrews, the latter 23 times in St Paul and twice in the Hebrews. In the former the idea of disobedience predominates (see Acts xxvi. 19. Rom. i. 30 ), in the latter that of unbelief (Mark ix. 24. John xx 27. Acts xxviii. 24). But the two are but two sides of the same character.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\omega}]$ Shown in. Acting in. In the form and shape of.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi o \sigma \tau \eta v a l]$ To stand off or away from: ( I ) whether to depart (clearly so in Luke iv. 13. Acts xii. ro. xv. 38. xix. 9. xxii. 29. 2 Cor. xii. 8), or (2) to stand aloof from (which might best suit Acts v. 38 . 2 Tim. ii. 19). To stand off (depart) from God would suit those who had once known Him. To stand aloof from Him would leave it in doubt whether He had ever been known. Perhaps the former is the best here, considering the implication of chapters vi. and $x$.
 31. xii. 22. A God who is all life. 13. àdגá] On the contrary. тарака入єîтє] Encouragethe meeting-point of the two thoughts, comfort, and exhort.



iii. 13. Or $\epsilon \xi \dot{\operatorname{v}} \mu \hat{\omega}^{\mu} \tau i s$.

тарак. Eavтои́s] See X. 25 (where no accusative is expressed). Compare I Thess. iv. i 8 and v. II ( $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda o v s$ ). The difference between éavcov̀s and $a^{2} \lambda \lambda \eta^{\prime} \lambda o u s$ is next to none: see Eph. iv. 32, cis $^{2} \lambda \lambda \lambda{ }_{\eta} \lambda o v s ~ \chi \rho \eta$ -



 cis éautoùs aúrò dıakovoūvtes. The use of eave. expresses the unity of the Christian body : they who forgive each other forgive themselves. (In the New Testament we have always $\mathfrak{c}^{2} u \tau \omega \nu$ \&c. never $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\omega}$ or $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ au $\bar{\omega} \hat{\omega}$ as mere reflexives. See Bp. Lightfoot on Gal. v. 14.) The classical usage of ex naut $\hat{\nu}$ for $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu \& c$. is more rare.
$\left.\kappa \alpha \theta^{3} \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu.\right] \quad$ An emphatic form (of the common $\kappa a \theta^{\prime}$ $\left.{ }_{\eta}^{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho^{\prime} \rho \alpha \nu\right)$ found only here in the New Testament.
äxpıs oui] Luke xxi. 24 ( $\pi \lambda \eta$ $\rho \omega \theta \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \nu)$. Acts vii. 18 (av $\left.{ }^{\prime} \sigma \neq \eta\right)$. xxvii. 33 ( ${ }^{\mu} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda_{\epsilon \nu}$ ). Rom. xi. 25 ( $\epsilon i \sigma \in \hat{\lambda} \theta_{\eta}$ ). I Cor. xi. 26 ( $\lambda \lambda \theta_{p}$ ). Rev. ii. 25 ( $\left.{ }^{*} \nu \quad \vec{\eta} \xi \omega\right)$. Here alone with a present indicative. Literally, until (the end of) the time during which; that is, so long as.
rò $\sigma$.] The 'today' of the above quotation from Psalm xor. Compare (for the sense) 2 Cor. vi. 2.

калєitaь] Is called, that is, named, used as applicable. Rom.
 there shall be called (named, spoken of) for thee a seed.
$\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho v v \theta \hat{\eta}]$ be hardened ( I ) by his own sin, (2) by the judical hardening which comes late but surely. See note on verse 8, $\mu \eta \grave{\jmath}^{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \eta p$ úv $\eta \tau \epsilon$.
 If the latter, there is some reason for emphasizing of you as in contrast with the generatron of the Exodus.
cis] Any single one (individualizing the danger).
$\dot{\mathbf{\alpha}} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \tau \eta \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \dot{\alpha} \mu$.] $B y$ a deceit belonging to (characteristic of) $\sin ($ all $\sin ) . \quad$ See 2 Thess. ii.
 Gen. iii. 13. I Tim. ii. 14. Rom. vii. 11. 2 Cor. xi. 3. All $\sin$ is committed under a deception, momentary at least, as to (r) the satisfaction to be found in it, (2) the excuse to be made for it, (3) the probebility of its punishment.
14. $\quad$ द́тохо1] See note on i . 9. In that place it is partners.


 $\sigma \eta \tau \epsilon, \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho v ́ v \eta \tau \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{s} \kappa \alpha \rho \delta i ́ a s \dot{v} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu \omega^{\prime} s$
 $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \pi i к \rho \alpha \nu \alpha \nu ; ~ \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ои́ та́vтєs oi є́ $\xi \in \lambda \theta o ́ v \tau \epsilon s$


And so always in the Septuagint. But in this Epistle in the three other places of its occurrence it has a genitive of the thing partaken of; and so here Christ is spoken of as the great inheritance, or possession, or even feast, of which all Christians partake. Compare John vi. throughout.
yóp] Reason for guarding against the forfeiture of so great a standing.

 same thought of present possession coupled with the one condition of perseverance.
 ginning of our confidence. That is, the confidence, the assured persuasion of truth and Christ, with which we began our Christian life. Equivaleut to $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$
 (compare I John ii. 7. iii. II).

ข่ $\left.\frac{1}{\circ} \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}\right]$ Confidence. See note on i. 3. From vííatartal (with a dative) comes the use of imórraots as an act of the mind supporting the
weight of a difficult revelation. For the sense compare x .32.
$\mu$ éxpl к.т. $\lambda$.] See note on the same words in verse 6.
15. $\dot{\epsilon} v \tau \bar{\varphi} \lambda \epsilon \not \subset$.] In (within, during) its being said. While it is still said. While the saying is still applicable. The thonght goes back to verse 13 (I4 being treated as parenthetical). There will come a time when $\sigma \eta^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \rho \frac{\nu}{\prime}$ will have become yesterday, and when its encouraging voice will be silent.
16. tives] Or $\tau$ tvés. The former is now generally adopted, and would certainly be preferable if we could settle iv. 2 ( $\quad$ oîs áкov́бaбvy) as having no reference to Caleb and Joshua. While that verse remains ambiguous, we cannot positively settle whether here the writer disregards the two excepted cases, and asks 'Who...? nay, did not all ${ }^{\prime}$ ' or recognizes the two exceptions, and says, 'Some ...but not quite all-there were two exceptions.' We must leave it in doubt till we reach iv. 2. aंкойбаитes] Afier hearing.





 $\dot{a} \pi \iota \sigma \tau i ́ a \nu$.


- So that mere hearing is no safeguard.
$\delta \iota a ̀$ M.] by means of. Equi-


17. $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \sigma^{\prime} \chi \theta$.] See note on verse io, $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \chi^{\theta} \iota \sigma a$.
ríciv 8́] If we read tıvès in verse 16, the sense is: Some -not all: what made the difference? Sin (verse 17). Disobedience (verse 18).
ouxi $\frac{1}{}$ oits áp.] Some put the interrogation at $\dot{\operatorname{j} \mu} \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{j} \sigma a \sigma \kappa v$, and make the rest of the verse a statement: And their carcases (accordingly) fell, \&ic. If so, hom. iii. 8 would resemble this
 this would balance well with the close of verse 19 , каi $\beta \lambda \epsilon^{\prime}-$ $\pi о \mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ к.т. $\lambda$.

аं $\mu a \rho \tau \eta \sigma^{\sigma} \alpha \sigma \iota \succ$ A post-classical first aorist of a ${ }^{\mu} \mu a \rho \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, found also in Matt. xviii. i5. Rom. v. 14, 16. vi. $15 . \quad 2$ Pet. ii. 4.
$\kappa \bar{\lambda} \lambda a]$ Levit. xxvi. ${ }^{2}$, каì




29, 32, 33. 1 Sam. xvii. 46. Isai. lxvi. 24.

 $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau a \iota \tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa \bar{\omega} \lambda a \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.
 verse i7, rían $\delta$ ©́. On the same supposition (of rivès, not tives, being read in verse 16), this verse gives the second answer to the question, What made the difference? Disobedience. For ${ }^{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \theta$. see mote on verse 12, àntozias.
19. каi $\beta \lambda \epsilon$ кто $\mu \boldsymbol{\epsilon}]$ And the result was in accordance with the threat. They did not enter. They could not enter. And why? Because of their a a ${ }^{2}$ oria. So that $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon_{i} \theta_{c a}($ verse 18$)$ and aं $\pi 1 \sigma$ Tia (verse 19) are treated as convertible terms, though with a shade of distinction between them. See again note on verse 12, dं $\boldsymbol{\pi} \iota \sigma$ tias.
$\left.\beta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \mu \tau \nu\right]$ We see on the Scripture page. For $\beta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon_{\epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu}$ in this mental sense, see, for example, ii. 9. X. 25 .



IV. I. oiv] It is an inference from the case of the Exodus generation.

катадєєтонє́vŋs] Being left in continuous succession. (I) Left behind by former generations. (2) The present teuse marks a repeated and successive leaving behind. (3) There is no $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu}$ or $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$ expressed after каталєıт. It is quite general. Left for others, whoever they may be, by former possessors.
 ү'́ $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ has two senses (1) to profess, (2) to promise. (The active voice, though classical, in the obvious sense of announce, proclaim, de., is not found in the New Testament.) Probablyboth are traceable to the idea of to announce as one's own, in differeut ways: (I) to announce as one's business, occupation, character, dec., (2) to announce as one's undertaking or engagement. The substantive $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma^{-}$ $\gamma \in \lambda i a$ occurs about 50 times in the New Testament, always as promise. In the Septuagint it is found only twice or thrice, and the verb no oftener.
$\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \in \tau]$ To enter. Of entering. That we (or some) should enter. The construction is loose: we might have expected rov with єícètєiv. Compare Rom. iv. I $_{3}$,
 єis $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ катáл $\alpha v \sigma \iota$ ] No such promise is anywhere made in express terms. But the inference is from Psalm xev. David's exhortation to the people of his generation, not to sin like the Exodus generation, lest they should incur its penalty of forfeiture of God's rest, implies that the rest, or its equivalent, or its antitype, was still open, to be entered or to be forfeited. Otherwise the exhortation itself would lack its point.

ठoкй] A difficult word here. We cannot (at all events without a каì before it) make it mean even seem to have missed it, even in appearance incur such a loss. It is better to take it in the forensic sense, in which סокєî would be the way of pronouncing a verdict. Did $\boldsymbol{s}$ סeiva commit suchorsuch acrime? $\delta о к є \hat{\imath}$ (he seems to have done it: I am of opinion that he did it). So here: lest any one of you should seem (should be judged) to have missed it. Another possible interpretation, that of a merely mitigating and softening form of expression, seems inadequate.
 No clear difference appears to lie between víтєןєiv and vं vтє fiofac. Can the latter be a


strict passive (to be reduced to want)? This sense might suit Luke xv. 14. 2 Cor. xi. 8. Phil.iv. 12. Heb. xi. 37 (where it occurs with two strict passives following). In a Cor. i. 7 it stands in a sort of contrast with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda$ ourí $\sigma \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$ in verse 5 . In i Cor. viii. 8, however, it simply stands over against $\pi \epsilon \rho \omega \sigma \sigma \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \varphi$. And in Rom. iii. 23 the passive sense can scarcely be maintained. Indeed in all places the sense to be behind, to come later than, or to come too late for, to miss or lack, seems sufficient for either voice of the word. Luke xxii. $35, \mu$ ' тtvos vítepи́øatє; 2 Cor. xi. 5. xii. II. Sometimes the construction varies from that with a genitive following: for example, Matt.
 Mark x. 2 I , 齐 $\boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\sigma e}$ (as to thee)
 oívov. I Cor. i. 7 (with év). xii. 24, $\tau \hat{\varphi} \hat{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho o v \mu \epsilon ้ \nu \omega$ (absolute).
2. кai $\left.{ }^{2} \mathrm{a} \rho\right]$ For also. Besides other points of resemblance, there is this (каí), that we (no stress on we, no $\left.{ }_{\eta \mu \epsilon i s}\right)$ have been evangelized (have had a message of good brought to us) even as also were they.

үóp] A reason for the ката$\lambda \epsilon \tau \pi о \mu \dot{\epsilon} v \eta \mathrm{~s} \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda$ ías of verse $\mathbf{I}$.
 of this phrase suggests the view taken of the promise of Canaan
as being not only typical, but representative too, of the greathope of rest, spiritual and heavenly, which is the Christian Gospel.
 pronise of Canaan lay (for the believing Israelite) that other promise without which the former would have been transitory and illusory. This thought runs through the chapter, and finds its parallel in the unhesitating assertions of the rith chapter as to the far-reaching faith of the saints of earlier dispensations.

 For this sense of spiritual and everlasting benefiting, see also (for example) Luke ix. 25. John vi. 63 . I Cor. xiii. 3.
ò $\lambda$. Tins $\left.\dot{\alpha} \kappa \circ \hat{\eta}_{\mathrm{s}}\right]$ The word of the tidings or divine message. For this sense of akoy, a thing for hearing, tidings, a message or announcement, see I Sam. ii. 23,

 'I $\boldsymbol{\text { º́á }}$. Psalm cxii. 7. Isai. lii. 7, $\alpha \times о \eta ̀ ~ \epsilon i p \eta ́ \nu \eta s . ~ M a t t . ~ i v . ~ 24, ~$
 28. John xii. 38. Gal. iii. 2, $\hat{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \kappa о \bar{\jmath} \varsigma \pi i ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \varsigma . \quad$ I Thess. ii. I3, тарадаßóvтєs 入óyov áкойs $\pi \alpha, \rho^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau 0 \hat{v}{ }^{\omega} \epsilon \epsilon \hat{u}$.


$\left.\mu \eta^{\prime}\right]$ Because they were nat;


\&ec. The Hellenistic use of $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ with the participle includes the various subjective ideas of because not, though not, as not, such as not, \&c. as well as the classical if not. For example, (1) If not: Gen. xliv. 34, $\pi$ 解

 Rom. v. I3, $\mu \grave{\eta}$ övtos vó $\mu$ ov. I

 Because not: Matt. xviii. 25 . xxii. 29, $\pi \lambda a \nu a ̂ \sigma \theta \epsilon \quad \mu \eta$ єióótes тàs $\gamma \rho$ роф́ás. Mark ii. 4. Luke ii. 45 . xi. 24. Acts ix. 26. xvii. 6. xxi. 14, 34. xxvii. 7, 15. Rom. iv. 19, каi $\mu \dot{\eta}$ à $\sigma \theta \in \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma a s$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi i ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon$.. 2 Cor. v. 19. Heb.
 $\tau о \hat{~} \beta$ абл $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \varsigma . \quad 2$ Pet. iii. $9, \mu \grave{\eta}$
 Though not: Acts xx.22. I Cor.

 i. $8, \hat{a}^{\rho} \rho \tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} \dot{\delta} \rho \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon 5$. (4) $A s$ not, such as not: Matt. i. 19, каї $\mu \dot{\eta} \theta \dot{\theta} \lambda \omega \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. ix. 36, $\mu \grave{\eta}$
 33. xiii. т1. xviii. 2, тòv $\Theta \in o ̀ v$

 v. 7. xiii. 11. xx. 29. Eph. ii.
 Heb. iv. $15, \mu \eta \eta^{\delta} \delta v a \dot{\mu} \mu v o v \sigma \nu \mu \pi a-$

 т $\rho є \dot{v} о \nu \tau a$. Jude $19, \pi \nu \in \hat{\mu} \mu a \quad \mu \eta े$

Éxoutes. (5) Guarding against, $^{2}$ avoiding: 1 Cor. x. $33, \mu \eta \zeta_{\eta} \zeta_{\eta \tau \omega}$
 2. vi. 3 .

бvvкєк.] Mere questions of formation ( $\sigma \nu к к є є р а \sigma \mu$., $\sigma v \nu \kappa є-$ кра $\mu$.) may be disregarded. The point of the interpretation lies in the case of the word. Is it the accusative plural, or is it the nominative singular? For the latter the Sinaitic alone (of great manuscripts) is quoted, and the former must be preferred on a balance of authorities. (I) If the former, the rendering must be, because they were not commingled by faith with those who heard. Because they were not united by faith with those who heard effectually. This will bring the two faithful hearers (Caleb and Joshua) into unexpected and unexplained prominence. It would at least require us to read cuès (not tíves) in iii. 16, and without interrogation. Even then, considering how slightingly áкоv́єır is used in iii. 16 (ảкойqavтєs $\pi a \rho \in \pi$ íxpavav), it is unsatisfactory to have it here employed, without further explanation, for obedient hearing, in contrast with that which is negligent and disobedient. A slenderly supported reading áкоvб $\theta$ eiनty would mend the
$\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \dot{o ́}^{\mu \epsilon \theta \alpha \alpha \text { } \dot{\alpha} \rho \text { єis } \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \pi \alpha \nu \sigma \iota \nu \text { oi } \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v^{\prime}-3}$


iv. 3. Or elafpx. oiv. Or omit tin.
sense : because they were not commingled by faith with (united by faith to) the things heard. Compare ii. 1, $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \in ́ \chi \in \iota \nu$ ทi $\mu$ âs roîs
 emendation is áкои́ $\mu \mu \sigma \tau \nu$, more like d́кov́бarıv, but unbiblical. (2) If the nominative singular, agreeing with $\lambda$ ớyos, the meaning is, because it was not commingled by faith with them that heard (conveying the idea of the assimilating effect of digestion, as in the Collect for the second Sunday in Advent) ; or, because it was not commingled with faith for (in the case of) them that leard (making faith as it were the chyle in the process of digestion). This rendering is somewhat easier than that afforded by the other reading, but it is less well supported. 'After much hesitation we have marked this passage as probably containing a primitive corruption' (Professors Westcott and Hort).

(1) With $\gamma \dot{\alpha}$, the verse gives
 каӨа́тєן ка’кєіขо. I say, еvangolized like them-for, \&c. (2) With ovv, it is an inference from it. In accordance with the above
assertion ( $є \dot{\eta} \eta \gamma \gamma$ кад. ка̉к.) we do enter, \&c.

єi $\left.\sigma \in \rho \chi^{\circ} \mu \epsilon \theta a\right]$ The present tense expresses the confidence of the assertion. We do, as a matter of fact, enter, \&c.
$\left.\tau \eta^{\prime} \nu\right]$ An alternative reading omits tiv. The difference is between the rest and $a$ rest: the rest spoken of in Psalm xcv.; or, a rest, whatever it be.
oi тıaтєúбavтєร] We, I say, who became (or are become) believers. This is the definition of the we involved in ei $\sigma \epsilon \rho \chi^{\circ}$ $\mu \in \theta a$.
 (God) hath said. It is the Scripture perfect. In accordance with the saying of the xuvth Psalm, written all those long centuries after the completion of creation, and clearly implying that the катátavgus of God was still accessible in David's time, and, if so (for what has occurred since to close it?), still and now.
wis \#̈ $\mu \sigma \sigma a$ к.r.. .] The whole stress lies on the last words of the quotation-enter into my rest. They shall not enter implies that they might have entered if they would have believed and obeyed.


 $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \beta \delta \delta^{\prime} \mu \eta \dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad{ }_{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega \nu \alpha \dot{v} \tau o \hat{v}$.


kaitooc] This in classical Greek would have been киínє $\rho$.
$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ढ़ $\gamma \omega \nu$ ] God's works of





аптоे кат. к.] From the time of. The same phrase occurs in ix. 26. Matt. xxv. 34. Luke xi. 50. Rev. xiii. 8. xvii. 8 . үєฑ $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \omega v]$ Had come into being, as by a single act of creating. The passive form $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon \cdot \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$ does not appear to differ in sense from the middle $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ о́ $\mu \eta$. See, for example, Acts iv. 4. a Thess.

 the use of $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha}$ or $\dot{v} \pi \dot{o}$ with other forms of $\gamma^{\text {inopac (Acts ii. } 43 . \mathrm{iv} .}$ 16. Luke xiii. 17. xxiii. 8) shows that spontaneity is no necessary part of the idea of the word.
 for connecting the rest after creation with the rest of Psalm xev. The Scripture phtase for both is the same (калध́тavaєv,

on ii. $6, \pi o v i \pi s$.
 elsewhere used without the substantive ( $\tilde{\eta}^{\dot{\eta}} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a$ ).
ou゙ $\tau \omega$ ] More often refers to something foregoing: here to a quotation following, as in Matt. ii. 5. Acts vii. 6. xiii. 34,47 . I Cor. xv. 45.

катétavaev] The verb is used both transitively and intransitively. See note on iii.

5. द̇v тovíc ] Probably neuter. Here. See v. 6, ̇̀v غ̇тє́pw. Also Acts xiii. 35, 8ıótı каі $\frac{\text { én }}{}$
 ambignity, the next preceding quotation not having been from a Psalm.

E' ti $\sigma \in \lambda$.$] "They shall not$ enter; but in the very fact of so saying is implied that the rest was accessible, and only forfeited by the personal fault of those to whom it was offered.
6. $\grave{e} \pi \epsilon \dot{i}$ ovy] The argument is close and cogent. God never speaks in vain. If His rest is offered to man, it is quite certain that the offer will not be made

#  


in vain. If one set of persons (say, one generation) refuses it, another will have the offer of $i t$. (Compare Matt. iii. 9.) The Exodus generation refused God's rest, David's generation is offered it. This offer of God's rest to David's generation shows that something better than an earthly Canaan was meant by it. If that had been all, the entrance of Canaan under Joshua would have fulfilled it. But the xevth Psalm says that the rest was still to be had or still to be forfeited three centuries after Joshua. If so, it is still to be had or still to be forfeited, for certainly no subsequent fulfilment of the promise can be pointed to, if the entrance under Joshua was not such. There remains therefore a катátavots; or its equivalent a $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta a \tau \iota \sigma \mu o ́ s$, for the real people of God. $\dot{a} \pi о \lambda \epsilon$ íлєтаu] It is left over; that is, from God's resting. The resting of God Himself did not exhaust the rest. It remains over, from and after God's resting, that His creatures, or some of them, are to enjoy the rest with Him and in Him. The present tense (like that of каталєıторе́$v \eta$ s in verse 1) expresses a successive or continuous leaving over until the promise is fulfilled. For $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda_{\epsilon} \epsilon^{\prime} \pi \epsilon \tau a l$, see also verse 9 .
x. 26. Here the nominative to àтодєíneтац is the phrase twàs

tıvàs] Some, not none. Like the $\tau u t$ ès of iii. 16 , if the interrogative be given up there.

каì oi тло́тєрог] Some must enter. God's purpose of addmitting into His rest cannot be drfeated by any number of refusals. (Compare Rom. iii. 3,
 That is the first postulate. The second is, that the former recipients of the offer, the Exodus generation, did refuse it. Consequently, so far as they are concerned, the promise remains (as it were) looking for a response, waiting its opportunity of ful filment, which yet must come. The oi $\pi \rho o \sigma_{\tau} \epsilon \rho o v$ are the éкeivo of verse 2, the Exodus generation of Israelites.
 And why?
$\left.\delta_{c}^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \epsilon a v\right]$ Equivalent to $\delta l^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \pi \iota \sigma t i a v$, iii. 19. See notes on iii. $12,18,19$.
7. та́入ıv к.т.. .] These two things being so-(I) that the rest must be occupied, and (2) that the Exodus generation failed to occupy it-God again fixes a day, \&c.
$\left.\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda_{c} v\right]$ Over again. The first defining of a day had been to the Exodus generation. Now





iv．7．Or тpoefpysev．
again we have a To－day in Da－ vid＇s time．

סоí化］From öpos，a bound or limit，whether of space or time（Exod．ix．5，каі हौ $\delta \omega к є \nu$
 avpıov к．т．$\lambda$ ．Nehem．ii．6，каi
 $\xi_{\epsilon e v}$ means，to mark out as by a boundary line，to determine， define，fix，settle，\＆c．Thus in the Septuagint it means，（ I ）in the literal sense，to bound，Num． xxxiv．6，［in B］$\theta \dot{\eta} \lambda a \sigma \sigma a \dot{\eta}^{\dot{\eta}} \mu \epsilon-$ үá̀خ $\eta$ óptє （z）in the middle voice，to lay down limits for oneself，as in the case of vows，Sum．xxx．3， 4，5，каi тoùs óplf $\mu$ oùs aủrท̂̀s outs
 \＆c．In the New Testament， Acts xvii． 26 ，$\dot{\circ}$ if gas $\pi \rho о \sigma \tau \epsilon \tau a \gamma-$

 all senses of ordaining or de－ termining．Luke xxii．22，кãà
 $\omega_{\rho} \rho \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta$ nov $\lambda \hat{n} . \quad$ x．42，on $\omega \rho \iota \sigma-$




Síneєрои к．т．入．］Saying in David，so long after the Exodus period，Today；as it has been above quoted，To－day，if ye shall hear His voice，de．The $\mathrm{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{n}}{ }^{-}$ $\mu \in \rho o v$ is put first to give it greater emphasis．But in order of construction it comes after X $\rho$ óvor．
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \Delta \alpha v \epsilon i \delta]$ In the person of David as His inspired utterer （ $\pi \rho 0 \phi \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \mathrm{~s})$ ．See in．1，év roîs трофйтаия．
$\mu \epsilon \tau$ ar тобойтоv रoóvov］After so long a lapse of intervening time since the Exodus period．

ка日ìs троєíp．］According to the above quotation from Psalm xciv．Whether we read $\pi \rho o \in i-$ $\rho \eta \tau \alpha i$ or $\pi \rho o \varepsilon i \rho \eta \kappa \varepsilon \nu$ ，the $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha}$ in either case refers to the quota－ lion，not to the passage itself．

8．ai yafo］I say that the rest was still open when David wrote his To－day；for，if the en－ trance into Canaan under Joshua had fulfilled the promise of the катámavets，there would have beer no place for the Today of the xcvth Psalm．
av̌roús］The Israelites．


'Inoov̂s] Joshua. So Acts vii.



катє́т $\alpha v \sigma \epsilon \nu]$ Had rested them, had given them rest. See note on iii. It, ті̀v ката́таибаiv $\mu$ оv. The text does not contradict the repeated statements of the Old Testament on this point (Josh. i. 13, Kúptos ó ©́còs víû̀
 т $\grave{v} \nu \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu \tau a v ́ \tau \eta v)$, but only says that that resting was not the resting. The entrance into Ca naan left the true rest of God still open, to be accepted or to be refused.
 is, God, would not have been speaking (as He is speaking in the xevth Psalm) of another day.
 (further, additional) day, not a day of a different kind. Compare


$\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau a \hat{v} \tau a]$ After the entrance into Canaan. Acts vii. 7. xiii. 20 . \&c.
 plete the argument, we must understand, And if up to David's time the rest was still open, certainly nathing has occurred since to close it.
äpa] So. Sometimes with $\gamma \in$ added, as Matt. vii. 2o, äpa
$\gamma \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \rho \pi \omega \hat{\nu}$ к.т. $\lambda$. xvii.
 Sometimes (St Paul only) with ovir added. So then. Rom. v. 18 ,
 25. viii. ז2. ix. ェ6, I8. xiv. 19. Gal. vi. ıo. Eph. ii. ı9. I Thess. v. 6. 2 Thess. ii. 15 . Alone, and as the first word in the clause or sentence (which is not classical), it has a strong conclusive emphasis, as in Matt. xii. 28. Luke xi. 20,48 , ä $\rho a$

 Rom. x. 17. I Cor. xv. 18, äра каi оі коци $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ к.т. $\lambda$.
 $\theta$ avov. vii. 12.
$\dot{a} \pi \mathbf{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i} \pi \epsilon \tau \alpha 1]$ See note on verse 6.
$\left.\sigma a \beta \beta a \tau \iota \sigma \mu{ }_{s}{ }^{\prime}\right]$ Not used elsewhere in the New Testament or the Septuagint. But $\sigma a \beta \beta a \tau^{\prime}$ $\zeta \epsilon t \nu$ occurs in Exod. xvi. 30,
 $\tau \hat{\eta} € \beta \delta_{o ́ \mu \eta}$. Levit. xxiii. $3^{2, \sigma \alpha \beta \text { - }}$ ßatıєîтє $\tau \mathfrak{a} \sigma \alpha \beta \beta a \tau a$ víuiv. xxvi. 35. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21. The substitution of $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta a \tau \iota \sigma \mu$ os for ката́талбєs hereserves to identify the rest of God (Gen. ii. 2, 3) with the rest promised to His people.
$\tau \hat{\omega} \lambda a \hat{\omega}$ тô̂ © $€ \hat{v}] \quad$ xi. 25. And see note on ii. 17, тoṽ入aô.

 $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ aं $\pi o ̀ o ~ \tau \omega \nu \nu ~ i ́ \delta i ́ \omega \nu ~ o ́ ~ Ө \epsilon o ́ s . ~$


 a $\sigma a \beta \beta a \tau \iota \sigma \mu$ ós-for, \&c. This verse justifies the interchange of the two words кататavats and $\sigma a \beta \beta a \tau \iota \sigma \mu$ ós. The rest promised has the peculiar feature of God's rest after creation, that it is a ceasing from works.
 aorists point to the single, decisive, once-for-all act. The act of entering is an ipso facto resting. He that has once entered has at once rested.
aủrov̂...av̇tov̄] The former av̉rov̂ is God's, the latter the man's.
 Rev. xiv. 13 , цака́рео оі уєкроі....

 $\lambda_{\text {ov }} \hat{\epsilon}_{\epsilon} \hat{i} \mu \epsilon \tau$ avicûv. There the rest is from the ко́тot, the ép ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ a are not done with. An instructive suggestion as to the difference between earthly activity and heavenly.
$\tau \hat{\omega v}$ i $\delta i \omega v$ ] The word istos is rare in the Septuagint, occurring only teu or eleven times till we reach the Apocrypha. In the Now Testament it is frequent, used more than a hundred
times, and used by every writer.
 occurs nine or ten times in the Septuagint, of which six are in the Book of Job. Sometimes transitive, (r) to hasten, (2) to harry or agitate; more often intransitive, (r) to make haste, to be eager, and so (2) to be flurried or troubled. In the New Testament its use is confined to St Paul and the 2nd Epistle of St Peter; and it is always intransitive, to be earnest or enger: Gal. ii. ro. Eph. iv. 3. I Thess. ii. 17. 2 Tim. ii. 15. iv. 9, 2 1. Tit. iii. 12. 2 Pet. i. $10,15$. iii. ${ }^{1} 4$.
osv] Inference from the continuance of the promise, and the risk of forfeiting it.
éкєivpl] That rest which has been the subject of the foregoing passage.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu]$ As the footprint in which a following step is placed. Lest any one fall (by placing his foot) in the mark left by the step of the Lxodus generation.

T $\hat{\omega}$ aủt $\hat{\omega}]$ The same which they left.
vंтобєí $\mu \mu a r i]$ The word means something shown (exhibited) as

 ма́ $\alpha є \rho а \nu ~ \delta i ́ \sigma т о \mu о \nu ~ к а і ~ \delta и к \nu о и ́ \mu є \nu о s ~ a ̈ \chi \rho \iota ~ \mu \epsilon-~$
a substratum for action of some kind: for example, a copy set to practise writing or drawing, or an act done to be imitated, or a representation of something for instruction, \&c. The word vimódє ${ }^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{a}$ occurs three times in the Apocrypha: Ecclus. xliv.

 In the New Testament, John





 23. James v. 10. 2 Pet. ii. 6, то́ $\lambda \epsilon เ s . . . v \pi \dot{\text { v }} \delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu a \quad \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$

$\pi \epsilon^{\prime} \sigma \eta$ ] Rom. xi. 1I, $\mu \grave{\eta}$

 $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon ́ \tau \omega \mu \dot{\jmath} \boldsymbol{\pi} \epsilon \in \sigma \eta$. James v. 12,

12. $\left.\zeta \omega \hat{\omega} \gamma \alpha^{\prime} \rho\right]$ Think not to escape their punishment if you $\sin$ their $\sin -f o r, d c$.
$\left.\zeta \omega \nu . . \delta^{\circ} \lambda.\right] \quad 1$ Pet. i. 23, $\delta \iota a ̀$ $\lambda_{0}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ vovios following, shown by the quotation inverse 25 to belong to dofoo, fixes the appropriation of $\zeta \omega \bar{\omega}$ vos also to $\lambda o ́ \gamma o y$, not to $\Theta \in \in \mathfrak{v})$.
ó dóyos rov̂ ©coì] Not the
personal Word of John i. 1, \&c.,
 $\mu \varepsilon v o s$ would scarcely be appropriate; but the utterance of God, specially in judging, that is, in discerning and discriminating. See John xii. 48, ${ }^{\circ}$


$\dot{\epsilon} v \epsilon \rho \gamma \eta^{\prime} s$ ] The later form of èvєр ${ }^{2}$ ós, at work, active, energetic. Not in the Septuagint (evepyós Ezek. xlvi. r). In the New Testament, I Cor. xvi. g, $\theta$ ' $\rho \alpha \ldots$




то $\omega \tau \tau \rho \sigma$ ] Only here. Not in the Septuagint. (In Isai. viii. I tópos is a substantive, slice, piece, tome.) The adjective is classical (Sophocles, Plato, \&c.).
$\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \in]$ After a comparative, as in Luke xvi. 8, фроvсн́́тєрос vimèp тov̀s viov̀s tov̂ фштós. 2 Cor.
 е̇кк $\lambda \eta \sigma$ ias. More often $\pi$ ара́. See note on i. 4 .
$\left.\mu \alpha_{\chi}{ }^{2} \rho a v\right]$ First in Gen. xxii. 6, ro: then frequent in the Septuagint (especially in Jeremiah and Ezekiel). In the New Testament it occurs 27 times, (1) literally, and (2) figuratively : as (1) Matt. xxvi. $47, \mu \epsilon \tau a^{\circ} \mu a \chi^{a u-}$ $\rho \omega ̂ v \kappa$ каì $\xi u ́ \lambda \omega v$. John xviii. 10 .


Acts xii．2．Heb．xi．34， 37 ． \＆c．（2）Matt．x．34，oủk єip $\eta \dot{\imath \eta \eta}$ ．．．à入入a $\mu a ́ \chi \alpha \iota \rho a \nu . ~ E p h . ~ v i . ~ 17, ~$
 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu \AA \dot{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu a$＠єо仑̂．

סí́ттоноv］Jud．iii．16，каì
 ठ＇́ $\sigma \tau о \mu о \nu, \quad \sigma \pi i \theta a \mu \eta \hat{s}$（span）тò $\mu \hat{\eta} \kappa o s$ аvंт $\eta$ s．Psalm cxlix．6，каi
 av̉т $\hat{\nu}$ ．Prov．v．4，каi ท̀коขך－ म́́vov $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o v \mu a \chi a i ́ p a s ~ \delta c \sigma т o ́ \mu о v . ~$ Ecclus．xxi．3．Rev．i．16，คо $\mu-$
 figure is that of a devouring animal．See 2 Sam．xi． 25 ，тотѐ
 фа́үєтає（A，фáүєтає B）خ̀ $\mu a^{-}$ $\chi^{\alpha \iota \rho \alpha}$

סєккои́ $є$ уоя］Reaching right through，going the whole length． Applied in Exod．xxvi． 28 and xxxvi． 33 to the middle bar which reached（or shot through the boards）from end to end．In the New Testament only here． But we have dockv．in Rom． xvi．19，and é $\phi \iota \kappa v$. in 2 Cor． x ． I3， 4.
$\left.{ }^{*} \chi \chi \rho\right\rfloor$ The two forms，$\mu \dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho t$ （ $\mu$ ккоós），to the length of，and $\alpha_{\chi}{ }^{\alpha} \rho \iota\left({ }_{\alpha} \kappa \rho \circ \mathrm{s}\right)$ ，to the extremity of， occur often in the New Testa－ ment，and apparently with no difference of meaning；for we
 4．Rev．ii．Io．xii．1I，and $\mu$ ќXpı Oavátov in Phil．ii．8，and $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota s$ аїцатоs in Heb．xii． 4.
$\mu \epsilon \rho \tau \sigma \mu \hat{v}]$ From $\mu \epsilon \beta^{\prime}(\zeta \epsilon \tau \nu$ ，to
portion or parcel out，whether for distribution（as in 1 Cor． vii．I7．\＆c．）or for severance（as in 1 Cor．i． 13 ．vii．34）．Here the latter：in ii． 4 the former．
 full division（ $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a, \psi v \chi \hat{\eta}, \pi v \epsilon \hat{v}-$ $\mu a$ ）is found only in 1 Thess． v．23．Elsewhere only $\sigma a \dot{\rho} \xi$ and $\pi v e \dot{\jmath} \mu a$（ $\sigma \dot{a} \rho \xi$ including both $\sigma \omega \mu \alpha$ and $\left.\psi v_{\chi} \eta\right\rangle$ ．The immaterial part of man is one and but one，and confusion of thought and language arises from forgetting this．When $\psi v x \eta$ and $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{u} \mu a$ are distin－ guished，as here，$\psi v \chi \eta$ means the immaterial part of man in its aspect towards this world， its affections，interests，ambi－ tions，occupations（including even the intellectual），and $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ the same immaterial part in its capacity of communica－ ting with and receiving com－ munications from God．Study I Cor．ii．I3－r 5．xv．44－46． Jude 19 ，$\psi v \chi<\kappa о i ́, ~ \pi v \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha ~ \mu \eta े$
 $\pi v \epsilon$ v́ $\mu$ atos here spoken of may lue regarded either as an abso－ lutely impossible thing（for the reason given above），mentioned only in rhetorical hyperbole，or else as a thing impossible with man，possible only with God． $\dot{\alpha} \rho \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i \mu \nu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu]$ The $\tau \epsilon$ is not both，but and．It couples the second pair to the first．The $\mu \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \mu o ̀ s$ of $\dot{a} \rho \mu o \grave{\imath}$ and $\mu \nu \epsilon \lambda_{0 \imath}$ is


made the parallel in the material to the $\mu \epsilon \rho \tau \sigma \mu o ̀ s$ of $\psi v \chi \grave{\eta}$ and $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ in the immaterial part of man. It need not be anatomically treated, in either case. The severance of the marrow from the containing and transmitting joints is made the acme of dissecting pow'er.
$\left.{ }^{\alpha} \rho \mu \omega \bar{\omega}\right]$ The word occurs in Ecclus. xxvii. 2, àva $\mu$ f́́ov áp $\mu \omega \nu \lambda i \theta \omega \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. In Eph. iv. 16 and Col. ii. 19 á $\phi \dot{y}$ is its equivalent (one from $\alpha{ }_{\alpha} \rho \omega$, the other from $\ddot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega)$.
$\mu v \epsilon \lambda \omega \bar{\omega}]$ Gen. xlv. 18, $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu$ $\mu v \epsilon \lambda \dot{\partial} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$. Job xxi. 24,
 diffused through his bones).

крьтько́s] Capable of discerning or discriminating by a process of sifting and separating. (The word is used by Plato, Aristotle, Lucian, \&c.)
 cesses of the $\theta u \mu$ s.s and processes of the vous. Feelings and thoughts. In the Septuagint (especially in Ezekiel) ${ }^{\prime} \nu \theta \dot{\imath} \mu \eta \mu a$ is the form. Both in it and in $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \nu \mu \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a i$ the idea of feeling or passion seems to be prominent, in the Septuagint at least. In the New Testament $\dot{e} v \theta i \mu \eta \sigma \sigma t s$ occurs in Matt. ix. 4 and xii. 25 , in both of which places passion rather than reflexion is in view. And so in the verb, in Matt.
ix. 4. In Matt. i. 20 and Acts x. I9 (where the revised text has $\delta \leftarrow \epsilon \nu \theta$.) it would be difficult to maintain this. The word $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$ vota is almost confined (in the Septuagint) to the Book of Proverbs, in which it is found ten times; as in xxini. 19, каі̀ катєú$\theta v v \epsilon$ èvoias $\sigma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ карб́ias. In the New Testament it oecurs only in I Pet. iv. I, Tŋ̀v avitウ̀v ëvolav (thought or idea) $\dot{\sigma} \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\sigma} a \sigma \theta \epsilon$.
13. ктívis] From its first sense, of the act of creating (Mark x. 6. xiii. ig. Rom. i. 20. \&c.), ктícts passes into that of created being, whether universal or particular: the latter here, and in Rom. viii. 39,

àфavis] Unmanifest, obscure. Ecclus. xx. 30, бофі́а кєкр $\mu \mu \mu$ е́ $\eta$

 34.
av̇тố...av̉тov̂] The latter, considering the rois $\dot{o} \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o i s$ with it, and the mpòs öv $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} v$ o $\lambda_{0}$ yos following it, may seem to be most naturally understood of God rather than of His word. It is not unnatural that the sentence should slide from the גóyos into the ©eòs whose $\lambda$ óyos it is. But this is not absolutely necessary: even the $\pi \rho \frac{1}{s}$ ô clause may be understood as saying that our dóyos has to do


with the $\lambda$ óyos of God，without actually personifying the $\lambda$ óyos， certainly without taking it of the Eternal Son．
$\gamma v \mu \nu a]$ Job xxvi．6，$\gamma \nu \mu \nu o ̀ s$


入aıov $\tau \hat{n} \dot{\alpha} \pi \omega \lambda$ cíạ．
$\tau \in \tau \rho a \chi \eta \lambda \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu a]$ A difficult word．Some senses of it are quite inappropriate here，such as that of the horse throwing its rider，and the aкáфos rрa－
 chief lines of explanation pre－ sent themselves．（I）It is a urestler＇s word．To seize by the neck（back or front），to grip or throttle．Hence to overmaster （as raîs émı日vpiaus in Plutarch， Philo，\＆c．）．（2）It is also a sacrificial word．To bars the neek for the knife．Hence $\phi$ a－ $\nu \in \rho о \pi о н$（patefacio）is given as its synonym．Decisive autho－ rity seems to be wanting for this sense，which yet would best suit the passage：for，with roîs $\dot{\dot{\sigma}} \phi \theta a \lambda \mu 0$ is following it，there must lie in it some notion of exposure．Some insist upon $\tau \rho a x \eta \lambda$ os being always the back of the neck，adducing the other New Testament places of its use（Matt．xviii．6．Mark ix． 42．Luke xy．20．xvii． 2. Acts xy．10．xx．37．Rom．
xvi．4）．The lexicons make no such distinction，nor does it lie on the surface of the texts quoted．On the whole，what－ ever the starting－point of the word，it seems as if $\pi \epsilon \varnothing \alpha \nu \in \rho \omega-$ $\mu \epsilon ́ v a$ must be its terminus． Naked and opened to the eyes． Some have seen in it the idea of the guilty creature hanging its head before the judge，but having it raised by the baring of the throat so as to be forced to meet the eye fixed upon it．
aúrov，$\left.\pi \rho o{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{s} \quad \mathrm{o} v\right]$ This is not to be read，of Him to whom． The avंrô is not emphatie but goes with toîs ó $\phi \theta a \lambda \mu o i ̂ s, ~ H i s$ eyes．Then $\pi \rho o \grave{s}$ öv begins an iudependent clause．
 ally，unto whom our word is． Mark the contrast of the re－ peated o $\lambda$ óyos．The word of God．．．unto whom our word is． In either case the $\lambda$ óros has to be interpreted by the context． God＇s word of judgment．Our word of account．For the lat－ ter，see Luke xvi．2，änódos ròv入óүov т g s viкогорías $\sigma o v$ ．Acts
 $\sigma v \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \hat{\eta}^{5}$ тaút $\eta \mathrm{s}$ ．Rom．xiv． 12，Є̈кабтоs $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \pi \in \rho \grave{\imath}$ є́autov̂ $\lambda$ ó iv．15．I Pet．iii．${ }^{5}$ ，$\pi \alpha v \tau \grave{\tau} \tau \hat{\varphi}$


 тoùs oưpavoús, 'I $\eta \sigma o u ̂ \nu ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ v i o ̀ ̀ ~ \tau o u ̂ ~ Ө \epsilon o u ̄, ~ к \rho \alpha-~$
 $\nu$. The Authorised Version is excellent in sense and phrase, only it fails to mark the contrast of the two dóroc.

14-16. These three verses are best regarded as forming a sort of transitional paragraph from the second to the third topic, from Christ and Moses to Christ and Aaron. The word á $\rho \chi \iota \epsilon \rho \in ́ a$ twice repeated might claim them for the latter, but not decisively: see ii. 17 and iii. 1, in both of which the same word occurs, evidently by anticipation. At all events the ovv shows them to be an inference from the foregoing, as the rap of $v$. I shows them to be a preparation for the following. The incidental way of introducing new topics, characteristic of the Epistle, has been noticed on i. 4 and iii. 2.
14. $\left.\dot{\alpha}^{\rho} \chi_{\chi เ \epsilon \rho \epsilon 6}\right]$ See note on

 кail iєрє́a $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \mathrm{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ к.т. $\lambda$. In both places the stress lies on $\mu$ '́yav, great, mighty, powerful, in tacit contrast with the merely human and therefore frail and weak Levitical high-priest.

ס८e入. т. ovㅇ.] Having passed through the (lower) heavens into heaven itself, the very presence of God. Comparevii. 26, é $\psi \eta \lambda$ о́т $\epsilon \rho o s$
 $\theta \epsilon v \ldots$...is avitòv tòv oúpavóv, vivv


 $\rho \alpha \nu \bar{\omega} v$. It is not necessary to define the number of heavens which may have been in the idea of the writer (any more than on 2 Cor. xii. 2, á $\rho \pi a \gamma^{\prime} \hat{\prime} \tau \alpha$
 (I) The atmospheric heaven is called an ovjovos in Matt. vi. 26. xvi. 3. James v. 18. dc. (2) The starry sky in Matt. xxiv. 29. Rev. vi. 13. \&c. (3) The abode of Angels, Matt. xxiv. 36. Mark xii. 25. Luke xxii. 43. (4) Above all there is the heaven of the Divine Presence itself, Matt. vi. 9. John iii. ${ }^{5} 3$. vi. $3^{22}$. 1 Cor. xv. 47.
'I. тòv viòv 9. ©.] First the human name, then the august dignity. The one the assurance of sympathy (ii. 17, 18), the other the groundwork of confidence (Rom. i. 4).

кратөенє] From кра́тоs (strength) крaтề is (1) absoLutely, to have strength, to rule, as Job ix. 19. Prov. xii. 24. Wisd. xiv. 19, кратойvть $\beta$ оv-入ó $\mu \epsilon \mathrm{Vos}$ apécal. (2) to get or have the mastery of, to mule over, to lay or keep hold of, to seize or hold firmly, (a) with a geni-



tive, as Dent. ii. 34. iii. 4. Esth. i. ı, є́като̀v єіккотıєлтà $\chi^{\omega-}$



 31. v. 4 I. \&c. (b) with an accu-



 xviii. 28, каi кратй́гаs av̉̃òv ётйүєv. xxii. 6. xxvi. 48, aủzós
 xx. 23. 2 Thess. ii. 15, кратєíte тàs тарадórcis. Rev. iii.
 §ра́коута.
ópodo óas $\left.^{\prime}\right]$ See note on iii. I. 15. où үáp] We may well do so-for, de.
$\mu \eta$ ] Such as cannot. See note on iv. 2, $\mu \eta$.
$\delta v y \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon v o v]$ See note on ii. 18, dúvatal.

бovra $0 \hat{\eta} \sigma a<]$ The two verbs, $\sigma v \nu \pi a ́ \sigma \chi \epsilon \omega$ and $\sigma v \sigma_{\pi} \theta \epsilon i v$, occur twice each in the New Testament (neither of them in the Septuagint). The one is literally to suffer with, to undergo something along with some one. Rom. viii. І7, єïтєр $\sigma v \nu \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \chi о \mu \epsilon v$ $\kappa \kappa \tau . \lambda$. (compare 2 Cor. i. $5, \pi \epsilon-$
 то̂̂ єis $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \hat{a} \mathrm{~s}$. Col. i. 24, ávт-
 $\theta \lambda i \nmid \epsilon \omega \nu$ тои̂ $\mathbf{X \rho \iota \sigma т o u ̂ ~ e ́ v ~ t \hat { n }} \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa i ́$ $\mu o v)$. I Cor. xii. 26, दé T८ $\pi \dot{a} \sigma$ -
 $\mu$ é̀ $\eta$. Community of suffering is all that the word speaks of. (Passages quoted from Plato as implying sympathy are capable, I think, of the lower meaning.) The other word ( $\sigma v v \pi \alpha-$ $\theta$ civ) comes through adádos and $\sigma v \mu \pi a \theta \eta^{\prime} s$, and takes the higher idea, not of fellow-suffering but of fellowffeeling. Here, and $x$. 34, тoîs סєб (in both of which places $\sigma v v$ $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \epsilon \iota$ would have been untrue).
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta c v \epsilon i a u s]$ Want of strength is the idea of $\dot{a} \sigma \theta \in \mathcal{\epsilon} \in a x$, and in a large majority of its uses bodily strength and weakness is the thing spoken of. But our Lord enlarges its scope when He

 and St Paul repeatedly applies it to the infirmities of a scrupulous conscience (Rom. xiv. 2. xv. 1. I Cor. viii. 11, 12), a feeble faith (Rom. iv. r9), a defective spirituality (Rom. vi. ig. 8. 26), or an unstable character ( 2 Cor. xi. 29).
 ii. I8. The aorist there, the
$\chi \omega \rho i s \quad \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i \alpha s . \quad \pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \theta \alpha$ оủv $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ I6
perfect here, is applied to our Lord; the former regarding His trials and temptations as actually past, the latter as permanent in their result. The present is used only of those who are still on earth, and whose life is a life of temptation and trial still.

ката̀ $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \alpha]$ See note on ii. 17.

ка $\theta^{\circ}$ оросо́тŋта] According to (by a rule, on a principle, of ) similarity. So vii. 15, ката̀ тウ̀v одоі́отทта Мєддıбєб́кк. Jude 7,
 same thought is expressed in ii.

 $\theta \in \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon i s$ in verse 18.


 plication differs in the two places. Here it is the personal apartness from all contact with or contagion of sin. There it is the apartness of the second Advent from all connexion with that work of sin-bearing and propitiation which was the special object of the first. In vii.
 $\tau \omega \lambda \omega \nu$, there is a third thought, the present separation from a world lying in wickedness ( I John v. I9) of the glorified Saviour, who must personally leave the world (John xvi. 28. xvii. II) in order to the media-
torial work which is His now. The rendering here should not be except $\sin$ (Art. $15, \sin$ only except), but without sin. Tempted in all points like us, but in absolute severance from any the least admission of sin.
16. $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \operatorname{a}]$ A great word in this Epistle. Some-
 6. Sometimes with no dative, as in x . $\mathrm{I}, \mathbf{2 2}$, tov's $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi^{\circ}{ }^{-}$

 drawing nigh. This is religion in exercise-a constant coming to God. It is the opposite to that aloofness from God which is either the original condition of the fallen, or else the beginning of apostasy in the Christian.
 (The word is the root of $\pi \rho o \sigma \eta^{-}$入utos. Lev. xix. 33, éàv $\delta$ é tıs

 रúntov.) For another application see 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5. $\pi \rho$ òs öv $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi^{\dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon \nu о,} \lambda_{i} \theta_{\sigma \nu} \zeta \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha \ldots$
 $\mu \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ оїкоя $\pi \nu \epsilon \cup \mu а т \iota к о ̀ s ~ к . т . \lambda . ~$ There also, though the approach is to Christ, and the figure not that of a worshipper, but that of a temple, the same present tense of the $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \chi^{\rho} \mu \epsilon v o l$ speaks of an habitual and constant access, not of oneeffected by a single effort. In the other place of its occurrence in this Epistle (xii.

 $\beta o \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota \alpha \nu$ ．


18，22，тробє $\lambda \eta \lambda \dot{v} \theta a \tau \epsilon \quad \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. the figure is that of the faith－ ful people gathered already（like yet unlike the Israelites at Mount Sinai）at the heavenly city，for present communion with saints and Angels，and with the God and Saviour of all．St Paul only once uses троб白 $\rho \in \sigma \theta a c$ ，and that in a peculiar sense，I Tim．vi．3，
 accedé to）íyuávovarı 入ójous $\kappa$ к． $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ．

таррпбias］See note on iii． 6.


 2．xxii．I，3，каì ì $\theta$ рóvos тoù
 к． $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ． ．

Tîs $\chi^{\text {ápıros }] ~ G e n i t i v e ~ o f ~}$ characteristic quality．
$\lambda a ́ \beta \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \ldots \epsilon \bar{\jmath} \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \nu]$ Take， by putting forth the hand for it． Find，as the result of seeking．
 xiii． $45,46, \zeta \eta$ гои̂vтє ка入оvis $\mu \alpha \rho$ ．
 к．.$\lambda$ ．In some passages the idea of seeking is minimized，and finding seems to be equivalent to gaining without any impli－ cation of previous search．Matt．
xi．2g．John x．9． 2 Tim．I． 18．\＆e．
$\left.{ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda_{\text {eos }} . . . \chi \chi^{\prime} \rho \iota \nu\right]$ See the Rubric in the Communion Service be－ fore the Commandments．In xápss the thought is free favour， implying entire absenee of merit； it is the opposite of é $\varnothing \in i \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ （Rom．iv．4）；but it might be shown to a worthy and irre－ proachable person．In ể $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ there is the further thought of the presence of demerit；it is kindness to the sinful．
 pas єن̉каípov．We have єن̇каєрía in Matt．xxvi．16．Luke xxii． 6．Also ékaípos Mark xiv． 11． 2 Tim．iv．2．And evkal－ $\rho \epsilon \overline{i v}$ Mark vi． 3 I ．Acts．xvii． 21．I Cor．xvi． 12.
$\beta o r, \theta \in u \nu]$ Acts xxvii． 17. （only）．See note on ii． 18 ．

V．I．$\left.\pi \hat{a} s \gamma^{\prime} \rho\right]$ We enter here upon the third and largest section of the Epistle．Christ and Aaron．It embraces three subsections．（1）The priest－ hood，（2）the sanctuary，（3）the sacrifice．An exact assignment of chapter and verse to each of these topics is not possible，for reasons already assigned．Each topic shades off into the next， and the exact point of transi－


v. 1. Or omit te.
tion might be fixed differently. But speaking cautiously we may yet say that the subsection of the priesthood occupies chapters v. vi., and vii. ; that of the sanctuary chapters viii. and ix.; and that of the sacrifice chapter x ., in which however application and exhortation begin at verse 19 , and fill the rest of the Epistle.
fá $\rho]$ Reason for the above description of our High Priest, and for the exhortation founded upon it. That reason is, that Christ satisfies the two conditions of priesthood, which are (1) a human nature, and (2) a divine appointment. The former condition is stated in verses I to 3 , the latter in verse 4 . The application to Christ begins in verse 5 with the latter of the two conditions, and turns to the former in verse 7 .
è $\xi \mathbf{a} v \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu]$ Not, every high priest that is taken from among men, but, every high priest, being taken, dc. The
 $\mu$ enos belongs not to the subject but to the predicate of the sentence. To be tahen from among men, for a particular purpose, is one of two conditions of priesthood.
$\left.\lambda а \mu \beta a v o ́ \mu \epsilon v_{0}\right]$ Num. viii.
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ( B omits $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ) vî̀v 'lopá̀n, ка.i áфaүvcî̀s avंтoús. The present participle expresses from time to time.

 xxiv. 45. Acts vi. 3. vii. 10. $\& \mathrm{sc}$.
 on ii. 17 .
$\pi \rho о \sigma \phi$ я́ $\bar{n}]$ The verb $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma$ $\phi$ éper occurs 20 times in this Epistle (and $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi o \rho a ̀$ five). It is not used by St Paul (who however has $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi o \rho a$ twice) nor in any other Epistle. St James and St Peter use àaф'́peev, which occurs also four times in this Epistle. The exact idea of $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota$ is the bringing of the victim to the altar of sacrifice; of duaф́$\rho \epsilon \iota$ the bringing $u p$ (with some thought perhaps of an elevated altar, James ii. 21,
 peov. I Pet. ii. 24, àv'́vє $\gamma \kappa \in$ $\ldots e ̀ \pi i$ тò $\xi \dot{\prime} \lambda o p$ ). The tense here expresses may keep offering.
$\delta \omega ि \rho \alpha ́ \tau \epsilon \kappa$ к. 0.$]$ When $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho a$ and $\theta$ voíac occur together, it is most natural to understand the latter of animal sacrifices, and the former of all other offerings. Otherwise either might


cover both. See Matt. xxiii. 18, 19, тò $\theta v a t a \sigma \pi \eta$ piotov tò áytálov тò $\delta \hat{0} \rho o v$. Lev. vii. 9 (B vi. 39),

 к.т.入. The combination, $\delta$. каi $\theta$., is found also in viii. 3 and ix. 9. If the distinction is to be made here between $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho a$ and $\theta v \sigma i a L$, then $\dot{v i \pi \grave{\rho} \rho} \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i \omega \hat{\omega}$ must be read only with the latter.
2. $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho เ o \pi a \theta \epsilon \hat{v}]$ Only here. (Even $\mu$ é $\boldsymbol{f}$ oos is not in the Septuagint, and in the New Testament only in the adverb, Acts xx. 12.) It is formed from $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho \iota o \pi a \theta \eta^{\prime}$ s, the mean between passionateness and indifference. So here, to be temperately affected towards, the opposite alike of violent anger and utter indifference. To be patient with, gentle to. It differs from $\sigma \nu \mu \pi a \theta \in \hat{\varepsilon}$ in not expressing fellow-feeling but feeling towards.

סuvá $\mu \in \nu=s]$ See notes on ii. 18 and iv. 15 .
á $\gamma v=o \hat{v} \sigma(v]$ Compare ix. 7, $\tau \omega \hat{\tau} \tau 0 \hat{v} \lambda a o \hat{a}$ à $\gamma \vee о \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$. It is the mildest of the names for sin, but does not imply total or absolute ignorance of its being sin, but rather that confused idea of it which is itself brought about by the $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho-$ tios (iii. 13) acting upon frailty through passion. See I Tim. i.
 тiq. Acts iii. 17 , катà ä̀ àvo九av


 avi $\frac{\omega}{\omega} \nu$ (an instructive parallel). I Pet. i. 14 , $\tau$ ais $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$ è $\nu \hat{\imath}$
 Litany distinguishes 'sins, negligences, and ignorances.' Ignorance is not innocence, except it be (1) total, (z) involuntary, and (3) irremovable by effort and enquiry.


 is that of straying or roving from the right way or the true owner. See iii. ro. 2 Tim. iii. 13, $\pi \lambda \alpha \nu \omega ิ \nu \tau \epsilon$ каі $\pi \lambda a \nu \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \iota$ (showing that the error is not necessarily venial or excusable).


$\pi \in р i ́ к \epsilon є \tau a \ell$ From to lie around, with $\pi \in \rho i$ (Mark ix. 42. Luke xvii. $2, \pi \epsilon \rho$ iкєє $\tau \alpha \iota \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{ }$
 (Heb. xii. 1, $\pi \epsilon \rho є к є \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ vé $\phi$ os) comes a secondary use, to have lying around one, to be surrounded by, with an accusative. See 4 Macc. xii. 3, ópôv

 $\pi \in \rho i ́ к є ц \mu a t$. Is compassed with infirmity.

 $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \iota \omega \bar{\nu}$. каi oủ $\chi \dot{\epsilon} \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\omega}$ тts $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha^{\prime} \nu \in \iota ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu 4$


> dádéveav] See note on iv. 15.
> 3. кaì ठo' aùvív] And because of it is bound, \&c. Remove the stop from the end of verse 2 , to mark the intimate connexion of the two thoughts.
ó $\phi \in$ ídcl $\left.^{\prime}\right]$ See note on ii. 17, wфє ${ }^{\text {wer. He incurs the obliga- }}$ tion of the кaì $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ éaurov $\pi \rho \circ \sigma-$ $\phi$ ф́ $\rho \in t$. The change from tav $\tau \eta v$ to aù $\dot{\boldsymbol{j}} \mathrm{v}$ eases the interpretation, which might otherwise have seemed to make this a condition of priesthood in the abstract, and so to involve an imputation of personal need of atonement in Christ. This last is a supposition so utterly adverse to the plain statements of this Epistle, as well as of all Scripture, that it confutes itself. But in fact this clause is secondary and subordinate to the general thought, which is that the priest himself must be human.
$\pi \epsilon \rho i . . . \pi \epsilon \rho i . ., \pi \epsilon \rho i]$ The revised text substitutes the third $\pi \in \rho i$ for the $\dot{u} \pi \grave{c}_{\epsilon} \rho$ of the received. It is the regular preposition for the sin-offering.

See, for example, Lev. xvi. 5 . Psalm xl. 7. Rom. viii, 3. $\kappa \alpha i ̀ \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\text { t.avinovi] }}$ The reference is to the ceremonies of the day of Atonement. See Lev. xvi. throughout. 'This was the only occasion on which the high priest, as such, concurred with the congregation of Israel, gathered together as one whole, in a common acknowledgment both of a moral and legal need of Atonement.'
4. кai oủ $]$ Secondcondition. The first was a common humanity, the second is a divine appointment.
$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \mu \dot{\eta} v]$ The honowr attaching to the high priesthood. It is not necessary to depart from the common use of $\tau<\mu \eta$ ' so as to make it mean the office. Perhaps we might render it the dignity, which combines the two ideas.
$\dot{a} \lambda \lambda a \dot{a}$ калоúpevos] Not to himself does a man take this dignity, but he takes it when called by God. For кa入єîv see Matt. iv. 2i. Mark i. 20.

каӨю́блє $]$ Only here.
5. ov̉т $\omega$ s] Application to Christ of the two conditions of





priesthood. And first of the latter, the divine appointment.
oủ $\mathfrak{e ́ a \nu \tau o ̀ v ~ \epsilon ́ \delta o ́ g a \sigma \epsilon v ] ~ J o h n ~}$


 xiii. 32. xvii. $1,5$.
$\gamma \in \eta \theta \hat{\eta} v a 1]$ He took not to Himself the dóga of becoming. Explanatory infinitive. 2 Cor. xi. 2. Rev. xvi. 9. \&c.
 said, and who called Him to the priesthood by saying, Yiós $\mu$ ov к.т.入. Compare Acts xiii. 33, where St Paul quotes the same verse (Psalm ii. 7) in proof of the resurrection of Christ: a ava$\sigma \pi \eta \dot{\sigma a s}$ 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v}$ (verse 34, €к
 $\mu \circ v$ eI $\sigma \dot{\prime}$ к.т. $\lambda$. This is rightly read as a Psalm for Easter Day. Compare also Rom, i. 4. The resurrection was the virtual investiture of Christ with the Priesthood. The exercise of it waited for the Ascension, which was to the Resurrection as the coronation is to the accession of a sovereign.
$\left.\sigma \eta^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \rho 0{ }^{2}\right]$ See note on i. 5 :
6. ка $\theta \omega \mathrm{\omega}$ каi] And this testimony accords with another.

Ėv érépw] Elsewhere (namely in Psalm cx. 4). But $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \dot{\varepsilon} \rho(\underset{\sim}{c}$ is neuter, not masculine. See note on iv. 5 , ėv тoúre.

тáELv] Properly arranging, and so arrangement, order, position, rank, class, icc. Num. i.


 $\tau \rho i \beta \omega \nu$ B) au̇т $\omega \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Job xxxviii. 12. dec. Hab. iii. II,


 40, кaтà $\tau \alpha ́ \xi \iota v ~ \gamma \iota v e ́ \sigma \theta \omega$. Col. ii. 5, $\beta \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega \nu \dot{\imath} \mu \omega \bar{\omega} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \xi \iota v$. Here, according to (on the scale of ) the rank (or position) of Melchizedek.
7. ös iv] This is practically the transition to the former of the two conditions of priesthood as satisfied in Christ, namely, the possession of a human nature. But, like other transitions of the Epistle, it is not formal but natural and almost casual in its introduction.
rais $\dot{\eta} \mu . \quad$ r. $\quad$. avitov̂] A phrase formed like those of
 रias av̉тoû. ii. 22. ix. 5 I , งàs


 xvii. 26 , èv taîs $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a t s$ tov̂ vioû тov̂ ${ }^{2} v \theta \rho$ ó́trov. Acts v. 37. xxi. 26. \&c. Somewhat characteristic (apparently) of St Luke, and, if so, one of the many links between him and the style of this Epistle.

Tर्गs oapkós] Of His abode on earth in flesh. John i. 14, io

 катà бápка. viii. 3. ix. 5. Eph.



 r Pet. iii. 18. iv. x. 1 John


$\delta \in \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \in \mathrm{s}]$ For the plural see Luke ii. 37, vךбтєiaus каì $\bar{\delta} \not \eta^{\prime}-$ gear. v. 33. 1 Tim. ii. I,
 дарибтias. $\quad 2$ Tim. i. 3 .
iкєт $\boldsymbol{q} \boldsymbol{i} a s]$ Originally a femenine adjective (with $\rho \dot{\rho} \beta \boldsymbol{\beta} \delta \delta_{o s}$ understood), the olive branch which was the badge of the suppliant, iкєтクрia became afterwards a synonym of iкєтєía, supplication. None of the cognates of iкétys occur elsewhere in the New Testament. In the Septagint they are frequent. Thus iкєтпрía (as here, with ס́́qo cs), Job xl. 27 ( $\mathrm{B}_{22}$ ), $\lambda a \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$ ठ́́



 токра́тороs. Ecclus. iv. 4. xxxvi.

 xix. 17. Psalm xxxvii. 7. Wisd. xiii. ı8. xix. 3. 2 Macc. xi. 6 . Also ixeteía, Ecclus. xxxv. I4. li. 9. 2 Mace. iii. I8. viii. 29. xii. 42. And iкєтía, 2 Macc. x. 25 .
 (addressed to) Him that was able to save Him out of death, and with reference to that ability. It is not a mere attribute of God, one out of many, but the appropriate one for the time and case. See xi. ry, 入oүıcá-
 Suvatòs of ©és.
$\left.\left.\boldsymbol{\sigma} \omega{ }^{\prime}\right\} \epsilon \epsilon \nu\right]$ See note on i. 14 ( $\sigma \omega$ т $\eta \mathrm{i}(a \nu$ ) for the two ideas of $\sigma \omega \dot{\zeta} \epsilon \nu$, to preserve and to save. $\sigma \dot{\omega} \zeta \epsilon \in \dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ ] John xii. ${ }^{27}$,

 өavátov. The meaning might be either to save out of a thing threatened, or to save out of a thing incurred. In the one
 to save from dying, in the other to raise from death. Either sense would be true as a divine attribute. The latter seems the higher and the more inclusive. He who can raise the


dead can do all things. Mark xiv. 36 , ' $A \beta \beta$ á, ó тато́ $\rho$, тávта


$\mu \in \tau а \grave{\kappa \rho}$. i $\sigma \chi$. к. $\delta$ акр.] An evident reference to the Agony, though neither of the two particulars is actually expressed in the Gospel record. Matt. xxvi.

 iv. 24, $\pi \epsilon \rho i ́ \lambda v \pi o ́ s ~ \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \psi . \mu$.


 Өро́ $\mu$ ßоя аїцатоs ката $\beta$ а́vоитеs


краvүท̄s] A cry (土) of alarm,
 'IOov' к.т. $\lambda$. (2) Of strife, Acts xxiii. 9. Eph. iv. 3I. (3) Of anguish, here, and Rev. xxi. 4. Compare the крá̧ecv of Matt. xxrii. 50.

סaxpúwv] The only decisive mention of the tears of Christ is in John xi. 35. For in Luke xix. 41 the word used is клaíctr, of which the point is rather wailing than weeping, though both might be true.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon$ к'́ $\gamma к а \varsigma$ ] The sacrificial
 iкєтクpiac of the days of His flesh were a kind of anticipation of the future priestly mediation. For $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi \dot{\phi} \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ see note on verse I. There is no instance ${ }_{y}$ among
the 25 uses of the word ( $\pi$ poor-
 Epistle, of any slighter or vaguer thought having place in it.

каì єібакоvб $\theta \epsilon i ́ s]$ The prayer was heard, listened to, that is, accepted, granted. This is always the force of civaкоv́єiv in connexion with prayer. Matt. vi.
 ס́énois gov. Acts x. 31. The prayer of Christ was not granted, if it was a prayer to be saved from dying. This should guide our interpretation of the prayer in Gethsemane, and its anticipation in John xii. 17. The prayer was not for deliverance from dying (which was the very purpose for which He came) but for relief from the horror of great darkness (Gen. xv. 12) which was upon Him in the conscious sin-bearing of Gethsemane and Calvary. He was leard, ( I ) in the appearance of the Angel from heaven strengthening Him (Lake xxii. 43); (2) in the support given Him through the agony and passion; (3) in the safe entrance of the soul into paradise; (4) in the quickening and resurrection. The primary reference of the passage to the Agony in Gethsemane cannot be doubted. But that particular conflict was only

the crowning instance of others before it and of the final one following it.
$\left.a^{3} \pi o^{\prime}\right]$ In consequence of, as the result of. Matt. xiv. 26,

 סád $\omega r$. Luke xix. 3, oủk $\eta^{\prime} \delta \mathbf{v}^{-}$ vaтo àmò тố ồ $\chi$ доv. xxii. 45,
 xxiv. 4 I , àтò $\uparrow \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ रa $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{a}}$. John


 тov̂ $\phi \omega \tau$ о̀s є̇кєє́vov.
$\epsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda a \beta \epsilon i a s]$ The idea of $\epsilon \dot{v} \lambda \alpha^{2}$ $\beta \eta$ s is that of care in taking or grasping, and so (1) cautious, (2) scrupulous, (3) reverent, devout. Lev. xv. 3 r. Mic. vii. 2.
 Acts ii. 5. viii. 2. xxii. 12 (revised text). Hence єỉdáß $\beta_{\epsilon}$, here, and in xii. $28, \mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ \epsilon v ̉ \lambda a-$ ßєías кaì Śćovs (revised text). Josh. xxii. 24. Prov. xxviii.

 xvii. 8. The verb єن̉̉a $\beta \in \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \downarrow$ occurs (in the New Testament) only in xi. 7 of this Epistle, but very often in the Septuagint (more than 30 times, including the Apocrypha). Here the attribute of reverence or devoutness is given to Christ, and is even made the ground of His acceptance in prayer. So human.
8. viós] Son. Not a son,
as one of many. Yet not the Son, because the stress is to be laid upon the quality, not upon the personality. See note on i. 2,主v vị̂.
$\stackrel{\leftarrow}{\epsilon} \mu a \theta \epsilon v] \quad$ Not as though He had once been ignorant of it, but because it was a true discipline which developed it in action. The same thought lies
 ii. 8.
 antithesis.
 obedience; that which all know to have been His; or (2) obedience universal, all obedience. The latter perhaps is best.
viтaкойv] Properly submissive hearing. Rom. v. 19, $\delta$ à $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ข่ такойs тоv̂ évós. Phil. ii.

 And for the thought, John v.
 26, 29, ä ท̈коиба $\pi \alpha \rho \rho^{3}$ av̀то̂,
 $\pi$ тоє $\pi$ ávtote. \&c. \&c. In the Septuagint vizaкoฑ́ occurs only in 2 Sam. xxii. 36. In the New Testament it occurs eleven times in St Paul (Rom. seven times, 2 Cor. three, Philem. once), three times in I Pet. For the contrast between vimako ${ }^{\prime}$ and паракоу, see note on ii. 2 , тара́ $\beta$ абıя каі таракоп.
9. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \theta \epsilon_{i}^{\prime}$ '] See note on ii. го, $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha L$. Consum-

 $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \iota \epsilon \rho \epsilon \dot{\nu} \kappa \kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \xi \iota \nu \mathrm{M} \epsilon \lambda \chi \iota \sigma \epsilon \delta \dot{\delta} \kappa$.

II Пєрi ovi тод̀̀s $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu$ ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ к а i ~ \delta и \sigma \epsilon \rho \mu и ́-~$

mated. Perfectly qualified for the office undertaken.

тоі̂s viтaк.] Who habitually obey Him. A brief description of Christians. See $\dot{v} \pi$ кко $\eta$ above. His obedience to the Father, theirs to Him.
aitios] The personal cause of. An adjective, answering the purpose of a masculine of the substantive airía. Not elsewhere in the New Testament. In the Septuagint r Sam. xxii. 22. And four times in the Apocrypha.
owinpias] See note on ii. 3 .
aiuviov] Sce note on i. 8, cis tòv aiēva tov̂ aièvos.
10. $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \alpha \gamma \rho \rho \epsilon \theta \epsilon i s]$ This clause is appended in explanation of the aüt. $\sigma$. aicuiov. It is as the Melchizedek Priest that He saves. The word ( $\pi \rho \circ \sigma a \gamma$.) only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint, Deut. xxiii. 6, oủ $\pi \rho o \sigma a y o \rho \in v ́-$ $\sigma \epsilon \epsilon s$ єipquiкà aviroîs. Wisd. xiv. 22. 1 Macc. xiv. 22 (B 40),


 x. 9. xiv. 37, кaтà $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ ย vivocav

$\mu \mathrm{evos}$. To address or accost as, especially in public (áyopev́eco from a' ${ }^{\prime}$ opá'). The aorist here expresses one solemn utterance of divine recognition in this new character, whether at the time of the prophecy of Psalm cx. or at the moment of its fulfilment in Resurrection and Ascension.
II. Mepi ovi] Concerning whom; that is, concerning Christ as Melchizedek Priest.
$\left.\pi 0 \lambda \bar{v}{ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu} \mu \hat{\nu}\right]$ Literally, owr intended speech (discourse) is large (copious), and mysterious to speak (utter), for the reason which follows. For $\pi$ odìs here compare Acts xv. 32, $\delta$ dà $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v$


ठvбєрнйvєvтоя] Dificult of interpretation. Formed like $\delta v \sigma$ ßávтактоs (Luke xi. 46) and Sugvóqros (2 Pet. iii. 16). Not used elsewhere in the Septuagint or the New Testament. But ép $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sim}$ 42. ix. 7. Heb. vii. 2. (Oftener $\mu \epsilon \theta \epsilon \rho \mu \eta \nu$. and $\delta \iota \epsilon \rho \mu \eta \nu$.) Also ép $\mu \eta v \in i ́ a$ Ecclus. Prologue and xlvii. 17. 1 Cor. xii. 10. xiv. 26. And $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \eta v \in v \tau \eta \prime s$ Gen. xlii. 23.


èrei＇］This clause obviously belongs only to $\delta v \sigma \epsilon \rho \mu \lambda \dot{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ， not to $\pi$ odis also．
$\nu \omega \theta \rho o i]$ Dull，sluggish．Also vi．12．Not elsewhere in the New Testament．But in the Septuagint in Prov．xxii． 29. Ecclus．iv．29，$\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ yivov та⿱丷天 ${ }^{\text {v }}$

 yous oov．xi．12，é $\sigma \tau \ell \nu \omega \theta^{2}$ pòs

 $\rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon v ́ \epsilon$ ．Also $\nu \omega \theta \rho o \kappa a ́ \rho \delta \iota o s$ in Prov．xii．8．Probably derived （and voligs also）from the Ho－ meric ء̈ $\theta$ оцац，to regard（ovंк $\mathfrak{a} \lambda \epsilon$－

$\gamma \epsilon \gamma^{\prime}$ varє］The fault is re－ presented as one of declension and deterioration．See x．32，\＆c．

тaîs áкoaîs］Literally，in（as to）your ears．Mark vii．35，


12．каì $\gamma$ áp］For even．It is even the case that，\＆ec．It has come to this，that，dec．The каi prefaces and prepares for a strong and startling statement． Compare Mark x．45．Rom． xv．3． 2 Cor，v．4．\＆e．A close examination will always find either an also or an even in каi $\gamma$ үáp．
óфєidovtcs］When（or though） you ought．

ठuà тòv रoóvov］Because of the lapse of time since you became V．H．

## Christians．

रociav ${ }^{\text {en }} \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ The phrase
 by a genitive，as here，and in verse 12 ，and x ． 36 ．Sometimes by an infinitive（without $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ ），as Matt．iii． 14 （ $\beta$（ 16．John xiii．10．I Thess．i． 8．iv．9．v．I．Sometimes by iva，as John xvi． 30 ．I John ii．
 $\kappa \eta$ vipãs．Sometimes it stands absolutely，as Mark ii．25．Acts ii． 45 ．iv． 35 ．I Cor．xii． 24 ． Eph．iv．28．I John iii． 17.
$\tau \circ \hat{v}$ ठठठáбкєє $\dot{y} \mu \hat{a} s]$ The construction depends upon the alternative accentuation of the $\tau \epsilon v a$（ $\tau i v a ̀$ or $\tau i v a$ ）．If $\tau i v a$, it is the accusative before $\delta i \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota$, which will then have two ac－ cusatives after it：ye have need of some one＇s teaching you the rudiments，\＆́c．For this didía－ кєш тıvá $\tau \iota$ ，compare Mark vi． 34. John xiv．26．Acts xxi． 2 I ． If tiva，it is，ye have need of the teaching you what are the rudi－ ments \＆c．It is then like （though with the addition here of $\tau o \hat{v}$ before the infinitive）I
 $\phi \epsilon \iota v i \mu \hat{v}$（with no accusative expressed before $\gamma$ pódecv，as here none before $\left.\delta \delta \delta a^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \tau\right)$ ．In I Thess．v．I the active $\gamma \rho a^{\prime} \phi \epsilon{ }^{\prime}$ is replaced by the passive $\gamma \rho a^{\prime}-$

H

 ${ }_{13}$ ov́ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \bar{\alpha} s$ т $\rho о \emptyset \bar{\eta} s$ ．$\pi \bar{\alpha} s \gamma^{\alpha} \rho$ ó $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \chi \omega \nu \gamma^{\alpha}-$
v. гг. Or тıvà. Or кai oú.
$\phi \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$（impersonal），that it be written to you，that you be uritten to．

тà aтoıरêa］Derived from $\sigma \pi o i \chi o s(a)$ row），it seems to sug－ gest as its first meaning the members of a aroiरos，the ele－ ments which compose it，and so （as its readiest illustration）the letters of the alphabet．More elaborate accounts of it have been given，but this seems ad－ equately to explain its two scriptural senses，which are（I） the rudiments of learning，and （2）the elements of nature．Of the former application we have examples in Gal．iv．3，9，and in Col．ii．8，20，where the ceremonial law is described （with the addition of $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ кó $\sigma \mu$ ov in three of the four places）as a rudimentary system using the material world as its instru－ ment of instruction．The latter sense，that of the natural ele－ ments（earth，air，fire，water）， is found in Wisd．vii． $\mathbf{7} 7$ ，cióévat
 aтoгхєíw． 2 Pet．iii．10，12，
 тац．．．бтоьхєєа кашбои́ $\mu є а$ тйкє－ rac．In the present instance the former is clearly the meaning， the rudiments，the alphabet，of Christian doctrine．
$\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \alpha \rho \chi \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}] \quad$ May either（ I ） be attached to $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ arot $\chi \epsilon \hat{i} a$, the rudiments belonging to the be－ ginning，the initial rudiments， upon which combined phrase $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ 入ovicuv hangs；or（2）be taken as the substantial geni－ tive on which $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ doyi $\omega \nu$ is suspended，in the sense of the beginning（frst principles） of the $\lambda_{0}$＇ra．The same ques－ tion will arise upon v．i，qòv $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ à $\rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ тồ $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \circ \hat{\imath}$ גóyov， which also might bear either interpretation；the initial doc－ trine of Christ，or the doctrine of the beginning（first principles） of Christ．The Revised Version prefers the latter．But the phrase the beginning of Christ seems to want the help of some parallel use of $\dot{a} \rho \chi \gamma^{\prime}$ ．In the absence of this the former construction appears to be preferable．


入óyıa ©єои̂．Psalm xii．7，тà dóza Kupiov dóyea à ro3．Acts vii． 38 ． 1 Pet．iv． II．The term $\lambda$ óyıa is used also of human words．Psalm xix． 15 ，ка̀̆ є̈́тоутає єis єỉסoкíav тà入óүıa тоv̀ бтó $\mu a \tau$ ós $\mu$ оу к．т．$\lambda$ ．

үаддактоs к．т．ג．］For the metaphor，compare I Cor．iii．2，
 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \nu \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \omega \nu \quad \delta \dot{\epsilon} \quad \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \tau \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \quad \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \alpha \dot{\alpha} \quad \tau \rho о \phi \dot{\eta}, ~ 14$


1 3. $\pi$ ans $\left.\gamma^{a} p\right]$ Reason for heststation in entering upon the new topic. The $\lambda$ of jos is $\delta v \sigma \in \rho \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{v}-$ mos to persons in your condition, for those who require milk for their sustenance are in that infantine state which is ä äelpos
 little blending of the figure and the thing signified by it-that is, of the natural and the spiritaal infancy-in the introducdion of the words $\boldsymbol{a}_{\pi \in \epsilon \rho} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \delta$. where they occur. They compel us to understand the $\mu \epsilon \tau . \gamma \mathrm{a} \lambda$. more or less metaphorically.
$\left.{ }^{a} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho o s\right]$ Without experience of. The word is used only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint it occurs three times.
 (endless, limitless). Zech. xi. 15 , тоцц́́vos д̀тєípov (inexperienced, ignorant). Wisd xiii. 18, tò̀ ȧєєро́тatov (most helpless). In the Septuagint it is always used absolutely, without a genilive.
dor ${ }^{\prime}$ vv $\delta<\kappa$.] The absence of the article lays the stress on the quality. Such a thing as a 入ó jos $\delta$ ıкаเ ơúvŋs. The phrase is like that of I Cor. xii. 8,



 i. 18, 入ó $\gamma \underset{\sim}{\omega}$ ar $\lambda \eta$ च $\theta$ є́as. Speech, discourse, doctrine, having as its characteristic feature righteousness, Christian holiness in reladion to God and man. For $\delta_{t}-$ кacoov́v $\eta$ in this broad general sense compare Rom. vi. 13,16 , 18, 19. 2 Cor. vi. 7, 14 . Eph. iv. 24. v. 9. vi. I4. Phil. i. II. I Tim. vi. ı п. \&c.
$v \eta \dot{\eta} \tau o s]$ I Cor. iii. 1 , wis $\nu \eta$ $\pi i o s s$ év $\mathbf{X \rho t o r q}$.
14. $\left.\quad \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \omega \nu \quad \delta \epsilon\right]$ In verse I3 the spiritual infancy pradominated, here the natural. The two are inextricably blended.
$\left.\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon^{\prime} \omega \nu\right]$ Mature. The op-

 $\omega \mu \in \nu v \dot{\eta} \pi \iota o l . \quad$ I Cor. xiii. no, r I,

 $\pi a i \delta i ́ a ~ \gamma i v \in \sigma \theta \epsilon \tau a i ̂ s ~ \phi \rho \epsilon \sigma i v, a \lambda \lambda a ̀$


$\dot{\eta} \sigma \tau \in \rho \in \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho$.] Either ( I ) the
 article) of verse 12 is here taken up with the article. That or. $\tau \rho$. Or (2) the article may be generic. All $\sigma \tau . \tau \rho$.
$\left.{ }^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \xi} \xi t v\right]$ Habit. The result of practice. The word occurs only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint it seems to be used (sometimes if not al-
 какой．


ways）for the body itself．Jud，
 $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \tau \grave{o} \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda$ ．
aiot $\eta$ ripia］Organs of sense． Only here in the New Testa－ ment．In the Septuagint，Jer．
 Sías $\mu$ ov．
$\left.\gamma \in \gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma \mu \mu^{\prime} v a\right]$ Trained．Also xii．II，тoîs $\delta i^{\prime}$ av̉ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \epsilon \gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma-$ $\mu$ évoos．I Tim．iv． 7.2 Pet．ii． 14．In the Septuagint， 2 Macc． x． 15 （only）．

ס̌áкрıбır］Discrimination．
 $\delta_{\iota a \lambda o \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \omega ि r . ~ I ~ C o r . ~ x i i . ~}^{\text {IO，}}$
 In the Septuagint，Job xxxvii． 16 （only）．For $\delta$ какрivetv，see Matt．xvi．3，тò $\mu$ èv $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi o v$
 Also Job xii．11，oủs $\mu$ èv $\gamma$ àp



калой тє каі̀ какой］Gen．ii．

 тоипрой．iii． $6(7 \mathrm{~B})$ ，ка入òv тò gúhov єis $\beta \rho \omega \hat{\omega} \tau \nu \ldots 2$ Sam．xix．


 $\alpha^{\gamma}{ }^{2} \theta_{o ̀ v} \hat{\eta}$ како́v．The primary idea of the text is the physical， for which ayäò and кало́v，
 the above passages）to be used indiscriminately．And the word aiv $\theta \eta$ rү́pta seems decisive in favour of this interpretation．

VI．i．Ato］Wherefore．Con－ sidering the shamefulness of such backwardness．
áф́́vтєs］Letting go．Leaving alone．Not in the sense of for－ getting or discarding，but in that of taking for granted，pre－ supposing，and rising from these to higher attainments．

тòv $\left.\hat{\eta}^{s} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s \tau . X . \lambda.\right]$ See note on v．12．The initial （elementary）word（doctrine）of Christ．
$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda$ ．］The article either （1）refers to the $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \omega \nu$ of $v$ ． 14，that $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon$ ór $\eta \mathrm{\eta}$ s which has been implied in the mention of $\tau \boldsymbol{e} \lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ above．Or（2）it is generic．All $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \circ$ ót $\eta \mathrm{s}$ ．

тєлєเóтๆта］Maturity．Ripe－ ness of age in Christ．The noun occurs only liere and in Col．iii． 14．See note on $v$. r4，$\tau \in \lambda \in i ́ \omega v$ ．
$\phi \in \rho \dot{\mu} \mu \theta a]$ Let us be borne along．The idea is that of（r）im－ pulse，（2）impetuosity．Movement under a motive power．Actsii． 2 ． Heb．ix．16． 2 Pet．i． 21, víò $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\prime}-$



## 

tion arises，whether（i）the author speaks here，using the plural of authorship，and pro－ posing a thesis for treatment in an opening section；or（2）the man，identifying himself with his fellow Christians，and ani－ mating himself and them to a higher attainment in Christian knowledge and life．The former view appears to be that of the Revised Version，which evi－ dently regards $\lambda$ óyov as dis－ course，not doctrine（perhaps on the strength of v．ir，ó $\lambda \hat{o}^{\prime} \gamma o s$ ）， and renders it ，let us cease to speak of，\＆c．But this seems far less touching and beantiful than the altermative，and less suitable to the grave passage which follows in verse 4 as the reason for the $\phi \varepsilon \rho \dot{\mu} \mu \epsilon \theta$ a．There may well，however，be so much of the other thought，in com－ bination with this，as that the writer hopes to aid them in the ligher attainment by his pro－ posed teaching，and says，Let us press on together in this course，$I$ in my place and you in yours；I teaching and lead－ ing，you learning and follow－ ing．
and $\left.\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \iota\right\rangle$ Not laying again and again a foundation，com－ posed of elementary particulars of Christian doctrine such as these six which follow．
$\theta \in \mu e ́ \lambda \iota o v]$ See I Cor．iii． 10－12．There the foundation
is described as a single unit， Jesus Christ Himself．Here， the point of view being different， a few separate elements of funda－ mental doctrine are enumerated， as specimens doubtless of many． For $\theta \in \mu \mu^{\prime} \lambda_{l}$ os as a masculine in the singular，see the passage just referred to（ä入入ov．．．тò

 Rev．xxi．19，20，ó $\theta_{\epsilon} \mu \mu^{\prime} \lambda_{\text {tos }} \delta$ трш̈тоs к．т．$\lambda$ ．The other passages are indecisive as to the gender in the singular，and both genders are found in the plural：$\theta \in \mu$ é $\lambda \iota o$ in Heb．xi．io and Rev．xxi．14， 19：$\theta$ ecé $\lambda_{\mathrm{I}}$ a Acts xvi．26．In the Septuagint the masculine only seems to be used in the singular， and the neuter to preponderate greatly in the plural．

ката $\beta$ а $\lambda \lambda_{\text {о́ }}^{\boldsymbol{\beta} \epsilon \text { ооя }}$ ］The middle
 only here in the New Testa－ ment．Compare 2 Mace．ii． 1 3，кaтаßа入入і́ $\mu \in v a s$（founding）
 for ourselves（as if low down in the ground）．Plato，\＆c．，are quoted for this use．
$\mu \varepsilon \tau a v o i ́ a s$ ànó $]$ Six elemen－ tary points follow，forming three pairs．Repentance and faith are naturally the first two．
$\mu$ eтavoías］An after－thought， a changed state of mind．The word is formed like ${ }^{*} v y o u a$（iv． 12）．Here（with $\dot{a} \pi \hat{0}$ ）it ex－ pressly refers to a former state．

## 



And so the verb，with àmo （Acts viii．22，$\mu \epsilon$ тavónซov ỡv
 є́к（Rev．ii．21，22，ov̀ $\theta \in \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon-$
 $\kappa$ к．$\lambda . \quad$ ix． $20,2 \mathrm{I}$ ，$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega \nu$

 а’ка日арбі́ к．т．А．）．Elsewhere with cis tòv © $\operatorname{cog}$（Acts xx．21）．
$\nu \in к \rho \omega \hat{\nu}]$ Dead，lifeless，be－ cause destitute of the true life towards，from，and in God．So



$\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \varsigma]$ Soul＇s sight．Reali－ zation of the invisible（xi．1）． Specially，Christian conviction， apprehension of things and persons revealed by and in Christ．With a genitive，Mark xi．22，ё $\chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu$＠єо̂̀．Acts iii．16．Rom．iii．22， $26, \delta \iota \dot{\text { a }}$
 $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega$＇ $1 \eta \sigma o \hat{v}$ ．Gal．ii． $16,20$. iii．22．Eph．iii．12．Phil．iii． 9．James ii．i．Rev．xiv． 12. Or with eis，Acts xx．2I，Tìv єís＠єòv $\mu \in \tau a ́ \nu o t a \nu ~ к а i ̀ ~ \pi i ́ \sigma \tau \iota v ~ \epsilon i s ~$
 24．xxvi．18．Col．ii．5．Or with $\pi \rho \dot{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$, I Thess．i． 8 ，$\dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{i} \sigma$－
 with $\dot{\epsilon} v$, I Tim．iii． $13, \hat{e} v \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon$
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ and an accusative，as here． The verb（ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v_{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$ ）with $\epsilon \in i$ and an accusative is more com－
mon than the noun（nívis）． See Acts ix．42，$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon v \sigma a \nu$
 xvi．31．xxii．19．Rom．iv．5， 24．Each construction enu－ merated above has its point of difference．The simple genitive is the least marked，realization of．With eis，the thought is that of union；with $\pi \rho o{ }^{\prime} s$, that of relation；with $\dot{\boldsymbol{e}}$, that of rest； with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ ，that of direction．

2．$\left.\beta a \pi \tau \iota \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \delta_{\ell} \delta_{\chi} \hat{\eta} s\right]$ In construction $\delta_{1} \delta a \chi \hat{\eta} s$ precedes $\beta a \pi \tau \iota \sigma \mu \omega \nu$ ．We have here the first nember of a second pair of fundamental truths．Doc－ trine（instruction）of（concern－ ing）$\beta a \pi \tau \iota \sigma \mu o$ í．The form $\beta$ ám－ $\tau \tau \sigma \mu a$ is the regular one for the distinctive ordinance of baptism，whether that of John （Matthew，Mark，Luke，Acts） or of Christ（Rom．vi．4．Eplı． iv．5．I Pet．iii． 2 r）．In Col． ii． 12 the reading varies be－ tween $\beta a \pi \tau \iota \sigma \hat{\omega}$ and $\beta a \pi \tau i ́ \sigma-$ matr．The masculine form （always in the plural）is found only here and ix．to（ ca申ó－
 4，where it is expressly applied to the Jewish ceremonious washings of vessels and tables． （Neither form occurs in the Septuagint．）It cannot be re－ garded here as synonymous with the rite of baptism， though from its position as


vi. 2. Or omit the and re.

one of the foundation truths of the Gospel we might be inclined so to understand it. The doctrine of washings seems rather to point to the typical ablutions of all kinds preserved by the ceremonial law, and to their intended testimony to the defilement of fallen nature and its purification by the blood of Christ. This seems better than to explain the peculiar form and the plural number by bringing in other baptisms, such as that of Jewish proselytes, or that of the Baptist, of which the former was of human institution and the latter temporary in its intention. The Soठax $\bar{y}$ of types was no inappropriate part of the elementary instruction of Hebrew Christians, whether in its reference to atonement or to sanctification.
 interpretation of the $\delta i \delta a \chi \eta$ $\beta a \pi \tau \iota \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is correct, it may be well to keep that clause distinct and separate, aud so to make $\dot{\epsilon} \pi t \theta \epsilon \in \sigma \epsilon \omega$ depend not upon $\delta_{t}$ $\delta$ aX $\eta_{s}$ but upon $\theta \in \mu \in ́ \lambda ı o v . ~(T h i s ~$ however is doubtful, and not of much importance.) Of the $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i^{-}$ $\theta \in \sigma \iota s$ रє $\rho \rho \hat{\omega}$, not as an act of blessing (Matt. xix. I5. \&c.), and not as a preliminary to healing (Matt. ix. 18. Acts xxviii. 8. dc.), but as a Christian ordinance, there are two kinds. The
one is ordination (Acts vi. 6. I Tim. iv. 14. v. 22.2 Tim. i. 6), the other that sequel and complement of baptism of which we have examples in Acts viii. 17, \&c. and xix. 6. To this last the text refers. It is made one of the rudimentary truths of Christianity, doubtless with reference to that communication of the Holy Spirit, testified in the early Church by supernatural gifts, which shared with the forgiveness of sins the foremost place in the new Gospel (Acts ii. 38). Of this ordinance confirmation is either the continuation or the imitation. Why not the former? Miraculous gifts were never the chief part of the spiritual endowment ( r Cor. xiii. I, 2). Supernatural grace is as necessary and as real now. Infant Baptism, when it became the rule of the Church, made a spiritual coming of age indispensable. It is significant that the outward rite, the $\boldsymbol{e} \pi i \theta \epsilon \sigma$ s $\chi \epsilon \iota \omega \hat{v}$, is the same in confirmation and in ordination. Confirmation too is a giftof ministry, though it be only in lay offices, or in very humble offices, in the Church which is Christ's body. We have thus, in the second pair of foundation truths, virtually the two all-important doctrines of Atonement and of the Spirit, and the apparent


inferiority of this pair to the preceding and the following is exchanged for an absolute equality．And if there might seem at first sight to be some－ thing casual or arbitrary in the choice of these six fundamentals， that view has disappeared in the examination of them．Re－ pentance and Faith－Atone－ ment and the Spirit－Resur－ rection and Judgment－what could have been added of equal dignity？
 rest of the list this clause de－ pends upon $\theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda^{\prime}$ cov．The ab－ sence of articles gives the whole the character of a catalogue．
 （without articles）occurs in Acts xvii．32．xxiii．6．xxiv． 21 ． 1 Cor．xv．12，\＆c．In Acts xxiv． $5_{5}$ it is expanded into


 is distributed into an $\dot{\alpha} v a ́ \sigma \tau a \sigma t s$ そ $\omega \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ and an $\dot{\alpha} v a ́ \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota s$ крí $\sigma \epsilon$ ．

каі крі́натоs］We might have expected крírews．But
 $\hat{\eta} \lambda$ orv．Acts xxiv．25，кai $\tau 0 \hat{v}$
 difference is that between trial


alavíau］See v．9，and note
on i．8．When the subject is （as here）a world beyond death， we can know nothing of limita－ tions save what Scripture may tell．
 will execute this purpose－of rising to a higher height of Christian attainment－you and I together．
 reverent recognition of the dif－ ficulty of the task undertaken． Compare r Cor．xvi．7，éàv ó
 There the permission is spoken of as a single act，here as con－ tinuous．Compare James iv．


4．ádívatov 人á $^{\prime} \rho$ ］Reason for pressing forward．Backward－ ness is of the genus of apostasy， and apostasy is the sin unto death．There is some difficulty in arranging the five participial clauses which follow．They are all included in the roús．But are they five separate clauses， or are some of them combined first and then appended？It seems best to combine the words from the former $\gamma \in v \sigma a \mu$ fovos to aîeros inclusive，and to attach them by the former $\tau \in$（and）
 ing the members of the whole phrase three instead of five in number．Thus：$\tau 0 \grave{s}$（1）ä $\pi a \xi$
$\phi \omega \tau \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \alpha s, \gamma \epsilon \nu \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o u s{ }^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \delta \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\alpha s} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$
$\phi \omega \tau \iota \sigma \theta$ ย́vтas, (2) $\gamma \epsilon \cup \sigma a \mu$ évous $\tau \epsilon$ ...каі̀ $\gamma є v \eta \theta$ ย́vтац...каì $\gamma є \in \sigma a \mu$ е́yous, (3) каì таратєбóvтаs. This differs (I) from the text of the Revised Version in detaching
 and attaching it to what follows; (2) from the margin of the Revised Version (which it otherwise resembles) in rendering the former $\tau \varepsilon$ and instead of both. Compare I Cor. i. 3o, ös
 ठ七каьоти́vŋ тє каì àjuaбuòs каì
 margin of the Revised Version makes $\tau \epsilon$ both instead of and, and introduces into its text a further unnecessary complication. It is simpler and better to begin by combining the three
 тоגv́тршбts) with each other, and then to append them (thus combined) by the particle $\tau \epsilon$ (and) to the roфía above. A doubt will sometimes suggest itself whether, after all, such a particularity may not be hypercriticism, and whether the Authorized Version may not have done wisely in reading all the clauses (in both passages) as consecutive and separate.
$\left.{ }_{\alpha} \pi \alpha \xi\right]$ Once for all. It is used eight times in this Epistle, and only six times in the rest of the New Testament. It is always distinguished from $\pi$ orè
as semel from quondam. The place where it is most difficult to preserve its proper sense is
 which however the Revised Version rightly renders, though ye know all things once for all. (Like I John ii. 20, xpípua
 тávтa.)
$\phi \omega \tau \sigma \theta$ '́tas] The verb $\phi \omega \tau i \zeta \epsilon t v$ is used with ( I ) things, and (2) persons. ( 1 ) To light up, to bring to light; as 1 Cor. iv.
 i. ro, לぃŋ̀v каì à $\phi \theta a \rho \sigma i a v$. Rev. xviii. 1. \&c. (2) To enlighten or illuminate; as Luke xi. 36. John i. 9, $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau a a^{2} \nu \theta_{\rho \omega \pi} \omega v$. Eph. i. 18. iii. g. Here, and in x. 32 ( $\phi \omega \tau \iota \theta \theta \hat{\epsilon} v \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ ), it is applìed to that first great illumination which is the believing reception of Christ.
 sight we might understand this of the Holy Spirit. See John iv, 10 (comparing vii. 37-39).
 тvé́patos. viii. 25. x. 45. xi. 17. But the express mention of the Holy Spirit in the next clause forbids this. We must take it as expressing the great all-including gift of redemption itself (John iii. 16). Compare Rom. iii. ${ }^{15-1} 7, \eta^{\prime}$ xápıs $\tau 0 \hat{v}$



є̇тоираviou каi $\mu \epsilon \tau o ́ \chi o u s ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \theta_{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha s ~ \pi \nu \epsilon v ́ \mu \alpha \tau о s$
 $6 \mu \epsilon \iota s ~ \tau \epsilon \mu \not ́ \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau о s$ аī̄vos，каi $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon \sigma o ́ v \tau \alpha s$ ，

Seкaloavivys． 2 Cor．ix．15，
 aùrov̂ סcopâ．＂For étrovpaviov see note on iii． 1 ．
$\mu \epsilon$ тóxous］See note on i． 9 ．
yevntevias］That is，when you first believed and were bap－ tized．
$\pi \nu є \dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{aros}$ áciov］See note on ii． 4 ．
 $\gamma \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ has the accusative：in verse 4 it had its usual genitive． The two constructions seem to be equally used in the Septua－ gint．Thus Job xii．ir，$\lambda$ áper $\xi$
 $\rho v \gamma \xi$ $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \tau \alpha, ~ \beta \rho \omega \sigma \tau v$ ．Ecclus．
 mara Olpas．But in the New $^{\prime}$ Testament the accusative is found only here and in John ii．
 $\boldsymbol{\tau} \delta \omega \rho$ oivov $\gamma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu}$ vov（tasted the water as having become wine； tasted that the water had become wine）．Such a writer as the author of this Epistle would scarcely have repeated the word， and at the same time varied the construction，in two contiguous verses，without a reason，and the place of кa入òv suggests it． The sense is，and tasted ©eov $\dot{\rho} \not{ }^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{a}$ as ка入óv，or，tasted that the word of God is good，or，tasted the goodness of the word of God．

It is in fact equivalent to $\gamma \in v \sigma \alpha-$ $\mu$ ćvous öть ка入óv è évıv．See I Pet．ii． 3 （from Psalm xxxiv．
 Kúpıos．
©єoû $\dot{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha]$ Without the article．Such a thing as．The stress lies upon the quality．The $\rho \hat{\eta} \mu a$ is，however，the Gospel． See note on Rom．x．8，é $\gamma \gamma \chi^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$


 vi．17，тìv $\mu \alpha ́ \chi a c \rho a \nu$ тov̂ $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v}^{-}$




ठuvá $\mu \epsilon \iota$ тє］Evidently de－ pending upon $\gamma \in v \sigma a \mu$＇́rovs，and still accusative．Is it that the $\kappa \alpha \lambda o ̀ v$ still accompanies the yevaańvovя，as though to say， and tasted the goodness of the סvvaucis？Or is it only that it would have been stiff and awk－ ward to change back to the genitive？The former explana－ tion seems the right one：$\kappa a \lambda d \dot{s}$ $\gamma \in \cup \sigma a \mu e ́ v o v s$（that is，ö́c кадаi $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon}(\nu)$ ．
$\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda o v \tau 0 s$ aî̀vos］Powers of（belonging to）a future aićv， but capable of imparting their glory and beauty（see last note） to dwellers in the present．The
 （in contrast with of aimv ovitos of

## 

the verse before) of Luke xx . 35. It is practically identical
 ii. 5, only expressed under the figure of time, not of space. It is the Messianic age (see note
 which, though nominally and doctrinally begun with the first Advent (as completed on the day of Pentecost), is still practically postponed till the second Advent. The aiav is still $\mu e \lambda$ $\lambda \omega v$, but it projects its $\delta v v a \dot{\mu} \mu \epsilon s$ upon the believing inmates of the present. These $\delta v v a \dot{\mu} \epsilon \iota s$ were once, in part at least, miraculous gifts (see ii. 4, $\pi$ ocki$\lambda a \iota s \delta v v a \dot{\mu} \epsilon \sigma \Delta v$ ), but their higher manifestation, even then, was in spiritual graces and therefore the $\gamma \in v \in \sigma \theta a t$ is still applicable.
6. каі̀ таратєбо́vтаs] This brief clause bears the whole weight of the terrible contrast letween the past state (with its many gracious particulars) and the lapse from it. All these experiences of grace-and all forfeited.

таратєбо́vтаs] Again an aorist of the single act. The many blessings enumerated ahove are all dated from the moment of believing: so the forfeiture is summed up in the one act of apostasy. The verb maparimetiv occurs only here in the New Testament. But in
the Septuagint it is often used by Ezekiel, generally in combination with its cognate noun $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi т ш \mu a$, as in xiv. 3. xv.

 (where the last word gives to the $\pi a \rho a \pi i \pi \tau \epsilon c y$ the emphasis of the passage before us). xx. 27. xxii. 4. The substantive тара́ттниa, a fall beside (the way), is St Paul's word for (1) the fall of man in Rom. v. 15, 17, 18, тஸ̂ той є́vòs таратто́-
 тov̂ evo's к.т.入. (2) the national fall of Israel in Rom. xi. 11, 12. Elsewhere its use is more general, as in Matt. vi. 14 . Rom. iv. 25.2 Cor. v. 19. Gal. vi. I. Eph. i. 7. ii. 1, 5 . Col. ii. 13. \&c. The context points to the actual sin of apostasy as the meaning of the text. Thus it corresponds with the unpardonable sin in its application to disciples in Luke xii. ro, i John v. ı6, and Heb. x. 29. It is the final throwing away of grace, not any one sin of exceptional heinousness, which is the subject of all these passages. The other form of the unpardonable sin is that of obstinately resisting the evidences of the Gospel as borne by the Holy Spirit in Christ and His Chureh (Matt. xii. 31, 32. Mark iii. 29).
$\left.\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda_{c v}\right]$ Again. They had



been renewed once when they became Christians.
ávaкaıvísciv] Only here in the New Testament. (Elsewhere avacauvouv is the form of the verb. 2 Cor. iv. 16 . Col. iii. ro.) In the Septuagint it occurs in Psalm xxxix. 2. ciii. 5. civ. 30 , ảvaкautê̂s тò $\pi \rho$ ó́ ผтоу $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$. Lam. v. 2 I. I Mace. vi. 9 .
avactavpov̂vias] Added in aggravation of the guilt of apostasy. Crucifying as they do, \&c. The apostate Christian treats Christ as an impostor, and joins those who said (John

 word àvartavooûv occurs nowhere else in the New Testament or the Septuagint. In classical use it means simply to crucify ( ${ }^{\prime} v{ }^{\prime}$ à in the sense of up). But since $\sigma \tau a v \rho o \hat{\nu}$ is constantly used in the New Testament for the act of crucifying, the compound with aंva may well have the further sense of crucifying again or afresh, a well-known use of $\boldsymbol{a} v a \dot{a}$ in composition.
éavtots] To (or for) themselves. The thought is that of wilfulness rather than of detriment. Rom. xiii. 2, éavtoîs крі́ца $\lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \psi о \nu \tau а$.

Tòv viòv r. ©.] The august title marks the heinousness of the treatment.

тараঠ̈є $\gamma \mu$.] Only here in the New Testament. (Matt. i. ı9, סєсүнатíonı, revised text.) In the Septuagint, Num. xxv.
 Kирíu катє́vavtı тои̂ $\dot{\eta} \lambda i ́ o v . ~ J e r . ~$ xiii. 22. Ezek. xxviii. 17. To make an example of, to put to open shame. (Jude $7, \pi \rho о ́ к \epsilon є ข \tau а є ~$ бсī $\mu \mathrm{a}$.)
7. $\left.\gamma \hat{\eta} \gamma^{a} p\right]$ It is in grace as it is in nature. Opportunity lost, beneficent influence thrown away, is irrecoverable. Impossible to renew them again-for, dec. They are like land upon which rain has fallen with no response of fertility, and which now must be given up to its barrenness.
$\gamma \hat{\eta}]$ Land, ground. Luke xiii. 7 , iva тí каî $\tau \grave{\eta} v \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu$ катар-



 The aorist sums up the past receiving of rain into a single act, and then the present ( $\tau i{ }^{-}$тovora) expresses its continuous consequence.

є́ $\left.\rho \chi^{\circ} \mu \neq \nu 0 \nu\right]$ Luke xii. 54,


е́кєívoıs $\delta_{i}^{\prime}$ oùs каi $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma \epsilon i ̄ \tau \alpha \iota, \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{\nu} \in \iota$




ขंєо́v] Acts xiv. 17, oủpa-
 ро̀̀s картофо́роия.
$\beta o \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \nu]$ Only here in the New Testament. See Gen. i.
 хо́ртоу к.т. $\lambda$. Exod. x. 12, 15. \&c.
*iverov] Properly, wellplaced; and so, convenient, suitable, serviceable, dc. Luke ix.
 тov̂ ©eô̂. xiv. 35. Psalm xxxii.

$\left.\delta c^{2} \cdot o \stackrel{u}{s}^{2}\right]$ For the sake of whom. For whose benefit.
$\kappa \alpha i ̀ \gamma$.] Also (as well as being serviceable to them). The verb occurs only here in the New Testament ( $\gamma \epsilon \omega^{\prime} p \gamma{ }^{\prime}$ ov, r Cor. iii. 9 : $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ ( often). I Chron. xxvii.



єìdoyias] Gen. xxvii. 27,
 $\gamma \eta \sigma \epsilon$ Kv́pıos.
8. éкф́́povora $\delta \in$ ] But if it ( $\eta \hat{\eta} \hat{\eta}$, understood from $\gamma \hat{\eta}$ above) brings forth. Gen i. 12, kai

 17, 18 (г8, уя B), е̇тєката́ратоя

 Hos. х. 8, áкарөає каі̆ трі́ßодоє
 av่тढ̂̀. The New Testament
 in three connexions. (I) Matt.

 тàs àкávөas к.т.入. Mark iv. 7, \&c. Luke viii. 7 , \&c. (3) Matt. xxvii. 2g, $\sigma \tau$ é фаvov $\dot{\epsilon}_{\xi}^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \alpha \kappa a v \theta \omega \hat{\omega}$. John xix. 2. For трíßoдоє ( $\tau \rho \iota \beta \in \lambda{ }^{\prime} \eta^{\prime}$, three-pointed) in the New Testament see only Matt. vii. $16, \hat{\eta} \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \pi \grave{o} \tau \rho \nmid \beta o ́ \lambda \omega \nu \sigma \hat{\kappa} \kappa a$;
aंס́ккцоs] The opposite of
 unacceptable, unapprovable, unworthy, rejected after trial, refuse, reprobate. Isai. i. 22, тò а́p ix. 27. 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 6, 7 . 2 Tim. iii. 8. Tit. i. 16, $\pi \rho$ oेs
 катápas є̇ $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \chi^{\prime} \dot{s}$ ] Compare
 thought of katápa may come from Gen. iii. г7, éпькатápatos $\dot{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta}$. The expression is softened, to avoid the appearance of absolutely condemning the readers.
$\dot{\eta}_{5}$ тò $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ élos] In form like 2 Cor. xi. 15 , 心V tò télos ë éval $\kappa а \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{a}$ ढ̆ $\rho \gamma a$ aùtติv. Phil. iii.
 cis kav̂ ${ }^{2} \nu$ ] Deut. xxix. 22,
9. $\Pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon i \sigma \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ ס̀̀ $\pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \dot{\nu} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu, \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \eta \tau o \dot{\prime}, \tau \dot{\alpha}$




 $\sigma \pi а \rho \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \ldots . . \omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ катєбтра́фך इо́òона каі Ѓ́норра к.т.д.
 the fate of the Christian who has sinned the fatal sin, of having finally received the grace of God in vain. But we have better hopes for you. For $\pi \mathrm{\epsilon}$ $\pi \epsilon і ̈ \mu \epsilon \theta$ a, compare Rom. xv. $\mathbf{1 4}$,


 к.т.д. And for a like turn from severity to tenderness,

 бete.
 Epistle. Rom. xii. 19. 2 Cor. vii. 1. xii. 19. Phil. iv. 1 . 1 Pet. ii. 1 ir. iv. 12.2 Pet. iii. I, 8, 14, 17. I John ii. 7 . iii. 2, 21. iv. I, 7 , II. Jude 3, 17, 20.

та кр. к. $\bar{\epsilon} \times$. v.] Those things which are better (than the above) and pertaining to salvation. For креícrova, see note on i. 4, крєі́ттшv.
 $\theta a t$ ( $\tau v{ }^{\prime}$ 's) is to hotd or cling to, and so (of a thing) to be next to. Mark i. $3^{8,}$, tis tàs èxouévas $\kappa \omega \mu о \pi$ о́лєs. Acts xx. 15. xxi.

 $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\varphi} \rho \underline{\text { c. }}$ Acts xxi. i. \&c.) Here, pertaining to.

тwrypias] See note on i. r4. $\epsilon \dot{e} \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ ] Only here in this Epistle. Most frequent in 2 Cor. If even. If it is even the case that. Often with no touch of uncertainty. 2 Cor. if., 7 ,


 is found even with ou. Luke xi. 8 , єi кaì oủ $\delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \notin \epsilon . \quad$ xviii. 4.
 єi $\mu$.
oürws] So as above (v. 11 vi. 8).
10. ädıкоs] Unjust, not because withholding a reward earned by merit, but because faithless to His promise and engagement in Christ. Compare another aspect of the same thought in I John i. g, $\pi$ avoós
 тàs ápaptias к.т.入. The justice there is not founded on man's abstract right to forgiveness (a contradiction in terms), but on the $\delta$ caA $\eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ of God in Christ.

тov̂ üpouv] The life-work. $^{2}$ The sum of the individual Christian action. See I Cor. iii. I3 - 15 . Gal. vi. 4, тò $\delta \dot{\text { è }}$ épyov



 Thess. i. 3, $\mu \nu \eta \mu o v \epsilon$ viovtes $\dot{\nu} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$



 text omits rov̂ кótov before $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$
 1 Thess. i. 3 -
$\left.{ }_{\eta} \mathrm{s}\right]$ For $\ddot{\eta}_{\eta}$. The common attraction of the relative to the antecedent. See ix. 20, $7 \hat{\eta} s \delta a-$

$\dot{e} v \epsilon \delta \epsilon i \xi a \sigma \theta \epsilon]$ The middle voice of $\bar{\epsilon} v \delta \in \epsilon$ кvivat (to indicate or point out) expresses to show as one's own, to manifest as a quality or attribute; as (1) of God, Rom. ix. 17, 22 (from Exod. ix. 16). Eph. ii. 7. I Tim. i. 16. \&c.; (2) of man, as here, and Rom. ii. 15.2 Cor. viii. 24. Tit. ii. $10, \pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \nu$
 2.

єi's тò övopa aùrov̀] Towards His name. That is, towards Him as He is; towards Him as His word reveals Him. See note on i. 4 .

סtaк. каi סtaк.] By having ministered and still ministering. Rom. xv. 25, дıaкovav тоî́ á ýocs. (In this Epistle סıaкavév occurs only here, scaкovia only in i.
14.) Of uncertain derivation
(conjecturally from an obsolete verb Súáк to hasten), סá́кovos and its cognates (occurring nearly 100 times in the New Testament) are applied to service of any kind, whether to God or man. For example, (I) to serving in the house or at the table, in Matt. viii. 15 . Mark i. 3 I. Luke iv. 39. $\mathbf{x}$. 40. xvii. 8. xxii. 27. John xii. 2 ; (2) to personal attendance, Acts xix. 22. Philem. 13; (3) to charitable service, Acts vi. 2 ; (4) to the ministry of the Gospel, Acts vi. 4 . Rom. xi. 13; (5) to angelic ministry, Matt. iv. in. Heb. i. I4; (6) to Christ's own service on earth, Matt. xx. 28. Luke xxii. 27.

г I. è $\pi \in \theta \nu \mu \circ \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon \nu]$ It is our heart's desire. We desire is ambiguous. The Revised Version has sought to make it clear by substituting may show for do show. For é ét $\theta v \mu \hat{\epsilon} \hat{v}$ in this good sense (and with an infinitive following it), compare Matt. xiii. 17 , по $\lambda \lambda$ ої $\pi \rho о ф \bar{\eta}$ тає
 $\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon . ~ L a k e ~ x x i i . ~ 15, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota-$




 12 форíav $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ є̀ $\lambda \pi i ́ \delta o s$ à $\chi \rho \iota \tau e ́ \lambda o v s, ~ \grave{\imath} \nu \alpha \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \omega \theta \rho o i$

 1 Thess. ii. 17.
$\sigma \pi \sigma v \delta \dot{\eta} \nu]$ From $\sigma \pi \epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta \epsilon \tau \nu$, (1) haste, Deut. xvi. 3, $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} v \sigma \pi o v \delta \hat{\eta}$


 39; (2) earnestness, Rom. xii. 8, 1 . 2 Cor. vii. ir, 12 . viii. 7,8, 16. 2 Pet. i. 5. Jude 3. т $\rho$ ós] Unto. With a view to. As the end and aim of the $\dot{\epsilon} v \delta \epsilon$ íкvvataı.
$\pi \lambda \eta \rho о ф о \rho i a v]$ Col. ii. $2, \pi a \hat{v}$
 $\sigma v v \epsilon \sigma \sigma \omega s$. I Thess. i. 5, каi $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o ф о \rho i ́ a ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta}$. Heb. vi. іп, є́v $\boldsymbol{\pi} \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi$ орía тícteшs. The original meaning of the verb $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \phi о \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ is to bring full, to fill the measure of, and so to fulffl, complete, or satisfy. With an accusative sometimes ( I ) of the thing: Luke i. $1, \pi \epsilon \rho i$ т $\hat{\nu}$ $\pi є \pi \lambda \eta \rho о \phi$ ор $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \nu \omega \nu$ (fully established or proved) $\dot{\epsilon} v \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{i} v \pi \rho a \gamma-$ $\mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu .2$ Tìm. iv. 5, 17, т $\quad{ }^{2}$ סıaкоviav бov $\pi \lambda \eta \rho о ф о ́ \rho \eta \sigma о \nu . .$. ïva $\delta \iota^{2} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{\jmath} \hat{\imath}$ тò кй $\rho v \gamma \mu a \quad \pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ-$ $\phi o \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$. Sometimes (2) of the person: Rom. iv. 21, $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o-$ фop $\theta$ Eis (fully assured) oi ${ }^{\circ} \tau$
 idí $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ vồ $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi о р \epsilon i ́ \sigma \theta \omega$. Col. iv.
 The Revised Version here gives
fulness in the text, full assurance in the margin. There is nothing in the derivation to suggest assurance, and the word satisfy, satisfaction, seems to be the sufficient idea both of verb and noun.
${ }_{a}^{a x} \chi \rho \iota$ té $\lambda$ ovs] In iii. 6 and 14 it is $\mu$ є́रि॰ т тédous. See note on ${ }^{a} \chi \rho, \mathrm{iv} .12$.
12. ve日poi] See note on v. II.
$\left.\gamma^{\prime} \operatorname{\epsilon } \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon\right]$ In v. II we have rєүovaтє. Here the condition is spoken of as not yet determined. A merciful discrepancy. That ye may not turn out (be in the result) that which too many symptoms point to as your state now.
$\mu \mu \eta \tau a i]$ Not in the Septuagint (where however we have $\mu \mu \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, Wisd. xv. 9, and $\mu \dot{\mu} \mu \mu a$, Wisd. ix. 8). In the New Testament, verb and noun are peculiar to St Paul and this Epistle (xiii. 7, $\mu_{t}$ $\mu \in i \sigma \theta \in \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \pi i \sigma \tau \nu v)$, with the single exception of 3 John I I ( $\mu \grave{\eta} \mu \mu \mathrm{ov}$ тò како́v), for in I Pet. iii. 13 the revised text reads $\zeta_{\eta} \lambda \omega \tau a i$. See I Thess. i.
 14. 2 Thess. iii. $7,9, \pi \omega \bar{\omega} \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ $\mu \mu \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \dot{\eta} \mu a \hat{s}$ к.т. $\lambda$. I Cor. iv. 16. xi. I, $\mu c \mu \eta \tau a i ́ \mu o v$ үi-



 (1) $\epsilon \circ \hat{u}$.

накроӨvцias] From $\mu а к \rho o ́-$ Qvuos, long or slow of wrath (first found in Exod. xxxiv. 6, оіктіришл каі ѐ $\lambda є \eta \not \mu \omega \nu, ~ \mu а к р о ́ \theta v-~$ $\mu о s$ каi. $\pi о \lambda v e ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma s)$, the substantive $\mu а к \rho о \theta \nu \mu i a$ is used both of God (Roin. ii. 4. ix. 22. I Tim. i. r6. i Pet. iii. 20. 2 Pet. iii. 15) and of man ( 2 Cor. vi. 6. Gal. v. 22. Eph. iv. 2. Col. i. if. iii. 12 . 2 Tim. iii. 10. iv. 2. James v. ro). In its human application it is most often employed as between man and man, vimopov̀ being the more distinctively suitable as between man and God.
 on i. 4. The idea of $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \nu o-$ $\mu_{\epsilon \in \nu}(\tau \iota)$ is not to be heir to, but to inherit, to enter upon the inheritance of. In $\kappa \lambda \eta$. senses (heir and inheritor) are found, theformer more frequently (Matt. xxi. 38. Gal. iv. I. James ii. 5. \&c.).



 O$\eta \sigma a \nu$ ai $\grave{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i ́ a c ~ \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. Heb. vii. 6. xi. 13, г7. The promises. All the various announcements of God's purposes of good, made from time to time to Abraham
and his descendants. It is possible that later promises, like those of Isaiah and other prophets, may be included in the plural phrase.
13. Tヘ̣̂ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho]$ I say $\delta \alpha^{2} \mu a-$
 -for, \&c. He takes the latter first, and the former in verse 15 .
 pared the recipient for delay, and so for the need of $\mu$ ккро$\theta$ өиia.
 made promise. The promise was prior to the oath, and was repeated again and again (Gen. xii. xiii. xv. xvii. xviii. \&c.) before the ópкснобía of Gen. xxii. The verb $\epsilon_{\pi} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \lambda$ $\lambda_{\epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota}$ has the two chief senses (in biblical as in classical Greek) of (1) promising, (2) professing. Thus (1) x. ${ }^{2} 3$,
 II. xii. 26. Mark xiv. II. Acts vii. 5. Rom. iv. 2 I, है $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma-$ $\gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \tau \alpha$, (middle in sense). Gal.
 passive in sense as in form). Tit. i. 2. James i. 12. ii. 5. 2 Pet. ii. 19. I John ii. 25. (2) I Tim. ii. $10, \gamma v v a \iota \xi i v, \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma \gamma є \lambda$ $\lambda_{0 \mu \epsilon ́ v a u s ~}^{\theta \in o \sigma \epsilon}$ Betav. vi. 2 I.
$\kappa a \tau^{\prime}$ ovं $\delta$.] Amos iv. $2, o \mu \nu v i \in c$
 7, 14. Zeph. i. 5, каì тoùs ò $\mu$ ขv̇ovтаs катà тov̂ Kupíov к.т. $\lambda$. (Elsewhere with $\dot{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}$, or with
 ${ }_{14} \dot{\epsilon} \alpha u \tau o \hat{v}, \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu, \mathrm{E} \dot{i} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \epsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda o \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \dot{u} \lambda o \gamma \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \sigma \epsilon$ ${ }^{15} \kappa \alpha i \pi \lambda \eta \theta \dot{v} \nu \omega \nu \pi \lambda \eta \theta \nu \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \epsilon$ ．каi оӥтшs $\mu \alpha \kappa$－

simple dative or accusative．） Matt．xxvi． 63 ，$\dot{\epsilon}$ ооркі́दे $\sigma \epsilon$ ката̀

$\left.\varepsilon \in \chi \in \nu . . \dot{\sigma}^{\dot{\sigma}} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \alpha c\right]$ For this （classical）use of ${ }^{4}{ }^{\prime}$ Kel with an in－ finitive，to have wherewith to do， to be able to do，compare Lukevii． 42，$\mu \dot{\eta}$ èхо́vт xii．4，каї $\mu \in \tau \grave{̀} \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \mu \eta$ є̀ $\chi$ о́vтшv $\pi \epsilon р и \sigma \sigma o ́ т \epsilon р о ́ v ~ \tau \iota \pi о \imath \eta$ бац．xiv．14，
 Acts iv．14．xxv．26．Tit．ii． 8.

ка日＇غ்avто̂̂］Gen．xxii．16，
 Isai．xlv．23，кат＇є́ $\mu a \nu \tau o v ̂ ~ o ̈ \mu \nu \dot{v} \omega$ ， $\epsilon i \mu \eta े \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ ．т．$\lambda$ ．

14．Ei $\left.\mu \eta_{\nu}\right]$ Given in the Septuagint $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{j}}^{\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ．But found in


 тov̂ $\gamma \in \in$ ย́ $\sigma \theta a \iota$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．It is difficult not to imagine it a mixed and corrupt phrase，made up of $\epsilon i$ $\mu \dot{\eta}$ and $\vec{\eta} \mu \eta^{\prime} \nu$ ，though equivalent in use to the latter．
$\epsilon \dot{\cup} \lambda o \gamma \omega v \in \epsilon^{\prime} \lambda$. ．］This is the usual way of reproducing the Hebrew form of strong assevera－ tion，in which what in the Greek is a participle is an abbreviated infinitive．Sense：I will abun－ dantly bless thee，and abundant－ ly multiply thee．
$\epsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda_{0} \hat{\omega}_{\omega} \overline{]}$ To speak well of
becomes，if God speaks，to do good to．With Him benediction and benefaction are one．

15．完 $\pi$ ध́ it is said of the Old Testament
 qediav，and the reason is added， iva $\mu \grave{\eta}$ रшріे $\dot{\eta}^{\dot{\eta}} \mu \hat{\omega} v \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \tau v$ ． In the same chapter，verse 33 ，
 said of living men，and must mean either obtained the utter－ ance to them by God，or obtain－ ed the fulfiment to them by God，of specific personal pro－ mises with reference to this life． It is plain that what Abraham is here said to have obtained was not the utterance but the fulfilment of promise，for the $\mu a к \rho о \theta \nu \mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma a s$ was subsequent to the utterance，and the procuring
 said then to have won by his patience either（ 1 ）the fulfilment to his seed after him of the earthly promise，or（2）the fulfil－ ment to himself of the promise of the heavenly rest typified by the former，yet without exhausting the higher promise，which has， even for him，its still future re－ surreetion－glory，and，for us，a fuller and nobler revelation now （крєitтóv $\tau$ ，xi．39），and an equal



share in the glory that waits for the second Advent. The latter of these two interpretations is decidedly to be preferred.
16. äv $\left.\theta \rho \omega \pi{ }^{2}{ }^{\prime} \gamma^{\alpha} \rho\right]$ Reason
 verse 13; 15 being treated as parenthetical. The $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ of the received text is right in sense, but is probably the insertion of a classicist.

то仑 $\mu$ cí[ovos] Him who is greater than themselves, that is, God.

каì тáaŋүs] And that oath (the article referring to the ${ }^{\circ} \mu$ vúouguv above) is to them a limit (end) of all àvтidoyía.
àvidoyías] Gainsaying, may be either ( I ) contradiction, as of one against one, whether in the form of denial or of reproach, or (2) controversy, dispute, a mutual gainsaying. For (I) see
 Jude it, đî àvadoyia tov̂ Kopé. (For its use in xii. 3 see the note there.) And so in the Septuagint, Num. xx, I3, тоиิтo [ $\mathrm{\tau}_{\mathrm{o}}$ ]



 dc. For (2) see Exod. xviii.

 Prov. xvii. 1 I, àveidoyias $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon i \rho \epsilon$
$\pi a ̂ s ~ к а к o ́ s . ~ x v i i i . ~ 18, ~ a ̀ v i л \lambda o \gamma i ́ a s ~$

 opíce. Here (considering the context) the former seems the more suitable sense. An oath removes all doubt as to the positiveness of an assertion. Precludes, for example, in the case of a promise, all doubt as to the serious intention of the giver.
$\pi \dot{\rho} \rho a s]$ Elsewhere in the New Testament only in the
 xii. 42. Luke xi. 3I) or Tifs
 Psalm xix. 4). But in the Septuagint, see Psalm exlv. 3, Tis

 $\pi$ t́pas той $\lambda_{0}$ óov. \&c.

єis $\beta \epsilon \beta a i ́ \omega \sigma \iota \nu]$ Unto confirmation. So as to confirm an assertion. Noun only here and Phil. i. 7. But see $\beta \notin \beta a z o s$ ii. 2, and note. Also $\beta_{\epsilon} \beta a \iota o u v v$, ii. 3 . Mark xvi. 20. Rom. xv. 8. \&c.
${ }_{0}^{\circ}$ ö $\left.\rho к о \mathbf{~}\right]$ See note on каi пáo $\eta$ s above.
 which state of things. This being so.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \nu]$ With $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota-$ $\delta \varepsilon i ́ \xi a \iota$. See note on ii. $\mathrm{I}, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma-$ богє́ $\rho \omega$.

Bov $\lambda$ ó $\mu \epsilon \mathrm{vos}]$ Applied (as here) to God in Luke xxii. 42.



James i. r8. To Christ, in Matt. xi. 27. Lukex. 22. To the Holy Spirit, in I Cor. xii. If.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \delta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \downarrow]$ Ouly here in the Epistles. Matt. xvi. r ( $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{i} o v)$. xxii. ig ( vó $\mu \tau \sigma \mu \alpha$ ). xxiv. I (оікоסouás). Luke xvii. 14 (éavioùs toîs iep.). xx. 24 ( $\delta \eta \nu$ ápiov). Acts ix. 39 (mid.). xviii. 28

$\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o v o ́ \mu o s$ ] See notes on i. 2,4 .
$\left.\tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda_{i}^{\prime} \alpha s\right]$ Primarily the promise to Abraham (verse 14); but including as the antitype of that, the promise of the eternal inheritance. See note

$\dot{a} \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \theta \in \tau о \nu]$ Only here and in verse i8. But $\mu \in \tau a \tau \iota \theta$ є́val ( $\mu \in \tau \alpha \alpha^{-}$ $\theta_{\epsilon \sigma t s) \text {, to change the place of, to }}$ transpose or transfer, ( I ) in a literal sense, in Acts vii. 16 ( $\mu \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ -


 and (2) in senses more or less figurative, in Gal. i. 6 (єis $\bar{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ v$

 $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\theta} \theta \in \sigma เ$ ). xii. 27 . Jude 4 (xá-


及ou入ns] The word $\beta$ oudì (occurring twelve times in the New Testament, of which nine are in St Luke's Gospel and the Acts) is applied (r) to men, as


 ё̣үои тойто. xxvii. 12,42 . I Cor.
 (2) To God, as in Luke vii. 30 . Acts ii. $2_{3}, \tau \hat{\eta} \omega_{\rho} \rho \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta \beta_{n o v \lambda \hat{\eta}}$

 ßoviriv тov̂ ©єov̂. Eph. i. II, тov̂ $\tau \grave{a}$ тávта èvєpyoîvтos катà
 This last passage seems to help the difficult distinction between $\beta o v \lambda \eta ̀$ and $\theta_{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \mu a$. The $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \eta \mu a$, ( $\tau \grave{\prime} \theta$.) is the will as a unit whole. The $\beta$ ou $\lambda \dot{\eta}(\dot{\eta} \beta$.) is the counsel or purpose of the $\theta^{\prime} \lambda \eta \mu a$, the sum of its intended activity. When $\theta \epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \eta \mu a$ has no article (as in Matt. xviii. 14. Rom. xv. 32. I Cor. i. 1. 2 Cor. i. 1. \&c.) it becomes one particular of the whole will; when it is plural (Acts xiii. 22), the several particulars of it. (This view is well illustrated in
 $\tau 0 \hat{v} \Theta \epsilon \sigma \hat{u}$, where $\tau \dot{\alpha} \theta \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \eta \mu a$ is represented as having $\theta \in \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$, as willing separate things.) So when $\beta$ oud $\eta$ has no article, it becomes a single item of the collective $\beta$ ovinj. When it is plural, several items, \&c.
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \sigma i t \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon]$ Mediated, interposed, intervened, acted as $\mu \epsilon \sigma i ́ \eta s$ or intermediate. But between whom 1 (See Gal. iii.


ठ̛́o $\pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \theta \epsilon ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ，$\grave{\epsilon} \nu$ oîs à $\delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \tau o \nu$ $\psi \epsilon v \dot{v} \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ Өєóv，i $\sigma \chi \nu \rho a ̀ \nu \quad \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́ к \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ є́ $\chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$

vi．18．Or $\tau \delta \nu$ ．

Apparently，by a bold figure， between Himself and the re－ ceiver of the promise．This seems simpler than to say，be－ tween the promise and the ful－ filment，or between the word and the man．A passage is quoted from Josephus，in which God is spoken of as being made a mediator by the mere fact of His being appealed to by the taking of an oath（ $\tau \alpha \hat{u} \tau \alpha \dot{\partial} \mu \nu v v^{\prime} v-$

 verb does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament，nor is either verb or noun found in the Septuagint．
 oath is made the instrument of the interposition．

I8．iva］The gracious pur－ pose of the interposition．

Svó］The promise，and the oath．
$\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ］From the ob－ vious sense of $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$ ，（ 1 ）a deed or act，through that of（2）a fact or event，a matter or thing，it passes in this Epistle into the higher idea of（3）a spiritual reality，as $\mathrm{x} . \mathrm{I}$ ，бкка̀ т $\hat{\omega} \nu \mu \in \lambda-$
 єіко́va т $\bar{\omega} \nu \quad \pi \rho а у \mu \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \nu$ ．хі．$\quad$ ，

 it is applied to God＇s word and

God＇s oath of promise，regarded as invested with all the reality of facts by being Hiss utterance．
iv ois］Wherein．In the matter（on the subject）of which． áóvararov Also in verse 4. x．4．xi．6．Characteristic of ${ }^{+}$ this Epistle．The nearest ap－ proach to it is in Mark x．27， тарà àv $\theta$ рө́тots áoúvatov（with－ out тov̂ro，which Matt．xix． 26 has）．
$\psi \in \dot{v} \sigma a \sigma \theta a l]$ The aorist $a p$－ plies the axiom to the case． Impossible for Him to have lied． Compare Psalm lxxxix．35，ä $\pi a \xi$
 $\Delta a v i \delta ~ \psi є 宀 ́ \sigma о \mu а є . ~$
©的反 $\left.{ }^{\prime}\right]$ The absence of the article（in contrast with o ©còs above）lays stress upon the quality．Majesty，holiness，truth．
i $\sigma \chi$ vóuv $] \quad$ v．7．xi． 34.
тара́к $\lambda \sigma \iota \nu$ Encouragement． The two ideas of comforting and exhorting meet in encourage－ ment，which avoids alike the unpractical feebleness of con－ solation and the unsympathetic externality of exhortation．The Scripture $\pi а р а ́ к \lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$ is at once tender and animating．It is that calling along，inviting to effort，as of a leader going before his men sword in hand，which may well be expressed by the English word encouragement，
 $19 \pi i ́ \delta o s, \stackrel{\eta}{\eta} \nu \dot{\omega} \stackrel{\prime}{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \nu \rho \alpha \nu \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \chi о \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \lambda \hat{\eta}$
which means putting the heart into a man．It occurs again in xii．5．xiii．22．And $\pi \alpha \rho a-$ калєîv in iii． $13 . \quad$ x． 25 ．xiii． 19， 22.
 oath confirming the promise， that we may have．An act of old time，having for its object the continual gnd ever present encouragement of Christians


катафиуо́vтеs］The tense carries back the thoughts to the one decisive act and moment of becoming a Christian．The special thought in катафєúyetv， to flee down，home，dec．，is that of taking refuge．It occurs once besides in the New Testament， Acts xiv．6．But its force is more clearly seen in such pas－ sages of the Septuagint as Num． xxxp．25，दis т ̀̀v $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota v ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \phi v \gamma a-~$
 е̇кєî к．т．入．Psalm cxliii．9， $\mathfrak{e} \xi \epsilon-$


$\kappa \rho a \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \mathrm{C}]$ To lay hold of． Again the aorist of the single act．For крateiv，see note on iv． 14，крат $\omega \mu \in \nu$.

трокєцнє́иŋг］For трокєi－ б日al，to lie forth，to lie in view， to be set forth in open view，see Lev．xxiv．7，каî є̈ซovтає єis


 к．т．入．In the New Testament it occurs in 2 Cor．viii． 12 ，$\epsilon i \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$
 coming）．Jude 7，то́́кєцขтац $\delta \epsilon i \gamma \mu a$ ．And Heb．xii．1，2，


$\left.\dot{e} \lambda \pi i \delta \delta_{0}\right]$ Is it here the grace of hope，or the object of hope？ Of the latter the clearest in－ stances are Gal．v．5．Col．i．5，
 èv roîs ovjpavois．I Thess．ii． 1 g ．


 The $\pi \rho о к \epsilon \leftharpoonup \epsilon \in \nu \eta s$ here is inde－ cisive，for while in xii． 2 it accompanies something future （ $\chi$ apass），in xii．I it stands with a thing present（ $\left.\alpha^{2} \gamma \hat{\omega} v a\right)$ ．And we may be said with equal pro－ priety to lay hold of a present grace，supporting and comfort－ ing，or of a future attainment of glory．On the whole，we may decide in favour of the former and commoner sense of $\dot{e} \lambda \pi i$＇s． Indeed the following verse says


19．ä $\gamma \kappa v \rho a v]$ Acts xxvii． 29，30， 40.
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi a \lambda \tilde{\eta} \tau \epsilon \kappa a i \quad \beta$.$] Not to$ be taken with ä ${ }^{\text {人quvpav，}}$ ，but with $\stackrel{\eta}{\eta} \nu(\dot{e} \lambda \pi i \delta \alpha)$ ．The other con－ nexion leads to great confusion of figure when we reach kai





 Prov. iii. 18, каì тои̂s ѐ $\pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon$ єо-
 $\beta \epsilon$ 'ßalos, see note on ii. 2.
 attempts have been made to justify the application of this
 with $\tilde{\eta}^{\nu} \nu(\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta \partial a)$, all difficulty disappears. Hope enters into the holy of holies.

єis тò є̇бútєpov т. к.] Into that which is inner than (within) the veil. The simple $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \omega$ might have stood here with the genitive, as in Mark xv. 16 ( ${ }^{*} \sigma \omega$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ aj$\lambda \hat{\eta} s)$, and perhaps in the revised text of 2 Cor. iv. 16 ( $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} v$ ). But the phrase comes from the Septuagint, Exod. xxvi. 33. Lev: xvi. 2. \&c. то̂̀ кататєтá $\mu a \tau \circ \varsigma]$ Matt. xxvii. 51. Mark xv. 38. Luke xxiii. 45. It is called in ix. 3 тò ठ́ќтєроу каталє́табна, in contrast with the curtain over the entrance into the tabernacle. See Exod. xxvi. 3r-36, каì

 $\pi \epsilon \tau a ́ \sigma \mu a \tau$ оs $\tau \grave{\eta} v \kappa \iota \beta \omega \tau \grave{̀} \nu \tau o \hat{v} \mu a \rho$ тирíov* каi ठьорьє̂ то̀ кататє́-

 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. The outer curtain is
often called $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \tau \rho o v$ (Exod. xxvi. 36. xxxy. 5 5. xxxix. 38 . xl. 28), but sometimes also каталє́таб $\mu a$ (Exod. xxvi. 37. \&c.) as indeed the $\delta \in u ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \circ v$ of Heb. ix. 3 implies. For the significance of the figure here see ix. $8, \& \mathrm{c}$.
20. $\bar{\circ} \pi \sigma v$ ]. The forms $\pi 0 \hat{2}$ and öto are not used in the Septuagint or the New Testament:
 pose alike of where and whither.
$\pi \rho o ́ \delta \rho о \mu о г]$ As forerunner. Only here in the New Testament. But the verb ( $\left.\pi \rho \circ \tau \rho \epsilon_{\chi} \in \epsilon \nu\right)$ occurs in Luke xix. 4, каì $\pi \rho \circ$ -


 тò $\mu \nu \eta \mu \epsilon i o v$. In the Septuagint,
 $\delta_{\rho о \mu о г ~ \sigma \tau а ф \nu \lambda} \bar{\eta} s$. Isai. xxviii.

 тє $\pi \rho \circ \delta \rho о ́ \mu о и s ~ т о \hat{v}$ от $\rho a \tau о \pi \epsilon ́ \delta o v$ боv $\sigma \phi \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha \varsigma$ к.т. $\lambda$.
$\left.\dot{v} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho{ }^{\dot{\eta}} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu\right]$ We might have expected the simple genitive ( $\tilde{\eta}^{\dot{*}} \mu \omega \nu$ ) after $\pi \rho o ́ \delta \rho о \mu о$ (as in the above passages). But the insertion of $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho$ is reverential, and marks the disparity of the $\pi \rho o \delta д \rho о \mu о s$ and the followers.
$\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu]$ By ascension. See






vii. I. Or os quavut.

The solemn ceremony of the day of Atonement is already tinging the phraseology. See
 'Аар凶̀v єis тウ̀v $\sigma \kappa \eta v \dot{\eta} \nu$ тov̂ $\mu a \rho-$ тvpíov к.т. $\lambda$.

катà т $\grave{̀ v} v \tau a ́ \xi(v]$ Thus we return once more to the text of the subsection, proposed in $v$. Io, and suspended by the following digression. Now we enter upon the subject.
VII. 1. Oivos $\gamma \operatorname{aj}_{\rho}^{\rho}$ ] I say, as the Melchizedel priest; and it is a significant title-for, \&c.
ovios] This who is the person named in the prophecy under consideration.
$\left.{ }_{\delta}^{\circ} \mathrm{M} \epsilon \lambda \chi^{\iota \sigma \epsilon} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \kappa\right]$ Gen. xiv. 18. The phrases and clauses quoted



 B] $\delta \in \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \eta v$ à $\pi \grave{o} \pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu$.
$\left.\Sigma a \lambda \eta^{\prime} \mu\right]$ The locality is immaterial, the name alone is significant.
iepev̀s rov̂ ©env̂] One of those outlying worshippers of the true God, whom Scripture presents to us as preserving a primitive tradition of truth, though not included in any special covenant of revelation. Job is another. Jethro may have been
another. To such cases St Paul's words in Rom. ii. 14 are directly applicable.
 morestrongly supported)reading ös involves a provoking breach of construction in which one would acquiesce unwillingly, especially in such an Epistle as this. Strictly taken, it implies that the intended construction was, who, having met Abraham... blessed him. It belongs to the same class of vexatious breaches of grammar as the $\$$ of Rom. xvi. 27.
ovvavtíras] Suggested by
 Z

 $\tau \omega \bar{\nu} \mu \in \tau^{*}$ avicoî. The word $\sigma v-$ av $\quad \hat{a} v$ occurs in the New Testament in Luke ix. 37. xxii. 10. Acts x. 25. xx .22.

кonths] See the above quotation. Smiting. Clades rather than coedes. Gen. xiv. 15, є̇ná$\tau a \xi \varepsilon v$. For the word, see Deut. xxviii. 25, $\delta \underset{\eta}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \boldsymbol{\sigma \epsilon}$ Kи́pıos $\grave{\epsilon \pi i}$
 Josh. x. 20, ко́ттоขтєs av่тov̀s
 tédos. Jud. xv. 7, àvarteé-

$\tau \omega \bar{\omega} \beta a \sigma\left(\lambda \epsilon \epsilon_{\omega \nu}\right]$ The four





kings against five of Gen．xiv． Hearing of the capture of Lot， Abram arms lis trained ser－ vants，born in his own house， three hundred and eighteen，pur－ sues the four kings to Dan，and （after a successful engagement） to Hobah，which is on the left hand of Damascus，rescues Lot， and returns by way of Sodom towards his tent－home at Mamre．

єंगo $\left.{ }^{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \sigma a s\right]$ The words are given in Gen．xiv．19，20， $\boldsymbol{\epsilon v}^{3}-$ $\lambda о \gamma \eta \mu$ évos＂ $\mathrm{A} \beta \rho a \mu \tau \hat{\varphi}$ © $\epsilon \hat{\varphi} \hat{\varphi} \tau \hat{\varphi}$





2．ठєка́т $\eta y$ ］Only here （and in verses $4,8,9$ ）in the New Testament．In the Septuagint， see Lev．xxvii．30．Deut．xiv． 22．\＆c．
ánò $\left.\pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu\right]$ This is the ex－ pression in Gen．xiv．20．It is varied in verse 4 into è̉к тต̂̀ аंк $\rho о \theta c{ }^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \omega$ ．

 to give as a share，to one person， see Rom．xii．3，éка́⿱㇒木тш wis ó
 1 Cor．vii． 17.2 Cor．x． 13 ．
$\pi \rho \omega ิ \tau o v, \mu \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{v}]$ After stating the few facts of the story of Melchizedek，he proceeds to argue，（ 1 ）from the statements and（2）from the silences of the narrative，the mysterious dig－ nity of the typical person，and so the predicted majesty of the antitype．And first the signi－ ficance of the names of the person and of the place．

as．Being when interpreted． For the word，see note on $v$ ． II，$\delta \nu \sigma \in \rho \mu \eta{ }^{2} \boldsymbol{v \epsilon v \tau o s . ~}$

及acidevis Sckatooúvךs］The meaning of the name Melchize－ dek．
$\left.\Sigma a \lambda \eta^{\prime} \mu\right]$ There is no ap－ parent reason for doubting that this denotes the place or capital of Melchizedek＇s sovereignty． But its site is unsettled，some identifying Salem with Jerusa－ lem on the strength of Psalm lxxvi． 2 （where however in the Septuagint $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon i p \eta \eta_{\eta} \eta$ is the ren－ dering of in Salem）．

3．$\dot{a} \pi \alpha ́ \tau \omega \rho, \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho]$ For all that the narrative in Genesis tells of him，Melchizedeh might have been all these．The arga－ ment is from the mystery in which he is enveloped，leaving


room for the supernatural at each turn, and so enhancing the applicability of the type to One who is really that which only the silence of Scripture leaves imaginable of Melchizedek. The three words occur only here in the New Testament or the Septuagint. But $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \tau \omega \rho$ and $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta}^{\prime}-$ $\tau \omega \rho$ are classical; the former in the various senses of fatherless, disowned, posthumous, of uncertain parentage; the latter in that of motherless, of mean birth, unmotherly.
àєยєа入ó $\eta_{\eta}$ тоs] Without ancestry, one whose pedigree cannot be moule out. See verse 6, $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ $\boldsymbol{v \in a \lambda o \gamma o v ́ \mu \in \nu o s . ~ A l s o ~ ( a s ~ m a r k - ~}$ ing the exaggerated anxiety and fanciful ideas of Jews on the subject of pedigrees) $\mathbf{I}$ Tim. i. 4, $\mu \dot{\jmath} \theta$ ous каї уєvєadoyíass à $\pi \epsilon \rho a ́ v-$ rots. Tit. iii. 9.
$\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \ldots \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon]$ Such as has neither...nor, \&c. Almost equivalent to one that has neither de. For this Hellenistic use (among several others) of $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with a participle, and passages illustrating it, see note on iv.

$\left.\eta_{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \ldots \zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s\right]$ No distinction seems to be intended : it is only a graceful variety of expression. Compare Psalm xxi.


к.т.д. The stress lies upon

àфшноьшн́́vos] Assimilated in these points to the Son of God. The passive recognizes the word of God in Scripture and the hand of God in history. The silence of Scripture as to the parentage and ancestry of Melchizedek, as to his birth and death; the way in which he suddenly steps forth for one mysterious interview with the father of the faithful, and then retires again into profound mystery withont one hint given as to the termination of either his life or his ministry; all this serves to make him, and seems to have been designed to make him, a type of One to whom such supernatural characteristics actually belong.

Tヘ̣̂ vị̂̀ тov ©िeô] The august title of the antitype marks the dignity of the typical person. See notes on iv. 14. vi. 6.
$\mu \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota$ iє $\rho \epsilon \dot{v} s]$ So far, that is, as Scripture speaks of him. He is left on the stage of the sacred history without a hint of cessation of office.
єis tò ót tuity. The phrase occurs only in this Epistle. See x. I, 12, 14. The word $\delta<\eta \nu \epsilon \kappa \eta$ s is classical, apparently from $\phi \dot{\rho} \rho \omega$, $\ddot{\eta} v \in \boldsymbol{\gamma} \kappa \mathrm{a}$, in the sense of continu-




$$
\text { vii. 4. } \operatorname{Or} \underset{\varphi}{\boldsymbol{j}} \text { каі } \delta
$$

onus (bearing right through). It has a curious but superficial resemblance to the Latin perpetuus.
4. ©єшрєiтє $\delta \bar{\epsilon}]$ After marking the typical appropriateness of the names of the man and his abode, and of the mystery lying upon his ancestry and parestage, his birth and death, the sacred writer proceeds to commont upon the two main features of the one recorded event of his life. And first the receiving of the $\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha \dot{\sigma} \eta$ of the spoils, with which however the other incldent, the blessing pronounced by him upon Abraham, becomes intertwined in verse 6, \&c.
$\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{i} \epsilon]$ This verb is found only here in this Epistle. Contemplate the greatness of this person. A lively and graphic representation is promised by the choice of the word.
$\pi \eta$ גiкos] Only here and in
 Not in the Septuagint.
$\oplus$ ] The alternative reading adds cai before $\delta \in \kappa a ́ t \eta \nu$, belonging however not to $\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \eta \nu$ but to the whole phrase: to whom it is even the case that Abraham gave, $\&$.
 toted here for $\alpha^{\alpha} \pi \grave{o} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ (verse
2). The change from $\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\circ}$ to ${ }^{2} \kappa$ prepares us for a difference between the two expressions. Here, out of (taking it from) the best of the spoil. Not, a tenth part of the áкpo日ivia, but, a tenth part (of the whole spoil) chosen out of the choicest phrdion of it. This is not mentinned in the record in Gen. xiv., but is a probable gloss upon it. The word áxpotivia, the uppermost parts of the heap ( $\theta$ iss or $\theta a y$ ), is not used elsewhere in the Septuagint or the New Testament.
o $\pi \alpha \tau \rho c a \rho \chi \chi \eta$,$] The separa-$ timon of the title from the name for the sake of emphasis is in the style of the Epistle which deals much in rhetorical trajectron. Compare, for example, in xii. In, the position of $\delta$ เкасобi$\nu \eta s$. The word $\pi a \tau \rho t \alpha_{\rho} \chi \eta s$, chief of a $\pi a \pi \rho t a ́$, is applied to David in Acts ii. 29, and to the twelve sons of Jacob in Acts vii. 8, 9. In the latter case the $\pi \alpha \tau \rho c a i$ are equivalent to the tribes, here the marpua is the nation of Abraham's descendants.
5. каì oi $\mu \dot{\epsilon} v]$ And whereas it is the duty of the Levitical priests to tithe their brethren, though sprung (like themselves)


from Abraham, here we see Abraham himself tithed, and that by an alien.
oi] Belongs to $\lambda a \mu \beta$ ávovres. Those of the sons of Levi who take the priesthood. Strictly speaking, indeed, it was the Levites who took tithes of the people, and then the priests took a tenth of the tithe. Compare Num. xviii. 2 1-24, with verses 26-28 of the same chapter. But this distinction does not affect the sense of the text. The priests may be said with suffcient accuracy to take tithe of the people if they tithe the tithe.
ípareiav] Also in Luke i. 9. In verses $11,12,24$ the form is iєp $\omega \sigma \dot{v} \eta$, which is the priestly office, as iєpareía is the priestly service. In the Septuagint, i i $\in \omega \omega \sigma$ viv $\eta$ is found in I Chron. xxix. 22. Eeclus. xlv. 24. I Mace. ii. 54. iii. 49. vii. 9. But iєратєía occurs about three times as often. Exod. xxix. 9, каì ératal aùzoîs

$\lambda a \mu \beta$ ávovtes] See v. 4, каi

$\left.\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \tau 0 \lambda \eta{ }^{2} v\right]$ It might have been
 vilege. But it was a precept too, one of the $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{0 \lambda a i}$ of the vóros. They lie under a command to carry out the law in this point.

both which it is the precept of appointment, the rule which confined the priesthood to the tribe of Levi and the family of Aaron. In ix. 19 the $\bar{\epsilon} v \boldsymbol{v}_{0} \lambda \boldsymbol{\eta}$ is any and every precept of the law.
 nation indicates a contraction of -óєu, instead of the usual -oviv which is properly the contraction of the Aolic termination -óv. (2) The compound verb ( $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \delta є к а т о \omega$ ) is found also in Matt. xxiii. 23. Luke xi. 42. xviii. 12 ( $\mathrm{B}-\epsilon \boldsymbol{v} \omega)$. Also in the Septuagint, in Gen. xxviii. 22,
 tithe them a tithe). Deut. xiv. 22. xxvi. 12. I Sam, viii. 15 17. (3) In all those places the accusative is that of the thing, produce, possession, de. (toìs Sov́dous of 1 Sam. viii. 16 forms no exception, slaves leing regarded as chattels), whereas here it is an accusative of the person from whom the tithe is taken. (4) The $\alpha \pi \dot{o}$ merely strengthens the simple $\delta \in \kappa a \tau o ́ \omega$, which in verses 6 and 9 has the same construction (an accusative of the person). (5) The classical form is $\delta \in \kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$ (with $\tau \iota \nu \dot{a}$ or $\pi \iota$ ).

катà тòv vó $\mu о \nu]$ See note on
 a precept to carry out the law in





this matter of the tithing of the people.
 phasize the dignity of the privilege. It is the high prerogative of the Levites to take tithe of those sprung like themselves from the father of the nation.
6. $\gamma \in \nu \in a \lambda о \gamma \circ v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s]$ Pedigreed, traced in pedigree. See note on verse 3 , á ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon a \lambda o ́ \gamma \eta \tau o s$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ av่ $\hat{\omega} \nu]$ By derivation from them, the Levites, as the root and source of his birth.

ठєб́єка́тตкєv] Has tithed. The perfect is that Scripture perfect of which this Epistle has so many instances. The $\gamma$ ' $\gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha \iota$ (so to say) quickens the dead, and gives to the proterite of the history the permanence of a perfect. Compare єن่入ó $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{\text { below, }}$ $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \omega \tau a \iota$ in verse 9 , and кє$\chi \rho \eta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ in viii. 5. Also xi. 5, 17, 28. \&c.

кai tóv] The other particular is thus brought in, but the subject of the tithing is resumed in verse 8 .

тòv 'Xovтa] The possessor of. Him who owned the promises. Compare xi. 17, ó tàs


є ๋่入о́үๆкєv] Has blessed.

Another Scripture perfect. See above.
7. $\chi^{\omega \rho i s}$ 8€] And apart from all possibility of contradiction this is true, that the inferior is blessed by the superior (not vice versa). The neuter is used to make the statement as general as possible. Only one comment is made upon the blessing, that it involves a claim of superiority. The father blesses the child, not the child the father. The act of blessing is not a mere prayer; it is a declaration of the divine favour resting upon a person, and therefore can only be pronounced by one who has commission, natural or official, to speak for God to the other. For
 For $\epsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda_{0} \gamma \epsilon i v$, on vi. 14. For $\kappa \rho \in i ́ t \tau \omega \nu$, on i. 4.
rò é̀ $\lambda a \tau t o v]$ John iL 10 ,


8. каì $\begin{gathered}\delta \epsilon \epsilon \\ \mu \epsilon ́ v] \text { Returning }\end{gathered}$ to the former topic, that of the $\delta_{\epsilon \kappa \alpha} \dot{\sigma} \eta$, the remark is made that, whereas under the Levitical system, the tithe is taken by dying men (see verse 23, סıà tò $\theta a v a ́ t \varphi$ $\kappa \omega \lambda v \in \sigma \theta a \iota \quad \pi \alpha \rho a \mu \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon \epsilon v)$, in the case of Melchizedeh on the cons-



trary it is taken by one of whom testimony is borne, by the mysterious silence of Scripture, $t$ tis testimony and no other, that he lives. It is an application of

 object of the comment is to enhance still further the dignity of the Melchizedek priesthood in comparison with the Levitical, by contrasting the earthly lifetimes and constant successions of the latter with the mysterious perpetual present of the former.

* $\delta \epsilon \epsilon]$ Here. In the scene constantly before us in the Levitical arrangements. (1) This is one of the many passages in the Epistle which speak of the Law and its ordinances as still in full operation. See ix. 6, 9, єícíaгıи ...троофє́роутає. x. І, і I. xiii. II. \&c. (2) For ${ }^{\omega} \delta \epsilon$, see xiii. I4. It is frequent in the four Gospels and Revelation. It occurs twice in the Acts (ix. 14, ${ }^{21}$ ), twice in St Paul (I Cor. iv. 2, revised text. Col. iv. 9), once in St James (ii, 3, contrasted there, as here, with éкєi).
 cessively dying human beings. The ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \theta$ р $\omega \pi$ ot applied to the Levitical priests does not of course mean to say that the
historical Melchizedek was not ${ }^{\text {áv}}{ }^{\text {a }}$ Opwas. . But we see here (as in verse 3) a sort of blending of type and antitype which makes the emphasis on the ävopwtoc intelligible.
ex $\hat{i}]$ There. In the case or history of Melchizedek.

нарторои́иеноs] One attested or borne witness to. The construction with ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{T}$ t is varied into an infinitive in xi. 4, 5 .

ӧт לn̂] Without one word about his birth or his death. See verse 3, and note. 'The actual historical Melchizedek no doubt died, but the Melchizedek of the sacred narrative does nothing but live.'
9. каi] I may even go so far as to say, that Levi himself paid tithe to Melchizedek in the person of his ancestor Abrahum.
 If I may venture the saying. The phrase (and even the word énos) occurs only here in Scripture. It is a classical expression in the sense (as here) of a somewhat questionable or hyperbolical statement. Thus it apologizes while it speaks.
 means of Abraham.

ठєб́єка́төтаи] Has been tithed. A Scripture perfect, as $\delta \delta \delta \epsilon-$ кátшкє (verse 6). There may

 $\sigma \epsilon \delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa$.


also be in the tense the idea of with abiding consequences in the confession thus made of the essential inferiority of the Levitical priesthood to one other.
10. ÉTL $\left.\gamma^{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \rho\right]$ 'The justification of the author's position rests not only ( 1 ) on the organic connexion between all the individual members of the same family, but also (2) on the divinely ordered connexion of all the developements of the sacred history itself....and (3) on the typical significance of every event in the personal history of Abraham' (Delitzsch). I should rather be inclined to accept the ws $\overline{\epsilon \pi} \pi=s$ cimeiv of the sacred writer himself, and read in the statement rather a poetical idea than a philosophical argument.
$\sigma v v \eta^{\prime} v \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon 1$ ] See verse $I$, and note.
II. Ei $\mu \grave{\mathrm{c} v}$ ov̉v] If then there was perfecting through the Levitical priesthood-or, in other words, through the Levitical law, for the whole legislation turned upon the priest-hood-what need was there still for a different priest to arise after the order of Melchizedeh, \&ce.
$\mu \epsilon \in]$ The implied antithetical clause with $\delta$ è does not actually follow, but is easily supplied. But there was no such tedeímots.
$\tau \in \lambda \epsilon i \omega \sigma \iota s]$ A comparison of
 tòv $\lambda a \tau \rho \in$ úovтa, might lead us to regard the perfecting spoken of as the absolution of the sinner by the application to the conscience of an availing propitiation. See also x. I, 14. But it may be safer to interpret the $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \sigma$ ts in the wider sense of consummating, bringing to completeness or maturity, whether of things or persons; comparing the general expression of verse
 where the neuter ovi $\delta \dot{c} \boldsymbol{v}$ seems to contain something more than ov̉déva would have done. See note on ii. 10, $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega} \sigma a l$
$\delta$ גaòs $\gamma^{\prime} \rho$ ] This parenthetical clause seems to imply such a suppression as that indicated in note on ci $\mu \mathrm{E} v$ oviv above. I say 'priesthood,' but I might say 'law'-for it is on the priesthood that the whole legislation of Israel hangs and turns.
$\left.{ }_{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime} a v ่ \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}\right]$ On it as its turn-

 12 'A $\alpha \rho \omega ่ \nu \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$; $\mu \in \tau \alpha \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta s$ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ i $\epsilon \rho \omega$ -

ing-point. The reading auvr $\hat{\eta}$ s for $a \dot{u} \tau \hat{\eta}$ is decisively attested. For this use of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ with a genitive, compare Matt. xviii. 16 , iva è $\pi i ̀ ~ \sigma \tau o ́ \mu a \tau o s ~ \delta o ́ o ~ \mu a p \tau u ́ p \omega \nu ~ \hat{\eta}$ $\tau \rho \omega \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \tau \alpha \theta \hat{\eta} \pi \hat{\alpha} \nu \dot{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha . \quad 2$ Cor. xiii. ı. 1 Tim. v. 19.
 legislated, constituted by legislation. (Plato has the expres-
 state which is being furnished with laws.) The statement is that the priesthood was the hinge and pivot of the whole Mosaic law. For the word and construction, compare viii. 6 ,

 still. What remaining necessity.

ह̈тєpov] The usual difference between ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda$ dos (one besides) and ËTepos (a different one).

 the two are intermixed, as in I Cor. xii. 8-ro, and 2 Cor. xi. 4, the distinction is not necessarily obliterated.
ávíotartal] To arise, in the general sense of appearing on the scene, not in the more special sense of rising from the dead. So in verse 1 5. Acts $\mathbf{x x}$.


Rom. xv. 12 (from Isai. xi. ro),
 And so àviotával, to raise up, to place on the stage of history, Acts iii. 22 (from Deut. xviii. 15),
 к.т. $\lambda$. vii. 37 .

кaì ovi] Not $\mu \dot{\eta}$, because the negative belongs not to the verb, but to the phrase кãà $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ $\tau a ́ \xi c v$ 'Aap由iv. And to be spoken of, described or designated, as not after the order of Aaron.
12. $\mu \in \tau \alpha \tau \ell \theta \epsilon \mu$ év $\left.\eta \mathrm{s} \gamma^{\alpha} \rho\right]$ $A n$ important change-for, if the priesthood is being displaced, there is necessarily taking place also the displacement of a vó $\mu$ os. This verse gives the reason for the above suppressed thought, If by the priesthood, then by the law. Thus verse 12 may almost be called a repetition of the parenthesis (ó خaòs $\gamma$ à к. $\tau . \lambda$.)
 to change the place of, and so to remove, see xi. 5, $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \in \in \theta \eta$
 Acts vii. 16, $\mu \in \tau \epsilon \tau \in \in \eta \sigma a \nu$ єis
 in a less literal sense, Gal. i. 6,
 Jude 4. Here to change the place of is (practically) to displace.
yópov] Without the article.




A law，any law，the law what－ ever it be，which ordains the priesthood．The difference is not great here between vóuos and $\delta^{\circ}$ vó $\mu \mathrm{os}$ ，but the form of ex－ pression generalizes the definite Levitical law into any law to which a priesthood is attached．

13．＇ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\prime}$＇$\frac{1}{} \nu \gamma^{\alpha} \rho$ ］But there is such a displacement of the Levitical priesthood－for，\＆c．
$\left.{ }^{\prime} \phi \phi^{\circ} \quad \dot{\sigma}\right]$ With respect to whom．The idea is that of the direction of thought towards．
 viòv тồ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\mu} \pi о и ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~$
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \tau a c]$ A more lively form of $\gamma \in \gamma \rho a \pi \tau a l$ ．As though the prophecy were in utterance now．
taû̃a］The things said in Psalm cx．4，which is the text of this subsection of the Epistle．
$\phi u \lambda \bar{\eta} s$ 白 $\tau \in ́ p a s]$ a different tribe．Judah，not Levi．
$\mu \in \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \chi \eta \kappa \epsilon \gamma]$ Has partaken of．Is partaker（a member）of． A．striking suggestion of the identity of Christ in heaven with Christ upon earth．Eph．
 ò à $\alpha a \beta$ ás．
a＇$\phi$＇${ }^{5}$ s］Starting（proceed－ ing，issuing）from which tribe．
$\pi \rho о \sigma$＇́гхךкєข］Has（up to this time）given heed to，attended to，given attendance at，the altar．

The nearest approach to this use of $\pi \rho o \sigma$＇$\chi \in \tau \nu$ is in I Tim．iv．
 and Acts xx .28 ，$\pi \rho \circ \sigma$ є́ $\chi \tau \epsilon . .$.
 éккдそбiav к．т．入．For an equi－ valent phrase，compare i Cor．
 $\delta \rho \in \dot{\prime}$

Qvalarthóie］Exod．xxvii． 1 ， \＆c．xxxviii． I ，\＆c．xl．6，29．The altar of burnt－offering is the one intended when no special indi－ cation is given of the altar of in－ cense．The latter（Exod．xxx．r， \＆c．）is the $\theta v \sigma L a \sigma \tau \eta \rho o o v ~ \tau o ̀ ~$
 contrast with $\tau o ̀ ~ \chi a \lambda k o v ̂ v$, or $\tau o \hat{v}$ òокаутш́ратоs．The service of the priests at the altar was（1） the keeping up of the perpetual fire upon it（Lev．vi．12，13）； （2）the offering of the morning and evening sacrifice（Exod． xxix． $3^{8,} 39$ ）；（3）the being ever at hand to offer the sacrifices of rich and poor，of the leper，the Nazarite，\＆c．
 Hebrew Christian can be ap－ pealed to as a believer alike in the prophecies about the Mes－ siah and in their fulfilment in Jesus Christ．The compound $\pi \rho o ́ \delta \eta_{\eta} \lambda_{o s}$, manifest forth，plain to view，occurs（in the New
 ${ }_{15} \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{v} \sigma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ є̀ $\lambda \alpha \dot{\lambda} \eta \eta \sigma \epsilon$ ．каi $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o ́ т \epsilon \rho о \nu$ є́ть ката́－


Testament）only here and in г Tim．v． 24,25 ，ai $\dot{\alpha} \mu а \rho т і a \iota$
 $\delta \eta \lambda a$ ．In the Septuagint，only in Jud．viii．29． 2 Mace．iii．i7． xiv． 39 ．
ávaréta入кєข］Has sprung． See note on verse $13, \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́-$ $\sigma \chi \not \eta^{\kappa \epsilon \nu}$ ．The verb $\alpha^{\alpha} v a \tau \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota v$ in the New Testament is always （except Luke xii．54，vєф́́ $\lambda \eta \nu$
 of light．Matt．v．45，còv $\eta^{\prime \prime} \lambda \iota o v$ av่тô̂ àvaté $\lambda \lambda_{\text {cl }} \quad$ xiii．6．Mark． iv．6．xvi．2．James i．if． 2 Pet． i．Ig．In the Septuagint it is frequent in the same sense（as， for example，Num．xxiv． 17 ，

 тє́тадкєข．Mal．iv．2，ảvate入єí
 equally often used in the sense of vegetation．Gen．xix．25，$\tau \grave{a}$

 ávaر́́＇́vov vóaros．Ezek．xvii．6，
 к．т．入．Zech．vi．12，i̊où àvíp，
 $\kappa \alpha ́ \tau \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$ av̉тои̃ $\alpha \cup \alpha \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \quad \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. There can be no doubt that the latter is the figure here，where there is no hint of a startling metaphor．
$\dot{o}^{*}$ Kúpos $\left.\dot{\eta}^{\mu} \omega \nu\right]$ Without addition，es in 2 Tim．i．8，cò
$\mu a \rho \tau$ úplov тồ Kupíov $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ ． 2 Pet．
 макродиціар．
eis $\left.\eta_{\nu}\right]$ As to，with regard to，which．Acts ii．25，Davei $\delta$ $\gamma$ ạ̀ $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon 1$ єis aùróv．Eph．v． 32 ，


 айтоі̂s $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau 0 \hat{\text { un．}}$
$\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i} \quad$ $\epsilon \rho \epsilon(\omega v]$ About priests． More graphic than the received reading $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ i $i \in \rho \omega \sigma v v^{\prime} \eta$ s．

15．каі тєрєббо́тєюоу ётг］ And this insufficiency and con－ sequent supersession of the Levi－ tical priesthood is still more con－ clusively proved by the par－ ticular designation of the pre－ dicted priest（in Psalm cx．4） as a priest cfter the likeness of Melchizedek．
$\pi \epsilon р \iota \sigma \sigma o ́ т \epsilon \rho \circ v]$ vi．I7．And see note on ii．I，$\pi \in \rho / \sigma \sigma o \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega s$.
$\kappa \alpha \tau a ́ \delta \eta \lambda o v]$ Another com－ pound of $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda_{0}$ ，like $\pi \rho$ ó $\delta \eta \lambda$ os above．Literally，downright evident．Both compounds are classical．But катádiŋдos is not found elsewbere in the Sep－ tuagint or the New Testament．
ci］If，as is the case．Matt．
 John vii． $23, \epsilon i \quad \pi \epsilon р \iota \tau о \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \lambda \alpha \mu-$







үєртає к.т.ג. Philem. 17 , єì oviv
 first note on this verse.
${ }_{\kappa \alpha} \theta^{\circ}$ о $\mu о$ о́т $\left.\boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \alpha\right]$ See iv. 15, and note.
ávíctaral] See note on verse II.
16. ös] Who, as such-as being a priest after Melchizedel's likeness-must possess what we have seen to be a characteristic of Melchizedek, a Gwì without
 plained above). See verses 3 and $8, \mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho o v ́ \mu \epsilon v o s$ ̈̈ $\tau \iota!\hat{\eta}$, and notes.

ở катà vó $\mu о v$ ] Not in accordance with a vónos of (characterized by, having for its charac-
 in accordance with a divapus of (belonging to, inseparable from)

$\left.\nu o{ }^{\prime} \mu о v\right]$ Without the article. See note on verse 12, vó $\mu$ оv.

є̇vтod $\overline{\mathrm{y}}$ ] Such as that which prescribed the tribe and family of the Mosaic priest. See note on verse $5, \dot{e} \nu \tau o \lambda \eta \eta v$.
$\sigma a \rho \kappa i \nu \eta s]$ The received reading here is $\sigma a \rho \kappa \kappa \kappa \hat{\eta} s$, but there can be no doubt as to the authority and advantage of the change. The distinction between б́́pкıvos and барккко̀s is that between material (carneus, of flesh) and resemblance (car-
nalis, flesh-like). The èvтodr was $\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa i v \eta$, because it dealt with $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \xi$, not with $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha$. It was not баркєкй, because it was a divine $e^{\prime} v \tau 0 \lambda \eta$ while it lasted, and gave no encouragement to the working of the $\sigma a \rho \xi$ for evil.
$\gamma^{\prime}$ 'үovev] IIas become such (iefcus). The perfect tense, because the priesthood is permanent.
$\alpha^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda a ̀$ кarà סúvaplv] Christ's priesthood is not one of vópos but of $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu$ es. It is His in virtue of a potency inseparable from an indestructible life. The typical Melchizedek had this indestructible life only from the studied mysteriousness of the Scripture record of him. Christ the antitype of Melchizedek has it in right of His resurrection to die no more. Rom. vi. 9,

 а́ката入и́тоv] Only here. For катади́єєv, the opposite of oiкоSo $\mu \mathrm{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i v}$, see Matt. xxvi. 6I, סv́va$\mu a \iota$ ката入र̂бaı тòv vaòv то̂̂ @єо̂̀





 оікодо $\mu \hat{\omega} \kappa$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.
17. цартvрєítaє $\gamma$ áp] In



proof of the $\zeta_{\omega} \boldsymbol{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ аेкатади́тои above, the cis $\tau \dot{v}$ ai $\bar{\omega} v a$ of the prediction is emphatically repeated, as well as the кат亢ं $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau$. M. which has been shown (verses 8 and 16) to involve the same idea of perpetuity.
$\mu а \rho т \nu \rho \in і ̈ т \alpha]$ ] $H e$ (the iepeìs єт $\tau \rho \circ \mathrm{\rho}$ ) is attested, borne witness to as follows. For the construction, see verse 8 . Also xi. 2, 4 , 5, 39. Rom. iii. 2 1. I Tim.v. Io.
18. à $\theta$. $\mu e ̀ v ~ \gamma a ́ p] ~ R e a s o n ~$ for the substitution of a new priesthood, as asserted above. The $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ is answered by $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma a-$ $\gamma^{\omega} \gamma \dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\delta}$ below.
d $\theta$ ध́ $\tau \eta \sigma \iota s]$ See also ix. 26,

 to set aside, see x. 28. Also Mark vi. 26 , ov่к $\dot{\eta} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \dot{\alpha} \theta_{\epsilon-}$

 John xii. 48. Gal. ii. 2I, จưк

 iv. 8. I Tim. v. ı2. Jude 8.
$\gamma^{\prime}$ yeral] Comes to pass, as implied in the prophecy of Psalm cx. 4. The tense implies that the change is in progress. It was not completed till the destruction of Jerusalem and the compulsory cessation of the temple ritual.
$\pi \rho o a, \gamma o v i \sigma \eta$ s] Preceding. The
verb $\pi \rho o a j \not \epsilon \omega \nu$ sometimes has a case, as in Matt. ii. 9 , ó áaтウ̀p...
 9, 3I. xxvi. $3^{22}$. xxviii. 7. Mark x. $3^{2}$. xiv. 28 . xvi. 7. (In Acts xii. 6. xvi. 30 . xxv. 26, it has the more obvious meaning to lead or bring forth or forward.) Sometimes, as here, it is used absolutely, to lead the way. Mark xi. 9. Luke xviii. 39. I Tim. i. 18. v. 24. 2 John 9 , $\pi \hat{a} \mathrm{~s}$ ó $\pi \rho \circ a_{-}^{-}$ $\gamma \omega \nu$ (who goes forward).
civo $\lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}]$ The precept spoken of is primarily, as in verse 16 , that which prescribed the qualifications of the Levitical priest.
$\left.\dot{a} \sigma \theta \in \nu \in \epsilon^{\prime}\right]$ Compare Gul. iv.
 The weakness of the Levitical evrody of the priesthood was shown in its inability ката $\sigma v \nu \epsilon i \partial ̂ \eta \sigma \iota \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \overline{\sigma a L}$ тòv $\lambda \alpha-$ т $\boldsymbol{\text { ćvovio (ix. 9) by applying to }}$ the conscience of sins (x. 2) a really availing propitiation. Rom. viii. 3, тò àơv́vatov тov̂ vó $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ о
 $\phi \in \lambda \epsilon i ̂ s ~ k a \grave{l}$ mátalol. The uselessness (unhelpfulness) of the priesthood was proved by its inability
 $\Theta \epsilon \oplus ̣ ̂$ which is their one want.
19. où $\delta \grave{e} v$ रáp] For the law perfected nothing. The ėvтodخ



which established the Levitical priesthood was weak and unprofitable, because the vó $\mu$ os (of which the priesthood was the hinge and pivot) was itself incapable of perfecting anything.

Ė $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \omega \sigma \epsilon \overline{\text { ] }}$ The law brought notfing to maturity (see note on v. I4, $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon(\omega \nu)$. It was a system of $\sigma$ rocxtia suitable to the vímtos, dealing with types and shadows, not with substance and reality.
$\left.\epsilon_{\epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \sigma a \gamma \omega\rangle}^{\prime} \delta \epsilon\right]$ Answering to $\hat{a} \theta \hat{\epsilon} \tau \eta \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\rho} \mu \hat{\epsilon} v$ above. The word is quite classical, but it occurs only here in the New Testament and the Septuagint. From é $\pi \in \epsilon \sigma a ́ \gamma \epsilon \omega$, to bring in above or besides. An introduction (into the world) in the way of addition, completion, or supersession, by the Author of the foregoing dispensation.

креіттоуоs $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \pi$ тíos] A hope superior (in clearness, compass, and satisfaction) to that which the Law had to offer in its types and ceremonies.
$\left.\delta \iota^{\circ} \dot{\eta} \mathrm{s}\right]$ By means of which hope, of forgiveness and absolution revealed in Christ, we draw nigh to God. James iv. 8, é $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma^{i-}$
 The idea is that of Rom. v. z, $\delta \iota^{\prime}$ ov каì $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \rho \sigma a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \dot{\eta}-$

 $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau \iota ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ П a \tau \epsilon ́ p a . ~ i i i . ~$ 12. In the Old Testament we have the limitation and prohibition of this drawing nigh, as in Exod. xix. 21, סıapáptopat
 Oєòv катаюой $\sigma a \iota$ каі $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \eta$ (A,


 yovertr. Something of the universal Christian priesthood is seen in the text, as in x. 1922. Compare the characteristic of priesthood in Exod. xix. 22, oi
 Now all are priests: i Pet. ii. 5, 9.
20. ка̀ ка $\theta^{*}$ ö $\left.\sigma o v\right]$ A further point of superiority of the Melchizedek priest over the Levitical. The solemn ípкшно$\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ia of Psalm cx. 4 gives a unique dignity not only to the person of the Melchizedek Priest, but to the $\delta_{\iota a} \eta_{\eta}^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ of which he is ${ }^{6} \gamma \gamma{ }^{\prime}$ vos. The sentence is broken by the parenthesis, oi $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \gamma \dot{a} \rho$
 18) or $\gamma^{\prime} \gamma$ ovev $i \epsilon \rho \epsilon \dot{s}$ may be mentally supplied.

о́ркшиогias] In the New Testament the word is found only in this passage. In the
 $\kappa \omega \mu о \sigma i ́ a s ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau o u ̄ ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o v \tau o s ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a v ̉ \tau o ́ v, ~ " ~ \Omega \mu o \sigma \epsilon \nu$
 22 єis тò $\nu$ аi $\bar{\omega} \nu \alpha$－к кот $\dot{\alpha}$ тобойто каi крєітттоуоs

Septuagint it occurs in Ezek． xvii．18，19，каі̀ ウ̀тínабєข（A，

 viii． 90 （ 93 B ），$\gamma \iota v \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta \omega$ ท̀ $\mu \hat{\iota} \nu$

oi $\left.\mu^{\prime} \in \mathcal{V}\right]$ The Levitical priests． cioiv icp．yєүovóтєs］Are hav－ ing become priests－are priests hawing become so－without any swearing of an oath．
 Priest．Understand from above，


סıá］Through．Not to be tied to the word ópкшрос́as， but rather dependent upon the whole clause écròv iєpєìs $\gamma \in \gamma^{\circ} \mathrm{vais}$ $\mu$ ．$\delta$ ．Having become so（with this peculiar feature of dignity） by means of llim who so ad－ dresses Him．

тov̀ $\lambda \epsilon$＇́ovtos］The present tense here carries something of the same thought（of the per－ manence and perpetuity of Scripture）which has been noticed above in the perfects
 єímóvtos（said）but $\lambda$ éyovtos （says，is saying）．
$\left.\mu \in \tau а \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \alpha\right]$ The future and aorist of $\mu \epsilon \tau а \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a c$ are passive in form only．See Matt． xxi．29，32，च̈бтєpov $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha-$
$\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i s \quad \dot{\alpha} \pi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu \quad$ к．$\tau . \lambda . \quad$ xxvii． 3．And so in the Septuagint， I Sam．xv．35，каi Kúptos $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon-$ $\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta$ öтı к．т．$\lambda$ ．$\quad$ Chron．xxi． 15．Psalm evi．45．Jer．xx． 16. Ezek．xiv．22，каi $\mu \epsilon \tau а \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta^{\prime} \eta^{-}$ $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ к．т．入．In 2 Cor．vii． 8 we have $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda o \mu a i$ and $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon-$ $\mu \epsilon \lambda о ́ \mu \eta v$ ．Zech．xi．5，каì о $\mathbf{v}$ $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \mu$ е́лоуто．The impersonal $\mu \epsilon \tau a \mu \epsilon \lambda_{\epsilon}$ is found in Exod．xiii． 17，$\mu \dot{\eta} \pi о \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \lambda \alpha \widehat{\varphi}$
 between $\mu \epsilon \tau a v o \in i v$（to have an after－mind，to repent）and $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha-$ $\mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$（to have an after－care， to regret）is never lost in the Scripture use of the two words． The Revised Version has sought， to mark（if not to express）the difference by using to repent for $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \nu о \epsilon \hat{v}$ ，and to repent oneself for $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a}$ ．
cis $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\partial} \boldsymbol{v}$ aiêva］Here the quo－ tation ends according to the Vatican and Sinaitic manu－ scripts and the Vulgate．

22．катà тoбoûto］Belongs to крєíttovas．In the same degree is the $\delta$ ta $\eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ of which
 to the $\delta \iota a \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ which preceded it． The кат $\dot{\alpha}$ тобойто points back to the кa $\theta^{\circ}$ ö $\sigma o v$ ，and says，In the same degree in which it is


more dignified to be made priest with than without a divine іокшнобía.
 (disponere, to set or place in distribution, to arrange) $\delta \iota a \theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ has the comprehensive sense of an arrangement, whether of relations (covenant) or of possessions (testament). In classical Greek the latter use predominates, though the former also is found. In the Septuagint and the New Testament the former is invariable, except in Heb. ix. I6, \&c., where the preceding өaváтov and кдๆроvopias prepare us for the argument from סtaO $\eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ as testament, a sense naturally occurring to a Greek writer. Examples of covenant in all connexions are frequent in the Septuagint. Between individuals (as I Sam. xxiii. 18. Mal. ii. 14), between nations (as Josh. ix. 6), between God and man, whether as an engagement of special blessing on God's part (as Gen. xv. r8. Isai. lix. 2 I ) or of special devotion on man's part (as 2 Chron. xv. 12. Jer. l. 5). The mutual idea is never wholly lost, but is thrown into the shade by the disparity of the parties, so that the real meaning of $\delta t a \theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ (in its divine application) is a gracious engagement of God on
man's behalf. Thus a divine covenant approaches very nearly to the sense of testament, which is a disposal of property by the free will of the disposer.
${ }^{6}$ ' $\gamma$ Yuas] The word (used in this sense of é $\gamma \gamma v \eta \tau{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{j}$ s, a surety, one who gives security for, by Xenophon and Aristotle) occurs only here in the Septuagint or the New Testament. Elsewhere we have $\mu \epsilon \sigma i(\eta s$ in the same connexion with $\delta 厶 a \theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ (viii. 6. ix. 15. xii. 24). But ${ }^{2} \gamma \gamma$ vos adds the further thought of one who makes himself responsible for the validity and effectuation of the $\delta \iota a \eta_{\eta}^{\prime} к \eta$.
23. каì oi $\mu \dot{\epsilon} v]$. A further and last point of superiority. And whereas they (the Levitical priests) are plural in number, because death prevents their permanence in office, the Melchizedek Priest, on the contrary, holds his office in sole and inviolable perpetuity.
$\pi \lambda$ eioves] Plural, more than one. Or somewhat many. This use of $\pi \lambda \epsilon^{\prime} \omega v$, without a genitive or $\vec{\eta}$ following, seems to be peculiar (in the New Testament) to St Luke. Luke xi. 53. Acts
 10. xxiv. $17, \delta^{2} \dot{\epsilon} \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon 0 ́ v \omega v$. xxy. 14. xxvii. 20. xxviii. 23, $\vec{\eta} \lambda \theta o v \quad \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a u ̉ r o ̀ v ~ \pi \lambda \epsilon i ́ o v \in s . ~ I n ~$ this use it seems nearly equiva-



 ( 1 Cor. ix. 19. 2 Cor.ii.6. iv. 15 . ix. 2. Phil. i. 14) to of $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda{ }^{2}$ í. $\pi \lambda$. $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \sigma c \nu \quad \gamma \in \gamma$. $\mathbf{i} \in \rho \in i \hat{i}]$ Are having become priests plural in number. Are priests in the plural number, having become so by reason of their being prevented by death from remaining (in office).

Gaváтч] Dative of the instrument. See vi. 17, оркц. Eph. i. 13, тヘ̣̂ $\pi \nu \operatorname{civ}^{\prime} \mu a \tau \iota$. Phil. iii. 3, $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \mu a \tau \iota ~ \Theta \epsilon \sigma v . ~ I ~ P e t . ~ i . ~$ 18 , ov $\phi \theta$ артоı̂s к.т. $\lambda$.
$\kappa \omega \lambda \dot{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \theta a l]$ The passive of $\kappa \omega \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon v$ is found only (besides) in
 wal. Rom. i. 13 .
tapapévevt] In I Cor. xvi. 6 (where, however, some read
 Phil. i. 25 with $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma u v, \dot{v} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$. Here, and in James i. 25, with no preposition or case following. To remain along, where one is, in life or position.
24. $\left.{ }_{\delta}^{6}{ }^{8}{ }^{6}\right]$ The Priest of the prophecy. The Melchizedek Priest.
cis tòv aiciva] Quoted from the prophecy of Psalm cx. 4.

азтара́ßатоу е́ $\chi \in t$ т. i.] Has the (or His) priesthood as one not to be invaded. Like äßatos,
 $\beta$ aros is passive, not active, in
sense, and $\dot{a} \pi \alpha \rho \dot{\beta} \beta$ aros is not one that cannot pass away, and so unchangeable, but one that cannot be transgressed, cannot have its boundary stepped over, and so inviolable in its sole possession, its unique tenure.
25. $\quad 0 \theta \epsilon v]$ See note on ii. 17. As the result of all which, specially of the last thought.
 $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a v$, and v. 7, $\sigma \omega$ '́दcir.

є's rò $\pi \alpha v \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ s]$ Compare

 may belong either to ảvacúqu, unable completely to straighten herself; or to $\mu \dot{\eta} \delta \nu v a \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta$, completely unable, dec.). From $\pi \alpha \nu-$ $\tau \epsilon \lambda \eta^{\prime} \varsigma$, complete, entire, єis то̀ $\pi$. is unto (so as to result in) that which is complete, and is nearly equivalent to $\pi a \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \omega \mathrm{~s}$, for which see 2 Macc. iii. 12. \&c.

סúvaral] As in ii. I8. Only there the power is ascribed to sympathy, here to immortality.



Sc' avirov̀] Through Him as their Priest. See ii. I7. iv. 14 - 16 .
 mary sense of the word, to light upon, to fall in with, comes that of applying to, making entreaty to; whether as man to man




vii. 26. Or omit the former кai.
(Acts Xxv. 24, $\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\text { ì }}$ ô $\mathfrak{a} \pi a v$ тò
 or as man to God (Rom xi. 2,
 'Iopaǹ $\lambda$ ), or as the Holy Spirit (Rom. viii. 27) or Christ to God, here, and in Rom. viii. 34, X $\rho \iota \sigma$ -

 The idea of intercession lies not in the word, but in the virè $^{\rho} \rho$ following or sometimes compounded with it (Rom. viii. 26, vim $\rho \rho$ -

26. Tooỗos $\gamma$ áp] A closing reason for the incomparable greatness of the new priesthood. We are bidden to reflect upon its exact adaptation to our case and need.
$\kappa$ каi $\left.{ }_{\epsilon} \pi \rho \epsilon \epsilon \pi \epsilon\right]$ ] The каì is doubtful as a reading. If inserted, it will be also. Besides being our Priest, He also suited our need. For $\pi \rho \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \epsilon \%$, here (alone in the New Testament) with a personal nominative, see note on ii. io. Compare Psalm

 $\pi \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\eta}^{2}$ aivérts. xciii. 5 .
ö $\sigma$ เos] Rarely usedin theNew Testament. Only eight times, of which three are quotations
from the Septuagint. Acts ii. 27 and xiii. 5 (from Psalm xvi.
 Sıaф0opáv. xiii. 34 (from Isai.

 хєípas. Tit. i. 8, $\sigma \omega ́ \phi \rho o v a, ~ \delta i ́-$

 ci....̈नtos. In the Septuagint it is frequent, occurring (with its cognate forms ócóo and óroó$\tau \eta s$ ) more than 50 times, of which half are in the Psalms. Its predominant sense is holy or saintly in character, whereas ajcos is rather holy or sacred by consecration. The third word of the group, iepós, is found but in two places of the New Testament (I Cor. ix. 13. 2 Tim. iii. 15), and in the Septuagint (as an adjective) only in Josh. vi. 8
 times in 2 Macc. It may be suggested that ö $\sigma$ cos alone speaks of personal holiness, and that, while both áyoos and iepos deal with consecration, ífoos is applied by preference to things, a ${ }^{\gamma}$ tos either to things or persons.
äкакоs] Only used once besides in the New Testament. Rom. xvi. 18 , $\dot{\epsilon} \xi a \pi a \tau \omega \bar{\omega} \iota v$ лàs

#  



карঠías тө̂̀ а̀ка́кшv. It is more frequent in the Septuagint, especially in Proverbs, where in ii. 21 (A) äкакоь is placed in paralleism with xpmoroi, in xiii. 6 (A) it is made the opposite of $\dot{a} \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon \hat{i}$, while in Psalm xxv. 21 it is associated with $\epsilon^{\hat{*}} \theta \in \mathrm{\epsilon}$ 个. By usage it is not so much innocent in the sense of freedom from eril as in that of freedom from guile, simple; sometimes even to a fault, as in Prov. xiv. 15, äкккоs
 less; akin to the thought of


 äरónєvov то仑̂ $\theta \dot{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta$ Qu. к.т. $\lambda$.

да́áaros] xiii. 4. James i.

 $\phi \theta$ артои каі à $\mu$ '́avтоу каї à д́́pavrov. In the Septuagint, Wisd. iii. Iz. iv. 2. viii, zo. 2 Mace. xiv. 36 .
$\kappa є \chi \omega \rho$. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o}$ т $\tau \hat{\omega} \dot{\alpha} \mu$.] This must be interpreted consistently with ii. 17 and iv. 15 . The separateness spoken of might be understood as either from contaminating influences (the $\chi$ wpis ápaptias of iv. 15) or from the reach of blasphemy or violence (the avicdoyia of xii. 3). Yet the former idea would almost repeat the three epithets preceding, and the latter seems scarcely to suit the tenderness
and elevation of the passage. May it perhaps be a feature of dignity, preparatory to the clause following? The local separateness implies no spiritual barrier: rather it is essential to the exercise of the mediatorial intercession, and even to the universal and impartial accessibility (compare Eph. iv. ıo, ìva $\pi \lambda \eta p \omega_{0} \eta$ $\left.\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha_{i} \tau \tau\right)$. The word $\chi \omega \rho i \underline{\xi} \epsilon \tau$ is not rare in the New Testament and the Septuagint. But there is no special appropriateness in any of its occurrences in either to this passage.
 note on iv. 14. The comparative
 only here and in Dan. viii. 3 . For the sense, compare Eph. iv.
 จั่วaขติ.

 ėтovpaviots. Phil. ii. 9 , stò кaì ó

27. кa $\left.\theta^{3} \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \nu\right]$ The phrase kar' éviaviò vowld have more
 $\rho \epsilon i{ }^{i}$ following. For the Levitical atonement for priests and people was made only once a
 ह̀ท principle is the same. A repeated sacrifice of propitiation, if needed at all, is needed perpetually. For the phrase à áy-
oi $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \iota \epsilon \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota}, \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ i $\bar{\delta} i \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \iota \omega \bar{\nu}$



vii．27．Ot тробєрєүкаs．

Cor．vii．37．Jude 3.
of $\left.{ }^{2} \rho \chi \chi є \rho \in i s\right]$ The successive high－priests of the order of Aaron．For the reference is to the ceremonies of the day of Atonement in which póvos ó ápXtєpєùs（ix．7）officiated．
$\pi \rho о ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu . . . \epsilon \notin \tau \epsilon \tau \alpha]$ Study Lev． xvi．，distinguishing the sin－ offering of the bullock（verses II－I4），from the sin－offering of the goat（verses 15,16 ）．

Ovoias］Plural，to suit the idea of the repeated offering．
àva申́ $\rho \in \epsilon \nu]$ For the uses of тробфє́petv and ávaф́́pєtv，see note on v．r，$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho_{\rho} \eta$ ．

тоиิто $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ є́тоín $\bar{\sigma} \epsilon \nu$ ］What is $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau о$ here？Doos it include $\dot{v} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ i $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu$ as well as $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau 0 \hat{v}$ $\lambda a o \hat{?}$ ？The question answers itself．To say so would be to contradict the whole language of the Epistle（as well as of Scripture throughout）as to the sinlessness of Christ．In many places a text may be found which，taken by itself and iso－ lated from all others，might seem to be capable of an Arian or Socinian meaning．But con－ front it with the tenor of Scrip－ ture，and all is consistency．It
 $\pi \alpha \xi$ ．Sometimes（ I ）at once，as I Cor．xv．6，тevtaкoбiots áde入－ фoís ėф́́тa乡．More often（2） once for all，as in ix． $\mathbf{1} 2$ ，єioŋ̃ $\lambda \theta \in \nu$ є́фа́т $\pi \xi$ єis $\tau \dot{a}$ ä $y t a$ ．x．Io．Rom． vi．Io，т̂̂á á $\alpha \rho \tau i ́ a ~ a ́ \pi \epsilon ́ \theta \alpha \nu \epsilon \nu ~ e ́ \phi \alpha ́-~$ $\pi a \xi$ ．Notused in the Septuagint． є́avтóv］ix．14，25，є́avто̀v

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{\eta}^{2} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ．ii． $20, \tau 0 \hat{\nu}$
 Eph．v．2， 25 ．I Tim．ii．6，${ }^{\circ}$
 $\tau \omega v$. Tit．ii．I4．Elsewhere $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ $\psi v \chi \eta v$, Matt．xx．28．Mark x．45．Or ті̀v га́pка，John vi． 5 I．Or то̀ б人ै $\mu a$, Heb．x．Io．
$a^{3} v \in \boldsymbol{v}^{\prime} \gamma \kappa \alpha$ s］The reading of the great manuscripts varies be－
 ка．s．See again note on V． 1 ， т $\rho o \sigma \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \eta$ ．

28．áv $\theta \rho \omega ́ \pi$ ovs］See verse
 av $\theta$ р＇́novs alone bears the stress． Human beings．See Gal．i．Io． There is no denial here of the true humanity of Christ，which is so prominent in this Epistle （compare I Tim，ii．5，єis кai

 $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \grave{o} \nu \nu \frac{\prime}{\mu} \mu \nu v i o ̀ \nu \epsilon i s ~ \tau \grave{o} \nu \alpha i \omega \nu \nu \alpha \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \nu$.

 the assertion of the true divinity. The implied thought is, mere human beings.

каөí $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma \iota]$ See note on v . 1, каӨі́тгатац.

ё́xovтas] Having (as all mere men have). See v. 2. Christ Himself was, but is not, compassed with infirmity. See 2 Cor. xiii. 4, каі̀ үà̀ è $\sigma \tau a v p \dot{\theta} \neq \eta$
 $\Theta^{\text {© }}$ єov.
© 入óyos $\delta$ ¢́ $]$ But the word of (belonging, attached, or appended, to) the óкшиобía of which we are speaking. The dójos is the divine declaration of Psalm cx. 4, Xì iepev̀s cis tòv
 is the $\ddot{\omega}_{\mu} \mu \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ки́p os к.т. $\lambda$. which prefaces and sanctions that declaration.
$\tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \mu \in \tau a ̀ \quad \tau . \quad \nu$.$] Which is$ later in time than, and comes to supersedle, the vóros of which the rule of the Aaronic priesthood was one '̇vo $\begin{aligned} \eta & \text {. The argument }\end{aligned}$ based upon this $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ is thus the converse of that drawn from another $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ in Gal. iii. 17. There the vómos which was later in time cannot cancel the doa$\theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ of the earlier $\dot{\boldsymbol{e}} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i a$. It was not meant to do so. It was a parenthetical institution, leaving the original promise un-
touched. But the $\dot{\rho} р к \omega \mu \sigma \sigma i a$ of the Melchizedek priesthood was meant, by the Author of both, to cancel the évto $\lambda \dot{\eta}$ of the Aaronic priesthood, and with it the vó $\mu$ os which hung upon it.
vióv] Uuderstand ка Ö́ $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma \iota \nu$. The prophecy of Psalm cx. 4 is itself the introducer and establisher of the new priesthood. For the absence of the article with vióv, laying the stress upon the quality, One who is Son (not ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s$ as His defnition), see notes on $\mathbf{i}, 2$ and v. 8.
$\left.\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega_{\mu} \mu^{\prime}{ }_{0} \nu\right]$ The general idea of consummated is here defined by the context into the more special one of consecrated. See note on ii. Io, $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \bar{\sigma}$.
VIII. I. Kєфádacov $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon$ ] We are passing from the first to the second sub-section of the third main comparison (Christ and Aaron); from the priesthood to the sanctuary. But, as usual, the transition is made quietly and silently, only revealing itself in retrospect. The construction of the first clause is that of an accusative in apposition with the sentence, containing, in fact, that which is the equivalent of the statement. And as a main point crowning ( $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$ ) our statement [we say this-namely, that] we have, dre. Such an accusa-


tive is generally placed at the end，not the beginning，of the sentence．See Rom．xii．r，Tiेv $\lambda о \gamma \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} v \lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i ́ a \nu$ ข $\mu \omega \omega \nu$ ．I Tim． ii．6，тò дартúplov кalpoís ióiols． The seeming exceptions，in
 тô̂ vó $\mu$ ov）and 2 Cor．vi． 13
 of a different explanation（see note on Rom．viii．3）．The passage before us may，however， give support to the like inter－ pretation in those places also．

кєфа́данov］This substan－ tive（properly the neuter of an adjective）has two principal uses：（ı）a capital，chief，or crowning particular，a main point；（2）a sum（of money，as Acts xxii． 28 ；principal，dis－ tinguished from interest，as Lev．vi．5．Num．v． 7 ；or of a column of figures or items，as Num．iv．2．xxxi．26，49）or summary（of proofs or argu－ ments）．Here the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ following （instead of $\tau \omega v \lambda \epsilon \gamma \rho \mu \epsilon v^{\prime} \omega v$ ）de－ cides in favour of the former， and makes the sense this：As a capital upon the things which are being said－as a thought（or fact）forming the headstone of the argument－we add this； namely，that our IIigh Priest is one who（after all else done）took His seat on the right hand of the throne of God．Thus the new topic，that of the sanctuary or
place of ministration，is intro－ duced as the completion or crown of the former，that of the nature of the priesthood．
èni］Upon，as their crown or completion．See above．

тois $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma$ он́évos］The things which are being said．The discussion is still going on．
 коข тà $\lambda е ү о ́ \mu є v a$ Acts viii 6，



то๐ท̂tov］Not such as we have said，adding ôs éкá ${ }_{\iota 七 \sigma \in \nu}$ к．т．入．as a merely subordinate particular．But toovỹov ôs éká ${ }^{2}$ l $\sigma \epsilon v$ ，such as took His seat． The description of Him is this， —that $\mathrm{He} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \hat{c}^{\prime} \theta_{\iota \sigma \epsilon \nu}$ к．т．入．For rooovtos answered by os（as often in classical Greek）instead of oios （1 Cor．xv．48）or $\dot{\text { ónoios（Acts }}$ xxvi．29），see 1 Cor．v． 1 ，каi

 $\lambda_{o s} \pi р \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\tau} \tau \eta$ к к．т．$\lambda$ ．

є่ $\delta \in \xi t \hat{a}]$ On the right hand of the throne of majesty，in the heavens．See notes on i． 3 ，є́кќ $\theta_{\ell}$－ $\sigma \epsilon v \dot{\epsilon} v \delta \epsilon \xi \in \hat{q} \tau \hat{\eta} s \mu \epsilon \gamma a \lambda \omega \sigma u ̛ v \eta s$ ，and $\dot{\epsilon} v \dot{v} \psi \eta \lambda o i t s$. The only difference between the two passages lies in the insertion here of $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta$ póvov before $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda \omega \sigma v v^{\prime} v \eta$, ，which shows all the more clearly that the $\dot{e} v$ clause is separate，and goes back to éкर́ $\theta_{\imath \sigma \epsilon v . ~}^{\text {．}}$

2．T $\left.\boldsymbol{\omega} \nu{ }^{2}{ }^{\prime} \gamma i \omega v\right]$ Called once

(in ix. 3) by its full title, ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \nsim a$ árícur, but elsewhere (ix. $8,12,25 .^{2}$
 It is the holy of holies, the inner chamber of the tabernacle. Here the antitype of the material holy of holies; the aviros ó oupavós of ix. 24.
$\left.\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{a} \gamma \dot{\prime} \omega \nu \ldots \kappa a i \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \quad \sigma \kappa \eta \nu \hat{\eta}_{\mathrm{s}}\right]$ Are we to distinguish here between the antitypal ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ ya and the antitypal $\sigma \kappa \eta v \eta^{\prime}$, regarding the latter as the outer sanctuary, the scene of divine manifestation to saints and Angels, and the former as that of the divine presence itself? Or is it that the $\sigma \kappa \eta v \eta$ includes both-as if it were, the holy of holies, and indeed the $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \dot{\eta}$ as a whole? The limitation of $\sigma \kappa \eta v\rangle$ to the outer chamber seems to find support in Lev. xvi. 16, каi
 $\pi \circ \circ \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \iota \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \kappa \eta \nu \hat{\eta}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.

入ectoupyós] See note on i. 7, $\lambda_{\text {eirovpyoús. }}$
$\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \bar{\eta} s]$ Here first we reach the word which naturally becomes so prominent in this subsection, which is that of the sanctuary. In other books of the New Testament aкचгѝ occurs but to times (only as often as in this one Epistle), and only once (Acts vii. 44) in the special sense of the Levitical tabernacle. Akin perlaps to $\sigma \kappa \iota \dot{\alpha}$ and $\sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \pi \eta$, it passes from the general idea of (J) a booth of leafy boughs (Lev. xxiii. 42, and the aкךro-
$\pi \eta \gamma^{\prime}$ a of Deut. xvi. 16 and John vii. 2), or of (2) a tent of skins and curtains (Gen. iv. 20. xii. 8. \&c. Heb. xi. 9), or of (3) a hut of planks and boards, into that of (4) a movable shrine or sanctuary, sometimes of a false deity (Amos v. 26. Acts vii. 43), or, in particular, that of (5) the Levitical tabernacle (Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, de.) or (6) its heavenly antitype (as here, and Rev. xiii. 6. xv. 5. xxi. 3).
a $\lambda \eta \theta \omega \eta$ s] Real, as distinguished from apparent. Here antitypical as opposed to typical. Compare Luke xvi. if. John i.


 to earthly applications of the saying). vi. 32, tòv ă ${ }^{\text {antov...tòv }}$ ad $\eta \theta_{0}$ óv (real, as opposed to
 vòs $\delta$ тénциas $\mu \epsilon$. viii. $16, \dot{\eta}$
 as opposed to fallacious). xv. I,
 as opposed to typical). xvii. 3 ,
 opposed to imaginary). xix.
 $\mu a \rho \tau v p i a$ (real, as opposed to shadowy). I Thess. i. 9, $\Theta \in \hat{\omega}$
 8. v. $20, ~ \tau \grave{o} \nu \dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta L \gamma^{\prime} \nu \ldots \dot{c}^{2} \nu \tau \hat{̣}$



 xix. 2, 9, 1 I. xxi. 5 ovito oi




 xxii. 6.
$\ddot{\eta} \nu$ ยै $\pi \eta \xi \in \tau]$ The contrast is that of ix. 24 , ou रà $^{\alpha} \rho$ eis $\chi$ cipo-
 $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda$ ' єis av̉ròv тòv oủpavóv. Compare Mark xiv. 58, tòv vaòv
 à $^{3}$ єцротоíqтои к.т. $\lambda$.
$\epsilon \pi \eta \xi \in \nu]$ The word ( $\pi \eta \gamma \vee v i v a \iota)$ is specially suitable to the putting together of a thing of parts and pieces like the tabernacle. It is however applied frequently to the pitching of a tent of less solid or elaborate workmanship.

 The clause here seems to come from Num. xxiv. 6, шбєє̀ $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu a \grave{i}$

${ }_{\text {o }}$ Kúpıos] The passage in Num. xxiv. 6 seems to decide that $\delta \mathrm{K}$ vpoos here is God. And so in verse in (from Jer. xxxi. 34), $\gamma \nu \omega \hat{\omega} \theta_{\imath}$ тòv K Ḱpıov. xii. 14,
 (comparing Matt. v. 8). Rom. xv. II (from Psalm cxvii. 1),
 ${ }^{1}$ Cor. x. 26 (from Psalm xxiv. r), тồ Kupiov $\dot{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta}$ к.т. $\lambda$.
oủk ă $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s]$ And no hu man being. See note on ii. 6,

3. $\left.\pi \hat{a} \mathrm{~s} \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \rho\right]$ I say, $\lambda_{\epsilon \tau \tau 0 v \rho-~}^{\text {- }}$ خós-for, \&cc.
$\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \tau]$ See note on v . 1, тробфє́ $\eta$.
$\delta \omega \rho \alpha \alpha^{\tau} \tau \kappa$. $\theta$.] See note on the same words in $v$. .

ка母ívтатац] See notes on $v$. I and vii. 28.
$\left.{ }^{\delta} \theta \epsilon \mathrm{c}\right]$ Whence. As an inference from which. See notes on ii. 17 and iii. 1.
àvaүкаîov] Acts xiii. 46,


кaì тov̂tov] That this Person also, the Melchizedek Priest. Compare iii. 3 , $\pi \lambda \in i o v o s ~ y a ̀ \rho$
 $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu i ́ a \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$.
 The offering spoken of is to be made once for all. And what offering? Considering that the place of it is the heavenly sanctuary, it must be, not the sacrifice on the brazen altar, but the presentation of the blood in the most holy place afterwards (Lev. xvi. 14, 15), which is the type here interpreted. In other words, the reference is not to the death on Calvary, but to the entrance into heaven, as the crucified and risen, to be the Intercessor and Mediator. Even this pre-


sentation of Himself to God is described as made once for all. The tense of $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa \eta$ ( r or 2 aor. subj.) decides this, and prepares us for the argument of ix. 25, 26, which is, that, if the $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \notin \nu$ (in this sense) is to be $\pi$ od入ákis, so must the má $\sigma \chi \epsilon \nu$ be upon which it is based.
4. єi $\mu \grave{v} v$ oviv] The $\mu \bar{v} v$ is answered by the $\bar{\delta} \hat{\epsilon}$ of verse 6 . The ovv is (as usual) in accordance with the above statement; here, namely, that He must have something to offer. Somethingthen what? Can it be something of the Levitical kind, to be presented in an earthly sanctuary? No, for upon earth He has no room for priesthood.
$\left.\epsilon i \ldots \tilde{\eta}_{\nu}\right]$ If He were (which $H e$ is not).
ovid ${ }^{\text {àv } v}{ }^{\eta} v{ }^{\text {i.] }] ~ H e ~ w o u l d ~ n o t ~}$ even be (have been being) a priest. The first condition of ministering would have been wanting to him-the office of a priest.
iepev́s] A priest of any kind; not to say $\alpha^{\prime} \rho \chi^{l \epsilon} \rho \in \dot{v}$, to whom alone belonged the $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi о \rho \alpha$ of the blood in the holy of holies.

оै $\boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \nu \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \pi \rho$.] There being (already, without Him) those who offer, de. The office of iєpès is full. There is no roam or place for IIm in il, while earth is its scene. For ôvtov, compare John
 was not the Light-that place was full). The words $\tau \hat{\omega} v i \in \rho \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$ (after $\begin{gathered}\text { or } \\ \text { ( } \omega v \text { ) are omitted in the }\end{gathered}$ revised text.
$\kappa \alpha \pi \alpha ̀$ vó $\mu о \nu]$ The revised text omits the article before vópor, and so makes the meaning to be, in accordance with a vómos, a divine code prescribing ritual as well as duty.
$\tau \dot{\alpha}$ § $\hat{\omega} \rho a]$ The proper gifts, those which are needed and ordered. Here $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho \alpha$ may include $\theta$ voía, according to note on v . I .
5. oituves] The effect of $\boldsymbol{\circ} \sigma$ $\tau i s$ is to generalize the relative. Any who. Persons who. See note on ii. 3 , $\boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \kappa$.

ขттобє' $\quad$ иааті к.т. $\lambda$.] The construction is that of xiii. 10 , oi $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \kappa \eta v \hat{\eta} \lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon \hat{y}^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{s}$. To serve the tabernacle is to perform its rites and ceremonies. The tabernacle is here described as a
 $\nu i \omega v$. See the following notes.
viтоঠєíy $\mu a \tau i]$ The tabernacle itself was a manifestation (or representation) of $\tau \mathfrak{a}$ è $\pi$ оирव́vıa, given for the instruction of manlind. See note on iv. ir .
$\sigma \kappa \hat{a}]$ The idea is that of the shadow cast by a solid body. Thus (1) literally, Acts v. I5, íva
 $\sigma \kappa \iota \alpha \sigma \eta($ (or $-\epsilon \iota) \tau \iota \nu \grave{\imath}$ av̇т $\omega \nu$. Hence
(2) in metaphor, Matt. iv. 16 (from Tsai. ix. 2). Luke i. 79, $\bar{\epsilon} v$ бко́тєц каї бкıâ өavátov. And so (3) still more figuratively, as the adumbration of a reality which it does not embody. Col. ii. 17,



 $\pi \rho a \gamma \mu \dot{a} \tau \omega v$. The tabernacle was a sort of shadow cast by the solid body of tà émovpávia. They were the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \mathrm{a}$, they were the ciк $\omega \boldsymbol{v}$ (see note on x . 1), of the existence of which the earthly tabernacle was a proof, of the nature of which it was a type. The other sense of okca, that of a shade protecting from heat and storm, is by far the commoner in the Septuagint, and is found in the New Testament in Mark iv. 32.
$\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon$ vovatv] The words $\lambda a$ $\tau \rho \varepsilon \dot{v} \epsilon t v$ and $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i a$ originally denote the service of a workman ( $\lambda a ́ t \rho t s)$ for hire ( $\lambda a ́ \tau \rho o v)$. Compare Exod. xii. 16, $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ Ĕ $\rho$ Yov גarpєutóv. In the Septuagint and New Testament the same words are frequently employed in reference to the service of God: whether ( r ) generally ly the worshippers; as first Exod. iii. 12, каì датрєи́वєтє $\tau \hat{\omega} \Theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \dot{\epsilon} v$

 iv: Io. Luke i. 74. ii. 37. John xvi. 2. Acts xxiv. 14. xxvi. 7 .


 vioũ aủroû (which may however, like Rom. xii. I. Phil. iii. 3 . Heb. ix. 14. xii 28 , be referred to the second head). Heb. ix. 9, 14. x. 2. xii. 28; or (2) specially by the priest; as bere, and

 xiii. 10, of $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \kappa \eta \nu \hat{\eta}$ 入arpejóoveєs. $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi<0 v \rho \alpha \nu i \omega v]$ See notes on iii. I and vi. 4. Here it might. mean the heavenly things, the realities which have their home in heaven where God is. But the local or semilocal idea is clearly predominant elsewhere in the phrase. Setix. 23. Eph.
 द̀v rô̂s émovoavíos. ii. 6. iii. ıo. If so taken here, the thought will be that the arrangements of the tabernacle, and specially the separation from each other of its two chambers, were typical of the two heavens (so to say), the heaven of the divine manifestation, and the heaven of the divine presence itself. The only question is whether the division of the two chambers (here as elsewhere) should not mark the obstacle between man and God rather than typity the two heavens. If so, heavenly things might be a safer rendering than heavenly places.


## 

tion of the tabernacle, as a vimó-
 accords with the expression used to Moses in the directions for the construction of the tabernacle.
$\kappa \in \chi \rho \eta \mu a ́ r \iota \sigma \tau a l]$ A Scripture perfect. See note on vii. $6, \delta \epsilon-$ $\delta \epsilon к а ́ \tau \omega к є \nu$. The verb $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau i$ í $\zeta_{\epsilon c v,}$ to transact business, is sometimes (1) absolute, as in $x$

 к.т. $\lambda$.), and in a peculiar and post-classical idiom comes to mean to transact business as (under the name of), and so to pass for, to be called, as in Acts xi. 26. Rom. vii. 3 , $\mu o t x^{a \lambda i s}$ $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau i \sigma \epsilon \iota$ è̀v к.т. $\lambda$. Sometimes (2) it is followed by $\tau$ vi or $\pi$ oós tiva (the person dealt with), with or without an accusative of the business transacted. Sometimes (3) it has an accusative of the person dealt with, or (in the passive) has the person dealt with for its nominative. In Scripture it is specially used (in all - constructions) in a sacred sense, of the communications of God with men in the form of revelation, admonition, or direction. Thus (1) Jer. xxv. (xxxii. B)
 $\tau t \epsilon \hat{\imath} . \quad$ Heb. xii. $25, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \pi \alpha \rho-$
 (2) Job xl. 8. Jer. xxvi. (xxxiii. B) $2, \chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau \iota \epsilon \hat{\varsigma} \pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota$ тô̂s 'lovSaioes к.т. . $\quad$ xxx. (xxxvii. B)

2, пávtas тò̀s 入óyous ov̂s èxpŋ$\mu a ́ \tau \iota \sigma a ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \sigma e ́ . ~ L u k e ~ i i . ~ 26 . ~$ (3) Matt. ii. 12, 22, $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma-$
 к.т. त. Acts x. 22. Heb. xi. 7, $\pi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \cdot \chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon i s \quad \mathrm{~N} \hat{\omega} \epsilon \quad \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ $\tau \omega \nu \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega \omega \beta \lambda_{\epsilon \pi о} \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$. (Hence $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma$ о́s, a divine communication, Rom. xi. 4. 2 Mace. ii. 4.) And so here. Moses has been (divinely) dealt with; has been communicated with by God Himself.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i v]$ Often, to finish, in contrast with beginning. Thus
 $\lambda_{\epsilon ́ \sigma \omega . ~ Z e c h . ~ i v . ~ 9, ~ a i ~ \chi е і р є s ~ Z . ~}^{\text {д }}$

 тóv. Rom. xv. 28. 2 Cor. viii.

 Phil. i. 6. But sometimes without any such contrast; as here, and ix. 6, $\tau$ às $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i a s ~ e ̂ m ı \tau \in \lambda o ̂ ̂ v-$ $\tau \epsilon \mathrm{s}$. Lev. vi. 22, ä $\pi a v$ е̇ $\pi \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \sigma-$ Gท́テєтal. Num. xxiii. 23, $\pi i$
 Render therefore here simply to make.
$\left.{ }^{7} \mathrm{O}_{\rho} \mathrm{a}\right]$ Exod. xxv. 40. The only variations in the quotation here are (1) $\pi \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} v \tau \alpha$ (inserted from verse above), and (2) $\delta \epsilon \chi \chi^{\theta} \dot{\prime} \nu \tau a$ for $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu}$.
$\left.\gamma^{\prime} \rho\right]$ This $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ is no part of the quotation, but gives the reason for its introduction; namely, to justify the descrip-




viii. 6. Or vani $\delta$ è.<br>$$
\text { Or } \tau \in \tau v \chi \in \nu .
$$

tion of the tabernacle as a vinó$\delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu a$ of the èmovpávia.
$\phi \eta \sigma \iota \nu]$ Understand $\delta$ © $\epsilon$ ós.
$\pi o c \eta \sigma \sigma \epsilon s]$ There is an ellipsis of $\stackrel{\circ}{\sigma} \omega \boldsymbol{s}$ in the phrase $\ddot{\sigma} \rho a$ тorǵvets. The ellipsis of ${ }^{\circ} \rho a$ would be the more classical.

ката̀ тòv r.] The question has been raised whether we are to suppose that a model of the tabernacle was shown to Moses in vision, or that he was to make the émovoáva themselves (as revealed to him in vision) his tútos in constructing it. It is a question quite beyond us. Delitzsch says, 'Not a mere plan of the earthly tabernacle, but a real manifestation of the heavenly world of which that tabernacle was to be a type...A manifestation made in such a form as to fit it to serve as a model for the earthly building.'
rínov] By derivation a stroke or blow, $\tau$ únos means ( x ) a mark or impression, John xx. 25 ( $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \bar{\eta} \lambda \omega v$ ); (2) a form or figure, Acts vii. 43 (from Amos v. 26). xxiii. 25; (3) a model or pattern, here, and Rom. v. 14. vi. 17. I Cor. x. 6. Phil. iii. ${ }^{17}$ 7. I Thess. i. 7. 2 Thess. iii. 9. 1 Tim. iv. 12. Tit. ii. 7, I Pet, v. 3.
$\delta \epsilon \tau \chi \theta \in v \tau a]$ The change from $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \tau \gamma \mu{ }^{\prime} \in \sigma \nu$ makes the exhibition a thing ended, without marking its abiding effect.
$\tau \hat{\varphi}$ ö $\rho \in \epsilon]$ This from Exod. iii. I and xix. 2 onwards is the special title of Mount Sinai. In Heb, xii. 22 Sinai is replaced by Sion.
6. vîv $\delta \epsilon \in]$ Or $v v v i \delta \epsilon \epsilon$. The $\delta \grave{e}$ answers the $\mu \mathrm{e} v$ of verse 4 , and contrasts fact with hypothesis. But as it is (as the case really stands). See xi. 15,16 ,
 xv, zo (after ei many times re-
 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$.

ס̌aфоретє́pas] See note on

$\left.\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \cup \chi^{\epsilon \epsilon V}\right]$ As in the compound évitu $\chi^{\text {ávecly }}$ (see note on vii. 25), the casual sense of $\tau v \gamma$ $\chi^{\text {áveci ( }}$ (o light upon) is almost lost in usage, and the idea becomes simply that of obtaining. See xi. 35, iva крє́ítovos áva-



 xxiv. 3. xxvi. 22, è $\pi \iota \kappa o \cup p i ́ a s ~ o v i v ~$






גeitovprias] See note on $\mathbf{i}$. 7, $\lambda$ eitovpүoús.
$\dot{\delta} \sigma \varrho \kappa \alpha i]$ The superiority of the $\lambda$ cirovpria is measured by the superiority of the $\delta \iota a \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ of which He is $\mu \epsilon \sigma i \neq \eta s$. In vii. 22, the converse was the argument, and the superiority of the $\delta_{\iota a} \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ was inferred from the superiority of the priesthood.

סcaA $\eta_{\kappa \eta}$ ] See note on vii. 22, $\delta<a \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ ร.
$\mu \epsilon \sigma i ́ t \eta s]$ Also ix. $15, \delta<\alpha-$

 бой. I Tim. ii. 5, єis каi $\mu \in \sigma i_{i}^{-}$
 Xpoctoos 'I $\eta \sigma o$ evs. The word $\mu \epsilon \sigma$ í $\eta \xi$ means an intermediate, one who stands between two persons or parties. In the quotation from I Tim. it has a genitive of the two persons or parties. Here, and in the two other places of its occurrence in this Epistle, it has a genitive of the subject of the intervention. Onewhostands between (others) in respect of something. One who mediates a $\delta \iota a \theta \dot{j} \kappa \gamma$. In Gal. iii. ig it is made a disparagement of the law that it required a $\mu \in \sigma \sigma_{i}^{\prime}$ rys (Moses) to negotiate it,
 simple utterance of God to man admitting no such intermediary. Yet St Paul himself applies the term to Christ in the passage
quoted from 1 Tim., and, in doing so, suggests the necessary distinction. Moses came between. God and Israel, as a third person, himself (in this respect) separate from both. Christ is both ©eòs and äv $\theta \rho \omega \pi o s$, not mediating between two parties neither of which He Himself is, but uniting two parties the nature of both of which He shares.
$\left.\eta_{\eta}^{\prime \prime} \tau s\right]$ One which. A Sta $\theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ which. See notes on ii. 3, $\vec{\eta} \pi t s$. viii. 5, oituves.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i]$ On the footing (or groundwork) of. The $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma \gamma \in$ (ía are made the basis and condition of the $\delta<\alpha \theta j \kappa \gamma$. For this use of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i ́$, compare Acts xxvi. 6, каi


 $\tau \hat{\omega} \theta \in \mu \in \lambda i \omega$ к.т. $\lambda$. Phil. iii. 9,
 ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \lambda \lambda \pi i \delta c \zeta \omega \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ ai $\omega v i o u$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.
$\nu є \nu о \mu о$ ө́т $\quad$ тає $]$ Has been (perfect of permanence) legislated (constituted by divine legislation). As in vii. II the גao's was said to have had its legal constitution given to it on the priesthood as its hinge (émi with a genitive), so here the new $\delta_{a} \theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ is said to have had its legal constitution given to it on promises as its basis ( $\epsilon \pi i$ with a dative). See note on vii. II.

 $\gamma \epsilon \iota, ~ ' I \delta o v ̀ \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a \iota ~ \epsilon ́ \rho \chi o \nu \tau \alpha \iota, ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota ~ K u ́ \rho \iota o s, ~$
viii. 8. Or airois.
7. єi yáp] I say крєítтovos -for, \&ec. There was room in
 ment. Its own prophets said so,
$\dot{\eta} \pi \rho$. є̇кєívך] Understand סtaAү́кп. It might have been
 ly used in the New Testament (only Eph. iv. 22, катà т $\grave{\gamma} v$ $\pi \rho o \tau \epsilon \rho a v \dot{\alpha}_{v a \sigma \tau \rho o \phi \dot{\eta} v) \text {, except in }}$ the adverbial form $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о v$. And to a Hebrew Christian the Mosaic was the primary (as well as the former) dispensation. For $\pi \rho \hat{\omega}$ tos as the former of two, see Acts i . 1 , tòv
 к.т. $\lambda$. I Cor. xv. 47, ò $\pi \rho \omega \hat{\omega} \tau$ оs
 к.т. ג. And Heb. ix. $1,2,6,8$, ${ }^{15}, 18$. x. 9 , àvalpeî тò $\pi \rho$ йтov,

$\left.{ }^{a} \mu \mu \mu \pi \tau o s\right]$ Faultless; not to be complained of as defective in any respect. Lukei. 6. Phil. ii. ${ }_{2}$ 5. iii. 6. I Thess. iii. 13. And ${ }_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{a}} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \tau \omega \mathrm{s}$ I Thess. ii. 10. v. 23.
oủk äv]. There would not have been (in the mind of God as expressed in His word of prophecy) a seeking of room for a second. The figure is that of a person dissatisfied with an existing arrangement, and looking about for an opportunity of
substituting for it a different one.
8. $\mu \epsilon \mu ф о ́ \mu \epsilon v o s ~ \gamma a ́ \rho] ~ B u t$
 scc. The special thought in $\mu_{\epsilon} \mu \phi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ is to find fault with as defective.
aürov́s] The Vatican manuscript has aviroics. The question of reading is here important. For if avtois were the reading, I should take it as neuter, and explain it by Gal. iii. 12 ( $\dot{\theta}$
 though only o ${ }^{\prime}$ vónos has there preceded) as meaning the particulars of the low. For, disparaging the provisions of the law, He saith, \&c. This has the advantage of making $\mu \in \mu \phi_{\boldsymbol{\prime}}^{\boldsymbol{\prime}} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ vos apply to the same thing as ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau 0 \varsigma$ above. If the reading is auvtoús, there is no alternative; the aủrov̀s must be the Israelites.
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon c]$ That is, ó ©cós. As $\phi \eta \sigma i v$ in verse 5.
'I $\delta 0$ ov'] The quotation is from Jer. xxxi. (xxxviii. B) 3r-34. It is one of the fullest of the Old Testament predictions of the Gospel. It begins with an emphatic statement of its unlikeness to the law (verse 9). Passing from




the negative to the positive, it divides itself into two promises: (r) that of a new spirit, conforming the will of the man to the will of God by a direct personal communication of instruction and influence to the individual sonl (verses 10 and II) ; (2) that of a free forgiveness of all sins (verse 12). The variations from the Alexandrine Septuagint are ( I ) ovivt-
 oikov (twice) for $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ oüкц, (3) ѐ $\pi о \dot{\prime} \eta \sigma a$ for $\delta \iota \epsilon \theta \epsilon ́ \mu \eta \nu$, (4) $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$ for $\phi \eta \sigma_{i}^{\prime}$ (twice), (5) vas omitted (with B) before карঠías, (6) $\pi 0-$ $\lambda_{i}{ }^{\prime} \eta \nu$ (with B) for $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma i o v,(7)$ $\alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\omega} v$ omitted after $\mu<\kappa \rho \hat{v}$.
 frequent in Jeremiah. See Jer. vii. 32. ix. 25 . xvi. 14. xix. 6. xxiii. 7 . xxx. 3. xxxi. 27 , 38. Amos iv. 2. ix. 13 . Luke xxiii. 29.
$\left.\kappa \alpha i{ }^{\prime}\right]$ The ubiquitous Hebrew and, serving here the purpose of the öte which might have been expected.
$\sigma v v \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \omega]$ Substituted (perhaps as a more significant word) for $\delta c a \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \rho \mu a l$, which adds nothing to the cognate $\delta \alpha a \theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta v$. The verb $\sigma v v \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$ is largely used in the Septuagint, and
stands with $\delta$ ua $\theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta v$ (as here) in Jer. xxxiv. (xli. B) 8, 15 . The word is much less common in the New Testament (less common even than $\dot{\epsilon \pi}(\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{i v})$. See Rom. ix. 28, and note there.

दो í $]$ Towards; in relation to. Well expressing the nature of a divine $\delta \iota a \theta$ ク́к $\eta$ (see note on vii. 22), as not a compact with, but an engagement towards, the human being with whom it deals.
oikov] First perhaps (in the wide sense) in Exod. xix. 3, táó


'Iopaìn...'Ioúda] The ten tribes and the two, from $I$ Kings xii, 19 onwards. Jer. iii. 6, 7. Hos. iv. $15 . \& c$.

каıү $\left.\eta^{\prime}\right]$ The distinction between кatvos (new in quality) and véos (new in date) is never obliterated, though either adjective may be applied with equal correctness in many cases. Thus кatvi is the epithet of the Gospel $\delta_{1} \theta \eta_{\eta}^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ (in contrast with that of the law) here and in ix. 15, véa in xii. 44. It was in those days new in time as well as in nature. And so the spiritual renewal of the Christian is: described by both words. See





Eph. iv. 23, 24, àvaveovartat $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$

 к.т. $\lambda$. Col. iii. ıо, каì évঠ̀vá́$\mu$ rvol tòv véov tòv àvakaıvoúmevov.
9. ov̉ кaгá] Not according to. Not after the likeness or after the pattern or on the scale of. See iii. 8, катà $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta}^{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a v$.


тois $\left.\pi a \tau \rho a{ }^{\circ} \tau v\right]$ For (the benefit of) their fathers. See note ou i. I, roîs $\pi$ atpáaco.

є́v $\left.\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu{ }^{\prime} \rho^{\prime} \rho a\right]$ In a day of me (ny) taking hold of their hand, \&c. The construction is an imitation of the Hebrew phrase (which however has an infinitive, not a participle). The figure is that of giving a helping hand to a child or infirm person. See note on ii. 16 , è $\pi<-$ $\lambda а \mu \beta a ́ v є т а є$.
$\dot{\epsilon}_{\xi}^{\xi} \alpha \gamma_{a \gamma \epsilon i v]}$ Acts vii. 40 , $\delta$

 finitive is that of the direct object.
ört] Reason why the new $\delta_{a} \theta \theta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ should not be like the old. The old had been a failure.
aviroi] They on their part.

In contrast with $\kappa \alpha^{\prime}{ }^{\omega}$ a following. Emphatic, as always in the nominative. See notes on i. II and iii. 10.
 $\mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon \nu)$ is the opposite of straying from (James v. 19, $\pi \lambda \alpha v \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta$ ai a $\pi \mathbf{0}$ ) or walking beside ( $\pi$ apa$\beta$ aivetv). Acts xiv. 22, тapa-
 Gal. iii. so (from Deut. xxvii.
 тоís $\gamma \in \gamma \rho a \mu \mu$ évoss к.т. 入. The commoner compound in the New Testament is $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu^{\prime} \dot{v} \epsilon \iota v$, which is not used in the Septuagint.
$\left.\dot{\eta}^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \eta \sigma a\right]$ The tense expresses a single act of abandonment. I gave up caring for them. The converse is found
 $\lambda^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \iota$ Kúpos. See note on ii. 3, $\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$.
10. öтt] I say каıท'v, and I say ov̉ катà к. $\tau . \lambda$. , because, \&c. The terms of the new $\delta_{\delta a} \theta_{\eta}^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ are adduced in proof of its novelty.
avir ] The sta日ink which $I$ shall make is this which follows.
 тvoía тov́ 'I $\omega$ ávvou к.т.д. XY. 12. xvii. 3. \&c.
 є́кєєivas, $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$ Kúpıos, סıסoùs vópous pou

 viii. ro. Or каро̇ar.

ScaOforoual] Acts iii. 25,

 quent in the Septuagint, beginning with Gen. ix. I7, toito rò

 бәई барко́s.

т Gen. xv. 18, סıéधєтo Kúpos т $\hat{\varphi}$ ${ }^{\top} \mathrm{A} \beta \rho а \mu$ ठ $<a \theta \eta{ }_{\eta} \kappa \eta \nu$. Deut. xxix. 1, $\mathbf{I} 4,25, \& \mathrm{c}$. Often with $\pi$ oós, as Exod. xxiv. 8, $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \delta_{\iota a} \dot{\eta} k \eta \mathrm{j}$
 $\mu \epsilon \tau a ́$, as 2 Sam. iii. I2, $\delta \dot{\alpha}$ ádou $^{\prime}$

 After (the arrival of) those days


סidoús] The construction is difficult. Is it, (1) giving (putting) my lavs into their mind, I will also write them upon their hearts-in which case the parallelism of the clauses is broken; or (2) [ $I$ will make $i t]$ by giving (putting) my laws into their mind, and upon their hearts $I$ will write them-a somewhat unwarranted insertion; or (3) which I will make for the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, by giving (putting) my laws into their
mind-letting the sentence run on withont any supplying of words to complete it? The Greek of the Septuagint scarcely bears such minute dissection. The 3 rd explanation is perhaps the simplest.

סıávocav] Matt.xxii. 37 (from Deut. vi. 5), карঠáa ... $\psi \mathbf{v} \hat{\eta} \ldots \delta a-$ voía. Mark xii. 30. Luke x. 27. Eph. iv. 18. Col. i. 21.
 ơodúas tîs sıavoias ípêv. 2 Pet. iii. I, $\delta \iota \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho \boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{\tau} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \nu$


карঠías] Is this a genitive singular, or an accusative plural? For the latter, we have the $\tau$ as of the Alexandrine Septuagint, and the companion accusative (also with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i)$ in x. 16 (revised text). For the former, the companion singular dóvoav here and in x . 16 (revised text). I incline to the accusative plural in both places, accounting for the different number (in the two clauses) by the difficulty of making a plural (in the required sense) of $\delta \iota \alpha-$ vola.
é $\pi \iota \gamma \rho a ́ \psi \omega]$ The promise is, that the will of God for man's conduct, instead of being in-


 $\alpha u ́ \tau o v, ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu, ~ \Gamma \nu \omega ̄ \theta_{\imath}$ тò̀ Kúpıov．ótı

scribed in the form of separate precepts upon tablets of stone， shall become the will of the man by a spiritual influence exerted directly upon him at the source and spring of his being．For the figure，see 2 Cor． iii．3，द̀ $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a \mu \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta$ ovं $\mu$ édav，

 карঠі́às $\sigma а \rho к i ́ v a \iota s$.

каі̀ ধ̈́тонаи］And thus shall be fulfilled that repeated promise of the Old Testament which can only have complete realization in a spiritual intercommuni－ cation between God and the in－ dividual man，such as has just been foretold．For the promise in one part，see Gen．xvii．7，eis
 к．т．入．And for the twofold promise，Exod．vi．7，каì $\lambda$ ท́ $\psi$ opą

 again and again afterwards in the Pentateuch and prophets． For the phrase eival cis，see 2 Sam．vii．14．Jer．xxxi．（xxxviii． B） $1,9.2$ Cor．vi．18．\＆c．

II．ка̀े ov $\left.\mu \eta^{\prime}\right]$ And this influence upon the individual man shall be an influence of
direct personal instruction， making him independent of any secondary or intermediate teach－ ing，except in so far as it may help the other．John vi．45，

 ©єô̂（Isai．liv．I3）．
ov $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ ］With an aorist sub－ junctive，xiii． 5 （from Deut． xxxi．6），ov่ $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ où $\delta$＂oú $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \gamma к а т а \lambda i ́ t \omega$ ．Rom．iv． 8. I Cor．viii．13．Gal．v． 16. 1 Thess．iv．15．v．3．\＆c．
$\pi o \lambda i ́ m b]$ A remarkable vari－ ation（with B）from the Alexan－ drine $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma i ́ v . \quad$ See Zech．xiii．
 $\delta \rho a$ то入ít $\eta \nu$ ноv．Prov．xxiv．

 Acts xxi． 39.
$\left.a^{2} \delta \in \lambda \phi o^{\circ}{ }^{2}\right]$ Perhaps in the less literal sense，as first in



 pañ入．
$\left.\Gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \theta_{\mathrm{l}}\right]$ Know，with the im－ plied thought，Let me teach thee． єiofigovatv］The regular form is єïqovtal．（Homer，Hero－




dotus, and Isocrates are quoted for this future.)
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{o} \mu \iota \kappa \rho o \hat{v}]$ A common $\mathrm{He}-$ brew idiom, to express all of every age and rank. Jer. vi.
 yálov. viii. 10. xlii. (xlix. B)
 $\mu \epsilon \gamma_{\text {ádov к.т. } \lambda . \quad \text { xliv. (li. B) } 12 .}$



 of divine individual communication is based upon a gospel of divine forgiveness of sins.
i $\lambda \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}]$ See note on ii. 17 ,
 (only found once besides in the New Testament, Matt. xvi. 22, in
 or $\epsilon \ddot{\eta} \eta{ }^{\eta}$ ó © $\Theta$ ќs, Mercy upon Thees) see Num. xiv. 20, iौє $\omega$ s av̀rois єiцi катà тò $\hat{p} \eta \mu a ́$ боv. 1 Kings viii. $30,34,36,39,50$, кai $\sigma \grave{u}$

 ŋ̀ $\mu \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau о \sigma \alpha ́ v$ бо九 к.т. $\lambda$. \&e.
dockiats] The plural is found only here in the New Testament, and that in a quotation from the Septuagint. It is frequent in the Septuagint, especially in the prophets. Micah


 ( $\mathrm{A}, \dot{\alpha} \pi о \rho \rho \iota ф \dot{\eta} \sigma о и т а \iota ~ B ?) ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~$


ov $\mu \eta$ '] The received text had каi $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} v o \mu \iota \hat{\omega} v a v i \tau \omega \nu$ after каi $\tau \hat{\omega} v$ á $\mu a \rho \tau \iota \hat{\omega} \nu$ à̇t $\bar{\omega} v$, before $\alpha v \dot{\prime} \mu \dot{\eta}$. In $\mathrm{x} . \mathrm{I} 7$ it reappears. It is not in the Septuagint of Jer. xxxi.
$\mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\omega}]$ Psalm xxv. $7, \underset{\propto}{\mu} \mu \alpha \rho-$ тías vєóтŋтós $\mu o v \ldots \mu \grave{\eta} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} s$.



 lxiv. 9.
13. द̇v $\tau \hat{\omega}]$ Mark the word кau ${ }^{\prime}$ v in this quotation. It implies, noy creates, a $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha \iota \alpha ́ v$. And to make a thing madatò is to predict its ádave $\mu_{0}$ 's.
 saying каıท'v, He (the Inspirer of Scripture) has antiquated the first $\delta \mathrm{\delta} a \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi a \lambda a i \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu]$ (I) A Scripture perfect. (2) The effect is permanent. For madaloûv, see


Tò ©́ $\overline{]}$ And the thing which is in course of being antiquated and of waxing old is nigh unto effacement.


ix. Ј. Or omit кai.

тadatov́ $\mu \epsilon v o v]$ In course of being made old. Though the thing is done, so far as the decision and the certainty is concerned, yet the working of it out takes time. And so the actual wearing out of the Mosaic institution is gradual, though the sentence of antiquation was pronounced when the кatviv of this prophecy of Jeremiah was written. How true to fact! The heart was gradually eaten out of the Levitical system by the formalism and literalism of the Rabbinical treatment of it. Thus the sentence of áфavi $\sigma \mu o ́ s$, which was already upon it, justified itself before its execution. For maגacos in its disparaging sense, see Matt. ix. 16, $\boldsymbol{1}_{7}, \underset{\epsilon}{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi i}$
 datoús. Rom. vi. 6, ó madacòs

 Col. iii. 9. But no such disparagement is found in Matt. xiii. 52 , канvà каì $\pi \alpha \lambda a \iota a ́ . ~ L u k e ~$


 quotation shows that $\pi \alpha \lambda a, o s$ (old) and $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \alpha \hat{\alpha} 0$ (ancient) are sometimes interchangeable. Even àpXaíos may be made by the context a word of reproach. 2 Cor. v. 17, т̀̀ $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi^{\alpha i a} \pi \alpha \rho \hat{\eta} \lambda$ -
 $\chi^{\alpha i o s}$.

үпра́́коу] John xxi. 18, o̊ ovav dè $\gamma \eta \rho a \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta \mathrm{~s}$. Frequent in the Septuagint in its literal sense. Ecclus. viii. 6, $\mu \dot{\eta}$ dं $\tau$ t-


̇̇ $\gamma \gamma^{v}{ }^{\prime}$ ] See vi. 8, катápas
 тov̂ кріцато́s $\mu о v$.
$\left.\dot{\alpha} \phi \alpha \nu \tau \mu \mu_{0} \bar{v}\right]$ Only used here in the New Testament. But frequent in the Septuagint. Deut.
 Jer. li. (xxviii. B) 37, Ẽoval
 the verb $\dot{\alpha} \phi$ avi $\zeta \epsilon \nu$, see Matt.
 áфaví̧є к.т. $\lambda$. James iv. 14. It occurs more than 75 times in the Septuagint. And ádovto $\mu{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ about 55 times.
 The oviv stands by itself (in the construction of the sentence) as the connecting particle. It is little more than continuativeto pursue the argument of the subsection of the Sanctuary. But it has something also of consequential; in accordance with the position and use of the first $\delta \iota a \theta$ ク̈к $\eta$. (2) The $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ belongs to Eixev, and prepares us for the inference: had, but with no intrinsic or abiding value.


An emphasis on had will best express its force. (3) Is the $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ answered formally or only by implication? The $\delta \bar{\epsilon}$ of verse II is too far off to be made the direct antithesis of the $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ in verse I , though it suggests the correct idea of the suppressed antithesis as given above. Had, but not so as to satisfy the real want.

каi ท่ $\pi \rho \omega \dot{T} \eta$ ] Understand $\delta_{1} a \theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$. The кai is omitted by the Vatican manuscript. If retained, it must be even rather than also; for the following particulars are not common to the old and the new.
$\delta_{\text {ıканы́ата] }}$ Ordinances. The verb $\delta$ tкasouv, in its application to a thing, means to make or declare just, to claim as a right, to require. Hence $\delta ь к a i \omega \mu a$ is ( I ) a thing made or declared just. (a) A decision or sentence; whether of acquittal (Rom. v. 16) or of condemnation (Rom. i. 32). (b) A requirement (Rom. ii. 26. viii. 4). (c) Av ordinance; as here, and verse io, סскаьш́иата баркós. Also Luke

 righteous act (Rom. v. I8. Rev. xv. 4. xix. 8).

גarpeías] See note on viii. 5. Also on Rom. i. $9, \lambda a \tau \rho \varepsilon \dot{\omega} \omega$.
 tuary a mundane (material) one.

As коб $\mu \iota \kappa \grave{v}$ cannot be made a substantive, this is the only rendering consistent with the position of the article.
$\left.{ }^{d} \gamma_{\iota}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{l}\right]$ There seems to be no parallel in the New Testament for the singular here. But in the Septuagint it is frequently used, both for the whole tabernacle (as here), and for the holy place as distinguished from the most holy. For the latter, see Exod. xxvi. 33,

 former, Exod. xxxvi. 3, єis $\pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau \tau a$

 tố áyiov. Ezek. xlv. 4, 18, roîs
 áүí $\omega . . . \tau 0 \hat{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \xi \iota \lambda a ́ \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ a ̆ \gamma \iota o v . ~$ коб $\mu$ кко́г] Not in the debased sense which коб $\mu$ ко̀̀ bears in the only other place of its occurrence in Scripture (Tit. ii. 12, tàs коб $\mu$ ккàs $\grave{\epsilon} \pi t-$ $\theta v \mu i a s)$, but still in the disparaging sense in which it is material as the opposite of spiritual, and earthly as the opposite of heavenly. The explanation is given in the phrase tà orot-
 Col. ii. 8, 20. The law is there so described, as being (1) a rudimentary system, in contrast with the full revelation of grace and truth in the Gospel; (2) a material system, in reference to
$\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \sigma \kappa є v \alpha \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta, \dot{\eta} \pi \rho \omega^{\prime} \tau \eta, \dot{\epsilon} \nu \hat{\dot{\eta}} \ddot{\eta}^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \lambda v \chi \nu^{\prime} \alpha$ каi $\dot{\eta}$ $\tau \rho \alpha ́ \pi \epsilon \zeta \alpha \kappa \alpha i \dot{\eta} \pi \rho o ́ \theta \epsilon \epsilon \iota s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \rho \tau \omega \nu, \eta^{\prime} \tau \iota \varsigma \lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$
its tabernacle and sacrifices. So here the Levitical sanctuary is called коб $\mu к о \nu$ in contrast with the heavenly temple in which Christ ministers. See verse 24 . See also note on Rom. i. 20, where the senses of кó $\sigma \mu$ os are arranged in order.
2. $\left.\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta^{\prime} \gamma^{\alpha} \rho\right]$ For there was a tabernacle constructed. First, a tabernacle: that was the general idea of the ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma{ }^{\circ}$ ov. Then the general is particularized. It was double in construction; it consisted of a first and a second (an outer and an inner) $\sigma \kappa \eta \eta^{\prime}$. No mention is made of the temple, which was onlya reproduction, on a grander scale, and of more solid material, and with certain variations, of the only ${ }^{\boldsymbol{a}}$ үoov which had divine directions for its construction. See note on viii. 2, $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta \eta_{s}$.
$\kappa а \tau \epsilon \sigma \kappa є v a ́ \sigma \theta \eta$ ] See note on iii. 3 , катабкєขáтая.
$\dot{\eta} \pi \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \eta]$ The $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta$ is now divided into its two parts, the outer and inner chamber. And $\eta{ }^{\dot{\eta}} \pi \rho \dot{\mu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \eta$ (as in verse 6 , where it is contrasted with $\dot{\eta} \delta \in u \tau \epsilon \rho a$ in verse 7) means, the first reached on entering; the outer.
$\left.\dot{\epsilon} v \eta^{*}\right]$ The contents of the outer chamber of the tabernacle are here made three nominally, but practically two only, for the shewbread occupied the table.

And so in Exod. xxy. 23, \&c. (where the first instructions are given for the furniture of the tabernacle) only the table of shewbread and the candlestick are mentioned: the altar of incense is not named till xxx. I. The omission here is remarkable: see note on verse 4 .
duxvía] Exod. xxv. 3 r-39,

 24. xl. 4, 24, 25 , aं $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{v} a \nu \tau \iota \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$

 Lev. xxiv. 2-4, $\quad \underset{\epsilon}{\xi} \xi \omega \theta \in \nu$ тои кататєта́әдатоя...каì каи́боvбьv



тра́тє६a] Exod. xxv. 23-


 xxxvii. ro- 16 . xl. 4, 22, 23 ,


$\left.\dot{\eta} \pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \sigma \tau s\right]$ Upon the $\tau \rho a^{\prime}-$ $\pi \epsilon \zeta a$. The setting forth of the loaves; that is, the loaves set forth. Exod. xxv. 3o. xl. 23,

 évavióor Kupíou. Lev. xxiv.



 $\sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon(\mathrm{A}, \pi \rho о \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \tau \alpha \mathrm{~B} ?) \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.



$$
\text { ix. 2. Or } \tau \dot{d} \text { ä } \gamma, \quad \text { 3. } \quad \text { Or } \tau \text { à } \frac{a}{a} \gamma . \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\mathrm{a}} \gamma .
$$

 which. See notes on ii. 3. viii. $5,6$.
äyıa A neuter plural. Made a proper name, and so dispensing with the article. (I do not find it so in the Septuagint.) The Vatican manuscript has rà ${ }_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{j}$ a.
3. $\left.\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha{ }^{\prime}\right]$ After reaching; and so, behind.

тò $\delta$ ©útepov] In contrast with the curtain over the door of the tabernacle. See note on vi. 19.

бкךиๆ̀ $\dot{\eta} \lambda$.] A tabernacle, namely, that which is calleds \&c. The two chambers are spoken of as two tabernacles. Partly perhaps to emphasize the separateness, and so the unapproached sanctity, of the inner.
á $\left.\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{1 a} \dot{a}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{y}^{i} \omega \nu\right]$ The Vatican manuscript has $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{a} \gamma \boldsymbol{\sigma}{ }^{\circ} \tau \hat{\omega} v$ $\dot{a}^{\circ} \boldsymbol{\gamma} i \omega v$. And with more support than for $\tau \alpha^{\prime}{ }^{\alpha} \gamma(\alpha$ in verse 2 . The Alexandrine and (first hand of) the Sinaitic omit the articles in both cases. I do not find äyıa $\alpha^{2} \gamma^{\prime} \omega \nu$ (without $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ and $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ) in the Septuagint in this special application.
4. Ovelatipoov] Is this to be rendered censer, or altar of incense? For censer, we have the biblical use of the word in

2 Chron. xxvi. 19 and Ezek. viii. if, the only two places of its occurrence in the Septuagint, which always has $\theta$ vocaoríptov Gvplámatos (Exod. xxx. I) or $\theta$ vataoctho 5) for the altar of incense. On the other hand, (1) $\pi v \rho \epsilon \overline{0} v$ (not Ovuratrípov) is the Levitical word for firepan or censer (Lev. x . 1. xvi. 12. Num. xvi. 6, \&c.), and nothing is said of its being kept in the holy of holies. (2) The omission of the incensealtar in the enumeration of the contents of the tabernacle is almost impossible. (3) It is said that $\theta v \mu$ actiptov is used for the incense-altar in Philo, Josephus, de. These considerations would be decisive, were it not for the place here assigned to the $\theta v \mu \iota a \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} \rho o v . ~ I t ~ w a s ~ n o-~$ torious that the incense-altar stood in the outer chamber (see Exod. xl. 26, द̀v $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma_{\kappa \eta \eta \hat{\eta}} \tau o v$ цартирі́ov ג̇лє́vavтє то̂ кататєта́бMaтos). Otherwise it would have been inaccessible to the ministering priests except on the day of Atonement, whereas incense was to be offered upon it twice daily (Exod. xxx. 7,8 . Compare Luke i. 9). Yet here it is in some way assigned to the holy of holies. We mark



the word ${ }^{\text {tyoura }}$ as suggesting a reconciliation which would have been precluded if the $\boldsymbol{e} v$ $\bar{\eta}$ of verse 2 had been employed. The altar of incense, though standing in the holy place, had a close connexion with the holy of holies. See its first mention


 тө̂v цартурї̀v к.т.т. xl. 5 , каi

 avтiov B) $\boldsymbol{\tau} \bar{\rho} \kappa \kappa \beta \omega \tau o v$. So that, though the veil was ordinarily between it and the mercy-seat, it closely adjoined it, and on the day of Atonement, when the veil was drawn aside, the incense-altar was expressly included in the highest ceremonial of the anniversary (Exod. xxx. 10). On the whole, with whatever sense of the difficulties, we must regard the $\theta v \mu u a t \eta \eta^{\prime} o v a v a s$ standing here for the altar of incense. The Vatican manuscript adds кaì tò $\chi \rho v \sigma o v ̂ \nu ~ \theta v u l-~$ arị $\dot{\rho}$
 kai in verse 4 , leaving only
 bably a mere correction of a supposed mistake of fact.)

кє $\beta$ сто́v $]$ Exod. xxv. го, \&c.

The central feature of the new worship. No form or figure of deity-only a chest or box (the word is found in Aristophanes, \&c.) containing the 'ten words' of precept and prohibition written on the two stone tablets. Elsewhere кıßштòs stands for the ark of the deluge (xi. 7 . Matt. xxiv. 38. Luke xvii. 27. I Pet. iii. 20). The ark of Exod. ii. 3 is a different word ( $\theta i \beta s s)$.
 contained the code of the $\delta$ ta$\theta \eta{ }^{\prime} k \eta$ or covenant. Exod. xxy.




 $\sigma \dot{\omega} \omega$ к.т. $\lambda$.
$\pi a ́ v \tau o \theta e v]$ Exod. xxv. II,
 aùvìv.

वта́дขоя] Here feminine. Masculine in Exod. xvi. 33, 34,



 тирío к.т. .







 тирíшv єis $\delta \iota a \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \sigma \iota v$ к.т. $\lambda$.
$\alpha i \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \epsilon s]$ In the first mention of them they are called $\pi u \xi ̆ i a$. Exod. xxiv. 12, каі̀ $\delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma$

 $\theta \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota ~ a v ่ \tau o i ̂ s . ~ T h e ~ f i r s t ~ o c c u r-~$ rence of $\pi$ ла́кєs is in Exod. xxxi.

 $\delta a \kappa \tau v ́ \lambda \omega$ тov̂ © $\in o \hat{v}$. These being broken (Exod. xxxii. 19) are replaced by others: Exod. xxxiv. I, \&c. $\lambda a ́ \xi \in v \sigma o v ~ \sigma \epsilon a v \tau ஸ ̣ ̂ ~ \delta u ́ o ~ \pi \lambda a ́-~$
 ...каĭ $\gamma \rho a ́ \psi \omega$ è $\pi i ̀ \tau \hat{\omega} v \pi \lambda a \kappa \hat{\omega} v \tau \grave{a}$
 $\pi \lambda a \xi i$ taîs $\pi \rho$ м́тats. xxxiv. 27,
 $\mu a \tau a$ таи̃тa к.т. $\lambda$. The emphatic $\sigma \epsilon a v \tau \omega \hat{\omega}$ might seem to mark a difference between the first and the second writing. But Deut.



 must correct any hasty inferv ence. In I Kings viii. 9 it is stated that there was nothing in the ark (at the dedication of the temple of Solomon) $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$
 $M \omega v \sigma \eta_{s}$ é $\kappa \in \hat{i}$, so that the writer to the Hebrews goes back to earlier times in his enumeration
of its contents.
5. ن víєрávш] Eph. i. 21. iv. ro. Also Deut. xxvi. 19. xxviii. I. Ezek. i. 26. xi. 22. Not far above, but simply turning $\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ (which is always an adverb in the New Testament and the Septuagint) into a preposition with a genitive. See note on ii. 8 , íтока́тн. So far from the Cherubim being far above the ark, they were a part of its cover. See Exod. xxy. I8, 22. xxxvii. 8, 乇̇к тố ì



Xєpov $\beta \in i v]$ The final letter is $v$ in the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts, $\mu$ in the Alexandrine. (In the Septuagint I only notice a final $\nu$ in 2 Sam. vi. 2.) The word occurs first, and without explanation, in

 фaiav к.т. $\lambda$. In Exod. xxv. 18, \&c. directions are given for making \&vo $\mathrm{X} \in \rho \frac{0}{} \beta \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu$ (as if their form were already known) for the two ends of the mercyseat. It is in Ezekiel and the Revelation that we find the composition of these figures, if we may regard the térooapa ̧̧̂̃a as their equivalent. They seem to have been representative of animated nature in its chief

divisions. Perhaps also typical of various qualities of character. When we add together the courage of the lion, the industry of the ox, the aspiration of the eagle, and the sympathy of the man, we seem to have in one whole the character most complete, and fittest for God's presence. The plural is here (and in Gen. iii. 24 and Ezek. iii. 8, \&c.) neuter; in Exod. xxv. and xxxvii. alternately neuter and masculine (in xxxvii. 9 we have the strong masculine, àvỳ̀ трòs
 gular is always masculine.

Sós $\eta$ s] Of, belonging or attached to, as its setting and framework, the Shechinah whicls was the symbol of God's presence. Exod. xxv. 22, $\lambda a \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma$


 тvpíov. Num. vii. 89. Ezek. x. 19, каi סóģa [Kvpíov] Өєov̂ 'I $\sigma$ $\rho a \dot{\eta} \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\prime}$ àv $\tau \hat{\omega} v \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho a ́ v \omega$. For Sóga, see note on i. 3, and on Rom. i. 23 and ix. 4.

катаок.] Exod. xxv. 20,



 xvii. 5 (aủroús). Mark ix. 7 (aủrois). Luke i. 35 (ool). ix. 34 (aviтov́s). Acts $\mathrm{v} . \mathrm{I}_{5}$ ( (тví).
inaotipoov] Properly the
neuter of inaorýpos, propitiatory or expiatory. Always in the Septuagint the merey-seat, the lid or cover of the ark in the holy of holies. Perhaps from the connexion of covering with forgiving (Psalm xxxii. $1, \mu a-$


 riau. Ezek. xlv. 17, 20, where the literal Hebrew of | $\boldsymbol{\xi} \xi \lambda \lambda a^{\prime}-$ |
| :---: | $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ is to cover). Perhaps from the prominence given to the cover of the ark in the ceremonies of the day of expiation (Lev. xvi. 14, 15), which made it the symbolic centre of the personal hope of mercy as well as of the divine presence in Israel. Exod. xxv. 17, 21, 22,

 $\chi \rho v \sigma i ́ v\rangle ~ к а \theta а \rho о \hat{v} \ldots к а і$ ѐ $\pi \iota \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$
 $\alpha^{\prime} \nu \omega \theta \in \nu$ к. т. $\lambda$. In Rom. iii. 25 (the ouly other place of inaatiopoov in the New Testament) Christ is called inaoripoov, as though He were Himself the mercy-seat of the antitypical tabernacle. See note on ii. 17,


$\pi \epsilon \rho i \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} v]$ Concerning which several particulars. As to their symbolical meaning. The only thing proposed to be dwelt upon is the separation between the two chambers of the tabernacle, and the inac-





cessibility of the holy of holies, except once a year, and then to one person, and with the most solemn ceremony.
 riv. This common classical idiom seems to be found in the New Testament only here and



ката̀ $\mu$ ย́pos] Part by part. In detail. (Only here.)
6. Tovitur] The reference is still to the distinctness of the two chambers rather than to the contents of either.

Tウ̀v $\quad \pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \nu]$ See note on verse 2. The first (outer chamber of the) $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta$ '.

סià $\pi a \nu \pi o ́ s]$ Also xiii. 15. Matt. xviii. 1o. Mark v. 5. Luke xxiv. 53. Acts ii. 25 . x. 2. xxiv. 16 . Rom. xi. 1 c. 2 Thess. iii. 16.
ciaíactr] Enter. The Levitical ritual is represented as still kept up, though it is superseded as to its virtue by the new $\delta \iota a \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$.
$\tau \grave{s}$ גatocias] These were (1) the lighting and dressing of the lamps of the golden candlestick (Exod. xxvii. 2 I. Lev.
xxiv. 3) at evening and morning; (2) the offering of incense on the golden altar (Exod. xyx. 7, 8) at the same times. The changing of the shewbread was a weekly duty (Lev, xxiv. 8) on the sabbath. These were offices of the sanctuary: for the attendance at the brazen altar see note on vii. I3.
 viii. $5, \dot{\epsilon} \pi / \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i v$.
 on verse $2, \dot{\eta} \pi \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta$.
 great day of Atonement. Lev.



но́vos ó ápxtєpєús] Lev. xvi.

 $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{a} v \dot{\epsilon}_{\dot{c}}^{\dot{c}} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \theta_{\eta}$.
ov' $\chi \omega \rho i s$ aí $\mu a \tau о s]$ Lev. xvi. 14, ${ }^{5}$, каї 入д́чєєтає à àò той аї $\mu$ атоя то̂ $\mu$ о́тхоо к.т. $\lambda$. каì





 к.т.д. $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon t]$ The $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi о \rho \dot{\alpha}$



spoken of is not the sacrifice on the brazen altar, but the presentation of the blood in the holy of holies. See note on viii. $3, \pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \kappa \eta$.

 á $\mu a \rho \tau i ́ a s ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ a u ̀ r o ̂ ̀ ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~ . ~$

кай тติ้ той $\lambda a 0$ й] Lev. xvi.
 ápapтías тòv $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ \tau о и ̀ ~ \lambda \alpha o ̂ ̀ ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~}$


8. тои̂то ठัך入ойvтоя] The Levitical ceremonial is here said (I) to have been due to divine inspiration, (2) to have had a typical significance in some at least of its particulars. For $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{v} \nu$ in application to the Holy Spirit, see 1 Pet. i. ir,
 èv aìroís $\pi v \epsilon \bar{v} \mu a$ Xportồ. As there Old Testament prophecy, so here Old Testament rituol, is ascribed to the Holy Spirit
$\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \omega$ тєфагє $\bar{\omega} \sigma \theta a i]$ That the way of (into) the true holy of holies, the avioos ó ovjpanòs of verse 24 , had not yet been made manifest, dec. The doctrine of Atonement, by the one sacrifice of Christ once offered, was not yet so distinctly revealed that a man could enter God's spiritual presence with a conscience
disburdened of guilt by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (x. 22. xii. 24. I Pet. i. 2).
 тà à ${ }^{\prime}$ ana, see note on viii. $z$. (2) Is oiós here way in the sense of road, or way in the sense of journey? For the former, see Matt. vii. 13, 14 ,

 xxi. 8, 19. xxii. ıo. de. For the latter, Luke ii. 44, $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\kappa} \mu \epsilon \in \rho a s$ sióóv. Acts i. 12, $\sigma a \beta \beta$ árov ёXov óóv, ix. 17, 27. 1 Thess.
 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \dot{~} \mu a \hat{s}$. \&c. Either sense might suit this place. But x. 19, 20 (where the elo $\sigma$ odos $\tau \omega \nu \alpha^{2} \gamma i \omega \nu$ interprets the following $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \delta \dot{0}{ }^{5}$ ) decides in favour of the latter. The journey of the ayia. That is, the mode of entering the antitypical holy of holies.

ёт $\tau \hat{q} \mathrm{~s} \pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \eta \mathrm{~s}]$ While the outer oкทrخ̀ still had a standing. The outer separate from the inner. While there was still place for a separate outer chamber in the typical tabernacle. In the other eight places of its occurrence $\sigma$ oóots has its other sense, of faction or sedition. Here it is simply a standing or

standing-place. It is frequent in this sense in the Septuagint.

 I Chron. xxviii. 2, оіко $\delta \frac{\mu \tilde{j} \sigma \sigma}{}$


 thing (the fact of there being a $\pi \rho \omega \dot{T} \eta$ oкทท̀ separate from the holy of holies) was a parable. At first sight $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ us might look like the direct relative of $\sigma \kappa \eta v \grave{\eta}$ alone : which $\pi \rho \omega \dot{T} \eta$ б $\sigma \kappa \eta v \dot{\eta}$ was a parable. But to call the $\sigma \kappa \eta v \eta े$ itself a mapaßoд̀̀ seems harsh and without example. And the attraction (in gender or number) of the relative to the predicate is quite common. See, for example, Mark xv. 16, ${ }^{\ell} \sigma \omega$ t $\hat{\eta}$ s






 \&c. So here $\bar{\eta} \tau \iota s$ refers neither to $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \grave{\eta}$ nor to $\sigma \tau$ á $\sigma t s$, but stands for ö $\tau \zeta$ which thing, or rather a thing which. See notes on ii. 3, $\ddot{\eta} \tau \iota s$. viii. 5, oítuves. dec. cis tòv каupóv] Unto (pointing to, with a view to) the present season (period). The existence of an outer tabernacle, distinct and divided from the inner, was a parable which was
to have its explanation in the Gospel age. The only question is whether the $\dot{\nu} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \dot{o} \tau \alpha$ is (now) present, or (then) instant. In favour of the former we have



 $\pi о \eta \eta \rho \hat{v}$. For the latter, $x$ Cor.

 т $\eta \kappa \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \tau o \hat{v} \mathrm{Kvpíov}$.2 Tim.
 moi. The former is however the simpler. For кaцoós, a portion cut out of time, a season or opportunity, with the two points of difference from $\chi$ oóvos, that it is (I) limited in duration, and (2) deffinite in purpose, see, for
 каирои́s. Eccles. iii. 1 -8, кацро̀s тои̂ тєкєîv каї каиро̀s той à $\pi о$ Әavє̂̀v $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. Song ii. $12, \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \eta \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \phi \theta \eta$
 $\kappa \varepsilon \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ Acts i. 7. xiv. 17. xvii. 26. \&c. \&c, For its application to the Gospel age, see verse io, $\mu$ е́хря каıрои $\delta \iota o \rho \theta \omega^{\prime}$ $\sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$. Rom. iii. 26, $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\omega} v \hat{v} \nu$ каєрิิ. viii. 18. xi. 5. I Cor. vii. 29. 2 Cor. vi. 2. 1 Tim. i. 6, тò $\mu$ арт 'lit. i. 3. $\quad$ Pet. i. 1 1, cis ríva $\vec{\eta} \pi$ тiov ка. $\rho$ iे к.т. $\lambda$.
$\left.\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \eta_{\nu}\right]$ In accordance with which parable. The Levitical sacrifices are in accord with this



peculiar feature of the Levitical sanctuary. It speaks of an obstacle between man and God: they offer an ineffectual propitiation.
$\delta \hat{\omega} \rho \alpha^{\prime}$ тє ка̀ $\theta$.] See once again note on v. $\mathbf{I}$.

тробфє́роขтац] Are being offered. The Levitical ritual is spoten of as still going on.
 not. See note on iv. 2, $\mu \eta^{\prime}$.
 conscience. By removing the consciousness of unforgiven sin by an effectual absolution. The word ovveiônots (from oiv-
 perly (1) fellow-knowledge, lnowledge with (some one, that some one being) oreself; self-privity, consciousness. So here, and in

 the faculty of this self-privity or consciousness, conscience. Acts xxiii. I. xxiv. 16. Rom. ix. 1. xiii. 5. I Cor. viii. 7, 10, 12. 2 Cor. i. 12. iv. 2. v. in. \&c. dc. See fuller note on Rom. ii. 15 .
$\left.\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \hat{\sigma} \alpha_{i}\right]$ So X. r, 14. See note on ii. 10 .
ròv $\lambda a \tau \rho \kappa$ v́ovтa] Here, and in verse 14 , and in x .2 and xii. 28, the worshipper. In viii. 5
and xiii. 10, the priest. See note on Rom. i. g.
ro. $\mu_{0 \prime v o v ~ e ́ \pi i] ~ A ~ d i f f i c u l t ~}^{\text {en }}$ verse. The Vatican manuscript retains the кai of the received text before $\delta \iota \kappa$. But it agrees with the Sinaitic and
 $\mu a \tau a$ for $\delta<\kappa \alpha \omega \omega^{\prime} \mu \sigma \tau \nu$, and this change makes the кai quite untenable. (I) Without it the verse may perhaps form a single clause in apposition with the $\mu \grave{\eta} \delta \nu v a ́ \mu \epsilon \varepsilon a \iota ~ к . \tau . \lambda$. of verse 9. The construction would then be this: $\mu$ óvov סıкаєш́ната


 Mere carnal ordinances resting upon (such things as) meats and drinks and divers washings until a time of reformation.
 compare John xi. 38, каì 入íقos
 style of the Epistle (see xii. 11. \&c.) might be pleaded in excuse for the late and isolated position of $\bar{\pi} \pi \iota \kappa$ ípeva. (2) The alternative is to make póvovßantıopois a clause by itself (only standing in, or resting upon, meats and drinks and divers washings), and סєкає́ш $\mu$ ата - і̇тккє́ $\mu \epsilon \nu a$ a second apposi-

## 



ix. го. ()r каі $\delta<\kappa$.

tional clause (carnal ordinances imposed until a time of reformation). This seems to want confirmation in two respects; (a) the independence of the Móvóv $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \bar{i}$ clause, and (b) the stress laid upon '̇пккєُ́ $\mu \in v a$, as meaning imposed as a burden, without saying upon whom. There are objections to either explanation. (3) Still more, I think, to that of the Revised Version, 'being only (with meats and drinks and divers washings) earnal ordinances,' \&e.

Bош́ $\mu a \sigma \iota$ ] Such distinctions of clean and unclean in matters of food as those of Lev. xi, and Deut. xiv. Compare Acts x. and Rom. xiv. and Col. ii.
$\left.\pi{ }^{\prime} \mu a \sigma \iota v\right]$ The reference must be to restrictions or prohibitions of wine for priests (Lev. x.), for Nazarites (Num. vi.), \&c. The word $\pi \dot{\mu} \mu \alpha$ occurs only here and in 1 Cor. x. 4 In the Septuagint, only in Psalm cii. 9 and Dan. i. 16.

סıaфópots] Rom. xii. 6. See note on i, 4, öqu Seaфори́тepov.
ßалтиороїs] Exod. xxix. 40. Lev. viii. 14. \&c. See note on vi. 2.

Sıкан́́ $\mu$ ата] See note on verse $\mathbf{I}$.

барко́s] As ко́ $\sigma \mu v$ in the phrase тà бтоıхєia тov̂ кóб $\mu$ оv
(Gal. iv. 3. Col. ii. 8, 20), so oapkòs here is a term of disparagement for the Levitical system of ordinance and sacrifice as essentially material and unspiritual in its form.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota \kappa$. ס.] Until a season (or veriod) of rectification. A striking description of the Gospel age. It comes to make the crooked straight ( $\tau \grave{a}$ бкодьà єis є $\mathfrak{i} \theta \epsilon \mathrm{a} a \mathrm{v}$, Isai. xl. 4) by turning shadow into substance and substituting the spiritual for the carnal. For кalpós, see note on verse above. The form Soó $\rho$ $\theta \omega \sigma \iota$ s occurs only here. The revised text has $\delta_{\iota o p} \theta \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega v$ (for катор $\theta \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega v$ ) in Acts xxiv. 2 , in the sense of reforms. In the Septuagint, the verb $\delta_{\text {to }} \theta_{0}$ ov occurs in Jer. vii. 3, 5, èàv סıop-
 $\dot{v \mu} \hat{\omega} \nu$, \&e. Also $\delta$ oop $\theta \omega \tau \dot{\eta}$ s in Wisd. vii. 15.

Ėтィкєi $\mu \in V \Omega]$ See the first note on the verse. (1) Lying upon (in the sense of imposed as a burden upon) seems to want a dative. (See I Cor. ix. 16.) Otherwise that sense would find illustration in Acts xy. 10, 28, ¿̀ $\pi$ l-
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu a \theta \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \ldots \mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu \pi \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \nu \grave{\epsilon} \pi t-$
 Lying upon (in the other suggested sense, of reating upon as

## 



 $\sigma t \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$, is unobjectionable except in collocation. See John xi. 38 (quoted in a former note).


II. Xptaròs $\delta \epsilon$ ] We reach now the great contrast. The antitype of the Levitical sanctuary is the heaven into which the Melchizedek High Priest entered once for all as the crucified and risen Saviour.

тарауєขо́иєขоs] Having arrived. IIaving appeared on the scene of fact and history. See Matt. iii. I, èv dè taîs $\eta \dot{\eta} \mu$ épacs

 $\pi а р \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu о ́ \mu \eta \nu$ סoűvaц $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{n} \gamma \hat{\eta}$. Compare Isai. lxii. II, єïnatє

 aorist does not point to any particular moment, such as the nativity or the beginning of the ministry, but sums up into a single act the whole of the manifestation, from incarnation to ascension.
 genitive gives the subject of the highpriestly action. High Priest concerned about, ministering in, securing and applying by His ministry, тà $\mu$ é $\lambda \lambda$ дovтa a a ${ }^{2}$ áá. The genitive in iii. I ( $\tau \tilde{\eta} s$ б $\quad \mu-$
$\left.\lambda o \gamma^{\prime} a s \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \mu \bar{\omega}\right)$ is rather different: see note there. The genitive here is nearly equivalent to the
 ii. 17.
$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ à $\gamma \alpha \hat{\omega} \nu]$ ] So
 ara0 $\hat{\omega}$. The reading of the Vatican manuscript is $\gamma \in \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{e}^{-}$ $\nu \omega v$. The good things already come to pass, already brought to light by the Gospel. Compare 2 Tim. i. Io. If $\mu \in \lambda \lambda \sigma^{\prime} v \tau \omega v$ (with the Alexandrine and Sinaitic manuscripts) be retained, still the sense may be the same. The good things future under the law, future till Christ came. But it is not certain whether the sense may not be, future still even under the Gospel. See vi. 5, סuváucts тє $\mu$ édiovtos aiwnos, and the note there.


 Communion Service. That by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefts of His Passion.

סıà $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ] Depends upon $\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \sigma$ $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon v$. Through, locally. He passed through the antitype of


the ${ }^{\text {ancos into the antitype of the }}$ $\vec{a}$ yea ajiou．What then is the antitype of the áyaa？（I）The phrases of iv． 14 （ $\delta_{L \in \lambda \eta \lambda \nu} \theta_{\text {ót }}$ Toùs oủpavov́s）and vii． 26 （ $2 \psi \eta$－ $\lambda o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o s ~ \tau \omega \nu ~ o u ̉ \rho a \nu \omega \nu)$ would point to the general idea of the lower heavens through which He pass－ ed into the aṽros ó oúpavós（ix． 24）of the divine Presence it－ self，which last is unquestion－ ably the antitype of the ${ }_{a} \gamma_{6}$ a $a^{\text {aficu }}$ here．（2）But the em－ phasis laid upon the particular $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \dot{\eta}$ here intended may seem to suggest a more definite in－ terpretation．May this be the ideal heaven of the divine self－ manifestation to saints and angels，as distinguished from the ideal heaven of the very Presence？（3）Something might be said for a totally different sense，making the $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \bar{\eta}$ the $\sigma \grave{\alpha} \xi$ of Christ，the human nature which He took upon Him and in which He minis－ tered and suffered below．See x． $2 \circ$ ，ठ¿à тоर̂ кататєта́ $\sigma \mu a \tau о \varsigma$,

 have a striking illustration in the version of John ii．ig（גv́бate тòv vaòv $\tau$ oùtov к．т．$\lambda$ ．）given by the false witnesses（Mark xiv．
 тоv，каї．．．ä̀入入оv áхєєротоíqтоv）． The figures and even the types
of Scripture are plastic，not rigid，and the same inspired writer may vary them with the context．The first of the three explanations is perhaps the simplest．
$\mu \in i ́ \zeta o v o s]$ Greater in diguity． Matt．xii．6，тồ iєpov̂ $\mu \in i ̂$ ̧̧ov


тєлєtotє́pas］More mature， as being the completion and fulfilment of the typical．See
 тé̀єєov，тò èк $\mu$ є́pous катарүך－ $\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \tau \alpha l$.
$\chi$ хєротосйтоv］So verse 24， оง $\gamma^{\grave{a} \rho}$ єis $\chi^{\epsilon} \rho о \pi о$ í $\eta \tau \alpha$ єio $\bar{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$


 тоוท̆́ros vaoîs катоккє̂．（In the
 stands for idols．Lev．xxvi．г． Isai．ii．ェ8．\＆c．）
 belonging to this（visible）crea－ tion．Col．i．15，23，mávŋs
 tòv oúpavóv．See note on iv． 13，and Rom．i．20．For $\tau \alpha v{ }^{\tau} \eta$ ， compare rov́rou in Rom．vii． 24.

12．Si＇aíparos］The former $\delta_{i a}$ was local，through．This is instrumental，by means of．The reference is to the annual day of Atonement（Lev．xvi．）on which the high priest＇s entrance into the holy of holies was
$\mu \dot{\prime} \sigma \chi \omega \nu, \delta \iota \alpha$, $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ той ídíou aí $\mu \alpha \tau о$, $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$

effected by means of the blood of the two sacritices. The blood gave him an admission impossible otherwise. Lev. xvi. 3, oṽt $\omega$ ( $s o$, and not otherwise)
 For another significant preposition in the same connexion, see

$\left.\tau \rho \alpha^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\nu} \kappa \alpha i \not \mu о \sigma \chi \omega \nu\right]$ An inversion of the order. The latter was the offering for the priests, and it came first. Lev. xvi. 6, 9, $1 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I} 5$.

Suà $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ roû ióíve] So only could He enter for us. As the Eternal Son, He has a right there: as the High Priest of man, He enters in virtue of the sacrifice of Himself.
$\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon v]$ By ascension. See vi. 20.
 See verse 25. For द̇фámák, see note on vii. 27.
$\tau \grave{a}$ á ${ }^{2}$ a] See note on viii. $2, \tau \bar{\omega} v a^{2} \boldsymbol{i}^{\prime} \omega v$. The antitype of the holy of holies, the divine Presence itself.
aieviav] In contrast with the temporary reconciliation effected by the annual ceremony of expiation. For the contrast between aíuvos and $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \kappa a \imath \rho o s$, see 2 Cor. iv. 18 . The feminine form (ai $\omega v i \alpha$ ) is found (in the New Testament) only here and in 2 Thess. ii. 16 . In the Sep-
tuagint, Num. xxv. 15. Isai. lxi. 4. Jer. xx. 17. Ezek. xxxvii. 26.

גи́т $\rho \omega \sigma \iota 1$ ] Luke i. 68. ii. 38. Elsewhere (in the New
 This is one of the links of a possible connexion between this Epistle and St Luke. The simple form occurs also in Lev. xxv. 48. Jud. i. 15 . Num. xviii. i6.


 forms of the uncompounded word are $\lambda \dot{\text { út }} \rho o v$, Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45 : $\lambda v \tau \rho \hat{v} \nu$ (middle and passive), Luke xxiv. 2 I. Tit. ii. 14. I Pet. i. I8: and $\lambda v \tau \rho \omega \tau{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$, Acts vii. 35. See fuller note on Rom. iii. 24, גттодvт $\rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$.

єบ์ $\rho \dot{\mu} \mu \in \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ] (A debased form, simulating a first aorist, for ev ро́ $\mu \in \nu=$ s). This is apparently the only instance, in the New Testament or the Septuagint, of the (classical) middle use of єvpioкш, to find for oneself, to win, or gain. The $\lambda$ v́rperes won is for us: but the voice expresses 'the latent sibi' which marks the Saviour's interest in it (He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satigfied).

Ј3. $\epsilon i$ yáp] I say aioviav $\lambda$ र́rpertu-for, dc. It is an argument a fortiori. If animal blood could have any value at


all in relation to religious mat-ters-and it could only be, at the best, an external and a ceremonial value-how much more, \&c. tò aifa] That blood. See verse i2. The reference in the first clause is still to the day of Atonement.

т $\quad$ á ${ }^{\prime} \omega \nu$ кà̀ тav́ $\rho \omega \nu$ ] Such is the order in the three great manuscripts.

тav́p $\omega \nu$ ] Always $\mu{ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi^{\omega \nu}$ in Lev. xvi. For $\tau \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \bar{\prime}$, see x. 4. Psalm l. 13, $\mu \grave{\jmath}$ фа́үодає коє́a
 Isai. i. i I, aíца таúpшу каì трáү $\omega \nu$ ov̀ $\beta$ ои́ $\lambda о \mu a<$.

кaì $\sigma \pi o \delta o ̀ s ~ \delta \alpha \mu a ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s] ~ A n ~$ abrupt transition to another Levitical ceremony, for which

 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$.
$\sigma \pi$ ơós $\left.^{\prime}\right]$ See Num. xix. 9, Io.
javri(lov $\sigma \alpha]$ The water of separation was called vidu $\rho \alpha$ тьш $\quad$ ий (Num. xix. 9, 13, 20, 2I). The expression here is condensed and abbreviated. The full phrase would at least
 even then would have required the mention of the water which made the ashes capable of the sprinkling. For $\hat{\rho} a \gamma \tau i \zeta \epsilon \omega$, see verses 19, 2 I , and X . 22. It occurs nowhere else in the

New Testament. And in the Septuagint only in Lev. vi. 27. 2 Kings ix. 33. Psalm li. 7,
 $\sigma \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$. Also $\dot{\rho} \alpha \nu \tau \tau \sigma \mu$ òs is found (in the New Testament) only in xii. 24 and I Pet. i. 2, and (in the Septuagint) only in Num. xix. The forms $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ aiverv and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \rho \rho a i v \epsilon \iota v$ are somewhat oftener used in Leviticus and Numbers.
 that lave been defled by contact with death in any shape.
 $\mu \epsilon \nu o s ~ \tau o \hat{v} \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa o ́ \tau o s . . . a ̈ \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s$



 $\pi \rho o \sigma$ úmov B) то仑 $\pi \in \delta i o v ~ \tau \rho a v-$ paтíov $\dot{\rho}$ oнфaias ( 13 omits $\dot{\rho}$.), "ֶ

 The water of separation was the a $\quad$ vacra in all such cases. For comoin (not in the Septuagint), sec Matt. xv. if, \&c. Mark vii. 15 , dc. Acts $x .15$. xi. 9. xxi. 28 . And for кowo's (the opposite of a $\gamma$ cos), see note on Rom. xiv. 14.
áytálєt] Sanctifies, in the sense of restoring to outward communion with God and His chosen nation. This was the effect of the application of the
$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ т \hat{\eta} s \sigma \alpha \rho к o ̀ s ~ к \alpha \theta а \rho o ́ т \eta т а, ~ \pi о ́ \sigma \omega ~ \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda о \nu ~ 14$

water of separation to one who had incurred the special defile－ ment of contact with physical death．It was the effect of the ceremony of the day of Atone－ ment upon the priests and people generally，in the form of a typi－ cal and prophetical absolution from offences against God．The two rites are combined in the one statement：both are said to avail only for a ка $\theta$ apór $\eta$ s of the
 ii．II．

тоós］With a view to，in the aspect of，as regards，that sort of purity（or cleanness） which belongs to the $\sigma a ́ p \xi$ as op－ posed to the avveíŋnoıs．That каӨaoótクs which is external and ceremonial，instead of spiritual or of the conscience．The form ка日apór力s is found here only in the New Testament or the Sep－ tuagint．

14．$\pi o ́ \sigma \omega \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o v]$ An ex－ clamation．In x．29，סокєíध is intérposed between $\pi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$ and the comparative（ $\chi$ cípovos）．I leave you to judge．See note on verse 13．For the phrase （always in the same d fortiori sense）see Matt．vii．in，ei oiv

 Luke xi．13．xii． 28 ．Rom． xi．12， 24 ．Philem． 16.
tò aipa roù X．］The full
and exact phrase occurs else－ where only in I Cor．$x .16$ and Eph．ii．13．But equivalent forms are frequent．See x．I9 （＇I $\eta \sigma o \hat{u}$ ）．xiii，12， 20 （ $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ iótóou ．．．$\delta \iota a \theta \eta^{\prime} к \eta$ s ácovíov）．Matt．xxvi．
 $\theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ ）$)$ Luke xxii． 20 （ $\mu o u$ ）． John vi．53－56（ $\mu \mathrm{ov}$ ）．Acts

 тov̂ iठóov）．Rom．iii．25．v． 9 （aủav̂）． 1 Cor．xi．25， 27 （ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\omega}$ $\stackrel{\dot{\epsilon}}{\mu} \hat{\omega} \ldots \ldots$ ．．．tov̂ Kvpiov）．Eph．i． 7 （aũ $\tau 0 \hat{u})$ ．Col．i． 20 （тои̂ $\sigma \tau \alpha v \rho \circ \hat{v}$ au่тov̂）．I Pet．i．2， 19 （＇I $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma$ où X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau \circ \hat{0} \ldots$ ．．． $\mathrm{X}_{\rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{)}}$ ．I John i． 7 （＇I $\eta$ oov̂ тov̂ viov̂ aùtoû）．Rev． i． 5 （av่าoû）．v． 9 （aov）．vii． 14．xii．II（тov ápviov）．The blood is the life（Lev．xvii．It，


 $\lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta a \ell \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\imath} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \psi \nu \chi \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. тò $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ aî $\mu a$ aùrồ ávrì $\tau \hat{\eta} s \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \xi(\lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \tau a c)$ ．The blood of Christ is the surrendered life，that obedience unto（up to）death （Phil．ii．8）by which He made atonement for $\sin$ ．
$\delta \iota a ̀$ т $\quad v \in \dot{v} \mu a t o s ~ a i \omega v i o v] ~ A$ very difficult passage．（r）Much depends upon the sense given to $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \eta \quad v \epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon v$ ．Is it the $\pi \rho \circ \sigma-$ $\phi$ ¢fecty of v．I，or is it the second $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi$ éfety of viii． 3 ？ In other words，is it the sacri－

## $\dot{\epsilon} \alpha \nu \tau \dot{\partial} \nu \pi \rho о \sigma \eta \dot{\eta} \nu є \gamma к є \nu{ }^{\alpha} \mu \omega \mu о \nu \quad \tau \hat{\omega}$ Ө $\Theta \hat{\omega}, \kappa \alpha \theta \alpha \rho \iota \epsilon \hat{\imath}$

fice of the death, or is it the sacrifice of the self-presentation, as the risen and ascended Lord, in heaven itself? In verses 25, 26 , the two are contrasted. If He has often to present Himself, He must often have suffered. (2) Upon the answer to this question will partly depend the meaning of $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha}$ тус́úpatos ail víov. That it is the Holy Spirit who is spoken of is certain either way. The omission of the article emphasizes the epithet Eternal. (a) But if the $\pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\eta} v \in \gamma \kappa \in$ refers to the self-presentation in heaven (as $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \eta$ in verse 25 ), then the agency of the Holy Spirit in resurrection may be prominent in the mention of the $\pi v \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ aićviov here. See Rom. viii. II, where the indwelling Spirit is made the agent of the future resurrection of the Christian, and, by implication, of the resurrection of Christ Himself. If this view of the $\pi \rho о \sigma \dot{\eta} v \in \gamma \kappa \in v$ is taken, the statement is that, by the agency of the Holy Spirit in raising Him from the dead, Christ was enabled to present Himself to God in heaven as the crucified and risen Saviour, in fulfilment of the type of the high priest carrying the blood of the victims, already sacrificed on the brazen altar, into the holy of holies on the day of Atonement. (b)

In the other view, the agency of the Eternal Spirit must be specially comnected with the ${ }^{\prime} \mu \mu \omega \mu \nu \quad$ which follows; and the thought will be, that the Saviour, whose humiliation consisted in receiving the Holy Spirit (John iii. 34, оจ๋к ย̇к $\mu$ с́т$\rho o v)$ as His inspirer and enabler throughout the days of His flesh, and living in all things as a Man full of the Holy Ghost, laying aside the present exercise of the powers and attributes of Deity, was thus preserved blameless $\mu$ є́хрь $\theta a v a ́ \tau o v, ~ a n d, ~$ as the antitype of the perfect viction of the Levitical ritual, offered Himself on the altar of the Cross as the all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world. I am in suspense between the two interpretations, but incline now to the former.
 ticular combination is found ouly here. For aiévos with a divine Person, see Rom. xvi. 26, qov̂ aicuíov © $\Theta o \hat{v}$. Also Job xxxiii. 12. Isai. xxvi. 4, ${ }^{\circ}$ ©єо̀s ó $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \gamma a s$ ó aíúvos. xl. 28, Oєòs aíuvos к.т. $\lambda$. Compare
 aicivov. For other epithets of the Holy Spirit (besides the commonest of all, $a^{d} y(o v)$, see x. 29, $\tau \bar{\eta} \mathrm{f}$ रápıтos. John xiv. 17 , тท̂s à̀ $\lambda \theta$ єius. Eph. i. I3, $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$

éavtóv] In contrast with



ix. 14. Or т. $\sigma, \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$.

the $\tau p a{ }^{\gamma} \omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ каi тávouv above. So in verses 25, 26, ėv aïpatı $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o t \rho i \omega$ is contrasted with $\delta a \dot{\alpha}$

$\pi \rho о \sigma \dot{\eta} \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon \nu]$ For the alternative sense here, see note above on $\delta_{\iota a} \pi \gamma$. aicuriov.
$\left.{ }^{\prime} \mu \mu \mu о \nu\right]$ I Pet. i. Ig, is
 word frequent in the Septuagint (first in Exod. xxix. i) in connexion with the choice of victims for sacrifice. Without blemish. Faultless. Eph. i. 4. v. 27. Col. i. 22. Rev. xiv. 5.
$\tau \hat{\omega} \Theta \epsilon \in \dot{0}]$ Depends on $\pi \rho o \sigma-$ $\eta^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon \nu$.

каӨa. $\epsilon \hat{\imath}]$ (With this word ends the Vatican manuscript, leaving the remaining chapters of the Epistle, together with the Pastoral Epistles, and that to Philemon, and the Revelation, without its help.) The verb $\kappa \alpha \theta$ api $\langle\epsilon \epsilon v$ is specially applied in the first three Gospels (I) to the cleansing of the leper (Matt. viii. 2, 3. x. 8. xi. 5. Mark i. $40-42$. Luke iv. 27. v. 12, 13. vii. 22. xvii. 14, 17 ), and (2) to the ceremonial cleansing of vessels (Matt. xxiii. 25, 26. Luke xi. 39). In the Acts and Epistles it passes ( r ) to the admission of all mankind to equal spiritual privileges (Acts x. 15. xi. 9), then (2) to the
idea of moral and spiritual cleansing (Acts xv. 9. 2 Cor. vii. r. Eph. v. 26 . Tit. ii. 14. James iv. 8. I John i. 7, 9). The course of the word in the Septuagint is analogous to this; beginning with its repeated use in ceremonial purifications, and specially in reference to the cleansing of the leper (Lev. xiii. and xiv.), and passing in the psalms and prophets to a spiritual purifying from guilt and $\sin$ (Psalm xix. 12, r3. li. 2, g. Jer, xxxiii. (xl. B) 8. Ezek. xxxyi. 25. Mal. iii. 3. \&c.).
$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \sigma v v \epsilon ' \hat{\delta} \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ ] See note on verse 9. The thought here is the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, and of His presentation of it in heaven, in taking away the sense of unforgiven sin from the conscience, and so setting the man free for a willing and devoted service.

рєкршә] The word is perhaps chosen in reference to the special office of the $v \delta \omega \rho$ pavtco$\mu o \hat{v}$ above in cleansing from the ceremonial defilement of contact with deatl. Not from dead bodies, but from dead works. See notes on verse 13 . Also note on vi. $\mathrm{I}, \nu \in \kappa \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$.
cis tò $\lambda a \tau \rho \varepsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau]$ The removal of the burden of $\sin$ by a free forgiveness is the preli-

## 15 Kai $\delta_{\iota \alpha} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ 

minary condition of a willing， spiritual，and life－long service． ＇I＇le tense expresses the con－ tinued，habitual，daily exercise of the new גarpeía．See again note on Rom．i． 9 ，${ }_{\oplus}^{*} \lambda a \tau \rho \in \dot{\sigma} \omega$ ．

 all life．In contrast with the $\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$ above，and with the de－ filing contact with literal death from which the $\sigma \pi 0 \delta o \dot{s} \delta a \mu a \dot{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \omega$ cleansed typically．Compare x．



15．Sんà тov̀ro］Because His blood is thus efficacious．
$\delta_{t a} a \eta$ и́к $\eta$ s］See notes on vii．
 каıทグข． $\dot{\delta} \pi \omega s]$ That，a death having taken place unto redemption of the transgressions which referred to（bore upon，were committed against）the first סtaOńк $\eta$ ，the called might receive the（fulfil－ ment of the）promise of the eter－ nal inheritance．This clause describes the object of the Me－ diatorship of the new $\delta_{2} a \theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ ． Namely，that，a full and perfect atonement having been made for past sins，possession might be given，to all to whom the Gospel call comes，of that pro－ mised eternal inheritance which could not without that atone－ ment be entered upon by any．

日avátov］A death．Inten－ tionally general，to lay stress upon death being indispensable to the object in view．It was not necessary to say whose death． Death in the abstract is the point．
$\left.\alpha^{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \tilde{\tau} \tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota v\right]$ Three thoughts always lie in ámoдv́тршбts．（1） A previous state of bondage．（2） The interposition of a 入úтpov． （3）A consequent deliverance． The word is not found in the Septuagint：it occurs ten times in the New Testament．The peculiarity here is the parti－ cular genitive following émodí－
 is either absolute（Rom．iii． 24. I Cor．i．30．Eph．i．7．iv． 3o．Col．i．14），or else takes a genitive of the person or thing delivered（Luke xxi．28，文 $\hat{\omega}_{\nu .}$ Rom．viii．23，төv̂ бө́́датоs． Eph．i．I4，$\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi o \iota \eta \sigma \epsilon \omega s)$. Here it is a genitive of the thing from which the deliver－ ance is．Removal，by a dóтpov （Matt．xx．28．Mark x．45）or àv íAuvpov（ 1 Tim．ii．6），of sins．
éni］With reference to．And so（by the context）against．
$\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \eta]$ The statement is that the death of Christ had a retrospective bearing upon sins committed under the Mosaic $\delta \iota \alpha \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ ．Is it that that $\delta \iota \alpha \theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ required vindicating before its
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \tau \bar{\eta} \pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \eta \delta^{\prime} \alpha \alpha \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta \alpha ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu \quad \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon-$


supersession? Has Isai. xlii. 21 (He will magnify the law, and make it howourable) anything of the same thought? At all events the atonement must not be confined to previous transgressions. See I John i. 7-9. ii. $\mathrm{I}, 2$.

тара $\beta$ áбєнг] See note on ii. 2, тара́ßабts к. $\pi$.
$\alpha^{\prime} \beta \omega \sigma \tau \nu$ Might take, in actual possession. For $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \gamma^{-}$ $\gamma \in \lambda i ́ a v \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v e c t$ in this sense of receiving the fulfilment of $a$ promise, see Acts ii. 33, गír $\tau \epsilon$



 notes on vi. 12, $\mathrm{I}_{5}$ (equivalent phrases), кגךроvouovivt $\omega v$


oi кєклдرє́vot] The expression used for the invited guests in the parables of Matt. xxii. 3, 4, 8, and Luke xiv. 17, 24. For the use here, compare note on Rom. viii. 30 . It means those invited by the Gospel, and (tacitly understood) accepting the call.
aievíov] In implied contrast with the earthly and therefore temporary possession of Canaan. See iv. 8, 9.

кдпроvoнías] Explained by the last reference (iv. 9), and by i. 14, к $\lambda \eta \rho о v о \mu \epsilon і г ~ \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i ́ a v . ~$ See note on i. 2, кגךроvó $\mu \sigma v$ тávтшv. Also on vi. 12, 17 .
16. ö $\pi$ ov yáp] See note on vii. 22, $\delta<a \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ s. The transition from covenant to testament is clear and not to be evaded. The latter was the commoner sense of $\delta \iota a \theta \eta \eta^{\prime} к \eta$. To one thinking in Greek there was nothing incongruous in the two senses. The fundamental idea of $\delta \iota a \theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ is arrangement. A covenant is an arrangement of relations, a testament is an arrangement of possessions. The transition is eased by the words $\theta$ avá ${ }^{2} o v$ and $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o v o \mu i a s$ in verse 15 . It is as if the sacred writer had said, And thus the סa日viкך which is in one aspect a covenant is in another aspect a testanvent. It presupposes a death, and it confers an inheritance. View it in this light. Thint what a testament is. See how appropriate is the idea to the Gospel Siaөиंк

Өávatov àvá $\overline{\kappa \eta] ~ a ~ t e s t a-~}$ ment presupposes a death-that of the testator. For बंvá $\gamma \kappa 7$, see verse 23, and Rom. xiii. 5.

ф' $\varphi \epsilon \sigma \theta a t]$ Both the Authorized Version and the Revised


 ix. 17: Or $\mu$ गे $\tau\langle\tau \in$.

Version recognize the difficulty of finding an English equivalent for $\phi \epsilon \in \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ here, by rendering it be. Such translations as be adduced or alleged (in a forensic sense), by way of proving the will, are harsh and stiff, and it seems better to think of vaguer uses of the passive, such as to move, come, or go, and hence to be current, to be about, to be in the case, sufficiently indicated by the simple to be. The repeated occurrence of it in 2 Pet.

 this looser passive.

тoû $\left.\delta \iota a \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \cdot \sigma v\right]$. For the phrase $\delta t a \tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ ठ $\iota a \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta \nu$, compare viii. Io. Acts iii. 25 .
17. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ veкроis] Either (1) in reference to dead persons (see, for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$, , verse $15, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \omega{ }^{-}$
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \hat{i}$ toîs $\delta \omega \rho \rho o t s ~ a \dot{v} \tau 0 \hat{v})$, or (2) on the footing, groundwork, or supposition, of dead persons (see
入íaıs).
$\beta \in \beta$ iia] Talid. See note on ii $2, \beta \epsilon \in \beta$ alos.
$\left.\epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\eta}^{\prime}\right]$ Since it never acails, \&ec. An unnsual, perhaps unexampled, instance of $\mu \dot{\eta}$, but thoroughly consistent with its Hellenistic use (and indeed
its proper definition) as the mental negative, the negative contemplated or reasoned upon. The justification of it lies in the $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \boldsymbol{\prime}$, which is essentially subjective. Compare John iii, 18,
 к.т. $\lambda$. To make the clause interrogative (for doth it ever avail...?) seems a harsh and needless expedient, with the above passage (John iii. 18) in view. (The alternative reading тótє simply anticipates and prepares for the ठ̈Tc. $^{\text {) }}$
$\left.{ }_{\delta}^{\circ} \tau \epsilon \zeta \hat{\eta}\right]$ For ${ }^{\circ} \tau \epsilon$ with a present indicative, see Mark xi. 1 , óte $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ íSourtv (when they are in the act of drawing nigh). John ix. 4, ӧтє oủdeis סv́vataı (when no one is in the state of being able). Here, when (while) the testator is living.
18. $\partial \theta \epsilon v$ ] Whence. In consequence of which principle; namely, that a testament presupposes a death. For $\bar{\delta} \theta \epsilon \nu$, see note on ii. I 7 .
ovidè $\dot{\eta} \pi \rho \omega \dot{T} \eta]$ Not even the first (the Mosaic) $\delta$ ca日 $\dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$. It might have seemed to be enough that the second (the Christian) $\delta_{t a} \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ should fulfil the condition of having a death antecedent to it. But it was not so. Even the Mosaic, typical
of the Christian, recognized the same necessity. The question arises, Was it that the Mosaic Sua $\eta_{\eta}^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ was itself testament as well as covenant? Or, that the Mosaic $\delta$ oatخкк typified the testamentary character of the Christian? I think the latter.

е̇vкєкаìvяттаı] Has been inaugurated. Either (1) the Scripture perfect. Thus it is written in the imperishable record. Or (2) the perfect of permanence. The inauguration is still in force while the Levitical system continues in operation. The word $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma^{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ derived nouns, is post-classical
 sical), and has the senses of (I) making new (as for the first time), as Ecclus. xxxvi. 6,
 making arew (remaking), as I Sam. хі. 14, каі̀ є́ $\gamma \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \dot{\prime} \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ е̇кє̂̂ тウ̀̀ $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a v . ~ 2 ~ C h r o n . ~$
 tи́poor Kupiov. Psalm li. го,
 є̀ $\gamma \kappa$ ќтols $\mu$ оv, and (3) inaugurating (dedicating), as Deut. xx. 5. I Kings viii. 63 , каì èveкаí-
 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. And so here, and in $x$. 20. Hence દ̇үкаívlots (Num.
 vii. 10), dedication. Also $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \gamma$ кaívi, a feast of dedication, Ezr.
vi. ェ6, 17. Neh. xii. 27. Dan. iii. 2. John x. 22.
19. $\lambda a \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i \sigma \eta s$ śáp] See Exod. xxiv. 3-8. The particulars given in Exodus are (I) the telling to the people $\pi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu \tau a \quad \tau \dot{\alpha}$
 para, (2) the answer of the people, Mávas toùs $\lambda$ ózous oüs
 the writing of the words, (4) the rising early to build an altar under the mountain, (5) the sending young men to offer блокауты́мата and to sacrifice a peace-offering ( $\theta v \sigma i a v ~ \sigma \omega \tau \eta p i o v$ ) of $\mu \sigma \sigma \chi^{\prime},{ }^{\prime}, a_{\text {, }}$ (6) the sprinkling of half the blood upon the altar, (7) the reading of тo $\beta \iota \beta \lambda i o v$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta_{t a} \theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta s$ in the ears of the people, and their answer, (8) the sprinkling of (the other half of) the blood on the people, with the words, 'I $\delta o v ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ a i \mu a ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$
 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu \tau 0 v^{-}$ tov. The ceremony is placed in Exodus between the two deliveries of the law, before the breaking of the first tables. To the particulars given in Exodus the Epistle adds (1) кaì $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 sprinkling of aúrò т̀̀ $\beta\langle\beta \lambda i ́ o v$. (We need not add to these variations by combining verse 21 with the preceding.) Of these (1) the addition of the






трáyou to the $\mu$ ó $\sigma \chi$ о may be regarded as a sort of formula of sacrifices；or it may have been suggested by the predominant thought of the whole sub－sec－ tion，which is that of the cere－ monial of the day of atonement． The details of（2）seem to come from Lev．xiv． 6 （the cleansing of the leper）and from Num． xix． 6 （the three ingredients of the burning of the $\delta^{\alpha} \mu a \lambda \iota s$ ，fol－ lowed by verse 9 which men－ tions the water，and verse 18 which mentions the hyssop），but may be introduced as natural and customary circumstances of the sprinkling of blood，the water to liquefy and multiply the blood，the wool to bind the hyssop to the cedar stick．（3） The addition of the $\beta \iota \beta \lambda i o v$ to the daós in the sprinkling is explained by the thonght that， ＇though containing divine words，it was written by human hands，＇and thus needed purify－ ing to qualify it for its abiding virtue．

каì т $\omega \hat{\nu} \tau \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu$ ］See note above．Compare verses 12 and 13.
$\mu \epsilon \tau \mathfrak{a}$ ช̛ $\delta a \tau o s]$ See note above，
and note on verse 13．Com－ pare Lev．xiv．4－7 and Num． xix．6， 9,18 ．

тò $\beta \iota \beta \lambda i o v]$ Exod．xxiv．4，




$\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$ тòv $\lambda$ ． épávт兀бєv］Exod． xxiv．8，$\lambda a \beta$ ß̀v $\delta$ è $\mathrm{M} \omega u \sigma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ тò аíца катєбкє́ठaбє тои̂ $\lambda a o v ̂$ ．For pavti\}cty, see note on verse 13 ．

20．$\lambda \epsilon$＇$' \omega v$ ］The only varia－ tions in the quotation from Exod． xxiv． 8 are（1）тои̃тo for iôov́，
 ©eòs for Kúplos．

т ${ }^{2}$ ai $\mu a \tau \bar{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \delta$ ．］The blood of， belonging to，shed to ratify，the $\delta c a \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ ．The words are applied by our Lord to His own blood， and to the new $\delta<a \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ ，in the institution of the Supper．Matt． xxvi．28，тоиิто үа́人 ѐ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ то̀

 áлортьิv．Mark xiv． 24 （with $\boldsymbol{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ for $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ，and omission of cis ${ }^{*} \phi . \dot{\alpha}^{\alpha} \mu$ ．）．Luke xxii．20，

 for $\pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ ）．$\quad$ Cor．xi． 25 （as in Luke，but with $\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu} \dot{\hat{c}}$ for $\mu o v$,


and omission of words follow－ ing it）．
$\left.{ }_{\eta}{ }^{5}\right]$ For $\eta \eta v$ ．The usual at－ traction of the relative to the antecedent．See vi． 10 ，$\tau \hat{\eta} s$


ѐvєтєíhato］Substituted for

 note．For $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \ell$ ，see xi．
 тeinato．The full construction
 xxviii． 20 ， ö $\sigma a$ è $\nu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \iota \lambda \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu \dot{v} \mu i \nu$. Mark x．3．John xv．I4， 17. Sometimes the accusative is varied into $\pi \epsilon \rho i ́$ tıvos（Matt．iv． 6），or ovit ${ }^{\text {s }}$（Acts xiii．47），or iva（Mark xiii．34），or is omitted （Acts i．2）．Sometimes the dative is changed into $\pi$ pós ruva， as here．The word occurs only about 12 times in the revised text of the New Testament，but more than $3 \not{ }^{\circ} 0$ times in the Sep－ tnagint．

21 ．каіे т ̀̀v $\sigma \kappa$ ．ठє］And （ $\delta \stackrel{\text { E }}{ }$ ）the tabernacle also（кai），\＆c． This is a new and separate state－ ment，for the tabernacle was not in existence at the time of the ceremony of Exod．xxiv．（1）It may be that the day of Atone－ ment is again in the writer＇s mind，when the blood of the two victims was sprinkled first upon the mercy－seat（Lev．xvi． 14，15），then upon the incense－
altar（Exod．xxx．Io），then upon the brazen altar（Lev．xvi．18）， and when it is expressly said （Lev．xvi．16）that atonement is made for co à ${ }^{\prime}$ rov and for $\eta^{2}$ $\sigma \kappa \eta v \eta$ ．But to this view there is the obvious objection that the atonement of Lev．xvi．is made，not by Moses，but by Aaron．（2）Some suppose that verse 21 refers to the anointing of the $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta \dot{\eta}$ ка⿱亠乂，$\pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha$ тà $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \dot{\prime} \eta$ aưr $\hat{\mathrm{s}}$（Exod．xl．9），and that， though only oil is there men－ tioned，as also in that account （Exod．xl．13， 15 ）of the conse－ cration of the priests，we must add in the case of the tabernacle that sprinkling of blood which is added in the case of the priests in Lev．viii．24．（Jose－ phus is quoted in confirmation of this last view．）


 т $\hat{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma \kappa \in \nu \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$ aú $\hat{\eta} s$ ．xxx．26－ 28．xl．9．\＆c．
$\tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \kappa . \tau \hat{\eta} s \lambda$ ．$]$ I Chron ix．
 $\lambda_{\text {eq }}$ ovplias．xxiii． $26, \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \nu \kappa \eta-$
 т $\dot{\eta} v \lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \tau o v o \gamma i a v ~ a u ̈ r}^{\eta} s$ ．For $\lambda_{\epsilon}$－ rovprias，see note on i． 7 ，$\lambda \epsilon t-$ тovp oús．
$\tau \hat{\sim}$ aípact］At first sight the article（ $\tau \hat{\omega}$ ai $\mu \mathrm{a} \tau \iota$ ）suggests the same blood as in verses 19 ，




20. This it cannot be. It must mean the (well known) blood. Appealing to the reader's knowledge of the Levitical ceremonial.

द́gávтıбєv] See note on verse 13.
22. kaì $\sigma \chi$ ¢ $\left.\delta_{0}^{\prime} v\right]$ And I may almost say that, \&c. The $\sigma_{\chi}{ }^{\boldsymbol{\delta} \delta \dot{\partial} \nu}$ qualifies the sweeping statement which it prefaces, and specially the ла́vтa. It occurs twice besides; both times in the Acts, and both times with $\pi \hat{\alpha}$ s. xiii.
 xix. 26, ov̉ $\mu$ óvov ' $\mathbf{E} \phi$ érov ả à $\lambda$ à

$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad a i \mu a \tau i]$ The $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ has its usual semilocal idea. The cleansing of everything is contained in, lies in, consists in, blood. It is the direct opposite of $\chi$ шopis. The èv aíparı of verse 25 has a slightly different tinge of meaning. See note there.
$\kappa \alpha \theta a \rho i \zeta \epsilon \tau \alpha]$ See note on verse i4, ка $\begin{aligned} \text { ареє } \\ \text {. }\end{aligned}$

каi $\chi \omega$ р's $]$ This is not a separate statement, laying down as an axiom that atonement (in its availing sense) can only be made by blood, true as the fact is in its Christian application. It belongs to the clause above,
with its qualifying кaтà tòv vórov. The sin-offering always involved the sacrifice of animal life.
aipaтєкхขणías] A word used nowhere else in the New Testament or the Septuagint. Towards its composition we have éкरoves aíparos in I Kings xviii. 28. Ecclus. xxvii. 15 .
äфєors] In the Septuagint äфєots stands specially for the release (from debt, slavery, \&c.) of the sabbatical year (Deut. xv. 1, \&c. xxxi. Io) and the year of jubilee (Lev. xxv. 28, \&c. xxvii. 17 , dc.). In the New Testament it is usually followed by $\dot{\alpha}^{〔} \mu a \rho \tau t \hat{\omega} v$ ( $\pi \alpha \rho a \pi \tau \omega \mu \dot{\tau} \tau \omega v$, Eph. i. 7), but here, and in Mark iii. 29, the genitive is understood.
23. "Avá ${ }^{k} \eta$ oủv] A good example of the effect of $\mu \hat{v} v$ in subordinating its clause to the one following with $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$. For the necessity spoken of applies only to the latter part of the verse. While animal sacrifices might suffice for the purifying of a material and typical sanctuary, an expiation of more intrinsic value was needed to purify heaven for man's entrance. The necessity




lies in the nature of things, like the a' $\delta$ vivarov of x. 4. It is impossible in the nature of things that animal blood should atone for sin. It is necessary therefore in the nature of things that, if there is to be forgiveness, a more availing propitiation should be revealed.
oviv] In continuation of the argument, and in accordance with its course thus far. See note on verse I .

ขंтоঠе́ $\boldsymbol{\gamma \mu a \tau \alpha ] ~ R e p r e s e n t a - ~}$ tions. See notes on iv. in and viii. 5 .
$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} v$ тoîs oujpavois] Equivalent to $\tau$ à émovávıa following. See note on viii. 5 .

тovirocs] By these things. Such sacritices as those referred to in verses 13, 19, 21 .
 needs no purifying in itself: the necessity spoken of is relativeto fit it for man's entrance. The purifying spoken of is therefore the sacrifice of Clirist for man's sin, and the self-presentation of Christ in heaven as man's High Priest.

крєítтoaıl] See note on i. 4. Compare the use of the word in vii. 19,22. viii. 6 .

Ovaiacs] Plural, to state the principle. Presently it will define itself into the $\mu$ iav $\theta v \sigma^{\prime} a v$ of $x .12$.
$\left.\pi \alpha \rho \alpha^{\prime}\right]$ For $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ̀$ after a comparative (characteristic of this Epistle) see note on i. 4 .
24. oú $\gamma \alpha^{\prime} \rho$ ] I say aúrà $\tau \dot{a}$ è $\pi$ oupávia, for that is the sanctuary of our High Priest's $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{-}$ точрүia. See viii. 1, 2.
$\chi$ хєротоínta] See note on verse 11, $\delta \dot{\alpha} \pi \hat{\eta}_{\rho}$. Here that is said of the antitypical ayua ${ }^{\circ} \gamma^{\prime} \omega v$ which is there said of the antitypical ${ }_{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} / \alpha$
àvтívura] Corresponding to. The same word dy ditumos may be either (I) answering in type to, or (2) answering to the type of. Thus type and antitype may change places in its use. The $\chi є ц о \pi о$ íp $\tau$ here (the Levitical holy of holies) are called àtitura to the heavenly. Corresponding typically to the $\alpha \lambda \eta-$ olyá. In I Pet. iii. 21 the water of baptism is said to correspond antitypically to the water of the deluge.
à $\left.\lambda \eta \theta_{\nu} \omega \bar{\omega}\right]$ See note on viii. 2, ${ }^{2} \lambda \eta \theta_{\nu} \nu \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$.
aúròv ròv oúpavóv] Distinguished from the of ovjoavoi of




iv． 14 and vii．26，where see notes．
vīv］In the Gospel day． See Rom．xvi．26． 2 Tim．i． 10．The accompanying aorist makes the whole Gospel period a single point of time．
$\left.{ }^{2} \mu \phi \alpha \nu a \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} r a c\right]$ The infini－ tive of the direct object．To be made é $\mu \phi$ фurn＇s（apparent or mani－ fest）．Equivalent to the $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi a v \hat{\eta}$ $\gamma \in \in \dot{v} \sigma \theta a i$ of Acts x．40．The aorist makes it the single act of self－presentation by ascension into heaven．For $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi a v i \zeta \epsilon u$ ， see Matt．xxvii．53，èvєфaví－ $\sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu \pi 0 \lambda \lambda o i ̂ s . ~ J o h n ~ x i v . ~ 2 I, ~$
 The exact thought of this pas－ sage，the self－manifestation of the ascended Lord to the Father in heaven，is found nowhere else．
$\left.\tau \hat{\omega} \pi \rho о \sigma \omega \omega^{\prime} \omega\right]$ To the face of God．Matt．xviii． 10 ，то̀ $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma-$
 ov́pavoîs．Rev．xxii．4，каì ä廿оvтal тò тро́тштov aútoû． Compare Psalm xvi．15，ò $\phi \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma o-$ $\mu a \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega ́ \pi \varphi, ~ \sigma o v . ~ x l i i . ~ 2, ~$


vं $\pi \grave{\varrho} \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega}]$ The simplest expression for the work of the Intercessor．To be in the pre－
sence of God for us，in our be－ half，as that which He is，ia work and heart．

25．ovid iva］Nor did He enter（ $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon v)$ that ILe may， $\mathcal{C}^{\circ} c$. $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \eta]$ The context de－ cides that this $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi$ écev is not the offering on the cross，but the subsequent presentation of Himself in hearen．See note
 víov．The present tense im－ plies the continuance or repeti－ tion of the $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi$ е́ $\rho \epsilon \nu_{\nu}$ ．That He may be often presenting Himself．
èvaipart］The $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} v$ here，pre－ serving its usual idea of con－ tained in，has the sense of en－ cased in as His protecting ar－ mour．Compare Eph．vi．I4，
 blood which the ligh priest carried was his instrument of entrance，his key or his pass－ port，in one aspect（verse iz， $\delta_{i}{ }^{\prime}$ аї $\left.\mu а т о s ~ т \rho a ́ \gamma \omega \nu ~ к а i ̂ ~ \mu о ́ \sigma \chi \omega \nu\right) ; ~ ;$ it was also his armour，his coat of mail，in another aspect（Lev． xvi． 2 ，каì ој̀к àтoӘavєîтaı）．
 ＇ $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \sigma \hat{v}$ ．
àd入oт $\left.{ }^{\prime} \varphi\right]$ Alien．Not his own．See verse 12 ，where $\delta i^{\prime}$



 contrasted with rov̂ iठiov in the next clause. Compare Luke xvi.
 with $\tau \dot{o} \dot{v} \dot{v} \mu$ ќ $\tau \in \rho o \nu$. The clause is added as a secondary point of contrast, the primary being the кaт ${ }^{\text {e }}$ evautóv. (I) The high priest enters year by year: Christ once for all. (2) The high priest enters in virtue of blood not his own: Christ in virtue of His own.
26. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i$ ] Since (if so) He must often have suffered. (For this use of $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i$, carrying with it the suppressed clause, if so, or if otherwise, according to the context, see X. 2, and note on Rom. iii. 6, émei.) If Christ is to present Himself again and again, He must suffer again and again. The annual presentation of the blood in the holy of holies followed upon the annual sacrifice on the brazen altar. So must it be in the antitype. If the $\pi \rho o \sigma-$ $\phi$ é $\rho \in \frac{\nu}{}$ in heaven is to be repeated, so must the $\pi a^{\sigma} \sigma \chi \in v$ on Calvary. This contrast is often overlooked, and the offer ( $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \phi^{\prime} \rho \eta$ ) of verse 25 is read as the synonym of the suffer $(\pi a \theta \hat{\epsilon} \hat{v})$ of verse 26 .
${ }^{4} \delta \epsilon \epsilon$ ] In order to the fultilment of the type and to the consistency of things. Com-
pare the $\begin{gathered}\text { ètet } \\ \text { of Luke xxiv. } 26, ~\end{gathered}$ 46. Acts xvii. 3 .
ànò к. к.]. For the phrase see note on iv. 3. Here the thought is, that, if the $\pi \rho o \sigma-$ $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ requires repetition, so must the $\pi a^{\prime} \sigma_{\chi \epsilon L}$, and, if repetition, then perpetucl repetition, from the time of creation itself. .The interval between creation and the fall is passed over as immaterial. Indeer, the fall being foreseen, its antidote should be anticipated.
vvii 8€] But as it is. As the case really stands. See note on viii. 6.
$\ddot{a} \pi a \xi]$ Once, and once only.
 $\pi \epsilon р і$ ápaptı̂̀v à $\pi \dot{\epsilon}$ धavev. See note on vi. 4 .
 The $\begin{gathered}\text { ent } \\ \text { is peculiar. From its }\end{gathered}$ primary sense of on, it seems to pass into that of on the occasion of, and so (in this connexion) is best rendered by at. Examples are not readily found. Perhaps 2 Cor. iii. 14, 白 $\pi \grave{\imath} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathfrak{a}$ à $v a \gamma \nu \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota$ к.т. 入. is one in point. (2) For avyтé̀єєа (consummation), see Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49. xxiv. 3. xxviii. 20 (always with rô aiब̄vos). Compare 2 Chron. xxiv.



 $\rho \circ \hat{u} \sigma v v \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i ́ a s . . . \epsilon i s \dot{\alpha}^{2} \nu a \pi \lambda \eta$ й $\rho \omega \sigma \iota$
 p $\omega \nu$. (3) For $\tau \omega \nu \alpha \omega \dot{\omega} \omega \omega$, see note on Heb. i. 2. Here the consummation of the ages is equivalent to the $\pi \lambda$ й $\rho \omega \mu \alpha$ тоv $\chi$ рóvov of Gal. iv. 4, and to the $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \mu a$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \iota \hat{\omega} v$ of Eph. і. го. The coming of Christ, meaning His entire manifestation, including incarnation, ministry, passion, resurrection, ascension, is spoken of as taking place at the completion of the aievves of time, without entering into the division of the two advents, or the long lapse of time between them. Reckoning by years, we might equally well say that Christ appeared in the middle of the aiwves. But in the divine view it was the closing of time, the Gospel being a final and self-developing dispensation. See note on i. 2, T $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$

 annulling of $\sin$ by an availing atonement. For difíchocs, see vii. I8 (only). The verb ( $\alpha^{2} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \varepsilon \hat{v}$ ) is used with either (I) persons, to reject, set at nought (as Mark vi. 26. Luke x. 16,
 John xii. 48. i Thess. iv. 8), or (2) things, to set at nought, to despise (as x. 28. Mark vii. 9. Luke vii. 3o. I Tim. v.
12. Jude 8), or to bring to nought, annul (as I Cor. i. 19. Gal. ii. 21. iii. 15). The last
 and in vii. 18.
$\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \dot{\alpha} \mu$.] Sin universal. All sin.
tîs $\theta$ vaias aúrov̂] The év
 that aủrov is emphatic. Of Him Himself. The avròs in such (Hellenistic) uses is appositional (as if it had been Xoırtồ av̀rov̂) and thus becomes emphatic. See, for example, Eph. i. 5, є's av่тóv (unto Him Himself). dc.
$\pi є ф а=є \rho \omega \tau \alpha t]$ Perfect of abiding consequences. Has been manifested. He was before, but now by His incarnation, ministry, passion, \&c., He has been disclosed, revealed, to the world. See John i. 3r. I Tim. iii. r6. I Pet. i. 20. I John iii. 5. The same term is applied to the second advent in Col. iii. 4 . I John ii. 28. iii. 2.
 tration from human example. Man dies once, and the next thing before him is judgment. So Christ died once, and the neat thing before Him is the advent. The ка $\theta$ O orov answered by ov゙ros (verse 28) makes the one sequence the measure of the other in probability. The use of $\kappa a \theta^{\prime}$ öcov is peculiar to



this Epistle (iii. 3, $\pi$ 入eionos

 катà тосоîто к.т.д.). We have ' $\phi^{\prime}$ ' ${ }^{\prime} \sigma o v$ in Matt. xxv. 40, 45. Rom. xi. 13 (differing from ка ${ }^{\text {, }}$ ofov only as forsomuch as, in 80 far as, from inasmuch as, in proportion as).

а̀то́кєitai] It is reserved. Literally, it lies off from all else. The idea is that of security from meddling or tampering. Compare Luke xix. 20, $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\dot{\prime}}$


 ò $\mathbf{v}$ pavoís. 2 Tim. iv. 8, גotròv

 is said of the living, for whom death no less than judgment is still in prospect.
 All men. The only occurrence of oi ${ }^{2}{ }^{2} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o c$ in this Epistle.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \xi]$ Once and only once. $\mu \epsilon \tau a ̀$ dè $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau o]$ As the next event, however long after.

крíars] See x. 27. Matt. x.


 Luke x. 14. xi. 3r, 32. 2 Pet.


 pas.
28. каı̀ o X.] Christ also. Like mankind in this-that, as they have only two events (death and judgment) before them, so before Him also there were but two events (death and advent), one of which is now in the past, and the other therefore the one event in prospect.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi a \xi]$ Once and once only.
 The context, and the passive voice, both show this $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \phi \circ \rho \dot{a}$ to be that of the sacrifice on Calvary. See note on v. i for the uses of $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \phi^{\prime} \rho \epsilon \epsilon$ and $\alpha^{z} \nu \alpha-$ ф́́pat. Here, having been brought to the altar of sacrifice that He might bring up to it in His oun person the sins of many. Compare Isai. liii. 12, кaì aúròs

 Tòv viòv av̉rov̂ èmì тò $\theta$ vataatrýpov. I Pet. ii. 24, ô's tàs a $\mu \alpha \rho-$


$\pi o \lambda \lambda \omega \nu]$ Might have been $\pi a ́ v \tau \omega v$. Compare Matt. xx. 28 (Mark x. 45), 入úтроv àvтì mod$\lambda \omega v$, with I Tim. ii. 6, $\dot{\alpha}^{2} v \tau^{\prime}-$ $\lambda v \tau \rho o v$ vimèp $\pi a ́ v \tau \omega v$. But the point here is to emphasize the

тías, е̇к $\delta \epsilon u \tau \notin \rho a v \quad \chi \omega \rho i s ~ \dot{\mu} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i ́ a s ~ o ’ \phi \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$

contrast between the once and the many, between the single offering and the multitude saved by it. In this respect it is like
 jatos ais máv ias àvOpótovs ais


 кообиоу.
éк סєутє́pov] In contrast with the first advent. The $\dot{\theta} \phi \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a l$ of this verse with the $\pi \epsilon \phi a v$ ep ital of verse 26.



 John ix. 24, é $\phi \dot{\omega} v \eta \sigma a v$ our đòv
 15. xi. 9.
$\chi$ wis jj $\mu a \rho \tau i ́ a s]$ See note on the same words in iv. 15 . Here the thought is, apart from all connexion with that work of sin-bearing and propitiation which was the special office of the first advent.
$\dot{\dot{\circ} \phi \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \tau a l]}$ The future corresponding with the ${ }^{*} \phi \theta \eta \nu \quad$ of the self-manifestations of the risen Saviour (Luke xxiv. 34 Acts ix. I7. xiii. 3I. xxvi. 16. \&c.). Only used besides (in the New Testament) in Acts xxvi.
 Ejrooual $\sigma \alpha$. It is frequent in the Septuagint; as, for example,



тoîs aủrò ${ }^{2}$ ar $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \delta$.] There may be an allusion to the reappearance of the high priest, after the solemn ceremonial in the holy of holies on the day of Atonement, to the anxiously waiting people. Even of the common daily ministry in the temple we read (Luke i. 21),
 píav к.т. $\lambda$. In I Thess. i. 10 it is made one half of the

 pavêv. Compare I Cor. i. 7,

 Phil. iii. 20, $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} p a$ ar $\pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \varepsilon-$


 For ar $\pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \dot{́} \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, , see notes on Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25. Gal. v. 5 .
cis $\sigma \omega t \eta \rho i a v]$ Are these last words to be attached to $\dot{\prime} \phi \theta \eta^{\prime}-$
 the latter, we have the $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho a$ $\dot{a}^{\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta є \chi о ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a}$ of Phil. iii. $\quad 20$, and perhaps the easier and more natural sequence of the Greek. The Authorized Yersion and Revised Version strongly support the former. The difference of sense is almost nothing. For the thought


（either way），compare Isai．xxy．



 $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho_{i}^{a} \eta^{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} v$ ．For $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i ́ a v$, see note on i．14．
 enter here upon the third sub－ section of the third main section of the Epistle．The great topic of Christ and Aaron divides itself into（1）the priesthood， （2）the sanctuary，（3）the sacri－ fice．But，as before，the new point is glided into without any osteusible transition．The first sentence is thrown into utter confusion by the（better sup－ ported）reading $\delta$ évavtat for $\delta$ u－ varat．It is almost inconceiv－ able that such a writer should have deliberately framed an anacoluthon like ó vó $\mu$ os é éX $\omega \nu .$. ov̉ס́́тотє סúvavtal．And the plural Sóvavtac is easily ac－ counted for as a clerical error by the preceding plural $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi \epsilon^{-}$ povorv．In such a case manu－ script authority may be too slavishly followed．（r）With Súvaviat，we must treat the words from $\sigma \kappa \stackrel{̀}{\nu}$ to $\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ as a nominative absolute，and suppose＇they＇（the priests）to be understood before $\delta$ úvaviat as before $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi$ ¢́fovotv．The sense will then be，Year by
year they never can perfect，de． That is，year by year they al－ ways fail to perfect，dec．It might be too bold to take kar evtavtiv taîs aúraîs as a com－ bined phrase，and render it， By the sacrifices which they offer in perpetuity，year by year the same，they never can perfect the worshippers．It must suffice to say，Year by year they （the priests）never can（always fail to）perfect，by the same sacrifices which they offer in perpetuity（by the sacrifices which they offer，the same over and over again，in perpetuity），those who draw nigh（to God）．（2） With ס́varac，the sentence is complete，though some of its minor difficulties remain．The law．．．year by year，never can perfect，\＆c．

इ̌cóv］See note on viii． 5 ． $\left.\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o ́ v \tau \omega \nu a^{\prime} \gamma\right]$ See note on ix．If，where the question is raised whether the good things spoken of were then，or are still， future．
ciкóva］We might have ex－ pected $\sigma \omega \tilde{\omega} \mu$ as the opposite of $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \kappa$ tá．But the sense is different． The $\sigma \omega \mu \alpha$ of the $\pi \rho \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \mu a \tau \alpha$ in question is in heaven itself． The disparagement of the law lies not in its not having the
 єiкс⿱亠䒑⿱⺊口灬 of them，but only a $\sigma \kappa \iota \alpha$ ．
$\kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime}$ '̀vlautò̀ tais $\alpha u ̛ t \alpha i ̂ s ~ \theta u \sigma i ́ a l s ~ \alpha i ̂ s ~ \pi \rho o \sigma-~$

 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \cup \cup \sigma \alpha \nu \tau о \quad \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha t$, $\delta_{i \alpha}^{\alpha}$ тò $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \mu i \alpha \nu$

х. І. Or ঠivara.

The selection of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon i \kappa \omega े \nu}$ shows how strong a word it is, and serves to interpret 2 Cor. iv. 4 and Col. i. $1_{5}$, where Christ is called the єiкшy тoû @єồ. See Bp. Lightfoot's note on the latter text, where he assigns to cikciv the two defining notions of representation (as opposed to mere resemblance) and manifestation (comparing John i. i8. xiv. 9, 10). See also Abp. Trench's Synonyms, where the implied thought (in єiк凶v) of an archetype or prototype is illustrated. See Matt. xxii. 20, rívos $\dot{\eta}$ єiкळข aṽ่ๆ; Mark xii. 16. Luke xx. 24. Rom. i. 23, єiкó-

 Onpíe. xiv. 9, i I. \&x. The other passages where єiкciv occurs are less literal, but answer the above conditions. Rom. viii. 29, $\sigma v \mu \mu o ́ \rho \phi o v s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ єंкóvos тov̂ vioû aủrov̂ (probably said of the resurrection body of Christ).
 Хӧ̈коิ...төй émoupavíov. 2 Cor. iii. 18 , $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ аủт $\grave{\eta} v$ єіко́va $\mu \epsilon \tau а \mu о \rho-$ фој́ $\epsilon \theta$ a (the spiritual likeness of Christ). Ool. iii. ro, кat' єiкóva тои̂ ктígavтos av̀тóv. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu]$ The reali-
ties. See note on vi. I8. кат ${ }^{2}$ évavióv] See first note on the chapter. The reference is clearly to the day of Atonement. тaîs uv̉тais] See first note.
 iepeis. Always so in the Epistle. See v. r, and throughout. єis tò ò̀qvєкє́s] In perpetuity. Year after year.
ovं $\left.\dot{\delta} \epsilon \pi=\tau \epsilon \delta_{v}^{v a v \tau \alpha}\right]$ See first note.

тoùs $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi$ онévavs] Those who approach. The worshippers. See note on iv. 16.
$\left.\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha_{t}\right]$ In ix. 9 катà $\sigma v \nu c i \delta \partial \sigma \sigma v$ is added. See note there. Also on ii. 10 .
2. $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i]$ Else would they not have ceased to be offered. The inefficacy of the Levitical sacrifices is argued from the mere fact of their periodical repetition. Their impotence is self-confessed. For this use of є̇л $\epsilon$ ', see note on ix. 26.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi a v \dot{\sigma} \alpha \nu \tau о \pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \in \rho o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a l]$ A (classical) construction most frequent in St Luke. See Luke v. 4. Acts v. 42. vi. 13. xiii. 10. xx. 31. xxi. 32. Also Eph. i. 16 . Col. i. 9.
ovvєíiךтьv á $\mu$.] Conscious. ness of sins still unforgiven and





x. 4. Or $\tau \rho$ á $\gamma \omega \nu$ каi $\tau a \cup j \rho \omega \nu$.
requiring atonement. For the construction, see I Pet. ii. Ig,
 where conscience. See note on ix. 9 .

тov̀s $\lambda a r \rho$.$] Here the wor-$ shippers. So ix. 9. Luke ii, 37. Acts xxvi. 7. Phil. iii. 3. Elsewhere the priests. See note on viii. 5 .

кєкаӨ.] See note on ix. 14, ка $\theta a \rho \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\text { in }}$
3. à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ย่vavंтais] But (instead of this) there is in them (the Levitical sacrifices) an ává$\mu \nu \eta \sigma t s$ а $\mu a \rho \tau \iota \omega \bar{v}$ year by year (on the day of Atonement).
ìv avíais] Contained, involved, embodied in them.
àváprचots] A recalling to mind (by oneself or another), a reminding. Luke xxii. 19 ,
 xi. 24, 25. Lev. xxiv. 7, cis
 Num. x. 10. Wisd. xvi. 6. For the active verb, to remind, see I Cor. iv. I7, üs
 2 Tim. i. 6, ג̀ ${ }^{2} \mu \mu \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega \quad \sigma \epsilon$ ${ }^{2}{ }^{3} v a \zeta \omega \pi v \rho \epsilon i v \kappa$ к.т. $\lambda$. Gen. xli. 9 ,

recall to mind) ońuegov. Num.


 mou. Ezek. xxi. 23, 24. xxix. 16.
4. á ©́nvarov $\left.^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho\right]$ It is soand it must be so-for, \&ec. It is impossible in the nature of things. See note on ix. 23, $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$.

аіна т. каї тр.] Without articles, to lay stress on the quality. Such a thing as blood. Such things as bulls and goats.
áфаере̂́v] Rom. xi. 27 (from Isai. xxvii. g), ö тау áфé $\lambda \omega \mu a \iota ~ \tau a ̀ s ~$ $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a s ~ a v i \tau \hat{\omega} v$. In the Septuagint (where ápatpêv is the rendering of nearly 40 Hebrew verbs) see Exod xxxiv. 7, ápat-
 tías. Lev.x. ı7. Num. xiv. 18.
5. Sto ] Wherefore. Because of which inherent impossibility.
ciacp $\chi$.]. See note on $\tau \boldsymbol{j} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ oiкov $\mu$ év $\eta v$ in i. 6 , where parallels from St John are quoted.
$\lambda$ '́y $\epsilon$ ] Psalm xl. 6, dc. The only variations from the Septuagint are ( I ) єंঠ́óк $\eta \sigma a s$ for ทีт $\eta \sigma a s,(2)$ o © ©ós instead of ${ }^{\circ}$


$\Theta . \mu o v$, and this (3) before instead of after тò $\theta$ é $\lambda \eta \mu$ á cov.
©uviav к. $\pi$.] In its first meaning, and on the lips of Lavid, the passage endorses 1 Sam. xv. 22 in its assertion of the superiority of obedience to sacrifice. But some of the expressions, such as $\sigma \omega \mu \mu$ 效 $\kappa$. $\mu$., and $\tilde{\eta} \kappa \omega$, and $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \mu o \hat{v}$, are almost incapable of application to any but the Messiah, and fall under the second rule laid down on i. 5, that, where that is written of a man, which no mere man can satisfy, there lies under it a reference to One who is not man only.

日. к. т.] Sacrifice and offering. See on v. i. Here $\pi \rho \circ \sigma-$ фopà seems nearly equivalent to $\delta \omega \rho \alpha$ there ( $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi$ 'िp $p$ there being the verb to both), pointing to offerings not of animal life. But, like $\delta$ unpa, it is only when distinguished from ovaia by being coupled with it that it has any such limitation.
$\dot{\eta} \theta \dot{\theta} \dot{\lambda} \eta \sigma a s]$ The phrase $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$
 haps Col. ii. I8) is a Septuagint construction. In the New Testament it occurs only in quotation, as Matt. ix. 13 (from Hos. vi.
 7. xxvii. 43 (from Psalm xxii. 8), єi $\operatorname{\theta é} \lambda \epsilon i$ aủróv. Other instances (such as John v. 2I.

Rom. ix. I8) admit of a different explanation, that of a suppressed infinitive.
$\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \boldsymbol{\delta} \bar{\delta}]$ A remarkable deviation from the Hebrew, which gives, mine ears hast Thow opened (digged). But the substitution is made by the Septuagint, not by the writer of the Epistle. Instead of the thought of an ear divinely opened for obedient hearing, the Septuagint version gives that of a whole body divinely framed for obedient action-obedience being the key-note of both phrases. But the Septuagint reading is more distinctly suggestive of the Messianic application.
$\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a]$ See Rom. vii. 4. Col. i. 22.

катךртíco] So Matt. xxi. 16 (from Psalm viii. 2), èk otóматоs v $\downarrow \boldsymbol{\pi} i \omega \nu$ к. $\theta$. кал $\rho \tau і \sigma \omega$ aivov. Elsewhere in the New Testament the active and passive voices are those used. In the Septuagint, the middle voice isfound also in Psalmxi. 3. xvii. 5. xxix. g. lxviii. g. lxxiv. 6 ,


6. о́лок. к. т. а $\mu$.] Burntofferings and sin-offerings. The former (in the New Testament) is found only in Mark xii. 33.
$\pi \in \rho i$ ci $\mu$.] The phrase is so complete in itself for the sin-
 йк $\omega, \dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \epsilon \phi \alpha \lambda i \delta \iota \beta \iota \beta \lambda i ́ o v \gamma \epsilon ́ \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha \iota \pi \epsilon \rho i$

offering (occurring more than 50 times in Leviticus alone) that it is indifferent to case and number, $\theta v \sigma i a$ (or, as here, the accusative plural $\theta$ vaias) being understood before it.

єv่סóкпбаая] The post-classical verb cưdoкєiv has the two main uses of (1) to think it well, to think fit, to be pleased, to desire, with an infinitive (as Luke xii. 32. Rom. xv. 26. I Cor, j. 2 I. 2 Cor. v. 8. Gal. i. 15. Col. i. 19. I Thess. ii. 8. iii. r), and (2) to be well pleased with, to take delight in, with $\dot{\epsilon} v$ (as Matt. iii. 17. xvii. 5. Mark i. in. Luke iii. 22. I Cor. x. 5. 2 Cor. xii. ro), cis (as 2 Pet. i. 17), or a simple dative ( 2 Thess. ii. 12), or accusative (here, and Matt. xii. 18). See a fuller note on Rom. xv. 26.
7. тóт $]$ The resolution following was formed at a particular point of time. The three preceding aorists, expressing in form divine acts of refusing and substituting, point to a moment of their realization by the speaker. I came to know that Thou wouldest not, \&c.: then (on my perceiving this) I said, \&cc. In the application to the Messiah, the resolution of incarnation is the (ideal) moment of the utterance. The same single act of
resolving is seen in the $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma a t o$ of Phil. ii. 6.
$\left.\ddot{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{\kappa}} \boldsymbol{\square}\right\rceil$ I am come. Here am I. Great vividness is thus given to the promptitude of the self-presentment for obedience. See John viii. 42, éx $\boldsymbol{\text { rov̂ }} \Theta \epsilon \in \hat{v}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \eta \lambda \theta$ ov каi $\ddot{\eta}^{\prime} \kappa \omega$. The verb $\dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \omega$ is used only once by St Paul (and that in a quotation), Rom. xi, 26.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa є \phi \alpha \lambda i \delta i]$ The кєфа $\lambda_{i}$ is said to be properly the projecting knob at the end of the stick round which the parchment was rolled, and hence the roll or scroll itself. Ezek. ii. 9, ỉoù
 avit? кєфa入is $\beta \iota \beta \lambda i o v . ~ i i i . ~ I, ~$

$\beta \iota \beta \lambda i o v]$ Like रovaíov (a thing made of $\chi$ रevoós), $\beta \iota \beta$ גiov is $a t h i n g$ made of $\beta i \beta$ रos (papyrus). A writing or document. See ix. 19. Matt. xix. $7, \beta \iota \beta \lambda i o \nu$ àтобтаб́ov. Luke iv. 17, 20,
 тоv'H ${ }^{\prime}$ aíov, каi àvoígas тò $\beta \iota \beta \lambda_{i ́ o v}$
 к.т.入. John xx. 30. xxi. 25,


 tàs $\mu \epsilon \mu \beta \rho a^{\prime} v a s$. The word occurs 23 times in the Apocalypse in all manner of connexions.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu \circ \hat{\mathbf{v}}] \quad$ Written concern-






ing me. The Revised Version of the Old Testament gives as an alternative in the margin, prescribed to me. But $\pi \epsilon p i{ }_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathrm{\epsilon}} \mu \mathrm{ov}$ clearly makes the speaker the subject, not the recipient. A decisive mark of the Messianic reference.

тov̂ roıท̄ $\sigma a 1]$ Depending upon $\vec{\eta}^{\kappa \omega}$. For the purpose of doing. See Luke xxiv. 29, каi
 \&c. The aorist expresses to do by a single act, whether literally (which would well suit the application of the words to the one sacrifice which is the subject here), or, as often, in the aspect of a life as one whole.
o ©és $]$ Vocative, as in i . 8. See the note there.
8. ávótepov] Luke xiv. тo (only).
 Xoforós. We might have expected $\epsilon i \pi \dot{\omega} \nu$ and $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon$ But the present and perfect forcibly emphasize the perpetual and the conclusive voice of Scripture. Or the $\lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega v$ may be, in the very act of saying. In the very moment of recognizing the nothingness in

God's esteem of animal sacrifices, He announces His resolution to replace them by His own obedience unto death. See note on

aírıves] Any which. Such as. See note on ii. $3, \vec{\eta} \tau t s$. катà vó $\mu o v$ ] In accordance with vónos, such a thing as a law, in a slightly disparaging tone. See note on vii. 12 , vópov.
9. тórє] At that moment. See above.
$\epsilon i \rho \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu]$ The Scripture perfect. See viii. 5 \&c.
àvaı $\rho \in i]$ Destroys, abolishes. Still Xpıatós. The verb avalрềv (always elsewhere with tuvá, not $\tau$ ), to slay, occurs 20 times in St Luke's Gospel and Acts, only four times elsewhere in the New Testament. In Acts vii. 21 (from Exod. ii. Io) àva $\rho \in i \sigma \theta$ au (middle) is to rescue (to take up for oneself).
 first thing...the second thing... named in the above quotation. The first is $\theta_{v \sigma i a}$ каi $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi о \rho \dot{\alpha}$ к.т. $\lambda$. The second is to mot $\eta \sigma a \iota$ тò $\theta$ é̀ $\lambda \eta \mu a$ той Өєой.
$\left.\sigma \tau \eta \eta_{\eta}\right]$ May establish. See



x. if. Or dexıepè̀s.
elternative reading in Mark vii. 9, iva ті̀v $\pi a \rho a ́ \delta o \sigma \iota v ~ \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma \tau \dot{\eta}-$ $\sigma \eta \tau \epsilon$ (for $\tau \eta \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon$ ). Rom. iii. 31, ài入à vó $\mu$ ov í $\sigma \tau a ́ v o \mu \epsilon v$. $\times$. 3. xiv. 4.
10. $\underset{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}{\nu} \stackrel{\Psi}{\Psi} \quad$ 日.] In which $\theta \in ́ \lambda \eta \mu a$ (as being contained and comprised in it) lies our consecration, \&c.

 We have been consecrated, made to belong to God, taken to be His. Acts xx. 32, кaì סov̂vat т $\grave{\eta} \nu$ к $\lambda \eta \rho o v o \mu i a v ~ \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ тоís $\dot{\eta} \gamma \iota a \sigma-$ $\mu$ évols tâact. xxvi. 18, каì
 т $\hat{n}$ tis $\dot{\epsilon}^{\mu} \dot{\epsilon}$. Rom, xv. r6. I Cor. i. 2, т $\hat{\eta}$ èкк $\lambda \eta \sigma i \underline{a}$ то̂̀ అєồ...
 $\kappa \lambda \eta \tau 0 i ̂ s ~ a ́ \gamma i o s s . ~ v i i . ~ 14 . ~ 2 ~ T i m . ~$ ii. 2 I.

тробфорâs] Eph. v. 2, каi
 $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} v) \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi о \rho a ̀ v$ каì $\theta v \sigma i ́ a \nu ~ \tau \hat{̣}$ © $\epsilon \underset{\text { ® }}{ }$

 тô̂ X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{.}$ Col. i. 21,22 , vvù


'I. X.] This double name occurs here for the first time (in the revised text) in this Epistle. Also xiii. 8, 21 .

є́фо́та६] vii. 27. ix. 12. Does it belong here to $\dot{\eta}$ yiac-
 I slightly prefer the latter.
II. Kaì $\left.\pi \hat{a}_{s} \mu \hat{c} v\right]$ The sacrifice of Christ, unlike the Levitical sacrifices, was sufficient and effectual: it was also single and final, closing for ever the sacerdotal ministration in its form of expiation of $\sin$. Notice the usual effect of $\mu \dot{\epsilon} v$ in subordinating its clause to the contrasted clause with $\delta \epsilon$. And whereas every Levitical priest, \&c., Christ on the contrary, \&e.
ífoẃs] Authorities are almost equally divided between
 the sense is the same. See, for ifpev̀s in the higher sense, vii. II, 15, 20, 23.

שढ $\sigma \tau \eta \kappa \in \nu]$ In contrast with the $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha^{\prime} \theta_{i \sigma \in V}$ of verse 12 . The posture of awe contrasted with the posture of dignity.
$\left.\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta}^{\dot{\eta}} \mu \dot{\rho} \rho a \nu\right]$ Belongs to $\lambda \epsilon \tau \tau о v \rho \gamma \hat{\omega}$, as $\pi о \lambda \lambda{ }^{\prime} \kappa \iota s$ to $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma-$ $\phi \dot{\rho} \rho \omega v$. The former speaks of the daily offices of priestly ministration, in all of which the high priest was the central figure even where he acted through subordinates; the latter, of the annual ceremony of atonement,
$\lambda \epsilon \iota \tau о \nu \rho \gamma \bar{\omega} \nu$ каі̀ та̀s $\alpha u ̛ \tau \alpha ̀ s ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ к \iota s ~ \pi \rho о \sigma \phi є ́ \rho \omega \nu ~$




in which he acted alone. For the daily services of the priests at the brazen altar, see note on vii. 13, $\theta$ valaotnpíc. And for those within the tabernacle, that on ix. 6, eiciacuv.

тод入áксs] Year after year.
aítucs] See above, on verse 6.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i v]$ To take off as something which is around one. So Gen. xli. 42, каi $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon$ ó $\mu \epsilon \nu$ оs
 Xelpòs aviтô̂. Exod. xxxiv. 34 ( 2 Cor. iii. 16), тєрирреіто то̀ $\kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \nu \mu \mu \alpha$. Jon. іii. 6, каі̀ $\pi \in \rho t \epsilon i ́-$
 Hence of the taking away of $\sin$ as an encumbering garment
 1). I Chr. xxi. 8, $\dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \rho^{\rho} \tau \eta к а$ $\sigma \phi o ́ \delta \rho \alpha \ldots \kappa a i ̀ v \hat{v} \tau \pi \rho i ́ \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \delta \grave{\eta} \tau \eta ̀ \nu$ какíav тaıסós боv.
12. oĩtos] iii. 3, $\pi$ גéiovos


vं $\pi \grave{\varphi} \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu$.] See v. I.

 $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \chi \theta \epsilon$ is $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$.
 To be taken with éxádivev, not with $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \kappa$ as. To say of the

Levitical priests that they $\pi \rho \circ \sigma$ -
 is appropriate: to say of Christ that $\mathrm{He} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \eta^{\prime} v \in \gamma \kappa \epsilon \nu$ єis $\tau \dot{o} \delta \iota \eta \nu \epsilon-$ $\kappa$ ќs is almost a self-contradiction. The phrase could only be applied to a single act when that single act leads on to a continued
 sat down (took Ilis seat) in perpetuity is quite intelligible. These considerations outweigh the argument that in the three other places eis tó $\delta$ o $\eta$ vekès follows (not precedes) its verb. Nor is there the slightest contradiction of the future advent in saying that He took His seat at the right hand of God in perpetuity. 'One thing at a time' is a maxim of Scripture. Compare Luke i. 33 with r Cor. xv.
 т. ©., see notes on i. 3 .
13. $\tau$ ò 入oınóv] Henceforth. The only certain places of the occurrence of the exact phrase are I Cor. vii. 29. Phil. iii. 1. iv. 8. 2 Thess. iii. I. As for that which remains. Sometimes said of subject-matter, sometimes of time. In the one case, finally. In the other, henceforth. In





Eph. vi. 10 the revised text reads tồ $\lambda$ otnồ, which ought to be the genitive of the point of time (in the future, as distinguished from for the future). But it is difficult to see its fitness there. Sometimes the article is omitted, as perhaps in Matt. xxvi. 45 and Mark xiv. 4 I , and decidedly in Acts xxvii. 20. I Cor, i. I6. 2 Cor. xiii. ir. i Thess. iv. i. 2 Tim. iv. 8. The difference between dotmóv (as for anything remaining, whether of time or topic) and тò dotmóv (as for that which remains, in either sense) is almost insignificant, and the two forms finally and henceforth have to serve for both phrases.
 an accusative: as xi. ro. Acts xvii. 16. 1 Cor. xi. 33. xvi. 1 I. James v. 7. Here absolute, waiting. And so (in the strengthened form $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \dot{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha i)$ I Pet. iii. 30.
fos retwart In i. 13 the quotation is exact from the Sep-
 oov к.т. $\lambda$. Here it is made passive. In Matt. xxii. 44 and Mark xii. $3^{6}$ the vimomódov of the Septuagint is replaced by ขंтока́тш. In Luke xx. 43 and

Acts ii. 35 vitomódov stands. In 1 Cor. xv. 25 the form is
 тódas aúroû. In that place St Paul speaks of some mysterious change which is to take place at that consummation, expressed in the handing over of the kingdom, then finally triumphant, to God the Father.
14. $\mu t a ̂$ 人 $\left.{ }^{\prime} p\right]$ This is all $H e$ has to wait for-for, dec. There is no further sacrifice needed: He has only to wait for the subjugation of hostile powers to His mediatorial reign.

тєтєлєं́шкєข] He has perfected (кaлà ovveídךouv, see ix. 9) in perpetuity those who are in course of sanctification. For the perfecting spoken of, see note on ii. ro, $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \omega \omega \sigma \sigma a$. And for the

 defined (in its use in the present tense) as the gradual bringing of the consecrated person into harmony of life and character with the consecration.
15. $\quad$ арттрє $\hat{\imath}$ 8є $]$ And of this effectual perfecting the Holy Spirit bears us witness in the words quoted before from the prophet Jeremiah: for, after promising, as one special gift

16 кє́val，Аӥтท $\dot{\eta} \delta \iota \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ グข $\delta \iota \alpha \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s$

 $\alpha \dot{u} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu, \kappa \alpha \dot{i} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \delta \iota \alpha ́ \nu o \iota \alpha \nu \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota-$


 фора̀ $\pi \epsilon \rho i ́ \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i ́ a s$.
of the new covenant，the writing of God＇s law on the heart，He goes on to say，And their．sins and their iniquities $I$ will re－ member no more．

16．Av゙т 7 ］See notes on viii．so，\＆c．

17．каí］The sentence is made to look incomplete by the absence of some words like ётєєта $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$ before this каí．
$\left.\mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma о \mu a t\right]$ Instead of the $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \omega$ of the Septuagint and of viii．12．The two construe－ tins are equally correct：the ovं $\mu \eta^{\prime} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\omega}$ giving the thought of the single act of forgetting， and the oo＇$\mu \dot{\eta} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \theta^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \rho \alpha a$ carry－ ing the forgetfulness into an end－ less futurity．I will never in the furthest future remember their sins against them．

18．ठттov 8＇］And，where there is such a final and absolute dismissal of sins as this，there is no further need or room for a sacrifice of propitiation．

19．＂EXovtes over］The argu－ mont is ended，and the applica－ ton begun．Christ is the anti－ type of Aaron，heaven itself of the tabernacle，the one sacrifice of all sacrifices．The true holy of holies is now open．Christ has inaugurated our entrance into it．Through the veil，which is His human nature，we，carry－ ing in our hand the blood of the true sacrifice，may go in，day by day，into the heaven where Christ，our one High Priest，is in God＇s presence for us．
oủv］The comprehensive par－ ticle of inference from all the preceding．

тар $\quad$ च $\sigma$ ia $]$ See note on iii． 6．Frankness of speech，towards God and man，springing out of freedom of heart－a heart en－ larged or set at liberty（Psalm cxix．32）by faith and grace．
cis Tiv e Eloodov］Unto the en－ bering．To make the entering possible．It is clear that eiloooos


is not（even in figure）an en－ trance（ $a$ way in），but an enter－ ing（a going in）．It is thus in each place where it occurs． Acts xiii．24，$\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\sim} \pi o v ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$ єíródou aủrov̂．I Thess．i．9，


 cis тìv aiévoov Bagı入eíar к．т．$\lambda$ The importance of the remark will be seen when we reach ódov in verse 20.
$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aricur］The true holy of holies．See notes on viii． 2. ix． $8,12,24,25$ ，xiii． 11 ．
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$ ai$\mu a \tau \iota]$ See note on ix．25．The figure is that of encasement in，as the protecting armour．And the figure seems to make all Christians priests， even high priests，in virtue of one ícpè̀s $\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma a s($ verse 21 ）．The mention of the aifa，and the employment of the same pre－ position（ ${ }^{\mathbf{e} v}$ ）which is expressly applied（in ix．25）to the Le－ vitical high priest＇s equipment with the aipa in entering the most holy place，seem to imply this．Christians are to rely upon the atonement when they exercise their right of entering God＇s presence，as the high priest relied upon the sacrificial blood in passing into the ${ }^{*}$ juca ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma^{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \omega v$.

20．$\left.\dddot{\eta}^{v}\right]$ The relative to
cïrodov above，repeated in oidiv below．Which act of entering He inaugurated for $u s$ as $a \dot{o} \delta \delta^{\prime}$ s new and living．
ieveкаíviatv］See note on ix． 18，ѐккєкаiviotal．The aorist points to the one sacrifice once offered．
ódóv］See note on ix．8， Tìv $\tau \hat{\omega} v \alpha^{2} \gamma \dot{i} \omega \nu \dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \dot{\sigma} v$ ，and the passages there quoted for the two senses of road and journey．
 in favour of the latter．The óoov is in fact an abbreviation of $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \delta o v$ ，to avoid a wearisome sameness．As a going，that is， a going in，an act of entering．
$\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \phi a r o v]$ Although ф́́vo （ $\pi$＇́фарац）is given as the root of $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \phi a \tau o s$, and is seen in the use of it by Homer（Il．xxiv． 757），no such idea belongs to this word in its common usage． Thus Acts xviii．2，$\pi \rho \circ \sigma ф а ́ т ш s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \lambda \nu \theta_{0} \tau \alpha$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Num．vi． 3 ， otaфv入ìr $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \phi$ arov．Deut． xxiv． 5 （ 7 B ），éàv $\delta \dot{c}$ t ts $\lambda a ́ \beta \eta$ $\gamma$ vvaîка тробфа́тшs．xxxii． 17 ，
 к．т．入．Psalm lxxxi．9，ойк єєбтац
 simply new in contrast with the old inaccessibility of the sanc－ tuary．
 Sos）－the entering of a living man，with all the life in him，

 $22 \tau \sigma \hat{v} \Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}, \pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \omega \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \omega \bar{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \kappa \alpha \rho \delta i^{\prime} \alpha \varsigma$
of body, mind and soul, on the
 25), and whose priesthood is

 ג́ката入úrov (vii. 16).
 A new application of the type of the curtain between the two chambers of the tabernacle. We have passed from Christ's to the Christian's entering. And it suits this topic to make the $\sigma \alpha ́ \rho \xi$ (the human nature) of Christ the medium of the entering. The realization of the incarnation is the $\delta \dot{\alpha}$ (see ix. 12), as the realization of the atonement is the $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu$ (see ix. 25 and x . 19) of the entering.

барко́s] ii. 14. v. 7. Rom. i. 3. viii. 3. ix. 5. Eph. ii. 15 . Col. i. 22. r Tim. iii. I6. I Pet. iii. r8. iv. I. I John iv. 2. 2 John 7 . These passages (from St John's Epistles especially) go far to interpret the $\delta \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa$ os of this text.

2 I . каìi ifp. réyav] Depending on èzoytes. For iepèेs in the sense of ajpxıєpє̀ेs, see note on verse in, and the texts there quoted. For $\mu$ '́ras, see note on
 Great, in contrast with the succession of dying human high
priests of Aaron's order. Great, in contrast with the individual Christian priests (see note on

 first sight this might appear equivalent to the $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$ tòv oitov
 points rather to the sense of tabernacle or temple than to that of either house or household (see note there, oưк ). Compare Zech. vi. 12, I $_{3}$, iठ̀ò
 оікодонйбєє то̀ оікор Kирі́оv...


 The individual Christian high priests have a great High Priest over the heavenly tabernacle or temple. See again iv. 14. For oikos in its application to the tabernacle, see Exod. xxiii. ig. xxxiv. 26. Judg. xviii. $3 \mathrm{I}, \pi$ ád $^{-}$

 Sam. i. 7, 24. \&c. And to the temple, I Kings vi. i. \&c. Acts vii. 47. \&e.
22. $\left.\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi{ }^{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a\right]$ See note on iv. 16. The exhortation is to a constant use of the Christian high-priesthood in its office of access to the holy of holies. This is the sum and substance

є́v $\boldsymbol{\pi} \lambda \eta \rho о ф о \rho i ́ a ~ \pi i ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}, ~ \rho ́ є \rho а \nu \tau \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ v o i ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \mathrm{~s}$

of personal religion. Let us keep appraaching.
$\mu \in \tau \alpha$ ] From the literal idea of in company with, the preposition passes into that of the mental accompaniments or circumstances of an act or life. See iv. 16, $\mu \in т \grave{a}$ тарр $\quad$ бias. x. $34, \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a}$ रapâs. xii. $28, \mu \varepsilon \tau \grave{a}$

à $\lambda \theta \Delta \nu \bar{\eta} s]$ Genuine, real. See note viii. 2.
$\pi \lambda \eta \rho о \phi$ opía] See note on vi.
 places, as in Col. ii. 2, fulness might be the sufficient rendering., But how in I Thess. i. 5?
 Possessing as we do the two parts of the high-priestly consecration, the sprinkling with blood (Lev. viii. 23) and the washing with water (Lev. viii. 6). The addition of the clause, with its two perfect participles, seems designed not to exhort to the acquisition of the qualifications, but rather to the exercise of the priesthood for which the two qualifications are already ours.
$\dot{\rho} \epsilon р а \nu \tau \iota \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} v o l]$ Our hearts being already sprinkled (with the atoning blood) from (so as to remove) a bad conscience. For $\mathrm{\rho}_{\mathrm{av}}$ ti'sev, see note on ix. i3. For the application, see xii. 24, кai aî $\mu a \tau \iota$ р́avтьб $\mu$ ô. 1 Pet. i. 2,
 Xperrov̂. The first qualification for the individual high-priesthood is faith in the atonement as removing the guilt of past sin.
àró Something of this emphatic from (ridding of or freeing from $)$ is seen in Rom. vii. 2, 6 (ámò тồ vópov). Gal. v. 4 (ả̃ò $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v})$.

бvvєiờ $\sigma \epsilon \omega \varsigma$ тоvךра̂s] $A$ bad conscience. A conscience clogged and burdened by the sense of unforgiven sin. The opposite of $\sigma v v \epsilon i \delta \eta \sigma e s \dot{s}^{\boldsymbol{a} \gamma \alpha \theta \eta^{\prime}}$ (Acts xxiii. r. I Tim. i. 5, r9. I Pet. iii. 16, 21), ка入 $\eta^{\prime}$ (Heb. xiii. 18), каөaрá ( I Tim. iii. 9. 2 Tim. i. 3), ä äро́бкотоs (Acts xxiv. 16).

каì $\lambda \epsilon \lambda o v \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ v o l] ~ A n d ~ h a v i n g ~$ the entire body already washed with pure water. For the difference between $\lambda o v \in \iota y$ and vímт $\epsilon \nu$, see John xiii $10, \dot{\delta} \lambda \in \lambda a v-$

 pos ${ }^{\circ} \lambda$ os. The reference to baptism is clear. The heart believes in the atonement, the body is washed in baptism. These are the two qualifications for the Christian individual highpriesthood. Both these you have. Doubtless the case of the He brew Christians was predominantly that of persons baptized
${ }^{2} 3 \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ ӥঠ́ $\alpha \tau \iota \kappa \alpha \theta \alpha \rho \hat{̣}$ ．катє́ $\chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$



as adults．To them baptism was an actual point of transition from the old to the new life． So Mark xvi． 16 （ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{́} \sigma a s$ каî $\beta a \pi \tau \sigma \sigma \in \epsilon$＇s，and in that order）． Acts ii． $3^{8 .}$ xxii． 16 ．Rom． vi．4．I Cor．vi．II．Gal．iii． 27．Col．ii．12． 1 Pet．iii． 2 I． vi $\delta a \tau \iota \kappa \alpha \theta a \rho \hat{\varphi}]$ Ezek．xxxvi．
 คо́v（ $\kappa . \tilde{v} . \mathrm{B}$ ），каі ка $\theta_{a \rho \iota \sigma \theta}^{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \theta \epsilon$ ато̀ $\pi а \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \kappa а \theta а р \sigma \iota \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$.

23．кат＇$\chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu]$（1）The sen－ tence begins with no convecting particle．Partly as an animated appeal（see note on iii． $12, \beta \lambda \bar{\epsilon}-$ $\pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon,{ }^{2} \dot{\delta} \delta \lambda \phi o \hat{\imath}$ ，partly as substan－ tially identical with the fore－ going．（2）Compare iii．6，14，
 $\kappa а т \alpha ́ \sigma \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \kappa$ кт．$\lambda$ ．Here the ex－ hortation（ $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ）is to a tenacious and constant grasping： there the grasping is spoken of in retrospect（ $\kappa a \tau a \dot{\sigma} \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ）， if（in the review of life as one act）we be found to have grasp－ ed，de．

ті̀v í $\mu \mathrm{o} \mathrm{\lambda oyia} \mathrm{\nu}]$ The great and all－comprehending acknow－ ledgment of our Christian hope． See note on iii．I．
${ }^{〔} \lambda \pi i \delta \mathrm{\delta}$ s］See note on vi． 18 ． $\left.{ }^{\alpha} \kappa \lambda e v \hat{\eta}\right]$ So as to be unwaver－ ing．Unswervingly．The word
 here only in the New Testa－ ment．
rıotòs $\gamma^{\text {áp }}$ ］Encouragement to the кaté $\chi$ єiv．So xi．in． 1 Cor．i．9．x．13．$\quad$ Thess．v． 24． 2 Thess．iii． 3.

24．каі̀ катаною $\mu \mathrm{ev}]$ And let ours be no selfish religion． Let us fix our attention upon each other．For кatavoeiv，see note on iii．r．
tis $\pi \alpha \rho o \xi$ ．］With a view to a $\pi a \rho o \xi v \sigma \mu o s$ of（to）love and good works．For $\pi$ apo $\xi v \sigma \mu o ̀ s$, see A．cts
 $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \chi \omega \rho \iota \sigma \hat{\eta} v a, ~ a \dot{v} \tau o \grave{v}^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$


 xxxii．37．There is a kind of paradox here．Let this be your тароछ彑vб就 of one another，a provocation altogether of love and for good．
$\left.\kappa_{\alpha a \lambda \omega \nu}^{\varphi} \rho \gamma \omega v\right]$ The exact op－ posite of the $\nu \in \kappa \rho \omega \nu \stackrel{\mu}{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega \nu$ of $v i$ ． $r$ and ix． 14.

25．$\mu \grave{\eta}$ è $\gamma к a \tau$ ．］Such deser－ tion of the Christian congrega－ tion would be a sure sign of the want of the attention（каталоє $\hat{v}$ ） insisted upon above．For＇̇үката－入eímeuv（to leave behind amongst perils or foes），see 2 Cor．iv．9，

є́ $\gamma \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \pi \sigma \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \quad \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \nu \nu \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \alpha \nu \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$,

 $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \alpha \nu$.

 $\pi о ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu о$.
$\dot{\epsilon \pi} \pi \iota \sigma v \nu a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta} v$ ] Used only once in the Septuagint: 2 Macc. ii. 7,

 Once also (besides this place) in the New Testament: 2 Thess. ii.


 to the future gathering of Christians at the second advent. And so the verb ('̇тtavváy Matt. xxiv. 31 and Mark xiii. 27. In Matt. xxiii. 37 and Luke xiii. 34 it is used of the present gathering to Christ of the dispersed and scattered mankind. In the text, érाovva $\sigma \omega \bar{j}$ may have been preferred to the more obvious avvarury, from the Jewish associations of the latter. The gathering of yourselves together (the '̇ं $i$ of direction).
 so early in the experience of the Church.
$\pi а \rho \alpha к \alpha \lambda о \hat{v} \tau \epsilon \epsilon]$ Thenecessary ả $\lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda o v s$ or éavo $\mathfrak{c}$ ov́s, interchangeable in the New Testament (see note on iii. 13, тирак. éautov́s),
is easily supplied from $\alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda^{\prime} \lambda o v s$ and $\dot{\epsilon} a v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ just above.

тобоit $\tau \mu, \dot{\sigma} \sigma \varphi]$ The nearness of the great day is made in motive for increased earnestness of effort for others. For тобои́т $\because \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \sigma \omega$, see i. 4 .
$\beta \lambda$ éterє] By witnessing the developement of the signs of the end as given in the great prophecies of Matt. xxiv. Mark xiii. Luke xvii. and xxi. It was not given to the Church to know beforehand that the $\sigma v \gamma \tau \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon a$ тố aîwos and the destruction of Jerusalem would not be synchronous. Expectation was to be the attitude of the Church in all her generations. See i Thess. i. 10.
${ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\xi} \gamma^{\prime}$ Covalov] Of time. Luke




Tìv $\eta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \nu]$ The briefest of all the terms for the great day.

 тєтая.
26. "Eк. $\gamma$ áp] Reason for the urgency of the above exhortations: $\tau \rho а \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \theta a \ldots$... катє́ $\chi \omega$ $\mu \epsilon \nu \ldots \kappa а т \alpha \nu о \omega \mu \in \nu$.



éxova'ios] The opposite of



 $\dot{\text { énovaíws is to sin not under the }}$ constraining force of sudden temptation acting upon the weakness of the mortal nature, but (as Psalm xxv. 3 expresses it) without cause (סcaкev̂̀s, Lxx.), that is, by free choice and will.
$\left.{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha \nu o ́ v \tau \omega \nu\right]$ The tense expresses habitual sinning, not the single act speedily repented of and turned from. This shows also that the word must not be limited to the one crowning sin of apostasy. All sin indeed points that way; but it is of the habit of sinning (in whatever form), not only of its culminating act, that the warning speaks.
$\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a}$ тò $\left.\lambda a \beta \epsilon \hat{\iota^{\nu}}\right]$ See this more fully drawn out in the four particulars of vi. 4, 5 . That passage of itself shows that the peril spoken of here is that of falling away from real grace, mysterious as the thought is, and impossible as is its explanation.
$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma v \omega \sigma c \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda$.] The phrase, and its two terms, occur only here in this Epistle. For
the combination, see I Tim. ii. 4. 2 Tim. ii. 25 . iii. 7. Tit. i. r. For éníyvoas (the further or full knowledge, that of the heart as well as the mind) see, besides, Rom. i. 28. iii. 20. x. 2. Eph. i. ry. iv. 13. Phil. i. 9. Col. i. 9, ro. ii. 2. iii. ro. 2 Pet. i. $2,3,8$. ii. 20 .

оข๋кย์т1] If the one sacrifice thus fails, there is no other in reserve to take its place. See
 a $\mu a \rho \tau i \alpha s$. Only there the thought is, because the one $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi o \rho a$ is all-sufficient: here, if the one Ovoía has failed.
$\dot{a} \pi о \lambda \epsilon і л \epsilon \tau а L]$ Is in reserve. The ámò is, as in ámóкет note on ix. 27), off from all else, whether (I) when all else is done, or (2) in security from being meddled with.
27. $\phi o \beta \epsilon \rho a ́]$ Only here and in verse 3 I and xii, 21 . Frequent in the Septuagint, beginning with Gen. xxviii. 17, ws $\phi о \beta \in \rho o ̀ s$ ó то́tos oṽtos.

Tis] A classical use, to convey an impression of mystery and awe.

Éк $\delta$ ox $\left.\eta^{\prime}\right]$ Evidently expectation, though perhaps not elsewhere so used. The $\bar{\epsilon} \kappa \delta є \chi \dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon v o s$ of verse 13 is near enough to leave no doubt of the meaning.




A sort of fearful looking for of judgment．The expectation is terrible，as well as the realiza－ tion．

каі тиро́s $\zeta \bar{\eta} \lambda о s]$ The refer－ ence is to Isai．xxvi．II，$\langle\hat{\eta} \lambda$ os

 combination $\zeta \hat{\eta}$ रos $\pi v \rho o{ }^{\prime} s$ may be either，$a \zeta \bar{\eta} \lambda o s$ consisting of fire （a 豸解 os which is fire），or，a Gìnos characterized by fire（hav－ ing fire for its index and in－ strument）．The parallelism in the passage quoted favours the former．For 乡йरोos（properly fervour，and used both for good and evil，zeal and jealousy），see （1）John ii． $17 . \quad 2$ Cor．vii． 7 ， II．ix．2．xi，2．（2）Acts v． 17．xiii．45．Rom．x．2．xiii． 13． 1 Cor．iii．3． 2 Cor．xii． 20．Gal．v．20．Phil．iii． 6. James iii．I4，I6．Here the fer－ vour is that of wrath．Compare


 $\pi \bar{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \tilde{\eta}^{\gamma} \gamma \hat{\eta}$ ．iii．8．Elsewhere the divine $\zeta \hat{\eta} \lambda o s$ is the fervour of love，as Isai ix．7．Ixiii．I5． Zech．i．14．\＆c．
 the passage quoted from Isaiah． uinevavriovs］ Col ． $\mathrm{ii}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{I} 4$ （only）．Frequent in the Sep－
tuagint，beginning with Gen． xxii． 17.

28． $\mathrm{a}^{2} \theta$ eт $\left.\dot{\eta} \sigma a s\right]$ See notes on vii． 18 and ix． 26.
vó $\mu$ or M．］The absence of the article，laying stress on the quality，gives here a slight tone of disparagement．Such a thing as．Much more then the Gospel．

хшріs оiктtp $\mu \omega \bar{\omega}]$ Apart from （irrespectively of）any compas－ sions．Compassion there might lee，but it could not stop the execution．For oikrıp ${ }^{\prime}$ ós，see Phil．ii．1，єĭ $\tau \iota \varsigma \sigma \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \gamma \chi^{\nu} \alpha \kappa$ каì оіктьрио́．
 strength（basis or ground）of two or three witnesses．Deut． xvii．6．The subject there is the punishment of apostasy to idols．This makes the refer－ ence here the more suitable． Other crimes were capital，but this is the one singled out for mention．In Matt．xviii． 16 and 2 Cor．xiii．i the quotation is from Deut．xix．15，where the principle is laid down， $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath}$
 $\sigma \tau о ́ \mu a \tau о s ~ \tau \rho \iota \omega \nu \quad \mu а \rho \tau і \rho \omega \nu \quad \sigma \tau a \theta \eta^{\prime}-$ $\sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota \pi \hat{\alpha} v \frac{\rho}{\rho} \eta \mu a$.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta v \eta \sigma \kappa \in]$ The present tense may refer to the explicit precept and past practice rather than assert the continuance of

#  


it (in the exact form) up to the writing of the Epistle. From
 ȧтоктєîvaı où $\delta \dot{\epsilon} v a$ ) we infer that the Roman authority was necessary for an execution. The execution of St Stephen was probably of a tumultuary character.
29. $\left.\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{u}\right]$ See note on ix. 14, $\pi о \sigma \omega \varphi \mu \bar{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o v$.

סoкєiтє] A parenthetical question (interposed in the exclamation) appealing to the intelligence of the reader. Think ye? I leave you to judge. Like the $\tau \kappa$ in verse 27 , a rhetorical and classical idiom.
xeipovos] The only occurrence of $\chi \epsilon i \rho \omega \nu$ in this Epistle. Elsewhere in Matt. ix. i6, $\chi \in \hat{i}-$ pov $\sigma \chi i \sigma \mu \alpha$, xii. 45. xxvii. 64. dc.
$\mathbf{a} \xi \iota \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a l] \quad \mathrm{By}$ God the Judge of all (xii. 23). For

rıншрíac] Only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint, Prov. xix. 29, є́тоцца́-

 $\mu o i \omega s$ ắ $\rho o \sigma \iota v$ B). xxiv. 22. \&c. For $\tau \ell \mu \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{i v}$, see Acts xxii. 5 . xxvi. it. The classical distinction (in Plato and Aristotle) between кó $\lambda a \sigma t s$ (chastisement)
 $\mu \omega \rho i ́ a ~(v e n g e a n c e)$ as tô̂ nolov̂v-
ros (in vindication of his honour, or of the honour of the broken law), may be present in Scripture (Matt. xxy. 46. I John iv. 18), but the passages are scarcely numerous enough to prove this positively.
còv viòv toû @coû] The august title is chosen, as in vi. 6 , to enhance the heinousness of the crime. In iv. I4 with an opposite purpose, to emphasize the sufficiency of the Saviour.

катататйбаs] The three aorist participles mark either (r) the moment of each particular sinning (d́áaptavóvтer in verse 26 expressing the habit and repetition), or else (2) the moment of the consummation of the habitual sinning in the single act of apostasy. Or both, For ката$\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon \hat{V}$, Matt. v. I3, тò $\begin{gathered}\text { ä } \\ \text { as... }\end{gathered}$
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \alpha^{\nu} \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\pi} \omega \omega \nu . \quad$ xiii. 6, $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon}$


 тoбìv aürஸ̂v. Luke viii. 5, ó
 $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \pi a \tau \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta$ к.т.入. xii. I. The passages quoted place in a strong light the contumely and profanity of the treatment of Christ by the sinner.

тò $\alpha i \mu \alpha, \eta_{\hat{\eta}} \delta$.] See note on ix. 20.



коєvóv] ( I ) Properly, common, in contrast with ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \operatorname{cov}\left(\tilde{\eta}^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta\right)$. And this is sufficient here, where the thought is that of the consecrated man making light of his consecration. (2) Elsewhere the further idea of deflement attaches to кocvós. See ix. 13, toùs кєкоlva $\mu$ évous. And so in Acts x. 14, \&e. Rom. xiv. 14 . Rev. xxi. 27, тây кowò̀ каì ó $\pi о \hat{\omega} y \quad \beta \delta \dot{́} \lambda v \gamma \mu a$.
$\left.\dot{\eta}_{\gamma} \eta^{\prime} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \nu \sigma \mathrm{s}\right]$ As by one decisive act. See note on катаmat $\dot{\sigma} \sigma a s$ above. And compare the same use of the aorist of $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ in xi. ı I, 26 . Phil. ii. 6.
$\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\Psi} \dot{\eta} \gamma \cdot]$ Wherein (as though by immersion or envelopement in it) he was consecrated. For the $\dot{\boldsymbol{c}} \boldsymbol{v}$ here (not precisely as in ix. 25 and x. 19) see note on ix. 22, द̀v aïuatı.
$\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{c}^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta$ ] The time referred to is the moment of conversion and baptism. But the thought is not simply that of $x$. 10 and
 but rather that of the priestly consecration then bestowed, as in verse 22 above, where see note.
$\tau \dot{o} \pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s \chi$.] The genitive of the characteristic quality, added to heighten the ingratitude and ungenerousness of the treatment. The Spirit who is
all grace-to insult Him-how base, how heartless I The effect is that of Eph. iv. $3^{0}, \mu \grave{\eta} \lambda v \pi \epsilon i ́ t \epsilon$ тò $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{u} \mu$.
évopoigas] Only here in the New Testament. Not in the Septuagint. The compound is classical. Properly to insult one in something (with or without a second ivy). But later (with no stress on the ${ }^{\prime} v$ ) just as $v \beta$ pi $\zeta \epsilon t v$, for which see Matt.


 $\sigma \epsilon \tau а ц . ~ A c t s$ xiv. 5, i $\mathbf{i} \beta \boldsymbol{\mu} \dot{\sigma} \alpha \iota$ каі $\lambda e \theta o \beta o \lambda \eta \ddot{\eta}^{2} a l$ av่тoús. These passages show the associations of the word, and so emphasize the application of it here. The very definition of $\vec{v} \beta \rho \iota$ is that combination of insult and injury, wanton outrage, which becomes frightful in its contact with the Spirit of grace..
 тинрías-for, \&c. We know Him who said. We know who and what He is. We have had experience of His power and truth. Like (yet unlike) 2 Tim.
 know who and what $H e$ is in whom I have put my trust).
ròv єimóvтa] Deut. xxxii.

 from the Septuagint is found in



x. $3^{\circ}$. Or $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \pi о \delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega, \lambda \in \gamma \epsilon \epsilon$ Kúpios.

Rom. xii. 19, as though there were a traditional form of the quotation. Unless indeed that passage was the source of the quotation here. The application differs in the two places. In Rom. xii. i9 the stress lies on $\dot{\epsilon} \mu$ o' $^{\prime}$. The man who avenges himself assumes God's prerogative. Here rather on éк $\bar{i} \kappa \eta \sigma \iota s$, in justification of the repwoias above.
 (ěкסькоs), to work out justice upon, whether in avenging (as Rom. xii. I9) or in punishing (as 2 Cor. x. 6). See note on Rom. xii. ı9, èкঠıкои̂vтєs.
 in return or to pay in requital
 $\kappa \epsilon i v)$ be either good or evil. For the good sense, see Luke xiv. I4. I Thess. iii. 9. For both senses, 2 Thess i. 6, ávia-

 ${ }_{a}^{*} \nu \in \sigma \tau \nu$. See note on xii. II,
 Kúpros which follow in the received text are not in Deut. xxxii. 35 (though кaì єiтє Kúptos follows in verse 37 ), and are omitted here in the revised text. In Rom. xii. 19 they
stand without challenge. Here the preponderance of authority and probability seems to be against them.

кai $\pi a ́ \lambda \imath v]$ Deut. xxxii. 36 ,
 There коıtê has plainly a merciful sense. The Lord shall avenge His people. It may be so here also. The Lord shall right His true people by punishing the false. The words ròv入aòv avंтô at first sight favour this view. But r Pet. iv. 17

 the other way.

3I. фоßєрóv] In 2 Sanı. xxiv. It and I Chron, xxi. I3 David makes this a reason either for choosing pestilence rather than one of the twoother punishments, or (as it may be understood) for referring the choice altogether to God, $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \sigma о \hat{\mu} \mu a \iota$ סj̀ cils xeîpas Kupiov, ötı mod入oi
 Ecclus. ii. 18. But in the text the penal aspect of judgment gives the other view of the $\epsilon^{\prime} \mu$ $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i v$. The true parallels here are Matt. x. 28 and Luke xii. 5 .
©eov̂ לलिvtos] A God who is all life, and whose insight and power none can escape. See




iii. I2. ix. 14. xii. 22. For the thought, compare iv. 12, 13 .
32. 'Avapu same sort of transition from severity to tenderness as in the parallel passage in vi. 9. The thought is that of Gal. iii. 4,
 єikj. And also (only that there doing predominates over suffering) of 2 John $8, \beta \lambda$ énєтє éavtoùs

 recall to one's own recollectiont, see 2 Cor. vii. 15. Also see note on x .3 (àvá $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \iota s$ ) for the active voice of the verb.

тоо́тєроv] Aforetime. See
 тєs. I Pet. i. 14 , таîs $\pi \rho o ́ t \epsilon \rho o v$

$\phi \omega \tau \sigma \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon$ ] See note on vi. 4 , $\phi \omega \tau \iota \theta$ '́vtas. The illumination spoken of would in those times synchronize with (or immediately precede) baptism recoived in mature age: but it is a distinct idea from it, though afterwards confused with it.
$\left.{ }^{n} \theta \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \nu\right]$ Struggle or confict. Only used here in the New Testament. Formed from
 $\kappa a i{ }^{\hat{a}} \hat{\theta} \lambda \hat{\eta} \tau \iota s$. .Nearly equivalent to St Paul's great word ár由y
(Phil. ii. 30. Col. ii. r. 1 Thess. ii. 2. I Tim. vi. 12. 2 Tim . iv. 7). See note on xii. 1 .
viтє $\mu \epsilon i v a \tau \epsilon]$ Ye endured (bore in a spirit of submissive waiting). See xii. 2, 3. 1 Cor. xiii. 7, па́vта ข่тонє́vєL. 2 Tim. ii. ro. See note on verse $3^{6}$, $\dot{\nu} \pi о \mu о \nu \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$.
$\pi \alpha \theta \eta \mu \dot{\sigma} \tau \omega v$ Genitive of $e x-$ planation or equivalence. Consisting of. See note on ii 9, $\pi a ́ \theta \eta \mu a$.
33. то̂̂тo $\mu$ ఢ̀v...t. סé] A classical idiom; a sort of emphasized $\mu \epsilon v$ and $\delta \epsilon$. As to this on the one hand...as to this on the other. In the first place... and in the second place.
 dative. For the word, see xi. 26. xiii. 13. Rom. xv. 3 (from Psalm lxix. 9).
$\left.\theta \lambda_{i}^{\prime} \psi \epsilon \sigma \omega\right]$ See note on xi. 37.
$\theta \in \alpha \tau \rho \iota \zeta_{0} \mu \epsilon \nu \circ$ ] Being made a spectacle or gazingstock. Only here. See I Cor. iv. 9, $\theta^{\prime} \alpha \pi \rho o \nu$ ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \nu \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \kappa \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu \omega$.

кошшขoi] Partners. So (with genitive or dative of the person) Matt. xxiii. 30 , ov̉к àv




 $\mu i o t s \quad \sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \pi \alpha \partial_{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon, \kappa \alpha i \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\dot{v} \pi \alpha \rho \chi o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \chi^{\alpha \rho} \rho \bar{s} \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \delta \dot{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$, ェ. 34. Or tois $\delta \in \sigma \mu o i ́ s ~ \mu o v$.

2 Cor. viii. 23, кotv $\quad$ vòs è $\mu$ ós.
 vavóv. Elsewhere partakers. Thus (with genitive of the thing) 2 Cor. i. $7, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi a \theta \eta \mu a^{\prime}-$ $\tau \omega v . ~ I ~ P e t . ~ v . ~ I, ~ \delta o ́ g \eta s . ~ 2 ~ P e t . ~$

 who thus lived; that is, who passed their life in the constant experience of being made a spectacle, \&c. For divaбтрє́ $\phi \epsilon \sigma \theta$ a، (the Latin versari), see xiii. I8,
 2 Cor. i. 12, àvє $\sigma \tau \rho a ́ \phi \quad \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} v$
 iii. 15 . I Pet. i. 17 , тòv $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ тароскías í $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ रро́vov àvaбтрá$\phi \eta \tau \epsilon .2$ Pet. ii. 18, тov̀s द̀v $\pi \lambda a ́ v \eta$ àvacт $\rho \in ф о \mu$ е́vovs.
 as if by one decisive act, like that by which Moses (xi. 24) declared his nationality.
34. кaì үáp] I say that you suffered, and $I$ say that you took part with sufferers-for, \&ec. And the latter point is taken first.

кai $\gamma$ à $\rho$ тoîs $\delta$.$] \quad For ye both$ sympathized with those that were in bonds. The received text
 the reading of the Sinaitic manuscript and some other authori-
ties. Theassumption of St Paul's authorship would encouragesuch a reading. It is not noticed even in the margin of the Revised Version.

тốs $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu i o t s]$ xiii. $3, \mu \mu \nu \eta^{\prime}-$ $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu i \omega v$ is $\sigma v \nu \delta \in \delta \epsilon-$ $\mu$ froo. The article is generic: prisoners as a class.

बvvєта日ं $\dot{\eta} \sigma a \tau \epsilon]$ For $\sigma \nu \mu \pi \alpha-$ $\theta$ cirv, see note on iv. 15 . You felt with them. Not $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \pi \alpha \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, which could not have been true of all.

каi. tive] From the proof of the toûto fè of verse 33 we return to the tov̂to $\mu$ èv-their own sufferings.
 Luke xi. 39. For á $\rho \pi \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \rho_{\epsilon c}$ in this sense, see John x. 12, ${ }^{\circ}$
 $\pi i \zeta \epsilon c$.
$\tau \hat{\omega} v \dot{v} \pi a \rho \chi . \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega}]$ The genitive after (or even before) rà visápxovta is common in the New Testament, as Matt, xix. 2 I. xxiv. 47. xxv. 14. Luke xi. 21. xii. 33,44 . xvi. 1.
 $\chi^{\dot{o} v \tau \omega \nu . ~} 1$ Cor. xiii. 3. It is even placed between the article and the participle (making the latter a complete substantive) in Luke xiv. 33, toîs èauroù

## 

X. 34. Or Éautoîs.
iँ $\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi^{\circ v \sigma t r}$. The dative occurs in Luke viii. 3. xii. 15 . Acts iv. $3^{2}$.
$\left.\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \chi^{\alpha \rho} \hat{a}_{\rho}\right]$ xiii. 1 \%. Matt. xiii. 2o. Mark iv. I6. LuFe viii. 13. x. $\mathrm{m}_{7}$ Phil. i. 4. $\left.\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \delta \in \xi_{a} \sigma \theta_{\epsilon}\right]$ The two main senses of $\pi \rho о \sigma \delta \dot{\delta} \chi \notin \sigma \theta a L$, in the New Testament as elsewhere, are (I) to accept (receive to oneself), as here, and xi. 35,
 $\sigma \omega$. Luke xv. 2, á $\mu a \rho \tau \omega \lambda$ ò̀s
 Rom. xvi. 2. Phil. ii. 29, $\pi \rho 0 \sigma-$
 (2) to expect, Mark xv. 43. Luke ii. 25,3 . xii. 36 . xxiji. 5 1. Acts xxiii. 2 I. Tit. ii. I3. Jude 2I. In Acts xxiv. 15 either sense might be given (the ${ }_{\epsilon} \chi \chi \omega \nu$ favours the former, Tit. ii. I 3 the latter).
 ceived text had ìv eavroîs. The $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ must be given up at all events, but there is some authority for cavrois. Knowing that ye have for yourselves (for your own). With eavoivs (the better supported reading) the meaningmay be either (I) that ye yourselves have a better possession, or (2) that ye have yourselves as a better possession. Neither rendering is quite satisfactory. If eavtoùs had preceded ë́civ, it would be, linowing as to (with regard to)
yourselves that ye have a better possession. But the position of the two words precludes this. There is something tlat in (I); ciavtov̀s seems superfluous. The idea of (2), which is that the man himself is his own better possession (better than anything of earthly substance), is subtle and unexpected, but has some support in Luke xii. 15, ovik $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} v$

 Perhaps too in Luke xvi. i2, $\epsilon i \dot{G} v$

 thislife ye proved yourselves unfaithful in the use of that earthly substance which from its precariousness of possession is rather another's than your own even while you have it, who shall give you that inalienable possession which is, being interpreted, your own finally gained soul?) Compare also Luke xvii. 33 .

 note on verse 39 , єis $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi$ оíqбı $\psi v \chi \bar{\eta} s$.
vi $\pi a \rho \xi(\nu]$ In clear contrast with $\dot{v} \pi \alpha \rho \chi$ о́vт $\omega v$ above. For the word see Acts ii. 45, tàs

$\mu \epsilon ́ v o v o a v]$ See xii. 27, iva $\mu \epsilon i v \eta \tau a ̀ \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \lambda \epsilon v o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a$. xiii. I ,




 $\tau о \bar{u} \Theta \epsilon o \bar{u} \pi о \iota \prime \prime \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ко $\mu i \sigma \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i ́ a \nu$.
nearly 70 times in St John's writings, often in this emphatic sense. See, for example, John


 Rom. ix. II. I Cor. xiii. 13 . 2 Cor. iii. ІІ, тò катаруои́цєvov ...тò $\mu$ évov.
35. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ àто $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \tau \epsilon$ ovv ] Discard not then your $\pi a \rho \rho \eta \sigma i a$. The figure is illustrated by Mark

$\pi a \rho \rho \eta \sigma i ́ a v]$ See note on iii. 6.

ग̈rts] One which. A rap$\rho \eta \sigma i a$ which. See notes on ii. 3 and viii. 5 .
$\mu \nu \theta a \pi o \delta o \sigma i a v]$ See note on ii. 2.
36. viтоноण $\hat{\mathrm{s}}$ ] From the literal sense of $\dot{v} \pi о \mu о v \dot{\eta}$ (with a genitive), abiding under, patient endurance of (as in 2 Cor. i. 6,
 $\tau \omega \nu)$, comes that of submissive waiting, patience, as a spiritual grace, having as its two ingredients the upward look and the onward look; the one the consciousness of a hand over us, the other the expectation of a future of explanation and blessing. First perhaps so found in Psalm ix. I8, $\dot{\eta} \dot{v} \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \mu, \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 ( A, тòv aī̀va B ). Luke viii. I $_{5}$. xxi. 19. I Tim. vi. 1 1. 2 Tim. iii. 10. Tit. ii. 2. Heb. xii. r. James i. 3. $\quad$ P Pet. i. 6. Sometimes $\boldsymbol{v \pi} \pi{ }^{2} \mu \mathrm{ovj}$ is the object of patience; as in Psalin xxxix.
 Kúpios; Sometimes it has a genitive of the thing persisted in
 a ja $\theta$ ov̂), the animating motive ( i Thess. i. $3, \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \dot{v} \pi \tau \mu o v \hat{\eta}_{5} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ i $\lambda \pi$ (ióos к. $\tau . \lambda$.), or the inspiring Person (2 Thess. iii. 5. Rev. iii. Io).
 v. $12, \chi \rho \epsilon i a \nu$ є̆ $\chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$.
iva tó] Compare vi. 15 , каi



т̀̀ $\theta . \tau . \Theta . \pi$.$] Perhaps with$ a slight reminiscence of verse 7 . See also xiii. 2 r , катарті́бац $\hat{v} \mu \hat{\alpha} \mathrm{~s}$
 $\theta \in ́ \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ aủ่ти̂. Matt. vii. 2 I. xii. 50. r John ii. r7. \&c. The norist sums up the life into a single act.

ко $\left.\mu^{\prime} \sigma \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon\right]$ From the literal meaning of коці弓eเv, to carry, convey, bring (as Luke vii. 37), comes that of the middle voice, (1) to carry off as one's own, to receive; and specially (z) to re-




## x. 37. Or $\chi$ poviei.

cover or get back (as xi. 19.
 $\mathcal{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \mu$ óv. 2 Cor. v. ıо. Eph. vi. 8. Col. iii. 25), (3) to receive as a thing due or promised (as here, and xi. 39. I Pet. i. 9. v. 4).
 مóv, see John xiii. 33, є̈ $\tau \iota \mu \iota \kappa$ о̀v

 $\dot{\text { ó ко́ } \sigma \mu о s ~} \mu \epsilon$ оихкє́ть $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath}$. For ö $\sigma o v \tilde{\sigma}^{\circ} \sigma o v$ (a classical phrase), see Isai. xxvi. $20, \dot{\alpha} \pi о к \rho \dot{v} \beta \eta \theta_{c} \mu с к \rho o ̀ v$ ö $\sigma o \nu$ ö $\sigma o \nu$ (accusative). Here it is the nominative. Literally, there is still a little-just so much as that. A very very little.
 as if there were a kai before
 above). The quotation is from Hab. ii. 3. The full passage is,
 tis $\pi$ t́pas, каì оưk $\epsilon$ is кєvóv- $\mathfrak{\epsilon a ̀ \nu}$

 The vision (opaots) is the fall of the Chaldran empire. If it linger, wait for it. The Septuagint makes the object of expectation a person. Wait for Him. Coming $H e$ shall come (He will surely come). The Epistle adds the article (o ${ }^{\circ} \rho$ xó $\mu \in \nu 0 s$ ), making it a title of
x. 38. Or omit $\mu o v$.

Christ (see Matt. xi. 3, ov̀ ধt ó е́рхо́лєчоя к.т.入. Luke vii. т9, 20. John vi. 14. xi. 27). The first advent has not exhausted the coming: it took a new start at the ascension. Christ is again and still ó $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$.
$\boldsymbol{\eta} \xi \in \varepsilon]$ Will have come. The coming One will have fulfflled His coming. See note on verse 7, ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \kappa \omega$.
où रpovíact] Will not delay beyond the time appointed. For $\chi^{\text {рoví'єiy, }}$ see Matt. xxiv. 48,
 Luke i. 2 I. xii. 45.
38. ó đè סíxauós $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{o v}]$ Continuation of the quotation (Hab. ii. 4), but with an inversion of the two clauses, which stand in
 (2) $\dot{\delta} \delta \bar{\delta} \epsilon$ - $\dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a t$. The $\mu \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is doubtful. It stands after $\pi i \sigma-$ rews in the Vatican manuscript of the Septuagint (faith in me), after סíkaios in the Alexandrine (my righteous servant). In Rom. i. 17 and Gal. iii. 1 I, as by several authorities here, it is omitted altogether.

گnंбєтal] Shall have life. In the full sense of life, in which it adds three things to mere existence ; (1) conscious, in distinction from vegetable life, (2)
 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \dot{\varphi} \nu \dot{v} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ єis $\dot{\alpha} \pi \omega^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu, \alpha \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$ єis $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi o i ́ \eta \sigma \iota \nu \psi \nu \chi \bar{\eta} s$.
satisfying，in distinction from a life of pain，shame，or misery， （3）everlasting，in distinction from the life which has death in prospect．See，for example， John v．25，кuì of áкои́ซаvтes そぞซovart．vi． 57 ．Rom．viii． 13 ． \＆c．

каì çáv］The Epistle follows the Septuagint，which departs here widely from the Hebrew． There it is said of the Chaldæan， His soul in him is puffed up，it is not upright．
íтоотєì $\eta$ та儿］A nantical figure；that of taking in or shortening sail in prospect of storm．Hence to draw in，to exercise caution or reserve．Once in the active voice，followed by ¢́avтóv，Gal．ii．I2（he drew him－ self $i n$ ）．More often，as here， in the middle．Acts $x x .20$ ，

 （I exercised reserve as to nothing ．．．so as not to declare it）к．т．$\lambda$ ． Wisd．vi．7，oủ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\text { vimoort }} \boldsymbol{\lambda \epsilon \hat { \epsilon } \tau \alpha \iota}$

 so $\sigma \tau \in ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, 2$ Cor．viii． 20 ，
 $\mu \omega \mu \eta \quad \sigma \eta \tau \alpha \mu$ к．т．入． 2 Thess．iii．
 $\dot{a} \dot{\delta} \epsilon \lambda \phi \circ \hat{v} \kappa$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．The idea is rather that of shrinking in than of
shrinking back，and is the direct opposite of that $\pi \alpha \rho \rho \eta \sigma \iota \dot{a} \zeta \sigma \theta$ at which is the outspokenness of Christian manliness．
ciठoкe $\hat{i}]$ See note on verse 6.

39．oủк $\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \quad \dot{v} \pi \circ \sigma \tau \circ \lambda \hat{\eta} s]$ We are not of．Either，we do not belong to，as our province or category．Or，we are not characterized by，as our leading feature or proper description． For the former，compare i Thess．
 tovs．For the latter， 2 Thess．

$\dot{\boldsymbol{v} \pi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}]$ A noun formed from the $\dot{v} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon i \lambda \eta r a \iota$ above，to balance the mívteos of both verses．
$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \sigma$ in $\sigma \iota \nu]$ The verb $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota-$ тoteiv（to make to be over and above）carries the two ideas of survival and surplus．The for－ mer predominates in the active voice，to save（a life，\＆c．），the latter in the middle，to acquire．


 $\kappa \alpha \lambda o ̀ v \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi о \iota \hat{v} \nu \tau \alpha$, Isai．xliii． $2 \mathrm{I}, \lambda a o ́ v \mu o v$ öv $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \pi \circ \iota \eta \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$. The noun in its New Testament use takes its colour from the middle．Acquisition．And like the English word it has the
 $\pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi$ оs oủ $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$. '̇̀ $\tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta \quad 2$ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \mu \alpha \rho \tau v \rho \eta^{\prime} \theta_{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$ oi $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\prime} \tau \epsilon \rho о \iota$.
twofold sense of (1) the act of acquiring (as here, and I Thess. v. 9 , єis $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi о i ́ \eta \sigma t v ~ \sigma \omega т \eta \rho i ́ a s . ~$

 пoíno(v), and (2) the thing acquired (Eph. i. 14, єis ámodí$\left.\tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \sigma \iota \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}\right)$. Thus here the thought is that of the $\psi v \times \eta \dot{\eta}$ being in this life the stake of the contest, to be won or lost in the great day. So Luke xxi.
 (ye shall gain) tàs $\psi v \chi$ às $\dot{v} \mu \omega \hat{v}$. This explains also Luke xvi. 12, the тò vi $\mu$ é $\tau \epsilon \rho \circ$ of the future in contrast with the ro à $\lambda \lambda{ }^{\prime}$ ópıov of the present.
XI. i. *Eatıv ס́' $^{\prime}$ The emphatic $\begin{gathered}\text { âcou } \\ \text { answers (as it were) }\end{gathered}$ the question, And what is faith? What faith is is this.
 $\pi i \sigma t i s$. The first form of the definition is incomplete. Assurance of things hoped for would limit faith to the future. Whereas the realm of faith is larger. $A l l$ the past belongs to it, and the larger part of the present. Things hoped for, if the definition is to be complete, must be replaced by things not seen.
víóवтaनts] See note on i . 3. Assurance of, as in four out of the five places where the
word occurs in the New Testament.
$\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu]$ For this peculiar sense of $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$, not fact or act, but reality, see note on vi. 18, where it is applied to the word and oath of God.
$\left.{ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \times o s\right]$ Only found here in the New Testament (for in 2 Tim. iii. 16 the revised text has $\left.\lambda^{\lambda} \epsilon \gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} v\right)$. It is frequent in the Septuagint (chiefly in the Proverbs) in the sense of reproof, which is here clearly unsuitable. Conviction is tempting, but is not a recognized use of the word. The only possible renderings here are proof and test. Of these two the latter introduces a thought somewhat far-fetched. Proof, that which convinces us of something, is simple and adequate. Faith is that quality or faculty of the mind which convinces us of, which enables us to accept, to grasp, to realize, the invisible.
2. Ėv таút $\left.\eta \gamma^{\prime} \rho\right]$ The $\gamma^{\prime} \rho$ seems to imply a suppressed clause. A comprehensive and an agelong grace-for, \&c.
 (not outside it) they were attested. In it was contained, in it lay, their commendation: exactly as in 1 Tim. v. 10, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{\boldsymbol{e}} v$


## 

this passive of $\mu \alpha \rho \tau v \rho \in \hat{\imath}$ ，sec also vii．8．Acts vi． $3,{ }^{a} \nu \delta \rho a s$
 x．22．xvi．2．xxii． 12.
oi $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta$ रitepot］They of the old time．The servants and saints of God from the begin－ ning．A peculiar use of the word，which elsewhere is ap－ plied either（ I ）in strict con－ trast with the young（as in I Pet．v．5），or（2）to Jews of former generations（Matt．xv． 2），or（3）to the official elders of the Jewish people（Matt． xxvi．3），or（4）to Christian presbyters（Acts xi．30．\＆c．）．

3．Пíotci voov̂ $\mu \boldsymbol{v}]$ The first instance of faith lies not in
 in the ov $\beta \lambda_{\epsilon \pi о \boldsymbol{\prime}}^{\boldsymbol{\mu} \varepsilon v a}$ of the past． To know that creation was an act of God，pure and simple，is a realization of the invisible of the highest order．
voo $\hat{v} \mu \in \nu]$ It is an act of the mind．Rom．i． $20, \tau \grave{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ áópata

 For vociv，see also Matt．xv．ip． xvi．9，11．xxiv．15，ó de dayl－ $\boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\sigma} к \boldsymbol{\operatorname { c o s }}$ ขоєíт（let him exerciso mind upon his reading）．Mark

 aat；viii．I7．xiii．14．John xii．40．Eph．iii．4，20，ávart－ $\nu \omega ́ \sigma к о ч т є s ~ v o \eta ̂ \sigma a \iota ~ к . т . \lambda . ~ I ~ T i m . ~$
 к．т．д． 2 Tim．ii．7，vóєє \＆ٌ 入є́ $\gamma \omega$ ．

катпртiбөai］The perfect tense expresses the permanence of the creation（2 Pet．iii．4，

 is properly to fit perfectly，and so either（ I ）to frame，adjust（as
 ті́б由 мо．Rom．ix．22，катпр－ тєбرе́va єis àmé入єtav），or（2） to complete，perfect（as xiii．21． Luke vi．40．I Cor．i．Io． 2 Cor．xiii．If．I Pet．v．io），or （3）to repair，restore（as Matt． iv． 21 ，катартílovтая та̀ дíктva． Mark i．ıg．Gal．vi．i，катар－ $\tau\langle\zeta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ то̀े тоюốtov．I Thess．iii．
 $\left.\tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s v^{i} \mu \hat{\omega} v\right)$ ．
tov̀s aîvas］See note on i．2．The émoincev there，as катทртібtal here，shows that the rendering should be，not the ages，but the worlds．Also the following clause here（eis $\boldsymbol{\text { o }}$ $\mu \grave{\eta}$ к．т．ג．）would be inappro－ priate to the notion of mere time．Still the idea of time is not lost．The worlds are time－ worlds，having their periods of duration and their limits of existence．
$\left.\dot{\rho} \dot{y}^{\prime} \mu a \tau \iota \odot \epsilon \bar{\imath}\right]$ By a fiat of God．The reference is to the repeated каi єitтє ó ©és of Gen．i．3，6，9，II，14，20， 24 ， 26．For $\hat{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$, see note on i．3－
cis ró］The resull of the
 by a fiat of God with this
 то́ $\mu \in \nu=\nu \quad \gamma є \gamma \sigma \nu \in ́ v \alpha l$.


result-that the thing seen has not come into being out of things apparent. For cis тó, compare
 cis to ìãotal aúvóv.
 apparent, visible to the eye. Creation was not a mere rearrangement of preexisting matrials, but (in the strictest sense) a bringing into being of the previously nonexistent.

то̀ $\left.\beta \lambda_{\varepsilon \pi \text { о́ } \mu \varepsilon v_{0}}\right]$ The thing discerned by the eye. The singuar gathers up the particulars of visible being into one whole.
yєүovéval] Has not come into being. For the perfect, see note on катррті́дal. Also John


4. Пíaтєє ... ${ }^{*}$ А $\beta \epsilon \lambda$ ] The second and third illustrations of faith have to do with its action upon the present. And first, Faith acting in worship.
$\left.\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon_{0}{ }^{2}\right]$ From its literal sense, more in number or quancity, плєíw passes into that of more in value, superior in quality. See Matt. v. so. vi.
 $\tau \rho о ф \hat{\eta} s$; xii. 41, 42, каì iठо̀̀


xi. 3I, 32. xii. 23. xxi. 3. Rev. ii. 19. The superiority of Abel's sacrifice lay in his faith, not in its material. Each brought of what he had: God read the heart of each, and saw in the one that realization of the Invisible which the other lacked.
$\pi \lambda \epsilon$ 'ova...тара́] For $\pi а р а ̀$ after a comparative, as a feature of the Epistle, see note on i. 4 .

троби́vєүкєv] See note on v. 1 .
$\left.\delta b^{i}{ }_{\eta} 5\right]$ It is doubtful, and scarcely material, whether $\dot{\eta}$ s refers to míaret or to $\theta \mathrm{voi}$ av. The latter is the nearer referene, and so far the simpler. But $\delta i^{\prime}$ aud $\hat{\mathrm{j}}$ s favours the formere. A like ambiguity occurs in verse 7.
$\left.\epsilon_{\epsilon} \mu \alpha \tau \tau \rho \eta^{\prime} \theta_{\eta}\right]$ He was attested to be righteous. Testimony was borne to him that he was righteous. By the acceptance of his offering. Gen. iv. 4, kail ai $\pi \in i \delta \in V$
 סwópots avi rove.
rival סíkalos] The phrase does not occur in the narrative of Gen. iv. But סíkaws is the epithet of Abel in Matt. xxiii.
 Sıкaiov. Compare I John iii.




$$
\text { xi. 4. Or } \alpha \dot{\imath} \tau 0 \hat{1} T \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \text {. }
$$

12, тà $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ тov̂ $\mathfrak{a} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o \hat{v}$ aủ $\tau o v ̂$ סíкala.
$\mu a \rho \tau v \rho o i ̂ v \tau o s]$ Still testifying. For the voice of Scripture is always speaking.
$\dot{\epsilon \pi} i$ tois] Gen. iv. 4 (quoted above). With respect to his gifts. See ix. 15, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{e} \pi i \hat{i} \tau \hat{a}$

 $\Theta \epsilon \hat{\omega}$ (though strongly supported) can scarcely be accepted. It would have to be taken with §ẃposs (like Ovoiav т $\hat{\varphi}$ Kvpícu, Gen. iv. 3, Lxx.). He (God) testifying of livs gifts unto God.
$\delta_{i}^{\prime}$ aviths] By means of his faith seems preferable to by means of his sacrifice; and, if so, $\delta_{i}{ }^{2}{ }_{j} \mathrm{~s}$ can scarcely be taken differently.
$\lambda a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}]$ So xii. 24, aï $\mu a \tau \iota$
 $\boldsymbol{\tau} \nu^{*} \mathrm{~A} \beta \in \lambda$. There is an evident allusion to Gen. iv. 10 , $\phi \omega \nu \eta$ aïนaтоs тov̂ ádeोфov̂ vou ßoạ $\pi \rho o ́ s \mu \in \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s$.
5. Пїбтєц 'Evш́х] Faith (still in the province of the present) acting, not in an act of worship, but in the life. See notes on verse I ( $\bar{\lambda} \pi \tau \zeta \zeta \rho \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu)$ and verse 4 ( $\pi$ ív $\tau \in c .{ }^{*} \mathrm{~A} \beta \epsilon \lambda$ ). The dative (ríotci) represents
faith as the instrument of the translation.
$\left.\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \theta_{\eta}\right]$ Was transferred or transposed. It was only a change of place. Acts vii. 16,
 note on vii. 12, $\mu \in \tau \alpha \tau\llcorner\theta \in \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta s$ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$.) In Gen. v. 24 the Hebrew says only, God took him. The Septuagint renders it, $\mu \in \tau \in \theta_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in$ aùtò̀ ó © $€$ ós.
$\tau o \hat{\mu} \mu \bar{\eta}$ i $\delta \in i \nu]$ This might be rendered, so that he did not see.

 av่т $\omega v$. Rom. vii. 3 , тov̀ $\mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon \tau \nu a \iota$ aúrìv $\mu o i \chi a \lambda i \delta \partial$. But the commoner sense, that he might not see, is equally suitable. Sue
 Matt. ii. I3, そŋтєìv тò $\pi \alpha_{1} \delta i o v$

 $\tau o v . ~ x i i i . ~ 3, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \xi \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \bar{o}$ ó $\sigma \pi \epsilon \dot{i} \rho \omega \nu$
 ßãtıônval тov́тovs. Rom. vi.

 à̀тóv) might suit either sense.
iठєiv Өávatov] Psalm lxxxix.

 $\theta$ ávazov к.т. $\lambda$. John viii. 51, $\theta$ ávatov ov่ $\mu \eta \eta^{\theta} \theta \epsilon \omega \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \eta$.
 $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ т $\frac{\mathrm{y}}{} \mathrm{s} \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \theta \epsilon \in \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s} \mu \epsilon \mu \alpha \rho \tau \dot{\prime} \rho \eta \tau \alpha \iota$ єủn $\rho \epsilon-$





 24. The Hebrew has only, and zot. The Septuagint adds $\eta$ vipioкєтo, suggesting the thought of his being wanted, and sought in vain, by the survivors.
 for, dec. The argument is, Enoch must have been a man of faith, because it is said of him that he pleased God, and without faith it is impossible to please Him.




$\mu \epsilon \mu a \rho \tau \dot{\rho} \eta \tau=1]$ The Scripture perfect. He has been attested. It is there, on the imperishable record. See note on vii. $6, \delta \in \delta \epsilon к \alpha ́ т \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu$.
 Septuagint paraphrase (Gen. v. 22, 24) of the Hebrew expression, walking with God. See also Gen. vi. 9. xvii. I. xxiv. 40. xlviii. I5.
6. $\chi$ wpis $\delta \epsilon$ ] And without faith. It is part of the chain
xi. 6. Or omit $\tau \hat{\varphi}$.
of proof. See note on verse 5 , $\pi \rho \grave{o}$ үáp.
ǻvarov] Impossible in the nature of things. For this $\dot{d} \delta \dot{i}-$ vatov, see vi. 4 , 18. x. 4 .
$\delta \in i]$ Necessary in the nature of things. 4 man cannot draw
 entity. And a man will not draw nigh to one to whom he ascribes a morose and heartless character.
 on vi. 16 , трогер $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$.
 points. First, the existence of God. Secondly, the certainty of the recompense. Together they satisfy the definition of faith in verse I. The one is an ov̉ $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \sigma^{\prime} \mu \epsilon v o v$, the other is an

 xv. 17 (from Amos ix. 12),


 тòv $0 \epsilon \dot{\sigma} v$.
$\mu$ ноөaтoסórms] Only here. For $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \theta$ amoдocia, see note on ii. 2.

## 7 Пíबтє८ $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon i s$ N $\omega \in \epsilon \epsilon \rho i \quad \tau \hat{\omega \nu} \mu \eta \delta \epsilon ́ \pi \omega$



（iveтal］Becomes，comes to be，shows and proves Himself， by a law of His being．

7．Пíवтєє．．．N $\omega \epsilon]$ After these examples of faith in the ov่ $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \sigma^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu \mathrm{of}$ of the past（verse 3）and of the present（verses 4－ 6）there follows a long series of examples of faith in the ov $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \sigma_{\mu} \mu \nu a$ of the future．These are not all $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi c\}_{0}{ }^{\prime} \mu \nu \alpha$, for the first example is of faith in a future of fear．
$\left.\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon{ }^{\prime}\right]$ Having been dealt with．Having received a divine communication．See note on viii． 5 ，кєхрпиа́тьбтац．
$\pi \in \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \omega \nu]$ Gen．vi．14， 17




 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \hat{i} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu, \kappa \alpha \pi \alpha \phi \theta \hat{\epsilon} \rho a \iota \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma a \nu$ ба́ $\rho к а$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．
$\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega]$ Not even yet，when they were so imminent．They were still among the ov $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \dot{o}-$ $\mu \epsilon \nu a$ ，which are the only sub－ jects of faith．The form $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\delta} \pi \omega$ occurs only here in the New Testament．

є $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \alpha \beta \eta \theta \in i s]$ Moved with godly fear．See note on v． 7 ， $\epsilon \dot{v} \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha$ s．

катєбкєva⿱㇒日धy］See note on iii．3，катабкєข́áбаs．
$\kappa<\beta \omega \tau o ́ v]$ Gen．vi． 14,18



 к．т．$\lambda$ ．

बwт $\quad$ íar $]$ See note on i． 14.
 бù кaì $\pi \tilde{\alpha} s$ ó oikós $\sigma o v$ єis tìv $\kappa \iota \beta \omega \tau$ óv．For olkos，see note on iii． 2 ，ot ${ }^{2} \kappa \omega$ ．
 $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ ．The same ambiguity as in verse 4 （ $\delta c^{\circ}{ }^{i}{ }^{\top} \varsigma$ and $\delta i^{\circ}$ avंगर̂s）．Here，by which ark （built in faith），or by which faith （shown by building）．The former would be preferable but for the parallel verse，in which the other view conmends itself．

катє́криєц］Condemned by the contrast of his own obedi－ ence．Compare Matt．xii．41，42，


 öти $\dot{\eta} \lambda \theta_{\epsilon \nu}$ к．т．入．Luke xi． 3 I， 32.

ко́б $\mu \sigma \nu$ ］ 2 Pet．ii．5，ката－ $\kappa \lambda \nu \sigma \mu \dot{\partial} \nu \kappa$ ко́ $\mu \varphi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \beta \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\alpha} \xi \alpha,$. The word ко́о $\mu о \varsigma$ ，starting from the sense of（1）order or arrange－ ment，often with the genitive тov̂ oúpavô̂（Deut．iv．19．Isai． xxiv．21）or $\tau 0 \hat{1}$ ờpavô̂ кaì tर̂s $\gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$（see Gen．ii．1），passes into that of（2）universe（Wisd．vii．
 є́ $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ е́єєто клдроро́моs.


17. xi. 17. \&c. John i. 10. Acts xvii. 24), and so of (3) the world of men (John i. 10, 29. iii. $16,17 . \& \mathrm{c}$.), and thence sinks into a disparaging term, denting (4) the world of matter in contrast with spirit (I Cor. vii. 33, 34. Gal. iv. 3. Col. ii. 8, 20 ), or (5) the world as infected by $\sin$ ( 1 Cor. xi. 32. Eph. ii. 2, 12. James i. 27.2 Pet. i. 4. ii. 5, 20 . I John ii. 15, 16, 17. iv. 4,5 . v. 4, 19). It is in the last sense that it is used here and in verse 38.
 The righteousness which is according to (by the rule of, on a principle of f faith. Equivalent phrases are סocacoav́vŋ $\pi$ iortews (Rom. iv. 13 ), Sıкаєобv́rך ท̀ ̇̀к тíarє (Rom. ix. 30. x. 6. Compare Rom. v. i. Gal. ii. 16. iii. 24), ठıкацобúvך ท̀ ठıà $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$

 Here alone in this Epistle $\delta t$ кatogviv $\eta$ occurs in the distincfive sense which St Paul has given to it , as the state or character of one who is díkaus in God's sight by the forgiveness of sins through faith in Christ. See Rom. i. 17. iii. 2I, dc. iv. 3 , \&c. v. 17. x. 3 , de. 2

Cor. v. 2 I. Gal. v. 5. For $\delta$ skatooviv in its more general sense, see note on v. I3, dójov $\delta<\kappa a l-$ oのv́vวs.

клұроуó $\mu$ os] See notes on i. 2, 4. vi. 17. Is the sense here heir or inheritor? (See note on vi. 12, $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \circ v o \mu о v v \tau \omega \varphi$.) The latter might seem to be intended here, inasmuch as $\delta L-$ кacoov́v $\eta$ is a present possession of the believing man (Rom. v. 1. \&c.). But see Gal. v. 5,

 The same thing may be regarded as either present or future according as firstfruit or harvest is the point of remark.
8. Пíवтєє...'A $\left.\beta_{\rho} a^{\alpha} \mu\right]$ From faith in its action upon a future of fear we pass to examples of faith acting upon a future of hope. Three such are selected from the history of Abraham. The first is his consenting to a life of exile.
$\kappa а \lambda о \underline{́} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s]$ Gen. xii. 1, каì



 $\ddot{\eta}^{\nu}$ adv oc $\delta \in \ell \xi \omega$. Acts vii. 2 ,


$\kappa \lambda \eta \rho о \nu о \mu i \alpha \nu, \kappa \alpha i \dot{\epsilon} \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon \in \pi \imath \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о s$ то仑̂

 aúróv．This call（invitation and summons in one）is the original of the sacred uses of кa入 $\epsilon \hat{v}$ ， such as those of Matt．iv． 2 I ． xxii．3．Rom．viii．30．I Cor． vii． 17. Eph．iv． 1.2 Thess． ii．14．r Pet．ii．9．\＆c．The present tense of кa入oú $\mu \in \boldsymbol{v o s}$ ex－ presses the promptitude of the response．In the very act of being called（ëтı 入a入oûvtós oov दे $\rho \in \hat{i}$, iòoù $\pi a ́ \rho є \iota \mu$ ，Isai．Iviii． 9）．
$\dot{\nu} \pi \dot{\eta} \kappa о v \sigma \epsilon \nu \vec{\epsilon} \xi \in \lambda \theta \epsilon \bar{\epsilon}\rangle$ Obeyed to go out．For íтaкои́єц，see note oin v．8，ப่такойv．The aorist expresses the single act of the will，the instant mental consent to the call．

каі $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu\rceil$ There might have been the will without the act．（Matt．xxi．29，宅 $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ ，кіияєє． $\kappa \alpha \hat{i}$ оэ่к $\dot{\alpha} \pi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \in v_{0}$ ）The $\dot{\text { ún }} \boldsymbol{\eta}-$ кovaєv $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \in \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ became the $\dot{\epsilon} \xi-$ $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$.
$\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \in \nu o s]$ Though he knew not．See note on iv．2， $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ ．
 currences of $\dot{\epsilon \pi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau a \sigma \theta a 亡$ in the New Testament， 9 are in the Acts．St Paul uses it only in I Tim．vi．4，$\mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon v o s$. Of the three words，oi $\delta a, \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \kappa \alpha$ ， $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau a \mu a t$ ，the first has the idea of insight or intuition，the second that of acquirement（I
have come to know），the third that of attention（application of the mind to a subject）．
$\pi о \hat{v}$ ёрхєтаı］Where（whi－ ther）he is（was）coming（going）． （1）The forms $\pi 0 \hat{\imath}$ and ò örol are not found in the Septuagint or New Testament．（See note on vi．2o，önov．）John iii．8，oủk oîóas $\pi \mathrm{ov}$ víáyєє．vii．35，$\pi 0 \hat{v}$ oṽтos $\mu \in ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau \pi о \rho \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota . . . ;$ viii．



 xiv．5．xvi．5．I John ii．II． （2）The idea of $\tilde{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\chi}_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is al－ ways that of coming，not of going：the writer or reader is supposed to be in the place ar－ rived at，not in the place left． （3）The present tense（in such phrases）serves for the im－ perfect，as（necessarily）in the infinitive and participle．

9．Пі́бтє८ тарч́кท $\sigma \epsilon \nu]$ A further action of faith．First （I）the consent of the will $\left(\dot{v} \pi \eta^{-}\right.$ кova $\epsilon \nu \mathcal{\xi} \xi \in \lambda \theta \in \hat{\epsilon} \nu)$ ．Then（z）the act of expatriation（ $\epsilon \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon v$ ）． Then（3）the settlement as a sojourner（ $\pi \alpha \rho \underset{\sim}{\prime} \kappa \eta \sigma \epsilon$ ），with the knowledge that for him it is permanent（калокки́баs）．For тарогкєiv，to dwell beside（not as one of）a nation，see Luke xxiv．18，бù $\mu$ óvos тароккеі́s ${ }^{\prime}$ Iepovба入’ $\mu$ к．т．ג．Gen．xvii．
$\gamma^{\prime} \lambda_{i ́ \alpha s}$ wis $\alpha \lambda \lambda о т \rho i ́ \alpha \nu, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \nu \quad \sigma к \eta \nu \alpha i s ~ к а т о к к \eta ́ \sigma \alpha s, ~$


 тароєкєís. \&c.

єis $\left.\gamma \hat{\eta} \nu \bar{\eta} \hat{\eta} s \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i^{\prime} a s\right]$ (I) For тарч́к $\quad \sigma \epsilon ้$ єis, compare Acts
 \&c. (2) Into a land (whatever it might be) belonging to (marked out by) the promise. (The absence of the article with $\gamma \hat{\eta} v$, and its presence with $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \gamma-$ $\gamma \in \lambda$ ías, are equally precise.)
ws $\alpha \lambda \lambda o r \rho i a v] ~ A s$ (with the full knowledge of its being) a land not his own. Matt. xyii.
 $\tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \lambda о \tau \rho i \omega \nu . ~ A c t s ~ v i i . ~ 6, ~$

 $\pi \alpha ́ \rho o t к o ́ s ~ \epsilon i \mu \tau ~ \epsilon ̀ v ~ \gamma \hat{q}$ ảd入отрía.
 ing taken up his permanent habitation in tents. The mapotкía was a катокía too. Faith reconciled him not only to exile, not only to a temporary sojourning, but to a life-long tent-life. For кaтoккєiv, see, for example, Acts vii. 4, кат '- $^{-}$

 $\tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta \nu$ єis $\ddot{\eta} v$ ujucis vîv кatolкєitє. \&e. For the combination of тароккєiv and катоикеiv, see

 aủrov̂.
$\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha$ 'I. ка̀ 'I.] With. As
did also. (According to the common chronology, Jacob was born 16 years before Abraham's death: but there is no need to take the $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$ of a literal dwelling together.)

бvvкд $\eta \rho o v o ́ \mu \omega v$ ] Rom. vií. 17. Eph. iii. 6. I Pet. iii. 7. See vi. ${ }^{1} 7$, тoîs к入ضроvómocs $\tau \hat{\eta} s$

10. $\left.\vec{\epsilon} \xi \in \dot{\delta} \epsilon ́ \chi \in \tau \circ \gamma{ }^{\prime} \rho\right]$ A distinct assertion that the old fathers did not look only for transitory promises (Art. vii.). There is an instinct of immortality in saintship. He who lives to God knows that he must live for ever (Matt. xxii.
 à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ ढ́́vт $\omega v$ ). Canaan could not be the goal of one who walked with God. For é $\times \delta \delta^{-}$ $\chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a i$, see note on x. 13, èx$\delta \in \chi о ́ \mu \epsilon v o s$.

Tìv tovis] The city which has the foundations. Rev. xxi.
 $\theta_{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon$ ious $\delta \dot{\omega} \dot{\delta} \epsilon \kappa$ к. The contrast here is that of nódıs with $\sigma \kappa \eta-$ vais, the permanent with the shifting and migratory. In this aspect the earthly Zion might have fulfilled the expectation (Psalm lxxxvii. I, oí $\theta \in \mu \epsilon ́$ éloo aúrov̂ ìv tốs öpeot tois áríols.
 v̇ாè $\rho \pi a ́ v \tau \alpha$ тà $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \omega ́ \mu a \tau \alpha$ ' $1 a$ -



xi. ıI. Or aitỹ Eáppa.

$\kappa \omega \dot{\beta} \beta)$. But verse 16 lifts the hope higher.
$\theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda i ́ o v s]$ See note on vi. г, $\theta \epsilon \mu$ édıov.
$\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu]$ Besides the obvious contrast with okquai in the aspect of permanence, ródis has also the threefold suggestion of (1) society, (2) constitution, (3) government. Phil. iii. 20, $\dot{\eta}^{\dot{j}} \mu \hat{\omega} v$ $\gamma$ àp тò $\pi$ одítєv $\mu \alpha$ év ov̉pavoîs

$\left.{ }_{\eta} \mathrm{s} \tau \epsilon \chi \nu i ́ \pi \eta \mathrm{~s}\right]$ Whose artificer and architect is God. He built, and He planned.
$\tau \in \chi \nu i ́ t \eta s]$ Wisd. xiii. $1, \dot{\epsilon} \kappa$


 $\tau \eta v$. For $\tau \in \chi$ vitns in its common application, see Acts xix. 24, 38. Rev. xviii. 22. 1 Chron. xxii. 15. xxix. 5. Jer. x. 9. \&c.


 ix. I7. \&c.
 (see note on i. 7), $\delta \eta \mu \iota o v \rho$ º̀s $^{\text {s }}$ is properly a people's (public) workman, but passes into a more general term. In the New Testament it is used only here. In the Septuagint, only in 2 Macc.
 $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \omega \dot{s}$. The verb ( $\delta \eta \mu \mu \nu р \gamma \epsilon \iota$ )
occurs in 2 Macc. x. 1 and Wisd. xv. 13. For the higher application of $\delta \eta \mu$ ovopos here Plato had made preparation (Rep. vii.
 زós).
11. Míarєc... इáppa] The second of the three examples of Abraham's faith is here ascribed to Sarah (unless indeed the alternative reading be adopted, which would understand a nominative and make Eáppa the dative: he received strength for her). This is the more noticeable because the record of Gen. xviii. 9-15 marks not her faith but her incredulity. (A caution is here against sweeping inferences from Scripture: the incredulity was a passing phase, not the abiding state.) Faith, acting upon a future of hope, is here shown counting all things possible. It is to this working of faith, entirelymental -not to the leaving of his country, and not to the sacrifice of his son-that Scripture annexes the justification of Abraham (Gen. xv. 6). God sees the realization of the invisible, shown in taking Him at His word, not in the result only, but at its source and spring.





кai aúvi］IIerself also．She in her place，as he in his．

之áppa］Seldom mentioned in Scripture except in the nar－ rative in Genesis．Isai．li． 2. Rom．iv．19．ix．9．I Pet．iii．




סv́vapıv єis］Luke v．17， каì dúvapts Kupíov $\dot{\eta} v$ eis tò ！â $\sigma \theta$ ai aưтóv．

каi тарá］Even beyond（the capacity of）her（then）time of life．The original idea of $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha}$ is beside．With the genitive， from beside，as John xvi． 27 ， $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ̀ \tau o v ̂ ~ \Pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \xi \eta ̄ \lambda \theta o v . ~ W i t h ~$ the dative，beside，as John xvii．

 tòv кóquov eivas mapá नoí．With the accusative，to the side of，
 тарà тov̀s $\pi$ ódas avitov̂（but more often，by a well known Greek idiom，in places where the dative sense is intended，as in
 $\chi$ єîגos tîs $\theta a \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \eta s)$ ．The idea of juxtaposition passes easily into that of comparison，and generally of favourable compa－ rison（beyond，more than），which is theuniform sense of $\pi a \rho \alpha$（with
the single exception above，itself in a quotation）in this Epistle， where it occurs only with the accusative，and generally after a comparative．See i．4，9．ii． 7 ， 9．iii．3．ix． 23 ．xi．4．xii． 24.

ทitiкias］The same word bears the two senses，of（1）age， as here，and John ix．21，23，
 as Matt．vi．27．Luke ii． 52. xii．25．xix． $3, \tau \hat{\eta} \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \kappa$ ќa $\mu$ ккро́s $\dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{v}$ ．Eph．iv． 13 ．
$\pi / \sigma \tau o ́ v]$ Compare $x .23$ ，
 See note on ii．17，тıб才ós．
$\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma a r o$ ］A single mental act．See note on x．29， $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\mathrm{y} \eta \sigma \alpha^{\prime}-}$ $\mu$ eros．Phil．ii．6，25，o＇v ap $\pi a \gamma \mu$ о̀ ${ }^{2} \gamma \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma a \tau 0$（at the mo－ ment of taking upon Him to deliver man）к．т．$\lambda$ ．I Tim．i．
 the moment of the $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \delta v v a \mu \omega$ ба⿱亠䒑⿱亠乂⿱一土儿，above）к．т．$\lambda$ ．
ròv è $\left.\pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \lambda_{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu o v\right]$ See note


12．Stó］Wherefore．Be－ cause of which exercise of faith． Implying that unbelief would have forfeited the promise．

каi á $\phi^{\prime}$ évós］Either（ I ） also，belonging to the whole following sentence，or（2）even， belonging to ${ }^{\alpha} \phi$＇$\dot{\text { ćvós．}}$

 тò $\chi \in i ̂ \lambda o s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\theta a \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \eta s$ í a’va $\hat{i}^{\prime} \theta \mu \eta \tau о s$.


каì тav̂тם] And that too. A classical idiom (introducing a further and stronger consideration) with or without the addition of $\mu$ évтol. Compare I Cor. vi. 6, 8, каі̀ тои̂то '̇ $\pi \grave{i}$
 Eph. ii. 8. Phil. i. 28. 3 John 5, єis тov̀s à $\delta € \lambda \phi$ oús, кaì тoûto gévovs.

ขєขєкршนє́vov] As good as dead. A delicate and felicitous rendering in the Authorized Version. Rom. iv. 19, катє-
 vov. Elsewhere only Col. iii. 5, vєкршंбатє ờv $\tau \grave{a} \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta$ к.т. $\lambda$.

 $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \sigma o v$ wis tov̀s áatépas tove

 For the former figure, compare Gen. xv. 5, ápi $\theta \mu \eta \sigma o v$ тoùs

 тò $\sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \mu a$ aov. Rom. iv. 18. To the latter the nearest approach is Gen. xiii. 16, каi

 $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \alpha \rho \iota \theta \mu \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \mu \mu o \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$, $\kappa a i$ то̀ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a$ боv $\bar{\epsilon} \xi a \rho \iota \theta \mu \eta \theta \eta^{\prime}-$ $\boldsymbol{\sigma e \tau a l}$. For ${ }^{\alpha} \sigma \tau \rho o \nu$ ( $a$ constella-

 43 (from Amos v. 26). xxvii.

 (a star), Matt. ii. 2, \&c. xxiv. 29. I Cor. xv, 4i. \&e. Also 14 times in the Revelation.
$\chi$ ©ìlos] For the literal sense, see xiii. 15. For its use here,


 $\boldsymbol{\partial}_{\epsilon}$. Jud. vii. 12. I Sam. xiii. 5. I Kings ix. 26 , $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath}$ тov̂
 к.т. $\lambda$. And so in Gen. xli, 3,

 Exod. vii. 15. Ezek. xIvi. 6, 7, 12.
ávapi $\theta \mu \eta$ ros] I Kings viii. 5, Ө́́ovтеs тро́ßaта, ßóas, àvapí $\theta$ $\mu \eta \tau a$. Job xxi. 33. xxii. 5,
 25. Prov. vii. 26. Joel i. 6,

 tos. xviii. i2. Ecclus. xxxvii. 25, aí $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\rho} \rho a \iota$ тои̂ 'I $\sigma \rho a \eta ̀ \lambda$ àvapit$\mu$ пто.
13. Kãà $\pi i ́ \tau \tau \iota v]$ According to (by the rule of, on the principle of ) faith. This better suits $\alpha^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \theta$ avo than the otherwise invariable mírtec. Verses




13 to 16 interrupt the ename－ ration of instances，to emphasize a peculiar feature of faith，as the stay of the dying．
ovitol тávecs］Does this include Abel，Enoch，Noah，or only Abraham and his house？ The express mention of the єт $\pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i a t$ ，as well as the tov $\mu \eta$ ideiv $\theta$ avatov（verse 5）of Enoch，might favour the more restricted reference．But the principle was the same for all．
$\mu \dot{\eta}$ коньа́аєєоь］As not hav－ ing rcceived．The not having received，so far from militating against，was a condition of，the dying in faith．The promise fulfilled is no longer（in this sense）an object of faith．For the $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ ，see again note on iv．$z$ ． For кодi $\zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta$ ai，see note on x． 36，коріб $\quad \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ．
 promised（as in Luke xxiv． 49. Acts i．4．ii．33）．See note on vi． 12.
$\pi о \rho \rho \omega \theta \epsilon \nu\rceil$ Luke xvii．I2 （only）．But it is frequent in the Septuagint．Job ii． 12 ，

 бкотє⿱㇒⿻丷木⿴囗十，Is $\quad$ Isai．xxxiii．I7，

 $\rho \omega \theta \epsilon v$ ．
 Having seen in the far distance with the soul＇s eye，and greeted as living realities with the soul＇s voice．One of the many graphic pictures of this chapter in its portraiture of the action of faith．
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon v o t]$ The word occurs frequently in its literal sense．The nearest approach to its use here is in Mark ix．r5， iòóvтєs av̉т̀े $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \theta a \mu \beta \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ ，каі


ء $\mu$ одоү $\left.{ }^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon\right]$ ］See note on

$\xi \in \in ́ v o l ~ к а i ̀ ~ \pi a \rho є \pi i o ̂ \eta \mu o \iota] ~ G e d . ~$



 Psalm xxxix． 12 ，па́ронкоs є́ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$

 senses of $\xi \in \neq 0$ os are（I）a stranger or foreigner（as Matt．xxv．35， đc．xxvii．7，єis тaфŋ̀v toîs छ́foots．Acts xvii． 2 I． 3 John 5）；and so figuratively（Eph．ii．
 к．т．$\lambda$. ）；and with a genitive， strangers to（Eph．ii．12，$\xi_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{q}_{0}$ $\tau \omega \nu \quad \delta c a \theta \eta \kappa \omega \nu)$ ；and as an adjec－ tive，of things，foreign or strange （xiii．9，סıбахаis тоוкiдaıs каì $\xi_{\xi \in ́ v a l s . ~ A c t s ~ x v i i . ~}^{18, \xi_{\epsilon}^{\prime} v \omega v}$



 guest (x Sam. ix. 13, каi $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тav̂тa $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta$ íovaty oi $\xi^{\prime} \dot{v} v o$ ) or host (Rom. xvi. 23, 「áios ó
 $\sigma i ́ a s)$.
 $\pi a \rho є \pi i \delta \eta \mu o s$ is one who resides in a country by the side (not as one) of its citizens. It is thus expressed in full by the phrase
 Gévol (compare Acts ii. io). The word occurs in a Pet. i. I,
 По́vтоv к.т.入. ii. II, таракад $\hat{\omega}$
 Also Gen. xxiii. 4. Psalm xxxix. 12 (quoted above).
$\left.\epsilon \pi i \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s \hat{\eta}_{s}\right]$ A reminiscence of $\dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\boldsymbol{n}} \gamma \hat{n}$ in Psalm xxxix. 12.
14. oí $\gamma$ áp] I say, катà жíctuv aंтétavov-for, do. The suppressed thought is, Home is a necessity of man, and therefore they who confess themselves homeless here must be expecting a home there.
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu$ фаviц̧overv] Make manifest. Show clearly. See note on ix. 24, ${ }^{2} \mu \phi a v a \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} v a l$. There of a person (and see references); here of a thing (for which see



 $2, ~ І 5, \pi \in \rho \grave{~ o v i . . . e ̀ v є ф a ́ v и \sigma a v ~ к . \tau . \lambda .) . ~}$
$\pi a \tau \rho i \hat{\delta} a]$ A fatherland. For a more restricted application of $\pi a \tau \rho i ́$, see Matt. xiii. 54, 57 ; Mark vi. r, 4, оі̀к є̈ $\sigma \tau<v \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta^{\prime}$ -


 23, 24. John iv. 44. In its large sense (as here), Esth. ii.
 $\gamma^{\prime} \dot{y}$ viii. $6, \vec{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{a} \pi \omega \lambda \epsilon i \not q ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \pi a-$ $\tau \rho \hat{\delta} o s \mu o v$. Jer. xxii. ıo, ov̉ס̀
 Ezek. xxiii. 15.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \zeta \eta \tau 0 \hat{\sigma} \sigma \nu]$ They are seeking for. The $\epsilon \pi i$ is that of
 (verse 6) is that of exploration.


 Matt. vi. 32. xii. 39. xvi. 4. Luke iv. 42. xii. $3^{\circ}$. Acts xii. 19. xiii. 7. xix. 39. Rom. xi, 7. Phil. iv. 17, ov $\chi$ ö $\boldsymbol{o} \iota \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota\langle\eta \tau \omega$
 $\kappa$ к. $\lambda$.
15. каi єi $\left.\mu \epsilon^{\prime}\right]$ And that quest of a country was no hankering after the old home of their race. If that had been their thought, they could easily have realized it.
 they so spoke) they were remem-


bering. Sometimes $\mu v \eta \mu о \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota$ has the sense of remembering, sometimes of mentioning. The latter in verse 22 (with $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ). Elsewhere always the former, either (I) with a genitive (as

 John xv. 2o, roû dóyou. xvi. 4, $21, \tau \hat{\eta} s \theta \lambda i \psi \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$. Acts xx . 35, $\tau \hat{\omega} v$ 入óy $\omega v$ той Kupíov 'I $\eta \sigma o v$. Gal. ii. 10, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \tau \omega \chi \omega \nu$. Col. iv. $18, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} v$. I Thess. i.
 Psalm vi. 5, $\dot{\delta} \mu \nu \eta \mu o v \epsilon \dot{v} \omega \nu$ шov. lxii. 6. \&c.) ; or (2) with an accusative (Matt. xvi. g, тò̀s $\pi \dot{\epsilon} v \tau \epsilon$ ă $\rho$ тous к.т. $\lambda$. r Thess. ii. 9, тò ко́тоу $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ к.т.д. 2 Tim. ii. 8,
 к.т.ג. Rev. xviii. 5. Exod. xiii. 3, Tìv $\grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a \nu ~ \tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta \nu . ~ I s a i . ~ x l i i i . ~$ 18, $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha . d c$.); or (3) with
 2 Thess. ii. 5), пó $\theta \epsilon v$ (Rev. ii. 5), or $\pi \hat{\omega}$ ( Rev. iii. 3) ; or (4) with a nominative participle ( 2 Kings ix. $25, \mu \nu \eta \mu о \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$ द́ ${ }^{\gamma} \dot{\omega}$ каì $\sigma \dot{v}$ ё $\pi \iota \beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa о ́ \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ к . т . \lambda$.$) ; or (5)$ absolutely (Mark viii. I8).
$\left.{ }^{a} \phi^{\prime}{ }^{\eta} \mathrm{j} \mathrm{s}{ }^{\epsilon} \xi \in \beta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu\right]$ Acts vii.



 $\tau \eta \nu$.
Eixov àp] They would have
been having. They would have
had all along. For the imperfect with $\ddot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{v}$ following the imperfect with $\epsilon \dot{i}(\epsilon \dot{L} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta \mu o ́ v є v o v$, єiरov $\left.{ }^{a} \nu\right)$, compare viii. $4,7, \epsilon i$


 тєіто то́тоя. Matt. xxiii. 3о, єi


 you were in possession of faith, you would have been saying erenow...and it would have instantly, by a single act, obeyed

 (if you were in the habit of believing Moses, you would have been all along believing me). viii. 39,42 . ix. 4I. xv. Ig. xviii. 3 . I Cor. xi. 3 I , $\epsilon \dot{\ell} \delta \grave{\epsilon}$
 vóuє $\theta$ (if we were in the habit of discriminating ourselves, we should not have been, as we are, in process of being judged).




 к.т.入. For кalpós, see note on ix. 9 .
 bending back may have been suggested by the second half of the chariot race, that from the

goal to the starting－place．But it is used in the commonest sense of returning．Matt．ii．
 Luke x．6．Acts xviii．2I， $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda c \nu ~ a ̉ \nu а к а ́ \mu \psi \omega ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ v i \mu a ̂ s ~ \tau o u ̂ ~$ © $\epsilon$ ov $\theta_{\text {é }} \lambda_{o v \tau o s . ~ I t ~ o c c u r s ~} 15$ times in the Septuagint．Exod．

 $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \pi а \rho є \mu \beta o \lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} .2$ Sam．i．22，
 кєขク。 \＆c．

16．vขิv $\delta \in \mathfrak{\epsilon}\rceil$ But as it is （as the case really stands）．The $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ answers the $\mu$ è $\nu$ of verse I5， and sets fact against hypothesis． See note on viii．6，vīv $\delta \epsilon$ ．For this use of $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ or $\nu v v i$（ not of time but of thought），compare

 $\tau \dot{a} \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \ldots \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi o \lambda \lambda a \dot{a} \mu \grave{\iota} \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta$ ，



крєíттоvos］See note on i． 4，крєі́тT $\omega \nu$ ．
óféyovтal］From the figure of reaching after（compare the
 $\mu$ eros in Phil．iii．14）comes that of desiring．The verb is used（in Scripture）only here and in I Tim．iii．I（ $\epsilon \mathfrak{l}$ tus $\grave{e} \pi t-$


è iovpaviov］For èmovpávios， see note on iii．I．The idea of oủpavòs or tà è éroupávca as the
aarpis of the blessed is found in many passages（as 2 Cor．v．r． Eph．ii．6．Phil．iii．2o．I Pet． i．4），but always in connexion with the presence there of Christ Himself．Beyond this there is nothing local in the conception．Indeed the holy city is seen in Rev．xxi． 2 as катаßaíyovgav ék тov̂ oupavoû to become the $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \dot{\eta}$ тoû $\Theta \epsilon \sigma \hat{u} \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{2} \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \pi \omega v$ ．Even in I Thess． iv． $15-17$（the nearest approach to a local representation）the same feature of the ката $\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau а є\end{aligned}$ d $\pi^{\prime}$ oupavov is prominent，and the $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi a \gamma \eta \sigma o{ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ is $\epsilon$ is $\dot{\alpha} \pi a ́ v \tau \eta-$ бtv тoù Kupiov，with no intima－ tion of His retracing His de－ scent．The newheaven is always combined with a new earth（Isai． lxv．17． 2 Pet．iii．13．Rev． xxi．1）．The $\sigma \grave{v} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ Kvpíu écó－ $\mu \in \theta a$ of 1 Thess．iv． 17 ，and the
 John xiv．3，seem to be the only revelations of the future home of the saints．

Sto＇］Wherefore．Because they were capable of such aspira－ tions．Because they were able thus to die in faith．
oủ火 ย̇สaloxúvєтal］God is not ashamed of them－not ashamed to be surnamed their God．The verb é $\pi a u \sigma \chi$ v́vєota $h a s$ three constructions，two of which are here combined．（I）With an accusative，as Mark viii． 38.

##  $\gamma^{\alpha} \rho$ au̇тоîs $\pi o ́ \lambda ı \nu$.




 2 Tim．i．8， 16 ．Job xxxiv． 19. （2）With an infinitive，as ii． 11 （where see note）．（3）With è $\pi i$ ，
 $\chi \chi v \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ．Isai．i．29．It is also used（4）absolutely，as 2 Tim．i． 12.
 be surnamed their God．To take to Himself this title，God of Abraham，God of Isaac，God of Jacob．Gen．xxvi．24，є̀ $\gamma$ с́ єí $\mu$

 ＇Aßpà̀ц той татрós $\sigma o v$, каì ò


 ＇Іакс́ $\beta$ ．（The three quotations give the gradual growth of the divine surname through suc－ ceeding generations．）For $\epsilon$ émt－ калєiv（to surname）and its pas－ sive，see Matt．x．25，єi то̀v oiко－
 Acts i．23，＇I $\omega \sigma \eta{ }^{2} \phi$ тòv кадоú－
 ${ }^{\prime}$＇Ioṽ $\sigma \tau$ os．iv． 36 ．x． $5,18,32$ ． \＆c．For the middle voice（to invoke，call in，appeal to ，see （I）in its human application， Acts xxy． 1 I，12， 2 1，25．xxvi．


ка入є́бабӨal Kaívapa к．т．入．；（2） in its religious use，Acts vii． 59．ix．14，21．xxii．16．Rom． x．12， 13,14 ． 1 Cor．i．2． 2 Cor．ị．23． 2 Tim．ii．22．I Pet． i．17．Also Gen．iv．26．xxxiii． 20．And so throughout the Psalms．In this last sense， $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi t-$ $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \not \theta a c$ is equivalent to the $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \alpha$ of this Epistle（see note on iv．I6）．
 є̇таибхソ́vєтаに－for，de．He has proved that He is not ashamed of them by preparing for them a city．
 In the eternal past，when the plans of God were formed．The aorist is that of Rom．viii．29，
 Eph．i．4，5，6，＇є $\xi \in \lambda \in \dot{\epsilon} \xi a \tau 0, \pi \rho о о р i-$
 ii． 13 ，єì入aro．de．For $\dot{\eta}$ roína－ $\sigma \epsilon v$（in this connexion），see John


 aútóv．And with tódes（as here），

 к．т．$\lambda$ ．
módır］Not a $\pi a \tau \rho i s ~ o n l y$, but a $\pi \delta$ dus．See note on verse 10，тóдıv．

17．Пібтєє．．．＇А $\beta \rho \alpha a ́ \mu]$ A third example of the faith of



Abraham. He so realized the future of promise, as not only to consent to exile and homelessness, and not only to accept on the word of God an apparent impossibility, but also still to trust and still to obey when God seemed to be defeating, and calling him to defeat, the word of promise itself. Faith harmonizes contradictions.
$\left.\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \eta \eta^{\prime} v \mathbf{\chi} \epsilon \nu\right]$ Has offered. The perfect expresses (I) the completeness of the act. All is done. Gen. xxii. $9,10, \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta 0 \nu$
 тò $\theta v \sigma ı \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \rho \iota o v . .$. каĭ бчитобívas



 The offering is perfect. (2) The permanence of the Scripture record. It is written. Thus the tense is that of vii. $6,9, \delta \epsilon-$
 $\tau \alpha L$ (where see notes). For $\pi \rho o \sigma-$
 $\phi \epsilon^{\prime} p \eta$.

тòv'Iбaćк] The article might seem to mean the Isaac of promise. But a comparison of other places (Matt. i. 1-16. Acts vii. 8. \&c.), and even of verse 20, shows that it simply indicates the case of an indeclinable name.
$\pi \epsilon \ell \rho \alpha$ ¢ó $\mu \epsilon v o s]$ The present participle may express either (1) the promptitude of the offering (in the very moment of trial, like кадо́́ $\epsilon v o s$ in verse 8 ), or (2) the continuance and protraction of the trial, so strongly marked in the narrative of


 For $\pi \epsilon t \rho a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$, see note on ii. I8, $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho a \sigma \theta \epsilon i$ s. For the special connexion of the word with this narrative, see Gen. xxii. I, ©
 каi тòv $\mu$ огоүє $\varphi \hat{\eta}]$ Added as a separate particular. Not only did the father offer the son, but (quite a separate feature of the case) the recipient of the promise offered the one person who was the subject of $i t$.
$\left.\mu o v \gamma \gamma^{\prime} v \hat{\eta}\right]$ In Gen. xxii. 2, 15, the phrase is not ròv povo$\gamma \in \hat{\eta}$ but $\tau \grave{v} \nu$ ả $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau o ́ v, ~ \tau o \hat{v}$ à $\gamma a-$ $\pi \eta \tau o v$. But àarr $\quad$ òs itself (in usage) implied povorevis. For ноvoүєи ${ }^{\prime}$ s, see Luke vii. I2,


 éoru. In the remaining places of its occurrence (John i. I4, 18. iii. 16, 8 8. I John iv. 9) it has the higher application. In Psalm xxii. 29 and xxxv. I7, $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$



$\mu o v o \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta}$ is placed in parallelism with $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \psi \nu \chi \dot{\eta} v \mu o v . ~ I n ~ P s a l m$ xxv. 16 , it is a plea for mercy,

 $\gamma \in \nu \in{ }^{\prime} s$ is one of the epithets of the $\pi v \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ which is in $\sigma о \phi \dot{\alpha} \alpha$.
$\pi \rho \sigma \sigma$ є́ $ф є \rho є 1$ ] The imperfect marks the gradualness of the process. Step by step he performed the act of offering. See note on $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \zeta$ б́ $\mu \in \nu=s$ above.

 $\gamma \in \lambda i ́ a s$, see note on vi. 12 .
 and in Acts xxviii. 7, ôs $\alpha^{2} v a \delta \delta_{-}$

 the idea of a cheerful and glad acceptance. He that had welcomed the promises. See 2 Macc.


18. $\left.\pi \rho{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{o} v\right]$ To whom. The relative points to Abraham, not to Isaac. The very person to whom the promise was spoken was thus required to defeat it. For $\pi$ pós, see note on i. 7 .
i $\lambda \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta$ ] See note on i. I, $\lambda a \lambda \eta^{\prime} \sigma a s$.
©́ 'Itraáк] In Isaac (not in Ishmael) shall there be called (spoken of') for thee a seed. In Isaac, and in none other, shalt
thou have an offspring to be called thine. The same clause is quoted in Rom. ix. 7, with a different application. Here the point is the severity of the trial of faith in being called to sacrifice the one life which had been expressly made the subject of the promise.
$\kappa \lambda \eta \theta \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha L$ For this use of калєiv, see note on iii. $\mathrm{I}_{3}$, ка入єiтаи.
$\left.\sigma \pi \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \mu \alpha\right]$ In Gal. iii. 16 , the singular number ( $\sigma \pi \epsilon \in \rho \mu$, not $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \tau a)$ is argued from, as implying not only a solidarity of race, but a unity of person, in the fulfilment of the promise


 tós). But here a less abstruse point is taken.
19. $\lambda o \gamma / \sigma \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu \in \nu=s$ ] The aorist indicates a single and decisive mental act (see verses 25 and 26, èдо́ $\mu \epsilon \nu 0 s \ldots \eta \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha^{\prime}-$ $\mu \in \operatorname{vos})$. Having reckoned this. The word $\lambda o y i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a i$ (occurring almost 35 times in St Paul's writings) occurs only here in this Epistle. It expresses the formation of an opinion by calculation or reasoning; as in


ó Өєós. ö $\theta \epsilon \nu$ аúтòv каі’ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta о \lambda \hat{\eta}$ є̀комібато.




 $\kappa$.т.д. \&c.
 general. That God is able even to raise from the dead. (Acts xxvi. 8, тíä ätotoу крiveтаı $\pi a \rho^{\prime}$
 The point is not that, if Isaac dies, God can give another Isaac to replace him; but that, if Isaac dies, God can restore the same Isaac by a resurrection.

סuvatós] Here only in this Epistle. Frequent elsewhere, both in its sense of (r) possible (Matt. xix. 26, $\pi a \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \in \epsilon \hat{\omega}$ тávra $\delta v \nu a r a ́$. \&c.), and in that of (2) powerful (Luke i. 49, ó ovvatós. xxiv. 19, Suvaròs év ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ каі $\lambda о$ о́ $\gamma \varphi$. Acts vii. 22. Rom. ix. 22, $\gamma^{\nu \omega \rho i ́ \sigma \alpha<~ t o ̀ ~ \delta v v a \tau o ̀ v ~}$ aข่าov̂. xv. I. I Cor. i. 26. 2 Cor. xii. 10, тóтє סvvarós єíu. xiii. 9), or able (as here, and Luke xiv. 31, єi סvvatós é $\sigma \tau \iota$ $\ldots \operatorname{cim}_{\nu \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota \kappa \text { к. } . \lambda \text {. Acts xi. } 17 .}$

 23. 2 Cor. ix. 8. 2 Tim. i. 12,
 $\phi v \lambda \alpha ́ \xi \alpha u$. Tit. i. 9. James iii. 2).


are practically parenthetical, and kai belongs to the whole clause. From whence he did also (in figure) recover liim. The sense will be but slightly varied if каi is even. And the English equivalent for кai in either case will be an emphasis on the auxiliary verb. From whence he did (in figure) recover him.
$\left.\epsilon_{\epsilon} \nu \pi a p \alpha \beta o \lambda \hat{b}\right]$. From the general idea of laying alongside, and so of comparison (usually in words, a parable or similitude), comes that of a resemblance in act or fact, a thing so done as to suggest another thing. Thus in ix. 9 the fact of there being a $\pi \rho \sigma^{\prime} \eta \sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta^{\prime}$, an outer chamber of the tabernacle, was called a $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta \circ \lambda \eta$ as teaching a spiritual truth. And here the recovery of Isaac from imminent death is made a $\pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda \dot{\eta}$ of resurrection.

є́коді́бато] He received him back. See note on x. 36, коді' $\sigma \eta \sigma \theta \varepsilon$.
20. Hívтєє...'I $\left.\sigma a \alpha^{\prime} k\right]$ Three examples follow of the dying thoughts of faith (as the realization of a future of promise) in reference to earth and the living. The first is that of Gen. xxvii.
$\kappa \alpha i ̀ \pi \epsilon \rho i$ ] Even concerning things future. The кai recog-



nizes the diffeulty of realizing the unseen. It is like the $\mu \eta$ $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega$ of verse 7 .
$\mu \in \lambda \lambda o ́ v \tau \omega \nu]$ Gen. xxvii. 29,

 It was a recognition of a future which at present gave no sign.

єủ̉ó $\gamma \eta \sigma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\prime}]$ Unconsciously at first, and under deception. But the unconscious blessing was consciously adhered to, as the expression of a will above his own. Gen. xxvii. 33, каi єủ入ó-
 And the very idea of the cỉdoyia, as a prediction and apportionment of things not yet seen, resting only upon promise, was an action of faith.
21. Пívरєє 'Іакш' $\beta$ ] Two separate occurrences are here combined, and in inverted order (Gen. xlviii. and xlvii.). By the inversion ( I ) the eino ${ }^{\prime}$ ia of Jacob is placed in juxtaposition with that of Isaac, and (z) the desire of Jacob to be buried not in Egypt but in Canaan is placed next before the same direction in the dying words of Joseph.



हैкаafor] In the selise of either of two, íка́тєроs is the
classical form; but it does not occur in the New Testament, and only three times in the Septuagint (Ezek. i. II, 12. 2 Macc. iii. 26), and in two of these incorrectly (for $\bar{\epsilon} \kappa a \sigma \tau 0 s$ ).
củdó $\eta \eta \sigma \epsilon \mathrm{l}$ ] The faith was shown (I) in distributing and apportioning (see note on verse 20) a future of promise giving as yet no sign of itself (Gen. xlviii. 19, 22), and (2) in that reliance upon God's providence in the future which has been the support of the past (verses 15, 16).

каі $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \kappa u ́ v \eta \sigma \epsilon v]$ See Gen. xlvii. 3 r, каì тробєкv́v $\quad$ бє
 aữov. This was an act of thankful adoration on receiving the promise, ratified by oath, that he should be buried in Canaan. Thus the act of worship defined itself into an act of faith realizing a future of promise.
$\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \kappa v i r \eta \sigma \epsilon \mathcal{]}]$ The idea of тробкขvєิ is that of reverence shown in posture. In its Scripture use, even where directed towards human beings (as in Acts x. 25), it seems always to imply a recognition of the superhuman, of the divine commission, and so (in some sort) of the
$22 \alpha \dot{v} \tau \sigma \bar{u} . \quad$ Пí $\sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \quad$ ' $\omega \omega \sigma \dot{\eta} \phi \quad \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$


divine presence, if not of the divine personality. Its use in the temptation (Matt. iv.g) is no real exception to this : scarcely even that in the oriental imagery of the parable of Matt. xviii. 26. See Matt. ii. 2, \&c. ix. 18. xiv. 33 . \&c. The construction of $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \kappa v \nu \epsilon \hat{v}$ varies. (1) Most often it is with the dative (as John iv. 21, 23 . I Cor. xiv. 25. \&c.). (2) Sometimes with theaccusative (as Johniv. 23, 24. Rev. xiii. 12. \&c.). (3) Sometimes it is putabsolutely (as John iv. 20 . xii. 20 . Acts viii. 27. xxiv. it. Rev. v. i4. \&c.), or is followed by èvétiov (as Luke iv. 7. Rev. xv. 4) or ${ }_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^{\boldsymbol{\mu} \mu \pi \rho o \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu}$ (Rev. xxii. 8).
'imi] Upon. Leaning or bowing himself (Gen. xlvii. 3I, Authorized and Revised Version) upon.

тò ắкрог] Luke xvi. 24 , тò äкроv то̂̀ סактúגov aủrov̂.
$\dot{\rho} \dot{\alpha} \beta \delta \delta o v]$ Following the Septuagint. The vowel points differently placed give bed (Authorized and Revised Version) instead of staff. The difference is immaterial to the application here made. For $\dot{\rho} a ́ \beta \delta o s$, see note on i. 8.
22. Míatel $\left.{ }^{\text {'I }} \omega \sigma \gamma \dot{\prime} \phi\right]$ Gen. 1 . 24, 25, каї єiтєv 'I $\omega \sigma \eta{ }^{\prime} \phi$ тois




$\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \hat{\omega}]$ Gen. 1. 16,26 ,
 єтєє ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \tau \eta \sigma \in \nu$ 'I $\omega \sigma \gamma \dot{\prime} \phi$. Matt. ii. 19. ix. 18. xxii. 25. Lake vii. 2. John xi. 39. Acts ii. 29. vii. 15 , каі катє $\beta \eta^{\prime}$ 'Іак $ө \beta$, каì е̇тєлєи́тךбєン aùtòs каì oí $\pi a т \epsilon ́ \rho \in s{ }^{\dot{\eta}} \mu \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$.

 к.т.д For the special application of the word ésoios, see Exod.





 Aiyúntov. Psalm cv. 38, $\epsilon \dot{v}-$
 aủtôv. cxiv. I. In the New Testament $\ddot{\text { éso }}$ o $\delta o s$ occurs but twice besides (Luke ix. 3r. 2 Pet. i. 15 ), and in a different application.
$\tau \omega \nu v i \omega \nu \quad$ 'I $\sigma \rho a \dot{\eta} \lambda]$ Here perhaps the actual sons of Jacob may be meant. See Gen. 1. 25,

 They were the representatives of the race, whether they should


be themselves dead or living at the time of the fulfilment of the promise．
$\left.{ }^{〔} \mu \nu \eta \mu o ́ v \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon \nu\right]$ See note on verse 15 ．
 （quoted above）．Ex．xiii．I9，кai
 $\mu \in \theta^{\prime}$ éavtov к．т．入．Jos．xxiv．32，




є̇vєтєídato］See note on ix． 20，文vєєєíhato．

23．Пíatє $\left.\mathrm{M} \omega v \sigma \hat{\eta}_{\mathrm{s}}\right]$ From Genesis to Exodus．From Abra－ ham to Moses．From the tent－ life into the world，whether of power，or of laxury，or of wis－ dom，or of sin．Four examples follow of the victory of faith in the history of Moses．In the first he is passive．The faith is that of his parents．
$\gamma \in v v \eta \theta \in \dot{\prime}(s]$ Acts vii．20，${ }^{2} v$
 word seems to reflect the detail and the emphasis of Exod．ii．r， 2.

е̇к $\kappa \dot{v} \beta \eta]$ Exod．ii．2，е̇ $\sigma \kappa$ ќта－ oav avitó．But afterwards（verse
 $\kappa \rho v i \pi \tau \epsilon \epsilon v$ ．For the form $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \rho \dot{v} \beta \eta$ ， see Luke xix．42．John viii． 59．xii． 36 ．

т $\rho$ í $\mu \eta v o v]$ Exod．ii．2，$\mu \hat{\eta} v a s$ тetis．And so Acts vii．20，ös

 has an unusual variety of gen－ der；feminine in Herodotus， masculine（but as adjective， with $\chi \rho$ óvos）in Sophocles，neuter （probably）here，and in Gen．
 Kings xxiv．8，каì трíц $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\nu о \nu}$
 Chron．xxxvi．2， 9 ．
$\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu]$ Parents．Father and mother．As oi joveis in Luke ii．27， $4 \mathrm{I}, 43$ ．Observe the masculine idóvres（Exod．ii． 2）evidently said both of the father and mother．

סєótc єiòov］They seem to have drawn hopefrom the child＇s singular beauty that he might have a great future．
aंबteiov］The word áatєios is properly urbanus，in contrast with ä ${ }^{\prime} \rho \frac{1}{c o s}$（rusticus），and hence polite，clever，witty．（It has some unexpected applica－ tions in the Septuagint，as in Jud．iii． 17 ，where the render－ ing from the Hebrew is fat．） From its first uses it passes into the sense of beautiful，whether morally（as Num．xxii．32，\％̈тt
 $\mu o v . ~ z ~ M a c c . ~ v i . ~ 23, ~ \lambda o \gamma ь \sigma \mu o ̀ v ~$

 äのтє́ws $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega \nu)$ ，or physically （as here，and Judith xi．23，кaì





It is a word specially applied to the infant Moses. Exod. ii. 2, i $\delta_{0}^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{S}$ §è aùtòv à áceiov. Acts vii. 20 , каì $\hat{\eta} v \dot{a} \sigma \tau \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} o s ~ \tau \hat{\varphi} \Theta \in \hat{\omega}$ (in the sight of God, divinely).

 therefore ovंк є́ $ф о \beta \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ то̀ $\delta$. т. $\beta$.
 Exod. i. 15, 17, кaì єiтev ©

 к.т.ג. For סьátayua, see Ezra vii. ıo. Wisd. xi. 7, єís ề $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma-$
 Compare Suatayń in Rom. xiii. 2. And $\delta \iota a \sigma \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon c$ in Matt. xi. I. Luke iii. 13 . Acts vii. 44 . xviii. 2. 1 Cor. xvi. 1. \&c.
24. Пíवтє $\mathrm{M} \omega \nu \sigma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}]$ Faith prompting the life-choice between the world and God.


 tov̀s viovs 'Iopainㅅ. In that recognition of his nationality was involved the renunciation of his adoption.
$\left.\eta_{\eta}^{\eta} v \dot{\eta} \sigma a \tau о \quad \lambda \epsilon \quad \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota\right]$ Refused to be called. Refused to continue to be called. The word ajpveio $\theta a$, (or the strengthened form $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \rho v \in \hat{\tau} \theta a \iota$ ) has three shades of meaning. (I) To
deny, (a) with an accusative of the thing (expressed or implied), as in Matt. xxvi. 70. Mark xiv. 68,7 o. Luke viii. 45 . xxii. 57. John i. 20. xviii. 25, 27. Acts iv. 16. Gen. xviii. 15 ; or (b) with an infinitive, as Luke xxii. 34, tpis $\mu \mathrm{E}$
 with ötc, as in r John ii. 22, $\epsilon i$
 (2) To disown, with an accusitive of the person (or thing personified). Thus Matt. x. 33. Luke ix. 23. xii. 9. John xiii. 38. Acts iii. 13, r4. vii. 35,

 2 Tim. ii. 12, r3. Tit. i. 16.
 к.т.入. $\quad 2$ Pet. ii. I. I John ii. 22, 23. Jude 4. Rev. ii. 13,
 8. And so Isai. xxxi. 7, Th

 к.т. . (3) To refuse, with an infinitive, as here, and in Wisd. xii. 27 , i̊óvтєs ồ $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda a \iota$ ท̉pvoûvтo єíéval. xvi. 16. xvii. 9.
viús Oryarpòs $^{\mathbf{\Phi} .]}$ Exod. ii.

25. © $\lambda o ́ \mu \in \nu 0 s]$ It was a single and decisive act. Deut. xxvi. 17, 18 , тòv Өєòv єỉlov बच́nçov єivaí qou Өєо́v...каi





 $\kappa$ к. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.

огvкакотхєิิ $\theta a c]$ The com. pound verb is found nowhere else in Scripture. But какоиX civ occurs in verse 37 and in xiii. 3. Also in 1 Kings ii. 26,


$\tau \widehat{Q} \lambda a \stackrel{\imath}{\hat{\imath}}$ тồ $\Theta є o \hat{v}] \quad$ The relîgious title of the chosen people, suggesting the deep reason for the $\dot{e} \lambda o ́ \mu \in \nu$ os. It was something more than patriotism. See notes on ii. 17 and iv. 9.

خ̀ $\pi \rho$ о́бкацрог] Than to (continue to) have a temporary enjoyment of $\sin$, in the luxurious court of an idolatrous king.
$\pi р о ́ \sigma к а ц о \nu]$ Matt. xiii. 21,
 iv. 17, ì $\lambda \lambda a ̀$ тро́бкацроí єívev.
 тро́бкагра.
 (only). For the verb, see Prov. vii. 18 , $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta$ ڤ̀ каi $\mathfrak{a} \pi о \lambda a v ́ \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$

 $\alpha^{\alpha} \gamma a \theta \omega \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\kappa} . \tau . \lambda$.
26. ì $\eta \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon v o s]$ Again the aorist of the single act, the resolute and decisive estimate made once and for ever. For tense and sense, see note on

$\theta \eta \sigma a v \rho \omega ้$ ] Ezek. xxviii, 4,

 $\sigma o v ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~ \& c . ~ \& c . ~$
$\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \dot{o} \nu \epsilon \iota \iota \sigma \mu \grave{\partial} \nu$ тồ $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}]$ Christ's reproach. This is one, and perhaps the most striking, of the passages (such as I Cor. x. 4. I Pet. i. II) in which the presence of Christ in the Old Testament is asserted or assumed in the New. His sufferings cast a shadow before as well as after: Moses bore His reproach fifteen centuries before Him, just as St Paul filled up the vigtєp ${ }^{\prime} \mu a \tau \alpha$ of His afflictions after Him (Col. i. 24), and spoke of His $\pi a \theta \eta \eta_{\mu}$ a a as redounding upon His people (z Cor. i. 5). This chapter is based upon the thought of the solidarity of the holy body through all time, in virtue of its union with Christ. For the special thought of the ojve $\delta \iota \sigma \mu$ òs of Christ, see xiii. 13 , тòv óvє1$\delta \iota \sigma \mu \grave{v}$ aủrov̂ ф́́ $\rho о \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma . \quad$ Also Psalm lxix. 7, 9, 10, 19, 20, モ̄vєка́









 $\mu 0 \hat{v} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \delta o v i \lambda \omega v ~ \sigma o v . . . o v ̃ ~ \omega v \epsilon i ́ \delta t \sigma \alpha \nu$

 Rom. xv. 3 .
$\left.\dot{a}^{\prime} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \nu\right]$ The $\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\prime}$ strengthens the simple $\beta \lambda$ étєєv. He looked away from all else to. Only here in the New Testament. (But see á $\phi$ opâv in xii. 2 , and $\dot{a} \pi \delta \delta \epsilon i v$ or $\dot{a} \phi \iota \delta \epsilon i v$ in Phil. ii. 23.) Psalm x. 8. Hos.

 didiorpíovs. In Soug vi. I and Mal. iii. 9, it is used without cis or $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$, and seenis to mean simply to look away.
$\mu \iota \sigma a \pi o \delta o \sigma i a v]$ See note on ii. 2.
 giving courage for a forty years' seclusion. The reforence is not to the Exodus, but to the flight into Midian. For (I) the Exodus, when it came, was not against the will of Pharaoh (Exod. xii. 31, 33). (2) The singular number (катé̀ıл $\iota \nu$ ) would not be appropriate to the Exodus. (3) The order of events would be contradicted if thedeparture were placed before the passover. Against this view is the superficial contradiction involved in the $\mu \eta$ 加 $\beta \eta \theta$ cis
compared with the ${ }^{\prime} \phi \circ \beta \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta$ of Exod. ii. 14. But the two fears are different: the one is the fear arising from the discovery of his slaying the Egyptian, the other is the fear of Pharaoh's anger on discovering his flight. He feared, and therefore fled: he feared not, and therefore fled. Exod. ii. 15 , aंvє $\boldsymbol{\chi}^{\omega} \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon$
 $\kappa а і ̈ к а \tau \varphi ́ к \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu(\mathrm{~A}, \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \kappa \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \mathrm{~B}) \dot{\epsilon} \nu$



$\left.\mu \dot{\eta} \phi o \beta \eta \theta_{\epsilon} \epsilon^{\prime} \mathrm{s}\right]$ As not fearing. Because he feared not. See note on iv. $2, \mu \dot{\eta}$.

Ovaóv] Of the 18 times of the occurrence of $\theta \nu \mu o s$ in the New Testament ten are in the Apocalypse. Of the 36 occurrences of ópỳ̀ six only are in that Book, 20 are in St Paul's writings. For $\theta \nu \mu$ os as the outburst of o $\rho \gamma \gamma^{\prime}$, see Rev. xvi. 19 ,



тòv үà $\rho$ áóparov] A noble definition of faith, less philosophical but more practical than that in verse I .
éкарт́́р $\quad \sigma \epsilon \nu]$ The only occurrence of картєрєiv (forti animo sum) in the New Testament. It is found in Job ii. 9,



$$
\text { xi. 28. Or ỏ } \lambda \epsilon \theta \rho \epsilon \mathfrak{v} \omega \nu \text {. }
$$

$\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho t ~ \tau i ́ r o s ~ к а \rho т є р \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon е s ; ~ I s a i . ~$ xlii. I4. Ecelus. ii. 2, єṽӨvvov
 xii. 15. 2 Macc. vii. 17.
28. Пі́бтєь $\pi \epsilon \pi о$ о́ $\boldsymbol{\kappa \epsilon \nu}$ ] Faith inspiring submission to an unexplained and seemingly unmeaning precept. (Exod. xii. 27 , $\kappa \alpha \grave{~ к u ́ \psi а s ~ o ̀ ~ \lambda a o ̀ s ~ т р о \sigma \epsilon к v ́ v \eta \sigma \epsilon .) ~}$
$\pi є \pi о i ́ \eta \kappa \varepsilon \nu]$ ( 1 ) The perfect suggests two thoughts; the permanence of the ordinance, and the perpetuity of the record. Probably the latter is predominant. A Scripture perfect. (2) There is no idea of instituting in moiєiv, but simply of keeping. Exod. xii. 48, éàv \&́é tıs rpooє́ $\lambda \theta_{\eta} \ldots \kappa \alpha i \operatorname{\pi ol} \hat{n}(\mathrm{~A}, \pi o \imath \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota \mathrm{~B})$ то̀ тá $\sigma \chi$ а Kирíш к.т. $\lambda$. Num. ix. 2, \&c. Deut. xvi. 1. Josh. v. 10. 2 Kings xxiii. 21. Ezra vi. Ig. Matt. xxvi. I8, трòs $\sigma \grave{\epsilon} \pi o \omega \omega$ тò $\pi a ́ \sigma \chi \alpha$ (the equivalent of фаүєiv тò $\pi a \dot{\sigma} \chi a$ above).

тò $\left.\pi a \sigma^{\prime} \chi^{a}\right]$ The word (written фaбèk in 2 Chron. xxx. I, \&c. xxxv. 1 , \&c.) occurs first in Exod. xii. II, oü $\tau \omega$ סє̀ фá $\gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$
 $\delta \hat{\eta} s^{*} \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \chi^{\alpha}$ є̇ $\sigma \tau i$ Kupíe. (I) Its first application seems to be to the paschal lamb, and $\theta$ vict is in this sense its characteristic verb. Exod. xii. 2 1 , каi $\theta$ v́батє тò тá $\chi_{\chi a}$. And so in Mark xiv. I2. Inke xxii. 7. 1 Cor.
v. 7. (2) Thence it passes to the paschal supper, with its unleavened bread and bitter herbs; and $\phi a \gamma \epsilon i v$ is as suitable to this sense as to the former. Exad. xii. II. Matt. xxvi. I9, кай riтоí $\mu a \sigma a \nu$ тò тá $\sigma \chi a$. Mark xiv. 16. Luke xxii. 8, 13. (3) Thence to the seven days' paschal feast. Luke ii. 4 x . xxii.
 $\dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \gamma о \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta$ та́a $\chi^{\alpha}$. John ii. I 3 , 23. vi. 4. xi. 55. xii. I. xiii. 1. xviii. 39. Acts xii. 4. The second seems to be the meaning in the verse before us, the directions for the seven days' feast (Exod. xii. $\mathrm{I}_{5}$ ) being apparently prospective (see verse 25).
 The affusion of the blood. Exod. xii. 7, 22, каi $\lambda \dot{j} \psi o v \tau \alpha t ~ \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial}$ то $\hat{\imath}$



 $\psi \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \in \epsilon \in \sigma \mu \eta \nu$ ข́ $\sigma \sigma \omega ́ \pi о v$ каi $\beta \alpha ́-$

 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \imath \mathrm{B}) \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \phi \lambda_{ı} \mathrm{a} s$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.
$\left.\pi \rho \sigma^{\sigma} \chi^{v \sigma \tau \nu}\right]$ Formed like
 $\chi$ voıs, de., but only used here. The verb m $\rho o \sigma \chi^{\epsilon} \omega$, however, is not rare in the Septuagint. Exod. xxiv. 6.
iva $\mu \eta$ ? The connexion of
$2 \dot{9} \alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$. Пí $\sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \delta \iota \epsilon \in \beta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \nu \theta \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu$
 $\tau \iota о \iota к а \tau \epsilon \pi \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$.
the act with the effect was left without explanation. The faith was shown in acquiescing in the mystery.
ó ódotpcúwv] Exod. xii. 23,




 кias $\dot{v} \mu \omega \bar{\nu} \pi a \tau \alpha{ }^{\prime} \xi a l$. God is present, but God is not the actor. Compare 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 17 (1 Chron. xxi. 15, 16, 27). 2 Kings xix. 35. I Cor. x. IO,
 то仑ิ.
$\tau \dot{\alpha}$ тршто́тока] Exod. xii. 12, 29, каì $\pi a \tau a \xi \omega$ тâv $\pi \rho \omega-$


$\theta i \gamma n]$ See xii. 20 (from Exod. xix. 12). Col. ii. 21.
aưтшu] Them. His (Moses's) people. For this pregnant use of aủ $\omega \hat{\nu}$, compare, for example, Luke xxiii. 51, т $\hat{\eta} \beta$ оид $\hat{\eta}$ ка $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \xi \in\llcorner$ аủ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$.
 venturing an apparently impossible enterprise. Exod. xiv.


 к.т.д.
$\left.\delta_{1} \epsilon \beta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu\right]$ In the first example of the faith of Moses he
was passive: in the fourth he is one of many. In the Septuagint, the exact word $\delta<a \beta a i v e i v$ is far more often applied to the passage of the Jordan than to that of the Red Sea. But see Num. xxxiii. 8, каi סıéß
 $\mu \nu v$.
$\left.\tau \dot{\eta} v \dot{\varrho} \rho v \theta_{\rho} \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \dot{\partial} \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma a v\right]$ First mentioned in Exod. x. 19, cis

 Afterwards about 20 times in the historical Books and the Psalms: not in the Prophets.
ws $\left.\delta \iota a ̀ \xi_{\eta \rho \hat{a}_{S}} \gamma^{\gamma_{\gamma}}\right]$ Exod.

 $\theta a \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \eta s . \quad x v . ~ 19$.
${ }_{i j}$ ] This may refer either to $\theta \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu$ or to $\hat{\eta} \hat{s}$. The latter is the nearer and perhaps the easier. Of which dry land (for such it was to the Israelites) the Egyptians making trial, de.

тєípav $\lambda a \beta o ́ v \tau \epsilon s]$ See verse
 There, to have experience of: here, to make experiment of. In Deut. xxviii. 56, $\pi \epsilon \hat{\rho} \rho a v \lambda a \mu-$ Bávetv is followed by an in-


 $\kappa$ к..$\lambda$.

катєло́白ךбаए] Were swal.


lowed up．Exod．xv．12，＇ţé－
 є́ $\pi \iota \in$ avirovs $[\dot{\eta}] \quad \gamma \hat{\eta}$ ．Num．xvi． 30，32，34，$\eta^{\eta} \nu о i \chi \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta}$ каі кал－ émiєV aúroús к．т．入．Psalm lxix．




 12．Isai．xxv．8．Jer．li．（xxviii．
 ${ }_{1}$ Cor．xv．54． 2 Cor．ii．7．v． 4．I Pet．v．8．Rev．xii．$\frac{1}{} 6$.

30．Míवret rà reíरク］From Moses to Joshua．Faith con－ quering by refraining．This was the trial of faith．Not a blow was to be struck．They were to compass without attack－ ing．It is the example of all cases in which attack or defence is foregone and the cause is committed to God（r Pet．ii． 23）．Josh．vi．2，єime Kúpos $\pi p o ̀ s$


$\tau \dot{a} \tau \epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi \eta$ Т．$\left.\tilde{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \pi \epsilon \sigma a v\right]$ Josh．


 к．т．$\lambda$ ．
$\left.\kappa v \kappa \lambda \omega \theta_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{v} \tau a\right]$ Josh．vi．4，14， 15，кขк入ш́батє тìv пó $\lambda \iota v$（om． B）$\ldots \pi \epsilon р \iota \epsilon к \dot{\kappa} \kappa \lambda \omega \sigma a \nu(-\sigma \epsilon \mathrm{B})$ ग̀ेv


（èvv т．à．тov̀ om．B）ö̀ $\rho \theta \rho o v$, каì $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$（ $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta$ ocav B）$\tau \dot{\eta} v$

 B）$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa \iota s$ ．
 14，15，ov̈т

 enri，for，to the extent of（in reference to duration of time），







 20．xxviii．6．Rom．vii．r．i Cor． vii．39．Gal．iv．I． 2 Pet．i． 13.
 postponing patriotism to religion． This was the very trial of the Hebrew Christian in the pro－ spect of the last struggle with Rome．Luke xxi．20，21，ӧтav



 $\rho \in i \tau \omega \sigma a \nu$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．The faith of Rahab was of the most ele－ mentary character．Josh．ii．9，
 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu, \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu \ldots o ̈ \tau \iota$ Kúpoos ó ©єòs

 катабко́тоиs．$\mu \in \tau^{\prime}$ єiрй $\quad \eta$ р．

But it touched the very point of present anxiety for the readers of the Epistle．
 Josh．ii．I，єioŋ̀ $\lambda$ tov（ $\epsilon i \sigma \eta \dot{\lambda} \lambda \theta \sigma \sigma a v$ B） $\operatorname{\epsilon is} \boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\eta} v(\mathrm{om} . \mathrm{B})$ oikiav $\gamma^{2} v a t-$

ov่ बvvanáneto］Josh．vi．
 $\pi о ́ \rho \nu \eta \psi . . . \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi о \neq \eta \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon \ldots \kappa \alpha \bar{\epsilon} \xi \eta \eta^{\prime}$






 $\dot{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mu \dot{\epsilon} p a s$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．
 disobeyed the divine mandate of the possession of Canaan by Israel．This precisely suits the language of Rahab（Josh．ii．9） quoted in the first note on this verse．For $\alpha \pi \kappa \theta \epsilon i \nu$ ，see iii． 18 ，$\epsilon i$ $\mu \eta$ rois $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \theta_{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \sigma \tau \nu$ ，and note on iii．12，àmı $\boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{i}$ as．

סє $\xi a \mu$ ér ］$]$ So James ii．25，


 $\dot{\boldsymbol{a} \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon і \lambda a \mu \epsilon \nu .}$

тoùs катабко́точs］Josh．ii．






 substantive is not used in this connexion in Joshua．It is found in Gen．xlii．9，\＆c．ката́бкотои́
 $\eta_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^{\text {катє к．к．}}$ ．Also I Sam．xxvi． 4． 2 Sam．xv．1o．Eeclus．xi． 30．I Macc．xii． 26.
$\boldsymbol{\mu \epsilon \tau}$＇єippiv $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mathrm{s}]$ The commoner phrase is èv cip $\eta$ vp．${ }^{\text {B }}$ But see Gen．xxvi．29，каì＇$\dot{\xi} \alpha \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon i ́ \lambda a-$
 23．Deut．xx．ro．Jud．viii． 9．xi．13．I Macc．vii． 28.
 ended．A grand peroration celebrates in general summary （I）the exploits of faith（verses $3^{2}$ to 34 ），and（2）its endur－ ances（verses 35 to 38 ）．For étc （further），see vii．I1，тís ề $\uparrow$ хрсía к．т．入．Matt．xxvi．65，
 Luke xiv．26．Acts ii． 26.



入́＇$\gamma \omega$ ］Must $I$（am $I$ to， shall I）say？For this（clas－ sical）use of the deliberative subjunctive，compare Rom．vi．

 $\mu \in \nu \quad$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．X．14， $15, \pi \hat{\omega}$ s ouv

$\mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \nu$ ó $\chi \rho о ́ \nu о s ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ~ \Gamma \epsilon \delta \epsilon \omega \dot{\nu}, \mathrm{~B} \alpha \rho \alpha ́ к, ~ \Sigma \alpha \mu \psi \omega ́ \nu$,

 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \grave{v} \mu a ̂ s . . . ;$
 phrase, only found here in biblical use. The word $\dot{\epsilon} \pi c \lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \iota v$ does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, nor (for certain) in the Septuagint.
 the construction of $\delta_{c} \eta \gamma \in \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a t$ is with an accusative, or with $\pi \hat{\omega}$ s. See Gen. xxix. 13, каì $\delta \iota \eta \gamma \eta^{\sigma} \sigma a \tau o$
 тovs. xl. 9, тò évítivov. i Sam. xi. 5, $\tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \dot{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\tau} a$. Psalm xix. r, סókar ©cov.. Isai. liii. 8 (Acts



 ó ©cós. ix. 10. Acts ix. 27,
 к.т. $\lambda$. хіі. 17 .
 are not in their strict chronological order. Barak lived before Gideon, Jephthah before Samson. (z) Nothingissaid of the persons named, but that which cannot be denied, that they had faith in an invisible presence. Any discussion of their actions in a moral light, or of their final state, is beside the mark. (3) One point may be taken in each life. In Barak, the humility of faith, shown in the willingness to take a journey
not for his own honour. Jud.

 mofev́n. In Gideon, the disinterestedness of faith, shown in his refusal of the kingdom. Jud.
 $\underset{\alpha}{ } \rho \xi_{\epsilon} \dot{i} \mu \omega \bar{\omega} v$. In Jephthah, the conscientiousness of faith, shown in the performance of his rash vow. Jud. xi. 39, каi є̀ $\pi \epsilon \tau \notin \lambda \epsilon-$

 Samson, the valour of faith, shown in forms grotesque and eccentric, yet in a firm realization of the invisible. Jud. xvi. 28, K'́pıє, $\mu v \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta \tau i \quad \mu о v$
 к.т.入.

Aaveío $\mathrm{t} \mathrm{\epsilon}]$ Is $\tau \epsilon$ and or both? I think the former, coupling this new group to the (practically though not expressly connected) group of four preceding.

каì इapovŋ刀] Placed after David, to bring him into closer connexion with the next named $\kappa \alpha i \grave{\tau} \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \phi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, whose representative head he was. Acts iii. 24 , кaì тávtes $\delta$ è oi $\pi \rho \circ \phi \hat{y} \tau \tau a \iota$

 троф $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta}$ s is applied earlier, even to Abraham (Gen. xx. 7, ơTь
 $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ coû к.т. . $^{\text {. }}$, as well as to Moses (Deut. xxxiv. ro, каì
$33 \phi \eta \tau \tilde{\omega \nu}$ ồ $\delta_{\iota \alpha} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$ кат $\eta \gamma \omega \nu i ́ \sigma \alpha \nu \tau o \quad \beta \alpha \sigma t-$



 paì入 wis M Muvis), and to the anonymous messenger of Jud. vi. 8 (áv $\delta \rho \alpha \pi \rho o \phi \eta i \tau \eta)$. But with Samuel began the order of prophets distinctively so named. See I Sam. iii. 20, каì $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma v \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$

 $\epsilon i s \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta_{\tau} \tau \eta \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \mathrm{K} v \rho i \varphi \varphi$. Acts

 For the word $\pi \rho \circ \phi \hat{\eta} \tau a$, see note on i. I, тoîs $\pi \rho о \phi \dot{\eta} \tau \alpha \iota$, especially the words, 'representatives of God to their generation.' For the catalogue of exploits which here follows requires this amplitude of the word $\pi \rho o \phi \hat{\eta} \tau a l$ to justify it.
33. кат $\left.\eta \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \operatorname{ví}^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau 0\right]$ The word is found nowhere else in the Septuagint or New Testament. Polybius is quoted for it. To wrestle doun, to subdue by conflict or contest, is its obvious meaning.
ßarcлeías] Whether in the original or later conquests of Israel.
 phrase seems vague and general in an enumeration of exploits. But perhaps it may be introduced as a memento of what is
the exploit of faith, the subjugation of $\sin$, a holy life.



 tairued promises. The reference is to those who by prayer or intercession won from God, for themselves or for their country, special particulars of blessing. Examples of both kinds may be found in the life of Hezekiah (2 Kings xix. 15 , \&c. xx. 2, \&c.).


 $\sigma \tau \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau \alpha$ т $\bar{\nu} \nu \lambda \epsilon o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$. For $\phi \rho a ́ \tau-$ $\tau \epsilon \iota$, and the compound (commoner in the Septuagint) $\dot{\epsilon} \mu$ фрátreır, with orópa, see also Job v. 16. Psalm lxiii. in.


 Mace. xiv. 36 .

## 

 iii. The expression $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu \nu \pi v$ poss (instead of $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ ) is well illustrated by the particulars of рíєuog ( $\left.{ }_{\eta}^{\eta} \psi a \tau o ~ B\right) ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \hat{v} \rho ~ \tau o \hat{v}$

 (каì aí тоíXes av̉т $\omega \bar{\nu}$ ой катє-



 aưtois.
${ }^{\text {É } \phi v \gamma o v ~} \sigma \tau . \mu \alpha \chi$.] (1) Illustrations of this clause might be found in many of the biographies of the Old Testament, such as those of David, of Elijah, of Elisha, of Jeremiah, \&c. (2) The plural of oró $\mu a$ is extremely rare. The passage above quoted from Dan. vi. 22, is perhaps the only instance of it in the Greek Bible, and there the accompanying plural $\lambda \epsilon \sigma^{\prime} \gamma-$ $\tau \omega \nu$ necessitates it. Here, with the singular $\mu \pi \chi \alpha i p \eta s$, it is most unexpected. (3) The phrase тто́да $\mu$ ахаipas occurs in Gen. xxxiv. 26. Deut. xiii. 15. Jush. xix. 47. Job i. 15 . Jer. xxi. 7. Equivalent phrases are aró-
 See notes on $\mu$ áxaloav and $\delta i ́$ $\sigma \tau о \mu о \nu$, iv. 12.
 pound $\dot{\epsilon} v \delta \nu \nu a \mu o v ̂ v, ~ f o r m e d ~ f r o m ~$ a late adjective év $\delta$ v́vapos (like ' $\gamma \kappa \rho a \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}$ 's), in possession of power, is commoner in the New Testament (Acts ix. 22. Rom. iv. 20. Eph. vi. 10. Phil. iv. 13. I Tim. i. 12. 2 Tim. ii. I. iv. 17 ) than the simple $\delta v v a-$ $\mu o v v$. The latter (the reading here of the revised text) occurs besides only in Col. i. $x \mathrm{i}, \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{y}$


the Septuagint, it is found in Psalm lxviii. 28, 反vvá $\mu \omega \sigma o v$, ó
 Eecles. x. 10. Dan. ix. 27.
$\left.{ }^{\epsilon} \delta v v . \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \in v \epsilon i ́ a s\right] ~ T h e r e$ may be some special references here, as, for example, to the history of Samson (Jud. xvii. 28), or of Hezekiah (2 Kings
 бov...ióovi íá $\sigma \mu \mu i ́ \sigma \epsilon$ ). But the words, like the clause jo jo'бavio סıкaıaбúvŋи above, may be quite general, exemplified in every instance of physical or spiritual enabling.
 Showed themselves. For the form, see note on iv. $3, \gamma \in \nu \eta-$ $\theta$ ध́ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \omega$.
ioxupoí] From ioxús (éx ${ }^{\omega}$, ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi(\omega)$, might, the adjective $i \sigma-$ xupos, ( I ) beginning with the idea of personalstrength, mighty, as here (and Matt. xii. 29. Mark iii. 27. Luke xi. 21, 22), (2) passes into all other applications of the idea of strength, whether (a) in a figurative or spiritual sense (as Matt. iii. in. Mark i. 7. Luke iii. 16. I Cor. iv. 10. x. 22. I John ii. 14), or (b) to things (as in v. $7, \mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$ к $\rho a v \gamma \hat{\eta} s i \sigma$ -
 $\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \nu$. Luke xy. 14, $\lambda \iota \mu o ̀ s$ i $\sigma$ रupó. 2 Cor. x. ıо, è $\pi \iota \sigma \tau o \lambda a i$ ßapeíaı каì íवरvpaí. Rev. xix. $6, \beta \rho \circ \nu \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ i $\sigma \chi \nu \rho \hat{\omega} v)$.

## 

 phrase seems to be found only here．But we have dovatòs $\dot{\epsilon} v$ $\pi о \lambda e ́ \mu \varphi$, Psalm xxiv．8．Jer．xli． （xlviii．B） 16. Ecclus．xlvii． 5.
$\pi a \rho \epsilon \mu \beta$ ．${ }_{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda$ ．］The absence of the article enhances the ex－ ploit．Whole armies of aliens． Compare Rom．iv．I3，ќáquоv， a whole world．xi．12， 15.2 Cor．v．19，ки́б $\mu_{0 \nu}^{\kappa \alpha \tau а \lambda \lambda \dot{́} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu}$ Є́autヘ̣̂．
$\pi \alpha \rho є \mu$ Boda＇s］From $\pi а \rho є \mu$－ $\beta{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda$ ect（literally to throw in alongside），to insert or inter－ pose，to include in a class or rank，and hence to draw up in array，and（7o times in the Book of Numbers alone）to encamp， comes the substantive $\pi a \rho \epsilon \mu$－ $\beta$ o $\lambda$＇，used（ I ）classically for an insertion by the way，whether in the form of parenthesis or digression；and（2）as a draw－ ing up in battle array，and so （a）an army thus draum up（as here），and（b）an encampment
 $\uparrow \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \mu \beta \mathrm{o} \lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ．Rev．xx．9， $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa u ́ \kappa \lambda \omega \sigma a \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \pi а \rho \epsilon \mu \beta о \lambda \eta े \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} i \omega v$ ，and throughout the Pen－ tateuch，\＆c．），and（c）a fort or castle（Acts xxi．34，37．xxii． 24．xxiii． $10,16,3^{2}$ ）．
échevav］Of this proper and classical use of $\kappa \lambda i v \in \iota \nu$ ，to make to bend or give way，and so to turn or rout，there does not seem to be any other clear example
in biblical Greek，except Jer． xlviii．（xxxi．B） $12, \dot{a} \pi \sigma \sigma r e \lambda \hat{\omega}$
 тóv（where the sense of the He － brew，as given in the Authorized and Revised Versions，seems to be different）．In Jud．xx．42， čк $\kappa \iota v a v$ is intransitive．
à入oт $\hat{i}(\omega v]$ Aliens，foreign－



 Jer．v．19．Lam．v．2，к $\lambda \eta \rho о$ о $\mu i a$

 xi．g．xxx．12．Hos．vii．g．viii． 7．dc．Matt．xvii．25，26．In $\alpha \lambda \lambda o \tau p i ́ \omega v$ we have a comprehen－ sive word for the enemies of Is－ rael all along the sacred history， but it certainlyincludes the Mac－ cabean struggle，and so prepares for the distinct references to that later period in the verses which follow．

35．ढ̈̀ $\lambda \beta$ ßov $\gamma^{v \nu \alpha i ̂ \kappa \epsilon s] ~(I) ~}$ The impossible reading yuvati－ кas，which is yet that of the greatest manuscripts，seems to give a salutary warning against an idolatry of authority in questions affecting the text． （2）The reference is clearly to the histories of Elijah and Elisha．For $\ddot{\text { en }} \lambda a \beta o v$ ，see es－ pecially 1 Kings xvii．23，каì
 iv． $3^{6}$ ，$\lambda a ́ \beta \epsilon$ тòv viór arov．（3） As examples of faith，we may


hesitate whether to dwell upon the guvaikes or upon the two prophets．Probably the latter． And thus the connexion with the main thought of the pas－ sage is preserved．By faith Elijah and Elisha gave back to the women of Zarephath and Shunem their dead sons by re－ surrection．
è $\dot{\xi}$ àva $a t a ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s]$ Out of（as the issue and product of）a resurrection．Rom．i．4，то̂
 $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ veкр $\hat{\nu} v$ ．In I Pet．i．3， we have $\delta_{c}{ }^{\prime}$ ava ${ }^{2} \sigma \tau a ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s$, another preposition，and another aspect of the transaction．For ava＇－ oraoıs in application to a mira－ culous restoration from a recent death，compare Acts ix．4I，



 the exploits to the endurances of faith．And the first ex－ amples are chosen from the history of the Maccabees，to form a contrast with the resur－ rections last mentioned．
$\left.{ }^{\xi} \tau v \mu \pi \alpha v i \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \gamma\right]$ The word тúpravov（or túravov，from тúntw）has the two senses of （I）the thing struck，the drum， （2）the thing which strikes，the
 may be either to strike with
cudgel or club，to beat to death
 $\zeta_{\text {eu }}$ ），or to stretch upon a drum or wheel for torture，to torture to death．Either sense has been preferred here．The special re－ ference is to the martyrdom of Eleazar in 2 Macc．vi．18，\＆c．， and to that of the seven bro－ thers in the following chapter． There the expression in vi．I9
 тavov $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \hat{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ к．$\tau . \lambda$. ）favours the latter of the two ideas， while that of vi． $3 \circ$（ $\mu \dot{1} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ tais $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma^{\alpha i s}$ teגcutâ $)$ and of vii． 1 （ $\mu$ áo そoú́vous）might rather suggest the former．On the whole，the rendering of the Authorized and Revised Versions，were tortured，will be retained，es－ pecially as the following verse introduces $\mu a \sigma$ riy $\omega v$ as a new particular．
$\left.\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \delta \epsilon \xi \alpha_{\mu \epsilon \varepsilon \%}\right]$ See note on x．34，$\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \delta \dot{\epsilon} \xi a \sigma \theta \in$ ．In 2 Maco． vi． 19 ，the word is ava $\delta \in \xi{ }^{2}{ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon v o s$. ті̀े $\dot{a} \pi=\lambda \dot{\tau} \tau \rho \omega \sigma v]$ The de－ liverance which was offered and pressed upon them．See 2 Macc． vi．21，22， 30 ，$\pi$ арєка́入ovv．．．i้а
 тov к．т．入．vii． 7 ，\＆c．For адто－ $\lambda$ ítperts，see note on ix． 15 ．
iva крєítrovos］ 2 Mace．vii． 9 ，II，14，23，29，36，ov̀ $\mu$ ér，





xi. 37. Or $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu, ~ \in ̇ \pi \rho i \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$.



 $\sigma \tau \boldsymbol{j} \sigma \epsilon \kappa$ к.т. $\lambda$.

креítrovos] Better than that àváotafıs which brought back the two mothers' sons at Zarephath and Shunem. The contrast is with the avacrácecs of the first clause of the verse.

тúx $\omega \sigma=1$ ] Luke xx. 35, тô̂


 mixture of ädios and '̇tepos in a series of clauses recalls Matt. xvi. 14. I Cor. xii. 8, 9, 10. Elsewhere the distinction of the two is clear. See note on iv. 8, ${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \eta \rho$.
$\left.{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \pi a \iota \gamma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu\right] \quad 2$ Macc. vii. 7,

 tos $\boldsymbol{i} v \in \pi$ аí̧єто. The form ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \mu$ $\pi$ aı $\gamma \mu$ òs occurs in Ezek. xxii. 4,

 $\chi$ ${ }^{\omega} \rho \alpha \iota s$ к.т. $\lambda$.
$\left.\mu a \sigma \tau^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu\right]$ Isai. 1. 6, тòv
 tàs dè olayóvas $\mu$ ои cís jatiorдата. 2 Mace. vii. $1,37, \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a}^{\prime}$ е̨табرलิ้ каi $\mu \alpha \sigma \tau i \gamma \omega \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$.



тєîpà ẽ̀ $\lambda a \beta o v]$ Had experience of. See note on verse 29, $\pi \epsilon i ̂ p a \nu$ 入aßóvтєs.

Éct $\delta \in \in$ And moreover. A more prolonged and protracted form of suffering. For ĕ́тı $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ (or $\tau \epsilon$ ), see Luke xiv. 26, ёTc $\tau \epsilon$
 26 (from Psalm xvi. 9), ếtı \$̇̀


$\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \omega \nu$ к. $\phi$.] As Hanani the seer under king Asa (2 Chron. xvi. ro), Micaiah under Ahab ( 1 Kings xxi, 26, 27), Jeremiah under Zedekiah (Jer. xxxii. 3), dec.
37. $\dot{e} \lambda \iota \theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu]$ (I) $O f$ the two forms $\lambda_{\lambda} \theta \alpha \zeta_{\epsilon} \in \nu$ and $\lambda_{\lambda} \theta_{o}$ Bodeir, the former occurs but once ( 2 Sam. xvi. 6, 13 ) in the Septuagint, the latter repeatedly (from Exod. viii. 26 onwards). In the New Testament, the two are found equally often; and apparently with no shade of difference of meaning. St Matthew and St Luke
 Paul (2 Cor. xi. 25) $\lambda c \theta a ́ \xi \epsilon \iota v$, the Acts and this Epistle both.
(2) The historical reference is to 2 Chron. xxiv. 21 , the stoning of Zechariah the son of Jehoiada between the temple and

## 

the altar by the people at the command of king Joash. See Matt. xxiii. 35, where our Lord connects this last recorded event of the kind with the first, the murder of Abel.
 of the two words is doubtful.
ímpi$\sigma \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu]$ An apparent reference to the traditional death of Isaiah under king Manasseh. For the word $\pi \rho$ ítev (or $\pi \rho i \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ) and $\delta \iota a \pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \epsilon \iota$ in a like application, see 1 Chron.



 '̀ $\chi$. к.т. $\lambda$. Sus. 59, ті̀v คंор-

$\dot{\epsilon \pi \pi є \rho а ́ \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a v] ~ C o n j e c t u r a l ~}$ readings (such as $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ ) have arisen from a failure to appreciate the incomparable severity of temptation (as such) in the martyrdoms of saints. See, for example, the successive offers made to the sufferers in the two chapters ( 2 Macc. vi. vii.) referred to in former notes. 'Far beyond any outward indignity or horror of suffering inflicted by man, they were exposed ever and anon to those indeed fiery trials, those frightful alternatives of the first death and the second, into which Satan brings a soul when at some critical moment he presents to it the offer of safety
and honour at the price of one word or sign of compliance or compromise. Adore an Emperor's image, call Jesus Anathema, and thou shalt be spared this torture, this cross, this flame.'
 the prophets in Jezebel's per-

 фйтаs Kypíov. xix. 10, 14, каì
 ро $\mu \phi$ аía к.т. $\lambda$. Or like Urijah under Jehoiakim. Jer. xxvi.


 the phrase фóves (or èv $\phi$.) $\mu a-$ $\chi^{\text {aipas, see Exod. xvii. 13. Num. }}$ xxi. 24. Deut. xiii. 15. xx.
 the particular death died), see, for example, Isai. l. 2, каі а̀тоOavoivtat ìv ס'ítc. Jer. xi. 22,


 (xlv. B) 2.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \subset \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta$ ov $]$ (I) Of $\pi \epsilon \rho \cdot \epsilon^{\rho} \rho-$ $\chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ without an accusative, and in this (quite classical) sense of going about as a stranger or mendicant, there is perhaps no other instance in the Septuagint or New Testament. The nearest approach to it is Wisd. vi. 17. (2) The aorist sums the life into an act, and so assimilates this to the


 $\sigma \pi \eta \lambda \alpha i o \iota s$ каi таîs ómais $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$.
other clauses, all of which speak of single events.
ì $u \eta \lambda \omega \tau a i ̂]$ The term $\mu \eta$ $\lambda_{\omega}{ }^{\prime} j$ is appropriated in the Septuagint to the 'mantle' of Elijah. See I Kings xix. 13, 19. 2 Kings ii. 8 , I $_{3}, 14$, к $\alpha i$


ìv aìféous] The darker and rougher material, the garb perhaps of mourning and seclusion.
ivт ¢оо́यevor] Destitute. See note on iv. r, ívrє $\rho \eta \kappa$ ќvau, and the question there raised as to the voice here. For the sense,
 $\theta$ al. 2 Cor. xi. 8, тарш̀ т $\rho o े s$


$\theta \lambda c \beta o ́ \mu \epsilon v o l]$ Afflicted. Only here in this Epistle, and $\theta \lambda i \not \psi t s$ only once ( x .33 ) likewise. Frequent (both) in St Paul, who however (unexpectedly) makes $\theta \lambda(\psi u s$ less severe than $\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu 0 \chi \omega \rho i ́ a$. Rom. ii. 9. viii. 35. The idea of painful pressure ( $\theta$ 人íqus) rises (in $\sigma$ тevo$\chi$ «upia) into that of agonizing compression. See 2 Cor. iv. 8,
 vодшроє́иєго (crushed).


See note on verse 25 , $\boldsymbol{\text { avvkaкov- }}$ $\chi^{\epsilon \in i o \theta a u}$
38. ※ँ оข่к ${ }^{\eta v}$ ] A magnificent parenthesis. The world

 (Acts xxii. 22). Heaven reverses this estimate, and says,

 ing over deserts. Like David, like Elijah, like the hundred prophets saved by Obadiah from Jezebel, like the Baptist, \&c. (1) The reading $\dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \pi i$ (with a verb of motion roving over, from one to another) is not easy to confirm by exactly parallel passages. Perhaps Rev. xxii. 16, $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \nu \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota ~ \hat{v} \mu \hat{\mu} v \quad \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau a \dot{\epsilon} \pi i ̀$ тaîs èкк $\lambda \eta \boldsymbol{\eta}$ iats (itself a revised reading), may be an approach to it. (2) The first meaning of द́ $\rho \eta \mu i a$ is probably solitude, in the sense of solitariness. Its plural (though not without classical authority) seems to be found here only in the New Testament or Septuagint. Even that of tip $p \mu \mathrm{os}$ (as a substantive) is peculiar in the New Testament to St Luke (i. 8o. v. 16. viii. 29), but is found in the Septuagint in Isai. v. 17. l lviii. 12. Ezek. xiii. 4. \&e. (3) The


literal sense of $\pi \lambda a v a \bar{\sigma} \theta a t$ is far rarer in Scripture than the fugurative. But see Matt. xviii. I2, 13. Also Exod. xiv. 3. Deut. xxii. I. Isai. xiii. 14. de. See note on iii. $10, \pi \lambda a v \hat{\omega} v t a \mathrm{I}$.

кai ${ }^{\text {oै } \rho \epsilon \sigma t y] ~ E z e k . ~ x x x i v . ~ 6, ~}$



кaì $\sigma \pi \eta \lambda a i ́ o s s]$ Jud. vi. 2 ,

 Ėv тoîs $\sigma \pi \eta \lambda a i o o s ~ к . \tau . \lambda$. I Kings
 $\beta \epsilon \lambda$ тov̀s тоофйтаs Kupiov...é-
 $\sigma \pi \eta \lambda а i ́ \varphi$ к.т.入. xix. 9. \&c.

каì тais òmais] The eleftes, chinks, fissures, of the land or earth. Obad. 3, катабкךvô̂vта ${ }_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathrm{\epsilon}} \nu$ taîs ò òais т $\hat{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon \tau \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$. Also Exod. xxxiii. 22, $\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \sigma \epsilon$ єis
 (from ${ }_{\partial} \boldsymbol{\psi} \psi$, $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \pi \omega \pi a$ ) is used for (r) the place from which a spring issues (James iii. 11); (2) a hole in a door (Song v. 5) or wall (Ezek. viii. 7) ; (3) the socket of the eye (Zech. xiv. 12). The definite article here may be either generic (all the) or characteristic (the well-known features of Palestine).
39. Kai ovitoc mávtes] And all these. Saints of former dispensations. A retrospect of the whole chapter, and of the sacred history of all former times.

the testimony of God borne to them in Scripture. See note on verse 2 .
 have been $\delta \dot{a} \tau \dot{\eta} v \pi i \sigma \tau e v$. But the form of expression makes faith, not the cause, but the instrument, of the attestations. By means of their faith. In verse 2, we have a third form of expression (iv). In their faith lay (or was contained) their attestation.

оијк е̇корі́баขто] In vi. 12 it is said of them that they already inherit the promises. And in vi. 15 (of one of them) that

 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma{ }^{\boldsymbol{\prime}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ íav. The individual rest is won, but the full glory waits for the advent and the resurrection. It is in this last sense
 The promise of promises. The fulfilment of all promise in what is elsewhere called the glory that shall be revealed. See Rom. viii. r8. i Pet. v. I. Compare Rom. viii. in. For ікоді́баито, see note on x. 36, коці́бпо $\epsilon$.

$$
\text { 40. то̂̀ Єєồ } \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \text { ท̀ } \mu \hat{\omega} v]
$$

Reason for the postponement of the complete blessedness of earlier saints. God defers their consummation, that He may not shut us out. That is the main thought. But a secondary

## Өєо̂̂ $\pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ коєітто́v $\tau \iota ~ \pi \rho о ß \lambda \epsilon 廿 \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v, ~$ $i \nu \alpha \mu \dot{\eta} \chi \omega \rho i s \dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon t \omega \theta \bar{\omega} \sigma t \nu$.

XII. I Toı
thought lies in the крє̂tттóv $\tau$. He gives us a present possession, in the Gospel of Christ, superior to that which was theirs in life. They hopedwe both hope and have.
$\pi \in \grave{\imath} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ Concerning us. It might have been vít $\rho$. Bat the $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ implies what $\dot{v} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho$ says. See, for example, xiii. 18, $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma-$
 thrice repeated $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ of v. 3 .
 note on this verse. It is as if it were, God having provided something for us also-yes, and that a better thing. Matt. xiii. 17. Luke x. 24. The superiority of the Gospel as a dispensation to live under forces itself upon mention, though the argument was complete without it.
$\pi \rho \sigma \beta \lambda \in \psi \alpha \mu \dot{\epsilon} v o v]$ (I) The middle voice of $\pi \rho \rho \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ is found only here. Even the active occurs only in Psalm xxevii. I3,
 tồ. In $\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ and its compounds (except perhaps $\pi \epsilon \rho$ $\beta \lambda \epsilon$ ' $\pi \epsilon \omega$ ) the middle voice is classical only in the future. (2) Is $\pi \rho o \beta \lambda \epsilon$ '́ $\pi \epsilon \iota$ here to provide or simply to foresee? The rarity of its use makes it difficult to decide this. And the one sense almost slips into the other.
iva $\mu \eta$ That without us they should not be consummated. As would have been the case if the great ovvréncua had come when they were ready for it. For another aspect of the postponement, see 2 Pet. iii. 9, ov


$\chi \omega$ is $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$ ] Apart from, in severance from, and so to the exclusion of, us. In this Epistle $\chi^{\omega p i s}$ occurs 13 times, beginning with iv. 15 , $\chi \omega \rho \bar{s}$ á $\mu a p-$ tías. St Paul uses it 16 times, the other Scripture writers 12 times in all. Its proper idea is seen in its contrast with ov $\mu \in \tau a ́$ in John xx. 7.
$\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \omega \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu]$ See note on
 the same term is applied to the blessedness of the intermediate state between death and resurrection. Here it is the description of the resurrection glory.
 An animated application of the great chapter of faith. These witnesses and martyrs of the past have not gone into nothingness. They still are, and are for us. We now fill the great arena, with a definite race to run: but they still surround us, in the living memory of the faith in which they found victory,

## 

and we must look，as they looked， to its author and its finisher． тосүарồv］A curious（but quite classical）confluence of ap－ parently conflicting particles： for surely then；as if the pre－ cept which follows were both cause and consequence；at once a reason for，and an inference from，dwelling upon those great examples which the Church be－ fore Christ has left to the Church after Christ of the faith in which the two are one．The only other occurrence of tot－ yapoiv in Scripture is in I Thess． iv． 8.

каi $\eta_{\mu}^{\mu \epsilon \iota s] ~ L i t e r a l l y, ~ w e ~ a l s o . ~}$ But it is not exactly we as well as they，which would involve a confusion．It is，We on our part，in mental contrast with they on theirs．Compare，for example，Eph．i．15，ס九à тô̂to
 ض̀ $\mu \mathrm{\epsilon}$ is． 1 Thess．ii． 13.

тобойтог］So numerous．We might have expected the rarer т $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ дикойто⿱（see note on ii．3，
 fact quite equaliy suitable．
${ }^{\prime}$ モ̌ovtcs］The dead are thus the possession of the living．
 closely around us．The dative
 43，$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta a \lambda o \hat{u} \sigma \iota y$［where，how－ ever，some read rapє $\mu \beta a \lambda o \hat{v} \sigma \iota v]$
 тє日́́val（Mati．Xxi．33．xxvii．

28，48，$\chi^{\lambda а \mu \nu ं \delta \alpha ~ к . ~ \pi є \rho เ є ́ \theta \eta к а \nu ~}$ av̉тஸ̂ к．т．ג．de．），\＆c．See note on v． $2, \pi \epsilon \rho$ íкєเтац．
vé申os］（I）Only here in the New Testament．Used more than 20 times in the Septua－ gint，of which 14 are in the Book of Job．（2）The figure is the classical one（védos $\boldsymbol{a}^{\prime}{ }^{2}$－ $\theta \rho \omega \dot{\prime} \pi \omega \nu, \pi \epsilon \zeta \omega \nu, \& c$. ．）．It seems to have here the two ideas，of density and of elevation．
$\mu a \rho \tau v \dot{\rho} \omega \overline{1}]$ Witnesses．Not in the loose sense of witnesses （spectators）of our ajow，but in the strict meaning of those who have borne testimony to the faith （often even to martyrdom）intheir own generation．It is a great word in the Acts．For example，
 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi a ́ v \tau a s ~ \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\mu} \pi \pi o v s . . . \tau \grave{o ̀ ~ a i p a}$

 єโ̇єs к．т．$\lambda$ Add Rev．ii． 13 ， ＇Avтitas ó $\mu$ áptus pov ó mıотós．
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu a \rho \tau \dot{\nu} \rho \omega \nu$＇ $\mathrm{I} \eta \sigma о \hat{v}$.
 aside all cumbrance．（1）This clause belongs to the apodosis of the sentence，$\tau \rho \epsilon \bar{\chi} \chi \omega \mu \epsilon v$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ． Let us lay aside．．．and run，\＆c． （2）The word ö $\gamma$ кos occurs only here in the New Testament or Septuagint．In derivation（éve $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$－ $\kappa \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} v)$ and in some of its uses it is curiously like фо́ртos（ $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \tau v$ ）． As фópтos（фортıкós）degene－ rates into vulgarity，so ö $\mathbf{\gamma}$ коя

into pretension and bombast. But its first meaning is bulk (size and weight), and so here the superfluous flesh which must be got rid of beforehand by the runner. (3) The exhortation in $\dot{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \pi о \boldsymbol{\theta}} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{v o t}$ is to training and discipline as for an athletic contest. See I Cor. ix. 25. I Tim. iv. 7. (4) But the tense (aorist) adds urgency and promptitude to the charge. Do it, and have done with it. (5) The verb $a^{\prime} \pi \tau^{\prime} i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$, properly applied to laying aside garments (Acts vii. $5^{8}$ ), and thence to getting rid of evil habit in all shapes and forms (Rom. xiii. r2. Eph iv. 22, 25. Col. iii. 8. James i. 21. I Pet. ii. 1), is here carried one step further, to the getting rid of one's own size and weight by severe self-discipline. We may interpret from Luke xxi.
 ßарך $\theta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ ai карסíaı ч́ $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. каі т̀̀े є єлєєрістатоу $\dot{\alpha} \mu$.] (I) The reference is not to one particular sin as specially dangerous, but to sin itself. The article is generic. All sin. (2) The word cijeєpiotatos (found only here) has something of a passive form. Thus araros is properly set or placed, and yet passes into standing. Thus too
 passive, surrounded, but is also used as a middle, standing round. So it is with the double com-
pound before us. Easily set or placed round becomes easily standing round or surrounding. And the rendering of the Authorized Version, the sin which doth so easily beset us, catches the point of the expression admirably until it is perverted into the besetting sin as something different from the whole body of sin. (3) Whether the figure is that of a surrounding crowd, breaking in upon the open course of the runner, or that of an enveloping garment, entangling and impeding the free use of his limbs, may be left doubtful. The latter seems the simpler and more natural.
 meaning of $\delta a a^{\circ}$ is through. Finst with a genitive. And (I) in reference to space: Rom. xv.

 $\sigma a \lambda a \dot{a} \sigma \sigma \eta s$ $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta o v . \& c$. (2) In reference to instrumentality:
 $\gamma^{\nu \omega \sigma i s}$ ámaptías. I Cor. xi. 12,
 \&c. (3) In reference to time: (a) during, as in ii. $15, \delta i a ̀$ тavтòs тoù ц̣̆̂v. dc.; (b) in the course of, Acts v. iq, ठıà vvктòs
 \&c.; (c) at an interval of (passing through and out of ), Gal.

 $\lambda \nu \mu a . \& c$. (4) In reference to

## 

circumstance (passing through, and so amidst or in a state of, with) : as here, and Rom. viii.
 2 Cor. ii. 4, ${ }^{2} \gamma \rho a \psi \alpha$ víiv $\delta$ ià $\pi o \lambda \lambda \omega \hat{\nu} \delta a \kappa \rho \dot{v} \omega \nu$. The use with an accusative is less complicated. It is twofold: (I) because of, Rom, xiv. 15, єi $\gamma^{\text {àp }}$ $\delta a \dot{a} \beta \rho \omega \hat{\mu a}$ ó à $\delta \in \lambda$ фós $\sigma o u \lambda v$ -

 \&c.; (2) for the sake of, Rom. iv. 23, 24, 25, oủк є̀ $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \eta$ ठ̀̀ $\delta l^{2}$ àviò̀ $\mu$ о́vov...à $\lambda \lambda a \dot{a}$ каì $\delta i^{\circ}$ $\dot{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}$ к. $\boldsymbol{\tau} \cdot \lambda$. See also note on

$\dot{v \pi} \pi \mu \nu \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}]$ See note on x . 36.
$\tau \rho \epsilon \chi \propto \mu \epsilon \tau]$ Thus the general word $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$, ${ }^{2}$, which elsewhere is left in its vagueness, with only ${ }^{2} \gamma^{\prime} \omega v{ }^{\prime} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (as in 1 Tim. vi.



 here defined into the foot-race, St Paul's favcuaite illustration. See I Cor. ix. 24, 26, oí ${ }_{\text {th }}$
 $\chi^{\text {ovo } \nu \quad ~ к . т . \lambda . ~ G a l . ~ i i . ~ 2, ~} \mu \eta$ ' $\pi \omega s$
 Phil. ii. 16, ӧть oùк єis кєvoेv \% $\delta \rho a \mu$ ко к.т. $\lambda .2$ Tim. iv. 7, тòv $\delta \rho o ́ \mu о \nu ~ т є т e ́ \lambda є к а . ~$

то̀v трокєí $\mu є \nu о \nu]$ Which lies forth (full in view) for us (as our prospect and portion). The dative is expressed here, as in

 xxiv. 7, єis àvג́ $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \nu$ трокє í $^{-}$
 without a case, as in vi. I8, кpa-
 Num. iv. 7. Esth. i. 8.
$\dot{\alpha} \gamma \bar{\omega} v a]$ The first sense of a $\gamma \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{u}$ is apparently ( I ) assembly (connected perhaps with äz ${ }^{\boldsymbol{a}} \mathbf{\omega}$ to hold or celebrate a festival), especially an assembly for athletic contests. Hence (2) the arena, or the contest itself. And so (3) finally, a conflict of any kind, whether an action at law, or any bodily, mental, or spiritual struggle. In the New Testament it is used only here and by St Paul. See Phil. i. 30. I Thess. ii. 2. I Tim. vi. 12. 2 Tim. iv. 7. In Col. ii. I , he applies it to urestling in prayer (possibly with allusion to Gen. xxxii. 24, interpreted
 "X $\omega$, followed by iva $\pi \alpha \rho a x \lambda \eta$ -
 the application is to the Christian life generally, as a constant struggle (notice the tense of $\tau \rho \in ́ \chi \omega \mu(\nu)$, whatever its particular circumstances. In the Septuagint, ajù occurs twice in Isai. vii. 13, in the phrase $\dot{a} \gamma \omega \bar{\omega} a$ (for the classical $\pi \rho a^{\prime} \gamma$ ната) таре́ $\chi \epsilon \nu$ тเví. Also in Wisd. iv. 2. x. 12, $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \nu a$ i $\sigma_{\chi} v$
 several passages of 2 Macc.;


for example，xiv．43，$\delta t a ̀$ ì̀ $v$


2．áфор仑̂ขтєє］Looking ear－ nestly（away from all else）．The verb áфорà occurs only here in Scripture．But see note on xi． 26，$\alpha^{2} \epsilon^{\prime} \beta \lambda \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon v$.
cis tóv］The primary thought may be the example（ös àvai $\tau \hat{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{s}$ к．т．$\lambda_{1}$ ），but the living sympathy and grace are also in full view． See ii．I8．iv．I4－I 6.
 （as everywhere else in this Epistle）the principle（grace） of faith？Or is it（as so often in St Paul，in such passages as Gal．iii． $23,24, \pi \rho \grave{̀}$ тои̂ $\delta \grave{\text { è }}$ è $\lambda$－
 míatces．\＆c．）the system（reve－ lation）of faith，that is，the Gospel ？Something will depend upon the interpretation of the
 on ii． 10 ，where the preference is given to author（originator） as the meaning of a $\rho \rho_{X} \eta \gamma$ os both there and here．But even thas the alternative is possible．The originator and perfecter of our faith may mean either of our individual faith（as its inspirer from first to last），or of the faith（as the author from first to last of the Gospel system）． On the whole，I incline to the former view，as best harmoni－ zing with the uniform use of
$\pi i \sigma \pi \iota s$ in the Epistle before us． The originator and perfecter of our faith，as its first inspirer and eventual completer in the individual Christian．
 The word is found only here． It seems to round the circle of cognate words（ $\tau$ édeios，tedel－
 teristic of this Epistle．
＇I $\eta \sigma \sigma \hat{v}]$ The tenderer and more personal name．Its po－ sition in the sentence is like that in ii． 9 and iii． 1 ，in both of which places（as here）it stands late and alone．
duvi＇From the first sense of a duti，over against，opposite to （in place），comes that of set against as an equivalent，（1）in exchange，return，or compensa－ tion for，（2）as the price or pur－ chase of，（3）instead of，to serve às，（4）on account of，because of． For example，（1）Matt．v． 38 ， ó $\phi \theta a \lambda \mu o ̀ \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \grave{\iota}$ ó $\phi \theta a \lambda \mu o \hat{v}$ к．т．$\lambda$ ． Rom．хіі．г7，како̀v ávті̀ какой． I Thess．v． 15. I Pet．iii．， $9 .^{9}$ （2）Matt．xx．28，גúтроу àv ${ }^{2}$ тод入ติv．Mark x．45．Heb． xii．i6．（3）Matt．ii．22，áv ${ }^{2}$

 xi．15，ко́ $\mu \eta \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \quad \pi є \rho \iota \beta$ oдáóov． James iv．I5．（4）Luke i．20，
 3．xix．44．Acts xii．23．Eph．



v. 31. 2 Thess. ii. 10. In Matt. xvii. 27 (ảvjì द́ $\mu o \hat{y}$ кaì $\sigma \sigma \hat{v}$ ) the idea is that of equivalerce, as the price of: In John i. 16 ( $\chi$ ápıv $\left.\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \chi^{\alpha} \chi^{\prime} \rho \iota \tau о s\right)$ the duri is in exchange for, replacing. In the verse before us the thought is, in consideration of, because of, for.
$\pi \rho о к є ц \mu \bar{\rho} \eta \eta$ ] Sce note on verse i, то̀v тоокєі́ $\mu є \nu о \nu$.

रapâs] Primarily that of Isai. liii. in, He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied, do. For xapa in connexion with Christ, see Matt. xxy. 21, 23, єis tìv $\chi$ apàv rô̂ кupiou oov. John xy. if,


 rois. We see the reflexion of this unselfish joy in Acts xi. 23. 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20. iii. 9. 2 John 4. 3 John 3, 4, є́xáp $\gamma^{\text {àp }}$ 入íay к.т. $\lambda$ \&e.
 32, viтєцєі́vaтє.
aravpóv] Without the article, to emphasize the quality (such a thing as), and so to enhance the greatness of the self-abnegation. Compare Phil. ii. 18, нéxpı $\theta$ avátov, өavázov ò̀ oт $\alpha v \rho o \hat{v}$.
 grand paradox. Despising dis-
grace, that most formidable of terrors to fallen man. For ai$\sigma_{\chi u ́ v \eta, ~(1) ~ i n ~ i t s ~ a c t i v e ~ s e n s e ~}^{\text {a }}$ (aioxivecu), that of putting to shame, see, for example, Psalm lxxxix. 45, катє́ $\chi$ єas av̉го̂ ai$\sigma \chi$ v́v $\eta \nu$. Dan. xii. 2, è $\gamma \epsilon \rho \theta \dot{\eta}^{\prime}-$

 sc. (2) In the middle sense (ai$\sigma_{\chi}{ }^{v} v \epsilon \sigma \theta a c$ ), that of feeling shame, Jer. viii. Iz (omit B), каíyє ai-

 xiv. 9. \&c.

катафрог ${ }^{\prime} \sigma a s$ ] (1) The tense expresses a single and decisive act of despising. Like the aorists of xi. 25,26 , è $\lambda$ ó- $^{-}$
 фpoveiv, to think down upon, to think slightingly of, see Prov.


 єтє́́роv катафрони́бєє. xviii. Іо,
 $\mu \iota \kappa \rho \hat{\omega}$ тойтшข. Luke xvi. I3. Rom. ii. 4. I Cor. xi. 22. I Tim. iv. ı2. vi. 2. 2 Pet. ii. ıo. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \delta \epsilon \xi \cdot \hat{a} \quad \tau \epsilon]$ See notes on i. 3. viii. I.
$\kappa є \kappa а ́ \theta \iota \kappa \epsilon y]$ Elsewhere èкко́$\theta_{l \sigma \epsilon v .}$ The perfect adds the thought of permanent consequences.
3. $\left.\dot{\alpha}_{\nu} \cdot \alpha \lambda o \gamma^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \rho\right]$ Reason

#  

xii. 3. Or द̇autà̀.

for the exhortation, $\delta i \quad v i \pi o-$ $\mu о \nu \bar{\eta} s \tau \rho \in ́ \chi \varnothing \mu \mu \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. The word ajvadoyiלcorac (only found here in the New Testament or Septuagint) is (I) to count (reckon or sum) up, as a number of particulars, (2) to consider a subject analytically, (3) to reconsider (though this sense seems to be an inference from
 peculiarity here is the accusative of the person. Review Him, think Him over, as by an enumeration of His acts or an analysis of His attributes.

Totaírnv] (1) Such as we all know of. Or (2) such as that above described (aravoóv, ai $\sigma \chi$ v́v $\overline{\text { s }}$ ). But the application of àvicioyia to such an act as crucifixion seems scarcely natural. See note on àvidoyíav below.
 only here ( $\mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \eta$ ко́таs 2 Macc. viii. I, $\mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota \sigma \alpha \nu$ I John ii. 19). The tense connects the past endurance with the abiding present effect in the sympathy of Christ.
viro] At the hands of. Depending upon viлоиєнєทкко́та.
 xvii. 12. Mark v. 26. i Thess. ii. 14. Add 2 Cor. xi. 24, vinò 'Iovסai $\omega \nu . . . \epsilon \lambda a \beta$ ºv.
$\tau \hat{\omega} v \dot{a} \mu$.] The article suggests that all sinners (of what-
ever race or time) conspired, as it were, by representation, in the avzidoyia. For oi ajap$\tau \omega \lambda o i ́$, see vii. 26, $\kappa є \chi \omega \rho \iota \sigma \mu$ ́́vos аंто̀ тஸ̂v $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda \omega \hat{\nu}$. Luke vi. 32, 33. And for the idea of a joint agency in rejecting and crucifying Christ, compare Matt. xxvi. 45: Mark xiv. 41, тapa-
 $\tau$ às $\chi \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \rho a s \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau \omega \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$. Luke xxiv. 7. Acts ii. 23, $\delta$ са̀ $\chi \in \rho$ о̀s aंvó $\mu \omega \nu$ (Gentiles) $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \pi \dot{\eta} \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ ảvєí̀atє.
cis éavtoús] Or cis éavtóv. Sinners against themselves. Or, àvidoyía against Himself. The authorities are divided between the plural and the singular. The plural (which is the reading of the Sinaitic manuscript and the Latin version) is the more difficult. The key to it is found in Num. xvi. 37, $\tau \dot{\alpha}$
 $\tau \alpha i \bar{s} \psi \sim x a i s ~ a v ं \tau \omega \nu$, the censers of these sinners in the matter of (these men who have sinned at the cost of) their own lives or souls. (The same history of Korah is apparently referred to, and loosely quoted from, in 2 Tim. ii. 19: see Num. xvi. 5, 26.)
àvidoyíav] Gainsayinag. But the word is stronger in use than its literal rendering would imply. This is seen also in the




 passes on into rebellion. See Jude 11, каì $\tau \hat{\eta}$ àvтıдoyía тồ Kopè ánódovтo (a special application of $\alpha_{v \tau} \tau \lambda o j^{\prime} \alpha$ which gives some confirmation to the reading eavrov̀s in this passage, involving a reference to the history of Korah). See note on vi. ıб, àтı入oyías.
 $\kappa \alpha ́ \mu \nu \omega v$ B) $\tau \hat{n} \psi v \chi \hat{n} \mu o v$. Elsewhere (in the Septuagint and New Testament) only of bodily sickness. James v. I5. Wisd. xv .9 .
tais $\psi 0 \times a \hat{i s}]$ The above quotation (Job x. I) might suggest taking this with ка́ $\mu \eta \tau \epsilon$. But the rhythm of the sentence points rather to connecting it with ёклчо́ $\mu \varepsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$. The dative is that of the part suffering.
ėкдvóucvot] From the active senses of $\bar{\kappa} \kappa \lambda \nu \bar{j} \epsilon \nu$, ( I ) to unloose


 and so (2) to relax or slacken
 $\chi \in \hat{c} \rho \alpha ́ s ~ \sigma o v \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{o} \tau \hat{\omega} v \pi a i ́ \delta \omega v \sigma o v)$, comes, by a transition marked in Gen. xlix. 24, ${ }_{\epsilon} \hat{\xi}_{\xi} \in \lambda \dot{v} \theta \eta \tau \dot{a} \nu \in \hat{v} \rho a$
 aưcêv, the constant use of the passive in the Septuagint and New Testament, to be faint or
spiritless ; as, for example, in 1
 2 Sam. xvi. 2, kaì ó otvos $\pi t \epsilon \hat{\imath}$
 I Kings xx. (xxi. B) 43, кaì

 $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \nu \mu e ́ v o s . ~ d c . ~ M a t t . ~ x v . ~ 32 . ~$ Mark viii. 3. Gal. vi. 9, $\theta \in \rho$ i$\sigma \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \mu \eta \grave{\epsilon}_{\kappa} \lambda \nu о ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о$.
4. oṽส $\omega$ ] In contrast with Hin who endured the cross. Your imitation of Christ has at all events not yet reached the point of martyrdom. Think nothing of it till then. For ov̈tw, see note on ii. 8.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho เ s$ аípatos] See 2 Macc. xiii. 14, $\gamma \epsilon \nu v a i \omega s$ á $\gamma \omega v i \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota ~ \theta a v a ́ т о v ~ \pi \epsilon \rho і ̀ ~ v o ́ ~ \mu \omega v, ~(\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~}$ B) $i \in \rho \circ \hat{v}, \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \varsigma, \pi a \tau \rho i \delta o s, \pi o \lambda_{t-}$ $\tau \epsilon$ ías. For $\mu$ é $\chi \rho \iota$, see iii. 6, 14. ix. ro. Also note on ${ }^{x} \chi \rho \rho$, iv. iz.
aipaтоs] Matt. xxiii. 35,
 €̈ $\omega$ s tồ aípatos Zaxapíov к.т. $\lambda$.
$\alpha \nu \tau \iota \kappa a \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \eta \tau \epsilon$ (1) As in verse 3 raîs $\psi v \chi a i ̂ s ~ j \mu \omega v$, so here $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{y} \nu \dot{a} \dot{\mu} \mu a \rho \tau i ́ a \nu$ seems to hang doubtfully between two verbs, wanted by each. But again the rhythm decides in favour of the second. The antagonist is not named with the former verb. (In this respect compare the àvtidiatı $\theta \epsilon \mu$ évous of 2 Tim. ii. 25.) Not yet has your resistance gone to the length of



martyrdom in your contest with sin. (2) The aorist sums the past life into a single act. See note on $\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\eta} \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{2}$, xi. 37 . No part of the verb à àıкаดıaтávaı occurs elsewhere in the New Testament. But see Deut. xxxi.

 B) $\mu a \rho \tau \cup \rho \circ \hat{\imath} \sigma a$.
 word, found only here in the Septuagint or New Testament.
5. каї éк $\lambda \in ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon]$ And ye have quite forgotten, de. Another classical word, found in the Greek Bible only here.
$\pi а р а к \lambda \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega s]$ See note on vi. 18, $\pi \alpha \rho a ́ \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma t v$.
$\stackrel{\eta}{\eta} \tau \leqslant \overline{\text { ] }}$ An exhortation which, \&c. See note on ii. 3 , $\boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \tau s$.
 is personified. It discourses (converses) with you as with sons. The persuasive tone of Scripture is the point. For $\delta$ da$\lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \in \sigma \theta a i$ (absolutely, or with $\tau u$ or tepí tivos, тù or $\pi$ óós tıva), specially common in the Acts (where it occurs no times out of 13 in the New Testament), see Exod. vi. 27, oûroí eiouv oi
 Aiyv́тtov...av̀тòs 'Aapஸ̀v каì $\mathrm{M} \omega$ -



 $\dot{\epsilon} v \tau \hat{\eta}$ ód $\hat{\omega}$ тís $\mu \epsilon i ́ \zeta \omega \nu$. Acts xvii. 2 , 17. xviii. 4, 19. xix. 8, 9. xx. 7, 9. xxiv. 12,25 , $\delta_{\text {eade }}$
 $\nu \eta$ к. к. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. Jude 9.

Yí́ $\mu 0 v$ ] Prov. iii. 1 I, 12. The only variation from the Septuagint is the insertion of нov after víc.
$\mu o v]$ The author of the Book is of course the direct speaker (Prov.i. I. jv. I. \&c.). But the Epistle bids us recognize in his voice that of God Himself.
$\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\delta} \lambda<\gamma \omega \dot{\omega} \rho \epsilon]$ This is the first danger, that of indifference.' The second follows in the $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ éк $\lambda$ úov.
od $\lambda<\boldsymbol{\omega} \rho \epsilon \epsilon]^{\prime}$ Again a classical
 $\rho \epsilon \hat{\omega}$, from $\tilde{\omega}^{\omega} \rho a$, care) found only here in the Septuagint or New Testament. Be not careless of. Think not slightingly of. It is a warning against losing sight of the religious aspect of affliction, its divine origin, action, and purpose.

тau $\delta$ ías] The uord is coextensive with education. But of the two parts of education, instruction and discipline, тaı $\delta$ eía (in the biblical language) most often, though not exelusively (see Acts vii. 22. xxii. 3),
 pıos $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon \dot{\prime} \epsilon \iota, \mu \alpha \sigma \tau \iota \gamma \circ \hat{\imath} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha$ viò $\nu$ ò $\nu$
meaus the latter. See i Kings


 in B). Psalm exviii. 18 , $\pi \alpha_{1}$



 $\chi^{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\rho} \rho \alpha$ катє́фаує то̀̀s трофйтаs

 àmоди́ $\sigma \omega$ к.т.д. (where St John in the parallel passage, xix. 1 , has $\left.\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \mu a \sigma \tau i ́ \gamma \omega \sigma \epsilon v\right)$. I Cor. xi.


 I Tim. i. 20. Rev. iii. 19.
 heart) when thou art reproved by Him. The second danger is

- that of despondency. Conscious of the divine agency, the sufferer is tempted to infor the divine displeasure. For $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}$ $\lambda \dot{́} \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$, see note on verse 3 , $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \nu о ́ \mu є ч о$.
 ary sense of testing, putting to
 its use with (1) things and (2) persons. Thus (1) to expose: as

 av่тои. Eph. v. 1 I, $13, \mu \eta \eta_{2} \sigma \gamma_{\text {коь- }}$


 ữò rồ фwtòs фavepồtat. Wiscl.


 $\pi \epsilon \rho і$ á $\mu a \rho т i a s$; xvi. 8. James ii. 9) or reprove (Lev. xix. 17 ,





 Luke iii. 19. I Tim. v. 20. ${ }_{2}$ Tim. iv, 2. Tit. i. I 3. \&c.). Under this last head fall the passages in which, as here, a Divine Person is the reprover, and the reproof is not in word but in act. 2 Chron, xxvi. 20 ,





6. $\pi \alpha \| \delta \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon 1]$ See note on verse 5, таєठєías.
$\mu a \sigma \tau 1 \gamma_{0 i]}$ Matt. x. 17. xx. 19. xxiii. 34. Mark x. 34. Luke xyiii. 33. John xix. I. For the application of this -strong word figuratively to God,
 $\mu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \tau \boldsymbol{i} \gamma \omega \sigma a s$. Psalm lxxxix.
 aviтớs, каі̀ оข̉к є̇то́vєбар. Another form of $\mu a \sigma \tau c \gamma o u v$ is $\mu a \sigma \tau i-$ $\zeta_{\epsilon \iota v}$ (Num. xxii. 25. Wisd. v. 11. Acts xxii. 25).


 of receiving along (by way of - transmission), as, for example, an office or an inheritance, or, again, a statement as true, or a writing as genuine, or an instruction as authoritative (compare Exod. xxiii. 1. Mark iv. 20. Acts xvi. 2 I . xxii. 18 . ${ }_{1}$ Tim. v. 19), comes that of accepting or recognizing a person, as duly accredited (Acts xv. 4, $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \delta \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ àmò тरीऽ є̇ккд $\lambda \sigma$ 'as), or as being that which he calls himself. This last is the meaning here. Every son whom $H e$ recognizes as such.
7. cis] The change of reading, from $\epsilon i$ to $\epsilon i s$, appears to be certain. And indeed, with ci, ข่то $\boldsymbol{\prime} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \tau \epsilon$ should have been $\pi \dot{a}^{\prime} \sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$. For the point (with that reading) would be not the temper of the sufferer but the fact of the chastisement.
 (exercise patience) unto (with a view to) discipline. Or else, It is with a vievo to discipline that ye exercise patience. There is some dififculty in deciding between the imperative and the indicative. But I incline to the former. The exercise of patience seems better to suit precept than assertion. The indicative would rather suggest
 in the imperative, the clause is a call to patience under suffering on the ground of the object of suffering. Suffering is for discipline: accept it in that view.

ن́тонє́vєтє] Everywhere else
 accusative. See note on x. $3^{2}$. Here (with the altered reading) it is absolute. To endure. To be patient. And so in Matt. x.
 $\sigma \omega \theta$ ท́ $\sigma \in$ тal. xxiv. 13. Mark xiii. 13. Rom. xii. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 12, єì نimouє́vouєv, каì $\sigma v \nu-$ ßacidé́бoutv. James v. in.

 There remain two examples of
 sense of staying behind (Luke ii. 43. Acts xvii. 14).
$\omega^{\prime}$ viois] Suffering proves sonship.

тробф'є́єтац] Of this classical use of $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a l(\tau \nu \nu i)$, to approach, and so to bear oneself towards, to deal with or behave towards, this is the only instance in the Greek Bible.

тís $\gamma$ à $\rho$ viós] If chastisement does not actually prove sonship, certainly the negative is true, that not to suffer is not to le a son.




 $\chi^{w}$ ois civaí tuvos, to be (or exist) apart from, see I Cor. xi. II. Eph. ii. 12.
$\mu$ éroxol] See note on i. 9, тov̀s $\mu$ cróxovs vou.
yєүóvarıv] Wave become, in all past history and experience up to this day.
$\pi \dot{a} v \tau \in \mathrm{~s}] \quad A l l$ (sons). The argument requires this limitation.
$\left.{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \alpha \mathrm{a}\right]$ Then. The position of $x^{x} \rho a$ as the first ward in the clause gives it a strong conclusive emphasis. See note on iv. $9, a_{p} \rho$ (and passages there quoted).
vó $0_{0}$ ] The word vó $\theta$ os is found only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint, it occurs only (and in the form of an adjective) in Wisd. iv. 3 .
9. tira tov̀s $\mu^{\prime} v$ ] Submission to divine discipline is reasonable. We have all shown it towards human parents. The sense of cira is not quite clear. It might be regarded as what in classical works is known as the Eita indignantis. Then is it so, that, whereas we reverenced the human discipline, we shall not submit to the divine? But there is no instance of this use of civa in the Greek Bible,
and the latter clause (ovं mod̀ $\mu a \lambda \lambda o v$ к.т. $\lambda$.) does not quite suit it. We are driven therefore to the sense of next, further, again: see Mark iv. 28, $\pi \rho \bar{\omega}$ то
 Gîtos. In 1 Cor. xii. 5, 7, the manuscripts vary between tita and étєєтa. We have no exactly parallel use in Scripture of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{i} \tau \alpha$ in argument, or succession of thought, which is what we want here.
toùs $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ ] The $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ stands as if the following clause were to be, $\tau \hat{e} \delta \delta \grave{\varepsilon} \pi a \tau \rho \hat{\imath} \tau \omega \hat{\mu} \pi \nu \epsilon \nu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$

 The contrast suggests (but does not decide) the Creationist and Traducianist controversy. So far as it goes, it favours the Creationist.

татє́рas] In xi. 23, татє́ $\rho \in \varsigma$ meant parents. See note there. Here the plural is explained by the plaral $\stackrel{\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \mathrm{v}}{ } \mathrm{v}$.
ex ${ }^{*}$ о $\mu \in \nu$ ] Had them as (for) chastisers. The construction is
 тòv 'А $\beta$ рраа́ $\mu$. Luke iii. 8. Phil.

$\left.\pi a \iota \delta \in \tau \alpha^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}\right]$ Hos. v. 2, द̀ $\gamma \omega$


ò $\pi o \lambda \dot{v} \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ и $\pi о \tau \alpha \gamma \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha \tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \alpha \tau \rho i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$


$\left.\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \tau \rho \epsilon \pi \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a\right]$ From the literal sense of èvтрє́тєєv ( $\tau \iota v$ á' $^{\text {) }}$, literally to invert, to turn one in upon oneself, and so to change in mind and feeling, specially to make ashamed (I Cor. iv. 14,
 the middle (or passive) has the two senses, ( I ) to be ashamed, as in 2 Thess. iii. s4. Tit. ii.
 and (2) the weaker and gentler one, to regard or reverence (aiways with an accusative in biblical Greek, while the genitive is more classical), as in Matt. xxi. 37. Mark xii. 6. Luke xviii. 2, 4. xx. 13. Frequent in the Septuagint: Exod.
 тท̂raí $\mu \epsilon$; Wisd. ii. 10, $\mu \eta_{\text {ö̀ }}$ $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \nu \tau$ е́pov ( $\mathrm{A}, \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta$ ́tov B )
 vi. 8. Often combined with ai$\sigma \chi^{v} \nu \in \sigma \theta a t$, as Job xxxii. 21 , äv$\theta \rho \omega \pi o v \gamma \dot{a} \rho$ ovं $\mu \grave{\eta}$ aio ${ }^{\sigma} \chi^{v v} \theta \hat{\omega}, \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$
 So metimes with vinó ruva (Jud. iii. 30 ), '̇ $\pi i ́ \tau \iota \nu \iota($ Ecclus. xli. 16), or ámó $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ tros ( 2 Kings xxii. 19. 2 Chron. xxvi. I2).
$\pi o \lambda \dot{v} \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o v]$ Here and in verse 25 the revised text gives $\pi \mathrm{o} \lambda \grave{v}$ for $\pi o \lambda \lambda \omega$. St Paul (Rom. v. 9, 10, 15, ry. I Cor. xii. 22. 2 Cor. iii. 9, 11. Phil. i. 23, ii. 12) invarially uses $\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega}$.
vпотаүךбо́ $\mu \epsilon \theta$ ] The tense makes it a single act; the voice suggests the passivity of the human being under the divine agency. Shall we not suffer ourselves to be once for all subjected
 $\Theta \in Q \hat{Q})$. For the exact form, see 1 Cor. xv. 28 (auly).
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \alpha \pi \rho \grave{\tau} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi \nu \epsilon \nu \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega v] T h e$ Father of spirits. In contrast with oapкós above. The article probably expresses universality (all spirits), rather than appropriation (our spirits). See Num. xvi. 22, ©єо́s, Өєòs $\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \pi \nu \epsilon ข \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ каї $\pi a ́ \sigma \eta s$ барко́s. Job xii. ıо, ėv
 omit B) $\zeta \dot{\omega} \nu \tau \omega \nu, \kappa \alpha i ̀ \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \eta s$ барко̀s ( A, тагтòs B ) $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega^{-}$ $\pi o v$. Eccles. xii. 7, каі тò $\pi \nu \hat{\epsilon \hat{\imath}} \mu \alpha$

 5, кai $\delta \delta \delta o \grave{s} \pi v o \eta ̀ \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \lambda \alpha \hat{\varphi} \tau \hat{\omega} \epsilon \in{ }^{\prime}$
 av̉rท่v. lvii. 16 . Zech. xii. 1 ,
 $\boldsymbol{a} v \boldsymbol{v} \tau \underline{\varphi}$. The plural of $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha$ is comparatively rare. Sometimes it is required (r) by its connexion with a plural following, as in verse 23 , кaì $\pi \nu \epsilon$ и́ $\mu a \sigma \iota \nu$ סıкаí $\omega v$ $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \in \omega \nu$. I Cor. xiv. 32,
 ข̀тота́ббєтal. In Psalm lxxvi. $\mathbf{r} 2$, the reading varies between $\pi \nu \epsilon v ́ \mu a \tau a$ (B) and $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ (A) àpхóvтшv. Sometimes (2) by the necessity of expressing plurality



(as in combination with áка́Gарта, томпрá, тגáva, \&c., or as
 $\pi \nu \epsilon v_{\mu} \mu \sigma \tau v$ ) or variety (as in I Cor. xii. 1о, ঠıакрі́бєıs $\pi v \in ข \mu a ́-$



каi לךซонке] And luave life. See note on x. $38, \zeta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha c$.
10. oi $\left.\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \gamma{ }^{2}{ }_{\rho}\right]$ Reason for the a fortiori of verse 9 . The discipline of human parents is brief, and it is guided by a fallible judgment. The divine discipline has a gracious and glorious object, and it steadily makes for it. The first point (moo's
 taken up in the contrasted clause. Even the other point (ката тò סoко仑̂̀ av́reîs) is not directly met by the $\in \pi i$ and tis of the second clause. In both cases something is left to be supplied by the reader.
$\pi \rho o s$ brief period of childhood. For the тоós, compare $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ к а ц \rho o ́ v ~$ (Luke viii. 13. I Cor. vii. 5), $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ c ̌ \rho a v ~(J o l n ~ v . ~ 35 . ~ 2 ~ C o r . ~$ vii. 8. Gal. ii. 5. Philem. 15),



ката̀ тò סокойv aùroîs] According to that which seemed good to them. Following their own judgment. (Matt. xvii.

25, $\tau i ́$ бol $\delta$ окєī; xviii. 12, $\tau i$ $\dot{\boldsymbol{v} \mu \hat{\imath} v}$ סоке̂; \&c.) There is no direct imputation of caprice or passion, only of fallibility, whether in the object or the method.

द̀ $\pi i$ тò $\sigma v \mu \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho o v]$. In the direction of that which is expedient. For our good. For $\epsilon \pi \pi$ í, see vi. $\mathrm{I}, \vec{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon o ́ t \eta \tau a$

 And for this highest idea of expediency, compare Matt. $v$. 29,30. John xvi. 7. 2 Cor. vii. 10.
 having partaken of. The $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \pi \boldsymbol{i}$ expresses the aim, the $\epsilon$ is the result. The aim of the divine discipline is our good, the result of it is our actual participation in the holiness of God Himself. For the thought, compare 2 Pet.

 $\mu \epsilon \tau а \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon \bar{L} v$ points to the moment of the consummation of grace in glory. For $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v \epsilon \iota \nu$, see vi. $7, \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{c} v \in \epsilon$ єủhopías. Acts ii. 46. xxvii. 33, 34 . 2 Tim. ii. 6, $\tau \hat{\omega} v \kappa a \rho \pi \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \tau a-$ $\lambda a \mu \beta \alpha ́ v \epsilon \iota$.
áqútqтos] Of the three
 $\sigma \mu$ ós, the third is the commonest (see note on verso 14). The


 $\nu \circ \iota \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \pi \sigma \delta i \delta \omega \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\delta} \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma v ́ \nu \eta s$.

xii. ı. Or $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \mu$ èv.

second occurs three times in the New Testament (Rom. i. 4. 2 Cor. vii. ı. I Thess. iii. I3) and in four places of the Septuagint (Psalm xcvi. 6. xevii. 12. cxlv. 5. 2 Macc. iii. 12). The first only here, and in the revised text of 2 Cor. i. 12 (where it takes the place of
 Septuagint (2 Macc. xv. 2).

Ir. $\pi$ ẫa $\delta \in \epsilon$ ] And although discipline is always painful at the time, yet the knowledge of its eventual blessing should reconcile us to it. The reading varies between $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ and $\mu \epsilon \in$. If probability may be taken into account, it certainly points rather to $\delta \epsilon$. We have a $\mu \grave{\iota} \nu$ and $\delta e$ following in clear contrast; and a foregoing $\mu \in{ }^{\prime} v$, implying a suppressed $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ to balance it, would anticipate the very antithesis which they both suggest and satisfy. Also it is not easy here to dispense with a connecting particle, the absence of which usually means either (I) the repetition (in explanation or expansion) of a former sentence, or (2) an intentional abruptness for the sake of em$j^{\text {hhasis }}$; neither of which reasons
seems appropriate here.
 (I) does not seent to belong to, as its province or category. Or (2) does not seem to be a matter of, as its characteristic feature. See note on x 39, ойк $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \hat{\epsilon} v$ $\dot{\boldsymbol{v} \pi о \sigma т о \lambda \tilde{\eta} s . ~}$
$\left.\lambda \dot{\prime} \pi \eta \mathrm{f} \ldots \chi^{\alpha} \alpha \hat{\alpha} \mathrm{s}\right]$ John xvi. 20, $2 \mathrm{I}, 22$.
 genitive is explanatory. Fruit (consisting) of righteousness. (1) The figurative use of карnos, produce or product, is common in the Septuagint and New Testament. Thus Psalm
 Stкаíw. Prov. xi. 30 , е̇к картой


 Amos vi. 12 ( 13 B), е̇ $\xi \in \sigma \tau \rho є ́ \psi \alpha, \tau \epsilon$ ...карлòv סıкаьобv́vךs єis $\pi \iota к р i ́ a \nu$. Luke iii. 8, картoùs dंदíous $\pi \hat{\gamma}_{\boldsymbol{\prime}}$

 Phil. i. I , $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \epsilon$ '́vot $^{\alpha} \alpha \rho \pi \dot{\partial} \nu$
 тои̂. James iii. 18 , карто̀s $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \delta_{t}$ $\kappa \alpha u 0 \sigma u ̛ \eta \eta s \dot{\epsilon} v \epsilon i \rho \eta ́ v \eta \sigma \pi \epsilon i \rho \epsilon \tau \alpha l$. \&c. (2) The position of $\delta$ eкatoavivŋs is characteristic of the style of the Epistle. See notes on i. r.

vii. 4. dc. (3) For סıкацoбv́v in this most general sense, of the Christian fulfilment of relations towards God and man, see note on V. I3, Aójop סıкacoav́$\nu \eta s$, and passages there quoted.

єірұขкко́v] Peaceful, rather than peaceable. The latter, however, is its sense in the only other place of its occurrence in the New Testament, James iii. 17, $\eta^{\dot{\eta}} \delta \grave{\varepsilon} \stackrel{a}{\alpha} \nu \omega \theta \in \nu$ aoфía
 к.т. $\lambda$. There the єipjiv suggested by it is that $\mu \epsilon \tau a^{a} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu-$ t $\omega v$ (see below, verse 14), here it is that of the often repeated $\chi^{\alpha}{ }^{\prime}$ เs каі̀ єip ${ }^{\prime} \nu \eta$ of the opening prayer of the Epistles. In the Septuagint, єiрquккòs occurs more than 40 times, ( 1 ) in the sense of peaceable (as, for example, Gen. xlii. x x, є' $\rho \eta \nu \iota к о$ ' ' $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ ), or (2) in connexion with $\theta$ vaía (expressed or understood), in that of the peace-offering ( 2 Sam. xxiv. 25, кaì àvive $\gamma \kappa \in \nu$
 Kings viii. 64, т̀̀ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \alpha \tau \alpha \tau \hat{\omega}$
 ขєкйv. Prov. vii. 14, $\theta$ voía

$\gamma \epsilon \gamma \boldsymbol{\nu}^{\mu \nu a \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ v o t s] ~ S e e ~ n o t e ~ o n ~}$ v. I4, $\gamma \in \gamma \nu \mu \nu \alpha \sigma \mu \epsilon \in \mathcal{}$.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \delta i \delta \omega \sigma v /]$ The literal sense of ámodeoóvat, lo give back, as a sum owed (Matt. xviii. 25) or a thing or person put into one's hands (Luke iv. 20. ix. 42), is often extended into that of
giving as a thing due (Rom.
 $\lambda_{\text {ás), }}$ whether earned (Matt. xx.
 promised (2 Tim. iv. 8, o $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$
 $\sigma \epsilon \iota \quad \mu \circ \iota{ }_{o}$ Kipios), threatened
 к.т.入.), or guaranteed in the order of nature or otherwise (Lev. xxvi. 4, каı̀ тà ģ́da тө̄v
 $\tau \omega v)$. This last is the sense here. Discipline yields righteousness as naturally as a tree yields its fruit.
12. $\Delta i o]$ Wherefore. Reconciled to suffering by all these considerations.

тàs $\pi а \rho є \mu$ е́vas к.т. ${ }^{2}$.] Evidently a reminiscence of Isai.

 $\pi а \rho а к а \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma а т є ~ к . т . \lambda . ~ I n ~ E c c l u s . ~$ xxv. 23 we have the $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \mu \epsilon$ '́vat of the text: $\chi$ єípes тарєцце́vaı каі $\gamma о ́ v a \tau a ~ \pi а р а \lambda є \lambda \nu \mu$ ќка.
 The two words, $\pi$ aptéval ( to let go along) and $\pi a \rho a \lambda$ vít (to loose along), are found together, as here, in the same general sense of relaxing or enfeebling, in Deut. xxxii. 36 , єíi $\epsilon \gamma$ à $\rho \pi a \rho a-$
 $\mu \epsilon ́ v o v s . ~(I) ~ F o r ~ z a p t e ́ v a l, ~ s e e ~ e$ also 2 Sam. iv. i, каі̀ $\pi$ ávтєs oi ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ 'I $\sigma \rho a \eta \lambda \lambda$ парє ${ }^{\prime} \theta \eta \sigma a v$. Jer.






xii．13．Or понйате．

 $\mu a \iota \phi є \rho \epsilon \tau \nu . \quad$ Ecclus．ii．13，ováà $\kappa \alpha \rho \delta i ́ a ~ \pi \alpha \rho є \iota \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta$ ．（2）For $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$ גúecv，Isui．xxiii．9，Kúpeos $\sigma a-$ $\beta \alpha \omega \dot{\theta} \dot{\epsilon} \beta$ оиде́́ $\sigma а т о$ тара $\lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha<\pi \hat{\alpha}-$
 xlvi．（xxvi．B） 15 ，ov่к $\frac{\breve{\epsilon}}{} \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon \nu$ ，on $\tau$ on Kúpoas таре́̀vaєн av̉тóv．Ezek． vii．27，каì ai $\chi є \hat{\epsilon} \rho \in s$ то̂̀ $\lambda \alpha o \hat{v}$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{S} \gamma_{\hat{\eta}} \mathrm{s} \pi a \rho a \lambda v \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o v \tau a l$. In the New Testament，it has the de－ finite sense of paralyzed．Acts

 And so тара入ıтькós，Matt．iv． 24 ．\＆c．

үóvaтa］Job iv．4，үóvaбt


$\left.\alpha^{2} \nu o \rho \theta \omega^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon\right]$ Not in the passage quoted，and at first sight more appropriate to $\chi{ }^{\epsilon!-}$ pas than to yóvara．But it follows the latter，and must have the general sense of setting right rather than of lifting up or making straight（Luke xiii， 13）．See Psalm xviii． 35 ，${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$

 $\theta \omega \dot{\theta} \eta \mu \in \nu$ ．cxlv．xt，ar vo $\theta$ oi $\pi a ́ \gamma-$ mas tò̀s катєрраүر́évous．

13．каi т $\rho \circ \chi$ tass］The read－ ing of the revised text（ $\pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \epsilon \hat{i t \tau}$ instead of $\left.\pi o \neq \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \tau\right)$ gets rid of
an unpleasing and improbable hexameter line．The quotation
 रuàs moíє qoîs тобí，каì тàs ódoús $\sigma$ av катcú ${ }^{\text {vive．}}$ Compare verse II，oi wis $\gamma$ àp cobias $\delta \delta \delta^{\prime}-$
 optais．The admonition is to straightforwardness and ap－ rightness of conduct，in con－ tract with perverseness or crookedness（see verses 25 and 27，oi ob $\phi \theta a \lambda \mu$ oi nov o $\rho \theta$ al $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon$－

 word $\tau \rho o \chi i a$ is found（in the Greek Bible）only in the Book of Proverbs，where it occurs five times．

Iva $\left.\mu \eta^{\prime}\right]$ The connexion would be quite obvious if in－ stead of $\dot{\partial} \rho \theta \dot{a} s$ we had $\lambda$ etas， level，which is the rendering of the Hebrew in the Revised Version of the passage quoted． Lameness would be under no temptation to diverge from a level path．If straight is the idea，we can still see that lame－ ness would prefer a short road to a circuitous one．

тò $\left.\chi \omega \lambda o{ }^{\nu}{ }^{2}\right]$ The reference is evidently to the weaker and faultier members of the Chris－ tian body，to whom example is


everything. For a like use of the figure, see I Kings xviii. 2 I,
 фотépaıs taîs ipvviaus;

є $\kappa \tau \rho a \pi \hat{\eta}] \quad 1$ Tim. i. 6, $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \xi\end{gathered}$
 15, $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \sigma a v$ ò $\pi i ́ \sigma \omega$ тov̂ $\Sigma \alpha$ tavâ. vi. 20. 2 Tim. iv. 4.
ia $\theta \hat{\eta} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu]$ Is this connected with the rooxcas ojpoas $\pi o t \epsilon \hat{i} \tau \epsilon$, as if the levelness (or else the directness) of the path would actually contribute to the healing? Or is it merely appended to it by way of completing the thought of the case in view-as if it were, instead of being healed, $a_{s}$ is most to be wished? The answer is doubtful.
14. єірך́vทv $\delta \omega \dot{\omega} \epsilon \tau \epsilon]$ A precept of peace, followed by a larger precept of holiness, which last is enforced by a prolonged passage of exhortation.
$\delta \iota \kappa \kappa є \tau \epsilon]$ The idea is that of pursuing a fugitive. The grace in question is one difficult of attainment. Compare Rom. xii.








$\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a} \pi a ́ v \tau \omega v$ ] In your deal.
ings and relations with all men. Rom. xii. I8, $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu-$


тòv áylacuóv\} The article means all (rather than that). The form áytaonoss (like $\mu$ акари$\sigma \mu o ́ s, \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \sigma \mu o ́ s, ~ \rho а \nu \tau и \sigma \mu o ́ s$, дд̀̀v$\mu$ ós, \&c.) indicates an act rather than a quality. In this it differs from the other two forms, ajtóт $\eta$ s (verse 12) and áүuшテ́və Sanctification rather than holiness. 'The bringing of the consecrated person into harmony of life and character with the consecration' (see note on ii. in,
 vi. 19, 22, тарабт $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma a \tau \epsilon \tau \alpha^{\prime} \mu{ }^{\prime} \lambda \eta$


 Thess. iv. 3, 4, 7, тои̃то $\gamma^{\text {áp }} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$
 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \ldots \dot{\epsilon} v$ à $\gamma\llcorner a \sigma \mu \hat{\imath}$ ка̀̀ $\tau \mu \hat{\eta} \ldots o v$

 Thess. ii. $13, \vec{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \lim ^{2} \mu \hat{\varphi} \pi \nu \epsilon^{\prime}-$

 бvíns. I Pet. i. 2.
oṽ $\chi$ ºpis]. Two Iambic lines follow. Accidental doubtless, perhaps unconseious, and yet strongly adverse to the idea of St Paul's authorship.
ö̀ $\psi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota \tau o ̀ v K$ Kúpıov] Matt. v. 8, мака́ptot oi каӨароì ти̂ карঠiạ,




 av่тồ．Isai．xxxiii．ı7，$\beta$ aбciéa $\mu \in \tau \dot{a} \delta_{o ́} \xi_{\eta}$ s ö $\psi \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，каi（omit B）
 то́ $\rho \rho \omega \theta_{\varepsilon \tau}$ ．Probably ó Kipios is here God（see note on viii．2）． Otherwise we should add to the above quotations I John iii．2，
 Rev．i．7，каì ö $\psi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ avitòv $\pi \hat{a}_{S}$ $\dot{o} \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o ́ s$.

15．èmıбкото仑ेvтєs］The oversight here enjoined is evi－ dently mutual and brotherly， not official and ministerial． Compare iii．12，13，$\beta \lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ，
 ชं $\mu \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．In 1 Pet．v．2，if $\dot{\epsilon \pi \tau \sigma \kappa о \pi о и ̆ \tau \epsilon ร ~ i s ~ t o ~ b e ~ r e t a i n e d ~}$ in the text（which is more than doubtful），the latter is its refer－ ence．
$\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau \iota$ ］Understand $\vec{\eta}$ ，as in verse 16．Lest there be any one $\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \sigma \tau \in \rho \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{v}$ ．
 see note on iv．I，vigrepqкévau． With $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{o}$ ，the sense may be not falling short of，missing，fail－ ing to attain，but falling short from（as from a thing once attained）．And thus the warn－ ing will be that of 2 Cor．vi．I， таракалоî $\mu \epsilon \nu$ $\mu \grave{\eta}$ єis кєขòv ті̀v
 And the case contemplated will be that of Gal．v．4，$\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \chi$ ápuтos

दोध $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon$.
 from Deut．xxix．i8，$\mu \eta^{\eta}$ tis éotiv

 stands in Field＇s edition．The Vatican omits $\pi \iota \kappa$ pías．Delitzsch quotes the Alexandrine Septua－ gint as reading miкpías，and as having $\dot{\epsilon} v o \chi \lambda \hat{n}$ in place of $\hat{\epsilon} \nu$ $x^{o \lambda} \hat{\eta}$ ．He thinks that the read－ ing there may have been sug－ gested by the form of the quota－ tion here．It is a difficult questiou．One thing we can－ not suppose－－that the writer to the Hebrews chose evo $\lambda \hat{\eta}$ from its resemblance to $\frac{\epsilon}{} \nu \chi^{\circ} \lambda \hat{\eta}$ ．
f̀íça тıкрías］Deut．xxxii． 32，$\dot{\eta}$（omit B）$\sigma \tau a \phi v \lambda \eta{ }^{2}$ avंт $\omega$,
 av̇тoîs．Lam．iii．ig．Acts vili．
 tyra．The figure is that of a poi－ sonous plant growing unnoticed in the field of the Christian com－ munity（Matt．xiii．24，\＆c．）．
äv ${ }^{\text {ar }}$ ф́vovad］Isai．xxxvii．


$\hat{\epsilon} \operatorname{vox} \lambda \hat{\eta}]$ Like áx $\overline{\text { citiv }}$（Tob． vi．7，є̇áv тוva ỏ $\chi \lambda \hat{y}$ ठач $\mu$ óvıov $\hat{\eta}$ $\pi v \epsilon \hat{y} \mu a$ порұоóv к．т．入．Acts v． 16），properly to throng or crowd one，and so to annoy or trouble， the compound érox $\bar{\epsilon} \hat{\imath} \nu$ ，properly



xii．16．Or а́тєд́ето．
etvai tivt，means to be trouble－ some to，with a dative or accusa－ tive，and sometimes absolutely （as here），to be troublesome，to give trouble．In the New Testa－ ment it occurs（besides）only in Luke vi． 18 ，where（as usually in the Septuagint）it is in the passive voice．
$\delta i^{\prime}$ aù $\left.\hat{\eta} s\right]$ Or $\delta i a ̀$ таи́т $\eta s$. The choice of reading is difti－ cult，and not important．Com－ pare 7.3 ，where，however，$\delta \iota^{\prime}$ avंrخे $\nu$ is decidedly preferable to סıà та⿱亠乂⿰丿⺄⿱㇒日勺心．
$\mu a \nu \theta \omega \bar{\omega} \tau \nu]$ The word inter－ prets the $\dot{f} i\} a \pi i \kappa \rho i a s$ above and prepares us for the $\mu \eta^{\prime} \pi s$ móp－ vos below．For $\mu$ caivct，see John xviii． 28 （illustrated by many applications of the word to ceremonial defilement in Levit．xiii．\＆c．）．Tit．i． 15 ， тávта каӨарà тoîs ка日apoîs тоїs
 ס̀̀v каӨаро́v，à $\lambda \lambda a ̀ \quad \mu \epsilon \mu i ́ a v \tau a \iota ~ a v ̉-$

 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．
oi mod入oí］The many．The community or Christian society． Rom．xii．5，oi mod入ò̀ c̀v $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a ́$
 And for the thought，compare



16．$\mu \dot{\eta} \tau i s]$ Understand $\hat{\eta}$ ，
as above．It is not clear whether ©ं＇Hoav̂ refers to both words， or only to $\beta \epsilon \in \beta \eta \lambda$ os．Bengel＇s remark，Libido et intemperantia cibi affines，suggests the com－ bination，and there is nothing in Esau＇s character to set against it．But charity，which has place even towards the dead，does not add to the Scripture record of evil．
$\beta \epsilon ́ \beta \eta \lambda o s]$ Derived from $\beta$ á $\omega$ ， $\beta a^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \omega$ ，the application of $\beta \bar{\epsilon} \beta \eta$－ Nos is（1）to things；open to the tread，theopposite of a $\gamma$ tos，sacred to God．Thus Lev．x．ıо，каì סıa－
 т $\hat{\omega} \nu \beta \epsilon \beta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ ，ка̀ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \mu \epsilon \epsilon \sigma о \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$


 xxii．26．xliv．23．I Tim．iv． 7. vi．20． 2 Tim．ii．16．Thence（ 2 ） to persons；counting holy things common，irreligious，first in Ezek．xxi．25，каì $\sigma v ́, \beta \epsilon ́ \beta \eta \lambda \epsilon$ ， ä้оцє к．т．$\lambda$ ． 1 Tim．i．9，ávo－

ws＇Hoavi］The profaneness of Esau is inferred from one transaction，in which he not only deliberately preferred the present to the future，but also treated the religious privileges of the patriarchal family（the domestic priesthood，the promise itself，the ancestorship of the



Messiah，dc．）as of no value in comparison with the satisfaction of a passing hunger．
ôs à $\left.2 \boldsymbol{\tau} i \beta \rho \omega^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}\right]$ Gen．xxv． 29－34，Гєйао́v $\mu \epsilon$ ．．．ӧть є́клєі́тш
 тото́кка́ аоv．．．＇Ivãí $\mu$ оц таи̂та тà



 ＇Н $\sigma a \hat{v}$ тà тррштото́кьа．For $\beta \rho \hat{\omega}-$ $\sigma \iota s$（eating），as distinguished from $\beta \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \mu$（ $f \circ o d$ ），see Rom． xiv．17．I Cor．viii．4，$\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{̀}$
 $\tau \omega \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda . \quad 2$ Cor．ix． 10 （from Isai．lv．10），каì äpтоv єis $\beta$ рйб兀г． Col．ii．16，$\mu \bar{\eta}$ oủv tes $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ крt－


 $\kappa \alpha \grave{\iota}$ ка入̀̀̀ єis $\beta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ ．iii． 6. \＆c．And so here．For a single meal．In some places the dis－ tinction is less marked．John
 к．т．А．vi． $27,55, \mu \eta ̀ \tau \eta े \nu ~ \beta \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma i \nu$
 бtv ті̀v $\mu$ е́vovoav к．т．$\lambda$ ．Psalm lxxviii． 30 ，$\ddot{\epsilon} \tau \iota \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ß $\beta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s} a \dot{v}-$
 de．
aंतéסoto］Or（in a later and debased form）$\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \hat{\epsilon} \tau 0$ ．The classical sense of the middle voice of àrobı $\delta$ óval，to give away for one＇s own gain，to sell，is
common in the Septuagint，be－ ginning with the passage here referred to，Gen．xxy．31， 33. In the New Testament，it occurs only here and in Acts v．
 a $\pi \epsilon \dot{\delta} \partial \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ）and vii． 9 （from Gen．



тà трштото́кца］See notes （above）on $\omega^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$＇H $\sigma a \hat{v}$ ，and ös aंvti $\beta \rho \omega \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ ．For the word，see also Gen．xxvii．36．Deut．xxi．
 токєіа．
tavtồ ］The addition of €avtov aggravates the folly of the act．

17．${ }^{\stackrel{ }{\prime} \sigma \tau \epsilon} \gamma^{\text {à } \rho o ̈ \tau \iota] ~ B e ~ s u r e ~}$ your sin will hind you out．It was so with Esau．Late but surely the sale of the birthright was punished by the forfeiture of the blessing．

й $\sigma \tau \epsilon]$ See Eph．v．5，тô̂to
 James i．Ig，ï $\sigma \tau \epsilon$ ，á $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o i ́ \mu o v$ aja ${ }^{2} \pi \eta \tau 0 i$ ．（In both cases，the revised text．Only here in the received also．The common Hellenistic form is ou $\delta a r \epsilon$ ，which， however，does not occur in this Epistle．）

каi $\mu$ ．］Either（1）also，as a further particular of the his－ tory．Or（2）even，taken closely with $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \epsilon \tau a$ ．Even after－ wards．So long after，that he


might have hoped that the early folly was forgotten and done with. The common chronology interposes more than 40 years between the two incidents.
$\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu \kappa \lambda$.$] When he willed$ (when it was his will) to inherit. Something of the eager and impetuous character of Esau is perhaps noticeable in the expression.

Tìv єidoyiav] The narrative of Gen. xxvii. is the first example of the importance attached to the solemn benediction of an aged or dying patriarch (though indeed the received chronology places more than 40 years between Gen. xxvii. and the death of Isaac in Gen. xxxy. 29). Compare Gen. xlviii. xlix. Deut. xaxiii. In I Chron. v. $\mathbf{1}, 2$, the cùdoyía seems to be used as synonymous with the трштото́кса. Reuben, though
 єis $\pi \rho \omega т о т о ́ к ь а . . . \eta^{\dot{\prime}}$ єìлоүia (the birthright, Revised Version) tồ ${ }^{3} \mathrm{I} \omega \sigma \gamma^{\prime} \phi$. For the phrase кл $\boldsymbol{\eta} \rho o-$
 iii. 9 .
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \delta о к \iota \mu \dot{a} \sigma \theta \eta]$ The choice of the word implies that the mind of the sacred writer is rising above the historical narrative into a region of spiritual application. Was rejected brings
in the thought of a greater than Isaac as the real agent, and a more momentous judgment than any earthly forfeiture as the real subject of warning. For алодокцца́दєєу, see (1) Psalm
 oi oiкоסоцойvтєs к.т. $\lambda$.) with its frequent quotations or reminiscences in the New Testament (Matt. xxi. 42. Mark viii 3 I. xii. Io. Luke ix. 22. xvii. 25. xx. I7. I Pet. ii. 4, 7), and (2) Jer. vi. 30 , á $\rho y^{\prime} p$ oov

 Kúplos. vii 29. xiv. 19. xxxi. (xxxviii. B) 37. Wisd. ix. 4, $\mu \eta^{\prime}$

$\left.\mu \epsilon \tau a v o i a s \gamma^{\alpha} \rho\right]$ The difficulty of the passage lies in two words, $\mu$ ктavoías and av̉тท́v. (1) Of $\mu \epsilon$ cávota in its uniform Scriptural sense, of repentance as distinguished from regret or remorse (see notes on vi. I, $\mu \in \tau \alpha-$ poías, and vii. 21, $\mu \in \tau a \mu \in \lambda \eta \theta_{\eta}^{\prime}-$ $\sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha l)$, there is not a trace in the Old Testament history of Esau. Its introduction here is due to the cause suggested in the note on $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \delta о к ц \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta$, namely, the application of the narrative (in the mind of the sacred writer) to the case of the readers of the Epistle. To this application $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu$ é $\lambda \epsilon \iota \alpha$ (the proper word for Esan) would have

18 Ờ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda u ́ \theta \alpha \tau \epsilon \quad \psi \eta \lambda \alpha \phi \omega \mu \epsilon \prime \nu \omega$ каі
been quite inadequate, But, even with $\mu \epsilon$ cávota, the terrible idea that repentance itself was sought and was not to be found is a mere perversion of the
 locus penitentice, is not in the mind of the sinner but in the circumstances of his life. It is room for repentance to operate in reversing the consequences of a sin. This is what (in its lower meaning) Esau did not find: this is what (in its more awful sense) they cannot find who fling away their spiritual birthright and hope nevertheless to secure the final blessing. (2) To which word does avitク̀ refer, the nearer $\mu \epsilon \tau a v o i a s$ or the more remote cindoyiav? There is no pretence for saying that Esau sought repentance and could not find it. What Esau sought with tears was the cidoyia, and to it alone can avirìv refer with any shadow of adherence to the history even if spiritualized into allegory. The simple explanation of the difficulty is that the words $\mu \in \tau a v o i a s$
 cally parenthetical to the main sentence. When he would fain have inherited the blessing, he was rejected (for he found no room for repentance to operate in undoing his old misdeed) though he sought the blessing earnestly with tears.
$\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a}$ ठакрv́wv] Gen. xxvii.
 каi $\pi \iota \kappa \rho a ̀ \nu \quad \sigma \phi o ́ d \rho a . . . \dot{\nu \nu \epsilon \beta o ́ \eta \sigma \epsilon}$

 т $\grave{y} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ciloyiay. Gen. xxvii. 3I,




 $\pi \alpha ́ \tau \epsilon \rho$. For $\grave{\epsilon} \kappa \zeta \eta \tau \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$, see note on xi. 6 .
18. $\left.0 \dot{v} \gamma^{\alpha_{\rho}^{\prime}}\right]$ An urgent reason for the preceding earnest exhortation. Very different is your position from that of your fathers at Sinai. They were gathered at a spot of alarm and portent, striking terror into the heart of the lawgiver himself. You are brought into direct communionwith aGod oflove, revealed in a Mediator of grace and peace. In the same degree must your responsibility be greater than theirs. The general thought is that of ii. 2,3. See also Rom,



$\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda_{i} \theta_{a \tau \epsilon]}$ Deut. iv. I I, $\kappa а \grave{\imath} \pi р а \sigma \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ каі ${ }^{\ell} \sigma \tau \eta \tau \epsilon$ vंт тò оे роз.
$\psi \eta \lambda a \phi \omega \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \propto]$ ] The great manuscripts omit opet (which nevertheless verse 22, with its emphasis on $\Sigma \iota \omega v$, seems almost to presuppose), and leave only the alternative explanation, (I)



a thing handled（or for handling， a palpable or material object） and a thing kindled with fire，or （2）a fire handled（palpable） and kindled．In favour of（ 2 ）， no doubt кєкаข $\mu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} v \underset{\varphi}{\text { might agree }}$ with rupi，a kindled fire（Psalm 1．3，$\pi \hat{v} \rho$ द́vavtion aùtoû кavөウ＇－ $\sigma \epsilon т а \iota ~ к . \tau . \lambda ., ~ a n d ~ \pi \hat{v} \rho$ кацо́ $\mu є \frac{\nu}{\nu}$ frequently）．But（a）$\pi \hat{\nu} \rho \psi \eta \lambda a-$ $\phi \dot{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu_{0}$ is so strange a com－ bination，and（b）the phrase $\kappa \alpha i ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \pi v \rho i$ is so frequent in this connexion（see Deut．iv．
 карסías（omit B）тov̂ oủ $\rho a v o u ̂ . ~ т . ~$ 23．ix．I5），that we must prefer （1）to（2）．The verb $\psi \eta \lambda a \phi \hat{a} v$ （from $\psi a$, ，to touch or rub）has two main uses，（1）to feel（as in Gen．xxvii．12， 2 I， 22 ．Luke xxiv．39． 1 John i．r），（2）to feel after，as a thing groped for in the dark（as in Deut．xxviii．



 roî $\chi{ }^{\circ} \nu$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Acts xvii． $27, \zeta \eta$－

 Here probably the former is the sense（in consideration of

 the latter（an object felt or groped for in the darkness）．
$\gamma$ 人ó申u］Gloom．From véфos． It occurs only here in the New Testament，but is frequent in the Septuagint，as in Exod．x．



 є́кє $\mathrm{\imath}$（omit B） $\boldsymbol{o}$ ©єós．See also Exod．xix．I6，кaì vєф́́ $\lambda \eta$ $\gamma^{\text {vo－}}$


Gódч］Mist．Akin to Géqv－ pos（a wind often represented as stormy and rainy）．The re－ vised text reads ̧́ó $\phi \underset{\sim}{\text { for }} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ко́тє． The word does not occur in the Septuagint．In the New Testa－ ment，see 2 Pet．ii．4， 7 ，ббipois
 Jude 6， 13.
$\theta v \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \eta]$ Storm．From $\theta \dot{v} \epsilon \tau$ ， to rush（formed like üє $\lambda \lambda a$ from $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{a} \epsilon \Delta v)$ ．It occurs only here in the New Testament．In the Septuagint，only in Exod．x． 22 （quoted above）．Deut．iv．II， бко́тоs，$\gamma$ vóqos，$\theta \dot{v} \in \lambda \lambda a . \quad$ Т． 22.

19．$\left.\sigma \alpha \lambda \pi \tau \gamma \gamma \operatorname{s} \eta_{\chi}{ }^{\omega}\right]$ Exod． xix． 16,19 ，$\phi \omega v \eta \dot{\eta}$ ths $\sigma \alpha \lambda \pi \iota \gamma \gamma o s$




$\phi \omega v \hat{0} \rho \dot{\rho} \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu]$ Deut．iv． 12，каї ę̉á $\lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon$ Kúpıos $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ $\dot{v} \mu \hat{a} \mathrm{~S}$［ $[\mathcal{\epsilon} v \tau \hat{c}$








 $\theta$ а́vшцєь.
$\pi a \rho \eta \pi j \sigma a v \tau 0]$ Of the two uses of mapaiteictac (both classsisal), the positive and the negafive, ( I ) to beg something of another ( $\tau i \quad$ tva or $\dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o}$ or $\pi$ ap d rios), and (2) to beg off from oneself $f$ (whether $\tau \iota$ or $\tau \nu{ }^{\prime}$ ), to deprecate, decline or refuse, the former is found in the Septapint, I Sam. xx. 6, 28 ( $\pi$ anal-


 aùroû $\pi o \rho \in \epsilon \theta \hat{\eta} v a c)$ and Esth. iv. 8, bat only the latter in the New Testament. See verse 25 . Also Luke xiv. 18, 19. Acts xxv. II, ò̀ тараитоїцаı тò ar apoGaveiv. I Tim. iv. 7. v. if. 2 Tim. ii. 23. Tit. iii. no. Here, literally, which voice they who heard deprecated any word being added to them, that is, begged that no further word should be spoken to them.
$\mu \eta^{\prime}$ ] The Sinaitic manuscript omits $\mu \eta^{\prime}$. Its insertion after тарұтйтаито (to express the negative result) is idiomatic, but not indispensable.

тробтє $\hat{\eta}_{\eta}$ val] The phrase is
evidently suggested by Deut. v. 25, द̀àv $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \theta \omega \hat{\mu} \mu \nu$ áкой $\sigma \alpha$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i s(A, \pi \rho о г \theta \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a \quad \dot{\eta} . \quad$ ak. B)




 Kvpiov к.т.ג.
 this sense of $\phi \bar{\varphi} \rho \epsilon 1$ (to endure), see Rom. ix 22, ${ }^{\eta} \nu \in \gamma \kappa \in \nu$ inv


 ¿ $\mu \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ к. т. $\lambda$. Jer. xiv. (li. B) 22 ,
 тросш̈тоv тогұрі́аs праүна́төv $\dot{v} \mu \omega \nu$.
 Septuagint $\delta$ oar te $\lambda$ Acc is used in all voices, active, middle, and passive. From its original sense to put asunder, set apart, separate (as Gen. xxx. 35 . Nom. viii. ${ }^{14}$, тoùs Aevíacs. xvi. 9. Deut. xix. 7, $\tau \rho \epsilon \bar{s}$ mo $\lambda \in \epsilon$. 1
 ...rove $\theta v \mu a ̂$ кк.т.. . Ruth i. 17 . \&c.), it passes into various modifictions, such as to disperse or scatter (Psalm xviii. 14. Mic. v. 8), to specify (Gen. xxx. 28 тòv $\mu$ no Óóv or. Lev. v. $4, \mu \epsilon \theta^{\circ}$ ${ }_{\text {ofkov. \&c.), or explain (Neh. }}$ viii. 8); and in the middle voice to state clearly, to give explicit warning (Ezek. iii. 18, \&ce., oi


 хіі. 2 г. Or єктроноя.
 (omit oviठ̀́ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda . \mathrm{B}$ ) тov̂ $\delta \iota a \sigma \tau \epsilon i-$
 New Testament it is only used (elsowhere) in the middle voice, and always in the sense of explicitly or distinctly command. ing. Mark v. 43, каì $\delta \iota \in \sigma т є i \lambda a \tau о$
 vii. 36. viii. І 5 , кai $\delta \iota \epsilon \sigma т$ é $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau о$ aن่тоїs $\lambda$ е́ $\gamma \omega v$ к.т. $\lambda$. ix. 9. Acts xv. 24, ois ovं $\delta \iota \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda a ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$. Even here it has been proposed to give a middle instead of a passive sense, that (word) which charged or commanded. But the passive is simpler, that which was being (repeatedly) commanded. And in one passage of the Septuagint ( 2 Macc. xiv. 28) we have a clear passive ( $\tau \alpha \delta \iota \epsilon \sigma \tau a \lambda$ $\mu \epsilon ́ v a)$ in this sense.
$\mathrm{K}_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \boldsymbol{v}$ Oŋpiov] A somewhat loose quotation of Exod. xix.





 $\zeta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha$,

Anpiov] Used by classical writers for any animal, even for fishes. Here substituted for the Septuagint rendering $\kappa r \hat{\eta} v o s$, for which see I Cor. Xv.

39, àv $^{\prime} \theta \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu \ldots \kappa \tau \eta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \ldots \pi \tau \eta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\ldots i \chi \theta \dot{v} \omega v$.
21. каí] The words оӥт $\omega$ - фаvтацо́цєvov are parenthetical. The кal belongs to Mov$\sigma \hat{\eta} S \epsilon i \pi \epsilon$.
 presented. The verb фаvтá乌єıv (from фavtós) is to make visible. Wisd. vi. 17 ( 16 B ), к кі̀ $\dot{\epsilon} v$ таĭ
 Hence фavтaбia, display (Acts xxv. 23. Hab. ii. I8, фаvтабíav $\psi \epsilon v \delta \hat{\eta}$. \&c.), sometimes lightning (Zech. x. 1), and фáv$\tau a \sigma \mu a$, an apparition or spectre (Matt xiv. 26. Mark vi. 49. Wisd. xvii. 14).
*Eкфоßós єi $\left.{ }^{2} \mu\right]$ Deut. ix. 19 ,


 But this was said at a later time and on a different occasion. And the words кai ếvipouos (or Éктро $\sim$ os, the reading of the Si naitic manuscript) are nowhere found used by Moses. For ${ }^{\boldsymbol{y}} \boldsymbol{v}-$ т $\rho о \mu о$, see Acts vii. 32, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu \tau \rho 0-$ $\mu \operatorname{sos} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$ M $\omega v \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ (at the burning bush) оэкк єтӑ $\lambda \mu a$ ката-


 тродоя.
22. à $\left.\lambda \lambda \alpha^{2} \pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda.\right]$ Con-

## 

trast of the Christian with the Jewish standing. Unlike the Hebrew nation, just escaped from the house of bondage, and now assembled at the foot of Sinai, amidst manifestations of the divine presence which struck terror into the hearts alike of the people and of their leader, you are brought into closest contact, for present comfort and converse, with a holy and heavenly community, of which seven characteristics are particularized in the clauses which follow. And first its home.
$\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \dot{v} \theta a \tau \epsilon]$ This perfect is too commonly read as a future, and the whole description relegated into a world beyond death. The effect is an utter misconception of the thought of the writer, and a miserable dwarfing and stunting of the Christian life alike in its privileges and in its duties. The first thought is, You are already in heaven. The second, What is your society there? Compare Eph. i. 3, ó eidoy ${ }^{\prime} \sigma a s$



 тєvua èv oujavoîs víápXєь. Col.
 $\sigma \grave{\nu} \tau \hat{\omega} \cdot \mathbf{X} \rho \tau \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \Theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega}$.
$\Sigma t \omega \nu$ ö $\rho \epsilon \epsilon]$ In the 23 passages of the Septuagint where the two words are combined the
order is uniformly ópos $\sum \iota \omega v$ (with whatever slight variations in the presence or absence of the article), and not $\Sigma_{\iota \omega v}$ öpos. Evidently here the ' Zion mountain' is mentally contrasted with another, the 'Sinai mountain.' And thus the omission of of oft in the revised text of verse 18 is virtually supplied. For the thought, compare Isai.



 here (in the New Testament almost always in quotations from the Septuagint, as Matt. xxi. 5. John xii. 15. Rom. ix. 33. xi. 26. i Pet. ii. 6), compare Rev. xiv. I , каi єīठov,
 opos $\Sigma{ }^{2} \omega \omega^{\prime} v$.

каì тód $\epsilon]$ It is a mistake to treat this as a new particular,
 Zion and Jerusalem are not to be made two separate things (as, for instance, the one the type of the divine presence itself, and the other, that of the divine beatific manifestation, see note on viii. $z$, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \hat{q}_{i}^{\prime} \omega \nu \ldots \alpha \alpha i \not \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ $\left.\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta{ }^{\prime}\right)$, but rather, Mount Zion and (on it) the looly city. In confirmation of this identity of


 'I $\sigma \rho a \eta \lambda$.

 Matt. v. 35, $\mu$ '̀'тє єis 'Iєробó $\lambda \nu \mu a$,





'I $¢ \rho$ ovба入 $\left.{ }^{\prime} \mu\right]$ Of the two forms 'Iєpovба入خ̀ $\mu$ and 'Ieporó$\lambda \nu \mu a$, the former only is used in the Septuagint, until we reach the Apocrypha, where both are found (in I Macc. only the former, in 2 Macc. only the latter). St Paul uses only the former, except in Gal. i. 17, 18, and ii. r. St John only the latter, except in Rev. iii. 12. xxi 2, ra. In St Matthew and St Mark 'Ifpoбóduнa predominates, in St Luke and the Acts
 are found in all these.
èmovpavíw] Applied to Jerusalem here only. But see quotation in a former note from Rev. iii. 12. Also Rev. xxi. 2,
 $\sigma \alpha \lambda \grave{\eta} \mu$ каเvŋ̀v, єỉ̀ov катаßaívou-


 vos, see note on iii. I.

каi $\mu v \rho$ áácu] $^{2}$ There are three possible combinations of the words which follow. (I) The first of these is preferred by the Authorized Version and adopted by the Revised: кai $\mu \nu p u a_{\sigma} \boldsymbol{v}$

$\pi \rho \omega т о т о ́ к \omega v$ к.т. $\lambda$, and to tens of thousands of Angels, to a $\pi$ avj-
 born. (2) The second is, каi

 to tens of thousands, even (a) a aavinvois of Angels and (b) an $\dot{\epsilon}_{\kappa}^{\kappa} \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ 'ía of the firstborn (making $\mu \nu \rho a \dot{a} \iota \nu$ include both the maví$\gamma v \rho \iota s \dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ and the $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \sigma^{\prime} a$ $\pi \rho \omega \tau о \tau o ́ \kappa \omega v)$. (3) The third is,
 каì е́ккд $\eta \sigma$ tía трштото́кшข, and to tens of thousands, even a mavŋ́ $\gamma$ pts of Angels; and to an $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a$ of the firstborn (restricting the

 begin a new item of enumeration). Of these, the first breaks the uniformity of the clauses, each one of which (after the first) begins with a кaí, and also involves the cumbersome and inelegant combination of the words
 тото́кшу to depend upon. The second strikes the ear as prosaic in its formal distribution of $\mu v$ ptá $\sigma$ v into two constituents: also the two constituents seem to have no special point of connexion which could justify the severance of the $\pi \rho \omega$ то́токои from a subsequent particular, that of
 $\mu \dot{\operatorname{v}} \omega \boldsymbol{v}$. On the whole, the third seems the best. The combina-



тav$\eta$ үipє alone presents no real difficulty－tens of thousands， even a marizvois of Angels－ and it leaves to each of the six clauses after the first its own kai to open it．
$\mu \nu p \dot{a}^{\sigma} \sigma \iota \nu$ We have the same word in connexion with Angels in Deut．xxxiii．2，Kúpoos éк

 тov̂．Psalm lxviii．17，тò ăpua
 к．т．入．Dan．vii．Io，גílıaı $\chi$ ц－入เáóєs è̀ $\lambda \epsilon \tau \tau \cup \cup ́ \rho \gamma o v v$ av̉rộ，ка̀

 pıos èv á áíals $\mu \nu \rho \iota a ́ \sigma t r$ aủtovi．

 av่т $\omega \nu \mu \nu \rho \iota a ́ \delta \epsilon s ~ \mu \nu \rho เ a ́ \delta \omega v ~ к . т . \lambda . ~$

тav $\eta \gamma$ v́p $\epsilon 1$ By derivation （ $\pi \hat{a} \varsigma$, àjє́ípw），a general assem－ bly：but by usage，an assembly gathered for a festival，a festal throng．See Ezek．xlvi．in，èv тaîs éopraîS кà̀ év raîs $\pi \alpha \nu \eta \gamma u ́-$ $\rho \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ к．r．ג．Hos．ii． 1 1，тá́баs tàs Éゆpooúvas aùrîs，tàs（omit

 $\boldsymbol{\sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon} \dot{\iota} \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a(-\rho a \iota s ~ B) \pi a \nu \eta \gamma \dot{v}$
 т $\mathrm{\eta}_{\mathrm{s}}$ тồ Kupiov；Amos v．2I，

 $\gamma \dot{v} \rho \in \sigma \iota v i \mu \omega \nu$ ．And so the verb



$a v ̄ \tau \hat{\eta} \ldots \chi^{a} \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \not \ddot{a}^{\alpha} \mu a \quad \alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\eta}$ к．т．$\lambda$. Thus the word，so suitable to the Angels，would be far less suitable to the $\pi \rho \omega$ тóтоко as ex－ plained in the next verse．For the statement，$\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda$ v́ $\theta a \tau \epsilon$
 sages which speak of the present ministry of Angels，Heb．i．14， and notes there．In that heavenly city which is already your home you have a host of sympathizing friends in those unfallen spirits who behold the face of your Fa－ ther．They are there，not in selfish repose，but in perpetual ministry for sinful and suffering mankind．They have charge concerning you in your perilous pilgrimage，invisible helpers and guardians in your hours of lone－ liness and temptation．
 third particular of the Chris－ tian＇s present access．And to a living assembly of firstborn sons enrolled already in heaven．It is a thought of comfort．You are not alone．You are in com－ munion and fellowship，even here on earth，with a great multitude which no man can number． And though on earth all is change，tumull，warfare，tempta－ tion，yet be of good cheer，the Lord knoweth them that are His，knows them by name．For
 є́кк $\lambda \eta \sigma i a s$ ．The word might include all Christian people

## 

whether dead or living, whether living or yet unborn. But the separate mention of the spirits of righteous men perfected, as well as the emphatic ajoze-
 $\lambda \epsilon \iota \omega \mu \epsilon ́ v(\omega \nu)$, gives to the church of the firstborn the distinctive sense of the Christian living, the true Chureh on earth.

трштото́кшу] Evidently the point of the title lies in the devotion or consecration to God of the firstborn sons under the law. Exod. xiii 2, á áááóv $\mu \mathrm{o}$
 roîs vioîs 'I $\sigma \rho a \eta$ ク́d. xxii. 29, тà тршто́тока тйv vî̀v vov $\delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ $\dot{\epsilon} \mu$ ól. $^{\text {. Num. iii. 13. viii. } 17 .}$ xviii. 15 . \&c.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi о \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho а \mu \mu ́ \epsilon є \omega \nu]$ Enrolled (registered) in heaven, not yet arrived there in personal presence. The word dimopodíatv occurs in Jud. viii. 14. Prov. xxii. 20. Luke ii. 1, 5. (Also $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \gamma \rho \propto \phi \eta^{\prime}, 2$ Macc. ii. . . Luke ii. 2. Acts v. 37.) For the numbering of the firstborn, and the substitution of the Levites for them as the special property of God, see Num. iii. 40 , \&e.,


 то́көи к.т.д.
 idea of a record of numes kept in heaven is found first in Exod.

 $\dot{\eta}^{*} \mathrm{~s}$ єَpa甘as. Psalm lxix. 28.



 $\sigma o v, \pi \hat{a} s \delta^{\circ}$ є $\boldsymbol{v} \rho \epsilon \theta \mathrm{eis}\left[{ }^{\circ}\right] \quad \gamma \in \gamma \rho a \mu-$ $\mu \epsilon ́ v o s\left(\pi \hat{\alpha} s\right.$ ó $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho$. B) ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \beta i \beta \lambda \omega$.












каi крит $\hat{\eta}$ ©. $\pi$.] A fourth particular. You have not to live in dread of a future terrible experience of a judgment anwious and precarious: you are already come to the Judge of all, and He is already your God. The thought of the militant Church is followed by the thought of God the Judge of all, both as the discerner of the true among the professing (a note of warning), and as the avenger of the true Church, now under persecution and temptation (a note of comfort). The construction of the words ought not to have been doubted: $\Theta \in \hat{\varphi}$ is interposed between $\kappa \rho \iota \tau \hat{\eta}$ and $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \nu$, in the characteristic style of the Epistle, which loves trajection,


and with an intimacy of connexion which adds to the force of the whole. For God the Judge, see James iv. 12, eis


каi $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\psi} \mu a \sigma c v]$ A fifth particular. Not only have you present access, for sympathy and communion, to 'the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world': that access, that advent, is yours also to the faithful departed. Their good example is your heirloom; their safe arrival in the home of the blessed is the pledge and warrant of yours. And not only thus. Already in worship and communion you meet and are at one with them.
$\pi v є \dot{\prime} \mu a \sigma \boxed{ }$ ] The distinctive word for the spiritual being of the intermediate state. Compare I Pet. iii. 19 (roîs ėv $\phi \quad \lambda \alpha \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \nu \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \mu \alpha \sigma(v)$, the only true parallel, though widely different in context. A comparison of Rev. vi. 9 will show the propriety of the choice of туєípata here. There are seen the $\psi v x a i$, the martyred lives,
 for satisfaction. Here the advent of the Christian is to the spirits awaiting in a paradise of blessedness the consummation of resurrection.

Suкaícv] Righteous, in the sense of St Paul (Rom. i. I7.
v. 19) and of this Epistle (x. 38. xi. 4).

тєтєлєiшนє้́шv] Consummat$e d$, in reference to the education of this life, its trials and perils. Safe for ever. Still waiting the $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon i \omega \sigma \iota s$ of resurrection and glory. See notes on ii. ro ( $\tau \epsilon-$ $\lambda \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega \sigma a l})$ and xi. 40 ( $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega-$ $\theta \omega \bar{\omega}(\nu)$.
 particular. The thought of the perfected righteous suggests that of the Saviour to whom all their happiness is due. The Saviour
 ready $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \lambda_{\eta} \lambda \dot{i}$ atat $^{\text {to }} \mathrm{Him}$ (John vi. 35).
$\left.\delta_{1 a} \theta_{\eta}^{\prime} \kappa \eta_{5}\right]$ See note on vii. 22.
$\boldsymbol{v e ́ n a s}^{\text {] }}$ See note on viii. 8, каuvjr. The Gospel $\delta_{a} \theta_{\eta} \kappa \bar{\eta}$, which is кaıvi as being new in kind, is also véa as being (i) recent (in comparison with the Mosaic covenaut) in time, and (2) ever fresh and young in virtue of an ever replenishing (because eternal) life.
$\mu \epsilon \sigma i \tau \eta]$ See note on viii. 6, $\mu \in \sigma i ́ t \eta s$.
'I $\eta \sigma o v=$ The human name, so full of the saving character

 $\sigma \omega ́ \sigma \in L ~ \tau \grave{o} v ~ \lambda a \grave{v} \nu$ aùrov̂ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o} \tau \hat{\omega} v$
 therefore to the struggling and militant Church.



кai aijari] A seventh and last particular. In having come to Jesus you have come also to that atoning blood, which, unlike another of which the old Scripture tells, cries for mercy, not for vengeance, upon the soul that has sinned.
aí $\mu$. $\dot{\rho} a v \tau \iota \sigma \mu 0 \hat{v}] \quad 4$ blood of (for) sprinkling. That is, designed and available for application to the human conscience clogged and defiled by the sense of sin. Compare I Pet. i. 2, cis
 'I $\eta$ бov̂ Xpıotov̂. There the blood is spoken of in its use, here in its purpose. For $\dot{\rho} a v \tau i \zeta \in t v$ and
 The two principal rites of sprinkling of blood in the law of Moses (besides that prescribed in the consecration of the high-priest, for which see notes on x. 22) were those of the purification of the leper (Lev. xiv. 7, \&c.), and of the person defiled by contact with death (for which see notes on ix. 13). No two types could be more helpful for the understanding of the present passage. For aipa itself, see note on ix. 14, тò aîца тoû Xpıттoû.

крєіттоу $\lambda \alpha \lambda о \hat{v} \nu \tau 1]$ Speaking a better thing than Abel when he, being dead, yet by his blood cried to God against
his murderer. The word is ßoâ (evidently inappropriate here) in Gen. iv. ro, but $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ in Heb. xi. 4. And $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon \hat{i}$ may have been chosen here in preparation for the $\lambda a \lambda o \hat{v} \nu \tau a$ of verse 25 , and in allusion to the frequent use of $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} v$ in reference to the voice on Siaai. See, for example, Exod. xx. I, 19, 22. Deut. iv. 12, 33. \&c.
25. $\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon]$ See note on iii. $12, \beta \lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, àd $\delta \lambda \phi \circ$ í. $\left.\pi \alpha \rho a \iota \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon\right]$ See note on verse 19, map 1 rj́gavto. Here with an accusative of the person refused, as in 1 Tim. v. 1 I ( $\chi$ ýpas) and Tit. iii. Io (aipe$\left.\tau<\kappa \grave{v} \stackrel{a}{\alpha} v \theta_{\mu} \omega \pi \sigma v\right)$.

тòv $\lambda a \lambda o u ̂ v \tau a]$ In Christ and the Gospel, in contrast with the $\lambda a \lambda \omega \nu$ at Sinai in terror and judgment.
ci $\gamma \boldsymbol{a} p$ éxeivol] For the argument, see ii. 2, 3, єi $\gamma$ àp ó $\delta L^{\prime}$

éкєivoc] See iv. 2, éккє́vovs.
 (without explanation of the thing to be dreaded), see ii. 3 ,

$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\pi} \hat{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\pi}$. тò̀ $\chi$.] Instead of ròv $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \gamma \hat{\eta} s \times . \pi$. This is shown by the tov ain ouparov which follows. For this inverted order (characteristic of the Epistle), see note on xii. in, סıкаєoซvirŋs.



xii. 25. Or oủpavoû.

тараıт $\quad \sigma a ́ \mu є v o l] ~ I n ~ t h e ~ i n-~$ nocent (Deut. v. 28, j $\rho \theta \omega \mathrm{\omega} . .$. è $\lambda$ á $\lambda \eta \sigma a v$ ) 'deprecation' of the direct divine speaking at Sinai the sacred writer sees prefigured the sinful refusals of the voice of God in the onward history of Israel, and draws a note of warning from them for Christian days.

т̀̀े $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau$ íלovтa] Him who dealt with them. See note on


тодv̀ $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o v \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon i ̂ s] ~ U n d e r-~$

$\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{i} i \mathbf{s}$ oi] We who. A merciful condescension, allying the writer with the refusers of the voice.
 stand $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau i \zeta o v \tau a$. For the thought of the Gospel being in all its utterances a voice from heaven, see note on iii. $\mathrm{I}, \kappa \lambda \eta^{\prime}$ $\sigma \epsilon \omega s$ émovpaviov. The key to it is found in the divine personality of the Holy Spirit, whose voice the Gospel is. See I Pet.
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \dot{u} a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \iota \sigma a \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\alpha} \mathrm{~s} \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{u}^{-}$
 vô.
 and passive tenses of $a^{\prime} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \rho \dot{\epsilon}-$ $\phi \epsilon \iota \nu$, to turn away from, besides
the obvious construction with $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{0}$ (as Jer. iii. 19, $\pi a \tau \epsilon \rho^{\rho}$
 a $\pi \sigma \sigma \tau \rho a \phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, take also the simple accusative of the person forsaken or shunned. Thus, for example, Jer. xv. 6, $\sigma \dot{v} \dot{a} \pi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \rho \alpha_{-}^{-}$ $\phi \eta s \mu \epsilon, \lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \epsilon$ Kúptos. Matt. v. 42, Tòv Gélovta à à̀ бov̂ §avcí$\sigma a \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \phi \hat{\eta} s . \quad 2$ Tim.



26. oṽ $\dot{\eta} \phi \omega v \dot{\eta}]$ From $\phi \omega v \hat{n}$ $\dot{\rho} \eta \mu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \omega \nu$ in verse 19. See note there.

Tク̀̀ $\gamma \hat{\eta} \nu]$ In preparation for the quotation from Haggai, which speaks of earth and heaven.

द̀ $\sigma$ á $\lambda \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon v]$ From $\sigma a^{\prime} \lambda o s$, the swell of the sea (Psalm lxxxix.
 $\theta a \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \eta s, ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \sigma a ́ \lambda o v ~ \tau \omega ̂ v ~ к v-~$


 is to make to rock or reel, to shake, in all senses, literal and figurative. It occurs some 70 times in the Septaagint. For example, Psalm xviii. 7,




## $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau \alpha \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu,{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \tau \iota \stackrel{\circ}{\alpha} \pi \alpha \xi$ є́ $\gamma \omega \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon i ́ \sigma \omega$ oủ $\mu o ́ v o \nu$

xlviii．5，è $\theta a \dot{v} \mu a \sigma \alpha \nu$ ，èт $\alpha \rho a ́ \chi \theta \eta-$ $\sigma a v, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma a \lambda \epsilon \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu . \quad$ xcvi． 11 ，


 $\pi \nu \epsilon \dot{́} \mu a \tau o s$ $\sigma a \lambda \epsilon v \theta \hat{p}$ ．And so Matt．xi．7．xxiv．29．Luke
 $\sigma a \ell$ avं $\eta \dot{\eta} \nu$ к．т．А．Acts iv． 3 r ，

 And metaphorically，Acts xvii． 13，ба入єи́ovtєя каì тара́ббоитєs tous ö $\chi$ dovs． 2 Thess．ii． 2 ，eis
 ànò тov voós．

тórє］At the giving of the law．Jud．v．4，5，रु $\hat{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \eta$

 $\rho a \eta$ Ps Palm lxviii． 8.
viv］In these days of Christ and the Gospel．In reference to the introduction of the new du－ $\theta \eta{ }_{\eta}^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ ．For this use of $\nu \hat{v} v$（or $v_{v i \prime}$ ）see Rom．iii．21，and note there．The interval of time be－ tween the first and the second advent is generally left un－ noticed in the Old Testament， and so here；for the prophecy about to be quoted has its ful－ filment still in the future．
＇̇ं $\pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau a l] \quad H e(G o d)$ has promised．（I）For einaryé $\lambda$－ $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ ，see note on vi．13．The passive form $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau a l$ ，used in a middle sense，occurs also in



Gal．iii．19，$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\gamma} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau a \epsilon$ is pro－ bably passive in sense as well as in form．And so in 2 Mace．
 $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \in i$ х $\not \eta \mu a ́ r \omega \boldsymbol{v}$ ．（z）The pro－ phecy is quoted as promise，for such it is to the faithful，not－ withstanding its imagery of terror．Compare Luke xxi． 28.
${ }^{*}$ Etı $\left.{ }^{2} \pi \alpha \xi\right] \quad$ Hag．ii．6， 7 （7，


 $\lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu$ ка̀̀ т̀̀v छŋррáv，каì бขб－

 $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \omega$（ $\pi \lambda$ ク̇́ $\sigma \omega$ B）ròv oiкоv тоûtov ঠóg $\eta \mathrm{s}$ ，$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \in \iota$ Kن́pıos пауто－ кра́т $\omega \rho$ ．The prophecy was ex－ pressly given as an encourage－ ment to the rebuilding of the temple under Zerubbabel and Joshua．Under the figure of a great convulsion affecting all nature（compare Matt．xxiv． 29. Mark xiii．25．Luke xxi．26） the introduction of a new dis－ pensation is foretold．And that， not in its inception in the first advent，but in its consummation in the second．

Є＇テl ámas］Yet once．Once more and once only．Gen．xviii．



 к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．
$\sigma \epsilon i \sigma \omega]$ The words $\sigma \in i \in \omega$ and $\sigma a \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \epsilon \in$ are here used




xii. 27. Or omit $\tau \grave{\eta}$.

interchangeably. And so commonly in the Septuagint and New Testament. Compare, for example, Matt. xi. 7 (ка́да $\mu о \nu$

 $\mu \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \lambda_{o v} \boldsymbol{\sigma \epsilon \epsilon}(\mu \epsilon ́ v \eta)$. Acts xvi.

 mpíov) with Matt. xxvii. 5 I ( $\dot{\eta}$
 $\theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu)$. Acts xvii. 13 ( $\sigma \alpha \lambda \epsilon \psi^{\prime}$ оитеs каї тара́ббоитєs то̀े ö $^{\chi}$ -入ovs) with Matt. xxi. ro (दे $\sigma$ eío-
 with Matt. xxviii. 4.
ov̉ $\mu o ́ v o v . . . \dot{a} \lambda \lambda a ̀$ каí] A variation for the sake of emphasis.
 neuter article serves the purpose (as usual) of the inverted commas of quotation. See, for example, iii. 3, тò oŋ́यєроv. Matt. xix. 18, tò ó фovévés $\kappa . \tau . \lambda . \quad$ Rom. xiii. $9, \tau \grave{\partial} \gamma^{\alpha} \rho$ ov̀



$\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{i}]$ By the finality of its terms. There can be no further thing after the ${ }^{\prime \prime} \tau \iota \stackrel{\prime}{c} \pi a \xi$. For $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{\text {, }}$, compare ix. 8, rov̂-
 áyiov.
$\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \alpha \lambda . \mu$.] The removal
of those things which are thus declared to be in process of being shaken. The prediction ( $\sigma \in \epsilon^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ) is treated as involving a process already at work ( $\sigma a \lambda \in v o \mu \dot{\prime} \nu \omega v$ ). Compare viii. 13. See note on $\sigma \epsilon i \sigma \omega$ (verse 26) for the identity (here implied) of $\sigma \epsilon i \epsilon t y$ and $\sigma a-$ $\lambda \in \dot{v} \epsilon \bar{c}$.
$\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \theta_{\epsilon \sigma L \nu]}$ Displacement (as in vii. 12), not mere transposition (as in xi. 5). See note on vii. 12.
ws $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \eta \mu \epsilon ่ \nu \omega \nu]$ As of things made (created), and therefore essentially temporal and perishable. See note on i. 2 , èmoín$\sigma \in \nu$
$\left.{ }_{i v a} \mu \epsilon i v \eta\right]$ Depending (practically) upon $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\theta} \epsilon \sigma \Delta v$, not upon $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{\text {. }}$. It is as if $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \omega \bar{\nu} \sigma$. $\mu \epsilon \tau a \dot{\theta} \epsilon \sigma \tau \nu$ bad been $\tau \grave{o} \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma a-$
 things are displaced, to bring into view the permanence of the eternal.
$\left.\mu \operatorname{ci}_{i} \eta\right]$ See note on x .34, $\mu$ évováav.
28. Stó] Wherefore. Considering this prophecy ( $\epsilon \tau \iota \tilde{a} \pi a \xi$ к.т. $\lambda$. .), and the gracious purpose of it (iva $\mu \epsilon_{i}^{\prime} \eta \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma$.), and our interest in it.

Baacheíav] Soe note on i. 8, тîs $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon i a s$ rov. The king-



xii．28．Or ЕХоцєу．

dom of Christ involves that of His people．See Dan．vii．18，

 B）$\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \ldots \kappa а і$ тウ̀ $\nu \quad \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ́ a v$


 ¿ Пarท́p $\mu o v$ ßarthciav．Rev．i．



á $\sigma a ́ \lambda \epsilon v \tau o v]$ Acts xxvii． 41 ． Also Exod．xiii．16，каi ëvtą

 Deut．vi．8．xi． 18 ．

тарадан $\beta$ áyovтеs］In course of receiving．The kingdom is not yet come，but the process of its coming is begun．The compound verb $\pi \alpha \rho a \lambda a \mu \beta$ ávєlv is（1）to take as by transmission from hand to hand（as in Mark
 таре́ $\lambda a \beta_{o v}$ кратєiv．Dan．v． 3 I， $\pi а \rho \epsilon ́ \lambda a \beta \epsilon ~ т \grave{\nu} \nu$ ßaбı入єiav．vii．

 so to take from the hard of another（as here，and Gal．i．
 таре́да $\beta$ ov айто́．Phil．iv． 9. $z$ Thess：iii．6，катà т $\dot{\jmath} \nu \pi \alpha \rho a ́-$
 \＆c．）；（2）to take to（or by）one＇s
side，to take to（or with）one （as in Matt．i．20，24．ii．I3， 14，20， 2 I．xii． 45 ．John xiv． 3．Acts xv．39．\＆c．）．
$\left.{ }^{\boxed{E}} \mathrm{X} \omega \mu \epsilon \nu\right]$ Let us have．It is ours if we will．Let us keep having．It is the кратळิнєv of iv．i4．Here，as in Rom．v．I （ $\epsilon \rho \eta \eta \nu \eta \nu \quad{ }^{\epsilon} \chi(\omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ），there is a variety of reading between ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ X $\omega$－ $\mu \epsilon \nu$ and ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \circ \mu \epsilon \nu$ ．
$\left.\chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota v\right]$ See note on iv．16， where it is distinguished from c̈̀ $\lambda$ єos．From its original sense of free favour comes that of gracious influence，for with God feeling is never divorced from action．Benevolence and bene－ ficence are with Him one．
 serviamus（Vulgate）．Whereby to serve．It is equivalent to ${ }_{i v a} \delta_{\imath}{ }^{2} a \dot{v} r \hat{\eta} s \lambda$ ．A more fre－ quentconstructionin Latin than in Greek．Compare Acts xxi．
 к．т．入．For $\lambda a \tau \rho \varepsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\text { r }}$ ，see note on viii． 5 ．

єuapécotws］The adverbial form（for which Xenophon is quated）occurs only here in the New Testament．For éváfé－
 тò «vápectov．Rom．xii．I，
 xiv， 18.2 Cor．v．9．Éph，v．
 $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \hat{v} \rho \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \alpha \lambda i ́ \sigma \kappa о \nu$.

10. Phil. iv. 18. Col. iii. 20. Tit. ii. 9. For the verb eva$\rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon i v$, see xi. $5,6$. xiii. $\frac{1}{}$.
 reading of the revised text for the aỉoùs кai єù $\lambda a \beta \epsilon i a s$ of the received. (Thus aidws survives in Scripture in 1 Tim. ii. 9 only. We have aidễöac in 2 Macc. iv. 34, and ai $\delta \eta \mu \omega \nu$ in 2 Mace. xv. 12.) For єv̉̉áßeıa, see note on v. 7. For ס́́os (found only here in the New Testament), see 2 Macc. iii. 17,
 тos... סéovs кaì таןа $\chi$ ך̄s. xii. 22.


29. каì रáp] $^{\rho}$ For also (besides other considerations). For каì $\gamma^{\prime} \rho$, see note on v. 12. No attempt must be made to connect кai with $\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ (our God also, or even our God, as though in contrast with the God of the Israelites). This would be a thoroughly unscriptural and heterodox conception. The кai belongs to the sentence, which is a quotation from Deut. iv. 24, ö́t Kúpoos ó @lés aov $\pi \hat{i} \rho$
 Also ix. 3. A comparison of the two passages in Deuteronomy gives the two aspects of the figure of fire in application
to God. The first is a warning against trifing with Him. The second is a promise of protection against foes. The fire which consumes evil is also a 'fire of love.' 'Keep far our foes... Where Thou art guide, no ill can come.'
 $\mu \in \nu \in ́ \tau \omega]$ The chapter opens with separate precepts of Cbristian living. But it soon passes into the grand subject of the Epistle: the law in all its parts is a $\sigma$ кıà $\tau \omega ิ \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o ́ v \tau \omega \nu, \tau o ̀ ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \quad \tau o v$ $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \sigma \hat{v}$.
$\dot{\eta} \phi$.] The article makes it $\phi \downarrow \lambda a \delta \in \lambda \phi_{i}{ }^{2}$ universal. So in verse $2, \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \phi \ell \lambda o \xi \in v i a s$. Com-





 of $\phi$ ida $\delta \subset \lambda \phi$ ia is only named (elsewhere) by St Paul and St Peter, though St John is full of it in the equivalent form of
 the passage quoted above from 2 Pet. i. 7, $\phi$ i $\alpha, \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi i ́ a$ is distinguished from ayaitr, the former being the love of Christians, the latter the love of mankind. (The word $\phi<\lambda$ ád $\dot{\epsilon} \phi$ os occurs in
 $\xi \epsilon \nu i \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon s \dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \in \lambda o v s . \quad \mu \mu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu i \omega \nu \quad 3$

the Septuagint, 2 Macc. xv. 14)
$\mu \in у \in ́ t \omega]$ - See notes on x. 34 ( $\mu$ '́vovorav) and xii. 27 ( $\mu$ évp).
2. $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ фidoģєvias] Love of strangers. The word hospitality has sunk from its Scripture level. Rom. xii. 13 , т ${ }^{2} \nu \quad \phi_{\nu} \lambda_{0-}$ $\xi \in v i a v$ סúкovtes (as though a difficult grace; see note on xii.
14). Also $\phi \quad \lambda$ ógevos, as one of the characteristic epithets of the presbyter ( $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma к о \pi о \varsigma), ~ s t a n d-~$ ing between кóбрцоs and $\delta \iota \delta a \kappa-$ тькós, in I Tim. iii. 2 (compare Tit. i. 8); and as a universal Christian virtue, in 1 Pet. iv.
 زo $\gamma \gamma v \sigma \mu o v \hat{\text {. }}$. See also Matt. xxv.


 фoùs каì tov̂to $\xi \in \neq v o v s$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \lambda a \nu \theta \dot{a} v \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon]$ Also verse 16, and vi. ro. The word occurs only eight times in the New Testament, but about 120 times in the Septuagint. It seems to be followed (indifferently) by a genitive or an accusative ; sometimes by $\boldsymbol{o ̈} \tau \mathrm{t}$, an infinitive, or even a nominative participle.
${ }_{\epsilon}^{2} \lambda_{\alpha} \theta \dot{\sigma}^{\prime} \nu \quad \tau$. $\left.\xi \in v i \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon s\right]$ This (classical) idiom occurs only here in the New Testament. There is one approach to it in the Septuagint, Wisd. i. 8.

Escaped (their own) notice in having entertained. Found afterwards that they had unwittingly entertained. The reference is to the Old Testament history, Gen. xviii. 3. xix. 2. Jud. vi. ı8, 22. xiii. 15,16 .
3. $\left.\mu \mu \nu \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon\right]$ See note on ii. $6, \mu \mu \nu \eta \sigma \sigma \eta$.
$\left.\mu . \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \mu^{\prime} \omega \nu\right]$ Matt. xxv.
 тро́s $\mu \epsilon$. Col. iv. 18, $\mu \nu \eta \mu \sigma-$ $\nu \epsilon$ и́єтє́ $\mu \nu v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta є \sigma \mu \omega \nu$. See also notes on x . 34 , каì $\gamma$ àp тоîs $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu i o t s ~ \sigma \nu v \epsilon \pi a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma a \tau \epsilon$.
ws... $\left.\omega^{\prime} \mathrm{s}\right]$ The former ws is as if, the latter as. The former prescribes an effort of feeling, the latter the recognition of a fact.
$\sigma v \nu \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \in \circ$ ] The verb occurs only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint, it generally means (like oivd $\sigma \sigma \mu$ ) to fetter, as in Exod. xiv. 25,

 proach to the figurative sense here is in I Sam. xviii. I, каi
 $\psi v \chi \hat{n} \Delta a v i ́ \delta$.

т $\hat{\nu}$ как.] There is no connecting particle, in order to give the idea of in other words, or that is to say; though in fact the scope of the clanse is wider than that of the preceding.



 xi. 37 (какоихоінєขои) and хі. 25

övтes èv $\sigma \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \tau \tau]$ See 2 Cor.

 ह̇ктòs тov̂ $\sigma$ ẃmatos. The phrase is equivalent to $\dot{i} v \sigma a p \kappa i, 2$ Cor.

 t̀v $\sigma$ арќ.
4. rielos] The passage resembles, in its disjointed and fragmentary construction, Rom. xii. 9 , \&c. For $\tau i \mu \operatorname{ses}$, in the sense not of valuable or precious (which is the commoner of the two), but of honourable, held inc honour, see Acts v. 34, tímos $\pi a v \tau i \tau \hat{\omega} \lambda \alpha, \underline{\varphi}$.
т. ó रáuos] Understand not
 ably) in verse 5 , and in Rom.
 $\gamma^{\mathrm{a}} \rho$ (instead of $\delta \hat{\xi}$ ) of the revised text makes this certain.
${ }_{\delta}$ yápos] Only here in the sense of the ordinance of marriage. Elsewhere in the New Testament it always means either a particular narriage (as John ii. 1), or the feast celebrating it (Matt. xxii. 8).
iv $\bar{\pi} \alpha \sigma v]$ Either ( I ) in all respects (as in verse 18 , $\hat{\nu} \nu \pi a \sigma \iota v$
 Phil. iv. 12 , ìv $\pi$ avì̀ каì év


 ii. 9) ; or (2) amongst or in the judgment or estimation of all men (as in 2 Cor. xi. 6 , where iv mavri occurs in the same clause, and not, as in Phil. iv. ${ }^{2} 2$, in combination with it).
 For ${ }^{2} \mu$ iavтos, see note on vii. 26.
 Compare Ron. xii. $9, \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta$
 кодла́нєขоє к.т.д. For àфıда́pyvoos, see 1 Tim. iii. 3 (only). We have фidápropos (as descriptive of the Pharisees) in Luke xvi. 14, and (as characteristic of the ка. $\rho 0 i=\chi^{a \lambda \epsilon \pi o i)}$ in 2 Tim. iii. 2. Also фidapरурía (as a píla $\pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ т̂̀v какйr) in I Tim. vi. ro. And $\phi$ i $\lambda$ apprpeiv in 2 Macc. x. 20. Between фidaprvpía and $\pi \lambda \epsilon-$ $\nu \epsilon \xi \in i a$ the obvious difference is that between avarice and covetousness, bnt фi入apyopia may include both.

о тоо́тог] Again understand Ë $\sigma \tau \omega$. Let your disposition be unavaricious. The word тро́тos (turn) has various applications, of which (1) the commonest is manner or fashion, as òv $\tau \rho \circ \dot{\pi} \pi$ (Matt. xxiii, 37. Luke xiii.


34. Acts i. ir. vii. 28 . 2 Tim. iii. 8), ка $\theta^{\circ}$ əे $v$ тоóтои (Acts xv. 11. xxvii. 25), тауті тро́тш (Phil. i. 18), év таvт̀̀ тро́тф (2 Thess. iii. 16), катà тávтa
 т оо́тог тои́тoı (Jude 7); and (2) the rarest (in Scripture), disposition or character, here only in the New Testament; and in the Septuagint, 2 Macc. v. 22,



 toùs 'Iovodaíous.
d.ркои́ $\mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{v o l}]$ The clauses are loosely strung together, just as in the passage above quoted from Rom. xii., and in I Pet. iii. 8, dc. But the precept of contentment is closely connected with that of unavariciousness. In the active voice, $\dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \epsilon i v$ is to suffice, to be sufficient. So in Matt. xxv. 9. John vi. 7. xiv. 8. 2 Cor. xii. 9, др $\rho \kappa \in \hat{\imath} \sigma 0 \iota \dot{\eta}$ Xápes $\mu o v$. And this is its almost invariable use in the Septuagint. Exod. xii. 4, ধैкааттоs
 22. 1 Kings viii. 27 , $\mathfrak{\epsilon i} \dot{\delta}$ où pavòs каì ó oưpavòs тoû oủpavồ оэкк дркє́тоиのі боє к.т. $\lambda$. Prov. xxx. 16, каì v゙ $\delta \omega \rho$ каi $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ ov̉ $\mu \grave{\eta}$
 (middle or passive) is to be contented or satisfied with (followed
by a dative, with or without $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i)$. Thus here, and Luke iii.
 1 Tim. vi. 8, тои́тот $\mathfrak{a} \rho \kappa \in \sigma \theta \eta-$ бо́ $\epsilon \theta$. 3 John ıо, каî $\mu \grave{\eta}$ di $\rho$ -
 in 2 Macc. v. 15 , оик ајркєо $\theta \epsilon$ іs §è тoútols.
roîs $\pi a \rho o \hat{v} \sigma \iota v$ ] Compare Phil. iv. II, I2, ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma^{\omega} \gamma^{\text {àp }}{ }_{c}^{c} \mu \mathrm{a} \theta o v$

aúròs रáp] $^{\circ}$ For He (God) Himself has said. The passage referred to is Deut. xxxi. 5,


 $\dot{v} \mu \omega \hat{\omega}$, ov̉ $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu \hat{\eta}$ oviơ ov่ $\mu \dot{\eta}$
 Gen. xxviii. ${ }^{15}$, ö $\tau \iota$ ov̉ $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$



 о́ұораí $\sigma \epsilon$. I Chron. xxviii. 2o,

 of these is so close to the words before us as the first quoted.
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \bar{\omega}]$ Forms of ávívai occurmore than 30 times in the Septuagint, but only four times (in all) in the New Testament. Acts xvi. $26, \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega v$ тà $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \grave{\alpha}$


 е $\gamma к а т а \lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, see note on x. 25 .



6. $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \ldots \lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \epsilon \nu]$ So that we say (not may say). The tense implies, It is our habitual language.

Eappov̂vтas] With confidence or good courage. Elsewhere, in the New Testament $\begin{gathered}\text { appeiv oc- }\end{gathered}$ curs only in 2 Cor. v. 6, 8, vii. 16. x. 1, 2. In the Septua-

 The form $\theta$ apotiv appears to be used only in the imperative ( $\theta$ áp $\rho \epsilon \epsilon, \hat{\theta} a \rho \sigma \epsilon \hat{\tau} \tau \epsilon$ ) in the Septuagint and New Testament, except in Prov. xxxi. in.

Kúpoos]. Psalm exviii. 6. The insertion or omission of кai before ov (both here and in the Septuagint) is a doubtful point, and quite immaterial. Also the punctuation. The Revised Version places a colon after $\phi о \beta \eta \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma о \mu a$. The Authorized made no stop before $\tau i ́ \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.

тí тои dative after motêv is strictly not to but for (in relation to). What shall a tuman being do for my hurt? Compare Matt.
 к.т.A.) with Matt. xxv. 40 ( ${ }^{6} \phi^{\prime}$

 note on ii. 6, ä̉v $\theta$ pwas...viós $\dot{\alpha} v \theta \rho \dot{\sim} \pi о v$.
7. Mvŋиоvє́́єтє] See note
 The tense says, Have in constant remembrance.
 leaders, as in verses 17 and 24. The context here shows that the reference is to departed leaders. Those who did lead you. There is some doubt as to the special reference. It would be sufficient to point to the martyrdoms of the pastors of the Church of Jerusalem in the persons of St Stephen and St James the Apostle, and of others who fell in early times of persecution. But it is far more probable that there is a peculiar allusion here to a recent event (which may itself help to date the Epistle), the martyrdom of St James 'the Lord's brother,' the resident head and president of the congregations of the mother Church of Jerusalem. For this use of $\dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \varepsilon \sigma \theta a c$ (either absolute, or with a genitive, or with $\overline{\epsilon \pi} i$ tuvos or tuvá), to lead or guide, and (in that sense) to rule, see

 tòv $\lambda$ aóv $\mu$ ov. (The quotation is from Mie. v. 2, where, however, ${ }^{*}$ rov́ $\mu \epsilon v o s$ does not appear in the Vatican manuscript, and


is bracketed in Field's Alexandrine.) Luke xxii. 26, каi o



 גórov (who led the word or
 $\mu \epsilon ́ v o v s ~ \grave{\epsilon} v$ toîs $\mathfrak{a} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi$ oís. Also in the Septuagint, Gen. xlix.

 Deut. i. $1_{5}$, каì кат $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a$ aviтov̀s $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \dot{\epsilon} \phi '$ vi $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. Esth.

oitcves] Whoever. Any who. See notes on ii. 3. \&c.
é $\lambda a ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha \nu]$ The aorist sums up the ministry spoken of into one past act.
én. $\operatorname{\tau òv}$ 入. тô̂ $()$.$] The exact$ phrase (among many equivalents) occurs in Acts iv. 31. xiii. 46. xvi. 32 (margin of re-. vised text).
 viewing the issue (exit) of their manner of life, imitate their faith. The death they died is described as the result or issue of the particular life they lived (avarтpoфí, not $\beta$ ios ). Having lived as they did, they (naturally and consequently) died as they did. Study those deaths. See in them the product of those lives. (г) For àva $\theta \omega \rho \in i v$, to contemplate analytically (ab imo ad
summum), to study attentively, see Acts xvii. 23, סєєрхо́ $\mu \boldsymbol{\operatorname { c o s }}$ $\gamma_{\dot{a}} \rho$ каі̀ $\dot{\alpha} v a \theta \epsilon \omega \rho \omega \hat{v} \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \beta \dot{\beta} \sigma \mu a \tau \alpha$
 egress or way out, see 1 Cor. $\mathbf{x}$.

 able and appropriate way of escape). Compare Wisd. ii. I7,
 каі $\pi є \iota \rho а ́ \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ тà द̀ $\nu \quad$ є̀к $\beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ avirov. (The word ${ }^{n} \xi$ odos is used in the same general sense in

 $\sigma a \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu . \quad 2$ Pet. i. $15, \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$
 manner of life, life in movement. (so suitable in combination with ё́gooos, life's departing movement), see its three uses by St Paul (Gal. i. 13, $\tau \grave{\eta} \boldsymbol{v} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta_{\eta} \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \eta_{\nu} \tau \pi \sigma \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$ ’I. Eph. iv. 22. I Tim. iv. 12), and its eight uses by St Peter (I Pet. i. 15,18 . ii. 12 . iii. $I, 2,16$. 2 Pet. ii. 7. iii. (I). Also James iii. 13. See note on $x$.

$\mu \mu \epsilon \hat{i} \theta \theta \epsilon]$ Imitate. Copy. The follow of the Authorized Version is the rendering of another word, and represents a different figure. Imitate is not a pleasing word, and imitation is not an attractive idea, but it is classical Euglish, and takes a new association in its Scriptural

##  <br> 

use. See note on vi. 12, $\mu_{i}$. $\mu \eta \tau a i ́$.
 sentence, with an aspect behind and before. (1) Jesus Christ, who strengthened your departed pastors to live and to die, is the same also for you. Imitate their faith. (2) Jesus Christ is not Yea and Nay (2 Cor. i. 19). He changes not. Be not carried astray by novel and shifting doctrines. The ambiguous rendering of ${ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \beta \alpha \sigma \tau \nu$ in the Authorized Version (end) in verse 7, and the strange omission of the verb is in this verse, led to an entirely mistaken interpretation (as though Éx $\beta$ acov had been rédos, and Jesus Christ were in apposition with it as in Rom. x. 4), and by degrees to an alteration of the full stop into a colon at the end of the 7 th verse.
 Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day, and for ever. The notes of time are two, not (as in the Authorized Version) three. (1) The same to-day as yesterday: (2) the same for ever. (1) The same at this day as in the 'yesterday' of your departed $\dot{\eta} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\sim}$-(2) the same in the longest future of time and eternity. Therefore (1) trust as they trusted. Therefore (2) hold
fast the faith once for all delivered.
 trast with 'the changes and chances of mortal life': Ecclus.
 $\sigma \eta^{\prime} \mu \in \rho \sigma$. The reading of the received text is $\chi^{\theta}{ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \mathrm{s}$ in each of the three places where the revised text has ${ }_{\epsilon} \chi \theta$ '́s (here, and John iv. 52, and Acts vii. 28). In the Septuagint the two forms are found indiseriminately, and most often in the com-
 $\tau \eta \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho a v^{\prime}$, heretofore or beforetime.
$o^{o}$ aứcós] See i. I2 (from Psalm cii. 28), đù ס̀́ ó aữòs ct,




кai $\epsilon$ is tò̀s aiêvas] Added with something of that love of completing which we notice in such passages as I Cor. iii. 23 and xi. 3. As regards the foregoing context, the thought was complete without this clause, but it lays the foundation for the charge which follows.
9. $\delta_{1} \delta \alpha \chi^{2} \hat{i}$ ] The warning is evidently directed primarily against Judaizing errors. The unchangeablenessof JesusChrist in His evangelical teaching is the point now in view. Of $\delta$ $\delta a \chi \eta$ in the plural this is the


only instance. But we have $\delta_{\iota} \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda i ́ a \iota$ (from Isai. xxix. 13) in Matt. xv. 9. Mark vii. 7. Col. ii. 22. Also in I Tim. iv. r. In the Septuagint, $\delta t-$ $\delta a \times \dot{\eta}$ is only found in the title of Psalm lx. In the New Testament, it is used by all the sacred writers except St James, St Peter, and St Jude. St Paul alone uses $\delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda i ́ a$ (specially in the Pastoral Epistles), with the exception of the above quotation from Isaiah in the first two Gospels.

токкíגacs] See note on ii. 4. The first meaning of nol-
 xxxvii. 3) well suits the patchwork effect of grafting Judaism upon the Gospel.
gévous] See note on xi. 13. The foreign speech of Judaism is added by this word to the motley garb ( $\pi о г \kappa i \lambda \alpha \iota s)$.

тараф́кєєб $\theta \epsilon]$ The received text had $\pi \epsilon \rho t \phi \in \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, as $\pi \epsilon \rho t-$ $\phi \epsilon \rho o ́ \mu \epsilon v a c$ in Jude 12 . The difference is that between carried about and carried astray (properly, by the side of instead of in the right course). The form $\pi \epsilon \rho \not ф \epsilon \in \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (in such an application) survives only in Eph. iv. 14).

кadòv үáp] The right food for the heart's health is $\chi$ ápıs, not $\beta$ ро́ната. Distinctions of clean and unclean, lawful and
forbidden, in matters of eating and drinking, are utterly beside the mark of spiritual profiting. It is our Lord's argument in Mark vii. 15, 18, I9 (where the revised text reads кaөapíl $\omega \nu$, 'This He said, making all meats clean'). As no ßрюึиа can defile, so can no $\beta \rho \omega \mu a$ edify. For кадòv in this use (without $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i v$ ) see Rom. xiv, 21. I Cor. vii. r, 8, 26. ix. 15. Gal. iv. 18.
$\left.\chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau \tau\right]$ See notes on ii. 9 ( $\chi^{\prime} \rho \iota \tau \iota \Theta \epsilon \sigma \hat{v}$ ) and xii. 28 ( $\epsilon^{\prime} \chi^{\omega-}$ $\chi_{\mu \nu} \chi^{\alpha} \rho(v)$. Divine favour, which is the first thought in xápıs, passes on into the exercise and manifestation of it in divine influence.
$\beta \in \beta a \iota o \bar{\sigma} \sigma \theta a i]$ Should be made firm and stedfast. See 1 Cor.


 тòv...@єós. Col. ii. 7, каi $\beta \epsilon-$

 $\left.\beta a t \omega^{\prime} \theta \eta\right)$ and vi. if ( $\beta \epsilon \beta$ aiwetv).

тìv кapoíav] See note on iii 8, т ${ }^{\text {às }} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \alpha \rho \delta \dot{\prime} \alpha$ s.
ov $\beta \rho \omega \dot{\mu} \mu a \sigma \iota v$ ] There is disparagement in the tone. Not by such things as $\beta$ рш́ $\mu a \tau a$. Compare Rom. xiv. 15, 20, ei




 xiii. g. Or $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \alpha \tau \mathfrak{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon$.
 Cor. vi. 13, тà $\beta$ ро́ната тй кои-

 $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$. viii. $8,13, \beta \rho \omega \mu \alpha$

 $\mu \epsilon \theta a$, ойтє $\epsilon \mathfrak{\epsilon} \dot{\nu} \nu$ фа́ $\gamma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \quad \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma-$


$\beta \rho \omega \mu \alpha \sigma \nu$ ] See note on ix. 10, $\beta \rho \epsilon^{\prime} \mu а \sigma \tau v$.

モ̇V oís к.т.入.] In which ( $\beta$ pú$\mu a \sigma(v)$ they who were wont to walk were not benefited. The revised text has $\pi \epsilon \rho!\pi a t o v ̂ v \tau \epsilon$ (instead of $\pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \pi \alpha \tau \eta{ }_{\sigma} \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ ), with the effect expressed in the above rendering (were wont to). Evidently the reference is to the niceties of the Rabbinical system in reference to ceremonial matters. (See Matt. xxiii. throughout.) For $\pi \in \rho-$ mateiv év, to walk about in, to have one's daily life contained in and circumscribed by, to have for one's whole occupation and interest, see Eph. ii. 2, èv ais $\pi о \tau \grave{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \pi а \tau \eta ́ \sigma a \tau \epsilon ~ к а т а ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\nu}$
 iii. 7, द̉ oís каi vícís $\pi \in \rho \iota \in \pi \alpha-$
 tols.
 benefited in a real and spiritual sense. The aorist throws the whole Rabbinical system into
the past, as a thing exploded and abolished. See notes on
 $\lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ) and vii. 18 ( ${ }^{\prime} \nu \omega \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon^{\prime}$ ). Compare Matt. xvi. 26 , тí $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{a} p}$
 Mark viii. 36 . Luke ix. 25.



 $\lambda o v ̄ \mu z t$ xiv. 6. Gal. v. 2 , $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} v$
 $\omega ф є \lambda \dot{\gamma} \sigma \epsilon$.
 playing with Judaism implies a mistrust of the sufficiency of the Gospel. The whole law of ceremony and ritual centred in its altar of sacrifice. It was that which gave point and meaning to the system. Now that altar is ours, as Christians, not in type but in antitype. Ours, to the exclusion of all who cling to the shadow when the substance is come. Ours, to the exclusion of the very priests of the old order. And of that exclusion we have a type in the burning without the camp of the bodies of the two victims on the day of Atonement. The priests had no share whatever in those victims. And that no feature of that typical ritual might be left unfulfflled, Jesus suffered outiside the gate of Jeru-


salem. There, outside of Judaism, let us seek Him.
10. $\left.{ }_{\chi} \neq \rho \mu \tau\right]$ The stress of the sentence lies on this word. We have, and need not seek.

Өvaıaбтíptov] This $\theta v \sigma t a \sigma-$ typoor, in accordance with the whole argument of the Epistle, is evidently the reality typified by the brazen altar; that is, the one availing sacrifice of Jesus Christ. To have this antitypical altar is to possess the atone-ment-so as to be able to obey the charge of $\mathrm{x} .19-22$.
' $\xi$ ỗ фayєiv] I Cor. ix. I3,

 ourtv ; x. I8. See Exod. xxix. 28. Lev. vii. 6, 34. x. 1215. Num. xviii. 9, \&cc.
ésovaiav] This word, so frequent elsewhere in Scripture, occurs here only in this Epistle. (r) Formed from ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \xi \in \epsilon \sigma \tau \nu$ ( $\epsilon$ Góv), its proper idea is that of lawful power (whether original or delegated), authority, right, \&c.; and it is thus distinguished from Sívapes, ioxús, крáтos, \&c. (see note on ii. 14, крáros). For example, Matt. vii. $29, \vec{\eta} v$



 áфtépat á $\mu$ ртías. ix. 8. x. 1 ,

 тoiạ ésovaía tav̂тa moctîs; кaì
 $\tau \eta \nu ; \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. xxviii. $18, \dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\delta} \theta \eta \mu \circ \iota$

 av̉roîs égovaíav тéкга అєov̂ $\gamma є-$

 xvii. 2. xix. 10, II. Acts viii. 19. ix. 14. Rom. ix. 2r. I Cor. ix. 4, 5, 6, 12, 18.2 Cor. x. $8, \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{i} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \dot{\epsilon} \xi$ ovaías $\hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{\eta}_{\mathrm{V}}$ éouкєv ó Kúplos к.т. $\lambda .2$ Thess. iii. 9. Rev. ii. 26. \&c. \&c. From the abstract it passes (like ${ }^{\alpha} \rho \chi \chi$, or like the English word authority) into the concrete, as in Rom. xiii. $1, \pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma a$
 $\tau а \sigma \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \omega$. Eph. iii. 1о. Tit. iii. . (2) Even when '̇govaia parts with its primary idea of legitimate power, it retains that of constituted (even if usurped) dominion, and is thus applied to the empire of evil in the spiritual world. Thus in Acts
 талâ. Eph. ї. 2, ката̀ ті̀v ăp$\chi^{\text {оута }} \tau \overline{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{s}$ देधovaias (government, empire) tồ à́pos. Col. i. 13,
 And (in the concrete) Eph. vi.

 нокоа́тораs той ако́тоvs тои́точ. Col. ii. 15 .


oi $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \kappa \eta \nu \hat{\eta} \lambda$.] The Levitical priests. The very priests of the old order. It needs not then to say, the people. See

 (and notes there).

Ir. $\dot{\omega v} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho]$ An exclusion (see note on verses ro-13) typified by the law itself, which withheld (for example) from the priests all share in the carcases of the two sin-offerings of the day of Atonement.

єírфє́ $\rho \epsilon \tau a \iota$ ] Lev. xvi. I2,
 кататєєа́братоя...каì ойбє! [àmò]
 к.т. $\lambda$.
$\pi \in \rho i$ ¿ $\mu$ аратías] See note on v. $3, \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{1}, . \pi \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\ldots} \ldots \pi \epsilon \rho$ í.
 viii. $2, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{2} \gamma^{\prime} \omega \bar{\sigma}$.
$\delta \iota a ̀$ rov̂ à $\rho_{\chi}$.] The preposition might have been vimó, but סia marks more strongly the ministerial character of the act. тои́т $\omega v$ тà $\left.\sigma \omega^{\prime} \mu a \tau \alpha\right]$ Lev. xvi. 2.7, каì то̀v $\mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \chi o v ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~$ ті̀s ápapтías каì тòv хí $\mu a p o v$ тòv


 $\pi а \rho є \mu \beta о \lambda \hat{\eta}$, каі катакаи́боубьข

$\left.\pi а \rho \epsilon \mu \beta \lambda_{i} ;\right]$ The scene is laid in the wilderness: the
phrase is varied afterwards into ${ }^{\epsilon} \xi \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \pi \dot{u} \lambda \eta \mathrm{~s}$, and then resumed on reaching the application. For $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \mu \beta$ о ${ }^{\prime}$, see note on xi. $34, \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \mu \beta$ о ${ }^{2}$ ás.
12. Só] Wherefore. Seeing that this is one feature of the Levitical ritual, demanding fulfilment (like the rest) in Christ the antitype of all.

каì 'I. Jesus also. The antitype like the type.
iva áycáo $\eta\rceil$ Doss this clause depend (r) only upon ${ }^{\prime} \pi a \theta \in v$, or (2) upon the whole phrase ${ }^{\prime \prime} \xi(\omega$
 sense is, He suffered ĩva ajuían к.т.д., and with this porticular point of characterization, name-
 If (2), That His work of sanetifying might be effectual, as lacking no one point of fulfilment of the type, He suffered ${ }^{\epsilon} \xi \omega$ Tiेs $\pi \dot{v} \lambda \eta s$. The question is somewhat like that on John xix. 28 , whether the clause iva $\tau \epsilon$ $\lambda \epsilon \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \hat{\eta}$ र $\quad$ рафи́ depends upon the $\bar{\eta} \dot{\delta} \eta \eta \pi \alpha \dot{\sigma} \tau a \quad \tau \in \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \tau a l$ before it or upon the $\lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \epsilon \Delta{ }^{\prime} \hat{\omega}$ after it ; whether, that is, the fulfilment of Scripture is spoken of as the object of the $\pi \alpha, v \tau a$, or of the special particular of the thirst. It is difficult (in either case) to answer it.
ajucion? It was the object



of the Levitical day of atonement áysá̧єtv qòv 入aóv. The word $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{\operatorname{con}}\} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{v}$ occurs in the directions for the ceremonial of that day (Lev. xvi.) only in verse 19, ка仓̀ каबарıє̂́ aưtó (the

 But the sense of aycajcu lies in the phrase which is used in verse 17 , каi $\dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \in \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha l . . . \pi \epsilon \rho i$
 That which was there done in type (1) by the blood of animal victims (2) for the national Israel, Jesus did effectually (1) by His own blood (2) for the greater Israel, of every kindred and tongue and people and nation (Rev. v. 9). For áy ${ }^{\text {a }}$ -

 exact thought in áycáap seems to be that of a consecration effected by the removal of guilt by an availing atonement. So that the best reference will be to the ajuáfec of ix. I3, where see the note.

тòv $\lambda a o ̛ v]$ See note on ii. 17, זoû $\lambda$ aoù.
 text of John xix. 20 stands in


 leaving room (at least) for the
marginal rendering of the Revised Version. In such a matter as the place of crucifixion the writer and the readers of an Epistle to the Hebrews written certainly within 40 years of the event may be trusted to have known the truth.
$\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \theta \in v]$ Suffered. For this phrase for a death by violence,
 גáкıs $\pi a \theta \in i ̄ v$. Also Luke xxii. I5, $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \mu \epsilon \pi \alpha \theta \epsilon i ̂ v . ~ x x i v . ~$ 46. Acts i. 3, $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ тò $\pi \alpha \theta \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\nu}$ av̉rớv. iii. 18, $\pi a \theta \epsilon i v ~ \tau \grave{o v} \mathrm{X}$ Хıotóv. xvii. 3. I Pet. ii. 2I. iv. 1 ,
 $\pi а \theta \omega े \nu ~ \sigma а \rho к i ́ ~ к . т . \lambda . ~$
13. тoivvv $\left.{ }^{\xi} \xi \in \rho \chi^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a\right]$ Christ is here, on llis cross, outcast from the camp of Judaism: let us come forth to Him, leaving Judaism behind.
roivur] The place of noivev as the first word in a sentence is unclassical, but the revised text gives another example of it in Luke xx. 25, Toivev a a $\boldsymbol{c}^{\prime}$ Sotє tà Kaífapos Kaíapl. It stands in its proper place in
 $\tau \rho \epsilon ́ \chi \omega$ к.т. $\lambda$.
${ }_{\dot{\epsilon} \xi} \xi \in \rho \chi{ }^{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega} \mu \in \theta$ ] See note on xi. 8, тov̂ ${ }^{\epsilon} p \nmid \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \tau \mathrm{a}$. The call is not to go but to come: the voice is from the cross.



xiii, 15. Or omit oûv.
Tòv $\dot{0} v \epsilon \iota \delta \iota \sigma \mu \grave{\partial} v$ av̉rov̂] See xxiv. 25. Rom. v. 14. viii. note on xi. 26 , $\quad \dot{\partial} \nu \quad \dot{\partial} \nu \epsilon i \delta t \sigma \mu \dot{\partial} \nu$ тô̂ $\mathrm{X} \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\mathrm{v}}$, and the passages there quoted.
$\phi$ ф́роитєs] Compare Luke

 'I $\eta \sigma o v$.
14. out raj] Reason for consenting to the call of verse 13. Reconciling ourselves to a present expatriation by the thought of the not les that is to be. Compare xi. 9, 10, 13-16. $\left.{ }^{\oplus} \delta \epsilon\right]$ Here on earth. For the word, see note on vii. 8. Notice (for the sense here) ${ }_{1}$ Cor. iv. 2 (revised text), 玉̄ठ $\lambda_{o \iota \pi \grave{v} v} \zeta_{\eta \tau \epsilon і т а \ell ~ к . \tau . ~}^{\text {. }}$.
$\mu$ е́vovбау] See x. 34, креі́бnova v̈rapgıv каï $\mu$ évov adv. Also xii. 27. And notes.
$\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu]$ See notes on xi. го, 16.

ті̀v $\mu$ é $\lambda \lambda o v \sigma \alpha v]$ That city which is to be. See xi. 10, 16 ,
 ...ท่тоipacev $\gamma$ àp av̀rô̂s móder. For $\mu \in \lambda \lambda_{\epsilon} \cdot v$ without an infinilive following (a classical use),

 ix. II, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ aa $\gamma a \theta \hat{\omega} v$. x. I. xi, 20 . Also Matt. iii. 7. xii. 32. Luke iii. 7. Acts
38. 1 Cor. iii. 22. Eph. i. 21. Col. ii. 17. I Tim. iv. 8, $\xi^{2} \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$



 sacrifices now are not carnal. Praise and thanksgiving, boneficence and almsgiving, these are now the accepted offerings-and all through Him.
àva申́ $\rho \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] For àvaфє́ $\rho \epsilon \iota$, see vii. 27. ix. 28. Also note on v. $\mathbf{I}, \pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho^{\prime} \eta$.
$\theta$ טóáa aiv́́ $\sigma \epsilon \omega s$ ] This was the name in the Levitical ritual for that particular form of the peace-affering which was offered as a thanksgiving. Lev. vii. II ( і B), \&c., ỡtos or vópos $\theta$ vaías


 äprovs. 2 Chron. xxix. er, кац

 Kupiou. It was already interprated in its spiritual sense in the Old Testament. Psalm 1.

 Ovoiar aivé $\sigma \epsilon \omega$, каi $\vec{\epsilon} \in a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{\alpha}-$
 $\lambda \iota a ́ \sigma \epsilon L$. Jer. xvii. 26 , каi $\bar{\eta} \xi$ оvбıv


 $\rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \varepsilon і т а \iota ~ o ́ ~ Ө \epsilon o ́ s . ~$
 олокаขтш́дата каї өvбíav (-ías B)
 piov. The word aivects occurs only here in the New Testament.

סcà $\pi$ artós] See ix. 6, and note there.

карто̀v Хєс入є́шv] Produce of the lips. Praise and thanks. giving. Isai. lvii. 19 (omit B), $\kappa \tau i ́ \zeta \omega \nu$ картòv $\chi \epsilon \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega v . ~ Н о в . ~$
 $\chi^{\epsilon \iota} \lambda_{\epsilon} \omega \nu$.
ó $\mu \mathrm{o} \mathrm{\lambda}$ обои́vтшv] Making acknowledgment to. See note on iii. г, оцодоүías.
 name. To Him as that which He is, in person, character, work, dec. See note on i. 4, oैvoua.
 sacrifice of praise must be accompanied by the sacrifice of charity.

єитоוias $\rceil$ Only here in Scripture. Lucian is quoted for it, and Aristotle for єỹoıทтькós. For є (only): more frequent in the Septuagint.

котшшvías] Like кошшveī (see note on ii. 14, кєкоьүш́v $\eta \kappa \in \nu$ ), кotvovia, of which the primary idea is that of going shares with
another in something, divides into the two senses of (1) partaking and (z) imparting. Examples of ( I ) are found in I Cor. i. 9 (tô̂ viồ avizoû). $\mathbf{x}$.
 2 Cor. viii. 4 ( $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ठtaкovías). xiii. 13 ( $\tau o \hat{v}$ áyiov $\pi v \in \mathfrak{i ́ \mu a r o s ) . ~}$ Phil. ii. 1 ( $\pi \nu \in \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau o s)$ iii. Io ( $\left.\pi \alpha \theta \eta \mu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \omega v\right)$. Philem. 6 ( $\tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma$ $\pi(\sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s)$. And to this head belong the instances of кowwvia as partnership, fellowship, communion, either absolutely, or with $\epsilon i s, \pi \rho$ ós, $^{\prime}$ or $\mu \in \tau$ á. Of (2), here, and in Rom. xv. 26,
 $\pi \tau \omega \chi$ oùs к. $\tau . \lambda \quad 2$ Cor. ix. $I_{3}$, каi $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda o ́ \tau \eta \tau \iota ~ т \eta \eta_{\mathrm{S}}$ коиขшvías єis aủtov̀s каi єis $\pi$ tàtas.
$\theta v \sigma i a t s]$ Thus under the Gospel we have the word $\theta v \sigma^{i} a$ and the idea of sucrifice appropriated to three main particulars. (I) The sacrifice of the body or living man: Rom. xii. 1, тарабт $\eta$ бац $\tau$ à $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau \alpha$ vi $\mu \hat{\omega} \psi$
 $\Theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega}$ к.т. $\lambda$. (2) The sacrifice of the separate acts of the life, whether of worship or conduct: I Pet. ii. 5, каіे aùroi... $\epsilon$ is iєpá-
 кàs $\theta$ valas єv̉л 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{0} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$. (3) The special


sacrifices of thanksgiving and almsgiving，expressly called $\theta_{v}$－ oriat here，as the former in Psalm 1．23，and the latter in Phil．iv． 18 ．

єи̇apєттєital］From єvápєб－ тos，acceptable，comes єjapєттєiv， to be acceptable to（ $\mathrm{ctvi}^{\prime}$ ，xi．5， 6，or èvótion or èvavtion tivós， 1＇salm exvi．9．Gen．xvii．1）， and here（only）in the passive， $\epsilon \dot{v} a \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \ell(\tau \tau v i)$ ，to be well pleased with．
 Trust and yield．Both are claimed for the $\dot{\eta} \gamma o \hat{o}_{\mu} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ vo．Can the work of the Church be done without both？
$\pi \in i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon]$ See，for example，



 $\lambda \in \gamma o \mu$ v́cos．
 verse 7．There the $\dot{\eta} \gamma \quad$ oú $\mu \in \boldsymbol{v}$ were in the past：their $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \\ \beta \text { aacts }\end{gathered}$ was a memory．Here，and in verse 24 ，they are the living pas－ tors of the Church or Churches addressed in the Epistle．
vícíкєтє］The word vintíкєiv （largely used in classical Greek） is found ouly here in the Greek Bible．It seems to express that yielding of the self－will to the judgment of another，which re－ cognizes constituted authority
even while it maintains per－ sonal independence．
avitoi yáp］Fior they on their part．The aviroi（always emphatic in the nominative） contrasts the toilsome and re－ sponsible work of the minister with the easier correlative duty of the people．See notes on $\alpha$ útó，i．Iг．iii．то．viii． 9.
ajpunvoṽov］From the clas－
 and v゙ $\pi v o s$ ），properly searching for sleep，and so sleepless，wake－ ful，comes the equally classical $a^{3} \gamma p v \pi \tau \in i$ r，to be sleepless，found in sceveral passages of the Sep－ tuagint and the New Testament． Thus Ezra viii．29，à $\gamma \rho \boldsymbol{\rho} \pi \nu \epsilon \bar{\tau} \epsilon$ каі $\tau \eta \rho \epsilon і ̈ \tau \epsilon$ Ё $\omega$ ¢ $\sigma \tau \hat{\tau} \tau \epsilon \kappa$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．Psalm

 cxxvii． I ，єis $\mu \dot{a} \tau \eta \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \gamma \rho u ́ \pi \nu \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ o ф фu入á $\sigma \sigma \omega v$ ．Prov．viii．34，


 xiii．33，$\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, à $\rho \gamma v \pi \nu \epsilon і т \epsilon$ ． Luke xxi． 36 ，á $\gamma \rho v \pi v \in i ́ \tau \epsilon ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \grave{\epsilon} v$


 They are wakeful for your souls． A graphic picture of the true pastor．

גóyov àтоঠ́cíбоขтєs］Matt．



 $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau o$.



גóyov tîs oikovopias gov. Acts xix. 40. Rom. xiv. 12, ёкаuтоs

 $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu \tau \hat{O}$ к.т. $\lambda$.
tra $\mu$. $\chi$.]. Depends upon $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \ldots \kappa a \dot{v} \dot{v} \pi \epsilon і ́ \kappa \epsilon \tau \epsilon$.

тойтo] That is, tò $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ od:Sóvat $\lambda$ ójov.
otєvóļovtes] With lamentation over lost souls. Isai. xlvi. 8, $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$ таи̂ $\alpha a$, каì $\sigma \tau \epsilon-$


$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \nu \sigma \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \in$ ] Only here in the Greek Bible. But $\lambda v \sigma \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \in \hat{\imath}$ in Luke xvii. $2, \lambda v \sigma \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} a v i \not \omega \hat{\imath}$ єi $\lambda i \theta_{\text {os к.т. }}$. And $\lambda v \sigma \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \eta_{j}^{\prime}$, $\lambda v \sigma \iota \tau \in ́ \lambda \epsilon i a, \lambda v \sigma \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i v$, in passages of the Apocrypha.
18. Пробє́хєє $\left.\theta \in \pi \epsilon \rho i \begin{array}{l}\eta \\ \mu \\ \omega \\ \nu\end{array}\right]$ The same request is made elsewhere Rom. xv. $30, \pi a \rho \alpha-$

 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ \Theta \epsilon o ́ v, ~ z ~ C o r . ~ i . ~ I I, ~$ бvทvточруойขт $\omega \nu$ каі̀ $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\nu} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho$ $\hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} v \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \in \hat{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ к.т.入. Eph. vi.

 Thess. iii. 1, тò $\lambda o \iota \pi o ̀ v ~ \pi \rho o \sigma-$
 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$.
$\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ It is often a doubtful question whether this use of the plural really includes others besides the writer. See, for instance, the and Epistle to the Corinthians, where the interchange of $I$ and we is too constant to be always significant (for example, chapters x . and xiii. throughout). And here, the plural $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \theta \theta^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ becomes the singular $\pi$ аракад $\omega$ in the next verse.
$\left.\pi \epsilon \theta \theta^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha \quad \gamma \alpha^{\prime} \rho\right] \quad I$ can ask your prayers, because I have no misgiving as to my own sincerity of purpose and consistency of life. Without this it would be hypocrisy to invite the intercession of others. The same thought is seen in two other passages. 2 Cor. i. I2 (following the request for the help of interces-

 $\delta \eta \quad \sigma \epsilon \omega$ й $\mu \mu \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. 1 John iii.

 $\tau \eta \rho \circ \hat{\nu} \mu \epsilon \quad$ к.т. $\lambda$. For $\pi \epsilon \theta \theta_{0}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ in the sense (nearly) of $\pi \epsilon \pi \sigma^{\prime}$ Oapev, see Acts xxyi. 26, , גay-日ávevy yà aúròv tovitav or̀ $\pi \epsilon$ é$\theta$ oual ovi $\theta$ ч́v.

 $\sigma \tau \alpha \theta \hat{\omega} \dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$.
 $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \pi o \imath \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \alpha$ т $\hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \quad \tau \grave{o} \nu \mu \in ́ \gamma \alpha \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$
$\left.\kappa \alpha \lambda \eta_{v}\right]$ We have кал $\eta$ with avveiongos only here. Elsewhere
 i. 5, 19. I Pet. iii. 16, 2I), ка甘apá (I Tim. iii. $9 . \quad 2$ Tim. i.

19. $\pi \epsilon \rho \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega$ ) For the word, see note on ii. I. Whether it here goes with mapa-
 certain and immaterial. This verse proves of itself ( I ) that there was no intended concealment of the authorship of the letter from its readers, and (2) that the writer stood in some established relation to them, at least of acquaintance and intercourse, if not of pastoral supervision.
 urtávac ( $\tau \iota$ or $\tau \tau v$ á $\tau \iota v$, or with
 Psalm xvi. 5, कv̀ єí ó àzoка-
 Mal. iv. 6, òs àжокатабтйбе
 \&c. Matt. xvii. it, 'H ${ }^{\prime}$ ias, $\mu \grave{v} v$
 Mark iii. 5, каi д̀ $\pi \epsilon к а т \epsilon \sigma \tau \dot{d} \theta \eta$ $\dot{\eta} \chi$ Хìp aùтой. viii. 25 , каі đітєкатє́ттך к.т.ג. de.


For this combination see also Rom. xv. 33. xvi, 20. 2 Cor.
 Phil. iv. 9. I Thess. v. 23. 2 Thess. iii. 16 (ó Kúpuos $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\left.\epsilon i p \dot{\eta} \eta \eta_{s}\right)$.
 $u p$ (not back). I Sam. ii. 6, Kúpıos Өаvaтoî каì Gшоүоуєi, ка$\tau \alpha \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \iota$ єis ädov ка̀̀ àváyєє. Rom. x. 7, тis катаß ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha l$ єis tìv
 éк veкри̂̀ àvayayeiv. The word
 the Old Testament to the Exodus from Egypt. See Gen. 1. 24. Lev. xi. 45 Num. xx. 4, 5 . Josh. xxiv. i 7 . Jer. xvi. 14. \&c.

тòv $\pi о \neq \mu \hat{\varphi} \nu \alpha \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \pi \rho o \beta \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu]$


 B) $\ldots o$ ó $a \gamma a \gamma \omega \nu \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \delta_{\epsilon} \xi t \hat{a}$ M $\omega v \sigma \hat{\eta} \nu$ к.т.ג. For the application of the figure to Christ, see Matt. xxvi. 3I (from Zech. xiii. 7),
 x. Ix, 14 , 1 Pet. ii. 25. тòv $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma a v]$ In contrast with Moses (Isai. lxiii. II, I2 above). So, in contrast with Aaron, iv. 14. X. 21 (where see note).

$$
\dot{\epsilon} v a i \mu a \tau \iota] \text { A closing refer- }
$$




xiii. 2 I. Or $\underset{\varepsilon}{\boldsymbol{v}} \dot{\boldsymbol{v} \mu \hat{\mu} \nu}$
ence to the entrance of the high priest into the holy of holies on the day of Atonement. For $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ aipart, as the protecting envelopement, the passport into the divine presence, see ix. 25. x. 19. Here first the blood which gives admission into the presence is spoken of as giving egress from death. The arrival in the heavenly presence for us in virtue of the atoning blood is here viewed in its start from the grave and from Paradise. It was in virtue of the availing sacrifice that Christ either left the tomb or reentered heaven.
aípaтı $\delta_{\iota a} \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ s] Compare note on ix. 20.
aicuiov] Now first made the epithet of $\delta \iota a \theta j \kappa \eta \eta$. We have had aicivos before as the epithet of $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i \alpha(\mathrm{v} .9$ ), of
 (ix. 15).

тòv ки́pıov $\eta^{\dagger} \mu \omega \hat{\omega}$ 'I $\left.\eta \sigma \sigma \nu \nu \nu\right]$ Added with solemn emphasis, to mark the abiding relationship to us of Him who inaugurated that relationship by death and resurrection.
21. катартібаи] See note on xi. 3 , катүртібөal.
$\left.\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \pi \alpha \nu \tau \dot{i} \dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\alpha} \theta \hat{\omega}\right] \quad$ In the
matter of (in point of) every good thing. Like Philem. 6, $\begin{gathered}\text { ev }\end{gathered}$
 The received text (with strong

 картофороиิvтєs к.т.д. See also 2 Thess. ii. 17, каì $\sigma$ трpikat èv


 iii. I $_{7}$. Tit. i. 16 . iii. I. The commonness of the phrase (with ${ }^{〔} \rho \gamma^{\omega}()$ may be somewhat against it here.

той $\sigma a l . . . \pi о \omega \hat{\omega}]$ To do His will, doing in us, \&c. The English ought to follow the Greek in marking the repetition of the word. The Authorized Version (followed here by the Revised) has to do His will, working in you, \&ec., just as in Phil. ii. I 3 ( $\dot{o}^{\dot{\epsilon}} \nu \in \rho \gamma \bar{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$
 has which worketh in you both to will and to do, \&c. (There the Revised Version has preserved the peculiarity of the Greek.)
$\pi o \iota \omega \nu$ ] An impossible reading, aú $\hat{\omega}$ before $\pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \hat{\omega} v$, is found in the Sinaitic and Alexandrine manuscripts. It is conjectured that it may be a corruption of
 єis toùs aiw $\nu a s{ }^{*} \alpha^{\prime} \mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu$.
aủtós (Itimself doing in us, \&e.).
$\left.{ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{e} v i \mu i v\right]$ This is the reading of the Sinaitic, $\dot{v} \mu \hat{i} \bar{y}$ of the Alexandrine. The greater difficulty of $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ (after $\dot{\tilde{x}} \mu \hat{\alpha} \mathrm{~s}$ above) may be in its favour.
 The phrase elsewhere has a simple dative (Rom. xii. i. xiv.
 v. 9. Eph. v. Io, єù́óeotov $\tau \hat{\omega}$ Kvpíc. Phil. iv. 18), or is followed by $\pi$ a $\rho a ́ ~ \tau \iota \nu \iota$ (Wisd. ix. 10), or stands absolutely (Rom. xii. 2. Tit. ii. 9).
 little doubtful whether these words belong to катартíбal $\mathfrak{v} \mu \hat{\mu} s$, or to rotêy, or to cúáfectov. The punctuation of the Revised (as well as of the Authorized) Version prechudes the third, and would suit either of the first two constructions. I incline to the last. It is through Jesus Christ that anything is єंख्विदєттov in the sight of God.
$\left.\stackrel{\oplus}{\dot{\varphi}} \dot{\eta} \delta \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\xi} a\right]$ Is the ascription to Christ, or to God? The former is the nearer, as also in Rom. xvi. 27 (if $\dot{\psi}$ is retained there) and I Pet. iv. If. In 2 Tim. iv. 18 the $\Phi$ refers to ${ }_{5}$ Kúpos, and that clearly is Christ. In 2 Pet. iii. 18 and Rev. v. 12 Christ is expressly
the object. In Gal. i. 5, Eph. iii. 21 , Phil. iv. 20, I Tim. i. 17, i Pet. v. 1 , Jude 25, and Rev. iv. II. vii. 12. xix. 1 , dce. the ascription is directly to God, with or without the addi-
 'I $\eta \sigma o$ û Xpıotoṽ. In Rev. v. 13 the ascription is to God and to Christ. We are therefore absolutely free to be guided in each case by the context. And here we may well be contented to leave it in doubt, remembering


22. àvé $\chi \in \sigma \theta$ ] The active voice of ávé $\chi \epsilon \nu$, to hold up or to hold back, occurs in the Septuagint in Amos iv. 7 (кaì $\dot{\text { ér }} \boldsymbol{\omega}$

 ó oupavòs ánò doóvov). The use of divé $\chi \in \sigma \theta a t$, to hold oneself up or back with regard to (from) any one, to refrain from, to bear with, or bear, is frequent both in the Septuagint and the New Testament, absolutely, or with a genitive, or with emi tıv. For example, Isai. xlii.




 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \iota \omega ́ \pi \eta \sigma a s$ к. $\tau . \lambda . \quad$ Matt. xvii.






17. Acts xviii. 14, катà 入ózov $\stackrel{\star}{\omega} \nu \alpha \nu \epsilon \sigma \chi \sigma^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu \dot{v} \mu \omega \nu . \quad$ I Cor. iv. 12, $\delta \iota \omega к о ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \iota ~ a ̀ v є \chi o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a . ~ 2 ~ C o r . ~$ xi. 1, \&c. Eph. iv. 2, àveरó-
 iii. 13. The less usual combination is with a thing : as here, and 2 Tim. iv. 3 , $\tau \hat{\eta}$ s íyıaıvov'


тoû $\lambda$ ó $\gamma o v \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma \pi$.] Acts xiii. 15 , eỉ tís èatıv èv ívîv dóros
 $\gamma \in \tau \epsilon$.

тарак $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega \varsigma$ ] See note on vi. ェ8, тара́к $\lambda \eta \sigma \iota v$.

каi $\gamma$ áp] For also. Besides other considerations, my letter is but brief, taking into account the transcendant importance of its topics.
$\delta_{\iota a}$ Bpađ ${ }^{\epsilon} \omega \nu$ ] Compare I
 $\pi а \rho \alpha к а \lambda \omega \nu \quad к . \tau . \lambda$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \in \dagger \lambda a]$ Acts xv .20,

23. үшшंणкєтє] Know. Imperative. I bid you know. Gal.
 later verses might well be St Paul's, but there is nothing in them to contradict the general testimony of style and manner
against that conclusion. The release of Timotheus from imprisonment has no evident bearing upon St Paul's history, remembering that in St Paul's latest letter he is only inviting Timotheus to Rome, with no indication of what will befall him there.

тáxเov] At all quickly. The comparative in the sense of somewhat is too common to need illustration. See John xiii. 27 , ö moucis $\pi 0 i ́ \eta \sigma o v ~ \tau a ́ \chi l o v . ~$

वै $\neq \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \dot{v} \mu \hat{\alpha} 5$ ] A final testimony to the knowledge of the writer by the readers.
 See verses 7 and 17 , and notes there.

Tovs ájíovs] See note on iii. r , $\boldsymbol{a}_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \boldsymbol{c o t}$.
 of Italy. The phrase is familiar both in classical writers and in the Greek Testament, and conveys no intimation of the present place of the persons spoken of, but only of the town or country to which they belong. Thus Luke xxiii. $5^{\circ}$, $5^{1}$,


## $25{ }^{\quad} \mathrm{H} \chi^{\alpha} \rho \stackrel{ }{ }{ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$.

 John i. 44, 45, 'I $\eta$ бô̂v viòv тoû


 Гadıлaías. xix. 38 . xxi. 2, Na -
 daías. Acts x. 23. The text would obviously be consistent with the idea that the persons in question were Italians who had accompanied the writer of the Epistle to some other country. But its more natural suggestion would be that he writes from Italy, and speaks of the Italian Christians surrounding hin. Perhaps one
from Rome.
25. 'H रápıs] The exact phrase is used (besides) only in Tit. iii. 15. But the omission of cồ Kupiov (or its equivalent) is seen also in Cul. iv. i8, $\dot{\eta}$ $\chi^{\alpha} \rho_{\iota}{ }^{\prime} \mu \in \theta^{\prime} \dot{v} \mu \omega \nu$. I Tim. vi. 2 I. ${ }_{2}$ Tim. iv. 22. The thought is, The great all-including grace -the divine favour evermore manifested in blessing-the love which is our life-may it be your companion all the days


 $\sigma_{0}{ }^{1}$ ).

[^0]
## SEPARATE NOTES

ON SOME TEXTS IN THE EPISTLE.

## I.

On iii. 7 and ix. 8.



We have here two of the strongest testimonies to be found in the New Testament to the Inspiration of the Old. At first sight all questioning on the subject might seem to be precluded. Further reflexion shows that this is not so. The word Inspiration itself is evidently a figure. It may be illustrated by another word. 'Inspiration' is a breathing into: 'influence' is a flowing into: neither word is selfexplanatory; the former, like the latter, may clearly admit of degrees and modifications.

The word Inspiration occurs twice in the English Version of the Bible. 'But there is a spirit ( $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ ) in man: and the inspiration ( $\pi \nu 0 \eta$ ) of the Almighty giveth them understanding' (Job xxxii. 8). 'All scripture is given by inspira-
 ( 2 Tim. iii. 16). In the one passage instruction is the chief thought, in the other edification. The word occurs twice also in the Prayer-Book. 'Grant to us Thy humble servants, that by Thy holy inspiration we may think those things that be good,' \&c. (Collect for the fifth Sunday after Easter.) 'Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee,' \&c. (Collect
in the Communion Service.) In both these sanctification is the end in view. Definition is still wanting.

In several passages of the Epistles (as, for example, Rom. xv. 4, and 2 Peter i. 20, 21) strong terms are employed to describe the objects and uses of Old Testament Scripture as a whole, and its source in the agency of the Holy Spirit. Nothing can be more inclusive than St Paul's ö $\sigma a \pi \rho \circ \epsilon \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \eta$, nothing more emphatic than St Peter's è $\lambda a ́ \lambda \eta \sigma a \nu ~ a ̀ \pi o ̀ ~ \Theta c o u ̃ ~$ $\ddot{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \sigma \iota$. Yet definition is still wanting alike of the word and of the thing.

Theories of Inspiration have been many, but it is not in conjecture or in reasoning that our idea of it should be sought. The only true view of Inspiration will be that which is the net result of a lifelong study of Scripture itself, with all freedom in registering its phenomena, and all candour in pondering the question, 'What saith it concerning itself?'

It is easy to see (and the Church of the present day is honest in avowing it) that the real truth must lie somewhere between two extremes-the extreme of verbal inspiration on the one side, and the extrome of a meroly human composition on the other.
I. Against the idea of a verbal inspiration of Scripture we are warned by many considerations. Amongst these we may place-
(I) Its utter unlikeness to all God's dealings in nature and grace. 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is free-dom'-freedom, not bondage-freedom, not rigidity.
(2) The language of the New Testament as to the difference between 'letter' and 'spirit,' between $\gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu \alpha$ and $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$-the deadness of the one, the power of the other. As soon as Inspiration itself is tied to the clause and the sentence, to the precise shape and form of the utterance and the black and white page of the written or printed book, it
too is turned from the $\pi \nu o \eta$ into the $\chi$ etpóypaфov, and has lost the very форà of the Spirit which made it a $\pi \rho \rho \phi \eta \tau \epsilon i a$ (2 Pet. i. 21).
(3) Such passages, for example, as the opening verses of St Luke's Gospel, which speak only of diligent research and a thoughtful judgment as his guides in composing; or St Paul's expressions in the 7 th chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, as to his speaking not always with authority but sometimes in the tone of suggestion and advice; or again, St Peter's remarks upon the Epistles of St Paul, which in the same breath he describes, by clear implication, as 'scriptures,' and yet characterizes with a freedom which would be irreverent and almost impertinent if each line of those 'scriptures' had been verbally inspired.
(4) The observation of differences of style and method between one Scripture writer and another; the employment, for example, by one of irony and sarcasm, by another of no weapons but those of simplest persuasion.
(5) The fearful importance attached to each reading and each rendering of each verse and clause of Scripture, if one was, and another was not, the very word dictated or the very thought breathed from heaven.
(6) Also the utter grotesqueness of such an idea as the revelation of science, whether astronomy, geology, or ethno-logy-which yet there would have been if, where such subjects are involved, the phrases and the sentences had been literally and verbally inspired of God; implying an anticipation, perhaps by many centuries, of discoveries for which God had made provision in His other gift of reason, and which it would have been contrary to all His dealings thus to forestall. 'Man's extremity is God's opportunity:' that which He had given faculties for finding out in time, He would not interpose, before the time came, to precipitate.
(7) The terrible risk to mankind of pinning down the faith to statements utterly indifferent to spiritual profiting, which yet, if philosophically accurate, must for whole ages bear the appearance of error. And who shall guarantee the Bible, even if accurately written up to the science of the 19th century, from being condemned by the science of the 20th?
II. If such are the confusions and contradictions of the one extreme, the other extreme is yet more perilous. The practical elimination (now so common) of the divine element in Scripture is fatal in every sense to its inspiration.
(1) It reduces Scripture to the level (at best) of works of human genius; and, when this is done, makes the question, for each book, a comparative one, in which some books would be exposed to a disparaging judgment.
(2) It sends us back to human reasoning, which is on many topics (such, for example, as immortality, forgiveness, and spiritual grace) human guessing, for all our information on things of gravest concern.
(3) It contradicts (a) express declarations of the New Testament Scriptures as to the divine authority of the Old, as well as (b) express assertion of divine illumination, promised and experienced, in the New Testament writers themselves.
(4) It does violence to the continuous doctrine of the Church of all ages, which has from the very first been express and peremptory in its view of the divinity of the Scriptures.
(5) It leaves us practically destitute even of a Revelation. Because, though there might be a revelation without an iuspiration (that is, a Gospel of Christ, brought into the world by Him, and by Him communicated to His Apostles, and by them to after ages, without a separate inspiration of the writers of its records), yet, as a matter of fact, it is by Scripture that we test our Revelation, and that which
shakes the authority of Scripture shakes the certainty of the Revelation which Scripture enshrines.
III. Between these two extremes lies somewhere the very truth itself about Inspiration. It would be arbitrary to define it so precisely as to unchristianize those who cannot see with us. That there is both a human and also a divine element in the Bible is quite certain. Some things we may say with confidence.
(i) Inspiration left the writer free to use his own phraseology, even his own mode of illustrating and arguing.
(2) It did not level the characteristic features of different minds. No one could imagine the Epistle to the Galatians written by St John, or the Epistle of St James written by St Paul.
(3) It did not supersede the necessity of diligence in investigating fact, nor the possibility of discrepancies in recording them; though it is more than probable that most or all of these would be reconciled if we knew all.
(4) While it left the man free in the exercise of all that was distinctive in his nature, education, and habits of thought, it communicated nevertheless an elevation of tone, an earnestness of purpose, a force and fire of holy influence, quite apart and different from that observable in common men.
(5) It communicated knowledge to the man of things otherwise indiscoverable, and also to the writer of things which it was the will of God to say by him to the learer or reader.
IV. While we refrain from definition, it is our duty as Christians to form a high conception of the thing itself for which Inspiration is the name.
(I) Let us think what would have become of the tapa$\theta \eta_{i}^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ itself, under whichever or whatever dispensation, if it had been left to depend upon oral transmission.
(2) Lct us give weight to the passages (some of them quoted above) which assert Inspiration in the strongest possible terms.
(3) Most of all, let us live so much in the study of Scripture as to acquire that reverent and devout conception of it which is ever deepest and strongest in those who best know it. A Christian man able to treat the Bible slightingly would be a contradiction in terms.

## II.

## On iv. 4 and 9.

$\Pi_{\epsilon \rho i} \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma \dot{\varepsilon} \beta \delta \delta^{\prime} \mu \eta \mathrm{\eta}$.
'Атодєíтєтаг $\sigma a \beta \beta a \tau \iota \sigma \mu$ '́s.

The seventh day. A prominent feature of Judaismcommented upon, as such, in jest or scorn, by 'heathen lite-rature-is it anything, or is it nothing, to a Christian ?

One day in seven, yet not the seventh day, is a marked day throughout Christendom. 'Holy day' or else 'holiday,' certainly a day by itself, distinct and different from the other six. In our country, in theory at least, and to a large extent in practice, one-seventh part of time is subtracted from competitive toil, under the popular title of Sunday.

This phenomenon, of the distinctness of the day, is of ancient date. We have even in Scripture the name of 'the Lord's day' (Rev. i. 10), and indications at least of a special regard for it, both in Asiatic and European Churches, for purposes of worship, communion, and charity (Acts xx. 7; I Cor. xvi. 2). It is Pliny's stato die in his letter to Trajan from Bithynia, a.d. 104. Justin Martyr, 50 years later, describes its congregations and communions. Tertullian, 50 years later still, speaks of its solemnities as independent even of persecution. As a Christian institution no one challenges it: the question remains, Is Sunday the Sabbath?

Two of St Paul's Epistles (Gal. iv. Io; Col. ii. 16) scem to disparage the Sabbath.

He is there cautioning Gentile Christians against imposing upon themselves the yoke of Judaism. All that was Jewish in the Sabbath they must eschew. But the question is still open, Was there nothing else in it?

We turn to the Old Testament, and there (if we are to read it as it stands) we find the Sabbath in existence before the law of Moses was given. There is more than an intimation of the ordinance and its groundwork in the second chapter of the Bible (Gen. ii. 2, 3). The existence of the Sabbath is presupposed in the rules of the manaa (Exod. xvi. 23). There is something then in the Sabbath which is not Jewish.

We reach the Decalogue. We have there a transcript of the fundamental principles of human duty. First the recognition of the unity, the spirituality, and the sanctity of God. Then the assertion, in precept and prohibition, of such primary duties as those of subordination, reverence for life, purity, honesty, truth, contentment. Embedded among these stands, 'Remember the Sabbath day.' In a list of moral, not positive, precepts how did this command ever find a place if there be not a fundamental and universal principle in it?

That principle is twofold. (1) Man's need of a periodical rest. (2) The religious character of that rest. It lies deep in the bodily, mental, and spiritual constitution of man's nature as God created it.

Several reasons are given for it in the Old Testament. Three of these are found in various versions of the Fourth Commandment in Exod. xx. and Deut. v.
(I) It is a memento of Creation. 'God rested-rest thou. Rest from the feverish unrest of a perpetual doing. Rest from the toils, the plannings, the acquisitions, the ambitions, of a life of sense and time. Rest in the rest of God.'
(2) It is a commemoration of Redemption. 'God brought thee out of Egypt: therefore He gave thee His Sabbath. Thou must have time to think over His mercies, There is a spiritual Egypt too, and a spiritual redemption. Let thy Sabbath be a weekly Easter.'
(3) It is an ordinance of divine humanity. 'That thy servants and thy cattle may rest as well as thou. Let all factitious differences on one day be forgotten, and let the real brotherhood be seen in the light of God.'
(4) It is a sign between man and God. This thought is repeated again and again in Ezek. xx. 'God comes to-day into thy world, stops the wheels of the self-life, and makes thee to remember that He is the Lord.'
(5) It is a designed anticipation of heaven. 'That resting from labour foreshadows the saints' rest in God. There remaineth a $\sigma a \beta \beta a \tau \iota \sigma \mu o ̀ s$ for the people of God -foretaste it now.'

In which of all these ways is the Sabbath superfluous? Our Lord Himself, while He claimed authority over the Sabbath, and while He swept away from it every relic of harshness and bondage, yet expressly declared it 'made for man' (Mark ii. 27).

But it would contradict history to assert the identity of Sabbath and Sunday. There is no evidence whatever of an express or formal change of day. Jewish Christians for years doubtless observed both. Gentile Christians never knew a Sabbath. Probably the Christian converts at first needed none-all days were Lord's days. A large proportion of the first converts were slaves: the gentlest of masters (I Pet. ii. 18) would not permit a day of inaction.

Nevertheless there was a promise-the Church has too often failed to realize its significance-applicable to this as to every subject, 'Lo, I am with you alway.' As the

Church became more and more a settled resident in the world, it needed more and more the counteracting influence of that 'periodical religious rest' which is the principle of a Sabbath. Then the adapting power (the real $\kappa v \beta \dot{\epsilon} \rho \nu \eta \sigma \iota s$ ) of the great Head of the Church guided her to invest more and more the new Sunday with all that was of essential value in the old Sabbath. Without any formal change of day, or any dogmatical reinstitution of the Sabbath of the Decalogue, the Church was influenced by the Holy Spirit to make her Lord's day in some degree sabbatical, and so to increase its consecrating influence upon a society constrained to have the world, whether of business or of society, too much with it.

Whatever our idea of the particular steps and stages of its history, we at all events are placed by God's Providence in possession, for use or abuse, of a day which is at once Sabbath and Sunday. Who shall deny its beneficent action, so far as it prevails, upon our national and individual life? Who does not see in it a gift of God, define it as you may?

The responsibility lies upon all of us of getting from it, for others and for ourselves, all the good of which it is capable. To make it attractive, above all to the young--this is one duty: to make it profitable, this is another and a higher duty still. For others, 'judge not, that ye be not judged.'

## III.

On x. 20.

-'See you that Veil, that. Curtain, of which we have said so much, hanging there, not outside the first dooryou have passed inside that-but between the two chambers of the Tabernacle? Yes:-What is that Veil? It is, the sacred writer says, His Flesh; the Human Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ.
' What do we not owe to the Incarnation of Jesus Christ? A vague, impalpable, intangible thing, to the carnal, unspiritual, fallen man, is the pure and glorious Divinity. No man, Scripture says, hath seen God at any time ${ }^{1}$ : no man, Scripture says again, hath seen or can see Him²: we know that He is, and that He is great and good, Omnipotent and Omnipresent-but what of that? I am not great and good -how can I draw nigh to Him?
'Well then, God knew this difficulty, this inaccessibility of the Infinite to the finite-and what has He done? Look again at that Veil. You may think that it divides, but it really forms a link between you and your God. That Veil, that Curtain, is the Humanity of Jesus Christ. He took our nature upon Him, that in it He might feel, that in it He might be tempted, that in it He might suffer, that in it He

[^1]might die. Draw nigh to Him in it-approach the Veil which is His Flesh, and you will be at the very door, on the very threshold, of the Heaven of the Invisible and the Selfexistent. Push aside that Veil-or rather, enter through it, through Jesus Christ as made for you very Man-and you are in God's Presence at once. That august shrine and presence-chamber which only one man could see in each generation-he only once a year, he only in figure and type-you can enter, not familiarly indeed, yet boldly, without concealment, without a secret, as often as you will, in the Blood of Jesus, and through the Veil which is His Flesh.
' I said indeed that every Christian man is a high priest. It is so. Scripture says this in plain words here. But it is not that he takes Christ's place. He is not his own high priest in the sense in which Christ is the High Priest of man. No. He takes Christ's Blood with him when he goes in. So far Christ is the Victim, the Sacrifice, once offered, never again to bleed or suffer or die, long as the world stands, long as eternity endures. But the 2 ist verse says this:-You are not independent high priests, even with the Sacrifice, even with the Blood. No, you have still a High Priest-or rather, 'a great (mighty) Priest'-over the House of God. Ill were it for us if it were not so. Even the allsufficient Sacrifice would be none, unless the Divine Victim lived, unless the Divine Victim were also the Immortal Priest. It is the Life after death which gives efficacy even to the Death. It is the presence of the great Priest in Heaven which makes the entering of the Holiest possible for man below. Christ the Sacrifice is also Christ the Priest, Christ the Intercessor, and Christ the Life.
' Yes, we are well equipped and furnished for the divine life proposed to us. Then let us draw near. The original
says, Let us leeep drawing near. It is not one act to which we are called. It is a repetition, it is a perpetuity, of acts of approach. This is our life. To be always drawing near. In acts of worship-of public prayer and praise, of edification and communion. But not thus only. This House of God-beautiful, majestic, august as it is-cannot supersede the more spiritual one. The beart is the shrine. There then let us be drawing near. In the evening, and morning, and at noon-day, will I pray, and that instantly ${ }^{1}$. And at special times and seasons also. When I am in heaviness, in loneliness, in sorrow. When I feel myself neglected, outcast, spurned by those I love, then let me draw near to One who never despises. And when the tempter is very near to me-when I hear his footstep, when I feel his breath, when he whispers to me, It is written ${ }^{2}$ _Thou shalt not surely die - then let me draw nigh. Satan never passes that Veil, which is the Flesh of Christ. He remembers too well, too vividly, what he suffered from it once below : the bruising of the head ${ }^{4}$, once received from it, is never forgotten. Take with you the Blood, pass within the VeilSatan will not follow you. And when death approachesthen more literally, then above all-draw near with a true heart, and you shall find rest for ever'.'

[^2]IV.

## On x. 35 and 39.

## 

The phrase to draw back gives the idea of withdrawal, of refusal, almost (in this connexion) of apostasy. But the word $\dot{\nu} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \dot{y}$ has a subtler meaning. It is a word expressive not of the cowardice of open flight, but of the caution which would avoid and evade a danger. We have an English word for either notion. The one is to $d r a w b a c k$, the other is to draw in. The Greek and the English are alike nautical phrases, descriptive of the taking in or shortening sail which guards against a coming storm. It is what St Peter did at Antioch, when, on the arrival of a party of Jewish Christians from Jerusalem, he $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu$ éavtóv (Gal. ii. I2), exercised, that is, a prudential reserve, and gained time for further thought by taking up a neutral and ambiguous position.

The thought therefore of the text may be expanded and paraphrased thus.
'We are not of them that draw in. We are not men of reserve and caution and temporizing. We are not men who look this way and that way, calculating the effect of our acts or the probable reception of our words, before we shape our conduct or before we give an answer as to our faith or hope. I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus: henceforth let no man trouble me with suggestions of compromise or alarms of consequences ${ }^{1}$. I have taken my side.
'There is a Christianity prevalent within the Christian body-its name is legion-of which the characteristic feature is just this intootod', this drawing in, of which the text speaks. It is a Christianity of caution. In its most obvious form, it fears the reproach of Christ. In this shape, its home is where humanity congregates-in schools and colleges, in houses and offices of business, in workmen's shops and gentlemen's clubhouses. But it has other shapes too. Sometimes it is the result of doubt. It has dabbled in scepticism. It has heard, it has read, that the text of Scripture is uncertain, that the science of Scripture is antiquated, that the Christian evidences are inconclusive. It has not the capacity for settling questions-any fool can stir them. It takes refuge in suspense for itself, and in silence towards outsiders. Or again, its motive is the dread of hypocrisy-that English instinct of honesty-that just misgiving of the humble soul, lest haply, in the long vista of the future, something should make havoc of its faith or of its morals, and then it should be the worse for it to have been once a Christian.
'Whatever its motive, this $\dot{u} \pi o \sigma$ odo $\eta$ has some common features of mischief.
'It withholds from the stock of Christian evidences its own quota of faith and example. This is a serious thing. For the aggregate of Gospel wealth in the world is largely made up of the contributions of individual believers. To draw in is to impoverish the treasury. It is to subtract so many items from the sum total of Christian power upon the hearts and consciences of mankind.
'But it has a terrible reaction upon the man himself. Not for nothing does the text add cis $\dot{a} \pi \omega^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon a \nu$ to the word $\dot{v} \pi 0 \sigma \pi o \lambda \dot{\eta}$. It is bad, it is injurious, it is at last fatal to the man, to have lived this life of religious reserve. Were it but the suppression of truth, it miglit be of near kin to falsehood.

There is a hypocrisy of dissembling quite as real as the more vulgar hypocrisy of pretending. It is an untruthful thing to try to pass for that which you are not, even if that for which you try to pass is worse than your real self. The effect is falsehood, whatever the excuse.
'Learn the importance to the cause of truth and good in the world, of being straightforward Christians. In this world-church and church-world of ours, we are bound to throw away reserve as to our convictions. Not by preaching, not by scolding, not by threatening, but by the quiet maintenance, in word and good example, of the o o $\mu$ до $\begin{aligned} & i a \\ & \text { which }\end{aligned}$ has the promise of two worlds, so, without ambiguity as without ostentation, let us walk in the light of the Lord ${ }^{1}$.'

[^3]
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