

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.



•

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

WITH NOTES

ВY

C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D.

DEAN OF LLANDAFF AND MASTER OF THE TEMPLE: FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

London MACMILLAN AND CO. AND NEW YORK 1891

[All Rights reserved.]

First Edition 1890. Reprinted 1891.

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

viii

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

x

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, (1) 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

xiv

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 a 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

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 To the Israelite patriotism and religion were blood. 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 Jewish-Christian 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

xviii

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, May 10, 1890.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

Πολυμερώς και πολυτρόπως πάλαι ο Θεός Ι. 1

Ι. Ι. Πολυμερώς και πολυ-The opening of the τρόπως] Epistle is characteristic of the whole. (1) 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 2nd 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.

Πολυμερώς] In many parts or portions (Rev. xvi. 19, τρία μέρη. John xix. 23, τέσσαρα μέρη. Neh. xi. 1, ἐννέα μέρη). Wisdom vii. 22, ἔστι γὰρ ἐν αὐτῆ πνεῦμα ... μονογενές, πολυμερές, κ.τ.λ., where the English Version renders it manifold. The prophetic revelations were made in portions, like the $\lambda \delta \gamma \iota \circ \nu$ Kupiou of Isai. xxviii. 13, $\epsilon \tau \iota$ $\mu \iota \kappa \rho \delta \nu$, $\epsilon \tau \iota \mu \iota \kappa \rho \delta \nu$. The Gospel is one and indivisible, like the $\chi \iota \tau \omega \nu$ $a \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} a \phi o s$, $\dot{\upsilon} \phi a \nu \tau \dot{o} s$ $\delta \iota' \delta \lambda o \nu$ (John xix. 23), because it is the revelation of God *in a Person*.

πολυτρόπως] In many ways or modes. 4 Macc. iii. 21, πολυτρόποις (Α, πολυτρόπως Β) έχρήσαντο συμφοραîs. It is the opposite of μονότροπος, uniform, simple: and is found in combination with such words as $\pi o \kappa \lambda o s$ and $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\tau \delta$, in the sense of versatile, multifarious, &c. The revelations of God to the prophet were various in the manner of their communication (1) to him, as well as (2) by him. (1) Num. xii. 6-8: έὰν γένηται προφήτης ὑμῶν Κυρίω, έν δράματι αὐτῷ γνωσθήσομαι, καὶ έν υπνω λαλήσω αύτῶ, ούχ ούτως ό θεράπων μου Μωυσής...στόμα κατα στόμα λαλήσω αντώ έν έίδει καὶ οὐ δι' αἰνιγμάτων, καὶ την δόξαν Κυρίου είδε κ.τ.λ. (2) Compare the typical acts of Ezekiel or Hosea with the visions of Zechariah and the evangelical predictions of Isaiah. The Gospel is of one

V. н.

2 λαλήσας τοις πατράσιν έν τοις προφήταις έπ'

mode and form, because in it God reveals Himself iv viç.

πάλαi] 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. iii. 14 we have τη̂s παλαιâs διαθήκηs, and in connexion with its aνάγνωσις.

 $\lambda a \lambda \eta \sigma a s = Having spoken.$ The aorist sums up the whole series of patriarchal, Mosaic, and prophetic revelations in a single past act. The word $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon i \nu$ is used (as here) of God's utterances in Luke i. 55, καθώς ελάλησεν πρός τοὺς πατέρας ήμῶν. John ix. 29, ήμεις οίδαμεν ότι Μωυσεί λελάληκεν ο Θεός. Acts iii. 21, ών ελάλησεν ο Θεος δια στόματος $\tau \hat{\omega} v \dots \pi \rho o \phi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} v$. vii. 44, katties διετάξατο ό λαλών τω Μωυσή. 1 Cor. xiv. 21 (varied from Isai. xxviii. 11, 12, LXX.) λαλήσω τώ λαώ τούτω...λέγει Κύριος. Heb. v. 5, ο λαλήσας πρός αὐτόν, Υἰός $\mu ov \in \sigma v$. xii. 25.

τοΐς πατράσιν] In its wider sense; the ancestors of this generation; them of old time. Thus 2 Pet. iii. 4, ἀφ΄ ῆς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν κ.τ.λ. More often with ἡμῶν, ὑμῶν, or αὐτῶν, as iii. 9. Matt. xxiii. 30, 32, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ...τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν. Luke vi. 23, 26. John vi. 49. Acts vii. 45, 51, 52, τίνα τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἐδίωξαν οἱ πατέρες ύμων; xv. 10, ΰν ούτε οί πατέρες ήμῶν οὖτε ήμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν Baorágai. xxviii. 25. I Cor. Elsewhere in the more X, I. restricted meaning of the patriarchs; (1) Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; as in Deut. i. 8, $\tau \eta \nu \gamma \eta \nu$ ήν ώμοσα τοις πατράσιν ύμων, Ίσαὰκ 'Αβραάμ καί $\tau \hat{\omega}$ καί Ίακώβ κ.τ.λ.; or (2) the twelve sons of Jacob; as in Acts vii. 12, 15, Ίακώβ... έξαπέστειλεν τούς πατέρας ήμῶν...καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν αύτος και οι πατέρες ήμων.

 $\epsilon v \tau \sigma \hat{s}$ The contrast with ϵv vi $\hat{\varphi}$ suggests the sense of *in* the persons of rather than in the writings of. The latter might be supported by Mark i. 2, Kabus γέγραπται έν τω 'Ησαία τω προφήτη. John vi. 45, έστιν γεγραμμένου έν τοις προφήταις. Acts xiii. 40, το είρημένον έν τοις προφήταις. xxiv. 14, πάσιν τοις κατά τον νόμον και τοις έν τοις προφήταις γεγραμμένοις. Elsewhere the phrase is Sia (Matt. i. 22. ii. 5, 15. viii. 17. &c., &c.), δια στόμα-705 (Luke i. 70. Acts i. 16. iii. 18, 21. iv. 25), or iv bibly (Acts vii. 42). Here the idea of speaking in seems more suitable than that of speaking by.

ł

τοΐς προφήταις] Not in the more technical sense in which οί προφήται form one division of the Old Testament (as Luke xxiv. 44, πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐντῷνόμῷ Μωυσέως καὶ τοῦς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῦς. John i. 45, ὅν ἔγραψεν

έσχάτου των ήμερων τούτων έλάλησεν ήμιν έν

Μωυσής έν τω νόμω και οι προ- $\phi \eta \tau \alpha \iota$), 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. 28 ('Αβραάμ καὶ 'Ισαάκ καὶ 'Ιακώβ καί πάντας τούς προφήτας) 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. 17. &c.), to Daniel (Matt. xxiv. 15), to Joel (Acts ii. 16), to Jonah (Matt. xii. 39. &c.), to John the Baptist (Matt. xi. 9. &c.). Compare Matt. v. 12, τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν. xiii. 17, πολλοὶ προφήται καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμησαν ίδειν α βλέπετε. Luke i. 70, τών αγίων απ' αιώνος προφητών αύτοῦ, ix. 8, 19, προφήτης τις των άρχαίων. John viii. 52, 'Aβραάμ απέθανεν και οι προφήται. James V. 10. I Pet. i. 10. &c. &c.

2. $\epsilon \pi^{2} \epsilon \sigma \chi \alpha' \tau \sigma v$] The received text has $\epsilon \sigma \chi \alpha' \tau \omega v$. And so in I Pet. i. 20, $\phi \alpha v \epsilon \rho \omega \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \sigma s$ $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \pi^{2}$ $\epsilon \sigma \chi \alpha' \tau \sigma v \tau \omega v \chi \rho \sigma \nu \omega v \delta \iota^{2} \delta \mu \alpha s$. In a third passage, 2 Pet. iii. 3, the received text had $\epsilon \sigma \chi \alpha' \tau \sigma v$, where we now read $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \sigma \sigma \tau \alpha \epsilon \epsilon \sigma^{2} \epsilon \sigma \tau \omega v \tau \omega v \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \omega v$. The difference is scarcely appreciable. The one $(\epsilon\sigma\chi\acute{a}\tau\sigma\nu)$ is at a latest point of these days; the other $(\epsilon\sigma\chi\acute{a}\tau\omega\nu)$ is at (in the time of) the latest (days) of these days. The one suggests an epoch, the other an era. Compare Matt. xxiv. 31 $(a\pi' \ \ddot{a}\kappa\rho\omega\nu \ o\dot{v}\rho\alpha\nu\omega' \ \dot{\epsilon}\omegas$ $\ddot{a}\kappa\rho\omega\nu \ a\dot{v}\tau\omega'$, where however an alternative reading inserts $\tau\omega\nu$ before the second $\ddot{a}\kappa\rho\omega\nu$) with Mark xiii. 27 $(a\pi' \ \ddot{a}\kappa\rhoov \ \gamma\eta$'s $\dot{\epsilon}\omegas$ $\ddot{a}\kappa\rhoov \ o\dot{v}\rho\alpha\nu\omega'$).

τών ήμερών τούτων 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, al ήμέραι aurai, does not occur elsewhere ; but it is implied in the opposite phrase, ήμέραι ἔρχονται, of Jer.

υίω, ον έθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων, δι' ού καί

xxxi. 31, LXX., quoted in Heb. viii. 8, &c. The common form is that of δ alw over δ , δ viv alwr. &c. contrasted with o alwr έκεινος, ο αίων ο μέλλων, &c., to which the above remark is equally applicable. See Matt. xii. 32, ούτε έν τούτω τω αίωνι ούτε έν τω μέλλοντι. Mark x. 30, έν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ. Luke xvi. 8. xviii. 30. xx. 34, 35, τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου...τοῦ αἰῶνος ereivou. Rom. xii, 2. I Cor. i. 20, ii. 6, 8, iii. 18. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Gal. i. 4, τοῦ ἐνεστώτος αἰώνος πονηροῦ. Eph. i, 21. I Tim. Tit. ii. 2 Tim. iv. 10. vi. 17. The idea of the text is 12. otherwise expressed in Gal. iv. 4, ότε δε ήλθεν το πλήρωμα τού xporvov. Eph. i. 10, eis oikovopiav τοῦ πληρώματος τών καιρών. The χρόνος of the one passage, the καιροì of the other, are equivalent to the $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho a \iota$ of the text; and the $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\mu a$ of those passages is (in effect) the toxator of this. Compare also I Cor. x. 11, είς ούς τα τέλη των αιώνων Kathvinker. The alwes there are the $\eta\mu$ (par here, the ages of the pre-Messianic time; and the $\tau \epsilon \lambda \eta$ of those addres are the egyator of these $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho a \iota$.

 $i\lambda\dot{a}\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$] Spake. As in λa - $\lambda\dot{\eta}\sigma as$ 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, έτι ένα είχεν υἰον ἀγαπητόν ἀπέστειλευ αὐτοῦ ἔσχατον προς αὐτούς, λέγων ὅτι ἐντραπήσονται τον υἱόν μου.

ev viŵ] 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, Arghus Deou vids εί. xxii. 45, πως υίος αύτου έστίν; xxvii. 43, 54, εἶπεν γαρ ὅτι Θεοῦ εἰμὶ υίός... Αληθώς υίος Θεοῦ ἦν outos. Luke i. 32, 35. Acts xiii. 33, Yiós µov el σν. Rom. i. 4, τοῦ ὅρισθέντος νίοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνά-Heb. v. 8, καίπερ ών υίός. μει.

čθηκεν] Set, appointed, constituted. John xv. 16, čθηκα υμῶς ἶνα κ.τ.λ. The reference is, not to the original glory, but to the εὐδοκία ην προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ (Eph. i. 9) as the Christ.

κληρονόμον πάντων] Rom. iv. 13, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν (Abraham or his seed) εἶναι κόσμου. The figure appears in the Parable of Matt. xxi., Mark xii., Luke xx. Οῦτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος. It is involved in the Sonship: Rom. viii. 17, εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι. Gal. iv. 7, εἰ δὲ υἱος, καὶ κληρονόμος. But the υἱοὶ are κληρονόμοι only in the υἱος. They are κληρονόμοι μὲν

έποίησεν τούς αίωνας δε ών απαύγασμα της 3

Θεοῦ, συνκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ. The *fulfilment* of the heirship is in the consummation of the great day: Rev. xi. 15, ἐγένετο ή βασιλεία τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ Κυρίου ήμῶν καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ.

δι ού καί] John i. 3, 10, πάντα δι' αύτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αύτου έγένετο ούδε εν ο γέγονεν... ό κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. 🛛 Cor. Col. i. viii. 6, δι' οῦ τὰ πάντα. 16, τα πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ... ἔκτισται. $\epsilon \pi o(\eta \sigma \epsilon v)$ Acts iv. 24, $\Delta \epsilon$ σποτα, σύ ό ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τα έν αὐτοῖς. xiv. 15. xvii. 24, 26, δ Θεός δ ποιήσας τον κόσμον... ἐποίησέν τε ἐξ ἑνὸς πῶν έθνος ανθρώπων κ.τ.λ. The commoner word in this sense is κτίζειν. The two are combined in Matt. xix. 4, o κτίσας απ' αρχής άρσεν και θήλυ εποίησεν αυτούς.

 $\tau o \hat{v} s a \hat{\omega} v a s$ The thought of duration is never wholly lost in the Scripture use of alw, though in this place, and in xi. 3 ($\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon i$ νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς alŵvas \dot{p} ήματι Θεού), it is all but effaced. - The world as material is κόσμος, the world as temporal is aiών. Once the two are combined in one phrase: Eph. ii. 2, κατά τὸν αίωνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (the timestate of this matter-world). The plural, 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.

os wv] Six points may 3. be distinguished in this grand summary of the doctrine of the Divine Son: (1) the original glory (ѽν ἀπαύγασμα κ.τ.λ.); (2) the destined empire (δν έθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων); (3) the creative action (δι' οὐ καὶ $\epsilon \pi o i \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda.$; (4) the sustaining operation ($\phi \epsilon \rho \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$.); (5) the redemptive work ($\kappa a \theta a$ ρισμόν τών άμαρτιών κ.τ.λ.); (6) the mediatorial exaltation (ἐκά- $\theta_{i\sigma\epsilon\nu}\epsilon\nu\delta\epsilon\xi_{i\hat{a}\kappa.\tau.\lambda.}$. The parallel passages are John i. 1, &c., where we have the first, third, and fifth of the above points enlarged upon; Phil. ii. 6, &c., dwelling upon the first, fifth, and sixth; and Col. i. 15, &c., embracing all the particulars of the above enumeration.

άπαύγασμα] Wisdom vii. 26, ἀπαύγασμα γάρ ἐστι ψωτὸς αϊδίου. From ἀπαυγάζειν, to beam or flash forth (light), comes the passive noun ἀπαύγασμα, a thing beamed forth, a substance formed by the emission of splendour; differing just so far from ἀπαυγασμός that it expresses the result, not the act, of shining, and

δόξης και χαρακτήρ της υποστάσεως αυτου,

is therefore the more suitable word for the Person in whom all the rays of the divine glory are concentrated for communication. Effulgence may be the nearest English word, but it lacks the characteristic idea of the embodiment of the emitted splendour, the $\phi \hat{\omega} \hat{s} \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \kappa \stackrel{\epsilon}{\phi} \omega \tau \hat{o} \hat{s}$, the Person in whom $\theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ $\tau \eta \nu \delta \hat{o} \hat{\xi} a \nu$ (John i. 14).

 $\tau \eta s \delta \delta \xi \eta s$ Glory is the forthshining of light. The λύχνος set υπο τον μόδιον ή υπο την κλίνην (Mark iv. 21) has no 'glory:' the dóga begins όταν ό λύχνος τη αστραπή φωτίζη σε (Luke xi. 36). The glory of God is His self-manifestation, John i. 14. xi. 40, όψει την δόξαν του Θεού. xii. 41. Rom. i. 23. vi. 4, ηγέρθη... δια τής δόξης του Πατρός. ix. 23. 2 Cor. iii. 18. Eph. iii. 16. &c. &c. The text seems to speak of a selfmanifestation, 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 τῷ ήγαπημένω of Eph. i. 6, in the τοῦ υἰοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ of Col. i. 13, in the δ ων είς τον κόλπον τοῦ Πατρός of John i. 18. Compare also John xvii. 5, 24, $\tau \hat{\eta}$ δόξη ή (or ήν) είχον προ του τον κόσμον είναι παρά σοί...ίνα θεωρώσιν την δόξαν την έμην ην δέδωκάς (οτ έδωκάς) μοι, ότι ήγάπησάς με πρό καταβολής κόσμου.

χαρακτήρ] From χαράσσειν, to mark, or engrave, as the image and superscription upon a coin (Ecclus. l. 27, παιδείαν συνέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης ἐχάραξα έν τῷ βιβλίω τούτω), comes χαρακ- $\tau \eta \rho$, (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, o yap χαρακτήρ (distinctive mark) τοῦ κατακαύματός έστι. 2 Macc. iv. 10, εὐθέως πρός τὸν Ἑλληνικόν χαρακτήρα (characteristic style) τοὺς ὅμοφύλους μετέστησε. These passages show that the idea of exact likeness, characteristic representation, is involved in the word, in Hellenistic as well as classical usage, and may incline us to the rendering of the English Version, express (or exact) image, in preference to the The latvaguer term *impress*. ter suggests rather the wax than the *seal*. For the general idea, compare 2 Cor. iv. 4, ős έστιν είκών τοῦ Θεοῦ. Col. i. 15, ος έσταν είκων του Θεού του αορά-But χαρακτήρ is more deτου. finite than eikwy as to the exactness of the likeness.

ύποστάσεως] The verb ὑφιστάναι, to set or place under, passes in the middle voice and

φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ρήματι της δυνάμεως

the intransitive tenses into two chief uses: (1) with a dative, to stand under so as to support (Zech. ix. 8, υποστήσομαι τ $\hat{\phi}$ οἶκ $\hat{\phi}$ μου); or with an accusative, to stand (instead of giving way) under, to withstand (Prov. xiii. 8, πτωχός δε ούχ υφίσταται απειλήν. 1 Macc. v. 40. &c. &c.): (2) absolutely, to stop (1 Sam. xxx. 10, υπέστησαν δε διακόσιοι ανδρες), to take up a position (Num. xxii. 26, υπέστη έν τόπω στενώ. Prov. xxv. 6, μηδε εν τόποις δυναστών ύφίστασο), to stand one's ground (Psalm exlvii. 17, κατά πρόσωπον ψύχους αύτοῦ τίς ύποστήσεται; &c. &c.). The substantive υπόστασις (occurring sixteen times in the Septuagint, as the rendering of almost as many Hebrew words) takes the colour of this twofold use, and means (1) support (Deut. i. 12, πως δυνήσομαι φέρειν μόνος τον κόπον ύμων καί τήν υπόστασιν υμών; the task of supporting the weight of you. Jer. xxiii. 22, εἰ ἔστησαν ἐν τῆ ύποστάσει μου. Ezek. xxvi. 11, και την υπόστασιν της ίσχύος σου επί τὴν γῆν κατάξει. xliii. II, και την υπόστασιν αυτου. Wisdom xvi. 21, ή μεν γαρ ύπό- $\sigma \tau a \sigma i s \sigma ov$, thy sustenance, the manna); and so confidence (sometimes we find $\dot{\upsilon}\pi \dot{\sigma}\sigma \tau a\sigma \iota v$ καὶ τόλμαν) regarded as an act of the mind supporting, instead of sinking under, a weight laid upon it (Ruth i. 12, ἐστί μοι υπόστασις του γενηθήναί με άνδρί. Psalm xxxix. 7, ή ύπόστασίς μου παρά σοί έστιν. Ezek. xix. 5, και απώλετο ή υπόστασις aυτής. 2 Cor. ix. 4, έν τή ύποστάσει ταύτη. xi. 17, έν ταύτη τη υποστάσει της καυχήσεως. Heb. iii. 14, την αρχην τής υποστάσεως. xi. 1, έστιν δέ πίστις έλπιζομένων υπόστασις); (2) a position (1 Sam. xiv. 4, είς την υπόστασιν των άλλοφ ύλων; a firm standing (Psalm lxix. 2, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπόστασις); and hence, finally, substance, in all senses, whether of wealth (Job xxii. 20, ήφανίσθη ή υπόστασις αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν καταφάγεται πῦρ. Jer. x. 17, συνήγαγεν έξωθεν την ύπόστασίν σου), bodily frame (Psalm 15, οὐκ ἐκρύβη τὸ exxxix. όστουν μου από σου...και ή υπόστασίς μου έν τοῖς κατωτάτοις τῆς $\gamma \hat{\eta}_{s}$), or essential being (Psalm xxxix. 5, ή υπόστασίς μου ώσει ούθεν ενώπιόν σου. lxxxix. 47, μνήσθητι τίς μου ή υπόστα- σ_{is}). This last is the meaning of the word here; substance or essence. We are not to import the theological distinction between ύπόστασις (person) and ovoía (substance): that distinction would carry us into subtleties which have no place in The statement is, Scripture. that the Son is the χαρακτήρ of

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

αύτοῦ, καθαρισμόν των άμαρτιων ποιησάμενος

God's essence; the Person in whom the essential nature of Deity is so embodied that the Gospel sayings are true, 'O $\epsilon\omega\rho a\kappa\omega s$ $\epsilon\mu\epsilon$ $\epsilon\omega\rho a\kappa\epsilon\nu$ $\tau o\nu$ $\Pi a \tau \epsilon \rho a$ (John xiv. 9), and 'E $\theta\epsilon a \sigma a \mu \epsilon \theta a$ $\tau \eta\nu$ $\delta \delta \xi a \nu$ $a \nu \tau o \hat{v}$, $\delta \delta \xi a \nu$ ωs $\mu o \nu o - \gamma \epsilon \nu o \hat{v} s$ $\pi a \rho a$ $\Pi a \tau \rho \delta s$ (John i. 14).

 $\tau \hat{\omega} [\dot{\rho} \eta \mu a \tau \iota]$ The dative expresses the *instrument* of the upholding. The φέρων, like the έποίησεν, is by a word of command. Compare xi. 3, $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon i$ νοούμεν κατηρτίσθαι τούς αίωνας ρήματι Θεού. The γενηθήτω of creation passes into the torw of the sustentation. For phua, always (conceptionally at least) a single thing said, compare its first use in the Septuagint, Gen. XV. Ι, μετά δε τα ρήματα ταυτα έγενήθη δήμα Κυρίου προς Άβραμ έν οράματι, λέγων κ.τ.λ. The peculiarity is never lost, even where the whole Gospel (for example) is the βήμα in question, as in Rom. x. 8, το βήμα τής πίστεως δ κηρύσσομεν. Eph. v. 26, εν βήματι. vi. 17, καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν βήμα Θεοῦ. Heb. vi. 5, καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους Θεοῦ βήμα. 1 Pet. i. 25, τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ βήμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.

της δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ] Belonging to, characteristic of, His power (potency). Luke vi. 19, ὅτι δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο. 2 Cor. xii. 9, ή δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Heb. vii. 16, κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου. 2 Pet. i. 16, ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν.

καθαρισμόν τ. δ. ποιησάμενος] Job vii. 21, δ_{μ} τ_{i} or λ_{i} θην εποιήσω της άμαρτίας μου, καί καθαρισμόν τής ανομίας μου; The peculiarity of the expression is the simple genitive; purification, not from, but of sins. So in Exod, XXX. 10, and Tov αίματος τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν άμαρτιών. 2 Pet. i. 9, λήθην λαβών τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ viation is involved in the transition from the $\lambda \epsilon \pi \rho o \lambda$ katapíζονται of Matt. xi. 5, to the έκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ή λέπρα of Matt. viii. 3.

ἐκάθισεν] viii. 1. x. 12. xii.
2. Rev. iii. 21, καὶ ἐκάθισα μετὰ τοῦ Πατρός μου ἐν τῷ θρόνῷ αἰ-τοῦ. The origin of the expression is found in Psalm ex. 1, εἶπεν ὁ

I. 3.

¿κάθισεν έν δεξιά της μεγαλωσύνης έν ύψηλοις,

Κύριος τῷ Κυρίω μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιών μου κ.τ.λ. Matt. xxii. 44. Mark xii. 36. Luke xx. 42. Acts ii. 34. Heb. i. 13.

έν δεξιά τής μεγαλωσύνης] On the right hand of majesty. Like Matt. xxvi. 64. Mark xiv. 62, δψεσθε τον υίον του άνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δυνάmews. Majesty here, as power there, is used as a name for God Himself. Heb. viii. I, ev de Eia τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης. The word $\mu\epsilon\gamma a\lambda\omega\sigma\nu\eta$ occurs also in Jude 25 as an attribute of God. In the Septuagint it is more frequent. Deut. xxxii. 3,δότε μεγαλωσύνην τῷ Θεῷ ήμῶν. I Chron. xxix. 11, σοί, Κύριε, ή μεγαλωσύνη, Psalm cxlv. 3, καὶ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ οὐκ $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\pi\epsilon\rho as.$ cl. 2. &c. &c. The form $\mu\epsilon\gamma a\lambda\epsilon_i \delta\tau\eta s$ also occurs three times in the New Testament; Luke ix. 43. Acts xix. 27. 2 Pet. i. 16. For the figure έν δεξιά, compare 1 Kings ii. 19, ο βασιλεύς... ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ · καὶ ἐτέθη θρόνος τῆ μητρί τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἐκάθισεν έκ δεξιών αύτοῦ. Psalm xlv. 10, παρέστη ή βασίλισσα ἐκ δεξιῶν σου, Zech. vi. 13, kai kabieitai καὶ κατάρξει ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, καί έσται ό ίερεύς έκ δεξιών αύτου, καί βουλή είρηνική έσται άναμέσον άμφοτέρων.

εν ὑψηλοῖς] Not to be connected with μεγαλωσύνης, but with ἐκάθισεν. And so ἐν τοῖς

oupavois in viii. 1. Compare Eph. i. 20, και καθίσας έν δεξιά αύτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. For έν ύψηλοΐς, see Psalm xciii. 4, θαυμαστός έν ύψηλοῖς ο Κύριος. cxiii, 5, τίς ώς Κύριος ό Θεός ήμῶν, ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν; An equivalent phrase is ἐν ὑψίσ-Job xvi. 19, iv ov-TOIS. ρανοίς ο μάρτυς μου, ο δε συνίστωρ μου έν ὑψίστοις. Luke ii. 14, δόξα έν ύψίστοις Θεώ. xix. 38, εν ουρανώ ειρήνη, και δόξα εν ύψίστοις.

τοσούτω κρείττων] In-4. troduction 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. i. 18, ίνα γένηται έν πασιν αύτος $\pi\rho\omega\tau\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega\nu$) is therefore the general subject. This is shown in a series of comparisons : (1) 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. 10. 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 άρχιερέα in iii. 1, and Μελχισεδèκ in v. 5.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

4 τοσούτω κρείττων γενόμενος των άγγέλων όσω

τοσούτφ....δσφ] An idiom peculiar (in Scripture) to this Epistle. See x. 25, και τοσούτφ μαλλον δσφ κ.τ.λ. Also vii. 20, 22, καθ δσον...κατα τοσούτο. In Rev. xviii. 7 there is an approach to it: δσα έδόξασεν αὐτὴν ...τοσοῦτον δότε κ.τ.λ.

κρείττων] This word occurs thirteen times in this Epistle, and only seven times elsewhere in Scripture (I Cor. vii. 9, 38. xi. 17. xii. 31. Phil. i. 23. I Pet. iii. 17. 2 Pet. ii. 21). In the Septuagint, it is chiefly found (21 times) in the Book of Proverbs.

yevóµevos] Mark the contrast with *w* above. We reach now the exaltation of the Son. not as God, but as the God-Man. Compare Eph. i. 20, &c. καθίσας... έν τοις επουρανίοις ύπεράνω πάσης άρχης κ.τ.λ. Phil. ii. 9, διο και ο Θεος αυτον υπερύψωσενκαὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα το ύπερ παν όνομα. Col. i. 18, πρωτότοκος ϵ κ τών νεκρών, ℓ να γένηται κ.τ.λ. 1 Pet. i. 21, τον έγείραντα αύτον έκ νεκρών, καί δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα. iii. 22, ὄς ἐστιν έν δεξιά Θεού, πορευθείς είς ούρανόν, υποταγέντων αυτώ άγγέλων κ.τ.λ.

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \ \dot{a} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \omega \nu$] The prominence 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. xxviii. 12. xxxii. 1. 7. Ι Kings xix. 5. Psalm xxxiv. 7. xci. 11. Dan. iii. 28. vi. 22. &c.) or specially. (1) In the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. Acts vii. 53, οίτινες ελάβετε τον νόμον είς διαταγάς άγγέλων. Gal. 11. 19, δ νόμος...διαταγείς δι άγγέλων έν χειρί μεσίτου. Heb. ii. 2, ο δι' άγγέλων λαληθείς λόyos. Compare Deut. xxxiii. 2, Κύριος έκ Σινα ήκει... έκ δεξιών αυτοῦ άγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. Psalm lxviii. 17, τὸ ẵρμα τοῦ Θεοῦ μυριοπλάσιον, χιλιάδες... Κύριος έν αύτοις έν Σινά έν τώ άγίω. The phenomena of wind and fire, of voice and trumpet (Exod. xix. 16, &c. Deut. iv. 11, &c. v. 22, &c.), even the preparation and engraving of the tables of stone (Exod. xxiv. 12. xxxii. 16), were doubtless assigned to angelic ministry: Psalm civ. 4, o ποιών τους άγγέλους αύτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργούς αύτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον. (2) In connexion with the march of Israel into Canaan. Exod. xiv. 19, δ ayyers $\tau o\hat{v}$ Θεοθ ό προπορενόμενος της παρεμβολής τών υίων Ισραήλ. xxiii. 20, αποστέλλω τον άγγελόν μου προ προσώπου σου, ίνα φυλάξη σε έν τῆ δδῷ, ὅπως εἰσαγάγη σε εἰς τὴν γην ην ητοίμασά σοι. xxxii. 34. XXXIII. 2. Num. XX. 16, Kai άποστείλας άγγελον έξήγαγεν ημας έξ Αιγύπτου. Josh. v. 14,

διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα.

δτι ἐγὼ ἀρχιστράτηγος δυνάμεως Κυρίου, νυνὶ παραγέγονα.

δσω διαφορώτερον] The actual exaltation of Christ above Angels is proportioned to the prophetic. The Name defined in Scripture is the measure of the superiority actually attained. (1) The adjective διάφορος occurs also in ix. 10, and in Rom. xii. 6, in the sense of *different*; as also in Deut. xxii. 9. Dan. vii. 19. Here the sense is *excellent*; different by *superiority*; as in viii. 6, διαφορωτέρας τέτευχεν λειτουρyías. The same twofold meaning is seen in the verb διαφέρειν (to differ, Dan. vii. 3. &c.; to excel, Matt. x. 31. &c. : in Rom. ii. 18 and Phil. i. 10, it may be (2) The comparative either). διαφορώτερος occurs only here and in viii. 6. (3) The use of π apá after a comparative is peculiar to this Epistle (ii. 7, 9. iii. 3. ix. 23. xi. 4. xii. 24) and Luke iii. 13, πλέον παρά τὸ διατεταγμένον ύμιν.

κεκληρονόμηκεν] The Son, manifested in the fulness of time, has entered upon the inheritance of the predicted Messiah. Scripture has marked out the boundaries of the great όνομα in many passages of promise: the Divine Son, as the Christ, has entered upon its possession. The word κληρονομείν occurs more than 125 times in the Septuagint; generally with an accusative of the thing $(\tau \eta \nu \gamma \eta \nu, \tau \lambda s \pi o \lambda \epsilon \iota s, \& c.)$; sometimes absolutely (Num. xviii. 20. & c.); sometimes with an accusative of the person (to be a man's heir; Gen. xv. 3, 4, $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \nu o \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$ $\mu \epsilon \dots o \nu \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \nu o \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon \kappa \tau \cdot \lambda$.). In the New Testament it is found 18 times $(\tau \eta \nu \gamma \eta \nu, \zeta \omega \eta \nu$ $a l \omega \nu \iota o \nu, \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon (a \nu \Theta \epsilon o \nu, \sigma \omega \tau \eta - \rho (a \nu, \epsilon \nu \lambda o \nu) \tau \lambda s \epsilon \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda (a s).$

ovoµa] 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, See Exod. xxxiii. åc. 10. xxxiv. 5-7, καὶ ἐκάλεσε τῷ ονόματι Κυρίου...Κύριος δ Θεός, οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων, μακρόθυμος καὶ πολυέλεος κ.τ.λ. John 12, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ όνομα αύτοῦ. xvii. 6, ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κ.τ.λ. ΧΧ. 31, ζωήν έχητε έν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. Acts iii. 16, τοῦτον... έστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Phil. η, καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ όνομα το ύπερ παν όνομα, ίνα έν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πῶν γόνυ κάμψη $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. The name is the designation, the description, in Scripture, of what the Messiah would be.

5. $\tau i \kappa \gamma a \rho$] Upon the quotations which follow it may be remarked in general, that the Epistle is addressed to persons

5 τίνι γαρ είπέν ποτε τών αγγέλων, Υίός μου εί

(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 approciate 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 The may be substituted for it. principles of the selection are two: (1) 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. T_{0} 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.

τίνι γαρ...τών αγγέλων Το which one of the Angels, &c. 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. 1. xxxviii. 7; in all which places however the Septuagint has not viol but ayyeloi), any more than by the application of the same title to Israelites of old (Exod. iv. 22, vios πρωτότοκός μου Ίσραήλ. Jer. xxxi. 9, Έφραϊμ πρωτότοκός μού έστιν. Hos. i. 10, κληθήσονται υίοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος), or to Christians now (Luke vi. 35. Rom. viii. 14, 19, ούτοι νίοί είσιν Θεού... τών υίων του Θεού. 2 Cor. vi. 18, ύμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἰοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας. Gal. iii. 26, πάντες γαρ υίοι Θεού έστε. iv. 6, 7. οὐκέτι εἶ δοῦλος, ἀλλὰ νίός. Heb. xii. 5, ύμιν ώς νίοις διαλέγεται). The whole stress lies on the individualization of the name.

Yiós $\mu ov \epsilon t \sigma v$] Psalm ii. 7. 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

I. 5, 6.

σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε; καὶ πάλιν, Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν; ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγη 6

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.

σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε] In its first meaning σήμερον 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 (2 Sam. vii. I, ότε εκάθισεν ό βασιλεύς έν τῷ οἶκῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ Κύριος κατεκληρονόμησεν αὐτὸν κύκλω από πάντων των έχθρων airoî). In its application, it is the day of Christ's Resurrection, and the Psalm was rightly selected for Easter Sunday. Compare Acts xiii. 33, αναστήσας Ίησοῦν, ώς καί...γέγραπται, Υίός μου εί σύ, έγω σήμερον κ.τ.λ. Rom. i. 4, τοῦ ὅρισθέντος υίοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει... έξ άναστάσεως νεκρών. 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 (1) to the Eternal Sonship, or (2) to the Incarnation.

'Εγώ ἔσομαι] 2 Sam. vii. 14. The subject is the promised seed of David (verse 12, ἀναστήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου μετα σέ...και έτοιμάσω την βασιλείαν αύτοῦ). Of him it is said, ανορθώσω τον θρόνον aù τ où ϵ ω s ϵ is τ or al ω ra (verse 13). 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 Abraham 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).

čσομαι εἰς... ἔσται εἰς] For the Hebraism, compare Matt. xix. 5. Mark x. 8. Luke iii. 5. 1 Cor. vi. 16. 2 Cor. vi. 18. Eph. v. 31. Heb. viii. 10. James v. 3.

6. $\delta \tau a \nu \delta \epsilon \pi a \lambda i \nu$] The place of $\pi a \lambda i \nu$ makes its sense ambiguous. Is it, like the $\pi a \lambda i \nu$ of verse 5 and ii. 13 (twice) and x. 30, the again of quotation; And when, again, He bringeth in, &c.? Or is it to be read with $\epsilon i \sigma a \gamma a \gamma n$, 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? (1) There is perhaps no precisely parallel instance of a transposed or parenthetical πa .

τον πρωτότοκον είς την οίκουμένην, λέγει, Καί

 $\lambda_{i\nu}$. But this Epistle deals much in the torical 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 particular word $\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \tau \delta \kappa \delta s$ is more evidently suitable to the Risen Christ than to the Eternal Son. It suggests, if it does not compel, 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 tov πρωτότοκον). And the quotation introduced by the clause $\delta \tau a \nu \delta \hat{\epsilon}$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$, though appropriate to either Advent, or to the Advent as a whole, cannot but be especially suitable to the Advent in glory.

όταν είσαγάγη...λέγει] When 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 construction, see 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28, όταν δε είπη ότι πάντα ύποτετακται ... όταν δε ύποταγή αὐτῶ τὰ πάντα, τότε αυτός ό υίος υποταγήσεται $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. When He shall have said the word, All things are subjected (manifestly excepting Him that subjected them)-when, I say, all things shall have been subjected, then shall the Son also Himself, &c. Compare verses 24, 54, όταν καταργήση... όταν ἐνδύσηται. xvi. 2, 3, 5, ἐλεύσομαι προς ύμας όταν Μακεδονίαν διέλθω. 2 Cor. x. 6. Col. iii. 4. iv. 16. &c. &c.

τόν πρωτότοκου] Here alone absolutely. In Luke ii. 7 with τον υίον αυτής. Rom. viii. 29, είς το είναι αύτον πρωτότοκον έν πολλοίς άδελφοίς. Col. i. 15, 18, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως...πρωτότοκος έν τών νεκρών. Rev. i. 5, ό πρωτότοκος τών νεκρών. See note on $\delta \tau a \nu \delta \epsilon \pi a \lambda \iota \nu$. If the eisayáyy refers to the first Advent (or to the Advent generally, without marking the difference), then the $\pi \rho \omega \tau \dot{\sigma} \tau \sigma \kappa \sigma s$ will mean simply the Eternal Son, the vids of verse 2. If to the second, there may be an allusion to the Resurrection, as in the $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \tau \pi \kappa a$ of verse 5, and as in the above quotations from Col. i. 18 and Rev. i. 5.

 $\tau \eta \nu$ olkov $\mu \epsilon \nu \eta \nu$] The word occurs almost forty times in the Septuagint, in the wider sense of the inhabited earth (Psalm xxiv. 1, τοῦ Κυρίου ή γη καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αυτής, ή οικουμένη και πάντες οί κατοικοῦντες έν αὐτη). And so Matt. xxiv. 14. Luke iv. 5. xxi. 26. Acts xvii. 31. xix. 27 (a rhetorical hyperbole). Rom. x. 18 (from Psalm xix, Rev. iii. 4). 10. xii, - 9. xvi. 14. In Heb. ii. 5 it has προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ. καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει, Ὁ 7 ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ

the peculiar sense given it by the addition of $\tau \eta \nu$ $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o v \sigma a \nu$ (see note there). In Luke ii. I and Acts xi. 28 the context limits it to the Roman Empire. Here it is equivalent to $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu os$, and the parallel passages are those of St John in which the Incarnation is spoken of as a coming into the κόσμος (John i. 9. iii. 17, 19. vi. 14. ix. 39. x. 36. xi. 27. xii. 46. xvi. 28. xvii. 18. xviii. 37. 1 John iv. o). The Eternal Son is outside the οίκουμένη (John i. 1, ο λόγος ήν προ'ς τον Θεόν). Incarnation brings Him into it (John xvi. 28, έξηλθον έκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ έλήλυθα είς τον κόσμον). Ascension again withdraws Him from the οἰκουμένη (πάλιν ἀφίημι τὸν κόσμον καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν $\Pi a \tau \epsilon \rho a$). The Advent brings Him back into it (John xiv. 3, έὰν πορευθῶ...πάλιν ἔρχομαι). The peculiarity of the expression here is the elocayew instead of the usual $\pi \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \nu$ or $a \pi o \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda$ - $\lambda \epsilon v$ of the Gospels. Even of the second Advent we have άποστέλλειν in Acts iii, 20. The nearest approach to the cioayew here is the ayer of I Thess. iv. 14 (ο Θεός τούς κοιμηθέντας δια τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ẳξει σὺν αὐτῷ).

Kaì $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \kappa v v \eta \sigma a \tau \omega \sigma a v$] The kaì is part of the quotation.

This, and the third person, point to Deut. xxxii. 43 (καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι [B, viol A] $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$) rather than to Psalm xevii. 7 (προσκυνήσατε αύτώ, πάντες οι άγγελοι αυτού) as 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, $\tau i \nu i \gamma a \rho$. The Angels themselves are bidden in prophecy to worship God manifested in the Son. The word $\pi \rho o \sigma \kappa v \kappa i v$ is only once used by St Paul (1 Cor. xiv. 25).

7. $\kappa a \ \pi \rho \delta s \ \mu \epsilon \nu$] The $\mu \delta \nu$ and $\delta \delta \epsilon$ 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, &c.

πρός] The towards of πρὸς varies according to the context between of (with regard to) and to. The one is the mental, the other the physical, looking to. Here, of the Angels ...to the Son. Compare, for example, Rom. x. 21 (πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγωι) with Heb. vii. 21 (τοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς αὐτόν).

'Ο ποιών] Psalm civ. 4.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

8 τούς λειτουργούς αύτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα· πρὸς

(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 (See note on verse ministry. 4, τών άγγέλων.) (2) The secondary application is, Who maketh His Angels (swift as) winds, (penetrating, pervasive, (3) The third &c.) as fire. sense, assigned to the words here, and more expressly in verse 14, is evidently a derived one; Who maketh His Angels spirits, &c.: they are spirits, by nature and essence. The same ambiguity, between wind and spirit, lying necessarily in the word $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$, is felt even in the great passage, John iii. 8, το πνεύμα δπου θέλει $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\iota}, \kappa. \tau. \lambda.$ (4) The rendering, Who maketh winds His messengers, 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.

λειτουργούς] From its original sense of a people's workman, a public servant (λείτος, from λεώς, and ἕργον), the word λειτουργός passes into that of minister generally. It is speci-

ally applied in the Septuagint (where, with its kindred forms, λειτουργείν, λειτουργία, and λειτουργικός, it occurs about 140 times) to the sacred offices of the Priests and Levites (Neh. x. 39, καί έκει σκεύη τα άγια, καί οί ίερεις οι λειτουργοί. Isai. lxi. 6, ίερεις Κυρίου κληθήσεσθε, λειτουργοί Θεού. &c., &c.). The attendant upon a prophet or king is called his λειτουργός, as in Josh. i. 1, τῷ Ἰησοῦ νίῷ Ναυή τῷ λειτουργώ (Α, ύπουργώ Β) Μωυσή. 1 Kings i. 4, 'Aβισάγ... έλειτούργει αὐτῷ. Χ. 5, καὶ τὴν στάσιν λειτουργών αύτοῦ. xix. 21, ἐπορεύθη οπίσω Ήλιού, καὶ ἐλειτούργει αὐτῷ. 2 Kings vi. 15, ωρθρισεν ο λειτουργός Έλισαιε avaotnyvai. In Psalm ciii. 21 the word is applied, as here, to the Angels (εὐλογεῖτε τὸν Κύριον, πάσαι αι δυνάμεις αύτοῦ, λειτουργοι αύτου, ποιούντες το θέλημα αὐτοῦ). In the New Testament the use is equally various. It includes service rendered by man to God (Luke i. 23. Rom. xiii. 6, λειτουργοί γάρ Θεού είσίν. Phil. ii. 17. Heb. ix. 21) or Christ (είς το είναι με λειτουργον Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη); by man to man (2 Cor. ix, 12. Phil. ii. 25, 30, και λειτουργόν τής χρείας μου...τής πρός με λειτουργίas); or by Christ to God (Heb. viii. 2, 6, των άγίων λειτουργός...διαφορωτέρας τέτευχεν λειτουργίας).

δε τον υίόν, Ο θρόνος σου, ό Θεός, είς τον αίωνα τοῦ αἰωνος, καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς εὐθύ-

i. 8. Or omit τοῦ alŵvos.

πυρὸς φλόγα] In the Septuagint it is πυρ φλέγον.

8. O $\theta \rho \delta \nu \sigma s \sigma \sigma v$] Psalm xlv. 6, 7. The occasion of the Psalm 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, $\tau i \nu \tau \gamma \alpha \rho$.)

ο Θεός] Evidently a vocative. God is thy throne might possibly have been said (Psalm xlvi. 1, ο Θεός ήμῶν καταφυγή καὶ δύναμις. &c., &c.): thy throne is God seems an unnatural phrase. And even in its first (human) application the vocative would cause no difficulty (Psalm lxxxii. 6, ἐγὼ εἶπα, θεοί ἐστε καὶ υίοὶ ὑψίστου πάντες. John x. 34, 35, ἐκείνους είπεν θεούς, πρὸς οῦς ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγένετο).

εἰς τὸν aἰῶνa τοῦ aἰῶνος] Amongst the multitude of like combinations found in the Septuagint (δι' aἰῶνος, εἰς τὸν aἰῶνα, εῶς τοῦ aἰῶνος, ἕως aἰῶνος, ἕως εἰς τὸν aἰῶνα, εἰς τοὺς aἰῶνας, ἕως εἰς τοὺς aἰῶνας, εἰς τὸν aἰῶνα καὶ ἐπέκεινα, εἰς τοὺς aἰῶνας καὶ ἔτι, ἕως τοῦ aἰῶνος ἔτι, εἰς τὸν aἰῶνα χρόνον, εἰς τὸν aἰῶνα τοῦ aἰῶνος, εἰς aἰῶνα alῶνος, τὸν aἰῶνα καὶ ἐπ΄ aἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι, ἕως aἰῶνος τῶν aἰῶνων) the precise form of the text seems to occur only in the Book of Psalms (lxxxiii. 17. xcii. 7. civ. 5. lxxxix. 29. exi. 3, 8, 10. exii. 3, 9). In the New Testament we have only (of the above) eis rov aiŵra, els roùs alŵvas, and (peculiar to it) είς αίωνα (Jude), είς πάντας τούς αἰώνας (Jude), εἰς αἰώνας αιώνων (Rev.), είς τούς αιώνας τών aιώνων (Gal, Phil., I Tim., 2 Tim., 1 Pet., Rev.), είς πάσας τας γενεάς του αιώνος τών αιώνων (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 ac- . cording 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 If the terms are apcontext. plied 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.

καὶ ή ῥά β δοs] (1) The καὶ is not in the Septuagint; but,

9 τητος ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου. ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ

i. 8. Or της β. αύτοῦ.

as the clause which it introduces follows immediately upon the former, it seems better to regard the kal 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) ράβδος, 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 There is very conlast word. siderable authority for avrou instead of *oov*. This reading may have been occasioned by missing the vocative use of o $\Theta \epsilon \circ s$ above (see note on $\circ \Theta \epsilon \circ s$). If avov is read, we must suppose the direct address of the former clause to be changed into the third person in the latter.

ράβδος] (1) A staff, for support.' Matt. x. 10. Mark vi. 8. Luke ix. 3. Heb. xi. 21. Psalm xxiii. 4, η ράβδος σου καὶ η βακτηρία σου, αὐτά (A, αὐταί B) με παρεκάλεσαν. (2) A staff, of office.' Heb. ix. 4. Exod. vii. 20, καὶ ἐπάρας 'Aaρŵν τὴν ῥάβδον (A, τῃ ῥάβδψ B) αὐτοῦ ἐπάταξε τὸ ὕδωρ. (3) A rod, for measuring.' Rev. xi. 1. Psalm lxxiv. 2, ἐλυτρώσω ῥάβδον κληρονομίας σου, ὅρος Σωών κ.τ.λ. (4) A rod, for chastising. 1 Cor. iv. 21. Psalm lxxxix. 32, ἐπισκέψομαι ἐν ῥάβδω τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐν μάστιξι τὰς ἀδικίας (Α, ἀμαρτίας B) αὐτῶν. (5) A sceptre.' Here, and in Rev. ii. 27. xii. 5. xix. 15. Psalm ii. 9. cx. 2, ῥάβδον δυνάμεως σου (Α, σοι after ἐξαπ. B) ἐξαποστελεῖ Κύριος ἐκ Σιών κατακυρίευε ἐν μέσω τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου.

εὐθύτητος] Combined with δικαιοσύνη' in Josh. xxiv. 14. Psalm ix. 8. With ἀκακία' in Psalm xxxvii. 37. With ἀλή-' θεια in Psalm cxi. 8. Eccles. xii. 10. Compare 1 Kings iii. 6, ἐν ἀληθεία 'καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνη' καὶ ἐν εὐθύτητι καρδίας.

τῆς βασιλείας σου] Dan. ii. 44, ἀναστήσει ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ βασιλείαν ἤτις εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας οὐ διαφθαρήσεται. vii. 13, 14, ὡς νἰὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος ἦν...καὶ αὐτῷ ἐδόθη ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία κ.τ.λ. From Matt. iii. 2 onwards the figure recurs perpetually in the New Testament.

 δικαιοσύνην ... ἀνομίαν]
 Contrasted' as in 2 Cor. vi. 14,
 τίς γὰρ μετοχή δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνομία; Compare 'Matt. xxiii,
 28, ἔξωθεν μὲν φαίνεσθε τοῦς ἀνθρώποις δίκαιοι, ἔσωθεν δέ ἐστε μεστοὶ ὑποκρίσεως καὶ ἀνομίας.

ἀνομίαν] The Alexandrine Septuagint has ἀδικίαν. The dis-

τοῦτο ἕχρισέν σε ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεός σου,

tinctive idea of avouia is insub-St John makes it ordination. the synonym of *ἀμαρτί*α (1 John iii. 4, πας ό ποιῶν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν καὶ την ανομίαν ποιεί · και ή άμαρτία έστιν ή ανομία). See Matt. vii. 23, αποχωρείτε απ' έμοῦ οἱ έργαζόμενοι την άνομίαν. xiii. 41. xxiv. 12. Rom. iv. 7 (from Psalm xxxii. 1), ῶν ἀφέθησαν αι ἀνομίαι, και ῶν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν ai aμαρτίαι. 2 Thess. ii. 3, 8, έαν μη...αποκαλυφθή ό ανθρωπος $\tau \eta s$ avoµías (with alternative reading άμαρτίας)...άποκαλυφθήσεται ο avonos. Heb. x. 17.

διά τοῦτο] The Divine approbation of the character is made the reason of the anoint-In its application to the ing. human subject, this approbation (whether of David, or Solomon, or Hezekiah) could be but comparative and partial. In its application to the Messiah, this is one of the texts which speak of the perfect obedience, in action and suffering, as the procuring cause of the exaltation. The anointing is the investiture with universal sovereignty, consequent upon Resurrection, The δια τούτο is the διο of Phil. ii. 9: γενόμενος υπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δε σταυρού · διό και ό Θεός αυτόν υπερύψωσεν κ.τ.λ. Compare John xvii. 4, 5, έγώ σε εδόξασα επί τής γής, τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας...καὶ νῦν δόξασόν με σύ, Πάτερ, παρὰ

σεαυτώ κ.τ.λ.

 $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi \rho \iota \sigma \epsilon \prime \nu \sigma \epsilon}$ In other places the anointing is connected with the entrance of our Lord upon His earthly Ministry. Luke iv. 18, 21, έχρισέν με εύαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοΐς...σήμερον πεπλήρωται ή γραφή αυτη κ.τ.λ. Acts iv. 27, συνήχθησαν... επί τον άγιον παιδά σου Ίησοῦν ὃν ἔχρισας Ἡρώδης τε και Πόντιος Πιλάτος κ.τ.λ. Χ. 38, ώς έχρισεν αύτον ό Θεός πνεύματι άγίω και δυνάμει, δς διηλθεν εύεργετών κ.τ.λ. Here the reference is evidently to a later anointing (see last note). And although the figure would apply to the prophetic (1 Kings xix. 16, χρίσεις είς προφήτην) or priestly (Exod. xl. 13, καὶ χρίσεις αὐτόν, καὶ ἱερατεύσει μοι. &c. &c.) consecration as well as to the royal, yet this last is clearly the subject here. I Sam. xvi. 12, ανάστα, χρίσον τον Δαυίδ. Psalm lxxxix. 20, εὗρον Δαυὶδ τον δοῦλόν μου, έν έλαίω (A, έλέει B, and omit μου) άγίω μου έχρισα αὐτόν. In other passages of the New Testament, $\chi \rho i \epsilon i \nu$ and $\chi \rho i \sigma \mu a$ are applied to the gift of the Holy 2 Cor. i. Spirit to Christians. I John ii. 20, 27. 21.

ό Θεός σου] The Person addressed is God (verse 8); and yet God is His God. Compare John xx. 17 (λέγει Ἰησοῦς... ᾿Αναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν...Θεόν μου) with verse 28 (Θωμᾶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ὁ...Θεός μου). See Eph. i.

έλαιον άγαλλιάσεως παρά τούς μετόχους

17, δ Θεός τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. In the frequently occurring phrase, ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, it is not quite certain that the genitive depends on both nominatives.

έλαιον] Elsewhere χρίειν has the dative. Num. xxxv. 25, δν έχρισεν (Α, έχρισαν Β) αὐτὸν τῷ ἐλαίψ τῷ ἀγίψ. Acts x. 38. Or έν. 2 Sam.i. 21. Psalm lxxxix. 20. Ezek. xvi. 9, καὶ ἐχρισά σε ἐν ἐλαίψ. Ecclus. xlv. 15. Or έξ. Exod. xxx. 25, 26, ἔλαιον χρῖσμα ἄγιον ἔσται· καὶ χρίσεις ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὴν σκήνην κ.τ.λ.

aγaλλιάσεως] (1) In the Septuagint, this form is peculiar to the Book of Psalms. See, for instance, Psalm xxx. 5, κλαυθμόςἀγαλλίασις. xlii. 4, ἐν φωνη άγαλλιάσεως και έξομολογήσεως. li. 12, απόδος μοι την αγαλλίασιν τοῦ σωτηρίου σου. exviii. 15, φωνή άγαλλιάσεως καὶ σωτηρίας έν σκηναΐς δικαίων. cxxvi. 2, 5, 6, χαράς... ἀγαλλιάσεως... ἐν δάκρυσιν, έν άγαλλιάσει κ.τ.λ. The form $d_{\gamma}a\lambda\lambda ia\mu a$ (a subject of exultation) is frequent in Isaiah and elsewhere. In the New Testament ayalliaois is found in Luke i. 14, 44, χαρά σοι καί άγαλλίασις κ.τ.λ. Acts ii. 46. Jude 24. The verb dyallia occurs in Luke i. 47. Rev. xix. 7: αγαλλιώσθαι in Matt. v. 12. Luke x. 21. John v. 35. viii. 56. Acts ii. 26 (from Psalm xvi. 9).

xvi. 34. I Pet. i. 6, 8. iv. 13. The genitive here expresses the characteristic. What is often in Scripture called the $\ell\lambda a \omega v$ $\tau \eta s \chi \rho (\sigma \epsilon \omega s)$ (Exod. xxix. 21. &c. &c.) is here an $\ell\lambda a \omega v$ $\dot{a} \gamma a \lambda \lambda a \dot{a}$ $\sigma \epsilon \omega s$, a chrism of exultation, for the dignity which it confers; thus raising into a higher sphere the words of Psalm civ. 15, $\tau \omega \tilde{v}$ $\ell\lambda a \rho \tilde{v} \omega t$ mpó $\sigma \omega \pi v \ell \ell \lambda a \ell \omega$.

 $\pi a \rho a$ From the sense of (1) beside, parallel to, comes that of (2) in comparison with; and so (3) in advantageous comparison with, more than, beyond. Luke xiii. 2, 4, άμαρτωλοί παρά πάντας τοὺς Γαλιλαίους...ὀφειλέται παρά πάντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς κατοικούντας Ίερουσαλήμ. Rom. 25, ἐλάτρευσαν τῆ κτίσει παρὰ τον κτίσαντα. iv. 18. xi. 24. xii. 3. xiv. 5, κρίνει ήμέραν παρ' $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho a \nu$. For the use of $\pi a \rho a$ with a preceding comparative, see note on verse 4, όσω διαφορώτερον.

τοὺς μετόχους σου] Thy partners, partakers with thee in the dignity of royalty. (1) Compare 1 Kings x. 23, καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθη Σαλωμῶν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς πλούτω καὶ ἀρρονήσει. In the application to Christ, only the general idea can be maintained; other potentates, whether earthly or angelic. Compare Rom. xiv. 9. Eph. i. 21, ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότη-

I. 10.

σου. καί, Σὺ κατ' ἀρχάς, Κύριε, τὴν γῆν 10 ἐθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἕργα τῶν χειρῶν σού

τος κ.τ.λ. Phil. ii. 11. Col. i. 16—18. 1 Pet. iii. 22, и́лотаγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν και δυνάμεων. Rev. i. 5, ο πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς. xix. 16, βασιλεύς βασιλέων και κύριος κυρίων. A more exclusive (or even explicit) reference to the Angels as µέτοχοι 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 μέτοχος is peculiar (in the New Testament) to this Epistle, excepting only Luke v. 7, where, as here, it is used absolutely (κατένευσαν τοῖς μετό- χ_{0is}). In the four other places of its occurrence it has a genitive (Heb. iii. 1, 14, κλήσεως έπουρανίου μέτοχοι...μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. vi. 4, μετόχους πνεύματος άγίου. xii. 8, ής μέτοχοι γεγόνασιν πάντες). In the Septuagint it is always absolute, as here; partner, not partaker. I Sam. xx. 30, μέτοχος εί σύ τώ via leoraí. Psalm cxix. 63. Eccles. iv. 10, ο είς εγερεί τον μέτοχον αὐτοῦ. Hos. iv. 17, μέτοχος είδώλων Έφραίμ.

10. $\kappa a(, \Sigma v)$ Psalm cii. 26 -28. The only departures from the Alexandrine Septuagint are (1) a change of order (from $\kappa a\tau'$ $a\rho\chi as \sigma v)$, (2) the reading $i\lambda i$ $\xi \epsilon us$ (with B) for $a\lambda\lambda a\xi \epsilon us$, (3) the insertion of a second us ίμάτιον after αύτούς. There is nothing in the Psalm itself to mark its application to Christ. But (1) the principle above stated fully justifies this use of Its subject is the interit. position 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, that πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρίς αύτου έγένετο ουδέ έν δ γέγονεν (John i. 3).

κατ' ἀρχάς] Psalm cxix. 152, κατ' ἀρχὰς ἔγνων ἐκ τῶν μαρτυρίων σου, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐθεμελίωσας αὐτά.

τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας] Job xxxviii. 4, ποῦ ῆσθα ὅτε ἐθεμελίωσα τὴν γῆν; Psalm xxiv. 2. lxxxix. 11, σή ἐστιν ἡ γῆ[·] τὴν οἰκουμένην καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς σὺ ἐθεμελίωσας. civ. 5. cxix. 90. Prov. iii. 19. Isai. xlviii. 13. li. 13, 16. In the New Testament θεμελιοῦν is used once in the Gospels (Matt. vii. 25) and twice (figuratively) in the Epistles (Eph. iii. 17. Col. i. 23).

έργα] Psalm viii. 6, κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου. Heb. iv. 3, 4, 10, τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γενηθέντων κ.τ.λ. 11 εἰσιν οἱ οὐρανοί· αὐτοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, σὐ δὲ διαμένεις· καὶ πάντες ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιω12 θήσονται, καὶ ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον ἐλίξεις αὐτούς, ὡς ἱμάτιον, καὶ ἀλλαγήσονται· σὺ

11. avroí] Always emphatic in the nominative. Either they themselves, or even they, or they indeed.

ἀπολοῦνται] 2 Pet. iii, 6, 7, ὁ τότε κόσμος...ἀπώλετο· οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ...τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν...εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων.

διαμένεις] It is the word applied by the scoffers, in 2 Pet. iii. 4, to the permanence of matter: πάντα ούτως διαμένει απ' άρχης κτίσεως. 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 aiŵva, Κύριε, δ λόγος σου διαμένει έν τώ ουρανώ εἰς γενεάν καὶ γενεάν ή αλήθεια σου έθεμελίωσας την γην καί διαμένει. In the New Testament, Siapéveir is found (besides) only in Luke i. 22. xxii. 28. Gal. ii. 5.

παλαιωθήσονται] viii. 13, τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ. Luke xii. 33, βαλλάντια μὴ παλαιούμενα. Compare Deut. xxix. 5, οὐκ ἐπαλαιώθησαν τὰ ἱμάτια ὑμῶν ἐπάνωθεν ύμῶν. Josh. ix. 5, 13, καὶ τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτῶν πεπαλαιωμένα ἐπάνω αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Neh. ix. 21. Job xiii. 28, δ παλαιοῦται... ὅσπερ ἱμάτιον σητόβρωτον. Isai. l. 9. li. 6, ὅ οὐρανὸς ὡς καπνὸς ἐστερεώθη, καὶ ἡ (A, ἡ δὲ B) γῆ ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσεται. Ecclus. xiv. 17.

περιβόλαιον] Psalm
 civ. 6, άβυσσος ώς ἱμάτιον τὸ περιβόλαιον αὐτοῦ. Isai. lix. 17, περιεβάλετο ἱμάτιον ἐκδικήσεως, καὶ τὸ περιβόλαιον ζήλου (A, αὐτοῦ B). &c. &c. 1 Cor. xi.

ελίξεις] Isai. xxxiv. 4, καὶ ελιγήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον. Rev. vi. 14, καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπεχωρίσθη ὡς βιβλίον ελισσόμενον.

is $i\mu\dot{\alpha}\tau\iota\sigma v$] The insertion seems ungraceful, as well as redundant. But the above quotation from Psalm civ. 6 (see note on $\pi\epsilon\rho_{\beta}\dot{\beta}\dot{\lambda}a\iota\sigma v$) gives a striking parallel. It seems best to connect is $i\mu\dot{\alpha}\tau\iota\sigma v$ with the preceding clause, thus: and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, even as a garment; and they shall be changed.

άλλαγήσονται] Gen. xxxv. 2, καὶ ἀλλάξατε τῶς στολῶς ὑμῶν. xli. 14. 2 Sam. xii. 20, καὶ δέ ό αὐτὸς εἶ, καὶ τὰ ἕτη σου οὐκ ἐκλείψουσιν. πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἴρηκέν 13 ποτε, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου; οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶν λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα, εἰς 14

ήλλαξε τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ. Jer. lii.
33. Dan. iv. 16, καὶ ἑπτὰ καιροὶ ἀλλαγήσονται ἐπ' ἀὐτόν. The word occurs also in Acts vi. 14.
Rom. i. 23 (from Psalm cvi. 20).
I Cor. xv. 51, 52. Gal. iv. 20. ὅ ἀὐτὸς εἶ] xiii. 8, Ἰησοῦς

ο αυτος ει] x111. 8, 1ησους Χριστος έχθες και σήμερον δ αυτος και εις τους αίωνας.

τὰ ἔτη σου] Job x. 5, η ὁ βίος σου ἀνθρώπινος; η τὰ ἔτη σου ὡς ἡμέραι (Α, ὡς ἡμ. omitted in B) ἀνδρός; Psalm lxi. 6, τὰ ἔτη αὐτοῦ ἔως ἡμέρας γενεῶς καὶ γενεῶς. cii. 24, ἐν γενεῷ γενεῶν τὰ ἔτη σου.

ούκ ἐκλείψουσιν] I Kings xvii. 14, ή ύδρία τοῦ ἀλεύρου οὐκ ἐκλείψει. ἀc. ἀc. In the New Testament ἐκλείπειν occurs only in Luke xvi. 9. xxii. 32.

13. $\epsilon_{l}^{0}\rho_{\kappa}\epsilon_{\nu}$] 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 iv. 12, $\epsilon_{l}^{1}\pi\epsilon_{\nu}$ adr $\tilde{\omega}$ d'Introôs ort $\epsilon_{\ell}^{0}\rho_{1}\pi\epsilon_{\ell}$, Our ékmeipáseis $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. Acts xiii. 34, our s $\epsilon_{\ell}^{1}\rho_{1}\kappa\epsilon_{\nu}$, ort dúsw $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$.

Ká θov] Psalm cx. 1. See notes on verse 3, $\epsilon \kappa a \theta i \sigma \epsilon v$, &c.

ύποπόδιον] Psalm xcix. 5, προσκυνείτε τῷ ὑποποδίῳ τῶν ποδών αὐτοῦ. Isai. lxvi. 1. Lam. ii. 1. Matt. v. 35. Acts vii. 49. James ii. 3.

14. οὐχὶ πάντες] 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 perpetual mission, for the sake of those who shall hereafter inherit salvation?

 $\pi \acute{a} \imath \tau \epsilon s$] In contrast to the $\tau \acute{\iota} \imath a$ above. All, alike' and equally,' without distinction' or selection' of any.

λειτουργικά] Belonging to, existing only for that $\lambda \epsilon_{i\tau}$ over $\gamma i a$, divine and human, by which the above quotation (verse 7) describes them. The adjective' occurs only here in the New Testament. But compare Exod. xxxi. 10, καὶ τὰς στολὰς τὰς λειτουργικάς 'Ααρών. ΧΧΧΙΧ. 1, 41. Num. iv. 12, 26, καὶ λήψονται πάντα τὰ σκεύη τὰ λειτουργικά κ.τ.λ. vii. 5, πρός τὰ έργα τὰ λειτουργικά τής σκηνής του μαρτυρίου. 2 Chron. xxiv. 14, σκεύη λειτουργικά όλοκαυτωμάτων,

eis diakovíav] Acts xi. 29.

διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν;

II. Ι Διά τοῦτο δεῖ περισσοτέρως προσέχειν ήμâς

1 Cor. xvi. 15. 1 Tim. i. 12. 2 Tim. iv. 11.

άποστελλόμενα] The present participle expresses a *repeated* or *continuous* mission. Psalm ciii. 20, 21, ποιοῦντες τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ...ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα (Α, τὰ θελήματα Β) αὐτοῦ. John i. 51, καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦΘεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας κ.τ.λ.

διὰ τοὺς] For the sake of. The ministry of Angels has the good of individual men for its object. This is implied in the αὐτῶν of Matt. xviii. 10, oἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν...βλέπουσιν τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Πατρός μου. Psalm xci. 11, 12, τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελείται περὶ σοῦ τοῦ διαφυλάζαι σε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὅδοῖς σου.

σωτηρίαν] The verb σώζειν 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 $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a$ 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, τοῦτο γὰρ προς της ύμετέρας σωτηρίας ύπάρχει. Psalm exviii. 15, φωνη αγαλλιάσεως καί σωτηρίας έν σκηναίς δικαίων. cxix. 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 $\sigma \omega \tau \eta$ - ρ ía the idea of *rescue*, restoration to well-being, rather than that of preservation in it. Acts xiii. 26, ύμιν ό λόγος της σωτηρίας ταύτης έξαπεστάλη. xvi. 17, καταγγέλλουσιν ήμιν όδον σωτηplas. And so throughout the Epistles. The adjective $\sigma \omega \tau \eta$ ριος (saving) occurs in Tit. ii. 11: σωτήριον (τό) in Luke ii. 30. iii, 6 (from Isai. xl. 5). Acts xxviii. 28. Eph. vi. 17 (from Isai. lix. 17), and often in the Septuagint : σωτήρια (τά), thankofferings for safety, peace-offerings, Exod. xx. 24, τα όλοκαυτώματα καί τα σωτήρια ύμων $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$; and so about 70 times in Leviticus, Numbers, &c.

II. 1—4. $\Delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau o \tilde{\nu} \tau o \delta \epsilon \tilde{i}$] 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

II. 1, 2.

τοις ακουσθεισιν, μή ποτε παραρυώμεν. Ει γαρ 2

Mosaic Dispensation which was inaugurated by the ministry of Angels.

1. $\Delta u \sim \tau o \tau \sigma \tau$ 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.

περισσοτέρως 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.12. ii. 4. vii. 13, 15. xi. 23. xii. 15. Gal, i, 14. Phil. i. 14. 1 Thess. ii. 17). The adjective περισσός (from $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ in its sense of over and above) means remaining over (Exod. x. 5, τὸ περισσόν, τὸ καταλειφθέν); and so either (1) abundant (John x. 10, kai περισσόν έχωσιν), superior, excellent (Dan. v. 12, 14, πνεθμα περισσον...σοφία περισσή), or (2) redundant, superfluous, excessive (2 Cor. ix. 1, $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \delta v$ μοί έστιν το γράφειν υμίν). Sometimes with a genitive, *exceeding*, more than (Matt. v. 37, to de περισσόν τούτων κ.τ.λ.).

 έαυτοῖς. XXI. 34. Acts v. 35. viii. 10, 11. XX. 28), or with dπ∂ (Matt. vii. 15. X. 17. Xvi. 6, 11, 12. Luke XX. 46, προσέχετε àπ∂ τῶν γραμματέων), or with both (Luke XII. 1, προσέχετε έαυτοῖς àπ∂ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων). It is a favourite word with St Luke. St Paul uses it only in the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim. i. 4. iii. 8. iv. 1, 13. Tit. i, 14).

τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν] The things which were heard; which were taught us in our first instruction as Christians. Eph. i. 13, ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας. iv. 21, εἴ γε αὐτὸν ἡκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε. Col. i. 6, 23, ἀφ ἡς ἡμέρας ἡκούσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τῆν χάριν...τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οῦ ἠκούσατε. 2 Tim. i. 13. ii. 2. I John ii. 7, 24, ὅ ἀπ ἀρχῆς ἡκούσατε. iii. 11. 2 John 6.

 $\mu \eta' \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon$] The temporal sense, lest at any time, would not be unsuitable here, nor in Luke xxi. 34, and a few other passages. 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.

 $\pi a \rho a \rho v \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon v$] The verb $\pi a - \rho a \rho \rho \epsilon \omega$, applied first to a river flowing by a place, is also used absolutely, in the sense of flow-

ό δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος ἐγένετο βέβαιος, καὶ πᾶσα παράβασις καὶ παρακοὴ ἕλαβεν ἕνδικον

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, υίέ, μη παραρρυής, τήρησον δέ $\epsilon \mu \eta \nu \beta_{0} \nu \lambda \eta \nu$. The figure is like that of Psalm lviii. 7, ¿ξουδενωθήσονται ώς ύδωρ διαπορευόμενον (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 \cdot defection. (The passive form $\epsilon \rho \rho \dot{v} \eta v$ is the usual aorist of $\dot{\rho} \epsilon \omega$.) 2. εί γάρ I say περισσοτέρως-for, &c.

ό δι' ἀγγέλων λ. λόγος] The word which was spoken by means (by the instrumentality, with the attendant ministry) of Angels. The Law of Moses. See note on i. 4, τῶν ἀγγέλων.

λόγος] John x. 35, προς ούς ο λόγος του Θεου εγένετο.

έγένετο] Became, came to be; proved or showed itself, by its penalties and its judgments.

 $\beta \in \beta_{\alpha, \alpha}$ Stedfast, firm to the tread (from Baw, Baivw. Thue iii. 23, κρύσταλλος ού βέβαιος ώστ έπελθείν). The word occurs five times in this Epistle (iii. 6, 14. vi. 19. ix. 17), and only four times besides in the New Testament (Rom. iv. 16. 2 Cor. i. 7. 2 Pet. i. 10, 19, έχομεν βεβαιότερον τον προφητικόν λόγον). In the Septuagint it is found only in Wisdom vii. 23, πνεύμα...βέβαιον ασφαλές αμέριμνον. For the verb $\beta \epsilon \beta a \omega v$, see verse 3. And for BeBaiwous vi. 16.

 $\pi \hat{a}\sigma a$] Every. None too trifling to be regarded. See Exod. xxi. xxii. Lev. xxiv. Num. xxxv. Deut. xix. xxi. xxv.

 π αράβασις καὶ π αρακοή (1) transgression and disobedience. \mathbf{The} substantive $\pi a \rho a \beta a \sigma \iota s$ (with τοῦ νόμου, Rom. ii. 23; or absolutely, Rom. iv. 15. v. 14. Gal. iii. 19. 1 Tim. ii. Heb. ix. 15) occurs but 14. once in the Old Testament. Ps. ci. 3, ποιούντας παραβάσεις εμίσησα. The verb (παραβαί $v \epsilon i v$) is very common, with $\tau \dot{o} v$ νόμον, την διαθήκην, τον λόγον, το ρήμα, &c. or $i\kappa$ τής όδου, $a_{\pi 0}$ τών έντολών, έν έμοί, &c. The idea is that of going by the side of instead of walking in the prescribed path. (2) We find

μισθαποδοσίαν, πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τηλικαύ- 3 της ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας; ήτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα

παρακοή but twice elsewhere; Rom. v. 19. 2 Cor. x. 6. It is properly mishearing, indifferent or rebellious hearing, in opposition to ὑπακοή, submissive hearing. The contrast is expressed (in the two verbs) in Isai. lxv. 12, ὅτι ἐκάλεσα ὑμᾶς καὶ οὐχ ὑπηκούσατε, ἐλάλησα καὶ παρηκούσατε. Elsewhere παρακούευν occurs only in the Book of Esther: iii. 3, 8, τὰ λεγόμενα, τῶν νόμων. iv. 14, ἐἀν παρακούσασα (A, omitted in B) παρακούσης ἐν τούτῷ τῷ καιρῷ.

ἐνδικον] Řom. iii. 8 (only). μισθαποδοσίαν] A word
peculiar to this Epistle: x. 35, ήτις έχει μεγάλην μισθαποδοσίαν.
xi. 26, ἀπέβλεπεν γὰρ εἰς τὴν
μισθαποδοσίαν. Also μισθαποδότης, xi. 6. We have the elements of the word in Deut.
xxiv. 15, αὐθημερὸν ἀποδώσεις
τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ. Jerem. xxii.
13. Wisdom x. 17. Matt. xx.
8, ἀπόδος τὸν μισθόν. The classical form is μισθοδοσία.

3. $\pi \hat{\omega} \hat{s} \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \hat{s} \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \phi \epsilon \upsilon \hat{\xi} \phi \mu \epsilon \theta a]$ If the Law, with its interposition of Angels, was thus formidable in its self-assertion, judge ye if it can be safe to trifle with the Gospel, which has the Son Himself for its Mediator. This is the direct inference. But a further suggestion follows, involved 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.

ήμεις] We Christians. See xii. 25, εί γὰρ ἐκείνοι...πολὺ μᾶλλον ήμεις.

 $\dot{\epsilon}$ κφευξόμεθα] Elsewhere with an accusative of the thing to be escaped: Luke xxi. 36, ταῦτα πάντα. Rom. ii. 3, τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Here the thing to be dreaded is left in mysterious silence. So in I Thess. v. 3, καὶ οῦ μὴ ἐκφύγωσιν. Heb. xii. 25, ἐκείνοι οὖκ ἐξέφυγον.

τηλικαύτης] So great, (1) by reason of the majesty of the Introducer, (2) in its own character. The word τηλικοῦτος occurs only (besides) in 2 Cor. i. 10. James iii. 4, τὰ πλοῖα τηλικαῦτα ὄντα. Rev. xvi. 18, τηλικοῦτος σεισμός, οῦτω μέγας.

άμελήσαντες] (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 δè ἀμελήσαντες ἀπῆλθον. I Tim. iv. 14. Compare Jer. xlviii. 10, ἐπικατάρατος ὁ ποιῶν τὰ ἐργα Κυρίου ἀμελῶς. The danger is that of

λαλεισθαι διά τοῦ Κυρίου ὑπό τῶν ἀκουσάντων

slighting rather than of refusing.

σωτηρίαs] Here made a synonym of the Gospel. This is its gracious import and purport as a whole. Acts xiii. 26, ό λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης. See note on i. 14, σωτηρίαν.

 $η_{\tau IS}$ $\dot{a}_{p\chi} \gamma \kappa.\tau.\lambda.]$ (I) The Gospel had Christ Himself for its original Preacher. (2) We received it on the sure testimony of its first hearers. (3) That testimony was not human only: God bore witness with it in all manner of supernatural gifts.

 $\eta_{\tau is}$] One which. A salvation which, having, &c. Compare viii. 5, 6. ix. 2, 9. x. 8, 11, 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.

άρχην λ. λαλείσθαι] 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, $\pi\epsilon\rho$ i πάντων...ών ήρξατο Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν (all that Jesus did and taught as a beginning of the new Dispensation). Gen. ii. 3, κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ῶν ἤρξατο ὁ Θεὸς ποιῆσαι.

διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου] Through the Lord. By (ὑπό) would have been equally true: but διὰ better suits the δι ἀγγέλων of verse 2, as well as the thought that of both Dispensations God is the Originator. See i. 1, 2, πάλαι ὁ Θeòs λαλήσας...ἐλάλησεν ἡμῦν ἐν υἰậ. Acts x. 36, τὸν λόγον [ὅν] ἀπέ στειλεν τοἱς νίοῖς Ἱσραὴλ εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· οῦτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος κ.τ.λ.

τοῦ Κυρίου] The Lord (absolutely) as a title of Christ is characteristic of St Luke. See Luke vii. 13. x. 1. xi. 39. xiii. 15. xvii. 5, 6. xii. 42. xviii. 6. xix. 8, 34. xxii. 61. xxiv. 34. Acts v. 14. ix. 1, 10, 11, 15, 17, 27, 35, 42. &c., &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. 1. vi. 23. xi. 2. It is found in St Paul's Epistles frequently

eis ήμας έβεβαιώθη, συνεπιμαρτυρούντος τού 4

(Rom. xiv. 8. 1 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. 10. Gal. i. 19. Eph. v. 22. vi. 7. Phil. iv. 5. Col. iii. 23. 1 Thess. i. 6, 8. iv. 15, 16. 2 Thess. i. 9. ii. 2. iii. 1. 2 Tim. i. 18. iv. 8, 17); but in most cases there is an evident reason in the context for the choice of the title.

τῶν ἀκουσάντων] Called in Luke i. 2, οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχής αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου. And in Acts x. 41, μάρτυσιν... οἶτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Compare John xiv. 26, ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἁ εἶπον ὑμῖν. xv. 27, καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε, ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχής μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστέ. Acts iv. 20, ἃ είδαμεν καὶ ἠκούσαμεν.

eis ήμας έβεβαιώθη Was certified unto us (so as to reach us; like I Thess. ii. 9, ernpúžaμεν είς ύμας. iv. 8, τον διδόντα το πνεύμα...είς ύμας). Compare 1 Cor. i. 6, τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ έβεβαιώθη έν ύμιν. For βεβαιοῦν, see also Mark xvi. 20, τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος. Rom. xv. 8. I Cor. i. 8. 2 Cor. i. 21. Col. ii. 7. Heb. xiii. 9. This reference to the testimony of the original heavers of Christ is exactly that of Luke i. 2, $\kappa a \theta \omega_s \pi a \rho \epsilon \delta \rho$ σαν ήμιν οι άπ' άρχης κ.τ.λ. But it is most unlike St Paul, who everywhere claims to be himself an original witness (1 Cor. ix. 1, $o\dot{v}\chi\dot{i}$ Invoiv $\tau \dot{v} \kappa \dot{v}\rho \iota v$ $\dot{\eta}\mu\omega \dot{v}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ $\rho \alpha \alpha_3$; xi. 23. xv. 8. Gal. i. 1, 12, $o\dot{v}\kappa \dot{a}\pi \dot{a}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega v$ oide $\delta\dot{c}$ $\dot{a}\nu$ $\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma\upsilon$... $o\dot{v}\delta\dot{\epsilon}$ yàp $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ mapà $\dot{a}\nu$ $\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma\upsilon$ mapéhabov $a\dot{v}\tau \delta$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. Eph. iii. 3), and could scarcely be supposed for any reason to waive or dissemble his direct authority.

4. συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος This double compound is only here used in Scripture. But we have $\epsilon \pi i \mu a \rho \tau v \rho \epsilon \hat{v}$ in 1 Pet. v. 12, and συμμαρτυρείν in Rom. ii. 15. viii. 16. ix. 1. The $\epsilon \pi \lambda$ 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 $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho(a)$ along with them (the human witnesses). Acts xiv. 3, παρρησιαζόμενοι έπι τω Κυρίω τῷ μαρτυροῦντι τῷ λόγω τής χάριτος αὐτοῦ, διδόντι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αύτών. Compare I Cor. i. 6, where the μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (the thing testified about Christ) is said, as here, to have been confirmed by the supernatural gifts of the Spirit to the hear-Also I Thess. i. 5, $\tau \dot{o}$ ers. εὐαγγέλιον ήμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη εἰς ύμας εν λόγω μόνον, αλλα και έν δυνάμει καί έν πνεύματι άγίω κ.τ.λ.

Θεού σημείοις τε και τέρασιν και ποικίλαις δυνά-

σημείοιs τε A fourfold description is here given of the supernatural evidences. Elsewhere we have (1) $\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\hat{a}a$ and $\tau\epsilon\rhoa\tau a$, Matt. xxiv. 24. Mark xiii. 22. John iv. 48. Acts ii. 19, 43. v. 12. vi. 8. vii. 36. iv. 30. xiv. 3. xv. 12; (2) on peria and δυνάμεις, Acts viii. 13; (3) δύναμις σημείων και τεράτων, Rom. xv. 19; (4) σημεία, τέρατα, and δυνάμεις (or δύναμις), Acts ii. 22. 2 Cor. xii. 12. 2 Thess. ii. 9. Of these various terms, $\tau \epsilon \rho a_s$ (miracle) denotes the marvellousness; $\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\hat{i}o\nu$ (sign) points to the *object* of miracle, as a *signal* of something or some one; δύνα- μ is (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.

σημείοις] Found in this sense in all the Gospels, but especially characteristic of St John. Matt. xii. 38, 39, σημείον ίδείν... σημείον ἐπιζητεί...σημείον οὐ δοθήσεται. &c. &c. John ii. 11, 18, 23, ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων κ.τ.λ. iii. 2, ταῦτα τὰ σημεία ποιείν ἁ σῦ ποιεῖs. iv. 54, δεύτερον σημείον. vi. 2, 26, 30. &c. &c. Acts iv. 16, 22, γνωστὸν σημείον κ.τ.λ. viii. 6. &c. &c. 2 Cor. xii. 12, τὰ σημεία τοῦ ἀποστόλου.

τέρασιν] Rarely found alone. Exod. iv. 21, πάντα τὰ τέρατα \mathring{a} έδωκα (Α, δέδωκα Β). xv. 11, θαυμαστός έν δόξαις, ποιών τέρατα. 1 Kings xiii. 3, 5, τοῦτο τὸ τέρας ὅ ἐλάλησε Κύριος κ.τ.λ. 2 Chron. xxxii. 31. Psalm xlvi. 8.

 π οικίλαις] From the literal sense, variegated, many-coloured (Gen. xxxi. 8, τέξεται πάντα τα πρόβατα ποικίλα. xxxvii. 3. χιτώνα ποικίλον. Ezek. xvi. 10. Zech. i. 8, ίπποι ποικίλοι), &c. comes that of various or manifold in all applications. Matt. iv. 24, ποικίλαις νόσοις. Mark i. 34. Luke iv. 40. 2 Tim. iii. 6, επιθυμίαις ποικίλαις. Tit. iii. 3, έπιθυμίαις καὶ ήδοναῖς ποικίλαις. Heb. xiii. 9, διδαχαΐς ποικίλαις καί ξέναις. James i 2, π ειρασ-1 Pet. i. 6. iv. μοΐς ποικίλοις. 10, ποικίλης χάριτος Θεοῦ. Add Eph. iii. 10, ή πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

δυνάμεσιν] Powers; exercises of power. Matt. vii. 22, Suráμεις πολλάς έποιήσαμεν. xi 20, 21, 23, ai πλείσται δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. xiii. 54, 58, ή σοφία αυτη καί αί δυνάμεις κ.τ.λ. xiv. 2, αί δυνάμεις ένεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ. Mark vi. 2, 5, 14, δυνάμεις τοιαῦται διά τών χειρών αυτού γινόμεναι κ.τ.λ. Luke x, 13. xix. 37, wv eidov δυνάμεων. Acts xix. 11, δυνάμεις ού τας τυχούσας. I Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29. Gal. iii. 5, кай ένεργων δυνάμεις έν υμίν. St John does not use the word δύναμις.

μεσιν καὶ πνεύματος ἀγίου μερισμοῖς κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν.

 $\pi v \epsilon \dot{v} \mu a \tau o s \dot{a} \gamma i o v$ The article is wanting, as it usually is when the communication of the Holy Spirit is the point in view. The Holy Spirit personally is to ayiov πνεῦμα, or τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, Examine Matt. xii. 32. xxviii. Mark xiii. 11. Luke ii. 19. 26. iii. 22. xii. 10, 12. John xiv, 26. Acts i. 8, 16. ii. 38. v. 3, 32. vii. 51. ix. 31. x. 44, 45, 47. xi. 15. xiii. 2, 4. xv. 8, 28. xvi. 6. xix. 6. xx. 23, 28. xxi. 11. xxviii. 25. 1 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 πνεθμα άγιον. Compare, for example, (1) Luke ii. 25 with 26: πνεθμα ήν άγιον επ' αὐτόν (there was upon him a Holy Spirit; that is, an inspiration of the Holy Spirit); кай դл айтф κεχρηματισμένον ύπο του πνεύματος τοῦ ἀγίου (and it had been communicated to him by the Holy Spirit, who is the Author of inspiration) $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. (2) John vii. 39 with xiv. 26: $v v \pi \omega$ yàp ηv $πν ε \hat{v} μ a a \dot{v} ι o v$ (for not yet was there a Holy Spirit: that is, an effusion of the Holy Spirit upon the Church according to the promise); τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἆγιον ὅ πέμ- $\psi \epsilon_{i}$ o $\pi \alpha \tau \eta \rho$ (the sending of the Holy Spirit is equivalent to the existence of a Holy Spirit). (3)Acts xix. 2 with 6: el nveupa άγιον ἐλάβετε...οὐδὲ <ỉ πνεῦμα δγιον έστιν ήκούσαμεν (did ye receive 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); $\eta \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \dot{o}$ $πν \in \hat{v} \mu a$ το αγιον $\epsilon \pi$ αυτούς (the 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.

μερισμοίς] Josh. xviii. 10. καὶ ἐμέρισεν Ἐησοῦς ἐκεῖ τὴν γῆν υίοῖς Ἰσραήλ κατὰ μερισμοὺς αὐ- $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ (clause omitted in B). The noun occurs (in the New Testament) only here and in iv. But the verb is frequent. 12. Mark vi. 41. Rom. xii. 3. čráστφ ώς ό Θεός ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως. 1 Cor. vii. 17. 2 Cor. x. 13. Heb. vii. 2. For the sense, compare Eph. iv. 7, ένὶ δὲ ἐκάστω ήμων έδόθη [ή] χάρις κατά το μέτρον τής δωρεάς του Χριστου. The 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. 11, &c.

κατὰ τ. αὐτοῦ θέλησιν] (1) The

5 Ού γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξεν τὴν οἰκουμένην 6 τὴν μέλλουσαν, περὶ ἡς λαλοῦμεν· διεμαρ-

place of airov makes it emphatic; His own will. Compare Rom. iii. 24, 25 (Tŷ avroù Xáριτι... έν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἶματι) with Eph. i. 6, 7 (της χάριτος αύτοῦ ...διά τοῦ αἴματος αὐτοῦ). (2) The autor probably refers to to? $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, and not to $\pi v \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a \tau o s$ a $\hat{v} i o v$. It would be a straining of the parallel to argue the latter from 1 Cor. xii. 11, πάντα δε ταῦτα ένεργεί το έν και το αυτό πνεύμα, διαιρούν ίδία έκάστω καθώς βού- $\lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha i$. For there the personality of the Spirit is as clearly prominent as here it is subordinate. (3) The form $\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \sigma \iota_s$ (volition, the act of willing) is found only here in the New Testament. But see 2 Chron. xv. 15. Psalm xxi. 2, την επιθυμίαν της καρδίας...και την θέλησιν (Α, δέησιν Β) τών χειλέων avrov. Prov. viii. 35. 2 Macc. xii. 16, τή τού Θεού θελήσει.

5-18. Où yàp $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$] It must be so. Christ must be above the Angels. For thus only can the Scripture be fulfilled. Scripture 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, suffering. This experience of suffer-

ing was necessary. So only could there be that conscious brotherhood 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, but men, are the object 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. $i\pi\epsilon\tau a\xi\epsilon\nu$] The nominative is evidently $\delta \Theta\epsilon\delta$, not understood from $\tau\delta\vartheta$ $\Theta\epsilon\delta\vartheta$ above, but rather as the *universal* nominative to *providences* and to *Scriptures*.

την οἰκουμένην την μέλλουσαν] For οἰκουμένη, see note on i. 6. The peculiarity here is the addition of την μέλλουσαν. Compare vi. 5, μέλλοντος alŵvos. The contrast is between the world of the present, with its predominant sin and suffering, and the new heaven and earth wherein dwelleth righteousness (2 Pet. iii. 13).

περί ής λαλούμεν] The real subject, when we speak of the exaltation of the Son, is the world not yet seen, the βασιλεία ασάλευτος which waits for the

τύρατο δέ πού τις λέγων, Τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος

μετάθεσις τῶν πεποιημένων (see xii. 26—28).

6. διεμαρτύρατο] The forms μαρτυρείν and μαρτύρεσθαι (or the strengthened form Siapapτύρεσθαι) are always kept distinct. The former is to bear witness, as in Num. xxxv. 30, μάρτυς είς ού μαρτυρήσει έπι ψυχήν. &c., &c. The latter is to call to witness, as in Jer. xxxii. 10, καί διεμαρτυράμην μάρτυpas. &c., &c. (1) 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, διαμαρτύρομαι ύμιν σήμερον τόν τε ουρανόν και την γην (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, &c.; as Gen. xliii. 3, διαμαρτυρία διαμεμαρτύρηται (Α, μεμαρτύρηται Β) ήμιν ό άν- $\theta_{\rho\omega\pi\sigma\sigma}$, $\lambda\epsilon_{\gamma\omega\nu}$ (the man did solemnly protest unto us, saying). Psalm lxxxi. 8, åkovorov, laós µov, καί διαμαρτυροῦμαί (Α, διαμαρτύ- $\rho o \mu a i B) \sigma o i$. (3) To this dative is often added an accusative of the subject spoken of; as Deut. xxxii. 46, τούς λόγους τούτους ούς έγω διαμαρτύρομαι ύμιν σήμερον (declare solemnly, as if with an appeal to witnesses). Acts xx. 21, διαμαρτυρόμενος Ίουδαίοις τε καί Ελλησιν την είς Θεόν μετάνοιav $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. (4) Or, by a slight variation, the dative of the person is exchanged for $\pi p \circ s$ with an accusative; as Zech. iii. 6, διεμαρτύρατο ο άγγελος Κυρίου πρός Ίησοῦν, λέγων κ.τ.λ. (5) Or the accusative of the subject is turned into a clause with ori, iva, or the infinitive; as Acts x. 42, κηρθέαι τω λαώ και διαμαρτύρασθαι ότι κ.τ.λ. Luke xvi. 28, $\delta \pi \omega s$ διαμαρτύρηται αύτοις ίνα μη καί αύτοι έλθωσιν κ.τ.λ. I Tim. v. 21. διαμαρτύρομαι... ίνα ταῦτα φυλάξης. Acts xviii. 5, διαμαρτυρόμενος τοΐς Ιουδαίοις είναι τον Χριστον 'Ιησούν. 2 Tim. ii. 14, διαμαρτυρόμενος...μή λογομαχείν. (6) Finally, the dative of the person is dropped, and the accusative of the subject (or some equivalent for it, as $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu \kappa. \tau. \lambda$ here) alone retained; as in Acts xx. 24, διαμαρτύρασθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. xxiii. II, διεμαρτύρω τα περί The simple verb $\mu a \rho \tau \dot{\nu}$ έμοῦ. $\rho\epsilon\sigma\theta a\iota$ 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 $\delta_{ia\mu a\rho\tau v}$ - $\rho\epsilon\sigma\theta a\iota$ is found 26 times in the Alexandrine Septuagint, and in 15 places of the New Testament, of which ten are in St Luke's Gospel and the Acts.

 $\pi o i \tau vs$] The indefinite form of expression is characteristic of the rhetorical style of the Epistle; avoiding the stiffness and bald-

ότι μιμνήσκη αυτοῦ, ἡ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου 7 ὅτι ἐπισκέπτη αὐτόν; ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν

ness of quotation by name and book. Compare iv. 4, εξοηκεν γάρ που κ.τ.λ. xiii. 2, έλαθόν τινες κ.τ.λ.

 $\tau i \ \epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu$] 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 πάντα υπέταξας of verse 6, taken in its literal meaning, bears wit-Universal dominion can ness. 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.

τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος] Compare Psalm cxliv. 3, Κύριε, τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι ἐγνώσθης αὐτῷ; ἡ νἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι λογίζη αὐτόν; But the whole tone and context there are opposite to those of Psalm viii.

άνθρωπος...υίος ἀνθρώπου] In the first meaning of the Psalm, a man...a son of man; any human being. Sec, for instance, Jer. xlix. 17, 18, καὶ ἔσται η Ἰδουμαία εἰς ἄβατον...οὐ μη καθίση ἐκεῖ ἀνθρωπος, καὶ οὐ μη κατοικήση ἐκεῖ υἰος ἀνθρώπου. li. 43, γῆ ἐν ἢ οὐ κατοικήσει ἐν αὐτῆ υἰος ἀνθρώπου. 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.

μιμνήσκη] xiii. 3, μιμνήσκεσθε τών δεσμίων. The present tense is rare. Isai. xii. 4. xlviii. 1, καὶ (A, omitted in B) Θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μιμνησκόμενοι. lxii. 6. Ecclus. vii. 36, μιμνήσκου τὰ ἔσχατά σου. 1 Macc. vi. 12, μιμνήσκομαι τῶν κακῶν ὧν ἐποίησα. xii. 11. The usual forms are μέμνημαι and ἐμνήσθην.

 $i \pi i \sigma \kappa i \pi \tau \eta$] Å verb of frequent use in the Septuagint, both in the judicial and the merciful sense. For the former, see Jer. V. 9, 29, μη iπι τούτοις ούκ iπισκέψομα...ούκ έκδικήσει ή ψυχή μου; &c. &c. For the latter, Jer. xv. 15, μνήσθητί μου καὶ ἐπίσκεψαί με. &c. &c. It is used in eleven passages of the New Testament, of which seven are St Luke's. The nouns ἐπίσκεψις and ἐπισκοπή are both comβραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους, δόξη καὶ τιμῆ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν, καὶ κατέστησας αὐ-

ii. 7. Or omit καί κ. αὐ. έ. τ. ξ. τ. χ. σου.

mon in the Septuagint; the latter only is found in the New Testament (Luke xix. 44. I Pet. ii. 12).

7. ηλάττωσας (1) The Hebrew is given literally 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 ayγέλους (as also in Psalm xevii. 7, and cxxxviii. 1). For έλαττοῦν, see John iii. 30, ἐκεῖνον δεῖ αὐξάνειν, ἐμὲ δὲ ἐλαττοῦσθαι. Also Num. xxvi. 54, τοις ελάττοσιν έλαττώσεις τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτῶν. Jer. XXX. 19, καὶ πλεονάσω αὐτούς, καὶ οῦ μὴ ἐλαττωθῶσι. &c. &c. (2) The tense of $\eta \lambda \dot{a}\tau$ τωσας (as of έστεφάνωσας, &c., 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.

 $\beta \rho a \chi \tilde{v} \tau i$] In Acts v. 34 $\beta \rho a \chi \tilde{v}$ (for there the τ*i* is to be omitted) is clearly used of time: $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon v \epsilon \xi \omega \beta \rho a \chi \tilde{v} \tau o \tilde{v} s a v \theta \rho \omega - \pi o v s \pi o i \eta \sigma a \iota$. And so in Luke xxii. 58, κai μετα β ρ a \chi \tilde{v} \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho o s $\delta \omega v \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. In Acts xxvii. 28 it is ambiguous: $\beta \rho a \chi \tilde{v} \delta \epsilon \delta \iota a$. $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma a v \tau \epsilon s$ (having interposed a *little* space or time). And so in Isai. lvii. 17, δια αμαρτίαν βραχύ τι έλύπησα αὐτόν, though the contrast with els rov alura and $\delta_{1a\pi a \nu \tau \delta s}$ (verse 16) makes the temporal sense the more probable. In 2 Sam. xvi. Ι (καὶ Δανίδ παρήλθε βραχύ τι από κ.τ.λ.) the *local* use is clear. Here the temporal sense (for a 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 mapa, see note on i. 4, δσω διαφορώτερον.

ἐστεφάνωσας] Of the two senses of στέφανος, a king's crown, and a victor's wreath, the latter is clearly intended in 1 Cor. ix. 25, ΐνα φθαρτὸν στέφανον λάβωσιν κ.τ.λ. 2 Tim. ii. 5, οὐ στεφανοῦται ἐὰν μὴ νομίμως ἀθλήση. 1 Pet. v. 4, κομιεῖσθε τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον.

8 τὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. ἐν τῷ γὰρ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν

ii. 8. Or omit 1st αντώ.

The former is indicated here, and in the asavburos $\sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a vos$ of Mark xv. 17 (and the parallel passages), and in the $\sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a vos$ $\chi \rho v \sigma \epsilon o o$ 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. Psalm v. 12. ciii. 4. Song iii. 11.

καὶ κατέστησας] 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.

κατέστησας ἐπὶ τά] We find καθιστάναι ἐπὶ with the three cases: (1) Matt. xxiv. 45. xxv. 21, 23, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω. Luke xii. 42. Acts vi. 3. vii. 27. (2) Matt. xxiv. 47. Luke xii. 44, ἐπὶ πῶσιν τοῦς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ καταστήσει αὐτόν. (3) Luke xii. 14, τίς με κατέστησεν κριτὴν ἡ μεριστὴν ἐφἱ ὑμῶς; In Dan. ii. 48 we have both (1) and (3): κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ πάσης χώ ρας... ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς σοφούς. Compare I Sam. viii. 5 with x. 19, κατάστησον ἐφ' ἡμῶς βασιλέα ...βασιλέα καταστήσεις ἐφ' ἡμῶν. Also I Kings iv. 7 with v. 16, καθεστάμενοι ἐπὶ πάντα Ἰσραήλ... ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων. And so throughout the Septuagint. The dative seems to be rare.

8. $\pi \acute{a} \imath \tau a \acute{v} \pi \acute{e} \tau a \acute{z} as]$ Quoted also in 1 Cor. xv. 27 and Eph. i. 22 ($\check{v} \pi \acute{v} \imath \imath s \pi \acute{o} \acute{s} a \imath \acute{v} \imath \imath \imath \imath$). The thought here is thoroughly that of St Paul; but the length of the quotation, and the $\pi \circ \acute{v} \imath \imath \imath s$ of its introduction, suggest a different writer.

iν τῷ γώρ] Mark the word πάντα. The subjugation spoken of is absolutely universal. It leaves room for no exception. Literally, For in the having subjected to him (man) the all things (the πάντα of the quotation) He

36

II. 8, 9.

αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον. νῦν δὲ οὕπω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα. τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι 9 παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰη-

(God) left nothing unsubject to him. The $i\pi\epsilon_{\tau}a_{\xi}a_{\xi}$ of the Psalm has in it (ϵ_{ν}) the exclusion of any exception whatsoever.

άφηκεν] vi. 1, ἀφέντες. Acts xiv. 17, οὐκ ἀμάρτυρον αὐτὸν ἀφηκεν. The tense is adapted to that of ὑπέταζας.

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

οῦπω] xii. 4. St Paul uses οῦπω once only, I Cor. iii. 2. It is found oftenest in St John.

ορωμεν] A comparatively rare word in Scripture (except in the imperative). I Cor. ix. I. Col. ii. I, 18. St John, however, uses it no less than 28 times in his Gospel and Epistles.

aὐτῷ] Throughout this verse aὐτῷ is man. The application to Christ does not begin till verse 9.

9. $\overrightarrow{vv} \delta i$ But, though we see not yet the fulfilment of the saying, we see thus much accomplished towards it. The universal reign is not yet: but the destined King is already crowned.

τον δε βραχύ τι] Him who 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 $\beta pa\chi \acute{v}$ ri 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.

'lycoûv] The position of the word gives it this meaning. Man, who has been placed (as the Psalm says) below the Angels, we behold, in the person of Jesus, crowned (as the Psalm further says) with glory and honour.

διά τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου The place of these words makes them somewhat ambiguous. If connected with $\eta \lambda a \tau \tau \omega \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$, they give the *motive* of the hu*miliation.* If connected with έστεφανωμένον, they give the cause of the exaltation. Either connexion is defensible. (1) 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, &c. Also the difficult clause, $\delta \pi \omega s$ σοῦν διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξη καὶ τιμῆ

χάριτι Θεού κ.τ.λ., might thus be taken as explanatory of $\delta_{ia} \tau \delta_{ja}$ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου, the words δόξη καὶ τιμῆ ἐστεφανωμένον having been thrown in, out of their strict order, to prevent too long a suspension of the principal statement. Him who had been made a little lower than the Angels, even Jesus, for the sake of suffering death—in other words, that by the grace of God He might taste death for every man_Him we nowbehold 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 $\delta_{i\delta}$ of Phil. ii. 9, 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 following, ὅπως χάριτι Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. 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 Rom. iv. 25, $\kappa a i \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \rho \theta \eta \, \delta i a \tau \eta \nu$ $\delta i \kappa a i \omega \sigma i \nu \eta \mu \omega \nu$. 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 $\delta \pi \omega s$ $\gamma \epsilon \nu \sigma \eta \tau a$, to which it would be difficult to find a clear parallel, in the sense of that He may have tasted.

δία] See the foregoing note. If (1) is adopted, compare (for the διά) Phil. ii. 30, διὰ τὸ ἔργον Χριστοῦ (for the sake of doing Christ's work) μέχρι θανάτου ἦγγισεν. If (2), 1 Thess. v. 13, ἡγείσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπερεκπερισσῶς διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν (because of their work done).

 $\pi \dot{a} \theta \eta \mu a$ (1) For $\pi \dot{a} \theta \eta \mu a$ in the general sense of a thing suffered, compare x. 32. Rom. viii. 18. 2 Cor. i. 6. Col. i. 24. 2 Tim. iii, 11. 1 Pet. v. 9. In application to Christ, ii. 10. $\mathbf{2}$ Cor. i. 5. Phil. iii. 10. I Pet. i. 11. iv. 13. v. 1. (2) The genitive του θανάτου is peculiar, defining the $\pi \dot{a} \theta \eta \mu a$ (suffering consisting of death). In Rom, viii. 18, the genitive τοῦ νῦν καφού expresses that to which the sufferings belong. In the other examples, the genitive is that of the person (τοῦ Χριστοῦ,

II. 10.

ἐστεφανωμένον, ὅπως χάριτι Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὺς γεύσηται θανάτου. ἕπρεπεν γὰρ αὐτῷ, δι ὃν 10

dc.). (3) In two instances (Rom. vii. 5. Gal. v. 24) $\pi \dot{a} \theta \eta \mu a$ runs into the sense of $\pi \dot{a} \theta \sigma s$.

öπως χάριτι Θεοῦ] See note on διὰ τὸ πάθημα. The curious reading χωρὶς Θεοῦ (sanctioned by Origen, &c.) was variously understood as (1) 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 ὑπὲρ παντός, and perhaps suggested by 1 Cor. xv. 27, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος κ.τ.λ.).

 $\chi \alpha \rho \tau \tau \Theta \epsilon \sigma v$ The exact phrase occurs only in I Cor. xv. 10, χάριτι δε Θεοῦ εἰμὶ ὄ εἰμι. The dative is that of the instrument. Compare 1 Cor. x. 30, el éyw χάριτι μετέχω. Eph. ii. 5. &c. &c. From the first sense of xapis, free favour, the opposite alike of $\delta\rho\gamma\eta$ (Eph. ii. 3, 5, $\eta\mu\epsilon\theta a$ τέκνα φύσει οργής...χάριτί έστε σεσωσμένοι) and of όφείλημα (Rom. iv. 4, ού κατα χάριν, άλλα κατὰ οφείλημα), comes that of free favour exercised and manifested (as in 2 Cor. xii. 9, ἀρκεῖ σοι ή χάρις μου ή γαρ δύναμις к.т.л. &с. &с.).

ύπερ παντός] (1) We have ύπερ πάντων in 2 Cor. v. 14, 15, είς ύπερ πάντων. 1 Tim. ii. 6, αντίλυτρον ύπερ πάντων. The singular is peculiar to this place, and suggests the idea of the individual object of the Atone-in reference to the death of Christ are $i\pi\epsilon\rho \pi o\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$ (Mark xiv. 24), ύπερ της εκκλησίας (Eph. v. 25), υπέρ ήμων (Rom. v. 8. Gal. iii. 13. Eph. v. 2. Tit. ii. 14. 1 Pet. ii. 21. 1 John iii. 16), υπέρ έμοῦ (Gal. ii. 20), ύπερ ασεβών (Rom. v. 6), δίκαιος υπερ αδίκων (1 Pet. iii. 18). (2) Of the three prepositions found in this connexion, $\vartheta \pi \epsilon \rho$, $\pi \epsilon \rho i$, and $dv\tau i, \, \upsilon \pi \epsilon \rho$ is simply in behalf of (with no definition of the mode), $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ concerning (Matt. xxvi, 28. I John ii. 2. &c. with a special reference to the *sin-offering*, the $\pi\epsilon\rho$ a μαρτίας of Leviticus, &c., and thence deriving a definiteness beyond its inherent meaning), avrí in exchange for (Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45, λύτρον $d\nu\tau i \pi o\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$). 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.

γεύσηται θανάτου] Matt. xvi. 28. Mark ix. 1. Luke ix. 27. John viii. 52, where the Jews quote the θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήση of verse 51 in the form οὐ μὴ γεύσηται θανάτου.

 io. ἕπρεπεν γὰρ αὐτῷ] I say πάθημα, and I say θανάτου. For, &c. It was so, and it ought so

τὰ πάντα και δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, πολλούς υίους είς

to be. Such an arrangement was suitable to the character of God, and to the purpose of the interposition. The $a\dot{v}\tau\hat{\varphi}$ here is God.

čπρεπεν] Matt. iii. 15, ουτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῦν πληρῶσαι πῶσαν δικαιοσύνην. In Heb. vii. 26 there is a personal nominative (τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεύς κ.τ.λ.); and in 1 Tim. ii. 10 and Tit. ii. 1 a neuter nominative (δ and \ddot{a}). Here the infinitive following serves as the nominative.

 $\delta \iota \: \hat{\iota} \nu \dots \delta \iota \: o \hat{\upsilon}]$ (1) The former might be either because of whom, The two or for whose sake. ideas, of the *first* cause and the final cause, are equally admissible. But, considering the use elsewhere of ϵ in the second of these senses (Rom. xi. 36, els αύτον τα πάντα. I Cor. viii. 6, ήμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν), it will be better to render Si' by because of whom, owing to whom. Between $\delta i' \delta v$ and the (commoner) $\dot{\epsilon}\xi$ of (Rom. xi. 36. I Cor. viii. 6) there is the difference of the two ideas, cause and origin. (2) The & out through whom, by whose agency, is more commonly the attribute of Christ. See I Cor. viii. 6, και είς κύριος Ίησοῦς Χριστός, δι ού τα πάντα, και ήμεις δι' αύτου. 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, ort is αύτου και δι' αύτου και είς αυτον

 π ολλούς vioύς] This clause is rendered-very difficult by the past tense of $\dot{a}\gamma a\gamma \delta \nu \tau a$. On the whole, it may best be taken thus. It became Him (God)... that, having (in His eternal 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 dyayóvta agree with tov άρχηγόν. It was not the Incarnation, it was the Resurrection. which saved: and to speak of Christ as having brought sons to glory before He actually suf-

δόξαν άγαγόντα τον άρχηγον της σωτηρίας

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, où's $\pi po \epsilon \gamma$ - $\nu \omega \dots \tau o \dot{\tau} \sigma v s \kappa ai \ell \delta \delta \ell a \sigma \epsilon v$. Compare also Eph. i. 3, &c., $\delta \epsilon \dot{v} \lambda \circ \gamma \dot{\gamma}$ oras $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{s} \dots \hat{\epsilon} v \tau \sigma \hat{s} \epsilon \dot{m} \sigma v p a v (os \dot{\epsilon} v)$ $\lambda \rho \sigma \tau \hat{\phi}$, $\kappa a \theta \hat{\omega} \hat{s} \dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \xi a \tau \sigma \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{s} \dot{\epsilon} v$ $a \dot{v} \tau \phi \tilde{\rho} \kappa \kappa a \tau \beta \delta \lambda \hat{\eta} \hat{s} \kappa \delta \sigma \mu o v \kappa. \tau. \lambda.$ 2 Thess. ii. 13.

πολλούς υίούς] (1) Rom. viii. 29, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. Rev. vii. 9, ἰδοὺ ὅχλος πολὺς κ.τ.λ. (2) Rom. viii. 14, 19, τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υίῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. 2 Cor. vi. 18. Gal. iii. 26. iv. 6, 7.

 $\delta\delta\xi a\nu$ From the idea of the forthshining of light, as, for instance, the Shechinah in the tabernacle or temple (I Kings viii. 11, έπλησε δόξα Κυρίου τύν οἶκον), is derived the figurative sense of the manifestation of excellence; (1) whether of God Himself, His power, wisdom, love, &c. (John xi. 4, 40, υπέρ της δόξης του Θεού, ίνα δοξασθή ό υίὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ...ἐὰν πιστεύσης όψη την δόξαν τοῦ Θεού. Rom. vi. 4, ηγέρθη Χριστος έκ νεκρών δια τής δόξης του Πατρός. &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,

εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. ix. 23, ὑ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν. 1 Cor. xv. 43, ἐγείρεται ἐν δόξη. 2 Cor. iv. 17, αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης. Eph. i. 18. Col. iii. 4, φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξη. 2 Thess. ii. 14. 1 Pet. v. 1, 4, 10. &c. &c.).

άγαγόντα] See note on πολλοὺς νίούς.

 $d\rho_{\chi\eta\gamma\delta\nu}$ The meaning of $d\rho\chi\eta\gamma$ o's varies (like that of $d\rho\chi\eta$) 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. 13, ἀρχηγὸς ἁμαρτίας αὖτη ἐστὶ τη θυγατρί Σιών. 1 Macc. ix. 61, τών ἀρχηγών τῆς κακίας. And so in Heb. xii. 2, where it is expressly contrasted with $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \omega$ - $\tau \eta s$. But (2) the idea of *leader*, ruler, prince, is more common. Exod. vi. 14, ούτοι αρχηγοί οίκων πατριών αυτών. Num. xiv. 4, δώμεν ἀρχηγόν, καὶ ἀποστρέψωμεν είς Αίγυπτον. xvi. 2, άρχηγοι συναγωγής...καὶ ἄνδρες ὀνομαστοί. Isai. iii. 6, 7, αρχηγος ήμων γενου...ούκ έσομαί σου άρχηγός. And so in Acts v. 31, τοῦτον δ Θεός αρχηγόν και σωτήρα υψωσεν $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. Here, and in Acts iii. 15 (τον δε αρχηγών της ζωής απεκτεί $va\tau\epsilon$), the appended genitive causes some ambiguity. The prince of life seems more natural in the one place, and is favoured by the only other instance of its

11 αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι. ὅ τε γὰρ

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, $\tau \partial \nu \tau \eta s \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ $a \rho \chi \eta \gamma \partial \nu \kappa a i \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \omega \tau \eta \nu)$ may be allowed to decide in favour of it.

σωτηρίας] See note on i. 14, σωτηρίαν.

 $\pi a \theta \eta \mu \dot{a} \tau \omega v$] See note on verse 9, πάθημα.

τελειώσαι] The verb τελειούν (occurring nine times in this Epistle, and fourteen times elsewhere in the New Testament) means to make $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon_{10} v$, 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 ($\tau \alpha s \eta \mu \epsilon$ ρας). John iv. 34 (τὸ ἔργον). v. 36. xvii. 4. xix. 28 (ή γραφή). Acts xx. 24 (τον δρόμον μου καί $\tau \eta \nu \delta (a \kappa o \nu (a \nu))$. Heb. vii. 19. James ii. 22 (ή πίστις). 1 John ii. 5 (ή αγάπη). iv. 12, 17. And so I Kings vii. 22. 2 Chron. viii. 16 (TOV olkov). Neh. vi. 3. &c. &c. (The peculiar expression of Exod. xxix. 9, &c. Lev. viii. 33, &c. Num. iii. 3, ereleiwse τας χείρας αυτών του ίερατεύειν, forms a transition to the personal use of $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu \nu$ 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. xii. 23, δικαίων τετελειωμένων). In three remaining passages of this Epistle the word is applied to Christ Himself. In vii. 28 the general idea of consummating is defined by the context into that of consecrating $(\dot{a}\nu\theta\rho\omega)$ πους καθίστησιν αρχιερείς...υίον τον αίωνα τετελειωμένον). eis Compare Lev. xxi. 10, καὶ τετελειωμένου τας χείρας αυτού ένδύσασθαι τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ. Here, and in v. 9 ($\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \omega \theta \epsilon i s$), the idea is that of *perfectly qualifying* for the office undertaken.

11. $\delta \tau \epsilon \gamma \delta \rho$ A reason for the $\epsilon \pi \rho \epsilon \pi \epsilon v$. There ought to be an identity of experience because there is an identity of *parentage*. Christ and His people have a The Christ of common Father. prophecy is the brother, the fellow-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.

άγιάζων καὶ οἱ άγιαζόμενοι ἐξ ἐνὸς πάντες·

άγιάζων...άγιαζόμενοι] From ayios, belonging to God (the opposite of Kolvós, belonging 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 character with the consecration. Sometimes the one thought predominates, sometimes the other. (1) Thus, (i) where the subject is a thing, the idea of a yiá ζειν is the act of consecrating. See Gen. ii. 3, ηὐλόγησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἡμέραν την έβδόμην, και ηγίασεν αυτήν. Exod. xix. 23, αφορίσαι τὸ ὄρος, καὶ ἀγιάσαι αὐτύ. 🛛 xl. 9, 10, χρίσεις την σκηνήν...και άγιάσεις αυτήν...και άγιάσεις το θυσιαστήριον κ.τ.λ. Lev. xxv. 10, άγιάσετε το έτυς κ.τ.λ. ΧΧΥΙΙ. 14, 18, δς αν άγιάση την οικίαν αυτού ...τον άγρον αύτοῦ κ.τ.λ. Jud. xvii. 3, άγιασμῷ (A, άγιάζουσα B) ήγίασα τὸ ἀργύριον τῷ Κυρίῳ. 1 Kings ix. 3, ήγίασα (Α, ήγίακα B) τον οἶκον τοῦτον ὃν ψκοδόμησas. Matt. xxiii. 17, 19, δ vaòs δ άγιάσας τὸν χρυσόν...τὸ θυσιαστήριον το άγιάζον το δώρον. Ι Tim. iv. 5, άγιάζεται γαρ δια λόγου Θεού και εντεύξεως. And so (ii) with a person, where (a) office is in view (Exod. xxx. 30, άγιάσεις αύτους ίερατεύειν μοι. Jer. i. 5, πρό τοῦ ἐξελθεῖν σε ἐκ μήτρας ἡγίακά σε, προφήτην εἰς ἔθνη τέθεικά σε), or (b) religious privilege (Ezek. XX. 12, ζγώ Κύριος ο αγιάζων αυτούς. Heb. ix. 13, άγιάζει πρός την της σαρκός κα- $\theta a \rho \delta \tau \eta \tau a$), or (c) derived sanctity (1 Cor. vii. 14, ήγίασται γόρ δ άνήρ ο άπιστος έν τη γυναικί $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$), 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 I Cor. i. 2, ήγιασμένοις έν Χριστώ Ίηvi. 11, άλλα ήγιάσθητε. σοῦ. Heb. x. 10, 29, ήγιασμένοι έσμεν διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς κ.τ.λ. τὸ αἶμα ... $\epsilon v \ \phi \ \eta \gamma \iota a \sigma \theta \eta$). To this head (that of *consecration*) belong the places where $\delta \gamma_i \alpha \zeta \epsilon_i \nu$ is applied to Christ Himself (John x. 36, δν ό Πατήρ ήγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν είς τον κόσμον. xvii. 19, ύπερ αὐτῶν εγῶ άγιάζω εμαυτόν, I consecrate myself wholly to God by a self-devotion even unto death. 1 Pet. iii. 15, κύριον δε τον Χριστον άγιάσατε έν ταις καρδίαις $i\mu\hat{\omega}\nu$), or even to God (Matt. vi. 0, άγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου, Thy Name, that which Thou art, be hallowed, or consecrated, in the thoughts, words, and acts of Isai. viii, 13, Thy creatures. τον Κύριον των δυνάμεων αυτόν άγιάσατε, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου $\phi \delta \beta \sigma$, (2) On the other hand, sanctification is the prominent idea wherever (a) a gradual process is implied (as in Heb. x. 14, δι' ήν αιτίαν ούκ ἐπαισχύνεται ἀδελφούς αὐτοὺς 12 καλεῖν, λέγων, Ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς

τοὺς ἀγιαζομένους) or (b) a vork still to be done (as John xvii. 17, 19, ἀγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθεία ...ἶνα ὥσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι κ.τ.λ. Eph. v. 26, ἶνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ κ.τ.λ. I Thess, v. 23, ἀγιάσαι ὑμῶς ὁλοτελεῖς). Here the present tense (ἀγιάζων, ἀγιαζόμενοι) suggests the idea of sanctifying, though in fact the articles make the phrase equivalent to two nouns, the Sanctifier and the sanctified.

 $\pi \acute{a} \imath \tau \epsilon_{s}$] He and they. The plural of $\acute{a} \imath \imath \imath \imath \imath \acute{a} \acute{c} \iota \iota \iota \iota$ prevents the use of the dual both, which would otherwise be clearer.

δι ην airíaν] Because He and they have one Father. The phrase δι ην airíaν is only found in 2 Tim. i. 6, 12. Tit. i. 13. Its construction in Luke viii. 47 is different.

οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται] He is not ashamed, counts it no disparagement of Himself. Compare xi. 16, διὸ οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς Θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν.

ἀδελφου'ς αὐτούς καλεῖν] Matt. xii. 50, αὐτός μου ἀδελφός. xxv. 40, ἐνὶ τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου. xxviii. 10, ἀπαγγείλατε τοῖς ἀδελφοῖςμου. Mark iii. 35. Luke viii. 21. John xx. 17, πορεύου προς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου. Rom. viii. 29, πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.

12. λέγων, Απαγγελώ] Psalm xxii. 23, διηγήσομαι το όνομά σου τοις αδελφοις μου κ.τ.λ. The Psalm, which opens with the Eloi, Eloi, and contains the σωσάτω αὐτόν, and the ຟ້ρυξαν χειράς μου και πόδας μου, and the διεμερίσαντο τα ιμάτιά μου, may well be quoted with confidence The depth of as full of Christ. the humiliation expressed in it, the height of the exaltation, are alike ov $\kappa \alpha \tau$ $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o \nu$, and can only find their *fulfilment* in the God-Man. The clause quoted is from the triumphant reverse which begins with it, and which contains the words $\tau \partial \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a$ μου δουλεύσει αὐτῷ (verse 30). The statement is, that the suffering 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 worshippers will sing God's praise.

άδελφοις μου, έν μέσω έκκλησίας ύμνήσω

 $a\pi a\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\hat{\omega}$ Of the various compounds of αγγέλλειν (to carry a message of), avaγγέλλειν (Mark, John, Acts, Rom., 2 Cor., I Pet., I John) and καταγγέλλειν (Acts, Rom., 1 Cor., Phil., Col.) are scarcely distinguishable in sense, while $a\pi a\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\nu$ (Matt., Mark, Luke, John, Acts, I Cor., I Thess., I John) has the special idea of bringing back, and διαγγέλλειν (found only three times, Luke, Acts, Rom.) that of spreading abroad, and $\pi a \rho a \gamma$ γέλλειν (Matt., Mark, Luke, Acts, 1 Cor., 1 Thess., 2 Thess., I Tim.) that of conveying along (as a word of command passed down the ranks), the tidings or The form επαγγέλmessage. $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (used in the middle voice only) has the two senses, both classical, of professing, and promising.

το ονομά σου] That which Thou art. See note on i. 4, δνομα.

ϵν μέσφ] Used by St Paul in I Thess. ii. 7 only. Frequent in St Luke's Gospel and Acts.

èν μέσφ ἐκκλησίας] The 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 His people, as set forth in prophetic Scripture.

έκκλησίας] 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), $\epsilon \kappa$ - $\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a$ becomes the congregation of God's people, gathered out of the world by His summons, whether in *occasional* or *permanent* session. The former is its common use in the Septuagint. See Deut. xviii. 16, $\tau \hat{\eta}$ $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho a$ τής ἐκκλησίας. I Kings viii. 14, καὶ πᾶσα ἐκκλησία Ἰσραὴλ εἶστή-2 Chron. xx. 14, έγένετο κει. **ἐπ΄ αύτὸν πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐν τῆ** ἐκκλησία. XXX. 13, συνήχθησαν είς Ίερουσαλήμ πολύς λαός... έκκλησία πολλή σφόδρα. Neh. v. Ι 3, καὶ εἶπε πῶσα ή ἐκκλησία, 'Αμήν, &c, &c. The latter is the Christian application of the word; whether to (1) the Church universal, as in Matt. xvi. 18, έπι ταύτη τη πέτρα οικοδομήσω μου την εκκλησίαν. Acts xx. 28, την εκκλησίαν του Θεού, ην περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἴματος τοῦ ἰδίου. 1 Cor. xii. 28, έθετο ό Θεός έν τή ἐκκλησία πρώτον ἀποστόλους κ.τ.λ. Eph. i. 22, κεφαλήν ύπερ πάντα τή ἐκκλησία. iii. 10, 21, διὰ τής ἐκκλησίας... ἐν τῆ ἐκκλησία. v. 23, &c., ίνα παραστήση αυτός έαυτῶ ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κ.τ.λ. Col. i. 18, 24. &c. &c.; or (2) the Church local, as in Acts xiv. 23. 27, κατ' έκκλησίαν πρεσβυτέρους

13 σε. καὶ πάλιν, Ἐγώ ἔσομαι πεποιθώs ἐπ' αὐτῷ. καὶ πάλιν, Ἰδοὺ ἐγώ καὶ τὰ παιδία ἅ

...συναγαγόντες την εκκλησίαν κ.τ.λ. Rom. xvi. 1, 4, 5, διάκονον τής έκκλησίας τής έν Κεγχρεαίς...πάσαι αι εκκλησίαι τών έθνῶν...τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν. 1 Cor. i. 2. vii. 17. xvi. 1, 19, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας ... αι εκκλησίαι $\tau \eta s$ 'Aσías. 2 Cor. viii. 1, έν ταῖς έκκλησίαις τής Μακεδονίας. xi. 8, άλλας ἐκκλησίας ἐσύλησα. &c. &c.; or (3) the Church in congregation, as in Matt. xviii. 17, είπε τη εκκλησία. I Cor. xi. 18, συνερχομένων ύμων έν ἐκκλησία. xiv. 4, 19, 28, ο δε προφητεύων έκκλησίαν οικοδομεί...σιγάτω έν ἐκκλησία...λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησία... &c. &c.

ύμνήσω σε] Acts xvi. 25, Παύλος καὶ Σίλας προσευχόμενοι ὕμνουν τὸν Θεόν. Compare 2 Chron. xxix. 30, ὑμνεῖν τὸν Κύριον ἐν λόγοις Δαυίδ. Isai. xii. 4, ὑμνεῖτε Κύριον. Elsewhere with a dative: Isai. xlii. 10, ὑμνήσατε τῷ Κυρίῳ ὕμνον καινόν. 13. καὶ πάλιν, Ἐγώ] A fur-

13. kai $\pi \alpha \lambda i \nu$, 'Eyw] A further 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 fellowbeliever. He can say of Himself that He is one who puts His trust in God. The quotation may be either from 2 Sam. xxii.

3 (δ Θεός μου φύλαξ έσται μου, πεποιθώς έσομαι έπ' αὐτῶ), or Isai. viii. 17 (μενώ τόν Θεόν...καὶ πεποιθώς έσομαι έπ' αυτώ ' ίδου έγώ κ.τ.λ.), or Isai. xii. 2 (ίδού, ό Θεός μου σωτήρ μου, πεποιθώς έσομαι έπ' αυτώ, και ου φοβηθήσομαι). The *first* of these is recommended by the occasion and by the writer: king David is reviewing the whole course of God's dealing with him, and in terms both of grandeur (such as ¿rapáχθη καί έσείσθη ή γή, και τα θεμέλια τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐταράχθησαν κ.τ.λ. φυλάξεις με είς κεφαλήν έθνων, λαός όν ούκ έγνων έδούλευσάν μοι κ.τ.λ.), and of self-assertion (such as $a\pi o\delta\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota$ μοι Κύριος κατά την δικαιοσύνην μου, και κατά την καθαριότητα τῶν χειρῶν μου έναντίον τών όφθαλμών αυτού $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$), which would involve an immense hyperbole as applied to the human author. The second (Isai. viii. 17) might seem to be recommended by its standing (in the original) immediately before the next quotation here (idoù $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega \kappa.\tau.\lambda.$): but the separation of it from that by another καὶ πάλιν is rather against this reference. On the whole, it is best to regard it as coming from 2 Sam. xxii. 3.

καὶ πάλιν, Ἰδού] As the Messiah is the brother, and the fellow-worshipper, and the fellow-

μοι ἕδωκεν ὁ Θεός. ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ παιδία 14 κεκοινώνηκεν αίματος καὶ σαρκός, καὶ αὐτὸς πα-

believer, so He is also (in another Scripture phrase) the parent, of His people. In all possible aspects the unity between 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: rai éorai (τα παιδία) είς σημεία και τέρατα *ἐν τ*ῷ Ἰσραήλ παρὰ Κυρίου Σαβαώθ κ.τ.λ. Thus the way was prepared for the transfer of the passage to Christ.

ẵ μοι ἔδωκεν] Gen. xvii. 16, δώσω σοι ἐξ αὐτῆς τέκνον. xlviii. 9, νἱοί μού εἰσιν, οὒς ἔδωκέ μοι ὅ Θεός.

14. $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i o \delta v$ 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, Incarnation is necessary to death, and death is necessary to redemption. The combination $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i \ o v$ occurs only here and in iv. 6. Of the forms $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$ and $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \eta$, 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.

 $\tau a \pi a \iota \delta i a$] Quoted from the last quotation. As an appellation of Christians, $\pi a \iota \delta i a$ is peculiar to St John (John xxi, 5. I John ii. 14, 18), as indeed $\tau \epsilon \kappa \iota i a$ also, with the more than doubtful exception of Gal. iv. 19. But the *idea* is not far distant in the $\omega s \tau a \pi a \iota \delta i a$ and $\epsilon v \pi a \iota \delta i o v \tau o \iota \delta \tau v o f Matt. xviii. 3, 5,$ $the <math>\tau \omega v \tau o \iota \omega \tau v o f$ Matt. xix. 14, and the parallels in St Mark and St Luke.

κεκοινώνηκεν...μετέσχεν Are partakers...took part. The one is the perfect, the other the aorist. (1) The proper sense of KOLVWVEIV is to go shares with another $(\tau_i v_i)$ in something $(\tau_i v_0 s)$. Sometimes the *dative* is omitted ; as here, and in Prov. i. 11, ἐλθὲ μεθ' ήμῶν, κοινώνησον αίματος. 2 Macc. xiv. 25, ἐκοινώνησε βίου. Sometimes the *genitive* is omitted; as Wisdom vi. 25, ούτος ού κοινωνεί (has no fellowship with) σοφία. Ecclus. xiii. 2, $\pi\lambda ov\sigma \omega$ τέρω σου μή κοινώνει. I Tim. v. 22, μηδε κοινώνει άμαρτίαις άλλοτρίαις. 1 Pet. iv. 13, κοινωνείτε τοις του Χριστου παθήμασιν. 2 John II, κοινωνεί τοις έργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς. Lastly, the going shares with divides into the two senses, of partaking in (Rom. xv. 27, rois nvevyatikois

ραπλησίως μετέσχεν των αὐτων, ίνα διὰ τοῦ

αὐτῶν ἐκοινώνησαν τὰ ἔθνη), and imparting to (Rom. xii. 13, ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἀγίων κοινωνοῦντες. Gal. vi. 6, κοινωνείτω ὁ κατηχούμενος...τῷ κατηχοῦντι. Phil. iv. 15, οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν). (2) For μετέχειν (τινός) see v. 13. vii. 13, φυλῆς ἑτέρας μετέσχηκεν. 1 Cor. ix. 12. x. 21. Absolutely (to be partaker), 1 Cor. ix. 10. x. 17, 30, ἐκ τυῦ ἐνὸς ἅρτου μετέχομεν...εἰ ἐγὼ χάριτι μετέχω).

αίματος καὶ σαρκός] Matt. xvi. 17, σὰρξ καὶ αἶμα. 1 Cor. xv. 50, σὰρξ καὶ αἶμα. Gal. i. 16, σαρκὶ καὶ αίματι. Eph. vi. 12, αίμα καὶ σάρκα.

παραπλησίως] From the idea of close alongside comes that of in precisely like manner. The adverb occurs only here in Scripture. Phil. ii. 27, ήσθένησεν παραπλήσιον θανάτω (he was sick nigh unto, close alongside of, death), explained in verse 30, μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισεν.

τών αὐτών] That is, αἴματος καὶ σαρκός.

iva διà τοῦ θανάτου] He must partake of flesh 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 subjects 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). Hisdeath as our atonement, His resurrection to be our life, His 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, 11. Rom. v. 10. viii, 3, 11. Col. ii. 15. Rev. xii. 5, 7-11).

διὰ τοῦ θανάτου] Rom. v. 10, κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἰοῦ ἀὐτοῦ. Eph. i. 7, ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἶματος αὐτοῦ. ii. 16, καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξη...τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ. Col. i. 20, 22, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἴματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ...ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου. Heb. ix. 12, 26, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἴματος...διὰ τῆς προσφορῶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ xiii. 12.

 $\kappa a \tau a \rho \gamma \eta \sigma \eta$] The word $\kappa a \tau a \rho \gamma \hat{e} \nu$ (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

II. 14.

θανάτου καταργήση τον το κράτος έχοντα του

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 Ezra (iv. 21, 23. v. 5. vi. 8) where it is applied to the compulsory making to cease from the labour of building. In Luke xiii. 7 (ίνα τί καὶ τὴν γῆν καταργεῖ;) the barren tree is said to render *inactive* the ground which it The same idea is occupies. prominent in Rom. iii. 3, 31, την πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταργήσει... νόμον ούν καταργούμεν κ.τ.λ. IV. 14, κεκένωται ή πίστις και κατήργηται ή έπαγγελία. Gal, iii. 17. In the remaining passages the making inoperative passes on into a stronger idea of annulling or destroying. Rom. vi. 6, ίνα καταργηθή τὸ σῶμα τής άμαρ-I Cor. i. 28. ii. 6. vi. τίας. 13. xiii. 8, 10, 11. xv. 24, 26, έσχατος έχθρὸς καταργείται ὁ θάvaros. 2 Cor. iii. 7, 11, 13, 14. Gal. v. 11, άρα κατήργηται το σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ. Eph. ii. 15. 2 Thess. ii. 8. And so here. In three places (Rom. vii. 2, 6. Gal. v. 4) the passive of $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ is followed by $d\pi \delta$, in the sense of abolished from, cut off from (τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ Χριστοῦ).

V. H.

τόν το κράτος έχοντα τ. θ.] 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) έχειν τας κλείς τοῦ θανάτου. The genitive expresses the power belonging to death; death's power. The devil possesses this (see note above, iνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου) as being the personal spiritual head of the empire of sin, which gives death its sting (1 Cor. xv. 56), its real and reasonable terror for the mind and heart of the fallen.

κράτος] The rarest (in Scripture) of the various words for *power*. It stands by itself in Luke i. 51, ἐποίησεν κράτος έν βραχίονι αύτοῦ. Ι Pet. v. II (revised text), αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος. Elsewhere it is found in combination; as (1) in the doxologies of I Tim. vi. 16, τιμή καί κράτος αἰώνιον. Ι Pet. iv. 11, ή δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος. Jude 25, δόξα μεγαλωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξου-Rev. i. 6, ή δόξα και το σία. κράτος. ν. 13, ή εὐλογία καὶ ή τιμή και ή δόξα και το κράτος $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$; (2) with a connected genitive, as in Eph. i. 19, ката την ενέργειαν του κράτους της ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ. vì. 10, ἐν τῷ κράτει τής ίσχύος αύτοῦ. Col. i. 11. κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. It may be added that, $\delta va\mu s$ being the most general word for power (potency), loxis is speci-

15 θανάτου, τοῦτ' ἐστιν τὸν διάβολον, καὶ ἀπαλλάξη τούτους ὅσοι φόβῷ θανάτου διὰ παντὸς

ally might (possession of power), κράτος strength (force of power), έξουσία authority (legality of power), ἐνέργεια operation (exercise of power).

τοῦτ' ἔστιν] vii. 5. ix. 11. x. 20. xi. 16. xiii. 15.

τον διάβολον] The word διάβoλos (originally perhaps διαβό- λos , one who sets at variance, but by usage a slanderer) is the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew Satan, an adversary (1 Chron. xxi. 1. Job i. 6, 7, 9, 12. ii. 1-4, 6, 7. Zech. iii. 1, 2). The original form Saray is found in the Septuagint only in I Kings xi. 14, 23, where it is applied to Hadad and Rezon in the general sense of adversary (avtikelyevos, verse 25); and o Satavas (the devil) in Ecclus. xxi. 27. In the New Testament Zaravas and SuaBolos occur with almost equal frequency; each writer, except St Mark, using διάβολος, and each writer, except St James, St Peter, and St Jude, using Zaravas. St Paul uses Σατανας ten times, and διάβολος (as a proper name) five times. In Rev. xii. 9 and xx. 2 the two words are combined : δ καλούμενος διάβολος, και ο Σατανάς... ός έστιν διάβολος και ό Σαταvas. The idea of διάβολοs as the traducer seems to be modified in its use as a translation

of $\sum a \tau a \nu$. 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. 10.

15. $a\pi a\lambda\lambda a\xi\eta$ From $a\lambda$ λάσσειν, to alter (Acts vi. 14, αλλάξει τα έθη κ.τ.λ. Ι Cor. xv. 51, 52. Gal. iv. 20, και άλλάξαι $\tau \eta \nu \phi \omega \nu \eta \nu \mu o \nu$. &c. See note on Heb. i. 12, άλλαγήσονται), various compounds are formed with prepositions; $\mu\epsilon\tau a\lambda\lambda\dot{a}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu$, πa ραλλάσσειν, καταλλάσσειν, &c. Of these, $d\pi a\lambda\lambda \dot{a}\sigma\sigma\epsilon v$ is properly to change away; and so (1) to remove (Jer. xxxii. 31, άπαλλάξαι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ προσώπου $\mu ov \kappa.\tau.\lambda.$, and (2) to deliver (Luke xii. 58, δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι $a\pi^{2}$ αυτού). So here. Might deliver from the life-long bondage of a fear of death, and from the reality of the apprehended consequences.

τούτους όσοι] 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 more often πάντες ὅσοι (Acts v. 36, 37. &c.), or ὅσοι...οῦτοι (Rom. viii. 14. Gal. vi. 12. &c.).

φόβω θανάτου] Psalm lv. 4, 5,δειλία θανάτου ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' ἐμέ· φόβος καὶ τρόμος ἦλθεν ἐπ' ἐμέ. διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν] This

50

τοῦ (ῆν ἕνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας. οὐ γὰρ δή- 16

lengthened form of $\delta \iota \dot{a} \pi a \nu \tau \dot{o} s$ does not seem to occur elsewhere in Scripture. Equivalent phrases are those of Josh. iv. 14, or $\chi \rho \dot{\rho} \nu \sigma \nu \dot{\xi} \dot{\eta}$. Jer. lii. 33, $\delta \iota \dot{a} \pi a \nu \tau \dot{o} \dot{s} \dots \pi \dot{a} \sigma a s$ ta's $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a s$ as $\dot{\xi} \dot{\xi} \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$. Rom. vii. 1 and 1 Cor. vii. 39, $\dot{\epsilon} \phi^* \dot{\delta} \sigma \sigma \nu \chi \rho \dot{\delta} \nu \sigma \nu \dot{\xi} \dot{\eta}$.

ένοχοι ήσαν δουλείας See end of note on $a\pi a\lambda\lambda a\xi \eta$ 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 evoxos, holden in or under, is (1) with a dative of the penalty, crime, charge, court, or law, to which a person is liable; as Deut. xix. 10, αίματι ένοχος. Josh. ii. 19, žvoxos čavtų (as his own accuser). Job xv. 5, evoxos ει ρήμασι στόματός σου (as thy crime). Matt. v. 21, 22, evoxos έσται τη κρίσει κ.τ.λ.: (2) with a genitive in the same senses; as 2 Macc. xiii. 6, τον ίεροσυλίας ένοχον όντα. Matt. xxvi. 66, ένοχος θανάτου έστίν. Mark iii. 29, ένοχός έστιν αἰωνίου άμαρτήµaros. xiv. 64. I Cor. xi. 27, ένοχος έσται τοῦ σώματος κ.τ.λ. James ii. 10: (3) with eis, Matt.

V. 22, $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu o \chi o s \epsilon i s \tau \gamma \nu \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu \nu a \nu \tau o v$ $\pi \nu \rho o s (to the extent of): (4) ab$ $solute; as Exod. xxii. 3, <math>\tilde{\epsilon}\nu o \chi o s$ $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, $a \nu \tau a \pi o \theta a \nu \epsilon v \tau a$. xxxiv. 6. Lev. xx. 9. &c. Here $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu o \chi o \iota$ $\delta o \upsilon \lambda \epsilon i a s$ is the exact equivalent of Gal. v. 1, $\zeta \nu \gamma \hat{\omega}$ $\delta o \upsilon \lambda \epsilon i a s$ $\tilde{\epsilon} \nu - \epsilon \chi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \epsilon$. 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.

 $\delta o \nu \lambda \epsilon i \alpha s]$ Is the $\delta o \nu \lambda \epsilon i \alpha$ (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 $\phi \delta \beta \phi \ \theta a \nu \alpha \tau \sigma v$ above. The second would find a parallel in Rom. viii. 15 and Gal. iv. 7. But in those places the contrast with $\nu i \delta \theta \epsilon \sigma i \alpha$ and $\nu i \delta s$ (severally) expressly defines the meaning. The more general idea of servitude seems the most suitable here.

16. of $\gamma 4\rho$] 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.

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

ϵπιλαμβάνϵται] Lays hold upon. Sometimes ϵπιλαμβάνϵσθαι is used literally, to lay hold

$\Pi PO\Sigma EBPAIOY\Sigma.$

που ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματοs 17 Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται. ὅθεν ὤφειλεν κατὰ

of ; as Jud. xvi. 3, καὶ ἐπελάβετο τών θυρών τής πύλης τής πόλεως. Acts xxiii. 19, επιλαβόμενος δε τής χειρός αύτου ό χιλίαρχος... $\epsilon \pi \nu \nu \theta d \nu \epsilon \tau o \kappa \tau \lambda$. Or in a mental or spiritual sense, to apply oneself to, to grasp ; as Prov. iv. 13, επιλαβού εμής παιδείας, μή αφήs. I Tim. vi. 12, 19, επιλαβοῦ τής αζωνίου ζωής... ίνα επιλάβωνται της όντως ζωής. Sometimes the context gives a clear intimation of a *purpose*; whether (1) unfriendly, as Isai. v. 29, καὶ ἐπιλήψεται και βοήσεται (Α, βοήσει B) us $\theta\eta\rho$ iov. Luke xx. 20, 26, ίνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου...οὐκ ίσχυσαν ἐπιλαβέσθαι τοῦ ῥήματος. Acts xvi. 19. xvii. 19. xviii. 17. xxi. 30, καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενοι τοῦ Παύλου είλκον αὐτον έξω τοῦ ίεροῦ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$; or (2) gracious, for helping, healing, leading, or saving; as Jer. xxxi. 32, έν ήμέρα έπιλαβομένου μου τής χειρός αύτων, έξαγαγείν αύτους έκ γής Αιγύπτου. Matt. xiv. 31. Mark viii. 23. Luke ix. 47. xiv. 4, και έπιλαβόμενος ιάσατο αυτόν. Acts ix. 27, επιλαβόμενος αὐτον ήγαγεν προς τους αποστόλους. This last is the sense here given to it by the context: He comes to the help, not of Angels, but of men. Of the 19 times of its occurrence in the New Testament 12 are in St Luke's writings.

 σ πέρματος 'Aβραάμ] The ob-

ject of Christ's interposition is here described as Abraham's seed, in the sense of that expression in Gal. iii. 29, ei de ύμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ ᾿Αβραὰμ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon$, 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, ίνα σωθή ό κόσμος δι' αύτου. The contrast between the two modes of expression is seen in a comparison of Matt. xx. 28 (λύτρον $\vec{a}\nu\tau\hat{\iota} \pi o\lambda\lambda\hat{\omega}\nu$ with I Tim. ii. 6 (άντίλυτρον υπέρ πάντων). The 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. $\delta\theta\epsilon v$] Whence. As the consequence of which fact namely, that He comes to the help of human beings. This use of $\delta\theta\epsilon v$ is confined to the Epistle to the Hebrews (iii. I. vii. 25. viii. 3. ix. 18) with the exception of Matt. xiv. 7.

II. 17.

πάντα τοις άδελφοις όμοιωθηναι, ίνα έλεήμων γένηται καί πιστός αρχιερεύς τα πρός τόν Θεόν,

Acts xxvi. 19, δθεν, βασιλεῦ 'Αγρίππα, οὐκ ἐγενόμην ἀπειθὴς τῆ ουρανίω οπτασία. I John ii. 18. $\delta \phi_{\epsilon i} \lambda_{\epsilon v}$] He incurred the obligation. The relation which He had assumed required it of *Him in consistency.* See Luke xvii. 10, δ $\omega \phi \epsilon i \lambda o \mu \epsilon v$ (by reason of our relation as $\delta o \hat{v} \lambda o i$) $\pi o i \hat{\eta} \sigma a i$ πεποιήκαμεν. John xiii. 14, εί οὖν ἐγὼ ἔνιψα ύμῶν τοὺς πόδας, ό κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος, καὶ ύμεῖς ὀφείλετε (by reason of your relation to me) $d\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\omega\nu$ $\nu(\pi\tau\epsilon)\nu$ τούς πόδας. Rom, xv. 27. 2 Cor. xii. 14. Eph. v. 28. 1 John ii. 6. iii. 16. iv. 11.

κατὰ πάντα] 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.

τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς] See verse 11, and note on ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν.

όμοιωθήναι] Acts xiv. 11, οί θεοι όμοιωθέντες ανθρώποις κατέβησαν προς ήμας.

iva... γ ένηται] To qualify Him for entering upon the office of, &c.

ελεήμων] Only here, and in Matt. v. 7, μακάριοι οἱ ελεήμονες. In the Septuagint it occurs frequently; (1) alone, as in Exod. xxii. 27, ελεήμων γάρ εἰμι. Jer. iii. 12, ὅτι ελεήμων ἐγώ εἰμι, λέγει

Κύριος κ.τ.λ., or (2) in combination with other attributes, as in Exod. xxxiv. 6, οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων, μακρόθυμος καὶ πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινός. Neh. ix. 17. Psalm lxxxvi, 15. ciii. 8. cxlv. 8. Joel ii. 13. Jonah iv. 3. &c. &c. In the New Testament oiktionwv also occurs but twice (Luke vi. 36. James v. 11). The difference between the two is that between pity (oiktos) and mercy ($\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda \epsilon os$); the one, simple compassion; the other, kindness to the undeserving.

πιστός] I John i. 9, πιστός έστιν καὶ δίκαιος ίνα ἀφῆ ήμιν τàs ἁμαρτίας. Trustworthy; one who can be relied upon to fulfil His engagements. See iii. 2, 5. x. 23. xi. 11. Deut. vii. 9, 6 Θεός ό πιστός, ό φυλάσσων την διαθήκην καὶ τὸ ἔλεος τοῖς ἀγαπώσιν αὐτόν (B omits 1st o, 3rd ό, τήν, τό). xxxii. 4, Θεός πιστός, καί ούκ έστιν άδικία. δίκαιος καί όσιος Κύριος. 1 Sam. ii. 35, καί άναστήσω έμαυτῷ ίκρέα πιστόν. iii. 20, δτι πιστός Σαμουήλ είς προφήτην τῶ Κυρίω. Psalm lxxxix. 37, καὶ ὁ μάρτυς ἐν οὐρανῶ πιστός. Isai. xlix. 7, ότι πιστός έστιν ό άγιος Ισραήλ. &c. &c.

 $d\rho\chi\iota\rho\epsilon\nu$ [s] 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

18 εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ. ἐν

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 premature obtrusion of the topic. It is prepared for by i. 3, καθαρισμον τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος, by ii. 9, ὅπως χ. Θ. ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου, and by ii. 11, ὅ τε γὰρ ἀμάζων καὶ οἱ ἀγιαζόμενοι.

τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν] As to those things which are towards God. In reference to all man's relations with God. For τὰ πρός, compare Luke xix. 42, εἰ ἐγνως ...τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην. Acts xxviii. 10, τὰ πρὸς τὰς χρείας. 2 Pet. i. 3, τὰ πρὸς ζωήν καὶ εὐσέβειαν. For the whole phrase, v. 1. Rom. xv. 17, καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.

eis το ίλάσκεσθαι] The tense shows that it is not the one sacrifice of propitiation which is spoken of, but the exercise of the To the perpetual priesthood. end that He may continually secure the forgiveness of the continually recurring sins of the people. The verb iλάσκεσθαι occurs (in the New Testament) only here and in Luke xviii. 13, ό Θεός, ίλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ. 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 (ίλαος, ίλεως), favourable or gracious (compare Exod. xxxii. 12, ίλεως γενού επί τη κακία τοῦ λαοῦ σου. Jer. xxxi, 34, ίλεως έσομαι ταις άδικίαις αὐτῶν. Matt. xvi. 22, ίλεώς σοι, Kúpie), (1) with $\pi \epsilon \rho i$, as Exod. xxxii. 14, ίλάσθη Κύριος περί της κακίας ής είπε ποιήσαι τον λαον aυτοῦ κ.τ.λ.; or (2) with a dative, (a) of the person, as 2 Kings v. 18, ίλάσεται Κύριος τῷ δούλω σου...ίλασθήσεται δη Κύριος τώ δούλω σου κ.τ.λ.; (b) of the thing, as Psalm xxv. 11, ίλάση τῆ ἀμαρτία μου. Ιxxix. 9, ἰλάσθητι ταις άμαρτίαις ήμων κ.τ.λ.; οι (3) absolutely, as Lam. iii. 42, ήμαρτήσαμεν, ήσεβήσαμεν, καὶ οὐχ ίλάσθης. Dan. ix. 19, ακουσον, Κύριε, ίλάσθητι, Κύριε, πρόσχες, Κύριε κ.τ.λ. 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 explated. The scriptural usage avoids the expression, rendering God gracious to the sinner (though there is a sense in which this might be made consistent with true doctrine), as tending to obscure the divine love which originates redemption. John iii. 16, οΰτως γαρ ήγάπησεν ο Θεός τον κόσμον ώστε τον υίον τον μονογενή έδωκεν $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. Thus, although the literal rendering of ιλάσκεσθαι τὰς άμαρ- τ ias might seem to be, to render God gracious as to our sins, this II. 18.

ώ γὰρ πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθείς, δύναται τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθήσαι.

would be an unscriptural phrase. The real thought is, to secure the forgiveness of sins, from day to day and from hour to hour, by His presence with God as the Propitiation first and then the Intercessor. I John ii. I, καὶ ἐάν τις ἁμαρτῷ, παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον, καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.

 $\tau \circ \hat{v} \lambda a \circ \hat{v}$] The expression suits the thought of the $a_{\rho\chi\iota\epsilon}$ ρεύς. Lev. xvi. 24, και έξιλάσεται...περί τοῦ λαοῦ, ὡς περί τῶν $i\epsilon\rho\epsilon\omega\nu$. To the Hebrew readers it would express that transference 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, τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ. viii. 10. xiii. 12, διό καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἶνα άγιάση δια τοῦ ἰδίου αξματος τον λαόν κ.τ.λ. Also Matt. i. 21, aυτος γαρ σώσει τον λαόν αυτού από των αμαρτιών αυτών. Acts xv. 14. λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. Tit. ii. 14, ἶνα λυτρώσηται ήμας από πάσης ανομίας και καθαρίση έαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον. 1 Pet. ii. 9, υμεῖς δε...λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν. Compare Gal. vi. 16, καί έπι τον Ίσραήλ του Θεού. Phil. iii. 3, ήμεις γάρ έσμεν ή περιτομή κ.τ.λ.

18. $\epsilon \nu \quad \tilde{\psi} \quad \gamma \delta \rho$] A reason for the katà $\pi \delta \nu \tau a$, and for the $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \eta \mu \omega \nu$, of verse 17. For in that He Himself has suffered by having been subjected to all manner of bodily, mental, and spiritual trial, He is able, &c. The alternative construction, $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho a\sigma$ - $\theta\epsilon$'s $\epsilon v \ \phi \ \pi\epsilon \pi ov \theta\epsilon v$, having been tempted (or tried) in that which He has suffered, is excluded by the tense of $\pi\epsilon \pi ov \theta\epsilon v$, which would have been (in that case) $\epsilon\pi a\theta\epsilon v$, as in verse 8. In fact $\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\rho a\sigma \mu\epsilon vos \epsilon v \ \phi \ \epsilon \pi a\theta\epsilon v$ would have been the more natural phrase for that construction.

 $\vec{\epsilon} v \vec{\phi}$] In that. The phrase is contracted from $\vec{\epsilon} v \tau \sigma \dot{v} \tau \psi$ (or $\vec{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon i v \psi$) $\vec{\delta}$, in this (or in that) as to which. Compare $\vec{\epsilon} \phi^* \dot{\phi}$, Rom. v. 12. 2 Cor. v. 4. The $\vec{\epsilon} v$ says that His ability to help is contained (or involved) in the fact that He has Himself suffered.

πέπονθεν] For πάσχειν without an accusative, compare 1 Cor. xii. 26, εἶτε πάσχει ἕν μέλος. Phil. i. 29, ὑμῦν ἐχαρίσθη...τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν. 2 Thess. i. 5, ὑπὲρ ἦς καὶ πάσχετε. 1 Pet. ii. 19, 20, 23, πάσχων ἀδίκως... πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε...πάσχων οὐκ ἡπείλει. iii. 14, 17. iv. 15, 19.

 $\pi\epsilon\epsilon\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon(s]$ The two senses, tried and tempted, are scarcely separable here. Both spring out of the idea of piercing ($\pi\epsilon\epsilon$ - $\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$) for discovery of the contents of a thing, and so for ascertainment of character; and

III. 1 'Όθεν, άδελφοι άγιοι, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτ-

the difference between the two is made by the context, The agent and object distinguish them. God tries, the devil tempts. To tempt is malevolent, to try is for dis-Compare James i. 2 cipline. 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.

δύναται Compare iv. 15, δυνάμενον συνπαθήσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ήμων. v. 2, μετριοπαθείν δυνάμενος τοΐς άγνοοῦσιν καὶ πλα $v \omega \mu \epsilon v o v s$. 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.

rois $\pi \epsilon_{io} \alpha_{io} \omega_{io} \beta_{io}$ 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.

βοηθήσαι] Illustrations of the versatility of this helping abound in Scripture. Matt. xv. 25, 28, έλθοῦσα προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγουσα, Κύριε, βοήθει μοι...καὶ ἰάθη ἡ θυγατὴρ αὐτῆς. Mark ix. 22, 24, εἶ τι δύνη, βοήθησον ἡμῶν σπλαγχυισθεὶς ἐφ' ἡμῶς ...βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστία κ.τ.λ.

III. 1. $"O\theta \epsilon v$] As an 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 $\delta\theta\epsilon\nu$, see note on ii. 17, $\delta\theta\epsilon\nu$.

άδελφοὶ ἄγιοι] The combination is peculiar to this place. St Paul usually employs ἀδελφοὶ alone; not infrequently with μου added. St Peter, St John, and St Jude prefer ἀγαπητοί. St James commonly uses ἀδελφοὶ or ἀδελφοί μου, sometimes combining the latter with ἀγαπητοί.

ayioi] The idea of conse-

III. I.

οχοι, κατανοήσατε τον απόστολον και αρχιερέα

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. Compare Lev. xx. 26, καὶ ἔσεσθέ μοι άγιοι, ὅτι ἐγὼ άγιός ϵἰμι Κύριος ό Θεός ύμων, ό αφορίσας ύμας πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν είναι dπò Thus I Pet. ii. 9, in two μοι. parallel clauses, $\epsilon\theta vos \, d\gamma i ov$, $\lambda a \delta s$ ϵ is περιποίησιν, a holy race, a people unto acquisition (that is, whom God has willed to make His own).

κλήσεως επουρανίου Compare Phil. iii. 14, This avo κλήσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ίησοῦ. The call is from heaven (1 Pet. i. 12, των ευαγγελισαμένων υμας πνεύματι αγίφ αποσταλέντι απ' ουρανοῦ) and to heaven (I Thess. ii. 12. Tou Θεού του καλούντος ύμας είς την έαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν), but it is also, and principally, above, or *heavenly*, because God is (always in Scripture) the Caller. See Rom. viii. 30, ούς δε προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν. I Cor. 9, πιστός δ Θεός δι οῦ ἐκλήθητε είς κοινωνίαν του υίου αὐτοῦ. vii. 17, έκαστον ώς κέκληκεν δ Θεός. Gal. i, 15. 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, τα χαρίσματα και ή κλήσις τού Θεού. I Cor.i. 26. Eph. i. 18. iv. 1, 4. 2 Thess. 2 Tim. i. 9, кай кале́i, 11. σαντος κλήσει άγία. 2 Pet. i. 10, βεβαίαν ύμων την κλησιν και έκλογήν ποιείσθαι. The word is used (as here) nine times by St Paul, and once by St Peter.

 $\hat{\epsilon}\pi ov par(ov)$ In one passage, Eph. i. 10, the revised text gives the combination $\tau a \epsilon \pi i$ (for $\epsilon \nu$) τ ois oupavois. Hence the adjective enoupávios, xi. 16. xii. 22. I Cor. xv. 40, καὶ σώματα *ἐπουράνια καὶ σώματα ἐπίγεια*. John iii. 12, τα επίγεια...τα έπουράνια. Phil. ii. 10, έπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθο-2 Tim. iv. 18, els την νίων. βασιλείαν αύτοῦ την επουράνιον. Often we find τa $\epsilon \pi o \nu \rho a \nu i a$, the heaventies (in a predominantly local sense), as in viii. 5. ix. 23 (where tà inoupávia is the equivalent of twir in tois ouparois above). Eph. i. 3, 20. ii. 6. iii. 10. vi. 12. Sometimes as a title of God, as in Psalm lxviii. 14, έν τῷ διαστέλλειν τον έπουράνιον βασιλείς έπ' αυτής (compare 2 Macc. iii. 39, o the katolkiav

2 της όμολογίας ήμων Ίησοῦν, πιστόν ὄντα τώ

έπουράνιον έχων), or of Christ, I Cor. xv. 48, 49, οἶος ὁ ἐπουράνιος...τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου.

μέτοχοι] See note on i. 9, τους μετόχους σου.

κατανοήσατε] Set your minds upon. Fasten your attention upon. Thus x. 24, κατανοώμεν άλλήλους κ.τ.λ. Gen. xlii. 9. Exod. ii. II, κατανοήσας δε τον πόνον αυτών δρά άνθρωπον κ.τ.λ. Psalm ΧΧΧΥΙΙ. 32, κατανοεί ο άμαρτωcxix. 18, aπoλός τόν δίκαιον. κάλυψον τούς οφθαλμούς μου, καί κατανοήσω τὰ θαυμάσιά σου (Β omits σου) έκ τοῦ νόμου σου. Matt. vii. 3. Luke vi. 41. xii, 24, 27, κατανοήσατε τους κόρακας ... κατανοήσατε τὰ κρίνα. XX. 23. Acts vii. 31, 32. xi. 6, els nu άτενίσας κατενόουν καὶ εἶδον κ.τ.λ. xxvii. 39. Rom. iv. 19. James i. 23, 24, έοικεν άνδρὶ κατανοοῦντι τὸ πρόσωπον της γενέσεως αύτου έν έσόπτρω, κατενόησεν γαρ έαυτον $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. It is noticeable that, of the fourteen places of its occurrence in the New Testament, eight are in St Luke's writings.

τον ἀπόστολον] The two titles here given to our Lord, ἀπόστολος and ἀρχιερεύς, may be said to contain in them two whole sections of the Epistle, the comparison with Moses, and the comparison with Moses, and the latter is postponed till chapter v. The former is at once entered upon. The word ἀπόστολος is not elsewhere ap-

plied either to Moses or to our Lord. In the Old Testament it occurs but once (1 Kings xiv. 6, εγώ είμι απόστολος πρός σε σκληρός). But the verb aπo- $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon w$ is frequently thus applied. See (1) Exod. iii. 10, 13, 14, 15, και νύν δεύρο, άποστείλω σε προς Φαραώ...ό ῶν άπέσταλκέ με πρὸς ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ. v. 22, ίνατί ἀπέσταλκάς με; Num. xvi. 28. Deut. xxxiv. 11. Josh. xxiv. 5. 1 Sam. xii. 8, ἀπέστειλε Κύριος τον Μωυσην και τον 'Aaρών. &c. &c. (2) Matt. xxi. 37, απέστειλεν προς αυτούς τον υίόν. Mark ix. 37, οὐκ ἐμè δέχεται άλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά John iii. 17, 34. v. 36, μ**ε**. 38. xvii. 3, 8, 18, 21, 23, 25. 1 John iv. 9, 10, 14, τον υίον αύτοῦ τὸν μονογενή ἀπέσταλκεν ό Θεός είς τον κόσμον ίνα ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ...ἑλασμὸν περὶ τών αμαρτιών ήμων...σωτήρα του κόσμου. &c. &c.

άρχιερέα] See note on ii. 17, άρχιερεύς.

τη̂ς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν] This genitive depends upon both the accusatives, ἀπόστολον and ἀρχιερία. The Apostle and High Priest belonging to (that is, who is the subject of) our ὁμολογία.

όμολογίας] From όμόλογος, of one speech with (τινί), holding the same language with (όμόλογός εἰμί τινι περί τινος), comes όμολογεῖν (τινί τι or κατά τι), to consent to another's statement;

III. 2, 3.

ποιήσαντι αὐτὸν ὡς καὶ Μωυσῆς ἐν ὅλῷ τῷ οἴκῷ αὐτοῦ. πλείονος γὰρ οὖτος δόξης παρὰ Μωυσῆν 3

iii. 2. Or omit öλφ.

and so, to acknowledge, in all senses, whether a thing (as I John i. 9, έαν όμολογωμεν τας άμαρτίας ήμων. iv. 15, δς έαν όμολογήση δτι κ.τ.λ.), or a person (as I John ii. 23, ο όμολογών ror vior). Sometimes, to make open acknowledgment to (Heb. xiii. 15) or on the subject of (ev, Matt. x. 32) a person. And thus ή όμολογία (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. 14. x. 23. 2 Cor. ix. 13, τη ύποταγή της δμολογίας ύμων (the obedience of your confession, that is, the obedience shown by you to the faith which you profess). I Tim. vi. 12, ώμολόγησας την καλην ομολογίαν. In I Tim. vi. 13 it is applied to the avowal made by Christ Himself before Pilate of His own Person and Mission.

2. $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \delta v$ $\delta \tau \sigma a$] 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.

τ $\hat{\varphi}$ ποιήσαντι] For this use of ποιείν, to make or create an official person, compare 1 Sam. xii. 6, μάρτυς Κύριος ο ποιήσας τον Μωυσήν και τον Άαρών. 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. 14, καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα, οὒς καὶ αποστόλους ωνόμασεν. Acts ii. 36, καί Κύριον αὐτὸν καί Χριστὸν έποίησεν ό Θεός, τοῦτον τον Ἰησούν κ.τ.λ.

ώς καὶ Μωυσῆς] The reference is to Num. xii. 7, οἰχ οἶτως ὁ θεράπων μου Μωυσῆς, ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἶκφ μου πιστός ἐστι.

 $oi\kappa\omega_j$] The two senses of oikos, house and household, run into one another in many passages, nor does $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\omega\delta'_{\epsilon}\omega_{\epsilon}$ (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 1 Cor. iii. 9. Eph. ii. 21. 2 Tim. ii. 20; the latter in 1 Tim. iii. 15.

aὐτοῦ] God's: see the quotation from Num. xii. 7. τῷ οἶκψ μου.

3. $\pi\lambda\epsilon$ iovos yáp] I say, ka- $\tau a voi / \sigma a \tau \epsilon$ for, &c. There is cause for this exhortation to fasten your thoughts upon the $d\pi \delta \sigma \tau o \lambda o s$ of our $\delta \mu o \lambda o y (a, for, b)$

ήξίωται καθ όσον πλείονα τιμήν ἕχει τοῦ οἴκου 4 δ κατασκευάσας αὐτόν. πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος κατασκευάζεται ὑπό τινος, ὁ δὲ πάντα κατασκευάσας

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.

οῦτος] See viii. 3, ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον κ.τ.λ. Χ. 12, οῦτος δὲ κ.τ.λ.

 $\eta \xi i \omega \tau a \iota$ The perfect expresses the *permanence* of the He was, and is, estimate. counted worthy, &c. For a Elouv, compare x. 29, χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας. 2 Thess. i. 11, ίνα ύμας άξιώση της κλήσεως ό Θεός ήμών. I Tim. v. 17, διπλης τιμης άξιούσθωσαν. Elsewhere with accusative and infinitive, as Luke vii. 7, ovdè έμαυτον ήξίωσα πρός σε έλθειν. (And so kata Eloîv, in both constructions: as (1) 2 Thess. i. 5. (2) Luke xx. 35. Acts v. 41.) Or with infinitive alone (to count a thing worthy, to think fit), as Acts xv. 38, Παῦλος δὲ ήξίου ...μή συμπαραλαμβάνειν τοῦτον. xxviii. 22, αξιούμεν δε παρά σού άκοῦσαι & φρονεῖς.

 $\kappa a \theta' \ \delta \sigma \sigma v$] Moses, though officially charged with an $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \kappa \sigma \pi$ in the house, is personally a part of the house, and, as such, is essentially the inferior of its maker. The following verse explains and completes the argument.

κατασκενάσας] The classical shade of difference between κa τασκενάζειν and παρασκευάζειν (the latter being used of the less permanent kinds of preparation) is noticeable in Scripture also. Compare Acts x. 10, ήθελεν γεύσασθαι, παρασκευαζόντων δε αυτών κ.τ.λ., with Heb. ix. 2, σκηνή γαρ κατεσκευάσθη κ.τ.λ. xi. 7. I Pet. iii. 20. See Wisdom ix. 1, 2, δ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ...καὶ τῆ σοφία σου κατασκευάσας $d\nu\theta_{\rho}\omega\pi_{\sigma}\nu$. In its application to a house, κατασκευάζειν may include the three functions, of the architect, builder, and furnisher. See I Chron. xxix. 19, Kal Tov έπι τέλος άγαγείν την κατασκευήν τοῦ οἴκου σου.

4. πα̂ς γὰρ οἶκος] Ι say, its maker (δ κατάσκευάσας αὐτόν). 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 $\pi a \nu \tau a$ to the Church III. 4—6.

Θεός. καὶ Μωυσῆς μὲν πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῷ τῷ οἴκῷ 5 αὐτοῦ ὡς θεράπων εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων, Χριστὸς δὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ· 6 οῦ οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, ἐὰν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ

universal: the larger sense given above is equally true, and at least equally to the purpose.

5. καί Μωυσης μέν] The $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ 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 (iv) God's house, and as a servant, Christ was faithful over $(\epsilon \pi i)$ God's 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 (1) between in and over, (2) between servant and Son.

 $\theta \epsilon \rho \dot{a} \pi \omega \nu$] 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. iv. 10. xiv. 31, επίστευσαν τώ Θεώ, καὶ Μωυσή τῷ θεράποντι avrov. Num. xi, 11. Deut. iii, 24. Josh. i. 2, Μωυσής όθεράπων μου τετελεύτηκε. viii. 31, 33. The other chief appropriation of the word is to Job: Job i. 8. ii. 3. xlii. 7, 8.

εis μαρτύριον] 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 μαρτυρία (testatio) and μαρτύριον (testimonium) is never obliterated, though in many cases either would be suitable. StJohn uses $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho i a$ only (a seeming exception in Rev. xv. 5 is not really such). For μαρτύριον see Acts iv. 33, απεδίδουν το μαρτύριον οι απόστολοι του κυρίου Ίησοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως (rendered, exhibited, presented, their great subject of testimony, namely, the resurrection). I Cor. i. 6. 2 Cor. i. 12, τὸ μαρτύριον τής συνειδήσεως ήμων (that which is borne witness of by our conscience). 2 Thess. i. 10. 1 Tim. ii. 6, το μαρτύριον καιροίς ίδίοις (which was to be the subject of testimony, &c.).

τῶν λαληθησομένων] See i. 2, ἐλάλησεν ήμῶν ἐν υἱῷ.

6. is viss $[And therefore of one rank and order with of <math>\kappa a \tau a \sigma \kappa \epsilon v a \sigma a s$. The contrast here with $\theta \epsilon \rho a \pi \omega v$ is like that in

καύχημα της έλπίδος μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν.

iii. 6. Or omit μέχρι τ. βεβαίαν.

 1, 2, with οἱ προφῆται. Compare John v. 18, 23, πατέρα ἴδιον ἕλεγεν τὸν Θεόν, ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ Θεῷ...ἶνα πάντες τιμῶσιν τὸν νίὸν καθώς τιμῶσιν τὸν Πατέρα.

 $i\pi i$ The change from iv to $\epsilon \pi i$ cannot be accidental. The Son is not in the house, whether κόσμος or ἐκκλησία. John xvi. 28, αφίημι τον κόσμον και πορεύομαι πρός τόν Πατέρα. xvii. 11, οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ κ.τ.λ. Compare Acts xx. 28, παντί τώ ποιμνίω, έν φ ύμας το πνεθμα το άγιον έθετο επισκόπους. The human shepherd is in, not over, the flock: but of Christ it is said (x. 21), καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν έπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

 $a\dot{v}\tau o\hat{v}...o\hat{v}$] As before, God^3s . The rendering of the Authorized Version, *His own house*, carries us away from the true antithesis, which lies in the $\epsilon\pi$ and the vis.

 $\epsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu...\epsilon\dot{a}\nu$] The combination is peculiar, and most suggestive. We are God's house not, 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 ($\epsilon\dot{a}\nu$), that of perseverance. Such is the teaching of Scripture—quietness and confidence, yet with the undersong of warring.

 $\pi a \rho \rho \eta \sigma (a \nu)$ The idea of freedom of speech ($\pi a \nu - \rho \eta \sigma (a)$ 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 (1) 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 (1) see iv. 16, προσερχώμεθα οῦν μετα παρρησίας τῷ θρόνω της χάριτος. x. 19, ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν είς την είσοδον των άγίων έν τώ αίματι Ίησου. Eph. iii. 12. I John ii. 28. iii. 21. iv. 17. For (2) see Acts iv. v. 14. 29, 31. xxviii. 31. 2 Cor. iii. vii. 4. Eph. vi. 19. 12.

καύχημα] Between καύχημα and καύχησιs there is the obvious difference between subject and act, between boast and boasting. The word καυχῶσθαι, with both its derivatives, is almost exclusively St Paul's, who uses καυχῶσθαι 34 times (St James twice), καύχησιs eleven times (St James once), and καύχημα ten times.

τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος] The subject of glorying belonging to (contained in) our great hope. That which our Christian hope gives us to glory in. It is doubtful whether τῆς ἐλπίδος belongs to both accusatives, or only (perhaps better) to τὸ καύχημα.

μέχρι τέλους $\beta \epsilon \beta a (av]$ In verse 14 these three words are

Διό, καθώς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, 7 Σήμερον, ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε,

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 $\kappa a \tau a \sigma \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$) from verse 14.

κατάσχωμεν] The acrist expresses, if we shall have held fast: if, when the great day comes, we shall be found to have held fast, &c.

7. $\Delta i\delta$] Wherefore. Considering the superiority of Christ to Moses, and in the same degree the greater danger of trifting 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 $\pi\epsilon\rho i\sigma\sigma\sigma \sigma \epsilon\rho \omega s$ of ii. 1, and the $\pi \delta \sigma \omega \chi \epsilon \ell \rho \sigma v s$ of x. 29.

διό, καθώς] What is the construction of the sentence thus begun? Is it (1) διδ...μη σκληρύηπε κ.π.λ. (verse 8)? Is it (2) διδ...βλέπετε, αδελφοί, κ.π.λ. (verse 12)? Or is (3) a suppressed imperative to be supplied mentally from the general sense of the quotation? Against (1) is the first person (God being the speaker) of verses 9-11: τὰ έργα μου ... προσώχθισα ... τὰς όδούς μου κ.τ.λ. 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.

λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα] A strong testimony to the inspiration of Old Testament Scripture. Compare x. 15, μαρτυρεί δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγιον · μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰρηκέναι κ.τ.λ. 2 Tim. iii. 16, πῶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος κ.τ.λ. 2 Pet. i. 21, ὑπὸ πνείματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλαλήσαν ἀπὸΘεοῦἀνθρωποι.

 $\Sigma_{\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu}$] Psalm xcv. 7—11. The authorship of the Psalm is ascribed to David in iv. 7, but nothing turns upon it, and the argument of that verse ($\mu\epsilon\tau\dot{\alpha}$ $\tau\sigma\sigma\sigma\dot{\sigma}\tau\sigma\nu$ $\chi\rho\dot{\sigma}\nu\sigma\nu$) 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.

eàr...aκούσητε] If ye shall (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-

8 μη σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ, κατὰ την ἡμέραν τοῦ

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 Him.

8. $\mu\eta$ $\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\nu\eta\tau\epsilon$ The tense (aorist subjunctive) 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 (1) to the man's own action in refusing grace, and (2) to the judicial sentence which at last endorses it. (1) Exod. xiii. 15, ήνίκα δε εσκλήρυνε Φαραώ εξαποστείλαι ήμας. Deut. x. 16, καί τον τράχηλον ύμων ού σκληρυνείτε έτι. 2 Kings xvii. 14, καί έσκλήρυναν τον νώτον αὐτῶν. 2 Chron. xxx. 8. xxxvi. 13. Neh. ix. 16, 17, 29. (2) Exod. iv. 21, έγω δε σκληρυνώ αυτοῦ τὴν καρδίαν. vii. 3. ix. 12. x. 20, 27. xi. 10. xiv. 4, 8, 17. Deut. ii. 30, έσκλήρυνε Κύριος ο Θεος ήμων το πνεύμα αύτου. Isai. lxiii. 17, έσκλήρυνας ήμων τας καρδίας του μή φοβείσθαί σε. Sometimes the passive is used, leaving the agency ambiguous. Exod. vii. 22, και έσκληρύνθη ή καρδία Φαραώ, καὶ οὐκ εἰσήκουσεν αὐτῶν. viii. 19. ix. 35.

 τ às κ apbías] The word κ apbía 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 example, Mark ii. 6, διαλογιζόμενοι έν ταις καρδίαις αυτών. Rom. ii. Ι 5, τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν έν ταΐς καρδίαις αυτών, where the alternative following (κατηγορούντων ή καὶ ἀπολογουμένων) shows \mathbf{that} understanding rather than affection is the prominent thought. I Cor. vii. 37, έστηκεν έν τη καρδία...και τοῦτο κέκρικεν έν τη ίδία καρδία. Here, 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 δια την πώρωσιν της καρδίαs is made a parallel and equivalent clause to $\delta_{la} \tau \eta \nu$ άγνοιαν την ούσαν έν αύτοις.

παραπικρασμ $\hat{\omega}$... πειρασμο $\hat{\upsilon}$] These words are the translation in the Septuagint of the Hebrew Meribah and Massah. 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 παρα-

III. 8, 9.

πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῆ ἐρήμϣ, οὗ ἐπείρασαν οἱ 9 πατέρες ὑμῶν ἐν δοκιμασία καὶ εἶδον τὰ

 π ikpa σ μ o's (exacerbation) is found only here. (In Exod. xvii. 7 Meribah is rendered $\lambda oldopholis$, and in Num. xx. 12 άντιλογία.) But παραπικραίνειν occurs often in this application; as in Deut. xxxi. 27. Psalm lxxviii. 8, 17, 40, ποσάκις παρεπίκραναν αυτόν έν τη ερήμω, παρώργισαν αυτόν εν $\gamma \hat{\eta}$ arúδρ φ (the following verse adding $i\pi\epsilon$ ipagav and π apώ ξ vvav as further equivalents). Ezek. ii. 3, 5-8. &c. &c. For πeιpaguo's see note on ii. 18, $\pi\epsilon \mu a$ - $\sigma\theta \epsilon i s$. For its use here, as the trial of God by men, the experimenting upon His power or forbearance, compare Exod. xvii. 7. Deut. vi. 16. ix. 22 (in all which places it is the rendering of *Massah*). And so the verb ($\pi\epsilon_{\iota\rho}a'_{\ell}\epsilon_{\iota\nu}$) in Exod xvii. 2, 7. Num. xiv. 22. Psalm lxxviii. 41, 56. evi. 14 &c.

 $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \tau \eta \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \alpha \nu$] According to, after the likeness of, the day, dc. The Hebrew (as the day) suggests this rendering, and the sense of on the day is scarcely borne out by such uses of $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha$ 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. ov Either (1) where, referring to $i v \tau \hat{\eta} i \hat{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu \omega$ above; or (2) wherewith, by attraction of the regular δv (cognate accusative) to the genitive $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho a\sigma\mu o\hat{\upsilon}$ preceding. The latter is the more probable.

ov $\epsilon\pi\epsilon i\rho a \sigma a \nu \kappa.\tau.\lambda.$] The text (verses 9 and 10) varies from the Septuagint (1) in the omission of $\mu\epsilon$ after $\epsilon\pi\epsilon i\rho a \sigma a \nu$, which nevertheless must be mentally supplied, (2) in the substitution of $\epsilon\nu$ $\delta\sigma\kappa\mu a\sigma a \sigma f$ for $\epsilon\delta\sigma\kappa i\mu a \sigma a \nu \mu \mu$ (B omits $\mu\epsilon$), (3) in the insertion of $\delta\iota\delta$ after $\epsilon\tau\eta$, thus connecting the $\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\rho a \kappa\sigma\nu\taua$ $\epsilon\tau\eta$ with verse 10, (4) in the substitution of $\tau a \sigma \tau\eta$ for $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon i \nu\eta$.

οί πατέρες ύμων] See note on i. 1. τοῖς πατράσιν.

εν δοκιμασία] The mode of the tempting. In putting me to the proof, (1) as to my power to help, or (2) as to the extent of my longsuffering. Thus (1) Exod. xvii. 7, δια το πειράζειν auroùs (B omits auroùs) Kúplov, λέγοντας, εί έστι Κύριος έν ήμιν, ή ού; (2) Isai. lxiii. 10, αὐτοὶ δὲ ήπείθησαν, καὶ παρώξυναν τὸ πνεῦμα το άγιον αύτοῦ κ.τ.λ. The noun δοκιμασία occurs in Ecclus. vi. 21, ώς λίθος δοκιμασίας ίσχύος (ἰσχυρός Β) ἔσται ἐπ' αὐτῷ. The verb δοκιμάζειν (from δέχομαι, δοκιμή) in the sense of to prove. is common in both Testaments: as Prov. xvii. 3, ώσπερ δοκιμάζεται έν καμίνω άργυρος και χρυσός. Zech. xiii. 9, πυρώσω avτούς ώς πυρούται το άργύριον, καί

V. н.

10 έργα μου τεσσεράκοντα έτη· διὸ προσώχθισα τῆ γενεậ ταύτη, καὶ εἶπον, ᾿Αεὶ πλανῶνται τῆ καρδία· αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ έγνω-

δοκιμώ αὐτοὺς ὡς δοκιμάζεται τὸ χρυσίον. Luke xiv. 19. 1 Cor. iii. 13. 1 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,

τά έργα μου] The και είδον 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. xxviii. 21, μετά θυμοῦ ποιήσει τα έργα αύτοῦ, πικρίας έργον. But the more inclusive sense is better. Compare Num. xiv. 22. οι ορώντες την δόξαν μου και τα σημεία μου (B omits μου) α έποίησα έν Αιγύπτω, και έν τη έρήμω ταύτη (B omits ταύτη), και έπείρασαν με τοῦτο δέκατον κ.τ.λ.

10. $\pi \rho o \sigma \omega \chi \theta i \sigma a$] A postclassical form of the Homeric $\dot{\sigma} \chi \theta \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ ($\dot{a} \chi \theta \sigma s$, $\dot{a} \chi \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a$), denoting a burden of grief or displeasure at, towards, or against ($\pi \rho \dot{\sigma} s$) a thing or person (with $\tau \nu \iota$, $\tau \iota \nu a$, $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ $\tau \iota \nu \iota$, or $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\sigma}$ $\tau \iota \nu \sigma s$). First in Gen. xxvii 56, $\pi \rho o \sigma$ - $\omega \chi \theta \iota \kappa a$ $\tau \eta \tilde{\chi} \chi \omega \eta$ $\mu o \nu \delta \iota a$ $\tau a \delta \nu \gamma a$ - $\tau \epsilon \rho a s$. Levit. xviii 25, 28, $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma$ - $\omega \chi \theta \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu \eta \gamma \eta \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ (B omits $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$) $\tau o \hat{\epsilon} s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa a \theta \eta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu o \iota s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{a} \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta s$... $\dot{\iota} \nu a \mu \eta$

προσοχθίση ύμιν ή γή έν τῷ μιαίνειν υμας αυτήν, όν τρόπον κ.τ.λ. Num. xxi. 5. xxii. 3, προσώχθισε Μωάβ από προσώπου υίων lopanλ. I Chron. xxi. 6. προσώχθισεν (Α, κατίσχυσε λ. Β) ό λόγος τοῦ βασιλέως τον Ἰωάβ. &c. And so $\pi \rho o \sigma \sigma \chi \theta i \sigma \mu a$, (1) displeasure, disgust, as Deut. vii. 26, προσοχθίσματι προσοχθίσεις αὐτῷ, καὶ βδελύγματι βδελύξη avró (B omits avrô and avró) κ.τ.λ. (2) an object of displeasure, an abomination, as 2 Kings xxiii. 13, δν ψκοδόμησε Σαλωμών βασιλεύς Ίσραήλ τη Αστάρτη προσοχθίσματι Σιδωνίων κ.τ.λ. For the application of $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\sigma$ - $\gamma \theta i \zeta \epsilon i \nu$ (as here) to God Himself, compare Levit. xxvi. 44, ούχ υπερείδον αυτούς ούδε προσώχθισα αύτοις ωστε εξαναλωσαι avrous.

ταύτη] This which is under review. The sense is not affected by the change of reading from $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \eta$.

πλανώνται] Sometimes the passive of πλανών is strongly emphasized, as in the πλανώντες καὶ πλανώμενοι of 2 Tim. iii. 13, and (by implication) in the μηδεἰς πλανάτω ὑμῶς of 1 John iii. 7. Here the middle is more suitable. The thought is expanded, and the latent idea of

σαν τὰς όδούς μου ώς ὤμοσα ἐν τῆ ὀργῆ 11 μου, Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν

influence is expressed, in 2 Pet. ii. 15, καταλιπόντες εύθειαν όδον ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῆ όδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ.

airoi $\delta \epsilon$] The pronoun airoi (always emphatic in the nominative) suggests the colon at $\kappa a \rho \delta (a, and the antithetical ren$ $dering of the clause airoi <math>\delta \epsilon$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. 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.

οὐκ ἔγνωσαν] Matt. xxiv. 39, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἔως ἦλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἦρεν ἄπαντας. Luke xix. 44, ἀνθ ῶν οὐκ ἔγνως τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου. John i. 10. Rom. iii. 17, ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν. 1 Cor. i. 21. ὡς.

τάς όδούς μου] My proceedings, my methods of acting. Isai. Iv. 8, ου γάρ είσιν αί βουλαί μου ώσπερ αί βουλαί ὑμῶν, οὐδ ὥσπερ αί δδοι ὑμῶν αί όδοί μου, λέγει Κύριος. Rom. xi. 33, και ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αί όδοι αὐτοῦ, Rev. xv. 3, δίκαιαι καὶ ἀληθιναὶ ai όδοί σου, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν.

ώς ὅμοσα] As I sware.
 Their conduct was in accordance with (explaining and justifying) my oath of exclusion.

Eἰ εἰσελεύσονται] A Hebraistic form of strong negation; the clause οὐ ζῶ (or the like) being understood before εἰ. Mark viii. 12, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ δοθήσεται τῆ γενεậ ταύτῃ σημεῖον. For an opposite phrase, expressing strong assertion, see Rom. xiv. 11, ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει Κύριος, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πῶν γόνυ κ.τ.λ., where the original passage in the Septuagint (Isai. xlv. 23, 24) has κατ ἐμαυτοῦ ἀμνύω...ὅτι κ.τ.λ. Compare 2 Cor. i. 18. xi. 10.

τήν κατάπαυσίν μου] The literal rendering might seem to be the *transitive* form, My resting of them, my causing them to rest. See Exod. xxxiii. 14, αύτος προπορεύσομαί σου καί καταπαύσω σε. Deut. xii. 10, καί καταπαύσει ύμας από πάντων των έχθρων ύμων. 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, καὶ κατέπαυσε τῆ ήμέρα τη έβδόμη κ.τ.λ. Exod. ΧΧΧΙ. 17, 18, έπαύσατο και κατέπαυσε (Β κατέπ. καὶ ἐπ.)...κατέπαυσε λαλών. Ruth ii. 7. I

12 μου. βλέπετε, αδελφοί, μή ποτε έσται έν τινι
 ύμων καρδία πονηρά απιστίας έν τῷ αποστήναι
 13 από Θεοῦ ζώντος. αλλά παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς

Kings viii. 56, δς έδωκε κατάπαυσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ. 2 Chron. vi. 41, ἀνάστηθι, Κύριε ὁ Θεός, εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν σου. &c.

12. $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, $\dot{a}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi oi$] A new sentence. See note on verse 7, $\delta i \delta$, $\kappa a \theta \omega \delta$ s. For the abruptness of the appeal (without connecting particle) compare xii. 25, $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon \mu \eta$ $\pi a \rho a i \tau \eta \sigma \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$ $\tau \delta \nu$ $\lambda a \lambda o \delta \nu \tau a$. Col. ii. 8, $\beta\lambda\epsilon$ - $\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon \mu \eta$ $\tau i \varsigma \kappa.\tau.\lambda$.

 $\mu\eta \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon$] See note on ii. 1, $\mu\eta \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon$.

έσται] The indicative implies a strong impression that the apprehension ($\beta\lambda$ έπετε μή) is well founded. Gal. iv. 11, φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς μή πως εἰκῆ κεκοπίακα. Col. ii. 8, βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν.

έν τινι ὑμῶν] In any one of you. The singular individualizes the need of watchfulness. Compare the τις ἐξ ὑμῶν of verse 13.

καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας] A bad heart of (characterized by) unbelief. Compare x. 22, συνειδήσεως πονηρῶς. Luke vi. 45, καὶ ὁ πονηρῶς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ προφέρει τὸ πονηρῶν· ἐκ γὰρ περισσεύματος καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

ἀπιστίας] Of the two groups, ἀπειθής (ἀπείθεια, ἀπειθεῖν) and ἀπιστος (ἀπιστία, ἀπιστεῖν), the former is found 14 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.

 $\dot{\epsilon} v \tau \hat{\psi}$] Shown in. Acting in. In the form and shape of.

aπoστηναι] To stand off or away from: (1) whether to depart (clearly so in Luke iv. 13. Acts xii. 10. 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.

Θεοῦ ζῶντος] See ix. 14. x. 31. xii. 22. A God who is all life.

 13. άλλά] On the contrary. παρακαλείτε] Encourage the meeting-point of the two thoughts, comfort, and exhort.

68

καθ' έκάστην ήμέραν, ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται, ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῆ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀπάτη τῆς ἁμαρτίας· μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ 14

iii. 13. Οτ έξ ύμων τις.

παρακ. έαυτούς] See x. 25 (where no accusative is expressed). Compare I Thess. iv. 18 and v. 11 (αλλήλους). The difference between Eavrov's and αλλήλουs is next to none: see Eph. iv. 32, εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοί... χαριζόμενοι έαυτοις. Col. iii. 13, ανεχόμενοι αλλήλων καί χαριζόμενοι έαυτοῖς. Ι Pet. iv. 9, 10, φιλόξενοι είς αλλήλους... είς έαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες. Τhe use of *tavt*. expresses the unity of the Christian body: they who forgive each other forgive themselves. (In the New Testament we have always taurŵr &c. never ήμῶν or ὑμῶν αὐτῶν as mere reflexives. See Bp. Lightfoot on Gal. v. 14.) The classical usage of έαυτων for αλλήλων &c. is more rare.

άχρις οῦ] Luke xxi. 24 (πληρωθῶσιν). Acts vii. 18 (ἀνέστη). xxvii. 33 (ἔμελλεν). Rom. xi. 25 (εἰσέλθη). 1 Cor. xi. 26 (ἕλθη). Rev. ii. 25 (ἀν ῆξω). Here alone with a present indicative. Literally, until (the end of) the time during which; that is, so long as. $\tau o \sigma$.] The 'to-day' of the above quotation from Psalm xcv. Compare (for the sense) 2 Cor. vi. 2.

καλείται] Is called, that is, named, used as applicable. Rom. ix. 7, κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα, there shall be called (named, spoken of) for thee a seed.

 $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \nu r \theta \hat{\eta}$] be hardened (1) by his own sin, (2) by the judicial hardening which comes late but surely. See note on verse 8, μη σκληρύνητε.

 $\tau_{is} \ \dot{\epsilon}\xi \ \dot{\nu}\mu$.] Or $\dot{\epsilon}\xi \ \dot{\nu}\mu$. τ_{is} . If the latter, there is some reason for emphasizing of you as in contrast with the generation of the Exodus.

 $\tau \iota s$] Any single one (individualizing the danger).

 $\dot{a}\pi \dot{a}\tau \eta \tau \eta \dot{s} \dot{a}\mu.]$ By a deceit belonging to (characteristic of) sin (all sin). See 2 Thess. ii. 10, $\pi \dot{a}\sigma \eta \dot{a}\pi. \tau \eta \dot{s} \dot{a}\partial\kappa \kappa \dot{a}s.$ Also Gen. iii. 13. 1 Tim. ii. 14. Rom. vii. 11. 2 Cor. xi. 3. All sin is committed under a deception, momentary at least, as to (1) the satisfaction to be found in it, (2) the excuse to be made for it, (3) the probability of its punishment.

14. μέτοχοι] See note on i.
9. In that place it is partners.

γεγόναμεν, ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως 15 μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν· ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς 16 ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ. τίνες γὰρ ἀκούσαντες παρεπίκραναν; ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐξελθόντες

iii, 16. Or τινές γ. ά. παρεπίκραναν άλλ' ού...Μωυσέως.

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.

 $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$] Reason for guarding against the forfeiture of so great a standing.

 $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \circ ra \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\epsilon \acute{a} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho$] See note on verse 6, $\epsilon \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \dots \epsilon \acute{a} \nu$. The same thought of present possession coupled with the one condition of perseverance.

την ἀρχην της ὑπ.] The beginning of our confidence. That is, the confidence, the assured persuasion of truth and Christ, with which we began our Christian life. Equivalent to την ὑπόστασιν ην είχομεν ἀπ' ἀρχης (compare 1 John ii. 7. iii. 11). ὑποστάσεως] Confidence. See note on i. 3. From ὑφίστασθαι (with a dative) comes the use of ὑπόστασις as an act of the mind supporting the weight of a difficult revelation. For the sense compare x. 32.

 $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] See note on the same words in verse 6.

15. $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\psi} \lambda \epsilon \gamma$.] In (within, during) its being said. While it is still said. While the saying is still applicable. The thought goes back to verse 13 (14 being treated as parenthetical). There will come a time when $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \rho o \nu$ will have become yesterday, and when its encouraging voice will be silent.

16. τίνες] Or τινές. The former is now generally adopted, and would certainly be preferable if we could settle iv. 2 (τοîs ακούσασιν) 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?' 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.

akovoavtes After hearing.

ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωυσέως; τίσιν δὲ προσώ- 17 χθισεν τεσσεράκοντα ἕτη; οὐχὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήσασιν, ὧν τὰ κῶλα ἕπεσεν ἐν τῆ ἐρήμω; τίσιν 18 δὲ ὥμοσεν μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν; καὶ 19 βλέπομεν ὅτι οὐκ ἤδυνήθησαν εἰσελθεῖν δι' ἀπιστίαν.

iii. 17. Or άμαρτήσασιν; ῶν...ἐρήμφ.

- So that mere hearing is no safeguard.

διὰ M.] by means of. Equivalent to διὰ χ ειρὸς Μωυσέως.

17. προσώχ θ .] See note on verse 10, προσώχθισα.

 $\tau i \sigma \iota \nu \delta \epsilon$] If we read $\tau \iota \nu \epsilon s$ in verse 16, the sense is: Some —not all: what made the difference ? Sin (verse 17). Disobedience (verse 18).

οἰχὶ τοῖς ἀμ.] Some put the interrogation at ἀμαρτήσασιν, and make the rest of the verse a statement: And their carcases (accordingly) fell, &c. If so, Rom. iii. 8 would resemble this (ῶν τὸ κρίμα ἐνδικόν ἐστιν). And this would balance well with the close of verse 19, καὶ βλέπομεν κ.τ.λ.

άμαρτήσασιν] A post-classical first aorist of άμαρτάνω, found also in Matt. xviii. 15. Rom. v. 14, 16. vi. 15. 2 Pet. ii. 4.

κῶλα] Levit. xxvi. 30, καὶ θήσω τὰ κῶλα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὰ κῶλα τῶν εἰδώλων ὑμῶν, καὶ προσοχθιεῦ ἡ ψυχή μου ὑμῶν. Num. xiv. 29, 32, 33. 1 Sam. xvii. 46. Isai. 1xvi. 24.

έπεσεν ἐν τῆ ἐρ.] See Num. xiv. 29, 32, 33, ἐν τῆ ἐρήμῳ ταύτη πεσείται τὰ κῶλα ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.

18. $\tau i \sigma i \nu \delta i$ See note on verse 17, $\tau i \sigma i \nu \delta i$. On the same supposition (of $\tau i \nu \delta s$, not $\tau i \nu \epsilon s$, being read in verse 16), this verse gives the second answer to the question, What made the difference? Disobedience. For $a \pi \epsilon i \theta$. see note on verse 12, $a \pi i \sigma \tau i s$.

19. Kai $\beta\lambda i \pi o\mu \epsilon v$] And the result was in accordance with the threat. They did not enter. They could not enter. And why? Because of their $i\pi i \sigma \tau i a$. So that $i\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon i a$ (verse 18) and $i\pi i \sigma \tau i a$ (verse 19) are treated as convertible terms, though with a shade of distinction between them. See again note on verse 12, $i\pi i \sigma \tau i a$ s.

βλέπομεν] We see on the Scripture page. For βλέπειν in this mental sense, see, for example, ii. 9. x. 25.

IV. 1 Φοβηθώμεν οὖν μή ποτε καταλειπομένης
 ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ
 2 δοκῆ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ὑστερηκέναι. καὶ γάρ ἐσμεν

IV. 1. $ovreme{b}$ It is an inference from the case of the Exodus generation.

καταλειπομένης] Being left in continuous succession. (1) Left behind by former generations. (2) The present tense marks a repeated and successive leaving behind. (3) There is no i μ μ μ μ or i μ μ μ expressed after καταλειπ. It is quite general. Left for others, whoever they may be, by former possessors.

έπαγγελίας] The verb έπαγ- $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ has two senses (1) to profess, (2) to promise. (The active voice, though classical, in the obvious sense of announce, proclaim, &c., is not found in the New Testament.) Probably both are traceable to the idea of to announce as one's own, in different ways: (1) to announce as one's business, occupation, character, &c., (2) to announce as one's undertaking or engage-The substantive $\epsilon \pi a \gamma$ ment. $\gamma \epsilon \lambda i a$ 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.

είσελθεῦν] To enter, Of entering. That we (or some) should enter. The construction is loose: we might have expected τοῦ with εἰσελθεῦν. Compare Rom. iv. 13, ή έπαγγελία...τό κλ. αὐτόν είναι.

eis $\tau \eta \nu$ κατάπαυσιν] No such promise is anywhere made in express terms. But the inference is from Psalm xcv. 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.

 $\delta o \kappa \hat{\eta}$ A difficult word here. We cannot (at all events without a *ka*l before it) make it mean even seem to have missed it, even in appearance incur such It is better to take it a losa in the forensic sense, in which Soke would be the way of pronouncing a verdict. Did o Seiva commit such or such a crime? Soke? (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.

ύστερηκέναι] That is, αὐτῆς. No clear difference appears to lie between ὑστερεῶν and ὑστερεῦσθαι. Can the latter be a

72

εψηγγελισμένοι καθάπερ κάκεινοι· άλλ' οὐκ ὦφέλησεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνους, μὴ

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 I Cor. i. 7 it stands in a sort of contrast with $\epsilon \pi \lambda o \upsilon \tau i \sigma \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$ in verse 5. In 1 Cor. viii. 8, however, it simply stands over against $\pi \epsilon \rho \omega \sigma \epsilon \dot{\nu} \epsilon \nu$. 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, $\mu \dot{\eta}$ τινος ύστερήσατε; 2 Cor. xi. 5. xii. 11. Sometimes the construction varies from that with a genitive following: for example, Matt. xix. 20, τί (as to what) έτι ύστερώ; Mark x. 21, ev or (as to thee) ύστερεί. John ii. 3, ύστερήσαντος oivou. I Cor. i. 7 (with iv). xii. 24, τῷ ὑστερουμένω (absolute).

2. wai $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ For also. Besides other points of resemblance, there is this ($\kappa \alpha i$), that we (no stress on we, no $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{s}$) have been evangelized (have had a message of good brought to us) even as also were they.

γάρ] A reason for the καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας of verse 1.

 $\epsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\epsilon\dot{\sigma}\eta\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda$.] The choice 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.

 $\kappa a \theta \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \rho \kappa \dot{a} \kappa \epsilon \hat{i} \nu \sigma i$] Under the promise of Cansan 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 11th chapter as to the far-reaching faith of the saints of earlier dispensations.

 $\dot{\omega}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$] See xiii. 9, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ of solv $\dot{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\eta\sigma a\nu$ of περιπατούντες. For this sense of spiritual and everlasting benefiting, see also (for example) Luke ix. 25. John vi. 63. 1 Cor. xiii. 3.

The word ό λ. τής ακοής] of the tidings or divine message. For this sense of akon, a thing for hearing, tidings, a message or announcement, see 1 Sam. ii. 23, ούκ αγαθη ή ακοή ήν εγώ ακούω. I Kings ii. 28, ή ακοή ήλθεν έως 'Ιωάβ. Psalm cxii. 7. Isai. lii. 7, aron elphyrns. Matt. iv. 24, ή ακοή αυτού. xiv. 1. Mark i. 28. John xii. 38. Gal. iii. 2, έξ ακοής πίστεως. I Thess. ii. 13, παραλαβόντες λόγον ακοής παρ' ήμων του Θεού.

έκείνους] See xii. 25, εἰ γὰρ ἐκείνοι οὐκ ἐξέφυγον.

 $\mu\eta$ Because they were not,

συνκεκερασμένους τη πίστει τοις ακούσασιν.

iv. 2. Οτ συνκεκερασμένος.

dc. The Hellenistic use of $\mu \eta'$ 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, $\pi \hat{\omega}$ s γαρ αναβήσομαι πρός τον πατέρα, τοῦ παιδίου μη όντος μεθ' ήμων; Rom. v. 13, µn ovros vóµov. 1 Cor. vii. 37, μη έχων ανάγκην. Gal. vi. 9, µn ekhvóµevol. (2) Because not: Matt. xviii. 25. xxii. 29, πλανασθε μή είδότες ràs ypadás. Mark ii. 4. Luke ii. 45. xi. 24. Acts ix, 26. xvii. 6. xxi. 14, 34. xxvii. 7, 15. Rom. iv. 19, καὶ μη ἀσθενήσας τη πίστει. 2 Cor. v. 19. Heb. xi. 27, μή φοβηθείς τον θυμον τοῦ βασιλέως. 2 Pet. iii. 9, μη βουλόμενός τινας απολέσθαι. (3) Though not: Acts xx.22. 1 Cor. ix. 20, 21, μη ών αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον...μή ών άνομος Θεού. 1 Pet. i. 8, αρτι μη ὑρῶντες. (4) As not, such as not: Matt. i. 19, καὶ μὴ θέλων κ.τ.λ. ix. 36, μὴ έχοντα ποιμένα. Luke i. 20. ix. 33. xiii. 11. xviii. 2, tov @cov μη φοβούμενος και ανθρωπον μη έντρεπόμενος. John xv. 2. Acts v. 7. xiii. 11. xx. 29. Eph. ii. 12, ελπίδα μη εχοντες. 1 Tim. i. 7. Heb. iv. 15, μη δυνάμενον συμπαθησαι κ.τ.λ. ix. 9, μη δυνάμεναι κατα συνείδησιν τελειώσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα. Jude 19, πνεθμα μή έχοντες. (5) Guarding against, avoiding: 1 Cor. x. 33, μη ζητών το έμαυτοῦ σύμφορον. 2 Cor. iv.
 2. vi. 3.

 $\sigma v \kappa \epsilon \kappa$.] Mere questions of formation ($\sigma v \kappa \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \rho a \sigma \mu$., $\sigma v \kappa \epsilon$ - $\kappa \rho a \mu$.) 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. (1) 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 rives (not rives) in iii. 16, and without interrogation. Even then, considering how slightingly akover is used in iii. 16 (akovσαντες παρεπίκραναν), it is unsatisfactory to have it here employed, without further explanation, for obedient hearing, in contrast with that which is negligent and disobedient. \mathbf{A} slenderly supported reading arovobeiouv would mend the είσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν οἱ πιστεύ-3 σαντες, καθώς εἰρηκεν, Ώς ὤμοσα ἐν τῆ ὀργῆ μου, Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν

iv. 3. Οτ είσερχ. ούν. Οτ omit τήν.

sense : because they were not commingled by faith with (united by faith to) the things heard. Compare ii. 1, προσέχειν ήμας τοις ακουσθείσιν. A conjectural emendation is akovo paoiv, more like akovoaow, but unbiblical. (2) If the nominative singular, agreeing with λόγος, 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 heard (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).

 3. εἰσερχόμεθα γάρ] Or οἶν.
 (1) With γάρ, the verse gives the reason for εἰηγγελισμένοι καθάπερ κἀκεῖνοι. I say, evangelized like them—for, &c. (2) With οἶν, it is an inference from it. In accordance with the above assertion (cinyy. Kat. Kak.) we do enter, &c.

 $\epsilon i\sigma\epsilon\rho\chi \circ \mu\epsilon \theta a$] The present tense expresses the confidence of the assertion. We do, as a matter of fact, enter, &c.

 $\tau \eta' \nu$] An alternative reading omits $\tau \eta' \nu$. The difference is between *the* rest and *a* rest; the rest spoken of in Psalm xcv.; or, a rest, whatever it be.

oi $\pi_i \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s$] We, I say, who became (or are become) believers. This is the definition of the we involved in $\epsilon \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \rho \chi \dot{\sigma} \cdot \mu \epsilon \theta a$.

καθώς εἰρηκεν] Even as He (God) hath said. It is the Scripture perfect. In accordance with the saying of the xcvth Psalm, written all those long centuries after the completion of creation, and clearly implying that the κατάπαυσις of God was still accessible in David's time, and, if so (for what has occurred since to close it?), still and now.

 $ω_5$ ωμοσα κ.τ.λ.] 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. μου, καίτοι τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου 4 γενηθέντων. εἴρηκεν γάρ που περὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης οὕτως, Καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ ἑβδόμη ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. 5 καὶ ἐν τούτῷ πάλιν, Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς 6 τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου. ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολείπεται

τών ἕργων] God's works of creation. Gen. ii. 2, 3, τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἂ ἐποίησε καὶ κατέπαυσε τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ῶν ἐποίησε.

άπο κατ. κ.] From the time of. The same phrase occurs in ix. 26. Matt. xxv. 34. Luke xi. 50. Rev. xiii. 8. xvii. 8.

 $\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu$] Had come into being, as by a single act of creating. The passive form $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta\nu$ does not appear to differ in sense from the middle $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\eta\nu$. See, for example, Acts iv. 4. I Thess. ii. 14, $\mu\mu\eta\eta\tau\alpha\lambda$ $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta\tau\epsilon$. I Cor. xv. 10, où $\kappa\epsilon\nu\eta$ $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta\tau\epsilon$. But the use of $\delta\iota\lambda$ or $\iota\gamma\sigma$ with other forms of $\gamma\iota\nu\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ (Acts ii. 43. iv. 16. Luke xiii. 17. xxiii. 8) shows that spontaneity is no necessary part of the idea of the word.

4. $\epsilon \epsilon \rho \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu \gamma a \rho \pi \sigma \nu$] Reason for connecting the rest after creation with the rest of Psalm xcv. The Scripture phrase for both is the same ($\kappa a \tau \epsilon \pi a \nu \sigma \epsilon \nu$, $\kappa a \tau a \pi a \nu \sigma \iota \nu$). For $\pi \sigma \nu$, see note on ii. 6, πού τις.

της έβδόμης] Apparently not elsewhere used without the substantive (ήμέρα).

ούτως] 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.

κατέπαυσεν] The verb is used both transitively and intransitively. See note on iii. ΙΙ, τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου.

5. $\epsilon v \tau o \dot{\tau} v \phi$] Probably neuter. Here. See v. 6, $\epsilon v \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \phi$. Also Acts xiii. 35, $\delta \iota \delta \tau \tau \kappa a \dot{\epsilon} v \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \phi \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota$, where there is no ambiguity, the next preceding quotation not having been from a Psalm.

Ei $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda$.] 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. $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$ or ν] 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

IV. 4—6.

τινας είσελθείν είς αυτήν, και οι πρότερον ευαγγελισθέντες ουκ είσηλθον δι' απείθειαν,

in vain. If one set of persons (say, one generation) refuses it, another will have the offer of it. (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 If that had been all, the enit. trance of Canaan under Joshua would have fulfilled it. But the xcvth 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 katámavois, or its equivalent a $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau \iota \sigma \mu \delta s$, for the real people of God.

άπολείπετα] 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 καταλειπομένης in verse 1) expresses a successive or continuous leaving over until the promise is fulfilled. For ἀπολείπεται, see also verse 9. x. 26. Here the nominative to $\dot{a}\pi \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \tau a \iota$ is the phrase $\tau \iota \nu \dot{a} s$ $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu \epsilon i s a \dot{v} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$.

 $\tau \iota \iota ds$] Some, not none. Like the $\tau \iota \iota \dot{\epsilon}$ of iii. 16, if the interrogative be given up there.

καί οι πρότερον] Some must God's purpose of adenter. mitting into His rest cannot be defeated by any number of refusals. (Compare Rom. iii. 3, τί γὰρ εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες; κ.τ.λ.) 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 fulfilment, which yet must come. The of $\pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho \delta \nu$ are the $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon \hat{\nu} \delta \nu$ of verse 2, the Exodus generation of Israelites.

ovik $\epsilon l \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta o v$] Failed to enter. And why?

δι' aπείθειar] Equivalent to $\delta i' aπιστίαν$, iii. 19. See notes on iii. 12, 18, 19.

7. $\pi \acute{a}\lambda v \kappa.\tau.\lambda$.] These two things being so—(1) that the rest must be occupied, and (2) that the Exodus generation failed to occupy it—God again fixes a day, &c.

 $\pi a \lambda \iota v$] Over again. The first defining of a day had been to the Exodus generation. Now

7 πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν, Σήμερον, ἐν Δαυ εἰδ λέγων μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον· καθώς
 προείρηται, Σήμερον, ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ
 ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας
 8 ὑμῶν. εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν, οἰκ

iv. 7. Οr προείρηκεν.

again we have a To-day in David's time.

όρίζει] From δρos, a bound or limit, whether of space or time (Exod. ix. 5, καἶ ἔδωκεν ό Θεός όρον, λέγων, [έν τη B] αύριον κ.τ.λ. Nehem. ii. 6, καί έδωκα αὐτῷ ὄρον), the verb օρί- $\zeta_{\epsilon \iota \nu}$ means, to mark out as by a boundary line, to determine, define, fix, settle, &c. Thus in the Septuagint it means, (1) in the literal sense, to bound, Num. xxxiv. 6, [ή B] θάλασσα ή μεγάλη opiei. Josh. xiii. 27. dec.; (2) in the middle voice, to lay down limits for oneself, as in the case of vows, Num. xxx. 3, 4, 5, καί τούς όρισμούς αύτης ούς ώρίσατο κατά της ψυχής αύτης. &c. In the New Testament, Acts xvii. 26, δρίσας προστεταγμένους καιρούς και τας δροθεσίας τής κατοικίας αὐτῶν. And so in all senses of ordaining or determining. Luke xxii. 22, Kata το ώρισμένον. Acts ii. 23, τη ώρισμένη βουλή. x. 42, ο ώρισμένος υπό τοῦ Θεοῦ. xi. 29, ώρισαν...πέμψαι. xvii. 31, έν ανδρί ψ ώρισεν. Rom. i. 4.

Σήμερον κ.τ.λ.] Saying in David, so long after the Exodus period, To-day; as it has been above quoted, To-day, if ye shall hear His voice, &c. The Σήμερον is put first to give it greater emphasis. But in order of construction it comes after χρόνον.

εν Δαυείδ] In the person of David as His inspired utterer (προφήτης). See 1. 1, εν τοῦς προφήταις.

μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον] After so long a lapse of intervening time since the Exodus period.

καθώς προείρ.] According to the above quotation from Psalm xcv. Whether we read προείρηται or προείρηκεν, the προ in either case refers to the quotation, not to the passage itself.

8. ϵ $\dot{\epsilon}$ $\dot{\epsilon}$

autous] The Israelites.

78

IV. 7-9.

ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει μετὰ ταῦτα ἡμέρας. ἄρα 9 ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Ίησοῦς] Joshua. So Acts vii. 45, οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῆ κατασχέσει τῶν ἐθνῶν.

κατέπαυσεν] Had rested them, had given them rest. See note on iii. 11, τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου. The text does not contradict the repeated statements of the Old Testament on this point (Josh. i. 13, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν κατέπαυσεν ὑμῶς καὶ ἔδωκεν ὑμῶν τὴν γῆν ταύτην), but only says that that resting was not the resting. The entrance into Canaan left the true rest of God still open, to be accepted or to be refused.

oùr $\dot{a}\nu \dots \dot{\epsilon}\lambda\dot{a}\lambda\epsilon\iota$] He, that is, God, would not have been speaking (as He is speaking in the xcvth Psalm) of another day.

aλλης] Not έτέρας. Another (further, additional) day, not a day of a different kind. Compare Gal. i. 6, 7, εἰς ἔτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ο̈ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄλλο.

μετὰ ταῦτα] After the entrance into Canaan. Acts vii. 7. xiii. 20. &c.

9. åpa ἀπολείπεται] To complete the argument, we must understand, And if up to David's time the rest was still open, certainly nothing has occurred since to close it.

apa] So. Sometimes with $\gamma \epsilon$ added, as Matt. vii. 20, apa

γε από τών καρπών κ.τ.λ. χνίι 26, άρα γε έλεύθεροί είσιν κ.τ.λ. Sometimes (St Paul only) with ov added. So then. Rom. v. 18, άρα ούν ώς δι ένος κ.τ.λ. vii. 3, 25. viii. 12. ix. 16, 18. xiv. 19. Gal. vi. 10. Eph. ii. 19. 1 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, apa μάρτυρές έστε κ.τ.λ. Acts xi. 18, άρα καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν κ.τ.λ. Rom. x. 17. 1 Cor. xv. 18, άρα καὶ οἱ κοιμηθέντες κ.τ.λ. 2 Cor. v. 15, αρα οι πάντες απέvii. 12. bavov.

 $\dot{a}\pi o\lambda \epsilon i\pi \epsilon \tau a i$] See note on verse 6.

 $au \hat{\phi}$ λα $\hat{\phi}$ τοῦ Θεοῦ] xỉ. 25. And see note on ii. 17, τοῦ λαοῦ. 10 ό γὰρ εἰσελθών εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἕργων αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ὁ Θεός.

11 Σπουδάσωμεν οὖν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν κατάπαυσιν, ίνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι

10. $\delta \gamma \partial \rho \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \omega \nu$] I say, a $\sigma a \beta \beta a \pi i \sigma \mu \delta s$ —for, &c. This verse justifies the interchange of the two words $\kappa a \pi a \pi a \pi \sigma \sigma s$ and $\sigma a \beta \beta a \pi i \sigma \mu \delta s$. The rest promised has the peculiar feature of God's rest after creation, that it is a ceasing from works.

 $\epsilon i\sigma\epsilon\lambda\theta\dot{\omega}r...\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu\sigma\epsilon\nu$] The 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.

airo \hat{v} ...airo \hat{v}] The former airo \hat{v} is God's, the latter the man's.

κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ τ. ἕ. αὐτοῦ] Rev. xiv. 13, μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ... ἶνα ἀναπαύσονται ἐκ τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν, τὰ γὰρ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκο λουθεῖ μετ΄ αὐτῶν. There the rest is from the κόποι, the ἔργα 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 $i \delta i \omega s$ is rare in the Septuagint, occurring only ten or eleven times till we reach the Apocrypha. In the New Testament it is frequent, used more than a hundred times, and used by every writer.

11. Σπουδάσωμεν] The word occurs nine or ten times in the Septuagint, of which six are in the Book of Job. Sometimes transitive, (1) to hasten, (2) to hurry or agitate; more often intransitive, (1) 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 eager: Gal. ii. 10. Eph. iv. 3. 1 Thess. ii. 17. 2 Tim. ii. 15. iv. 9, 21. Tit. iii. 12. 2 Pet. i. 10, 15. iii. 14.

 $o\bar{v}v$] Inference from the continuance of the promise, and the risk of forfeiting it.

 $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \tau \eta v$] That rest which has been the subject of the foregoing passage.

iv] 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 Exodus generation.

 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \ a \dot{v} \tau \hat{\varphi} \ The same which they left.$

ύποδείγματι] The word means something shown (exhibited) as

80

πέση της απειθείας. ζών γαρ ο λόγος του 12 Θεοῦ καὶ ἐνεργὴς καὶ τομώτερος ὑπερ πασαν μάχαιραν δίστομον και δικνούμενος άχρι με-

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 υπόδειγμα occurs three times in the Apocrypha: Ecclus. xliv. 16, Ένωχ...υπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταίς γενεαίς. 2 Macc. vi. 28, 31. In the New Testament, John xiii. 15, υπόδειγμα γαρ έδωκα υμιν ίνα καθώς έγω έποίησα υμίν καί ύμεις ποιήτε. Heb. viii. 5, ύποδείγματι...τῶν ἐπουρανίων...δρα γάρ, φησίν, ποιήσεις πάντα κατά τον τύπον τον δειχθέντα σοι. ix. 23. James v. 10. 2 Pet. ii. 6, πόλεις ... υπόδειγμα μελλόντων ασεβείν (or ασεβέσιν) τεθεικώς.

 $\pi \epsilon \sigma \eta$ Rom. xi. II, $\mu\eta$ έπταισαν ίνα πέσωσιν; xiv. 4, στήκει η πίπτει. I Cor. x. 12, βλεπέτω μη πέση. James v. 12, ίνα μη ύπο κρίσιν πέσητε.

 ζŵν γάρ] Think not to escape their punishment if you sin their sin-for, &c.

ζών...όλ.] 1 Pet. i. 23, διά λόγου ζώντος (where the καὶ μέvovtos following, shown by the quotation in verse 25 to belong to $\lambda \dot{o} \gamma o v$, fixes the appropriation of Luros also to Loyov, not to Θεού).

> ό λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ] Not the

personal Word of John i. 1, &c., to which $\tau \circ \mu \omega \tau \epsilon \rho \circ s$ and $\delta \mu \kappa \nu \circ \upsilon \mu \epsilon vos$ would scarcely be appropriate; but the utterance of God, specially in judging, that is, in discerning and discriminating. See John xii. 48, o λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα ἐκεῖνος κρινεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν τῆ ἐσχάτη ήμέρα.

 $\epsilon v \epsilon \rho \gamma \eta s$] The later form of ἐνεργός, at work, active, energetic. Not in the Septuagint (everyos Ezek. xlvi. 1). In the New Testament, I Cor. xvi. 9, θύρα... μεγάλη και ένεργής. Philem. 6, όπως ή κοινωνία της πίστεώς σου ένεργής γένηται.

τομώτεροs] Only here. Not in the Septuagint. (In Isai. viii. 1 τόμος is a substantive, slice, piece, tome.) The adjective is classical (Sophocles, Plato, &c.).

 $i\pi\epsilon\rho$ After a comparative, as in Luke xvi. 8, φρονιμώτεροι υπέρ τους υίους του φωτός. 2 Cor. xii. 13, ήσσώθητε ύπερ τας λοιπας έκκλησίας. More often παρά. See note on i. 4.

μάχαιραν] First in Gen. xxii. 6, 10: 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, pera paxaiρών καὶ ξύλων. John xviii. 10.

ν. н.

ρισμού ψυχής και πνεύματος, άρμων τε και

Acts xii. 2. Heb. xi. 34, 37. &c. (2) Matt. x. 34, οὐκ εἰρήνην ...ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν. Eph. vi. 17, τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ῥῆμα Θεοῦ.

δίστομον] Jud. iii. 16, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ 'Aωδ μάχαιραν δίστομον, σπιθαμῆς (span) τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς. Psalm cxlix. 6, καὶ ῥομφαῖαι δίστομοι ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν. Prov. v. 4, καὶ ἦκονημένον μᾶλλον μαχαίρας διστόμου. Ecclus. xxi. 3. Rev. i. 16, ῥομφαία δίστομος ὀξεῖα. ii. 12. The figure is that of a devouring animal. See 2 Sam. xi. 25, ποτὲ μὲν οῦτως καὶ ποτὲ οῦτως καταφάγεται (A, φάγεται B) ἡ μάχαιρα.

διακνούμενος] 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 $\dot{a}\phi_{i\kappa\nu}$. in Rom. xvi. 19, and $\dot{\epsilon}\phi_{i\kappa\nu}$. in 2 Cor. x. 13, 14.

 $[a\chi\rho\iota]$ The two forms, $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota$ ($\mu \alpha \kappa \rho \sigma s$), to the length of, and $[a\chi\rho\iota]$ ($[a\kappa \rho \sigma s)$), to the extremity of, occur often in the New Testament, and apparently with no difference of meaning; for we have $[a\chi \rho \iota]$ $[a\mu a \tau \sigma \sigma s]$ in Acts xxii. 4. Rev. ii. 10. xii. 11, and $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota$ $[a\nu a \tau \sigma \sigma s]$ in Heb. xii. 4.

μερισμού] From μερίζειν, to

portion or parcel out, whether for distribution (as in 1 Cor. vii. 17. &c.) or for severance (as in 1 Cor. i. 13. vii. 34). Here the latter: in ii. 4 the former.

ψυχής καὶ πνεύματος The full division ($\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, $\psi v \chi \eta$, $\pi v \epsilon \hat{v}$ - μa) is found only in 1 Thess. Elsewhere only $\sigma a \rho \xi$ V. 23. and πνεῦμα (σὰρξ including both $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ and $\psi v \chi \eta$). The immaterial part of man is one and but one, and confusion of thought and language arises from forgetting this. When $\psi v \chi \eta$ and $\pi v \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ are distinguished, as here, $\psi v \chi \eta$ means the immaterial part of man in its aspect towards this world, its affections, interests, ambioccupations (including tions, the intellectual), even and $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ the same immaterial part in its capacity of communicating with and receiving communications from God. Study 1 Cor. ii. 13—15. xv. 44—46. Jude 19, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μή έχοντες. The μερισμός ψυχής καὶ πνεύματος here spoken of may be regarded either as an absolutely impossible thing (for the reason given above), mentioned only in rhetorical hyperbole, or else as a thing impossible with man, possible only with God.

άρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν] The τε is not both, but and. It couples the second pair to the first. The μερισμός of άρμοι and μυελοι is

μυελών, και κριτικός ένθυμήσεων και έννοιών καρδίας και ούκ έστιν κτίσις άφανης ένώπιον 13

made the parallel in the material to the $\mu\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\mu\delta$ s of $\psi\nu\chi\eta$ and $\pi\nu\epsilon\partial\mu a$ 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 power.

άρμῶν] The word occurs in Ecclus. xxvii. 2, ἀναμέσον άρμῶν λίθων κ.τ.λ. In Eph. iv. 16 and Col. ii. 19 άφη is its equivalent (one from ἀρω, the other from ἀπτω).

μυελών] Gen. xlv. 18, τόν μυελόν τής γής. Job xxi. 24, ό δε μυελός αύτοῦ διαχείται (is diffused through his bones).

κριτικός] Capable of discerning or discriminating by a process of sifting and separating. (The word is used by Plato, Aristotle, Lucian, &c.)

ένθυμήσεων και έννοιων | Processes of the $\theta v \mu \delta s$ and processes of the vous. Feelings and thoughts. In the Septuagint (especially in Ezekiel) ἐνθύμημα is the form. Both in it and in $\epsilon \nu \theta \nu \mu \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota$ the idea of feeling or passion seems to be prominent, in the Septuagint at least. In the New Testament ενθύμησις 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. 19 (where the revised text has $\delta\iota\epsilon\nu\theta$.) it would be difficult to maintain this. The word $\acute{e}\nu$ vota is almost confined (in the Septuagint) to the Book of Proverbs, in which it is found ten times; as in xxiii. 19, κai κατεύ- $\theta\nu\epsilon\epsilon$ $i\nu\kappa\epsilon$ ias correction for the term $<math>\theta\nu\epsilon\epsilon$ $i\nu\kappa\epsilon$ as corrections for the termNew Testament it occurs only $in 1 Pet. iv. 1, <math>\tau\eta\nu$ $a\dot{\nu}\tau\eta\nu$ $\acute{e}\nu\nu\epsilon$ $a\nu\epsilon$.

13. κτίσις] From its first sense, of the act of creating (Mark x. 6. xiii. 19. Rom. i. 20. &c.), κτίσις passes into that of created being, whether universal or particular: the latter here, and in Rom. viii. 39, ουτε τις κτίσις έτέρα.

ἀφανής] Unmanifest, obscure. Ecclus. xx. 30, σοφία κεκρυμμένη καὶ θησαυρὸς ἀφανής, τίς ὠφέλεια ἐν ἀμφοτέροις; Also 2 Macc. iii. 34.

aở τοῦ... aở τοῦ] The latter, considering the τοῖς ỏ φθαλμοῖς with it, and the πρòς ὅν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος 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 λόγος into the Θεὸς whose λόγος it is. But this is not absolutely necessary: even the πρὸς ὅν clause may be understood as saying that our λόγος has to do

αὐτοῦ, πάντα δὲ γυμνὰ καὶ τετραχηλισμένα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος.

with the $\lambda \dot{0}\gamma os$ of God, without actually personifying the $\lambda \dot{0}\gamma os$, certainly without taking it of the Eternal Son.

γυμνά] Job xxvi. 6, γυμνός ό άδης ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (mark the ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ of that passage in this also), καὶ οὐκ ἔστι περιβόλαιον τῆ ἀπωλεία.

 $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho a \chi \eta \lambda \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu a$ A difficult word. Some senses of it are quite inappropriate here, such as that of the horse throwing its rider, and the oraqoos toaχηλιζόμενον eis βάθοs. Two chief lines of explanation pre-(1) It is a sent themselves. wrestler's word. To seize by the neck (back or front), to grip or throttle. Hence to overmaster (as ταις έπιθυμίαις in Plutarch, Philo, &c.). (2) It is also a sacrificial word. To bare the *neck* for the knife. Hence ϕa $v \epsilon \rho o \pi o \iota \hat{\omega}$ (patefacio) is given as its synonym. Decisive authority seems to be wanting for this sense, which yet would best suit the passage: for, with $\tau o \hat{s}$ $\partial \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o \hat{i} s$ following it, there must lie in it some notion of exposure. Some insist upon $\tau \rho \alpha \chi \eta \lambda os$ being always the back of the neck, adducing the other New Testament places of its use (Matt. xviii. 6. Mark ix. 42. Luke xv. 20. xvii. 2. Acts xv. 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, whatever the starting-point of the word, it seems as if $\pi\epsilon\phi av\epsilon\rho\omega-\mu\epsilon'$ $\mu\epsilon' va$ 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.

airoî, $\pi \rho \delta \delta v$] This is not to be read, of Him to whom. The airoî is not cmphatic but goes with roîs $\delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o \delta s$, His eyes. Then $\pi \rho \delta \delta v$ begins an independent clause.

προ'ς όν ήμιν ό λόγος] Literally, unto whom our word is. Mark the contrast of the repeated of $\lambda \delta \gamma \sigma s$. The word of God...unto whom our word is. In either case the $\lambda \delta \gamma \sigma_{S}$ has to be interpreted by the context. God's word of judgment. - Our word of account. For the latter, see Luke xvi. 2, ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον τής οίκονομίας σου. Acts xix. 40, αποδούναι λύγον περί της συστροφής ταύτης. Rom. xiv. 12, έκαστος ήμων περί έαυτοῦ λόγον αποδώσει τῷ Θεῷ. Phil. iv. 15. 1 Pet. iii. 15, παντί τώ αἰτοῦντι ὑμῶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν υμιν ελπίδος. iv. 5, οι αποδώ-

IV. 14.

"Εχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα 14 τοὺς οὐρανούς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, κρα-

σουσιν λόγον τῷ ἐτ. ἔχ. κρίναι ζ. κ. ν. The Authorised Version is excellent in sense and phrase, only it fails to mark the contrast of the two λόγοι.

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 άρχιερέα 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 ovvshows them to be an *inference* from the *foregoing*, as the yap of v. 1 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. ἀρχιερέα] See note on Ϊ. 17, ἀρχιερεύς.

 $a\rho\chi\epsilon\rho\epsilon a \mu\epsilon\gamma ar]$ See x. 21, $\kappa a i\epsilon\rho\epsilon a \mu\epsilon\gamma ar \kappa.\tau.\lambda$. In both places the stress lies on $\mu\epsilon\gamma ar$, great, mighty, powerful, in tacit contrast with the merely human and therefore frail and weak Levitical high-priest.

διελ. τ. ούρ.] Having passed through the (lower) heavens into heaven itself, the very presence of God. Compare vii. 26, δψηλότερος

τῶν οὐρ. γενόμενος. ΙΧ. 24, εἰσήλ- $\theta \epsilon v \dots \epsilon i s$ autov tov ovpavóv, vův έμφανισθήναι τῷ προσώπψ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ήμῶν. Eph. iv. 10, δ άναβας ύπεράνω πάντων των ούpavŵr. 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, άρπαγέντα τον τοιούτον έως τρίτου ούρανού). (1) The atmospheric heaven is called an oupavos in Matt. vi. 26. xvi. 3. James v. 18. &c. (2) The starry sky in Matt. xxiv. 29. Rev. vi. 13. &c. (3) The abode of Angels, Matt. xxiv. 36. Mark xii. 25. Luke (4) Above all there xxii. 43. is the heaven of the Divine Presence itself, Matt. vi. g. John iii. 13. vi. 32. 1 Cor. xv. 47.

I. $\tau \partial \nu \nu \partial \nu \tau$. \odot .] 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).

κρατώμεν] From κράτος (strength) κρατείν is (1) absolutely, to have strength, to rule, as Job ix. 19. Prov. xii. 24. Wisd. xiv. 19, κρατοῦντι βουλόμενος ἀρέσαι. (2) to get or have the mastery of, to rule over, to lay or keep hold of, to seize or hold firmly, (a) with a geni-

15 τώμεν της όμολογίας. οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μη δυνάμενον συνπαθησαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ήμῶν, πεπειρασμένον δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ ὁμοιότητα

tive, as Deut. ii. 34. iii. 4. Esth. i. 1, έκατον είκοσιεπτά χωρών εκράτησεν. And so here, and vi. 18, κρατήσαι τής προκειμένης έλπίδος. Matt. ix. 25, εκράτησεν της χειρός. Mark i. 31. v. 41. &c. (b) with an accusative, 2 Sam. vi. 6, ¿ξέτεινεν... τήν χείρα αύτου έπι τήν κιβωτόν τοῦ Θεοῦ κατασχεῖν αὐτήν, καὶ έκράτησεν αὐτήν. &c. Matt. xviii. 28, καὶ κρατήσας αὐτὸν έπνιγεν. χχιι. 6. χχνι. 48, αὐτός έστιν κρατήσατε αὐτόν. John XX. 23. 2 Thess. ii. 15, краτείτε τας παραδόσεις. Rev. iii. 11. XX. 2, καὶ ἐκράτησεν τὸν δράκοντα.

όμολογίας] See note on iii. 1. 15. οὐ γάρ] We may well do so—for, &c.

 $\mu \eta$ Such as cannot. See note on iv. 2, $\mu \eta$.

δυνάμενον] See note on ii. 18, δύναται.

συνπαθήσαι] The two verbs, συνπάσχειν and συνπαθεΐν, 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. 17, είπερ συνπάσχομεν κ.τ.λ. (compare 2 Cor. i. 5, περισσεύει τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς. Col. i. 24, ἀνταναπληρώ τὰ ύστερήματα τών θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῆ σαρκί μου). I Cor. xii. 26, εἶ τι πάσχει έν μέλος, συνπάσχει πάντα τα μέλη. Community of suffering is all that the word speaks of. (Passages quoted from Plato as implying sympathy are capable, 1 think, of the lower meaning.) The other word ($\sigma v \nu \pi a$ - $\theta \epsilon i \nu$) comes through $\pi a \theta \sigma s$ and $\sigma \nu \mu \pi a \theta \eta s$, and takes the higher idea, not of *fellow-suffering* but of *fellow-feeling*. Here, and x. 34, τοις δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε (in both of which places συν- $\pi a \sigma \chi \epsilon i \nu$ would have been untrue).

a obeveiais] Want of strength is the idea of $d\sigma\theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon_{ia}$, 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 says, τὸ μὲν πιεῦμα πρόθυμον, ή δε σαρξ ασθενής (Matt. xxvi. 41), and St Paul repeatedly applies it to the infirmities of a scrupulous conscience (Rom. xiv. 2. xv. 1. 1 Cor. viii. 11, 12), a feeble faith (Rom. iv. 19), a defective spirituality (Rom. vi. 19. 8. 26), or an unstable character (2 Cor. xi. 29).

 $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$] See notes on ii. 18. The about there, the

χωρίς άμαρτίας. προσερχώμεθα οὖν μετὰ 16

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.

κατὰ πάντα] See note on ii. 17.

καθ όμοιότητα] According to (by a rule, on a principle, of) similarity. So vii. 15, κατά την όμοίοτητα Μελχισεδέκ. Jude 7, τον όμοίον τρόπον τούτοις. The same thought is expressed in ii. 17, κατά πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς όμοιωθήναι, followed by πέπονθεν πειρασθείς in verse 18.

 $\chi \omega \rho is a \mu a \rho \tau i a s$ So in ix. 28, έκ δευτέρου χωρίς αμαρτίας $\phi \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau a \kappa \tau \lambda$. But the application 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. 20, κεχωρισμένος από των άμαρ- τ ωλών, there is a third thought, the present separation from a world lying in wickedness (1 John v. 19) of the glorified Saviour, who must personally leave the world (John xvi. 28. xvii. 11) in order to the mediatorial 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. προσερχώμεθα] A great word in this Epistle. Sometimes with τῷ Θεώ, vii. 25. xi. 6. Sometimes with no dative, as in x. 1, 22, τούς προσερχομένους τελειώσαι...προσερχώμεθα μετά άληθινής καρδίας. Let us be drawing nigh. This is religion in exercise—a constant coming It is the opposite to to God. that *aloofness* from God which is either the original condition of the fallen, or else the beginning of apostasy in the Christian. See note on iii. 12, anorrhvai. (The word is the root of $\pi \rho o \sigma \eta$ -Lev. xix. 33, dar be ris λυτος. προσέλθη προσήλυτος ύμιν... δτι προσήλυτοι έγενήθητε έν γη Αι- $\gamma \upsilon \pi \tau \sigma \upsilon$.) For another application see I Pet. ii. 4, 5. προs δν προσερχόμενοι, λίθον ζωντα... καί αύτοι ώς λίθοι ζώντες οίκοδομείσθε οίκος πνευματικός κ.τ.λ. 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 $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \circ \mu \epsilon v \circ \iota$ speaks of an habitual and constant access, not of one effected by a single effort. In the other place of its occurrence in this Epistle (xii.

παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος, ίνα λάβωμεν ἕλεος καὶ χάριν εὕρωμεν εἰς εὕκαιρον βοήθειαν.

V. 1 Πας γαρ αρχιερεύς έξ ανθρώπων λαμβανό-

18, 22, $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\lambda\eta\lambda\nu\delta\sigma\tau\epsilon \ \kappa.\tau.\lambda.$) the figure is that of the faithful 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 $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\rho\chi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\mu$, and that in a peculiar sense, I Tim. vi. 3, $\kappa\lambda$ $\mu\eta$ $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (does not accede to) $\nu\gamma\mu\alpha\nu\sigma\nu\nu$ $\lambda\gamma\nu\sigma\nu$

 $\pi a \rho \rho \eta \sigma i a s$] See note on iii. 6.

τῷ θρόνῷ] Isai. vi. 1, εἶδον τὸν Κύριον καθήμενον ἐπὶ θρόνου ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐπηρμένου. Rev. iv. 2. xxii. 1, 3, καὶ ὁ θρόνος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀρνίου ἐν αὐτῇ ἔσται κ.τ.λ.

 $\tau\eta$ s $\chi \alpha \rho \tau \sigma s$] Genitive of characteristic quality.

λάβωμεν...ειρωμεν] Take, by putting forth the hand for it. Find, as the result of seeking. Matt. vii. 7, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὐρήσετε. xiii. 45, 46, ζητοῦντι καλοὺς μαργαρίτας· εὖρών δὲ ἕνα πολύτιμον κ.τ.λ. In some passages the idea of seeking is minimized, and finding seems to be equivalent to gaining without any implication of previous search. Matt. xi. 29. John x. 9. 2 Tim. 1. 18. &c.

čλεος... χάριν] See the Rubric in the Communion Service before the Commandments. In χάρις the thought is free favour, implying entire absence of merit; it is the opposite of ἐφείλημα (Rom. iv. 4); but it might be shown to a worthy and irreproachable person. In έλεος there is the further thought of the presence of demerit; it is kindness to the sinful.

 $\epsilon \ddot{v}\kappa a \rho o v$] Mark vi. 21, $\dot{\eta}\mu \dot{\epsilon}$ pas $\epsilon \ddot{v}\kappa a \dot{\rho} o v$. We have $\epsilon \dot{v}\kappa a \dot{\rho} \dot{\mu} \dot{a}$ in Matt. xxvi. 16. Luke xxii. 6. Also $\epsilon \ddot{v}\kappa a \dot{\rho} \omega s$ Mark xiv. 11. 2 Tim. iv. 2. And $\epsilon \ddot{v}\kappa a \dot{\rho} \epsilon \hat{v}$ Mark vi. 31. Acts. xvii. 21. 1 Cor. xvi. 12.

βοήθειαν] Acts xxvii. 17. (only). See note on ii. 18.

V. I. $\pi \hat{a}s \gamma \hat{a}\rho$] We enter here upon the third and largest section of the Epistle. Christ and Aaron. It embraces three subsections. (1) The priesthood, (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 transiμενος ύπèp ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρòς τὸν Θεόν, ίνα προσφέρη δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας ὑπèp

v. 1. Or omit *\tau*.

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.

 $\gamma \alpha \rho$] 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.

ξ ἀνθρώπων] Not, every high priest that is taken from among men, but, every high priest, being taken, &c. The clause ξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος belongs not to the subject but to the predicate of the sentence. To be taken from among men, for a particular purpose, is one of two conditions of priesthood.

λαμβανόμενος] Num. viii.

6, λάβε τοὺς Λευίτας ἐκ μέσου τῶν (B omits τῶν) υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἀφαγνιεῖς αὐτούς. The present participle expresses from time to time.

καθίσταται] vii. 28, ἀνθρώπους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς. Matt. xxiv. 45. Acts vi. 3. vii. 10. &c.

τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν] See note on ii. 17.

προσφέρη] The verb προσ- $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ 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 προσφορά twice) nor in any other Epistle. St James and St Peter use avadépeir, which occurs also four times in this Epistle. The exact idea of $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$ is the bringing of the victim to the altar of sacrifice; of avapéper the bringing up (with some thought perhaps of an elevated altar, James ii. 21, άνενέγκας 1. επί το θυσιαστή-I Pet. ii. 24, ανήνεγκεν ριον. The tense ... έπὶ τὸ ξύλον). here expresses may keep offering.

δώρά τε κ. θ.] When δώρα and θυσίαι occur together, it is most natural to understand the latter of animal sacrifices, and the former of all other offerings. Otherwise either might

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

2 άμαρτιών, μετριοπαθείν δυνάμενος τοίς άγνοοῦσιν καὶ πλανωμένοις, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περίκειται

cover both. See Matt. xxiii. 18, 19, $\tau \delta$ $\theta v \sigma_{1} a \sigma_{\tau} \tau'_{\rho_{1} \rho_{2} \nu} \tau \delta$ $\dot{a} \gamma_{1} \dot{a} \dot{a} \rho \sigma_{\tau}$ $\tau \delta \delta \sigma_{\rho \rho \nu}$. Lev. vii. 9 (B vi. 39), $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \theta v \sigma (a \eta \tau_{15} \pi \epsilon \phi \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau a (A, \pi \sigma_{17} \eta \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau a B)$ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \tau \phi \kappa \lambda_{1} \beta \dot{a} \nu \phi$ $\kappa \tau . \lambda$. The combination, δ . kai θ , is found also in viii. 3 and ix. 9. If the distinction is to be made here between $\delta \omega \rho a$ and $\theta v \sigma (a t, then v \pi \epsilon \rho a \mu a \rho \tau t \omega \nu$ must be read only with the latter.

2. $\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\iota\sigma\pi a\theta\epsilon i\nu$ Only here. (Even $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho \iota o s$ is not in the Septuagint, and in the New Testament only in the adverb, Acts xx. 12.) It is formed from $\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\iota\sigma\pi a\theta\eta$'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 It differs from $\sigma \nu \mu \pi a \theta \epsilon i \nu$ to. in not expressing *fellow*-feeling but feeling towards.

δυνάμενος] See notes on ii. 18 and iv. 15.

άγνοοῦσιν] Compare ix. 7, τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων. 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 ἀπάτη τῆς ἁμαρτίας (iii. 13) acting upon frailty through passion. See I Tim. i. 13, $d\gamma vo \hat{\omega} v$ $\epsilon \pi o i \eta \sigma a$ ϵv $d \pi i \sigma - \tau i q$. Acts iii. 17, $\kappa a \tau a$ $a \gamma vo i a v$ $\epsilon \pi \rho a \xi a \tau \epsilon$. xvii. 30. Eph. iv. 18, $\delta \iota a$ $\tau \eta v$ $a \gamma vo \iota a v$ $\tau \eta v$ ϵv $a v \tau \sigma o s$, $\delta \iota a$ $\tau \eta v$ $\pi \omega \rho \omega \sigma \iota v$ $\tau \eta s$ $\kappa a \rho \delta i a s$ $a v \tau \omega v$ (an instructive parallel). 1 Pet. i. 14, $\tau a \hat{s} \pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \epsilon v$ $\tau \eta$ $a \gamma vo i q$ $\omega \mu \omega v$ $\epsilon \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu i a s$. The Litany distinguishes 'sins, negligences, and ignorances.' Ignorance is not innocence, except it be (1) total, (2) involuntary, and (3) irremovable by effort and enquiry.

πλανωμένοις] See Matt. xviii. 12, 13. Heb. xi. 38, ἐπὶ ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι καὶ ὅρεσιν. The idea is that of straying or roving from the right way or the true owner. See iii. 10. 2 Tim. iii. 13, πλανῶντες καὶ πλανώμενοι (showing that the error is not necessarily venial or excusable). Tit. iii. 3, ἀπειθεῖς, πλανώμενοι, δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις κ.τ.λ.

περίκειται] From to lie around, with περί (Mark ix. 42. Luke xvii. 2, περίκειται περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ), or a dative (Heb. xii. 1, περικείμενον ἡμῦν νέφος) comes a secondary use, to have lying around one, to be surrounded by, with an accusative. See 4 Macc. xii. 3, ὁρῶν ἦδη τὰ δεσμὰ περικείμενον. Acts xxviii. 20, τὴν ἅλυσιν ταύτην περίκειμαι. Is compassed with infirmity. ἀσθένειαν καὶ δι' αὐτὴν ὀΦείλει, καθὼς περὶ τοῦ 3 λαοῦ, οὕτως καὶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ προσφέρειν περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν. καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν 4 τιμήν, ἀλλὰ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καθώσπερ καὶ Ἀαρών. οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ 5

 $d\sigma\theta \epsilon v \epsilon av$] See note on iv. 15.

3. $\kappa a \lambda \delta i' a v \tau \eta v f And be$ cause of it is bound, &c. Remove the stop from the endof verse 2, to mark the intimate connexion of the twothoughts.

όφείλει] See note on ii. 17, $\overset{\bullet}{\omega}$ φειλεν. He incurs the obligation of the και περι έαυτου προσ- $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon i \gamma$. The change from $\tau \alpha \dot{\nu}$ - $\tau \eta v$ to a $\dot{v} \tau \eta \dot{v}$ eases the *interpre*tation, 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.

 $\pi\epsilon\rho\lambda...\pi\epsilon\rho\lambda...\pi\epsilon\rho\ell$] The revised text substitutes the third $\pi\epsilon\rho\lambda$ for the $i\pi\epsilon\rho$ of the received. It is the regular preposition for the sin-offering.

See, for example, Lev. xvi. 5. Psalm xl. 7. Rom. viii. 3.

καὶ περὶ ἐαυτοῦ] 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. kalov χ] Second condition. The first was a common humanity, the second is a divine appointment.

 $\tau \eta \nu \tau \iota \mu \eta \nu$] The honour attaching to the high priesthood. It is not necessary to depart from the common use of $\tau \iota \mu \eta$ so as to make it mean the office. Perhaps we might render it the dignity, which combines the two ideas.

άλλα καλούμενος] Not to himself does a man take this dignity, but he takes it when called by God. For καλεῦν see Matt. iv. 21. Mark i. 20.

καθώσπερ] Only here.

5. ούτως] Application to Christ of the two conditions of έαυτον έδόξασεν γενηθηναι ἀρχιερέα, ἀλλ' ὅ
λαλήσας προς αὐτόν, Υἰός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγῶ
σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. καθῶς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῷ
λέγει, Σὐ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν
τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ. ὅς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς

priesthood. And first of the latter, the divine appointment.

ούχ έαυτον ἐδόξασεν] John viii. 54, ἐαν ἐγῶ δοξάσω ἐμαυτόν, ή δόξα μου οὐδέν ἐστιν· ἔστιν ὁ Πατήρ μου ὁ δοξάζων με. Also xiii. 32. xvii. 1, 5.

 $\gamma \epsilon \eta \theta \hat{\eta} val$] He took not to Himself the dóta of becoming. Explanatory infinitive. 2 Cor. xi. 2. Rev. xvi. 9. &c.

 $a\lambda\lambda$ o $\lambda a\lambda\eta\sigma as$ He who said, and who called Him to the priesthood by saying, Yiós µov κ.τ.λ. Compare Acts xiii. 33, where St Paul quotes the same verse (Psalm ii. 7) in proof of the resurrection of Christ: avaστήσας Ίησοῦν (verse 34, ἐκ νεκρών) ώς και...γέγραπται, Υίός μου εί σύ κ.τ.λ. 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.

σήμερον] See note on i. 5. 6. καθώς καί] And this testimony accords with another. ϵν ϵτ ϵρφ Elsewhere (namely in Psalm cx. 4). But ϵτ ϵρφ is neuter, not masculine. See note on iv. 5, ϵν τούτφ.

τάξιν] Properly arranging, and so arrangement, order, position, rank, class, &c. Num. i. 52, παρεμβαλοῦσιν οἱ νἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ, άνηρ έν τη αύτου τάξει. Jud. v. 20, αστέρες έκ της τάξεως (Α, έκ τρίβων Β) αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Job xxxviii. 12. &c. Hab. iii. 11, και ή σελήνη έστη έν τη τάξει αὐτής. Luke i. 8, ἐν τή τάξει τής έφημερίας αὐτοῦ. I Cor. xiv. 40, κατά τάξιν γινέσθω. Col. ii. 5, βλέπων ύμων την τάξιν. Here, according to (on the scale of) the rank (or position) of Melchizedek.

7. $\delta s \ \epsilon v$] 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.

ταῖς ήμ. τ. σ. αὐτοῦ] Α phrase formed like those of Luke i. 23, aἰ ήμέραι τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ. ii. 22. ix. 51, τὰς

σαρκός αύτοῦ, δεήσεις τε καὶ ἰκετηρίας πρός τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου μετὰ

 $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho as \tau \eta s dva \lambda \eta \mu \psi \epsilon \omega s a v τ o 0.$ xvii. 26, $\epsilon v \tau a \hat{s} \eta \mu \epsilon \rho a s \tau o 0 v i o v t$

τής σαρκός] Of His abode on earth in flesh. John i. 14, ό λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. Rom. i. 3, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δ. κατὰ σάρκα. viii. 3. ix. 5. Eph. ii. 15. Col. i. 22, ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. 1 Tim. iii. 16, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. Heb. x. 20, τοῦτ ἔστιν, τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. 1 Pet. iii. 18. iv. 1. 1 John iv. 2, ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα. 2 John 7, ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί.

δεήσεις] For the plural see Luke ii. 37, νηστείαις καὶ δεήσεσιν. v. 33. I Tim. ii. I, δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας. 2 Tim. i. 3.

iker $\eta\rho$ ias] Originally a feminine adjective (with $\dot{\rho}a\beta\delta os$ understood), the olive branch which was the badge of the suppliant, iker $\eta\rho$ ia became afterwards a synonym of iker ϵia , supplication. None of the cognates of ike $\eta \gamma$ s occur elsewhere in the New Testament. In the Septuagint they are frequent. Thus iker $\eta\rho$ ia (as here, with $\delta\epsilon\eta\sigma v$ s), Job xl. 27 (B 22), $\lambda a\lambda\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\sigma ot \delta\epsilon\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon$ s kaì iker $\eta\rho$ ias (A, δεήσει, iκετηρία B) μαλακώς ; Also iκέτης, Mal. iii. 14, έπορεύθημεν iκέται προ προσώπου Κυρίου παντοκράτορος. Ecclus. iv. 4. xxxvi. 17, εἰσάκουσον, Κύριε, δεήσεως τῶν iκετῶν σου. And iκετεύειν, Job xix. 17. Psalm xxxvii. 7. Wisd. xiii. 18. xix. 3. 2 Macc. xi. 6. Also iκετεία, Ecclus. xxxv. 14. li. 9. 2 Macc. iii. 18. viii. 29. xii. 42. And iκεσία, 2 Macc. x. 25. προς τον δυνάμενον] Unto

(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. 19, $\lambda \circ \gamma \iota \circ \dot{\alpha} \cdot \mu \epsilon \nu \circ s$ or $\kappa a i \epsilon \kappa \nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ duratos o $\Theta \epsilon \circ s$.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

κραυγής ίσχυρας και δακρύων προσενέγκας και 8 είσακουσθεις από της εύλαβείας, καίπερ ων υίος

dead can do all things. Mark xiv. 36, ²Αββά, ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σοι· παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

μετὰ κρ. ἰσχ. κ. δακρ.] An evident reference to the Agony, though neither of the two particulars is actually expressed in the Gospel record. Matt xxvi. 37, 38, ἦρἑατο λυπεῦσθαι...περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου. Mark iv. 24, περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ Ψ. μ. Luke xxii. 44, καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνία ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρως αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἴματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

κραυγής] A cry (1) of alarm, Matt. xxv. 6, κραυγή γέγονεν, Ίδού κ.τ.λ. (2) Of strife, Acts xxiii. 9. Eph. iv. 31. (3) Of anguish, here, and Rev. xxi. 4. Compare the κράζειν of Matt. xxvii. 50.

δακρύων] The only decisive mention of the *tears* of Christ is in John xi. 35. For in Luke xix. 41 the word used is κλαίειν, of which the point is rather wailing than weeping, though both might be true.

προσενέγκας] The sacrificial word, as though the δεήσεις καὶ iκετηρίαι of the days of His flesh were a kind of anticipation of the future priestly mediation. For προσφέρειν see note on verse I. There is no instance, among the 25 uses of the word $(\pi\rho\sigma\sigma-\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\nu)$ and $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\phi\rho\rhoa$ in this Epistle, of any slighter or vaguer thought having place in it.

και είσακουσθείς] The prayer was heard, listened to, that is, accepted, granted. This is always the force of eiganover in connexion with prayer. Matt. vi. Luke i. 13, εἰσηκούσθη ή Sénois ou. 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 *heard*, (1) in the appearance of the Angel from heaven strengthening Him (Luke 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

ἕμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἕπαθεν την ὑπακοήν, καὶ τελειωθείς 9

the crowning instance of others before it and of the final one following it.

ἀπο] In consequence of, as the result of. Matt. xiv. 26, ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἐκραξαν. xviii. 7, οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῷ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων. Luke xix. 3, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅχλου. xxii. 45, κοιμωμένους ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης. xxiv. 41, ἀπὸ τῆς χαρῶς. John xxi. 6, ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἰχθύων. Acts xx. 9, ἀπὸ τοῦ ῦπνου. xxii. 11, ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτὸς ἐκείνου.

 $\epsilon v \lambda a \beta \epsilon i as$] The idea of $\epsilon v \lambda a$ - $\beta\eta$'s is that of care in taking or grasping, and so (1) cautious, (2) scrupulous, (3) reverent, devout. Lev. xv. 31. Mic. vii. 2. Luke ii. 25, δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής. Acts ii. 5. viii. 2. xxii. 12 (revised text). Hence εὐλάβεια, here, and in xii. 28, µera evla- β cías kai déous (revised text). Josh. xxii. 24. Prov. xxviii. 14, μακάριος ἀνήρ δς καταπτήσ-Wisd. σει πάντα δι' ευλάβειαν. xvii. 8. The verb εὐλαβεῖσθαι 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, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ vi $\hat{\omega}$.

έμαθεν] 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 in the γενόμενος ὑπήκοος of Phil. ii. 8.

 $\check{\epsilon}\mu a \theta \epsilon v \dots \check{\epsilon} \pi a \theta \epsilon v$] A classical antithesis.

την ὑπακοήν] Either (1) His obedience; that which all know to have been His; or (2) obedience universal, all obedience. The latter perhaps is best.

υπακοήν] Properly submissive hearing. Rom. v. 19, διà της υπακοής του ένός. Phil. ii. 8, εταπείνωσεν εαυτόν, γενόμενος ύπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου κ.τ.λ. And for the thought, John v. 30, καθώς άκούω κρίνω. viii. 26, 29, α ήκουσα παρ' αὐτοῦ, ταῦτα λαλώ...τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτώ ποιώ πάντοτε. &c. &c. In the Septuagint $i\pi \alpha \kappa o \eta$ 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 $\vartheta \pi \alpha \kappa o \eta$ and $\pi a \rho a \kappa o \eta$, see note on ii. 2, παράβασις καὶ παρακοή.

9. τελειωθείς] See note on ii. 10, τελειώσαι. Consumἐγένετο πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ αἴτιος
 10 σωτηρίας αἰωνίου, προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ
 ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ.

11 Περὶ οὖ πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν, ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς.

mated. Perfectly qualified for the office undertaken.

 $\tau \circ \hat{s} \circ \pi \alpha \kappa$.] Who habitually obey Him. A brief description of Christians. See $\circ \pi \alpha \kappa \circ \eta$ above. His obedience to the Father, theirs to Him.

airios] The personal cause of. An adjective, answering the purpose of a masculine of the substantive airia. Not elsewhere in the New Testament. In the Septuagint 1 Sam. xxii. 22. And four times in the Apocrypha.

σωτηρίας] See note on ii. 3. aἰωνίου] See note on i. 8, εἰς τὸν aἰώνα τοῦ aἰώνος.

10. προσαγορευθείς] This clause is appended in explanation of the air. σ . alwriov. \mathbf{It} is as the Melchizedek Priest that The word ($\pi \rho o \sigma a \gamma$.) He saves. only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint, Deut. xxiii. 6, οὐ προσαγορεύσεις εἰρηνικὰ αὐτοῖς. Wisd. xiv. 1 Macc. xiv. 22 (B 40), 22. προσηγόρευνται Ιουδαίοι ύπο 'Ρωμαίων φίλοι καὶ σύμμαχοι καὶ άδελφοί. 2 Macc. i. 36. iv. 7. x. 9. xiv. 37, κατά την εύνοιαν πατήρ των Ιουδαίων προσαγορευό $\mu\epsilon vos.$ To address or accost as, especially in public ($\dot{a}\gamma o\rho\epsilon v\epsilon v$ from $\dot{a}\gamma o\rho a$). The acrist 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.

11. Περι ου] Concerning whom; that is, concerning Christ as Melchizedek Priest.

πολὺς $\eta \mu \hat{\nu} \gamma$] Literally, our intended speech (discourse) is large (copious), and mysterious to speak (utter), for the reason which follows. For πολὺς here compare Acts xv. 32, διὰ λόγου πολλοῦ. xx. 2, λόγψ πολλῷ.

δυσερμήνευτος] Difficult of interpretation. Formed like δυσβάστακτος (Luke xi. 46) and δυσνόητος (2 Pet. iii, 16). Not used elsewhere in the Septuagint or the New Testament. But έρμηνεύειν Ezra iv. 7. John i. 42. ix. 7. Heb. vii. 2. (Oftener μεθερμην. and διερμην.) Also έρμηνεία Ecclus. Prologue and xlvii. 17. 1 Cor. xii. 10. xiv. 26. And έρμηνευτής Gen. xlii. 23.

V. 10–12.

καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν 12 χρόνον πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς

 $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$ This clause obviously belongs only to $\delta v \sigma \epsilon \rho \mu$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon i \nu$, not to $\pi o \lambda v s$ also.

νωθροί] Dull, sluggish. Also Not elsewhere in the vi. 12. New Testament. But in the Septuagint in Prov. xxii. 29. Ecclus. iv. 29, μη γίνου ταχύς (Α, τραχύς Β) έν γλώσση σου, καὶ νωθρός καὶ παρειμένος ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου. Χί. 12, έστι νωθρός καὶ προσδεόμενος ἀντιλήψεως, ύστερών ἰσχύϊ, καὶ πτωχεία περισσεύει. Also νωθροκάρδιοs in Prov. xii. 8. Probably derived (and $\nu\omega\theta\eta$'s also) from the Homeric δθομαι, to regard (our aλεγίζει, οὐδ' ὄθεται).

 $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\delta\nu\alpha\tau\epsilon$] The fault is represented as one of declension and deterioration. See x. 32, &c.

ταῖς ἀκοαῖς] Literally, in (as to) your ears. Mark vii. 35, ηνοίγησαν αὐτοῦ aἱ ἀκοαί.

12. $\kappa ai \gamma a \rho$] For even. It is even the case that, &c. It has come to this, that, &c. The $\kappa a i$ prefaces and prepares for a strong and startling statement. Compare Mark x. 45. Rom. xv. 3. 2 Cor. v. 4. &c. A close examination will always find either an also or an even in $\kappa a i \gamma a \rho$.

όφείλοντες] When (or though) you ought.

δια τὸν χρόνον] Because of the lapse of time since you became Christians.

χρείαν έχετε] The phrase χρείαν έχειν is properly followed by a genitive, as here, and in verse 12, and x. 36. Sometimes by an *infinitive* (without $\tau \circ \hat{v}$), as Matt. iii. 14 ($\beta a \pi \tau i \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} v a i$). xiv. 16. John xiii. 10. I Thess. i. 8. iv. o. v. I. Sometimes by lva, as John xvi. 30. I John ii. 27, ου χρείαν έχετε ίνα τις διδάσκη ύμας. Sometimes it stands absolutely, as Mark ii. 25. Acts ii. 45. iv. 35. I Cor. xii. 24. Eph. iv. 28. I John iii. 17.

τοῦ διδάσκειν ύμας] The construction depends upon the alternative accentuation of the τινα (τινά or τίνα). If τινά, it is the accusative before διδάσκειν, which will then have two accusatives after it: ye have need of some one's teaching you the rudiments, &c. For this διδάσκειν τινά τι, compare Mark vi. 34. John xiv. 26. Acts xxi. 21. If τ iva, it is, ye have need of the teaching you what are the rudiments &c. It is then like (though with the addition here of rou before the infinitive) I Thess. iv. 9, ού χρείαν έχετε γράφειν ύμιν (with no accusative expressed before ypápew, as here none before διδάσκειν). In I Thess. v. I the active $\gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \epsilon v$ is replaced by the passive γρά-

н

Υ. н.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

τίνα τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν ἕχοντες γάλακτος, 13 οὖ στερεᾶς τροφῆς. πῶς γὰρ ὁ μετέχων γά-

v. 12. От тича.

Or kai où.

 $\phi \epsilon \sigma \theta a i$ (impersonal), that it be written to you, that you be written to.

τα στοιχεία] Derived from $\sigma \tau o i \chi o s$ (a row), it seems to suggest as its first meaning the members of a στοίχος, the elements 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 adequately to explain its two scriptural senses, which are (1) 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 τοῦ κόσμου in three of the four places) as a rudimentary system using the material world as its instrument of instruction. The latter sense, that of the natural elements (earth, air, fire, water), is found in Wisd. vii. 17, εἰδέναι σύστασιν κόσμου και ένέργειαν στοιχείων. 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12, στοιχεία δε καυσούμενα λυθήσεται...στοιχεία καυσούμενα τήκε- $\tau a \iota$. In the present instance the former is clearly the meaning, the rudiments, the alphabet, of Christian doctrine.

 $\tau \hat{\eta} s \, \hat{a} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$] May either (1) be attached to ta otoixeia, the rudiments belonging to the beginning, the initial rudiments, upon which combined phrase $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda o \gamma i \omega \nu$ hangs; or (2) be taken as the substantial genitive on which $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\lambda_0 \gamma i \omega \nu$ is suspended, in the sense of the beginning (first principles) of the $\lambda \delta \gamma \mu a$. The same guestion will arise upon v. 1, tor τής άρχής του Χριστού λόγον, which also might bear either interpretation; the initial doctrine 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 $d\rho\chi\eta$. In the absence of this the former construction appears to be preferable.

λογίων] Řom. iii. 2, ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ. Num. xxiv. 4, 16, φησὶν ἀκούων λόγια Θεοῦ. Psalm xii. 7, τὰ λόγια Κυρίου λόγια ἁγνά. cxix. 103. Acts vii. 38. 1 Pet. iv. 11. The term λόγια is used also of human words. Psalm xix. 15, καὶ ἔσονται εἰς εὐδοκίαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ στόματός μου κ.τ.λ.

γάλακτος κ.τ.λ.] For the metaphor, compare 1 Cor. iii. 2,

V. 13, 14.

λακτος ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης, νήπιος γάρ ἐστιν· τελείων δέ ἐστιν ή στερεὰ τροφή, 14 τῶν διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασ-

γάλα ύμας ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα.

13. πâs γάρ] Reason for hesitation in entering upon the new topic. The λόγος is δυσερμήνευ-Tos to persons in your condition, for those who require milk for their sustenance are in that infantine state which is $d\pi \epsilon \rho o s$ λόγου δικαιοσύνης. There is a little blending of the figure and the thing signified by it-that is, of the natural and the spiritual infancy—in the introduction of the words $a\pi\epsilon \rho os \lambda$. δ . where they occur. They compel us to understand the $\mu\epsilon\tau$. yal. more or less metaphorically.

afterpos] Without experience of. The word is used only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint it occurs three times. Jer. ii. 6, $\epsilon \nu \gamma \eta$ $\delta \beta \delta \tau \omega$ kal $\delta \pi \epsilon i \rho \psi$ (endless, limitless). Zech. xi. 15, moupéros $\delta \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho ov$ (inexperienced, ignorant). Wisd. xiii. 18, $\tau \delta \nu$ $\delta \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \delta \tau a \tau v$ (most helpless). In the Septuagint it is always used absolutely, without a genitive.

λόγου δικ.] The absence of the article lays the stress on the quality. Such a thing as a λόγος δικαιοσύνης. The phrase is like that of I Cor. xii. 8, λόγος σοφίας...λόγος γνώσεως. 2 Cor. vi. 7, ϵv λόγω $a\lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i \alpha s$. Phil. ii. 16, λόγον ζωής. I Thess. ii. 5, $\epsilon \nu \lambda \delta \gamma \psi \kappa \delta \lambda a \kappa \epsilon i a s.$ James i. 18, $\lambda \delta \gamma \psi a \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i a s.$ Speech, discourse, doctrine, having as its characteristic feature righteousness, Christian holiness in relation to God and man. For δi - $\kappa a \iota o \sigma \dot{\nu} \gamma \eta$ in this broad general sense compare Rom. vi. 13, 16, 18, 19. 2 Cor. vi. 7, 14. Eph. iv. 24. v. 9. vi. 14. Phil. i. 11. 1 Tim. vi. 11. &c.

νήπιος] Ι Cor. iii. 1, ώς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ.

14. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \omega \nu \delta \epsilon$] In verse 13 the *spiritual* infancy predominated, here the *natural*. The two are inextricably blended.

τελείων] Mature. The opposite of νήπιος. Eph. iv. 13, 14, εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον...ἶνα μηκέτι ῶμεν νήπιοι. Ι Cor. xiii. 10, 11, ὅταν δὲ ἔλθη τὸ τέλειον...ὅτε ἤμην νήπιος κ.τ.λ. xiv. 20, μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῆ κακία νηπιάζετε, ταῖς δὲ φρεσίν τέλειοι γίνεσθε.

 η στερεά τρ.] Either (1) the στερέας τροφής (without the article) of verse 12 is here taken up with the article. That στ. τρ. Or (2) the article may be generic. All στ. τρ.

 $\xi [w]$ 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 alμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ.

VI. 1 Διὸ ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα, μὴ πάλιν

ways) for the body itself. Jud. xiv. 9, ἐκ τῆς ἔξεως τοῦ λέοντος ἐξεῖλε τὸ μέλι.

alσθητήρια] Organs of sense. Only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint, Jer. iv. 19, καὶ τὰ alσθητήρια τῆς καρδίας μου.

 $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu a$] Trained. Also xii. 11, $\tau o \hat{s} \delta \hat{t}$ a $\tilde{v} \tau \hat{\eta} \hat{s} \gamma \epsilon \gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma - \mu \epsilon \nu o i \hat{s}$. 1 Tim. iv. 7. 2 Pet. ii. 14. In the Septuagint, 2 Macc. x. 15 (only).

διάκρισιν] Discrimination. Rom. xiv. 1, μη εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν. 1 Cor. xii. 10, ἄλλω δὲ διακρίσεις πνευμάτων. In the Septuagint, Job xxxvii. 16 (only). For διακρίνειν, see Matt. xvi. 3, τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε διακρίνειν. Also Job xii. 11, οὖς μὲν γὰρ ῥήματα διακρίνει, λάρυγξ δὲ σῖτα γεύεται [ἑαυτῷ].

καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ] Gen. ii. 9, καλὸν εἰς βρῶσιν...καὶ τὸ ξύλον τοῦ εἰδέναι γνωστὸν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ. iii. 6 (7 B), καλὸν τὸ ξύλον εἰς βρῶσιν...2 Sam. xix. 35, μὴ (A, εἰ μὴν B) γνώσομαι ἀναμέσον ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ; Isai. vii. 16, πρὶν ἡ γνῶναι τὸ παιδίον ἀγαθὸν ἡ κακόν. The primary idea of the text is the physical, for which ἀγαθὸν and καλόν, κακόν and πονηρόν, seem (from the above passages) to be used indiscriminately. And the word aloθητήριa seems decisive in favour of this interpretation.

VI. 1. $\Delta \iota \delta$] Wherefore. Considering the shamefulness of such backwardness.

àqévres] Letting go. Leaving alone. Not in the sense of forgetting or discarding, but in that of taking for granted, presupposing, and rising from these to higher attainments.

τον τῆς ἀρχῆς τ. Χ. λ .] See note on v. 12. The initial (elementary) word (doctrine) of Christ.

 $\tau \eta \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda$.] The article either (1) refers to the $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \omega \nu$ of v. 14, that $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \omega \tau \eta s$ which has been implied in the mention of $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \omega$ above. Or (2) it is generic. All $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \omega \tau \eta s$.

τελειότητα] Maturity. Ripeness of age in Christ. The noun occurs only here and in Col. iii. 14. See note on v. 14, τελείων.

φερώμεθα] Let us be borne along. The idea is that of (1) impulse,(2) impetuosity. Movement under a motive power. Acts ii. 2. Heb. ix. 16. 2 Pet. i. 21, ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι. The quesVI. 1.

θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι μετανοίας από νεκρών

tion arises, whether (1) the author speaks here, using the plural of authorship, and proposing a thesis for treatment in an opening section; or (2) the man, identifying himself with his fellow Christians, and animating himself and them to a higher attainment in Christian knowledge and life. The former view appears to be that of the Revised Version, which evidently regards λόγον as discourse, not doctrine (perhaps on the strength of v. 11, δ λόγος), and renders it, let us cease to speak of, &c. But this seems far less touching and beautiful than the alternative, and less suitable to the grave passage which follows in verse 4 as the reason for the $\phi \epsilon \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \theta a$. There may well, however, be so much of the other thought, in combination with this, as that the writer hopes to aid them in the higher attainment by his proposed teaching, and says, Let us press on together in this course, I in my place and you in yours; I teaching and leading, you learning and following.

μη πάλιν] Not laying again and again a foundation, composed of elementary particulars of Christian doctrine such as these six which follow.

 $\theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda_{i0\nu}$] 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 fundamental doctrine are enumerated, as specimens doubtless of many. For $\theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \iota os$ as a masculine in the singular, see the passage just referred to $(a\lambda \lambda o\nu \dots \tau \partial \nu)$ κείμενον). Also 2 Tim. ii. 19, ο μέντοι στερεός θεμέλιος κ.τ.λ. Rev. xxi. 19, 20, o beµélios o πρώτος κ.τ.λ. The other passages are indecisive as to the gender in the singular, and both genders are found in the plural: $\theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \iota o \iota$ in Heb. xi. 10 and Rev. xxi, 14. 10: θεμέλια 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.

καταβαλλόμενοι] The middle voice of καταβάλλεω is found only here in the New Testament. Compare 2 Macc. ii. 13, καταβαλλόμενος (founding) βιβλιοθήκην. v. 6. Depositing for ourselves (as if low down in the ground). Plato, &c., are quoted for this use.

μετανοίας ἀπό] Six elementary points follow, forming three pairs. Repentance and faith are naturally the first two.

 $\mu\epsilon\tau avoids$] An after-thought, a changed state of mind. The word is formed like $\epsilon vvoia$ (iv. 12). Here (with $a\pi o$) it expressly refers to a former state.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

2 έργων και πίστεως έπι Θεόν, βαπτισμών διδαχής

vi. 2. Or διδαχήν.

And so the verb, with $d\pi \dot{\sigma}$ (Acts viii. 22, $\mu\epsilon\tau a\nu \dot{\sigma}\eta\sigma\sigma\nu$ oùr $d\pi \dot{\sigma}$ $\tau\eta$'s κακίας σου ταύτης), or $\epsilon\kappa$ (Rev. ii. 21, 22, où $\theta\epsilon \dot{\lambda}\epsilon\iota$ $\mu\epsilon \tau a\nu \sigma \dot{\eta}\sigma a\iota$ $\epsilon\kappa$ $\tau\eta$'s πορνείας aŭτη's $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. ix. 20, 21, $\epsilon\kappa$ τών $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omega\nu$... $\epsilon\kappa$ τών $\phi \dot{\sigma}\nu\omega\nu$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. xvi. 11), or $\epsilon\pi \dot{\iota}$ (2 Cor. xii. 12, $\epsilon\pi \dot{\iota}$ $\tau\eta'$ $a\kappa a \theta a \rho \sigma (\alpha \kappa.\tau.\lambda)$. Elsowhero with $\epsilon \dot{\iota}$ s $\tau \dot{\nu} \Theta \epsilon \dot{\omega} r$ (Acts xx. 21).

νεκρών] Dead, lifeless, because destitute of the true life towards, from, and in God. So ix. 14, καθαριεί τὴν συνείδησιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι.

πίστεως] Soul's sight. Realization of the invisible (xi. 1). Specially, Christian conviction, apprehension of things and persons revealed by and in Christ. With a genitive, Mark xi. 22, έχετε πίστιν Θεού. Acts iii. 16. Rom. iii. 22, 26, δια πίστεως Ίησοῦ Χριστοῦ...τον ἐκ πίστεως 'Ιησοῦ. Gal. ii. 16, 20. iii. 22. Eph. iii. 12. Phil. iii. q. James ii. 1. Rev. xiv. 12. Or with els, Acts xx. 21, The είς Θεόν μετάνοιαν και πίστιν είς τον Κύριον ήμων Ίησουν. xxiv. xxvi. 18. Col. ii. 5. Or 24. with $\pi\rho \omega s$, I Thess. i. 8, $\eta \pi i \sigma$ τις ύμων ή πρός τόν Θεόν. Or with $\epsilon_{\nu, 1}$ Tim. iii. 13, $\epsilon_{\nu} \pi_{i\sigma\tau\epsilon_{\nu}}$ τŷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Or with $i\pi i$ and an accusative, as here. The verb (πιστεύειν) with επί and an accusative is more common than the noun ($\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$). See Acts ix. 42, $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \upsilon \sigma a \nu$ $\pi \sigma \lambda \lambda \circ i \epsilon \pi i \tau \circ \nu K \upsilon \rho \circ \nu$. xi. 17. xvi. 31. xxii. 19. Rom. iv. 5, 24. Each construction enumerated above has its point of difference. The simple genitive is the least marked, *realization* of. With $\epsilon i s$, the thought is that of union; with $\pi \rho \circ s$, that of *relation*; with $\epsilon \nu$, that of *rest*; with $\epsilon \pi i$, that of *direction*.

2. βαπτισμών διδαχής] In construction διδαχήs precedes $\beta a \pi \tau i \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} v$. We have here the first member of a second pair of fundamental truths. Doctrine (instruction) of (concerning) $\beta a \pi \tau i \sigma \mu o i$. The form $\beta a \pi \tau_{i\sigma\mu a}$ is the regular one for the distinctive ordinance of baptism, whether that of John (Matthew, Mark, Luke, Acts) or of Christ (Rom. vi. 4. Eph. iv. 5. I Pet. iii. 21). In Col. ii. 12 the reading varies between $\beta a \pi \tau i \sigma \mu \hat{\varphi}$ and $\beta a \pi \tau i \sigma$ -The masculine form ματι. (always in the plural) is found only here and ix. 10 (Suapópois Bantiopois) and Mark vii. 4, where it is expressly applied to the Jewish ceremonious washings of vessels and tables. (Neither form occurs in the Septuagint.) It cannot be regarded here as synonymous with the rite of baptism, though from its position as

102

VI. 2.

έπιθέσεώς τε χειρών, αναστάσεώς τε νεκρών και

vi. 2. Or omit the 2nd $\tau \epsilon$.

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 in-The $\delta\iota\delta a\chi\eta$ of types tention. was no inappropriate part of the elementary instruction of Hebrew Christians, whether in its reference to atonement or to sanctification.

 $\epsilon \pi i \theta \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \omega_s \tau \epsilon \chi$.] If the above interpretation of the διδαχή βαπτισμών is correct, it may be well to keep that clause distinct and separate, and so to make $\epsilon \pi i \theta \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \omega_s$ depend not upon διδαχήs but upon $\theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \iota \sigma v$. (This however is doubtful, and not of much importance.) Of the $\epsilon \pi i - \theta \epsilon \sigma s \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega v$, not as an act of blessing (Matt. xix. 15. &c.), and not as a preliminary to healing (Matt. ix. 18. Acts xxviii. 8. &c.), but as a Christian ordinance, there are two kinds. The

one is ordination (Acts vi. 6. 1 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 (1 Cor. xiii. 1, 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 $\epsilon \pi i \theta \epsilon \sigma i s$ $\chi \epsilon_{i\rho} \hat{\omega} \nu$, is the same in confirmation and in ordination. Confirmation too is a gift of *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

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

3 κρίματος αἰωνίου. καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν ἐάνπερ 4 ἐπιτρέπη ὁ Θεός. ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ

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 something casual or arbitrary in the choice of these six fundamentals, that view has disappeared in the examination of them. Repentance and Faith—Atonement and the Spirit—Resurrection and Judgment—what could have been added of equal dignity ?

άναστάσεώς τε] Like the rest of the list this clause depends upon $\theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \omega \nu$. The absence of articles gives the whole the character of a *catalogue*. The phrase ανάστασις νεκρών (without articles) occurs in Acts xvii. 32. xxiii. 6. XXIV. 21. 1 Cor. xv. 12, &c. In Acts xxiv. 15 it is expanded into έλπίδα έχων είς τον Θεον...ανάστασιν μέλλειν έσεσθαι δικαίων τε και αδίκων. In John v. 29 it is distributed into an avaoraous ζωής and an ανάστασις κρίσεως.

καὶ κρίματος] We might have expected κρίσεως. But see John ix. 39, εἰς κρίμα ἐγώ... ηλθον. Acts xxiv. 25, καὶ τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μέλλοντος. The difference is that between trial and sentence. See ix. 27, ẳπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις.

aiwviou] See v. 9, and note

on i. 8. When the subject is (as here) a world beyond death, we can know nothing of *limitations* save what Scripture may tell.

3. καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν] We will execute this purpose—of rising to a higher height of Christian attainment—you and I together.

έάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ Θεός] A reverent recognition of the difficulty of the task undertaken. Compare I Cor. xvi. 7, ἐἀν ὅ Κύριος ἐπιτρέψῃ (revised text). There the permission is spoken of as a single act, here as continuous. Compare James iv. 15, ἐἀν ὁ Κύριος θελήση.

4. aδύνατον γάρ] Reason for pressing forward. Backwardness 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 rows. But are they five *separate* clauses, or are some of them combined *first* and *then* appended { Τt seems best to combine the words from the former yevrauévous to aiŵvos inclusive, and to attach them by the former $\tau \epsilon$ (and) to $a\pi a\xi \phi \omega \tau i \sigma \theta \epsilon v \tau as, thus mak$ ing the members of the whole phrase three instead of five in Thus: $\tau o \hat{v} s (1) \tilde{a} \pi a \xi$ number.

104

φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους τε της δωρεάς της

φωτισθέντας, (2) γευσαμένους τε ...καὶ γενηθέντας...καὶ γευσαμένους, (3) και παραπεσόντας. This differs (1) from the text of the Revised Version in detaching γευσαμένους τε from φωτισθέντας and attaching it to what follows; (2) from the margin of the Revised Version (which it otherwise resembles) in rendering the former $\tau \epsilon$ and instead of both. Compare 1 Cor. i. 30, ös έγενήθη ήμιν σοφία από Θεού, δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἀγιασμὸς καὶ απολύτρωσις. There also the 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 nouns (δικαιοσύνη, άγιασμος, ά- $\pi \circ \lambda \upsilon \tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota s$) with each other, and then to append them (thus combined) by the particle $\tau\epsilon$ (and) to the $\sigma \circ \phi$ ia above. Α 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.

 $a\pi a\xi$] 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 $\pi \sigma r \epsilon$ as semel from quondam. The place where it is most difficult to preserve its proper sense is Jude 5 ($\epsilon i \delta \delta \tau a s \pi a s \pi a \tau a$), which however the Revised Version rightly renders, though ye know all things once for all. (Like I John ii. 20, $\chi \rho i \sigma \mu a$ $\epsilon \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon a \pi \delta \tau c \delta a \gamma i \delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ $\pi a \gamma \tau a$.)

φωτισθέντας] The verb $\phi \omega \tau i \zeta \epsilon v$ is used with (1) things, and (2) persons. (1) To light up, to bring to light; as I Cor. iv. 5, τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους. 2 Tim. i. 10, ζωήν και άφθαρσίαν. Rev. xviii. 1. &c. (2) To enlighten or *illuminate* ; as Luke xi. 36. John i. 9, πάντα άνθρωπον. Eph. i. 18. iii. 9. Here, and in x. 32 ($\phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon$ s), it is applied to that first great illumination which is the believing reception of Christ.

τη̂ς δ. τη̂ς έπουρ.] At first sight we might understand this of the Holy Spirit. See John iv. 10 (comparing vii. 37–39). Acts ii. 38, την δωρεάν τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος. viii. 20. 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. 15–17, ή χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ή δωρεά...τῦ δωρημα... τη̂ς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεῶς τῆς έπουρανίου καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος 5 ἀγίου καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους Θεοῦ ῥῆμα δυνά-6 μεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ παραπεσόντας,

δικαιοσύνης. 2 Cor. ix. 15, χάρις τῷ Θεῷ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνεκδιηγήτψ αὐτοῦ δωρεậ. For ἐπουρανίου see note on iii. 1.

μετόχους] See note on i. 9.

yevnbérras] That is, when you first believed and were baptized.

πνεύματος άγίου] See note on ii. 4.

5. και καλόν γευσ. | Here $\gamma \epsilon v \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha$ has the accusative: in verse 4 it had its usual genitive. The two constructions seem to be equally used in the Septuagint. Thus Job xii. 11, λάρυγξ δέ σίτα γεύεται. xxxiv. 3, λάρυγξ γεύεται βρώσιν. Ecclus. xxxvi. 19, φάρυγξ γεύσεται βρώματα θήρας. But in the New Testament the accusative is found only here and in John ii. 9, έγεύσατο δ άρχιτρίκλινος τό ύδωρ οίνον γεγενημένον (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 $\kappa a \lambda \partial \nu$ suggests it. The sense is, and tasted Ocoû βημα as καλόν, or, tasted that the word of God is good, or, tasted the goodness of the word of God.

It is in fact equivalent to γευσαμένους ότι καλόν έστιν. See 1 Pet. ii. 3 (from Psalm xxxiv. 8), είπερ έγεύσασθε ότι χρηστός ό Κύριος.

Θεοῦ ἡῆμα] Without the article. Such a thing as. The stress lies upon the quality. The ἡῆμα is, however, the Gospel. See note on Rom. x. 8, ἐγγύς σου τὸ ἡῆμά ἐστιν...τοῦτ ἔστιν, τὸ ἡῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὅ κηρύσσομεν. Eph. v. 26, ἐν ἡήματι. vi. 17, τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ἡῆμα Θεοῦ. 1 Pet. i. 25, τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ ἡῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.

δυνάμεις τε] Evidently depending upon γευσαμένους, and still accusative. Is it that the καλον still accompanies the γευσαμένους, as though to say, and tasted the goodness of the δυνάμεις? Or is it only that it would have been stiff and awkward to change back to the genitive? The former explanation seems the right one: καλάς γευσαμένους (that is, ὅτι καλαί είσαν).

μέλλοντος alώνος] Powers of (belonging to) a future alών, but capable of imparting their glory and beauty (see last note) to dwellers in the present. The μέλλων alών is the ό alών έκεινος (in contrast with ό alών ούτος of

VI. 5, 6.

πάλιν ανακαινίζειν είς μετάνοιαν, ανασταυρούντας

the verse before) of Luke xx. 35. It is practically identical with ή οίκουμένη ή μέλλουσα of ii. 5, only expressed under the figure of time, not of space. It is the Messianic age (see note on i. 2, τῶν ήμερῶν τούτων) 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 alw is still $\mu \epsilon \lambda$ - $\lambda \omega v$, but it projects its $\delta v v \dot{a} \mu a s$ upon the believing inmates of These δυνάμεις the present. were once, in part at least, miraculous gifts (see ii. 4, $\pi o \kappa i$ - $\lambda_{\alpha is} \delta_{\nu \nu \alpha} \mu_{\epsilon \sigma i \nu}$, but their higher manifestation, even then, was in spiritual graces and therefore the $\gamma \epsilon \dot{\nu} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ is still applicahle.

6. καὶ παραπεσόντας] This brief clause bears the whole weight of the terrible contrast between the past state (with its many gracious particulars) and the lapse from it. All these experiences of grace—and all forfeited.

 $\pi a \rho a \pi \epsilon \sigma \delta \tau \tau a s]$ Again an a orist of the single act. The many blessings enumerated above are all dated from the moment of believing: so the forfeiture is summed up in the one act of a postasy. The verb $\pi a \rho a \pi (\pi \tau \epsilon w \text{ occurs only here in})$ the New Testament. But in

the Septuagint it is often used by Ezekiel, generally in combination with its cognate noun παράπτωμα, as in xiv. 3. XV, 8. xviii. 24, έν τῷ παραπτώματι αύτου ῷ παρέπεσε...άποθανειται (where the last word gives to the $\pi a \rho a \pi i \pi \tau \epsilon v$ the emphasis of the passage before us). xx. xxii. 4. The substantive 27. παράπτωμα, a fall beside (the way), is St Paul's word for (1) the fall of man in Rom. v. 15, 17, 18, τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι ο θάνατος έβασίλευσεν δια τοῦ ένὸς κ.τ.λ. (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. 1. 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. 10, 1 John v. 16, 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 Church (Matt. xii. 31, 32. Mark iii. 29).

πάλιν] Again. They had

έαυτοις τον υίον του Θεου και παραδειγματίζον τας. γη γάρ ή πιουσα τον έπ' αυτής έρχόμενον
 πολλάκις ύετόν, και τίκτουσα βοτάνην εύθετον

been renewed once when they became Christians.

άνακαινίζειν] Only here in the New Testament. (Elsewhere άνακαινοῦν is the form of the verb. 2 Cor. iv. 16. Col. iii. 10.) In the Septuagint it occurs in Psalm xxxix. 2. ciii. 5. civ. 30, άνακαινιεῦς τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς. Lam. v. 21. I Macc. vi. 9.

avaoravpovvras] 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 xix. 7), οφείλει αποθανείν, ότι υίον Θεού έαυτον έποίησεν. The word avastavpour occurs nowhere else in the New Testament or the Septuagint. In classical use it means simply to crucify (ava in the sense of up). But since $\sigma \tau a \nu \rho o \hat{\nu} \nu$ is constantly used in the New Testament for the act of *crucifying*, the compound with ava may well have the further sense of *crucifying* again or afresh, a well-known use of ava in composition.

čavroîs] To (or for) themselves. The thought is that of wilfulness rather than of detriment. Rom. xiii. 2, čavroîs κρίμα λήμψονται. $\tau \partial \nu \nu \partial \nu \tau$. \odot .] The august title marks the heinousness of the treatment.

παραδειγμ.] Only here in the New Testament. (Matt. i. 19, δειγματίσαι, revised text.) In the Septuagint, Num. xxv. 4, παραδειγμάτισου αύτοὺς τῷ Κυρίψ κατέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου. Jer. xiii. 22. Ezek. xxviii. 17. To make an example of, to put to open shame. (Jude 7, πρόκεινται δείγμα.)

7. $\gamma \hat{\eta} \gamma \hat{\alpha} \rho$] It is in grace as it is in nature. Opportunity lost, beneficent influence thrown away, is irrecoverable. Impossible to renew them again—for, dc. 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 tí kai thư $\gamma \hat{\eta} v$ katap- $\gamma \hat{\epsilon}_i$; &c.

πιοῦσα] Deut. xi. 11, ή δὲ γῆ εἰς ἤν [σῦ] εἰσπορεύη...ἐκ τοῦ ὑἐτοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίεται ὕδωρ. The aorist sums up the past receiving of rain into a single act, and then the present (τίκτουσα) expresses its continuous consequence.

έρχόμενον] Luke xii. 54, δμβρος έρχεται. VI. 7, 8.

ἐκείνοις δι' οὒς καὶ γεωργεῖται, μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἐκφέρουσα δὲ ἀκάνθας 8 καὶ τριβόλους ἀδόκιμος καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς, ἦς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν.

ύετόν] Acts xiv. 17, οὐρανόθεν ὑμῶν ὑετοὺς διδοὺς καὶ καιροὺς καρποφόρους.

βοτάνην] Only here in the New Testament. See Gen. i. 11, 12, βλαστησάτω ή γή βοτάνην χόρτου κ.τ.λ. Exod. x. 12, 15. &c.

τύθετον] Properly, wellplaced; and so, convenient, suitable, serviceable, &c. Luke ix. 62, τύθετός έστιν τη βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. xiv. 35. Psalm xxxii. 6, ἐν καιρῷ τὐθέτῳ.

δι' ovs] For the sake of whom. For whose benefit.

καὶ γ.] Also (as well as being serviceable to them). The verb occurs only here in the New Testament (γεώργιον, I Cor. iii. 9: γεωργός often). I Chron. xxvii. 26, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν γεωργούντων τὴν γῆν τῶν ἐργαζομένων.

εὐλογίας] Gen. xxvii. 27, ὡς ὀσμὴ ἀγροῦ πλήρους ὅν ηὐλόγησε Κύριος.

8. ἐκφέρουσα δέ] But if it (ή γη, understood from γη above) brings forth. Gen. i. 12, καὶ ἐξήνεγκεν ή γη βοτάνην χόρτου.

ἀκάνθας καὶ τρ.] Ĝen. iii. 17, 18 (18, 19 B), ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου...ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους ἀνατελεῖ σοι. Hos. x. 8, ἄκανθαι καὶ τρίβολοι ἀναβήσονται ἐπὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτῶν. The New Testament has ἄκανθαι (from ἀκή, a point) in three connexions. (1) Matt. vii. 16, ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλάς. (2) Matt. xiii. 7, &c., ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰs ἀκάνθας κ.τ.λ. Mark iv. 7, &c. Luke viii. 7, &c. (3) Matt. xxvii. 29, στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν. John xix. 2. For τρίβολοι (τριβελής, three-pointed) in the New Testament see only Matt. vii. 16, ἢ ἀπὸ τριβόλων σῦκα;

άδόκιμος] The opposite of δόκιμος (from δέχεσθαι), and so unacceptable, unapprovable, unworthy, rejected after trial, refuse, reprobate. Isai. i. 22, τὸ ἀργύριον ὑμῶν ἀδόκιμον. I Cor. ix. 27. 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 6, 7. 2 Tim. iii. 8. Tit. i. 16, πρὸς πῶν ἕργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι.

κατάρας ἐγγύς] Compare viii. 13, ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ. The thought of κατάρα may come from Gen. iii. 17, ἐπικατάρατος ή γῆ. The expression is softened, to avoid the appearance of absolutely condemning the readers.

ης το τέλος] In form like 2 Cor. xi. 15, ών το τέλος ἔσται κατα τα ἔργα αὐτών. Phil. iji. 19, ῶν το τέλος ἀπώλεια.

eis kaûow] Deut. xxix. 22,

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

9 Πεπείσμεθα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀγαπητοί, τὰ κρείσσονα καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας, εἰ καὶ οὕτως
 10 λαλοῦμεν. οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι

23, δψονται τὰς πληγὰς τῆς γῆς ἐκείνης...θεῖον καὶ ἅλα κατακεκαυμένον· πῶσα ἡ γῆ αὐτῆς οὐ σπαρήσεται...ὦσπερ κατεστράφη Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα κ.τ.λ.

9. $\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon i\sigma\mu\epsilon\theta a \delta\epsilon$] Such is 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 $\pi\epsilon$ - $\pi\epsilon i\sigma\mu\epsilon\theta a$, compare Rom. xv. 14, $\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon i\sigma\mu\epsilon\theta a$

ἀγαπητοί] Only here in this Epistle. Rom. xii. 19. 2 Cor. vii. 1. xii. 19. Phil. iv. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 11. iv. 12. 2 Pet. iii. 1, 8, 14, 17. 1 John ii. 7. iii. 2, 21. iv. 1, 7, 11. Jude 3, 17, 20.

τὰ κρ. κ. $\dot{\epsilon}\chi$. σ.] Those things which are better (than the above) and pertaining to salvation. For κρείσσονα, see note on i. 4, κρείττων.

έχόμενα] The middle έχεσθαι (τινός) is to hold or cling to, and so (of a thing) to be next to. Mark i. 38, εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις. Acts xx. 15. xxi. 26, τη έχομένη ήμέρα. (Hence έξης, Luke ix. 37, έν τη έξης ήμέρα. Acts xxi. 1. &c.) Here, pertaining to.

σωτηρίας] See note on i. 14. εἰ καί] 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. iv. 7, εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐλαβες. vii. 12, ἄρα εἰ καὶ ἔγραψα. Col. ii. 5, εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῆ σαρκὶ ἀπειμι. And so it is found even with oở. Luke xi. 8, εἰ καὶ οὐ δώσει. xviii. 4. 2 Cor. xii. 11, εἰ καὶ οὐδέν εἰμι.

ούτως] So as above (v. 11vi. 8).

10. $\delta \delta \kappa \kappa \sigma s^2$ 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. 9, $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \delta s$ $\delta \sigma \tau \iota \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \delta \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma s$ i $\iota \alpha \alpha \delta \eta \eta \eta \mu \tilde{\iota} \nu$ $\tau \delta s \delta \mu a \rho \tau \delta \kappa s \kappa \tau \lambda$. The justice there is not founded on man's abstract right to forgiveness (a contradiction in terms), but on the $\delta \iota \alpha \theta \eta \kappa \eta$ of God in Christ.

επιλαθέσθαι] xiii. 2, 16.

110

VI. 9–11.

τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς ἀγἀπης ἧς ἐνεδείξασθε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες. ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ ἕκαστον ὑμῶν 11

έαυτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος. 1 Thess. i. 3, μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως. V. 13, διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν. 1 Pet. i. 17, κατὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον.

καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης] The revised text omits τοῦ κόπου before τῆς ἀγάπης. It probably came from I Thess. i. 3.

 η_5] For η_V . The common attraction of the relative to the antecedent. See ix. 20, $\tau\eta_5$ dia- $\theta\eta_{\kappa\eta_5}$ η_5 èvere(laro.

èνεδείξασθε] The middle voice of ἐνδεικνύναι (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. 1 Tim. i. 16. &c.; (2) of man, as here, and Rom. ii. 15. 2 Cor. viii. 24. Tit. ii. 10, πάσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθήν. iii. 2.

εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ] Towards His name. That is, towards Him as He is; towards Him as His word reveals Him. See note on i. 4.

διακ. καὶ διακ.] By having ministered and still ministering. Rom. xv. 25, διακονών τοῦς ἀγίοις. (In this Epistle διακονεῦν occurs only here, διακονία only in i. 14.) Of uncertain derivation

(conjecturally from an obsolete verb διάκω to hasten), διάκονος 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, (1) to serving in the house or at the table, in Matt. viii. 15. Mark i. 31. Luke iv. 39. 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. 11. Heb. i. 14; (6) to Christ's own service on earth, Matt. xx. 28. Luke xxii. 27.

11. $\epsilon \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu o \tilde{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu$] 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 $\epsilon \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ in this good sense (and with an infinitive following it), compare Matt. xiii. 17, $\pi o \lambda \lambda o i$ $\pi \rho o \phi \hat{\eta} \pi a$ $\kappa a i \delta i \kappa a \circ i \epsilon \pi \epsilon \theta \delta \mu \eta \sigma a \nu i \delta \delta \hat{\nu} a$ $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon$. Luke xxii. 15, $\epsilon \pi \iota - \theta \nu \mu \epsilon \theta$ $\delta \mu \omega \nu$. I Pet. i. 12, $\epsilon i_s a$ $\epsilon \pi \ell \theta \nu \mu o \hat{\nu} \sigma \iota \nu$ $\delta \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda o \iota$ $\pi a \rho a \kappa i \psi a \iota$. Add Phil. i. 23, $\tau \eta \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu i a \nu$ την αυτην ένδείκνυσθαι σπουδην προς την πληρο-12 φορίαν της έλπίδος άχρι τέλους, ίνα μη νωθροί γένησθε, μιμηταί δε των δια πίστεως και μακρο-

έχων είς το άναλῦσαι κ.τ.λ. 1 Thess. ii. 17.

σπουδήν] From σπεύδειν, (1) haste, Deut. xvi. 3, ἐν σπουδή ἐξήλθετε ἐξ Αἰγύπτου. Mark vi. 25, εἰσελθοῦσα εὐθὺς μετὰ σπουδής πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα. Luke i. 39; (2) earnestness, Rom. xii. 8, 11. 2 Cor. vii. 11, 12. viii. 7, 8, 16. 2 Pet. i. 5. Jude 3. πρός] Unto. With a view to. As the end and aim of the ἐνδείκνυσθαι.

 $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \phi o \rho (a \nu)$ Col. ii. 2, $\pi \hat{a} \nu$ το πλούτος της πληροφορίας της συνέσεως. 1 Thess. i. 5, καί πληροφορία πολλή. Heb. vi. 11, έν πληροφορία πίστεως. The original meaning of the verb $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\rho\phi\rho\rho\epsilon\hat{i}\nu$ is to bring full, to fill the measure of, and so to fulfil, complete, or satisfy. With an accusative sometimes (1) of the thing : Luke i. 1, περί τών πεπληροφορημένων (fully established or proved) iv huiv mpayμάτων. 2 Tim. iv. 5, 17, τήν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον... ίνα δι' έμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα πληρο- $\phi_{0}\rho_{\eta}\theta_{\eta}$. Sometimes (2) of the person: Rom. iv. 21, $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\sigma$ φορηθείς (fully assured) ότι κ.τ.λ. Rom. xiv. 5, έκαστος έν τώ ίδίω νοι πληροφορείσθω. Col. iv. 12, τέλειοι και πεπληροφορημένοι. 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.

άχρι τέλονς] In iii. 6 and 14 it is μ έχρι τέλονς. See note on άχρι, iv. 12.

12. νωθροί] See note on V. 11.

 $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$] In v. 11 we have $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \sigma \sigma \sigma \epsilon$. 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 μιμέισθαι, Wisd. xv. 9, and µíµηµa, Wisd. ix. 8). In the New Testament, verb and noun are peculiar to St Paul and this Epistle (xiii. 7, μi μείσθε την πίστιν), with the single exception of 3 John 11 (μη μιμού το κακόν), for in 1 Pet. iii. 13 the revised text reads ζηλωταί. See I Thess. i. 6, μιμηταί ήμων εγενήθητε. ii. 14. 2 Thess. iii. 7, 9, πως δεί μιμείσθαι ήμας κ.τ.λ. Ι Cor. iv. 16. xi. 1, μιμηταί μου γίθυμίας κληρονομούντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. τῷ 13 γὰρ ἘΑβραὰμ ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὁ Θεός, ἐπεὶ κατ

νεσθε καθώς κάγὼ Χριστοῦ. Eph. ν. Ι, γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

μακροθυμίας] From μακρό- $\theta_{\nu\mu\sigma\sigma}$, long or slow of wrath (first found in Exod. xxxiv. 6, οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων, μακρόθυμος και πολυέλεος), the substantive μακροθυμία is used both of God (Rom. ii. 4. ix. 22. I Tim. i. 16. I Pet. iii. 2 Pet. iii. 15) and of man 20. (2 Cor. vi. 6. Gal. v. 22. Eph. iv. 2. Col. i. 11. iii. 12. Tim. iii. 10. iv. 2. James v. 10). In its human application it is most often employed as between man and man, $b\pi o\mu o\nu \eta$ being the more distinctively suitable as between man and God.

κληρονομούντων] See note on i. 4. The idea of κληρονομεῖν (τι) is not to be heir to, but to inherit, to enter upon the inheritance of. In κληρονόμος both senses (heir and inheritor) are found, the former more frequently (Matt. xxi. 38. Gal. iv. 1. James ii. 5. &c.).

τὰs ἐπαγγελίας] Plural as in Rom. ix. 4, Ἱσραηλεῖται, ῶν...ai διαθῆκαι...καὶ ai ἐπαγγελίαι κ.τ.λ. Gal. iii. 16, τῷ δὲ ᾿Αβραὰμ ἐρρέθησαν ai ἐπαγγελίαι κ.τ.λ. Heb. vii. 6. xi. 13, 17. 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. $\tau \hat{\psi} \gamma \alpha \hat{\rho}]$ I say dia ma- $\kappa \rho o \theta \nu \mu i as, and I say \epsilon \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i as$ — for, &c. He takes the latter first, and the former in verse 15. But indeed even the $\omega \mu \sigma \sigma \epsilon \nu$ prepared the recipient for delay, and so for the need of $\mu \alpha \kappa \rho \sigma - \theta \nu \mu i \alpha$.

ἐπαγγειλάμενος] Having The promise made promise. was prior to the oath, and was repeated again and again (Gen. xii. xiii. xv. xvii. xviii. &c.) before the δρκωμοσία of Gen. xxii. The verb ἐπαγγέλ- $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ has the two chief senses biblical (in as in classical Greek) of (1) promising, (2)professing. Thus (1) x. 23, πιστός γάρ ό έπαγγειλάμενος. xi. 11. xii. 26. Mark xiv. II. Acts vii. 5. Rom. iv. 21, $\delta \epsilon \pi \eta \gamma$ γελται (middle in sense). Gal. iii. 19, ῷ ἐπήγγελται (probably passive in sense as in form). Tit. i. 2. James i. 12. ii. 5. 2 1 John ii. 25. (2) Pet. ii. 19. 1 Tim. ii. 10, γυναιξίν έπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν. vi. 21.

κατ' οὐδ.] Amos iv. 2, ὀμνύει Κύριος κατὰ τῶν ἀγίων αὐτοῦ. viii. 7, 14. Zeph. i. 5, καὶ τοὺς ὀμνύοντας κατὰ τοῦ Κυρίου κ.τ.λ. (Elsewhere with ἐν, or with

V. H.

ούδενος είχεν μείζονος ομόσαι, ὤμοσεν καθ 14 ἐαυτοῦ, λέγων, Εἰ μὴν εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε 15 καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ σε. καὶ οὕτως μακ-16 ροθυμήσας ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. ἄνθρωποι

simple dative or accusative.) Matt. xxvi. 63, ξεορκίζω σε κατά τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζώντος.

είχεν ... ὀμόσαι] For this (classical) use of έχειν with an infinitive, to have where with to do, to be able to do, compare Luke vii. 42, μὴ ἐχόντων αὐτῶν ἀποδοῦναι. xii. 4, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἐχόντων περισσότερόν τι ποιῆσαι. xiv. 14, οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναί σοι. Acts iv. 14. xxv. 26. Tit. ii. 8.

καθ' ἐαυτοῦ] Gen. xxii. 16, κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ ὧμοσα, λέγει Κύριος. Isai. xlv. 23, κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ ὀμνύω, εἰ μὴν κ.τ.λ.

14. Eì $\mu\eta'\nu$] Given in the Septuagint $\eta'\mu\eta'\nu$. But found in Ezek. xxxiii. 27, $\zeta\omega' \epsilon\gamma\omega$, $\epsilon i \mu\eta\nu$... $\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma$ îνται. xxxiv. 8, $\zeta\omega' \epsilon\gamma\omega$, $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota$ Κύριος Κύριος, $\epsilon i \mu\eta\nu'$ aντί τοῦ γενέσθαι κ.τ. λ . It is difficult not to imagine it a mixed and corrupt phrase, made up of ϵi $\mu\eta'$ and $\eta'\mu\eta'\nu$, though equivalent in use to the latter.

 $\epsilon i \lambda \circ \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon i \lambda$.] This is the usual way of reproducing the Hebrew form of strong asseveration, in which what in the Greek is a participle is an abbreviated infinitive. Sense: I will abundantly bless thee, and abundantly multiply thee.

ευλογών] To speak well of

becomes, if God speaks, to do good to. With Him benediction and benefaction are one.

15. επετυχεν] Yet in xi. 39, it is said of the Old Testament saints, ούκ ἐκομίσαντο την ἐπαγ- $\gamma \epsilon \lambda i a \nu$, and the reason is added, ίνα μη χωρίς ήμῶν τελειωθωσιν. In the same chapter, verse 33, ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν is apparently said of *living* men, and must mean either obtained the utterance to them by God, or obtained the fulfilment to them by God, of specific personal promises 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 μακροθυμήσας was subsequent to the utterance, and the procuring cause of the $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau v \chi \epsilon v$. He is said then to have won by his patience either (1) the fulfilment to his seed after him of the earthly promise, or (2) the fulfilment 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 resurrection-glory, and, for us, a fuller and nobler revelation now (κρείττόν τι, xi. 39), and an equal

γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος ὀμνύουσιν, καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὁ ὅρκος. ἐν ῷ περισσότερον βουλόμενος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιδεῖξαι 17

share in the glory that waits for the second Advent. The latter of these two interpretations is decidedly to be preferred.

16. $\vec{a}\nu\theta\rho\omega\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu\gamma\dot{a}\rho$] Reason for the $\vec{\omega}\mu\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu\kappa\alpha\theta$ $\vec{a}\nu\sigma\sigma\hat{\nu}$ of verse 13; 15 being treated as parenthetical. The $\mu\hat{e}\nu$ of the received text is right in sense, but is probably the insertion of a classicist.

τοῦ $μ\epsilon$ ίζονος] Him who is greater than themselves, that is, God.

καὶ πάσης] And that oath (the article referring to the $d\mu$ νύουσιν above) is to them a limit (end) of all ἀντιλογία.

aντιλογίας] Gainsaying, may be either (1) contradiction, as of one against one, whether in the form of *denial* or of *reproach*, or (2) controversy, dispute, a mutual gainsaying. For (1) see vii. 7, χωρίς δε πάσης αντιλογίας. Jude 11, τη άντιλογία του Κορέ. (For its use in xii. 3 see the note there.) And so in the Septuagint, Num. xx. 13, τοῦτο [τό] υδωρ αντιλογίας, ότι ελοιδορήθησαν οι υίοι Ίσραήλ έναντι Κυρίου. åc. Psalm lxxx. 6, čθου ήμαs eis αντιλογίαν τοῖς γείτοσιν ήμῶν. &c. For (2) see Exod. xviii. 16, όταν γάρ γένηται αυτοίς άντιλογία, καὶ ἔλθωσι πρός με κ.τ.λ. Prov. xvii. 11, αντιλογίας εγείρει πα̂ς κακός. xviii. 18, ἀντιλογίας παύει κλήρος (Α, σιγηρὸς Β), ἐν δὲ δυνάσταις (Α, δυναστείαις Β) ὁρίζει. 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.

πέρας] Elsewhere in the New Testament only in the plural, τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς (Matt. xii. 42. Luke xi. 31) or τῆς οἰκουμένης (Rom. x. 18 from Psalm xix. 4). But in the Septuagint, see Psalm cxlv. 3, τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστι πέρας. Dan. vii. 28, ἔως ὥδε τὸ πέρας τοῦ λόγου. &c.

εἰς βεβαίωσιν] Unto confirmation. So as to confirm an assertion. Noun only here and Phil. i. 7. But see βέβαιος ii. 2, and note. Also βεβαιοῦν, ii. 3. Mark xvi. 20. Rom. xv. 8. &c. ο ὅρκος] See note on καὶ πάσης above.

17. ἐν ῷ] Wherein. In which state of things. This being so.

περισσότερον] With έπιδείξαι. See note on ii. 1, περισσοτέρως.

βουλόμενος] Applied (as here) to God in Luke xxii. 42.

τοῖς κληρονόμοις τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τὸ ἀμετάθετον 18 τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ, ἵνα διὰ

James i. 18. To Christ, in Matt. xi. 27. Luke x. 22. To the Holy Spirit, in 1 Cor. xii. 11.

 $\epsilon \pi \iota \delta \epsilon l \xi a \iota$] Only here in the Epistles. Matt. xvi. I ($\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{\iota} o \nu$). xxii. 19 ($\nu \delta \mu \iota \sigma \mu a$). xxiv. I ($o l \kappa o \delta \sigma \mu a$). Luke xvii. 14 ($\epsilon a \nu \tau \sigma \delta \nu$ $\tau \sigma \hat{\iota} s$). Luke xvii. 14 ($\epsilon a \nu \tau \sigma \delta \nu$ $\tau \sigma \hat{\iota} s$). xx. 24 ($\delta \eta \nu a \rho \iota \sigma \nu$). Acts ix. 39 (mid.). xviii. 28 ($\epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu a \iota \tau \partial \nu X \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma \sigma \delta \nu$).

κληρονόμοις] See notes on i. 2, 4.

τής ἐπαγγελίας] Primarily the promise to Abraham (verse 14); but including as the antitype of that, the promise of the eternal inheritance. See note on verse 15, ἐπέτυχεν.

άμετάθετον] Only here and in verse 18. But μετατιθέναι (μετάθεσις), to change the place of, to transpose or transfer, (1) in a literal sense, in Acts vii. 16 (μετετέθησαν εἰς Συχέμ). Heb. xi. 5 (Ένωχ μετετέθη...μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός...πρὸ τῆς μεταθέσεως); and (2) in senses more or less figurative, in Gal. i. 6 (εἰς ἔτερον εὐαγγέλιον). Heb. vii. 12 (μετατιθεμένης τῆς ἱερωσύνης...νόμου μετάθεσις). xii. 27. Jude 4 (χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν).

 $\beta oυλ\hat{\eta}s$] The word $\beta oυλ\hat{\eta}$ (occurring twelve times in the New Testament, of which nine are in St Luke's Gospel and the Acts) is applied (1) to men, as in Luke xxiii. 51, τ $\hat{\eta}$ βουλ $\hat{\eta}$ καὶ τή πράξει αυτών. Acts v. 38, εαν ή έξ ανθρώπων ή βουλή αυτη ή το έργον τοῦτο. xxvii. 12, 42. I Cor. iv. 5, τα's βουλα's των καρδιών. (2) To God, as in Luke vii. 30. Acts ii. 23, τη ώρισμένη βουλή καί προγνώσει του Θεού. xiii. 36. XX. 27, αναγγείλαι πάσαν την βουλήν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Eph. i. 11, τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος κατὰ την βουλην του θελήματος αύτου. This last passage seems to help the difficult distinction between β ουλή and θέλημα. The θέλημα $(\tau \delta \theta)$ is the will as a unit whole. The $\beta_{ov\lambda\eta}(\eta \beta)$ is the counsel or purpose of the $\theta \in \lambda \eta \mu a$, the sum of its intended activity. When $\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu a$ has no article (as in Matt. xviii. 14. Rom. xv. 32. 1 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 1 Pet. iii. 17, εί θέλοι το θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, where τὸ θέλημα is represented as having $\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu a \tau a$, as willing separate things.) So when $\beta o \nu \lambda \eta$ has no article, it becomes a single item of the collective $\beta_{0\nu\lambda\eta}$. When it is plural, several items, &c.

VI. 18.

δύο πραγμάτων ἀμεταθέτων, ἐν οἶς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι Θεόν, ἰσχυρὰν παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν

vi. 18. Or tov 0.

Apparently, by a bold figure, between Himself and the receiver of the promise. This seems simpler than to say, between the promise and the fulfilment, 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 (ταῦτα ὀμνύντες έλεγον καὶ τὸν Θεὸν μεσίτην ών ύπισχνούντο ποιούμενοι). The verb does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, nor is either verb or noun found in the Septuagint.

 $\delta \rho \kappa \phi$] By an oath. The oath is made the *instrument* of the interposition.

18. *iva*] The gracious purpose of the interposition.

δύο] The promise, and the oath.

πραγμάτων] From the obvious sense of πρᾶγμα, (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 x. I, σκιῶν τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὖκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων. Xi. I, ελπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἐλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων. Here it is applied to God's word and God's *oath* of promise, regarded as invested with all the reality of *facts* by being His utterance.

εν ofs] Wherein. In the matter (on the subject) of which.
 αδύνατον] Also in verse 4.
 x. 4. xi. 6. Characteristic of this Epistle. The nearest approach to it is in Mark x. 27, παρά ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατον (without τοῦτο, which Matt. xix. 26 has).

ψεύσασθαι] The aorist applies the axiom to the case. Impossible for Him to have lied. Compare Psalm lxxxix. 35, απαξ ώμοσα ἐν τῷ ἁγίφ μου, εἰ τῷ Δαυὶδ ψεύσομαι.

 \mathfrak{Geol} The absence of the article (in contrast with $\delta \mathfrak{Geols}$ above) lays stress upon the *quality*. Majesty, holiness, truth.

lσχυράν] v. 7. xi. 34.

παράκλησιν] Encouragement. The two ideas of comforting and exhorting meet in encouragement, which avoids alike the unpractical feebleness of consolation and the unsympathetic externality of exhortation. The Scripture παράκλησις 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.

$\Pi PO\Sigma EBPAIOY\Sigma.$

οί καταφυγόντες κρατήσαι της προκειμένης έλ-19 πίδος, ην ώς άγκυραν έχομεν της ψυχης, άσφαλη

which means putting the heart into a man. It occurs again in xii. 5. xiii. 22. And $\pi a p a$ - $\kappa a \lambda \hat{e} \nu$ in iii. 13. x. 25. xiii. 19, 22.

 $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$] Interposed, by the oath confirming the promise, that we may have. An act of old time, having for its object the continual and ever present encouragement of Christians now ($\tilde{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\sigma(\tau\epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon\nu...\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu)$).

καταφυγόντες The tense carries back the thoughts to the one decisive act and moment of becoming a Christian. The special thought in καταφεύγειν, to flee down, home, &c., 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 passages of the Septuagint as Num. XXXV. 25, είς την πόλιν του φυγαδευτηρίου αυτού...ου κατέφυγεν έκει κ.τ.λ. Psalm cxliii. 9, έξελού με έκ τών έχθρών μου, Κύριε, δτι πρός σε κατέφυγον.

κρατήσαι] To lay hold of. Again the aorist of the single act. For κρατείν, see note on iv. 14, κρατώμεν.

προκειμένης] For προκείσθαι, to lie forth, to lie in view, to be set forth in open view, see Lev. xxiv. 7, καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ἄρτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκείμενα τῷ Κυρίφ. Num. iv. 7, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν τὴν προκειμένην κ.τ.λ. In the New Testament it occurs in 2 Cor. viii. 12, εἰ γὰρ ἡ προθυμία πρόκειται (is forthcoming). Jude 7, πρόκεινται δεἶγμα. And Heb. xii. 1, 2, τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα...τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς.

 $\lambda \pi i \delta os$] Is it here the grace of hope, or the object of hope? Of the latter the clearest instances are Gal. v. 5. Col. i. 5, την έλπίδα την αποκειμένην υμίν er tois ouparois. I Thess. ii. 19. τ Tim. i. 1, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς έλπίδος ήμῶν. Τit. ii. 13, προσδεχόμενοι την μακαρίαν ελπίδα. The $\pi \rho \circ \kappa \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon \nu \eta s$ here is indecisive, for while in xii. 2 it accompanies something future $(\chi a \rho \hat{a} s)$, in xii. I it stands with a thing present (ayŵva). And we may be said with equal propriety to lay hold of a present grace, supporting and comforting, or of a future attainment of glory. On the whole, we may decide in favour of the former and commoner sense of $\epsilon \lambda \pi i_s$. indeed the following verse says έχομεν and είσερχομένην.

19. άγκυραν] Acts xxvii. 29, 30, 40.

 τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, ὅπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ 20 ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

εἰσερχομένην. For ἀσφαλής, see Phil. iii. 1, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀσφαλές. Prov. iii. 18, καὶ τοῖς ἐπερειδομένοις ἐπ' αὐτὴν...ἀσφαλής. For βέβαιος, see note on ii. 2.

καὶ εἰσερχομένην] Strange attempts have been made to justify the application of this clause to ἄγκυραν. Taking it with $\eta \nu$ (ελπίδα), all difficulty disappears. Hope enters into the holy of holies.

είς το ἐσώτερον τ. κ.] Into that which is inner than (within) the veil. The simple ἐσω might have stood here with the genitive, as in Mark xv. 16 (ἐσω τῆς aὐλῆς), and perhaps in the revised text of 2 Cor. iv. 16 (ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν). But the phrase comes from the Septuagint, Exod. xxvi. 33. Lev. xvi. 2. &c.

τοῦ καταπετάσματος] Matt. xxvii. 51. Mark xv. 38. Luke xxiii. 45. It is called in ix. 3 τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα, in contrast with the curtain over the entrance into the tabernacle. See Exod. xxvi. 31-36, καὶ ποιήσεις καταπέτασμα...καὶ εἰσοίσεις ἐκεῖ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ μαρτυρίου· καὶ διοριεῖ τὸ καταπέτασμα ὑμῖν ἀναμέσον τοῦ ἀγίου καὶ ἀναμέσον τοῦ ἀγίου τῶν ἀγίων κ.τ.λ. The outer curtain is often called $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \pi a \sigma \tau \rho ov$ (Exod. xxvi. 36. xxxv. 15. xxxix. 38. xl. 28), but sometimes also $\kappa a \tau a$ - $\pi \epsilon \tau a \sigma \mu a$ (Exod. xxvi. 37. &c.) as indeed the $\delta \epsilon v \tau \epsilon \rho ov$ of Heb. ix. 3 implies. For the significance of the figure here see ix. 8, &c.

20. $\delta \pi \sigma v$] The forms $\pi \sigma \hat{\iota}$ and $\delta \pi \sigma \iota$ are not used in the Septuagint or the New Testament: $\pi \sigma \hat{\upsilon}$ and $\delta \pi \sigma v$ serve the purpose alike of where and whither.

πρόδρομος] As forerunner. Only here in the New Testament. But the verb (προτρέχειν) occurs in Luke xix. 4, καὶ προδραμῶν ἔμπροσθεν ἀνέβη κ.τ.λ. John xx. 4, προέδραμεν τάχιον τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ ἦλθεν πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. In the Septuagint, Num. xiii. 20, ἡμέραι ἔαρος, πρόδρομοι σταφυλῆς. Isai. xxviii. 4, ἔσται τὸ ἄνθος...ὡς πρόδρομος σύκου. Wisd. xii. 8, ἀπέστειλάς τε προδρόμους τοῦ στρατοπέδου σου σφῆκας κ.τ.λ.

 $i π \epsilon \rho \ \eta μ ω ν$] We might have expected the simple genitive $(\eta μ ω ν)$ after πρόδρομος (as in the above passages). But the insertion of $i π \epsilon \rho$ is reverential, and marks the disparity of the πρόδρομος and the followers.

εἰσῆλθεν] By ascension. See ix. 12, 24, εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰs τὰ ἀγια....εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν.

VII. 1 Ούτος γάρ ό Μελχισεδέκ, βασιλεύς Σαλήμ, ίερεύς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, ὁ συναντήσας ᾿Αβραὰμ ὑποστρέφοντι ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς τῶν

vii. 1. Or 55 συναντ.

The solemn ceremony of the day of Atonement is already tinging the phraseology. See Lev. xvi. 3, 23, καὶ ἐἰσελεύσεται 'λαρών εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου κ.τ.λ.

κατὰ τὴν τάξιν] Thus we return once more to the text of the subsection, proposed in v. 10, and suspended by the following digression. Now we enter upon the subject.

VII. 1. Ούτος γάρ] I say, as the Melchizedek priest; and it is a significant title—for, &c.

obros] This who is the person named in the prophecy under consideration.

ό Μελχισεδέκ] Gen. xiv. 18. The phrases and clauses quoted in the text are, καὶ Μελχισεδὲκ βασιλεὺς Σαλημ...ἰερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου...ηὐλόγησε τὸν "Αβραμ...καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ["Αβραμ Β] δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων.

 $\sum \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu$] The locality is immaterial, the name alone is significant.

 $i\epsilon\rho\epsilon\dot{v}s\tau \sigma\dot{v}\Theta\epsilon\sigma\dot{v}$] 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.

 $\delta \sigma vvar.$] The alternative (and morestrongly supported) reading δs 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 \mathfrak{F} of Rom. Xvi. 27.

συναντήσας] Suggested by Gen. xiv. 17, έξηλθε δε βασιλεύς Σοδόμων εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτῷ, μετὰ τὸ ὑποστρέψαι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς τοῦ Χ. καὶ τῶν βασιλέων τῶν μετ ἀὐτοῦ. The word συναντῶν occurs in the New Testament in Luke ix. 37. xxii. 10. Acts x. 25. xx. 22.

κοπής] See the above quotation. Smiting. Clades rather than cædes. Gen. xiv. 15, ἐπάταξεν. For the word, see Deut. xxviii. 25, δώη σε Κύριος ἐπὶ κοπὴν ἐναντίον τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου. Josh. x. 20, κόπτοντες αὐτοὺς κοπὴν μεγάλην σφόδρα ἔως εἰς τέλος. Jud. xv. 7, ἀναστρέψαντες ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς.

τών βασιλέων] The four

VII. 1---3.

βασιλέων καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτόν, ῷ καὶ δεκά- 2 την ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισεν ᾿Αβραάμ, πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενος βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, ἕπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὅ ἐστιν βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης, ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἀρχὴν 3

kings against five of Gen. xiv. Hearing of the capture of Lot, Abram arms his trained servants, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen, pursues 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.

ειλογήσας] The words are given in Gen. xiv. 19, 20, ειλογημένος ^{*}Αβραμ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ ὑψίστῳ, ὅς ἔκτισε τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν· καὶ εὐλογητὸς ὅ Θεὸς ὁ ὕψιστος, ὅς παρέδωκε τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποχειρίους σοι.

2. $\delta \epsilon \kappa \dot{a} \tau \eta v$] Only here (and in verses 4, 8, 9) in the New Testament. In the Septuagint, see Lev. xxvii. 30. Deut. xiv. 22. &c.

 $\dot{a}\pi\dot{o}\pi\dot{a}\nu\tau\omega\nu$] This is the expression in Gen. xiv. 20. It is varied in verse 4 into $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa \tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\dot{a}\kappa\rho\sigma\theta\omega\omega\omega\nu$.

 $\epsilon \mu \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \epsilon v$] In the Septuagint it is $\epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon v$. For $\mu \epsilon \rho i \zeta \epsilon \iota v$, to deal, to give as a share, to one person, see Rom. xii. 3, $\epsilon \kappa a \sigma \tau \psi$ ws o Θεο's $\epsilon \mu \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \epsilon v$ $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho o v$ $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$. I Cor. vii. 17. 2 Cor. x. 13. $\pi\rho\tilde{\omega}\tau\sigma\nu\ \mu\epsilon\nu$] 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 dignity of the typical person, and so the predicted majesty of the antitype. And first the significance of the *names* of the person and of the place.

ἐρμηνευόμενος] Interpreted
 as. Being when interpreted.
 For the word, see note on v.
 11, δυσερμήνευτος.

βασιλεύς δικαιοσύνης] The meaning of the name Melchizedek.

 $\Sigma a \lambda \eta \mu$] There is no apparent reason for doubting that this denotes the place or capital of Melchizedek's sovereignty. But its site is unsettled, some identifying Salem with Jerusalem on the strength of Psalm lxxvi. 2 (where however in the Septuagint $\epsilon \nu \epsilon i \rho \eta \nu \eta$ is the rendering of in Salem).

3. ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ] For all that the narrative in Genesis tells of him, Melchizedek might have been all these. The argument is from the mystery in which he is enveloped, leaving

$\Pi PO\Sigma EBPAIOY\Sigma.$

ήμερών μήτε ζωής τέλος έχων, ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὐς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.

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 $d\pi d\tau \omega \rho$ and $d\mu \eta$ - $\tau \omega \rho$ are classical; the former in the various senses of fatherless, discound, posthumous, of uncertain parentage; the latter in that of motherless, of mean birth, unmotherly.

άγενεαλόγητος] Without ancestry, one whose pedigree cannot be made out. See verse 6, γενεαλογούμενος. Also (as marking the exaggerated anxiety and fanciful ideas of Jews on the subject of pedigrees) I Tim. i. 4, μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις. Tit. iii. 9.

 $\mu\dot{\eta}\tau\epsilon...\mu\dot{\eta}\tau\epsilon$] Such as has neither...nor, &c. Almost equivalent to one that has neither &c. For this Hellenistic use (among several others) of $\mu\dot{\eta}$ with a participle, and passages illustrating it, see note on iv. 2, $\mu\dot{\eta}$ συνκεκερασμένους.

ήμερῶν...ζωής] No distinction seems to be intended : it is only a graceful variety of expression. Compare Psalm xxi. 4, ζωήν ήτήσατό σε, καὶ ἔδωκας αὐτῷ μακρότητα ἡμερῶν εἰς αἰῶνα κ.τ.λ. The stress lies upon $\dot{a}\rho\chi\dot{\eta}\nu$ and $\tau\dot{\epsilon}\lambda$ os.

αφωμοιωμένος] 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 without 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.

τῷ τ ἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ] The august title of the antitype marks the dignity of the typical person. See notes on iv. 14. vi. 6.

 $\mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \iota \epsilon \rho \epsilon \delta s$ 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.

είς τὸ διηνεκές] In perpetuity. The phrase occurs only in this Epistle. See x. 1, 12, 14. The word διηνεκής is classical, apparently from $φ_{\epsilon \rho \omega}$, ήνεγκα, in the sense of continu-

VII. 4, 5.

Θεωρεῖτε δὲ πηλίκος οὖτος, ῷ δεκάτην 4 ᾿Αβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων ὁ πατριάρχης. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν νίῶν Λευεὶ τὴν ἱερατείαν 5

vii. 4. Or & kai d.

ous (bearing right through). It has a curious but superficial resemblance to the Latin perpetuus.

4. $\Theta \epsilon \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau \epsilon \delta \epsilon$] After marking the typical appropriateness of the names of the man and his abode, and of the mystery lying upon his ancestry and parentage, his birth and death, the sacred writer proceeds to comment upon the two main features of the one recorded event of his life. And first the receiving of the $\delta \epsilon \kappa \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta$ of the spoils, with which however the other incident, the blessing pronounced by him upon Abraham, becomes intertwined in verse 6, &c.

 $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \epsilon \tilde{i} \tau \epsilon$] 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.

πηλίκος] Only here and in Gal. vi. 11, πηλίκοις γράμμασιν. Not in the Septuagint.

 $\tilde{\psi}$] The alternative reading adds kal before $\delta \epsilon \kappa \dot{a} \tau \eta \nu$, belonging however not to $\delta \epsilon \kappa \dot{a} \tau \eta \nu$ but to the whole phrase: to whom it is even the case that Abraham gave, &c.

 ϵ_{κ} τών ἀκροθινίων] Substituted here for ἀπὸ πάντων (verse

2). The change from $d\pi \dot{o}$ to $\epsilon\kappa$ 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 akpobina, but, a tenth part (of the whole spoil) chosen out of the choicest por-This is not mention of it. tioned in the record in Gen. xiv., but is a probable gloss upon it. The word appobilia, the uppermost parts of the heap (θ is or θ is not used elsewhere in the Septuagint or the New Testament.

ό πατριάρχης] The separation of the title from the name for the sake of emphasis is in the style of the Epistle which deals much in rhetorical trajection. Compare, for example, in xii. 11, the position of δικαιοσύνης. The word πατριάρχης, chief of a πατριά, 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 πατριαὶ are equivalent to the tribes, here the πατριαἰ is the nation of Abraham's descendants.

5. $\kappa a i o i \mu \epsilon v$ And whereas it is the duty of the Levitical priests to tithe their brethren, though sprung (like themselves)

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

λαμβάνοντες έντολην έχουσιν ἀποδεκατοῖν τόν λαὸν κατὰ τὸν νόμον, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς

from Abraham, here we see Abraham himself tithed, and that by an alien.

oi] Belongs to $\lambda a \mu \beta \dot{a} \nu o \nu \tau es.$ 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. 21-24, 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 sufficient accuracy to take tithe of the people if they tithe the tithe.

iepareiaν] Also in Luke i. 9. In verses 11, 12, 24 the form is iepωσύνη, which is the priestly office, as iepareia is the priestly service. In the Septuagint, iepωσύνη is found in 1 Chron. xxix. 22. Ecclus. xlv. 24. 1 Macc. ii. 54. iii. 49. vii. 9. But iepareia occurs about three times as often. Exod. xxix. 9, καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῖς iepareia ἐμοὶ εἰς τὸν aἰώνα. &c.

λαμβάνοντες] See v. 4, καὶ οὐχ ἐαντῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμήν. ἐντολήν] It might have been called an ἐξουσία, a right or privilege. But it was a precept too, one of the ἐντολαὶ of the νόμος. They lie under a command to carry out the law in this point. For ἐντολή, see verses 16, 18, in 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 $i \nu \tau o \lambda \eta$ is any and every precept of the law.

αποδεκατο $i\nu$] (1) The termination indicates a contraction of $-\delta\epsilon\iota\nu$, instead of the usual $-\delta\nu\nu$ which is properly the contraction of the Æolic termination $-\acute{o}\epsilon\nu$. (2) The compound verb $(a\pi o\delta\epsilon\kappa a\pi o\omega)$ is found also in Matt. xxiii. 23. Luke xi. 42. xviii. 12 (B $-\epsilon \dot{v}\omega$). Also in the Septuagint, in Gen. xxviii. 22, δεκάτην αποδεκατώσω αὐτά (I will 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, &c. (roùs δούλους of I Sam. viii, 16 forms no exception, slaves being regarded as chattels), whereas here it is an accusative of the person from whom the tithe is taken. (4) The $d\pi \dot{o}$ merely strengthens the simple $\delta \epsilon_{\kappa \alpha \tau \delta \omega}$. which in verses 6 and 9 has the same construction (an accusative of the *person*). (5) The classical form is δεκατεύω (with τιγα or τι).

κατὰ τὸν νόμον] See note on ἐντολήν above. They are under a precept to carry out the law in αὐτῶν, καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος ἀΑβραάμ· ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν 6 δεδεκάτωκεν ἀΑβραάμ, καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας εὐλόγηκεν. χωρὶς δὲ πάσης ἀντιλογίας 7 τὸ ἔλαττον ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος εὐλογεῖται. καὶ 8

this matter of the tithing of the people.

 $\tau o \hat{v} \tau' \tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$] Added to emphasize 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. γενεαλογούμενος] Pedigreed, traced in pedigree. See note on verse 3, αγενεαλόγητος.

 ξ $a v \tau \hat{w} v$] By derivation from them, the Levites, as the root and source of his birth.

δεδεκάτωκεν] Has tithed. The perfect is that Scripture perfect of which this Epistle has so many instances. The γέγραπται (so to say) quickens the dead, and gives to the præterite of the history the permanence of a perfect. Compare εὐλόγηκεν below, δεδεκάτωται in verse 9, and κεχρημάτισται in viii. 5. Also xi. 5, 17, 28. &c.

kaì $\tau \circ r$ The other particular is thus brought in, but the subject of the tithing is resumed in verse 8.

τὸν ἔχοντα] The possessor of. Him who owned the promises. Compare xi. 17, ὁ τὰς ἔπαγγελίας ἀναδεξάμενος.

εὐλόγηκεν Has blessed.

Another *Scripture* perfect. See above.

7. $\chi \omega \rho is \delta \epsilon$ 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 *aντιλογίa*, see note on vi. 16. For evloyeiv, on vi. 14. For κρείττων, on i. 4.

τὸ ἐλαττον] John ii. 10, πρώτον τὸν καλὸν οἶνον τίθησιν, καὶ ὅταν μεθυσθώσιν τὸν ἐλάσσω.

8. καὶ ὡδϵ μέν] Returning to the former topic, that of the δϵκάτη, the remark is made that, whereas under the Levitical system, the tithe is taken by dying men (see verse 23, διὰ τὸ θανάτψ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν), in the case of Melchizedek on the conώδε μέν δεκάτας αποθνήσκοντες άνθρωποι λαμ-9 βάνουσιν, έκει δε μαρτυρούμενος ότι ζη. και ώς έπος είπειν, δι' 'Αβραὰμ και Λευεις ό δεκάτας

trary it is taken by one of whom testimony is borne, by the mysterious silence of Scripture, this testimony and no other, that he lives. It is an application of the $\mu\eta\tau\epsilon$ $d\rho\chi\eta\nu$ $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$ $\mu\eta\tau\epsilon$ $\zeta \omega \hat{\eta}$ ς τέλος έχων of verse 3. The 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.

ώδε 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, cloiaow ...προσφέρονται. x. 1, 11. xiii. 11. &c. (2) For ώδε, see xiii. 14. It is frequent in the four Gospels and Revelation. It occurs twice in the Acts (ix. 14, 21), twice in St Paul (1 Cor. iv. 2, revised text. Col. iv. 9), once in St James (ii. 3, contrasted there, as here, with *exci*).

άποθνήσκοντες άνθρωποι] Successively dying human beings. The άνθρωποι applied to the Levitical priests does not of course mean to say that the historical Melchizedek was not $a\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma s$. But we see here (as in verse 3) a sort of blending of type and antitype which makes the emphasis on the $a\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma oi$ intelligible.

 $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon \hat{i}$] There. In the case or history of Melchizedek.

 $\mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho o \dot{\mu} \epsilon v o s]$ One attested or borne witness to. The construction with $\delta \tau \iota$ is varied into an infinitive in xi. 4, 5.

 $\delta_{rr} \langle \hat{\chi}_{\hat{I}} \rangle$ 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. καί] I may even go so far as to say, that Levi himself paid tithe to Melchizedek in the person of his ancestor Abraham.

δι 'Aβραάμ] Through or by means of Abraham.

 $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\kappa$ άτωται] Has been tithed. A Scripture perfect, as δεδεκάτωκεν (verse 6). There may λαμβάνων δεδεκάτωται· έτι γὰρ ἐν τῆ ὀσφύϊ 10 τοῦ πατρὸς ἦν ὅτε συνήντησεν αὐτῷ Μελχισεδέκ.

Ei μέν οὖν τελείωσις διὰ τῆς Λευειτικῆς ἱερω- 11 σύνης ἦν, ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς νενομοθέτηται,

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. έτι γάρ] '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 $\omega_s \, \epsilon \pi \sigma s \, \epsilon i \pi \epsilon i \nu$ of the sacred writer himself, and read in the statement rather a poetical idea than a philosophical argument.

συν ήντη σεν] See verse I, and note.

11. El $\mu i \nu$ $o v \nu$] If then there was perfecting through the Levitical priesthood—or, in other words, through the Levitical law, for the whole legislation turned upon the priesthood—what need was there still for a different priest to arise after the order of Melchizedek, &c. $\mu \epsilon \nu$] The implied antithetical clause with $\delta \epsilon$ does not actually follow, but is easily supplied. But there was no such $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \sigma \tau s$.

 $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon (\omega \sigma \iota s)$ A comparison of ix. 9, κατά συνείδησιν τελειώσαι τον λατρεύοντα, 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. 1, 14. But it may be safer to interpret the $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \omega \sigma \iota s$ in the wider sense of consummating, bringing to completeness or maturity, whether of things or persons; comparing the general expression of verse 19, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος, where the neuter ovder seems to contain something more than See ovoéva would have done. note on ii. 10, τελειώσαι.

ό λαός γάρ] This parenthetical clause seems to imply such a suppression as that indicated in note on ϵi μèν oùv above. I say 'priesthood,' but I might say 'law'—for it is on the priesthood that the whole legislation of Israel hangs and turns.

 $\epsilon \pi$ av $\tau \eta s$] On it as its turn-

τίς έτι χρεία κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ έτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν 12 ἀΑαρών λέγεσθαι; μετατιθεμένης γὰρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ νόμου μετάθεσις γίνεται.

ing-point. The reading $a\dot{v}r\hat{\eta}s$ for $a\dot{v}r\hat{\eta}$ is decisively attested. For this use of $\epsilon \pi i$ with a genitive, compare Matt. xviii. 16, $iva \epsilon \pi i \sigma \tau o \mu a \tau o s \delta v \sigma \mu a \rho \tau v \rho w \tilde{\eta}$ $\tau \rho \iota \hat{\omega} v \sigma \tau a \theta \hat{\eta} \pi \hat{a} v \hat{\rho} \eta \mu a.$ 2 Cor. xiii. 1. 1 Tim. v. 19.

νενομοθέτηται] Has been legislated, constituted by legislation. (Plato has the expression, ή νομοθετουμένη πόλις, the 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, διαθήκης...ήτις...νενομοθέτηται.

 τ is $\epsilon \tau i \chi \rho \epsilon i a$] What need still. What remaining necessity.

čτερον] The usual difference between $å\lambda\lambda$ os (one besides) and čτεροs (a different one). Gal. i. 6, 7, εἰs ἔτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ö οὐκ ἔστιν ǎλλo. Even where the two are intermixed, as in I Cor. xii. 8—10, and 2 Cor. xi. 4, the distinction is not necessarily obliterated.

aνίστασθα!] 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 15. Acts XX. 30, αναστήσονται ανδρες κ.τ.λ. καὶ oủ] Not μή, because the negative belongs not to the verb, but to the phrase κατὰ τὴν τάξιν `Aapών. And to be spoken of, described or designated, as not after the order of Aaron.

12. μετατιθεμένης γάρ] Απ important change-for, if the priesthood is being displaced. there is necessarily taking place also the displacement of a vóµos. 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 ($\delta \lambda a \delta s \gamma a \rho \kappa. \tau. \lambda.$) in verse 11. For μετατιθέναι, to change the place of, and so to remove, see xi. 5, μετετέθη... μετέθηκεν...μεταθέσεως. xii. 27. Acts vii. 16, μετετέθησαν είς Συχέμ και έτέθησαν κ.τ.λ. Hence in a less literal sense, Gal. i. 6, ούτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε κ.τ.λ. Jude 4. Here to change the place of is (practically) to displace.

vóµov] Without the article.

VII. 12-14.

έφ' ὃν γὰρ λέγεται ταῦτα Φυλῆς ἑτέρας μετ- 13 έσχηκεν, ἀφ' ἦς οὐδεὶς προσέσχηκεν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ· πρόδηλον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν 14

A law, any law, the law whatever it be, which ordains the priesthood. The difference is not great here between νόμος and ό νόμος, but the form of expression generalizes the definite Levitical law into any law to which a priesthood is attached.

ξφ' ὑν γάρ] But there
 such a displacement of the
 Levitical priesthood—for, &c.

ϵφ' δν] With respect to
whom. The idea is that of the
direction of thought towards.
Mark ix. 12, γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν
υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κ.τ.λ.

λέγεται] A more lively form of γέγραπται. As though the prophecy were in utterance now.

 $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a$] The things said in Psalm cx. 4, which is the text of this subsection of the Epistle.

φυλής έτέρας] A different tribe. Judah, not Levi.

μετέσχηκεν] Has partaken of. Is partaker (a member) of. A striking suggestion of the identity of Christ in heaven with Christ upon earth. Eph. iv. 10, δ καταβάς αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ δ ἀναβάς.

 $a \dot{\phi} \dot{\eta} s$] Starting (proceeding, issuing) from which tribe.

 $\pi \rho o \sigma (\sigma \chi \eta \kappa e v)$ Has (up to this time) given heed to, attended to, given attendance at, the altar.

The nearest approach to this use of προσέχειν is in 1 Tim. iv. 13, πρόσεχε τŷ ἀναγνώσει κ.τ.λ. and Acts xx. 28, προσέχετε... παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίψ...ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κ.τ.λ. For an equivalent phrase, compare 1 Cor. ix. 13, οἱ τῷ θυσιαστηρίψ παρεδρεύοντες.

θυσιαστηρίω] Exod. xxvii. 1, &c. xxxviii. 1, &c. xl. 6, 29. The altar of burnt-offering is the one intended when no special indication is given of the altar of incense. The latter (Exod. xxx. 1, &c.) is the θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσούν, or του θυμιάματος, in contrast with το χαλκοῦν, or τοῦ όλοκαυτώματος. 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. 38, 39); (3) the being ever at hand to offer the sacrifices of rich and poor, of the leper, the Nazarite, &c.

14. $\pi\rho\delta\eta\lambda\sigma\nu\gamma\delta\rho$] The Hebrew Christian can be appealed to as a believer alike in the prophecies about the Messiah and in their fulfilment in Jesus Christ. The compound $\pi\rho\delta\eta\lambda$ os, manifest forth, plain to view, occurs (in the New δ Κύριος ήμῶν, εἰς ἡν φυλὴν περὶ ἱερέων οὐδὲν
 15 Μωῦσῆς ἐλάλησεν. καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι κατά δηλόν ἐστιν, εἰ κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδὲκ

Testament) only here and in 1 Tim. v. 24, 25, at $\dot{a}\mu a\rho\tau i a\iota$ $\pi\rho \delta\delta\eta\lambda o\iota...\tau \dot{a}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma a$ $\tau \dot{a}$ $\kappa a\lambda \dot{a}$ $\pi\rho \dot{\epsilon}\delta\eta\lambda a$. In the Septuagint, only in Jud. viii. 29. 2 Macc. iii. 17. xiv. 39.

avat έταλκεν] Has sprung. See note on verse 13, $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ σγηκεν. The verb ανατέλλειν in the New Testament is always (except Luke xii. 54, νεφέλην ανατέλλουσαν από δυσμών) used of light. Matt. v. 45, τον ήλιον aυτοῦ ἀνατέλλει. xiii. 6. Mark iv. 6. xvi. 2. James i. 11. 2 Pet. i. 19. In the Septuagint it is frequent in the same sense (as, for example, Num. xxiv. 17, ανατελεί αστρον έξ Ίακώβ. Isai. lx. 1, ή δόξα Κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνατέταλκεν. Mal. iv. 2, ανατελεί υμιν...ηλιος δικαιοσύνης), but is equally often used in the sense of vegetation. Gen. xix. 25, 7à ανατέλλοντα έκ της γης. Isai. xliv. 4, ανατελούσιν ώσει χόρτος araμέσον ύδατος. Ezek. xvii. 6, ανέτειλε και έγένετο είς αμπελον κ.τ.λ. Zech. vi. 12, ίδου ανήρ, άνατολή δνομα αύτῷ, καὶ ὑποκάτωθεν αυτού ανατελεί κ.τ.λ. There can be no doubt that the latter is the figure here, where there is no hint of a startling metaphor.

ο Κύριος ήμων] Without addition, as in 2 Tim. i. 8, το μαρτύριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. 2 Pet. iii. 15, τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν.

εἰς ἡν] As to, with regard to, which. Acts ii. 25, Δαυελδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν. Eph. v. 32, ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστόν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. I Pet. i. II, εἰς τίνα ἡ ποῖον καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῦς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ.

περì iερέων] About priests. More graphic than the received reading περì iερωσύνης.

15. Kai $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \delta \tau \epsilon \rho \circ v \epsilon \tau l$ And this insufficiency and consequent supersession of the Levitical priesthood is still more conclusively proved by the particular designation of the predicted priest (in Psalm ex. 4) as a priest after the likeness of Melchizedek.

περισσότερον] vi. 17. And see note on ii. 1, περισσοτέρως.

κατάδηλον] Another compound of δήλος, like πρόδηλος above. Literally, downright evident. Both compounds are classical. But κατάδηλος is not found elsewhere in the Septuagint or the New Testament.

ϵἰ] If, as is the case. Matt.
vii. 11, ϵἰ οὖν ὑμϵῖς...οἴδατϵ κ.τ.λ.
John vii. 23, ϵἰ περιτομήν λαμβάνει [δ] ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαββάτῷ
κ.τ.λ. 1 Cor. xv. 12, ϵἰ δὲ Χριστος κηρύσσεται ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγή-

ἀνίσταται ἱερεὺς ἕτερος, ὃς οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἐντο- 16 λῆς σαρκίνης γέγονεν ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου. μαρτυρεῖται γὰρ ὅτι Σὺ ἱερεὺς 17

γερται κ.τ.λ. Philem. 17, εἰ οὖν με ἔχεις κοινωνόν κ.τ.λ. See the first note on this verse.

καθ' δμοιότητα] See iv. 15, and note.

avíorarai] See note on verse

16. 5 Who, as such—as being a priest after Melchizedek's likeness—must possess what we have seen to be a characteristic of Melchizedek, a $\zeta w \eta$ without $a \rho \chi \eta$ or $\tau \epsilon \lambda os$ (in the sense explained above). See verses 3 and 8, $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho o \dot{\mu} \epsilon v os$ $\delta \tau i \dot{\zeta} \eta$, and notes.

οὐ κατὰ νόμον] Not in accordance with a νόμος of (characterized by, having for its characteristic) an ἐντολὴ σαρκίνη, but in accordance with a δύναμις of (belonging to, inseparable from) a ζωὴ ἀκατάλυτος.

νόμον] Without the article. See note on verse 12, νόμου.

 $\epsilon \nu \tau o \lambda \hat{\eta} s$] Such as that which prescribed the tribe and family of the Mosaic priest. See note on verse 5, $\epsilon \nu \tau o \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu$.

 $\sigma a \rho \kappa i r \eta s$] The received reading here is $\sigma a \rho \kappa i \kappa \eta s$, but there can be no doubt as to the authority and advantage of the change. The distinction between $\sigma a \rho \kappa i \kappa \sigma s$ is that between material (carneus, of flesh) and resemblance (carnalis, flesh-like). The $\epsilon \tau \tau \sigma \lambda \eta$ was $\sigma a \rho \kappa i \tau \eta$, because it dealt with $\sigma a \rho \xi$, not with $\pi \nu \epsilon \partial \mu a$. It was not $\sigma a \rho \kappa i \kappa \eta'$, because it was a divine $\epsilon \nu \tau \sigma \lambda \eta$ while it lasted, and gave no encouragement to the working of the $\sigma a \rho \xi$ for evil.

 $\gamma \epsilon \gamma o \nu \epsilon \nu$] Has become such (ispecies). The perfect tense, because the priesthood is permanent.

άλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν] Christ's priesthood is not one of νόμος but of δύναμις. 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, $X\rho_{I}$ στὸς ἐγερθεἰς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκε...ὅ δὲ ζῆ, ζῆ τῷ Θεῷ.

άκαταλύτου] Only here. For καταλύειν, the opposite of οἰκοδομεἶν, see Matt. xxvi. 61, δύναμαι καταλῦσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν οἰκοδομῆσαι. 2 Cor. v. 1, ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους καταλυθῆ, οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἔχομεν, οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον κ.τ.λ. Gal. ii. 18, εἰ γὰρ ἅ κατέλυσα, ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ κ.τ.λ.

17. μαρτυρείται γάρ] In K 2 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ. 18 ἀθέτησις μὲν γὰρ γίνεται προαγούσης ἐντολῆς 19 διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές, οὐδὲν γὰρ

proof of the $\zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s$ ἀκαταλύτου above, the $\epsilon i s$ τον αίωνα of the prediction is emphatically repeated, as well as the κατὰ τὴν τ. M. which has been shown (verses 8 and 16) to involve the same idea of perpetuity.

μαρτυρείται] He (the ἰερεὺς ἐτερος) is attested, borne witness to as follows. For the construction, see verse 8. Also xi. 2, 4, 5, 39. Rom. iii. 21. 1 Tim. v. 10. 18. aθ. μèν γάρ] Reason for the substitution of a new priesthood, as asserted above. The μèν is answered by ἐπεισαγωγή δè below.

άθέτησις] See also ix. 26, εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας. For ἀθετεῖν (from ἄθετος, placeless), to set aside, see x. 28. Also Mark vi. 26, οὐκ ἦθέλησεν ἀθετῆσαι αὐτήν. vii. 9, ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολήν. Luke vii. 30. x. 16. John xii. 48. Gal. ii. 21, οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ. iii. 15, διαθήκην οὐδεἰς ἀθετεῖ. I Thess. iv. 8. I Tim. v. 12. Jude 8.

 γ *iveral*] Comes to pass, as implied in the prophecy of Psalm ex. 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.

 π ροαγούσης] Preceding. The

verb $\pi \rho o \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \nu$ sometimes has a case, as in Matt. ii. 9, $\dot{\sigma} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta \rho \ldots$. $\pi \rho o \eta \gamma \epsilon \nu$ a $\dot{\sigma} \tau \sigma \dot{\sigma} s$. xiv. 22. xxi. 9, 31. xxvi. 32. xxviii. 7. Mark x. 32. 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, $\pi \hat{\alpha} \hat{s} \circ \pi \rho o \hat{\alpha} - \gamma \omega \nu$ (who goes forward).

 $i = i \sqrt{3} \sqrt{3}$ The precept spoken of is primarily, as in verse 16, that which prescribed the qualifications of the Levitical priest.

 $d\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\epsilon$ s] Compare Gal. iv. 9, τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεία. The weakness of the Levitical ἐντολὴ of the priesthood was shown in its inability κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειώσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα (ix. 9) by applying to the conscience of sins (x. 2) a really availing propitation. Rom. viii. 3, τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου.

 $\dot{a}\nu\omega\phi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon_{s}$] Tit. iii. 9, $\dot{a}\nu\omega$ φελεΐς καὶ μάταιοι. The uselessness (unhelpfulness) of the priesthood was proved by its inability to aid men in that $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\ell\zeta\epsilon_{i}\nu$ τŵ Θεŵ which is their one want.

19. οὐδὲν γάρ] For the law perfected nothing. The ἐντολή

VII. 18—20.

ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος, ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, δι' ἦς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ Θεῷ. καὶ καθ' 20 ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας—οἱ μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς

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

čτελείωσεν] The law brought nothing to maturity (see note on v. 14, τελείων). It was a system of στοιχεία suitable to the νήπιος, dealing with types and shadows, not with substance and reality.

ëπεισαγωγὴ δε] Answering to ἀθέτησις μὲν above. The word is quite classical, but it occurs only here in the New Testament and the Septuagint. From ἐπεισάγειν, 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.

κρείττονος έλπίδος] A hope superior (in clearness, compass, and satisfaction) to that which the Law had to offer in its types and ceremonies.

δί ης] By means of which hope, of forgiveness and absolution revealed in Christ, we draw nigh to God. James iv. 8, έγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐγγιεῖ ὑμῦν. The idea is that of Rom. v. 2, δι' οῦ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχή-

Eph. ii. 18, δι' αὐτοῦ καμεν. έχομεν την προσαγωγήν... έν ένι πνεύματι πρός τόν Πατέρα. iii. In the Old Testament we τ2. have the limitation and prohibition of this drawing nigh, as in Exod. xix. 21, διαμάρτυραι τῷ λαῷ μήποτε ἐγγίσωσι πρὸς τὸν Θεόν κατανοήσαι και πέση (Α, πέσωσιν B) έξ αὐτῶν πληθος. xxiv. 2, έγγιεί Μωυσής μόνος προς τον Θεόν, αυτοί δε ούκ εγγιοῦσιν. Something of the universal Christian priesthood is seen in the text, as in x. 10-22. Compare the characteristic of priesthood in Exod. xix. 22, of ίερεις οι έγγίζοντες Κυρίω τῷ Θεώ. Now all are priests: I Pet. ii. 5, 9.

20. καὶ καθ ὅσον] A further point of superiority of the Melchizedek priest over the Levitical. The solemn ὅρκωμοσία of Psalm cx. 4 gives a unique dignity not only to the person of the Melchizedek Priest, but to the διαθήκη of which he is έγγυος. The sentence is broken by the parenthesis, οἱ μèν γàρ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. Either γίνεται (from verse 18) or γέγονεν ἰερὲνs may be mentally supplied.

όρκωμοσίas] In the New Testament the word is found only in this passage. In the 21 όρκωμοσίας εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες, ὁ δὲ μετὰ ὅρκωμοσίας διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς αὐτόν, "Ωμοσεν Κύριος, καὶ οὐ μεταμεληθήσεται· σὺ ἱερεὺς
 22 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα—κατὰ τοσοῦτο καὶ κρείττονος

Septuagint it occurs in Ezek. xvii. 18, 19, καὶ ἠτίμασεν (A, ἠτίμωσεν B) ὅρκωμοσίαν τοῦ παραβῆναι διαθήκην κ.τ.λ. 1 Esdr. viii. 90 (93 B), γινέσθω ἡμῖν ὅρκωμοσία προς τον Κύριον.

oi $\mu \epsilon v$ The Levitical priests.

εἰσὶν ἱερ. γεγονότες] Āre having become priests—are priests having become so—without any swearing of an oath.

21. ο δέ] The Melchizedek Priest. Understand from above, έστιν ίερεὺς γεγονώς.

διά] Through. Not to be tied to the word δρκωμοσίας, but rather dependent upon the whole clause έστιν ίερεὺς γεγονώς μ . δ. Having become so (with this peculiar feature of dignity) by means of Him who so addresses Him.

τοῦ λέγοντος] The present tense here carries something of the same thought (of the permanence and perpetuity of Scripture) which has been noticed above in the perfects δεδεκάτωκεν, εὐλόγηκεν, &c. Not εἰπόντος (said) but λέγοντος (says, is saying).

μεταμεληθήσεται] The future and aorist of μεταμέλεσθαι are passive in form only. See Matt. XXI. 29, 32, ^τστερον δε μεταμεληθείς απηλθεν κ.τ.λ. xxvii. 3. And so in the Septuagint, 1 Sam. xv. 35, καὶ Κύριος μετεμελήθη ότι κ.τ.λ. I Chron. xxi. 15. Psalm cvi. 45. Jer. xx. 16. Ezek. xiv. 22, και μεταμεληθήσεσθε κ.τ.λ. In 2 Cor. vii. 8 we have $\mu\epsilon\tau a\mu\epsilon\lambda o\mu a\iota$ and $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ μελόμην. Zech. xi. 5, και ου The impersonal μετεμέλοντο. μεταμέλει is found in Exod. xiii. 17, μήποτε μεταμελήση τῷ λαῷ ίδόντι πόλεμον. The distinction between $\mu\epsilon\tau$ avo ϵ iv (to have an after-mind, to repent) and µera- $\mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (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 μετανοείν, and to repent oneself for μεταμέλεσθαι.

 ϵ is $\tau \delta \nu$ alia ν a] Here the quotation ends according to the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts and the Vulgate.

22. κατὰ τοσοῦτο] Belongs to κρείττονος. In the same degree is the διαθήκη of which Jesus has become ἔγγυος superior to the διαθήκη which preceded it. The κατὰ τοσοῦτο points back to the καθ ὄσον, and says, In the same degree in which it is

134

διαθήκης γέγονεν έγγυος Ίησοῦς. καὶ οἱ μὲν 23 πλείονές εἰσιν γεγονότες ἱερεῖς διὰ τὸ θανάτω

more dignified to be made priest with than without a divine δρκωμοσία.

διαθήκης From διατιθέναι (disponere, to set or place in distribution, to arrange) διαθήκη 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. 16, &c., where the preceding θανάτου and κληρονομίαs prepare us for the argument from $\delta_{i\alpha}\theta_{\eta\kappa\eta}$ as testament, a sense naturally occurring to a Greek writer. Examples of covenant in all connexions are frequent in the Septuagint. Between individuals (as 1 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. 18. Isai. lix. 21) or of special devotion on man's part (as 2 Chron. xv. 12. Jer. 1. 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 διαθήκη (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.

έγγνος] The word (used in this sense of έγγυητής, a surety, one who gives security for, by Xenophon and Aristotle) occurs only here in the Septuagint or the New Testament. Elsewhere we have μεσίτης in the same connexion with διαθήκη (viii. 6. ix. 15. xii. 24). But έγγυος adds the further thought of one who makes himself responsible for the validity and effectuation of the διαθήκη.

23. val of $\mu(v)$ 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.

πλείονες] Phural, more than one. Or somewhat many. This use of πλείων, without a genitive or η following, seems to be peculiar (in the New Testament) to St Luke. Luke xi. 53. Acts xiii. 31, $\epsilon n i \eta μ \epsilon \rho a π λ \epsilon i ο v σ ν.$ 10. xxiv. 17, $\delta i \epsilon r \delta v π λ \epsilon i \delta v σ ν.$ xxv. 14. xxvii. 20. xxviii. 23, $\eta \lambda \theta o v \pi \rho \delta s a \delta r \delta v \pi \lambda \epsilon i \delta v e s.$ In this use it seems nearly equiva24 κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν · ό δὲ διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν
εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην.
25 ὅθεν καὶ σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελὲς δύναται τοὺς

lent to $\pi \circ \lambda \wedge \circ$, just as of $\pi \lambda \epsilon \circ \circ \epsilon$ (1 Cor. ix. 19. 2 Cor. ii. 6. iv. 15. ix. 2. Phil. i. 14) to of $\pi \circ \lambda \wedge \circ \circ$.

 $\pi\lambda$. elow yey. lepcîs] 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).

θανάτω] Dative of the instrument. See vi. 17, ὄρκω. Eph. i. 13, τῷ πνεύματι. Phil. iii. 3, πνεύματι Θεοῦ. 1 Pet. i. 18, οὐ φθαρτοῦς κ.τ.λ.

κωλύεσθαι] The passive of κωλύειν is found only (besides) in Acts xvi. 6, κωλυθέντες...λαλησαι. Rom. i. 13.

παραμένειν] In I Cor. xvi. 6 (where, however, some read καταμενώ) with προς ύμας. In Phil. i. 25 with πασιν ύμιν. Here, and in James i. 25, with no preposition or case following. To remain along, where one is, in life or position.

24. δδί] The Priest of the prophecy. The Melchizedek Priest.

 ϵ is $\tau \circ \nu$ alwa] Quoted from the prophecy of Psalm cx. 4.

απαράβατον έχει τ. i.] Has the (or His) priesthood as one not to be invaded. Like αβατος, έπιβατός, ύπερβατός, &c., παραβατός is passive, not active, in sense, and $\dot{a}\pi a\rho \dot{a}\beta a \tau os$ 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. $\delta\theta\epsilon v$] See note on ii. 17. As the result of all which, specially of the last thought.

σω'(ειν] See notes on i. 14, σωτηρίαν, and v. 7, σω'(ειν.

έἰς τὸ παντελές] Compare Luke xiii. 11, μὴ δυναμένη ἀνακύψαι εἰς τὸ παντελές (where it may belong either to ἀνακύψαι, unable completely to straighten herself; or to μὴ δυναμένη, completely unable, &c.). From παντελής, complete, entire, εἰς τὸ π. is unto (so as to result in) that which is complete, and is nearly equivalent to παντελῶς, for which see 2 Macc. iii. 12. &c.

δύναται] As in ii. 18. Only there the power is ascribed to sympathy, here to immortality.

προσερχομένους] See note on iv. 16, προσερχώμεθα.

δι αὐτοῦ] Through Him as their Priest. See ii. 17. iv. 14--16.

έντυγχάνειν] From the primary sense of the word, to light upon, to fall in with, comes that of applying to, making entreaty to; whether as man to man προσερχομένους δι αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ, πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν.

Τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεύς, 26 ὅσιος, ἄκακος, ἀμίαντος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν

vii. 26. Or omit the former kal.

(Acts xxv. 24, $\pi\epsilon\rho$) où a $\pi a\nu$ rò $\pi\lambda\eta\thetaos \tau a\nu$ louda($\omega\nu\epsilon\nu\epsilon r v_{\chi} o\nu \mu o\iota$), or as man to God (Rom. xi. 2, $\omega s \epsilon \nu \tau v_{\chi} \alpha \nu \epsilon \iota$ $\tau \phi \Theta \epsilon \omega$ $\kappa a \tau a$ $\tau où$ 'lopa $\eta\lambda$), or as the Holy Spirit (Rom. viii. 27) or Christ to God, here, and in Rom. viii. 34, X $\rho \iota \sigma$ - $\tau \circ s \circ a \pi o \theta a \nu \omega \nu$, $\mu a \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \rho$ $\theta \epsilon i s... \delta s \kappa a i \epsilon \nu \tau v_{\chi} \alpha \nu \epsilon \iota \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \eta \mu \omega \nu$. The idea of *intercession* lies not in the word, but in the $\dot{\nu} \pi \epsilon \rho$ following or sometimes compounded with it (Rom. viii. 26, $\dot{\nu} \pi \epsilon \rho$ - $\epsilon \nu \tau v_{\chi} \alpha' \nu \epsilon \iota$).

26. To $ioi ros \gamma \alpha \rho$] 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.

καὶ ἔπρεπεν] The καὶ is doubtful as a reading. If inserted, it will be also. Besides being our Priest, He also suited our need. For πρέπειν, here (alone in the New Testament) with a personal nominative, see note on ii. 10. Compare Psalm lxv. I, σοὶ πρέπει ὕμνος, ὁ Θεός, ἐν Σιών. xxxiii. I, τοῖς εὐθέσι πρέπει ἡ aἶνεσις. xciii. 5.

όσιος] Rarely used in the New Testament. Only eight times, of which three are quotations from the Septuagint. Acts ii. 27 and xiii. 5 (from Psalm xvi. 10), ού δώσεις τον δσιόν σου ίδειν διαφθοράν. xiii. 34 (from Isai. lv. 3), τὰ ὅσια Δαυείδ τὰ πιστά. I Tim. ii. 8, επαίροντας οσίους χείρας. Tit. i. 8, σώφρονα, δίκαιον, δσιον, έγκρατη. Rev. xv. 4, ori μόνος orios. xvi. 5, δίκαιος ci...ooios. In the Septuagint it is frequent, occurring (with its cognate forms oriow and orio- $\tau\eta$ s) more than 50 times, of which half are in the Psalms. Its predominant sense is holy or saintly in character, whereas aγιos is rather holy or sacred by consecration. The third word of the group, is found but in two places of the New Testament (1 Cor. ix. 13. 2 Tim. iii. 15), and in the Septuagint (as an adjective) only in Josh. vi. 8 (έπτα σάλπιγγας ίεράς) and four times in 2 Macc. It may be suggested that Jows alone speaks of personal holiness, and that, while both ayios and ispos deal with consecration, icoos is applied by preference to things, ayios either to things or persons.

ắκακος] Önly used once besides in the New Testament. Rom. xvi. 18, ἐξαπατῶσιν τὰς άμαρτωλῶν, καὶ ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενό-27 μενος· ὃς οὐκ ἔχει καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνάγκην, ὥσπερ

καρδίας τών ακάκων. It is more frequent in the Septuagint, especially in Proverbs, where in ii. 21 (A) anakou is placed in parallelism with χρηστοί, in xiii. 6 (A) it is made the opposite of aσεβείς, while in Psalm xxv. 21 it is associated with $\epsilon \vartheta \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} s$. By usage it is not so much innocent in the sense of freedom from evil as in that of freedom from guile, simple; sometimes even to a fault, as in Prov. xiv. 15, arakos πιστεύει παντί λόγω. Here guileless; akin to the thought of I Pet. ii. 22, οὐδὲ εὖρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. Compare Jer. xi. 19, έγω δε ώς αρνίον ακακον αγόμενον τοῦ θύεσθαι κ.τ.λ.

άμίαντος] xiii. 4. James i. 27, θρησκεία καθαρά καὶ ἀμίαντος. 1 Pet. i. 4, εἰς κληρονομίαν ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον. In the Septuagint, Wisd. iii. 13. iv. 2. viii. 20. 2 Macc. xiv. 36.

κεχωρ. ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμ.] This must be interpreted consistently with ii. 17 and iv. 15. The separateness spoken of might be understood as either from contaminating influences (the χωρὶs ἁμαρτίας of iv. 15) or from the reach of blasphemy or violence (the ἀντιλογία 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. 10, iva $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\sigma\eta$ $\tau \dot{a} \pi \dot{a} \nu \tau a$). The word $\chi \omega \rho (\zeta \epsilon \nu i s)$ 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.

ύψηλότερος τῶν σύρ.] See note on iv. 14. The comparative ύψηλότερος seems to be found only here and in Dan. viii. 3. For the sense, compare Eph. iv. 10, δ ἀναβὰς ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν.

γενόμενος] See Eph. i. 20, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. Phil. ii. 9, διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν κ.τ.λ.

27. $\kappa a\theta' \dot{\eta}\mu\dot{\epsilon}\rho a\nu$] The phrase $\kappa a\tau' \dot{\epsilon}\nu \iota a \upsilon \tau \delta\nu$ would have more exactly suited the $\delta\sigma \pi\epsilon\rho$ of $d\rho\chi\iota\epsilon \rho\epsilon\hat{\iota}s$ following. For the Levitical atonement for priests and people was made only once a year. See ix. 7, 25, $\delta\pi a\xi$ $\tau o\tilde{\nu}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\iota a \upsilon \tau o\tilde{\nu}$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. x. 1, 2. But the principle is the same. A repeated sacrifice of propitiation, if needed at all, is needed perpetually. For the phrase $d\nu a\gamma$ - οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, πρότερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίας ἀναφέρειν, ἔπειτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας. ὁ 28 νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς ἔχον-

vii. 27. Οτ προσενέγκας.

κην ἔχειν, see Luke xiv. 18. 1 Cor. vii. 37. Jude 3.

of $d\rho\chi(\epsilon\rho\epsilon \hat{s})$ The successive high-priests of the order of Aaron. For the reference is to the ceremonics of the day of Atonement in which $\mu \phi ros$ o $d\rho\chi(\epsilon\rho\epsilon)s$ (ix. 7) officiated.

πρότερον...έπειτα] Study Lev. xvi., distinguishing the sinoffering of the bullock (verses 11—14), from the sin-offering of the goat (verses 15, 16).

 $\theta v \sigma i as$] Plural, to suit the idea of the *repeated* offering.

aνaφ ερειν For the uses of προσφέρειν and aνaφ ερειν, see note on v. 1, προσφέρη.

τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν] What is τοῦτο here? Does it include ύπερ των ιδίων as well as των του $\lambda ao\hat{v}$? 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 isolated from all others, might seem to be capable of an Arian or Socinian meaning. But confront it with the tenor of Scripture, and all is consistency. It

is so here.

έφάπαξ] An emphasized απαξ. Sometimes (1) at once, as I Cor. xv. 6, πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ. More often (2) once for all, as in ix. 12, εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ẵγια. x. 10. Rom. vi. 10, τŷ ἁμαρτία ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ. Not used in the Septuagint.

έαυτόν] ix. 14, 25, έαυτόν προσήνεγκεν...προσφέρη έαυτόν. Gal. i. 4, τοῦ δόντος έαυτὸν περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. ii. 20, τοῦ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. Eph. v. 2, 25. 1 Tim. ii. 6, ὅ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. Tit. ii. 14. Elsewhere τὴν ψυχήν, Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45. Or τὴν σάρκα, John vi. 51. Or τὸ σῶμα, Heb. x. 10.

 $d \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \alpha s$] The reading of the great manuscripts varies between $d \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \alpha s$ and $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \prime \epsilon \gamma \gamma \kappa \alpha s$. See again note on v. 1, $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \eta$.

28. aνθρώπουs] See verse 8, aποθνήσκοντες ανθρωποι. Here aνθρώπουs alone bears the stress. Human beings. See Gal. i. 10. There is no denial here of the true humanity of Christ, which is so prominent in this Epistle (compare 1 Tim. ii. 5, είς καὶ μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀν-

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

τας ἀσθένειαν, ὁ λόγος δὲ τῆς ὁρκωμοσίας τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον. VIII. 1 Κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, τοιοῦτον

 $\theta \rho \omega \pi \sigma s X \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta s' I \eta \sigma \sigma \hat{v} s)$, but only the assertion of the true divinity. The implied thought is, *mere* human beings.

καθίστησιν] See note on v. 1, καθίσταται.

έχοντας] Having (as all mere men have). See v. 2. Christ Himself was, but is not, compassed with infirmity. See 2 Cor. xiii. 4, καὶ γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ ζŷ ἐκ δυνάμεως Θεοῦ.

ο λόγος δέ] But the word of (belonging, attached, or appended, to) the δρκωμοσία of which we are speaking. The λόγος is the divine declaration of Psalm cx. 4, Σừ ἰερεὺς εἰς τὸν alŵνa κ.τ.λ. And the δρκωμοσία is the ὅμοσεν κύριος κ.τ.λ. which prefaces and sanctions that declaration.

τη̂ς μετὰ τ. ν.] Which is later in time than, and comes to supersede, the νόμος of which the rule of the Aaronic priesthood was one ἐντολή. The argument based upon this μετὰ is thus the converse of that drawn from another μετὰ in Gal. iii. 17. There the νόμος which was later in time cannot cancel the διαθήκη of the earlier ἐπαγγελία. It was not meant to do so. It was a parenthetical institution, leaving the original promise untouched. But the $\delta\rho\kappa\omega\mu\sigma\sigma'a$ of the Melchizedek priesthood was meant, by the Author of both, to cancel the $\epsilon\nu\tau\sigma\lambda\eta$ of the Aaronic priesthood, and with it the $\nu\delta\mu\sigma$ s which hung upon it.

viór] Understand καθίστησιν. The prophecy of Psalm cx. 4 is itself the introducer and establisher of the new priesthood. For the absence of the article with viór, laying the stress upon the quality, One who is Son (not ἄνθρωπος as His definition), see notes on i. 2 and v. 8.

τετελειωμένον] The general idea of consummated is here defined by the context into the more special one of consecrated. See note on ii. 10, τελειώσα.

VIII. Ι. Κεφάλαιονδέ] 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 $(\epsilon \pi i)$ our statement [we say this __namely, that] we have, &c. Such an accusa-

140

VIII. 1, 2.

έχομεν ἀρχιερέα δε ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾶ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, τῶν ἀγίων 2

tive is generally placed at the end, not the beginning, of the See Rom. xii. I, The sentence. λογικήν λατρείαν ύμων. I Tim. ii. 6, τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ίδίοις. The seeming exceptions, in Rom. viii. 3 (το γάρ αδύνατον τοῦ νόμου) and 2 Cor. vi. 13 (την δε αυτην αντιμισθίαν), admit of a different explanation (see note on Rom. viii. 3). The passage before us may, however, give support to the like interpretation in those places also.

κεφάλαιον] This substantive (properly the neuter of an adjective) has two principal uses: (1) a capital, chief, or crowning particular, a main point; (2) a sum (of money, as Acts xxii. 28; principal, distinguished 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 arguments). Here the $\epsilon \pi i$ following (instead of $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$) decides in favour of the former. and makes the sense this: As acapital upon the things which are being said—as a thought (or fact) forming the headstone of the argument—we add this; namely, that our High 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 introduced as the completion or crown of the former, that of the nature of the priesthood.

 $\epsilon \pi i$ Upon, as their crown or completion. See above.

τοῖς λεγομένοις] The things which are being said. The discussion is still going on. See Luke xviii. 34, οὖκ ἐγίνωσκον τὰ λεγόμενα. Acts viii. 6, προσεῖχον δὲ οἱ ὅχλοι τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου.

τοιοῦτον] Not such as we have said, adding os erabioev $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. as a merely subordinate particular. But τοιούτον δς ἐκάθισεν, such as took His seat. The *description* of Him is this -that He ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ. For τοιοῦτοs answered by δs (as often in classical Greek) instead of olos (I Cor. xv. 48) or $\delta \pi o \hat{l} o \hat{l} o \hat{l}$ (Acts xxvi. 29), see 1 Cor. v. 1, кай τοιαύτη π. ήτις κ.τ.λ. Compare Philem. 9, τοιοῦτος ὤν ὡς Παῦλος πρεσβύτης κ.τ.λ.

èν δεξιά] On the right hand of the throne of majesty, in the heavens. See notes on i. 3, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιά τῆς μεγαλωσύνης, and ἐν ὑψηλοῖς. The only difference between the two passages lies in the insertion here of τοῦ θρόνου before τῆς μεγαλωσύνης, which shows all the more clearly that the ἐν clause is separate, and goes back to ἐκάθυσεν.

2. των άγίων Called once

λειτουργός και της

(in ix. 3) by its full title, $a_{\gamma ia}$ $a_{\gamma i \omega \nu}$, but elsewhere (ix. 8, 12, 25. x. 19. xiii. 11) simply $\tau a a_{\gamma ia}$. It is the holy of holies, the inner chamber of the tabernacle. Here the antitype of the material holy of holies; the $a v \tau \delta s$ $\delta o v p a \nu \delta s$ of ix. 24.

τών άγίων...και τής σκηνής] Are we to distinguish here between the antitypal $\delta \gamma \mu a$ and the antitypal $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta$, 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 orny as a whole? The limitation of $\sigma \kappa \eta v \eta$ to the outer chamber seems to find support in Lev. xvi. 16, Kai έξιλάσεται το άγιον...και ουτω ποιήσει τη σκηνή κ.τ.λ.

λειτουργός] See note on i. 7, λειτουργούς.

 $\sigma \kappa \eta v \eta s$] 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 $\sigma \kappa \eta v \eta$ occurs but 10 times (only as often as in this one Epistle), and only once (Acts vii. 44) in the special sense of the Levitical tabernacle. Akin perhaps to $\sigma \kappa i a$ and $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \pi \eta$, it passes from the general idea of (1) a booth of leafy boughs (Lev. xxiii. 42, and the $\sigma \kappa \eta v$ $\pi\eta\gamma i$ 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, &c.) or (6) its heavenly antitype (as here, and Rev. xiii. 6. xv. 5. xxi. 3).

 $d\lambda\eta\theta u\eta$ s] Real, as distinguished from apparent. Here antitypical as opposed to typical. Compare Luke xvi. 11. John i. 9, to \$\phi\$ to a \ny 0.000. iv. 23, 37, οι άληθινοι προσκυνηται... δ λόγος έστιν αληθινός (real, as opposed to earthly *applications* of the saying). vi. 32, tòv ắptov...tòv $d\lambda\eta\theta$ vóv (real, as opposed to vii. 28, έστιν άληθιmaterial). νὸς ὁ πέμψας με. viii. 16, ή κρίσις ή έμη αληθινή έστιν (real, as opposed to fallacious). xv. 1, ἐγώ εἰμι ή ἄμπελος ή ἀληθινή (real as opposed to *typical*). xvii. 3, τύν μόνον αληθινόν Θεόν (real, as opposed to *imaginary*). xix. 35, καὶ ἀληθινή αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ή μαρτυρία (real, as opposed to shadowy). Ι Thess. i. 9, Θεώ ζώντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ. ı John ii. v. 20, τον αληθινόν... έν τώ 8. ἀληθινῷ...ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός. Rev. iii. 7, 14. vi. 10, δ δεσπότης δ άγιος και άληθινός. xv. 3, δίκαιαι και αληθιναι αι όδοί σου. xvi. 7. xix. 2, 9, 11. xxi. 5 ouros of έπηξεν δ Κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος. πῶς γὰρ ἀρχιε- 3 ρεὺς εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας καθίσταται ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον ὃ προσενέγκη. εἰ μὲν οὖν ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐδ' ἂν 4

λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί εἰσιν. xxii. 6.

ην έπηξεν] The contrast is that of ix. 24, οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα εἰσηλθεν ἄγια Χριστός... ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν. Compare Mark xiv. 58, τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον...ἆλλον ἀχειροποίητον κ.τ.λ.

έπηξεν] The word (πηγνύναι) 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. Gen. XXVI. 25, καὶ ἔπηξεν ἐκεῖ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ. XXXV. 21. &c. The clause here seems to come from Num. XXIV. 6, ὡσεὶ σκηναὶ åς ἔπηξε Κύριος.

ό Κύριος] The passage in Num. xxiv. 6 seems to decide that ὁ Κύριος here is God. And so in verse 11 (from Jer. xxxi. 34), γνῶθι τὸν Κύριον. xii. 14, οῦ χωρὶς οὐδεἰς ὄψεται τὸν Κύριον (comparing Matt. v. 8). Rom. xv. 11 (from Psalm cxvii. 1), aἰνεῖτε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὸν Κύριον. 1 Cor. x. 26 (from Psalm xxiv. 1), τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ γῆ κ.τ.λ.

οὐκ ἄνθρωπος] And no human being. See note on ii. 6, ἄνθρωπος...υίδς ἀνθρώπου. 3. πâs γάρ] I say, λειτουργός—for, &c.

δώρά τε κ. θ .] See note on the same words in v. 1.

 $\kappa a \theta i \sigma \tau a \tau a \iota$] See notes on v. 1 and vii. 28.

öθer] Whence. As an inference from which. See notes on ii. 17 and iii. 1.

άναγκαίον] Acts xiii. 46, ύμιν ήν άναγκαίον πρώτον κ.τ.λ.

καὶ τοῦτον] That this Person also, the Melchizedek Priest. Compare iii. 3, πλείονος γὰρ οῦτος δόξης κ.τ.λ. x. 12, οῦτος δὲ μίαν κ.τ.λ.

προσενέγκη] Not προσφέρη. 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 preἦν ἱερεύς, ὄντων τῶν προσφερόντων κατὰ νόμον 5 τὰ δῶρα· οἴτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιῷ λατρεύ-

sentation of Himself to God is described as made once for all. The tense of $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \eta$ (1 or 2 aor. subj.) decides this, and prepares us for the argument of ix. 25, 26, which is, that, if the $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \mu \nu$ (in this sense) is to be $\pi \sigma \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \kappa s$, so must the $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \epsilon \mu$ be upon which it is based.

4. $\epsilon i \ \mu \hat{\nu} v \ ovrl]$ The $\mu \hat{\nu} v$ is answered by the $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ of verse 6. The ovr is (as usual) in accordance with the above statement; here, namely, that He must have something to offer. Something then 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.

 $\epsilon l \dots \bar{\eta} \nu$] If He were (which He is not).

oùo av nv i.] He would not even be (have been being) a priest. The first condition of ministering would have been wanting to him—the office of a priest.

is periodic for the say approximate of any kind; $not to say <math>ap_{\chi}$ is p_{χ} is p_{χ} , to whom alone belonged the $\pi po\sigma\phi opa$ of the blood in the holy of holies.

οντων τών πρ.] There being (already, without Him) those who offer, &c. The office of $i \epsilon_{P} \epsilon_{VS}$ is full. There is no room or place for Him in it, while earth is its scene. For όντων, compare John i. 9, $\eta v \tau \delta \phi \omega s \tau \delta d\lambda \eta \theta w \delta v$ (John was not the Light—that place was full). The words $\tau \omega v$ is field (after $\delta v \tau \omega v$) are omitted in the revised text.

κατὰ νόμον] The revised text omits the article before νόμον, and so makes the meaning to be, in accordance with a νόμος, a divine code prescribing ritual as well as duty.

 $\tau a \delta \hat{\omega} \rho a$] The proper gifts, those which are needed and ordered. Here $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho a$ may include $\theta v \sigma i a$, according to note on v. 1.

5. $oi\tau_{i}v\epsilon_{s}$] The effect of o_{σ} - τ_{is} is to generalize the relative. Any who. Persons who. See note on ii. 3, $\eta\tau_{is}$.

υποδείγματι κ.τ.λ.] The construction is that of xiii. 10, of τη σκηνη λατρεύοντες. To serve the tabernacle is to perform its rites and ceremonies. The tabernacle is here described as a υπόδειγμα και σκια τών έπουρανίων. See the following notes,

ύποδείγματι] The tabernacle itself was a manifestation (or representation) of τα ἐπουράνια, given for the instruction of mankind. See note on iv. 11.

 $σκι \hat{a}$] The idea is that of the shadow cast by a solid body. Thus (1) literally, Acts v. 15, ίνα έρχομένου Πέτρου κἂν ή σκιὰ ἐπισκιάση (or -ει) τινὶ αὐτῶν. Hence

144

ουσιν των έπουρανίων, καθώς κεχρημάτισται

(2) in metaphor, Matt. iv. 16 (from Isai, ix. 2). Luke i. 79, ev σκότει και σκιά θανάτου. And so (3) still more figuratively, as the adumbration of a reality which it does not embody. Col. ii. 17, ά έστιν σκιά τών μελλόντων, το δε σώμα Χριστού. Heb. x. 1, σκιάν γαρ έχων ο νόμος των μελλόντων άγαθών, ούκ αύτην την εικόνα των πραγμάτων. The tabernacle was a sort of shadow cast by the solid body of τα έπουράνια. They were the $\sigma\hat{\omega}\mu a$, they were the εἰκών (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 $\sigma \kappa_i a'$, 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.

 $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon v o v \sigma v \gamma$ The words λa τρεύειν and λατρεία originally denote the service of a workman (λάτρις) for hire (λάτρον). Compare Exod. xii. 16, παν έργον $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon v \tau \delta v$. In the Septuagint and New Testament the same words are frequently employed in reference to the service of God: whether (\mathbf{r}) generally by the worshippers; as first Exod. 12, καὶ λατρεύσετε τῶ Θεῶ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτω. xii. 25, φυλάξασθε τήν λατρείαν ταύτην. Matt. iv. 10. Luke i. 74. ii. 37. John xvi. 2. Acts xxiv. 14. xxvi. 7.

xxvii. 23, οὗ εἰμί, ῷ καὶ λατρεύω. Rom. i. 9, ω λατρεύω έν τῶ πνεύματί μου έν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ viou avrou (which may however, like Rom. xii. 1. 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 here, and ix. 1, 6, δικαιώματα λατρείας...οί ίερεῖς τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες. xiii. 10, οί τη σκηνή λατρεύοντες.

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \mathbf{v} \ \hat{\epsilon} \pi o v \rho a \mathbf{v} (\omega \mathbf{v})$ See notes on iii. 1 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. See ix. 23. Eph. i. 20, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιậ αὐτοῦ έν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. ii. 6, iii. 10. 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 typify the two heavens. If so, heavenly things might be a safer rendering than heavenly places.

καθώς] And this descrip-

 \mathbf{L}

Μωυσής μέλλων έπιτελειν την σκηνήν "Ορα γάρ

tion of the tabernacle, as a $i\pi 6$ $\delta\epsilon_{i\gamma\mu\alpha}$ and $\sigma\kappa_{i\dot{\alpha}}$ of the $i\pi\sigma_{i\gamma\mu\alpha}$, accords with the expression used to Moses in the directions for the construction of the tabernacle.

κεχρημάτισται] A Scripture perfect. See note on vii. 6, $\delta\epsilon$ δεκάτωκεν. The verb χρηματί-Lew. to transact business, is sometimes (1) absolute, as in 1 Kings xviii. 27 ($\mu\eta\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\chi\rho\eta\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$ ζει αυτός, ή μήποτε καθεύδει αυτός $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$), 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, µorxadis χρηματίσει έαν κ.τ.λ. Sometimes (2) it is followed by $\tau u \dot{v}$ or $\pi p \dot{o} s$ τ iva (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 \sim 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) 30, Κύριος αφ' ύψηλου χρηματιεί. Heb. xii. 25, επι γης παραιτησάμενοι τον χρηματίζοντα. (2) Job xl. 8. Jer. xxvi. (xxxiii. B) 2, χρηματιείs πάσι τοις 'Iovδαίοις κ.τ.λ. xxx. (xxxvii. B)

2, πάντας τοὺς λόγους οὺς ἐχρημάτισα πρὸς σέ. Luke ii. 26. (3) Matt. ii. 12, 22, χρηματισθέντες κατ ὄναρ μη ἀνακάμψαι κ.τ.λ. Acts x. 22. Heb. xi. 7, πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων. (Hence χρηματισμός, a divine communication, Rom. xi. 4. 2 Macc. ii. 4.) And so here. Moses has been (divinely) dealt with; has been (divinely) dealt with by God Himself.

 $\hat{\epsilon}\pi_{i\tau\epsilon}\lambda_{\epsilon\hat{i}\nu}$ Often, to finish, in contrast with *beginning*. Thus 1 Sam. iii. 12, αρξομαι και έπιτελέσω. Zech. iv. 9, ai χείρες Z. έθεμελίωσαν τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον, καὶ αί χείρες αύτου έπιτελέσουσιν αυτόν. Rom. xv. 28. 2 Cor. viii. 6, ίνα καθώς προενήρξατο ούτως καί επιτελέση κ.τ.λ. Gal. iii. 3. Phil. i. 6. But sometimes without any such contrast; as here. and ix. 6, τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες. Lev. vi. 22, απαν επιτελέσθήσεται. Num. xxiii. 23, τί έπιτελέσει ο Θεός. I Pet. v. g. Render therefore here simply to make.

⁸Opa] Exod. xxv. 40. The only variations in the quotation here are (1) $\pi \acute{a}\nu\tau a$ (inserted from verse above), and (2) $\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\theta\acute{e}\nu\tau a$ for $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\acute{e}\nu\sigma\nu$.

 $\gamma \alpha \rho$] This $\gamma \alpha \rho$ is no part of the quotation, but gives the reason for its introduction; namely, to justify the descrip-

VIII. 6.

φησιν ποιήσεις πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει· νῦν δὲ διαφορω- 6 τέρας τέτευχεν λειτουργίας, ὄσῳ καὶ κρείτ-

viii. 6. Or vunt de,

Οτ τέτυχεν.

tion of the tabernacle as a $i\pi \delta$ - $\delta \epsilon_{i\gamma\mu a}$ of the $\epsilon_{\pi o \nu \rho a' \nu i a}$.

φησιν] Understand ο Θεός.

ποιήσειs] There is an ellipsis of δπωs in the phrase δρaποιήσεις. The ellipsis of δρawould be the more classical.

κατὰ τὸν τ.] 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 $\epsilon \pi o v \rho a v r a$ themselves (as revealed to him in vision) his $\tau \upsilon \pi \sigma$ 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.'

τύπον] By derivation a stroke or blow, τύπος means (1) a mark or impression, John xx. 25 (τῶν ἦλων); (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. I Thess. i. 7. 2 Thess. iii. 9. I Tim. iv. 12. Tit. ii. 7. I Pet. v. 3. $\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\theta\epsilon\prime\tau a$] The change from $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\epsilon\prime\tau a$ makes the exhibition a thing ended, without marking its abiding effect.

 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \quad \delta \rho \epsilon i$] This from Exod. iii. 1 and xix. 2 onwards is the special title of Mount Sinai. In Heb. xii. 22 Sinai is replaced by Sion.

6. $v \bar{v} v \delta \dot{\epsilon}$] Or $v v v \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon}$. The $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ answers the $\mu \dot{\epsilon} v$ of verse 4, and contrasts fact with hypothesis. But as it is (as the case really stands). See xi. 15, 16, $\kappa a \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} v \dots v \hat{v} v \delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. I Cor. xv. 20 (after $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon}$ many times repeated), $v v v \dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\epsilon} X \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \eta \gamma \epsilon \rho \tau a \iota$ $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$.

διαφορωτέρας] See note on i. 4, δσφ διαφορώτερον.

τέτευχεν] As in the compound ἐντυγχάνειν (see note on vii. 25), the casual sense of τυγχάνειν (to light upon) is almost lost in usage, and the idea becomes simply that of obtaining. See xi. 35, ΐνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν. Job vii. 2, ὦσπερ θεράπων...τετυχηκώς σκιᾶς. Luke xx. 35, οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ ἀιῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν. Acts xxiv. 3. xxvi. 22, ἐπικουρίας οὖν τυχών τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. xxvii. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 10, ἶνα καὶ αὐτοὶ σωτηρίας τύχωσιν τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

 ${}_{
m L}2$

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

τονός έστιν διαθήκης μεσίτης, ήτις έπι κρείτ-7 τοσιν έπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται. εἰ γαρ ή

λειτουργίας] See note on i. 7, λειτουργούς.

όσφ καί] The superiority of the λεισουργία is measured by the superiority of the διαθήκη of which He is μεσίτης. In vii. 22, the converse was the argument, and the superiority of the διαθήκη was inferred from the superiority of the priesthood.

διαθήκης] See note on vii. 22. διαθήκης.

μεσίτης] Also ix. 15, διαθήκης καινής μεσίτης έστίν. xii. 24, καί διαθήκης νέας μεσίτη 'Ιη-I Tim. ii. 5, είς και μεσίσοῦ. της Θεού και ανθρώπων, ανθρωπος Χριστος Ίησοῦς. The word μεσim means an intermediate. one who stands between two persons or parties. In the quotation from 1 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 διαθήκη. In Gal. iii. 19 it is made a disparagement of the law that it required a $\mu \epsilon \sigma i$ -THS (Moses) to negotiate it, whereas the $\epsilon \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i a$ was a 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 $\Theta \epsilon \delta s$ and $\delta v \theta \rho \omega \pi o s$, not mediating between two parties neither of which He Himself is, but uniting two parties the nature of both of which He shares.

ήτις] One which. Α διαθήκη which. See notes on ii. 3, ήτις. viii. 5, οἴτινες.

 $\epsilon \pi i$] On the footing (or groundwork) of. The $\epsilon \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i a i$ are made the basis and condition of the $\delta i a \theta \eta \kappa \eta$. For this use of $\epsilon \pi i$, compare Acts xxvi. 6, kai vîv $\epsilon \pi^2 \epsilon \lambda \pi i \delta i \tau \eta \varsigma$... $\epsilon \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i a s \rho i \nu \delta \mu \eta \epsilon \eta \epsilon \pi \delta \eta$. $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \kappa a \kappa \rho i \nu \delta \mu \eta \epsilon \eta \epsilon \eta \epsilon \eta$. Eph. ii. 20, $\epsilon \pi o i \kappa o \delta o \mu \eta \theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \pi i$ $\tau \hat{\psi} \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda i \omega \kappa \tau \cdot \lambda$. Phil. iii. 9, $\epsilon \pi i \tau \eta \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon i$. Tit. i. 2, $\epsilon \pi^2$ $\epsilon \lambda \pi i \delta i \zeta \omega \eta \varsigma$ a low lov $\kappa \cdot \tau \cdot \lambda$.

veropobéryrai] Has been (perfect of permanence) legislated (constituted by divine legislation). As in vii. 11 the $\lambda a \delta s$ was said to have had its legal constitution given to it on the priesthood as its hinge ($i\pi \lambda$ with a genitive), so here the new $\delta ia \theta \eta \kappa \eta$ is said to have had its legal constitution given to it on promises as its basis ($i\pi \lambda$ with a dative). See note on vii, 11.

148

VIII. 7, 8.

πρώτη ἐκείνη ἦν ἄμεμπτος, οὐκ ἂν δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο τόπος. μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοὺς λέ- 8 γει, Ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει Κύριος,

viii. 8. Or autois.

7. εί γάρ] Ι say κρείττονος -for, &c. There was room in the former διαθήκη for improvement. Its own prophets said so. ή πρ. $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i \nu \eta$ Understand διαθήκη. It might have been προτέρα. But πρότεροs is scarcely used in the New Testament (only Eph. iv. 22, κατά την προτέραν αναστροφήν), except in the adverbial form $\pi p \circ \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$. And to a Hebrew Christian the Mosaic was the primary (as well as the former) dispensation. For $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \sigma s$ as the former of two, see Acts i. 1, $\tau \partial \nu$ μέν πρώτον λόγον εποιησάμην κ.τ.λ. I Cor. xv. 47, ο πρώτος άνθρωπος... δ δεύτερος άνθρωπος κ.τ.λ. And Heb. ix. 1, 2, 6, 8, 15, 18. x. 9, άναιρεί το πρώτον, ίνα το δεύτερον στήση.

άμεμπτος] Fauliless; not to be complained of as defective in any respect. Luke i. 6. Phil. ii. 15. iii. 6. I Thess. iii. 13. And άμέμπτως I Thess. ii. 10. v. 23.

oùs av] 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. $\mu\epsilon\mu\phi\phi\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma \gamma d\rho$] But there was such a $\zeta\eta\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ -for, &c. The special thought in $\mu\epsilon\mu\phi\epsilon\sigma\theta a\iota$ is to find fault with as defective.

avrovs] The Vatican manuscript has avrois. The question of reading is here important. For if avois were the reading. I should take it as neuter, and explain it by Gal. iii. 12 (6 ποιήσας αύτα ζήσεται έν αύτοις, though only o vous has there preceded) as meaning the particulars of the law. For, disparaging the provisions of the law, He saith, &c. This has the advantage of making μεμφόμεvos apply to the same thing as $a\mu\epsilon\mu\pi\tau\sigma$ above. If the reading is αὐτούς, there is no alternative; the airovs must be the Israelites.

 $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota$] That is, $\delta \Theta \epsilon \delta s$. As $\phi \eta \sigma i \nu$ in verse 5.

' $1\delta\omega i$] The quotation is from Jer. xxxi. (xxxviii. B) 31-34. 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 καί συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα διαθήκην καινήν, 9 οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην ἡν ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν ἐν ἡμέρα ἐπιλαβομένου

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 soul (verses 10 and 11); (2) that of a free forgiveness of all sins (verse 12). The variations from the Alexandrine Septuagint are (1) ourteλέσω for διαθήσομαι, (2) έπι τον oikov (twice) for $\tau \hat{\psi}$ oik ψ , (3) έποίησα for διεθέμην, (4) λέγει for $\phi \eta \sigma i$ (twice), (5) ras omitted (with B) before $\kappa a \rho \delta i a s$, (6) πo - $\lambda i \tau \eta \nu$ (with B) for $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma i o \nu$, (7) αὐτῶν omitted after μικροῦ.

 $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho a \epsilon \rho \chi \rho \nu \tau a]$ Å phrase 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.

 $\kappa a(i)$ The ubiquitous Hebrew and, serving here the purpose of the $\delta \tau \epsilon$ which might have been expected.

συντελέσω] Substituted (perhaps as a more significant word) for διαθήσομαι, which adds nothing to the cognate διαθήκην. The verb συντελεΐν is largely used in the Septuagint, and stands with $\delta in\theta \eta' \kappa \eta \nu$ (as here) in Jer. xxxiv. (xli. B) 8, 15. The word is much less common in the New Testament (less common even than $\epsilon \pi i \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} \nu$). See Rom. ix. 28, and note there.

 $\epsilon \pi i$] Towards; in relation to. Well expressing the nature of a divine $\delta \iota a \theta \eta \kappa \eta$ (see note on vii. 22), as not a compact with, but an engagement towards, the human being with whom it deals.

οἶκον] First perhaps (in the wide sense) in Exod. xix. 3, τάδε έρεις τῷ οἶκῷ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἀναγγελεῖς τοῖς νίοῖς Ἰσραήλ.

'Ισραηλ...'Ιούδα] The ten tribes and the two, from 1 Kings xii. 19 onwards. Jer. iii. 6, 7. Hos. iv. 15. &c.

 $\kappa_{air\eta\nu}$] The distinction between $\kappa_{air\delta\varsigma}$ (new in *quality*) and $\nu \epsilon \sigma \varsigma$ (new in *date*) is never obliterated, though either adjective may be applied with equal correctness in many cases. Thus $\kappa_{air\eta}$ is the epithet of the Gospel $\delta_{ia}\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ (in contrast with that of the law) here and in ix. 15, $\nu\epsilon a$ 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 VIII. 9, 10.

μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῆ διαθήκῃ μου, κἀγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, λέγει Κύριος. ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἢν δια- 10

Eph. iv. 23, 24, ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον κ.τ.λ. Col. iii. 10, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον.

9. οὐ κατά] Not according to. Not after the likeness or after the pattern or on the scale of. See iii. 8, κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν. v. 6, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν.

τοῖς πατράσιν] For (the benefit of) their fathers. See note οιι i. 1, τοῖς πατράσιν.

èv $\eta\mu\epsilon\rhoq$] In a day of me (my) 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, $\epsilon\pi\iota$ - $\lambda a\mu\beta ávera.$

έξαγαγείν] Acts vii. 40, ό γὰρ Μωυσῆς οἶτος, ὅς ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου. The infinitive is that of the direct object.

 $\delta\tau\iota$] Reason why the new $\delta\iota a\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ should not be like the old. The old had been a failure.

autoi They on their part.

In contrast with $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega$ following. Emphatic, as always in the nominative. See notes on i. 11 and iii. 10.

i v i μ ειναν To abide in (i μμένειν) is the opposite of straying from (James v. 19, πλανάσθαι από) or walking beside (παραβαίνειν). Acts xiv. 22, παρακαλοῦντες ἐμμένειν τῆ πίστει. Gal. iii. 10 (from Deut. xxvii. 26), πῶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει πῶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις κ.τ.λ. The commoner compound in the New Testament is ἐπιμένειν, which is not used in the Septuagint.

 ιöτι] I say καιτήν, and I say οὐ κατὰ κ.τ.λ., because, &c. The terms of the new διαθήκη are adduced in proof of its novelty.

avrη] The διαθήκη which I shall make is this which follows. John i. 19, καὶ αὖτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου κ.τ.λ. XV. 12. xvii. 3. &c. θήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, λέγει Κύριος, διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς, καὶ ἕσομαι αὐ-

viii. 10. Or καρδίαν.

διαθήσομαι] Acts iii. 25, τῆς διαθήκης ἦς διέθετο ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν. Frequent in the Septuagint, beginning with Gen. ix. 17, τοῦτο τὸ σημείον τῆς διαθήκης ἦς διεθέμην ἀναμέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀναμέσον πάσης σαρκός.

τῷ οἴκῷ] The dative as in Gen. xv. 18, διέθετο Κύριος τῷ ^{*}Αβραμ διαθήκην. Deut. xxix. 1, 14, 25, &c. Often with πρός, as Exod. xxiv. 8, τῆς διαθήκης ^{*}ης διέθετο Κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Or μετά, as 2 Sam. iii. 12, διάθου διαθήκην σου μετ' ἐμοῦ.

μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας] After (the arrival of) those days (ἡμέραι ἔρχονται).

διδούς] The construction is difficult. Is it, (I) giving (putting) my laws 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 it] 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 without any supplying of words to complete it? The Greek of the Septuagint scarcely bears such minute dissection. The 3rd explanation is perhaps the simplest.

διάνοιαν] Matt. xxii. 37 (from Deut. vi. 5), καρδία...ψυχη...διανοία. Mark xii. 30. Luke x. 27. Eph. iv. 18. Col. i. 21. 1 Pet. i. 13, αναζωσάμενοι τὰς οσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν. 2 Pet. iii. 1, διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν.

καρδίας] Is this a genitive singular, or an accusative plural? For the latter, we have the ras of the Alexandrine Septuagint, and the companion accusative (also with $\epsilon \pi i$) in x. 16 (revised text). For the former, the companion singular διάνοιαν 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 διάvoia.

 $\epsilon \pi_i \gamma \rho a \psi \omega$] The promise is, that the will of God for man's conduct, instead of being in-

VIII. II.

τοῖς εἰς Θεόν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μοι εἰς λαόν. καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν 11 πολίτην αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων, Γνῶθι τὸν Κύριον· ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσίν με ἀπὸ μικροῦ αὐτῶν

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, $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\gamma\eta$ où $\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\nu$, $\lambda\lambda\lambda$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha\tau$ $\Theta\epsilon\sigma\delta$ ζ $\omega\nu\tau\sigma\varsigma$, où $\epsilon\nu$ $\pi\lambda\alpha\xi$ ν λ ℓ ν $\pi\lambda\alpha\xi$ ν κ $\alpha\rho\delta$ (as $\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa$ ($\nu\alpha$ $\nu\alpha$).

καί ἔσομαι] And thus shall be fulfilled that repeated promise of the Old Testament which can only have complete realization in a spiritual intercommunication between God and the individual man, such as has just been foretold. For the promise in one part, see Gen. xvii. 7, eis διαθήκην αἰώνιον, εἶναί σου Θεός κ.τ.λ. And for the *twofold* promise, Exod. vi. 7, καὶ λήψομαι ύμας έμαυτώ είς λαόν έμοί, καί έσομαι ύμων Θιός. Repeated again and again afterwards in the Pentateuch and prophets. For the phrase $\epsilon i v \alpha \epsilon$ is, see 2 Sam. vii. 14. Jer. xxxi. (xxxviii. B) 1, 9. 2 Cor. vi. 18. &c.

II. καὶ οὐ μή] And this influence upon the individual man shall be an influence of direct personal instruction, making him independent of any secondary or intermediate teaching, except in so far as it may help the other. John vi. 45, $\overline{\epsilon}\sigma\tau$ iv $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho a\mu\mu\epsilon'$ vor $\overline{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau o\hat{s}$ $\pi\rho o\phi \eta'$ - τais , Kai $\overline{\epsilon}\sigma$ ov τai $\pi a\prime \tau \epsilon s$ διδακτοù $\Theta\epsilon$ oû (Isai. liv. 13).

où $\mu \eta$] With an aorist subjunctive, xiii. 5 (from Deut. xxxi. 6), où $\mu \eta$ $\sigma \epsilon$ av $\hat{\omega}$ où $\hat{\delta}$ où $\mu \eta$ $\sigma \epsilon$ $\hat{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa a \tau a \lambda (\pi \omega.$ Rom. iv. 8. I Cor. viii. 13. Gal. v. 16. I Thess. iv. 15. v. 3. &c.

πολίτην] Å remarkable variation (with B) from the Alexandrine πλησίον. See Zech. xiii. 7, [†]ρομφαία, ἐξεγέρθητι...ἐπ' ἄνδρα πολίτην μου. Prov. xxiv. 28, μὴ ἴσθι ψευδὴς μάρτυς ἐπὶ σὸν πολίτην. Luke xv. 15. xix. 14. Acts xxi. 30.

ἀδελφόν] Perhaps in the less literal sense, as first in Exod. ii. 11, ἐξήλθε πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ ... Ἐβραῖον τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ (Α, ἑαυτοῦ ἀδ. Β) τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.

 $\Gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \theta i$] Know, with the implied thought, Let me teach thee.

εἰδήσουσιν] The regular form is είσονται. (Homer, Hero12 έως μεγάλου αὐτῶν. ὅτι ὅλεως ἔσομαι
ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν
13 αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι. ἐν τῷ λέγειν
καινὴν πεπαλαίωκεν τὴν πρώτην. τὸ δὲ πα-

dotus, and Isocrates are quoted for this future.)

άπό μικροῦ] A common Hebrew idiom, to express all of every age and rank. Jer. vi. 13, ἀπό μικροῦ αὐτῶν καὶ ἔως μεγάλου. viii. 10. xlii. (xlix. B) 1, 8, πῶς ὁ λαὸς ἀπὸ μικροῦ καὶ ἔως μεγάλου κ.τ.λ. xliv. (li. B) 12. ἀc. Acts viii. 10, πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἔως μεγάλου. xxvi. 22, μαρτυρόμενος μικρῷ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ.

 δτι] This new διαθήκη of divine individual communication is based upon a gospel of divine forgiveness of sins.

 $[\lambda \epsilon \omega s]$ See note on ii. 17, εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι. For ἶλεως (only found once besides in the New Testament, Matt. xvi. 22, in the phrase ίλεώς σοι, that is, ἔστω or εἰη ὁ Θεός, Mercy upon Thee) see Num. xiv. 20, ἶλεως αὐτοῖς εἰμὶ κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου. I Kings viii. 30, 34, 36, 39, 50, καὶ σὺ εἰσακούσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ...καὶ ἴλεως ἔσῃ ταῖς ἀἰκίαις αὐτῶν αἶς ἡμάρτοσάν σοι κ.τ.λ. ἁc.

άδικίαις] 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 vii. 19, αὐτὸς ἐπιστρέψει καὶ οἰκτειρήσει ήμâς, [καὶ] καταδύσει τὰς ἀδικίας ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀπορρίψει (Α, ἀπορριφήσονται Β?) εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θαλάσσης πάσας τὰς ὰμαρτίας ἡμῶν.

où $\mu \eta$] The received text had kai tŵr ảroµıŵr aùtŵr after kai tŵr ảµaptıŵr aùtŵr, before où $\mu \eta$. In x. 17 it reappears. It is not in the Septuagint of Jer. xxxi.

μνησθώ] Psalm xxv. 7, άμαρτίας νεότητός μου...μη μνησθής. lxxix. 8, μη μνησθής ήμῶν ἀνομιῶν ἀρχαίων. Isai. xliii. 25, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἐξαλείφων τὰς ἀνομίας σου ...καὶ οὐ μη μνησθήσομαι κ.τ.λ. lxiv. 9.

13. $iv \tau \hat{\varphi}$ Mark the word $\kappa a_i v \hat{\gamma} v$ in this quotation. It implies, nay creates, a $\pi a \lambda a_i \dot{a} v$. And to make a thing $\pi a \lambda a_i \dot{o} v$ is to predict its $a \dot{\phi} a_i v \sigma \mu \dot{o} s$.

έν τῷ λέγειν] In the very saying καινήν, He (the Inspirer of Scripture) has antiquated the first διαθήκη.

πεπαλαίωκεν] (1) A Scripture perfect. (2) The effect is permanent. For παλαιοῦν, see note on i. 11, παλαιωθήσονται.

 $\tau \partial \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ And the thing which is in course of being antiquated and of waxing old is nigh unto effacement.

154

λαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ. Εἶχεν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη δικαιώματα ΙΧ. 1

ix. 1. Or omit kal.

 $\pi a \lambda a \omega \psi \mu \epsilon v o v$ 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 $\kappa \alpha \nu \eta \nu$ 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 a pavio µos, which was already upon it, justified itself before its execution. For $\pi a \lambda a \partial s$ in its disparaging sense, see Matt. ix. 16, 17, επί ίματίω παλαιώ...είς άσκοὺς παλαιούς. Rom. vi. 6, ο παλαιος ήμῶν ἄνθρωπος. 1 Cor. v. 7, τήν παλαιάν ζύμην. Eph. iv. 22. Col. iii. 9. But no such disparagement is found in Matt. xiii. 52, καινά και παλαιά. Luke v. 39, ό παλαιός χρηστός έστιν. 1 John ii. 7, έντολην παλαιάν ην έλχετε απ' αρχής κ.τ.λ. The last quotation shows that $\pi a \lambda a i \delta s$ (old) and apxalos (ancient) are sometimes interchangeable. Even appairs may be made by the context a word of reproach. 2 Cor. v. 17, τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρήλθεν. Rev. xii. 9, δ ὄφις ό ἀρχαίος.

γηράσκον] John xxi. 18, δταν δε γηράσης. Frequent in the Septuagint in its literal sense. Ecclus. viii. 6, μη άτιμάσης ἄνδρα εν γήρα, και γαρ εξ ήμων γηράσκουσ.

ἐγγύς] See vi. 8, κατάρας ἐγγύς. Job xiii. 18, ἐγγύς εἰμι τοῦ κρίματός μου.

άφανισμοῦ] Only used here in the New Testament. But frequent in the Septuagint. Deut. vii. 2, ἀφανισμῷ ἀφανιεῖs αὐτούs. Jer. li. (xxviii. B) 37, ἐσται Baβυλὼν εἰς ἀφανισμόν. &c. For the verb ἀφανίζειν, see Matt. vi. 19, 20, ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει κ.τ.λ. James iv. 14. It occurs more than 75 times in the Septuagint. And ἀφανισμὸς about 55 times.

IX. 1. Eixev $\mu i \nu \sigma \delta \nu$] (1) The $\sigma \delta \nu$ stands by itself (in the construction of the sentence) as the connecting particle. It is little more than continuative to 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 $\delta_{ia} \theta \eta \sigma \sigma_{i}$ (2) The $\mu i \nu$ belongs to $\epsilon i \chi \epsilon \nu$, and prepares us for the inference: had, but with no intrinsic or abiding value.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

2 λατρείας τό τε άγιον κοσμικόν. σκηνή γαρ

An emphasis on had will best express its force. (3) Is the $\mu i \nu$ answered formally or only by implication? The δi of verse 11 is too far off to be made the direct antithesis of the $\mu i \nu$ in verse 1, though it suggests the correct idea of the suppressed antithesis as given above. Had, but not so as to satisfy the real want.

καὶ ἡ πρώτη] Understand διαθήκη. The καὶ 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.

δικαιώματα] Ordinances. The verb δικαιοῦν, in its application to a thing, means to make or declare just, to claim as a right, to require. Hence δικαίωμα is (1) 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) An ordinance; as here, and verse 10, δικαιώματα σαρκός. Also Luke i. 6, έν πάσαις ταις έντολαις καί δικαιώμασιν τοθ Κυρίου. (2) Α righteous act (Rom. v. 18. Rev. xv. 4. xix. 8).

λατρείας] See note on viii. 5. Also on Rom. i. 9, λατρεύω.

τό τε åγιον] And its sanctuary a mundane (material) one. As $\kappa o \sigma \mu i \kappa \partial \nu$ cannot be made a substantive, this is the only rendering consistent with the position of the article.

 $\tilde{a}_{\gamma,o\nu}$ 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, άναμέσον τοῦ άγίου καὶ ἀναμέσον τοῦ ἀγίου τῶν ἀγίων. For the former, Exod. xxxvi. 3, eis mávra τα έργα τοῦ άγίου. Num. iii. 38, φυλάσσοντες τας φυλακάς τοῦ ἀγίου. Ezek. xlv. 4, 18, τοῖς ίερεῦσι τοῖς λειτουργοῦσιν ἐν τῷ άγίω...τοῦ ἐξιλάσασθαι τὸ ἄγιον.

κοσμικόν] Not in the debased sense which KOGMIKO'S bears in the only other place of its occurrence in Scripture (Tit. ii. 12, τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπι- $\theta v \mu i as$), 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 ta otoχεία του κόσμου, Gal. iv. 3. 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

κατεσκευάσθη, ή πρώτη, ἐν ἡ ή τε λυχνία καὶ ή τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, ἤτις λέγεται

its tabernacle and sacrifices. So here the Levitical sanctuary is called $\kappa \sigma \sigma \mu \kappa \kappa \dot{\nu} \nu$ in contrast with the heavenly temple in which Christ ministers. See verse 24. See also note on Rom. i. 20, where the senses of $\kappa \dot{o} \sigma \mu \sigma s$ are arranged in order.

σκηνή γάρ] For there 2. was a tabernacle constructed. First, a *tabernacle*: that was the general idea of the ayior. Then the general is particular-It was *double* in conized. struction: it consisted of a first and a second (an outer and an inner) σκηνή. No mention is made of the *temple*, which was only a reproduction, on a grander scale, and of more solid material, and with certain variations, of the only ayiov which had divine directions for its construction. See note on viii. 2, orguns.

κατεσκευάσθη] See note on iii. 3, κατασκευάσας.

ή πρώτη] The σκηνή is now divided into its two parts, the outer and inner chamber. And ή πρώτη (as in verse 6, where it is contrasted with ή δευτέρα in verse 7) means, the first reached on entering; the outer.

i v j 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. xxv. 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.

λυχνία] Exod. xxv. 31—39, ἐκ χρυσίου καθαροῦ...τοὺς λύχνους αὐτῆς ἑπτά κ.τ.λ. xxxvii. 17— 24. xl. 4, 24, 25, ἀπέναντι τῆς τραπέζης (B omits) εἰς τὸ κλίτος τῆς σκηνῆς τὸ πρὸς νότον κ.τ.λ. Lev. xxiv. 2—4, ἔξωθεν τοῦ καταπετάσματος...καὶ καύσουσιν αὐτὸ ᾿Ααρῶν καὶ οἱ υἰοὶ αὐτοῦ ἀφ᾽ ἑσπέρας ἕως πρωΐ κ.τ.λ.

τράπεζα] Exod. xxv. 23-30, χρυσίου καθαρου...και επιθήσεις επι την τράπεζαν άρτους ενωπίους εναυτίον μου διαπαντός. xxxvii. 10-16. xl. 4, 22, 23, προς βορραν, έζωθεν του καταπετάσματος της σκηνής κ.τ.λ.

ή πρόθεσις] Upon the τράπεζα. The setting forth of the loaves; that is, the loaves set forth. Exod. xxv. 30. xl. 23, καὶ προέθηκεν (Α, προσέθηκεν Β?) ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἐναντίον Κυρίου. Lev. xxiv, 5-9, καὶ ἐπιθήσετε αὐτοὺς δύο θέματα, ἐξ ἄρτους τὸ ἐν θέμα...εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκείμενα τῷ Κυρίῳ τῦ ἡμέρα τῶν σαββάτων προθήσετε (Α, προσθήσεται Β?) κ.τ.λ. 3 άγια· μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα σκηνή
 4 ή λεγομένη άγια ἀγίων, χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμια-

ix. 2. Οτ τὰ ἅγ.

3. Or τὰ ἄγ. τῶν ἀγ.

 $\eta_{\tau is}$] One which. A $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta$ which. See notes on ii. 3. viii. 5, 6.

 $\ddot{a}\gamma \iota a$] 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 τa $\ddot{a}\gamma \iota a$.

3. µετά] After reaching; and so, behind.

 $\tau \delta$ $\delta \epsilon \dot{\tau} \epsilon \rho \sigma r$] In contrast with the curtain over the door of the tabernacle. See note on vi. 19.

 $\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\eta$ $\dot{\eta}$ λ .] A tabernacle, namely, that which is called, &c. The two chambers are spoken of as two tabernacles. Partly perhaps to emphasize the separateness, and so the unapproached sanctity, of the inner.

äγια άγίων] The Vatican manuscript has τὰ ἄγια τῶν άγίων. And with more support than for τὰ ἄγια in verse 2. The Alexandrine and (first hand of) the Sinaitic omit the articles in both cases. I do not find ἅγια άγίων (without τὰ and τῶν) in the Septuagint in this special application.

4. $\theta \nu \mu \iota a \tau \eta \rho \iota o \nu$] 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. II, the only two places of its occurrence in the Septuagint, which always has θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος (Exod. xxx. 1) or θυσιαστήριον χρυσοῦν (Exod. xl. 5) for the altar of incense. On the other hand, (1) $\pi v \rho \epsilon i o \nu$ (not $\theta v \mu a \tau \eta \rho o v$ is the Levitical word for *firepan* or *censer* (Lev. xvi. 12. Num. xvi. 6, х. і. &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 $\theta v \mu_{12} \tau \eta \rho_{10} v$ is used for the incense-altar in Philo, Josephus, &c. These considerations would be decisive, were it not for the place here assigned to the θυμιατήριον. It was notorious that the incense-altar stood in the outer chamber (see Exod. xl. 26, έν τη σκηνή του μαρτυρίου απέναντι του καταπε- $\tau \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \sigma s$). 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. g). Yet here it is in some way assigned to the holy of holies. We mark

τήριον καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης περικεκαλυμμένην πάντοθεν χρυσίω, ἐν ἦ στάμνος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος ᾿Ααρων ή βλα-

the word *exoura* as suggesting a reconciliation which would have been precluded if the ϵv \tilde{n} 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 in Exod. xxx. 1—10, καὶ θήσεις αύτο απέναντι του καταπετάσματος τοῦ ὄντος ἐπὶ τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῶν μαρτυρίων κ.τ.λ. xl. 5, καὶ θήσεις το θυσιαστήριον το χρυσούν είς τὸ θυμιῶν ἐνώπιον (ἐναντίον B) της κιβωτού. 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 θυμιατήριον as standing here for the altar of The Vatican manuincense. script adds και το χρυσούν θυμιατήριον after άρτων in verse 2, and omits χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον kai in verse 4, leaving only έχουσα before την κιβωτόν. (Probably a mere correction of a supposed mistake of fact.)

κιβωτόν] Exod. xxv. 10, &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 $\kappa_{l}\beta\omega r \delta s$ 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 $(\theta i \beta_{15})$.

 τῆς διαθήκης] Because it contained the code of the διαθήκη or covenant. Exod. xxv.
 16, καὶ ἐμβαλεῖς εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν τὰ μαρτύρια ἅ ἂν δῶ σοι. xl. 3,
 20. See note on vii. 22, διαθήκης. περικεκαλυμμένην] Exod.
 xxviii. 20, περικεκαλυμμένα χρυσιώ κ.τ.λ.

πάντοθεν] Exod. xxv. 11, έσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν χρυσώσεις αὐτήν.

στάμνος] Here feminine. Masculine in Exod. xvi. 33, 34, λάβε στάμνον χρυσοῦν ἕνα, καὶ ἐμβαλε εἰς αὐτὸν πλῆρες τὸ γομὸρ τοῦ μάν, καὶ ἀποθήσεις αὐτὸ ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ...ἐναντίον τοῦ μαρτυρίου κ.τ.λ.

ή βλαστήσασα] Num. xvii. 2, &c., καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐβλάστησεν ή ράβδος [ή] ᾿Ααρών...καὶ ἐξήνεγκε βλαστόν, καὶ ἐξήνθησεν ἄνθη, καὶ

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

5 στήσασα καὶ αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης, ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς Χερουβεὶν δόξης κατασκιάζοντα το

ἐβλάστησε κάρυα...ἀπόθες τὴν ῥάβδον ᾿Ααρῶν ἐνώπιον τῶν μαρτυρίων εἰς διατήρησιν κ.τ.λ.

ai $\pi\lambda\dot{a}\kappa\epsilon s$ In the first mention of them they are called πυξία. Exod. xxiv. 12, και δώσω σοι τὰ πυξία τὰ λίθινα, τὸν νόμον καί τας έντολας ας έγραψα νομο- θ ernoral autois. The first occurrence of $\pi\lambda\dot{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon_{s}$ is in Exod. xxxi. 18, τὰς δύο πλάκας τοῦ μαρτυρίου. πλάκας λιθίνας, γεγραμμένας τώ δακτύλω του Θεού. These being broken (Exod. xxxii. 19) are replaced by others: Exod. xxxiv. κ. λάξευσον σεαυτώ δύο πλάκας λιθίνας καθώς και αι πρώται ...καὶ γράψω ἐπὶ τῶν πλακῶν τὰ ρήματα α ήν επί (εν Β) ταις πλαξί ταις πρώταις. ΧΧΧΙΥ. 27, 28, 29, γράψον σεαυτώ τα βήματα ταῦτα κ.τ.λ. The emphatic $\sigma \epsilon \alpha v \tau \hat{\omega}$ might seem to mark a difference between the first and the second writing. But Deut. x. 4, 5 (καὶ ἔγραψεν ἐπὶ τὰς πλάκας...και έδωκεν αύτας Κύριος έμοί...καὶ ἐνέβαλον τὰς πλάκας είς την κιβωτον ην εποίησα) must correct any hasty inference. In I Kings viii. 9 it is stated that there was nothing in the ark (at the dedication of the temple of Solomon) $\pi \lambda \eta v$ δύο πλάκες λίθιναι... ας έθηκε Movor's exel, so that the writer to the Hebrews goes back to earlier times in his enumeration of its contents.

5. $\sqrt[3]{\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{a}\nu\omega}$ Eph. i. 21. iv. 10. Also Deut. xxvi. 19. xxviii. 1. Ezek. i. 26. xi. 22. Not far above, but simply turning $\tilde{a}\nu\omega$ (which is always an adverb in the New Testament and the Septuagint) into a preposition with a genitive. See note on ii. 8, $\sqrt[3]{\pi\sigma\kappa\dot{a}\tau\omega}$. So far from the Cherubin being far above the ark, they were a part of its cover. See Exod. xxv. 18, 22. xxxvii. 8, $\epsilon\kappa$ $\tauo\hat{v}$ $\lambda\lambda a \tau \eta\rho iov$ $\epsilon \pi o i \eta \epsilon \tau o v S X \epsilon \rho o v \beta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \xi \ \dot{a} \mu \phi o \tau \epsilon \rho o v \mu \epsilon \rho \delta v a v \tau o v.$

αὐτῆς] That is, τῆς κιβωτοῦ.

 $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{O} \cup \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{U}$ The final letter is ν in the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts, μ in the Alexandrine. (In the Septuagint I only notice a final ν in 2 Sam. vi. 2.) The word occurs first, and without explanation, in Gen. iii. 24, καὶ ἔταξε τὰ Χερουβίμ και την φλογίνην βομ- $\phi_{aiav \kappa.\tau.\lambda}$. In Exod. xxv. 18. &c. directions are given for making δύο Χερουβείμ (as if their form were already known) for the two ends of the mercy-It is in Ezekiel and the seat. Revelation that we find the composition of these figures, if we may regard the τέσσαρα ζώα as their equivalent. They seem to have been representative of animated nature in its chief

160

ίλαστήριον· περί ών οὐκ έστιν νῦν λέγειν κατά

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, $dv\eta\rho \pi\rho\partial s$ τον αδελφον αυτού). The singular is always masculine.

δόξης] Of, belonging or attached to, as its setting and framework, the Shechinah which was the symbol of God's presence. Exod. xxv. 22, λαλήσω σοι ἄνωθεν τοῦ ἰλαστηρίου ἀναμέσον τῶν δύο Χερουβεὶμ τῶν ὄντων ἐπὶ τῆς κιβωτοῦ τοῦ μαρτυρίου. Num. vii. 89. Ezek. x. 19, καὶ δόξα [Κυρίου] Θεοῦ Ἰσραηλ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῶν ὑπεράνω. For δόξα, see note on i. 3, and on Rom. i. 23 and ix. 4.

κατασκ.] Exod. xxv. 20, συσκιάζοντες (ἐν Β) ταῖς πτέρυξιν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰλαστηρίου. xxxvii. 9 (ἐπὶ τὸ ἰλαστήριον). Elsewhere ἐπισκιάζειν. Matt. xvii. 5 (αὐτούς). Mark ix. 7 (αὐτούς). Luke i. 35 (σοι). ix. 34 (αὐτούς). Acts v. 15 (τινί).

ίλαστήριον] Properly the

neuter of iλaστήριos, propitiatory or explatory. Always in the Septuagint the mercy-seat, the lid or cover of the ark in the holy of holies. Perhaps from the connexion of *covering* with forgiving (Psalm xxxii. 1, µaκάριοι ων αφέθησαν αι ανομίαι, καί ων έπεκαλύφθησαν αι άμαρríai. Ezek. xlv. 17, 20, where the literal Hebrew of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι is to cover). Perhaps from the prominence given to the cover of the ark in the ceremonies of the day of explation (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, καὶ ποιήσεις ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα χρυσίου καθαροῦ...καὶ ἐπιθήσεις τὸ ίλαστήριον ἐπὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν άνωθεν κ.τ.λ. In Rom. iii. 25 (the only other place of $i\lambda a\sigma \tau \eta$ plov in the New Testament) Christ is called $i\lambda a \sigma \tau \eta \rho \omega v$, as though He were Himself the mercy-seat of the antitypical tabernacle. See note on ii. 17, Also on είς το ίλάσκεσθαι. Rom. iii. 25, iλαστήριον.

 $\pi \epsilon \rho \delta \omega$ 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-

Υ. Н.

6 μέρος. τούτων δὲ οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων, εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν διὰ παντὸς εἰσίασιν οἱ 7 ἱερεῖς τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες· εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, οὐ χωρὶς αἴματος, ὃ προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ

cessibility of the holy of holies, except once a year, and then to one person, and with the most solemn ceremony.

κατὰ μέρος] Part by part. In detail. (Only here.)

6. $\tau o \dot{\tau} \sigma v \tau \omega v$] The reference is still to the distinctness of the two chambers rather than to the contents of either.

την πρώτην] See note on verse 2. The first (outer chamber of the) σκηνή.

διὰ παντός] Also xiii. 15. Matt. xviii. 10. Mark v. 5. Luke xxiv. 53. Acts ii. 25. x. 2. xxiv. 16. Rom. xi. 10. 2 Thess. iii. 16.

 $\epsilon i \sigma i \sigma \sigma \nu$] Enter. The Levitical ritual is represented as still kept up, though it is superseded as to its virtue by the new $\delta i a \theta \eta \kappa \eta$.

 $\tau \dot{a}_s \lambda ar \rho \epsilon \dot{a} s$] These were (1) the lighting and dressing of the lamps of the golden candlestick (Exod. xxvii. 21. Lev. xxiv. 3) at evening and morning; (2) the offering of incense on the golden altar (Exod. xxx. 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. 13.

ἐπιτελοῦντες] See note on viii. 5, ἐπιτελεῖν.

7. $\tau \eta \nu \delta \epsilon \upsilon \tau \epsilon \rho a \nu$] See note on verse 2, $\eta \pi \rho \omega \tau \eta$.

ẵπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ] On the great day of Atonement. Lev. xvi. 29, ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ ἑβδόμῳ, δεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς κ.τ.λ.

μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς] Lev. xvi. 17, καὶ πῶς ἀνθρωπος οὐκ ἔσται ἐν τῆ σκηνῆ τοῦ μαρτυρίου...ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθη.

οὐ χωρὶς αἴματος] Lev. xvi. 14, 15, καὶ λήψεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀἰματος τοῦ μόσχου κ.τ.λ. καὶ σφάξει τὸν χίμαρον...καὶ οἴσει ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴματος αὐτοῦ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, καὶ ποιήσει τὸ αἶμα αὐτοῦ ῦν τρόπον ἐποίησε τὸ αἶμα τοῦ μόσχου, καὶ ῥανεῖ τὸ αἶμα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱλαστήριον κ.τ.λ.

προσφέρει] The προσφορά

τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων· τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ 8 πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων όδὸν ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης

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, $\pi po\sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \eta$.

ύπερ έαυτοῦ] See Lev. xvi. 6, 11—14, τὸν μόσχον τὸν περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τὸν αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.

καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ] Lev. xvi. 15, τὸν χίμαρον τὸν περὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας τὸν περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ κ.τ.λ.

αγνοημάτων] See note on v. 2, αγνοούσιν.

8. τοῦτο δηλοῦντος] The Levitical ceremonial is here said (1) to have been due to divine inspiration, (2) to have had a typical significance in some at least of its particulars. For $\delta\eta\lambda \partial v$ in application to the Holy Spirit, see I Pet. i. II, είς τίνα ή ποΐον καιρόν έδήλου τό έν αύτοις πνεύμα Χριστού. As there Old Testament prophecy, so here Old Testament ritual, is ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι] That the way of (into) the true holy of holies, the aὐrờs ὁ oὐparờs of verse 24, had not yet been made manifest, &c. 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. 1 Pet. i. 2).

την τών άγίων όδόν (1) For rà ayıa, see note on viii. 2. (2) Is obos here way in the sense of road, or way in the sense of journey? For the former, see Matt. vii. 13, 14, ευρύχωρος ... τεθλιμμένη κ.τ.λ. xiii. 4, παρά την όδόν. xx. 30. xxi. 8, 19. xxii. 19. &c. For the latter, Luke ii. 44, ήμέρας Acts i. 12, σαββάτου ύδόν. έχον οδόν. ix. 17, 27. 1 Thess. iii. II, κατευθύναι την όδον ήμων $\pi \rho \dot{\rho} s \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{a} s$. &c. Either sense might suit this place. But x. 19, 20 (where the erodos τών άγίων interprets the following obos) decides in favour of the latter. The journey of the ພ້າງເລ. That is, the mode of entering the antitypical holy of holies.

črι τη̂ς πρώτης] While the outer σκηνὴ 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 στάσις has its other sense, of faction or sedition. Here it is simply a standing or

 ${}_{
m M}2$

9 στάσιν· ήτις παραβολή είς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνε-

standing-place. It is frequent in this sense in the Septuagint. Deut. xxviii. 65, οὐδὲ μὴ γένηται στάσις τῷ ἶχνει τοῦ ποδός σου. I Chron. xxviii. 2, οἰκοδομῆσαι οἶκον ἀναπαύσεως...καὶ στάσιν ποδῶν Κυρίου ἡμῶν. &c.

0. $\eta \tau is \pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda \eta$ Which thing (the fact of there being a πρώτη σκηνή separate from the holy of holies) was a parable. At first sight not might look like the direct relative of $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta$ alone: which πρώτη σκηνή was a parable. But to call the $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta$ itself a $\pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda \eta$ 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, $\delta \sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} s$ αύλής, δ έστιν πραιτώριον. Eph. iii. 13, έν ταις θλίψεσίν μου ύπερ ύμων, ήτις εστίν δόξα ύμων. vi. 17, την μάχαιραν του πνεύματος, ό έστιν ρήμα Θεού. I Tim. iii. 15, έν οίκω Θεού αναστρέφεσθαι, ήτις έστιν έκκλησία Θεού ζώντος. So here $\eta_{\tau \iota s}$ refers neither dc. to σκηνή nor to στάσις, but stands for $\delta \tau_{L}$ which thing, or rather a thing which. See notes on ii. 3, notes. viii. 5, otraves. de.

 ϵ is tov $\kappa a \iota \rho \delta v$] 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 evertnkota is (now) present, or (then) instant. In favour of the former we have Rom. viii. 38, ουτε ενεστώτα ουτε μέλλοντα. Ι Cor. iii. 22. είτε ένεστώτα είτε μέλλοντα. Gal. ί. 4. έκ τοῦ αίωνος τοῦ ένεστωτος $\pi o \nu \eta \rho o \hat{v}$. For the latter, I Cor. vii. 26, δια την ένεστωσαν άνάγ. κην. 2 Thess. ii. 2. ws ori everτηκεν ή ήμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου. 2 Tim. iii. Ι, ένστήσονται καιροί χαλε- $\pi o i$. The former is however the simpler. For kalpós, a portion cut out of time, a season or opportunity, with the two points of difference from xpóvos, that it is (1) limited in duration, and (2) definite in purpose, see, for example, Gen. i. 14, corwoav eis raipoirs. Eccles. iii. 1-8, raipòs τοῦ τεκεῖν καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν κ.τ.λ. Song ii. 12, τὰ ἄνθη ὥφθη έν τῆ γῆ, καιρὸς τῆς τομῆς ἔφθακεν κ.τ.λ. Acts i. 7. xiv. 17. xvii. 26. &c. &c. For its application to the Gospel age, see verse 10, μέχρι καιρού διορθώσεως. Rom. iii. 26, έν τῷ νῦν кафф. viii. 18. xi. 5. 1 Cor. vii. 29. 2 Cor. vi. 2. 1 Tim. i. 6, το μαρτύριον καιροίς ίδίοις. Tit. i. 3. Ι Pet. i. 11. είς τίνα ή ποίον καιρόν κ.τ.λ.

 $\kappa a \theta' \tilde{\eta} v$] In accordance with which parable. The Levitical sacrifices are in accord with this στηκότα, καθ' ήν δωρά τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειωσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα, μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασιν καὶ πόμασιν 10

peculiar feature of the Levitical . sanctuary. It speaks of an obstacle between man and God: they offer an ineffectual propitiation.

δώρα τε καὶ θ .] See once again note on v. 1.

προσφέρονται] Are being offered. The Levitical ritual is spoken of as still going on.

μη δυνάμεναι] Such as cannot. See note on iv. 2, μή.

κατά συνείδησιν As regards By removing the conscience. consciousness of unforgiven sin by an effectual absolution. The word συνείδησις (from σύνοιδα, συνειδέναι) means properly (1) fellow-knowledge, knowledge with (some one, that some one being) oneself; self-privity, consciousness. So here, and in Χ. 2, δια το μηδεμίαν έχειν έτι συνείδησιν άμαρτιών. Hence (2) the faculty of this self-privity or consciousness, conscience. Acts xxiii. 1. xxiv. 16. Rom. ix. xiii. 5. 1 Cor. viii. 7, 10, Ι, 2 Cor. i. 12. iv. 2. 12. v. See fuller note on 11. &c. &c. Rom. ii. 15.

τελειώσαι] So x. 1, 14. See note on ii. 10.

τον λατρεύοντα] 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. 9.

μόνον $\epsilon \pi i$] A difficult 10. The Vatican manuverse. script retains the kai of the received text before Sik. But it agrees with the Sinaitic and Alexandrine in reading δικαιώματα for δικαιώμασιν, and this change makes the kai quite untenable. (1) Without it the verse may perhaps form a single clause in apposition with the μή δυνάμεναι κ.τ.λ. of verse The construction would **n**. then be this: μόνον δικαιώματα σαρκός ἐπικείμενα ἐπὶ βρώμασιν καί πόμασιν και διαφόροις βαπτισμοΐς μέχρι καιρού διορθώσεως. Mere carnal ordinances resting upon (such things as) meats and drinks and divers washings until a time of reformation. For $\epsilon \pi i \kappa \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu a \epsilon \pi i$, we might compare John xi 38, καὶ λίθος έπέκειτο έπ' αύτώ. And the style of the Epistle (see xii. 11. &c.) might be pleaded in excuse for the late and isolated position of $\epsilon \pi i \kappa \epsilon i \mu \epsilon v a$. (2) The alternative is to make µóvov--- $\beta_{a\pi\tau\iota\sigma\muols}$ a clause by itself (only standing in, or resting upon, meats and drinks and divers washings), and δικαιώματα --- čπικείμενα a second apposi-

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς δικαιώματα σαρκὸς μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα.

ix. 10. Or sai dis.

tional clause (carnal ordinances imposed until a time of refor-This seems to want mation). confirmation in two respects; (a) the independence of the $\mu \dot{\rho} \nu \dot{\rho} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon}$ clause, and (b) the stress laid upon inikeiµeva, 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) carnal ordinances,' &c.

 $\beta \rho \omega \mu a \sigma v$] 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.

πόμασιν] The reference must be to restrictions or prohibitions of wine for priests (Lev. x.), for Nazarites (Num. vi.), &c. The word πόμα occurs only here and in 1 Cor. x. 4. In the Septuagint, only in Psalm cii. q and Dan. i, 16.

διαφόροις] Rom. xii. 6. See note on i. 4, δσφ διαφορώτερον.

βαπτισμοîs] Exod. xxix. 40. Lev. viii. 14. &c. See note on vi. 2.

δικαιώματα] See note on verse 1.

σαρκός] As κόσμου in the phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (Gal. iv. 3. Col. ii. 8, 20), so $\sigma a \rho \kappa \partial s$ here is a term of disparagement for the Levitical system of ordinance and sacrifice as essentially material and unspiritual in its form.

μέχρι κ. δ.] Until a season (or period) of rectification. A striking description of the Gospel age. It comes to make the crooked straight (rà σκολιà eis eveleiav, Isai. xl. 4) by turning shadow into substance and substituting the spiritual for the carnal. For Kaipós, see note on verse above. The form Sióo- $\theta\omega\sigma\iota$ s occurs only here. The revised text has διορθωμάτων (for κατορθωμάτων) in Acts xxiv. 2, in the sense of *reforms*. In the Septuagint, the verb $\delta_{io\rho}\theta_{ov}$ occurs in Jer. vii. 3, 5, tav Supθουντες διορθώσητε τας όδους υμών. &c. Also $\delta \iota o \rho \theta \omega \tau \eta s$ in Wisd, vii. 15.

iπικείμενa] 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 xv. 10, 28, iπιθείναι ζυγὸν iπὶ τὸν τράχηλοντῶν μαθητῶν...μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῶν βάρος κ.τ.λ. (2)Lying upon (in the other suggested sense, of resting upon as

Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος, ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελ- 11 λόντων ἀγαθῶν, διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας

ix. 11. Οr τών γενομένων άγ.

a basis), taken with $\epsilon \pi \lambda$ $\beta \rho \omega \mu a$ - $\sigma \iota \nu \kappa.\tau.\lambda$, is unobjectionable except in collocation. See John xi. 38 (quoted in a former note). xxi. 9, $\dot{\alpha} \nu \beta \rho \alpha \kappa \dot{\alpha} \nu \kappa \kappa \epsilon \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \nu \kappa \alpha \dot{\epsilon}$ $\dot{\alpha} \psi \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \kappa \dot{\epsilon} (\mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \nu.$

11. $X\mu\sigma\tau\delta$; $\delta\epsilon$] 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.

 $\pi a \rho a \gamma \epsilon v \delta \mu \epsilon v o s = Having ar$ rived. Having appeared on the scene of fact and history. See Matt. iii. 1, έν δε ταις ήμέραις έκείναις παραγίνεται Ίωαννής. Luke xii. 51, δοκείτε ότι εἰρήνην παρεγενόμην δούναι έν τη γη. Compare Isai, 1xii. 11, єїπατε τη θυγατρί Σιών, Ίδού σοι ό σωτήρ παραγίνεται κ.τ.λ. The 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.

 $d\rho\chi$. τών μελλόντων] The genitive gives the subject of the highpriestly action. High Priest concerned about, ministering in, securing and applying by His ministry, τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά. The genitive in iii. I (τῆς ὁμολογίας ήμῶν) is rather different: see note there. The genitive here is nearly equivalent to the accusative τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν in ii, 17.

τών μελλόντων άγαθών] So in x. 1, σκιάν...των μελλόντων The reading of the αγαθών. Vatican manuscript is yevoµéνων. The good things already come to pass, already brought to light by the Gospel. Compare 2 Tim. i. 10. If μελλόντων (with the Alexandrine and Sinaitic manuscripts) be retained, still the sense may be the The good things future same. under the law, future till Christ But it is not certain came. whether the sense may not be. future still even under the Gospel. See vi. 5, δυνάμεις τε $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda ov \tau os$ alúros, and the note there.

άγαθῶν] See John x. 10, έγω ἦλθον ἕνα ζωὴν ἔχωσιν καὶ περισσὸν ἔχωσιν. Compare the 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 benefits of His Passion.

διὰ $\tau \hat{\eta}_s$] Depends upon εἰσ- $\hat{\eta}\lambda \theta$ εν. Through, locally. He passed through the antitype of σκηνής ου χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ου ταύ-12 της της κτίσεως, οὐδὲ δι' αίματος τράγων καὶ

the Lyia into the antitype of the ayıa ayiwv. What then is the antitype of the $d\gamma_{1}a$? (1) The phrases of iv. 14 (διεληλυθότα roùs oùpavoùs) and vii. 26 ($\psi\eta$ λότερος τών οὐρανών) would point to the general idea of the lower heavens through which He passed into the avros o ovpavos (ix. 24) of the divine Presence itself, which last is unquestionably the antitype of the $\check{a}\gamma\iota a$ $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\dot{\omega}\nu$ here. (2) But the emphasis laid upon the particular $\sigma_{\kappa\eta\nu\dot{\eta}}$ here intended may seem to suggest a more definite interpretation. May this be the ideal heaven of the divine selfmanifestation 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 $\sigma \kappa \eta v \eta$ the $\sigma a \rho \xi$ of Christ, the human nature which He took upon Him and in which He ministered and suffered below. See x. 20. διά τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τουτ' έστιν της σαρκός αύτου. The ou χειροποιήτου would thus have a striking illustration in the version of John ii. $IQ(\lambda i \sigma a \tau \epsilon)$ TO'V VAOV TOUTOV K.T. λ .) given by the false witnesses (Mark xiv. 58, τον ναόν τοῦτον τον χειροποίητον, καί... άλλον άχειροποίητον). 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.

μείζονος] Greater in dignity. Matt. xii. 6, τοῦ ἱεροῦ μεῖζόν ἐστιν ὦδε. &c.

τελειοτέρας] More mature, as being the completion and fulfilment of the typical. See I Cor. xiii. 10, όταν δὲ ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον, τὸ ἐκ μέρους καταργηθήσεται.

χειροποιήτου] So verse 24, οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα εἰσῆλθεν ἀγια Χριστός. Acts vii. 48, ἀλλ οὐχ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεί. xvii. 24, οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῦς κατοικεί. (In the Septuagint, χειροποίητα often stands for idols. Lev. xxvi. 1. Isai, ii. 18. &c.)

οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως] Not belonging to this (visible) creution. Col. i. 15, 23, πάσης κτίσεως...ἐν πάση κτίσει τῆ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν. See note on iv. 13, and Rom. i. 20. For ταύτης, compare τούτου in Rom. vii. 24.

12. $\delta i' a l \mu a \tau os]$ The former $\delta \iota a$ 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

IX. 12.

μόσχων, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αίματος, εἰσηλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ άγια, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος.

effected by means of the blood of the two sacrifices. The blood gave him an admission impossible otherwise. Lev. xvi. 3, ourws (so, and not otherwise) $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \sigma \epsilon \tau a$ 'Aap $\omega \nu \epsilon i s \tau \delta$ äyuov. For another significant preposition in the same connexion, see verse 25, $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \epsilon \tau a \dots \epsilon \nu$ aïµar.

τράγων και μόσχων] An inversion of the order. The latter was the offering for the priests, and it came first. Lev. xvi. 6, 9, 11, 15.

δια δὲ τοῦ ἰδίων] 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.

έφάπαξ] Not κατ' ένιαυτών. See verse 25. For έφάπαξ, see note on vii. 27.

τὰ ἀγια] See note on viii. 2, τῶν ἀγίων. The antitype of the holy of holies, the divine Presence itself.

aiwviav] In contrast with the temporary reconciliation effected by the annual ceremony of expiation. For the contrast between aiwvios and $\pi p \acute{o} \sigma \kappa a i \rho o \sigma$, see 2 Cor. iv. 18. The feminine form (aiwvia) is found (in the New Testament) only here and in 2 Thess. ii. 16. In the Septuagint, Num. xxv. 15. Isai. lxi. 4. Jer. xx. 17. Ezek. xxxvii. 26.

 $\lambda \dot{v}$ τρωσιν] Luke i. 68. ii. 38. Elsewhere (in the New Testament) always απολύτρωσις. 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. 16. Psalm exi. 9, λύτρωσιν απέστειλε τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ. εxxx. 7, καὶ πολλὴ παρ' αὐτῷ λύτρωσις. The other forms of the uncompounded word are λύτρον, Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45: λυτροῦν (middle and passive), Luke xxiv. 21. Tit. ii. I Pet. i. 18: and λυτρωτής. Acts vii. 35. See fuller note on Rom. iii. 24, απολυτρώσεως.

 $\epsilon \delta p \dot{a} \mu \epsilon v os]$ (A debased form, simulating a first aorist, for $\epsilon \delta - \rho \dot{a} \mu \epsilon v os$). This is apparently the only instance, in the New Testament or the Septuagint, of the (classical) middle use of $\epsilon \delta p \dot{a} \sigma \kappa \omega$, to find for oneself, to win, or gain. The $\lambda \dot{v} \tau \rho \omega \sigma \sigma$ 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 satisfied).

13. εἰ γάρ] I say aἰωνίaν λύτρωσιν—for, dc. It is an argument à fortiori. If animal blood could have any value at

13 εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἰμα τράγων καὶ ταύρων καὶ σποδὸs δαμάλεωs ῥαντίζουσα τοὺs κεκοινωμένουs ἀγιάζοι

all in relation to religious matters—and it could only be, at the best, an external and a ceremonial value—how much more, &c.

 $\tau \circ at\mu a$] That blood. See verse 12. The reference in the first clause is still to the day of Atonement.

τράγων καὶ ταύρων] Such is the order in the three great manuscripts.

ταύρων] Always μόσχων in Lev. xvi. For ταύρων, see x. 4. Psalm l. 13, μὴ φάγομαι κρέα ταύρων, ἢ αίμα τράγων πίομαι; Isai. i. 11, αίμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων οὐ βούλομαι.

καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως] An abrupt transition to another Levitical ceremony, for which see Num. xix. 1, &c. λαβέτωσαν πρός σε δάμαλιν πυρρὰν ἄμωμον κ.τ.λ.

σποδός] See Num. xix. 9, 10.

ρaντίζουσa] The water of separation was called υδωρ ρaντισμοῦ (Num. xix. 9, 13, 20, 21). The expression here is condensed and abbreviated. The full phrase would at least have been ρaντιζομένη ἐπί, and even then would have required the mention of the water which made the ashes capable of the sprinkling. For ρaντίζειν, see verses 19, 21, 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, *javruiis* $\mu\epsilon$ *vorwing* kal kalapiothyropa. Also *jarrurpos* 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 *jaivieu* and $\pi\epsilon\rho_i\rho_iaivieu$ are somewhat oftener used in Leviticus and Numbers.

τούς κεκοινωμένους] Those that have been defiled by contact with death in any shape. Num. xix. 13-16, πας ό άπτόμενος του τεθνηκότος...άνθρωπος έαν αποθάνη έν οικία, πας ό είσπορευόμενος είς την οικίαν...και παν σκεύος ανεφγμένον...και πας ΰς αν αψηται επί πρόσωπον (Α, προσώπου Β) τοῦ πεδίου τραυματίου ρομφαίας (B omits ρ.), η νεκρού, ή οστέου ανθρώπου (Α, ανθρωπίνου Β), ή μνήματος κ.τ.λ. The water of separation was the $a\gamma m\sigma\mu a$ in all such cases. For KOLVOUV (not in the Septuagint), see Matt. xv. 11, &c. Mark vii. 15, &c. Acts x. 15. xi. 9. xxi. 28. And for KOLVOS (the opposite of aylos), see note on Rom. xiv. 14.

aγιάζα] Sanctifies, in the sense of restoring to outward communion with God and His chosen nation. This was the effect of the application of the

IX. 13, 14.

προς την της σαρκός καθαρότητα, πόσω μάλλον 14 το αίμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου

water of separation to one who had incurred the special defilement of contact with physical death. It was the effect of the ceremony of the day of Atonement upon the priests and people generally, in the form of a typical and prophetical absolution from offences against God. The two rites are combined in the one statement: both are said to avail only for a $\kappa a \theta a \rho \delta \tau \eta_s$ of the $\sigma a \rho \xi$. For $\dot{a} \gamma u \dot{a} \zeta \epsilon w$, see note on ii. II.

 $\pi\rho \delta s$] With a view to, in the aspect of, as regards, that sort of purity (or cleanness) which belongs to the $\sigma \delta \rho \xi$ as opposed to the $\sigma vr \epsilon \delta \eta \sigma v s$. That $\kappa a \theta a \rho \delta \tau \eta s$ which is external and ceremonial, instead of spiritual or of the conscience. The form $\kappa a \theta a \rho \delta \tau \eta s$ is found here only in the New Testament or the Septuagint.

14. $\pi \acute{o} \sigma \psi \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \sigma r$] An exclamation. In x. 29, $\delta \sigma \kappa \epsilon \tilde{c} \tau \epsilon$ is interposed between $\pi \acute{o} \sigma \phi$ and the comparative ($\chi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \sigma \sigma \sigma$). I leave you to judge. See note on verse 13. For the phrase (always in the same *d* fortiori sense) see Matt. vii. 11, ϵi oùv $\dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \hat{s} \pi \sigma \tau \eta \rho \circ i$ $\delta \tau \tau \epsilon s \dots \pi \acute{o} \sigma \psi \mu \hat{a} \lambda$ $\lambda \sigma \nu \delta$ Hatther $\dot{\sigma} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \tau . \lambda$. x. 25. Luke xi. 13. xii. 28. Rom. xi. 12, 24. Philem. 16.

τὸ alµa τοῦ X.] The full

and exact phrase occurs elsewhere only in 1 Cor. x. 16 and Eph. ii. 13. But equivalent forms are frequent. See x. 19 (Ίησοῦ). xiii. 12, 20 (τοῦ ἰδίου ...διαθήκης αἰωνίου). Matt. xxvi. 28. Mark xiv. 24 (μου της διαθήκης). Luke xxii. 20 (μου). John vi. 53-56 (400). Acts xx. 28 (τήν εκκλησίαν του Θεού ήν περιεποιήσατο διά του αίματος του ίδίου). Rom. iii. 25. v. 9 (avtov). 1 Cor. xi. 25, 27 (tŵ έμώ...τοῦ Κυρίου). Eph. i. 7 (αὐτοῦ). Col. i. 20 (τοῦ σταυροῦ 1 Pet. i. 2, 19 ('Inoov αὐτοῦ). Χριστού...Χριστού). 1 John i. 7 (ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἰοῦ αὐτοῦ). Rev. i. 5 (aυτού). v. 9 (σου). vii. 14. xii. 11 (τοῦ ἀρνίου). The blood is the life (Lev. xvii. 11, ή γὰρ ψυχή πάσης σαρκός αίμα αύτου έστι, και έγω δέδωκα αύτο ύμιν έπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου έξιλάσκεσθαι περί των ψυχών ύμων. τὸ γὰρ αἶμα αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς έξιλάσεται). The blood of Christ is the surrendered life, that obedience unto (up to) death (Phil. ii. 8) by which He made atonement for sin.

διὰ πνεύματος aἰωνίου] A very difficult passage. (1) Much depends upon the sense given to προσήνεγκεν. Is it the προσφέρεων of v. I, or is it the second προσφέρεων of viii. 3? In other words, is it the sacri-

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

έαυτον προσήνεγκεν άμωμον τώ Θεώ, καθαριεί

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. Īf He has often to present Himself, He must often have suffered. (2) Upon the answer to this question will partly depend the meaning of $\delta_{ia} \pi v \epsilon \dot{v} \mu a \tau os alw$ νίου. 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 $\pi \rho o \sigma \eta \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon \nu$ refers to the self-presentation in heaven (as $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \eta$ in verse 25), then the agency of the Holy Spirit in resurrection may be prominent in the mention of the $\pi v \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a a l \omega v o v here.$ See Rom. viii. 11, 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 $\pi \rho o \sigma \eta v \epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon v$ 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 the crucified and risen as 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 connected with the $d\mu\omega\mu\sigma\nu$ which follows; and the thought will be, that the Saviour, whose humiliation consisted in receiving the Holy Spirit (John iii. 34, our er uét- $\rho \circ v$) 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 μέχρι θανάτου, and, as the antitype of the perfect victim 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.

πνεύματος alωνίου] This particular combination is found only here. For alώνιος with a divine Person, see Rom. xvi. 26, τοῦ alωνίου Θεοῦ. Also Job xxxiii. 12. Isai. xxvi. 4, ở Θεὸς à μέγας ὁ alώνιος. xl. 28, Θεὸς alώνιος κ.τ.λ. Compare I Tim. i. 17, τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ τῶν alώνων. For other epithets of the Holy Spirit (besides the commonest of all, äγιον), see x. 29, τῆς χάριτος. John xiv. 17, τῆς alϣθείας. Eph. i. 13, τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.

čavióv] In contrast with

την συνείδησιν ήμων ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι.

ix. 14. Or τ. σ. ὑμῶν.

the τράγων καὶ ταύρων above. So in verses 25, 26, ἐν αἶματι ἀλλοτρίψ is contrasted with διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ.

προσήνεγκεν] For the alternative sense here, see note above on διὰ πv . aἰωνίου.

άμωμον] I Pet. i. 19, ώς άμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου. A word frequent in the Septuagint (first in Exod. xxix. 1) in connexion with the choice of victims for sacrifice. Without blemish. Faultless. Eph. i. 4. v. 27. Col. i. 22. Rev. xiv. 5.

τῷ Θεῷ] Depends on προσήνεγκεν.

 $\kappa a \theta a \rho \iota \epsilon \hat{\iota}$ (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 κ α θ α ρ ί ζ ειν is specially applied in the first three Gospels (1) to the cleansing of the leper (Matt. viii. 2, 3. x. 8. xi. 5. Mark i. 40-42. Luke iv. 27. ٧. 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 (1) 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. 1. 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, 13. li. 2, 9. Jer. xxxiii. (xl. B) 8. Ezek. Mal. iii. 3. &c.). xxxvi. 25.

 $\tau \eta \nu \sigma \upsilon \epsilon i \delta \eta \sigma \upsilon r$] 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.

νεκρών] The word is perhaps chosen in reference to the special office of the ⁱδωρ ^jραντισμοῦ above in cleansing from the ceremonial defilement of contact with death. Not from dead *bodies*, but from dead *works*. See notes on verse 13. Also note on vi. 1, νεκρών.

 $\epsilon is \tau \delta \lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon v \epsilon u re$ moval of the burden of sin by afree forgiveness is the preli15 Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν, ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν

minary condition of a willing, spiritual, and life-long service. The tense expresses the continued, habitual, daily exercise of the new $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i a$. See again note on Rom. i. 9, $\dot{\omega} \lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i \omega$.

Θεῷ ζῶντι] See note on iii. 12, Θεοῦ ζῶντος. A God who is all life. In contrast with the νεκρῶν above, and with the defiling contact with literal death from which the σποδος δαμάλεως cleansed typically. Compare x. 31, εἰς χείρας Θεοῦ ζῶντος. xii. 22, πόλει Θεοῦ ζῶντος.

15. διà τοῦτο] Because His blood is thus efficacious.

διαθήκης] See notes on vii. 22. viii. 6, 8, διαθήκης, μεσίτης, καινήν.

 $\delta \pi \omega s$] That, a death having taken place unto redemption of the transgressions which referred to (bore upon, were committed against) the first διαθήκη, the called might receive the (fulfilment of the) promise of the eternal inheritance. This clause describes the object of the Mediatorship of the new $\delta \iota a \theta \eta \kappa \eta$. 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 promised eternal inheritance which could not without that atonement be entered upon by any.

 $\theta av a rov$] A death. Intentionally 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.

απολύτρωσιν] Three thoughts always lie in $a\pi o\lambda \psi \tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota s$. (1) A previous state of bondage. (2) The interposition of a *litpov*. (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 particular genitive following $a\pi o\lambda \dot{v}$ τρωσις. Elsewhere απολύτρωσις is either absolute (Rom. iii. 24. 1 Cor. i. 30. Eph. i. 7. iv. 30. Col. i. 14), or else takes a genitive of the person or thing delivered (Luke xxi. 28, υμών. Rom. viii. 23, τοῦ σώματος. Eph. i. 14, της περιποιήσεως). Here it is a genitive of the thing from which the deliverance is. Removal, by a Aύτρον (Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45) or αντίλυτρον (I Tim. ii. 6), of sins. $\epsilon \pi i$ With reference to. And

 $\epsilon \pi i$] With reference to. And so (by the context) against.

τŷ πρώτη] The statement is that the death of Christ had a retrospective bearing upon sins committed under the Mosaic διαθήκη. Is it that that διαθήκη required vindicating before its

IX. 15, 16.

ἐπὶ τῆ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας. ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη 16

supersession? Has Isai. xlii. 21 (He will magnify the law, and make it houourable) anything of the same thought? At all events the atonement must not be confined to previous transgressions. See I John i. 7-9. ii. I, 2.

παραβάσεων] See note on ii. 2, παράβασις κ. π.

λάβωσιν] Might take, in actual possession. For ἐπαγγελίαν λαμβάνειν in this sense of receiving the fulfilment of a promise, see Acts ii. 33, τήν τε ἐπαγγελίαν...λαβών παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο κ.τ.λ. Gal. iii. 14, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν κ.τ.λ. See notes on vi. 12, 15 (equivalent phrases), κληρονομούντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, and ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.

oi $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha i$ 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.

aiwviov] In implied contrast with the earthly and therefore temporary possession of Canaan. See iv. 8, 9, κληρονομίας] Explained by the last reference (iv. 9), and by i. 14, κληρονομείν σωτηρίαν. See note on i. 2, κληρονόμον πάντων. Also on vi. 12, 17.

οπου γάρ] See note on 16. vii. 22, διαθήκης. The transition from *covenant* to *testament* is clear and not to be evaded. The latter was the *commoner* sense of $\delta_{\iota a} \theta \eta \kappa \eta$. To one thinking in Greek there was nothing incongruous in the two senses. The fundamental idea of $\delta_{ia}\theta_{\eta\kappa\eta}$ is arrangement. A covenant is an arrangement of *relations*, a *testament* is an arrangement of possessions. The transition is eased by the words $\theta a v a \tau o v$ and κληρονομίαs in verse 15. It is as if the sacred writer had said. And thus the $\delta \iota a \theta \eta \kappa \eta$ which is in one aspect a covenant is in another aspect a testament. It presupposes a death, and it confers an inheritance. View it in this light. Think what a testament is. See how appropriate is the idea to the Gospel Siaθήκη.

θάνατον ἀνάγκη] A testament presupposes a death—that of the testator. For ἀνάγκη, see verse 23, and Rom. xiii. 5.

 $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a i$] Both the Authorized Version and the Revised

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

17 φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου. διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μή ποτε ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῆ δ δια18 θέμενος. ὅθεν οὐδὲ ή πρώτη χωρὶς αἴματος

ix. 17. Οτ μη τότε.

Version recognize the difficulty of finding an English equivalent for *dépegdal* here, by rendering Such translations as be it 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. i. 17, 18, 21 (φωνής ένεχθείσης $\dots \eta v \epsilon \chi \theta \eta \pi \rho o \phi \eta \tau \epsilon a)$, illustrates this looser passive.

τοῦ διαθεμένου] For the phrase διατίθεσθαι διαθήκην, compare viii. 10. Acts iii. 25.

17. ἐπὶ νεκροῖs] Either (1) in reference to dead persons (see, for ἐπί, verse 15, τῶν ἐπὶ τῷ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ. xỉ. 4, μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῦς δώροις αὐτοῦ), or (2) on the footing, groundwork, or supposition, of dead persons (see viii. 6, ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις).

 $\beta \epsilon \beta a i a$] Valid. See note on ii. 2, $\beta \epsilon \beta a i o s$.

 $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i \mu \eta$ Since it never avails, & An unusual, perhaps unexampled, instance of $\mu \eta$, 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 $i\pi\epsilon i$, which is essentially subjective. Compare John iii, 18, $\eta \delta \eta \ \kappa \epsilon \kappa \rho \iota \tau a \iota$, $\delta \tau \iota \ \mu \eta \ \pi \epsilon \pi \ell \sigma \tau e \kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$. 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 $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon$ simply anticipates and prepares for the $\delta \tau \epsilon$.)

δτε $\{\hat{\eta}\}$ For δτε with a present indicative, see Mark xi. 1, δτε εγγίζουσιν (when they are in the act of drawing nigh). John ix. 4, δτε οὐδεἰς δύναται (when no one is in the state of being able). Here, when (while) the testator is living.

18. $\delta\theta\epsilon v$] Whence. In consequence of which principle; namely, that a testament presupposes a death. For $\delta\theta\epsilon v$, see note on ii. 17.

οὐδὲ ἡ πρώτη] Not even the first (the Mosaic) διαθήκη. It might have seemed to be enough that the second (the Christian) διαθήκη should fulfil the condition of having a death antecedent to it. But it was not so. Even the Mosaic, typical

ένκεκαίνισται. λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης έντολῆς 19

of the Christian, recognized the same necessity. The question arises, Was it that the Mosaic $\delta \iota a \theta \eta \kappa \eta$ was *itself* testament as well as covenant? Or, that the Mosaic $\delta \iota a \theta \eta \kappa \eta$ typified the testamentary character of the Christian? I think the latter.

ένκεκαίνισται] 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 *έγκαινίζειν*, with its cognate and derived nouns, is post-classical (Kaivilleir and Kaivour are classical), and has the senses of (1)making new (as for the first time), as Ecclus. xxxvi. 6, έγκαίνισον σημεΐα κ.τ.λ., (2) making anew (remaking), as 1 Sam. xi. 14, και έγκαινίσωμεν έκει την βασιλείαν. 2 Chron. xv. 8, καὶ ἐνεκαίνισε τὸ θυσιαστήριον Κυρίου. Psalm li. 10. πνεῦμα εὐθὲς ἐγκαίνισον ἐν τοῖς έγκάτοις μου, and (3) inaugurating (dedicating), as Deut. xx. 5. I Kings vili. 63, Kal evekaíνισε τον οίκον Κυρίου ο βασιλεύς $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. And so here, and in x. Hence eykaíviois (Num. 20. vii. 88), and eykawiopuos (Num. vii. 10), dedication. Also eyка́іна, a feast of dedication. Ezr.

V. H.

vi. 16, 17. Neh. xii. 27. Dan. iii. 2. John x. 22.

λαληθείσης γάρ] See 10. Exod. xxiv. 3-8. The particulars given in Exodus are (1) the telling to the people $\pi \dot{a} \nu \tau a$ $\tau \dot{a}$ ρήματα του Θεού και τα δικαιώ- $\mu a \tau a$, (2) the answer of the people, Πάντας τοὺς λόγους οῦς ελάλησε Κύριος ποιήσομεν, (3) the writing of the words, (4) the rising early to build an altar under the mountain, (5) the sending young men to offer όλοκαυτώματα and to sacrifice a peace-offering ($\theta v \sigma (a v \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho (a v))$ of μοσχάρια, (6) the sprinkling of half the blood upon the altar, (7) the reading of $\tau \delta \beta i \beta \lambda i o \nu$ $\tau \eta s \delta \iota a \theta \eta \kappa \eta s$ 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, Idoù tò aiµa tôs διαθήκης ής διέθετο Κύριος προς ύμας περί πάντων τών λόγων τού- $\tau \omega \nu$. 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) Kai Tŵr τράγων, (2) μετα ύδατος και ερίου κοκκίνου και υσσώπου, (3) the sprinkling of auto to BiBliov. (We need not add to these variations by combining verse 21 with the preceding.) Of these (1) the addition of the

κατὰ νόμον ὑπὸ Μωυσέως παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, λαβών τὸ αἶμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τῶν τράγων μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου καὶ ὑσσώπου αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν ἐρἀντισεν, 20 λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ αἶμα τῆς διαθήκης ἦς

τράγοι to the μόσχοι may be regarded as a sort of formula of sacrifices; or it may have been suggested by the predominant thought of the whole sub-section, which is that of the ceremonial 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 $\delta \dot{a} \mu a \lambda \iota s$, followed by verse 9 which mentions 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 $\beta \iota \beta \lambda i o \nu$ to the $\lambda a \dot{o} s$ in the sprinkling is explained by the thought that, 'though containing divine words, it was written by human hands,' and thus needed purifying to qualify it for its abiding virtue.

καὶ τῶν τράγων] See note above. Compare verses 12 and 13.

μετά δατος See note above,

and note on verse 13. Compare Lev. xiv. 4-7 and Num. xix. 6, 9, 18.

τὸ βἰβλίον] Exod. xxiv. 4, 7, καὶ ἔγραψε Μωυσῆς πάντα τὰ ῥήματα Κυρίου...καὶ λαβών τὸ βιβλίον τῆς διαθήκης ἀνέγνω εἰς τὰ ὦτα τοῦ λαοῦ κ.τ.λ.

πάντα τον λ. ἐράντισεν] Exod. xxiv. 8, λαβών δὲ Μωυση̂ς το αἶμα κατεσκέδασε τοῦ λαοῦ. For ῥαντίζειν, see note on verse 13.

20. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega v$] The only variations in the quotation from Exod. xxiv. 8 are (1) τοῦτο for ἰδού, (2) ἐνετείλατο for διέθετο, (3) ὁ Θεὸs for Κύριος.

τό αίμα της δ.] The blood of, belonging to, shed to ratify, the διαθήκη. The words are applied by our Lord to His own blood, and to the new $\delta_{ia}\theta_{\eta\kappa\eta}$, in the institution of the Supper. Matt. xxvi. 28, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν το αίμά μου τής διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλών ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν aμαρτιών. Mark xiv. 24 (with $i\pi\epsilon\rho$ for $\pi\epsilon\rho i$, and omission of eis ap. au.). Luke xxii. 20, τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ή καινή διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἴματί μου (with ὑμῶν for $\pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} v$). I Cor. xi. 25 (as in Luke, but with $\epsilon\mu\hat{\omega}$ for $\mu\sigma\nu$,

IX: 20, 21.

ένετείλατο πρός ύμας ό Θεός. και την 21 σκηνήν δὲ και πάντα τὰ σκεύη της λειτουρ-

and omission of words follow-

 η_{s} For η_{v} . The usual attraction of the relative to the antecedent. See vi. 10, η_{s} $a_{\gamma}a_{\pi}\eta_{s}$ η_{s} èvedétéa $\sigma\theta_{e}$.

ένετείλατο] Substituted for διέθετο, as συντελέσω for δια- $\theta \eta \sigma o \mu a \iota$ in viii. 8, where see note. For ἐντέλλεσθαι, see xi. 22, περί των οστέων αύτου ένε- $\tau \epsilon i \lambda a \tau o$. The full construction is εντελλεσθαί τι τινι. Matt. xxviii. 20, όσα ένετειλάμην ύμιν. Mark x. 3. John xv. 14, 17. Sometimes the accusative is varied into περί τινος (Matt. iv. 6), or ούτως (Acts xiii. 47), or iva (Mark xiii. 34), or is omitted (Acts i. 2). Sometimes the dative is changed into $\pi \rho \delta s \tau \nu a$, as here. The word occurs only about 12 times in the revised text of the New Testament, but more than 340 times in the Septuagint.

21. $\kappa a i \tau \eta \nu \sigma \kappa$. $\delta \epsilon$ And ($\delta \epsilon$) the tabernacle also ($\kappa a l$), &c. This is a new and separate statement, for the tabernacle was not in existence at the time of the ceremony of Exod. xxiv. (1) It may be that the day of Atonement 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. 10), then upon the brazen altar (Lev. xvi. 18), and when it is expressly said (Lev. xvi. 16) that atonement is made for $\tau \delta$ aylov and for η $\sigma \kappa m \dot{m}$. 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 σκηνή και πάντα τα σκεύη $a\dot{v}r\hat{\eta}s$ (Exod. xl. g), and that, though only oil is there mentioned, as also in that account (Exod. xl. 13, 15) of the consecration 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. (Josephus is quoted in confirmation of this last view.)

σκηνην καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη] Exod. xxv. 9, τὸ παράδειγμα τῆς σκηνης καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα πάντων τῶν σκευῶν αὐτῆς. xxx. 26— 28. xl. 9. &c.

τὰ σκ. τῆς λ.] I Chron ix. 28, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας. xxiii. 26, τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῆς. For λειτουργίας, see note on i. 7, λειτουργούς.

 $\tau \hat{\psi}$ alµaτι] At first sight the article ($\tau \hat{\psi}$ alµaτι) suggests the same blood as in verses 19, 22 γίας τῷ αίματι ὁμοίως ἐράντισεν. καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αίματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ χωρὶς αἰματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις.

23 'Ανάγκη οὖν τὰ μέν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν

20. This it cannot be. It must mean the (well known) blood. Appealing to the reader's knowledge of the Levitical ceremonial.

εράντισεν] See note on verse
13.

22. καὶ σχεδόν] And I may almost say that, &c. The σχεδόν qualifies the sweeping statement which it prefaces, and specially the πάντα. It occurs twice besides; both times in the Acts, and both times with πâs. xiii. 44, σχεδόν πâσα ή πόλις συνήχθη. xix. 26, οὐ μόνον Ἐφέσου ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν πάσης τῆς ᾿Ασίας.

iv $ai\mu a\tau_i$] The iv has its usual semilocal idea. The cleansing of everything is contained in, lies in, consists in, blood. It is the direct opposite of $\chi w p is$. The iv $ai\mu a\tau_i$ of verse 25 has a slightly different tinge of meaning. See note there.

καθαρίζεται] See note on verse 14, καθαριεί.

kai $\chi \omega \rho is$ 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 κατὰ τὸν νόμον. The sin-offering always involved the sacrifice of animal life.

aiματεκχυσίας] A word used nowhere else in the New Testament or the Septuagint. Towards its composition we have έκχυσις aiματος in 1 Kings xviii. 28. Ecclus. xxvii. 15.

 $a\phi\epsilon\sigma\iota_s$] In the Šeptuagint $a\phi\epsilon\sigma\iota_s$ stands specially for the release (from debt, slavery, &c.) of the sabbatical year (Deut. xv. 1, &c. xxxi. 10) and the year of jubilee (Lev. xxv. 28, &c. xxvii. 17, &c.). In the New Testament it is usually followed by $a\mu a\rho\tau\iota\omega\nu$ ($\pi a\rho a\pi\tau\omega\mu a\tau\omega\nu$, Eph. i. 7), but here, and in Mark iii. 29, the genitive is understood.

23. 'Aváy $\kappa\eta$ ov?] A good example of the effect of $\mu \epsilon v$ in subordinating its clause to the one following with $\delta \epsilon$. 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

τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι, αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια κρείττοσιν θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας. οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα εἰσῆλθεν ἅγια Χριστός, 24 ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν

lies in the nature of things, like the dòśvarov 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.

ovr] In continuation of the argument, and in accordance with its course thus far. See note on verse 1.

τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς] Equivalent to τὰ ἐπουράνια following. See note on viii. 5.

τούτοις] By these things. Such sacrifices as those referred to in verses 13, 19, 21.

airà dè rà erovpária] Heaven needs no purifying in itself: the necessity spoken of is *relative* to fit it for man's entrance. The purifying spoken of is therefore the sacrifice of Christ for man's sin, and the self-presentation of Christ in heaven as man's High Priest.

 $\kappa\rho\epsilon i\tau\tau\sigma\sigma\iota\nu$] See note on i. 4. Compare the use of the word in vii. 19, 22. viii. 6. $\theta v \sigma i a s$] Plural, to state the principle. Presently it will define itself into the $\mu i a r \theta v \sigma i a r$ of x. 12.

 $\pi a \rho \dot{a}$] For $\pi a \rho \dot{a}$ after a comparative (characteristic of this Epistle) see note on i. 4.

24. où yá ρ] I say airà rà $\epsilon \pi o v \rho a r i a$, for that is the sanctuary of our High Priest's $\lambda \epsilon i - \tau o v \rho \gamma i a$. See viii. 1, 2.

χειροποίητα] See note on verse 11, δια τῆς. Here that is said of the antitypical ẵγια $\aaγίων$ which is there said of the antitypical ẵγια.

aντίτυπα Corresponding to. The same word artitutos may be either (1) answering in type to, or (2) answering to the type Thus type and antitype of. may change places in its use. The yeipomointa here (the Levitical holy of holies) are called *aντίτυπ* to the heavenly. Corresponding typically to the alm-In I Pet. iii. 21 the θινά. water of baptism is said to correspond antitypically to the water of the deluge.

 $a\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\omega\nu$] See note on viii. 2. $a\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\eta$ s.

aὐτον τὸν οὐρανόν] Distinguished from the οἱ οὖρανοὶ of οὐρανόν, νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῷ τοῦ 25 Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. οὐδ' ἱνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ ἐαυτόν, ὥσπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ 26 ἅγια κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν αίματι ἀλλοτρίῳ· ἐπεὶ

iv. 14 and vii. 26, where see notes.

 $v\hat{v}v$] 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.

έμφανισθήναι] The infinitive of the direct object. To be made ¿µφavýs (apparent or manifest). Equivalent to the $i\mu\phi av\hat{\eta}$ yevérbai of Acts x. 40. The aorist makes it the single act of self-presentation by ascension into heaven. For *èµφavíζειν*, see Matt. xxvii. 53, evequei- $\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\pi_0\lambda\lambda\eta$, John xiv. 21, 22, εμφανίσω αυτώ εμαυτόν κ.τ.λ. The exact thought of this passage, the self-manifestation of the ascended Lord to the Father in heaven, is found nowhere else.

τῷ προσώπῳ] To the face of God. Matt. xviii. 10, τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. Rev. xxii. 4, καὶ ὄψονται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ. Compare Psalm xvi. 15, ὀφθήσομαι τῷ προσώπῳ σου. xlii. 2, πότε ἦξω καὶ ὀφθήσομαι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ; &c.

 $i\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\eta\mu\omega\nu$] The simplest expression for the work of the Intercessor. To be in the presence of God for us, in our behalf, as that which He is, in work and heart.

25. ovd iva] Nor did He enter ($\epsilon i\sigma \eta \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$) that He may, dc.

 $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\phi\epsilon\rho\eta$] The context decides that this $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\nu$ is not the offering on the cross, but the subsequent presentation of Himself in heaven. See note on verse 14, $\deltaia \pi\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha\sigma\sigma$ alwviov. The present tense implies the continuance or repetition of the $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\nu$. That He may be often presenting Himself.

 $\dot{\epsilon}v \, a \ddot{\iota} \mu a \tau \iota$ The $\dot{\epsilon}v$ here, preserving its usual idea of contained in, has the sense of encased in as His protecting armour. Compare Eph. vi. 14, περιζωσάμενοι... εν άληθεία. The blood which the high priest carried was his instrument of entrance, his key or his passport, in one aspect (verse 12, δι' αίματος τράγων και μόσχων); it was also his *armour*, his coat of mail, in another aspect (Lev. xvi. 2, καὶ οὐκ ἀποθανεῖται). Compare x. 19, έν τῷ αίματι Ίησοῦ.

άλλοτρί $[mathcal{e}]$ Alien. Not his own. See verse 12, where δί

IX. 25, 26.

έδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου· νυνὶ δὲ ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς

aiµaros $\tau p a j \psi r \kappa a i$ µόσχων is contrasted with $\tau o \hat{v} i \delta i o v$ in the next clause. Compare Luke xvi. 12, $i r \tau \hat{\psi} a \lambda \lambda \sigma \tau \rho i \psi$ contrasted with $\tau \hat{o} v \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho o v$. The clause is added as a secondary point of contrast, the primary being the $\kappa a \tau$ $i r a v a v \tau o v$. (1) 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. enei] Since (if so) He must often have suffered. (For this use of $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$, carrying with it the suppressed clause, if so, or if otherwise, according to the context, see x. 2, and note on Rom. iii. 6, $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$.) 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 $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma$ - $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon w$ in heaven is to be repeated, so must the $\pi a \sigma \chi \epsilon \nu$ on Calvary. This contrast is often overlooked, and the offer $(\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\phi\epsilon\rho\eta)$ of verse 25 is read as the synonym of the suffer $(\pi a \theta \epsilon i v)$ of verse 26.

 $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon i$] In order to the fulfilment of the type and to the consistency of things. Compare the έδα of Luke xxiv. 26, 46. Acts xvii. 3.

 $\dot{a}\pi\dot{o}\kappa$. κ .] For the phrase see note on iv. 3. Here the thought is, that, if the $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma$ - $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\nu$ requires repetition, so must the $\pi\dot{a}\sigma\chi\epsilon\nu$, and, if repetition, then *perpetual* repetition, from the time of creation itself. The interval between creation and the fall is passed over as immaterial. Indeed, the fall being foreseen, its antidote should be anticipated.

vovì δέ] But as it is. As the case really stands. See note on viii, 6.

άπαξ] Once, and once only. See I Pet. iii. 18, Χριστος άπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν. See note on vi. 4.

έπι συντελεία των al.] (1)The $\epsilon \pi i$ is peculiar. From its 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, ἐπὶ τῆ ἀναγνώσει $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$ is one in point. (2) For συντέλεια (consummation), see Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49. xxiv. 3. xxviii. 20 (always with rou alώνος). Compare 2 Chron. xxiv. 23, μετά την συντέλειαν του ένιαυτοῦ. Dan. ix. 27, ἔως [της] συγ-

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

27 θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται. καὶ καθ' όσον

τελείας καιρού. xii. 4, 13, έως καιρού συντελείας...είς αναπλήρωσιν συντελείας...είς συντέλειαν ήμε- $\rho \hat{\omega} v$. (3) For $\tau \hat{\omega} v$ alw $v \omega v$, see note on Heb. i. 2. Here the consummation of the ages is equivalent to the $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\mu a$ $\tau\sigma\hat{v}$ $\chi\rho\delta\nu\sigma v$ of Gal. iv. 4, and to the $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu a$ Tŵr Kalpŵr of Eph. i. 10. 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 always 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 dispensa-See note on i. 2, Tŵy tion. ήμερών τούτων.

eis àdérnouv $\tau \eta s$ àµ.] Unto annulling of sin by an availing atonement. For àdérnous, see vii. 18 (only). The verb (àdereîv) is used with either (1) persons, to reject, set at nought (as Mark vi. 26. Luke x. 16, ò àderoîv ὑµâs èµè àdereî κ. τ . λ . John xii. 48. I Thess. iv. 8), or (2) things, to set at nought, to despise (as x. 28. Mark vii. 9. Luke vii. 30. I Tim. v. 12. Jude 8), or to bring to nought, annul (as I Cor. i. 19. Gal. ii. 21. iii. 15). The last is the sense of *attérησus* here and in vii. 18.

 $\tau\eta$ s áµ.] Sin universal. All sin.

τη̂ς θυσίας αὐτοῦ] The ἐν αἰματι ἀλλοτρίω above shows that αὐτοῦ is emphatic. Of Him Himself. The αὐτὸς in such (Hellenistic) uses is appositional (as if it had been Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ) and thus becomes emphatic. See, for example, Eph. i. 5, ϵἰς αὐτόν (unto Him Himself). &c.

 $\pi\epsilon\phi a\nu\epsilon\rho\omega\tau a\iota$] 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. 31. I Tim. iii. 16. 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.

27. $\kappa a \delta \kappa a \theta \delta \sigma o v$] Illustration from human example. Man dies once, and the next thing before him is julgment. So Christ died once, and the next thing before Him is the advent. The $\kappa a \theta \delta \sigma o v$ answered by obves (verse 28) makes the one sequence the measure of the other in probability. The use of $\kappa a \theta \delta \sigma o v$ is peculiar to ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις, οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός, ἅπαξ 28 προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρ-

this Epistle (iii. 3, $\pi\lambda\epsilon$ íovos $\delta \delta \xi \eta \dots \kappa a \theta$ δσον $\pi\lambda\epsilon$ íova τιμήν $\xi \chi \epsilon \iota \kappa. \tau. \lambda$. vii. 20, καθ δσον... κατὰ τοσοῦτο κ.τ.λ.). We have $\epsilon \phi$ δσον in Matt. xxv. 40, 45. Rom. xi. 13 (differing from καθ δσον only as forsomuch as, in so far as, from inasmuch as, in proportion as).

άπόκειται] It is reserved. Literally, it lies off from all else. The idea is that of security from meddling or tampering. Compare Luke xix. 20, ή $\mu v \hat{a}$ σου ήν είχον ἀποκειμένην ἐν σουδαρίφ. Col. i. 5, τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῶν ἐν τοῦς οὐρανοῦς. 2 Tim. iv. 8, λοιπὸν ἀπόκειταί μοι ὅ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος. The ἀπόκειται here is said of the living, for whom death no less than judgment is still in prospect.

τοῖς ἀνθρώποις] Mankind. All men. The only occurrence of οἱ ἀνθρωποι in this Epistle.

κρίσις] See x. 27. Matt. x. 15, ἐν ἡμέρα κρίσεως. xi. 22, 24. xii. 41, 42, ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῆ κρίσει...ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῆ κρίσει. Luke x. 14. xi. 31, 32. 2 Pet. ii. 9, εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως. 1 John iv. 17, ἐν τῆ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως. Jude 6, εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ήμέpas.

28. kai 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.

 $[a\pi a\xi]$ Once and once only. προσενεχθείς ... ανενεγκείν] The context, and the passive voice, both show this $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi o \rho a$ to be that of the sacrifice on Calvary. See note on v. I for the uses of $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon v$ and d v aφέρειν. Here, having been brought to the altar of sacrifice that He might bring up to it in His own person the sins of many. Compare Isai. liii. 12, kai autos άμαρτίας πολλών άνήνεγκε κ.τ.λ. James ii. 21, averéyras Isaak τον υίον αύτου έπι το θυσιαστήριον. I Pet. ii. 24, δς τας άμαρτίας ήμων αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αύτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον.

πολλών] Might have been πάντων. Compare Matt. xx. 28 (Mark x. 45), λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλών, with 1 Tim. ii. 6, ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. But the point here is to emphasize the τίας, ἐκ δευτέρου χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας ὀΦθήσεται τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις εἰς σωτηρίαν.

contrast between the once and the many, between the single offering and the multitude saved by it. In this respect it is like Rom. v. 18, 19, δι' ένος δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς κ.τ.λ. Compare I John ii. 2, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου.

έκ δευτέρου] In contrast with the first advent. The όφθήσεται of this verse with the πεφανέρωται of verse 26. For ἐκ δευτέρου, see Matt. xxvi. 42, πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου ἀπελθών κ.τ.λ. Mark xiv. 72, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. John ix. 24, ἐφώνησαν οὖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ δευτέρου, Acts x. 15. xi. 9.

 $\chi \omega \rho \lambda s \dot{a} \mu a \rho \tau i a s]$ 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.

οφθήσεται] The future corresponding with the ώφθην of the self-manifestations of the risen Saviour (Luke xxiv. 34. Acts ix. 17. xiii. 31. xxvi. 16. &c.). Only used besides (in the New Testament) in Acts xxvi. 16, μάρτυρα ῶν τε είδες ῶν τε ὀφtήσομαί σοι. It is frequent in the Septuagint; as, for example, Lev. xvi. 2, έν γὰρ νεφέλη ὀφθήσομαι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου.

τοίς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδ.] 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), ήν ο λαός προσδοκών τον Ζαχαρίαν κ.τ.λ. In I Thess. i. io it is made one half of the characteristic Christian life avaμένειν τον υίον αύτου έκ των ουpavŵv. Compare 1 Cor. i. 7, απεκδεχομένους την αποκάλυψιν τοῦ κυρίου ήμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Phil. iii. 20, σωτήρα ἀπεκδε-χόμεθα κύριον Ίησοῦν Χριστόν. 2 Tim. iv. 8, πάσιν τοις ήγαπηκόσιν την επιφάνειαν αυτού. For $a\pi\epsilon\kappa\delta\epsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta a_i$, see notes on Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25. Gal v. 5.

 ϵ is $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho$ iav] Are these last words to be attached to $\delta\phi\theta\eta'$ - $\sigma\epsilon\tauai$ or to $d\pi\epsilon\kappa\delta\epsilon\chi \rho\mu\epsilon\nu\sigmais$? For the latter, we have the $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho a$ $a\pi\epsilon\kappa\delta\epsilon\chi \delta\mu\epsilon\theta a$ of Phil. iii. 20, and perhaps the easier and more natural sequence of the Greek. The Authorized Version and Revised Version strongly support the former. The difference of sense is almost nothing. For the thought

Σκιάν γάρ έχων ό νόμος των μελλόντων Χ. 1 άγαθων, ούκ αύτην την εἰκόνα των πραγμάτων,

(either way), compare Isai. xxv. 9, ίδού, ό Θεός ήμῶν, ἐφ' ῷ ήλπίζομεν, καὶ σώσει ήμᾶς οἶτος Κύριος, ὑπεμείναμεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἠγαλλιώμεθα καὶ εὐφράνθημεν ἐπὶ τῆ σωτηρία ήμῶν. For σωτηρίαν, see note on i. 14.

Χ. Ι. Σκιάν γάρ έχων] We enter here upon the third subsection 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 sacrifice. But, as before, the new point is glided into without any ostensible transition. The first sentence is thrown into utter confusion by the (better supported) reading δύνανται for δύ-It is almost inconceivναται. able that such a writer should have deliberately framed an anacoluthon like o vouos žywy... ούδέποτε δύνανται. And the plural Sévavia is easily accounted for as a clerical error by the preceding plural $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\phi\epsilon$ povoriv. In such a case manuscript authority may be too slavishly followed. (r) With $\delta \dot{\nu} a \nu \tau a \iota$, we must treat the words from $\sigma \kappa i a \nu$ to $\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \omega \nu$ as a nominative absolute, and suppose 'they' (the priests) to be understood before Súvavia before $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \sigma \sigma \iota v$. The as sense will then be, Year by

year they never can perfect. &c. That is, year by year they always fail to perfect, &c. It might be too bold to take $\kappa \alpha \tau$ ένιαυτον ταΐς αυταίς as a combined phrase, and render it, By the sacrifices which they offer in perpetuity, year bų 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 δύναται, the sentence is complete, though some of its minor difficulties remain. The law...year by year, never can perfect, &c.

 $\Sigma_{\kappa(\alpha\nu)}$ See note on viii. 5.

τών μελλόντων dγ.] See note on ix. 11, where the question is raised whether the good things spoken of were then, or are still, future.

 $\epsilon i \kappa \delta \nu a$] We might have expected $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu a$ as the opposite of $\sigma \kappa \iota \dot{a}$. But the sense is different. The $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu a$ of the $\pi \rho \dot{a} \gamma \mu a \tau a$ in question is in heaven itself. The disparagement of the law lies not in its not having the $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu a$, but in its not having the $\epsilon i \kappa \omega \nu$ of them, but only a $\sigma \kappa \iota \dot{a}$.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

κατ' ένιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις αἶς προσ-Φέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς οὐδέποτε δύνανται 2 τοὺς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι. ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν

х. 1. Or би́гатаι.

The selection of cikwr shows how strong a word it is, and serves to interpret 2 Cor. iv. 4 and Col. i. 15, where Christ is called the eikwy row Ocov. See Bp. Lightfoot's note on the latter text, where he assigns to cikŵv the two defining notions of representation (as opposed to mere resemblance) and manifestation (comparing John i. 18. xiv. 9, 10). See also Abp. Trench's Synonyms, where the implied thought (in elkov) of an archetype or prototype is illustrated. See Matt. xxii. 20, tivos ή εἰκών αὐτη; Mark xii. 16. Luke xx. 24. Rom. i. 23, eikóνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου κ.τ.λ. Rev. xiii. 14, 15, ποιήσαι εἰκόνα τώ θηρίω. xiv. 9, 11. &c. The other passages where eikov occurs are less literal, but answer the above conditions. Rom. viii. 29, συμμόρφους της είκόνος τοῦ νίοῦ aὐτοῦ (probably said of the resurrection body of Christ). 1 Cor. xv. 49, την εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκού...τού έπουρανίου. 2 Cor. iii. 18, την αυτην εικόνα μεταμορφούμεθα (the spiritual likeness of Christ). Col. iii. 10, Kat' εικόνα του κτίσαντος αυτόν.

τών πραγμάτων] The reali-

ties. See note on vi. 18.

 $\kappa \alpha \tau'$ $\epsilon \nu \iota \alpha \upsilon \tau \sigma' \nu$] See first note on the chapter. The reference is clearly to the day of Atonement.

ταῖς αὐταῖς] See first note. προσφέρουσιν] That is οἱ ἰερεῖς. Always so in the Epistle. See v. 1, and throughout.

εἰs τὸ διηνεκές] In perpetuity. Year after year.

οὐδέποτε δύνανται] See first note.

τοὺς προσερχομένους] Those who approach. The worshippers. See note on iv. 16.

τελειώσαι] In ix. 9 κατά συνείδησιν is added. See note there. Also on ii. 10.

2. $i\pi\epsilon i$] 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 $i\pi\epsilon i$, see note on ix. 26.

 $\epsilon \pi a \dot{v} \sigma a v \tau \sigma \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon v a.$] 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.

συνείδησιν άμ.] Consciousness of sins still unforgiven and έχειν έτι συνείδησιν άμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας άπαξ κεκαθαρισμένους; ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς ἀνά- 3 μνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν. ἀδύνατον γὰρ 4 αἶμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων ἀΦαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας. διὸ εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον λέγει, Θυσίαν 5

x. 4. Οτ τράγων και ταύρων.

requiring atonement. For the construction, see I Pet. ii. 19, δια συνείδησιν Θεοῦ (only). Elsewhere conscience. See note on ix. 9.

τοὺς $\lambda \alpha \tau \rho$.] Here the worshippers. So ix. 9. Luke ii. 37. Acts xxvi. 7. Phil. iii. 3. Elsewhere the priests. See note on viii. 5.

κεκαθ.] See note on ix. 14, καθαριεί.

 αλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς] But (instead of this) there is in them (the Levitical sacrifices) an ἀνάμιτησις ἀμαρτιῶν year by year (on the day of Atonement).

ev autaîs] Contained, involved, embodied in them.

ἀνάμνησις] A recalling to mind (by oneself or another), a reminding. Luke xxii. 19, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. Lev. xxiv. 7, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκείμενα τῷ Κυρίω. Num. x. 10. Wisd. xvi. 6. For the active verb, to remind, see 1 Cor. iv. 17, ὅς ὑμᾶς ἀναμνήσει τὰς ὅδούς μου. 2 Tim. i. 6, ἀναμιμνήσκω σε ἀναζωπυρεῖν κ.τ.λ. Gen. xli. 9, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν μου ἀναμιμνήσκω (I recall to mind) σήμερον. Num. v. 15, θυσία μνημοσύνου ἀναμιμνήσκουσα ἁμαρτίαν. 1 Kings xvii.18, τοῦ ἀναμνῆσαι τὰς ἀδικίας μου. Ezek. xxi. 23, 24. xxix. 16.

 αδύνατον γάρ] It is so and it must be so—for, &c. It is impossible in the nature of things. See note on ix. 23, ανάγκη.

alpa τ . kai $\tau \rho$.] Without articles, to lay stress on the quality. Such a thing as blood. Such things as bulls and goats.

άφαιρέιν] Rom. xi. 27 (from Isai. xxvii. 9), ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. In the Septuagint (where ἀφαιρεῖν is the rendering of nearly 40 Hebrew verbs) see Exod. xxxiv. 7, ἀφαιρῶν ἀνομίας καὶ ἀδικίας καὶ ἁμαρτίας. Lev. x. 17. Num. xiv. 18.

5. δ_{10} [Wherefore. Because of which inherent impossibility.

 $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi$.] See note on $\tau \eta \nu$ olkovµ $\epsilon \nu \eta \nu$ in i. 6, where parallels from St John are quoted.

λέγει] Psalm xl. 6, &c. The only variations from the Septuagint are (1) εὐδόκησαs for ητησαs, (2) ὁ Θεόs instead of ὁ

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας, σῶμα δὲ 6 κατηρτίσω μοι. ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ

O. μov , and this (3) before instead of after $\tau \delta \ \theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu a \ \sigma ov$.

Ovoíav κ . π .] In its first meaning, and on the lips of David, the passage endorses 1 Sam. xv. 22 in its assertion of the superiority of obedience to sacrifice. But some of the expressions, such as $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \ \delta \hat{\epsilon} \ \kappa$. μ ., and $\eta \kappa \omega$, and $\pi \epsilon \rho i \epsilon \mu o \hat{\nu}$, 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.

 θ . κ . π .] Sacrifice and offering. See on v. 1. Here $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma$ - $\phi \rho \rho a$ seems nearly equivalent to $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho a$ there ($\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \eta$ there being the verb to both), pointing to offerings not of animal life. But, like $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho a$, it is only when distinguished from $\theta v \sigma i a$ by being coupled with it that it has any such limitation.

Rom. ix. 18) admit of a different explanation, that of a suppressed infinitive.

 $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \delta \hat{\epsilon}$ A remarkable deviation from the Hebrew, which gives, mine ears hast Thou opened (diaged). 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.

σώμα] See Rom. vii. 4. Col. i. 22.

κατηρτίσω] So Matt. xxi. 16 (from Psalm viii. 2), ἐκ στόματος νηπίων κ. θ. κατηρτίσω alvor. Elsewhere in the New Testament the active and passive voices are those used. In the Septuagint, the middle voice isfound also in Psalm xi. 3. xvii. 5. xxix. 9. lxviii. 9. lxxiv. 16, σὺ κατηρτίσω φαῦσιν καὶ ἥλιον (A, ἡλιον καὶ σελήνην B). lxxx. 15.

6. όλοκ. κ. π. άμ.] Burntofferings and sin-offerings. The former (in the New Testament) is found only in Mark xii. 33.

 $\pi\epsilon\rho$ i $\dot{a}\mu$.] The phrase is so complete in itself for the sin-

άμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας· τότε εἶπον, Ἰδοὺ 7 ήκω, ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ, τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ Θεὸς, τὸ θέλημά

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 $\theta v \sigma i a s$) being understood before it.

εὐδύκησας] The post-classical verb evoloxeir 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. 21. 2 Cor. v. 8. Gal. i. 15. Col. i. I Thess. ii. 8. iii. I), and 10. (2) to be well pleased with, to take delight in, with iv (as Matt. iii. 17. xvii. 5. Mark i. 11. Luke iii. 22. 1 Cor. x. 5. 2 Cor. xii. 10), eis (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. $\tau \circ \tau \epsilon$] 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 would est not, &c.: then (on my perceiving this) I said, &c. 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 ἡγήσατο of Phil. ii. 6.

έν κεφαλίδι] The κεφαλὶs 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, ἰδοὺ $\chi εἰρ ἐκτεταμένη πρός με, καὶ ἐν$ αὐτῷ κεφαλὶς βιβλίου. iii. 1,κατάφαγε τὴν κεφαλίδα ταύτην.

βιβλίου] Like χρυσίον (a thing made of xpuros), BiBliov is a thing made of $\beta i \beta \lambda o_{S}$ (papyrus). A writing or document. See ix. 19. Matt. xix. 7, βιβλίον άποστασίου. Luke iv. 17, 20, επεδόθη αυτώ βιβλίον του προφήτου Ήσαίου, και ανοίξας το βιβλίον εύρεν τον τόπον ού ην γεγραμμένον κ.τ.λ. John xx. 30. xxi. 25, τα γραφόμενα βιβλία. Gal. iii. 10, έν τῷ βιβλίψ τοῦ νόμου. 2 Tim. iv. 13, τὰ βιβλία, μάλιστα τ às $\mu\epsilon\mu\beta\rho$ ávas. The word occurs 23 times in the Apocalypse in all manner of connexions.

περί έμοῦ] Written concern-

8 σου. ἀνώτερον λέγων ὅτι θυσίας καὶ προσ-Φορὰς καὶ ὅλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας οὐκ ἠθέλησας οὐδὲ ηὐδόκησας, αἴτινες
9 κατὰ νόμον προσφέρονται, τότε εἴρηκεν, Ἰδοὺ ἤκω τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου. ἀναιρεῖ
10 τὸ πρῶτον ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ. ἐν ῷ

ing me. The Revised Version of the Old Testament gives as an alternative in the margin, prescribed to me. But $\pi\epsilon\rho\hat{\epsilon}\mu\rho\hat{\upsilon}$ clearly makes the speaker the subject, not the recipient. A decisive mark of the Messianic reference.

τοῦ ποιῆσαι] Depending upon ἦκω. For the purpose of doing. See Luke xxiv. 29, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μεῖναι σὺν αὐτοῖs. &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.

ο Θεός] Vocative, as in i. 8. See the note there.

8. ἀνώτερον] Luke xiv. 10 (only).

λέγων...είρηκεν] That is, Xριστός. We might have expected εἰπῶν and λέγει. But the present and perfect forcibly emphasize the perpetual and the conclusive voice of Scripture. Or the λέγων 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 xi. 8, καλούμενος.

altives] Any which. Such as. See note on ii. 3, https://www.as.

κατὰ νόμον] In accordance with νόμος, such a thing as a law, in a slightly disparaging tone. See note on vii. 12, νόμου.

9. $\tau \circ \tau \epsilon$] At that moment. See above.

 $\epsilon i \rho \eta \kappa \epsilon v$] The Scripture perfect. See viii. 5. &c.

 $dvaιρ \epsilon \hat{i}$] Destroys, abolishes. Still Χριστός. The verb $dvaι-ρ \epsilon \hat{i} v$ (always elsewhere with τινά, not τι), 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. 10) $dvaιρ \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a a$ (middle) is to rescue (to take up for oneself).

τὸ πρῶτον...τὸ δεύτερον] The first thing...the second thing... named in the above quotation. The first is θυσία καὶ προσφορὰ κ.τ.λ. The second is τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ.

στήση] May establish. See

θελήματι ήγιασμένοι έσμὲν διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ. Καὶ πᾶς μὲν ἰερεὺς ἕστηκεν καθ ἡμέραν 11

x. 11. Or doxiepeds.

alternative reading in Mark vii. 9, ίνα την παράδοσιν ύμων στήσητε (for τηρήσητε). Rom. iii. 31, άλλα νόμον ίστάνομεν. x. 3. xiv. 4.

10. $\dot{\epsilon} v \ddot{\psi} \theta$.] In which $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \mu a$ (as being contained and comprised in it) lies our consecration, &c.

ήγιασμένοι ἐσμέν] See note on ii. 11, ἀγιάζων...ἀγιαζόμενοι. We have been consecrated, made to belong to God, taken to be His. Acts xx. 32, καὶ δοῦναι τὴν κληρονομίαν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πᾶσιν. xxvi. 18, καὶ κλῆρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πίστει τỹ ἐἰς ἐμέ. Rom. xv. 16. 1 Cor. i. 2, τỹ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ... ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἱησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἀγίοις. vii. 14. 2 Tim. ii. 21.

προσφορâs] Eph. v. 2, καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (or ἡμῶν) προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ Θεῷ.

σώματος] Rom. vii. 4, έθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Col. i. 21, 22, νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου.

'I. X.] This double name occurs here for the first time (in the revised text) in this Epistle. Also xiii. 8, 21. ἐφάπαξ] vii. 27. ix. 12. Does it belong here to ήγιασμένοι ἐσμέν, or to προσφορâs ! I slightly prefer the latter.

11. Kai $\pi \hat{a} \hat{s} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$] 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 explation of sin. Notice the usual effect of $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ in subordinating its clause to the contrasted clause with $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$. And whereas every Levitical priest, dcc., Christ on the contrary, dc.

iepevis] Authorities are almost equally divided between iepevis and $d\rho\chi_{1epevis}$. Probably the sense is the same. See, for iepevis in the higher sense, vii. 11, 15, 20, 23.

 $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$] In contrast with the $\epsilon \kappa a \theta \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu$ of verse 12. The posture of awe contrasted with the posture of dignity.

καθ $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho ar$] Belongs to λειτουργών, as πολλάκις to προσφέρων. 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,

V. H.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

λειτουργών καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πολλάκις προσφέρων θυσίας, αἴτινες οὐδέποτε δύνανται περιελεῖν 12 ἁμαρτίας· οὖτος δὲ μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσίαν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιậ 13 τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως τεθῶ-

in which he acted alone. For the daily services of the priests at the brazen altar, see note on vii. 13, $\theta v \sigma \iota a \sigma \tau \eta \rho i \omega$. And for those within the tabernacle, that on ix, 6, $\epsilon i \sigma i \omega \sigma v$.

πολλάκις] Year after year.

 $ai\tau iv\epsilon s$] See above, on verse 6.

περιελείν] Το take off as something which is around one. So Gen. xli. 42, καὶ περιελόμενος Φαραώ τὸν δακτύλιον ἀπὸ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ. Exod. xxxiv. 34 (2 Cor. iii. 16), περιηρεῖτο τὸ κάλυμμα. Jon. iii. 6, καὶ περιείλατο τὴν στολὴν αὐτοῦ ἀφ ἑἀυτοῦ. Hence of the taking away of sin as an encumbering garment (τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἀμαρτίαν, xii. I). I Chr. xxi. 8, ἡμάρτηκα σφόδρα...καὶ νῦν περίελε δὴ τὴν κακίαν παιδός σου.

12. ούτος] iii. 3, πλείονος γὰρ ούτος δόξης κ.τ.λ. viii. 3, έχειν τι και τούτον κ.τ.λ.

υπερ άμ.] See v. 1.

προσενέγκας] ix. 14, 28, έαυτον προσήνεγκεν...άπαξ προσενεχθεὶς κ.τ.λ.

είς τὸ διηνεκές] In perpetuity. To be taken with ἐκάθισεν, not with προσενέγκας. To say of the Levitical priests that they $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma$ φέρουσιν είς το διηνεκές (verse 1) is appropriate: to say of Christ that He $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \eta \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon \nu \epsilon is \tau \delta \delta \eta \nu \epsilon$. $\kappa \epsilon_{s}$ is almost a self-contradiction. The phrase could only be applied to a single act when that single act leads on to a continued state, like erabioev here. He sat down (took His seat) in per*petuity* is quite intelligible. These considerations outweigh the argument that in the three other places eis to Sinvere's 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 1 Cor. xv. 24, &c. For εκάθισεν εν δεξιά τ . O., see notes on i. 3.

13. το λοιπόν] Henceforth. The only certain places of the occurrence of the exact phrase are I Cor. vii. 29. Phil. iii. I. 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

σιν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. μιῷ γὰρ προσφορῷ τετελείωκεν εἰs τὸ 14 διηνεκὲs τοὺs ἁγιαζομένουs. μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν 15 καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰρη-

Eph. vi. 10 the revised text reads του λοιπού, 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. 41, and decidedly in Acts xxvii. 1 Cor. i. 16. 2 Cor. xiii. 20. Thess. iv. 1. 2 Tim. iv. TI. 8. The difference between λ_{0i} - $\pi \circ \nu$ (as for anything remaining. whether of time or topic) and το λοιπόν (as for that which remains, in either sense) is almost insignificant, and the two forms finally and henceforth have to serve for both phrases.

ἐκδεχόμενος] Usually with an accusative: as xi. 10. Acts
xvii. 16. I Cor. xi. 33. xvi.
11. James v. 7. Here absolute, waiting. And so (in the strengthened form ἀπεκδέχεσθαι)
1 Pet. iii. 30.

čωs τεθώσιν] In i. 13 the quotation is exact from the Septuagint, čωs αν θω τοὺs ἐχθρούs σου κ.τ.λ. Here it is made passive. In Matt. xxii. 44 and Mark xii. 36 the ὑποπόδιον of the Septuagint is replaced by ὑποκάτω. In Luke xx. 43 and Acts ii. 35 $i\pi\sigma\pi\delta\delta\iota\sigma\nu$ stands. In I Cor. xv. 25 the form is $\check{a}\chi\rho\iota$ où $\vartheta\eta$ $\pi\dot{a}\nu\tau as$ τ . $\dot{\epsilon}$. $i\pi\dot{\sigma}$ roùs $\pi\delta\dot{a}s$ $a\dot{\nu}\tau\sigma\dot{v}$. 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. $\mu i \hat{\rho} \gamma \alpha \rho$] This is all He has to wait for—for, &c. There is no further sacrifice needed: He has only to wait for the subjugation of hostile powers to His mediatorial reign.

τετελείωκεν] He has perfected (κατὰ συνείδησιν, see ix. 9) in perpetuity those who are in course of sanctification. For the perfecting spoken of, see note on ii. 10, τελειώσα. And for the sanctification, that on ii. 11, άγιάζων...άγιαζώμενοι, where it is 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. $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \nu \rho \epsilon \hat{\delta} \epsilon$ 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 κέναι, Αύτη ή διαθήκη ήν διαθήσομαι πρός αὐτοὺς μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, λέγει Κύριος, διδοὺς νόμους μου ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν ἐπι-17 γράψω αὐτούς καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν
- καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι
- 18 ἕτι. ὅπου δὲ ἄφεσις τούτων, οὐκέτι προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας.
- 19 "Εχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν εἰς την

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 remember no more.

16. $A_{\nu\tau\eta}$ See notes on viii. 10, &c.

17. κai The sentence is made to look incomplete by the absence of some words like $\xi \pi \epsilon_i \tau a \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon_i$ before this κai .

μνησθήσομαι] Instead of the μνησθώ of the Septuagint and of viii. 12. The two constructions are equally correct: the où μη μνησθώ giving the thought of the single act of forgetting, and the où μη μνησθήσομαι carrying the forgetfulness into an endless futurity. I will never in the furthest future remember their sins against them.

18. $\delta \pi \sigma v \delta \epsilon$ 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. "Exorres ov] The argument is ended, and the application begun. Christ is the antitype 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, carrying 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.

 ov_{i} The comprehensive particle of inference from all the preceding.

 $\pi a \rho \rho \eta \sigma(av)$ See note on iii. 6. Frankness of speech, towards God and man, springing out of freedom of heart—a heart enlarged or set at liberty (Psalm cxix. 32) by faith and grace.

εἰς τὴν ἐἴσοδον] Unto the entering. To make the entering possible. It is clear that ἐἴσοδος

είσοδον των άγίων έν τῷ αίματι ἰησοῦ, ἡν 20 ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν όδον πρόσφατον καὶ ζωσαν

is not (even in figure) an entrance (a way in), but an entering (a going in). It is thus in each place where it occurs. Acts XIII. 24, $\pi\rho\delta$ $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\omega'\pi\sigma\upsilon$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ elosdov autoù. I Thess. i. 9, o'moiar elosdov esta couer $\pi\rho\delta$ super i. 1. 2 Pet i. 11, $\pi\lambda\sigma\sigma\omega$ eta cop $\eta\gamma\eta\theta\eta\sigma$ etat uur η elosdos els $\tau\eta\nu$ alubrior β asiletar $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$ The importance of the remark will be seen when we reach obdiv in verse 20.

τών άγίων] The true holy of holies. See notes on viii, 2. ix. 8, 12, 24, 25. xiii. 11.

 $i v \tau \hat{\psi} a i \mu a \tau i$ 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 iepeùs µéyas (verse 21). The mention of the alua, and the employment of the same preposition (ϵ_{ν}) which is expressly applied (in ix. 25) to the Levitical high priest's equipment with the $a i \mu a$ 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 ayıa άγίων.

20. $\hat{\eta} v$] The relative to

ώσοδον above, repeated in όδον below. Which act of entering He inaugurated for us as a όδος new and living.

ἐνεκαίνισεν] See note on ix. 18, ἐνκεκαίνισται. The aorist points to the one sacrifice once offered.

 $\delta\delta\delta\nu$] See note on ix. 8, $\tau\eta\nu \tau\omega\nu \dot{\alpha}\gamma\omega\nu \dot{\delta}\delta\nu$, and the passages there quoted for the two senses of road and journey. Here the $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\delta\sigma$ above decides in favour of the latter. The $\delta\delta\delta\nu$ is in fact an abbreviation of $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\delta\sigma\nu$, to avoid a wearisome sameness. As a going, that is, a going in, an act of entering.

πρόσφατον] Although φένω $(\pi \epsilon \phi a \mu a \iota)$ is given as the root of $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi a \tau o s$, 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, προσφάτως έληλυθότα κ.τ.λ. Num. vi. 3, σταφυλήν πρόσφατον. Deut. xxiv. 5 (7 B), έαν δέ τις λάβη γυναίκα προσφάτως. ΧΧΧΙΙ. 17, (θεοί) καινοί και πρόσφατοι ηκασιν κ.τ.λ. Psalm lxxxi. 9, οὐκ ἔσται έν σοί θεός πρόσφατος. &c. Here simply new in contrast with the old inaccessibility of the sanctuary.

 $\tilde{\zeta}\omega\sigma a_V$] A living obly (eiobos)—the entering of a living man, with all the life in him,

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς 21 σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον 22 τοῦ Θεοῦ, προσερχώμεθα μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας

of body, mind and soul, on the strength of One $\pi \acute{a} \prime \tau \sigma \tau \epsilon \zeta \widehat{\omega} \nu$ (vii. 25), and whose priesthood is His où katà vóµov ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναµν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου (vii. 16).

διὰ τοῦ κ., τοῦτ' ἐστιν τῆς σ.] 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 σάρξ (the human nature) of Christ the medium of the entering. The realization of the incarnation is the διὰ (see ix. 12), as the realization of the atonement is the εν (see ix. 25 and x. 10) of the entering.

σαρκός] ii. 14. v. 7. Rom. i. 3. viii. 3. ix. 5. Eph. ii. 15. Col. i. 22. 1 Tim. iii. 16. 1 Pet. iii. 18. iv. 1. 1 John iv. 2. 2 John 7. These passages (from St John's Epistles especially) go far to interpret the δια τ $\hat{\eta}$ s σαρκός of this text.

21. καὶ ἰϵρ. μέγαν] Depending on ἔχοντϵs. For ἰϵρεὺs in the sense of ἀρχιϵρεὺs, see note on verse 11, and the texts there quoted. For μέγαs, see note on iv. 14, ἔχοντϵs οὖν ἀρχιϵρἑα μέγαν. 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 Verse 19, $\ell v \tau \phi a \ell \mu a \tau \iota$).

έπὶ τὸν οίκον τοῦ Θ.] At first sight this might appear equivalent to the $\epsilon \pi i \tau \partial \nu$ of $\kappa o \nu$ avrov of iii. 6. But the context points rather to the sense of tabernacle or temple than to that of either house or household (see note there, $olk\omega$). Compare Zech. vi. 12, 13, 1000 ανήρ, Ανατολή όνομα αυτφ...καί οίκοδομήσει τον οίκον Κυρίου... καὶ καθιεῖται καὶ κατάρξει ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσται ὁ (Β omits ό) ίερεύς έκ δεξιών αύτου κ.τ.λ. The individual Christian high priests have a great High Priest over the heavenly tabernacle or temple. See again iv. 14. For olkos in its application to the tabernacle, see Exod. xxiii. 19. xxxiv. 26. Judg. xviii. 31, máσας τὰς ήμέρας ὄσας ήν ὁ οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Σηλώ (Σηλώμι Β). I Sam. i. 7, 24. &c. And to the temple, I Kings vi. I. &c. Acts vii. 47. &c.

22. $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\rho\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\theta a$] 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

X. 21, 22.

έν πληροφορία πίστεως, ὀεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ λελου-

of personal religion. Let us keep approaching.

μετά] 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, μετὰ παρρησίας. x. 34, μετὰ χαρᾶς. xii. 28, μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δίους, &c.

ảληθινής] Genuine, real. See note viii. 2.

 $\pi\lambda\eta\rho o\phi op(a]$ See note on vi. 11, $\pi\lambda\eta\rho o\phi op(av)$. In these two places, as in Col. ii. 2, *fulness* might be the sufficient rendering. But how in I Thess. i. 5?

 $\hat{\rho}\epsilon particulture k$, $\lambda\epsilon\lambda output voi]$ 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.

βεραντισμένοι] Our hearts being already sprinkled (with the atoning blood) from (so as to remove) a bad conscience. For βαντίζειν, see note on ix. 13. For the application, see xii. 24, καὶ alμaτι βαντισμοῦ. 1 Pet. i. 2, εἰς...ῥαντισμὸν αἶματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The first qualification for the individual high-priesthood is faith in the atonement as removing the guilt of past sin.

ảπο] Something of this emphatic from (ridding of or freeing from) is seen in Rom. vii. 2, 6 (ἀπό τοῦ νόμου). Gal. v. 4 (ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ).

συνειδήσεως πονηρôς] A bad conscience. A conscience clogged and burdened by the sense of unforgiven sin. The opposite of συνείδησις ἀγαθή (Acts xxiii. 1. I Tim. i. 5, 19. I Pet. iii. 16, 21), καλή (Heb. xiii. 18), καθαρά (I Tim. iii. 9. 2 Tim. i. 3), ἀπρόσκοπος (Acts xxiv. 16).

και λελουσμένοι] And having the entire body already washed with pure water. For the difference between *loven* and νίπτειν, see John xiii. 10, ό λελουμένος ούκ έχει χρείαν εί μη τους πόδας νώμασθαι, άλλ' έστιν καθαρος όλος. 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 Hebrew Christians was predominantly that of persons baptized 23 σμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ. κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῆ· πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ
24 ἐπαγγειλάμενος· καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους εἰς
25 παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἕργων, μὴ

as adults. To them baptism was an actual point of transition from the old to the new life. So Mark xvi. 16 (πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθείς, and in that order). Acts ii. 38. xxii. 16. Rom. vi. 4. I Cor. vi. 11. Gal. iii. 27. Col. ii. 12. I Pet. iii. 21. võaτι καθαρφ] Ezek. xxxvi. 25, καὶ ῥανῶ ἐφ ὑμᾶς ὕδωρ καθαρόν (κ. ΰ. B), καὶ καθαρισθήσεσθε ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀκαθαρσιῶν ὑμῶν.

23. $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ (I) The sentence begins with no connecting particle. Partly as an animated appeal (see note on iii. 12, $\beta\lambda\epsilon$ - $\pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, ἀδελφοί), partly as substantially identical with the foregoing. (2) Compare iii. 6, 14, έαν...το καύχημα της ελπίδος... κατάσχωμεν κ.τ.λ. Here the exhortation ($\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$) is to a tenacious and constant grasping: there the grasping is spoken of in retrospect (κατάσχωμεν), if (in the review of life as one act) we be found to have grasped, &c.

την όμολογίαν] The great and all-comprehending acknowledgment of our Christian hope. See note on iii. 1.

ϵλπίδος] See note on vi. 18. ἀκλινῆ] So as to be unwavering. Unswervingly. The word akharn's is used by Plato, but here only in the New Testament.

πιστός γάρ] Encouragement to the κατέχειν. So xi. 11. 1 Cor. i. 9. x. 13. 1 Thess. v. 24. 2 Thess. iii. 3.

24. καὶ κατανοῶμεν] And let ours be no selfish religion. Let us fix our attention upon each other. For κατανοεῖν, see note on iii. 1.

εἰs παροξ.] With a view to a παροξυσμὸς of (to) love and good works. For παροξυσμὸς, see Acts xv. 39, ἐγένετο δὲ παροξυσμὸς ὥστε ἀποχωρισθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων. Deut. xxix. 28, ἐν θυμῷ καὶ [ἐν] ὀργῆ καὶ [ἐν] παροξυσμῷ μεγάλῷ σφόδρα. Jer. xxxii. 37. There is a kind of paradox here. Let this be your παροξυσμὸς of one another, a provocation altogether of love and for good.

καλών έργων] The exact opposite of the $ν\epsilon κρ ων$ έργων of vi. 1 and ix. 14.

25. $\mu\dot{\gamma}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa a\tau$.] Such desertion of the Christian congregation would be a sure sign of the want of the *attention* ($\kappa a\tau avo\epsilon\hat{\nu}$) insisted upon above. For $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa a\tau a \lambda\epsilon i\pi\epsilon i \nu$ (to leave behind amongst perils or foes), see 2 Cor. iv. 9,

200

έγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἕθος τισίν, ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες, καὶ τοσούτῷ μᾶλλον ὅσῷ βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν.

Έκουσίως γαρ άμαρτανόντων ήμων μετά τό 26

διωκόμενοι ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγκαταλειπόμενοι.

¿πισυναγωγήν] Used only once in the Septuagint : 2 Macc. ii. 7, έως αν συναγάγη ό Θεός έπισυναγωγήν τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἴλεως γένηται. Once also (besides this place) in the New Testament : 2 Thess. ii. 1, υπέρ της παρουσίας του κυρίου ήμων Ι. Χ. και ήμων επισυναγω- $\gamma \eta_{S} \epsilon \pi$ autor. There it is applied to the *future* gathering of Christians at the second advent. And so the verb ($\epsilon \pi i \sigma \nu \nu \alpha \gamma \epsilon i \nu$) in Matt. xxiv. 31 and Mark xiii. In Matt. xxiii. 37 and 27. Luke xiii. 34 it is used of the present gathering to Christ of the dispersed and scattered mankind. In the text. intour $a\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$ may have been preferred to the more obvious συναγωγή, from the Jewish associations of The gathering of the latter. yourselves together (the $\epsilon \pi i$ of direction).

καθώς έθος τισίν] Already, so early in the experience of the Church.

παρακαλοῦντες] The necessary αλλήλους or ἑαυτούς, interchangeable in the New Testament (see note on iii. 13, παρακ. ἑαυτούς), is easily supplied from ἀλλήλους and ἑαυτŵν just above.

τοσοίτψ μ. δσψ] The nearness of the great day is made a motive for increased earnestness of effort for others. For τοσοίτψ δσψ, see i. 4.

 $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$] By witnessing the development 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 συντέλεια του aiŵros and the destruction of Jerusalem would not be synchronous. Expectation was to be the attitude of the Church in all her genera-See 1 Thess. i. 10. tions.

εγγίζουσαν] Of time. Luke xxi. 8, δ καιρός ήγγικεν. Acts vii. 17, καθώς δὲ ήγγιζεν ὅ χρόνος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.

την ημέραν] The briefest of all the terms for the great day. See I Cor. iii. I3, η γαρ ημέρα δηλώσει, ότι έν πυρὶ ἀποκαλυπτεται.

26. $[E\kappa, \gamma \alpha \rho]$ Reason for the urgency of the above exhortations: $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \theta a \dots \kappa a \tau \epsilon \chi \omega \mu \epsilon v \dots \kappa a \tau a v o \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon v$.

λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκέτι περὶ 27 ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία, φοβερὰ δέ τις ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως καὶ πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλον-

έκουσίως] The opposite of αναγκαστῶς. See I Pet. v. 2, μη αναγκαστῶς αλλὰ ἐκουσίως. Philem. 14, μη ὡς κατὰ ἀνάγκην... αλλὰ κατὰ ἐκούσιον. To sin ἐκουσίως 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 (διακενης, LXX.), that is, by free choice and will.

 $\dot{a}\mu a \rho \tau a \nu \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$] 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.

 $\mu\epsilon\tau\dot{a} \ \tau\dot{o} \ \lambda a\beta\epsilon \hat{v}$] 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.

την $\epsilon \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma i \nu$ της $\delta \lambda$.] 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. I. For $i\pi i\gamma \nu \omega \sigma_{15}$ (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. 17. iv. 13. Phil. i. 9. Col. i. 9, 10. ii. 2. iii. 10. 2 Pet. i. 2, 3, 8. ii. 20.

over i ov

άπολείπεται] Is in reserve. The ἀπὸ is, as in ἀπόκειται (see note on ix. 27), off from all else, whether (1) when all else is done, or (2) in security from being meddled with.

27. $\phi o \beta \epsilon \rho \dot{a}$] Only here and in verse 31 and xii. 21. Frequent in the Septuagint, beginning with Gen. xxviii. 17, $\dot{\omega}s$ $\phi o \beta \epsilon \rho \dot{o}s \dot{o} \tau \dot{o} \pi \sigma s \dot{o} \dot{\tau} \sigma s$.

 τ_{15}] A classical use, to convey an impression of mystery and awe.

 $\epsilon \kappa \delta 0 \chi \eta$] Evidently expectation, though perhaps not elsewhere so used. The $\epsilon \kappa \delta \epsilon \chi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$ of verse 13 is near enough to leave no doubt of the meaning. τος τούς ύπεναντίους. ἀθετήσας τις νόμον 28 Μωυσέως χωρίς οἰκτιρμῶν ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν ἀποθνήσκει· πόσω δοκεῖτε χείρονος 29

A sort of fearful looking for of judgment. The expectation is terrible, as well as the realization.

καὶ πυρὸς ζηλος] The reference is to Isai. xxvi. 11, ζηλος λήψεται λαόν απαίδευτον, και νύν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδεται. The combination $\zeta \eta \lambda_{00} \pi v \rho \delta s$ may be either, a $\zeta \eta \lambda o_{\varsigma}$ consisting of fire (a $\zeta \hat{\eta} \lambda os$ which is fire), or, a $\zeta \eta \lambda$ os characterized by fire (having fire for its index and instrument). The parallelism in the passage quoted favours the former. For $\zeta \hat{\eta} \lambda os$ (properly fervour, and used both for good and evil, zeal and jealousy), see (1) John ii. 17. 2 Cor. vii. 7, II. ix. 2. xi. 2. (2) Acts v. 17. xiii. 45. Rom. x. 2. xiii. I Cor. iii. 3. 2 Cor. xii. 13. Gal. v. 20. Phil. iii. 6. 20. James iii. 14, 16. Here the fer*vour* is that of *wrath*. Compare Psalm lxxix. 5, ἐκκαυθήσεται ώς πῦρ ở ζήλός σου; Zeph. i. 10, έν πυρί ζήλου αὐτοῦ καταναλωθήσεται $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \dot{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta}$. iii. 8. Elsewhere the divine $\zeta \hat{\eta} \lambda os$ is the fervour of love, as Isai. ix. 7. Ixiii. 15. Zech. i. 14. &c.

 εσθίειν] From the έδεται of the passage quoted from Isaiah.
 ύπεναντίους] Col. ii. 14 (only). Frequent in the Septuagint, beginning with Gen. xxii, 17.

28. åθετήσας] See notes on vii. 18 and ix. 26.

 $v \phi \mu o v$ 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.

χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν] Apart from (irrespectively of) any compassions. Compassion there might be, but it could not stop the execution. For οἰκτιρμός, see Phil. ii. 1, ϵi τις σπλάγχνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί.

 $\epsilon \pi i$ Sugiv η $\tau \rho_{i\sigma}(v)$ On the 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 reference 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. 1 the quotation is from Deut. xix. 15, where the principle is laid down, $\epsilon \pi i$ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων και έπι στόματος τριών μαρτύρων σταθήσεται παν δήμα.

 $\dot{a}\pi \sigma \theta \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \epsilon i$] The present tense may refer to the explicit precept and past practice rather than assert the continuance of

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

άξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας ό τον υίον τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατήσας καὶ τὸ αἶμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν

it (in the exact form) up to the writing of the Epistle. From John xviii. 31 ($\eta \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \ o \dot{\nu} \epsilon \xi \epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu a \pi \sigma \kappa \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu} \alpha i \ o \dot{\nu} \delta \epsilon' a$) we infer that the Roman authority was necessary for an execution. The execution of St Stephen was probably of a tumultuary character.

29. πόσω] See note on ix. 14. πόσω μάλλον.

 $\delta \delta \kappa \epsilon i \epsilon$] A parenthetical question (interposed in the exclamation) appealing to the intelligence of the reader. Think ye? I leave you to judge. Like the $\tau \iota_s$ in verse 27, a rhetorical and classical idiom.

 $\chi\epsilon\epsilon\rho\nu\sigma s$] The only occurrence of $\chi\epsilon\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$ in this Epistle. Elsewhere in Matt. ix. 16, $\chi\epsilon\epsilon$ - $\rho\sigma\nu\sigma\chi\epsilon\sigma\mu a$. xii. 45. xxvii. 64. &c.

aξιωθήσεται] By God the Judge of all (xii. 23). For $a\xi_{10}\hat{v}_{\nu}$, see note on iii. 3, $\eta\xi(\omega\tau a)$. $\tau_{\mu\nu\rho\alpha\beta}$ Only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint, Prov. xix. 29, Eroupáζονται ακολάστοις μάστιγες, καί τιμωρίαι ώμοις αφρόνων (A, δμοίως αφροσιν Β). xxiv. 22. &e. For timopeiv, see Acts xxii. 5. xxvi. 11. The classical distinction (in Plato and Aristotle) between κόλασις (chastisement) as τοῦ πάσχοντος ἔνεκα, and τιμωρία (vengeance) as τοῦ ποιοῦνros (in vindication of his honour, or of the honour of the broken law), may be present in Scripture (Matt. xxv. 46. I John iv. 18), but the passages are scarcely numerous enough to prove this positively.

τον υίον τοῦ Θεοῦ] The august title is chosen, as in vi. 6, to enhance the heinousness of the crime. In iv. 14 with an opposite purpose, to emphasize the sufficiency of the Saviour.

The καταπατήσας \mathbf{three} aorist participles mark either (1) the moment of each particular sinning (άμαρτανόντων 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 Kataπατείν, Matt. v. 13, το άλας... βληθέν έξω καταπατείσθαι ύπο τῶν ανθρώπων. xiii. 6, μηδε βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν έμπροσθεν τών χοίρων, μήποτε καταπατήσουσιν αύτούς έν τοις Luke viii. 5, ô ποσὶν αὐτῶν, μέν έπεσεν παρά την όδον καί κατεπατήθη κ.τ.λ. xii. I. The passages quoted place in a strong light the contumely and profanity of the treatment of Christ by the sinner.

το alμa τη̂s δ.] See note on ix. 20.

204

ήγησάμενος, ἐν ῷ ἡγιάσθη, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας. οἴδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα, 30

κοινόν] (1) Properly, common, in contrast with ǎγιον (ἡγιάσθη). 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 defilement attaches to κοινός. See ix. 13, τοὺς κεκοινωμένους. And so in Acts x. 14, &c. Rom. xiv. 14. Rev. xxi. 27, πâν κοινὸν καὶ ὅ ποιῶν βδέλυγμα.

 $\dot{\eta}\gamma\eta\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigmas$] As by one decisive act. See note on $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ - $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\sigma\alpha s$ above. And compare the same use of the aorist of $\dot{\eta}\gamma\epsilon\hat{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ in xi. 11, 26. Phil. ii. 6.

i v i v i γ.] Wherein (as though by immersion or envelopement in it) he was consecrated. For the i v here (not precisely as in ix. 25 and x. 19) see note on ix. 22, i v αίματι.

 $\dot{\eta}\gamma\iota\dot{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta$] The time referred to is the moment of conversion and baptism. But the thought is not simply that of x. 10 and I Cor. vi. II ($\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\dot{\alpha}$ $\dot{\eta}\gamma\iota\dot{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta\tau\epsilon$), but rather that of the *priestly* consecration then bestowed, as in verse 22 above, where see note.

το πνεῦμα τῆς χ.] The genitive of the characteristic quality, added to heighten the *ingrati*tude and ungenerousness of the treatment. The Spirit who is all grace—to insult Him—how base, how heartless / The effect is that of Eph. iv. 30, μη λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα.

 $evo\beta \rho (\sigma as]$ Only here in the New Testament. Not in the Septuagint. The compound is Properly to insult classical. one in something (with or without a second ϵv). But later (with no stress on the iv) just as υβρίζειν, for which see Matt. xxii. 6, υβρισαν και απέκτειναν. Luke xviii. 32, έμπαιχθήσεται καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυσθή-Acts xiv. 5, υβρίσαι και σεται. λιθοβολήσαι αυτούς. These passages show the associations of the word, and so emphasize the application of it here. The very definition of $\delta\beta\rho\mu$ s is that combination of insult and injury, wanton outrage, which becomes frightful in its contact with the Spirit of grace..

30. οἶδαμεν γάρ] I say τιμωρίας—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. i. 12, οἶδα γὰρ ῷ πεπίστευκα (I know who and what He is in whom I have put my trust).

τον εἰπόντα] Deut. xxxii. 35, εν ήμερα εκδικήσεως ανταποδώσω. The same variation from the Septuagint is found in

ΠΡΟΣ EBPAIOYΣ.

Έμοι ἐκδίκησις, ἐγώ ἀνταποδώσω· και πά-31 λιν, Κρινεῖ Κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. Φοβερὸν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας Θεοῦ ζῶντος.

x. 30. Οτ άνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος.

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. 19 the stress lies on $i\mu o i$. The man who avenges himself assumes God's prerogative. Here rather on $i\kappa \delta i \kappa \eta \sigma i s$, in justification of the $\tau i \mu \omega \rho i a s$ above.

čκδίκησις] From čκδικέν (čκδικος), to work out justice upon, whether in avenging (as Rom. xii. 19) or in punishing (as 2 Cor. x. 6). See note on Rom. xii. 19, čκδικοῦντες.

ανταποδώσω] To give back in return or to pay in requital (ανταποδιδόναι) may (like εκδι- $\kappa \epsilon i \nu$) be either good or evil. For the good sense, see Luke I Thess. iii. 9. xiv. 14. For both senses, 2 Thess. i. 6, avraποδούναι τοις θλίβουσιν υμάς θλίψιν και υμίν τοις θλιβομένοις ανεσιν. See note on xii. 11, αποδίδωσιν. The words λέγει Kúpios which follow in the received text are not in Deut. xxxii. 35 (though καὶ ϵἶπϵ Κύριος 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.

καὶ πάλιν] Deut. xxxii. 36, ὅτι κρινεῖ Κύριος τὸν λαὸν, αὐτοῦ. There κρινεῖ 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 τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ at first sight favour this view. But I Pet. iv. 17 (καιρὸς τοῦ ὅμξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἶκου τοῦ Θεοῦ) points the other way.

31. $\phi_0\beta_{\epsilon\rho}\delta_{\nu}$ In 2 Sam. xxiv. 14 and 1 Chron. xxi. 13 David makes this a reason either for choosing pestilence rather than one of the two other punishments, or (as it may be understood) for referring the choice altogether to God, immerovipar δή είς χείρας Κυρίου, ότι πολλοί οί οἰκτιρμοὶ αὐτοῦ σφόδρα κ.τ.λ. Ecclus. ii. 18. But in the text the *penal* aspect of judgment gives the other view of the $\ell\mu$ -The true parallels here πεσεῖν. are Matt. x. 28 and Luke xii. 5.

 $\mathfrak{G} \mathfrak{e} \mathfrak{o} \mathfrak{i} \, \zeta \mathfrak{w} \mathfrak{v} \tau \mathfrak{o} \mathfrak{s}]$ A God who is all life, and whose insight and power none can escape. See Άναμιμνήσκεσθε δὲ τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, ἐν 32 αἶς φωτισθέντες πολλὴν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων, τοῦτο μὲν ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψε- 33 σιν θεατριζόμενοι, τοῦτο δὲ κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτως

iii. 12. ix. 14. xii. 22. For the thought, compare iv. 12, 13.

32. 'Avaµµµµµσκεσθε δέ] The same sort of transition from severity to tenderness as in the parallel passage in vi. 9. The thought is that of Gal. iii. 4, τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῆ; εἶ γε καὶ εἰκῆ. And also (only that there doing predominates over suffering) of 2 John 8, $\beta\lambda$ έπετε ἑαυτοὺς ίνα μὴ ἀπολέσητε ἁ ἡργασάμεθα κ.τ.λ. For ἀναµµµτσκεσθαι (to recall to one's own recollection), see 2 Cor. vii. 15. Also see note on x. 3 (ἀνάµµησις) for the active voice of the verb.

πρότερον] Aforetime. See iv. 6, οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες. 1 Pet. i. 14, ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοία ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις.

 $\phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon_{s}$] See note on vi. 4, $\phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon_{s}$. The illumination spoken of would in those times synchronize with (or immediately precede) baptism received in mature age: but it is a distinct idea from it, though afterwards confused with it.

äθλησιν] Struggle or conflict. Only used here in the New Testament. Formed from $dθλ\epsilon iν$. See 2 Tim. ii. 5, $i a v \delta i$ και $a dθ \lambda \hat{y} \tau vs$. Nearly equivalent to St Paul's great word $a \gamma \omega v$ (Phil. ii. 30. Col. ii. 1. 1 Thess. ii. 2. 1 Tim. vi. 12. 2 Tim. iv. 7). See note on xii. 1.

πaθημάτων] Genitive of explanation or equivalence. Consisting of. See note on ii. 9, πάθημα.

33. $\tau \circ \tilde{v} \tau \circ \mu \epsilon v \dots \tau$. $\delta \epsilon'$] 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.

ονειδισμοῖς] Instrumental dative. For the word, see xi. 26. xiii. 13. Rom. xv. 3 (from Psalm lxix. 9).

θλώψεσιν See note on xi. 37. θεατριζόμενοι Being made a spectacle or gazingstock. Only here. See I Cor. iv. 9, θέατρον έγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ.

κοινωνοί] Partners. So (with genitive or dative of the person) Matt. xxiii. 30, οὐκ ἀν ημεθα αὐτῶν κοινωνοί. Luke v. 10, κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι. 1 Cor. x. 18, 20, κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου...κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

34 ἀναστρεφομένων γενηθέντες. καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε, καὶ τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε,

x. 34. Οτ τοίς δεσμοίς μου.

2 Cor. viii. 23, κοινωνός έμός. Philem. 17, εἰ οὖν με ἐχεις κοινωνόν. Elsewhere partakers. Thus (with genitive of the thing) 2 Cor. i. 7, τῶν παθημάτων. I Pet. v. I, δόξης. 2 Pet. i. 4, θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως.

τών ούτως άναστρ.] Of those who thus lived; that is, who passed their life in the constant experience of being made a spectacle, &c. For άναστρέφεσθαι (the Latin versari), see xiii. 18, καλώς θέλοντες άναστρέφεσθαι. 2 Cor. i. 12, άνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. Eph. ii. 3. 1 Tim. iii. 15. 1 Pet. i. 17, τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε. 2 Pet. ii. 18, τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους.

 $\gamma \epsilon v \eta \theta \epsilon v \tau \epsilon s$] Having become, as if by one decisive act, like that by which Moses (xi. 24) declared his nationality.

34. kai $\gamma \alpha \rho$] I say that you suffered, and I say that you took part with sufferers—for, &c. And the latter point is taken first.

καὶ γὰρ τοῦς δ.] For ye both sympathized with those that were in bonds. The received text has τοῦς δεσμοῦς μου, which is the reading of the Sinaitic manuscript and some other authorities. The assumption of St Paul's authorship would encourage such a reading. It is not noticed even in the margin of the Revised Version.

τοῖς δεσμίοις] xiii. 3, μιμνήσκεσθε τῶν δεσμίων ὡς συνδεδεμένοι. The article is generic: prisoners as a class.

συνεπαθήσατε] For συμπαθεῖν, see note on iv. 15. You felt with them. Not συνεπάθετε, which could not have been true of all.

καὶ -τήν] From the proof of the τοῦτο δὲ of verse 33 we return to the τοῦτο μὲν—their own sufferings.

άρπαγήν] Matt. xxiii. 25. Luke xi. 39. For άρπάζειν in this sense, see John x. 12, δ λύκος άρπάζει αὐτὰ καὶ σκορπίζει.

τῶν ὑπαρχ. ὑμῶν] The genitive after (or even before) τὰ ὑπάρχοντα is common in the New Testament, as Matt. xix. 21. xxiv. 47. xxv. 14. Luke xi. 21. xii. 33, 44. xvi. 1. xix. 8, τὰ ἡμίσεά μου τῶν ὑπαρχόντων. 1 Cor. xiii. 3. It is even placed between the article and the participle (making the latter a complete substantive) in Luke xiv. 33, τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ

208

γινώσκοντες έχειν έαυτούς κρείσσονα ύπαρξιν

x. 34. Or éautois.

ύπάρχουσιν. The dative occurs in Luke viii. 3. xii. 15. Acts. iv. 32.

μετα χαρδς] xiii. 17. Matt. xiii. 20. Mark iv. 16. Luke viii. 13. x. 17. Phil. i. 4.

προσεδέξασθε The two main senses of $\pi \rho o \sigma \delta \epsilon \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, in the New Testament as elsewhere, are (1) to accept (receive to oneself), as here, and xi. 35, ού προσδεξάμενοι την απολύτρω-Luke xv. 2, aµaptwhois σιν. προσδέχεται καὶ συνεσθίει αὐτοῖς. Rom. xvi. 2. Phil. ii. 29, προσδέχεσθε οὖν αὐτὸν ἐν Κυρίω κ.τ.λ.; (2) to expect, Mark xv. 43. Luke ii. 25, 38. xii. 36. xxiii. 51. Acts xxiii. 21. Tit. ii. 13. Jude 21. In Acts xxiv. 15 either sense might be given (the $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi}\omega\nu$ favours the former, Tit. ii. 13 the latter).

γινώσκοντες έχ. έ.] The received text had in Eaurois. The $\epsilon \nu$ must be given up at all events, but there is some authority for *ϵavτoîs.* Knowing that ye have for yourselves (for your own). With *eavrous* (the better supported reading) the meaning may be either (1) that ye yourselves have a better possession, or (2)that ye have yourselves as a better possession. Neither rendering is quite satisfactory. If favrois had preceded execu, it would be, knowing as to (with regard to)

yourselves that ye have a better possession. But the position of the two words precludes this. There is something flat in (1); έαυτούs 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, oùr èr τῷ περισσεύειν τινί ή ζωή αὐτοῦ έστιν έκ των υπαρχόντων αυτώ. Perhaps too in Luke xvi. 12, ei er τῶ ἀλλοτρίω πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ὑμέτερον τίς δώσει ὑμῖν; (if in this life 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. xxi. 19, έν τη ύπομονη ύμων κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν. See note on verse 39, είς περιποίησιν ψυχης.

υπαρξιν] In clear contrast with υπαρχόντων above. For the word see Acts ii. 45, τὰς υπάρξεις ἐπίπρασκον.

μένουσαν] See xii. 27, ἴνα μείνη τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα. xiii. 1, 14, οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ὧδε μένουσαν πόλιν. The word μένειν occurs

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

35 καὶ μένουσαν. μὴ ἀποβάλητε οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν ὑμῶμ, ήτις ἔχει μεγάλην μισθαποδοσίαν.36 ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε χρείαν, ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιήσαντες κομίσησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν.

nearly 70 times in St John's writings, often in this emphatic sense. See, for example, John vi. 27, $\tau\eta\nu$ $\beta\rho\omega\sigma\nu$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\sigma\mu$ ϵ ls $\zeta\omega\eta\nu$ alwrov. XV. 16, $\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa a$ $\iota\mu\alpha$ s $\iota\nu\alpha$. $\iota\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\delta$ s $\iota\mu\omega\nu$ $\mu\epsilon\nu\eta$. Rom. ix. 11. 1 Cor. xiii. 13. 2 Cor. iii. 11, $\tau\delta$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\gamma\delta\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\delta\nu$... $\tau\delta$ $\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu$.

35. μὴ ἀποβάλητε οὖν] Discard not then your παρρησία. The figure is illustrated by Mark x. 50, ἀποβαλών τὸ ἱμάτιον.

παρρησίαν] See note on iii.6.

i_{jτις}] One which. A παρρησία which. See notes on ii. 3 and viii. 5.

μισθαποδοσίαν] See note on ii. 2.

36. $i\pi \circ \mu \circ \nu \hat{\gamma}_s$] From the literal sense of $i\pi \circ \mu \circ \nu \hat{\gamma}$ (with a genitive), abiding under, patient endurance of (as in 2 Cor. i. 6, $i\nu$ $i\pi \circ \mu \circ \nu \hat{\gamma}$ $\tau \circ \nu$ $a \cdot v \cdot \pi a \theta \eta \mu \dot{\alpha}$ - $\tau \circ \nu$), 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. 18, $\dot{\eta}$ $i\pi \circ \mu \circ \nu \gamma$ πενήτων ούκ απολείται είς τέλος (A, TOr alŵra B). Luke viii, 15. xxi. 10. 1 Tim. vi. 11. 2 Tim. iii. 10. Tit. ii. 2. Heb. xii. James i. 3. 2 Pet. i. 6. 1. Sometimes $i\pi o\mu ov\eta$ is the object of patience; as in Psalm xxxix. 7, τίς ή υπομονή μου; ουχι ό Κύριος; Sometimes it has a genitive of the thing persisted in (Rom. ii. 7, καθ' υπομονήν έργου $\dot{a}\gamma a \theta o \hat{v}$), the animating motive (1 Thess. i. 3, της ύπομονης της $\epsilon \lambda \pi i \delta \sigma \kappa. \tau. \lambda.$), or the inspiring Person (2 Thess. iii. 5. Rev. iii. 10).

έχετε χρείαν] See note on v. 12, χρείαν έχετε.

ίνα τό] Compare vi. 15, καὶ ούτως μακροθυμήσας ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.

το θ. τ. Θ. π.] Perhaps with a slight reminiscence of verse 7. See also xiii. 21, καταρτίσαι ύμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἀγαθῷ ἐἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ. Matt. vii. 21. xii. 50. 1 John ii. 17. &c. The aorist sums up the life into a single act.

κομίσησθε] From the literal meaning of κομίζειν, 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 (2) to re-

210

έτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει 37 καὶοὐ χρονίσει. ὁ δὲδίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως 38 ζήσεται· καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται οὐκ εὐ-

x. 37. От хронеї.

x. 38. Or omit µov.

cover or get back (as xi. 19. Matt. xxv. 27, ἐκομισάμην ἀν τὸ ἐμόν. 2 Cor. v. 10. Eph. vi. 8. Col. iii. 25), (3) to receive as a thing due or promised (as here, and xi. 39. 1 Pet. i. 9. v. 4).

37. $\epsilon \tau_{II} \gamma \alpha \rho_{I}$ For $\epsilon \tau_{II} \mu \kappa_{\rho \rho \nu}$, see John xiii. 33, $\epsilon \tau_{II} \mu \kappa \rho \rho \nu$ (accusative) $\mu \epsilon \theta' \dot{\nu} \mu \omega \nu \epsilon \dot{\ell} \mu \dot{\mu}$. xiv. 19, $\epsilon \tau_{II} \mu \kappa \rho \rho \nu$ (nominative) κai $\delta \kappa \delta \sigma \mu o s \mu \epsilon \ o \dot{\nu} \kappa \epsilon \tau_{I} \ \theta \epsilon \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$. For $\delta \sigma \sigma \nu \delta \sigma \sigma \nu$ (a classical phrase), see Isai. xxvi. 20, $\alpha \sigma \kappa \rho \rho \beta \eta \theta_{I} \mu \kappa \rho \rho \nu$ $\delta \sigma \sigma \nu \delta \sigma \sigma \nu$ (a ccusative). Here it is the nominative. Literally, there is still a little—just so much as that. A very very little.

ό ἐρχόμενος] The sense is as if there were a $\kappa a \lambda$ before ο έρχόμενος (see John xiv. 19 above). The quotation is from Hab. ii. 3. The full passage is, έτι δρασις είς καιρόν, καὶ ἀνατελεῖ είς πέρας, καὶ οὐκ εἰς κενόν ἐαν ύστερήση, ύπόμεινον αὐτόν, ὄτι έρχόμενος ήξει, και ού μή χρονίση. The vision (opaous) is the fall of the Chaldean empire. If it linger, wait for it. The Septuagint makes the object of expectation a person. Wait for Him. Coming He shall come (He will surely come). The Epistle adds the article ($\delta \epsilon \rho$ χόμενος), making it a title of Christ (see Matt. xi. 3, $\sigma \vartheta \epsilon l \delta \epsilon \rho \chi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s \kappa \tau \lambda$. Luke vii. 19, 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 $\delta \epsilon \rho \chi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$.

 $\eta \xi \epsilon_i$ Will have come. The coming One will have fulfilled His coming. See note on verse 7, $\eta \kappa \omega$.

ού χρονίσει] Will not delay beyond the time appointed. For χρονίζειν, see Matt. xxiv. 48, χρονίζει μου δ κύριος. xxv. 5. Luke i. 21. xii. 45.

38. $\delta \delta \tilde{\epsilon} \delta i \kappa a i \delta s \mu o v$] Continuation of the quotation (Hab. ii. 4), but with an inversion of the two clauses, which stand in the Septuagint, (1) $\tilde{\epsilon} v - a v \tau \tilde{\sigma}$, (2) $\delta \delta \tilde{\epsilon} - \tilde{\epsilon} \gamma \tilde{\sigma} \epsilon \tau a c.$ The $\mu o v$ is doubtful. It stands after $\pi i \sigma - \tau \epsilon \omega s$ in the Vatican manuscript of the Septuagint (*faith in me*), after $\delta i \kappa a i \sigma$ in the Alexandrine (*my righteous* servant). In Rom. i. 17 and Gal. iii. 11, as by several authorities here, it is omitted altogether.

 $\zeta_{\eta'\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha l}$ 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)

39 δοκεῖ ή ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς.

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, καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσουσιν. vi. 57. Rom. viii. 13. &c.

kal čáv] 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.

ύποστείληται] A nautical 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 caυτόν, Gal. ii. 12 (he drew himself in). More often, as here, in the middle. Acts xx. 20, 27, ώς ούδεν υπεστειλάμην των συμφερόντων του μη άναγγείλαι (I exercised reserve as to nothing ...so as not to declare it) $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. Wisd. vi. 7, ού γαρ υποστελείται πρόσωπον ο πάντων δεσπότης, ούδε έντραπήσεται μέγεθος κ.τ.λ. And so στέλλεσθαι, 2 Cor. viii. 20, στελλόμενοι τοῦτο, μή τις ήμας μωμήσηται κ.τ.λ. 2 Thess. iii. 6, στέλλεσθαι ύμας από παντός $a\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o \hat{v} \kappa. \tau. \lambda$. The idea is rather that of shrinking in than of shrinking back, and is the direct opposite of that $\pi a \rho \rho \eta \sigma i \Delta \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ which is the outspokenness of Christian manliness.

εὐδοκ $\hat{\epsilon i}$] See note on verse 6.

οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς]
 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 1 Thess.
 v. 5, οὐκ ἐσμὲν νυκτὸς οὐδὲ σκότους. For the latter, 2 Thess.
 ii. 3, ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας.

υποστολής] A noun formed from the υποστείληται above, to balance the πίστεως of both verses.

 $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi o (\eta \sigma i v)$ The verb $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ - $\pi \operatorname{ouil} (to make to be over and$ above) carries the two ideas of survival and surplus. The former predominates in the active voice, to save (a life, &c.), the latter in the middle, to acquire. Thus Acts xx. 28, $\eta \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \pi \sigma \iota$ ήσατο δια του αίματος του ίδίου. 1 Tim. iii. 13, βαθμόν έαυτοις καλόν περιποιούνται. Isai. xliii. 21, λαόν μου δν περιεποιησάμην. The noun in its New Testament use takes its colour from the middle. Acquisition. And like the English word it has the

212

"Εστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, ΧΙ. 1 πραγμάτων ἕλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων. ἐν ταύτη 2 γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι.

twofold sense of (1) the act of acquiring (as here, and I Thess. v. 9, είς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας. 2 Thess. ii. 14, είς περιποίησιν δόξης. I Pet. ii. 9, λαός είς περι- $\pi o(\eta \sigma v)$, and (2) the thing acquired (Eph. i. 14, cis anolvτρωσιν της περιποιήσεως). Thus here the thought is that of the $\psi v \chi \eta$ being in this life the stake of the contest, to be won or lost in the great day. So Luke xxi. 19, έν τῆ ὑπομονῆ ὑμῶν κτήσεσθε (ye shall gain) tas ψυχàs υμών. This explains also Luke xvi. 12, the το υμέτερον of the future in contrast with the $\tau \dot{o}$ αλλότριον of the present.

XI. 1. *Eotiv $\delta \epsilon$] The emphatic $\epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu$ answers (as it were) the question, And what is faith ? What faith is is this.

 $i\lambda\pi\omega\omega\omega\omega$] Definition of $\pii\sigma\tau is$. 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. All 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.

ύπόστασις] See note on i. 3. Assurance of, as in four out of the five places where the word occurs in the New Testament.

 $\pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega r$] For this peculiar sense of $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \gamma \mu \alpha$, not fact or act, but reality, see note on vi. 18, where it is applied to the word and oath of God.

čλeγχos] Only found here in the New Testament (for in 2 Tim. iii. 16 the revised text has $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu o \nu$). 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.

 εν ταύτη γάρ] The γάρ seems to imply a suppressed clause. A comprehensive and an age-long grace—for, &c.

 $\dot{\epsilon}_{\nu}$ τ. $\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu\alpha\rho\tau\nu\rho\eta}[\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu]$ In it (not outside it) they were attested. In it was contained, in it lay, their commendation : exactly as in 1 Tim. v. 10, $\dot{\epsilon}_{\nu}$ $\dot{\epsilon}_{\rho\gamma\sigma\nu}$ καλοîs μαρτυρουμένη. For

3 Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥή-

this passive of $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho \epsilon \hat{v}$, see also vii. 8. Acts vi. 3, $a^{\nu} \delta \rho a s$ $\epsilon \xi \ \dot{v} \mu \hat{u} \nu \mu a \rho \tau v \rho o v \mu \epsilon \nu o v s \kappa \tau \cdot \lambda$. x. 22. xvi. 2. xxii. 12.

oi $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \acute{v} \epsilon \rho oi]$ They of the old time. The servants and saints of God from the beginning. A peculiar use of the word, which elsewhere is applied either (1) in strict contrast with the young (as in 1 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. Πίστει νουῦμεν] The first instance of faith lies not in the $\epsilon \lambda \pi \iota \zeta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu a$ of the future, but in the où $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu a$ 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.

νοοῦμεν] It is an act of the mind. Rom. i. 20, τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα καθορῶται. For νοεῖν, see also Matt. XV. 17. XVI. 9, 11. XXIV. 15, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω (let him exercise mind upon his reading). Mark Vii. 18, οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι πῶν τὸ ἔξωθεν...οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι; viii. 17. Xiii. 14. John Xii. 40. Eph. iii. 4, 20, ἀναγινώσκωντες νοῆσαι κ.τ.λ. 1 Tim. i. 7, μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε ἂ λέγουστι κ.τ.λ. 2 Tim. ii. 7, νόει ἂ λέγω.

 $\kappa a \tau \eta \rho \tau i \sigma \theta a i$ The perfect tense expresses the permanence of the creation (2 Pet. iii. 4, πάντα ούτως διαμένει απ' αρχής κτίσεως). The verb καταρτίζειν is properly to fit perfectly, and so either (1) to frame, adjust (as here, and x. 5, $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \delta \hat{\epsilon} \kappa a \tau \eta \rho$ τίσω μοι. Rom. ix. 22, κατηρτισμένα είς απώλειαν), or (2) to complete, perfect (as xiii. 21. Luke vi. 40. 1 Cor. i. 10. Cor. xiii. 11. 1 Pet. v. 10), or (3) to repair, restore (as Matt. iv. 21, καταρτίζοντας τα δίκτυα. Mark i. 19. Gal. vi. 1, Katapτίζετε τον τοιούτον. I Thess. iii. 10, καὶ καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τής πίστεως ύμῶν).

rois aiŵvas] See note on i. 2. The $\epsilon \pi o i \eta \sigma \epsilon v$ there, as $\kappa a \tau \eta \rho \tau i \sigma \theta a \iota$ here, shows that the rendering should be, not the ages, but the worlds. Also the following clause here ($\epsilon i s \tau o$ $\mu \eta \kappa. \tau. \lambda$.) would be inappropriate to the notion of mere time. Still the idea of time is not lost. The worlds are timeworlds, having their periods of duration and their limits of existence.

 $\dot{\rho}$ ήματι Θεοῦ] By a fiat of God. The reference is to the repeated καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεός of Gen. i. 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, 26. For βήμα, see note on i. 3. εἰς τό] The result of the κατηρτίσθαι βήματι Θεοῦ. Framed by a fiat of God with this

 $\mathbf{214}$

XI. 3, 4.

ματι Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι.

Πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν Άβελ παρά Κάϊν 4 προσήνεγκεν τῷ Θεῷ, δι ἦs ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι

result—that the thing seen has not come into being out of things apparent. For εἰς τό, compare Luke v. 17, δύναμις Κυρίου ἡν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν.

 $i\kappa \phi a i v o \mu i v o v$ Out of things apparent, visible to the eye. Creation was not a mere rearrangement of preexisting materials, but (in the strictest sense) a bringing into being of the previously non-existent.

το β λεπόμενον] The thing discerned by the eye. The singular gathers up the particulars of visible being into one whole.

γεγονέναι] Has not come into being. For the perfect, see note on κατηρτίσθαι. Also John i. 3, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἐν ὅ γένονεν.

4. $\Pi(\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota...^*A\beta\epsilon\lambda)$ The second and third illustrations of faith have to do with its action upon the *present*. And first, *Faith acting in worship*.

πλείονα] From its literal sense, more in number or quantity, πλείων passes into that of more in value, superior in quality. See Matt. v. 20. vi. 25, ούχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλείόν ἐστιν τῆς τροφῆς; xii. 41, 42, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλείον Ἰωνᾶ ὡδε...πλείον Σολομῶνος ὥδε. Mark xii. 43. Luke xi. 31, 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... π apá] For π apà after a comparative, as a feature of the Epistle, see note on i. 4.

προσήνεγκεν] See note on v. 1.

 $\delta i \ \eta s$] It is doubtful, and scarcely material, whether ηs refers to $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon i$ or to $\theta v \sigma i a v$. The latter is the *nearer* reference, and so far the simpler. But $\delta i \ a v \tau \eta s$ favours the former. A like ambiguity occurs in verse 7.

èμαρτυρήθη] He was attested to be righteous. Testimony was borne to him that he was righteous. By the acceptance of his offering. Gen. iv. 4, καὶ ἐπεῖδεν $\delta \Theta$ εὸς ἐπὶ "Αβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦς δώροις αὐτοῦ.

είναι δίκαιος] The phrase does not occur in the narrative of Gen. iv. But δίκαιος is the epithet of Abel in Matt. xxiii. 35, από τοῦ αίματος "Αβελ τοῦ δικαίου. Compare I John iii. δίκαιος, μαρτυρούντος έπι τοις δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ 5 Θεοῦ, καὶ δι αὐτῆς ἀποθανῶν ἔτι λαλεῖ. Πίστει Ἐνῶχ μετετέθη τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, καὶ οὐχ

xi. 4. Οι αύτοῦ τῷ Θεφ.

12, τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ δίκαια.

μαρτυροῦντος] Still testifying. For the voice of Scripture is always speaking.

ϵπὶ τοῦς] Gen. iv. 4 (quoted above). With respect to his gifts. See ix. 15, τῶν ἐπὶ τῆ πρώτη διαθήκη.

 $\tau \circ \hat{v} \otimes \epsilon \circ \hat{v}$] The reading $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\otimes \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$ (though strongly supported) can scarcely be accepted. It would have to be taken with $\delta \omega \rho \circ is$ (like $\theta v \sigma (av \tau \hat{\varphi} K v \rho (\omega),$ Gen. iv. 3, LXX.). He (God) testifying of his gifts unto God.

 $\delta i a \vartheta \tau \eta s$] By means of his faith seems preferable to by means of his sacrifice; and, if so, $\delta i \eta s$ can scarcely be taken differently.

λαλεί] So xii. 24, αίματι μαντισμοῦ κρεῖττον λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν ᾿Αβελ. There is an evident allusion to Gen. iv. 10, φωνὴ αίματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοậ πρός με ἐκ τῆς γῆς.

5. $\Pi(\sigma\tau\epsilon, \mathbf{E}\nu\omega\chi]$ Faith (still in the province of the present) acting, not in an act of worship, but in the life. See notes on verse 1 ($i\lambda\pi\iota(\omega\mu\epsilon)\nu\nu$) and verse 4 ($\pi(\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota, \mathbf{A}\beta\epsilon\lambda)$). The dative ($\pi(\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota)$ represents faith as the *instrument* of the translation.

μετετέθη] Was transferred or transposed. It was only a change of place. Acts vii. 16, μετετέθησαν εἰς Συχήμ. (See note on vii. 12, μετατιθεμένης γάρ.) In Gen. v. 24 the Hebrew says only, God took him. The Septuagint renders it, μετέθηκεν αὐτῶν ὁ Θεός.

 $\tau \circ \hat{\nu} \mu \eta i \delta \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ This might be rendered, so that he did not see. Acts vii. 19, εκάκωσεν τούς πατέρας τοῦ ποιεῖν τὰ βρέφη ἕκθετα αὐτῶν. Rom. vii. 3, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αύτην μοιχαλίδα. But the commoner sense, that he might not see, is equally suitable. See x. 7, ήκω...τοῦ ποιήσαι κ.τ.λ. Matt. ii. 13, ζητείν το παιδίον του απολέσαι αυτό. iii. 13, παραγίνεται...του βαπτισθήναι υπ' αυτου. xiii. 3, εξηλθεν ο σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν. Acts x. 47, τοῦ μη βαπτισθήναι τούτους. Rom. vi. 6, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν. &c. Acts iii. I 2 (πεποιηκόσιν τοῦ περιπατειν avróv) might suit either sense.

ίδειν θάνατον] Psalm lxxxix. 48, δε ζήσεται και ούκ δψεται θάνατον. Luke ii. 26, μη ίδειν θάνατον κ.τ.λ. John viii. 51, θάνατον ού μη θεωρήση.

XI. 5, 6.

ηύρίσκετο διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός. πρὸ γὰρ τῆς μεταθέσεως μεμαρτύρηται εὐηρεστηκέναι τῷ Θεῷ· χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον 6 εὐαρεστῆσαι· πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ τὸν προσερχόμενον τῷ Θεῷ ὅτι ἔστιν καὶ τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτὸν μισθαποδότης γίνεται.

xi. 5. Or εὐαρεστ.

καὶ οὐχ ηὐρίσκετο] Gen. v. 24. The Hebrew has only, and not. The Septuagint adds ηὑρίσκετο, suggesting the thought of his being wanted, and sought in vain, by the survivors.

πρό γάρ] I say, by faith for, &c. 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.

μεταθέσεως] See vii. 12, και νόμου μετάθεσις γίνεται. xii. 27, τῶν σαλευομένων μετάθεσιν ώς πεποιημένων.

μεμαρτύρηται] The Scripture perfect. He has been attested. It is there, on the imperishable record. See note on vii. 6, δεδεκάτωκεν.

εὐηρεστηκέναι τῷ Θεῷ] The Septuagint paraphrase (Gen. v. 22, 24) of the Hebrew expression, walking with God. See also Gen. vi. 9. xvii. 1. xxiv. 40. xlviii. 15.

6. $\chi \omega \rho$ is $\delta \epsilon$] And without faith. It is part of the chain

of proof. See note on verse 5, $\pi\rho\delta$ yáp.

xi. 6. Or omit $\tau \hat{\varphi}$.

άδύνατον] Impossible in the nature of things. For this ἀδύνατον, see vi. 4, 18. x. 4.

 $\delta \epsilon \tilde{\iota}$] Necessary in the nature of things. A man cannot draw nigh to ($\pi po\sigma \epsilon p \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a$) a nonentity. And a man will not draw nigh to one to whom he ascribes a morose and heartless character.

τον προσερχόμενον] See note on vi. 16, προσερχώμεθα.

ότι έστιν καλ...γίνεται] Two points. First, the existence of God. Secondly, the certainty of the recompense. Together they satisfy the definition of faith in verse 1. The one is an ού βλεπόμενον, the other is an ελπιζόμενον.

τοίς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτόν] Acts xv. 17 (from Amos ix. 12), ὅπως ἀν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν Κύριον. Rom. iii. 11, οὖκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν Θεόν.

μισθαποδότης] Only here. For μισθαποδοσία, see note on ii. 2. 7 Πίστει χρηματισθείς Νώε περί τών μηδέπω βλεπομένων εύλαβηθείς κατεσκεύασεν κιβωτόν είς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, δι' ἦς κατέκρινεν

 γ iveral] Becomes, comes to be, shows and proves Himself, by a law of His being.

7. $\Pi(\sigma\tau\epsilon\dots N\delta\epsilon]$ After these examples of faith in the où $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\delta\mu\epsilon\nu a$ of the past (verse 3) and of the present (verses 4— 6) there follows a long series of examples of faith in the où $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\delta\mu\epsilon\nu a$ of the future. These are not all $\epsilon\lambda\pi\delta\delta\mu\epsilon\nu a$, for the first example is of faith in a future of fear.

χρηματισθείς] Having been dealt with. Having received a divine communication. See note on viii. 5, κεχρημάτισται.

περὶ τῶν] Gen. vi. 14, 17 (18 B), καὶ εἶπε Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Νῶε, Καιρὸς παντὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦκει ἐναντίον μου...καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ διαφθείρω αὐτοὺς καὶ τὴν γῆν...ἐγὼ δὲ ἰδοὺ ἐπάγω τὸν κατακλυσμόν, ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καταφθεῦραι πῶσαν σάρκα κ.τ.λ.

 $μη \delta (πω)$ Not even yet, when they were so imminent. They were still among the où βλεπόμενα, which are the only subjects of faith. The form μηδέπω occurs only here in the New Testament.

εὐλαβηθείς] Moved with godly fear. See note on v. 7, εὐλαβείας.

κατεσκεύασεν] See note on iii. 3, κατασκευάσας. κιβωτόν] Gen. vi. 14, 18 (15, 19 B), ποίησον ούν σεαυτῷ κιβωτόν ἐκ ξύλων τετραγώνων... εἰσελεύση δὲ εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν σὺ καὶ οἱ υἰοί σου καὶ ἡ γυνή σου κ.τ.λ.

 $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho (a \nu)$ See note on i. 14.

οίκου] Ĝen. vii. 1, είσελθε σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν. For οἶκος, see note on iii. 2, οἴκω.

δi' ηs'] Either κιβωτοῦ or πίστεως. The same ambiguity as in verse 4 (δi' ηs and δi' aὐτη̂s). 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 commends itself.

κατέκρινεν] Condemned by the contrast of his own obedience. Compare Matt. xii. 41, 42, ανδρες Νινευείται...κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν, ὅτι μετενόησαν κ.τ.λ. βασίλισσα νότου...κατακρινεῖ αὐτήν, ὅτι ἡλθεν κ.τ.λ. Luke xi. 31, 32.

κόσμον] 2 Pet. ii. 5, κατακλυσμον κόσμω ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας. The word κόσμως, starting from the sense of (1) order or arrangement, often with the genitive τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (Deut. iv. 19. Isai. xxiv. 21) or τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς (see Gen. ii. 1), passes into that of (2) universe (Wisd. vii.

 $\mathbf{218}$

XI. 7, 8.

τόν κόσμον και της κατά πίστιν δικαιοσύνης εγένετο κληρονόμος.

Πίστει καλούμενος Άβραὰμ ὑπήκουσεν ἐξ- 8 ελθεῖν εἰς τόπον ὃν ἤμελλεν λαμβάνειν εἰς

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. &c.), and thence sinks into a disparaging term, denoting (4) the world of matter in contrast with spirit (1 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. 1 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.

τής κατά πίστιν δικαιοσύνης The righteousness which is according to (by the rule of, on a principle of) faith. Equivalent phrases are δικαιοσύνη πίστεως (Rom. iv. 13), δικαιοσύνη ή έκ πίστεως (Rom. ix. 30. x. 6. Compare Rom. v. 1. Gal. ii. 16. iii. 24), δικαιοσύνη ή δια πίστεως (Phil. iii. 9), y ek @600 Sika10σύνη ἐπὶ τῆ πίστει (Phil. iii. 9). Here alone in this Epistle δ_{ℓ} καιοσύνη occurs in the distinctive sense which St Paul has given to it, as the state or character of one who is Síkalos in God's sight by the forgiveness of sins through faith in Christ. See Rom. i. 17. iii. 21, &c. iv. 3, &c. v. 17. x. 3, &c. 2

Cor. v. 21. Gal. v. 5. For dikaloriv η in its more general sense, see note on v. 13, $\lambda \delta \gamma o v \delta i \kappa a locular$

κληρονόμος] See notes on i. 2, 4. vi. 17. Is the sense here heir or inheritor l (See note on vi. 12, κληρονομούντων.) The latter might seem to be intended here, inasmuch as δικαιοσύνη is a present possession of the believing man (Rom. v. 1. &c.). But see Gal. v. 5, ήμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. The same thing may be regarded as either present or future according as firstfruit or harvest is the point of remark.

8. $\Pi(\sigma\tau\epsilon\ldots)^{A}\beta\rho a\dot{a}\mu$ 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.

καλούμενος] Gen. xii. 1, καὶ εἶπε Κύριος τῷ ⁸Αβραμ, ⁸Εξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρός σου, καὶ δεῦρο εἰς τὴν γῆν ἢν ἆν σοι δείξω. Acts vii. 2, ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης ὥφθη τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν ³Αβραὰμ...καὶ εἶπεν κ.τ.λ.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

κληρονομίαν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν μὴ ἐπιστάμενος ποῦ 9 ἔρχεται. Πίστει παρώκησεν εἰς γῆν τῆς ἐπαγ-

Isai. li. 2, $\delta \tau \iota \epsilon \bar{l} s \bar{\eta} \nu$, kaì $\epsilon \kappa \delta \lambda \epsilon \sigma a$ aù $\tau \delta \nu$. This call (invitation and summons in one) is the original of the sacred uses of $\kappa a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$, such as those of Matt. iv. 21. xxii, 3. Rom. viii. 30. I Cor. vii. 17. Eph. iv. I. 2 Thess. ii. 14. I Pet. ii. 9. &c. The present tense of $\kappa a \lambda \delta \hat{\iota} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$ expresses the promptitude of the response. In the very act of being called ($\epsilon \tau \iota \lambda a \lambda \delta \hat{\upsilon} \nu \tau \delta \sigma \sigma \omega$ $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota}, i \delta \delta \hat{\upsilon} \pi a \rho \epsilon \mu \iota$, Isai. lviii. 9).

καὶ ἐξήλθεν] There might have been the will without the act. (Matt. xxi. 29, ἐγώ, κύριε· καὶ οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν.) The ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν became the ἐξῆλθεν.

μη ἐπιστάμενος] Though he knew not. See note on iv. 2, μή.

ϵπιστάμενος] Of the 14 occurrences of ϵπίστασθαι in the New Testament, 9 are in the Acts. St Paul uses it only in 1 Tim. vi. 4, μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος. Of the three words, οἶδα, ἔγνωκα, ϵπίσταμαι, 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).

ther) he is (was) coming (going). (1) The forms $\pi o\hat{i}$ and $\delta \pi oi$ are not found in the Septuagint or New Testament. (See note on vi. 20, δπου.) John iii. 8, οὐκ οίδας που ύπάγει. vii. 35, που ούτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι...; viii. 14, οίδα πόθεν ηλθον και ποῦ υπάγω κ.τ.λ. xii. 35. xiii. 36, που υπαγεις ;... υπου υπάγω ου δύνασαί μοι νῦν ἀκολουθησαι. xiv. 5. xvi. 5. 1 John ii. 11. (2) The idea of $\epsilon \rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ is always that of coming, not of going: the writer or reader is supposed to be in the place arrived at, not in the place left. (3) The present tense (in such phrases) serves for the imperfect, as (necessarily) in the infinitive and participle.

9. $\Pi(\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota \pi a\rho\phi\kappa\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu)$ A further action of faith. First (1) the consent of the will $(\delta\pi\eta'-\kappa\circ\nu\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}\nu)$. Then (2) the act of expatriation $(\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu)$. Then (3) the settlement as a sojourner $(\pi a\rho\phi\kappa\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu)$, with the knowledge that for him it is permanent $(\kappa\alpha\tau\circ\kappa\eta'\sigma\alphas)$. For $\pi apoix\epsilon\hat{i}\nu$, to dwell beside (not as one of) a nation, see Luke xxiv. 18, $\sigma\dot{\nu}$ µóνος παροικείς Ίερουσαλήμ κ.τ.λ. Gen. xvii,

XI. 9, 10.

γελίας ώς άλλοτρίαν, ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας, μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ τῶν συνκληρονόμων τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς· ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν τοὺς 10

8, καὶ δώσω σοι...τὴν γῆν ῆν παροικεῖς. &c.

εἰς γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας] (1) For παρώκησεν εἰς, compare Acts vii. 4, εἰς ῆν ὑμεῖς νῦν κατοικεῖτε. &c. (2) Into a land (whatever it might be) belonging to (marked out by) the promise. (The absence of the article with γῆν, and its presence with ἐπαγγελίας, are equally precise.)

ώς ἀλλοτρίαν] As (with the full knowledge of its being) a land not his own. Matt. xvii. 25, ἀπὸ τῶν νίῶν αὐτῶν ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων. Acts vii. 6, ὅτι ἐσται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ πάροικον ἐν γŷ ἀλλοτρίą. Exod. ii. 22, πάροικός εἰμι ἐν γŷ ἀλλοτρίą.

έν σκηναίς κατοικήσας] Having taken up his permanent The mapoihabitation in tents. κία was a κατοικία too. Faith reconciled him not only to exile, not only to a temporary sojourning, but to a life-long For Katolkelv, see. tent-life. for example, Acts vii. 4, κατώκησεν έν Χαρράν κακείθεν... μετώκισεν αύτὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην είς ήν υμείς νύν κατοι-Keite. &c. For the combination of παροικείν and κατοικείν, see Gen. xxxvii. 1, κατώκει δε Ίακωβ έν τη γη ού παρώκησεν ό πατήρ avrov.

µета 'I. кай '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 $\mu\epsilon\tau a$ of a literal dwelling together.)

συνκληρονόμων] Rom. viii. 17. Eph. iii. 6. 1 Pet. iii. 7. See vi. 17, τοῖς κληρονόμοις τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (and note).

10. έξεδέχετο γάρ A distinct assertion that the old fathers did not look only for transitory promises (Art. vii.). There is an instinct of immor-He who *tality* in saintship. lives to God knows that he must live for ever (Matt. xxii. 32, ούκ έστιν [ό] Θεός νεκρών άλλα ζώντων). Canaan could not be the goal of one who walked with God. For exdéχεσθαι, see note on x. 13, έκδεχόμενος.

την τούς] The city which has the foundations. Rev. xxi. 14, και τὸ τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως ἔχον θεμελίους δώδεκα. The contrast here is that of πόλις with σκηναîς, the permanent with the shifting and migratory. In this aspect the earthly Zion might have fulfilled the expectation (Psalm lxxxvii. I, οἰ θεμέλιοι αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῦς ὅρεσι τοῦς ἀγίοις ἀγαπậ Κύριος τὰς πύλας Σιών ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ σκηνώματα Ἰαθεμελίους έχουσαν πόλιν, ής τεχνίτης και δημι-11 ουργός δ Θεός. Πίστει και αὐτή Σάρρα δύναμιν

xi. 11. Οτ αὐτή Σάρρα.

 $\kappa \omega \beta$). But verse 16 lifts the hope higher.

θεμελίους] See note on vi. 1, θεμέλιον.

πόλιν] Besides the obvious contrast with σκηναὶ in the aspect of permanence, πόλις has also the threefold suggestion of (1) society, (2) constitution, (3) government. Phil. iii. 20, ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει.

 $\eta_5 \tau \in \chi v(\tau \eta_5]$ Whose artificer and architect is God. He built, and He planned.

τεχνίτης] Wisd. xiii. 1, ἐκ τῶν ὁρωμένων ἀγαθῶν οὐκ ἴσχυσαν εἰδέναι τὸν ὅντα, οὖτε τοῦς ἔργοις προσσχόντες ἐπέγνωσαν τὸν τεχνίτην. For τεχνίτης in its common application, see Acts xix. 24, 38. Rev. xviii. 22. I Chron. xxii. 15. xxix. 5. Jer. x. 9. &c. Wisd. viii. 6, εἰ δὲ φρόνησις ἐργάζεται, τίς αὐτῆς τῶν ὅντων μᾶλλόν ἐστι τεχνίτης; xiv. 2, 18. Ecclus. ix. 17. &c.

δημιουργός] Like λειτουργός (see note on i. 7), δημιουργός 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. iv. J, τών κακών δημιουργός καθεστηκώς. The verb (δημιουργέν) occurs in 2 Mace. x. 1 and Wisd. xv. 13. For the higher application of δημιουργός here Plato had made preparation (Rep. vii. p. 530, ό τοῦ οὐρανοῦ δημιουργός).

Πίστει...Σάρρα The II. 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 Záppa 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.

XI. 11, 12.

είς καταβολήν σπέρματος ἕλαβεν καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας, ἐπεὶ πιστὸν ἡγήσατο τὸν ἐπαγγειλάμενον. διὸ καὶ ἀφ' ἑνὸς ἐγεννήθησαν, καὶ 12

xi. 12. Or eyernonav.

καὶ αὐτή] Herself also. She in her place, as he in his.

Σάρρα] Seldom mentioned in Scripture except in the narrative in Genesis. Isai. li. 2. Rom. iv. 19. ix. 9. I Pet. iii. 6, ώς Σάρρα υπήκουεν τῷ 'Αβραὰμ...ής εγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι κ.τ.λ.

δύναμιν είs] Luke v. 17, καὶ δύναμις Κυρίου ἢν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν.

 $\kappa ai \pi a p a'$ Even beyond (the capacity of) her (then) time of *life.* The original idea of $\pi a \rho \dot{a}$ is beside. With the genitive, from beside, as John xvi. 27, παρά τοῦ Πατρός ἐξηλθον. With the dative, beside, as John xvii. 5, δόξασόν με σύ, Πάτερ, παρα σεαυτώ τη δόξη ή είχον πρό του τον κόσμον είναι παρά σοί. With the accusative, to the side of, as Matt. xv. 30, Eppular autous παρα τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (but more often, by a well known Greek idiom, in places where the dative sense is intended, as in verse 12, ή άμμος ή παρά το χείλος τής θαλάσσης). The idea of *juxtaposition* passes easily into that of *comparison*, and generally of *favourable* comparison (beyond, more than), which is the uniform sense of $\pi a \rho a$ (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. $\eta\lambda\iota\kappa\iotaas$] The same word bears the two senses, of (1) age, as here, and John ix. 21, 23, $\eta\lambda\iota\kappa\iotaav \xi\chi\epsilon\iota \kappa.\tau.\lambda.$, (2) stature, as Matt. vi. 27. Luke ii. 52. xii. 25. xix. 3, $\tau\eta$ $\eta\lambda\iota\kappa\iotaa\mu\iota\kappa\rho$ os $\eta\nu$. Eph. iv. 13.

πιστόν] Compare x. 23, πιστός γάρ ο έπαγγειλάμενος. See note on ii. 17, πιστός.

ήγήσατο] A single mental act. See note on x. 29, ήγησάμενος. Phil. ii. 6, 25, ούχ άρπαγμὸν ήγήσατο (at the moment of taking upon Him to deliver man) κ.τ.λ. I Tim. i. 12, ὅτι πιστόν με ήγήσατο (at the moment of the ἐνδυναμώσαντι above) κ.τ.λ.

τον έπαγγειλάμενον] See note on vi. 13, έπαγγειλάμενος.

12. διό] Wherefore. Because of which exercise of faith. Implying that unbelief would have forfeited the promise.

kai $\dot{a}\phi$ $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\dot{c}s$] Either (1) also, belonging to the whole following sentence, or (2) even, belonging to $\dot{a}\phi$ $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\dot{c}s$.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

ταῦτα νενεκρωμένου, καθώς τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει καὶ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ ἀναρίθμητος.

13

Κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μή

καὶ ταῦτα] And that too. A classical idiom (introducing a further and stronger consideration) with or without the addition of μέντοι. Compare I Cor. vi. 6, 8, καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ ἀπίστων...καὶ τοῦτο ἀδελφούs. Eph. ii. 8. Phil. i. 28. 3 John 5, εἰs τοὺs ἀδελφούs, καὶ τοῦτο ξένουs.

νενεκρωμένου] As good as dead. A delicate and felicitous rendering in the Authorized Version. Rom. iv. 19, κατενόησεν τὸ ἐαυτοῦ σῶμα νενεκρωμένον. Elsewhere only Col. iii. 5, νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη κ.τ.λ.

καθώς τα άστρα] Gen. xxii. 17, καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνώ τὸ σπέρμα σου ώς τους αστέρας του ουρανού και ώς την αμμον την παρά το χείλος της θαλάσσης. For the former figure, compare Gen. xv. 5, αρίθμησον τοὺς αστέρας, εί δυνήση εξαριθμήσαι αύτούς και είπεν, Ούτως έσται το σπέρμα σου. Rom. iv. 18. To the latter the nearest approach is Gen. xiii. 16, Kai ποιήσω το σπέρμα σου ώς την άμμον της γης ει δύναταί τις έξαριθμήσαι την αμμον τής γής, καί το σπέρμα σου έξαριθμηθήσεται. For aστρον (a constellation) see Luke xxi. 25, ἐν ήλίω καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἄστροις. Acts vii. 43 (from Amos v. 26). xxvii. 20, μήτε δὲ ἡλίου μήτε ἄστρων ἐπιφαινόντων κ.τ.λ. For ἀστὴρ (a star), Matt. ii. 2, &c. xxiv. 29. I Cor. xv. 41. &c. Also 14 times in the Revelation.

χείλος] For the literal sense, see xiii. 15. For its use here, compare Josh. xi. 4, καὶ ἐξῆλθον...ὅσπερ ἡ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ χείλος τῆς θαλάσσης τῷ πλήθει. Jud. vii. 12. 1 Sam. xiii. 5. 1 Kings ix. 26, ἐπὶ τοῦ χείλους τῆς ἐσχάτης θαλάσσης κ.τ.λ. And so in Gen. xli. 3, 17, καὶ ἐνέμοντο παρὰ τὰς βόας ἐπὶ τὸ χείλος τοῦ ποταμοῦ κ.τ.λ. Exod. vii. 15. Ezek. xlvii. 6, 7, 12.

άναρίθμητος] Ι Kings viii. 5, θύοντες πρόβατα, βόας, ἀναρίθμητα. Job xxi. 33. xxii. 5, ἀναρίθμητοι...αἰ ἁμαρτίαι. xxxi. 25. Prov. vii. 26. Joel i. 6, ἔθνος...ἰσχυρὸν καὶ ἀναρίθμητο. Wisd. vii. 11, ἀναρίθμητος πλοῦτος. xviii. 12. Ecclus. xxxvii. 25, aἰ ἡμέραι τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἀναρίθμητοι.

13. Karà $\pi(\sigma\tau w)$ According to (by the rule of, on the principle of) faith. This better suits $a\pi \ell \theta avor$ than the otherwise invariable $\pi(\sigma\tau \omega)$. Verses

XI. 13.

κομισάμενοι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι, καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς

13 to 16 interrupt the enumeration of instances, to emphasize a peculiar feature of faith, as the stay of the dying.

οῦτοι πάντες] Does this include Abel, Enoch, Noah, or only Abraham and his house? The express mention of the ϵ παγγελίαι, as well as the τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον (verse 5) of Enoch, might favour the more restricted reference. But the *principle* was the same for all.

μη κομισάμενοι] As not having received. 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 μή, see again note on iv. 2. For κομίζεσθαι, see note on x. 36, κομίσησθε.

τάς ἐπαγγελίας] The things promised (as in Luke xxiv. 49. Acts i. 4. ii. 33). See note on vi. 12.

πόρρωθεν] Luke xvii. 12 (only). But it is frequent in the Septuagint. Job ii. 12, ίδόντες δε αὐτὸν πόρρωθεν. xxxix. 29, πόρρωθεν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ σκοπεύουσι. Isai. xxxiii. 17, βασιλέα μετὰ δόξης ὅψεσθε, οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν ὅψονται γῆν πόρρωθεν. ίδόντες καὶ ἀσπασάμενο] 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.

άσπασάμενοι] The word occurs frequently in its literal sense. The nearest approach to its use here is in Mark ix. 15, ιδόντες αυτόν έξεθαμβήθησαν, καὶ προστρέχοντες ήσπάζοντο αυτόν.

όμολογήσαντες] See note on iii. I, όμολογίας.

ξένοι και παρεπίδημοι] Gen. xxiii. 4, πάροικος και παρεπίδημος έγώ είμι μεθ' ύμῶν. xlvii. 9, ai ήμέραι των έτων της ζωής μου, άς παροικώ... άς ήμέρας παρώκησαν. Psalm xxxix. 12, πάροικος έγώ είμι έν τη γη και παρεπίδημος, καθώς πάντες οι πατέρες μου. The senses of $\xi \notin vos$ are (1) a stranger or foreigner (as Matt. xxv. 35, xxvii. 7, είς ταφήν τοις åc. έένοις. Acts xvii. 21. 3 John 5); and so figuratively (Eph. ii. 19, οὐκέτι ἐστε ξένοι και πάροικοι $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$; and with a genitive, strangers to (Eph. ii. 12, Éévoi των διαθηκών); and as an adjective, of things, foreign or strange (xiii. 9, διδαχαίς ποικίλαις καί Eévais. Acts xvii. 18, Eévav

V. H.

14 γής. οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες ἐμφανίζουσιν 15 ὅτι πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσιν. καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης

δαιμονίων. I Pet. iv. 12, ώς ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος): (2) a guest (I Sam. ix. 13, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐσθίουσιν οἱ ξένοι) or host (Rom. xvi. 23, Γάῖος ὁ ξένος μου καὶ ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας).

παρεπίδημοι] Like πάροικος, παρεπίδημος 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 of Acts xvii. 21, of ἐπιδημοῦντες ξένοι (compare Acts ii. 10). The word occurs in 1 Pet. i. 1, ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου κ.τ.λ. ii. 11, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους. Also Gen. xxiii. 4. Psalm xxxix. 12 (quoted above).

 $\epsilon \pi i \tau \eta s \gamma \eta s$] A reminiscence of $\epsilon v \tau \eta \gamma \eta$ in Psalm xxxix, 12.

14. of $\gamma \alpha \rho$ I say, kard $\pi i \sigma \tau w \alpha \pi \ell \theta a v o v$ for, &c. The suppressed thought is, Home is a necessity of man, and therefore they who confess themselves homeless here must be expecting a home there.

έμφανίζουσιν] Make manifest. Show clearly. See note on ix. 24, ἐμφανισθῆναι. There of a person (and see references); here of a thing (for which see Acts xxiii. 15, 23, ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχψ...ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισαs πρός με. xxiv. 1, ἐνεφάνισαν τῷ ήγεμόνι κατά τοῦ Παύλου. xxv. 2, 15, περί οὗ...ἐνεφάνισαν κ.τ.λ.).

πατρίδα] A fatherland. For a more restricted application of πατρίς, see Matt. xiii. 54, 57. Mark vi. 1, 4, οὐκ ἐστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῆ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῆ οἰκία αὐτοῦ. Luke iv. 23, 24. John iv. 44. In its large sense (as here), Esth. ii. 10, καὶ οὐχ ὑπέδειξεν Ἐσθὴρ τὸ γένος αὐτῆς οὐδὲ τὴν πατρίδα. viii. 6, ἐν τῆ ἀπωλεία τῆς πατρίδος μου. Jer. xxii. 10, οὐδὲ ὄψεται τὴν γῆν πατρίδος αὐτοῦ. Ezek. xxiii. 15.

 $i \pi i \zeta \eta \tau o \vartheta \sigma i v$] They are seeking for. The $i \pi i$ is that of direction, as the $i \pi i$ is that of direction, as the $i \pi i$ is $i \pi i \pi i \eta$ (verse 6) is that of exploration. For $i \pi i \zeta \eta \tau c \hat{v}$, see xiii. 14, où $\gamma a \rho \tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi \sigma \mu e \nu}$ $\tilde{\omega} \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu \sigma a \nu \pi i \lambda i \nu$, $d \lambda a \tau \eta \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu \sigma a \nu \epsilon \pi i \zeta \eta \tau o \vartheta \mu e \nu$. Matt. vi. 32. xii. 39. xvi. 4. Luke iv. 42. xii. 30. Acts xii. 19. xiii. 7. xix. 39. Rom. xi. 7. Phil. iv. 17, où $\chi \delta \tau i \epsilon \pi i \zeta \eta \tau \hat{\omega}$ $\tau o \delta \delta \mu a, d \lambda h a \epsilon \pi i \zeta \eta \tau \tilde{\omega} \tau o \nu \kappa a \rho \pi o \nu$ $\kappa. \tau. \lambda$.

15. Kal $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon v$] 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.

εἰ μὲν ἐμνημόνευον] If (when they so spoke) they were remem-

ἐμνημόνευον ἀφ' ἦs ἐξέβησαν, εἶχον ἂν καιρὸν ἀνακάμψαι· νῦν δὲ κρείττονοs ὀρέγονται, τοῦτ' 16

bering. Sometimes µνημονεύειν has the sense of *remembering*. sometimes of mentioning. The latter in verse 22 (with $\pi\epsilon\rho i$). Elsewhere always the former, either (1) with a genitive (as here, and xiii. 7, tŵr ήγουμένων. Luke xvii. 32, της γυναικός Λώτ. John xv. 20, τοῦ λόγου. xvi. 4, 21, της θλίψεως. Acts xx. 35, τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. Gal. ii. 10, τών πτωχών. Col. iv. 18, τών δεσμών. I Thess. i. 3, τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως κ.τ.λ. Psalm vi. 5, δ μνημονεύων σου. lxii. 6. &c.); or (2) with an accusative (Matt. xví. 9, roùs πέντε άρτους κ.τ.λ. I Thess. ii. 9, τον κόπον ήμων κ.τ.λ. 2 Tim. ii. 8, Ἰησοῦν Χριστον έγηγερμένον κ.τ.λ. Rev. xviii. 5. Exod. xiii. 3, την ήμέραν ταύτην. Isai. xliii. 18, $\tau a \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau a$. &c.); or (3) with ότι (Acts xx. 31. Eph. ii. 11. 2 Thess. ii. 5), $\pi \delta \theta \epsilon \nu$ (Rev. ii. 5), or $\pi \hat{\omega}$ s (Rev. iii. 3); or (4) with a nominative participle (2 Kings ix. 25, μνημονεύω έγὼ καὶ συ επιβεβηκότες κ.τ.λ.); or (5) absolutely (Mark viii. 18).

ἀφ' ἦς ἐξέβησαν] Acts vii. 2, 3, ὄντι ἐν τῆ Μεσοποταμία... ἐξελθών ἐκ γῆς Χαλδαίων κατώκησεν ἐν Χαρράν· κἀκεῖθεν...μετώκισεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην.

άχον åν] They would have been having. They would have had all along. For the imperfect with av following the imperfect with 6? (6? ¿μνημόνευον, eixov av), compare viii. 4, 7, ei μέν γαρ ην έπι γης, ούδ άν ην ίερεύς...εί γαρ ή πρώτη έκείνη ήν αμεμπτος, ούκ αν δευτέρας έζητείτο τόπος. Matt. xxiii. 30, εί ήμεθα...ούκ αν ήμεθα κ.τ.λ. Luke xvii. 6, εἰ είχετε πίστιν...ελέγετε av...κaì ὑπήκουσεν <math>av ὑμîv (if you were in possession of faith, you would have been saying erenow...and it would have instantly, by a single act, obeyed you). John v. 46, el yap entoτεύετε Μωυσεΐ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί (if you were in the habit of believing Moses, you would have been all along believing me). viii. 39, 42. ix. 41. xv. 19. xviii. 36. 1 Cor. xi. 31, el de έαυτούς διεκρίνομεν, ούκ αν έκρινόμεθα (if we were in the habit of discriminating ourselves, we should not have been, as we are, in process of being judged). Gal. i. 10, εί έτι ανθρώποις ήρεσκον. Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ αν ήμην.

καιρόν ἀνακάμψαι] Rov. xi. 18, καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι καὶ δοῦναι...καὶ διαφθεῖραι κ.τ.λ. For καιρός, see note on ix. 9.

aνaκάμψαι] The figure of bending back may have been suggested by the second half of the chariot race, that from the

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

έστιν έπουρανίου διο ούκ έπαισχύνεται αύτούς

goal to the starting-place. But it is used in the commonest sense of returning. Matt. ii. 12, $\mu\eta$ avaka $\mu\psi$ ai $\pi\rho$ os H $\rho\omega\delta\eta\nu$. Luke x. 6. Acts xviii. 21, $\pi a\lambda i\nu$ avaka $\mu\psi\omega$ $\pi\rho$ os $\psi\mu$ as τov $\Theta \epsilon ov$ $\theta\epsilon\lambda ov \tauos$. It occurs 15 times in the Septuagint. Exod. xxxii. 27, $\delta i\epsilon\lambda\theta a\tau\epsilon$ kai avaka $\mu\psi$ μ are $a\pi\delta$ $\pi v\lambda\eta s$ $\epsilon\pi i$ $\pi v\lambda\eta \nu$ δid $\tau\eta$ s $\pi a\rho \epsilon \mu\beta o\lambda\eta s$. 2 Sam. i. 22, kai $\rho_0\mu\phi_a ai$ Zaoùh oùk ave kau $\psi\epsilon$ kevé, &c.

16. $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$] But as it is (as the case really stands). The $\delta \epsilon$ answers the $\mu \epsilon v$ of verse 15, and sets fact against hypothesis. See note on viii. 6, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$. For this use of $v \bar{v} v$ or v v v' (not of time but of thought), compare 1 Cor. vii. 14, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$ aytá écriv. xii. 18, 20, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$ aytá écriv. xii. 18, 20, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$ aytá écriv. xii. 18, 20, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$ aytá écriv. xii. 18, 20, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$ aytá écriv. xii. 18, 20, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$ aytá écriv. xii. 18, 20, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$ aytá écriv. xii. 18, 20, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$ aytá écriv. xii. 18, 20, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$ aytá écriv. xii. 18, 20, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$ aytá écriv. xii. 18, 20, $v \bar{v} v \delta \epsilon$ aytá écriv.

κρείττονος] See note on i. 4, κρείττων.

ορέγονται] From the figure of reaching after (compare the stronger expression ἐπεκτεινόμενος in Phil. iii. 14) comes that of desiring. The verb is used (in Scripture) only here and in I Tim. iii. I (εἶ τις ἐπισκοπη̂ς ὀρέγεται) and vi. 10 (η̂ς τινὲς ὀρεγόμενοι).

ἐπουρανίου] For ἐπουράνιος, see note on iii. I. The idea of οὐρανὸς or τὰ ἐπουράνια as the

 $\pi a_{\tau \rho}$ of the blessed is found in many passages (as 2 Cor. v. 1. Eph. ii. 6. Phil. iii. 20. 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 καταβαίνουσαν έκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ to become the σκηνή τοῦ Θεοῦ μετά τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Even in 1 Thess. iv. 15-17 (the nearest approach to a local representation) the same feature of the καταβήσεται $a\pi$ over $a\nu$ over $a\nu$ is prominent, and the appraynooueda is els anavrnσιν τοῦ Κυρίου, with no intimation of His retracing His descent. The new heaven is always combined with a new earth (Isai. lxv. 17. 2 Pet. iii. 13. Rev. xxi. 1). The σύν Κυρίω έσό- $\mu\epsilon\theta a$ of 1 Thess. iv. 17, and the ίνα δπου είμὶ έγω καὶ ύμεῖς ἦτε of John xiv. 3, seem to be the only *revelations* of the future home of the saints.

 $\delta(\delta)$ Wherefore. Because they were capable of such aspirations. Because they were able thus to die in faith.

οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται] God is not ashamed of them—not ashamed to be surnamed their God. The verb ἐπαισχύνεσθαι has three constructions, two of which are here combined. (1) With an accusative, as Mark viii. 38.

228

ό Θεός Θεός έπικαλείσθαι αὐτῶν, ἡτοίμασεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν.

Luke ix. 26, ôs yàp $dv \epsilon \pi a i \sigma$ $\chi v v \theta \hat{j} \mu \epsilon$ καὶ τοὺς $\epsilon \mu o i
vee$ ς λόγους, τοῦτον ὁ viòς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισ- $\chi v v θ ή σ \epsilon \tau a i$ κ.τ.λ. Rom. i. 16. 2 Tim. i. 8, 16. Job xxxiv. 19. (2) With an *infinitive*, as ii. 11 (where see note). (3) With $\epsilon \pi i$, as Rom. vi. 21, $\epsilon \phi$ o is vũv $\epsilon \pi a i \sigma$ - $\chi v \kappa \sigma \theta \epsilon$. Isai. i. 29. It is also used (4) absolutely, as 2 Tim. i. 12.

Θεός επικαλείσθαι αυτών 70 be surnamed their God. Totake to Himself this title, God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob. Gen. xxvi. 24, eyú eiui ό Θεός 'Αβραάμ τοῦ πατρός σου. xxviii. 13, έγώ εἰμι ὁ Θεὸς 'Αβραάμ τοῦ πατρός σου, καὶ ό Θεος Ισαάκ. Exod. iii. 6, εγώ είμι ό Θεός του πατρός σου, Θεός 'Αβραάμ, καὶ Θεὸς Ἰσαάκ, καὶ Θεὸς Ίακώ β . (The three quotations give the gradual growth of the divine surname through succeeding generations.) For $\epsilon \pi \iota$ καλείν (to surname) and its passive, see Matt. x. 25, ci tov oikoδεσπότην Βεελζεβουλ επεκάλεσαν. Acts i. 23, Ίωσηφ τον καλούμενον Βαρσαββάν, δς ἐπεκλήθη 'Ιοῦστος. iv. 36. x. 5, 18, 32. For the middle voice (to åc. invoke, call in, appeal to), see (1) in its human application, Acts xxv. 11, 12, 21, 25. xxvi. 32. xxviii. 19, ήναγκάσθην έπικαλέσασθαι Καίσαρα κ.τ.λ.; (2) in its religious use, Acts vii. 59. ix. 14, 21. xxii. 16. Rom. x. 12, 13, 14. 1 Cor. i. 2. 2 Cor. i. 23. 2 Tim. ii. 22. 1 Pet. i. 17. Also Gen. iv. 26. xxxiii. 20. And so throughout the Psalms. In this last sense, $iπ_{\kappa \alpha}\lambda\epsilon i \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ is equivalent to the προσέρχεσθαι of this Epistle (see note on iv. 16).

ήτοίμασεν γάρ] I say, οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται—for, &c. He has proved that He is not ashamed of them by preparing for them a city.

 $\eta \tau o(\mu a \sigma \epsilon v)$ A single past act. In the eternal past, when the plans of God were formed. The aorist is that of Rom. viii. 29, 30, προέγνω, προώρισεν, &c. Eph. i. 4, 5, 6, έξελέξατο, προορίσας, έχαρίτωσεν, &c. 2 Thess. ii. 13, είλατο. &c. For ήτοίμα- $\sigma \epsilon \nu$ (in this connexion), see John xiv. 2, πορεύομαι έτοιμάσαι τόπον υμίν κ.τ.λ. Ι Cor. ii. 9, & ήτοίμασεν δ. Θεός τοις άγαπωσιν autóv. And with $\pi \delta \lambda is$ (as here), Rev. xxi. 2, και την πόλιν την άγίαν...ήτοιμασμένην ώς νύμφην κ.τ.λ.

πόλιν] Not a πατρὶs only, but a πόλις. See note on verse 10, πόλιν.

17. Π iora...'A $\beta \rho a a \mu$] A third example of the faith of

17 Πίστει προσενήνοχεν 'Αβραὰμ τὸν 'Ισαὰκ πειραζόμενος, καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερεν ὁ

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.

προσενήνοχεν] Has offered. The perfect expresses (1) the completeness of the act. All is done. Gen. xxii. 9, 10, ηλθον έπι τον τόπον...και ψκοδόμησεν το θυσιαστήριον...καί συμποδίσας Ίσαἀκ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον...καὶ ἐξέτεινεν `Αβραὰμ την χείρα αύτοῦ λαβείν την μάχαιραν σφάξαι τον υίον αύτου. The offering is perfect. (2) The permanence of the Scripture record. It is written. Thus the tense is that of vii. 6, 9, $\delta \epsilon$ δεκάτωκεν...εὐλόγηκεν...δεδεκάτω- $\tau \alpha i$ (where see notes). For $\pi \rho o \sigma$ - $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon i \nu$, see note on v. I, $\pi \rho o \sigma$ φέρη.

 $\tau \delta v$ Ioaák] 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.

 $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \zeta \delta \mu \epsilon v o s$ The present participle may express either (1) the promptitude of the offering (in the very moment of trial, like $\kappa a \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu \epsilon v o \hat{\gamma}$ in verse 8), or (2) the continuance and pro*traction* of the *trial*, so strongly marked in the narrative of Gen. xxii. 4, 5 (τη ήμέρα τη τρίτη...είδε τον τόπον μακρόθεν ...διελευσόμεθα έως ώδε κ.τ.λ.). For $\pi \epsilon_{i} \rho \alpha \zeta \epsilon_{i} \nu$, see note on ii. 18. $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho a\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota$'s. For the special connexion of the word with this narrative, see Gen. xxii. 1, o Θεός επείρασε τον Αβραάμ κ.τ.λ.

kai rov $\mu ov o\gamma \epsilon v \hat{\eta}$] 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 it.

μονογενη] In Gen. xxii. 2, 16, the phrase is not τον μουογενη but τον ἀγαπητόν, τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ. But ἀγαπητὸς itself (in usage) implied μονογενής. For μονογενής, see Luke vii. 12, μονογενής νίδς τη μητρὶ αὐτοῦ. viii. 42. ix. 38, ἐπιβλέψαι ἐπὶ τὸν νίόν μου, ὅτι μονογενής μοί ἐστιν. In the remaining places of its occurrence (John i. 14, 18. iii. 16, 18. I John iv. 9) it has the higher application. In Psalm xxii. 29 and xxxv. 17, τὴν XI. 17—19. 231

τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀναδεξάμενος, πρὸς ὃν ἐλαλήθη 18 ὅτι ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα· λογισάμενος ὅτι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν δυνατὸς 19

μονογενή is placed in parallelism with την ψυχήν μου. In Psalm xxv. 16, it is a plea for mercy, ότι μονογενης καὶ πτωχός εἰμι ε΄γώ. In Wisdom vii. 22, μονογενες is one of the epithets of the πνεῦμα which is in σοφία.

 $\pi po\sigma \left(\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon v\right)$ The imperfect marks the gradualness of the process. Step by step he performed the act of offering. See note on $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \zeta \phi \mu \epsilon v os$ above.

ό τάς] See vii. 6, τὸν ἔχοντα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. For τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, see note on vi. 12.

άναδεξάμενος] Only here and in Acts xxviii. 7, ôs ἀναδεξάμενος ἡμῶς τρεῖς ἡμέρας φιλοφρόνως ἐξένισεν. The word has the idea of a cheerful and glad acceptance. He that had welcomed the promises. See 2 Macc. vi. 19, ὁ δὲ τὸν μετ εὐκλείας θάνατον...ἀναδεξάμενος.

18. $\pi \rho \delta \delta v$] 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 $\pi \rho \delta s$, see note on i. 7.

ἐλαλήθη] See note on i. 1, λαλήσας.

iv Iσαάκ] 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.

κληθήσεται] For this use of καλεΐν, see note on iii. 13, καλεΐται.

19. $\lambda \circ \gamma \iota \sigma \dot{a} \mu \epsilon \nu \circ s$] The aorist indicates a single and decisive mental act (see verses 25 and 26, $\epsilon \lambda \circ \mu \epsilon \nu \circ s$... $\dot{\eta} \gamma \eta \sigma \dot{a} \mu \epsilon \nu \circ s$). Having reckoned this. The word $\lambda \circ \gamma \dot{\ell} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (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 Rom. viii. 18, $\lambda \circ \gamma \dot{\ell} \circ \mu a \iota$ $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ $\delta \tau \iota$ où $\kappa \dot{a} \dot{\xi} \iota a \tau \dot{a} \pi a \theta \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a \tau \circ \dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \nu$

$\Pi PO\Sigma EBPAIOY\Sigma.$

ό Θεός· όθεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν παραβολῆ ἐκομίσατο. Πίστει καὶ περὶ μελλόντων εὐλόγησεν Ἰσαὰκ

καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθήναι εἰς ήμῶς. Ι Cor. xiii. ΙΙ, ὅτε ήμην νήπιος...ἐλογιζόμην ὡς νήπιος. 2 Cor. x. 7, τοῦτο λογιζέσθω πάλιν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ κ.τ.λ. &c.

ότι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν] Quite general. That God is able even to raise from the dead. (Acts xxvi. 8, τί ἄπιστον κρίνεται παρ' ὑμῦν εἰ ὁ Θεὸς νεκροὺς ἐγείρει;) 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.

δυνατός] Here only in this Epistle. Frequent elsewhere, both in its sense of (1) possible (Matt. xix. 26, παρά δε Θεώ πάντα δυνατά. &c.), and in that of (2) powerful (Luke i. 49, o Suratos. xxiv. 19, Suratos er έργω και λόγω. Acts vii. 22. Rom. ix. 22, γνωρίσαι το δυνατον avrov. xv. 1. 1 Cor. i. 26. 2 Cor. xii. 10, τότε δυνατός είμι. xiii. 9), or able (as here, and Luke xiv. 31, εί δυνατός έστιν ... υπαντήσαι κ.τ.λ. Acts xi. 17. Rom. iv. 21, ότι δ επήγγελται δυνατός έστιν καί ποιήσαι. xi. 23. 2 Cor. ix. 8. 2 Tim. i. 12, δυνατός έστιν την παραθήκην μου φυλάξαι. Tit. i. 9. James iii. 2).

 $\delta\theta\epsilon\nu$] That is, $\epsilon\kappa$ $\nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\omega\nu$.

καί] The words έν παραβολή

are practically parenthetical, and $\kappa a belongs$ to the whole clause. From whence he did also (in figure) recover him. The sense will be but slightly varied if $\kappa a is even$. And the English equivalent for $\kappa a i$ in either case will be an emphasis on the auxiliary verb. From whence he did (in figure) recover him.

έν παραβολή] 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. o the fact of there being a $\pi \rho \omega \tau \eta \sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta$, an outer chamber of the tabernacle, was called a $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta o \lambda \eta$ as teaching a spiritual truth. And here the recovery of Isaac from imminent death is made a $\pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda \eta$ of resurrection.

 ϵ κομίσατο] He received him back. See note on x. 36, κομίσησθε.

20. Ilíorte... Ioaak] 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.

καὶ $\pi \epsilon \rho i$] Even concerning things future. The καὶ recog-

232

20

τόν Ίακώβ καί τόν Ήσαῦ. Πίστει Ἰακώβ ἀπο- 21 θνήσκων ἕκαστον τῶν υίῶν Ἰωσὴφ εὐλόγησεν, καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου

nizes the *difficulty* of realizing the unseen. It is like the $\mu\eta$ - $\delta\epsilon\pi\omega$ of verse 7.

μελλόντων] Gen. xxvii. 29, δουλευσάτωσάν σοι έθτη, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσάν σοι ἀρχοντες κ.τ.λ. It was a recognition of a future which at present gave no sign.

εὐλόγησεν] 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, καὶ εὐλόγησα αὐτόν, καὶ εὐλογημένος ἔσται. And the very *idea* of the εὐλογía, as a prediction and apportionment of things not yet seen, resting only upon promise, was an action of faith.

21. Π'_{OTEA} $[Ia\kappa\omega\beta]$ Two separate occurrences are here combined, and in inverted order (Gen. xlviii. and xlvii.). By the inversion (1) the $\epsilon i\lambda \alpha \gamma i a$ of Jacob is placed in juxtaposition with that of Isaac, and (2) 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.

αποθνήσκων] Gen. xlviii. 21, ίδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποθνήσκω.

 $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa a\sigma \tau ov$] In the sense of either of two, $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa a \tau \epsilon \rho os$ is the classical form; but it does not occur in the New Testament, and only three times in the Septuagint (Ezek. i. 11, 12. 2 Macc. iii. 26), and in two of these incorrectly (for $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\sigma\sigma$).

 $\epsilon \partial \lambda \delta \gamma \eta \sigma \epsilon v$] The faith was shown (1) 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).

καί προσεκύνησεν] See Gen. xlvii. 31, καὶ προσεκύνησεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ. 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.

προσεκύνησεν] The idea of προσεκυνείν 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 αὐτοῦ. Πίστει Ἰωσήφ τελευτῶν περὶ τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐμνημόνευσεν, καὶ περὶ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ ἐνετείλατο.

divine presence, if not of the divine *personality*. Its use in the temptation (Matt. iv. 9) is no real exception to this : scarcely even that in the oriental imagery of the parable of Matt. xviii. See Matt. ii. 2, &c. ix. 26. 18. xiv. 33. &c. The construction of $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \kappa v \kappa v \epsilon i v$ varies. (1) Most often it is with the *dative* (as John iv. 21, 23. 1 Cor. xiv. 25. &c.). (2) Sometimes with the accusative (as John iv. 23, 24. Rev. xiii. 12. &c.). (3) Sometimes it is put absolutely (as John iv. 20. xii. 20. Acts viii. 27. xxiv. 11. Rev. v. 14. &c.), or is followed by evwnior (as Luke iv. 7. Rev. xv. 4) or $\epsilon\mu\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$ (Rev. xxii. 8).

 $\epsilon \pi i$] Upon. Leaning or bowing himself (Gen. xlvii. 31, Authorized and Revised Version) upon.

τὸ ἄκρον] Luke xvi. 24, τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ.

 $\dot{\rho}\dot{a}\beta\delta\omega$] 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 $\dot{\rho}\dot{a}\beta\delta\omega$ s, see note on i. 8.

22. Πίστει Ίωσήφ] Gen. l. 24, 25, και είπεν Ίωσήφ τοις άδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ, λέγων, Ἐγω ἀποθνήσκω· ἐπισκοπῆ δὲ ἐπισκέψεται ὁ Θεὸς ὑμᾶς...καὶ συνανοίσετε τὰ ὀστᾶ μοῦ ἐντεῦθεν μεθ' ὑμῶν.

τελευτών] Gen. l. 16, 26, προ τοῦ τελευτήσαι αὐτόν...καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰωσήφ. Matt. ii. 19. ix. 18. xxii. 25. Luke vii. 2. John xi. 39. Acts ii. 29. vii. 15, καὶ κατέβη Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν.

περί της έξόδου] Gen. l. 24, και ανάξει ύμας έκ της γης ταύτης $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. For the special application of the word ξ_{δ} solves, see Exod. xix. 1, τοῦ δὲ μηνός τοῦ τρίτου τής έξόδου τῶν υίῶν Ἰσραήλ ἐκ γής Αίγυπτου κ.τ.λ. Num. xxxiii. 38, Άαρών ο ιερεύς...απέθανεν έκει έν τώ τεσσαρακοστώ έτει της έξόδου τών υίων Ισραήλ έκ γής Aiyúnrov. Psalm ev. 38, evφράνθη Αίγυπτος έν τη έξόδω αντών. cxiv. I. In the New Testament ¿ξοδος occurs but twice besides (Luke ix. 31. 2 Pet. i. 15), and in a different application.

τῶν νίῶν Ἰσραήλ] Here perhaps the actual sons of Jacob may be meant. See Gen. l. 25, καὶ ὥρκισεν Ἰωστὴφ τοὺς νίοὺς Ἰσραήλ, λέγων...ὑμᾶς...μεθ ὑμῶν. They were the representatives of the race, whether they should

Πίστει Μωυσης γεννηθείς εκρύβη τρίμηνον 23 ύπο των πατέρων αὐτοῦ, διότι εἶδον ἀστεῖον το

be themselves dead or living at the time of the fulfilment of the promise.

έμνημόνευσεν] See note on verse 15.

περί τών οστέων] Gen. l. 25 (quoted above). Ex. xiii. 19, και έλαβε Μωυσής τα οστά Ίωσηφ μεθ' έαυτοῦ κ.τ.λ. Jos. xxiv. 32, και τα οστά Ἰωσηφ ἀνήγαγον οἱ υἱοι Ἰσραηλ ἐξ Αιγύπτου, και κατώρυξαν ἐν Σικίμοις κ.τ.λ.

ένετείλατο] See note on ix. 20. ένετείλατο.

23. Πίστει Μωυσ $\hat{\eta}$ s] From Genesis to Exodus. From Abraham to Moses. From Abralife into the world, whether of power, or of luxury, or of wisdom, 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.

 $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \epsilon \tilde{\epsilon}$] Acts vii. 20, $\epsilon \nu$ $\tilde{\psi} \kappa \alpha \iota \rho \tilde{\psi} \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \eta$ Movo ηs . The word seems to reflect the detail and the emphasis of Exod. ii. 1, 2.

 $\epsilon \kappa \rho i \beta \eta$] Exod. ii. 2, $\epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \pi a$ σαν αὐτό. But afterwards (verse 3) $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$ δε οὐκ εδύναντο αὐτὸ ετι κρύπτειν. For the form $\epsilon \kappa \rho i \beta \eta$, see Luke xix. 42. John viii. 59. xii. 36.

τρίμηνον] Exod. ii. 2, μηνας τρεῖς. And so Acts vii. 20, ὅς ἀνετράφη μηνας τρεῖς ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ τοῦ πατρός. The form τρίμηνος has an unusual variety of gender; feminine in Herodotus, masculine (but as adjective, with χρόνος) in Sophocles, neuter (probably) here, and in Gen. xxxviii. 24, μετὰ τρίμηνον. 2 Kings xxiv. 8, καὶ τρίμηνον έβασίλευσεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 2, 9.

 $\pi a \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$] Parents. Father and mother. As of yovers in Luke ii. 27, 41, 43. Observe the masculine idorres (Exod. ii. 2) evidently said both of the father and mother.

διότι είδον] They seem to have drawn hope from the child's singular beauty that he might have a great future.

agreen The word agreens is properly *urbanus*, in contrast with ayooikos (rusticus), and hence polite, clever, witty. (It has some unexpected applications in the Septuagint, as in Jud. iii. 17, where the rendering from the Hebrew is fat.) From its first uses it passes into the sense of *beautiful*, whether morally (as Num. xxii. 32, or ούκ αστεία ή όδός σου εναντίον 2 Macc. vi. 23, λογισμόν μου. άστειον άναλαβών και άξιον της ήλικίας. xii. 43, πάνυ καλώς καί αστείως πράττων), or physically (as here, and Judith xi. 23, Kai νύν αστεία εί σύ εν τω είδει σου).

παιδίον, καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ διάταγμα τοῦ 24 βασιλέως. Πίστει Μωυσῆς μέγας γενόμενος 25 ἠρνήσατο λέγεσθαι υἱὸς θυγατρὸς Φαραώ, μᾶλ-

It is a word specially applied to the infant Moses. Exod. ii. 2, idórtes de autor acteior. Acts vii. 20, kai hr acteios the Oce (in the sight of God, divinely).

οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν] See Exod. i. 17, ἐφοβήθησαν τον Θεόν, and therefore οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ δ. τ. β.

το διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως] Exod. i. 15, 17, καὶ εἶπεν ὅ βασιλεὺς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων...καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησαν καθότι συνέταξεν αὐταῖς κ.τ.λ. For διάταγμα, see Ezra vii. 10. Wisd. xi. 7, εἰς ἔλεγχον νηπιοκτόνου διατάγματος κ.τ.λ. Compare διαταγή in Rom. xiii. 2. And διατάσσειν in Matt. xi. 1. Luke iii. 13. Acts vii. 44. xviii. 2. 1 Cor. xvi. 1. &c.

24. Π ($\sigma \tau \epsilon t$ Mwv $\sigma \eta s$] Faith prompting the life-choice between the world and God.

μέγας γενόμενος] Exod. ii. 11, μέγας γενόμενος Μωυσής έξηλθε προς τοις άδελφους αυτού τους υίους 'Ισραήλ. In that recognition of his nationality was involved the renunciation of his adoption.

 deny, (a) with an accusative of the thing (expressed or implied), as in Matt, xxvi. 70. Mark xiv. 68, 70. 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, τρίς με απαρνήση είδέναι κ.τ.λ.; or (c) with ori, as in I John ii. 22, ed μή ο αρνούμενος ότι Πησούς κ.τ.λ. (2) To disown, with an accusative of the person (or thing personified). Thus Matt. x. 33. Luke ix. 23. xii. 9. John xiii. 38. Acts iii. 13, 14. vii. 35, ύν ήρνήσαντο είπόντες κ.τ.λ. 1 Tim. v. 8, την πίστιν ήρνηται. 2 Tim. ii. 12, 13. Tit. i. 16. ii. 12, αρνησάμενοι την ασέβειαν κ.τ.λ. 2 Pet. ii. 1. 1 John ii. 22, 23. Jude 4. Rev. ii. 13, ούκ ήρνήσω την πίστιν μου. iii. 8. And so Isai. xxxi. 7, τŷ ήμέρα ἐκείνη ἀπαρνήσονται οἱ ανθρωποι τα χειροποίητα αυτών κ.τ.λ. (3) To refuse, with an infinitive, as here, and in Wisd. xii. 27, ίδόντες δν πάλαι ήρνουντο eidévai, xvi. 16. xvii. 9.

υίος θυγατρος Φ.] Exod. ii. 10, και εγενήθη αυτή είς υίον.

λον έλόμενος συνκακουχεῖσθαι τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ πρόσκαιρον ἔχειν ἁμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσιν, μείζονα 26 πλοῦτον ἡγησάμενος τῶν Αἰγύπτου θησαυρῶν τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἀπέβλεπεν γὰρ εἰς

Κύριος είλατό σε σήμερον, γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον κ.τ.λ.

συνκακουχείσθαι] The compound verb is found nowhere else in Scripture. But κακου- χ είν occurs in verse 37 and in xiii. 3. Also in 1 Kings ii. 26, ότι ἐκακουχήθης ἐν πῶσιν οἶς ἐκακουχήθη ὁ πατήρ μου. xi. 39.

 $τ_{\hat{\psi}}$ λα_ψ τοῦ Θεοῦ] The religious title of the chosen people, suggesting the deep reason for the ελόμενος. It was something more than patriotism. See notes on ii. 17 and iv. 9.

πρόσκαιρον] Matt. xiii. 21, ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρός ἐστιν. Mark iv. 17, ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν. 2 Cor. iv. 18, τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα πρόσκαιρα.

ἀπόλαυσιν] Ι Tim. vi. 17 (only). For the verb, see Prov. vii. 18, ἐλθὲ καὶ ἀπολαύσωμεν φιλίας ἕως ὅρθρου. Wisd. ii. 6, δεῦτε οὖν ἀπολαύσωμεν τῶν ὅντων ἀγαθῶν κ.τ.λ.

26. $\eta\gamma\eta\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\sigma\nu\sigmas$] Again the aorist of the single act, the resolute and decisive estimate made once and for ever. For tense and sense, see note on verse 11, ήγήσατο.

θησαυρών] Ezek. xxviii. 4, 13, καὶ χρυσίου ἐνέπλησας τοὺς θησαυρούς σου καὶ τὰς ἀποθήκας σου κ.τ.λ. &c. &c.

τόν ονειδισμόν τοῦ Χριστοῦ] Christ's reproach. This is one, and perhaps the most striking, of the passages (such as I Cor. x. 4. 1 Pet. i. 11) 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 $v\sigma \tau \epsilon_0 \eta \mu a \tau a$ of His afflictions after Him (Col. i. 24), and spoke of His $\pi a \theta \eta \mu a \tau a$ as redounding upon His people (2 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 δνειδισμός of Christ, see xiii. 13, Tor overδισμόν αύτοῦ φέροντες. Also Psalm lxix. 7, 9, 10, 19, 20, ένεκά σου υπήνεγκα ονειδισμόν...οί ονειδισμοί των όνειδιζόντων σε επέπεσον έπ' εμέ...εγενήθη είς ονειδισμούς έμοί...σύ γαρ] γινώσκεις τον όνειδισμόν μου...όνειδισμόν προσεδόκησεν ή ψυχή μου. Ιχχχίχ. 50,

27 την μισθαποδοσίαν. Πίστει κατέλιπεν Αίγυπτον, μη φοβηθείς τον θυμον τοῦ βασιλέως· τον
28 γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκαρτέρησεν. Πίστει πε-

51, μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τοῦ ὀνειδισμοῦ τῶν δούλων σου...οῦ ὠνείδισαν οἱ ἐχθροί σου, Κύριε, οῦ ὠνείδισαν τὸ ἀντάλλαγμα τοῦ χριστοῦ σου. Rom. xv. 3.

 $\dot{a}\pi\epsilon\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\nu$] The $\dot{a}\pi\dot{o}$ strengthens the simple $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\nu$. He looked away from all else to. Only here in the New Testament. (But see $\dot{a}\phi o\rho\hat{a}\nu$ in xii. 2, and $\dot{a}\pi\imath\delta\epsilon\hat{\nu}$ or $\dot{a}\phi\imath\delta\epsilon\hat{\nu}$ in Phil. ii. 23.) Psalm x. 8. Hos. iii. 1, $\kappa a\dot{a}$ advoi $\dot{a}\pi\sigma\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\sigma\nu\sigma\nu\nu$ (A, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\imath\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\sigma\nu\sigma\nu\nu$ B) $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\dot{\epsilon}$ $\theta\epsilon\dot{\sigma}\dot{s}$ $\dot{a}\lambda\lambda\sigma\tau\rho\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\nu$. In Song vi. 1 and Mal. iii. 9, it is used without $\epsilon\dot{s}$ or $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\dot{\epsilon}$, and seems to mean simply to look away.

μισθαποδοσίαν] See note on ii. 2.

27. Πίστει κατέλιπεν] Faith giving courage for a forty years' seclusion. The reference is not to the Exodus, but to the flight into Midian. For (1) the Exodus, when it came, was not against the will of Pharaoh (Exod. xii. 31, 33). (2) The singular number ($\kappa a \tau \epsilon \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon \nu$) would not be appropriate to the Exodus. (3) The order of events would be contradicted if the departure were placed before the passover. Against this view is the superficial contradiction involved in the $\mu\eta$ $\phi o\beta\eta\theta\epsilon$ is

compared with the $\epsilon \phi o \beta \eta \theta \eta$ 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, $\delta \nu \epsilon \chi \omega \eta \sigma \epsilon$ $\delta \epsilon M \omega \nu \sigma \eta s \delta \pi \delta \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \pi \omega \nu \Phi \sigma \rho \omega$, kai kar $\omega \kappa \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ (A, $\tilde{\psi} \kappa \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ B) $\epsilon \nu$ $\gamma \eta M \Delta \delta \omega \mu$. Acts vii. 29, $\epsilon \phi \nu \gamma \epsilon \nu$ $\delta \epsilon M \omega \nu \sigma \eta s \epsilon \nu \tau \psi \lambda \delta \gamma \psi \tau \sigma \upsilon \tau \psi$, kai $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \tau \sigma \pi \delta \rho \sigma \kappa \sigma s \epsilon \nu \gamma \eta M \Delta \delta \omega \mu$.

μὴ φοβηθείς] As not fearing. Because he feared not. See note on iv. 2, μή.

 $\theta v \mu \delta v$] Of the 18 times of the occurrence of $\theta v \mu \delta s$ in the New Testament ten are in the Apocalypse. Of the 36 occurrences of $\delta \rho \gamma \eta$ six only are in that Book, 20 are in St Paul's writings. For $\theta v \mu \delta s$ as the outburst of $\delta \rho \gamma \eta$, see Rev. xvi. 19, $\tau \delta$ $\pi \sigma \tau \eta \rho \iota \sigma v$ $\sigma \delta v \rho v \sigma \delta \theta v \mu \delta v$ $\tau \eta s$ $\delta \rho \gamma \eta s$ avtro $\delta v \tau \delta s$ avec

 $\tau \partial \nu \gamma \partial \rho \ a \delta \rho a \tau \sigma \nu$] A noble definition of faith, less philosophical but more practical than that in verse 1.

 $\epsilon \kappa a \rho \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon v$] The only occurrence of $\kappa a \rho \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \hat{v}$ (forti animo sum) in the New Testament. It is found in Job ii. 9,

ποίηκεν τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ alματος, ίνα μὴ ὁ ὀλοθρεύων τὰ πρωτότοκα θίγη

xi. 28. Or όλεθρεύων.

μέχρι τίνος καρτερήσεις; Isai. xlii. 14. Ecclus. ii. 2, εθθυνου την καρδίαν σου καὶ καρτέρησου. xii. 15. 2 Macc. vii. 17.

 Πίστει πεποίηκεν] Faith inspiring submission to an unexplained and seemingly unmeaning precept. (Exod. xii. 27, καὶ κύψας ὁ λαὸς προσεκύνησε.)

 $\pi \epsilon \pi o (\eta \kappa \epsilon \nu)$ (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 $\pi o\iota \epsilon i v$, but simply of keeping. Exod. xii. 48, $\epsilon a \nu \delta \epsilon \tau \eta \sigma$ έλθη...καὶ ποιῆ (Α, ποιῆσαι Β) τὸ πάσχα Κυρίω κ.τ.λ. Num. ix. 2, &c. Deut. xvi. 1. Josh. v. 10. 2 Kings xxiii. 21. Ezra vi. 19. Matt. xxvi. 18, προs σε ποιώ το πάσχα (the equivalent of φαγείν το πάσχα above).

το πάσχα] The word (written φασὲκ in 2 Chron. xxx. 1, &c. xxxv. 1, &c.) occurs first in Exod. xii. 11, οὖτω δὲ φάγεσθε αὐτό...ἔδεσθε αὐτο μετὰ σπουδῆs πάσχα ἐστὶ Κυρίφ. (1) Its first application seems to be to the paschal *lamb*, and θύειν is in this sense its characteristic verb. Exod. xii. 21, καὶ θύσατε τὸ πάσχα. And so in Mark xiv. 12. Luke xxii. 7. 1 Cor.

v. 7. (2) Thence it passes to the paschal supper, with its unleavened bread and bitter herbs; and $\phi_{\alpha\gamma\epsilon\hat{i}\nu}$ is as suitable to this sense as to the former. Exod. xii. 11. Matt. xxvi. 19, кай ήτοίμασαν το πάσχα. Mark xiv. Luke xxii. 8, 13. (3) 16. Thence to the seven days' paschal feast. Luke ii. 41. xxii. ήγγιζεν δε ή έορτη των αζύμων ή λεγομένη πάσχα. John ii. 13, 23. vi. 4. xi. 55. xii. 1. 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. 15) being apparently prospective (see verse 25).

την πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αιματος The affusion of the blood. Exod. xii. 7, 22, καὶ λήψονται ἀπὸ τοῦ αίματος καὶ θήσουσιν ἐπὶ τῶν δύο σταθμῶν καὶ ἐπὶ την Φλιὰν ἐν τοῖς οἶκοις ἐν οἶς ἂν Φάγωσιν αὐτὸ (A, αὐτὰ B) ἐν αὐτοῖς...λήψεσθε δὲ δέσμην ὑσσώπου καὶ βάψαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αίματος τοῦ παρὰ την θύραν καθίζετε ἐπὶ (without ἐπὶ B) τῆς Φλιῶς κ.τ.λ.

πρόσχυσιν] Formed like απόχυσις, έγχυσις, έκχυσις, πρόχυσις, άc., but only used here. The verb προσχέω, however, is not rare in the Septuagint. Exod. xxiv. 6.

 $i\nu a \mu \eta$ The connexion of

29 αὐτῶν. Πίστει διέβησαν τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ώς διὰ ξηρᾶς γῆς, ῆς πεῖραν λαβόντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι κατεπόθησαν.

the act with the effect was left without explanation. The faith was shown in *acquiescing in* the mystery.

ό ολοθρεύων] Exod. xii. 23, καὶ παρελεύσεται Κύριος πατάξαι τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, καὶ ὄψεται τὸ αἰμα...καὶ παρελεύσεται Κύριος τὴν θύραν, καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσει τὸν ολοθρεύοντα εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὰς οἰκίας ὑμῶν πατάξαι. God is present, but God is not the actor. Compare 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 17 (1 Chron. xxi. 15, 16, 27). 2 Kings xìx. 35. 1 Cor. x. 10, καὶ ἀπώλοντο ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀλοθρευτοῦ.

τὰ πρωτότοκα] Exod. xii. 12, 29, καὶ πατάξω πῶν πρωτότοκον ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτω ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἔως κτήνους κ.τ.λ.

 $\theta(\gamma \eta)$ See xii. 20 (from Exod. xix. 12). Col. ii. 21.

aὐτῶν] Them. His (Moses's) people. For this pregnant use of aὐτῶν, compare, for example, Luke xxiii. 51, τŷ βουλŷ καὶ τŷ πράξει aὐτῶν.

29. Πίστει διέβησαν] Faith venturing an apparently impossible enterprise. Exod. xiv. 16, 22, εἰσελθάτωσαν οἱ νἰοὶ Ἰσραηλ εἰς μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης κατὰ τὸ ξηρόν...καὶ εἰσῆλθον κ.τ.λ.

 $\delta\iota\epsilon\beta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$] 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 $\delta\iota a \beta a \acute{\iota} \kappa \epsilon \nu$ is far more often applied to the passage of the Jordan than to that of the Red Sea. But see Num. xxxiii. 8, καὶ $\delta\iota \epsilon \beta \eta \sigma a \nu$ $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \tau \eta \mathring{s} \theta a \lambda \acute{a} \sigma \sigma \eta \mathring{s} \epsilon \acute{i} \mathring{s} \tau \eta \nu \check{\epsilon} \rho \eta$ - $\mu \rho \nu$.

την ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν] First mentioned in Exod. x. 19, εἰς την θάλασσαν την ἐρυθράν (A, εἰς την ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν B). Afterwards about 20 times in the historical Books and the Psalms: not in the Prophets.

ώς διὰ ξηρᾶς γῆς] Exod. xiv. 29, οἱ δὲ νίοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπορεύθησαν διὰ ξηρᾶς ἐν μέσφ τῆς θαλάσσης. xv. 19.

 $\hat{\eta}_s$] This may refer either to $\theta i \lambda a \sigma \sigma a \nu$ or to $\gamma \hat{\eta}_s$. The latter is the nearer and perhaps the easier. Of which dry land (for such it was to the Israelites) the Egyptians making trial, &c.

πείραν λαβόντες] See verse 36, μαστίγων πείραν έλαβον. There, to have experience of: here, to make experiment of. In Deut. xxviii. 56, πείραν λαμβάνειν is followed by an infinitive: ή τρυφερά, ής οὐχὶ πείραν έλαβεν ὁ ποὺς αὐτῆς βαίνειν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διὰ τὴν τρυφερότητα κ.τ.λ.

κατεπόθησαν] Were swal-

Πίστει τὰ τείχη Ἱεριχώ ἔπεσαν κυκλωθέντα 30 ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας. Πίστει Ῥαὰβ ή πόρνη οὐ 31

lowed up. Exod. xv. 12, $\epsilon\xi\epsilon$ τεινας την δεξιάν σου, [καὶ] κατέπιεν αὐτοὺς [ή] γη. Num. xvi. 30, 32, 34, ηνοίχθη ή γη καὶ κατέπιεν αὐτούς κ.τ.λ. Psalm lxix. 15, μή με καταποντισάτω καταιγὶς ὕδατος, μηδὲ καταπιέτω με βυθός κ.τ.λ. cxxiy. 3, 4, ἄρα ζώντας ἀν κατέπιον ήμῶς...ἅρα τὸ ὕδωρ ἀν κατεπόντισεν ήμῶς κ.τ.λ. Prov. i. 12. Isai. xxv. 8. Jer. li. (xxviii. B) 34, κατέπιέ με ὡς δράκων. &c. 1 Cor. xv. 54. 2 Cor. ii. 7. v. 4. I Pet. v. 8. Rev. xii. 16.

Πίστει τα τείχη] From 30. Moses to Joshua. Faith conquering by refraining. This was the trial of faith. Not a blow was to be struck. They were to compass without attacking. 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, εἶπε Κύριος προς Ίησοῦν, Ἰδοὺ ἐγῶ παραδίδωμι ὑπογείοιόν σοι την Ιεριχώ κ.τ.λ.

τὰ τείχη Τ. ἐπεσαν] Josh. vi. 5, 20, πεσείται αὐτόματα τὰ τείχη τῆς πόλεως... καὶ ἔπεσε (ἔπεσεν ἄπαν Β) τὸ τείχος κύκλῳ κ.τ.λ.

κυκλωθέντα] Josh. vi. 4, 14, 15, κυκλώσατε την πόλιν (om. B)...περιεκύκλωσαν (-σε B) την πόλιν...[ἐν] τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ ἐβδόμη ἀνέστησαν ἐν τῆ ἀναβάσει τοῦ (ἐν τ. ἀ. τοῦ οm. Β) ὅρθρου, καὶ περιῆλθον (περιήλθοσαν Β) τὴν πόλιν...ἐν τῆ ἡμέρα ἐκείνῃ ἐκύκλωσαν τὴν πόλιν (ἐκ. τ. π. om. Β) ἑπτάκις.

έπι έπτα ήμέρας] Josh. vi. 14, 15, ούτως εποίει επί εξ ήμεpas : καί έγένετο έν (έγ. έν om. B) τη ήμέρα τη έβδόμη κ.τ.λ. For $i\pi i$, for, to the extent of (in reference to duration of time), see Matt. ix. 15, ¿of orov per αυτών έστιν ο νύμφιος. Acts xiii. 31, έπὶ ήμέρας πλείους. xvi. 18, ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας. xvii. 2, έπι σάββατα τρία. xviii. 20, έπι πλείονα χρόνον. xix. 8, 10, 34, έπι μήνας τρείς... ἐπὶ ἔτη δύο...ώς (or ώσει) έπι ώρας δύο. xx. 11. xxvii. 20. xxviii. 6. Rom. vii. 1. 1 Cor. vii. 39. Gal. iv. 1. 2 Pet. i. 13.

31. Πίστει 'Paáß] Faith postponing patriotism to religion. This was the very trial of the Hebrew Christian in the prospect of the last struggle with Rome. Luke xxi. 20, 21, orav δε ίδητε κυκλουμένην ύπο στρατοπέδων Ίερουσαλήμ...τότε οἱ έν τῆ Ἰουδαία φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ όρη, καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσω αὐτῆς ἐκχω- $\rho\epsilon i \tau \omega \sigma a \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$. The faith of Rahab was of the most elementary character. Josh. ii. o. 11, επίσταμαι ότι έδωκε Κύριος ύμιν την γην... δτι Κύριος δ Θεός ύμῶν αὐτὸς (om. B) Θεὸς ἐν

V. Н.

R

συναπώλετο τοις απειθήσασιν, δεξαμένη τους κατασκόπους μετ' εἰρήνης.

32 Καί τί έτι λέγω; ἐπιλείψει με γὰρ διηγού-

οὐρανῷ ἀνω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω. But it touched the very point of present anxiety for the readers of the Epistle.

[•]Paàß ή πόρνη] James ii. 25. Josh. ii. 1, εἰσῆλθον (εἰσήλθοσαν B) εἰς τὴν (om. B) οἰκίαν γυναικὸς πόρνης ή ὄνομα Ῥαάβ.

οὐ συναπώλετο] Josh. vi. 17, 22, 23, 25, πλην 'Ραὰβ την πόρνην...περιποιήσασθε...καὶ ἐξήγαγον (ἐξηγάγοσαν Β) 'Ραὰβ την πόρνην...καὶ πᾶσαν την συγγένειαν αὐτῆς, καὶ κατέστησαν αὐτην ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς Ἰσραήλ...καὶ 'Ραὰβ την πόρνην...ἔζώγρησεν Ἰησοῦς, καὶ κατώκησεν (κατώκισεν Β) ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας κ.τ.λ.

τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν] Those who 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 ἀπαθεῖν, see iii. 18, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν, and note on iii. 12, ἀπιστίας.

δεξαμένη] So James ii. 25, υποδεξαμένη τους άγγέλους και ετέρα όδω έκβαλούσα. Josh. vi. 17, ότι έκρυψε τους άγγέλους ούς άπεστείλαμεν.

τοὺς κατασκόπους] Josh. ii. 1, &c. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἰησοῦς... δύο νεανίσκους κατασκοπεῦσαι κρυφή (om. B) λέγων, Ἀνάβητε καὶ μετ' εἰρήνης] The commoner phrase is ἐν εἰρήνη. But see Gen. xxvi. 29, καὶ ἐξαπεστείλαμέν σε μετ' εἰρήνης. Exod. xviii. 23. Deut. xx. 10. Jud. viii. 9. xi. 13. 1 Macc. vii. 28.

32. Kai $\tau i \ \epsilon \tau i$] Detail is ended. A grand peroration celebrates in general summary (1) the exploits of faith (verses 32 to 34), and (2) its endurances (verses 35 to 38). For $\epsilon \tau i$ (further), see vii. 11, $\tau i \varsigma \ \epsilon \tau i$ $\chi \rho \epsilon i \alpha \kappa \tau . \lambda$. Matt. xxvi. 65, $\tau i \ \epsilon \tau i \ \chi \rho \epsilon i \alpha v \ \epsilon \chi \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu \mu \alpha \rho \tau \nu \rho \omega v;$ Luke xiv. 26. Acts ii. 26. xxi. 28, $\epsilon \tau i \ \tau \epsilon \ \kappa a i \ \epsilon \lambda \lambda \eta \nu a \varsigma \ \epsilon i \sigma \eta \gamma a \gamma \epsilon \nu \ s \tau o \ i \epsilon \rho o \nu \kappa \tau . \lambda.$

λέγω] Must I (am I to, shall I) say? For this (classical) use of the deliberative subjunctive, compare Rom. vi. I, 15, τί οῦν ἐροῦμεν; ἐπιμένωμεν τỹ ἁμαρτία...τί οῦν; ἁμαρτήσωμεν κ.τ.λ. X. 14, 15, πῶς οῦν ἐπικαλέσωνται κ.τ.λ. I Cor. iv. μενον ό χρόνος περὶ Γεδεών, Βαράκ, Σαμψών, Ἰεφθάε, Δανείδ τε καὶ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν προ-

21, τί θέλετε; ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω προς ὑμᾶς...;

έπιλείψει με γάρ] A classical phrase, only found here in biblical use. The word ἐπιλείπειν does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, nor (for certain) in the Septuagint.

διηγούμενον περί] Elsewhere the construction of $\delta \eta \gamma \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a \hat{i} \hat{s}$ with an accusative, or with $\pi \hat{\omega}_s$. See Gen. xxix. 13, καὶ διηγήσατο τῷ Λάβαν πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους. xl. 9, το ενύπνιον. 1 Sam. xi. 5, τα ρήματα. Psalm xix. 1, δόξαν Θεού. Isai. liii. 8 (Acts viii. 33), την γενεάν αυτού τίς διηγήσεται; Mark ix. 9, ίνα μηδενί α είδον διηγήσωνται. Luke viii. 39, διηγού όσα σοι εποίησεν ο Θεός. ix. 10. Acts ix. 27, διηγήσατο αύτοϊς πως έν τη όδω κ.τ.λ. xii. 17.

 $\pi\epsilon\rho \Gamma\epsilon\delta\epsilon\omega\nu$] (1) The names are not in their strict chronological order. Barak lived before Gideon, Jephthah before Samson. (2) Nothing issaid 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. iv. 9, ούκ έσται τὸ προτέρημά σου είς (επί Β) την όδον ην συ πορεύη. In Gideon, the disinterestedness of faith, shown in his refusal of the kingdom. Jud. viii. 23. ούκ ἄρξω έγω...Κύριος αρξα ύμών. In Jephthah, the conscientiousness of faith, shown in the performance of his rash Jud. xi. 39, και επετέλεvow. σεν Ίεφθάε (ἐποίησεν Β) έν αὐτή την ευχήν αυτού ην ηυξατο. InSamson, the valour of faith, shown in forms grotesque and eccentric, yet in a firm realization of the invisible. Jud. xvi. 28, Κύριε, μνήσθητί μου (μν. δή μου Β) και ενίσχυσόν με к.τ.λ

 $\Delta avei(\delta \tau \epsilon)$ 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.

καὶ Σαμουήλ] Placed after David, to bring him into closer connexion with the next named καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, whose representative head he was. Acts iii. 24, καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν κ.τ.λ. The term προφήτης is applied earlier, even to Abraham (Gen. xx. 7, ὅτι προφήτης ἐστί, καὶ προσεύξεται περὶ σοῦ κ.τ.λ.), as well as to Moses (Deut. xxxiv. 10, καὶ

33 φητῶν· οἱ διὰ πίστεως κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας, ἠργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην, ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγ34 γελιῶν, ἕφραξαν στόματα λεόντων, ἕσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρός, ἕφυγον στόματα μαχαίρης, έδυ-

ούκ ανέστη έτι προφήτης έν Ίσ- $\rho a \eta \lambda$ is Maron's), and to the anonymous messenger of Jud. vi. 8 (ανδρα προφήτην). But with Samuel began the order of prophets distinctively so named. See I Sam. iii. 20, kai eyvwoav πας Ισραήλ από Δαν και έως Βηρσαβεε ότι πιστός Σαμουήλ eis προφήτην τῷ Κυρίω. Acts xiii. 20, και μετά ταῦτα ἔδωκεν κριτάς έως Σαμουήλ προφήτου. For the word $\pi \rho o \phi \hat{\eta} \tau a_{i}$, see note on i. 1, tois προφήταιs, especially the words, 'representatives of God to their generation.' For the catalogue of exploits which here follows requires this amplitude of the word $\pi \rho o \phi \hat{\eta} \tau a \iota$ to justify it.

33. κατηγωνίσαντο] The word is found nowhere else in the Septuagint or New Testament. Polybius is quoted for it. To wrestle down, to subdue by conflict or contest, is its obvious meaning.

 $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon i a s$] Whether in the original or later conquests of Israel.

 $\eta \rho \gamma a \sigma a v \tau \sigma \delta \kappa a \iota \sigma \sigma \sigma v \gamma \nu$] The 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. Acts x. 35, $d\lambda\lambda$ έν παντὶ ἕθνει ὁ φοβούμενος αὐτὸν καὶ ἐργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἐστίν.

 $i \pi \epsilon \tau v \chi o v i \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i \hat{\omega} v$] Obtained 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.).

έφραξαν στ. λ.] Dan. vi. 22, ό Θεός μου ἀπέστειλε τὸν ἀγγελον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνέφραξε τὰ στόματα τῶν λεόντων. For φράττειν, and the compound (commoner in the Septuagint) ἐμφράττειν, with στόμα, see also Job v. 16. Psalm lxiii. 11. cvii. 42, καὶ πῶσα ἀνομία ἐμφράξει στόμα αὐτῆς. Rom. iii. 19, Ινα πῶν στόμα φραγῆ. 2

34. ἕσβεσαν δ. π.] Dan. iii. The expression δύναμιν πυρὸς (instead of πῦρ) is well illustrated by the particulars of Dan. iii. 26 (94 B), οὐκ ἐκυρίευσε (ήψατο B) τὸ πῦρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ θρὶξ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν οὖκ ἐφλογίσθη (καὶ αἱ τρίχες αὐτῶν οὖ κατε-

 $\mathbf{244}$

XI. 33, 34.

ναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμω, παρεμβολὰς ἕκλιναν ἀλλοτρίων·

κάησαν Β)...καὶ ὀσμὴ πυρὸς οὐκ (οὐδὲ ὀσμὴ τοῦ πυρὸς Β) ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς.

έφυγον στ. μ aχ.] (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 $\sigma \tau \delta \mu a$ 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 λεόν- $\tau \omega \nu$ necessitates it. Here, with the singular μαχαίρης, it is most unexpected. (3) The phrase στόμα μαχαίρας occurs in Gen. xxxiv. 26. Deut. xiii. 15. Josh. xix. 47. Job i. 15. Jer. xxi. Equivalent phrases are στόμα δομφαίας and στόμα ξίφους. See notes on µáyaıpav and δíστομον, iv. 12.

 \mathbf{The} έδυναμώθησαν compound evouvanour, formed from a late adjective ἐνδύναμος (like έγκρατής), in possession of power, is commoner in the New Testament (Acts ix. 22. Rom. iv. Eph. vi. 10. Phil. iv. 20. I 3. 1 Tim. i. 12. 2 Tim. ii. iv. 17) than the simple δυναμοῦν. The latter (the reading here of the revised text) occurs besides only in Col. i. 11, èv πάση δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατα το κράτος της δόξης αυτού. In

the Septuagint, it is found in Psalm lxviii. 28, δυνάμωσον, ό Θεός, τοῦτο ὅ κατηρτίσω ἐν ἡμῖν. Eccles. x. 10. Dan. ix. 27.

έδυν. aπδ aσθενεias] There may be some special references here, as, for example, to the history of Samson (Jud. xvii. 28), or of Hezekiah (2 Kings xx. 5, ηκουσα τη̂ς προσευχη̂ς σου...ίδου ἰάσομαί σε). But the words, like the clause ηργάσαιτο δικαιοσύνην above, may be quite general, exemplified in every instance of physical or spiritual enabling.

έγενήθησαν] Came to be. Showed themselves. For the form, see note on iv. 3, γενηθέντων.

ίσχυροί] From ἰσχύς (ἔχω, $i\sigma\chi\omega$), might, the adjective $i\sigma$ - $\chi u \rho \partial s$, (1) beginning with the idea of personal strength, 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, 11. Mark i. 7. Luke iii. 16. 1 Cor. iv. 10. x. 22. I John ii. 14), or (b) to things (as in v. 7, μετά κραυγής ίσvi. 18, ισχυράν παράχυράς. κλησιν. Luke xv. 14, λιμός ίσχυρά. 2 Cor. x. 10, επιστολαί βαρείαι και ισχυραί. Rev. xix. 6, βροντών ίσχυρών).

35 έλαβον γυναίκες έξ αναστάσεως τους νεκρούς

 $i\sigma_{\chi}$. $i\nu \pi o\lambda i\mu \omega$] The exact phrase seems to be found only here. But we have $\delta v \nu a \tau \delta s$ iv $\pi o\lambda i\mu \omega$, Psalm xxiv. 8. Jer. xli. (xlviii. B) 16. Ecclus. xlvii. 5.

παρεμβ. έκλ.] The absence of the article enhances the exploit. Whole armies of aliens. Compare Rom. iv. 13, κόσμον, a whole world. xi. 12, 15. 2 Cor. v. 19, κόσμον καταλλάσσων έαυτώ.

παρεμβολάς] From παρεμ- $\beta \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \epsilon v$ (literally to throw in alongside), to insert or interpose, to include in a class or rank, and hence to draw up in array, and (70 times in the Book of Numbers alone) to encamp, comes the substantive $\pi a \rho \epsilon \mu$ - $\beta o \lambda \eta$, used (1) classically for an insertion by the way, whether in the form of *parenthesis* or digression; and (2) as a drawing up in battle array, and so (a) an army thus drawn up (as here), and (b) an encampment or camp (as xiii. 11, 13, έξω τής παρεμβολής. Rev. xx. 9, εκύκλωσαν την παρεμβολην τών $\dot{a}_{\gamma i \omega \nu}$, and throughout the Pentateuch, &c.), and (c) a fort or castle (Acts xxi. 34, 37. xxii. 24. xxiii. 10, 16, 32).

 $\tilde{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \iota v a v$] Of this proper and classical use of $\kappa \lambda \iota v \epsilon v$, 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, ἀποστελῶ αὐτῷ κλίνοντας, καὶ κλινοῦσιν αὐτόν (where the sense of the Hebrew, as given in the Authorized and Revised Versions, seems to be different). In Jud. xx. 42, ἔκλιναν is intransitive.

aλλoτρίων] Aliens, foreigners. Isai. i. 7, την χώραν ύμων ένώπιον ύμων άλλότριοι κατεσθίουσιν αὐτήν, καὶ ἠρήμωται κατεστραμμένη ύπο λαών αλλοτρίων. Jer. v. 19. Lam. v. 2, κληρονομία ήμων μετεστράφη αλλοτρίοις, οί οίκοι ήμων ξένοις. Ezek. vii. 21. xi. 9. xxx. 12. Hos. vii. 9. viii. 7. &c. Matt. xvii. 25, 26. In αλλοτρίων we have a comprehensive word for the enemies of Israel all along the sacred history, but it certainly includes the Maccabean struggle, and so prepares for the distinct references to that later period in the verses which follow.

(1) 35. έλαβον γυναϊκες The impossible reading yova?kas, 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 $\lambda a \beta o \nu$, see especially I Kings xvii. 23, kai έδωκεν τῆ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ. 2 Kings iv. 36, λάβε τον υίόν σου. (3)As examples of *faith*, we may

XI. 35.

αὐτῶν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν, οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστά-

hesitate whether to dwell upon the yuraîkes or upon the two prophets. Probably the latter. And thus the connexion with the main thought of the passage is preserved. By faith Elijah and Elisha gave back to the women of Zarephath and Shunem their dead sons by resurrection.

ξξ ἀναστάσεως] Out of (as the issue and product of) a resurrection. Rom. i. 4, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος νίοῦ Θεοῦ...ξζ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν. In 1 Pet. i. 3, we have δι ἀναστάσεως, another preposition, and another aspect of the transaction. For ἀνάστασις in application to a miraculous restoration from a recent death, compare Acts ix. 41, δοὺς δὲ αὐτῆ χεῦρα ἀνέστησεν αὐτήν, ψωνήσας δὲ τοὺς ἀγ. κ. τ. χ. παρέστησεν αὐτὴν ζῶσαν.

 $\tilde{a}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\delta\tilde{\epsilon}$] We pass from the *exploits* to the *endurances* of faith. And the first examples are chosen from the history of the Maccabees, to form a contrast with the *resurrections* last mentioned.

 $\epsilon_{\tau \nu \mu \pi a \nu (\sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu)}$ The word τύμπανον (or τύπανον, from τύπτω) has the two senses of (1) the thing struck, the drum, (2) the thing which strikes, the drum-stick. Hence τνμπανίζειν may be either to strike with cudgel or club, to beat to death (like the classical $a\pi \sigma \tau \nu \mu \pi a \nu i$ - $\zeta_{\alpha\nu}$), or to stretch upon a drum or wheel for torture, to torture to death. Either sense has been preferred here. The special reference is to the martyrdom of Eleazar in 2 Macc. vi. 18, &c., and to that of the seven brothers in the following chapter. There the expression in vi. 19 and 28 (αθαιρέτως επί το τύμ- $\pi a v o \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \eta \gamma \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$.) favours the latter of the two ideas, while that of vi. 30 ($\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ $\delta \epsilon$ ταῖς πληγαῖς τελευταν) and of vii. Ι (μάστιξι και νευραίς αίκιζομένους) might rather suggest the former. On the whole, the rendering of the Authorized and Revised Versions, were tortured, will be retained, especially as the following verse introduces μαστίγων as a new particular.

προσδεξάμενοι] See note on x. 34, προσεδέξασθε. In 2 Macc. vi. 19, the word is αναδεξάμενος.

την ἀπολύτρωσιν] The deliverance which was offered and pressed upon them. See 2 Macc. vi. 21, 22, 30, παρεκάλουν...ίνα τοῦτο πράξας ἀπολυθη τοῦ θανάτου κ.τ.λ. vii. 7, &c. For ἀπολύτρωσις, see note on ix. 15.

ίνα κρείττονος] 2 Macc. vii. 9, 11, 14, 23, 29, 36, σὺ μέν, αλάστωρ, ἐκ τοῦ παρόντος ήμῶς

36 σεως τύχωσιν· έτεροι δὲ ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ μαστίγων πεῖραν ἕλαβον, ἔτι δὲ δεσμῶν καὶ 37 Φυλακῆς· ἐλιθάσθησαν, ἐπρίσθησαν, ἐπειράσ-

xi. 37. Or έπειράσθησαν, έπρίσθησαν.

ζῆν ἀπολύεις, ὁ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου βασιλεὺς ἀποθανόντας ἡμᾶς...εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει κ.τ.λ.

κρείστονος] Better than that ἀνάστασις which brought back the two mothers' sons at Zarephath and Shunem. The contrast is with the ἀναστάσεως of the first clause of the verse.

τύχωσιν] Luke xx. 35, τοῦ aἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάστως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν.

36. $\epsilon_{\tau\epsilon\rhooi} \delta\epsilon$] This intermixture of $\delta\lambda \lambda \sigma_{s}$ and $\epsilon_{\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma_{s}}$ 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, $\delta\lambda \lambda \eta_{s}$.

ἐμπαιγμῶν] 2 Macc. vii. 7, 10, τον δεύτερον Ϋγον ἐπὶ τον ἐμπαιγμόν...μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ὁ τρίτος ἐνεπαίζετο. The form ἐμπαιγμός occurs in Ezek. xxii. 4, δέδωκά σε εἰς ὅνειδος τοῦς ἔθνεσι, καὶ εἰς ἐμπαιγμόν πάσαις ταῦς χώραις κ.τ.λ.

μαστίγων] Isai. l. 6, τὸν νῶτόν μου δέδωκα εἰς μάστιγας, τὰς δὲ σιαγόνας μου εἰς ῥαπίσματα. 2 Macc. vii. 1, 37, μετὰ ἐτασμῶν καὶ μαστίγων κ.τ.λ. Acts xxii. 24, εἶπας μάστιξιν ἀνετάζεσθαι αὐτόν. $\pi\epsilon \hat{i} pav \epsilon \lambda a \beta ov]$ Had experience of. See note on verse 29, $\pi\epsilon \hat{i} pav \lambda a \beta \acute{o} v \tau \epsilon s$.

ëτι δέ] And moreover. A more prolonged and protracted form of suffering. For ετι δè (or τε), see Luke xiv. 26, ετι τε καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ. Acts ii. 26 (from Psalm xvi. 9), ετι δè καὶ ἡ σάρξ μου κ.τ.λ. xxi. 28, ετι τε καὶ Ελληνας κ.τ.λ.

δεσμών κ. φ.] As Hanani the seer under king Asa (2 Chron. xvi. 10), Micaiah under Ahab (1 Kings xxi. 26, 27), Jeremiah under Zedekiah (Jer. xxxii. 3), &c.

37. $i\lambda i \theta a \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$] (1) Of the two forms $\lambda i \theta \dot{a} \zeta \epsilon i \nu$ and $\lambda i \theta o$ - $\beta o \lambda \epsilon i \nu$, 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 use λιθοβολεΐν, St John and St Paul (2 Cor. xi. 25) λιθάζειν, 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

 $\mathbf{248}$

θησαν, ἐν φόνω μαχαίρης ἀπέθανον, περιήλθον ἐν

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.

 $\epsilon \pi \rho (\sigma \theta, \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \sigma \theta)$ The order of the two words is doubtful.

έπρίσθησαν] An apparent reference to the traditional death of Isaiah under king Manasseh. For the word πρίειν (or πρίζειν) and διαπρίειν in a like application, see I Chron. XX. 3, καὶ τὸν λαὸν τὸν ἐν αὐτῆ ἐξήνεγκε, καὶ διέπρισε πρίοσι κ.τ.λ. Amos i. 3, ἀνθ ῶν ἔπρίζον πρίοσι σιδηροῖς τὰς ἐν γ. ἐχ. κ.τ.λ. Sus. 59, τὴν ῥομφαίαν ἔχων πρίσαι σε μέσον κ.τ.λ.

έπειράσθησαν] Conjectural readings (such as $\epsilon \pi \rho \eta \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$) 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.'

έν φόνω μαχαίρης (1) Like the prophets in Jezebel's persecution. 1 Kings xviii. 13, ev τώ αποκτείνειν Ίεζαβελ τους προφήτας Κυρίου. xix. 10, 14, καί τούς προφήτας σου απέκτειναν έν ρομφαία κ.τ.λ. Or like Urijah under Jehoiakim. Jer. xxvi. 23, καὶ εἰσήγαγον αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ιωακείμ, και επάταξεν αὐτον ἐν μαχαίρα κ.τ.λ. (2) For the phrase $\phi \delta v \omega$ (or $\delta v \phi$.) μa xaípas, see Exod. xvii. 13. Num. xxi. 24. Deut. xiii. 15. xx. (3) For another in (of 13. the particular death died), see, for example, Isai. l. 2, καὶ ἀποθανοῦνται ἐν δίψει. Jer. xi. 22, έν μαχαίρα άποθανοῦνται. xxi. 9, άποθανείται έν μαχαίρα και έν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν θανάτω. xxxviii. (xlv. B) 2.

 $\pi \epsilon \rho i \eta \lambda \theta \sigma v$] (1) Of $\pi \epsilon \rho i \epsilon \rho$, $\chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ 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 μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν, ὑστερούμενοι, 38 θλιβόμενοι, κακουχούμενοι· ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος· ἐπὶ ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι καὶ ὄρεσιν καὶ σπηλαίοις καὶ ταῖς ὀπαῖς τῆς γῆς.

other clauses, all of which speak of single events.

i v uηλωτaîs] The term μηλωτη is appropriated in the Septuagint to the 'mantle' of Elijah. See I Kings xix. I3, I9. 2 Kings ii. 8, I3, I4, καὶ έλαβε την μηλωτην Ήλιού, ή έπεσεν ἐπάνωθεν αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.

 iν αἰγείοις] The darker and rougher material, the garb perhaps of mourning and seclu-sion.

ύστερούμενοι] Destitute. See note on iv. 1, ὑστερηκέναι, and the question there raised as to the voice here. For the sense, see Luke XV. 14, ἤρξατο ὑστερεῖσθαι. 2 Cor. Xi. 8, παρών πρὸς ὑμῶς καὶ ὑστερηθείς. Phil. iv. 12, καὶ περισσεύειν καὶ ὑστερεῖσθαι.

κακουχούμενοι] Maltreated.

See note on verse 25, συνκακουχείσθαι.

38. $\delta \nu$ oùk $\eta \nu$] A magnificent parenthesis. The world says, $a l \rho \epsilon a \pi \delta \tau \eta s \gamma \eta s \tau \delta \nu \tau \sigma t \sigma \delta \tilde{\nu} \tau \sigma \nu$, où $\gamma a \rho \kappa a \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu a \upsilon \tau \delta \nu \zeta \eta \nu$ (Acts xxii. 22). Heaven reverses this estimate, and says, $\delta \nu$ oùk $d \zeta \iota o s \delta \kappa \delta \sigma \mu o s$.

έπι έρημίαις πλαν.] Wandering over deserts. Like David, like Elijah, like the hundred prophets saved by Obadiah from Jezebel, like the Baptist, &c. (1) The reading $\epsilon \pi i$ (with a verb of motion roving over, from one to another) is not easy to confirm by exactly parallel passages. Perhaps Rev. xxii. 16, μαρτυρήσαι ύμιν ταθτα έπι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (itself a revised reading), may be an approach to (2) The first meaning of it. *έρημία* 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 *epymos* (as a substantive) is peculiar in the New Testament to St Luke (i. 80. v. 16. viii. 29), but is found in the Septuagint in Isai. v. 17. lviii. 12. Ezek. xiii. 4. &c. (3) The Καὶ οὖτοι πάντες μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς 39 πίστεως οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, τοῦ 40

literal sense of $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\hat{a}\sigma\thetaa\iota$ is far rarer in Scripture than the figurative. But see Matt. xviii. 12, 13. Also Exod. xiv. 3. Deut. xxii. 1. Isai. xiii. 14. &c. See note on iii. 10, $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\hat{\omega}\tau\alpha\iota$.

καὶ ὅρεσιν] Ezek. xxxiv. 6, καὶ διεσπάρησαν τὰ πρόβατά μου ἐν παντὶ ὅρει κ.τ.λ.

καὶ σπηλαίοις] Jud. vi. 2, ἐν τοῖς ὅρεσι καὶ τοῖς σπηλαίοις. Ι Sam. xiii. 6, καὶ ἐκρύβη ὁ λαὸς ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις κ.τ.λ. Ι Kings xviii. 4, 13, ἐν τῷ τύπτειν Ἰεζάβελ τοὺς προφήτας Κυρίου...ἔκρυψεν αὐτοὺς κατὰ πεντήκοντα ἐν σπηλαίω κ.τ.λ. xix. 9. &c.

кай таїз отаїз The clefts, chinks, fissures, of the land or earth. Obad. 3, κατασκηνοῦντα έν ταις όπαις των πετρών. Also Exod. xxxiii. 22, θήσω σε είς $\partial \pi \eta v \tau \eta s \pi \epsilon \tau \rho a s$. Elsewhere $\partial \pi \eta$ (from $\delta \psi$, $\delta \pi \omega \pi a$) is used for (1) 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 obroi márres] And all these. Saints of former dispensations. A retrospect of the whole chapter, and of the sacred history of all former times.

μαρτυρηθέντες Having had

the testimony of God borne to them in Scripture. See note on verse 2.

διὰ τῆς πίστεως] It might have been διὰ τὴν πίστεν. 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.

ούκ έκομίσαντο] In vi. 12 it is said of them that they already inherit the promises. And in vi. 15 (of one of them) that he επέτυχεν της επαγγελίας. Here that they our exomioarto the έπαγγελίαν. The individual rest is won, but the full glory waits for the advent and the resurrection. It is in this last sense that $\tau \eta \nu \epsilon \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda (a \nu is here used.$ The promise of promises. The fulfilment of all promise in what is elsewhere called the glory that shall be revealed. See Rom. viii. 18. 1 Pet. v. 1. Compare Rom. viii. 11. For čκομίσαντο, see note on x. 36, κομίσησθε.

40. $\tau o \hat{v} \Theta c o \hat{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{i} \eta \omega \hat{v}$ 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

Θεοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν κρεῖττόν τι προβλεψαμένου, ίνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσιν.

XII. 1

Τοιγαρούν και ήμεις, τοσούτον έχοντες περι-

thought lies in the $\kappa\rho\epsilon\hat{\iota}\tau\tau\sigma\tau$. He gives us a present possession, in the Gospel of Christ, superior to that which was theirs in life. They hoped we both hope and have.

περὶ ἡμῶν] Concerning us. It might have been ὑπέρ. But the περὶ implies what ὑπὲρ says. See, for example, xiii. 18, προσεὐχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν. Or the thrice repeated περὶ of v. 3.

κρείττόν τι] See the first 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.

προβλεψαμένου] (1) The middle voice of προβλέπειν is found only here. Even the active occurs only in Psalm xxxvii. 13, προβλέπει ὅτι ἢξει ἡ ἡμέρα aὐτοῦ. In βλέπειν and its compounds (except perhaps περιβλέπειν) the middle voice is classical only in the future. (2) Is προβλέπειν 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 $\sigma v r \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u$ had come when they were ready for it. For another aspect of the postponement, see 2 Pet. iii. 9, où $\beta \rho a \delta v \epsilon u$ Kúpuos $\tau \eta s \epsilon \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i a$... $a \lambda \lambda a \mu a \kappa \rho o \theta v \mu \epsilon \epsilon i s v \mu a s.$

 $\chi \omega \rho is \dot{\eta} \omega v]$ Apart from, in severance from, and so to the exclusion of, us. In this Epistle $\chi \omega \rho is$ occurs 13 times, beginning with iv. 15, $\chi \omega \rho is \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho$ - $\tau i \alpha s$. St Paul uses it 16 times, the other Scripture writers 12 times in all. Its proper idea is seen in its contrast with où $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ in John xx. 7.

τελειωθώσιν] See note on ii. 10, τελειώσαι. In xii. 23, 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.

XII. I. Toyapoŵr kai musis] 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.

XII. I.

κείμενον ήμιν νέφος μαρτύρων, όγκον αποθέμενοι

and we must look, as they looked, to its author and its finisher.

roivapour A curious (but quite classical) confluence of apparently conflicting particles: for surely then; as if the precept which follows were both cause and consequence; at once a reason for, and an inference from, dwelling upon those great examples which the Church before Christ has left to the Church after Christ of the faith in which the two are one. The only other occurrence of Tolyapoù in Scripture is in 1 Thess. iv. 8.

καὶ ἡμεῖς] Literally, we also. 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, διὰ τοῦτο κὰγώ. Col. i. 9, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς. I Thess. ii. 13.

τοσοῦτον] So numerous. We might have expected the rarer τηλικοῦτον (see note on ii. 3, τηλικαύτης), but τοσοῦτον is in fact quite equally suitable.

 $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi ov\tau\epsilon s}$ The dead are thus the *possession* of the living.

περικείμενον ήμιν] Lying closely around us. The dative as with περιβάλλειν (Luke xix. 43, περιβάλοῦσιν [where, however, some read παρεμβάλοῦσιν] οἱ ἐχθροί σου χάρακά σοι), περιτιθέναι (Matt. xxi. 33. xxvii 28, 48, χλαμύδα κ. περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ. &c.), &c. See note on v. 2, περίκειται.

 $\nu\epsilon\phi\sigma$ s] (1) Only here in the New Testament. Used more than 20 times in the Septuagint, of which 14 are in the Book of Job. (2) The figure is the classical one ($\nu\epsilon\phi\sigma\sigma$ $a\nu$ $θ\rho\omega\pi\omega\nu$, $\pi\epsilon\zeta\omega\nu$, &c.). It seems to have here the two ideas, of density and of elevation.

μαρτύρων Witnesses. Not in the loose sense of *witnesses* (spectators) of our ayour, but in the strict meaning of those who have borne testimony to the faith (often even to martyrdom) in their own generation. It is a great word in the Acts. For example, xxii. 15, 20, con μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρός πάντας ανθρώπους...τό αίμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρός σου. xxvi. 16, ύπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε είδες κ.τ.λ. Add Rev. ii. 13, Αντίπας δ μάρτυς μου δ πιστός. xi. 3. xvii. 6, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἶματος τών μαρτύρων 'Ιησού.

όγκον ἀποθέμενοι π.] Laying aside all cumbrance. (1) This clause belongs to the apodosis of the sentence, τρέχωμεν κ.τ.λ. Let us lay aside...and run, &c. (2) The word ὄγκος occurs only here in the New Testament or Septuagint. In derivation (ἐνεγκέν) and in some of its uses it is curiously like φόρτος (φέρειν). As φόρτος (φορτικός) degenerates into vulgarity, so ὅγκος

πάντα και την εύπερίστατον άμαρτίαν δι ύπο-

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 $d\pi_0\theta$ further is to training and discipline as for an athletic contest. See 1 Cor. ix. 25. 1 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 $a\pi \sigma \tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a i$, properly applied to laying aside garments (Acts vii. 58), and thence to getting rid of evil *habit* in all shapes and forms (Rom. xiii. 12. 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. 34, προσέχετε δε εαυτοίς μή ποτε βαρηθώσιν αι καρδίαι ύμων κ.τ.λ.

kai $\tau \eta v$ ευπερίστατον άμ.] (1) The reference is not to one particular sin as specially dangerous, but to sin itself. The article is generic. All sin. (2) The word ευπερίστατος (found only here) has something of a passive form. Thus στατος is properly set or placed, and yet passes into standing. Thus too περίστατος is sometimes a strict passive, surrounded, but is also used as a middle, standing round. So it is with the double compound 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 Sia is through. First with a genitive. And (1) in reference to space: Rom. xv. 28, απελεύσομαι δι' υμών είς Σπανίαν. Ι Cor. x. I, διὰ της θαλάσσης διήλθον. &c. (2) In reference to instrumentality : Rom. iii. 20, δια γαρ νόμου έπίyrwois apaprias. I Cor. xi. 12, ούτως και ο ανήρ δια τής γυναικός. &c. (3) In reference to time: (a) during, as in ii. 15, διà παντός τοῦ ζην. &c.; (b) in the course of, Acts v. 19, Sia vuktos ήνοιξεν τας θύρας τής φυλακής. &c.; (c) at an interval of (passing through and out of), Gal. ii. Ι, έπειτα δια δεκατεσσάρων έτων πάλιν ανέβην εἰς Ἱεροσό- $\lambda v \mu a$. &c. (4) In reference to

μονής τρέχωμεν τον προκείμενον ήμιν αγώνα,

circumstance (passing through, and so amidst or in a state of. with): as here, and Rom. viii, 25, δι υπομονής απεκδεχόμεθα. 2 Cor. ii. 4, εγραψα υμίν δια πολλών δακρύων. The use with an *accusative* is less complicated. It is twofold: (1) because of, Rom. xiv. 15, el yap δια βρώμα ο άδελφός σου λυπείται. xv. 15, δια την χάριν την δοθεισάν μοι ύπο του Θεού. &c.; (2) for the sake of. Rom. iv. 23, 24, 25, οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι αυτόν μόνον...άλλα και δι ήμâs κ.τ.λ. See also note on ii. 10, δι σν...δι συ.

 $\tau \rho \epsilon \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ Thus the general word aywv, which elsewhere is left in its vagueness, with only aywrilleorbar (as in I Tim. vi. 12, αγωνίζου τον καλον αγώνα. 2 Tim. iv. 7, τον καλον άγωνα ηγώνισμαι) or έχειν (Col. ii. 1, ήλίκον άγωνα έχω) before it, is here defined into the *foot-race*, St Paul's favourite illustration. See 1 Cor. ix. 24, 26, oi iv σταδίω τρέχοντες πάντες μὲν τρέχουσιν κ.τ.λ. Gal. ii. 2, μή πως είς κενον τρέχω ή έδραμον. v. 7. Phil. ii. 16, อть одк еля кетот έδραμον κ.τ.λ. 2 Tim. iv. 7, τον δρόμον τετέλεκα.

tor $\pi poset(\mu evor)$ Which lies forth (full in view) for us (as our prospect and portion). The dative is expressed here, as in verse 2, ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς. Exod. x. 10. Lev. xxiv. 7, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκείμενα τῷ Κυρίῳ. Elsewhere it is without a case, as in vi. 18, κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος. Num. iv. 7. Esth. i. 8.

The first sense of ayŵva] $\dot{a}\gamma \hat{\omega} v$ is apparently (1) assembly (connected perhaps with dyew 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. I Thess. ii. 2. I Tim. vi. 30. 2 Tim. iv. 7. In Col. ii. I 2. I, he applies it to wrestling in prayer (possibly with allusion to Gen. xxxii. 24, interpreted by Hos. xii. 4), ήλίκον ἀγῶνα έχω, followed by ίνα παρακληθώσιν αί καρδίαι αύτῶν. Here the application is to the Christian life generally, as a constant struggle (notice the tense of $\tau \rho \epsilon_{\chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu}$, whatever its particular circumstances. In the Septuagint, ayour occurs twice in Isai. vii. 13, in the phrase $\dot{a}\gamma\hat{\omega}\nu a$ (for the classical $\pi\rho\dot{a}\gamma$ ματα) παρέχειν τινί. Also in Wisd. iv. 2. X. 12, ayŵra iozvpor espasevorer auro. And in several passages of 2 Macc.;

2 ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν, ὅς ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ

for example, xiv. 43, διὰ την τοῦ ἀγῶνος σπουδήν.

αφορῶντες] Looking earnestly (away from all else). The verb ἀφορῶν occurs only here in Scripture. But see note on xi.
 26, ἀπέβλεπεν.

 $\epsilon is \tau \delta v$] The primary thought may be the example ($\delta s \ a v \tau i \tau \eta s$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$), but the living sympathy and grace are also in full view. See ii. 18. iv. 14—16.

 $\tau \eta s \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$] Is $\pi i \sigma \tau i s$ here (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, προ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθείν την πίστιν... ελθούσης δε της π istews. &c.) the system (revelation) of faith, that is, the Gospel ? Something will depend upon the interpretation of the άρχηγος και τελειωτής. See note on ii. 10, where the preference is given to author (originator) as the meaning of apyryo's both there and here. But even thus 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 harmonizing with the uniform use of $\pi i \sigma \tau i s$ in the Epistle before us. The originator and perfecter of our faith, as its first inspirer and eventual completer in the individual Christian.

τελειωτήν] Consummator. The word is found only here. It seems to round the circle of cognate words (τέλειος, τελειότης, τελειοῦν, τελείωσις) characteristic of this Epistle.

'I $\eta\sigma\sigma\hat{v}r$] The tenderer and more personal name. Its position in the sentence is like that in ii. 9 and iii. 1, in both of which places (as here) it stands late and alone.

 $a\nu\tau i$ From the first sense of avri, over against, opposite to (in place), comes that of set against as an equivalent, (1) in exchange, return, or compensation for, (2) as the price or purchase of, (3) instead of, to serve as, (4) on account of, because of. For example, (1) Matt. v. 38, οφθαλμον αντί οφθαλμού κ.τ.λ. Rom. xii. 17, Kakov avti Kakov. I Thess. v. 15. I Pet. iii. 9. (2) Matt. xx. 28, λύτρον αντί Mark x. 45. πολλών. Heb. xii. 16. (3) Matt. ii. 22, avri τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρώδου. Luke xi. 11, αντί ίχθύος όφιν. 1 Cor. xi. 15, κόμη αντί περιβολαίου. James iv. 15. (4) Luke i. 20, ανθ ών ουκ επίστευσας κ.τ.λ. xii. 3. xix. 44. Acts xii. 23. Eph.

χαρᾶς ὑπέμεινεν σταυρὸν αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας, ἐν δεξιậ τε τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ κεκάθικεν. ἀναλογίσασθε γὰρ τὸν τοιαύτην ὑπομεμενηκότα 3

v. 31. 2 Thess. ii. 10. In Matt. xvii. 27 (ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ) the idea is that of equivalence, as the price of. In John i. 16 (χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος) the ἀντὶ is in exchange for, replacing. In the verse before us the thought is, in consideration of, because of, for.

προκειμένης] See note on verse I, τον προκείμενον.

 $\chi_{a\rho\hat{a}s}$] Primarily that of Isai. liii. 11, He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied, &c. For $\chi_{ap\hat{a}}$ in connexion with Christ, see Matt. XXV. 21, 23, εἰs τὴν $\chi_{ap\hat{a}\nu}$ τοῦ κυρίου σου. John XV. 11, ĩνa ἡ $\chi_{ap\hat{a}}$ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ἦ. XVII. 13, ĩνa ἔχωσιν τὴν $\chi_{ap\hat{a}\nu}$ τὴν ἐμὴν πεπληρωμένην ἐν ἑaυτοῦs. 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, ἐχάρην γàρ λίαν κ.τ.λ. &c.

ύπέμεινεν] See note on x. 32, ύπεμείνατε.

σταυρόν] 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, μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.

alσχύνης καταφρονήσας] A grand paradox. Despising dis-

V. H.

grace, that most formidable of terrors to fallen man. For al- $\sigma\chi'\nu\eta$, (1) in its active sense (al $\sigma\chi'\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$), that of putting to shame, see, for example, Psalm lxxxix. 45, $\kappa a\tau\epsilon\chi\epsilon as$ autou al- $\sigma\chi'\nu\eta\nu$. Dan. xii. 2, $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\rho\theta\eta'$ - $\sigma\nu\taua\iota$ (A, $\epsilon\xi\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\rho\theta\eta'\sigma\nu\taua\iota$ B)... ϵis $\delta\nu\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\sigma\mu\delta\nu\kappa$ is alo $\chi'\nu\eta\nu$ ald $\omega\iota\nu\sigma\nu$. &c. (2) In the middle sense (al- $\sigma\chi'\nu\epsilon\sigma\thetaa\iota$), that of feeling shame, Jer. viii. 12 (omit B), $\kappa a'\gamma\epsilon$ al- $\sigma\chi'\nu\eta\nu$ obk $\eta'\sigma\chi'\nu\eta\sigma a\nu$, $\kappa a'\gamma\epsilon$ èv- $\tau\rhoa\pi\eta'\nu a obk <math>\epsilon\gamma\nu\omega\sigma a\nu$. Luke xiv. 9. &c.

The καταφρονήσας] (\mathbf{I}) tense expresses a single and *decisive act* of despising. Like the aorists of xi. 25, 26, έλόμενος...ήγησάμενος. (2) For καταpoveiv, to think down upon, to think slightingly of, see Prov. xix. 16, ό δε καταφρονών τών έαυτοῦ όδῶν ἀπολεῖται. Matt. vi. 24, ένος άνθέζεται και του έτέρου καταφρονήσει. xviii. 10, δράτε μή καταφρονήσητε ένος των μικρών τούτων. Luke xvi. 13. Rom. ii. 4. 1 Cor. xi. 22. 1 Tim. iv. 12. vi. 2. 2 Pet. ii. 10. er δεξιά τε] See notes on i. 3. viii. 1.

κεκάθικεν] Elsewhere ϵ κάθισεν. The perfect adds the thought of permanent consequences.

3. αναλογίσασθε γάρ] Reason

ύπο των άμαρτωλών είς έαυτούς άντιλογίαν, ίνα

xii, 3. Or éautor.

for the exhortation, $\delta i \dot{v} \pi o$ μονής τρέχωμεν κ.τ.λ. The word avaλογίζεσθαι (only found here in the New Testament or Septuagint) is (1) 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 the noun avaλoγισμός). The 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.

τοιαύτην] (1) Such as we all know of. Or (2) such as that above described (σταυρόν, aἰσχύνης). But the application of ἀντιλογία to such an act as crucifixion seems scarcely natural. See note on ἀντιλογίαν below.

ύπομεμενηκότα] The perfect only here (μεμενηκόταs 2 Macc. viii. 1, μεμενήκεισαν 1 John ii. 19). The tense connects the past endurance with the abiding present effect in the sympathy of Christ.

ύπο] At the hands of. Depending upon ύπομεμενηκότα. Like πάσχειν ύπ' αὐτῶν, Matt. xvii. 12. Mark v. 26. 1 Thess. ii. 14. Add 2 Cor. xi. 24, ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων...ἕλαβον.

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \mu$.] The article suggests that all sinners (of what-

ever race or time) conspired, as it were, by representation, in the $d\nu\tau\iota\lambda o\gamma (a.$ For of $d\mu ap <math>\tau\omega\lambda o($, see vii. 26, $\kappa\epsilon\chi\omega\rho\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu os$ $d\pi\delta$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $d\mu ap\tau\omega\lambda\omega\nu$. Luke vi. 32, 33. And for the idea of a joint agency in rejecting and crucifying Christ, compare Matt. XXVI. 45. Mark Xiv. 41, πapa bidorat δ vids τoi $d\nu ap dimo els$ τas $\chi\epsilon i pas <math>\tau\omega\nu$ $d\mu ap \tau\omega\lambda\omega\nu$. Luke XXVI. 7. Acts ii. 23, $\delta\iota a$ $\chi\epsilon\mu\rho os$ $<math>d\nu \omega\mu\omega$ (Gentiles) $\pi\rho o\sigma\pi i fartes$ $d\nu\epsilon i here.$

είς έαυτούς] Οr είς έαυτόν. Sinners against themselves. Or, aντιλογία 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 The key to it more difficult. is found in Num. xvi. 37, 7à πυρεία τῶν άμαρτωλῶν τούτων ἐν ταις ψυχαις αυτών, 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.)

a'ντιλογίαν] Gainsaying. But the word is stronger in use than its literal rendering would imply. This is seen also in the verb (a'ντιλέγειν). John xix. 22,

XII. 4.

μὴ κάμητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ἐκλυόμενοι. οὕπω 4 μέχρις αίματος ἀντικατέστητε πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρ-

πας ό βασιλέα έαυτον ποιών ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καίσαρι. Contradiction passes on into rebellion. See Jude 11, καὶ τῷ ἀντιλογία τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο (a special application of ἀντιλογία which gives some confirmation to the reading ἑαυτοὺς in this passage, involving a reference to the history of Korah). See note on Vi. 16, ἀντιλογίας.

κάμητε] Job x. 1, κάμνω (A, κάμνων B) τη ψυχη μου. Elsewhere (in the Septuagint and New Testament) only of bodily sickness. James v. 15. Wisd. xv. 9.

ταΐς ψυχαΐς] The above quotation (Job x. 1) might suggest taking this with κάμητε. But the rhythm of the sentence points rather to connecting it with ἐκλυόμενοι. The dative is that of the part suffering.

έκλυόμενοι] From the active senses of ἐκλύειν, (1) to unloose (Gen. xxvii. 40, ἔσται δὲ ἡνίκα ἐὰν καθέλης καὶ ἐκλύσης τὸν ζυγὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ τραχήλου σου), and so (2) to relax or slacken (Josh. x. 6, μὴ ἐκλύσης τὰς χεῦράς σου ἀπὸ τῶν παίδων σου), comes, by a transition marked in Gen. xlix. 24, ἐξελύθη τὰ νεῦρα βραχιόνων χειρῶν (Α, χειρὸς B) αὐτῶν, the constant use of the passive in the Septuagint and New Testament, to be faint or spiritless; as, for example, in 1 Sam. xiv. 28, καὶ ἐξελύθη ὁ λαός. 2 Sam. xvi. 2, καὶ ὁ οἶνος πιεῖν τοῖς ἐκλελυμένοις ἐν τỹ ἐρήμω. 1 Kings xx. (xxi. B) 43, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ πρὸς οἶκον αὐτοῦ συγκεχυμένος καὶ ἐκλελυμένος. &c. Matt. xv. 32. Mark viii. 3. Gal. vi. 9, θερίσομεν μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι.

4. $o\check{v}\pi\omega$] In contrast with Him 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 $o\check{v}\pi\omega$, see note on ii. 8.

μέχρις αίματος] See 2 Macc. xiii. 14, γενναίως άγωνίσασθαι μέχρι θανάτου περὶ νόμων, (περὶ B) ἱεροῦ, πόλεως, πατρίδος, πολιτείας. For μέχρι, see iii. 6, 14. ix. 10. Also note on ắχρι, iv. 12.

αίματος] Matt. xxiii. 35, ἀπὸ τοῦ αίματος ^{*}Αβελ τοῦ δικαίου ἔως τοῦ αίματος Ζαχαρίου κ.τ.λ.

άντικατέστητε] (1) As in verse 3 ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν, so here πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν 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 ἀντιδιατιθεμένους of 2 Tim. ii. 25.) Not yet has your resistance gone to the length of

5 τίαν ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι· καὶ ἐκλέλησθε τῆς παρακλήσεως, ἥτις ὑμῖν ὡς υἱοῖς διαλέγεται, Υἰέ μου, μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας Κυρίου, μηδὲ ἐκλύου

martyrdom in your contest with sin. (2) The aorist sums the past life into a single act. See note on $\pi\epsilon\rho_i\eta\lambda\theta\sigma$, xi. 37. No part of the verb $d\nu\tau\iota\kappa\alpha\theta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{a}\nu\alpha$ occurs elsewhere in the New Testament. But see Deut. xxxi. 21, καὶ ἀντικαταστήσεται ἡ ψδὴ αὖτη κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν (omit B) μαρτυροῦσα.

άνταγωνιζόμενοι] A classical word, found only here in the Septuagint or New Testament.

5. καὶ ἐκλέλησθε] And ye have quite forgotten, &c. Another classical word, found in the Greek Bible only here.

παρακλήσεως] Šee note on vi. 18, παράκλησιν.

 $\eta_{\tau is}$] An exhortation which, &c. See note on ii. 3, $\eta_{\tau is}$.

διαλέγεται The παράκλησις is personified. It discourses (converses) with you as with sons. The persuasive tone of Scripture is the point. For δια- $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (absolutely, or with $\tau \iota$ or περί τινος, τινί or πρός τινα), specially common in the Acts (where it occurs 10 times out of 13 in the New Testament), see Exod. vi. 27, obroi eiow oi διαλεγόμενοι πρός Φαραώ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου...αὐτὸς ᾿Ααρών καὶ Μωυσής. Isai, lxiii. 1, έγω διαλέγομαι δικαιοσύνην κ.τ.λ. Mark ix. 34, τί έν τη όδω διελογίζεσθε;

...πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν ἐν τῆ όδῷ τίς μείζων. Acts xvii. 2, 17. xviii. 4, 19. xix. 8, 9. xx. 7, 9. xxiv. 12, 25, διαλεγομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ περὶ δικαιοσύνης κ.τ.λ. Jude 9.

Yié μov] Prov. iii. 11, 12. The only variation from the Septuagint is the insertion of μov after vié.

 μov The author of the Book is of course the direct speaker (Prov. i. 1. iv. 1. &c.). But the Epistle bids us recognize in his voice that of God Himself.

μη όλιγώρει] This is the first danger, that of *indifference*. The second follows in the μηδὲἐκλύου.

όλιγώρει] Again a classical word (όλίγωρος, όλιγωρία, όλιγωρεῖν, from ῶρα, 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.

 $\pi a\iota \delta \epsilon (as]$ The word is coextensive with education. But of the two parts of education, instruction and discipline, $\pi a\iota \delta \epsilon (a$ (in the biblical language) most often, though not exclusively (see Acts vii. 22. xxii. 3), XII. 5, 6.

ύπ' αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος· ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπậ Κύ- 6 ριος παιδεύει, μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἰὸν ὃν

means the latter. See I Kings xii. 11, ό πατήρ μου ἐπαίδευσεν ύμας έν μάστιξιν, έγω δε παιδεύσω ὑμᾶς ἐν σκορπίοις (A, varied Psalm cxviii. 18, maiin B). δεύων έπαίδευσέ με ο Κύριος, καί τώ θανάτω ού παρέδωκέ με. Jer. ii. 30, μάτην ἐπάταξα τὰ τέκνα ύμων, παιδείαν ούκ εδέξασθε μάχαιρα κατέφαγε τοὺς προφήτας ύμων...και ούκ έφοβήθητε. Luke xxiii. 16, 22, παιδεύσας οῦν αὐτὸν απολύσω κ.τ.λ. (where St John in the parallel passage, xix. 1, has έμαστίγωσεν). I Cor. xi. 32, κρινόμενοι δε ύπο του Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα. 2 Cor. vi. 9, ώς παιδευόμενοι καὶ μὴ θανατούμενοι. 1 Tim. i. 20. Rev. iii. 19.

μηδὲ ἐκλύου] Nor faint (lose heart) when thou art reproved by Him. The second danger is that of despondency. Conscious of the divine agency, the sufferer is tempted to infer the divine displeasure. For ἐκλύεσθαι, see note on verse 3, ἐκλυόμενοι.

έλεγχόμενος] From the primary sense of testing, putting to the proof, ελέγχειν branches into its use with (1) things and (2) persons. Thus (1) to expose: as in John iii. 20, οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἶνα μὴ ἐλεγχθŷ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. Eph. V. 11, 13, μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῦς ἔργοις τοῦς ἀκάρποις τοῦ σκότους, μῦλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε...τα δε πάντα ελεγχόμενα ύπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦται. Wisd. ii. 11, τὸ γὰρ ἀσθενὲς ἄχρηστον έλέγχεται. (2) To convict (John viii. 46, τίς έξ υμών έλέγχει με περί αμαρτίας; xvi. 8. James ii. 9) or *reprove* (Lev. xix. 17, έλεγμῷ έλέγξεις τὸν πλησίον σου. Prov. ix. 8, έλεγχε σοφόν, καί άγαπήσει σε. χ. 10, ο δε ελέγχων μετά παρρησίας είρηνοποιεί. Εςclus. xix. 13, &c., έλεγξον φίλον ... ἕλεγξον τὸν πλησίον κ.τ.λ. Luke iii. 19. 1 Tim. v. 20. 2 Tim. iv. 2. Tit. i. 12. &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 $_{\sim}$ but in act. 2 Chron. xxvi. 20, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἔσπευσεν ἐξελθεῖν, δτι ήλεγξεν αυτόν Κύριος. Rev. iii. 19, έγω όσους έαν φιλώ *ἐλ*έγχω καὶ παιδεύω.

6. $\pi aι \delta \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon i$] See note on verse 5, $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon \dot{i} a s$.

μαστιγοί] Matt. x. 17. xx. 19. xxiii. 34. Mark x. 34. Luke xviii. 33. John xix. 1. For the application of this strong word figuratively to God, see Job xxx. 21, χειρὶ κραταιậ με ἐμαστίγωσας. Psalm lxxxix. 32. Jer. v. 3, ἐμαστίγωσας αὐτούς, καὶ οὐκ ἐπόνεσαν. Another form of μαστιγοῦν is μαστίζειν (Num. xxii. 25. Wisd. v. 11. Acts xxii. 25).

7 παραδέχεται. εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε· ὡς ὑίοῖς ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ Θεός· τίς γὰρ ὑἰὸς ὃν οὐ

 $\pi a \rho a \delta \epsilon \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota$] From the sense 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. 21. xxii. 18. I Tim. v. 19), comes that of accepting or recognizing a person, as duly accredited (Acts xv. 4, παρεδέχθησαν από της έκκλησίας), or as being that which he calls himself. This last is the meaning here. Every son whom He recognizes as such.

7. ϵis] The change of reading, from ϵi to ϵis , appears to be certain. And indeed, with ϵi , $i\pi o\mu \epsilon v \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ should have been $\pi a \sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$. For the point (with that reading) would be not the temper of the sufferer but the fact of the chastisement.

 ϵ is π aideíav $i\pi o\mu$.] Endure (exercise patience) unto (with a view to) discipline. Or else, It is with a view to discipline that ye exercise patience. There is some difficulty 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

 $\pi \alpha \sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ than $i \pi \circ \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon$. Read 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.

 $v\pi_0\mu\epsilon_{\epsilon}v\epsilon_{\epsilon}$ Everywhere else in this Epistle $v\pi o\mu \epsilon v \epsilon v$ has an accusative. See note on x. 32. Here (with the altered reading) it is absolute. To endure. Tobe patient. And so in Matt. x. 22, ο δε ύπομείνας είς τέλος ούτος σωθήσεται. xxiv. 13. Mark xiii. 13. Rom. xii, 12. 2 Tim. ii. 12, εἰ ὑπομένομεν, καὶ συνβασιλεύσομεν. James v. 11. 1 Pet. ii. 20, εί άγαθοποιοῦντες καί πάσχοντες ύπομενείτε κ.τ.λ. There remain two examples of $v\pi o\mu \epsilon v \epsilon v$ (absolute) in the simple sense of staying behind (Luke ii. 43. Acts xvii. 14).

ພ໌s vioîs] Suffering proves sonship.

προσφέρεται] Of this classical use of προσφέρεσθαι (τινί), to approach, and so to bear oneself towards, to deal with or behave towards, this is the only instance in the Greek Bible.

 τ 's γ àp viớs] If chastisement does not actually prove sonship, certainly the negative is true, that not to suffer is not to be a son. παιδεύει πατήρ; εἰ δὲ χωρίς ἐστε παιδείας, ἦς 8 μέτοχοι γεγόνασιν πάντες, ἄρα νόθοι καὶ οὐχ υἱοί ἐστε. εἶτα τοὺς μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν 9 πατέρας εἴχομεν παιδευτὰς καὶ ἐνετρεπόμεθα·

8. $\chi \omega \rho (s \ \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \ \pi a \iota \delta.]$ For $\chi \omega \rho is \ \epsilon \ell v a \ell \ \tau \iota v o s, to be (or exist) apart from, see 1 Cor. xi. 11. Eph. ii. 12.$

μέτοχοι] See note on i. 9, τοὺς μετόχους σου.

 $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \acute{o} \gamma a \sigma \iota v$] *Have become*, in all past history and experience up to this day.

 $\pi \acute{a}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$] All (sons). The argument requires this limitation.

 $a\rho a$] Then. The position of $a\rho a$ as the first word in the clause gives it a strong conclusive emphasis. See note on iv. 9, $a\rho a$ (and passages there quoted).

vόθω] The word vóθωs 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. $\epsilon l \tau a \tau o v s \mu \epsilon v$] Submission to divine discipline is reasonable. We have all shown it towards human parents. The sense of $\epsilon l \tau a$ is not quite clear. It might be regarded as what in classical works is known as the $\epsilon l \tau a$ 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 $\epsilon l \tau a$ in the Greek Bible,

and the latter clause (où $\pi o \lambda \dot{v} \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \kappa. \tau. \lambda.$) does not quite suit it. We are driven therefore to the sense of *next*, further, again: see Mark iv. 28, $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$ $\chi \acute{o} \rho \tau o \nu$, $\epsilon \ddot{t} \tau a \sigma \tau \acute{a} \chi v \nu$, $\epsilon \ddot{t} \tau a \pi \lambda \acute{\eta} \rho \eta s$ $\sigma \hat{\tau} \tau o s$. In 1 Cor. xii. 5, 7, the manuscripts vary between $\epsilon \ddot{t} \tau a$ and $\check{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \tau a$. We have no exactly parallel use in Scripture of $\epsilon \dot{t} \tau a$ in argument, or succession of thought, which is what we want here.

τοὺς μέν] The μὲν stands as if the following clause were to be, τῷ δὲ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων οὐ πολὺ μậλλον ὑποταγησόμεθα;

τὴς σαρκὸς...τῶν πνευμάτων] The contrast suggests (but does not decide) the Creationist and Traducianist controversy. So far as it goes, it *favours* the Creationist.

 $\pi a \tau \epsilon \rho a s$] In xi. 23, $\pi a \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon s$ meant *parents*. See note there. Here the plural is explained by the plural $\eta \mu \omega \nu$.

 $[\epsilon_{i\chi}^{*}$ χομεν] Had them as (for) chastisers. The construction is as in Matt. iii. 9, πατέρα έχομεν τον Άβραάμ. Luke iii. 8. Phil. iii. 17, έχετε τύπον ήμας.

παιδευτάς] Hos. v. 2, εγώ δε παιδευτής ύμων. Ecclus. xxxvii. 19, εστιν ανήρ πανοῦργος

ού πολύ μάλλον ύποταγησόμεθα τῷ πατρί τῶν

(καί B) πολλών παιδευτής. Rom. ii. 20, παιδευτής αφρόνων.

ένετρεπόμεθα] \mathbf{From} the literal sense of $\epsilon \nu \tau \rho \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$ ($\tau \iota \nu \alpha$), literally to invert, to turn one in upon oneself, and so to change in mind and feeling, specially to make ashamed (1 Cor. iv. 14, ούκ έντρέπων ύμας γράφω ταῦτα), the middle (or passive) has the two senses, (1) to be ashamed, as in 2 Thess. iii. 14. Tit. ii. 8 (iva o $\dot{\epsilon}\xi$ $\dot{\epsilon}vav\tau(as \epsilon v\tau\rho a\pi \eta)$, and (2) the weaker and gentler one, to regard or reverence (always 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. x. 3, έως τίνος ου βούλει έντρα- $\pi \eta v \alpha i \mu \epsilon$; Wisd. ii. 10, $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon$ πρεσβυτέρου (Α, πρεσβύτου Β) έντραπώμεν πολιάς πολυχρονίους. vi. 8. Often combined with aiσχύνεσθαι, as Job xxxii. 21, avθρωπον γάρ ου μή αἰσχυνθώ, άλλά μήν ούδε βροτόν ου μή εντραπώ. Sometimes with $v\pi o' \tau v a$ (Jud. iii. 30), ἐπί τινι (Ecclus. xli. 16), or aπό τινος (2 Kings xxii, 19. 2 Chron. xxvi. 12).

πολὺ μâλλον] Here and in verse 25 the revised text gives πολὺ for πολλῷ. St Paul (Rom. v. 9, 10, 15, 17. 1 Cor. xii. 22. 2 Cor. iii. 9, 11. Phil. i. 23. ii. 12) invariably uses πολλῷ. iποτaγησόμεθa] 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 (James iv. 7, iποτάγητε οἰν τῷ Θεῷ). For the exact form, see 1 Cor. xv. 28 (only).

τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων] The Father of spirits. In contrast with oapros above. The article probably expresses universality (all spirits), rather than appropriation (our spirits). See Num. xvi. 22, Θεός, Θεός τῶν πνευμάτων και πάσης σαρκός. Job xii. 10, έν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ψυχὴ πάντων τῶν (Α, omit B) ζώντων, και πνευμα πάσης σαρκός (Α, παντός Β) ανθρώπου. Eccles. xii. 7, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα έπιστρέψει (Α, -ψη Β) πρός τον Θεόν δς έδωκεν αυτό. Isai. xlii. 5, καὶ διδοὺς πνοὴν τῷ λαῷ τῷ ἐπ' αὐτῆς, καὶ πνεῦμα τοῖς πατοῦσιν aurny. lvii. 16. Zech. xii. 1. καὶ πλάσσων πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου ἐν αὐτῶ. The plural of $\pi v \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ is comparatively rare. Sometimes it is required (1) by its connexion with a plural following, as in verse 23, καὶ πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων. I Cor. xiv. 32, πνεύματα προφητών προφήταις ύποτάσσεται. In Psalm lxxvi. 12, the reading varies between πνεύματα (B) and πνεῦμα (A) $d \rho \chi \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$. Sometimes (2) by the necessity of expressing plurality

πνευμάτων καὶ ζήσομεν; οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς ὀλίγας 10 ἡμέρας κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς ἐπαίδευον, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγιό-

(as in combination with ἀκάθαρτα, πονηρά, πλάνα, &c., or as in 1 Pet. iii. 19, τοῦς ἐν ψυλακῆ πνεύμασιν) or variety (as in 1 Cor. xii. 10, διακρίσεις πνευμάτων. 1 John iv. 1, δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνεύματα εἰ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν).

καὶ ζήσομεν] And have life. See note on x. 38, ζήσεται.

10. οί μέν γάρ Reason for the à 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 $(\pi \rho \delta s)$ ολίγας ήμέρας) is not expressly taken up in the contrasted clause. Even the other point (κατά το δοκούν αύτοις) is not directly met by the $\epsilon \pi i$ and ϵ is of the second clause. In both cases something is left to be supplied by the reader.

προς ολίγας ήμέρας] For the brief period of childhood. For the πρός, compare προς καιρόν (Luke viii. 13. 1 Cor. vii. 5), προς ώραν (John v. 35. 2 Cor. vii. 8. Gal. ii. 5. Philem. 15), προς καιρόν ώρας (1 Thess. ii. 17), προς ολίγον (James iv. 14).

κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς] According to that which seemed good to them. Following their own judgment. (Matt. xvii. 25, τi σοι δοκεi; xviii. 12, τi $i\mu i\nu$ δοκεi; &c.) There is no direct imputation of *caprice* or *passion*, only of *fallibility*, whether in the object or the method.

είς το μεταλαβείν] Unto our having partaken of. The $\epsilon \pi i$ expresses the aim, the ϵ 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. i. 4. ίνα δια τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοί φύσεως. The tense of $\mu\epsilon\tau a\lambda a\beta\epsilon \hat{i}\nu$ points to the moment of the consummation of grace in glory. For μεταλαμβάνειν, see vi. 7, μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας. Acts ii. 46. xxvii. 33, 34. 2 Tim. ii. 6, τών καρπών μεταλαμβάνειν.

άγιότητος] Of the three forms, άγιότης, άγιωσύνη, άγιασμός, the third is the commonest (see note on verse 14). The 11 τητος αὐτοῦ. πῶσα δὲ παιδεία πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν οὐ δοκεῖ χαρῶς εἶναι ἀλλὰ λύπης, ὕστερον δὲ καρπὸν εἰρηνικὸν τοῖς δι' αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις ἀποδίδωσιν δικαιοσύνης.

xii. 11. Or πάσα μέν.

second occurs three times in the New Testament (Rom. i. 4. 2 Cor. vii. 1. 1 Thess. iii. 13) and in four places of the Septuagint (Psalm xcvi. 6. xcvii. 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 $a\pi\lambda\delta i\eta\pi i$), and once in the Septuagint (2 Macc. xv. 2).

11. $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \delta \hat{\epsilon}$ 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 $\delta \epsilon$ and $\mu \epsilon \nu$. If probability may be taken into account, it certainly points rather to $\delta \epsilon$. We have a $\mu \epsilon \nu$ and de following in clear contrast; and a foregoing µév, implying a suppressed $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ 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 (1)the repetition (in explanation or expansion) of a former sentence, or (2) an intentional abruptness for the sake of emphasis; neither of which reasons

seems appropriate here.

οὐ δοκεῖ χαρῶς εἶναι] Either (1) does not seem 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, οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς.

λύπης... χαράς] John xvi. 20, 21, 22.

καρπον ... δικαιοσύνης] The genitive is explanatory. Fruit (consisting) of righteousness. (1) The figurative use of $\kappa \alpha \rho$ - $\pi \delta s$, produce or product, is common in the Septuagint and New Testament. Thus Psalm lviii. 11, εἰ ἄρα ἐστὶ καρπὸς τῷ δικαίω. Prov. xi. 30, έκ καρπου δικαιοσύνης φύεται δένδρον ζωής. xiii. 2, από καρπού (Α, καρπών B) δικαιοσύνης φάγεται άγαθός. Amos vi. 12 (13 B), έξεστρέψατε ...καρπόν δικαιοσύνης είς πικρίαν. Luke iii. 8, $\kappa \alpha \rho \pi \sigma \vartheta s$ déious $\tau \eta s$ peravoías. Rom. vi. 22, exere τον καρπον ύμων είς άγιασμόν. Phil. i. 11, πεπληρωμένοι καρπόν δικαιοσύνης τον δια Ίησου Χριστου. James iii. 18, καρπός δε δικαιοσύνης έν ειρήνη σπείρεται. &c. (2) The position of dikalogivns is characteristic of the style of the Epistle. See notes on i. I.

Διό τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ παρα- 12

vii. 4. &c. (3) For $\delta i\kappa a i o \sigma i \eta \eta$ in this most general sense, of the Christian *fulfilment of relations* towards God and man, see note on v. 13, $\lambda \delta \gamma o \nu \delta i \kappa a i o \sigma i - \gamma \eta s$, and passages there quoted.

eipnvikóv] 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, ή δὲ ανωθεν σοφία ... εἰρηνική, ἐπιεικής, εύπειθής κ.τ.λ. There the $\epsilon i \rho \eta \nu \eta$ suggested by it is that $\mu\epsilon\tau\dot{\alpha}$ $\pi\dot{\alpha}\nu$ - $\tau\omega\nu$ (see below, verse 14), here it is that of the often repeated χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη of the opening prayer of the Epistles. In the Septuagint, είρηνικός occurs more than 40 times, (1) in the sense of *peaceable* (as, for example, Gen. xlii. 11, είρηνικοί έσμεν), or (2) in connexion with $\theta v \sigma i a$ (expressed or understood), in that of the peace-offering (2 Sam. xxiv. 25, και ανήνεγκεν όλοκαυτώσεις και ειρηνικάς. Ι Kings viii. 64, τὰ στέατα τῶν είρηνικών...τάς θυσίας τών είρη-Prov. vii. 14, θυσία νικών. είρηνική μοί έστι).

γεγυμνασμένοις] See note on v. 14, γεγυμνασμένα.

 $a\pi o \delta (\delta \omega \sigma w]$ The literal sense of $a\pi o \delta \delta \delta \sigma a$, to 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. xiii. 7, απόδοτε πάσιν τας όφει- $\lambda \dot{a}_{s}$), whether earned (Matt. xx. 8, απόδος αυτοίς τον μισθόν), promised (2 Tim. iv. 8, o ths δικαιοσύνης στέφανος, δν αποδώσει μοι ό Κύριος), threatened (Rev. xviii. 6, $d\pi \delta \delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ av $\tau \hat{\eta}$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$), or guaranteed in the order of nature or otherwise (Lev. xxvi. 4, καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων αποδώσει τον καρπόν αύ- $\tau \hat{\omega} v$). This last is the sense here. Discipline yields righteousness as naturally as a tree yields its fruit.

12. $\Delta \omega \delta$ Wherefore. Reconciled to suffering by all these considerations.

τὰς παρειμένας κ.τ.λ.] Evidently a reminiscence of Isai. xxxv. 3, ἰσχύσατε, χείρες ἀνειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα⁻ παρακαλέσατε κ.τ.λ. In Ecclus. xxv. 23 we have the παρειμέναι of the text: χείρες παρειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα.

παρειμένας ... παραλελυμένα] The two words, παριέναι (to let go along) and παραλύειν (to loose along), are found together, as here, in the same general sense of relaxing or enfeebling, in Deut. xxxii. 36, είδε γαρ παραλελυμένους αὐτοὺς...καὶ παρειμένους. (1) For παριέναι, see also 2 Sam. iv. 1, καὶ πάντες οἱ ανδρες Ἰσραήλ παρείθησαν. Jer. iv. 31, ἐκλυθήσεται καὶ παρήσει τὰς χείρας αὐτῆς. xx. 9, καὶ

13 λελυμένα γόνατα ἀνορθώσατε, καὶ τροχιὰς
ὀρθὰς ποιεῖτε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν, ἵνα μὴ τὸ
14 χωλὸν ἐκτραπῆ, ἰαθῆ δὲ μᾶλλον. εἰρήνην διώ-

xii. 13. Or ποιήσατε.

παρείμαι πάντοθεν, και ου δύναμαι φέρειν. Ecclus. ii. 13, oval καρδία παρειμένη. (2) For παραλύειν, Isai. xxiii. 9, Κύριος σαβαώθ έβουλεύσατο παραλύσαι πάσαν την ύβριν των ενδόξων. Jer. xlvi. (xxvi. B) 15, our Euciver, ori ό Κύριος παρέλυσεν αυτόν. Ezek. vii. 27, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες τοῦ λαοῦ τής γής παραλυθήσονται. In the New Testament, it has the definite sense of *paralyzed*. Acts viii. 7, πολλοί δε παραλελυμένοι καί χωλοί έθεραπεύθησαν. &c. And so παραλυτικός, Matt. iv. 24. &c.

γόνατα] Job iv. 4, γόνασι δè (A, τε B) αδυνατοῦσι περιέθηκας θάρσος (A, θ. π. B).

άνορθώσατε] Not in the passage quoted, and at first sight more appropriate to χ εΐpas than to γόνατα. 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, ή παιδεία σου ἀνώρθωσέ με. XX. 8, ήμεῖς δὲ ἀνέστημεν καὶ ἀνωρθώθημεν. cxlv. 14, ἀνορθοῦ πάντας τοὺς κατερραγμένους.

13. καὶ τροχιάς] The reading of the revised text (ποιεῖτε instead of ποιήσατε) gets rid of an unpleasing and improbable hexameter line. The quotation is from Prov. iv. 26, oρθàs τροχιας ποίει σοΐς ποσί, και τας όδούς σου κατεύθυνε. Compare verse 11, όδους γαρ σοφίας διδάσκω σε, εμβιβάζω δέ σε τροχιαίς dobais. The admonition is to straightforwardness and uprightness of conduct, in contrast with perverseness \mathbf{or} crookedness (see verses 25 and 27, οι οφθαλμοί σου ορθά βλεπέτωσαν...μή εκκλίνης είς τα δεξιά, μηδε είς τα αριστερά κ.τ.λ.). The word $\tau \rho o \chi i \dot{a}$ is found (in the Greek Bible) only in the Book of Proverbs, where it occurs five times.

 $i\nu a \mu \eta'$ The connexion would be quite obvious if instead of $\delta \rho \theta \delta s$ we had $\lambda \epsilon i \alpha s$, *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 lameness would prefer a short road to a circuitous one.

τὸ χωλόν] The reference is evidently to the weaker and faultier members of the Christian body, to whom example is

κετε μετὰ πάντων, καὶ τὸν ἀγιασμόν, οὖ χωρὶς củδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν Κύριον· ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις 15

everything. For a like use of the figure, see I Kings xviii. 21, έως πότε ὑμεῖς χωλανεῖτε ἐπ' ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς ἰγνύαις;

έκτραπη] 1 Tim. i. 6, έξετράπησαν εἰς ματαιολογίαν. v. 15, έξετράπησαν ἀπίσω τοῦ Σατανᾶ. vi. 20. 2 Tim. iv. 4.

 $ia\theta_{\hat{\eta}} \delta i \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \sigma r$] Is this connected with the $\tau \rho \alpha \mu \hat{a} \delta \sigma \rho \hat{a} \delta \pi \sigma \mu \hat{a} \epsilon$, 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, as is most to be wished? The answer is doubtful.

14. $\epsilon l p \eta v \eta v \delta \iota \omega \kappa \epsilon \tau \epsilon$] A precept of *peace*, followed by a *larger* precept of *holiness*, which last is enforced by a prolonged passage of exhortation.

δώκετε] The idea is that of pursuing a fugitive. The grace in question is one difficult of attainment. Compare Rom. xii. 13, τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες. xiv. 19, τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν. I Cor. xiv. 1, διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην. I Thess. v. 15, τὸ ἀγαθὸν διώκετε. I Tim. vi. 11, ταῦτα φεῦγε, δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην κ.τ.λ. I Pet. iii. 11 (from Psalm xxxiv. 14), ζητησάτω εἰρήνην καὶ διωξύτω αὐτήν.

μετά πάντων In your deal-

ings and relations with all men. Rom. xii. 18, μετα πάντων άνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντες.

τον άγιασμόν] The article means all (rather than that). The form aylaopos (like parapiσμός, πειρασμός, βαντισμός, όδυρ- μ ós, &c.) indicates an *act* rather than a quality. In this it differs from the other two forms, ayότης (verse 12) and άγιωσύνη. Sanctification rather than holiness. 'The bringing of the consecrated person into harmony of life and character with the consecration' (see note on ii. 11, άγιάζων ... άγιαζόμενοι). Rom. vi. 19, 22, παραστήσατε τα μέλη ύμῶν δοῦλα τη δικαιοσύνη εἰs άγιασμόν... ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν είς άγιασμόν. Ι Cor. i. 30. 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, 7, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν θέλημα του Θεου, ό άγιασμός ύμων... έν άγιασμώ και τιμή...ου γαρ εκάλεσεν ήμας ο Θεός επί ακαθαρσία αλλ έν αγιασμώ. 2 Thess. ii. 13, έν άγιασμῷ πνεύματος. I Tim. ii. 15, έν πίστει καί άγάπη καὶ άγιασμῷ μετὰ σωφρο-1 Pet. i. 2. σύνης.

où $\chi \omega \rho is$] Two Iambic lines follow. Accidental doubtless, perhaps unconscious, and yet strongly adverse to the idea of St Paul's authorship.

όψεται τὸν Κύριον] Matt. v. 8, μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῆ καρδία, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν Θεὸν ὄψονται. Rev.

ύστερών ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ· μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας ἀνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῆ καὶ δι αὐτῆς

xii. 15. Or διὰ ταύτης.

xxii. 4, καὶ ὄψονται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ. Isai. xxxiii. 17, βασιλέα μετὰ δόξης ὄψεσθε, καὶ (omit B) οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν ὄψονται γῆν πόρρωθεν. Probably ὁ Κύριος is here God (see note on viii. 2). Otherwise we should add to the above quotations 1 John iii. 2, ὅτι ὀψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθῶς ἔστιν. Rev. i. 7, καὶ ὄψεται αὐτὸν πῶς ὀφθαλμός.

15. $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \kappa \sigma \pi o \tilde{v} \tau \epsilon s$] The oversight here enjoined is evidently mutual and brotherly, not official and ministerial. Compare iii. 12, 13, $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, $a \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o i$, $\mu \eta$ $\pi \sigma \tau \epsilon$ $\epsilon \sigma \tau a i$ $\epsilon \nu$ $\tau v u$ $v \mu \hat{w} \nu \kappa \tau . \lambda$. In 1 Pet. v. 2, if $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \kappa \sigma \sigma \tilde{v} \tau \tau \epsilon$ is to be retained in the text (which is more than doubtful), the latter is its reference.

μή τις] Understand η, as in verse 16. Lest there be any one ύστερών.

υστερῶν ἀπό] For ὑστερῶν, see note on iv. I, ὑστερηκένα. With ἀπό, the sense may be not falling short of, missing, failing to attain, but falling short from (as from a thing once attained). And thus the warning will be that of 2 Cor. vi. I, παρακαλοῦμεν μὴ εἰς κενὸν τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς. And the case contemplated will be that of Gal. v. 4, τῆς χάριτος έξεπέσατε.

 $\mu \eta \tau \iota s \dot{\rho} (\zeta a]$ The words are from Deut. xxix. 18, μή τίς ἐστιν έν ύμιν ρίζα [πικρίας] άνω φύουσα So the text έν χολή και πικρία. stands in Field's edition. The Vatican omits $\pi i \kappa \rho i \alpha s$. Delitzsch quotes the Alexandrine Septuagint as reading $\pi i \kappa \rho i \alpha s$, and as having $\epsilon v \circ \chi \lambda \hat{\eta}$ in place of ϵv $\chi_0\lambda_{\hat{\eta}}$. He thinks that the reading there may have been suggested by the form of the quotation here. It is a difficult question. One thing we cannot suppose—that the writer to the Hebrews chose $\partial v_{0\chi}\lambda \hat{\eta}$ from its resemblance to $\partial \chi_{0\lambda} \hat{\eta}$.

άνω φύουσα] Isaï. xxxvii. 31, φυήσουσι ρίζαν κάτω, καὶ ποιήσουσι σπέρμα άνω.

ένοχλ $\hat{\eta}$] Like $\dot{\sigma}_{\chi\lambda}\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$ (Tob. vi. 7, ἐάν τινα ἀχλ $\hat{\eta}$ δαιμόνιον $\hat{\eta}$ πνεῦμα πονηρόν κ.τ.λ. Acts v. 16), properly to throng or crowd one, and so to annoy or trouble, the compound ἐνοχλεῖν, properly perhaps ἐν ὅχλψ (like δι' ὅχλου)

XII. 16.

μιανθώσιν οἱ πολλοί· μή τις πόρνος η βέβηλος 16 ως Ήσαῦ, ὃς ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιῶς ἀπέδοτο τὰ

xii. 16. Or amédero.

 ϵ ivaí $\tau_{1\nu_1}$, means to be troublesome to, with a dative or accusative, and sometimes absolutely (as here), to be troublesome, to give trouble. In the New Testament it occurs (besides) only in Luke vi. 18, where (as usually in the Septuagint) it is in the passive voice.

δι' αὐτῆς] Or διὰ ταύτης. The choice of reading is difficult, and not important. Compare ∇ . 3, where, however, δι' αὐτὴν is decidedly preferable to διὰ ταύτην.

 $\mu_{\alpha\nu}\theta\hat{\omega}\sigma_{\nu}$ The word interprets the $\delta i \zeta a \pi i \kappa \rho i a s$ above and prepares us for the $\mu\eta$ $\tau\iota s \pi \delta \rho$ - νos below. For maiver, see John xviii. 28 (illustrated by many applications of the word to ceremonial defilement in Levit. xiii. &c.). Tit. i. 15. πάντα καθαρά τοις καθαροίς τοις δε μεμιαμμένοις και απίστοις ουδεν καθαρόν, άλλα μεμίανται αὐτων και ό νους και ή συνείδησις. Jude 8, σάρκα μέν μιαίνουσιν κ.τ.λ.

οί πολλοί] The many. The community or Christian society. Rom. xii. 5, οί πολλοι ἐν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ. Ι Cor. x. 17. And for the thought, compare I Cor. v. 6, οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ;

16. $\mu \eta \tau is$ Understand \hat{y} ,

as above. It is not clear whether $\dot{\omega}s$ 'H $\sigma a\hat{v}$ refers to both words, or only to $\beta \epsilon \beta \eta \lambda os$. Bengel's remark, *Libido et intemperantia cibi affines*, suggests the combination, 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.

 $\beta \epsilon \beta \eta \lambda os$] Derived from $\beta \delta \omega$, $\beta a i \nu \omega$, the application of $\beta \epsilon \beta \eta$ - λ_{0s} is (1) to things; open to the tread, the opposite of ayios, sacred to God. Thus Lev. x. 10, καὶ διαστειλαι άναμέσον τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τῶν βεβήλων, καὶ ἀναμέσον τῶν άκαθάρτων καὶ τῶν καθαρῶν. Ι Sam. xxi. 4, ἀρτοι βέβηλοι... ἀρτος άγιος (A, άρτοι άγιοι B). Ezek. 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, και σύ, βέβηλε, άνομε κ.τ.λ. 1 Tim. i. 9, ανοσίοις και βεβήλοις.

 ω_s 'H $\sigma a \hat{v}$] 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

17 πρωτοτόκια έαυτοῦ. ἴστε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομῆσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν ἀπε-

Messiah, &c.) as of no value in comparison with the satisfaction of a passing hunger.

δς αντί βρώσεως] Gen. xxv. 29-34, Γεῦσόν με...ὅτι ἐκλείπω ... Απόδου μοι σήμερον τα πρωτοτόκιά σου... Ινατί μοι ταθτα τα πρωτοτόκια;... άπέδοτο δε 'Ησαν τα πρωτοτόκια αυτού (A, omit B) τῷ Ἰακώβ...καὶ ἔφαγε καὶ ἔπιε, καὶ άναστάς ώχετο και έφαύλισεν 'Ησαῦ τὰ πρωτοτόκια. For βρώ- σ_{is} (eating), as distinguished from $\beta \rho \hat{\omega} \mu a$ (food), see Rom. xiv. 17. 1 Cor. viii. 4, περί της βρώσεως ουν των είδωλοθύ- $\tau \omega_{\gamma} \kappa \tau \lambda$. 2 Cor. ix. 10 (from Isai. lv. 10), καὶ ἄρτον εἰς βρώσιν. Col. ii. 16, μη ούν τις ύμας κρινέτω έν βρώσει καὶ έν πόσει. Gen. i. 29, ύμιν έσται είς βρώσιν. ii. 9, παν ξύλον ώραιον είς δρασιν καί καλόν είς βρώσιν. iii. 6. &c. And so here. For a single meal. In some places the distinction is less marked. John iv. 32, έγώ βρώσιν έχω φαγείν κ.τ.λ. vi. 27, 55, μη την βρώσιν την απολλυμένην αλλα την βρώσιν τήν μένουσαν κ.τ.λ. Psalm ·lxxviii. 30, έτι της βρώσεως αὐτών ούσης έν τῷ στόματι αὐτών. de.

 $\dot{a}\pi\epsilon \delta o \tau o$] Or (in a later and debased form) $\dot{a}\pi\epsilon \delta \epsilon \tau o$. The classical sense of the middle voice of $\dot{a}\pi \sigma \delta i \delta \delta \sigma a \iota$, to give away for one's own gain, to sell, is common in the Septuagint, beginning with the passage here referred to, Gen. xxv. 31, 33. In the New Testament, it occurs only here and in Acts v. $8 (\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \ \mu o \iota, \epsilon i \ \tau \sigma \sigma o \omega \tau \sigma v \ \tau \delta \ \chi \omega \rho i \sigma v$ $a \pi \epsilon \delta o \sigma \theta \epsilon$) and vii. 9 (from Gen. xxxvii. 36), $\tau \delta v$ Iwory ϕ $a \pi \epsilon \delta \delta \sigma \tau \sigma$ $\epsilon i s \Lambda i \gamma v \pi \tau \sigma v$.

τά πρωτοτόκια] See notes (above) on ώς Ήσαῦ, and ὅς ἀντὶ βρώσεως. For the word, see also Gen. xxvii. 36. Deut. xxi. 17, καὶ τούτῷ καθήκει τὰ πρωτοτοκεία.

čaυτοῦ] The addition of čaυτοῦ aggravates the folly of the act.

17. ἴστε γὰρ ὅτι] Be sure your sin will find you out. It was so with Esau. Late but surely the sale of the birthright was punished by the forfeiture of the blessing.

 $[\overline{i}\sigma\tau\epsilon]$ See Eph. v. 5, τοῦτο γàρ $[\overline{i}\sigma\tau\epsilon]$ γινώσκοντες ὅτι κ.τ.λ. James i. 19, $\overline{i}\sigma\tau\epsilon$, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί. (In both cases, the revised text. Only here in the received also. The common Hellenistic form is οἶδατε, which, however, does not occur in this Epistle.)

καὶ μ .] Either (1) also, as a further particular of the history. Or (2) even, taken closely with μετέπειτα. Even afterwards. So long after, that he

XII. 17.

δοκιμάσθη, μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὗρεν, καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν.

might have hoped that the early folly was forgotten and done with. The common chronology interposes more than 40 years between the two incidents.

 $\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega v \kappa \lambda$] 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.

την εύλογίαν] 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. xxxv. 29). Compare Gen. xlviii. xlix. Deut. xxxiii. In I Chron. v. I, 2, the $\epsilon i \lambda o \gamma i a$ seems to be used as synonymous with the πρωτοτόκια. Reuben, though the πρωτότοκος, ούκ έγενεαλογήθη είς πρωτοτόκια... ή εὐλογία (the birthright, Revised Version) τοῦ 'Ιωσήφ. For the phrase κληρονομείν την εύλογίαν, see I Pet. iii. g.

άπεδοκιμάσθη] 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 αποδοκιμάζειν, see (1) Psalm cxviii. 22 (λίθον δν απεδοκίμασαν of olkodomouves $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$.) with its frequent quotations or reminiscences in the New Testament (Matt. xxi. 42. Mark viii. 31. xii. 10. Luke ix. 22. xvii. xx. 17. 1 Pet. ii. 4, 7), 25. and (2) Jer. vi. 30, ἀργύριον αποδεδοκιμασμένον καλέσατε αύτούς, ότι απεδοκίμασεν αυτούς Kúpios. vii. 29. xiv. 19. xxxi. (xxxviii. B) 37. Wisd. ix. 4, $\mu \eta$ με αποδοκιμάσης έκ παίδων σου.

μετανοίας γάρ] The difficulty of the passage lies in two words, μ eravoías and aŭr ηv . (1) Of $\mu \epsilon \tau$ ávola in its uniform Scriptural sense, of *repentance* as distinguished from regret or remorse (see notes on vi. 1, µeravoias, and vii. 21, $\mu\epsilon\tau a\mu\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\eta'$ - $\sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$), 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 $a\pi\epsilon$ δοκιμάσθη, 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 $\mu\epsilon\tau a\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon a$ (the proper word for Esau) would have

18 Οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε ψηλαφωμένω καὶ

been quite inadequate. But. even with $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a} \nu o \iota a$, the terrible idea that repentance itself was sought and was not to be found is a mere perversion of the words. Α μετανοίας τόπος, a locus penitentia, 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 avin' refer, the nearer metavolas or the more remote alloyíar? There is no pretence for saying that Esau sought repentance and could not find it. What Esau sought with tears was the είλοyía, and to it alone can avryv refer with any shadow of adherence to the history even if spiritualized into allegory. The simple explanation of the difficulty is that the words $\mu\epsilon\tau$ avoias γαρ τόπον ούχ εύρεν are practically parenthetical to the main When he would fain sentence. 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.

μετὰ δακρύων] Gen. xxvii. 34, 38, ἀνεβόησε φωνὴν μεγάλην καὶ πικρὰν σφόδρα...ἀνεβόησε φωνῆ Ἡσαῦ καὶ ἔκλαυσε.

εκζητήσας αὐτήν] That is, τὴν εὐλογίαν. Gen. xxvii. 31, 34, 36, 38, ὅπως εὐλογήσῃ με ἡ ψυχή σου...εὐλόγησον δὴ κἀμέ, πάτερ...οὐχ ὑπελίπου μοι εὐλογίαν, πάτερ;...μὴ εὐλογία μία σοί ἐστι, πάτερ ; εὐλόγησον δὴ κἀμέ, πάτερ. For ἐκζητεῖν, see note on xi. 6.

18. $O\dot{v} \gamma \dot{a} \rho$ An urgent reason for the preceding earnest Very different is exhortation. 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 communion with a God of love, 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, vi. 14, άμαρτία γαρ ύμων ου κυριεύσει, ου γάρ έστε υπό νόμον αλλα ύπο χάριν.

προσεληλύθατε] Deut.iv.11, καὶ προσήλθετε καὶ ἔστητε ὑπὸ τὸ ὅρος.

 $\psi\eta\lambda a\phi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\phi]$ The great manuscripts omit $\check{o}\rho\epsilon\iota$ (which nevertheless verse 22, with its emphasis on $\Sigma\iota\omega\nu$, seems almost to presuppose), and leave only the alternative explanation, (1)

κεκαυμένω πυρὶ καὶ γνόφω καὶ ζόφω καὶ θυἐλλῃ καὶ σάλπιγγος ἤχω καὶ φωνῷ ῥημάτων, 19 ἦς οἱ ἀκούσαντες παρῃτήσαντο μὴ προστε-

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 κεκαυμένω might agree with $\pi v \rho i$, a kindled fire (Psalm 3, πῦρ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ καυθήσεται κ.τ.λ., and πυρ καιόμενον frequently). But (a) $\pi \hat{\nu} \rho \psi \eta \lambda a$ φώμενον is so strange a combination, and (b) the phrase καίεσθαι πυρί is so frequent in this connexion (see Deut. iv. ΙΙ, καί τὸ ὄρος ἐκαίετο πυρί ἕως καρδίας (omit B) τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. v. 23. ix. 15), that we must prefer (1) to (2). The verb $\psi \eta \bar{\lambda} a \phi \hat{a} \nu$ (from $\psi \dot{a} \omega$, to touch or rub) has two main uses, (1) to feel (as in Gen. xxvii. 12, 21, 22. Luke xxiv. 39. 1 John i. 1), (2) to *feel after*, as a thing groped for in the dark (as in Deut. xxviii. 20, καὶ ἔση ψηλαφῶν μεσημβρίας, ώς εἰ ψηλαφήσαι ὁ τυφλὸς (Α, εἶ τις ψ. τ. Β) έν τῷ σκότει. Isai. lix. 10, ψηλαφήσουσιν ώς τυφλοὶ τοιχον κ.τ.λ. Acts xvii. 27, ζητειν τόν Θεόν, εί άρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αυτόν και ευροιεν κ.τ.λ.). Here probably the former is the sense (in consideration of the $\kappa \epsilon \kappa a \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \psi \pi \nu \rho \epsilon$), though the γνόφω καὶ ζόφω might favour the latter (an object felt or groped for in the darkness).

γνόφψ] Gloom. From νέφος. It occurs only here in the New Testament, but is frequent in the Septuagint, as in Exod. x. 22, καὶ ἐγένετο σκότος, γνόφος, θύελλα ἐπὶ πᾶσαν γῆν Αἰγύπτου τρεῖς ἡμέρας. xx. 21, Μωυσῆς δὲ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν γνόφον, οῦ ῆν ἐκεῖ (omit B) ὁ Θεός. See also Exod. xix. 16, καὶ νεφέλη γνοφώδης ἐπ᾽ ὅρους Σινᾶ.

 $\dot{\zeta} \phi \phi \phi$] Mist. Akin to $\zeta \dot{\epsilon} \phi v$ pos (a wind often represented as stormy and rainy). The revised text reads $\zeta \dot{\phi} \phi \phi$ for $\sigma \kappa \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon$. The word does not occur in the Septuagint. In the New Testament, see 2 Pet. ii. 4, 17, $\sigma \epsilon \mu \rho \hat{\rho} \hat{\varsigma}$ $\zeta \dot{\phi} \phi v \dots \dot{\delta} \zeta \dot{\phi} \phi \delta \tau \sigma v \sigma \kappa \dot{\sigma} \tau \sigma v s$. Jude 6, 13.

 $\theta v \epsilon \lambda \lambda y$] Storm. From $\theta \dot{v} \epsilon v$, to rush (formed like $\check{a} \epsilon \lambda \lambda a$ from $\check{a} \epsilon u \nu$). It occurs only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint, only in Exod. x. 22 (quoted above). Deut. iv. 11, $\sigma \kappa \dot{\sigma} \sigma s$, $\gamma v \dot{\sigma} \phi s$, $\theta \dot{v} \epsilon \lambda \lambda a$. V. 22.

19. σάλπιγγος ήχω] Exod. xix. 16, 19, φωνή τῆς σάλπιγγος ήχει μέγα... ἐγίνοντο δὲ ai φωναὶ τῆς σάλπιγγος προβαίνουσαι ἰσχυρότεραι σφόδρα. xx. 18, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν τῆς σάλπιγγος.

φωνή βημάτων] Deut. iv. 12, καὶ ἐλάλησε Κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς [ἐν τῷ ὅρει] ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρός φωνήν βημάτων (ήν Β)

20 θηναι αύτοις λόγον οὐκ ἔφερον γὰρ τὸ διαστελλόμενον, Κἂν θηρίον θίγη τοῦ ὄρους,

ύμεῖς ἠκούσατε, καὶ ὁμοίωμα οὐκ εἴδετε, ἀλλ' ἢ φωνήν.

ής οἱ ἀκούσαντες] See Exod. xx. 19, καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς Μωυσῆν, Λάλησον σừ ἡμῖν, καὶ μὴ λαλείτω πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεός, μήποτε ἀποθάνωμεν.

παρητήσαντο] Of the two uses of mapaireiorbai (both classical), the positive and the negative, (1) to beg something of another (tí tiva or and or mapa τ ivos), and (2) to beg off from oneself (whether $\tau \iota$ or $\tau \iota v \dot{a}$), to deprecate, decline or refuse, the former is found in the Septuagint, 1 Sam. xx. 6, 28 (παραιτούμενος παρητήσατο απ' έμοῦ Δαυίδ δραμείν ... παρήτηται Δαυίδ παρ' έμου έως είς Βηθλεέμ τ. π. αὐτοῦ πορευθήναι) and Esth. iv. 8, but only the latter in the New Testament. See verse 25. Also Luke xiv. 18, 19. Acts xxv. 11, ού παραιτοῦμαι το ἀποbareîr. 1 Tim. iv. 7. v. 11. 2 Tim. ii. 23. Tit. iii. 10. 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.

 $\mu \eta'$] The Sinaitic manuscript omits $\mu \eta'$. Its insertion after $\pi a \rho \eta \tau \eta' \sigma a \nu \tau \sigma$ (to express the *negative result*) is idiomatic, but not indispensable.

 $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \epsilon \theta \eta v \alpha l$ The phrase is

evidently suggested by Deut. v. 25, έαν προσθώμεν ακοῦσαι ήμεῖς (Α, προσθώμεθα ή. ἀκ. Β) τὴν φωνὴν Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ ήμῶν ἔτι, καὶ ἀποθανούμεθα. xviii. 16, κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἤτήσω ...λέγοντες, Οὐ προσθήσομεν τοῦ (omit B) ἀκοῦσαι τὴν φωνὴν Κυρίου κ.τ.λ.

20. οὐκ ἔφερον γάρ] For this sense of φέρειν (to endure), see Rom. ix. 22, ἦνεγκεν ἐν πολλŷ μακροθυμία σκείη ὀργŷs. Also Deut. i. 12, πῶς δυνήσομαι φέρειν μόνος (μ. φ. Β) τὸν κόπον ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ. Jer. xliv. (li. B) 22, οὐκ ἦδύνατο Κύριος ἔτι φέρειν ἀπὸ προσώπου πονηρίας πραγμάτων ὑμῶν.

το διαστελλόμενον] In the Septuagint $\delta_{ia\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\nu}$ is used in all voices, active, middle, and passive. From its original sense to put asunder, set apart, separate (as Gen. xxx. 35. Num. viii. 14, τούς Λευίτας. xvi. 9. Deut. xix. 7, τρείς πόλεις. Ι Chron. xxiii. 13, διεστάλη 'Ααρών ... τοῦ θυμιαν κ.τ.λ. Ruth i. 17. &c.), it passes into various modifications, such as to disperse or scatter (Psalm lxviii. 14. Mic. v. 8), to specify (Gen. xxx. 28 τον μισθόν σου. Lev. v. 4, μεθ' бркоv. &c.), or explain (Neh. viii. 8); and in the middle voice to state clearly, to give explicit warning (Ezek. iii. 18, &c., où

λιθοβοληθήσεται· καὶ (οὕτω Φοβερὸν ἦν τὸ 21 Φανταζόμενον) Μωυσῆς εἶπεν, Ἐκφοβός εἰμι καὶ ἐντρομος· ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιών ὄρει 22

xii. 21. Or *Eктроµ*os.

διεστείλω αὐτῷ, οὐδὲ ἐλάλησας (omit ουδε ελ. Β) του διαστείλασθαι τῷ ἀνόμω κ.τ.λ.). In the New Testament it is only used (elsewhere) in the middle voice, and always in the sense of explicitly or distinctly commanding. Mark v. 43, και διεστείλατο αύτοις πολλά ίνα μηδείς κ.τ.λ. vii. 36. viii. 15, και διεστέλλετο αύτοις λέγων κ.τ.λ. ix. 9. Acts xv. 24, οίς ου διεστειλάμεθα. 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 (τα διεσταλ- $\mu \epsilon \nu a$) in this sense.

Κάν θηρίον] A somewhat loose quotation of Exod. xix. 12, 13, προσέχετε έαυτοις τοῦ ἀναβῆναι εἰς τὸ ὅρος καὶ θιγείν τι αὐτοῦ...οὐχ ἄψεται αὐτοῦ χείρ ἐν γὰρ λίθοις λιθοβοληθήσεται, ἢ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται· ἐάν τε κτῆνος, ἐάν τε ἄνθρωπος, οῦ ζήσεται.

 $\theta\eta\rho(\sigma v)$ Used by classical writers for any animal, even for fishes. Here substituted for the Septuagint rendering $\kappa\tau\eta\bar{\gamma}vos$, for which see 1 Cor. xv. 39, ανθρώπων...κτηνών...πτηνών
 ...ιχθύων.

το φανταζόμενον] The sight presented. The verb φαντάζειν (from φαντός) is to make visible. Wisd. vi. 17 (16 B), και εν ταις τρίβοις φαντάζεται αυτοις εύμενως. Hence φαντασία, display (Acts xxv. 23. Hab. ii. 18, φαντασίαν ψευδη. &c.), sometimes lightning (Zech. x. 1), and φάντασμα, an apparition or spectre (Matt. xiv. 26. Mark vi. 49. Wisd. xvii. 14).

^{*}Εκφοβός είμι] Deut. ix. 19, και έκφοβός είμι δια την δργήν και τον θυμόν (A, τ. θ. κ. τ. δ. B), ότι παρωξύνθη Κύριος έφ' υμίν. But this was said at a later time and on a different occasion. And the words kal evropous (or έκτρομος, the reading of the Sinaitic manuscript) are nowhere found used by Moses. For evτρομος, see Acts vii. 32, έντρομos δε γενόμενοs Μωυσήs (at the burning bush) οὐκ ἐτόλμα κατανοήσαι. xvi. 29, καὶ ἔντρομος γενόμενος προσέπεσεν τ \hat{arphi} Π. καὶ Dan. x. 11, avéorny év-Σ. τρομος.

22. αλλά προσεληλ.] Con-

καί πόλει Θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίω,

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.

 $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda v \theta a \tau \epsilon$ This perfect is too commonly read as a future, and the whole description relegated into a world The effect is beyond death. 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, o eddoynjoas ήμας... έν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστώ. ii. 6, καί συνεκάθισεν έν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Phil. iii. 20, ήμων γαρ το πολίτευμα έν ούρανοῖς υπάρχει. Col. iii. 3, καὶ ή ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σύν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ,

 $\Sigma_{i\omega\nu} \delta_{\rho\epsilon i}$ In the 23 passages of the Septuagint where the two words are combined the order is uniformly opos Liwr (with whatever slight variations in the presence or absence of the article), and not $\Sigma_{\iota}\omega\nu$ opos. Evidently here the 'Zion mountain' is mentally contrasted with another, the 'Sinai mountain.' And thus the omission of $\delta \rho \epsilon_i$ in the revised text of verse 18 is virtually supplied. For the thought, compare Isai. ii. 3, δεύτε καὶ ἀναβῶμεν εἰς τὸ ὅρος τοῦ (omit B) Κυρίου...ἐκ γὰρ Σιών εξελεύσεται νόμος, και λόγος Κυρίου έξ Ίερουσαλήμ. For Σιών here (in the New Testament almost always in quotations from the Septuagint, as Matt. xxi, 5. John xii. 15. Rom. ix. 33. xi. 26. 1 Pet. ii. 6), compare Rev. xiv. 1, Kai cidor, και ίδου το αρνίον έστος έπι το όρος Σιών.

καὶ πόλει] It is a mistake to treat this as a new particular, distinct from Liwy oper. Mount 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. 2, των άγίων...και της σκηνήs), but rather, Mount Zion and (on it) the holy city. In confirmation of this identity of $\Sigma_{i\omega}$ and $\pi \delta_{i\beta}$, see, for example, Isai. lx. 14, και κληθήση πόλις Κυρίου, Σιών (Α, π. Σ. Β) αγίου Ίσραήλ.

XII. 23.

καί μυριάσιν άγγέλων πανηγύρει, και έκκλησία 23

πόλει Θεοῦ ζώντος, 'Ι.] See Matt. v. 35, μήτε εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶν τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως. Rev. iii. 12, τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ Θεοῦ μου, τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ καταβαίνουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ μου.

'Ιερουσαλήμ] Of the two forms 'Ιερουσαλήμ and 'Ιεροσό- $\lambda v \mu a$, 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, St John only the and ii. I. latter, except in Rev. iii. 12. xxi. 2, 10. In St Matthew and St Mark Ίεροσόλυμα predominates, in St Luke and the Acts **Γ**_{ερονσαλήμ}, though both forms are found in all these.

ἐπουρανίω] Applied to Jerusalem here only. But see quotation in a former note from Rev. iii. 12. Also Rev. xxi. 2, καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἀγίαν, Ἱερουσαλὴμ καινήν, εἶδον καταβαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Compare Gal. iv. 26, ἡ δὲ ἀνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ κ.τ.λ. For ἐπουράνιος, see note on iii. 1.

καὶ μυριάσιν] There are three possible combinations of the words which follow. (1) The first of these is preferred by the Authorized Version and adopted by the Revised : καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίą πρωτοτόκων κ.τ.λ., and to tens of thousands of Angels, to a $\pi a v \eta$ rupis and erringia of the firstborn. (2) The second is, rai μυριάσιν, άγγέλων πανηγύρει καί έκκλησία πρωτοτόκων κ.τ.λ., and to tens of thousands, even (a) a $\pi a \nu \eta \gamma \nu \rho \rho s of Angels and (b) an$ ἐκκλησία of the firstborn (making $\mu v \rho_i a \sigma_i v$ include both the $\pi a v \eta$ γυρις άγγέλων and the έκκλησία πρωτοτόκων). (3) The third is, καί μυριάσιν άγγέλων πανηγύρει, και εκκλησία πρωτοτόκων, and to tens of thousands, even a $\pi a \nu \eta \gamma v$. ρις of Angels; and to an ἐκκλησία of the firstborn (restricting the μυριάσιν to the παιήγυρις άγγέλων, and making και ἐκκλησία 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 rai, and also involves the cumbersome and inelegant combination of the words πανηγύρει και εκκλησία for πρωτοτόκων to depend upon. The second strikes the ear as prosaic in its formal distribution of μv ριάσιν into two constituents: also the two constituents seem to have no special point of connexion which could justify the severance of the $\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \tau \sigma \kappa \sigma \iota$ from a subsequent particular, that of the πνεύματα δικαίων τετελειωμένων. On the whole, the third 🖊 seems the best. The combination of μυριάσιν with άγγέλων

πρωτοτόκων απογεγραμμένων έν ούρανοῖς, καί

πανηγύρει alone presents no realdifficulty—tens of thousands,even a πανήγυρις of Angelsand it leaves to each of the sixclauses after the first its ownκαι to open it.

μυρίάσιν] We have the same word in connexion with Angels in Deut. xxxiii. 2, Κύριος ἐκ Σινῶ ἦκει...σὺν μυριάσι Κ., ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἀγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. Psalm lxviii. 17, τὸ ἄρμα τοῦ Θεοῦ μυρισπλάσιον, χιλιάδες κ.τ.λ. Dan. vii. 10, χίλιαι χιλιάδες ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῷ, καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ. Jude 14, ἰδοῦ ἦλθεν Κύpιος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ. Rev. v. 11, ἦκουσα φωνὴν ἀγγέλων πολλῶν...καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν μυριάδες μυριάδων κ.τ.λ.

 $\pi a v \eta \gamma v \rho \epsilon i$] By derivation $(\pi \hat{a}s, d\gamma \epsilon i \rho \omega), a general assem$ bly: but by usage, an assembly gathered for a festival, a festal throng. See Ezek. xlvi. 11, ev ταίς έορταις και έν ταις πανηγύρεσιν κ.τ.λ. Hos. ii. 11, πάσας τάς εύφροσύνας αύτης, τάς (omit B) έορτας αυτής...και πάσας τας πανηγύρεις αυτής. ix. 5, τί ποιήσετε έν ημέρα (-pais B) πανηγύρεως, και έν ήμεραις (-ρα Β) έορτής τού Κυρίου; Amos v. 21, άπωσμαι έορτας ύμων, και ού μή όσφρανθώ θυσίας έν ταις πανηγύρεσιν ύμῶν. And so the verb (πανηγυρίζειν) in Isai. lxvi. 10, εὐφράνθητε άμα Ἱερουσαλήμ (Α, -ητι Ί. Β), καὶ πανηγυρίσατε έν

αὐτή ... χαρήτε άμα αὐτή κ.τ.λ. Thus the word, so suitable to the Angels, would be far less suitable to the $\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \tau \sigma \kappa \sigma \iota$ as explained in the next verse. For the statement, $\pi \rho \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \dot{\upsilon} \theta a \tau \epsilon$ άγγέλων πανηγύρει, see the passages 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 Father. They are there, not in selfish repose, but in perpetual ministry for sinful and suffering They have charge mankind. concerning you in your perilous pilgrimage, invisible helpers and guardians in your hours of loneliness and temptation.

23. και έκκλησία πρωτ. Α third particular of the Christian's present access. And to a living assembly of firstborn sons enrolled already in heaven. Τt You is a thought of comfort. are not alone. You are in communion and fellowship, even here on earth, with a great multitude which no man can number. And though on earth all is change, tumult, warfare, temptation, yet be of good cheer, the Lord knoweth them that are His, knows them by name. For έκκλησία, see note ou ii. 12, έκκλησίas. The word might include all Christian people

κριτή Θεώ πάντων, και πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετε-

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 $i\pi\sigma\gamma\epsilon-\gamma\rho\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\nu$ (enrolled, not yet rere- $\lambda\epsilon\mu\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\nu$), gives to the church of the firstborn the distinctive sense of the Christian living, the true Church on earth.

πρωτοτόκων] Evidently the point of the title lies in the devotion or consecration to God of the firstborn sons under the law. Exod. xiii. 2, άγίασόν μοι πâν πρωτότοκον πρωτογενές...έν τοις νίοις Ίσραήλ. xxii. 29, τὰ πρωτότοκα τῶν νίῶν σου δώσεις έμοί. Num. iii. 13. viii. 17. xviii. 15. &c.

 $d\pi o\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a \mu \mu \epsilon v \omega v$ Enrolled (registered) in heaven, not yet arrived there in personal presence. The word $a\pi \alpha \gamma \rho a \phi a \nu$ occurs in Jud. viii. 14. Prov. xxii. 20. Luke ii. 1, 5. (Also άπογραφή, 2 Macc. ii. 1. 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, &c., έπίσκεψαι πῶν πρωτότοκον ἄρσεν τών υίων Ισραήλ...λάβε τους Λευίτας αντί πάντων των πρωτοτόκων κ.τ.λ.

άπογεγρ. ἐν οὐρανοῖς] The idea of a record of names kept in heaven is found first in Exod. xxxii. 32, 33, ἐξάλεψον κἀμὲ

(-ψόν με Β) ἐκ τῆς βίβλου σου ης έγραψας. Psalm lxix. 28. Isai. iv. 3, άγιοι κληθήσονται πάντες οι γραφέντες είς ζωήν έν Ίερουσαλήμ. Dan. xii. 1, έν τῶ καιρώ εκείνω σωθήσεται ό λαός σου, πας δ εύρεθείς [δ] γεγραμμένος (πας ο γεγρ. Β) έν τη βίβλω. Luke x. 20, χαίρετε δε ότι τα όνόματα ύμων έγγέγραπται έν τοις oupavois. Phil. iv. 3, we ta ovoματα έν βίβλω ζωής. Rev. iii. 5, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐξαλείψω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ έκ τής βίβλου τής ζωής. xiii. 8, έν τῷ βιβλίω τής ζωής τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου ἀπὸ καταβυλής κόσμου, xvii. 8. xx. 12, και άλλο βιβλίον ήνοίχθη, δ έστιν τής ζωής. xxi. 27.

καὶ κριτ $\hat{\eta}$ Θ. π . A fourth particular. You have not to live in dread of a future terrible experience of a judgment anxious 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: $\Theta_{\epsilon \hat{\omega}}$ is interposed between $\kappa \rho_i \tau \hat{\gamma}$ and $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$, in the characteristic style of the Epistle, which loves trajection,

24 λειωμένων, καὶ διαθήκης νέας μεσίτη Ἰησοῦ, καὶ αίματι ῥαντισμοῦ κρεῖττον λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν

and with an intimacy of connexion which adds to the force of the whole. For God the Judge, see James iv. 12, είς έστιν νομοθέτης και κριτής.

καὶ $\pi v \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a \sigma i v$ A fifth par-Not only have you ticular. 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.

 $\pi v \epsilon \psi \mu a \sigma w$ The distinctive word for the spiritual being of the intermediate state. Compare I Pet. iii. 19 (roîs èv φυλακή $\pi v \epsilon \dot{v} \mu a \sigma v$, the only true parallel, though widely different in context. A comparison of Rev. vi. 9 will show the propriety of the choice of $\pi v \epsilon \dot{\nu} \mu a \tau a$ here. There are seen the woxaí, the martyred lives, ύποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, crying for satisfaction. Here the advent of the Christian is to the spirits awaiting in a paradise of blessedness the consummation of resurrection.

δικαίων] Righteous, in the sense of St Paul (Rom. i. 17.

v. 19) and of this Epistle (x. 38. xi. 4).

τετελειωμένων] Consummated, in reference to the education of this life, its trials and perils. Safe for ever. Still waiting the τελείωσις of resurrection and glory. See notes on ii. 10 (τελειώσαι) and xi. 40 (τελειωθώσιν).

24. καὶ διαθήκης] A sixth particular. The thought of the perfected righteous suggests that of the Saviour to whom all their happiness is due. The Saviour is not only δ έρχόμενος, you already προσεληλύθατε to Him (John vi. 35).

διαθήκης] See note on vii. 22.

véas] See note on viii. 8, $\kappa \alpha \nu \eta \nu$. The Gospel $\delta \iota a \theta \eta \kappa \eta$, which is $\kappa \alpha \iota \nu \eta$ as being new in kind, is also véa as being (1) recent (in comparison with the Mosaic covenant) in time, and (2) ever fresh and young in virtue of an ever replenishing (because eternal) life.

μεσίτη] See note on viii. 6, μεσίτης.

Ίησοῦ] The human name, so full of the saving character (Matt. i. 21, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν), so attractive therefore to the struggling and militant Church.

Άβελ. βλέπετε μη παραιτήσησθε τον λα- 25 λοῦντα. εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἐξέφυγον ἐπὶ γῆς

kai aiµarı] A seventh and last particular. In having come to Jesus you have come also to that atoming blood, which, unlike another of which the old Scripture tells, cries for mercy, not for vengeance, upon the soul that has sinned.

alμ. partoμoῦ] Λ blood of (for) sprinkling. That is, designed and available for application to the human conscience clogged and defiled by the sense of sin. Compare 1 Pet. i. 2, eis υπακοήν και ραντισμόν αίματος 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ. There the blood is spoken of in its use, here in its purpose. For partifeir and partionos, see note on ix. 13. 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 alua itself, see note on ix. 14, τὸ αἶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

κρείττον λαλοῦντι] Speaking a better thing than Abel when he, being dead, yet by his blood cried to God against his murderer. The word is $\beta o \hat{\rho}$ (evidently inappropriate here) in Gen. iv. 10, but $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota}$ in Heb. xi. 4. And $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$ may have been chosen here in preparation for the $\lambda a \lambda o \hat{\upsilon} \nu \tau a$ of verse 25, and in allusion to the frequent use of $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$ in reference to the voice on Sinai. See, for example, Exod. xx. 1, 19, 22. Deut. iv. 12, 33. &c.

25. βλέπετε] See note on iii. 12, βλέπετε, αδελφοί.

παραιτήσησθε] See note on verse 19, παρητήσαντο. Here with an accusative of the person refused, as in I Tim. v. 11 (χήρας) and Tit. iii. 10 (aiρετικον āνθρωπον).

τόν λαλοῦντα] In Christ and the Gospel, in contrast with the λαλῶν at Sinai in terror and judgment.

εί γἆρ εκείνοι] For the argument, see ii. 2, 3, εί γαρ ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος κ.τ.λ.

έκεινοι] See iv. 2, έκείνους.

έξέφυγον] For this ἐκφεύγειν (without explanation of the thing to be dreaded), see ii. 3, πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα κ.τ.λ.

 $\epsilon \pi i \gamma \eta s \pi$. $\tau \delta \nu \chi$.] Instead of $\tau \delta \nu \epsilon \pi i \gamma \eta s \chi$. π . This is shown by the $\tau \delta \nu a \pi' \delta v \delta \mu a \nu \omega \nu$ which follows. For this inverted order (characteristic of the Epistle), see note on xii. 11, $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \sigma \nu \eta s$.

παραιτησάμενοι τὸν χρηματίζοντα, πολὺ μᾶλλον 26 ἡμεῖς οἱ τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἀποστρεφόμενοι. οὗ ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσεν τότε, νῦν δὲ ἐπήγ-

xii. 25. Or odpavoû.

παραιτησάμενοι] In the innocent (Deut. v. 28, ὀρθώς... ελάλησαν) '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.

τον χρηματίζοντα] Him who dealt with them. See note on viii. 5, κεχρημάτισται.

πολύ μαλλον ήμεις] Understand οὐκ ἐκφευξόμεθα.

 $\eta\mu\epsilon\hat{s}$ oi] We who. A merciful condescension, allying the writer with the *refusers* of the voice.

τον ἀπ' οὐρανῶν] Understand χρηματίζοντα. For the thought of the Gospel being in all its utterances a voice from heaven, see note on iii. I, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου. The key to it is found in the divine personality of the Holy Spirit, whose voice the Gospel is. See I Pet. i. 12, ἂ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῶν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμῶς πνεύματι ἁγίω ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ.

άποστρεφόμενοι] The middle and passive tenses of άποστρέφειν, to turn away from, besides the obvious construction with and (as Jer. iii. 19, $\pi a \tau \epsilon \rho a$ $\kappa a \lambda \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon$, $\kappa a \lambda a \pi^* \epsilon \mu o v v v v$ $a \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \rho a \phi \eta \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$), take also the simple accusative of the person forsaken or shunned. Thus, for example, Jer. xv. 6, $\sigma v a \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \rho a$ $\phi \eta s \mu \epsilon$, $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon i K v \rho i o s.$ Matt. v. 42, $\tau \delta v \theta \epsilon \lambda \delta v \tau a$ $a \pi \delta \sigma \sigma v \delta \delta a v \epsilon \epsilon \sigma a \sigma \theta a i \mu \eta a \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \rho a \phi \eta s.$ 2 Tim. i. 15, $a \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \rho a \phi \eta \sigma \delta r v e \epsilon$ $\delta v \tau \eta^* A \sigma (q. Tit. i. 14, a v \theta \rho \delta \pi \omega v$ $a \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \phi o \mu \epsilon v w v \tau \eta v a \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i a v.$

26. οῦ ἡ φωνή] From φωνη ἡημάτων in verse 19. See note there.

 $\tau \eta \nu \gamma \eta \nu$] In preparation for the quotation from Haggai, which speaks of earth and heaven.

ἐσάλευσεν] From σάλος, the swell of the sea (Psalm lxxxix. 9, σὺ δεσπόζεις τοῦ κράτους τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸν δὲ σάλον τῶν κυμάτων αὐτῆς σὺ καταπραὑνεις. Jon. i. 15, καὶ ἔστη ἡ θάλασσα ἐκ τοῦ σάλου κ.τ.λ.), σαλεύειν is to make to rock or reel, to shake, in all senses, literal and figurative. It occurs some 70 times in the Septuagint. For example, Psalm xviii. 7, ἐσαλεύθη καὶ ἔντρομος ἐγενήθη ἡ γῆ, καὶ τὰ θεμέλια τῶν ὀρέων ἐταράχθησαν καὶ ἐσαλεύθησαν.

γελται λέγων, "Ετι άπαξ έγω σείσω οὐ μόνον

xlviii. 5, έθαύμασαν, έταράχθησαν, ἐσαλεύθησαν. xcvi. 11. σαλευθήτω ή θάλασσα καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτής. Isai. vii. 2. ύν τρόπον έν δρυμώ ξύλον ύπο πνεύματος σαλευθή. And so Matt. xi. 7. xxiv. 29. Luke vi. 48, και ούκ ίσχυσεν σαλεῦσαι αὐτὴν κ.τ.λ. Acts iv. 31, έσαλεύθη ο τόπος κ.τ.λ. xvi. 26, ὦστε σαλευθήναι τὰ θεμέλια κ.τ.λ. And metaphorically, Acts xvii. 13, σαλεύοντες και ταράσσοντες τους δχλους. 2 Thess. ii. 2, els τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθήναι υμας από του νοός.

τότε] At the giving of the law. Jud. v. 4, 5, γη ἐσείσθη ...ὅρη ἐσαλεύθησαν...τοῦτο Σινα ἀπὸ προσώπου Κυρίου Θεοῦ Ἱσραήλ. Psalm lxviii. 8.

 $v\hat{v}v$] In these days of Christ and the Gospel. In reference to the introduction of the new δia - $\theta \eta \kappa \eta$. For this use of $v\hat{v}v$ (or $vv\hat{v}$) see Rom. iii. 21, and note there. The interval of time between the first and the second advent is generally left unnoticed in the Old Testament, and so here; for the prophecy about to be quoted has its fulfilment still in the future.

 $\epsilon \pi \eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau a i$] He (God) has promised. (1) For $\epsilon \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda$. $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a i$, see note on vi. 13. The passive form $\epsilon \pi \eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau a i$, used in a middle sense, occurs also in Rom. iv. 21, δτι δ $\epsilon \pi \eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau a i$ δυνατός έστιν καὶ ποιήσαι. In Gal. iii. 19, $\epsilon \pi \eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau a \iota$ is probably passive in sense as well as in form. And so in 2 Macc. iv. 27, $\tau \omega \nu$ $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \pi \eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \tau \tilde{\omega}$ $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \chi \sigma \eta \mu \dot{a} \tau \omega \nu$. (2) The prophecy is quoted as *promise*, for such it is to the faithful, notwithstanding its imagery of terror. Compare Luke xxi. 28.

"Eτι aπaξ] Hag. ii. 6, 7 (7, 8 Β), τάδε λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ, "Ετι απαξ έγω σείσω τον ούρανον και την γην, και την θάλασσαν καί την ξηράν, καί συσσείσω πάντα τα έθνη, και ήξει τα έκλεκτα πάντων των έθνων, καί πληρώσω (πλήσω Β) τον οίκον τοῦτον δόξης, λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ. The prophecy was expressly given as an encouragement 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 dispensation is foretold. And that, not in its *inception* in the *first* advent, but in its consummation in the second.

ἔτι ἄπαξ] Yet once. Once more and once only. Gen. xviii. 32, ἐἀν λαλήσω ἔτι ἅπαξ; ἐἀν δὰ εύρεθῶσιν ἐκεῖ δέκα; Jud. vi. 39, λαλήσω ἔτι ἅπαξ, καὶ πειράσω (δὴ καί γε B) ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐν τῷ πόκῳ κ.τ.λ.

σείσω] The words σείειν and σαλεύειν are here used 27 την γην άλλα και τον ουρανόν. το δε έτι άπαξ δηλοι την των σαλευομένων μετάθεσιν ώς 28 πεποιημένων, ίνα μείνη τα μη σαλευόμενα. διό

xii. 27. Or omit Thr.

interchangeably. And so commonly in the Septuagint and Compare, for New Testament. example, Matt. xi. 7 (κάλαμον ύπο ανέμου σαλευόμενον) with Rev. vi: 13 (συκη ... υπο ανέμου μεγάλου σειομένη). Acts xvi. 26 (σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας ὦστε σαλευθήναι τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου) with Matt. xxvii. 51 (ή γή εσείσθη και αι πέτραι εσχίσθησαν). Acts xvii. 13 (σαλεύοντες καί ταράσσοντες τούς όχλους) with Matt. xxi. 10 (ἐσείσθη πάσα ή πόλις). 2 Thess. ii. 2 with Matt. xxviii. 4.

ov μόνον... ἀλλὰ καί] A variation for the sake of emphasis.

27. $\tau \delta \delta \epsilon \epsilon \tau i \tilde{a}\pi a \xi$] The neuter article serves the purpose (as usual) of the inverted commas of quotation. See, for example, iii. 3, $\tau \delta$ $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \sigma \nu$. Matt. xix. 18, $\tau \delta$ of $\phi \sigma \nu \epsilon \delta \sigma \epsilon \epsilon s$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. Rom. xiii. 9, $\tau \delta$ $\gamma a \rho$ of $\mu \sigma i \chi \epsilon \delta \sigma \epsilon s$, $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. Gal. v. 14, $\epsilon \nu$ $\tau \phi$ $\delta \gamma a \pi \eta \sigma \epsilon s$, $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. Eph. iv. 9, $\tau \delta$ $\delta \epsilon$ $\delta \nu \epsilon \beta \eta \tau i \epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu \epsilon \ell \mu \eta \kappa.\tau.\lambda$.

δηλοί] By the finality of its terms. There can be no further thing after the έτι $aπa\xi$. For δηλοί, compare ix. 8, τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ay(ou.

τήν τών σαλ. μ.] The removal

of those things which are thus declared to be in process of being shaken. The prediction ($\sigma\epsilon(\sigma\omega)$) is treated as involving a process already at work ($\sigma a \lambda \epsilon v o \mu \epsilon v \omega \nu$). Compare viii. 13. See note on $\sigma\epsilon(\sigma\omega)$ (verse 26) for the identity (here implied) of $\sigma\epsilon(\epsilon \nu)$ and $\sigma a - \lambda\epsilon v \epsilon \nu$.

μετάθεσιν] Displacement (as in vii. 12), not mere transposition (as in xi. 5). See note on vii. 12.

ώς πεποιημένων] As of things made (created), and therefore essentially temporal and perishable. See note on i. 2, $\epsilon πoiη$ σεν.

ĩνα μείνη] Depending (practically) upon μετάθεσιν, not upon δηλοΐ. It is as if τὴν τῶν σ. μετάθεσιν had been τὸ τὰ σαλευόμενα μετατίθεσθαι. Created things are displaced, to bring into view the permanence of the eternal.

 $\mu \epsilon i \nu \eta$] See note on x. 34, $\mu \epsilon \nu o \nu \sigma a \nu$.

28. δ_{1d} Wherefore. Considering this prophecy ($\xi \tau_1 \ \delta \pi a \xi \kappa \cdot \tau \cdot \lambda$.), and the gracious purpose of it (iva $\mu \epsilon(v \eta \tau a \ \mu \eta \sigma$.), and our interest in it.

 β aσιλείαν] See note on i. 8, τῆς βασιλείας σου. The king-

XII. 27, 28.

βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον παραλαμβάνοντες ἔχωμεν χάριν, δι' ἡς λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ Θεῷ

xii. 28. Οτ έχομεν.

dom of Christ involves that of His people. See Dan. vii. 18, 22, 27, έως οῦ ἦλθεν ὁ παλαιὸς τῶν (Α, τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τὸν παλαιὸν Β) ἡμερῶν...καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν (Α, τὸ βασίλειον Β) κατέσχον οἱ ἀγιοι κ.τ.λ. Luke xxii. 29, κἀγῶ διατίθεμαι ὑμῦν καθῶς διέθετὁ μοι ὁ Πατήρ μου βασιλείαν. Rev. i. 6. V. 10, καὶ ἐποίησας αὐτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς, καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

ἀσάλευτον] Acts xxvii. 41. Also Exod. xiii. 16, καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖον ἔπὶ τῆς χειρός σου, καὶ ἀσάλευτον πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου. Deut. vi. 8. xi. 18.

παραλαμβάνοντες In course of receiving. The kingdom is not yet come, but the process of its coming is begun. The compound verb παραλαμβάνειν is (1) to take as by transmission from hand to hand (as in Mark vii. 4, και άλλα πολλά έστιν ά παρέλαβον κρατείν. Dan. v. 31, παρέλαβε την βασιλείαν. vii, 18, καί παραλήψονται την βασι- $\lambda \epsilon i a \nu$ a γ_{101} $\dot{\nu} \psi i \sigma \tau_{00}$. &c.), and so to take from the hand of another (as here, and Gal. i. 12, ούδε γαρ εγώ παρά άνθρώπου παρέλαβον αυτό. Phil. iv. 9. 2 Thess: iii. 6, κατά την παράδοσιν ήν παρελάβετε παρ' ήμων. &c.; (2) to take to (or by) one's side, to take to (or with) one (as in Matt. i. 20, 24. ii. 13, 14, 20, 21. xii. 45. John xiv. 3. Acts xv. 39. &c.).

 $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu}]$ Let us have. It is ours if we will. Let us keep having. It is the $\kappa\rhoa\tau\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ of iv. 14. Here, as in Rom. v. 1 ($\epsilon i\rho\eta'\nu\eta\nu$ $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu}$), there is a variety of reading between $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi\omega-}$ $\mu\epsilon\nu$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi\mu\epsilon\nu}$.

 $\chi \acute{a}\rho w$] See note on iv. 16, where it is distinguished from $\emph{e}\lambda \emph{cos}$. From its original sense of *free favour* comes that of *gracious influence*, for with God *feeling* is never divorced from *action. Benevolence* and *beneficence* are with Him one.

δί ης λατρεύωμεν] Per quam servianus (Vulgate). Whereby to serve. It is equivalent to iva δι αὐτης λ. A more frequent construction in Latin than in Greek. Compare Acts xxi, 16, ἄγοντες παρ' ξ ξενισθώμεν κ.τ.λ. For λατρεύειν, see note on viii. 5.

εὐαρέστως] The adverbial form (for which Xenophon is quoted) occurs only here in the New Testament. For εὐάρεστος, see xiii. 21, ποιῶν ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον. Rom. xii. 1, θυσίαν ἀγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ. xiv, 18. 2 Cor. v. 9. Eph, v.

29 μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον.

XIII. 1,2 Η φιλαδελφία μενέτω. της φιλοξενίας μή

10. Phil. iv. 18. Col. iii. 20. Tit. ii. 9. For the verb $\epsilon v a - \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon i \nu$, see xi. 5, 6. xiii. 16.

εύλαβείας και δέους] The reading of the revised text for the aldors rai evhaßelas of the received. (Thus alde's survives in Scripture in I Tim. ii. 9 only. We have $ai\delta\epsilon i\sigma\theta a\iota$ in 2 Macc. iv. 34, and αἰδήμων in 2 Mace. xv. 12.) For ευλάβεια, see note on v. 7. For Séos (found only here in the New Testament), see 2 Macc. iii. 17, 30, δέος τι και φρικασμός σώματος...δέους και ταραχής. xii. 22. xiii. 16, δέους και ταραχής. xv. 23, els déos και τρόμον.

29. кай үа́р] For also (besides other considerations). For rai váp, see note on v. 12. No attempt must be made to connect rai with nuŵv (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 rai belongs to the sentence, which is a quotation from Deut. iv. 24, ότι Κύριος ό Θεός σου πῦρ καταναλίσκον έστι, Θεός ζηλωτής. 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 triffing 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.'

XIII. I. 'H $\phi_i\lambda a\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi_i a$ $\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omega$] The chapter opens with separate precepts of Christian living. But it soon passes into the grand subject of the Epistle: the law in all its parts is a $\sigma\kappa a$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\delta\nu\tau\omega\nu$, $\tau\delta$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\sigma\omega\mu a$ $\tau\sigma\nu$ $X\rho_i\sigma\tau\sigma\nu$.

 $\eta \phi$.] The article makes it φιλαδελφία universal. So in verse 2, $\tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma \phi_i \lambda_0 \xi \epsilon \nu i \alpha \varsigma$. Compare Rom. xii. 9, 10, ή ἀγάπη... τή φιλαδελφία κ.τ.λ. I Thess. iv. 9, περί δε τής φιλαδελφίας. 2 Pet. i. 7, έν δε τη εύσεβεία την φιλαδελφίαν, έν δε τη φιλαδελφία την αγάπην. The grace of φιλαδελφία is only named (elsewhere) by St Paul and St Peter, though St John is full of it in the equivalent form of άγαπώμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς. In the passage quoted above from 2 Pet. i. 7, φιλαδελφία is distinguished from $\dot{a}\gamma\dot{a}\pi\eta$, the former being the love of Christians. the latter the love of mankind. (The word φιλάδελφοs occurs in

 $\mathbf{288}$

XII. 29. XIII. 1-3.

έπιλανθάνεσθε· διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ἕλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες ἀγγέλους. μιμνήσκεσθε τῶν δεσμίων 3 ώς συνδεδεμένοι, τῶν κακουχουμένων ὡς καὶ

the Septuagint, 2 Macc. xv. 14)

 $\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omega$] See notes on x. 34 ($\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu\sigma\mu\nu$) and xii. 27 ($\mu\epsilon\ell\nu\eta$).

2. $\tau \eta \varsigma \phi i \lambda o \xi \epsilon v i a \varsigma$ Love of strangers. The word hospitality has sunk from its Scripture level. Rom. xii. 13, την φιλο-Eeviar Siwkortes (as though a difficult grace; see note on xii. Also φιλόξενος, as one of the characteristic epithets of the presbyter (ἐπίσκοπος), standing between roopuos and Sidarτικόs, in 1 Tim. iii. 2 (compare Tit. i. 8); and as a universal Christian virtue, in I Pet. iv. 9, φιλόξενοι είς αλλήλους άνευ γογγυσμού. See also Matt. xxv. 35, ξένος ήμην και συνηγάγετέ 3 John 5, αγαπητέ, πιστον με. ποιείς ο έαν έργάση είς τους άδελφούς και τουτο ξένους.

 $\epsilon \pi i \lambda a \nu \theta a \nu \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$] Also verse 16, and vi. 10. 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 $\delta \pi_i$, an infinitive, or even a nominative participle.

čλαθόν τ. ξενίσαντες] 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. 18, 22. xiii. 15, 16.

3. μιμνήσκεσθε] See note on ii. 6, μιμνήσκη.

μ. τών δεσμίων] Matt. xxv. 36, εν φυλακή ήμην καὶ ήλθατε πρός με. Col. iv. 18, μνημονεύετέ μου τών δεσμών. See also notes on x. 34, καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε.

 $\dot{\omega}_{\text{s...}}$... $\dot{\omega}_{\text{s.}}$] The former $\dot{\omega}_{\text{s}}$ is as if, the latter as. The former prescribes an effort of feeling, the latter the recognition of a fact.

συνδεδεμένοι] The verb occurs only here in the New Testament. In the Septuagint, it generally means (like σύνδεσμος) to fetter, as in Exod. xiv. 25, καὶ συνέδησε τοὺς ἄξονας τῶν ἀρμάτων αὐτῶν. The nearest approach to the figurative sense here is in 1 Sam. xviii. 1, καὶ ή ψυχὴ Ἰωνάθαν συνεδέθη τῆ ψυχὴ Δαυίδ.

 $\tau \hat{\omega} v \kappa \alpha \kappa$.] 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 clause is wider than that of the preceding.

Υ. Н.

4 αὐτοὶ ὄντες ἐν σώματι. τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν
 πῶσιν καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος· πόρνους γὰρ καὶ
 5 μοιχοὺς κρινεῖ ὁ Θεός. ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος·

κακουχουμένων] See notes on xi. 37 (κακουχούμενοι) and xi. 25 (συνκακουχείσθαι).

όντες έν σώματι] See 2 Cor. v. 6, ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι. xii. 2, 3, εἶτε ἐν σώματι...εἶτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος. The phrase is equivalent to ἐν σαρκί, 2 Cor. x. 3, ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες κ.τ.λ. Gal. ii. 20, ὅ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί.

4. $\tau(\mu uos)$ The passage resembles, in its disjointed and fragmentary construction, Rom. xii. 9, &c. For $\tau(\mu uos)$, in the sense not of valuable or precious (which is the commoner of the two), but of honourable, held in honour, see Acts v. 34, $\tau(\mu uos)$ $\pi uvi) \tau \hat{\omega} \lambda a \hat{\omega}$.

τ. ό γάμος] Understand not ἐστὶν but ἔστω, as (unquestionably) in verse 5, and in Rom. xii. 9, ή ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος. The γὰρ (instead of δὲ) of the revised text makes this certain.

δ γάμος] Only here in the sense of the ordinance of marriage. Elsewhere in the New Testament it always means either a particular marriage (as John ii. 1), or the feast celebrating it (Matt. xxii. 8).

ἐν πάσιν] Either (1) in all respects (as in verse 18, ἐν πάσιν καλῶς θέλοντες ἀναστρέφεσθαι. Phil. iv. 12, ἐν παντί καὶ ἐν πασιν μεμνήμαι κ.τ.λ. 1 Tim. iii. 11, πιστὰς ἐν πασιν. 2 Tim. iv. 5, σὐ δὲ νῆφε ἐν πασιν. Tit. ii. 9); or (2) amongst or in the judgment or estimation of all men (as in 2 Cor. xi. 6, where ἐν παντὶ occurs in the same clause, and not, as in Phil. iv. 12, in combination with it).

ἀμίαντος] That is, ἶστω. For ἀμίαντος, see note on vii. 26.

5. ἀφιλάργυρος...ἀρκούμενοι] Compare Rom. xii. 9, ή ἀγάπη ανυπόκριτος ... αποστυγοῦντες... κολλώμενοι κ.τ.λ. For αφιλάρyupos, see I Tim. iii. 3 (only). We have φιλάργυρος (as descriptive of the Pharisees) in Luke xvi. 14, and (as characteristic of the raipol $\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi o l$ in 2 Tim. iii. 2. Also φιλαργυρία (as a ρίζα πάντων τῶν κακών) in I Tim. vi. 10. And $φ_i$ λαργυρείν in 2 Macc. x. 20. Between $\phi_i\lambda_{a\rho\gamma\nu\rho_ia}$ and $\pi\lambda_{\epsilon o}$ - $\nu \epsilon \xi i a$ the obvious difference is that between avarice and covetousness, but φιλαργυρία may include both.

ό τρόπος] Again understand έστω. Let your disposition be unavaricious. The word τρόπος (turn) has various applications, of which (1) the commonest is manner or fashion, as δν τρόπον (Matt. xxiii, 37. Luke xiii.

άρκούμενοι τοῖς παροῦσιν αὐτὸς γὰρ εἰρηκεν, Οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω ὥστε 6

34. Acts i. 11. vii. 28. 2 Tim. iii. 8), καθ όν τρόπον (Acts xv. 11. xxvii. 25), παντί τρόπω (Phil. i. 18), έν παντί τρόπω (2 Thess. iii. 16), κατὰ πάντα τρόπον (Rom. iii. 2), τον δμοιον τρόπον τούτοις (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, το μέν γένος Φρύγα, τον δε τρόπον βαρβαρώτερον έχοντα τοῦ καταστήσαντος. viii. 36, και δια τον τρόπον τουτον ατρώτους είναι τούς Ίουδαίους.

αρκούμενοι] The clauses are loosely strung together, just as in the passage above quoted from Rom. xii., and in I Pet. iii. 8, &c. But the precept of contentment is closely connected with that of unavariciousness. In the active voice, apreîr is to suffice, to be sufficient. So in Matt. xxv. q. John vi. 7. xiv. 2 Cor. xii. 9, apreî σοι ή 8. xápis µov. And this is its almost invariable use in the Septuagint. Exod. xii. 4, Exactos το αρκούν αύτῷ κ.τ.λ. Num. xi. 22. I Kings viii. 27, et o oùραγός καί ο ούρανός του ούρανου ούκ αρκέσουσί σοι κ.τ.λ. Prov. XXX. 16, καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ οὐ μὴ είπωσιν, αρκεί. But αρκείσθαι (middle or passive) is to be contented or satisfied with (followed by a dative, with or without $\epsilon \pi i$). Thus here, and Luke iii. 14, αρκείσθε τοῖς ὀψωνίοις ὑμῶν. 1 Tim. vi. 8, τούτοις ἀρκεσθησόμεθα. 3 John 10, καὶ μὴ ἀρκούμενος ἐπὶ τούτοις κ.τ.λ. Also in 2 Macc. v. 15, οὐκ ἀρκεσθεἰς δὲ τούτοις.

τοῖς παροῦσιν] Compare Phil. iv. 11, 12, ἐγώ γὰρ ἔμαθον ἐν οἶς εἰμὶ αὐτάρκης εἶναι κ.τ.λ.

avros yáp] For He (God) *Himself has said.* The passage referred to is Deut. xxxi. 5, ανδρίζου καὶ ἴσχυε, μὴ φοβοῦ μηδε δειλία... δτι Κύριος ο Θεός σου ούτος ό προπορευόμενος μεθ' ύμῶν, οὐ μή σε ἀνῆ οὐδ' οὐ μή σε έγκαταλίπη. Compare also Gen. xxviii. 15, ὅτι οὐ μή σε έγκαταλίπω, έως κ.τ.λ. Deut. xxxi. 8, ούκ ανήσει σε ούδ' ού μή έγκαταλίπη σε. Josh, i. 5, καὶ ούκ έγκαταλείψω σε, ούδε ύπερόψομαί σε. 1 Chron. xxviii. 20, ούκ ανήσει σε, οιδ ού μή σε έγκαταλίπη έως κ.τ.λ. But no one of these is so close to the words before us as the first quoted.

θαρρούντας ήμας λέγειν, Κύριος έμοι βοηθός, ου φοβηθήσομαι· τί ποιήσει μοι άνθρωπος; Μνημονεύετε των ήγουμένων ύμων, οίτινες

6. $\[missingsymbol{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon...\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\mu
]$ So that we say (not may say). The tense implies, It is our habitual language.

 $\theta a p \rho o \hat{v} \tau a s]$ With confidence or good courage. Elsewhere, in the New Testament $\theta a \rho \rho \hat{\epsilon} \hat{v}$ occurs only in 2 Cor. v. 6, 8. vii. 16. x. 1, 2. In the Septuagint, only in Prov. i. 21, $\hat{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\iota}$ $\hat{\delta} \hat{\epsilon}$ $\pi \hat{\upsilon} \lambda a \iota s$ $\pi \hat{\upsilon} \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \omega s$ $\theta a \rho \rho o \hat{\upsilon} \sigma a \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota$. The form $\theta a \rho \sigma \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\upsilon} v$ appears to be used only in the *imperative* $(\theta a \rho \sigma \epsilon \hat{\iota}, \theta a \rho \sigma \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\iota} \tau \epsilon)$ in the Septuagint and New Testament, except in Prov. xxxi. 11.

 \hat{K} ύριος] Psalm cxviii. 6. The insertion or omission of καὶ before où (both here and in the Septuagint) is a doubtful point, and quite immaterial. Also the punctuation. The Revised Version places a colon after φοβηθήσομαι. The Authorized made no stop before τί κ.τ.λ.

τί ποιήσει μοι ἄνθρ.] The dative after ποιεῖν is strictly not to but for (in relation to). What shall a human being do for my hurt? Compare Matt. xxvii. 22 (τί οἶν ποιήσω Ἰησοῖν κ.τ.λ.) with Matt. xxv. 40 (ἐφ' ὅσον ἐποιήσατε ἐνὶ τούτων...ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε). For ἄνθρωπος, see note on ii. 6, ἄνθρωπος...νἱὸς ἀνθρώπου. Μνημονεύετε] See note on xi. 15, εἰ μὲν ἐμνημόνευον. The tense says, Have in constant remembrance.

τών ήγουμένων ύμων] Your 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 ήγεισθαι (either absolute, or with a genitive, or with $\epsilon \pi i$ τ ivos or τ ivá), to lead or guide, and (in that sense) to rule, see Matt. ii. 6, ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ήγούμενος, δστις ποιμανεί τον λαόν μου. (The quotation is from Mic. v. 2, where, however, nyoúµevos does not appear in the Vatican manuscript, and

XIII. 7.

έλάλησαν ύμιν τον λόγον του Θεού, ών αναθεωρούντες την έκβασιν της αναστροφής μιμεισθε

is bracketed in Field's Alexandrine.) Luke xxii. 26, sai o ήγούμενος ώς ό διακονών. Acts vii. 10, κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἡγούμενον έπ' Αίγυπτον κ.τ.λ. xiv. . I 2, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ἡγούμενος τοῦ $\lambda \dot{0} \gamma o \upsilon$ (who led the word or speaking). xv. 22, avopas yyouμένους έν τοις άδελφοις. Also in the Septuagint, Gen. xlix. 26, ών ηγήσατο αδελφών. Exod. xiii. 21, ό δε Θεός ήγειτο αύτων. Deut. i. 15, και κατέστησα αυτούς ήγεισθαι έφ' ύμων. Esth. v. 11, ήγεισθαι της βασιλείας.

olitives] Whoever. Any who. See notes on ii. 3. &c.

 $i\lambda a \lambda \eta \sigma a v$] The aorist sums up the ministry spoken of into one past act.

 $\hat{\epsilon}\lambda$. τοῦ ϑ .] The exact phrase (among many equivalents) occurs in Acts iv. 31. xiii. 46. xvi. 32 (margin of revised text).

ων ἀναθεωροῦντες] And, reviewing 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 (ἀναστροφή, not βίος). Having lived as they did, they (naturally and consequently) died as they did. Study those deaths. See in them the product of those lives. (1) For ἀναθεωρεῖν, to contemplate analytically (ab imo ad

summum), to study attentively. see Acts xvii. 23, διερχόμενος γὰρ καὶ ἀναθεωρῶν τὰ σεβάσματα ύμων κ.τ.λ. (2) For έκβασις, egress or way out, see 1 Cor. x. 13, αλλά ποιήσει σύν τω πειρασμώ καὶ τὴν ἔκβασιν (the suitable and appropriate way of escape). Compare Wisd. ii. 17, ίδωμεν εί οι λόγοι αύτοῦ ἀληθεῖς, καὶ πειράσωμεν τὰ ἐν ἐκβάσει αὐτοῦ. (The word ἔξοδος is used in the same general sense in Luke ix. 31, την έξοδον αύτοῦ ην ήμελλεν πληρούν έν Ίερουσαλήμ. 2 Pet. i. 15, μετά την έμην έξοδον.) (3) For αναστροφή, manner of life, life in movement (so suitable in combination with έξοδος, life's departing move*ment*), see its three uses by St Paul (Gal. i. 13, The europe αναστροφήν ποτε έν τῶ 'Ι. Eph. iv. 22. 1 Tim. iv. 12), and its eight uses by St Peter (1 Pet. i. 15, 18. ii. 12. iii. 1, 2, 16. 2 Pet. ii. 7. iii. 11). Also James iii. 13. See note on x. 33, τών ούτως άναστρεφομένων.

 $\mu \iota \mu \epsilon i \sigma \theta \epsilon$] 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 English, and takes a new association in its Scriptural

8 την πίστιν. 'Ιησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐχθὲς καὶ σήμερον 9 ὁ αὐτός, καὶ ἐἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις

use. See note on vi. 12, µ1µηταί.

8. [']Ιησούς Χριστός] Α new 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 The ambiguous rendoctrines. dering of Expanse 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 expansion had been $\tau \epsilon \lambda os$, 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 7th verse.

'I. X. εχθες κ. σ. δ αὐτός] 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 $\eta\gamma o \hat{\mu} evo (2)$ 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.

έχθὲς καὶ σήμερον] In contrast with 'the changes and chances of mortal life': Ecclus. xxxviii. 22, ἐμοὶ ἐχθὲς καὶ σοὶ σήμερον. The reading of the received text is χθές in each of the three places where the revised text has ἐχθές (here, and John iv. 52, and Acts vii. 28). In the Septuagint the two forms are found indiscriminately, and most often in the combination ἐχθές (or χθές) καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν, heretofore or beforetime.

ό αὐτός] See i. 12 (from Psalm cii. 28), σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, καὶ τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ ἐκλείψουσιν. Compare Mal. iii. 6, ἐγώ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν οὐκ ἠλλοίωμαι.

kal els rols alŵvas] 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. $\delta_{\iota}\delta a \chi a \hat{s}$] The warning is evidently directed primarily against Judaizing errors. The unchangeableness of Jesus Christ in His evangelical teaching is the point now in view. Of δ_{ι} - $\delta a \chi \eta$ in the plural this is the

καὶ ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε· καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν, οὐ βρώμασιν, ἐν οἶς

only instance. But we have $\delta\iota\delta\sigma\kappa a\lambda(a\iota)$ (from Isai. xxix. 13) in Matt. xv. 9. Mark vii. 7. Col. ii. 22. Also in 1 Tim. iv. 1. In the Septuagint, $\delta\iota$ - $\deltaa\chi\eta$ 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 $\delta\iota\delta\sigma\kappa a\lambda(a)$ (specially in the Pastoral Epistles), with the exception of the above quotation from Isaiah in the first two Gospels.

ποικίλαις] See note on ii. 4. The first meaning of ποικίλος (the χιτών ποικίλος of Gen. xxxvii. 3) well suits the patchwork effect of grafting Judaism upon the Gospel.

 ξ évais] See note on xi. 13. The foreign speech of Judaism is added by this word to the motley garb ($\pi o \iota \kappa i \lambda a \iota s$).

 $\pi a p a \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$] The received text had $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, as $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota - \phi \epsilon \rho \delta \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, as $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota - \phi \epsilon \rho \delta \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, 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 $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (in such an application) survives only in Eph. iv. 14).

καλον γάρ] The right food for the heart's health is χάρις, not βρώματα. 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, 19 (where the revised text reads $\kappa a \theta a - \rho (\zeta \omega v, `This He said, making$ $all meats clean'). As no <math>\beta p \hat{\omega} \mu a$ can defile, so can no $\beta p \hat{\omega} \mu a$ edify. For $\kappa a \lambda \hat{o} v$ in this use (without $\hat{c} \sigma \tau \hat{v}$) see Rom. xiv. 21. 1 Cor. vii. 1, 8, 26. ix. 15. Gal. iv. 18.

 $\chi \acute{a}\rho \imath \tau_i$] See notes on ii. 9 ($\chi \acute{a}\rho \imath \tau_i \otimes \epsilon \circ \circ$) and xii. 28 ($\check{e}\chi \omega \cdot \mu \epsilon v \chi \acute{a}\rho \imath v$). Divine favour, which is the first thought in $\chi \acute{a}\rho \imath s$, passes on into the exercise and manifestation of it in divine influence.

βεβαιοῦσθαι] Should be made firm and stedfast. See I Cor. i. 8, δs καὶ βεβαιώσει ὑμᾶς ἔως τέλους κ.τ.λ. 2 Cor. i. 21, δ δὲ βεβαιῶν ἡμᾶς σὺν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν...Θεός. Col. ii. 7, καὶ βεβαιούμενοι τỹ πίστει κ.τ.λ. See notes on ii. 2, 3 (βέβαιος, ἐβεβαιώθη) and vi. 16 (βεβαίωσιν).

την καρδίαν] See note on iii. 8, τας καρδίας.

ού βρώμασιν] There is disparagement in the tone. Not by such things as βρώματα. Compare Rom. xiv. 15, 20, εἰ γὰρ διὰ βρώμα ὁ ἀδελφός σου λυπείται...μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκείνον ἀπόλλυε ὑπὲρ οῦ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν...μὴ ἕνεκεν βρώματος

10 ούκ ώφελήθησαν οι περιπατούντες. έχομεν θυ-

xiii. ο. Οr περιπατήσαντες.

κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ι Cor. vi. 13, τὰ βρώματα τῆ κοιλία, καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασιν ὁ δὲ Θεὸς καὶ ταύτην καὶ ταῦτα καταργήσει. viii. 8, 13, βρῶμα δὲ ἡμῶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ Θεῷ οὐτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, οὖτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν...διόπερ εἰ βρῶμα σκανδαλίζει τὸν ἀδελφόν μου κ.τ.λ.

βρώμασιν] See note on ix. 10, βρώμασιν.

 e_V ois κ.τ.λ.] In which (βρώ- $\mu a \sigma_{iv}$ they who were wont to walk were not benefited. The revised text has $\pi \epsilon \rho (\pi a \tau o \hat{v} \tau \epsilon s)$ (instead of $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi a\tau\eta\sigma a\nu\tau\epsilon_s$), 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 cere-(See Matt. monial matters. xxiii. throughout.) For $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota$ mateiv ev, 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, ev αΐς ποτέ περιεπατήσατε κατά τὺν αίωνα του κόσμου τούτου. Col. iii. 7, έν ois και υμείς περιεπατήσατέ ποτε ότε έζητε έν τού-7015.

οὐκ ώφελήθησαν] Were not 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 viii. 13. Also on iv. 2 ($\dot{\omega}\phi\dot{\epsilon}$. $\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$) and vii. 18 ($\dot{a}\nu\omega\phi\epsilon\lambda\dot{\epsilon}s$). Compare Matt. xvi. 26, τi yàp $\dot{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau ai$ $\ddot{a}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma s$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. Mark viii. 36. Luke ix. 25. John vi. 63, η $\sigma\dot{a}\rho\dot{\xi}$ oùk $\dot{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\dot{\epsilon}i$ oùb $\dot{\epsilon}v \cdot \tau a$ $\dot{p}\eta\mu a\tau a$ \ddot{a} $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\dot{a}$. $\lambda\eta\kappa a$ $\dot{v}\mu\dot{v}$ $\pi v \hat{v}\mu\dot{a}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau v$. $\kappa a\dot{\epsilon}$ $\dot{\xi}\omega\eta$ $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau v$. I Cor. xiii. 3, oùb $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\dot{\omega}\phi\epsilon$. $\lambda o \dot{v}\mu a t$. xiv. 6. Gal. v. 2, $\dot{\epsilon}a\nu$ $\pi\epsilon\rho t \tau \dot{\epsilon}\mu\nu\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$ $X\rho t \sigma\tau \dot{s}$ $\dot{v}\mu a$ s oùb $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\dot{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon u$.

10-13. έχομεν κ.τ.λ.] This 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 unfulfilled. Jesus suffered outside the gate of Jeru-

σιαστήριον έξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἐχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῆ σκηνῆ λατρεύοντες. ὧν γὰρ εἰσφέρεται 11

salem. There, outside of Judaism, let us seek Him.

10. $\xi_{\chi o \mu \epsilon \nu}$] The stress of the sentence lies on this word. We have, and need not seek.

 θ voia $\sigma \tau \eta \rho i \rho v$] This $\theta v \sigma i a \sigma - \tau \eta \rho i \rho v$, 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 atonement—so as to be able to obey the charge of x. 19–22.

έξ οῦ φαγεῖν] Ι Cor. ix. 13,
οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐσθίουσιν; x. 18. See Exod. xxix.
28. Lev. vii. 6, 34. x. 12—
15. Num. xviii. 9, &c.

 $\dot{\epsilon}\xi ov\sigma(av)$ This word, so frequent elsewhere in Scripture, occurs here only in this Epistle. (I) Formed from ξέστιν (ξόν), its proper idea is that of lawful power (whether original or delegated), authority, right, &c.; and it is thus distinguished from δύναμις, ίσχύς, κράτος, &c. (see note on ii. 14, κράτος). For example, Matt. vii. 29, h γάρ διδάσκων αύτους ώς έξουσίαν έχων. viii. 9, ανθρωπός είμι ύπο έξουσίαν. ix. 6, έξουσίαν έχει δ υίδη του άνθρώπου έπι τής γής $\dot{a}\phi_{i\epsilon\nu\alpha i}$ $\dot{a}\mu a\rho\tau_{i}a_{s}$. ix. 8. x. 1, έδωκεν αύτοις έξουσίαν πνευμάτων άκαθάρτων. xxi. 23, 24, 27, έν ποία έξουσία ταῦτα ποιεῖς; καὶ τίς σοι έδωκεν την έξουσίαν ταύτην; κ.τ.λ. χχνιιι. 18, εδόθη μοι πάσα έξουσία έν ούρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ [τη̂s] γη̂ς. John i. 12, ἔδωκεν αύτοις έξουσίαν τέκνα Θεού γενέσθαι. v. 27, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αυτώ κρίσιν ποιείν. χ. 18. xvii. 2. xix. 10, 11. Acts viii. 19. ix. 14. Rom. ix. 21. I Cor. ix. 4, 5, 6, 12, 18. 2 Cor. x. 8, περί της έξουσίας ήμων ής έδωκεν ο Κύριος κ.τ.λ. 2 Thess. iii. 9. Rev. ii. 26. &c. &c. From the abstract it passes (like $d\rho_{\chi\eta}$, or like the English word *authority*) into the concrete, as in Rom. xiii. 1, $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a$ ψυχη έξουσίαις ύπερεχούσαις ύποτασσέσθω. Eph. iii. 10. Tit. iii. 1. (2) Even when ξεουσία 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 xxvi. 18, της έξουσίας του Σατανά. Eph. ii. 2, κατά τον άρχοντα της έξουσίας (government, empire) roi acpos. Col. i. 13. έκ της έξουσίας του σκότους. And (in the concrete) Eph. vi. 12, ή πάλη...πρός τὰς ἀρχάς, πρός τας έξουσίας, πρός τους κοσμοκράτορας του σκότους τούτου. Col. ii. 15.

ζώων τὸ αἶμα περὶ ἀμαρτίας εἰς τὰ ἅγια διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, τούτων τὰ σώματα κατακαίεται ἔξω 12 τῆς παρεμβολῆς. διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα ἀγιάση

οί τ $\hat{\eta}$ σκην $\hat{\eta}$ λ.] The Levitical priests. The very priests of the old order. It needs not then to say, the people. See viii. 5, οίτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιậ λατρεύοντες τῶν ἐπουρανίων (and notes there).

11. $\delta v \gamma \alpha \rho$ An exclusion (see note on verses 10-13) 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.

εἶσφέρεται] Lev. xvi. 12, 15, 27, εἰσοίσει ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος...καὶ οἶσει [ἀπὸ] τοῦ αἶματος αὐτοῦ ἐσώτερον τ. κ. κ.τ.λ.

περί άμαρτίας] See note on v. 3, περί...περί...περί.

είς τὰ ἄγια] See note on viii. 2, τῶν άγίων.

διὰ τοῦ ἀρχ.] The preposition might have been ὑπό, but διὰ marks more strongly the ministerial character of the act.

τούτων τὰ σώματα] Lev. xvi. 2.7, καὶ τὸν μόσχον τὸν περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τὸν χίμαρον τὸν περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ῶν τὸ αἶμα εἰσηνέχθη ἐξιλάσασθαι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ, ἐξοίσουσιν αὐτὰ ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, καὶ κατακαύσουσιν αὐτὰ ἐν πυρὶ κ.τ.λ.

 $\pi a \rho \epsilon \mu \beta o \lambda \hat{\eta} s$] The scene is laid in the wilderness: the

phrase is varied afterwards into $\xi \omega \tau \eta s \pi \upsilon \lambda \eta s$, and then resumed on reaching the application. For $\pi a \rho \epsilon \mu \beta o \lambda \eta$, see note on xi. 34, $\pi a \rho \epsilon \mu \beta o \lambda a s$.

12. διό] Wherefore. Seeing that this is one feature of the Levitical ritual, demanding fulfilment (like the rest) in Christ the antitype of all.

 $\kappa a i i Jesus also. The antitype like the type.$

iva ayiaon] Does this clause depend (1) only upon $\epsilon \pi a \theta \epsilon v$, or (2) upon the whole phrase $\xi \omega$ τη̂ς πύλης έπαθεν? If (1), the sense is, He suffered iva ayiáon $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$, and with this particular point of characterization, namely, that it was έξω της πύλης. If (2), That His work of sanctifying might be effectual, as lacking no one point of fulfilment of the type, He suffered έξω της $π \dot{\nu} \lambda \eta s$. The question is somewhat like that on John xix. 28, whether the clause $iva \tau \epsilon$ λειωθ $\hat{\eta}$ ή γρα ϕ ή depends upon the ήδη πάντα τετέλεσται before it or upon the $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota \Delta \iota \psi \hat{\omega}$ after it; whether, that is, the fulfilment of Scripture is spoken of as the object of the $\pi a \nu \tau a$, or of the special particular of the thirst. It is difficult (in either case) to answer it.

 $ay_i a \sigma \eta$] It was the object

XIII. 12—14.

διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αίματος τὸν λαόν, ἔξω τῆς πύλης ἕπαθεν. τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἕξω τῆς 13 παρεμβολῆς τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ Φέροντες. οὐ 14

of the Levitical day of atonement άγιάζειν τον λαόν. The word ayiágew occurs in the directions for the ceremonial of that day (Lev. xvi.) only in verse 19, καὶ καθαριεί αὐτό (the altar), και άγιάσει αυτό άπο τών ακαθαρσιών τών υίων Ισραήλ. But the sense of ayia Lev lies in the phrase which is used in verse 17, καὶ ἐξιλάσεται...περὶ πάσης συναγωγής υίων Ισραήλ. 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 ayıáζειν, see note on ii. 11, αγιάζων ... ayıa comercian a comercian exact thought in ayiasy 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 ayiáze of ix. 13, where see the note.

τον λαόν] See note on ii. 17, τοῦ λαοῦ.

έξω τῆς πύλης] The revised text of John xix. 20 stands in this order: ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἦν ὁ τόπος τῆς πόλεως (for τῆς πόλεως ὁ τόπος) ὅπου ἐσταυρώθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, 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.

έπαθεν] Suffered. For this phrase for a death by violence, see ix. 26, έπεὶ έδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν. Also Luke xxii. 15, πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν. xxiv. 46. Acts i. 3, μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν αὐτόν. iii. 18, παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν. xvii. 3. I Pet. ii. 21. iv. 1, Χριστοῦ οὖν παθύντος σαρκί...ὁ παθών σαρκί κ.τ.λ.

 τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα] Christ is here, on His cross, outcast from the camp of Judaism : let us come forth to Him, leaving Judaism behind.

τοίνυν] The place of τοίνυν as the first word in a sentence is unclassical, but the revised text gives another example of it in Luke xx. 25, τοίνυν ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι. It stands in its proper place in I Cor. ix. 26, ἐγῶ τοίνυν οῦτῶς τρέχω κ.τ.λ.

έξερχώμεθα] See note on xi. 8, ποῦ ἔρχεται. The call is not to go but to come: the voice is from the cross.

γὰρ ἕχομεν ὧδε μένουσαν πόλιν, ἀλλα τὴν 15 μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν. δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως διὰ παντὸς τῷ Θεῷ,

xiii. 15. Or omit obv.

τον ονειδισμόν αὐτοῦ] See note on xi. 26, τον ονειδισμόν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and the passages there quoted.

φέροντες] Compare Luke xxiii. 26, ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν φέρειν ὅπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

14. où $\gamma \alpha \rho$] Reason for consenting to the call of verse 13. Reconciling ourselves to a present expatriation by the thought of the $\pi \delta \lambda \alpha$ that is to be. Compare xi. 9, 10, 13-16.

ωδε] Here on earth. For the word, see note on vii. 8. Notice (for the sense here) I Cor. iv. 2 (revised text), ωδελοιπόν ζητείται κ.τ.λ.

μένουσαν] See x. 34, κρείσσονα ὕπαρξιν καὶ μένουσαν. Also xii. 27. And notes.

 π όλιν] See notes on xi. 10, 16.

την μέλλουσαν] That city which is to be. See xi. 10, 16, την τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν ...ήτοίμασεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν. For μέλλειν without an infinitive following (a classical use), see ii. 5, την οἰκουμένην την μέλλουσαν. vi. 5, μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. ix. 11, τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν. x. 1. xi. 20. Also Matt. iii. 7. xii. 32. Luke iii. 7. Acts xxiv. 25. Rom. v. 14. viii. 38. 1 Cor. iii. 22. Eph. i. 21. Col. ii. 17. 1 Tim. iv. 8, ζωής τής νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης.

ἐπιζητοῦμεν] See xi. 14, ἐμφανίζουσιν ὅτι πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσιν.

15. δι αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.] Our sacrifices now are not carnal. Praise and thanksgiving, beneficence and almsgiving, these are now the accepted offerings—and all through Him.

άναφέρωμεν] For ἀναφέρειν, see vii. 27. ix. 28. Also note on v. 1, προσφέρη.

θυσίαν alvéσεως] This was the name in the Levitical ritual for that particular form of the peace-offering which was offered as a thanksgiving. Lev. vii. II (Ι Β), &c., ούτος ο νόμος θυσίας σωτηρίου... έαν μέντοι περί αινέσεως προσφέρη αὐτήν, καὶ προσοίσει έπι της θυσίας της αινέσεως 2 Chron. xxix. 31, Kai aprovs. ανήνεγκεν ή εκκλησία θυσίας και airéoeus (airéoeis B) eis oiror Kupiou. It was already interpreted in its spiritual sense in the Old Testament. Psalm l. 23, θυσία αινέσεως δοξάσει με. cvii. 22, καὶ θυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ θυσίαν αινέσεως, και έξαγγειλάτωσαν τὰ έργα αι τοῦ ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει. Jer. xvii. 26, και ήξουσιν

XIII. 15, 16.

τοῦτ' ἐστιν καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. τῆς δὲ εὐποιίας καὶ κοινωνίας 16 μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε· τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ Θεός.

ἐκ τῶν πόλεων Ἰούδα...φέροντες όλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίαν (-ίας B) ...φέροντες αἶνεσιν εἰς οἶκον Κυρίου. The word αἶνεσις occurs only here in the New Testament.

 $\delta i \hat{a} \pi a \nu \tau \delta \hat{s}$] See ix. 6, and note there.

καρπόν χειλέων] Produce of the lips. Praise and thanksgiving. Isai. lvii. 19 (omit B), κτίζων καρπόν χειλέων. Hos. xiv. 2, καὶ ἀνταποδώσομεν καρπόν χειλέων.

όμολογούντων] Making acknowledgment to. See note on iii. 1, όμολογίας.

τ $\hat{\psi}$ οὐνόματι αὐτοῦ] To His name. To Him as that which He is, in person, character, work, &c. See note on i. 4, ὄνομα.

16. $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon \epsilon \vartheta \pi \sigma u(as]$ The sacrifice of praise must be accompanied by the sacrifice of charity.

εὐποιίας] Only here in Scripture. Lucian is quoted for it, and Aristotle for εὐποιητικός. For εὖ ποιεῖν, see Mark xiv. 7 (only): more frequent in the Septuagint.

κοινωνίας] Like κοινωνεΐν (see note on ii. 14, κεκοινώνηκεν), κοινωνία, of which the primary idea is that of going shares with another in something, divides into the two senses of (1) partaking and (2) imparting. Examples of (1) are found in 1 Cor. i. 9 (τοῦ νίοῦ αὐτοῦ). x. 16 (τοῦ αίματος...τοῦ σώματος). 2 Cor. viii. 4 ($\tau \eta s$ $\delta \iota a \kappa o \nu i a s$). xiii. 13 (τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος). Phil. ii. 1 (πνεύματος). iii. 10 $(\pi \alpha \theta \eta \mu \alpha \tau \omega \nu)$. Philem. 6 $(\tau \eta s$ πίστεως). And to this head belong the instances of *κοινωνία* as partnership, fellowship, communion, either absolutely, or with ϵis , $\pi \rho o s$, or $\mu \epsilon \tau a$. Of (2), here, and in Rom. xv. 26, κοινωνίαν τινά ποιήσασθαι είς τούς πτωχούς κ.τ.λ. 2 Cor. ix. 13, καί απλότητι της κοινωνίας eis αύτούς και είς πάντας.

 $\theta v \sigma i a s$] Thus under the Gospel we have the word $\theta v \sigma i a$ and the idea of *sacrifice* appropriated to three main particulars. (1) The sacrifice of the body or living man: Rom. xii. παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζώσαν άγίαν εδάρεστον τώ $\Theta\epsilon\hat{\omega}$ $\kappa.\tau.\lambda$. (2) The sacrifice of the separate acts of the life, whether of worship or conduct: 1 Pet. ii. 5, καὶ αὐτοὶ...εἰς ἱεράτευμα άγιον, άνενέγκαι πνευματικας θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους Θεῷ δια Ιησού Χριστού. (3) The special

17 Πείθεσθε τοις ήγουμένοις ύμων και ύπείκετε αὐτοι γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπερ των ψυχων ὑμων

sacrifices of *thanksgiving* and *almsgiving*, expressly called θv - $\sigma'(\alpha t)$ here, as the former in Psalm 1. 23, and the latter in Phil. iv. 18.

εναρεστείται] From ενάρεστος, acceptable, comes εναρεστείν, to be acceptable to (τινί, xi. 5, 6, or ενώπιον or εναντίον τινός, Psalm cxvi. 9. Gen. xvii. 1), and here (only) in the passive, εναρεστείσθαι (τινί), to be well pleased with.

17. Πείθεσθε...καὶ ὑπείκετε] Trust and yield. Both are claimed for the ήγούμενοι. Can the work of the Church be done without both ?

πείθεσθε] See, for example, Acts v. 36, 37, πάντες δσοι ἐπείθοντο αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ XXVII. 11, τῷ κυβερνήτῃ καὶ τῷ ναυκλήρῷ μᾶλλον ἐπείθετο ἢ τοῖς ὑπὸ Παύλου λεγομένοις.

τοῖς ήγουμένοις ὑμῶν] See verse 7. There the ήγούμενοι were in the past : their ἔκβασις was a memory. Here, and in verse 24, they are the living pastors of the Church or Churches addressed in the Epistle.

 $i\pi\epsilon i\kappa\epsilon \tau\epsilon$] The word $i\pi\epsilon i\kappa\epsilon \iota \nu$ (largely used in classical Greek) is found only here in the Greek Bible. It seems to express that yielding of the self-will to the judgment of another, which recognizes constituted authority even while it maintains personal independence.

airoi $\gamma \alpha \rho$] For they on their part. The airoi (always emphatic in the nominative) contrasts the toilsome and responsible work of the minister with the easier correlative duty of the people. See notes on airoi, i. 11. iii. 10. viii. 9.

άγρυπνοῦσιν] From the classical άγρυπνος (άγρειν, άγρεύειν, and varvos), properly searching for sleep, and so sleepless, wakeful, comes the equally classical $dypu\pi v \epsilon i v$, to be sleepless, found in several passages of the Septuagint and the New Testament. Thus Ezra viii. 29, ἀγρυπνεῖτε καὶ τηρείτε έως στήτε κ.τ.λ. Psalm cii. 7, ήγρύπνησα και έγενόμην ώς (ἐγενήθην ώσεὶ Β) στρουθίον κ.τ.λ. cxxvii. 1, είς μάτην ήγρύπνησεν Prov. viii. 34, ό φυλάσσων. άγρυπνών έπ' έμαις θύραις καθ ήμέραν. Song v. 2, εγώ καθεύδω, καί ή καρδία μου άγρυπνεί. Mark xiii. 33, βλέπετε, ἀργυπνεῖτε. Luke xxi. 36, αγρυπνείτε δε έν παντί καιρφ δεόμενοι ίνα κ.τ.λ. Eph. vi. 18, προσευχόμενοι...καί είς αὐτὸ ἀγρυπνοῦντες κ.τ.λ. They are wakeful for your souls. A graphic picture of the true pastor.

λόγον ἀποδώσοντες] Matt. xii. 36, ἀποδώσουσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον. Luke xvi. 2, ἀπόδος τὸν

XIII. 17, 18.

ώς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες· Ίνα μετὰ χαράς τοῦτο ποιῶσιν καὶ μὴ στενάζοντες· ἀλυσιτελὲς γὰρ ὑμῖν τοῦτο.

Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν· πειθόμεθα γὰρ 18 ὅτι καλὴν συνείδησιν ἔχομεν, ἐν πᾶσιν καλῶς

λόγον τῆς οἰκονομίας σου. Acts xix. 40. Rom. xiv. 12, ἕκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει. 1 Pet. iv. 5, οἶ ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ κ.τ.λ.

ίνα μ. χ.] Depends upon πείθεσθε...και ύπείκετε.

τοῦτο] That is, τὸ ἀποδιδόναι λόγον.

στενάζοντες] With lamentation over lost souls. Isai. xlvi. 8, μνήσθητε ταῦτα, καὶ στενάξατε. Lam. i. 21, ὅτι στενάζω ἐγώ, οὖκ ἔστιν ὁ παρακαλῶν με.

άλυσιτελές] Only here in the Greek Bible. But λυσιτελεί in Luke xvii. 2, λυσιτελεί αὐτῷ εἰ λίθος κ.τ.λ. And λυσιτελής, λυσιτέλεια, λυσιτελείν, in passages of the Apocrypha.

18. Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν] The same request is made elsewhere. Rom. xv. 30, παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς...συναγωνίσασθαί μοι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. 2 Cor. i. 11, συνυπουργούντων καὶ ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῆ δεήσει κ.τ.λ. Eph. vì. 18, 19, δεήσει περὶ πάντων τῶν ἀγίων, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ κ.τ.λ. 2 Thess. iii. 1, τὸ λοιπὸν προσεύχεσθε, ἀδελφοί, περὶ ἡμῶν, ἴνα κ.τ.λ. $\eta\mu\omega\nu$] It is often a doubtful question whether this use of the plural really includes others besides the writer. See, for instance, the 2nd 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 $\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\circ\mu\epsilon\theta a$ becomes the singular $\pi a\rho a\kappa a\lambda\omega$ in the next verse.

πειθόμεθα γάρ] 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. 12 (following the request for the help of intercession), ή γαρ καύχησις ήμων αυτη έστίν, το μαρτύριον τής συνειδήσεως ήμων κ.τ.λ. Ι John iii. 22, καὶ ὃ ἂν αἰτῶμεν λαμβάνομεν απ' αυτού, ότι τὰς εντολάς αυτού τηροῦμεν κ.τ.λ. For πειθόμεθα in the sense (nearly) of $\pi\epsilon\pi oi$ θαμεν, see Acts xxvi. 26, λανθάνειν γαρ αυτον τούτων οι πείθομαι σθέν.

19 θέλοντες ἀναστρέφεσθαι. περισσοτέρως δὲ παρακαλῶ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, Ἱνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῦν.

20

Ο δε Θεός της εἰρήνης, ό ἀναγαγών ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἐν

καλήν] We have καλή with συνείδησις only here. Elsewhere ἀγαθή (Acts xxiii. I. I Tim. i. 5, 19. I Pet. iii. 16, 21), καθαρά (I Tim. iii. 9. 2 Tim. i. 3), ἀπρόσκοπος (Acts xxiv. 16). 19. περισσοτέρως] For the word, see note on ii. I. Whether it here goes with παρακαλῶ or with ποτήσαι is uncertain and immaterial. This verse proves of itself (I) that there was no intended conceal-

ment 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.

ἀποκατασταθω] For ἀποκαθιστάναι (τι οτ τινά τινι, or with ἀπό, εἰs, ἐν, ἐπί, or πρός), see Psalm xvi. 5, σῦ εἶ ὁ ἀποκαθιστῶν τὴν κληρονομίαν μου ἐμοί. Mal. iv. 6, ôς ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱόν κ.τ.λ. &c. Matt. xvii. 11, Ἡλίας μὲν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα. Mark iii. 5, καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεἰρ αὐτοῦ. viii. 25, καὶ ἀπεκατέστη κ.τ.λ. &c.

20. Ο δε Θεός της ειρήνης]

For this combination see also Rom. xv. 33. xvi. 20. 2 Cor. xiii. 11 ($\tau\eta$ s $\dot{a}\gamma\dot{a}\pi\eta$ s κal $\epsilon i\rho\eta\prime\eta$ s). Phil. iv. 9. 1 Thess. v. 23. 2 Thess. iii. 16 (\dot{o} K $\dot{v}\rho\iotaos$ $\tau\eta$ s $\epsilon i\rho\eta\prime\eta$ s).

ό ἀναγαγών] Who brought up (not back). I Sam. ii. 6, Κύριος θανατοῖ καὶ ζωογονεῖ, κατάγει εἰς ἄδου καὶ ἀνάγει. Rom. x. 7, τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ǚβυσσον; τοῦτ ἐστιν, Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν. The word ἀνάγειν is specially applied in the Old Testament to the Exodus from Egypt. See Gen. I. 24. Lev. xi. 45. Num. xx. 4, 5. Josh. xxiv. 17. Jer. xvi. 14. &c.

τον ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων] Isai. lxiii. 11, 12, ποῦ ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων αὐτοῦ (omit B)...ὁ ἀγαγῶν τῆ δεξιậ Μωυσῆν κ.τ.λ. For the application of the figure to Christ, see Matt. xxvi. 31 (from Zech. xiii. 7), πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα κ.τ.λ. John x. 11, 14. 1 Pet. ii. 25.

 $\tau \circ r \mu \epsilon \gamma a v$] In contrast with Moses (Isai. lxiii. 11, 12 above). So, in contrast with *Aaron*, iv. 14. x. 21 (where see note).

iv aluari] A closing refer-

XIII. 19—21.

αίματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἀγαθῷ εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι 21 τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον

xiii. 21. Or έν ὑμίν.

ence to the entrance of the high priest into the holy of holies on the day of Atonement. For iv aluari, 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.

aίματι διαθήκης] Compare note on ix. 20.

alwivo] Now first made the epithet of $\delta \iota a \theta \eta \kappa \eta s$. We have had alwivos before as the epithet of $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a$ (v. 9), of $\lambda \iota \tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota s$ (ix. 12), of $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \rho \nu \rho \mu i a$ (ix. 15).

τον κύριον ήμῶν [Ιησοῦν] Added with solemn emphasis, to mark the *abiding* relationship to us of Him who *inaugurated* that relationship by death and resurrection.

21. καταρτίσαι] See note on xi. 3, κατηρτίσθαι.

έν παντί αγαθώ] In the

matter of (in point of) every good thing. Like Philem. 6, ev έπιγνώσει παντός άγαθοῦ κ.τ.λ. The received text (with strong support) has $\epsilon \nu \pi$. $\epsilon \rho \gamma \omega \dot{a} \gamma$., as Col. i. 10, έν παντί έργω άγαθώ καρποφοροῦντες κ.τ.λ. See also 2 Thess. ii. 17, καὶ στηρίξαι ἐν παντί ἔργω καὶ λόγω ἀγαθώ. r Tim. v. 10, εί παντί έργω αγαθώ έπηκολούθησεν. 2 Tim. ii. 21. iii. 17. Tit. i. 16. iii. 1. The commonness of the phrase (with $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omega$) may be somewhat against it here.

ποιήσαι...ποιών Το 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, &c., just as in Phil. ii. 13 (ố ẻνεργῶν ẻν ύμιν κ. τ. θ. καὶ τὸ ἐνεργειν) it has which worketh in you both to will and to do, &c. (There the Revised Version has preserved the peculiarity of the Greek.)

ποιών] An impossible reading, αὐτῷ before ποιῶν, is found in the Sinaitic and Alexandrine manuscripts. It is conjectured that it may be a corruption of ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ῷ ἡ δόξα εἰs τοὺs αἰῶναs· ἀμήν.

22

Παρακαλώ δε ύμας, αδελφοί, ανέχεσθε του

aὐτός (Himself doing in us, &c.).

 $\epsilon \nu \ \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} V$] This is the reading of the Sinaitic, $\hat{\nu} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ of the Alexandrine. The greater difficulty of $\hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ (after $\hat{\nu} \mu \hat{a} \hat{s}$ above) may be in its favour.

το εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ] The phrase elsewhere has a simple dative (Rom. xii. 1. xiv. 18, εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ. 2 Cor. v. 9. Eph. v. 10, εὐάρεστον τῷ Κυρίφ. Phil. iv. 18), or is followed by παρά τινι (Wisd. ix. 10), or stands absolutely (Rom. xii. 2. Tit. ii. 9).

διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] It is a little doubtful whether these words belong to καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς, or to ποιῶν, or to εὐάρεστον. The punctuation of the Revised (as well as of the Authorized) Version precludes the third, and would suit either of the first two constructions. I incline to the last. It is through Jesus Christ that anything is εὐάρεστον in the sight of God.

 the object. In Gal. i. 5, Eph. iii. 21, Phil. iv. 20, 1 Tim. i. 17, 1 Pet. v. 11, Jude 25, and Rev. iv. 11. vii. 12. xix. 1. &c. the ascription is directly to God, with or without the addition of έν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ or διὰ Ίησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 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 John x. 30, έγω και ό Πατήρ ἕν ἐσμεν.

22. $dv \epsilon \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$] The active voice of avexew, to hold up or to hold back, occurs in the Septuagint in Amos iv. 7 (rai éyè ανέσχον έξ ύμων τον ύετον) and Hagg. i. 10 (δια τοῦτο ἀνέξει ό ουρανος από δρόσου). The use of avéxecobar, 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 $\epsilon \pi i$ $\tau \iota \nu \iota$. For example, Isai. xlii. 14, μή και άει σιωπήσομαι και ανέξομαι; lxiii. 15, που έστι το πληθος του έλέους σου...ότι ανέσχου ήμων; lxiv. 12, και έπι πασι τούτοις ανέσχου, Κύριε, καί έσιώπησας κ.τ.λ. Matt. xvii.

λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως· καὶ γὰρ διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν. γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν 23 Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον, μεθ' οὗ, ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται, ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς. ἀσπάσασθε πάντας τοὺς 24 ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἱταλίας.

 Acts xviii. 14, κατὰ λύγον ἂν ἀνεσχόμην ὑμῶν. 1 Cor. iv.
 3. διωκόμενοι ἀνεχόμεθα. 2 Cor.
 xi. 1, &c. Eph. iv. 2, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπη. Col.
 iii. 13. The less usual combination is with a thing : as here, and 2 Tim. iv. 3, της ὑγιαινούσης διδασκαλίας οὐκ ἀνέξονται.

τοῦ λόγου τῆς π.] Acts xiii. 15, εἶ τίς ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῦν λόγος παρακλήσεως πρὸς τὸν λαόν, λέγετε.

παρακλήσεως] See note on vi. 18, παράκλησιν.

καὶ γάρ] For also. Besides other considerations, my letter is but brief, taking into account the transcendant importance of its topics.

δια βραχέων] Compare 1 Pet. v. 12, δι' ολίγων ἔγραψα, παρακαλῶν κ.τ.λ.

ἐπέστειλα] Acts xv. 20, αλλα ἐπιστείλαι αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.

23. $\gamma \iota \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \epsilon \tau \epsilon$] Know. Imperative. I bid you know. Gal. iii. 7, $\gamma \iota \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ apa $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. These 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.

τάχιον] At all quickly. The comparative in the sense of somewhat is too common to need illustration. See John xiii. 27, δ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχιον.

 $\delta\psi_{0\mu\alpha i}\dot{\nu}\mu\hat{\alpha}s$] A final testimony to the knowledge of the writer by the readers.

24. τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν] See verses 7 and 17, and notes there.

τοὺς ἀγίους] See note on iii. 1, ἄγιοι.

οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας] They 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. 50, 51, ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσὴφ...ἀπὸ ᾿Αρι-

<u>x 2</u>

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

25 Ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.

μαθαίας πόλεως τών Ιουδαίων. John i. 44, 45, Ίησοῦν νίὸν τοῦ 'Ιωσήφ τον από Ναζαρέτ. xi. 1, Λάζαρος από Βηθανίας. xii. 21, Φιλίππω τῶ ἀπὸ Βηθσαιδὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας. xix. 38. xxi. 2, Naθαναήλ ό άπὸ Κανὰ τῆς Γαλι-Acts x. 23. The text λaías. 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 him. Perhaps one might infer with some proba-

bility that he did not write from Rome.

25. H χάριs] The exact phrase is used (besides) only in Tit. iii. 15. But the omission of Too Kupion (or its equivalent) is seen also in Col. iv. 18, η χάρις μεθ' ύμῶν. Ι Tim. vi. 21. 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 (ήνίκα αν περιπατής, μετά σου έστω : ώς δ' άν καθεύδης, φυλασσέτω σε, ινα έγειρομένω συλλαλή σοι').

¹ Prov. vi. 22.

SEPARATE NOTES

ON SOME TEXTS IN THE EPISTLE.

On iii. 7 and ix. 8.

Καθώς λέγει το πνεῦμα το ἅγιον. Τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου.

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 $(\pi \nu \epsilon \eta)$ of the Almighty giveth them understanding' (Job xxxii. 8). 'All scripture is given by inspiration of God ($\theta \epsilon \phi \pi \nu \epsilon \nu \sigma \tau \sigma s$), and is profitable for doctrine,' &c. (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

I.

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 $\delta\sigma a \pi\rho o \epsilon \gamma \rho \dot{a}\phi\eta$, nothing more emphatic than St Peter's $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\dot{a}\lambda\eta\sigma a\nu \dot{a}\pi\dot{\sigma}$ $\Theta\epsilon\hat{v}\hat{u}$ $\ddot{a}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega$. 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 extreme of a merely 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—

(1) Its utter unlikeness to all God's dealings in nature and grace. 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom'—freedom, not bondage—freedom, not rigidity.

(2) The language of the New Testament as to the difference between 'letter' and 'spirit,' between $\gamma \rho \dot{a} \mu \mu a$ and $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ —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 $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho \delta\gamma\rho a\phi o\nu$, and has lost the very $\phi o\rho d$ of the Spirit which made it a $\pi\rho o\phi\eta\tau\epsilon ia$ (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 7th 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 ethnology—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 inspiration (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.

(1) 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 hearer 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.

(1) Let us think what would have become of the $\pi a \rho a$ - $\theta \eta \kappa \eta$ itself, under whichever or whatever dispensation, if it had been left to depend upon oral transmission.

(2) Let 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.

Περὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης. ἘΑπολείπεται σαββατισμός.

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. 10; 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 eachew. 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 manna (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.

(1) 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 $\sigma a\beta\beta a\tau \iota \sigma \mu \delta s$ 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 $\kappa \nu \beta \epsilon \rho \nu \eta \sigma \iota s$) 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.

Διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.

--- 'See you that Veil, that Curtain, of which we have said so much, hanging there, not outside the first door---you 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 time¹: 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

```
<sup>1</sup> John i. 18. <sup>2</sup> 1 Tim. vi. 16.
```

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 21st 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 It is the Life after death which gives efficacy even Priest. 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 keep 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 heart is the shrine. There then let us be drawing near. In the evening, and morning, and at noon-day, will I pray, and that instantly¹. 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 written²-Thou shalt not surely die³—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 head⁴, once received from it, is never forgotten. Take with you the Blood, pass within the Veil-Satan 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"."

- ¹ Psalm lv. 17. ² Matt. iv. 6.
- ³ Gen. iii. 4.

4 Gen. iii. 15.

⁵ From Lessons of the Cross and Passion.

¥ 2

IV.

On x. 38 and 39.

Ούκ ἐσμέν ύποστολής κ.τ.λ.

The phrase to draw back gives the idea of withdrawal, of refusal, almost (in this connexion) of apostasy. But the word $i\pi\sigma\sigma\tau\sigma\lambda\eta$ 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 draw back, 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 $i\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\nu$ $\epsilona\nu\tau\delta\nu$ (Gal ii. 12), 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 consequences¹. 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 $i\pi \sigma \sigma \tau \sigma \lambda \eta$, 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 $\delta \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \sigma \lambda \eta$ 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 $\epsilon i s \dot{a} \pi \omega \lambda \epsilon i a \nu$ to the word $\dot{\nu} \pi o \sigma \tau o \lambda \eta$. 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 might 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 $\delta\mu\sigma\lambda\sigma\gammaia$ which has the promise of two worlds, so, without ambiguity as without ostentation, let us walk in the light of the Lord¹.'

¹ From a Temple Sermon.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

The Numerals refer to Chapter and Verse.

άγαθός ix. 11. x. 1. άγαλλίασις i. g. aγaπav i. 9. xii. 6. ayan vi. 10. x. 24. ayannos vi. 9. άγγελος i. 4. ii. 2. xii. 22. xiii. 2. uyeu ii. 10. αγενεαλόγητος vii. 3. άγια (τά) viii. 2. ix. 8, &c. x. 19. xiii. 11. άγια άγίων ix. 3. άγιάζειν 11. 11. 1x. 13. x. 10, 14, 29. XIII. 12. άγιασμός xii. 14. άγιος 111. Ι. αγιότης xii. 10. άγκυρα vi. 19. άγνοείν v. 2. αγνόημα ix. 7. αγρυπνείν xiii. 17. αγών xii. 1. άδελφός ii. 11, &c. iii. 1. &c. άδικία viii. 12. adikos VI. 10. αδόκιμος vi. 8. αδύνατος vi. 4, 18. x. 4. xi. 6. deí iii. 10. αθετείν x. 28.

αθέτησις vii. 18. ix. 26. āθλησις x. 32. αίγειος xi. 37. Αιγύπτιος xi. 29. Aίγυπτος iii, 16. viii. 9. xi. 26, 27. alµa ii. 14. ix. 7, &c. x. 4, &c. xi. 28. xii. 4, 24. xiii. 11, &c. αίματεκχυσία ix. 22. aiveous xiii. 15. αίρεῖσθαι xi. 25. αίσθητηριον v. 14. alσχύνη xii. 2. airía ii. 11. aiπios V. 9. aiw i. 2, 8. vi. 5. ix. 26. xi. 3. &с. aiwrios v. 9. vi. 2. ix. 12, &c. xiii. 20. а́какоз vii. 26. åκavθaι vi. 8. άκατάλυτος vii. 16. ακλινής x. 23. ακοή iv. 2. V. 11. akovew ii. 1, 3. iii. 7, &c. iv. xii. 19. 2. åκροθίνια vii. 4. άκρον xi. 21.

àλήθεια x. 26. aληθινός viii. 2. ix. 24. x. 22. άλλάσσειν i. 12. άλλήλων x. 24. åλλος iv. 8. αλλότριος ix. 25. xi. 9, 34. άλυσιτελής xiii. 17. άμαρτάνειν iii, 17. x. 26. άμαρτία i. 3. ii. 17. iii. 13. iv. 15. ix. 28. xii. 1. &c. αμαρτωλός vii. 26. xii. 3. άμελεῖν ii. 3. viii. 9. αμεμπτος viii. 7. αμετάθετος vi. 17, 18. αμήτωρ vii. 3. aμίαντος vii. 26. xiii. 4. άμμος xi. 12. άμωμος ix. 14. av xi. 15. &c. ανάγειν xiii. 20. avaykaîos viii. 3. ανάγκη vii. 12, 27. ix. 16, 23. αναδέχεσθαι xi. 17. αναθεωρείν xiii. 7. $dvaip \hat{u} v x. g.$ ล่งลหลเขเว้ยเข vi. 6. άνακάμπτειν xi. 15. αναλογίζεσθαι xii. 3. άναμιμνήσκεσθαι Χ. 32. ανάμνησις Χ. 3. άναρίθμητος xi. 12. ανάστασις vi. 2. xi. 35. ανασταυρούν vi. 6. αναστρέφεσθαι x. 33. xiii. 18. αναστροφή xiii. 7. ανατέλλειν vii. 14. aναφέρειν vii. 27, ix. 28, xiii. 15. $a\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi$ os ii. 6. v. 1. vii. 8, 28. &c. áriérai XIII. 5. aνίστασθαι vii. 11, 15. aropía i. 9. X. 17.

ανορθούν xii. 12. ανταγωνίζεσθαι xii. 4. άνταποδιδόναι Χ. 30. avrí xii. 2, 16. άντικαθιστάναι xii. 4. αντιλογία vi. 16. vii. 7. xii. 3. αντίτυπος ix. 24. *ἀνυπότακ*τος ii. 8. avw xii, 15. άνώτερον x.8. ανωφελής vii. 18. akus xi 38. aξιούν iii. 3. x. 29. άόρατος xi. 27. απαγγέλλειν ii. 12. απαλλάσσειν ii. 15. åπaξ vi. 4. ix. 7, &c. x. 2. xii. 26, 27. απαράβατος vii. 24. απάτη iii. 13. απάτωρ vii. 3. απαύγασμα i. 3. απείθεια iv. 6, 11. aπειθείν iii. 18. xi. 31. āπειρος **ν. 13**. απεκδέχεσθαι ix. 28. απιστία iii. 12, 19. aπό iv. 3. v. 7. vii. 13. x. 22. xiii. 24. &c. αποβάλλειν x. 35. αποβλέπειν xi. 26. άπογράφειν xii. 23. αποδεκατούν vii. 5. aπoδιδόνaι xii. 11, 16. xiii. 17. άποδοκιμάζειν xii. 17. αποθνήσκειν vii. 8. ix. 27. x. 28. xi. 4, &c. άποκαθιστάναι xiii. 19. απόκεισθαι ix. 27. απόλαυσις xi. 25. απολείπειν iv. 6, 9. x. 26. άπόλλυσθαι Ι. ΙΙ. απολύειν xiii. 23.

απολύτρωσις ix. 15. xi. 35. άποστέλλειν i. 14. απόστολος iii. 1. αποστρέφεσθαι xii. 25. αποτιθέναι xii. 1. απώλεια x. 39. apa iv. 9. xii. 8. άρκείσθαι xiii. 5. άρμός iv. 12. αρνείσθαι xi. 24. άρπαγή x. 34. άρτος ix. 2. αρχή ii. 3. iii. 14. v. 12. vi. 1. åc. αρχηγός ii. 10. xii. 2. αρχιερεύς ii. 17. iii. 1. iv. 14, 15. v. 1. &c. άσάλευτος xii. 28. ασθένεια iv. 15. v. 2. vii. 28. xi. 34. ασθενής vii. 18. ασπάζεσθαι xi. 13. xiii. 24. αστείος xi. 23. άστρον xi. 12. ασφαλής vi. 19. avrós ii. 4. iii. 10. viii. 8. xi. 11, 28. xiii, 8. &c. άφαιρείν Χ. 4. aφavήs iv. 13. άφανισμός viii. 13. άφεσις ix. 22. x. 18. άφιέναι ii. 8. vi. 1. αφιλάργυρος xiii. 5. άφιστάναι 111. 12. αφομοιούν vii. 3. apopâv xii. 2. άχρι, άχρις iii. 13. iv. 12. vi. II.

βαπτισμός vi. 2. ix. 10. βασιλεία i. 8. xi. 33. xii. 28. βασιλεύς vii. 1, &c. xi. 23, 27. βέβαιος ii. 2. vi. 19. ix. 17. &c. βεβαιοῦν ii. 3. xiii. 9. βεβαίωσις vi. 16. βέβηλος xii. 16. βιβλίον ix. 19. x. 7. βλαστάνειν ix. 4. βλέπειν ii. 9. iii. 12, 19. x. 25. xi. 1, &c. xii. 25. βοήθεια iv. 16. βοηθείν ii. 18. βonθós xiii. 6. βοτάνη vi. 7. βούλεσθαι vi. 17. βουλή vi. 17. βραχύς ii. 7, 9. xiii. 22. βρώμα ix. 10. xiii. 9. βρώσις xii. 16.

γάλα ν. 12, 13. γάμος xiii. 4. yevea iii. 10. γενεαλογείσθαι vii. 6. YEVVâv i. 5. Xi. 12, 23. γεύεσθαι ii. 9. vi. 4, 5. γεωργείσθαι vi. 7. γη i. 10. vi. 7. xii. 25. &c. γηράσκειν viii. 13. γίνεσθαι i. 4. ii. 2. &c. γινώσκειν iii. 10. xiii. 23. &c. yródos xii. 18. γόνυ Xii. 12. $\gamma p \dot{a} \phi \epsilon w = x. 7.$ γυμνάζειν v. 14. xii. 11. γυμνός iv. 13. δάκρυ ν. 7. Χίι. 17. Δαυείδ iv. 7. xi. 32. δέησις ν. γ. δεικνύναι viii. 5.

δείν ii. 1. ix. 26. xi 6. δεκάτη vii. 2, &c. δεκατοῦν vii. 6, 9. δεξιός i. 3, 13. &c.

δέρμα xi. 27. δέσμιος x. 34. xiii. 3. δεσμός xi. 36. δεύτερος viii. 7, ix. 3, &c. x. 9. δέχεσθαι xi. 31. δηλούν ix. 8. xii. 27. δημιουργός xi. 10. δήπου ii. 16. διά ii. 10. &c. διαβαίνειν 🛛 xi. 29. διάβολος ii. 14. διaθήκη vii. 22. viii. 6, &c. ix. 4, &c. διακονείν vi. 10. διακονία i. 14. διάκρισις v. 14. διαλέγεσθαι xii. 5. διαμαρτύρεσθαι ii. 6. διαμένειν i. 11. διάνοια viii. 10. x. 16. δια παντός ix. 6. xiii. 15. διαστέλλειν xii. 20. διάταγμα xi. 23. διατιθέναι viii. 10. ix. 16, 17. x. 16. διάφορος i. 4. viii. 6. ix. 10. διδάσκαλος V. 12. διδάσκειν v. 12. viii. 11 διδαχή vi. 2. xiii. 9. διδόναι ii. 13. &c. διέρχεσθαι iv. 14. διηγείσθαι xi. 32. διηνεκής vii. 3. x. 1, &c. διικνεῖσθαι iv. 12. δίκαιος x. 38, xi. 4. xii. 23. δικαιοσύνη xi. 7, 33. xii. 11. &c. δικαίωμα ix. 1, 10. διό iii. 7. vi. 1. &c. διότι xi. 5, 23. διώκειν xii. 14. δοκείν iv. 1. x. 29. xii. 10, II. δοκιμασία iii. 9.

δόξα i. 3. ii. 10. xiii. 21. &c. δοξάζειν ν. 5. δουλεία ii. 15. δυναμις i. 3. ii. 4. vi. 5. vii. 16. xi. 11, 34. δυναμούν xi. 34. δύνασθαι ii, 18, iii, 19. iv. 15. v. 2. &c. δυνατός xi. 19. δύο vi. 18. δυσερμήνευτος V. II. δωρεά vi. 4. δώρον V. I. viii. 3, 4. ix. 9. xi. 4. čáν iii. 7, &c. x. 38. xiii. 23. čavroi iii. 13. v. 3, &c. vi. 6. x. 34. &c. έβδόμη iv. 4. έγγίζειν vii. 19. x. 25. έγγυος vii. 22. έγγύς vi. 8. viii. 13. έγείρειν xi. 19. έγκαταλείπειν x. 25. xiii. 5. έθos x. 25. el ii 2. iii. 11. vii. 15. &c. ei raí vi. g. εἰκών Χ. Ι. *cì μή* iii 18. εί μήν vi. 14. cidov iii. 9. xi. 5, &c. eiπεîv vii. 9. &c. εἰρήνη vii. 2. xi. 31. xii. 14. xiii. 20. εἰρηνικός xii. 11. eis i. 5. ii. 3. vi. 10. &c. eis ii, 11. xi. 12. &c. είσάγειν i. 6. είσακούειν ν. 7. εἰσέρχεσθαι iii. 11. vi. 19. ix. 12. X. 5. dec. etorévai ix. 6. είσοδος Χ. 19.

είσφέρειν xiii. 11. elta xii. 9. êr, êş i. 13. v. 1, 7. vii. 4, &c. xi. 3. &c. **ёкаото**я ііі. 13. хі. 21. &с. έκβαίνειν xi. 15. čκβασις xiii. 7. ἐκδέχεσθαι x. 13. xi. 10. έκδίκησις Χ. 30. έκδοχή x. 27. čka vii, 8. έκεινος iv. 2. xii. 25. &c. έκζητείν xi. 6. xii. 7. έκκλησία ii. 12. xii. 23. έκλανθάνεσθαι xii. 5. ἐκλείπειν i. 12. čκλύειν xii. 3, 5. έκουσίως x. 26. έκτρέπεσθαι xii. 13. έκφέρειν τι. 8. έκφεύγειν ii. 3. xii. 25. έκφοβος xii. 21. έλαιον i. g. έλαττοῦν ii. 7, 9. ἐλάττων vii. 7. έλέγχειν xii. 5. έλεγχος xi. 1. έλεήμων ii. 17. έλεος iv. 16. έλίσσειν i. 12. ελπίζειν xi. 1. έλπίς iii. 6, &c. vii. 19. x. 23. έμπαιγμός xi. 36. έμπίπτειν Χ. 31. *ἐμφανίζειν* ix. 24. xi. 14. έν i. 1. ii. 18. iii. 15. ix. 25. &c. ένδεικνύναι vi. 10, 11. ένδικος ii. 2. ένεργής iv. 12. ένθύμησις iv. 12. ένιστάναι (ένεστηκώς) ix. 9. ενκαινίζειν ix. 18. x. 20. Errola iv. 12.

evoxλeiv xii. 15. ένοχος ii. 15. έντέλλεσθαι ix. 20. xi. 22. έντολή vii. 5, &c. ix. 19. & ρέπεσθαι xii. 9. έντρομος xii. 21. έντυγχάνειν vii. 25. ένυβρίζειν Χ. 29. ένώπιον iv. 13. xiii. 21. 'Ενώχ xi. 5. έξάγειν viii. 9. έξέρχεσθαι iii. 16. vii. 5. xi. 8, 15. xiii. 13. έξις v. 14. έξοδος xi. 22. έξουσία ΧΙΙΙ. ΙΟ. έξω xiii. 11, 12, 13. έπαγγελία iv. 1. vi. 12, &c. vii. 6. viii. 6. ix. 15. x. 36. xi. 9, åc. έπαγγέλλεσθαι vi. 13. x. 23. xi. 11. xii. 26. έπαισχύνεσθαι ii. 11. xi. 16. ểπεί ii. 14. iv. 6. ix. 17, 26. x. 2. &c. **έπει**σαγωγή Vii. 19. έπειτα vii. 2, 27. επί i. 2. iii. 6. vii. 11, 13. viii. 1. ix. 10, &c. xi. 4, &c. xii. 10. &c. επίγνωσις Χ. 26. $\epsilon \pi i \gamma \rho \dot{a} \phi \epsilon i \nu$ viii. 10. X. 16. επιδεικνύναι vi. 17. επιζητείν xi. 14. xiii. 14. *επίθεσι*ς vi. 2. *ἐπιθυμεῖν* vi. 11. επικαλείν xi. 16. **έ**πικείσθαι ix. 10. **έ**πιλαμβάνεσθαι ii. 16. viii. 9. έπιλανθάνεσθαι vi. 10. xiii. 2, 16. έπιλείπειν xi. 32. **ε**πισκέπτεσθαι ii. 6.

έπισκοπείν xii. 15. έπίστασθαι xi. 8. επιστέλλειν xiii. 22. **έ**πισυναγωγή x. 25. επιτελείν viii. 5. ix. 6. έπιτρέπειν vi. 3. έπιτυγχάνειν vi. 15. xi. 33. ἔπos vii.g. έπουράνιος iii. 1. vi. 4. viii. 5. ix. 23. xi. 16. xii. 22. έπτά xi. 30. έργάζεσθαι xi. 33. έργον iv. 3. vi. 1, 10. x. 24. &c. εἰρηκέναι i. 13. iv. 3, &c. x. 9. xiii. 5. έρημία xi. 38. έρημος iii. 8, 17. έριον ix. 19. έρμηνεύειν vii. 2. έρυθρα θάλασσα xi. 29. έρχεσθαι vi. 7. viii. 8. x. 37. xi. 8. xiii. 23. δσθίειν Χ. 27. έσχατος i. 2. έσώτερος vi. 19. έτερος v. 6. vii. 11, &c. xi. 36. έτι vii. 11, &c. ix. 8. x. 2, &c. xi. 32, 36. &c. **έτοιμάζειν xi.** 16. éros i. 12. iii. 9, 17. εύαγγελίζεσθαι iv. 2, 6. evapeoreiv xi. 5, 6. xiii. 16. εδάρεστος xiii. 21. εύαρέστως xii. 28. εὐδοκεῖν x. 6, 8, 38. εύθετος vi. 7. εύθύτης i. 8. *с*икагроз iv. 16. εύλάβεια v. 7. xii. 28. εύλαβεῖσθαι xi. 7. εύλογείν vi. 14. vii. 1, &c. xi. 20, 21. εύλογία vi. 7. xii. 17.

εύπερίστατος xii. Ι. εύποιία xiii. 16. εύρίσκειν iv. 16. ix. 12. xi. 5. xii. 17. ἐφάπαξ vii. 27. ix. 12. x. 10. ἔχεαν ii. 14. iv. 14. vi. 9, 13. åс. έχθές xiii. 8. έχθρός i. 13. x. 13. έως i. 13. viii. 11. x. 13. ζηλος x. 27. ζην ii. 15. iii. 12. iv. 12. ix. 17. x. 20. xii. 9. &c. ζητείν viii. 7. ζόφος xii. 18. ζωή vii. 3, 16. ή ii. 6. x. 28. xi. 25. xii. 16. ήγεισθαι x. 29. xi. 11, 26. xiii. 7, åc. ήκειν x. 7, &c. ήλικία 🛛 🛛 🗛 ΤΙ. ήμεῖς ii. 3. &c. ημέρα i. 2. iii, 8. iv. 4. viii. 8. x. 25. &c. 'Hσaῦ xi. 20. xii. 16. ηχος xii. 19. θάλασσα xi. 12, 29. bávatos ii. 9, &c. v. 7. vii. 23. ix. 15, 16. xi. 5. θαρρείν xiii. 6. θεατρίζειν 🕱. 33. θέλειν x. 5, 8. xii. 17. xiii. 18. θέλημα x. 7, &c. xiii. 21. θέλησις ii. 4. θεμέλιος vi. 1. xi. 10. θεμελιοῦν ἱ. ΙΟ. Θεός i. I. &c. θεωρείν vii. 4. θηρίον xii. 20. θησαυρός xi. 26.

θιγγάνειν xi. 28. xii. 20. θλίβειν xi. 37. θλίψις x. 33. θρόνος i. 8. iv. 16. viii. 1. xii. 2. θυγάτηρ xi. 24. θύελλα xii. 18. θυμιατήριον ix. 4. θυμός xi. 27. θυσία v. 1. vii. 27. viii. 3. ix. 9, &c. x. 1, &c. xi. 4. xiii. 15, 16. θυσιαστήριον vii. 13. xiii. 10. **Ιακώβ** xi. 9, &c. lâσθαι xii. 13. ίδιος iv. 10. vii. 27. ix. 12. xiii. 12. ίδού ii. 13. viii, 8. x. 7, 9. lepaτeía vii. 5. ίερεύς v. 6. vii. 1, &c. viii. 4. ix. 6. x. 11, 21. Υεριχώ xi. 30. Υερουσαλήμ xii. 22. ίερωσύνη vii. 11, &c. Ίεφθάε xi. 32. 'Ιησούς ii. 9. iii. 1. iv. 14. vi. 20. vii. 22. x. 19. xii. 2, 24. xiii. 12, 20. Ίησοῦς Χριστός Χ. 10. xiii. 8, 21. 'Ιησοῦς iv. 8. iκετηρία. v. 7. ίλάσκεσθαι ii. 17. ίλαστήριον ix. 5. ίλεως γι΄. 12. *μάτιον* i. 11, 12. ĩva ii. 14. &c. iva μή iii. 13. &c. Ίούδας vii. 14. viii. 8. Ίσαάκ xi. 9, &c. Ισραήλ viii. 8, 10. xi. 22. ίστάναι Χ. 9, 11.

ἰσχύειν ix. 17. ίσχυρός v. 7. vi. 18. xi. 34. Ιταλία xiii. 24. 'Ιωσήφ xi. 21, 22. καθάπερ iv. 2. καθαρίζειν ix. 14, &c. x. 2. каварισμός i. з. каваро́з X, 22. καθαρότης ΙΧ. Ι3. кавйовас і. 13. καθίζειν i. 3. viii. I. X. 12. xii. 2. καθιστάναι v. 1. vii. 28. viii. 3. καθώς iii. 7. &c. καθώσπερ v. 4. καίειν xii. 18. Kaïv xi. 4. καινός viii. 8, 13. ix. 15. καίπερ v. 8. vii. 5. xii. 17. καιρός ix. 9, 10. xi. 11, 15. καίτοι iv. z. κακός V. 14. κακουχείν xi. 37. xiii. 3. καλείν ii. 11. iii. 13. v. 4. ix. 15. xi. 8, 18. καλός V. 14. vi. 5. x. 24. xiii. 9, 18. καλώς xiii. 18. κάμνειν xii. 3. ка́v xii. 20. карбіа ііі. 8, &c. iv. 7, 12. viii. 10. x. 16, &c. xiii. 9. καρπός xii. 11. xiii. 15. картєрєїх xi. 27. ката ііі. 8, 13. v. 6. vi. 13, 16. ix. 5, 25. xi. 7. &c. καταβάλλειν vi. 1. καταβολή iv. 3. ix. 26. xi. 11. καταγωνίζεσθαι xi. 33. κατάδηλος vii. 15. κατακαίειν xili. 11. κατακρίνειν ΧΙ. 7.

καταλείπειν iv. 1. xi. 27. καταναλίσκειν xii. 29. κατανοείν iii. 1. X. 24. καταπατείν x. 29. καταπαύειν iv. 4, &c. κατάπαυσις iii. 11, 18. iv. 1, &c. καταπέτασμα vi. 19. ix. 3. x. 20. καταπίνειν xi. 29. κατάρα vi. 8. καταργείν ii. 14. καταρτίζειν x. 5. xi. 3. xiii. 21. κατασκευάζειν iii. 3, 4. ix. 2, 6. xi. 7. κατασκιάζειν ix. 5. κατάσκοπος xi. 31. καταφεύγειν vi. 18. καταφρονείν xii. 2. κατέχειν iii. 6, 14. x. 23. Katoikeîv Xi. 9. καῦσις vi. 8. καύχημα iii. 6. κεφάλαιον viii. I. κεφαλίς x. 7. κιβωτός ix. 4. xi. 7. κληρονομείν i. 4, 14. vi. 12. xii. 17. κληρονομία ix. 15. xi. 8. κληρονόμος i. 2. vi. 17. xi. 7. κλήσις iii. 1. κλίνειν xi. 34. KOLVÓS X. 29. κοινούν ix. 13. κοινωνείν ii. 14. κοινωνία xiii. 16. когишио́я Х. 33. κοίτη xiii. 4. κομίζειν x. 36. xi. 19, 39. κοπή vii. 1. κοσμικός ix. ι. κόσμος iv. 3. ix. 26. x. 5. xi. 7, 38. κρατείν iv. 14. vi. 18. κράτος 11. 14.

κραυγή V. 7. κρείσσων (-ττων) i. 4. vi. 9. vii. 7, &c. viii. 6. ix. 23. &c. κρίμα vi. 2. κρίνειν x. 30. xiii. 4. κρίσις ix. 27. x. 27. κριτής xii. 23. κριτικός iv. 12. κρύπτειν xi. 23. κτίσις iv. 13. ix. 11. κυκλοῦν xi. 30. Κύριος i. 10. ii. 3. vii. 14. xiii. 20. åc. κωλον iii. 17. κωλύειν vii. 23. λαλείν i. 1, 2. ii. 2, 3. siii. 5. v. 5. xi. 4. xii. 24, 25. &c. λαμβάνειν ii. 2, 3. v. 1, 4. &c. λανθάνειν xiii. 2. λαός ii. 17. iv. 9. xi. 25. xiii. 12. &c. λατρεία ix. 1, 6. λατρεύειν viii. 5. ix. 9, 14. x. 2. xii. 28. xiii. 10. λέγειν i. 6, 7. ii. 6, 12. &c. λειτουργείν x. 11. λειτουργία viii. 6. ix. 21. λειτουργικός i. 14. λειτουργός i. 7. viii. 2. Λευεί (-είς) vii. 5, 9. Λευειτικός Vii, 11 λέων xi. 33. λιθάζειν xi. 37. λιθοβολείν xii. 20. λογίζεσθαι xi. 19. λόγιον V. 12. λόγος ii. 2. iv. 2, &c. vi. 1. vii. 28. &c. λοιπός Χ. 13. λούειν x. 22. λύπη xii. 11. λύτρωσις ix. 12.

λυχνία ix. 2. μακροθυμείν vi. 15. μακροθυμία vi. 12. μάλλον xi, 25. &c. μανθάνειν v. 8. μάννα ix. 4. μαρτυρείν vii. 8, 17. x. 15. xi. 2, &c. μαρτύριον iii. 5. μάρτυς x. 28. xii. 1. μαστιγούν xii. 6. μάστιξ xi. 36. μάχαιρα iv. 12. xi. 34, 37. μεγαλωσύνη i. 3. viii. 1. μέγας iv. 14. viii. 11. x. 21, 35. xi. 24. xiii. 20. μείζων vi. 13, 16. ix. 11. xi. 26. μέλλειν i. 14. ii. 5. vi. 5. viii. 5. ix. 11. x. 1, 27. xi. 8, 20. XIII. 14. Μελχισεδέκ v. 6, 10. vi. 20. vii. 1, &c. μέμφεσθαι viii. 8. µ.év i. 7. iii. 5. &c. μένειν vii. 3, 24. x. 34. xii. 27. xiii. 1, 14. μερίζειν vii. 2. μερισμός ii. 4. iv. 12. μέρος ix. 5. μεσιτεύειν vi. 17. μεσίτης viii. 6. ix. 15. xii. 24. μέσος ii. 12. μετά iv. 7, 16. ix. 3. xi. 9. xii. 14. xiii. 25. &c. μετάθεσις vii. 12. xi. 5. xii. 27. μεταλαμβάνειν vi. 7. xii. 10. μεταμέλεσθαι vii. 21. иста́гога vi. 1, 6. xii. 17. μετατιθέναι vii. 12. xi. 5. μετέπειτα xii. 17. μετέχειν ii. 14. v. 13. vii. 13. μέτοχος i. g. iii. 1, 14. vi. 4. xii. 8. μετριοπαθείν v. 2. μέχρι, μέχρις iii. 6, 14. ix. 10. xii. 4. μή iv. 2, 15. ix. 9. xi. 8. de. $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon$ xii. 5. μηδείς Χ. 2. μηδέπω xi. 7. μή ποτε ii. 1. iii. 12. iv. 1. ix. 17. $\mu\eta\pi\omega$ ix. 8. μήτε vii. 3. μιαίνειν xii. 15. μικρός viii. 11. x. 37. μιμείσθαι xiii. 7. μιμητής vi. 12. μιμνήσκεσθαι ii. 6. viii. 12. x. 17. xiii. 3. μιστέλν i.g. μισθαποδοσία ii. 2. x. 35. xi. 26. μισθαποδότης xi. 6. μνημονεύειν xi. 15, 22. xiii. 7. μονογενής Χί. 17. μόνον ix. 10. xii. 26. μόνος ix. 7. μόσχος ix. 12, 19. μυελός iv. 12. μυριάς xii. 22. Mωυσής iii. 2, &c. vii. 14. viii. 5. ix. 19. x. 28. xi. 23, 24. xii. 21. νεκρός vi. 1, 2. ix. 14, 17. xi. 19, 35. xiii. 20. νεκρούν xi. 12. véos xii. 24. νέφος xii, 1. νήπιος V. 13. νοείν xi. 3. $v \delta \theta o s x i i$. 8. νομοθετείν vii. 11. viii. 6.

νόμος vii. 5, &c. viii. 4, 10. ix. 19, 22. X. I, &c. vvv ii. 8. viii. 6. ix. 5, &c. xi. 16. xii. 26. voví ix. 26. Nŵe xi. 7. νωθρός v. 11. vi. 12. ξενίζειν xiii. 2. Eévos xi. 13. xiii. 9. ξηρός xi. 29. όγκος xii. Ι. όδός iii. 10. ix. 8. x. 20. όθεν ii. 17. iii. 1. vii. 25. viii. 3. ix. 18. xi. 19. olkos iii. 2, &c. viii. 8. x. 21. xi. 7. οἰκουμένη i. 6. ii. 5. οἰκτιρμός x. 28. ολίγος xii. 10. όλιγωρείν xii. 5. ολοθρεύειν xi. 28. όλοκαύτωμα x. 6, 8. όλος iii. 2, 5. όμνύναι iii. 11, 18. iv. 3. vi. 13, 16. vii. 21. όμοιότης iv. 15. vii. 15. δμοιοῦν ii. 17. όμοίως ix. 21. όμολογείν xi. 13. xiii. 15. όμολογία iii. 1. iv. 14. x. 23. όνειδισμός x. 33. xi. 26. xiii. 13. öνομα i. 4. ii. 12. vi. 10. xiii. 15. *ỏπή* xi. 38. őπov vi. 20. ix. 16. x. 18. όπτεσθαι ix. 28. xii. 14. xiii. 23. öπωs ii. 9. ix. 15. όραν ii. 8. viii. 5. xi. 27. οργή iii. 11. iv. 3.

ορθός xii. 13. δρίζειν iv. 7. δρκος vi. 16, 17. ορκωμοσία vii. 20, &c. όρος viii. 5. xi. 38. xii. 20, 22. δσιος vii. 26. όσος i. 4. ii. 15. iii. 3. &c. οστέον xi. 22. όστις ii. 3. viii. 5, 6. ix. 2, 9. x. 8, &c. xii. 5. xiii. 7. οσφύς vii. 5, 10. δταν i. 6. δτε vii. 10. ix. 17. õτι ii. 6. åc. ovik i. 12. &c. ovdé viii. 4. &c. ovdeis ii. 8. dec. ουδέποτε Χ. Ι, ΙΙ. ούκέτι Χ. 18, 26. ου μή viii. 11, 12. x. 17. xiii. 5. ouv ii. 14. &c. ούπω ii. 8. xii. 4. oupavós i. 10. iv. 14. vii. 26. viii. 1. ix. 23, 24. x. 34. xi. 12. xii. 23, &c. outos iii. 3. iv. 5. vii. 1, 4. viii. 3. x. 12, 33. xi. 12, &c. xiii. 11. &c. ούτω, ούτως iv. 4. vi. 15. x. 33. åc. οὐχί i. 14. iii. 17. οφείλειν ii. 17. v. 3, 12. όφθαλμός iv. 13. πάθημα ii. 9, 10. Χ. 32. παιδεία xii. 5, &c. παιδεύειν xii. 6, διο. παιδευτής xii. 9. παιδίον ii. 13, 14. xi. 23. πάλαι i. 1. παλαιούν i. 11. viii. 13. πάλιν i. 5, 6. iv. 7. vi. 1, 6. &c.

πανήγυρις xii. 23. παντελής vii. 25. πάντοθεν ix. 4. παρά i. 4, 9. ii. 7, 9. iii. 3. ix. 23. xi. 4, &c. xii. 24. παράβασις ii. 2. ix. 15. $\pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda \eta$ ix. 9. xi. 19. παραγίνεσθαι ix. 11. παραδειγματίζειν vi. 6. παραδέχεσθαι xii. 6. παραιτείσθαι xii. 19, 25. παρακαλείν iii, 13. x. 25. xiii. 19, 22. παράκλησις vi. 18. xii. 5. xiii. 22. παρακοή ii. 2. παραλαμβάνειν xii. 28. παραλύειν xii. 12. παραμένειν vii. 23. παραπικραίνειν iii. 16. παραπικρασμός iii. 8, 15. παραπίπτειν vi. 6. παραπλησίως ii. 14. $\pi a \rho a \rho \rho \epsilon \epsilon u$ ii. 1. παραφέρειν xiii. 9. παρείναι xii. 11. xiii. 5. παρεμβολή xi. 34. xiii. 11, 13. παρεπίδημος xi. 13. παριέναι xii. 12. π apoikeîv xi. 9. παροξυσμός Χ. 24. παρρησία iii. 6. iv. 16. x. 19, 35. πas i. 2. &c. πάσχα xi. 21. πάσχειν ii. 18. v. 8. ix. 26. xiii. 12. πατήρ i. 1, 5. iii. 9. vii. 10. viii. 9. xi 23. xii. 7, &c. πατριάρχης vii. 4. $\pi a \tau \rho i s$ xi. 14. παύειν X. 2. πείθειν ii. 13. vi. 9. xiii. 17, 18. πειρα xi. 29, 36. **V**. **H**.

πειράζειν ii. 18. iii. 9. iv. 15. xi. 17, 37. πειρασμός iii. 8. πέρας vi. 16. περί v. 3. x. 6. &c. περιαιρείν Χ. ΙΙ. περιβόλαιον i. 12. περιέρχεσθαι xi. 37. περικαλύπτειν ix. 4. περικεῖσθαι v. 2. xii. 1. περιπατείν xiii. 9. περιποίησις Χ. 39. περισσώς ii. 1. vi. 17. vii. 15. xiii. 19. πηγνύναι viii. 2. πηλίκος vii. 4. πικρία xii. 15. πίνειν vi. 7. πίπτειν iii. 17. iv. 11. xi. 30. πιστεύειν iv. 3. xi. 6. πίστις iv. 2. vi. 1, 12. x. 22, &c. xi. 1, &c. xii. 2. xiii. 7. πιστός ii. 17. iii. 2, 5. x. 23. xi. 11. πλανάσθαι iii. 10. v. 2. xi. 38. πλάξ ix. 4. πλείων iii. 3. vii. 23. xi. 4. πληθος xi. 12. πληθύνειν vi. 14. πληροφορία vi. 11. x. 22. πλούτος xi. 26. πνεῦμα i. 7, 14. ii. 4. iii. 7. iv. 12. vi. 4. ix. 8, 14. x. 15, 29. XII. 9, 23. ποιείν i. 2, &c. iii. 2. xi. 28. xiii. 21. &c. ποικίλος ii. 4. xiii. 9. ποιμήν xiii. 20, πόλεμος xi. 34. πόλις xi. 10, 16. xii. 22. xiii. 14. πολίτης viii. 11. πολλάκις νί. 7. ΙΧ. 25, 26. Χ. ΙΙ.

πολυμερώς i. 1. πολύς ii. 10. v. 11. ix. 28. x. 32. xii. 9, &c. πολυτρόπως i. 1. πόμα ix. 10. πονηρός iii. 12. x. 22. πόρνη xi. 31. πόρνος xii. 16. xiii. 4. πόρρωθεν xi. 13. πόσος ix. 14. x. 29. ποτέ i. 5, 13. πov ii. 6. iv. 4. ποῦ xi. 1. πούς i. 13. ii. 8. x. 13. xii. 13. πρâγμα vi. 18. x. 1. xi. 1. πρέπειν ii. 10. vii. 26. πρίειν xi. 37. πρό xi. 5. προάγειν Vii. 18. πρόβατον xiii. 20. προβλέπειν xi. 40. πρόδηλος vii. 14. πρόδρομος vi. 20. προειρηκέναι iv. 7. πρόθεσις ix. 2. προκείσθαι vi. 18. xii. 1, 2. πρός i. 8. iv. 13. ix. 13. xi. 18. xii. 10. &c. προσαγορεύειν V. IO. προσδέχεσθαι x. 34. xi. 35. προσέρχεσθαι iv. 16. vii. 25. x. 1, 22. xi. 6. xii. 18, 22. προσεύχεσθαι xiii. 18. προσέχειν ii. I. vii. I3. προσκυνείν i. 6. xi. 21. προσοχθίζειν iii. 10, 17. προστιθέναι xii. 19. $\pi \rho \dot{o} \sigma \phi a \tau o s x. 20.$ προσφέρειν v. 1, &c. viii. 3, &c. ix. 7, &c. x. 1, &c. xi. 4, &c. xii. 7. προσφορά x. 5, &c. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \chi v \sigma is xi. 28.$

 $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \omega \pi \circ \nu$ ix. 24. πρότερον iv. 6. vii. 27. x. 32. προφήτης i. 1. xi. 32. πρώτος viii. 7, 13. ix. 1, &c. X. Q. πρώτον vii. 2. πρωτοτόκια xii. 16. πρωτότοκος i. 6. xi. 28. xii. 23. πύλη xiii. 12. πῦρ i. 7. x. 27. xi. 34. xii. 18, 29. πŵς ii. 3. 'Paáβ xi. 31. páβdos i. 8. ix. 4. xi. 21. ραντίζειν ix. 13, &c. x. 22. ραντισμός xii. 24. βήμα i. z. vi. z. xi. z. xii. 19. ρίζα xii, 15. σαββατισμός iv. 9. σαλεύειν xii. 26, 27. Σαλήμ vii. 1, 2. σάλπιγξ xii. 19. Σαμουήλ xi. 32. Σαμψών xi. 32. σάρκινος vii. 16. σάρξ ii. 14. v. 7. ix. 10, 13. x. 20. xii. 9. Σάρρα xil 11. σβεννύναι xi. 34. σείειν xii. 26. σημείον ii. 4. σήμερον i. 5. iii. 7. xiii. 8. &c. Σιών xii. 22. σκεῦος ix. 21. σκηνή viii. 2, 5. ix. 1, &c. xi. 9. xiii. 10. σκιά viii. 5. x. 1. σκληρύνειν iii. 8, &c. iv. 7. σπέρμα ii. 16. xi. 11, 18. σπήλαιον xi. 38. σποδός ix. 13.

σπουδάζειν iv. 11. σπουδή vi. 11. στάμνος ix. 4. στάσις ix. 8. σταυρός xii. 2. στενάζειν xiii. 17. στερεός V. 12, 14. στεφανούν ii. 7, 9. στοιχείον V. 12. στόμα xi. 33, 34. συμφέρειν xii. 10. συναντάν vii. 1, 10. συναπολλύναι xi. 31. συνδέειν xiii. 3. συνείδησις ix. 9, 14. x. 2, 22. xiii. 18. συνεπιμαρτυρείν ii. 4. συνκακουχείν X1. 25. συνκεραννύναι iv. 2. συνκληρονόμος xi. 9. συνπαθείν iv. 15. x. 34. συντέλεια ix. 26. συντελείν viii. 8. σχεδόν ix. 22. σώζειν v. 7. vii. 25. σώμα x. 5, &c. xiii. 3, 11. σωτηρία i. 14. ii. 3, 10. v. 9. vi. 9. ix. 28. xi. 7. τάξις v. 6. vii. 11. &c. ravpos ix. 13. x. 4. ταχύ xiii. 19, 23. τε iv. 12. vi. 4. &c. τείχος xi. 30. τέλειος v. 14. ix. 11. τελειότης vi. I. τελειούν ii. 10. v. 9. vii. 19, 28. ix. 9. x. 1, 14. xi. 40. xii. 23. τελείωσις vii. II. τελειωτής xii. 2. τελευτάν xi. 22. τέλος iii. 6, 14. vi. 8, 11. vii. 3.

τέρας ii. 4. τεσσεράκοντα iii. 9, 17. τεχνίτης xi. 10. τηλικούτος ii. 3. τιθέναι i. 2, 13. x. 13. τίκτειν vi. 7. τιμή ii. 7, 9. iii. 3. v. 4. τίμιος xiii. 4. Τιμόθεος xiii. 23. τιμωρία X. 29. TIS ii. 6. iii. 4. X. 27. &c. tis i. 5. v. 12. dtc. τοιγαρούν xii. I. τοίνυν xiii. 13. τοιοῦτος vii. 26. viii. 1. xi. 14. xii. 3. xiii. 16. τομός iv. 12. τόπος viii. 7. xi. 8. xii. 17. τοσούτος i. 4. iv. 7. vii. 22. x. 25. xii. I. τότε x. 7, 9. xii. 26. τοῦτ' ἔστιν ii. 14. vii. 5. ix. 11. x. 20. xi. 16. xiii. 15. τράγος ix. 12, &c. x. 4. τράπεζα ix. 2. τραχηλίζειν iv. 13. τρεîς x. 28. τρέχειν xii. ι. τρίβολος vi. 8. τρίμηνον xi. 23. τρόπος xiii. 5. τροφή ν. 12, 14. τροχιά xii. 13. τυγχάνειν viii. 6. xi. 35. τυμπανίζειν xi 35. τύπος viii. 5. ύδωρ ix. 19. x. 22. ύετός vi. 7. viós i. 2. ii. 10. iii. 6. v. 8. vii. 28. xii. 5. &c. ύπακοή v. 8. ύπακούειν V. 9. xi. 8.

υπαρξις x. 34. υπάρχειν x. 34. ύπείκειν xiii, 17. ύπεναντίος x. 27. ύπέρ ii. g. iv. 12. vi. 20. vii. 25, 27. åc. ύπεράνω ix. 5. υπό ii. 3. v. 10. xii. 3. &c. υπόδειγμα iv. 11. viii. 5. ix. 23. υποκάτω ii. 8. ύπομένειν x. 32. xii. 2, &c. ύπομονή x. 36. xii. 1. υποπόδιον i. 13. x. 13. υπόστασις i. 3. iii. 14. xi. 1. υποστέλλειν x. 38. ύποστολή x. 39. ύποστρέφειν Vii. 1. υποτάσσειν ii, 5, 8. xii. 9. νσσωπος ix. 19. υστερείν iv. 1. xi. 37. xii. 15. ύστερον xii. 11. υψηλός i. 3. vii. 26. υψιστος vii. 1. φαγείν xiii. 10. φαίνεσθαι xi. 3. φάναι viii. 5. φανερούν ix. 8, 26. φαντάζειν xii. 21. Φαραώ xi. 24. φέρειν i. 3. vi. 1. ix. 16. xii. 20. xiii. 13. φεύγειν xi. 34. φιλάδελφία xiii. 1. φιλοξενία xiii. 2. φλόξ i. 7. φοβείν iv. 1. xi. 23, 27. xiii. 6. φοβερός x. 27, 31. xii. 21. φόβος ii. 15. φόνος xi. 37. φράττειν xi. 33. φύειν xii. 15.

φυλακή xi. 36. φυλή vii. 13, 14. φωνή iii. 7, 15. iv. 7. xii. 19, 26. φωτίζειν vi. 4. x. 32. χαρά x. 34. xii. 2, 11. xiii. 17. χαρακτήρ i. 3. χάρις ii. 9. iv. 16. x. 29. xii. 15, 28. xiii. 9, 25. χείλος xi. 12. xiii. 15. χείρ i. 10. ii. 7. vi. 2. viii. 9. x. 31. xii. 12. χειροποίητος ix. 11, 24. χείρων Χ. 29. Χερουβείν ix. 5. χρεία ν. 12. vii. 11. x. 36. χρηματίζειν viii. 5. xi. 7. xii. 25. χρίειν i. 9. Χριστός iii. 6, 14. v. 5. vi. 1. ix. 11, &c. xi. 26. χρονίζειν x. 37. χρόνος iv. 7. v. 12. xi. 32. χρυσίον ix. 4. χρυσούς ix. 4. χωλός xii. 13. χωρίζειν vii. 26. χωρίς iv. 15. vii. 7, 20. ix. 7, &c. x. 28. xi. 6, 40. xii. 8, 14. ψεύδεσθαι vi. 18. ψηλαφάν xii. 18. ψυχή iv. 12. vi. 19. x. 38, 39. xii. 3. xiii. 17. ώδε vii. 8. xiii. 14. us vii. 9. xiii. 3. &c. ώσεί i. 12. ώσπερ iv. 10. vii. 27. ix. 25. ώστε xiii. 6. ώφελείν iv. 2. xiii. 9.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. & SONS, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Messrs MACMILLAN AND CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

WORKS BY THE VERY REV. C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D.,

Dean of Llandaff and Master of the Temple.

- The Prayers of Jesus Christ. A Closing Volume of Lent Lectures in the Temple Church. Globe 8vo.
- St Paul's Epistle to the Romans. The Greek Text with English Notes. Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- University Sermons, New and Old. A Selection of Sermons preached before the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 1861-1887. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Memorials of Harrow Sundays. Sermons preached in the Chapel of Harrow School. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 105. 6d.
- Temple Sermons. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Lectures on the Revelation of St John. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 105. 6d.
- Lectures on the Epistle to the Philippians. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Lessons of the Cross and Passion. Words from the Cross. The Reign of Sin. The Lord's Prayer.—Four Courses of Lent Lectures. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 105. 6d.
- Authorised or Revised? Sermons on some of the Texts in which the Revised Version differs from the Authorised. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Heroes of Faith: Lectures on the Eleventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- St Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. The Greek Text, with Translation, Paraphrase, and Notes for English Readers. Cr. 8vo. 5s.
- Epiphany, Lent, and Easter. A Selection of Expository Sermons. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 105. 6d.
- Twelve Discourses on Subjects connected with the Liturgy and Worship of the Church of England. Fourth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.
- Notes for Lectures on Confirmation. With Suitable Prayers. Fourteenth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 15. 6d.
- The Church of the First Days: The Church of Jerusalem, The Church of the Gentiles, The Church of the World. New Edition. Crown 8vo. ros. 6d.
- Christ satisfying the Instincts of Humanity. Eight Lectures delivered in the Temple Church, Lent, 1870. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.