CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL

HAND-BOOK

TO

THE EPISTLES

TO

TIMOTHY AND TITUS,

BY

JOH. ED. HUTHER, TH.D.,

PASTOR AT WITTENFÖRDEN BEI SCHWERIN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN BY

DAVID HUNTER, B.A.,

AND TO

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS,

BY

DR. GÖTTLIEB LÜNEMANN,

PROFESSOR IN THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GÖTTINGEN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN BY

REV. MAURICE J. EVANS, B.A.

WITH A PREFACE AND SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES TO THE AMERICAN EDITION BY

TIMOTHY DWIGHT,

PROFESSOR OF SACRED LITERATURE IN YALE COLLEGE.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY.

NEW YORK AND LONDON.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1885,
By FUNK & WAGNALLS,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

PREFACE

TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

THE present volume of Meyer's Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the New Testament contains the Commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles, by Dr. Huther, and on the Epistle to the Hebrews, by Dr. Lünemann. In the work of preparing these Commentaries for publication in the American edition, I have followed the same general plan with that which was adopted in the volume on the Epistles to the Colossians, Philippians, and Thessalonians, issued within the present year. The limits imposed upon me have made it impossible to discuss all the points of interest or importance, which the Epistles offer for consideration, as fully as might have been desired. But I have endeavored to follow the course of the chapters and verses, and, in some sense, to give a continuous series of annotations on the several Epistles. These annotations cover more than one hundred and twenty pages, and I trust that they will prove to be not otherwise than suggestive and helpful to the student.

The question as to the Pauline authorship of these Epistles is discussed with much learning, ability and fairness by Drs. Lünemann and Huther. I would commend the careful reading of what they have written to all who may use the volume. With the general conclusions which they reach, I would here express my agreement, believing, as I do, that Paul may probably be regarded as the writer of the Pastoral Epistles, but not of the Epistle to the Hebrews. For the reason, however, which was mentioned in my preface to the volume on "Philippians," etc., I have refrained from entering upon an independent examination of this question, and have confined myself wholly to annotations explanatory of the meaning and thought of the epistles. In the course of these annotations, indeed, I have considered the plan of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and have pointed out its un-Pauline character; but this matter was so intimately connected with the primary purpose of my notes that it could not be passed over altogether. What I have been led, thus incidentally, to set forth respecting this point is submitted to the candid consideration of the reader.

As in former volumes, the references to pages in Winer's and Buttmann's Grammars of the New Testament, are given both to the German and American editions of those works—the American edition being designated by the letters E. T. In my own notes, the pages of the American translation only are indicated. The abbreviations of the names of commentators, in my annotations, will be readily understood by the reader. For other abbreviations, reference may be made to page xxiv. of the volume on the Epistle to the Romans.

As in the case of the two other volumes of this Commentary, which have passed under my editorial care, I dedicate my portion of the present volume to the Students and Graduates of the Divinity School of Yale College. It is a pleasure to me to unite my name, once more, with theirs, in a book whose object is to aid all honest students of the New Testament writings in an impartial investigation of their meaning.

TIMOTHY DWIGHT.

NEW HAVEN, *Oct.* 22d, 1885.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

In publishing the fourth edition of my Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, I recall with painful feeling the man who began and conducted the work in which I count it a special honor to take part. When the third edition of my Commentary on the Epistle of James appeared in the year 1870, he was still busy with undiminished mental vigor in conducting his work nearer to that goal of completion, which he had kept before him from the first. At that time I did not anticipate that in a few years he would be called away from his work. Through his death Science has sustained a heavy loss, but she has this comfort, that if he himself has departed from her, the work to which he devoted the labor of a lifetime still remains, a brilliant example of the most thorough and unbiassed exegesis, of an exegesis which, holding itself free from all subjective caprice, "devotes itself soberly, faithfully, submissively, to the service of the Divine Word." The works of Meyer testify that he himself adhered to the law which he set down for the expositors of the holy Word, viz. that "they must interpret its pure contents as historical facts in a manner *simple, true,* and *clear, without bias* and independent of dogmatic prejudice, neither adding nor taking away anything, and abstaining from all conjectures of their own" (Preface to the fifth edition of the Commentary on 1 Cor.).—Since he invited me to take part in the work, it has been my constant endeavor to imitate his example; and it shall always be so with me, so long as I am spared to go on with it. Of what use is it, either to theological science or to the Church, if the expounder of the holy Scriptures uses his acuteness in endeavoring to confirm from them his own preconceived opinions, instead of faithfully interpreting and presenting the thoughts actually contained in them?—The same endeavor has guided me in this new revision, as will be shown, I hope, by the revision itself. In addition to the scrutiny to which I have subjected my earlier work, I have also carefully considered and examined the writings on the Pastoral Epistles, published since 1866, when the third edition of this Commentary appeared. Above all, I have examined the third edition of van Oosterzee's Commentary, the practical exposition by Plitt, and Hofmann's Commentary. While fully acknowledging the acuteness displayed in

Hofmann's exposition, I have but seldom been able to agree with it; for the most part, I have felt myself bound to refute it. However convincing it may frequently appear at the first glance, as frequently it will not bear an unbiassed, scrutinizing consideration. While it certainly does not yield itself to exuberant fancies, it still follows a mode of exegesis, in which the chief purpose is to put forth new and striking explanations, and then to support them with all kinds of ingenious arguments.—Nevertheless I feel myself bound to express my thanks to it, because it has incited me to examine the thought of the holy text all the more carefully and thoroughly.

The disfavor with which the Pastoral Epistles used often to be regarded has gradually disappeared, and rightly; for the more deeply we enter into the spirit of their contents, the more they appear worthy of the apostle whose name they bear. Excellent service in presenting their fulness of thought has been done by Stirm, a deacon in Reutlingen, in his treatise published in the *Jahrbuch für deutsche Theologie* (vol. xviii. No. 1, 1872), and called "Hints for Pastoral Theology contained in the Pastoral Epistles." The more they who are entrusted with the clerical office make use of the contents of these epistles as their guiding star, the richer in blessing will their labors be.—To that same end may the Lord of the Church bless this my new work!

JOH. ED. HUTHER.

WITTENFÖRDEN, *November*, 1875.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

INTRODUCTION.

SECTION 1.—TIMOTHY AND TITUS.

TIMOTHY.—He was the son of a Christian Jewess (γυναικὸς Ἰουδαίας πιστῆς, Acts xvi. 1) named Eunice (2 Tim. i. 5), and of a Greek. We cannot determine for certain his place of birth. The passage in Acts xx. 4 does not prove that he was born in Derbe, since the position of καί forbids the connection of Τιμόθεος with Δερβαῖος.[1] From Acts xvi. 1, we might possibly take Lystra to be his birthplace. If this be right, we may from it explain why in Acts xx. 4, Τιμόθεος, without more precise description, is named along with Caius of Derbe, since Lystra lies in the neighborhood of Derbe.[2] From his mother and his grandmother, called Lois, he had enjoyed a pious education; and he had early been made acquainted with the holy scriptures of the Jews (2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 14, 15). When Paul on his second missionary journey came into closer connection with him, he was already a Christian (μαθητής), and possessed a good reputation among the believers in Lystra and Iconium. Paul calls him his τέκνον (1 Tim. i. 2, 18; 2 Tim. i. 2; 1 Cor. iv. 17), from which it would appear that he had been converted by the preaching of the apostle, probably during the apostle's first stay in Lystra (Acts xiv. 6, 7); and, according to the reading: παρὰ τίνων, in the passage 2 Tim. iii. 14, by means of his mother and grandmother. Paul, after circumcising him, because his father was known in the district to be a Gentile,[3] adopted him as his assistant in the apostleship.

[1] Wieseler (*Chronol. des apost. Zeitalters*, p. 25) argues that Δερβαῖος should go with Τιμόθεος. He points out that in xix. 29, Γάϊος is called a *Macedonian* along with Aristarchus, and that xx. 4 would agree with this if καὶ Γάϊος were joined to Θεσσαλονικέων. But in this construction καί before Σεκοῦνδος is superfluous. The Gaius here named is not to be held identical with the one mentioned in xix. 29; see Meyer on Acts xx. 4.

[2] According to Otto, the ἦν does not denote Timothy's *abode*, but only his temporary *sojourn* occasioned by the presence of Paul—an assertion which the context flatly contradicts.

[3] From the expression: ὅτι Ἕλλην ὑπῆρχεν (Acts xvi. 3), Otto wishes to infer that the

From that time forward, Timothy was one of those who served the apostle (*εἷς τῶν διακονούντων αὐτῷ*, Acts xix. 22), his *συνεργός*. The service (*διακονία*) consisted in helping the apostle in the duties of his office, and was therefore not identical with the office of those called evangelists (this against Wiesinger). See on 2 Tim. iv. 5.—Timothy accompanied the apostle through Asia Minor to Philippi; but when Paul and Silas left that city (Acts xvi. 40), he seems to have remained behind there for some time, along with some other companions of the apostle. At Berea they were again together. When Paul afterwards traveled to Athens, Timothy remained behind (with Silas) at Berea; but Paul sent a message for him to come soon (Acts xvii. 14, 15).[1] From Athens, Paul sent him to Thessalonica, to inquire into the condition of the church there and to strengthen it (1 Thess. iii. 1–5). After completing this task, Timothy joined Paul again in Corinth (Acts xviii. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 6). The two epistles which Paul wrote from that place to the Thessalonians were written in Timothy's name also (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1).[2] When Paul on his third missionary journey remained for some considerable time in Ephesus, Timothy was with him; where he was in the interval is unknown. Before the tumult occasioned by Demetrius, Paul sent him from Ephesus to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22). Immediately afterwards the apostle wrote what is called the First Epistle to the Corinthians, from which it would appear that Timothy had been commissioned to go to Corinth, but that the apostle expected him to arrive there after the epistle (1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10, 11). Matthies asserts without proof that Timothy did not carry out this journey.—When Paul wrote from Macedonia the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Timothy was again with him;[3] for Paul composed that epistle also in Timothy's name, a very natural act if Timothy had shortly before been in Corinth.—He next traveled with the apostle to Corinth; his presence there is proved by the greeting which Paul sent from him to the church in Rome (Rom. xvi. 21).—When Paul after three

father was "*properly* a Hellene, but that not much of a Gentile nature was to be seen in him," because *ὑπάρχειν*, in contrast to *φαίνεσθαι*, is = "to be fundamentally" (!).

[1] There is no tenable ground for Otto's assertion that Silas remained at Berea, and that Timothy, after completing the apostle's commission in Thessalonica, joined Silas again at Berea on the return journey, from which place the two traveled together to Corinth.

[2] Otto asserts that in Corinth Timothy made "his *first* attempts at the *κήρυγμα τοῦ λόγου* (2 Cor. i. 19)," which is in manifest contradiction with 1 Thess. iii. 1–5. *Στηρίζειν* and *παρακαλεῖν περὶ τῆς πίστεως* necessarily include the *κηρύσσειν τὸν λόγον*, and are not to be regarded merely as the fulfillment of a "*messenger's duty*, demanding no particular experience nor ability."

[3] Wieseler assumes that Timothy joined Paul again while still in Ephesus (*l. c.* pp. 57 f.), but his proofs are not decisive.

months left Greece, Timothy, besides others of the apostle's assistants, was in his company. He traveled with him ἀχρι τῆς Ἀσίας, *i. e.* as far as Philippi, from which the passage across to Asia Minor was usually made. From there Timothy and some others went before the apostle to Troas, where they remained till the apostle also arrived (Acts xx. 3–6). At this point there is a considerable blank in Timothy's history, since he is not mentioned again until the apostle's imprisonment in Rome.[1] He was with the apostle at that time, because Paul put his name also to the Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Philippians. This fact is at the same time a proof that no other of his assistants in the apostleship stood in such close relations with him as Timothy.—When Paul wrote the last epistle, he intended to send him as soon as possible to Philippi, in order to obtain by him exact intelligence regarding the circumstances of the churches there (Phil. ii. 19 ff.).

From our two Epistles to Timothy we learn also the following facts regarding the circumstances of his life:—

According to 1 Tim. i. 3, Paul on a journey to Macedonia left him behind in Ephesus, that he might counteract the false doctrine which was spreading there more and more. Perhaps on this occasion—if not even earlier—Timothy was solemnly ordained to his office by the laying on of hands on the part of the apostle and the presbytery. At this ordination the fairest hopes of him were expressed in prophetic language (comp. 1 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6), and he made a good confession (1 Tim. vi. 12).—Paul at that time, however, hoped soon to come to him again.—As to the period of Paul's apostolic labors into which this falls, see § 3.—Later on, Paul was a prisoner in Rome. When he was expecting his death as near at hand, he wrote to Timothy to come to him soon, before the approach of winter, and to bring him Mark, together with certain belongings left behind in Troas (2 Tim. iv. 9, 11, 13, 21).—Regarding this imprisonment of Paul, see § 3.

Timothy is only once mentioned elsewhere in the N. T., and that is in Heb. xiii. 23. It is very improbable that the Timothy there mentioned is another person; and from the passage we learn that when the epistle was written, he was again freed from an imprisonment, and that its author, as soon as he came, wished, along with him, to visit those to whom the epistle was directed.

According to the tradition of the church, Timothy was the first bishop

[1] In this it is presupposed that the two Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians, and the Epistle to Philemon, were written in Rome, and not, as Meyer assumes, in Cæsarea.

of Ephesus. Chrysostom, indeed, merely says: *δῆλον, ὅτι ἐκκλησίαν λοιπὸν ἦν πεπιστευμένος ὁ Τιμόθεος, ἣ καὶ ἔθνος ὁλόκληρον τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας* (*Homil.* 15, on 1 Tim.); but Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii. 4), says directly: *Τιμόθεος τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παροικίας ἱστορεῖται πρῶτος τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν εἰληφέναι.* Comp. also *Const. Apost.* i. 7, ch. 46; *Photii Bibl.* 254.—From the First Epistle only this much is clear, that the apostle gave to him a right of superintending the church at Ephesus, similar to that which the apostles exercised over the churches. It was a position from which afterwards the specially episcopal office might spring, but it cannot be considered as identical with the latter.

Titus.—Regarding the circumstances of his life, we possess still less information than regarding those of Timothy. He was also one of Paul's assistants, and is first mentioned as such in Gal. ii. 1, where Paul tells us that he took Titus with him to Jerusalem on the journey undertaken fourteen years after his conversion or after his first stay in Jerusalem. Though Titus was of Gentile origin, Paul did not circumcise him, that there might be no yielding to his opponents.—When Paul wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians, he sent Titus to Corinth, that a report might be brought to him of the state of matters there. Paul was disappointed in his hope of finding him again at Troas (2 Cor. ii. 13), but afterwards joined him in Macedonia (2 Cor. vii. 6). The news brought by Titus led him to compose the Second Epistle. With this he sent Titus a second time to Corinth, where he was at the same time to complete the collection for the poor of the church in Jerusalem, which he had already on a previous occasion begun (2 Cor. viii. 6, 16, 23).—When Paul, from his imprisonment in Rome, wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy, Titus was not with him, but had gone to Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv. 10). On this point we do not possess more exact information.

From the Epistle to Titus itself, we learn that he had assisted the apostle in his missionary labors in Crete, and had been left behind there in order to make the further arrangements necessary for forming a church (Tit. i. 5). By the epistle he is summoned to come to Nicopolis, where Paul wished to spend the winter (Tit. iii. 12).—Paul calls him his *γνήσιον τέκνον κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν*, from which it appears that he had been converted to Christianity by Paul.

According to the tradition of the church, Titus was installed by Paul as the first bishop of Crete. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii. 4): *Τιμοθεός γε μὴν τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παροικίας ἱστορεῖται πρῶτος τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν εἰληχέναι· ὡς καὶ Τίτος τῶν ἐπὶ Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν*; comp. Jerome, *Catal. Script. Eccles.*; Theodoret on 1 Tim.

iii.; Theophylact, *Procm. ad Tit.*; *Const. Apost.* vii. 46. He is said to have died and been buried in Crete in his ninety-fourth year.

SECTION 2.—CONTENTS OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

First Epistle to Timothy.—The epistle begins with a reminder that the apostle had left Timothy behind in Ephesus in order to counteract the heresies of certain teachers. These heresies are described in detail, and the evangelic principle of life is placed in opposition to them (i. 3–10) by directing attention to the gospel as it had been entrusted to the apostle. This furnishes an opportunity for expressing his thanks for the grace shown to him in it (11–17), to which is added an exhortation to Timothy to act rightly in regard to it (18–20). Then follow particular directions, first as to public intercessions and the behavior of the men and women in the meetings of the church (ii. 1–15), and then as to the qualities necessary in a bishop and a deacon (iii. 1–13). After briefly pointing out the essential truth of the gospel (14–16), the apostle goes on to speak further regarding the heretics, and confutes their arbitrary rules (iv. 1–6). After this we have further exhortations to Timothy,—first as to his behavior towards the heresy (7–11), then as to his official labors (12–16), and lastly in reference to his attitude towards the individual members of the church. Under this last head are given more detailed instructions about widows and presbyters (v. 1–25), to which are added some special remarks regarding slaves (vi. 1, 2).—After another attack on the heretics (3–10), there follow again exhortations to Timothy to be true to his calling, which are interrupted by an allusion to the rich (11–22).

Second Epistle to Timothy.—The epistle begins with the apostle's assurance to Timothy that, full of desire to see him again, he remembered him always in prayer, and was convinced of his unfeigned faith (i. 3–5). This is followed by an exhortation to stir up the gift of the Spirit imparted to him, and not be ashamed of the gospel, but to be ready to suffer for it (6–8); his attention also is directed to the grace of God revealed in the gospel, and to the apostle's example (9–12). Then follow further exhortations to Timothy to hold fast the doctrine he had received, and to preserve the good thing entrusted to him, the apostle also reminding him of the conduct of the Asiatics who had turned away from him, and of the fidelity of Onesiphorus (13–18).—The doctrine received from the apostle he is to deliver to other tried men, but he himself is to suffer as a good soldier of Jesus Christ, and to remember the Risen One; just as he, the apostle, suffers for Christ's sake, that the elect may become partakers of blessed-

ness (ii. 1–13). Then follow warnings against the heresy, which may exercise on many a corrupting influence, but cannot destroy the building founded by God (14–19). Instructions are also given how Timothy is to conduct himself towards this heresy, and towards those who give themselves up to it (20–26). With prophetic spirit the apostle points next to the moral ruin which threatens to appear in the future in the most varied forms. He pictures the conduct of the heretics, and exhorts Timothy on the contrary—in faithful imitation of his exemplar as before—to hold fast by that which he knows to be the truth (iii. 1–17). In reference to the threatening general apostasy from the pure doctrine of the gospel, the apostle exhorts Timothy to perform faithfully the evangelic duties of his office, especially as he himself was already at the end of his apostolic career (iv. 1–8). Then follow various special commissions, items of news, greetings, the repeated summons to come to him soon before the approach of winter, and finally the Christian benediction with which the epistle closes.

The Epistle to Titus.—After a somewhat elaborate preface, Paul reminds Titus that he had left him behind in Crete for the purpose of ordaining presbyters in the churches there. The qualities are named which the presbyter ought to possess, and Paul points out the upholding of the pure gospel as the most important requisite of all, that the presbyter may be able to withstand the continually growing influence of the heretics. The mention of the heretics in Crete gives the apostle an opportunity of quoting a saying of Epimenides, which describes the character of the Cretans, while at the same time he sketches the heretics, with their arbitrary commands and their hypocritical life, and vindicates against them the principle of life in the gospel (i. 5–16). Then follow rules of conduct for the various members of the church, for old and young, men and women, together with an exhortation to Titus to show a good example in work and doctrine, and especially to call upon the slaves to be faithful to their masters. These exhortations are supported by pointing to the moral character of God's grace (ii. 1–15).—Then follows the injunction that Titus is to urge the Christians to obedience towards the higher powers, and to a peaceful behavior towards all men. The latter point is enforced by pointing to the undeserved grace of God which has been bestowed on Christians (iii. 1–7). To this are added warnings against heresy, and directions how Titus is to deal with a heretic (8–11). The epistle closes with an injunction to come to the apostle at Nicopolis, some commissions, greetings, and the benediction.

The First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus are letters on business, both occasioned by the apostle's desire to impart to his colleagues definite instructions for their work in Ephesus and in Crete respectively. The Epistle to Titus has at the same time the purpose of enjoining him, after the arrival of Artemas or Tychicus, to come to Paul at Nicopolis.—The Second Epistle to Timothy is a letter "purely personal" (Wiesinger), occasioned by the wish of the apostle to see him as soon as possible in Rome. It was written, too, for the purpose of encouraging him to faithfulness in his calling as a Christian, and particularly in his official labors. The apostle felt all the greater need for writing, that he perceived in his colleague a certain shrinking from suffering.—The instructions in the First Epistle to Timothy refer to the meetings of the church, to prayer and the behavior of the women in the meetings, to the qualifications of bishops and deacons, to widows, to the relation of slaves to their masters, but at the same time also to Timothy's conduct in general as well as in special cases.—In the Epistle to Titus the apostle instructs him regarding the ordination of bishops, the conduct of individual members of the church, both in particular according to their age, sex, and position, and also in their general relation to the higher powers and to non-Christians. In all three epistles, besides the more general exhortations to faithfulness in word and act, there is a conspicuous reference to *heretics* who threaten to disturb the church. The apostle exhorts his fellow-workers not only to hold themselves free from the influence of such men, but also to counteract the heresy by preaching the pure doctrine of the gospel, and to warn the church against the temptations of such heresy. He imparts also rules for proper conduct towards the heretics.

The three epistles are closely related in contents, and also in the expression and the form in which the thoughts are developed. They have thus received a definite impress, which distinguishes them from the apostle's other epistles. All Paul's epistles contain expressions peculiar to him alone, and this is certainly the case with every one of these three. But there is also in them a not inconsiderable number of expressions peculiar to them all, or even to two of them, and often repeated in them, but occurring only seldom or not at all in the other epistles of the N. T. The nature of the Christian life is denoted specially by *εὐσέβεια*. 1 Tim. ii. 2, iii. 16, etc.; 2 Tim. iii. 5; Tit. i. 1 (*εὐσεβέω*, 1 Tim. v. 4; *εὐσεβῶς*, 2 Tim. iii. 12; Tit. ii. 12). The following virtues are specially extolled as Christian :—*σεμνότης*, 1 Tim. ii. 2, iii. 4; Tit. ii. 7 (*σεμνός*, 1 Tim. iii. 8, 11; Tit. ii. 2); *σωφροσύνη*, 1 Tim. ii. 9, 15 (*σώφρων*, 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8, ii. 2, 5; *σωφρόνως*,

Tit. ii. 12; *σωφρονέω*, Tit. ii. 6; *σωφρονίζειν*, Tit. ii. 4; *σωφρονισμός*, 2 Tim. i. 7). The same or very similar words, which occur seldom or nowhere else, are used to denote the doctrine of the gospel; *e. g.* the word *διδασκαλία*, especially in connection with *ὑγιαινοῦσα*, 1 Tim. i. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Tit. i. 9, ii. 1. The use of *ὑγιαίνω* and *ὑγιής* in general is peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles: *λόγοι ὑγιαίνοντες*, 1 Tim. vi. 3; 2 Tim. i. 13; *λόγος ὑγιής*, Tit. ii. 8. We may also note: *ἡ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλία*, 1 Tim. vi. 3, and *ἡ ἀλήθεια ἡ κατ' εὐσέβειαν*, Tit. i. 1; *ἡ καλὴ διδασκαλία*, 1 Tim. iv. 6 (*καλός* is also a word which occurs very often in all three epistles). Even in describing the heresy there is a great agreement in all three. Its substance is denoted in a more general way by *μῦθοι*, 1 Tim. i. 4; 2 Tim. iv. 4; Tit. i. 14; more specially by *γενεαλογίαι*, 1 Tim. i. 4; Tit. iii. 9. Frequently it is reproached with occasioning foolish investigations (*μωραὶ ζητήσεις*), as in 1 Tim. vi. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 23; Tit. iii. 9. In 1 Tim. i. 6 it is on this account called *ματαιολογία*, and in accordance with this the heretics are called in Tit. i. 10 *ματαιολόγοι*. In 1 Tim. vi. 4 the blame of *λογομαχίαι* is given to it, and in 2 Tim. ii. 14 there is a warning against *λογομαχεῖν*. The same reproach is contained in *αἱ βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι*, which is found in 1 Tim. vi. 20, and 2 Tim. ii. 16.—But also in other respects there is a striking agreement in these epistles. Among the points of agreement are the formula, *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος*, 1 Tim. i. 15, iii. 1, iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Tit. iii. 8; the word *ἀρνέομαι*, 1 Tim. v. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 12, 13, iii. 5; Tit. i. 16, ii. 12; the formula of assurance, *διαμαρτύρεσθαι ἐνώπιον (τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰ. Χρ.)*, 1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1; the figurative expression, *ἡ παγὶς τοῦ διαβόλου*, 1 Tim. iii. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 26; the phrase, *φυλάσσειν τὴν παραθήκην*, 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14; further, the words, *κατ' ἐπιταγήν*, 1 Tim. i. 1; Tit. i. 3; *ὑπομιμνήσκειν*, 2 Tim. ii. 14; Tit. iii. 1; *δι' ἣν αἰτίαν*, 2 Tim. i. 6, 12; Tit. i. 13; *ἡ ἐπιφάνεια (τοῦ κυρίου)*, used of the future return of Christ, 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8; Tit. ii. 13; *δεσπότης* (instead of *κύριος*, Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22), 1 Tim. vi. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 21; Tit. ii. 9; *παραιτεῖσθαι*, 1 Tim. iv. 7, v. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 23; Tit. iii. 10; *διαβεβαιοῦσθαι περί τινος*, 1 Tim. i. 7; Tit. iii. 8, etc.—Wherever in the three epistles the same subject is spoken of, substantially the same expressions and turns of expression are used, though with some modifications. Thus the benedictions in the inscription agree: *χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη* (Tit. i. 4 should, however, perhaps have the reading: *χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη*). In reference to the redemption by Christ we have in 1 Tim. ii. 6: *ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*; and Tit. ii. 14: *ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς*; in reference to his office Paul says in 1 Tim. ii. 7: *εἰς ὃ (τὸ μαρτύριον) ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κήρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος . . . διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν*; and so also in 2 Tim. i. 11. The

necessary qualities of the bishop are mentioned in the same way in 1 Tim. iii. 2 ff. and Tit. i. 6: *μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ, σώφρων, φιλόξενος, μὴ πάροινος, μὴ πλήκτης.* The general exhortations to Timothy in 1 Tim. vi. 11 and 2 Tim. ii. 22 agree with each other almost to the very letter.

In the other Pauline epistles the fullness of the apostle's thought struggles with the expression, and causes peculiar difficulties in exposition. The thoughts slide into one another, and are so intertwined in many forms that not seldom the new thought begins before a correct expression has been given to the thought that preceded. Of this confusion there is no example in the Pastoral Epistles. Even in such passages as come nearest to this confused style, such as the beginning of the First and Second Epistles to Timothy (Tit. ii. 11 ff., iii. 4 ff.), the connection of ideas is still, on the whole, simple. It is peculiar that, as De Wette has shown, the transition from the special to a general truth is often made suddenly—thus 1 Tim. i. 15, ii. 4–6, iv. 8–10; 2 Tim. i. 9 ff., ii. 11–13, iii. 12; Tit. ii. 11–14, iii. 4–7; and that after such general thoughts a resting-point is often sought in an exhortation or instruction addressed to the receivers of the epistle, as in 1 Tim. iv. 6, 11, vi. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 14, iii. 5; Tit. ii. 15, iii. 8.

SECTION 3.—TIME AND PLACE OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

1. *First Epistle to Timothy.*—Regarding the *time of the composition of this epistle*, different views from an early period have been put forward, since the indications contained in the epistle itself leave a difficulty in assigning to it its proper place in the events of the apostle's life. According to these indications, Paul had been for some time with Timothy in Ephesus, and had traveled from there to Macedonia, leaving Timothy behind in Ephesus to take his place. Probably the epistle was written by Paul from Macedonia, to remind Timothy of his charge, and to give him suitable instructions; for, although Paul hoped to return to Ephesus soon, still a delay was regarded as possible (chap. iii. 14, 15).—According to Acts, Paul was twice in Ephesus. The first occasion was on his second missionary journey from Antioch, when he was returning from Corinth to Antioch (Acts xviii. 19). On this first occasion he stayed there only a short time, as he wished to be in Jerusalem in time for the near-approaching festival. The composition cannot be assigned to that occasion, since there was at that time no Christian church in Ephesus, and Paul was not traveling to Macedonia.—On his third missionary journey Paul was in Ephesus a second time. This time he stayed for two or three years, and then, after

the riot caused by Demetrius, traveled to Macedonia and Greece (Acts xx. 1, 2). Theodoret, and after him many other expositors, assume that Paul wrote the epistle on this journey to Macedonia, or in Macedonia. But to this the following circumstances are opposed:—(1) According to Acts xix. 22, Paul, before his own departure from Ephesus, had already sent Timothy to Macedonia; we are not told that Timothy, after being commissioned to go to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17), returned *to Ephesus* again before the apostle's departure, as the apostle certainly had expected (according to 1 Cor. xvi. 11). (2) When Paul undertook that journey, he did not intend to return soon to Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 6, 7), which decidedly was his intention at the time of the composition of the epistle (1 Tim. iii. 14); and on his return journey from Greece he sailed from Troas past Ephesus for the express purpose of avoiding any stay there (Acts xx. 16). (3) According to 2 Cor. i. 1, Timothy was in Macedonia with Paul when he wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and, according to Acts xx. 4, he accompanied the apostle on his journey from Corinth to Philippi. Timothy therefore must also have left Ephesus after the apostle's departure, although the apostle had charged him to remain there till his own return (1 Tim. iv. 13), and this we can hardly suppose to have been the case. All these reasons prove that the apostle's journey from Ephesus to Macedonia, mentioned in Acts xx. 1, cannot be the same with that of which he speaks in 1 Tim. i. 3.

Some expositors (Bertholdt, Matthies), alluding to Acts xx. 3–5, suppose that Timothy set out from Corinth before the apostle, and then went to Ephesus, where he received the epistle. The supposition is, however, contradicted by *πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν*. This objection Bertholdt can get rid of only by the most arbitrary combinations, Matthies only by most unwarrantably explaining *πορευόμενος* to be equivalent to *πορεύομαι*. Besides, Luke's historical narrative is against the whole hypothesis, unless, as Bertholdt actually does, we charge it with an inaccuracy which distorts the facts of the case.—If the composition of the epistle is to be inserted among the incidents in the apostle's life known to us, the only hypothesis left is, that the apostle's journey from Ephesus to Macedonia, which is mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 3, and during which Timothy was left behind by him in Ephesus, falls into the period of his sojourn for two or three years in Ephesus, but is not mentioned by Luke. This is the supposition of Wieseler (*Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters*), who follows Mosheim and Schrader. It is not only admitted, on the whole, that the apostle may possibly have made a journey which Luke leaves unnoticed, but there are

also several passages in the Epistles to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 14, 21, xiii. 1, 2) which put it beyond doubt that Paul had been in Corinth not *once* but *twice* before their composition, but that the second time he had stayed there only a short time. For this journey, of which Luke tells us nothing, we can find no place in the apostle's history, unless during his stay at Ephesus; see Wieseler, *l.c.* pp. 232, ff. It is natural, therefore, to identify this journey with the one to Macedonia mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 3, and to suppose that the epistle was written on this journey from Macedonia. There are still, however, several considerations against this view. One is that both the church organization presupposed in the epistle, and the requirement that the ἐπίσκοπος should not be νεόφυτος, indicate that the church had already been some time in existence. To this Wieseler, indeed, replies that the journey was undertaken shortly before the end of the apostle's stay in Corinth, so that the church had then been long enough in existence to justify the presupposition and the requirement. But still there is against this hypothesis the consideration that it supposes the apostle to have been in Corinth *himself, shortly* before the composition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, so that he could not therefore have any sufficient occasion for *writing* to the church there. Besides, the passage in Acts xx. 29, 30 is against Wieseler's view. According to the epistle, the heresy had already made its way into the church at Ephesus, but, according to that passage, Paul mentions the heresy as something to be expected in the future. Supposing even that the words ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν do not refer to the church, but only to the presbyters assembled at Miletus, still εἰς ὑμᾶς in ver. 29 must be taken to refer generally to the Christians in Ephesus. Surely Paul, in his address to the presbyters, would not have passed over the presence of heretics in Ephesus, if he knew the church to be so much threatened by the danger that he thought it necessary, even before this, to give Timothy solemn instructions regarding it, as he does in his epistle.—Further, the view implies that Paul had only *for a short time* been separated from Timothy, and that he must have sent him away *immediately* after his own return. But how does the whole character of the epistle agree with this? The instructions which Paul gives to Timothy indicate that the latter was to labor in the church for some time; and the greater the danger threatened it by the heresy, the more inconsistent it seems that Paul, after giving these instructions, should have taken Timothy away so soon from his labors in the church.—The views mentioned hitherto proceed from a presupposed interpretation of 1 Tim. i. 3, viz. that Paul commissioned Tim-

othy to remain in Ephesus, and that the commission was given when Paul departed from Ephesus to Macedonia. This presupposition, however, has been declared erroneous by several expositors, who refer *πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν* not to the apostle, but to Timothy. Paulus explains *προσμεῖναι* as = "abide by a thing," joins *πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδ.* to *ἵνα παραγγείλῃς*, and takes the latter imperatively, so that the sense is: "As I have exhorted thee to abide in Ephesus, and warn them against false doctrine, so do thou travel now to Macedonia, and exhort certain people there to abstain from false doctrine." The opinion of Paulus is therefore that Paul wrote the epistle during his imprisonment at Cæsarea.—Schneckenburger and Böttger try to help the matter by conjecture, wishing both to read, instead of *προσμεῖναι*, the participle *προσμείνας*. The former then assumes that the epistle was composed at the time denoted in Acts xxi. 26; the latter, that it was written in Patara (Acts xxi. 1), or in Miletus (Acts xx. 17). These obviously are arbitrary suppositions. If the journey to Macedonia, mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 3, is not to be understood as one made by the apostle, but as made by Timothy, then it is much more natural to suppose with Otto that this is the journey of Timothy which is mentioned in Acts xix. 22, and that Paul wrote the epistle in Ephesus. This is the view which Otto has sought to establish in the first book of his work of research, *Die geschichtlichen Verhältnisse der Pastoralbriefe*. But this, too, is wrecked on the right explanation of 1 Tim. i. 3, which refers *πορευόμενος εἰς Μακ.* to the subject contained in *παρεκάλεσα*; see on this point the exposition of the passage.

The Epistle to Titus.—The following are the historical circumstances to which this epistle itself points. After Paul had labored in Crete, he left Titus behind there. Then he wrote to the latter this epistle, instructing him, so soon as Artemas and Tychicus had been sent to him, to come with all haste to Nicopolis, where the apostle had resolved to pass the winter.—The epistle, indeed, contains nothing definite regarding the first beginning of Christianity in Crete, nothing regarding the duration and extent of the apostle's labors there, nothing regarding the length of time which intervened between the apostle's departure from Crete and the composition of the epistle; but it is probable that when Paul came to Crete he found Christianity already existing there, and that he himself remained there only a short time; for on the one hand there were already Christian churches there in the chief places, at least in several towns of the island, at the time of composing the epistle, while on the other hand they were still unorganized. It is probable that the epistle

was written by Paul not long after his departure, for it is not to be supposed that Paul would leave his substitute in the apostleship long without written instructions. It is probable also that Paul gave Titus these instructions some time before the beginning of winter, for it would have been meaningless to give instructions, unless Paul intended Titus to labor in Crete for some considerable time.

If we set out with the presupposition that the composition of the epistle is to be placed in that period of the Apostle Paul's life which is described in Acts, we may thus state more definitely the question regarding the apostle's stay in Crete, and the composition of the epistle. Did both take place *before*, or *after*, or *during* the two or three years' stay in Ephesus (Acts xix.)? Each of these suppositions has its supporters among expositors and critics. Those who place the two events in the period *before* the stay at Ephesus, assume as a fixed date *either* the time during which Paul was first in Corinth (Acts xviii. 1–18) (Michaelis), *or* the time during which he was traveling from Corinth to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 18, 19) (Hug, Hemsen), *or*, *lastly*, the time after he had passed through Galatia and Phrygia in the beginning of his third missionary journey, and before he went from there to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 23) (Credner, Neudecker). To all these views alike, however, there is this objection, that Apollos could not be the apostle's assistant before the (second) arrival in Corinth (Acts xviii. 24–xix. 1), whereas he is so named in this epistle. We would then have to suppose that another Apollos was meant here—which would be altogether arbitrary. There are, besides, special objections to these three views. Against the *first*, according to which Paul had made the journey from Corinth to Crete, and from there to Nicopolis in Epirus (iii. 12), and had then returned to Corinth, it may be urged that the apostle's second stay in Corinth, alluded to in 1 Cor. xvi. 7, 2 Cor. ii. 1, etc., did not take place *then*, but *later*. Against the *second*, we might object not only that the journey from Corinth to Jerusalem was undertaken with some haste, so as to leave no room for labors in Crete, but also that it takes Nicopolis to be the town in Cilicia, without giving any reason why Paul should pass the winter there and not in Antioch. As to the *third* view, which is, that Paul for this third missionary journey had chosen Ephesus mainly as his goal (Acts xviii. 21), and that his labors, therefore, on the journey thither consisted only in confirming those who already believed (Acts xviii. 23: *ἐπιστηρίζων πάντας τοὺς μαθητάς*), how are we to reconcile with it the facts that Paul, instead of going at once to Ephesus from Phrygia, went to Crete and Corinth, that he there resolved to pass the winter in

Nicopolis (by which Credner in his *Einl. in d. N. T.* understands the town in Cilicia), and that then only did he go to Ephesus?—There is still less justification for the opinion of some expositors, that Paul traveled to Crete at the date defined by Acts xv. 41, and wrote the epistle later during his two or three years' stay in Ephesus. The former part of this is contradicted by the route (comp. xv. 41 and xvi. 1) furnished by the apostle himself; the latter, by the circumstance that almost the whole of the apostle's second, and a part of his third, missionary journey lay between the beginning of Titus' independent labors in Crete and the despatch of the epistle to him.

The *second* supposition is, that both events are to be placed in the time *after* the apostle's stay at Ephesus, *i. e.* in the period mentioned in Acts xx. 1–3. Its representatives, as before, differ as to the details. *Some* suppose that Paul, on the journey from Ephesus to Greece, went from Macedonia (vv. 1, 2) to Crete; *others*, that he undertook this journey during his three months' stay in Greece (ver. 3). According to the *former* opinion, we should have to suppose that Titus, after completing his second mission to Corinth, returned again to the apostle in Macedonia; that Paul then made the journey with him to Crete, and from there returned to Macedonia alone; that he then wrote the epistle from Macedonia, and afterwards went to Corinth. In this way, therefore, Paul after composing the Second Epistle to the Corinthians would have twice journeyed past Greece, whereas it must have been of great importance to him, after the last news he had received from Corinth, not to put off his journey thither.—The *latter* opinion, supported particularly by Matthies, refutes itself, in so far as the three months which Paul spent in Hellas were winter months, in which traveling to and fro to Crete was hardly possible. Besides, it was when Paul returned from Crete that he formed his plan of passing the winter at Nicopolis. He then informed Titus of it, with the remark that he was to come to him in that place, after he had first waited for the arrival of Artemas or Tychicus. Wiesinger is right in saying: "Unless we exercise ingenuity, we must take the κέκριμαι παραχειμάσαι (chap. iii. 12) to have been written before the approach of winter."

The *third* supposition is, that Paul undertook the journey to Crete from Ephesus before his departure to Macedonia, and also wrote the Epistle to Titus from there. Wieseler defends it with great acuteness. It puts the case in this way. After Paul had stayed over two years in Ephesus, he made by way of Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3) a journey (the second, not mentioned in Acts) to Corinth. On this journey, which was but *short*, he was

accompanied by Titus, who also went with him to Crete. On departing from Crete, he left Titus behind there, returned to Ephesus, and from Ephesus wrote the Epistle to Titus. Then he sent Timothy to Macedonia, instructing him to go to Corinth, and wrote afterwards our First Epistle to the Corinthians. He next sent Tychicus and Artemas to Crete, and bade Titus return to him. Titus was sent afterwards to Corinth. Paul went on the journey to Macedonia, hoping to meet Titus at Troas. They did not meet, however, at Troas, but in Macedonia, when Titus was a second time sent away to Corinth. After the apostle had written our Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he went through Macedonia to Nicopolis in Epirus, where he spent the first months of winter, going afterwards to Corinth.—However well all this seems to go together, there are still the following reasons against the hypothesis:—(1) If Paul made the second journey to Corinth at the time here mentioned, he can have employed only a short time in it. How, then, can we conceive that he used this short time for missionary labors in Crete? (2) Paul wrote to Titus that he was to remain in Crete till Tychicus and Artemas were sent to him, and that then he was to come to Nicopolis. This hypothesis would make out that he had changed his mind, for according to it he bade Titus come to him at *Ephesus*. Besides, we cannot think that, just after he had assigned to Titus an important task in Crete, he should take him so quickly away from it again. (3) It is improbable also that Paul should have chosen for his winter residence a town in which he had not been before, and where, therefore, he could not know how he would be received. His resolution seems rather to presuppose that he had labored before in Nicopolis.[1] (4) In 1 Cor. xvi. 6 Paul writes to the Corinthians: *πρὸς ὑμᾶς δὲ τυχὸν παραμενῶ, ἢ καὶ παραχειμάσω*. According to Wieseler, this *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* is not to be referred to the Corinthians alone, but generally to the Christians in Achaia, to whom (according to i. 2) the epistle is addressed. As Nicopolis in Epirus, on the authority of Tacitus,[2] was counted as belonging to Achaia, Wiese-

[1] Otto objects to this, that Paul might very well spend a winter in a town in which he had not before preached; but that is not the point. The point is that Paul should have formed a resolution to remain for the winter in a town, even before he knew whether his preaching would be received there or not.

[2] Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 53: "Sed eum honorem Germanicus iniit apud urbem Achajae Nicopolim." Pliny also, *Nat. Hist.* iv. 2, assigns Nicopolis to Acarnania, while Strabo, xvii. p. 840, describes, according to the arrangement of the Emperor Augustus, the province in these words: *Ἑβδόμην δ' Ἀχαίαν μέχρι Θετταλίας καὶ Αἰτωλῶν καὶ Ἀκαρνάνων καί τινων Ἠπειρωτίκων ἐθνῶν, ὅσα τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ προσώριστο.*" (Wieseler, l. c. p. 353.) In opposition to Wieseler's assertion, Otto (pp. 362–366) seeks to prove that Nicopolis itself was not counted in Achaia, but only the suburb of the town situated on the Acarnanian side.

ler is of opinion that by spending the winter in Nicopolis the apostle kept the promise given in that passage. But although the epistle was not directed merely to the church in Corinth, it has a special reference to that church, so that its readers could surely understand the words only of an intended stay in Corinth, and not in a place so far distant from Corinth. Paul could not possibly be thinking then of Nicopolis, as is obvious from the fact that at that time, as Wieseler himself maintains, he had not been there; he did not preach the gospel in Nicopolis till later. Paul, however, in the epistle regarded his readers as *Christians* only, not as those who were afterwards to be converted to Christianity. Lastly, although Augustus extended the name of Achaia to Epirus, it does not follow that in common life Nicopolis was considered to be in Achaia. It should be added, too, that Paul, in Wieseler's representation, had not at all fulfilled the promise given in Tit. iii. 13, for he supposes that the apostle remained in Nicopolis only two months of winter, and therefore went to Corinth in the middle of winter.—There may be, too, some accessory circumstances which are favorable to Wieseler's view, and give it an air of probability; such circumstances as the following:—that Apollos was along with Paul in Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 12; Tit. iii. 13); that Tychicus as an Asiatic (Acts xx. 4) probably became acquainted with Paul in Ephesus, and that the mention of him in Tit. iii. 13 agrees with the composition of the epistle in Ephesus; that by the two brothers who accompanied Titus to Corinth we may understand Tychicus and Trophimus—make the theory probable, but cannot completely establish its correctness. Like Wieseler, Reuss (*Gesch. d. heil. Schriften d. N. T.*, 2d ed. 1853, § 87, pp. 73 f.) connects the apostle's journey to Crete with his *second* (see Meyer on 2 *Cor.*, Introd. § 2 Rem.) journey to Corinth during the three years' stay at Ephesus; but he differs from Wieseler in supposing that Paul journeyed first to Crete and then to Corinth, that from the latter place he wrote the epistle, that he then went farther to the north to Illyricum, where trace of him is lost, and returned to Ephesus towards the end of winter. To all this we must say that not only is it inconceivable that Paul should have interrupted his three years' stay by various missionary journeys, occupying so much time, and to districts so remote, but also that Acts xx. 31 contradicts such a theory. Otto, too, refutes the theory of the apostle's journey to Crete, and the composition of the epistle during the three years' stay at Ephesus. In his opinion, Paul made from Ephesus an excursion to Crete,—not mentioned in Acts by Luke,—and on that occasion visited Corinth ἐν παρόδῳ (1 Cor. xvi. 7; 2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 14, 21, xiii. 1, 2). Then in Ephesus

after he had written the lost epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 9), he addressed a letter to Titus whom he had left in Crete.—The passages quoted put it beyond doubt that Paul from Ephesus made a visit to Corinth ἐν παρόδῳ before composing what is called his First Epistle to the Corinthians. Not only, however, is there no indication that Crete was at that time the goal of his journey, but it is also improbable. The theory makes the journey in any case a short one, and Paul could not well choose for its goal a country in which he could not beforehand determine the length of his stay, as he had not been there before. Otto recognizes fully the objections arising from the contents of the epistle, which are against placing the date of composition in the three years' stay; but he thinks to overcome them by supposing that the dates in it rest on a plan of the journey, afterwards altered by the apostle. It is certainly clear from 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, 23, that Paul, on account of circumstances in Corinth, did indeed alter the plan of the journey he had previously formed; but that he ever intended to go to Nicopolis in order to spend the winter there, is a fiction contradicted by what he says himself in the passages quoted. According to these, his original plan was to come from Ephesus direct to Corinth, to pass from there to Macedonia, and to return from Macedonia to Corinth again in order to set out for Judea. There is no trace in the apostle's plans of a journey to Epirus and a winter residence in Nicopolis. The latter he could not even think of, for the reason quoted above.

2. *Second Epistle to Timothy.*—The historical circumstances alluded to in the epistle prove that it was written by the apostle in imprisonment in Rome; comp. i. 8, 12, 16, 17, etc.—This imprisonment has been held to be the same as that mentioned by Luke in the Acts, and a different date has therefore been assigned to the composition of the epistle. Wieseler, following Hemsen, Kling, and others, supposes that the epistle belongs to the time following the διετία, mentioned in Acts xxviii. 30, and was therefore composed after the Epistle to the Philippians. He rests his supposition on two grounds—(1) That while in his Epistle to the Philippians the apostle was still able to cherish the hope of being soon set free, in this epistle he expresses definite anticipations of death. (2) That in Phil. ii. 19–24 the apostle expresses his intention of sending Timothy to Philippi, and that at the time of composing this epistle Timothy was actually in those regions, viz. at Ephesus. Against this second ground Otto rightly maintains that "Timothy would not have served the apostle as a child his father," if after being expected to bring (Phil. ii. 19) comfort

to the imprisoned apostle by the news from Philippi, he did not return at once to Rome, but proceeded instead to Ephesus, and there remained till the apostle "by a solemn apostolic message compelled him to return." Besides, Otto insists that, as Wieseler's interpretaton of 2 Tim. iv. 16 is that "the apostle is telling Timothy of his first *ἀπολογία*," the latter according to this was sent away *before* the first judicial hearing, *i. e.* before he could know how the case would end; whereas according to Phil. ii. 23, 24, "he makes the despatch of Timothy depend on his expectation of a favorable conclusion of the trial."—On these grounds Otto rejects Wieseler's hypothesis, but at the same time he himself—agreeing with Schrader, Matthies, and others—supposes that the epistle was written in the beginning of the *διετία* mentioned, and therefore *before* the composition of the Epistle to the Philippians. But, as Wieseler and Wiesinger rightly observe, "the whole position of the apostle as represented in the epistle" is against this view. According to the apostle's utterances in the Epistle to the Philippians, he was uncertain about the fate hanging over him, but circumstances have so shaped themselves that the expectation of being freed from imprisonment decidedly prevailed with him, and hence he wrote: *πέποιθα ἐν κυρίῳ, ὅτι . . . ταχέως ἐλεύσομαι.* In *this* epistle there is no trace of any such expectation. The apostle rather sees his end close approaching, chap. iv. 6–8; and although in the first *ἀπολογία* he had been rescued, as he says, *ἐκ στόματος λέοντος*, and now expresses the hope that the Lord would rescue him *ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ*, he is thinking not of a release from imprisonment, but of a rescue *εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον*. Otto indeed maintains that the apostle's expressions in chap. iv. 6–8 do not refer to the end of his life, but to the end appointed to him of his missionary labors in the apostleship, and that in the Second Epistle to Timothy there is no trace whatever of anticipations or expectations of death; but this assertion is based on an exposition which, however acute, is anything but tenable. See on this the commentary on the passages in question.—Besides, several of the special notices made by the apostle weigh against the composition of the epistle during the imprisonment mentioned by Luke. Of special weight are the remarks regarding Erastus and Trophimus. Of the former Paul says that he remained in Corinth; of the latter, that he was left behind in Miletus sick. This presupposes a journey made by the apostle to Rome by way of Corinth and Miletus. But on the voyage which Paul made from Cæsarea to Rome as a prisoner, he did not touch at these places. Hence we cannot but suppose that the reference in both cases is to the apostle's previous journey to Jerusalem;

but against this there is the inconceivability of his still mentioning those circumstances after a lapse of several years. Besides, according to Acts xxi. 29, Trophimus was with the apostle in Jerusalem. Wieseler can only get over this by the following artificial combination: "The ship in which Paul as a prisoner embarked at Caesarea in order to be brought to Rome, went to Adramyttium in the neighborhood of Troas. With it Paul went as far as Myra in Lycia. There he embarked in another ship which sailed direct for Italy. Trophimus accompanied the apostle to Myra; there he stayed behind on account of his illness, in order to go on with the ship from Adramyttium as far as Miletus, which was probably his place of residence, and where he wished to stay." This arrangement, artificial to begin with, is contradicted by the apostle's expression in chap. iv. 20. Besides, all this could not but have been long known to Timothy, who was with Paul in the interval, known all the more if, as Wieseler thinks, the apostle had intended to take Trophimus with him to Rome as a witness against his Jewish accusers. It is an unsatisfactory device to maintain that the emphasis is laid on Τρόφιμον δέ and on ἀσθενοῦντα, and that Paul by this remark wished to remind Timothy only of the *feeble health* of Trophimus, which might even prevent him from coming to Rome. The sentence has anything but the form of such a reminder.—Otto attacks the point in a different way, by questioning the presence of Trophimus in Jerusalem at the time when the apostle was put in prison. He asserts that ἦσαν προεωρακότες in Acts xxi. 29 must be referred to the apostle's presence in Jerusalem four years previously, since according to Acts xx. 4 Trophimus accompanied the apostle on his return from his third missionary journey only into Asia and no farther. Against this, however, it is to be noted that the apostle's companions there named did really go farther, as is plain from Acts xxi. 12; for by the ἡμεῖς Luke cannot have meant himself alone, but himself and the companions who had accompanied the apostle on his journey to Macedonia. Ἄχρι τῆς Ἀσίας in Acts xx. 4 simply means that these companions of the apostle remained with him till he had come to the place where the passage across to Asia was made. There they left him, crossing over to Troas without him; but later on, Paul again came to them here, and then they continued their journey in company. No hint is given by Luke that they remained at Miletus after the apostle's departure. There is therefore no ground for assuming that Trophimus was not in Jerusalem when the apostle was put in prison. Rather the opposite. It is inconceivable that the Asiatic Jews should after so long a time have used a suspicion formed four years before as

a ground of complaint against the apostle. We do not see why they should not have brought it forward when it was formed. Besides, according to Otto's hypothesis, these same Asiatic Jews must be regarded as having been present in Jerusalem on both occasions.—In regard to the mention of Erastus, Wieseler is of opinion that he too was important to the apostle as a witness, and that the apostle had summoned him to Rome either through Timothy himself or through Onesiphorus, but that he stayed on nevertheless at Corinth, and that this is what Paul now communicates to Timothy. But there is nowhere the slightest trace of such a summons. Further, the order in which ver. 20 occurs, by no means makes it probable that it referred to judicial matters. Something was said of these in vv. 16 and 17, and these verses could not but have been connected with ver. 20 if the reference in them had been the same; they are, however, separated from it by the greetings in ver. 19. On the other hand, they are immediately attached to the apostle's summons to Timothy to come to him πρὸ χειμῶνος. It is more than probable that vv. 20 and 21 stand in a similar relation to each other as do vv. 9 and 10. In the latter, Timothy knew that Demas, Crescens, and Titus were with Paul in Rome, and so Paul announces that they had left him; in the former, Timothy was in the belief that Erastus and Trophimus had accompanied Paul to Rome, and so Paul now announces that this was not the case. In this way everything stands in a simple, natural connection.—Otto's explanation, too, is unsatisfactory. According to Acts xix. 22, Paul during his stay in Ephesus sent Erastus along with Timothy to Macedonia. Otto now supposes that both were to make this journey by way of Corinth, and there await the apostle. But afterwards Paul changed the plan of his journey; he himself proceeding to Macedonia without touching at Corinth, and sending for Timothy to come thither, while Erastus remained at that time in Corinth, to which fact allusion is now made in Ἔραστος ἔμεινεν ἐν Κορίνθῳ. This, however, is inconceivable. If the case were as Otto thinks, Timothy himself could not but know very well that Erastus, with whom he had made the journey to Corinth, had been left behind in Corinth. And what purpose was the allusion to serve, since the stay of Erastus in Corinth some years before could in no way furnish a reason for his not being with Paul in Rome after the lapse of these years?—Further, if we suppose that the epistle was composed during the apostle's imprisonment in Rome, which is known to us, the charge given to Timothy in chap. iv. 13 is very strange. According to Otto, Paul left behind the articles here mentioned when he set out from Troas, as is mentioned in Acts xx. 13,

because they were a hindrance to his journeying on foot, and he intended to return into those parts later. But according to Acts xx. 22–25, the apostle at that time cherished no such intention; and if those articles were a hindrance to his journeying on foot, his companions might have taken them on board ship.—Finally, it is worth noting that in the epistle no mention whatever is made of Aristarchus, who had accompanied the apostle to Rome. Otto tries to explain this by saying that Paul had only to mention his actual fellow-laborers in the gospel, and that Aristarchus was not one of these, but simply looked after the apostle's bodily maintenance. This, however, is one of Otto's many assertions, which are only too deficient in actual as well as apparent foundation. The result of unbiassed investigation is that the imprisonment of the Apostle Paul in Rome, during which he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy, is not the imprisonment mentioned by Luke, during which he wrote the Epistles to the Philippians, to the Ephesians, and to Philemon.

Remark.—Otto has attempted, not only to weaken the strength of the arguments against the composition of the epistle during that imprisonment, but also to give some as positive proofs that the epistle could have been written *only at that time*. One such argument is that, if the epistle is to belong to a second imprisonment of the apostle in Rome, the situation of the apostle during it must have been the same as during the first imprisonment. He argues that this is altogether incredible, since the apostle's favorable situation during the former had its ground only in an ἄνεσις quite unusual and produced by peculiar circumstances, an ἄνεσις which was much more considerable than that granted to him in Caesarea. The latter consisted only in this, that it was permitted to him to be attended by his own followers—whether kinsmen or servants; it was not permitted to have personal intercourse with his helpers in the apostleship, as was granted to him in Rome. This assertion rests, however, on an unjustifiable interpretation of the passage in Acts xxiv. 23, where Otto leaves the concluding words: ἢ προσέρχεσθαι αὐτῷ, altogether out of consideration. Certainly the apostle's *custodia militaris* in Rome had a mild form; but there is no proof that it may not have been so during his second imprisonment, all the less that its occasion and special circumstances are wholly unknown to us. Otto further asserts that about 63 there prevailed at the imperial court, through the influence of Poppaea, a feeling favorable to the Jews, that this feeling caused the apostle's confinement to be made more severe after lasting two years, and that this is even clearly indicated by Luke in the word ἀκωλύτως, Acts xxviii. 31. But Otto himself makes this friendly disposition to the Jews active even in 61: how then is it credible that not till 63 had it any influence in aggravating the apostle's situation? The assertion is erroneous that Luke's ἀκωλύτως indicates any such thing.—If it were the case that Nero was influenced by Poppaea's favorable inclination to the Jews to cast the blame of the fire in 64 on the Christians, it does not follow from this that Paul was not set free in the spring of 63, though this favorable disposition of the court towards the Jews might explain his condemnation in 64 after a brief

imprisonment.—Wieseler thinks that "the chief judicial process against Paul and his *πρώτη ἀπολογία* before the emperor and his council took place only *after* the two first years of his imprisonment in Rome;" against which Otto maintains that by the *πρώτη ἀπολογία* in 2 Tim. iv. 16 we are to understand the process before Festus, mentioned in Acts xxv. 6-12. If Otto were right in this assertion, the Second Epistle to Timothy must have been written during the first imprisonment at Rome. But in order to confirm this assertion, Otto sees himself compelled not only to give an unwarrantable interpretation of the expressions in 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17 (see on this the exposition of the passage), but also to assume that Acts xxiv. 1-21 mentions only the preliminary process—the *nominis delatio*, not the *actio*. For the proof of this, Otto appeals to the use of *ἀπεκρίθη τε ὁ Παῦλος* instead of *ἀπελογήσατο* in Acts xxiv. 10. This, however, manifestly proves nothing, since Paul himself distinctly called his speech an *ἀπολογία* (ver. 10: *τὸ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ ἀπολογοῦμαι*). The whole process before Felix wears so decidedly, from beginning to end, the character of the *actio*, that it cannot in any sense be considered simply a *nominis delatio*. Otto, too, falls into contradiction with himself by saying elsewhere that the *nominis delatio* took place in Jerusalem when Festus went there after entering on his office.—In defence of his opinion that the epistle was written in the beginning of the first Roman imprisonment, Otto appeals further to the peculiarities which are already apparent in the first seven verses, and insists that these peculiarities can only be explained from the circumstances of that period of the apostle's life. As peculiarities of this nature, Otto mentions: (1) The emphasis laid on holding fast by the promise and faith of the fathers, both on the part of the apostle and on that of Timothy; (2) The apostle's allusion to the earliest circumstances of Timothy's life and ministry; (3) Timothy's irresolution in regard to ministering as a missionary; and (4) the repeated mention and discussion of imprisonment on the apostle's part. Taking up these points in succession, we may note the following:—(1) Not only at the time indicated, but from the very beginning of his apostolic labors, the apostle "had to consider, regarding the gospel, whether it was compatible with the faith inherited from the fathers, or involved a departure therefrom." It would be strange if the apostle had first been led to such consideration by the accusations of the Jews before Felix and Festus. (2) It is quite natural that the apostle should make less mention of the circumstances of Timothy's previous life and ministry in the First Epistle than in the Second. The former is more official in character, the latter more personal. If that allusion to Timothy's earliest circumstances is to be inexplicable after Timothy had already given proof of himself in the apostle's imprisonment in Rome, then it must be quite as inexplicable that Paul, in the beginning of his imprisonment, says not a syllable to Timothy to remind him of the fidelity which he had shown to the apostle on his third missionary journey. (3) The Second Epistle does, indeed, presuppose that Timothy had slackened in his zeal to labor and suffer for the gospel; but this might have happened later quite as much as earlier. Besides, the decline of zeal was not to such an extent as Otto in exaggeration says, "that he had almost abandoned his office through anxiety and timidity." (4) In the other epistles, written during his imprisonment, the apostle makes mention of it not less than in this. There is, however, no reason for saying that in this one he designedly explains the significance of his imprisonment in a way which suits only the beginning of the imprisonment in Rome.

From the survey we have made, it is clear that the composition of all three epistles does not fall into that period of Paul's life described in Acts, and that there is nothing in the same period to account for their origin. In spite of these opposing difficulties, it might be held as not absolutely impossible that one or other of them was written at some time during that period; but there are two considerations of special weight against this—(1) There is the same difficulty *with all three* in finding a place in the period specified for the epistle, and in each case combinations more or less improbable, and of a very ingenious nature, have to be used. (2) *The very* events and circumstances in the life of the apostle which are pre-supposed in *these* epistles must be regarded as omitted in Acts, which is not the case to the same extent with any other of the Pauline Epistles. And even apart from all this, there are other weighty reasons against assigning their composition to that period—reasons contained in the structure of the epistles themselves. As to their contents, there runs alike through the three Epistles, as before remarked, a polemic against certain heretics. These heretics are of quite another kind than those with whom Paul has to do in the Epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans. They are similar to those against whom he contended in the Epistle to the Colossians—heretics, of such a nature as could only have arisen at a later time, and whose appearance in the church is indicated as something future in Paul's address to the Ephesian presbyters at Miletus. Christianity must have already become an aggressive power, before such a mixture of Christian with heathen-Jewish speculation could be formed as we find in these heretics.—Then as to the form of the epistles, *i. e.* the diction peculiar to them, it has manifestly another coloring than in the other Pauline Epistles, so much so that we cannot explain the difference from the fact "that these epistles were written to the apostle's pupils and assistants, the others to churches and members of churches" (Otto). It is inconceivable that the First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus should have been written almost at the same time with the First Epistle to the Corinthians, in the period between the composition of the Epistle to the Galatians and that of the Epistle to the Romans; and it is equally inconceivable that the Second Epistle to Timothy should have been written at a time so much later than those two with which it stands in every way so closely connected. The hypothesis brings together things different in kind, and sunders those that are like one another.

REMARK.—Otto's attempt to prove the close relationship between the First Epistle to Timothy and the First Epistle to the Corinthians—both of which he

refers to the same church and assigns to the same period—must be considered entirely unsuccessful. The contrasts of the epistles compel Otto himself to take some precautions in order to blunt the edge of certain objections to his assertion. His precautionary remarks are—(1) That the image of the condition of the Corinthian church, which was in his mind when writing the Epistle to Timothy, had become different when he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians; and (2) that the apostle "had to write in one fashion to the church, and in another fashion to his deputies." There are, indeed, in the epistles some points of agreement, which, however, may be satisfactorily explained by their common authorship; in both, attention is directed to heretics, and both refer more specially to the inner circumstances of the church than the apostle's other epistles. Otto has only succeeded in making it probable that the heretics in the two epistles were the same. He arbitrarily constructs for himself, out of the apostle's theses in the Epistles to the Corinthians, an image of the antitheses of the heretics, and unjustifiably refers to the latter trains of thought which are quite unsuitable. Nevertheless, he has not succeeded in proving that the heresy spoken of in the Pastoral Epistles, the nature of which may be gathered from the expressions: *μῦθοι*, *γενεαλογίαι*, etc., was also the doctrine of the heretics in Corinth.

The result of an unbiassed investigation is—(1) That all three epistles belong to one and the same period of the apostle's life, and (2) that this period does not fall into that portion of the apostle's life with which we are more closely acquainted through Acts and the other Pauline Epistles. Their composition must accordingly belong to a later time in the apostle's life; and this is possible only if Paul was released from the imprisonment at Rome mentioned by Luke, and was afterwards a second time imprisoned there.

The narrative in Acts cannot be used to disprove the historical truth of such a release and renewed imprisonment on the apostle's part,[1] since, so far as it is concerned, the apostle's martyrdom at the close of the imprisonment there described is as much an hypothesis as the release. It depends on the notices of the elder Fathers. In this respect, however, we must not overlook the fact that in general their communications regarding the apostle are only scanty. In their writings they are not so much concerned for historical truth as for exhortation and dogma; their writings serve the present, and cast only an occasional glance on the facts of the past. Hence we are not surprised that they give but little information regarding the events of Paul's life, and that little only by allusions.—The first clear and distinct notice of Paul's release from the imprisonment mentioned by Luke is found in Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. 22): *τότε μὲν* (*i. e.*

[1] Otto came forward in 1860 as a decided opponent of this conjecture, and in the same year there appeared in its defence the work, *Saint Paul; sa double captivité à Rome, étude historique*, par L. Ruffet.

after the lapse of the two years, Acts xxviii. 30) *οὗν ἀπολογησάμενον αὖθις ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ κηρύγματος διακονίαν λόγος ἔχει στείλασθαι τὸν ἀπόστολον, δεύτερον δ' ἐπιβάντα τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν* (*i. e.* Nero) *τελειωθῆναι μαρτυρίῳ· ἐν ᾧ δεσμοῖς ἐχόμενος τὴν πρὸς Τιμόθεον δευτέραν ἐπιστολὴν συντάττει, ὁμοῦ σημαίνων τήν τε πρότεραν αὐτῷ γενομένην ἀπολογίαν καὶ τὴν παραπόδας τελείωσιν.* This testimony of Eusebius has, however, not been left unquestioned. It has been declared invalid, (1) because Eusebius himself does not appeal to reliable authorities, but only to tradition (*λόγος*); and (2) because his conviction of the accuracy of this tradition rests only on the Second Epistle to Timothy itself, and particularly on his explanation of 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17. But, on the other hand, it is to be observed that the formula *λόγος ἔχει* (for which there also occur the expressions: *λόγος κατέχει, παρειλήφαμεν, ἱστορεῖται, ἐγνωμεν, ἐμαθόμεν, ἡ παράδοσις περιέχει*) does not, in the mouth of Eusebius, quite mean "as the story goes" (Otto), but is used by him when he wishes to quote tradition as such, without intending[1] to mark it as erroneous. Hence his testimony proves this, if nothing more, that in his time the opinion prevailed that Paul was released again from that imprisonment. Then it is to be noted that Eusebius does indeed explain the quoted passage incorrectly, by understanding the words: *ἐρρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος*, of the release from the first imprisonment, but that this incorrect explanation arose from his conviction agreeing with the tradition, and not the tradition from the explanation, as Rudow thinks (in his prize treatise, *De argumentis histor., quibus . . . epistolarum pastoral. origo Paulina impugnata est*, Gottingen 1852): in illam sententiam adductus est interpretatione falsa . . . verborum *ἐρρύσθην κ.τ.λ.*, quae quum ad Neronem referret, putavit, apostolum jam semel saevo . . . . Neronis judicio evasisse.— Though it may seem strange that Eusebius quotes no definite testimony from an older writer in support of the correctness of the tradition, still this proves nothing against it, all the less that he mentions no testimony which contradicts it. For the truth of that tradition some earlier documents seem also to speak. In the first place, the passage in Clemens Rom., 1 *Epist. ad Corinth.* chap. v. The Codex Alex. is the only MS. of it preserved,[2] and its text, as amended by the conjectures of the editor Junius, runs thus: *διὰ ζῆλον* [*ὁ*] *Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον* [*ἔπεσχ*]*εν . . .*

[1] It is clear that Eusebius by this formula does not mean to denote simply a vague report, for he not only directly recognizes the accuracy of the λόγος under discussion, but also confirms it by his interpretation.

[2] *Translator's Note.*—Another MS., fortunately unmutilated, was discovered in the library of the Holy Sepulchre, at Fanari in Constantinople, and was published in 1875 by Bryennius, metropolitan of Serrae. Later still, a Syriac MS., purchased for the University of Cambridge, has been found to contain

κῆρυξ [γενό]μενος ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν [τῇ] δύσει, τὸν γενναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἐλαβεν· δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον κ[αὶ ἐπὶ] τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθὼν καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου.[1] If the expression: *τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως*, means the limits of the west, we can only understand it to be Spain, and in that case this passage favors the theory that the apostle was released from the first Roman imprisonment. The reasons urged against this by Meyer, in the fifth edition of his *Epistle to the Romans*, are not sufficient. Meyer makes appeal to the following facts:—(1) That Clement's words in general bear a strong impress of oratorical hyperbole; but this is seen at most in the expression: *ὅλον τὸν κόσμον*, which, however, is sufficiently explained by the previous: *ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ κ. ἐν τ. δύσει.* (2) That Clement speaks from Paul's point of view; but *ἀνατολή* and *δύσις* are simple geographical designations, just like our expressions east and west. (3) That, if Spain were meant, the *μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμ.* would transport us to the scene of a trial in Spain; but that is not the case, since *οἱ ἡγούμενοι* (note the defin. article) can only be understood as denoting the highest officials of the empire, and besides, in Clement's time it was known generally that Paul had suffered martyrdom in Rome. (4) That Clement otherwise would indicate by the *οὕτως* that Paul's death took place in Spain; but *οὕτως* does nothing but bring together the preceding facts.[2] The meaning is: *in this way*, viz. after he had taught righteousness to the whole world, and come to the limits of the west and "borne testimony before those in power" . . .; *οὕτως* is used in the very same way here as shortly before in the passage about Peter: *οὐχ ἕνα, οὐδὲ δύο, ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκεν πόνους, καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης.*—That Clement did not mean Rome by this expression, is shown by the fact that he was himself in Rome, and would therefore hardly speak of that city as the *τέρμα τ. δύσεως*, and also by the very emphatic position of those words. If Clement had not wished to point to some place beyond Rome, he would have been content with the expressions previously used, since they would have been perfectly sufficient to denote the apostle's labors in the west, and therefore in Rome. Several expositors, however, deny the proposed interpretation

a translation of Clement's two epistles.—See *Smith's Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. I. p. 557.

[1] The text, according to Dressel and others, runs somewhat differently. See on this point Meyer's *Comment. über den Brief an die Römer*, 5th ed. p. 15. Meyer remarks: "Still the various readings of the different revisions of the . . . text make no material difference in regard to this question."

[2] Hofmann (*D. heil. Schr. Thl.* V. p. 8) wrongly refers *οὕτως* only to *διὰ ζήλου*; but the wide interval between *οὕτως* and *διὰ ζήλου* is decisive against this.

of the word τέρμα as equivalent to *limits*. The explanation given by Schrader and Hilgenfeld: "*the boundary limits*," and that by Matthies: "*the centre of the west*," are altogether arbitrary. Otto's explanation seems to have more justification. Following Baur and Schenkel, Otto seeks to prove, on "philological grounds which they have not supplied," that by τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως we are to understand "the goal in the west appointed to the apostle." He wishes, in the secondary use of the word, to maintain the original meaning, according to which τὸ τέρμα denotes "the goal-point, the goal-pillar, in the hippodrome and the stadium." He supplies with τὸ τέρμα the genitive of the τρέχων, who in this place is Paul, and takes the genitive τῆς δύσεως as the genitive of the stadium. But the very last quotations which Otto brings forward from the classics to support his assertion, show his error. In the passage, Eurip. *Alc.* 646: ἐπὶ τέρμ' ἦκων βίου, the pronoun is not to be supplied with τέρμα, but with βίου; it does not mean "come to *his* goal of life," but "come to the goal of *his* life." So also with the passage in *Suppl.* 369, where we have: ἐπὶ τέρμα ἐμῶν κακῶν ἱκόμενος, and not ἐπὶ τέρμα ἐμὸν κακῶν. Accordingly, in the present passage, if the third personal pronoun were to be supplied, it should be with δύσεως and not with τέρμα; but that would be meaningless. But, further, it is arbitrary here, where there is no hint of a figure taken from running a race, to supply with τὸ τέρμα the notion of the apostolic ministry, separating τῆς δύσεως from its *close* connection with τὸ τέρμα, and taking it as equivalent to ἐν τῇ δύσει; all the more that, when so understood, the words are a somewhat superfluous addition. Besides, it is improper to consider τῆς δύσεως as the stadium, and then to place the τέρμα not at the end of it, but somewhere in the middle. If τέρμα in the secondary application is to retain its original meaning, τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως is either to be explained: "the goal to which the δύσις extends," or, more naturally: "the goal which is reached by passing through the δύσις." This may be the ocean which bounds the δύσις, but quite as well the extreme land of the west. If the text is rightly restored by Junius, appeal may also be made to this passage for the apostle's journey to Spain, but certainly not for successful *labors* there, which rather appears to be excluded by the use of the simple ἐλθών. Wieseler, however, has his doubts about the correctness of the restoration, as he believes that the original text was not καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα κ.τ.λ., but καὶ ὑπὸ τὸ τέρμα. This he translates: "after he had taught righteousness to the whole world, and *had appeared before the highest power of the west*, and had borne witness before the first," etc. His explanation, however, is contrary to the meaning of the word, for τέρμα does sometimes occur—

only in connection with ἐχειν—in the sense of "*the highest power or decision*," but it never denotes "the supreme government." Besides, this conjecture and its explanation would designate the supreme imperial government simply as that of the west, while its authority extended equally over the east. Least of all would Clement, who, according to Wieseler's own expression, "is obviously tuning a panegyric on Paul," have used any limited description for that supreme authority. If he had understood τὸ τέρμα in that sense, he would surely have added to the word not simply τῆς δύσεως, but—as was the actual fact—τῆς ἀνατολῆς καὶ τῆς δύσεως.[1] Still less can Rudow's opinion (in the work quoted, p. 7) be justified, that we should not read ἐπί, but ὡς, and explain it as equivalent to "*prope* ad finem imperii occidentalis:" for on the one hand this gives to ὡς an impossible signification, and on the other it attributes to Clement a very commonplace thought.[2]

The second passage is found in the Muratorian Canon, composed about A.D. 170. It runs thus: Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scribta sunt. Lucas obtime Theophile comprindit, quia sub praesentia ejus singula gerebantur, sicuti et semote passionem Petri evidenter declarat, sed profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis. From these words, in themselves unintelligible, this much at least is clear, that Paul's journey to Spain was the subject of tradition in the author's time. Even if, as Wieseler thinks, the word "*omittit*" has been dropped after *proficiscentis*, the words do not say that the journey did not take place, or that it was doubtful and disputed, but only that Luke did not mention it.—Otto conjectures that in the author's time some began, for ecclesiastical purposes, to maintain the journey into Spain to be an historical fact. This conjecture, as well as the other, that the original text of the Canon afterwards received many interpolatory additions, is a mere makeshift in order to confirm, against the testimony of the Canon, the hypothesis that Paul did not make the journey to Spain.[3]

[1] Wieseler's other opinion is arbitrary, that in the words "μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων" the ἡγούμενοι are the *principes* who composed the *concilium* which the emperor was wont to consult in his judgments.

[2] It is strange that Rudow, in his conjecture and its explanation, does not understand Spain by τέρμα τ. δυσ., but Rome (τὸ τέρμα τ. δυσ., non ad Hispaniam sed ad Romam referendum puto), which would make the meaning to be that Paul had come *almost* to Rome.

[3] It will be sufficient here to quote some of the conjectures proposed. Otto thinks that for *sicuti* and *sed*, *sic uti* and *sic et* should be read. Laurent (*Neutest. Studien*, p. 109) makes the conjecture: sicuti et semota passione Petri evidenter declarat et profectione Pauli ab Urbe Spaniam proficiscentis. Many have tried to make the passage clear by retranslating it into Greek. Schott (*Der erste Brief Petri*, p. 353) translates it: καθὼς καὶ, παρεὶς μαρτυρίαν μὲν τὴν τοῦ Πέτρου φανερῶς ἀποσῃ-

From this passage it follows that tradition preserved the report of a journey made to Spain by the apostle, but not of successful *labors* there.[1] This (confirmed by the formula in Eusebius: λόγος ἔχει) agrees with the release of the apostle from the imprisonment in Rome, mentioned by Luke, since the journey could only have taken place if Paul were again at liberty.—As nothing can be shown to be decidedly inaccurate in this tradition so as to prove its impossibility, or even its improbability,[2] we are justified in using this result in determining the date at which our epistles were composed. If we can find no suitable date for any one of them in the apostle's life, down to his first imprisonment in Rome; if, at the same time, the composition of all three necessarily belongs to one and the same period of the apostle's life, and the contents of the epistles point to a later period,—then we are surely justified in assuming that they were written after the imprisonment recorded in Acts, the First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus in the period between this first and a second imprisonment at Rome, and the Second Epistle to Timothy during the second. This view—if we take for granted the genuineness of the epistles—is the only one tenable after the investigation we have made, and hence also more recently it has been accepted by the defenders of their authenticity (even by Bleek, who, however, disputes the authenticity of the First Epistle to Timothy), with the exception of Matthies, Wieseler, and Otto.[3]—The answer to the question, What date is to be assigned to the second imprisonment? depends on the date fixed for the first; and for this the year of Festus' entry on office furnishes a fixed point, since Paul

μαίνει, πορείαν δὲ τὴν τοῦ Παύλου ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν πορευομένου. Hofmann (*D. h. Schr.* pp. 9 f.): καθὼς καὶ παρεὶς τὸ τοῦ Πέτρου πάθος σαφῶς δηλοῖ, Παύλου δὲ τὴν πορείαν εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν πορευομένου. Comp. Meyer's *Römerbrief*, 5th ed. pp. 17 f.

[1] When this is observed, it may be explained also how Innocent I. (A. D. 416) could write: manifestum in omnem Italiam, Gallias, Hispanias, Africam atque Siciliam . . . nullum instituisse ecclesias, nisi eas, quas venerabilis ap. Petrus aut ejus successores constituerint sacerdotes.

[2] The words of Origen in Euseb. iii. 1: τί δεῖ περὶ Παύλου λέγειν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκότος τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ὕστερον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος μεμαρτυρηκότος, do not exclude the *journey* to Spain (against Meyer), but any apostolic *labors* there. On the whole, however, too much should not be inferred from these brief summaries, for otherwise it might be concluded from these words that Paul had preached only from Jerusalem to Illyria, and not in Rome.—It is of still less importance that there is no mention of any release of the apostle in the *Hist. apostolica* of pseudo-Abdias.

[3] Kolbe, too (in a review of Hofmann's commentary, *Zeitschr. f. die luth. Theol. u. K.* 1875, No. 3), will acknowledge no second imprisonment of the apostle, which he holds to be an unnecessary hypothesis, "not necessary after Wieseler in so natural a manner (!) had assigned to the Pastoral Epistles their proper place in the apostle's life."

arrived at Rome in the spring of the following year.—If, with Anger, Wieseler, Hofmann, we suppose that Festus entered on office in the year 60, then Paul was released from the first imprisonment in 63, and the second imprisonment took place either *after* or *before* the burning of Rome and the consequent persecution of the Christians (in the summer of 64). The first supposition seems to be opposed by the fact that in the Pastoral Epistles there is not the slightest allusion to this persecution, while the second gives, from the spring of 63 to the summer of 64, too short time for the events to which the Pastoral Epistles bear witness. It is true that the objection to the first supposition may be weakened by dating the apostle's martyrdom as late as possible, say in 67 or 68. For this we have the support of the old tradition; but on the one hand the tradition is very uncertain,[1] and on the other we would have the apostle laboring for so many years after his first imprisonment, that it would be inexplicable why not a scrap of information has been preserved regarding it. The objection to the second supposition is of less importance, for, even if the time allowed be short, it is not too short. The events would be placed in the following order:—In the spring of 63, Paul leaves Rome; he lands at Crete, where he spends a short time only, and, leaving Titus behind, proceeds to Ephesus, where he meets Timothy. Soon after he crosses to Macedonia, and from there writes the Epistle to Timothy; then somewhat later, after resolving to pass the winter in Nicopolis in Epirus, he writes the Epistle to Titus. Towards the end of winter he returns to Ephesus by way of Troas, and then proceeds, without halting there, by Miletus, where he leaves Trophimus behind sick, and by Corinth, where Erastus does not join him as he wished, to Spain; and from there (perhaps as a prisoner) to Rome. In this way he might still arrive at Rome some time before the burning, and undergo his first trial, after which he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy.[2] Shortly before the burning, or in the persecution

[1] In Jerome (*Catal.* c. 15) it runs: Decimo quarto Neronis anno eodem die quo Petrus Romae pro Christo capite truncatus sepultusque est in via Ostiensi.

[2] Against this reckoning, Otto raises two points in particular—(1) the shortness of the period indicated, and (2) the apostle's summons in 2 Tim. iv. 9 and 21. As to the first point, Otto grants that about five months might be sufficient for the journeys from Rome to Nicopolis, but thinks that the time from March to the middle of July 64 is too short for the journey to Spain and Rome, since the apostle "must have preached in Spain, been taken prisoner, undergone a process before the provincial court, and again made appeal to Caesar." But these presuppositions are not to be considered as at all necessary, since the actual course of events may have been quite different. As to the second point, Otto maintains that Timothy could get from Ephesus to Rome in one month, and that if the same time is to be given for forwarding the Epistle, Paul could

occasioned by it, the apostle suffered martyrdom, and by the sword, according to the testimony of tradition. Wiesinger grants, indeed, that in this view the favorable treatment of the imprisoned apostle is more natural than by supposing that he was imprisoned after the burning; but still he thinks that he cannot agree to it. His chief grounds against it are—(1) that the Second Epistle to Timothy is brought too close to the first; (2) that the apostle, according to 1 Tim. iii. 14 ff., did not stay so short a time in Ephesus; (3) that it is inconceivable how the Asiatics (2 Tim. i. 15–18) should be still in Rome during the time of the apostle's imprisonment, and how Timothy had already been informed of their conduct. But, on the other hand, it is to be observed (1) that there is no hint of the Second Epistle being written a long time after the First, the agreement between them rather testifying against this; (2) that from 1 Tim. iii. 14 ff. no conclusion can be drawn of a long stay made by the apostle in Ephesus; (3) that the verb *ἀπεστράφησαν* in 2 Tim. i. 15 does not imply the presence of the Asiatics in Rome. Ruffet agrees in the representation here given, but remarks: Huther fait mourir Paul en 64, pendant la grande persécution. Il est difficile, dans ce cas, d'expliquer le procès de Paul. He gives 66 as the year of the apostle's death. Against him it must be maintained that there is no ground for assuming that the process was carried out formally, and that it is arbitrary to assign 66 as the year of the apostle's death.

Remark.—Meyer (*Apgesch.* 3d ed. 1861, Introd. sect. 4) has sought on two grounds to prove, against Wieseler, that the retirement of Felix from office did not take place in the year 60, but in 61. His first ground is, that it follows from Josephus, *Vita*, § 3, that in the year 63 Josephus went to Rome in order to obtain the release of some priests who had been imprisoned by Felix, and sent thither. Now, if Felix retired from office in 60, Josephus would have put off his journey too long. But, on the other hand, before undertaking this journey, Josephus had to await the result of the complaint (*Antiq.* xx. 8, 10) made to the emperor against Felix by the Jews; and when Felix was acquitted, it could only appear to Josephus to be unfavorable to his purpose. He would hardly, therefore, undertake his journey immediately after he had received news of it. Meyer's second ground is, that from Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. 8. 11, it is clear that Poppaea was already Nero's wife at the time when Festus entered on office, and she became so in May 62. But the passage in question does not at all prove that. What Josephus says is this.

not write in the beginning of July, but only in the middle or end of August, that Timothy was to make haste to come to him before winter! But even this assertion has only an apparent justification, since it rests on the unproved presupposition that Paul forwarded the letter by the shortest route, and supposed that Timothy would and could choose the shortest route for his journey. Besides, it is to be observed that *ταχέως* and *πρὸ χειμῶνος* are not immediately connected with one another.

About the time when a great impostor was destroyed with his followers by the troops which Festus, on entering office, sent against him, Agrippa built in Jerusalem the great house from which he could see into the temple. The Jews built a wall to prevent his looking into the temple, and, after vainly negotiating on the matter with Festus, they brought the case before Nero by means of ambassadors. Nero gave them a favorable answer, *τῇ γυναικὶ Ποππηίᾳ ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἰουδαίων δεηθείσῃ χαριζόμενος*. Josephus does not say how much time was taken up in building the house, in erecting the wall, in negotiating with Festus, in sending the ambassadors, in awaiting Nero's answer; but it is more than probable that some years must have passed while these things were going on. Besides, it is least questionable whether the use of *γυνή* implies that Poppaea was then Nero's wife.—If Meyer's reckoning were still to be correct, the apostle's release would have taken place shortly before the fire. The fact that there is no allusion to Nero's persecution in the epistles would have to be explained in this way, that the apostle was already made acquainted with it when he was with Timothy in Ephesus.—Dr. H. Lehmann (*Chronologische Bestimmung der in der Apgesch. Kap.* 13–28, *erzählten Begebenheiten*, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, No. 2, pp. 312–319) gives the date of Festus' entry on office quite differently from Wieseler and Meyer. According to Lehmann's investigation, the year 58 is both the earliest and the latest possible date for the recall of Felix. He believes that Felix was not recalled *after* the year 58, because Felix was acquitted from the charge raised against him by the Jews through the intercession of his brother Pallas, *who*, according to the express statement of Josephus, *was then in high favor with Nero*. But Pallas was in favor with Nero only till 59; his influence was very closely connected with that of Nero's mother, Agrippina, so that her downfall and murder in 59 would necessarily deprive Pallas of Nero's favor, just as some years later (in 62) he was poisoned by Nero, who coveted his treasures.—Lehmann is of opinion also that Felix was not recalled *before* 58, because the revolt of the Egyptians (Acts xxi. 38) cannot have taken place before 56.—According to this, Paul would therefore be at liberty again in the spring of 61, which certainly would be a result very favorable to dating the composition of the Pastoral Epistles before Nero's persecution.

As to the *place of composition*, Paul wrote the First Epistle to Timothy after his departure from Ephesus, probably in Macedonia, or at least in the neighborhood of that country, while Timothy was in Ephesus. In accordance with this, the subscription in *Auct. Synops.* runs: *ἀπὸ μακεδονίας*, while in the Coptic and Erpenian versions Athens is set down quite arbitrarily as the place of composition. In several MSS., on the other hand, we find the subscription which has passed into the Received Text: *ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας, ἥτις ἐστὶ μητρόπολις Φρυγίας τῆς Πακατιανῆς*; in Cod. A simply *ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας*. This place is assigned to it also in the Peschito, the Aethiopic version, in Oecumenius, Theophylact, etc. The addition *τῆς Πακατιανῆς* points to a division which arose in the fourth century. The opinion that the epistle was written in Laodicea is probably grounded on the fact that this epistle was regarded as identical with the *ἐπιστολὴ ἐκ Λαοδικείας* men-

tioned in Col. iv. 16. Theophylact says: *τίς δὲ ἦν ἡ ἐκ Λαοδικείας; ἡ πρὸς Τιμόθεον πρώτη, αὕτη γὰρ ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἐγράφη.*

The place in which the Epistle to Titus was written can only be so far determined, that it was on the apostle's journey from Crete to Nicopolis. The subscription in the Received Text runs: *πρὸς Τίτον τῆς Κρητῶν ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως τῆς Μακεδονίας.* This has, however, arisen out of a misconception of chap. iii. 12, where the word *ἐκεῖ* proves that Paul, at the time of composing the epistle, was not yet in Nicopolis.—If the epistle was written on the apostle's journey, between the first and second imprisonment at Rome, we cannot, with Guericke, assume that it was composed in Ephesus; for if Paul had already in Ephesus the intention of passing the winter at Nicopolis, he could not, after leaving Ephesus and arriving in Macedonia, write to Timothy that he thought of coming again to him soon, 1 Tim. iii. 14. The Epistle to Titus can therefore have been written only after the First Epistle to Timothy. While composing the latter, he was, indeed, thinking of a speedy return to Ephesus, but he considered it possible then that his return might be delayed (1 Tim. iii. 15). This actually took place when he resolved to pass the winter at Nicopolis, after which resolution he wrote to Titus.

As to the Second Epistle to Timothy, there can be no doubt that it was written in Rome, as many subscriptions say. Only Böttger (*Beiträge*, etc., part 2) supposes that Paul wrote it in his imprisonment at Caesarea—which, however, rests on the utterly incorrect presupposition that Paul was only five days a prisoner in Rome.

SECTION 4.—THE HERETICS IN THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

All three epistles contain warnings against heretics. These are described as follows:

First Epistle to Timothy.—They have left the path of faith and of a good conscience (i. 5: *ὧν (i. e. καθαρᾶς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου) ἀστοχήσαντες*; i. 19: *ἣν (i. e. ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν) τινες ἀπωσάμενοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν*; vi. 21: *περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἠστόχησαν*). They are estranged from the truth (vi. 5: *ἀποστερημένοι τῆς ἀληθείας*), and do not abide by the sound doctrine of the gospel (vi. 3). Morally corrupt (vi. 5: *διεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν*), they have an evil conscience (iv. 3: *κεκαυτηριασμένοι τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν*). Beclouded with self-conceit (vi. 4: *τετύφωται*), they boast of a special knowledge (vi. 20: *τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*), which they seek to spread by teaching (i. 3: *ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*). Their doctrine is a meaningless, empty,

profane babble (i. 6: *ματαιολογία*; vi. 20; *βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι*), a doctrine of the devil (iv. 2: *διδασκαλίαι δαιμονίων*). Its contents are made up of profane and silly myths (i. 4, iv. 7: *βέβηλοι καὶ γραώδεις μῦθοι*) and genealogies (i. 4: *γενεαλογίαι ἀπέραντοι*), which only furnish points of controversy and arouse contests of words (i. 4, vi. 4), in which they take a special delight (vi. 4: *νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας*). Without knowing the meaning of the law, they wish to be teachers of it (i. 7: *θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι*), and add to it arbitrary commands forbidding marriage and the enjoyment of many kinds of food (iv. 3; *κωλύοντες γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων*); by their ascetic life they seek to gain the reputation of piety in order to make worldly gain by it (vi. 5? *νομίζοντες, πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν*).

The Epistle to Titus.—The heretics (i. 9: *οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες*) belong especially to Judaism (i. 10: *μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*). While boasting of their special knowledge of God, they lead a godless life (i. 16), condemned by their own conscience (iii. 11: *αὐτοκατάκριτος*). What they bring forward are Jewish myths (i. 14: *προσέχοντες Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις*), genealogies, points of controversy about the law (iii. 9), and mere commands of men (i. 14: *ἐντολαὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων ἀλήθειαν*). They are idle babblers (i. 10: *ματαιόλογοι*), who with their shameful doctrine (i. 11: *διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ*) seduce hearts (i. 10: *φρεναπάται*), cause divisions in the church (iii. 10: *αἱρετικὸς ἄνθρωπος*), and draw whole families into destruction (i. 11: *ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσι*); and all this—for the sake of shameful gain (i. 11: *αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν*).

Second Epistle to Timothy.—Here, just as in the First Epistle, the heretics are denoted as people who have fallen away from the faith, who are striving against the truth (ii. 18: *περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστόχησαν*; iii. 8: *ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ . . . ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν*; ii. 25: *οἱ ἀντιδιατιθέμενοι*), who are morally corrupt (iii. 8: *ἄνθρωποι κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν*; iii. 13; *πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι*), who are in the snare of the devil (ii. 25), so that there already exist among them that godlessness and hypocrisy which, the Spirit declares, will characterize mankind in the last days. They seek to extend their doctrine, which is nothing but an unholy babble of empty myths, and contains nothing but points of controversy; and this they do by sneaking into houses, and by knowing especially how to befool women (iii. 6), just like the Egyptian sorcerers who were opposed to the truth (iii. 8).—Contrary to the truth, they teach that the resurrection has already taken place (ii. 18: *λέγοντες τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἤδη γεγονέναι*).

Have the Pastoral Epistles to do with *one* or with several different classes of heretics? Credner (*Einleitung in d. N. T.*) assumes four differ-

ent classes. He takes the heretics of the Epistle to Titus to be non-Christians, and those of the two Epistles to Timothy to be apostatized Christians, while he divides the *former*—in consequence of the *μάλιστα*, chap. i. 10.—into Jews, more precisely Essenes, and into Gentiles who are not further described, the *latter* into heretics of the present and heretics of the future (1 Tim. iv. 1 ff.; 2 Tim. iii. 2 ff.).—These distinctions are, however, not justifiable, for the expression *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς* does not necessarily denote Jews who are not Christians (comp. Acts xi. 2; Gal. ii. 12). Further, *μάλιστα* does not establish a difference in regard to the heretics, but only indicates that some were added who were not *ἐκ περιτομῆς*. Lastly, in 1 Tim. iv. 1 ff. and 2 Tim. iii. 2 ff. the future is certainly spoken of; but there is no hint in either of the passages that a heresy would appear different from the present one.—Thiersch (*Versuch zur Herstellung*, etc., pp. 236 f. and 273 f.) divides the heretics into three groups—(1) Judaists, *i. e.* Judaizing teachers of the law to whom there still clung the spirit of Pharisaism; (2) some spiritualistic Gnostics who had suffered shipwreck in the faith; (3) impostors. He supposes that the first are mentioned in the Epistle to Titus and in some passages of the First Epistle to Timothy, the second in the First and Second Epistles to Timothy, the last in 2 Tim. iii. But apostasy from the faith is charged not only against those mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 19, but also against those in 1 Tim. i. 3 ff., and in the Second Epistle to Timothy the same characteristics are attributed to the heretics as in the Epistle to Titus; comp. 2 Tim. ii. 23 and Tit. iii. 9. As to the impostors, they are not at all distinguished from the other heretics as a special class.—Wiesinger confesses, indeed, that the errors placed before us in the three epistles are substantially the same; but he thinks that on the one hand "more general errors" are to be distinguished from those of individuals, and on the other hand phenomena of the present from those which are designated as future. Hofmann's view is allied to this. He thinks also that those against whom Paul had a special polemic (Tit. i. 9, 10, iii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 3 ff., etc.) are distinct from those to whom Hymenaeus and Philetus belonged (2 Tim. ii. 17), and from those mentioned in 2 Tim. iii. 6 ff.; and further, that those characterized in 1 Tim. iv. 1–4 are to be regarded as people of the future, and not of the present. Against this, however, it is to be maintained that such a distinction of different classes is not marked in any way by the apostle, and that the men of the future mentioned by him are characterized in substantially the same way as the men of the present against whom he directs his polemic. Mangold (*Die Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe*) rightly

maintains that the polemic of the Pastoral Epistles is not directed against different forms of heresy, but against one and the same heresy; but he agrees with Credner in thinking that the heretics mentioned in the Epistle to Titus stood quite outside of the Christian church, since it is not said of them that they had fallen away from the faith. But against this it is to be observed that the polemic in the N. T. is everywhere directed only against those who, as members of the church, sought to disturb the true faith, and not against non-Christians who assailed the Christian faith from without.[1] It is arbitrary also to distinguish the *αἱρετικοί* mentioned in chap. iii. 10 as corrupted Christians from those named in chap. i. 10 as non-Christians.

The second question is, Of what nature was the heretical tendency against which the Pastoral Epistles contend? The views on this point differ widely from one another. The heretics have been held to be—(1) *Gnostics*, either "forerunners of the Gnostics of the second century" (so most expositors), or "Cerinthians" (Mayerhoff in his work, *der Brief an die Colosser*, 1838; Neander in the first edition of his *apostol. Zeitalter*), or Gnostics of the second century, in particular Marcionites (Baur); (2) *Cabbalists* (Grotius, Baumgarten); (3) *Pharisaic Judaists* (Chrysostom, Jerome, partly also Thiersch); (4) *Essenes* (Michaelis, Heinrichs, Wegscheider, Mangold, partly also Credner), or *Therapeutae* (Ritschl); and lastly, (5) *Jewish Christians*. These last either had a preference for allegorical interpretations of the Jewish genealogies (pedigrees), which in itself was innocent and not delusive, but which might easily lead to apostasy from the faith

[1] Otto decides quite differently by roundly calling the heretics *Jews*, and remarking: "I have found no passage in the two epistles, not even in *all* the Pauline Epistles, which compelled me to suppose that the heretics were members of the church." But should not this assertion be at once refuted by the fact that Paul, when speaking of non-Christians, always denotes them as such, Gentiles as Gentiles, Jews as Jews; whereas of the heretics, against whom he contends, he nowhere says that they stand outside of the Christian church? And would not both his polemic and his warnings have quite another character if the heretics did not belong externally to the church?—Otto grants that many members of the church had been led astray by those non-Christian heretics; but would not those betrayed have sought to spread their opinions among their fellow-members, and thus become false teachers themselves? Besides, Otto can support his opinion only by an artificial interpretation of the single passages in question, as is the case among others with 1 Tim. i. 3 (see the exposition of the passage) and with 2 Cor. xi. 13 23. 1 Cor. iii. 15 alone causes him some scruples; but he overcomes them by referring the pronoun *αὐτός* to *ὁ θεμέλιος*, altogether omitting to observe that Paul in this passage is not thinking of heretics at all—Whether the *τίνες* in Acts xv. 1 were also Jews—and not Christians—Otto does not say; if he were consistent in his opinions, he would be bound to maintain the former.

(Wiesinger, who, however, remarks that in some are found the germs of the later gnosis), or they were busying themselves with investigations regarding the legal and historical contents of the Thora, to which they ascribed a special importance for the religious life (Hofmann). The *second* and *third* views have already received a sufficient refutation. The words: θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι (1 Tim. i. 7), are the only argument in favor of the opinion that these opponents resembled those against whom Paul contended in the Epistle to the Galatians and in the first part of the Epistle to the Romans. From 1 Tim. iv. 3, Tit. i. 14, it is clear that their zeal for the law did not at all agree with the pharisaically-inclined Jewish-Christians, as they did not maintain the necessity for circumcision.—*Cabbalists* they cannot be called, although there existed earlier among the orthodox Jews many elements from which was developed the cabbalistic system afterwards imprinted on the books of Jezira and Sohar; these were secret doctrines, and it cannot be proved that *these* heretics had the same views. For that matter, there are even some points here, such as forbidding to marry, the spiritualistic doctrine of the resurrection, which are foreign to Cabbala. There is only one kindred point in the phenomena of the two: they both consisted in combination of revealed religion with speculation originally heathen.

The view that the heretics were Essenes has found in Mangold a defender both thoroughgoing and acute; but he has been able to prove the identity of the two only by a somewhat bold assertion. Proceeding from the opinion "that Essenism was only an attempt to carry out practically the Alexandrine-Jewish philosophy in the definite arrangements of a sect," he deduces from this the unjustifiable canon: "If, therefore, any trait in the picture of the heretics should find a direct parallel, though only in such a passage of Philo as gives quite general characteristics of the Jewish-Alexandrine philosophy, we ought not to hesitate in explaining this trait to be Essenic, provided only it does not stand in contradiction with the definite information given by Philo and Josephus regarding this sect."—Mangold tries to trace back to Essenism not only the γενεαλογίαι, but also the other traits in the picture of the heretics, especially the μῦθοι, the ζητήσεις, the γνῶσις ψευδώνυμος, the asceticism, the doctrine of the resurrection, the view of the person and work of Christ, not indeed expressed, but indicated, the greed, the hypocrisy, the comparison with the Egyptian sorcerers, etc. But if he had not the aid of the canon quoted, and of an interpretation sometimes very forced, the result would simply be this, that in the heretics of the epistles there existed some traits which belonged

also to Essenism. On the other hand, the heretics had many peculiarities not found among the Essenes, and the Essenes again had distinct characteristics of which there is no mention here (comp. Uhlhorn's criticism of Mangold's book in the *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1857, No. 179).—The fact that Mangold could only justify his assertion that the heretics were Essenes by identifying the general Jewish-Alexandrine speculation with Philonism and Essenism, is a sufficient proof that his assertion has no firm and sure ground.—Against Ritschl's view that the heretics were *Therapeutae*, Uhlhorn's remarks (in the criticism quoted) are sufficient: "They have no hesitation in assuming a quite close connection with the Jewish-Alexandrine philosphy, nor would they make any difficulty of importing into it the principles of Philo. But then new difficulties appear. If it is already hazardous to imagine Essenes in Ephesus and Crete, it might become much harder to suppose that there were Therapeutae in those regions. Their whole nature is so thoroughly Egyptian, that we can hardly venture on the hypothesis of the sect being transplanted and extended into Asia Minor and Crete. Yet that would be the smallest difficulty. The main point is that the picture of the heretics applies to the Therapeutae much less than to the Essenes; not only because the most striking characteristics of the Therapeutae are wanting, but also because there are features which do not suit the Therapeutae at all. Thus, *e. g.*, the busy activity mentioned in 2 Tim. iii. 6 stands in glaring contrast with their habits of contemplation."

The view which is by far the most prevalent is, that the heresy was *Gnosticism*, either "a rough elementary form of gnosis," or one of the cultivated systems. Baur, as is well known, declares himself for the latter with great decision. His judgment (*Die sog. Pastoralbriefe des Ap. Paulus*, 1835, p. 10) runs thus: "We have before us in the heretics of the Pastoral Epistles the Gnostics of the second century, especially the Marcionites." For the Marcionitism Baur appeals—(1) to the Antinomianism denoted in 1 Tim. i. 6–11; (2) to the ascetic ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων, 1 Tim. iv. 3, which was founded on a certain opposition and dislike to God's creation—as to something unclean, and therefore on a decidedly dualistic view of the universe (such as Marcion in particular held); (3) to the doctrine of the resurrection, mentioned in 2 Tim. ii. 18; (4) to the express mention of the Marcionite antithesis, 1 Tim. vi. 20.—Of these reasons we must at once strike out the first and the last, as resting on an arbitrary and quite unjustifiable interpretation. As to the second, the opposition made to the asceticism of the heretics in Tit. i. 15 and 1 Tim.

iv. 3, 4, by no means points to a decided form of dualism; and with regard to the third ground, it is to be observed that the doctrine of the resurrection had no more connection with Gnosticism than with other speculative systems.—For the Gnosticism of the heretics, Baur produces the following grounds:—(1) The myths and genealogies by which the Valentinian series of æons and the whole fantastic history of the pleroma were denoted. This, he says, is apparent from the adjective *γραώδης*, which was chosen because the Sophia-Achamoth was denoted as an old mother. (2) The emphasis laid in the epistles on the universality of the divine grace, by which is expressed the opposition to the Gnostic distinction between pneumatic and other men. But even these grounds furnish no proof that the heresy belonged to the second century, for series of emanations and particularism were not phenomena of cultivated Gnosticism alone. The interpretation of the word *γραώδης*, however, certainly needs no serious refutation. Baur further declares that even the author of the epistles was infected with Marcionitism, as appears especially from the opposition in which the *ἄνθρωπος* of 1 Tim. ii. 5 stands to *ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί* in 1 Tim. iii. 16, also from the passage in 1 Tim. iii. 16, where two sets of clauses are opposed, the one more Gnostic, the other more anti-Gnostic; lastly, from the use of doxologies that have a Gnostic sound. But apart altogether from single pieces of arbitrary conjecture, of which Baur is guilty in his proof, how curious in itself the opinion is, that the assailant of Marcionitism should himself have been half a Marcionite, without having any suspicion of his self-contradiction! In his work, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*, 1845, Baur brought forward yet another new and peculiar proof of his assertion that the Gnosticism of the heretics belonged to the second century. He finds it in the express statement of Hegesippus (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 32), that the *ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις* did not appear openly till there were none of the apostolic circle left. From this Baur draws two inferences—(1) that Gnosticism belonged only to the post-apostolic age; and (2) that the author of the Pastoral Epistles borrowed the expression *ἡ ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις* from Hegesippus. But against the first inference it is to be noted that in this passage it is not only not denied, but it is even expressly stated that there had existed earlier such as "corrupt the sound rule of wholesome preaching," and that it is simply remarked that the *ἑτεροδιδάσκαλοι* ventured only after the death of the apostles to preach their heresy quite openly and freely. Against the second inference we must maintain that the passage in Eusebius (as Thiersch in his *Versuch zur Herstellung*, etc., pp. 301 ff., and following him Wiesinger and Mangold, have

proved) is not a simple quotation from Hegesippus, but that the thought only was expressed by Hegesippus, while its elaboration and form are due to Eusebius; and that "although the Ebionite Hegesippus would hardly have used the Pastoral Epistles for expressing his own views, yet there is no reason why these expressions in Eusebius should not be traced back to the Pastoral Epistles as their source" (comp. Mangold, pp. 108–112).[1] Thus the theory that the heretics in question were Marcionites, or other Gnostics of the second century, has no real foundation; for which reason, as Mangold says, "all exegetes and writers on Introduction who have studied the question are unanimous against Baur's view" (Mangold, p. 14).—Quite as little support has been given also to the theory that the heretics were *Cerinthians;* and rightly so, since it cannot be proved that they held the doctrine of Cerinthus regarding the Demiurge, or his Docetism or the Chiliasm ascribed to him by Caius and Dionysius.—The answer to the question whether Paul's opponents were Gnostics (so far, of course, only followers of a gnosis still undeveloped) or not, depends to a large extent, if not wholly, on the meaning to be given to γενεαλογίαι. Irenaeus and Tertullian, whom many later expositors have followed, understood by it, "Gnostic series of emanations." In more recent times an attempt has been made to maintain that we are to understand by it actual genealogies. Dähne (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, No. 4), supported by Mangold and Otto, makes it more definite, and says that by it are meant the genealogies of the Pentateuch, along with its historical sections, the former of which Philo interprets in his τρόποι τῆς ψυχῆς. But there is not the slightest indication in the Pastoral Epistles that the heretics here mentioned made any such interpretation themselves. Wiesinger has let this more definite statement drop, and explains the γενεαλογίαι to be simply Jewish genealogies. Hofmann, on the contrary, going back again to Philo, considers them to be not genealogies proper, but "the whole historical contents of the Thora."[2] Both these expositors do not wish to regard Paul's opponents here as heretics in the proper sense. Wiesinger, as he develops this point, contradicts himself. For, when he grants that they

[1] If Hegesippus did use the expression ἡ ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις, it is in any case more probable that he should have borrowed it from the First Epistle to Timothy, than that the author of the epistle should have taken it from Hegesippus.

[2] This explanation Hofmann justifies by referring to Philo's division of the historical contents of the Thora into two parts: τὸ περὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως and τὸ γενεαλογικόν. But though Philo uses the name τὸ γενεαλογικόν for the part after the history of the creation, because it begins with a genealogy, it does not follow, as a matter of fact, that the single historical events are designated by the word γενεαλογίαι.

cultivated an arbitrary asceticism,—that they strove after a higher holiness as well as a higher knowledge than the gospel presents, and that they sought to attain this by an allegorical interpretation of the genealogies,[1] —he is manifestly describing them as heretics in the proper sense of the term. Hofmann does not indeed fall into this contradiction, but with his view it remains wholly unexplained how they could give to the study of the historical contents of the Thora a special importance for the religious life, if they still did not seek to get from it knowledge transcending the gospel. The following points are against both these explanations:—(1) The sentence of condemnation pronounced in the epistles is so sharp, that it points to something quite different from mere unprofitable speculation. Although Paul, as these argue, calls their reasonings *ματαιολογία* and *κενοφωνία*, he describes this empty babble of theirs not merely as a useless, foolish, old woman's chatter, but also as something unholy, *i. e.* profane (*βέβηλος*, comp. Heb. xii. 16), and the reasoners as those who, fallen away from the faith, contradict the truth, and are morally corrupt in thought. (2) Paul defines the *γενεαλογίαι* more precisely by the adjective *ἀπέραντοι*, which gives, not, as it has been wrongly explained, the nature of the investigations regarding the *γενεαλογίαι* (as those "which spin on *ad infinitum*," Wiesinger; or "the end of which is never reached," Hofmann), but the nature of the *γενεαλογίαι themselves*. Since neither the Jewish genealogies nor the facts given in the Thora are unlimited, we can hardly understand the *γενεαλογίαι* to be anything else than "Gnostic series of emanations," which have no necessary termination in themselves, and can therefore be regarded as unlimited.—Besides the expression *γενεαλογίαι ἀπέραντοι*, there are other features in the apostle's polemic pointing to the Gnostic tendencies of his adversaries here, who boasted of a special knowledge, called by Paul *γνῶσις ψευδώνυμος*; still their Gnosticism is quite distinct from Gnosticism proper, *i. e.* from the Gnosticism which spread so widely in the church in the second century. The soil of the *latter* was Gentile Christianity; the soil of the *former* was Judaism, or Jewish Christianity mingled with Gentile speculation. An appeal to the Mosaic law was quite out of place in Gnosticism proper, but these heretics wished to be *νομοδιδάσκαλοι*. The asceticism of the Gnostics was based on dualism; the ascetic precepts of these heretics proceeded from the distinction—contained also in the law of Moses—between clean and unclean; and although

[1] Wiesinger has not observed that allegorical interpretation is not to be regarded as the source of any special knowledge, but that knowledge obtained in other ways makes use of allegorical interpretation for its own confirmation.

they inconsistently spiritualized the contrast between spirit and matter, there is nothing to show that they adopted dualism proper, though we may take it for granted that they were so inclined. Gnosticism distinguishes between the Demiurge and the highest God—a distinction not known to these heretics. Finally, while Gnosticism is substantially Docetic in its view of the Redeemer's person, it is nowhere said that these heretics were Docetic; it rather appears on the whole as if the idea of redemption had not with them the central importance which it had in Gnosticism.—All these details prove that, although the heresy in question was in many respects akin to Gnosticism, its nature was still distinct. Peculiar to both is the mingling of revealed religion with Gentile speculation; but in the one case—in Gnosticism—Christianity itself was invaded and penetrated by heathen philosophy; while here, on the other hand, Judaism first underwent that process. This Judaism, modified by speculation and united with Christianity, assumed, indeed, new elements, and suffered thereby many alterations. Still there was no *substantial* change of form, the Christian element in *this* form of Jewish Christianity being always overpowered by the Jewish. From it there arose such phenomena as are presented in the Ebionite, the Clementine, the Elkesaitic, and other heresies which are distinguished from systems strictly Gnostic, by preserving as much as possible a monotheistic character. To this speculative Jewish Christianity belongs also the heresy mentioned and combated in the Pastoral Epistles. It does not follow, however, that it was one single system definitely developed; the apostle rather keeps in view the general tendency which embraced manifold distinctions, so that all the individual features dwelt on by him were not necessarily characteristic of all these heretics. The general judgment refers to all. All who have yielded to this tendency stand opposed to the doctrine of the gospel as well as to Christian morality; but all did not give direct utterance to the principle that the resurrection had already taken place, or that marriage was to be avoided, and we are not bound to regard them all as impostors, or as men who put on the appearance of piety only from motives of greed. One point might be more prominent in one, another in another; they are all, however, governed by one spirit, which could only exercise a disturbing influence on true Christianity.—This tendency is substantially the same as that combated in the Epistle to the Colossians. The distinction is simply this, that at the time of composing the Pastoral Epistles the same heresy was found in a stage of higher development. The doctrine of angels had already assumed the form of an emanation theory; the con-

trast between spirit and matter had been made wider, and the self-seeking motives in its followers had become more distinct.[1]

SECTION 5.—AUTHENTICITY OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

Eusebius reckons the Pastoral Epistles among the homologumena, as there existed not the smallest doubt of their genuineness in the catholic church. They not only stand as Pauline Epistles in the Muratorian Canon and the Peschito, but they are also repeatedly quoted as such by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clemens Alex. Though they are not specially quoted by earlier ecclesiastical writers, yet many expressions and sentences occur showing that they were not less known than the other Pauline Epistles, such expressions appearing as quotations, or at least as reminiscences.[2] Clemens Rom. not only makes use of the expression εὐσέβεια, so often used in the Pastoral Epistles to denote Christian piety, but also in *Ep. I. ad Corinth.* chap. 2, we have a phrase almost agreeing with Tit. iii. 1: ἑτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἐργον ἀγαθόν, and in chap. 29 there is an echo of the words in 1 Tim. ii. 8 which can hardly be denied: προσελθῶμεν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσίοτητι ψυχῆς, ἁγνας καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτόν.—In the Epistles of Ignatius, the passage in the *Ep. ad Magnes.* chap. 8: μὴ πλανᾶσθε ταῖς ἑτεροδοξίαις, μηδὲ μυθεύμασι τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνωφελέσιν οὖσιν, reminds one of 1 Tim. i. 4 and Tit. iii. 9.—Still more striking is the agreement between some passages of the Epistle of Polycarp and corresponding passages in the Pastoral Epistles. Thus in particular chap. 4: ἀρχὴ πάντων χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία· εἰδότες οὖν, ὁτι οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι ἐχομεν, ὁπλισώμεθα τοῖς ὁπλοις τῆς δικαιοσύνης, with 1 Tim. vi. 7, 10,—an agreement which even de Wette can only explain by supposing Polycarp to have been acquainted with this epistle.—In Justin Martyr the expressions θεοσέβεια and εὐσέβεια frequently occur. In his *Dialog. c. Tryph.* chap. 47, we have: ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Θεοῦ, as in Tit. iii. 4.[3] In the *Ep. ad Diogn.* chap. 4, there is the expression: αὐτῶν θεοσεβείας μυστήριον μὴ προσδοκήσης κ.τ.λ., which, compared with 1 Tim. iii. 16, is not to be overlooked.—Hegesippus (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 32), in agreement with 1 Tim. vi. 20, calls the heresies γνῶσις ψευδώνυμος, provided that Eusebius is quoting him verbally, and not simply

[1] To the view expressed here, Zöckler (in Vilmar's *Past.-theol. Blätter*, 1865, p. 67) has given his adherence.

[2] Comp. especially Otto's thorough investigation in the excursus, "The External Testimonies to the Authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles," appended to his work, *Ueber die geschichtl. Verhältnisse der Pastoralbriefe.*

[3] The appeal to Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 26, who quotes words from a work of Justin's, is out of place, since the expression: τὸ μέγα τῆς θεοσεβείας μυστήριον, occurring there, does not belong to the quoted passage.

giving the substance of his thought; see p. 48.—Theophilus of Antioch says, *ad Autolyc.* iii. 14, clearly alluding to 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2: *ἔτι μὲν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις, καὶ εὔχεσθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, κελεύει ὑμῖν θεῖος λόγος, ὅπως ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν.*[1] In Athenagoras, also, there are several allusions to passages in our epistles; thus, *Leg. pro Christ.* pp. 37, 39, etc.—It might indeed be thought strange, that when the older ecclesiastical writers are dealing with the same subjects as occur in the Pastoral Epistles, or subjects akin to them, there is not some more definite allusion to these epistles; but this is quite natural, when we take into account their relative independence.—According to the testimonies quoted, it is a point beyond dispute that the Pastoral Epistles from an early time were regarded in the catholic church as genuine Pauline Epistles. It is different, indeed, with the Gnostic heretics.[2] In Marcion's Canon all three are wanting, and Tatian acknowledged only the Epistle to Titus as genuine. We cannot infer, from the absence of the epistles in his Canon, that Marcion did not know them. Jerome, in his introduction to the *Commentary on the Epistle to Titus*,[3] reproaches him as well as other heretics with rejecting the epistles willfully. It is well known what liberties Marcion ventured to take with many N. T. writings recognized by himself as genuine; and it is quite in keeping with his usual method, that he should without further ado omit from the Canon epistles containing so decided a polemic against Gnostic tendencies. The striking fact, however, that Tatian acknowledges the Epistle to Titus as genuine, may arise from his being more easily reconciled to it than to the Epistles to Timothy, because in it the heretics are more distinctly called *Jewish* heretics than in the latter; comp. i. 10, 14, iii. 9. But however that may be, the oppo-

[1] We should also note Theoph. Ant. *ad Aut.* i. 2: *ὅπως ᾖ καὶ ταῦτο εἰς δεῖγμα, τοῦ μέλλειν λαμβάνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν δι' ὕδατος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας πάντας τοὺς προσίοντας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀναγεννωμένους*; comp. with Tit. iii. 5.

[2] Nevertheless, in the fragments of some Gnostics, preserved to us by the Fathers, there are some passages which point back to the Pastoral Epistles. Thus in Herakleon (Clem. Al. *Strom.* Book iv. p. 502) the phrase: *ἀρνήσασθαι ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται*, is to be compared with 2 Tim. ii. 13; and in the extracts from Valentinian sources which are contained in the work: *Ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας κατὰ τοὺς Οὐαλεντίνου χρόνους ἐπιτομαί*, usually appended to the writings of Clem. Al., we have the expression *φῶς ἀπρόσιτον*, with which comp. 1 Tim. vi. 16. See on this, Otto, *l. c.*

[3] Licet non sint digni fide, qui fidem primam irritam fecerunt, Marcionem loquor et Basilidem et omnes haereticos, qui V. laniant Test., tamen eos aliqua ex parte ferremus, si saltem in Novo continerent manus suas. . . . Ut enim de cæteris epistolis taceam, de quibus quidquid contrarium suo dogmati viderant eraserunt, nonnullas integras repudiandas crediderunt, ad Timotheum videlicet utramque, ad Hebraeos et ad Titum. . . . Sed Tatianus, qui et ipse nonnullas Pauli epistolas repudiavit, hanc vel maxime, h. e. ad Titum,

sition of these heretics, when the genuineness of the epistles is recognized by the Fathers, can furnish no reason for doubt, all the less that Tertullian even expresses his wonder how Marcion could have left them out of his Canon.—After Tatian, their genuineness remained uncontested till the beginning of this century; only the more recent criticism has attempted to make it doubtful. At first the assault was directed against the First Epistle to Timothy. After J. E. C. Schmidt, in his Introduction, had expressed some doubts, its authenticity was disputed in the most decided manner by Schleiermacher in his letter to Gass, 1807. Schleiermacher acknowledged the authenticity of the two other epistles, and tried to explain the origin of the First by saying that the others had been used and imitated. He was at once opposed by Planck, Wegscheider, Beckhaus, who stoutly defended the epistle attacked by him; but the controversy was by no means settled by them. Criticism went farther on the way once opened, directing its weapons against the presupposition from which Schleiermacher set out in his polemic. From the inner relationship of all three epistles, it was impossible to deny that many grounds which Schleiermacher urged against the authenticity of the one epistle were not less strong against that of the others. Eichhorn therefore attacked the authenticity of all three, and was followed by de Wette (in his *Einleitung ins N. T.* 1826), but with some uncertainty. For although de Wette declared them to be historically inconceivable, and combined Schleiermacher's view, that the First Epistle to Timothy arose from a compilation of the other two, with Eichhorn's theory, that not one of the three was Pauline, he still confessed that the critical doubts were not sufficient to overturn the opinion cherished for centuries regarding these epistles, which did indeed contain much Pauline matter, and that the doubts therefore only affected their historical interpretation.—De Wette's theory, so wavering in itself, was besides only of a negative character. Eichhorn, on the other hand, had already tried to reach some positive result, by expressing the opinion that the epistles were written by a pupil of Paul in order to give a summary of his verbal instructions regarding the organization of churches. In this he was supported by Schott (*Isagoge*, 1830), who, in a very arbitrary fashion, ascribed the authorship to Luke.—Again, there was no lack of defenders of the epistles assailed. Hug, Bertholdt, Veilmoser, Guericke, Böhl, Curtius, Kling, and others[1] took

Apostoli pronuntiandam credidit; parvipendens Marcionis et aliorum qui cum eo in hac parte consentiunt, assertionem.

[1] Neander, also, in his *Gesch. der Pflanzung . . . der Kirche*, 1832; confessing, however, that he had not the same confident conviction

up the defence, partly in writings of a general character, partly in special treatises. Heydenreich and Mack also made a point of refuting the charges in their commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles.—Eichhorn's positive result had remained very uncertain, a mere suggestion without any tenable grounds. So long as no firmer and better supported theory was brought forward, the defence also had no sure basis. Baur was right (*Die sog. Pastoralbriefe des Ap. P. aufs neue kritisch untersucht*, 1835) in saying that "there was no sufficient basis for a critical judgment so long as it was known only that the epistles could not be Pauline; that some positive data must also be established by which they could be transferred from the time of the apostle to some other." The theory which Baur had formed of the relations of Christian antiquity, together with the peculiar character of the Pastoral Epistles, led him to believe that they had been written while Marcionite errors were current, and written by an author who, without being able to get rid of Gnostic views himself, had in the interests of the Pauline party put his polemic against Gnostic doctrines in the mouth of the Apostle Paul. In this way Baur thought he had found a firm positive foundation for criticism, and thereby brought it to a conclusion. But his opinion did not stand uncontested. Baumgarten, Böttger, and Matthies, in particular, appeared against it, and it is only the later Tübingen school that has given adherence to it. Even de Wette, in his commentary, 1844 (though he was more decided than ever in disputing the authenticity), declared himself against it, though in a somewhat uncertain fashion. His words are: "Since the references to Marcion are not at all certain, and the testimonies to the existence of the Pastoral Epistles cannot be got over, we must apparently assume an earlier date for their composition, say at the end of the first century."—Credner, in his *Einleitung ins N. T.* 1836, advanced a peculiar hypothesis, viz., that, of the three epistles, only the one to Titus is genuinely Pauline, with the exception of the first four verses; that the Second Epistle to Timothy is made up of two Pauline Epistles, the one written during the first, the other during the second imprisonment at Rome, and is interwoven with some pieces of the forger's own; lastly, that the First Epistle to Timothy is a pure invention. As a matter of course this ingenious hypothesis found no adherents, and, later, Credner himself (*das N. T. nach Zweck, Ursprung, Inhalt für denkende Leser der Bibel*, 1841–1843, chap. ii. pp. 98 f.) withdrew it, and declared all three letters to be not genuine.—Soon after the appear-

of the genuineness of the First Epistle to Timothy as of the direct Pauline origin of all the other Pauline Epistles.

ance of this commentary, Wiesinger, in his commentary, 1850, declared himself for the genuineness of all three epistles, and made a thoroughgoing defence of them. Later, however, Schleiermacher's hypothesis found a supporter in Rudow (in the work already quoted, 1850).—Reuss, in the second edition of his *Gesch. der heil. Schriften*, 1853, is not quite certain of the genuineness of the Epistle to Titus and of the First Epistle to Timothy, but is quite confident that the Second Epistle to Timothy is genuine. On the other hand, Meyer, after declaring in the first edition of his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 1836, the genuineness of the Second Epistle to Timothy to be beyond doubt, in the second edition of the same commentary, 1854, acknowledges that the three epistles stand or fall with each other; and that if they were written by Paul, it could only have been after the first imprisonment in Rome, the one mentioned by Luke. At the same time, he disputes the reality of a release and a second imprisonment, and therefore cannot admit the genuineness of all three epistles. His remarks amount to this, that the more precarious the proof of the second imprisonment, the greater justification there is for the doubts of the genuineness, doubts arising from the epistles themselves.—About the same time, Guericke, in his *Neutest. Isagogik*, 1854, re-stated his conviction of the genuineness of all three epistles. Mangold (in his work, *Die Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe*, 1856) admits, on the contrary, that neither the heresy mentioned in the epistles, nor the precepts contained in them regarding church matters, militate against their origin in the time of Paul. At the same time, he remarks that their authenticity is dependent on the solution of a whole series of other questions, and that the weight of these compels him to take the side of the exegetes who do not acknowledge their Pauline origin.—Bleek (*Einleitung ins N. T.* 1866) defends the genuineness of the Epistle to Titus and of the Second Epistle to Timothy. Regarding the First Epistle to Timothy, he thinks that it presents difficulties so considerable that we may suppose it to have been written in Paul's name by an author somewhat later, but within the orthodox church. Hausrath (*Der Apostel Paulus*, 1872) considers the epistles to be not genuine, but conjectures that the Second Epistle to Timothy is based "on a short letter addressed to Timothy by the apostle from his imprisonment in Rome." Pfitt thinks them Pauline in contents, but supposes that "they have been worked up afterwards by the addition of one or two utterances from oral tradition, which has given a somewhat different color to them." As the latest decided defenders of the genuineness besides Otto (1860), we may name specially, L. Ruffet (1860), van Oosterzee (1861, '74), and Hofmann (1874).

The reasons which chiefly awaken doubt regarding the genuineness of the epistles are the following three:—(1) the difficulty of conceiving historically that Paul composed them; (2) allusions and discussions which point to a later time than that of the apostles; and (3) their peculiarity in development of thought and mode of expression, departing in many respects from the epistles which are recognized to be genuine.

As to the *first* reason, the difficulty exists only when we presuppose that the apostle was not released from the Roman imprisonment mentioned in Acts, and that therefore the First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus must have been composed before, the Second Epistle to Timothy during that imprisonment, if they are to be considered genuine at all. But this presupposition, as already shown, has no sufficient grounds, and with it disappears one reason for disputing the authenticity of the epistles.

In regard to the *second* reason, there are especially three points to be considered—(1) the heretics against whom all the three epistles contend; (2) the church-organization presupposed in the First Epistle to Timothy and in the Epistle to Titus; and (3) the institution of widows, mentioned in the First Epistle to Timothy.

1. In regard to the *heretics*, comp. § 4. Only by taking a false view of their nature can these be adduced as testifying against the authenticity of the epistles. In what the author says of them, there is nothing which compels us to assign them to the post-apostolic age.

2. *The church-organization.*—Those who dispute the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, especially Baur and de Wette, reproach their author with hierarchical tendencies, and maintain that the establishment and improvement of the hierarchy, as intended by the hints given in these epistles, could not have been to Paul's advantage. While de Wette contents himself with this general remark, Baur goes more into detail. In the earlier work on the Pastoral Epistles, he remarks that in the genuine Pauline Epistles there is no trace of distinct officers for superintending churches (comp. on the contrary, Rom. xii. 8: ὁ προϊστάμενος; 1 Cor. xii. 28: κυβερνήσεις), whereas, according to these epistles, the churches were already so organized that ἐπίσκοποι, πρεσβύτεροι, and διάκονοι have a significant prominence. In this he assumes that the plural πρεσβύτεροι denotes collectively the presidents who, each with the name of ἐπίσκοπος, superintended the individual churches. In the later work on Paul, Baur asserts that the Gnostics, as the first heretics proper, gave the first impulse to the establishment of the episcopal system. Granted that such was the case, that very fact would be a reason for dating the composition of the epistles earlier

than the time of Gnosticism, since there is no trace in them of a regular episcopal system. Even if Baur's view regarding the relation of the expressions πρεσβύτεροι and ἐπίσκοπος were correct, the meaning of ἐπίσκοπος here would be substantially different from that which it had later in the true episcopal system.—In our epistles we still find the simplest form of church-organization. The institution of the deacons had already arisen in the beginning of the apostolic age, and although tradition does not record at what time the presbytery began or how it was introduced, it must, apart from all the evidence in Acts, have arisen very early, as we cannot conceive a church without some superintendence. But all the instructions given in our epistles regarding the presbyters and deacons have clearly no other purpose than to say that only such men should be taken as are worthy of the confidence of the church, and are likely to have a blessed influence.—Where in this is there anything hierarchical? How different the Epistles of Ignatius are on this point! Had the Pastoral Epistles arisen at a later time, whether at the end of the first or in the middle of the second century, the ecclesiastical offices would have been spoken of in quite another way. Wiesinger is right in insisting on the identity between bishop and presbyter which prevails in the epistles, on the entire want of any special distinctions given to individuals, and also on the absence of the diaconate in the Epistle to Titus. "On the whole," says Wiesinger, "there is clearly revealed the primitive character of the apostolic church-organization" (comp. also Zöckler, *l. c.* p. 68). Wiesinger is also right when he points to ὀρέγεσθαι ἐπισκοπῆς, to the νεόφυτος, and to the διδακτικός as signs that the epistles were composed in the later period of Paul's labors. It may be thought strange, however, that while such indications are not contained in the epistles recognized to be genuine, they are given here; but it must, on the other hand, be observed that it must have been the apostle's chief concern in the later period of his life, all the more that he saw the church threatened by heretics, to instruct the men who had to take his place in setting up and maintaining the arrangements for the life of the church.[1] There is no ground whatever for asserting that Paul had not the least interest in ecclesiastical institutions, and that this want had its deep ground in the spirit and character of the Pauline

[1] The charge, that the system is insisted on *too* strongly, is in any case exaggerated. In the Second Epistle to Timothy nothing is said of it at all, and in the two others it is discussed only in a few single passages, and in such simple fashion that nothing more is said than is absolutely necessary. In particular, the divine origin of the episcopal office is nowhere named, much less emphasized. Even Clement of Rome insists on the significance of the office quite differently from what is done here.

Christianity. Besides, all this is in most striking contrast with the information given us in Acts regarding the nature of the apostle's labors.[1]

3. *The institution of widows.*—Schleiermacher quoted what is said in 1 Tim. v. 9 ff. regarding the *χήρα*, as a proof of the later origin of this epistle. At the same time, he did not, like many other expositors, understand ver. 9 to refer to their being placed on the list of those whom the church supported, but to their admission as deaconesses; and he thinks that such a regulation, ordaining that deaconesses shall promise perpetual widowhood, that they shall not marry a second time, and that their children shall be grown up, is not conceivable in the apostolic age (*Ueber den 1 Br. an Tim.* pp. 215–218). While Schleiermacher thus takes *χήρα* to be a name for the deaconesses, Baur gives a different explanation of the word as used in ver. 9. He thinks that this expression denoted, in the ecclesiastical language of the second century, those women who devoted themselves to an ascetic mode of life, and who in this capacity formed an ecclesiastical grade very closely connected with the grade of *ἐπίσκοποι*, *πρεσβύτεροι*, and *διάκονοι*, on which account the name of deaconesses was given to them. It seems, says Baur further, that they were not real widows, but bore that name. As a proof of this, Baur quotes in particular the passage of Ignatius, *Ep. ad Smyrn.* chap. 13, where he greets *τοὺς οἴκους τῶν ἀδελφῶν σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις, καὶ τὰς παρθένους, τὰς λεγομένας χήρας.* But that passage only proves that in the second century there were virgins who, of course for ascetic reasons, remained in that condition, led a retired life, and, as solitaries, were named *χῆραι*.[2] It cannot, however, be in the least inferred from this that the *χῆραι* named in the First Epistle of Timothy were such *παρθένοι*; on the contrary, everything here said of the *χήραι* shows that *actual widows* are meant. It is true that in verse 9 only those widows are spoken of who can be called *church-widows;* but Baur's assertion, that at the time of the composition of the epistle, according to ver. 11, virgins also were received into the number, is an erroneous opinion, which can only be supported by a wrong interpretation of the verse. On the whole, however, it is very questionable whether we should

[1] Only this much is correct, that Paul in his apostolic labors could not begin with regulations for the church, and could not expect salvation from church-organization. But later, when there had developed a manifold life in the churches, he kept organization more in mind—a fact which does not conflict with his peculiar spirit. Luther's conduct in this respect forms an interesting parallel.

[2] It is incorrect to interpret, as do Böttger and Wiesinger, *παρθένους* of real widows, and to take the addition *τὰς λεγομένας χήρας* as a more precise explanation of the expression *παρθένους*. In that case Ignatius could not but have said: *τὰς χήρας, τὰς λεγομένας παρθένους.*

think of deaconesses at all in the passage. This view was disputed formerly by Mosheim and recently by de Wette. Mosheim supposes that the *χῆραι*, as ecclesiastical personages, are to be kept distinct from the deaconesses, and that Tertullian, *de vel. virg.* chap. ix., speaks of those who are also called *πρεσβύτιδες*, presbyterae, presbyterissae. (The other proof-passages to which Mosheim appeals are: Palladii *vita Chrysostomi*, p. 47; Hermae, *Pastor*, Vision II. p. 791, ed. Fabricii.—Lucianus, *de morte Peregrini*, *Works*, vol. iii. p. 335, ed. Reitzian.; particularly also the eleventh canon of the Council of Laodicea, which in the translation of Dionysius Exiguus runs thus: mulieres, quae apud Graecos presbyterae appellantur, apud nos autem *viduae seniores*, *univirae* et *matriculariae* nominantur, in ecclesia tanquam ordinatas constitui non debere.) The distinction, according to Mosheim, lay in this, that the deaconesses acted as attendants, observed what went on among the women, and did not venture to sit down among the clergy; while the *spiritual widows* occupied an honorable place in the congregation, had a kind of superintendence over other women, and were employed in instructing and educating the orphans who were maintained by the love of the churches. If Mosheim's view is correct (see on this the exposition of 1 Tim. v. 9 ff.), we can see no reason why such a grade of widows should not have arisen in the apostolic age. Even de Wette thinks it probable that, from the very first, pious widows had an ecclesiastical position, and his only objection is that in this place it is presupposed to be a position defined by law and resting on a formal election. But *καταλεγέσθω* in ver. 9 by no means presupposes an election in the proper sense. The demand that the widow should be *ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή* has caused much difficulty; this difficulty, however, vanishes when the expression is rightly explained (see the exposition).

Besides the points mentioned, many others are quoted in proof by the opponents of the authenticity; all these, however, fall to the ground when the passages are explained. There is no doubt that the attacks often proceed from nothing but a groundless view of the relations of the apostolic age, and not seldom rest on the wrong presupposition that usages and views met with in authors of the second century were formed only in their time, and were not rather propagated from the preceding age. We can only discuss one more point here, and that is the assumed *νεότης* of Timothy. It has been thought strange that in both Epistles to Timothy he should be spoken of as still a young man; that, as de Wette says, the author "places him on a low-footing, reminding him, as a beginner whose faith is weak and doctrine hesitating, of his pious education, of the

instruction received from Paul, of the use of the Holy Scriptures, questioning his ability to understand a parable, and exhorting him, as a coward, to brave devotion to the cause of the gospel." We need hardly remark how much exaggeration there is in this description. But as to Timothy's youth, de Wette assumes that at the time of the apostle's Roman imprisonment he had already been about ten years in the ministry of the gospel, and was then at least thirty-five years of age. This reckoning, however, is very uncertain. The manner in which he is spoken of in Acts xvi. 1 ff., on his first acquaintance with the apostle, would rather suggest that he was then a good deal younger than twenty-five. It is to be observed that Paul, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, also feels himself compelled to remark regarding Timothy: *μή τις αὐτὸν ἐξουθενήσῃ*, which remark was certainly caused by his youth; see Meyer on the passage.—Besides, we must take into consideration both the difference between his age and that of the apostle, and also the relation of his age to the position which the apostle had assigned to him shortly before the composition of the epistle, and which gave him the superintendence over the church with the oldest in it, etc.[1] Further, we do not see what should have moved a forger to represent Timothy as younger than he could have been according to historical facts.—It is not right to say that the pressing exhortations imparted to him in the epistles place him on too low a footing, since Paul had had many sad experiences in the last period of his life, and he is far from refusing to put any confidence in his pupil.

As to the *third* reason, we have already remarked that the Pastoral Epistles have much that is peculiar in expression and in development of thought. The only question is, whether the peculiarity is great enough to be an argument against their apostolic origin. The number of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* occurring in them is obviously not decisive, since every one of Paul's epistles contains less or more of such expressions peculiar to itself; thus the Epistle to the Galatians has over fifty; the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians have together over 140.—The use of some of these expressions in later authors (*e. g. ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Θεοῦ* in Ignatius, *Ep. ad Rom.* chap. 6; *διδασκαλίας δαιμονίων* in Tertullian, *De praescr. haer.* chap. 7) is clearly no proof that they belong *only* to post-apostolic times. It would be otherwise if such expressions could be shown to have arisen from some

[1] Bleek takes objection to *μηδείς σου τῆς νεότητος καταφρονείτω*, because "though Timothy was not yet at the time exactly old, he had been Paul's trusted helper for many years, and had received the most weighty commissions." It is, however, to be observed, that Paul in the epistle is giving him a position in the church such as he had never before occupied.

view or custom which was formed only in a later age; but that is not the case. The statements that the expression *μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ* presupposes an unapostolic view of marriage, that the plural *βασιλεῖς* points to a period when, in consequence of the custom of adoption, introduced since Hadrian, there were co-emperors besides the emperor proper, and other similar statements, made by Baur, are arbitrary and without proof. On the other hand, the peculiar circumstances of these epistles made peculiar expressions necessary. Apart from the reference to the circumstances of the church here discussed, and to the position of the receivers of the epistles as assisting the apostle in his ministry, there is especially the heretical tendency, which could not but exercise a distinct influence on the expression. This would happen not merely in passages directly polemical, but also in the sections containing more general exhortations connected by the author in any way with the heretical errors. Wiesinger is right in remarking: "Considering all the circumstances, that the epistles are aimed at new phenomena, that they are addressed to fellow-teachers, that they are kindred in contents, and were composed at the same time, the peculiar vocabulary is conceivable, and, in comparison with Paul's other epistles, presents no special difficulty."—The epistles are peculiar, not only in individual expressions, but also in the entire manner of their thought and composition, and from this some have tried to prove that they are not genuine. But even this phenomenon is sufficiently explained by the peculiar circumstances, in so far as they are in some sort business letters, for the express purpose of conveying to their receivers short and simple directions on certain points. In this way the lack of the dialectic, which elsewhere is so characteristic of Paul, is not surprising. Nothing is proved against their authenticity, when de Wette notes the peculiarity that "there is an inclination to turn away from the proper subject of the epistle to general truths, and then commonly a return is made, or a conclusion and resting-point found, in some exhortation or direction to the readers." Such rapid transitions to general sentences are found often enough in Paul; comp. Rom. xiii. 10, xiv. 9, 17; 1 Cor. iv. 20, vii. 10, etc. Apart from the form of presenting the subject, the mental attitude indicated in the epistles is said to testify against the Pauline authorship. De Wette directs attention to the following points as un-Pauline:—the prevailing moral view of life, the frequent injunction and commendation of good works, of the domestic virtues among others, the advocacy of moral desert which almost (?) contradicts the Pauline doctrine of grace, the defence of the law in which a moral use of it is granted,

But, on the one hand, emphasis is laid most strongly on the ethical character of Christianity in all Paul's epistles; and, on the other, there is nothing in these epistles to advocate moral desert to the prejudice of divine grace. De Wette acknowledges the universalism in 1 Tim. ii. 4, iv. 10, Tit. ii. 11, to be Pauline, but he thinks that it has a different polemical bearing from that usual with Paul. The natural reason for this is, that Paul has not to do with Judaizing opposition here, as in his other Epistles.—De Wette's chief complaint is, that the injunctions given to Titus and Timothy are too general and brief. But why could the apostle not have contented himself with giving the chief points of view from which they were to deal with the various cases? Besides, if they are really so brief, how comes it that the church has always found in them a rich treasure of pointed and pregnant instruction? Nor has the church erred in this respect, as may be seen from Stirm's excellent treatise among others: "Die pastoraltheologischen Winke der Pastoralbriefe," in the *Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie*, 1872, No. 1.

It would certainly awaken justifiable scruples, if it could be proved that other Pauline epistles had been used in composing these three. The passages on which this charge is founded are as follow:—From the First Epistle to Timothy, i. 12–14 compared with 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10; ii. 11, 12, with 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35. From the Second Epistle to Timothy, i. 3–5 compared with Rom. i. 8 ff.; ii. 5 with 1 Cor. ix. 24; ii. 6 with 1 Cor. ix. 7 ff.; ii. 8 with Rom. i. 3; ii. 11 with Rom. vi. 8; ii. 20 with Rom. ix. 21; iii. 2 ff. with Rom. i. 29 ff.; iv. 6 with Phil. ii. 17. From the Epistle to Titus, i. 1–4 compared with Rom. i. 1 ff. Certainly the partial agreement is too great to be considered purely accidental. But it is as natural to suppose that the same author, when led to deal with the same thoughts, employed a similar form of expression, as that a forger made use of some passages in the genuine epistles of Paul in order to give his work a Pauline coloring.

As a whole, therefore, the diction and thought peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles cannot be regarded as testifying against their genuineness. But as each of the epistles may bear special traces of non-Pauline origin, we must further consider the criticisms made against them singly.

The First Epistle to Timothy.—According to Schleiermacher, it arose out of a compilation of the two other epistles. As proof of this, Schleiermacher mentions several facts, viz., that many expressions standing in a right connection in them, are here used unsuitably; that resemblances and agreements are found which amount to an appearance of plagiarism;

and that this appearance is made an undeniable truth by misunderstandings and by difficulties, only to be explained by the hypothesis of their being imported from the one epistle into the other. The expressions to which Schleiermacher thus directs attention are as follow:—i. 1: *σωτήρ* and *κατ' ἐπιταγήν* (Tit. i. 3); ver. 2: *γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει* (Tit. i. 4); ver. 4: *μῦθοι* (Tit. i. 14); *προσέχειν, γενεαλογίαι* (Tit. iii. 9); *ζητήσεις* (*idem*); ver. 6: *ἀστοχήσαντες* (2 Tim. ii. 18); ver. 7: *διαβεβαιοῦσθαι* (Tit. iii. 8); ver. 10: *ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία*; ver. 16: *ὑποτύπωσις*; ii. 7 compared with 2 Tim. i. 11; iii. 2: *νηφάλιον* (Tit. ii. 2); ver. 3: *ἄμαχον* (Tit. iii. 2); ver. 4: *σεμνότης* (Tit. ii. 7); ver. 9: *ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει* (2 Tim. i. 3); ver. 11: *μὴ διαβόλους* (Tit. ii. 3); iv. 6: *παρηκολούθηκας* (2 Tim. iii. 10); ver. 7: *βεβήλους* (2 Tim. ii. 16); ver. 9: *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* (2 Tim. ii. 11; Tit. iii. 8). But when considered impartially, these expressions are by no means unsuitably used in the First Epistle to Timothy; it cannot therefore be proved that they are borrowed, and borrowed unskilfully. The agreement of the Pastoral Epistles in their mode of expression is sufficiently explained by the fact that they were written with no long interval between them. Comp. with this the general agreement between the Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians.—Besides this, however, Schleiermacher charges the epistle not only with want of internal connection, launching out often from one subject to another, but also with containing many thoughts foreign to Paul (i. 8, ii. 14, 15, ii. 5, etc.). But on the *former* point it is to be noted that the epistle is not a work on doctrine, but a business letter, in which subjects of various kinds are treated according to circumstances; and on the *latter* point, that the thoughts mentioned are not at all in contradiction with Paul's views.—De Wette, too, has no grounds for asserting that the execution does not correspond with the aims proposed in the epistle. The passage in i. 3, for example, does not justify any one in expecting an elaborate polemic against the heretics; it is sufficient for the purpose to give some of their characteristics. As a rule, Paul enters on a thorough polemic only against those opponents who disputed his gospel from presuppositions recognized by himself; this, however, was not the case with these heretics.—The charges, that the directions for managing the church are too general and insignificant, and that the exhortations given to Timothy (i. 18 f., iv. 7 ff., 12 ff., v. 23, vi. 11 ff.) are not suitable to his character and position, are not to the point; and the same may be said of the assertion, that a business letter addressed to Timothy ought to discuss the apostle's special relations with the church at Ephesus, which was so dear to him. As to other points, de Wette holds that Schleiermacher goes too far in his

unfavorable judgment, and does not agree with the theory of a compilation. Still he, too, places this epistle after the other two, and considers it the last written, though he assigns all three to the same author. All this makes it inconceivable how the forger did not express in *one* epistle what he wished to write in the apostle's name.—Mangold agrees with de Wette in regarding the First Epistle to Timothy as the last written. The chief ground for this view is the advanced stage of heresy shown in the epistle. When the Epistle to Titus was written, the heretics, according to this theory, still stood outside the church as purely Jewish Essenes, and had had some trifling success only in Crete. When the Second Epistle to Timothy was composed, they had found a more favorable soil in Ephesus; by fusing their dogmas with Christian ideas they had won over notable members of the church, so that there was a danger of this heresy eating into it like a cancer. The author was not deceived in this respect, but saw "the introduction of Essene dogmas into Christianity completed," and the heretical transformation of the fundamental ideas of Christianity into Essenism carried out to its ultimate consequences; hence he wrote another Third Epistle. In the earlier epistle, however, "he had chosen the situation in Paul's imprisonment just before his death," and thus "he had now to select some earlier period in the apostle's life for writing anew." The hypothesis is clever enough, but on the one hand there is no ground for presupposing that the heresy is more advanced in the First Epistle than in the Second, and on the other hand the forger would have acted most foolishly in placing the *later* stage of the heresy in an *earlier* period. Altogether, apart from the necessary explanation which these hypotheses give of some points, they leave many other points quite untouched. Mangold, in agreement with de Wette, gives one more proof for this theory of later composition—viz. that the Hymenaeus, mentioned in the Second Epistle as a member of the church, had already been excommunicated in the First. But, granting the identity of the persons, why could Paul not bring forward later as a heretic a man who had been excommunicated for his heresy? Besides, in the manner in which the man is mentioned in 2 Tim. ii. 17, there is no indication that Timothy had known anything of him before. Bleek (*Einleitung in das N. T.*) has anew sought to prove the correctness of Schleiermacher's view, that the First Epistle to Timothy is the *only* one not genuine. The chief ground on which he relies is the entire want of allusion to personal relations in the church; but this want is sufficiently explained by the motive of the epistle. Bleek thinks it strange that in the instructions regarding the bishopric no mention is

made of any particular person in Ephesus fitted for the office; but we must remember that those instructions were given to Timothy not for the Ephesian Church alone. Stress is laid on the absence of any greetings from Paul to the church or to individual members of it, and from the Macedonian Christians to Timothy; but greetings were not at all necessary, and there are other epistles in which they are altogether wanting or very subordinate. All the other reasons advanced by Bleek, he himself declares to be secondary. When impartially considered, they are seen to have no weight—especially for one who, like Bleek, acknowledges that the epistle contains nothing un-Pauline.

The Epistle to Titus.—The criticisms made on this epistle by de Wette are, that it neither agrees with the state of things mentioned in it, nor corresponds with its purpose and the relation of the writer to the reader. As to the first point, it rests chiefly on the erroneous theory, that the epistle was written soon after the gospel was first preached in Crete. If Christianity had already spread to Crete and in the island before the apostle arrived there, there would be nothing strange in mentioning the multitude of heretics, nor in the blame given to the Cretans in spite of their readiness to receive Christianity, nor in the instructions which presuppose that Christianity had been some time in existence there. With regard to the second and third charge, we must note, *on the one hand*, that de Wette arbitrarily defines the purpose of the epistle to be, "to give to Titus instructions about the choice of presbyters, and about contending with heretics," which certainly makes the greatest part of the epistle appear to be a digression from its purpose; and, *on the other hand*, that the weight and importance of the general instructions and exhortations for the development of the Christian life have received too little recognition.—Reuss (*Gesch. d. heiligen Schriften des N. T.*, 2d ed. 1853) shows greater caution than de Wette in his opinion: "The somewhat solemn tone may excite surprise, not less so that Paul apparently found it necessary in a special letter to say things to Titus which were self-evident. This surprise may, however, give way before the consideration that Paul did not consider it necessary to deliver to his substitute a kind of official instruction and authorization as his certificate in the churches. More simply and surely it may give way, when it is remembered that the apostle wrote for special reasons and that an important matter could never appear to him to be too strongly enjoined."—As to other points, even de Wette acknowledges that the epistle, "though not written with the Pauline power, liveliness, and fullness of thought, has still the apostle's clearness, good connection, and vocabulary."

The Second Epistle to Timothy.—In this epistle, apart from the historical inconceivability which it seems to him to share with the other two, de Wette takes exception to the following points, viz.: that, as already remarked, Timothy is not treated in a proper fashion, and that many exhortations (especially ii. 2, 14–16, iii. 14–iv. 2), as well as the prophetic outbursts (iii. 1–5, iv. 3) and the polemic attacks (ii. 16–21, 23, iii. 6–9, 13), do not accord with the purpose of inviting him to come to Rome.—But as to the first accusation, the apostle's exhortations do not by any means presuppose *such* a feebleness of faith and faintness of heart in Timothy, as de Wette in too harsh a fashion represents; besides, a forger would hardly have sketched a picture of Timothy in contradiction with the reality. The second accusation is based solely on de Wette's inability to distinguish between the occasion and purpose of an epistle. De Wette further finds fault with the epistle, that here and there it is written with no good grammatical and logical connection, and without proper tact (for which he appeals to iii. 11, iv. 8!); but these are subjective judgments which decide nothing.—Schleiermacher declared the process of thought both in this epistle and in that to Titus to be faultless; and Reuss pronounces the following judgment on them: "Among all the Pauline Epistles assailed by criticism, no one (except the one to Philemon) bears so clearly the stamp of genuineness as this epistle, unless it be considered without any perception of the state of things presented in it. The personal references are almost more numerous than anywhere else, always natural, for the most part new, in part extremely insignificant; the tone is at once paternal, loving, and confidential, as to a colleague; the doctrine brief and hastily repeated, not as to one ignorant and weak, but as from one dying who writes for his own peace.—The reference to the apostolic office is the chief point from beginning to end, and there is no trace of hierarchical ambition or any other later tendencies." Bleek is decided in maintaining the authenticity both of the Epistle to Titus and of this epistle.

The following are the results of an investigation which takes the actual circumstances into careful consideration:—1. The external testimonies are decidedly in favor of the authenticity of the epistles. 2. The difficulty of bringing them into any period of the apostle's life disappears when we assume a second imprisonment at Rome. 3. The internal peculiarity of the epistles, both in regard to the matter discussed in them and in regard to the process of thought and mode of expression, presents much that is strange, but nothing to testify against the authenticity. 4. "There is no sufficient resting-place for the critical judgment of rejection, so long as we

only know that the epistles cannot be Pauline; everything depends on proving positively that they arose at a later date." Such is Baur's opinion. But this positive proof entirely breaks down. Baur's attempt has no evidence to support it; de Wette makes an uncertain conjecture; and Mangold, who sees Essenism in the heresy, himself admits that this is no reason for assigning the epistles to the post-apostolic age. If there are difficulties in vindicating the Pauline authorship, it is still more difficult to prove in whole or in part how a forger could manufacture three such epistles as these are, in form and contents, and foist them on the Apostle Paul.—Since, therefore, there is no sufficient proof of the *post-apostolic* origin of the epistles, we may further (as Wiesinger also has completely shown) maintain their right to a place in the Canon as Pauline writings, all the more that the Pauline spirit is not contradicted in them, and that, in comparison with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, they show a decided superiority in their whole tenor.[1]

[1] Guericke: "The Pastoral Epistles are certainly not written in so fresh and lively a manner, nor do they enter as thoroughly into details, as do Paul's earlier epistles. They show us the great apostle as a grey-haired man, bent with age, with persecution, with anxiety (?). His hate is especially sharpened against the enemies of the kingdom of God; but he is at the same time filled with a sadness all the more deep, as he beholds the kingdom of Antichrist develop now and threaten the future. Thus the fragile (?) covering reveals all the more nobly the spirit of faith and love which dwelt within him."

Παύλου πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολὴ πρώτη.

A, *al.* have the shorter inscription *πρὸς Τιμόθεον ᾱ*, which in D E F G is preceded by the word *ἀρχεται.*

CHAPTER I.

VER. 1. *ἐπιταγήν*] ℵ reads instead *ἐπαγγελίαν*, a reading not found elsewhere, and not confirmed by its meaning; it may have arisen inadvertently from 2 Tim. i. 1.—*Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν.*] In the later MSS. there is great variety in the reading, partly by arranging the words differently, partly by adding the article to one or other of them, partly by inserting the word *πατρός*; *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ*, 73, 80, 116, 213, *al.*, Arm.—*τοῦ σωτῆρος Θεοῦ ἡμῶν*, 37.—*Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, 38, 48, 72, *al.*, codd.—*καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*] *καί* is omitted by various cursives, or placed before *σωτῆρος*; the latter in the MSS. just named, as well as in Ambros., who has *Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*; the former in Ar. pol., which has *Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, κυρίου.* In many cursives *καί* is omitted along with *κυρίου* following it; *Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, in 17, 31, *al.*; *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, 43, and in those above mentioned, 38, 48, 72, and in Ambros.—Cod. 118 has *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν* I. X. *καὶ κυρίου* I. X.—*κυρίου* is wanting in the most important authorities, A D* F G, many cursives and translations (Syr. both, Copt. Sahid. Aeth., etc.); hence it is omitted by Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch., while Matthaei has retained it with the remark: ita omnes omnino mei.—Instead of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the most important MSS., etc., have the reading Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, which is therefore adopted by Griesb. ℵ has the same reading as the *Rec.*: *καὶ κυρίου* Ἰησ. Χρ.—Ver. 2 *ἡμῶν* after *πατρός* is wanting in A B D* F G 17; 23, *al.*, Copt. (not Sahid.) Arm. Slav., etc., and is therefore to be deleted; the interpolation is easily explained from a comparison with the other Pauline Epistles.—Ver. 4. For *γενεαλογίαις, κενολογίαις* occurs as a conjecture.—Instead of *ζητήσεις*, ℵ, A and some cursives have *ἐκζητήσεις*, which is adopted by Tisch. 8. This reading may be the original one, which as a *ἅπαξ λεγομ.* in the N. T. was changed into the usual *ζητήσεις*; the meaning is the same.—*Οἰκοδομίαν* (*Rec.*) is found perhaps in no Greek MS. According to Tisch., D*** has it; but this is denied by Reiche (*Commet. crit. in N. T.* II. p. 356). It is, according to Reiche: "nil nisi error typothetarum Erasmi, aut conjectura Erasmi ipsius;" the latter he considers more probable. By far the most have *οἰκονομίαν*; only D* and Iren. gr. ap. Epiph. have *οἰκοδομήν* (aedificationem: Lyr. Erp. Syr. p. in m. Vulg. Ambr. Aug. Ambrosiast.). The reading *οἰκονομίαν* is supported by authorities so important, that we cannot doubt its correctness. Matthaei says: *οἰκονομίαν* ita omnes omnino mei, ac ii quidem, qui scholia habent, etiam in scholiis, uti quoque interpretes editi, *οἰκοδομίαν* nihil nisi error est typothetarum Erasmi, *δ* cum *ν* confuso, nisi Erasmus deliberato ita correxerit ad Latinum *aedificationem.*—Ver. 8. Instead of *χρῆται*, Lachm. reads *χρήσηται*, after A 73, Clem. The common reading is more natural, and is to be considered right, as the

other has not sufficient testimony.—Ver. 9. Instead of the regular forms *πατραλῴαις* and *μητραλῶαις*, A D F G 48, 72, 93, *al.* have *πατρολῴαις* and *μητρολῴαις*, which Lachm. and Tisch. have adopted; several cursives have *πατραλοίαις* and *μητραλοίαις*.—Ver. 11. In D* and several versions there stands before *κατά* the art. *τῇ*; a manifest interpolation in order to connect *κατὰ κ.τ.λ.* with the foregoing *διδασκαλίᾳ*.—Ver. 12. *καὶ χάριν ἔχω*] The most important authorities, A F G 17, 31, 67** 71, *al.*, Copt. Aeth. Arm. Vulg., etc., also ℵ, are against *καί*, which seems to have been added in order to join this verse more closely with the previous one. In Matthaei *καί* stands without dispute. Lachm. and Tisch. 8 left it out; Tisch. 7, with Wiesinger, had retained it, following D K L, several versions, and Fathers.—*ἐνδυναμώσαντί με*] ℵ has the pres. *ἐνδυναμοῦντι*, and omits *με*; a reading supported by no other authority.—Ver. 13. *τὸν πρότερον ὄντα*] A D* F G ℵ 17, 67*** 71, 80, *al.*, *Dial. c. Marc.* have *τό* instead of *τόν*. The latter is a correction in order to join the partic. and the following subst. more closely with the previous *με*. Lachm. and Tisch. adopted *τό*. Matthaei, on the other hand, reads *τόν*, with the remark: *τὸ πρ.* in nullo meorum inveni, nisi in uno Chrysostomi *a* qui fortasse voluit, *τὸν τὸ πρότερον*. Muralto likewise reads *τόν*.—After *ὄντα*, A 73 have *με*, which is also adopted by Lachm. It disturbs, however, the natural connection, and the authorities for it are not sufficient; hence it is not adopted by Tisch.—Ver. 15. ℵ omits *τόν* before *κόσμον*.—Ver. 16. Lachm. and Tisch. 7, following A D, etc., read *Χρ. Ἰησ.*; Tisch. 8, following ℵ K L P, reads *Ἰησ. Χρ.*—Instead of *πᾶσαν* according to D K L, Tisch. rightly adopted *ἅπασαν* from A F G, etc.—Ver. 17. Instead of *ἀφθάρτῳ*, D* has the reading *ἀθανάτῳ*, and F G have this word inserted after *μόνῳ*.—The word *σοφῷ* is rightly rejected by Griesb. Knapp, Lachm. Tisch. Buttm. and others, since A D* F G ℵ 37, 179, 73, the Syr. Copt. Arm. and other versions testify against it. It was probably an interpolation from Rom. xvi. 27; Matthaei retained it, remarking: Vulgatum habet et repetit Chrys. xi. 569, 570; item i. 464, c. v. 393, e. Ath. ii. 425, 433. Attamen *σοφῷ* abest ap. Cyrill. v., a. 295, haud dubie casu ac per errorem. Ex omnibus omnino Codd. omittunt soli A D F G 37. Reiche (*Comment. crit. in N. T.* II. pp. 360–363) maintains that *σοφῷ* cannot be an interpolation from Rom. xvi. 27, because the doxology there is not genuine. See, on the other hand, Meyer in his critical remarks on the passage; he holds *σοφῷ* to be genuine, on internal grounds, viz.: (1) Because Paul had no reason for emphasizing the unity of God against the heretics; and (2) because the reading *μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ* is the more difficult one. But these internal grounds are insufficient against the weight of the authorities.—Ver. 18. Instead of *στρατεύῃ*, ℵ has *στρατεύσῃ*.

Vv. 1, 2. [On Vv. 1, 2, see Note I., pages 86, 87.] As in most of his other epistles, Paul here calls himself an apostle of Jesus Christ in the narrower sense of the term, according to which it was applied only to those immediately called by Christ to the ministry of the gospel. He directs attention to the immediate nature of the call by adding the words *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.* In 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Eph., Col., 2 Tim., *διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ* is used for a like purpose. The expression *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν κ.τ.λ.* is found elsewhere in the inscription only in Tit. i. 3, where, however, it is not placed in such close connection with *ἀπόστολος* as here (comp. besides Rom. xvi. 26, also 1 Cor. vii. 6; 2 Cor. viii. 8). The *θέλημα* is the source

of the *ἐπιταγή*, by which we are to understand the commission given to the apostle. By this addition the apostle expresses his "assured consciousness of the divine origin and worth of his apostleship" (Matthies). It is not, however, an "*involuntary*" expression. The apostle deliberately insists on his apostolic authority, for the very sufficient reason that he was laying down in his epistle rules for church life. Heydenreich's suggestion, that Paul meant at the same time to confirm Timothy's position, is very far-fetched.—*Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*] This collocation of the words is only found elsewhere in the N. T. in Jude 25; in all passages of the Pastoral Epistles it usually runs: *ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν Θεός*. In this passage *σωτὴρ ἡμῶν* is added as in adjectival apposition to *Θεοῦ*; while in Luke i. 47 it is marked as a substantive by the article. In the Pastoral Epistles *σωτήρ* is used both of God (so frequently in O. T.; comp. LXX. Ps. xxiv. 5; Isa. xii. 2, xlv. 15, 31; Wisd. Sol. xvi. 7; Ecclus. li. 1) and of Christ; in the other Pauline Epistles (*e. g.* Eph. v. 23; Phil. iii. 20), as well as in John iv. 42, Acts v. 31, etc., it serves to denote Christ. Heydenreich is right in remarking that God does not bear this name as preserver and benefactor of men in general, but on account of the means He has instituted for saving and blessing us through Christ.—*καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*] These words are added on account of the apostle's Christology; so also in Gal. i. 1.—*τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν*] Christ is so named because He is both "the ground of our hope" (Wiesinger) and the object of it. He is hoped for, because by Him the *σωτηρία* is brought to completion (Calvin: in eo solo residet tota salutis nostrae materia); comp. the expression in Col. i. 27: *ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς δοξῆς*.—*Τιμοθέῳ γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει*] Paul calls Timothy his child; he was not so *κατὰ σάρκα* but *ἐν πίστει*, since he was converted to the faith by Paul, as we learn from 1 Cor. iv. 14–17. Paul usually calls himself the father of those who had been led to the faith by him (comp. Gal. iv. 19). The idea of *τέκνον* is strengthened by *γνήσιος*, perhaps by way of contrast with the heretics. The opposite of *γνήσιος* is *νόθος* or *οὐκ ὄντως ὢν* (comp. Plato, *Rep.* 203). This addition also gives prominence to the fact that Timothy was his son in the faith, not in appearance but in truth; hence Paul calls him also in 1 Cor. iv. 17 his *τέκνον ἀγαπητὸν καὶ πιστὸν ἐν κυρίῳ*.—*ἐν πίστει*] "in the sphere of faith," is not to be connected with *γνησίῳ* but with *τέκνῳ*, as defined more closely by *γνησίῳ*; comp. Tit. i. 4, and see Winer, p. 130 [E. T. p. 137].—*χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη*] This collocation occurs only in the Pastoral Epistles and in 2 John 3; in the other Pauline Epistles it runs: *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*. In Gal. vi. 16, however, *εἰρήνη* and *ἔλεος* are connected with one another. In Jude 2 we have: *ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη*. The three expressions manifestly do not indicate three different gifts of grace, but only *one*. The distinction is, that *χάρις* points more to the soil from which the gift comes, and *εἰρήνη* denotes its nature, while the *ἔλεος* (standing between the two others in the Pastoral Epistles) lays stress on the element of compassionate love in *χάρις*.[1] Otto arbitrarily finds in

[1] Wiesinger is right in not agreeing with Olshausen, who wishes to see in the expressions *σωτήρ*, *ἐλπίς*, *ἔλεος*, a special reference to the apostle's position as a prisoner. Van Oosterzee aptly remarks: "Grace may be called the greatest benefaction for the guilty,

ἔλεος "a reference to the official position," appealing to such passages as 1 Tim. i. 13, 16; 1 Cor. vii. 25; 2 Cor. iv. 1. Paul does also acknowledge that his call to the ministry of the word came from God's ἔλεος; but it does not follow from this that the word ἔλεος is used only in reference to the official position; comp. Gal. vi. 16; 2 Tim. i. 16, 18.—ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κ.τ.λ.] Even with the reading ἡμῶν the genitive Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ cannot be made to depend on Θεοῦ. Next to the Father, Paul names Christ as the source from which the blessing comes, because all the Father's gifts of blessing come through the Son.

Vv. 3, 4. [On Vv. 3, 4, see Note II., pages 87–89.] The apostle reminds Timothy, in the first place, of a previous exhortation, obviously for the purpose of impressing it more deeply on him.—The most natural construction of the sentence appears to be, to take it as an anacolouthon, to connect ἐν Ἐφέσῳ with προσμεῖναι, to refer πορευόμενος to the subject of παρεκάλεσα, and to make ἵνα dependent on παρεκάλεσά σε κ.τ.λ. This construction is held by most expositors to be the only admissible one. The missing apodosis cannot, however, be supplied before ἵνα, because ἵνα is closely connected with what precedes; we may insert with Erasmus "ita facito," or with Beza "vide," or with most expositors "οὕτω καὶ νῦν παρακαλῶ" (Winer, p. 530 [E. T. p. 570]). The peculiarity in such an involuntary (Buttm. p. 331 [E. T. 386]) anacolouthon is, that the grammatical connection is not established by inserting the omitted apodosis. The most simple course is to suppose that the apostle had "οὕτω καὶ νῦν παρακαλῶ" or "οὕτω ποίει" in mind, but the place for it was lost in the abundance of the thoughts that streamed in on him.—Several expositors depart from the construction commonly accepted. Matthies takes προσμεῖναι as "stay," not as "remain behind," refers πορευόμενος not to the subject of παρεκάλεσα, but to σε (making an unjustifiable appeal to Eph. iii. 17, 18, iv. i. 2; Col. iii. 16[1]), and explains the whole thus: When Timothy was intending to travel to Macedonia, Paul had charged him to stop at Ephesus and remain there. Schneckenburger (see his *Beiträge z. Einl.* pp. 182 ff.) arbitrarily changes the infin. προσμεῖναι into the partic. προσμείνας, and refers πορευόμενος to the following clause: ἵνα παραγγείλῃς. Otto treats πορευόμενος in the same way, at the same time connecting ἐν Ἐφέσῳ with παρεκάλεσα, taking προσμεῖναι in an absolute sense, making the apodosis begin with ἵνα, and translating: "Just as I exhorted you to stand firm in Ephesus, so shalt thou on the journey to Macedonia command the people not to give attention to strange teachers, nor to hold them in esteem," etc.

compassion for the suffering, peace for the contending (?) disciple of the Lord." Hofmann is right in his remark on 1 Tim. i. 1, that χάρις with ἀπό does not denote God's thoughts, but "that in which His thoughts are shown, the grace which man receives." In his explanation of 1 Tim. i. 2: "χάρις is that which is imparted to man by God, *who wishes him well*," the idea of χάρις is made far too general.

[1] In the passages quoted, Paul adds the participles to the previous clauses in the nom., and these participial clauses thus acquire the independence due to them according to the context. But in these passages the relation of the participial clause to the preceding main clause is quite different from what it is here, where there is no reason whatever for departing from the regular construction.

This construction is, however, so artificial, that it is obviously incorrect to every one who is not blinded by the desire of placing the date of the composition of the epistle in a period of the apostle's life known to us.

REMARK.—In order to justify his view of the sentence, Otto tries to prove the incorrectness of the usual construction, and to get rid of the objections to his own. The hypothesis of an ellipsis he rejects on account of the rule that the emphatic word can never be omitted, and that if we supply the apodosis by "*οὕτω καὶ νῦν παρακαλῶ*," the emphatic words are *καὶ νῦν*. But these words are not by any means the most emphatic. The apostle might be using them not specially of the contrast between past and present, but only to give point to his former exhortation; hence he might easily omit the apodosis. Otto further maintains, that in the usual construction *καθώς*, which always denotes a material, actual correspondence, even to identity of motives, and further, of material contents, does not get its full force. On this point we indeed grant that the peculiar meaning of *καθώς* (as distinguished from *ὡς*) is not distinctly marked by the expositors; but it is not at all necessary in the usual interpretation to weaken arbitrarily the force of *καθώς*, since the apostle's former exhortation could not but be his guide in the present one. Still less difficulty, however, is presented by *καθώς*, if we choose to supply *οὕτω ποίει* (as Hofmann does), since the meaning then is, that Timothy's conduct is to be conformed to the exhortation already given by the apostle.—Otto tries further to show that in the usual explanation the participle *πορευόμενος* is not in its proper place. The rules which Otto lays down on the subject of participial clauses in order to support his assertion are, on the whole, not incorrect. The passages he quotes from the N. T. certainly show that the participle following a finite verb mostly defines it more precisely; that it either explains more precisely the verbal notion, or gives the accompanying circumstances of the verb. But Otto has overlooked the departures from this rule which occur in the N. T.; comp. Luke iv. 40 with Mark i. 31; Matt. xii. 49 with Acts xxvi. 1; Matt. xxii. 15 with Matt. xii. 14; further, Luke xxiv. 17.[1] It cannot be denied that the participle following sometimes gives simply the time in which the action of the finite verb takes place; that here, therefore, the *πορευόμενος* may simply denote the time of the former exhortation.[2] Otto quotes the passage in Acts xii. 25 as supporting the rule that the participle following should serve to explain the verbal notion, and justifies this by saying that the participle *πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν gives the motive* of the return. But to give the motive is no explanation. In this passage, however, the position of the participle after the finite verb is justified in this way, that it gives the motive for the action expressed by the finite verb. So, too, in the passage here there is nothing to be said against the connection of *πορευόμενος* with *παρεκάλεσα*, so soon as we suppose that the journey *was the occasion*

[1] Otto tries to weaken the force of this passage against him by assuming a rhetorical inversion, because, he says, it is declared "that taking a walk and holding solemn dispute are inconsistent with one another" (!).

[2] In his groundless denial of this, Otto thinks that if *πορευόμενος* be joined to *παρεκάλεσα* it must be assumed to be a circumstance accompanying the *παρεκάλεσα*, but that this assumption is impossible, since a *continuing* fact (part. pres.) cannot be regarded as the accompanying circumstance of a *concluded* fact (part. aor.). But Otto overlooks the fact that *πορευόμενος* in this connection is not to be understood in the sense of continuing a journey, but in the sense of beginning one, of setting out.

for Paul giving Timothy the exhortation in question. Lastly, Otto attacks the usual construction from the notion of προσμεῖναι, because this word is explained in the construction to be equivalent to "remain, stay;" whereas, when not connected with a dative (or with a participial clause representing a dative), but standing absolutely, it has the meaning: "to maintain the position hitherto possessed, to stand firm." Hence, if any definition of place is added, it is not as a completion of the verbal notion, but only indicates where the standing firm takes place. Otto infers from this: "accordingly ἐν Ἐφέσῳ here does not complete προσμεῖναι, but rather προσμεῖναι is absolute, and ἐν Ἐφέσῳ gives the place at which the whole sentence, viz. παρεκάλεσά σε προσμεῖναι, took place." This inference is obviously incorrect, since from Otto's premises it only follows that, if ἐν Ἐφέσῳ belongs to προσμεῖναι, the place is thus given where Timothy is to stand fast,—in particular against the heretics,—it does not follow that ἐν Ἐφέσῳ may be connected with προσμεῖναι. Besides, from Acts xviii. 18, it is clear beyond dispute that προσμένειν does occur in the N. T. in the weakened sense of "remain stay."[1] Otto does not disguise the objections to his view, but he thinks that when thoroughly weighed they are more apparent than real. In this, too, he is wrong. It is indeed right to say that in the N. T. a sentence often begins with ἵνα without any verb preceding on which it depends,—and this not only in cases where the governing verbal notion is easily supplied from what precedes, as in John i. 8, ix. 3, xiii. 18, 2 Cor. viii. 7, but also when that is not the case, so that the clause beginning with ἵνα stands as an imperative clause, as in Eph. v. 33; Mark v. 23 (comp. Buttm. pp. 207 f.). But in all passages where ἵνα is used elliptically, this is shown clearly and distinctly by the form of the sentence, which is not the case here. It is right also to say that emphatic parts of the clause construed with ἵνα are often placed before ἵνα, so that πορευόμενος, therefore, might very well be connected with the clause following ἵνα; but this, too, is always indicated clearly by the form of the sentence. Wherever words standing before ἵνα are to be referred to what follows ἵνα, these words cannot possibly be connected with what precedes them, and the part of the sentence following ἵνα is incomplete in itself, so that it has to be taken along with the part before ἵνα. It is wrong to maintain that the participial clause πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδ. becomes emphatic by contrast with ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, inasmuch as what took place in *Ephesus* is now to take place also *on the journey to Macedonia*; for—the two things are not at all the same. In Ephesus (according to Otto's view), Paul exhorted Timothy to stand firm; but on the journey to Macedonia, Timothy is to encounter those who had been led astray. Lastly, it is right to assume that the sender of a letter, if he has anything to say of the place from which the letter is sent, may speak of it by

[1] In this passage, also, Otto claims for προσμένειν, as a vox militaris, the meaning: "keep one's ground," remarking, "for the circumstances in Corinth were such that they might well have induced Paul to cease his labors and depart." But this assertion is in contradiction with Luke's statement, that the attack attempted by the Jews through Gallio was decisively warded off. Otto's explanation, too, becomes all the more unsuitable, since, according to it, Luke would charge the apostle with not holding his ground more, and with abandoning his post.—Further, Otto seems to hesitate whether to take προσμεῖναι in the present passage as really absolute, or whether to supply with it the dative ἐμοί. After finally deciding for the former, he then explains προσμεῖναι as "keeping ground along with the leader appointed by God in the struggle against all the attacks of the heretic," and thus in self-contradiction returns to the latter, since this leader is the Apostle Paul.

name, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 32, xvi. 8, so that ἐν Ἐφέσῳ might convey to us that Paul was himself in Ephesus while writing; but we must take into consideration the special circumstances of the case. According to Otto, our epistle is a paper of instructions which the apostle put into Timothy's hands in Ephesus, where he wrote it before setting out for Macedonia. In that case it was improper to mention the place by name. We cannot understand, then, why Paul in such a paper of instructions should have laid special stress on the exhortation he had imparted to Timothy *in the very place* where he put that paper into his hands.

Some expositors take the whole section vv. 5–17 to be a parenthesis, and ver. 18 to be the apodosis corresponding to καθώς. The awkwardness of this construction is obvious; but Plitt thinks that, though it is not without its difficulties, most may be said for it. He is wrong, however, since ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν, in ver. 18, does not resume the παρεκάλεσά σε.—If we avoid all subtleties, we cannot but explain it: *Even as I exhorted thee to remain in Ephesus when I set out for Macedonia, that thou mightst command certain men not to teach false doctrine . . . even so do* (or: *even so I exhort thee also now*).[1] Regarding the meaning of καθώς and προσμεῖναι, see the above remark.—παρεκάλεσα] Chrys.: ἄκουε τὸ προσηνές, πῶς οὐ διδασκάλου κέχρηται ῥωμῇ, ἀλλ' οἰκέτου σχεδόν· οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ἐπέταξα, οὐδὲ ἐκέλευσα, οὐδὲ παρῄνεσα, ἀλλὰ τί; παρεκάλεσά σε. Towards Titus, however, Paul uses the expression διεταξάμην (Tit. i. 5), although he was not less friendly towards him than towards Timothy.—πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν] "when I went away, from Ephesus to Macedonia;" πορεύεσθαι has in itself the general meaning of going, but it is also used of going away from a place, both absolutely (Matt. xi. 7) and connected with ἀπό (Matt. xxiv. 1, xxv. 41, xix. 15: ἐκεῖθεν; Luke xiii. 31: ἐντεῦθεν). Otto explains it: "on the way to Macedonia," which is grammatically correct, but opposed to the connection of ideas. There is no ground whatever for thinking that Paul, in this expression, had in mind one particular place on the way to Macedonia, viz. Corinth. We can see no reason why Paul should have expressed himself indefinitely. Otto, indeed, is of opinion that Timothy could not have been uncertain about the meaning of the expression; and that the apostle chose it in order to spare the feelings of the Corinthians, and that he might not confess to the heretics how they had provoked his apostolic opposition to an exceptional degree. But the first reason proves too much, since Paul, if he refrained from the definite expression because Timothy knew his wishes without it, would also have refrained from the indefinite expression. The other two reasons are weak, because if Timothy was to labor successfully against the heretics, he must necessarily appeal to the authority of the apostle in whose name he was to labor. Besides, such playing at hide-and-seek as Otto imputes to the apostle, is in entire contradiction with Paul's frank character.—ἵνα παραγγείλῃς κ.τ.λ.] gives the purpose for which Timothy was to remain in Ephesus. The

[1] Hofmann is wrong in asserting that Paul, when he wrote καθώς (not ὡς), could not have had in mind "any expression of which the writer was the subject, but only an exhortation as to what Timothy was to do."

theory that this gives at the same time the purpose of the whole epistle (Matthies), which opinion de Wette brings forward as proving the epistle not to be genuine, is wrong.—*παραγγείλῃς*] does not necessarily involve the suggestion of publicity which Matthies finds in it.—*τισί*] The same indefinite term is used for the heretics also in vv. 6, 19, iv. 1, v. 15, etc.: "certain people whom the apostle is unwilling to designate further; Timothy already knows them" (Wiesinger).—*μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*] [II *b.*] The word, which is not made up of *ἕτερος* and *διδασκάλειν* (= *διδάσκειν*), but is derived from *ἑτεροδιδάσκαλος*, occurs in the N. T. only here and in vi. 3 (comp. *ἑτεροζυγεῖν* in 2 Cor. vi. 14). In *ἕτερος* there is not seldom the notion of *different in kind, strange*, something not agreeing with something else, but opposed to it. Accordingly, in the apostle's use of the word, a *ἑτεροδιδάσκαλος* is a teacher who teaches other things than he should teach, who puts forward doctrines in opposition to the gospel; and *ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν* here means nothing else than to teach something opposed to the gospel (Heb. xiii. 9: *διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε*); comp. 2 Cor. xi. 4; Gal. i. 6: *εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον*. Wiesinger, in order to favor his theory that heresy proper is not spoken of, weakens the meaning into "teach otherwise," so that according to him it signifies "teaching things which lie apart from *ἡ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλία*." This is incorrect, for in that case some more precise definition would have been given.—Even in classic Greek, *ἕτερος*, in composition, often has the meaning alleged by us; thus *ἑτεροδοξεῖν* = diversae opinionis esse; comp. Plato, *Theaet.* p. 190 E: *δόξαν εἶναι ψευδῆ τὸ ἑτεροδοξεῖν*. According to Otto, *ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν* means: "to have another teacher, to follow another teacher." Otto wrongly appeals for this to Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 32, where *ἑτεροδιδάσκαλοι* does not mean false teachers, but "such members of the church as had abandoned the teaching of the apostles and become attached to strange teachers;" and also to Ignat. *ad Polycarp.* chap. 3, where *ἑτεροδιδασκαλοῦντες* has the same meaning.[1] Otto also makes appeal to the Greek usage, according to which, in composite nouns, the concluding word, if it be a noun, does not contain the subject of the fundamental thought in such composite words, but the nearer or more distant object. But this rule is only valid with *adjectival* forms. In composite *substantives*, on the contrary, the concluding word (if it be an unaltered substantive) may also denote the subject, which is only defined more precisely by the word that precedes.[2]—There is no

[1] The first passage runs: *τηνικαῦτα* (viz. after the apostle's death) *τῆς ἀθέου πλάνης ἀρχὴν ἐλάμβανεν ἡ σύστασις διὰ τῆς τῶν ἑτεροδιδασκάλων ἀπάτης, οἱ καὶ . . . γυμνῇ λοιπὸν ἤδη κεφαλῇ τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας κηρύγματι τὴν ψευδώνυμον γνῶσιν ἀντικηρύττειν ἐπεχείρουν*. The relative clause shows most clearly that the word *ἑτεροδιδάσκαλοι* means nothing else than false teachers.—The second passage is: *οἱ δοκοῦντες ἀξιόπιστοι εἶναι καὶ ἑτεροδιδασκαλοῦντες μή σε καταπλησσέτωσαν*; in which, also, false teachers, heretics, are meant, as is evident from the injunction: *μή σε κ.τ.λ.*, as well as from the exhortation that follows.

[2] The adj. *ἑτερόπους* certainly does not denote "a halting foot," but "one who has a halting foot." On the contrary, *κακόδουλος* is not "one who has a bad slave," but "a bad slave." Comp. also *μικροβασιλεύς*, *ψευδόμαντις*, and others; in the N. T., especially the expressions: *ψευδοδιδάσκαλος* (*ψευδοπροφήτης*, *ψευδόμαρτυρ*, *ψευδαπόστολος*), 2 Pet. ii. 1, and *καλοδιδάσκαλος*, Tit. ii. 3. It is to be noted, also, that in Sextus Empiricus, *Adv. Rhet.* 42, *κακοδιδασκαλεῖν* does not mean "to have a bad teacher," but "to teach what is bad."

ground whatever for Schleiermacher's opinion, that the verb suggests the idea of a hierarchy.—To *μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν* there is added a second point: *μηδὲ προσέχειν κ.τ.λ.*, which Timothy is to forbid to *τινες*.[1] Except in the Pastoral Epistles, *προσέχειν* does not occur in Paul. Here, as in Tit. i. 14, it includes the notion of agreement; so also in Acts viii. 6.—*μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις*] The *καί* is to be taken epexegetically; we can neither join the two expressions as an hendiadys (fabulosae genealogiae, Heumann), nor regard them as denoting different things. The notion of *μῦθοι* has been limited too narrowly by many expositors,—as by Theodoret, who understands by it the traditional supplements to the law; or by others, who take it as denoting the allegorical system of interpretation, or the Jewish stories of miracles (such as occur in the pseudo-epigrapha or the Apocrypha), or even the Gentile mythologies. Leo is wrong in agreeing with Theodoret's exposition, appealing to Ignatius (*Ep. ad Magnes.* chap. 8), and alluding to ver. 7. From that verse it is certainly clear that heretics had peculiar views regarding the law, which were in contradiction with the gospel; but it is a mere assertion to say that *μῦθοι* here refers to these views, all the more that the word stands closely connected with *γενεαλογίαι*. De Wette limits the meaning of the word in another fashion, inferring from 2 Pet. i. 16: *σεσοφισμένοι μῦθοι*, that the *μῦθοι* here meant, formed the definite element in an *artificial* system; the notion of something artificial is obviously imported. Other expositors take the expression quite generally in the sense of "false doctrine," as Suidas explains the word: *μῦθος· λόγος ψευδής, εἰκονίζων τὴν ἀλήθειαν*; this is too indefinite. Paul rather employs it because it was used to denote false ideas regarding the nature of the Godhead. The word that follows defines the nature of these *μῦθοι* more precisely.—On the *γενεαλογίαι ἀπέραντοι*, see Introd. sect. 4. Wiesinger's view, that they denote the genealogies in the O. T., as well as that of Hofmann, that they are the historical facts in the Thora, are both to be rejected. Credner's view, that the genealogies of Christ are meant, is quite arbitrary. So, too, with Chrysostom's explanation: *οἶμαι καὶ Ἕλληνας αὐτὸν ἐνταῦθα αἰνίττεσθαι, ὅταν λέγῃ μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις, ὡς τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν καταλεγόντων.* It is very far-fetched to refer to the Kabbalistic Sephiroth. The application of the expression to the Essenic doctrine of angels (Michaelis), is contradicted by the fact that theories of emanations cannot be proved to have existed among the Essenes. The view upheld by most expositors, that the apostle was thinking of the series of emanations in the speculation of the heretics, must be considered the right one. It is confirmed by the addition of the adjective *ἀπέραντοι*. The genealogies are "unlimited," since there was no necessity for them to stop at any point whatever. The conclusion was altogether arbitrary: hence, in the various systems, the genealogies of the æons differ from one another in all sorts of ways.—*αἵτινες*] is not simply an attributive relative; it gives at the same time the reason of the foregoing exhortation *μὴ προσέχειν* "as those

[1] Without grounds in usage or in fact, Hofmann asserts that "*προσέχειν τινί* is not an expression applicable to a teacher, and that therefore the *ἑτεροδ.* was to be applied to some, and the *προσέχειν κ.τ.λ.* to others."

which."[1]—*Ζητήσεις παρέχουσι μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκονομίαν Θεοῦ*] [II *c.*] Both notions: *ζητήσεις* and *οἰκονομ. Θεοῦ*, may be taken either *subjectively* or *objectively*. If *ζητήσεις* be taken *objectively* it is "points of controversy, questions of dispute;" if *subjectively* it is "investigations, controversies, disputations" ("each one trying to maintain his arbitrary fictions," Matthies). If *οἰκονομία Θεοῦ* is taken *objectively*, it is "the salvation of God" ("the salvation grounded historically in Christ and publicly preached by means of His apostles," Matthies; or according to others, "the ministry of the gospel;" or, lastly, "the divine gift of grace," *i. e.* the divine influence on individuals by which they are brought to the faith). If it is taken *subjectively*, it is "the work of man as an *οἰκονόμος Θεοῦ*;" de Wette: "the work of a steward of God in the faith (to be awakened or to be furthered)." This latter may be taken, in a general sense, as meaning, "the Christian activity, the Christian exercise of the divine gifts of grace,"[2] or, more narrowly: "the maintaining, the strengthening in Christianity, the nourishment in the faith by the spiritual food of Christianity, which the *teachers as stewards of God* distribute," Zachariae. The meaning of *παρέχουσι* is also modified according to the interpretation of these two notions. If they are interpreted objectively, *παρέχειν* is "reach forth, present;" if subjectively, it is "cause, bring about" (so Gal. vi. 17; also frequently in classic Greek and in the Apocrypha of the O. T.)[3] *Ζήτησις* is not identical with *ζήτημα*; *οἰκονομία* is indeed used in the sense of "office of steward," but *οἰκονομία Θεοῦ* denotes "the preparation, the arrangement made by God" (comp. Eph. i. 10, iii. 9), and never "the divine salvation." Hence the subjective interpretation (Hofmann) is to be preferred to the objective (as formerly in this commentary; also Wiesinger, Plitt, Oosterzee). In any case, Matthies is wrong in taking *ζητήσεις* subjectively and *οἰκονομία Θεοῖ* objectively, and then assuming that *παρέχειν* is used in a zeugma. Otto's explanation is purely arbitrary. He explains *ζητήσεις* by "speculations," and *οἰκονομίαν Θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει* by "a system of divine order in the universe (*sc.* creation and government), resting on faith, grounded in faith,—the cosmogony and physics of the Jewish gnosis." Of the latter phrase, he says that Paul "adopts the hypocritical name which the *νομοδιδάσκαλοι* claimed for their system, so that the *ζητήσεις* form the *real*, the *οἰκον. ἡ ἐν πίστει*, on the contrary, the *pretended* contents of the *μῦθοι* and *γενεαλογίαι*." By the addition of *τὴν ἐν πίστει*, the labor of the *οἰκόνομος Θεοῦ* is defined more precisely as one in the sphere of faith (not "causing faith," Hofmann).—*μᾶλλον ἢ*] as in several passages of the N. T., John iii. 19, Acts xxvii. 11, 2 Tim. iii. 4, stands here in the sense of denying the thought contained in the following member, so that (with Suidas) it is equivalent to *καὶ οὐ*.[4]—With the reading *οἰκοδομία* (or *οἰκοδομή*) *Θεοῦ*, we must interpret,

[1] Comp. Soph. *Oed. R.* 1184; Pape, *Handwörterbuch der griech Spr.* See the word *ὅστις*.

[2] Thus Reiche: ista commenta . . . non exhibent, praebent, efficiunt dispensationem (distributionem) bonorum quae Deus Christo misso in nos contulit.

[3] Comp. Wahl, *Clav. libr. V. T. apocryph.*, under the word.

[4] Hofmann wrongly applies this form of expression in order to dispute the reference of *γενεαλογίαι* to the series of æons, saying: "How could it occur to the apostle to

"the edifying in the faith as decreed by God" (Luther, inaccurately: "the improvement towards God in the faith").

Ver. 5. [On vv. 5–11, see Note III., pages 89, 90.] *Τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.*] It cannot be denied that in *παραγγελίας* we have an echo of *παραγγείλῃς* in ver. 3; but it does not follow that we are to understand by it the command which the apostle gave to Timothy not to teach falsely (so Bengel: praecepti quod Ephesi urgere debes). It rather stands here in contrast with the *ἑτεροδιδασκαλία* just mentioned, and denotes the command which is serviceable to the *οἰκονομία Θεοῦ* (ver. 4). It is equivalent to the *ἐντολή* in vi. 14, the evangelic law which forms the external rule for the conduct of Christians (Hofmann). The apostle alludes to this because he is about to pass to the doctrine of the heretics regarding the law.—It is wrong to understand by *παραγγελία* the *Mosaic* law (Calvin, Beza, and others), from which there would arise a thought foreign to the context; and it is unsatisfactory to take it in a general sense as "practical exhortation" (de Wette, Wiesinger, Plitt, Oosterzee), for in that case the imperative should have been used instead of *ἐστιν*. It is a peculiarity of the N. T. usage to take expressions which of themselves have a more general signification, and to mark them off with the definite article as ideas specifically Christian; thus *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, *ἡ ὁδός* (often in Acts), *τὸ κήρυγμα*, and others.—*τέλος*] is neither "fulfillment" nor "chief sum" (Luther, Erasmus: quod universam legis mosaicae vim compendio complectitur ac praestat est caritas), but "goal, scopus ad quem tendit *παραγγελία*" (Koppe, Wegscheider, de Wette, Wiesinger, and others[1]).—While the *ἑτεροδιδασκαλία* only causes *ζητήσεις*, which serve to engender divisions (*γεννῶσι μάχας*, 2 Tim. ii. 23), the aim of the command of the gospel is love.—*ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας κ.τ.λ.*] [III *b*.] The gospel proclaims to the believer *one* divine act, the reconciliation through Christ grounded in God's love, and it demands also *one* human act, viz. love, for *πλήρωμα νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη* (Rom. xiii. 10). Leo and Matthies wrongly explain *ἀγάπη* here of love to God and to one's neighbor. Here and elsewhere in the N. T., where no other genitive of the object is added, we should understand by it love to one's neighbor. The words following declare of what nature this love should be.—*ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας*] *καρδία* denotes the inward centre of human life, especially as the seat of emotions and desires. Hence in regard to love it is often remarked that it must come from the *καρδία* (comp. Matt. xii. 37), and from a heart that is pure, *i. e.* free from all self-seeking; 1 Pet. i. 22: *ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενῶς*; comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 5: *ἡ ἀγάπη . . . οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς*.—The two additions that follow: *καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου* (as is clear from 1 Tim. i. 19, iii. 9, iv. 2), are added with special reference to the heretics, who are reproached with having both an evil conscience and a pretended faith.—*συνείδησις ἀγαθή* (ver. 19; 1 Pet. iii. 16; *καλή*, Heb. xiii. 18; *καθαρά*, 1 Tim. iii. 9; 2 Tim. i.

treat the question only as a possible one, whether these follies of their own invention could not in some measure be useful to what he calls *οἰκονομίαν Θεοῦ*? Such a possibility is not indicated by *μᾶλλον ἤ*.

[1] Arriani *dissertt. Epict.* Book I. chap. 20: *τέλος ἐστὶ τὸ ἕπεσθαι θεοῖς*.

3) is not "the conscience pure from the guilt of sin" (de Wette), nor "the conscience reconciled with God" (van Oosterzee, Plitt), nor "the consciousness of peace with God" (Hofmann). Although "a conscience not reconciled with God and one's neighbors cannot love purely," there is no hint here of the element of reconciliation. It is simply the consciousness of cherishing no impure, wicked purposes.[1]—*πίστις*] is not confidence towards one's neighbor, as it might be here when placed in connection with the idea of love; but, in accordance with the contents of the epistle, is "faith," which in Gal. v. 6 also is denoted as the ground of love.—*ἀνυπόκριτος* (also in Rom. xii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 Pet. i. 22, connected with the idea of love) denotes truth and uprightness in opposition to all flattery. It is used here not without allusion to the heretics who conducted themselves as believers in order to gain a more easy admission for their heresies.

Vv. 6, 7. At ver. 6 the apostle passes to the heretics.—*ὧν*] refers to the ideas immediately preceding: *ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας κ.τ.λ.*, not—as Wiesinger rightly remarks—to *ἀγάπη* direct, "since *εἰς ματαιολογίαν* manifestly denotes a false goal in contrast with the true goal, which is *ἀγάπη*."[2]—*ἀστοχήσαντες*] This verb occurs only in the Pastoral Epistles, in this passage and also in 1 Tim. vi. 21 and 2 Tim. ii. 18 (where it is joined with *περί* and the accusative). Here it stands in its original sense: a scopo sive meta aberrare,[3] which corresponds to the *τέλος* mentioned in ver. 5, and gives us to understand that the heretics had at first been on the way which leads to the goal, but had not remained in it. In this way Schleiermacher's criticism (p. 90), that the word here is far from clear, loses its force.—*ἐξετράπησαν*] *ἐξ* has its full force (Josephus, *Antiq.* xiii. 18: *ἐκτρέπεσθαι τῆς ὁδοῦ δικαίας*) in this verb, which, except in Heb. xii. 13, only occurs in the Epistles to Timothy. The goal to which they have come after turning from the *τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας* is *ματαιολογία*. This word (only found here; Tit. i. 10: *ματαιολόγοι*) characterizes the heresy as empty in nature, contributing nothing to the furtherance of the Christian life. It consists on the one hand of *μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις*, on the other of such definitions regarding the law as were opposed to evangelic doctrine. This latter reference is proved by the close connection of the verse with what follows.—*θέλοντες*] The participle does not express contrast: "although;" it gives rather a more precise definition of the previous verb *ἐξετράπησαν*. Some expositors (de Wette: *wish to be*, without being so in reality; Bengel has *temere;* so also Plitt) rightly urge that *θέλειν* expresses an allegation of their own; Hofmann,

[1] Otto on 2 Tim. i. 3 (pp. 302 f.) explains the expression *καθαρὰ συνειδήσις* rightly (following Matthies) as "the self-consciousness of pure thoughts and endeavors;" but, on the other hand, he is wrong in regard to 1 Tim. i. 19, where he interprets *ἀγαθὴ συνείδ.* as "the conscience innocent and expectant of all salvation," "the consciousness of divine grace supporting itself by daily putting to death the old nature."

[2] Hofmann is wrong in disputing the reason given by Wiesinger, and maintaining that *παραγγελία* and not *τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας* is opposed to *ματαιολογία*. There is no ground also for his assertion that *ἀστοχεῖν* has here the general sense of "to leave uncared for." The *ἐξετράπησαν* clearly shows that *ἀστοχεῖν* is to be taken in its own proper sense.

[3] Comp. Plut. *de Defect. Oracul.* chap. 10.

on the other hand, wrongly takes it in the sense of "arbitrary assumption."[1]—*νομοδιδάσκαλοι*] Luther's translation is, "masters of the Scripture" (and similar explanations are given; Heinrichs has "teachers"); but this does not give the full force of *νόμος*. By *νόμος* we must of course understand the Mosaic law, though it does not follow that the heretics here were Judaizers such as those against whom Paul contends in the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians: they might rather be men who acquired the name by laying down arbitrary commands in their interpretations of the law, and calling these the right knowledge of the law. Baur's theory, that Paul gave this name to the heretics because of their antinomianism, is quite arbitrary, and contrary to the natural meaning of the words. De Wette rightly disproves this by referring to Tit. i. 14, from which it is abundantly clear that the heretics made it their business to lay down arbitrary commands. Baur's appeal to ver. 8, according to which he thinks the heretics must have declared that the law was not good, must decidedly be rejected, since the idea is only an arbitrary importation into ver. 8.[2]—*μὴ νοοῦντες*] This participle expresses contrast (Leo: quamquam ignorant), "without, however, understanding." The object of *νοοῦντες* is given in a sentence of two clauses: *μήτε . . . μήτε*. The first: *μήτε ἃ λέγουσι*, is clear in itself; the second: *μήτε περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦνται*, has been variously explained. Most find the difference between the clauses to lie in this, that the one refers to the utterances themselves, the other to things of which the utterance was made, *i. e.* to the subject-matter of the doctrine (so Raphelius, Leo, Matthies, Wiesinger, Plitt, Oosterzee, Hofmann). De Wette, again, thinks that this explanation rests on a grammatical error, and that "*περὶ τίνων* does not refer to the things of which corroboratory assertions were made, but to these assertions themselves" (Luther: *what they say or what they suppose*). In support of this opinion de Wette wrongly appeals to Tit. iii. 8.[3] He is wrong, too, in translating *διαβεβ.* by "corroborate;" it means rather: "give full assurance." Hofmann says, "to express oneself with confidence regarding anything." The expression is quite general, and Mack seems to be arbitrary in limiting the thought by explaining how *ἃ λεγ.* refers to expressions in the law brought forward as proofs of assertions with which they had no real connection, and *περὶ τίν. βεβ.* to those assertions for which proofs out of the law were given, and which in themselves had no meaning. Paul merely says that the *νομοδιδάσκαλοι* possessed no insight into the nature of the law, and hence they made assertions regarding it which were not understood even by themselves.[4]

[1] Hofmann's reason for this explanation is, that "*νομοδιδάσκαλοι*, who make the law of Israel the subject of their instruction, have no business in the church of the gospel." This is altogether wrong, as may be seen when, further on, Paul appears as a *νομοδιδάσκαλος*.

[2] Contrary to the train of thought, van Oosterzee remarks on *νομοδιδάσκαλοι*: "not in a good, rather in a bad, non-evangelical meaning of this word; men who mixed up law and gospel." In this explanation he overlooks the *θέλοντες εἶναι*.

[3] The classical usage is against de Wette's explanation; comp. Plutarch, *Fabii Vita*, chap. 14: *διαβεβαιούμενος περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων*; Polyb. xii. 12. 6: *διοριζόμενος καὶ διαβεβαιούμενος περὶ τούτων*.

[4] On the conjunction of the relative and interrogative pronouns *ἅ . . . τίνων*, see Winer p. 159 [E. T. p. 169].

Ver. 8. In contrast with the heretics' advocacy of the law, the apostle, in what follows, states its real value. [III *c, d.*]—Οἴδαμεν δὲ, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.] Baur wrongly infers from these words that the heretics, as Antinomians, had no desire to vindicate the law as good. It is not these first words, but the words ἐάν τις κ.τ.λ., that are directed against the heretics. In spite of Hofmann's denial, οἴδαμεν δέ stands in a concessive sense, (Wiesinger), as in Rom. vii. 14, 1 Cor. viii. 1, the apostle making an acknowledgment which is restricted by ἐάν τις κ.τ.λ.; still we cannot translate it simply by *concedimus*, as Heinrichs does.—καλὸς ὁ νόμος] By νόμος we must understand, neither the Christian moral law, nor a single part of the Mosaic law, but the latter as a whole. It is of the entire Mosaic law in its existing form as a revelation of the divine will given in a system of written commands—it is of this that Paul uses καλός as a suitable epithet. It is not enough to take καλός as equivalent to ὠφέλιμος (Theodoret), though the idea of usefulness is included in it; καλός denotes generally the internal excellence of the law, just as the same is set forth in still more significant expressions in Rom. vii. 12, 14. But the good and excellent qualities of the law depend on its being applied according to its nature and signification: when applied otherwise, it ceases to be καλός. Hence Paul, in opposition to the heretics, adds: ἐάν τις αὐτῷ νομίμως χρῆται. The νομίμως, which is clearly a play on words with νόμος, only expresses the formal relation; we can only infer from the thoughts that follow what is meant by the *lawful* use of law.[1] De Wette rightly remarks: "There is in this passage nothing but what the words really say, that the Christian teacher must not uphold the law as binding on the δίκαιος." While nearly all expositors understand by τις the Christian as such, Bengel remarks: Paulus hoc loco non de auditore legis, sed de doctore loquitur; in this he is right, as is acknowledged also by de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Hofmann. Paul says nothing here as to how the law is to be obeyed, but rather he tells us how it is to be made use of by Christian teachers.

Vv. 9, 10. Εἰδὼς τοῦτο] is not to be referred to οἴδαμεν, but to τις, *i. e.* to the teacher of the church. The use of the same verb is against the construction with οἴδαμεν. As to the meaning of the word, it is to be observed that here, as in many other passages of the N. T., it expresses not only the idea of knowing, but also that of "weighing, considering." De Wette says, "as he knows and considers." The law is rightly used only when it is considered that, etc.—ὅτι δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κεῖται] [III *e.*] We may, with Hofmann, take this sentence quite generally, so as to understand by νόμος not any special law, but law in general, and by δίκαιος any one who does rightly, φύσει, and not for the law's sake.[2] In that case we would have the same thought here as in *Antiph. ad Stobaeum*, 9: ὁ μηδὲν ἀδικῶν

[1] Most expositors have on this passage told us wherein consisted the material advantage of the law; but however correct their statements in themselves may be, they are out of place, since there is no ground for them in the apostle's words.

[2] Theophylact: ὃς δι' αὐτὸ τὸ καλὸν τὴν τε πονηρίαν μισεῖ καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν περιπτύσσεται.

οὐδενὸς δεῖται νόμου.[1]—The sentence, however, may also be taken in such a way as to make νόμος the Mosaic law (notwithstanding the omission of the article; comp. Rom. ii. 12, 14, 23, *al.*), and δίκαιος the righteous man in the specially Christian sense, *i. e.* the man who, in faith as a child of God, fulfills the divine will in the free obedience of the spirit. In that case we have here the thought which forms the fundamental idea of Paul's view regarding the relations of the Christian to the law (comp. Rom. vi. 14; Gal. v. 18, *al.*). As Paul in ver. 11 appeals to the gospel entrusted to him for confirmation of the thought expressed in this verse, the connection of ideas decidedly favors the latter view, which is adopted also by Matthies, de Wette, Wiesinger, Van Oosterzee, *et al.*—κεῖται] has not, as Heydenreich thinks probable, the additional notion of an oppressive burden; νόμος κεῖται simply means, according to a usage current even in profane writings: "the law is given, exists." Otto rightly remarks: "the νόμος κείμενος is one which has not only been given, but is still valid." The collocation does not occur elsewhere in the N. T.; comp., however, Luke ii. 34 (Phil. i. 16); 1 Thess. iii. 3; especially also 2 Macc. iv. 11.—If the law was not given for the δίκαιος (as the heretics falsely maintained), then it is valid only for the ἄδικος. This thought Paul emphasizes by pointing out the nature of the ἄδικος in various aspects, mentioning them at first in pairs.—ἀνόμοις δὲ καὶ ἀνυπότακτοις] These two ideas, which express the most decided contrast, are rightly placed first. Ἄνομοι, in 1 Cor. ix. 21, means the heathen (Rom. ii. 14: ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα); but here it means those who withstand the law, who do not serve the law, but their own pleasure; comp. Mark xv. 28.—To this corresponds the following ἀνυπότακτοι (only here and in Tit. i. 6, 10; comp. Heb. ii. 8), as a designation of those who submit themselves to no higher will, no higher order. It is quite arbitrary, with Tittmann and Leo, to refer ἀνομ. to divine, and ἀνυπ. to human ordinances.—ἀσεβέσι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς] These ideas (found together also in 1 Pet. iv. 18 and in Wisd. xli. 5) are distinguished from the foregoing by a more definite reference to God; ἀσεβής (used by Paul only here and in Rom. iv. 5, v. 6) is the man who does not stand in awe, who has no holy awe of God in his heart.—ἀνοσίοις καὶ βεβήλοις] give prominence to the opposition to what is holy. Ἀνόσιος (again in 2 Tim. iii. 2), when joined with ἀσεβής in the classical usage, refers to the injury of human rights.[2] This distinction, however, cannot here be pressed. βέβηλος, which occurs only in the Epistles to Timothy and in Heb. xii. 16 (the verb βεβηλόω in Matt. xii. 5; Acts xxiv. 6), is synonymous with ἀνόσιος. In these first three pairs the ἄδικοι are characterized as those who stand opposed to what is divine, recognizing no divine law, and having no awe of God, and whose life is not consecrated by communion with God.—The ideas that follow refer, on the other hand, to our relations with our neighbor.—πατραλῴαις καὶ μητραλῴαις] only here in N. T.: *parricides and matricides.* Hesychius explains them: ὁ τὸν πατέρα ἀτιμάζων, τύπτων, ἢ κτείνων; and similarly Mat-

[1] Comp. also the expression of Socrates in Clemens Alex. *Stromata*, iv. 678: νόμον ἕνεκεν ἀγαθῶν οὐκ ἂν γενέσθαι.

[2] Xenophon, *Cyrop.* viii. 8. 13: ἀσεβεστέρους περὶ θεοὺς, καὶ ἀνοσιωτέρους περὶ συγγενεῖς.

thies: "those who actually assault father and mother." As the word occurs in this wider sense in Demosth. 732, 14; Lys. 348, ult.; Plato, *Phaed.* chap. 62, it may be so taken here. At least we cannot, with de Wette, quote the following *ἀνδροφόνοις* as a cogent reason against it.—*ἀνδροφόνοις*] 2 Macc. ix. 28; *ἅπαξ λεγόμ.* in N. T.; the compound is selected to correspond with the previous words.—*πόρνοις, ἀρσενοκοίταις*] refer to unchastity, the one towards the female, the other towards the male sex; for this latter, comp. Rom. i. 27; 1 Cor. vi. 9.—*ἀνδραποδισταῖς*] The Scholiast on Aristoph. *Plut.* v. 521, says: *εἴρηται ἀνδραποδιστὴς παρὰ τὸ ἄνδρα ἀποδίδοσθαι, τουτέστι πωλεῖν.* This crime is often mentioned in Greek authors; but also in Ex. xxi. 16; Deut. xxiv. 7.—*ψεύσταις, ἐπιόρκοις*] stand both in opposition to truthfulness; *ἐπίορκος* is one who wantonly breaks an oath, as well as one who swears something false.—We cannot help seeing that in enumerating these various classes of the *ἄδικοι*, the apostle has had the Decalogue in mind, not adhering to it strictly, but partly extending, partly limiting it, still without departing from its order.—In order to describe the *ἀδικία* as a whole, the apostle adds: *καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀντίκειται.*—The expression *ἡ ὑγιαίν. διδασκ.* is one of those which only occur in the Pastoral Epistles, and help to give them a peculiar impress; comp. 2 Tim. iv. 3; Tit. ii. 1, i. 9.—In 1 Tim. vi. 3 and in 2 Tim. i. 13, we have *ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι*; in Tit. ii. 8, *λόγος ὑγιής.* In these epistles *ὑγιαίνειν* is even used figuratively in another connection; thus Tit. i. 13, ii. 2 (*νοσεῖν* in opposite sense, 1 Tim. vi. 4); elsewhere in the N. T. it occurs only in its proper meaning. The expression *διδασκαλία* is particularly frequent in these epistles, sometimes denoting "the doctrine" (so here) in the objective sense, sometimes subjectively, "the teaching" (comp. chap. iv. 1, 6, 13, 16, *al.*; 2 Tim. iii. 10, iv. 3; Tit. i. 9 ff.).—He lays emphasis on *sound* doctrine, as opposed to the *ματαιολογία* of the heretics. Luther translates *ὑγιαίνουσα* inaccurately by "wholesome;" the wholesomeness is only the result of the soundness. By *ἡ ὑγιαίν. διδ.* is here meant the pure gospel, free from all foreign admixture, having nothing unclean or sickly in it. The apostle here is certainly thinking chiefly of the ethical side of the *διδασκ.*; still Leo is wrong in translating it "sound morality." By the form *εἴ . . . ἀντίκειται* Paul gives us to understand that there are indeed other forms and shapes of unrighteousness, incompatible with the pure doctrine of the gospel. The neuter form *τὶ ἕτερον* is strange. In explanation, we might appeal to passages like 1 Cor. i. 17, Heb. vii. 7, and others, where the neuter denotes persons; but the use of the verb *ἀντίκειται* is against this. It is better to regard it as a transition from persons to things.[1]

Ver. 11. *Κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κ.τ.λ.*] may be joined with *ἀντίκειται*, so far as the grammar goes; but the thought is against this, since the *ὑγιαίν. διδασκ.* is simply the doctrine of the gospel, and the whole of the added clause would be very slipshod. There is as little ground for joining it with

[1] As Wiesinger rightly remarks, vv. 9 and 10 show that the apostle is not contending here against actual Judaizers, but "against such as consider the law a means of attaining to a still higher moral perfection."

διδασκαλία, as was done by Theophylact (τῇ ὑγ. διδ., τῇ οὔσῃ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγ.) and approved by many later expositors. The only right construction is to refer this addition to the whole of the preceding thought (Wiesinger, Platt, van Oosterzee, Hofmann), so as to bring the thought to a concluding point. Similarly in Rom. ii. 16, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγ. is joined with what precedes. The apostle asserts thereby that his doctrine regarding the law is not founded on his own private opinion, but on the gospel entrusted *to him*. In order to make its authority plainer as a rule of life, he describes it as τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου Θεοῦ (de Wette, Matthies).—The genitive τῆς δόξης is not to be interpreted by the adjective ἔνδοξος, and then joined with τὸ εὐαγγ. (=τὸ εὐαγγ. ἔνδοξον; Luther: "according to the glorious gospel"), or even with Θεοῦ (Heinrichs: = τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Θεοῦ); the genitive should rather be allowed to retain its special meaning. Ἡ δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ may be *the glory of the Christians*, which is given them by God.[1] It is more natural, however, to understand the expression here, as in 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6, Rom. ix. 23, etc., of the glory dwelling in God, peculiar to Him, "revealed to the world in Jesus Christ" (Wiesinger). The relation of the genitive τῆς δόξης to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is not to be taken to mean that the δόξα was declared to be the ground of the gospel (the gospel proceeding from the glory of God); the δόξα is rather contained in the gospel (Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt), so that it is thereby revealed and communicated to men.—God's nature is here described more precisely by the adjective μακαρίου, by which still greater emphasis is laid on God's δόξα, manifesting itself in the gospel in its peculiar power. Though the word is not foreign to the N. T., it is used only here and in vi. 15 as an attribute of God. It is not improbable that the apostle uses it with some reference to the heretics. If, in ver. 4, we are to understand by the genealogies, series of æons emanating from God, he might readily use μακάριος of God in order to mark the divine unity, for holiness excludes all division of nature. Theodore of Mopsuestia thinks that God is here called μακάριος, not only because He has τὸ μακάριον in His nature διὰ τῆς ἀτρεπτότητος, but also because out of His grace He imparts it to us.[2] The words that follow declare that the gospel was entrusted to the apostle: ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ (Tit. i. 3). Regarding the construction of these words, cf. Buttmann, *Gr. Gram.* § 121. 7; Winer, p. 244 [E. T. p. 260]. The same construction is found in Rom. iii. 2; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 4; 1 Cor. ix. 17. It is to be observed that this construction of the verb πιστεύεσθαι, apart

[1] Comp. Rom. v. 2. Wegscheider: "according to the gladdening doctrine of the salvation which the blessed God imparts to us;" Theodoret: εὐαγγ. δόξης τὸ κήρυγμα κέκληκεν, ἀπειδὰν τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἐπαγγέλλεται τοῖς πιστεύουσι, and Theophylact.

[2] Otto takes the reference otherwise. He refers the word to the heretics, inasmuch as they taught the eternal continuance of the law: "The eternal continuance of the law presupposes a godlessness that cannot be amended. And these νομοδιδάσκαλοι teach a *blessed* God? God is not blessed if He is for ever afflicted with those opposed to Himself, with the ἀνόμοις κ.τ.λ. I teach that God got rid of this opposition by reconciling the world to Himself, and that we have indeed a *blessed* God." Hofmann refers μακαρίου to this, that the heretics "make the law the subject of their instruction in the place where there should only be preached the things by which God has glorified His blessedness." In any case, Paul chose the attribute, because the heresy stood in contradiction to God's blessedness.

from the Pastoral Epistles, occurs only in the epistles of Paul, and only where he speaks of the gospel, or the office given him to hold.[1]

Ver. 12. [On Vv. 12–17, see Note IV., pages 90, 91.] After pointing in these last words to his personal relation to the gospel, the apostle, down to ver. 17, describes the grace experienced by him, not merely "to let it be seen what assurance he had for his gospel" (Wiesinger), but also to prove by his own example (*πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν κ.τ.λ.* ver. 16) the glory of the gospel entrusted to him as the *εὐαγγ. τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου Θεοῦ*. There is therefore no ground for de Wette's criticism, "that the self-styled apostle lets fall here the thread of his meaning, that he may not have to take it up again." This section is in the closest connection with the preceding one, since it shows how deep is the contrast between the heresy and the gospel. The heresy, on the one hand, takes up unfruitful speculations, and, whenever it wishes to become practical, it places the Christian in bondage to the law. The one thing which is all-important, the forgiveness of sins, it does not assure, and hence it does not know the compassion of the Lord. On the contrary, it is of the very essence of the gospel to reveal this compassion; and in proof of this, Paul appeals to his own experience. [IV *a*, *b*.]—*χάριν ἔχω*] We have the same expression in 2 Tim. i. 3 (comp. also Luke xvii. 9; Heb. xii. 28); and in the other Pauline Epistles we have instead: *εὐχαριστῶ*.—*τῷ ἐνδυναμώσαντί με*] must not be limited to the strength granted for enduring afflictions and sufferings; it is rather to be applied to his whole work as an apostle. The proper reason of thanksgiving is only furnished by the clause that follows *ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*; but an additional reason is given in this participle.[2]—*Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κ.τ.λ.*] is not to be explained, according to some older expositors: "qui me potentem reddidit Christo," *for* Christ, but as a dative closely belonging to the verb.—*ὅτι πιστόν με ἡγήσατο*] [IV *c*.] *πιστός* corresponds with the following *διακονία*. The reason of his thanksgiving is Christ's confidence in him that he would become a faithful *διάκονος*.[3] This confidence the Lord has shown by committing to him the ministry of the gospel, hence he adds: *θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν*, which is either "placing me in the ministry" (Heydenreich, van Oosterzee, Hofmann), or "setting me apart for the ministry" (de Wette, Plitt, Winer). The latter seems to be more in accordance with the usage of the N. T.; comp. 1 Thess. v. 9. De Wette rightly remarks that the participle does not stand for *ὡς τίθεσθαί με*, nor is it to be taken as a pluperfect; it is simply the proof of *πιστόν με ἡγ.*; see also Winer, p. 326 [E. T. p. 348].—If the apostle's thanks are due to the Lord on the general ground of His confidence, they are all the more due that he had been before an opponent of the gospel; to this the next verse points.

[1] We need not be surprised that here, and somewhat frequently in the Pastoral Epistles, Paul directs attention to himself and his office, if only we reflect that the apostle was fully conscious of his position towards the development of God's kingdom, and that he was bound, therefore, to vindicate fully the principle of the Christian life which he had enounced.

[2] According to the reading of ℵ: *ἐνδυναμοῦντι* without *με* is to be taken as a simple attribute: "Christ Jesus who bestows strength."

[3] Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 25; *γνώμην δὲ δίδωμι ὡς ἠλεημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι*. Paul gives the nature of this *διακονία* in Acts xx. 24: *ἡ διακονία ἣν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, διαμαρτύρασθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ*.

Ver. 13. Τὸ *πρότερον ὄντα βλάσφημον κ.τ.λ.*] *τὸ πρότερον* is equivalent to the adverb *πρότερον*, just as, in Matt. xxvi. 45, *τὸ λοιπόν* is equivalent to *λοιπόν*. The participle stands here in the relation of contrast to what precedes: "though I was before," or "I who was *nevertheless*."—*βλάσφημον*] only here as a substantive; comp. on this Acts xxvi. 11. For the most part, the idea of *βλασφημία* is used in reference to what is divine (Suidas: *ἡ εἰς Θεὸν ὑβρις*).—*καὶ διώκτην*] Leo says: "Paulus non dictis tantum sed etiam factis furuerat in Christianos;" the word occurs only here in the N. T.; on the subject-matter, comp. Acts xxii. 4; Gal. i. 13.—*καὶ ὑβριστήν*] also in Rom. i. 30. Luther translates "reviler," but Wegscheider: "one who does violence." Neither translation expresses the full meaning as it is given in Tittmann's (*Syn.* p. 74) explanation: "qui prae superbia non solum contemnit alios, sed etiam contumeliose tractat, et injuriis afficit." Ὑβρίζειν denotes the arrogant conduct of another, whether in words or in actions. —The context leads us to think of Christ's work, or Christ Himself, as the object of the apostle's blasphemy.—Having judged his former conduct in straightforward fashion, Paul goes on to contrast with it the grace of the Lord: *ἀλλ' ἠλεήθην*, adding, however, by way of explanation: *ὅτι ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ*. De Wette is not correct in supposing that the intended aim of these words is to furnish some excuse for himself.[1]—*ἠλεήθην*] (Luther: "to my lot did compassion fall") is not to be limited to the pardon of his persecuting fury (Matthies: "to me was my mad eagerness in persecution most graciously forgiven"), but should be taken more generally of the grace imparted to the apostle.[2]—*ἀγνοῶν*] (comp. Rom. x. 2: Ζῆλον Θεοῦ ἔχων, *ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν*), *i. e.* without knowing how grievously I sinned therein. The reason of this unconsciousness was *ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ*. Mack is wrong in inverting the relation, as if the apostle added *ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ* to explain his *ἄγνοια*. How far the *ἀπιστία* was one to be blamed, Paul does not here say: the idea is to be taken in its purely negative form. It was not this, but the *ἄγνοια* grounded on it, which lessened his guilt.[3]

Ver. 14. The last words might be so explained as to weaken seemingly the divine grace; and therefore the apostle feels bound to set forth its abundant riches.—*ὑπερεπλεόνασε δὲ ἡ χάρις κ.τ.λ.*] The verb *ὑπερπλεονάζειν* only occurs here in the N. T., and is not current in classical Greek. The simple *πλεονάζειν*, with the classic writers, means: "to be more, *i. e.* than the measure demands, therefore to go beyond the measure;" but in several passages of the N. T. it has clearly the meaning: "*become* more, therefore increase, grow larger." Comp. 2 Thess. i. 3 (synon. with *ὑπεραυξάνειν*); Rom. v. 20, vi. 1 (Meyer: accumulate); so also Phil. iv. 17 and 2 Cor. iv. 15 (Meyer has there: "*become* abundant . . . increase," and

[1] Wiesinger: "The words are not intended to exculpate his acts, but to explain wherein the power of divine grace began to work on him." Similarly Plitt, van Oosterzee, and others.

[2] Otto wrongly finds in *ἠλεήθην* a special reference to the fact that Paul "was entrusted with the ministry of the word."—What precedes in ver. 12 might seem to support this, but what follows is entirely against such a limitation of the thought.

[3] Hofmann wrongly takes *ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ* as in pure apposition to the participle *ἀγνοῶν*, and maintains that *ἀγνοεῖν* is not always an ignorance which simply does not even know, but a misconception of something which it should

here: "be increased"). The prefix *ὑπερ* serves, with Paul, to strengthen the idea with which it is joined; thus *ὑπεραυξάνει*, 2 Thess. i. 3; *ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ*, Eph. iii. 20; *ὑπερλίαν*, 2 Cor. xi. 5, *al.* In Rom. v. 20, *ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν* seems to mean that the *ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία* was surpassed by the *χάρις* (so Meyer; Hofmann differs). If we assume here this reference of surpassing, we cannot regard *ἠλεήθην* as the thing surpassed. For *χάρις* cannot be regarded as something surpassing *ἔλεος*;[1] but *ὑπερ* in that case would have to be referred to *τὸ πρότερον ὄντα βλάσφημον κ.τ.λ.* Hence the apostle's meaning in *ὑπερεπλεόνασεν* would be that grace was manifested to him in abundant measure, far surpassing his enmity (so in a former edition of this commentary); but in that case *ἀλλὰ ἠλεήθην κ.τ.λ.* would be parenthetical. It is more correct not to assume such a reference here, but to explain *ὑπερπλεονάζειν*: "to go (abundantly) beyond the measure" (Plitt, van Oosterzee, Hofmann). The apostle added *ὑπερεπλ. ἡ χάρις* to *ἠλεήθην*, because the latter expression did not seem enough to his mind, which was penetrated by the unbounded greatness of the grace he had experienced. "It is as though he wrestles with speech in order to find some sufficient expression for the feeling which quite overpowers him" (van Oosterzee). The particle *δέ* belongs to the relation of climax existing between the two clauses, as in Heb. xii. 6; it corresponds to the English *yea* or *aye* in a climax.[2]—*μετὰ πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης*] [IV *d.*] The preposition *μετά* with the genitive serves to connect the fact with the points that accompany it. *Πίστις* and *ἀγάπη* therefore are, properly speaking, not mentioned as results of the *χάρις*, but as blessings immediately connected with *χάρις*. They form, as de Wette says, the subjective side of the condition of grace. Leo is right, therefore, in saying: "verbis *μετὰ κ.τ.λ.* indicatur, *π. κ. ἀγ.* quasi comites fuisse illius *χάριτος*" (so also Plitt and van Oosterzee); but he is wrong, if he means that Paul added these words to tell in what the grace was manifested as *ὑπερπλεονάζουσα*.—By *πίστις κ. ἀγ. ἡ ἐν* Χρ. Ἰ. we are not to understand God's faithfulness and love in Christ, nor the apostle's endeavor to bring others to faith and love; nor, again, is *ἐν* to be explained by *διά* or by *εἰς*. The words *τῆς ἐν* Χρ. Ἰ. are added to *τῆς ἀγάπης*, and mark the love as one "that has its ground and middle-point in Christ" (Matthies); cf. 2 Tim. i. 13. It is doubtful whether the addition is to be referred also to *πίστεως* (for this Matthies, Plitt, van Oosterzee; against it, Hofmann); since *πίστεως* does not properly require it, it might be better to limit the reference to *ἀγάπης*.[3] "In contrasting his former *ἀπιστία* with his present

have known. But this more precise reference is clearly not contained in the words themselves.

[1] Chrysostom: *οὐκ ἐτιμωρήθην· ἠλεήθην γάρ, ἀρ' οὖν τοῦτο μόνον, καὶ μέχρι τούτου ὁ ἔλεος, τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι τιμωρίαν; οὐδαμῶς· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα, διὰ τοῦτο φησίν· ὑπερεπλ· ἡ χάρις, δηλῶν, ὅτι ὑπερέβη καὶ τὸν ἔλεον τὰ δῶρα· ταῦτα γὰρ οὐκ ἐλεοῦντός ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ φιλοῦντος καὶ σφόδρα ἀγαπῶντος.* Similarly Leo. In this view the force of *ἠλεήθην* is arbitrarily weakened.

[2] Hofmann explains *δέ* as ranking another fact with the one already mentioned; but in *ἠλεήθην* and *ὑπερεπλ. ἡ χάρις* we have not two different facts, but one and the same fact—though expressed in two different ways.

[3] Hofmann alleges against the connection with *πίστεως*, that "*ἐν* would have a different meaning when joined with *πίστεως*; according to Eph. i. 15; Col. i. 4;" but his reason is without force, as this other reference is here cut off by the intervening *ἀγάπης*.

increasing πιστις κ. ἀγ." (Heydenreich), Paul does not lose sight of the heresy which did not effect οἰκονομία Θεοῦ ἐν πίστει (ver. 4), and had not the ἀγάπη (ver. 5) as its goal.

Ver. 15. Πιστὸς ὁ λόγος κ.τ.λ.] [IV *e.*] With this formula, which is peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles (found besides here in iii. 1, iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Tit. iii. 8; only in Rev. is there a similar formula: οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί εἰσι, xxi. 5, xxii. 6), the apostle introduces the general thought whose truth he had himself experienced.—καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἀξιος] This addition is also in iv. 9; the word ἀποδοχή occurs nowhere else in the N. T. (comp. ἀπόδεκτος, ii. 3, v. 4). As Raphelius has shown by many proofs from Polybius, it is synonymous in later Greek with πίστις: the verb ἀποδέχεσθαι ("*receive believing*") is used in the same sense in Acts ii. 41. The adjective πάσης describes the ἀποδοχή of which the word is worthy, as one complete and excluding all doubt.—ὅτι Χρ. Ἰησ. ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον] This expression, found especially in John, may be explained from the saying of Christ: ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, John xvi. 28, κόσμος having here a physical, not an ethical meaning: "the earthly world."—Ἁμαρτωλοί stands here in a general sense, and is not with Stolz to be limited to the opponents of Christianity, nor with Michaelis to the heathen. As little can the idea of σῶσαι be limited in the one direction or the other. After this general thought, that the aim of Christ's coming is none other than the σωτηρία of sinners, the apostle returns to his own case, adding, in consciousness of his guilt (ver. 13): ὧν πρῶτός εἰμι ἐγώ, "*of whom I am first.*" [IV *f.*] Paul says this, conscious of his former determined hostility to Christ when he was a βλάσφημος κ.τ.λ. (ver. 13), and considering himself at the same time as standing at the head of sinners. It is inaccurate to translate πρῶτος without qualification by "the foremost" (in opposition to Wiesinger and others). Even in Mark xii. 28, 29, πρώτη πάντων ἐντολή is the commandment which stands at the head of all, is first in the list, and δευτέρα is the one following. In order to qualify the thought, Flatt wishes to translate πρῶτος by "one of the foremost," which he thinks he can justify by the absence of the article. Wegscheider, again, wishes not to refer ὧν to ἁμαρτωλούς, but to supply σωζομένων or σεσωσμένων; and similarly Mack explains ὧν by "of which saved sinners." All these expositions are, however, to be rejected as pieces of ingenuity. The thought needs no qualification—at least not for any one who can sympathize with the apostle's *strong* feeling. The apostle does not overstep the bounds of humility in what he says in 1 Cor. xv. 9 and Eph. iii. 8; neither does he overstep them here.

Ver. 16. After calling *himself* the first of sinners, Paul gives the reason why *he*, this foremost sinner, found grace. He begins with ἀλλά, since it must appear strange that grace was imparted to him.—διὰ τοῦτο ἠλεήθην] De Wette says: "therefor (to this end) did I receive grace."—ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ πρώτῳ ἐνδείξηται Χρ. Ἰ. τὴν ἅπασαν μακροθυμίαν.—ἐν ἐμ. πρ.] stands first for the sake of emphasis; ἐν is not equivalent to "by means of," but to "*in the case of*" (comp. Rom. vii. 19). To supply ἁμαρτωλῷ with πρώτῳ (first ed. of this commentary, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, and others) is arbitrary.

There is no need to supply anything. The thought is: "in my case, Christ first showed His *entire* μακροθυμία."[1] Paul says this, meaning that the entire fullness of Christ's μακροθυμία (Buttmann, p. 105 [E. T. 120]) could not be shown to those who before had received grace, because they had not cherished such decided enmity to Christ as he. The πρώτῳ therefore has ἅπασαν corresponding with it; the greater the guilt, the greater the manifestation of μακροθυμία. Bengel says: "cunctam longanimitatem: quum minores peccatores etiam mensura quasi minor possit restituere." It is not necessary to give the word μακροθυμία the meaning here of "magnanimity"). (Heydenreich, Matthies: "long-suffering or magnanimity"). The apostle here regards the love of the Lord as not causing judgment to follow straight on condemnation, but as patient, and granting space for conversion. In this Paul has given the purpose of his pardon; but he states it still more definitely in the words that follow: πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ. The expression ὑποτύπωσις, "likeness, image," occurs elsewhere only in 2 Tim. i. 13; it is synonymous with ὑπόδειγμα in 2 Pet. ii. 6, and other passages. Elsewhere in the Pauline Epistles we find τύπος (Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. x. 6, 11; Phil. iii. 17). Leo, without sufficient grounds, explains the word by *institutio*. The idea of *type* is not contained in the word itself, but is here transferred to it from the μελλόντων.—πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ] This construction of the word πιστεύειν is found in the N. T. only here and in Rom. ix. 33, x. 11, 1 Pet. ii. 6; but in all these passages it occurs in words quoted from Isa. xxviii. 16, where the LXX. has simply ὁ πιστεύων. It may be explained in this way, that faith has confidence as its substance and basis. Matthies rightly says: "ἐπ' αὐτῷ, not so much *in Him* as the object of faith, but rather *trusting in faith on Him* as the absolute basis of our salvation."—εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον] These words are not to be joined to the distant ὑποτύπωσιν (Bengel), but to the πιστεύειν immediately preceding. They present the goal towards which the πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ is directed (Wiesinger). As Paul usually sets forth his conduct to others as a type, so here he gives to his experience a typical meaning for future believers.[2] This may be explained from the peculiar and important position which he held for the development of God's kingdom on earth, and of which he was distinctly conscious.

Ver. 17. "Ex sensu gratiae fluit doxologia" (Bengel). With this doxology the apostle closes the digression begun in ver. 11, and returns again to the proper epistolary style.—τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων] [IV *g*.] This designation for God is not found elsewhere in the N. T. (even the use of βασιλείς of God only occurs elsewhere in chap. vi. 15 and Matt. v. 35), but it is found in the Apocrypha of the O. T. in Tob. xiii. 6, 10. (Ecclesiasticus xxxvi. 19: ὁ Θεὸς τῶν αἰώνων.) Οἱ αἰῶνες means either "the world," as

[1] Hofmann: "If πρῶτος before had the meaning of locality, here πρώτῳ has the meaning of time as opposed to τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν."

[2] Hofmann, without grounds, disputes this view, and gives the apostle's thought in this way: "The aim is to give a type, not to them, but of them; they were to know that they had to expect such conversions as his, the conversions of revilers and persecutors." But there is no hint whatever of revilers and persecutors only in οἱ μέλλοντες πιστεύειν.

in Heb. i. 2, xi. 3 (see Delitzsch and Lünemann on this passage), or "the times." [IV *h*.] The former meaning is adopted by Chrysostom, Leo, etc.[1]; the latter, by Matthies: "the ruler of all times, so that all generations are at the same time concretely included." In a similar way, Heydenreich has "the supreme ruler of time, and of all that takes place in its course." This latter explanation is supported as correct both by the preceding *μελλόντων* (van Oosterzee), and also by the *ἀφθάρτῳ* following, and by *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων* farther on.[2] It is incorrect to take *αἰῶνες* as equivalent to "eternity," and translate: "to the king eternal" (de Wette, but tentatively; Hofmann: "the king who is for ever and without end"),[3] for *αἰῶνες* never has that meaning in itself. Only in the formulas *ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων* and *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* does the meaning of the word approach that idea. Besides, the apostle would surely have expressed that adjectival idea by an adjective. It is quite erroneous to take the word here in the Gnostic sense of series of emanations, synonymous with *γενεαλογίαι* in ver. 4; for, on the one hand, no proof is given that this expression had been already used by the heretics alluded to in this epistle; and, on the other, the apostle considered the whole theory of genealogies as belonging to the sphere of myths. It was impossible, therefore, for him in his doxology to speak of God as the king of things which were to Him nothing but the inventions of fancy.—*ἀφθάρτῳ*] is only used of God elsewhere in Rom. i. 23 (Plut. *adv. St.* 31; Wisd. of Sol. xii. 1). Matthies: "God is the Imperishable One, because His nature is unchanging and based on itself," equivalent to *ὁ μόνος ἐχων ἀθανασίαν*, chap. vi. 16.—*ἀοράτῳ*] comp. Heb. xi. 27 (without Θεός), Rom. i. 20, and Col. i. 15 (with Θεός); equivalent to *ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται*, chap. vi. 16; comp. also John i. 18.—*μόνῳ Θεῷ*] chap. vi. 15: *μόνος δυναστής*; comp. also John v. 44, xvii. 3; Rom. xvi. 27: *μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ*. The words *ἀφθάρτῳ . . . Θεῷ* are to be taken as in apposition to *τῷ βασιλεῖ*. But it is doubtful whether *Θεῷ* is to be joined with *μόνῳ* only, or also with *ἀφθάρτῳ* and *ἀοράτῳ*, as is commonly done. De Wette is wrong in asserting that all these predicates are used of God superfluously: they manifestly express the absolute exaltation of God above all conditioned finite being, and are occasioned naturally (which Hofmann disputes) by the contrast with the heresy which denied the absoluteness of the divine existence.—*τιμὴ καὶ δόξα*] The two words are united also in Rom. ii. 7, 10; Heb. ii. 7; but only here and in the Apocalypse do they occur in doxologies. Paul elsewhere uses only *δόξα*, and always with the article.—*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*] a very common conclusion in doxologies, and found in Paul's other epistles. It is not to be overlooked that this doxology has a peculiar character distinct from those usually occurring in Paul, both in the mode of connection (elsewhere a pronoun connects them with what precedes) and also in the designation for God and the expressions used.

[1] Leo appealing to Eusebius, *de Laud. Constant.* chap. vi. p. 431, ed. Heinrichs: *τὸν μέγαν τοῦ σύμπαντος αἰῶνος βασιλέα.*

[2] Comp. Ps. cxlv. 13, LXX.: *ἡ βασιλεία σου βασιλεία πάντων τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἡ δεσποτεία σου ἐν πάσῃ γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ.*

[3] Wiesinger explains it: "He is a king of the aeons, which together give the idea of

Ver. 18. [On Vv. 18–20, see Note V. pages 91, 92.] Paul again addresses himself to Timothy direct.—*ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν*] [V *a.*] cannot be referred back to *ἵνα παραγγείλῃς* in ver. 3 (Otto), because there he was speaking of a *παραγγελία* which Timothy was to receive, here he is speaking of a *παραγγελία* to which Timothy was to give heed. Nor can it be referred to *καθὼς παρεκάλεσά σε* (Plitt), since that denotes only a special commission, to which there is here no allusion. Some have therefore joined *ταύτην* immediately with the following *ἵνα*, and taken *ἵνα* as introducing the object.[1] This construction, however, is opposed by the order of the words; after the verb and the parenthesis *κατὰ τὰς κ.τ.λ.*, we no longer expect an expansion of the thought contained in *ταύτην τ. παρ.*[2] The only course remaining is to agree with Hofmann in referring *ταύτ. τ. παραγγ.* back to *τῆς παραγγελίας* in ver. 5; not, however, agreeing with him in interpreting the word here, "the Christian teaching," but taking it in the same sense in both places.—*παρατίθεμαί σοι*] comp. 2 Tim. ii. 2. The verb is here explained by most expositors, against usage, as equivalent to "lay to heart" (Luther: "order," in the sense of "recommend to"). Otto, and following him Hofmann, took it in the sense of "give something into one's *charge*," which meaning is *possible*, but not imperative. In itself the word means "bring something before one," and is defined more precisely by its context, *i. e.* the purpose of *bringing before* is not contained in the word itself. *Παρατίθεσθαι παραγγελίαν* may therefore quite well mean: *propose a command to one*, viz. that he may act in accordance with it.[3]—*τέκνον Τιμ.*] see ver. 1.—*κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφητείας*] [V *b.*] Before giving the command itself, Paul inserts these words to add force to his exhortation; for they are not (as some expositors, Oecumenius, Heumann, Flatt, wish) to be placed after *ἵνα* in sense, but to be joined with *παρατίθεμαι*.—*κατά*, "*in conformity with*," not "justified and occasioned by."—*προαγούσας* stands here quite absolutely, with the same meaning as in Heb. vii. 18: *ἀθέτησις . . . γίνεται προαγούσης ἐντολῆς*, "the law that preceded;"[4] the *προαγ. προφητ.* are accordingly "*the promises that preceded*." Matthies is wrong in explaining *προάγουσα* in connection with *ἐπὶ σέ*, as

eternity, just as His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom."

[1] So Chrysostom and Theophylact, Matthies, de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee; also in this commentary; comp. Winer, pp. 314 f. [E. T. p. 334 f.].

[2] Hofmann wrongly maintains that this construction is impossible in point of language and in point of fact: "in point of language, because *παρατίθεσθαι* does not mean *lay to heart*, but *propose*, and a command is not proposed (why not?); in point of fact, because what he calls *τὰς προαγούσας ἐπί σε* cannot furnish any standard for the apostle's injunction to Timothy to discharge his office well" (why not?).

[3] In Matt. xiii. 24, 31, it is joined with *παραβολήν*; it is used of setting forth a doctrine in Acts xvii. 3; it is chiefly used of setting forth food, as in the N. T. Mark viii. 7; Luke ix. 16, x. 8, xi. 6; it has the sense of "committing to the care of" in Luke xii. 48.

[4] Comp. Lünemann and Delitzsch on the passage. Otto is wrong in asserting that *προάγειν* is never used of priority of time. While it occurs more frequently in the sense of "precede some one," it has in other passages of the N. T. (*e. g.* Matt. xxvi. 32; Mark vi. 45) the meaning practically of "go before some one in any direction whatever," the notion of space manifestly passing into that of time. In the passage in Hebrews, Otto thinks that *προάγουσα* ought to mean: "driving forward from one election of high priest to another" (!).

equivalent to "leading towards thee," *i.e.* "pointing or aiming towards thee." This meaning προάγειν never has; as a transitive verb it certainly means: "lead forward to any one;" but this is manifestly a different idea from that which Matthies ascribes to it. Otto explains it: "the prophecies *that guide* to thee," making appeal to Xenophon, *Memorab.* iv. 1, in which passage Kühner paraphrases προάγειν by *viam monstrare*. In this case we should have to understand it: those among the prophecies that showed others the way leading to Timothy, a statement clearly without meaning. It is, however, altogether arbitrary when Otto defines the prophecies more precisely as those that led to Timothy's ordination, or occasioned it.—ἐπὶ σέ] is not to be connected with προαγούσας, but with προφητείας, as Luther rightly translates it: "according to the former prophecies regarding thee;" or de Wette: "in accordance with the preceding prophecies on thee" (so, too, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt, Hofmann). On the other hand, the translation: "vaticinia olim de te praenuntiata" (Heydenreich), is inaccurate. Αἱ ἐπὶ σὲ προφ. are: the prophecies (expressed) over thee (the peculiar meaning of ἐπί as descending to something should not be overlooked); while προαγ. describes these as preceding Timothy's apostleship.[1] —προφητείας] Chrysostom: τὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας καὶ ἱερωσύνης ἀξίωμα, μέγα ὄν, τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δεῖται ψήφου . . . διὰ τὸ παλαιὸν ἀπὸ τῆς προφητείας γίνονται οἱ ἱερεῖς, τουτέστι ἀπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου. Οὕτως ὁ Τιμ. ᾑρέθη. This is wrong, simply because Timothy's office was not a priestly one. It is quite arbitrary to translate προφητεῖαι by: "doctrines, exhortations," or "hopes," or "good testimonies" (Heinrichs: "by means of the good hope and expectation which every one cherished regarding thee"). Προφητεῖαι here, as always, are utterances proceeding from the Holy Spirit, whatever be their contents or their occasion; here it is most natural to think of prophecies made when the ἐπίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου (chap. iv. 14) was imparted to Timothy and made regarding his worthy discharge of the office (Wiesinger).[2]—ἵνα στρατεύῃ ἐν αὐταῖς τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν] [V *c.*] Purpose of the παρατίθεμαί σοι. Στρατεία (elsewhere only in 2 Cor. x. 4) is frequently translated inaccurately by "fight;" Luther is more correct: "that thou mayest exercise in it a good *knighthood*." Στρατεία denotes the entire warfare; the only thing wrong in Luther's translation is the indefinite article. Though the Christian calling is not seldom described as a warfare, yet here the word is used specially of Timothy's office, in which he had to contend against the ἑτεροδιδασκαλοῦντες (vv. 3 ff.).[3] De Wette inaccurately explains it: "that thou conduct thyself worthily and bravely

[1] In taking the words thus: αἱ ἐπὶ σὲ προφητεῖαι, there is not, as Otto maintains, a change of order not occurring in Greek; comp. 2 Cor. viii. 2: ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία αὐτῶν. It is also wrong to say that the prepositional clause must flow from the substantive, and that περί, therefore, should stand here for ἐπί. In the passage quoted, κατά manifestly does not flow from the idea of the substantive πτωχεία.

[2] According to Hofmann, they were prophecies "which had promised to Paul that Timothy would be a true servant of the gospel, and had confirmed him in his choice when he assumed Timothy as his colleague in the apostleship."

[3] Manifestly Paul here returns to vv. 3 ff., and so far gives reason for saying that here "we have not in form but in substance" the apodosis which was wanting before (Wiesinger).

in the discharge of thy evangelic duty;" as if the words were: *ἵνα καλῶς στρατ. τὴν στρατείαν.* The chief accent rests on *ἐν αὐταῖς*, not on *καλήν*; the *στρατεία* assigned to Timothy is in itself *καλή*, quite apart from his behavior in it.—*ἐν αὐταῖς*] According to Matthies, Winer (p. 362 [E. T. p. 387]), Wiesinger, Otto, and others, Paul conceives the *προφητεῖαι* as an armor round Timothy: "as though equipped with them;" it might, however, be more natural to translate: "*within* them," *i. e.* in their limits, not exceeding them. The interpretation: *in accordance with them* (van Oosterzee, Hofmann: "the prophecies are to be regarded as a rule of conduct"), is against the usage of the N. T.

Ver. 19. The manner in which Timothy is to discharge his office, is given still more precisely in the words *ἔχων πίστιν καὶ ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν.* It is difficult to bring *ἔχων* into direct connection with the preceding figure *στρατεία* (Matthies: "hold fast the faith which elsewhere, in Eph. vi. 16, is called a shield, a weapon of defence in our warfare;" Otto thinks that Paul conceives *πίστις* and *ἀγ. συνείδησις* as "the contending power which the general commands, *i. e.* as his troops!"). It is simply "holding, maintaining" (de Wette), *i. e.* not denying. The reason for the collocation peculiar to this epistle of *πίστις* and *ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις*, and for the strong emphasis laid on the latter idea (comp. ver. 5, iv. 2, etc.), is, that the apostle regards the denial of the *ἀγ. συνείδ.* as the source of the heresy. This is proved by the words that follow, in which Paul returns to the mention of the heretics: *ἣν* (viz. *ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν*) *τινες* (comp. ver. 6) [V *d.*] —*ἀπωσάμενοι*] This expression, not *strange* (de Wette) but suitable, denotes the "wantonness" (de Wette) with which the heretics sacrificed the good conscience to their selfish purposes.[1]—*περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐνανάγησαν*] *ναυαγεῖν* occurs only here in a figurative sense. *Περί* gives the matter in which they had made shipwreck, *i. e.* suffered loss. *Περί* with the accusative, equivalent to *quod attinet ad*, is found in the N. T. only in the Pastoral Epistles; comp. 1 Tim. vi. 4, 21; 2 Tim. ii. 18, iii. 8; Tit. ii. 7; see Winer, p. 379 [E. T. p. 406].

Ver. 20. *Ὧν ἐστὶν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος*] In 2 Tim. ii. 17, the apostle names two false teachers whose words eat like a cancer—Hymenaeus and Philetus. There is no ground for distinguishing between the Hymenaeus there and the one here mentioned. No difficulty is caused even by the fact that "the one here is mentioned as a man cast out from the church, and the other merely as an example of error" (de Wette); for Hymenaeus and Philetus are not so *tenderly* dealt with in the other passages as de Wette seems to think. As to Alexander, we must leave it unsettled whether he is the same as the one mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 14. The reasons are not decisive which seem to tell against the identity, viz. that in the other passage the surname *ὁ χαλκεύς* is added, and that "he is

[1] Van Oosterzee remarks on *ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν* "as a troublesome reminder," which is not appropriate, because *ἀγ. συνειδ.* is not the conscience exhorting to good and punishing evil, but of willing and doing good.—Hofmann's opinion, that the good conscience is compared to "the ballast which gives the necessary stability to a ship," is wrong, since *ἀπωθεῖσθαι* does not mean "to cast overboard."

mentioned there not as excommunicated, but rather as still coming in contact with the apostle; not as a heretic, but as an opponent" (de Wette). It is, however, quite arbitrary to regard the Alexander (Acts xix. 33) who took part in the uproar at Ephesus as identical with the one mentioned here (see Meyer on the passage).[1]—*οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ σατανᾷ*] [V *e.*] the same excommunication of which the apostle speaks in 1 Cor. v. 5 (comp. Meyer on the passage). It is not simply excommunication from the church, but with the purpose of ensuring, through Satan's means, *ὀλεθρος τῆς σαρκός* to the one excommunicated. This is shown not only by the formula itself, but also by the solemnity with which Paul there expresses himself. The added clause, *ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν κ.τ.λ.*, makes it clear that here also the apostle had in mind *εἰς ὄλεθρον τ. σαρκ.*, for that clause at the same time gives the purpose of the *παρέδωκα*, which is the reformation (*ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ*, 1 Cor. v. 5), or at least the preservation, of the excommunicated man from *βλασφημεῖν*.[2]—*παιδεύειν*] in classical Greek equivalent to "educate, especially by instruction," so also Acts vii. 22, xxii. 3, has elsewhere in the N. T. the meaning of "punish in order to reform," *i. e.* chastise; comp. 2 Tim. ii. 25; 1 Cor. xi. 32; 2 Cor. vi. 9, especially Heb. xii. 5–11. In Rev. iii. 19 it stands connected with *ἐλέγχειν* (in Luke xxiii. 16, 22, the purpose of reformation falls quite into the background).—The *ὀλεθρος τῆς σαρκός* is intended by the apostle to be a chastisement to the one named, that he may be kept from further reviling. The expression *βλασφημεῖν* shows that they had not only suffered shipwreck in faith, but in their unbelief were on the point of proceeding actually to revile the Lord.

Notes by American Editor.

I. Vv. 1, 2.

The opening salutations of the Pastoral Epistles have some peculiarities which distinguish them from those of the other Pauline Epistles, and some which distinguish them from each other. The reader finds himself passing in these letters, even at the beginning, into a new sphere of language to some extent, and the question which meets him is whether the change is so great as to indicate a difference in the authorship. In the decision of this question two facts, which are noticeable everywhere in Paul's writings, must be borne in mind:—namely, the freedom which characterizes his style, even where he uses phraseology of the same

[1] Otto (pp. 98–112) gives a very vivid and detailed picture of the tumult at Ephesus in which a certain Alexander took part, in order to prove the identity of the two Alexanders, and confirm his view regarding the date of the composition of this epistle. But even if the course of that tumult was as Otto describes it, with the aid of many arbitrary suppositions, still we can by no means infer the identity he maintains. In order to prove it, Otto does not despise many strange assumptions, such as, that the designation *χαλκεύς* (2 Tim. iv. 14) was given to Alexander because he was one of those who manufactured the miniature silver temples; further, that he, deceived by the soothsayers, had made no objection to the union of the worship of Jehovah with heathen idolatry.

[2] In opposition to Hofmann's opinion, that neither here nor in the passage of Corinthians we are to think of an excommunication from the church, comp. Meyer on 1 Cor. v. 5.

general character, and the readiness with which he adopts new expressions, as he moves from one section of his epistles to another, according as the subjects of discussion or the errors which threaten the churches become new.

Though addressed to individuals who had long been closely related to himself, it is evident that the Apostle, in these letters, has reference to the churches which were, and were to be, under their general superintendence. The letters, accordingly, have a double character, and they can only be properly explained as this peculiarity is observed. It is in this way, undoubtedly, that the use of the word ἀπόστολος in all the three letters is to be accounted for, as contrasted with the simple δέσμιος of the Epistle to Philemon, the only other letter addressed to an individual. Possibly, the combination of the two elements may be seen in Tit. i. 1, where the words δοῦλος and ἀπόστολος are both used. With respect to the use of the phrase κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ, it may be noticed: (1) that it occurs in Tit. i. 3 in connection with the more definite statement that the Apostle was intrusted with the matter of proclaiming the gospel; (2) that in this employment of the phrase we find a close resemblance to its use in Rom. xvi. 26; (3) that in 2 Tim. i. 1 the common Pauline phrase διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ is substituted for it; (4) that in the last mentioned passage the words κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς are added, with which we may compare κατὰ πίστιν κ.τ.λ. . . . ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου of Tit. i. 1f., (see τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, 1 Tim. i. 1). The similarity and, at the same time, variety of thought and expression are, thus, so characteristic of Paul, that the mere fact of the non-occurrence of the phrase κατ' ἐπιταγ. θεοῦ elsewhere (except in Tit. i. 3, and Rom. xvi. 26) can hardly be regarded as showing the words to be un-Pauline. The same, in substance, may be said of the word σωτήρ as applied to God the Father. This application of the word in the Pastoral Epistles, however, is a point worthy of consideration with reference to the view presented in them of the relation of Christ to the Father. It will be noticed that σωτήρ is connected with θεοῦ in this salutation of 1 Tim., while in the opening verses of Tit. it is joined both with θεοῦ (ver. 3) and with Χρ. Ἰησοῦ (ver. 4) and in 2 Tim. i. 1, 2 it is not found. The addition of the word ἔλεος to the ordinary χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη of the Pauline salutations is peculiar, but can hardly be considered as a matter of difficulty—especially as, according to the larger part of the oldest authorities, it does not occur in the Epistle to Titus. Tisch., Treg., W. & H., Alf., R. V., Ell., Huther, and others omit the word in Titus. The greater fullness of expression in the salutation of the last-named Epistle, by reason of which it reaches twice the length of those in the letters to Timothy, is to be explained in connection with the double character of all these epistles already alluded to.

II. Vv. 3, 4.

(*a*) On the construction of vv. 3, 4, nothing need be added to what is said by Huther in his note. The apodosis to be supplied is οὕτω καὶ νῦν παρακαλῶ. With this construction, the sentence implies a condition which is apparently inconsistent with the placing of the Epistle within that portion of Paul's history which is included in the narrative of the Acts. The same thing is indicated by other considerations connected with this and the other two Epistles. The allusion to the fables and endless genealogies points to a later date for the letter than that at which the Epp. to the Ephesians and Colossians were written.—(*b*) The word ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν seems to be a sort of negative to προσέχειν κ.τ.λ. as a positive. The

former may be regarded as describing in its opposition to the gospel, what the latter sets forth in its own character. This view is not only made probable by the construction of the two parallel clauses, but also by vi. 3, the only other passage in which *ἑτεροδιδ.* occurs. In that passage it is contrasted with "consenting to sound words" and "the doctrine which is according to godliness." Though a word not used elsewhere, and perhaps, as some hold, coined by this writer, it is a word which is so easily formed and which, in the idea suggested by it, is so nearly kindred to undoubtedly genuine Pauline expressions (comp. Gal. i. 6 f. etc.) that no objection can be made to it, as if it could not be employed by the Apostle. As to the other words in the corresponding clause—*μύθοις* and *γενεαλογίαις*,—the former is found in iv. 7, where the adjectives *profane* and *old wives'* are joined with it, in 2 Tim. iv. 4, where the *μῦθοι* are contrasted with *the truth*, and in Tit. i. 14, where they are called *Jewish*, and are connected with *commandments of men who turn away from the truth*. The latter word, on the other hand, occurs only once elsewhere—Tit. iii. 9, where it is used in connection with *foolish questionings, strifes*, and *fightings about the law*. There can be little doubt, as the two words are carefully considered, that the doctrines or views which the writer has in mind are Jewish. They are distinctly called Jewish in Tit. i. 14, and are so described in other passages as related to the law, that there can scarcely be any question respecting this point. Indeed, vv. 7 ff. of the present chapter make this evident. The words themselves, however, are such as manifestly could not be used of the Judaistic doctrine referred to in Gal., and they seem to indicate something more than is hinted at in Eph. or Col. This further growth and development may be more distinctly noticed in the many other statements made in these epistles respecting the errors. They show that, on the moral side, there was a movement towards license rather than asceticism, and, on the intellectual side, a progress in the general line of the Gnostic ideas. That the tendency to asceticism is still manifest, however, is clear from 1 Tim. iv. 3; and the terms and descriptions, in general, which are employed do not indicate any such marked remove from the state of things presented before us in Col., as to prove a much later date for the Pastoral Epistles. In the rapid movement of thought which we may believe to have characterized that early period of the history of the church, it is not difficult to suppose that the change which occurred between the time of writing to the Romans and that of addressing the Colossians may have been followed by a change between the time of the epistle to the latter and the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, such as appears in the descriptions of errors which they contain, even if these last mentioned letters were separated from Col. by but four or five years. —(*c*) The word *ζητήσεις* is, strictly, of the active form and to be understood in an active sense. But, as it seems to border in its idea both upon the active and passive sense, and as *οἰκονομίαν*, when connected with *θεοῦ*, has apparently elsewhere the objective meaning, it may be regarded as somewhat more probable that both words are here to be taken objectively, than subjectively, as Huther in his last edition prefers. Grimm Lex. N. T. takes them objectively, so Ell., Alf., Wiesinger, and others. Grimm says, "*quae materiem disceptationum potius quam dispensationem rerum, quibus deus christianam salutem praeparavit et paravit, quae fide amplectenda est (cognoscendam) praebent.*" Ell. says, "The fables and genealogies supplied questions of a controversial nature, but not the essence and principles of the divine dispensation." The question between the two explanations of the words is one of much uncertainty, and the most that can be affirmed, on either

side, is a probability. With either interpretation of *οἰκονομίαν*, the added words *ἐν πίστει* denote the sphere within which the dispensation or stewardship moves. —(*d*) *αἵτινες* may mean *since they*, or *such as*. W. and H., with ℵ A 17, read *ἐκζητήσεις*. So also Treg. and Tisch. 8th ed. and the text adopted by R. V. This form occurs nowhere else.

III. Vv. 5–11.

(*a*) That there is a close connection between *παραγγελίας* of ver. 5 and the corresponding verb in ver. 4 can hardly be doubted; but, as the verb, as here used, adds to itself the idea expressed in *μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*, it is probable that the noun extends itself, also, to the same thing, and thus the "charge" contains that which belongs in and with "the healthful teaching." The end and aim of this is love. Love here means love to one's neighbor, as Huther remarks, and from the connection with what follows seems to stand in contrast to that which the *τινές* were promoting.—(*b*) The contrast of *ἀγάπη*, although *in the form of expression* with *ματαιολογίαν*, must be *in reality* with that to which the *ματαιολ.* leads. This does not seem to be merely the strifes which attend upon, or are likely to be produced by, the *ἐκζητήσεις* (comp. Tit. iii. 9), but all that which, in these Epp., is indicated as the result of the doctrine of these men. Having swerved from a pure conscience, heart, etc., they had turned aside—these words and the following point apparently to such a turning from the true teaching of the gospel towards the law, as not indeed, like the Galatian Judaizers, merely to make the latter essential to justification, but rather to misconceive the purpose of the law and even direct it to wrong ends. Alf. says: The Apostle was dealing "with men who corrupted the material enactments of the moral law, and founded on Judaism not assertions of its obligation, but idle fables and allegories, letting in latitude of morals and unholiness of life. It is against this abuse of the law that his arguments are directed; these men struck, by their interpretation, at the root of all divine law itself, and therefore at that root itself does he meet and grapple with them."—(*c*) That the law here referred to is the Mosaic Law is proved both by the *ὁ νόμος* of ver. 8 and the fact that the fables, etc., are called Jewish (Tit. i. 14). This being the case, there can be little doubt that *νομοδιδάσκαλοι* means teachers of this particular law, and it is highly probable that *νόμος* of ver. 9 has the same reference. This law is the only one, apparently, of which the Apostle speaks, or which he has in mind, in any passage in these epistles.—(*d*) The relation of the persons spoken of to the law is suggested by the clause *ἐάν τις αὐτῷ νομίμως χρῆται*. This expression points to what is said by Alford, as quoted above, and would scarcely have been used by the Apostle of the Galatian teachers.—(*e*) The exact meaning of the word *δικαίῳ* of ver. 9 is somewhat doubtful. The contrast with *ἀνόμοις*, etc., and the not improbable connection in thought, in the use of these words, with the prohibitions of the Decalogue, point to the ordinary sense of *δίκαιος*. The reference, on the other hand, to the Pauline gospel in ver. 11, and the fact that here, as elsewhere in his Epistles, the Apostle apparently contends against those who oppose his own doctrine, suggest that he has in mind righteousness in the peculiarly Christian sense. Not improbably, there may be a certain union of the two elements in the word, as connected with the fact that these teachers of the law were pressing their opposing views even to the point of lawlessness and laxity in morals.—(*f*) The connection of *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγ.* which Huther favors is that which

most of the recent commentators adopt. This phrase, accordingly, refers to all that has been said about the law. Δόξης is an objective genitive, and probably has reference to the revelation of the Divine glory which the gospel makes, as contrasted with the erroneous and empty doctrines of the false teachers.

IV. Vv. 12–17.

(*a*) With regard to the connection between this passage and what precedes, two remarks may be made: (1) that, as the letter is one having both a personal and a general or public aim, it is not strange that the writer should at times turn, even somewhat abruptly, to a matter related to his own experience or his individual reminiscences. Such transitions from the general to the individual are, in such a letter, no indication of weakness of style or thought; and (2) that, if such a transition is allowed to the author here, the thought moves on in a suitable progress from the verses which precede to the end of this passage. If these letters were written by Paul, they belong to the latest period of his life. His impulse towards dwelling upon his own personal history is observable in all his Epistles, even those of earliest date. That, in later years, this impulse should have become stronger, is only what might be reasonably expected. Advancing life and its many trials and successes made him recall, with ever fresh interest, what he had gone through, and, especially, the wonder of the Divine grace in his case. Passages like the present, therefore, so far from being a ground of objection to the Pauline authorship of the Epistle, are, on the contrary, entirely consistent with it.—(*b*) It is to be observed, also, that, in the case of this particular passage, no just objection can be made to the Pauline authorship on the ground that one who was so familiar with Timothy as the Apostle was, and had long been, could not be expected to make to him such detailed statements respecting himself and his own history. Whatever may be said of other cases, there is nothing here which is inconsistent with what a man like Paul might have said in grateful remembrance of his past life.—(*c*) The meaning of πιστός in ver. 15, where it is used of a thing (λόγος), is, apparently, *worthy of credit*. Probably, the adjective has a similar meaning, *trustworthy, to be relied upon, worthy of credit*, in 1 Cor. vii. 25; possibly, also, in 2 Tim. ii. 2. The correspondence of ver. 12 with the verse mentioned in 1 Cor., in its general thought (comp. ἠλεήθην ver. 13, ἠλεημένος κ.τ.λ. in 1 Cor.), and the fact that the Divine choice of Paul for the ministry was made before the question of actual faithfulness in service could arise, favor giving to the adjective the sense of *trustworthy* in this verse. It is commonly, however, rendered *faithful*. So Huther, Alf., Ell., R. V., Bib. Com., and others, ("He knew me to be such an one, in His foresight, as would prove faithful to the great trust," Alf.)—(*d*) Love and faith in ver. 14, are immediately connected with ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, and thus are here viewed as divine gifts. They are suggested, probably, by the thought of vv. 4, 5, where these words occur as the end and sphere of the divine παραγγελία and οἰκονομία. The closeness of the thought here to that of the earlier verses is thus manifest.—(*e*) Ver. 15. The phrase πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, which occurs several times in these Epistles, refers here, and perhaps in all cases, to what follows. The word λόγος seems to have the sense of common or fixed saying,—something of the character of a proverbial sentence. The introduction of the words with this formula is to be accounted for in connection with the public character of the latter, while the preceding and following words have a more individual reference. This

intermingling of the two is a part of the semi-official style in which the Epistle is written. It cannot be regarded as an Epistle written simply for the private reading of Timothy.—(*f*) The statement that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners is intended, apparently, to contrast the gospel with the doctrine of the errorists, in that the great distinguishing characteristic of the gospel is its design of saving sinners. The errorists gave themselves to a vain discoursing about the law and legal righteousness, which moved in the outward region and even tended to laxness in true morality; but the teaching of the gospel was a teaching of forgiveness, and, then, of inward sanctification. To no better illustration of the power of this Christian doctrine, or its transforming effect, could the Apostle refer than his own life, and so he at once turns again to his own case—declaring himself to be *πρῶτος* among sinners, and the one in whom, as *πρῶτος*, the long-suffering of Christ was shown as an example for all who should follow in after times. *πρῶτος* of ver. 15 almost certainly means *first*, in the sense of *chief*; *πρώτῳ* of ver. 16 has primarily, if not exclusively, the sense of *first*, as related to *τῶν μελλόντων*—it is possible, however, that in *πρώτῳ*, also, there may be combined with *first in time*, or succession, the idea of *chief*.—(*g*) The peculiarities of the doxology in ver. 17 are (1) the introduction of the words with a substantive form in the dative, instead of a relative pronoun as in all other cases in Paul's writings where a dative opens a doxological clause; (2) the use of *βασιλεύς* as a designation of God, which does not occur in the other Pauline Epistles; (3) the expression *βασ. τῶν αἰώνων*. This expression is not found elsewhere in the N. T. On the other hand, *ἀφθαρτός* is applied to God by Paul in Rom. i. 23; *ἀόρατος*, in Col. i. 15; *μόνος*, in Rom. xvi. 27. *δόξα* and *τιμή* are used in connection with each other by Paul, but not in a doxology. In the variety of the Pauline expressions, which include even several of the words here used, we may easily find a place for a doxology of this character, although one precisely like it, in all respects, may not be discovered. The turn to the doxology, like that to the expression of thanks in ver. 12, is somewhat abrupt—more so than is ordinarily the case in the Pauline doxologies. The connection in the thought is, possibly, though not very probably, in the words *αἰώνιον—αἰώνων*. The suggestion of the ascription of praise to God comes undoubtedly, from the thought of the divine mercy and grace which had been manifested in his case.—(*h*) That *τῶν αἰώνων* here means *the ages*, and not *the world*, is rendered probable both by the *αἰώνιον* which precedes and the *αἰῶνας αἰώνων* which follows, and by the fact that the relation of God to the world does not seem to be naturally suggested in this place. The ages are, apparently, all the ages of duration, and so, although the word is not equivalent to the adjective *eternal*, the idea of eternal existence is suggested in connection with it. The connection of *ἀφθάρτῳ* and *ἀοράτῳ* with *θεῷ*—the King of the ages, the incorruptible, invisible, only God—is probably to be preferred to that which seems to be adopted by R. V.: the King eternal, incorruptible, invisible, the only God.

V. Vv. 18–20.

(*a*) Vv. 12–17 are, evidently, in one sense—so far as they express the writer's thankfulness and refer to his own experience—a digression or parenthesis. In another sense—so far as there is a reference to the doctrine of the gospel—they set forth what is in the line of the preceding verses. While, therefore, it may be questioned whether *παραγγελίαν* of ver. 18 is to be immediately connected with the

same word in ver. 5, it is probable that, in the general thought, the Apostle goes back to that verse, and that, in this word, he refers to the comprehensive charge appertaining to the Christian teaching. This charge he commits—deposits, as it were, in his hands—to Timothy, in accordance with the prophecies, etc. As these prophecies assigned to Timothy the work of a preacher and missionary, the fulfillment of the general charge of the gospel in his case would be accomplished by his "warring in the sphere of them the good warfare." The charge is, therefore, committed to him by the Apostle, in order that he may war, etc. This explanation of the word *παραγγελίαν*, and of the construction, seems, on the whole, the simplest and best—making *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.* denote the end in view of *παρατίθεμαι*, rather than finding in that clause the explanation of what is meant by the *παραγγελίαν*. This view is confirmed by the correspondence of *πίστιν* and *ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν* of this verse with the same words in ver. 5, and in the general similarity of their relation to the main thought in the two cases.—(*b*) R. V. renders *τὰς προαγούσας κ.τ.λ. which went before on thee*, in the text, and *led the way to thee*, in the margin. A. R. V. substitutes this marginal rendering for the text. This rendering of A. R. V. is favored by the position of the words *ἐπὶ σέ*, but as *προαγ.* in Heb. vii. 18 has the sense of *foregoing, former*, and as there seems little occasion here to introduce the idea of *led the way to thee*, it is probably better, with Huther and many of the best recent comm., to give the participle the meaning *former* or *preceding*, and to make *ἐπὶ σέ* qualify *προφητείας*. (So Alf., Ell., Fairbairn, Holtzm., Grimm, and others).—(*c*) Alf., Ell., Plumptre, Bib. Com., as well as the writers mentioned by Huther, regard *ἐν αὐταῖς* as carrying in it the figure of armor. This seems, however, so doubtful, that it is safer to take *ἐν* more generally, in the sense of *in the sphere of*. It was in the sphere of what these prophecies suggested, that the warfare, in Timothy's case, could be rightly carried forward. With *τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν* we may compare the kindred, and yet different, phrase *τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα*, 2 Tim. iv. 7.—(*d*) That *ἣν* of ver. 19 refers to *ἀγ. συνείδησιν* only is indicated both by the singular number and by the fact that it was by wilfully thrusting from themselves that which is indicated by *ἣν*, that they made shipwreck concerning *πίστις*. That *τὴν πίστιν* is, in a certain sense, objective here is evident; but that it means *the faith*, as a system of doctrine, is doubtful, or even improbable. The use of *πίστις* in the latter sense, in the Pauline Epistles, is questionable.—(*e*) The expression *παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ* (ver. 20) is found elsewhere only in 1 Cor. v. 5. In that passage it seems to indicate something additional to, and different from, excommunication. While the latter was the act of the church, this was a thing, apparently, which appertained to the apostolic office alone. Not improbably, it may have been attended by some bodily evil in the person thus delivered; but this cannot be confidently affirmed. From the final clauses added both in 1 Cor. and here, it seems probable that the design of it was reformatory (comp. especially *ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου* 1 Cor. v. 5). That the result was always reformation is not certain. Apparently this was the result in the case mentioned in 1 Cor., as we may infer from what the Apostle says in 2 Cor. ii. 5 ff.,—if, indeed this penalty was there finally inflicted.

CHAPTER II.

VER. 1. *παρακαλῶ*] Instead of this, D* F G, Sahid. Clar. Boern. Hilar. Ambrosiast. ed. Cassiod. (alicubi) Or. (ter ut Rec.) have the imperative *παρακάλει*, which is manifestly a conjecture for the purpose of giving to the words the form of a commission to Timothy.—*πάντων*] is omitted in some codd. (G, G, Boern. Or. [semel]); it might easily be overlooked as merely strengthening the *πρῶτον*.—Ver. 3. In A 17, 67** ℵ, Cop. Sahid. *γάρ* is wanting, and is therefore omitted by Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. 8; it is retained in Matthaei and Tisch. 7.—Ver. 6. *τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις*] Some codd. have the reading *οὗ τὸ μαρτ. κ. ἰδ. ἐδόθη* (D* F G, Clar. Boern. Harl.* Ambrosiast.; while some cursives have the reading *οὗ*, but without *ἐδόθη*). This reading has only arisen out of a desire to connect the words more closely with what precedes. The omission of the words *τὸ μαρτύριον* in A is to be considered merely an error in copying. Lachm. in his large edition (so also Buttm.) left them out; in the small edition he retained them. ℵ has the reading *καί* for *τό*.—Ver. 7. The words *ἐν Χριστῷ* were rejected from the text even by Griesb. (so also Scholz, Lachm., and others), because they are wanting in the most important authorities, in A D* F G 3, 6, 23* 31, *al.*, Syr. utr. Arr. Copt. etc.; on the other hand, they are found in ℵ. Matthaei, however, has retained them with the remark: adhuc maneo in ea sententia, ut credam, ab Praxapostolis et Euchologiis exclusum esse in fine lectionis. If they are compared with Rom. ix. 1, it is easy to explain how they came into the text.—Instead of *ἐν πίστει*, ℵ has *ἐν γνώσει*. Buttm., following A, reads *ἐν πνεύματι*.—Ver. 8. Instead of the singular *διαλογισμοῦ*, F G 17, 47, 67** *al.*, Syr. utr. Boern. Or. (ter sed ter ut Rec.) Eus., etc., have the plural *διαλογισμῶν* (Tisch. 7); Matthaei remarks on this: hujusmodi lectiones plerumque placent viris graece doctis; verum in N. T. contraria ferenda est sententia. Most authorities, including ℵ, have the singular (Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8). The plural is with Reiche to be considered a mere correction, all the more that the singular of the word does not occur elsewhere in the N. T. (except in Luke ix. 46, 47); comp. especially Phil. ii. 14.—Ver. 9. *καὶ τάς*] are wanting in A 71; *καί* alone is wanting in ℵ, and *τάς* alone is wanting in D* F G 67** 73, *al.*, Or. Lachm. and Buttm. omitted both words, Tisch. only *τάς*.—*ἢ χρυσῷ*] Instead of the *Rec. ἤ* (in D*** K L, etc.), Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. rightly adopted *καί*, following A D* F G, etc. Tisch. retained the *Rec. χρυσῷ*, following D K L, etc.; Lachm. and Buttm., on the other hand, read *χρυσίῳ* following A F G, etc. As both forms are used in the N. T., we can hardly decide which is right here.—Ver. 10. The reading *ὡς* instead of *ὁ*, found in some cursives, Arm. and Cypr., is manifestly a correction to facilitate the interpretation.—Ver. 12. Instead of *γυναικὶ δὲ διδάσκειν* (Tisch. 7), we should follow A D F G ℵ, *al.*, Arm. Vulg. It. Cypr. Jer. Ambrosiast., and read *διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικί*, which has been received into the text by Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8. Hofm., for the sake of his exposition, prefers the *Rec.*—Ver 14. Instead of the *Rec. ἀπατηθεῖσα*, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. read the compound *ἐξαπατηθεῖσα*, on the testimony of A D* F G

17 28, *al.*, Mt. K., Bas. Chrys. If the compound had not such weighty authorities in its favor, we should be inclined to account for it out of Rom. vii. 11 and 2 Cor. xi. 3.—Ver. 15. On the reading γάρ for δέ, found in some codd., Matthaei rightly remarks: ita centies istae particulae . . . praesertim in principio pro arbitrio mutantur.

Ver. 1. [On Vv. 1–7, see Note VI., pages 109–111.] After directing Timothy's attention generally to the στρατεία to which he had been appointed, Paul proceeds to mention in detail the things for which, in his office, he had to care. This connection of thought is marked by the particle of transition οὖν (Wiesinger), which therefore does not stand (as de Wette, following Schleiermacher, thinks) without any logical connection.[1] [VI *a.*] —πρῶτον πάντων] is not to be taken with ποιεῖσθαι, as Luther does: "to do before everything else," but with παρακαλῶ (Heydenreich, Matthies, de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee).—ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις κ.τ.λ.] [VI *b.*] The apostle herewith begins to give "instructions regarding public prayer" (Wiesinger). The idea of prayer is here expressed by four words. Δέησις and προσευχή are connected in other passages as synonyms—in Eph. vi. 18, Phil. iv. 6; the difference between them is this, that δέησις can be used only of petitionary prayer, προσευχή of every kind of prayer. Not less general in meaning is ἔντευξις, from ἐντυγχάνειν τινί incidere in aliquem, adire aliquem, and in reference to God: *precari* (Wisd. viii. 21, xvi. 28). The reference to another is not contained in the word itself, but in the preposition connected with it, as in Rom. xi. 2: κατά τινος; and Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25: ὑπέρ τινος. Accordingly, the substantive ἔντευξις, which occurs only here and in chap. iv. 5, does not in itself possess the meaning of intercession for others, but denotes simply prayer as an address to God (Wiesinger).[2] The three words, accordingly, are thus distinguished: in the first, the element of insufficiency is prominent; in the second, that of devotion; and in the third, that of child-like confidence (prayer—the heart's converse with God). Calvin is right in his remark, that Paul joined these three words together here "ut precandi studium et assiduitatem magis commendet ac vehementius urgeat." [3]—εὐχαριστίας] "prayers

[1] Hofmann's reference of οὖν to i. 15 and the conclusion of ver. 16 is far-fetched: "If Christ came into the world to save sinners, and if the long-suffering of God towards the man whom He made His apostle from being a reviler, was to be a prophecy regarding the conversion of those who were afterwards made to believe on Him, it becomes Christians not, in sectarian fashion, to limit its command to its sphere at that time, but to extend it to all men."

[2] Comp. Plutarch, *Vita Numae*, chap. 14: μὴ ποιεῖσθαι τὰς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἐντεύξεις ἐν ἀσχολίᾳ καὶ παρέργως.

[3] In regard to the more precise definition of the word, there is much that is arbitrary in expositors older and more recent. Thus δέησις is understood to be prayer for averting the punishment of sin; προσευχή, prayer for the bestowal of benefits; ἔντευξις, prayer for the punishment of the unrighteous (Theodoret: δέησίς ἐστιν, ὑπὲρ ἀπαλλαγῆς τινῶν λυπηρῶν ἱκετεία προσφερομένη· προσευχὴ ἐστιν αἴτησις ἀγαθῶν· ἔντευξίς ἐστι κατηγορία τῶν ἀδικούντων; so, too, Theophylact and Oecumenius). Photius (*ad Amphil.* qu. 193) explains ἔντυχία in the same way: ἔντυχία (ὅταν τὶς κατὰ τῶν ἀδικούντων ἐντυγχάνῃ τῷ Θεῷ, προσκαλούμενος αὐτὸν εἰς ἐκδίκησιν); but the other two words differently: δέησις μὲν λέγεται, ὅταν τὶς Θεὸν ἀξιοῖ εἰς πρᾶγμα· προσευχὴ δὲ, ὅταν ὑμνῇ τὸν Θεόν. Origen (περὶ εὐχῆς, § 44) finds a climax in the succession of the words, and distinguishes προσευχαί from δεήσεις in this way, that the former are prayers joined with a δοξολογία, made for greater things and μεγαλο-

of thanksgiving," the apostle adds, because in Christian prayer the giving of thanks should never be wanting; comp. Phil. iv. 6: *ἐν παντὶ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμῶν γνωρίζεσθαι πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.—ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*] is not to be referred merely to *εὐχαριστία*, but also to the preceding words (Wiesinger). The prayer of the Christian community (for this and not private prayer is here spoken of) is—in petition and thanksgiving—to embrace all mankind. [VI *c.*]

Ver. 2. *Ὑπὲρ βασιλέων*] *βασιλεῖς* are not merely the Roman emperors, the apostle using the plural because of the emperor's colleagues (Baur); the word is to be taken, in a more general sense, as denoting the *highest* authorities in the state.—*καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων*] not only denoting the governors in the provinces, but all who hold the office of magistrate anywhere. The expression is synonymous with *ἐξουσίαι ὑπερέχουσαι* in Rom. xiii. 1; comp. 2 Macc. iii. 11: *ἀνὴρ ἐν ὑπεροχῇ κείμενος*. Josephus calls the magistrates simply *αἱ ὑπεροχαί* (*Antiq.* vi. 4, 3). In the old liturgies we find, in express accordance with this passage, the *δέησις ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ, ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου*. The purpose for which intercession is specially to be made for all men in authority is given in the words that follow: *ἵνα ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν*, which, as de Wette rightly remarks, denotes the objective and not the subjective purpose. Paul does not mean here to direct attention to the value which intercession has for our own inner life, and by means of this for outward peace, as Heydenreich ("Christians are to pray also for heathen rulers, that by this prayer they may keep alive within themselves the quiet submissive spirit of citizens"), Matthies ("animated with loving thoughts towards the representatives of the government, they are to be blameless in their walk, and to strive after the undisturbed enjoyment of outward peace"), and others think; but the apostle is speaking of the still, quiet life as a blessing which the church obtains by prayer to God for the rulers. The prayer is directed, as Wiesinger rightly remarks, not for the conversion of the heathen

φνέστερον, while *ἐντεύξεις* are the prayers of one who has *παῤῥησίαν τινὰ πλείονα*.—Still more arbitrary is Kling's explanation, that *δεήσεις* are prayers in reference to the circumstances of all mankind; *προσευχαί*, prayers for some benefit; *ἐντεύξεις*, prayers for the aversion of evil. Matthies is partly right, partly wrong when he says: *δέησις* is the prayer made with a feeling of the need of God, so that the inner side of the need *and of uprightness* (?) is particularly prominent; *προσευχή*, prayer, in the act of devotional address to the Godhead, *therefore with reference to the outward exercise* (?); *ἐντεύξεις*, intercession, made not so much for ourselves as on behalf of others (?).—There is no ground whatever for the opinion of Heydenreich, that the first two expressions are used of prayer (*δέησις* = petition; *προσευχή* = thanksgiving) for the whole Christian community, while the other two (*ἔντευξις* = petition; *εὐχαριστία* = thanksgiving) are used of prayer for the whole of mankind. Lastly, we may note the peculiar view of Augustine (*Ep.* 59), according to which the four expressions are to be understood of prayers used at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, *δεήσεις* being the *precationes* before consecration; *προσευχαί*, the *orationes* at the benediction, consecration, and breaking of bread; *ἐντεύξεις*, the *interpellationes* at the benediction of the congregation; and *εὐχαριστία*, the *gratiarum actio* at the close of the communion. Plitt so far agrees with this view of Augustine, that he thinks the apostle's various expressions denote the various liturgical prayers, as they were defined even in ancient times at the celebration of the Eucharist (?).

[1] Hofmann maintains, without grounds, that *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.* does not give the purpose of the prayer for all men and for rulers, but "the purpose for which rulers exist" (!).

rulers, but for the divine blessing necessary to them in the discharge of their office (Rom. xiii. 14).—The adj. *ἤρεμος* occurs only here[1] in the N. T., and *ἡσύχιος* only here and in 1 Pet. iii. 4 (synonymous with *πραΰς*). The expression *βίον διάγειν* also occurs only here; in Tit. iii. 3, *διάγειν* is used without *βίον*.—No exact distinction can be established between *ἤρεμος* and *ἡσύχιος*. Olshausen (in Wiesinger) says, without reason, that the former means: "not disquieted from without;" the latter, "from within." Ἠρέμα denotes, in classic Greek at any rate, "still, tranquil existence;" but *ἡσύχιος* (*ἥσυχος*) has the same meaning, and also denotes that there is no disturbance from without. The collocation of the two words serves to give more force to the thought; a *ἤρ. κ. ἡσύχ. βίος* is a life led without disturbance from without, with no excitement of fear, etc.—*βίον διάγειν*] "spend life, more than *ἄγειν*" (Wiesinger); the same expression is often found in classical writers.—*ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι*]. Not on this, but on *ἤρ. καὶ ἡσύχ.* is the chief emphasis of the sentence laid (Plitt); the words only add a more precise definition. Εὐσέβεια, a word foreign to the other Pauline Epistles, and (with *εὐσεβής, εὐσεβῶς, εὐσεβέω*) occurring only in the Pastoral Epistles, in Acts, and in 2 Pet., denotes the godliness of the heart; *σεμνότης*, also peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles (*σεμνός*, only here and in Phil. iv. 8), denotes the becoming conduct of the Christian in all the relations of life. Hofmann is arbitrary in separating this addition from what immediately precedes, and joining it with *ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις κ.τ.λ.*, as "denoting the manner in which the prayer commended is to be made."

Ver. 3. [VI *d.*] This verse points back to what was said in ver. 1; not, however, in such a way as to make ver. 2 a parenthesis (so in a former edition of this commentary), but rather so as to include the points mentioned in it.—*τοῦτο*] does not refer to the thoughts immediately preceding, but to the *ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις . . . ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων κ.τ.λ.*—The highest motive of the Christian to such prayer is the good pleasure of God.—*καλὸν καὶ ἀπόδεκτον*] *ἀπόδεκτος* (like *ἀποδοχή*) occurs only in this First Epistle to Timothy; it is synonymous with *εὐάρεστος* in Col. iii. 20 (*τοῦτο γὰρ εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν ἐν κυρίῳ*).—*ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ*] is referred only to *ἀπόδεκτον* by several expositors, who either take *καλόν* absolutely (de Wette: "good in itself;" so also van Oosterzee, Matthies: "*καλ.* denotes the endeavor recommended in its inner worth and contents"), or, as Leo, supply with it *ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων*: "which is praiseworthy, *sc.* before men." The latter is clearly quite arbitrary; but even for the former there is not sufficient ground, all the more when we compare 2 Cor. viii. 21: *προνοοῦμεν γὰρ καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον κυρίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον ἀνθρώπων.*[2] On *σωτήρ*, see i. 1. —Paul uses this name for God here because he has already in mind the thought that follows (Wiesinger).

[1] Nor is the positive *ἤρεμος* used in the Greek classics. As yet it has been found only in the *Inscript. Olbiopol.* n. 2059, v. 24, by Lobeck; see Winer, p. 68 [E. T. p. 70]; Buttmann, p. 24 [E. T. 28].—The substantives *ἡσυχία* and *ἠρεμία* are frequently found together in the classics; *e. g.* Demosth. *de Contributione*, § 8; Bekk. s. Dorville, *On Chariton*, p. 411.

[2] Heydenreich's opinion is utterly erroneous, that Paul calls prayer for all *καλόν*, because it is not only right and good, but

Ver. 4. Ground of the previous thought. The general intercession is καλ. κ. ἀπόδ. before God, because He, etc. It is not unusual to give in a relative clause the grounds of a previous statement. Ὅς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι (comp. Tit. ii. 11)] [VI *c.*] The chief accent is laid on πάντας (corresponding with ὑπὲρ πάντων, ver. 1), which is therefore placed first. God's purpose of salvation extends to all, and therefore the prayer of Christians must include all. Wiesinger, however, is right in remarking that "the apostle in ὃς κ.τ.λ. does not mean specially to give a reason for prayer for the conversion of all men, but for prayer generally as a duty of universal love to men." Chrysostom puts it differently: μιμοῦ τὸν Θεόν· εἰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι, θέλε καὶ σύ· εἰ δὲ θέλεις, εὔχου· τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων (τῶν θελόντων) ἐστὶ τὸ εὔχεσθαι.—The true connection of thought is obscured if we supply the intermediate thought, that prayer for all, and specially for kings, serves to maintain the peace without which the spread of Christianity would be hindered.[1]—καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν] The same connection of words is found elsewhere only in 2 Tim. iii. 7; on the meaning of ἐπίγνωσις, see my *Commentary on Colossians*, pp. 74 f., Remark.—The connection of the two expressions σωθῆναι and εἰς ἐπίγν. ἀλ. ἐλθεῖν may be regarded differently. Hofmann takes them to be in substance identical; Heydenreich takes the latter as an explanation of the former, "showing how and by what means God wishes to effect the salvation of all;" he therefore regards the ἐπίγνωσις τ. ἀλ. as the *means* of the σωτηρία. So, too, Winer (p. 514 [E. T. p. 553]): "at first the general purpose is mentioned (καί, and in pursuance of this), then the immediate purpose (as a means of attaining the other)." It is explained in the same way by Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, and others. But it seems more natural to regard the ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἀληθείας as the goal to which the rescue (σωθῆναι) leads (so, too, Plitt).[2]

Ver. 5. Εἷς γὰρ Θεός] [VI *f.*] The particle γάρ connects this verse with the thought immediately preceding (Wiesinger), and not, as Leo and Mack think, with the exhortation to pray for all.[3] The apostle wishes by it to confirm the idea of the universality of the divine purpose of salvation as true and necessary: he does this first by pointing to the unity of God. There is a quite similar connection of ideas in Rom. iii. 30 (emphasis is laid on God's unity in another connection in 1 Cor. viii. 6, and, in a third connection, in Eph. iv. 6). From the unity of God, it necessarily follows that there is only one purpose regarding all; for if

"brings a benefit to the Christians, by recommending them to their rulers."

[1] Mosheim (*Instit. Hist. Eccles.* maj. I. 36): Id sanctus homo tradit: nisi pax in orbe terrarum vigeat, fieri nullo modo posse, ut voluntati divinae, quae omnium hominum salutem cupit, satisfiat; bellis nimirum flagrantibus haud licuisset legatis Jesu Christi, secure ad omnes populos proficisci.

[2] In this verse the idea of the universality of God's purpose of salvation is clearly and distinctly expressed. Calvin, in order to save his theory of predestination, has to take refuge in an exposition more than ingenious: de hominum generibus, non singulis personis, sermo est; nihil enim aliud intendit, quam principes et extraneos, populos in hoc numero includere.

[3] Van Oosterzee confuses the two references: "God's universal purpose of salvation is here established in such a way that at the same time there is *to a certain extent* (!) an indication of a third motive for performing Christian intercessions."

there were various purposes for various individuals, the Godhead would be divided in its nature. As there is one God, however, so also there is one Mediator.—*εἷς καὶ μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων*] The word *μεσίτης*[1] occurs elsewhere in the Pauline Epistles only in Gal. iii. 19, 20, where the name is given to Moses, because through him God revealed the law to the people. Elsewhere in the N. T. the word is found only in Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24, and in connection with *διαθήκης*, from which, however, it cannot (with Schleiermacher and de Wette) be concluded that the idea *mediator* refers necessarily to the *corresponding* idea *covenant*. Christ is here named the *μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων*, because He is inter Deum et homines constitutus (Tertullian). He is the Mediator for both, in so far as only through Him does God accomplish His purpose of salvation (His *θέλειν*) regarding men, and in so far as only through Him can men reach the goal appointed them by God (*σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγν. ἀλ. ἐλθεῖν*). Hofmann says: "He is the means of bringing about the relation in which God wishes to stand towards men, and in which men ought to stand towards God." As with the unity of God, so also is the unity of the Mediator a surety for the truth of the thought expressed in ver. 4, that God's *θέλειν* refers to all men.—To define it more precisely, Paul adds: *ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς*. This addition may not, as Otto and others assume, have been occasioned by opposition to the docetism of the heretics. In other epistles of the N. T. special emphasis is laid on Christ's humanity, with no such opposition to suggest it; thus Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21; Phil. ii. 7; Heb. ii. 16, 17. In this passage the reason for it is contained first in the designation of Christ as the *μεσίτης*;[2] and further, in the manner in which Christ carried out His work of mediation, *i. e.*, as the next verse informs us, by giving Himself up to death.[3]

Ver. 6. *Ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*] The word *ἀντίλυτρον*, which occurs only here, is synonymous with *ἀντάλλαγμα* in Matt. xvi. 26; it is distinguished from the simple *λύτρον*, as Matthies rightly remarks, only in this, that the preposition makes the idea of exchange still more emphatic. According to the usage of the N. T., there can be no doubt that the apostle here alludes to Christ's reconciling death; comp., besides Tit. ii. 14, Matt. xx. 28, etc., especially 1 Pet. i. 18, 19, where the *τίμιον αἷμα* is mentioned as the means by which we are redeemed. The expression *δοὺς ἑαυτόν* has here—where *ἀντίλυτρον* is added by way of apposition to *ἑαυτόν*

[1] Regarding the use of the word in classical Greek, comp. Cremer, *s. v.*—There is no necessity for Cremer's opinion, that *μεσίτης* in the passages of Hebrews does not so much mean "mediator" as "surety."

[2] Theodoret: *ἄνθρωπον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ὠνόμασεν, ἐπειδὴ μεσίτην ἐκάλεσεν· ἐνανθρωπήσας γὰρ ἐμεσίτευσεν.*

[3] The *ἀνθρώπων* suggested the *ἄνθρωπος* all the more naturally, that in the apostle's consciousness the *σωτηρία* of *men* could be wrought only by a man. Only a *man* could reconcile *men* with God; only, indeed, the man of whom it was said *ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί* (chap. iii. 16). Hofmann supposes that Christ Jesus is here called *ἄνθρωπος*, "in order to say that, as He became man to be mediator, He is therefore the mediator and saviour not of this or of that man, but of all men without distinction." This thought, however, is more the ground of the *εἷς*, for even the mediator "of this or that man" might also be a *man*.

(as in Matt. xx. 28, *λύτρον* is in apposition to *τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ*)—the emphatic meaning of self-surrender to death, as in Tit. ii. 14, Gal. i. 4 (comp. also in John vi. 51, *ἣν* [*τὴν σάρκα μου*] *δώσω*, which, indeed, is uncertain critically), where *δοὺς ἑαυτόν* has the same meaning as *παραδοὺς ἑαυτόν* in Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 25 (comp., too, Rom. viii. 32). He gave Himself as a ransom by giving Himself up to death. The thought on which it is based is this: men were held *ἐν τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ σκότους* (Col. i. 13); from this they could not free themselves (*τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ*; Matt. xvi. 26); Christ therefore gave the *ἀντίλυτρον* necessary to free them; this ransom is *Himself* (*δοὺς ἑαυτόν*), *i. e.* His life: *τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ*, Matt. xx. 28; so that by this, *σωτηρία* is purchased for them. This, however, was done for the benefit not of some, but of *all*. Hence Paul adds expressly *ὑπὲρ* (equivalent to: in commodum[1]) *πάντων*, which is emphatic, and with which he returns to the beginning of ver. 4. In this, as at i. 15, the apostle revealed the substance of the *ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία*, only that here he defines his former expression more precisely. [VI *g*, *h*.]—In order, however, that this act of love on the Lord's part may bring forth its fruit, it must be proclaimed to the world; this is indicated in the words that follow.—*τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις*] *τὸ μαρτύριον* is not to be taken as in apposition to *ἀντίλυτρον*, and explained of the death of Christ (Chrysostom: *μαρτύριον τὸ πάθος*); it is to be regarded as in apposition to the thought contained in the previous words of this verse (not "to the *whole* of what was previously said," Hofmann). This does not mean, however, that *τὸ μαρτύριον* denotes Christ's gift of Himself as a ransom (or "Christ's sacrifice"), to be "the witness of salvation set forth at the appointed time, the historical fact that the divine purpose of salvation is realized" (Matthies);[2] for *μαρτύριον* is not the deed itself, but the attestation, the proclamation of the deed; comp. 1 Cor. i. 6, ii. 1. Nor does it mean that by *μαρτύριον* we are to understand the testimonium, quod Deus per Christi vitam, doctrinam et mortem protulit, vera esse ea omnia et rata, quae V. T. prophetae fore divinaverant (Heinrichs), for there is nothing to indicate an allusion to O. T. prophecy. The act of Christ already mentioned is called *τὸ μαρτύριον*, in so far as this was its meaning and purpose. Bengel: *τὸ μαρτύριον* acc. absol. ut *ἔνδειγμα*, 2 Thess. i. 5, innuitur testimonium redemtionis universalis.[3] The reason why the preaching of the gospel is called *μαρτύριον*, is that its subject is an historical fact, the importance of which becomes known only by individual experience.—*καιροῖς ἰδίοις*] "is to be connected with *τὸ μαρτύριον*, just as if it were connected with *τὸ μαρτυροούμενον*"

[1] Van Oosterzee asserts, without reason, that *ὑπέρ* here is to be taken in the sense of substitution.

[2] Leo's explanation is substantially the same as this: Quae Christus, inquit apostolus, ad homines servandos fecit, ea sunt ipsius Dei testimonium. Quid vero testatus est Deus eo, quod Jesum Christum mori passus est? Quid aliud, quam amorem suum in genus humanum plane incomparabilem?

[3] Van Oosterzee believes that *μαρτύριον* here must be taken as in apposition to *ἀντίλυτρον*, the apostle calling the Lord's surrender of Himself the great *μαρτύριον*, with special reference to *the* truth mentioned in ver. 4. But against this it is to be remarked, that this explanation does not give a right definition of the relation of apposition, nor of the meaning and purpose of the *μαρτύριον*.

(Hofmann); the same expression is found in vi. 15; Tit. i. 3; also Gal. vi. 9 (Acts xvii. 26: *καιροὶ προτεταγμένοι*); Chrysostom: *τοῖς προσήκουσι καιροῖς*.

Ver. 7. This verse defines more precisely the previous *μαρτύριον*, it was for proclaiming the *μαρτύριον* that the apostle received the office entrusted to him. The chief emphasis rests on the universality; the subject of the *μαρτύριον* is the fact that Christ gave Himself a ransom for *all*.—*εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κήρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος*] Comp. on this, Eph. iii. 1–12; Col. i. 25–28; 2 Tim. i. 9–11.—*εἰς ὅ*: for which (*μαρτύριον*), viz. "for proclaiming which." *ἐτέθην* is to be taken in close connection with *κήρυξ κ.τ.λ.*—*κήρυξ*, it is true, only occurs here and in 2 Tim. i. 11 as a name for the preacher of the gospel (in 2 Pet. ii. 5, Noah is called a *κήρυξ δικαιοσύνης*); but *κηρύσσειν* is used very frequently of the preaching of the gospel. In 1 Cor. i. 21, *κήρυγμα* is identical with *εὐαγγέλιον*. In order to direct attention to his peculiar apostolic authority, Paul adds to the general idea of *κήρυξ*, the more specific expression *ἀπόστολος*. By the addition of *ἀλήθειαν λέγω, οὐ ψεύδομαι*, the truth of the *εἰς ὅ* is confirmed;[1] he explains himself sufficiently on account of the heretics who wished that Paul should not be considered an apostle by the appointment of God. [VI *i.*]—The further definition: *διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν*, is to be taken in apposition to *κήρυξ κ. ἀπόστολος*. It was added to make clearer the reference to the heathen already indicated in *εἰς ὅ*, not, as Hofmann thinks, to form an apposition to the subject of *ἀλήθειαν λέγω*; had that been so, we should have had an emphatic *ἐγώ*. The connected words *ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ* do not form the object of *διδ.* (Heydenreich takes it as "equivalent to *ἐν τῇ πίστει τῇ ἀληθινῇ*, a teacher of the Gentiles who is to instruct them in the true religion"); they are loosely added, according to a common usage of the N. T., and denote here the sphere in which he was appointed to discharge his office as teacher of the Gentiles. The peculiar point of view must not be lost by arbitrarily changing the words into *ἐν τῇ πίστει τ. ἀληθινῇ*, or, as Leo does, into *πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός*. It is wrong also to render *πίστις* here by "faithfulness," and *ἀλήθ.* by "verity" (Hofmann: *ἐν πίστει*, equivalent to "faithfully," and *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ* to "in verity"). *Πίστις* is faith, the subjective relation, and *ἀλήθεια* is truth, the objective benefit, appropriated in faith (so also Plitt and van Oosterzee).[2]

[1] Wiesinger less suitably refers the addition to the *διδ. ἐθνῶν*, which in that case should have been preceded by a *καί*. Otto (p. 117) unjustifiably uses this asseveration of the apostle to confirm his assertion that the epistle was written during the apostle's stay at Ephesus, insisting that Paul, after he was put in prison in Jerusalem, was acknowledged an apostle in all Christian churches, and from that time, therefore, had no occasion for this asseveration. Apart from other points, Otto errs in referring the words *ἀλήθειαν κ.τ.λ.* only to the expression *ἀπόστολος*, whereas they apply to the entire thought in *εἰς ὃ κ.τ.λ.* Paul does not make asseveration that he was appointed an apostle, but that he was appointed an apostle of the *μαρτύριον*, the subject of which he had already mentioned. Comp. on this the passages quoted above.

[2] Bengel seems to take the words in a sense corresponding to the formula of asseveration, *ἀληθ. λέγω κ.τ.λ.* He says in regard to this formula: "pertinet haec affirmatio ad comma praecedens; nam subsequenti additur parallela: *ἐν π. καὶ ἀληθ.*;" a view for which there is no justification.—Matthies expresses himself somewhat obscurely; for while he in the first place mentions faith and truth not only as the elements, but also as the aims of the teaching, he says at the end of the discussion: "The apostle is teacher of the Gentiles in such a way that he knows himself to be impregnably established thereby in faith and truth."

Ver. 8. [On Vv. 8–10, see Note VII., pages 111, 112.] After giving, in the digression of vv. 3–7, the grounds of his exhortation to prayer for all, Paul returns to the exhortation itself in such a way as to define it more precisely in regard to those who are to offer the prayer.—*βούλομαι οὖν προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ*] "Hoc verbo (*βούλομαι*) exprimitur auctoritas apostolica," Bengel; comp. v. 14; Tit. iii. 18: "*I ordain.*" [VII *a.*]—*οὖν*] Bengel's explanation: "particula *ergo* reassumit versum 1," is not quite accurate; the particle connects with ver. 1 in order to carry on the thought there expressed.—*προσεύχεσθαι*] [VII *b.*] Bengel: "sermo de precibus publicis, ubi sermonem orantis subsequitur multitudinis cor." Matthies wrongly disputes the opinion that *προσεύχεσθαι* here is used of "prayer in the congregations." The whole context shows beyond doubt that the apostle is here speaking of congregations.—*τοὺς ἄνδρας*] opposed to *τὰς γυναῖκας*, ver. 9. Paul assigns to each part its proper share in the assemblies for worship; "he has something different to say to the men and to the women" (Wiesinger).—*ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ*] does not stand here in opposition to the Jewish limitation to the temple (Chrysostom and others): "not once found" (de Wette), nor to the synagogue (Wolf), nor in reference to the various places of Christian worship in Ephesus (van Oosterzee), nor to the neighboring congregations belonging to Timothy's diocese (Heydenreich); it is to be taken generally, not in the sense of *every* place, "where the religious *mood*, custom, or duty cherishes it" (Matthies), but to all places where Christian congregations assemble (Wiesinger).—As to the construction, *ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ* does not belong to *προσεύχεσθαι* alone, but "to the whole clause" (Wiesinger, Matthies, van Oosterzee, Hofmann). The apostle means to lay stress not on this, that men are to pray, but on *how* they are to pray; the chief emphasis, therefore, rests on *ἐπαίροντας κ.τ.λ.*—*ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας*] The Jews lifted up their hands not only in swearing an oath, Gen. xiv. 22 (Rev. x. 5), and in blessing, Lev. ix. 22 (Luke xxiv. 50), but also in prayer, Ps. xxviii. 2, xliv. 21, lxiii. 5, etc. This passage is a proof that the same custom was observed in the Christian church. It is true that in the N. T. it is nowhere else mentioned, but in Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians we have at chap. xxix. an evident allusion to this passage: *προσέλθωμεν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἁγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτόν.*—Regarding the form *ὁσίους* for *ὁσίας*, see Winer, p. 67 [E. T. p. 68].[1]—The hands are holy which have not been given over to the deeds of wicked lust; the opposite is given by *μιαραί, βέβηλοι χεῖρες*, 2 Macc. v. 16; comp. on the expression, Job xvii. 9, Ps. xxiv. 4, and in the N. T. Jas. iv. 8 especially: *καθαρίσατε χεῖρας καὶ ἁγνίσατε καρδίας.* Hofmann is ingenious is defining *ὁσίους χεῖρας* more precisely by what follows: "The hands of the one praying are *ὅσιοι* only when he is inwardly saturated with the consecration without which his praying does not deserve the name of prayer."—*χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ*] Bengel is more pregnant than exact when he says: "ira, quae contraria amori et mater dubitationis; dubitatio, quae adversatur fidei. Fide et amore constat

[1] It would be very forced to connect *ὁσίους* with *ἐπαίροντας* as a masculine, which Winer considers at least possible.

christianismus, gratiam et veritatem amplectens. Gratia fidem alit; veritas amorem Eph. iv. 5;" for *διαλογισμός* is not to be rendered by "doubt,"[1] which never is its signification. The rendering "contention" is also inaccurate; *διαλογισμός* is equivalent to consideration, deliberation, *cogitatio*. In the N. T. the singular occurs only here and in Luke ix. 46, 47; it is usually in the plural. The word is in itself a *vox media*, but it is mostly used where evil or perverted thoughts are spoken of; comp. Matt. xv. 19; Mark vii. 21; Luke v. 22, vi. 8, xxiv. 38. That it is to be taken here *malo sensu*, is shown by the close connection with *ὀργή*, which indicates that it is applied to deliberation towards one's neighbor; comp. Meyer on Phil. ii. 14, and especially Reiche, *Comment. Crit. in N. T.*, on this passage. In the Pastoral Epistles, special stress is laid on peaceableness as a Christian virtue, iii. 3; Tit. iii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 24.

Vv. 9, 10. *Ὡσαύτως γυναῖκας κ.τ.λ.*] After speaking of the men, Paul turns to the women, and gives some precepts regarding their behavior in church assemblies.—As to the construction, it is obvious that the verse depends on *βούλομαι* in ver. 8. Several expositors, however, connect it not only with *βούλομαι*, but also with *βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι*: "I will that the men pray . . . so also the women;" they then take what follows: *ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ κ.τ.λ.*, as corresponding to *ἐπαίροντας κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 8, and as defining more precisely the manner in which the women are to pray. The infinitive *κοσμεῖν*, however, is against this construction. De Wette, indeed, thinks that it is added to the infinitive *προσεύχεσθαι* by asyndeton; but although the connection of *several* infinitives with one another asyndetically frequently occurs (v. 14, vi. 18; Tit. iii. 1, 2), there is no example of *two* infinitives being thus connected.[2] Hofmann is forced to assume that *κοσμεῖν* "is a consequence dependent on *μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης*;" but how can self-adorning be considered a consequence of "modesty and good sense"? Though sometimes the infinitive does stand connected in such loose fashion with what precedes, it would be difficult to find an instance of such a connection as Hofmann here assumes.—Against that construction there is also this point: since in ver. 8 *προσεύχεσθαι* means prayer made by the men aloud in the church, here in ver. 9 it would have to be taken in a weakened sense; and it is so rendered by de Wette and Hofmann: "taking part in prayer."—According to this, the verse cannot be dependent on *βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι*, but on *βούλομαι* alone, so that *ἐν καταστολῇ κ.τ.λ.* merely states how the women are to adorn themselves (so, too, Plitt). De Wette, indeed, thinks that objection may be made to this construction because the affirmative *ἐν κατ. κ.τ.λ.* is followed not only by a negative *μὴ ἐν πλ. κ.τ.λ.*, but also by a second affirmative in ver. 10. This accumulation of clauses, however, cannot be urged, since we have a simi-

[1] So Bengel, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, Theodoret, Luther, and many others.

[2] Wiesinger unites the *κοσμεῖν* with the *προσεύχεσθαι*, and defends it with the remark, that if instead of the asyndeton of the infinitive *κοσμεῖν* we had the participle, there could have been no doubt regarding it. Then he asks: "Have we not elsewhere examples enough of a similar change of construction?" To this we must answer, "No," unless "similar" be taken in too wide a sense.

far accumulation in vv. 11, 12. Nor is the particle *ὡσαύτως* an argument against us, since it stands in other places where the same predicates are not used (comp. iii. 8; Tit. ii. 3). *Ὡσαύτως* may be used wherever the members to be connected contain something not exactly alike, but of a kindred nature, as is the case here with *ὁσίους . . . διαλογισμοῦ* and *ἐν καταστολῇ . . . σωφροσύνης*.[1] Nothing is to take place in the church, neither among the men nor among the women, which can hurt its spiritual dignity.—*ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ*] [VII *c.*] *καταστολή* may, according to Greek usage, denote "sedateness of nature."[2] Hence it is that some expositors (de Wette among others) take it here as equivalent to *habitus κατάστημα* (Tit. ii. 3); but it never occurs in that sense. The words that follow: *μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν . . . ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ*, show that the word is to be understood of clothing. True, it does not originally mean this, but the letting down, *e. g.*, of the *περιβολή* (Plutarch, *Pericl.* 5). This meaning, however, might easily pass into that of "the garment hanging down," and then further, into that of "clothing in general." This is the explanation given here by most expositors (also by Plitt and Hofmann; van Oosterzee translates it: "bearing," but explains it afterwards: "*καταστολή* = *ἔνδυμα*"). Some take it quite generally; others, again, understand it of the garment enveloping the whole body (Chrysostom: *ἡ ἀμπεχόνη πάντοθεν περιστέλλουσα καλῶς, μὴ περιέργως*). This last explanation has no sufficient support in the etymology, nor in the ordinary usage.—*κόσμιος*] does not mean "delicately" (Luther), but "*modestly, honorably*" (comp. iii. 2); beyond these passages, it is not found in the N. T.—*μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης*] The outward modesty which makes itself known in the dress, is to be accompanied by inward purity and chastity, since the former would otherwise be of no account. While *αἰδώς* denotes the inward shrinking from everything immodest, *σωφροσύνη* expresses the control of the desires; *τὸ κρατεῖν ἡδονῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμίων* (Luther): "with modesty and propriety."[3]—It is to be noted that *σωφροσύνη* (apart from Acts xxvi. 25: *σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ἀποφθέγγομαι*, in opposition to *μαίνομαι*) occurs only here and in ver. 15, and that all words kindred to it (except *σωφρονεῖν* in Rom. xii. 3, opposed to *ὑπερφρονεῖν* in 2 Cor. v. 13, denoting the opposite of the ecstatic state; also in Mark v. 15; Luke viii.

[1] It is necessary therefore to do, as van Oosterzee does, supply the participle *προσευχομένας* with *γυναῖκας* because of the *ὡσαύτως*.

[2] In this sense the word is found, *e. g.* in Arrian (*Epict.* ii. 10), joined with *αἰδώς* and *ἡμερότης*.—In the passage of Josephus, *B. J.* ii. 8. 4: *καταστολὴ δὲ καὶ σχῆμα σώματος ὅμοιον τοῖς μετὰ φόβου παιδαγωγουμένοις παισίν*, which is commonly quoted as a proof of the meaning "clothing," the meaning is doubtful. Salmasius explains it: sedatus animus et remissus, elato et superbo tumentique oppositus, in contrast with *ὀργῆς*, ver. 8; but in that case the added adjective *κόσμιος* is superfluous.

[3] The two words are also placed together elsewhere as feminine virtues. See Raphelius, who quotes, among others, the passage from Epictetus (*Enchir.* chap. 62): mulieres in ornatu spem collocant omnem; quare operae pretium est, dare operam, ut sentiant, sibi non ob aliud honorem haberi, *ἢ τῷ κοσμίαι φαίνεσθαι, καὶ αἰδήμονες ἐν σωφροσύνῃ*. Although in the *Cyropaedia* (Book viii.) the two words are thus distinguished: *διήρει* (*sc.* Cyrus) *δὲ αἰδὼ καὶ σωφροσύνην τῇδε, ὡς τοὺς μὲν αἰδουμένους, τὰ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ αἰσχρὰ φεύγοντας, τοὺς δὲ σώφρονας, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ ἀφανεῖ*, the distinction cannot be regarded as always valid.—Aristotle (*Rhet.* i. 9) explains *σωφροσύνη* in the following fashion: *σωφροσύνη ἀρετή, δι' ἣν πρὸς τὰς ἡδονὰς τοῦ σώματος οὕτως ἔχουσιν, ὡς ὁ νόμος κελεύει*.

35; 1 Pet. iv. 7), such as *σωφρονίζειν, σωφρονισμός, σώφρων, σωφρόνως,* are found only in the Pastoral Epistles.—*μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν κ.τ.λ.*] Instead of *πλέγματα,* we have *ἐμπλοκὴ* [*τριχῶν*] (Isa. iii. 24: מַקְשֶׁה) in 1 Pet. iii. 3, which is particularly to be compared with this passage; it denotes "the artificial plaits of hair."[1]—*καὶ χρυσίῳ*] The *καί* divides the ornament into two parts, *πλέγματα* belonging to the body itself, and what follows being the things put on the body. In 1 Pet. iii. 3, we have *περίθεσις χρυσίων* (comp. Rev. xvii. 4).—It is wrong to connect *χρυσίῳ* with the previous *πλέγμ.* as a hendiadys for *πλέγμα χρύσιον* (Heinrichs).—*ἢ μαργαρίταις*] The gems are not named in Peter, and instead of *ἱματισμὸς πολυτελής* we have there *ἐνδυσις ἱματίων*; the adjective *πολυτελής* (Matt.: *μαλακὰ ἱμάτια*) is contrasted with *κόσμιος.*—*ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει κ.τ.λ.*] Most expositors[2] refer *δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν* to *κοσμεῖν,* and take *ὃ πρέπει . . . θεοσέβειαν* as a parenthesis.[3] But there are three points against this, viz., that the ornament of the women is already named in *ἐν καταστολῇ κ.τ.λ.,* that the preposition *διά* does not suit with *κοσμεῖν* (which is construed previously with *ἐν*), and that "good works" would be unsuitably described as ornament here, where he is speaking of the conduct of the women in the assemblies of the church, unless we arbitrarily limit the general idea to offerings for the poor, as is done by Heydenreich and van Oosterzee. Theodoret rightly joins *δι' ἐργ. ἀγ.* with the immediately preceding *ἐπαγγελλ. θεοσεβ.* ("*εὐσέβειαν ἐπαγγέλλεσθε, καὶ τὴν δι' ἔργων ἀρετήν*").[4] The comma before *διά,* which is found in the editions, must therefore be deleted. [VII *d.*] Hofmann connects the words with what follows, taking *διά* in the sense of accompanying; but *διά* never has such a simple copulative meaning.[5]—The relative *ὃ* stands here either for *ἐν τούτῳ ὅ,* for which Matthies appeals, but wrongly, to Rom. vi. 21 and x. 14; or more probably for *καθ' ὅ.* So far as the meaning goes, the various reading *ὡς* (*καθώς,* Eph. v. 3) is correct. Hofmann wishes to refer *ὃ* to *κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς* in such a way that "the latter is mentioned as a thing . . . seemly for women." The intervening *ἀλλά,* however, manifestly makes this construction impossible.—*ἐπαγγελομέναις θεοσέβειαν*] *ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι* usually means in the N. T. "promise." Matthies accordingly renders the word here by "give information, show;" so, too, Luther: "who therein manifest blessedness." But it is more correct here to take the word in the sense in which *profiteri artem* is used, so that *θεοσέβεια* is regarded as an art or a handicraft. De Wette rightly says: "who make profession of blessedness;" so, too, vi. 21; comp. Xenophon, *Memor.* i. 2, 7: *ἀρετὴν ἐπαγγελλόμενος* (Ignatius, *ad Ephes.* chap. 14: *οὐδεὶς πίστιν ἐπαγγελλόμενος ἁμαρτάνει*).—*θεοσέβεια*] only here in the N. T. (LXX. Gen. xx. 11; more frequently in the Apocrypha;

[1] Clemens Alex. *Paedag.* iii. 11: *περίπλοκαι ἑταιρικαὶ τῶν τριχῶν.*

[2] Among them Wegscheider, Flatt, Heydenreich, Leo, de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, also Winer, p. 149, note 1 [E. T. p. 158, note 1].

[3] Van Oosterzee explains it as "a causal periphrasis to show why precisely *this* ornament is extolled by the apostle."

[4] So, too, Oecumenius, Luther, Calvin, etc.; and among more recent names, Maek, Matthies, and Plitt.

[5] Hofmann thus paraphrases the thought: "They are to do what is good, and to learn in still seclusion. The former is that which is to be accompanied by the latter." He appeals to 2 Cor. ii. 4. He does not prove, however, that that passage justifies such a paraphrase.

θεοσεβής, John ix. 31; LXX. Ex. xviii. 21), is equivalent to *εὐσέβεια*.—*δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν*] must not be limited to works of benevolence alone. The addition of these words is fully explained by a comparison with 2 Tim. iii. 5.[1]

Vv. 11, 12. [On Vv. 11–15, see Note VIII., pages 112, 113.] Further injunctions for women.—*γυνὴ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μανθανέτω*] *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ*, "without speaking herself;" *μανθάνειν* denotes here, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 31, attention to the word in order to learn from it what is necessary for advancing and building up the Christian life. [VIII *a*, *b*.]—*ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ*] "*in complete subordination*," *i.e.* without contradiction.—The thought here expressed is to be filled up by what Paul says in 1 Cor. xiv. 35 (which passage should be particularly compared with this[2]): *εἰ δέ τι μαθεῖν θέλουσιν, ἐν οἴκῳ τοὺς ἰδίους ἄνδρας ἐπερωτάτωσιν*.—"Spiritual receptivity and activity in domestic life were recognized as the appropriate destiny of women, and therefore the female sex was excluded from the public discussion of religious subjects" (Neander).[3] Though in Christ there is no distinction, yet Christianity does not put an end to the natural distinctions ordained by God; it recognizes them in order to inform them with its higher life.—*διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω*] *Διδ.* stands first in emphatic opposition to *μανθάνειν*; in the parallel passage (1 Cor. xiv.) *διδ.* stands instead of the more general word *λαλεῖν*.—*οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός*] Leo: "*αὐθεντεῖν* et *αὐθέντης* apud seriores tantum scriptores ita occurrit, ut *dominii* notionem involvat; melioribus scriptoribus est *αὐθέντης* idem quod *αὐτόχειρ*."[4] Luther has rightly: "that she be master of her husband;" whereas in the translation: "to assume to herself respect or mastery" (Heydenreich, de Wette, van Oosterzee), the notion of assumption is imported. Hofmann, too, is wrong when he says that *αὐθεντεῖν* in conjunction with the genitive of the person should mean: "to act independently of this person, *i.e.* as one's own master" (!).—Many expositors (Matthies, and earlier, Estius, Calovius, and others) assume in this word a reference to domestic relations; whereas Heydenreich, de Wette, Wiesinger, and others, limit even this command to behavior in the assemblies for divine worship.[5] This last is correct, as is shown by *ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ*, corresponding to *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ* in ver. 11. Yet *οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν τ. ἀνδρ.* puts the prohibition to teach under a more general point of view, and at the same time confirms it. Nor can it be denied that women are

The relation between writing and tears is obviously quite different from that between learning in stillness and good works.

[1] Calvin gives the connection with the preceding words rightly: si operibus testanda est pietas, in vestitu etiam casto apparere haec professio debet.

[2] Otto quotes the agreement of these passages with one another as a proof that the letters are contemporaneous. It is, however, to be observed that Paul himself, in the words: *ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἁγίων* (1 Cor. xi. 33), describes the maxim as one which he was seeking to establish in all the churches. Hence there is nothing strange in his urging it on Timothy's attention at a later period, just as he had urged it before on the Corinthians.

[3] *Geschichte der Pflanzung der Kirche durch die Apost.*, Part I. p. 125.

[4] See Valckenaer, *Diatr. in Eurip. rell.* chap. xviii. pp. 188 ff.; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 120.

[5] Hofmann, in opposition to these two views, maintains that the apostle here speaks of the "Christian life in general," "of all action for which there was occasion in ordinary life;" but the context gives no ground for his assertion.

not *αὐθεντεῖν τ. ἀνδρ.* in the assemblies, because in the apostle's opinion that does not beseem them at any time. The reason why not, is given in the verses that follow.—It is to be observed, further, that ver. 12 corresponds exactly with ver. 11: *γυνὴ . . . γυναικί; μανθανέτω . . . διδάσκειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω; ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ . . . οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν τοῦ ἀνδρ.; ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ . . . ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ.* This parallelism is clear proof that the same thing is spoken of in ver. 12 as in ver. 11, which Hofmann denies. Still ver. 12 is not therefore superfluous, since it both emphasizes and more precisely defines the particular ideas in ver. 11.—*ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ*] The same construction is found in 1 Cor. xiv. 34. The infinitive is dependent on a *βούλομαι* to be supplied from *οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω*—an abbreviated construction which occurs also in classic Greek.—De Wette rightly directs attention to these points, that we must not by arbitrary interpretations take away the clear definite meaning from the commands here laid down, in order to make them universal in application; and, on the other hand, that they are not to be considered as local and temporal ordinances: they are rather injunctions to be still held valid as applying to public assemblies.[1]

Ver. 13. First reason for the previous prohibition, taken from the history of the creation. [VIII *c.*]—Ver. 14. The second reason, taken from the history of the fall. Elsewhere in the Pauline Epistles we find proofs that the historical facts of the O. T. are to the apostle full of meaning as symbols of higher, universal truths. So here, the facts that Adam was first created, and that Eve, not Adam, was tempted by the serpent, are to him prototypes and proofs that it is becoming for the wife not *αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός*, but to be meekly subordinate to the husband. Hence he says: *Ἀδὰμ γὰρ πρῶτος ἐπλάσθη, εἶτα Εὔα.* · The verb *πλάσσειν* occurs in the N. T. only here and in Rom. ix. 20, both times in its original meaning. The meaning "*create*," here appropriate to the word, is, however, found in the LXX. Gen. ii. 7, from which passage the apostle here has drawn (comp. also 2 Macc. vii. 23: *ὁ πλάσας ἀνθρώπου γένεσιν*). Compare 1 Cor. xi. 2 ff., where the apostle says that the husband is *εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα Θεοῦ*, and the wife *δόξα ἀνδρός*, because the husband is not *ἐκ γυναικός*, but the wife *ἐξ ἀνδρός*. De Wette, without reason, thinks that the author of this Epistle to Timothy had that passage in mind.

Ver. 14. *καὶ Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη*] In order to justify this expression, the

[1] Compare with this apostolic expression, *Const. Apost.* iii. 6: *οὐκ ἐπιτρέπομεν γυναῖκας διδάσκειν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀλλὰ μόνον προσεύχεσθαι καὶ τῶν διδασκάλων ἐπακούειν.* Tertull. *De Virg. Vel.*: non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui, sed nec docere, nec tinguere, nec ullius virilis muneris, nedum sacerdotalis officii sortem sibi vindicare. It is curious that in the *Apost. Const.* it is permitted to women *προσεύχεσθαι* in church, while here it is granted only to men to do so. But, on the one hand, *προσευχεσθαι* in the *Constitutions* does not mean exactly prayer *aloud*; and, on the other hand, this passage here does not plainly and directly forbid *προσεύχεσθαι* to women; it only forbids distinctly *διδάσκειν* on their part.—There is the same apparent contradiction between 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35, and 1 Cor. xi. 5, 13. While in the former passage *λαλεῖν* is forbidden to women, in the latter *προσεύχεσθαι* and even *προφητεύειν* are presupposed as things done by women, and the apostle does not rebuke it.—The solution is, that Paul wishes everything in church to be done *εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν*; while, on the other hand, he holds by the principle: "*τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε*" (1 Thess. v. 19). Meyer on 1 Cor. xi. 5 differs.

expositors have sought to define it more precisely, mostly by supplying πρῶτος. So Theodoret; Tertullian, too (*De Hab. Mul.*), says, perhaps alluding to this passage: tu divinae legis prima es desertrix. Others, again, supply ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄφεως (Matthies: "As the apostle remembers the O. T. story of the fall, there comes into his thoughts the cunning serpent by which Eve, not Adam, let herself be ensnared"). De Wette thinks that the author is insisting on the notion *be charmed, betrayed* (by sinful desire), as opposed to some other motive to sin. Hofmann arbitrarily supplies with Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη the thought: "so long as he was alone."—The apparent difficulty is solved when we remember the peculiarity of allegorical interpretation, which lays stress on the definite expression as such. This here is the word ἀπατᾶν (or ἐξαπατᾶν). On this word the whole emphasis is laid, as is clearly shown by the very repetition of it. This word, however, in the Mosaic account of the fall, is used only of the woman, not of the man, for in Gen. iii. 13 the woman expressly says: ὁ ὄφις ἠπάτησέ με; the man, however, uses no such expression. And in the story there is no indication that as the woman was deceived or betrayed through the promises of the serpent, so was the man through the woman. —Adam did certainly also transgress the command, but not, as the woman, influenced by ἀπάτη. Paul, remembering this, says: Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἐξαπατηθεῖσα. Bengel: serpens mulierem decepit, mulier virum non decepit, sed ei persuasit. To supply anything whatever, only serves therefore to conceal the apostle's real meaning.—ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἐξαπατηθεῖσα ἐν παραβάσει γέγονε] This betrayal of the woman by the serpent is mentioned by Paul also in 2 Cor. xi. 3, where he employs the same word: ἐξαπατᾶν.— The emphasis, as is apparent from what precedes, is not on the last words, but on ἐξαπατηθεῖσα; hence it is not right to supply πρώτη with ἐν παρ. γεγ. Παράβασις here, as elsewhere (οὐ οὐκ ἐστι νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις, Rom. iv. 15), is used in regard to a definite law.—The construction γεγονέναι ἐν occurs frequently in the N. T. in order to denote the entrance into a certain condition, a certain existence. De Wette: "fell into transgression." Luther wrongly: "and brought in transgression."—As to the thought itself, expositors find the force of this second reason to lie in the fact that in the fall the weakness of the woman, her proneness to temptation, was manifested, and that consequently it is not seemly for the woman to have mastery over the man. But did the man resist the temptation more stoutly than the woman? Paul nowhere gives any hint of that. The significant part of the Mosaic narrative to him is rather this, that the judgment of God was passed upon the woman because she had let herself be *betrayed* by the serpent, and it is in accordance with this judgment that the husband is made lord over the wife.[1]

Ver. 15. Σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας] σωθήσεται δέ is in opposition to the previous ἐν παραβάσει γέγονε. Still this sentence is not intended merely

[1] The right interpretation of this passage does not even in appearance contradict Rom. v. 12. In the latter, Paul does not mention the woman, but the man, as the origin of sin; but then he is thinking of the man as the image of God, of the woman as the image of the man.

to moderate the judgment pronounced in ver. 14 (Matthies); after the apostle has forbidden to the woman any activity in church assemblies as unbecoming to her, he now points to the destiny assigned her by God, the fulfillment of which brings salvation to her. The subject of *σωθήσεται* is *ἡ γυνή*, to be supplied from the preceding words; but, of course, it applies collectively to the whole sex, while referring specially to Eve.[1]—*σωθήσεται* is to be taken here in the sense which it continually has in the N. T. (not then equivalent to "she will win for herself merit and reward," de Wette). Every reason to the contrary falls to the ground, if only we consider that *τεκνογονία* is regarded as the destiny assigned to the woman by God, and that to the woman *σωτηρία* is assured by it under the condition given in the words following: *ἐὰν κ.τ.λ.* It is to be noted also, that though faith is the only source of salvation, the believer must not fail in fulfilling his duties in faith, if he is to partake in the *σωτηρία*.—*διά* is taken by several expositors (also Wiesinger) in the sense of "in;"[2] but this is wrong, for either this signification "in" passes over into the signification "by means of," or it has much the same force as "notwithstanding, in spite of" (Rom. ii. 27; see Meyer on the passage); *διά*, however, cannot be used in this sense, since *τεκνογονία* would in that case have been regarded as a hindrance to the attainment of the *σωτηρία*. This militates also against Hofmann's view, "that *σώζεσθαι διά τινος* has the same meaning here as in 1 Cor iii. 15, to be saved as through something;" this explanation also makes the *τεκνογονία* appear to be something through which the woman's *σώζεσθαι* is endangered.[3]—*τεκνογονία*, a word which occurs only here in the N. T. (as also *τεκνογονέω* only in chap. v. 14, and *τεκνοτροφέω* only in chap. v. 10), can have here nothing but its etymological meaning. [VIII *d.*] Some, quite wrongly, have taken it as a term for the marriage state, and others have made it synonymous with *τεκνοτροφία*. This latter view is found in the oldest expositors.[4]—The question, how the *τεκνογονία* contributes to the *σωτηρία*, is answered by most by supplying[5] with the one or

[1] Even Theophylact declared against the curious view, that Mary is to be taken here as subject. Clearly also *Eve* cannot here be meant.

[2] Van Oosterzee translates *διά* by "by means of," and then says: "it simply indicates a *condition* in which the woman becomes a partaker of blessedness," leaving it uncertain in what relation the apostle places *τεκνογονία* to *σώζεσθαι*.

[3] Hofmann says in explanation: "If it is appointed to the woman to bear children in pain, she might succumb under such a burden of life;" but, in reply, it is to be observed that *τεκνογονία* does not mean "to bear children *with pain*."

[4] Thus Theophylact remarks, not without wit: *οὐ γεννῆσαι μόνον δεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ παιδεῦσαι· τοῦτο γὰρ ὄντως τεκνογονία, εἰ δὲ οὔ, οὐκ ἐστὶ τεκνογονία, ἀλλὰ τεκνοφθορία ἔσται ταῖς γυναιξί.*

[5] Most think of the faithful fulfillment of maternal duty in the education of children. Chrysostom: *τεκνογονίαν, φησί, τὸ μὴ μόνον τεκεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ Θεὸν ἀναγαγεῖν.*—According to Heinrichs, Paul means here to say: mulier jam hoc in mundo peccatorum poenas luit, *διὰ τῆς τεκνογ.* eo, quod cum dolore parturit, adeoque haec *τεκνογ.* eam quasi *σώζειν* putanda est, et ipsa *σώζεσθαι διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας*. The passage quoted by Heinrichs, Gen. iii. 16, does not denote the *τεκνογονία* as such, but the pains connected with it as a punishment of transgression. According to Plitt, the *τεκνογ.* serves to further the woman's *σωτηρία*; on the one hand, because by the fulfillment of her wish gratitude is aroused within her; on the other hand, because of her care for her children she is preserved from many frivolities.

the other something of which there is no hint in the words of the apostle, and by which the thought is more or less altered. This much may be granted, that Paul, by laying stress on the τεκνογονία (the occasion for which was probably the κωλύων γαμεῖν on the part of the heretics, chap. iv. 3), assigns to the woman, who has to conduct herself as passive in the assemblies, the domestic life as the sphere in which—especially in regard to the children—she has to exercise her activity (comp. v. 14).—In order not to be misunderstood, as if he had said that the τεκνογονία as a purely external fact affects σωτηρία, he adds the following words: ἐὰν μείνωσιν ἐν πίστει κ.τ.λ. The subject of μείνωσιν is the collective idea γυνή (see Winer, pp. 481, 586 [E. T. pp. 516, 631]), and not, as many older (Chrysostom and others) and later (Schleiermacher, Mack, Leo, Plitt) expositors think: "the children." This latter might indeed be supplied from τεκνογονία, but it would give a wrong idea.—It is quite arbitrary, with Heydenreich, to supply "man and wife."—Paul uses the expressions ἐν πίστει κ.τ.λ. to denote the Christian life in its various aspects. They are not to be limited to the relation of married life, πίστις denoting conjugal fidelity; ἀγάπη, conjugal love; ἁγιασμός, conjugal chastity; and σωφροσύνη, living in regular marriage. Σωφροσύνη is named along with the preceding cardinal virtues of the Christian life, because it peculiarly becomes the thoughts of a woman (comp. ver. 9), not because "a woman is apt to lose control of herself through her excitable temperament" (Hofmann). There is in the context no hint of a reference to female weakness.[1]

Notes by American Editor.

VI. Vv. 1-7.

(*a*) The connection of the particle οὖν of ver. 1, which has occasioned difficulty in the minds of some writers on this Epistle, is probably to be explained by the fact, already referred to, that the letter is an official, as well as a personal one. The official character is indicated at the beginning (i. 3), and is to be regarded as carried over to this chapter through i. 18, although the latter verse is not to be limited in its application simply to Timothy's official duties.—(*b*) Alf. regards ποιεῖσθαι as in the middle voice because of the position in the sentence, which would, he thinks, throw too much emphasis on it if taken as a passive. It would seem, however, to be the simpler construction in such a sentence to make the prayers, etc., the subject of the infinitive as a passive verb, and so R. V. and the great majority of the best comm. explain it.—(*c*) Considering the official character of the letter, it can hardly be doubted that the Apostle refers in this passage to public, not private prayers. This reference to public service and meetings of the church is apparent, also, in the closing verses of the chapter, (comp. 1 Cor. xi. 2 ff.,

[1] De Wette asserts too much when he says that this passage is in contradiction with 1 Cor. vii. 7 ff., 25 ff., 38 ff. The truth is rather that the matter is regarded from various points of view. In 1 Corinthians the apostle is delivering his judgment, while he considers the difficult position of Christians amid the hostility of the world, without for a moment denying that τεκνογονία is an ordinance of God. Here, however, he is considering only the latter point, without entering into every detail.

xiv. 34 ff.). The argument for the same reference in the intermediate verses is, accordingly, a very strong one. This especial reference to public religious service is natural in a letter which, of course, could not, in such exhortations, be intended for the individual himself who was addressed, but must be designed to guide him in his oversight of the churches. The great prominence given to prayers for kings and those in authority (*in high place*, R. V.) is doubtless to be explained in connection with the peculiarities of the age, and with the tendencies of the Pauline doctrine of Christian liberty and equality to lead some to excess, so that they became disposed to carry the application of it unduly into the sphere of civil and social relations. It may be questioned whether, in the changed condition of the present, such peculiar prominence would be given to this subject,—the exhortation to pray for magistrates being placed as the "first of all" exhortations. The peculiar necessity for such a state of mind and feeling towards the existing authorities as would induce Christians to make public supplications for them, and the evil or danger of the opposite state of mind, are indicated by the *ἵνα* clause, which gives the end in view of the exhortation.—The same thing may, no doubt, be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of the directions and statements with regard to the women, as also those respecting servants or slaves, in these and the other Epistles of Paul. Practical exhortations or rules of this character must vary in some degree, in respect to the prominence and force given to them, with the changes in circumstances and the progress of public sentiment, which are the result of the working of Christianity in the history of the world. "The political duty of men in a Christian state," says Dr. Washburn in Schaff's ed. of Lange's Comm., "cannot be the same with that of the primitive church under a Nero."—(*d*) The connection of ver. 3 with vv. 1, 2, is evidently that of a ground or reason for the fulfillment of the duty to which he exhorts them. The connection of ver. 4 with ver. 3 is that of proof or evidence that God would have all men attain salvation. The immediate connection in both verses, accordingly, is with the idea of "all men," which is suggested at the opening of ver. 1. We must believe, however, that there is a reference in the author's mind to that which he had made so prominent—the prayers for kings and persons in authority,—and that his suggestion is founded upon some hesitation on the part of many Christian believers to offer such prayers. As Dr. Plumptre says (Schaff's Pop. Com.), "Men were tempted to draw a line of demarcation in their prayers, and could hardly bring themselves to pray for a Nero or a Tigellinus. St. Paul's argument is that such prayers are acceptable with God because they coincide with that will which, though men in the exercise of the fatal gift of freedom may frustrate it, is yet itself unchangeable."—(*e*) *θέλει* of ver. 4, as distinguished from *βούλομαι*, denotes the desire or gracious will of God, what He would have, but not that purpose which will necessarily be carried out. The doctrine of an unlimited atonement is implied in this passage, but not that of universal salvation. The universality of the provision for all is set forth in different places in Paul's writings. Universality of realization of the offered blessing is not declared. It is made dependent on the action of man in accepting or rejecting the offer. Comp. iv. 10, in connection with this verse, as indicating the Apostle's view so far as it is given in this Epistle.—(*f*) The unity of God (ver. 5) is presented here, not for its own sake, but as bearing upon the statement of ver. 4. This verse, therefore, cannot properly be urged as an argument against the divinity of Christ. The fact that there is one God and one mediator is a ground of confidence that there is a common

salvation for all. The demands of the thought, accordingly, occasion the presentation of God and Christ in their separateness, rather than their oneness with each other, and also cause the setting forth of Christ as ἄνθρωπος, rather than θεός. R. V. brings out the force of the anarthrous ἄνθρ. by the words "*himself* man." The rendering of A. V., *the man Christ Jesus*, is misleading. ἄνθρ is added, apparently, as indicating the community of nature between the mediator and those for whom he acts. Comp. Heb. ii. 10 ff.—(*g*) The connection in thought between the first clause of ver. 6 and i. 15, and the "healthful teaching" spoken of in i. 10, which Huther points out, is evident, and the fact of this connection places the true construction of τὸ μαρτύριον substantially beyond doubt. μαρτύριον is the testimony which consists in the proclamation of the great truth of the gospel just mentioned, ὁ δοὺς κ.τ.λ. That the writer's thought moves on without any break of connection from i. 3 to this point, is shown by the striking correspondence between vv. 6, 7, and the verses of chap. i. which have just been referred to. The want of logical connection which de Wette and some others find in οὖν of ver. 1 cannot, therefore, have been apparent to, or intended by, the writer.—(*h*) In Matt. xx. 28, Mk. x. 45, we find the expression λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, with the words δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. These passages show that the reference here is to Christ's giving up His life. It is worthy of notice that the preposition ἀντί occurs, in such phrases, only in the two cited verses of Matt. and Mk. Elsewhere the prep. is either ὑπέρ, as here, or περί. The force of ἀντί is here, however, possibly suggested by the compound ἀντίλυτρον.—(*i*) The introduction of the words ἀλήθειαν λέγω, οὐ ψεύδομαι (ver. 7) must be regarded as intended for the church and other readers, rather than Timothy himself. The tendency to the repetition of expressions such as make up this verse—independently of these particular words,—which we observe in this Epistle, must be admitted to be singular; but it cannot be urged as a very weighty argument against the Pauline authorship, when it is remembered that the Apostle was always disposed to speak of himself and his own experiences; that he had now for years seen errors developing, and assaults of different kinds made upon the doctrine which he preached; and that he was moving onward, at this time, into his later life. Instances of an increasing tendency of this character among prominent men of our own day, who are not far from the age of the Apostle when he wrote this letter, could be easily pointed out.

VII. Vv. 8–10.

(*a*) βούλομαι is regarded by Huther as equivalent to "I ordain." It expresses more than θέλω and seems to carry with it here, and in Tit. iii. 8, the force of παραγγέλλω, which we find in other Epistles. Holtzm. (Tit. iii. 8) says it is an expression of apostolic authority, which is not connected with the word as used by Paul in his undoubtedly genuine writings.—(*b*) The position of προσεύχεσθαι in the sentence is, probably, due to the connection (οὖν) with the idea of prayer as presented in ver. 1. The contrast of τοὺς ἄνδρας with γυναῖκας (ver. 9), together with what is said respecting women in vv. 11 ff., makes it probable that a certain emphasis was, also, intended to be placed on τοὺς ἄνδρας, so that, in ver. 9, κοσμεῖν alone, and not this verb in connection with προσεύχεσθαι, is the object of βούλομαι as related to that verse. In the modifying participial clause, *lifting up holy hands*, etc., the word ὁσίους is the one on which the emphasis is to be placed, and then the words χωρὶς κ.τ.λ. are added in further explanation. On διαλογισμῶν comp.

note by Am. Ed. on Phil. ii. 14.—(*c*) Ell. agrees with de W. and some others in making *καταστολῇ* of ver. 9 substantially, though Ell. says not exactly, equivalent to *καταστήματι* of Tit. ii. 3. He would translate here *in seemly guise*—the prevailing idea here being, as he suggests in his note on Tit. ii. 3, "outward deportment as enhanced by what is purely external, dress, etc.," while in Tit. it is "outward deportment as dependent on something more internal, e. g. manner, gesture, etc." L. & S., Grimm, Rob., Alf., Fairb., Plumptre, R. V., and others agree with Huther, and this view seems, on the whole, the best. Holtzm. gives both views, but apparently is disposed to favor that of Huther. He calls attention to the fact that the suggestions of the verse have reference to the meetings of the church for worship, and adds that there is no prohibition of all adornment of dress on the part of women on other occasions.—(*d*) The view of Huther, that *δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν* is to be taken as qualifying *ἐπαγγελλομέναις*, is not favored by most commentators. The objections which he urges are certainly worthy of serious consideration; but the use of *ὅ*, in such a sentence, for *ἐν τούτῳ ὅ* or for *καθ' ὅ* seems quite improbable, and the natural contrast would appear to be between one kind of adornment (*μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν κ.τ.λ.*) and another (*δι' ἐργ. ἀγ.*). The reference of the sentence is to public assemblies, but this does not seem necessarily, as Huther apparently supposes, to limit the *ἐργ. ἀγ.* to offerings for the poor, *i. e.* things done in the meetings. The women are to appear in the meetings with the adornment, not of dress, but of their general good works.

VIII. Vv. 11–15.

(*a*) The views of Paul with reference to the speaking of women in the public assemblies are found expressed in 1 Cor. xi. 2 f., xiv. 34 ff., and in this passage. In 1 Cor. xi., there is but little on the subject, but, as the thing which the Apostle disapproves of is praying and prophesying by the women without a veil, it seems not improbable that such prophesying or prayer, provided the veil is worn, is, under some circumstances, allowed. In 1 Cor. xiv., there is a more full statement, and one which corresponds very closely with that which is contained in these verses. The phrase *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ* here is equivalent to *σιγάτωσαν* of 1 Cor. xiv. 34; *λαλεῖν* of that verse is substantially equivalent to *διδάσκειν* of this; while the words *μανθάνειν*, *ὑποτάσσεσθαι* or its kindred noun, and *ἐπιτρέπω* are used in both alike. The grounds of the prohibition, etc., however, are somewhat different in the two cases. The two grounds here given are, (1) the fact that the man was created before the woman, (2) that the woman fell into transgression through being deceived. The first of these points is suggested, in a slightly different form of expression, in 1 Cor. xi. 8, 9, but neither of them appears in 1 Cor. xiv. In that passage, on the other hand, the reason given why the woman should not speak is, that it is *αἰσχρόν* for her to do so, and the reason for her subjection is, that the law requires it. As to the matter of speaking, the objection, in both 1 Cor. xi. and xiv., seems to lie more exclusively in the region of propriety and what is becoming. Here, it is connected with arguments derived from the story of Adam and Eve.—(*b*) If the expressions of the Apostle are interpreted naturally, and according to legitimate rules of interpretation, there would seem to be no question as to what his views were;—namely, that, in the condition of things in the particular churches to which he was writing, at least, (or in all the churches of his time, perhaps, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 16, xiv. 36), the speaking or teaching of women in the church meetings should

not be permitted. A possible exception is, perhaps, made in 1 Cor. xi., in case a woman was inspired by the gift of prophecy. Even then, however, she was to have a symbol of subordination on her head.—(*c*) The arguments which are set forth in the passage in the epistle before us are not such as would, probably, be brought forward by writers at the present time, and the *αἰσχρότης*, or indecency, of such an act on the part of a woman would not be felt by the ordinary Christian mind of to-day as keenly, as the Apostle apparently felt it at that time. The change is, doubtless, owing to the influence which Christianity has had upon the condition of woman, and upon the estimate placed by man upon her. As to the perpetual force of the prohibition here given, it will depend, in part at least, on the question how far, in practical matters of this character, directions are to be looked for in the Scriptures, or indeed are possible, which shall be equally adapted to all circumstances—even to opposite conditions.—(*d*) The reference of *τῆς τεκνογονίας* (ver. 15) to "the relation in which woman stood to the Messiah"—*the child bearing*—which Ell. favors, and which is also advocated by Hammond and Words., and adopted by the English Revisers in the text of R. V., is rejected by other comm., and even passed, almost or altogether, without notice by some of high authority. Alf. says, it is "a rendering which needs no refutation." Plumptre, with somewhat less positiveness, says, "It is scarcely credible that St. Paul, if he meant this, would have expressed it so obscurely." Huther, de W., Holtz., and others, make only the slightest allusion to it. A. R. V., on the other hand, while not allowing it a place in the text, inserts it in the margin. The position taken by the American Revisers is, perhaps, to be accepted, but the explanation given by Huther as to this and the other words of this verse is, more probably, the correct one.

CHAPTER III.

VER. 1. *πιστός*] Instead of this, D has *ἀνθρώπινος*, and some Latin Fathers have humanus. "Haec lectio vetustior est Hieronymo. Quod si vero vetustior Hieronymo, vetustior quoque est nostris codicibus omnibus. Nemo tamen ita temerarius est, ut eam probaret," Matthaei.—Ver. 2. Instead of *νηφάλεον*, Griesb., following the weightiest authorities, accepted the form *νηφάλιον*; so, too, Scholz, Matthaei, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch.—Ver. 3. The words *μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ* are left out in A D F G 5, 6, 17, *al.*, Syr. Arr. Copt. etc. Griesb. is right, therefore, in striking them out; they were probably interpolated from Tit. i. 7. De Wette's suggestion, that they may have been omitted intentionally as superfluous, since *ἀφιλάργυρον* follows, is very improbable; comp. Reiche, *Comment. crit.* on this passage.—Ver. 4. For *προϊστάμενον*, ℵ has the form *προιστανόμενον*, occurring only in later authors.—Ver. 6. Several cursives have the reading *καὶ παγίδα* after *διαβόλου*, which, however, is manifestly taken from the next verse.—Ver. 7. *δεῖ δὲ αὐτόν*] So Griesb. and Scholz, following the *Rec.*; Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. left out *αὐτόν*, because it is not found in A F G H 17, Copt. Boern.; in Matthaei it stands without dispute. The insertion is more easily explained than the omission.—Ver. 9. For *ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει*, ℵ has the singular reading: *καὶ καθαρᾶς συνειδήσεως*—which can only be explained from an oversight occasioned by the genitive before.—Ver. 14. *τάχιον*] Lachm. and Buttm. read *ἐν τάχει*, following A C D* 17, 71, 73, *al.* (*ταχεῖον* and *ταχέως* are also found). The *Rec.*, which has the testimony of D*** F G K L, *al.*, Chr. Theodoret, *al.*, and is retained by Tisch., is the more difficult reading; besides, in the other passages of the N. T. where the word occurs, the comparative form can be easily explained; *ἐν τάχει* seems to be an explanatory correction.—In ver. 15, D* Arm. Vulg. Clar. Or. Ambrosiast. have *σε* inserted after *δεῖ*.—Ver. 16. For the *Rec.* *Θεός*, the most important authorities have the reading *ὅς*, as A C F G[1] ℵ 17, 73, 181. Further, the Copt. Sahid. and Gothic versions, also the Syr. Erp. Aeth. Arm., have the relative. Orig., Theod. Mops., Epiph., Cyr., Al., Jerome, Eutherius, beyond doubt, found the latter reading in their MSS.; with several others it is at least probable. The *Rec.* *Θεός* is found, on the other hand, in D*** K L, in nearly all cursives, in the edd. Arab. p. Slav. MS., and besides in Greg. Nyss. (who seems once, however, to have read *ὅς*) Chrys. Theodoret, Didym. (*De Trinitate*, p. 83) Damasc. Oecum. Theophyl. In Ignatius (*Ep. ad Ephes.* ℣ 19) we find *Θεὸς ἀνθρωπίνως φανερούμενος*; in the *Apost. constitt.*: *Θεὸς κύριε ὁ ἐπιφανεὶς ἡμῖν ἐν σαρκί*; in Hippol.: *Θεὸς ἐν σώματι ἐφανερώθη*, in Gregor. Thaum. (see pot. Apollin. in Photius): *Θεὸς ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς*—all which passages seem to testify in favor of *Θεός*.—In the MS. gr. D* is found the reading *ὃ*. The It. and Vulg. have: mysterium s. sacramentum, quod manifes-

[1] On the point that in A and C there was originally written not ΘΣ but ΟΣ, comp Griesb. in *Symb crit.* vol. I. pp viii.–liv, and vol II. pp. 56–76; further, Tisch. *Proleqq. ad Cod Ephr.* sec. vii. p. 39, excursus on 1 Tim iii. 16.

tatum est, and in this they are followed by the Latin Fathers, excepting Jerome himself. This translation does not, however, point necessarily to the reading ὅ; it might also be taken from ὅς, which was referred to μυστήριον. Till Wetstein, the reading ὅς was generally held to be the right one,—later also by Matthaei, Tittm. Scholz, Hahn, Heydenr, Linck, Mack: the reading ὅ is specially defended by Wetstein and Schulthess. Almost all later critics and expositors, both on external and internal grounds, have rightly preferred the reading ὅς, which is accepted also by Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. Comp. the thorough investigation by Reiche, *Comment. crit.* ii., on the passage.

Ver. 1. [On Vv. 1–7, see Note IX. pages 133–135.] After speaking of the behavior of men and women in the church-assemblies, Paul goes on to give instructions regarding the proper qualifications of office-bearers in the church. He begins emphatically with the introductory words: πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, which here, as in i. 15, do not refer to what precedes (Chrysostom, Erasmus, and others), but to what follows. [IX *a.*]—εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται] Since ἐπισκοπή corresponds with ἐπίσκοπος in ver. 2, the word does not denote here generally "the office of one who is set over others" (Hofmann), but specially "*the office of a bishop;*" for only in this way can the inferences in vv. 2 f. be drawn from what is said here. Why the previous words πιστὸς ὁ λόγος should not be in agreement with this, we cannot understand.—Ἐπισκοπή has a similar meaning in Acts i. 20, where it denotes the office of apostle; comp. Meyer on the passage. In the N. T. the word usually means "the visitation."—ὀρέγεται does not necessarily imply here, as de Wette thinks, the notion of ambitious striving; comp. Heb. xi. 16.—The ground of the ὀρέγεσθαι *may* indeed be ambition, but it may also be the zeal of faith and love. The apostle does not blame the ὀρέγεσθαι in itself; he merely asks us to consider that the ἐπισκοπή is a καλὸν ἔργον, and that not every one therefore may assume it.—καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ] Leo and others take ἔργον here in the sense of τί; but it seems more correct to hold by the meaning: "work, business" (Luther, Matthies, de Wette, Wiesinger, Hofmann, and others); comp. 2 Tim. iv. 5; ἔργον ποίησον εὐαγγελιστοῦ; 1 Thess. v. 13, where the church is exhorted διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν to the love of the προϊστάμενοι. It is, however, very doubtful to say the least, that the word is chosen to lay stress on the thought that the ἐπισκοπή is an office of *work* and not of enjoyment (Jerome: "opus non dignitatem, non delicias;" Bengel: "negotium, non otium").—καλοῦ, see i. 18; 2 Tim. iv. 7.

Ver. 2. Δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι κ.τ.λ.] τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, as a name for the superintendent of the congregation, only occurs in the Pastoral Epistles (here and at Tit. i. 7), and in Acts xx. 28; Phil. i. 1 (the verb ἐπισκοπεῖν is found in 1 Pet. v. 2). There can be no doubt that in the N. T. the ἐπίσκοποι and the πρεσβύτεροι denote the same persons. [IX *b.*] The question why these different names should be given to the same persons has been differently answered.

REMARK.—Baur supposes that every single town had originally *one* superintendent, who in his relation to the congregation was called ἐπίσκοπος, but that

when several *ἐπίσκοποι* over single congregations were taken together, they were for the most part designated by the co-ordinate name of *πρεσβύτεροι*. He finds the chief support for his opinion in the passages, Tit. i. 5: *ἵνα καταστήσῃς κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους*, and Acts xiv. 23: *χειροτονήσαντες . . . πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν*; but the form of expression here used does not necessarily imply that every single town (or congregation) received or was to receive only *one* presbyter. Since *κατὰ πόλιν* (*ἐκκλησίαν*) means: by cities, *i. e.* in every city, and the plural (*πρεσβυτέρους*) is herewith joined with it, it *may* be taken in Baur's sense, but it may also be as well taken to mean that the plural refers to each single city. The passage in Acts xv. 21, to which Baur appeals, proves nothing for his view, since it is well known that there were several synagogues in each city of the Jewish country.—According to the view of Kist,[1] the Christians in any one place formed originally several house-congregations, each of which had its particular superintendent. The college of presbyters then consisted of the superintendents of those house-congregations in one city, which, taken together, were regarded as *a* congregation. The passage in Epiphanius, *Haer.* lxix. 1,[2] shows that in later times such an arrangement did exist; but there is no passage in the N. T. to prove that that was the original arrangement. In the N. T. the presbyters are always named as the superintendents of one congregation, and there is nowhere any hint that each house-congregation had its special superintendent. Even when James (v. 14) enjoins that a sick man is to summon *τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας*,—and not the presbyter of the house-congregation of which he was a member,—his words are clearly against Kist's view.—The most probable theory is, that originally the superintendents of the single congregations—according to the analogy of Jewish custom—bore the name of *πρεσβύτεροι*, but, that, in so far as they were *ἐπισκοποῦντες* in reference to the congregation, they were called *ἐπίσκοποι*; comp. Acts. xx. 17 and 28.—There are, however, two striking facts to be noticed. In the first place, Paul in his epistles (the Pastoral Epistles excepted) makes use of the word *ἐπίσκοπος only* in Phil. i. 1, and of the word *πρεσβύτεροι* not at all. Nay, he almost never mentions the superintendents of the congregation except in Eph. iv. 11, where he calls them *ποιμένες καὶ διδάσκαλοι*, and 1 Thess. v. 12, where he mentions them as *προϊστάμενοι ὑμῶν* (comp. also Rom. xii. 8: *ὁ προϊστάμενος*); comp., however, the passages quoted above from Acts. From this it is clear that at first his attention was directed to the congregation only in its indivisible unity, and only by degrees does he give more prominence to its leaders. We cannot, however, conclude from this, either that the congregations in the earlier period had no leaders, for it lay in the very nature of a congregation to have some kind of leading; or that the Pastoral Epistles were not written by Paul, for why in the later period of his career should circumstances not so have shaped themselves that he thought it necessary to give the leaders more prominence?—The second striking fact is, that both in this passage and in Tit. i. 7 the singular *ἐπίσκοπος* and not the plural *ἐπίσκοποι* is used, though in the latter passage the plural *πρεσβύτεροι* immediately precedes, and here at ver. 8 we have the plural *διάκονοι* (comp. also v. 17: *οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι*). Is there any reason for this in the nature of the episcopate? The fact certainly might be interpreted to favor

[1] Illgen's *Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol.* II. 2, pp. 47 ff.

[2] Ὅσαι ἐκκλησίαι τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ὑπὸ ἕνα ἀρχιεπίσκοπον οὖσαι, καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν ταύταις ἐπιτεταγμένοι εἰσὶ πρεσβύτεροι διὰ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς χρείας τῶν οἰκητόρων

Kist's view; but it may more simply and naturally be explained from the fact that both times a τις precedes, and this almost by necessity compels the use of the plural after it.

Οὖν] is not simply a particle of transition. From the fact that the ἐπισκοπή is a καλὸν ἔργον, the apostle deduces the necessity of a blameless character on the part of the ἐπίσκοπος; Bengel: bonum negotium bonis committendum.—ἀνεπίληπτον εἶναι] In enumerating the qualities which an ἐπίσκοπος must possess, the apostle begins appropriately with a general idea; so also Tit. i. 7: ἀνεπίληπτος, equivalent to μὴ παρέχων κατηγορίας ἀφορμήν, Schol. Thucyd. v. 17. It is important that they who stand at the head of the church should lead an irreproachable life in the opinion both of Christians and of non-Christians.—μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνδρα] [IX c.] This expression cannot here be properly referred to polygamy; for, although polygamy might at that time be still found among the civilized heathen, and even among the Jews,[1] it was as a rare exception. Besides, there is an argument against such an interpretation in the phrase ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή, v. 9; for similarly such a phrase ought to refer to polyandry, which absolutely never occurred.—Most recent expositors[2] take the expression as referring to a second marriage after the death of the first wife. Heydenreich quotes many testimonies from the earlier Fathers to justify this view. The results which these give are the following: *Firstly*, Many held marriage after the death of the first wife to be something immoral. Athenagoras[3] calls second marriage a εὐπρεπὴς μοιχεία; and Tertullian repudiates it utterly, as do the Montanists. *Secondly*, This was, however, by no means the view that generally prevailed. It had many decided opponents, but even opponents of the view regard[4] abstinence from a second marriage as something praiseworthy, nay, meritorious. Hermas[5] and the later Fathers, as Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Cyril, all write in this strain.—Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, iii. p. 461) says, that he who marries a second time does not commit sin.[6] *Thirdly*, As to those who held office in the church, it was a general principle that they should not marry a second time. The proof of this is the objection which Tertullian puts in the mouth of his opponents against his condemnation of second marriages: adeo, inquiunt, permisit Apostolus iterare connubium, ut solos qui sunt in Clero, monogamiae jugo adstrinxerit (*de Monogamia*, chap. 12). Origen's words are in complete accordance with this: ab ecclesiasticis dignitatibus non solum fornicatio, sed et nuptiae repellunt; neque enim episcopus, nec presbyter, nec diaconus, nec vidua possunt esse digami.—On the other

[1] Comp. Justin Martyr, *Dialog. c. Tryph.*; Chrysostom on the passage; Josephus, *Antiq.* vii. 2.

[2] Leo, Mack, de Wette, Heydenreich, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt.

[3] *Leg. pro Christo*, p. 37, edit. Colon.

[4] Still there are exceptions, such as Theodore of Mopsuestia, who shows his freedom of thought in arguing most decidedly against this view; see Theodori ep. Mops. in N. T. commentarium, quae reperiri potuerunt; ed. O. F. Fritzsche, pp. 150–152.

[5] *Past. mandat.* iv. chap. iv: dic, Domine, si vir vel mulier alicujus discesserit et nupserit aliquis eorum, num quid peccat? Qui nubit, non peccat; sed si per se manserit, magnum sibi conquirit honorem apud Dominum.

[6] οὐ γὰρ κεκώλυται πρὸς τοῦ νόμου· οὐ πληροῖ δὲ τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πολιτείας τὴν κατ' ἐπίτασιν τελειότητα.

hand, there is a weighty counter-argument in the fact that the earlier expositors of the Pastoral Epistles (Theodoret, Theophylact, Jerome, Oecumenius) do not share in this view,[1] though the practice prevailing in their day must have made the interpretation to them an obvious one. Besides, nowhere else in the N. T. is there the slightest trace of any ordinance against second marriages; nay, in Rom. vii. 2, 3, and also in 1 Cor. vii. 39, Paul declares widows to be perfectly free to marry again; in 1 Cor. vii. 8, he even places widows and virgins on the same level; and in this epistle, v. 14, he says: *βούλομαι νεωτέρας (χήρας) γαμεῖν.* It would certainly be more than strange if the apostle should *urge* the younger widows to a step which would hinder them later in life from being received into the class of church-widows (see on chap. v. 9).—Appeal has been made to the facts that the *nuptiae secundae* were held to be unseemly for women even among the heathen[2]; but it is to be observed, on the other hand, that it was considered in no way objectionable for a *man* to marry again *after the death of his wife*, and that there exists no trace of the opposite principle. (There is no ground for Heydenreich's opinion, that the priests highest in rank, *e. g.* the Pontifex Maximus, could only be married once.) Hence, neither Christians nor non-Christians could be offended if the presbyters of the churches were married a second time, and Paul would have laid down a maxim which in his day had never been heard of. The undecided opposition to second marriages appeared among the Christians only in the post-apostolic age, when asceticism was already taking a non-Pauline direction, and was therefore inclined to give its own interpretation to the apostle's words. Besides, the expression here, as also in Tit. i. 6, stands in the midst of others, which denote qualities to be possessed not only by the bishop, but also by every Christian as such. Accordingly, there is good ground for taking the disputed expression simply as opposed to an immoral life, especially to concubinage. What he says then is, that a bishop is to be a man who neither lives nor has lived in sexual intercourse with any other woman than the one to whom he is married (Matthies, Hofmann[3]). Thus interpreted, the apostle's injunction is amply justified, not only in itself, but also in regard to the extraordinary laxness of living in his day, and it is in full harmony with the other injunctions. The expression under discussion might also be possibly referred to successive polygamy, *i. e.* to the re-marriage of *divorced* persons, but its terms are too general to make such a reference certain.[4]—*νηφάλιον*] only

[1] Chrysostom places the two views together: *οὐ νομοθετῶν τοῦτο φησίν, ὡς μὴ εἶναι ἐξὸν ἄνευ τούτου (γυναικός) γίνεσθαι· ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀμετρίαν κωλύων, ἐπειδὴ ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐξῆν, καὶ δευτέροις ὁμιλεῖν γάμοις, καὶ δύο ἔχειν κατὰ ταὐτὸν γυναῖκας.*

[2] Comp. Rein, *Das römische Privatrecht*, pp. 211, 212, and the Latin word *univira*.

[3] Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 421) says: "The injunction is, that the husband have no other wives in addition to his own wife, and the widow (chap. v. 9) no other husbands in addition to her own husband." So also in his comment. on Tit. i. 6.

[4] As a matter of course, Paul did not, as Carlstadt thought, mean in these words to command the bishop to marry; but, on the other hand, there is at bottom a presupposition that it is better for a bishop to be married than to be unmarried (see vv. 4, 5).—We should note also as an exegetical curiosity, that some Catholic expositors, in the interests

here and in ver. 11 (Tit. ii. 2). In its proper meaning it is equivalent to *μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέχοντα*, ver. 8; but it is also used in a kindred sense (like the Latin *sobrius*) to denote one who is not enchanted nor intoxicated by any fleshly passion. It is used, therefore, of sobriety of spirit. This is the meaning of the word here, where it is joined immediately with *σώφρονα*, and where the original sense follows in the word *πάροινος*, ver. 3. Even the root-word *νήφω* occurs in the N. T. only in the figurative sense, as in 1 Thess. v. 6, 8, where it is joined with *γρηγορεῖν*, and stands in opposition to the spiritual *καθεύδειν* and *μεθύειν*; and in 1 Pet. iv. 7, where it is also connected with *σωφρονεῖν*.—*σώφρονα, κόσμιον*] see ii. 9.—Bengel: quod *σώφρων* est intus, id *κόσμιος* est extra. Theodoret: *κόσμιος· καὶ φθέγματι καὶ σχήματι καὶ βλέμματι καὶ βαδίσματι ὥστε καὶ διὰ τοῦ σώματος φαίνεσθαι τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς σωφροσύνην.*—*φιλόξενον*] in special reference to strangers who were Christian brethren; comp. 1 Pet. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 2; Rom. xii. 13.—*διδακτικόν*] "able to teach" (Luther); "*good at teaching*" (van Oosterzee). *Διδακτικός* is one who possesses everything that fits him for teaching, including also the inclination (Plitt: "inclined to teach") or the "willingness" (Hofmann). Hofmann is wrong in specializing it into "a *moral* quality." That is justified neither by the etymology of the word (comp. the similarly-formed *πρακτικός, γραφικός*, etc.) nor by the position in which it stands here or in 2 Tim. ii. 24. The word is found elsewhere only in Philo, *De Praem. et Virt.* 4, not in classic Greek. Though the public address in the congregation (both that of the *διδασκαλία* and that of the *προφητεία*, 1 Cor. xii.–xiv.) was permitted to every one to whom the Holy Spirit had imparted the *χάρισμα*, still the *ἐπίσκοπος* in particular had to know how to handle doctrine, in instructing the catechumens, in building up the faith of the church, and in refuting heretics (see Tit. i. 9); hence Paul, in Eph. iv. 11, calls the *ποίμενες* of the church, *διδάσκαλοι*.

Ver. 3. The positive characteristics are now followed by two that are negative (or three, according to the *Rec.*): *μὴ πάροινον*] This word occurs only here and in Tit. i. 7. Though it is used (comp. *παροινέω*, LXX. Isa. xli. 12) also in the wider sense, as equivalent to *contumeliosus* (Josephus, *Antiq.* vi. 10, where it stands opposed to the word *σωφρονεῖν*), yet there is here no sufficient ground for departing from its original sense. It is true that, as Bengel indicates, the *ἀλλ' ἐπιεικῆ* afterwards seems to be in favor of the wider meaning here, without special reference to drunkenness; but the contrast is the same in the other case, if we only remember that *πάροινος* does not mean simply "drunken" but "impudent, arrogant in intoxication."[1]—*μὴ πλήκτην*] This word also may be taken in a narrower and a wider sense. Here, as in Tit. i. 7, it denotes the passionate man who is inclined to come to blows at once over anything. With these two ideas there are three placed in contrast: not, however, in exact correspondence, for in

of celibacy, have explained the word *γυνή* of the church.—The strange opinion of Bretschneider, that *μιᾶς* is here the indefinite article, and that Paul meant a bishop should be married, hardly needed the elaborate refutation which is accorded to it by Winer, pp. 111 f. [E. T. p. 117 f].

[1] Comp. Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, 981, where the scholiast explains it *μέθυσος καὶ ὑβριστής*; see Pape on the word.

that case the reading of the *Rec.*, *μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ*, would be indispensable, and for this reading there is too little testimony; but in such a way that the conduct denoted in the one case is opposed to that in the other.—*ἀλλ' ἐπιεικῆ, ἄμαχον, ἀφιλάργυρον*] In Tit. iii. 2, as here, the first two expressions stand together. *Ἄμαχος* does not occur elsewhere in the N. T. *Ἐπιεικής* does not mean "yielding," for it does not come from *εἴκω*, but from *εἰκός* (*εἰκα*).—The nearest meaning is "beseeming." As used, however, it has mostly the sense of moderateness and gentleness (in Plutarch, *Pyrrh.* 23.—*ἐπιεικῶς* is used along with *πρᾴως*). Luther rightly: "*mild.*" *Ἄμαχος* is equivalent to peaceful; Luther: "not quarrelsome."—*ἀφιλάργυρον* (only here and in Heb. xiii. 5; *φιλάργυρος*, 2 Tim. iii. 2 and Luke xvi. 14; the substantive *φιλαργυρία*, 1 Tim. vi. 10) lays stress on a point of which no hint was given before. It is joined with *ἄμαχος*, since avarice necessarily brings strife with it.

Ver. 4. In the second verse, the apostle touched on the subject of marriage-life; here, he directs how the bishop is to conduct himself in his own house.—*τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον*] Though *ἴδιος* is used at times in the N. T. instead of the simple possessive pronoun, it is here emphatic, in contrast with *ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ*, ver. 5.—*οἶκος* here, as elsewhere, denotes the entire household, including slaves. It is above all important that he should act properly in regard to the children; hence the apostle adds: *τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος*] [IX *d.*] From a comparison with the corresponding passage in Tit. i. 6, it is clear that he is speaking here, not of the father's disposition, but of that of the children (in opposition to Hofmann). The *ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ* corresponds in sense with *μὴ . . . ἀνυπότακτα* in the other passage, and in construction with *ἔχοντα . . . μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας*. The bishop is to preside over his house in such a way that the children shall not be wanting in submissiveness. The words *μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος* are to be connected with what immediately precedes, and not with *προϊστάμενον* (Hofmann). If it be right to refer them to the fathers (Heydenrich, Matthies, van Oosterzee), *ἔχειν* must be explained as equivalent either to *tenere* (Matthies: "holding the children in obedience") or to *κατέχειν* (van Oosterzee). That, however, is arbitrary; besides, the parallel passage in Tit. i. 6, where *ἀσωτία* is the opposite of *σεμνότης*, is against it. Leo, Mack, de Wette, Wiesinger, are right therefore in referring the words to the children. The idea of *σεμνότης* does not forbid this reference, if only we avoid thinking of little children; comp., by way of contrast, the conduct of the children of the high priest Eli, in the O. T.

Ver. 5 in a parenthesis gives the reason why a bishop ought to know how to govern his house properly.—*εἰ δέ τις τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου προστῆναι οὐκ οἶδε*] *δέ* shows that the confirmatory clause is adversative; the conclusion is made *a minori ad majus*. Bengel: plus est regere ecclesiam, quam familiam.[1]—*πῶς ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ ἐπιμελήσεται*] The contrast here made becomes still more forcible when it is observed that in ver. 15 Paul calls the

[1] Theodoret: *ὁ τὰ σμικρὰ οἰκονομεῖν οὐκ εἰδὼς, πῶς δύναται τῶν κρειττόνων καὶ θείων πιστευθῆναι τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν.*

ἐκκλησία the οἶκος Θεοῦ.—ἐπιμελήσεται] The future here, as often with the Greeks, expresses the capability; see Bernhardy's *Syntax*, p. 377. The verb ἐπιμελέομαι has not only the more general meaning of "take care of something" (Luke x. 34, 35), but also more definitely, "fill an office, be overseer over something," in which sense it is used here.—For a right understanding of the connection of this verse with what precedes, it is to be observed that the first requisite for a successful superintendence is obedience (ὑποταγή) from the church towards its superintendent. It is the bishop's duty so to conduct himself that the members of the church may be obedient to him, not as servants to a master, but as children to a father, that they may show him obedience in love.

Ver. 6. Μὴ νεόφυτον] depending on δεῖ . . . εἶναι in ver. 2, is attached to the previous accusatives, ver. 5 being a parenthesis. Νεόφυτος is rightly explained by Chrysostom: οὐ τὸν νεώτερον ἐνταῦθα λέγει, ἀλλὰ τὸν νεοκατήχητον; comp. 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7. Heinrichs is wrong if he thinks that, on account of what follows, the explanation rejected by Chrysostom is really the right one; for the rapid promotion to the episcopate of one newly admitted into the church, might easily have consequences to be dreaded by the apostle.—The reason why a "novice" (Luther) should not be bishop is given in the words that follow: ἵνα μὴ τυφωθεὶς εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου. Τυφωθείς: [IX *e.*] "*lest he being beclouded with conceit* (*of foolish pride*)." The verb (which occurs only here and in vi. 4 and 2 Tim. iii. 4) comes from τῦφος, which in the figurative sense especially denotes darkness, as beclouding man's mind so that he does not know himself, so that the consciousness of his own weakness is hidden from him; in 2 Tim. iii. 4 it is appropriately joined with μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος (comp. Athenaeus, vi. 238*d*). Τυφωθείς describes the conduct of the νεόφυτος which brings on him the κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου.—εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου] Nearly all expositors take ὁ διάβολος here and in ver. 7 to be the devil. Some, again, explain it as "the libellous fellow."[1] Against this latter view, however, there are three decisive arguments—(1) According to the constant usage of the N. T., the substantive ὁ διάβολος always denotes the devil (it is otherwise in the LXX., but only in Esth. vii. 4, viii. 1).[2] (2) The singular has the definite article, which seems to mark out one definite individual, for the collective use of the singular can always be inferred from the context (as in Matt. xii. 35; Rom. xiv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 18; Jas. ii. 6; this, indeed, is less the case in Jas. v. 6); besides, here the idea of "libeller" is too indefinite for the train of thought; hence Hofmann is forced to define it arbitrarily: "whoever makes it his business to speak evil *of Christianity*." (3) If, in the expression ἡ τοῦ διαβόλου παγίς, at 2 Tim. ii. 26, τοῦ διαβόλου cannot mean anything else than the devil, it is arbitrary to render it otherwise when used in the same expression at ver. 7.—κρίμα is not equivalent to "charge, accusation" (Matthies), but "*the judgment*," especially "the judgment of

[1] Mosheim, Wegscheider, Hofmann; Luther: "the slanderer."

[2] Paul uses the word only here and in ver. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 26; Eph. iv. 17, vi. 11. In 2 Tim. ii. 26 and in Eph. vi. 11, even Hofmann takes it to be the devil; but, on the other hand, both here and in Eph. iv. 17 he takes it to be the human slanderer.

condemnation."—*τοῦ διαβόλου* is mostly (even by Wiesinger and van Oosterzee) taken to be the *genitivus objecti* (comp. especially Rev. xvii. 1), equivalent to "the judgment which is executed on the devil" (van Oosterzee), because *κρίνειν* is not the devil's business; Bengel: diabolus potest opprobrium inferre (ver. 7), judicium inferre non potest, non enim judicat, sed judicatur.[1] But the notion that the devil is delivered to condemnation because of self-conceit, cannot be scripturally proved. For this reason, and also because *τοῦ διαβόλου* in ver. 7 is manifestly the subjective genitive, it is preferable to take it in the same way here (so, too, Plitt).[2] Of course the *κρίμα* of the devil cannot mean a trial which the devil holds, but the judgment which serves to give him foundation for accusing man with God (comp. the name for the devil, *κατήγωρ*, in Rev. xii. 10).[3]

Ver. 7. *Δεῖ δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν*] *Δεῖ δέ* (which does not present something opposed to ver. 6) adds a *new* requirement to those already given in vv. 2–6, a requirement needed for the sake of those who are not Christians. Thus *δεῖ* here becomes connected with the *δεῖ* in ver. 2.—*μαρτυρία* occurs in the Pauline Epistles only here and in Tit. i. 13.—*ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν*] *οἱ ἐξωθεν* (for which Paul commonly uses *οἱ ἔξω*) are those outside the church; *ἀπό* is equivalent not to "among," but to "*from*;" the testimony comes from those who are not Christians. In the choice of a bishop, care is to be taken that he is a man who has led an irreproachable life even in the eyes of those who are not Christians. The reason is added just as in ver. 6: *ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν ἐμπέσῃ καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου*] *ὀνειδισμόν* may be taken absolutely (Wiesinger, Plitt), or joined with *τοῦ διαβ.* (van Oosterzee). The former view is supported by the fact that *ἐμπέσῃ* separates *ὀνειδ.* from *παγίδα*; the latter, by the fact that the preposition is not repeated before *παγίδα*. The passage in vv. 14, 15, when compared with this, supports the former view, which is further established as correct by the consideration that we cannot well suppose *ὀνειδίζειν* to be an act of the devil. Since *ὀνειδισμός* is not defined more precisely, it must be taken as quite general in meaning.—*καὶ παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου*] the same expression in 2 Tim. ii. 26; in 1 Tim. vi. 9 it stands without *τοῦ διαβ.*, and there, too, it is joined with *πειρασμός* (elsewhere only in Rom. xi. 9, which follows Ps. lxix. 23). It is a figurative name for the lying in wait of the devil, who is represented as a hunter. The idea of its association with *ὀνειδισμός* is this, that the disgrace incurred by one who has not a good testimony from the non-Christians, is used by the devil as a snare, not only to tempt him, but also to seduce him into apostasy from the gospel.[4]

[1] It is out of place to appeal to 2 Pet. ii. 4 and Jude 6 (Wiesinger), since in these passages mention is made, not of the judgment which will be passed on the devil, but of the judgment which will be passed on a number of wicked angels.

[2] Had the apostle been thinking of the judgment which will be passed on the devil (Matt. xxv. 41; Rev. xx. 10 [11, 15]), he would have expressed himself more clearly, with something like this: *ἵνα μὴ κρίνηται σὺν τῷ διαβόλῳ*.

[3] Hofmann asserts that it is irrational to speak of a judgment which the devil pronounces; but we may ask, on the other hand, whether it is not irrational to speak of a devil *without* judgment.

[4] In explaining *τοῦ διαβόλου* Hofmann explains *ἐμπέσῃ* (*εἰς*) *παγ. τ. διαβ.* to mean, that the slanderer tries to ensnare such a one in

Ver. 8. [On Vv. 8–13, see Note X. page 135.] From this to ver. 13 we have instructions regarding the deacons. [Χ *α.*]—*διακόνους ὡσαύτως σεμνούς κ.τ.λ.*] The deacons, as at first instituted in the church at Jerusalem, were originally almoners of the poor (Acts vi. 1–6). They are mentioned again only in Phil. i. 1. In Rom. xvi. 1, Paul calls Phœbe a *διάκονος* of the church at Cenchrea. There are some other passages which allude to the diaconate—Rom. xii. 7; 1 Cor. xii. 28 (*ἀντιλήμψεις*); 1 Pet. iv. 11. It is known that this office in the church was afterwards not confined to its original object, but there is nothing to indicate how far it was developed in the apostolic age. Many of the duties assigned to the deacons in later times, can only be arbitrarily connected with the office in the apostolic age. Only it is to be observed that both here and in Phil. i. 1, the deacons are named *after* the bishops.—*ὡσαύτως*] marks here, as in ii. 9, the transition to ordinances in regard to another class of persons, indicating at the same time their similarity to those preceding.—*σεμνούς*] The accusative is dependent on *δεῖ εἶναι*, which is to be supplied; regarding the idea contained in the word, see ii. 2.—*μὴ διλόγους*] the word *δίλογος* only here. In Prov. xi. 13, LXX.; in Ecclus. v. 9, 11, vi. 1, xxviii. 13, we have the similar word: *διγλώσσος*[1] (comp. also *δίψυχος* in Jas. iv. 8); Theophylact: *ἄλλα φρονοῦντες καὶ ἄλλα λέγοντες, καὶ ἄλλα τούτοις καὶ ἄλλα ἑκείνοις.*—*μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέχοντας*] *προσέχειν* here, as in iv. 13 and Heb. vii. 13: "*be addicted to*;" Tit. ii. 3: *μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας.*—*μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς*] only here and in Tit. i. 7; comp. 1 Pet. v. 2: *ἐπισκοποῦντες . . . μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς, ἀλλὰ προθύμως*; and Tit. ii. 11, where it is said of the heretics that they by unseemly doctrine destroy houses *αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν*. These passages show that we are not to think here of gain from "dishonorable dealing" (Luther, Theodoret: *ἐκ πραγμάτων αἰσχρῶν καὶ ὧν ἄτοπον*), but rather of using the spiritual office for a material advantage (comp. vi. 5).

Ver. 9. Ἔχοντας *τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει*] The emphasis is not on *ἔχοντας*, as if it meant "holding fast," but on *ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει* (Wiesinger).—*τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως*] This collocation occurs nowhere else. *Πίστις* is not the doctrine of faith (Heumann), but subjective faith (de Wette). *Μυστήριον* is the subject-matter of faith, *i. e.* the divine truth, which is a secret not only in so far as it was hidden from the world until it was revealed at the appointed time (Rom. xvi. 25) and remains hidden to every man till the knowledge of it is wrought in him by the Spirit of God (1 Cor. ii. 7–10, 14), but also in so far as it is even to the believer *ὑπερβάλλουσα τῆς γνώσεως* (Wiesinger). The expression is synonymous with that in ver. 16: *τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον.*—*ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει*] Comp. i. 5, 19. The clause is to be joined closely with *ἔχοντας*, and is to be understood neither specially of occupying the office, nor quite generally of the virtuous life, or "the moral disposition" (Hofmann), but of purity and uprightness in regard to the mystery of the faith. It stands in contrast with the impurity of the heretics, who had their conscience stained by the mingling of truth with errors; comp. iv. 2.

the sense of "showing him as an evidence of the state of morality in an association which selects such a man as its head" (I).

[1] Theogn. v. 91: *ὃς μὴ γλώσσῃ δοὺ' ἔχει.*

Ver. 10. Καὶ οὗτοι δὲ δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον] The particles καὶ . . . δέ mean *and also*, καί being purely copulative; δέ, however, opposing and emphasizing[1] something new. Since this new thing, which is necessarily emphatic, always stands between καί and δέ, οὗτοι, as van Oosterzee has rightly seen, must be opposed to those before named, *i. e.* to the presbyters; it is to be explained: "and *these* too, *i. e.* not only the presbyters, but also the deacons, are first to be proved." It is wrong, therefore, to make δοκιμαζέσθωσαν emphatic, and to explain οὗτοι without reference to those before named ("and these are further to be proved"), as was done in the former editions of this commentary.[2] Had he wished to say that, the apostle could not but have written καὶ δοκιμαζέσθωσαν δὲ οὗτοι; comp. John viii. 16. It is true that nothing has been said hitherto about an examination in regard to the office of presbyter; but, of course, such an examination must have preceded the election. The examination for the office of deacon would certainly refer to the life and stedfastness in the faith. He does not say who was to undertake the examination, but it is natural to suppose that it was to be undertaken by those who elected. At the first institution of the diaconate the *election* was made by the church, the installation to the office by the apostles. It is not known how it was managed later in the apostolic age. Heydenreich makes the examination too formal when he says: "They are to be examined first by Timothy, with the aid of the presbytery; the votes of the members of the church are to be taken concerning his worthiness," etc. On the other hand, the force of δοκιμαζέσθωσαν must not be weakened by such explanations as: "Paul wishes only those to be made διάκονοι regarding whom a definite opinion had already been formed in the church" (so in the second edition of this commentary); or: "it is the moral testing which naturally took place when they lived for some time under the eyes of the church and its leader;" or: "it is in substance the same thing as μὴ νεόφυτον, used regarding the choice of presbyters" (Hofmann).—It is quite wrong, with Luther ("and these are first to be tried") and others, to understand the words as if they meant that candidates were first to be tried in the affairs of the diaconate.—εἶτα διακονείτωσαν, ἀνέγκλητοι ὄντες] The participle expresses the condition under which they are to be admitted to the office of deacon. Διακονεῖν, as applied definitely to the office of deacon, occurs only here, at ver. 14, and in 1 Pet. iv. 11.

Ver. 11. Γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως σεμνὰς κ.τ.λ.] [X *b.*] No further hint is given as to what women he is here speaking of; only it is to be observed that these instructions regarding them are inserted amongst the rules for the diaconate, since ver. 12 continues to speak of the latter. They must therefore, at all events, be regarded as women who stand in close relation to the deacons—either the wives of the deacons or the deaconesses. Mack's supposition, that they are the wives of the deacons *and of the bishops*, is quite arbitrary. The second view is found as early as in Chrys-

[1] Comp. Meyer on John vi. 51; Hartung, *Lehre von den Partik. d. gr. Spr.* I. pp. 181 ff.; Buttmann, p. 312 [E. T. 364].

[2] Wiesinger, too, seems to take it in this way: "These, however, also are first to be proved, then they may serve."

ostom (*γυναῖκας διακόνους φησί*), Theophylact, Oecumenius, Grotius, and others; de Wette, Wiesinger, and Hofmann also think it correct. The principal grounds for it are—(1) the word *ὡσαύτως*, which indicates that the apostle here passes (see ver. 8) to a new class of ecclesiastical persons (Wiesinger); and (2) the fact that the instructions given in this whole section are rather directions for election than exhortations to the persons named. On the other hand, the omission of *αὐτῶν* (de Wette, Wiesinger) and the expression *πιστὰς ἐν πᾶσιν*, usually understood, as de Wette wrongly thinks, of conjugal fidelity, are of no weight.—Against this view, however, there are two circumstances which should be considered, viz., that the instruction regarding the deaconesses is inserted among those given to the deacons, and also that the apostle calls them quite generally *γυναῖκες*, instead of using the definite *αἱ διάκονοι* (comp. Rom. xvi. 1). This makes it probable that by the *γυναῖκες* we should understand the deacons' wives (so, too, Plitt). The reason of the special exhortation would then be, not, as Heydenreich says, that even the domestic life of the deacons should be considered, but that the office of the deacons, consisting in the care of the poor and the sick, was of a kind in which their wives had to lend a helping hand. Hence we can explain why the wives of the bishops are not specially mentioned.[1]—*μὴ διαβόλους*] *διάβολος*, as an adjective: "slanderous," occurs only in the Pastoral Epistles, here and at 2 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 3.—*νηφαλίους*] is not equivalent to *μὴ οἴνῳ πόλλῳ προσεχούσας*, ver. 8; it is to be taken in the same sense as in ver. 2 (in opposition to Wiesinger, van Oosterzee).—*πιστὰς ἐν πᾶσιν*] "faithful in all things;" *ἐν πᾶσιν* forbids us to limit the command of fidelity to any one sphere; it is not merely faithfulness at home nor in the duties of the church that is meant.

Ver. 12. The apostle returns to the deacons, and gives regarding their domestic life the same instructions as he gave in vv. 2–4 in regard to the bishops.

Ver. 13. To these instructions he adds in this verse a reason: *οἱ γὰρ καλῶς διακονήσαντες* (*διακονεῖν* is here and in ver. 10 used in the official sense) *βαθμὸν ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν περιποιοῦνται*.[2] The word *βαθμός*, [X *c.*] which occurs only here, denotes, like *gradus*, in the figurative sense, a degree of honor. As to what is to be understood by this, expositors are not agreed; but we may reject at once all explanations in which a comparative is put in place of the positive *καλόν*. This objection applies to the view that *βαθμός* denotes here the higher ecclesiastical office, the office of bishop,[3] which view, moreover, presupposes a regulation of rank altogether foreign to the

[1] Van Oosterzee's view is arbitrary, that *those* deacons' wives are meant who at the same time held the office of deaconess.

[2] Hofmann thinks that ver. 13 is connected only with ver. 12; because a man might fill the office of deacon well, though he lacked the qualities named in vv. 8–10, but not if his house were badly managed. But that is not the case. Those qualities, not less than the one given in ver. 12, are the necessary conditions for filling the office of deacon well.

[3] Jerome: "bonum hic pro gradu majori posuit; sunt enim minores [diaconi];" Bengel: "gradum ab humilitate diaconiae ad majora munera, in ecclesia. Qui in minore gradu fidelis est, ad majora promovetur;" so, too, Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Heumann, Heydenreich, Baur, Plitt, and others.

apostolic age. The same objection applies to the view that *βαθμὸς καλός* is a higher stage of the life of faith, *i. e.* an increase in Christian perfection. The expositors who hold by the positive *καλός*, interpret the idea, some of the future, others of the present life. The *former* understand by it "a higher stage of blessedness;"[1] the *latter* explain the expression as applying to "respect in the church."[2]—Heinrich, de Wette, and Wiesinger agree with the view of the former, only modifying it to mean not a stage of holiness, but "the expectancy of it." This modification is, however, unwarrantable, since the idea of "expectancy or claim" is imported. *βαθμός* means a stage; it cannot at the same time mean the claim to a stage; and if *βαθμός* must mean the claim to something, then there is nothing to indicate what the claim refers to.—The decision between the two interpretations depends on the explanation of the words that follow: *καὶ πολλὴν παῤῥησίαν ἐν πίστει τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*] *παῤῥησία* means, in the first place, candor in speech; then more generally, bold courage in action, synonymous with *ἄδεια* (Hesychius); and lastly, firm confidence in something; thus in reference to men, 2 Cor. vii. 4 (*πολλή μοι παῤῥησία πρὸς ὑμᾶς*), or to God, viz. the confidence which the Christian in faith has in the saving grace of God; so in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the First Epistle of John.[3] If *βαθμός* is to be referred to future blessedness, then *παῤῥησία* here, as in 1 John iii. 21, Heb. iv. 16, is confidence towards God. But in 1 John iii. 21 we have *πρὸς τὸν Θεόν* along with *παῤῥησία*, and in Heb. iv. 16 *μετὰ παῤῥησίας* is added to define more precisely the clause: *προσερχώμεθα τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος*; as to the parallel passage in vi. 19, to which de Wette likewise appeals, the reference to the future life is distinctly expressed by the words *εἰς τὸ μέλλον*. Of all this there is nothing here; there is nothing, either here or with *καλὸν βαθμόν*, to direct us to the future life, nothing to indicate that with *παῤῥησία* we should supply *πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, or the like. Hence it is more natural to refer these ideas to the sphere in which the *διακονεῖν* takes place, and to understand by *βαθμός*, respect in the church;[4] by *παῤῥησία*, confidence in their official labors. These two things stand in closest relation to one another, since only *he* can possess right confidence in his office who is open to no just reproach, who is honored for conducting himself well in the matters with which his office is concerned. Wiesinger, against this view, maintains that "the aorist (*διακονήσαντες*) makes the *βαθμὸν ἑαυτ. καλ. περιπ.* appear to be the *final result* of the official labor;"[5] but if that were the case, the present *περιποιοῦνται* should not have been used, but the perfect; for the acquisition does not take place *after* the official labor, but during it.—Certainly

[1] So Theodoret (*τὸν τίμιον τοῦτον βαθμὸν ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι λήψονται βίῳ*), Flatt, and others.

[2] So Calvin, Planck, Wegscheider, Leo, Matthies, and others.

[3] Regarding Luther's translation of *παῤῥησία* by "joyfulness," see my *Comment. on the Epistles of John*. 3d ed., on 1 John iv. 17.

[4] Van Oosterzee's opinion is manifestly wrong, that *βαθμός* is "a beautiful stage of the spiritual life, and also of eternal blessedness."

[5] The other grounds apply only to the exposition of Matthies, who understands by *βαθμὸς καλός* "the influential post;" by *παῤῥησία*, "the free play of thought and speech, a wide open field of spiritual activity." In this he certainly exceeds the meaning which may be assigned to these words.

the aorist is somewhat strange; but it may mean that the *βαθμὸς κ.τ.λ.* is always the result of good service.[1]—The verb *περιποιεῖσθαι*, in the N. T. only here and in Acts xx. 28, has even in classical writers the meaning "gain for oneself." The dative *ἑαυτοῖς* is added to show clearly that he is speaking of the gain to the deacons themselves, and not to the congregation.—*ἐν πίστει τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*] is not to be joined with *βαθμόν* and *παῤῥησίαν* (van Oosterzee), but only with *παῤῥησίαν*.[2] It is not the sphere in which, nor the object in regard to which, there is *παῤῥησία* (Heumann: "the boldness to teach the Christian faith even in public;" Wegscheider: "free activity for Christianity, or a greater sphere for the spread of Christianity"); but it denotes the *παῤῥησία* as Christian, as rooted in Christian faith. The construction of *πίστις* with *ἐν* following it, is found also in 2 Tim. iii. 15; Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 15; Col. i. 4 (only that in these passages there is no article before *ἐν*, while there is one before *πίστις*; on the other hand, comp. Acts xx. 21, xxvi. 18). This construction may be explained to mean that Christ is the object of faith already apprehended; the believer not only has Christ before him, but he lives in communion with Him.

Vv. 14, 15. [On Vv. 14–16, see Note XI., pages 135–137.] The apostle has come here to a resting-point, since he has brought to an end his instructions regarding some of the chief points to be noticed in the affairs of the church; but, before passing to any new matter, he casts a glance back on the instructions he has given, and tells what was the occasion of his giving them.—*ταῦτά σοι γράφω*] Bengel's explanation: "*ταῦτα, i. e.* totam epistolam," in which Hofmann agrees,[3] is so far right, that *ταῦτα* refers rather to the instructions that precede (from ii. 1 onward).—*ἐλπίζων ἐλθεῖν πρός σε τάχιον*] *ἐλπίζων* does not give the real ("hoping," Matthies), but the adversative ground (Leo: Part. *ἐλπίζων* per *καίπερ* seu similem particulam esse resolvendum, nexus orationis docet; so, too, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt). The real ground is given by the following *ἵνα*. Hofmann asserts, but does not prove, that this view does not accord with the following *δέ*. Hofmann finds that *ἐλπίζων* only expresses an accompaniment of the act of writing, and that it was added "lest Timothy should infer from the sending of an epistle that the apostle meant to leave him for some time in Ephesus;" but in this he imports a motive of which the context furnishes no hint.—*τάχιον* [XI *a*.] (comp. on this form, Winer, p. 67 [E. T. p. 69]; Buttmann, p. 24 [E. T. 27]) is here taken by most expositors as a pure positive "soon;" the comparative sense (according to Winer, pp.

[1] Hofmann's explanation of *βαθμός* and *παῤῥησία* agrees in substance with that given here. He is wrong, however, in asserting that the deacons do not acquire both *during*, but only after their tenure of office. If the latter were the case, the means by which it takes place would not be given.

[2] Hofmann, indeed, holds even this connection of ideas to be unsuitable; but we do not see why the *παῤῥησια* may not be marked as Christian, as rooted in faith in Christ. To connect it with what follows, would be to suppose that the apostle lays emphasis on a point, which to Timothy would be self-evident.

[3] Hofmann's assertion, that the reference of *ταῦτα* to what precedes is forbidden by the present *γράφω* (for which we should have had *ἔγραφα*), is contradicted by 1 Cor. iv. 14, xiv. 37; 2 Cor. xiii. 10; Gal. i. 20; also by 1 John ii. 1.

227 f. [E. T. p. 243]), though in the background, has not wholly disappeared: "sooner" (not "than the arrival of this letter," or "than thou wilt have need of these instructions," Winer) "than is or was to be expected."—In spite of this hope, the apostle's arrival might possibly be longer delayed, and this possibility had induced him to impart his instructions by writing, lest Timothy should be without them.—*ἐὰν δὲ βραδύνω* (the verb only here and at 2 Pet. iii. 9), *ἵνα εἰδῇς πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι*] *πῶς δεῖ ἀναστρέφεσθαι* refers not so much to the Christian life in general, as to behavior in church life, viz. in divine service and in church arrangements. This limitation is clearly indicated by the connection with what precedes, the *ταῦτα* referring us back (in opposition to Hofmann). Its subject is either Timothy, in which case *σέ* is to be supplied (Luther: "how thou shouldst walk;" so, too, Wiesinger), or no definite subject should be supplied: "how one should walk."[1] Both explanations are possible in language and in fact; but the second may be preferred, because Paul in the preceding part (to which *ταῦτα* refers) did not say what Timothy was to do, but what arrangements were to prevail in the church; Hofmann thinks differently, as he understands *ταῦτα* of the whole epistle. The expression *οἶκος Θεοῦ* denotes properly the temple at Jerusalem (Matt. xxi. 13), then also the O. T. people as the church in which God had His dwelling (Heb. iii. 2, 5); in Christian usage it is the N. T. people in whom the dwelling of God has been fully realized; Heb. iii. 6 (Heb. x. 21); 1 Pet. iv. 17; synonymous with it are the expressions: *κατοικητήριον Θεοῦ*, Eph. ii. 22; *ναὸς Θεοῦ*, 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16.—To elucidate the symbolic expression, Paul adds: *ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ ζῶντος*] The pronoun *ἥτις* (= "seeing it") makes the explanatory sentence emphatic, by indicating why there should be such behavior in the house of God as Paul had prescribed (which Hofmann denies); and the reason is not simply that it is an *ἐκκλησία*, *i. e.* a church, and as such has necessarily certain definite ordinances, but still more definitely because it is a church of God, of the *living* God, who as such esteems highly His ordinances in His church.—There follow in simple apposition the words: *στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας*] [XI *b.*] These words are in apposition to *ἐκκλησία Θ. ζ.*, and as such are rightly explained by the older[2] and most of the recent commentators.[3] Some Protestant commentators, however, in-

[1] The impersonal *δεῖ* is usually joined with the accusative and infinitive, the infinitive denoting the thing, the accusative the person who must do the action expressed by the verb. More frequently the person is not named, but is easily supplied from the context, as *e. g.* in Matt. xxiii. 23, where *ὑμᾶς*, in Luke xii. 12, where again *ὑμᾶς*, and in Luke xv. 32, where *σέ* is to be supplied. Hofmann is therefore wrong in asserting that there is no linguistic justification for supplying *σέ* here, where *εἰδῇς* precedes. Sometimes, however, *δεῖ* refers to no particular person; so John iv. 20: *ὅπου προσκυνεῖν δεῖ*; Acts v. 29: *πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ Θεῷ*; xv. 5: *δεῖ περιτέμνειν αὐτούς*; Tit. i. 11: *οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν*; the *δεῖ* in that case corresponds to the English "one must." It is arbitrary, with Hofmann, to supply *τινά* here, and understand by it one who "has to govern a house of God."

[2] Theodore of M. rightly says: *ἐκκλησίας οὐ τοὺς οἴκους λέγει τοὺς εὐκτηρίους κατὰ τὴν τῶν πολλῶν συνήθειαν, ἀλλὰ τῶν πιστῶν τὸν σύλλογον, ὅθεν καὶ στύλον αὐτὴν καὶ ἑδραίωμα τ. ἀλ. ἐκάλεσεν, ὡς ἂν ἐν αὐτῇ τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν σύστασιν ἐχούσης.*

[3] Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, Beza, Mack, Matthies, de Wette, Wiesinger, Hofmann;

fluenced by their polemic against the Catholic idea of the church, have taken these words as the beginning of the following sentence.[1] The reasons against this construction are—(1) That the new thought would be taken up in a very abrupt and sudden manner, while by connecting it with the previous words, the train of thought is suitable and natural; (2) That "grammatically the third defining term, simply adjectival, *ὁμολ. μέγα*, cannot well be placed in co-ordination with two predicates like *στῦλος* and *ἑδραίωμα*" (Wiesinger, following Schleiermacher); and (3) That, whereas *τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον* is nothing else than the *ἀλήθεια*, this construction would make the former designate the latter as *στῦλος καὶ ἑδρ.*, which would clearly be unsuitable. There is manifestly nothing to be said for the opinion of some commentators,[2] that by *στ. κ. ἑδρ.* we are to understand Timothy.[3]—*στῦλος* in the figurative sense occurs only here and at Gal. ii. 9; Rev. iii. 12. The *οἶκος Θεοῦ* is called *στῦλος τῆς ἀληθείας*, inasmuch as the pillar supports and bears the roof resting on it (see Meyer on Gal. ii. 9), but not "inasmuch as it serves to elevate something and make it manifest" (Hofmann). The same idea is expressed by the second word: *ἑδραίωμα*, the base, foundation (similarly *θεμέλιος*, 2 Tim. ii. 19), a word which is only used here in the N. T. The thought that the divine truth is supported and borne by the church, has nothing startling when we remember that the church, as the *οἶκος Θεοῦ*, has the Spirit of God, which is the Spirit of truth; the Spirit of truth, therefore, is its indwelling, all-penetrating principle of life, by which it stands in closest communion with its head.[4] But if the church is set up to be the preserver of divine truth, it is all the more important that all should be well-ordered in it. These words stand, therefore, in close connection with what precedes: but, at the same time, they make the transition to what follows, where the apostle in a few brief characteristics gives the nature of the truth, that he may from this point return to his polemic against the heretics, and continue it further.

Ver. 16. *Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον*] *καί* connects what follows with the preceding words, and in such a way as to emphasize the following predicate.—*ὁμολογουμένως*] which only occurs here, means neither "manifestly" (Luther), nor "according to the song of praise" (Mack), nor even "correspondingly" (Hofmann[5]); but: "*as is*

now, too, by van Oosterzee, 3d ed. Van Oosterzee is, however, inclined to conjecture that "there is here a corruption of the text which cannot now be restored with certainty."

[1] First, in the edition of the N. T. at Basel, 1540, 1545; later, Bengel, Mosheim, Heydenreich, Flatt; formerly also van Oosterzee.

[2] Gregory of Nyssa (*de Vita Mosis*): *οὐ μόνον Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωαννης στύλοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰσι . . . ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος καὶ τὸν Τιμόθεον στύλον καλὸν ἐτεκτήνατο, ποιήσας αὐτὸν, καθὼς φησὶ τῇ ἰδίᾳ φωνῇ, στύλον καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας*

[3] Though Chrysostom construes rightly, he yet inverts the meaning of the sentence: *οὐχ ὡς ἐκεῖνος ὁ Ἰουδαικὸς οἶκος θ., τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ συνέχον τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα· ἡ γὰρ ἀλήθειά ἐστι τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα.*

[4] Wiesinger rightly calls attention to the distinction which should be made between "the truth as it is in itself, and the truth as it is acknowledged in the world," and then says: "in the former respect it needs no support, but bears itself; in the latter, it needs the church as its support, as its bearer and preserver." If the Catholic Church has drawn wrong conclusions from the apostle's words, it has itself to blame, and not the apostle.

[5] Hofmann, without reason, takes objection to the sense given to the apostle's remark,

acknowledged" comp. 4 Macc. vi. 31, vii. 16, xvi. 1; Josephus, *Antiq.* i. 10. 2, ii. 9. 6).—*μέγα*] comp. Eph. v. 32 (*καὶ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν*), has the sense of "*important, significant.*"—The subject of the sentence: *τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον*, is a paraphrase of the *ἀλήθεια* in the preceding verse. It is so called by the apostle, because, as the substance of the Christian fear of God, or piety, it is hidden from the world: the sense is the same, therefore, as that of *τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως* in ver. 9. It is wrong to translate it, as Luther does: "the blessed secret," or to explain it: "the doctrine which leads to godliness." Wiesinger is incorrect in explaining it: "a secret accessible only to godliness;" and Hofmann in saying: "the truth which is of such a nature as to produce godliness where it finds acceptance."—The purport—*i. e.* the christological purport—is now given in the next clauses, Paul laying stress on it on account of the polemical tendency of the epistle against the heretics (chap. iv.), whose theology and Christology were in contradiction with the gospel.—As to the construction of these clauses, there would be no difficulty with the reading *Θεός*. [XI *c, d.*] If *ὁ* be read, it must relate to *μυστήριον*, which also might be the construction with *ὅς*. According to the Vulgate (sacramentum quod manifestatum est), the latter is the construction adopted by the Latin Fathers who understood Christ to be the *μυστήριον*,[1]—an interpretation quite unjustifiable and unsuitable to the general train of thought. Several expositors (Mangold, Hofmann, and others) assume the first clause: *ὅς . . . σαρκί*, to be the subject, and the other five clauses to form the predicate; but "on account of the parallelism, that is not advisable" (Winer, p. 547 [E. T. p. 588]). It is much more natural from their similar form to regard all six clauses as co-ordinate. Then the subject to which *ὅς* relates is not named; but, according to the purport of the various clauses, it can be none other than Christ. [XI *e.*] This curious omission may be thus accounted for; the sentence has been taken from a formula of confession, or better, from an old Christian hymn, as its metrical and euphonious character seems to indicate.[2] This view is also adopted by Heydenreich, Mack, de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt.—The opinion of Matthies is untenable, that the apostle does not name Christ expressly, in order to maintain the character of *τὸ μυστήριον* (in the sense: Acknowledged great, etc., . . . he who is revealed, etc.), and that this absolute use of the relative pronoun is found elsewhere in the N. T. In the passages quoted by him, Rom. ii. 23, 1 Cor. vii. 37, John i. 46, iii. 34, 1 John i. 3, the pronoun has not the absolute meaning alleged by him. The first clause runs: *ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί*] *ἐφανερώθη* is often used of Christ's appearance on earth, of His becoming man, 1 John i. 2, iii. 5; it presup-

that believers acknowledged the secret of godliness to be great. But if this thought is meaningless here, not less is the one he substitutes: "to the greatness of the house of God corresponds the greatness of the mystery of piety."

[1] Even Buttmann is of this opinion, as he quotes this passage (*μυστήριον, ὃς ἐφανερώθη*) under the rule (p. 242) [E. T. p. 282], that the relative agrees with the natural gender of the preceding substantive.

[2] Comp. Rambach's *Anthologie christl. Gesänge aus allen Jahrh. d. Kirche*, I. 33, and Winer, p. 594 [E. T. p. 639 f.].

poses a previous concealment,[1] and consequently the pre-existence of Christ as the eternal Logos.—Ἐν σαρκί] (comp. 1 John iv. 2: ἐληλυθὼς ἐν σαρκί; Rom. viii. 3: ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας) denotes the human nature in which Christ appeared; John i. 14: ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο.—With this first clause the second stands in contrast: ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι] means (as in Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 35): to be shown to be such a one as He is in nature; here, therefore, the sense is: He was shown in His divine glory (as the Logos or eternal Son of God), which was veiled by the σάρξ. Ἐν πνεύματι is contrasted with ἐν σαρκί, the latter denoting the earthly, human manner of His appearing, the former the inner principle which formed the basis of His life. Though ἐν with πνεύματι has not entirely lost its proper meaning, yet it shades off into the idea of the means used, in so far as the spirit revealed in Him was the means of showing His true nature.[2] It would be wrong to separate here the πνεῦμα from His person, and to understand by it the spirit proceeding from Him and imparted to His own; it is rather the living spiritual principle dwelling in Him and working out from Him (so, too, Plitt).—Chrysostom diverges from this exposition, and explains ἐδικαιώθη by: δόλον οὐκ ἐποίησεν, ὅπερ ὁ προφήτης λέγει. ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησε; and Bengel takes the meaning of the expression to be that Christ bore the sins of the world (peccata peccatorum tulit . . . et justitiam aeternam sibi suisque asseruit); but both views import ideas which are here out of place. The expression ἐν πνεύματι has also found very varying interpretations. Instead of πνεῦμα being taken in its real sense, particular elements of it in the life of Christ, or particular modes of revealing the πνεῦμα, have been fixed upon, or πνεῦμα has been taken simply of the divine nature of Christ.[3]—ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις] The right meaning of this third clause also can only be got from a faithful consideration of the words. The word ὤφθη is in the N. T. frequently joined with the dative, Matt. xvii. 3; Luke i. 11; Acts vii. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 5–8; Heb. ix. 28, etc. In all these passages it is not the simple "was seen," but "was revealed" or "appeared;" it always presupposes the activity of the thing seen.—From the analogy of these passages, we must think here of Christ going to those to whom He became visible, so that all explanations which take ὤφθη merely as "was seen" are to be rejected.—In the N. T. ἄγγελοι is especially applied to angels: in itself the word may also denote human messengers (comp. Jas. ii. 25). To take it here in this latter sense (which Hofmann

[1] Hence the same word is used also of the resurrection and second coming of Christ.

[2] Baur is wrong in explaining ἐν πνεύματι "as spirit." This cannot be justified by exegesis, and hence Baur contents himself with the mere assertion that it is so.

[3] The older expositors take πνεῦμα to denote particularly Christ's miracles (Theodoret: ἀπεδείχθη διὰ τῶν θαυμάτων καὶ ἀπεφάνθη, ὅτι Θεὸς ἀληθὴς καὶ Θεοῦ υἱός). Others apply it to the Spirit imparted to Him in baptism; others, to the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost; others, to Christ's resurrection as the most glorious work of the Spirit (so Heydenreich in particular). Akin to this view is that of Hofmann, who says that πνεῦμα is "that which quickens, makes alive," and deduces from this "that spirit changed the existence of Christ in the flesh . . . into something that had its nature from the Spirit," and explains ἐδικ. ἐν πν. as relating to the justification He received through His resurrection. All these explanations fall to the ground when it is observed that the context contains no reference to any such special fact. Glassius explains it thus: Justus de-

does), as denoting the apostles to whom Christ appeared after His resurrection, is impossible, because nothing, not even the article, is used here to point to them in particular. If, then, ἀγγέλοις can only mean angels, it is most natural to take ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις of the ascension, by which Christ—as the Glorified One—was made manifest to angels (so, too, Plitt). Still there is nothing here to lay stress on the ascension (as is done in the sixth clause); the point is, that He who was justified ἐν πνεύματι presented Himself to the angels in His glory.—Baur, indeed, in gnostic fashion interprets the passage of Christ as passing through the various series of æons, but it is clear that the words neither demand nor even justify such a view. No less arbitrary is de Wette's opinion, that probably the ὀφθῆναι ἀγγέλοις relates to a supernatural scene differing from the ascension, and forming the antithesis to the descent into hell.—The very form of the expression shows that we are not to think of appearances of angels at various moments in the earthly life of Christ, as some expositors suppose. More noteworthy is an explanation given by Chrysostom and approved by some later expositors, especially by Matthies and Wiesinger.[1] Matthies appeals to passages which he thinks are elucidated by the words, passages where Christ is said to have been manifested as . . . head to all things in heaven and on earth, Eph. i. 20 ff., iii. 10, iv. 8 ff.; Col. i. 15 ff., ii. 10, 15; Heb. i. 6 ff. But, though Christ's lordship over all is spoken of in such passages, it is not said that Christ was made manifest to the angels only by means of His incarnation. The only passage which might be quoted here is Eph. iii. 10, which, however, rather declares that to the angels the eternal decree of the divine love or of God's wisdom was to be made known διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. But *such* cannot possibly be the meaning of ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις. Wiesinger simply explains it: "the angels saw the σαρκωθέντα on earth;" but obviously the sentence is meant to express something which befell not men, but *angels*.—ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν] for ἐκηρύχθη, comp. Phil. i. 15; and for ἐν ἔθνεσιν, Matt. xxviii. 19. There is no good reason for taking ἐθνη here as relating not to the nations in general, but, as Hofmann thinks, to the heathen exclusive of the Jews.[2]—ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ] ἐπιστεύθη is not, with some expositors, to be explained by ἐδικαιώθη: "He has been testified" (viz. by the miracles of the apostles), or by "fidem sibi fecit" ("he gained belief for Himself"); it is to be taken in its proper meaning. The word κόσμος has the same general meaning as the preceding ἔθνη; van Oosterzee is wrong in thinking that it ought to be taken here in an ethical sense.—"Jesus is personally the subject-matter of preaching and of faith" (Hofmann).—ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ] Mark xvi. 19; Acts i. 11 (Acts x. 16), where the same verb joined with εἰς οὐρανόν is used of Christ's ascension. This supports the opinion of most expositors, that the same fact is men-

claratus est et filius Dei comprobatus in Spiritu i. e. per deitatem suam, cujus vi miracula fecit.

[1] Chrysostom says: ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις· ὥστε καὶ ἄγγελοι μεθ' ἡμῶν εἶδον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, πρότερον οὐχ ὁρῶντες. Theodoret's expression is still more pointed: τὴν γὰρ ἀόρατον τῆς θεότητος φύσιν οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνοι ἑώρων, σαρκωθέντα δὲ ἐθεάσαντο.

[2] We cannot, in any case, see how "the sentence is emptied of its meaning" by regarding Israel as included in the idea of ἔθνη.

tioned here.—*ἐν δόξῃ*] may be taken as an adverbial adjunct equivalent to *ἐνδόξως* (similarly 2 Cor. iii. 8; Col. iii. 4); but in that case the expression of this sixth clause would be quite out of keeping with the others. Wahl takes the expression per attractionem pro: *ἀνελ. εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἐστὶν ἐν δόξῃ*, which is the only right exposition.[1] The apostle did not write *εἰς δόξαν*, but *ἐν δόξῃ*, to show that Christ not only entered into glory, but abides for ever in it (so, too, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee). Still we cannot go so far as Matthies, who says that the result rather than the act of the transition is here mentioned; the expression with forcible brevity includes both points. De Wette's assertion, too, is quite arbitrary, that Paul is speaking here not of the historical ascension, but of a heavenly occurrence.—In what relation now do these six clauses stand towards each other?—We cannot help seeing that there is a definite order in their succession. It is beyond doubt chronological, since the second clause does not relate to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and the last points more to Christ's life in glory than to the historical ascension. But, at the same time, we can recognize a close relation between the clauses. Matthies, de Wette, Wiesinger, and Hofmann have adopted three groups, each containing two clauses; but, though *ἀγγέλοις* and *ἔθνεσιν* are contrasted, still this arrangement would separate between the fourth and fifth clauses, whose connection Theodoret rightly points out: *οὐκ ἐκηρύχθη μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιστεύθη.* Besides, in order to make the correspondence complete, *ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν* should have come before *ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις*. It is more correct, therefore, to divide the whole into two parts, each with three clauses, the two first in each case referring to what took place on earth, the third to what took place in heaven (so, too, Plitt[2]).

Notes by American Editor.

IX. Vv. 1–7.

(*a*) W. and H. connect the words *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* with the closing words of the preceding chapter. The great majority of comm., as well as Tisch., Treg., Lachm., connect them with what follows. The latter connection seems more probable, because it makes the transition to chap. iii. less abrupt, and because the phrase is better adapted to the following than the preceding statement.—(*b*) The identity of the office of *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος*, at the date of these epistles, is now so generally admitted by the ablest and most candid scholars, that further discussion of the question is hardly necessary. The absence of the word *πρεσβύτερος* from the earlier Pauline Epistles, to which Huther calls attention, is noticeable, but is, doubtless, to be accounted for by the fact that those epistles were occupied with subjects quite remote from the constitution and offices of the church, and espe-

[1] Strange to say, Hofmann disputes this, on the ground that Jesus "was not received into glory, but into the celestial sphere." He appeals for this to Heb. i. 3, which is utterly from the point.

[2] Baur maintains that in these six clauses every two form a contrast, the one being more gnostic, the other more anti-gnostic. But in that case the author of the epistle would, in the second part, have very strangely given up the order observable in the first. Besides, of all the clauses, the third has by far the most resemblance to Gnosticism.

cially by the fact that that constitution was in the earlier apostolic times of the simplest sort, and the official character of the leaders had little of the prominence which was subsequently given to it. In the only instance in which Paul speaks of ἐπίσκοποι, in his epistles which were written before the three to Timothy and Titus, (Phil. i. 1), he evidently presents them as secondary to the church. The development of church organization which is indicated even in these three epistles is seen, so soon as the matter is carefully examined, to be very moderate. There are only two officers mentioned—presbyters and deacons, who are, also, alluded to as early as Acts vi. and xi.—(*c*) that the words μᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνδρα do not have reference to contemporaneous polygamy, is evident from the reasons indicated by Huther, especially from the fact that the corresponding phrase in v. 9, ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή, cannot be interpreted in this way. They must either be understood as opposed to a second marriage after the death of the first wife—successive polygamy, as it is sometimes called,—or to an immoral life in the way of concubinage. The former of these views is held, in addition to the writers mentioned in Huther's note, by Ell., Alf., Holtzm., Bib. Com. [the writer in this com., however, includes marriages after divorce], and others. Plumptre (so Conyb., Bloomf. 9th ed.) favors the reference to a second marriage after divorce, but this is justly objected to on the ground that there is no distinct mention of divorce. Fairbairn holds that the apostle "simply required that when one was called to office in the Christian church, there should be but one living woman to whom he stood related as husband." Hofmann and Matthies agree with Huther in supposing the meaning to be, "that a bishop is to be a man who neither lives, nor has lived, in sexual intercourse with any other woman than the one to whom he is married." The subject is briefly considered by Dr. Woolsey in his work on Divorce and Divorce Legislation. It is, also, discussed in an extended note (Appendix B.) in Fairbairn's Com. on the Past. Epp. Comp., also, the comm. generally.

The natural interpretation of the words, as affected by the corresponding phrase used with regard to widows, the absence of any reference to divorce, the indications in early writers that second marriages were not approved, or that abstaining from them was commended, and the propriety of special self-restraint on the part of officials in the churches, which might, not improbably, have been felt by Christians at that time, strongly favor the explanation which makes the apostle refer to second marriages. On the other hand, it is clear that Paul allows widows to remarry, in 1 Cor. vii. 39, and that his whole treatment of the subject of the marriage relation, as, indeed, that which we find throughout the N. T., considers its obligations as ceasing with the death of either party. In the case of the younger widows, he even recommends second marriage in this epistle (v. 14). This recommendation in their case, however, can hardly be regarded as inconsistent with a statement opposing re-marriage in the case of presbyters.—(*d*) The words μετὰ πάσης σεμνότητος (ver. 4) are probably, though not certainly, to be connected with ἔχοντα κ.τ.λ. and referred to the children—σεμν. here denoting propriety and becoming modesty in deportment, gravity. So Huther and most comm.—(*e*) The word τυφωθείς (ver. 6) apparently refers to the puffed-up or conceited state of mind, which might naturally be connected with the elevation of a recent convert to such a position as that of a presbyter. The dignity of the position is implied by the word, but there does not seem to be anything in it, or in the word νεόφυτος, which is inconsistent with the Pauline authorship of the letter, or which demands for it a later date. The word διαβόλου undoubtedly, as Huther clearly proves,

means the devil. This word, in ver. 7, is a subjective genitive. Huther takes it in the same way in ver. 6. But *κρίμα* is a word which naturally suggests the idea of divine judgment, in such a case; the N. T. conception of judgment as related to the devil is that of judgment passed upon him; it is necessary, if Huther's view be adopted, to make *κρίμα* mean (as he holds) "the judgment which serves to give the devil foundation for accusing man with God," or (as Holtzm. holds) "the judgment of the devil speaking through the heathen," or to give it some other and improbable meaning. For these reasons, the genitive in ver. 6 must be regarded as objective.

X. Vv. 8–13.

(*a*) It is noticeable that the qualifications for the office of deacon are mainly the same in substance with those for the office of *ἐπίσκοπος*, and that, in both cases, they are mainly in the line of general moral character. Both classes of officials were to be selected from among those members of the churches who had such virtues, and were in such a degree free from immoral and evil habits or tendencies, that they would have the respect both of the church and of those outside of it. The absence of any emphatic presentation of other points may naturally indicate an earlier, rather than a later date for the Epistles, and thus point to their authorship as within the life-time of Paul. There is certainly no special development of ecclesiasticism, and no special alarm indicated as to dangers of heresy, in these specified qualifications. Nor is there much to be discovered in them, as showing a growth in the character or functions of the offices from the time of the earliest notices which we have of them.—(*b*) That *γυναῖκας* (ver. 11) refers to the wives of the deacons, and not to a special order of deaconesses, is rendered probable by the considerations mentioned in Huther's note,—especially, by the fact that the writer returns immediately, in ver. 12, to the subject of the deacons. This view is taken by A. V., Conyb., Wieseler, Mack, and others. De W., Alf., Ell., Plumptre, Hofmann, and others understand the reference to be to deaconesses. The grounds for this view are, that there is no *αὐτῶν* referring to the deacons, that there were deaconesses in the churches, that *ὡσαύτως* indicates a similar official character in these women to that of the deacons (comp. *ὡσαύτως* of ver. 8 connecting the deacons with the bishops), and that *πιστὰς ἐν πᾶσιν* is appropriate to official position. The absence of *αὐτῶν*, however, is less remarkable than the absence of the designation as deaconesses; the evidence as to the existence of deaconesses in the churches generally, at the date of these letters, is uncertain; *ὡσαύτως* is easily explicable on either view; *πιστὰς ἐν πᾶσιν* is a phrase which does not require a reference to an office, but may be equally applicable to those not in official station.—(*c*) The word *βαθμόν* (ver. 13) is rendered in R. V. by *standing*. This rendering seems better than *degree*, of A. V., and the meaning, though quite uncertain, is probably *a good standing*—an honorable position as connected with the office which they hold. The force of *ἐν πίστει* is that of the sphere in which the confidence moves, and perhaps, also, that on which it is grounded. *παρρησία* can hardly be limited, with Huther, to confidence in their official labors.

XI. Vv. 14–16.

(*a*) W. and H., Treg., and R. V. read, with Lachm. and Buttm., *ἐν τάχει* in place of *τάχιον*. The latter reading, which is adopted by Tisch., has the support

of ℵ, in addition to the authorities mentioned by Huther. The fact that Paul was hoping soon to return to Ephesus, when taken in connection with the fact that he had left that city not long before the date of the Epistle, and that he had, apparently, passed some time there with Timothy before his departure, makes it somewhat surprising that he should add to the suggestions of the earlier verses of this chapter such a passage as this which now follows—a passage, which gives a solemn and formal declaration of the great Christian truth and of the relation of the church to it. Like other peculiarities in the Epistle, which have a more or less similar character, it indicates that the Apostle was writing for the churches, as well as for his younger companion and friend. In connection with this more general design, the explanation which Huther gives of *ἀναστρέφεσθαι* as having an indefinite subject, *how one should behave, conduct oneself*, may not improbably be the correct one.—(*b*) The common view of the construction of *στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα*, that they are in apposition with *ἐκκλησία*, is that which, on the whole, best accords with the position of the words and the general indications of the sentence. The assertion of Huther, however, that there is manifestly nothing to be said for the opinion of some commentators, that by *στ. κ. ἑδρ.* we are to understand Timothy, is hardly founded in fact. This reference of the words is in accordance with the possibilities of the sentence; it harmonizes with the reference of *στῦλος* to individuals in Gal. ii. 9, the only other passage where Paul uses the word (comp. also Rev. iii. 12); it avoids the mingling of figures, which the other explanation involves; and it closely connects the whole statement with the suggestions to Timothy in a most natural way. If referred to Timothy, however, *σέ* must be understood as the subject of *ἀναστρέφεσθαι*. The absence of *σέ*; the fact that *στ. κ. ἑδρ.* follows, instead of preceding the words referring to the church; and perhaps the somewhat easier connection of ver. 16 with ver. 15, if the other view is taken, favor the uniting of the words with *ἐκκλησία*. Holtzm. suggests a connection with *θεοῦ ζῶντος*, after the manner of Mk. vii. 19; Jas. iii. 8; Rev. iii. 12. This, however, seems quite improbable in a sentence like the present.—(*c*) The reading *ὃς*, instead of *θεός*, in ver. 16, is now almost universally admitted to be the genuine text. So Griesb., Tisch., Treg., Lachm., Buttm., W. and H., Green, Alf., Words., Ell., de W., Holtzm., Fairbairn, Plumptre, Bib. Com., v. Oost. in Lange, R. V., and substantially all recent critics and scholars of note. Dr. Scrivener says, in his second edition, 1874, "We must consider it highly probable (indeed, if we were sure of the testimony of the first-rate uncials [referring especially to A and C], we might regard it as certain) that . . . *θεός* of the more recent many [must] yield to *ὃς* of the ancient few." In his third edition, 1883, he repeats this statement, but adds: "Yet even then the force of the Patristic testimony remains untouched," and closes by saying: "I dare not pronounce *θεός* a corruption." He thus seems to feel the great difficulty of accepting *θεός*, but to be, of late, somewhat more inclined to hesitate in rejecting it. Dean Burgon, in his volume entitled "The Revision Revised," makes a characteristic assault on the reading *ὅς*, and a defence of *θεός*, even claiming for the latter reading the Alex. MS., in regard to which Alford, twenty years ago, said: "It is to to be hoped that A will never again be cited on the side of the received text." The discussion by Dean Burgon in favor of *θεός*, and that by Dr. William Hayes Ward (Bib. Sac. Jan. 1865), in favor of *ὃς*, will give the student a full presentation of the case, as viewed at present on both sides. Dean Burgon is, probably, the latest scholar of much eminence, who will appear in the annals of the defence of the reading *θεός*,

and his work, in this section of it, as well as in its other parts, will gain the attention of interested students on this account, when the views which it advocates have ceased to be supported by learned men.—(*d*) The result of all the most careful examinations of the MSS. A and C, which have been made by different scholars, and under the most favorable circumstances now possible—although two or three among these scholars have doubts—must be regarded, it is believed, as decisive, that the original reading of those MSS. was ὅς. This was, undoubtedly, the original text of ℵ, and as the reading ὁ in D is, in all probability, a corruption of ὅς, and B does not include the Past. Epp., the earliest manuscript evidence is unanimous against θεός. This evidence is supported by the Syriac and Egyptian versions; and by the Latin versions also, which, however, read *quod*.—(*e*) If ὅς is adopted as the text, R. V. has probably the correct rendering, making ὅς the subject of each of the verbs: *who was manifested, was justified*, etc. The μυστήριον is, thus, defined to be Christ. The question as to whether Paul believed or taught the divinity of Christ does not depend on the textual reading of this verse. If the correct reading is θεός, there is a special declaration respecting it here, in that the name θεός is given to Him, but the support of the doctrine does not lie in this statement.

CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 1. *πλάνως*] For this, many cursives and Fathers have *πλάνης*, which, however, is only a correction, perhaps after 1 John iv. 6.—Ver. 2. Instead of the form *κεκαυτηριασμένων* (*Rec.* Tisch.), we should probably, after A L ℵ, read *κεκαυστηριασμένων* (Lachm. smaller ed., Buttm.).—For *ἰδίαν συνείδησιν*, which is supported by the weightiest authorities, D* has (in Matthaei, E) *συνείδησιν ἑαυτῶν*.—Ver. 6. For *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, so many important authorities (A D F G, many cursives, etc.) have *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, that the latter must be held the right reading.—*τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας*] for which some cursives, etc., have *τῇ καλῇ διδασκαλίᾳ*, which may have arisen from a belief that these words are co-ordinate with *τοῖς λόγοις*.—For the *Rec.* *ᾗ παρηκολούθηκας* (Tisch.), Lachm. smaller ed., and Buttm., following A 80, have adopted the gen. *ἧς παρηκ.*, an attraction seldom occurring, but not without examples; see Winer, p. 154 f. [E. T. p. 163. f.].—Ver. 8. In ℵ the preposition *πρός* is wanting before *ὀλίγον*; possibly *πρὸς ὀλίγον* may have been formed on the analogy of the *πρὸς πάντα*.—For the *Rec.* *ἐπαγγελίαν*, which is found in the weightiest authorities, and is received by nearly all critics and editors, ℵ, many cursives have the plural *ἐπαγγελίας*. This is defended by Matthaei and Rinck as the original reading, but is disputed by Reiche (*Comment. crit.* I. pp. 389 f.). It is at least possible that the singular found its way into the text as a correction.—Ver. 10. *καὶ κοπιῶμεν*, *Rec.*, supported by F G K, most cursives, etc. (Tisch. 7); in A C D ℵ 17, 47, *al.*, Syr. Arr. Copt. Arm. Vulg. etc., *καί* is wanting, and is therefore omitted by Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. 8. Its genuineness is very doubtful.—Instead of the *Rec.* *ὀνειδιζόμεθα* (supported by D L, most versions, Theodoret, etc., Tisch. 7), A C F G K ℵ, *al.*, have the reading *ἀγωνιζόμεθα*, which has been adopted by Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8. The authorities give a preference to the latter reading, yet it may have arisen from Col. i. 29. Reiche defends the *Rec.*; we cannot decide with certainty which is original; see further in the exposition of the verse.—Ver. 12. Between *ἐν ἀγάπῃ* and *ἐν πίστει* the *Rec.* has *ἐν πνεύματι*; rightly withdrawn from the text as not genuine by Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch., following the weightiest authorities (A C D F G 31, 47, 70, 71, *al.*, Syr. utr. Erp. Copt. etc., Clemens, Chrys. etc.); comp. Reiche (*Comment. crit.* I. p. 392).—Ver. 15. For *ἐν πᾶσιν*, Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. rightly adopted *πᾶσιν* (*without ἐν*), after A C D F G ℵ 17, 31, *al.*, Syr. Erp. Copt. etc., Clem. Chrys. etc. It is defended, too, by Reiche as the original reading; *ἐν* appears to have been inserted from the analogy of Rom. i. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 19.

Ver. 1. [On Vv. 1–5, see Note XII., page 153.] In the first five verses of this chapter, Paul speaks of the heretics, directing special attention in ver. 3 to one point in their doctrine.—*τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει*] [XII *b*.] The *δέ* connects this verse with the beginning of iii. 16, and connects it by way of contrast. *Τὸ πνεῦμα* is the Holy Spirit, as the source of prophecy.

To explain the expression by *οἱ πνευματικοί* (Heydenreich) is inaccurate. Paul goes back here to the fundamental basis of all prophecy.—*ῥητῶς* (*ἅπαξ λεγ.*) means: "*in express words*," and is used particularly with quotations.[1] Heydenreich is inaccurate in explaining it as equivalent to *σαφῶς*, *φανερῶς*; Luther: "distinctly." The apostle, then, appeals here to a prophecy of the Spirit expressly worded. Such a prophecy of the future apostasy lay before him in many utterances, both of Christ and of others; besides, the Spirit declared them to the apostle himself.—Leo is wrong: animus mihi praesagit.—*ὅτι ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἀποστήσονταί τινες τῆς πίστεως*] We might readily take *ὕστεροι καιροί* here as equivalent to *ἔσχατοι καιροί*;[2] but we must not overlook the difference between the two expressions. The former points simply to the future, the latter to the last time of the future, immediately preceding the completion of God's kingdom and the second coming of Christ (so, too, van Oosterzee, Hofmann). It is unsuitable to press *καιρούς* here in the sense of "the fitting time," and to translate it with Matthies: "in the fitting time hereafter."—*Τινες* are not the heretics, but those who are led away from the faith by the heretics. The apostasy belonged to the future, but the heresy to the present. Hofmann thinks differently, assigning the heresy also to the future, though the apostle's expression does not warrant this.[3] We must not, however, with Otto, infer that in the apostle's time the heretics were still outside the church.—*ἀποστήσονται τῆς πίστεως*] "This sentence forms the antithesis to what has preceded, iii. 15, 16" (Wiesinger); for the expression, comp. Luke viii. 13; Heb. iii. 12; Wisd. iii. 10; 1 Macc. i. 15, and other passages.—*προσέχοντες*] comp. i. 4; the partic. tells how the apostasy is brought about.—*πνεύμασι πλάνοις*] the *πνεύματα πλάνα* are in contrast with the *πνεῦμα* in ver. 1; and the former are as little to be identified with the heretics, as the latter with the prophets (Wolf: spirituales seductores, *i. e.* doctores seducentes). The *πνεύματα* are rather the active spiritual powers hidden in the heretics, the tools and servants of the devil. As the truth is one, so also is its principle one: *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας*. Error on the other hand is manifold, and is supported by a plurality of spirits, who may, however, be regarded as a unity: *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης*, 1 John iv. 6.—These *πνεύματα* are called *πλάνα*, because they seduce man from the truth to falsehood; comp. 2 John ver. 7.—*καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων*] *δαιμονίων* is not the objective,[4] but the subjective genitive.[5] The *δαιμόνια* are the source of the doctrines which are opposed to the truth, of the *σοφία δαιμονιώδης* (Jas. iii. 15); comp. Col. ii. 22. It is wrong to suppose that the *δαιμόνια* are the heretics themselves. As with *πνεῦμα* in ver. 1, Paul goes back here to the inner grounds; the *διδασκαλίαι* pro-

[1] [Huther must mean that *ῥητῶς* is *ἅπαξ λεγ.* in the N. T.; for it is found in Sext. Empir. *adv. Log.* i. 8: *ὁ Ξενοφῶν ῥητῶς φησίν*; also in Strabo, i. p. 4 B, and Polybius, ii. 23. 5.—Tr.]

[2] Comp. 2 Tim. iii. 1: *ἐσχαται ἡμέραι*; 1 Pet. i. 5: *καιρὸς ἔσχατος*; 2 Pet. iii. 3; Jude, ver. 18; in Ignatius, *Ep. ad Ephes.* c. xi.: *ἔσχατοι καιροί*.

[3] Plitt is not wrong in observing that "the errors now described by the author were no longer matters purely of the future; they were already appearing."

[4] Heydenreich: "doctrines regarding demons, a characteristic of Essene-gnostic heretics who spoke so much of the higher world of spirits, of aeons," etc.

[5] Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Winer, p. 176 [E. T. p. 187].

ceeding from these form the opposite of the *διδασκαλία ἡ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ*.[1]

Ver. 2. *Ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων*] Leo: "errarunt sine dubio, qui genitivos, qui sequuntur, *ψευδολόγων, κεκαυτηριασμένων, κωλυόντων*, lege appositionis, junctos esse dicebant cum voc. *δαιμονίων*;" but we must also reject Leo's opinion, that *ἐν ὑποκρ. ψευδ.* was added to the previous statement as a second characteristic of the heretics, meaning: eadem simulantes, quae simulare solent homines *ψευδολόγοι*, etc.; *ψευδολ., κεκαυτημ., κωλυόντων* denote the heretics themselves, and not those whom they imitated. To regard the genitive *ψευδολόγων* as dependent on *διδασκαλίαις*, and *ἐν ὑποκρίσει* as defining more precisely the substantive following it (Estius: doctrinis, inquam, hominum in hypocrisi loquentium mendacium), would make a double difficulty of construction. Nor can Luther's translation be defended: "by means of such as are speakers of lies in hypocrisy." *Ἐν ὑποκρίσει* is either to be taken with *ἀποστήσονται* (so Bengel: Constr. cum deficient; hypocrisis ea, quae est falsiloquorum, illos auferet; *τινες* aliqui, illi, sunt seducti; falsiloqui, seductores: falsiloquorum, genitivus, unice pendet ab hypocrisi), or, still better, with *προσέχοντες* (Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt). The objection of Matthies, which agrees with Leo's explanation, that in that case we should have had instead of *ἐν* either *διά* or *ἕνεκα* with the article, is contradicted by the usage of the N. T. In the N. T. *ἐν* is not seldom used with the instrument, and in regard to the article there prevails a greater freedom of use than in classic Greek. Hofmann strangely combines *δαιμονίων ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων* into one idea, explaining *δαιμονίων* to be an adjective with *ψευδολόγων*, and *ἐν ὑποκρίσει* also as a qualification of *ψευδολόγων* in the sense of "hypocritical."[2]—The hypocrisy of the heretics consisted in giving themselves, in obedience to a false spiritualism (see ver. 3), the appearance of a spiritually-inspired life.—The word *ψευδολόγοι* ("liars," Luther) occurs only here in the N. T. In sense it is equivalent to *ψευδοδιδάσκαλος*, 2 Pet. ii. 1, and *ψευδοπροφήτης*, 1 John iv. 1 (comp. *ματαιολόγοι*, Tit. i. 10).—*κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν*] On the grammatical structure, comp. vi. 5 (*διεφθαρμένοι ἄνθρωποι τὸν νοῦν*; the more precise definition is not infrequently added in the accusative, see Winer, p. 215 [E. T. p. 229]), "*branded as to their conscience*" (Wahl: *κεκαυτηριασμένην ἔχοντες τὴν ἰδ. συνείδησιν*).—It is to be noted that the *καυτηριάζειν* (cauterio notare) was not only done on slaves "ut facilius possent discerni" (Leo), but was also a form of punishment for marking criminals as such (comp. Meyer on Gal. vi. 17). As these bore the brand on their forehead,—that is the figurative expression.—so do the heretics bear it on their conscience, *i. e.* they bear in their conscience the knowledge of their

[1] The expression *δαιμόνια* occurs often in the synoptic Gospels; in John only in the singular. Paul has it only here and in 1 Cor. x. Otto uses this last fact as a proof that the two epistles were contemporaneous, but he is wrong; the reference is different in the two cases; in the passage of 1 Cor. it is not the "gnostic" heresy that is spoken of.

[2] Hofmann opposes the view here put forward that *ἐν ὑποκρίσει* is to be taken with *προσέχοντες*, and makes the curious remark that *ἐν* "can only introduce that which is of use to me for doing something, not that which makes me do a thing only in so far as it is of use to another to determine me to do it" (!).

guilt.[1] Theodoret (followed by Heumann) wrongly understands the apostle's expression to denote moral deadness.[2] The apostle does not blame the heretics for having a conscience completely blunted, but for acting against their conscience; comp. Tit. iii. 11: *αὐτοκατάκριτος*.—On *ἰδίαν*, de Wette remarks that it is not emphatic here; but it is not improbable that the apostle had some such side-thought in mind as Bengel suggests: dum alios tamen urgent (so, too, Wiesinger).

Ver. 3. Further description of the heretics. [XII *c*, *d*.]—Κωλυόντων γαμεῖν] Since even the Essenes and Therapeutae made abstinence from marriage a necessary condition of a holy life, there is no ground whatever for supposing that this description proves the heretics to have been followers of the later Christian gnostics (especially of Marcion, according to Baur).—*ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων*] similar construction in ii. 12; 1 Cor. xiv. 34; the infinitive is dependent on the *κελευόντων* implied in *κωλυόντων* (=*κελευόντων μή*); see Winer, p. 578 [E. T. p. 622]; Buttmann, p. 343 [E. T. 401.]. Isidor of Pelusium unnecessarily corrects *ἀπέχεσθαι* into *ἀντέχεσθαι*. In the Epistle to the Romans (chap. xiv.) the apostle speaks of weak brethren's anxiety in regard to the enjoyment of many meats, and the heretics combated in the Epistle to the Colossians are distinctly described as forbidding the enjoyment of certain meats; but neither here nor in these passages is it said what kinds of meat were forbidden, nor why (comp. also Tit. i. 14, 15). It is, however, not improbable—if we follow the analogy of later gnostics—that animal food, and perhaps also wine (Col. ii. 6: *ἐν βρώσει ἢ ἐν πόσει*), are specially meant. There is no indication that the prohibition was founded on gnostic dualism (van Oosterzee); it is more probable that the false asceticism of the heretics was connected with the Mosaic distinction between clean and unclean (comp. Tit. i. 15); so also Wiesinger.[3]—In the Epistle to the Colossians (ii. 22) the apostle indicates the perversity of such a prohibition in a brief relative clause; and so also here.—*ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισεν εἰς μετάληψιν κ.τ.λ.*] Different answers have been given to the question why only the second, and not also the first error is refuted. It may have been that the heretics did not make abstinence from marriage, as they made abstinence from certain meats, a command laid on all. It may have been, too, "that the prohibition to marry stood in manifest contradiction with the divine order of creation, whereas the prohibition of certain meats might appear less objectionable because of its analogy with the prohibition in the law of Moses" (Hofmann). Besides, the apostle has already indicated in ii. 15 the opposition of the gospel to this prohibition to marry.—The word *μετάληψις* occurs only here, though in Acts xxvii. 33 we find *μεταλαβεῖν τροφῆς*.—The apostle does not content himself with saying that God made food to be enjoyed, but he shows at

[1] Theophylact rightly: *ἐπεὶ συνίσασιν ἑαυτοῖς ἀκαθαρσίαν πολλήν, διὰ τοῦτο τὸ συνειδὸς αὐτῶν ἀνεξαλείπτους ἔχει τοὺς καυτῆρας τοῦ ῥυπαροῦ βίου.*

[2] *νέκρωσις καὶ ἀποβολὴ πάσης αἰσθήσεως, ἰσχάτη ἀναλγησία· ὁ γὰρ τοῦ καυτῆρος τόπος νεκρωθεὶς τὴν πρότεραν αἴσθησιν ἀποβάλλει.*

[3] Hofmann, with no good reason, declares, on the other hand, that attention is directed here to the Essenes and Therapeutae, and to the weak Christians mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans, as well as to the heretics at Colosse.

the same time how God meant it to be enjoyed, viz.: *μετὰ εὐχαριστίας* (comp. on this 1 Cor. x. 31). He then limits the general thought by a special reference to believers: *τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπεγνωκόσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, as those in whom the purpose of creation is fulfilled, solis filiis suis Deus totum mundum et quicquid in mundo est destinavit, qua ratione etiam vocantur mundi heredes (Calvin). The apostle's thought is distorted by adding "also" before *τοῖς πιστοῖς*, as is done by some expositors.—Heydenreich rightly says that the words are equivalent to *ἵνα οἱ πιστοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐπεγνωκότες τὴν ἀληθ. μεταλαβῶσιν αὐτῶν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας*. Hofmann unjustifiably takes exception to this, and—in spite of *ὅτι* beginning a new sentence—seeks to connect *τοῖς πιστοῖς* not with what goes before, but with what follows (!). The added words: *τοῖς πιστοῖς κ.τ.λ.*, show most clearly the perverse conduct of the heretics in forbidding the enjoyment, and to believers of all people. *Πιστοί* are "believers," and not "those convinced that enjoyment is permitted to them;" *ἐπεγν. τ. ἀλήθ.* also does not denote a special class of the *πιστῶν*: "the Christians who have come to the true gnosis" (as Heydenreich thinks probable), but the *πιστοί* themselves, as those who, in contrast to the heretics, have recognized the truth, *i. e.* the divine truth. *Καί* is epexegetical; comp. ii. 4.

Ver. 4. *Ὅτι πᾶν κτίσμα Θεοῦ καλόν*] This verse gives the ground of the preceding thought, which Hofmann denies. Bengel wrongly takes it to be in apposition to *ἀλήθειαν*.—*κτίσμα*, which does not occur elsewhere in Paul, means here of course the creatures of God destined for nourishment. On the principle here expressed, comp. Rom. xiv. 14: *οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' αὐτοῦ*, and ver. 20: *πάντα καθαρά*; Acts x. 15: *ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκαθάρισε, σὺ μὴ κοίνου*.—*καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον*] comp. *Iliad*, iii. 65: *οὗτοι ἀπόβλητ' ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα*; and the scholiast's remark: *ἀπόβλητα· ἀποβολῆς ἄξια· τὰ ὑπὸ θεῶν, φησὶ, διδόμενα δῶρα οὐκ ἐστι μὲν ἀρνήσασθαι*. Here the thought stands in contrast with the idea of defilement caused by partaking of certain meats. Going back to the *μετὰ εὐχαριστίας* in ver. 3, the apostle defines it more precisely, though not by mentioning an accessory point merely: *μετὰ εὐχαριστίας λαμβανόμενον* (Eph. v. 20: *εὐχαριστοῦντες πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων*), because God wishes His gifts to be enjoyed with thankful heart, and the purpose of creation is therefore fulfilled only by him who partakes with thankfulness.

Ver. 5 serves to elucidate the thought expressed in ver. 4, that every meat *taken with thanksgiving* is good, and not to be rejected.—*Ἁγιάζεται γὰρ διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως*] *ἁγιάζειν* is not "declare to be clean and permissible," but "make something holy." In itself the meat is not something holy, for, as a purely material thing, it can be called neither holy nor unholy (so also van Oosterzee). It is less suitable to say, with Wiesinger, that "the *κτίσις* being burdened with a curse, is subject to *ματαιότης* and the *δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς*;" but it is made holy for those who enjoy it by the *λόγος Θεοῦ*. Wahl and Leo take *Θεοῦ* to be the objective genitive, and interpret it as "oratio ad Deum facta," which makes the expression synonymous with *ἔντευξις* following it; but *λόγος Θεοῦ* never occurs in this sense. Other expositors have supposed that reference is made to some particular passage of the Scriptures, either to Gen. i. 31 or

Acts x. 15; but de Wette rightly remarks that the words in that case go quite beyond ver. 4, and touch on the question whether certain meats are clean or unclean. For the same reason, *λόγος Θεοῦ* cannot mean generally "the expressions of the divine doctrine, the principles of Christianity" (Heydenreich). Since the expression points back to *μετὰ εὐχαριστίας* in ver. 4, and is closely connected with *ἐντεύξις*, it can only mean the word of God occurring in the prayer of thanksgiving (de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee), either in this sense, that the word of thanks itself is called the Word of God, inasmuch as it is the expression of God's indwelling Spirit, or because the prayer is supposed to consist of the words of Scripture.[1]—Regarding *ἐντεύξις*, see ii. 1.

Ver. 6. [On Vv. 6–10, see Note XIII., pages 153–155.] After describing the heretics, the apostle turns again to Timothy, exhorting him, in the first place, with special regard to the matters last under discussion, and then more generally in regard to the duties of his office.—*ταῦτα ὑποτιθέμενος τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*] *ταῦτα* [XIII *a.*] does not, as Heydenreich supposes, pass over all intermediate matter and go back to the christological doctrines expressed in iii. 16. It is more correct, with Hofmann, to refer it to the whole section from iii. 16 to iv. 5 (so Chrysostom); but possibly also Paul had in view only the prohibitions of the heretics (Wiesinger; van Oosterzee doubtfully).—*ὑποτίθεσθαι* (the middle only here, the act. in Rom. xvi. 4), properly: "put under the hand or foot," may also mean "instruct" (Josephus, *Antiq.* i. 14), as much as "advise" or "command" (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7); here it stands more in the latter sense; Luther: "point out."—Hofmann wrongly explains it as equivalent to "take as a theme," and—against the natural structure of the sentence—connects it with what follows, though in this way it becomes tolerably superfluous.—*καλὸς ἔσῃ διάκονος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*] Paul here uses *διάκονος*, inasmuch as Timothy was formally appointed to serve in the work of Christ; it has the same meaning as "so wilt thou well occupy the office committed to thee (*διακονία*, 2 Tim. iv. 5)." To this is attached the participial clause: *ἐντρεφόμενος τοῖς λόγοις τῆς πίστεως κ.τ.λ.*] The present participle does not stand for the perfect participle, but brings out how Timothy is to behave at all times, in order to fulfill his commission as a *καλὸς διάκονος Ἰ. Χρ.* It declares that he is to be one who makes the words of faith his nourishment. It is inaccurate, therefore, to translate *ἐντρεφόμενος* by innutritus (Bengel[2]), or "reared" (Luther).[3] The *λόγοι τῆς πίστεως* are the words in which faith

[1] In the *Apostolic Constitutions*, vii. 49, there stands the following grace before meat: *εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ τρέφων με ἐκ νεότητός μου, ὁ διδοὺς τροφὴν πάσῃ σαρκί, πλήρωσον χαρᾶς καὶ εὐφροσύνης τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν, ἵνα πάντοτε πᾶσαν αὐτάρκειαν ἔχοντες, περισσεύωμεν εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐν Χρ. Ἰησοῦ, τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα, τιμὴ καὶ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.*

[2] Bengel, however, did not overlook the signification of the present altogether, since he explains thus: Praesens cum respectu praeteriti, innutritus; nutrimentum perpetuum. Chrysostom remarks: *τὸ διηνεκὲς τῆς εἰς τὰ τοιαῦτα προσοχῆς δηλῶν.* Winer says: "*ἐντρεφόμενος* shows that the *λόγοι τῆς πίστεως* are to Timothy a permanent means of nourishment and culture."

[3] As to the meaning of the word *ἐντρέφεσθαι* (in N. T. a ἅπαξ λεγ.), see Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.*: *ἐνετράφης τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν*, and Plato, *Leg.* vii. 798*a*: *οἷς γὰρ ἂν ἐντραφῶσι νόμοις.*

expresses itself. The added words: *καὶ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας* (see i. 10), make the contrast with the heretics more decided, and the further clause: *ᾗ (ᾗς) παρηκολούθηκας*, shows that Timothy had hitherto been faithful to pure doctrine. This latter perfect stands in apt contrast with the present participle *ἐντρεφόμενος*. The original meaning of the verb: "follow near any one," furnishes naturally for the present context the meaning: "*which thou hast faithfully followed*, to which thou hast remained faithful." The translation: "according to which thou hast formed thyself," is inaccurate; the word occurs in the N. T. only here and in 2 Tim. iii. 10, as well as in Luke i. 3 and Mark xvi. 17.

Ver. 7. The exhortation to Timothy in the previous verse, that he should continue faithful to sound doctrine, is followed by an injunction to keep from heresy.—*τοὺς δὲ βεβήλους καὶ γραώδεις μύθους παραιτοῦ*] *παραιτοῦ· τὴν τελείαν ἀποφυγὴν αἰνίττεται*, Chrysostom: "have nothing to do with." Here, as in i. 4, the apostle calls the heresies *μῦθοι*, in reference to the fictions they contained; but at the same time he describes them more precisely by the adjectives *βέβηλοι* and *γραώδεις*. On the former, comp. i. 9 (Luther: "unspiritual"). It is in contrast with *ὅσιος*, and would be manifestly too strong, if the *μῦθοι* were only "things which bear no moral fruit," which "have an innocent aspect," and only "*possibly* lead to apostasy" (against Wiesinger).[1] *Γραώδης* (occurring only here) is equivalent to "old-wifish" (Luther), *i. e.* antiquated; comp. 2 Tim. ii. 23. Otto regards "the *μῦθοι γραώδεις* on the *formal* side as myths, such as are told *to children* by old fathers;" but the passages quoted by him from Plato[2] do not support his opinion. These merely say that nurses, mothers, and more generally old wives, are to tell myths to the children, from which we can infer neither that *γραώδεις* refers merely to the *form* of the story, nor that Paul had any thought of a reference to children.—The apostle's exhortation does not touch so much on Timothy's teaching as on his own personal conduct; but correctness of conduct is all the more necessary that it is a condition of the right fulfillment of his *διακονία*.—*γύμναζε δὲ σεαυτὸν πρὸς εὐσέβειαν*] [XIII *b*.] After telling Timothy what he is not to do, viz. that he is not to give himself up to the *μύθοις βεβήλοις*, he tells him now what—in contrast to these things—he is to do. The *δέ* indicates not only the transition to a new thought (Hofmann), but also the contrast to what has preceded. The figurative expression *γυμνάζειν* is used also in classic Greek of every straining exercise. This meaning is to be maintained here.[3]—*πρός* indicat finem, ad quem illa *γυμνασία* vergat (Leo); this goal is *εὐσέβεια*, *i. e.* Christian piety rooted in faith. Comp. on this verse, 2 Tim. ii. 22, 23.

Ver. 8. The reason for the previous exhortation is given by contrasting

[1] Hofmann is right in saying that *βέβηλος* does not properly mean "wicked" or "godless," but "unholy." He, however, overlooks the fact that it denotes not simply the negation, but also the opposite of what is holy. He is wrong, therefore, in maintaining: "the apostle cannot, however, truly describe in this way the doctrines of devilish liars."

[2] *Republic*, i. 350 E; ii. 377 C, and 378 D.

[3] Theodoret: *γυμνασίας ἄρα χρεία καὶ πόνων διηνεκῶν· ὁ γὰρ γυμναζόμενος καὶ ἀγῶνος μὶ ὄντος ἀγωνίζεται ἱδρῶτος ἄχρι.*

the *σωματικὴ γυμνασία* with the *γυμνασία πρὸς εὐσέβειαν*. [XIII c.]—*ἡ γὰρ σωματικὴ γυμνασία πρὸς ὀλίγον ἐστὶν ὠφέλιμος*] Regarding the meaning of *σωματ. γυμν.*, there are two opinions which need no refutation: the one is that it means the ceremonial law;[1] the other is that of Chrysostom, who understands by it disputation with the heretics.[2] It is a question whether Paul makes use of the word with or without reference to the heretics. Many expositors[3] adopt the former view, and explain the *σωματικὴ γυμνασία* to mean the practice prevailing among the heretics of abstaining from marriage and from certain meats. The connection of ideas is against this view, since in the words immediately preceding he was not speaking of rules of abstinence, but of the myths of the heretics; the sense is also against it, for Paul could not possibly say of the heretics' mode of life, which before he had called devilish, that it was *πρὸς ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμος κ.τ.λ.* Wiesinger thinks the apostle had in mind, not that degenerate form of asceticism which was to appear in the future, as he described in ver. 3, but "the phenomena of the present," viz. an asceticism to which even Timothy (v. 23) had some inclination. But since, in Wiesinger's opinion, even this asceticism is to be regarded as an *error*, we cannot well refer to it the words *πρὸς ὀλίγον ἐστὶν ὠφέλιμος*.—Hofmann understands the *σωματικὴ γυμνασία* to be a discipline such as the apostle practiced on himself in abstaining from things permitted; not, however, as if the self-denial were anything in itself, but only lest he should be hindered by the needs of the body from attaining the goal. For this Hofmann quotes 1 Cor. ix. 27. But the discipline which Paul practiced on himself was by no means a purely bodily one; it was rather a *γυμνασία πρὸς εὐσέβειαν*, since the faithful fulfillment of official duty formed part of the *εὐσέβεια*. The expression is therefore to be explained simply from itself, and we must understand by it the exercise of the body in general.[4]—The reason why Paul here speaks of bodily exercise is contained in the previous exhortation: *γύμναζε σὲ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν*. This he wishes to make emphatic by contrasting with it the *γυμνάζειν* practiced so carefully among the Greeks, though only *πρὸς ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμον*. The connection of ideas is by no means, as de Wette thinks, a mere "lexical allusion," nor is the idea itself superfluous.—*πρὸς ὀλίγον* is in Jas. iv. 14 used of time: "for a short time." In this sense many have taken it here; but the contrasted *πρὸς πάντα* is against this. It is inaccurate also to regard, as Heumann does, *πρὸς ὀλίγον* as equivalent to *ὀλίγῳ* (Luther: "of little use"); it means "for little." Paul does not mean to say that the *σωμ. γυμνασία* is of *no* use, but that its use extends to little, only to some relations of the present, earthly life.[5] It is different with

[1] Braun, *Selecta sacra*, i. 10, § 156.

[2] Chrysost.: *μηδὲ εἰς γυμνασίαν ποτὲ καταθὲς σεαυτὸν, διαλεγόμενος πρὸς ἐκείνους· οὐ γάρ ἐστι πρὸς τοὺς διεστραμμένους μαχόμενον ὀνῆσαί τί ποτέ.*

[3] Of the older, Ambrosius, Thomas; of the more recent, Calvin, Grotius; also Heydenreich, Leo, Matthies.

[4] As Theodoret, Pelagius, Wolf, and others (of those more recent, Mack, de Wette, and van Oosterzee) have rightly explained it.

[5] If *ὀλίγον* (without *πρός*), the reading of ℵ, is correct, then the meaning is that which Luther has expressed. Still *ὀλίγον* might be taken also as a milder expression for the absolute negation: of *little* use, *i. e.* properly speaking, of *no* use, viz. for the calling of a Christian. But even this view does not

that to which Timothy is exhorted: *ἡ δὲ εὐσέβεια πρὸς πάντα ὠφέλιμός ἐστιν*] A more exact contrast would have been presented by *ἡ δὲ γυμνασία ἡ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν*; but Paul could here speak at once of the use of *εὐσέβεια* in order to strengthen the previous exhortation. *Πρὸς πάντα* is here opposed to *πρὸς ὀλίγον*. The general reference thus given must not be arbitrarily limited. There is nothing, no active occupation, no condition, no human relation, on which the *εὐσέβεια* does not exercise an influence for good.—*ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχουσα ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης*] This participial clause gives a reason for the words immediately preceding, and confirms them. De Wette, and following him Wiesinger, explain (by appealing to passages such as Ex. xx. 12; Deut. iv. 40; Matt. vi. 33; Eph. vi. 2, and others) *ζωὴ ἡ νῦν* as equivalent to "a long and happy life." But *ζωή* with *ἡ νῦν* cannot have a meaning different from that which it has with *ἡ μέλλουσα*. It is incorrect also to understand by *ζωή* "eternal life, life in the full and true sense of the word" (Hofmann),[1] for it is arbitrary to maintain that *τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης* was added to *ζωῆς* only as an after-thought. This contrast forbids us to understand *ζωή* as anything else than simply "life;" *ζωὴ ἡ νῦν* is the present, *ζωὴ ἡ μέλλουσα* is the future life which follows the earthly. The genitive is to be taken as a *more remote* objective genitive,—"promise for the present and the future life" (so, too, van Oosterzee and Plitt). [XIII *d.*] The *thing promised* is not indeed named, but it can be easily supplied.

Ver. 9 [XIII *e.*] serves to strengthen the expression immediately preceding (not the thought in iii. 16, against Heinrichs), whereas in i. 15 (comp. also iii. 1) the same words refer to what follows. The *γάρ* in ver. 10 prevents us from connecting them with what comes next. It is no less unsuitable to refer them, as Hofmann does, to the *ὅτι* following, and to regard *εἰς τοῦτο . . .* as a parenthesis. This connection is opposed not only by the harshness of the construction, but also by the consideration that, as a matter of fact, the conduct of the Christian, viz. *ἠλπικέναι κ.τ.λ.*, needed for Timothy no such confirmation as is given in these words.[2]

Ver. 10. *Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ κοπιῶμεν· καὶ ὀνειδιζόμεθα κ.τ.λ.*] The particle *γάρ* [XIII *f.*] shows that this verse is to serve as a reason or confirmation of the preceding thought that godliness is profitable for all things, having promise of this and the future life. *Εἰς τοῦτο* is by expositors either referred directly to this thought (de Wette, van Oosterzee), or is joined with the *ὅτι* following (Wiesinger); in the latter case the *ἠλπίκαμεν* points only to the thought in ver. 8. The former construction deserves the preference, not only because it is more natural to refer the *τοῦτο* to the thought of ver. 8 so purposely confirmed by ver. 9; and also because *εἰς τοῦτο* cannot be taken as equivalent to *διὰ τοῦτο* (by which Theodoret paraphrases it), *id circo* (Beza). *Εἰς* always points to a goal (and not to the

justify the interpretation of *γυμνασία* which we have rejected above.

[1] It is clear that *ζωή* is not the "*blessed life*" (Matthies), since *εὐσέβεια* itself denotes the blessed life.

[2] This difficulty is concealed in Hofmann by laying the emphasis on *Θεῷ ζῶντι*, so that *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος κ.τ.λ.* is to refer to the thought that God is a living God.

reason of something.) Ἠλπικέναι, however, as an already existing condition, cannot be regarded as the goal to which the κοπιᾶν is directed; hence Luther's translation: "to this end we labor also . . . that we . . . have hoped," cannot be justified. The meaning therefore is: In regard to this, that godliness has promise, viz. in order that this promise may be fulfilled in us, we labor.—With the *Rec.* καὶ κοπιῶμεν καὶ ὀνειδιζόμεθα, καὶ . . . καὶ is either equivalent to "both . . . and," or the first καὶ is equivalent to "yea also," and the second καὶ is simply "and." In the former case the two ideas κοπιᾶν and ὀνειδίζεσθαι are more widely separated; in the latter, they are more closely connected. The second view seems to be more natural. There is very weighty authority for the reading: κοπιῶμεν καὶ ἀγωνιζόμεθα, which also gives a thoroughly appropriate meaning; but still the *Rec.*, for which, too, almost all expositors[1] have decided, might be preferred. The change of ὀνειδιζόμεθα into ἀγωνιζόμεθα may be easily explained from the following facts, that in Col. i. 29 κοπιᾶν is joined with ἀγωνιζεσθαι, that ὀνειδίζειν does not occur elsewhere in Paul (except at Rom. xv. 3 in an O. T. quotation), that the passive ὀνειδιζόμεθα does not seem suitable, whereas ἀγωνιζόμεθα agrees well with the figure in ver. 8. On the other hand, the change of ἀγωνιζόμεθα into ὀνειδιζόμεθα is scarcely explicable. The plural κοπιῶμεν is not to be limited to the apostle, or to him and Timothy; it expresses the general Christian consciousness. The verb, often joined with another verb which has in it the idea of active exertion (1 Cor. iv. 12; Eph. iv. 28; Col. i. 29), does not denote simple labor, but labor with trouble and suffering: "to toil and moil" (Heydenreich); καὶ ὀνειδιζόμεθα again points to the reproach which the Christian bears from the world. Ὀνειδιζόμεθα is a "concise expression for we endure to be slandered" (Wiesinger).—ὅτι ἠλπίκαμεν ἐπὶ Θεῷ ζῶντι] If εἰς τοῦτο refers to what precedes, ὅτι is equivalent to "because:" the meaning in that case is: in regard to the promise given to εἰσ. ζ., we take trouble and reproach upon ourselves, because we have set our hope on the living God, and are certain, therefore, that that promise does not remain unfulfilled. Ὅτι refers to both the preceding verbs, and does not merely stand "in close connection with the latter," as van Oosterzee without reason thinks. The perfect ἠλπίκαμεν as here: 1 Cor. xv. 19; 2 Cor. i. 10.—God is here called the *living* God, inasmuch as He fulfills what He has promised.—Ἐλπίζειν is construed with ἐπί and the dative, because the living God is regarded as the ground on which the hope rests. The construction is only found here at vi. 17, and at Rom. xv. 12 in an O. T. quotation. Elsewhere ἐλπίζειν is construed with ἐν, or εἰς, or ἐπί and the accusative.—The relative clause ὅς ἐστι σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν serves as a seal of the hope grounded in God. Since God is the σωτήρ, this hope, too, cannot be vain; de Wette is wrong, therefore, in asserting that this clause is "out of all keeping."—The first words are explained by ii. 4: ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι. By μάλιστα πιστῶν it is indicated that the will of God unto salvation is realized only in the case of believers. Μάλιστα does not stand

[1] De Wette, Wiesinger, Reiche, van Oosterzee, Hofmann, and others.

here "unsuitably" (de Wette); it rather gives suitable expression to the thought that God is and continues to be the *σωτὴρ* for all, whether they desire *σωτηρία* or not; but in the proper and special sense the *σωτηρία* is only for believers who really desire it.

Ver. 11. [XIII *g.*] *Παράγγελλε ταῦτα καὶ δίδασκε*] Timothy is to proclaim to the community that which Paul has enjoined to him. *Ταῦτα* refers not only to what is in ver. 10 (according to Hofmann: "to God's living power and willingness to help"), but to everything that has been said previously in regard to *εὐσέβεια*. The two verbs *παραγγέλλειν* and *διδάσκειν* tell how he is to proclaim these things. They are not distinguished from each other as referring, the one to private, the other to public instruction, nor as expressing, the one, generally public proclamation, the other, more especially exact instruction, explanation, information (Matthies); but *παραγγέλλειν*, which in the N. T. has constantly the sense of "command," indicates that Timothy is to hold up these things (*ταῦτα*) to the community as the standard of their conduct.

Ver. 12. [On Vv. 12–16, see Note XIV., pages 155, 156.] From this verse on to the end of the chapter, Paul instructs Timothy how he is to behave towards the community that his *παραγγέλλειν καὶ διδάσκειν* (ver. 11) may not be in vain. [XIV *a.*]—*μηδείς σου τῆς νεότητος καταφρονείτω*] [XIV *b.*] *σου* is dependent on *τῆς νεότητος*, which is the object of *καταφρον*. Wahl, on the contrary (followed by Leo and Matthies), construes *σου* directly with *καταφρ.*, and takes *τῆς νεότ.* as a genitive defining the substantive more precisely (= *μηδεὶς διὰ τὴν νεότητα καταφρονήσῃ σου*, Chrysostom), so that *καταφρ.* here (like *κατηγορεῖν*) would be connected with a double genitive (comp. Buttm. p. 143 [E. T. 165]). This construction, however, is more forced than the former, and *καταφρ.* occurs nowhere else with it.—According to the form of the sentence, the command is directed to the community, but in sense to Timothy. Timothy is not to permit the authority entrusted to him as representative of the apostle, to be limited on account of his youth: "*permit no one to despise thy youth.*" The *ἀλλά*, however, attached to this injunction shows that he is to effect this especially by his Christian conduct; most expositors find here *only* this last thought.—That he may retain respect, he is to make himself an example to all: *ἀλλὰ τύπος γίνου τῶν πιστῶν*. A comma is not unsuitably placed after *πιστῶν*, giving the clause greater independence, and making the qualifications that follow: *ἐν λόγῳ κ.τ.λ.*, more emphatic. On the exhortation *τύπος γίνου*, comp. besides Tit. ii. 7; Phil. iii. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 9; 1 Pet. v. 3. *Γίνου* does not mean "*become*," as if Timothy had not been so hitherto, but "*be*." The next five words: *ἐν λόγῳ κ.τ.λ.*, tell wherein Timothy is to be an example to believers. We cannot but observe that there is a certain order in the succession of the words. First we have *ἐν λόγῳ* and *ἐν ἀναστροφῇ*. *Λόγος* includes every kind of speaking (not merely *doctrine*), *i. e.* teaching, exhorting, warning, comforting, etc., both in public assemblies and in private intercourse. *Ἀναστροφή* is the life as embodied in deeds. Word and life are the two forms of revealing the inner hidden disposition. To this inner life we are directed by the next words: *ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν πίστει*, which denote

the powers that give motion to the Christian life. The last word: *ἐν ἁγνείᾳ*, gives, finally, the nature of the life that is rooted in faith and love. The word does not denote here specially chastity in the relation of sex, but generally "purity of moral behavior" (Hofmann); comp. *ἁγνός*, v. 22; 2 Cor. vii. 11; Jas. iii. 17; *ἁγνότης*, 2 Cor. vi. 6; *ἁγνίζειν*, Jas iv. 8; 1 Pet. i. 22; 1 John iii. 3.

Ver. 13. *Ἕως ἔρχομαι*] comp. iii. 14. De Wette says in explanation: "so long as thou in my absence dost preside over the church at Ephesus." This does not agree with the circumstances, inasmuch as Timothy had not been installed as the regular superintendent of the church. That was an office held more by presbyters.—*πρόσεχε* (i. 4, iii. 8, iv. 1): "curam et studium nava;" de Wette: "*wait.*"—*τῇ ἀναγνώσει, τῇ παρακλήσει, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ*] Bengel rightly says: "lectioni Scripturae sacrae in ecclesia: huic adjunguntur duo praecipua genera, adhortatio, quae ad agendum et doctrina, quae ad cognoscendum pertinet."—*ἀνάγνωσις* in Acts xiii. 15, 2 Cor. iii. 14, is used of the reading of the law and the prophets in the synagogue; this custom was continued in Christian congregations.—The two expressions *παράκλησις* and *διδασκαλία* are found elsewhere in connection with one another (Rom. xii. 7, 8; comp. also *παράγγελλε καὶ δίδασκε* above). Chrysostom is wrong in his explanation: *παράκλησις· πρὸς ἀλλήλους, διδασκαλία· πρὸς πάντας.* With as little ground do others understand by *διδασκ.* private instruction, and by *παράκλ.* public preaching; or also by the former, instruction for catechumens, and by the latter, instruction for the church.[1]

Ver. 14. *Μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος*] [XIV *c.*] Timothy is not to let the *χάρισμα* lie unused; he is to apply it diligently and faithfully to the purpose for which it was imparted to him. This exhortation does not imply blame, nor does that given in 2 Tim. i. 6.—The word *χάρισμα* may be applied to every gift of God bestowed on man by God's *χάρις*. In the N. T. it denotes both generally the new spiritual life wrought in the believer by the Holy Spirit, and also specially every faculty imparted for special Christian work (*ἱκανότης*, comp. 2 Cor. iii. 5). Here, where he is speaking of Timothy's official work, it can only mean the faculty given him for the office (not simply "the gift of teaching," as Hofmann thinks), in regard both to the *κυβέρνησις* and specially to the *παράκλησις* and *διδασκαλία* (not, however, as Chrysostom explains it, the *διδασκαλία* itself). It is not to be taken as denoting the office itself: the *ἐν σοί* is against this, and nowhere in the N. T. has the word this meaning.[2]—*ὃ ἐδόθη σοι*] not as

[1] Van Oosterzee's remark is also wrong: "The former was necessary for individuals in special circumstances, the latter for all every day;" because all need continually both the *διδασκαλία* as well as the *παράκλησις*.

[2] Otto grants, indeed, that *χάρισμα* never stands exactly for office, but thinks that *χάρισμα* may be used as a *predicate* of the idea, office, which is certainly right. Otto, however, does not wish to take *χάρισμα* here as the office generally speaking, but (distinguishing in the office—(1) the rights of office; (2) the occupations of office) as the *rights of office:* "A position of power working out from within." To *ἐν* he assigns the meaning "resting upon some one;" but, whatever Otto may say against it, the *ἀναζωπυρεῖν* (2 Tim. i. 6) does not accord with that idea. So long as any one holds the office, the *rights of office* remain to him undiminished; for these lie not in the person, but in the office, in the person only as holding the office.

Heinrichs says: *a me, Apostolo*, but, as a matter of course, by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 4).—*διὰ προφητείας μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*] *διά* is here "by means of," so that the *προφητεία* is to be regarded as the means through which the *χάρισμα* was given to Timothy (by the Holy Spirit). It is arbitrary to weaken this, the proper meaning of the preposition, as Beza does when he explains it: per prophetiam i.e. ita jubente per os prophetarum spiritu sancto;[1] and as Otto also does, when he finds here the thought that the ordination was *occasioned* by the *προφητεία*. Though Hofmann in his *Schriftbeweis* (II. 2, pp. 278 f.) had explained it: "The word of prophecy pointed out Timothy as the one to be appointed the apostle's colleague," he now says: "*διὰ προφητείας* does not mean *by means of* prophecy, but *in consequence of* prophecies." This latter explanation, however, agrees with the one which he disputes, since the expression "in consequence of" gives not merely the relation of time, but also the relation of cause. We must reject even the qualification of the meaning which Matthies demands: "The fundamental meaning of the preposition *διά*, which may be shortly defined as means, may be so modified in many cases as to give the manner in which something is done, or the intermediating form under which something comes into life." We must reject this, because, as de Wette rightly remarks, there would otherwise be no indication of a relation of cause. Besides, such passages as Acts viii. 17, 18, ix. 17, xix. 6, 2 Tim. i. 6, prove that we must keep by the proper meaning of *διά*. The *προφητεία* is mentioned as the means, but in close connection with *ἐπίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν*. *Προφητεία* (i. 18) is not equivalent to "foretelling," but is more generally the word proceeding immediately from the Holy Spirit—whether the word of promise, or of exhortation, or of prayer. This word was spoken at the time (*μετά*) when the presbytery laid their hands on Timothy and appointed him to his ministry. *Μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τ. χ.* is to be taken in close connection with *διὰ προφητείας*; the laying on of hands is to be regarded as part of the means; comp. 2 Tim. i. 6.[2] Otto wrongly says: "The laying on of hands is not a coefficient of the ordination, but an act connected with the ceremony of ordination; the *χάρισμα* was imparted to Timothy *along with* the laying on of hands, not by *means of* the laying on of hands." Wherein, then, did the ceremony of ordination consist? It is curious that Hofmann, influenced by 2 Tim. i. 6, says regarding *μετά*, that "it was of course the *apostle's* business to impart the gift to Timothy by laying on of hands," but then grants that "the presbytery of Timothy's home-church took part in the laying on of hands," without telling us what then signified the presbytery's laying on of hands. The hands were imposed by the presbytery, but Paul

For such a meaning of *ἐν*, Otto has produced some passages from classic Greek, but none from the N. T.

[1] Beza goes still farther wrong when he continues: "Potest tamen etiam sic accipi, ut idem valeat *εἰς προφητείαν*, i. e. ad prophetandum; vel *ἐν προφητείᾳ*, ita ut quod sit hoc donum exprimat apostolus."

[2] De Wette rightly: "The *προφ.* is only named as a part of the whole act of consecration by which the *χαρ.* was imparted, and the preposition *διά* is not to be referred in strictness only to *προφ.*, but also to the next words."

does not say who uttered the προφητεία. Leo remarks: "adfuerunt fortassis, quum manus imponebantur Timotheo, prophetae Christiani, qui praesagiebant faustissima quaevis, et dignum eum fore dicebant ecclesiae doctorem" (similarly Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, and others). It is, however, most probable to assume that they who uttered the προφητεία were the same as they who laid their hands on Timothy,[1] so that we cannot think here of prophets, in the narrower sense of the word, as present at the ordination.—The ἐπίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν is well known as a symbolic action of the early Christians; it was the symbol and means not only of imparting the Holy Spirit in general (Acts viii. 17, xix. 6; Heb. vi. 2), but also of bestowing the inward equipment for a special Christian ministry (Acts vi. 6, xiii. 3; comp. also Acts xiv. 23). By the presbytery, we must understand the college of presbyters belonging to the church in which the hands were imposed. What church this was, we are not told. Ecclesiastical tradition, followed by Mack, makes it the church at Ephesus; Matthies, Leo, de Wette, Wiesinger, and others think it more probable that the ordination took place at Lystra, where Paul assumed Timothy as his companion, and that the ordination was held for this very purpose.[2] To this latter view we must object, that there is no passage in the N. T. to prove that the reception into the number of the colleagues of the apostles was made with such a solemn ceremony. It is more natural to suppose that such a reception took a freer form, and that a regular ordination was only held after a more independent position had been assigned to the colleague, a position not merely of carrying out certain instructions, but of representing the apostle in a more complete way, viz. in a particular church, such as Timothy now held. Perhaps, therefore, this ordination of Timothy had taken place when Paul on his departure for Macedonia left Timothy behind him in Ephesus as his substitute (i. 3); still it is also possible that it had been done on some earlier occasion.[3]—It is strange that in 2 Tim. i. 6 the laying on of hands is mentioned only as the act of the *apostle*. Paul might certainly be speaking there of some other occasion than here, for the consecration by laying on of hands might be imparted on different occasions *to the same man*. It is more probable, however, that he is speaking of the same occasion in both passages, and "that Paul imposed hands along with the elders, but as the first" (de Wette).—It is further to be remarked that the word πρεσβυτέριον occurs elsewhere in the N. T. only as a name for the Jewish Sanhedrim (Luke xxii. 66; Acts xxii. 5), and that it is used here only of the college of the Christian presbyters of a church.

[1] Bengel is wrong: "Constr. prophetiam presbyterii, nam manus imposuit Paulus Timotheo; impositio manus proprie fit per unam personam et quidem digniorem; prophetia vero fiebat etiam per aequales, per plures."

[2] So also Hofmann, in whose opinion the "precedent" here alluded to (which, however, he is not willing to recognize as an ordination) must have taken place in Timothy's "home-church."

[3] Otto, in accordance with his whole view, places Timothy's ordination in the last period of Paul's three years at Ephesus. The reasons by which he seeks to establish this period as the one most exactly corresponding in Timothy's life, are anything but sufficient.

Ver. 15. In order that Timothy may rightly lay to heart the exhortations just given, Paul continues: *ταῦτα μελέτα, ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι*] *ταῦτα* referendum ad omnia ea, quae a ver. 12, usque ad ver. 14, praeceperat Paulus Timotheo, Leo.—*μελετᾶν* occurs elsewhere in the N. T. only at Mark xiii. 11 and Acts iv. 25, where it means "think, consider, reflect on something," equivalent to meditari. The more original meaning, however, is "exercere, carry on something with care;" this is to be maintained here, where it is a matter of putting recommendations into practice. De Wette: "let this be thy care."—*ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι*] added to strengthen the preceding words; it is equivalent in meaning to the Latin omnis (totus) in hoc sis.[1]—*ἵνα σου ἡ προκοπὴ φανερὰ ᾖ πᾶσιν*] With *προκοπή* (only elsewhere in Phil. i. 12, 15), "progress," not "progressiveness" (Hofmann), we may either supply "in filling thy office" (Heydenreich; de Wette: to the perfection of the God-man, 2 Tim. iii. 17), or more generally, "in the Christian life." The purpose of this lay in the fact that Timothy was to be a *τύπος τῶν πιστῶν*.

Ver. 16. Cumulat sane h. l. Paulus adhortationes, unde ejus amorem in Timotheum et in Christianos Timotheo subditos intelligas, Leo.—*ἐπεχε σεαυτῷ*] "*take heed to thyself*," refers to ver. 12; *καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ* refers to ver. 13. Heinrichs wrongly combines the two together as an hendiadys ("pro *σεαυτῷ* ut possis tradere bonam *διδασκαλίαν*"). On the other hand, however, we must not understand the *διδασκαλία* to mean the doctrine of others (Heydenreich: take heed, that nothing is neglected in the instruction of Christians by the teachers placed under thy oversight).—*ἐπίμενε αὐτοῖς*] *αὐτοῖς* is not masculine, as Grotius and Bengel think, the one understanding it of the Ephesians, the other of the audientes. It is neuter, and as such it is to be referred not only to what immediately preceded (="in this attention to thyself and to the doctrine"), but, glancing back to *τούτοις*, *ταῦτα* in ver. 15 (Wiesinger), it is to be referred also to all the precepts from ver. 12 onward. Hofmann is wrong in connecting *τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ* with *ἐπίμενε*, and explaining *αὐτοῖς* as the dativus commodi; for, on the one hand, no subject precedes to which *αὐτοῖς* could be referred; and, on the other, there is nothing to show that *αὐτοῖς* is the dat. commodi.—The exhortations close with words confirming them: *τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν*] "if thou doest this" (regarding the form of the clause, comp. ver. 6); *καὶ σεαυτὸν σώσεις καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντάς σου*] [XIV *d.*] Without reason, de Wette thinks that *σώσεις* has in Timothy's case a different meaning from that which it has in the case of others; that in his case it is to be understood of the *higher* (!) *σωτηρία*, in theirs simply of the *σωτηρία*. *Σώζειν* means originally "save;" but in the N. T. it has in connection with Christian doctrine not only a negative, but also a positive meaning. Hence we cannot, with Mack, take it here as signifying merely, protecting from heresy and its effects. Luther translates it rightly: "thou shalt make blessed," etc.—*i. e.* thou shalt further thine own salvation as well as the salvation of those who hear thee, *i. e.* of the church assigned to thee. [XIV *e.*]

[1] Hor. *Ep.* i. 1, 11, quid verum atque decens curo . . . et omnis in hoc sum.

Notes by American Editor.

XII. 1–5.

(*a*) The reference here made to heresies or erroneous teachings seems not to be introduced because the writer would discuss them as an independent matter; but, on the other hand, the teachings are spoken of as connected with the duty of Timothy respecting them. The point of these verses is thus found in the opening words of ver. 6.—(*b*) The prophetic declaration is one which, not improbably, the Apostle may have himself received from the Holy Spirit, but it may also, as Alf. holds, include the general prophetic testimony which the Spirit bore throughout the church. These introductory words are, apparently, a part of what Paul would have Timothy call to the minds of the Christians in Ephesus. By the mention of this declaration of the Spirit, he would warn them against the errors and show them that they were *διδασκαλίαι δαιμονίων*.—(*c*) The characteristics of the erroneous doctrines which are set forth are twofold, as indicated by *κωλυόντων γαμεῖν* and *ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων* (ver. 3). The latter point is closely connected, both in the statement of it and in the accompanying words which follow in vv. 4 *b*, 5, with what is said of the Judaistic party in the earlier epistles. Comp. Rom. xiv. 1–6; 1 Cor. viii., x. The former point is not alluded to elsewhere, but is very probably connected with the Essenic tendency of which we find indications, though in another line, in the Ep. to the Colossians. There is nothing here which suggests any further progress in error than might easily have taken place before the death of Paul. The passage is interesting, as showing how the Apostle's view on the subject of meats remained precisely the same through the successive periods of his life.—(*d*) The persons who teach these doctrines and who lead astray the *τινές* are described as characterized by falsehood and hypocrisy, and as having their conscience branded with the mark of their own guilt. These points, especially if they are to be further explained by what is said in such passages as 2 Tim. iii. 1 ff., Tit. i. 10 f., indicate a degree of conscious wickedness in these teachers, which was beyond what appears in the earlier epistles, and, in some degree, beyond what is suggested even in those of latest date previous to the Past. Epp. The steady movement along the Jewish line, and outward from it, is, however, strikingly manifest as the letters pass on from one period to another, and the links which unite the following to the preceding ones, in each case, are evident. That *ψευδολόγων* is dependent on *ὑποκρίσει* and refers to the teachers, not to the *δαιμόνια*, is admitted by most commentators.

XIII. Vv. 6–10.

(*a*) The simplest and most natural reference of *ταῦτα* in ver. 6 is to the first five verses of the chapter. By this reference this entire passage is made to correspond with those which precede and follow, as bearing upon Timothy's official action and as written especially from the standpoint of suggestions to him. The letter was for him primarily; its lessons or directions or warnings for the church were only through him and the method of his working. By suggesting to the brethren these things (*ὑποτιθέμενος* is rendered by R. V. *putting in mind;* it possibly means *teaching* or *setting forth* (Ell.) or *commanding* (Holtzm., comp. Huther), Timothy would be a good minister of Christ Jesus, i. e. one who, so far forth as this matter

was concerned, faithfully performed the duties of his office. The following participial clause presents the subjective condition which will accompany the bearing in his own mind, and suggesting to the brethren, the things referred to—that is, which will accompany the faithful discharge of duty. He will himself be in a state of continual nourishment in and by the words of faith and of the good teaching. The *good teaching*, which is the *healthful teaching* of i. 10, is here opposed to the errors referred to in vv. 1–5. It is opposed, also, to the profane and old wives' fables of ver. 7, which, quite clearly, are the same with those mentioned in i. 4. It is thus evident that the errors alluded to in i. 4 and iv. 1–5 are the same, the latter verses giving certain characteristics of them. Indeed, there can be little doubt, as the *μῦθοι*, etc., are spoken of in different places in the three epistles, that all the descriptive phrases marking the errors and errorists are to be taken together as giving the comprehensive idea of what the heresies were.—(*b*) Ver. 7.—While refusing and having nothing to do with the fables, Timothy was to exercise himself as an athlete—this strong word seems to be used as a complete opposite to *παραιτοῦ*—with a view to *εὐσέβεια*. This last word, although not equivalent to *μυστήριον εὐσεβ.* of iii. 16, can hardly, when its contrast to the *μῦθοι* is noticed, be altogether unconnected in thought with it. As a teacher of others, and called to preside over the churches after the manner of the apostles, this friend of Paul was to make earnest effort in the sphere of the *καλὴ διδασκαλία*—the very central truth of which (the *μυστ. εὐσεβείας*) was *ὃς ἐφανερώθη κ.τ.λ.*—to the end of that piety whose final issue was to be eternal salvation.—(*c*) *γάρ* of ver. 8 evidently gives a reason for the exhortation *γύμναζε*. The thought of this *γάρ* clause is, however, undoubtedly suggested, as are similar figures elsewhere, e. g. 1 Cor. ix. 24 ff., by the Greek athletic exercises and contests, with which both the writer and the person addressed had now been long familiar. The other explanations mentioned by Huther, which give the word a special reference to abstaining from meats and from marriage, or a more general one to asceticism, are to be rejected. Ell. argues for the latter explanation, that the context seems to require a contrast between external observances and inward holiness, and that ascetic practices formed a very distinctive feature of the current Jewish theosophy. But it cannot be justly affirmed that the context requires this contrast which Ell. speaks of. If it were so, we might even expect the author to have expressed the thought of ver. 7*a* in words more exactly adapted to set it forth, using the *γυμνάζειν* form there. Moreover, as Huther and other commentators say, the Apostle could not admit that the erroneous doctrines or practices, to which he had just referred as teachings of demons, were profitable for a little. The answer which Ell. attempts to give to this objection to his view, that Paul is speaking, not of the more extreme development of asceticism referred to in vv. 2, 3, which belonged to the *ὕστεροι καιροί*, but of a more innocent asceticism of the time then present, is quite inadequate, because the only subject to which allusion has been made is the asceticism described in vv. 2, 3, and, if there is any close connection between ver. 7 and the preceding verses, such as the contrast which Ell. supposes requires, the allusion here must be to those two verses.—(*d*) The best explanation of *ζωῆς* is that which regards it (with Huther) as a more remote objective genitive, or (with Alford) as a possessive genitive.—(*e*) The connection of *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* (ver. 9) is (as Huther takes it) with what precedes. This is made probable, though not certain, by the *γάρ* which follows. In 2 Tim. ii. 11, notwithstanding the following *γάρ*, the phrase, in all probability, points to what is found in the succeeding clause.

The decision, in each case, depends on the character of the sentences in the context. Here the preceding sentence is the one which has the character of a general or well-known saying, such as is required by the formula πιστός κ.τ.λ. In 2 Tim. ii. 11, the following clause has this character.—(*f*) γάρ of ver. 10, whatever view is taken of πιστ. ὁ. λόγ., is to be connected with the clause which precedes those words. The determination of the reference of the words εἰς τοῦτο is more difficult. Probably, however, Hüther is correct in referring them to the statement that godliness is profitable, etc., and in giving to ὅτι the sense of *because*.—(*g*) Ver. 11 is made the beginning of a paragraph by Tisch., Treg., W. and H., and others, but as ταῦτα evidently refers to what precedes, and there is a turn in the thought in vv. 12–16 to what concerns Timothy himself more directly, it may be questioned whether the new paragraph should not open with the 12th verse.

XIV. Vv. 12–16.

(*a*) These verses present before us exhortations or suggestions, which would seem adapted rather to a young man who was beginning or had recently begun his work as a preacher, than to one who, like Timothy, may, not improbably, have been at this time from thirty-six to forty years of age, and who had been for many years an associate in missionary labors with the Apostle. Possibly, they were designed to have a bearing upon other preachers whom Timothy might appoint, as well as upon himself, and may have been governed in their form of expression, in some degree, by this fact. Possibly they may be accounted for by the fact that the Apostle was now becoming advanced in years, and thus was disposed to look upon his younger companion as even younger than he really was. But the expressions of this character which are found here, and in some other places in the epistles to Timothy, must be regarded as somewhat peculiar and as difficult of explanation in an entirely satisfactory way. The difficulty is not such, however, as to overbalance very weighty arguments which support the Pauline authorship of the epistles. Dr. Plumptre thinks that Timothy may not have been more than from twenty-eight to thirty-three at this time; but, when it is remembered that he was old enough, at his first appearance in the history recorded in the Acts, to have already gained the favorable opinion of the churches both in Lystra and Iconium, and to make Paul desirous of associating him with himself as an assistant in his missionary work, it is almost impossible to suppose that he was under the age of twenty-one at that time, and, not improbably, he was above that age. It is more reasonable, therefore, with Bp. Ellicott, to place his age, at the time when this epistle was written, at thirty-eight to forty. He could hardly have been less than thirty-five, and probably not so young as this. He had been, for fourteen years or more, an intimate and most trusted companion of the Apostle.—(*b*) The exhortations here given, as well as those of the earlier part of the chapter, have a certain reference to Timothy's public life and relations. It was his action and conduct as related to the church, which Paul had in mind. But evidently it is his own personal action, as connected with his own personal living in and before the church, which is now made prominent.—(*c*) The gift alluded to in ver. 14 is that which belonged to Timothy as a preacher—the παρακλησις and διδασκαλια, etc.,—and the recognition of it, and perhaps its special impartation, is pointed out by the accompanying words as having taken place in connection with a public setting apart for his work. This gift is said here to have been bestowed by means of pro-

phecy. Apparently there was in the case of Timothy something kindred to what is recorded in Acts xiii. 1 ff. in connection with the setting apart of Paul and Barnabas for their missionary work. The laying on of hands was also added in the case of Paul and Barnabas. With reference to Timothy this imposition of hands is said here to have been by the body of elders; in 2 Tim. i. 6, by the Apostle himself. The relation of prophecy to the end in view was that of Divine indication or direction that Timothy was to be thus set apart; that of the imposition of hands was symbolic. The true relation of the two seems to be indicated here by the use of the preposition *διά* with *προφητείας* and *μετά* with *ἐπιθέσεως*. In 2 Tim. i. 6, *διά* is, by a less strict use, connected with the latter word. Huther seems disposed to believe that this ordination took place when Paul left Timothy at Ephesus on his own departure for Macedonia. But there is no sufficient reason to reject the view that it was earlier than this, and the word *ἀναζωπυρεῖν* of 2 Tim. i. 6 rather favors that view than otherwise. Whichever of these views is correct, the ordination was by the elders, Paul uniting with them (unless 2 Tim. i. 6 refers to another occasion, which is quite improbable), and nothing in the matter of ordination beyond this can be inferred from the passage.—(*d*) The last clause of the 16th verse combines the results of the exhortations given, as affecting both his own future and that of those over whom he presided or to whom he preached. This result will be salvation. The prominent thought in the writer's mind, in accordance with all that has preceded, is, probably, that, through such action as would tend to his own salvation, Timothy would secure the salvation of his hearers. A certain special emphasis is thus laid upon *καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντάς σου*.—(*e*) It has been quite commonly supposed that Timothy had a certain timidity of character, which led the Apostle to give him such exhortations as that which is found at the beginning of ver. 12. There is, apparently, no evidence of this, except that which the exhortations suggest. They would seem, in themselves, to suggest youthfulness or inexperience rather than timidity, but may possibly be accounted for in a measure, if not indeed wholly, by the latter. The interweaving in the epistle of personal counsel with directions which were to affect others, or the churches, is so remarkable, that it must everywhere be borne in mind in case of questions or difficulties which arise.

CHAPTER V.

VER. 4. *μανθανέτωσαν*] The reading *μανθανέτω*, which is found in some cursives, 3 35, and many others, as well as in Vulg. Clar. Ambr. Aug. Ambrosiast. Pel., is to be regarded as a correction, *τὶς χήρα* being supposed to be the subject of the verb. As to the correctness of this supposition, see the exposition.—*ἀπόδεκτον*] The words *καλὸν καί*, which precede in the *Rec.*, are rightly omitted from the text by Griesb., who follows all uncials, very many cursives, versions, etc.; they are beyond doubt taken from ii. 3.—Ver. 5. Instead of *ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν*, ℵ and some other authorities have the reading *ἐπὶ κύριον*.—Ver. 8. *τῶν οἰκείων*] The article is wanting in A D* F G ℵ; probably not genuine; Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8 omitted it.—For the active *προνοεῖ* (Tisch. 7), D* F G K ℵ, *al.*, have the middle *προνοεῖται* (Tisch. 8), which, however, may be a correction after Rom. xii. 17; in 2 Cor. viii. 21 the reading is doubtful.—Ver. 10. *ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν*] The reading *ἐτεκνοφόρεσεν* in F G, gr. is strange, since the word occurs nowhere else.—Ver. 11. For *καταστρηνιάσωσι* (*Rec.* Lachm. ed. maj., Tisch. 7, following C D K L ℵ, most others), A F G 31 have the reading *καταστρηνιάσουσιν* (Lachm. ed. min., Buttm. Tisch. 7). The infrequency of the construction of *ὁταν* with the indic. pres., which occurs only a few times in the N. T. (compare especially Rev. iv. 9), might be an argument for the originality of the latter reading; but most authorities are against it.—Ver. 14. Before *νεωτέρας* there stands in D* and some cursives the article *τάς*; some other cursives, as well as Slav. Chrys. Theodor. etc., have *χήρας* after *νεωτέρας*; clearly an explanatory correction.—Ver. 15. It is doubtful whether *τινες* was originally placed *before* or *after* *ἐξετράπησαν*. For the former position (*Rec.* Tisch. 8) we have the authority of ℵ C D K L P, *al.*; for the latter (Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 7), that of A F* G, *al.*—Ver. 16. The *Rec.* *πιστὸς ἢ πιστή* is found in D K L, nearly all cursives, some versions, and in Ath. *contra Arr.* Tisch. 7 retained the *Rec.*; on the other hand, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8 omitted *πιστὸς ἤ*. The expositors (also Reiche) have declared for the *Rec.* It is to be noted further, that in Vulg. ed. Ambros. Aug. Pel. the words *ἢ πιστή* are omitted, and also that in Boern. Vulg. ms. the translation *si quis fideles habet viduas* is found. For further remarks, see the exposition of the verse.—Instead of *ἐπαρκείτω* (*Rec.* Tisch. 7, following C D K L P, *al.*), A F G ℵ have the middle *ἐπαρκείσθω* (Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8), which is indeed the original reading, the change being occasioned by the *ἐπήρκεσεν* in ver. 10, and the *ἐπαρκέσῃ* in ver. 16.—Ver. 18. For *βοῦν ἀλῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις*, Lachm. and Buttm., on the authority of A C P 37, 57, 73, 80, *al.*, Copt. Arm. Vulg. Chrys. etc., read *οὐ φιμώσεις βοῦν ἀλοῶντα*, which, however, might be a correction after 1 Cor. ix. 9. Tisch. has the common reading.—Ver. 20. After *τοὺς*, Lachm. and Buttm., on the authority of A D* Clar. Theoph. Ambros. Jerome, read *δέ*, which in F G, Boern. Vulg. ms. is found after *ἁμαρτάνοντας*. This variety in the position of *δέ* makes it suspicious in any case.—Ver. 21. *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (Scholz, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. Reiche, etc.), instead of the usual reading *κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Against *κυρίου* we have the testimony of

A D* F G 17, 31, *al.*, Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Clem. Basil. etc., and for *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* we have that of A D^{2} G 17, 31, 73, *al.*, versions, even the Sahidic and Fathers.—For *πρόσκλισιν* (*Rec.*, with the authority of F G K, many others, It. Vulg. etc.) it is too rash, with Lachm. and Buttm., on the authority of A D L 10, 31, *al.*, Ath. Bas. etc., to read *πρόσκλησιν*; because, notwithstanding the testimony of the oldest MSS., the sense almost imperatively demands *πρόσκλισιν*. This is a case where Tisch.'s words (see the article "Bibeltext des N.T." in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, II. pp. 183 f.) apply: "In spite of the great preference to be given to our oldest Greek MSS., we must not overlook the fact that sometimes those opposed to them, and centuries later, have at the same time the authority of much older versions and Fathers." Tisch. retained the *Rec.*; he explains (*l. c.* p. 164) *πρόσκλησιν* as an itacism occasioned by the dictation of the text; similarly Reiche on the passage.—Ver. 23. *Rec. στόμαχόν σου* (Tisch. 7, after D F G K L, *al.*); the *σου* is wanting in A D* P ℵ (Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8); in any case, the later addition is easier to explain than the omission.—Ver. 25. After *ὡσαύτως*, Lachm., on the authority of A F G g., inserted *δέ*; it is possible that *δέ* was struck out by a copyist on the analogy of ii. 9.—*τὰ καλὰ ἔργα*] Instead of this reading, A D F G ℵ 37, 116, *al.*, Vulg. Clar. Boern. Theophyl. Aug. Ambros. Pelag. are decisive for *τὰ ἔργα τὰ καλά* (Lachm. Buttm. Tisch.).—Instead of the *Rec. ἐστι* after *πρόδηλα*, there stands in D F G P 17, 67* 93, *al.*, *εἰσιν*; in A ℵ 67** it is omitted (Lachm. Buttm. Tisch.).—*δύνανται*] Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. read the plur. *δύνανται*, on the authority of A D ℵ 17, 44, 67, 71, *al.*, plur. edd. Theodoret.

Vv. 1, 2. Directions regarding Timothy's behavior towards elder and younger church-members of both sexes.—*πρεσβυτέρῳ μὴ ἐπιπλήξῃς*] Chrysostom rightly remarks: *ἆρα τὸ ἀξίωμα νῦν φησίν; οὐκ οἶμαι· ἀλλὰ περὶ παντὸς γεγηρακότος.* Otherwise we could not but take *νεώτεροι* as equivalent to *διάκονοι*, and understand by *νεώτεραι* the deaconessess, which, however, would be arbitrary. There is, besides, no ground for Mack's opinion, that the *οἱ νεώτεροι* mentioned in Acts v. 6 (ver. 10: *οἱ νεανίσκοι*) were "church servants." By far the greater number of expositors rightly agree with Chrysostom.—*ἐπιπλήσσειν*] only occurring here, properly "strike upon," then "scold, make violent reproaches." The opposite: Gal. vi. 1, *καταρτίζειν ἐν πνεύματι πραότητος.* It is presupposed in this and the next exhortations that the church-members named had been guilty of some transgression or other.—*ἀλλὰ παρακάλει ὡς πατέρα κ.τ.λ.*] It is not to be forgotten that Timothy was still a *νεός*. As such he is in his office to deal in childlike respect with the elder men and women, if they had rendered themselves liable to his correction.—*νεωτέρους ὡς ἀδελφούς*] supply only *παρακάλει*; still Bengel is right in meaning when he remarks on *μὴ ἐπιπλήξῃς*: hoc pertinet etiam ad ea, quae sequuntur. By *ὡς ἀδελφούς* and *ὡς ἀδελφάς* it is implied that Timothy was not to exalt himself over those who were of the same age as himself or younger, but that he was to deal with them in brotherly love as his equals.—The addition *ἐν πάσῃ ἁγνείᾳ*, which follows *ὡς ἀδελφάς*, may grammatically be referred to all the members; but Chrysostom[1] and most expositors since, connect it closely with

[1] Chrysostom: *μὴ μοί, φησὶ, τὴν τῆς μίξεως μόνον εἴπῃς ἁμαρτίαν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ ὑποψίαν, φησί,*

the words immediately preceding. Rightly; since, even when taken in the more general sense of "purity of morals" (iv. 12), it cannot rightly be referred to the preceding relations; but it is very appropriate to the last, all the more if it be taken in the more special sense of "modesty, chastity."[1]

Ver. 3. [On Vv. 3–16, see Note XV., pages 178–181.] From this to ver. 16 we have instructions regarding the widows of the church. [XV *a.*]—*χήρας τίμα*] Theodoret, Theophylact, Pelagius, and most recent expositors, among others, de Wette and Wiesinger, refer *τίμα* to the support of the widows by money. De Wette explains *τίμα* directly as "care for them, support them," adding, "he is speaking of support from the church-purse." Wiesinger, on the other hand, remarks: "We do not say that *τιμάω* means 'support' exactly, but it means an honoring which was to manifest itself in supporting them." In proof of this view, appeal is made to the passages in Acts vi. 1, xxviii. 10; Matt. xv. 4–6; but wrongly. In the two last passages the meaning "support with money" can only arbitrarily be given to *τιμᾶν* (see Meyer on Acts xxviii. 10); and though the widows were supported by the church, as we learn from Acts vi. 1,[2] we cannot from that draw any inference as to the meaning of *τιμᾶν*. But even the context does not necessitate us to specialize the meaning. Granted that all that follows referred only to money-support to be given to the widows, why should not these special exhortations be introduced by one of a more general nature? Besides, the support mentioned being the business of the church, and not of Timothy alone, the apostle—according to the analogy of *καταλεγέσθω* (ver. 9)—would not have written *τίμα*, but *χήραι τιμάσθωσαν*. Hence, with several old and some recent commentators, such as Matthies, van Oosterzee, Plitt, Hofmann, we should retain the usual meaning of *τιμᾶν*. Their support by the church is simply a consequence and proof of the *τιμᾶν*.—*τὰς ὄντως χήρας*] is added to define more precisely what widows Paul was thinking of, viz. those who are widows in the true and proper sense of the word (Luther: right widows). Ὄντως is used as an adjective only here in the N. T.[3] What kind of widows are meant thereby, we are to infer from what follows.

Vv. 4–8. [XV *b.*] There are two opposing views regarding the explanation of this section. (1) The view upheld by the majority of recent commentators, de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt, which is as follows. Paul is giving Timothy instructions to support the "*real*" widows. From these he distinguishes (ver. 4 being in contrast with ver. 3) the widow who has children or grandchildren, because they are able and ought to care for her. With *μανθανέτωσαν* we should supply as subject *τέκνα ἢ ἔκγονα*, and

δῷς· ἐπεὶ ἰδὴ γὰρ αἱ πρὸς τὰς νεωτέρας γενόμεναι ὁμιλίαι δυσκόλως διαφεύγουσιν ὑποψίαν, δεῖ δὲ γίνεσθαι παρὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τοῦτο, διὰ τοῦτο, ἐν πάσῃ ἀγνείᾳ προστίθησι.—On the words ὡς ἀδελφάς, Bengel briefly and aptly says: hic respectus egregie adjuvat castitatem.

[1] Comp. Athenagoras, *Leg. pro Christ.* p. 36: καθ' ἡλικίαν τοὺς μὲν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας νοοῦμεν, τοὺς δὲ ἀδελφοὺς ἔχομεν καὶ ἀδελφάς· καὶ τῆς πρυβεβηκόσι τὴν τῶν πατέρων καὶ μητέρων τιμὴν ἀπονέμομεν.

[2] Comp. also Ignatius, *ad Polycarp.* chap. iv.; Justin Martyr, *Apolog.* i. 67.

[3] Plato, *Phaedr.* 260*a*: τὰ ὄντως ἀγαθὰ

we should understand by *τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον* and *τοῖς πρωτότοκοις* the widowed mother or grandmother. Ver. 5 contrasts again with ver. 4; *καὶ μεμονωμένη* explains the signification of *ἡ ὄντως χήρα*. The predicate *ἠλπικε κ.τ.λ.* denotes the life-work which the "right," *i. e.* the forsaken, widow has to fulfill, her fulfillment of it being a necessary condition of receiving support. Ver. 6 declares negatively what conduct the apostle expects from an *ὄντως χήρα*, and to such conduct Timothy (ver. 7) is to exhort them. At ver. 8, Paul returns to ver. 4, *τις* referring to the widows' relations, and *τῶν ἰδίων καὶ μάλιστα* [*τῶν*] *οἰκείων* to the widows themselves.—(2) The view upheld by most older and some recent commentators, especially Matthies and Hofmann, which is as follows. After enjoining on Timothy to honor the "real" widows, Paul first directs the widows who have children or grandchildren (still uncared for), to show these all loving care, and thereby recompense the love shown to themselves by their parents. The subject of *μανθανέτωσαν* is *τις χήρα* (as a collective idea); *τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον* are the children or grandchildren, and *οἱ πρόγονοι* the dead parents of the widow. Ver. 5 describes the "real" widow as one who in her loneliness leads a life pious and consecrated to God; and as a contrast to this we have the picture of a wanton widow in ver. 6. In ver. 8, again (ver. 4), widows who have relations needing their care are again reminded of the duty of this care.[1]—Each of these views has its difficulties. Against the *second* view, the supporters of the first maintain the following points: —(1) that as ver. 4 is in contrast with ver. 3, and ver. 5 in contrast again with ver. 4 (*δέ*), the *χήρα* spoken of in ver. 4 cannot be regarded as belonging to the *ὄντως χήραις*; and (2) that as *εὐσεβεῖν* (ver. 4) applies more naturally to the conduct of children towards their mother (or grandmother) than *vice versa*, and as the thought: the widow is by her care for her children to make recompense for the care shown to herself by her parents, is "somewhat far-fetched" (de Wette), the *ὄντως χήρα* can only mean the widow with no relations for whom it is her duty to care.—But the *first* view has also its difficulties. If we adopt it, we find it strange that the apostle should not have written simply *αὐτήν* for *τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον*, and *αὐτῇ* for *τοῖς προγόνοις*, all the more that *οἱ πρόγονοι* is a name for "progenitors." Further, *πρῶτον*, which Wiesinger translates inaccurately by "before all," does not get its full force. It is arbitrary to understand by *τέκνα ἢ ἔκγονα*, *grown-up* children, especially as the expression *τέκνα ἔχειν* makes the children appear dependent on the mother (comp. iii. 4; Tit. i. 6). De Wette says regarding ver. 5: The author would have more clearly said: "Remind a true and forsaken widow to whom thou dost give support, that it falls upon her to show an example of confidence in God and of continual prayer;" but we can hardly think that the apostle would have expressed *this* thought in such an uncertain way. Even the three repetitions of the same thought in vv. 4, 8, and 16, is at least very strange. Finally, the idea of money-support, on which this view lays all

[1] Hofmann, however, takes these verses (5–8) in a different way from that in which they are here interpreted by most expositors; see farther on.

stress, is purely imported. These difficulties are too considerable for us to regard the *first* view as right in spite of them.[1]—De Wette and Wiesinger are certainly right in regarding ver. 4 as contrasted with ver. 3, and ver. 5 with ver. 4, as well as in thinking that the word μεμονωμένη sets forth the apostle's mark of the ὄντως χήρα; but they are not justified in inferring that in ver. 4 he is speaking of a widow with relations who can take care of her. Why, in that case, should the apostle in ver. 5 have said regarding the ὄντως χήρα, that she was to προσμένειν ταῖς δεήσεσι καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς, and to do so νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, for all this is in no way opposed to what is said in ver. 4? The προσμένειν leads us to suppose that the apostle was thinking of a widow who had not to care for relations.—The right view will accordingly be this. After exhorting Timothy to honor the "real" widows (see on ver. 3), Paul distinguishes from these ὄντως χήρας, in the first place, the one who is *not forsaken*, but has children or grandchildren (not grown up); and he lays it on her as a duty not to neglect them. Then he describes the conduct of the "*real*" or *forsaken* widow, who has therefore no ἴδιον οἶκον, showing what beseems her in her position in life as a Christian widow; so that he is contrasting the widow who works diligently for her own, and the lone widow who continues day and night in prayer. As opposed to the latter (or even to both), he mentions in ver. 6 the χήρα σπαταλῶσα, who is, however, to be considered as dead, because her conduct is in entire contradiction with her widowed state. Then there is a natural transition to the exhortation in ver. 7, which gives the apostle an opportunity for uttering, in ver. 8, a general maxim in order to impress once more on the widow with relations to care for, the exhortation in ver. 4.—Ver. 4. τέκνα ἢ ἔκγονα] ἔκγονα here (in connection with τέκνα) means the "grandchildren" (τέκνα τέκνων, Hesychius).[2] In classical usage, ὁ ἔκγονος is usually the son (ἡ ἔκγονος, the daughter), but also the grandson; τὰ ἔκγονα denotes properly posterity.[3]—μανθανέτωσαν] The subject for this verb *might* be taken from the object in the protasis: but the formation of the sentence is more correct, if we take the subject of the protasis (τις χήρα) to be the subject here also. Τις χήρα is then a collective idea, and takes the plural. Winer, too (p. 586 [E. T. p. 631]), supports this opinion.—πρῶτον] viz., before they give themselves up to the care of the church for them, with special reference to what follows: χήρα καταλεγέσθω, ver. 9, or better perhaps: "before she makes work for herself outside the house" (Hofmann).—τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον εὐσεβεῖν] The term οἶκον likewise shows that he is speaking not of the things which the children are to do for their widowed mother (or grandmother), but of the things which the widows as mothers are to do for the children; because the mother or

[1] Van Oosterzee, in agreeing with the *first* view, thinks it puzzling that this commentary gives the preference to the second. But he does not by this furnish anything towards the solution of the question, all the less that he has neglected to enter in any way upon the difficulties surrounding the view he adopts.

[2] Luther translates it "Neffen" (nephew), which in Old German usage has the meaning "descendant, grandchild;" comp. Gen. xxi. 23; Job xviii. 19; Isa. xiv. 22.

[3] Comp. Wisd. xl. 15, xliv. 11, xlv. 13, xlvii. 22; synonymous with τὸ σπέρμα.

grandmother does not necessarily belong to the *οἶκος* of a grown-up son or grandson, whereas the children not grown up necessarily belong to the *οἶκος* of the widowed mother. The meaning therefore is: they are not to forsake their house, *i. e.* their children or grandchildren. The term *εὐσεβεῖν* is used to show that the house is a temple to whose service they are to devote themselves. Matthies inaccurately translates: "practice piety in regard to one's own house." *Οἶκον* is not the accusative of reference, but purely an objective accusative; comp. Acts xvii. 23, and Meyer on the passage. "To honor one's house" is therefore equivalent to serving it with pious heart;[1] Luther's translation: "rule divinely," is not to the point.—*καὶ ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς προγόνοις*] According to the context, the meaning is this: the widows by the *εὐσεβεῖν* of their house, *i. e.* by their pious care for their children and grandchildren, are to recompense the love shown to themselves by their parents.[2] Though this thought is peculiar, it is neither *ingenious* (de Wette) nor *far-fetched* (Wiesinger).—*ἀμοιβή*, in the N. T. *ἅπαξ λεγόμ.*[3]—*οἱ πρόγονοι*, in contrast with the previous *τὰ ἔκγονα*: the progenitors; in the N. T. only here and 2 Tim. i. 3. It would be against usage to understand by it the (widowed) mother or grandmother who is still alive.—*τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι ἀπόδεκτον κ.τ.λ.*] comp. ii. 3.

Ver. 5 [XV *c.*] defines more precisely what widows the apostle specially exhorts Timothy to "honor."—*ἡ δὲ ὄντως χήρα καὶ μεμονωμένη*] *καὶ μεμονωμένη* is an epexegetical addition, defining *ἡ ὄντως χήρα* as one with no relatives who take care of her, or of whom she takes care.—*ἤλπικεν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν*] The distinction between *ἐλπικέναι ἐπί* with the dative (iv. 10) and *ἐλπικ. ἐπί* with accusative, is that in the former case the object furnishes the ground on which the hope rests; in the latter, the goal towards which it is directed. —*καὶ προσμένει* (strengthened form of *μένει*; *τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖν*, Rom. xii. 12; Col. iv. 2) *ταῖς δεήσεσι κ. ταῖς προσευχαῖς* (comp. ii. 1) *νυκτὸς κ. ἡμέρας* (1 Thess. ii. 9). With this we may compare what Luke (ii. 37) says of Anna the prophetess. Matthies rightly remarks: "The idea of the genuine widow is explained not abstractly, but in concrete form, in actual realization, for which reason we have the indicative used instead of the imperative or optative, as if a single representative of the whole class were described in living, personal form." Hofmann will not allow this natural explanation to stand, because "the predicate which names a moral behavior does not accord with a subject denoting an outward state." Taking *ἡ δέ* as a relative pronoun, he connects it with *ἤλπικεν ἐπὶ Θ.*, and regards *καὶ προσμενεῖ* (for *προσμένει*) as the apodosis, *ὄντως χήρα καὶ μεμονωμένη* forming an affix to *ἡ δέ*. Apart from the objection that the meaning

[1] It is certainly correct that *εὐσεβεῖν* is used properly of conduct towards God, and then of conduct towards parents and persons of higher position; but it is not restricted to such use. In Euripides, *Alcestis*, 1151, it is used, *e. g.* of *ξένοι*. Hofmann well says: "If a widow turns her back on the house of her dead husband and of her relations, she neglects her nearest duty, and sins against the holiness of family ties."

[2] Chrysostom: *ἀπῆλθον ἐκεῖνοι (οἱ πρόγονοι)· οὐκ ἠδυνήθης αὐτοῖς ἀποδοῦναι τὴν ἀμοιβήν· ἐν τοῖς ἐκγόνοις ἀμείβου· ἀπόδιδου τὸ ὀφείλημα διὰ τῶν παίδων.*

[3] *ἀμοιβ. ἀποδιδόναι*, Euripides, *Orestes*, 467.

[4] Jerome (*Ep. ad Gerontiam*): quibus deus spes est, et omne opus oratio.

advanced by Hofmann would have been expressed much more naturally by *ἡ δὲ ὄντως χήρα κ. μεμ., ἠ ἠλπικεν ἐπὶ Θεὸν, καὶ προσμενεῖ*, the meaning would be far from appropriate here. Besides, it gives no characteristic mark of the widow, for the hope which results in continual prayer is not peculiar to widows. Hofmann in his polemics does not observe that, in the apostle's presupposition, she whose outward condition is more definitely described is a believing widow. When this is observed, we cannot deny the appropriateness of the reference (in Wiesinger) to 1 Cor. vii. 32 ff.

Ver. 6. *Ἡ δὲ σπαταλῶσα*] The opposite of the *ὄντως χήρα* who has dedicated her life to piety. *Σπαταλᾶν*, "revel, be wanton," occurs elsewhere only in Jas. v. 5 (Wisd. xxi. 15). There is nothing to show that the apostle was here thinking of the squandering of the support received.—*ζῶσα τέθνηκε*] These words have been taken as exhorting Timothy to consider the wanton widow as dead, and not to support her; but this takes away all point from the words. The right meaning is obtained by comparing such passages as Eph. iv. 18, Rev. iii. 1, and others similar. While the widow who conducts herself as a widow should, lives in God, the wanton widow leads a life given up to the desires of the world, a life only in appearance, the very opposite of the true life. Theophylact: *κἂν δοκεῖ ζῆν κατὰ τὴν αἰσθητὴν, τέθνηκε κατὰ πνεῦμα.*

Ver. 7. After describing briefly the conduct of the two classes of widows, the apostle continues: *καὶ ταῦτα παράγγελλε*] *ταῦτα* refers to what was said regarding widows. Timothy is, by way of exhortation, to announce to the church, therefore to the widows, what the apostle has written to him; *παράγγελλε*, comp. iv. 11.—*ἵνα ἀνεπίλημπτοι ὦσιν*] *ἵνα* here gives the purpose (at 2 Thess. iii. 12 it stands after *παραγγέλλειν κ. παρακαλεῖν* in a different sense). The subject of the clause is not the dependants (*τέκνα καὶ ἔκγονα*, ver. 4) of the widows, much less they along with the widows (Heydenreich), or men and women (Grotius), but the widows spoken of in the preceding verses.

Ver. 8. [XV *d.*] *Εἰ δέ τις τῶν ἰδίων καὶ μάλιστα* [*τῶν*] *οἰκείων οὐ προνοεῖ*] "*But if any one does not take care for his relatives, and especially for those of his household;*" *τις* is here quite general in meaning, and this generality must in the first place be maintained.—*τῶν ἰδίων* and [*τῶν*] *οἰκείων* are not neuters, but masculines. In the N. T., as a rule, *οἱ ἴδιοι* are those in close fellowship and community with another. For instance, in John xiii. 1 the relation of Christ to His disciples is thus named. *Οἱ ἴδιοι* is here wider in meaning than *οἱ οἰκεῖοι*, which is "those properly of the household." Hofmann thinks that, if the reading without the article be adopted, *μάλιστα* does not belong to the verb, but to *οἰκείων* = *οἰκειοτάτων*. It is well known that in classic Greek the superlative is sometimes expressed by *μάλιστα* before the positive. But this usage is never found in the N. T.; and besides, here, where *οἰκεῖος* refers to *τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον* (ver. 4), and is therefore equivalent to "member of the household or family," the superlative *οἰκειότατος* is meaningless. To paraphrase it into "nearest kinsman of all" is purely arbitrary. At any rate, the article is by no

means necessary before *οἰκειων*, since the *ἰδιοι* and the *οἰκεῖοι* belong to *one* class; the intervening *μάλιστα* makes no difference, although it lays special emphasis on the latter.—*τὴν πίστιν ἠρνηται*] inasmuch as he does not do that to which faith, if it be a living faith, incites him; fides enim non tollit officia naturalia, sed perficit et firmat, Bengel.—*καὶ ἐστιν ἀπίστου χείρων*] Ἄπιστος here is not (as at 2 Cor. iv. 4; Tit. i. 15) "an enemy of Christ," but "one who is not a Christian," one who as such is incited by natural law to love his own children (comp. Matt. v. 46, 47).[1] The reference of this general thought varies according to the various interpretations of ver. 4. If *τέκνα καὶ ἔκγονα* be taken there as the subject of *μανθανέτωσαν*, then it refers to the relation of these to the widowed mother or grandmother; if the proper subject be *αἱ χῆραι*, it refers naturally to the conduct of the widows. There is nothing to show that the apostle here was thinking of the mutual relation between the widows and their dependants (Matthies). Still less correct is it, with Hofmann, to wrench ver. 8 away from ver. 4, and to understand by *τις* "*the father of a family*," "who at his death leaves wife and child unprovided for, when he might well have provided for them." Such a sudden transition from what hitherto has been the subject of discussion would be exceedingly strange; nor is there any hint of it given by the verb *προνοεῖν*, which denotes care in general terms, not "care for those left behind at death." Paul has hitherto been speaking of the conduct of widows, and only to that same subject can this verse be referred.

Vv. 9 ff. From this point the apostle takes up a special class of widows, viz. those who had been placed by the church on a formal list, and who accordingly possessed a certain position of honor in the church. From ver. 16 it is to be inferred that it was the duty of the church to care for them so long as they lived, while from ver. 10 it appears that they had to perform for the church certain labors of love suited to them. The various views regarding them have already been given in the Introduction, § 5; each has its special difficulties. Still Mosheim's view is the most probable,[2] only what the apostle says of these widows does not justify us in transplanting into the apostolic age the ecclesiastical institution of the *χῆραι* (*πρεσβύτεραι, πρεσβύτιδες*) in the same form as it had at a later date. We have here only the tendencies from which the institution was gradually developed. Though the apostle takes it for granted that the church takes care of these widows, we cannot conclude that, as the older expositors assume,[3] he means by the *καταλεγέσθω* their reception into the number

[1] Calvin says on this: quod duabus de causis verum est, nam quo plus quisque in cognitione Dei profecit, eo minus habet excusationis; . . . deinde hoc genus officii est, quod natura ipsa dictat, sunt enim *στοργαὶ φυσικαί*.

[2] With his view de Wette and Wiesinger agree; also Hofmann in substance. Even van Oosterzee refers us to Mosheim; but he wrongly identifies the widows here mentioned with the deaconesses, whereas Mosheim clearly distinguishes between them.

[3] Chrysostom in his commentary explains this passage as meaning, receiving in order to care for. In his *Hom.* 31, *in div. N. T. loc.*, however, he interprets it of receiving into an ecclesiastical office, saying: *καθάπερ εἰσὶ παρθένων χοροὶ, οὕτω καὶ χηρῶν τὸ παλαιὸν ἦσαν χοροὶ, καὶ οὐκ ἐξῆν αὐταῖς ἁπλῶς εἰς τὰς χήρας ἐγγράφεσθαι*.

of the widows to be supported by the church. Poor widows, like poor persons generally, would surely be supported by the church without being placed in the special class of the *χῆραι* here meant.—Vv. 9, 10. *χήρα καταλεγέσθω*] [XV *c.*] *καταλέγειν* (*ἅπ. λεγ.* in N. T.), properly "select," then "*place upon a list*," used especially of the citizens chosen for service in war.[1] *χήρα* is not the subject, but the predicate; Winer, p. 549 [E. T. p. 590]: "*as widow let her be registered* (enrolled) who is not under sixty" (so, too, Wiesinger, Hofmann). The common translation is: "let a widow be chosen" (so de Wette, van Oosterzee, Plitt.).—*μὴ ἐλαττον ἐτῶν ἑξήκοντα γεγονυῖα*] Leo and some others connect *γεγονυῖα* with what follows (Vulgate: quae fuerit unius viri uxor; so Luther). A comparison with iii. 2 shows that this is incorrect; besides, the construction itself demands the connection with what precedes. The genitive does not depend on *γεγονυῖα* (as Luke ii. 42: *ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα*), but on *ἐλαττον*, and is equivalent to *ἢ ἐτη ἑξήκοντα*.[2]—*ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή*, after the explanation given at iii. 2 of the corresponding expression: *μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ*, denotes the widow who has lived in sexual intercourse with no one but her lawfully wedded husband.—*ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς μαρτυρουμένη*] *μαρτυρεῖν* in the N. T. has often the meaning: give one a good testimony; hence the passive is: *possess a good testimony* (*μαρτυριαν καλὴν ἐχειν*, iii. 7). Ἐν here (as elsewhere in connection with verbs of similar meaning, see Wahl, *s. v. ἐν* II. *a.*) gives the ground (of the good testimony); comp. Heb. xi. 2, for which in Heb. xi. 39 we have *διά*.—The *ἔργα καλά* (comp. ver. 25, vi. 18, and other passages in the Pastoral Epistles) are not only works of benevolence, although to these chief attention is directed, but generally "*good works*."—*εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν*] *εἰ* cannot be joined immediately with *καταλεγέσθω*, since the sense forbids us to consider this and the following clauses as co-ordinate with what precedes. It is rather attached to the *ἐν ἔργ. καλ. μαρτυρουμένη*, not, however, in such a way (as Heydenreich thinks) as to stand for *ὅτε* (which is also not the case in Acts xxvi. 22, 23), but in such a way as to distribute the preceding idea into its single parts, and connect them with it in free fashion, "*if namely*." Luther: "and who has a testimony of good works, as she has brought up children."—On *ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*) Theodoret remarks: *οὐ θρέψαι μόνον ἀπαιτεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ εὐσεβῶς θρέψαι.* Wrong; the verb, not "rear" (van Oosterzee), but "nurse" (Luther), refers to the attention of love, as do the verbs that follow; compare Acts xxii. 3: *ἀνατεθραμμένος* distinguished from *πεπαιδευμένος*. There is no reason for thinking here of strange children, since it may rightly be called a *καλὸν ἔργον*, if a mother does not entrust the rearing of her children to others, but takes care of them herself (in opposition to Leo and Wiesinger); the apostle is not thinking of the distinction between strange children and one's own. Heydenreich, de Wette, and others think that Paul bases this exhortation on the ground that the *τεκνοτροφια* was part of the official duties of a *χήρα*, and that she must have practised them before;

[1] Comp. Aristophanes, *Acharn.* 1629, *Lysist.* 14. 6.

[2] Comp. Demosthenes, *in Timocrat.* p. 481; *γέγονα οὐκ ἔλαττον ἢ τριάκοντα ἔτη.*

but they are wrong, because in that case we could not but consider the *ξενοδοχεῖν κ.τ.λ.* as also the special duties of such widows.—*εἰ ἐξενοδόχησεν*] comp. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8 (*φιλόξενος*); Rom. xii. 13; Heb. xiii. 2. The word *ξενοδοχεῖν* (Euripides, *Alc.* 555) is in the N. T. *ἅπαξ λεγ.*—*εἰ ἁγίων πόδας ἔνιψεν*] comp. John xiii. 5 ff.; also Luke vii. 44. Wahl: pedum lotio (apud Judaeos) opus erat servile eademque apud eos in primis humanitatis officiis hospiti praestandis ponebatur. The feet-washing is meant literally, and not merely as "a symbolic expression for the manifestations of self-denying love" (first ed.); although Paul might at the same time be thinking of other services of lowly love.[1]—The *ἅγιοι* are not merely the *ξένοι* (in opposition to Wiesinger), but the Christians in general who came into the house as guests.—*εἰ θλιβομένοις ἐπήρκεσεν*] Bengel arbitrarily limits the meaning of *θλιβόμενοι*, wishing to interpret it only of the poor; it is to be taken more generally as equivalent to "*those in distress.*" Ἐπαρκεῖν in the N. T. only here and at ver. 16.—After naming several works of love in detail, the apostle adds more generally, in order to exhaust the *ἐν ἔργ. καλ. μαρτυρεῖσθαι: εἰ παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ ἐπηκολούθησε.*[2] Hence we must not here think of works of benevolence only, but take *πᾶν ἔργον* in its entire meaning.—*ἐπακολουθεῖν* (in the N. T. only here at ver. 24, at Mark xvi. 20, where it is absolute, and at 1 Pet. ii. 21, where it is joined with *τοῖς ἴχνεσι*) is mostly referred to persons; but we cannot therefore, with Schleiermacher, supply here *αὐτοῖς, i. e. θλιβομένοις.*[3] It stands here in the same sense as *διώκειν*, vi. 11; 1 Thess. v. 15; Heb. xii. 14. Luther: "who has followed every good work."[4]

Ver. 11. *Νεωτέρας δὲ χήρας παραιτοῦ*] [XV *f.*] *νεωτέρας* is not here strictly comparative in reference to ver. 9 (Wiesinger: "widows under sixty years"); it is rather a positive, as in vv. 1, 2 (so, too, van Oosterzee).—*παραιτοῦ*] in opposition to *καταλεγέσθω*, ver. 9 (and in opposition to *τίμα* in ver. 3); yet in such a way that, according to the analogy of the passages, iv. 7, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit. iii. 10, Heb. xii. 25, it denotes not only that they are to be omitted from the *καταλέγεσθαι*, but also that they are to be avoided personally. Luther: "the young widows, however, get rid of."[5] The reason for this injunction is given by the apostle in the next

[1] Theophylact: *εἰ τὰς ἐσχάτας ὑπηρεσίας τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀνεπαισχύντως ἐξετέλεσε.*

[2] This Hofmann wrongly disputes, wishing to lay the emphasis not on *παντὶ ἔργ. ἀγαθ.*, but on *ἐπηκολούθησε*: "if there was any good to be done, *she was to follow after it with all diligence*, she was to make it her business."

[3] Bengel gives a peculiar reference to the word, which cannot be justified, saying: antistitum et virorum est bonis operibus praeire Tit. iii. 8, 14, mulierum, subsequi, adjuvando pro sua parte.

[4] Hofmann is indeed not wrong in contending against the view that ver. 15 points to the services which the widows here mentioned are to perform for the church. He says that this verse only tells that "she must have fulfilled the duties of a mother and a Christian housewife." But the enumeration of all these duties indicates that as a church-widow she must be practised in the exercise of many services of love.

[5] Baur at an earlier period (*Die Sog. Pastoralbriefe*, p. 47) construed *νεώτεραι χῆραι* grammatically together, and only—very arbitrarily, it is true—maintained that these *χῆραι* are distinguished from those in ver. 9 by being only virgins (and not *ὄντως χῆραι*) bearing the name of *χῆραι*. Later (*Paulus, d. Ap. J. Chr.* p. 497) he expressed the opinion that *νεωτέρας* and *χήρας* are not to be taken together, that the one is the subject rather, the other the predicate, and that the words accordingly have the sense: "Younger persons of the

words: *ὅταν γὰρ καταστρηνιάσωσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ γαμεῖν θέλουσιν*] The meaning of the verb is variously given by expositors. Several take it as equivalent to "be voluptuous, lust after," and so refer it to sexual relation, appealing to Rev. xviii. 9, where *στρηνιᾶν* is used along with *πορνεύειν*. But this collocation does not prove that the verbs are related in sense, all the less that in the passage *πορνεύειν* is not used literally. Even in Rev. xviii. 3, *στρῆνος* has not the meaning of sexual desire, but more generally of "*wantonness*." There is no justification, therefore, for de Wette's translation: "to feel sexual desire," and that of Jerome:[1] quae fornicatae sunt. Others maintain here the more general meaning of the word luxuriari (Wiesinger; van Oosterzee also translates: "if they have become luxurious," but explains it of voluptuous desire, of the pruritus libidinosus). Since the word *στρῆνος* also occurs in the sense of violent desire for something,[2] Plitt explains *στρηνιᾶν* as equivalent to "go in pursuit of the satisfaction of one's desires," but without saying what desires are here meant. In Pape, the word is explained as equivalent to "be insolent" (*στρῆνος* = "insolence").[3] It will be most correct to adhere to the meaning "be luxurious." In all these various explanations the prefix *κατα* is taken in the sense of hostile opposition, and the genitive *τοῦ Χριστοῦ* regarded as the object to which those widows are opposed by their *στρηνιᾶν*. This reference of *κατα* is in entire accordance with Greek usage; comp. in the N. T. the words: *καταδυναστεύω, κατακαυχάομαι, καταναρκάω, κατασοφίζομαι*. Hofmann's explanation completely diverges from these: "After such widows have let the Saviour have their whole desire, after they have delighted in Him, they wish to marry." For this interpretation of *καταστρηνιᾶν Χριστοῦ*, Hofmann appeals to Ps. xxxvii. 4, where the Hebrew הִתְעַנַּג עַל־יְהוָה ("rejoice in God, delight in God") is translated in the LXX. by *καταστρυφᾶν τοῦ κυρίου*. But to this there are three objections—(1) This interpretation of *καταστρυφᾶν* in a good sense is quite singular in nature; (2) *καταστρυφᾶν* cannot without proof be considered identical with *καταστρηνιᾶν*; and (3) *ὅταν* is explained simply by "after that," whereas it properly means: "*in case that, so soon as.*" Ὅταν may indeed be sometimes rendered by "after that;" but whereas the latter only expresses the relation of time, *ὅταν* is only used in such cases of an inner relation. In the present case it shows that the *θέλειν γαμεῖν* is something which has its ground or presupposed condition in the *καταστρηνιᾶν* of the widows. But how can it be imagined that delight in the Lord gives any ground whatever for the desire of marriage?—Besides, the whole context compels us to take *καταστρ.* in a bad sense.[4]—*γαμεῖν θέλουσιν*] We must not overlook

female sex do not receive into the list of the *χῆραι*." This only adds to the arbitrariness of the historian, the arbitrariness of the exegete.

[1] *Ep.* 123, al. 11, *ad Agerochiam* al. *Gerontiam.*

[2] *Lycophr.* 438, see Pape, 5, *s. v.*

[3] So, too, in Stephanus (*καταστρηνιάω* = insolentius et lascivius me gero adversum); similarly Theophylact: *καθυπερηφανεύεσθαι.*

[4] Even earlier expositors rejected the strange opinion which Heydenreich adopts, that "*στρηνιᾶν* in its root-signification and origin *παρὰ τῷ στερεῖν καὶ ἀποσπᾶν τὰς ἡνίας* means, cast off the reins, be or become unbridled."—Quite as wrong is the inversion

the fact that Paul does not say simply γαμῶσιν; he wishes here to bring out the direction in which their thoughts turn. If a widow received the honorable distinction of καταλέγεσθαι, she had to recognize it as her duty to devote her life henceforth to her office, to her works of love for the church. These she must regard as her life-vocation. But in young widows the worldly desire was roused only too easily, so that they put aside their life-vocation, and sought only their own satisfaction in forming a new marriage, thereby withdrawing themselves from the work for the church. Their thoughts were therefore turned to something else than the things to which their position in the church directed them.[1]

Ver. 12. Ἔχουσαι κρίμα, ὅτι] Almost all expositors take ὅτι as introducing the object, so that what follows describes the κρίμα which the widows have to suffer. There is variance only in the more precise definition of κρίμα, whether it is to be understood as the judgment of God (Wiesinger, van Oosterzee), or the judgment of men (Wegscheider: "they draw blame on themselves;" Plitt: "they meet with reproof"), or the judgment of their own conscience (so in this commentary; comp. iv. 2: κεκαυτηριασμένοι τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν). Hofmann takes ὅτι as "because," as there is no article with κρίμα: "they are liable to condemnation;" but this makes the meaning of κρίμα ἔχειν too vague. Since the use of the article in the N. T. is so wavering, it is difficult to come to a definite conclusion. Plitt's explanation may be taken as the most natural.—ὅτι τὴν πρώτην πίστιν ἠθέτησαν] τὴν πίστιν ἀθετεῖν in Polybius (who often uses ἀθετεῖν by itself) is "fidem fallere, break a pledge." This meaning has rightly been maintained here by most.[2] We cannot infer from this expression that any formal oath not to marry again was demanded when they were received into the number of church-widows; but it certainly does follow that the reception pledged the widows to devote their lives only to the service of the Lord. To this pledge they were unfaithful so soon as they began the behavior described in ver. 11. It is out of place here to appeal to such passages in the Fathers as testify that in later times the *deaconesses* had to vow that they would not marry. Πρώτην does not stand for πρότερον, but is used by the apostle because the vow (tacit or expressed) to serve the Lord was taken at the *beginning* of their new position in life. Calvin wrongly takes the πρώτη πίστις as the fides in *baptismo* data, referring the unfaithfulness to the desire to marry, which is defined more precisely by ὅταν καταστρηνιάσωσι τ. Χρ.

Ver. 13. [XV *g.*] Ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσι περιερχόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας] By far the greater number of expositors connect μανθάνουσι immediately with περιερχόμεναι, "they learn to run about in houses" (Luther; so, too, de

of thought which Heinrichs takes up, saying: clarius mentem expressisset Ap. inverso ordine: ὅταν γὰρ γαμεῖν θέλωσιν, καταστρηνιῶσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ; for γαμεῖν θέλουσιν is a consequence of the καταστρηνιᾷν, not *vice versâ*.

[1] It is to be noted that Paul does not speak of the θέλειν γαμεῖν on the part of the widows as necessarily a καταστρηνιᾷν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. He is not uttering any general principle; he is dealing only with the actual circumstances which were occurring among the widows under discussion.

[2] So Chrysostom: παρέβησαν τὰς συνθήκας; Augustine on Ps. lxxv.: primam fidem irritam fecerunt; voverunt et non reddiderunt.

Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee). But *μανθάνειν* with the partic. does not mean *learn;* it is "*observe, perceive, remark;*" *μανθάνειν*, in the sense of *learn* ("accustom oneself"), has always the infinitive (comp. ver. 4). Leo therefore takes it here as "be wont to:" but this sense only occurs in the preterite. Winer (pp. 325 f. [E. T. p. 347]) thinks it probable that *ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσι* are to be taken together, "*they learn idleness*" (or "they learn to be lazy;" so in the second edition of this commentary; so, too, Hofmann). It is in favor of this construction that the chief emphasis is laid on *ἀργαί*; but no passage can be found confirming it.[1] Besides, the position of *ἀργαί* shows that it belongs to the subject. Bengel had taken refuge in supplying something explaining it: discunt quae domos obeundo discuntur, i. e. statum familiarum curiose explorant. Buttmann (pp. 260 f. [E. T. 303 f.]) agrees with this explanation, only that he regards the supplied words; statum, etc., as too arbitrary and sweeping; he observes: "what they learn *περιερχόμεναι τ. οἰκ.* is sufficiently indicated, not indeed grammatically, but in sense, by *ἀργαί, φλύαροι, περίεργοι, λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα.*" But if, as Buttmann thinks, we are to assume here an anacolouthon, it would be more natural to find the hint of what is to be supplied in the *περιερχόμεναι τ. οἰκ.*, so that the meaning would be: they learn *περιερχόμεναι* this very *περιέρχεσθαι.*—On the construction *περιερχόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας*, comp. Matt. iv. 23: *περιῆγεν ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.*—*οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀργαὶ. ἀλλὰ καὶ φλύαροι κ.τ.λ.*] *φλύαροι*, "talkative" (Luther), only occurs here; the verb *φλυαρέω* in 3 John 10. Theophylact: *περιοδεύουσαι τὰς οἰκίας, οὐδὲν ἀλλ' ἢ τὰ ταύτης εἰς ἐκείνην φέρουσι, καὶ τὰ ἐκείνης εἰς ταύτην.* Calvin: ex otio nascebatur curiositas, quae ipsa garrulitatis est mater.—*καὶ περίεργοι*, "inquisitive," Luther (likewise *ἀπ. λεγ.*; but in 2 Thess. iii. 11: *μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους, ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους*), forms a peculiar contrast to the preceding *ἀργαί*; Chrysostom: *ὁ γὰρ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ μὴ μεριμνῶν τὰ ἑτέρου μεριμνήσει πάντως.*—*λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα*] added to define further what precedes.—In these two verses Paul sets forth the danger of receiving young widows into the class of church-widows. It is not improbable that there were definite instances, and these caused the apostle to speak in this general way.

Ver. 14. Positive instructions regarding young widows.—*βούλομαι οὖν*] *βούλομαι* does not express a wish merely (de Wette: "I hold it to be advisable, desirable"), but a definite command; comp. ii. 8.—*οὖν* shows that this thought is a deduction from the one previous; Leo: quae quum ita sint. —*νεωτέρας, sc. χήρας*, not the virgins, as Baur thinks.—*γαμεῖν*] [XV *h.*] used also in 1 Cor. vii. 39 of the re-marriage of widows.—*τεκνογονεῖν* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*, the substantive in ii. 15) does not include, according to the notion peculiar to himself, the rearing of children (van Oosterzee.) The apostle mentions single points; every one can supply the appropriate details for himself. Leo rightly says that the idea of rearing children is included rather in the

[1] Winer, indeed, quotes two passages, one from Plato, *Euthyd.* 276b: *οἱ ἀμαθεῖς ἄρα σοφοὶ μανθάνουσι*, and the other from Dio Chr. 55. 558: *ὁ Σωκράτης ὅτι μὲν παῖς ὢν ἐμάνθανε λιθοξόος τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς τέχνην, ἀκηκόαμεν.* Buttmann remarks on the first, that the addition *σοφοί* (which is quite meaningless) is rejected on ms. authority, and on the other that it is of quite a different nature. In both cases he is clearly right.

next word.—*οἰκοδεσποτεῖν* (ἅπ. λεγ.; the substantive often occurs in the N. T.) denotes properly the work of the husband, and is equivalent to *τοῦ οἴκου προίστασθαι*, iii. 4, 12; here it is used of the wife, who necessarily has her share in ruling the household.—*μηδεμίαν ἀφορμὴν διδόναι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ λοιδορίας χάριν*] The last words: *λοιδορίας χάριν*, are not to be taken with *βούλομαι* (Mack: "I will . . . for the sake of the reproach which would otherwise be cast upon the church;" the meaning is obviously the reverse of this, so soon as these words are placed in thought after *γαμεῖν*, since *χάριν* never loses the sense of "for the sake of," nor with *τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ* (Leo: "inimica ad calumniandum parato"). They are to be connected with *ἀφορμὴν διδόναι*, but not in such a way as to form a supplement to that phrase (de Wette, with the remark that this is indeed a strange construction; also Wiesinger); the supplement should have been in the genitive, see 2 Cor. v. 12. In short, *λοιδορ. χαρ.* only defines *ἀφορμὴν διδόναι* more precisely. A definite object is not to be supplied (Leo: occasionem sc. ipsas seducendi praebere; so, too, van Oosterzee, and in this commentary), but the interpretation is: "*they are to afford the enemy no opportunity for slandering*," *i. e.* they are to abstain from everything which the enemy may use for slandering the church (not merely the widows); so, too, Hofmann on the whole. By the *ἀντικείμενος* is meant either the devil (so most of the older commentators,[1] also Leo and Matthies; van Oosterzee uncertain) or the human enemy, the Jew and Gentile (so de Wette, Wiesinger, Plitt, Hofmann). Hofmann is wrong, however, in asserting that *τοῦ σατανᾶ* in ver. 15 is decisive against the first explanation, for *αὐτοῦ* would have been used.—De Wette joins the last part of the clause to what precedes, in such a way as to supply: "and in this way." But there is no hint of this limitation. If we add it simply to what precedes, it is more natural to refer it to the whole conduct of the widows.

Ver. 15. Reason for the injunction given: *ἤδη γάρ τινες ἐξετράπησαν ὀπίσω τοῦ σατανᾶ.—τινές*, viz. "widows;" *ἐξετράπησαν κ.τ.λ.*; comp. i. 6; *ὀπίσω*, comp. Acts v. 37, xx. 30: they have turned away, viz. from the Christian path of life, and have followed Satan. This does not necessarily mean a formal apostasy from Christianity, or a connection with the heretics; it may also mean yielding oneself up to an un-Christian, carnal life (Wiesinger). This arose from their not living in accordance with the rule laid down by the apostle.—On *ἤδη*, Bengel rightly remarks: particula provocandi ad experientiam. De Wette is quite unjustified in asserting that Paul could not yet have had such an experience.

Ver. 16. According to Heydenreich, Leo, de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, and other expositors, this verse is *in substance* a repetition of what was already said in vv. 4 and 8; but if a right view of those verses be taken, there is not so much repetition.—Hofmann wishes to separate ver. 16 from what precedes it, as he separates ver. 8 from the preceding words: "If in ver. 16 the apostle comes to speak of the case in which the support of a

[1] Comp. *Constit. Apost.* iii. 2: *νεωτέραις (χήραις) δὲ μετὰ τὴν τοῦ πρώτου τελευτὴν συνεχωρήσθω καὶ ὁ δεύτερος, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου ἐπέσωσι, καὶ παγίδας πολλὰς, καὶ ἐπιθυμίας νοήτους.*

widow is not to fall a burden on the church, this has no reference to the honoring of widows." There is as little ground for the one separation as for the other; for it is not to be supposed that *καταλέγεσθαι* in ver. 9 does not refer to the church's support.—*εἰ τις πιστὸς ἢ πιστὴ ἔχει χήρας*] [XV *i.*]so runs the *Rec.* (Tisch. 7). But the weightiest MSS. have the reading: *εἰ τις πιστὴ ἔχει χήρας* (Tisch. 8), which is decidedly to be preferred. The other is only a pointless correction, arising from the idea that the husband should be named along with the wife, and without considering that *ἤ* is by no means suitable to the mention of both together, and that *τὶς πιστή* must in any case be a Christian *spouse*. The reason why the wife and not the husband is named is, that on her was laid the duty of caring for the widows belonging to the house. The *ἐχειν* expresses the close connection of the widows with the particular family, a connection which may most naturally be supposed to be one of kin.[1] Erasmus translates it: si qua mater habet filiam viduam; and de Wette, too, supposes that by widow here we are to understand the daughter, niece, etc., not the mother, aunt, etc. This limitation, however, is not contained in the expression itself. Had Paul thought of the relationship in this definite way, he would have expressed himself accordingly.—*καὶ μὴ βαρείσθω ἡ ἐκκλησία*] let not a charge or burden be laid on the church by undertaking the support of such widows.[2]—The next words give the reason: *ἵνα ταῖς ὄντως χήραις κ.τ.λ.*—On the train of thought in this section dealing with widows, Matthies rightly says: "Complaints are made from the most various quarters regarding difficulties and inequalities, regarding want of order and clearness, regarding repetition and confusion in this section; but all this is, for the most part, founded on presuppositions which have no basis in fact." We cannot but see that the train of thought is simple and natural, so soon as we observe that the chief point in the apostle's mind in this section is the injunction regarding the *καταλέγεσθαι* of the widows, and that in ver. 4 he is not speaking as in ver. 16 of widows to be cared for, but of those who have to care for the children or grandchildren belonging to them.

Ver. 17. [On Vv. 17–20, see Note XVI., page 181.] In this and the following verses Paul instructs Timothy as to his behavior towards the presbyters.[3]—*οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν*] On *καλῶς προεστῶτες*, comp. iii. 4. The contrast to the elders "who superintend well," is formed by *οἱ ἁμαρτάνοντες*, ver. 20, not merely, as van Oosterzee thinks, "those who distinguish themselves *less* in their office:" *καλῶς* does not denote a special distinction, but conduct worthy of the office.—Chrysostom explained *τιμή* by *θεραπεία καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων χορηγία*; de Wette trans-

[1] Hofmann thinks that "here the case is supposed of a Christian woman having widows in her house who, for a long or short period, are serviceable, helpful to her." But, as a matter of course, such widows receive hire from those in whose service they work, and their support can therefore not be laid as a burden on the church.

[2] The verb belongs to later Greek for the common *βαρύνειν*; only the form *βεβάρημαι* is Attic; comp. Buttmann, *Ausf. Gr.* II. p. 88.

[3] Strange to say, Hofmann asserts that in ver. 17 *πρεσβύτεροι* are not the presbyters, but "the men of advanced years, from whom the superintendents were chosen, and out of these the apostle exalts those who occupy this office worthily." Only in ver. 19 does he think that *πρεσβύτερος* is used in the official sense.

lates it directly by "*reward*." True, *τιμή* does occur in classic use in the sense of "present, reward"; but the context by no means demands that meaning here (in opposition to de Wette). We must keep here to the general meaning of *τιμή*, "honor,"—as in vi. 1 (comp. also *τιμᾶν*, ver. 3), —although we may grant that the apostle was thinking particularly of the honor which the church was bound to show to their elders by presenting them with the means necessary for their support. It is quite erroneous to interpret *τιμή* of a maintenance definitely fixed. The adjective *διπλῆς* is taken by most expositors in the wider sense; but though in the use of *διπλόος* it is not necessary to urge an accurate measure, still it is never equivalent to *πλείων*. It is certainly wrong to refer (see de Wette on the passage) the *διπλῆς* here to the heavenly and earthly honor (Ambrosius), or to the distinction between respect and reward (Matthies), or to the double portion of the first-born (Grotius), or to the double portion which, according to the *Const. Apost.* ii. 28, the presbyter received in the oblations (Heydenreich and Baur); all these references are arbitrary. The double honor here is that which comes to the presbyter on account of his office (not, as Hofmann thinks, on account of his age[1]), and that which he obtains by filling his office well.— *μάλιστα οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ*] [XVI *a*.] On *κοπιῶντες*, comp. iv. 10. Wiesinger says rightly: "we need not seek any special emphasis in *κοπιῶντες*: those who toil and moil in opposition to those who do not; *κοπιάω* is used, as elsewhere, of the teacher's arduous vocation."—The preposition *ἐν* denotes that *λόγος κ. δ.* is the sphere in which the work takes place (van Oosterzee).—*λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ* is not to be taken as an hendiadys. *Λόγος* is more general, *διδασκαλία* more special. Special stress is laid here on the latter, because activity in teaching was of special importance as a bulwark against heresies. This addition does not prove that at the time when this epistle was composed there was a clear distinction between ruling and teaching presbyters (in opposition to de Wette and Baur). The apostle might quite well have used the same expressions, although the individual superintendents labored according to their gifts and free determination, not according to fixed rules.

Ver. 18 furnishes the reason for the instruction given in ver. 16, a reason which attaches itself to the idea of *κοπιῶντες*. [XVI *b*.]—*λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· βοῦν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις*] This expression is found in Deut. xxv. 4. *φιμόω*, though often used figuratively in the N. T., stands here in its literal meaning. The whole passage, however, is taken figuratively, just as at 1 Cor. ix. 9, where Paul handles it at greater length.[2]—To these words of Scripture the apostle further adds: *καὶ ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ*] These words are not quoted from the O. T., for the passages to which attention has been directed at Lev. xix. 13 and Deut. xxiv. 14 run differently; but they are found in the N. T. at Luke x. 7 (similarly Matt. x. 10). Hence Baur and Plitt maintain that they are quoted from Luke.—The *λέγει ἡ γραφή* does not, however, compel us so to refer the words; the

[1] It might even be a younger man who filled the office of a presbyter.

[2] Even Philo says (*De Sacrif.*): *οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλόγων ὁ νόμος, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῶν νοῦν καὶ λόγον ἐχόντων.*

apostle simply adds to the words of Scripture a proverb (Christ, too, in the passage quoted seems to use the phrase as proverbial). So Calvin, also Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Hofmann.—The two sentences, according to the apostle's meaning, express the same thought; hence it is not improbable that the second was added as an interpretation of the first.

Ver. 19. The apostle now defines the proper conduct on Timothy's part towards the presbyters who do not superintend the church *καλῶς*, but expose themselves to blame, thereby doing hurt to their official influence. —*Κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου κατηγορίαν μὴ παραδέχου*] Chrysostom wrongly remarks on *πρεσβυτέρου*: *οὐχὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν.* Timothy is not to receive an accusation (*κατηγορία*, Luke vi. 7; John xviii. 29) in order to decide regarding it, *ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων.* On the pleonasm, *ἐκτὸς εἰ μή*, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 459; comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 5, xv. 2. Paul is here referring manifestly to the Mosaic law, Deut. xix. 15 (LXX.: *ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ ἐπὶ στόματος τριῶν μαρτύρων στήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα*); comp. Deut. xvii. 6 (*ἐπὶ δυσὶ μάρτυσιν ἢ ἐπὶ τρισὶ μάρτυσι*). It is a question whether he does so in the sense—corresponding with the law—of ordaining that Timothy is only to receive an accusation against a presbyter when supported by the testimony of two or three witnesses (so de Wette,[1] Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, and in general most expositors); or whether here, as in Matt. xviii. 16, there is only a somewhat general reference to the law, and it is merely said that Timothy is to receive the accusation only when brought before him in presence of two or three witnesses[2] (so Hofmann; comp., too, Winer, p. 351 [E. T. p. 375]; Buttmann, p. 289 [E. T. 336]; *ἐπὶ μαρτύρων* occurs also in the classics in the sense of "before witnesses"). As he is not speaking here of a decision, but only of the *reception* of an accusation (in order that a decision may be made), and as the construction also is irregular, the second view may be adopted as the more probable one (different in the third edition of this commentary). Reference to the law is made in the N. T. also at Matt. xviii. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 1, and Heb. x. 28; comp., too, John viii. 17.

Ver. 20 contains a further instruction regarding his conduct toward the presbyters.—*τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας*] does not refer to the members of the church in general (de Wette, Wiesinger), but to the presbyters (van Oosterzee, Plitt, Hofmann).—those presbyters who, in their official work or general walk, do not conduct themselves in a manner worthy of their office. In such cases it does not matter whether a charge against them is brought before Timothy or not.[3]—*ἐνώπιον πάντων ἔλεγχε*] The most natural reference of *πάντες* also is to the presbyters. [XVI *c.*] It would clearly be too much to expect that Timothy should punish *all* sinners before the

[1] De Wette's question, whether Timothy was not to observe this precept of justice in the case of accusations against others, is not to the point. Timothy was not appointed judge over all matters of private dispute.

[2] The suitability of such a precept is manifest when we consider the position which Timothy had to take up towards the presbyters; comp. on this Hofmann.

[3] Neither the present (*ἁμαρτάνοντας*) nor the lack of *δέ* disproves this view. The aorist (*ἁμαρτήσαντας*) would have pointed to some earlier incident, and *δέ* would be necessary only if the apostle had had clearly in mind the contrast to the *καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι* mentioned in ver. 17.

whole church (comp. Matt. xviii. 15–17); that would be unsuitable, even in the case of presbyters who had sinned. On *ἐλέγχειν*, "censure," comp. Luke iii. 19; Tit. i. 13, ii. 15.—*ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ φόβον ἔχωσι*] "*οἱ λοιποί* may be only the rest of the same class to which the *ἁμαρτάνοντες* belong," Hofmann.

Ver. 21. [On Vv. 21–25, see Note XVII., pages 181, 182.] The apostle concludes the section, on the proper conduct towards the presbyters, with a solemn adjuration to observe the precepts given.—*διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων*] In the N. T. the verb *διαμαρτύρεσθαι* means "testify" (so Acts viii. 25, x. 42, xviii. 5, etc.) and "*adjure*," and in the latter sense often serves to strengthen an exhortation (Luke xvi. 28; Acts ii. 40; 1 Thess. iv. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 14, etc.); so, too, here. The addition *καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων* is explained from the idea that the throne of God is surrounded by angels as His servants. The reference to the last judgment is wrong, as in Bengel (with whom Wiesinger and van Oosterzee agree): repraesentat Timotheo judicium extremum, in quo Deus revelabitur et Christus cum angelis coram conspicietur. Paul is appealing, not to something future, but to something *present*.—The *ἐκλεκτῶν* cannot be taken as a genitive dependent on *τῶν ἀγγέλων* (="before the angels of the elect, *i. e.* believers," so Hofmann); *ἐκλεκτῶν*, as its position between the article and the substantive shows, is an adjective belonging to *ἀγγέλων*.[1] It does not distinguish *higher* angels from *lower*,[2] nor the *good* from the *bad*, nor the guardian angels of Timothy and the Ephesian church (Mosheim) from all others, nor the angels in general from earthly beings; it is to be taken simply as an epitheton ornans. The angels as such are *ἐκλεκτοὶ Θεοῦ*, whom God has chosen as the objects of His love; comp. 1 Pet. ii. 4, where *ἐκλεκτός* is synonymous with *ἔντιμος*. Wiesinger rightly remarks that *ἐκλεκτοί* is to be taken as a general epithet of all angels, like *ἅγιοι ἀγγ.*, *ἀγγ. φωτός*, and the like. It is added in order to give greater solemnity to the form of adjuration.[3]—*ἵνα ταῦτα φυλάξῃς*] [XVII *a*.] *ταῦτα* does not refer to "everything that has been said to Timothy regarding his conduct towards each class" (Hofmann), but to what was said in vv. 17–20 regarding the presbyters. The solemn adjuration is due to the importance which the office of presbyter had for the church. De Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee refer it only to ver. 20; but this is contradicted by the close connection of the verse with what precedes.—*Χωρὶς προκρίματος, μηδὲν κ.τ.λ.*] *πρόκριμα*, "*prejudice*," in a favorable as well as an unfavorable sense.

[1] Cases occur in which the genitive of a substantive is governed by a substantive likewise in the genitive (*e. g.* 2 Cor. iv. 4); cases, too, in which the dependent genitive precedes the substantive governing it (*e. g.* Rom. xi. 13); but none in which the genitive of a substantive—in form adjectival—governed by a substantive in the genitive, stands between it and the article belonging to it.

[2] Baur explains the expression from the gnostic idea of angels who stand in special connection with the Redeemer. Irenaeus, i. 4. 5: **οἱ ἠλιωκότες αὐτοῦ (τοῦ Σωτῆρος) ἄγγελοι**, vii. 1: **οἱ περὶ τὸν Σωτῆρα ἄγγελοι**; iv. 5: **οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ οἱ δορυφόροι.**—But apart from other reasons, the expression here used is much too indefinite to be referred to that idea. Van Oosterzee takes *ἐκλεκτοί* to denote the *highest* orders of angels, but does not prove that the word is used in such a way.

[3] Comp. with it the form in Josephus, where (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 16. 14) in Agrippa's address to the Jews we have: *μαρτύρομαι δι' ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμῶν τὰ ἅγια καὶ τοὺς ἱέρους ἀγγέλους τοῦ Θεοῦ.*

Several expositors take it here in an unfavorable sense, so that the next words: *μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ πρόσκλισιν*, form a contrast to *χωρὶς προκρίματος* (so in this commentary). But as there is nothing to indicate a contrast, it is better to take the second member as defining the first more precisely: "*without prejudice, doing nothing by favor.*"—Hofmann translates *πρόκριμα* by "preference" (so Leo); but Wiesinger has already remarked that this meaning cannot be proved. If *πρόκλησιν* were to be taken as the original reading, it would have to be explained as Theophylact explains it: *προσκαλεῖταί σε τὸ ἓν μέρος εἰς τὸ βοηθεῖν αὐτῷ μὴ τοίνυν ποιήσῃς κατὰ τήν ἐκείνου πρόσκλησιν*, which nevertheless is still an artificial interpretation.[1]

Ver. 22. The exhortation in this verse: *χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει*, is not defined further. [XVII *b*.] In the N. T. the laying on of hands is mentioned on various occasions; thus specially in healing the sick (whether by Christ or His disciples), in bestowing the divine blessing (Matt. xix. 13, 15), in imparting the Holy Spirit (Acts viii. 17), in appointing to a definite ecclesiastical office (Acts vi. 6), in setting apart for special church work (Acts xiii. 3). It has been thought that Paul has here in mind the laying on of hands which was done at the readmission of excommunicated persons (de Wette, Wiesinger); but there is no trace in the N. T. of the existence of this custom in apostolic times. It is more natural to refer it to the ordination, whether of a presbyter or deacon (besides the older expositors, Mosheim, Otto, van Oosterzee,[2] Plitt, and others); but in that case ver. 22 should have come before ver. 21. Hofmann thinks that it is used of the appointment to a church office; but of this there is no hint in the context. It will be most correct to take the exhortation quite generally, so that the meaning is, Timothy is to lay hands *ταχέως*, *i. e.* "in over-hasty fashion," on no one—whatever the occasion may be. The reason why not, is given in the next words: *μηδὲ κοινώνει ἁμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις*. The *ἀλλοτρίαι ἁμαρτίαι* are not, as Hofmann thinks, the sins of those who are hasty in the laying on of hands, but the sins of those on whom hands are too hastily laid. He who thoughtlessly lays hands on the unworthy, thereby declaring them worthy of the divine blessing, makes himself a sharer in their sins. Against this Timothy is to guard; he is rather to observe what Paul expresses by saying: *σεαυτὸν ἁγνὸν τήρει*. This exhortation is in itself quite general, but it stands here in close relation to the foregoing warning. Timothy is to keep himself pure (*ἁγνός* as in iv. 12, not in the special meaning "chaste"), particularly in not making himself a partaker of others' sins by laying hands on them too hastily. This reference, declared by van Oosterzee to be the only one possible, is wrongly denied by de Wette and Wiesinger. Heinrichs and others err in regarding the apostle's exhortation as "a prohibition against intercourse with wicked men." [XVII *c*.]

[1] Reiche is wrong in saying: Huther et Matthies, quin lectionem hanc (*πρόσκλησιν*) absurdam Lachmanni auctoritate sequantur, *parum abesse* videntur. The reading *πρόσκλισιν* is distinctly enough preferred by Matthies, as well as in this commentary, in spite of the weight allowed to the important authorities that testify for the other reading.

[2] Van Oosterzee wrongly thinks that vv. 24, 25, are in favor of this explanation; there is

Ver. 23. [XVII *d.*] Μηκέτι ὑδροπότει κ.τ.λ.] Of course the apostle does not mean to forbid Timothy to drink water at all, but only urges him not to avoid wine altogether. ὑδροποτεῖν does not exactly mean "drink water," but: "*be a water-drinker*," and is only used of a man who makes water his special and exclusive drink; see Winer, p. 464 [E. T. p. 498]. The reason of Timothy's abstinence from wine is not that he, after the fashion of the Essenes, regarded its enjoyment as something not permitted to him, nor that he subjected himself to an asceticism wrong in nature (Wiesinger); but that, in his zeal for moderation (which is a part of the ἁγνεία), and in order to set an example against excess, he avoided wine, whereby, however, he might appear to favor a false asceticism (so, too, van Oosterzee). If this be kept in view, we cannot overlook the connection of the verse with what precedes. De Wette rightly remarks (following Estius, Grotius, and others) that this exhortation contains a limitation of the previous exhortation, and at the same time a contrast to exaggerated asceticism. As a reason for Timothy's enjoying some wine, Paul adduces his sickliness. It does not, however, follow, as Matthies thinks, that the apostle made this exhortation *only* out of concern for Timothy's health. Had that been the case, we cannot but hold, with Schleiermacher, that the apostle here descends to particulars which strangely interrupt the train of thought, since ver. 24 is clearly attached again to ver. 22.

Ver. 24. [XVII *e.*] This and the following verse, in close relation to one another, as ὡσαύτως shows, express a truth quite general, which the context defines more precisely.—τινῶν ἀνθρώπων αἱ ἁμαρτιαι πρόδηλοί εἰσι] πρόδηλος does not mean "formerly manifest,"[1] but "manifest before all eyes."[2] Comp. Heb. vii. 14 (see Delitzsch, comment. on the passage): Judith viii. 29; 2 Macc. iii. 17, xiv. 39.[3]—προάγουσαι εἰς κρίσιν is here, as often, intransitive (opp. ἀκολουθεῖν, comp. Matt. xxi. 9), equivalent to "*precede*." According to the sense, we must supply as the dative of more precise definition: "those who have committed the sins."—εἰς κρίσιν, equivalent to "to judgment." The meaning therefore is: some men are in such a condition that their sins are not only made manifest by the κρίσις, but they are already notorious beforehand; they precede to judgment those who have practiced them, and thus show in anticipation the result of the judgment.—The next clause forms the contrast to this thought: τισὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπακολουθοῦσιν] ἐπακολουθεῖν corresponds to the προάγειν, and ἄδηλοι naturally suggests itself in contrast with πρόδηλοι. The meaning is: Some men are in such a condition that—in regard to the κρίσις—their sins follow them, *i. e.* that their sins are only made manifest by their coming to judgment; the judgment alone makes their sins manifest.—Mack imports arbitrary references by his interpretation: "they follow *hard on their heels*, so that they cannot remain unknown, *except to those hasty and careless* in observing."—De Wette is right in his explanation: "with some they are only

in them no hint of any reference to ordination.

[1] Calvin, Beza, Leo, Mack, Matthies, and others.

[2] Chrysostom, Theodoret, de Wette, Wiesinger, Hofmann, and others.

[3] So also in the classics (comp. the Latin propalam.)

known afterwards;" but he is wrong in his additional remark: "when they have gone on a longer or shorter distance;" on this point there is clearly nothing said here.—As the verse has the appearance of an aphorism, *κρίσις* is to be taken quite generally; but since the apostle utters this general sentence in reference to ver. 22, it is to warn Timothy that he is to lay hands on no man rashly, etc., without a *κρίσις i. e.* without subjecting him to a judgment whereby sins, usually hidden, may become manifest.—As there is no good ground for interpreting ver. 22 of ordination, it is wrong to take *κρίσις* here as identical with *δοκιμάζειν*, iii. 10. For de Wette's explanation also: "the *ecclesiastical* decision of the moral censor," there is no sufficient ground. There is as little ground for the opinion of some expositors (Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Hofmann) who interpret the *κρίσις* of the judgment of God, and find the thought expressed that in the *divine* judgment all sins alike, whether manifest before or hidden, shall come to light. Wiesinger further assumes that thereby the exhortation to Timothy to beware of others' sins as of *his own*, is strengthened. But, on the one hand, it is arbitrary to supply *Θεοῦ* with *κρίσις*:[1] on the other hand, the apostle is not discussing various sins, but the sins of various men. Further, it is wrong to obscure the meaning of *ἐπακολουθοῦσιν*, and to put in its place the thought, "they are hidden." Besides, we cannot see how the thought thus taken could serve Timothy as a standard for his conduct, for *those* sins which are only made manifest by the last judgment must remain hidden to Timothy, in which case he could not be reproved for laying hands on those who had committed such sins.[2] To the opinion that Paul wished to strengthen his exhortation to Timothy by alluding to the last judgment there is this objection, that the only reason for drawing a distinction between manifest and hidden sins, would have been a suspicion on Paul's part that Timothy was guilty of secret sins. But how could he have such a suspicion, and how can this interpretation agree with *τινῶν ἀνθρώπων* and *τισὶ δέ*?—The *κρίσις* here mentioned is therefore not the divine judgment, but a trial which Timothy must hold, lest the thing of which he is warned in ver. 22 should happen (so, too, Plitt).

Ver. 25 supplements ver. 24, the distinction between manifest and hidden being applied to good works.—*ὡσαύτως καὶ τὰ ἔργα τὰ καλὰ πρόδηλα*] It may be supposed from what precedes that *τινῶν ἀνθρώπων* is to be supplied here. But it is improbable that Paul was thinking definitely of this, otherwise the clause following would have received another form. Hofmann maintains that the *Rec. πρόδηλά ἐστιν* is the original reading, taking the words *ὡσαύτως . . . καλά* as a complete clause, and explaining *πρόδηλά ἐστιν* by: "there are manifest (ones)." This purely arbitrary view needs no refutation. The assertion that the apostle could not say that the good

[1] It is certainly correct to say that *κρίσις*, even without *Θεοῦ*, sometimes in the N. T. denotes the judgment of God; but this only takes place when the context gives clear indication of it, as in Jas. ii. 13, which is not the case here.

[2] This objection does not affect Hofmann's interpretation, for he—unjustifiably—separates vv. 24, 25 from what precedes, and wishes to regard them as introductory to what follows.

works were manifest, is contradicted by the addition of the necessary restriction in the next words.—*καὶ τὰ ἄλλως ἔχοντα* is not to be referred to *κατά*, but to *πρόδηλα*: the good works with which it is different, *i. e.* which are not *πρόδηλα*.—*κρυβῆναι οὐ δύνανται*] "can, however, not remain continually hidden;" they will likewise become manifest on a careful *κρίσις*. Ver. 24 was a warning against showing favor too hastily; this verse is a warning against condemning too hastily.

Notes by American Editor.

XV. Vv. 3–16.

(*a*) After the general directions respecting the treatment of older and younger members of the churches, both men and women, special suggestions are given with reference to widows. The primary object of these suggestions seems to be to determine what widows shall be supported by the church. It will be observed that this is the first and main point which is presented. The widows who are really such (*ὄντως*) are those who have no children or grandchildren to provide for them, who are *μεμονωμέναι*, who are sixty years of age and, therefore, are not likely to marry again. Unless they are in such circumstances, their own friends are to support them, that the church may be able to give all its help to those who peculiarly need it. It will, also, be observed that the other points specified have reference to character and conduct in past life, or in their present widowhood, which have rendered them worthy objects of the church's care. Comp. what is found in ver. 9, and ver. 5. Nothing is said of any official duties or official character as appertaining to these widows. The word *καταλεγέσθω* simply means to be entered upon a list, and its meaning is fully answered by the recording on a list of persons who should be supported by the congregation out of the common funds. Is it certain, even, that the verb must have so definite a meaning as this? The arguments urged in favor of a certain official character as belonging to them are the following: (1) that it is required that they should be sixty years of age. If it were a mere matter of support, it is said that widows under this age might be destitute. But it is of permanent pensionaries of the church that the Apostle is here speaking, and that such a limit of age should be required for them is not surprising. (2) That such a widow, it is said, must have been the wife of only one husband, i. e. should not have been twice married. This, it is claimed, could hardly be made an essential condition to her being supported by the church. This argument will, of course, be worthy of consideration, only in case the meaning of the phrase is the one mentioned. If, on the other hand, the words mean that there must have been no violation, in any degree, of the marriage relation, the condition might well be deemed a necessary one. But even if the former sense is correct —as, in all probability, it is—there might easily have been, at that period, sufficient reasons for making a second marriage a disqualification for admission into the number of those who were to be permanent pensionaries of the church; as there were for making it such in the case of persons who might be thought of, on other grounds, as candidates for the office of *ἐπίσκοπος*. Such a condition would be as unlikely to be mentioned, at the present day, with reference to the latter position as the former. (3) That ver. 10 implies that the persons had been in possession of property; and, accordingly, that persons of this class, not those who had been

always poor, would by this understanding of the passage, be allowed support. This argument, however, depends on inferences from ver. 10, which are not at all necessary. (4) That ver. 12 implies a pledge to remain a widow, and this indicates an order or official class. This is the strongest of the points urged. But it is to be observed: 1, that *πίστιν* does not necessarily mean a pledge; 2, that the words connected with the *πίστιν* clause involve something more than the mere disposition to marry a second time;—*καταστρηνιάσωσι* can scarcely have less force than *σπαταλῶσα* of ver. 6, which denotes wantonness, living riotously (Ell.), giving oneself to pleasure (R. V.);—it is something which causes one to be dead while still living; 3, that immediately after the allusion to these younger widows who thus become wanton against Christ, the writer refers to the point that widows, who have friends to aid them, should not be supported by the church, precisely as he makes the same statement after alluding to the elder widows who give themselves to pleasure;—the question of support by the church is the prominent question in mind, and everything apparently turns upon this point; 4, that, as it is declared, in ver. 8, that the person who does not provide for his family denies the faith, it is not strange if it is here declared, that those who marry through becoming wanton against Christ, reject their first faith. The evidence in this passage of an ecclesiastical order of widows, with vows of perpetual widowhood, is, to say the least, very uncertain, and an argument against the Pauline authorship of the epistle as connected with any late development of such an institution rests on very precarious foundations.

(*b*) The question as to what is the subject of *μανθανέτωσαν* (ver. 4)—whether the widows or the children—is much disputed. But the following considerations seem decisive in favor of the latter: 1, The 16th verse, the correspondence of which with vv. 4, 8 can hardly be doubtful, clearly refers to the supporting of widows by relatives. 2. The only natural interpretation of *ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς προγόνοις* of ver. 4, is that which understands the words as requiring of children that they should make return to their parents for what the parents had done for them. 3. The connection of ver. 5 with ver. 4 indicates that *μεμονωμένη* refers to a bereft or solitary state in which the widow is left without help and care from others, rather than to a condition in which she has no one as the object of her care. 4. The contrast between the widows mentioned in ver. 4 and the "widows indeed" of ver. 3, as connected with the similar contrast which evidently relates to the matter of support in ver. 16, renders it altogether probable that that which (to the Apostle's thought as here presented) made the widow an *ὄντως χήρα*, was the fact that she had no children to support her. 5. It may be added that, while *τὶς χήρα may* be regarded as a collective idea, and thus may be taken as a plural subject, the use of the plural verb *μανθανέτωσαν* points more naturally to the plural nouns *τέκνα* and *ἔκγονα*. The objections to this view, which are presented by Huther, are not of special weight. He urges the use of *τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον* and *τοῖς προγόνοις* instead of *αὐτήν* and *αὐτῇ*. But this is accounted for very simply and easily, by the desire of the writer to put the sentence in a general form; comp. ver. 8. He urges, secondly, that *οἱ πρόγονοι* means *progenitors*, and thus seems inappropriate as referring to parents. But its use may be explained as suggested by *ἔκγονα*, and, as Alf. says, it was the only word which would include both mother and grandmother. He argues, thirdly, that the expression *τέκνα ἔχειν* makes the children dependent on the mother (iii. 4; Tit. i. 6), and that it is an arbitrary supposition to suppose that grown-up children only are here alluded to. This argu-

ment has no force, if the indications of the context show that the writer has in mind mature children, who can care for their parents. What the age of the children is, and whether they are regarded as independent of parents or dependent on them, must be determined, in all such cases, by the thought of the author at the time. Finally, the objection which he finds in πρῶτον seems to have no foundation, for, in such a sentence, *first* is often used as denoting *before proceeding to take another course*,—here, before leaving her to the care of the church. De W., Wies., Ell., Alf., Fairb., Plumptre, Bib. Comm., v. Oost., and others regard the children as the subject of μανθανέτωσαν. Luther, Calv., Holtzm., Hofm., and some others agree with Huther in making the widows the subject.—(*c*) Ver. 5 is sometimes taken as indicating duties which belonged to the ecclesiastical widow. The verse, however, is not put in the form which would directly point to this, and it may be satisfactorily and more simply explained as designating the general characteristics of the widow who is μεμονωμένη, and who is to be honored as ὄντως χήρα. The words ταῦτα παράγγελλε of ver. 7 probably refer to vv. 5, 6.—(*d*) Ver. 8, which is expressed in a general form, favors the reference of the μανθανέτωσαν of ver. 4 to the children and grandchildren—independently of other considerations—for the reason that cases were not unlikely to occur in which they would be disposed to neglect the widow and leave her to the care of the church, whereas cases in which a widowed mother would leave her young children, that she might become an ecclesiastical widow, were less likely to suggest themselves to the writer's mind. The meaning of ἀπίστου is *unbeliever* (R. V.), not *infidel* (A. V.). The person thus neglecting his own family was worse than the ordinary heathen, whom natural affection impelled to provide for his own.—(*e*) χήρα of ver. 9 is regarded by Winer and most commentators as a predicate, and not improbably it is so. So R. V. That this must necessarily be the case, however, may be questioned.—(*f*) The rejection of the younger widows (ver. 11) is evidently founded on the fact that they are likely to desire to marry, and liable to do so because of a disposition to turn away from Christ to the pleasures and worldliness of an unspiritual life. That persons who had been placed among the number of those who were to receive support from the church as permanent pensionaries, on the ground of their solitary and bereft condition, should be thus turning aside, was likely to be a cause of scandal and evil, and the danger of it was to be avoided. It involved a rejection or abandonment of their *first faith*—comp. above, *hath denied the faith*—or of a *pledge* which they had given. If the latter meaning is to be assigned to πίστιν, the conclusion does not necessarily follow (as Huther also affirms), that there was any formal vow not to marry again. It is to be observed, also, as Huther says in his footnote, that Paul does not represent the desire to marry, in the case of the younger widows, as necessarily a καταστρηνιᾶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. If there was any "order" of widows, everything in the passage shows that it had as little as possible of ecclesiastical development.—(*g*) The construction of ver. 13 is difficult, but, on the whole, the supplying of εἶναι, and making ἀργαί predicate to this infinitive, seems to be the least objectionable way of explaining the sentence. The explanation given by Holtzm. (comp. Words.) which takes μανθ. absolutely, and contrasts learning by going about from house to house with learning from their husbands at home (ii. 11), must be regarded as quite improbable.—(*h*) The ground of the direction given that the younger widows should marry, is one which is in the general line of thought in the passage;—λοιδορίας is the reproach which conduct such as that indicated in the preceding verses might occasion, and ἐξετράπησαν κ.τ.λ.

corresponds closely with *καταστρηνιάσωσιν κ.τ.λ.* of ver. 11.—(*i*) That *πιστή*, and not *πιστὸς ἡ πιστή*, is the true text in ver. 16 is to be believed, because it is given by the best authorities and because it is the more difficult reading. The use of the feminine is connected, possibly, with the fact that, since ver. 8, the discourse has been wholly about women—possibly, however, with the fact alluded to by Huther, that the duty specified would fall especially upon the woman. The reading with both masc. and fem. would have seemed antecedently more natural.

XVI. Vv. 17–20.

(*a*) The indications of ver. 17 are that there were presbyters who, in addition to the work of presiding, devoted themselves to teaching and preaching. But that there was a marked division between two classes of elders—ruling and teaching elders—is neither stated, nor rendered probable, by this verse. The words of Rom. xii. 7 ff. and 1 Cor. xii. 28 may, probably, point to a combination of these gifts as often belonging to preachers and teachers, but, neither there nor here, is there anything to show established ecclesiastical orders. The so-called ruling elders, or presiding elders, of different modern branches of the church have certainly no connection with what the Apostle is here speaking of. The persons to whom he alludes were neither lay-elders, nor presbyters presiding over a district or over a body of presbyters or churches in a district. They were presiding and teaching presbyters of single churches, *ἐπίσκοποι* in the N. T. sense of that word.—(*b*) The 18th verse makes it evident that, if the word *τιμῆς* (ver. 17) does not distinctly mean *reward* or *remuneration*, this idea was prominent in the Apostle's mind as connected with the *honor* of which these presbyters were to be accounted worthy. The quotation from the O. T. in the first clause as united with the words *ἄξιος κ.τ.λ.* of the second, and as used and applied in 1 Cor. ix. 9, scarcely admits of any other explanation. The second clause of the verse is not found in the O. T., and nothing sufficiently near to it in form of expression is there discoverable to justify the application to this clause of *ἡ γραφὴ λέγει* in the ordinary N. T. sense of that phrase. It is found, however, in Luke x. 7. Does the union of the two clauses by *καί* prove that *γραφή* is here used by the writer as covering the N. T., as well as the O. T.? The most that can be fairly affirmed is, that it may indicate such a use, but not that it cannot be otherwise. This verse does not, therefore, afford a decisive argument to prove a later date for the epistle than the end of Paul's life; nor can it be regarded as an argument overbalancing strong evidences which may be discovered on the other side. The explanation given by Huther is a possible, and even a not improbable one; and this notwithstanding the fact, which Holtzm. alleges, that it is not in accordance with N. T. usage to unite a Scriptural and a mere proverbial statement in this way.—(*c*) *πάντων* of ver. 20 is explained by Huther as referring to the presbyters. This reference, however, is certainly not necessary, and it seems quite doubtful, since the *πάντων* has no limiting word added to it. Ell. would, for a similar reason, give a general sense to *τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας*; but the sequence of the verses more naturally suggests the supply *πρεσβυτέρους* with this participle, as also the understanding of *οἱ λοιποί* as meaning the rest of the presbyters.

XVII. Vv. 21–25.

(*a*) The reference of *ταῦτα φυλάξῃς* of ver. 21 may be to vv. 17–20, as Huther supposes, but is more probably to be limited to vv. 19, 20. The explanation given

by Huther of *προκρίματος*, on the other hand, is better than that of other writers, who give it an unfavorable sense; because the word, in itself, does not necessarily have that sense, and because it seems improbable that the two opposite sides would be presented without some separating particle or, at least, a *καί*. The second phrase follows the first as if explanatory.—(*b*) The question as to what imposition of hands is referred to in ver. 22 cannot be confidently answered. The indefinite and general expression, in itself, is favorable to Huther's view. On the whole, however, the connection must be regarded as favoring the application of the words to the ordaining of presbyters. Ell. agrees with de W. and Wiesinger in referring the words to the laying on of hands at the absolution of penitents and their re-admission to church-fellowship.—(*c*) The second and third clauses of ver. 22 are thought by Ell. and de W., to imply too much of evil in candidates for ordination and presbyters, provided the *χειροθεσία* of ordination is to be understood as referred to. But the general form of the statement does not, in such cases, affirm, necessarily, that what is spoken of is of frequent occurrence.—(*d*) The meaning of ver. 23, so far as the words of the verse are concerned, is sufficiently clear, but the question as to its connection with the context is one of much difficulty, and has given rise to various explanations. Among the most singular of these is that of Plumptre, who is one of the very recent writers on this epistle. His view is, that the preceding verse refers especially to cases of trials where offences against purity were to be considered. "All experience shows," says Plumptre, "that it is the weakened, bloodless brain that can least control its thoughts and is most open in its thoughts to impure imaginations." Paul therefore, probably under the advice of Luke, his medical adviser, suggests to Timothy that he should get his brain "into a state of healthy equilibrium" in preparation for such trials by "a moderate use of the stimulant which he had hitherto denied himself." A recommendation to bishops and judges to guard themselves against the polluting influence of ecclesiastical cases of the sort indicated by a moderate use of stimulants, is certainly somewhat remarkable. Alford thinks that Timothy had a timidity and feebleness which prevented such keen sighted judgment and vigorous action as a bishop should show in estimating the characters of candidates for the ministry. Stimulants, taken with moderation, might overcome this feeble condition. This is hardly more probable than the suggestion of Plumptre. Some have supposed that it is a mere suggestion bearing upon Timothy's health, with no reference to the preceding verse. The insertion of a recommendation of this kind, respecting the bodily health of the person addressed, is, however, in such a context, so improbable that this view must be rejected. The true explanation is suggested by the connection, and by the fact that the thought passes on in the same line, but to a more general statement, as the sentences move from ver. 22 to ver. 24. There can be little doubt, therefore, that ver 23 is a limitation of the last clause of ver. 22 in such a way as to indicate that what is mentioned in ver. 22 *b*., is not to be carried to the extent of extreme asceticism.—(*e*) The words of vv. 24, 25 contain the statement of a general truth, but, in the connection, they must be regarded as having a more or less particular application to the subject which is especially under consideration. The word *κρίσιν* is to be taken in a wide and general sense, and the application will be determined by the matter which happens to be under discussion. The reference, so far as questions respecting presbyters are concerned, must naturally be to the judgment or trial of those questions.

CHAPTER VI.

VER. 1. The reading *δούλου* (F G) is to be regarded as a correction; so, too, with the reading *δουλείας* (73, Sahid.).—Ver. 2. In ℵ the words *ὅτι ἀδελφοί εἰσιν* are omitted, probably through an oversight. Instead of the curious *εἰνεργεσίας* here, F G, gr. 46, and some other cursives have the reading *εἰσεβείας*; 45 has *ἰργασίας*.—Ver. 3. Instead of *προσέρχεται* (*Rec.* with the support of nearly all MSS.; Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 7), ℵ has the reading *προσέχεται* (in Latin: acquiescit), which Tisch. 8 adopted. This form occurs nowhere else in the N. T.—Ver. 4. Tisch. 7 read *ἐρεις*, after D F G L, etc.; Tisch. 8, on the contrary, *ἐρις* (*Rec.* with the support of A K ℵ, etc.; so, too, Lachm. Buttm.). It can hardly be decided which is the original reading; the meaning is substantially the same in either case; possibly the singular was changed into the plural on account of the other plurals.—Ver. 5. Instead of the *Rec.* *παραδιατριβαί*, Griesb. rightly adopted *διαπατριβαί*, on the weightiest authority: A D F G ℵ, *al.*, 10, 17, 23, etc., Clem. Basil. Chrys. etc. In one MS. *διαπαραδιατριβαί* is found; others have *διατριβαί*; others, *παρατριβαί*; and one *δι ἀ παρατριβαί*, which Reiche approves.—The words *ἀφίστασο ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων* are, according to A D* F G ℵ 17, 67** 93, *al.*, Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Vulg. It., probably to be considered an addition not genuine, although they are found in K L, nearly all cursives, and the Fathers, Ambros. Pel. Chrys. etc.; Griesb. marked them as very much to be suspected; Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. omitted them; Reiche, on the other hand, defended them as genuine.—Ver. 7. *δήλον*] is wanting in several of the weightiest authorities, in particular A F G ℵ 17, Copt. Sahid. Aeth. etc., on which account it was also struck out by Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8. But as it is almost indispensable for the sense, its omission may perhaps be only an oversight, unless *ὅτι*, as Buttm. p. 308 [E. T. 358], thinks, be elliptical for *δῆλον ὅτι*.—Ver. 8. Instead of *διατροφάς*, D F G and several cursives have the common singular form *διατροφήν*; and instead of *ἀρκεσθησόμεθα*, there is found in 30, 117, 219, *al.*, Vulg. Chrys. etc., the form *ἀρκεσθησώμεθα*; see on this, Winer, p. 72 [E. T. p. 75].—Ver. 9. After *παγίδα*, D* F G, several cursives, Fathers, and versions have *τοῦ διαβόλου*, which, however, is to be regarded as an insertion from iii. 7.—Ver. 11. Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8, omitted the article *τοῦ* before *Θεοῦ*: it is wanting in A ℵ 17.—In ℵ the word *εὐσέβειαν* is wanting.—*πραΰτητα*] This reading stands only in later MSS.; A F G ℵ 71, Ignat. Petr. Alex. Ephr. Hesych. have *πραϋπάθειαν*, which is therefore rightly adopted by Scholz, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch.—Ver. 12. *εἰς ἣν*] The *Rec.* is *εἰς ἣν καί*. The *καί* was rightly omitted by Griesb., on the authority of all uncials, many cursives, Syr. Arr. Copt. etc., Chrys. Theodor. etc.—Ver. 13. The *σοι* after *παραγγέλλω* (*Rec.* supported by the most important authorities, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 7) was omitted by Tisch. 8, on the authority of F G 17, etc.; so, too, with the article *τοῦ* before *Θεοῦ*, after ℵ, though it stands in nearly all authorities. Instead of *ζωοποιοῦντος* (*Rec.* K L ℵ, *al.*), A D F G 17, etc., Ath. Cyr. etc., have *ζωογονοῦντος*, which deserves preference as the more unusual word. Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. adopted it into the text;

Reiche, on the other hand, defends the *Rec.*, especially on the ground that Paul uses the word *ζωοποιεῖν* continually of the futura hominum mortuorum ad vitam restitutio, quacum rerum universarum instauratio conjuncta erit.—Ver. 17. *ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι*] is changed in D E, Syr. Copt. Sahid. Vulg. etc. into *τοῦ νῦν αἰῶνος*. For *αἰῶνι*, ℵ has *χαιρῷ*; and for *ὑψηλοφρονεῖν, ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν*, which Tisch. 8 adopted. —*ἐν τῷ Θεῷ*] For the preposition *ἐν* (*Rec.* D*** K L, Tisch. 7, Reiche), A D* F G ℵ, several cursives, etc., have *ἐπί* (Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8). This reading seems, however, to have arisen from a correction in order to make this clause symmetrical with the one previous. The article *τῷ* (*Rec.* A D*** E K L, etc.; Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 7) is wanting in D* F G ℵ, *al.* (Tisch. 8).—*τῳ ζῶντι*] omitted by Lachm. and Tisch., after A G 17, 23, 47, *al.*, many versions, is to be regarded as not genuine. It may have been inserted from a recollection of iv. 10.—*πάντα πλουσίως*] adopted by Griesb. Scholz, Tisch. for *πλουσίως πάντα*, after D E 17, 44, 46, *al.*, Syr. Arr. Copt. Vulg. etc., Basil. Chrys. Theodoret, etc. Lachm. and Buttm. read, on the authority of A 17, 37, 57, *al.*, *τὰ πάντα πλουσίως*, which might deserve preference as the more difficult reading.—Ver. 19. The *Rec. αἰωνίου* is manifestly a correction of the original *ὄντως* (in A D* E F G ℵ 17, 23, 31, 57, *al.*, Syr. utr. Erp. Copt. etc., Constitut. Clem. Orig. Basil. etc.), which Griesb. rightly received into the text.—Ver. 20. *παραθήκην*] rightly adopted by Griesb. for *παρακαταθήκην*, on the authority of A D E F G ℵ 31, 37, 44, *al.*, Sahid. Syr. Clem. Ignat. *al.*; comp. 2 Tim. i. 12, 14. The reading *καινοφωνίας* (for *κενοφ.*), in F G 73, It. Vulg. (profanas vocum novitates) and the Latin Fathers, is an oversight arising from the similarity of *αι* and *ε* in sound.—Ver. 22. *ἡ χάρις μετὰ σοῦ*] For *σοῦ*, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8, after A F G 17, *al.*, adopted *μεθ' ὑμῶν*, perhaps a correction from 2 Tim. iv. 22 and Tit. iii. 15. Tisch. 7 had the *Rec. σοῦ*, after D E K L, most cursives, several versions, etc.—The *Rec. ἀμήν* at the end (after D** K L) is to be regarded as not genuine, on the authority of A D* F G ℵ, etc.

Vv. 1, 2. [On Vv. 1, 2, see Note XVIII., page 198.] Precept regarding the conduct of Christian slaves. [XVIII *a.*]—*ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δοῦλοι*] *δοῦλοι* is added to explain *εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζ.* Paul does not say simply *ὅσοι εἰσὶν δοῦλοι*, because he wishes to mark the oppressive circumstances of the condition of a slave. *ζυγός* is not used elsewhere in the N. T. of the yoke of slavery (in Herodotus: *δούλιον ζυγόν*). The expression is not to be limited to those slaves who were oppressed more than usual by their masters, as Heydenreich thinks, quoting 1 Pet. ii. 18. It is clear from the clause *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*, as well as from the contrast in ver. 2, that Paul is thinking here of the slaves who had heathen masters.—*τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότας*] *ἰδίους* is so far emphatic, that it directs attention to the circumstance of the personal relation more than would be done by the usual pronoun.—*πάσης τιμῆς* (*i. e.* of all honor which is due to them as masters) *ἀξίους ἡγείσθωσαν* (f. *ἀξιοῦν*, v. 17); comp. the exhortations in Tit. ii. 9; Eph. vi. 5–8; Col. iii. 22–25; 1 Pet. ii. 18.—In confirmation, Paul adds *ἵνα μὴ τὸ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ.*; comp. Tit. ii. 10.[1]—*τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ*] comp. Rom. ii. 24.—*ἡ διδασκαλία*] the gospel, as the doctrine prevailing among Christians.—Ver. 2. *οἱ δὲ πιστοὺς*

[1] The meaning is correctly given by Chrysostom: *ὁ ἄπιστος ἂν μὲν ἴδῃ τοὺς δούλους διὰ τὴν πίστιν αὐθάδως προφερομένους, βλασφημήσει πολλάκις ὡς στάσιν ἐμποιοῦν τὸ δόγμα· ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃ πειθομένους, μᾶλλον πεισθήσεται, μᾶλλον προσέξει τοῖς λεγομένοις*

ἔχοντες δεσπότας] The adversative *δέ* shows that the apostle is here speaking of other slaves than in ver. 1, viz., as he himself says, of those whose masters are *πιστοί*, not keeping their slaves as *ὑπὸ ζυγόν*, but treating them kindly and gently because of their *πίστις*. This last point is, indeed, not formally expressed here, but it is presupposed in *μὴ καταφρονείτωσαν*.—*πιστούς* is either to be joined with *δεσπότας* as an adjective, or to be taken as a substantive, *δεσπότας* defining it more precisely: "who have believers as masters." The order of the words might give the preference to the latter view.—*μὴ καταφρονείτωσαν*] *καταφρονεῖν* denotes here conduct towards masters in which the honor due to them is not given.—*ὅτι ἀδελφοί εἰσιν*] These words are not the ground of the previous exhortation; they are the ground on which the *δοῦλοι* might be led to think their masters of little worth; not the slaves, but the masters, form the subject (de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, and others).—*ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δουλευέτωσαν*] *μᾶλλον*, equivalent to "*all the more*."—*ὅτι πιστοί εἰσι καὶ ἀγαπητοί, οἱ κ.τ.λ.*] With *ἀγαπητοί* we must supply *Θεοῦ* (Rom. i. 7; comp. Rom. xi. 28); "beloved of God;" this is supported by the close connection with *πιστοί*.—The subject is formed not by the slaves (Wetstein: intelligo non de dominis, sed de servis, qui dant operam, ut dominis beneficiant et bene de iis mereantur), still less by both slaves and masters (Matthies), but by the masters only. The only possible construction is this, that *οἱ . . . ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι* forms the subject, *πιστοὶ . . . ἀγαπητοί* the predicate [XVIII *b*.]; for the article shows that the words *οἱ τῆς κ.τ.λ.* do not give a more precise definition of what precedes. Most recent expositors (de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt, also hitherto in this commentary) understand by *ἡ εὐεργεσία* the kindness which the slaves show to their masters by faithful service, and explain *ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι* as equivalent to "receive, accept;" but this explanation cannot be justified by usage.[1] In the N. T. the word occurs only in Luke i. 54 and Acts xx. 35, in the sense of "accept of some one." This sense it has also in classic Greek, when it refers to persons; in reference to things, it means: "carry on something eagerly," also: "make oneself master of a thing." Hofmann accordingly is not incorrect in translating: "devote themselves to kindness, making it their business." If we keep strictly to this meaning, as indeed we must, then the words *οἱ τ. εὐεργ. ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι* apply to the Christian masters in regard to their conduct towards their slaves, so that the meaning of the exhortation is: "*Serve* (your masters) *all the more, that they, devoting themselves to kindness towards you, are believers and beloved* (of God)."[2] De Wette, against this explanation, maintains that "it makes the predicate 'believing' somewhat superfluous,

[1] De Wette wrongly seeks to justify this meaning by saying that *ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι* also means: "perceive with the senses," and that in Porphyrius, *De Abstin.* i. 46, it means: *μήτε ἐσθίων πλειόνων ἡδονῶν ἀντιλήψεται.* Though the Vulg. translates it: "qui beneficii participes sunt," and Luther: "and are partakers of the benefit," the word is taken in a sense foreign to it. The same is true of Heydenreich's explanation: "*συγκοινωνοὶ τῆς χάριτος*" (Phil. i. 7), wherein he also arbitrarily takes *εὐεργεσία* as equivalent to *χάρις*.

[2] So rightly Theophylact: *οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι, τουτέστι: οἱ δεσπόται οἱ φροντίζοντες τοῦ εὐεργετεῖν τοὺς δούλους*: so, too, Chrysostom, Grotius, Wegscheider, Leo, and others.

because the masters, being kindly towards their slaves, are already showing their Christian faith in action." He is wrong; for, on the one hand, *εὐεργεσία* towards slaves might be true even of heathen; and, on the other, Paul wishes to insist on the Christian belief of the masters as a motive for careful and faithful service. Hofmann is wrong in thinking that *καὶ . . . ἀντιλαμβ.* does not depend on *ὅτι*, but forms an independent clause in this sense, that the slaves who serve their masters willingly in distributing their alms, are beloved (viz. by their fellow-Christians). This view is opposed not only by the *καί* (for to what previous sentence is it to be attached ?), but also by this, that whereas the *ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι* are the slaves, *τῶν δεσπότων* is arbitrarily supplied with *εὐεργεσίας*.—The apostle concludes the exhortations given in regard to the slaves with the words: *ταῦτα δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει*, which Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. wrongly refer to what follows; comp. iv. 11, v. 7; the right construction is given by de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, and others.

Vv. 3–5. [On Vv. 3–10, see Note XIX., pages 198–200.] Description of the heretics. [XIX *a*, *b*.]—*εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ*] On *ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*, comp. i. 3; *εἴ τις* often occurs in the epistle for *ὅστις* or the like; comp. iii. 5, v. 8; the thought is given in its most comprehensive form.—*καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται κ.τ.λ.*] [XIX *c*.] defines *ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν* more exactly, characterizing it as opposed to the pure doctrine of the gospel, [XIX *d*.] as a preaching therefore of heresy (not merely "of a doctrine which has not the quality of being pious" (!), Hofmann).—*προσέρχεσθαι* is used of mental agreement, and is equivalent to "agree with" (de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee);[1] On *ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις*, comp. i. 10. Hofmann arbitrarily explains the word by: "devote oneself to a thing; employ one's pains on it." If *προσέχεται* is the correct reading, then it is to be explained: "and does not *hold fast* by sound words." The genitive *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμ. Ἰ. Χρ.* gives the source from which the *λόγοι* proceed. *Καὶ τῇ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ*] an epexegetic addition to what preceded. The expression is not, with Leo and Wiesinger, to be explained by: doctrina ad pietatem ducens; *κατά* rather expresses the relation of correspondence, suitability (van Oosterzee). By *εὐσέβεια* is meant Christian piety.—Ver. 4. *τετύφωται*] comp. iii. 6.[2] With this word begins the apodosis, which Wegscheider, Mack, and others find expressed only in *ἀφίστασο ἀπὸ τ. τοιούτων*, which words we can hardly consider genuine. *μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος* (comp. i. 7), the participle is not to be resolved into "although;" all the more that *τετύφωται* conveys a suggestion of dumbness. Their knowledge, on which they presume, is limited to fables, and does not penetrate into the truth.—*ἀλλὰ νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας*] *νοσῶν*, in contrast with *ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις* in ver. 3.—*Περὶ ζητήσεις κ.τ.λ.* gives the sickness of which he is ill.[3] Luther, not clear: "diseased *in*

[1] Comp. Philo, *de Gigantt.* p. 289: *μηδενὶ προσέρχεσθαι γνώμῃ τῶν εἰρημένων.*

[2] Hofmann thinks that *τετύφωται* does not here, as in iii. 6, contain the idea of darkness, since "Paul means to express regarding the schismatics an opinion, not in regard to their moral, but in regard to their spiritual condition." This opinion is contradicted by the fact that in what follows *νοσῶν κ.τ.λ.* manifestly denotes a moral fault.

[3] Comp. Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 288: *ὁ νοσῶν περὶ λόγων ἀκοήν*; Winer, p. 379 [E. T. p. 406].

questions;" Stier, correct: "diseased *with*."—On *ζητήσεις*, comp. i. 4; the addition of *λογομαχίαι* denotes more exactly the nature of the *ζητήσεις*. Calvin: *λογομαχίας* nominat contentiosas disputationes de verbis magis, quam de rebus, vel (ut vulgo loquuntur) sine materia aut subjecto. The word (occurring only in later Greek) is *ἅπ. λεγ.*, the verb *λογομαχεῖν*, 2 Tim. ii. 14.—Hitherto he has described the "condition of soul among the *ἑτεροδιδασκαλοῦντες*" (Wiesinger); the consequences of their *ζητ.* and *λογομ.*, particularly the destructive tendencies, are given in what follows: *ἐξ ὧν γίνεται κ.τ.λ.*] *φθόνος, ἔρις,*[1] *βλασφημίαι*, form a climax. [XIX *e.*] *βλασφημίαι* and *ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί* are wrongly understood by Chrysostom of conduct towards God. On the latter expression, equivalent to "wicked suspicion" (Luther), see Wisd. iii. 24; the word is *ἅπ. λεγ.* in the N. T. Hofmann wishes to separate *πονηραί* from *ὑπόνοιαι*, and to connect it with the next word, "because *ὑπονοεῖν* in itself means suspecting evil." But, on the one hand, *ὑπονοεῖν* has often the simple meaning "conjecture" (*e.g.* Acts xiii. 25; also in classic Greek); and, on the other hand, "the suspicion of something evil," and "the evil, wicked suspicion," are by no means identical things.—Ver. 5. *διαπαρατριβαί*] This word and *παραδιατριβαί* (according to the usual reading) are not equivalent, as Heydenreich thinks; see Winer, p. 96 [E. T. p. 102]. The distinction between *παρατριβή* and *διατριβή* is to be maintained. *Διατριβή* means, in regard to time: "its consumption, pastime, occupation;" with the prefix *παρα* there is added the idea of idle, useless, so that *παραδιατριβή* denotes the useless occupation of time. The word *παρατριβή* (only in later Greek) means: "wrangling, dispute;" *δια* serves to intensify the meaning, hence *διαπαρατριβή* is equivalent to "*continuous* or *violent wrangling*" (de Wette). Luther translated it: "scholastic disputes." As the idea of strife has been given already by *ἔρις*, we might be inclined to consider the *Rec.* to be the original reading, were the evidence for it not too weak. The same may be said of the reading *διατριβαί*, which Hofmann, without sufficient ground, maintains to be "what was originally written." At any rate, the idea "continual wrangling" is not so identical with that of "strife" (*ἔρις*) as to prevent them from being used together.[2] Reiche paraphrases the reading *δ' ἃ παρατριβαί* as equivalent to per quae, nempe vitia morbosque animi vs 4, exoriuntur rixae et certamina, etc.; but *δ' ἃ* is not equivalent to *per* quae, and the previous *ἐξ ὧν* is against this construction.—*διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν*] Regarding this accus., see Winer, p. 215 [E. T. p. 229]; comp. 2 Tim. iii. 8:[3] "*whose understanding is destroyed.*"—*καὶ ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας*] "*who have been robbed of the truth.*" This and the previous participial clauses indicate that formerly the heretics had their understanding

[1] Clemens Al. *Stromata*, vii. p. 759: *ὑπὸ δοξοσοφίας ἐπῃρμένοι ἐρίζοντες πελοῦσι.*

[2] Oecumenius explains the expression *ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ψωραλέων προβάτων*, and Chrysostom says likewise: *καθάπερ τὰ ψωραλέα τῶν προβάτων παρατριβόμενα νόσου καὶ τὰ ὑγιαίνοντα ἐμπίμπλησιν, οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι οἱ πονηροὶ ἄνδρες.*—The meaning "provocations" (Mack), and this other: "wicked and hurtful meetings or clubs" (Heinrichs), can be assigned neither to *παραδιατριβαί* nor to *διαπαρατριβαί.*

[3] Xenophon, *De Exped. Cyri*, iv. 259: *διεφθαρμένοι τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς.*

sound, and were in possession of the truth, but that they had lost both these jewels, according to iv. 1, by the influence of demons. It should never have been denied that they who are thus described were actual heretics. —The next clause adds another peculiar characteristic, which proves the *διεφθαρμένων κ.τ.λ.*: *νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν*] *πορισμός* (only here and at ver. 6; comp. Ecclus. xiii. 19, xiv. 2) is equivalent to "*means of gain*," *i.e.* a business bringing gain; Luther: "trade."—Wegscheider wrongly explains *εὐσέβεια* as equivalent to *ἡ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλία*. The idea is to be kept in its proper meaning; although that which the heretics made to appear *εὐσέβεια* was not *εὐσέβια*, but only the appearance of it (2 Tim. iii. 5: *μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας*), by means of which they sought to make earthly gain (Tit. i. 11).—As to the construction, it seems most natural to make the substantive at the beginning of the verse dependent on *ἐξ ὧν γίνεται*, ver. 4, along with the substantives before it. Hofmann, on the contrary, thinks it curious, "that besides the bad things already mentioned, there should also be named those with whom they occur;" and he wishes rather to regard *πονηραὶ διατριβαί* (which he reads) as in apposition to *ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας*, just as in Jas. iii. 8, where the nominative stands in apposition to the previous accusative as a kind of exclamation. This construction is possible, but it is by no means necessary, and from the structure of the sentence not even probable.—The last remark furnishes the apostle with an opportunity for a digression on Christian contentment.[1]

Ver. 6. Ἔστι δὲ κ.τ.λ.] Calvin: eleganter et non sine ironica correctione in contrarium sensum eadem verba retorquet. The *meaning* is: piety is certainly a *πορισμός*, but in another and higher sense than the heretics suppose; *ἔστι* is opposed to *νομιζόντων* (ver. 5), Wiesinger.—*πορισμὸς μέγας κ.τ.λ.*] [XIX *f.*] *πορισμός* has here the same meaning as before; Luther wrongly says: "it is, however, a great gain, one that is blessed," etc.—*ἡ εὐσέβεια μετὰ αὐταρκείας*] "*Piety when united with contentment*," which certainly belongs of necessity to true piety. The gain of which the apostle is here thinking is not the heavenly, eternal blessings (Theodoret: *τὴν γὰρ αἰώνιον ἡμῖν πορίζει ζωήν*; Calvin, Heydenreich, Matthies, and others), but the gain to which we are directed in the next verses, 7–10. Several expositors hold the gain to be the *αὐτάρκεια* itself (so Chrysostom, Bengel: nam affert *αὐτάρκειαν*; de Wette, and others[2]); but this reference is not indicated in the added words: *μετὰ αὐταρκείας*. On *αὐτάρκεια*, comp. Phil. iv. 11: *ἐγὼ ἔμαθον ἐν οἷς εἰμι αὐτάρκης εἶναι*.

Ver. 7 begins the confirmation of the principle that godliness with contentment is a great *πορισμός*. The apostle here places two clauses together, each of which contains a well-known and undoubted truth: "*We brought nothing into the world*," and "*We can take nothing out of it*."[3] The question

[1] Hofmann's opinion, that the deductions following are not occasioned by the conduct of the heretics, but by Timothy's conduct, are not warranted by the exhortation in ver. 11: *ταῦτα φεῦγε*.

[2] Van Oosterzee: "In one short, compressed sentence, the apostle expresses two chief ideas, that true piety of itself makes content, and that by doing so it brings great gain."

[3] The same two thoughts are found elsewhere in collocation; so Job i. 21; Eccles. v. 14; also in the profane writers, *e. g.* Seneca,

is only, in what relation do they stand to one another? According to the common view, the first thought serves to confirm the second: "As we brought nothing in, it is manifest that we will take nothing out." Against this, Hofmann maintains that the second thought is in no way a consequence of the first. He therefore takes *δῆλον ὅτι* as an adverbial: "clearly," standing at the end of the sentence, but belonging to both clauses; and he explains: "Clearly we have brought nothing in, and can also take nothing out." He is certainly right that the first does not strictly prove the second; but then the apostle did not intend that it should; he simply placed the two sentences together, the second corresponding to the first in such a way as to be confirmed by it in popular opinion. Hence it is not right to connect—contrary to the order of the words—*δῆλον ὅτι* with the first sentence. As to the lack of *δῆλον* before *ὅτι* (see the critical remarks), de Wette observes: "that in popular logic the consequence is often quoted with *ὅτι* as the reason, *e.g.* Homer, *Il.* xvi. 35, *Od.* xxii. 36." This, however, is not to the point here; in the two passages quoted, *ὅτι* simply denotes the logical ground of knowledge.

Ver. 8. *Ἔχοντες δέ*] De Wette thinks that for *δέ* we should have had *οὖν*. This is certainly right; still the bearing of this verse on the previous one would have been different from what it is now. The apostle used *δέ* because he had in mind the contrast to those striving after earthly gain.—*διατροφὰς καὶ σκεπάσματα*] The same collocation in *Sextus Empiricus*, Book ix. 1; the two expressions only occur here in the N. T. (*διατροφή*, 1 Macc. vi. 49). *Σκέπασμα*, the covering, hence both clothing and dwelling. Here it is to be taken in the former sense; de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, and others include both senses in it; but it is more than improbable that one word should be used to denote two different objects.[1] In food and clothing the necessary wants of life are also elsewhere summed up; comp. Matt. vi. 25; Jas. ii. 15; Gen. xxviii. 20.—*τούτοις ἀρκεσθησόμεθα*] "*we will be content with them.*" Hofmann's explanation is wrong: "so will we *have enough* of them." The passive *ἀρκεῖσθαι* occurs as a personal verb only in the sense of "*be content with;*" comp. Luke iii. 14; Heb. xiii. 5; 3 John 10; 2 Macc. v. 16; 4 Macc. vi. 22; so, too, continually in profane writers; comp. Pape, *s.v.*—The future is here taken imperatively by several expositors. It is well known that the imperative is often expressed by the future, but there is no passage which exactly corresponds with this (comp. Buttmann, p. 221 [E. T. 259]). It is better, therefore, to take the future here in the sense of sure expectation (so de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt; comp. Winer, p. 296 [E. T. p. 315 f.]).

Ver. 9. *Οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι πλουτεῖν*] [XIX *g.*] *δέ* expresses opposition to what immediately preceded. *πλουτεῖν* is properly not "become rich," but "*be rich.*"—*ἐμπίπτουσιν* (cf. iii. 7) *εἰς πειρασμὸν καὶ παγίδα*] De Wette explains it inaccurately: "to whom enticing opportunities present themselves for unrighteous gain." In *ἐμπίπτειν* is contained the indication of the power

Ep. 102: non licet plus efferre, quam intuleris. For the second thought, comp. Job xxvii. 19; Ps. xlix. 12.

[1] Chrysostom: *τοιαῦτα ἀμφιέννυσθαι, ἃ σκεπάσαι μόνον ἡμᾶς ὀφείλει καὶ περιστεῖλαι τὴν γύμνωσιν.*

which the *πειρασμός* ("the temptation to enrich oneself unrighteously") exercises over them.—By *παγίδα*, the *πειρασμός* is defined to be a power fettering and taking prisoner.—*καὶ ἐπιθυμίας πολλὰς ἀνοήτους καὶ βλαβερὰς*] This is the consequence immediately connected with what precedes: by falling into *πειρασμός*, they fall into *many* foolish and hurtful lusts, *i. e.* these lusts are not only excited in them, but gain power over them. Thus the seductive power of the *πειρασμός* can be recognized in the *ἐπιθυμίαις*. These are also *ἀνόητοι*, because instead of the gain which was expected to come from satisfying them, they bring hurt only.—*αἵτινες* (explanatory: "such as") *βυθίζουσι εἰς ὄλεθρον καὶ ἀπώλειαν*] *βυθίζειν*; in the literal sense at Luke v. 7; 2 Macc. xii. 4.—Destruction is likewise the deep into which they are plunged by their desires. The expression is strengthened by bringing together the two synonymous ideas. There is no ground for van Oosterzee's conjecture that *ὄλεθρος* denotes the destruction of the body, *ἀπώλεια* the destruction of the soul. De Wette incorrectly explains the words of "moral ruin," against which Wiesinger justly observes: "they are in that already." *ὄλεθρος* stands here as in 1 Thess. v. 3, 2 Thess. i. 9 (*ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος*); *ἀπώλεια*, as in Phil. i. 28 (opp. *ἡ σωτηρία*), iii. 19, and other passages. —There is no good ground (with Olshausen in Wiesinger) for understanding *ὄλεθρος* exclusively of temporal destruction.

Ver. 10 gives a reason for the thought in ver. 9.—*ῥίζα γὰρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἡ φιλαργυρία*] It is to be observed that Paul does not mean to say, whence all *κακά* whatever proceed, but what proceeds from *φιλαργυρία*. Hence there is no article with *ῥίζα*. Hence, too, de Wette's correcting remark, that ambition, too, may entirely destroy man, does not affect the author of the epistle.—By *τὰ κακά* may be understood both physical and moral evils (wickedness); here the latter idea is uppermost.[1] *φιλαργυρία* only here in the N. T. (Jer. viii. 10, LXX.).—*ἧς τινὲς ὀρεγόμενοι*] *ὀρέγεσθαι* does not mean deditum esse, but it is to be acknowledged that the manner of connection is not exact, since *φιλαργυρία*, as de Wette rightly says, is itself an *ὄρεξις*. Hofmann's interpretation is artificial. He makes *ὀρέγεσθαι* denote here "the grasping of a man after something out of his way," and "the thing after which he reaches sideways is said to be the plant which afterwards proves to be to him a root of all evils," so that *ἧς* does not refer to *φιλαργυρία*, but to *ῥίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν*.—*ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως*] The reason of this is the inner connection between faith and blessedness. The denial of the one necessarily implies the denial of the other. The aorist passive has a neuter sense; Luther rightly: "have gone astray from the faith." The compound only here and at Mark xiii. 22; the *ἀπό* added serves to intensify the meaning.—*καὶ ἑαυτοὺς περιέπειραν ὀδύναις πολλαῖς*] *περιπείρειν ἀπ. λογ.* "pierce through," not "sting all round, wound in every part" (Matthies). The *ὀδύναι πολλαί*, here regarded as a sword with which they have pierced themselves through, are not the outward pains which they have drawn on themselves by avarice, but the stings of conscience ("the precursors of the future *ἀπώλεια*," Wiesinger) which they have pre-

[1] Otherwise in Polycarp, *Ep.* 4: *ἀρχὴ πάντων χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία.*

pared for themselves by apostasy from the faith. To this his own experience the apostle here directs attention, that he may thereby present more vividly the destructiveness of the *φιλαργυρία*.

Ver. 11. [On Vv. 11–21, see Note XX. pages 200, 201.] The apostle again turns to Timothy, exhorting him to a faithful fulfillment of his Christian and evangelical vocation.—*σὺ δέ*] opposed to *τινές* ver. 10. [XX *a.*]—*ὦ ἄνθρωπε* [*τοῦ*] *Θεοῦ*] The expression may be taken in a more general or a more special sense; so, too, in 2 Pet. i. 21. It does not, however, follow "that Paul thus names Timothy here because of his evangelic office;" the exhortations following rather show that the apostle was thinking of Timothy's position as a Christian; comp. 2 Tim. iii. 17.—*ταῦτα φεῦγε*] *ταῦτα* refers to the *φιλαργυρία* and that which is connected with it (de Wette, Wiesinger, and others); not to everything that has been said in vv. 3–10, because "vv. 17 ff. show that the author is keeping in view the subject of riches," de Wette. *φεύγειν* vitare; comp. 2 Tim. ii. 22; 1 Cor. vi. 18. Hofmann wrongly deduces from this exhortation that Timothy had some inclination to *φιλαργυρία*; one might as well deduce from the next exhortation that Timothy had no inclination to *δικαιοσύνη κ.τ.λ.* It is to be observed that it is not said *φεῦγε ἀπό* or *ἐκ τούτων*; comp., besides, the passages quoted.—*δίωκε δὲ τὴν δικαιοσύνην*] *διώκειν* here as in Deut. xvi. 20, LXX.; Rom. xii. 13, and other passages of the N. T.[1] Paul names six Christian virtues which Timothy is to cultivate, the six being arranged in pairs. The two most general in meaning are placed first: *δικαιοσύνην* (righteousness) and *εὐσέβειαν* (comp. Tit. ii. 12). Then follow *πίστιν* (not "faithfulness or conscientiousness," but "faith") and *ἀγάπην* as the ground principle of the Christian life. Last come *ὑπομονήν* and *πραϋπάθειαν* [XX *b.*] (*ἅπ. λεγ.*, Philo, *de Abrah.* p. 379), which denote the Christian conduct proper in regard to the hostility of the world against the gospel, the former being opposed to submission, the latter to exasperation.

Ver. 12. *Ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως*] [XX *c.*] Here, as in i. 18 (*τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν*), we must not overlook the definite article. The struggle to which Timothy is summoned is the struggle (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 25) of the faith appointed to Christians; on this comp. 2 Tim. iv. 7.—*ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς*] *ἐπιλαμβάνειν* (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 24 and Phil. iii. 12, where the apostle uses the expressions *λαμβάνειν* and *καταλαμβάνειν*) denotes the actual grasping, *αἰώνιος ζωή* being regarded as the *ἆθλον*; not, however, according to Winer's remark (p. 293 [E. T. p. 312]), "as result of the struggle, but as object of the striving." It is not improbable that Paul is here speaking figuratively. It is different, however, with the next words: *εἰς ἣν ἐκλήθης*, by which eternal life is pointed out as the goal of Timothy's vocation; comp. 1 Pet. v. 10.—*καὶ ὡμολόγησας τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν*] Heinrichs incorrectly takes *καί* for *καὶ γάρ*: "for thou hast also." Commonly this clause is made to depend still on *εἰς ἣν* (Leo: *εἰς ἣν* pertinet non solum ad *ἐκλήθης*, sed etiam ad *ὡμολόγησας*). De Wette, on the contrary (Wiesinger and van Oos-

[1] Neque exteris scriptoribus infrequens est hujus verbi notio; see Xenophon. *Cyropaedia*, viii. 1. 39; Thucydides, ii. 62; Leo.

terzee agree with him), rightly regards it as simply co-ordinate with εἰς ἣν ἐκλήθης. So, too, Hofmann: "the relative clause, as is not seldom the case in Greek, passes into a clause independent of the relative." Still the two clauses must be taken as standing in close connection; Timothy's καλὴ ὁμολογία is the answer which he gave to the κλῆσις proclaimed to him (so, too, Hofmann).—τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν] [XX *d.*] In this phrase, too, expositors have not observed the definite article. Paul does not say that Timothy confessed a confession good "in its contents and in the enthusiasm of its utterance," de Wette; but that he confessed *the* good confession, *i. e.* the definite confession of Christ to which the disciples of the Lord are appointed. Hence it is quite wrong to think of ὁμολογία as a vow or the like; that contradicts the constant usage of the N. T.; comp. 2 Cor. ix. 13; Heb. iii. 1, 4, 14, x. 23.—Paul is clearly referring here to a definite fact in Timothy's life, but what it was he does not say. Chrysostom says: ἀναμιμνήσκει τῆς κατηχήσεως αὐτόν, and thinks therefore of the confession of Timothy at his baptism. Others, on account of ver. 13, understand it of a confession which Timothy had confessed during a persecution. According to most, Paul is here thinking of the same act as that to which iv. 14 refers. Since in this whole section, vv. 11–16, there is nothing to direct the attention to Timothy's official position, and since the ὁμολογία is closely joined with the ἐκλήθης, the view first given is to be considered the right one (Hofmann).

Vv. 13, 14. Παραγγέλλω σοι] Matthies regards τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν as the subject belonging to this; but against this construction there is both the meaning of the verb and the τηρῆσαί σε following.[1] Leo justly says: quo magis ad finem vergit epistola, eo gravior existit apostoli oratio. To give his exhortation greater force, Paul adds to παραγγέλλω (comp. i. 3) the words of adjuration: ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.—Τοῦ ζωογονοῦντος τὰ πάντα] ζωογονεῖν in the classic usage, equivalent to "bring forth alive, make alive," serves in the LXX. for translating the Piel and Hiphil of חָיָה in the double signification: "maintain in life," Ex. i. 17; Judg. viii. 19, and other passages; and "make alive," 1 Sam. ii. 6 (comp. 2 Kings v. 7). In the N. T. it occurs here and at Luke xvii. 33, Acts vii. 19, in the sense of "maintain in life." When connected with τὰ πάντα, ζωογ. is not to be understood specially of the *resurrection* (de Wette, van Oosterzee), but either "*of God's might that upholds everything*" (Wiesinger, Hofmann), or, still better, of "*His power that quickens everything*" (Plitt), in the same sense as it is said of God in Neh. ix. 6: σὺ ζωοποιεῖς τὰ πάντα. God is therefore mentioned here as the source of life for the universe (τὰ πάντα), there being a special reference to ver. 12: ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς.—Καὶ Χρ. Ἰησ. τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν] τὴν κ. ὁμολογίαν is not dependent on παραγγέλλω (Matthies: "I make known to thee . . . the good confession"), but on μαρτυρήσαντος. It is open to question, however, whether the καλὴ ὁμολογία is the confession of the Christian which Timothy too has made (Wiesin-

[1] The objections made by Matthies against the correct construction are only founded on this, that he considers the definite article τὴν to be unsuitable before καλὴν ὁμολογίαν.

ger, Plitt, Hofmann), or the confession which Christ made (Leo, van Oosterzee). In the former case, *μαρτυρεῖν* is much the same as "testify, *i. e.* confirm, declare for truth;" in the latter it is kindred in meaning with *ὁμολογεῖν*. Wiesinger asserts that *μαρτυρεῖν* never has the latter meaning, but unjustly; because in John v. 32 we have *μαρτυρίαν μαρτυρεῖν*, and in John iii. 11 we have *ὃ οἴδαμεν λαλοῦμεν καὶ ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν* (1 John i. 2; Rev. i. 2). On the contrary, there is no passage to be found where *μαρτυρεῖν* with the accus. means so much as "confirm the truth of an utterance by a testimony in regard to it."[1] The first view, therefore, is to be rejected as contrary to usage. Besides, the confession made by Jesus, and Timothy's confession mentioned in ver. 12, are not in contents different from one another. De Wette thinks that *μαρτυρεῖν* "is used here in the well-known ecclesiastical signification, consequently that Christ is represented as the first martyr," and that the meaning is: "Christ confirmed the confession of the truth by His suffering and death." This is not only against the usage of the N. T., but fails also by generalizing in an arbitrary way the idea of *ἡ καλὴ ὁμολογία*.—If *ἡ κ. ὁμολ.* is the confession which Christ witnessed of Himself, *ἐπὶ Ποντ. Πιλ.* cannot mean: "under Pontius Pilate" (de Wette), but only: "*before* Pontius Pilate." Ἐπί stands here as in Matt. xxviii. 14, Acts xxv. 9, xxvi. 2, and other passages.—As the words added with *τοῦ Θεοῦ* point back to *τῆς αἰων. ζωῆς*, so do those added here with Χρ. Ἰησ. point back to *καὶ ὡμολόγησας κ.τ.λ.—τηρῆσαί σε τὴν ἐντολὴν ἄσπιλον, ἀνεπίλημπτον*] These words, depending on *παραγγέλλω*, give the purpose of Paul's exhortation to Timothy. *Τηρεῖν*, joined with *ἐντολή* in many passages of the N. T., means "keep, observe," as in chap. v. 22 (de Wette and most expositors; Wiesinger differs).—*Τὴν ἐντολήν* is not a single moral or official law given specially to Timothy; it is synonymous with *ἡ παραγγελία* in i. 5 (so, too, Hofmann), pointing out the law of the gospel as the divine standard, according to which the Christian has to regulate his life.[2]—*ἄσπιλον* and *ἀνεπίλημπτον* must, from their position, be referred to *ἐντολήν*,[3] and not to *σε*.[4] Expositors take *ἄσπιλον* and *ἀνεπίλημπτον* as two co-ordinate adjectives, so that for the sense *καί* has to be supplied between them (so hitherto in this commentary). This, however, is against usage; *καί* is dropped only when more than two attributes are reckoned, comp. *e. g.* iii. 2 ff., or when the one adjective forms *one* idea with the substantive, so that the other adjective defines the compound idea more precisely (comp. *e. g.* 1 Cor. x. 4; see Winer, pp. 488 f. [E. T. p. 525]). It is

[1] Had Paul wished to express the thought that Christ had confirmed, by word or deed, the truth of the Christian confession, he would have written the dative *τῇ καλῇ ὁμολογίᾳ*.—The expression *μαρτυρίαν μαρτυρεῖν*, also occurring in classic Greek, does not mean: "confirm the truth of a testimony," but simply: "testify, *i. e.* make a testimony."—The old expositors justly directed attention to Matt. xxvii. 11 and John xviii. 26 f. in regard to *ἡ καλὴ ὁμολογία*.

[2] The special reference to ver. 12 (van Oosterzee) is arbitrary. Still it might perhaps be said that Paul sums up in *τὴν ἐντολήν* the commands which he gave to Timothy in vv. 11, 12. In this command, however, there is also contained the sum of the whole Christian law.

[3] With de Wette, van Oosterzee, Plitt, Hofmann, and others.

[4] As Leo, Matthies, Wiesinger, and most suppose. Wiesinger thinks that *ἄσπ.* and *ἀνεπίλ.* denote the *result* of *τηρῆσαι τὴν ἐντολήν*. But how can this be justified grammatically?

more correct, therefore, to connect *ἄσπιλον* closely with *ἐντολήν*, and to take *ἀνεπίλημπτον* in such a way that it declares how Timothy is to keep this *ἐντολὴ ἄσπιλος*: he is to keep the commandment which is in itself spotless, and to keep it so as to expose it to no blame.—*μέχρι τῆς ἐπιφανείας τ. κυρίου ἡμ. Ἰησ. Χρ.*] [XX *e.*] *ἡ ἐπιφάνεια* is the second coming of Christ. The word occurs outside of the Pastoral Epistles only in 2 Thess. ii. 18 (2 Tim. iv. 1, 8; Tit. ii. 13; in 2 Tim. i. 10, it is used to denote Christ's first coming in the flesh). For the second coming we usually have *ἀποκάλυψις* (1 Cor. i. 7) or *παρουσία*. The word *ἐπιφάνεια* brings into prominence the element of visibility in the *παρουσία*; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 8 (Wiesinger). Chrysostom's explanation is wrong: *μέχρι τῆς σῆς τελευτῆς*.—Bengel: fideles in praxi sua proponebant sibi diem Christi, ut appropinquantem, nos solemus nobis horam mortis proponere.

Vv. 15, 16. The apostle concludes with a doxology, which is attached to the previous words by means of the relative clause *ἣν . . . δείξει κ.τ.λ.*—*ἣν καιροῖς ἰδίοις δείξει*] On *καιροῖς ἰδ.*, comp. ii. 6; Tit. i. 3; also Gal vi. 9.—*δείξει*] Bengel: ostendi dicitur, quod jam ante erat, Acts iii. 20. The verb does not mean "effect;" nor is it, with Heydenreich, to be translated: "which He will show *in its majesty*, will cause to follow and present *in visible glory*," but simply: "*which He will make visible, cause to appear.*" The expression is used by the apostle in reference to Christ's present hiddenness. The hope of the near return of Christ did not lead the apostle to fix arbitrarily the hour when that would take place.—Instead of the simple *Θεός*, there follows, as subject to *δειξει*, a series of designations for God, by which Paul represents God as the blessed, the only potentate, the immortal, the invisible—in *one* word, the absolute (comp. with this i. 17). This he does not simply for the purpose "of giving to his words a more solemn conclusion" (de Wette), but to satisfy the inward impulse of naming the chief features of the idea of God as rooted in the Christian consciousness—specially in opposition to the fictions of the heretics (according to Wiesinger, "in antithetic reference to the striving after earthly riches, rebuked in the preceding verses").—*ὁ μακάριος*] comp. i. 11; *μακάριος* is to be taken as an adjective, as is clear from the omission of the article before *μόνος*.—*Καὶ μόνος δυνάστης*] To God alone as the Almighty is the predicate *δυνάστης* due in the absolute sense; hence the addition of *μόνος*. The supreme power contained in *δυνάστης* (comp. 2 Macc. xii. 15; 3 Macc. v. 51) is made still more prominent by the next words: *ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων κ.τ.λ.*; comp. i. 17; Rev. xvii. 14; Deut. x. 17; Ps. cxxxvi. 3.—Ver. 16. *ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν*] comp. i. 17. *Ἀθανασία* is synonymous with *ἀφθαρσία*, 1 Cor. xv. 53.[1]—*φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον*] This idea that God, who is Himself called light (1 John i. 5), dwells in light, is found nowhere else in the N. T.; but we may compare with it Ps. civ. 2; Ezek. i. 26 ff.[2]—The

[1] Justin Martyr (*Quaest. et Respons. ad Orthod.* 61): *μόνος ἔχων τὴν ἀθανασίαν λέγεται ὁ Θεός, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ θελήματος ἄλλου ταύτην ἔχει, καθάπερ οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες ἀθάνατοι, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας οὐσίας.*

[2] Chrysostom remarks on this: *οὐκοῦν καὶ τόπῳ ἐμπεριείληπται; ἄπαγε· οὐχ ἵνα τοῦτο νοήσωμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα τὸ ἀκατάληπτον τῆς θείας φύσεως παραστήσῃ, φῶς αὐτὸν οἰκεῖν εἶπεν ἀπρόσιτον, οὕτω θεολογήσας, ὡς ἦν αὐτῷ δυνατόν.*

verb *οἰκεῖν* is found only here in the N. T. with an accusative; the construction is often found in the classics, also 2 Macc. v. 17, vi. 2.—*ἀπρόσιτος* is *ἅπ. λεγ.* in Holy Scripture. This participial clause does not serve as a reason for the one previous (Hofmann: "*by* dwelling in light unapproachable"), but adds to it a new definition of the divine nature.—To the idea that God is surrounded by an unapproachable majesty of light, there is attached the corresponding thought: *ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται*; on which comp. John i. 18; 1 John iv. 12; Matt. xi. 27. The following two sentences may serve as explanation: Theophilus (*ad Autol.* p. 71): *τὸ εἶδος τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . μὴ δυνάμενον ὀφθαλμοῖς σαρκίνοις ὁραθῆναι*; and Dionysius Areop. (*De Divin. Nom.* ch. i. p. 376, I. ed. Corder): *πάσαις διανοίαις ἀδιανόητόν ἐστι τὸ ὑπὲρ διάνοιαν ἓν.*[1]—*ᾧ τιμὴ καὶ κράτος αἰώνιον*] comp. i. 17.

Ver. 17. The apostle might have stopped at ver. 16; but, glancing back to vv. 9 ff., he adds another injunction in regard to the rich.[2]—*τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι*] [XX *f.*] Chrysostom: *εἰσὶ γὰρ καὶ ἄλλοι πλούσιοι ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.* Still we cannot press the contrast so far as to make the earthly riches necessarily exclude the heavenly (wealth in God, Luke xii. 21).—*παραγγέλλε μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν*] *ὑψηλοφρονεῖν* only here and at Rom. xi. 20 (Rom. xii. 16: *τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν*): "exalt themselves haughtily over others because of their possessions."—*μηδὲ ἠλπικέναι ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι*] *ἀδηλότης* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*), from *ἄδηλος*, which is equivalent to "not manifest, hidden," is properly "hiddenness," then "*uncertainty*." The word indicates that it is uncertain whether or not riches continue to him who possesses them (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 26: *ἀδήλως*). Instead of the substantive, we might have had the adjective: *ἐπὶ τῷ πλούτῳ τῷ ἀδήλῳ* (Luther: "on uncertain riches"); still the form of expression here makes the idea of uncertainty more prominent (see Winer, p. 221 [E. T. p. 236]), and that is all the more appropriate here that it points out more forcibly the folly of the hope. Hofmann explains *ἀδηλότης* unsuitably by "hiddenness," in the sense of "the rich man having put his riches safely away," as if riches would be put safely away by being hidden.—*ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ Θεῷ*] The construction of *ἐλπίζειν* with *ἐν* is in the N. T. the more uncommon one, but comp. Eph. i. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 19.—The truth that all hope must rest on God is confirmed by adding the words: *τῷ παρέχοντι ἡμῖν τὰ πάντα* (*i. e.* all that we possess) *πλουσίως εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν*] *εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν* (comp. iv. 3: *εἰς μετάληψιν*) is not added by way of opposition to a wrong abstinence, but in opposition to the *ὑψηλοφρονεῖν* and *ἠλπικέναι ἐπὶ πλούτῳ.* The apostle means to say that God does not give us earthly blessings that we may possess them and be

[1] There is no good ground for deriving, with Hofmann, all these names for God from His relations "to other potentates who meet with trouble, whom death does not permit to abide, who are not unapproachable and invisible." And there is as little ground for saying that this doxology was added, because the apostle intended to describe "God who will grant to see the appearance of Jesus as judge with reward or punishment, to describe Him as a potentate who is infinitely more and higher than all earthly kings and lords," and did so because Timothy "was in danger of injuring his position as a Christian, and his calling as a teacher *for the sake of gain*" (!).

[2] "There Paul had spoken of the dangers of those who *wish* to become rich: now he turns to those who *are* rich" (van Oosterzee).

proud over them, but that we may enjoy them,—according to His will,—and therefore use them rightly.

Ver. 18. The negative ideas of the previous verse are followed by four positive, joined two and two.—*ἀγαθοεργεῖν, πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς*] These ideas are synonymous, the second, however, being stronger than the first. It is not probable that we are to think only of the practice of benevolence; that is brought out in the next two expressions. On *ἀγαθοεργεῖν*, comp. Acts xiv. 17, where, however, the *Rec.* has *ἀγαθοποιῶν*; the word *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* in Num. x. 32, LXX.; 1 Macc. xi. 33.—*πλουτεῖν ἐν ἐργ. ἀγ.* hints at *τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τ. νῦν αἰῶνι* (Wiesinger).—*εὐμεταδότους εἶναι, κοινωνικούς*] The two expressions occur only here in the N. T.: *μεταδίδωμι* is, however, used specially of giving to the poor in Luke iii. 11; Rom. xii. 8; Eph. iv. 28. Some expositors wrongly find in *κοινωνικούς* an express contrast to *ὑψηλοφρονεῖν*; Chrysostom: = *ὁμιλητικοί, προσηνεῖς*. It stands here like *κοινωνεῖν*, Gal. vi. 6; *κοινωνία* (joined with *εὐποιία*), Heb. xiii. 16.

Ver. 19. *Ἀποθησαυρίζοντας ἑαυτοῖς θεμέλιον καλόν*] The participle tells what the rich desire by the conduct already mentioned; it is not to be exchanged with the infinitive. *Ἀποθησ.* and *θεμέλιον* are not exactly suitable to one another. This, however, is not to be corrected by conjecturing (with Clericus) *κειμήλιον* or (with Lamb, Bos) *θέμα λίαν καλόν*, nor by explaining *θεμέλιον* as equivalent to *θέμα* (Tob. iv. 9; Leo: "and gather for themselves a good fund for the future"), nor even by taking *ἀποθησ.* as absolute and *θεμέλιον* as in apposition. Wolf: ita . . . ut divites thesauros sibi ipsis colligere jubeantur, qui sint fundamento alicui olim inservituri; Luther: "gather treasures, to themselves a good ground for the future."—*ἀποθησαυρίζειν*] "lay something aside for the purpose of preserving, and therefore collect." It is unnecessary to give the word here the more general signification of "acquire." The apostle's thought is, that the rich, by giving away their *θησαυρούς* in sympathetic love, are gathering for themselves a treasure, and are also laying a good foundation on which their future salvation is built.—*εἰς τὸ μέλλον* is not to be connected with *καλόν*, but with the verb: "for the future."—*ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς*] *ἵνα* does not express the consequence, "so that," but the purpose, "in order that." *Ἐπιλάβωνται*, comp. ver. 12; de Wette, rightly: "in order that they (at the same time planting their feet on this basis) may seize;" *τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς*, comp. v. 3.

Vv. 20, 21. Final exhortation and benediction to Timothy. The apostle begins fervently and impressively with: *ὦ Τιμόθεε* (Matthies).—*τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον*] [XX *g.*] comp. 2 Tim. i. 12, 14; *παραθήκη* is a "possession entrusted;" Paul does not say what kind of possession. Even in these parallel passages a more precise definition is not given, except that at ver. 12 he denotes by *μου* that it is entrusted to him, and in ver. 14 adds the adjective *καλήν*. In any case there is meant by it here a gift entrusted to Timothy by God, which gift he is to preserve (*φύλαξον*) from every hurt. As the apostle puts its preservation (*φυλάσσειν*) in close connection with the *ἐκτρέπεσθαι* of the heretics, we may understand by it either Timothy's *διακονία* (de Wette, Otto), or the gospel, "sound doctrine" (Wiesinger, van

Oosterzee, Hofmann).—As the chief purpose of the epistle is to instruct Timothy regarding his conduct in the ministry committed to him, it seems right to understand by *παραθήκη* a possession entrusted, not to all Christians, but to Timothy in particular. Thus—in spite of the absence of *σοι*—the first view deserves the preference, all the more that in the other passages quoted this meaning of the word is the most suitable. The next word, *ἐκτρεπόμενος*, shows that Timothy would injure his office by entering upon the *βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι*. Plitt arbitrarily takes *παραθήκη* as equivalent to "eternal life."—*ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας*] *ἐκτρέπεσθαι*, properly: "turn away from anything;" then with the accusative (as in 2 Tim. iii. 5: *ἀποτρέπεσθαι*): "*avoid*," synonymous with *παραιτεῖσθαι*.—*κενοφωνία*] synonymous with *ματαιολογία*, i. 6; comp. 2 Tim. ii. 16: "*empty talk without anything in it*."—This talk is still more precisely defined by the next words: *καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*] It is to be observed that *ἀντιθέσεις* is closely connected with the previous *κενοφωνίας*, the article *τάς* belonging to both words and the genitive *τῆς ψευδ. γνώσεως* referring to both alike. Hence *ἀντιθέσεις* must here express some thought corresponding with *κενοφωνίας*. It is not therefore advisable to understand by it in general terms "the statutes of the heretics against the gospel" (Matthies, Wiesinger), or "the controversial theses of the heretics directed against the gospel" (so before in this commentary[1]); it is much more correct to understand it of the theses which the heretics sought to maintain against one another (Hofmann). Thus understood, the word corresponds to *λογομαχίαι* in ver. 4. It is possible that these had the character of *dialectic* proofs (Conybeare and Howson, quoted in van Oosterzee), but the word itself does not show this. Baur's assertion is purely arbitrary, that the contrariae oppositiones are here meant which Marcion exerted himself to establish between the law and the gospel.—*τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*] The expression is easily explained by the fact that the heretics boasted of possessing a knowledge, a *φιλοσοφία* (Col. ii. 8), in which there was a more perfect science of divine things than that presented by the gospel.—Paul was also acquainted with a *γνῶσις*, which, however, was rooted in faith, and was effected by the *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*. But the *γνῶσις* of the heretics did not deserve this name, and hence Paul called it *ψευδώνυμος* (occurring only here in the N. T.); on which Chrysostom aptly remarks: *ὅταν γὰρ πίστις μὴ ᾖ, γνῶσις οὐκ ἐστιν*. Baur, without just ground, seeks to draw from the use of this word a proof for his hypothesis that the epistle was composed at the date of the heresy of Marcion.—Ver. 21. *ἣν τινες ἐπαγγελλόμενοι*] *ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι* stands here in the same sense as in ii. 10; Luther inexactly: "which some allege."—*περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἠστόχησαν*] The same construction in 2 Tim. ii. 18; with the genitive, i. 6. The *ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι τὴν ψευδ. γν.* includes (comp. i. 6) the *ἀστοχεῖν περὶ τ. πίστιν*, "erring in regard to the faith." This Wiesinger wrongly denies, with the remark that "the apostle did not consider the mere occupation with such things to be apostasy, but

[1] Against these explanations there is also the relative clause *ἣν κ.τ.λ.* attached to *γνώσεως*, since, of course, the followers of a *γνῶσις* containing anti-evangelic doctrines had departed from the faith.

only a possible occasion for apostasy.[2] Ἐπαγ. manifestly denotes more than merely being occupied with a thing. By τινες here, as in i. 3, 6 (vi. 3), we must understand the heretics.

Ver. 22. The benediction, as in the other Pauline Epistles. If ὑμῶν is the right reading, we can only infer from it that Paul intends the benediction for the whole church, not that he addresses the epistle to the whole church along with Timothy.

Notes by American Editor.

XVIII. Vv. 1, 2.

(*a*) It is somewhat remarkable that the exhortation to slaves should be the only one having reference to civil or social relations, which is given here. Comp. Eph. v. 22–vi. 9; Col. iii. 18–iv. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 18–iii. 7., where other relations are mentioned. The distinction made here between slaves having heathen and those having Christian masters, is not found elsewhere in Paul's writings. These two facts, as well as the words addressed to the slaves, may indicate the danger, in the case of this considerable section of the early believers, that the doctrine of Christian liberty which the Apostle preached might be carried to excess in other lines than those which were in the sphere of the distinctly Christian life. The evil to the cause of the gospel in all such undue pressing of liberty and equality, which was at that time especially to be apprehended; is indicated, in this passage, at the end of ver. 1. It was, that scandal and offense would be occasioned—that the name of God and the Christian teaching would be spoken ill of and blasphemed. The word καταφρονείτωσαν is somewhat surprising, and seems to show how far the feeling of the slaves, that Christianity destroyed all former distinctions, was sometimes carried. In the other passages referring to slaves, even in Tit. ii. 9 f., obedience, refraining from gainsaying and purloining, serving heartily and not with mere eye-service, etc., are the things spoken of.—(*b*) The explanation of οἱ ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι as the subject of the clause in which it stands, is the simplest and most natural one. This clause thus becomes parallel with the preceding ὅτι clause—the slaves are not to despise the masters on the ground that the latter are brethren, but are to perform the duties of slaves to them because of this fact. In the word εὐεργεσίας, however, the Apostle seems to give a hint of the feeling which the master should have towards the slave. He should regard the slave's service as a εὐεργεσία, a benefit or good deed rendered. Huther, Holtzm., and some others refer the εὐεργ. to the masters, and make the words mean "those who devote themselves to kindness towards you." This is in accordance with the use of ἀντιλαμβ. in most, if not all, cases of similar construction and reference in the classics. Wiesinger thinks Paul may have used the compound verb in a sense derived from its two component parts: *receive in return*, and that there may thus be a reference to a reciprocal relation between the master and the slave.

XIX. Vv. 3–10.

(*a*) W. and H., and Treg., like Tisch., Lachm., and Buttm., connect ταῦτα . . . παρακάλει with the following paragraph. R. V., on the other hand, unites these

[2] Hofmann, coinciding with Wiesinger's view, says: "The occupation with that which claimed, but did not deserve, the name of science, brought them unawares on the wrong track;" but the "unawares" is purely imported into the verse.

words, as does Huther, with what precedes. Ell., Alf., Fairb., Holtzm., agree with R. V. and Huther, and this is, perhaps, the more correct view.—(*b*) The following passage is declarative, not hortatory. The Apostle turns—quite abruptly, if *ταῦτα κ.τ.λ.* is to be joined to the previous verses—to the subject of the errors and heresies once more. He here presents certain further characteristics of the false teachers, bringing out especially their avariciousness. It was not unnatural for the Apostle to close the epistle with this matter, with which he had opened it —making further statements respecting it, and urging Timothy to avoid the errors, and to give himself to the true doctrine and to the good fight of the faith.—(*c*) The verb *προσέρχεται* (for which Tisch. 8th ed. alone among the textual editors reads *προσέχεται*, following ℵ), from the original sense of the word *to come to*—thus *to come to, in order to visit to surrender*, etc., passes, apparently, here to the meaning *consent to*, or *agree with*; *προσέχεται*, in the middle voice, means *to cling to*, or, as Huther says, *hold fast to*. The latter has so little support that it can hardly be adopted, but it would seem to be the word which the Apostle would, in this connection, have been more likely to use.—(*d*) In the word *ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ* the Apostle returns to the *ἑτεροδιδασκαλία* of i. 3. Comp. also, *ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ* i. 10, with *ὑγ. λόγ.* These two correspondences, together with the fact that this subject mainly occupies the remainder of this chapter, make it probable that it was his design to close the letter with the same admonition and exhortation with which he had begun it, and thus to give a double emphasis to his words. The expression *τῇ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκ.* is, through the phrase *μυστήριον εὐσεβ.* of iii. 16, which contains the great central truth of the Christian doctrine, easily connected with the suggestion, which is found in i. 10, of the accordance of the healthful teaching with the gospel. The similarity in the expressions *μὴ ἐπιστάμενος* and *μὴ νοοῦντες* of i. 7, may, also, be noticed. *Ζητήσεις* and *λογομαχίας*, also, unquestionably correspond with *ζητήσεις* of i. 4. The clause beginning with *ἐξ ὧν* merely sets forth the results in feeling, disputation, wrangling, etc., which naturally follow from such *ζητ. καὶ λογ.* The added words *νομιζόντων κ.τ.λ.*, accordingly, describe the peculiar characteristic of the erroneous teachers which is here made prominent, as distinct from and beyond what has been mentioned before. These words indicate avariciousness or, at least, that the persons spoken of regarded piety simply as a means of advancing themselves in worldly good; "a new business, an investment, a means of getting on in life," Plumptre, "a gainful trade," Conybeare. In Tit. i. 11 similar teachers are referred to as teaching for the sake of base gain, an expression which seems to point to avariciousness on their part. The same thing would appear to be indicated here, by the fact that the Apostle goes on, in ver. 9 f., to speak of the desire to be rich and the love of money.—(*e*) With regard to particular words in vv. 4, 5, there can be little doubt that Huther's explanation of *βλασφημίαι*, *ὑπόνοιαι πον.*, and *διαπαρατριβαί* is correct. Envy and strife were the first results, and these led to the other things which are mentioned. The words *τετύφωται* and *νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογ.* are strikingly descriptive of skeptics, especially of intellectual skeptics, of all ages.—(*f*) The gain mentioned in ver. 6, which appertains to piety when united with contentment, is apparently the blessing in peace of mind, happiness, etc., which, when the man is sufficient for, and in, himself, in the sense of being independent of the riches, etc., of the world, he has through his piety. *Γάρ* of ver. 7 gives the ground of the necessity and reasonableness of the adding of contentment to piety, when speaking of the latter as a source of great gain. The word *δῆλον* of this

verse must, apparently, be rejected by reason of the great weight of manuscript evidence against it. The sentence becomes, with this omission, quite difficult. The suggestion of Buttm. (E. T. p. 358) that ὅτι alone may be equivalent to δῆλον ὅτι seems doubtful. The expl. of de W. mentioned in Huther, with which R. V. perhaps agrees, is also a questionable one, both because of the use of ὅτι and the antecedent improbability that the writer would bring out the thought in this way; but it is, probably, the best one that can be offered.—(*g*) The contrast of ver. 9 with ver. 8, and the use of *βουλόμενοι*, "are minded to be rich," as well as the word *φιλαργυρία* of ver. 10, show that the writer is referring to those who give themselves wholly, and to the entire exclusion of the *αὐτάρκεια* just mentioned, to the work of acquiring riches. It is such *φιλαργυρία*, which is a root of all evils. That *ῥίζα* necessarily means *a root*, as distinguished from *the root*, cannot be affirmed, because the article may disappear by reason of the fact that the word is in the predicate. That it, in all probability, has this meaning, however, can hardly be questioned, and it is not to be doubted that R. V. expresses the right idea of the sentence by rendering *πάντων τῶν κακῶν* by *all kinds of evil*. Alf. insists that *ῥίζα* means *the root*. Most of the recent commentators agree with R. V.

XX. Vv. 11–21.

(*a*) That *σύ* is contrasted with *τινές* of ver. 10, and that *ταῦτα* refers to the love of money, etc., just mentioned, is indicated by all the considerations which the passage suggests. That the expression "man of God" is not applied to Timothy as an *official* term, is rendered probable by the use of the same expression in 2 Tim. iii. 17, where it clearly refers to the *believer* as a man of God. The fact that Timothy was a man of God should keep him from the course which was followed by these men who had gone astray, and should lead him to pursue that line of life to which God calls.—(*b*) *ὑπομονή* and *πραϋπάθεια* are, apparently, intended to be connected together—stedfast endurance, pressing on in spite of all trials or persecutions, was to be accompanied by gentleness of temper as related to the trials or to the authors of them. *πραϋπάθεια* is nearly equivalent to *πραΰτης*, and may mean *meekness* or *gentleness*. Here it may, not improbably, include both. —(*c*) *τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα* (ver. 12): Timothy is exhorted to do what, in 2 Tim. iv. 7, Paul declares himself, by the use of the same words, to have done. The Christian course, which is called *στρατείαν* in i. 18, is here called *ἀγῶνα*, a contest in the sense of the Greek games (comp. *δρόμον*, 2 Tim. iv. 7). *πίστις* does not here, or indeed in any place in the Past. Epp., as, also, it does not elsewhere in Paul's writings, mean the system of faith, the doctrine believed by Christians. It always refers to subjective faith, though sometimes this is viewed subjectively, and sometimes in a more objective way.—(*d*) The good confession which Timothy is said to have confessed (probably—by reason of the close connection with *ἐκλήθης* (as Huther also says)—at the time of his baptism) was not in form, or precisely, the same with that made by Christ before Pilate. Indeed, Christ can scarcely be said, in the strict sense, to have confessed the good confession. This was what Timothy did; but Christ's witnessing or confessing was through His acts and His general declarations made when He was on trial at Pilate's tribunal. Huther is apparently correct, however, in making *μαρτυρεῖν* here substantially equivalent to *ὁμολογεῖν*, as against the view of Ell., Alf., Grimm, and others, that it means *attest, bear witness to*, by His sufferings and death. Holtzm. agrees with Huther.

If Huther's view is correct, *ἐπί* means *before*; but if the view of Ell. is adopted, it may be rendered by *under*,—which meaning is given by him and de W. Alf., however, holds that, even with this latter explanation of *μαρτυρία*, the preposition means *before*.—(*e*) *τηρῆσαι . . . μέχρι τῆς ἐπιφανείας* points towards (though it may possibly be explained otherwise) an expectation that the *ἐπιφάνεια* would soon take place. The setting forth of this "appearance" as made visible by the power of God the Father is very distinct and emphatic in these verses, and the statements seem to represent it as a glorious manifestation in which both God and Christ have part, though the manifestation itself is here, as everywhere else, the *ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

(*f*) Ver. 17. The *αἰὼν οὗτος* seems to be alluded to, here, in contrast to the *ἐπιφάνεια* as the beginning of the *αἰὼν μέλλων*. It is spoken of however, primarily, in its contrast, as related to the character of its works, with the good works of the Christian life. The *μέλλων* idea is brought out distinctly in ver. 19. In connection with, and through these good works, they were to lay up for themselves, as a treasure, a good foundation on which to rest, that they might be able to lay hold upon that real life which belongs to the *αἰὼν μέλλων*. The doctrine of good works as a ground of reward, but not as a ground of justification, is here indicated.

(*g*) Whether *παραθήκην* (ver. 20) refers to the *διακονία* or the *διδασκαλία ὑγιαίνουσα* is uncertain; but, as the contrast throughout the epistle seems to be between the latter and the erroneous teaching, it may be regarded as more probable that it is this which the Apostle means. The use of *γνῶσις* here belongs to the later period of the life of Paul, rather than the earlier, but does not seem to carry us far beyond the time of the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians.

Παύλου ἡ πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολη δευτέρα.

A. *al.* have the shorter superscription: *πρὸς Τιμόθεον β′*; so, too, D E F G, but with *ἀρχεται* preceding.

CHAPTER I.

VER. 1. Tisch., on the authority of D E F G K P ℵ, *al.*, several versions, and Fathers, adopted *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* instead of the *Rec.* *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (A L, pl. etc., Lachm. and Buttm.). For the singular *ἐπαγγελίαν*, ℵ has the plural *ἐπαγγελίας*.—Ver. 3. To *τῷ Θεῷ* there is added *μου* in D* E 17, Sahid. Vulg. ed. Sixtin. Demidor. Clar. Germ. Or. Ambrosiast. etc. Imitation of Rom. i. 8.—Ver. 4. The reading *ἐπιποθῶ* (G, Boern. utrumq. Chrys.) seems only to have arisen from an endeavor to simplify the structure of the sentence.—Ver. 5. For *λαμβάνων* (*Rec.* with D E K L, *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret, etc.), Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. read *λαβών*, on the authority of A C F G 17, 31. This latter deserves preference as the more difficult reading, all the more that it is preceded by the present *ἐπιποθῶν*. —Instead of *Λωΐδι*, some MSS. have *Λοΐδι*, others *Λωΐδῃ*, and one *Λαΐδι*; still the *Rec.* is too strongly supported to leave doubts of its correctness. For *Εὐνίκῃ*, several cursives have *Εὐνείκῃ*.—Ver. 7. *δειλίας*] The reading *δουλείας* (in 238, Aeth. Didym. Chrys.) has clearly arisen from Rom. viii. 15.—Ver. 11. *ἐθνῶν* (Tisch. 8 omits) may possibly have been inserted on the analogy of 1 Tim. ii. 7; but since it is wanting only in A ℵ, and some cursives, it is safer to regard it as the original reading, all the more that it is necessary for the meaning.—Ver. 12. In ℵ, *καί* is wanting before *ταῦτα*; all other MSS., however, support its genuineness.—For *παρακαταθήκην* (*Rec.*), we must read here and at ver. 14, *παραθήκην*, just as in 1 Tim. vi. 20.—The *μου* that follows is wanting in D* E and some cursives; it was probably omitted because in those two other passages no pronoun stands with the word.—Ver. 15. The mode of writing the name *Φύγελλος* varies very much; the best supported is *Φύγελος*, which Lachm. and Tisch. adopted.—For *Ἑρμογένης*, Tisch. has adopted *Ἑρμογένης*, with the remark: testatur antiquissimus accentuum testis D*** etc.—Ver. 16. For *ἐπησχύνθη* (*Rec.*), all uncials, except K, several cursives, also Basil. Oec. Theodoret, have *ἐπαισχύνθη* (Lachm. Buttm. Tisch.); comp. Winer, p. 70 [E. T. p. 73].—Ver. 17. Tisch. 7 retained the *Rec.* *σπουδαιότερον*, with D*** E K L, *al.* Lachm. and Tisch. 8 adopted *σπουδαίως*, on the authority of C D* F G ℵ, *al.*; Buttm. read *σπουδαιοτέρως*, on the authority of A. This last reading seems to be only a correction of the *Rec.* Which of the two others is the original one, cannot be decided. The positive may be considered a correction of the comparative; but, on the other hand, the latter is more usual with Paul than the former, which occurs with him only in Tit. iii. 13. Besides, the comparative is often found in Paul where we might except the positive (comp. 1 Tim. iii. 14).

Vv. 1, 2. [On Vv. 1, 2, see Note XXI., pages 218, 219.] *Διὰ θελήματος*] comp. on 1 Tim. i. 1. [XXI *a.*]—The words of this address are peculiar: *κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*; they are not to be joined with *θελήματος*, nor with the following *Τιμοθέῳ*, but with *ἀπόστολος κ.τ.λ.* *Ἐπαγγελία* in the N. T. constantly means "*the promise*;" it is incorrect to translate it here by "preaching;" comp. 1 Tim. iv. 8. Its object is the *ζωή*, the blessed life which "exists objectively, and is presented in Christ" (Wiesinger). The preposition *κατά* shows that Paul's apostleship stands in connection with this promise. Matthies defines this connection more precisely by saying that *κατά* denotes the *harmony* between the plan of salvation, of which that *ἐπαγγελία* is the chief element, and the apostleship. But it is more natural, and more in accordance with the passage in Tit. i. 2, to explain it, as does Theodoret, followed by de Wette and Wiesinger: *ἀπόστολόν με προεβάλετο ὁ Θεὸς ὥστε με τὴν ἐπαγγελθεῖσαν αἰώνιον ζωὴν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κηρύξαι*, so that *κατά* directs attention to the purpose; see Winer, p. 376 [E. T. p. 402]. Otto contends that *κατά* means "for the purpose," and that *κηρύξαι* should be supplied. He explains it more generally: "in the matter of, in regard to," with the remark: "Paul means to say that his apostolic office . . . in its entire work is *defined* by that promise." This explanation, however, comes back substantially to the former one, since the work of the apostolic office is specially the *κηρύσσειν*. Hofmann explains *κατά* as equivalent to "in consequence of," in the sense, viz., that the promise of life forms the presupposition of Paul's apostleship; but for this there is no support in usage; besides, it is self-evident that without that promise of life there would be no apostleship.—Ver. 2. *Τιμοθέῳ ἀγαπητῷ τέκνῳ*] *ἀγαπητῷ*, [XXI *b.*] in distinction from *γνησίῳ*, 1 Tim. i. 2 and Tit. i. 4, does not indicate a greater confidence, nor even blame, as if Timothy, by showing a want of courageous faith, no longer deserved the name (Mack).

Ver. 3. [On Vv. 3–5, see Note XXII., pages 219, 220.] *Χάριν ἔχω τῷ Θεῷ*] [XXII *a.*] As in several other epistles, Paul begins here with a thanksgiving to God,—only he usually says *εὐχαριστῶ* or *εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός*. The expression is only in 1 Tim. i. 12 (elsewhere in the N. T. Luke xvii. 9; Heb. xii. 28). To *τῷ Θεῷ* there is next attached the relative clause: *ᾧ λατρεύω ἀπὸ προγόνων ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει*, which is added because the apostle wishes to remind Timothy of his *πρόγονοι*, viz. his grandmother and mother,—not to bring into prominence a relationship *different* from the apostle's own (Hofmann), but one *corresponding* with his own.—*ἀπὸ προγόνων* [XXII *b.*] is not equivalent to *ἀπὸ βρέφους*, iii. 15; it means that the apostle serves God "in the manner handed down by his progenitors, as they had done" (Buttm., p. 277 [E. T. 322]), or that the service of the *πρόγονοι*, *i. e.* not the ancestors of the Jewish people (Heydenr. and others), but the progenitors of the apostle himself (so most expositors), is continued in him, and denotes therefore "the continuity of the true honoring of God by Judaism" (de Wette). Otto says that the expression is not to be referred to the education (Flatt) or disposition (Winer, p. 349 [E. T. p. 372]; van Oosterzee, Wiesinger), but to the ancestral mode of worship;

but, in reply, it is to be observed, that on account of *ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει* the reference to disposition is by no means to be considered as excluded.[1] The apostle, by his conversion to Christianity, did not interrupt his connection with the *λατρεύειν* of his ancestors, because it was a necessary condition of the new faith to honor the God of revelation whom the Jews served. This utterance regarding the apostle himself, and particularly the words *ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδ.*, are not in contradiction with 1 Tim. i. 13 and similar passages, since the apostle, even while he was zealous for the law, served the God of his fathers *ἐν καθ. συνειδ.*, as little then as afterwards falsifying the revealed word with arbitrary fictions, which was done by the heretics; comp. Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 14 ff. Hofmann is wrong in breaking up the inner relation of these words, referring *λατρεύω* only to *ἀπὸ προγόνων*, and not also *ἐν καθ. συνειδήσει*, which he refers only to the apostle. This he does, although the structure of the sentence is most decidedly against such a distribution of the references.—On *ἐν καθ. συνειδ.*, comp. 1 Tim. i. 5.[2]—*ὡς ἀδιάλειπτον κ.τ.λ.*] [XXII *c.*] *ὡς* does not give the reason of thanksgiving, as Chrysostom explains it: *εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι μέμνημαί σου, φησὶν, οὕτω σὲ φιλῶ*, and as Luther translates: "that I," etc. Against this there is not only the word *ὡς*, but also the sense. The apostle, in his giving of thanks to God, often indeed recalls his *μνεία* of those to whom he writes (Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 2; Philem. 4), but he never points them out as the ground of his thanksgiving. Otto, while granting that there are objections to it, wishes to take *ὡς* as the same as *ὅτι*, and to regard it as a particle of the *reason*, equivalent to *ὅτι οὕτως*, which, however, cannot be justified from usage.[3] Just as little should we take *ὡς* adverbially with *ἀδιαλ.* Mack': "I thank God, etc. . . . I keep right continually," etc.—A subordinate clause begins with *ὡς*, which, however, does not mean: "since, quippe, siquidem" (Heydenreich, Flatt, Matthies: "in so far"), "so often" (Calvin: "quoties tui recordor in precibus meis, id autem facio continenter, simul etiam de te gratias ago"), but expresses the parallel relation of the subordinate clause to the principal one, and should be translated by "as" (Wiesinger, van Oosterzee); in Gal. vi. 10,

[1] Had the apostle not been conscious that his ancestors had served God *ἐν καθ. συνειδ.*, he would not have expressed himself as he does here.

[2] Otto rightly: "With Paul *συνείδησις* is purely the self-consciousness of the subject. The consciousness is pure, when it is conscious of no impure strivings. Impurity appears whenever any one, under the pretence of serving God, follows after his own selfish purposes." There is no ground for Hofmann's assertion, that the *καθ. συνείδησις* is only "a conscience free from consciousness of guilt, such as only that man can have who is conscious of the forgiveness of his sins."

[3] The particle *ὡς* does sometimes occur in classic Greek in such a way that it is resolvable into *ὅτε οὕτως*; but, as is shown in the very nature of the word, only *in cases when* the sentence beginning with *ὡς* expresses something *surprising*, something *exciting astonishment*, in particular, therefore, after the verb *θαυμάζω*. It follows, as Pape says, *s. v.*, that "in such cases we may translate it with the simple *how*." That such is the case, is proved by all the quotations brought together by Otto (p. 301) from the Greek classics. It is therefore *entirely erroneous* for Otto to say quite generally that "it is in the manner of genuine Greek to contract the causal *ὅτι* with the following *οὕτως* into the adverbial pronoun *ὡς*." Only if the *ἀδιάλειπτον ἔχω τὴν περὶ σοῦ μνείαν* occurred to the apostle as something *strange*, *astonishing*, could *ὡς* be explained here by *ὅτι οὕτως*.—Besides,

ὡς has a very similar meaning. The sense accordingly is: "*I thank God, as I am continually mindful of thee in my prayers,*" so that already in the subordinate clause it is indicated that the thanksgiving to God refers to Timothy. In Rom. i. 9, ὡς stands in quite another connection, which makes de Wette's objection all the less justifiable, that here it has been taken from that passage.—*ἀδιάλειπτον ἔχω τὴν περί σου μνείαν*] De Wette arbitrarily maintains that Paul would have said: *ἀδιαλείπτως μνείαν σου ποιοῦμαι.* Though Paul does so express himself in Rom. i. 9 (and similarly Eph. i. 16), it does not, however, follow that he might not use another form of expression in another epistle, especially since the connection of *μνείαν* with *ἔχειν* is by no means unusual with him; comp. 1 Thess. iii. 6.—*ἀδιάλειπτον* stands first for emphasis. There is nothing strange here in *μνεία* being joined with *περί*, since *μνᾶσθαι* takes that construction even in the classics.[1]—*ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσί μου νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας*] *ταῖς* is not to be supplied before *νυκτός*, since the last words are not to be taken with *δεήσεσι*, but either with *ἀδιαλ. ἔχω κ.τ.λ.* (Wiesinger, van Oosterzee) or with what follows (Matthies, Plitt, Hofmann). The first construction is preferable, because the chief emphasis is laid on the preceding thought, the *ἐπιποθῶν* being made subsidiary; besides, the apostle had no particular reason for directing attention to the uninterrupted duration *of his longing* for Timothy as the source of his unceasing prayer. The assertion, that *νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας* is superfluous on account of the previous *ἀδιάλειπτον*, is not to the point; comp. Acts xxvi. 7, where the same words are added with *ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ*.

Ver. 4. As in Rom. i. 11, Phil. i. 8, and other passages, Paul also expresses here his longing to see the person to whom the epistle is addressed. The participle *ἐπιποθῶν* is subordinate to the previous *ἔχω*; to it, in turn, the next participle *μεμνημένος* is subordinated. The longing for Timothy causes him to be continually remembered in the apostle's prayers, and the remembrance is nourished by thinking of his tears.—*σου τῶν δακρύων*] [XXII *d.*] By these are meant—as the verb *μεμνημένος* shows—not tears which "Timothy shed" when at a distance from the apostle (Wiesinger), and of which he knew only through a letter (which Timothy therefore "shed by letter," Hofmann); but the tears of which he himself had been witness, the tears which Timothy shed probably on his departure from him (van Oosterzee, Plitt). These were, to the apostle, a proof of Timothy's love to him, and produced in him the desire of seeing Timothy again, that he might thereby be filled with joy. In this connection of the clauses with one another, the apostle has not yet given the object of thanks appropriate to the *χάριν ἔχω*; he does not do so till ver. 5.[2]—

it is inaccurate for Otto to ascribe to ὡς a causal signification, and then call the clause beginning with it an objective clause.

[1] Comp. Herod. i. 36; Plato, *Lach.* p. 181 A; Xenophon, *Cyrop.* i. 6. 12; so, too, with *μνημονεύειν*, Heb. xi. 22.

[2] Against this view it cannot be maintained that it makes a subordinate participle *μεμνημένος* depend on the subordinate participle *ἐπιποθῶν*, for that is not in itself impossible; nor can it be said "that the insertion of a clause *μεμνημένος* between *ἰδεῖν σε* and *ἵνα* is intolerable," since the chief stress is not on *μεμνημένος*, but on *ἐπιποθῶν κ.τ.λ.* Further,

According to Hofmann, the reason of the thanks is already given in the participial clause *μεμνημένος*. But the idea that Paul thanks God for Timothy's tears, is out of all analogy with the other epistles of the apostle. Even the *ἵνα χαρᾶς πληρωθῶ* is against this view, for the apostle could not possibly say that he remembers Timothy's tears in order that he may be filled with joy.

Ver. 5. *Ὑπόμνησιν λαβὼν τῆς κ.τ.λ.*] [XXII *e.*] This participial clause is to be taken neither with *μεμνημένος* nor with *ἐπιποθῶν* (de Wette, Leo); the sense forbids us to subordinate it to one of these ideas, and the want of the copula *καί* to co-ordinate it with them. Otto joins it with *ἵνα χαρᾶς πληρωθῶ*: "that I may be filled with joy, as I (*sc.* by thy personal presence in Rome) receive a renewal of my remembrance of thy unfeigned faith." Against this construction, however, there are the following reasons:—(1) That to supply "by thy presence" is not only arbitrary, but does not suit with the idea *ὑπόμνησιν λαμβάνειν*, since the impression made on us by anything before the eyes cannot be described as reminding us of that thing. (2) That, if the remembrance of Timothy's constancy in the faith is so unceasing with the apostle that he thanks God for it, it is quite inconceivable how he could still wish to receive a *ὑπόμνησις* of it. (3) That we see ourselves forced by it to prefer the reading *λαμβάνων* (which Tisch. adopted) to *λαβών*.—The only remaining course is to connect *ὑπομν. λαβ.* with *χάριν ἔχω τῷ Θεῷ* (so Wiesinger, Plitt, and others). It does stand at some distance from it, but that cannot be considered a good reason against the construction. The construction in Phil. i. 3–5 is similar. Nor can we make objection that "Paul according to this view would not thank God because Timothy stands in such faith, but because he has been brought to his recollection" (Hofmann), for the participial clause does not give the reason of the thanksgiving directly, but only hints at it. It is the same here as at Eph. i. 15 and Col. i. 3, where, too, the subject of thanksgiving is not the *ἀκοῦειν*, but that which the apostle had heard.—*ὑπόμνησιν λαβών* is not equivalent to "recordans, as I remember" (de Wette: "retaining the remembrance"), for *ὑπόμνησις* in the N. T. (comp. 2 Pet. i. 13, iii. 1; also Ecclus. xvi. 11; 2 Macc. vi. 17) has an *active* signification; it is equivalent, therefore, to "since I have received remembrance," *i. e.* "since I have been reminded" (Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Hofmann). It is not said what had reminded the apostle of Timothy's faith. Bengel supposes that it was *externa quaedam occasio*, or a *nuntius a Timotheo;* Wiesinger, that it was Onesimus. But it suits better with the context to regard the tears just mentioned as causing the recollection, inasmuch as they were to the apostle a proof of his unfeigned faith. It is unnecessary to derive the *ὑπόμνησις* from some inner working of the apostle's soul (so formerly in this commentary); there is no hint of any such thing. The present *λαμβάνων* is not against this interpretation, since these tears came so vividly before the apostle's soul that he was thereby reminded more and more of

it cannot provoke objection that Timothy's tears nourished in the apostle the longing to see him again, since these were a proof of his love—and of his faith.

Timothy's faith.—*τῆς ἐν σοὶ ἀνυποκρίτου πίστεως*] see 1 Tim. i. 5; this, now, is the subject of the thanksgiving.—As Paul is conscious that the God whom he serves was the God also of his ancestors, he can remind Timothy of the fact that the faith which dwells in him was before the possession of his grandmother and mother.[1]—*ἥτις ἐνῴκησε πρῶτον*] *ἐνοικεῖν* as in ver. 14; Rom. viii. 11; 2 Cor. vi. 16. The word is chosen here "to denote faith on its objective side as a possession coming from God" (Wiesinger), and it declares that "it has not become a merely transient feeling, but an abiding principle of life dwelling in them" (van Oosterzee).—*πρῶτον* is not, with Luther, to be translated by "before," but to be taken in its proper meaning, in reference to the *πρόγονοι* of Timothy. The point brought out is, that Timothy was not the first of his family to be a believer, but we cannot press the point so far as to suppose that a distinction is drawn between the apostle whose ancestors served God as Jews, while Timothy's ancestors were heathen (so Hofmann).—*ἐν τῇ μάμμῃ σου κ.τ.λ.*] Regarding *μάμμη*, see Wahl on the passage.—This grandmother of Timothy is not mentioned elsewhere. Of the mother, it is said in Acts xvi. 1 ff. that she was a *γυνὴ Ἰουδαία πιστή*; her name is given only here. The mention of the two is not to be regarded as a superfluous—or even surprising—afterthought. Paul might repose in Timothy all the greater confidence, that he, brought up by a pious mother, had before him her example and that of his grandmother.—This confidence the apostle expresses still more definitely in the next words: *πέπεισμαι δὲ, ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοί*, with which Heydenreich wrongly supplies *ἐνοικήσει* instead of *ἐνοικεῖ*.

Ver. 6. [On Vv. 6–14, see Note XXIII., pages 220–222.] *Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἀναμιμνήσκω σε κ.τ.λ.*] This verse contains the chief thought of the whole chapter. By *δι' ἣν αἰτίαν* (a formula which occurs in Paul only here, at ver. 12, and at Tit. i. 13; *αἰτία* not at all in the other Pauline epistles), the apostle connects his exhortation with the previous *πέπεισμαι κ.τ.λ.*, since his conviction of Timothy's faith was the occasion of his giving the exhortation. There is no ground for the objection raised by Otto against this connection of thought, that *αἰτία* "never expresses anything but the external objective occasion;" he is no less wrong in wishing to refer *δι' ἣν αἰτίαν* not to *ἀναμιμνήσκω*, but to *ἀναζωπυρεῖν*. In that case the apostle would have written *δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἀναζωπύρει κ.τ.λ.* (as Otto explains the expression). The verb *ἀναμιμνήσκειν*, properly, "remind of something," contains in itself the idea of exhorting; the apostle finely interprets the word so as to make Timothy appear himself conscious of the duty which was urged on him; *ὑπομιμνήσκειν* is often used exactly in this way.—*ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ*

[1] Since Timothy's *ἀνυπόκριτος πίστις* is Christian faith, faith in Jesus Christ, it is manifestly wrong to regard the *πίστις* of the grandmother and mother as only faith in the O. T. promise (Otto); the relative *ἥτις* shows that the two are identical. From Paul's ascription to himself of a *λατρεύειν ἀπὸ προγόνων*, we cannot infer, with Otto, that the "matter of faith on the part of Timothy's *πρόγονοι* cannot be taken *further* than on the part of the apostle's *πρόγονοι*." The apostle does not at all boast of the *πίστις* of his ancestors, but says merely that he serves *the same* God as they had served. Timothy's faith could only mean something to him, if it was not only faith in the promise, but also faith in Him who had appeared according to the promise.

Θεοῦ] [XXIII *a.*] ἀναζωπυρεῖν: ἀπ. λεγ.: "fan into life again."[1] By χάρισμα τ. Θ. is meant here, as in 1 Tim. iv. 14, the fitness (ἱκανότης) bestowed by God on Timothy for discharging the ἔργον εὐαγγελιστοῦ (iv. 5), which fitness includes both the capacity and also (though Hofmann denies this) zeal and spirit for official labors. The context shows that the courage of a Christian martyr is here specially meant. This παῤῥησία is not the work of man, but the gift of God's grace to man. It can only be kept alive unceasingly by the labor of man.[2] Bengel is not incorrect in remarking on this exhortation: videtur Timotheus, Paulo diu carens, nonnihil remisisse; certe nunc ad majora stimulatur. His former zeal seems to have been weakened, particularly by the apostle's suffering (ver. 8), so that it needed to be quickened again.[3] Otto here, too, understands by χάρισμα, the "*right* of office;" but this does not accord with the verb ἀναζωπυρεῖν, since the *right* did not need to be revived. However Timothy might conduct himself in regard to the right imparted to him, it remained always the same; if he did not exercise it as he should have done, he *himself* or *his activity* needed the ἀναζωπυρεῖν, but not the *right* which had been delivered to him with the office.[4] On the next words: ὃ ἐστιν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου, comp. 1 Tim. iv. 14. There can be no reason for doubting that the same act is meant in both passages. As to the difficulty that, whereas in the former passage it was the presbytery, here it is Paul who is said to have imposed hands, see the remark on that passage. The reason for this lies both in the character of the epistle, "which has for its foundation and in part for its subject the personal relation between the apostle and Timothy," as well as in Paul's exhortation to Timothy in ver. 8, "to make the gift an effective agent for him through whom the gift was received" (Wiesinger).

Ver. 7. The exhortation in ver. 6, Paul confirms by pointing to the spirit which God has given to His own people: οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα δειλίας] [XXIII *b.*] By ἡμῖν, Otto understands not Christians in general, but the apostle and Timothy in particular as office-bearers. The context, however, does not demand such special reference, since the apostle, in order to confirm his exhortation to Timothy, might very well

[1] Comp. Jamblichus, *De Vit. Pyth.* chap. xvi.: ἀνεζωπύρει τὸ θεῖον ἐν αὐτῇ.

[2] Chrysostom: δεῖ σου προθυμίας πρὸς τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . ἐν ἡμῖν γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ σβέσαι, καὶ ἀνάψαι τοῦτο· ὑπὸ μὲν γὰρ ῥᾳθυμίας καὶ ἀκηδίας σβέννυται, ὑπὸ δὲ νήψεως καὶ προσοχῆς διεγείρεται.

[3] It has been already remarked (Introd. § 3, p. 27) that Otto is not justified in accusing Timothy of having almost laid down his office through anxiety and timidity. It is a part of this accusation that Otto here finds it said that "Timothy was to resume the duties delivered to him by the apostolic laying on of hands."—The meaning of ἀναζωπυρεῖν is mistaken by van Oosterzee and Plitt, if they think that we cannot infer from it that there had been an actual decrease of Timothy's official zeal.

[4] Otto contends, that "along with the office, when the hands were laid on him, Timothy received the understanding, the personal gifts for filling it." Against this it is to be remarked—(1) That the natural talents are not bestowed along with the office, but the conscious and intentional concentration and employment of them in the office, otherwise the receiver of the office is only a dead machine in it; and (2) that the apostle, in laying on hands, acted as the instrument of the Holy Spirit; and of this Timothy was also aware.

appeal to a fact which had been experienced by Christians in general as well as by himself. Besides, the *ἡμᾶς* in ver. 9 is against Otto's view. *Πνεῦμα* here is *either*—(1) the objective spirit of God, the Holy Spirit (Bengel, Heydenreich, Otto), of whom it is first said negatively that it is not a spirit of *δειλία*, *i. e.* not a spirit producing *δειλία* in man, and then positively that it is a spirit of *δύναμις κ.τ.λ.*, *i. e.* a spirit imparting *δύναμις* to man; *or* (2) *πνεῦμα* is the subjective condition of man, the spiritual life wrought in him by the Spirit of God (Mack, Matthies, Leo, similarly, too, Hofmann[1]), which is then described more precisely as a spirit, not of *δειλία*, but of *δύναμις κ.τ.λ.* The context in which the similar passage in Romans stands, and especially the passage corresponding to this in Gal. iv. 6, make the first view preferable.—*δειλία* denotes timidity in the struggle for the kingdom of God; comp. John xiv. 27; Rev. xxi. 7, 8.—The ideas *δύναμις*, *ἀγάπη*, and *σωφρονισμός* are closely related to each other. That the Christian, as a warrior of God, may rightly wage the warfare to which he is appointed, he needs first *δύναμις*, *i. e.* power, not only to withstand the attacks of the world, but also to gain an increasing victory over the world. He has need next of *ἀγάπη*, which never suffers him to lose sight of the goal of the struggle, *i. e.* the salvation of his brethren, and urges him to labor towards it with all self-denial. Lastly, he has need of *σωφρονισμός*. While Chrysostom and Theophylact leave it uncertain whether this word is to be taken intransitively, reflectively, or transitively,[2] later expositors (Hofmann too: "discretion") have taken it as synonymous with *σωφροσύνη*;[3] de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt make it reflective, "*self-control*" (properly, therefore, "the *σωφρόνισις* directed towards oneself"). Neither explanation, however, can be justified by usage. Etymology and usage are decidedly in favor of the *transitive* meaning, which therefore must be maintained, with Otto, unless we attribute to the apostle a mistake in the use of the word. In itself the Holy Spirit might be called *πνεῦμα σωφρονισμοῦ* in *the other* sense, since the *σωφρονίζειν* is His characteristic. He practises it; but, as the preceding genitives denote effects, and not qualities, of the spirit, the genitive *σωφρονισμοῦ* would stand to *πνεῦμα* in a relation differing from that of the other genitives. The Holy Spirit can therefore receive such a designation here, only in so far as He produces the *σωφρονίζειν* (comp. Tit. ii. 4) in the Christian, *i. e.* impels him not to remain inactive when others go wrong, but to correct them that they may desist. Thus taken, the idea of *σωφρονισμός* appropriately includes that of *ἀγάπη*, part of which is to be active in amending the unhappy circumstances of the church,—here all the more appropriately because the thought which is true of all Christians is specially applied here to Timothy.[4]

[1] Hofmann, to a certain extent, combines the two, saying: "The spirit which we have received is, looking to its source, the Spirit of God; but, looking to what we become through it, it becomes in us the spirit of our life thus created."

[2] Theophylact: *ἢ ἵνα σώφρονες ὦμεν· . . . ἢ ἵνα σωφρονισμὸν ἔχωμεν τὸ πνεῦμα, κἂν τις πειρασμὸς ἡμῖν ἐπιγένηται, πρὸς σωφρονισμὸν τοῦτον δεχώμεθα· ἢ ἵνα καὶ ἄλλοις ὦμεν σωφρονισταί.*

[3] Thus Augustine, *ad Bonif.* iv. chap. 5: continentia; Vulgate: sobrietas; Beza: sanitas animi; Leo: temperantia.

[4] The explanation here given of *σωφρονισμός* is in substantial agreement with that pro-

Ver. 8. Μὴ οὖν (deduction from what has preceded: since God has given us the spirit of *δύναμις κ.τ.λ.*, then, etc.) *ἐπαισχυνθῇς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*] [XXIII *c.*] On the construction, comp. Rom. i. 16: *οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.*—*μαρτύριον*, like *μαρτυρεῖν* in 1 Tim. iii. 16, does not denote the martyrdom of Christ, nor even specially the testimony regarding the martyr-death of Christ (Chrysostom: *μὴ αἰσχύνου, ὅτι τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον κηρύσσεις*), but more generally the testimony regarding Christ, which certainly includes the other special meaning. Κυρίου is not the subjective genitive,[1] but the objective.[2]—The connection between this and the preceding thought is brought out by Bengel's words: timorem pudor comitatur; victo timore, fugit pudor malus.—*μηδὲ ἐμὲ τὸν δέσμιον αὐτοῦ*] Paul places himself in immediate connection with the gospel, as he was a prisoner because of his witness of Christ; and the reason of the special mention of himself lies in the summons to Timothy to come to him at Rome.[3] Paul calls himself *δέσμιος Χριστοῦ* here and at Eph. iii. 1, Philem. 9, because he bore his bonds for Christ's sake: or better, because "Christ (Christ's cause) had brought him into imprisonment and was keeping him there" (Winer, p. 178 [E. T. p. 189]; Meyer on Eph. iii. 1: Wiesinger). The expression in Philem. 13: *δεσμοὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, forbids the explanation: "a prisoner belonging to Christ." Hofmann is inaccurate: "a prisoner whose bonds are part of his relation to Christ."—*ἀλλὰ συγκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*] "*but suffer with* (*sc.* me) *for the gospel*;" the verb, occurring only here and perhaps at ii. 3 (the simple form at ii. 9, iv. 5; Jas. v. 13), is limited more precisely by the reference to the previous *ἐμέ*. Luther ("suffer with the gospel, as I do") refers the *σύν* to the dative following; but against this there is the unsuitable collocation of person and thing.[4] The dative *τῷ εὐαγγ.* is to be taken as dativus commodi,[5] as in Phil. i. 27: *συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*; in Heb. xi. 25: *συγκακουχεῖσθαι τῷ λαῷ*, the dative has another meaning.—*κατὰ δύναμιν Θεοῦ*] [XXIII *d.*] These words do not belong, as Heinrichs thinks possible, to *τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*, in the sense: doctrina cui inest *δύναμις Θεοῦ*, but to the preceding verb. The meaning, however, is not: "strengthened through God's aid" (Heydenreich), but *κατά* denotes the suitability: "in accordance with the power of God which is effectual in thee," or "which will not fail thee" (Hofmann). *Δύναμις Θεοῦ* is not here "the power produced by God," nor is it "God's *own* power" (Wiesinger), in the sense of an abstract idea apart from its actual working in the believer.

posed by Otto, except that Otto regards the *σωφρονισμός* as a work, *official* in kind.

[1] Wahl: testimonium quod dixit Jesus de rebus divinis quas audivit a Patre; Hofmann: "the truth of salvation witnessed by Christ." Hofmann for this explanation appeals wrongly to 1 Cor. i. 6, ii. 1; besides, *μαρτύριον* does not mean "truth of salvation," unless it is so defined.

[2] De Wette, Wiesinger.

[3] Wiesinger: "Here the twofold contents of the epistle are set forth as the theme; for the contents of the epistle are simply the general duties laid on Timothy as a preacher of the gospel; and the particular service of love which he was to render to the imprisoned apostle."

[4] Chrysostom rightly says: *συγκακοπάθησον, φησί, τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, οὐχ ὡς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κακοπαθοῦντος, ἀλλὰ τὸν μαθητὴν διεγείρων ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου πάσχειν.*

[5] Mack, Matthies, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt, Hofmann.

Ver. 9. In the series of participial and relative clauses which here follow each other in the Pauline manner, the apostle details the saving works of God's grace, not so much "to bring into prominence the *δύναμις Θεοῦ*" (Wiesinger), as to strengthen the exhortation in ver. 8.—*τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγίᾳ*] This thought is closely related to the one preceding, since the mention of the divine act of love serves to give strength in working and suffering for the gospel.—The *καλεῖν* is placed after the *σώζειν*, because the salvation of God, the *σωτηρία*, is imparted to man by God through the call. The thought is to be taken generally of all Christians, and not merely to be referred to Paul and Timothy, as several expositors think, at the same time explaining *κλήσις* of the special call to the office of Christian teacher (Heydenreich).—Κλῆσις in the N. T. constantly denotes the call to partake in the kingdom of God, the call being made outwardly by the preaching of the gospel, inwardly by the influence of the spirit working through the word. Κλῆσις and *καλεῖν* are similarly joined in Eph. iv. 1.—The added *ἁγία* defines the *κλῆσις* more precisely in its nature, not in its working (de Wette, "hallowing").—In order to denote the *σώζειν*[1] and *καλεῖν* as purely acts of God's grace, and thus set the love of God in clearer light, Paul adds the words: *οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.* The first clause is negative, declaring that our works were not the standard (*κατά*) of that divine activity (comp. Tit. iii. 5). The second clause is positive, setting forth the principle by which alone God has guided himself. De Wette is inaccurate in explaining *κατά* as giving the motive; that is not given by *κατά*, but by *ἐξ*; comp. Rom. ix. 11. The only rule for God in the work of redemption is God's *ἰδία πρόθεσις*; comp. on this Rom. viii. 28 f.; Eph. i. 11; Tit. iii. 5: *κατὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ ἔλεον.* Ἴδιος is here emphatic, in order to show that this his purpose has its ground in himself alone.[2]—*καὶ χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων*] [XXIII *e.*] By this addition still greater emphasis is laid on the thought contained in the previous words, since the *ἰδία πρόθεσις* is called a *χάρις* which has been already given us in Christ *πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων*. It is natural to take *πρὸ χρόν. αἰων.* as identical with *πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων*, 1 Cor. ii. 7 (Eph. i. 4: *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*), *i. e.* to regard it as a term for eternity, since the *χρόνοι αἰώνιοι* are the times beginning with the creation (so hitherto in this commentary). Heydenreich and others with this view explain *δίδοναι* as equivalent to "destinare, appoint;" but as the word does not possess this meaning, it is better to adhere to the idea of *giving*, but in an *ideal* signification, "in so far as that which God resolves in eternity is already as good as realized in time" (de Wette). Ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, which is attached immediately to *δοθεῖσαν*, denotes Christ Jesus as the mediator through whom grace is imparted to us, but in such a way that Christ's mediatorship is regarded as one provided by God before time was.[3] But the expression

[1] De Wette's assertion, that with Paul God is never the Saviour, is contradicted by 1 Cor. i. 21.

[2] Πρόθεσις, as Wiesinger rightly remarks, is not equivalent to "foreordination," but to "purpose;" see Rom. i. 13; Eph. i. 9, 11.

[3] Hofmann, in his *Schriftbew.* I. p. 232, puts forward the explanation: "It is the eternal conduct of God the Father to the Son, in which and with which there is given to us

πρὸ χρόν. αἰων. may be otherwise taken. In Tit. i. 2, it clearly has a weaker signification, viz. "from time immemorial" (similarly Luke i. 70: ἀπ' αἰῶνος). If the expression be taken in that way here, δοθεῖσαν may be explained in the sense that to us the χάρις is already given in the promise (Tit. i. 2 also refers to God's promise); so Hofmann. In that case, however, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is not to be taken in the sense of mediation, which does not agree with the addition of Ἰησοῦ to Χριστῷ, but as Hofmann explains it: "τὴν δοθ. ἡμ. ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ denotes that the grace given us was given that Christ Jesus might be given us; He, however, has been given us from the beginning of time, when God promised the Saviour who was to appear in the person of Jesus." This view (especially on account of Tit. i. 2) might be preferred to the one previously mentioned. As contrasted with κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν, stress is to be laid on πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων. If the imparting of the grace is eternal (resting on the eternal counsel of God), it is all the less dependent on the works of man.

Ver. 10. Φανερωθεῖσαν δὲ νῦν] These words form a contrast with τὴν δοθεῖσαν . . . πρὸ χρόν. αἰων., the grace being concealed which was bestowed on Christians in Christ *before* the ages. It is to be observed that the idea of the φανέρωσις does not refer here to the decree, but to the grace of God; Heydenreich is therefore inaccurate in saying that "the φανεροῦν here denotes the execution of the divine decree which was made from eternity, and has now come forth from its concealment." The means by which the φανέρωσις of the divine grace has been made, the apostle calls the ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Ἐπιφάνεια is used only here to denote the appearance of Christ in the flesh. As a matter of course (so, too, van Oosterzee, Plitt, and others), it denotes not only the birth of Christ, but also His whole presence on the earth up to His ascension. There is added τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν in reference to τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς, ver. 9, in order to make it clear that the grace eternally given to us was made manifest by the appearance of Christ Jesus, because He appeared as our σωτήρ (see on 1 Tim. i. 1). The means by which He showed Himself to be this, and by which He revealed that grace, are told us in the two participial clauses: καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον, φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. [XXIII *f.*]—καταργεῖν, properly, "make ineffectual," means here, as in 1 Cor. xv. 26, Heb. ii. 14, "*bring to nought*." Θάνατος is death, as the power to which man is, for his sins, made subject, both for time and for eternity. It is not the "prince of the realm of the dead," as Heydenreich thinks (also in Heb. ii. 14 there is a distinction between θάνατος and διάβολος). Still less to the point is the hypothesis of de Wette, that the καταργεῖν τὸν θάνατον is spoken "with subjective reference to the power of death over the mind, or the fear of death;" the discussion here is not of subjective states of feeling, but of objective powers. The question whether

who are in Christ the grace of God eternally;" but he has since withdrawn it.—Wiesinger remarks that the πρόθεσις is not to be understood of a purpose in reference to *individuals*, but of the purpose in reference to the *world*, and that every position of the *individual* is grounded on this eternal grace presented to the *world* in Christ; but this limitation is in no way indicated by the context.

θάνατος means here physical or eternal death, may be answered in this way, that the apostle regards the two as one in their inner relation to one another.[1] The second clause: φωτίσαντος δὲ κ.τ.λ., corresponds with the first: καταργ. κ.τ.λ. Φωτίζειν has usually the intransitive signification: "shine," Rev. xxii. 5; but it occurs also as transitive, both in the literal and derivative sense, Rev. xxi. 23, John i. 9. In 1 Cor. iv. 5, it is synonymous with φανεροῦν: "*bring to light from concealment;*" so, too, in Ecclus. xxiv. 30, and in this sense it is used here. The expression is all the more pointed that θάνατος is "a power of darkness" (Wiesinger); comp. Luke i. 79.—Heydenreich's explanation: "Christ raised the hope of immortality to fullest certainty," weakens the apostle's meaning. ζωή denotes the blessed life of the children of God, which is further described as eternal, ever-during, by the epexegetical καὶ ἀφθαρσία (Wiesinger). This life was originally hid in God, but Christ brought it to light out of concealment, and brought it διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. These added words are to be referred only to the second clause, for the annihilation of death was not effected by the gospel, but by Christ's death and resurrection.—On the other hand, the revelation of life was made by the preaching of the gospel, inasmuch as Christ thereby places before us the ζωὴ καὶ ἀφθαρσία as the inheritance assigned us in Him.—It is incorrect, with Wiesinger, to separate διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου from the nearest verb to which it is thoroughly suited if taken in a natural sense, and to connect it with the more distant φανερωθεῖσαν, the means of which, moreover, is already given in διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας. Plitt wrongly thinks that the construction here is somewhat careless, and that διὰ τ. εὐαγγ. is to be co-ordinated with διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας, giving a still more precise definition to φανερωθεῖσαν.

Ver. 11. Εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην κ.τ.λ.] With these words the apostle turns to his office and his suffering in his office, in correspondence with μηδὲ ἐμὲ τ. δέσμ. αὐτοῦ, ver. 8. The relative ὑ does not refer to the thoughts expressed in the previous verses, but to εὐαγγελίου: "*for which,*" *i. e.* in order to preach it. Comp. the parallel passages in 1 Tim. ii. 7.

Ver. 12. Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν (see on ver. 6) refers to what immediately precedes: "therefore, because I am appointed apostle." [XXIII *g.*]—καὶ ταῦτα πάσχω] goes back to ver. 8. Καί expresses the relation corresponding to what was said in ver. 11.—ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι] viz. of the sufferings; said in reference to μὴ οὖν ἐπαισχυνθῇς in ver. 8. Imprisonment is to me not a disgrace, but a καύχημα; comp. Rom. v. 3; Col. i. 24. The apostle thereby declares that his suffering does not prevent him from preaching the μαρτύριον τοῦ κυρίου (ver. 8) as a κήρυξ κ.τ.λ. The reason is given in the next words: οἶδα γὰρ ᾧ πεπίστευκα. Heydenreich inaccurately: "I know Him on whom I have trusted;" de Wette rightly: "I know on whom I have set my trust."—This is defined more precisely by: καὶ πέπεισμαι, ὅτι δυνατός ἐστι κ.τ.λ., which words are closely connected with those previous, in the sense: I know, that He in whom I trust is mighty, etc.—The confidence

[1] Wiesinger: "Death as the power to which the whole man, both body and soul, has fallen a prey in consequence of sin, and which makes the bodily death the precursor of death eternal."

that God can keep His *παραθήκη*, is the reason of his *οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεσθαι*. With *οἶδα . . . καὶ πέπεισμαι*, comp. Rom. xiv. 14; with *ὅτι δυν. ἐστι*, comp. Rom. xi. 23, xiv. 4; 2 Cor. ix. 8.—On the meaning of *τὴν παραθήκην* [XXIII *h*.] (*Rec. παρακαταθήκην*) *μου*, expositors have spoken very arbitrarily.[1] —The same substantive occurs again at ver. 13; so, too, at 1 Tim. vi. 20.—It is hardly possible to imagine that Paul in ver. 14 should have meant something else by *παραθήκη* than he means here; all the less that he connects the same verb with it in both passages. Though here we have *μου*, and God is the subject, still the supposition is not thereby justified.[2] The genitive *μου* may either be subjective or objective. In the former case, *ἡ παραθ. μου* is something which Paul has entrusted or commended to God; in the latter, something which God has entrusted to Paul, or laid aside for him (a deposit destined for him). With the former view Hofmann understands by *παραθήκη* the apostle's *soul* which he has commended to God; but there is nothing in the context to indicate this. Hofmann appeals to Ps. xxxi. 6; but against this it is to be observed that nothing can justify him in supplying the idea of "*soul*" with the simple word *παραθήκη*.—With the latter view of the genitive, Wiesinger understands by it the *ζωὴ καὶ ἀφθαρσία* (iv. 8: *ὁ δικαιοσύνης στέφανος*) already mentioned; so, too, Plitt; van Oosterzee, too, agrees with this view, though he, without good grounds, explains *μου* as a subjective genitive. Against this interpretation there is the fact that with the sentence *εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην* the apostle's thought has already turned from the *ζωὴ καὶ ἀφθαρσία* to his *διακονία*. The following interpretation suits best with the context: for what other reason could there be for the apostle's *οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι* than the confidence that God would keep the *διακονία* in which, or for whose sake, he had to suffer, would keep it so that it would not be injured by his suffering.—It is less suitable to understand by the *παραθήκη* the gospel, because the *μου*, pointing to something entrusted to the apostle personally, does not agree with this. By adding *εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν*, the apostle sets forth that the *παραθήκη* is not only kept "*till* that day" (Heydenreich, Wiesinger, Otto[3]), but "*for* that day,"

[1] Theodoret says: *παρακαταθήκην, ἢ τὴν πιστιν φησι καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα, ἢ τοὺς πιστοὺς, οὓς παρέθετο αὐτῷ ὁ Χριστὸς ἢ οὓς αὐτὸς παρέθετο τῷ κυρίῳ, ἢ παρακαταθήκην λεγει τὴν ἀντιμισθιαν.*

[2] Wiesinger adduces three counter-reasons —(1) in ver. 14 *φυλάσσειν* is represented as Timothy's business, here as God's; (2) in ver. 14 *παραθήκη* refers to the doctrine, here it is represented as a personal possession; (3) in ver. 14 he is discussing the right behavior for Timothy, here the confidence in the right behavior. But against the *first* reason, it is to be observed that *φυλάσσειν* of every gift of grace is the business both of God and of the man to whom it is entrusted: in ver. 11 it is expressly said, *διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου*. Against the *second* reason, it may be urged that to interpret *παραθήκη* of doctrine in ver. 14 is at least doubtful; but even if it were correct, still the gospel, too, might be regarded as something given personally to the apostle; comp. 1 Tim. i. 11: *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον . . . ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ*; Rom. ii. 16: *τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου*. Against the *third* reason, it may be said that no one can really keep the blessing entrusted to him without having confidence that God keeps it for him, and no one can have this confidence without himself preserving the blessing (*διὰ πν. ἁγίου*).

[3] Otto wrongly uses this passage to support his assertion that in this epistle "there is no trace to be found of forebodings and expectations of death." He says: "If Paul has confidence in the Lord, that he can maintain for him the *παραθήκη* till the *παρουσία*, he must also have hoped that his official work would not be interrupted by his bodily death, since

i. e. that it **may** be then manifested in its uninjured splendor. The phrase *ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα* is equivalent to *ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, "the day of Christ's second coming"; it is found also in ver. 18, iv. 8, 2 Thess. i. 10, and more frequently in the Gospels. On the meaning of the preposition *εἰς*, comp. Meyer on Phil. i. 10.

Ver. 13. Exhortation to Timothy.—*ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαινόντων λόγων, ὧν κ.τ.λ.*] For *ὑποτύπωσις* here, as in 1 Tim. i. 16, "*type*" is to be retained. There is no reason for explaining the word here by "sketch" (Flatt), or docendi forma et ratio (Beza), or a written sketch given by the apostle to Timothy (Herder). Timothy is to carry with him the words he had heard from Paul as a *type*, *i. e.* in order to direct his ministry according to it. Luther translates *ὑποτύπωσις* by "pattern" (so, too, de Wette, Wiesinger, and others), but the reference thus given is not in the words themselves. The verb *ἔχειν* stands here in the sense of *κατέχειν*.[1] It is incorrect, with Hofmann, to take *ὑποτ. ὑγιαιν. λόγων* as the predicate of the object, and to assume accordingly that it is a contracted form for *ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαινόντων λόγων τὴν ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν λόγων ὧν κ.τ.λ.* Such a contraction is inconceivable, nor does Hofmann give any instance to prove its possibility. The words *ἐν τῇ πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ τῇ κ.τ.λ.*, which are neither to be joined with *ἤκουσας*, nor, with Hofmann, referred to what follows, show that the *ἔχειν* does not take place externally, but is an effort of memory. Ἐν is not equivalent to "with" (Heydenreich); the *πίστις* and *ἀγάπη* are rather regarded as the vessel, in which Timothy is to keep that type. The added words: *τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, which go only with *ἀγάπῃ* (de Wette, Wiesinger, Hofmann), mark the Christian character of the love which Paul desires from Timothy: "the love grounded in Jesus Christ;" comp. 1 Tim. i. 14. On the expression *λογ. ὑγ.*, comp. 1 Tim. i. 10. The article is wanting, "because this expression had become quite current (like *νόμος* and others) with the author" (de Wette, Wiesinger).—Why this exhortation, as de Wette thinks, gives Timothy a low place, we cannot understand; every appearance of such a thing disappears when it is remembered that the apostle, grey-headed and near his end, is speaking to his pupil and colleague after enduring painful experience of the unfaithfulness of others, to which unfaithfulness he returns afterwards.—Even de Wette wrongly asserts that this verse has no connection with the one preceding; for Paul has been speaking of himself and of the gospel entrusted to him, with the desire that Timothy should always keep in mind his example.

Ver. 14. The exhortation in this verse is most closely connected with that in ver. 13, for *παραθήκη* here, as in ver. 12, is the ministry of the gospel.—*τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον*] *ἡ καλὴ παραθήκη* is, like *ἡ καλὴ διδασκαλία*, 1 Tim. iv. 6; *ὁ καλὸς ἀγὼν κ.τ.λ.*, to be taken in a general objective sense. There is no sufficient reason for interpreting *παραθήκη* otherwise than in ver. 12—whether, with Wiesinger and Hofmann, as equivalent to "the

the apostle in it does not in any way express the hope that God would *maintain for him* his official work till the day of Christ." The "*for him*" is arbitrarily imported, and *φυλάσσειν* does not mean "*maintain*."

[1] Bengel rightly: vult Paulus ea, quae Timotheus semel audierat, semper animo ejus observari et impressa manere.

sound doctrine," or, with van Oosterzee, as equivalent to *τὸ χάρισμα*. Since all that the apostle has enjoined on Timothy from ver. 6 onward has special reference to the discharge of his office, we may surely understand *παραθήκη* to have the same meaning here as in ver. 12; besides, as already remarked, it is not conceivable that Paul, in two sentences so closely connected, should have used the same word with different meanings. It need not excite wonder that in ver. 12 Paul looks to God for the preservation of the *παραθήκη*, while here he lays it on Timothy as a duty; God's working does not exclude the activity of man. *Φυλάσσειν* here, as in ver. 12, is: "*to keep from harm uninjured*," and from the tendency of the whole epistle it is clear that this exhortation referred to the heresy which perverted the gospel.—*διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου*.][1] Timothy is not to employ any human means for preserving the *παραθήκη*; the only means is to be the Holy Spirit, *i. e.* he is to let the Spirit work in him free and unconfined, and only do that to which the Spirit impels him. The Spirit, however, is not something distant from him, as is shown by the words: *τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν*. On *ἐνοικοῦντος*, comp. ver. 5. *Ἐν ἡμῖν* denotes the Spirit as the *one* principle of the new life, working in *all* believers. *Ἡμῖν*, here as in ver. 6, must not be referred simply to Paul and Timothy; nor is it to be overlooked that Paul does not say *ἐν σοί*.

Ver. 15. [On Vv. 15–18, see Note XXIV., page 222.] The apostle reminds Timothy of those who had deserted him. [XXIV *a*.] This is done to incite Timothy to come to Rome with the greater speed, and also not to be ashamed of Paul, the prisoner of Christ, as the others had been (ver. 8).—*οἶδας τοῦτο*] expresses not the probability merely (as Matthies says), but the certainty that he knows.—*ὅτι ἀπεστράφησάν με*] The aorist passive has here the force of the middle voice; for the same construction, comp. Tit. i. 14; Heb. xii. 25; see Wahl on the passage, and Buttmann, p. 166 [E. T. 192]. The word does not denote the departure of any one, but is equivalent to aversari, properly, "turn one's countenance away from any one," and so "throw off inwardly the acquaintance of any one."[2] Without reason, de Wette denies that it has this meaning here. There is therefore in the verb no ground for the common opinion that the *πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ* had been with Paul in Rome, and had again returned to Asia (Matthies, de Wette, Wiesinger). Nor is there more ground in the term used for the subject; *πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ* are "all who are in (proconsular) Asia;" but, as a matter of course, that cannot mean all the Christians there. Perhaps Paul was thinking only of his colleagues who were then residing in Asia (Otto); but in that case he would surely have designated them more precisely. It is possible that the construction has its explanation in the addition *ὧν ἐστιν Φύγελλος καὶ Ἑρμογένης*, viz.: "all the Asiatics, to whom belong Phygellus and Hermogenes." In any case, these two are named because they were the most conspicuous in their unfaithfulness to the apostle. Paul gives no hint of it, and we

[1] Chrysostom: *οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀνθρωπίνης ψυχῆς οὐδὲ δυνάμεως, τοσαῦτα ἐμπιστευθέντα ἀρκέσαι πρὸς τὴν φυλακήν.*

[2] So in the N. T., in the LXX., the Apocrypha of the O. T., and the classical writers; comp. Otto, p. 283.

can hardly think it probable that they were heretics, and that the other Asiatics had also fallen away from the truth (Otto).

Vv. 16–18. With these unfaithful Asiatics, Paul contrasts the faithfulness of Onesiphorus, probably that he might place an example before Timothy.—*δῴη ἔλεος ὁ κύριος τῷ Ὀνησιφόρου οἴκῳ*] [XXIV *b.*] *διδόναι ἔλεος* does not occur elsewhere in the N. T. Regarding the form *δῴη*, proper to later Greek, see Buttmann, *Ausführl. Gramm.* § 107, Rem. 9; Winer, pp. 75 f. [E. T. p. 78]. By *ὁ κύριος* we must understand Christ, according to the usage of the N. T. Onesiphorus is named only here and at iv. 19. Many expositors (also Hofmann) think that his household only is in both passages mentioned, because he was no longer in life. This opinion is confirmed by the way in which mercy is wished for him in ver. 18 (de Wette).—Paul expressed such a wish because of the love that had been shown him; *ὅτι πολλάκις με ἀνέψυξε*] *ἀναψύχειν*, properly, "cool," then "refresh, enliven" (*Od.* iv. 568: *ἠτορ*), occurring only here in the N. T. (more frequently in the LXX.; *ἀνάψυξις*, Acts iii. 19), is not to be derived from *ψυχή* (Beza), but from *ψύχω*. De Wette, without ground, thinks that a bodily refreshment of meat and drink only is meant; it should rather be referred more generally to all proofs of love on the part of Onesiphorus. These were all the more precious to the apostle that they were given to him in his imprisonment, and proved that Onesiphorus was not ashamed of his bonds (vv. 8, 12); this is expressed in the words that follow. On *ἁλυσιν*, comp. Eph. vi. 20.—Ver. 17. *ἀλλά*] in opposition to the preceding *οὐκ.—γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ*] (comp. Matt. xxvi. 6; Acts xiii. 5). It is not said what moved him to journey to Rome; it is mere conjecture to suppose that it was business matters.—*σπουδαιότερον* (*Rec.* Tisch. 8: *σπουδαίως*) *ἐζήτησέ με*] The comparative is the right reading, and is to be explained by referring to *τ. ἁλυσίν μου οὐκ ἐπαισχύνθη*, "*all the more eagerly*" (Wiesinger, Hofmann).—The *ζητεῖν* stands in sharp contrast with *ἀπεστράφησάν με*, ver. 15.—The addition of *καὶ εὗρε* brings out that Onesiphorus had sought him till he found him.—Paul at first wished mercy only to the house of Onesiphorus; he now does the same to Onesiphorus himself.—Ver. 18. Matthies, Wiesinger, Hofmann think that *εὑρεῖν ἔλεος* is a play on words with the preceding *εὗρε*; but this is at least doubtful.—The repetition of *κύριος* is striking: *ὁ κύριος . . . παρὰ κυρίου*. We can hardly take these to refer to two different subjects (according to de Wette, the first being God, the second Christ; according to Wiesinger and Hofmann, the very opposite).—*ὁ κύριος* here is in any case Christ, as in ver. 16, iv. 18 (certainly not: "the world-ruling, divine principle," Matthies). The apostle in what follows might simply have said *εὑρεῖν ἔλεος ἐν ἐκ. τ. ἡμέρᾳ*; but in his mental vision of the judgment, seeing Christ as judge, he writes down *παρὰ κυρίου* just as it occurs to him, without being anxious to remember that he had begun with *δῴη αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος*.[1] The phrase *εὑρίσκειν ἔλεος παρά* with genitive does not occur elsewhere; only in the Song of the Three Children, ver. 14, have we *εὑρεῖν ἔλεος*; in 2 John 3: *ἔσται . . . ἔλεος . . . παρὰ*

[1] Van Oosterzee: "An inartistic form of expression, in which the second *κύριος* may be taken for the reflective pronoun."

Οὐσῖ. As to the expression, we should compare especially Heb. iv. 16: ἵνα λάβωμεν ἔλεος καὶ χάριν εὕρωμεν (εὑρίσκ. χάριν, Luke i. 30; Acts vii. 46, and often in the LXX. and the Apocrypha of the O. T.). On ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, comp. ver. 12. This wish the apostle utters not only because of the love Onesiphorus had shown him in Rome, but also because of what he had done in Ephesus, of which, however, he does not wish here to speak further, as it is well known to Timothy.—καὶ ὅσα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ διηκόνησε] Heydenreich, Hofmann,[1] and some others supply μοί, others τοῖς ἁγίοις; both are unnecessary. Even without supplying anything, we can of course understand that he is speaking of services rendered in the church. On the other hand, there is nothing to indicate that Onesiphorus was actually a διάκονος of the church.—βέλτιον σὺ γινώσκεις] The adverb βέλτιον only here; the comparative does not simply stand for the positive, see Winer, pp. 227 f. [E. T. p. 242]. There is a comparison implied here: "than I could tell thee," or the like.[2]

Notes by American Editor.

XXI. Vv. 1, 2.

(*a*) The expression which is peculiar to the salutation of this Epistle, as compared with any other, is κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς. The preposition here is taken by Grimm, Rob., and most of the recent commentators in the sense of *purpose, object* or *intention*—to make known the promise of life. That it ordinarily in the N. T. has, in such constructions, the sense of *according to* cannot be doubted. The examples quoted by Winer and others in support of the former meaning hardly seem to be, in the full sense, parallel with the case here presented. They either suggest the idea of motion, or, like one which Winer cites—κατ' ἀτιμίαν λέγω—have the preposition in the sense of *by way of*, or have some kindred peculiarity. It cannot be denied, however, that the use of κατά as denoting direction towards an object or purpose is a known use in Greek writers. The phrase κατὰ πίστιν in Tit. i. 1 is a stronger case than the present one, as favoring this meaning in the phrase ἀπόστολος κατὰ followed by an accusative. It may be said as to both cases, that the presumption from Pauline and N. T. usage is strongly against this sense; that, in the verse before us, there is no special difficulty in explaining the words with the ordinary sense of κατά in such phrases—the promise of life is the fundamental thing, in conformity with which all offices in the church and all commissions to preachers and messengers are given of God; and that, even in the case of Tit. i. 1 f., it is not impossible to assign to the preposition the same meaning, because of the connection of faith with the eternal life promised by God, which is there presented as being close and immediate. Still it must be admitted, that it is much less probable that Paul would speak of himself as being an Apostle in accordance with the faith of men, than as being such in accordance with the will or

[1] Hofmann supposes that those services are meant which Onesiphorus, after his return from Rome to Ephesus, rendered to the apostle for the purpose of disarming the charges that had brought him into prison. This, however, is a mere conjecture.

[2] Otto supposes that Onesiphorus was the first to seek Paul out in his imprisonment, and that he brought the news spoken of from Ephesus: but these are conjectures which can hardly be called probable, as there is no ground on which to rest them.

command of God. Noyes translates by *according to* in 2 Tim. i. 1 and *for* in Tit. i. 1, and this seems, not improbably, the best rendering. R. V., like A. V., has *according to* in both cases.—(*b*) The discussions of some of the commentators as to whether ἀγαπητῷ (ver. 2) is not purposely used as indicating that Timothy, having lacked in courage or faith since the first epistle, could not now be called γνήσιος, or (as Alf. presents it in a milder way) as showing more of love on Paul's part, indeed, but less of confidence, must be regarded as without any reasonable ground. Paul must be allowed to have written his letters with the freedom with which men of his free, ardent spirit write in all ages. He wrote γνήσιος twice in these three epistles and ἀγαπητος once, instead of writing γνήσιος three times, because he was alive in the region of thought and affection, and not mechanically obedient to grammarians and critics.

XXII. Vv. 3–5.

(*a*) The same freedom of a living writer is shown in the expression of thanks in vv. 3 f. There are certain correspondences between this passage and the thanksgiving at the beginning of the Ep. to the Romans, but, when taken in connection with the marked differences, they are not such as characterize an imitator trying to pass off his work under the name of another, but a writer precisely like the Apostle Paul, whose combination of similarities and dissimilarities in this way is a most marked, and even inimitable, feature of his style.—(*b*) Of the two explanations which Huther allows for the meaning of ἀπὸ προγόνων, and which he quotes from Buttmann and de Wette, the latter is the more probable: "The service of the Apostle's progenitors is continued in him." With ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδ. we may compare ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου of Rom. i. 9, though the meaning of the phrases is not precisely the same.—(*c*) The explanation of the quite difficult and involved sentence beginning with χάριν ἔχω and ending with the fifth verse, which is given by Huther, Ellicott, and Wiesinger, is the one which commends itself. This explanation makes the passage accord with the general expressions of thanks which are found at the opening of different epistles, (1) in that it gives a ground for the thankfulness in something which the Apostle hears or knows of the person or persons addressed (here: since I have been reminded of the unfeigned faith that is in thee); (2) in that it places the mentioning of the person addressed in the writer's prayers in just that relation to the thought and sentence, which it ordinarily has in such passages; (3) in that it gives due subordination to the secondary clauses ἐπιποθῶν κ.τ.λ., μεμν. κ.τ.λ.; (4) in that it assigns to ὡς the meaning *as*, instead of *how* which is far less natural. Had the Apostle intended to refer to his unceasing remembrance, etc., as the ground of his thankfulness, he would have used ὅτι, or have said *how unceasingly I have*, or *how unceasing is*; (5) in that it makes that which is evidently the thing for the bringing out of which the sentence was written—the faith of Timothy, handed down to him, as it were, from the previous generations—the cause of the feeling whose expression has the first and prominent place in the sentence.—(*d*) The words μνείαν σοῦ τῶν δακρύων (ver. 4) are parenthetical as related to the clauses preceding and following, and ἵνα χαρᾶς πληρωθῶ is to be connected with ἐπιποθῶν σε ἰδεῖν. Tisch. 8th ed. unites ἵνα κ.τ.λ. with μεμν. σ. τ. δακρ. W. and H. place a comma between these words and δακρύων, but do not place one between them and ἐπόθησαν. Treg. places a comma both before and after the ἵνα clause. The text adopted by R. V. places a comma before the clause, and a colon after it. The punctuation of Treg. is correct, if the

view of the construction just given is to be accepted. Against that given by Tisch. may be urged the naturalness and fitness of connecting ἵνα with ἐπιποθῶν κ.τ.λ., and the improbability (not to say, with Huther, impossibility) of the Apostle's saying, that he remembers Timothy's tears in order that he may be filled with joy. Against that of W. and H., the arguments presented by Huther in his note on ver. 5, in opposition to Otto's view, or the last two of them, are of so much force as to make it quite improbable. That of R. V. is exposed to the objections which are involved in the reasons given above for connecting ὑπόμ. λαβὼν with ἔχω χάριν.—(*c*) λαβών (ver. 5), thus gives the ground of Paul's thankfulness, and, being an aor. part., refers to what he had already received. It seems better to suppose that the reminding referred to had come to him through some messenger, or other external means. It is much less probable that the remembrance of Timothy's tears (which were shed, we may believe, at the time of Paul's parting from him, and which therefore may have been in his recollection ever since), was the cause, as Huther holds. Both the word ὑπόμνησις and the aor. part., as Holtzm. also says, point to an outward, rather than an inward occasion. Alford, who with some other writers, is disposed to find evidences everywhere that Timothy's character had much of weakness and timidity, supposes that there is an evidence of the same thing here—the remembrance being of the past, and the present existence of the faith being only introduced, somewhat later, as a confident hope. The baselessness of this view, so far as this passage is concerned, is shown by almost every word in the sentence, which is full of affection and commendation; by the fact that the whole record of Timothy's career, so far as the N. T. gives it, presents him as Paul's most trusted associate and helper; and by the correspondence of this expression of thankfulness with the expressions of the same feeling in other epistles—especially with that in Phil., which is the most affectionate letter of all those which Paul addressed to the churches.

XXIII. Vv. 6–14.

(*a*) The χάρισμα of ver. 6 is that which was connected with his office as a preacher. This is proved by the clause which follows, since that clause evidently refers to Timothy's ordination. This gift of the Holy Spirit the Apostle exhorts him to stir up—ἀναζωπυρεῖν meaning either *to kindle up* or *kindle afresh*, but, in either case, not necessarily implying that the flame had died away or been extinguished. The entire exhortation of this passage can be accounted for as the expression of the urgent desire which, in the circumstances in which he himself was at the time, Paul may have felt that his younger friend should be earnest and faithful in all the emergencies of his work. The appreciation of the trial which would come upon his faithful helpers and companions, in case of his death, must have been in his mind in view of the threatening possibilities of the future, and he may, most naturally, have been impelled to urge them not to be ashamed of the gospel, as he had not been, but, on the other hand, to stir up afresh the divine gift which had been imparted to them, and to be ready to suffer hardship for the gospel. That ἀναζωπ. does not imply that Timothy's faith had failed, is indicated by the words δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, which connect it immediately with the expression of his confidence that the faith was still existing and with the allusion to the reminding of it which he had received.—(*b*) γάρ (ver. 7) evidently introduces a reason—which belongs to the very foundation of the Christian life—for the exhortation

of ver. 6. This reason is expressed on the positive and negative side. The word *ἡμῖν* refers, probably, to all Christians, not to preachers only; comp. Rom. viii. 15. *πνεῦμα*, in such phrases as this, is best taken as referring to the Holy Spirit (though it cannot be affirmed that this is certainly the meaning), and the genitives are characteristic gen. These words in the genitive, however, *δειλίας, δυνάμεως, κ.τ.λ.*, indicate the results which come (or, as *δειλίας*, do not come) from the Spirit,—that is, the Spirit is so characterized because He produces these results. —(*e*) With *ἐπαισχυνθῇς κ.τ.λ.* (ver. 8) comp. Rom. i. 16. With some of the words of vv. 9, 10, comp. Eph. i. 11; ii. 7, 9; Rom. xv. 16, xvi. 25 f., and other passages. Whether there is a special reference here to the desired coming of Timothy to Rome, or whether the meaning is more general, is doubtful. But, as there is no distinct allusion to a visit to Rome and no apparent necessity of limiting the words in their application, it is better to adopt the latter view. If the reference is general, *συγκακοπάθησον* must be understood in a similar way. This suffering of evil was to be for the gospel, and with Paul (*σύν*), but not merely by sharing in his work or trials in Rome.—(*d*) *κατὰ δύναμιν* is best explained in connection with the following words, and thus as denoting God's power in salvation. So Ell., Alf., Fairb., Bib. Com., Wiesinger and others. Holtzm., de W., and others agree with Huther. The addition of the full description of the *δύναμις* as displayed in salvation is apparently for the purpose of enforcing the exhortation *μὴ ἐπαισχ. κ.τ.λ.* Vv. 9. 10, accordingly, both "bring into prominence the *δύν. θεοῦ*" (Wiesinger), and "strengthen the exhortation of ver. 8" (Huther).—(*e*) *πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων* (ver. 9). The similarity between the expressions here and in Rom. xvi. 25 f. makes it almost certain, that, in this phrase, the Apostle refers to the purpose of God, in eternity past, to bestow grace in Christ. In the sense of being thus purposed and determined, the grace was already given. But it was not yet manifested. The manifestation and real bestowment of it took place when Christ appeared. The word *ἐπιφάνεια* is, as Huther remarks, found in this place only as referring to the appearance of Christ in the flesh. But the corresponding verb occurs, with a similar reference, in Tit. ii. 1. Comp. also Tit. iii. 4, 5, in which verses there are further points of similarity with this passage.—(*f*) The use of *καταργήσαντος* with *τὸν θάνατον* (ver. 10), as compared with 1 Cor. xv. 26, indicates a reference to death as a power or enemy of the kingdom of God and His people. The use of the word *φωτίσαντος* in the contrasted clause implies a revelation of something unknown to their minds. The two words together seem to suggest a destruction of the power of death through this revelation, and thus a removal of that power, not only in itself as in 1 Cor. xv., but also in its influence and terror for the Christian believer. The word *θάνατος* here has, primarily and of itself, the sense of physical death, but, in its connection with the following words, it suggests that which attends upon physical death as a consequence in the future.

(*g*) The reference in *δι' ἣν αἰτίαν* (ver. 12) is not to *ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κ.τ.λ.* considered in itself alone, but to the fact that Paul's appointment as a preacher was related to the proclamation of such a glorious truth so wonderfully exhibiting the power of God. In this way, the connection of the entire passage iv. 8 ff becomes clearly manifest.—(*h*) The meaning of *παραθήκην* of ver. 12, if determined by the preceding context, would seem, most naturally, to be the *διακονία* or *χάρισμα* which had been bestowed upon the Apostle. If determined by the fact that *μου* is added here, and not in other places where the word occurs; that the adjective *καλήν*, on the other hand, is not here added, as it is elsewhere; and that God is spoken of in this

verse, as He is not in the other passages, as guarding (φυλάξαι) the παραθήκην "against that day" (in the other cases Timothy is exhorted to guard it), the word would seem to mean something committed by Paul to God, rather than something committed by God to Paul. If, finally, it is to be determined by the παραθήκην of ver. 14, and that word by the corresponding word in 1 Tim. vi. 20 (see note XX *g*. above), the meaning will be *the truth which is preached*—that which appertains to the gospel. The considerations suggested in connection with the second way of explaining the word strongly support that explanation.—(*i*) It will be observed that the allusion to the ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι in this passage occurs only in ver. 13. The fact that it does occur in this verse makes it altogether probable that παραθήκην of ver. 14 corresponds in meaning exactly with παραθήκην of 1 Tim. vi. 20. The fact, on the other hand, that these words do not occur until ver. 13 may easily account for a difference in the application of παραθήκην of ver. 12 from that which is made in ver. 14. The objection suggested by Huther and some others against giving παραθ. a different reference in the two verses of this chapter is thus removed.

XXIV. Vv. 15–18.

(*a*) The abandonment of Paul by the persons alluded to in these verses, and the grateful mention of the friend who had aided and comforted him in his imprisonment, are inserted here as matters personal to himself, of which he might easily and naturally write in a personal, friendly letter. Perhaps the reason of their insertion may be partly, also, the desire to give emphasis to his urgent request to Timothy which is presented in the preceding part of the chapter. That the latter object was in the Apostle's mind is, possibly, indicated by the opening verses of the second chapter.—(*b*) That Onesiphorus was dead at the time of the writing of this letter is not improbable, but it is by no means certain. The indication of anything like praying for the dead, in the doctrinal sense of that phrase, must be admitted to be very questionable. Whether there is any such indication depends on whether Onesiphorus had already died, which cannot be proved, and whether, if he had died, this expression of a wish must be understood as, strictly speaking, a prayer for the dead, which also cannot be proved. The doctrine, therefore, is weak in both of its foundations, and it cannot be rested upon this passage. Onesiphorus probably had been, or, if still living, was, a resident of Ephesus; but even if living, he was now absent from his home, comp. iv. 19.

CHAPTER II.

VER. 3. In place of *σὺ οὖν κακοπάθησον*, we should read *συγκακοπάθησον*, which is supported by the weightiest authorities, and adopted by Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. It is found in A C* D* E* F G ℵ 17, 31, *al.*, Vulg. It. Aug. Ambrosiast. Pel. Gildas. The *Rec.* is found apart from K L only in the altered text of C D E, and especially in the Greek Fathers, for which reason Reiche regards it as the original reading. Probably the beginning of ver. 1 gave occasion to the alteration, which was also recommended by the lack of any word to which the prefixed preposition refers. Even the occurrence in some MSS. of the reading *συνστρατιώτης* for *στρατιώτης* is a proof that *συγκακοπ.* is original.[1]—For *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* we should read *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, following the weightiest authorities.—Ver. 4. The words *τῷ Θεῷ* added to *στρατευόμενος* in some MSS., etc., have arisen from a misapprehension; the apostle is speaking not of God's foes, but of foes in general.—Ver. 6. The reading *πρότερον* in ℵ for *πρῶτον* seems to be a mere correction.—Ver. 7. *ἃ λέγω*] Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. rightly read *ὃ λέγω*, after A C F G, 17, *al.*, Chrys.; *ἃ* is a correction, in order to bring out a reference to the three previous sentences.—*δώσει*] for *δώῃ*, after A C* D E F G ℵ 17, *al.*, Copt. Arm. etc., Ambrosiast. Pel. etc.; *δώῃ* is explained from i. 17, 18.—Ver. 12. For *ἀρνούμεθα* we find in A C several cursives, translations, and Fathers, the future *ἀρνησόμεθα*, which Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. adopted; the presents (*ὑπομένομεν*; *ἀπιστοῦμεν*) seem to be in favor of our adopting the present here; but the very same reason might have suggested the alteration of the future into the present.—Ver. 13. After *ἀρνήσασθαι* we should read *γάρ*, according to the weightiest authorities, and this Griesb. adopted into the text.—Ver. 14. *τοῦ κυρίου*] Instead of this, C F G ℵ 37, *al.*, Copt. Arm. etc., Chrys. Theoph. etc., have *τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Tisch. 8); but *τοῦ κυρίου* is the original reading; the correction may be explained from 1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 1.—Instead of the infinitive *λογομαχεῖν* (C**** D E F G K L ℵ, the cursives, several versions, etc., Tisch.), we find *λογομάχει* in A C* Aeth. Vulg. etc. (Lachm. Buttm.). According to the former reading, the verb *λέγω* is dependent on *διαμαρτυρόμενος*; according to the latter, *διαμαρτ.* is connected with what precedes, and *λογομάχει* begins a new imperative clause. For the decision on the point, see the explanation of the verse.—*Εἰς οὐδέν*] A C, 17, *al.*, have *ἐπ' οὐδέν* (Lachm. Buttm. Tisch.); F G ℵ (first hand), Vulg. It. Ambrosiast. Pelag. etc., *ἐπ' οὐδενὶ γάρ*. Of these various readings, least can be said for *ἐπ' οὐδενὶ γάρ*; it seems to have arisen from an endeavor to form these words in the same way as those that follow; even the *γάρ* is only an insertion by way of explanation. Of the two others, *ἐπ' οὐδέν* is to be preferred as the less usual form; *εἰς οὐδέν* occurs elsewhere in the N. T., and *εὐχρηστος*, especially in iv. 11, is construed with *εἰς*.—Ver. 19. ℵ has *πάντας* before *τοὺς ὄντας*, probably a later addition.—*κυρίου* for *Χριστοῦ* was rightly adopted by

[1] To Reiche's remark: Quomodo in unius Codicis D lectione *συνστρατιώτης* lectionis *συγκακοπ.* praesidium sit, non video, it may be replied that the scribe was probably induced by the previous *συγκακ.* to prefix *συν* also before the word *στρατιώτης*.

Griesb.—Ver. 21. *ἡγιασμένον, εὔχρηστον,* instead of *ἡγιασμ. καὶ εὔχρ.,* after A C** D* E* F G, etc.—Ver. 22. Between *μετά* and *τῶν* there is found *πάντων* (Lachm. Buttm.) in A C F G 17, 23, *al.*, Aeth. Slav. etc., Chrys. Theodoret, etc.; F G further omit the article *τῶν*. Since *πάντες* stands in the same expression at Rom. xi. 12, 1 Cor. i. 2, it seems to have been inserted from these passages. Tisch. omits *πάντων*, on the authority of D E K L, *al.*, Vulg. Copt. Syr. etc.—Ver. 25. For *δῷ*, Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. rightly read *δῴη*, after A C D* F G ℵ (first hand), 31, *al.*, Ephr. Chrys. ms. Isidor.

Ver. 1. [On Vv. 1–7, see Note XXV., pages 241–243.] After interrupting his exhortations by an allusion to the unfaithful Asiatics and to the faithful Onesiphorus, Paul with *σύ* resumes his exhortations to Timothy, at the same time connecting them by *οὖν* with those already given. [XXV *a.*] In the first place, he now appeals to him: *ἐνδυναμοῦ ἐν τῇ χάριτι τῇ ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ.*] [XXV *b.*] *ἐνδυναμοῦσθαι* does not mean: "feel oneself strong," nor: "depend on something" (Heydenreich); but: "become strong, grow strong" (see Eph. vi. 10). The active voice is found in iv. 17 and 1 Tim. i. 12. As the apostle sees the end of his labors draw nearer, he is the more anxious that Timothy, for whom he has the warmest paternal love (*τέκνον μου*), should become a stronger and bolder champion for the Lord.—*ἐν τῇ χάριτι*] may either be a completion of the idea of *ἐνδυναμοῦ* (Wiesinger), or define it more precisely (van Oosterzee, Plitt, Hofmann). The second view is the correct one: Timothy is to become strong by the *χάρις ἡ ἐν Χρ.*, that he may be capable of discharging faithfully the office entrusted to him; comp. the passage in Eph. vi. 10.—*ἡ χάρις ἡ ἐν Χρ. Ἰ.*] is not the office of teacher (Calovius and others), nor is it equivalent to *χάρισμα*, i. 6; on the other hand, it is not "the life imparted by divine grace," nor "the redemption" of the Christian (Wiesinger); it is objectively the grace dwelling in Christ, the grace of Jesus Christ, or better: "the grace obtained for us in the person of Christ" (Hofmann).—*ἐν* is explained by Chrysostom and others as equivalent to *διά*; this is not incorrect, only that *ἐν* indicates a more internal relation than *διά*. The believer lives *in* the grace which is in Christ; the strengthening to which Timothy is exhorted can only be effected by his abiding in this grace.

Ver. 2. While ver. 3 corresponds with the first verse, ver. 2 seems to contain a thought foreign to this connection. But as the contest to which Paul is exhorting Timothy, consists substantially in the undaunted preaching of the pure gospel and in the rejection of all heresy, it was natural for him to exhort Timothy to see that others were armed with the word for which he was to strive. The true warrior must care also for his companions in the fight.—*καὶ ἃ ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ*] (comp. i. 13: *διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων*). These words belong immediately to *ἤκουσας*; Heydenreich is wrong in supplying *μαρτυρούμενα* or *βεβαιούμενα*. According to Clemens Alexandrinus, *Hypotyp.* i. 7, Oecumenius, Grotius, and others, *μάρτυρες* is equivalent to *νόμος καὶ προφῆται*, for which there is as little justification as for the opinion that the other apostles are meant. The preposition *διά* is explained by Winer, p. 354 [E. T. p. 378]: "intervenientibus multis testibus, with *inter-*

wonlion, i. e. here in presence of many witnesses" (so, too, the more recent expositors). Right; but *διά* is not equivalent to *ἐνώπιον* (1 Tim. vi. 12). *Διά* intimates that the witnesses were present to confirm the apostle's word, or, as Wiesinger says, "that their presence was an integral element of that act to which the apostle is alluding."—According to Matthies, van Oosterzee, Hofmann, the apostle is thinking here of his public discourses on doctrine; but the whole character of the expression, particularly also the otherwise superfluous addition of *διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων*, make it more probable that the words refer to a definite fact, the fact spoken of in 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6 (Wiesinger). In that case, the *μάρτυρες* are the presbyters and other members of the church who were present at Timothy's ordination. Mack rightly directs attention to 1 Tim. iv. 14; but he is wrong in explaining *διὰ μαρτ.* by *διὰ προφητείας*, "in consequence of many testimonies."—*ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις*] [XXV *c.*] Heydenreich: "this doctrine commit to faithful keeping and further communication as a legacy, as a precious jewel" (comp. Herod. ix. 45: *παραθήκην ὑμῖν τὰ ἔπεα τάδε τίθεμαι*); but the expression *ἃ ἤκουσας* does not refer so much to the whole of evangelic doctrine as to the instructions given to Timothy for the discharge of his office.—*πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις*] not "believing," but "faithful, trustworthy" men.—*οἵτινες ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται καὶ ἑτέρους διδάξαι*] Heydenreich thinks that this denotes a second quality of those to be instructed by Timothy, a quality in addition to their "honest sense," viz. their capacity for teaching; but *οἵτινες*, which, as contrasted with the simple relative pronoun, refers to a subject undefined, but in various ways definable,[1] points back to *πιστοῖς*, so that the meaning is: "who as such," etc. The future *ἔσονται* does not stand in the same sense as the present, but denotes their capacity as one depending on the tradition to be imparted to them ("as the consequence of the *παρατίθεσθαι*," Wiesinger). The *καί* before *ἑτέρους* is not to be overlooked; "others too," *i. e.* "others in turn." Who are the *ἕτεροι*? According to the common presupposition, with which van Oosterzee also agrees, the *ἕτεροι* are the church, or more generally the hearers of the preaching of the gospel. But in this view the *καί*, which does not belong to *ἑτέρους διδάξαι* (Hofmann), but to *ἑτέρους*, is inexplicable; it is more probable that Paul means other *πιστοὶ ἄνθρωποι* (de Wette, Wiesinger). Paul gathered round him pupils to whom he gave instructions in regard to their office; they, too, are to do the same: those chosen by them the same in their turn, etc., that in the church there may abide a stock of apostolic men who will see to the propagation of pure doctrine.—The words *διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων* show that there is no thought of a secret doctrine; nor is he speaking of the regular employment of teachers who, in the absence of Timothy, are to take his place in the church at Ephesus, "ne sine episcopo vaga oberret ecclesia" (Heinreichs).

Ver. 3. *Συγκακοπάθησον*] [XXV *d.*] Timothy is not to shun a community of suffering with the apostle, i. 8, 12, 16.—*ὡς καλὸς στρατιώτης Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*] *στρατιώτης* stands elsewhere in the N. T. only in its proper sense, but, as is

[1] See Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 387.

well known, the kindred words *στρατεία, στρατεύεσθαι*, are often used of the Christian life. Here, however, the apostle is speaking not generally of Timothy's work as a Christian, but more specially of his work in the office committed to him, viz. of his struggle against the opponents of evangelic truth and the toils connected therewith. [XXV *e.*]

Ver. 4. "Hoc versu commendatur *τό* abstine; accedit versu seq. *τό* sustine" (Bengel).—*οὐδεὶς στρατευόμενος*] alludes to *στρατιώτης*: "no one serving as a soldier" (de Wette); comp. 1 Tim. i. 18.—*ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματείαις*[1]] *ἐμπλέκεσθαι* elsewhere only in 2 Pet. ii. 20.—*πραγματείαι*] occurs only here in the N. T. (the verb *πραγματεύεσθαι*, Luke xix. 13); *αἱ τοῦ βίου πραγμ.* are the occupations which form means of livelihood; Heydenreich: "the occupations of the working class as opposed to those of the soldier class."—From these the *στρατευόμενος* abstains *ἵνα τῷ στρατολογήσαντι ἀρέσῃ*] *στρατολογήσας* (only here), from *στρατολογεῖν*: "gather an army, raise troops," is a term for a general.—Only that soldier who gives himself up entirely to military service, and does not permit himself to be distracted by other things, only he fulfills the general's will. The application to the *στρατιώτης Ἰησ. Χρ.* is self-evident; *he*, too, is to devote himself entirely to *his* service, and not to involve himself in other matters which might hinder him in his proper calling. The literal interpretation, according to which the apostle or preacher should take no concern whatever in civil affairs, is contradicted by Paul's own example; according to the precept here given, he is to avoid them only when they are a hindrance to the duties of his office.

Ver. 5. A new thought is added, that the contender who wishes to be crowned must contend *νομίμως*.—*ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀθλῇ τις*] *καί* connects this thought with what precedes: "if one, too, does not permit himself to be kept from the struggle by other occupations;"[2] but the figure here is different from that we had in ver. 4, *ἀθλεῖν* (*ἅπ. λεγ.* in the N. T.) denoting the contest in running, to which the Christian calling is often compared; comp. iv. 7, 8; 1 Cor. ix. 24, 25.—*οὐ στεφανοῦται, ἐὰν μὴ νομίμως ἀθλήσῃ*] The runner, in order to gain the prize, must in the contest adhere to its definite rules. Theodoret: *καὶ ἡ ἀθλητικὴ νόμους ἔχει τινὰς, καθ' οὓς προσήκει τοὺς ἀθλητὰς ἀγωνίζεσθαι· ὁ δὲ παρὰ τούτους παλαίων, τῶν στεφάνων διαμαρτάνει.* In this, too, according to 1 Cor. ix. 25, *ἐγκρατεύεσθαι* should be observed.[3] The word *νομίμως* occurs only here and in 1 Tim. i. 8.—The thought contained in it is this, that Timothy, in order to share in the reward, must conduct himself in his evangelic warfare according to the laws of his evangelic office.

Ver. 6. To the two foregoing sentences Paul adds still another, expressed figuratively: *τὸν κοπιῶντα γεωργὸν δεῖ πρῶτον κ.τ.λ.* Many expositors assume

[1] Ambros. *de Offic.* i. 1: is, qui imperatori militat, a susceptionibus litium, actu negotiorum forensium, venditione mercium prohibetur humanis legibus.—Athan. *Dict. et Interpr. Parab. S. Ev.* qu. 119: *εἰ γὰρ ἐπιγείῳ βασιλεῖ ὁ μέλλων στρατεύεσθαι οὐκ ἀρέσει, ἐὰν μὴ ἀφήσῃ πάσας τὰς τοῦ βίου φροντίδας, πόσῳ μᾶλλον μέλλων στρατευθῆναι τῷ ἐπουρανίῳ βασιλεῖ;*

[2] Hofmann denies this connection of thought, maintaining wrongly that *καί* could only have this meaning if the apostle had continued to use the same figure.

[3] Comp. Galen, *Comm. in Hippocr.* i. 15: *οἱ*

that there is here an inversion of phrase, and explain the words as equivalent to *τὸν γεωργόν, κοπιῶντα πρῶτον, δεῖ τῶν καρπῶν μεταλ.*, or as Wahl and Winer (in the earlier editions of his *Grammar*) put it, *τὸν γεωργὸν, τὸν θέλοντα τῶν καρπῶν μεταλ., δεῖ πρῶτον κοπιᾷν*, so that *πρῶτον* is attached to *κοπιᾷν* in meaning, and the sentence contains an exhortation; Beza: necesse est agricolam, ut fructus percipiat, prius laborare. Heinrichs, on the other hand, remarks: nihil attinet, mutare quidquam, aut transponere, dummodo *πρῶτον* cum Grotio adverbialiter pro *ita demum* dictum putemus, emphasinque ponamus in *τὸν κοπιῶντα*. But this explanation of *πρῶτον* cannot be justified. Matthies, de Wette, and others reject the supposition of any inversion, and explain *πρῶτον* as "first before all others," so that the meaning would be: "as the husbandman first enjoys the fruits of the field, so, too, has the servant of the gospel a notable reward to expect for his work" (de Wette); but this thought diverges entirely from that contained in vv. 4, 5, and neglects, besides, the emphasis laid on *κοπιῶντα*.— It is accordingly to be explained: Not every one, but *that* husbandman who toils hard at his work, is first to enjoy the fruits; Wiesinger: "the working farmer has the right of first enjoying the fruits, not he who does not work; therefore, if thou dost wish to enjoy the fruits, work." So, too, van Oosterzee. Hofmann, against this explanation, upholds the meaning of *δεῖ*, which does not express what *ought to* happen, but what *must* happen, in so far as it lies in the nature of things. Δεῖ certainly has this meaning of necessity (not that of duty); but if *κοπιῶντα* be regarded as furnishing the condition under which the husbandman tilling the ground must, before all others, be partaker of the fruits of the ground tilled, then *δεῖ* in the former explanation presents no difficulty; in this case it cannot be said, with Hofmann, that the *πρῶτον* is meaningless. It is to be observed that *κοπιῶντα* does not contrast the husbandman who works with the husbandman who does *not* work, but the husbandman who works hard with the husbandman who carries on his work *lazily*.—Hofmann, in interpreting the sentence as declaring that Timothy must bear everything, whether good or bad, that arises from his work, departs from the figure, which clearly does not say that the husbandman must content himself alike with good fruit and with weeds, but rather that in the nature of things the husbandman should before all others enjoy the fruit for which he has labored. It is incorrect, with Theodoret and Oecumenius, to understand *πρῶτον* of the preference over the pupil which is the teacher's due; or to find in the words of the apostle the thought that the teacher must appropriate to himself the fruits of the spirit which he wishes to impart to others. Even Chrysostom rightly rejected the opinion,[1] that here the

γυμνασταὶ καὶ οἱ νομίμως ἀθλοῦντες ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀρίστου τὸν ἄρτον μόνον ἐσθίουσι, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δείπνου τὸ κρέας.

[1] This opinion is also brought forward by Otto, who refers all three sentences to anxiety regarding bodily wants, as if Timothy had become careless in his office through fear of suffering want in it. This, however, is a reproof which cannot be justified. Van Oosterzee rightly says: It is undoubtedly a Pauline principle that the teacher has a right to suitable support from the church; but this is not the principle taught *here*.

apostle is speaking of the bodily support due to the teacher; but he himself gives the words a wrong subsidiary sense when he thinks that Paul wishes to console Timothy regarding the preference shown in the reward.

Ver. 7. [XXV *f.*] As he has been expressing his exhortations in figurative gnomes, Paul thus continues: *νόει ὃ λέγω*] which does not refer immediately to the thoughts expressed, as Heydenreich, Matthies, and others think, but to the form of expression. It does not mean, therefore: "lay these exhortations to heart," but: "mark or understand what I say" (de Wette); comp. Matt. xxiv. 15; Eph. iii. 4, 20; so, too, Hofmann, only that he for no sufficient reason refers the words merely to the last sentence. Plitt is of opinion that the apostle is intending thereby to give a quite general warning against misconceptions; but this would be an arbitrary disturbance of the connection of ideas.—To this exhortation Paul confidently adds that God will not fail to bestow on Timothy understanding in this and all other points; *γάρ* here, as elsewhere, is a particle of explanation.—*ἐν πᾶσι* belongs to this verse, and not, as Sam. Battier thinks, to the following one.

Ver. 8. [On Vv. 8–13, see Note XXVI., page 243.] *Μνημόνευε Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*] *μνημονεύειν* is usually followed by the genitive; but the accusative is found both here and at 1 Thess. ii. 9. Timothy is to remember Jesus Christ, that he may gain the proper strength for discharging his official duties—to remember especially His resurrection, in which He triumphed over sufferings and death, and in which is contained for the believer the seal of his victory;[1] hence Paul adds: *ἐγηγερμένον ἐκ νεκρῶν*, "as one who rose from the dead." [XXVI *a.*]—The added asyndeton: *ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβίδ*, does not denote the humiliation, but the Messianic dignity of Christ.[2] The antithetical relation between the two clauses is here the same as in Rom. i. 3, 4 (*ἐκ σπ. Δαβίδ . . . ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*), where it is distinctly marked by *κατὰ σάρκα . . . κατὰ πνεῦμα*. Hofmann incorrectly makes both *ἐκ σπέρμ. Δ.* and *ἐκ νεκρῶν* depend on *ἐγηγερμένον*; in that case the verb would have to be taken in two different senses; besides, *ἐκ τ. σπέρμ.* is nowhere found in connection with *ἐγείρεσθαι*. There is nothing to indicate (Wiesinger) that *ἐκ σπέρμ. Δαβίδ* is an antithesis "to the docetic error of the heretics" (van Oosterzee). Heydenreich rightly rejected the secondary references which many expositors give to these words, such as: that they indicate a similarity between the vicissitudes of Christ's life and those of David; or that they are to serve as a proof of the certainty of Christ's resurrection (Michaelis); or that they denote the whole state of

[1] Hofmann wrongly maintains that "the remembrance of Jesus Christ was not to be a pledge to Timothy of his victory over all he had to encounter for Christ's sake, but only to make him willing to endure." Such willingness could only have come to him from the conviction that the victory of Christ was a pledge of victory to the believer.

[2] Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, pp. 113 f.): "Timothy being disinclined to suffer for the gospel's sake, the apostle reminds him that through death Jesus attained to the heavenly glory, to which He had a right through His descent from the line of David."—Van Oosterzee incorrectly assumes that *ἐκ σπέρμ. Δ.* simply denotes the *human* origin of Jesus. The apostle clearly goes beyond this in mentioning David by name.

Christ's humiliation (Mosheim), and so on.—The added words: *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου*, may be referred either to *μνημόνευε κ.τ.λ.* (Hofmann), or to the attributes of *Ἰησ. Χριστόν*. The latter reference is the more probable one; Paul, as a rule, does not use the formula *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγ.* to denote the rule for the believer's conduct, but to confirm a truth he has expressed (comp. Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25; 1 Tim. i. 11). To refer it only to *ἐκ σπέρμ. Δ.* is arbitrary. Still more arbitrary is Jerome's opinion, that Paul by *τὸ εὐαγγ. μου* means the gospel of Luke (Baur).

Ver. 9. In this verse Paul again, as before, points to his own example, in order to encourage Timothy to the *συγκακοπαθεῖν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*, i. 8, ii. 3. —*ἐν ᾧ*] [XXVI *b.*] according to Paul's manner, refers to *εὐαγγέλιον* immediately preceding, and not to the more distant *Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*. The preposition *ἐν* is not equivalent to *διά*, Col. iv. 3 (Heydenreich). Matthies presses the original signification too far when he gives the interpretation: "the gospel is, as it were, the ground and soil in which his present lot is rooted." Beza rightly gives the meaning thus: cujus annuntiandi munere defungens; de Wette says: "in preaching which." Comp. Phil. iv. 3; 1 Thess. iii. 2. Hofmann incorrectly explains *ἐν* by "in consequence of," which *ἐν* never does mean, not even in 1 Tim. i. 18.—*κακοπαθῶ*] is an allusion to ver. 3.—*μέχρι δεσμῶν*] comp. Phil. ii. 8: *μέχρι θανάτου*.—*Ὡς κακοῦργος* directs attention to the criminal aspect of Paul's bonds, and thereby strengthens the *κακοπαθῶ μέχρι δεσμῶν*.[1] The word *κακοῦργος* occurs only here and in Luke's gospel; it is synonymous with *κακοποιός*, 1 Pet. iv. 14. —*ἀλλ' ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ δέδεται*] [XXVI *c.*] Chrysostom explains it: *δεσμοῦνται μὲν αἱ χεῖρες, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἡ γλῶττα*; comp. Phil. i. 12. The meaning according to this would be: "the bonds do not, however, hinder me from freely preaching the gospel." But this limitation is not contained in the words themselves; they have rather the more general meaning: "though I (to whom the gospel is entrusted) am bound, the gospel itself is not thereby fettered, but goes freely forth into the world and works unfettered" (2 Thess. iii. 1: *ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου τρέχει*). This is the very reason of the apostle's joy in his bonds, that Christ is preached; comp. Phil. i. 18. This connection of ideas does not, however, compel us to take *διὰ τοῦτο* with these words (Hofmann). If so connected, *διὰ τοῦτο* would rather appear to be a modification added loosely; besides, Paul never places it at the end of a sentence.—Some have wrongly understood by *ὁ λόγ. τ. Θ.* here, the divine promises, and have taken *οὐ δέδεται* to mean that these do not remain unfulfilled.

Ver. 10. *Διὰ τοῦτο*] Bengel: "quia me vincto evangelium currit." Heydenreich wrongly refers it at the same time to the reward to which ver. 8 alludes. The knowledge that the gospel is unfettered in its influence enables Paul to endure all things for the sake of the *ἐκλεκτοί*. *Διὰ τοῦτο* cannot be referred to what follows (Wiesinger), because of the *διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς*; it would be another thing if *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.* were joined immediately

[1] Otto, opposed to Wieseler, rightly remarks that these words do not justify any inference as to an increase in the severity of his imprisonment.

with *ὑπομένω*; but even in that case the "abrupt transition" would still be an objection.—*πάντα ὑπομένω*] *ὑπομένειν* does not denote suffering pure and simple, but the willing, stedfast endurance of it.—By adding to *πάντα ὑπομένω* the words *διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς*, explained by the succeeding clause, Paul declares that he patiently endured everything for the sake of the *ἐκλεκτοί*, because he knows that the gospel is not bound—is not made ineffectual—by his bonds. Were it otherwise, were the gospel hindered in its influence by his suffering, then he would not endure for the sake of the *ἐκλεκτοί*. Hofmann has no grounds, therefore, for thinking that the connection of *διὰ τοῦτο* with the sentence following it would give an impossible sense. It is wrong to supply *καί* before *διὰ τ. ἐκλ.* (Heydenreich), as if these words furnished an additional reason to that contained in *διὰ τοῦτο*.—*οἱ ἐκλεκτοί*] This name is given to believers, inasmuch as the deepest ground of their faith is the free choice of God (i. 9). Heydenreich leaves it indefinite whether "Christians already converted" are meant here, or "those elected to be future confessors of Christianity;" so, too, Matthies; de Wette, on the other hand, understands only the latter, whereas Grotius and Flatt think only of the former. The words themselves do not prove that Paul had any such distinction in mind; *καὶ αὐτοί* does not necessarily imply a contrast with present believers (de Wette), but may be quite well used in relation to the apostle himself, who was conscious of the *σωτηρία* attained in Christ (Wiesinger, van Oosterzee). Comp. especially Col. i. 24, where the apostle places his suffering in relation to the *ἐκκλησία*, as the *σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, of which the *ἐκλεκτοί* are members.[1] In how far the apostle bears his afflictions *διὰ τοὺς ἐκλ.*, is told by the words: *ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ σωτηρίας τύχωσι τῆς ἐν Χρ. Ἰησοῦ*. The question how the apostle might expect this result from his *πάντα ὑπομένειν*, cannot be answered by saying, with Heinrichs: "as he hoped to be freed from his sufferings;" the result was to be effected not by a release, but by the patient endurance of the suffering, inasmuch as this bore testimony to the genuineness and strength of his faith, not, as van Oosterzee thinks, because the apostle stedfastly continued to preach. The apostle's suffering for the gospel was itself a preaching of the gospel. We must, of course, reject the notion that Paul regarded his sufferings as making atonement for sin, like those of Christ.—The addition *μετὰ δόξης αἰωνίου* points to the future completion of the salvation. It directs special attention to an element contained in the *σωτηρία*, and does not contrast the positive with the negative conception (Heydenreich).

Vv. 11–13. In order to arouse the courage of faith, Paul has been directing attention to the resurrection of Christ and to His own example; he now proceeds, in a series of short antithetical clauses, to set forth the relation between our conduct here and our condition hereafter. This he introduces with the words *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος*. [XXVI *d.*] The *γάρ* following

[1] Hofmann rightly remarks: "The apostle names those towards whom he has to fulfill his calling, for the elect's sake, because this designation denotes the heaviness of his responsibility, if he did not help those destined for salvation to that for which God ordained them."

seems, indeed, to make the words a confirmation of the thought previously expressed, as in 1 Tim. iv. 9 (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Flatt, de Wette, Wiesinger, Plitt); but Paul only uses this formula to confirm a *general* thought. There is, however, no general thought in the preceding words, where Paul is speaking only of his own personal circumstances. Hence the formula must, as in 1 Tim. i. 15, iii. 1, be referred here to what follows, and *γάρ* explained by "namely" (so, too, van Oosterzee).—We cannot say for certain whether the sentences following are really strophes from a Christian hymn [1] or not; still it is not improbable that they are, all the more that the same may be said of 1 Tim. iii. 16. The first sentence runs: *εἰ συναπεθάνομεν καὶ συζήσομεν*] *συν* refers to Christ, expressing fellowship, and not merely similarity. De Wette points us to Rom. vi. 8 for an explanation of the thought; but the context shows that he is not speaking here of spiritual dying, the dying of the old man, which is the negative element of regeneration (against van Oosterzee), but of the actual (not merely *ideal*) dying with Christ. In other words, he is speaking of sharing in the same sufferings which Christ endured (so also Hofmann), and whose highest point is to undergo death. The meaning therefore is: "if we in the faith of Christ are slain for His sake;" comp. Phil. iii. 10; also Rom. viii. 17; Matt. v. 11; John xv. 20, and other passages. The aorist *συναπεθάνομεν* is either to be taken: "if we have entered into the fellowship of His death," or it denotes the actual termination: "if we are dead with Him, we shall also live with Him."—*συζήσομεν*, corresponding to *συναπεθάνομεν*, is not used of the present life in faith, but of the future participation in Christ's glorified life (so, too, Hofmann); comp. 1 Thess. v. 10.—Ver. 12. The second sentence runs: *εἰ ὑπομένομεν, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν*] This sentence corresponds with the previous one in both members; comp. Rom. viii. 17, where *συμπάσχειν* and *συνδοξασθῶμεν* are opposed to one another. On *συμβασ.*, comp. Rom. v. 17 (*ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσι*); it denotes participation in the reign of the glorified Messiah.[2] Like death and life, so are enduring and reigning placed in contrast.—The third sentence is a contrast with the two preceding: *εἰ ἀρνησόμεθα, sc.* Χριστόν] comp. Matt. x. 33; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Jude 4; used here specially of the verbal denial of Christ, made through fear of suffering. *κἀκεῖνος ἀρνήσεται ἡμᾶς*: "he will not recognize us as His own," the result of which will be that we remain in a state without grace and without blessing. The meaning of this sentence is confirmed by ver. 13.—*εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν, ἐκεῖνος πιστὸς μένει*] *ἀπιστεῖν* does not mean here: "not believe, be unbelieving"[3] (Mark xvi. 11, 16; Acts xxviii. 24), but—in correspondence with *ἀρνεῖσθαι*—"*be unfaithful*," which certainly implies lack of that genuine faith from which the faithful confession cannot be separated. In Rom. iii. 3 also, unbelief

[1] Münter, *Ueber die älteste christliche Poesie*, p. 29, and Paulus, *Memorabilia*, i. 109.

[2] The *συζῆν* begins for the believer immediately after his death (Phil. i. 23; comp. also Luke xxiii. 43); the *συμβασιλεύειν* not till after Christ's *παρουσία*; comp. Hofmann.

[3] Such is the explanation of Chrysostom, who gives Christ's resurrection as the subject of unbelief: *εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν, ὅτι ἀνέστη, οὐδὲν ἀπὸ τούτου βλάπτεται ἐκεῖνος*, and assigns to *ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτ. οὐ δύν.* the strange signification of *οὐκ ἔχει φύσιν μὴ εἶναι.*

and unfaithfulness go together, since the people of Israel, to whom the *λόγια Θεοῦ* were given, showed themselves unfaithful to God by rejecting the promised Messiah, and this after God had chosen them for His people.—*ἐκεῖνος πιστὸς μένει*] *πιστός* can only mean "*faithful.*" The faithfulness of the Lord is shown in the realization of His decree—both in acknowledging and in rejecting; the context preceding shows that the latter reference predominates.—The next words confirm this truth: *ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται*, which declare the *ἀπιστία* of the Lord to be an impossibility, since it involves a contradiction of Himself, of His nature.

Ver. 14. [On Vv. 14–21, see Note XXVII., pages 243–245.] In this verse the apostle goes on to set before Timothy how he is to conduct himself in regard to the heresy appearing in the church.—*ταῦτα ὑπομίμνησκε*] [XXVII *a*.] *ταῦτα* refers to the thoughts just expressed and introduced by the formula *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος*; of these thoughts Timothy is to remind the church, not future teachers in particular (Heydenreich). The apostle says *ὑπομιμνήσκειν*, because these thoughts were known to the church; comp. 2 Pet. i. 12 (*οὐκ ἀμελήσω . . . ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν . . . καίπερ εἰδότας*).—*διαμαρτυρόμενος ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου*] iv. 1; 1 Tim. v. 21. With the reading *λογομάχει* (see the critical remarks) these words belong to what precedes, a new section beginning with *μὴ λογομάχει*; on the other hand, with the *Rec. μὴ λογομαχεῖν*, the infinitive depends on *διαμαρτ.* Hofmann wishes to take the *Rec.* imperatively; but to give an imperative force to an infinitive standing among several imperatives, would be something unheard of.—It can hardly be decided which is the right reading. De Wette and Wiesinger have declared themselves for the *Rec.*, because "the verb *διαμαρτ.* is commonly used by Paul for introducing exhortations, and is not in keeping with the weak appeal *ταῦτα ὑπομίμνησκε*." These reasons, however, are not sufficient, since *διαμαρτ.* may quite as well be connected with what precedes as with what follows, although it does not occur elsewhere in the N. T. in such a connection; and *ταῦτα ὑπομ.* is not used by the apostle in so weak a sense that he could not strengthen it by such a form of adjuration. Nor can it be maintained that the exhortation *μὴ λογομάχει* is unsuitable for Timothy, since there is again at ver. 16 an exhortation quite similar in nature; comp. also ver. 23. There is more force in Reiche's observation: supervacaneum . . . fuisset, Timotheo, uno quasi halitu bis fere idem imperare, *μὴ λογομάχει*, and ver. 16, *τὰς δὲ . . . κενοφωνίας περίϊστασο*; but, on the other hand, *μὴ λογομάχει* is a suitable addition to the exhortation: *ταῦτα ὑπομίμνησκε*. On the whole, seeing that the transition from the one exhortation to the other is somewhat abrupt, and that the authorities are mostly on the side of the *Rec.*, this reading should be preferred.—On the conception of *λογομαχεῖν*, comp. 1 Tim. vi. 4.—*εἰς* [*ἐπ'*] *οὐδὲν χρήσιμον*] Regarding this appended clause in apposition, see Winer, p. 497 [E. T. p. 533]. *χρήσιμος* is a word which only occurs here; in Tit. iii. 9 the *ζητήσεις* of the heretics are called *ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι*.—*ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ τῶν ἀκουόντων*] "*which is useful for nothing, (serving rather) to the perversion of the hearers;*" Chrysostom: *οὐ μόνον οὐδὲν ἐκ τούτου κέρδος, ἀλλὰ*

καὶ βλάβη πολλή.[1]—καταστροφή (opposed to τῇ οἰκοδομῇ) here and in 2 Pet. ii. 16, where it has its proper meaning; it is synonymous with καθαίρεσις in 2 Cor. xiii 10. Ἐπί here does not express the aim (Gal. v. 13; Eph. ii. 10), but the result (Wiesinger). Xenophon, *Memor.* ii. 19: ἐπὶ βλάβῃ.

Ver. 15. [XXVII *b.*] Continuation of the exhortation to Timothy.—σπούδασον σεαυτὸν δόκιμον παραστῆσαι τῷ Θεῷ] σπουδάζειν expresses the eager striving, as in Eph. iv. 3, 1 Thess. ii. 17, etc., and has a suggestion of making haste, iv. 9, 21; Tit. iii. 12.—δόκιμον, equivalent to probatus, *tried*, is absolute, and should not to be taken with ἐργάτην (Luther, Mack). A more precise limitation is given in the next words: παραστῆσαι τῷ Θεῷ; comp. Rom. vi. 13, 16, and other passages in the Pauline epistles; here it has the additional meaning: "for the service of." Hofmann gives an unsuitable construction by joining τῷ Θεῷ—in spite of παραστῆσαι—with δόκιμον (= "approved by one"), separating ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυντον from one another, and connecting ἐργάτην with δόκιμον, so that ἀνεπαίσχυντον forms a second predicate to ἐργάτην, ὀρθοτομοῦντα κ.τ.λ. being added as a third. All this not only assigns to δόκιμος a meaning which it never has in the N. T. (not even in Rom. xiv. 18; comp. Meyer on the passage), but separates παραστῆσαι from the τῷ Θεῷ standing next to it, although Paul almost never uses the word without adding a dative of the person (comp. in particular, Rom. vi. 13, xii. 1; 1 Cor. viii. 8; 2 Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 27).—ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυντον] ἐργάτης specially de opere rustico; used, besides, of the work in the field of God's kingdom (2 Cor. xi. 13; Phil. iii. 2).—ἀνεπαίσχυντος; in the N. T. a ἅπαξ λεγ., and in classic Greek used only in Sp. as an adverb with the signification: "immodestly, shamelessly." It is synonymous with ἀναίσχυντος, which in classic Greek is used only in a bad sense: "one who is not ashamed when he ought to be." It cannot, of course, have this meaning here. The most reliable interpretation is to keep by the fundamental meaning of the word taken in a good sense: "who is not ashamed, because he has nothing to be ashamed of." Bengel: cui tua ipsius conscientia nullum pudorem incutiat; de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt translate it simply: "who has nothing to be ashamed of." Hofmann arbitrarily explains it as equivalent to: "of whom God is not ashamed," a meaning suitable to the context only if δόκιμος be taken in the sense he maintains. The next words make the definition still more precise: ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας] ὀρθοτομεῖν, ἅπαξ λεγ., is rightly explained by most as recte tractare (which is the actual translation of the Vulgate); but there is very great variety in the derivation of the notion. Melanchthon, Beza, and others derive the expression ab illa legali victimarum sectione ac distributione Lev. i. 6; Vitringa, from the business τοῦ οἰκονόμου, cui competat panem cibosque frangere, distribuere filiis familias; Pricaeus, a lapicidis; Lamb. Bos, from the ploughers, qui arantes τέμνειν τὴν γῆν, σχίζειν et ἐπισχίζειν ἀροῦρας dicuntur, yet in such a way that it

[1] The harm of λογομαχεῖν consists not so much in this, "that its tendency with those who listen to it is to make the Christian doctrine seem uncertain, since it produces such contention" (Hofmann), as in this, that those who give ear to it are led away from the fundamental principles of Christianity.

is committed to those qui rectas vias insistunt. De Wette (Wiesinger agreeing with him) maintains the latter; recte secare viam, *λόγον* being put for *ὁδόν*. Certainly *τέμνειν* is often joined with *ὁδός*, *κέλευθος*; but it does not follow that in *ὀρθοτομεῖν* by itself there is contained a reference to the way.[1] As little can we say that any other of the references is contained in it. The word in itself means: "cut rightly," or, according to Pape: "cut straight, in straight direction;" then, the notion of *τέμνειν* falling into the background, as is often the case with *καινοτομεῖν*, it has the more general signification: "deal rightly with something so as not to falsify it."[2]—Hofmann's explanation is curious: "cut straight through the word of truth, *i. e.* cut it, so that it is a straight cut, passing into the heart of it, whereas a slanting cut would not reach the inner part of the word of God, but only touch the outwork." This explanation—apart from other reasons—is refuted by the fact that *ὀρθοτομεῖν* has not the signification: "cut through the middle point." The Gloss. ordinar. explains it: secundum competentiam singulorum, ut: altis spiritualia, lac distribuere parvulis, so that Paul is directing Timothy to preach the word according to his hearers' capacity of understanding. This is the meaning also according to Luther's translation: "who rightly parts the word of truth;" but the thought is entirely foreign to the context.[3]—Chrysostom explains it by *τέμνειν τὰ νόθα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐκκόπτειν*; so, too, Oecumenius; but this is unsuitable, for there is nothing false in the *λόγος τῆς ἀληθ.*, and therefore nothing to be separated from it.—The expositors are quite wrong who refer the expression to a life in accordance with God's word=*κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὀρθότατα βιοῦν*.—The right interpretation makes it the simple opposite of *καπηλεύειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 2 Cor. ii. 17.[4]

Ver. 16. *Τὰς δὲ βεβήλους κενοφωνίας* (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 20), *περίϊστασο*] "*avoid*" (comp. Tit. iii. 9, synonymous with *ἐκτρέπεσθαι*, 1 Tim. vi. 20); properly: "*go out of the way.*" Beza is wrong: cohibe, i. e. observa et velut obside, nempe ne in ecclesiam irrepant.—The reason for the exhortation follows in the next words: *ἐπὶ πλεῖον γὰρ προκόψουσιν ἀσεβείας*] *προκόπτειν* here is intransitive (comp. iii. 9, 13), and *ἀσεβείας* is the genitive depending on *ἐπὶ πλεῖον*,[5] not the accusative, as if *προκ.* had here the transitive

[1] De Wette, indeed, appeals to LXX. Prov. iii. 6, xi. 5; but in these passages *ὁδόν* appears, and the verb, like the יָשַׁר, has the transitive signification: "make straight, smooth."—Nor does the passage in Eurip. *Rhes.* v. 422: *εὐθεῖαν λόγων τέμνων κέλευθον*, justify de Wette's explanation. The possibility of substituting *λόγον* for *ὁδόν* is not proved simply by remarking that "the word is a way." We certainly do speak of "walking in the path of the divine word, of virtue," etc., but not of "walking in the divine word, in virtue."

[2] Perhaps the expression may be explained in this way, that the imparting of the *λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας* makes it necessary to part it, since only a part of it can be delivered each time; it therefore amounts to saying that this parting is to be done rightly, so that the *λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας* may receive no injury.

[3] In Beza's explanation: nihil praetermittere, quod dicendum sit, nil adjicere de suo, nil mutilare, discerpere, torquere, deinde diligenter spectare, quid ferat auditorum captus, the first part alone is to the point.

[4] In the Fathers the word *ὀρθοτομία* is sometimes found synonymous with *ὀρθοδοξία*. Clemens Alex. *Stromata*, vii. p. 762: *τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν σώζων ὀρθοτομίαν τῶν δογμάτων*; but this usage took its rise from the above passage.

[5] In Diod. Sicul. there occurs: *ἐπὶ πλεῖον κακίας προβαίνειν*; see Bengel on the passage.

meaning "to further." The subject is formed by the heretics whom the apostle has in mind, not the *κενοφωνίαι*, as *ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν* shows. Hence Luther's translation is incorrect: "it (evil talking) helps much to ungodly character;" besides, it puts the present for the future. Bengel: Futurum, proprie; est enim praedictio, ut *ἐξει*, ver. 17; comp. iii. 3 ff., 6. Hofmann wishes a distinction to be made between those who deal in *βεβ. κενοφωνίαι* and those to whose number Hymenaeus and Philetus belong: and according to him, the subject should be taken from the *ὧν ἐστι κ.τ.λ.*, so as to mean the followers of these two heretics. We cannot, however, understand why Paul should not have included among the *βεβ. κενοφωνίαις* the heresy that the resurrection had already taken place, unless this expression be greatly weakened, as Hofmann indeed does, to favor his view of the heresy at Ephesus (see Introduction, § 4). In any case, it is a mistake to take the subject for *προκόψουσιν* only from what follows, since such subject does not present itself naturally; and there is least ground of all for supposing that it must be *οἱ περὶ Ὑμέναιον καὶ Φιλητόν*.—The *γάρ*, which refers only to the sentence immediately preceding, makes the increasing godlessness of the heretics the reason why Timothy should not meddle further with the *κενοφωνίαι*, but simply oppose to them the word of truth.

Ver. 17. The increase of the *ἀσέβεια* is closely connected with the further spread of the heresy. On this point the apostle says: *καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἕξει*] *γάγγραινα*, [XXVII *c.*] an eating ulcer, like cancer, called in Galen the cold burn (*σφάκελος*); *νομὴν ἐχειν=νέμειν* (Acts iv. 17: *ἐπὶ πλεῖον διανέμεσθαι*), "*eat into the flesh, spread;*" comp. Polybius (ed. 2, Tauchnitz), i. 4, viii. 5: *ἡ τοῦ πυρὸς νομή* is equivalent to the spreading of fire; i. 81, 6, used of an ulcer (Pape, *s. v. νομή*).—Jerome, *Ep. ad Galat.*: doctrina perversa, ab uno incipiens, vix duos aut tres primum in exordio auditores reperit, sed paulatim cancer serpit in corpore. The body on which the gangrene is found, and in which it spreads ever wider, is the church. He is therefore speaking here not so much of the *intensive* increase of the evil (Mack, Wiesinger) in those attacked by it, as of its *extensive* diffusion (so most expositors), thinking, at the same time, of the ever deepening mark which it is making on the inner life of the church. Chrysostom rightly says: *τὸ πᾶν λυμαίνεται*; but his further explanation is not apposite: *ἐνταῦθα τὸ ἀδιόρθωτον αὐτῶν δηλοῖ*, for the apostle does not say here that the heretics are beyond amendment.—Of these heretics Paul mentions two: Hymenaeus and Philetus, of whom nothing further is known, except that the former is possibly the same as the one named in 1 Tim. i. 20 (see on that passage).

Ver. 18. More precise description of the heretics, in the first place generally, as men who "*have erred in regard to the truth*" (de Wette).—*περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστόχησαν*] see 1 Tim. i. 6, vi. 21. The chief point in their heresy is given thus: *λέγοντες τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἤδη γεγονέναι*.—Both Irenaeus and Tertullian mention Gnostics, who denied the resurrection in its literal sense.[1]

[1] Comp. Tertullian, *De Resurr.* chap. xix.: resurrectionem mortuorum distorquent asseverantes ipsam etiam mortem spiritualiter intelligendam . . . resurrectionem

There is no ground for Baur's assertion, that there is allusion here to Marcion. The passage in 1 Cor. xv. 12 proves that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead had even in the apostolic age become a stumbling-block to many in the church.—The denial of these heretics was closely related to views which made a false contrast between flesh and spirit.—They had already exercised an injurious influence on others, as the next words declare: *καὶ ἀνατρέπουσι τὴν τινῶν πίστιν*] not: "whereby they make many err in their persuasion:" *πίστις* is the Christian faith which includes the certainty of the future resurrection, and *ἀνατρέπειν* (see Tit. i. 11) means "*evertere, destroy.*"

Ver. 19. As a contrast to the unsettling action of the heretics, we have *ὁ μέντοι στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἑστηκεν*] *θεμέλιος* (properly an adjective, supply *λίθος*) is originally the foundation-stone of a building; if that signification be retained here, the building can only mean the church of Christ. The question then arises, what is its foundation-stone? and to this various answers have been given. Ambrosius understands it to be God's promises; Bengel, the fides Dei immota; Heinrichs, the Christian religion; Ernesti, the doctrine of the resurrection (ver. 18); Calvin, the election of grace. All this is arbitrary. The *θεμέλιος* must be something which, according to the next verse, can also be regarded as *οἰκία*, [XXVII *d.*] viz. as Heydenreich says: *ἐκκλησία τεθεμελιωμένη ὑπὸ Θεοῦ* (similarly de Wette and Wiesinger). Paul, however, calls it *θεμέλιος*, not because that word denotes a building, which is not the case, but because the church, as it was originally set by God in the world, only forms the foundation of the building which is to be perfected gradually (so, too, van Oosterzee). Chrysostom's explanation is inapposite: *αἱ στερεαὶ ψυχαὶ ἑστήκασι πεπηγυῖαι καὶ ἀκίνητοι*; for Paul is not thinking here of individual believers, but of the church of which they are members. Possibly the *θεμέλιος* does not mean anything definite, and the apostle "merely intends to say that the church is firmly founded" (Hofmann); but that is not probable, especially as the attribute *στερεός* and the verb *ἑστηκεν* point to a definite, concrete conception in the apostle's mind.—*στερεός* and *ἑστηκεν* form a contrast to *ἀνατρέπουσι*. Though the faith of some may be destroyed, the foundation of God, *i. e.* which God has laid, still stands firm, unwavering.—The mark of this is given in the next words: *ἔχων τὴν σφραγῖδα ταύτην*] *σφραγίς*, "the seal," is partly a means of keeping safe, partly a sign of relevancy, partly a form of declaration whereby a document or the like is proved to be valid. Here it is the inscription[1] on the *θεμέλιος*, according to Wiesinger, "as a guarantee that the *ἐκκλησία ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεθεμελιωμένη* has an existence not to be shaken;" or, better still, as God's testimony to the peculiar nature of the structure (similarly Hofmann: "because through it God so acknowledges the structure as to declare of what nature He means it to be when thus founded"); van Oosterzee combines the two

eam vindicandam, qua quis addita veritate redanimatus et revivificatus Deo, ignorantiae morte decussa, velut de sepulcro veteris hominis eruperit.

[1] The figure is founded on the custom of placing inscriptions on the door-posts as well as on the foundation-stones; comp. **Deut. vi. 9, xi. 20; Rev. xxi. 14.**

interpretations.—Paul mentions two inscriptions. The first, with allusion to Num. xvi. 5 (the LXX. puts יְדַע for יֹדַע), is *ἔγνω κύριος τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ*. Haec sententia . . . a parte Dei (Wolf).—*ἔγνω*] Bengel: *novit* amanter, nec nosse desinit, sed perpetuo servat suos: a word of comfort for the believers exposed to the destroying influence of the heretics in the church. The other inscription (with which we may compare Num. xvi. 26; Isa. lii. 11) runs: *ἀποστήτω ἀπὸ ἀδικίας πᾶς ὁ ὀνομάζων τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου*] Haec sententia . . . a parte hominum (Wolf). Ἀδικία is the sum total of everything opposed to God, including heresy.—*ὀνομάζειν τὸ ὀν. τ. κυρ.*, according to Wahl, is equivalent to קֹרֵא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה, nomen Dei invocare. This is incorrect; it corresponds rather to the phrase: *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὀνομ. κυρίου* (*τὸν κύριον*, ver. 22). Bengel correctly says: quisquis nominat nomen Christi, ut domini sui.—This second inscription is an exhortation to believers to abstain from all unrighteousness notwithstanding the seductive influence of the heretics.—Heydenreich: two truths must likewise characterize the indestructible temple of God, the church, and these denote the comfort and hope, but also the duty and responsibility of the true worshipers of Jesus.[1]

Ver. 20. To the church as the *θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ* only those belong whom the Lord acknowledges as His, and who abstain from every kind of *ἀδικία*. This thought is contained in ver. 19. But there were also in the church *ἄδικοι*, opposing the gospel by word and deed. This strange fact Paul now explains by a figure: *ἐν μεγάλῃ δὲ οἰκίᾳ*] The Greek expositors understand by *οἰκία* "the world," to which Calvin rightly objects: ac contextus quidem hue potius nos ducit, ut de ecclesia intelligamus; neque enim de extraneis disputat Paulus, sed de ipsa Dei familia. It is different with the similar passage in Rom. ix. 21 ff.—*οὐκ ἔστι μόνον σκεύη χρυσᾶ καὶ ἀργυρᾶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ξύλινα καὶ ὀστράκινα*] By the *former* articles are meant the worthy, genuine members of the church; by the *latter*, those not genuine (not: those less good, Estius, Mosheim, and others): "each class, however, contains degrees within itself; comp. Matt. xiii. 23" (Wiesinger). The apostle's distinction is given more precisely in the next words, which cannot be referred alike to each of the two classes named, but express the same antithesis: *καὶ ἃ μὲν εἰς τιμήν*, viz. the *σκεύη χρ. κ. ἀργ.*; *ἃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν*, viz. the *σκεύη ξυλ. κ. ὀστρ.* [XXVII *c.*] To this Hofmann objects, that the material of the vessels does not determine their purpose and use, and that the second clause, therefore, does not correspond with the first; "the first antithesis rather declares that in the house of God there are members of rich gifts and spiritual attainments, and members whose gifts are few and who spiritually are of no consideration." But in this way there is manifestly imported an antithesis of which there is no hint in the context. It is indeed true that vessels even of wood and clay may be applied to honorable uses; but undue pressure is laid on the apostle's words when they are

[1] Chrysostom understands *θεμέλιος* of individual believers, and is therefore compelled to give this thought an incorrect reference: *πόθεν δηλαὶ εἰσίν; ἀπὸ τοῦ τὰ γράμματα ταῦτα ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων, ἀπὸ τοῦ γνωρίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ μὴ συμπαραπόλλυσθαι, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀφιστάναι ἀπὸ ἀδικίας, ταῦτα τὰ γνωρίσματα τοῦ θεμελίου.*

interpreted in accordance with such a possibility.—*εἰς τιμήν* and *εἰς ἀτιμίαν* do not refer to the house, nor to their possessor, on whom they bring honor or shame (Matthies), but to the vessels themselves (de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee). To some honor is given, to others shame, *i. e.* in the various uses to which they are applied by their possessors. The insertion of *ἑτοιμασμένα* would give an unsuitable thought; see Meyer and de Wette on Rom. ix. 21.

Ver. 21. Without explaining the figure, the apostle carries it on, but in such a way as to show to the members of the church how each one may become a vessel to honor.—*ἐὰν οὖν τις ἐκκαθάρῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων*] *ἐκκαθαίρειν*, according to classic Greek (also 1 Cor. v. 7), is an intensive form of *καθαίρειν* (N. T. *καθαρίζειν*).[1] The opinion (formerly expressed in this commentary) was incorrect, that *ἐκ* only foreshadows the *ἀπὸ τούτων*. The translation is inaccurate: "if one keeps himself pure" (Heydenreich, equivalent to *καθαρὸν, ἁγνὸν ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν*); Luther rightly: "purifies himself." The word indicates the departure from impure companionship; comp. ver. 19, *ἀποστήτω*, and 1 Tim. vi. 5 (according to *Rec.*) *ἀφίστασο ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων*.[2] Wiesinger makes the construction pregnant: "separate oneself from these by self-purification;" it is more correct, however, to regard the separation itself as the purification.—*ἀπὸ τούτων*] cannot according to the context be taken as a collective neuter: "from such things," *ἀπὸ τῶν εἰρημένων, ἡγοῦν ἀδικίας, ἀτιμίας*, or even *ἀπὸ τῶν βεβήλων κενοφωνιῶν*, ver. 16; it refers rather to *ἃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν*. Luther: "from such people;" comp. the passage quoted, 1 Tim. vi. 5. Hofmann is altogether mistaken in his curious idea that *ἀπὸ τούτων* means "from that time forward," and is to be connected with what follows. This reference is nowhere in the N. T. expressed by *ἀπὸ τούτων* (comp. Matt. xxvi. 29: *ἀπ' ἄρτι*); besides, this more precise definition of *ἔσται* is quite superfluous, whereas *ἐκκαθάρῃ ἑαυτόν* without more precise definition is too general.—*ἔσται σκεῦος εἰς τιμήν, ἡγιασμένον*] Lachmann has wrongly deleted the comma between *τιμ.* and *ἡγιασμ.* Εἰς does not depend on *ἡγ.*, but *σκ. εἰς τιμ.* forms here, like *ἃ μὲν εἰς τιμήν* in ver. 20, *one* idea to which various attributes, *ἡγιασμένον* being the first, are added in order to describe the nature of such a *σκ. εἰς τιμ.*—*ἡγιασμένον*] is not = *σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς*, Acts ix. 15 (Heydenreich), but: "*sanctified*," as belonging to the Lord. Εὔχρηστον = "*good for using;*" *τῷ δεσπότῃ*, "*the master of the house;*" *εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἡτοιμασμένον* (comp. Rev. ix. 7), "*prepared for every good work.*" While all expositors join *τῷ δεσπότῃ* with *εὔχρηστον*, Hofmann prefers to refer it to what follows, without giving any reason for so doing. Elsewhere in the N. T. *εὔχρηστος* occurs only in connection with the dative of more precise definition (iv. 11; Philem. 11).

Ver. 22. [On Vv. 22–26, see Note XXVIII., page 245.] Timothy is exhorted to Christian behavior; it is impossible to overlook the connec-

[1] Chrysostom rightly says: *οὐκ εἶπε· καθάρῃ, ἀλλ' ἐκκαθάρῃ, τουτέστι, παντελῶς καθάρῃ.*

[2] Bengel remarks: Activum cum pronomine reciproco indicat liberrimam facultatem fidelium.—Beza seeks, on the other hand, to save the doctrine of predestination: Volumus et efficimus, sed per eum qui gratis et in solidum efficit in nobis bonam et efficacem voluntatem, tum quod ad *διάθεσιν*, tum quod ad *ἐνέργειαν* attinet.

tion with what precedes.—*τὰς δὲ νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας*] [XXVIII *a.*] *νεωτερικαί* is *ἁπ. λεγ.*, juveniles, quibus juvenes indulgent, not cupiditates rerum novarum. Chrysostom and Theophylact rightly remark that the meaning is not to be limited too closely to *πορνεία*.[1] Hofmann supposes that the desires are meant which are found in younger members in contrast with those advanced in years, *e.g.* the desire for brilliant gifts and offices; but neither the context nor the expression supports his interpretation. This reference is rather a pure importation into the text, and is adopted by Hofmann that it may agree with his erroneous view of ver. 20; it is opposed, finally, by the *δίωκε δικαιοσύνην κ.τ.λ.—δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην κ.τ.λ.*] very similar to 1 Tim. vi. 11.—*εἰρήνην*, "*i. e.* inner fellowship and harmony" (de Wette).—*μετά* should not be construed with *δίωκε*, but with *εἰρήνην*; comp. Heb. xii. 14.—*μετὰ πάντων τ. ἐπικαλουμένων τὸν κύριον*] This expression occurs somewhat frequently as a name for Christians; comp. Acts ii. 21, ix. 14; Rom. x. 12. The passage in 1 Cor. i. 2 shows that Christ is meant by *κύριος.—ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας*] belonging not to *δίωκε* but to *ἐπικαλουμένων*, stands here in special contrast to the heretics who did also call Christ their Lord, but not from a pure heart. Chrysostom's remark: *μετὰ τῶν ἀλλων οὐ χρὴ πρᾷον εἶναι*, goes too far, since in ver. 25 there is an express appeal for *πραότης* towards the *ἀντιδιατιθέμενοι*; still the believer can only keep peace with those who call on the Lord out of a pure heart, the others he must oppose. *Εἰρήνη* is mentioned last, because the apostle is thinking of it specially; comp. the next verses.

Ver. 23 is in contrast (*δέ*) with ver. 22. As in 1 Tim. i. 4, vi. 4, *ζητήσεις* are brought forward as the characteristic of heresy. Paul calls them *μωραὶ καὶ ἀπαίδευτοι*] *μωραί*, Tit. iii. 9.—*ἀπαίδευτοι*, properly, "uninstructed;" in N. T. *ἁπ. λεγ.*; more frequently found in LXX. and Apocrypha, but only in reference to persons. It is synonymous with *μωρός* (כְּסִיל); even here, where it refers to things, it is synonymous with *μωρός* (= ineptus). There is no just ground for Hofmann's supposition, that it is to be derived here not from *παιδεύεσθαι*, but from *παιδεύειν*, and hence that it means "unsuited for educating spiritually" (Mosheim, Heydenreich, Mack, Matthies).—On *παραιτοῦ*, comp. 1 Tim. iv. 7, v. 11.—*εἰδώς* does not give the reason why Timothy should follow the exhortation (equivalent to "since, or because, you know"); it forms part of the exhortation in the sense: "as you know (consider);" comp. Tit. iii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 58; Col. iii. 24, iv. 1.—*ὅτι γεννῶσι μάχας*] *μάχαι*, Jas. iv. 1, synonymous with *πόλεμοι*; opposed to *εἰρήνη*, ver. 22.

Vv. 24–26. In regard to the last thoughts, Paul gives a sketch of the conduct which beseems the *δοῦλος κυρίου*. *Δοῦλος κυρίου* is here, as often, one who has been charged with the office of preaching the gospel.—*Οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι*] [XXVIII *b.*] Luther is inaccurate: "must not be disputatious;" it does not denote so much the disposition as the act, and is in close relation with the preceding *μάχας*; it furnishes the reason, therefore, why he should not devote himself to foolish investigations, which only give rise

[1] Theodoret: *τρυφὴν, γέλωτος ἀμαρτίαν, δ ἐστι κενὴν καὶ τὰ τούτοις προσόμοια.*

to contentions.—*ἀλλ' ἤπιον εἶναι πρὸς πάντας*] *ἤπιος*, here and at 1 Thess. ii. 7, "*amiable, friendly;*" properly, "addressing in a friendly manner;" it forms a pointed antithesis to *μάχεσθαι*.—*διδακτικόν* (1 Tim. iii. 2). Hoc non solum soliditatem et facilitatem in docendo, sed vel maxime patientiam et assiduitatem significat, Bengel. According to the context here, the word expresses not only the ability, but also the willingness to teach.—*ἀνεξίκακον*] *ἅπ. λεγ.* (*ἀνεξικακία*, Ecclus. ii. 19, kindred in meaning with *ἐπιείκεια*), denotes the opposite of irritability: "*patient, submissive*" in regard to contradiction (perhaps slanderous).—Ver. 25. *ἐν πραΰτητι* is wrongly joined by Luther with *ἀνεξίκακον*: "who can endure the wicked with gentleness;" it belongs rather to what follows, and describes the manner of *παιδεύειν*.—*παιδεύειν* is here equivalent not to erudire, but to corripere. Luther: "punish," set right, see 1 Tim. i. 20.—*τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους*] *ἅπ. λεγ.*, synonymous with *ἀντιλέγοντες*, Tit. i. 9, and denoting all opposed to the word of truth preached by the *δοῦλος κυρίου*. The context compels us to interpret it not as "the unbelievers" (Hofmann), but specially the heretics. The name, however, is not given to them because they are "weak in faith" (Wiesinger). Luther's translation is too strong: "contumacious;" comp. with this passage Tit. i. 9, 13. The rule here laid down is not in contradiction with the *ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως*, Tit. i. 13, not because the *ἀντιδιατιθέμενοι* here are different from the *ἀντιλέγοντες* of Tit. i. 9, as Hofmann maintains, but because even with the *ἐλέγχειν ἀποτόμως* there should also be the *ἐν πραΰτητι παιδεύειν*. The purpose which should guide the servant of the Lord in his conduct towards the *ἀντιδιατιθέμενοι* is given in the next words.—*μήποτε δώῃ αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς μετάνοιαν*] *μήποτε*, "whether it may not be," is joined with the conjunctive and the optative; comp. Buttmann, p. 220 [E. T. 256]. The *μετάνοια* is here supposed to be necessary because the ground of opposition is *ἀδικία*; *μετάνοια* is the change of thought which is necessary *εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας*.—Ver. 26. *καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος*] In the verb *ἀνανήφειν*, the *ἀνα* may express motion from beneath, as in other verbs thus compounded (*e.g. ἀναζέω*), so that it is equivalent to "become sober," *i. e.* "come up out of the stupefaction which holds them down" (Hofmann[1]); but the usual meaning of the word in classic Greek is, however, "become sober *again*." If the word has this meaning here, then the *ἀντιδιατιθέμενοι* must be the heretics. The error into which they had fallen is to be compared with the intoxication which beclouds men's wits; the verb is *ἅπ. λεγ.* In 1 Cor. xv. 34 we have *ἐκνήφειν*.—The figure *παγίς* is certainly not in harmony with this verb; but a collocation of various figurative expressions is not infrequent; here it is more easy to justify it, as an intermediate thought like *καὶ ῥυσθῶσιν* (Heydenreich) may be at once supplied. The collocation may indeed be altogether avoided, if, with Michaelis and Hofmann, we connect *ἐκ τῆς . . . παγίδος* with *ἐζωγρημένοι* following; but against this there is the signification of this word, which does not mean being saved, but being taken captive.—*ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα*] [XXVIII c.] *ζωγρεῖν* has here the same meaning as in

[1] Hofmann appeals to *ἀναζῆν*, Rom. vii. 9, for this signification; but comp. Meyer on that passage.

Luke v. 10: "*catch*," the notion "alive" being allowed to fall into the background. It is questionable whether the devil or the *δοῦλος κυρίου* (ver. 24) is to be regarded as the *ζωγρῶν*. Several expositors, Wetstein, Bengel, Mack, Wiesinger, Hofmann, and others, have declared themselves in favor of the second view. But against this there is the perfect, since the *ἀνανήφειν* does not take place until they *have been caught* by the *δοῦλος Θεοῦ*;[1] besides, the meaning thus obtained would be open to the reproach of being too artificial.[2]—With the *first* view (Matthies, de Wette, van Oosterzee, Plitt) *ἐζωγρημένοι* may be joined in a natural sense with the preceding *παγίδος*; Luther is therefore right: "by whom they are caught at his will." The last words: *εἰς . . . θέλημα*, are by Beza joined with *ἀνανήψωσιν*: ad illius, nempe Dei, voluntatem, videlicet praestandam; hunc enim locum sic esse accipiendum mihi videtur utriusque illius relativi pronominis (*αὐτοῦ . . . ἐκείνου*) proprietas et ipsa constructio postulare. But *ἐκείνου* may very easily refer to the same subject as *αὐτοῦ*.[3]—As with Beza's interpretation, *ἐζωγρ. ὑπ. αὐτοῦ*, "would be made too bare" (de Wette), the additional clause under discussion is to be joined with *ἐζωγρημένοι*, as indeed it ought to be, according to its position.—Aretius takes the correct view of *ἐζωγρ.*, but wrongly explains the words *εἰς κ.τ.λ.* as equivalent to "according to *God's* will, *i.e.* so long as God pleases." Heinrichs, too, though he refers *ἐκείνου* rightly, wrongly says it is equivalent to ex suo arbitrio, pro suo lubitu. Εἰς stands here rather as in 2 Cor. x. 5; the *θέλημα τοῦ διαβόλου* is regarded "as a local sphere" into which they have been taken; see Meyer on the passage quoted.

Notes by American Editor.

XXV. Vv. 1–7.

(*a*) The emphatic *σύ* of ver. 1 can only be explained by a reference to the persons alluded to in i. 15 f.—probably by way of contrast to *οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ*. The words which follow, however, clearly indicate a connection with what precedes those verses. The particle *οὖν*, accordingly, must be regarded as including all the previous context in itself.—(*b*) The word *ἐνδυναμοῦ* is connected in thought with *συγκακοπάθησον* of ver. 3 (comp. i. 6, 7 and i. 8). These verses relate to Timothy's own condition and action. The second verse refers to what he is to do in respect to other teachers. With ver. 2 may be compared 1 Tim. i. 3 and Tit. i. 5, though here the exhortation may perhaps bear upon a succession of teachers who were to follow afterwards, while, in the other epistles, the reference is to those who were teaching errors, or to the appointment of presbyters in the

[1] Hofmann does not acknowledge the validity of the objection: "The perfect partic. expresses nothing else than a condition abiding thenceforward;" but this "thenceforward" is quite unsuitable here, for in the connection of *ἐζωγρημένοι* with *ἀνανήψωσι* that perfect does not show the position into which they enter only by *ἀνανήφειν*—and which remains thenceforward, but to the position in which they were when the *ἀνανήφειν* took place.

[2] This is valid also against Theophylact's explanation: *ἐν πλάνῃ νήχονται ἀλλὰ ζωγρηθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ . . . ἀναιτήψωσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑδάτων τῆς πλάνης.*

[3] See the passage cited by de Wette; Plato, *Cratylus*, p. 430 E: *δεῖξαι αὐτῷ ἂν μὲν τύχῃ, ἐκείνου εἰκόνα*; comp. also Kühner, § 629, A 3.

churches. The insertion of ver. 2 in this place is somewhat strange, and the connection is somewhat loose. Yet it was not altogether out of place, in the setting forth of what Timothy was to be and do as a faithful worker in the Church, now that the Apostle was in prison and in danger of death, to call his attention, to the duty of seeing that the truth was committed to other faithful men who might unite with or follow him in the same great work.—(*c*) *Πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις* (ver. 2)—The question whether a succession of teachers is here alluded to, is one of some uncertainty. Huther and a considerable number of the recent commentators maintain that such a succession was in the writer's mind. The points on which the question turns are the following:—1. Whether *καί* belongs to *ἑτέρους* or to *διδάξαι ἑτέρους*. 2. What is the intended reference of *ἑτέρους*. 3. Who are meant by *πολλῶν μαρτύρων*. The third of these points bears only indirectly upon the decision. But it may, nevertheless, have a certain influence, which may properly be considered. As to *καί*, there seems to be no special ground for affirming with Huther, against Hofmann, that it qualifies *ἑτέρους* only. Paul may easily be supposed to have desired Timothy to commit the word to trustworthy persons, who had, in addition to other things, the particular quality of aptness to teach, and to have expressed this by *καί*. It must be admitted, however, that *ἕτεροι* seems somewhat better adapted to designate other *teachers*, than simply other *persons*, *i. e.* the ordinary hearers of the gospel. That *ἕτεροι* may denote the latter cannot be denied, but the use of the word can be more readily accounted for, if the former meaning is given. The bearing of *διὰ πολλ. μαρτ.* on the subject is connected with the question as to whether these words refer to the presbyters who participated in Timothy's ordination. If they do, there is a certain probability, arising from this fact, that the Apostle's mind was dwelling, throughout the passage, only on the committing of the truth to teachers and preachers. The reference to Timothy's ordination is favored by many of the recent commentators. It is, however, to say the least, very doubtful. The most that can be affirmed, therefore, is that there is a slight probability that a succession of teachers is intended by *ἑτέρους*. That there is anything in the words which necessarily implies the transmission of doctrine or truth independent of the common Scripture revelation, cannot be affirmed.—(*d*) *συγκακοπάθησον* (ver. 3) is undoubtedly parallel with the same verb in i. 8, and has the same meaning. R. V., however, renders in i. 8, *suffer hardship with the gospel*—making *τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ* depend on *σύν*—while here it renders, in the text, *suffer hardship with me*, and, in the margin, *take thy part in suffering hardship*. The recent commentators are disposed to supply *with me* in i. 8, and to make *τῷ εὐαγ.* mean *for the gospel*, as Huther and Note XXIII. *c* above.—(*e*) The thought seems to pass, through the last clause of ver. 3, which suggests the readiness of the soldier to suffer, from *συγκακοπάθησον* to the more general ideas, which are unconnected with that verb, in vv. 4–7. These verses set forth the call upon the Christian preacher, to give himself wholly and faithfully to his work—a thought which is presented under three figures:—1. that of the soldier, who does not involve himself in the matters which belong to civil life; 2. that of the athlete, who contends in the games with hope of success only as he acts in accordance with the rules of the contest—giving up all things for, and subordinating all things to the attainment of the end, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 24 ff; and 3. that of the husbandman, who partakes of the fruits only as he works hard for them. The same idea lies at the foundation of all the figures, and this explanation which regards them as a threefold presentation of a single thought,

is the simplest and most satisfactory one.—(*f*) The object of ver. 7 seems to be to call Timothy's especial attention to the thought suggested by these illustrative references, as bearing upon his own official life and work. γάρ, which Huther regards as a particle of explanation, can be understood, as Ell. and de W. take it, as causal. The demand in νόει may well be made, and it can be fulfilled, *for*, etc. The causal force of γάρ is so nearly universal in the N. T., that the presumption is strongly in favor of this sense.

XXVI. Vv. 8–13.

(*a*) The relation of ver. 8 to what precedes is indicated by the fact that κακοπαθῶ is found in the first clause of ver. 9. This verb is connected in thought, evidently, with συγκακοπ. of ver. 3. The remembrance of Jesus Christ as risen from the dead is suggested as a means of strengthening Timothy (ἐνδυναμοῦ) in the line of the endurance of suffering. The encouragement derived from this remembrance, however, is not founded on the fact that Christ suffered death, but that He had the victory over it. Accordingly, as Wiesinger remarks, the words ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ do not refer at all to Christ's humiliation. They "mark, as at Rom. i. 3, only His outward, visible nature in distinction from the invisible; and in both relations, here as there, He appears exalted and glorified; since, according to the flesh, the promise given to the house of David is fulfilled in Him, and as risen from the dead, He is declared the Son of God in power κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγ. Rom. i. 4." Thus in this verse, as in Rom., Paul "comprises in these two predicates the substance of the gospel," and "the clause 'according to my gospel' becomes perfectly intelligible."—(*b*) The antecedent of ᾧ at the beginning of ver. 9 is εὐαγγέλιον, *i. e.* in the sphere of his work as a preacher of the gospel. Comp. Phil. i. The reference to his own suffering in the word κακοπαθῶ, is an indication that the σύν in συγκακοπ. of ver. 3 is to be taken with a μοί to be supplied.—(*c*) The "not binding" of the word of God is evidently contrasted with the "binding" of the Apostle (οὐ δέδεται—δεσμῶν), and thus refers to the fact that the preaching of the gospel is not prevented by his imprisonment, and cannot be. For this reason he stedfastly endures, etc. The use of the word ἐκλεκτούς, as designating Christians, here, is probably connected with that of οὐ δέδεται—both expressions suggesting the idea of the Divine power, or purpose, as not to be overcome by anything that human opposition can do.—(*d*) Ver. 11—That πιστὸς ὁ λόγος refers here to what follows, is indicated by the fact that the following words are of the character which is suited to that phrase, while the preceding words are not so, either in themselves, or as they stand here in dependence on ἵνα. The γάρ, which introduces the following clauses apparently goes back in its force to the thoughts of the 9th and 10th verses. It thus passes over the phrase πιστ. ὁ λόγ. Huther, here as in ver. 7, takes γάρ in the sense of *namely;* but see note on that verse, above. As connected with vv. 9, 10, these successive clauses form a ground of encouragement and of warning.

XXVII. Vv. 14–21.

(*a*) The reference in ταῦτα of ver. 14 is to vv. 12, 13, or perhaps to vv. 8–13. The things spoken of in the following verses are among those which appertain to a denying of Him and a proving unfaithful to Him. The principal reference is to the erroneous teachings and doctrines, which are alluded to in all the Past.

Epp.; but there are, also, exhortations addressed to Timothy to guard himself against evils and dangers. The heresies are here described by the words *λογομαχεῖν* (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 4), *βεβήλους* (comp. 1 Tim. i. 9, iv. 7, vi. 20), *κενοφωνίας* (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 20), *ἠστόχησαν* (comp. 1 Tim. i. 6, vi. 21), *μωρὰς ζητήσεις* (comp. Tit. iii. 9), *μάχας* (comp. Tit iii. 9). They are, moreover, additionally set forth here, in their injurious and destructive influence, as to no profit, subverting those who hear, eating as doth a gangrene, overthrowing faith, being ignorant questions; and their teachers are described as vessels unto dishonor, and taken captive by the devil (but see, on this last phrase, Note XXVIII *c*). Though in some of these additional points the statements are kindred to those found elsewhere, the description, as a whole, is the most full and detailed which the Apostle gives. There seems, however, to be nothing, in these verses, which marks any special growth or development as compared with the other two epistles.—(*b*) Ver. 15 sets forth the course to be pursued by Timothy with reference to his own office and work, as ver. 14 has pointed out what he should do in the way of reminding and charging the members of the church. In contrast with ver. 16, on the other hand, ver. 15 gives that which may be called the positive side of Timothy's duty, while ver. 16 gives the negative side. In ver. 15 *ἐργάτην ἀνεπ.* serves to define *δόκιμον* more particularly, and the clause *ὀρθοτομοῦντα κ.τ.λ.* defines, still more particularly, the words *ἐργ. ἀν.* The real point of the verse is thus found in *ὀρθοτ. κ.τ.λ.* This phrase is rendered by R. V. (1) in the text, by *handling aright the word of truth*, (2) in the margin, by *holding a straight course in the*, etc., (3) also in the margin, by *rightly dividing the*, etc., which last rendering is that of A. V. text. The translation of R. V. text is the one approved by Huther, who says the word in itself means *to cut rightly*, indeed, or *cut straight* (as Pape), but that the notion of *τέμνειν* falls into the background, and so the sense is *to deal rightly with something, so as not to falsify it.* Alf. agrees with Huther. So Fairb. and others. Ell. de W. and others connect the word more directly with the idea of *cutting a way*, or *road, straight.* Plumptre thinks the figure is connected with the accuracy of cutting essential in surgery. The view of R. V. text is, perhaps, the most satisfactory.—(*c*) That *ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἕξει* of ver. 17 is to be understood in an extensive, rather than an intensive meaning, is shown by the fact that the thing which thus eats is *ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν, i. e.* the teachings of the errorists which overthrow the faith of those who hear them, and by the general indication, in ver. 14, that the writer has the church, and the effect of true and false teaching upon the church, in mind. The marginal rendering of R. V., *spread*, accordingly, gives the sense in which *eat* is here used. It spreads like an eating ulcer.—(*d*) The *θεμέλιος* of ver. 19 must (as Huther says) be something which can be explained consistently with the use of *οἰκία* in ver. 20. It must, also, be something which can effectually stand against, and resist, all the teachers and doctrines which turn aside from the truth. And it must be something on which the inscriptions mentioned can be conceived of as written. That these conditions may be fulfilled, and that the statement respecting the vessels in the house may be satisfactorily met, it would seem that the apostle must have in mind here the church. The church is, however, viewed under the figure of a building, and, in a certain sense, apart from its members. Not that the members do not compose the house, and make its foundation as well as the superstructure. But the figure pictures it as containing the members, and in it are vessels of different sorts. On the foundation of the building are inscribed two Divine declarations:—the first indicating that

the true disciples are safe in His care, "The Lord knoweth them that are His;" and the second calling them to their duty, "Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness." The contrast of the church in its true discipleship to its adversaries, within as well as without, and its security against them—its firmness and perpetuity—are thus set forth; and, at the same time, all within it are admonished to be in the truest and complete sense disciples.—(*c*) The question whether Paul means by "the vessels unto honor" the same that he means by "the vessels of gold and silver,"—and so, in each case, there is a corresponding idea presented in two different phrases,—or whether, on the other hand, the vessels to honor and dishonor are different from those of gold, etc., and of wood, etc., cannot be determined with certainty. All that can be said is that the individual member of the church, whoever he may be, can become, not only a vessel to honor, but both good for the Master's use and prepared for *every* good work.

XXVIII. Vv. 22–26.

(*a*) The comparison of ver. 22 with 1 Tim. vi. 9–11 makes it altogether probable that *ἐπιθυμία* has its ordinary sense of evil desires or lusts, and does not mean either "*cupiditates rerum novarum*," or desires for brilliant gifts, or desires in the line of the false *γνῶσις*. The reference is to those *ἐπιθυμίαι* (1 Tim. vi.) which appertain to the moral debasement of the false teachers, and which are contrasted with righteousness, etc. These were the same *ἐπιθ.*, in their larger development, as those to which persons might be exposed in youthful life.—(*b*) The word *μάχεσθαι* of ver. 24 is determined in its meaning mainly, if not wholly, by *μάχας* of ver. 23. The *δοῦλος κυρίου*, who is here the official servant or preacher, is forbidden to contend after the manner of the false teachers. They were prone to angry controversy. He must be mild, speaking in a gentle way, patient, apt to teach, etc. The *δοῦλοι κυρίου* in recent years, as well as in earlier times, seem to have been more ready to obey the Apostle's injunctions in some other lines, than in this.—(*c*) The question as to the meaning of *αὐτοῦ* and *ἐκείνου*, in ver. 26, is one of much difficulty. If, however, *ἐκείνου* can be referred to the same person with *αὐτοῦ*, there can be little doubt that the explanation which regards them as both used of the devil, is that which best meets the demands of the sentence. This interpretation accords most fully with the perfect tense in the participle *ἐζωγρημένοι*, with the verb *ἀνανήψωσιν* as suggesting the idea of recovery, and with the natural connection of *αὐτοῦ* with *διαβόλου*. It avoids the difficulty of making the capture by the devil to be designed to the end of accomplishing the Lord's will that deliverance should take place, which is required if *αὐτοῦ* is referred to *διαβόλου* and *ἐκείνου* to the Lord. It also avoids the unnaturalness of mingling the idea of recovery of men (or of awaking them to sobriety) out of a snare with that of being taken captive by a person who rescues or awakes them, which is necessary if *αὐτοῦ* is referred to the Lord's servant. Instances are cited by Kühner, and referred to by Huther and Alf., (Plato *Cratyl.* p. 430 E. and Lysias c. Eratosth. p. 429), which may, to say the least, justify the application of the two pronouns to the same person. If, however, such an application can ever be allowed, the present sentence is one in which it may easily be believed, that a special emphasis was designed to be placed upon the agency of the devil in carrying out his own will. R. V. text has *having been taken captive by the Lord's servant unto the will of God.* The two other possible renderings are placed in the margin. A. R. V. places in the text the explanation favored in this note: *having been taken captive by him unto his will.*

CHAPTER III.

VER. 1. *γίνωσκε*] For this, Lachm. and Buttm., on the authority of A F G 238, *al.*, Aeth. Boern. Aug., adopted *γινώσκετε*. Tisch., on the authority of C D E K L ℵ, most cursives, versions, etc., retained the *Rec.*, of which reading nearly all expositors, even Reiche, have declared themselves to be in favor. Still the plur. might be the original reading, since there was no occasion for changing the sing. into the plur.—Ver. 2. ℵ omits *οἱ* before *ἄνθρωποι*; a mere alteration, because the art. seemed to present a difficulty in meaning.—Ver. 3. ℵ omits *ἀστοργοι*.—Ver. 6. *αἰχμαλωτίζοντες*, for *αἰχμαλωτεύοντες*, was adopted even by Griesb., on the authority of A C D* E F G ℵ, many cursives, versions, and Fathers.—Before *γυναικάρια* the *Rec.* has the art. *τά*, which, however, was deleted by Griesb., on the authority of A C D E F G ℵ, etc.—Ver. 8. The two names are differently written by some MSS.; for, *Ἰαννῆς*, C* has *Ἰωάννης*; Vulg. Cypr. etc. have *Jamnes*; for *Ἰαμβρῆς*, F G, Vulg. It., many Fathers, also the Talmudists, have *Μαμβρῆς*. Matthaei thinks that this change was made arbitrarily by Origen, who had a fashion of altering proper names, partim propter ineptas allegorias, partim propter ineptas etymologias suas.—Ver. 9. The reading in A, *διάνοια* for *ἄνοια*, must be regarded as an arbitrary alteration.—Ver. 10. *παρηκολούθηκας*] *Rec.* Tisch. 7; for this, A C F G ℵ 17, *al.*, have the aorist *παρηκολούθησας*, which was adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8; F and G have the simple *ἠκολούθησας*. The perf. seems to be a correction made after the analogy of 1 Tim. iv. 6.—Instead of the difficult *τῇ ἀγωγῇ*, there is found in D* gr. *τῇ ἀγάπῃ*, a manifest correction.—Ver. 11. For *ἐγένετο*, Lachm. and Buttm. read *ἐγένοντο*, after A 38, *al.*; but there is not sufficient testimony to establish its genuineness.—Ver. 12. Tisch. 7: *εὐσεβῶς ζῆν*, *Rec.* supported by a large majority of authorities; on the other hand, Tisch. 8: *ζῆν εὐσεβῶς* (Lachm. Buttm.), after A P ℵ, etc.—Ver. 14. *τίνος*] The reading *τίνων*, which has the testimony of A C F G 17, 71, *al.*, Slav. It. Ambrosiast., and was adopted by Lachm. Buttm. Tisch., deserves to be preferred to the usual *τίνος*, for this reason, that the latter may easily be explained to have arisen from thinking here of Paul only. De Wette is undecided, but Reiche is in favor of the *Rec.*—Ver. 15. The art. *τὰ* before *ἱερά* is placed in brackets by Lachm. and omitted by Tisch. 8; it is wanting in C** D* F G ℵ.—Ver. 16. As *καί* seems to disturb the construction, it is omitted in several versions and Fathers; Origen even has once: *θεόπνευστος οὖσα, ὠφέλιμός ἐστι*.—For *ἔλεγχον*, Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. adopted *ἐλεγμόν*, on the authority of A C F G ℵ, 31, 71, 80, *al.*

Ver. 1. [On Vv. 1–9, see Note XXIX., page 258.] Consequent on the previous exhortations we have a foreshadowing of the evil state of things in the future.—*τοῦτο δὲ γίνωσκε*] Even if the plural *γινώσκετε* be the correct reading, it does not follow that the epistle was directed to others beside Timothy; when an exhortation is general in nature, there is nothing strange in an extension of the point of view.—*ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*]

[XXIX *a.*] comp. 1 Tim. iv. 1; Grotius wrongly translates: posthac. It denotes a definite period, not, however (as in Acts ii. 17; Heb. i. 1), the present, the time between the appearance of Christ in the flesh and His second coming to judgment (Heydenreich), nor the time in which the errors shall come to an end (Mack), but the time immediately preceding Christ's *παρουσία*, in which time, according to apostolic prophecy, the might of the wicked one shall be fully revealed in order to be completely overcome; comp. 2 Pet. iii. 3; Jude 18.—*ἐνστήσονται*] *ἐνίστημι*, as an intransitive verb, has the sense of "be near at hand," but in such a way that it passes over into the sense of "be present;" thus in Rom. viii. 38, 1 Cor. iii. 22, *ἐνεστῶτα* and *μέλλοντα* stand in sharp antithesis as "things present" and "things future." Bengel therefore is correct: aderunt. The same is the case with the Latin instare; hence there is no ground for finding fault with the Vulg. "instabunt" (de Wette), since in the future something future was denoted. Luther is not quite exact: "will come."—*καιροὶ χαλεποί*] de Wette: "critical times;" *καιρός* is not simply the time, but the state of things at the time.—The next verses show in what way these *καιροί* will show themselves to be *χαλεποί*.

Vv. 2–5. *Ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι*] [XXIX *b.*] The article *οἱ* is not to be overlooked. Luther is inaccurate: there will be men; Nouveau Test. à Mons: il y aura des hommes. The article points to the generality, but, as Matthies rightly observes, not exactly "all without exception, rather taking the average, as a general rule."—Bengel: majore gradu et numero tales, quam unquam, *in ecclesia*.—Mack is incorrect: "the people of whom I am speaking."—*φίλαυτοι* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*). It may be explained from Arist. *ad Nicom.* ix. 8: *τοὺς φιλαύτους ἐν αἰσχρῷ ἀποκάλουσι.* Heinrichs, on the analogy of 1 Cor. x. 24, says: *ζητῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῦ, μὴ τὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου.*—*φιλάργυροι*] only elsewhere in Luke xvi. 14; the substantive occurs in 1 Tim. vi. 10.—*ἀλάζονες, ὑπερήφανοι*] Rom. i. 30; the first expresses boastfulness without intending contempt for others; the second, pride and haughtiness with contempt for others; see Meyer on that passage. Hofmann's explanation of *ἀλάζων* is not appropriate: "he who attributes to himself an honor which is not his."—*βλάσφημοι*] "slanderous;" not quite "blasphemous" (Matthies). In 1 Tim. i. 13 a definite reference to divine things is given by the context.—*γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς*] Rom. i. 30.—*ἀχάριστοι*] elsewhere only in Luke vi. 35 (Ecclus. xvi. 29; Wisd. xxix. 17).—*ἀνόσιοι*] 1 Tim. i. 9. Beza: quibus nullum jus est nec fas.—Ver. 3. *ἄστοργοι*] Rom. i. 31, especially of the natural affection between parents and children: caritate a natura ipsa nobis insita orbati, Heinrichs.—*ἄσπονδοι*] Rom. i. 31; both those who make no covenant (Luther: "irreconcilable") and those who do not keep a covenant made, "covenant-breaking." Hofmann says: "one who is destitute of moral sense of justice;" but that does not give the reference peculiar to the word.—*διάβολοι*] 1 Tim. iii. 11.—*ἀκρατεῖς* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*), "having no control over one's passions;" 1 Cor. vii. 5: *ἀκρασία*; the opposite is *ἐγκρατής*, Tit. i. 8.—*ἀνήμεροι*] (*ἅπ. λεγ.*). Oecumenius makes it equivalent to *ὠμοί, ἀπάνθρωποι*; synonymous with *ἀνελεήμονες*, Rom. i. 31.—*ἀφιλάγαθοι* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*); the opposite: *φιλάγαθοι*, Tit. i. 8. Theophylact: *ἐχθροὶ παντὸς*

ἀγαθοῦ. Luther wrongly: "unkindly."—Ver. 4. προδόται] Luke vi. 16; Acts vii. 52; here: "men among whom there is no fidelity" (Wiesinger). —προπετεῖς] (Acts xix. 36), qui praecipites sunt in agendo (Bengel), "foolhardy." Hofmann's is too weak: "inconsiderate."—τετυφωμένοι] 1 Tim. iii. 6, vi. 4, "puffed up," not merely "made stupid" (Hofmann).—φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι (both words ἅπ. λεγ. Philo, *de Agricult.*: φιλήδονον καὶ φιλοπαθὴ μᾶλλον ἢ φιλάρετον καὶ φιλόθεον ἐργάζεσθαι); such paronomasia are often found in the N. T.; see Wilke's *Hermeneutik*, vol. II. p. 346: "rather hunting after pleasure than seeking after God."[1]—Ver. 5. ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας] μόρφωσις, Rom. ii. 20, in a different meaning from here; see Meyer on that passage. We must not, like Beza, understand it to be vera forma et effigies pietatis, sicut in lege proponitur; it rather denotes *the external form* in general. But as Paul contrasts it here with δύναμις, it acquires the signification of mere *appearance* in distinction from true nature.—τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἠρνημένοι] δύναμις in contrast with μόρφωσις: "the living, powerful nature of genuine blessedness" (Heydenreich).—ἠρνημένοι] 1 Tim. v. 8; Tit. i. 16, ii. 12: "they show that they do not possess the δύναμις, and do not wish to possess it."—This ends the enumeration of the characteristics which Paul uses to describe the men in the last times.—Rom. i. 30, 31 is similar to this passage; Wiesinger (following Olshausen) aptly remarks: "it is a new heathendom under a Christian name which the apostle is here describing."—A definite connection between the ideas cannot be established,[2] but in both passages kindred ideas are placed together. Thus the two first are compounded with φίλος; then follow three expressions denoting arrogance; to γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς there is added ἀχάριστοι; this word begins a longer series of words beginning with ἀ privative, and the series is interrupted by διάβολοι; the next expressions: προδόται, προπετεῖς, seem to form a paronomasia; to προπετεῖς there is added the kindred notion τετυφωμένοι; some more general notions close the list. But this very confusion brings out more vividly the varied manifestations of the evil one. It is to be observed, however, that the list begins with φίλαυτοι, that accordingly only such qualities are enumerated as have their root in φιλαυτία, and that hypocrisy is the last mentioned, as the means by which the selfish man seeks to conceal his selfishness by a show of piety.—Heydenreich wrongly tries to establish in the particular expressions a special reference to the peculiar nature of the heretics.—As the closing word, Paul adds the exhortation: καὶ τούτους ἀποτρέπου] ἀποτρέπου, ἅπ. λεγ. (1 Tim. vi. 20: ἐκτρέπεσθαι), is kindred in meaning with παραιτοῦ, ii. 23: "from these things turn away, these things

[1] Theod. v. Mopsu.: φίλαυτοί εἰσιν οἱ πάντα πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ὠφέλειαν ποιοῦντες, ἀλαζόνες καυχώμενοι ἔχειν ὃ μὴ ἔχουσιν, ὑπερήφανοι μεγάλα φρονοῦντες ἐπὶ τοῖς οὖσιν, βλάσφημοι κατηγορίαις χαίροντες, ἀνόσιοι ἐπιμέλειαν τοῦ δικαίου μὴ ποιούμενοι, ἄστοργοι περὶ οὐδένα σχέσιν ἔχοντες, ἄσπονδοι οὐ βέβαιοι περὶ τὰς φιλίας, οὐδὲ ἀληθεῖς περὶ ἃ συντίθενται, διάβολοι ταῦτά τε ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖνα ἐνταῦθα λέγοντες ἐπὶ τῷ κατεργάζεσθαι μάχην, ἀκρατεῖς ἥττους τῶν παθῶν, ἀνήμεροι οὐδεμιᾶς χρηστότητος ἐπιμελούμενοι, τετυφωμένοι μεγάλα φρονοῦντες ἐπὶ τοῖς μὴ προσοῦσι.

[2] Hofmann does indeed seek to establish an order in accordance with definite points of view, but he does not accomplish this without much ingenuity and many inaccurate interpretations.

avoid."—This exhortation shows that Paul in single phenomena of the day already recognized the approach of the *καιροὶ χαλεποί* which were to come fully in the future.

Ver. 6. In this verse the apostle passes on to definite facts in the present. We cannot but see that he is thinking of the heretics on whose *ἀσέβεια* he lays stress also in other passages; comp. ver. 8 (ii. 16). Hofmann says that "Paul was thinking of people who wished to be considered, and pretended to be, on good terms with Timothy;" but there is no hint of this in the context. By similarity of disposition they belong already to the number of the godless men of the future; hence Paul says: *ἐκ τούτων γάρ εἰσιν*] *γάρ* gives the reason of the previous exhortation, as the apostle means to declare that men such as he has described already exist.—*οἱ ἐνδύνοντες εἰς τὰς οἰκίας*] *ἐνδύνειν* here, "*enter, press into*," with a suggestion of secrecy; Luther: "who slip into houses here and there;" Bengel: irrepentes clanculum; in this sense the word is *ἅπαξ λεγ.*[1] The form of expression *οἱ ἐνδύνοντες* shows that this *ἐνδύνειν* is a characteristic of those of whom the apostle is speaking.—The purpose of this secret entering is given in the next words: *καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες γυναικάρια κ.τ.λ.*] [XXIX *c.*] *αἰχμαλωτίζειν*, a verb belonging to later Greek: "make a prisoner of war;" it denotes here, getting complete possession of; the word is thoroughly apposite for describing the conduct of the founders of heretical sects.[2]—*γυναικάρια*] *ἅπ. λεγ.*, the diminutive with a suggestion of contempt; "the contemptuous epithet indicates their weakness and proneness to temptation" (van Oosterzee).—The nature of these *γυναικάρια* is described in the following three participial clauses: *σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις*] *σωρεύειν* (Rom. xii. 20), "gather, heap up," corresponds to the Latin cumulare: "cumulatae peccatis."—*ἀγόμενα ἐπιθυμίαις ποικίλαις* (Rom. viii. 14; Gal. v. 18, *ἄγεσθαι πνεύματι*). Luther is inaccurate: "who go on with manifold lusts." Their internal motive and spring of action are their manifold lusts.[3]—Comp. Tit. iii. 3.—Ver. 7. *πάντοτε μανθάνοντα*] Bengel adds the adverb: curiose. The incentive of their *μανθάνειν* was not the search after truth, but mere desire for entertainment, a longing for intellectual pastime (comp. the description of the Athenians, Acts xvii. 21); this longing makes them the prey of teachers who promise new wisdom. Hence it goes on: *καὶ μηδέποτε εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν δυνάμενα*] *μηδέποτε* is *ἅπ. λεγ.*; *δυνάμενα* is emphatic; they *cannot* attain to the truth, because the necessary conditions do not exist in their inner life.[4]—Mosheim thinks that the three participial clauses describe the three different classes of the *γυναικάρια*: (1) sinners, (2) seekers after happiness, (3) devotees; they rather denote various traits in the same persons, and "the very union of

[1] Chrysost: *εἶδες, τὸ ἀναίσχυντον πῶς ἐδήλωσε διὰ τοῦ εἰπεῖν; ἐνδύνοντες· τὸ ἄτιμον, τὴν ἀπάτην, τὴν κολακείαν.*

[2] The word occurs in Ignatius (*Ep. ad Philadelph.* chap. ii.) in the same sense as here: *πολλοὶ λύκοι ἀξιόπιστοι ἡδονῇ κακῇ αἰχμαλωτίζουσι τοὺς θεοδρόμους.*

[3] Chrysostom: *τί ἐστι ποικίλαις; ἐνταῦθα πολλὰ ἠνίξατο, τὴν τρυφὴν, τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην, τὴν λαγνείαν.*

[4] Chrysostom: *ἐπειδὴ ἑαυτὰς κατεχωσαν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ἐκείναις καὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν, ἐπωρώθη αὐτῶν ἡ διάνοια.*

such traits is characteristic" (de Wette).—It is no matter of surprise that the heretics, to win more followers, turned their attentions to the fair sex; that has been done by heretics in all ages. It is a charge brought specially against the Gnostics by various writers.[1] This, however, cannot be taken as a proof of the later composition of the epistle, all the less that many expressions in the descriptions of the Fathers show that they had this description in their thoughts.

Ver. 8. Further description of the heretics: *ὃν τρόπον δὲ Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς ἀντέστησαν Μωϋσεῖ*] Paul here compares the heretics to the Egyptian Magi who are mentioned in Ex. vii. but not named. Origen (*Tract.* 35 *in Matt.*) thinks that the apostle extracted them from a liber secretus which bore the title "Jamnes et Mambres." That is, however, doubtful; Theodoret's supposition is more probable: *τὰ μέντοι τούτων ὀνόματα οὐκ ἐκ τῆς θείας γραφῆς μεμάθηκεν ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἀγράφου τῶν Ἰουδαίων διδασκαλίας.* The names were a part of Jewish tradition from which they passed into the Talmudic and other Jewish writings; see Targum Jonathan, Ex. vii. 11, xxii. 22. Even the Pythagorean Numenius in the second century mentioned them, as Origen (*Contra Celsum*, iv.) and Eusebius (*Præp. Evangel.* ix. chap. 8) inform us. "According to Jewish tradition, they are said to have been the sons of Balaam, and at first the teachers of Moses, but afterwards his chief opponents, and to have perished at last with the Egyptian army in the Red Sea;" see Heydenreich and Wetstein on this passage.—The correlation of *ὃν τρόπον . . . οὕτω* does not necessarily place emphasis on the similarity of the *manner* of the act, but often only on the similarity of the act itself (comp. Matt. xxiii. 37; Acts vii. 28). Possibly, therefore, the heretics are compared with these sorcerers only because they both withstood the truth (so Plitt).—Possibly, also, it is because the resemblance lay in the heretics preaching the same thing as Timothy, just as the sorcerers did the same thing as Moses, the heretics and the sorcerers having the same purpose of striving against the truth (so Hofmann). Still the mention of the sorcerers at all is strange; hence we may suppose that the heretics by some more characteristic trait suggested the resemblance to the apostle's mind, and that this trait was their use of magic arts, to which there is allusion made also in *γόητες*, ver. 13 (de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee[2]). The *δέ* not only marks the transition to a new thought, but also introduces something in contrast to what

[1] Irenæus, i. 13. 3, says of Marcus the Valentinian Gnostic: *μάλιστα περὶ γυναῖκας ἀσχολεῖται*; and Epiphanius, *Hær.* xxvi., expressly upbraids the Gnostics with *ἐμπαίζειν τοῖς γυναικαρίοις* and with *ἀπατᾶν τὸ αὐτοῖς πειθόμενον γυναικεῖον γένος*; see Baur, p. 36. The passage, quoted by Mack from Jerome (*Ep. ad Ctesiphontem*), is very descriptive: Simon Magus haeresin condidit adjutus auxilio Helenae meretricis; Nicolaus Antiochenus omnium immunditiarum conditor choros duxit foemineos; Marcion quoque Romam praemisit mulierem ad majorem lasciviam; Apelles Philemonem comitem habuit; Montanus Priscam et Maximillam primum auro corrupit, deinde haeresi polluit; Arius ut orbem decipêret, sororem principis ante decepit. Donatus Lucillae opibus adjutus est; Elpidium caecum Agape caeca duxit; Prisciliano juncta fuit Galla.

[2] Van Oosterzee here makes an apposite allusion to Simon Magus, to Elymas, to the itinerating devil-exorcisers among the Jews, and to the magic arts practised from time immemorial at Ephesus, comp. Acts xix. 19.

preceded: what they did they did with an appearance of piety, but in truth they were opposing the truth.—*κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν*] The verb *καταφθείρω* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*; in 2 Pet. ii 12 it is the reading of the *Rec.*, but there is more testimony for the simple verb) is synonymous with *διαφθείρω*, 1 Tim. vi. 5.—*ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν*] Luther's translation: "incapable of believing," is inaccurate; nor is Beza's explanation suitable: rejectanei, i. e. falsae et adulterinae doctrinae doctores, quos oporteat ab omnibus rejici. Ἀδόκιμος is one who does not stand proof, and in connection with *περὶ τὴν πίστιν* one who does not stand proof in regard to faith: "not standing proof in respect of faith" (Matthies, de Wette); comp. 1 Tim. i. 19. The description here given of the heretics is the same as in 1 Tim. vi. 5: *διεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν καὶ ἀπεστερημένοι τῆς ἀληθείας.*

Ver. 9. A ground of comfort.—*ἀλλ' οὐ προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ πλεῖον*] This appears to stand in contradiction with ver. 13 and ii. 16, 17. Bengel remarks: non proficient amplius: non ita, ut alios seducant; quamquam ipsi et eorum similes proficient in pejus ver. 13. Saepe malitia, quum late non potest, profundius proficit. This, however, is not a satisfactory explanation, since *νομὴν ἕξει*, ii. 17, and *πλανῶντες*, ver. 13, point to the increasing extent of the heresy. Chrysostom, however, says rightly: *κἂν πρότερον ἀνθήσῃ τὰ τῆς πλάνης, εἰς τέλος οὐ διαμένει.* The contradiction exists only when the apostle's words are wrongly pressed so as to contain a denial of *every* further extension of the heresy. For the present their influence is extending; but later it will come to an end; this does not contradict the apostle's prophecy in vv. 1–5, since Paul does not say that the demoralization of men will be brought about by the heretics of whom he is thinking here. Hofmann sees no apparent contradiction, as he supposes that Paul in the passages mentioned is not speaking of the same people; but in this he is wrong, since both the context and the expression show that those mentioned in ver. 13 are the same as those in vv. 6–9.—The apostle confirms the thought expressed by adding the words: *ἡ γὰρ ἄνοια αὐτῶν ἐκδηλος ἐσται πᾶσιν*] The *ἄνοια* (= "want of judgment, senselessness") of the heretics does not refer so much to their doctrines opposed to the truth, as to their conduct described in ver. 6.—*ἐκδηλος* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*) . . . *ὡς καὶ ἡ ἐκείνων ἐγένετο*] "as they were put to shame before Moses," Ex. viii. 18 f., ix. 11 (de Wette).

Vv. 10, 11. [On Vv. 10–17, see Note XXX., pages 258, 259.] As a contrast to the heresy, the apostle now describes Timothy's former conduct, for the purpose of inciting him to show a like fidelity still. [XXX *a.*]—*σὺ δὲ παρηκολούθησας*] The verb denotes neither that he was an actual witness (Chrysostom: *τούτων σὺ μάρτυς*; so, too, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, and others;—this exposition is unsuitable, since these events, ver. 11, in the apostle's life had taken place before Timothy's conversion), nor even that the knowledge was gained through others (Luther: "thou hast come to know"). Παρακολουθεῖν means "follow," either theoretically, as in Luke i. 3 ("of intellectual following after, by which the knowledge of a thing is gained," Meyer on the passage), or practically, as in 1 Tim. iv. 6. Here it can only have the latter meaning. Here, however, as in 1 Tim.

iv. 6, it is not equivalent to imitari, follow as a *pattern* (de Wette), for that does not agree with διωγμοῖς (ver. 11), but the apostle's διδασκαλία, ἀγωγῇ κ.τ.λ. are regarded as guides by which Timothy is to steer his course through life (so also van Oosterzee, Hofmann, Otto[1]). Wiesinger explains it: "thou hast let thyself be moved by my διδασκαλία κ.τ.λ. to *join* thyself to me." But this explanation unjustifiably limits the παρακολουθεῖν to "the act by which Timothy first joined himself to the apostle;" further, this notion of joining himself is imported; and finally, it would seem superfluous to enumerate the particular points if they are only to be understood as motives for Timothy's joining himself to the apostle.—The aorist says that Timothy followed the apostle before; there is no indication whether he did so later. This earlier period was, of course, the time when he was the apostle's συνεργός. The perfect would have meant that Timothy continued to do so.—μου τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ] [XXX *b.*] comp. 1 Tim. iv. 6.—τῇ ἀγωγῇ] With this and the following words μου is to be supplied. Mack wrongly says that μου is not to be supplied, and that ἀγωγή and the terms following do not refer to Paul, but to Timothy: "thou hast followed my doctrine in behavior," etc. Apart from the unnatural construction, this view is decidedly opposed by ver. 11, for it is quite untenable to suppose that Timothy in the places named suffered persecution just as Paul did.—ἀγωγή (ἅπ. λεγ.) in classic Greek is both transitive, "the guidance," and intransitive, "mode of life," ratio vivendi. The latter meaning (see Esth. ii. 20) should here be retained; the word cannot of itself mean guidance of *the church*, as some interpret it. Luther says well: "my manner."—τῇ προθέσει] cf. Acts xi. 23, "the purpose on which the mode of life is founded."—τῇ πίστει] not "fidelity in office," nor "conscientiousness," but "faith."—τῇ μακροθυμίᾳ κ.τ.λ.] The difference between μακροθυμια and ὑπομονή is, that the former is applied to one who is not irritated, the latter to one who is not discouraged.—Ver. 11. τοῖς διωγμοῖς, τοῖς παθήμασιν] The transition to these is formed by ὑπομονή. The idea of διωγμοῖς is expanded by adding παθήμασιν. The apostle is thinking specially of his persecutions, and his reason is that Timothy shrank to a certain extent from suffering; comp. i. 6–8.—οἷά μοι ἐγένοντο (ἐγένετο)] οἷα is distinguished from the relative ἃ, inasmuch as it points to the nature of the παθήματα; ἃ would have limited παθήμασιν to what the apostle had to endure in Antioch, etc.; but οἷα indicates that he means by παθήμασιν all sufferings of the same nature as those endured in Antioch, etc. This is the case also with οἵους farther on. The sufferings endured in Antioch, etc., are mentioned because they took place at the time when Timothy was adopted by Paul as his colleague.—In the next words: οἵους διωγμοὺς ὑπήνεγκα, the

[1] Otto: "παρακολουθεῖν is to be taken in its most literal sense, not comprobari, amplecti, or even imitari, but *follow after*. Timothy of his own accord not only *followed after* his doctrine, but also his sufferings; for that these lay in the path of an apostle was shown clearly enough by events in Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra. Hence, however, he is not to be surprised if he finds on his way the very thing he had willingly followed after."—Hofmann explains it: "Timothy as scholar followed that in which Paul had preceded him as teacher, so that Christianity taught him what Christianity was."

verb is emphatic; it was important, when directing Timothy to the example given him, to remind him that the persecutions had been borne undauntedly—and then that the Lord had granted rescue from them all; hence he continues: *καὶ ἐκ πάντων με ἐρύσατο ὁ κύριος.* Erasmus, Flatt, Mack, Heydenreich unnecessarily take the sentence: *οἵους . . . ὑπήνεγκα*, as a touching appeal; Hofmann, both this sentence and the preceding one: *οἷά μοι ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ.* This would only be an unsuitable interruption of the quiet train of thought.[1]—*ὑποφέρειν* denotes persevering, stedfast endurance, 1 Cor. x. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 17.—*καὶ ἐκ πάντων με κ.τ.λ.*[2]] He mentions his sufferings, and his rescue from them, that he may encourage Timothy to be ready to suffer for Christ's sake. It is to be observed that *με ἐρύσατο* refers not only to rescue from bodily danger, but also to rescue from the danger of being unfaithful to his calling, so that out of his sufferings he had issued without hurt to body *or soul;* comp. iv. 17.

Ver. 12. The principle here laid down is intended, like the mention of Timothy's conduct in ver. 11, to incite Timothy to willing endurance of suffering.—*καὶ πάντες δέ*] *καὶ . . . δέ*, see 1 Tim. iii. 10.—*οἱ θέλοντες*] is here emphatic: "they whose thoughts are thus directed."—*ζῆν εὐσεβῶς*] the adverb *εὐσεβῶς* only here and in Tit. ii. 12.—*ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*] denotes the pious life as Christian in its nature; but it is to be observed that, according to the apostolic view, true *εὐσέβεια* is possible only in communion with Christ.[3] Hofmann unsuitably remarks that the emphasis should not be on *ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ.*, but on *εὐσεβῶς*, for *ζῆν εὐσεβῶς ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ.* forms only *one* idea: that of the Christian life of piety.—*διωχθήσονται*] expresses the certainty: Christian piety cannot continue without persecution, because the world is hostile to the kingdom of God; comp. John xv. 19, 20; Matt. x. 22, 38, and other passages. Wiesinger rightly remarks: "Not to comfort himself does the apostle say this, but to show that his experience was a universal one, as something necessarily bound up with *εὐσεβῶς ζῆν*," and, it should be added, to give encouragement to Timothy.

Ver. 13. Matthies (with whom Wiesinger agrees) thus states the connection between this and the preceding verses: "Quite different is it with evil men, who, instead of suffering for the truth, proceed always farther in their wickedness;" but there is no real opposition in the two thoughts thus opposed.[4] The apostle here continues the description of the heretics which was interrupted at ver. 10; in contrast with *οἱ θέλοντες εὐσεβῶς ζῆν*, he

[1] Hofmann maintains that if the sentences beginning with *οἷα* and *οἵους* were to be relative sentences, the apostle would have written: *τοῖς διωγμοῖς, οἵους ὑπήνεγκα, τοῖς παθήμασιν, οἷά μοι ἐγένετο*; but this would make too wide a separation between the cognate ideas *διωγμοῖς* and *παθήμασιν*, and the second sentence: *οἷα κ.τ.λ.*, would be only a weak appendage.—The objection, that the relative sentence with *διωγμοῖς* is quite superfluous, is quite removed if the emphasis be placed on *ὑπήνεγκα*. Nor can it be said that "*διωγμούς* is unskilfully introduced," since this introduction was necessary, if the apostle wished to express his thought in a relative clause.

[2] Chrysostom: *ἀμφότερα παρακλήσεως, ὅτι καὶ ἐγὼ προθυμίαν παρειχόμην γενναίαν, καὶ οὐκ ἐγκατελείφθην.*

[3] Bengel: extra Jesum Christum nulla pietas.

[4] Wiesinger argues, on the other hand, that "suffering for the sake of holiness, and advance in wickedness with outward success," do form a contrast; but the idea "with outward success" is entirely imported.

calls them *πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι καὶ γόητες*, and says of them, *προκόπτειν ἐπὶ τὸ χείρον*, which is all the more suitable that it was the very reason why persecution was threatening the honest disciples of Christ, and with them Timothy.—*πονηροὶ δὲ ἄνθρωποι*] As the article is wanting, the thought is quite general, but *καὶ γόητες* clearly shows that the heretics mentioned above are specially meant (in opposition to Hofmann). Paul gives this name to the heretics, with reference to ver. 8, where he compared them to the Egyptian *sorcerers*. The word *γόης* is *ἅπ. λεγ.* (*γοητεία*, 2 Macc. xii. 24); it is equivalent to *μάγος*, Acts xiii. 6, 8 (comp., too, Acts viii. 9, 11). Hofmann generalizes the idea to that of a *traitor*; but this is all the more arbitrary, that the expression is undoubtedly an allusion to ver. 8.—*προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον*] denotes a greater degree of wickedness, while ver. 9 refers to the increase in the extent of its influence.—How this increase of wickedness comes to pass, is told by the words *πλανῶντες καὶ πλανώμενοι*. Bengel and Heydenreich make *πλανῶντες* and *γόητες*, *πλανώμενοι* and *πονηροί* parallel to each other; for this, however, there is no ground. Even the meaning of *πλανώμενοι* is against the parallel, for it is neither transitive: "leading astray" (Matthies), nor middle: qui se seducendos permittunt (Bengel), nor even intransitive: "going astray" (Hofmann); it is purely passive: "being led astray" (Luther), or otherwise it would have been put first. He who leads others astray is himself led astray.

Ver. 14. To the good testimony given to Timothy by Paul in ver. 10, there is added the exhortation to stand stedfast in the truth.—*σὺ δέ*] said in opposition to the heretics.—*μένε ἐν οἷς ἐμαθες*] *μένε*, see 1 Tim. ii. 15; John viii. 31.—*ἐν οἷς* is equivalent to *ἐν τούτοις, ἃ*.—*Ἐμαθες*] comp. ii. 2.—*καί*] (*sc. ἃ*; not *ἐν οἷς*, as Heydenreich suggests) *ἐπιστώθης*] not= quae tibi concredita sunt (Beza, Luther: "and is entrusted to thee"); for *πιστόω* does not mean "entrust to," but confirmare. It is rightly interpreted by the Greek expositors, with whom also de Wette and Wiesinger agree; Theophylact: *μετὰ πληροφορίας ἐμαθες*; properly, "*of which thou hast been assured*," *i. e.* of which thou hast been convinced for certain;[1] it serves to give "more force to *ἐμαθες*" (Wiesinger), by declaring that Timothy was also convinced of the truth of what he learnt (so, too, van Oosterzee, Plitt, Hofmann).—To strengthen the exhortation, Paul reminds Timothy of those from whom he learnt the truths of the gospel: *εἰδὼς παρὰ τίνων ἐμαθες*] *εἰδώς*, see ii. 23.—*παρὰ τίνων*] [XXX *c.*] With the usual reading *παρὰ τίνος*, which Hofmann prefers, *τίνος* is not, as some think, Christ, but the apostle as teacher; but still it would be strange for Paul not to name himself directly and without periphrasis, as he usually does when speaking of himself; comp. ii. 2. If *τίνων* be the correct reading, then these teachers cannot be the *πολλοὶ μάρτυρες* mentioned in ii. 2 (Matthies), nor Paul and Barnabas (according to Acts xvi. 1 comp. with xiv. 6 ff., Grotius); but only, as is shown by *ἀπὸ βρέφους* following, the grandmother and mother of

[1] In classic Greek *πιστόω* occurs specially in connection with *ὅρκῳ*; thus Thucydides, iv. 88: *καὶ πιστώσαντες αὐτὸν τοῖς ὅρκοις*, *i. e.* "after they had made sure of him by oath" = "after they had made him swear." Comp. also Hom. *Od.* i. 21. 218: also 2 Macc. vii. 24, xii. 25.

Timothy, whose faith the apostle expressly mentions, i. 5 (so, too, van Oosterzee and Plitt).—Timothy had already been instructed in the truth of the gospel before Paul met with him, nay, even before this instruction he had been carefully made acquainted with the holy Scriptures. This very fact, that from childhood he had been under the influence of divine truth and been nourished by the bread of life, was to be an incentive to him to adhere faithfully to this word of truth.

Ver. 15. *Καὶ ὅτι*] Most expositors, including Wiesinger, Plitt, and Hofmann[1] assume that *εἰδώς* and *ὅτι . . . οἶδας* are co-ordinate sentences giving the reason why. In justification of this irregular construction, Bengel directs us to John ii. 24, 25; Acts xxii. 29; but wrongly.[2]—Beza, on the other hand, gives the right construction by making *καὶ ὅτι* dependent on *εἰδώς*: sciens a quo didiceris, teque a puero sacras literas novisse. This, too, de Wette (van Oosterzee agreeing with him) adopts, correctly remarking that *εἰδώς* usually denotes not only knowledge, but also reflection.—*ἀπό βρέφους τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας*] *ἀπὸ βρέφους*, Mark ix. 21: *παιδιόθεν*.[3] *Ἀπὸ βρέφους* stands first because it is emphatic; it points back to *παρὰ τίνων ἐμαθες*. In order that he may continue in what he has learned, Timothy is to remember his teacher, and also that he has known the holy Scriptures from childhood.—*τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα*] This name for the O. T. only occurs here; in John vii. 15 without *ἱερά*; the more usual name is *αἱ γραφαί*, with and without *ἅγιαι*. De Wette's conjecture is quite arbitrary, that the author of the epistle was also thinking here of some writings of the N. T.—*τὰ δυνάμενά σε σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν*] *τὰ δυνάμενα* is present and not preterite ("quae poterant," Bengel); it tells us of a permanent characteristic of the O. T. (de Wette, Wiesinger). *Σοφίζειν* is equivalent to sapientem reddere; to explain the word as synonymous with *διδάσκειν* is inaccurate. When joined with *εἰς σωτηρίαν* it is usually taken in the sense: "teach the way to holiness;" but, as Paul adds *διὰ πίστεως κ.τ.λ.*, which cannot be joined immediately with *σωτηρίαν* (= *τὴν διὰ σωτηρ.*), but belongs to *σοφίσαι*, that interpretation is here unsuitable; he who has faith is already on the way to *σωτηρία*, or rather is in possession of the *σωτηρία*. We must therefore adhere to the full signification of *σοφίζειν*; so that he is speaking here not of the first instruction in salvation, but of the ever deepening knowledge of it, how that furthers the *σωτηρία* (so, too, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt).—*διὰ πίστεως τῆς ἐν Χρ. Ἰησοῦ*] comp. 1 Tim. iii. 13. Wiesinger rightly remarks that these words are not to be taken as giving the means immanent in the Scriptures, but "contain the necessary condition attached to the use of the O. T." (de Wette). Hofmann asserts that

[1] *Schriftbew.* I. pp. 675 f., and so also in his commentary.

[2] Hofmann, in regarding the appeal to Acts xxii. 29 as appropriate, overlooks the difference of construction in the two passages. In Acts xxii. 29, two sentences beginning with *ὅτι* are dependent on *ἐπιγνούς*, whereas here the first independent sentence would be expressed by a participle (*εἰδώς* instead of *ὅτι οἶδας*), to which a sentence beginning with *ὅτι* is made co-ordinate. This irregularity of construction is manifestly not removed by Hofmann's remark, that the first sentence gives an additional fact, the second furnishes a reason.

[3] Chrysostom: *ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας*; comp. *Antip. Th.* 32: *ἐκ βρέφεος*.

σοφ. εἰς σωτηρίαν only denotes an instruction, "giving complete acquaintance with salvation;" for "in order that Timothy might remain in what he had learnt, it was only necessary for the Scripture to teach what he knew." But what any one already knows does not require still to be taught to him; and instruction leading on to knowledge ever more complete, does not hinder him from abiding in what he has already learnt. According to Hofmann, διὰ πίστεως is to be joined with σωτηρίαν, because—as he strangely enough asserts—"instruction by means of faith is a chimera" (!).

Ver. 16. Reason given for the last thought.—πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς κ.τ.λ.] [XXX *d.*] πᾶσα γραφή, not: "the whole of Scripture" (Beza: tota scriptura, i. e. Canon Hebraeorum), but "every Scripture;" or, still better, "all Scripture."—θεόπνευστος] ἅπ. λεγ.; the explanation of this word, which also in classic Greek is applied to seers and poets, is specially aided by the passage in 2 Pet. i. 21: ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν οἱ ἅγιοι Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι.—In various old versions (Syr. Vulg.; so also in Clement, Origen, Tertullian, etc.) καί is wanting; and Luther did not express it in his translation; in that case θεόπν. is clearly an attribute belonging to the subject; Luther: "all Scripture inspired by God is." With the correct reading, however, θεόπν. may be a predicate; so Bengel: est haec pars non subjecti (quam enim scripturam dicat Paulus, per se patet), sed praedicati; so, too, Matthies, de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, and others. Other expositors, again, such as Grotius, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Plitt, Hofmann, take θεόπνευστος as an attribute of the subject, even with this reading, and explain καί as "also." This construction is the right one. On the one hand, it is ungrammatical to explain πᾶσα γραφή by "the whole of Scripture." Wiesinger argues against this by appealing to Eph. ii. 21 and to Heb. iii. 3; see Meyer on the one passage and Delitzsch on the other, where, too, Lünemann translates: "every house."[1] Wiesinger argues also that γραφή is regarded as a proper name, which he tries to prove by 2 Pet. i. 20 and John vii. 15; but, though a substantive is used once without an article, it does not follow that it has the signification of a proper name (on John vii. 15, comp. Meyer). On the other hand, this sentence does not properly give a reason for the preceding thought (Wiesinger), but rather confirms it, and hence there was no reason for directing attention to the fact that the *whole* of Scripture is θεόπνευστος. There was no doubt on that point (viz. that the *whole* of Scripture and not a part of it was inspired by God), but on the point whether the Scriptures as θεόπνευστοι are *also* (καί serves to confirm) ὠφέλιμοι. There is no ground for asserting that, with this view, there could not have been an ellipse of ἐστιν (Wiesinger).—πρὸς διδασκαλίαν κ.τ.λ.] Heydenreich thinks that the apostle is not speaking here of the profitableness of Scripture in general and for all Christians, but of its utility to teachers of religion. So also Hofmann: "The sentence does not say of what service Holy Scrip-

[1] Not less inappropriate is van Oosterzee's appeal to Eph. iii. 15 (comp. Meyer on the passage, and Winer, pp. 105 f. [E. T. p. 111] and to 1 Pet. i. 15.

ture is to him who reads it, but what use can be made of it by him who teaches." This view, however, is wrong; neither in ver. 14 nor ver. 15 is there anything said regarding Timothy's work in teaching; the apostle does not pass on to this point till the next chapter, ver. 17 notwithstanding.—*πρὸς διδασκ.*; Holy Scripture is profitable for teaching by advancing us in knowledge; *πρὸς ἐλεγχον* (or *ἐλεγμόν*), by convincing us of sin and rebuking us on account of sin.[1] Chrysostom understands it only of the conviction of error; so, too, Bengel: convincit etiam in errore et praejudicio versantes; Heydenreich, too, refers it, like *διδασκαλία*, only to what is theoretical. Ἐλέγχειν certainly does occur in this sense, Tit. i. 9, 13, but it is more frequently used of what is practical, 1 Tim. v. 20; Tit. ii. 15.—*πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν*] by working amendment in us.[2]—*ἐπανορθ.* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*) is synonymous with *νουθεσία*, 1 Cor. x. 11.—*πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*] by advancing us in the further development of the Christian life. Luther is not wrong in translating *παιδεία* by "correction," inasmuch as in N. T. usage it is applied to the education which not only develops the existing good, but also counteracts existing evil. *δικαιοσύνη*: "the Christian life of piety."—Theodoret: *ἐκπαιδεύει ἡμᾶς τὰ εἴδη τῆς ἀρετῆς.*—There is an obvious climax in the series of these thoughts.

Ver. 17. Ἵνα declares the purpose which Scripture is to serve.—*ἄρτιος ᾖ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος*] *ἄρτιος* (literally, "adapted") is a *ἅπ. λεγ.*, equivalent to *τέλειος*, Col. i. 28, "perfect;" according to Hofmann: "in suitable condition," which, however, agrees with the notion of perfection.—*ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος*] [XXX *c.*] is mostly understood by expositors to denote those entrusted with the office of evangelist, and is referred specially to Timothy. The latter point is clearly wrong, since ver. 16 is general in sense; the apostle speaks here not of Timothy only, but of every one who is an *ἄνθρ. τ. Θεοῦ*. Even although Timothy is so named in 1 Tim. vi. 11 with reference to his office, it does not follow that here, where the thought is quite general, it is a name for the office; every believing Christian by his relation to God (van Oosterzee: "he who by the Holy Spirit is born of God and is related to God") may receive the same name.—*πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτισμένος*] a more precise definition of *ἄρτιος*.—*πᾶν ἐργ. ἀγ.* is also, for the most part, understood to have an official reference. Bengel: genera talium operum enumerantur ver. 16; nam homo Dei debet docere, convincere, corrigere, instituere iv. 2. But this is wrong; it is rather to be taken quite generally (Wiesinger, van Oosterzee; de Wette differs). Ver. 16 does not tell for what purpose Scripture may be used with others, but what is its influence on one who occupies himself with it; and though iv. 2 does deal with Timothy's official work, that does not prove that *πᾶν ἐργ. ἀγ.* is only to be limited to this special thought.—*ἐξηρτισμένος*] *equipped*, Luther: "skilled."—The same word occurs in Acts xxi. 5, but in another connection (see Meyer on the passage); corresponding to it we find *κατηρτισμένος* in Luke vi. 40 and other passages.

[1] Theodoret: *ἐλέγχει γὰρ ἡμῶν τὸν παράνομον βίον.*

[2] Theodoret: *παρακαλεῖ καὶ τοὺς παρατρεπέντας ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς τὴν εὐθείαν ὁδόν.*

Notes by American Editor.

XXIX. Vv. 1–9.

(*a*) The use of the word ἐσχάταις, as distinguished from ὑστέροις (1 Tim. iv. 1), shows that the reference here is to what are especially called "the last days," that is, the time just preceding the second coming of the Lord. This is indicated, also, by the future of the verb as connected with καιροί—the grievous times are not present, but future, belonging to the last period. The 5th verse, however, can hardly be explained, without finding in its words an intimation, that what thus belonged to the future was already beginning. According to the most natural interpretation of these verses, therefore, they would seem to point to the Parousia as, to the writer's view, not very remote. Yet the time of its coming was uncertain, and it is evident from iv. 6, that he did not himself now expect to live to see it.—(*b*) The description of the men of these coming times is, in several particulars, somewhat strikingly similar to that which is given of the heathen nations in Rom. i. 28 ff. At the same time, it is evident that it goes beyond what is there found, and we may believe that the Apostle bases his representation of their character on that of the erroneous teachers whom he sees already at work, and that he carries into the descriptive words the force which results from them. The words, accordingly, have a deeper meaning and they represent a depraved moral condition which is, in the sense that it comes from a wilful rejection of the truth, worse than that depicted in the earlier epistle.—(*c*) Fairbairn supposes the persons alluded in ver. 6 as *taking captive*, etc., to be not teachers, but "of the class called sorcerers or magicians, men of bloated consciences and reprobate minds, who for merely selfish ends, played upon the weakness and credulity of mankind, and pre-eminently upon certain portions of the female section of them." The general reference to teachers, however, which is manifest in all the other passages in which the errors are spoken of, renders it probable that a similar reference is to be found here. The action of these teachers was of the insinuating, selfish and misleading character, which Fairbairn suggests. He thinks the women here referred to were "the frivolous and worldly-minded, who lived, for the most part, in fullness and pleasure, but were visited at times with recoils of feeling, guilty compunctions, fears of a judgment to come."

XXX. Vv. 10–17.

(*a*) In this passage Paul sets forth the past course of Timothy, in contrast to the course of the false teachers, and then urges him to continue in the same. Writers who, like Alford, regard Timothy as having grown weak and become fearful, find in the aorist tense, παρηκολούθησας, as distinguished from the perfect, an intimation of this change. This seems unnecessary. The aorist refers to the time past, when Timothy had been in association with the Apostle as a fellow-laborer, and the standpoint of time which divides the past from the future is taken, as so frequently in Paul's writings. Had there been any such special change, or falling back from faithfulness, in Timothy, it could hardly fail to have been brought out with greater clearness and definiteness.—(*b*) The reference to the Apostle's own history and experience, which is made in these verses, is strikingly in accordance with his ordinary manner of alluding to himself in his earlier

epistles. The particular references here given are introduced, as explained by Huther, because the things mentioned took place when Timothy became his companion. The statement of the deliverance which had been granted to himself, and the declaration of ver. 12, are doubtless designed to strengthen and encourage Timothy to meet the sufferings which he might be called to undergo.—(*c*) The reading *τίνων* (ver. 14) is preferred by Huther, as also by Tisch. 8th ed., Treg., W. & H., Alf., and others. So also R. V. This reading has the best manuscript authority, and may easily have been changed by copyists to *τίνος*, in order to connect the instruction of Timothy with Paul. If *τίνων* is adopted, it refers, in all probability, to the grandmother and mother (comp. i. 5). That an allusion to them would be natural here, is indicated by the fact of the previous allusion in the first chapter, and that they are the persons whom the Apostle has in mind is rendered probable, if not certain, by the words *ἀπὸ βρέφους* of ver. 15.—(*d*) The construction of ver. 16 adopted by R. V., which makes *θεόπνευστος* a part of the subject and gives to *καί* the meaning *also*, is probably correct. The decision respecting this point depends mainly on the connection of thought with the preceding verse. That verse assumes the *ἱερά* character of the *γράμματα*, and predicates of them that they are able to make Timothy wise unto salvation. It is exactly in accordance with this to regard ver. 16 as assuming the *θεοπν.* character of *every Scripture*, and as affirming that it is useful for the particular ends mentioned, which are all connected with the wisdom unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. The formal statement, that Scripture is inspired, is not demanded by the context, or, apparently, by anything in Timothy's condition, and it seems antecedently improbable that it would be made to him in such a passage as this, which relates to other subjects more immediately. Paul is not making an emphatic contrast here between the truth and the false teaching, considered in themselves or as to the source from which they come. He is, on the other hand, speaking only of the perfecting of the man of God and the furnishing him thoroughly for every good work.—The determination of the question as to the relation of *θεοπν.* to the sentence does not necessarily affect the teaching of the verse as to inspiration. If the adjective belongs to the subject, it is to be observed, that, according to the suggestion of the preceding verse, where *ἱερά* is a descriptive adjective, it most naturally qualifies *πᾶσα γραφή* as an attributive word. It covers *πᾶσα γραφή*, accordingly, and does not mark or distinguish one *γραφή* in the *ἱερὰ γρ.* from another. The doctrine of the verse is thus, probably, the same—so far as inspiration is concerned—whichever construction is adopted. The doctrine is distinctly declared, if *θεοπν.* is a predicate; it is assumed and implied, if *θεοπν* is part of the subject. Questions of dynamical or mechanical or minute verbal inspiration are, as Bp. Ellicott remarks, not determined by this verse. These questions must find their answer and solution in the various statements and phenomena of the Old and New Testaments, which have a bearing upon the subject.—(*e*) The phrase *ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος*, (ver. 17), if determined in its meaning by the 16th verse, is to be taken in a general sense and with reference to every Christian. This must, probably, be regarded as the meaning intended by the writer; but it is not impossible that, in applying the general truth to Timothy, he thought of him more particularly with reference to his official life, which was, indeed, the life within which the good works appointed for him to do would mainly fall.

CHAPTER IV.

VER. 1. *διαμαρτύρομαι*] The words *οὖν ἐγώ* following this in the *Rec.* were omitted from the text by Griesb., on the authority of A C D* E F G L ℵ 17, *al.*, Syr. Erp. Copt. etc.—The same is the case with the words *τοῦ κυρίου*, against which there is the testimony of A C D* F G ℵ 31, 37, *al.*—For *κρίνειν* the aorist *κρῖναι* is found in F G, several cursives, Theodoret, and Theoph.; this construction does occur sometimes in the N. T. (also in classic Greek), but there is not sufficient authority for it here.—*κατὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν*] For *κατά* (*Rec.* after D*** E K L, etc.), *καί* is the reading of A C D* F G ℵ 17, *al.*, Copt. Vulg. ms. It. Harl. etc. This reading, as it implies a change of construction in the verb, and even then makes the connection difficult, is of a kind which would easily give occasion for correction; the easiest correction was into *κατά*. Chrysostom in his commentary reads: *ἐν τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ*. Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. rightly adopted *καί*, which is approved also by Matthiæs, de Wette, Wiesinger, and van Oosterzee. Reiche, on the other hand, because of the difficulty of the reading, *καί*, regards the *Rec.* as the original reading, while he connects *κατά* with *μέλλοντας κρίνειν* as a preposition of time.—Ver. 2. Tisch. 7 reads *ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον*, with the majority of the authorities; whereas Tisch. 8 reads *παρακάλεσον, ἐπιτίμησον*. The placing of *ἐπιτίμησον* first may be a correction, because this word is related in meaning to the previous *ἔλεγξον*.—Ver. 3. *τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας*] adopted by Griesb. in place of *τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τὰς ἰδίας*, on the authority of A C D E F G ℵ 3, 37, *al.*, Arm. Vulg. etc.—Ver. 6. Instead of *τῆς ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως*, which is the *Rec.* supported by D E K L, *al.* (Tisch. 7), it is more correct, with Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. 8, to read *τῆς ἀναλύσεώς μου*, on the authority of A C F G ℵ, *al.*—Ver. 7. For *τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν καλόν* (Tisch. 7), Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8, on the authority of A C F G ℵ, *al.*, adopted *τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα*, which is certainly in harmony with the usage of the Pastoral Epistles, but for that very reason may be a correction.—Ver. 10. For the *Rec.* *ἐγκατέλιπεν*. (D* K ℵ, etc.), Tisch. 7 adopted the imperfect *ἐγκατέλειπεν*, on the authority of A C D** and *** E F G L, etc.; Tisch. 8 retained the *Rec.*, which is supported by D* K ℵ, etc.—In C ℵ, several cursives, and Fathers, Γαλίαν is found instead of the *Rec.* Γαλατίαν; Epiph. *Haer.* 57, dis. says: *οὐ γὰρ ἐν Γαλατίᾳ, ὡς τινες πλανηθέντες νομίζουσιν, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ Γαλίᾳ*; of this reading Reiche says: est utique notatu digna; . . . me cum Bengelio in hanc lectionem inclinare sentio. But the mss. almost all support the *Rec.*; and it cannot be inferred from the name Κρήσκης (Crescens) that this man was sent more probably to Gaul, where Latin was in use, than to Galatia, where Greek was spoken (Reiche); it is too rash, therefore, to regard this as the original reading. Tisch. 8, however, adopted it, whereas Tisch. 7 does not even mention it; Hofmann thinks it the correct reading.—Ver. 11. For *ἀγε*, Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. 7 read the form *ἄγαγε*, which, however, does not seem to have sufficient testimony in A 31, 58, etc.; Tisch. 8 retained the *Rec.*, with the support of almost all authorities.—Ver. 13. For *φελόνην* are found also the forms *φαιλώνην*,

φαιλόνην, φελώνην; but φελόνην is best supported. While Tisch. 7 adopted the imperfect ἀπέλειπον, on the authority of A C F G, etc., Tisch. 8 read the aorist ἀπέλιπον (*Rec.*), on the authority of D E K ℵ, *al.*; so, too, Lachm. and Buttm. —Ver. 14. ἀποδώσει] This is rightly read by Scholz, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8, on the authority of A C D* gr. E F G ℵ 6, 17, *al.*, Copt. Arm. etc., Chrys. Theodoret, instead of ἀποδῷ, which has the support of D*** E** K L, etc., Tisch. 7, Reiche.—Ver. 15. ἀνθέστηκε] Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8 rightly read ἀντέστη, on the authority of A C D* F G ℵ, *al.*; Tisch. 7 read ἀνθέστηκεν, on the authority of D*** E K L, etc.—Ver. 16. συμπαρεγένετο] Following A C F G ℵ 17, *al.*, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8 adopted the simple παρεγένετο;—no doubt the compound συμπαρεγ. (Tisch. 7) occurs seldom in the N. T., being found elsewhere only in Luke xxiii. 48; but it seems nevertheless to be a correction made on account of μοι. Here, too, the readings vary between the imperfect ἐγκατέλειπον (*Rec.*) and the aorist ἐγκατέλιπον; Tisch. 7 has the former, Tisch. 8 the latter; comp. vv. 10 and 13.—Ver. 17. Instead of the singular ἀκούσῃ, Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. rightly read the plural ἀκούσωσι, supported by A C D E F G ℵ 17, 39, *al.*—Ver. 18. Καί at the beginning of the verse was rightly omitted by Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch., on the authority of A C D* ℵ 31, *al.*, versions, Fathers; it was inserted to connect this verse with the preceding one.—Ver. 20. Μιλήτῳ] For this Λ has Μηλωτῷ, and Arab. Μελίτῃ.—Ver. 22. For the *Rec.* ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (C D E K L), Lachm. and Buttm. have ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς (Λ 31), Tisch. only ὁ κύριος (F G 17, etc.). Lachmann's reading should perhaps have the preference, as it is the one most open to correction.—ἀμήν was omitted by Griesb. as a later addition.

Vv. 1, 2. [On Vv. 1–8, see Note XXXI., pages 275–277.] Exhortation to faithful performance of official duty, enforced by the introductory formula: διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.] comp. ii. 14; 1 Tim. v. 21.—τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν ζ. κ. νεκρ.] Theophylact rightly expounds it: ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς λέγει τοὺς ἤδη ἀπελθόντας, καὶ τοὺς τότε καταλειφθησομένους ζῶντας; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52. Christ is called judge of the dead and the living, also in Acts x. 42; 1 Pet. iv. 5; it is quite wrong to suppose that the *spiritually* dead and living are meant. The allusion to the last judgment gives special strength to the exhortation.—καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ] Most expositors adopt κατά, the usual reading, as the correct one, and then take it as a preposition of time (Matt. xxvii. 15; Acts xiii. 27; Heb. iii. 8), belonging to κρίνειν. With the correct reading, τὴν ἐπιφ. κ.τ.λ. depends on διαμαρτύρομαι as the accusative of the oath (so, too, van Oosterzee and Plitt). [XXXI *a*.] It is, however, to be noted that in the N. T. διαμαρτύρεσθαι does not mean "swear" by itself, but only in connection with ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ (only in the Pastoral Epistles), and therefore only in this connection does it, like other verbs of swearing, govern the accusative, as Hofmann rightly remarks. Hence it follows that καί does not connect ἐπιφάνειαν with the previous ἐνώπιον, but belongs to the following καί: "both . . . and" (Hofmann). De Wette, appealing to Deut. iv. 26, incorrectly expounds it: "I call his appearance, etc., to witness:" present things may be summoned as witnesses, but not future events like the ἐπιφάνεια of Christ.—The Vulg. has: per adventum, without καί: probably a transla-

tion of *κατά*, which is taken as *κατά* with the genitive, Matt. xxvi. 63.—*ἐπιφάνεια*, see 1 Tim. vi. 14.—*καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ*] Several expositors join the two expressions as an hendiadys (Bengel: *ἐπιφανεια est revelatio et exortus regni*) = *τὴν ἐπιφ. τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ*; but the *αὐτοῦ* with *ἐπιφ.* is against this. The two things are considered separately (Wiesinger: "the repetition of *αὐτοῦ* is rhetorical; each element is intended to be taken independently, and considered in its full significance"); the *βασιλεία αὐτοῦ* is the regnum gloriae which begins with the return of Christ.—The reason for adding these words lies in the *κρίνειν ζ. κ. ν.*; Paul says he has Christ's second coming and kingdom in his thoughts, that he may give greater importance to his exhortation.—Ver. 2. *κήρυξον τὸν λόγον*] In 1 Tim. v. 21, *διαμ.* is followed by *ἵνα* with the conjunctive; but here we have the simple imperative, which makes the appeal all the more urgent (Wiesinger).—*τὸν λόγον, sc. τοῦ Θεοῦ*] This more precise definition is wanting here, because the emphasis lies chiefly on the verb, Paul indicating to Timothy the work to be done.—*ἐπίστηθι εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως*] [XXXI *b.*] Most expositors join these words closely with *κήρυξον* in sense. Heydenreich: *ἐπιστηθι, sc. τῷ κηρύσσειν.* Theodoret: *οὐχ ἁπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν αὐτὸν κηρύττειν παρεγγυᾷ, ἀλλὰ πάντα καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον πρὸς τοῦτο νομίζειν.* Vulg.: "insta;" Luther: "persist;" so also van Oosterzee; similarly Wiesinger, who, in harmony with *ἐπίμενε αὐτοῖς*, 1 Tim. iv. 16, expounds it: "keep one's attention or activity directed to a thing." But this is not the usual meaning of the verb; it means rather "*stop towards* or *draw near*" (Hofmann is less precise: "approach, appear"), comp. Luke ii. 8, 38, and other passages. The word is defined more precisely by *κήρυξον τὸν λόγον*: draw near with the preaching of the word. Who are the persons to whom Timothy is to draw near, may easily be supplied from the context, viz. to those to whom he has to preach the word. It is incorrect to think only of the whole church (Bretschneider: accede ad coetus christianos, so also de Wette), or only of the individual members (so before in this commentary). Plitt is correct: "draw near (to men), viz. with the word."—*εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως*[1]] Chrysostom: *μὴ καιρὸν ἔχε ὡρισμένον, ἀεὶ σοὶ καιρὸς ἔστω.* The further definition given by Chrysostom: *κἂν ἐν τοῖς κινδύνοις, κἂν ἐν δεσμωτηρίῳ ᾖς κ.τ.λ.*, or by Theodoret: *καὶ ἐν δεσμωτηρίῳ, καὶ πλοίῳ καὶ παρακειμένης τραπέζης*, and others similar by other expositors, are wrong, since we ought to think here not so much of the circumstances in which Timothy (or more generally the preacher of the word) may be, but of the circumstances of the hearers: "whether the time seems to thee seasonable or unseasonable for it" (de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee). Hofmann is wrong: "whether he comes seasonably or not to those whom he approaches with the word;" for there was no need to tell Timothy that the preacher was not bound to inquire into his hearers' opinion and act accordingly. For the truth, the occasion is always seasonable. He who desires to wait until the occasion seem com-

[1] Similar collocations without any particle of union or separation are not found in the N. T., but occur in Greek and Latin classics; see Bengel on this passage. Nicetas Choniates; *παιδαγωγῷ ἐμβριθεῖ ἐοικὼς, εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως. ἐπέπληττεν.* Julian: *ἐπορεύετο ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν φίλων οἰκίας ἄκλητος κεκλημένος.* Virgil: digna indigna pati.

pletely favorable for his work, will never find it. This is particularly true of the exercise of the evangelic office.—Note, finally, Beza's remark: nempe quod ad carnis prudentiam pertinet; nam alioqui requiritur sanctae prudentiae spiritus, captans occasiones ad aedificationem opportunas.—*ἔλεγξον*] should be restricted neither to heresies nor to moral transgressions; it includes blame of everything blameworthy.—*ἐπιτίμησον*] stronger than *ἔλεγξον*: "blame with decided manifestation of dislike;" often in the Gospels, also in Jude 9.—*παρακάλεσον*] Blame and exhortation should be joined in order to cause edification; blame by itself embitters, exhortation by itself is ineffectual.—*ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ*] An appendix to *παρακάλεσον*, or, according to the reading of Tisch. 8, to *ἐπιτίμησον*, with which, however, it seems less appropriate. On *μακροθυμία*, comp. iii. 10.—*διδαχῇ*] The exhortation is to be of a kind that will instruct; the purpose, as Heydenreich aptly remarks, is not to produce momentary emotion and violent tumult of feeling. *Διδαχή* is instruction, and is not equivalent to studium alios vera docendi. It is wrong, too, to make it an hendiadys, as if it were *ἐν πάσῃ διδαχῆς μακροθυμίᾳ*.—Note the connection of this verse with iii. 16. The preacher of the divine word has not to perform the work of teaching, of reproving, etc., without placing himself under the teaching, the reproof, etc., of the divine word.

Vv. 3, 4. Ground of the previous exhortation, *ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς, ὅτε*] [XXXI *c.*] see ii. 16, 17, iii. 1 ff.—The *ἔσται* shows that he is speaking not of the present (Heinrichs), but of the future; comp. iii. 1; 1 Tim. iv. 1.—*τῆς ὑγιαινούσης διδασκαλίας*] see 1 Tim. i. 10.—*οὐκ ἀνέξονται*] [XXXI *d.*] comp. Acts xviii. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 4. De Wette: "find intolerable, because not consistent with their desires."—*ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας*] "according to wilful, selfish lusts;" the accent is on *ἰδίας*—a contrast to obedience under the divine will.—*ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισωρεύσουσι διδασκάλους*] *ἐπισωρεύειν* (ἅπ. λεγ., the simple form in iii. 6), "heap up, procure in abundance." Heydenreich's conjecture is groundless, that the word here has the suggestion of: they will set him up *for a burden* to themselves (Luther: "burden themselves") for their own hurt; on the other hand, Chrysostom is right: *τὸ ἀδιάκριτον πλῆθος διὰ τοῦτο ἐπισωρεύσουσι, ἰδιάζωσι*. We cannot but see that the word here is meant to indicate the contemptible part of their conduct. The *ἐπί* does not compel us to follow Hofmann in his exposition: "in addition to those who represent sound doctrine;" what follows rather shows that they turn away from all such.—The reason is given in the words: *κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν*. *Κνήθω* (ἅπ. λεγ.), tickle, cause to itch; *κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν*, "be tickled in the ear," *i.e.* feel a tickling in the ear (*τὴν ἀκοήν* being the accusative of more precise definition). This tickling is usually taken to mean a pleasant sensation;[1] so Hesychius: *ζητοῦντες τὶ ἀκοῦσαι καθ' ἡδονήν*, and almost all expositors. But this view, before adopted in this commentary, is opposed by the fact that *ζητοῦντες* is purely imported. The present participle cannot mean: "that they *wish* to feel a tickling in the ear, but only that they do feel it." Hofmann is therefore right in

[1] Plutarch (*De Superst.* p. 167): *μονσικὴν ἀνθρώποις οὐ τρυφῆς ἕνεκα καὶ κνήσεως ὠτῶν δοθῆναι.*

explaining this tickling of the ear to mean the desire of hearing something different from what they had heard before; "because they feel a tickling in the ear, they procure for themselves teachers after their own lusts."—Ver. 4. *καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἀλ. κ.τ.λ.*] *τῆς ἀληθείας = τῆς ὑγ. διδασκαλίας.* —*ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς μύθους*] see 1 Tim. i. 4.—*ἐκτραπήσονται*] see 1 Tim. i. 6.

Ver. 5. A general exhortation summing up the particulars already mentioned.—*σὺ δέ*] see iii. 10.—*νῆφε ἐν πᾶσι*] *νήφειν*, synonymous with *γρηγορεῖν*, 1 Thess. v. 6, and *σωφρονεῖν*, 1 Pet. iv. 7, opposite of "be intoxicated;" it denotes the clear prudence in thought and action which it is all the more necessary for Timothy to show, because there is impending what the apostle in vv. 3, 4 has described.—*ἐν πᾶσι*] "in all parts."—*κακοπάθησον*] [XXXI *c.*] see i. 8, ii. 3.—*ἔργον ποίησον εὐαγγελιστοῦ*] According to Eph. iv. 11, there were special evangelists, who were distinct both from the apostles and from the pastors and teachers. Theodoret characterizes them in the well-known words: *περιίοντες ἐκήρυττον.* They did not belong to a particular church like the *ποιμένες*, but traveled about like the apostles, preaching the Gospel to the Jews or heathen. They could lay no claim to authority in their office, since, as Otto rightly remarks,[1] they labored not in consequence of an office committed to them, but by means of a *χάρισμα* imparted to them, as did also the *προφῆται.* It is incorrect to identify them with the assistant apostles. Philip was an evangelist (Acts xxi. 8), but not an assistant apostle. Timothy, Titus, and others were assistant apostles, and as *such*, evangelists only in the same sense in which the apostles themselves were evangelists; standing in closer relation to the apostles, they were their *συνεργοί* in all official duties, and all they did belonged to their *διακονία* (so, too, Plitt).[2] As the *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* was Timothy's chief vocation (as with the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. i. 17), the apostle exhorts him: *ἔργον ποίησον εὐαγγελιστοῦ*, adding the further exhortation: *τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον.* This latter is not to be taken as a mere repetition of the preceding one, or as "only laying emphasis on the same thought by the use of *πληροφόρησον*" (Wiesinger), since, as the whole of the first epistle testifies, his *διακονία* included more than the *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* (which Hofmann wrongly denies[3]).—*πληροφορεῖν*] synonymous here with *πληροῦν*, which is even the reading of some MSS. Luther rightly: "execute;" see Col. iv. 17; Acts xii. 25. Though *πληροφορεῖν* in

[1] Comp. too, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, pp. 272 f.

[2] Wiesinger is wrong in thinking that Timothy's office was only that of an evangelist, and therefore quite the same as Philip had, and that his labors beyond that in Ephesus did not belong to his *διακονία.* It is certain that his labors were done on the special commission of Paul; but it is incorrect to suppose that Paul commissioned him to do anything beyond his office.—Otto's remark on the relation of the evangelists to the assistant apostles agrees in substance with what has been said above, only it might be more than doubtful that their preaching, as he thinks, was confined to an *account of Christ's words and works*, that they were therefore only "heralds of the gospel *history*."—Otto rightly says that the assistant apostles "represented the apostle in the entire range of his work."

[3] Hofmann, without reason, supposes that at the time when Paul wrote this epistle, and even before, Timothy was no longer an assistant to Paul in the apostleship. There is no hint of this anywhere; on the contrary, the contents of the second epistle are decidedly against the supposition.

this sense is ἁτ. λεγ., still it is well employed "to indicate the full measure of activity, in which not the least point may fail" (van Oosterzee). Beza's exposition is too ingenious: ministerii tui plenam fidem facito, i. e. veris argumentis comproba te germanum esse dei ministrum.

Ver. 6. Paul points to his approaching death in order to strengthen his exhortation to Timothy to fulfill his duties faithfully. [XXXI*f.*] As he himself cannot any longer contend against the increasing disorder, Timothy must be all the more careful to prove himself faithful.—*ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι*] *ἐγώ* is emphatic by position, being in contrast with *σύ*, ver. 5.—*ἤδη*] not "soon," but "already:" it denotes present time; his sufferings form already the beginning of the *σπένδεσθαι*.—*σπένδομαι*] Wahl wrongly takes the verb here in the middle voice: sanguinem meum libo, i. e. vires et vitam impendo. But it is impossible thus to supply the object; the verb is passive. It does not, however, stand for *κατασπένδομαι*: "I am besprinkled," *i. e.* I am consecrated for the sacrificial death (Heydenreich and others); the proper meaning is to be retained: "*I am made a libation, poured out as drink-offering*" (de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Hofmann). The meaning is, dropping the figure, already is my blood shed: comp. Phil. ii. 17. De Wette maintains that the form of expression is incorrect without *ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ κ.τ.λ.*; but why, it is difficult to see. Heinrichs wrongly lets the idea of sacrifice drop out of the word, and explains it quite generally as effundere, *i. e.* viribus defici, "my end is already near, it is all over with me." Luther translates it inexactly, but rightly enough in meaning: "I am already offered."—Paul does not use *θύομαι*, but *σπένδομαι*, not because he means to declare that he is *fully and completely* offered for God's cause (Oecumenius: *τῆς μὲν θυσίας μέρος τὶ μόνον Θεῷ εἰς θυμίαμα ἀφιεροῦτο· ἡ δὲ σπονδὴ ἅπασα αὐτῷ ἀφιέρωται*), but because the shedding of blood is analogous to the pouring out of the drink-offering; and as the libation formed the conclusion of the sacrifice, the apostle's martyrdom closed his apostolic service, which to him was the same as a service of sacrifice (Rom. x. 16; Phil. ii. 17).—The idea contained in the figurative expression that his death was near, is again expressed by Paul in the next words: *καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀναλύσεώς μου ἐφέστηκε*] The verb *ἀναλύειν* means "unloose what was tied," so that *ἀνάλυσις* might be equivalent to "unloosing," dissolutio (Vulgate, Matthies); but it is more correct to return to the usage by which in nautical language *ἀναλύειν* with or without *ἄγκυραν* means "weigh anchor, depart," or even of an army, "strike tents, set out on the march." Hence *ἀνάλυσις* is equivalent to "departure, setting out," and ought to be explained as the departure from this life; see Phil. i. 23.[1] Elsner and Wolf think that there is here a special reference to rising from table, and that the word is used in very close connection with *σπένδομαι*: moris olim erat, ut, qui de conviviis discederent, diis libarent; discedentes autem dicebantur *ἀναλύοντες* et libantes (Wolf), and

[1] Otto objects, that in Phil. i. 23 *ἀναλῦσαι* does not of itself mean the departure from the flesh, but only when connected with the co-ordinate *σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι*. But his objection is made still less forcible by the fact that this meaning of the word is clearly indicated, not only by the preceding *σπένδομαι*, but also by vv. 7, 8.

that Paul means to say: so ex hac vita molestiisque exsatiatum abiturum, libato non vino, sed sanguine suo (Elsner). But, on the one hand, the allusion to σπένδομαι is not to heathen, but to Jewish ritual; and, on the other hand, there is no hint of the figure of a feast. Not less arbitrary is Beza's explanation, that ἀναλύσεως refers specially to the departure from battle.—ἐφέστηκε] "is near at hand;" Luther incorrectly: "is ready."

REMARK.—According to the exposition which has been given here, and which, in substance, is generally accepted, this passage decidedly contradicts the hypothesis that Paul wrote this epistle at the beginning of the imprisonment mentioned by Luke. Otto, therefore, to favor this hypothesis, finds himself compelled to give σπένδομαι another signification. This he tries to obtain from a searching consideration of the passage in Phil. ii. 17. He tries to prove that the apostle in that passage could only have used σπένδομαι in the sense of "devotion to his missionary labors." His proof is based on the assertion—apparently to the point, but in reality erroneous—that when the particles εἰ καί are joined together, "the καί resumes the statement made under εἰ the conditional particle, at the same time *marking it as an actual fact.*" This assertion is apparently to the point, since εἰ καί is used often where an *actual* fact is under discussion; and in this way, *e. g.*, the passage at 2 Cor. iv. 16 may be explained: "if our outward man is destroyed, —*and it is actually being destroyed,*—then," etc. But the assertion is erroneous, because εἰ καί is also used in passages where no actual fact is under discussion. This, *e. g.*, is the case in the passage 1 Cor. vii. 21, where, clearly, the explanation cannot be given: "if thou canst become free—*and thou canst indeed become free.*" Otto has quite overlooked the fact that εἰ καί with the indicative cannot be different from the simple εἰ with the indicative, and this does not *declare* the fact to be actual, but only *supposes* it to be actual, whether actual or not; the fact *may* be actual, but it may quite as well not be actual, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 12, 13, where both cases stand close to one another. Hence it is not the case that σπένδεσθαι must denote something which, as the apostle said it of himself, did *actually* take place; it cannot therefore be understood to mean the apostle's martyrdom, because, according to Phil. i. 25, he was expecting to be freed from imprisonment, but must mean simply the cessation of his missionary labors.—As for the evidence by which Otto seeks to obtain this meaning for σπένδεσθαι, it must be held erroneous, since there is no justification whatever for the assertions on which it rests—viz. (1) that by the ἐγώ contained in σπένδομαι (standing here in opposition to σύ) the apostle meant his "apostolic labors;" and (2) that in Acts xxiii. 11, by the word of the Lord "Rome was appointed to the apostle as the goal of his apostolic calling, beyond which he was not to preach the gospel." Though it may be said that "the apostle's *ego* lived and wrought only in one thing, and that, to preach the gospel to the heathen," it by no means follows that when he is speaking of *himself*, he does not mean *himself*, his person, but his apostolic calling. And though, according to Phil. i. 25, 26, the apostle expects to continue his labors after the Roman imprisonment, it is a pure fiction to suppose that these labors were to be episcopal rather than apostolic.[1]—As a result of this interpretation of σπένδομαι, Otto can-

[1] Weiss (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 588) rightly says: "If it be said to the apostle that he is to testify also in Rome, there is not the slightest hint that he is to advance with his preaching *only so far as Rome.*"

not understand *ἀνάλυσις* to mean the departure from this life; it is quite consistent for him, therefore, to say: "*ἀνάλυσις* can only be the discessus, abitus from the place in which Paul then was, this place being the *τέρμα* of his apostolic career." This exposition presupposes an erroneous view of Acts xxiii. 11, and its unsuitability becomes all the clearer when Otto continues: "when the messenger has come to his destination, and executed his commission, he must return to him by whom he was sent; Paul was sent by Christ, to Christ he must return; this is what the apostle says: the time of my return home is near, for I am at the goal, and have discharged my commission." And then Otto still thinks that the apostle might with this cherish the expectation of being able to labor among the Philippians *for a longer period*, since *ἐφέστηκεν* does not mean "is near," but simply "is impending" (!). Finally, there is nowhere the slightest trace that the apostle thought at any time before his death of ceasing to be the apostle of the Lord.

Ver. 7. In the prospect of his approaching end, Paul expresses the consciousness of having been faithful in the career appointed to him, and the hope of the heavenly reward.—There is no ground whatever for de Wette's assertion, that this expression is opposed to Christian humility.—*τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγώνισμαι*] Luther inaccurately: "I have fought a good fight." The definite article must not be overlooked; see 1 Tim. vi. 12. The perfect *ἠγώνισμαι* shows that the apostle now stood at the end of the fight to which he was called as the apostle of the Lord,[1] and that he had fought through it faithfully.—Baur, quite arbitrarily, is of opinion that Phil. i. 30 was here made use of; as little was the passage at Phil. iii. 12 ff. used (de Wette). —*τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα*] The same thought is expressed by the more definite figure of a *race*. The point chiefly brought out is that the apostle, after continuing it without stopping, now stands at the goal. Compare with this passage Acts xx. 24; the same figure is used also in 1 Cor. ix. 24, and is indicated in Phil. iii. 12 ff.—*τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα*] "*I have kept the faith*," viz. against all inducements to deny it. Heydenreich wrongly takes this expression also as a figurative one, and expounds *πίστις* to mean fidelity in observing the laws of battle and rules of the race; comp. against this, 1 Tim. vi. 12.—*τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως*] Bengel: res bis per metaphoram expressa nunc tertio loco exprimitur proprie.

Ver. 8. Λοιπόν] Wahl interprets it by *ἤδη* (jam, already), but this meaning is very doubtful. Other expositors take it to be equivalent to *τὸ λοιπόν*: "for the future;" Heydenreich: "one day, after course and fight are finished." But the present *ἀπόκειται* is against this; it cannot be "future in sense" (Hofmann), for the signification of the word forbids it. Beza's interpretation suits the context best: "in reliquum;" and with this de Wette and Wiesinger agree. At the end of his life-course, when he has faithfully played out his part, there remains nothing more for the apostle—than to receive the reward which is already prepared for him.—*ἀπόκειταί μοι*] comp. Col. i. 5 (see my Commentary, p. 57).—*ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης*

[1] Hofmann wrongly maintains that the apostle is not speaking here of his labors in the calling of an apostle, but generally of his Christian calling. The context clearly points to the former.

στεφανος] Continuation of the figure from ver. 7.—*ὁ στέφανος* is used for the prize of victory in 1 Cor. ix. 25. The genitive *τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, like *τῆς ζωῆς* in Jas. i. 12, Rev. ii. 10, and *τῆς δόξης* in 1 Pet. v. 4, may be taken most naturally as the genitivus appositionis, and *δικαιοσύνη* as the perfect state, granted at the judgment to the believer by the sentence that justifies him (so, too, van Oosterzee). *Δικαιοσύνη* does not denote the act of justifying so much as the state of justification. [XXXI *g*.]—Two other interpretations are found in Heinrichs: *στεφ. δικαιοσ., i. e.* corona, vel quae *δικαίως* dabitur ei, qui ea dignus est, a *δικαιῳ κριτῇ* ("the crown of just recompense," Heydenreich, Matthies, and others; but *δικαιοσύνη* never means recompense), vel quae mihi ob *δικαιοσύνην* debetur. This last interpretation is found in Chrysostom: *δικαιοσύνην ἐνταῦθα τὴν καθόλου φησὶν ἀρετήν*; also in de Wette, Wiesinger, Plitt. It is indeed possible, but improbable, because in that case we would not be told of what the crown of victory consists. Besides, the analogy of the passages quoted is against this interpretation.[1]—It is manifestly quite out of place to understand *δικαιοσύνη* here, as Calovius and Mosheim do, of the imputed righteousness of Christ.—*ὃν ἀποδώσει* (often used to denote the divine recompense on the day of judgment, Matt. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 6) *μοι ὁ κύριος* (*i. e.* Christ) *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ὁ δίκαιος κριτής* (see ver. 1), in apposition to *ὁ κύριος*. There is nothing strange in laying stress on the *righteousness* of the judge, since that forms the main element in the divine judgment. God's *χάρις* does not take away His *δικαιοσύνη*, and the gospel does not deny, but confirms, the truth that for the believer the judgment will take place *κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, or *κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ*. To this truth Paul often directs attention, not only for exhortation, but also for comfort; see 2 Thess. i. 5.[2]—While Paul expresses for himself the hope of the reward of victory, he knows that he is not claiming something special for himself alone. Hence he adds: *οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐμοί* (*sc. ἀποδώσει κ.τ.λ.*), *ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἠγαπηκόσι*] the perfect in the sense of the present: "who have fixed their love on," *i. e.* "who love" (comp. Winer, p. 256 [E. T. p. 273]). But if we proceed from the standpoint of *ἀποδώσει*, the perfect may also be understood to mean: "to those who in this mortal life have longed for the appearing of the Lord" (Hofmann).—*τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ*] is not to be understood of the first appearance of the Lord in the flesh, i. 10, but, according to the context, and in harmony with ver. 1, of

[1] Hofmann disputes the interpretation given above, because "Life, glory is a blessing, whereas righteousness is a condition which is rewarded;" but righteousness, taken as it is taken here, is a blessing. On the other hand, Hofmann disputes Wiesinger's interpretation, at the same time giving one of his own which is far from clear: "he who obtains the *στέφανος* adjudged to him, is thereby acknowledged to be a righteous man."

[2] De Wette is wrong in his assertion, that this passage is incompatible with Paul's view of grace, and that from a subjective standpoint God's righteousness can only be feared if we are rightly humble and have knowledge of self. If it is not denied that in the Pauline passages, Rom. ii. 5 ff., 2 Thess. i. 5, a reward is expected from God's righteousness, we cannot see why Paul could not possibly have claimed it for himself. Was the consciousness of his fidelity in the service of the Lord, which, moreover, he expresses elsewhere, altogether incompatible with his utterance of humility in Phil. iii. 12?—The contrast of objective and subjective point of view—to which contrast de Wette makes appeal—does not exist for the Christian consciousness.

the second coming. The verb *ἠγαπηκόσι* is not opposed to this, for it is used elsewhere to denote the desire for something future; see 1 Pet. iii. 10. Matthies: "to all who in love for Him wait longingly for His second coming."

Ver. 9. [On Vv. 9–22, see Note XXXII., pages 277, 278.] From this verse to the end we have detached commissions and items of news. "This forms the second chief section of the epistle. The apostle, with his usual habit of keeping the more personal matter for the end, places it after the exhortations given to Timothy about his office" (Wiesinger).—*σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με ταχέως*] [XXXII *a*.] Here the apostle's wish that Timothy should come to him, hinted already in i. 3, 8, is distinctly expressed. Even if it were the proximate cause of his writing, it is arbitrary to regard this as the chief purpose of the epistle, as de Wette does.[1]—The apostle wished him to come, because those who had assisted him hitherto had left him.

Ver. 10. *Δημᾶς γάρ με ἐγκατέλιπεν*] [XXXII *b*.] *ἐγκαταλείπειν* is equivalent to "leave in the lurch." It is wrong to interpret this either of a departure from the place merely, or of an entire apostasy from the gospel. Demas is mentioned also in Col. iv. 14 and Philem. 24 as a *συνεργός* of the apostle.—*ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα*] The reason why Demas had left him; *ἀγαπήσας*, not "having fixed his love on" (Matthies), but "because he loved."—*τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα*] the present world, as opposed to the future, *i. e.* the earthly, visible blessings of life. In the desire for these things, Demas had left the apostle and gone to Thessalonica, *καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην*, perhaps "for the sake of trade," as some conjecture, or because it was his native place.[2]—*Κρήσκης εἰς Γαλατίαν*, *sc. ἐπορεύθη*; but without *ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα*. Crescens is mentioned only here. Nothing further is known of him, nor do we know why he had set out for Galatia, and Titus for Dalmatia. The verb *ἐπορεύθη* is against the suggestion of Matthies, that they had been sent thither by Paul.[3]

Ver. 11. *Λουκᾶς ἐστὶ μόνος μετ' ἐμοῦ*] There is no reason for doubting that this Luke was the apostle's well-known assistant. He accompanied Paul on his second missionary journey from Troas, Acts xvi. 10, then on his third journey, Acts xx. 5–xxi. 18. He was with Paul both in his imprisonment at Caesarea and in the first imprisonment at Rome, Acts xxvii.; Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24.—*Μάρκον ἀναλαβὼν ἄγαγε* (or common reading: *ἄγε*) *μετὰ σεαυτοῦ*] Mark, too, is the young apostle with whom we are acquainted from the Book of Acts. According to Col. iv. 10, Philem. 13, he was likewise with Paul in his first Roman imprisonment; *ἀναλαβών*, see Acts xx. 14. It is not known where Mark was at this time. The reason why Paul wished to have him is given in the words: *ἔστι γάρ μοι*

[1] Hofmann's remark is purely hypothetical, that *σπούδασον κ.τ.λ.* is not an invitation, but refers to Timothy's willingness to come, which he had expressed to Paul in a letter.

[2] Chrysostom: *τῆς ἀνέσεως ἐρασθείς, τοῦ ἀκινδύνου καὶ τοῦ ἀσφαλοῦς, μᾶλλον εἵλετο οἴκοι τρυφᾶν, ἢ μετ' ἐμοῦ ταλαιπωρεῖσθαι καὶ συνδιαφέρειν μοι τοὺς παρόντας κινδύνους.*

[3] Hofmann, taking *Γαλίαν* to be the original reading, supposes that Crescens and Titus had left the apostle in order to work for the gospel in places to which Paul himself had not come.

εὔχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν] *εὔχρηστος*, ii. 21. *Διακονία* here is to be understood of the apostolic office[1] (according to Wiesinger: "of Mark's personal services, but certainly in the apostle's vocation").

Ver. 12. *Τύχικον δὲ ἀπέστειλα εἰς Ἔφεσον*] Tychicus was in Greece with Paul on the third missionary journey, and preceded him to Troas, Acts xx. 4, 5. According to Col. iv. 7 and Eph. vi. 21, Paul sent him from Rome to Asia Minor. Otto thinks that this was the occasion mentioned here, and tries to prove it particularly by an interpretation of the passages quoted from the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians. There are, however, well-founded objections to his theory. The facts are such, the two occasions on which he was sent can obviously not be identical.—*εἰς Ἔφεσον*] Paul here mentions Ephesus as the place to which he had sent Tychicus; but we cannot infer from this, as Theodoret and de Wette infer, that Timothy had not at that time lived in Ephesus.—The reason why he was sent is not given. Possibly it was to convey this epistle (Wieseler), but not probably, for in such a case Paul would have certainly written *πρὸς σέ* (Tit. iii. 12; Wiesinger).

Ver. 13. Timothy is commissioned to bring with him certain belongings. The first named is *τὸν φελόνην*. On the various spellings of this word, see the Greek lexicons. Regarding the meaning, Chrysostom said: *φελόνην ἐνταῦθα τὸ ἱμάτιον λέγει· τινὲς δέ φασι τὸ γλωσσόκομον, ἐνθα τὰ βιβλία ἐκειτο*; and the most recent expositors are still at variance. Matthies takes it in the second meaning: "*cloak-bag*, covering for books," because it is improbable that Paul should have left his *traveling cloak* behind him. De Wette adopts the first meaning, for the reason given by Bengel: theca non seorsum a libris appellaretur. This is the more probable view; there is little force in the objection, that we cannot see what use Paul would have for the mantle when he was expecting death so soon.—*ὃν ἀπέλιπον ἐν Τρωάδι παρὰ Κάρπῳ*] From this it is clear that Paul had been in Troas before he came to Rome, but the time is not stated. In any case, it is very improbable (see Introd. p. 25) that this sojourn was the one mentioned in Acts xx. 6. He did not, however, touch at Troas on his voyage from Caesarea to Rome.—Carpus is mentioned only here.—*καὶ τὰ βιβλία, μάλιστα τὰς μεμβράνας*] Since Paul says nothing further about them, it is idle conjecture to define more precisely the contents of the books written on papyrus, and of the more valuable rolls of parchment.

Vv. 14, 15. Warning against a certain Alexander. *Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ χαλκεύς*] see on 1 Tim. i. 20.—*πολλά μοι κακὰ ἐνεδείξατο*] The words point to a personal injury which he had inflicted on the apostle. This must, however, be added to an attitude of opposition to his words, as is shown in the words: *λίαν γὰρ ἀντέστη τοῖς ἡμετέροις λόγοις*] It is doubtful where this was

[1] What Otto (pp. 257 ff.) on this passage adduces regarding the relation of Mark to Paul are groundless suppositions. It is a purely arbitrary assumption that Mark, after abstaining for some time from work among the heathen, had again offered his services to Paul through Timothy. And it is equally an assumption to say, that from the words *εὔχρηστος κ.τ.λ.* it would appear that Mark could not have hitherto given Paul his services, because in that case Paul would not have "censured him regarding his usefulness for the ministry" (!).

done, and where Alexander was at the time of the composition of this epistle. Further, the warning: *ὃν καὶ σὺ φυλάσσου*, may refer both "to Timothy's presence in Ephesus and to his future stay in Rome" (de Wette). Wiesinger conjectures that this Alexander, a native of Ephesus, had come from there to Rome to give testimony against the apostle (at his *πρώτῃ ἀπολογίᾳ*, ver. 16), and had afterwards returned to Ephesus. This conjecture obtains some probability from the fact that in the very next verse Paul speaks of the *ἀπολογία*; but this fact cannot be regarded as making the matter certain. The words preceding this warning, if we read *ἀποδώσει αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, present no difficulty. [XXXII *c.*] Even with the reading *ἀποδώῃ* they cannot form a reason for reproaching the apostle with a desire for vengeance; Christian love does not extinguish the feeling of justice; besides, the apostle does not speak the words because of the personal injury, but because of Alexander's hostility to the truth.[2]

Vv. 16, 17. Information regarding the apostle's present condition, *ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μου ἀπολογίᾳ*] *ἀπολογία*: the public appearance before the court; comp. Phil. i. 7. Ἐν *τῇ πρώτῃ* shows that there was a second appearance in order to bring the case to an end. On the time when the first trial took place, see the Introduction, where, too, there is a discussion of Otto's hypothesis, that it means the proceedings before Festus, as recounted in Acts xxv. 6–12.—*οἰδείς μοι παρεγένετο*] "no one stood on my side, was present with me," viz. as *patronus*[3] (defender). It is the negative expression of the thought which in the next words is given positively: *ἀλλὰ πάντες με ἐγκατέλιπον*. [XXXII *d.*] As to the reason why they had left the apostle, Theodoret says rightly: *οὐ κακοηθείας ἦν, ἀλλὰ δειλίας ἡ ὑποχώρησις*. [XXXII *e.*]—However much this want of evangelic spirit may have pained the apostle, he says no word in anger: *μὴ αὐτοῖς λογισθείη*: "may it not be reckoned to them, but pardoned."—Ver. 17. *ὁ δὲ κύριός μοι παρέστη*] said in sharp antithesis to the previous thought. The presence of the Lord manifested itself to the apostle in the courage which he had to testify freely and openly regarding Him; hence *καὶ ἐνεδυνάμωσέ με*] Chrysostom: *παῤῥησίαν ἐχαρίσατο*; comp. 1 Tim. i. 12; Phil. iv. 13. According to Otto, this expression means simply that the Lord "maintained the apostle's cause against his accusers," which is clearly an unjustifiable paraphrase of the word, as the apostle is speaking not of *his cause*, but of *himself*. Even if *ἐνεδυνάμωσε* be used in a forensic sense, its signification cannot be altered; it applies to the strengthening which enabled the

[1] Hofmann supposes that this Alexander was the same as the one mentioned in Acts xix., and that he had given testimony against the apostle in Ephesus. The opinion is manifestly too far-fetched, that Luke would not have mentioned him in the Acts, if the Roman Theophilus, for whom in the first place he wrote the Acts, "had not known Alexander from some other source, in the manner in which we make acquaintance with him in the passage before us."

[2] Justin (*quaest.* 125, *ad Orthod.*) says of these words: *πρέπουσα ἀνδρὶ ἀποστόλῳ μὴ ἐκδικοῦντι ἑαυτὸν, ἀλλὰ διδόντι τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ*; comp. Rom. xii. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 23.

[3] Wolf: verb. *συμπαραγίνεσθαι* indicat patronos et amicos, qui alios, ad causam dicendam vocatos, nunc praesentia sua, nunc etiam oratione adjuvare solebant. Graeci dicunt nunc *παραγίνεσθαι*, nunc *παρεῖναι*, nunc *συμπαρεῖναι*.—See further, in Rein, *Röm. Privatrecht*, p. 425; Schömann, *Attisch. Recht. p.* 708.

apostle so to speak as to ward off sentence against him. The purpose of this strengthening was: *ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα πληροφορηθῇ*] According to the meaning suitable to the word *πληροφορεῖν* in Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5, Beza translates: "ut per me praeconio evangelii fides fieret." Heydenreich, too, thinks that *πληροφ.* refers to the confirmation of the gospel or testimony to it, either through the proofs delivered by Paul or through the joy he exhibited. But it is safer to take *πληροφ.* in the same sense here as in ver. 5, some of the MSS. even reading *πληρωθῇ* for *πληροφορηθῇ*. It is, however, inaccurate to take the expression in the sense of: "that I might be enabled to preach the gospel" (de Wette). In this interpretation full force is not given to *πληροφορεῖν*. These words must be taken in very close connection with *καὶ ἀκούσῃ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, and referred to the apostle's being called to preach the gospel to the heathen. The *κήρυγμα*, *sc.* *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, was *fulfilled* by Paul, inasmuch as it was done openly before all people (Wieseler, Wiesinger) in the metropolis of the world (was delivered before the corona populi, before the court). Hofmann, regarding this interpretation of the apostle's words as forced, understands *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.* in this way: "If courage and strength had failed the apostle before the heathen tribunal of the metropolis of the world . . . his confident belief that the heathen world was called to become the church of Christ would have been shattered." But the words *δι' ἐμοῦ . . . πληροφορηθῇ* distinctly say that the preaching had been carried out by the apostle himself, and not simply that the preaching to be done by others would not be hindered by him, *i. e.* by his conduct.—The *ἵνα* was fulfilled by the apostle's speech in the *πρώτη ἀπολογία*. Otto, on the contrary, asserts that the first *ἀπολογία* and the preaching in Rome took place at different times, and that *ἵνα* refers to what was to be done afterwards in Rome by the apostle. This is wrong, since in that case *ἵνα* ought not to stand *before*, but *after* *ἐῤῥύσθην*.—*καὶ ἐῤῥύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος*] second proof of the help and presence of the Lord.—*στόμα λέοντος* has been very variously explained. The expression is not to be taken literally (Mosheim), but figuratively, and is to be referred to the punishment of being thrown to the lions.—Chrysostom and many after him take Nero to be the *λέων*; Pearson again takes Helius Caesareanus, since Nero at the time had departed for Greece. Wahl thinks *λέων* a metaphor for tyrannus crudelis, while Wolf explains it to be omnis illa hostium caterva, quorum conatus in prima apologia tunc facta eluserit.[1] All these interpretations are inappropriate. In the first place, the metaphor is not in *λέων* alone, but in *στόμα λέοντος* (so, too, van Oosterzee, Hofmann); and, secondly, this expression can hardly be referred simply to the danger that threatened the apostle from men, but also to the danger prepared for him by the might of Satan, which was opposed to Christ. Hence the interpretation "*deadly danger*" (so de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee) is not sufficient.[2] Paul escaped from

[1] Otto adopts an explanation to suit his opinion that this *ἀπολογία* took place in Caesarea before Festus: "Judaism was the lion that panted for the apostle's blood," and from it the apostle was delivered when he appealed to the emperor, and Festus received the appeal.

[2] Hofmann: "His danger was a greater one,

the danger impending over him, unhurt in body and soul (see on iii. 11), escaped as a conqueror in the eyes of the Lord, and hence he says: *ἐρρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος.*

Ver. 18. In the assured confidence of faith, the apostle adds to *ἐρρύσθην* the word of hope: *ῥύσεταί με ὁ κύριος ἀπὸ πάντος ἔργου πονηροῦ*, for he knows that the Lord—even if it be through death (ver. 6)—will bring him into His kingdom. [XXXII *f.*]. *ἔργον πονηρόν* is not equivalent to evil, as Luther translates it and Matthies explains it: from every evil circumstance." Taken in this sense, the thought would be quite irreconcilable with the apostle's conviction in ver. 6. Besides, in the N. T. *πονηρόν* never refers to merely external affliction; it denotes rather what is morally evil. Still it cannot here mean the evil work which the apostle might do (Chrysostom: *πᾶν ἁμάρτημα*; Grotius: liberabit me, ne quid agam Christiano, ne quid Apostolo indignum; de Wette: "from all evil work which I might do through want of stedfastness, through apostasy, and the like;" so, too, Beza, Heydenreich, and others). It must be interpreted of the wicked works of the enemies of the divine word; only with this view is the verb *ῥύσεται* appropriate, especially when combined with *σώσει* (Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Hofmann). The apostle was still exposed to the attacks of the evil one, but he expresses the hope that the Lord would save him from them, so that they would do him no harm. Not, indeed, that he would not suffer the martyrdom he expected, but that through this he would come into the heavenly kingdom of the Lord, where there was prepared for him *στέφανος τῆς δικαιοσύνης* (ver. 8).—*καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον*] *σώσει εἰς* is a pregnant construction: he will save me and bring me into = *σώσων ἄξει με εἰς* (Heydenreich).—The expression *ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐπουράνιος* does not occur elsewhere in the N. T.; but the idea is thoroughly apostolic and Pauline. For though Paul often calls Christ's kingdom a future one, Christ is also present to him as *βασιλεὺς ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*, whose *βασιλεία*, therefore, is also a present one.[1] The context points to this meaning here. In Phil. i. 23, Paul expresses the longing to come to Christ *through death*; here he expresses the hope that the Lord would remove him into His kingdom *ἐκ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ*.—As a suitable and natural utterance of awakened feeling, there follows a doxology which in this place cannot surprise us, though commonly his doxologies refer to God and not to Christ specially.[2]

Ver. 19. Paul sends greetings to Prisca and Aquila.—Paul had become acquainted with them in Corinth (Acts xviii. 2), from which they accompanied him to Syria (ver. 18). When Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans they were in Rome (Rom. xvi. 13), but they were in Corinth at the time of his writing the First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 19).—*καὶ τὸν Ὀνησιφόρου οἶκον*, see on i. 16.

to lose . . . before the tribunal his courage in confessing Christ. That he had escaped it, he owes thanks to God's help."

[1] There is nothing to indicate that the apostle is here alluding to the heavenly kingdom of the Lord, "in contrast with the *earthly dominion of the present*" (Hofmann).

[2] In Rom. xvi. 27, ix. 5, Heb. xiii. 21, the reference is at the very least doubtful.

Ver. 20. Ἔραστος ἔμεινεν ἐν Κορίνθῳ] While on his third journey, the apostle sent forward a certain Erastus from Ephesus to Macedonia along with Timothy (Acts xix. 22). It can hardly be doubted that it is the same man who is mentioned here. It is more uncertain if the one alluded to in Rom. xvi. 23 is also the same (as Otto thinks); still it does favor the identity that the latter dwelt in *Corinth* as ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως, and that the Erastus here mentioned remained in *Corinth*. Meyer, however (see on Rom. xvi. 23), and Wiesinger think it improbable. Hofmann holds that the Erastus mentioned in Acts xix. 22, and the city chamberlain in Rom. xvi. 23, are two different men, and that the one mentioned here is identical with the latter.—ἔμεινε] *i. e.* "he remained in Corinth, viz. when I left it;" the tense favors this view. Paul notices the fact because he thought that Timothy believed that Erastus had left Corinth with the apostle. Hug explains it: "Erastus, whom I expected in Rome, remained behind in Corinth;" but this would suit better with the perfect. Besides, there is nothing to indicate such an expectation.—Τρόφιμον δὲ ἀπέλιπον ἐν Μιλήτῳ ἀσθενοῦντα] Trophimus, an Asiatic, accompanied Paul on his third journey, and went before him from Greece to Troas (Acts xx. 4). His presence in Jerusalem was the occasion of the tumult against Paul (Acts xxi. 29).—From this passage it would appear that Trophimus had wished to accompany the apostle on his journey, but had been left behind at Miletus sick. The apostle cannot have been in Miletus with Trophimus before the first imprisonment in Rome; hence the expositors who deny that Paul was twice imprisoned in Rome, and admit the genuineness of the epistle, are driven to great straits in interpreting this passage. Thus Hug, Hemsen, and Kling hold ἀπέλιπον to be the third person plural. Wieseler does not give the proper force to ἀπέλιπον, which—as de Wette rightly remarks—presupposes that they had been previously together in Miletus. Regarding the views of Wieseler and Otto, comp. Introduction, § 3, pp. 17 ff. It is altogether arbitrary to read ἐν Μελίτῃ, or to suppose that Miletus in Crete is meant.—The reason for speaking about Erastus and Trophimus appears in ver. 21; comp. vv. 9, 10. He did not mention them in ver. 10, because "there he was speaking only of those who had already been with him in Rome and had left him" (Wiesinger). Hofmann thinks that Paul mentions them in reply to a question from Timothy regarding the two who might serve as witnesses for his defence; but this is mere conjecture, for which no good grounds can be given.[1]

Ver. 21. Σπούδασον πρὸ χειμῶνος ἐλθεῖν] see ver. 9, ταχέως. Even if πρὸ χειμῶνος is to be connected with ταχέως, it does not follow that the epistle was written just before winter; comp. Introd. § 3. Χειμών *may* indeed mean the "*winter-storm*" (Wieseler), but it is more natural here to understand it of the season of the year (Wiesinger). Timothy is to come to the

[1] Hofmann regards them as suitable witnesses for the defence, assuming that the charge against the apostle rested on this, that his preaching of the gospel was contrary to the constitution of the state. Erastus was present in Corinth on the occasion mentioned in Acts xviii. 12, and Trophimus when Paul was made a prisoner at Jerusalem. Both might therefore testify that Paul was not to blame for these tumults.

apostle before winter, that the winter might not prevent him from coming soon.—Finally, Paul sent greetings from Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia, who are mentioned only here and from all the Christians in Rome. These are named specially, not as the apostle's *σύνεργοι*, but probably because they were personally acquainted with Timothy. Linus is probably the one whom the Fathers name as the first bishop of Rome.

Ver. 22. Benediction. This is peculiar in its nature. Only at the end of the First Epistle to the Corinthians do we find, as here, a double benediction, and there it runs differently. For *ὁ κύριος . . .* and *ἡ χάρις . . .* the form elsewhere is always *ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου.—μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου*] comp. Gal. vi. 18; Philem. 25.—*ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν*] comp. 1 Tim. vi. 22.

Notes by American Editor.

XXXI. Vv. 1-8.

(*a*) The view of Huther with respect to *διαμαρτύρομαι κ.τ.λ.* seems to be the correct one—namely, that *καί* before *ἐπιφάνειαν* means *both*, and that the true rendering is, I adjure thee in the sight of God and of Christ Jesus, both by His appearance and His kingdom. There is no satisfactory ground of objection to this view, and it avoids the difficulty of joining the simple accusative after a verb of swearing in a parallelism with the *ἐνώπιον* construction. The allusion to the appearance and kingdom, as well as to the dead and living—that is, those who at the time of the judgment (the Parousia) shall have already died and those who shall then be still alive—is an indication (additional to the others already noticed in the two Epp. to Timothy) of the impressiveness of the thought of the Parousia to the Apostle's mind. It had an emphasis, and living power, to his apprehension such as to Christians in our own day it does not have, and such as *may,—not improbably, to say the least,*—find its explanation in the thought that it was near. The "kingdom," cannot here have the same sense, precisely as in 1 Cor. xv. 24 ff., but must refer to that consummated and victorious state of things which is introduced by the Parousia.—(*b*) The explanation given of *ἐπίστηθι* by Huther, with whom de Wette, Holtzmann and some others substantially agree, has in its favor the more common meaning of the verb. It does not seem perfectly clear that it has the precise sense *be instant*, in a sentence of this character. Yet the supply of a dative from the preceding verb *κήρυξον* is not difficult, and, with such a supply there can be little doubt that the verb may mean *give attention to, fix the mind upon, be attentive to.* On the other hand the use of the mere verb *draw near*, as equivalent to *draw near to men with the word*, in such a series of exhortations as we find here, must be regarded as in a high degree improbable. The question is one which cannot be decided confidently in favor of either meaning as against the other, but the objection to the rendering *be instant* of R. V., A. V., (so in substance, if not exactly, many commentators including Ell., Alf., van Oost., Fairb., Plumptre and others), is, on the whole, less serious than that which lies against Huther's rendering.—Plumptre explains *εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως* as meaning "with or without what seems to men a special opportunity." Not improbably, however, there is a somewhat stronger force in the latter word, such that it means "even when men think it unseasonable." That the action of the preacher, in this matter, is not to be carried beyond due limits is indicated by the reasonableness which directs in the

application of all Christian rules of such a character, and is even suggested by Matt. vii. 6—(*c*) The future referred to in *ἐσται καιρός* (ver. 3), in connection with similar passages already noticed, is best explained as the time of development of error previous to the Parousia, which, in its beginnings and foreshadowings, gave signs of its coming even at the date of the latter. It is evident, in all these passages, that Paul describes the future errors in terms corresponding very nearly to those in which he sets forth the false doctrines of the present. His conception seems to be only that of a further and natural growth in the same line. Timothy is to be faithful and earnest in his work, in order that the growth may be arrested, or its injurious consequences may be averted, as far as possible. And this is especially urged upon him, because the Apostle now feels that his own time for working draws near to its end.—(*d*) The subject of *ἀνέξονται* is probably *persons in the church*, as it is of such persons that the writer speaks in the several passages where the healthful teaching and its opposite are alluded to. The errors are those of professed Christians, which, starting from a Jewish origin, developed under the influence of Greek or Oriental thought intermingling with Judaistic ideas. The use of the article with *μύθους* in ver. 4 can hardly be satisfactorily accounted for, except as some connection is given to these fables with those mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 4 and elsewhere.—(*e*) The repetition of the word *κακοπάθησον* (ver. 5) in this new exhortation to Timothy to fulfill the duties of his ministry, in contrast to a yielding to errors or the erroneous teachers, shows how important an element in the life before him the Apostle thought such hardship and suffering would be, and how essential the stedfast enduring of such evil, in the times then present and to come, was to his apprehension. The word *evangelist*, as here used, refers to Timothy's work as a preacher going about from place to place in his missionary labors. In a similar sense, all Paul's assistants, and even Paul himself, though an Apostle, had been evangelists from the beginning. *πληροφόρησον* (ver. 5) has the sense of *fulfill*, rather than *make full proof of* (*omnem in partem ministerio satisfacio*, Grimm, Lex. N. T.). Alf. says, "fill up in every point, leaving nothing undone in."—(*f*) The contrast between the Apostle's expression in Phil. ii. 17 and that in ver. 6 of this chapter is noticeable. There, he merely supposes the case, *εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι*, saying that he will rejoice if the result of his trial should even prove to be death, but adding, immediately afterwards, his strong hope in the Lord that it will not be so. Here, on the other hand, he realizes the certainty of the future, and speaks of himself as if already dying or being offered. His work is done, and the reward will be given at the day of the appearing. The cause is to be committed to his younger associates, who should keep the commandment and fulfill the ministry until that appearing (1 Tim. i. 14). The word *ἀνάλυσις*, which is here used in the clause following *σπένδομαι*, is also found, in the verbal form, in Phil. i. 23. It is interesting to observe, in connection with this word, that while the Apostle, at the time when there was an uncertainty as to his fate, and a possibility, yet only a possibility, that he might be put to death, declares that he has a desire to depart, and that it is far better. He now declares, when the certainty has come, his satisfaction in review of the past, and his undoubting confidence for the future.—(*g*) *δικαιοσύνης* of ver. 8 is best taken, as Huther takes it, as gen. of apposition. So also Holtzm., and others. Ell., Plumptre, and others, prefer to make it a sort of gen. possess. Ell. places at the foundation an objective notion, "the crown for which (so to speak) *δικ.* has a claim," but says it is "in fact a sort of proleptic gen. possess." Alf., with something of the same

objective idea perhaps, says "the bestowal of which is conditional on the substantiation and recognition of righteousness." *δικαιοσύνη* has here, apparently (as gen. appos.), the ordinary, not the peculiar Pauline (forensic) sense. (So Grimm, de W., and others.)

XXXII. Vv. 9–22.

(*a*) The request made in ver. 9 connects itself, in some sense, with what is said in vv. 6–8—thus *ταχέως* may be partly, or possibly wholly, accounted for. But the main connection is with ver. 10. The thought turns here, at the close of the epistle, to more personal matters, as was natural in view of the Apostle's own condition and his friendly relations with Timothy. The verb *σπουδάζειν* carries with it the idea of earnest endeavor, as well as of haste (*σπείδειν*). Timothy is thus urged to make every effort to hasten his departure from Ephesus, and his arrival at Rome. In ver. 21, the limit of time is more definitely indicated, *before winter*. As the winter season would begin as early as November, and about three or four months must be allowed for the passing of the letter from Rome to Ephesus, for Timothy's necessary preparations, and for the journey from Ephesus to Rome, the date of the Epistle must be placed as early in the year as June or July. Vv. 6–8, therefore, cannot be understood as meaning that the Apostle regarded his death as certainly to take place in the most immediate future. He must have thought that his life might be spared for a few months, but he evidently looked for the end—as he did not in Phil. i. ii.—as a thing to be confidently anticipated, and that at an early time.—(*b*) Of the persons here mentioned, Demas, Luke, Mark and Tychicus are alluded to in Col., and the first three of them in Philem. The desertion of Demas had evidently occurred since the date of those letters, and apparently after the arrival of Paul in Rome, on his second visit to that city. Whether Demas had abandoned the Christian faith is not distinctly stated. It is stated, however, that he had forsaken the Apostle (*left him in the lurch*, Huther) because he loved the present *αἰών*. An unchristian motive for his action is, therefore, affirmed.—(*c*) The true reading in ver. 14, as proved by the weight of manuscript evidence, is *ἀποδώσει*. The statement is, accordingly, that the Lord *will reward* him according to his works, and all questions as to the propriety or probability of an expression of a desire on Paul's part that he *should be thus rewarded* are set aside by the fact that no such desire is expressed.—(*d*) The use of the word *ἐγκατέλειπον* in ver. 16 favors the view that the same word in ver. 10 does not imply an absolute defection from the faith. The argument from this verse is not decisive, however, for the word may be modified as to its force, in each case, by the sentence in which it stands. In the present case, Paul prays that their abandoning him may not be laid by God to the charge of the persons alluded to. The language is milder than that used respecting Alexander, even if the reading *ἀποδώσει* be the right one in the verse which refers to him, and certainly so, if *ἀποδώῃ* is there the correct text.—(*e*) The "first defence," which is mentioned in ver. 16, is supposed by some of the best recent commentators who think that Paul was twice in Rome, to have been connected with a *first hearing* or *trial* within the time of the *second imprisonment*. This view is favored by the fact that, during the period of the first imprisonment, Timothy had been with Paul in Rome previous to the date of the Ep. to the Philippians, and would scarcely need information as to what happened at or near that date. The general indications of that Epistle would seem, also, to suggest such a condition of things, and such prospects as to

the issue of the trial, as to make it unlikely that all his friends would desert him at that time. If the reference is, thus, to the time of the second imprisonment, the *ἵνα* clause of ver. 17 must refer to his defence, and not to subsequent missionary labors, and this is indicated, also, by the insertion of this clause between the *ἐνεδυνάμωσε* and the *ἐρρύσθην* clause, both of which relate to the defence or trial. The *lion* is probably to be understood as meaning either the devil, as the power that brought the danger upon him and thereby a temptation to sin, or Nero, as the one before whose tribunal he stood. The expression may, however, simply denote "deadly danger"—a figurative way of setting forth this idea. This seems less probable. Ver. 18 may, perhaps, be regarded as favoring the reference of *λέοντος* to Satan. Evidently we must conclude from vv. 6–8, that the Apostle does not mean by ver. 18 deliverance from imprisonment or death.—(*f*) That *ὁ κύριος* of ver. 18 refers to Christ is made clear by the words *τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ*, and, if so, the verse contains a doxology to Christ.

Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἡ πρὸς Τίτον ἐπιστολή.

In A, *al.* the inscription begins with *ἀρχεται*; in D E F G it runs simply *πρὸς Τίτον.*

CHAPTER I.

VER. 1. For *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Buttm. and Tisch. 7, following A, *al.*, adopted *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*; but the majority of the most important MSS. (D** E F G H J K L ℵ) support the *Rec.* (Lachm. Tisch. 8).—Ver. 4. *χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη*] So Scholz, Tisch., following C* D E F G J ℵ 73, *al.*, Syr. Copt. Chrys. Aug. *al.*—Lachm. and Buttm. retained the usual reading: *χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη*; it is found in A C** K L, etc., but seems nevertheless to be a correction from the analogy of 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2.—Tittmann's reading: *χάρις, ἔλεος, καὶ εἰρήνη*, is quite arbitrary.—Matthaie: *ἔλεος* nullus meorum omittit, nec ex quinque iis, quos postea consului. Reiche decided for the reading of Tisch.—*καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*] For this Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. read *καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, on the authority of A C D* *al.*, Vulg. Copt. Arm. Theodoret, etc.—Ver. 5. So far as internal evidence goes, we cannot decide whether the *Rec.* *κατέλιπον* or the reading *ἀπέλιπον* (Lachm. Tisch.) is the original one; both may be corrections, the latter on the analogy of 2 Tim. iv. 20, the former on the analogy of Acts xviii. 19, xxiv. 27. Hofmann prefers *καταλείπειν*, because it means: "leaving some one behind in going away;" but the simple verb is in no way unsuitable in the passage. The external evidence (A C D* F G, *al.*, Or. Basil. ms.) is in favor of *ἀπέλιπον*. It is uncertain, too, whether the aor. *ἀπέλιπον* (*Rec.* supported by D E K ℵ, *al.*, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8) or the imperf. *ἀπέλειπον* (A C F G J L, *al.*, Tisch. 7) is the original reading. Hofmann prefers the imperf. "because it was part of the purpose for which Paul at that time left Titus behind;" but this would not prevent the apostle from writing the aor.—The authorities waver between the middle *ἐπιδιορθώσῃ* (*Rec.* Tisch.) and the act. *ἐπιδιορθώσῃς* (Scholz, Lachm. Buttm.). Since in classic Greek the middle is more current than the active, it may be supposed that the middle was a correction. It can hardly be supposed that the copyists did not know the middle form (Hofmann).—Ver. 10. In A C J ℵ, many cursives, etc., *καί* is wanting between *πολλοί* and *ἀνυπότακτοι*, for which reason it was omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. Tisch. 7 retained it, on the authority of D E F G K L, several cursives, etc. The *καί* was perhaps added to be in accordance with classical usage.—In several MSS. (F G 67* 73, *al.*), as well as in some versions, Oecum. Hilar., a *καί* was inserted after *ἀνυπότακτοι*.—Ver. 15. The *μέν* following *πάντα* in the *Rec.* is to be deleted, on the authority of A C D* E** F G ℵ 17, *al.*, Vulg. It. Or. Tert. etc.—For *μεμιασμένοις, μεμιαμμένοις* is found in A C K L ℵ, many cursives, etc., and was adopted by Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. (see Winer, p. 84 [E. T. p. 88]). D* has *μεμιανμένοις.*

Ver. 1. [On Vv. 1–4, see Note XXXIII., pages 290–292.] *Παῦλος δοῦλος Θεοῦ*] [XXXIII *a*.] This designation, which indicates generally the official position (Wiesinger: "*δοῦλος Θεοῦ* here in the same sense as in Acts xvi. 17, Rev. i. 1, xv. 3, etc., not as in 1 Pet. ii. 16, Rev. vii. 3," etc.), is not usually found in the inscriptions of the Pauline Epistles. In the Epistle of James we have: *Θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰ. Χρ. δοῦλος*, and in writing to the Romans and Philippians Paul says *δοῦλος Ἰ. Χρ.—ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰ. Χρ.*] *δέ* indicates here not so much a contrast (as Mack thinks) as a further definition (Matthies: a more distinct description); comp. Jude 1. With this double designation comp. Rom. i. 1: *δοῦλος Ἰ. Χρ., κλητὸς ἀπόστολος.—κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ*] *κατά* is explained by Matthies to mean: "according to faith, so that the apostleship is described in its normal state, in its evangelic character;" but it is altogether opposed to the apostolic spirit to make appeal on behalf of the apostleship to its harmony with the faith of the elect. *Κατά* rather expresses here the general relation of reference to something: "in regard to faith;" the more precise definition must be supplied. This, however, can be nothing else than that which in Rom. i. 5 is expressed by *εἰς* (*εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τ. ἔθνεσιν*). It is on account of the *πίστις ἐκλ. Θεοῦ* that he is a *δοῦλ. Θεοῦ* and *ἀπόστ. Χρ.*, and to this his office is related, see 2 Tim. i. 1. This general relation is limited too precisely by the common exposition: "for *producing* faith," etc.[1] Hofmann thinks the apostle uses *κατὰ πιστ. ἐκλ.* to describe faith as that which is presupposed in his apostleship, as that without which he would not be an apostle; but, on the one hand, we should in that case have had *μου*; and, on the other hand, *κατά* does not express a presupposition or condition.—The expression *ἐκλεκτοὶ Θεοῦ* is taken by de Wette in a proleptic sense, to mean those who, by the free counsel of God, are predestinated to faith; and *κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλ. Θ.*, according to him, declares the faith of these elect to be the aim of the apostolic office. Wiesinger, on the contrary, thinks the expression *ἐκλεκτοὶ Θεοῦ* quite abstract, leaving it uncertain "whether the *κλῆσις* has already taken place in their case or not;" but he agrees with de Wette in taking the *ἐκλεκτοί* to be the object of the apostolic labors, so that the meaning is: in order to produce or further faith in the elect. But in the N. T. the expression *ἐκλεκτοὶ Θεοῦ* is always used of those who have already become believers, never of those who have not yet received the *κλῆσις*. Since it cannot be said that the purpose of the apostolic office is to produce faith in the *ἐκλεκτοί* (Plitt: "that the elect may believe"), who as such already possess faith, nor that it is to further their faith, *πίστις ἐκλεκτῶν* must be taken as *one* thought, the genitive serving to define more precisely the faith to which Paul's apostolic office is dedicated. We have therefore here a contrast between the *true* faith and the false *πίστις*, of which the heretics boasted.—*καὶ ἐπι-*

[1] There is no doubt that in classic Greek *κατά* sometimes denotes the aim of exertion; see Kühner, § 607.—Herod. ii. 152: *κατὰ τὴν λῆψιν ἐκπλώσαντες*. Thucydides, vi. 31: *κατὰ θέαν ἦκεν*. *Odyssey*, iii. 106: *ἤ τι κατὰ πρῆξιν . . . ἀλάλησθε, κατὰ λῆΐδα*. But the relation here is quite different, being active. *Κατὰ πίστιν* would therefore mean "in order to believe," which would give no sense.

γνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ' εὐσέβειαν] In genuine faith the knowledge of the truth is a substantial element; and Paul here lays stress on this element to point the contrast with the heretics. The *ἐπίγνωσις* is the subjective aspect, as the *ἀλήθεια* is the objective.—*τῆς κατ' εὐσέβειαν* [XXXIII *b.*] serves to define *ἀλήθεια* more precisely.[1] De Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt interpret *ἡ κατ' εὐσέβειαν*: "leading to holiness," thus, indeed, naming a right element in truth, but one rather indicated than expressed by *κατά*; it is merely said that here a truth is under discussion which is in nature akin to *εὐσέβεια*. Hofmann translates it "piously," asserting that *κατ' εὐσέβειαν* without the article stands for an adjective; but had Paul used the clause as an adjective, he would certainly have written: *τῆς κατ' εὐσέβειαν ἀληθείας* (as in Rom. ix. 11: *ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις*). Besides, the translation "piously" is not sufficiently clear.

Ver. 2. *Ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου*] [XXXIII *c.*] *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι*, "in hope" (comp. Rom. iv. 18, viii. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 10). It is not to be taken with *ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας* ("the knowledge of the truth which gives hope of an eternal life," Heydenreich, but with hesitation; Wiesinger: "it is a knowledge whose content is that *ἀλήθεια*, and whose ground and condition is the hope of eternal life, by which hope it is supported and guided"), nor is it to be taken with *εὐσέβεια* ("a holiness the possessor of which is justified in hoping for eternal life," which Heydenreich likewise considers possible), nor with *τῆς κατ' εὐσέβειαν* (Matthies: "truth and holiness in their inner relationship are founded evangelically on the hope of eternal life"), nor even with the two ideas closely connected: *πίστιν* and *ἐπίγνωσιν ἀλ.* (so Plitt: "the *πίστις* and the *ἐπίγνωσις* rest on the *ἐλπίς*"); but it is to be joined with *ἀπόστολος κ.τ.λ.* Paul by this declares that the *ἐλπὶς ζωῆς αἰωνίου* is the basis on which he stands as an *ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ πίστιν κ.τ.λ.*[2] Van Oosterzee: "Paul in ver. 4 says he fulfills his task with or in hope of eternal life" (so, too, Hofmann).—The believer, it is true, possesses the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* in the present; but its perfection will only be granted to him in the future (comp. Col. iii. 3, 4); here it is to be considered as a future blessing, which is indicated by *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι.*—*ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ ἀψευδὴς Θεὸς πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων*] [XXXIII *d.*] *ἣν* relates to *ζωῆς αἰωνίου*, and not, as some expositors (Flatt, Mack, and others) think, to *ἀλήθεια.*—*ἐπηγγείλατο*, viz. *διὰ τῶν προφητῶν*, comp. Rom. i. 2.—*ὁ ἀψευδὴς Θεός*] This epithet occurs only here; *ἀψευδής* is equivalent to *πιστός*, *ἀληθής* in regard to the divine promises, comp. Heb. vi. 18: *ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι Θεόν*; 1 Cor. i. 9; Rom. iii. 4.—*πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων* here is not equivalent in meaning to *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* or similar expressions; for in that case *ἐπηγγείλατο* must have meant promittere decrevit, or the like, as Chrysostom expounds it: *ἄνωθεν ταῦτα προώριστο*, which is impossible. It is equivalent to *ἀπ' αἰῶνος*, Luke i. 70: "before eternity, *i. e.* before the

[1] As Chrysostom says: *ἐστὶ γὰρ ἀλήθεια πραγμάτων, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' εὐσέβειαν, οἷον τὸ εἰδέναι τὰ γεωργικά, τὸ εἰδέναι τέχνας, ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν εἰδέναι· ἀλλ' αὕτη κατ' εὐσέβειαν ἡ ἀλήθεια.*

[2] If *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι* be in this way connected with *ἀπόστολος κ.τ.λ.*, the objection of Wiesinger is overcome, viz. that in connecting it with *ἀπόστολος* there should be a *δέ* or something similar to indicate the co-ordinate position of *ἐπί* and *κατά*.

earliest times" (Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt, Hofmann), comp. 2 Tim. i. 9.[1] De Wette rightly remarks that apparently the opposite is declared in *μυστήριον χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένον*, Rom. xvi. 25.

Ver. 3. [XXXIII *e.*] *Ἐφανέρωσε δὲ καιροῖς ἰδίοις τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ*] *ἐφανέρωσε* forms an antithesis to *ἐπηγγείλατο*. True, the promise is a revelation, but only a revelation in which the point under consideration still remains hidden. The object of *ἐφανέρωσε* is not the same as that to which *ἐπηγγ.* relates, viz. *ἦν, i. e. τὴν ζωὴν αἰώνιον*; Beza: quam promiserat Deus . . . manifestam autem fecit . . . The object is *τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ*, which is not to be taken as in apposition to *ἦν* (or as Heinrichs even thinks, to *ἐλπίδα ζωῆς*), though it is strange that *ἐφαν.* should begin a new sentence. This is one of the cases where—as Buttmann, p. 328 [E. T. 383], remarks—a relative sentence passes almost imperceptibly into a principal sentence, without such continuation changing the actual principal sentence into one subordinate.—*τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ*] is, of course, not a name for Christ (scholiasts in Matthaei), but the gospel, which contains the *ἀποκάλυψις μυστηρίου*, Rom. xvi. 26, or, as is said here, *τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου*.[2]—*καιροῖς ἰδίοις*] comp. 1 Tim. ii. 6. How this *φανέρωσις* of the divine word took place, is told in the next words: *ἐν κηρύγματι ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ*] *κήρυγμα* (see 2 Tim. iv. 17) is not quite "the general preaching of the gospel by the apostles" (Matthies, Wiesinger), the thought being limited by the words following; *κήρυγμα* is to be taken as forming one thought with what follows: "the preaching entrusted to me." Paul had some reason for describing *his* preaching as the means by which this revelation was made, since *he* recognized the depth of the divine decree as no other apostle had recognized it, and by him it was proclaimed "to all peoples" (see 2 Tim. iv. 17).—*ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ*] see 1 Cor. ix. 17; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 4; 1 Tim. i. 11.—To define and emphasize the thought that the *κήρυγμα* was not according to his own pleasure, Paul adds: *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ*] comp. 1 Tim. i. 1. Hofmann construes differently, connecting together *κατὰ πίστιν* and *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι* as well as *ἐν κηρύγματι*, and then joining *κατ' ἐπιταγήν* immediately with *ἀπόστολος*. But this construction not only makes *τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ* (which, according to Hofmann, is in apposition to *ἡμ*) quite superfluous, but separates ideas closely attached to each other, *κήρυγμα* and *λόγος*, *ἐπιστεύθην* and *κατ' ἐπιταγήν*.

Ver. 4. *Τίτῳ γνησίῳ τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν*] [XXXIII *f.*] On *γνησίῳ τέκνῳ*, see 1 Tim. i. 2. *Κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν* gives the point of view from which Titus can be considered the genuine son of the apostle. Beza: *i. e.* fidei respectu qua quidem et Paulo patri et Tito filio communis erat. There is nothing to indicate that in using *κοινήν* Paul was thinking of an original difference between them, he being a Jewish Christian, Titus a Gentile

[1] Calvin rightly says: hic, quia de promissione tractat, non omnia saecula comprehendit, ut nos adducat extra mundi creationem, sed docet, multa saecula praeterisse, ex quo salus fuit promissa.

[2] Wiesinger rightly: "Any one can see why the apostle changes its object, or rather its name; eternal life is in its appearance still something future, revealed only as *λόγος*. Hence, too, it is plain that the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* is here to be regarded as the content of this *λόγος* in specie."

Christian.—*χάρις* [*ἔλεος*], *εἰρήνη κ.τ.λ.*] see on 1 Tim. i. 2.—The designation appended to *Χριστοῦ*, viz. *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, is peculiar to this epistle. [XXXIII *g*.]

Ver. 5. [On Vv. 5–9, see Note XXXIV., pages 292, 293.] The epistle begins by the apostle reminding Titus of the commission already given him by word of mouth. [XXXIV *a*.]—*τούτου χάριν ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ*] [XXXIV *b*.] Regarding the time when this happened, see the Introduction; as to the reading, see the critical remarks.—*ἵνα τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσῃς*] *τὰ λείποντα*: quae ego per temporis brevitatem non potui coram expedire (Bengel).—*ἐπιδιορθώσῃς*] The preposition *ἐπί* does not serve here to strengthen the meaning (=omni cura corrigere, Wahl) but conveys the notion of something additional: "*still further bring into order.*"—*τὰ λείποντα*] means "that which is wanting," *i. e.* here that which was wanting for the complete organization of the church. The apostle himself had already done something, but in many respects the churches were not organized as they ought to be; presbyters had still to be appointed to gather single believers into a firmly-established church. This Titus was now to do,[1] as the next words say: *καὶ καταστήσῃς κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους*. [XXXIV *c*.]—*κατὰ πόλιν*] For the expression, comp. Luke viii. 1; Acts xv. 21, xx. 23; and for the fact, Acts xiv. 23. Baur wrongly assumes that each *πόλις* was to receive only *one* presbyter, see Meyer on Acts xiv. 23.—*ὡς ἐγώ σοι διεταξάμην*] "relates both to the fact and to the manner of it, the latter being set forth more fully in mentioning the qualities of those to be chosen" (de Wette). Hofmann, without sufficient ground, wishes *πρεσβυτέρους* to be regarded not as the object proper, but as something predicated of the object, which object is found by the words *εἴ τις κ.τ.λ.* This view is refuted by the addition of *κατὰ πόλιν*.[2]

Ver. 6. *Εἴ τις ἐστίν*] [XXXIV *d*.] This form is not, as Heinrichs and Heydenreich think, selected to express a doubt whether such men could be found among the corrupt Cretans. The meaning is rather: "*only such an one as.*"—*ἀνέγκλητος*] see 1 Tim. iii. 10; *ἀνεπίλημπτος* is used in 1 Tim. iii. 2. The objection which de Wette raises on the ground that Titus is in the first place to have regard to external blamelessness, has been proved by Wiesinger to have no foundation whatever.—*μιᾶς γυν. ἀνήρ*] see 1 Tim. iii. 2.—*τέκνα ἔχων πιστά*] comp. 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5; *πιστά*, in contrast to those that were not Christian, or were Christian only in name.—*μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας*] "qui non sunt obnoxii crimini luxus" (Wolf); *ἀσωτία* is a debauched, sensual mode of life (1 Pet. iv. 4; Eph. v. 18).[3]—*ἢ ἀνυπότακτα*] see 1 Tim. iii. 5. Comp. the picture of the sons of Eli in 1 Sam. ii. 12 ff. As the bishop is to be an example to the church, his own house must be well conducted.

[1] Theod. v. Mops.: *ὁ γὰρ τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγος παρεδέδοτο πᾶσι παρ' αὐτοῦ, ἐλείπετο δὲ οἰκονομῆσαι τὰ κατὰ τοὺς πεπιστευκότας καὶ εἰς ἁρμονίαν αὐτοὺς καταστῆσαι ταῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς διατυπώσεσι.*

[2] Hofmann rightly remarks, that (according to the apostle's injunction) "Titus was to appoint the superintendents according to his own choice, and was not to cause them to be elected by the Christians who were still to be organized into a community."

[3] Chrysostom: *οὐκ εἶπε μὴ ἁπλῶς ἄσωτος, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ διαβολὴν ἔχειν τοιαύτην, μηδὲ πονηρᾶς εἶναι δόξης.*

Ver. 7. Δεῖ γάρ] The statements of ver. 6 are now confirmed by alluding to the higher moral necessity; "δεῖ is the emphatic word" (Wiesinger).—τὸν ἐπίσκ. ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι] ἀνέγκλ. is resumed from ver. 6, that the thought may be further developed. It is to be noted that the name ἐπίσκοπος appears here; it is given to the presbyter as superintendent of the church. As such "he must not be liable to any reproach, if he is to guide the church" (Wiesinger).—ὡς Θεοῦ οἰκονόμον] is added to give the reason for that higher necessity of the ἀνεγκλ. εἶναι; Heydenreich wrongly turns it to mean simply that he must know how to superintend his house well.—ὡς = "as," i. e. "*since he is*."—Θεοῦ οἰκονόμος is the bishop in so far as there is committed to him by God authority in the ἐκκλησία as the οἶκος Θεοῦ (1 Tim. iii. 15). Mack is not wrong in proving from this expression that the ἐπίσκοποι are not merely "ministers and plenipotentiaries of the church." Even if they are elected by the church, they bear their office as divine, not exercising it according to the changing pleasure of those by whom they are elected, but according to the will of God.—μὴ αὐθάδη] occurs only here and in 2 Pet. ii. 10. It is compounded of αὐτός and ἁδέω, and synonymous with αὐτάρεσκος (2 Tim. iii. 2; φίλαυτος), "who in everything behaves arrogantly and regardlessly as seems good in his own eyes;" Luther: "willful."—μὴ ὀργίλον] ἅπ. λεγ. "passionate;" οἱ ὀργίλοι ταχέως ὀργίζονται.—μὴ πάροινον] see 1 Tim. iii. 3.—μὴ πλήκτην] see also 1 Tim. iii. 3.—μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ] see 1 Tim. iii. 8; perhaps with special reference to the opportunities which the bishop had in his office of acquiring gain.—These five negative qualifications are opposed to arrogance, anger, and avarice; several positive qualifications follow.

Ver. 8. Ἀλλὰ φιλόξενον] see 1 Tim. iii. 2.—φιλάγαθον] ἅπ. λεγ. (the opposite in 2 Tim. iii. 3), loving either the good or what is good. Chrysostom is inaccurate: τὰ αὐτοῦ πάντα τοῖς δεομένοις προϊέμενος; and Luther: "kindly."—σώφρονα] see 1 Tim. iii. 2.—δίκαιον, ὅσιον] These two ideas are frequently placed together.[1]—δίκαιος is one who does no wrong to his neighbor; ὅσιος is one who keeps himself free from that which stains him in the eyes of God; synonymous with ἀκακος, ἀμίαντος, Heb. vii. 26.—ἐγκρατῆ] ἅπ. λεγ.[2] There is no ground for limiting the word to the relation of the sexes; besides, ἐγκράτεια and ἐγκρατεύεσθαι in the N. T. hardly convey anything more than the general idea of self-control. The three last qualifications are closely related to each other, describing the conduct of the man towards his neighbor, towards God, towards himself; comp. ii. 12.—The positive qualifications in this verse are not *direct* antitheses to the negative qualifications in the preceding verse; still there is a certain antithesis of cognate ideas. This is the case with μὴ αὐθάδη and φιλόξενον, φιλάγαθον; with μὴ ὀργίλον, μὴ πάροινον, μὴ πλήκτην, and σώφρονα; μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ and δίκαιον, ὅσιον, ἐγκρατῆ. Still these epithets, though corresponding to one another, are not quite the same in the extent of their application.

[1] Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 10; Eph. iv. 24; Plato (*Gorg.* 507 B) thus distinguishes between them: καὶ μὴν περὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπους τὰ προσήκοντα πράττων δίκαι' ἂν πράττοι, περὶ δὲ θεοὺς ὅσια.

[2] Chrysostom: τὸν πάθους κρατοῦντα, τὸν και

Ver. 9. To these requisites, somewhat general in nature, Paul adds another with special bearing on the official duties of a bishop: *ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου*] The exposition given by most of the compound idea *τοῦ . . . λόγου* is inaccurate and confused. Heydenreich divides the expression into two parts: (1) *ὁ πιστὸς λόγος*, "the true doctrine of the gospel;" and (2) *ὁ λόγος κατὰ τὴν διδαχήν*, "the doctrine in which the bishop is instructed," and gives the following translation: "holding firmly, as instructed, by the word which is certain (to reliable doctrine)." But manifestly this translation arbitrarily inverts the meaning. The words *κατὰ τὴν διδαχήν* are not dependent on *πιστοῦ*, but on *λόγου*, defined by *πιστοῦ*, so that *τοῦ κ. τ. διδ. πιστοῦ λόγ.* is equivalent to *τοῦ πιστοῦ λόγου, τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχήν*. *Ὁ πιστὸς λόγος* does not occur elsewhere in our epistles, but there is no doubt that Paul means thereby the pure, wholesome word (*λόγοι ὑγιαίνοντες*, 1 Tim. vi. 3; *οἱ λόγοι τῆς πίστεως*, 1 Tim. iv. 6) of the gospel, in contrast to the false doctrine of the heretics. He uses the epithet *πιστός* because it is not treacherous, it can be relied on: "*the sure, reliable word.*" This sure word is defined more precisely by *κατὰ τὴν διδαχήν*] *διδαχή* is not active (Luther: "that which can teach"), but means, as it often does in the N. T., "*doctrine.*" Here it denotes "the Christian doctrine," which is none other than that preached by Christ Himself and by His apostles; so Matthies, Wiesinger, Plitt, Hofmann. It is less appropriate to explain *διδαχή* to be "the instruction imparted" (so van Oosterzee, and formerly in this commentary);[1] comp. 1 Tim. iv. 6; 2 Thess. ii. 15.—*ἀντέχεσθαι* (in Matt. vi. 24, synonymous with *ἀγαπᾶν*, opposed to *καταφρονεῖν*; used in a similar sense, 1 Thess. v. 14) occurs often in Polybius (see Raphelius on the passage) in the sense of: adhaerere, studiosum esse (*ἀντέχεσθαι τῆς ἀληθείας*). Here, too, it has this meaning, as in Phil. ii. 16: *ἐπέχειν*; 2 Thess. ii. 15: *κρατεῖν*, "*adhere to.*" Luther: "he holds by the word."—Heydenreich rightly remarks that this does not indicate the zeal the teacher was to show in speaking of divine doctrine, but his own internal adherence, etc.—*ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*] This adherence to the word is necessary for the bishop that he may discharge the duties of his office. It is further defined more precisely in two ways: *ἵνα δυνατὸς ᾖ καὶ . . . καί*: "both . . . and." The first is: *παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ*, which refers to believers. *παρακαλεῖν*] *encourage, exhort;* viz. to remain in the way on which they have entered, and to advance ever further in it, *ἐν* being here instrumental: "through, by means of." Matthies is incorrect: "to edify in sound doctrine;" comp. 1 Thess. iv. 18.—*ἡ διδασκ. ἡ ὑγιαιν.*] see 1 Tim. i. 10.—The second is: *τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν*] "By correction and reproof to refute those who contradict" (viz. the pure doctrine of the gospel), by which are meant the heretics.—Even in classic Greek, the two conceptions "refute" and "reprove" are some-

γλώττης, καὶ χειρὸς, καὶ ὀφθαλμῶν ἀκολάστων· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐγκράτεια, τῷ μηδενὶ ὑποσύρεσθαι πάθει.

[1] Several expositors cite, in explanation of this expression, the passage from Polyb. p. 815: *οἱ κατὰ τὴν παράκλησιν λόγοι*, and according to this *ὁ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν λόγος* would be the word whose content is doctrine. But the attribute *πιστός* makes this explanation unsuitable.

times combined in *ἐλέγχειν*; see Pape, *s. v.*—This verse leads on to further description of the heretics.

Ver. 10. [On Vv. 10–16, see Note XXXV., pages 293, 294.] *Εἰσὶ γάρ*] *γάρ* shows that this verse serves to explain the preceding words. [XXXV *a.*]—*πολλοὶ* [*καὶ*] *ἀνυπότακτοι*] If *καί* be read, the phrase should be explained by the usage common in Greek of joining *πολλοί* with an adjective following it (see Matthiae, § 444, 4, p. 830), and *ἀνυπότακτοι* taken as an adjective. If *καί* be omitted, *ἀνυπότακτοι* may be taken as a substantive. The heretics are so named because they set themselves in opposition to the gospel and refuse obedience to it; the word is found also in 1 Tim. i. 9; Tit. i. 6.—The heretics are further styled *ματαιόλογοι*] see 1 Tim. i. 6, and *φρεναπάται* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*; the verb in Gal. vi. 3), "*misleaders*," almost synonymous with *γόητες*, 2 Tim. iii. 13.—*μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*] A name for the Jewish-Christians, as in Gal. ii. 12.—*μάλιστα* indicates that the preachers of heresy in Crete were chiefly Jewish Christians, but that they had also found followers among the Gentile Christians. These appended words do not compel us to take *ἀνυπότακτοι* as the predicate, and the Christians of Crete as the unexpressed subject of *εἰσίν* (in opposition to Hofmann). Of course Paul by *εἰσὶν γὰρ. κ.τ.λ.* means to say that Crete is the place where such chatterers are to be found.

Ver. 11. *Οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν*] goes back to the end of ver. 9.—*ἐπιστομίζειν* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*) is from *ἐπιστόμιον*, which denotes both the bridle-bit and the muzzle, and is equivalent either to freno compescere, coercere (synonymous with *τοὺς χαλινοὺς εἰς τὰ στόματα βάλλειν*, Jas. iii. 3), or to os obturare (=*φιμοῦν*, Matt. xxii. 34). The latter signification is more usual (see Elsner, p. 332): "put to silence."[1]—*αἵτινες* (=quippe qui, and giving the reason for *οὓς δεῖ*) *ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσι*] The chief emphasis is laid on *ὅλους*: not merely individuals, but also whole families are misled by them into unbelief.—*Ἀνατρέπειν*] see 2 Tim. ii. 18; "the figure is here used in keeping with *οἴκους*" (Wiesinger).—*διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ*] "teaching what should not be taught;" this shows the means by which they exercise so destructive an influence; *ἃ μὴ δεῖ*, equivalent to *τὰ μὴ δέοντα*, 1 Tim. v. 13.[2]—This refers to *ματαιόλογοι*, just as *ἀνατρέπουσι* does to *φρεναπάται*.—The purpose is briefly set forth by *αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν*: The disgrace of their gain consists in the means they employ for acquiring it. The apostle adds these words to point out the selfish conduct of the heretics, who work only for their own profit.

Ver. 12. Paul quotes the saying of a Cretan poet as a testimony regarding the Cretans.—*εἶπέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης*] *ἐξ αὐτῶν* is by most expositors referred to the preceding *πολλοί* or to *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*; but such a reference is unsuitable; the apostle is rather thinking of Cretans in general.—The *ἴδιος αὐτῶν* declares still more strongly that the say-

[1] Theophylact: *ἐλέγχειν σφοδρῶς, ὥστε ἀποκλείειν αὐτοῖς τὰ στόματα.*

[2] The distinction between *ἃ μὴ δεῖ* and *ἃ οὐ δεῖ* is rightly given by Winer, p. 448 [E. T. p. 480]. The former expresses as a moral conception what the latter denotes objectively. We cannot, however, go as far as Hofmann, who says: "*μή* indicates that they who thus teach are conscious they ought not to do so, and teach in this way nevertheless."

ing proceeds from a Cretan and not from a stranger, see Winer, p. 146 [E. T. p. 154].—*προφήτης*] According to Chrysostom, Theophylact, Epiphanius, Jerome, it is Epimenides who is meant. [XXXV *b.*] This Epimenides was a contemporary of the seven wise men, and by some was even reckoned as one of them in place of Periander; he was born in the sixth century B. C. The saying quoted by Paul, which forms a complete hexameter, is said to have been in his lost work *περὶ χρησμῶν*. Theodoret, on the other hand, ascribes the saying to Callimachus, who, however, was a Cyrenian in the third century B. C.; besides, it is only the first words that occur in his *Hymn. ad Jov.* ver. 8. Epiphanius and Jerome think that Callimachus took the words from Epimenides. Paul does not call Epimenides a *προφήτης* because poets and philosophers were often called prophets in ancient times, but because the saying of Epimenides described beforehand the character of the Cretans as it was in the apostle's time. Still it is to be noted that this very Epimenides was famed among the Greeks for his gift of wisdom, so that even Cicero (*De Divinat.* xviii.) places him among those vaticinantes per furorem.[1]—Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται] Chrysostom refers these words chiefly to the pretence of the Cretans that Jupiter lay buried among them; to this, at any rate, the verse of Callimachus refers;[2] but the Cretans in ancient times were notorious for falsehood, so that, according to Hesychius, *κρητίζειν* is synonymous with *ψεύδεσθαι καὶ ἀπατᾶν*; for proofs of this, see in Wetstein.—κακὰ θηρία] denoting their wild, unruly character; some expositors refer this name specially to the greed of the Cretans, as Polybius, book vi., specially mentions their *αἰσχροκερδία καὶ πλεονεξία*; but it is more than improbable that Epimenides had this meaning in his words.—γαστέρες ἀργαί] synonymous with Phil. iii. 19: *ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία* (comp. Rom. xvi. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 13, 14); this denotes the Cretans as men given to sensuality. Plato, too (*De Legg.* i.), reproaches them with lust and immodesty.—The apostle's purpose in quoting this saying of Epimenides is indicated in the next verse. The national character of the Cretans was such that they were easily persuaded to listen to the heretics, and hence it was all the more necessary to oppose the latter firmly.

Ver. 13. In confirmation of the verse quoted, Paul says: *ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής*, and attaches to it an exhortation to Titus.[3] Bertholdt, without reason, holds this verse to be a later interpolation.—δι' ἣν αἰτίαν]

[1] Comp. Diogenes Laertius, *Vita Philos.* p. 81, ed. Henr. Steph.

[2] This verse runs:

> Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται.
> Κρῆτες ἐτεκτήναντο·
> καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ὦ ἄνα, σείο
> σὺ δὲ οὐ θάνες· ἐστὶ γὰρ ἀεί.

[3] De Wette thinks this confirmation by Paul himself hard and unjust, since the gospel had been received in Crete in such a way that several churches were formed in a short time. But in spite of the character here described, there might still be many individuals ready to receive the gospel; and yet because of that peculiarity there was ground for anxiety lest they should be easily misled into unfaithfulness. De Wette is also wrong in thinking that the expression regarding the Cretans in vv. 12 f. does not harmonize with the apostle's prudence in teaching.—But how bitterly Luther expresses himself regarding the Germans, calling them, *e. g.*, animals and mad beasts! Was Luther on that account deficient in prudence in his teaching?

see 2 Tim. i. 6. Chrysostom: *διὰ τοῦτο· ἐπειδὴ ἦθος αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν ἰταμὸν καὶ δολερὸν καὶ ἀκόλαστον*; it refers to the picture of the Cretan character given in the testimony.—*ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως*] *ἔλεγχε*, as in ver. 9; "the apostle here drops all reference to the bishops to be appointed, and assigns to Titus himself the duty of applying a remedy" (Wiesinger).—*αὐτοῖς*] not so much the heretics as the Cretans, who were exposed to their misleading influence. These latter needed the *ἐλέγχειν*, because they were not resisting the heretics as they ought, but (as *οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσι* shows) were yielding to them easily.—*ἀποτόμως*] "sharply, strictly;" elsewhere only in 2 Cor. xiii. 10; the substantive *ἀποτομία* in Rom. xi. 22.—*ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν ἐν τῇ πίστει*] "*that they may be sound in the faith.*" De Wette takes this as the immediate contents of the *ἐλέγχειν*, just as *ἵνα* occurs with *παρακαλεῖν*, but without good grounds. Ἐν here is not instrumental (Heinrichs: per religionem), but *πιστις* is the subject in which they are to be sound.

Ver. 14. One especial requisite for the *ὑγιαίνειν ἐν τῇ πίστει* is given by Paul in the participial clause: *μὴ προσέχοντες Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς κ.τ.λ.*] *προσέχοντες*, see 1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 1. Here, as in the epistles to Timothy, the heresies are called *μῦθοι*, from the theories they contained; see on 1 Tim. i. 4. Here, however, they are further defined by the epithet *Ἰουδαϊκοί*, as they were peculiar to Jewish speculation, though their substance was derived from Gentile modes of thought. The description, too, in the First Epistle to Timothy shows that to the speculative part of the heresy there was added a legal element founded on an arbitrary interpretation of the Mosaic law. The *ἐντολαί* of the heretics are here called *ἐντολαὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν*: "*commands of men which depart from the truth*," because they were founded not on Christianity, but on the arbitrary wills of men estranged from Christianity. These *ἐντολαί* consisted not so much of moral precepts, as of prohibitions of food and the like, see 1 Tim. iv. 3. Hofmann refers the adjective *Ἰουδαϊκοῖς*, and the defining words *ἀνθρώπων κ.τ.λ.*, to both substantives,—a possible construction, but not necessary. His reasons are far from sufficient.—*ἀποστρεφομένων*] see 2 Tim. i. 15. [XXXV *c.*]

Ver. 15. The apostle, bearing in mind the prohibitions of the heretics, opposes to them a general principle which shows their worthlessness.—*πάντα καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς*] *πάντα* quite generally: *all things in themselves*, with which a man may simply have to do, but not a man's actions, nor, as Heydenreich thinks, the errors of the heretics. The usual explanation which limits the bearing of the words to the arbitrary rules of the heretics regarding food and other things, is only so far right that Paul lays down his general principle with special reference to these rules; but *πάντα* itself should be taken quite generally. Even the exposition of Matthies: "all that falls into the sphere of the individual wants of life," places an unsuitable limitation on the meaning. Chrysostom rightly: *οὐδὲν ὁ Θεὸς ἀκάθαρτον ἐποίησεν.*—*καθαρά* as the predicate of *πάντα* is to be connected with it by supplying *ἐστί*: "*all is pure*," viz. *τοῖς καθαροῖς*. Bengel: omnia externa iis, qui intus sunt mundi, munda sunt. Many expositors wrongly

refer the conception of *καθαροί* to knowledge.[1] It should rather be taken as referring to disposition: to those who have a pure heart everything is pure (not: "to them everything *passes* for pure"), *i. e.* as to the pure, things outside of them have no power to render them impure.[2] On *καθαροῖς*, van Oosterzee remarks: "By nature no one is pure; those here called *καθαροί* are those who have purified their heart by faith, Acts xv. 9." This is right, except that Paul is not thinking here of the means by which the man becomes *καθαρός*; the indication of this point is given afterwards in *ἀπίστοις*. The apostle purposely makes the sentence very emphatic, because it was with the distinction between pure and impure that the heretics occupied themselves so much.—The contrast to the first sentence is given in the words: *τοῖς δὲ μεμιαμμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις οὐδὲν καθαρόν*. Regarding the form *μεμιαμμένος*, see Winer, p. 84 [E. T. p. 88].[3] The verb forms a simple contrast with *καθαροῖς*, and stands here not in a Levitical (John xviii. 28), but in an ethical sense, as in Heb. xii. 15; Jude 8. *Καὶ ἀπίστοις* is not an epexegesis of *μεμιαμ.*, but adds a new point to it, viz. the attitude of the heretics towards the saving truths of the gospel. The two words do not denote two different classes of men, as the article *τοῖς* is only used once. To these impure men nothing is pure, *i. e.* every external thing serves only to awaken within them impure lust.—*ἀλλὰ μεμίανται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις*] This sentence expresses positively what *οὐδὲν καθαρόν* expressed negatively, at the same time furnishing the reason for the preceding thought. De Wette's opinion therefore is not correct, that "for *ἀλλά* there should properly have been *γάρ*; the author, however, makes moral *character* equivalent to moral *action*." The relation of the two sentences is pretty much the same as if, *e. g.*, we were to say: he is not rich, but his father has disinherited him. If Paul had used *γάρ*, the sentence would simply have furnished the reason for what preceded; *ἀλλά*, on the other hand, indicates the contrast. Still we must not conclude, with Hofmann, that the second sentence merely says the same thing as the first. It should be interpreted: "but to them everything is impure, because their *νοῦς* and their *συνείδησις* are defiled."—*Νοῦς* and *συνείδησις* do not here denote the inner nature of man on the two sides of knowledge and will (so Hofmann). *Νοῦς* is the spiritual faculty of man acting in both directions; in N. T. usage the reference to action prevails, *νοῦς* being equivalent to the practical reason. *Συνείδησις*, on the other hand, is the human consciousness connected with action, and expressing itself regarding the moral value of action; it corresponds to "conscience" (see on 1 Tim. i. 3).[4] The two conceptions are distinguished

[1] As Jerome: qui sciunt omnem creaturam bonam esse, or as Beza: quibus notum est libertatis per Christum partae beneficium.

[2] From the same point of view we have in the *Testam. XII. Patriarch. test. Benjam.* chap. viii.: *ὁ ἔχων διάνοιαν καθαρὰν ἐν ἀγάπῃ, οὐχ ὁρᾷ γυναῖκα εἰς πορνείαν· οὐ γὰρ ἔχει μιασμὸν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ.* Kindred thoughts are found in Matt. xxiii. 26; Luke xi. 41; comp. also the similar expression in Rom. xiv. 20.

[3] Also Veitch, Irregular Greek Verbs, *s. v.*

[4] De Wette asserts, without reason, that *συνείδησις* is the "consciousness *that follows*," since the consciousness of the deed may precede as well as accompany and follow it.—Wiesinger explains *νοῦς* inaccurately by: "the

from each other by *καὶ . . . καί*, and at the same time closely connected. By this, however, no special emphasis is laid on the second word (formerly in this commentary). In iii. 11 (*αὐτοκατάκριτος*) and 1 Tim. iv. 2, the apostle again says as much as that the conscience of the heretics was defiled. Though the thought contained in this verse is quite general in character, Paul wrote it with special reference to the heretics, and is therefore able to attach to it a further description of them.

Ver. 16. *Θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι*] not: "they pretend" (Matthies), but "they loudly and publicly confess,"[1] that they know God. Paul leaves it undecided whether their confession is correct or not. He does not grant to them, as de Wette thinks, that "they have the theoretical knowledge of God, and in a practical aspect," nor does he deny this to them. His purpose here is to declare that, in spite of this their confession, their actions are of such a nature as to argue that they had no knowledge of God: *τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται*] *ἀρνοῦνται*, opposed to *ὁμολογοῦσιν*, see 1 Tim. v. 8; 2 Tim. iii. 5. Supply *Θεὸν εἰδέναι* (so, too, van Oosterzee, Hofmann). —*βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς*] *βδελυκτός* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*), equivalent to abominabilis, detestable (comp. Luke xvi. 15); Luther: "whom God holds in abomination."—The word is joined with *ἀκάθαρτος* in Prov. xvii. 15, LXX. Paul does not apply this epithet to the heretics, because they were defiling themselves with actual worship of idols, which especially was regarded by the Jews as *βδέλυγμα*, but in order to describe their moral depravity.—*καὶ ἀπειθεῖς*] "and disobedient," synonymous with *ἀνυπότακτοι* in ver. 10; this indicates why they are *βδελυκτοί*.—*καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι*] "the result of the preceding characteristics" (Wiesinger); *ἀδόκιμος*, as 2 Tim. iii. 8.

Notes by American Editor.

XXXIII. Vv. 1–4.

(*a*) With respect to several of the points in these verses which contain the salutation of this Epistle, the reader is referred to Notes I. and XXI., above. A few words as to some of them may be added here:—1. That *κατὰ πίστιν* can be explained, with R. V. and A. V., as meaning *according to*, is denied by Alf., who says "it is inadmissible." The objection made to this explanation is substantially that which Huther presents, "that it is opposed to the apostolic spirit to make appeal on behalf of the apostleship to its harmony with the faith of the elect." But if the faith of the elect is here spoken of, as it may be, in its relation to the great truth towards which the faith goes out, and on which it rests, this objection falls away. It must be admitted, however, as already remarked in Note XXI.,

entire spiritual habitus" (van Oosterzee still more inaccurately by: "the tendency of the man, the direction of his entire disposition"), but *συνείδησις* quite accurately by: "the moral consciousness of my thinking and action in their relation to the law."

[1] Hofmann asserts that this explanation is contrary to the meaning of the word, and that *ὁμολογεῖν* here must be taken in its most general signification as = "declare, affirm;" but we cannot see why. It is to be noted that *ὁμολογεῖν* in the N. T. always indicates an utterance more or less emphatic; also Matt. vii. 23 (comp. Meyer on the passage).

that this sense of the preposition is less probable here than in the case of *κατ ἐπαγγελίαν* of 2 Tim. i. 2, and that, with this sense, the expression becomes a quite peculiar one, to which we find nothing fully corresponding elsewhere in Paul's declarations as to his apostleship. The meaning given by Huther, "in regard to faith," or the more definite one expressing purpose, "for faith," Ell., Alf., or "for producing faith," Dykes and others, is, on the whole, to be preferred. Holtzmann says *according to, secundum fidem catholicam*. He urges, and the argument must undoubtedly be regarded as having force, that the same preposition in the phrase *κατ' εὐσέβειαν*, and also in the phrase, in ver. 4, *κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν*, and it might be added, in *κατ' ἐπιταγήν* (ver. 3), has this signification. Still the general thought of Paul—that his office was given *according to* Divine appointment, but *for the purpose of* producing faith on the part of men—might easily suggest to the reader the different uses of the preposition as intended here.—2. As to the relation of *ἐκλεκτῶν* to *πίστιν*, the view of Huther, with whom Ell., Alf., and some others agree, is to be adopted, because of the reason which Huther presents, and also because, if the meaning were the producing of faith and knowledge in the elect, the *ἐκλεκτοί* would probably be mentioned after both of the nouns *πίστιν* and *ἐπίγνωσιν*, and the expression would more naturally be *ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς* than *ἐκλεκτῶν*.—(*b*) Ell., and de W. give to *κατ' εὐσέβειαν* the same sense, so far as the preposition is concerned, as to *κατὰ πίστιν*. But it is much more in accordance with the analogy of ordinary usage, in such cases, to make it define the truth spoken of as that which corresponds with *εὐσέβεια*.—(*c*) *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι κ.τ.λ.* is most naturally connected, not with *ἀπόστολος* as Huther takes it, but with *πίστιν* and all that follows as far as *εἰσέβειαν*. The faith and knowledge, etc., rest upon hope of eternal life. When all these words are taken together, and especially when they are taken in connection with what follows, we may notice how nearly they approach, in the main idea, to the *ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς* of 2 Tim. i. 2, and how possible it is to regard them, though primarily referring to what is subjective to the Christian mind, as suggesting also the objective truth which is at the foundation of the belief and knowledge—the truth and promise appertaining to the eternal life. The possibility of giving to *κατά*, even in the phrase *κατὰ πίστιν*, the sense of *according to* is clearly not to be rejected altogether, and without hesitation, as Alford rejects it. The question is one of probabilities only, and the most that can be affirmed as to the other sense—*for*, or *in relation to*, or *to produce*—is that it has somewhat greater probability in its favor.—(*d*) The correspondence in phraseology of vv. 2, 3 with 2 Tim. i. 9, 10 is worthy of remark. Except for the word *σεσιγημένου*, there is a noticeable correspondence with Rom. xvi. 25. In regard to this word, the suggestion of Alford is a just one, that there is a mingling, in both of the passages in the Past. Epp., of the two ideas of the actual promise, made in time, and of the purpose fixed from eternity, as the result of which the promise came. The purpose was kept in silence (*σιγή*.) through eternal times, but has now been made manifest to all by the prophetic writings and by the apostolic proclamation.—(*e*) Tisch. places a comma after *αἰωνίων* of ver. 2, and thus makes *λόγον* depend on *ἐφανέρωσεν*. So R. V., Huther, Alf., Ell., and many others. On the other hand, W. and H. omit the comma following *αἰωνίων* and insert one after *ἰδίοις*. They accordingly seem to regard *τὸν λόγον* as in apposition with *ἣν*. This construction is much less simple, for, though the other involves a change from a relative to an independent clause, such a change is not so singular, in a writer like Paul, as the introduction of such a peculiar apposition as *λόγον* following *ἣν*

would be in the present sentence.—(*f*) *κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν* (ver. 4) qualifies *γνησίῳ τέκνῳ*. Titus was the genuine son of Paul only in accordance with the faith, which was common to the two and to all Christians.—(*g*) The application of the word *σωτήρ* both to *θεός* (ver. 3) and *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς* (ver. 4) is noticeable. The omission of *ἔλεος* is to be allowed, on the authority of the best manuscripts and versions.

XXXIV. Vv. 5-9.

(*a*) The epistle opens, like 1 Tim., with the statement as to the purpose with which the Apostle had left his friend and assistant in the place where he had himself been working on behalf of the Church. The indications of the passage, and of the epistle, are such that we must suppose, even as in the case of Ephesus as alluded to in 1 Tim., that the Church in Crete had not now been just established, but that it had been founded at an earlier time, and had been in existence for a considerable period. During a recent visit, however, Paul had evidently done something in the way of strengthening and more permanently organizing the believers, and now, as he is himself called to move on to other regions, he leaves Titus to complete the work. The striking correspondences between this letter and 1 Tim., both in the matters referred to and in language and style, show clearly that the two epistles belong to the same period of the Apostle's life. Their date must be after the close of the history as given in the Acts, and the one must have been separated from the other by an interval of only a few months or a year.—(*b*) The phrase *τούτου χάριν* occurs in Eph. iii. 1. 14, in both of which verses it refers to what precedes. Here it undoubtedly refers to what follows, and *τούτου* is explained by the *ἵνα* clause. *ἐπιδιορθώσῃ* is to be understood as Huther interprets it—the preposition "conveying the notion of something additional," and thus answering to *τὰ λείποντα*. *Καί* adds the particular thing which follows with a certain emphasis, showing that this was a matter of special importance as accomplishing the end in view.—(*c*) The fact that the *πρεσβύτεροι* and the *ἐπίσκοποι* were the same is plainly set forth in this passage. As to the manner in which the presbyters were to be appointed, Huther quotes approvingly the remark of Hofmann, that the appointment was to be made by Titus himself, according to his own choice, and not in connection with an election by the Christians, who were as yet not organized into a community. Dykes, on the other hand, says "it was part of the apostolic function to institute church officers. But the word *ordain* (used of deacons in Acts vi. 3) tells nothing of how the elders were selected or appointed." Wiesinger also remarks that "the expression throws no light on the question whether this appointment of presbyters was to be with or without the co-operation of the church. In Acts vi. 3, *καθιστάναι* expresses an action common to the apostle and the church. In Acts xiv. 23, we read *χειροτονήσαντες αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους*, which, compared with 2 Cor. viii. 16, represents the idea of a co-operation on the part of the church as more probable, although it does not necessitate such a supposition, comp. Acts x. 41." The view of Wiesinger is probably correct. That the church took action in matters of its own government, and generally, if not always, in the selection of its officers, is indicated in several places in the N. T., and cannot reasonably be questioned, as these indications are observed. That in the case of newly organized bodies of believers such appointments were made, with the consent of the church, by Paul or his associates is not impossible or improbable. But there is no satisfactory evidence, that these officers were imposed on the churches

without such consent.—(*d*) The qualifications for the office of bishop or presbyter, which are given here, are substantially the same with those mentioned in 1 Tim. The slight differences in the words and in the order of arrangement, and the addition in ver. 9 of what is found in another connection in 1 Tim., are characteristic of the style of Paul in different epistles belonging to the same period of time. The thing required of the bishop in ver. 9 is, in substance, the same as that which is urged upon Timothy in relation to his own personal work, in 1 Tim. i. 3 ff. The force of *ἀντεχόμενον* (ver. 9) is given by Grimm as *firmiter adhaerere, holding firmly to.* The construction of the following words is that which Huther favors. The Apostle, accordingly, demands of the *ἐπίσκοπος*, that he should hold fast to the "faithful" (i. e. *trustworthy, to be relied upon*) "word," which is in accordance with the Christian doctrine (the instruction which has been given him), in order that, etc. The two things which are referred to in the *ἵνα* clause are things which are needful in all ages, but there is no doubt that they are introduced, here, in a special connection with the demands of the particular time and region in which these two friends of the Apostle, Timothy and Titus, were now carrying forward their work. May it not be the fact, also, that, in the case of some of the more general words which precede those of ver. 9, points are mentioned with respect to the qualifications of the presbyter-bishops, which are suggested by opposite characteristics in the erroneous teachers of the day?

XXXV. Vv. 10–16.

(*a*) Ver. 10 introduces the statement of the existence of such errorists as the ground for the necessity of the qualification just mentioned (ver. 9) in the person who is to be appointed a presbyter. Vv. 10, 11 set forth the fact that they are mainly Jewish Christians, and add two other points which are also mentioned in 1 Tim. vi. 5 ff., and 2 Tim. iii. 6, 7, though not in precisely the same terms—namely, avariciousness and the subverting of whole houses, which latter expression seems to refer to a perverting them from the faith. The point indicated by *ματαιολόγοι* is found, also, in the corresponding passage 1 Tim. i. 6, and that indicated by *διδασκ. ἃ μὴ δεῖ*, in 1 Tim. v. 13. The heretics, thus, are evidently the same class of persons in the two epistles.—(*b*) The quotation in ver. 12, and one or two other quotations occurring in other places (Acts xvii. 28, 1 Cor. xv. 33), have been supposed to indicate a wide acquaintance on the part of the Apostle with Greek literature. But the evidence for this is very slight, and the inference which may be drawn is, rather, on the other side—namely, that the very small number of allusions in his epistles to anything in the writings of Greek authors shows him to have had little knowledge of them. The characteristics here mentioned as belonging to the Cretans, and the words which follow, make it probable that the persons to whom the sharp reproof was to be given, were the members of the church, whom the heretical teachers were leading astray, rather than the teachers themselves. The verb *ἔλεγχε* conveys the idea of *confuting*, and not simply of *reproving* or *rebuking.*—(*c*) The heretics are further described in the words following *ἀνθρώπων* of ver. 14, but in a manner which, in general, corresponds with what we find in the epistles to Timothy (1 Tim. vi. and 2 Tim. iii. iv.). Here the foundation of the whole is placed in the fact that they are not *καθαροί*. The reader, who carefully and candidly examines the false doctrines against which Paul contends in his various epistles, and the characteristics of the false teachers

as he gives them—tracing the matter in the chronological succession of the letters,—may convince himself of two things: 1. that the Jewish element, which was the original one, and was, at first, unmingled with any other, continued even to the end, only that, as time moved on, it became united with, and greatly affected by, Greek or Oriental philosophizing; and 2. that the development of error was in the exact line in which it might naturally have been expected to take place, and neither more rapid nor greater than the possibilities of the period of Paul's life-time allowed.

CHAPTER II.

VER. 3. *ἐν καταστήματι*] For this F G, without reason, have *κατασχήματι*.—Some MSS. (C H** *al.*) have the reading *ἱεροπρεπεῖ*; Vulg.: in habitu sancto, which gives a good enough meaning, but must, however, be regarded as a mere correction; see Reiche on the passage.—*μὴ οἴνῳ*] A C ℵ 73, *al.*, have the reading *μηδέ* for *μή*.—Ver. 4. For the *Rec.* *σωφρονίζωσιν*, supported by C D E K L, *σωφρονίζουσιν* is read by A F G H ℵ, *al.* (Lachm. Tisch.). The conjunctive seems to be a correction, because the indicative contradicts the force of the *ἵνα*; but also in 1 Cor. iv. 6, Gal. iv. 17, it stands after *ἵνα*. In these passages, however, Meyer explains *ἵνα* as equivalent to *ubi*; comp. Winer, pp. 272 f. [E. T. p. 290], and Buttm. p. 202 [E. T. 235]. As in later post-apostolic times, the construction with the indic. was not unusual, *σωφρονίζουσιν* is possibly to be ascribed to a later copyist.—Ver. 5. Instead of the word *οἰκουροίς* (*Rec.* supported by D*** II J K, the cursives, Fathers, and versions), which occurs frequently in classic Greek, A C D* E F G ℵ have the word *οἰκουργούς* (Lachm. Buttm. Tisch.), which is not used elsewhere. Matthaei declares this to be a lectio vitiosa et inepta; so Reiche. De Wette thinks it an error in copying, as the word does not occur elsewhere. This certainly is possible, and yet it is strange that it should have such weighty testimony. Matthaei thinks that the scribae istorum sex codicum were so very barbari that the word *οἰκουρός* was unknown to them; but that is hardly conceivable.—Ver. 7. The *Rec.* *ἀδιαφθορίαν* (D*** E** L, *al.*, Chrys.) is to be exchanged for the reading *ἀφθορίαν* (A C D* E* K ℵ, *al.*, Lachm. Buttm. Tisch.), though Reiche seeks to prove from the meaning of two substantives not used elsewhere that the *Rec.* should be preferred. As the adj. *ἀδιάφθορος* frequently occurs, and *ἄφθορος* but seldom, we may readily suppose that the *Rec.* was a correction in keeping with the more usual adjective.—After *σεμνότητα*, D** E, gr. 23, 44, and many other cursives, etc., have the word *ἀφθαρσίαν*; but the weightiest authorities are against its genuineness, A C D* (E apud Mill) F G 47, *al.*, Syr. Erp. Copt. Aeth. Vulg. It. etc.—Ver. 8. *περὶ ἡμῶν*] so Griesb. Scholz, Tisch., supported by C D E F G K L P ℵ 17, 23, *al.*, many versions and Fathers. Lachm. retained the common reading.—Both readings give a good sense, but the testimony assigns the preference to *ἡμῶν*. Matthies wrongly says that A C D E F G have the reading *ὑμῶν*. —Ver. 9. Instead of *ἰδίοις δεσπόταις* (Tisch. 8, on the authority of C F G K L ℵ), Lachm. (so, too, Tisch. 7) reads *δεσπόταις ἰδίοις*, on the authority of A D E 27, *al.*, Vulg. It. Jerome, Ambrosiast. *al.*—Ver. 10. For *μή*, the correction *μηδέ* is found in D F G, *al.*, 17.—*πᾶσαν πίστιν*] for *πίστιν πᾶσαν* (Tisch. 7). This is read by Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8, on the authority of A C D E ℵ 31, 37, *al.*, Vulg. Clar. Germ. Jerome, Ambrosiast.—After *διδασκαλίαν* Griesb. inserted *τήν*, with the support of the weightiest authorities, A C D E F G I ℵ, *al.*, Chrys. Theodor. —Ver. 11. Instead of *ἡ σωτήριος* (Tisch. 7), *σωτήριος*, *without the article*, has been adopted by Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8, on the authority of A* C* D ℵ, Syr. utr.

The reading: *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, found in F G, Copt. Aeth. *al.*, must have arisen from ver. 10; still ℵ has *σωτῆρος*.—Ver. 13. Tisch. 7 reads *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, with the support of most MSS.; on the other hand, Tisch. 8 reads *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*.

Ver. 1. [On Vv. 1–8, see Note XXXVI., pages 305, 306.] Instructions to Titus how he is to exhort the various members of families, down to ver. 10. [XXXVI *a*.]—*σὺ δέ*] see 2 Tim. iii. 10, iv. 5. A contrast with the heretics, not, however, as Chrysostom puts it: *αὐτοί εἰσιν ἀκάθαρτοι· ἀλλὰ μὴ τούτων ἕνεκεν σιγήσῃς*. It is with regard to their unseemly doctrine that Paul says: *σὺ δὲ λάλει ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαιν. διδασκαλίᾳ*. In contrast with their *μῦθοι* and *ἐντολαὶ ἀνθρώπων*, Titus is to speak things in harmony with sound doctrine, by which are meant not so much the doctrines of the gospel themselves, as the commands founded on them, vv. 3 ff. (Wiesinger). On *τῇ ὑγ. διδ.*, see i. 9. [XXXVI *b*.]

Ver. 2. The members of the family are distinguished according to age and sex. First, we have *πρεσβύτας*, which is not equivalent to *πρεσβυτέρους*, the official name, but denotes age simply: senes aetate; Philem. 9; Luke i. 18.—*νηφαλίους εἶναι*] The accusative does not depend on a word understood such as *παρακάλει*, but is an object accusative to the verb preceding *λάλει ἃ πρέπει*: "viz. that the old men be *νηφάλιοι*."—*νηφαλίους*] see 1 Tim. iii. 2.—*σεμνούς*] see 1 Tim. ii. 2.—*σώφρονας*] i. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 2.—*ὑγιαίνοντας τῇ πίστει, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ ὑπομονῇ*] On the use of the dative here, for which in i. 13 there stands the preposition *ἐν*, see Winer, p. 204 [E. T. p. 217]; it is to be explained as equivalent to "in respect of, in regard to."—To *πίστις* and *ἀγάπη*, the cardinal virtues of the Christian life, *ὑπομονή* (quasi utriusque condimentum, Calvin) is added, the stedfastness which no sufferings can shake. All three conceptions are found together also in 1 Thess. i. 3 (*ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος*); *ὑπομ.* and *πίστις* in 2 Thess. i. 4; *ἀγ. καὶ ὑπομ.*, 2 Thess. iii. 5; comp. also 1 Tim. vi. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 10.

Ver. 3. *Πρεσβύτιδας* ("the aged women" = *πρεσβύτεραι* in 1 Tim. v. 2) *ὡσαύτως* (see 1 Tim. ii. 9) *ἐν καταστήματι ἱεροπρεπεῖς*] [XXXVI *c*.] *κατάστημα* is taken in too narrow a sense, only of the clothing (Oecumenius: *τὰ περιβόλαια*). It denotes the entire external deportment; Jerome: ut ipse earum incessus et motus, vultus, sermo, silentium, quandam decoris sacri praeferant dignitatem. Heydenreich, on the other hand, makes the conception too wide, when he includes under it the temper of mind.—*ἱεροπρεπεῖς*] (*ἅπ. λεγ.*) is equivalent to *καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις*, Eph. v. 3; comp. also 1 Tim. ii. 10. Luther rightly: "that they behave themselves as becometh saints."—*μὴ διαβόλους*] see 1 Tim. iii. 11.—*μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας* is equivalent to *μὴ οἴν. π. προσέχοντας* in 1 Tim. iii. 8.—*καλοδιδασκάλους*] (*ἅπ. λεγ.*) Beza: "honestatis magistrae; agitur hic de domestica disciplina;" but not so much by example as by exhortation and teaching, as appears from what follows.

Vv. 4, 5. *Ἵνα σωφρονίζωσι τὰς νέας κ.τ.λ.*] Since *σωφρονίζειν* must necessarily have an object, *τὰς νέας κ.τ.λ.* should not, like *πρεσβύτας νηφαλίους εἶναι*, ver. 2, and *πρεσβύτιδας*, ver. 3, be joined with *λάλει*, ver. 1 (Hofmann), but with *σωφρονίζουσιν*, so that the exhortations given to the *young women* are to pro-

ceed from the older women.[1]—*σωφρονίζειν*] (*ἅπ. λεγ.*) is properly "bring some one to *σωφροσύνη*," then "amend," viz. by punishment; it also occurs in the sense of "punish, chastise;" it is synonymous with *νουθετεῖν*.[2] According to Beza, it expresses opposition to the juvenilis lascivia et alia ejus aetatis ac sexus vitia.—The aim of the *σωφρονίζειν* is given in the next words: *φιλάνδρους* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*) *εἶναι, φιλοτέκνους* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*). These two ideas are suitably placed first, as pointing to the first and most obvious circumstances of the *νέαι*.—Ver. 5. *σώφρονας ἁγνάς*] The latter is to be taken here not in the general sense of "blameless," but in the more special sense of "chaste" (Wiesinger).—*οἰκουρούς* (*Rec.*); Wahl rightly: "ex *οἶκος* et *οὖρος* custos: custos domus, de feminis, quae domi se continent neque *περιέρχονται*, 1 Tim. v. 13." Vulgate: domus curam habentes; Luther: "domestic."[3] The word *οἰκουργούς* [XXXVI *d.*] (read by Tischendorf, see critical remarks) does not occur elsewhere; if it be genuine, it must mean "*working in the house*" (Alford: "workers at home"), which, indeed, does not agree with the formation of the word. The word *οἰκουργεῖν* occurring in later Greek means: "make a house;" see Pape, *s. v.* —*ἀγαθάς*] is rightly taken by almost all as an independent epithet: "kindly." Some expositors, however, connect it with *οἰκουρούς* (so Theophylact, Oecumenius); but this is wrong, since *οἰκουρούς* is itself an adjective. Hofmann joins it with *οἰκουργούς*, and translates it "good housewives" (so Buttmann, in his edition of the N. T., has no comma between the two words); but where are the grounds for explaining *οἰκουργούς* to mean "*housewives*"?—*ὑποτασσομένας τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν*] On *τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδρ.*, comp. 1 Cor. vii. 2. The thought that wives are to be subject to their husbands is often expressed in the N. T. in the same words, comp. Eph. v. 22; Col. iii. 18; 1 Pet iii. 1. It is to be noted that the apostle adds this *ὑποτασσομένας* after using *φιλάνδρους*. The one thing does not put an end to the other; on the contrary, neither quality is of the right kind unless it includes the other. How much weight was laid by the apostle on the *ὑποτάσσεσθαι* may be seen from the words: *ἵνα μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ βλασφημῆται*, which are closely connected with *ὑποτασσομένας κ.τ.λ.*; comp. ver. 10, where the same thought is expressed positively, and 1 Tim. vi. 1. The apostolic preaching of freedom and equality in Christ might easily be applied in a fleshly sense for removing all natural subordination, and thus disgrace be brought on the word of God; hence the express warning.[4]

Ver. 6. *Τοὺς νεωτέρους*] "*the younger men;*" not, as Matthies supposes,

[1] Of course there might be circumstances in which *σωφρονίζειν* could stand without an object, as *e. g. παρακαλεῖν* in 2 Tim. iv. 2 (to which Hofmann appeals); but here a definite object was needed to tell to whom the *σωφρον.* of the older women had reference, it being impossible to assign it to them without some limitation. It is to be noted that in the passage—in which *παρεκάλεσεν* is joined with another transitive verb—the object is very easily supplied, and that in the N. T., when *παρακαλεῖν* is used, the more precise limitation is expressly given, or can be easily supplied from the context.

[2] Dio Cassius, lv. p. 650: *δεῖ τοὺς μὲν λόγοις νουθετεῖν, τοὺς δὲ ἀπειλαῖς σωφρονίζειν.*

[3] Chrysostom: *ἡ οἰκουρὸς γυνὴ καὶ σώφρων ἔσται· ἡ οἰκουρὸς καὶ οἰκονομική· οὔτε περὶ τρυφὴν, οὔτε περὶ ἐξόδους ἀκαίρους, οὔτε περὶ ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων ἀσχοληθήσεται.*

[4] The remark of Chrysostom: *εἰ συμβαίη γυναῖκα πιστὴν ἀπίστῳ συνοικοῦσαν, μὴ εἶναι ἐνάρετον, ἡ βλασφημία ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν διαβαίνειν εἰωθεν*, is unsatisfactory, because the apostle's

the younger members of the church, without distinction of sex.[1]—*ὡσαύτως*] here, as in ver. 3, on account of the similarity of the exhortation.—*παρακάλει σωφρονεῖν*] equivalent to *σώφρονας εἶναι*, opposed to omnibus immoderatis affectibus (Beza). Hofmann: "The whole purport of the apostle's exhortations is included by the apostle in the one word *σωφρονεῖν*, which therefore contains everything in which the moral influence of Christianity may be displayed."

Vv. 7, 8. The exhortation by word is to be accompanied by the exhortation of example. [XXXVI *e.*]—*περὶ πάντα*] does not belong to what precedes, but begins a new sentence, and is put first for emphasis. Πάντα is not masculine: "towards every one," but neuter: "in regard to all things, in all points."—*σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον καλῶν ἔργων*] On the use of the middle *παρέχεσθαι* with the pronoun *ἑαυτόν*, "show himself," see Winer, p. 242 [E. T. p. 257].[2]—*τύπον*, "type," is in the N. T. only found here with the genitive of the thing.—*καλὰ ἔργα*] 1 Tim. v. 10; an expression often occurring in the Pastoral Epistles.—*ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀφθορίαν*] This and the following accusatives are dependent on *παρεχόμενος*; see Col. iv. 1. Luther inaccurately: "with unadulterated doctrine, with sobriety," etc.; Jerome: in doctrina, in integritate et castitate.—*ἀφθορία*, only in later Greek, is from *ἄφθορος*,[3] which is equivalent to "*chaste*," and therefore means "*unstained chastity.*" Ἀδιαφθορία (*Rec.*) is of more general signification; it is also used of virgin chastity,[4] but denotes in general soundness, also especially incorruptibility. Older as well as more recent expositors (Heydenreich, Mack, Wiesinger) refer the word here to the disposition: "purity of disposition;"[5] but it is more in accordance with the context to understand by it something immediately connected with the *διδασκαλία*, to which *σεμνότητα* also refers. Matthies, de Wette, and others refer it (as does Luther also) to the subject-matter of the doctrine; de Wette: "incorruptness in doctrine, *i. e.* unadulterated doctrine." But in that case it would mean the same thing as the following *λόγον ὑγιῆ*; there is no justification for Bengel's interpreting *ἐν διδασκαλίᾳ* to mean *public* addresses, and *λόγον* the talk of daily intercourse. According to its original meaning, *ἀφθορία* is most suitably taken to mean chastity in doctrine, which avoids everything not in harmony with its true subject and aim, and it has a special reference to the form (comp. 1 Cor. ii. 1, 3). So, too, van Oosterzee: "the form of the doctrine which Titus preaches is to be pure, chaste, free from everything that conflicts with the nature of the gospel."—*σεμνότητα*, on the other hand,

words are thereby arbitrarily restricted to a relation which is quite special.

[1] Hofmann remarks that the transition to the younger men makes it clear "that he was to exhort the younger women also himself, and not merely by means of the older ones;" but in that case Paul would simply have written: *τοὺς νεωτέρους σωφρονεῖν*, and further, in that case it would have been more natural for him to mention the *νεωτεροι* first and then the *νέαι*.

[2] Comp. Xenophon, *Cyrop.* viii. 1. 39: *παραδειγμα . . . τοίονδε ἑαυτὸν παρείχετο.*

[3] In Artemidorus, ver. 95: de virginibus puerisque intactis et illibatis legitur; Reiche; Esth. ii. 2: *κοράσια ἄφθορα καλὰ τῷ εἴδει.*

[4] Artac. 26, Diodorus Siculus, i. 59.

[5] Reiche, who prefers the reading *ἀδιαφθορίαν*, agrees with the exposition of Erasmus; integritas animi nullis cupiditatibus corrupti, non ira non ambitione non avaritia.

denotes dignity in the style of delivery. Both these things, the ἀφθορία and the σεμνότης, were injured by the heretics in their λογομαχίαις.[1]—λόγον ὑγιῆ ἀκατάγνωστον (âπ. λεγ.) refers to the subject-matter of the doctrine: "*sound, unblamable word,*" is opposition to the corruptions made by the heretics.—The purpose is thus given: ἵνα ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας ἐντραπῇ] ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας (âπ. λεγ.), qui ex adverso est; according to Chrysostom: ὁ διάβολος καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἐκείνῳ διακονούμενος; but the next words are against this interpretation. According to ver. 5 and 1 Tim. vi. 1, it means the non-Christian opponent of the gospel, and not the Christian heretic (Heydenreich, Wiesinger).—ἐντραπῇ, "*be ashamed, take shame to oneself;*" 1 Cor. iv. 14; 2 Thess. iii. 14. The reason for the shame is contained in the words: μηδὲν ἔχων περὶ ἡμῶν (or ὑμῶν) λέγειν φαῦλον] "*having nothing wicked to say of us.*"—If περὶ ἡμῶν be the correct reading, it is not to be limited to Titus and Paul, but should be taken more generally. With the reading ὑμῶν, on the other hand, the apostle's words refer to Titus and the churches that follow his example.

Vv. 9, 10. [On Vv. 9–15, see Note XXXVII., pages 306–311.] Exhortation in regard to slaves.—δούλους ἰδίοις δεσπόταις (or δεσπόταις ἰδίοις) ὑποτάσσεσθαι] [XXXVII *a*.] The construction shows that Paul is continuing the instructions which he gives to Timothy in regard to the various members of families, so that vv. 7 and 8 are parenthetical; παρακάλει is to be supplied from ver. 6. Heydenreich and Matthies wrongly make this verse dependent on ver 1. The harder the lot of the slaves, and the more unendurable this might appear to the Christian slave conscious of his Christian dignity, the more necessary was it to impress upon him the ὑποτάσσεσθαι. Even this is not sufficient, and so Paul further adds: ἐν πᾶσιν εὐαρέστους εἶναι. Ἐν πᾶσιν, equivalent to "*in all points*" (ver. 7: περὶ πάντα; Col. iii. 20, 22: κατὰ πάντα), is usually joined with εὐαρέστους εἶναι; Hofmann, on the contrary, wishes to connect it with ὑποτάσσεσθαι. Both constructions are possible; still the usual one is to be preferred, because the very position of the slaves made it a matter of course that the ὑποτάσσεσθαι should be evinced in its full extent, whereas the same could not be said of εὐάρεστοι εἶναι, since that goes beyond the duty of ὑποτάσσεσθαι. The word εὐάρεστος occurs frequently in the Pauline Epistles, but only in speaking of the relation to God. The two first exhortations refer to general conduct; to these the apostle adds two special points: μὴ ἀντιλέγοντας and μὴ νοσφιζομένους. Hofmann is wrong in saying that μὴ ἀντιλέγοντας is the antithesis of εὐαρέστους. The conduct of slaves, which is well-pleasing to masters, includes more than refraining from contradiction. Van Oosterzee says not incorrectly: "It is not contradiction in particular instances, but the habitus that is here indicated." Luther: "not contradicting." The verb νοσφίζεσθαι is found only here and in Acts v. 2, 3: "*not pilfering, defrauding.*"—The next words: ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθήν (Luther: "but showing all good fidelity"), is in the first place opposed to

[1] Hofmann wishes to refer both words to the subject-matter and form alike; and so, also, with λόγον ὑγιῆ; but we cannot see why in that case Paul does not specially name the latter.

μὴ νοσφιζομένους, but includes more than merely to abstain from defrauding (in opposition to Hofmann). As in ver. 5, so, too, here, where the maintenance of the natural duties of subordinates is under discussion, the apostle adds *ἵνα τὴν διδασκαλίαν κ.τ.λ.*, except that the expression is now positive, whereas before it was negative; the thought is substantially the same. —*ἡ διδασκαλία* is equivalent to *ὁ λόγος, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.*—*τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμ. Θεοῦ*] see 1 Tim. i. 1; not, as some expositors (Calvin, Wolf) think, Christ, but God.—*κοσμῶσιν*] "*do honor to.*"—*ἐν πᾶσιν*] ver. 9, "*in all points,*" not "with all, in the eyes of all" (Hofmann).—Chrysostom: *οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δόγματος δόγματα, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ πραγμάτων καὶ βίου τὰ δόγματα κρίνουσιν οἱ Ἕλληνες· ἔστωσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ γυναῖκες καὶ δοῦλοι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τῆς οἰκείας ἀναστροφῆς.*

Vv. 11–14. [XXXVII *b.*] Foundation for the moral precepts given from the nature of Christianity: eximium ex evangelii medulla motivum inseritur (Bengel).—Chrysostom[1] and others refer ver. 11 (*γάρ*) only to the exhortation to slaves which immediately precedes. It is more correct, however, to refer it to the whole sum of moral precepts, given from ver. 1 onwards (so, too, van Oosterzee, Plitt, Hofmann).—*ἐπεφάνη γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ*] *ἐπεφάνη* (see iii. 4) is used of the sun in Acts xxvii. 20. Possibly Paul is speaking here with this figure in mind (comp. Isa. ix. 2, lx. 1; Luke i. 79), as Heydenreich, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee suppose; but possibly, also, the expression simply means that the *χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ*, formerly hidden in God, has come forth from concealment and become manifest and visible.—*ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ*] The old writers on dogma give to this expression, which denotes the absolute ground of the work of redemption, too special a reference to Christ's incarnation.[2] It need hardly be said that he is speaking here not simply of a revelation of the divine grace *by teaching*, but also of its appearance *in act*, viz. in the act of redemption.—To define the *χάρις* more accurately, there is added: *σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις*] not: "as bringing salvation" (de Wette, van Oosterzee). This would make *σωτήριος* here the main point, which from the context it cannot be; the main point is not given till *παιδεύουσα*. Σωτήριος is rather an adjective qualifying the substantive *χάρις*: "there appeared the grace bringing salvation to all men." With the *Rec. ἡ σωτήριος* this construction is beyond doubt.—*πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις*] does not depend on *ἐπεφάνη*, but on *σωτήριος*. Matthies is not intelligible in regarding it as dependent on both.[3] —The emphasis laid on the universality of the salvation, as in 1 Tim. ii. 4 and other passages of the Pastoral Epistles, is purely Pauline.

Ver. 12. *Παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς, ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*] On this the chief emphasis is laid. By *παιδεύουσα* the apostle makes it clear that "the grace of God has a paedagogic purpose" (Heydenreich). Here, as also elsewhere in the N. T., *παιδεύειν* does not simply mean "educate," but "educate by disci-

[1] Πολλὴν παρὰ τῶν οἰκετῶν ἀπαιτήσας τὴν ἀρετὴν, ἀπάγει καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν δικαίαν, δι' ἣν ὀφείλουσι τοιοῦτοι εἶναι οἱ οἰκέται.

[2] Oecumenius: *ἡ μετὰ σαρκὸς ἐπιδημία*; Theodoret: *τούτου χάριν ἐνηνθρώπησεν ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*

[3] Wiesinger translates: "for there appeared the grace of God which brings salvation to all men;" and on the construction of *πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις* he afterwards says: "according to the context, it can only be construed with *σωτήριος*."

plinary correction." Hence Luther is not incorrect in translating: "and chastises us." This reference is to be noted here, as is shown by the next words: *ἀρνησάμενοι κ.τ.λ.* *Ἵνα* does not indicate the purpose here, but the object to be supplied, for *παιδ.* is not subjective, but objective; the sentence beginning with *ἵνα* might also have been expressed by the infinitive; comp. 1 Tim. i. 20; not therefore "*in order that* we," but "*that* we." On this use of *ἵνα*, see Winer, pp. 314 ff. [E. T. pp. 334 ff.][1]—*ἀρνησάμενοι*] see i. 16: "denying," *i. e.* renouncing, abandoning.—*τὴν ἀσέβειαν*] is not equivalent to *εἰδωλολατρείαν καὶ τὰ πονηρὰ δόγματα* (Theophylact), but is the opposite of *εὐσέβειαν*: the behavior of man, ungodly, estranged from God, of which idolatry is only one side.—*καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας*] *κοσμικός* only here and in Heb. ix. 1, but there in another connection. The *κοσμ. ἐπιθυμίαι* are not "desires or lusts referring to the earthly, transient world" (first edition of this commentary; so, too, Wiesinger), but "the lusts belonging to the *κόσμος*, *i. e.* to the world estranged from God," which, indeed, is the same thing (so, too, van Oosterzee). Kindred conceptions are found *ἐπιθυμία σαρκός*, Gal. v. 15; Eph. ii. 3; *ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαι*, 1 Pet. iv. 2.—*σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν*] see i. 8 (*σώφρονα, δίκαιον, ὅσιον*). This denotes the life of Christian morality in three directions. Immediately after *ἐπιθυμίαι* we have the opposing conception *σωφρόνως*, which expresses self-control. *Δικαίως* denotes generally right conduct such as the divine law demands, having special reference here, as in i. 8, to duty towards one's neighbor. *Εὐσεβῶς* (opposite of *ἀσέβειαν*) denotes holiness in thought and act.—Even the older expositors find in the collocation of these three ideas an expression for the whole sum of duties. Wolf: optime illi res instituunt, qui per *τὸ εὐσεβῶς* officia adversus Deum, per *τὸ δικαίως* officia adv. proximum, per *τὸ σωφρόνως* vero illa adv. hominem ipsum indicari existimant; still it might be doubtful whether Paul regarded the ideas as so sharply distinct from each other.—*ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι*] Paul adds this to remind Titus that for the Christian there is another and future life towards which his glance is directed even in this;—still these words cannot be construed with *προσδεχόμενοι*.

Ver. 13. *Προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα*] The strange collocation of *προσδεχ.* and *ἐλπίδα* is found also in Acts xxiv. 15: *ἐλπίδα ἔχων . . . ἣν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι προσδέχονται*; so, too, in Gal. v. 5: *ἐλπίδα . . . ἀπεκδεχόμεθα*. The reason of it is that *ἐλπίς* not only denotes actively the hope, but also passively the thing hoped for, the subject of the hope; comp. Col. i. 5: *ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡ ἀποκειμένη ἐν τ. οὐρανοῖς*; comp., too, Rom. viii. 24.—*μακαρίαν*] Paul thus describes the *ἐλπίδα* in so far as the expectation of it blesses the believer. Wolf wrongly interprets *ἡ μακ. ἐλπὶς* as equivalent to *ἡ ἐλπιζομένη μακαριότης*.—This *ἐλπίς* is further defined by the epexegesis: *καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χριστοῦ*] [XXXVII *c.* pages 307–311.] According to Hofmann, the adjective *μακαρίαν* as well as

[1] Wiesinger translates: "educating us, that we . . . live holily," but thinks that *ἵνα* is to be retained in its proper signification as denoting the *aim* of the *παίδευμα*. In its proper signification, however, *ἵνα* does not give the *aim*, but the *purpose*. If it be taken in this sense here, we cannot but translate it "in order that."

the genitive *τῆς δόξης κ.τ.λ.* belongs to both substantives, to *ἐλπίδα* and to *ἐπιφάνειαν*, because, as he thinks, *ἡ μακαρία ἐλπίς* is not a conception complete in itself. But Rom. xv. 4 shows this to be wrong. The genitive could only be construed with the two substantives by giving it a different reference in each case. Hofmann, indeed, maintains that this presents no difficulty, as it occurs elsewhere; but he is wrong in his appeal to Rom. xv. 4 (comp. Meyer on the passage) and to 1 Pet. i. 2 and 2 Pet. iii. 11 (comp. my commentary on the passages).—Beyond doubt, the *ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης κ.τ.λ.* denotes Christ's second coming (1 Tim. vi. 14); it may, however, be asked whether *μεγάλου Θεοῦ* is an independent subject or an attribute of *Ἰησ. Χρ.* The older expositors are of the latter opinion; the orthodox even appealed to this passage against the Arians. Ambrosius, however, distinguishes here between Christus and Deus Pater.[1] Erasmus, too, says: simul cum Patre apparebit eadem gloria conspicuus Dominus ac Servator noster J. Chr.; and Bengel says of *Θεοῦ* simply: referri *potest* ad Christum. Among more recent expositors, Flatt, Mack, Matthies, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Hofmann, adopt the former view; while de Wette, Plitt, Winer, pp. 123 f. [E. T. p. 130], adopt the latter. Heydenreich leaves the question undecided.[2] It cannot be decided on purely grammatical grounds, for *μεγ. Θεοῦ* and *σωτῆρος ἡμ.* may be two attributes referring to *Ἰησ. Χριστοῦ*; still it may be also that *σωτῆρ. ἡμῶν Ἰησ. Χρ.* is a subject distinct from *μεγ. Θεοῦ*, even although only *one* article is used.[3] The question can only be answered by an appeal to N. T. usage, both for this passage and others like it: 2 Pet. i. 1; Jude 4; 2 Thess. i. 12. In 2 Pet. i. 11, iii. 18, the unity of the subject is beyond doubt. The following points may be urged in favor of distinguishing two subjects:—(1) In *no single* passage is *Θεός* connected directly with *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* as an attribute (see my commentary on 2 Pet. i. 1); *i. e.* there *never* occurs in the N. T. the simple construction *ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησ. Χρ.*, or *ὁ Θεὸς Ἰησοῦς Χρ.*, or *Ἰησ. Χρ. ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν*, whereas *κύριος* and *σωτήρ* are often enough construed in this

[1] The words of Ambrosius are: hanc esse dicit beatam spem credentium, qui exspectant adventum gloriae magni Dei, quod revelari habet judice Christo, in quo Dei patris videbitur potestas et gloria, ut fidei suae praemium consequantur. Ad hoc enim redemit nos Christus, ut, puram vitam sectantes, repleti bonis operibus, regni Dei haeredes esse possimus.

[2] Heydenreich wrongly supposes that *δόξα* here is the glory which God and Christ will give to believers.

[3] Hofmann wrongly asserts that because *σωτῆρος ἡμῶν* stands before *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and with *μεγάλου Θεοῦ* under one and the same article, therefore *ἡμῶν must* belong to *μεγάλου Θεοῦ* as much as to *σωτῆρος*, and *μεγάλου* to *σωτῆρος* as much as to *Θεοῦ*, and both together to *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* as predicate. There are instances enough of two distinct subjects standing under *one* article only, and we cannot see why these instances should not be quoted here. It cannot indeed be said that *σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χρ.* needs no article; for, although *σωτήρ* as well as *κύριος* may be construed with *Ἰ. Χρ.* without the article, still there is no instance of *κύριος ἡμῶν* being without the article when construed with *Ἰ. Χρ.* But the article before *μεγ. Θεοῦ* may, according to N. T. usage, be also referred to *σωτῆρος Ἰ. Χρ.* without making it necessary to assume a unity of subject; comp. Buttm. pp. 84 ff. [E. T. 97, 100]; Winer, pp. 118 ff. [E. T. p. 124 ff.]. Hofmann is no less wrong in what he says regarding the *necessity* of the reference of *μεγάλου* and of *ἡμῶν*. Paul, indeed, might have written: *τοῦ μεγ. Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησ. Χρ. τοῦ σωτῆρος ὑμῶν*, but he could also express the same thought in the way he has written it.

way. (2) The collocation of God (Θεός) and Christ as two subjects is quite current, not only in the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim. i. 1, 2, v. 21, vi. 13; 2 Tim. i. 2, iv. 1; Tit. i. 4), but also in all the epistles of the N. T., Pauline or not, *so much so*, that when in some few passages the turn of the expression is such as to make Θεός refer grammatically to Christ also, these passages have to be explained in accordance with the almost invariable meaning of the expression. (3) The addition of the adjective *μεγάλου* indicates that Θεοῦ is to be taken as an independent subject, especially when it is observed how Paul in the First Epistle to Timothy uses similar epithets to exalt God's glory; comp. 1 Tim. i. 17, iv. 10, vi. 15, 16, especially i. 11; *ἡ δόξα τοῦ μακαρίου Θεοῦ*. It is true the expression *ὁ μέγας Θεός* is not found in the N. T., except in the *Rec.* of Rev. xix. 17, but it occurs frequently in the O. T.: Deut. vi. 21, x. 17; Neh. ix. 32; Dan. ii. 45, ix. 4.[1] —For the unity of the subject only one reason can be urged with any show of force, viz. that elsewhere the word *ἐπιφάνεια* is only used in reference to Christ; but Erasmus long ago pointed out that it does not stand here *ἐπιφ. τοῦ Θεοῦ*, but *τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Wiesinger, too, has to admit "that, according to passages like Matt. xvi. 27, Mark viii. 38, Christ appears in the glory of the Father and at the same time in His own glory (Matt. xxv. 31), and His appearance may therefore be called the appearance both of God's glory and of His own." Wiesinger, indeed, tries to weaken this admission by remarking that in reality it is Christ Himself who will appear *ἐν δόξῃ τοῦ πάτρος*, and not God, that therefore *δόξα* would be construed with the genitives in quite different relations, and that on grammatico-logical principles it must mean either *ἐν σωτῆρι ἡμῶν Ἰησ. Χριστῷ*, or *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ* (Matthies). But his remark is wrong. Even if the subjects be distinct, the genitive *τοῦ μεγ. Θεοῦ* stands in the same relation to *τῆς δόξης* as does the genitive *σωτῆρος ἡμ. Ι. Χρ.* Nor is the form of expression necessary on which Matthies insists, because in the N. T. *God* and *Christ* are often enough connected simply by *καί* without marking their mutual relations. Wiesinger further remarks that no reason whatever can be found in the context for connecting Θεός here as well as Christ with the *ἐπιφάνεια*, but he has manifestly overlooked the relation of *προσδεχόμενοι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγ. Θεοῦ* to *ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ*.[2]—Chrysostom rightly says: *δύο δείκνυσιν ἐνταῦθα ἐπιφανείας· καὶ γάρ εἰσι δύο· ἡ μὲν πρότερα χάριτος, ἡ δὲ δευτέρα ἀνταποδόσεως*. The *χάρις* of God has already appeared; the *δόξα* of God appears only at the day of completion, when Christ is made manifest in His *δόξα*, which is the *δόξα* of God. Though not so directly as it would have been if the subjects were identical, this passage is still a testimony in favor of

[1] Usteri (*Paul. Lehrb.* 5th ed. p. 326) says: "God the Father did not need the extolling epithet *μέγας*;" to which it may be replied: "Did Christ need such an epithet?"—If Hofmann be right in remarking that Christ is not *ὁ Θεός*, which is the subject-name of the Father, then it is very questionable that Paul would call Him *ὁ μέγας Θεός*.

[2] Van Oosterzee has advanced nothing new in support of the view disputed above. The appeal to 2 Pet. i. 11 is of no use, unless it be proved in passages beyond dispute that *Θεός* like *κύριος*, is joined with *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* as an attribute.

the truth of the doctrine of Christ's divinity.[1]—Matthies suggests that in the expression *τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ* there is an allusion to the *great Zeus* worshiped in Crete, but that is more than improbable.—The genitive *σωτῆρος* is not dependent on *ἐπιφάνειαν*, but on *τῆς δόξης*. In 1 Pet. iv. 13 also Christ's second coming is called the revelation of His *δόξα*.

Ver. 14. The thought in this verse is very closely related to ver. 12: *παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς, ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*, as it shows how far the appearance of the grace of God exhorts us to deny *ἀσέβεια κ.τ.λ.* In construction, however, it is connected with *σωτῆρος ἡμ. Ἰ. Χρ.—ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτόν*] comp. Gal. i. 4, equivalent to *παρέδωκεν ἑαυτόν*, Eph. v. 25. The conception of the *voluntary* submission to death is not contained in *ἑαυτόν* (Heydenreich) so much as in the whole expression.—*ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*] is not equivalent to *ἀντὶ ἡμῶν*, but: "*for us, on our behalf;*" the notion of *ἀντί*, however, is not excluded (Matt. xx. 28). The purpose of this submission is given in the next words: *ἵνα λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς*] *λυτροῦσθαι*: "set free by means of a ransom." In Luke xxiv. 21 (comp. too, 1 Macc. iv. 11, and other passages in the Apocrypha) the reference to ransom falls quite into the background; but in 1 Pet. i. 18, 19, where, as here, the redemption through Christ is spoken of, the *τίμιον αἷμα* of Christ is called the ransom. The same reference is indicated here by the previous *ἔδωκεν ἑαυτόν*, comp. 1 Tim. ii. 6. The middle form includes the reference which in the next clause is expressed by *ἑαυτῷ*.—*ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας*] "from all unlawfulness." *Ἀνομία* is regarded as the power from which Christ has redeemed us; it is opposed to *σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζῆν*: "the unrighteousness in which the law of God is unheeded." It is wrong to understand by *ἀνομία* "not only the sin, but also the punishment incurred by sin" (Heydenreich), or only the latter; comp. Rom. vi. 19, 2 Cor. vi. 14, and especially 1 John iii. 4: *ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία.—καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον*] positive expression of the thought which was expressed negatively in the previous clause. De Wette and Wiesinger without reason supply *ἡμᾶς* as the object of *καθαρίσῃ*; the object is *λαὸν περιούσιον.—περιούσιος* (ἅπ. λεγ. in N. T.). Chrysostom wrongly interprets it by *ἐξελεγμένος, οὐδὲν ἔχων κοινὸν πρὸς τοὺς λοιποὺς*; Theodoret more correctly by *οἰκεῖος*; so, too, Beza: peculiaris, and Luther: "a people for a possession." The phrase *λαὸς περιούσιος* belongs to the O. T., and is a translation of the Hebrew עַם סְגֻלָּה, Ex. xix. 5; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18, LXX.; in the church of the N. T. the promise made to the people of Israel is fulfilled; comp. 1 Pet. ii. 9: *λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν.—ἑαυτῷ* corresponds with *λυτρώσηται ἀπό*. The sentence is pregnantly expressed, and its meaning is: "that He by the purifying power of His death might acquire for Himself (*ἑαυτῷ*) a people for a possession."—The moral character of the *λαὸς περιούσ.* is declared by the words in apposition, *ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων*: accensum studio bonorum operum.—De Wette is inaccurate in saying that the apostle is speaking here not of reconcilia-

[1] Calvin: Verum brevius et certius repellere licet Arianos, quia Paulus, de revelatione magni Dei loquutus, mox Christum adjunxit, ut sciremus, in hujus persona fore illam gloriae revelationem, ac si diceret, ubi Christus apparuerit, tunc patefactum nobis iri divinae gloriae magnitudinem.

tion, but *only* of moral purification. Wiesinger rightly asks: "What else are we to understand by ἐδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν than the reconciling death?" But de Wette is so far right, that reconciliation is not made the chief point here, but rather, as often in the N. T., *e.g.* 1 Pet. i. 17, 18, the design is mentioned for which Christ suffered the death of reconciliation; comp. Luther's exposition of the second article of faith.

Ver. 15. Ταῦτα (viz. these moral precepts, see ver. 1, with the reasons given for them, vv. 11–14) λάλει καὶ παρακάλει καὶ ἔλεγχε] The distinction between these words is correctly given by Heydenreich. Λαλεῖν denotes simple teaching, παρακάλ. pressing exhortation, ἔλεγχ. solemn admonition to those who neglect these duties. "The theoretic, the paraenetic-practical, and the polemic aspects of the preaching of the gospel are combined" (Matthies).—μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς] According to 1 Cor. vii. 6, συγγνώμη is the opposite of ἐπιταγή; this clause therefore enjoins that Titus is not to leave it to the free choice of the church whether his exhortations shall be obeyed or not, but to deliver them as commands. De Wette translates: "with all recommendation," which is right in sense; still ἐπιταγή is not properly recommendation but command, and it is therefore better to say, "*with entire full command.*"—With this the final words are closely connected: μηδείς σου περιφρονείτω] περιφρονεῖν (ἀπ. λεγ.); properly: "consider something on all sides;" then: "think beyond, despise," equivalent to καταφρονεῖν; comp. 1 Tim. iv. 12. Luther is right in sense: "let no man despise thee," viz. by not receiving thy teachings, exhortations, and admonitions as commands, and by thinking lightly of them. There is nothing to suggest that Titus is to conduct himself so that no one may be right in despising him.

Notes by American Editor.

XXXVI. Vv. 1–8.

(*a*) The passage which now follows, and which has reference to the exhortations and instructions to be given by Titus to men and women, according as they were older or younger—Huther says, to the members of families, but the words may be regarded as more general in their application,—is opened by a direction addressed to him to speak the things befitting "the healthful teaching." As related to what goes before, this direction forms a contrast to the course pursued by the false teachers (δέ). As related to what follows, it finds its special application in the several lines which are mentioned. Evidently, as thus applied, the practical bearing of the διδασκαλία, is what the Apostle has in mind. Very probably it may be because of this fact, that the peculiar expression ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγ. διδ. is used.—(*b*) In suggesting the exhortations which Titus should give to the older men and the older women in general, it is noticeable that Paul bids him urge upon all of them such actions, and the possession of such qualities, in the main, as in 1 Tim. he sets forth as proper to be required in presbyters and in the class of widows to whom he specially refers. Thus, in 1 Tim., the presbyter-bishop is to be νηφάλιος, σώφρων, and, in Tit. i. 8, 9, holding fast to and able to exhort in the ὑγιαιν. διδασκ. The women, on the other hand, who are alluded to—the wives of the deacons or,

if it be so, the deaconesses—are called upon to be *μὴ διάβολοι, σεμναί, νηφάλιοι*, and those widows who are to receive support from the church (1 Tim. iv. 3 ff.) are required to have exhibited virtues in their past career, which are preparatory in their nature to those demanded of the older women here. These facts tend to show how completely the Apostle's mind, in all the suggestions as to the officials of the church, or those in any more public station among the body of believers, was upon the moral and Christian qualifications which were needed, and how very slight, as yet, was the development of the idea of government, authority or office in the churches. The latest epistles of Paul have scarcely anything, if indeed anything, more in the line of the latter idea, than the earlier ones. It is worthy of notice, also, that, in 1 Tim., where he brings out these moral qualifications, etc., as necessary for bishops and deacons, and for widows who were to be placed upon the list of widows, he simply says, with respect to the older and younger men and women, that Timothy should treat them as he would treat parents, or as he would treat brothers and sisters; but here, on the contrary, not dwelling so largely on the case of persons holding public station, he deals fully with the demands of the Christian teaching on *all* men and women, according as they are old or young. This, again, is suggestive as to how widely removed the Apostle's thoughts were from the notions of office and authority, which arose in later times.—(*c*) On the word *καταστήματι* (ver. 3) see Note VII. *c*, above, 1 Tim. ii. 9. The thing required of all women in the church-meetings, in that passage, is in this place demanded—so far as *καταστήματι* here corresponds with *καταστολῇ* there—of the elder women at all times. *κατάστημα* has, however, a somewhat more internal reference, as we may not improbably hold, and perhaps a more extended meaning, than *καταστολή*—(*d*) The reading *οἰκουρούς* (ver. 5), *workers at home*, is so largely supported by the best authorities, that it must be adopted as the true text. Tisch., Lachm., Treg., W. & H., Alf. adopt it. With either reading, *οἰκουρούς* or *οἰκουροὺς* (*keepers at home*), the contrast with *περιεργόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας* of 1 Tim. v. 13 can hardly be mistaken. The *ἵνα* clause which follows is one indication, among many, that the evil-speaking on the part of those outside of the Church, in case the Christian women violated the sentiment of the age and country in regard to the proper position of their sex, was a chief reason for the Apostle's urgency in his exhortations as to this matter. The exhortation to the younger men is comprehended in the word *σωφρονεῖν*, but this seems here to be, in connection with the various other terms of the preceding verses, a word which is intended to be comprehensive in its meaning.—(*e*) To the end of adding the greatest force to his exhortations to others, Titus is urged in vv. 7, 8 to exhibit the characteristics, in his own living, which he asks them, according to their position, to manifest in theirs; and the same thing is urged to the end that those who were adversaries, whether Jewish or Gentile, may not be able to say anything evil of the life or action of the believers, and thus may be put to shame. The emphasis in the position of *τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ* (ver. 7) is, not improbably, that of contrast to *ἔργων*, but it may also be connected with the general prominence which is given in the Past. Epp. to the healthful teaching, as opposed to the present and threatening errors.

XXXVII. Vv. 9–15.

(*a*) The exhortation to slaves, which in 1 Tim. is given by itself (vi. 1, 2), is here placed at the end of a series of exhortations to different classes, as it is in

some of the other epistles. But it is thrown into an especial prominence by the fact that the closing words of it—the ἵνα clause of ver. 10—are made the introduction to the very important declaration of the fundamental Christian truth which is set forth in the following verses. These verses, in their immediate grammatical connection (γάρ), and by reason of the word σωτήριος (ver. 12) as related to σωτῆρος (ver. 10), are to be joined with what is said about the slaves. But, in their wider application, as a reason for the course of life and conduct indicated, they extend in their force over all the verses from the beginning of the chapter; and, in themselves, they contain an independent and comprehensive statement. Tisch. and several of the leading commentators make a paragraph at ver. 11, joining vv. 9, 10 with vv. 1–8. W. & H. make a half-paragraph at this point. Not improbably, this is the correct division of the passage. Treg., however, unites vv. 9, 10 with the following verses, beginning the new paragraph with ver. 9, and R. V. unites all the verses, from ver. 1 to ver. 14 inclusive, in one paragraph.—(*b*) In the passage vv. 11–14, as proved by the γάρ and its connection with what precedes, the chief idea, as related to the context, is to be found in the ἵνα clauses—primarily, in the first ἵνα clause, ἀρνησάμενοι . . . ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, and secondarily, in the second ἵνα clause, λυτρώσηται . . . ἔργων. The emphasis, however, which is given to these ideas is, that the very object of the manifestation of the grace of God, and of the gift which, as the result of that grace, Christ made of Himself, was that the ends thus indicated might be realized. That which lay at the foundation of the purpose and work of God, which Christianity proclaims; that, also, for which Christianity takes its followers under its educating and disciplinary influence, and bids them look forward to the hope and glory of the future, is that they may become a peculiar people zealous of good works. The beginning and the ending of the whole doctrine of Christianity, thus, is the divine life in the soul; and, because it is so, the exhortations given to every believer, according to his own particular station, age, duty, office, is to let that life-principle work out into his character and conduct. This it is which makes the grace of God σωτήριος and gives to God Himself and Christ the title of σωτὴρ ἡμῶν.

(*c*) Ver. 13. The question as to the construction of the words τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (T. R.), or Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Tisch. 8, W. & H. text), has been much discussed. According to R. V. marg., A. R. V. text, and many commentators, these words should be rendered *of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;* according to R. V. text, A. R. V. marg., and many commentators, on the other hand, they should be rendered *of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.* In the latter case, the name θεός is given to Christ; in the former, it is not thus given. The limits of this note will only allow a very brief presentation of the arguments, on both sides, which seem to be especially worthy of being considered.

A. The grounds on which the latter view of the construction and meaning is maintained are as follows:—1. The general rule that where two appellative words are united by καί under a common article, they belong to one subject. As both θεός and σωτήρ are, in themselves and originally, appellative words, as they are thus united under one article, and as they are followed by Ἰ. Χρ., with which, if used as appellatives, they would naturally be connected, it must be inferred that it was the writer's intention thus to connect them.—1. To this argument it is answered, *first*, that the words θεοῦ and σωτῆρος, as here used, are not appellatives, but proper names, i. e., nouns which, though originally common nouns, had become by usage

quasi-proper names, and that, like proper nouns generally, they may be joined under one article whenever the two persons are conceived of as standing in a common relation to the matter under consideration. They are thus conceived of here, it is claimed. This answer is not to be regarded as satisfactory, for, though *σωτήρ* apparently came to be used as a proper name in this way, at a later time, it cannot be affirmed that the apostolic authors so used it. A careful examination of the subject, some years ago, convinced the writer of this note that there is no N. T. passage which will support such an affirmation, and he is glad to find himself sustained in this opinion by the late Prof. Ezra Abbot, a scholar as fair-minded as he was eminent, who (though holding, on other grounds, that *θεοῦ* is not to be referred to Christ) says, "I find no sufficient proof of his [Alford's] statement that *σωτήρ* had become in the N. T. 'a quasi proper name.'"—2. To this argument it is answered, *secondly*, that *ἡμῶν* which is joined with *σωτῆρος* serves the purpose of defining the latter word, and thus renders the repetition of the article unnecessary. An examination of all the passages in which the word *σωτήρ* is used in the N. T. will, it is believed, show that the article is added wherever *σωτήρ* is found with *ἡμῶν*, unless some other and sufficient reason for its omission is apparent. In other words, *σωτὴρ ἡμῶν* does not seem to occur, as *πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ* may occur (instead of *τὸ πρόσωπ. αὐτ.*), because the person cannot be supposed to have more than one face. It is, also, to be observed that such an omission of the article, on such a ground, is less naturally to be expected in a compound phrase of the character which we find here, than in simple phrases, like *θεὸς σωτὴρ ἡμῶν*. The kindred expression in 2 Pet. i. 1, where the words are *τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰ. Χρ.*, and *σωτῆρος* has, accordingly, no *ἡμῶν* connected with it, may, also, have its due weight as bearing upon this point.—3. To this argument it is answered, *thirdly*, that the omission of the article is owing to the fact that the appositional word precedes the proper name. It is believed that, with reference to this point as well as to those already mentioned, the passages in which *σωτήρ* is used in the N. T., if examined, will show that there is no justification for this position, and especially none as bearing against the general rule in such a compound phrase.—4. To this argument it is answered, *fourthly*, that the article may be omitted in this case, as in Phil. iii. 20, because the writer wishes to "fix attention on the quality, or character, or peculiar relation expressed by the appellative." As in Phil. iii. 20 Paul says, "we wait for *a Saviour*, the Lord Jesus Christ," *σωτῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰ. Χρ.*, so here he may intend to say, "of the great God and *a Saviour* of us, Jesus Christ." The want of parallelism between the two cases, however, will be observed, it is believed, by the careful reader, and the writer of this note can scarcely doubt that it will be generally admitted, not only that the cases are different from each other, but also that the proposed rendering of the present passage is contrary to the analogy of all passages in the N. T., which are similar to it, and to all the probabilities which such a compound phrase suggests.—5. It is answered to this argument, *finally*, that language is not bound by absolute laws, which admit of no deviation from their utmost strictness; that the only object of the article is to give definiteness, and, where this is evident enough without it, a writer may trust to the intelligence of his readers; and that we find such expressions in the N. T. as *τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντες* (Matt. xxi. 12), where the persons described as buying and selling are manifestly not the same. This is, no doubt, to be admitted; but the phrase now in question is not parallel with that in Matt. xxi. 12, or similar ones. The N. T. writers do not speak of God and Christ in this way, except where the words *θεὸς* and *Χριστος* are

proper names (as e. g. Paul and Barnabas, Acts xv. 22, are spoken of in a united capacity by the use of the words τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ, as contrasted with Acts xv. 2, where they are mentioned in a more individual relation, and τῷ Π. καὶ τῷ Β. is the expression employed), and in the phrase τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰ. Χρ., in respect to which it may be noticed that κύριος is often used as a proper name, while σωτήρ is not.

II. The fact that the relative pronoun in ver. 14 is in the singular number, and manifestly refers to Christ, shows that there is only one person—namely Jesus Christ—spoken of in ver. 13.—It is said in reply to this argument, that, after alluding to two persons, it is perfectly allowable for a writer to add a relative clause which refers only to the latter. Gal. i. 3, 4 is cited as a parallel case, where τοῦ ὄντος κ.τ.λ. follows the words "from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ," but evidently belongs only with Ἰησ. Χρ. 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6 is, also, referred to. In the latter passage, however, the words are εἷς γὰρ θεός, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης . . . . Χρ. Ἰησοῦς, ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον, and the construction of the sentence varies from that of the verses before us in just that particular (καί coming *after*, not *before*, the second εἷς, and meaning *also*), which makes it perfectly clear that ὁ δούς must refer to Χρ. Ἰ only. In the former case, the two are plainly distinguished by the word πατρός added to θεοῦ; the sentence is one in which κυρίου is used, which is a quasi-proper name, as σωτήρ is not; and there is no allusion to anything (such as ἐπιφάνεια of the present passage) which may, by any possibility, be regarded as having an exclusive reference to Christ.

III. The word ἐπιφάνεια is one which is always used of Christ in the N. T., and never of God the Father.—To this argument it is answered, that the expression here used is not ἐπιφάνεια, but ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης; that the coming of Christ is represented in Matt. xvi. 27, Mark viii. 38 (comp. Luke ix. 26) as being ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ; that in 1 Tim. vi. 14–16 God is spoken of as "showing" the ἐπιφάνεια of Christ, and words setting forth the glory of God are added; that Jewish writers often called any extraordinary display of divine power an ἐπιφάνεια of God, and that it was very natural in these sentences, and in the development of the thought expressed in them, to speak of the ἐπιφάνεια of *the glory* of God as the end of that great plan which, in its beginning, was an ἐπιφάνεια of His *grace* (ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ).—That the future ἐπιφάνεια denotes an appearing of Christ, according to the N. T. writers, cannot be questioned. There is, no doubt, a certain probability arising from this fact that the reference of this word is in all cases, and so in this passage, wholly to Him, and this probability may, perhaps, be regarded as somewhat strengthened, in the verses before us, by the fact that the following relative clause is descriptive of Him only. But the candid scholar will be disposed to admit that this argument has been pressed too strongly by many writers, and that its force is greatly weakened, if not, indeed, entirely set aside, by the considerations mentioned.

IV. Arguments derived (*x*) from the addition of the adjective μεγάλου to θεοῦ, no instance of which occurs elsewhere in the N. T.—that its use would be unnecessary and antecedently improbable, if applied to God the Father, or that, as an adjective, it must most naturally be understood as belonging to θεοῦ and σωτῆρος, and thus, like the article, as uniting the two as appellatives of Christ; or (*y*) from the fact that λαὸν περιούσιον properly, and according to the O. T. conception, means the people of God, God's peculiar possession—that the use of this expression, therefore, carries with it the implication that the relative ὃς must include in its antecedent θεοῦ,

and that Christ must, accordingly, be here called God,—must be regarded as of comparatively little weight. The use of adjectives as descriptive of God is somewhat characteristic of the Past. Epp., and, although this particular adjective, *μέγας*, does not occur in connection with *θεός* elsewhere in Paul's writings, or in the N. T., it is found frequently in the O. T., e. g. Deut. x. 17; Neh. ix. 32. For adjectives and descriptive words used with *θεος* in the Past. Epp., comp. 1 Tim. i. 11, iv. 10, Tit. i. 2, 1 Tim. i. 1, Tit. ii. 3. As for the expression *λαόν περ.*, on the other hand, the relation of Christ to the Church, in the N. T., is such, that the transference of such a phrase from its O. T. reference to the people of God to this new and peculiar reference could hardly be considered strange, even on the part of an author who might always be disposed to distinguish God and Christ by the names *θεός* and *Χριστός*, and never to apply the former name to our Lord.

B. The grounds on which the interpretation of the words which make them distinguish between Christ and God—"the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ"—is maintained, are the following:—I. The fact that, though Paul uses the word *θεός* more than five hundred times, he never employs it as descriptive of Christ.—On this point, the reader is referred to note cii. by the present writer, page 396 ff. of Meyer's Com. on Romans, Am. ed., and an article by the same, in the Journal of the Society of Bibl. Lit. and Exegesis for 1881.

II. The fact mentioned by Huther, that we do not find the word *θεός* connected directly with 'I. *Χρ.* as an attribute—in such a phrase, for example, as *ὁ θεὸς* 'I. *Χρ.*—These two arguments must, both of them, be regarded as worthy of very serious consideration. It is to be remarked, however, that it was altogether in accordance with what might naturally be expected of the apostolic writers, that they should prevailingly speak of Christ as *man, Saviour, Lord*, etc. and only rarely as *God*. Even John speaks of Him as God only *twice* in his Gospel, and, possibly, *once* in his first Epistle. It was only in harmony with this general usage, also, that they should be indisposed to employ such phrases as *ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν* 'I. *Χρ.*, and that, in case of referring to the deity of Christ at all, they should make use of expressions like the present, in which His relation to men as their Saviour is added, or like that in Rom. ix. 5, where the declaration that He is *θεός* is associated with a statement of what He was *κατὰ σάρκα*. It cannot be too emphatically insisted upon, or too carefully borne in mind, that the belief of the apostles that Christ was *θεός* need not necessarily have led them to declare it, often, in their writings, or even to state it anywhere in the particular form *ὁ θεὸς* 'Ιησοῦς *Χριστός*.

III. The frequency with which God and Christ in their distinction from each other, are brought together in the N. T., and by Paul in his Epistles, as having a common relation to men in the way of grace and the plan of salvation, makes it probable that the same sort of union of the two is intended here, and not a presentation of Christ as Himself *θεός*. The force of this argument, it is claimed, is increased by the fact, that such a uniting of God and Christ, as two subjects, occurs in several places in the Past. Epistles, and—in connection with the repeated presentation of the idea of God as working through Christ—may be regarded as even somewhat peculiarly characteristic of them. Especially, it is urged that there is a very striking correspondence between 1 Tim. ii. 5 f. and this passage.—The answer to this argument must be found in the consideration that the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, when it affirms that He is called *θεός*, only affirms that He is called thus in some passages. It claims, not that He is generally described by this name, or that He is not distinguished from God the Father by giving the

name θεός to the Father, and κύριος to Him, in most places where they are both referred to. All that it asserts is that, as Christ in the view of the N. T. writers is God, it is natural that they should sometimes speak of Him as θεός, and that, this being both possible and natural, the several passages should be interpreted according to grammatical rules and the suggestions of the context.

IV. The evident reference of the word θεοῦ in ver. 11 to God the Father, it is claimed, makes it altogether improbable that θεοῦ in ver. 13 has any other reference.—Undoubtedly, this position would be the true one in most sentences. The phenomena of the present sentence, however, it is answered, remove this improbability, and render it apparent to the reader that the word θεοῦ, which denotes the Father in the former verse, denotes Christ in the latter.

The acceptance or rejection of the doctrine that Christ is divine will, almost necessarily, affect the mind of the student, in some degree, with respect to the weight which he gives to the several considerations mentioned and the readiness with which he will admit, or refuse to admit, that θεοῦ here is an appellative word. The question, however, is one which properly lies within the region of interpretation, and is to be determined by grammatical and linguistic probabilities. It is a question, as it appears to the writer of this note, which is nearly evenly balanced—the strong arguments, on the one side, being those which are connected with the article and the probability that ἐπιφάνεια must limit the whole expression to Christ; the strongest argument, on the other, being the fact that Paul, confessedly on the part of all, very rarely applies the word θεός to Christ—some writers even maintaining that he never does so. Of the two arguments which are thus mentioned as favoring the application to Christ, the force of the first has, in the judgment of the writer of this note, been too little regarded by many of the recent commentators, and that of the second has been given greater weight by Bp. Ellicott and others than it justly merits. On the other hand, the argument pressed upon the other side in respect to the use of θεός by Paul—when emphasized by the presentation of numbers, as five hundred compared with two or three—is made to carry with it a weight which the mere numbers do not warrant.

The tendency of recent writers is, apparently, somewhat strongly towards the rendering of A. R. V. text, which is also the rendering of A. V. Huther, who adopts it, says that "though not so directly as it would have been if the subjects were identical, this passage is still a testimony in favor of the truth of the doctrine of Christ's divinity." Alford, who also adopts this rendering, takes even a stronger position, and says, "whichever way taken, the passage is just as important a testimony to the divinity of our Saviour." It is evident that the doctrine does not depend on this verse, and is at most only supported by it. The doctrine is inwoven in the N. T. teaching as a whole.

CHAPTER III.

VER. 1. *ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις*] In A C D* E* F G ℵ 17, 31, *al.*, Damasc. *καί* is wanting, and was therefore omitted by Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch. It can hardly be done without; but, as the *καί* is wanting also between the next two words, it seems to have been wanting here originally, and to have been inserted later. F G have a *καί* inserted between the verbs.—Ver. 2. For *μηδένα*, F G have *μή*; but the former is supported alike by suitability to the context and by the weightiest testimony.—Instead of *πραΰτητα* (*Rec.*), Lachm. Buttm. Tisch., on the authority of A C, etc., adopted here and elsewhere the form *πραότητα*.—ℵ has, instead of *ἐνδεικνυμένους πραΰτητα*, the reading *ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδήν*.—Ver. 5. *ὧν*] For this we should probably read *ἁ*, as is done by Lachm. and Tisch. 8, on the authority of A C* D* F G ℵ 17, *al.*, Clem. Cyr. The *ὧν*, which Tisch. 7 retained, seems to be a correction from the analogy of classic Greek.—For *τὸν αὐτοῦ ἔλεον*, Lachm. Buttm. and Tisch., on the authority of A D* E F G 31, *al.* Clem. Max. *al.*, read *τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος*; D E F G Ambr. Aug. etc., put *αὐτοῦ* after *ἔλεος*.—Before *λουτροῦ*, Lachm. and Buttm. put *τοῦ*, on the authority of A.—After *ἀνακαινώσεως*, D* E* F G, Ambr. Aug. etc., have the reading *διά*, which is manifestly an interpretation.—Ver. 7. *γενώμεθα*] Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. rightly read *γενηθῶμεν*, on the authority of A C D* F G, 17, *al.*, Chrys. Ath.—Ver. 8. *τῷ Θεῷ*] According to all uncials, the *τῷ* should be deleted; so, too, with *τά* before *καλά*.—Ver. 9. For *ἔριδας* (Tisch. 7) there is found in D E F G ℵ the singular *ἔριν* (Tisch. 8), which is indeed the original reading altered on account of the plurals around it.—Ver. 10. The *Rec.* *μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν* (Lachm. Buttm. Tisch. 8) is supported by A C K L ℵ, all cursives, Vulg. etc.; Tisch. 7 adopted instead of it: *μετὰ μίαν νουθεσίαν καὶ δευτέραν*, on the authority of D E F G, several Fathers, etc. Reiche rightly prefers the *Rec.*—Ver. 13. Tisch. 7 reads *Ἀπολλώ*, while Tisch. 8 gives *Ἀπολλών*; some MSS. have *Ἀπολλῶνα*.—While Tisch. 7, with the support of most authorities, read *λείπῃ* (so, too, Lachm. and Buttm.), Tisch. 8 adopted *λίπῃ*, on the authority of ℵ D* etc.—Ver. 15. In D** and D*** E F G H K L, *al.*, several versions, etc., the word *ἀμήν* forms the close; but it is wanting in A C D* 17, etc. Tisch. and Buttm. omitted it; Lachm. enclosed it in brackets.

Vv. 1, 2. [On Vv. 1–3, see Note XXXVIII., pages 322, 323.] Instructions to give exhortations regarding conduct towards the authorities and towards all men.—*ὑπομίμνησκε αὐτούς*] [XXXVIII *a*.] (see 2 Tim. ii. 14) presupposes that they are aware of the duties regarding which the exhortation is given. It is not so certain that Paul is alluding to definite precepts already expressed by him.—*αὐτούς*] viz. the members of the church. —*ἀρχαῖς* (*καὶ*) *ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι*] [XXXVIII *b*.] *ἀρχαὶ κ. ἐξουσίαι* as a name for human authorities is used also in Luke xii. 11 (comp. too, Luke

xx. 20; *ἐξουσίαι* alone, in Rom. xiii. 1). The two words are joined together in order to give fuller expression to the notion of authority. It cannot, however, be shown that the one denotes the higher, the other the lower authorities (Heydenreich). It is at least doubtful whether this inculcation of obedience to the authorities had its justification in the rebellious character of the Cretans nationally (Matthies and others). Similar precepts also occur in other epistles of the N. T.; and here the exhortation harmonizes with the injunctions given in chap. ii. The Christians needed the exhortation all the more that the authorities were heathen.—*πειθαρχεῖν*] here in its original signification: "*obey the superior.*" Its meaning in Acts xxvii. 21 is more general. The *πειθαρχεῖν* is the result and actual proof of the *ὑποτάσσεσθαι*. The want of *καί* does not prove, as de Wette thinks, that it does not belong to the datives *ἀρχαῖς* (κ.) *ἐξ*. *Καί* would have been out of place here, since the following words also are to be construed with that dative.—*πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἑτοίμους εἶναι*] [XXXVIII *c.*] not to be taken generally, but in very close connection with *ἀρχαῖς*: "*for the authorities* prepared to every good work" (so, too, Wiesinger and van Oosterzee). The *ἀγαθόν* is not without significance, as it points to the limits within which they are to be ready to obey the will of the authorities.[1]—Ver. 2. *μηδένα βλασφημεῖν*] The new object *μηδένα* shows that from this point he is no longer speaking of special duties towards superiors, but of general duties towards one's neighbor. *Βλασφημεῖν* is used specially in reference to what is higher, but it occurs also in the more general sense of "*revile.*" Theodoret: *μηδένα ἀγορεύειν κακῶς.—ἀμάχους εἶναι, ἐπιεικεῖς*] see 1 Tim. iii. 3; the first expresses negatively what the second expresses positively.—*πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους* (see ii. 10) *πραΰτητα πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους*] Chrysostom: *καὶ Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλληνας, μοχθήρους κ. πονηροίς.*—It is impossible not to see that the apostle is thinking specially of conduct towards those who are not Christian.

Ver. 3. [XXXVIII *d.*] *Ἦμεν γάρ*] *γάρ* shows that the thought following it is to give a reason for the previous exhortation. But the reason does not lie in this verse taken by itself (Chrysostom: *οὐκοῦν μηδενὶ ὀνειδίσῃς, φησὶ· τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἦς καὶ σύ*; so, too, Hofmann), but in this verse when connected with the verse following. The meaning therefore is: As we were in the state in which they are now, but were rescued by the kindness of God, it becomes us to show kindness and gentleness towards those whom we were at one time like. *Ἦμεν* stands first as emphatic; *ποτέ*, "at one time," viz. before we became believers. Wiesinger: "The contrast to *ποτέ* is given by *ὅτε δέ* in ver. 4; we have here the well-known contrast between *ποτέ* and *νῦν*; comp. Rom. xi. 30; Eph. ii. 2, 11, 13, v. 8; Col. i. 21, iii. 7, 8; they are the two hinges of the Pauline system."—*καὶ ἡμεῖς*] "*we too;*" *ἡμεῖς* includes all believing Christians. It is to be noted that even here Paul makes no distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christians (otherwise in Eph. ii. 3).—*ἀνόητοι*] is equivalent to *ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ*

[1] Theodoret: *οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰς ἅπαντα δεῖ τοῖς ἄρχουσι πειθαρχεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν δασμὸν καὶ τὸν φόρον εἰσφέρειν, καὶ τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀπονέμειν τιμήν· εἰ δὲ δυσσεβεῖν κελεύσειεν, ἀντικρὺς ἀντιλέγειν*; comp. Acts iv. 19.

διανοίᾳ, Eph. iv. 18; without understanding, viz. in reference to divine things; not simply: "blinded regarding our true destiny" (Matthies), or: "without knowing what is right" (Hofmann). Heinrichs refers this and *πλανώμενοι* to idol-worship, but the apostle is not speaking here of Gentile Christians alone.—*ἀπειθεῖς*] disobedient to divine law; Heydenreich wrongly refers it to the relations with the authorities.—*πλανώμενοι*] (see 2 Tim. iii. 13) stands here not in a neuter, but in a passive sense: "led astray," proceeding on a wrong path, not merely "in regard to knowledge," but more generally. Wiesinger: "*sc.* *ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας*, *ἀλήθεια* being regarded not as abstract truth, but as the sum total of moral good;" comp. Jas. v. 19; Heb. v. 2.—*δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις* (see 2 Tim. iii. 6) *ἡδοναί*, as Jas. iv. 1, 3. He who follows his lusts is a slave to them, hence *δουλεύοντες*; see Rom. vi. 6, 12. Michaelis gives it too narrow a meaning by referring it to sins of lust.—*ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθόνῳ διάγοντες*] *κακία* is not "vileness," but "wickedness;" comp. Col. iii. 8; Eph. iv. 31; otherwise in 1 Cor. v. 8 and other passages, where it is synonymous with *πονηρία*.—*διάγοντες*] connected with *βίον* only here and in 1 Tim. ii. 2.—*στυγητοί* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*) is equivalent to *μισητοί* (Hesychius), "detested and detestable;" it is wanting in Luther's translation.—*μισοῦντες ἀλλήλους*] comp. Rom. i. 29.

Vv. 4–6. [On Vv. 4–6, see, Note XXXIX., pages 323–325.] *Ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία κ.τ.λ.*] [XXXIX *a.*] *χρηστότης* as a human quality; 2 Cor. vi. 6; Gal. v. 22; Col. iii. 12; used of God, Rom. ii. 4, xi. 22 (often in the LXX.); with special reference to God's redemptive work in Christ, Eph. ii. 7.—*φιλανθρωπία*] elsewhere only in Acts xxviii. 1 (2 Macc. vi. 22, xiv. 9) as a human quality. De Wette remarks on it: "unusual for the idea of *χάρις*." The reason why Paul makes use of the word here is contained in ver. 2, where he exhorts to *πραΰτης πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους*. *Χρηστότης* corresponds in conception to *πραΰτης* (both words stand closely connected in Gal. v. 22 and Col. iii. 12); and in allusion to *πρὸς π. ἀνθρ.*, Paul adds *φιλανθρωπία*. The goodness and love of God to man, on which our salvation is based, should lead us to show benevolence and gentleness to all men. At the same time, the *χρηστότης* and *φιλανθρωπία* of God form a contrast with the conduct of men as it is described in ver. 3 in the words: *ἐν κακίᾳ . . . μισοῦντες ἀλλήλους*. Hofmann rightly remarks that as *φιλανθρωπία* has the article, it is made independent and emphatic by the side of the *χρηστότης*; it does not, however, follow from this that *χρηστότης* here denotes "the goodness of God in general towards His creatures."—*ἐπεφάνη*] just as in ii. 11.—*τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ*] see 1 Tim. i. 1.—Ver. 5. [XXXIX *b.*] The apodosis begins here and not at *ἔλεος*, so that the words *οὐκ . . . ἔλεος* modify *ἔσωσεν*; so more recent expositors, even Hofmann.—*οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς*] On *ἐξ*, comp. Rom. iii. 20. Matthies wrongly: "not from works appearing in the form of righteousness which we accomplished, *i.e.* not from our works produced with the appearance of righteousness." *Ἔργα τὰ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* are rather: "*works which are done in righteousness.*" *Ἐν* denotes the condition of life in which the works are accomplished (de Wette, Wiesinger). *Δικαιοσύνη* here is not justification (van Oosterzee: justitia coram Deo), but righteousness, *integrity;* so, too,

Hofmann.—*ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεις*] *ἡμεῖς* is added emphatically to make the contrast all the stronger (Wiesinger). Paul is not speaking of works which may have been done by us, but denies that we have done such works of righteousness. Bengel rightly: Negativa pertinet ad totum sermonem: non fueramus in justitia: non feceramus opera in justitia: non habebamus opera, per quae possemus salvari.[1]—The thought here expressed is not, as de Wette thinks, unsuitable to the context. In its negative form it rather serves to give emphasis to *ἀλλὰ κατὰ* (*by means of*) *τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος*, and hence to the conception of the divine *χρηστότης* and *φιλανθρωπία*. Wiesinger: "The apostle even by the contrast of the *οὐκ* wishes to make it quite clearly understood that saving grace is quite free and undeserved."[2]—On *κατὰ τὸ αὐτ. ἔλεος*, comp. 1 Pet. i. 3.—*ἐσωσεν ἡμᾶς*] *sc. ὁ Θεός*. As *ὅτε . . . ἐπεφάνη* does not mean: "when or after it had appeared," but: "*when it appeared*," the saving is here represented as simultaneous with the appearance of the divine *χρηστότης κ.τ.λ.*, although *διά* refers *ἐσωσεν* to its application to individuals, which is different in time from the *ὅτε κ.τ.λ.* above. But Paul could rightly put these two things together, because the goodness of God which appeared in Jesus Christ comes to perfection in the saving of individuals by the *λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας*; the former is the efficient cause of the other.—*ἡμᾶς* is not to be referred to all mankind, but to believers. The means by which the saving is effected are set forth in the words: *διὰ* (*τοῦ*) *λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου*] The expression: *τὸ λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας*, has been very arbitrarily interpreted by some expositors, some taking *λουτρόν* as a figurative name for the regeneratio itself, or for the predicatio evangelii, or for the Holy Spirit, or for the abundant imparting of the Spirit. From Eph. v. 26 it is clear that it can mean nothing else than baptism; comp. too, Heb. x. 23; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Acts xxii. 16.—*παλιγγενεσία*] occurs also in Matt. xix. 28, but in quite a different connection, viz. in reference to the renovation of things at Christ's second coming; comp. however, 1 Pet. i. 3, 23, *ἀναγεννάω*, and John iii. 3 ff., *γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν*.—According to the context, Paul calls baptism the bath of the new birth, not meaning that it pledges us to the new birth ("to complete the process of moral purification, of expiation and sanctification," Matthies), nor that it is a visible image of the new birth (de Wette), for neither in the one sense nor in the other could it be regarded as a means of saving (*ἐσωσεν ἡμᾶς διά*). Paul uses that name for it as the bath by means of which God *actually* brings about the new birth.[3]

[1] Similarly Theophylact: *ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ὧν ἐποιήσαμεν, ἀντὶ τοῦ· οὔτε ἐποιήσαμεν ἔργα δικαιοσύνης, οὔτε ἐσώθημεν ἐκ τούτων, ἀλλὰ τὸ πᾶν ἡ ἀγαθότης αὐτοῦ ἐποίησε.*

[2] Hofmann is not correct in analysing *ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* into two statements. He says that *ἐξ ἔργων* is "in the first place to be conceived by itself," and that *τῶν ἐν δικ.* further "denies that we have done what we should have done in order to deserve to be saved." He then maintains that the relative sentence belongs to *τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*. But *ἔργα τὰ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* forms *one* conception, and on this the relative sentence depends.

[3] It is certainly right to say that baptism carries with it a pledge to continue the process of purification, and that, from its outward form, it bears in itself a symbolic character; only these are not the reasons for which the apostle calls it the *λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας*.—In the first edition of this commentary I remarked: "Baptism is regarded as the inner

Comp. with this the apostle's expressions elsewhere regarding baptism, especially Rom. vi. 3 ff., Gal. iii. 27, Col. ii. 12, which all alike assign this real signification to baptism.—*καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου*] The genit. *πν. ἁγ.* is the genit. of the efficient cause: "the renewal wrought by the Holy Spirit" (de Wette, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee). This may be taken as the *continuing* influence of the Spirit working in the regenerated Christian, or as the single act of inward change by which the man became a *καινὴ κτίσις* (2 Cor. v. 17), a *τέκνον Θεοῦ*. Here the word is to be taken in the latter signification, as is clear from its connection with *ἐσωσεν ἡμᾶς*;[1] otherwise in Rom. xii. 2; Eph. iv. 22–24. According to some expositors, the genit. *ἀνακαινώσεως* is dependent on *διά*; Bengel: duae res commemorantur: lavacrum regenerationis, quae baptismi in Christum periphrasis et renovatio Spiritus sancti. According to others, it depends on *λουτροῦ*, and is co-ordinate with *παλιγγενεσίας*; Vulgate: per lavacrum regenerationis et renovationis (de Wette, Wiesinger). The latter is the right view, for "what else could *ἀνακαίνωσις πν. ἁγ.* be than the new birth denoted by *παλιγγενεσία*?" (Wiesinger). In this way *ἀνακ. πν. ἁγ.* is added epexegetically to the previous conception *παλιγγενεσία*, explaining it, but not adding any new force to it.[2] Heinrichs quite wrongly thinks that *πν. ἁγ.* here is the *πν.* hominis ipsius, which (quatenus antea fuit *ψυχικόν, σαρκικόν, ἐπίγειον*) becomes holy by the *ἀνακαίν.*—Ver. 6. *οὗ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως*] *οὗ* is not dependent on *τοῦ λουτροῦ*, but on *πνεύματος ἁγίου*. The genit. *οὗ* is in accordance with the common Greek usage. Heydenreich explains it wrongly by supposing *ἐξ* or *ἀφ'* to have been omitted: "from which he abundantly, of which he poured out an abundant measure."—*ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς*] an expression which has passed from the O. T. (Joel iii. 1; Zech. xii. 10) into the N. T. It is used to describe the gift of the Holy Spirit; see Acts ii. 17, 33, x. 45. The rich abundance of this gift is indicated by *πλουσίως*.[3]—*ἐφ' ἡμᾶς*] goes back to *ἡμᾶς* in ver. 5. Christians are saved by God pouring upon them, at baptism, the Holy Spirit, which renews them. The apostle is not speaking here of the gift of the Spirit which was made at Pentecost, but of the gift made to individuals, and made after the outpouring at Pen-

new birth manifesting itself in the external act of the bath." This is not apposite, since baptism is not the new birth itself, but the means for producing it.

[1] These words, *παλιγγενεσία* and *ἀνακαίνωσις*, do not occur in classic Greek. In the former word, which Hofmann translates awkwardly enough by "resurrection," the prefix *πάλιν* points to the former sinless condition of man, into which he is restored from his corruption. Thus *παλιγγενεσία*, in Matt. xix. 28, corresponds in conception to *ἀποκατάστασις*. It is doubtful whether the same reference is adapted to *ἀνακαίνωσις* (which only occurs here and in Rom. xii. 2); the *ἀνα* does not make such reference necessary. Expositors tacitly avoid this question; comp. Cremer, *Wörterb. d. neut. Gräc.*

[2] Hofmann indeed disputes our remark that *ἀνακαιν. τ. πν.* is added epexegetically to *παλιγγ.*; because, as he says, *παλιγγενεσία* is "an incident of the resurrection," whereas *ἀνακαίνωσις* is "a work of the Holy Spirit." But is not this renewing work of the Holy Spirit an incident for him on whom it is wrought? He further maintains that it might be said: *ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς δι' ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου*, but not *ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ παλιγγενεσίας*; but this we cannot admit. The latter may be said quite as much as the former.

[3] It is *ὁ Θεός* here who imparts the Holy Spirit, whereas in Acts ii. 33 the gift is ascribed to Christ; see John xiv. 16 comp. with John xv. 26. The explanation of this is contained in the *διά*.

tecost.—*διὰ Ἰησ. Χρ. τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*] This does not belong to *ἐσωσεν*, which is already defined by *διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ κ.τ.λ.* It goes with *ἐξέχεεν*, so that Christ here, as elsewhere in the N. T., is represented as the medium by which the Holy Spirit is sent.[1] In order to understand the train of thought properly, we must note that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is not a consequence, but the substantial inward fact in baptism, which is the bath of the new birth.

REMARK.—The question why the apostle here speaks of baptism is rightly answered by Wiesinger in this way. Baptism, as the bath of the *παλιγγενεσία*, "is the basis on which rests all further growth in the life of the Spirit," inasmuch as by it the believer is removed from the *εἶναι ἐν σαρκί* into the *εἶναι ἐν πνεύματι* or *ἐν Χριστῷ*, *i. e.* into the condition in which it is possible for him to live no longer *κατὰ σάρκα*, but *κατὰ πνεῦμα*. On the other hand, the apostle does not mention *faith* here as a medium of the saving love of God, because he is looking away entirely from the *human* aspect of the matter, and considering only the *divine* work in the saving of men. Leaving *faith* out of consideration, baptism is to the apostle what he says of it here, viz. the means of the new birth or renewal by the Holy Spirit, and also, according to ver. 7, of the completion of the *δικαιοῦσθαι*; and baptism does not become this to him by means of faith. Hence the apostle's expression cannot be rectified conjecturally by supplying this point, viz. faith. It is true that in other passages of the N. T. *πίστις* denotes that which brings about the new birth, the receiving of the Holy Spirit, justification; and the one expression should not be neglected for the sake of the other. There is here a problem which it is the task of Biblical Theology and of Dogmatics to solve; here, however, as the passage before us presents no handle for the discussion, it can only be indicated without solving it. This much only may by said, that according to these sayings of the Scriptures, man only becomes a *τέλειος ἐν Χριστῷ* when he is justified and regenerated both by baptism and by faith (the faith, viz., which is *πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς*, Rom. x. 17).

Ver. 7. Ἵνα declares the purpose, not the consequence. It is doubtful whether it belongs to *ἐξέχεεν* (Heydenreich, Wiesinger, van Oosterzee, Plitt, Hofmann) or to *ἐσωσεν* as defined by *διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ . . . τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν* (Bengel, de Wette, and others). The thought is substantially the same with both constructions, since the *σωτηρία* is necessarily brought about by the outpouring of the Spirit. Still the structure of the sentence is in favor of the reference to *ἐξέχεεν*. Wiesinger rightly considers the other view "to be unnecessarily harsh, ignoring the explanatory relation of vv. 6 and 7 to ver. 5, and depriving *ἐξέχεεν* of its necessary definition."—*δικαιωθέντες*] not "found righteous" (Matthies), still less "sanctified," but "justified," *i. e.* "acquitted of the guilt, and with it, of the punishment." Hofmann rightly says that this justification means the same thing as in Rom. iii. 24; that it does not mean the change of our conduct towards

[1] Matthies remarks, by adding the words *διὰ Ἰ. Χρ.*, faith is at the same time assumed as the subjective condition; but the remark is out of place, as Paul is not in the least discussing subjective conditions.

God, but of our relations to Him.[1]—*τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι*] does not belong to what follows, but to what precedes. Justification is an act of *grace*. Ἐκείνου does not refer to God as the subject of *ἐξέχεεν* (van Oosterzee, Plitt, and formerly in this commentary), but to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Hofmann), according to the usage of the N. T., for which see Acts iii. 13; John vii. 45. Comp. Winer, p. 118 [E. T. p. 157]; Buttmann, p. 91. [E.T. 104]. Heydenreich and Wiesinger are wrong in referring it to *πνεύματος*; for, on the one hand, this would involve the wrong conception that justification is a work of the Spirit; and, on the other hand, there is no mention in the N. T. of a *χάρις τοῦ πνεύματος*.—Τῇ *χάριτι* points us back to *οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων*.[2]—*κληρονόμοι γενηθῶμεν* [*γενώμεθα*] *κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου*] [XXXIX *c.*] *κατ' ἐλπίδα* cannot, as Heydenreich thinks probable, be construed with *ζωῆς αἰωνίου* as one conception, so as to be equivalent to *ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἐλπιζομένης*. On the other hand, it is also unsuitable to take *κατ' ἐλπ. ζ. αἰων.* together: "in accordance with the hope of eternal life" (Matthies), because in that case *κλήρ.* would not be defined. Κατ' *ἐλπίδα* should rather be joined with *κληρ. γενηθ.*, and then the genit. *ζωῆς αἰωνίου* belongs to the latter. Chrysostom has two interpretations: *κατ' ἐλπίδα, τουτέστι· καθὼς ἠλπίσαμεν, οὕτως ἀπολαύσομεν, ἤ, ὅτι ἤδη καὶ κληρονόμοι ἐστέ.* According to the former view, the words would have to be translated: "in order that we, in proportion to our hope (*i. e.* as we hope), may become heirs of eternal life;" according to the latter, it would be: "that we, according to hope, might become heirs of eternal life." The latter view is the correct one. The apostle is speaking not of the future, but of the present condition of believers. They *are* heirs of eternal life; but they are so in hope, not yet in actual possession; for *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* in its full meaning is something future, Rom. vi. 22, 23.—*κατ' ἐλπίδα* stands here as *τῇ ἐλπίδι* in Rom. viii. 24; see Meyer on the passage.[3]

Ver. 8. [On Vv. 8–11, see Note XL. page 325.] Πιστὸς *ὁ λόγος*] [XL *a.*] refers, as in 1 Tim. iv. 9, to what precedes, but not to the last sentence merely.[4] It refers to the entire thought expressed in vv. 4–7.—*καὶ περὶ τούτων βούλομαί σε διαβεβαιοῦσθαι*] Regarding the construction of the verb *διαβεβ.*, see on 1 Tim. i. 7. Vulgate rightly: de his volo te confirmare; Wiesinger: "and on these points I wish you to be strongly assured;" Beza,

[1] The apostle says nothing here regarding the relation of justification to the *ἀνακαίνωσις* wrought by the Holy Spirit. It is wrong at any rate to regard the latter as the ground of the former, so that God justifies man because he is renewed. Nor, on the other hand, can the renewing be regarded as a later consequence of the justification, in the sense that God imparts to man the Holy Spirit after man has been justified. The two things are very closely connected. Justification is to be regarded as the ground of renewing, while renewing is the actual completion of justification. God justifies man so as to renew him, to make him His child born of the Spirit.

[2] Chrysostom: *πάλιν χάριτι, οὐκ ὀφειλῇ.*

[3] This passage, vv. 4–7, is substantially different from that in ii. 11–14. While in the latter the chief point is the paedagogic aim of the work of redemption, and the apostle accordingly is thinking how Christians are pledged to a holy life, in the former the chief point is the undeserved love of God made manifest in the work of redemption. Hence in this passage also much emphasis is laid on the idea of regeneration, which is granted to the Christian by the gift of the Holy Spirit.

[4] So Chrysostom: *ἐπειδὴ περὶ μελλόντων διαλέχθη καὶ οὔπω παρόντων, ἐπήγαγε τὸ ἀξιόπιστον.*

on the contrary: haec volo te asseverare. De Wette also maintains that *περὶ τούτων* is the immediate object, but without proving it.—*ἵνα φροντίζωσι καλῶν ἔργων προίστασθαι οἱ πεπιστευκότες [τῷ] Θεῷ]* In harmony with the train of thought in vv. 2, 3 ff., Paul here gives a practical purpose as his motive. The subject *οἱ πεπιστευκότες Θεῷ* are Christians generally; the designation is used because the Cretan Christians had before been heathen. Luther translates it rightly: "*those who have become believers in God;*" while Wiesinger is wrong in explaining it: "those who have put faith in God, *i. e.* in His gospel." The phrase *πιστεύειν Θεῷ* expresses the relation to God Himself, not merely to His word; comp. Acts xvi. 34. *Θεῷ* is used here as *τῷ κυρίῳ* often is, comp. Acts xviii. 8, xvi. 15; it is synonymous with *εἰς τὸν Θεόν*, John xiv. 1; comp. *πιστεύειν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰ. Χρ.*, 1 John iii. 23, and *π. εἰς τ. ὀν.*, John i. 12. Hofmann is altogether mistaken in construing *Θεῷ* with what follows. If *Θεῷ* were to be opposed to *ἀνθρώποις*, the latter would have been put before *ὠφέλιμα*; besides, *ταῦτα* clearly forms the beginning of a new clause.—*φροντίζειν* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*, often in the Apocrypha of the O. T., also in the LXX.), "reflect on something, take an interest in something;" here, as often in the classics, with a suggestion of anxiety (comp. 1 Sam. ix. 5, LXX.).—*καλῶν ἔργων*] depends on *προίστασθαι*; it is quite general, and should not be restricted to the services to be rendered to the church (Michaelis), nor to official duties[1] (Grotius), nor to deeds of charity (Chrysostom).—*προίστασθαι* here and in ver. 14 is used in the same sense as when it is joined with *τέχνης*[2] being equivalent to *exercere*, "carry on, practise an art;" properly, it is "present oneself before." The Vulgate translates it: bonis operibus praeesse, which, however, is obscure; Beza incorrectly: bene agendo praecedere, which he explains in a peculiar fashion by sanctae et rectae vitae antistites. Wolf thinks that *προίστ.* denotes not only the studium, but also the patrocinium of good works; comp. Rom. xii. 17: *προνοεῖσθαι καλά.*—*ταῦτά ἐστι [τὰ] καλὰ καὶ ὠφέλιμα τ. ἀνθρώποις*] see 1 Tim. ii. 3. *Ταῦτα* does not refer to *καλῶν ἔργων* (Heinrichs, Wiesinger), for the apostle certainly did not need to say that *καλὰ ἔργα* are *καλά* for men; nor does it resume *περὶ τούτων* (de Wette, Hofmann). It should be referred either to *φροντίζειν καλ. ἔργ. προίστασθαι* (Heydenreich, Matthies) or to *διαβεβαιοῦσθαι*. The latter reference might be preferred—as confirming the exhortation made to Timothy. On the reference of *ταῦτα* to *one* subject, see Winer, p. 153 [E. T. p. 162].

Ver. 9. Contrast to the last words.—*μωρὰς δὲ ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας κ.τ.λ.*] *ζητήσεις*, see 1 Tim. i. 4; connected with *μωράς* also in 2 Tim. ii. 23; *καὶ γενεαλογίας*, see i. 4; the latter refers to the contents, the former to the form.—*καὶ ἔριν [ἔρεις] καὶ μάχας νομικάς*] *ἔρις*, like the other words, serves to describe the behavior of the heretics; it is not therefore *ἔρεις τὰς πρὸς αἱρετικούς*, as Chrysostom interprets it, but quarrels such as take place

[1] Hofmann, too (*Schriftbeio.* II. 2), restricts *καλ. ἔργ. προίστ.* to "honest exertion," by which "each one may support himself and contribute to the needs of others, or to the purposes of Christian church-life." This interpretation, however, he seems to have given up, as he does not mention it in his commentary.

[2] Synesius, *Ep.* 2; Athenagoras, xiii. 612*a*.

among the heretics. The *μάχαι νομικαί* are disputes about the law and the individual precepts of the law; see 1 Tim. i. 7 and Tit. i. 14.—Heydenreich wrongly refers the adjective *νομικάς* also to *ἔριδας*. Hofmann even refers it to all the preceding conceptions, arbitrarily explaining *νομικαί* of the contents of the Pentateuch, *i. e.* of the Thora; with him, therefore, the *ζητήσεις νομικαί* are "discussions in which all disputed questions in the Thora are taken up," and the *γενεαλογίαι νομικαί* are "investigations into the historical contents of the Thora."—*περιΐστασο*] see 2 Tim. ii. 16.—With these fables and quarrels that go on among the heretics Titus is to have nothing to do.—*Εἰσὶ γὰρ ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι*] contrast with *ταῦτά ἐστι καλὰ κ.τ.λ.*—*μάταιος*, like *ὅσιος*, 1 Tim. ii. 8, is used as an adjective of two terminations.

Vv. 10, 11. An injunction regarding behavior towards the heretics.—*Αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον*] [XL *b.*] *αἱρετικός* (*ἅπ. λεγ.*) is not equivalent to contentiosus, but is, according to Calvin: quisquis sua protervia unitatem ecclesiae abrumpit, any one who causes departure from the pure sound doctrine of the gospel. With this Wiesinger agrees, only that he wishes to consider the divisions as not brought about by heresies, but by "eccentricities and perversities." The word *αἱρέσεις* is often used by Paul of ecclesiastical divisions, 1 Cor. xi. 19; Gal. v. 20. So, too, in 2 Pet. ii. 1, where it expressly refers to heresies.[1]—*μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ*] Vitringa (*De Vet. Synag.* iii. 1. 10) understands *παραιτοῦ* to mean the formal excommunication, and *νουθεσία* the excommunicatio privata, as these were appointed among the Jews for certain cases. But he is wrong; Paul is not speaking here of excommunication proper. *Νουθεσία* (1 Cor. x. 11; Eph. vi. 4) is equivalent to "*reprimand*," including both blame and exhortation. This is not to be employed once, but several times: "after one or two."—*παραιτοῦ*] 1 Tim. iv. 7. Bengel: monere desine, quid enim juvat? laterem lavares.—Ver. 11. *εἰδώς*] see 2 Tim. ii. 23.—*ὅτι ἐξέστραπται ὁ τοιοῦτος*] "that such an one is perverse;" comp. Deut. xxxii. 20: *ὅτι γενεὰ ἐξεστραμμένη ἐστιν*, הוֹר תַּהְפֻּכֹת; it shows the total perversion of thought and endeavor. Baur says arbitrarily and wrongly: "he has turned away from us, and departed out of the communion of believers."—*καὶ ἁμαρτάνει ὢν αὐτοκατάκριτος*] defines the preceding words more precisely. *Ὢν αὐτοκατάκριτος* is connected with *ἁμαρτάνει*, but not with *ἐξέστραπται* also (Hofmann). The perversity shows itself in the fact that he sins condemning himself. *Αὐτοκατάκριτος* is equivalent to *κεκαυτηριασμένος τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν*, 1 Tim. iv. 2, qui suopte judicio est condemnatus. The meaning is: he sins with the consciousness of his guilt and of his own condemnation, so that there is no hope of his return.

Ver. 12. Invitation from the apostle to Titus to come to him at Nicopolis so soon as he had sent Artemas or Tychicus. Artemas is not mentioned elsewhere; regarding Tychicus, see 2 Tim. iv. 12. The object in sending them is not told. Had the apostle's purpose been that Artemas

[1] Comp. also Rom. xvi. 17: *παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε ποιοῦντας καὶ ἐκκλίνατε ἀπ' αὐτῶν.*

or Tychicus should continue the work begun by Titus, he would surely have given some hint of it, and not contented himself with the simple πρὸς σέ. It is more probable that the apostle wished to have Titus brought by one of them, as he could not yet determine the exact time when he was to come (Hofmann). Nicopolis is a name borne by several cities, one in Epirus, built by Augustus as a memorial of his victory at Actium; another built by Trajan in Thrace; and another in Cilicia. In the subscription of the epistle there stands: ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως τῆς Μακεδονίας, which may mean either the city in Thrace or that in Epirus. It does not appear from his words that Paul wrote the epistle there; on the contrary, the ἐκεῖ rather shows that Paul himself was not there when he wrote the epistle. His purpose was to pass the winter there; comp. Introd. § 3.

Ver. 13. Ζηνᾶν τὸν νομικόν] Zenas is otherwise unknown. The epithet τὸν νομ. shows either that he had been formerly a Jew learned in the Scriptures, a γραμματεύς (Matt. xxii. 35, and other passages), or—as is more probable—that he was one skilled in law, a jurisconsultus.[1]—καὶ Ἀπολλώ] He is known from Acts and 1 Corinthians; but it is not known when he went to Crete.[2]—σπουδαίως πρόπεμψον] "*equip carefully for departure;*" on προπέμπειν, comp. 3 John 6. Wiesinger translates σπουδαίως by "hastily," unsuitably, as the words ἵνα κ.τ.λ. show. In σπουδαίως the prevailing conception is zeal; σπουδαίως ἔχειν is equivalent to "be zealous for a thing." Luther: "make ready with diligence."—ἵνα μηδὲν αὐτοῖς λείπῃ] Hofmann's opinion, that "this is an imperative sentence in itself," is all the more arbitrary that ἵνα manifestly refers to σπουδαίως; comp. besides what was said on 1 Tim. i. 3.

Ver. 14. Μανθανέτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι] οἱ ἡμέτεροι are the Christian brethren in Crete, not, as Grotius thought, Zenas and Apollos. Καί stands with reference not merely to the Jews (Hofmann), but to non-Christians in general. As non-Christians provide for the needs of their own, so ought Christians, and not refrain through their anxiety for heavenly things.—καλῶν ἔργων προίστασθαι] in the same general sense as in ver. 8, but the words following give the phrase a more special reference to works of benevolence; εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας, "*in regard to the necessary wants.*"—ἵνα μὴ ὦσιν ἄκαρποι] The subject is οἱ ἡμέτεροι. Hofmann construes the words εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας with the clause of purpose following them. He says that "the particle of purpose is placed after the emphatic part of the clause," a thing which *frequently* occurs in the N. T., and for this he appeals to Winer, p. 522 [E. T. p. 561]. In this he is entirely wrong. Such a construction seldom occurs, and of all the passages there quoted by Winer, that from 2 Cor. xii. 7 alone is to the point; the rest are of quite another kind. It is quite clear from what was said on ἵνα in 1 Tim.

[1] Strabo, 12, p. 539: ἐξηγητὴς τῶν νόμων, καθάπερ οἱ παρα Ῥωμαίοις νομικοί.

[2] Hofmann suggests that Zenas and Apollos set out from the place where Paul was at the time of writing the epistle, in order to proceed by Crete to Alexandria, which was Apollos' native place, and that Paul gave them this epistle to Titus to serve them also as a letter of recommendation. These are mere conjectures, for which there is no foundation.

i. 3,[1] that such a construction is not to be admitted here. The exhortation in the passage does not refer simply to the present case of equipping Zenas and Apollos, which indeed occasioned it, but is in general terms, and is applicable to all cases where the necessary wants of others have to be considered (van Oosterzee).

Ver. 15. End.—*ἀσπάζονταί σε οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες*] is not to be understood generally of believers, but of the apostle's fellow-workers.—*ἀσπασαι τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει*] *φιλεῖν* marks the inner, personal relation. The distinction between *ἀγαπᾶν* and *φιλεῖν* is plain from a comparison of John iii. 16, *ἠγάπησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον*, with John xvi. 17, *ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς*; also Matt. x. 37. *Ἡμᾶς*, *i. e.* the apostle.—*Ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν*] "with you all," *i. e.* "with thee and all Cretan believers." The form of the benediction does not imply that Titus was to communicate the epistle to the churches in Crete.

Notes by American Editor.

XXXVIII. Vv. 1-3.

(*a*) The word *αὐτούς*, following, as it does, after the specification of various classes of persons who make up the entire membership of the church, and after ii. 15, which, by its *ταῦτα λάλει κ.τ.λ.*, as well as its *μηδείς*, suggests a general reference, must be understood as meaning the Christians in Crete universally. Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 14, where, though the word *αὐτοῖς* is not found, there is, in connection with *ὑπομίμνησκε*, the same suggestion of admonition to all. The first of the things which Titus is urged to put them in mind of, is obedience to magistrates. This duty is thus put in a parallelism, here, with that of slaves to their masters, as the latter is, elsewhere, joined with similar suggestions as to the relation of wives to their husbands. These three things, as already noticed in other epistles, were likely to be lost sight of, by reason of the doctrine of Christian equality and of the new position which the Christian believers regarded themselves as having attained, and hence it is not strange that they are pressed in the same way, or on the same grounds, in different epistles.—(*b*) The *καί* between *ἀρχαῖς* and *ἐξουσίοις* which is found in T. R. is to be rejected, as Tisch., W. & H., Treg., Alf., Ell., Huther and others hold. *Πειθαρχεῖν* is best taken independently, and as having its fundamental meaning; *to obey one in authority*. The connection of *ἀρχ.*, *ἐξουσ.* with *πειθαρχ.*, making this verb the result and proof of *ὑποτασσ.*, which is favored by Huther, involves so peculiar and uncommon a construction as to render it much less probable. The double expression, however, is somewhat strange, whatever explanation of it may be attempted. Ell. thinks that *πειθαρχ.* may, possibly, have the sense here of *coactus obsequi*, and *ὑποτασσ.* that of *lubens et sponte submittere*, which Tittmann assigns to the two verbs in their distinction from each other. This, however, seems doubtful, and, if it were intended, the reverse order would be more natural.—(*c*) The clause *πρὸς πᾶν ἔργ. κ.τ.λ.* is taken by Huther and some others in immediate connection with *ἀρχαῖς*, and thus as referring to the duties of citizens or subjects of government. This connection is supposed by some to be indicated or favored by Rom. xiii. 3. Huther and some others think that the *ἀγαθόν*

[1] To say that with the common construction the clause of purpose is too general (Hofmann), is not to the point, since it can easily be defined from what precedes.

points to *good works* as those in respect to which alone they were to be ready to obey the magistrates. Wiesinger, on the other hand, says, that, while it is implied that the magistrate requires good works, the idea that obedience is not to be rendered to what is evil is not intended to be distinctly expressed, and that it does not belong to the context to suggest any thought on this point. When we consider (1) the fact that the exhortation certainly turns from duties to magistrates to what is more general, in the next clause, if not here; 2. the independent form of this clause, and its parallelism, in this respect, with that which precedes and those which follow; 3. the very general character of kindred expressions in 1 Tim. v. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 21, iii. 17; Tit. i. 16; and 4. the apparent improbability that, if a limitation to duties towards rulers were intended, there would be no word referring to them in the clause, there seems to be much reason to question whether any such special reference was in the mind of the writer. The connection with Rom. xiii. 3, certainly, seems very remote.—(*d*) The reason for the exhortation which now follows in vv. 3–6, is similar, in one aspect of it, to that which is given, in ii. 11 ff., for the exhortations of that chapter—namely, that the very object and purpose of the divine work of redemption was to accomplish that to which the exhortation points. This point is even brought out with an especial emphasis, by presenting the contrast between what the Christians were before conversion (ver. 3) and what belongs to the new life upon which they have entered (ver. 2). But there is another aspect in which the matter is here set forth. In this view of the words, the reason given is different from that in the verses mentioned, and the emphatic *ἡμεν* and *ἡμεῖς*, as well as the *χρηστότης* and *φιλανθρωπία*, indicate that the force of the thought is to be found herein—namely, in that, having been rescued from the state in which unconverted and heathen men are living, by the kindness of God and His love towards man, the Christian ought to manifest a similar spirit towards his fellow-men. A combination of the two thoughts, with a certain emphasis upon the latter, is, apparently, to be discovered in the verses, and was, probably, in the mind of the Apostle. The emphasis referred to indicates something corresponding in vv. 1, 2. We may believe that, while the writer's expressions in those verses are universal and are to be allowed a universal application, he intends to give a special prominence to the feeling and actions of the members of the church towards those who are outside of it and are unbelievers. The characteristics mentioned in ver. 3 are those which are especially descriptive of the heathen, as we see in Eph. and Rom. The word *ἡμεῖς* may include all, whether they had been Gentiles or Jews, but the former class are so far in his thought as, of themselves, to suggest the words in their fullness of meaning.

XXXIX. Vv. 4–7.

(*a*) The word *ὅτε* is contrasted here with the *ποτέ* which precedes, and marks the transition from the old to the new condition of things. It is evident, however, that the matter of salvation is spoken of especially from the divine side of it. This is indicated by the words *χρηστότης* and *φιλανθρ.*, also by *ἔλεος*, by the reference to the gift of the Spirit, by *τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι*, and even by *ἐσωσεν* as here used. The fact that the kindness of God and His love towards men have been manifested to those who had previously been *ἀνόητοι*, *ἀπειθεῖς κ.τ.λ.*, is that on which the special emphasis is laid. The manifestation, as in ii. 11, was through the appearance of Christ in the world.—(*b*) In connection with this setting forth of the kindness

and love of God, Paul takes occasion to give a statement of the means by which God accomplishes the end, which His love has in view—namely salvation. This statement was not essential to the main thought of the passage, indeed, but was very naturally suggested by it, just as a similar statement—though not, indeed, in all its details, which, as here, are modified by the context—was suggested and introduced in Rom. iii. 23–26. The Pauline doctrine of justification and salvation is set forth, first, negatively—it is not as the result of works which we had done in the sphere of our own righteousness (emphatic *ἡμεῖς*); and then, positively. On the positive side, we have presented before us: 1. the originating cause of justification and salvation, the mercy and grace of God; 2. an allusion to the objective means in the offering of Christ; 3. the means by which the provision made by God is applied and rendered effectual in the individual man, baptism and the gift of the Spirit; 4. the final object and purpose of the provision: that the believer may become an heir of eternal life. The especial peculiarity of the passage, as compared with the one in Rom. iii., to which reference has just been made, is in the prominence given to baptism and the impartation of the Spirit, rather than the work of Christ and faith. This peculiarity may, perhaps, be accounted for, so far as the reference to the Spirit is concerned, by the fact that the contrast in the character and conduct between the present and past life of the *ἡμεῖς* (vv. 1, 2, comp. with ver. 3) was in the writer's mind. With respect to the matter of baptism as here spoken of, the following points may be noticed:—1. There is nothing in the passage which expresses with definiteness the precise relation, which, according to the author's conception of the matter, baptism has to regeneration or salvation. He simply says, by means of the *washing* (or *laver*, *bath*) of regeneration God saved us. But *how* it was by means of this, he does not declare by any more detailed statement. The preposition *διά* is one the limits of whose meaning and application (within the general sense of *means*) are widely extended. 2. There is no passage in the N. T. which, fairly interpreted, necessarily ascribes saving efficacy to baptism, considered in itself. All the passages which relate to the subject are either as little, or even less, definite in their statements than the one now before us. 3. The uniform representation with regard to baptism and the work of the Spirit is that the latter is internal, transforming and renewing, the former external. The internal, according to the N. T. everywhere, is the essential; the external is not so. 4. The symbolic idea of baptism, as the outward sign of the inward change, will meet the demands of all the N. T. passages, and of this passage in particular. Nothing more than this can be proved, either from the *διά* of this passage or from the genitive *παλιγγενεσίας*—for the *λουτρόν* is a *λουτ. παλιγγ.*, if baptism is the outward symbol and seal, and *διά* denotes means, if this outward symbol is looked upon as that which accompanies or follows upon the act of faith, and as that which marks the convert as a believer.—(*c*) The construction of the genitive *ζωῆς αἰωνίου* of ver. 7—whether it depends on *ἐλπίδα*, or on *κληρονόμοι*—is doubtful. The immediate connection of the words with *ἐλπίδα*, while they are separated from *κληρονόμοι*, and the phrase *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰων.* in i. 1 favor the view that they depend on *ἐλπ.* The improbability that the writer would use *κληρονόμοι* without some such defining word, may be urged in support of the construction which unites the genitive with that noun. Alford claims that *κληρον.* stands alone in every place where Paul uses it in a spiritual sense, and cites Rom. iv. 14, viii. 17; Gal. iii. 29, iv. 1, 7. But in all these passages the context suggests the defining genitive immediately, or mor-

clearly than it does here, and they can hardly be considered as parallel cases. Huther urges in favor of his view of the meaning that the Apostle is speaking not of the future, but of the present condition of believers. But may it not be, that he is carrying forward the thought of the work of saving us even to its end? The use of *κατ' ἐλπίδα*, in the sense of *τῇ ἐλπίδι* of Rom. viii. 24, "in hope, as contrasted with actual possession," is not demanded by the context here, as it is in Rom. R. V. text makes *ζωῆς* depend on *ἐλπίδα*. R. V. marg. joins it with *κληρονόμοι*. Not improbably, this is the correct presentation of the matter.

XL. Vv. 8–11.

(*a*) With the solemn formula *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* referring to the declaration of the Christian truth in vv. 4–7, the Apostle now brings his letter to a close,—taking occasion, at the end, to say once more what he had in substance said before: that his desire and command was, that Titus should confidently affirm this truth, and, on the other hand, should avoid the questionings, genealogies and strifes to which the false teachers and their disciples gave themselves—the object of all, both the affirmation of the truth and the avoidance of the error, being that the believers might be careful to maintain good works. This last phrase, *καλῶν ἔργων προίστασθαι*, in rendered in the margin of R. V., *profess honest occupations*. But as the idea of good works, as belonging to and to be cultivated by the Christians, is so prominent in this Epistle, and as the verb can be used in the sense of *carrying on* or *practicing an art*, or in the sense of *curam gerere, operam dare*, (Grimm), there can be little doubt that the other meaning is the one here intended.—(*b*) The word *αἱρετικόν* (ver. 10) is, quite probably, to be rendered by *factious*. This accords with the sense in which *αἱρεσις* is to be understood generally in the N. T. The *αἱρ. ἀνθρ.* is one who causes divisions.

COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

BY

DR. GOTTLIEB LÜNEMANN,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GÖTTINGEN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN BY

REV. MAURICE J. EVANS, B.A.

WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES BY

TIMOTHY DWIGHT,

PROFESSOR OF SACRED LITERATURE IN YALE COLLEGE.

PREFATORY NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

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

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

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

It is, however, by his grammatico-critical and purely exegetical

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

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

M. J. E.

EXEGETICAL LITERATURE.

FOR THE GREEK FATHERS.

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

ON THE VULGATE TEXT.

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

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

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

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

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

ON THE GREEK TEXT.

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

ANGUS (Joseph), Professor in Regents Park College, London: Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. In Schaff's Popular Commentary. New York, 1882.

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

BIESENTHAL (J. H. R.): Epistola Pauli ad Hebraeos, cum rabbinico commentario. Berol. 1857.

BISPING (A.): Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Briefen des Ap. Paulus [vol. iii.]. Münster, 1855–63.

BLEEK (Franz), † 1859: Der Brief an die Hebräer. Berlin, 1828–40. Der Hebräerbrief erklärt. Edited by Windrath. Elberfeld, 1868.

BULLINGER (Heinrychus), † 1575: In omnes Apostolicas Epistolas, Divi videlicet Pauli xiiii. etc. Commentarii. [P. 639–731.] fol. Tiguri, 1549.

CAMERON (John), Professor at Saumur, † 1625: Annotationes in N. T. Edited by Lewis Cappel. 1628.

CAPPEL (Jacques), †1624: Observationes in Epistolam ad Hebraeos. 8vo, Sedan, 1624.

CARPZOV (J. B.), Professor at Helmstädt, †1803: Sacrae Exercitationes . . . ex Philone Alexandrino. 8vo, Helmst. 1750.

CRAMER (Johann Andreas), Professor at Kiel, † 1788: Erklärung des Briefes an die Hebräer, 2 parts. Copenh. 1757.

DE WETTE (W. M. L.), † 1849: Kurze Erklärung, etc. Die Briefe an Tit. Tim. und Heb. [vol. ii. part 5]. Leipz. 1844, *al.*

DELITZSCH: Commentar zum Brief a. d. Hebr. Leipz. 1857. [Eng. transl., T. & T. Clark, 1868.]

DICKSON (David), † 1662: Short Explanation of the Epistle to the Hebrews. [See also ROMANS.] 8vo, Aberdeen, 1649.

D'OUTREIN (Jan.): Zendbrief . . . aan de Ebreen, ontleidet, uitgebreed en verklaard. 1711.

EBRARD (H. A.), Professor at Erlangen: Commentar über den Hebräerbrief. Königsberg, 1850. [Eng. transl., T. & T. Clark, 1853. Revised, with additional notes, by Prof. A. C. Kendrick, D.D. New York, 1858.]

EWALD (G. H. A.), Professor at Göttingen, † 1876: Sendschreiben an die Hebräer. Götting. 1870.

GERHARD (John), † 1637: Commentarius super Epist. ad Hebraeos. 8vo, Jenae, 1661.

GOMAR (Francis), Professor at Leyden, † 1641: Analysis Epistolae Pauli ad Hebraeos. Opera [pp. 285–380]. Amstel. 1644.

GOUGE (W.), D. D., † 1653: Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. 2 vols. [Reprinted 1866, 1867.] fol. Lond. 1655.

GUERS (E.): Etude sur l'Epitre aux Hébreux. Genève et Paris, 1862.

HOFMANN (J. C. K. von), † 1877: Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments. Vol. v. 8vo, Nördlingen, 1873.

HOLZHEUER (Otto): Der Brief an die Ebräer ausgelegt. Berlin, 1883.

HYPERIUS (Andreas), † 1564: Commentarii in Epistolam D. Pauli Apostoli ad Hebraeos. fol. Tiguri, 1584.

JONES (W.), D.D.: Commentary on the Epistles to Philemon, Hebrews, and the First and Second Epistles of John. fol. Lond. 1636.

KAY (William), D. D., Rector of Great Leghs: Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the Bible (Speaker's) Commentary. London and New York.

KLEE (H.): Auslegung des Hebräerbriefs. Mainz, 1833.

KLUGE: Der Hebräerbrief, Auslegung und Lehrbegriff. Neu.-Ruppin, 1863.

KURTZ (J. H.), Professor at Dorpat: Der Hebräerbrief exklärt. 1869.

LAWSON (George), Rector of More, Shropshire: Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. fol. Lond. 1662.

M'Caul (J. B.), Canon of Rochester: A Paraphrastic Commentary, etc. Lond. 1871.

Manchester (George Montagu, Duke of): Horae Hebraicae [Heb. i.–iv. 11]. Lond. 1835.

Manoury (A. F.): See Pastoral Epistles.

Menken (Gottfried), † 1831: Homilien über das 9te und 10te Kap., nebst einem Anhange etlicher Homilien über Stellen des 12ten Kap. Bremen, 1831.

Moll (C. B.): Der Brief an die Hebräer [Lange's series]. Bielefeld, 1861.
[Translated by A. C. Kendrick, D.D. New York, 1871.]

Oecolampadius (Joannes), † 1531: In Epistolam ad Hebraeos J. O. explanationes. 4to, Argentorati, 1524.
[From notes taken by some of the hearers.]

Owen (John), D. D., † 1683: Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews. 4 vols. fol. London, 1668–74, *al.*

Pellican (Conrad), † 1556: Commentaria Bibliorum. 9 vols. fol. Tiguri, 1532–42.
[Vol. ix. "in omnes Epistolas."]

Piscator (John), Professor at Herborn, † 1626: Analysis Logica Epistolae Pauli ad Hebraeos.
[Commentarii in omnes libros Novi Testamenti, 3d ed. fol. p. 674–718. Herbornae, 1638.]

Reiche (J. G.): Commentarius Criticus in Novum Testamentum. 3 vols. 4to, Göttingen, 1853–62.
[Vol. iii. In Hebraeos et Catholicas Epistolas.]

Reuss (Ed.): L'Epître aux Hébreux. Essai d'une traduction nouvelle, accompagné d'un commentaire théologique. Strasbourg, 1862.

Riehm (E. C. A.): Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs. Ludwigsb. 1858, 1859.

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

Schlichting (Jonas), † 1664, and John Crell, † 1633: In Epistolam ad Hebraeos Commentarius. 8vo, Racoviae, 1634.

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

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

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

Steward (George): Argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 8vo, Edin. 1872.

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

Stuart (Moses), Professor of Sacred Literature at Andover, † 1852: Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. 2 vols. 8vo, 1827, 1828, *al.*

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

VALCKENAER (Lewis Casp.), Professor of Greek at Leyden, † 1785: Selecta e Scholiis. Edited by Wassenbergh. Tom. ii. Amst. 1817.

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

WIESELER (Karl), Professor at Greifswald: Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief, namentlich seinen Verfasser und seine Leser. 8vo, Kiel, 1861.

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

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. 1.—THE AUTHOR.

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

(1) The testimonies of Christian antiquity in favor of Paul as the author of the epistle are neither so general nor so confident as we must expect, if the epistle had been from the beginning handed down as a work of the Apostle Paul.—Not unfavorable to the claim of Paul, but yet by no means decisive, are the judgments of the early Alexandrian Church. Pantaenus, president of the school of catechetes in Alexandria about the middle of the second century, the first from whom an express statement as to the name of the author has come down to us, certainly assigned the epistle to the Apostle Paul. But yet it is to be observed that even he felt called to set aside an objection, which seemed to lie against the justice of this view, namely: that, contrary to the custom of Paul, the author has not, even in an address prefixed to the epistle, mentioned himself by name; whether it was that this difficulty first arose in the mind of Pantaenus

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

himself, or that, in opposition to others who had raised it, he wished to show the invalid nature thereof. (Comp. the notice of Clemens Alexandrinus on Pantaenus, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 14: *Ἤδη δέ, ὡς ὁ μακάριος ἔλεγε πρεσβύτερος, ἐπεὶ ὁ κύριος, ἀπόστολος ὢν τοῦ παντοκράτορος, ἀπεστάλη πρὸς Ἑβραίους, διὰ μετριότητα ὁ Παῦλος, ὡς ἂν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀπεσταλμένος, οὐκ ἐγγράφει ἑαυτὸν Ἑβραίων ἀπόστολον διά τε τὴν πρὸς τὸν κύριον τιμὴν διά τε τὸ ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλειν, ἐθνῶν κήρυκα ὄντα καὶ ἀπόστολον.*)—Clemens Alexandrinus, too, the disciple of Pantaenus (end of the second and beginning of the third century), makes repeated mention of the epistle as a work of the Apostle Paul (*Strom.* ii. p. 420, iv. p. 514 sq., ed. Sylburg, Colon. 1688, *al.*). But yet he does not venture to ascribe it in its present form immediately to Paul. Not only is for him, too, the same objection, which his teacher already had undertaken to set aside, still of sufficient weight for him to attempt its removal in a new, though, it is true, equally unsatisfactory manner; but also the un-Pauline character of the language in the epistle does not escape his glance. Rather to Luke than to Paul does the garb of the letter seem to him to point. On this account he assumes that a Hebrew (Aramaic) original writing of Paul forms the substratum of the epistle, but that our present epistle is only a version or adaptation of that original writing by Luke, designed for Hellenes. (Comp. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 14: *Καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους δὲ ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου μέν εἶναί φησι, γεγράφθαι δὲ Ἑβραίοις Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ, Λουκᾶν δὲ φιλοτίμως αὐτὴν μεθερμηνεύσαντα ἐκδοῦναι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν· ὁθὲν τὸν αὐτὸν χρῶτα εὑρίσκεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ταύτης τε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν πράξεων· μὴ προγεγράφθαι δὲ τὸ Παῦλος ἀπόστολος, εἰκότως. Ἑβραίοις γάρ, φησίν, ἐπιστέλλων πρόληψιν εἰληφόσι κατ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑποπτεύουσιν αὐτὸν συνετῶς πάνυ οἷός ἐν ἀρχῇ ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτοὺς τὸ ὄνομα θεῖς.*)—Equally does Origen († 254) make the Epistle to the Hebrews stand, it is true, in some relation to the Apostle Paul, as he accordingly more than once cites passages therefrom as sayings of Paul (*e. g. Exhort. ad Martyr.* 44, *in Joh.*, ed. Huet. t. ii. p. 56; *ibid.* t. iii. p. 64, t. x. p. 162, *al.*). But not only is he aware that in point of fact deniers of the composition of the epistle by Paul have arisen (*οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς οὐ Παύλῳ γεγραμμένην, Epist. ad African.* c. 9. Comp. also *in Matt.* xxiii. 27 sq.: Sed pone aliquem abdicare epistolam ad Hebraeos, quasi non Pauli); he too, for his own part, is not able to bring himself to recognize the epistle as a work of Paul in the narrower sense. Only the thoughts of the epistle does he ascribe to Paul; the diction and composition, on the other hand, he denies to be his. Since he admits withal that the contents of the epistle are Pauline, he regards the ancient tradition, which traces it back to Paul, as not unfounded; he has

therefore no fault to find if a church looks upon the epistle as the work of Paul. By whom, however, it was in reality composed is, he thinks, known only to God. Tradition, he tells us, speaks sometimes of the Roman bishop Clement, sometimes of Luke, as the author. (Comp. the two fragments of the lost homilies of Origen on the Epistle to the Hebrews, preserved in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 25: Ὅτι ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τουτέστι τῇ φράσει, ἀλλά ἐστιν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φράσεων διαφορὰς ὁμολογήσαι ἂν· πάλιν τε αὖ ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσιά ἐστι καὶ οὐ δεύτερα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων, καὶ τοῦτο ἂν συμφήσαι εἶναι ἀληθὲς πᾶς ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ. . . . Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἰποιμ' ἄν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικὰ καὶ ὡσπερεὶ σχολιογραφήσαντός τινος τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. Εἰ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκιμείτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἀνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι· τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας[1] τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν· ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ὑπό τινων μὲν λεγόντων, ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολήν, ὑπό τινων δέ, ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις.) —Only subsequently to the time of Origen, accordingly, was the epistle universally regarded within the Alexandrian Church, as within the Egyptian Church in general, as a writing which proceeded immediately from the Apostle Paul. Declarations thereof are appealed to, as simply the

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

words of Paul, by the Alexandrian bishops, Dionysius, about the middle of the third century (in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 41); Alexander, about 312 (in Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 3, Opp. ed. Schulze, tom. iii. p. 736, and in Socrat. *H. E.* i. 6, ed. Vales., Paris 1686, p. 11); Athanasius († 373), in his thirty-ninth *epistola festalis*, and elsewhere; Didymus, the president of the Alexandrian school of catechetes († 395), the Egyptian monks, Macarius the elder, and Marcus Ascetes (*c.* 400), and others.

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

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

3), in the chief passage on the New Testament canon (*Hist. Eccles.* iii. 25), —as a constituent part of the epistles of Paul, which are mentioned only in general,—to belong to the *Homologumena*. But yet he regards the epistle only as a version from a Hebrew original of Paul (*Hist. Eccles.* iii. 38), and can tell of Greeks who, in reliance upon the adverse judgment of the Roman Church, denied the Pauline origin of the epistle in any sense (*Hist. Eccles.* iii. 3). Nay, in another place (*Hist Eccles.* vi. 13), himself even reckons the epistle among the *ἀντιλεγόμεναι γραφαί*;[1] inasmuch as he places it in one line with the Wisdom of Solomon, that of Jesus Sirach, and the epistles of Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, and Jude! On the other hand, the epistle is acknowledged as directly the work of Paul, in the sixtieth canon of the Council at Laodicea after the middle of the fourth century, by Titus of Bostra († *c.* 371), by Basil the Great († 379), and his brother Gregory of Nyssa; by Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem († 386); by Gregory of Nazianzus († 389), in the *Jambi ad Seleucum*, where, nevertheless, the remark has been inserted: *τινὲς δέ φασι τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους νόθον*; by Epiphanius († 402), Chrysostom († 407), Theodore of Mopsuestia († *c.* 428), and others. Yet Theodoret in his *Prooemium* to the epistle (comp. also Epiphanius, *Haer.* 69. 37) is still engaged in polemics against those of Arian sentiments, who rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews as *νόθος*, denying its Pauline authorship.

While thus the testimonies of the East in general are favorable indeed to a Pauline origin of the epistle, an immediate composition thereof by Paul, however, was for the most part asserted only in later times, whereas in the earlier period more generally only a mediate authorship was maintained; the West, on the other hand, during the first centuries, does not acknowledge an authorship of Paul in any sense.—A voucher for this statement is Tertullian, belonging to the North African Church, at the end of the second century and the beginning of the third. Only on a single occasion does he make express mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in order to cite from it the words vi. 4–8, and it is here evidently his endeavor to rate as highly as possible the authority of the writing cited by him. Of a composition thereof by the Apostle Paul, however, he knows nothing; instead of Paul he names Barnabas as its author, and that not in the form of a conjecture, but simply and without qualification.

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

in such wise that he manifestly proceeds upon a supposition universally current in the churches of his native land. (Comp. *de Pudicitia*, c. 20: Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum. Exstat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, a Deo satis auctoritati viri,[1] ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore: "aut ego solus et Barnabas non habemus hoc operandi potestatem?" Et utique receptior apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum. . . . Hoc qui ab apostolis didicit et cum apostolis docuit, nunquam moecho et fornicatori secundam poenitentiam promissam ab apostolis norat.)—Also, in the time immediately following, the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot in Proconsular Africa have been regarded as a writing of the Apostle Paul. This is proved on the authority of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage († 258), who, with the single exception of the short Epistle to Philemon, makes citations from all the letters of Paul, and yet nowhere quotes passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews, but asserts, on the other hand, that Paul wrote only to seven churches (comp. *Testim. adv. Jud.* i. 20; *De Exhortat. Martyrii*, c. 11).

But as the early Church of North Africa, so also the early Roman Church knew nothing of an appertaining of the Epistle to the Hebrews to the Pauline collection of letters. This is the more noteworthy, inasmuch as within the Roman Church the earliest trace is met with of the existence of the Epistle to the Hebrews. For a series of characteristic expressions of the latter is taken up by Clemens Romanus (towards the end of the first century) in his Epistle to the Corinthians (comp. specially cap. 36 with Heb. vi. 4, i. 3, 4, 5, 7, 13; cap. 17 with Heb. xi. 37; and in general, Lardner, *Credibility of the Gospel History*, Part ii. vol. i., Lond. 1748, p. 62 ff.; Böhme, p. lxxv. sq.). These derived expressions, however, are not introduced as citations, but are blended with his own discourse. They prove, therefore, only that Clement was acquainted with the Epistle to the Hebrews, and highly prized it, but afford no information on the question as to whom he regarded as the author. That, however, Clement believed the Apostle Paul to be the author is rendered extremely improbable by the position which the Roman Church of the subsequent period assumed towards this epistle. In the fragment on the canon of the Roman Church, discovered by Muratori, belonging to the close of the second century, it is stated that Paul wrote to seven churches; upon

[1] Thus we have to read, with Oehler (*Tertull. Opp.* tom. i., Lips. 1853, p. 639), in place of *adeo satis auctoritatis viri.*

which follows an enumeration of our present thirteen Pauline Epistles. Besides these, two other letters are then named, which have been forged as coming from Paul; but of the Epistle to the Hebrews not even mention is made. It cannot thus in the Roman Church of that time have been invested with any canonical authority, much less have been looked upon as a writing of the Apostle Paul.—In like manner Caius, presbyter at Rome at the end of the second century and beginning of the third, recognized, in express opposition to the περὶ τὸ συντάττειν καινὰς γραφὰς προπέτειά τε καὶ τόλμα, only thirteen epistles as the work of the Apostle Paul, to the exclusion of the Epistle to the Hebrews (comp. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 20).—Even as late as about the middle of the third century the Epistle to the Hebrews was not in the Roman Church esteemed to be a work of Paul, nor indeed regarded as a canonical writing. This is evident from the fact that Novatian, in his dissertations, *De Trinitate* and *De Cibis Judaicis* (in Gallandi, *Biblioth. Patr.* t. iii. p. 287 sqq.), although these abound in Biblical citations, and although their subject might naturally suggest the employment of the Epistle to the Hebrews, nowhere so much as makes mention of the same; an omission which, supposing its recognition as a canonical writing, and one proceeding from Paul, would be the more inexplicable, inasmuch as Novatian could hardly have urged any passage of Scripture in favor of his severer view with regard to the receiving again into the communion of the church of those who had lapsed, with greater appearance of justification than this very text of Heb. vi. 4–6.—So likewise Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* vi. 20) expressly observes with respect to *his* age (first half of the fourth century): καὶ εἰς δεῦρο παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισὶν οὐ νομίζεται τοῦ ἀποστόλου τυγχάνειν.—Of Irenaeus, moreover, the representative of the Church of Southern Gaul at the end of the second century and beginning of the third, Stephanus Gobarus relates, in Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 232 (ed. Hoeschel, Rothomagi 1653, fol. p. 903), that he, equally as Hippolytus, denied that the Epistle to the Hebrews was composed by Paul. In harmony with this statement is the fact that Irenaeus, in his great work *Advers. Haereses*, often as he had occasion to cite this epistle, and frequently as he otherwise adduces proof passages from the epistles of Paul, yet nowhere appeals to the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the lost writing βιβλίον διαλέξεων διαφόρων, he did indeed, according to a notice in Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* v. 26), cite some passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews (just as he did from the Wisdom of Solomon); but that Irenaeus regarded the Apostle Paul as its author is not said by Eusebius either.

Only after the middle of the fourth century did the opinion that Paul was its author gradually find acceptance in the West—a change of views which, without doubt, is to be traced to the preponderating influence of the Greek Church upon the Latin. As a work of Paul it is cited by Hilary, bishop of Poitiers († 368); Lucifer of Cagliari († 371); his contemporary, Fabius Marius Victorinus; Philastrius, bishop of Brescia († *c.* 387); Ambrose, bishop of Milan († 397); Rufinus of Aquileia († *c.* 411); Jerome († 420); Augustine († 430), and others. That change of views comes out with special distinctness in the African synods at the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth. In the thirty-sixth canon of the synod at Hippo (393), as in the forty-seventh canon of the third synod at Carthage (397), in the determination of those books of the New Testament to be held as canonical, the number of the epistles of Paul is declared to be altogether thirteen; and then is added: by the same, the Epistle to the Hebrews (Pauli apostoli epistolae tredecim; ejusdem ad Hebraeos una). This separate mention shows that at this time they did not yet venture to concede to the Epistle to the Hebrews a perfectly equal rank with that of the thirteen universally recognized letters of Paul. Presently after, however, in the twenty-ninth canon of the fifth Carthaginian synod (419), it is said, on the occasion of a similar enumeration: epistolarum Pauli apostoli numero quatuordecim. Yet, spite of this revolution of the judgments in general, doubts as to the canonicity and Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews were not entirely reduced to silence, even in this late period. Philastrius still remarks that the same was only rarely read in church among the Latins (*Haeres.* 89); and in *Haeres.* 88 mentions, among the books which, according to the appointment of the apostles and their successors, were alone to be publicly read in the assemblies, only thirteen Pauline Epistles. The commentary of Hilary (Ambrosiaster), moreover, covers indeed the whole thirteen Pauline Epistles, but not the Epistle to the Hebrews; and even Rufinus adds, on a mention of the epistle (*Invectiva in Hieronymum* 1, Opp. Hieronymi, ed. Martianay, t. v. p. 279), the words: si quis tamen eam receperit. With like wavering does Jerome also often express himself (*e. g.* on Tit. i. 5, *Opp.* ed. Vallars, 2, t. vii. P. 1, p. 695: Si quis vult recipere eam epistolam, quae sub nomine Pauli ad Hebraeos scripta est.—*Ibid.* on ii. 2, p. 714: Relege ad Hebraeos epistolam Pauli, sive cujuscunque alterius eam esse putas), and observes expressly, *e. g. Epist.* 125 *ad Exagrium* (ed. Martianay, t. ii. p. 571): Epistola ad Hebraeos, quam omnes Graeci recipiunt et nonnulli Latinorum.—*Comment. on Matt.* xxvi. 8, 9 (ed. Vallars, t. vii. P. 1,

p. 212): Paulus, in epistola sua, quae scribitur ad Hebraeos, licet de ea multi Latinorum dubitent.—*Catalog.* c. 59 (ed. Martianay, t. iv. p. 117): sed et apud Romanos usque hodie quasi Pauli apostoli non habetur; and similarly elsewhere. In like manner Augustine also observes (*De Peccatorum meritis et remissione*, 1. 27, Opp. ed. Bened. t. x., Antw. 1700, p. 18) that the Epistle to the Hebrews is *nonnullis incerta*, although he himself is decided in his judgment by the auctoritas ecclesiarum orientalium, among whom this writing also is held in canonical repute.

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

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

[1] That the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was in a state of captivity, and was begging of the church for intercession with God in his θλῖψις, Tobler ("Studien nach dem Codex Sinaiticus über den Hebräerbrief," in Hilgenfeld's *Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1861, H. 4, p. 357 f.) has nevertheless felt bound to deduce from the form of the text in the Codex Sinaiticus: προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν ὅτι καλὴ. θα γὰρ ὅτι καλὴν συνείδησιν ἔχομεν ἐν πᾶσιν καλῶς

the third passage we may certainly conclude that the author was on terms of friendship with Timothy, the well-known assistant of Paul. But this fact could be regarded as a sign indicative of Paul himself only if Timothy were characterized as a person who occupied a subordinate position towards the author, which is not the case. As the words read, the passage is appropriate to any disciple of Paul as the writer. To this the consideration must be added, that in the passage in question the deliverance of Timothy out of his captivity is announced: the readers must thus have had a knowledge of the imprisonment itself; it could not therefore have been either insignificant or of short duration. Of an imprisonment of Timothy, however, so long as he was the assistant of Paul, there is not found the slightest trace, either in the epistles of the latter or in the Acts of the Apostles.[1] Much more probable is it, therefore, that this notice refers to an imprisonment suffered by Timothy only after the death of the Apostle Paul. The fourth passage, finally, is supposed to show that the epistle was written from Rome, and on that account probably by Paul. But from *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας* the author could send salutations only if he were somewhere outside of Italy. If he had himself been present in Italy, with the Italian Christians from whom the salutations come, at the time of the composition of the epistle, he must have indicated them as *οἱ*

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

προσευχεσθε πε
ρι ημων οτι καλη.
θα γαρ οτι καλην
συνιδησιν κ.τ.λ.

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

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

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

Against Paul as the author argue—

(3) The style and manner of presentation characteristic of the epistle. Origen has already observed (*vid. supra*, p. 331), that every one who is a judge of the diversities of language must admit that this writing is συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως ἑλληνικωτέρα than the letters of Paul; and the same fact, even before his time, drew the attention of Clemens Alexandrinus (*vid. supra*, p. 2), as in general the widespread belief of antiquity in a Hebrew original of the epistle is based upon such divergency. But the epistle is distinguished not merely by a purer Greek,—with which are found mingled Hebraisms, for the most part only in the citations borrowed from the Old Testament,—it is also more perfectly rounded off into periods, and more rhetorical. Whereas Paul wrestles with the language in order to express in words the abundance of thoughts pouring in upon him, and irregularities of grammar, variations of structure, and *anacoluthias* are nothing rare with him, the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews always flows on in smooth facility. The harmonious symmetry of the sentences is preserved uninterrupted, even where parentheses of considerable extent are inserted (comp. vii. 20–22); nay, parenthesis is enclosed within parenthesis, and yet the writer steadily returns to complete the construction begun (comp. xii. 8–24). The greatest care is bestowed throughout upon euphony and musical cadence (comp. *e.g.* i. 1–4, vii. 1–3), upon the effective grouping of words (comp. *e.g.* vii. 4), and even the use of particles and participles betrays throughout an acquaintance with the art of composition and a learned rhetoric. While the Apostle Paul is everywhere concerned only about the matter itself which he is presenting, never troubles himself about a fair form of its clothing in language, and with him even the most affecting outbursts of natural eloquence are never anything but the immediate product of the moment,—in the Epistle to the Hebrews the endeavor after euphony and adornment of style extends even to the

details of expression and the turns of the discourse. Where, for instance, the plain and simple *μισθός*, of which Paul regularly makes use, might have been placed without any difference of sense, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews chooses just as regularly the fuller sounding *μισθαποδοσία* (ii. 2, x. 35, xi. 26), and in accordance therewith makes use of *ὁρκωμοσία* (vii. 20, 21, 28), *αἱματεκχυσία* (ix. 22), and other sonorous compounds. Whilst, further, *e. g.*, the sitting of Christ at the right hand of God is indicated by Paul simply by *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος* (Col. iii. 1; comp. also Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20), in the Epistle to the Hebrews the majestic formulas: *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* (i. 3), *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (viii. 1), *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκάθικεν* (xii. 2), serve to express the same thought. Further, that which Paul predicates of Christ, in describing Him simply as *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ* (2 Cor. iv. 4), or as *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου* (Col. i. 15), or as *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων* (Phil. ii. 6), is expressed by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in more carefully chosen language by means of the characteristic *ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ*.[1]—As, however, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews surpasses the Apostle Paul in respect of this external side of the diction, and of all writers of the New Testament comes nearest to a classical perfection,—in such wise that only some portions in Luke bear comparison therewith,—yet, on the other hand, he falls considerably behind the Apostle Paul in respect of the inner character of his mode of presentation. There is wanting to his argumentation that dialectic acuteness (comp. *e. g.* xii. 25), to his sequence of thought that severe and firm connectedness (comp. *e. g.* iv. 14), to his expression that precision and definiteness (comp. *e. g.* vii. 27), which are characteristic of the Apostle Paul.

(4) Deviations from Paul are shown, further, in the doctrinal subject-matter of the epistle. Certainly in the main, and regarded as a whole, its fundamental doctrinal conception is the same as in the Pauline Epistles, as also in details it affords manifold notes of accord with the doctrinal presentation of the latter.[2] Nevertheless, this dogmatic harmony is not

[1] Many further differences of language in details, in part connected with the fact that in the Epistle to the Hebrews the language is preponderantly rhetorical, with Paul preponderantly dialectic, see in Schulz, *Der Brief an die Hebr.*, Breslau 1818, p. 135 ff.; Seyffarth, *De ep. quae dicitur ad Hebr. indole maxime peculiari*, Lips. 1821, p. 25 sqq.

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

without peculiar, individual, independent coloring in the Epistle to the Hebrews.[1] The Apostle Paul regards as the most important fact in the history of salvation, the resurrection of Christ; by this did the work of salvation first receive the divine sanction and attestation; by it was Christ first by a divine deed proved to be the Son of God. Of the death of Christ, therefore, Paul speaks almost always in connection with the resurrection. This importance, however, the resurrection of Christ has not for the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Only incidentally, in the invocation xiii. 20, is it mentioned by him; in the body of the epistle, on the contrary, stress is laid exclusively upon the death of Christ and the heavenly high-priesthood, of which office the Saviour Christ, exalted to the right hand of God, is the occupant and fulfiller. In addition to this, the notion of πίστις is different with our author from what it is with Paul. Whereas with Paul the πίστις involves an opposition to the νόμος and the ἔργα νόμου, and has its object in particular in Christ, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, understands thereby in general the believing, humble confiding in God's grace and promises, in opposition to the *seeing* of their realization,—a phase of the conception which but rarely (comp. 2 Cor. v. 7) is met with in Paul. It is, moreover, a remarkable fact that no reference is made to the participation of the Gentiles in the Messianic kingdom,—although the author must have entertained the same views as Paul on this point, inasmuch as he regards Judaism only as an imperfect preparatory stage to Christianity, and demands a coming forth from the former, in order to become partakers of the blessings of the latter,—whence it seems to follow that the author found his life's task not so much in the conversion of the Gentiles, as in the conversion of his Jewish kinsmen. Peculiar to this epistle is, further, the prevailing fondness for a typico-symbolic mode of contemplation,[2]

[1] Yet on account of this independence to regard the epistle, with Riehm (*Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs*, Ludwigsb. 1858, 1859, II. p. 861 ff.), after the example of R. Köstlin (*Theol. Jahrbb.* of Baur and Zeller, 1854, H. 4, p. 463 ff.), also Ritschl (*Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche*, 2 Aufl., Bonn 1857, p. 159 ff.) and Weiss (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1859, H. 1, p. 142 ff.), as not the work of a writer of the Pauline school, but to discover in it a later stage of development of the primitive apostolic Judaeo-Christianity, is a proceeding not warranted by any sufficient ground. There is the less reason for such judgment, inasmuch as a very close personal connection of the author of the epistle with Paul and his disciples and fellow-laborers is conceded; in the doctrinal conception of the epistle not only no contradiction of Paul is discovered, but, on the contrary, a higher agreement with him on all essential points; and it is, moreover, taken for granted that the epistle arose through the incitement and under the influence of Paulinism.

[2] Comp. de Wette, "Ueber die symbolisch-typische Lehrart des Briefes an die Hebr."

which is met with indeed in Paul's writings (*e.g.* Gal. iv. 21 ff., 1 Cor. x. 1 ff.), but yet only in isolated instances; and other peculiarities besides. Comp. Richm. *Lehrbegr. des Hebraerbr.* I. p. 221 ff., 385 ff., II. p. 632 ff., 821 ff.; Davidson, *Introduction*, I. p. 241 ff.

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

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

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

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

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

(in the *Theologische Zeitschrift* of Schleiermacher, de Wette, and Lücke, Heft 3, Berlin 1822, p. 1 ff.).

Erasmus within the Catholic Church declared themselves against the claim of Paul to the authorship of the epistle. The former was on that account assailed by Ambrosius Catharinus, the latter was compelled to defend himself against the Sorbonne, and the Council of Trent suppressed all further expression of a freer judgment, in decreeing the epistle to be the fourteenth epistle of Paul.[1] Yet more decidedly was the Pauline authorship of the epistle denied by the Reformers. Luther separated the Epistle to the Hebrews from the letters of Paul in his editions of the New Testament, and placed it, with the Epistles of James and Jude and the Apocalypse, after "the right certain main books of the New Testament," since those four books "of old time (*vor zeiten*) had another estimation put upon them." "First of all," he says (see Walch, Thl. 14, p. 146 f.), "that this Epistle to the Hebrews is not St. Paul's or any other apostle's, is shown thereby, that it stands in chap. ii. 3 thus: this doctrine has come down to us through those who themselves have heard it of the Lord. By this it is made clear that he speaks of the apostles as a disciple to whom such doctrine has come from the apostles, perhaps long after. For St. Paul, Gal. i. 1, powerfully attests that he has his gospel from no man, nor by man, but from God Himself. Besides this, it has a hard knot, in that it in chap. vi. and x. straightway denies and refuses repentance to sinners after baptism, and in xii. 17 says Esau sought repentance and yet did not find it. The which, as it sounds, seemeth to be against all gospels and epistles of St. Paul. And although one may make a gloss thereon, yet the words after all sound so clear, that I know not whether it will suffice. To me it seems that this is an epistle put together out of several parts, and not in regular order treating of one and the same thing. However this may be, it certainly is a wondrously fine epistle, which speaks in a masterly and solid way of the priesthood of Christ out of the Scriptures, and, moreover, finely and fully expounds the Old Testament. This is clear, that it comes from an excellent learned man, who was a disciple of the apostles, had learned much of them, and was firmly experienced in the faith and exercised in the Scripture. And though he, indeed, lays not the foundation of the faith, as he himself testifieth, chap. vi. 1, that which is the office of the apostles,—yet he builds thereon fine gold, silver, precious stones, as St. Paul says, 1 Cor. iii. 12. On that account we shall not be troubled if perchance a little wood, straw, or hay be therewith mingled, but receive such fine teaching with all honor, without being able to equal

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

it in all respects to the apostolic epistles. Who wrote it, however, is unknown, and will indeed remain unknown for awhile yet; but that is no matter. The doctrine shall content us, since this is so firmly based on and in the Scripture, and likewise shows a right fine grasp and measure for reading and handling the word of Scripture." As Luther, so also Melanchthon, the Magdeburg Centuriators, Lucas Osiander, Balduin, Hunnius, and others, denied the Pauline origin of the epistle; and of the Reformed Church, Calvin, Beza, Jos. Scaliger, Dan. Heinsius, cum multis aliis.[1] Later, however, even in the Protestant Church the supposition that Paul was the author became gradually again more general, and was after the beginning of the seventeenth century the ecclesiastically accepted opinion, from which only the Arminians and Socinians ventured to depart. A freer research was first set going again by Semler and Michaelis; it has almost universally decided unfavorably to Paul. Yet the theory of a directly Pauline origin has still found defenders in Storr, Hug, G. W. Meyer (in Ammon and Bertholdt's *Krit. Journal der neuesten theol. Literat.*, Bd. ii. St. 3, p. 225 ff.), Heinreichs (but comp. the preface to the second edition), Hofstede de Groot (*Disputatio, qua ep. ad Hebr. cum Paulinis epp. comparatur*, Traj. ad Rhen. 1826), Moses Stuart, Gelpke (*Vindiciae originis Paulinae ad Hebraeos epistolae, nova ratione*[2] *tentatae*, Lugduni Batav. 1832, 8.), Paulus, Stein, Bloomfield (*Greek Testament*, 9th ed. vol. ii., Lond. 1855, p. 572 ff.), Biesenthal (*Epistola Pauli ad Hebraeos cum rabbinico Commentario*, Berol. 1857; *Ztschr. f. Luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1866, H. 4, p. 616), J. Chr. K. v. Hofmann (*Der Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, 2 Aufl., Nördling. 1860, p. 105, 378; *Die heil. Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht*, Thl. 5, Nördl. 1873, p. 520 ff.), Robbins (in Park and Taylor's *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. xviii., Andover 1861, July, p. 469 ff.), W. Volck (in the Dorpat *Ztschr. für Theol. u. Kirche*, Jahrg. 1869, Bd. ii. H. 4, p. 504 ff.), J. B. M'Caul (*The Epistle to the Hebrews in a Paraphrastic Commentary, with Illustrations from Philo, the Targums, the Mishna and Gemara, the later Rabbinical Writers*, etc., Lond. 1871, p. 4, 329), Joh. Wichelhaus (*Akadem. Vorless. über. das N.*

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

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

T., herausgeg. v. A. Zahn, Halle 1875, p. 3 f.), and Jatho (*Blicke in die Bedeutung des mosaischen Cultus,* Hildesh. 1876, p. 1 ff.); while Woerner (*Der Brief St. Pauli an die Hebräer.,* Ludwigsb. 1876, p. 253 f.) expresses himself with hesitation, and Guericke (*Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 441), Delitzsch (in Rudelbach and Guericke's *Ztschr. f. d. Luth. Theol.* 1849, p. 266, and in the commentary), Ebrard, and some others seek at least to trace back the epistle indirectly to Paul, inasmuch as they suppose it to have been written by his direction and under his oversight. But that this last modification also is an untenable and unjustified one, is evident. For, of a fact of this kind there must of necessity be some indication found in the epistle itself; whereas this writing everywhere gives the impression of an independent work of an independent Christian teacher. So likewise, inasmuch as then, too, Paul would surely be the only representative of the subject-matter of the epistle, the meaning of such expressions as ii. 3 and others would become more absolutely inexplicable.

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

Barnabas has been looked upon as the author by J. E. Chr. Schmidt (*Histor.-Krit. Einleit. in's N. T.,* Abth. 1, p. 289 ff.), Twesten (*Dogmatik.* Bd. 1, 4 Aufl. p. 95), Thiersch (*De Epistola ad Hebr. commentatio historica,* Marb. 1848, p. 1[1]), Wieseler, *Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters,* Götting, 1848, p. 504 ff.; *Untersuchung über den Hebraerbrief, namentlich seinen Verfasser u. seine Leser,* 1 Hälfte [Schriften der Universität zu Kiel aus dem Jahre, 1860, 4, Bd. VII.; also printed separately, Kiel 1861, 8]), Adalb. Maier (*Comment. üb. d. Br. an d. Hebr.,* Freib. im Br. 1861, p. 13 ff.), Ritschl (*Theol. Studd. u. Kritt.* 1866, H. 1, p. 89), and Renan (*L'Antechrist,* Paris 1873, p. xvii. f. 210 f.).[2] According to Wieseler, of all the claims to the

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

[2] Joh. Cameron is also named as a representative of this view. Bleek (Abth. 1, p. 261, note 364) refers to Cameron's *Quaestio* ii. *in Ep. ad Hebr.*, and Ullmann (p. 389, note) to his

authorship, that of Barnabas is best vouched for by the tradition of antiquity. But in reality there remains only the single testimony (certainly a very definite one) of Tertullian (*vide supra*, p. 333 f.) in favor of Barnabas. For that it was also held in the majority of churches of the East to be a work of Barnabas, cannot be inferred, with Wieseler (comp. already Ullmann, p. 391), from the words of Jerome (Epist. 129, *ad Dardan.*, Opp. ed. Martianay, t. ii. p. 608): Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam, quae inscribitur ad Hebraeos, non solum ab ecclesiis orientis sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Graeci sermonis scriptoribus quasi Pauli apostoli susciri; licet plerique eam vel Barnabae vel Clementis arbitrentur, et nihil interesse, cujus sit, quum ecclesiastici viri sit et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur. To supply a *nostrorum* to the plerique, with Tholuck and Delitzsch, out of the preceding *nostris*, is indeed impossible; *plerique* can receive its more precise definition only either from the last member of the sentence beginning with *ab*, or else from the two such members. But it is in an equal degree unjustifiable, in connection with the latter supposition, to assign *vel Barnabae*, in distinct separation, to the ecclesiae orientis, and *vel Clementis* to the Graeci sermonis scriptores, and then to help out the verdict thus gained—to wit, that the majority in the East traced the epistle indeed to Paul, but derived its present Greek form from Barnabas—with the conjecture "that the original tradition of those Eastern churches pointed to the sole authorship of Barnabas." Rather is Jerome's manner of expressing himself in the fore-cited passage in more than one respect inaccurate; inasmuch as he is, moreover, acquainted with Luke, as a third person who might be mentioned in the same category with Barnabas and Clement, and elsewhere is able to adduce only a single early authority in favor of the opinion that Barnabas composed the epistle, and this authority belonging not to the Eastern church, but to that of the West. The passage finds its corrective in the words of the *Catalogus Scriptorum*, c. 5 (Opp. ed. Martianay, t. iv. p. 103 sq.): Epistola autem, quae fertur ad Hebraeos, non ejus creditur propter stili sermonisque distantiam, sed vel Barnabae juxta Tertullianum, vel Lucae evangelistae, juxta quosdam, vel Clementis Romanae ecclesiae episcopi, quem ajunt ipsi adjunctum sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornasse sermone,—according to which Jerome was acquainted only with Tertullian as the representative of the view that Barnabas wrote the epistle. If, further,

Myrothecium Evangelicum. But in the latter work, at any rate, there is found no statement of this kind. In this Cameron usually speaks of the author as Apostolus, but certainly distinguishes him from the Apostle Paul. Comp. *e. g.* on Heb. vii. 18, ed. Salmur., 1677, 4, p. 270.

Philastrius, *Haer.* 89, observes: Sunt alii quoque, qui epistolam Pauli ad Hebraeos non adserunt esse ipsius, sed dicunt aut Barnabae esse apostoli, aut Clementis de urbe Roma episcopi, it is likewise entirely unprovable that the *aut Barnabae* did not refer merely to Tertullian. In like manner it does not, of course, at all follow, from the fact that the Epistle to the Hebrews is placed after the Pastoral Epistles in the Peshito, that the early Syrian Church regarded the epistle as the work of none other than Barnabas. It is, in the last place, a mere assertion when we are told that in the *Versus scribturarum sanctarum*—an ancient stichometric catalogue of the sacred writings of the O. and N. T., which is preserved to us, inserted in the Codex Claromontanus between the Epistle to Philemon and that to the Hebrews (comp. *Cod. Claromontanus*, ed. Tischendorf, Lips. 1852, 4, p. 468 sq.)—the Epistle to the Hebrews bears the name of an *Epistola Barnabae*. (So first Credner in the *Theol. Jahrbb.* 1857, p. 307 ff.; *Gesch. des Neutest. Kanon.*, Berl. 1860, p. 175 ff.) That catalogue presents only the words: *Barnabae epist. ver.* DCCCL; it simply mentions, therefore, the Epistle of Barnabas, and adds how many verses or lines (*stichoi*) it contains. The supposition is thus only natural, that the same writing is meant which elsewhere in the early church bears the name of the Epistle of Barnabas, and in the Codex Sinaiticus is bound up with the canonical books of the New Testament. Nay, this supposition is raised entirely beyond doubt by the fact that, in addition to the "Barnabae epist.," and on the same level therewith, the *Pastor*, the *Actus Pauli*, and the *Revelatio Petri*, thus writings which in later time were just as little reckoned among the canonical books (the "sanctae scribturae" of the catalogue) as the Epistle of Barnabas, are likewise enumerated and stichometrically defined in this catalogue. Moreover, the Epistle to the Hebrews, if this had been thought of in connection with the "Barnabae epist.," must at least have been denoted by the reading *Barnabae ad Hebraeos epist.*; as also Tertullian (comp. p. 7) did not deem the addition *ad Hebraeos*, for the designation of our Epistle to the Hebrews, redundant. It is true the assertion has been made, that the number of lines mentioned points to the Epistle to the Hebrews. But we should be permitted to make a deduction from this number of lines, only in case the number of lines for the several books of the New Testament were a fixed one in the MSS. It is, however, an altogether wavering and changing one. Thus the accounts of the lines for the Epistle to the Hebrews (comp. Tischendorf, N. T. ed. 7, P. ii. p. 596) vary between the numbers 703 and 830. Not one of these numbers reaches the sum of 850 mentioned in the catalogue. If, therefore, we are

to make any deduction at all from these data, we must rather suppose that the number 850 is much more favorable to the epistle otherwise known as the Epistle of Barnabas than to our Epistle to the Hebrews, since the former exceeds the latter in extent by about a third. (In the Codex Sinaiticus the Epistle of Barnabas occupies 53½ columns, and the Epistle to the Hebrews 40½.) It is asserted, further, that the *Barnabae epist.* of the catalogue must be regarded as the Epistle to the Hebrews, because it has obtained a place in the enumeration *before* the Revelation of John and the Acts of the Apostles, and so by the intervention of the two latter writings is separated from the *Pastor*, the *Actus Pauli*, and the *Revelatio Petri*. But this order of enumeration does not warrant such conclusion, any more than a special mark of design is to be discovered in the unusual order of mentioning the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon only after the Pastoral Epistles, which is observed in the same catalogue. The consideration that, if our view be correct, the Epistle to the Hebrews has been entirely passed over without mention in the catalogue, can present no difficulty. We need not even suppose that the mention thereof has been overlooked in consequence of a mere blunder in copying. This is indeed possible, since the Epistles to the Thessalonians and that to the Philippians have for a like reason been passed over unmentioned, and otherwise the negligence of the copyist displays itself in the catalogue, in the fact that the two Epistles of Peter, *e. g.*, bear therein the appellations *ad Petrum* I. and *ad Petrum* II. The non-mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews is rather to be explained simply from the fact, well known from other sources, that this epistle was not invested with any canonical authority in the early church of the West, from which this catalogue comes down to us.—Favorable to the claim of Barnabas might appear the historic incident of his receiving this his name (*υἱὸς παρακλήσεως*), according to Acts iv. 36, on account of his gifts of prophetic or spiritual utterance, with which the eloquent language of the Epistle to the Hebrews might be shown to accord. Nor would there be anything directly opposed to such view in the circumstance that in Acts xiii. 9 ff., 16 ff., xiv. 9 ff., not Barnabas but Paul is described as the chief speaker, and that consequently the former is in Acts xiv. 12 compared to Zeus; the latter, on the other hand, to Hermes. For although the Epistle to the Hebrews is superior in point of diction to the Pauline Epistles, a greater facility of graceful writing does not of necessity argue a greater facility of oral discourse. In favor of Barnabas, might, further, his birth in Cyprus be supposed to plead, and consequently—since Cyprus was in various ways

connected with Alexandria—the Alexandrian type of thought which appears in the epistle would not be inappropriate to him. But absolutely decisive against Barnabas is the fact that, according to Acts iv. 36, 37, he was a Levite, and must have long time dwelt in Jerusalem, since he even possessed land there. He must therefore have been more accurately informed with regard to the inner arrangements of the temple in Jerusalem at that time than was the case with the author of our epistle.[1] For the temple at Jerusalem is meant (see sec. 2), and not that at Leontopolis in Egypt, as Wieseler supposes.

Luke has been frequently regarded even in early times as at least the translator or the penman of the epistle; and a share in the work of its composition has been ascribed to him by Hug (in the later editions of his *Einleit. in's N. T.*), and more recently Delitzsch (in Rudelb. and Guericke's *Zeitschr. für. die Luth. Theol.* 1849, H. 2, p. 272 ff., and in the *Kommentar zum Hebr.-Br.* p. 704) and Ebrard, as also J. v. Döllinger (*Christenthum u. Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung*, Regensb. 1860, p. 86), inasmuch as the first-named attributes to him the linguistic garb of the epistle, and the others assign to him the elaboration of the thoughts furnished to him by the Apostle Paul. As the independent composer, on the other hand, Luke has been regarded by Grotius and S. Crell (in the pseudonymous writing, *Artemonii initium ev. Joannis ex antiquitate ecclesiastica restitutum*, P. 1, 1726, 8, p. 98); and Delitzsch also (comp. his commentary on the Ep. p. 707) now holds this view to be at least possible. To the Pauline Christian Luke, certainly the self-characterizing of Heb. ii. 3 is appropriate (comp. Luke i. 2), as well as the purer Greek and the more skillful formation of periods. There are also to be discovered certain peculiarities in the phraseology—to which Grotius already calls attention—which are met with only in the writings of Luke and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Nevertheless, these points of contact are only of a subordinate nature, whilst side by side with them a thorough diversity of style and presentation is to be observed. In Luke, where he writes independently, there is displayed a mere smoothness in the flow of the language; in the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, a self-conscious majesty of rhetoric reveals itself. Moreover, there is nothing in Luke to correspond to the Alexandrian-Jewish spirit of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The proof which Delitzsch has recently sought to establish in his commentary—

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

namely, that the most decided similarity as regards the choice of words and the construction of the sentences connects the Epistle to the Hebrews with the writings of Luke, nay, that even in characteristic points of doctrine a striking coincidence is to be observed between the respective writings—was therefore predestined to failure. The evidence for his assertion has been scattered by Delitzsch through his whole commentary; and it almost seems as though this, for the reader and critic highly inconvenient mode of proceeding, had been chosen under the unconscious feeling that the evidence was not in a position to admit of synoptical classification, without in such case at once being laid bare in all its weakness. For, so soon as we critically sift that which has been uncritically piled together by Delitzsch; so soon as we separate therefrom that which is not exclusively peculiar to Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews; so soon as we also put out of the account that which Luke has only taken up out of the sources employed by him, and cease to lay any weight upon isolated expressions and turns of discourse which were the common property either of the Greek language in general, or of the later Greek in particular, and are only accidentally present in Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews,—there is nothing whatever left of an actual affinity, such as must of necessity admit of being traced out between works of the same author. That, namely, on which Delitzsch founds his argument is the following:—

The particle *τε*, i. 3, and frequently, is but rarely found in the N. T. save in the writings of Paul, and more especially of Luke.—The middle *ποιεῖσθαι*, i. 3, is a favorite one with Paul, and particularly so with Luke. It is here similarly used, as *e. g.* in *δεήσεις ποιεῖσθαι*, Luke v. 33; Phil. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1; *κοπετὸν ποιεῖσθαι*, Acts viii. 2; *ἀναβολὴν μηδεμίαν ποιεῖσθαι*, Acts xxv. 17.—*παρά*, after the comparative, i. 4, is also not foreign to Luke (Luke iii. 13).—*δέ*, i. 13, in the third place, as Luke xv. 17; Acts xxvii. 14; Gal. iii. 23.—*προσέχειν τινί*, ii. 1, like *προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις*, Acts xvi. 14.—*τὰ ἀκουσθέντα*, ii. 1, is the word of salvation, which in the Epistle to the Hebrews is nowhere called *εὐαγγέλιον*, as also Luke in his writings (with the exception of Acts xv. 7, xx. 24) loves to express the idea of *εὐαγγέλιον* by various forms of periphrasis.—*συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν*, ii. 4, is formed after the manner of *συνεπιτίθεσθαι*, Acts xxiv. 9.—*ποικίλαι δυνάμεις*, ii. 4, has its analogon in Acts ii. 22 (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 9).—*διαμαρτύρεσθαι*, ii. 6, is specially frequent in Luke, *e. g.* Acts xx. 23, xxiii. 11.—The construction *ἐν γὰρ τῷ κ.τ.λ.*, ii. 8, corresponds entirely to that of Acts xi. 15.—*ἀρχηγός*, ii. 10, xii. 2, is the name which Jesus bears also in Acts iii. 15, v. 31.—*καταργεῖν*, ii. 14, a favorite word with Paul, is found besides in the N. T.

only in Luke xiii. 7.—*δήπου*, ii. 16, occurs, it is true, only here in the N. T.; but yet *δή*, which also is rare in the N. T., occurs with the greatest comparative frequency in Luke ii. 7. The coloring of the expression is thoroughly Lucan. The *ὀφέν*, which is met with six times in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is foreign to the letters of Paul, but occurs Acts xxvi. 19. *Ὁμοιωθῆναι* is employed exactly as Acts xiv. 11 in the cry of the men of Lystra. *Ἱλάσκεσθαι* has in Luke xviii. 13 its single parallel in the N. T. *Κατὰ πάντα* is, Acts xvii. 22, certainly to no less extent Lucan than Pauline. *Τὰ πρὸς θεόν* occurs, indeed, elsewhere only v. 1 and Rom. xv. 17; but at Luke xiv. 32, xix. 42, Acts xxviii. 10 (comp. also Luke xiv. 28, Acts xxiii. 30, according to the *textus receptus*), *τὰ πρός* is likewise found as a current form of expression.—*δύνασθαι*, ii. 18, here, as with few exceptions throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews, construed with the infinitive *aorist*, just as in Luke i. 20, 22, iii. 8, v. 12, and often.—*πέπονθεν πειρασθείς*, ii. 18, has again its parallels in Luke; inasmuch as, according to Acts xx. 19, sufferings, as such, are *πειρασμοί*; and according to Luke xxii. 28, the sufferings of the Lord in particular were so.—*μέτοχοι*, iii. 1, vi. 4, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Luke v. 7.—*κατανοεῖν*, iii. 1, x. 24, is a favorite word with Luke, *e. g.* xii. 24, 27, and often; comp. especially Acts xi. 6.—The *γάρ*, iii. 16, accentuating the question, is equally Lucan, Acts xix. 35, viii. 31, as Pauline, 1 Cor. xi. 22.—*ἀλλ' οὐ*, iii. 16, is placed as in Luke xvii. 7 f.; comp. *ἀλλὰ τί*, Matt. xi. 7-9.—*ἐπαγγελία*, in the signification of *assurance, promise*, iv. 1, is of most frequent occurrence with Luke and Paul; and the combination with the bare infinitive, instead of *τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν*, which recurs xi. 15, is like that of Acts xiv. 5.—*εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, iv. 2, used passively of the persons to whom glad tidings are proclaimed, is common to the Epistle to the Hebrews with Luke vii. 22, xvi. 16.—*καίτοι*, iv. 3, is a particle, attested also Acts xiv. 17, xvii. 27, as well as *καίτοιγε* and *καίγε*.—*ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, iv. 3, ix. 26, is not met with in the LXX., but is found in Luke xi. 50, and often elsewhere in the N. T.—With *ζῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*, iv. 12, we may compare, in addition to 1 Pet. i. 23, also Acts vii. 38 (*λόγια ζῶντα*); and *τομώτερος ὑπέρ*, iv. 12, is construed as Luke xvi. 8.—*ἐνθυμήσεις*, iv. 12, occurs elsewhere only Acts xvii. 29; Matt. ix. 4, xii. 25.—*κρατεῖν*, iv. 14, vi. 18, with the genitive, as Luke viii. 54.—Of *ἀσθένειαι*, iv. 15, mention is made in Luke v. 15 and other places; comp. Matt. viii. 17.—*περικεῖσθαί τι*, v. 2, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts xxviii. 20.—The construction *ἐδόξασεν γενηθῆναι*, v. 5, is similar to that of Luke ii. 1; Acts xi. 25, xv. 10; Col. iv. 6.—*καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ*, v. 6, is similar to the reading of Acts xiii.

35.—*μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων*, v. 7, reproduces the most salient features with which precisely Luke (xxii. 39–46) describes the agony of prayer in the garden, as these now force themselves upon the mind.—In the use of *εὐλάβεια*, v. 7, and *εὐλαβεῖσθαι*, the Epistle to the Hebrews coincides in a characteristic way with the usage of Luke (apart from Acts xxiii. 10).—*ἀπό*, v. 7, is employed exactly as in Luke xix. 3, xxiv. 41; Acts xii. 14, xx. 9, xxii. 11.—On *αἴτιος*, v. 9, we have to compare *ἀρχηγός*, ii. 10; Acts iii. 15, v. 31.—*φέρεσθαι*, vi. 1, expresses the idea of external impulse and forward pressing urgency, as Acts ii. 2.—*ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, iv. 1, as *ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου* or *τοῦ θεοῦ* = *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, most frequently in the writings of Luke, who hardly ever uses *εὐαγγέλιον*.—The construction *μετάνοια ἀπό*, vi. 1, is Lucan, Acts viii. 22; moreover, *πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν* or *τὸν κύριον*, which is not entirely foreign to Paul's writings, Rom. iv. 5, 24, is found with Luke, as well as *πιστεύειν εἰς*, at least more ordinarily than with any other N. T. writer, Acts ix. 42, xi. 17, xvi. 31, xxii. 19; and as to the thing intended, Acts xx. 21 is similar to Heb. vi. 1, inasmuch as in the former place *τὴν εἰς θεὸν μετάνοιαν* is employed with as little apparent significance, and as really deep significance, as in the latter place *πίστεως ἐπὶ θεόν*.—With reference to the delineation of the sin against the Holy Ghost, chap. vi. and x., the Epistle to the Hebrews has its immediate parallel in Luke xii. 8–10.—*ἐπί* with a genitive, after a verb of motion, vi. 7, as Acts x. 11, and frequently.—*εὔθετος*, vi. 7, is in the N. T. a word of Luke's, xiv. 35, ix. 62.—In vi. 9 also we hear the language of Luke. For as *ἡ ἐρχομένη*, Luke xiii. 33, Acts xx. 15, xxi. 26, xiii. 44, denotes the day immediately following, so too *ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας*, that which stands in immediate connection with the salvation, which has reference to the salvation.—The classic *ἔχειν* with a following infinitive, vi. 13, is Lucan, Luke vii. 42, xii. 4; Acts iv. 14, xxv. 26. Considering the Lucan form of the expression, it is doubly noteworthy that allusion is made precisely in Luke's writings, as well Luke i. 73 as Acts vii. 17, to the solemn confirmation of the promise by an oath, Gen. xxii. 16 (comp. xxiv. 7).—*καὶ οὕτως*, vi. 15, is used as Acts vii. 8, xxvii. 44, xxviii. 14, and also frequently with Paul.—The *μέν solitarium*, vi. 16, belongs to the number of the not rare anacoluths, as well of Luke, *e. g.* Acts i. 1, as of Paul, *e. g.* Rom. xi. 13 f.—*βουλή*, vi. 17, of God's gracious will, is an expression current with Luke, vii. 30, Acts ii. 23, and frequently. With Paul, only Eph. i. 11.—On *τράγματα*, vi. 18, we have to compare *πράγματα*, Luke i. 1.—*καταφεύγειν*, vi. 18, is found also Acts xiv. 6.—*πατριάρχης* is a Hellenistic word, and in the N. T. Lucan; it occurs elsewhere only Acts ii. 29, vii. 8, 9.—*ἱερα-*

τεία, vii. 5, the epistle has in common with Luke i. 9 (comp. i. 8: ἱερατεύειν).—τοῦτ' ἔστιν, κ.τ.λ. vii. 5, is a Hebraistic mode of expression, as Acts ii. 30.—μαρτυρεῖσθαι, vii. 8, xi. 2, is a favorite expression as well in the Acts, vi. 3, x. 22, xvi. 2, xxii. 12, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is found, besides, only once with Paul and once with John.—ἀνίστασθαι, vii. 11, *to be set up by God upon the theatre of history*, as Acts iii. 22, vii. 37; and according to the ordinary interpretation, also Acts xiii. 32.—προσέχειν τινί, vii. 13, as 1 Tim. iv. 13, comp. Acts xx. 28.— εἰς, vii. 14, as Acts ii. 25; Eph. v. 32.—εἰς τὸ παντελές, vii. 25, is found again in the N. T. only Luke xiii. 11.—The ἀνάγκην ἔχειν conjoined with the infinitive, vii. 27, is Lucan, Luke xiv. 18, xxiii. 17; while Luke in the Gospel and Acts employs, instead of ἀναφέρειν in the sense of offering, the expression προσφέρειν, likewise usual in our epistle.—ἀληθινός, viii. 2, the epistle has in common with Luke xvi. 11 and the three Johannine writings, and besides these only 1 Thess. i. 9.—λατρεύειν, viii. 5, is specially frequent in the writings of Luke.—The passive use of χρηματίζεσθαι, viii. 5, is found also in Acts x. 22, Luke ii. 26, and twice in Matt.—To the passage of Scripture cited, viii. 5, Stephen refers in Acts vii. 44. This is again to be noted as a Lucan parallel.—ἄμεμπτος, viii. 7, passively, as Luke i. 6, and everywhere in the N. T.—The mode of expression, ζητεῖν τόπον, viii. 7 (comp. τόπον εὑρίσκειν, xii. 17), is similar to that of τόπον λαμβάνειν, Acts xxv. 16; τόπον διδόναι, Rom. xii. 19.—ἐπικεῖσθαι, ix. 10, with the subsidiary idea of pressing and burdening, as Acts xv. 10, 28.—With μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως, ix. 10, we have to compare Acts xxiv. 3, where the text wavers between διορθωμάτων and καθορθωμάτων.—παραγίγνεσθαι, ix. 11, is the usual word for historic self-presentation and presence, Luke xii. 51; Matt. iii. 1; 1 Macc. iv. 46.—οὐ χειροποιήτου, ix. 11, 24, is a word of Luke's in like connection, Acts vii. 48, xvii. 24.—Το τὸ ἴδιον αἷμα, ix. 12, xiii. 12, a parallel is presented in Acts xx. 28.—λύτρωσις, ix. 12, is, along with ἀπολύτρωσις, a word of Luke's, Luke i. 68, ii. 38; comp. ἀπολύτρωσις, Luke xxi. 28 (in the usage of Paul the only word); λυτροῦσθαι, Luke xxiv. 21; λυτρωτής, Acts vii. 35.—διά, ix. 14, of the inner principle, just as Acts i. 2, xi. 28, xxi. 4.—The mode of expression, λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, ix. 15, xi. 13, in the sense of the taking to oneself the very blessing promised, the epistle has in common with Acts ii. 33.—As to ix. 15, the most apt N. T. linguistic parallel is Acts xiii. 38 f., so also in expression and thought everything is Lucan. To be compared is Acts iii. 25; Luke xxii. 29 f.—On τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα, ix. 20, which, as seems probable, consciously or involuntarily refers to the words of the Supper, we have to observe that

in these the *ἐστίν* is wanting only with Luke, xxii. 20; although they read similarly in Matt. and Mark.—*σχεδόν*, ix. 22, occurs only twice besides in the N. T., and precisely with Luke, Acts xiii. 44, xix. 26. On each occasion it stands in immediate connection with *πᾶς*.—*ἄφεσις, sc. ἁμαρτιῶν*, ix. 22, commonly met with in Luke's writings.—*Τὸ αἱματεκχυσία*, ix. 22, *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον*, Luke xxii. 20 (comp. xi. 50), forms verbally and really the most natural parallel.—*ἐμφανίζειν*, ix. 24, xi. 14, is a word common to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and especially Luke, who employs it as well in the signification "make known," Acts xxiii. 22, as "present oneself, appear," Acts xxiv. 1 (= *ἐμφανίζειν τινὶ ἑαυτόν* = *ἐμφαίνεσθαι*).—*ἀποκεῖσθαι*, ix. 27, is in the N. T. common to Luke xix. 20; with Paul, Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 8.—*ἐκ δευτέρου*, ix, 28, as Acts x. 15, xi. 9, and elsewhere.—The construction of *παύεσθαι* with the participle, x. 2, for the rest the usual one, is the same as Acts v. 42, *οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες*.—*ἀναιρεῖν*, x. 9, is a favorite word with Luke.—*περιελεῖν*, x. 11, as Acts xxvii. 20, *περιῃρεῖτο πᾶσα ἐλπίς*.—*παροξυσμός*, x. 24, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts xv. 39, there in a good sense, and here in a bad sense.—*τιμωρία*, x. 29, is found only here in the N. T.; to be compared, however, is Acts xxii. 5, xxvi. 11.—*τὰ ὑπάρχοντα*, x. 34, with the genitive, as *e.g.* Luke xi. 21 (with the dative, *e.g.* Luke viii. 3).—*προσδέχεσθαι*, x. 34, of willing reception, as *e.g.* Luke xv. 2.—*ὕπαρξις*, x. 34, is a word of Luke's, Acts ii. 45.—*εἶναι τινός*, x. 39, with personal subject and genitive of the property, as Luke ix. 55 (*Rec.*); Acts ix. 2.—The infinitive with *τοῦ*, xi. 5, a not unclassic form of expression, is in the N. T. specially peculiar to Luke.—*ἐκζητεῖν*, xi. 6, as Acts xv. 17; Rom. iii. 11.—The construction of *ποῦ* with the indicative, xi. 8, is as Acts xx. 18, x. 18, xv. 36, and frequently elsewhere.—*παρῴκησεν*, xi. 9, is equivalent to *παροικεῖν ἦλθεν*, of which the style of Luke presents not a few examples. Apart from the most similar passage, Luke xxiv. 18, *παροικεῖς εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ*, where this reading is too ill attested, we have to compare Acts vii. 4, *εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς νῦν κατοικεῖτε*; xii. 19, *εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν διέτριβεν*; Luke xi. 7; Acts viii. 40, and xviii. 21, xix. 22, *Rec.*—*τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς*, xi. 9, is written instead of *τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαγ.*, as elsewhere only Luke ii. 8.—Corresponding to the *καὶ αὐτὴ Σάῤῥα*, xi. 11, there is found also in Luke *καὶ αὐτός* in like position with proper names, Luke xx. 42, *καὶ αὐτὸς Δαυίδ*; xxiv. 15, *καὶ αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς*; comp. Acts viii. 13, *Σίμων καὶ αὐτός*.—For the combination *δύναμις εἰς*, xi. 11, only Luke v. 17, *δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτούς*.—The *διὸ καί*, xi. 12, xiii. 12, bringing cause and effect, means and end, reason and consequence into very close reciprocal relation, is equally Lucan (Luke i. 35; Acts x.

29, xiii. 35) as Pauline.—*ἀποθνήσκειν*, xi. 21, to lie a-dying, as Luke viii. 42.—*ἀστεῖον*, xi. 23, comp. *ἀστεῖον τῷ θεῷ*, Acts vii. 20.—*ἐπί*, xi. 30, of the space of time, as Luke iv. 25; Acts xiii. 31, xix. 10.—The mode of expression *ἐργάζεσθαι δικαιοσύνην*, xi. 33, recurs also Acts x. 35 (comp. Jas. i. 20).—The phrase *στόμα μαχαίρας*, xi. 34, is Lucan, Luke xxi. 24.—To the *ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν*, xi. 35, a parallel is presented by *τυγχάνειν ἀναστάσεως*, Luke xx. 35.—The heightening *ἔτι δέ*, xi. 36, is met with also Luke xiv. 26; Acts ii. 26.—*ὑστερούμενοι*, xi. 37, is used absolutely, as in Luke xv. 14; Phil. iv. 12, *al.*—We are reminded as well by *παράκλησις* as by *διαλέγεται*, xii. 5, of Luke in the Acts. There we meet with *παράκλησις* of apostolic address, going to the heart, Acts xiii. 15, xv. 31 (comp. also 1 Tim. iv. 13); there also *διαλέγεσθαι*, in the inchoative sense: "to open a conversation, to enter upon it," is the constant word for the standing up of Paul among the Jews, Acts xvii. 2, 17, xviii. 4, and often besides.—On *ἥτις διαλέγεται*, xii. 5, we have to compare Luke xi. 49: *ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν*.—*μεταλαμβάνειν*, xii. 10, is (besides 2 Tim. ii. 6) the word common to the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Acts for "to become possessed of," *i. e.* to come into the enjoyment or possession of a thing.—*δὲ μᾶλλον*, xii. 13, as Luke x. 20 (*Rec.*).—The combination *ῥίζα πικρίας*, xii. 15, comp. *χολὴ πικρίας*, Acts viii. 23; and the verb *ἐνοχλεῖν*, Luke vi. 18 (according to A B L, *al.*), comp. *ὀχλεῖν*, Acts v. 16; and *παρενοχλεῖν*, Acts xv. 19, is Lucan.—The *accus. cum infin.* *μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον*, xii. 19, governed by the *παρῃτήσαντο*, employed, as ver. 25, Acts xxv. 11, in the sense of "begging off from, declining with entreaty" (pure Greek, with *μή* in the infinitive clause), resembles Luke xx. 27.—*ἔντρομος*, xii. 21, is found elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts vii. 32, xvi. 29.—*Ἱερουσαλήμ*, xii. 22, is the form of the name with Luke, Paul, and in the Apocalypse.—*ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς*, xii. 23, has its parallel in Luke x. 20: *τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγράφη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*; and the verb *ἀπογράφεσθαι*, in Luke ii. 1, 3, 5.—*λέγων*, xii. 26, the Hebrew לֵאמֹר, is employed as in Luke i. 63, and frequently in the N. T., specially with Luke.—The neuter plural of the subject, *τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα*, xii. 27, is combined with the singular of the predicate *μείνῃ*, as Acts i. 18, xxvi. 24; and the perfect is followed by the *subjunctive* (conjunctive) *aorist*, as *e. g.* Acts ix. 17.—*ἔχειν χάριν*, xii. 28, to cherish and manifest gratitude, as Luke xvii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 3.—The conception in the exhortation, xiii. 7, is out and out Lucan. For *ἡγούμενοι* is the Lucan apellative of the leaders of the congregation, Acts xv. 22, comp. Luke xxii. 26, elsewhere only Heb. xiii. 17, 24. Paul says similarly, *προϊστάμενοι*, 1 Thess.

v. 12. Then *λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ* is the ordinary Lucanic expression for the preaching of the gospel, Acts iv. 31, viii. 25, xiii. 46, and often. The verb *ἀναθεωρεῖν*, of continued penetrating contemplation, occurs again, outside of the Epistle to the Hebrews, only Acts xvii. 23. And for *ἔκβασις* (1 Cor. x. 13), of the end of life, or as it is here designedly termed, of the walk, Luke has at least the synonymous expressions *ἔξοδος*, Luke ix. 31, and *ἄφιξις*, Acts xx. 29.—*ἀλυσιτελές*, xiii. 17, does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., but *λυσιτελεῖ* is found Luke xvii. 2.—*πειθόμεθα*, xiii. 18, is Lucan, according to Acts xxvi. 26.—*ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, xiii. 21, is with Luke, much more than with Paul, a favorite expression, and to the preface to the wish (ver. 20) there is no more fitting parallel than Acts xx. 28, where the church of the Lord is, as here, designated as a flock which He has purchased by His own blood.—xiii. 22 is altogether Lucan: *ἀνέχεσθαι*, to give a patient, willing hearing, Acts xviii. 14, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 4; *λόγος παρακλήσεως*, Acts xiii. 15; *ἐπιστέλλειν* (like *mittere*), *to write a letter*, elsewhere only Acts xv. 20, xxi. 25.—The *ἀπολύειν*, not occurring with Paul, is employed in the style of Luke, as well of release from custody or prison (apart from Luke xxii. 68, xxiii. 16 ff., *e. g.* Acts iii. 13, iv. 21), as of official delegation, Acts xiii. 3, xv. 30 (for which Paul has *πέμπειν*; *e. g.* 2 Thess. iii. 2); solemn dismission, Acts xv. 33; and in general, dismissal, Acts xix. 41, xxiii. 22.—*οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας*, xiii. 24, denotes the Italiotes, according to the usage of Luke, Acts x. 23, 38, xii. 1, xvii. 13, xxi. 27.

That which Delitzsch adduces besides (in the commentary, p. 705 f.) in favor of Luke as the penman of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in favor of a joint-participation of the Apostle Paul in the composition thereof, namely—(1) that the worldly calling of Luke as a physician (Col. iv. 14) is in striking keeping with the conformation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, inasmuch as this, so to speak, contains an anatomic (iv. 12 f.), a dietetic (v. 12–14), and a therapeutic passage (xii. 12 f.), and much besides which would seem appropriate to the pen of a physician; as, *e. g.*, the use of *νωθρός*, v. 11, vi. 12; *βρώματα καὶ πόματα* (as with Hippocrates, ed. Littré, i. 622, iv. 380), in connection with which it might perhaps be observed that *ἐπιχειρεῖν*, as employed Luke i. 1, is a favorite word of Hippocrates; (2) that it is hardly accidental that the Epistle to the Hebrews, according to its earliest location, followed immediately upon the Epistle to Philemon, among the last words of which occurs the name of Luke; (3) that it is hardly accidental, that just where the author of the Acts begins to relate with "we" (xvi. 10), the account of the association of Timothy with Paul has preceded; and, finally, (4) that it is hardly accidental that the Epistle

to the Hebrews begins in a manner so strongly alliterating on the name ΠΑΥΛΟΣ,—all these are arguments which ought not to have been found at all, in a work which lays claim to a scientific character.

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

The claim of Clemens Romanus to the authorship has been favored by some among the moderns. Erasmus was inclined to regard him as such; and, finally, Bisping, following the example of Reithmayr (*Einleit. in die kanon. BB. des N. T.*, Regensb. 1852, p. 681 ff.), has decided in favor of Clement. In order, however, not to approach the declaration of the Council of Trent too nearly, Bisping assumes that Clement prepared the epistle independently as a sort of homily, only as far as xiii. 17, to which xiii. 18 ff. was then added as a brief supplement by the Apostle Paul, in order thereby to adopt the whole letter as his own. But—apart from the fact that xiii. 18 ff. can proceed from no other author than that of the whole preceding letter, inasmuch as a change of the speaking subject is

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

nowhere indicated, but, on the contrary, the opposite clearly presupposed in ver. 22—the sentences in the first, indisputably genuine, Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, which in point of contents and composition remind of the Epistle to the Hebrews (*vid. supra*, p. 7 f.), have evidently only been taken over by him from this epistle, in consequence of a use and imitation thereof. For, as regards originality and grasp of mind, the Epistle of Clement is far inferior to the Epistle to the Hebrews. In other respects, the character of the respective writings is too greatly diverse for them to be able to proceed from one and the same author. Of the Alexandrian speculative mind, and the oratorical flight of the Epistle to the Hebrews, not a trace is found in the Epistle of Clement.

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

The opinion that Apollos was the author of this epistle was first broached by Luther. Comp. on Gen. xlviii. 20 (ed. Witeberg. 1561, t. vi. p. 710): autor epistolae ad Hebraeos, quisquis est, sive Paulus, sive, ut ego arbitror, Apollo.—*Sermon von den Sekten*, 1 Cor. iii. 4 ff. (with Walch, Th. xii. p. 1996): "This Apollo was a highly intelligent man; the Epistle Hebraeorum is of a truth his."—*Epist. am Christtag.*, Heb. i. 1 ff. (with Walch, Th. xii. p. 204): "That is a stout, powerful, and lofty epistle, which soars high, and treats of the sublime article of faith in the Godhead of Christ; and it is a credible opinion that it is not St. Paul's, for the reason that it maintains a more ornate discourse than is the wont of St. Paul in other places. Some think it is St. Luke's, some St. Apollo's, whom St. Luke extols as having been mighty in the Scriptures against the Jews, Acts xviii. 24. It is indeed true that no epistle wields the Scripture with such force as this; that it was an excellent apostolic man, be he whosoever he may." Luther's conjecture has been accepted by Lucas Osiander, Clericus, Heumann (*Schediasma de libris anonymis ac pseudonymis*, Jenae 1711, 8, p. 38 sqq.), Lorenz Müller (*Dissertatt. de eloquentia Apollinis, viri apostolici*, Schleus. 1717), Semler (in his "Contributions to a more accurate understanding of the Epistle to the Hebrews," prefixed to Baumgarten's commentary, p. 15 f.; yet he expresses himself with hesitation), Ziegler (*Vollständ. Einleit. in den Br. an die Hebr.*, Götting. 1791, 8, p. 255

ff.), Dindorf (on *Ernesti lectt.* p. 1180); and recently by Bleek, Tholuck, Credner, Reuss, Bunsen (*Hippolytus und seine Zeit*, Bd. I., Leipz. 1852, p. 365), Henry Alford (*Greek Testament*, vol. iv. P. 1, Lond. 1859, Prolegg. p. 58 ff.), Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* II. p. 894), which last, however, only claims the same degree of probability in favor of Apollos as of Silvanus; Bäumlein (*Commentar üb. d. Ev. des Joh.*, Stuttg. 1863, p. 26), Samuel Davidson (*Introduction*, p. 255 ff.), J. H. Kurtz (*der Br. an die Hebr. erkl.*, Mitau 1869, p. 55 f.), Hilgenfeld (*Hist.-krit. Einl. in das N. T.*, Leipz. 1875, p. 356, 386 ff.), and others, even by the Catholics Feilmoser (*Einl. in's N. T.* p. 359 ff.) and Lutterbeck (*Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, Bd. II., Mainz 1852, p. 101 ff.).[1] It is, moreover, the only correct one. The mental portrait which we are compelled to form to ourselves of Apollos, in harmony with the notices of the Acts (xviii. 24 ff.) and the First Epistle to the Corinthians (chap. i.–iv., xvi. 12), harmonizes exactly with the traits in which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has unconsciously depicted himself. This agreement is so striking and reaches so deeply, that as against it, seeing the lack of a definite tradition coming down from the apostolic age, the circumstance becomes of no moment, that among the conjectures of the ancients not one has lighted upon Apollos as the author of the epistle. Apollos was no immediate disciple of the Lord, but belonged to a second generation of Christians. By friends of Paul he was more deeply instructed in Christianity, and lived on terms of intimacy with Paul himself. He was, however, as a Christian teacher, too original and prominent for standing merely in the relation of an apostolic helper. He was a Jew by birth, and his labors as a Christian teacher were directed by preference to the conversion of his Jewish kinsmen; on which account the personal acquaintance of the author of the epistle with the Palestinian Jewish-Christians, presupposed Heb. xiii. 19, can least of all surprise us in the case of Apollos. He was a native of Alexandria, versed in the Scriptures, and qualified for expounding and applying the same, and for deducing therefrom the proof that Jesus is the Messiah. Appropriate to him as an Alexandrian is the preponderantly typico-symbolic mode of teaching in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the endeavor to point out under the veil of the letter a deeper spiritual meaning. He was above all distinguished by the gift of brilliant eloquence. In him, finally, as an Alexandrian Jew, the exclusive use of the LXX., as well as

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

the want of acquaintance with the internal arrangement of the temple in Jerusalem at that time, need cause no surprise.

That, if we are to fix upon a particular person as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, this can be no other than Apollos, because contents and form of the epistle are so admirably fitting to no other Christian teacher of the apostolic age as to this, is admitted also by W. Grimm (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1870, p. 74 ff.). He finds, however, an instance of decisive counter-evidence against Apollos in the passage Heb. ii. 3 as compared with Acts xviii. 24–28. For, according to Heb. ii. 3, the message of salvation had come to the author of the epistle, equally with his readers, by the instrumentality of those who had heard the Lord Himself; whereas, according to the Acts, Apollos, as a disciple of John, had been only in the vestibule of Christianity, and had been first introduced into the sanctuary thereof by means of the Christians Aquila and Priscilla, who were converts of Paul's. But apart from the fact that—as Grimm himself acknowledges—the narrative of Acts xviii. 24 ff. is so far obscure and not free from self-contradiction, as it represents Apollos, although he knew only the baptism of John, nevertheless as *κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου*, and an *ἀκριβῶς διδάσκειν τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* is attributed to him (ver. 25).—we must remember that at Heb. ii. 3 recipients and author of the epistle are characterized only as belonging to a second generation of Christendom. Not that every single one of the persons mentioned ver. 3 had received the word of salvation at the mouth of immediate ear-witnesses, or were by these specially received into instruction, is expressed; but only that the message of salvation was handed down in a certain and trustworthy way from the original ear-witnesses to the totality of the Christian circle which is formed by the *ἡμεῖς*, and thus came to the knowledge of each single one of this totality. Even, therefore, if Apollos had not been directly brought into any intercourse with the *ἀκούσαντες*, yet the passages Acts xviii. 24 ff. and Heb. ii. 3 would not be irreconcilable the one with the other. But is it at all conceivable that such a leading Christian teacher as Apollos, who continued in such intimate association with the Apostle Paul, should come into no personal contact whatever with the original apostles?—To the further objections brought by Grimm against the Apollos-theory, he himself attaches no decisive weight. They are the following:—(1) In connection with a former disciple of John, it must appear exceedingly strange that he makes no mention, i. 1, of the distinguished position occupied by John the Baptist, as the greatest prophet (Luke vii. 28, Matt. xi. 11) and forerunner of the

Lord, towards the kingdom of God; (2) Clemens Romanus, although making frequent use of the epistle, could hardly have known it as a work of Apollos, since it would otherwise have only been natural that he should, in the 47th chapter of his Epistle to the Corinthians, have reminded the Corinthian Christians of our epistle as a work of Apollos. But that Clement *must necessarily* have so acted cannot be maintained. For a reference to John the Baptist, however, Heb. i. 1 offered no occasion whatever; because it was with the author only a question of contrasting with each other the revelations of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament as such.

SEC. 2.—THE PERSONS ADDRESSED.[1]

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

The Jewish-Christians in all Asia Minor, or at least in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Asia proconsularis, have been regarded as the original recipients of the epistle by Bengel, Ch. F. Schmid (*Observatt. super ep. ad Hebr.* p. 16 sq.), and Cramer; those in Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, by W. Wall (*Brief Critical Notes*, etc., Lond. 1730, p. 318) and Wolf; the Laodiceans, by Stein (*Kommt. zu dem Ev. des Lucas*, Halle 1830, p. 289 ff.); the Galatians, by Storr and Mynster (*Kleine theol. Schrif-*

[1] Comp. my Whitsuntide *Programm:* De literarum, quae ad Hebraeos inscribuntur, primis lectoribus, Gott. 1853.

ten, Copenhag. 1825, p. 91 ff.); the Lycaonians, by Credner (*Einl. in d. N. T.*, Th. 1, Abth. 2, Halle 1836, p. 561); the Antiochians, by Böhme and Hofmann (*Die h. Schr. N. T.*, Th. 5, p. 531); the Cyprians, by Ullmann (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1828, p. 397); those in one of the numerous Greek cities on the coast of Asia Minor, or of Syria and Palestine, by Grimm (Theolog. Literat.-Bl. to the Darmstadt *Allg. Kirch.-Zeit.* 1857, No. 29, p. 660; but not decidedly); the Macedonians, specially those of Thessalonica, by Semler (in Baumgarten, p. 37 ff.) and Nösselt (*Opusc. ad interpretationem sacrarum scripturarum*, Fasc. I., Halae 1785, p. 269 sqq.); those of Corinth, by Mich. Weber (*De numero epistolarum ad Corinthios recte constituendo*, Wittenb. 1798–1806) and Mack (*Theolog. Quartalschr.* 1838, II. 3); those of an Italian congregation, perhaps of the great city Ravenna, by Ewald (*Gött. gel. Anzz.* 1863, p. 286; cf. *Gesch. Isr.*, Bd. VI. p. 638, *Das Sendschreiben an die Hebr.*, Gött. 1870, p. 6); those of Rome, by Wetstein (*Nov. Test.* II. p. 386 sq.), and recently by R. Köstlin (*Theol. Jahrbb.* of Baur and Zeller, 1850, H. 2, p. 242), who, however, afterwards withdrew this opinion (*vid. infra*); by Holtzmann (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1859, II. 2, p. 297 ff., in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, VIII., and in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, H. 1, p. 1 ff.), by Alford (*Greek Test.*, vol. IV. part 1, Lond. 1859, *Prolegg.* p. 62 ff.), by Kurtz, p. 42 ff., by Renan (*L'Antechrist*, Paris, 1873, p. xviii. ff., 211), by Mangold (in Bleek's *Einleitt. in das N. T.*, 3 Aufl., Berl. 1875, p. 612 f.), and by Harnack (*Patr. Apostt. Opp.* I. p. lxxxii.); those of Spain, finally, by Nicolaus de Lyra (in the *Prooemium* to the epistle) and by Ludwig (in Carpzov's *Sacr. Exercitt. in St. P. ep. ad Hebr.*, Helmst. 1750, p. lix. sq.).

All these opinions, however, which in part rest upon the erroneous supposition that the epistle is the work of the Apostle Paul, find their refutation at once in the fact that it cannot have been addressed to so-called mixed assemblies, consisting of Jewish- and Gentile-Christians, but only to an exclusively Jewish-Christian circle of readers. Not even the slightest reference is made to conditions such as must of necessity arise from the living together of converted Jews with converted Gentiles, and which, by reason of the manifold conflicts to which they would give occasion, were of too great importance to be passed over unnoticed.[1] Nowhere is the rela-

[1] For this reason it cannot be asserted, with Holtzmann (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1859, II. 2, p. 298), that there is nothing at all contradictory in the supposition of the epistle being addressed to a large congregation, still outwardly composed of Gentile- and Jewish-Christians; that there the epistle had naturally sought out its Jewish readers; and on that account it leads us, without any address properly speaking, *in medium rem*. That the epistle presupposes exclusively Jewish-Christian readers has been anew disputed by Wieseler

tion of the Gentiles to the Jews, and of both to the kingdom of God, spoken of; rather is everything specially referred to the Jewish people of God, already sanctified in their fathers. Unmixed Jewish-Christian congregations, however, cannot be historically proved, in the late time at which the date of the epistle falls (see sec. 4), in any of the fore-mentioned places. The fact, likewise, is opposed to those suppositions, that the readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews regarded the continued participation in the institutions of the Jewish temple-service and sacrifices as so necessary, that without this they thought they could obtain no complete expiation of their sins. Such a form of Judaism, still continuing to operate in the Christian state, does not apply to the Jewish-Christians of the diaspora, but only to those who had their dwelling-place in the immediate vicinity of the Jewish temple. For in the case of Jews who lived at a greater distance from the temple, the zeal for the Mosaic law manifested itself naturally most of all in a tenacious clinging to the rite of circumcision, to the injunctions regarding food and purification, to the observance of the Sabbath, and the like.

A Jewish temple, however, besides that at Jerusalem, existed at the time of our epistle only in Egypt. The epistle can therefore only have been addressed either to the Christian congregation in Palestine, mainly in Jerusalem, or to Egyptian, specially Alexandrian, Jewish-Christians. The latter supposition has found defenders in J. E. Chr. Schmidt (*Hist.-krit. Einl. in's N. T.*, Giessen 1804, p. 284, 293), Bunsen (*Hippolytus und seine Zeit*, Bd. I., Leipz. 1852, p. 365), Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1858, H. 1, p. 103; *Hist.-krit. Einl. in das N. T.*, Leipz. 1875, p. 385 f.), Volkmar (*Gesch. des Neutest. Kanon*, von C. A. Credner, Herausgg. v. G. V., Berl. 1860, p. 182), Ritschl (*Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1866, H. 1, p. 90), and in particular Wieseler (*Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters*, Gött. 1848, p. 481 ff.; *Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief, namentlich seinen Verfasser u. s. Leser.* Second half. [*Schriften der Universität zu Kiel aus d. J.* 1861, 4, B. VIII.; also separately printed, Kiel 1861, 8.] Comp. also *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1847, H. 4, p. 840 ff.; 1867, H. 4, p. 665 ff.), and R. Köstlin (*Theol. Jahrbb.* of Baur and Zeller, 1854, H. 3, p. 388 ff.); Davidson, too (*Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, vol. I., Lond. 1868, p 265 ff., 270), although he does not decide, gives it the preference. The

(*Schriften der Univers. zu Kiel aus d. J.* 1861, p. 21 ff., *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, p. 695 ff.), by Holtzmann (in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1867, p. 26 f.), by Mangold (in Bleek's *Einl. in d. N. T.* p. 612), and by Hilgenfeld (*Einl. in d. N. T.* p. 380, 386), but in a by no means convincing manner. See the detailed and effective refutation of this supposition in Grimm (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1870, p 34 ff.).

prevailing opinion, on the other hand, is the first one. Within recent times it has been maintained by Bleek, Schott, de Wette, Thiersch, Stengel, Delitzsch, Tholuck, Ebrard,[1] Bisping, Bloomfield, Ritschl (*Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche*, 2 Aufl., Bonn 1857, p. 159), Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebr.-Br.* I. p. 31), Maier, Langen (*Tübing. theol. Quartalschr.* 1863, H. 3, p. 379 ff.), Moll, and others.[2] And rightly so.

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

(1) Even in ancient times the Epistle to the Hebrews bore likewise the title of a letter to the Alexandrians, and in general there is seen to be a wavering within the early church itself in the indication of the original circle of readers. Whether, indeed, the superscription Πρὸς Ἑβραίους proceeds from the author himself, a view to which Bleek and Credner are inclined, is doubtful. But not only is this superscription very ancient, since it is found in the Peshito, and with Tertullian, Origen, and many others; but the fact, moreover, is universally presupposed in Christian antiquity as beyond doubt that the Ἑβραῖοι, whose name the epistle bears at its head, were the Palestinian Christians. The evidence for this statement is afforded by Pantaenus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and many others. It is now indeed supposed that we possess a testimony in favor of the Alexandrians as the original recipients of the epistle, namely, in the so-called Canon of Muratori, in which we read: Fertur etiam ad Laudecenses (Laodicenses), alia ad Alexandrinos, Pauli nomine fictae (fictae) ad haeresem Marcionis, et alia plura, quae in catholicam ecclesiam recepi (recipi) non potest (possunt). Fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit. For that by the words *alia ad Alexandrinos* the Epistle to the Hebrews is meant must be assumed, as is supposed, since otherwise the Epistle to the Hebrews would, remarkably enough, not be even mentioned in the fragment, which, forsooth, is a list both of the genuine and spurious epistles ascribed to the Apostle Paul. Now this epistle, it is argued, not being in the early Roman Church, either

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

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

regarded as a work of Paul, or indeed as canonical, must have been mentioned by name precisely in this passage, in which the writer is speaking of epistles of which the authorship is falsely imputed to the Apostle Paul. But against this it must be said that the characteristics of the epistle *ad Alexandrinos*, of which the fragment makes mention, are not suitable to the Epistle to the Hebrews. For the former was a forgery, composed "Pauli nomine," the meaning of which is too distinct for us to be able, with Wieseler, to subtilize it into the statement that the epistle had only indirectly, from its contents and general bearing, left the impression of its proceeding from Paul; which rather can only indicate that this epistle, in a prefixed address altogether wanting to the Epistle to the Hebrews, put forth the claim to be a work of Paul. Moreover, it was fabricated "ad haeresem Marcionis," which can mean nothing else but that its contents were in agreement with the errors of Marcion, and were designed to wage a propaganda for the same. With Marcionite errors, however, the Epistle to the Hebrews has confessedly nothing in common; but, on the contrary, "its fundamental doctrine of Mosaism as pointing forward to Christianity, as well as the idea of the incarnation of the Divine Logos, is in glaring contrast with Marcion's Gnosis" (Grimm, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1870, p. 55), as accordingly it obtained no reception into Marcion's canon.[1] That, finally, the fragmentist *must necessarily* have mentioned the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot be asserted, inasmuch as, considering the non-currency thereof within the early Roman Church, it was quite possible that he should not be at all acquainted with it. Comp. also Fr. H. Hesse, *das Muratori'sche Fragment neu untersucht und erklärt*, Giessen 1873, p. 201 ff.—But as it cannot be shown that the Epistle to the Hebrews passed in antiquity for an epistle to the Alexandrians, so in like manner it cannot be shown that this epistle was regarded by others in early times as an epistle to the Laodiceans. This last has been inferred from the words of Philastrius (*Haeres.* 89): Haeresis quorundam de epistola Pauli ad Hebraeos. Sunt alii quoque, qui epistolam Pauli ad Hebraeos non adserunt

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

esse ipsius, sed dicunt aut Barnabae esse apostoli aut Clementis de urbe Roma episcopi. Alii autem Lucae evangelistae ajunt epistolam etiam ad Laodicenses conscriptam. Et quia addiderunt in ea quaedam non bene sentientes, inde non legitur in ecclesia; etsi legitur a quibusdam, non tamen in ecclesia legitur populo, nisi tredecim epistolae ejus et ad Hebraeos interdum. But manifestly the words *Alii autem*, etc., are only a concise expression for the declaration that others looked upon the evangelist Luke as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and not only as the author of this, but also of the Epistle to the Laodiceans. The Epistle to the Laodiceans was not at all read in the service of the church; the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, was read indeed in the service of the church, not, however, as the thirteen Pauline Epistles, regularly, but only occasionally.[1] Just as little, finally, is there any indication of a controversy with regard to the original recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when Chrysostom, in the *Prooemium* of his commentary, takes up the question: *ποῦ δὲ οὖσιν ἐπέστελλεν*; and then answers this with *ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ*. For Chrysostom perceived that the superscription of the epistle was in and of itself an ambiguous one, inasmuch as it admitted the possibility of thinking of the Jewish-Christians in general as the recipients of the letter; he thought it needful, therefore, to state the limitation with which in his estimation the *Πρὸς Ἑβραίους*, of such wide signification, is to be understood.

(2) The description of the Jewish sanctuary (ix. 1–5), as well as the acts of ritual performed in the same (vii. 27, x. 11), is supposed to point to the

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

temple at Leontopolis in Egypt. But even if it could be proved that the temple arrangements at Leontopolis furnished the standard for that description, and that the original regulations of Moses were identified with these, yet only the conclusion would be warranted with respect to the author, that he must have been by birth an Egyptian Jew, but it could not be inferred with equal necessity that his readers also were to be sought in Egypt. Nevertheless, that assertion itself by no means admits of proof. For Josephus—to whose testimony Wieseler appeals,—where he is describing in general that *ἱερόν* at Leontopolis, designates the same as *ὅμοιον* (*Antiq.* xii. 9. 7), or as *παραπλήσιον* (*Antiq.* xx. 10) *τῷ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις*, but then observes, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 10, 3, where he is relating somewhat more exactly, as follows: *Ὀνίας τὸν μὲν ναὸν οὐχ ὅμοιον ᾠκοδόμησε τῷ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἀλλὰ πύργῳ παραπλήσιον, λίθων μεγάλων εἰς ἑξήκοντα πήχεις ἀνεστηκότα, τοῦ βωμοῦ δὲ τὴν κατασκευὴν πρὸς τὸν οἶκοι ἐξεμιμήσατο καὶ τοῖς ἀναθήμασιν ὁμοίως ἐκόσμησε, χωρὶς τῆς περὶ τὴν λυχνίαν κατασκευῆς. Οὐ γὰρ ἐποίησε λυχνίαν· αὐτὸν δὲ χαλκευσάμενος τὸν λύχνον χρυσοῦν ἐπιφαίνοντα σέλας χρυσῆς ἁλύσεως ἐξεκρέμασεν.* Josephus accordingly relates that the temple of Onias in Egypt was indeed as to its outward form different from the temple at Jerusalem, inasmuch as it stood upon a foundation or sub-structure[1] of great stones rising sixty cubits high, and thereby acquired a tower-like appearance; that, on the other hand, its inner arrangement, with the single exception of the golden candlestick, was constituted in the same manner as that of the temple at Jerusalem, for the altar of burnt-offering and the other sacred objects were similar in both. Now, how does it follow from these statements that the golden altar of incense in the Egyptian temple occupied the very site which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews assigns to it at ix. 4, in contradiction with the

etiam—inasmuch as it would in that case belong to the whole proposition—must have been placed immediately after *Ajunt.*

[1] If Josephus had, as Wieseler supposes, ascribed to the *ναός* only a total height of sixty cubits, he would neither have characterized it as tower-like, nor have designated it as unlike the *ναός* in Jerusalem. For the latter also had, at any rate, a height of sixty cubits. It is true Wieseler finds actually expressed by *ἀλλὰ πύργῳ παραπλήσιον* not a dissimilarity, but a resemblance to the temple erected at Jerusalem by Zerubbabel; but he reaches this result only by unwarrantably translating *ἀλλά* as "but yet," and accordingly taking *ἀλλὰ . . . ἀνεστηκότα* as a kind of parenthetical insertion: "Onias erected the temple not indeed equal to that one in Jerusalem, but yet tower-like, since it was built up of large stones sixty cubits high; in the construction of the altar, however, he imitated that of his native land." That *ἀλλά*, on account of the preceding *οὐχ*, can signify only *but, on the contrary* [sondern], and introduces the particular point of difference by which the before-mentioned dissimilarity is evidenced, ought not to have been called in question.

actual position thereof in the temple at Jerusalem, namely, in the Most Holy Place? of such a difference—and surely just this point would have called for proof—Josephus says in truth not a single word, but, on the contrary, leaves the opposite impression. And then how could the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, if he had had the temple of Onias before him in his description of the sanctuary, have written ἐν ᾗ ἡ λυχνία, ix. 2, when, according to the express statement of Josephus, there was not therein a lamp-stand resting on the ground, as in the temple at Jerusalem, but a chandelier suspended by a golden chain?—In Philo, too, Wieseler has subsequently (comp. *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1867, p. 673 ff.) fancied he could discover a support for his opinion. In *de sacrificantibus*, § 4 (ed. Mangey, II. p. 253), and *de animal. sacrific.* § 10 (ed. Mangey, II. p. 247), it is thought that Philo expressly testifies that in the temple of Onias the altar of incense, as well as the vessels mentioned Heb. ix. 4, 5, were present in the Most Holy Place. Yet how entirely unsuccessful this attempted proof of Wieseler's is, has been already convincingly shown in detail by Grimm, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1870, p. 60 ff.—But just as little do the notices, Heb. vii. 27, x. 11, lead to think of the temple of Onias. For even supposing—what is far, however, from being the case—that it could be historically proved, with regard to the Egyptian temple, that the high priest entered into the Most Holy Place every day, yet such fact would not so much as accord with the presuppositions of the Epistle to the Hebrews. For, Heb. ix. 7, it is expressly said that the high priest went into the Most Holy Place only once in the year. Nor, as we need hardly remark, can this passage, in connection with ix. 4, vii. 27, x. 11, contain the sense which Wieseler would put into it, that the high priest entered indeed the Most Holy Place every day, but only once in the year with blood. For to εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν διὰ παντὸς εἰσίασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς only the words εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς form the opposition, and not until after the laying down of this opposition is the nearer modality for the final member added, namely, that the high priest, in the (special) case of his entering the Most Holy Place, enters it not without blood.

The fact, however, in general, that the original recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews attached so high a value to the temple service and the sacrificial ritual, that even as Christians they regarded continual participation in the same as necessary for the attaining of salvation, is one which points not to Alexandrians, but only to Palestinians. For, quite apart from the consideration that we do not even know from other sources

whether the Christian congregation of Alexandria was an unmixed Jewish-Christian one, nay, whether an organized Christian congregation existed there at all so early as the time of our letter, the Alexandrian Jews had been so greatly affected by Grecian culture and philosophy, that their whole bent of mind had become a spiritualistic one. Far from all narrow-minded cleaving to the letter of the Mosaic law, they sought by allegoric interpretation to discover and bring into recognition the deeper spiritual sense underlying the precepts and institutions of Judaism. In addition to this, the temple of Onias in Leontopolis was not able to boast even in Egypt itself of any high estimation. The Egyptian Jews were to a great extent displeased that it did not stand upon Moriah; the Egyptian Samaritans, that it did not stand upon Gerizim (comp. Jost, *Allg. Gesch. des Israel. Volks*, in 2 vols., Bd. I. p. 515 ff.). The yearly temple-gifts, too, were on that account for the most part sent not to Leontopolis, but to Jerusalem (comp. Frankel, *Histor.-krit. Studien zu der Septuaginta*, Bd. I. Abth. 1, Leipz. 1841, p, 186, note *d*); and pilgrimages of Alexandrian Jews to Jerusalem, to offer prayers and sacrifices in the temple there, did not cease so long as this temple continued to exist. Even Philo vouches for this. (Comp. Opp., ed. Mangey, t. II. p. 646: *καθ' ὃν χρόνον εἰς τὸ πατρῷον ἱερὸν ἐστελλόμην εὐξόμενός τε καὶ θύσων.*)

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

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

(5) That the author so exactly follows the Septuagint in his Old Testament citations, even in the case of striking deviations of the same from the original text, is said not to harmonize with the hypothesis of Palestinian readers, since with them the Septuagint was held in no estimation;

but certainly with that of Alexandrians, for whom the Septuagint had long been the accepted book of the synagogues. But were that translation really in so little credit in Palestine, then neither would the Apostle Paul, educated as he was at Jerusalem, have made such frequent use of it, nor would the Palestinian Josephus have fallen back upon that oftener than upon the original text. Moreover, the fact that the Alexandrine recension is to be traced in the text of the Septuagint used in the Epistle to the Hebrews (comp. Bleek, I. p. 372 ff.), and (Heb. xi. 35 f.) reference is made to the second Book of Maccabees (Köstlin, *l. c.* p. 402), *i. e.* a writing peculiar to Alexandrian Judaism, admits only of an inference pointing back to an Alexandrian author, but not to Alexandrian readers.

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

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

Whilst the above-mentioned arguments are common to the majority of

those who dispute the Palestineo-Jerusalemic destination of the epistle, Köstlin has sought to confirm his position by the following additional counter-moments peculiar to himself:—

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

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

(3) If Jerusalem had been the place of destination for the epistle, the author (ii. 3) could not have omitted to remind the readers that the Lord Himself had walked, and taught, and wrought among them, had in their midst, nay, before their eyes, suffered the death of the cross, among them had found the first witnesses of His resurrection and ascension; and the more so, since during the years 60–70 there must still have been a large number of the immediate disciples of Jesus present in Jerusalem. But, in reply, we cannot at all expect to see the personal life and labors of Jesus described ii. 3, because the connection does not lead thereto. For

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

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

(5) The Jerusalemic Christians, he asserts, consisted partly of members

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

(6) From the carefully-chosen designation *τοῖς ἁγίοις*, it is evident that the Ἑβραῖοι are here presupposed to be a non-Palestinian community, who have aided the Palestinenses with their support. Any other congregation (!) than the primitive one could not have been thus simply designated as *οἱ ἅγιοι*, whereas the employment of this name with regard to that congregation is very frequent (1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1; Rom. xv. 25, 31). A usage to be accounted for by the fact that, as distinguished from all the other *ἐκκλησίαι*, the Palestinian, and specially the Jerusalemic Christians, were the *ἅγιοι κατ' ἐξοχήν*, who before all others, chosen and separated from the world by Christ and His apostles themselves, became the first recipients of the divine word and of the Holy Spirit, were the first witnesses and intermediate channels of Christian truth for all other Christian communities, and were also, as such, acknowledged (specially Rom. xv. 27), until, owing to the destruction of Jerusalem and the rending progress of Gentile Christianity, this relation of dependence and filial affection was gradually dissolved of itself.—In order, however, to show the mistake in such reasoning, it suffices to point to the use of *οἱ ἅγιοι* in passages like 1 Cor. vi. 1, 2, xvi. 15; Rom. xii. 13, xvi. 2; 1 Tim. v. 10; to the addresses of the Pauline epistles; to the addition *τῶν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ*, considered necessary in connection with *τῶν ἁγίων*, Rom. xv. 26; and many similar instances. (1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, on the other hand, there was no need of such addition,—against Kurtz,—because the

collection which is the subject treated of in those passages was a business already known to the Corinthians, and before earnestly enjoined upon them: while, Rom. xv. 25, it was already apparent from νυνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, and, Rom. xv. 31, from ἡ εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, of what ἅγιοι the apostle was speaking.) Yea, Köstlin has even overlooked the consideration, that by means of this argument, if it were well-grounded, he would most effectually refute himself! For what further proof, that the readers of the letter are to be sought in Jerusalem, would it then need than the utterance of our epistle itself, xiii. 24: ἀσπάσασθε πάντας τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους?

(7) That the Jerusalemic congregation remained, as is clear from Acts ii. 46, iii. 1 (comp. xxi. 20), from the first in connection with the temple ritual. By the recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, all religious connection with Judaism was originally relinquished, and only now had they become involved in peril, as well through the influence of teachings which would urge the necessity of holding firmly to the Mosaic law (xiii. 9 ff.), as also, as it seems, through the influence of enticing offers (comp. xii. 16 f.), partly also by harassing manifestations of ill-will on the part of their former Jewish fellow-believers, of being seduced into a return to the Jewish religious constitution. But the actual state of matters is by this assertion inverted into its exact opposite. For that the recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews not only still continued to occupy themselves with the Jewish temple-service and sacrificial ritual, but even regarded participation therein as a necessary requirement for the complete expiation of sins, certainly underlies the whole argumentation of the epistle as an everywhere-recurring presupposition.

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

The Epistle to the Hebrews was occasioned by the danger to which the Christians in Palestine, particularly in Jerusalem, were exposed, of renouncing again their faith in Christ, and wholly falling back again into Judaism (comp. specially vi. 4–6, x. 26 ff.). This danger had become a very pressing one, inasmuch as many had already as a matter of fact ceased to frequent the Christian assemblies (x. 25). The epistle accordingly aims, by the unfolding on every side of the sublimity of the Christian revelation as the perfect and archetypal, above that of the Old Testament as the merely preparatory and typical, as well as by setting forth the terrible consequences of an apostasy, to warn against such falling away, and to animate to a faithful perseverance in the Christian course.—Differ-

ently, but quite incorrectly, does Thiersch (*De epistola ad Hebr.*, Marb. 1848, p. 2 sqq.; *Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter*, Frankf. and Erlang. 1852, p. 188 ff.) define the object of the epistle, to the effect that it was to be a consolatory letter to the Christians of Jerusalem, on account of the exclusion from the Jewish temple with which they had been visited on the part of their unconverted compatriots at the outbreak of the Jewish war. Nothing in the epistle points to any such state of the matter; but, on the contrary, even the one passage, Heb. xiii. 13, serves to place in a clear light the erroneousness of this conjecture. For, instead of mentioning a state of exclusion, and bestowing a word of consolation upon the occasion of an event like that, the author here assuredly summons to a coming forth out of Judaism as a voluntary act, and thus, as in his other reasoning, presupposes that the readers were still in the midst of Judaism, and adhered thereto with narrow-minded and unchristian stubbornness. A special support for his hypothesis Thiersch fancies is to be found in the eleventh chapter. All the historic instances there adduced are, he tells us, chosen by the author with a special bearing upon such a position of the readers as is assumed by him. But a glance at the paraphrase of the eleventh chapter, which Thiersch affords in proof of this assertion, shows that everything from which he derives his argument has first been imported by himself into the text.—That, finally, also Ebrard's view—according to which the epistle was designed to be "a kind of manual (*Leitfaden*)" (!) for Jerusalem "neophytes" (!), who, "out of dread of exclusion from the temple cultus," seemed about to withdraw again from Christianity[1]—is an extremely arbitrary one, needs hardly a word of further demonstration.

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

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

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

to Christianity, and nevertheless apostatize from the faith, by their own fault let slip beyond recovery the Christian blessedness; then, however, expresses the confidence he feels that it will not be so with the readers, who have distinguished themselves, and do still distinguish themselves by works of Christian love, and indicates what he desires of them, namely, perseverance to the end; while at the same time he directs their attention to the inviolability of the divine promise and the objective certainty of the Christian hope (v. 11–vi. 20). With the seventh chapter the author returns to the subject under discussion. He dwells first upon the person of Melchisedec himself, following up the hints of Scripture as he presents to his readers the exalted position of Melchisedec, and shows a threefold superiority of the same over the Levitical priests (vii. 1–10). From this relation of inferiority, however, it follows now that the Levitical priesthood, and thus consequently the Mosaic law in general, is imperfect and incapable of leading on to perfection. For otherwise there would have been no need, after the law had long been instituted, of the promise and the appearing of another priest of other descent (vv. 11, 12). That the Levitical priesthood, together with the Mosaic law, has lost its validity, is evident from the circumstance that Christ, to whom that divine utterance Ps. cx. 4 has reference, belongs as a matter of fact to a tribe which, according to Mosaic ordinance, has no part in the administration of the priestly office (vv. 13, 14); it is further evident from the consideration that the new priest who is promised is to bear a resemblance to Melchisedec, in which is implied just the particular, that his characteristic peculiarity is other than that of the Levitical priests (vv. 15–17). The end, to the bringing in of which the Levitical priesthood was wanting in power, is attained by Christ's everlasting priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec (vv. 18, 19). The preeminence of this over the Levitical priesthood appears further from the fact that it was constituted by God by virtue of an oath, whereas the former was constituted without an oath (vv. 20–22). The Levitical priests, moreover, die one after another: Christ's priesthood, on the other hand,—and that forms a third point of superiority,—since He ever liveth, is an unchangeable and intransitory priesthood (vv. 23–25). A fourth point of superiority is manifested in the distinction, that while the Levitical priests are sinful men, who each successive day must offer sacrifices for their own sins and the sins of the people, Christ is the sinless Son of God, who once for all has offered up Himself as a sacrifice (vv. 26–28). But not only as regards His own person is Christ exalted far above the Levitical priests: the sanctuary, too, in

which He exercises the high-priestly functions, is exalted far above the Levitical one. For Christ administers His office of high priest in the heavenly tabernacle, erected by God Himself, of which, as the prototype, the earthly tabernacle in which the Levitical priests minister is a mere copy (viii. 1–5). So much more excellent is the personal ministry of Christ, inasmuch as the covenant, whose Mediator He is, is a better covenant, because resting upon the foundation of better promises. The character of this promised new covenant is a more inner, spiritual one; and by the promise of a new covenant the old is declared to be worn out and no longer serviceable (vv. 6–13). In the disposition of the Mosaic sanctuary itself, and the ordering of the priestly ministration in conformity therewith, lies the indication on the part of God, that Mosaism is not itself the perfect religion, but only the preparatory institution for the same (ix. 1–8); as accordingly also the Levitical sacrifices, since they belong to the domain of carnal ordinance, are not in a position to make real atonement, whereas the sacrifice of Christ, presented by virtue of an eternal spirit through the efficacy of His own blood, possesses an everlasting power of atonement (vv. 9–14). In order to be the Middle Person of the New Covenant, Christ, however, *must needs suffer death*. That follows from the notion of a *διαθήκη*, since such acquires a binding character only when the death of the *διατίθεμενος* has been before proved; as accordingly also the first, or Old Testament *διαθήκη*, was not consecrated without blood, and without blood-shedding there is, under the Mosaic law, no forgiveness. For the consecration of the earthly sanctuary the blood of slain animals sufficed, but for the consecration of the heavenly sanctuary there was need of a more excellent sacrifice than these; this Christ has offered once for all at the end of the world, by His sin-cancelling sacrificial death; and in connection with His return, to be looked for unto the salvation of them that wait for Him, no repetition of sacrifice will be necessary (vv. 15–28). In the imperfection of the Mosaic law is to be sought the cause that under it the expiatory sacrifice is repeated every year; that repetition contains the reminder that there are ever sins still present, as truly a cancelling of sins by the blood of bulls and of goats is from the very nature of the case impossible (x. 1–4). Already in Scripture has it been expressed, that not by animal sacrifices, but only by the fulfilling of the will of God, deliverance from sins is to be attained. On the ground of this fulfillment of His will by Christ are we Christians sanctified (vv. 5–10). Hereupon the main distinction between the Old Testament high priest and the High Priest of the New Testament is once more brought into

relief—namely, in that the former daily repeats the same sacrifices without thereby effecting the cancelling of sin; the latter, on the other hand, by His sacrifice once offered, has wrought everlasting sanctification; and finally, attention is drawn to the Scripture testimony, that there is no more need for further expiatory sacrifice (vv. 15–18).

The readers in possession of such an High Priest, and the blessing mediated by Him, are to cleave with resolution and constancy to the Christian faith, to incite one another to love and good works, and not, as has become a practice with some, to forsake the religious assemblies. And the more so since the Advent is now close at hand (vv. 19–25). For he who wittingly contemns recognized Christian truth, and sins against it, will not escape the avenging judgment of God (vv. 26–31). Mindful of the Christian courage they have displayed in former days, the readers are not to lose their Christian cheerfulness, but to persevere in the Christian career; for only a short time longer will it be before the return of Christ, and the entrance into the promised fullness of blessing (vv. 32–39). The author hereupon defines the nature of the πιστις which he requires of the readers, and then sets before them examples of the heroism of faith from times gone by (chap. xi.). In possession of such a multitude of examples, and with the eye fixed upon Jesus Himself, the readers are to endure with stedfastness the conflict which awaits them, and to regard their sufferings as a salutary chastisement on the part of that God who is full of fatherly love towards them (xii. 1–13). To this attaches an exhortation to concord and growth in holiness (vv. 14–17). The very constitution of the New Covenant, to which the readers have come, obliges them to the endeavor after sanctification. Whereas the Old Covenant bore the character of the sensuous, earthly, and that which awakens merely fear, the New Covenant has the character of the spiritual, heavenly, brings into communion with God and all holy ones, and confers reconciliation. The readers are therefore to be on their guard against apostatizing from the New Covenant, for their guilt and exposure to punishment would be thereby incomparably augmented. Rather should they be filled with gratitude towards God for the participation in the unshakable kingdom of the New Covenant, and serve Him with awe and reverential fear (vv. 18–29). To this are now appended exhortations to continued brotherly love (xiii. 1), to hospitality (ver. 2), to the assistance of prisoners and oppressed (ver. 3), to chastity (ver. 4), to the eschewing of covetousness and to contentment (vv. 5, 6), to the remembering of former teachers and the emulating of their faith (ver. 7), to the avoidance of unchristian doctrines

and precepts (vv. 8–15), to benevolence (ver. 16), to obedience towards the presidents of the congregation (ver. 17). There follows a call to intercession on behalf of the author (vv. 18, 19), a wish of blessing (vv. 20, 21), the petition for a friendly reception of the epistle (ver. 22), the communication of a piece of intelligence (ver. 23), the prayer for the delivery of salutations, and, at the same time, the conveying of salutations to the readers (ver. 24), and the concluding wish of blessing (ver. 25).

SEC. 4.—TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

The epistle can only have been written at a late time. For, according to ii. 3, xiii. 7 (comp. also v. 12, x. 32 ff.), the recipients belonged to a second generation of Christians. According to xiii. 7, the presidents and teachers of the congregation had already been snatched away from the same by death, and that a death by martyrdom. The death, too, of James, the brother of the Lord, who as president of the congregation at Jerusalem was reckoned one of the pillars of the Christian church (Gal. ii. 9), must thus have already taken place; as it is, moreover, on general grounds hardly conceivable that, so long as James was still living, an encroachment upon his province, by means of a letter of such tone and contents as are displayed by the Epistle to the Hebrews, should have been made by the author of this epistle. The Epistle to the Hebrews cannot therefore have been written before the year 63 (Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. 9. 1). Its time of composition, however, must yet fall in the period before the destruction of Jerusalem. For the presupposition that the Levitical service of the temple is still continuing, underlies the current of the whole epistle. Instances in proof are found not only viii. 4, 5, ix. 6 ff., xiii. 10 ff., and specially ix. 9,—where the continued existence of the foretabernacle (or holy place) in the Jewish sanctuary is expressly explained as a typical reference to the time now being, in which the priests still continue to offer sacrifices which are unable to afford satisfaction to the conscience (comp. besides vii. 8, 20, viii. 13, x. 2),—but also in general a great part of the contents of the epistle, wherein the erroneous persuasion of the readers that the attainment of everlasting salvation is not possible without continued participation in the Levitical sacrificial rites and temple cultus, is controverted by our author. Further, our epistle must have been composed even before the beginning of the Jewish war; for if this had already broken out, distinct references thereto could not have been wanting. Yet it would seem that the commotions and insurrections which immediately preceded the outbreak of the Jewish war had already begun. For, x. 25,

reference is made to the fact that the visible signs of the approaching advent of Christ have already appeared before the eyes of the readers; and their personal condition was, according to xii. 4 ff., xiii. 13, one of great suffering. That supposition is thus the most natural one which places the date of the epistle's composition between the years 65 and 67.

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

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

SEC. 5.—FORM AND ORIGINAL LANGUAGE.

That the composition was an actual *letter*, and not, as has been assumed by Berger (*Gotting. theol. Bibl.*, Th. III. St. 3, p. 449 ff.; *Moral. Einleit. in das N. T.*, Th. III. p. 442 f. Comp. also Reuss, *Geschichte der h. Schrr. N. T.*, 5th ed., Braunschw. 1874. § 151), a *homily*, is acknowledged, and is, more-

over, rendered certain by the personal allusions at the close of the composition, since these admit neither of our regarding them, with Berger, as the later appendix of another author, nor, with Schwegler (*Nachapostolisches Zeitalter*, Bd. II. p. 304), as a "literary fiction."

In like manner, the opinion frequently expressed in ancient times,—originally broached with a view to the removal of the difficulties arising from the literary character of the book, upon the presupposition of the authorship of the Apostle Paul,—and in recent times specially advocated by Joseph Hallet, jun., and John David Michaelis, that the epistle was originally composed in the Hebrew (Aramaic) language, and only afterwards translated into Greek, is at the present time universally recognized to be erroneous. Even on account of the great freedom with which the translator must have proceeded in the remoulding of the original,—on account of the purity in the Greek expression, the skill in the formation of genuine Greek periods, such as are foreign to the Aramaic,—on account of the many compound terms, the equivalent of which could have been expressed in Aramaic only by means of periphrases (as *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*, i. 1; *ἀπαύγασμα*, i. 3; *μετριοπαθεῖν*, v. 2; *εὐπερίστατος*, xii. 1, etc.),—on account of the multitude of paronomasias, which could not possibly be in every case the work of chance (i. 1, ii. 2, ii. 3, ii. 8, ii. 10, ii. 18, iii. 13, iv. 2, v. 1, v. 8, v. 14, vii. 3, vii. 9, vii. 13, vii. 19, 22, vii. 23, 24, ix. 10, ix. 28, x. 29, x. 34, x. 38, 39, xi. 27, xi. 37, xii. 24, 25, xiii. 14),—and on account of the ambiguous use of *διαθήκη*, ix. 15 ff.,[1] this view is wanting in all probability and naturalness. Absolutely inadmissible, however, it becomes only from the fact that the author, not only in connection with his Biblical citations, but also in the conducting of his argument, bases his reasoning throughout upon the form of the text in the LXX., even when this version gives a sense entirely at variance with that of the original text. With particular distinctness does this appear x. 5 ff., where in place of the Hebrew אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִי the entirely diverse *σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι* of the LXX. is adopted by our author, and then at ver. 10 the *προσφορὰ τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* brought into relation therewith.

[1] Nevertheless, as has already been observed by Braun, as also by Bleek, the דִּיתִיקִי, adopted by the Aramaic from the Greek and occurring in the Talmud, as frequently also in the Peshito; or the קְיָם, more usual with the Chaldee Paraphrasts, as also in the Peshito,—might certainly also have combined the twofold signification of a "covenant" and a "testament."

Ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολή.

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

CHAPTER I.

VER. 1. *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου*] Elz.: *ἐπ' ἐσχάτων*. Against A B D E K L M ℵ, most min., Vulg. Copt. *al.*, and many Fathers. The plural *ἐσχάτων* arose from the *τῶν* immediately following.—Ver. 2. In place of *καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν* of the *Recepta*, A B D* D*** Ξ M ℵ, 17, 37, *al.*, Vulg. It. Copt. Syr. *al.*, Patres Gr. et. Lat. m. have *καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας*. Already recommended by Griesb. Rightly adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. In addition to the strong attestation, this position of the words is favored by the internal ground that in this order the emphasis falls, as was required, upon *ἐποίησεν*, instead of falling upon *τοὺς αἰῶνας*.—Ver. 3. Before *καθαρισμόν*, Elz. Wetst. Griesb. Matth. Scholz, Bloomf. Tisch. 7, Reiche (*Commentarius Criticus in N. T.*, t. III. p. 6 sq.), with D***, almost all min. Syr. utr. (Aeth. ?) Ath. p. 362, Chrys. in text. et comm. dis., Oec. Theoph. Aug. (?) add *δι' ἑαυτοῦ*. But *δι' ἑαυτοῦ* instead of which *δι' αὐτοῦ* (according to Theodoret's express observation to be read as *δι' αὑτοῦ*) is found with D* 137, Copt. Clar. Germ. Cyr. (semel) Didym. Theodoret, in t. et comm. Euthal. Damasc. in textu, is wanting in A B D** ℵ, 17, 46* 47, 80, Vulg. Arm. Cyr. (saepe) Cyr. Hieros. pseudo-Athanas. (ed. Bened. ii. 337), Damasc. (comm.) Sedul. Cassiod. Bede. Already suspected by Mill (Prolegg. 991). Rightly deleted as a gloss by Bleek, de Wette, Lachm. Tisch. 1, 2, and 8, and Alford. For although the addition *δι' ἑαυτοῦ* (by Himself, *i. e.* by the offering of Himself, inasmuch as He was at the same time High Priest and Victim) is in perfect keeping with the after deductions of the epistle, it is nevertheless not indispensable; and though it is conceivable that *δι' ἑαυτοῦ* was taken up into the preceding *αὐτοῦ*, yet it is, on the other hand, hardly credible, seeing the endeavor of the author after linguistic euphony, that he should have placed the words *αὐτοῦ, δι' ἑαυτοῦ* (*αὐτοῦ*) in immediate juxtaposition the one with the other.—Instead of *ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*, Bengel, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Alford read: *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος*. In favor of the latter decides the preponderant attestation on the part of A B D E M ℵ, 37, 46, *al.*, Vulg. It. Cyr. Cyr. Hieros. Athan. Did. ps.-Athan. Dam. (comm.).—*τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*] Elz. Matth. Scholz: *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*. But *ἡμῶν* is wanting in A B D* E* M ℵ*, 67** *al.*, Vulg. It. Copt. Syr. Aeth. Cyr. utr. Nyss. Didym. Damasc. Aug. Sedul. Cassiod. *al.* Already suspected by Mill (Prolegg. 496) and Griesb. Rightly rejected by Lachm., Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Reiche, Alford. It was added as a dogmatic precaution, in order to guard against a referring of the words also to the own *ἁμαρτίαι* of the subject.—Ver. 8. *ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου*] Instead of that, Lachm. in the edit. stereot. (as likewise Tisch. 8)

read: *καὶ* (A B D* E* M ℵ, 17, Aeth. Clar. Germ. Vulg. ms. Cyr.) *ἡ* (A B M ℵ, Cyr.) *ῥάβδος τῆς* (A B M ℵ** Cyr.) *εὐθύτητος ῥάβδος* (A B M ℵ** Cyr.) *τῆς βασιλείας σου.* In the later larger edition, vol. II., on the other hand, he has adopted *καὶ ῥάβδος τῆς εὐθύτητος ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου.* The *καί* at the beginning is, as also Bleek and Alford decide, to be looked upon as original, but in other respects the *Recepta* is to be retained, inasmuch as the *ἡ* before the first *ῥάβδος* (in the first edition of Lachmann) would be a variation from the text presented by the LXX., such as could hardly be ascribed to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, considering the closeness with which he follows that translation in other cases, and the purity in other respects of his Greek expression.—Ver. 9. *ἀνομίαν*] A ℵ, 13, 23, *al.*, Cyr. Chron. Alex. Eus. Chrys. ms. *ἀδικίαν*; preferred by Bleek, since it is also found in the Cod. Alex. of the LXX. Adopted also by Tisch. 8. But *ἀνομίαν* might easily be changed into *ἀδικιαν*, since the latter formed a more direct opposite to the preceding *δικαιοσύνην*.—Ver. 12. *ἕλιξεις*] Beza, Bengel, Tisch. 8: *ἀλλάξεις*. Only insufficiently supported by D* ℵ* 43, Vulg. (not Harl.*) It. Tert.—*αἱ τοὺς*] Lachm.: *αὐτοὺς, ὡς ἱμάτιον*, after A B D* E ℵ, Aeth. Arm. Clar. Germ. Spite of the strong authority, an apparent gloss, explanatory of *ὡσεὶ περιβάλλαιον*.

Vv. 1–4. [On Vv. 1–3, see Note XLI., pages 410–414.] Without beginning with the ordinary salutation, with the omission even of any kind of preface, the author proceeds at once to place the revelation of God in Christ in contrast with the revelations of God under the Old Covenant, inasmuch as he characterizes the revelations under the Old Covenant as imperfect, while he shows the perfection of this new revelation by a description of the incomparable dignity of its Mediator. With vv. 1–3 the author strikes the keynote for all that which he is subsequently to disclose to the readers. The utterances of these three verses afford the theme of his whole epistle. [XLI *a.*] For the later dogmatic disquisitions are only the more full unfolding of the same; and for the later paraeneses they form the motive and fundamental consideration. To ver. 4, however,—which combines grammatically with that which precedes into the unity of a well-ordered, rhetorically vigorous and majestic period,—vv. 1–3 stand related as the universal to the particular, since that which was before expressed in a more general way is in ver. 4 brought into relief on a special side, which finds in the sequel its detailed development, in such wise that then ver. 4 in turn forms, as regard its contents, the theme for the first section of the epistle (i. 4–ii. 18).

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

Ver. 1. *Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως κ.τ.λ.*] [XLI *b.*] After God had spoken oftentimes and in manifold ways of old time to the fathers in the prophets. The twofold expression *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* (comp. Maximus Tyrius, *Dissert.* vii. 2, xvii. 7) is by no means merely rhetorical amplifica-

tion of one and the same idea (Chrysostom: τουτέστι διαφόρως; Michaelis, Abresch, Dindorf, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Reiche, Tholuck,[1] and others). Τὸ πολυμερές is that which *is divided into many parts* (τὸ εἰς πολλὰ μεριζόμενον, Hesychius). Πολυμερῶς therefore presents the λαλεῖν of former ages from the point of view of something which was accomplished in a multiplicity of successive acts, whereas πολυτρόπως brings out the manifold character of the modality in which, in connection with those acts, the λαλεῖν was accomplished. Common thus to both expressions is, indeed, the notion of changeful diversity; but the former marks the changeful diversity of the times in which, and the persons through whom, God revealed Himself; the latter, the changeful diversity of the divine revelations as regards contents and form. For not only was the substance and extent of the single revelations disproportioned, but also the modes of their communication varied, inasmuch as God spoke to the recipients of His revelations sometimes by means of visions and dreams, sometimes mouth to mouth (comp. Num. xii. 6 ff.), sometimes immediately, sometimes by the intervention of an angel, sometimes under the veil of symbols and types, sometimes without these.[2] By the very choice of πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως our author indicates the imperfection of the O. T. revelations. No single one of them contained the *full* truth, for otherwise there would have been no need of a succession of many revelations, of which the one supplemented the other. And just so was the continual change in the modes of communicating these revelations a sign of imperfection, inasmuch as only a perfect form of communication corresponds to the perfect truth.—As, moreover, on the one hand, by means of the adverbs the imperfection of the O. T. revelation is indicated in contrast with the perfection of the N. T. revelation; so, on the other hand, by means of the identity of the subject ὁ θεός in λαλήσας and ἐλάλησεν, the inner connection between the revelations of the O. T. and that of the N. T. is brought into relief, and in this way attention is tacitly drawn to the fact that the former was the divinely appointed preliminary stage and preparation for

[1] The last-named expositor would otherwise expect an antithetical ἁπλῶς (!) or ἐφάπαξ at the close of the verse.

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

the latter.—[XLI c.]—*πάλαι*] *of old*, in long bygone times. For Malachi was looked upon as the last of the O. T. prophets, and since his appearing already from four to five centuries had elapsed. Delitzsch: *πάλαι* is not so much *antiquitus* as *antehac*, since the contrast is not between *ancient* and *recent* or *new*, but between *past* and *present*. Wrongly; for the opposition of a "*prius*" and "*post*" had certainly been already expressed by *λαλήσας* and *ἐλάλησεν*, whereas *πάλαι* still finds its special, and indeed very significant opposition in *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων*, and must accordingly be explained after the analogy of this.—*λαλεῖν*] particularly in our epistle of very frequent use, to indicate divine revelations. Comp. ii. 2, 3, iii. 5, vii. 14, ix. 19, xi. 18, xii. 24, 25.—*τοῖς πατράσιν*] *to the fathers* (forced, and needlessly; Kurtz: *τοῖς πατράσιν*, and equally so afterwards *ἡμῖν*, is *dativus commodi*) *i. e.* to the forefathers of the Jewish people. Comp. Rom. ix. 5. The expression in its absolute use characterizes author and recipients as born Jews.—*προφήται*] is to be taken in the widest sense, in such wise that all holy men of the O. T. history who received revelations from God are comprehended under it. For unquestionably the aim of the discussion now begun, that of expressing the pre-eminence of the revelation contained in Christ over each and all of the O. T. revelations, demands this. But thus must Moses also, and very specially, be reckoned as belonging to the *προφῆται*, since Moses held the first rank in the series of development of the pre-Christian revelations; as, accordingly, iii. 2 ff., the superiority of Christ even over Moses is expressly asserted. Nor does the wider acceptation of *προφῆται* encounter any difficulties on the ground of Biblical usage. Comp. *e. g.* Gen. xx. 7, where Abraham is spoken of as a *προφήτης* (נָבִיא.) Deut. xxxiv. 10, where it is said of Moses: *καὶ οὐκ ἀνέστη ἔτι προφήτης ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς Μωϋσῆς*.[1]—By virtue of this wider acceptation of *προφῆται* in itself, the opinion of Er. Schmid and Stein, that *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* signifies: "in the prophetic Scriptures," becomes an impossibility; quite apart from the consideration that this interpretation is also sufficiently refuted by the antithesis *ἐν υἱῷ*. But just as little is *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* to be made equivalent to *διὰ τῶν προφητῶν*.[2] For the linguistic character of the Epistle to the Hebrews affords no warrant for the supposition of such a Hebraism in the interchange of prepositions. Nor is this proved by ix. 25, to which Tholuck appeals in following the precedent of Fritzsche (*Jen. Literaturzeit.* 1843, p. 59). Ἐν is of more extensive significance than *διά*. While the latter would signify the mere medium, the mere instrument, *ἐν* implies that God, in revealing Himself to the fathers by the prophets, was present in the latter, was indwelling in them, in such wise that the prophets were only the outward organs of speech for the God who spoke in them. Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 3; Matt. x. 20.—*ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων*] Antithesis to *πάλαι*. Wrongly does Delitzsch, with the approval of Meier,[3] take

[1] Philo, too (*de nom. mut.* p. 1064 A, ed. Mangey, I. p. 597), calls Moses the *ἀρχιπροφήτης*.

[2] As is done by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, and the majority, also Böhme, Reiche, Tholuck, Stengel, Ebrard, Bisping, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Maier, and M'Caul.

[3] Comp. also Schneckenburger in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, II. 3, p. 557.

τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων as apposition to ἐπ' ἐσχάτου: "at the period's close, which these days form,"—for which, on account of the article before ἡμερῶν, the placing of ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐσχάτου would at least have been required,—while he then still more arbitrarily finds in ἐσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν "the expression indicative of one idea, equivalent to אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים," and makes τούτων belong logically to the whole idea! The ἡμέραι αὐταί are identical with that which is elsewhere called ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, in opposition to ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων. The demonstrative τούτων refers to the fact that these ἡμέραι are the period of time in which the author equally as his readers lives, and of an ἔσχατον of these ἡμέραι he speaks, because like all N. T. writers—the author of the Second Epistle of Peter (iii. 4 ff.) excepted—he regards the return of Christ, for the transforming of the present order of the world and the accomplishment of the Messianic kingdom, as near at hand; comp. x. 37, ix. 26.—ἡμῖν] *to us*, namely, who belong to the age just mentioned, the ἐσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων. Antithesis to τοῖς πατράσιν.—ἐν υἱῷ] anarthrous, as vii. 28; not because υἱός has acquired the nature of a *nomen proprium*,[1] but for the indication of the essential property: in one (to wit, Christ) who is not merely prophet—who is more than that, namely, *Son*.

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

Ver. 2. As far as τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, ver. 3. The dignity of the Son as the premundane Logos.—Τιθέναι with double accusative, in the sense of ποιεῖν τινά τι, is no *Hebraism* (שׂוּם, שִׁית), but is very frequent with the classics.[2] Ἔθηκεν, however, has reference not so much to the time when Christ, having completed the work of redemption, has returned to the Father in heaven (so the Greek expositors; and in like manner Primasius, Erasmus (*Paraphr.*), Calvin, Cameron, Corn. a Lapide, Grotius, Schlichting, Calov, Hammond, Braun, Limborch, Storr, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 295 ff.;[3] Maier, Moll, and others), but

[1] Böhme, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 272.

[2] Comp. *e. g.* Herodian, *Hist.* v. 7. 10: Ἐφ' οἷς Ἀντωνίνος πάνυ ἠσχαλλε καὶ μετεγίγνωσκε, θέμενος αὐτὸν υἱὸν καὶ κοινωνὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς; Xenophon, *Cyrop.* iv. 6. 3: ὥσπερ ἂν εὐδαίμονα πατέρα παῖς τιμῶν τιθείη; Aelian, *Var. Hist.* xiii. 6; Homer, *Odyss.* ix. 404, *al.* Comp. also Elsner *ad loc.*; Kühner, II. p. 226.

[3] According to Riehm, the author first (ver. 2) glanced at the final point of the power of the Redeemer, and then at the beginning thereof, and after this (ver. 3) described the way to that final point with respect to the beginning. But however delicate and acute this conception of the subject, it is too greatly refined and artificial. In point of simplicity and naturalness it falls short of the view that at vv. 2, 3 the various phases of the life of Christ are described in their historic succession, so that only in connection with the intermediate member—ὢν . . . φέρων τε κ.τ.λ., ver. 3 (*see on the verse*)—there resounds throughout, in addition to the main reference to an earlier condition of the life of Christ, at the same time the subordinate reference to a later condition of His life. That which Riehm urges in support of his own view, and in refutation of the opposite one, is easily disposed of. When he thinks, in the first place, that only by his apprehension the whole structure of the period becomes thoroughly clear, this is already shown to be inaccurate by the fact that the simple is always more clear than the complex. For even if it be admitted in some respects that a new division of thought begins with the ὅς, ver. 3, which specially brings into relief the subject, where-

relates to the appointment made in the eternal decree of God before all time; thus has reference to Christ as the premundane Logos. This application is required in order to a due proportion with the declarations immediately following, and to the logical development of the well thought-out periods, in which the discourse reaches the exaltation of the incarnate Redeemer only with *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς*, ver. 3. The idea of the pre-existence of Christ or the Son of God as the eternal Logos with its nearer definitions, as this comes forth here and in that which immediately follows, is the same as is met with also in Paul's writings.[1] Yet, in the shaping of this idea on the part of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, not only the teaching of Paul, but likewise the Logos-speculations of Philo, with whose writings the Epistle to the Hebrews has manifold points in common, have not been without influence.—*κληρονόμον πάντων*] *heir, i. e.* (future) Possessor and Lord *of all things*, namely, of the world.[2] Comp. Gal. iv. 7; Rom. viii. 17.—*δι' οὗ*] *by whom.* Grammatically unwarranted, Grotius: propter quem (*δι' ὃν*). Comp. also ii. 10.—*καὶ ἐποίησεν*] The emphasis falls upon the word *ἐποίησεν*, on that account preposed, while *τοὺς αἰῶνας* only takes up again under a varying form a notion already expressed in that which precedes, and *καί* indicates no heightening of the expression (*even*, or *more than this*: Wolf and

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

[1] Comp. Col. i. 15 ff.; Phil. ii. 6; 1 Cor. viii. 6, x. 4, xv. 47; 2 Cor. iv. 4, viii. 9.

[2] Chrysostom: *Τῷ δὲ τοῦ κληρονόμου ὀνόματι κέχρηται, δύο δηλῶν, καὶ τὸ τῆς υἱότητος γνήσιον,*

others), but is intended to bring out the accordance between the statement in the second relative clause and that in the first; so that the fact that by the Son the *αἰῶνες* were created is made to follow as something quite natural, from the fact that He was by God constituted *κληρονόμος πάντων* (by whom He also created, etc.). Wrongly does Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 298 f.) invert the relation of the two members indicated by *καί*, in finding out the sense: "the installation of the Son in the office of the world's dominion is in entire accordance with the fact that by the Son the world was created; in other words, from the relation of the Son to God and the world, revealed in the latter fact, His installation in the office of the world's dominion presents nothing extraordinary, but rather appears something which we could not at all expect to be otherwise." [So in substance Owen, who seeks to combine the two meanings of *τιθέναι*.] Had this been meant, then *δι' οὗ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὃν καὶ ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων* must have been written. For the *καί* of the second clause accentuates the fact that what follows is in accord with that which precedes, not that what precedes is in accord with that which follows. Comp. Phil. iii. 20, where by means of *καί* the fact that we expect the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven as a deliverer is represented as something quite natural, since our *πολίτευμα* is in heaven; but not conversely is the fact that our *πολίτευμα* is in heaven deduced from the presupposition of our expecting Christ from thence.—*τοὺς αἰῶνας*] does not here denote the ages; either in such wise that the totality of the periods of time from the creation of the world to its close is meant (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Thomas Aquinas, Daniel Heinsius), for this thought would be too abstract; or in such wise that the two main periods in the world's history—the pre-Messianic and the Messianic—are to be understood thereby (Paulus, Stein), for in connection with the absolute *τοὺς αἰῶνας* no one could have thought of this special division into two parts. Nor must we either apprehend *τοὺς αἰῶνας* of the *Aeons* in the sense of the Gnostics (Amelius in Wolf, Fabricius, *Cod. Apocryph. N. T.* I. p. 710); for at the time when our author wrote this notion of the word did not yet exist. *τοὺς αἰῶνας* is to be understood of the *worlds*, of the totality of all things existing in time (and space), so that it is identical with the preceding *πάντων* and the following *τὰ πάντα* of ver. 3. *ὁ αἰών*, it is true, has always with the classics the strict notion of duration of time; but, as in the case of the Hebrew עוֹלָם, this notion might easily pass over into the wider notion of that which forms the visible contents of time, thus into that of the complex of all created things. This interpretation is confirmed by the reading of xi. 3, where *αἰῶνες* cannot possibly be used in any other sense.—As parallel passages to this second relative clause of ver. 2, expressing the thought of a creation of the universe by the preмundane Son of God, comp. in Paul's writings, Col. i. 16; 1 Cor. viii. 6; in those of John, John i. 3, 10. Philo, too, supposes the world was created by the Logos as the earliest or first-born Son of God.[1]

καὶ τὸ τῆς κυριότητος ἀναποσπαστον.

[1] Comp. *de Cherubim*, p. 129 (ed. Mangey, I. p. 162): *ἴδε τὴν μεγίστην οἰκίαν ἢ πόλιν, τόνδε τὸν κόσμον· εὑρήσεις γὰρ αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ τοῦ*

Ver. 3. Continued description of the dignity of the Son. The main declaration of the verse, *ὃς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς*, is established on the grounds presented in the preceding participles *ὢν . . . φέρων τε . . . ποιησάμενος*. The grounding, however, is a twofold one, inasmuch as the participles *present* still relate to Christ as the *Λόγος ἀσαρκος*, and describe His nature and sway, while the participle *aorist* has as its contents the redeeming act of the *Λόγος ἐνσαρκος*. Of the two present participles, the first corresponds to the former half of the proposition, ver. 2, and the second to the latter half.—*ὢν ἀπαύγασμα*] not: quum esset, but: quum sit *ἀπαύγ.*, or *as ἀπαύγασμα*. For the *εἶναι ἀπαύγασμα κ.τ.λ.* and *φέρειν τὰ πάντα κ.τ.λ.*, which was appropriate to the Son of God in His prehuman form of existence, has, after the exaltation or ascension has taken place, become again appropriate to Him.[1]—*ἀπαύγασμα*] [XLI *c.*] an Alexandrian word, occurring Wisd. vii. 26, and frequently with Philo, but only here in the N. T. It is explained either (1) as a *beaming forth* or *radiance, i. e.* as a ray which flows forth from the light, *e. g.*, of the sun.[2] Or (2) as *image, reflected radiance, i. e.* as a likeness formed by reflex rays, *reflection*.[3] In favor of the former interpretation it may be advanced that Hesychius paraphrases *ἀπαύγασμα* by *ἡλίου φέγγος*; and in *Lexic. Cyrilli ms. Brem.* are found the words: *ἀπαύγασμα ἀκτὶς ἡλίου, ἡ πρώτη τοῦ ἡλιακοῦ φωτὸς ἀποβολή*, as accordingly also Chrysostom and Theophylact explain *ἀπαύγασμα* by *φῶς ἐκ φωτός*, the latter with the addition *τὸ ἀπαύγασμα ἐκ τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ οὐχ ὑστερον αὐτοῦ*; and Theodoret observes: *Τὸ γὰρ ἀπαύγασμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πυρός ἐστι καὶ σὺν τῷ πυρί ἐστι· καὶ αἴτιον μὲν ἔχει τὸ πῦρ, ἀχώριστον δέ ἐστι τοῦ πυρός· ἐξ οὗ γὰρ τὸ πῦρ, ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα.* But without reason does Bleek claim, in favor of this first interpretation, also the usage of Philo and Wisd. vii. 26. For in the passage of Philo, *de Specialll. legg.* § 11 (ed. Mangey, II. p. 356), which Bleek regards as "particularly clear" (*Τὸ δ' ἐμφυσώμενον* [Gen. ii. 7] *δῆλον ὡς αἰθέριον ἦν πνεῦμα καὶ εἰ δή τι αἰθερίου θεόν, ὑφ' οὗ γέγονεν, ὕλην δὲ τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα, ἐξ ὧν συνεκράθη, ὄργανον δὲ λόγον · θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κατεσκευάσθη, τῆς δὲ κατασκευῆς αἰτίαν τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ.—De Monarch.* lib. ii. p. 823 B (ed. Mangey, II. p. 225): *Λόγος δὲ ἐστιν εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δι' οὗ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο.—Legg. allegor.* lib. iii. p. 79 A (ed. Mangey, I. p. 106): *σκιὰ θεοῦ δὲ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν, ᾧ καθάπερ ὀργάνῳ προσχρησάμενος ἐκοσμοποίει.*

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

[2] So Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz, and Hofmann, after the example of Clarius, Jac. Cappellus, Gomar., Schlichting, Gerhard, Calov, Owen, Rambach, Peirce, Calmet, Heumann, Böhme, Reiche.

[3] So Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Wittich, Limborch, Stein, Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt *A. Kirch.-Z.* 1857, No. 29, p. 661, and in his *Lexic. N. T.* p. 36), Nickel

πνεύματος κρεῖττον, ἅτε τῆς μακαρίας καὶ τρισμακαρίας φύσεως ἀπαύγασμα), there is found no ground of deciding either for or against this acceptation of the word. The other two passages of Philo, however, which are cited by Bleek, tell less in favor of it than against it. For in the former of these ἀπαύγασμα is explained by ἐκμαγεῖον [*impression*] and ἀπόσπασμα [*shred*] as synonyms, in the latter by μίμημα [*copy*]. (*De Opific. Mundi*, p. 33 D, in Mangey, I. p. 35: πᾶς ἄνθρωπος κατὰ μὲν τὴν διάνοιαν ᾠκείωται θείῳ λόγῳ, τῆς μακαρίας φύσεως ἐκμαγεῖον ἢ ἀπόσπασμα ἢ ἀπαύγασμα γεγονώς, κατὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ σώματος κατασκευὴν ἅπαντι τῷ κόσμῳ.—*De plantat. Noë*, p. 221 C, Mang. I. p. 337: Τὸ δὲ ἀγίασμα οἷον ἁγίων ἀπαύγασμα, μίμημα ἀρχετύπου· ἐπεὶ τὰ αἰσθήσει καλὰ καὶ νοήσει καλῶν εἰκόνες.) Finally, there are found also, Wisd. vii. 26, as kindred expressions, besides ἀπαύγασμα, the words ἔσοπτρον and εἰκών. (Ἀπαύγασμα γάρ ἐστι φωτὸς ἀϊδίου καὶ ἔσοπτρον ἀκηλίδωτον τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνεργείας καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ.) The decision is afforded by the form of the word itself. Inasmuch as not ἀπαυγασμός, but ἀπαύγασμα is written, an *active* notion, such as would be required by Bleek's acceptation, cannot be expressed by it, but only a *passive* one. Not the ray itself, but the result thereof must be intended. For as ἀπήχημα denotes that which is produced by the ἀπηχεῖν, the resonance or echo, and ἀποσκίασμα that which is produced by the ἀποσκιάζειν, the shadow cast by an object, so does ἀπαύγασμα denote that which is produced by the ἀπαυγάζειν. Ἀπαύγασμα is therefore to be rendered by *reflected radiance*, and a threefold idea is contained in the word—(1) the notion of independent existence, (2) the notion of descent or derivation, (3) the notion of resemblance.—τῆς δόξης] *of His* (the divine) *glory* or majesty. For the following αὐτοῦ belongs equally to τῆς δόξης as to τῆς ὑποστάσεως.—καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ] [XLI *f.*] *and as impress of His essential being*, so that the essential being of the Father is printed forth in the Son, the Son is the perfect image and counterpart of the Father. Comp. Philo, *de plantat. Noë*, p. 217 A (ed. Mangey, I. p. 332), where the rational soul (ἡ λογικὴ ψυχή) is called a coin which stands the test, οὐσιωθεῖσα καὶ τυπωθεῖσα σφραγῖδι θεοῦ, ἧς ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐστιν ἀΐδιος λόγος. In the N. T. the word χαρακτήρ is found only in this place. To interpret ὑπόστασις, however, in the sense of πρόσωπον, or "Person,"[1] is permitted only by later usage, not by that of the apostolic age. For the rest, that which is affirmed by the characteristic ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, the Apostle Paul expresses, Col. i. 15, by εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, and, Phil. ii. 6 (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4), by ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων.—φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ] [XLI *g.*] *and as He who upholds the whole creation by the word of His power*. Comp. Col. i. 17: καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν; Philo. *de Cherub.* p. 114 (ed. Mang. I. p. 145): ὁ πηδαλιοῦχος καὶ κυβερνήτης τοῦ παντὸς λόγος θεῖος.—τὰ πάντα is not to be limited, with the Socinians, to the kingdom of grace, but is identical with πάντων; and τοὺς αἰῶνας, ver. 2, thus denotes the com-

(Reuter's *Repert.* 1857, Oct., p. 17), Moll, and others; so substantially also Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 279).

[1] Thomas Aquinas, Cajetan, Calvin [in the exposition], Beza, Piscator, Cornelius a Lapide, Gerhard, Dorscheus, Calov, Sebastian Schmidt, Bellarmin, Braun, Brochmann, Wolf, Suicer.

plex of all created things. On φέρειν in the signification: *to uphold anything*, so that its continued existence is assured, comp. Plutarch, *Lucull.* 6: φέρειν τὴν πόλιν.[1]—τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ] more emphatic than if τῷ ῥήματι αὐτοῦ τῷ δυνατῷ were written, to which Wolf, Kuinoel, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield would, without reason, make the words equivalent.[2] —Not *the gospel*, however, is meant by ῥῆμα τῆς δυνάμεως; but as by the word of Omnipotence the world was created (comp. xi. 3), so is it also by the word of Omnipotence upheld or preserved.—αὐτοῦ] goes back to ὅς, thus to the Son, not to God (Grotius, Peirce, Reiche, Paulus). [XLI *h.*]—καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος] *after He had accomplished a cleansing from the sins.* [XLI *i.*] Progress of the discourse to the dignity of the Son as the eternal Logos *incarnate*, or the Redeemer in His historic appearing on earth. The nearer defining of the sense conveyed by the declaration: καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος,—with regard to the grammatical expression of which LXX. of Job vii. 21, 2 Pet. i. 9, may be compared,—was naturally presented to the readers. As the object on which the καθαρισμός was wrought was understood as something self-evident, the *world of mankind*, which until then was under the defiling stain of sins, without possessing the power for its own deliverance; as the means, however, by which the καθαρισμός was accomplished, the atoning death of Christ. [Owen compares the *lustrations*, i. e. purifications by sacrifice, and cites Lucian's ῥίψομεν μὲν αὐτὸν τοῦ κρημνοῦ καθαρισμὸν τοῦ στρατοῦ ἐσόμενον, "We shall cast him down headlong for an expiation of the army."] To conceive of the ἁμαρτίαι themselves as a direct object to καθαρισμόν, to which Bleek and Winer, *Gramm.* 5th ed. p. 214 (differently, 6th ed. p. 168, 7th ed. p. 176 [E. T. 187]), were inclined, and in favor of which Delitzsch and Alford (comp. also Hofmann *ad loc.*) pronounce themselves with decision,—in such wise that these are thought of as the disease of the human race, which is healed or put away by Christ,—is not at all warranted by the isolated and less accurate form of expression: ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, Matt. viii. 3. Nor is it requisite to supply ἀπό before τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, and assume a pregnancy of expression, since καθαρός and its derived words are not only connected by ἀπό, but likewise, with equal propriety, by the bare genitive.[3]—ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς] *sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high.* Culminating point of the description. Characteristic of the dignity of the Son *after the completed work of redemption*, in the period of His return to the Father, which followed the period of His self-abasement. The sitting at the right hand of God is a well-known figure, derived from Ps. cx. 1, in order to designate

[1] Valerius Maximus, xi. 8. 5: Humeris gestare salutem patriae; Cicero, *pro Flacco*, c. 38: Quam (rempublicam) vos universam in hoc judicio vestris humeris, vestris inquam humeris, judices sustinetis; Seneca, *Ep.* 31: Deus ille maximus potentissimusque ipse vehit omnia; Herm. Past. iii. 9. 11: Nomen Filii Dei magnum et immensum est et totus ab eo sustentatur orbis.

[2] Oecumenius: ῥῆμα δὲ εἶπε δεικνὺς πάντα εὐκόλως αὐτὸν ἄγειν καὶ φέρειν. Theophylact: τηλικοῦτον ὄγκον τῆς κτίσεως τὸν ὑπέρμεγαν ὡς οὐδὲν αὐτὸς διαβαστάζει καὶ λόγῳ μόνῳ πάντα δυναμένῳ.

[3] See Kühner, II. p. 163.

supreme honor and dominion over the world (Rom. viii. 34, *al.*).—*ἐν ὑψηλοῖς*] Comp. Ps. xciii. 4, cxiii. 5; tantamount to *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, Heb. viii. 1; or *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*, Eph. i. 20; or *ἐν ὑψίστοις*, Luke ii. 14, xix. 38, *al.* The addition belongs not to *μεγαλωσύνης* (Beza, Böhme, Bleek, Ebrard, Alford),—since otherwise the article would be repeated,—but to *ἐκάθισεν*. The plural *ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* is explained from the supposition of several heavens, in the highest of which the throne of the Divine Majesty was placed.

Ver. 4. [On Vv. 4–6, see Note XLII., pages 414–416.] The author has first, vv. 1–3, instituted a parallel between the mediators of the Old Testament revelations in general or *in pleno*, and the Mediator of the Christian revelation. [XLII *a*.] But among the revelations of God under the Old Covenant, none attained in point of glory to the Mosaic; inasmuch as this was given not only through the medium of a man enlightened by the Spirit of God,—*i. e.* by one of the *προφῆται*, mentioned ver. 1,—but, according to the universal Jewish belief (*vid. ad* ii. 2), was given by the instrumentality not only of Moses, but also of angels. As, therefore, the author has maintained the superiority of Christ, as the Son of God, over the *προφῆται*, so is he now naturally further led to show the superiority of Christ over the angels also. This is done in the declaration, ver. 4, which in a grammatical sense is closely connected with that which precedes, and serves for the completing of the description of Christ's characteristic qualifications; at the same time, however, logically regarded, affords the theme for the following disquisition, which constitutes the first section of the epistle (i. 5–ii. 18).—The supposition of Tholuck, that the addition of ver. 4 "has an independent object," *i. e.* is occasioned by polemic reference to the opinion spread abroad among the Jews, in addition to other conceptions with regard to the person of the Messiah, that He was an intermediate spirit or angel,[1] is entirely erroneous. It finds no countenance whatever in the reasoning of the author, and is opposed to the whole scope of the epistle, that of showing in detail the inferiority of the Old Covenant as compared with the New, and of influencing in a corresponding manner the conduct of the readers. [XLII *b*, *c*.]—The oratorical formula of comparison: *τοσούτῳ . . . ὅσῳ*, which recurs vii. 20–22, viii. 6, x. 25, is found likewise with Philo, but never with Paul.—*κρείττων*] *better*, or more excellent, namely, in power, dignity, and exaltedness; comp. vii. 19, 22, viii. 6, ix. 23, x. 34, xi. 16, 35, 40, xii. 24.—*γενόμενος*] marks the *having begun to be* in time, whereas *ὤν*, ver. 3, expressed the timeless eternal existence. *Κρείττων τῶν ἀγγέλων* did Christ become just at that time when, having accomplished the work of redemption, He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high. The *γενόμενος* thus closely attaches itself to the *ἐκάθισεν*, ver. 3, [XLII *d* 1.] and is more fully explained by the fact that Christ, by virtue of His incarnation, and so

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

long as He dwelt on earth, was made lower than the angels; comp. ii. 7, 9.—The comparative *διαφορώτερον*, found in the N. T. only here and viii. 6, serves, since even the positive *διάφορον* would have sufficed for the indication of the superiority, for the more emphatic accentuating of the signification of the word. The opinion of Hofmann, that the comparative is chosen because the name *ἄγγελος* is in itself an *ὄνομα διάφορον*, when the author contrasts the spirits of God with men living in the flesh, is quite remote from the idea of the passage.—*παρά*] after a comparative is very common in our epistle; cf. iii. 3, ix. 23, xi. 4, xii. 24.[1] With Paul it never occurs. Similar is *ὑπέρ* with the accusative, Heb. iv. 12; Luke xvi. 8.—*ὄνομα*] must not, with Beza, Calov, Wittich, Storr, Valckenaer, Zachariae, Heinrichs, be altered into the notion of "dignity." For this *ὄνομα* never signifies in itself, and its substitution would in our passage, in relation to *κρείττων γενόμενος*, bring about only a tautology. The name of pre-eminence above the angels, which Christ has obtained as an inheritance, is the name *υἱός*, Son of God,—comp. ver. 5 and ver. 1,—while the angels by their name are characterized only as messengers and servants of God. Contrary to the context, Delitzsch says: the name *υἱός* suffices not to express the thought in connection with *ὄνομα*. The supra-angelic name, to which the author refers, lies beyond the notionally separating and sundering language of men. It is the heavenly total-name of the Exalted One, His שֵׁם הַמְפֹרָשׁ, *nomen explicitum*, which in this world has entered into no human heart, and can be uttered by no human tongue, the *ὄνομα ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτός*, Rev. xix. 12. The following words of Scripture are, he supposes, only upward pointing signs, which call forth in us some foreboding as to how glorious He is. But this is opposed to the connection. For even though it be true, as advanced by Delitzsch in support of his view, that in the following O. T. passages there occur also, in addition to *υἱός*, the wider appellations *θεός* and *κύριος*; yet, on the other hand, not merely *ἐν υἱῷ*, ver. 1, as likewise ver. 5 with its proof-giving *γάρ*, but also the antithesis *πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους* and *πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν*, vv. 7, 8, shows that *υἱός* is the main conception, to which the words of address: *ὁ θεός* and *κύριε*, vv. 8, 10, stand in the relation of subordination, inasmuch as they are already contained in this very idea of Son.—The perfect *κεκληρονόμηκεν*, however, not the aorist *ἐκληρονόμησεν*, is employed by the author; because Christ did not first obtain this name at the time of the *καθίζειν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλ.*, ver. 3, but had already as pre-existing Logos obtained it as an abiding portion and possession. [XLII. *d* 2.] We have not, in connection with *κεκληρονόμηκεν*, to think "quite in general of the O. T. time, in which the future Messiah received in the Word of God the name of Son," as is asserted by Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 274), whose statement is endorsed by E. Woerner.[2] For this view is contradicted by the *δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας*, ver. 2, in its

[1] Comp. also Luke iii. 13; 3 Esdr. iv. 35; Thucyd. i. 23: *ἡλίου τε ἐκλείψεις, αἱ πυκνότεραι παρὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ πρὶν χρόνου μνημονευόμενα ξυνέβησαν*: Herod. vii. 103: Winer, p. 225, [E. T. 240].

[2] *Der Brief St. Pauli an die Hebräer*, Lud. wigsb. 1876.

relation to ἐν υἱῷ, ver. 1, according to which Christ already existed as the Son before all time. The declarations of ver. 5, which Riehm has urged in favor of the construction put by him on our passage, have only the object of affording vouchers for a condition of things already existing.—The difficulty raised, for the rest, that the name of Son is here insisted on as a distinguishing characteristic of Christ, while, nevertheless, in single passages of the O. T.,[1] angels too are called sons of God, is already disposed of by the reflection that this is *not* the characteristic name for the angels as such. There is no need, therefore, of the justification of the author made by Bleek, that this writer, since he was not at home in the Hebrew text of the O. T., but only in the Alexandrine version thereof, which latter freely renders the majority of those passages by ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, may easily have overlooked, or perhaps have otherwise interpreted, those passages in which the literal translation is found in the LXX. (Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 7 [Gen. vi. 2, 4?]).

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

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

[1] Job i. 6, ii. 1. xxxviii. 7; Gen. vi. 2, 4; Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 7; Dan. iii. 25.

question is now, how he conceived of the σήμερον. [XLII *d* 3.] It is referred either to the moment in which Christ was *manifested* to be the Son of God, *i. e.* to the moment of the *Resurrection* or the *Ascension*,[1] or to the moment of the *Incarnation*,[2] or, finally, to the period before the creation of the world, thus to *eternity*.[3] That the author[4] attached no definite notion to the σήμερον, as being without significance for his demonstration, is an unexegetical supposition. Exclusively correct, because alone in harmony with the context, is the referring of the σήμερον to *eternity;* since, according to ver. 2, God created the world by Christ as the Son, thus Christ must already have existed as Son before the foundation of the world. With Philo, too, occurs the same interpretation of σήμερον, as signifying eternity.[5]—καὶ πάλιν] *and further*, serves, as frequently (*e. g.* ii. 13, x. 30; Rom. xv. 11, 12; 1 Cor. iii. 20; Philo, ed. Mangey, I. p. 88, 490, *al.*), for the introduction of a new passage of Scripture. The καὶ πάλιν κ.τ.λ. is not, however, to be taken as an assertory declaration, so that merely εἶπεν would have to be supplied (in accordance with which Lachmann punctuates); but the question is continued in such wise that the proposition is to be completed by καὶ (τίνι εἶπέν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων) πάλιν.—This second citation is derived from 2 Sam. vii. 14, in verbal accordance with the LXX. Comp. also 1 Chron. xvii. (xviii.) 13. αὐτῷ and αὐτός refer in the historic sense to Solomon. To David, who designs building a temple to Jehovah, the divine direction comes by Nathan to desist from his purpose. Not David, but his seed, who shall ascend the throne after him, is to build a temple to Jehovah; to him will Jehovah for ever establish the throne of his kingdom; to him will Jehovah be a father, and he shall be to Him a son, and, if he transgress, Jehovah will chasten him with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men. Even this latter addition (which, for the rest, is not found in the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xvii. (xviii.) 13) makes it impossible to refer the words to the Messiah, as, moreover, the reference to Solomon is rendered certain even from the O. T. itself by the following passages: 1 Kings v. 19 (5), viii. 17 ff.; 2 Chron. vi. 9, 10; as also 1 Chron. xxii. (xxiii.) 9 ff., xxviii. (xxix.) 2 ff.—εἶναι εἰς] Formed after the Hebrew לְ הָיָה. Comp. viii. 10, *al.*

Ver. 6. [XLII *d* 4.] Ὅταν, with the conjunctive aorist, takes the place of the Latin *futurum exactum*. See Winer, p. 289 [E. T. 308]. Ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ can-

[1] Hilary, *in Psalmum;* Ambrose, *de Sacram.* 3. 1; Calvin, Cameron, Grotius, Schlichting, Limborch, Jac. Cappellus, Owen, Calmet, Peirce, Storr, Bloomfield, Bisping, Maier; comp. Delitzsch, who would have the words interpreted of "the entrance of the Son into the kingly life of supra-terrestrial glory in God, of which the resurrection is the initial point."

[2] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Eusebius, *in Psalmum, alii;* Piscator, Böhme, Kuinoel, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 123 f. of the 2d ed.; Woerner.

[3] Origen *in Joh.* t. i. c. 32; Athanasius, *de decret. Nicen. Synod.* § 13; Basil, *contra Eunom.* 2. 24; Augustine, *in Psalmum* [Arnobius of Gaul, *in Psalmum*]; Primasius, Theophylact, Thomas Aquinas, Cornelius a Lapide, Estius, Calov, Wittich, Braun, Carpzov, Bleek [but with wavering; more decidedly in the lectures edited by Windrath, *Der Hebräerbr., erklärt von Dr. Fr. Bleek*, Elberf. 1868], Stein, Alford, Kurtz, and the majority.

[4] As Bleek I., de Wette, and Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 287 f.) deem possible.

[5] Comp. *De Profugis*, p. 458 E (with Mangey, I. p. 554): σήμερον δ' ἐστὶν ὁ ἀπέρατος καὶ ἀδιεξίτητος αἰών· μηνῶν γὰρ καὶ ἐνιαυτῶν καὶ

not consequently mean, as was still assumed by Bleek I., and recently by Reuss:[1] "when He brings in," but only: "when He shall have brought in." To take *πάλιν*, however,[2] as ver. 5, *i. e.* merely as the formula for linking on a new citation, is forbidden by the position of the words. It must then have been written: *πάλιν δέ, ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ . . . λέγει.* The possibility of an inversion of the *πάλιν* is defended, it is true, by Bleek, after the precedent of Carpzov, on the authority of two passages in Philo (*Legg. Allegor.* iii. p. 66; ed. Mangey, p. 93). But neither of these presents a case analogous to the one before us, nor does an inversion of the *πάλιν* at all take place in them. For in both *πάλιν* has the signification *in turn*, or *on the other hand*, inasmuch as in the former two classes of persons (*ὁ δὲ νοῦν τὸν ἴδιον ἀπολείπων* and *ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἀποδιδράσκων θεόν*) in the latter two classes of *δόξαι* or opinions (*ἡ μὲν τὸν ἐπὶ μέρους, τὸν γεννητὸν καὶ θνητὸν ἀπολιποῦσα* and *ἡ δὲ πάλιν θεὸν ἀποδοκιμάζουσα*), are compared together by way of contrast, in such wise that in both *πάλιν* only serves for bringing the *δέ* into stronger relief, and in both has occupied its legitimate place. By virtue of its position, *πάλιν*, in our passage, can be construed only with *εἰσαγάγῃ*, in such wise that a bringing again of the First-born into the world, which is an event still belonging to the future, is spoken of. In the former member of ver. 6 the reference can accordingly be neither to the time of the Incarnation of the Son;[3] nor to the time of the Resurrection and Exaltation to heaven;[4] nor[5] to a moment yet preceding the Incarnation of Christ, in which the Father had, by a solemn act as it were, conducted forth and presented the Son to the beings created by Him, as the First-born, as their Creator and Ruler, who was to uphold and guide all things,[6]—which in any case would be an entirely singular thought in the N. T.,—but simply and alone to the coming again of Christ to judgment, and the accomplishment of the Messianic kingdom.[7] The objection brought by Bleek and Ebrard against this interpretation of the former member, required as it is by the exigencies of the grammar, viz. that the discourse could not turn on the bringing again of the First-born into the world, unless an earlier bringing in of the same into the world, or at least

συνόλως χρόνων περίοδοι δόγματα ἀνθρώπων εἰσὶν ἀριθμὸν ἐκτετιμηκότων, τὸ δ' ἀψευδὲς ὄνομα αἰῶνος ἡ σήμερον.

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

[2] With the Peshito, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Hammond, Bengel, Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Valckenaer, Schulz, Kuinoel, Bleek, Stengel, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Reuss, *alii.*

[3] Chrysostom, Primasius, Calvin, Owen, Calov, Bengel, Storr, Kuinoel [Stuart: or beginning of His ministry], Bleek II. *alii.*

[4] Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, Wittich, Braun, Wetstein, Rambach, Peirce, Whitby, and others

[5] As Bleek I. supposed.

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

[7] So, rightly, Gregory Nyssen, *contra Eunom. Orat.* iii. p. 541; Cornelius a Lapide, Cameron [Mede: for the inauguration of His millennial kingdom], Gerhard, Calmet, Camerarius, Estius, Gomar, Böhme, de Wette, Tholuck, Bisping, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. p. 172, 2d ed.), Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 306, 617), Alford, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Woerner.

a former being of the Son *ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ* had been explicitly spoken of, is invalidated by vv. 1, 3, where certainly the discourse was already of the historic appearing of the Son on earth, and thus of a first bringing in of the same into the world. The additional objection of Bleek, however, that the author would hardly have limited the scope of a divine summons to the angels to do homage to the First-born to a time even in his day future, is set aside by the consideration that, according to ii. 9, Christ was during His earthly life humbled to a condition beneath the angels, and only the Parousia itself is the epoch at which His majesty will be unfolded in full glory.—*τὸν πρωτότοκον*] in the N. T. only here without more precisely defining addition; comp. however, Ps. lxxxix. 28 (27). That the expression must not be regarded as equivalent to *μονογενής*,[1] is self-evident. But neither is it identical with the *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, Col. i. 15, in such wise that the temporal priority of Christ, as the eternal Logos, over all creatures, and the notion of His precedence over all creatures, necessarily resulting therefrom, should be contained in the word.[2] For this interpretation is excluded by the absoluteness of the expression in our passage. Rather is Christ called the First-born with respect to Christians, who are His brethren (ii. 11 f.), and therefore likewise *υἱοί* of God (ii. 10). Comp. also Rom. viii. 29.—As, for the rest, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews terms Christ the First-born Son of God; so does Philo also term the Logos the First-born Son.[3]—*ἡ οἰκουμένη*] *the world*, not in the widest sense (equivalent to *οἱ αἰῶνες*, Bleek; or to *ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα*, (Böhme); but, since the former member has reference to the Parousia, *the habitable earth*.—*λέγει*] *sc. ὁ θεός*, not *ἡ γραφή* (Grotius, Clericus, Böhme, and others) The *present* is chosen, because the utterance of God, which shall infallibly be made in the future, stands already noted down in the Scripture.—The citation is not derived from Ps. xcvii. 7, but from Deut. xxxii. 43. For, in the former passage, the LXX. have a reading divergent from that of our text, in the words: *καὶ προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες* [*οἱ*] *ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ*, whereas in the Codex Vaticanus of Deut. xxxii. 43, the words occur as in our text; while the *καί*, taken up by the author into his citation, manifestly points—seeing that it is without any importance for his reasoning—to the verbatim reproduction of an O. T. utterance. Now, it is true our author follows in other cases a form of the Sept. text which bears affinity less to that contained in the Codex Vaticanus than to that in the Codex Alexandrinus, and the latter displays the variation from the Cod. Vat. Deut. xxxii. 43, in so far as *υἱοὶ θεοῦ* is found therein in place of *ἄγγελοι θεοῦ*. But the Song of Moses, of which Deut. xxxii. 43 forms the conclusion, is communicated anew, in many Mss. of the LXX., and so also in the Codex Alexandrinus,

[1] As is done by Primasius, Oecumenius (*τὸ δὲ πρωτότοκον οὐκ ἐπὶ δευτέρου λέγει ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ἑνὸς καὶ μόνου τοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐκ τοῦ πατρός*), Clarius, and even now by Stengel.

[2] Bleek, Grimm in the Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt *A. K.-Z.*, No. 29, p. 662; Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 292 f.; Kurtz, Ewald, and others.

[3] Comp. *de Agricultura*, p. 195 B (ed. Mangey, I. p. 308): *τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον, πρωτόγονον υἱόν. De Confus. Ling.* p. 329 (ed. Mang. I. p. 415): *τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ πρεσβύτατον υἱὸν ὁ τῶν ὄντων ἀνέτειλε πατήρ, ὃν ἑτέρωθι πρωτόγονον ὠνόμασεν, al.*

in a second recension, having its place after the Psalms; and in this second recension the Codex Alexandrinus, too, reads ἀγγελοι θεοῦ, only the article οἱ has been interpolated between πάντες and ἀγγελοι. It is probable, therefore, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews did not take the citation direct from Deut. xxxii. 43, but mediately, *i. e.* from that second recension of the hymn.—It remains to be said that the words of the citation are wanting in the Hebrew; they are found only in the LXX.—προσκυνεῖν] with the *dative* only in the case of later classic authors, whereas the earlier combine the *accusative* with this verb.[1] The N. T. has both constructions, as besides them the Hebraizing turns προσκυνεῖν ἐνώπιον, or ἐμπροσθέν τινος, or τῶν ποδῶν τινος. See the Lexicons.—αὐτῷ] That this pronoun of the third person was to be referred to the Messiah naturally suggested itself, inasmuch as Jehovah is the subject speaking immediately before in the Song. [XLII *e.*]

Vv. 7–12. Contrastful comparison of a declaration of Scripture characterizing the angels, and two declarations characterizing the Son. [On Vv. 7–14, see Note XLIII., pages 416–420.]

Ver. 7. [XLIII *a.*] Πρός] *with regard to*, as Luke xx. 19; Acts xii. 21; Rom. x. 21, and frequently.[2]—μέν] corresponds to the δέ of ver. 8, thus places ver. 7 in express opposition to ver. 8. [XLIII *b.*]—λέγει] namely, God, in the Scripture.—The citation is from Ps. civ. 4, according to the LXX. (Cod. Alex., whereas Cod. Vatican. has πῦρ φλέγον instead of πυρὸς φλόγα). The psalm praises Jehovah as the Creator and Sustainer of all nature. In the Hebrew the words cited read: עֹשֶׂה מַלְאָכָיו, רוּחוֹת מְשָׁרְתָיו אֵשׁ לֹהֵט and, having respect to their connection with what precedes and that which follows, no doubt can obtain on the point that they are to be rendered,—what is objected thereto by Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. p. 325 f., 2 Aufl.), Delitzsch, and Alford is untenable,—"God makes winds His messengers, and flames of fire (lightnings) His servants," in such wise that the thought is expressed: as the whole of nature, so are also winds and lightnings servants of God the Lord.[3] Otherwise have the LXX. apprehended the sense of the words, as is shown by the addition of the article before ἀγγέλους and λειτουργούς, and they are followed by our author. [So the Targum also.] They have taken τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ and τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ as the objects, πνεύματα and πυρὸς φλόγα, on the other hand, as the predicates to ποιῶν, thus have found the meaning of the words: "He makes His angels winds, and His servants a flame of fire." If we now observe the scope of the thought of those declarations of Scripture concerning the Son which follow, vv. 8–12, placed as they are in antithetical relation to the one before us, it is evident that the author must have discovered the inferiority of the angels compared with the Son, as attested in Scripture, in a twofold respect—(1) that the angels are ser-

[1] Comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 463; Bernhardy, *Syntax*, p. 113, 266.

[2] Comp. Matthiae, p. 1181; Winer, p. 378 [E. T. 405].

[3] Comp., as to the thought, Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, iv. 3. 14, where quite similarly lightning and winds (κεραυνός and ἄνεμοι) are called ὑπηρέται τῶν θεῶν.

vants, whereas the Son is ruler: (2) that the angels are mutable and perishable, whereas the Son abides the same for ever.—The conception of such a subjection on the part of the angels, that they must submit even to be changed into elements, is, moreover, not uncommon among the Rabbins.[1] —*πνεύματα*] not: *spirits* (Luther, Erasmus, *Paraphrase;* Clarius, Piscator, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Brochmann, Bengel, Böhme), but: *winds*—*λειτουργούς*] only another name for *ἀγγέλους*.

Vv. 8, 9 derived from Ps. xlv. 7, 8 (6, 7). The psalm is an *epithalamium*, a wedding-song. But even by Rabbins like Aben Esra, Kimchi, and others, it is Messianically interpreted.—Ver. 8. [XLIII c.] The nominative *ὁ θεός* is taken by our author in the sense of the vocative (comp. *e.g.* Col. iii. 18 ff.; Luke viii. 54; Winer, p. 172 [E. T. 182]; Kühner, II. p. 155), thus as an apostrophe to the Messiah.[2] In the Hebrew words: כִּסְאֲךָ אֱלֹהִים,אֱלֹהִים עוֹלָם וָעֶד is not vocative, but to be translated either after the analogy of Lev. xxvi. 42 (וְזָכַרְתִּי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקוֹב I will remember my Jacob's-covenant, *i. e.* the covenant made by me with Jacob), with Bleek, de Wette, and Kurtz: "thy throne of God," *i. e.* "thy divine throne;" or, with Ewald (*ad loc.* and *Gramm.* § 517): "thy throne is (throne) of God *or* divine." The Greek *ὁ θεός*, too, it has been thought by Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt *Allg. Kirch.-Zeit.* 1857, No. 29, p. 662) and Ewald (*das Sendschr. an d. Hebr.* p. 55), ought not to be explained in the sense of a vocative. According to Grimm, the words are to be taken in the acceptation: "Thy throne, *i. e.* the foundation of Thy throne, is God;" according to Ewald, they say that "the throne of the Messiah for everlasting ages is God Himself, so that where He reigns, there God Himself is virtually ever present." But the argument urged by Grimm in favor of this construction—that, since Philo, as frequently also the Christian Alexandrians, makes a sharp distinction between *ὁ θεός* (with the article) as a designation of God, and *θεός* (without an article) as designation of the Logos, it is hardly to be regarded as probable that a man of Alexandrian culture, like our author, would have called *Christ* as to His divine nature *ὁ θεός*—would have had weight only if that designation, in place of being met with in a citation, had occurred in our author's own discourse.—*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*] *sc. ἐστίν*. So LXX., Cod. Alex.; Cod. Vatican.: *εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος*. The same (merely Hellenistic) formula, strengthening the simple *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (v. 6, and often), also Tob. vi. 18; Ps. lxxxiii. 18, *al.* In independent discourse the author uses in place thereof

[1] Comp. *e. g. Shemoth rabba*, sec. 25, fol. 123. 3: "aliquando ipsos (angelos) facit ventos, q. d. qui facis angelos tuos ventos, aliquando ignem, q. d. ministros tuos flammam ignis." *Jalkut Simeoni*, part II. fol. 11. 3: "Angelus dixit ad Manoah: nescio ad cujus imaginem ego factus sim; nam Deus singulis horis nos immutat; cur ergo nomen meum interrogas? Nonnunquam facit nos ignem, alias ventum, interdum viros, alias denique angelos." See in general, Schöttgen and Wetstein *ad loc.*

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

εἰς τὸ διηνεκές. Comp. vii. 3, x. 1, xii. 14.—ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος] *a sceptre of uprightness, i. e.* of righteousness. εὐθύτης, in the N. T. only here; but comp. LXX. Ps. ix. 9, lxvii. 5, xcvi. 10, xcviii. 9. Comp. also Aeschylus, *Persae*, ver. 726 f. (according to the division in Hartung's edition, Leipzig 1853):

ἓν' ἀνδρ' ἁπάσης Ἀσίδος μηλοτρόφου
ταγεῖν, ἔχοντα σκῆπτρον εὐθυντήριον.

Ver. 9. Ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην κ.τ.λ.] *Thou lovedst righteousness and hatedst wrong.* In the Hebrew the corresponding verbs have a *present* signification: thou lovest justice and hatest wrong. Our author, however, refers the aorists of the LXX. to the historic life of the Son of God upon earth. —διὰ τοῦτο] *therefore, i. e.* as a reward for the ἀγαπᾶν δικαιοσύνην καὶ μισεῖν ἀνομίαν. Comp. διό, Phil. ii. 9. Erroneously Augustine (*in Ps.*), Thomas Aquinas, Gerhard, Dorscheus, Brochmann, Schöttgen, and others: *for this cause*, that thou mightest love righteousness, etc.—ἐχρισέν σε, ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός σου ἔλαιον κ.τ.λ.] [XLIII *d.*] *O God, Thy God hath Thee anointed with oil of gladness above Thy companions.* Here, too, the author takes ὁ θεός as an apostrophe,[1] whereas in the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים is the subject to מְשָׁחֲךָ, and is taken up again into the discourse, and more nearly defined by אֱלֹהֶיךָ. The anointing with the oil of joy in the psalm is a figurative designation of the blessing and abundance given by God. Our author, however, understands it of the anointing to be king, as a figure of the divine glory with which the Son, after His life upon earth and His exaltation to heaven, has been crowned. Comp. also Acts iv. 27, ii. 36. The sense of the author is departed from when the Fathers and earlier expositors interpret the expression of the anointing of the Son with the Holy Ghost.—On the double accusative combined with ἐχρισεν (Rev. iii. 18), see Winer, p. 212 [E. T. 226]. As an analogon, comp. also Aristophanes, *Acharn.* 114: ἵνα μή σε βάψω βάμμα Σαρδιανικόν.—Παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου] [XLIII *e.*] refers in the original to the contemporary kings, the rulers of other lands. But what our author understood by it in the application is obscure. Kuinoel, Ebrard, Delitzsch, and Moll suppose the author, like the Psalmist, to intend the other kings; Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 306), all earthly and heavenly princes; Wittich, Braun, Cramer, the kings, high priests, and prophets of the O. T., inasmuch as they were anointed as types of Christ; Klee, all the creatures; Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Bengel, and Bisping, men in general; Theodoret, Calvin, Beza, Cameron, Piscator, Schlichting, Maier, Kurtz, the Christians specially [Owen hesitates between *all believers* and *prophets and apostles*]; Bleek, Olshausen, Alford, and Ewald finally, after the precedent of Peirce and others, *the angels*, "as beings which do not indeed appear as sitting at the right hand of God, but yet as existing in immediate proximity to the divine throne." The last supposition is the most probable. It is true de Wette regards it

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

as the least conceivable, because the author has "placed the angels in no other position than deeply below Christ," and Ebrard even thinks the author must have been "beside himself" if he had referred the words to the angels. But (1) it is a question throughout the whole section of a comparison of Christ with the angels; the renewed indication of this point of comparison also in ver. 9 cannot therefore in itself be found unsuitable. (2) If shortly before (ver. 7) the angels are placed deeply below Christ, so it will be admitted their inferiority is likewise expressly intimated by means of παρά in our passage. (3) The angels were, in the conception of the author, the next in rank after Christ; for they are exalted above men. To whom, therefore, could the author more fittingly apply the designation μέτοχοι than precisely to them? The objection of Delitzsch, finally, that after all angels are not anointed ones, would be of weight only if the author were obliged of necessity to think of the μέτοχοι too as anointed; he finds, on the contrary, in the anointing only of the Son, a fact expressed, from which the exaltedness of the same above His companions, *i.e.* of those who of all others stand nearest to Him in dignity, is necessarily deduced. For παρά is used here not in the sense of the quantity arising from the notion of comparison, but denotes the part accruing to one to the exclusion of others.

Vv. 10–12. A second citation—co-ordinate with the Scripture testimony adduced, vv. 8, 9—derived from Ps. cii. 26–28 (25–27) according to the LXX. [XLIII *f.*] The psalm is a lamentation, belonging probably to the first century after the Captivity. The words of address refer in the original to God. The author, however, mainly indeed misled[1] by the κύριε in the LXX., which was the ordinary appellation of Christ in apostolic time, takes the utterance as an address to Christ, the Son of God. This interpretation must the more have appeared to him unquestionable, inasmuch as the scope of the utterance fully harmonized with his own conception of the Son of God as the premundane Logos. Comp. vv. 2, 3. When, for the rest, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. p. 169 f., 2 Aufl.) supposes that the author found no address whatever to Christ designed in the κύριε of the psalm, but only meant to say in the words of Scripture what was true of Jesus according to his own belief and that presupposed in the readers, this is a freak of fancy without anything to justify it, and even opposed to the context (comp. πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν, (ver. 8). For the author can have been concerned only about this very object of proving the higher attestation

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

given to his assertion by the Scriptures.—Καί] not a constituent part of the citation, but a brief formula of connecting, when a further passage of Scripture is linked to that which precedes, comp. Acts i. 20.—σὺ κατ' ἀρχάς, κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας] LXX. Cod. Alex.: κατ' ἀρχὰς σύ, κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας; Cod. Vatic.: κατ' ἀρχὰς τὴν γῆν σύ, κύριε, ἐθεμελίωσας. It is probable the author changed the position of the words in order to make σύ the more emphatic. —κατ' ἀρχάς] *in the beginning.* With the LXX. elsewhere only Ps. cxix. 152, instead of the more usual ἐν ἀρχῇ or ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, but frequently met with in Philo and the classics (see Raphel, Wetstein, and Munthe *ad loc.*). In the Hebrew stands the more general לְפָנִים, "formerly," or "of old."

Ver. 11. Αὐτοί] refers back not to earth and heaven, ver. 10, taken together (Kuinoel, Stuart, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Kurtz), but, as is evident from the following πάντες, and in particular from ἑλίξεις, ver. 12, only to οἱ οὐρανοί.—ἀπολοῦνται] *shall perish.* Comp. Isa. xxxiv. 4, li. 6, lxv. 17; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xx. 11, xxi. 1.—σὺ δὲ διαμένεις] *but Thou abidest for evermore* (throughout all duration of time, διά). On account of the environment of futures, and because the future is used here in the Hebrew, Bleek, after the example of Luther, Cornelius a Lapide, Peirce, Bengel, Wetstein, *alii*, accentuates: διαμενεῖς. So also the Vulgate (permanebis). Hardly in the sense of the author. For, since he employed only the LXX., not the Hebrew original, he surely took σὺ δὲ διαμ. as a parallel member to σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, ver. 12, consequently also construed the former as a *present.*—ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσονται] *will grow old like a garment*, which by long use is worn out and laid aside, to be replaced by a new and better one. Comp. Isa. l. 9, li. 6; Ecclus. xiv. 17.

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

Ver. 13. Further citation from Ps. cx. 1, according to the LXX. The psalm was looked upon universally in the time of Christ (comp. Matt. xxii. 44 ff.; Mark xii. 35 ff.; Luke xx. 41 ff.), and also in later times by many Rabbins (see Wetstein on Matt. xxii. 44), as a prophecy relating to the Messiah; inasmuch as on the ground of the superscription לְדָוִד David himself was regarded as the author of it, and in connection with this view the reference to the Messiah was easily proved on the ground of the words at the beginning: "to my Lord speaketh Jehovah," according to which David acknowledges, in addition to his God, also a Lord over him. The superscription לְדָוִד, nevertheless, indicates not the writer, but the subject of the psalm. It is in its historic sense an oracle pronounced *to* David, when the latter was preparing for war against his powerful foes. See Ewald on the Psalm.—[illegible] in the *third* place, as often occurs

after prepositional combinations.[1]—The sitting at the right hand, figure of the highest honor and dominion, see on ver. 3.—*ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου*] *the footstool of Thy feet.* There lies in the expression an allusion to the custom of the victor of placing his foot upon the neck of the vanquished, in token of the complete subjection of the latter; comp. Josh. x. 24.—*ὑποπόδιον*] first used in the Greek of a later age.[2]

Ver. 14. Confirmation of the *πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἴρηκέν ποτε*, showing the inconceivableness of such a thing by a reference to the nature of the angels, and with this the termination of the present train of thought.—The emphasis rests upon *πάντες* and *λειτουργικά*: are not *all* (alike, whether they belong to a lower or higher class of angels) *ministering* spirits [spirits *in waiting*]? *πνεύματα* here in a different sense from ver. 7.—*εἰς διακονίαν*] [XLIII *g.*] *for service, sc.* which they render *to God*, not to the men who shall inherit the *σωτηρία*; otherwise, in place of *διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας*, the dative *τοῖς μέλλουσι κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν* (1 Cor. xvi. 15) or the genitive *τῶν μελλόντων κ.τ.λ.* would have been placed.—The participle *present ἀποστελλόμενα* brings out the permanent, habitual character of the action expressed by the verb.—*διὰ τοὺς κ.τ.λ.*] *for the sake of those who shall inherit* (everlasting) *salvation* (this is intended by *σωτηρίαν*, although without the article, see Winer, p. 114 [E. T. 120]; not: *deliverance from peril*, as Michaelis, Schleusner, Böhme, Kuinoel assume), *i. e.* in order, by means of the offices in which they are employed by God, to bring it in for the same.

Notes by American Editor.

XLI. Vv. 1–3.

(*a*) The Epistle to the Hebrews differs from the Pauline Epistles at its beginning, not merely in the fact that the name of the author is not given, but also in two other points which are connected with this omission. There is no salutation—"grace and peace" to the readers,—and, also, no introductory passage of a general character. On the other hand, the writer proceeds at once to state the subject on which he proposes to discourse, in vv. 1–3, and then enters immediately upon his extended argument. The subject of the Epistle is: The superiority of the N. T. system or revelation to the O. T. system or revelation. This subject, however, is not presented in the form of a definite proposition, such as might be found at the beginning of a treatise or a philosophical thesis, but, after the manner of Paul's Epistles, in the form which is characteristic of a letter addressed to a church for the final purpose of admonition and exhortation. The Epistle is rhetorical, and artistically arranged, in a degree quite beyond the ordinary letters of Paul, but it nowhere loses the character of a letter, or assumes that of a rhetorical or oratorical discourse.

(*b*) In the statement of the subject or proposition to be proved, the writer sets forth the superiority of the N. T. to the O. T. revelation, *primarily*, by describing it as *ἐν υἱῷ*, and *secondarily* (in connection with this fact), as being,—not, like the

[1] Comp. Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 378 f.; Hartung, *Partikellehre*, I. p. 190 f.; Ellendt, *Lexic. Soph.* I. p. 397; Winer, p. 519, [E. T. 558].

[2] Comp. Sturz, *de dial. Alex. et Maced.* p. 190.

O. T. system, revealed *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*, but—complete and full. The *primary* emphasis on the thought suggested by *ἐν υἱῷ* of ver. 2 is shown by the fact, that the whole of the following argument is the setting forth of Christ as superior to the agents employed for introducing and carrying forward the O. T. system; and the *secondary* emphasis on the other point is made clear by many hints and statements in the course of the argument, as well as by the prominent position given to the two adverbs at the opening of the first verse. In this connection, it may be noticed that the words *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις*—though, in the position given them in the arrangement and statement of vv. 1, 2, they are coördinate (in contrast) with *ἐν υἱῷ*—are, in relation to the substance of thought filling the Epistle, scarcely more than mere descriptive words characterizing the O. T. revelation. The contrasts of the Epistle are not between Christ and the prophets, but *first*, between Christ and the angels and Moses, and *secondly*, between Christ and the O. T. High-priests. The angels and Moses are the instrumental agents who introduce the old system; the High priests, the instrumental agents who carry it forward. The prophets are not spoken of as connected with either office. Indeed the word *prophet* is not used elsewhere in the Epistle, except in the enumeration of the heroes of faith in xi. 32, "Samuel and the prophets." The special emphasis on *πολυμ. καὶ πολυτρ.* in the arrangement of words in ver. 1 is due to the demands of the thought *in that verse*, rather than of the thought *in the epistle*. As related to the thought of the epistle, the rendering of R. V. brings out the emphasis correctly:—"God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His Son," or, as in the marg., *a Son*.

(*c*) With respect to the words of ver. 1, the following points may be noticed: 1. God is evidently declared to be the author of the two revelations.—2. The verb *λαλεῖν* has in these verses, and so, to a considerable extent, throughout the epistle, a certain technical or peculiar sense, and refers to the revelations which God makes.—3. The two adverbs, at the beginning, serve the purpose of setting forth the partial and incomplete character of the O. T. revelation. The distinction between them is that which is given by Lünemann in his note.—4. *ἐν* does not mean *by*, but *in*.—5. If the text-reading *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων* is adopted, as it undoubtedly should be, *τ. ἡμ. τουτ.* is used as equivalent to *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος*, and the N. T. revelation is conceived of (as ordinarily by the N. T. writers) as made in the closing period of the ante-Messianic age, *i. e.*, the period before the full establishment of the Messianic kingdom.—6. *υἱῷ* is translated both by A. V. and R. V. "*his* Son." It is difficult, in a version, to express the exact idea of *υἱῷ* as here used in distinction from *τῷ υἱῷ*, or *τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ*. What the writer means is: one who stands in the relation of *son* to God, and not in the position of a mere *prophet*. It is a characteristic, descriptive word here, and not a proper name. *What Christ is, as Son*, is set forth in the sentences which follow, and, indeed, throughout the epistle.

(*d*) The statements in vv. 2, 3 respecting the one who is *υἱός* are contained in three relative clauses, the last of which includes several minor and participial clauses. If the progress of the compound sentence is closely observed, it can hardly fail to be noticed that the verbs are intended to be arranged in a certain chronological succession. This is clear in the case of *ἐποίησεν—ποιησάμενος—ἐκάθισεν*; and, this being the fact, it can hardly be otherwise than true, that the same holds good respecting *ἐθηκεν*, as related to the other words. As the verb

ἐποίησεν evidently refers to the time of creation, ἔθηκεν must have reference to what preceded that time, and hence is, doubtless, to be understood of the eternal purpose of God, who appointed the Son, while in His condition as λόγος ἀσαρκος, heir of all things. In the carrying out of this purpose, He made the worlds through Him; employed Him as the one who should make purification of sins; gave Him a seat at His own right hand in the Heavens; and bestowed upon Him a more excellent name than on any other. The correspondence of this description of the Son with that which is given by Paul in Col. i. 15 ff. is very noticeable. See, also, notes of Amer. Ed. on that passage in Col., in *Meyer's vol. on Phil., Col. and Thess.* The idea of κληρονόμον πάντων, which is not presented in Col., is here introduced, not improbably, in connection with, and as preparatory to, the thought of the dominion of Christ, which is referred to in the latter part of this chapter, and of that glorious consummation which is alluded to in chap. ii. The suggestion of the Headship of Christ and His exaltation is made, in another form and in a somewhat different connection, in Eph. i. 20 ff., Phil. ii. 8–10, and at the end of the passage in Col. (i. 18 *b*).

(*c*) The word ἀπαύγασμα (ver. 3) is one whose precise meaning has been much discussed and is quite difficult of determination. It is derived from ἀπό and αὐγασμα, αὐγάζω, αὐγή. The formation in μα and the most natural sense of ἀπό would seem to suggest the idea of light flashed or rayed forth from a luminous body. If, however, ἀπό is to be understood in the sense which it has in the kindred verb of sound, ἀπηχέω, *to sound back*, and in the corresponding noun ἀπήχημα, *echo* (or the sound coming back, or sent back, from an object which has been struck, as it were, by that which went forth from the resounding body), the idea of ἀπαύγασμα will be that of *reflection*. Either sense of ἀπό in compounds is, apparently, allowable. This word occurs in but few places, and unfortunately for the decision of the question of its exact signification, the passages in which it is found are open to dispute. There is but one passage in the O. T. Apoc. books, Wisd. vii. 26, and none in the O. T. or N. T. except the one before us, which can throw any light on the meaning. Directly opposite views are held, as e. g. by Bleek and Lünem, respecting Wisd. vii. 26. The fact mentioned by Lünem., that ἐσοπτρον and εἰκών are used in parallel clauses of that verse, is undoubtedly favorable to his understanding of ἀπαύγ. as there used. But it is not decisive, because the writer may have intended to use two figures—one of rayed-forth light, as connected with ἀίδιον φῶς, and another of a mirror or image, as related to ἐνέργεια and ἀγαθότης (see the words of the passage in Wisd., as quoted by Lünem.); and, as Bleek says, the meaning may be, that wisdom is a light beaming forth from the everlasting light, and, for this very reason, an image, etc. The passages cited from Philo and other writers by different comm. are equally uncertain, though the first one which Lünem. gives from Philo seems to be more naturally interpreted according to Bleek's view.

The position taken by Lünem., that the form in μα, as distinguished from μος, determines the question, can hardly be sustained. All that the form in μα requires is, that the *passive* idea should be in the substantive, and this is found in the *flashed-forth* light. More properly we may say, with Cremer (Lex. N. T.), that the noun may mean either *brightness* or *reflection*, so far as its derivation is concerned;—and so we must form our conclusion according to the probabilities of the passage which may be before us. In noticing these in the present case, we may observe that δόξα seems to refer to the being of God as manifesting itself outwardly, and ὑπόστασις

to the being of God in its inward essence. This being the fact, we may believe that the writer had in his mind the two ideas, and that, in his description of the Son, he intended to set forth His relation to God, with emphasis and completeness, by the use of the two words. If this was his purpose, it is probable that he did not desire simply to make an ordinary parallelism— as of a *reflected image* of a luminous body and a *stamped image* of a die or stamp;—but that he wished to go beyond this, and, in his parallelism, express in each part that which belonged to the peculiar figurative word which he selected. The Son is, thus, on the side of the δόξα (the outward manifestation of God's being) *the effulgence—the rayed-forth light*,—which comes from it, and, on the side of the ὑπόστασις (the inward essence) *the express image, the exact counterpart*, answering to it.

The decision between the two possible meanings of ἀπαύγασμα is, however, not essential to the doctrine of the passage, and is not of great importance even as bearing upon the main thought of the two clauses; for, in either case, the interpretation of the words places them in close relation with the words of Paul, in his later Epistles, and of John, in his Gospel, and makes this writer declare that Christ is εἰκὼν θεοῦ, with all which that expression involves.

Grimm (Lex. N. T.) gives to ἀπαύγασμα the meaning *splendor repercussus;* L. and S. 7th ed. and Rob. regard it as meaning *effulgence.* R. V., and A. V., as well as the recent English translations generally, adopt the latter signification: *effulgence, brightness.* So also, in addition to the writers mentioned by Lünem., Alf., W. and Wilk., Bib. Comm., Angus., in Schaff's Pop. Comm., Stuart and others. Ebrard translates by *ray-image*—"a light radiated from another light, and viewed as now become an independent light"—thus fully satisfying the passive form.

(*f*) There can be no reasonable doubt, both by reason of the correspondence with δόξα and because the use of the word in the sense of *person* belongs only to a later time, that ὑπόστασις here denotes *essence* or *substance*—that which stands under the outward form. Of this essential being of God the Son is the χαρακτήρ, *the very image* (R. V. text), *the impress* (R. V. marg). Ebrard says, "As it belongs to the δόξα to concentrate and reproduce itself in a form composed of rays, a sun, so it is proper to the οὐσία or ὑπόστασις to stamp itself out in a manifest form or figure. This form or figure, however, is not to be viewed as a copy, but as an immediate and substantial rendering visible and corporeal, of the ὑπόστασις."

(*g*) The close connection of the φέρων clause with the preceding words by τε, is, doubtless, intended to intimate that the statement of this clause naturally follows upon that which goes before. Being the ἀπαύγασμα κ.τ.λ., it is His office, as to create, so also to sustain all things. The participles ὤν and φέρων are evidently continuous present participles, and indicate what the Son is in His permanent existence and in His work of power.—(*h*) The word αὐτοῦ, in the expression τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, is to be referred to Christ for the following reasons:— 1. Because the clause is a participial descriptive clause, which has reference to the Son. 2. Because the action spoken of (φέρων) is an action of the Son. 3. Because there is nothing in the surrounding context which necessitates any other reference. 4. Because the entire passage is evidently designed to set forth the glory of the Son. 5. Because the instrumental agency of the Son in the creation, as presented in the kindred passages of John (Gosp. i. 3) and Paul (Col. i. 16 f.), points only to what is declared here in the last clause of ver. 2; while what Paul says in Col. i. 17 (αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν) accords rather with the present verse, if αὐτοῦ is understood of the Son, than if of

the Father. The complete dependence of the creation on the Son is the idea on which both writers are insisting with emphasis. 6. Because the statement, if *αὐτοῦ* is made to refer to the Father, contains a thought not thus formally expressed elsewhere in the N. T.

(*i*) The participle *ποιησάμενος* is antecedent to *ἐκάθισεν*, and describes the work of the Son while in His earthly life, and what He accomplished especially through His death. The preceding participles are clearly distinguished from this, and their reference and significance are indicated by this fact, as well as by the other suggestions of the passage. The explanation: cleansing, or purifying *from*, rather than *of*, which is given by Lünem. to *καθαρισμόν* as connected with *τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν* is probably correct; comp. 2 Pet. i. 9. Bleek, Alf., and others say *of*. De W. agrees with Lünem. It does not seem probable, on the other hand,—certainly, not necessary,—that *ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* should be taken, as Lünem. holds, with *ἐκάθισεν*. The connection with *μεγαλωσύνης* is sustained by a number of parallel cases in the N. T., where the article is omitted with a defining prepositional phrase following a noun; and by means of this connection the expression here used becomes more simple and natural.

XLII. Vv. 4-6.

(*a*) At the 4th verse the development of the subject of the epistle begins, and from this point the argument in proof of the proposition involved in the first three verses moves steadily forward through the entire letter, until the end of the twelfth chapter is reached. The plan of the epistle is fundamentally different from that which we discover in the principal doctrinal epistles of Paul. In the latter, Paul has, in each case, a doctrinal section, containing the proof of the proposition which he desires to establish; and only when this is finished does he turn to a practical section, whose exhortations are more or less connected with what has been previously proved. This writer, on the other hand, carries his argument, as just intimated, throughout his whole work, and interweaves into it a hortatory element at every stage of its progress. This hortatory element is everywhere the same. The exhortation is always directed to one object—that the readers should not abandon the N. T. system and go back to Judaism, but should hold fast and endure to the end. It is repeated at the close of the presentation of each point of the argument; and, in each successive case, the readers are urged to yield to it in view of what has been established in the next preceding sub-section.

The underlying thought of the writer, as he begins his course of reasoning, seems evidently to be the following:—The N. T. system is superior to the O. T. system, in the first place, because the instrumental agent employed by God to introduce it is more exalted than the instrumental agents employed to introduce the O. T. Of these latter agents there were two: the angels and Moses. Christ is more exalted than either of these. And *first*, He is more exalted than the angels. This underlying thought is plainly indicated by the progress of the argument, but it is left to the reader to supply. It must be supplied at the beginning of ver. 4 in order to make the statement of the plan, and also of the proof, complete.

It is the last of these points which is now developed:—Christ is more exalted than the angels. This is proved, *first*, in what may be described as a more *direct;* and, *secondly*, in what may be styled a more *indirect* way. The former in i. 5–14; the latter in ii. 5–18. The hortatory passage belonging to the former includes ii. 1–4; that which belongs to the latter is found in iii. 1. Then follows, in iii. 2—

iv. 16, the comparison of Christ with Moses, together with a hortatory passage appertaining to it. In the direct setting forth of the superiority of Christ to the angels two points are presented: 1. He is called Son, while they are called servants, vv. 5–7. 2. He has everlasting dominion, while they are sent forth as messengers and ministers, vv. 8–14.

(*b*) While the plan of the epistle, as well as the absence of any salutation or introductory passage, distinguishes it from the Pauline writings, it will be noticed that the omission of what has been alluded to as an underlying thought, and the manner in which the first point of the argument is brought in, as grammatically subordinate to the verb *ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ.*, are characteristic of Paul's style. We find thus, here as everywhere throughout the epistle, that combination of resemblances to the letters of the Apostle with marked differences, which renders the question of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews one of so much difficulty. It must be admitted, however, that these points of unlikeness which are met with at the very beginning, and which have been mentioned, are deserving of most serious consideration. They are points connected with the essential elements of an author's thought and his manner of writing, and points in which it is not easy to believe that a man of Paul's peculiar habits of mind would have turned aside, in one of his epistles, from his ordinary course in his other writings.

(*c*) The view of Lünem., expressed at the beginning of his note on ver. 4,—that the author at first, in vv. 1–3, has reference to the O. T. revelations in general, and now, in this verse, turns to the Mosaic—is hardly to be accepted, because it breaks the unity of the passage, and because the comparison throughout all the epistle is between the Mosaic and the Christian revelations.

(*d*) As to the individual words and phrases of vv. 4–7, the following points may be noticed:—1. *γενόμενος* is, as Lünem. also says, to be connected with *ἐκάθισεν*, and thus refers to the time when Christ took His seat at the right hand, etc. It indicates, together with the verb, the last step in that succession which begins with *ἐθηκεν* of ver. 2.—2. With respect to *κεκληρονόμηκεν* Alford justly remarks, that "the *κρείττων γενόμ.* is not identical with it, but in proportion to it: the triumphant issue of His Mediation is consonant to the glorious name which is His by inheritance." The verb *κληρον.* is, thus, used because Christ, in His very nature, stands and has always stood in the relation of *υἱός*, and also because, in a certain sense and completeness, He entered into possession of His glory as *υἱός* at the time when His earthly work was finished.—3. With respect to the question of the time indicated by *σήμερον*, it may be noticed: (*x*) that the time-element is not the prominent one in the writer's thought as he introduces these citations; *υἱός* is the emphatic word. It is not impossible, therefore, that the citations are made without attaching any definite notion to *σήμερον*, as Riehm and de Wette suggest. It is evident, however, (*y*) that, if *πάλιν* of ver. 6 is explained according to its position in the sentence, there is a reference in that verse to time—a fact which would seem to suggest, at least, a similar reference in ver. 5. It will, also, be observed (*z*) that, in the O. T. passages as originally written (Ps. ii. 7 and 2 Sam. vii. 14), the time-element is not without prominence. While it cannot properly be affirmed, therefore, with Lünem., that the view of de W. and Riehm involves an unexegetical supposition, it must be regarded as not improbable that the writer of the epistle had in his mind the idea of time. If he had this idea, the determination as to what the time which he thought of was, will depend on the adjustment to each other of two points:—*first*, the evident fact that in the O. T. the

words, both in Ps. ii. and 2 Sam. vii., refer primarily to Solomon (or in Ps. ii. to some Israelitish king), and, so far as they are Messianic, to the Messiah's reign on earth, and, *secondly*, the preceding and following context in this chapter. This adjustment seems, on the whole, to be most successfully made by carrying back—in the transference of the application of the words from the earthly king to the Divine Son—the time of constituting the sonship, or "begetting," to the period indicated in ἐθηκεν κ.τ.λ. of ver. 2. There are, then, two epochs referred to,—that in ver. 2, when it was said to the Son, "Thou art, etc.; To-day have I begotten thee," and "I will be to him," etc.; and that in ver. 6, when it is said, "Let all the angels worship him:"—the epoch of His appointment as heir of all things, and the epoch of the final consummation of His glory at the end of His work. Both parts of ver. 5 have reference to the same time.—4. The position of πάλιν, of ver. 6, in the sentence in which it stands, and the connection of the verses, make it almost, if not indeed absolutely, certain, that it is not parallel with the same word in ver. 5 *b*, but that it qualifies εἰσαγάγῃ. The objections to this view, which are mentioned by Bleek, in his first edition, and Ebrard, are satisfactorily answered by Lünemann. The appropriateness of the word εἰσαγάγῃ to express the idea of the introduction to the full possession of the kingdom (comp. Exod. xiii. 5; Deut. vi. 10, etc.); the reference of οἰκουμένη in ii. 5 to the Messianic αἰών; the following verses of this chapter which speak of eternal dominion and the subjection of all enemies; and the evident intention of the author, in the early verses, to cover in thought the whole progress of the work of the Son, even to its end;—all these things point very clearly to the second coming as indicated by πάλιν.

(*c*) Ver. 7 may be regarded as having a twofold connection. By the construction with μέν and δέ, and the correspondence of πρὸς τοὺς ἀγγέλους with πρὸς τὸν υἱόν, it is evidently intended to have a close relation to ver. 8. By the indication that the angels are, like the winds and the lightning, mere servants of God, it stands in contrast to ver. 5, where Christ is presented as Son, and gives, as it were, a ground for the call upon the angels to worship Him, which is quoted from the LXX., in ver. 6.

XLIII. Vv. 7–14.

(*a*) The immediate and special connection of ver. 7 is, as intimated in the preceding note, with ver. 8, and the καί at the beginning of the verse adds the statement of these two verses to that of vv. 5, 6. That the sense of the original passage, Ps. civ. 4, is different from that of the LXX. translation which is quoted by the writer of the epistle, is rendered probable by the verses which precede and follow the one quoted, and by the progress of thought in the Psalm. We may hold, therefore, with Lünem., Bleek, Ebrard, de Wette, W. and Wilk. and other comm., that the Heb. is to be translated, as in A. R. V., "Who maketh winds his messengers, flames of fire, his ministers." [R. V., gives this rendering for the first clause, but translates the second, "his ministers a flaming fire"]. On the ground that the order of the words in this verse is different from that in the previous verses of the Psalm, and that the rendering favored by Lünem., joins a singular object *flaming fire* with a plural predicate, Alford, Delitzsch, Stuart and some others insist that the Heb., means: "who maketh his messengers winds," etc. Moll holds that, as the Hebrew verb here used, when it has a double Acc., usually means *to make out of something*, the words may be properly translated: "making His messengers out of winds, His servants out of flaming fire."

The writer to the Hebrews evidently quotes from the LXX., and, whatever may be true as to the O. T. passage as originally written, his idea is that the angels are, like the winds and the lightning, mere ministers or servants for the accomplishment of God's will.

(*b*) As πρός of ver. 7 must be translated *with respect to*, there can be little doubt that the same meaning is to be given to πρός in ver. 8. The preposition in the latter verse might be taken, so far as the verse itself is concerned, in the ordinary sense of *to*, and so Bleek understands it. He holds that the author uses πρός in the same sense in the 7th ver., also, without being distinctly conscious that the words there cited are not, after the same manner, addressed to the angels, as those of ver. 8 are to the Son. But the argument in the case goes rather from ver. 7 to ver. 8, than from ver. 8 to ver. 7.

(*c*) The comm. generally regard ὁ θεός of ver. 8 as a vocative, both in this author's use of the words and in the LXX. So Lünem., Alf., Moll, W. and Wilk, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, de Wette, Delitzsch, and many others. Comp., also, Buttm., p. 140. As to the construction in the orginal Heb. of the Psalm, there is much more difference of opinion, but a large proportion of the best recent writers hold that the Hebrew word, also, is a vocative. The writer of the present note would offer the following suggestions with respect to the matter:

1. There is no reasonable ground to doubt that the author of this Epistle believed, as Paul and John did, in the divinity of Christ. The correspondence between the early verses of this chapter and such passages as John i. 1 ff. and Col. i. 15 ff. (see Note of Am. Ed. in Meyer's Comm. on Col.) places this beyond question. The legitimate and natural explanation of vv. 2, 3 of this Chap., also, establishes this view. Whatever, therefore, may be true as to ὁ θεός in ver. 8, or *Elohim* in Ps. xlv. 6, the doctrine of this Epistle is not affected. The question concerns the statement *of this particular verse alone*, and is only as to whether the name *God* is given to Christ *in this place.*

2. With regard to this question it may be noticed, *first*, that *Elohim* in the O. T. passage is, by no means, necessarily a vocative, but may be either a genitive in sense: "thy throne of God"=thy divine throne, or thy throne is (throne) of God, or divine—in the former case, the *Elohim* having more of the adjective-genitive character, and, in the latter, more of the predicate-genitive character;—or it may be a predicate nominative: "thy throne is God"=God is the foundation of thy throne. [R. V. gives, as a marginal rendering, "Thy throne is the throne of God"]; *secondly*, that the explanation of *Elohim* in the Hebrew Psalm as a vocative is opposed by the fact, that this word is not used of the person addressed anywhere else in the Psalm; that, on the other hand, God is spoken of as distinct from him in two different places—as blessing him in ver. 2, and anointing him in ver. 7; and that God is even described in ver. 7 as his (thy) God. The explanation of the word as a genitive or nominative, on the contrary, is favored by all that is said of the honor and majesty of the ruler referred to as *given to him* by God, as the reward of his loving righteousness, etc.; *thirdly*, it must be admitted, however, that the genitive and predicate constructions alluded to are, in sentences of this sort, somewhat less simple and natural than that with the vocative, provided the latter be possible, as it certainly is here. The passages cited in support of these constructions are few in number, and it is claimed by some writers, that none of them are exactly parallel to the one before us. This latter position, however, cannot be sustained,—at least, so far as to exclude their force as confirm-

ing the possibility of a corresponding explanation here; *fourthly*, as the Psalm has, apparently, a Messianic character, it is more difficult than it might be in other cases, to pronounce a decisive judgment respecting the employment in it of such a word as *Elohim* as a vocative of address; yet, inasmuch as there can be little doubt that it had a primary reference to some earthly ruler (perhaps, Solomon), it would seem that its interpretation must be mainly determined by this fact. Now it is to be noticed that, while the word *Elohim* is applied to kings or magistrates in two or three places in the O. T., Ps. lxxxii. vv. 1, 6, Ex. xxi. 6, xxii. 8, it is thus applied, apparently, not to the individual magistrate, but to the collective magistracy (comp. Delitzsch on this verse). It is nowhere used as a title in addressing a human ruler.—In view of these considerations, it seems, on the whole, not improbable that *Elohim* in the original Psalm-passage is to be regarded, not as a vocative, but as having a genitive or nominative character. This explanation of the word, however, cannot be insisted upon as more than probable. It cannot, by any means, be affirmed as beyond question.

3. Respecting the words as used by this writer, who quotes from the LXX, it is clear that the genitive construction is impossible. That ὁ θεός, however, may be a predicate nominative, and that the meaning may be, as Grimm gives it, "Thy throne, i. e. the foundation of thy throne, is God," can hardly be denied. On the other hand, the use of the nominative, with the article, as a vocative is, as Buttm. says, well-known both in the O. T., and N. T., and is also found in the colloquial language of classical writers, such as Plato and Aristophanes. In an ordinary and independent N. T. sentence, written in this form, the interpretation of ὁ θεός as a vocative would, undoubtedly, be the most natural one. But, in the present case, the fact that it is an O. T. passage, which, in the original Hebrew, may probably, or at least not improbably, have had another construction, must be borne in mind, and must be allowed such weight as it deserves.

4. It is worthy of consideration, also, that the writer of the Epistle does not seem to use this word θεός as showing the superiority of Christ to the angels; that is, he does not seem to make it a prominent point in his argument. This is indicated by two facts connected with the passage: (*x*) the fact, that the main statement of the cited verses, and the main idea which the author of the Epistle apparently desires to set forth in his use of them, is that the throne of the Son is for ever and ever, i. e. that He has had bestowed upon Him everlasting dominion, while the angels have not; and not that He is θεός, while they are not; and (*y*) the fact, that the word θεός, which, if intended to be used in the argument, was of more significance and importance than any other in the entire passage, is introduced in so incidental a way, and is passed over without emphasis, and without developing or dwelling upon the idea which it suggests. If the author not only understood the O. T., in these verses, to declare the Son to be God, but proposed to make use of this declaration as presenting a great fact respecting His exaltation above the angels, in the same way as he did of the statement in ver. 5 *a*, it seems very strange, that he should not have placed it at the beginning of his argument. This was the position which would naturally have been assigned to it; because, if the Son was God, His superiority to the angels was put beyond question, and the revelation through Him was the greatest of all possible revelations. Indeed, if He was addressed as God and declared to be God in the O. T., what further proof of His superiority to the angels and Moses could be needed in a writing whose entire argument is so manifestly founded upon the statements of the O. T.? It is

evident, however, that the writer makes no further allusion to these words—as involving a declaration that Christ has the name υἱός—in the entire course of the Epistle, and that he does not lay emphasis, in any other passage, on the fact that He has this name.

The considerations on the different sides of this question, which have been thus briefly, and some of them incidentally, mentioned, must influence the decision that is reached. It seems possible to take one or another of three positions. In the first place, we may assume, either (*x*) that the writer to the Hebrews uses ὁ θεός as a vocative—founding our view upon the greater simplicity and naturalness of the construction in the Greek, and perhaps, also, in the Hebrew, if the word is thus understood; or (*y*) that he uses it as a nominative—giving the greater weight to the other reasons suggested above. In the second place, if we adopt (*x*), we may hold either (*x**) that, in the use of the vocative, he intended to make the statement, which the employment of the name θεός might naturally involve, a part of his proof of the main proposition which he was undertaking to defend; or (*x***) that, without any such intention, he simply cited the passage as he found it in the LXX.—allowing the vocative to express whatever it might to the mind of any reader, but not designing to press it as a vital point in the argument. The probabilities of the case seem to the writer of this note to favor either *x*** or *y*, rather than *x**. Perhaps *x*** may be regarded as the view which best meets the difficulties of the case.

(*d*) The construction of the first ὁ θεός in ver. 9 is, also, a point of discussion among commentators. A. R. V. marg., Lünem., Blk., Ebr., de W., and others hold that the writer of the epistle uses this, also, as a vocative. R. V., A. R. V. text, A. V., Alf., Grimm, and many others regard it as a nominative, with which the second ὁ θεός is in apposition. The opinion is almost universal that the word in the Hebrew is, in this case, a nominative, (Ebrard, however, denies this), and there seems to be no reason for making it a vocative as used in the epistle, except the correspondence with the (supposed) vocative in ver. 8. But such a correspondence is not demanded by the passage, and the reasons which may be thought to require the explanation of ὁ θεός, of ver. 8, in this way, do not exist in connection with ver. 9. Delitzsch, Stuart, and some others agree with A. R. V. in allowing either rendering of the word in this verse. Prof. Stuart, at the end of his notes on vv. 8, 9 has the following words: "Does the word θεός here denote the *divine* or the *kingly* nature or condition of the Messiah? Most interpreters, who admit the doctrine of the Saviour's divine nature, contend for the first of these senses; as I have myself once done in a former publication. But further examination has led me to believe, that there are grounds to doubt of such an application of the word θεός in this passage. The king here called θεός, has for himself a θεός; 'thy God hath anointed *thee*.' The same king has *associates* (μετόχους). As *divine*, who are the μέτοχοι with the Saviour, to whom He is preferred?" He thinks the title *Elohim* may be applied, (as in the case of magistrates, but in a peculiar and preëminent sense) to the Messiah as *King*. His opinion borders thus upon that which is alluded to in this note under *x***. He adds that, from other statements of the writer, there is no doubt of his regarding the Messiah as having a divine nature. The same is true, it may be added, if we interpret ὁ θεός in these two verses according to the manner indicated by *y* above.

(*e*) The reference in τοὺς μετόχους σου (ver. 9) is, in the original Psalm, evidently to other kings. The same general reference—that is, the exaltation of this

Son, in His everlasting dominion, above all others who, as having dominion or sovereignty, might be thought of in comparison with Him—seems to be intended by the writer, in his citation of the words. The objection which de Wette presents against referring μετόχ. to the angels, is one of much force:—that "the author has placed the angels in no other position than deeply below Christ;" and the answers to it, which Lünemann gives in his note, do not set it aside.

(*f*) The citation from the Psalms (cii.; ci. LXX.) in vv. 10–12 is evidently intended by the writer of the epistle to set forth the idea that the Son abides the same for ever (so Lünem.). In connection with vv. 8, 9, however, we may believe that this idea is, in the writer's mind, closely related to the thought of the dominion of the Son; and hence that by all these verses, as brought together, he means to contrast the everlasting sovereignty of Christ with the temporary and changing offices of the angels, who are servants. This citation is peculiar in two respects: 1. in that κύριε has no corresponding word in the Hebrew text, and is manifestly borrowed from the LXX., and 2. in that the words are addressed in the original Psalm to God, and refer to Him. The first point is easily explained by the writer's constant, and apparently exclusive, use of the LXX. for his quotations. The second is regarded by Lünem. as due to his being misled by the κύριε into the idea that the words were addressed to the Son. This supposition does not seem to be necessary, and it is exposed to the following objections: (*w*) that a careful reading of the Psalm in the LXX. must have shown him, as the examination of the original Hebrew showed those who read it, that the Psalmist was speaking of and to God, and not Christ; (*x*) that his own use and understanding of κύριος, both in passages which he writes himself and in some which he quotes from the O. T., make it clear that he, like the other N. T. authors, recognizes the possibility of the application of the word to God—the mere presence of the word, therefore, could scarcely lead him into error; (*y*) that the difficulties of this passage cannot be considered in entire independency of those which meet us in other O. T. citations, which the writer makes, and in which such an explanation as Lünem. here gives will not prove satisfactory; (*z*) that, if Apollos was the author of the epistle and was (as is declared in Acts xviii. 24) δυνατὸς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, it is especially improbable that an error like this, which does not seem to belong to an earnest student of the O. T., should have been made by him. The explanation of many such cases is, rather, to be found in the view which the N. T. writers had of the O. T. They regarded it as so full of Christ in all its design and purpose, as having the consummation of its history and prophecy so completely and exclusively in Him—as being so wholly without significance, even, except as it was realized, in all its foreshadowings, by His life and work—that they carried Him in thought, as it were, into any and every part of it, and saw Him in many of its words, whose first pointing, as they well knew, was to some other than Himself. Their view was in one sense, if not indeed in another,—it was, as regarded from the highest standpoint, and, may we not say, in the truest conception of the whole matter,—the right view. He, who filled the whole, must also fill the parts.

(*g*) The explanation of διακονίαν (ver. 14) given by Lünem., Alf., de W., Blk., Moll, and others—that it refers to their service to God, which has in view the eternal salvation of His people, and is thus for their sake or on account of them—is undoubtedly correct. The contrast between the angels and the Son in respect to the endlessness of the sovereignty is thus set forth with a similar emphasis to that with which, in vv. 7, 8, the contrast with reference to the sovereignty itself is presented.

CHAPTER II.

VER. 1. Instead of the *Recepta*: ἡμᾶς προσέχειν (K L, Theodoret), Lachm. Tisch. and Alford read: προσέχειν ἡμᾶς. In favor of the latter decides the preponderating authority of A B D E ℵ, Vulg. Athan. Aug. *alii*.—Ver. 4. αὐτοῦ] D* E*: τοῦ θεοῦ. Explanatory gloss.—Ver. 6. Τί ἐστιν] Lachm. (but only in the *ed. stereot.*) Bleek, and Kurtz: τίς ἐστιν. Only insufficiently attested by C* Clar. Sangerm. Tol. Copt. Damascenus, although also A contains τίς in Ps. viii. By reason of the preceding τίς, τί might easily pass over into τίς.—Ver. 7. After ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν there is added by Elz., with A C D* E* M ℵ, many cursives and translations, Theodoret, Sedulius: καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου. Against B D*** E** K L, more than 65 min., Syr. (codices and some edd.) Slav. ms. Chrys. Damasc. *alii*. The addition already regarded as spurious by Mill (*Prolegg.* 1376, 1421). Bracketed by Lachm. and Bloomf. Rightly deleted by Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Alford, Reiche, and others. Complementary gloss from the LXX. Comp. the exposition of ver. 7.—Ver. 8. ἐν γὰρ τῷ] So A C K L, *al.* Lachm. and Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, after B D E M ℵ, 23: ἐν τῷ γάρ.—Ver. 9. Besides χάριτι θεοῦ (so also in the *Cod. Sinait.*, as well as A B C D E K L, *al.*), Origen,—*in Joann.* i. 1, Opp. iv. 41; *in Joann.* xi. 49, Opp. iv. 393; *in Joann. extr.* Opp. iv. 450,—Theodor. Mopsuest. (*in N. T. commentariorum quae reperiri potuerunt*, ed. Fritzsche, Turic. 1847, p. 163 f.), and Jerome, on Gal. iii. 10, know of a reading χωρὶς θεοῦ, to which the two former give the preference. Theodoret *ad loc.* and *ad Eph.* i. 10, takes notice only of the reading χωρὶς θεοῦ. In like manner do, also, Anastas. abbas Palaestin., in the 8th century, in his work, *Contra Judaeos* (Latin ed. Canis.), in ant. lect. iii.; Ambrose, *de fid. ad Gratian.* ii. 8, 63, 65, v. 8. 106; Fulgentius, *ad Thrasimund.* iii. 20; and Vigilius Thapsens. *Contra Eutych.* ii. 3, cite in accordance with the same; it has also passed over into single mss. of the Peshito (sometimes in combination with the ordinary reading; so also in *Syr. Cod. Heidelbergens.*: "ipse enim excepto Deo per beneficentiam suam pro quovis homine gustavit mortem," according to Tremellius in Tisch. edd. 7 and 8); comp. La Croze, *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*, iii. 3, 64; Bode, *Pseudo-crit. Millio-Bengel*, t. ii. p. 339. So, too, it is found in *Arab. Petropolitana* of the 8th century (in Tisch. edd. 7 and 8): "quare χωρὶς θεοῦ, qui eum sibi fecerat templum, gustavit mortem ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων." Above all, this reading was championed by the Nestorians (see Oecumen. and Theophyl. *ad loc.*). Among later expositors it has found defenders in Camerarius, P. Colomesius (*Observatt. sacr.* p. 603), Bengel, Ch. F. Schmid, Paulus, and Ebrard. But neither in our codd. nor in the versions (with the exceptions above named) does χωρὶς θεοῦ find any countenance; it is met with only in the Cod. M (of Tisch.; with Wetst. and Griesb.: Cod. 53) of the 9th or 10th century, and in the Cod. 67 of the 11th or 12th century—in the latter only on the margin. On internal grounds, too, it is to be rejected (see the exposition, and Reiche in the *Commentarius Criticus*, p.

14 ff.). Probably arose from the placing of *χωρὶς θεοῦ*, occasioned by 1 Cor. xv. 27, as a gloss to the words of ver. 8: *οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον*; and this gloss being erroneously regarded by a later transcriber as a correction of *χάριτι θεοῦ*, ver. 9, was taken up in place thereof into the text.—Ver. 14. Elz. Matthaei, Scholz: *σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος*. But A B C D E M ℵ, 37, *al.*, many versions and Fathers, have *αἵματος καὶ σαρκός*. Already approved by Bengel and Griesb. Rightly adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. The *Recepta* is a later transposition, since the order *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* is elsewhere the more usual one.—*τῶν αὐτῶν*] D* E* It. Eus. Theodoret (semel), Jerome: *τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων*. (Erroneous) explanatory gloss.—*διὰ τοῦ θανάτου*] D* E* It.: *διὰ τοῦ θανατου θάνατον*. An addition incompatible with that which follows. Proceeded from an erroneous twofold writing of *θανάτου*.

Vv. 1–4. [On Vv. 1–4, see Note XLIV., pages 446, 447.] The author, in availing himself of the communicative form of speech, deduces from the superiority of the Son over the angels, set forth in chap. i., as likewise from the fact that even the Mosaic law, given through the instrumentality of angels, could not be transgressed with impunity, the imperative obligation for the readers to hold fast to the salvation revealed by Christ, securely handed down, and confirmed by God with miracles. Thus there already comes out here the paraenetic main tendency of the epistle: to animate the Hebrews, urgently exposed as they were to the peril of apostasy, to perseverance in the Christian faith, as this aim is also manifested elsewhere in repeated admonitions (*e.g.* iii. 6, 14, iv. 14, vi. 11, x. 23); although the author has the intention of speaking further concerning the relation of Christ to the angels (comp. ver. 5 ff.).

Ver. 1. *Διὰ τοῦτο*] [XLIV *b.*] *therefore, sc.* because Christ, the mediator of the New Covenant, is as the Son of God so highly exalted above the angels, the intermediate agents in the giving of the Old Covenant.—*δεῖ*] indication of the inner necessity resulting of itself from the described conditions.—*περισσοτέρως*] *so much the more, sc.* than would be the case if He who proclaimed the *ἀκουσθέντα* were one of lower rank. We have not, however, to connect *περισσοτέρως* with *δεῖ* (Grotius, Bengel, Dindorf, Böhme, Kuinoel), but with *προσέχειν* as the main idea.—*προσέχειν τινὶ πρ.*] *to give heed* or attention to anything, *sc.* in order to hold fast to it.—*τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν*] *to that which has been heard.* The salvation preached by the Lord and His immediate disciples is intended, of which the readers had heard. Comp. ver. 3. [XLIV *c.*]—*μήποτε παραῤῥυῶμεν*] *lest haply we should be carried past it,*[1] *i. e.* lest we lose it, fail of obtaining the salvation promised to us by the word we have heard; comp. ver. 3. The interpretation of Erasmus, Clarius, Beza, Cameron, Stuart, *al.*: *lest we forget it, or let it escape attention,* is unmeaning and almost tautological. *παραῤῥυῶμεν* (or *παραρυῶμεν*, as Lachmann and Tischendorf 2 and 7 write it, after A B* D* I, ℵ), moreover, is not, as Wittich, Dindorf, and others suppose, conjunctive present active of *παραῤῥυέω*,—for the forms *παραῤῥυέω*, *παραῤῥύω*,

[1] Comp. LXX. Prov. iii. 21: *υἱὲ μὴ παραῤῥυῇς, τήρησον δὲ ἐμὴν βουλὴν καὶ ἔννοιαν.*

παραῤῥέμι are mere figments of the grammarians,[1] in order to derive certain tenses therefrom,—but see. aorist conjunct. passive from παραῤῥέω.

Vv. 2–4. Establishing of the δεῖ περισσοτέρως προσέχειν ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἀκουσθεισιν, ver. 1, by a warning reference to the great responsibility and culpability in the case of its neglect, and this in a conclusion *a minore ad majus*. Not justifiably does de Wette take vv. 2–4 as a "proving of the danger of the παραῤῥ." For not the possibility of foregoing salvation, but the culpability of losing it through neglect, forms the central thought in vv. 2–4.

Ver. 2. Ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος] *the word proclaimed by angels* (not: *by human messengers, i. e.* prophets; so Daniel Heinsius and G. Olearius, against the connection with chap. i., and contrary to Biblical usage), *i. e.* the Mosaic law. Of an activity of the angels in connection with the act of legislation on Sinai nothing indeed is mentioned in Ex. xix.; it was, however, a traditional view very widely spread among the Jews. See Schoettgen and Wetstein on Gal. iii. 19. The earliest traces thereof appear Deut. xxxiii. 2, LXX., and Ps. lxviii. 18 (17). It is clearly enunciated Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19; Josephus, *Antiq.* xv. 5. 3.—To understand other divine revelations given through the intervention of angels, like Gen. xix. 26, to the exclusion of the Mosaic law (Dorscheus, Calov, Schoettgen, Carpzov, Semler, *al.*), or with the inclusion of the same (Baumgarten, Ewald, M'Caul: "To my mind, the transition to the law exclusively is in the present instance somewhat abrupt. Does it not rather also refer to the ministrations of angels vouchsafed from time to time during the whole of the earlier dispensation, and to which allusion is made in the concluding verse of the first chapter?"), as intended by the ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος, is forbidden—apart from the connection in its main points, and the whole tendency of the epistle—by the expression ὁ λόγος in the singular.—The preterites ἐγένετο and ἔλαβεν characterize the period of the Mosaic law as a *past* one, the condition of life prevailing in the same as one now obsolete and historically surmounted.—βέβαιος] [XLIV *d.*] *firm, i. e.* inviolable and obligatory, as is evident from the explanatory clause καὶ πᾶσα . . . μισθαπ. immediately following.—παράβασις the *objective* transgression, παρακοή the *subjective* listless hearing or inattention, *Uebertretung* and *Ueberhörung*. Not inaptly Böhme, in preserving the paronomasia, "non commissa solum, sed omissa etiam."—ἔνδικος] *just*, in the N. T. only here and Rom. iii. 8. μισθαποδοσία] selected, sonorous word, a favorite one with our author in the sense of the simple μισθός, but not occurring elsewhere in the N. T. The term is a *vox media*, signifies thus *recompense*. It is here employed in the unfavorable sense (= punishment), x. 35, xi. 26, in the favorable sense (= reward).

Ver. 3. The apodosis follows in the form of a question, which for the rest extends only to σωτηρίας, not to the close of ver. 4.—πῶς] how is it possible that.—ἡμεῖς] has the emphasis. The Christians in general are

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

meant, in opposition to the men once belonging to the O. T. theocracy, of whom the writer has spoken at least by implication in ver. 2.—*ἐκφευξόμεθα*] stands absolutely, as xii. 25; 1 Thess. v. 3. Needlessly do Heinrichs, Stengel, Ebrard, Bisping, Maier, and many others supplement from ver. 2: *τὴν ἐνδικον μισθαποδοσίαν.—ἀμελήσαντες*] Instancing of the case or condition, after the arising of which an escape or deliverance from punishment becomes an impossibility: *in case that*, or *if, we shall have neglected* (slighted). The participle *aorist* is properly used, since the culpability must first have been incurred before a punishment can ensue.—*τηλικαύτης σωτηρίας*] [XLIV *e.*] *such a salvation, i. e.* one so great, so far surpassing in exaltedness that of the O. T.[1]—*τηλικαύτης* does not in itself contain a reference to *ἥτις* (Tholuck and others; the former will then have *ἥτις* taken in the sense of *ὥστε*), but stands there independently of any correlative; it is then, however, after the question has closed with *σωτηρίας*, enforced by the clause with *ἥτις* (quippe quae).—*ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη*] *which indeed, at first proclaimed by the Lord, was handed down with certainty to us by them that heard it.* Wrongly does Ebrard translate: "which was confirmed to us by the hearers, as one proclaimed by the Lord from the very first," in supposing that *ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα* depends upon *ἐβεβαιώθη* as an "apposition of object." For how can *ἀρχὴν λαβὸν λαλεῖσθαι* denote something proclaimed "from the very beginning," or "from the commencement"? And how unskilfully would the author have proceeded in the choice and position of his words, if—as Ebrard supposes—he had wished to express the thought, "that the *σωτηρια* was directly revealed by the Lord, has been transmitted to us as a certainty, and thus as a divine legitimation of the *σωτηρία* by the *ἀκούσαντες*, the ear- (and eye-) witnesses!" Ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν, *to begin*, always presupposes an opposition, expressed or understood, to a being continued, or to a being brought to an end. When thus in our passage there is mention made not only of an *ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν λαλεῖσθαι* by the Lord, but also of a *βεβαιωθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς* on the part of those who heard the Lord, it is clear that the author will have these two factors regarded as statements of two distinct but mutually corresponding periods of time.—In general, it is wrong when Ebrard, in connection with his explanation just adduced, will find in ver. 3 the twofold contrast with the law—(1) That the law was a mere word (*λόγος*); the gospel, on the other hand, a deliverance, a redemption, an act. (2) That the *σωτηρία* was manifested and proclaimed to men as at first hand, by the Lord Himself; the law, on the contrary, only at second hand, by the angels. For, as concerns the first alleged point of difference, assuredly the emphasis rests neither upon *λόγος*, ver. 2, nor upon *σωτηρίας*, ver. 3; but, ver. 2, upon *δι' ἀγγέλων*, and, ver. 3, upon *τηλικαύτης*. The second alleged point of difference falls, however, with the consideration that the author employs the preposition *διά*, as before *ἀγγέλων*, ver. 2, so

[1] Theodorus Mopsuestenus: *ἐκεῖνο νομίμων δόσις ἦν μόνον, ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ χάρις πνεύματος καὶ λύσις ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ βασιλείας οὐρανῶν ἐπαγγελία καὶ ἀθανασίας ὑπόσχεσις· ὅθεν καὶ δικαίως τηλικαύτης εἶπεν.*

also before τοῦ κυρίου, ver. 3; thus indicates that the supreme Author alike of the Mosaic law and of the gospel is God Himself, both consequently are proclaimed to man "only at second hand."[1] The pre-eminence of the gospel can accordingly have been discovered by our author only in the fact that in connection with this the Lord Himself was the intervening agent; in connection with the law, on the other hand, only the angels, who, according to chap. i., are subordinate to the Lord.—ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων] *by them that heard it* (*sc.* from the Lord; παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, Chrysost.), thus by His apostles and immediate disciples. From these ἀκούσαντες the author distinguishes himself and his readers (εἰς ἡμᾶς). As well he himself as the Palestinian Christians to whom he writes must consequently have already belonged to a second generation of Christendom, and the author of the epistle cannot have been Paul (comp. *Introd.* p. 11). [XLIV *g.*] When Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. p. 378, 2 Aufl.) objects to this: "from εἰς ἡμᾶς is in truth evident only that the author belonged not to the number of those who could testify that they had with their own ears heard the Lord, at the time when He was upon earth proclaiming that salvation which they now preached," this is indeed perfectly correct. But when he adds that Paul likewise had certainly only heard the word of salvation from the mouth of those who had listened to Jesus, this is—so long as the solemn asseveration of Paul himself (comp. expressly Gal. i. 12) has any value for us—decidedly false. For Paul reckons himself not among the disciples of the ἀκούσαντες, but among the ἀκούσαντες themselves. For the circumstance that the ἀκούειν was otherwise brought about in his case than in the case of the original apostles, inasmuch as these had stood in the relation of ἀκούσαντες to the Christ walking upon earth, Paul, on the other hand, stood in the relation of an ἀκούσας to the exalted or heavenly Christ, left the essence of the matter itself untouched. Nor even by the assumption of a so-called ἀνακοίνωσις, to which recourse has very frequently been had, can the conclusion resulting with stringent necessity from the words of our verse be set aside; for that which the writer of a letter says to his readers by means of an ἀνακοίνωσις is always of such nature as to be likewise true of himself; never can it stand in excluding opposition to himself.—ἐβεβαιώθη] corresponds to the ἐγένετο βέβαιος, ver. 2; and εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη is a well-known blending of the notion of rest with that of the preceding movement. See Winer, p. 386 f. [E. T. 414 f.] Theophylact: διεπορθμεύθη εἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαίως καὶ πιστῶς, *it came to us in a firm, trustworthy manner*, so that it has become for us a σωτηρία βεβαία. Wrongly Heinrichs (and so also Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Wolf, Cramer, Paulus, and

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

others), according to whom εἰς ἡμᾶς signifies *ad nostra tempora*, or *usque ad nos*.

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

Vv. 5–18. [On Vv. 5–8, see Note XLV. pages 447–450.] Further investigation of the relation of Christ to the angels, and demonstration of the necessity for the death of Christ. Not to angels, but to Christ, the Son of man, has, according to the testimony of Scripture, the Messianic world been subjected. Certainly Christ was abased for a short time lower than the angels; but so it must be, in order that mankind might obtain salvation: He must suffer and die, and become in all things like unto men, His brethren, in order to be able as High Priest to reconcile them to God.

Ver. 5. [XLV *a*.] The author has brought into relief the fact, ver. 3, that it was the Son of God, or the Lord, according to chap. i., highly exalted above the angels, by whom the Messianic salvation was proclaimed,

[1] See examples in Bleek, Abth. II. 1 Hälfte, p. 218.

[2] On the un-Attic θέλησις, comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 7, 353; Pollux, v. 165: βούλησις ἐπιθυμία, ὄρεξις, ἔρως· ἡ δὲ θέλησις ἰδιωτικόν.

and from whose immediate disciples it was handed down to Christendom. He now justifies this order of things as founded in a higher divine decree, and already foretold in the Scriptures of the Old Covenant. That order of things is, however, justified, in conformity to the comparison of Christ with the angels, which is begun with i. 4, first, *e contrario* or negatively, ver. 5, and then, ver. 6, positively. The emphasis lies in ver. 5 upon ἀγγέλοις, and this then finds its antithesis in ἄνθρωπος and υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ver. 6. For when the author first in an absolute form of expression says: For not unto the angels has He put into subjection the world to come, and then continues: But one in a certain place testifies, etc., the sense—on account of the close connectedness of ver. 6 (see on that verse) with ver. 5—is certainly this: for, *according to the testimony of Scripture*, the world to come is put in subjection, not to angels, but to Christ, the Son of man. —ἀγγέλοις] without article. For it stands generically: beings who are angels, who have the nature of angels (Bleek). [Owen: nature angelical.] De Wette supposes the reason for the anarthrous form to be in the possibility that only *a part of the angels* are to be thought of. Unsuitably, because in connection with οὐκ ἀγγέλοις already the definite antithesis: "but to the Son of man," was present to the mind of the author (comp. ver. 6).—ὑπέταξεν] *sc.* ὁ θεός, which naturally follows from the τοῦ θεοῦ of ver. 4. The verb expresses the notion of making dependent, or of the placing in a position of subjection, and is chosen because the same expression is employed in the citation presently to be adduced (comp. ver. 8).—τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν] *the world to come.* This mode of designating it is explained from the well-known Biblical phraseology, according to which the Messianic period was distinguished as the αἰὼν μέλλων, from the pre-Messianic as the αἰὼν οὗτος.[1] What is meant, consequently, is not something purely future (Theodoret: ὁ μέλλων βίος; Oecumenius: ὁ ἰσάμενος κόσμος; Schulz: the new order of the world which is approaching; Bleek II.: the blessings of the kingdom of God which will first be manifested and conferred upon believers at the return of the Lord in glory; Grotius, Maier, and others: heaven, as the future dwelling-place of the Christians also), but *the new order of things in the Messianic kingdom, which in its first manifestations has already appeared, but as regards its completion is still a future one.* Calvin: apparet non vocari orbem futurum dumtaxat, qualem e resurrectione speramus, sed qui coepit ab exordio regni Christi, complementum vero suum habebit in ultima redemptione. τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν is itself without emphasis; on the contrary, only resumes under another form the τηλικαύτης σωτηρίας of ver. 3. It results from this, that the opinion according to which the tacit contrast is to be supplied in thought to the declaration, ver. 5: "the present world is indeed" to be regarded as "subjected to the angels, by them swayed and governed" (Cameron, Bleek, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 656, *al.*), is a baseless

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

one. For it must then have been written *οὐ γὰρ τὴν μέλλουσαν οἰκουμένην ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξεν.—περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν*] does not go back to i. 6 (Theophylact, Zeger, Grotius, Schlichting, Schulz, Böhme, comp. also Delitzsch),—against which the *present* λαλοῦμεν, in place of which a preterite must have been expected, and not less the addition τὴν μέλλουσαν to τὴν οἰκουμένην, is decisive,—nor is λαλοῦμεν put in place of a future: "de quo in sequenti testimonio loquemur" (Vatablus); but the relative clause is to be taken quite generally: which is the subject of our discourse (our epistle). Too specially Kurtz: "of which we are speaking just now, in this section of our epistle," which would have called for the addition of a νῦν. The plural λαλοῦμεν, moreover, has reference merely to the writer. Comp. v. 11, vi. 9, 11, xiii. 18. Without good reason does Bengel supplement *nos doctores;* while even, according to Hofmann, "all who believe the promise, the apostle *and* his readers," are the subject of λαλοῦμεν, inasmuch as it is only a question of an "additional explanatory clause, when the apostle adds that that world to come is intended, of which the Christians speak!"

Ver. 6 attaches itself closely to ver. 5, in that the adversative δέ (different from the disjunctive ἀλλά, *but, on the contrary.* Comp. Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 171), as iv. 13, 15, ix. 12, x. 27, xii. 13, 1 Cor. vii. 15, 25 fin., and frequently, as it were correcting the preceding negative statement, now places in opposition the actual state of the question: *Some one, however* (some one, on the contrary), *testified in a certain place and said.* Quite wrongly does Heinrichs suppose an entirely new section of the epistle to begin with ver. 6.—*πού τις*] The wavering character of this form of citation is derived by Grotius from the consideration that the Psalms were the work of different authors, and the authors of particular psalms were often unknown. But the eighth Psalm, here cited, is, both in the Hebrew and the LXX., expressly ascribed to David. According to Koppe (*Excursus I. ad epist. ad Roman.*, 2d ed. p. 379), Dindorf, Schulz, Heinrichs (comp. also Stengel), the indefiniteness of the formula is to be explained by the fact that the author is citing from memory. But the words agree too exactly with the LXX. to be a citation from memory, and, moreover, the indefinite *που* occurs again, iv. 4, in connection with the citation of Gen. ii. 2, thus in connection with an appeal to a passage of the O. T. Scripture, of which the place where it is found could not possibly escape the memory of our author. De Wette, after the precedent of Bleek [cf. Peshito: *the Scripture witnesses, and says*], regards it as the most correct supposition that the author "was not concerned about the particular writers of Scripture, since for him God or the Holy Ghost spoke through the Scripture." Yet, if the reason for the form of expression is to be sought in this, then in general we should hardly expect the personal indication τὶς to be added, but rather a passive construction to be chosen. According to Hofmann, finally, *πού τις* is intended to declare "that it is indeed a matter of indifference for his purpose who said this, and where it is found; that it is adduced as the utterance of *some* man, only an utterance which comes invested with the authority of Scripture!" The indefinite mode of citation has probably no other than a rhetorical ground, inasmuch as the

author presupposes a universal acquaintance with the passage, without concerning himself to learn whether it is known to all or not.[1] The same reticence in the mode of citation is often found with Philo.[2]—The citation, which extends to *ποδῶν αὐτοῦ*, ver. 8, is from Ps. viii. 5–7 (4–6). [XLV *b*.] The utterance in its historic sense contains a declaration with regard to man in general; but the author, on the ground of the ideal import of the passage, as likewise in particular on the ground of the expression *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, which in consequence of Dan. vii. 13 was current with the Jews as an appellation of the Messiah (comp. John xii. 34), which, too, was one often bestowed by Jesus upon Himself, finds in it a declaration concerning the Son of man *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, *i. e.* concerning Christ.[3] Paul, too, has Messianically interpreted the psalm, 1 Cor. xv. 27 f. (comp. Eph. i. 22).—Τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος κ.τ.λ.] *What is man that Thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that Thou regardest him! i. e.*, in the sense of the original, How small, weak, and insignificant, as compared with the majestic heavenly bodies, is man, that Thou shouldst nevertheless take a loving and careful interest in him! In the application: How great and full of dignity is man, that Thou so greatly distinguishest him with loving care! (Kuinoel, Heinrichs, Böhme, Bleek, Stein; otherwise, de Wette, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 45, 2 Aufl.; Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 361; Alford, Moll, Kurtz, *al.*). Thus the author *could* understand the words, although the "being mindful" and "looking upon" do not very well accord therewith, in that he was guided in his acceptance of them pre-eminently by the final clause *δόξῃ . . . αὐτοῦ*.—ἤ] instead of this וְ is found in the Hebrew, thus introduces a purely parallel member, in such wise that *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* is identical with *ἄνθρωπος* in the first member, and is distinguished therefrom only as a more sharply defined presentation of the same notion.

[1] So substantially also Chrysostom (*τοῦτο δὲ αὐτό, οἶμαι, τὸ κρύπτειν καὶ μὴ τιθέναι τὸν εἰρηκότα τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς περιφερομένην καὶ κατάδηλον οὖσαν εἰσάγειν, δεικνύντος ἐστίν, αὐτοὺς σφόδρα ἐμπείρους εἶναι τῶν γραφῶν*), Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Jac. Cappellus, Cornelius a Lapide [Owen: "the reason is plain; both person and place were sufficiently known to them to whom he wrote"], Calov, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, *al.*

[2] Comp. *e. g. de ebrietate*, p. 248 (ed. Mangey, I. p. 365): *εἶπε γάρ που τις* (sc. Abraham, Gen. xx. 12). Further examples see in Bleek, Abth. II. 1 Hälfte, p. 239.

[3] In contradiction with the design of the whole explication, as this clearly manifests itself from the context, do Beza, Piscator, Storr, Ebrard, Delitzsch (p. 57, 59), Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 45, 2 Aufl.), Alford, Moll, and others, refer *ἄνθρωπος*, even in the sense of our author, and *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* to *man generally*, namely, to the man of the New Covenant, inasmuch as he *shall* receive the dominion over all things, in the possession of which Christ is already set. When Ebrard, p. 81, asserts that the "Messianic" interpretation "of the non-Messianic eighth Psalm" cannot be laid to the account of the author of the epistle, without charging him with "a downright Rabbinical misunderstanding of a psalm;" and when, in like manner, Delitzsch, p. 57, declares it "not at all conceivable that the author of our epistle should without any explanation have referred *ἄνθρωπος* and *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* of the psalm *to Christ*," unless we are to attribute "the uttermost limitation of thought to the N. T. exposition of Scripture," that is nothing else than a controlling of the author of the epistle by preconceived opinions of one's own, from which, in the face of 1 Cor. xv. 27 f., one ought to have shrunk. For the rest, against the view espoused by Ebrard, Delitzsch, and Hofmann, comp. also Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 368 ff., note.

Ver. 7. [XLV *c* 1, 2, 3.] Ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους] Thus the LXX. translate the Hebrew וַתְּחַסְּרֵהוּ מְעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים. The sense of the Hebrew is: "Thou hast made Him only a little lower than God, hast made Him only a little less than God." The βραχύ τι is consequently in the original a note of degree, and the whole former member ἠλάττωσας . . . ἀγγέλους contains in the original the same thought as the immediately following δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν. The author, however, takes the βραχύ τι of the LXX. in the *temporal* sense: "for a short time" (comp. ver. 9), and finds in the second member an opposition to the first, in such wise that in the application he refers the statement of the first clause to the *humiliation* of Christ, that of the second to the *exaltation* of Christ.—The words following these in the LXX. (as also in the Hebrew): καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου (comp. the critical remarks), have been left out by the author as unsuitable to his presentment. For the statement that God has set the Son of man or the Messiah over the works of creation which proceeded from the hands of God, might appear to contain a contradiction to i. 10 (comp. also i. 2), where earth and heaven were designated as works created by the hands of the Son.

Ver. 8. Πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ] *All things didst Thou put in subjection under His feet.* In the psalm these words refer to the dominion which God has conferred upon man over the earth, and indeed specially (comp. Ps. viii. 8, 9 [7, 8]) over the whole animal world. The author of the epistle, on the other hand, taking πάντα in the absolute sense, understands them of the dominion over the universe which has been conferred upon Christ, the Son of man. Comp. Matt. xxviii. 18.—With ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι . . . ἀνυπότακτον the author still dwells on the closing words of the citation: πάντα ὑπέταξας κ.τ.λ., in order by way of elucidation to unfold its contents, and thus to place in clearer light the truth of the main thought expressed vv. 5–8. γάρ consequently refers back to that which immediately precedes, and the supposition of Tholuck —that ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι κ.τ.λ., as the clause which affords the proof, is parenthetically preposed to the νῦν δὲ κ.τ.λ., as the clause which is to be proved, so that the connection would be: "but now we see not yet all things made subject to Him; for, *according to the declaration of the psalm*, all things without exception are subject to Him"—is to be rejected as entirely unnecessary; quite apart from the fact that no instance of such parenthetical preposing of an elucidatory clause with γάρ is to be found anywhere in the N. T. (not in John iv. 44, 45 either), although not rare with classical writers.[1] Nor does γάρ stand for οὖν (Heinrichs, Stengel), but is the explicative *namely*. [XLV *c* 4.] The subject in ὑποτάξαι, further, is not *David*, the singer of the psalm (Heinrichs), but *God*; and the emphasis rests upon the opposition between τὰ πάντα and οὐδέν. The threefold αὐτῷ, finally, relates not to *man* in general,[2] but to the *Son*

[1] Comp. Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 467; Kühner, *Gramm.* II. p. 454.

[2] Beza [Piscator: *the believers*], Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Whitby, Storr, **Kuinoel**, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, **Hofmann**, Woerner, and others.

of man, and that not merely as regards its signification,[1] but—as is shown by the Ἰησοῦν, only incidentally added, ver. 9—to the Son of man as He appeared in Christ as an historical person.[2] The sense is accordingly: by the fact, namely, that God made all things subject to Christ, the Son of man, He left nothing that is not subjected unto Him; it is thus also—this natural inference the author leaves to the readers themselves to make—to Him, the Son of man, and not to the angels, that ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα (ver. 5), which is only a part of that τὰ πάντα, is subjected; nay, the angels themselves, seeing that *all things* have been put in subjection under Him, are themselves subject to Him.—With νῦν δὲ οὔπω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα the author limits the immediately preceding declaration by an admission, by which, however, as is then further shown, ver. 9, the correctness of the former assertion as to the actual state of the matter suffers no infringement: *now*, however,—that must be conceded, —*we see not yet* all things subjected unto Him. For we are as yet in the condition of the earthly body; as yet the kingdom of God is only partially established; as yet it has to wage warfare with many enemies (comp. x. 12, 13; 1 Cor. xv. 24–27) We shall *see* that all things have been made subject to Christ by God the Father only when Christ shall have returned for the consummation of the kingdom of God.

Ver. 9. [On Vv. 9–16, see Note XLVI., pages 450–452.] Proof that, notwithstanding the circumstances just mentioned, the matter itself which has been asserted is perfectly true. Certainly we do not, at the present moment, as yet see all things *made subject* to Christ, the Son of man; but we *do* see Him already crowned with glory and honor, in that after suffering and dying He has been exalted to the right hand of the Father. From the reality of the one, however, which we see, follows of necessity the reality of the other, which we do not yet see. For if the word of Scripture: δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν, has already been fulfilled in His case, there can be no kind of doubt but in like manner also the further word of Scripture: πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, inseparably connected as it is with the former, has already attained its realization in Him.—The words of ver. 9 have undergone a strange misinterpretation on the part of Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 45 ff. 2 Aufl.). As Hofmann with regard to ver. 7 already denies that the two members of the sentence in that verse: ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους and δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν, form in the mind of the writer an opposition to each other, so just as little is the writer in ver. 9 supposed to have had present to his mind in connection with τὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον the *humiliation* of Christ, and with δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον the *exaltation* of Christ. Ver. 9 is thought rather to refer exclusively to the Jesus "living in the flesh," and the connection is thus explained: "Far from its being the case that we see all things subjected to man, He,

[1] Masch, Bleek, de Wette.

[2] Calvin, Gerhard, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Peirce, Schulz, Tholuck, Klee, Stuart, Conybeare, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 364; Kurtz, Ewald, *al.*

on the contrary, of whom that which the psalm speaks of man holds good in full truth, Jesus namely, stands before our eyes in a position of divine appointment, as such demanded by the existing calamity of death, which, according to ver. 14, makes the devil a ruler and us bondsmen." For by *βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένος* there is reference made, in the opinion of Hofmann, to the person of man, of which the psalm is treating, with regard to the dignity belonging thereto as conferred by God,—inasmuch as *βραχύ τι* is to be taken *of degree*,—but by *τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου* is indicated the misfortune consisting in death itself, and not his *suffering* of death; and *δόξα καὶ τιμή* finally expresses, according to iii. 3, v. 4, 5, the glorious character of his position by virtue of his vocation. The sense of ver. 9, then, is supposed to be: "What He, in whom the wealth of human nature has appeared in full truth, *denotes* and *represents* on the part of God,—for the former is meant by *τιμή*, the latter by *δόξα*,—*that* He denotes and represents, for the *reason* that mankind is obnoxious to the suffering of death, and to the *end* that He might taste a death which should redound unto good for every one!" See, on the other hand, the remarks of Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 333 ff., note.—*τὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον* is the object, and *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον* the predicate to *βλέπομεν*, while *Ἰησοῦν* is the appositional nearer definition of the object brought in only at the close. The sense thus is: "*But we do indeed see the one for a time abased below the angels, namely Jesus, crowned with glory and honor.*" Wrongly others: "As the one for a time abased below the angels do we recognize Jesus, who is crowned with glory and honor." For, in order to express this thought, *Ἰησοῦν τὸν . . . ἐστεφανωμένον* must have been placed. Wrongly likewise Ebrard, with whom Delitzsch agrees in substance, who takes *Ἰησοῦν* as object, *ἠλαττωμένον* as adjectival attribute to *Ἰησοῦν*, and *ἐστεφανωμένον* as predicate to the object. The sense then is: "*mankind* is not yet exalted; but *Jesus*, who was indeed abased for a while below the angels, we see already crowned with glory and honor." This construction, which at any rate rests upon the false supposition that the subject of discourse, vv. 6–8, is *not* already Christ, the Son of man, but only man in general, and that the author of the epistle had regarded as fully identical the two utterances of the psalm: *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν*, and *πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ*, would only be permissible in the case that *Ἰησοῦν δέ, τὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον, βλέπομεν κ.τ.λ.*, or *τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον Ἰησοῦν βλέπομεν κ.τ.λ.*, had been written. By the position of the *Ἰησοῦν* after *βλέπομεν* it becomes impossible; since in consequence thereof *Ἰησοῦν* appears as entirely unaccentuated, consequently can be regarded only as a supplementary addition by way of elucidation with regard to the question who is to be understood by the *ὁ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένος*. *Ἰησοῦν* might even have been entirely left out without detriment to the sense and intelligibility of that which the author would imply; it is nevertheless inserted, in order, by the express mention of His name, to cut off every kind of doubt upon the point that it is no other than Christ, the historic Redeemer, of whom the citation ad-

duced, vv. 6–8, is treating.—*βλέπομεν*] *we see*, perceive; namely, with the eyes of the mind; comp. iii. 19, *al.* For it is openly testified that Christ rose from the dead, and ascended to the right hand of the Father in heaven; and Christians feel that He is reigning in power and glory by means of the Holy Spirit, which He has conferred upon them.—*διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*] [XLVI *a.*] *on account of His suffering of death*, belongs not to *βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον*,[1] but to *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον*.[2] Only this mode of referring the clause has the merit of naturalness from the position of the words; only this is grammatically and logically justified. For not only with this construction does *διά* with the accusative retain its only possible signification, but the thought likewise finds its confirmation in the sequel (*διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι*, ver. 10), and accords with the view of Paul, Phil. ii. 9, according to which the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of the Father was the consequence and divine recompense of the voluntary abasement endured even to the death of the cross. Supposing the connection to be with that which precedes, *διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου* must contain a later added nearer definition to *ἠλαττωμένον*; but a second supplementary nearer definition, seeing that Ἰησοῦν already occupies such a position, would be extremely improbable, when we consider the carefulness with regard to style which prevails in this epistle; it would not, like Ἰησοῦν, have a purpose to serve, but be merely an instance of linguistic negligence such as ought not to be readily laid to the charge of our author. Moreover, *διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*, referred to that which precedes, does not even admit of any satisfactory explanation. For, as thus combined, it is interpreted either: humbled *by reason of* the suffering of death, *i. e.* by suffering death, or: humbled *for the sake of* the suffering of death, *i. e.* in order to be able to undertake it. But in the latter case the choice of the preposition *διά* would be an exceedingly ill-judged one, since we must, at any rate, have expected *εἰς τὸ πάσχειν τὸν θάνατον*, or something similar. In the former case, on the other hand, *διά* must have been combined with the *genitive* instead of the *accusative*, quite apart from the consideration that the author can hardly be supposed to limit the humiliation of Christ to the moment of His death, but rather (comp. ver. 14), like Paul, to comprehend in general the whole period of His life in the flesh.—*ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου*] *that He by the grace of God might taste death for every one*, does not depend upon *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον*. For the enduring of death was certainly not something which was to take place only after the exaltation, but already preceded this. The contorted interpretations, however: *so that He died for all*,[3] or: *in order that He may have suffered death for all*,[4] or: *postquam mortem gustavit*,[5] are grammatically impossible. But since a

[1] Origen, *in Joann.* t. ii. c. 6; Augustine, *contra Maximin.* iii. 2. 5; Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Beza, Schlichting, Cornelius a Lapide, Cameron, Calov, Limborch, Semler, *al.*

[2] Luther, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, Wetstein, Böhme, Bleek, Tholuck, de Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 357; Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, and many others.

[3] Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, Tena, Ribera, Morus, Valckenaer, Kuinoel.

[4] Ebrard.

[5] Schleusner.

connecting of the final clause with *ἠλαττωμένον*,[1] is, considering the grammatical construction of ver. 9, quite inconceivable, *ὅπως κ.τ.λ.* can be only a further, but pregnant, exponent of the preceding *τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*: *on account of His suffering of death*, namely, *in order that He might*, etc.—*χάριτι θεοῦ*] for the grace and love of God is the supreme cause of the redeeming death of Christ (comp. Rom. v. 8; Gal. ii. 21).—*ὑπερ*] *on behalf of, for the weal of.*—*παντός*] is not *neuter*, in such wise that the declaration should apply to the whole creation, including the angels (Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact; comp. Origen, *in Joann.* t. i. c. 40);[2] for this thought comes into collision with ver. 16, and the expression thereof would be incorrect, since we must expect in that case *ὑπὲρ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως*, or at least *ὑπὲρ τοῦ παντός*. *Παντός* is *masculine*, and has reference only to *mankind*. The singular, however, is placed, not the plural *πάντων*, in order distinctly to bring out the thought that Christ died on behalf of each single individual among men (namely, who will appropriate the salvation offered him), not merely for mankind as a totality, as a compact corporation. [Piscator and Owen understand: *each and every one*, sc. *of the πολλοὶ υἱοί* mentioned ver. 10. Cf. Acts xx. 28.]—*γεύεσθαι θανάτου*] represents the experiencing of death under the figure of a *tasting of* the same. Comp. Matt. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27; John viii. 52.[3] The formula is only a more significant expression for the ordinary *ἀποθνήσκειν*. Neither the notion of the *brief duration* of Christ's death[4] nor along with this the notion of the *reality* of that death[5] nor, finally, the notion of the *bitterness* of the death sufferings[6] lies in the expression.

REMARK.—In connection with the explanation of the reading *χωρὶς θεοῦ* (see the critical remarks) comes forth the main diversity, that these words were either taken as closely conjoined with *ὑπὲρ παντός*, or regarded in themselves as an independent nearer defining of the verb. The former mode of explanation is adopted by Origen, Theodoret, Ebrard, Ewald: "in order that He might suffer death for all beings, with the exception of God alone;" further Bengel, and Chr. F. Schmid: "in order that, with a view to purchasing or subjecting all things except God, He might suffer death." But against both acceptations is the fact that *παντός cannot be neuter* (see above), against the latter, moreover, in particular the fact that the notion: "in order to purchase to himself," cannot possibly be expressed by the mere *ὑπὲρ παντός*. As an independent addition *χωρὶς θεοῦ* is taken by Theodorus Mopsuestenus, Ambrose, Fulgentius, the Nestorians, and P. Colomesius (*Observatt. Sacr.* p. 603): "that He might taste death without God, *i.e.* without the participation of His Godhead, with the mere sharing of His

[1] Akersloot, Bengel, Böhme, Bisping.

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

[3] The formula corresponds to the rabbinical טָעַם מָוֶת (see Schoettgen and Wetstein on Matt. xvi. 28), and has its manifold analogies in the Greek turns: *γεύεσθαι μόχθων* (Soph. *Trachin.* 1101), *κακῶν* (Eurip. *Hec.* 379; Luc. *Nigr.* 28), *πένθους πικροῦ* (Eurip. *Alcest.* 1069), *πόνων* (Pindar, *Nem.* vi. 41), *οἴστοῦ* (Homer, *Odyss.* xxi. 98), *τῆς ἀρχῆς, τῆς ἐλευθερίης* (*Herod.* iv. 147, vi. 5), etc.

[4] Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Clarius, Camerarius, Braun, Peirce, Cramer, Ch. F. Schmid.

[5] Beza, Bengel.

[6] Calov, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz.

humanity in death." But that such a thought, in itself entirely alien as it is to the Biblical writers, could not have been expressed by *χωρὶς θεοῦ*, is at once apparent. There must at least have been written *χωρὶς τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος*. To this place further belongs Paulus, with an appeal to Matt. xxvii. 46: "as without God, as one abandoned by God, not delivered." But the added "as," by which alone the interpretation becomes tolerable, is, without grammatical justification, the expositor's own *additamentum*.

Ver. 10. [XLVI *b*.] Not without design has the author, ver. 9, added to the declaration *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον* the indication of the cause, *διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*, and then brought into relief this superadded clause by the final statement: *ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου*. For the Redeemer's death on the cross, ridiculed by the Gentiles as folly, was to the Jews an offence (1 Cor. i. 23). Even to the Hebrews, to whom the author is writing, the thought of a Messiah who passed through sufferings and death might be a stumbling-block not yet surmounted, and, with other things, have contributed to shake their confidence in Christianity, and incline them to relapse into Judaism. Without, therefore, further giving express utterance to the conclusion to be expected after ver. 9 (see on ver. 9, *init.*), but rather leaving the supplying of the same to the readers, the author passes over, ver. 10 ff., at once to the justification of that fact regarded as an offence, in bringing into relief the consideration that the choice of that way, so apparently strange, of causing the Messiah to attain to glory through sufferings and death, was altogether worthy of God (ver. 10), and necessary (vv. 14–18), in order that Christ might be qualified to be the redeemer of sinful humanity.—Wrongly does Tholuck suppose that ver. 10 attaches itself to *δόξῃ ἐστεφανωμένον*, ver. 9, and expresses the thought that the glorification of Him could not fail of its accomplishment, who became to others the author of salvation. For the centre of gravity in the proposition lies not in *τελειῶσαι*, but in *διὰ παθημάτων*, which Tholuck erroneously degrades to a mere "secondary thought."—*ἔπρεπεν*] *it was befitting;* not an expression of *necessity* (Kuinoel, Bloomfield, *al.*), but of *meetness* and *becomingness*, in relation partly to the nature of God (comp. *δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα*), partly to the ends He would attain (cf. vv. 14–18).[1]—*αὐτῷ δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα*] does not relate to *Christ* (Primasius, Hunnius, Königsmann, Cramer, *al.*), but is a periphrasis for *God*. This periphrastic delineation, however, of the divine characteristics justifies the *ἔπρεπεν* in its truth and naturalness. For He who is the Supreme Cause and Creator of the Universe cannot have done anything unworthy of Himself.—*τὰ πάντα*] *the totality of all that exists*, not merely that which serves for the bringing about of salvation (Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Paulus).—*δι' ὃν*] *for the sake of whom*,[2] characterizes God as the One *for* whom, *i. e.* to accomplish whose

[1] Comp. Philo, *Legg. allegor.* I. p. 48 E (with Mangey, I. p. 53): *πρέπει τῷ θεῷ φυτεύειν καὶ οἰκοδομεῖν ἐν ψυχῇ τὰς ἀρετάς.—De incorrupt. Mundi*, p. 950 B (with Mangey, II. p. 500): *ἐμπρεπὲς δὲ θεῷ τὰ ἄμορφα μορφοῦν καὶ τοῖς αἰσχίστοις περιτιθέναι θαυμαστὰ κάλλη.*

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

ends, all things are designed, and corresponds to the *εἰς αὐτόν*, Rom. xi. 36, 1 Cor. viii. 6; while *δι' οὗ* characterizes Him as the One by whom all things have been effected or created, inasmuch as, according to the popular conception, the notion of the *originating* is not strictly separated from that of *effecting*, since both are summed up under the more general notion of disposing, preparing [*ποιεῖν, παρασκευάζειν, ἑτοιμάζειν*]; comp. 1 Cor. i. 9; Gal. i. 1. In the case of our author, moreover, the placing of the inaccurate *δι' οὗ* instead of the more accurate *ἐξ οὗ* (comp. Rom. xi. 36) or *ὑφ' οὗ*, may also have been occasioned with a view to the paronomasia produced by the use of the twofold *διά* with different cases.—*πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα*] is not a preposed apposition to *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν*: "*it became God to make Him,—as one who led many sons unto glory,*—namely, *the Beginner of their salvation, perfect through sufferings*"[1] Such construction is not indeed to be opposed, as Böhme and Bleek think, on the ground that the article *τόν* could not in that case have been wanting also before *πολλούς*. On the contrary, either the addition or the omission of the article before *πολλούς* would be justified; only a modification of the sense results from the choice of the one or the other course. If the article is placed, then *τὸν πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα* and *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν* are two parallel but co-ordinate utterances, in such wise that the second repeats the first only in more sharply-defined form of expression. In connection with the omission of the article, again, the first expression stands in the relation of subordination to the second, and is a preposed statement of the reason for the same. But what really decides against that view is—(1) That according to ver. 11 the believers are brethren of Christ, and sons of God; consequently *πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα* would be unsuitable as an utterance with respect to Christ, while the interpretation of the *υἱούς* as sons of *God*, adopted by Nickel, *l.c.*, in connection with the referring of the *ἀγαγόντα* to *Christ*, would be unnatural. (2) That, assuming the identity of the subject in *ἀγαγόντα* and *ἀρχηγόν*, both expressions would in effect cover each other, consequently become tautological. We must accordingly take, as the subject in *πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα*, *God;* in *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν*, *Christ.*[2] It cannot, however, be urged against the referring of *ἀγαγόντα* to God (Carpzov, Michaelis, and others), that we have not, instead of the accusative *ἀγαγόντα*, the dative *ἀγαγόντι*, which no doubt would have been more accurate on account of the preceding *αὐτῷ*; since this very accusative is otherwise the general case of the subject grammatically construed with the accusative. Transitions to the latter, spite of a preceding dative, are accordingly nothing rare.[3]—*Πολλούς*] not equivalent to *πάντας*

[1] Primasius, Erasmus, *Paraphr.*; Estius, Heinrichs, Stuart, Winer, p. 321 f. [E. T. 343]; Ebrard, Nickel, in Reuter's *Repert.* 1857, Oct. p. 20, and many others.

[2] So Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, *Annott.*; Luther, Vatablus, Calvin, Piscator, Grotius, Owen, Bengel, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch, Buttmann (*Gramm.* p. 262), [E. T. 306]; Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 51 f.), Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 581), Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Woerner, and many others.

[3] Comp. Acts xi. 12, xv. 22; Luke i. 74; Kühner, *Gramm.* II. p. 346 f.; Bernhardy, *Syntax*, p. 367, *fin.*

(Seb. Schmidt). Πολλούς renders prominent only the notion of multitude or plurality, quite apart from the question whether or not this plurality is to be thought of as the totality of mankind; comp. ix. 28; Rom. v. 15, viii. 29; Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28.—εἰς δόξαν] The δόξα is not distinguished, as to the thing itself, from the σωτηρία mentioned immediately after. The Messianic glory and blessedness is intended thereby. The word δόξα, however, was chosen in accordance with the words: δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον, ver. 9, taken over from the psalm cited.—ἀγαγόντα] [XLVI *c.*] cannot signify: "since He would lead."[1] For the *aorist* has never a *future* sense. But neither is ἀγαγόντα to be rendered by "qui *adduxerat*;"[2] in such wise that the thought were directed to the saints of the O. T., already led to glory. For the characterizing of Christ as the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν shows that the υἱοί, in whom was accomplished the εἰς δόξαν ἀγεσθαι on the part of God, must already have been in communion with Christ,[3]—the communion with Christ was the conditioning cause of their attainment to the δόξα. According to Tholuck, who is followed by Moll, the participle aorist indicates, "as the nearer defining of the infinitive aorist τελειῶσαι, the specific character of the same without respect to the relation of time." But only the *infinitive*, not the *participle* aorist is used non-temporally; and the "specific character" of τελειῶσαι cannot be expressed by ἀγαγόντα, for the reason that the personal objects of ἀγαγόντα and τελειῶσαι are different. ἀγαγόντα can have no other meaning than: *since He led*, and is the indication of the *cause* from the standpoint of the writer. The participle aorist has its justification in the fact that, from the moment Christ appeared on earth as a redeemer, and found faith among men, God in reality was leading εἰς δόξαν those who believed, *i. e.* caused them to walk in the way to the δόξα. For only this notion of title to the δόξα *in reversion*, not that of the actual *possession* of the same, can be meant; inasmuch as the possession of the δόξα will only come in at the Parousia. The causal relation, however, of the participial clause: πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα, to the main statement: ἔπρεπε τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι, and consequently the justification of the latter by the former, lies in the fact that the πολλοὶ υἱοί, just because they were not angels but men, could only be redeemed in that Christ for them became man, and for them suffered and died; even as the author himself will more fully show, ver. 14 ff. Others find the causal relation by supplying, in thought, διὰ παθημάτων to the first clause also.[4] But in this case

[1] Bleek, Stengel, Bloomfield, and Bisping; after the precedent of Erasmus, *Annott.*; Piscator, Grotius, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Peirce, Starck, Wolf, Storr, Ernesti, Dindorf, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee.

[2] With the Vulgate, Estius, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 39, 1 Aufl.; *Komm.* p. 121; differently *Schriftbew.* 2 Aufl. p. 51), and others.

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

[4] So Jac. Cappellus: "quum tot filios suos per afflictiones consecrasset, afflictionum via perduxisset ad gloriam pater coelestis, decebat sane et aequum erat, ut principem salutis eorum eadem via perduceret ad coelestem gloriam." In like manner Grotius: "quia

the express addition of *διὰ παθημάτων* in the first clause could not have been omitted.—*τὸν ἀρχηγόν*] [XLVI *d.*] Comp. xii. 2; Acts iii. 15, v. 31. Designation of the beginner, or first in a series, to which the further notion of *author* then easily attaches, so that the word is frequently used, as here, exactly in the sense of *αἴτιος*. Instances in Bleek, Abth. II. 1 Hälfte, p. 302.—*τελειῶσαι*] *to bring to perfection*, to lead to the goal, does not here express "an inner moral perfection, which has as its consequence the attainment of the highest outward goal" (de Wette, Tholuck, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 343, 346; and, long ago, Cameron), nor does it denote the close of the appointed course with which God has brought Jesus to the goal of that which He was to become, to the end of His earthly temporal existence (Hofmann): but resumes the notion of the *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ στεφανοῦσθαι*, ver. 9, and is identical with this.

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

fieri non potest, ut qui se pietati dedunt, non multa mala patiantur . . . ideo Deus voluit ipsum auctorem salutiferae doctrinae non nisi per graves calamitates perducere ad statum illum perfectae beatitudinis."

[1] Delitzsch arbitrarily takes *ἁγιάζειν*, ver. 11, as synonymous with *τελειοῦν*, ver. 10: "In order to be crowned with *δόξα καὶ τιμή* Jesus must first be sanctified, or, as the author says, ver. 10, be made perfect through suffer-

comp. x. 10, 14, ix. 13 f., xiii. 12) *all have their origin in One*,—is a special statement concerning Christ and Christians. To take the words as a proposition of universal validity, the application of which to Christ and the Christians was left to the readers, wherein there is specially an underlying allusion to the O. T. high priest and those whose cleansing from sins he accomplished (Schlichting, Gerhard, Schöttgen, *al.*), is forbidden by the connection with that which precedes and that which follows.—The *present* participles ὁ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι are used substantively. Comp. Winer, p. 331 f. [E. T. 353].—ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες] *sc.* εἰσίν. ἑνός is *masculine*. Wrongly is it by others taken as a *neuter*, in that they either supplement in thought: σπέρματος, or αἵματος, or γένους (so Carpzov, Abresch, *al.*), or else explain: *ex communi massa* (Jac. Cappellus, Akersloot), or "of one and the same nature" (Calvin, Cameron: ejusdem naturae et conditionis spiritualis; Cornelius a Lapide, Owen, Whitby, Moses Stuart); for neither is the supplying of a substantive admissible, nor can ἐκ, expressive as it is of the origin, be transformed into a declaration of nature and constitution. We have, however, to understand by ἑνός, not *Adam*[1] or *Abraham*[2] but *God*. Yet the notion of fatherhood, which is in this way assigned to God, is not to be expounded in the universal sense, in such wise that God would be called Creator and Father in relation to Christians *also*, only in the same manner in which He is the Creator of every creature,[3] but is to be referred specially to the fact that Christians are His *spiritual* children.[4] Comp. John viii. 47; 1 John iii. 10, iv. 6, v. 19; 3 John 11.—πάντες] Peirce and Bengel would have taken with οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι alone. The position of the word, however, renders this impossible. Rather does πάντες, after the close connection between the ἁγιάζων and the ἁγιαζόμενοι has already been accentuated by means of the τέ . . . καί, still further lay stress upon the fact that they *all*, the Christians not less than Christ, are ἐξ ἑνός.—δι' ἣν αἰτίαν] *Wherefore*. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 6, 12; Tit. i. 13. The same formula also not rarely with Philo.—οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται] *He* (*sc.* ὁ ἁγιάζων) *is not ashamed*. For Christ is the higher one. Comp. xi. 16.—αὐτοίς] *sc.* τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους.

Vv. 12, 13. Documentary proofs from Scripture for the οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν, ver. 11. [XLVI *f.*]

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

ings, inasmuch as the sufferings melted away that about Him which was not capable of exaltation, that He, Himself sanctified before, might be able to sanctify us, and so to raise us to like δόξα." Of a being sanctified, on the part of Christ, there is no mention made either here or anywhere else in the epistle.

[1] Erasmus, *Paraphr.*; Beza, Estius, Justinian, Hunnius, Baumgarten, Zachariae, Bisping, Wieseler in the *Publications of the University of Kiel*, 1867, p. 26; Hofmann, Woerner.

[2] Drusius, Peirce, Bengel.

[3] So Chrysostom and the majority.

[4] Piscator, Grotius, Limborch, Paulus, Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll.

Ver. 13. *Second and third proofs*, taken from Isa. viii. 17, 18. The design of the author in dividing into two different citations, by means of καὶ πάλιν, the words which stand together in the Hebrew and the LXX., is *not* to present the relation of community between Christ and the Christians on two different sides, in that, namely, it is indicated in his first passage how the incarnate Son of God descended to the standpoint of man; in the second, on the other hand, how redeemed men are raised by God to the standpoint of Christ (Kurtz),—all of which is subtle and far-fetched; but only to pile up the Scripture testimonies, inasmuch as the end of ver. 17, as well as the beginning of ver. 18, seemed to him to contain each in itself an independent means of evidence for that which he would make good. The words of the first proof passage: πεποιθὼς ἐσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ, are likewise found in the LXX. at 2 Sam. xxii. 3 and Isa. xii. 2. But that the author was not thinking of one of these passages (according to Ebrard, of the first), but of Isa. viii. 17, is the more natural supposition, because with the LXX. and in the original the words, which here, too, are first adduced (only in partially inverted order, and augmented by ἐγώ): καὶ πεποιθὼς ἐσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ, immediately precede the directly following passage, taken from Isa. viii. 18. In their historic sense the words cited refer to the prophet and his sons, and, indeed, with the LXX., the ἰδοὺ . . . θεός is a further unfolding of the subject in ἐσομαι. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, however, regards the words as an utterance of Christ, led thereto, as Bleek rightly conjectures, by the καὶ ἐρεῖ, interpolated by the LXX. before ver. 17, which seemed to indicate another subject than the prophet, since he spoke throughout the whole section in the first person; and other than God, since He is spoken of, by virtue of ἐπ' αὐτῷ, as the one in whom the speaker trusts. The demonstrative force of the words cited is found by our author in the fact that the person speaking, *i. e.* Christ, places Himself, by means of the testifying of His confidence in God, upon the same level with other men;[1] as also in that the author understands by the παιδία, not the children of the speaker, but the children of God, the children whom God the Father has given to Christ.

Vv. 14, 15. The author, after the subsidiary remarks, vv. 11–13, returns to the main thought of ver. 10, now further to develop the same. [XLVI *g.*] To lead Christ through sufferings to perfection, was a provision worthy of God. For it was necessary, if Christ was to be the Redeemer of sinful humanity. In order, however, to be able to take upon Himself sufferings and death, He must become man as other men, and place Himself upon one level with those to be redeemed.[2]—οὖν] is the outward sign of that return to the main thought. Logically it belongs not to the protasis, with which it is grammatically connected, but to the main thesis: καὶ αὐτὸς παραπλησίως μετέσχεν κ.τ.λ. An attachment of ver. 14 to ver. 13, therefore, is effected only in so far as τὰ παιδία, ver. 13, has given occasion for the

[1] Theophylact: καὶ διὰ τούτου δείκνυσιν, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἕκαστος τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς πέποιθεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, τουτέστι τῷ πατρί.

[2] Comp. on ver. 14, Zyro in the *Theol. Studd. u. Kritt.* 1864, II. 3, p. 516 ff.

resuming of this word in the first clause of ver. 14. In a strangely perverted fashion Heinrichs (comp. also Valckenaer): "Quod si homo fuit Christus, infans quoque primo fuerit omnemque in nativitate sua humanam naturam induerit necesse est."—*κεκοινώνηκεν*] here, as often in the case of the classics, combined with the *genitive;* whereas elsewhere in the N. T. the *dative* is used with *κοινωνεῖν* (Rom. xv. 27; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 13, *al.*). The persons with whom the communion or the common participation takes place are not the *parents* (Valckenaer, who supplies *γονεῖσι*), but the *children* themselves. One *παιδίον* with the other, one as well as the other, has part in blood and flesh, or possesses the same. The *perfect*, however, indicates the constant and definitive character of the order of nature, as this has always prevailed already, and still continues to assert its sway.—*αἵματος καὶ σαρκός*] The same succession of words, also Eph. vi. 12. Otherwise more ordinarily: *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα*. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Matt. xvi. 17; Ecclus. xiv. 18, xvii. 31. *αἷμα καὶ σάρξ*, the two main constituents of the sensuously perceptible outward nature of man.—*παραπλησίως*] is not: "equally," [1] or: "likewise," [2]—a signification which is linguistically undemonstrable,—but: *in a manner very closely resembling.* It expresses the resemblance with the accessory notion of the diversity; in such wise that the author characterizes the human form of Christ's existence, in all its correspondence with the form of existence of other men, as still different from the latter.[3] And rightly so. For Christ was no ordinary man, but the incarnate Son of God. He was distinguished from His human brethren by His sinlessness (comp. iv. 15). As therefore Paul, Phil. ii. 7 (and similarly Rom. viii. 3), speaks of the incarnate Christ not as *ἀνθρωπος γενόμενος*, but as *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος*, even so the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also here places not *ἐξ ἴσου*, but *παραπλησίως μετέσχεν τῶν αὐτῶν*. Comp. also *ὄθεν ὤφειλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι*, ver. 17.—*μετέσχεν*] The *aorist.* For the incarnation and the earthly course of Christ is a fact already belonging to the purely past; *now* Christ is already the glorified Son of God.—*τῶν αὐτῶν*] *sc. αἵματος καὶ σαρκός.* Erroneously, because without taking into account the reference imperatively required by the former clause, Bengel: *eadem*, quae fratribus accidunt, sanguine et carne laborantibus, ne *morte* quidem excepta.—*διὰ τοῦ θανάτου*] [XLVI *h.*] *by means of death*, the enduring of which first became possible by the taking upon Him of flesh and blood. Bengel: *διὰ τοῦ θανάτου* Paradoxon. Jesus mortem passus vicit; diabolus mortem vibrans succubuit.—The placing of the characteristic *τὸν τὸ κράτος ἐχοντα τοῦ θανάτου* before *τὸν διάβολον* is chosen, in order to gain a marked contrast to the preceding *διὰ τοῦ θανάτου.* [XLVI *i.*]—A ruler's power over death,[4] however, is possessed by the devil, inasmuch as

[1] Bleek, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Grimm in the Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt *A. K. Z.* 1857, No. 29, p. 663; Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 57, 2 Aufl.; Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 313 f.; Maier.

[2] De Wette.

[3] Cameron, Owen, Akersloot, Cramer, Böhme, Zyro, Moll, Woerner.

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

by the enticement of the devil sin came into the world of men, and sin brings about death for man. Comp. Wisd. ii. 24: *φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον*; Rom. v. 12.

Ver. 15. Καί] consecutive: *and in consequence thereof.*—ἀπαλλάξῃ] stands absolutely: *might set free, deliver.* Without warrant do Grotius, Wolf, and others supplement *τοῦ φόβου* or *τοῦ φόβου θανάτου.*—Τούτους] does not go back to *τὰ παιδία* (Böhme, Kuinoel), but serves for the bringing into relief of the following ὅσοι, and *τοὺτους ὅσοι κ.τ.λ.* is a periphrasis of the unredeemed humanity; the thought is not merely of the Israelites (Akersloot, Rambach, Braun, Woerner), and still less merely of the Gentiles (Peirce). —*φόβῳ θανάτου*] *out of fear of death,* causal definition to *διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας.*—*διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν*] *throughout the whole life.* The infinitive is employed, by virtue of the addition *παντός,* entirely as a substantive (*διὰ πάσης τῆς ζωῆς*). This practice is more rare than the coupling of the infinitive with the mere preposition and article. Yet this very infinitive *ζῆν* is found exactly so used, as Bleek remarks, with Aesch. *Dial.* iii. 4 (*ὥσπερ εἰς ἕτερον ζῆν ἐπιθανούμενος*); Ignat. *Ep. ad Trall.* 9 (*οὐ χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν*), *ad Ephes.* 3 (*καὶ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν*).—*ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας*] belongs together; *were held in bondage, had become subject to bondage.* [XLVI *j.*] We have not to construe *ἔνοχοι ἦσαν* with *φόβῳ θανάτου,* and *δουλείας* with *ἀπαλλάξῃ* (Abresch, Dindorf, Böhme). For against this the position of the words is decisive. On the *thought,* comp. Rom. viii. 15.

Ver. 16. [XLVI *k.*] The necessity for the assumption of flesh and blood on the part of the Redeemer is more fully brought to light by means of an establishing of the characteristic *τούτους ὅσοι κ.τ.λ.,* ver. 15. This assumption was necessary, since the object of this redemption was confessedly not *angels, i. e.* beings of a purely spiritual nature, but *descendants of Abraham,* i. e. beings of flesh and blood.—*οὐ δήπου*] or *δή που,* as it is more correctly written, does not signify: "nowhere" (Luther, Zeger, Calvin, Schlichting, Limborch, Bisping, *al.*; Vulg.: *usquam*), in such wise that *που* should be referred to a passage in the O. T., and the sense would result: nowhere in the O. T. is it spoken of, that, etc.[1]—For such reference must at least have been indicated by the context, which is not the case. *Δή που* stands rather, according to purely classical usage (in the N. T., for the rest, it is found only here; with the LXX. not at all), to denote, in ironical form of expression, the presupposition that the statement to be expressed is a truth raised above all doubt, which must be conceded by every one. It corresponds to our "assuredly," "surely" (*doch wohl*), "I should think," to the Latin "opinor."[2]—*ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαί τινος*] *to take a helping interest in any one* (comp. Ecclus. iv. 11), here to deliver him from the guilt and punishment of sin (comp. *ἀπαλλάξῃ,* ver. 15; and *εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ,* ver. 17; wrongly, because

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

[2] Comp. Hartung, *Partikellehre,* I. p. 285; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 427.

τούτους ὅσοι κ.τ.λ., ver. 15, stands not in reciprocal relation with ἐπιλαμβάνεται, but with the antithesis οὐκ ἀγγέλων ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, ver. 16; Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 59, 2 Aufl.: "in order that the fear of death might not in our life terrify and enslave us"). The *present*, since the ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι is something still continuing. The interpretation of Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Erasmus, Luther, Clarius, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, Beza, Calov, Wolf, and many others: not angels, but the seed of Abraham, that is to say: not the nature of angels, but *the nature of the seed of Abraham did Christ assume*, has fallen into deserved disrepute;[1] only Castellio, however, first perceived its grammatical impossibility. The proposal of Schulz to supply ὁ θάνατος from vv. 14, 15 as the subject to ἐπιλαμβάνεται: "*for certainly he* (death, or the lord of death) *does not lay hold of*, or carry off, *angels, but the posterity of Abraham does he lay hold of*," is indeed grammatically permissible; logically, however, it does not commend itself, inasmuch as ver. 17 stands in close connection with ver. 16, but at ver. 17, as vv. 14, 15, the subject again is naturally *Christ*.—ἀγγέλων] without article, like the following σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, *generically*. The author here excludes the angels from the province of the redemption which takes place through Christ. He is thus brought into contradiction with the teaching of Paul (comp. Col. i. 20)—a position which is wrongly denied by Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 59 f.; Delitzsch, and Moll; by the first-named upon the untenable ground that "the design in this connection was not to say whom Jesus helps and whom He does not help, but what He is for those with whom He concerns Himself, for whom He exerts Himself!"—σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ] does not denote mankind in general (Bengel, Böhme, Klee, Stein, Wieseler, *Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters*, p. 491 f., *al.*), in such wise that the expression should be taken in the spiritual sense, or "the congregation of God, reaching over from the O. T. into the N. T., which goes back to Abraham's call and obedience of faith for its fundamental beginning, Israel and the believers out of all mankind, the whole good olive tree, which has the patriarchs as its sacred root, Gal. iii. 29; Rom. iv. 16, xi. 16" (Delitzsch, Hofmann, II. 1, p. 60, 2 Aufl.; Kluge, Kurtz), which must have been introduced and made manifest by the context; but *the Jewish people* (comp. τοῦ λαοῦ, ver. 17; τὸν λαόν, xiii. 12). For Apollos, who (according to sec. 1 of the *Introduction*) is to be regarded as the author of the epistle, the conviction of the universality of Christianity must, it is true, have been not less firmly established than for Paul himself. He has mentioned, however, in place of the *genus*—*i.e.* in place of mankind in general—only a *species* of this *genus*, namely, Jewish humanity; just because he had only to do with born Jews as the readers of his epistle. Grotius: Hebraeis scribens satis habet de illis loqui; de gentibus alibi loquendi locus. Rightly at the same time does de Wette remark that Paul, even under a precisely identical state of the case, would hardly have expressed himself as is here done.[2]

[1] M'Caul alone has espoused it afresh.

[2] Comp. also Reuss (*Nouvelle Revue de Théologie*, vol. V., Strasb. et Paris 1860, p. 208): "Nous doutons, que Paul eût pu traiter un

Ver. 17. [On Vv. 17, 18, see Note XLVII., pages 452, 453.] Inference from ver. 16, and consequently a reverting to the main statement in ver. 14.—*ὅθεν*] *wherefore*, sc. on account of the essential constitution of those to be redeemed, as indicated in ver. 16. [XLVII *b*.] The particle *ὁθεν* is of very frequent occurrence in the Epistle to the Hebrews (comp. iii. 1, vii. 25, viii. 3, ix. 18, xi. 19). In Paul's writings, on the other hand, it is nowhere met with.—*ὤφειλεν*] *He ought*. Expression, not of the necessity founded in the decree of God (cf. *δεῖ*, Luke xxiv. 26), but of that founded in the nature of the case itself, comp. v. 3, 12.—*κατὰ πάντα*] *in all respects*.[1] —*ὁμοιωθῆναι*] is not: "to be made the same or equal,"[2] but expresses, as always, the notion of *resemblance*. Christ was in all things *similar* to men, His brethren, inasmuch as He had assumed a truly human nature; He was distinguished from them, however, by His absolute sinlessness. Comp. iv. 15.—*ἐλεήμων*] *merciful*, full of compassion for the sufferings of the *ἀδελφοί*, may be taken by itself,[3] but also as *πιστός*, may be taken with *ἀρχιερεύς*.[4] In the former case, which, on account of the position of the words, seems more natural, *καί* denotes "and in consequence thereof," so that *ἐλεήμων* indicates the quality, the possession of which fits him to become a *πιστὸς ἀρχιερεύς*.—*πιστός*] *faithful*, so fulfilling His high-priestly office as to satisfy the requirements of those to be reconciled.—*τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*] *with regard to the affairs of God*, or: *with regard to the cause of God*. Comp. v. 1; Rom. xv. 17.—*ἱλάσκεσθαι*] middle voice.—*τοῦ λαοῦ*] *of the people* (of Israel, xiii. 12), see on ver. 16.—The idea of the high-priesthood of Christ here first comes out in this epistle. From iv. 14 onwards it is unfolded in detail. It is disputed, however, at what point our author thought of the high-priestly office of Christ as beginning, whether *even on earth, with His death on the cross*,[5] or *only after the return to the Father;* in such wise that, according to the view of the author, the offering of His own body upon the earth, and the entering with His own blood into the heavenly sanctuary, is to be regarded only as the inauguration of Christ to His high-priestly dignity, this dignity itself, however, beginning only with the moment when Christ, in accordance with Ps. cx. 1, sat down at the right hand of God the Father, Heb. viii. 1.[6] It is certainly undeniable that the author in the course of his epistle very strongly accentuates the high-priesthood of Christ (comp. v. 9 f., vi. 19 f., vii. 24–26, viii. 4, ix. 24). But the polemic against readers who thought they could not dispense with the ritual of the Jewish sacrifice of atonement for the

pareil sujet en s'imposant un silence absolu sur un principe, qui était, à vrai dire, le centre de son activité apostolique."

[1] Chrysostom: *τί ἐστι κατὰ πάντα; ἐτέχθη, φησίν, ἐτράφη, ἠὐξήθη, ἔπαθε πάντα ἅπερ ἐχρῆν, τέλος ἀπέθανεν.* Theodoret: *Ὁμοίως γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ τροφῆς μετέλαβε καὶ πόνον ὑπέμεινε καὶ ἠθύμησε καὶ ἐδάκρυσε καὶ θάνατον κατεδέξατο.*

[2] Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 320; Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, *al.*

[3] Luther, Grotius, Böhme, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Tholuck, Woerner [after Peshito, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions].

[4] Owen, Bengel, Cramer, Storr, Stuart, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm, p. 330; Alford, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann.

[5] So Cramer, Winzer, *de sacerdotis officio, quod Christo tribuitur in ep. ad Hebr.*, Lips. 1825, Comment. I. p. vi. sq.; de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, and others.

[6] So Bleek and Kurtz, after the precedent

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

Ver. 18. Elucidatory justification of ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται κ.τ.λ., and by means thereof corroborative conclusion to the last main assertion: ὤφειλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι. Christ, namely, became qualified for having compassion and rendering help, inasmuch as He experienced in His own person the temptations, the burden of which pressed upon the brethren He came to redeem. Comp. iv. 15, 16—ἐν ᾧ] equivalent to ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι (comp. John xvi. 30: ἐν τούτῳ, *propter hoc*), literally: upon the ground of (the fact) that, *in that*, i. e. *inasmuch as*, or *because*.[1] The interpretation "wherein," or "in which province,"[2] with which construction an ἐν τούτῳ corresponding to the ἐν ᾧ has to be supplied before δύναται, and ἐν ᾧ itself is connected with πέπονθεν or with πειρασθείς, or else by the resolving of the participle into the *tempus finitum* is connected in like measure with both verbs, is to be rejected; not, indeed, because in that case the aorist ἔπαθεν must have been employed (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 392, 2 Aufl.), nor because the plural ἐν οἷς must have been placed (Hofmann, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 320, *note*).—for only slight modifications of the sense would result in this way, the substance of the statement itself remaining untouched,—but in reality for the

of Faustus Socinus, Schlichting [Whitby], Griesbach, *Opusc.* II. p. 436 sq.; Schulz, p. 83 f., and others.

[1] Comp. Bernhardy, *Synt.*, p. 211: Fritzsche *on Rom.* viii. 3, p. 93.

[2] Luther, Casaubon, Valckenaer, Fritzsche, *l. c.* p. 94, *note*; Ebrard, Bisping, Kurtz, Woerner, and others.

reason that the thought thus resulting would be unsuitable. For Christ's capacity for conferring sympathy and help would then be restricted within the too narrow bounds of like conditions of suffering and temptations in the case of Himself and His earthly brethren. Bleek, too, understands *ἐν ᾧ* in the ordinary signification: "wherein," but then—after the example of Chr. Fr. Schmid—takes the words *ἐν ᾧ πέπονθεν* as a kind of adverbial nearer defining to *αὐτὸς πειρασθείς*: "Himself tempted in that which He suffered," *i. e.* Himself tempted in the midst of His sufferings. So likewise more recently Alford: "for, having been Himself tempted in that which He suffered." Against this, however, the violence of the linguistic expression is decisive, since *πειρασθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν*, or something similar, would have been much more simply and naturally written. —The emphasis rests not upon *πέπονθεν* (Hofmann), but upon *αὐτὸς πειρασθείς*, inasmuch as not the *πάσχειν* in and of itself, but the *πάσχειν* in a definite state, is to be brought into relief: *because He Himself suffered as one tempted, i. e.* because His suffering was combined with temptations. *αὐτὸς πειρασθείς*, however, was designedly placed at the end, in order to gain thereby a marked correspondence to the following *τοῖς πειραζομένοις*. —*δύναται*] not a note of the *inclination* (Grotius: *potest auxiliari pro potest movere ad auxiliandum*, and similarly many others), but of the *possibility*.—*τοῖς πειραζομένοις*] a characteristic of *τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*, ver. 17. The participle *present*, since the state of temptation of the human brethren is one still continuing.—*βοηθῆσαι*] *to come to the help*, *sc.* in that He entirely fills with His Spirit the suffering ones, whose necessities He has become acquainted with as a result of His own experience.

Notes by American Editor.

XLIV. Vv. 1–4.

(*a*) These verses contain an exhortation founded upon vv. 4–14 of the preceding chapter and should, properly, be joined with that chapter. The exhortation is, in substance, that which we find in all parts of the Epistle—the one great exhortation which the writer presses upon the readers, and for the purpose of giving force to which he writes the letter—*on the negative side*, not to apostatize from Christianity to Judaism; *on the positive side*, to hold fast their Christian faith and confession to the end. Sometimes, the positive side is more prominently presented, as it is here; sometimes the negative side is emphasized; sometimes they are both set forth. But the substance of the thought and the end in view are always the same.—(*b*) *διὰ τοῦτο* points back to the whole passage i. 4–14. That passage is thus made the ground of *δεῖ περισσοτέρως κ.τ.λ.* The latter words are, again, through *γάρ* of ver. 2 founded upon what is said in vv. 2 ff. These verses, however, contain—so far as their statement as to the two systems or revelations is concerned—nothing more than has been suggested in chap. i., namely, that the revelation which has come through the Lord must, for this very reason, be superior to that which came through angels. But in connection with the repeated expression of this thought, reference is made to the greater danger resulting from neglecting the greater system. The introduction of the *γάρ* sentence after the *διὰ τοῦτο*—as

considered both in the repetition of the main thought and the addition of the special reason,—and the consequent resting of the δεῖ κ.τ.λ. on both what precedes and what follows, is in accordance with one of the peculiar characteristics of the Pauline style.—(*e*) Though there is no special emphasis to be laid upon ἡμᾶς, the reference in the word is plainly to the readers as those who have heard and accepted the Christian revelation. They are reminded of the duty—the moral necessity (δεῖ)—of giving more earnest attention to what had been heard, than would have been demanded if the new system were only like the old. παραρρυῶμεν is rightly explained by Lünem. It means to be *carried by* as on a flowing stream, *floated past*, and thus to *drift away*, as R. V. The verb is appropriately chosen as suggesting the idea of indifference or want of thoughtfulness which is opposed to περισσοτέρως προσέχειν.

(*d*) βέβαιος (ver. 2) seems to be immediately related in thought with ἐλαβεν ἐνδ. μισθ., and παρακοή *mis-hearing*, "the subjective listless hearing or inattention" (Lünem.), may, not improbably, be added to παράβασις *transgression* in connection with the idea conveyed in παραρρυῶμεν.—(*e*) The word σωτηρίας has, in this place, a peculiar sense, which is both demanded and indicated by the context. It means not *salvation*, but *a salvation* or *a system of salvation*. The rendering of the word by *salvation*, A. V., R. V., is likely to mislead the English reader.—(*f*) The contrast between the two systems is set forth, in vv. 2, 3, by δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς and λαβεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου. The writer, throughout the entire epistle, presents the same idea which he expresses here;—namely, that there are two revelations, both of which alike come from God, but one of which is made through angels (or Moses), while the other is given through Christ. The superiority of the latter to the former, accordingly, is not in the originating source of the system, but in the instrumental agent employed.

(*g*) The argument against the Pauline authorship which Lünem., Alf., Blk., and others find in the words ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη, deserves serious consideration. These words show that the writer places himself, with the readers, among those to whom the knowlege of the N. T. revelation had not come directly from Jesus, but only from those who had heard Him. Paul, on the other hand, claims with regard to himself, in Gal. i. 11 ff., that he had derived the Gospel immediately from Christ. The only ways of reconciling the two statements, as being made by the same auther, are either (1) to suppose that he uses the "communicative *we*," or (2) that, while, in Gal., he is speaking of the great impartation of the Gospel truth in preparation for his apostleship and ministry, he is, in this passage, referring only to the fact, that, not having been associated with Jesus when He was on the earth, as the other apostles were, he, like the readers, was obliged to depend on their testimony for his acquaintance with many of the things which Jesus did and said. To the former supposition Lünem. very properly objects, that "what a writer of a letter says to his readers by means of an ἀνακοίνωσις is always of such a nature as to be likewise true of himself." With regard to the latter supposition, it cannot be affirmed that it is impossible, but it may justly be declared in a high degree improbable.

XLV. Vv. 5–8.

(*a*) At ver. 5 the writer begins the more indirect argument in proof of the exaltation of Christ, as the instrumental agent in the N. T. revelation, above the

angels. His thought has been understood in two different ways, according as the reference in vv. 6 ff. has been supposed to be to *Christ*, or to *man*. If the former view is taken, the fact that the *οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα*, *i. e.* the *αἰὼν μέλλων* or the Messianic period, is subjected, according to God's plan, to Christ, is made the ground of the assertion of His superiority. He was, indeed, for a time made lower than the angels, but this was only for the purpose of the accomplishment of His great work. At the consummation of the work, the glory belonging to Him in connection with it began to be manifested, and it will be manifested hereafter in its fullness. On this interpretation, the thought centres upon Christ throughout. If the latter view is adopted, on the other hand, the writer presents the *οἰκουμ. μέλλ.* as subjected, not to angels, but to man. Man, indeed, is not yet elevated to the dominion designed for him, but the exaltation has already been given to *the representative man*, Jesus Christ, and He is to lead his brethren—the sons of God among mankind, of whose nature He has partaken—to the attainment of it in the future. The main purpose of the passage is the same, in whichever of the two ways it is explained. But, in the latter case, the line of thought is somewhat more indirect than it is in the former. The considerations which favor the latter view are the following:—(1) The verses quoted from the Psalm refer, in the original, not to Christ, but to man. (2) The later verses of the chapter speak of the exaltation of man as the end accomplished by the work and exaltation of Christ. (3) It gives the simplest and most natural explanation of the introduction of the thought of Christ's assuming the nature of man and undertaking to help man. (4) It best accounts for the fact that the name of Christ is not introduced in ver. 5. On the contrary, the former view is favored by the following considerations:—(1) that Christ is made prominent throughout the entire passage; and (2) that the order of words in ver. 9 is not *Ἰησοῦν δὲ τὸν κ.τ.λ. βλέπομεν*, (as if the writer would call attention to the realization of the fact in the case of Jesus as having already been witnessed, though not as yet seen in the experience of mankind universally), but *τὸν δὲ . . . ἠλαττωμ. βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν* (as if the name *Jesus* were only added without emphasis, for the purpose, simply, of designating the person who had already, in the preceding verses, been spoken of as the one who was made lower than the angels). The force of this last objection to the reference of vv. 6 ff. to man is insisted upon by Lünemann and others. But it does not seem to be conclusive, because the object of the writer may have been, not to say: we do not yet see man exalted to his destined glory and dominion, but we do see Jesus thus exalted; but to say: we do not yet see man, indeed, exalted, but we do see *the representative man*, namely, Jesus, crowned, etc. Now if this was the author's design, and if he desired to express his thought in the exact phraseology of the Psalm, it is difficult to see how he could have adopted any better course than the one which we find him to have taken.

(*b*) The reference of the words, as used by the Psalmist, is evidently to the honor put upon man by his Creator, and the dominion given to him over the other creatures on the earth—the sheep and oxen, the beasts and birds and fishes (vv. 7, 8 of the Psalm). The Psalmist is contemplating the glory of God's power and being as manifested in the starry heavens, and is filled with wonder that He should have so "visited" man and been "mindful of him," even making him "but little lower than God," and subjecting all things to him. The writer of the epistle transfers the thought to the *αἰὼν μέλλων*, and to the dominion of man, or of Christ, in that period. He quotes from the LXX. and incidentally, thus, brings

in a reference to a temporary condition of Christ, or man, below the angels, which is not to continue, since the coming age is, by God's appointment, not to be subordinated to the angels, but to him. It is doubtful whether the writer supposed the Psalmist to have intended, in his words, to make any reference either to the *αἰὼν μέλλων* or to the Messianic King. The words were suited to express his own thought respecting the point in hand, and he used them for the purpose for which, in the highest and best sense, the Old Testament, in all its parts and words, had been Divinely prepared.

(*c*) With respect to individual words and phrases in these verses, the following points may be noticed:—1. The explanation given by Lünem. of *ἀγγέλοις* as used without the article, and of *περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν* as equivalent to "which is the subject of our discourse (our epistle)," is to be adopted as correct. 2. The indefiniteness in the use of *τις* and *που*, in ver. 6, is characteristic of the writer of this epistle. He seems, in general, to be less careful to present the name of the O. T. author whose words he cites, than he is to give the words themselves. That such words are in the O. T., which was God's earlier revelation and which is so reverenced by the readers, is the point of all importance to his mind. The use, in different passages, of the different phrases: "a certain one says," "the Holy Spirit says," "he hath said somewhere," "it is witnessed," "the exhortation which says," may be sometimes accidental and sometimes determined by special reasons; but the same design, to bring out the thought for its own sake, and as coming from God, not from any particular prophet or writer, is manifest, whatever may be the form of expression. 3. *βραχύ τι.* This expression is, apparently, used here in a different sense from that of the corresponding phrase in the original Psalm. The meaning of the Psalmist is, as given in R. V., "Thou hast made him *but little* lower than God." The *dignity* and *exaltation* of man are thus set forth, as they are, also, in the following clause: "and crownest him with glory and honor." But *here*, the thought must be that of man's *inferiority*, as is evident from the reference to Jesus in ver. 9. The words, as here used, may refer to degree or to time, *a little*, some little in measure, or *for a little time*. As between these two meanings, the former is favored by the fact that, in the original passage, the idea is that of measure or degree; and, though the writer of the epistle might, in employing the passage for his special purpose, change the thought from *but little* to *some little*, he was less likely to give an altogether new sense to the words. But, on the other hand, the interpretation of the phrase as meaning *for a little time* is exactly suited to the application which is made of the clause to Jesus in ver. 9; it is, also, fitted to the course of thought, in the chapter, respecting man, if the primary reference of vv. 6–8 is to him, and not to Christ; and it likewise accords with the suggestion which arises from *οὐπω* of ver. 8. Lünem., Blk., Grimm, de W., Calv. and others adopt this view. 4. *γάρ* of ver. 8 is regarded by Winer, p. 447, as giving the proof that there is nothing which was not put in subjection to Him, and, therefore, indirectly of ver. 5: that the world to come is also subjected to Him. This case, however, is one of the strongest which we find in the N. T., as showing that this conjunction was occasionally used by the writers of its different books in the sense of *namely, indeed, that is, certainly.* The connection with ver. 5 is remote, not to say, harsh. That with ver. 8*a*, on the other hand, is difficult, and involves some degree of tautology, if *γάρ* is regarded as argumentative. But if *γάρ* is taken as explicative, this latter connection is most simple, and is just in accordance with what might be expected:—God is declared by the Psalmist to have put all things under him.

This means, certainly, that there is nothing which is not put under him. We do not, as yet, however, see this grand result secured in its completeness. But we do see it begun and the assurance of the end given, in that we behold Jesus crowned with glory. The progress of the thought may thus be regarded as proving this sense of *γάρ* (as Lünem. also takes it) to be the true one.

XLVI. Vv. 9–16.

(*a*) With reference to the difficulties in the construction of the last portion of ver. 9, we may notice: 1. that, for the reasons suggested by Lünem., the words *διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου* are not to be connected with *ἠλαττωμένον*, but with *ἐστεφανωμένον*; 2. that, with the latter connection, these words have a peculiar and marked emphasis—the author must have intended to make especially prominent, at this point, the ground of Christ's exaltation to glory; 3. that, inasmuch as this was evidently his intention, the further explanation of His suffering of death in relation to its purpose as bearing upon mankind, might naturally be added; 4. that, for the sake of not breaking the close union between *διὰ τ. πάθ.* and *ἐστεφαν.*, and of not interfering with the primary emphasis on the former of these two expressions, and the secondary on the latter, this desired addition might be separated by *ἐστεφαν.* from the words to which it immediately belonged; 5. that the relation of Christ to men—and in the way of delivering them from the fear and power of death by His own sufferings and dying—which is presented in the following verses, is developed out of the comprehensive statement of this verse, and thus demands, for the greatest clearness of the thought, the placing of the words: "that he should taste of death for every man," where they are, i. e., at the end of ver. 9. These considerations render it almost certain that the *ὅπως* clause belongs with *πάθημα* (as if he had said: on account of that suffering of death, which He suffered in order that, etc.). The words of this clause, it may be added, are a plain declaration of the universality of the atonement.

(*b*) Ver. 10 sets forth the fitness that Jesus should have had this experience appointed to Him by God. The fact of this fitness is developed and established in vv. 11 ff. As men, and not angels, are the sons of God who are to be brought to glory, there was a need that He who was to be the leader of the great company, and the representative man, should partake of their human nature, and should pass through their experience. He must be perfected as a leader and Saviour through sufferings. *τελειῶσαι* does not, probably, convey the idea of bringing to perfection with respect to moral character, but in relation to His office.—Lünem. says it is equivalent to *δόξῃ . . . στεφανοῦσθαι*, but this is doubtful.

(*c*) That the participle *ἀγαγόντα* refers to God, not to Christ, is proved by the considerations which Lünem., presents in his note. The explanation of the aorist tense is to be found in the fact, that the whole work of the *ἄγειν* is conceived of as, in a sense, centered in the *τελειῶσαι* of Christ. This gathering up of *the results* of Christ's death and glorification into *the one fact* of His death and glorification, is characteristic of the Pauline mode of thought. Comp. for a similar centering of all results of evil in the first transgression of Adam, Rom. v. 12.—R. V., text renders *ἀγαγ. in bringing*—so also A. V. R. V., marg. has *having brought*. The rendering *bringing, as he did*, which is suggested by Alford, seems perhaps more exactly to suit the aorist participle.—(*d*) The word *ἀρχηγός* is found twice in this epistle, in this verse and xii. 2. In the latter passage, it is explained by Grimm

(Lex. N. T.), as *qui in aliqua re præit*, and he adds the words: *eoque modo exemplum edit*. It is used by Plutarch, Isocrates and others, as Bleek shows, with reference to the originator of a family as the leader of his descendants. It is, also, employed as equivalent in meaning to *αἴτιος*. This last sense is given to it here by Lünem., Bleek, Grimm, and others. The connection of thought in this chapter, and also in chap. xii., seems, however, to point to the fact that Christ not only is the author of salvation or faith for His brethren, but that He is so *by being their leader*—the one who went through their experience to the glorious consummation, and thus became the first, and, as it were, the representative of them all. The choice of the word, instead of *αἴτιος*, we may believe to have been determined by the desire of the writer to bring out this compound idea of cause and leader, which *αἴτιος* would not have suggested.—(*e*) Vv. 11–13 do not appear to be merely subsidiary and, as it were, parenthetical, as Lünem., regards them. They form a part of the proof given of ver. 10, though, as compared with vv. 14, 15, a subordinate part. In developing the idea of the fitness, that, in His plan of bringing His sons to glory, God should perfect the *ἀρχηγός* through sufferings, two thoughts needed to be presented and confirmed—namely, that the *ἀρχηγός* was a son, as the *υἱοί* for whom He was to accomplish the great result were sons, and that, in order to have their position fully, and be a leader for them, it was necessary for Him to become a partaker of their human nature, and thus to become subject to death. These two thoughts might, not improbably, have been introduced coördinately by ordinary writers, as two grounds for the statement or suggestion of ver. 10. But this author, who constantly manifests the Pauline influence in his manner of writing, introduces the first and less important thought by *γάρ*, connecting it immediately with *πολλοὺς υἱούς*, and then afterwards, in ver. 14, he brings in the second thought as an inference (*οὖν*) suggested by the words *τὰ παιδία* of ver. 13. The immediate and grammatical connection is, in this case, accordingly, as so often in Paul's epistles, different from the logical connection.—(*f*) We find a use of O. T. passages in vv. 12 f. similar to that which has been noticed in ch. i., and in vv. 6–8 of this chapter. The change in the reference of *τὰ παιδία*, by which it is made to designate, not the children of the prophet, as in the O. T., but the children of God, is, also, noticeable, and finds its explanation in the way in which the author viewed the O. T. Such a change was, at the most, a sacrifice of the letter for the more full and perfect setting forth of the Divine truth. The O. T. was filled with foreshadowings of Christ and the new system.

(*g*) The movement in the thought from vv. 11 ff. to what follows is evidently through ver. 14*a* towards vv. 14*b*, 15—the emphasis being on the idea expressed in the latter. The representative is crowned with glory and honor on account of his suffering of death, because this was the course by which the end which God had in view—the deliverance of men from the fear of death—might be accomplished. To this end, accordingly, Christ becomes a son, in the human sense, and partakes of flesh and blood.—(*h*) *καταργήσῃ* is used here in a sense similar to that which we find in 1 Cor. xv. 24, 26, i. e. of *bringing to nought* (R. V.) or destroying the power of the enemy to do injury with respect to the thing in question. Here the devil is deprived of the power of death so far as the persons mentioned, the *υἱοί* or *παιδία*, are concerned.—(*i*) The power of death, here spoken of, is apparently that connected with fear. This verse may, perhaps, be regarded as throwing light on some passages in Paul's writings, where death is referred to as the consequence of sin, and as showing that to the Pauline thought death, as thus used,

always carried with it this idea, and did not mean simply the separation of the soul from the body. However this may be, the power of death is here ascribed to the devil, as we cannot doubt, because he was the one who introduced sin into the race, through the temptation at the beginning, and death is the result of sin. See Rom. v. 12, 1 Cor. xv. 56, and other passages.—(*j*) δουλείας seems to be determined in its meaning by the earlier words of the clause. It does not denote the bondage to the law of decay and death, *the bondage of corruption*, Rom. viii. 21, but the bondage to the fear of death as a terrible and hopeless evil.—(*k*) The immediate connection of ver. 16 through γάρ is, manifestly, with vv. 14, 15, as still further explanatory of what is there said. It seems, however, to be an unnecessary addition, so far as this object alone is concerned, and to be even repetitious, in its idea, of what has been already brought out with sufficient fullness. It is not improbable, therefore, that the writer was led to write these words, not so much for the purpose of adding a new point or argument, as of calling attention at the end, as he had done at the beginning (ver. 5), to the fact that the οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα was, in God's plan, subjected not to angels, but to men. The use of the words "seed of Abraham," instead of *men*, is most simply explained in accordance with Lünemann's supposition: the author writes thus just because he had only to do with born Jews as the readers of his epistle. That there is a conflict between the statements of this passage, and of this verse, and Paul's declaration in Col. i. 20, has been maintained by Lünemann and some others. But when we take the different passages in Paul's writings, which relate to the work of redemption, into careful consideration, it can hardly be doubted that his including of the angels in the ἀποκαταλλάξαι of Col. i. 20 is, in no sense, such as to cover the ground of this author in this chapter. Paul does not regard the angels as among the sons of God whom Christ leads to salvation and glory through His sufferings, and into the experiences of whose nature Christ enters for this end.

XLVII. Vv. 17–18.

(*a*) The close correspondence between these verses and those at the end of the fourth chapter will not fail to be observed. This correspondence is seen: 1. in the ideas and expressions of these corresponding verses in the two chapters; 2. in the connection of the verses, in each case, with the preceding context; 3. in the fact that the word ἀρχιερεύς is found in each, whereas neither this word nor any suggestion of the idea of the High-priesthood of Jesus is introduced anywhere else in the first and second, or again in the third and fourth chapters, (iii. 1 forms no proper exception, see note on that verse). It can scarcely be questioned, it would seem, that when a writer, who is so careful with respect to the artistic arrangement of his work as the author of this epistle is, has two such passages in two corresponding places, he means to make them parallel to each other. When we observe also, that the High-priesthood of Christ is the subject of the second half of the epistle (v. 1—xii. 29), and that this second part is that on which the author dwells with greater fullness and emphasis, we may believe that, in these verses, he intends to give a hint or foreshadowing, at the close of each subdivision of the first section of his work, of that which is to be the great thought of its second and most important division. An artistic arrangement of this character is quite foreign to the style of Paul in his thirteen epistles.—(*b*) As to the similarities between ii. 17, 18 and iv. 14–16, the following points may be noticed: 1. The use of the

same words, in the case of ἀρχιερεύς, πειράζομαι, βοηθῆσαι (βοήθειαν), ὁμοιωθῆναι (καθ' ὁμοιότητα). 2. The general correspondence in the thought, where the words are unlike, as e. g. "the merciful high-priest in things pertaining to God," as compared with "approaching the throne of grace (through him) that we may find mercy"; "in that he has suffered being tempted, he is able," etc., as compared with "tempted in all points like as we are;" "he becomes a merciful and faithful high-priest through being made like unto his brethren," as compared with "he is able to sympathize with our infirmities because he was tempted like ourselves." The few differences in expression and in the minor details of the verses are only such as might be expected in a careful rhetorical writer, who would avoid mechanical repetition, and who, in the latter case, is drawing nearer to the thoughts and expressions of the second part of the epistle.

CHAPTER III.

VER. 1. Ἰησοῦν] *Recepta:* Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. Rightly rejected by Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Scholz, de Wette, Tisch. Alford, *al.* For against it stands the preponderating authority of A B C* D* M ℵ, 17, 34, *al.*, many vss. and Greek as well as Latin Fathers, and not less the *usus loquendi* of the epistle, since Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς is found nowhere else therein, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός only [vi. 20, with D* E* It.] x. 10, xiii. 8 [20, with D* 17, *al.*], 21; quite commonly, on the other hand, the simple Ἰησοῦς (ii. 9, iv. 14, vi. 20, vii. 22, x. 19, xii. 2, 24, xiii. 12, 20) or the simple Χριστός (iii. 6, 14, v. 5, vi. 1, ix. 11, 14, 28, xi. 26).—Ver. 2. ἐν ὁλῷ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ] Instead thereof, Tisch. 1 and 2 reads merely ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ. But for the deletion of ὁλῷ the authority of B, Sahid. Erp. Ambr. does not suffice. ὁλῷ is defended not only by A C D E K L M ℵ, Vulg. *al.*, but also by the consideration that it forms a constituent part of the passage Num. xii. 7, to which the writer has respect, and the complete formula ἐν ὁλῷ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ is, on account of its repetition in ver. 5, already presupposed for ver. 2.—Ver. 3. οὗτος δόξης] Elz. Matthaei, Bloomfield: δόξης οὗτος. Against A B C D E ℵ, 37, 47, *al.*, It. Chrys. Transposition for bringing into marked relief the opposition οὗτος παρὰ Μωϋσῆν. —Ver. 4. In place of the *Recepta* τὰ πάντα, Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. read only πάντα. To be preferred, not merely on account of the strong attestation by A B C* D* E* K M ℵ, *al. mult.*, Chrys. ms., but also because the notion of the universe, which τὰ πάντα would contain, does not suit the connection.—Ver. 6. In place of ἐάνπερ, Lachm. (this editor, however, only in the *edit. stereot.*; in the larger edition he adds περ in brackets) and Tisch. have adopted, after B D* E* M ℵ* 17, the mere ἐάν. The author, however, is fond of the fuller ἐάνπερ (comp. ver. 14, vi. 3), and here it has preponderating testimonies (A C D*** E** K L ℵ*** Lucif. Cal.) in its favor.—μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν] Instead of this, Tisch. 2 and 7 reads merely κατάσχωμεν. But, for the omission of the words μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν (already condemned by Mill, *Prolegg.* 1208, and more recently by Delitzsch and Alford), the authority of B, Aeth. Lucif. Ambr. does not suffice; and as a gloss from ver. 14 they can hardly be regarded, inasmuch as, with regard to the object the author has in view, they are just as little without significance here as there. See, moreover, the observations of Reiche, p. 19 sq.—Ver. 9. Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomf. have ἐπείρασάν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, ἐδοκίμασάν με. Defended also by Reiche. But the only accredited reading is ἐπείρασαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ. Already preferred by Griesbach. Adopted by Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Alford, *al.* ἐπείρασαν, in place of ἐπείρασάν με, is demanded by A B C D* E* ℵ* 17, It. Copt. Lucif.; ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ in place of ἐδοκίμασάν με, by A B C D* E M ℵ* 73, 137, It. Copt. Lucif. Clem. Al. *protrept.* c. 9, § 84, Didym.—Ver. 10. Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomf. Reiche: τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ. More correctly, after A B D* M ℵ, 6, 17, *al.*, Vulg. Clem. Did. Bengel, Böhme, Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Alford (recommended also by Griesb.): τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ. Deviating from the LXX.,

the author chose ταύτῃ, in order to make the bearing of the passage upon the readers the more palpable.—Ver. 13. The *Recepta* τὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν (adopted by Tisch. 8) is, with Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Scholz, Bloomf. Tisch. 1, 2, 7, Alford, *al.*, to be transposed into ἐξ ὑμῶν τις, in accordance with B D E K L, 46, 48, Theodoret, Damasc. *al.* By means of the transposition, the person of the readers, in opposition to the fathers in the wilderness, comes out more emphatically, and more in accordance with the context.—Ver. 14. Elz. Matthaei, Bloomf.: γεγόναμεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ] But the important attestation by A B C D E H M ℵ 37, *al.*, Vulg. Clar. Germ. Cyr. Damasc. Lucif. Hilar. Hier. Ambr. Vigil. Taps. decides in favor of the order of the words τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν; accepted by Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Scholz, Tisch. Alford, *al.*

Vv. 1–6. Even above Moses is Christ exalted. By so much higher than Moses does He stand, as the son exercising authority over his own house has precedence over the servant of the house. This new dogmatic consideration, to which the discourse now advances, was indeed already contained *implicite* as the *minus*, in the preceding argument as the *majus;* it must, however, still be separately insisted on, inasmuch as, in addition to the angels as the suprahuman agents (*Vermittler*) in connection with the founding of the Old Covenant, Moses, as the human agent (*Vermittler*) in the founding of the same, could not remain unmentioned. Appropriately to the subject, however, the author treats of this new point of comparison only with brevity, blending the same with the exhortation, derived from that which precedes, to cleave firmly unto the end to Christ and the Christian hope; and then, from ver. 7 forward, further developing this exhortation in detail,—in the form of a parallel instituted between the people of God of the present time, *i. e.* the *Christians*, and the people of God of Moses' time,—in their interest, with even a warning impressiveness.

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

Ver. 1. [On Vv. 1–6, see Note XLVIII., pages 470–472.] Ὅθεν] refers back to the total characterization of Christ given in chaps. i. ii. [XLVIII

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

a.] *Wherefore, i. e.* seeing that it stands in such wise with Christ, His nature and disposition. As regards its contents, ὅθεν is unfolded by the τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν immediately following, inasmuch as by these designations the preceding total-characterization of Christ is recapitulated in its two main features (*vid. infra*). For if the author says: "Therefore regard well Jesus, the ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν!" that is only a Greek form of expression for the thought: "Therefore, because Jesus is the ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, regard Him well!"—ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι] belongs together. With Michaelis, to separate the two words from each other by a comma, would be permissible only if by the isolation thereof a gradation were obtained. But this is not the case; since then only two relations parallel to each other, namely, on the one side the relation of the readers to the author (ἀδελφοί), and on the other side their relation to the non-Christian world (ἅγιοι), would be rendered separately prominent.—ἀδελφοί] designates the readers not as brethren of *Christ* (so with an unwarranted appeal to ii. 11, 12, 17, Peirce, Michaelis, Carpzov, Pyle; comp. also Delitzsch, according to whom this is at least *also* to be thought of), nor does it express the brotherly relation in the national sense, *i. e.* the descent from the Jewish people common to the author and readers (Chr. Fr. Schmid), but has reference to the spiritual, ideal brotherly relationship, into which author and recipients of the letter have been brought towards each other by the common bond of Christianity.—κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι] *ye who are partakers of a heavenly calling.* This second direct address—to which Grotius needlessly supplies "nobiscum"—strengthens the former, and the two forms of address explain the ground of the obligation to the κατανοεῖν, by pointing to the reader's state of grace. κλῆσις stands actively. It denotes the call or invitation, which God[1] has by Christ given to the readers, to participation in the Messianic kingdom. This calling, however, is termed ἐπουράνιος, either because the blessings, the possession of which it promises, are existent in heaven and of heavenly nature (Grotius, *al.*), or, what is more probable, because they have come to men from heaven [so Owen], where God their supreme author has His throne, and whence Christ their proclaimer and procurer (*Vermittler*) was sent forth. It is possible, however, that both references are to be combined: "a calling which proceeds from heaven and leads to heaven."[2]—κατανοήσατε] *direct your view to Jesus, sc.* in order to cleave firmly to Him; regard well what He is and what you have in Him!—τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν] [XLVIII *b.*] *the Envoy and High Priest of our confession,* is comprehended into a unity of idea by the article τόν only once placed ("Him who is ἀπόστολος and ἀρχιερεύς in one person"), in connection with which τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν is then also most naturally referred in equal degree to both substantives. τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, however, is not to be resolved into ὃν ὁμολογοῦμεν (Luther,

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

[2] So Bengel, Tholuck, Stuart, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 693; Alford, Maier, Kurtz, and others.

Cameron, Calov, Wolf, de Wette, Maier, and others; similarly Delitzsch: "who is the subject-matter of our confession;" and Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 427 f.: "who appertains to our confession"), but stands, like πίστις, Gal. i. 23, and ἐλπίς, Col. i. 5, *objectively: of our Christian confession* (of our evangelical faith). Comp. iv. 14, x. 23; 2 Cor. ix. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13. [So Calvin, Piscator, Owen (with hesitation), Stuart.] The opposition is to the pre-Christian or Mosaic confession, without, however, the emphasis, as Kurtz supposes, falling upon ἡμῶν, which is forbidden by the position of the words: *The deputed One* (*sc.* of God) *for our confession, i. e.* sent by God (comp. Gal. iv. 4; Matt. x. 40, *al.*) in order to bring about our confession or Christian faith. The signification "mediator," which Tholuck attaches to the word ἀπόστολος, after the example of Braun and others, appealing in favor thereof to the authority of Rabbinico-talmudic usage, the latter never has. The notion of mediator follows, alike for ἀπόστολον as also for ἀρχιερέα, only from the context. By ἀπόστολον, namely, is referred back to the main thought of the last and highest divine revelation (the λαλεῖν), contained in Christ, of which the writer has treated i. 1–ii. 4; by ἀρχιερέα, to the main thought of the reconciliation of sinful humanity to God by Christ, then further treated in the second chapter. Aptly, therefore, does Bengel distinguish ἀπόστολον and ἀρχιερέα as "eum, qui *Dei* causam apud nos agit" and "qui *nostram* causam apud Deum agit."

Ver. 2. [XLVIII *c.*] The discourse takes a turn, by virtue of a further alleging of reasons for the κατανοήσατε, to the comparison of Jesus with Moses, in that first of all the relation of parity between the two is brought prominently forward. The O. T. passage which the author here has under consideration is Num. xii. 7, where Moses is designated by God as faithful in all His house.—ὄντα] characterizes the being faithful as an *inherent* property; the sense of a strict *present* is not to be asserted for the participle (with Seb. Schmidt and Bleek), according to which we should have to think only of an *exalted* Christ; rather does πιστὸν ὄντα attach itself as well to the notion Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπόστολον τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν as to the notion Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν; ὄντα embraces, therefore, equally the time from which Christ, as the incarnate Son of God, had appeared upon earth, and the time from which He, invested with the high-priestly dignity, has returned to the Father, and now continues to fulfill in heaven His high-priestly office.—τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν] [XLVIII *d* 1.] Periphrasis of God: *Him who created Him.* Only this sense of the *calling forth into existence* can the word ποιεῖν have when placed absolutely; comp. LXX. Isa. xvii. 7, xliii. 1, li. 13; Hos. viii. 14; Job xxxv. 10; Ps. xcv. 6, cxlix. 2; Ecclus. vii. 30, *al.* Rightly is this accepted by the early Latin translation of the codd. D E (fidelem esse creatori suo), Ambrose (*de fide*, 3. 11), Vigilius Tapsensis (*contra Varimadum*, p. 729), Primasius, Schulz, Bleek, Alford, Kurtz, and Hofmann. Contrary to linguistic usage—for an appeal cannot be made to 1 Sam. xii. 6 (where ποιεῖν (עָשָׂה) has its ordinary signification), and still less to Mark iii. 14 (where a nearer defining is given to the verb by means of ἵνα κ.τ.λ.), or to Acts ii. 36 (where a double accusa-

tive is found)—do Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Vatablus, Clarius [Calvin], Cameron, Piscator, Grotius, Owen, Wolf, Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Stuart, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 286 f.), Reuss, Maier, Kluge, Moll, M'Caul, Woerner, and the majority, interpret τῷ ποιήσαντι either by: *who appointed Him thereto* (*sc.* Apostle and High Priest), or ordained Him thereto; or—what amounts to the same thing—explaining the supplementing of a second accusative to ποιήσαντι as unnecessary, by: who set Him forth upon the stage of history. Whether, for the rest, the author referred the notion of *having created* to the incarnation of Christ, as the above-mentioned early ecclesiastical writers suppose, or to His preмundane generation as the First-born (cf. i. 5, 6), which Bleek rightly regards as at least possible, cannot be determined.[1]—ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς] *sc.* πιστὸς ἦν τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν.—ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ] does not belong to πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, in such wise that we have, with Calvin, Paulus, Bleek, Ebrard, and Hofmann, to enclose ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς within commas, but it is to be comprehended with ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς (de Wette, Kurtz, and the majority). For not only, Num. xii. 7, do the words appended: ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, stand in special relation to Moses,—so that the author might very well derive from that place the same addition with the same special reference to Moses,—but also the equal reference of ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ to Christ, as to Moses, would be unsuitable to the connection with that which follows, since the author, ver. 5 and ver. 6, definitely distinguishes the place occupied by Moses, as the position of a servant ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ, from the place occupied by Christ, as a position of ruler ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον; and in harmony with this distinction, already ver. 3 characterizes Moses as merely a member of the οἶκος itself; Christ, on the other hand, as the founder of the οἶκος.—αὐτοῦ] refers neither to *Christ* (Bleek) nor to *Moses* (Oecumenius and others), but, as also determined by the form of the expression with the LXX. (ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου), to *God*.—But the house of God is the people of God, or the kingdom of God; and ἐν denotes the province, *in the administration of which* the πιστὸν εἶναι was made manifest.

Ver. 3.[2] [XLVIII *d* 2.] Continued alleging of reasons for the κατανοήσατε, ver. 1, in bringing into more distinct relief the exaltedness of Christ above Moses. Ver. 3 is not, as de Wette supposes, explication or analysis of

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

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

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

Ver. 4. [XLVIII *d* 3.] The author has spoken, ver. 2, of the house of *God*, and yet, ver. 3, has ascribed the founding and preparing of the same to *Christ.* For the justification of this apparent contradiction does the remark, ver. 4, serve. Although every house has its special preparer, yet this notwithstanding, it is *God* who has prepared all things. That special foundership of Christ does not exclude the universal higher foundership of God. The proposition ver. 4 is incidental to the main argument. It is not, however, to be enclosed in a parenthesis, because *αὐτοῦ*, ver. 5, refers back to *θεός*, ver. 4.—In the second clause, *θεός* is subject, and *ὁ δὲ πάντα κατασκευάσας* predicate. Wrongly has *θεός* been ordinarily taken by others as predicate, and as subject either *ὁ δὲ πάντα κατασκευάσας* or merely *ὁ δέ*, since *πάντα κατασκευάσας* was taken as a defining adjunct. The second member of the proposition was then referred to *Christ*, and the statement found therein that Christ is God.[1] But with this thought the sequel is not in keeping. For not of Christ's being God, but of His exalted relation to the *house* of God as the *υἱός*, while Moses was only a *θεράπων*, does the author speak, vv. 5, 6.—*πάντα*] denotes not the univer-

[1] So Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, Beza, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Cornelius a Lapide, Cameron, Piscator, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Braun, Akersloot, Calmet, Bengel, Cramer, Whitby, Stuart, Baumgarten, and many others; also still Woerner.

sality of all created things, thought of as a *unity*, but in general: *each and all*, that exists.

Ver. 5 as far as *αὐτοῦ*, ver. 6. Return to the point of comparison between Christ and Moses, ver. 2 (*πιστός*), and the exaltedness of the former above the latter, ver. 3 (*υἱός, ἐπί . . . θεράπων, ἐν*).—*καί*] is the more sharply-defining "and indeed;" whereas *μέν* serves to bring into relief the personal name *Μωϋσῆς*, and finds in *Χριστὸς δέ*, ver. 6, its emphatic opposition. Vv. 5, 6 *init.* does not, accordingly, contain a second proof for the superiority of Christ to Moses,[1] but is only a more detailed unfolding of the thoughts, ver. 2 and ver. 3.—*πιστός*] *sc. ἦν*, or else *ἐστίν*, in connection with which latter mode of supplementing, the thought would be less of the historic fact as such, than of the fact as it still continues present in the O. T. narrative.—*αὐτοῦ*] refers not to *Μωϋσῆς* (as Ebrard assumes, since he starts with the erroneous presupposition that the author speaks of a twofold *οἶκος*, and that the design of vv. 5, 6 was just that of rendering clearly apparent the difference of the house entrusted to Moses on the one hand, and that entrusted to Christ on the other), but to *θεός*, ver. 4.—*ὡς θεράπων*] *in his capacity as servant*, comp. Num. xii. 7. Upon this, as upon the preceding *ἐν*, rests the emphasis of ver. 5.—*εἰς μαρτύριον*] belongs to *θεράπων*. It is unnaturally referred back by Estius, Seb. Schmidt, Stengel, and others to *πιστός*.—*εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων*] [XLVIII *d* 4.] *to give testimony to that which should be spoken*, or proclaimed to the people. *Τὰ λαληθησόμενα* are not the revelations afterwards to be given in Christ,[2] which must have been more precisely specified; and still less does the expression indicate: "dicenda a nobis in hac epistola de cerimoniis earumque significatione et usu" (Pareus), but *the law* to be proclaimed by Moses, at the mandate of God, to the Jewish people is intended.

Ver. 6. *Χριστὸς δὲ ὡς υἱός*] *Christ, on the other hand, in His capacity as Son, sc. πιστός ἐστιν.* Upon this supplement depends *ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ* (comp. Matt. xxv. 21, 23); and as *υἱός* forms an ascent from the preceding *θεράπων*, so does *ἐπί* form an ascent from the preceding *ἐν*. Erasmus, *Paraphr.*; Vatablus, Piscator, Grotius, Delitzsch, Moll, and others supply to *Χριστὸς δὲ . . . αὐτοῦ* simply *ἐστίν*, whereby, however, the relation of just proportion between ver. 5 and ver. 6 is destroyed. The opening words of ver. 5, moreover,—inasmuch as they attach themselves not only to ver. 3, but also again to ver. 2,—manifestly point to the fact that the author will indicate not the *mere* difference between Christ and Moses, but their difference within the quality common to both. Yet others, as Bleek, de Wette, and Bisping, supply a double *πιστός ἐστιν*, the first after *Χριστὸς δέ*, the second after *αὐτοῦ*; since[3] they refer *αὐτοῦ* back to *υἱός*: Christ, however, is faithful, as a son is faithful over his house. But a satisfactory ground for taking *οἶκος αὐτου*, ver. 6, otherwise than the same expression

[1] Calvin, Bengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Woerner.

[2] Erasmus, Calvin, Cameron, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Owen, Limborch, Wolf, Wetstein, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, Ewald, M'Caul, Woerner, and others.

[3] As the Vulgate, Beza, Estius, Grotius, Owen, Er. Schmid, Calov, Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Baumgarten, Gabler, Valckenaer, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Tholuck, and others.

ver. 5, is not to be found. The house of God, or the divine kingdom, is for Moses and Christ the common sphere of operation; only by the position which the two occupy towards this house, are they distinguished the one from the other.—As αὐτοῦ, ver. 6, so is the relative οὗ, with which the author prepares the way for a transition to the paraenesis, not to be referred to *Christ*,[1] but to *God*;[2] [XLVIII *d* 5.] although as regards the matter itself even the former reference would not be incorrect, since the house of God, ver. 2, is likewise characterized as the house of Christ, ver. 3.—The article before οἶκος was not imperatively required, although the whole Christian community forms a single indivisible house of God, since the notion of the word was one sufficiently well known, and, moreover, adequately defined by that which precedes.—The *absolute* declaration: οὐ οἰκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, on the import of which 1 Cor. iii. 9, 16, 2 Cor. vi. 16, Eph. ii. 20 ff., 1 Tim. iii. 15, 1 Pet. ii. 5, iv. 17, is to be compared,[3] and which is taken in a strangely perverted way by Ebrard (p. 137) and Delitzsch as the logical antithesis to εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων, ver. 5, the author limits by a condition.—The fuller ἐάνπερ is foreign to the epistles of Paul.—τὴν παῤῥησίαν] not *the bold confession*[4] to which βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν would not be fitting, but *cheerful confidence* as a disposition. Comp. iv. 16, x. 19, 35. τὴν παῤῥησίαν, to which τῆς ἐλπίδος[5] belongs in like manner as to τὸ καύχημα (against Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 739), is the main idea, whereas καὶ τὸ καύχημα adds only an explicative subsidiary factor. That is manifest from the feminine βεβαίαν (which Stengel wonderfully refers back, in a *constructio ad sensum*, to ἐλπίδος). Instances of the agreement of the adjective in point of gender with the remoter substantive, in cases where this forms the principal idea, occur also with the classics.[6]—The ἐλπίς is the Christians' hope of the consummation of the kingdom of God, and the glorification of the Christians bound up therewith. Comp. Rom. v. 2, also Heb. vi. 11, 18, vii. 19, x. 23. καύχημα, however, is not here either equivalent to καύχησις,[7] any more

[1] Oecumenius, Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Owen, Whitby, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Woerner, *al.*

[2] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Calvin, Stengel, Stuart, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, and others.

[3] Philo, too, often employs the same figure, applying it to the human soul. Comp. *de Somn.* p. 587 E (ed. Mangey, I. p. 643): σπούδασον οὖν, ὦ ψυχή, θεοῦ οἶκος γενέσθαι, ἱερὸν ἅγιον κ.τ.λ.—*De resip. Noë*, p. 282 E (ed. Mangey, I. p. 402): τίς γὰρ οἶκος παρὰ γενέσει δύναιτ' ἂν ἀξιοπρεπέστερος εὐρεθῆναι θεῷ πλὴν ψυχῆς τελείως κεκαθαρμένης καὶ μόνον τὸ καλὸν ἠγουμένης ἀγαθόν; . . . κατοικεῖν δὲ λέγεται ἐν οἴκῳ ὁ θεὸς οὐχ ὡς ἐν τόπῳ (περιέχει γὰρ τὰ πάντα πρὸς μηδενὸς περιεχόμενος), ἀλλ' ὡς πρόνοιαν καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν ἐκείνου τοῦ χωρίου διαφερόντως ποιούμενος· παντὶ γὰρ τῷ δεσπόζοντι οἰκίας ἡ ταύτης κατὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον ἀνῆπται φροντίς.

[4] Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Hammond, Limborch, Whitby, Heinrichs, and others.

[5] Both words are found combined in Josephus likewise, *Antiq.* xvi. 3. 3: καὶ δεινὸς ὢν τὸν τρόπον Ἀντίπατρος, ἐπειδὴ παῤῥησίας τινὸς τῆς οὐ πρότερον οὔσης ἐλπίδος ἀντεποιήσατο, μίαν ἔσχεν ὑπόθεσιν κακοῦν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, κ.τ.λ.

[6] Comp. Hom. *Il.* xv. 344: τάφρῳ καὶ σκολόπεσσιν ἐνιπλήξαντες ὀρυκτῇ; Hesiod. *Theogon.* 972 f.: ὃς εἶσ' ἐπὶ γῆν τε, καὶ εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης, πᾶσαν; Xenophon, *Anab.* i. 5. 6: ὁ δὲ σίγλος δύναται ἑπτὰ ὀβολοὺς καὶ ἡμιοβόλιον Ἀττικούς; Thucydides, viii. 63: πυθόμενος τὰ περὶ τὴν ναυμαχίαν καὶ τὸν Στρομβιχίδην καὶ τὰς ναῦς ἀπεληλυθότα. See Bernhardy, *Syntax*, p. 431.

[7] Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Stengel, Bisping, Maier, and others.

than 2 Cor. v. 12, ix. 3, which have been unwarrantably appealed to (see Meyer *ad loc.*), but denotes the subject of the boasting. Sense: *provided we shall have maintained the Christians' hope as a cheerful confidence and subject of boasting firm unto the end.*—*μέχρι τέλους*] not: *until the death of each individual* (Schlichting, Grotius, Kuinoel); not: "until the final decision of the readers in favor of going over to Christianity" (! Ebrard), but as ver. 14, vi. 11, 1 Cor. i. 8, *al.*, *unto the end of the present order of the world*, intervening with the coming again of Christ, and thought of as in the near future (comp. x. 25, 37), at which time faith shall pass over into sight, hope into possession.

Ver. 7–iv. 13. [On Vv. 7–14, see Note XLIX., pages 472, 473.] The author, in detailed development of the paraenesis already contained in vv. 1, 6, warns against unbelief and apostasy, making the basis of this warning the admonitory utterance of Scripture in Ps. xcv. 7–11; and by means of a parallelizing of the people of God of the present time, *i. e.* the Christians, with the people of God of Moses' day, *i. e.* the Israelite fathers in the wilderness,—a parallelizing equally suggested by this passage of Scripture as by the preceding comparison of Christ with Moses,—he sets forth before the eyes of his readers the fate of the ancient people of God, who because of their unbelief were consigned to destruction, that the readers may earnestly ponder thereon. [XLIX *a.*]

Ver. 7. *Διό*] [XLIX *b.*] *Wherefore, i. e.* either: because Christ stands higher than Moses,[1] or, which is better: because we are the *οἶκος* of God, only in the case that we hold fast the *παῤῥησία* and the *καύχημα* of the Christian hope unto the end (ver. 6). [XLIX *c.*] The *tempus finitum* belonging to *Διό* is *βλέπετε*, ver. 12,[2] in such wise that *καθὼς . . . κατάπαυσίν μου* forms an intervening clause. The length of the intervening clause, at which de Wette takes umbrage, decides nothing against the supposition of such construction, which at all events possesses the advantage of greater regularity and naturalness, since the author, owing to the care which he everywhere bestows upon his diction, in other cases, too, accurately fits in his discourse again to the opening words of the proposition, notwithstanding the occurrence of lengthy intervening clauses. Comp. vii. 20–22, xii. 18–24. That, moreover, which de Wette further objects, that in the intervening clause the discourse takes a new departure with *διό*, ver. 10, forms no valid counter-argument, since the connectedness of the preceding and following words as part of a Biblical citation follows naturally. In any case, ver. 10 connects itself with that which precedes, without a new beginning, in a simply relative fashion, if—as we are perfectly justified in doing—we write *δι' ὁ* instead of *διό*. When de Wette, finally, discovers a difficulty in the fact that the warning, vv. 12, 13, does not appear in the form of a simple application of the passage of Scripture, but, on the contrary, begins with an analysis of the same, this also is

[1] So Carpzov, Zachariae, Böhme, Stuart, Kurtz, and Woerner; comp. already Schlichting.

[2] Erasmus, *Annott.*; Calvin, Estius, Piscator, Pareus, Grotius, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Bengel, Peirce, Carpzov, Wetstein, Abresch, Zachariae, Böhme, Bleek, Bisping, Alford, Kurtz, Woerner, *al.*

without weight, inasmuch as the correctness of this assumed fact must itself be contested. In addition to this, if the author had conceived of the structure otherwise than has been indicated, he would assuredly have placed *βλέπετε οὖν*, ver. 12, instead of the disconnected *βλέπετε*. For neither is it permissible to appeal (with Tholuck) to the disconnected *βλέπετε*, xii. 25, in proof of the opposite, since this passage, on account of the rhetorical character of the description which there immediately precedes, is totally different from ours. Others[1] connect *διό* immediately with *μὴ σκληρύνητε*, in connection with which, however, the direct address of God, coming in ver. 9 ff., occasions a great harshness; or else,[2] leave the application *μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν* to be supplied in thought from these words; or, finally, supplement *διό* in a somewhat free manner: *therefore conduct yourselves in accordance with that which the Holy Ghost speaks.*—*τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*] *the Spirit of God in prophecy;* comp. ix. 8, x. 15.—*σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε*] is in the Hebrew (הַיּוֹם אִם-בְּקֹלוֹ תִשְׁמָעוּ) an independent clause, and the expression of a wish: "would that you would only to-day listen to His (God's) voice!" It is possible that the LXX. also understood the words as a wish, since elsewhere, too (*e.g.* Ps. cxxxix. 19), they render the particle of wishing, אִם, by *ἐάν*. Differently, however, does the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews take the words (against Hofmann). He regards *ἐάν* as the protasis, and *μὴ σκληρύνητε* as the apodosis; comp. ver. 15, iv. 7.—In the application *σήμερον* denotes the time of salvation which has come in with the appearing of Christ upon earth, and *ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ* the voice of God which through Christ sounds forth to the readers by means of the gracious message of the gospel.

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

Ver. 9. *οὗ*] is taken by Erasmus Schmid, Bengel, and Pierce as attraction to *πειρασμοῦ* instead of *ᾧ*, *wherewith*. But in this case *οὗ* would have been connected immediately with *πειρασμοῦ*. It is the local "where;" thus stands, as frequently, in the sense of *ὅπου*, and refers back to *ἐρήμῳ*.—*οὗ ἐπείρασαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ*] *where your fathers essayed temptation,*[3] *on the ground of proving or testing, i. e.* where your fathers tempted me and put me to the test. *δοκιμασία* as *πειράζειν* here in the bad sense.

[1] As Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Wittich, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Stengel, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Reuss, and Hofmann.

[2] As Tholuck, de Wette, and Maier, who appeal to Rom. xv. 3, 21, 1 Cor. i. 31, ii. 9.

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

The former contains an enhancement of the latter. This involves doubt with regard to the *inclination* of God to render help, that doubt with regard to His *power* of doing so.—*καὶ εἶδον*] *κ.τ.λ.*] *and yet saw my works forty years long.* This was a fact that aggravated their guilt. In the original, *τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη* belongs to the following *προσώχθισα.* To the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also this original connection was known, as is evident from ver. 17. If he nevertheless refers *τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη* to that which precedes, and moreover consolidates this connection by means of the *διό* (*δι' ὅ*) interpolated only by himself, he must have been guided by a distinct design in doing so. Rightly, therefore, is it assumed[1] that the author discovered in the forty years during which the Israelites in the wilderness saw the works of God, a typical reference to the about equal space of time during which the Hebrews had now also witnessed the government of God as manifested in Christ, and would make this reference clear to the readers, in order thereby to render the more impressive his exhortation to receptiveness, while there is yet time. The reminder of Akersloot, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Abresch, Bleek, and others, is at the same time worthy of notice, viz. that also in the Talmud and by the Rabbins a duration of forty years is assigned to the Messianic kingdom with reference to Ps. xcv. and the forty years of the wilderness.[2]

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

Ver. 11. *Ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου*] *as accordingly I* (as to the sense equivalent to: *so that I;* see Winer, p. 431 [E. T. 462]; in the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר) *sware* (comp. Num. xiv. 21 ff., xxxii. 10 ff.; Deut. i. 34 ff.) *in* (not: *by*) *my wrath.*—*εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου*] *not enter, shall they, into my rest. εἰ* is an exact imitation of the negative Hebrew particle אִם in formulas of swearing, and is to be explained from an aposiopesis of the latter clause.[3] —*κατάπαυσις*] in the sense of the psalmist, the undisturbed possession of

[1] Calov, Wittich, Akersloot, Surenhus, Schöttgen, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Abresch, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 618: Alford, Reiche, *Comm. Crit.* p. 22; Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others.

[2] Comp. *Sanhedr.* fol. 99, 1: R. Eliezer dixit: dies Messiae sunt quadraginta anni, sicut dicitur: *quadraginta annos sqq.* (Ps. xcv. 10): *Tanchuma*, fol. 79, 4: Quamdiu durant anni Messiae? R. Akiba dixit: quadraginta annos quemadmodum Israëlitae per tot annos in deserto fuerunt.

[3] Comp. Mark viii. 12; Ewald, *Krit. Gramm.* p. 661; Winer, p. 466 [E. T. 500]; Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 308 [E. T. 358].

the land of Canaan promised by God.[1] Afterwards, because with the possession of the promised land the expected full repose and happiness had as yet by no means come in, the meaning of the promise was sublimated, just as that of the kindred *κληρονομεῖν τὴν γῆν* Ps. xxxvii. 9, into the everlasting Messianic blessedness. This reference obtains, as is evident from the following disquisition, with our author also.

Vv. 12, 13. [XLIX *d.*] Close of the period begun with *διό*, ver. 7.—*βλέπετε*] *beware, take heed.*—*μή ποτε ἔσται*] *μή* after *βλέπε, ὅρα*, and similar words, with the indicative future (comp. Col. ii. 8), expresses at the same time with the warning, the fear that the warning will be slighted.[2] The enclitic *ποτε* appended to the *μή*, not: *at any time* (Beza and others), but: *haply* [ii. 1; Luke xiv. 29; Acts v. 39; Matt. iv. 6, etc.].—*ἐν τινι ὑμῶν*] different from *ἐν ὑμῖν*. Calvin: Nec tantum in universum praecipit apostolus, ut sibi omnes caveant, sed vult ita de salute cujusque membri esse sollicitos, ne quem omnino ex iis, qui semel vocati fuerint, sua negligentia perire sinant. Comp. ver. 13, x. 24, xii. 15.—*καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας*] *an evil heart of unbelief;* comp. iv. 2, 3. Wrongly Schulz and others: of *faithlessness* or *ἀπείθεια*, iv. 6, 11, iii. 18; for the latter is only the consequence of the *ἀπιστία*. *ἀπιστίας* is either genitive of *origin*, which proceeds from unbelief (Owen, Bleek, Stengel, and others), or genitive of *result*, which leads to unbelief, renders inclined to the same (de Wette, Bisping, *al.*), or genitive of *reference to a more precise characterization* of *πονηρά*: a heart evil (on account) of unbelief, which is then equivalent to *καρδία πονηρίαν ἀπιστίας ἔχουσα* (so Winer, p. 183 [E. T. 194.]; Ebrard, Alford, Meyer, Moll, and Hofmann). The last acceptation is to be preferred, since thereby *ἀπιστίας* is more clearly brought out as the main idea (for *καρδία πονηρά* is only a clothing of the same attaching itself to *ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ*, ver. 10).—*ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος*] more precise definition[3] to *ἀπιστίας* for the declaration of the outward form of appearance, in which the inner unbelief comes forth: *in the falling away from the living God*, or *in such wise that a falling away from the living God takes place. God* (not *Christ:* Gerhard, Dorscheus, Calov, S. Schmidt, Schöttgen, Carpzov, *al.*) is called *living*, not in opposition to the dead works of the law (ix. 14, vi. 1; Bleek), nor in opposition to the idols of the heathen, similarly as 2 Kings xix. 16, 1 Thess. i. 9, 2 Cor. vi. 16, Acts xiv. 15 (Böhme and others),—both of which must have been suggested by the context,—but because He does not allow His declared will to be slighted with impunity. Comp. x. 31. That which is meant is the relapse from Christianity into Judaism.[4]

[1] Comp. Deut. xii. 9, 10: *Οὐ γὰρ ἤκατε ἕως τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν καὶ εἰς τὴν κληρονομίαν, ἣν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν δίδωσιν ὑμῖν· καὶ διαβήσεσθε τὸν Ἰορδάνην καὶ κατοικήσετε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἧς κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κατακληρονομεῖ ὑμῖν καὶ καταπαύσει ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν τῶν κύκλῳ καὶ κατοικήσετε μετὰ ἀσφαλείας.*

[2] Comp. Winer, p. 468 f. [E. T. 503]; Hartung, *Partikellehre*, II. p. 140.

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

[4] Limborch: Defectio hic intelligitur a religione Christiana; quia enim illa continetur ultima ac perfecta Dei voluntas, hinc sequitur, quod is, quia a religione Christiana deficit, ab ipso Deo deficiat. Ergo quicunque deserta

Ver. 13. Ἑαυτούς] tantamount to ἀλλήλους, comp. 1 Cor. vi. 7; Eph. iv. 32; Col. iii. 13; 1 Thess. v. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 8, *al.*; Kühner, II. p. 325.—ἄχρις οὗ] [XLIX *e.*] in the inclusive sense: as far as that, *i. e. so long as.*[1] ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται] *so long as the to-day*, of which mention is made in the passage of the psalm, *is named*, or: so long as it is still called "to-day," and it is thus not yet too late to be obedient to the admonition of the psalm.[2] Others:[3] *so long as that to-day of the psalm is called out, i. e.* is called out, or proclaimed, to you.—The "to-day" is not *the duration of the lifetime of the individuals*,[4] but (comp. μέχρι τέλους, vv. 6, 14) the *continued existence of the earthly world*, which, with the Parousia of Christ—thought of as near at hand (x. 25, 37)—attains its end.—ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας] *by the deception* (the treacherous enticement or alluring) *of sin*. The ἁμαρτία is here personified, comp. Rom. vii. 11. What is meant is the allurement exerted by the seductive splendor of the ancient cultus to a relapse into the same, and therewith to an apostasy from Christianity.

Ver. 14. Warning justification of ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν τις κ.τ.λ., ver. 13, inasmuch as the fulfilling of a condition is necessary to the attainment of salvation.—μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ] *Participators in* (iii. 1, vi. 4, xii. 8) *Christ, i. e.* in His treasures of blessing and in His glory. Schulz, Delitzsch, Ewald, Hofmann, and others explain: *Associates of Christ* (i. 9), *i. e.* His brethren (ii. 11 ff.), or His συγκληρονόμοι (Rom. viii. 17), inasmuch as "the δόξα, into which Christ, the Anointed One existing in kingly glory, has entered as our ἀρχηγός, is, by virtue of the κλῆσις ἐπουράνιος, not only *His*, but also *ours*, although as to its revelation and consummation *in hope*" (Delitzsch); against which, however, the fact is decisive that ἐάνπερ κ.τ.λ. points to a relation not of *equality*, but of *dependence*, and μετόχους τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἶναι corresponds to the notion of εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν, vv. 11, 18. Compare, moreover, against Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 719, *note.*—γεγόναμεν] *we have become.* The author does not write ἐσμεν, as ver. 6, in order to dismiss at once the thought of claim existing from the first, and, on the contrary, to represent the said prerogative as one only acquired (by faith, comp. ἐάνπερ κ.τ.λ.).—ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως κ.τ.λ.] *if so be that* (provided) *we preserve the beginning of the confidence firm to the end*, comp. ver. 6, *fin.* ὑπόστασις does not here denote *fundamentum* (Erasmus, *Paraphr.*; Seyffarth, p. 67: prima religionis fundamentum; Christiana ad Judaismum redeunt, a Deo deficiunt; licet enim Deum non abnegent, qui legis Mosaicae auctor est, tamen, quia Deus nunc non secundum legis praecepta se coli velle testatur, sed juxta evangelium illique credentibus fidem in justitiam imputaturum, etiam, qui illud deserunt, a Deo deficere dicendi sunt. Deus enim multis ac evidentissimis signis ac miraculis se Christum misisse ostendit, et voce e caelo demissa testatus est eum esse suum filium, in quo sibi complacuit jussitque ut eum audiant. Ergo praecepta ejus sunt praecepta Dei, etc.

[1] Cf. 2 Macc. xiv. 10: ἄχρι γαρ Ἰούδας περίεστιν, ἀδύνατον εἰρήνης τυχεῖν τὰ πράγματα. Josephus, *Antiq.* x. 2. 2: ηὔχετο μέχρις τῆς αὐτοῦ ζωῆς εἰρήνην ὑπάρξαι; Xenophon, *Cyrop.* v. 4. 16: Καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἀσσύριος διώξας ἄχρις οὗ ἀσφαλὲς ᾤετο εἶναι, ἀπετράπετο.

[2] So Luther, Estius, Schlichting, Owen, Carpzov, Stuart, Bleek, Alford, Maier, Kurtz, al.

[3] As Heinrichs, Dindorf, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Tholuck, Moll, Hofmann.

[4] Basil, Ep. 42, *Opp.* iii. p. 130: τὸ σήμερον σημαίνει ὅλον τὸν χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν; Theodoret, Theophylact, Primasius, Erasmus, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, J. Cappellus, Dorscheus, Valckenaer.

damenta; Schulz: the first [anfänglichen] firm foundation; Stein and others), nor *substantia*, whether this be taken as *reality* [*Wesen*], as Luther (the reality begun), or as *that of which a thing consists* [*Bestand*], which constitutes it (Vatablus: illud, per quod primum subsistimus, i. e. fidem firmam; Estius: fidem, per quam in vita hac spirituali subsistimus; Bisping: the beginning of the subsistence [of Christ in us], *i. e.* faith; Ewald, *al.*). The expression stands, on the contrary, in the well-ascertained signification: *confidence*, which notion is here naturally defined by the connection as *confidence of faith* (not *hope*, as Whitby and Delitzsch think).[1]—*τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως*] *the beginning of the confidence, i. e.* not: *the first confidence*, which now begins to diminish,[2] but *the confidence with which we have made a beginning*, in such wise that *τὴν ἀρχήν* corresponds to the following *μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν*. Thus, rightly, Bleek, de Wette, Alford.

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

Vv. 15, 16. [On Vv. 15–19, see Note L., pages 473, 474.] With regard to the construction of ver. 15 the views of expositors greatly differ. It is assumed—(1) That ver. 15 forms an independent, complete sentence. It is then supposed that the citation introduced by *ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι* embraces only the words *σήμερον . . . ἀκούσητε*, and that afterwards with *μὴ σκληρύνητε κ.τ.λ.* the author proceeds, it is true, in the following words of that Biblical citation, but appropriates them to himself, and employs them only for the clothing of the admonition to be uttered on his own part.[3] As, however, the same words: *μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ*, had already been adduced, ver. 8, in the midst of the Biblical citation, and as a constituent part thereof, it could not possibly occur to the reader here at once to detach them from *σήμερον . . . ἀκούσητε*, and to understand them as words of the author addressed to themselves; and the less so, because ver. 16 ff. there follows a comment on the passage, in which ver. 16 glances back to *σήμερον . . . παραπικρασμῷ*, ver. 15 (ver. 7 f.); ver. 17 to the *προσώχθισα κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 10; ver. 18, finally, to the *ὤμοσα κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 11, so that the natural explanation can only be, that the author intended to refer

[1] Comp. Heb. xi. 1; 2 Cor. ix. 4, xi. 17; LXX. Ps. xxxix. 8; Ezek. xix. 5; Ruth i. 12. Compare also Polybius, iv. 50. 10: Οἱ δὲ Ῥόδιοι, θεωροῦντες τὴν τῶν Βυζαντίων ὑπόστασιν, πραγματικῶς διενοήθησαν πρὸς τὸ καθικέσθαι τῆς προθέσεως; vi. 55. 2: οὐχ οὕτω τὴν δύναμιν, ὡς τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τόλμαν καταπεπληγμένων τῶν ἐναντίων; Diodorus Siculus, *Excerpta de Virt. et vit.* (Opp. ed. Wesselingius, t. ii., Amstelod. 1745, fol.) p. 557: ἡ ἐν ταῖς βασάνοις ὑπόστασις τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τὸ καρτερικὸν τῆς τῶν δεινῶν ὑπομονῆς περὶ μόνον ἐγενήθη τὸν Ἀριστογείτονα; Josephus, *Antiq.* xviii. 1. 6: τὸ ἀμετάλλακτον αὐτῶν τῆς ὑπὸ τοιούτοις ὑποστάσεως.

[2] *τὴν ὑπόστασιν, ἣν ἤρξασθε ἔχειν* vel *ἣν εἴχετε ἐν ἀρχῇ*, Cameron; *τὴν ὑπόστασιν τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς*, Grotius, Wolf, Bloomfield; *τὴν πρώτην ὑπόστασιν* as *τὴν πρώτην πίστιν*, 1 Tim. v. 12, and as *τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν πρώτην*, Rev. ii. 4; Abresch, Tholuck, Stuart, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 754; Maier, Kurtz, Hofmann.

[3] So Flacius Illyricus, Jac. Cappellus, Carpzov, Kuinoel, Winer, *Gramm.*, 5 Aufl. p. 620, and Bloomfield; comp. also Hofmann *ad loc.*

back to the whole Scripture citation already previously adduced, vv. 7–11, but that—inasmuch as he might presuppose it as known from that which precedes—he expressly repeats it only to the point at which the first member of his comment could attach itself. (2) Ver. 15 is connected with that which precedes, in that ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι κ.τ.λ. is either regarded as epexegesis to μέχρι τέλους, ver. 14,[1] or is attached to the conditional clause ἐάνπερ . . . κατάσχωμεν there occurring,[2] or to all the words of ver. 14: μέτοχοι . . . κατάσχωμεν,[3] or, finally, is construed with παρακαλεῖτε, ver. 13.[4] But in the first case one must expect ἀχρις οὐ λέγεται, or something similar, in place of ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι. In the other cases ver. 15 would drag as a feeble addition; in the last, moreover, ver. 14 would, contrary to all probability, become a parenthesis. (3) Ver. 15 is combined with that which follows. With φοβηθῶμεν οὖν, iv. 1, it is connected by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Olearius, Wittich, Valckenaer. Vv. 16–19 must then be regarded as a parenthesis, and οὖν, iv. 1, as a particle of resumption. But of a resuming of the, as yet, incomplete thought, ver. 15, in iv. 1, there is no appearance in the form of discourse in the latter passage, notwithstanding the accuracy of style on the part of our author. On the contrary, from the tenor of iv. 1, it is indubitable that this verse is represented by virtue of οὖν as a consequence from iii. 16–19. These verses, therefore, can form no parenthesis. But thus every possibility of connecting ver. 15 with iv. 1 falls away.—There remains, therefore, no course open but to take ver. 15 with the first question of ver. 16: τίνες γὰρ ἀκούσαντες παρεπίκραναν; as one whole.[5] The sense is: "When it is said: 'to-day,' etc., (now, I ask:) who then were they who, although they heard (the voice), resisted? was it not all, etc.?" On ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, comp. ἐν τῷ λέγειν, viii. 13.—γάρ serves for the strengthening of the particle of interrogation, but, at the same time, confirms the state of the fact expressed, ver. 14.[6] From what has been already observed, it is evident that ver. 16 contains two questions, of which the second forms the answer to the first. [L *b.*] This view of ver. 16, appearing only rarely in antiquity (in the Peshito, with Chrysostom and Theodoret), and only asserted afresh since the beginning of last century, is now almost universally regarded as the true one. According to the mode of interpretation formerly current, two affirmative statements were recognized in ver. 16, the first of which was limited by the second. τινές was accordingly written instead of τίνες,[7] and the thought was found expressed that *some*, it is true, but by

[1] Primasius, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Bisping, Reuss.

[2] Erasmus Schmid, Wolf.

[3] Ebrard, Alford.

[4] Cameron, Peirce, Bengel, Cramer, Baumgarten, Abresch.

[5] This is done by Semler, Morus, Storr, Heinrichs, Dindorf, Böhme, Klee, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Winer, p. 532 [E. T. 571]; Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, and Woerner.

[6] See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 245 f. Comp. also Matt. xxvii. 23; John vii. 41; Acts xix. 25; 1 Cor. xi. 22.

[7] Wrongly is it supposed by Bisping, who (equally as M'Caul) espouses afresh this interpretation formerly current, that it is a matter of indifference whether in connection therewith the two clauses be taken as questions or as absolute statements. For, in reality, οὐ has in a question, like the Latin *nonne*, always an affirmative sense. See

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

Vv. 17, 18. Further development of the truth, ver. 16, by means of recapitulation of the other main points of the Scripture citation. It was just this perverse totality of the Israelites with whom God was wroth on account of their sin forty years long, and against whom, on account of their disobedience, He closed by an oath the entrance into His κατάπαυσις.—Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Delitzsch, Moll, Hofmann, and others, place the second note of interrogation, ver. 17, immediately after ἁμαρτήσασιν, and then take ὧν . . . ἐρήμῳ as an assertory statement. But on account of the environment of purely interrogatory clauses, and because the author indicates the result at which he aims only in ver. 19, it seems more correct, with Luther, Calvin, Beza, Mill, Wetstein, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford, Maier, and others, to take the whole clause: οὐχὶ . . . ἐρήμῳ, together as a single question, in such wise that ὧν κ.τ.λ. forms a prolonged characterization of τοῖς ἁμαρτήσασιν.—τοῖς ἁμαρτήσασιν] *those that had sinned*, namely, by unbelief and apostasy from God.—ὧν τὰ κῶλα κ.τ.λ.] pictorial description of seizure by a violent death, taken from Num. xiv. 29, 32.—κῶλα] *limbs* (specially hands and feet), with the LXX.,

Kühner, II. p. 579; Hartung, *Partikellehre*, II. p. 88. ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες cannot consequently signify, as Bisping maintains, "but certainly not all," but, on the contrary, only "but certainly all."

[1] So Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Seb. Schmidt, Owen, and others.

[2] So Cornelius a Lapide, Braun, Carpzov, *al.*

translation of the Hebrew פְּגָרִים, thus in general bodies or corpses.—*ἔπεσεν*] *fell down*, were stretched out dead, comp. 1 Cor. x. 8.

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

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

Notes by American Editor.

XLVIII. Vv. 1–6.

(*a*) Ver. 1 contains an exhortation which is parallel with the one in ii. 1–4 (*κατανοήσατε—δεῖ περισσοτέρως προσέχειν*), but which, through *ὅθεν*, is connected with the next preceding passage, as the previous exhortation is with i. 4–14. It is the one, often-repeated exhortation, which is pressed upon the readers as the result of the argument in all its parts. In this case, the hortatory passage is closely joined in the grammatical construction with what follows in ver. 2, which is a part of the words contrasting Christ with Moses. This grammatical union, however, is only incidental to the epistolary and Pauline character of the writing. In relation to the thought and to the plan of the epistle, this first verse of chap. iii. should be placed at the end of chap. ii.—(*b*) The word *ἀπόστολος* is used here in a sense in which *ἄγγελος* might be used—that is, as designating the one sent from God to communicate the revelation, and thus to become the instrumental agent in the introduction of the N. T. system. It is doubtless chosen because the writer wished to compare Christ, in this regard, with the angels, and yet felt naturally impelled to avoid, in this connection, the use of *ἄγγελος*. The addition of *ἀρχιερεύς* cannot be regarded as anything more than a passing allusion to the title given in ii. 17, and thus must be considered, as it were, accidental. There is no dwelling upon the thought suggested by this title in the following context, as there has been none in the preceding context. The suggestion of Lünem., that *ἀρχ.* refers back to the main thought of chap. ii.—the reconciliation of sinful humanity to God by Christ—is to be rejected, because the main thought of chap. ii. is rather that of the death of Jesus for all men, and His preparation to be a leader of the great company to salvation, than that of presenting an offering on their behalf before God, or ministering as a priest. The latter ideas belong to the distinctive peculiarities of the high-priestly office, and to this author's conception of it; and the treatment of these which he gives is wholly in the later chapters.—The genitive *τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν* may be considered, grammatically, a possessive genitive. Jesus is the apostle of, i. e., appertaining to, our confession. But He is so, not as being the one whom we confess, but the one who introduces the new confession. The actual

relation of the two words is, accordingly, an objective one, when the fundamental thought is considered.

(*c*) Ver. 2 is introduced by ὅντα as a mere descriptive phrase, setting forth the faithfulness of Jesus, and belonging with ver. 1. In the plan of the epistle, however, the comparison of Jesus with Moses begins here, and vv. 2–6 stand in a parallelism with the entire comparison with the angels in chaps. i., ii. In the development of the argument here, ver. 2 presents the fact that Christ and Moses were both instrumental agents employed by God and doing faithfully His appointed work. Ver. 3 and ver. 5 set forth the superiority of Christ, in that He was employed to establish and preside over the house of God, while Moses was only, as a servant, a part of the house, and one whose work found its end, not in itself, but in what was to follow after him. There are not two distinct and independent ideas in ver. 3 and ver. 5; there is only a development of one idea, which appears in the two separated verses by reason of the incidental insertion of ver. 4.—(*d*) With respect to minor points in vv. 2–5, the following remarks may be made:—1. ποιήσαντι is translated in A. V. and R. V. by *appointed* (though the marg. of both versions reads, Gr. *made*). Lünem., Blk., Alf., Grimm, and others maintain that this meaning cannot be given to ποιεῖν when it stands absolutely, as it does here—that a second accusative cannot, in such a case, be supplied with this verb from the context. They hold that *made* or *created* is the meaning of the word. As to whether it refers to the incarnation or to the pre-mundane condition of the Son, there is some difference of opinion. On this point, it may be observed, (*w*) that, inasmuch as ver. 1 and, also, ver. 5 speak of official position, the idea of *appointing to office* is most suitable to the context, and this sense is, therefore, the most natural one for the word, if, indeed, it is a possible sense in such a case; (*x*) that the idea of *creating* the Son, either by an eternal generation or through His incarnation, is not suggested in the epistle elsewhere, and seems unlikely to have been presented here; (*y*) that this verb in 1 Sam. xii. 6 may have this meaning, and according to Gesenius and other prominent authorities does have it, although there is no second accusative in the text—a probability even, that this is the correct understanding of the word in that passage, being found in the second verse which follows (ver. 8), where, in referring to the same matter, the word *sent* is used, and where it can hardly mean *sent by creating;* (*z*) that, if ever allowable to omit the second accusative, it would seem very natural to do so here, because the word designating office has been just mentioned, and because the repetition of it would be rhetorically offensive. The use of ποιήσαντι, instead of the participle of the verb καθιστάναι (v. 1, vii. 28, viii. 3), is, not improbably, connected with its use in 1 Sam. xii. 6.—2. γάρ of ver. 3 is to be joined with κατανοήσατε (ver. 1) in the grammatical construction of the sentences as they are written. But, if the thought of vv. 2–6 be considered, as apart from ver. 1, γάρ has no proper place in ver. 3. Some particle signifying *but* or *however* would be more suitable to the passage considered as independent and beginning with ver. 2.—3. Ver. 4 is explained most satisfactorily by Ebrard, as showing that the declaration of ver. 3 is not inconsistent with that of ver. 2, or, in other words, "that the 'being faithful' might be predicated of Christ *although* He was the κατασκευάσας." By this explanation the γάρ which opens the verse is easily accounted for, and the verse itself, though subordinate and secondary, comes into living connection with the development of the leading thoughts.—4. τῶν λαληθησομένων of ver 5, is best understood as referring to the N. T. revelation. This is indicated by the fact that

λαλεῖν is used especially of the two revelations, in this epistle; by the future tense, which naturally refers to the latter of the two, and also to what is future to the time of Moses' testimony; and by the indications which the writer gives that, in his view, the O. T. revelation through Moses was only a preparation and foreshadowing of the revelation through Christ.—5. The reference of αὐτοῦ in vv. 2, 5 is to God, and the house of God is one and the same, only conceived of in its O. T. and N. T. condition. Of this house *we* i. e., the writer and his readers, are a part, *if*, and *only if* they hold fast to the end. The clause οὗ οἶκός ἐσμεν of ver. 6 forms an easy transition to the hortatory passage which follows, iii. 7–iv. 13.

XLIX. Vv. 7–14.

(*a*) From ver. 7 to iv. 13 we have the hortatory passage belonging to the portion of the argument just given, vv. 2–6. This passage is made up of four parts: *the first* containing the general exhortation of the epistle (as presented in this connection), which is enforced by a quotation from the Psalms, vv. 7–14; *the second* calling attention to the cause of the failure of the persons spoken of in the Psalm-passage to receive the promised blessing, vv. 15–19; *the third* suggesting the danger that the readers might fail of the blessing from a similar cause, iv. 1–10; and *the fourth* pressing the exhortation anew, in view of the fact that the word of God, which threatens punishment to the disobedient, is sure to be fulfilled, iv. 11–13.—(*b*) In the first part of the passage, the exhortation is found in vv. 12–14 (negatively, not to apostatize, ver. 12; positively, to hold fast, vv. 13, 14). It is connected by διό of ver. 7 with vv. 2–6, and is thus founded upon the superiority of Christ to Moses—the Psalm-passage having, as related to the progress of the thought, a parenthetical character. This Psalm-passage would more naturally have had its place after ver. 14, but it is inserted immediately after διό in order to give additional force to the exhortation. Διό of ver. 7, accordingly, qualifies βλέπετε κ.τ.λ. of ver. 12; καθώς of ver. 7 follows βλέπετε κ.τ.λ. in thought, and also qualifies it; but διό of ver. 10 is merely a part of the cited passage, connecting προσώχθισα κ.τ.λ. with ἐπείρασαν κ.τ.λ. of ver. 9, and has no bearing upon the main thought in ver. 12.—(*c*) The connection of διό of ver. 7 with the thought that we are the οἶκος of God only in case we hold fast etc., which Lünem prefers, is to be rejected—at least, so far as the development of the main thought of the epistle is concerned—*first*, because the main thought of the epistle is, not that we are the οἶκος of God only in that case, but it is that Christ is superior to the agents employed by God in the O. T. revelation; *secondly*, because, even in the preceding verses, οὗ οἶκος κ.τ.λ., is only a subordinate and secondary clause, while the principal idea is the exaltation of Christ above Moses; and *thirdly*, because, in the artistic arrangement of the epistle, the writer seems in every case, as already suggested, to found his exhortation on the point which he has made of chief importance in the next preceding sub-section. If διό is to be joined with οὗ οἶκός ἐσμεν, therefore, it is only a grammatical connection, as we may say, and not the logical one. There is no necessity, however, for regarding this as the grammatical connection.

(*d*) The exhortation vv. 12, 13 is affected, in the expressions used, by the words quoted from the O. T. Comp. καρδία πονηρά (which, as Lünem. says, is only a clothing of the idea attaching itself to ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ); τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται; σκληρυνθῇ. It is characteristic of Paul's style, after the insertion of a parenthetical

passage of this sort, e. g., Rom v. 15–17, to express the following part of the main discourse in language which is, more or less, influenced by the parenthesis. But in this writer we notice something more than this:—namely, that, after a citation from the O. T., he is disposed to linger, in the presentation of what follows, within the language of the verses cited, and that he apparently thinks that, by so doing, he can give greater emphasis and force to the suggestions which he has to set before his readers. This peculiarity of his style, as connected with O. T. quotations, is strikingly manifest from this point of the epistle to the end.

(*e*) In connection with what has been noticed under (*d*), the expression *ἀχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται* is to be explained. *τὸ σήμερον* means the to-day of the passage quoted; and the period within which the invitation and call of God come is set forth by this word, because of the writer's desire to move in the sphere of that passage, so far as his language is concerned. *ἀχρις οὗ* and *καλεῖται* are to be understood as Lünem. interprets them. The former of these two expressions probably refers, as he also says, to the time before the Parousia, but this view of the matter is not rendered absolutely necessary by the words used.

(*f*) The *γάρ* of ver. 14, after the *διό* of ver. 7, is to be explained as the *γάρ* of ii. 2 following *διὰ τοῦτο* of ii. 1 (See Note XLIV *b* above). The thought and language of this verse are nearly the same as in ver. 6 *b*. It will be noticed, however, that, in addition to the minor differences (*ἐσμεν* substituted for *ἐσμεν* and *τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως* for *τὴν παρρησίαν κ.τ.λ.*), we find here *μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ* in place of *οὗ οἶκος*. This change of expression is indicative of the fact that the idea of Christ is the prominent one throughout the entire passage from the beginning of the chapter, and it may thus be regarded as confirmatory of the view advocated above, respecting the connection of *διό* (ver. 7) with the thought of Christ as being higher than Moses.

L. Vv. 15–19.

(*a*) The question whether ver. 15 is to be connected with ver. 14 or with vv. 16–19, is one of much difficulty. The connection with the following verses is favored, 1. by the fact that, at this point, there is a turn—from the application of the passage from the Psalms to the readers—to the setting forth of the reason why the persons in the O. T. history, to whom the passage alludes, failed to receive the offered blessing; 2. by the fact, at such a turning-point, it was natural that the writer should repeat the leading verse of the cited passage; 3. by the fact, that in ii. 8 and viii. 13, when making a turn which is in some measure, though not precisely, similar to that which he makes here, the writer uses the phrase *ἐν τῷ* with an infinitive—and, in viii. 13 at least, without any particle of transition; 4. by the fact, that the correspondence of the latter part of ver. 14 with the latter part of ver. 6 renders it probable, as Bleek says, that the thought of vv. 12–14 is intended to close with ver. 14; 5. by the fact of the feeble and dragging—we may add, unnecessarily repetitious—character of ver. 15 as an addition to vv. 12–14; 6. by the fact that, while there are two other cases in which the writer uses *ἐν τῷ* with an infin. in a sense kindred to that which it has here, if ver. 15 is joined with vv. 16–19, there is no place where he uses it with such a meaning as is assigned to it if this verse is united with ver. 14, i. e. *while, as long as, seeing that, inasmuch as*, etc. For the latter ideas, we should rather expect *ἀχρις οὗ*, or *διό*, or some similar expression. The only objection to the connection with ver. 16 lies

in the word γάρ. This particle must in this case be taken in the sense of *then*, or *pray*, which seems somewhat improbable in such a sentence; while, on the other hand, if ver. 15 is joined with ver. 14, γάρ has its ordinary meaning *for*, and is quite in place. This objection, however, does not appear to be insuperable. Lünem. seems to hold that γάρ has a kind of double force, strengthening the particle of interrogation and, at the same time, confirming the statement of the fact expressed in ver. 14. But if ver. 15 begins a new thought, it is improbable that γάρ goes beyond it to ver. 14. The bearing of vv. 15–19 is rather towards iv. 1 (comp οὖν of that verse). On the whole, therefore, the connection of ver. 15 with vv. 16–19 is to be accepted as that which was intended by the author, and γάρ is to be taken as having no reference to ver. 14.—Dr. Kendrick, in a note in Moll's Commentary on the Ep. to the Heb., defends the connection of ver. 15 with iv. 1, adopting the view of Chrys. and others mentioned by Lünem. He modifies Chrysostom's view somewhat, and holds that, "as the writer was about to proceed to the train of thought ch. iv. 1, he was led, especially by the language of the quotation itself, to restate, sharply and distinctly, what had been previously but implied and hinted at, the *actual crime* and the *actual punishment* of the ancient Israelites;" that "he therefore abruptly breaks off in the middle of his sentence [end of ver. 15], to introduce, in a series of sharp interrogations and statements, these ideas: which being accomplished, he returns,—with a natural *change of construction* occasioned by the long interposed passage,—to the idea which at iii. 15 he had started to develop." By this method the objections to the view which makes ver. 15 a protasis, to which iv. 1 is the apodosis,—namely that the particle οὖν is out of place, and that vv. 16–19 become a mere parenthesis, in the strict sense, whereas οὖν can only be properly explained as pointing back to those verses—are, in his judgment, obviated. But such a digression at ver. 16 seems improbable, as compared with the straight-forward progress of thought which the connection of ver. 15 with vv. 16–19 gives, as set forth above. If the author had it in mind, at all, to state sharply and distinctly the actual crime, etc., of the ancient israelites, he could accomplish this end with far more of impressiveness, if he turned directly to it at the close of ver. 14, and made it the next prominent thought of the passage, than if he introduced it only in a parenthetical way after beginning the expression of another idea. Moreover, as Bleek says, this writer, as contrasted with Paul, is careful to avoid such anacoluthic constructions, which leave the end not in accord with the beginning.

(*b*) The τινες of ver. 16 is now universally regarded as interrogative, not indefinite, as A. V., and the earlier writers referred to by Lünem., understood it.—ἀλλά is rendered by *nay* in R. V. It is well explained by Grimm (Lex. N. T.), by "*at cur rogo? nonne erant omnes, etc.*" Alf. says that it expresses "a negation of the uncertainty implied in the question—a ground why the question should not have been asked at all." That the two parts of ver. 16 are both interrogative is proved, beyond reasonable doubt, by the interrogative character of vv. 17, 18.—The close connection of ἀπείθεια and ἀπιστία is made clear both in these verses and in iv. 1–6. ἀπιστία is the foundation of ἀπείθεια.

CHAPTER IV.

VER. 2. Better attested, it is true, than the nominative singular *συγκεκραμένος* (*συγκεκραμμένος*), which the *Recepta* presents, is the accusative plural of this participle, inasmuch as A B C D* M, 23, *al.*, Theodor. Mops. read *συγκεκερασμένους* (*συνκεκερασμένους*), and D*** E K L, 4, 6, 10, *al. plur.*, Cyr. Alex. (semel) Macar. Chrys. Theodoret, Phot. *al.*, *συγκεκραμένους* (*συγκεκραμμένους*), and also the majority of translations (Syr. poster. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Slav. *al.*) render in the accusative. Griesbach therefore commended the accusative to notice. *συγκεκραμ(μ)ένους* is adopted into the text by the edd. Complut. Antw. Plantin. Genev., by Matthaei and others; *συγκεκερασμένους*, by Lachm. Tisch. 1, and Alford. The accusative is, notwithstanding, to be rejected, as opposed to the context and unmeaning. This reading being accepted, we have as exposition either: "but the word listened to did not profit them, since they were not mixed in faith or joined together in one with Joshua and Caleb, who heard, *i. e.* were obedient to the word listened to" (so Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Hammond, Cramer, Matthaei, *al.*). But this interpretation is in conflict with iii. 15 ff., according to which the whole people of Israel brought out of Egypt by Moses is described as rebellious and unbelieving; between two classes thereof, on the other hand, a class of believers and another of unbelievers, no distinction whatever is made. Moreover, in connection with this interpretation, *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* suffers transmutation into a notion which it cannot have, regarded in itself only, much less here, seeing its evident correspondence with the preceding *ἀκοῆς*. Not less untenable is the modification of this construction with Alford, who, rejecting all reference to Joshua and Caleb, will have *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* taken, not at all in the historic sense, but, like John v. 25, as an indication of the category: "*ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς* having been mentioned in the general sense of the word heard, *οἱ ἀκούσαντες* is also in the general sense of its hearers, and the assumption is made that the word heard has naturally recipients, of whom the normal characteristic is faith. And so these men received no benefit from the word of hearing, because they were not one in faith with its hearers; did not correspond, in their method of receiving it, with faithful hearers, whom it does profit;" as, accordingly, Alford himself frankly confesses that he does not feel satisfied with this explanation, and is only driven to adopt it on the ground of critical and grammatical difficulties,—difficulties of the latter kind, nevertheless, do not exist, and those urged by Alford are easily solved. Or else a *passive* notion is substituted for the active *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν*. So already Theodore of Mopsuestia, who thinks *τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν*[1] must be read (in *Nov. Test. Commentariorum quae reperiri potuerunt Coll. O. Fr. Fritzsche*, Turici 1847, p. 166: *μηδὲ γάρ τις οἰέσθω ἀρκεῖν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τῶν μελλόντων, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις· οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν κατὰ τὴν πίστιν τοῖς ἐπαγγελθεῖσι συνημμένοι· δθεν οὕτως ἀναγνωστέον· μὴ συγκεκερασμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκουσ-*

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

θεῖσιν, ἵνα εἴπῃ ταῖς πρὸς αὐτοὺς γεγενημέναις ἐπαγγελίαις τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ **Μωσέως**); further, as it appears, Theodoret, since—although in our editions *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* precedes—he makes use of the words: *τί γὰρ ὤνησεν ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπαγγελία τοὺς ταύτην δεξαμένους, μὴ πιστῶς δεξαμένους καὶ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμει τεθαῤῥηκότας καὶ οἷον τοῖς θεοῦ λόγοις ἀνακραθέντας*; and recently Bleek, who, led thereto by Noesselt's remark on Theodoret's exposition of Heb. iv. 2 (*Theod. Opp.* t. iii., Hal. 1771, p. 566, *note* 1), conjectures *τοῖς ἀκούσμασιν*. For such alteration of the text, however, there exists not the slightest diplomatic justification. We must therefore regard the accusative plural as having arisen from a transcriber's error, to which the preceding *ἐκείνους* gave occasion, and look upon the nominative singular of the *Recepta* *συγκεκραμένος*, which yields an excellent sense (see the exposition), as that which was originally written by the author. Rightly, therefore, is the *Recepta* defended by Mill, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Reiche (p. 24 sqq.), and others, and also received again into the text by Tisch. 2 (*συγκεκραμένος*), 7 (*συνκεκραμένος*), and 8 (*συνκεκερασμένος*). Nor is it by any means so badly attested that one could assert, with Bleek, that it could "claim not much more authority than as being a not improbable conjecture." For it is supported by the testimony of the Peshito, which in antiquity surpasses any of our MSS., as well as by the Codex Sinaiticus, which has *μὴ συνκεκερασμένος*. It is found, besides, in the Vulg. It. Erp., as well as with Cyr. Alex. (sem.) [Theodoret (Hervet.)] Lucif. and in five cursives (17, 31, 37, 41, 114).—Ver. 3. *εἰσερχόμεθα γάρ*] A C: *εἰσερχώμεθα οὖν*. But with an exhortation, the following *οἱ πιστεύσαντες* is irreconcilable, instead of which *πιστεύοντες* or *διὰ πίστεως* must be placed.—Ver. 7. Elz. Wetstein, Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomf.: *εἰρηται*. But in favor of *προείρηται*, which is indirectly supported also by *προϊρηκεν* in B, 73, 80, the preponderating authority of A C D* E* ℵ, 17, 23, 31, *al.*, Syr. utr. Copt. Arm. Vulg. Cyr. Al. Chrys. Theodoret. Lucif. Bed. is decisive. Commended already by Grotius, Bengel, Griesbach. Rightly adopted into the text by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. Approved also by Reiche.—Ver. 10. *ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ*] D* E, Syr. poster. Cyr. Chrys. ms.: *ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ*. Expansion from ver. 4.—Ver. 12. Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomfield: *ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνεύματος*. But *τε* is wanting in A B C H L ℵ (in which last originally only *μερισμοῦ καὶ πνεύματος* was written, which, however, was already supplemented, as it would appear by the first hand, by a *ψυχῆς* inserted before *καί*), 3, 73, *al.*, with Origen (three times), Athan. Euseb. Chrys. Theodoret, Cyril Al. (eleven times), John Damasc. Theoph. and many others. Condemned already by Bengel and Griesbach, [Doubted by Owen.] Rightly rejected by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. Addition for the sake of uniformity with the following clause: *ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν*, in which *τε* is wanting with no witnesses.—Ver. 15. Instead of the *πεπειραμένον*, commended by Griesbach and adopted by Matthaei, Tisch. 1, 2, 7, and Bloomfield, as earlier by Mill and Bengel (also preferred by Reiche), the *πεπειρασμένον* of the *Recepta*, supported by A B D E ℵ, Origen (four times), Chrys., *al.*, is to be retained, with Wetstein, Scholz, Lachm. Alford, and Tisch. 8. For the context demands the notion of *having been tempted*, for which, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (cf. ii. 18, xi. 17, 37), only the verb *πειράζεσθαι* is used, while *πεπειραμένον* would yield the totally unsuitable sense: *who had made attempts*.—Ver. 16. Elz.: *ἐλεον*. The form of the word, preferred by Tisch. Bloomf. and Alford, *ἐλεος*, is, however, required by A B C* D* K ℵ, 17, 71, *al. pl.*, Antioch.

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

Ver. 1. [On Vv. 1–3, see Note LI., pages 495–497.] Exhortation to the readers, deduced from the historic fact, iii. 15–19, and softened by the form of community with the readers adopted by the author, which, however, is involuntarily abandoned again at the close of the verse.—*φοβηθῶμεν οὖν*] [LI *a*.] *Let us therefore be apprehensive.*—Indication not of the mere *being afraid*, but of the *earnest endeavor*, based upon the fear of coming short of the proposed goal.[1]—*καταλειπομένης . . . αὐτοῦ*] is made by Cramer and Ernesti dependent on *ὑστερηκέναι*, against which, however, the anarthrous participle in itself suffices to decide. It is parenthetical, and *καταλειπομένης* with emphasis preposed: while there yet *remains* promise of entering into His rest. But a promise remains so long as it has not yet received its fulfillment. For with its fulfillment it ceases to be a promise, loses its existence—inasmuch as the character of the future essential to it has then become present. Erroneously do Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Strigel, Hyperius, Estius, Schlichting, S. Schmidt, Limboreh, Braun, Semler, Carpzov, *al.*, explain: "by neglect or non-observance of the promise." For, although *καταλείπειν* can signify that (comp. Acts vi. 2; Baruch iv. 1), yet in that case the article *τῆς* could not have been wanting before *ἐπαγγελίας*; and certainly also an active (*καταλείψας τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν*) would have been chosen in place of the passive participle. Finally, against the latter explanation, and in favor of that above given, pleads the *ἀπολείπεται*, vv. 6, 9.—*αὐτοῦ*] not *of Christ* (Rambach, Chr. F. Schmid), but *of God*. This is required by the connection, alike with that which precedes (iii. 11, 18) as with that which follows (vv. 3–5, 10).—*ἡ κατάπαυσις*] the repose and blessedness which belong to God Himself, and which shall become the portion of believing Christians in the epoch of consummation beginning with the coming again of Christ.—*δοκῇ ὑστερηκέναι*] *should appear* [be seen] *to have come short, i.e.* to have failed of attaining to the *κατάπαυσις*. The *infinitive perfect* characterizes that which, with the dawn of the Parousia, has become an historically completed, definite fact. *δοκῇ ὑστερηκέναι*, however, does not stand pleonastically in place of the bare *ὑστερῇ* or *ὑστερήσῃ* (Michaelis, Carpzov, Abresch, *al.*), nor is it placed "because, in connection with the question whether and where the *ὑστερηκέναι* exists as a concluded, and therefore irreparable, fact, the human perception does not extend beyond a mere *videtur*" (Kurtz); for it is not here a case of a question to be decided by men still living upon earth. It serves rather, as the *videatur* often added in Latin, to give a more refined and delicate expression to the discourse. Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 16. Erroneously, however, Delitzsch, that in *δοκῇ* there is contained not only a

[1] Calvin: Hic nobis commendatur timor, non qui fidei certitudinem exeutiat, sed tantam incutiat sollicitudinem, ne securi torpeamus. Metuendum ergo, non quia trepidare aut diffidere nos oporteat quasi incertos de exitu, sed ne Dei gratiae desimus.

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

Ver. 2. [LI *b*.] corroborates in its first half the καταλειπομένης, ver. 1, while the second half shows the danger of the ὑστερηκέναι in the example of others. The emphasis in the first half lies upon ἐσμὲν εὐηγγελισμένοι. The sense is not: for we, too, like them, have promise (to express this the addition of ἡμεῖς after καὶ γάρ would have been called for), but: *for* promise (*sc.* of entering into the κατάπαυσις, cf. vv. 1, 3) have we indeed, even as they (the fathers), *sc.* had it.—Most arbitrarily is the meaning of this and the following verse apprehended by Ebrard. According to Ebrard, ver. 2 ff. proclaims as the reason why the Jews did not attain the promised κατάπαυσις, not their "subjective unbelief," but "the objective imperfection of the Old Testament revelation." With the second half of ver. 2, namely, a gradation (!) is supposed to begin, and the progress of thought to be as follows: "The word which we have received is even infinitely better than the word which the Israelites received through Moses. For, first, the word spoken by Moses was unable to bring the people to faith—it remained external to them; it set forth a promise, it is true, and also attached a condition, but it communicated no strength to fulfill this condition (vv. 2–5, comp. vv. 12, 13); but, secondly, the promise there given was not even in its purport the true one; there, earthly rest was promised; here, spiritual and everlasting rest (vv. 6–10)." That the context affords no warrant for the bringing out of such a meaning is self-evident. For neither does the author here distinguish such twofold word of promise, nor a twofold κατάπαυσις, nor can λόγος . . . μὴ συγκεκραμένος signify a word which "could not prove binding."—Erroneous, too, is the view of the connection on the part of Delitzsch, to whom Riehm (*Lehrbegr.*

des Hebräerbr. p. 798 ff.) accedes in all essential particulars. According to Riehm, the (as yet unproved) presupposition is first provisionally expressed in the parenthesis, ver. 1, in a simply assertory manner, viz. that there is still in existence a promise of entering into the rest of God, a promise of which the fulfillment is yet outstanding, and this presupposition is then repeated, ver. 2, in other expressions of a more general bearing, no doubt, but essentially in the same way of simple assertion. Upon this, however, the author now wishes to furnish proof that such presupposition is fully warranted. Accordingly, ver. 3, he formulates that presupposition in the most definite manner, inasmuch as in the opening words of ver. 3, εἰσερχόμεθα . . . πιστεύσαντες, he lays down the theme which is to be proved in the sequel. This proof is afforded in the following way: the rest of God has existed long; nevertheless, in the oath of God, mentioned in the words of the psalm, a rest of God is spoken of as yet future, and of a truth it is one and the same rest of God which, according to Gen. ii. 2—in so far as God enjoys it alone—has existed from the beginning of the world, and, according to the word of the psalm,—in so far as the people of God are to participate therein,—is one yet approaching. Although thus the long present rest of God was the aim and end of the creative activity of God, yet it is not the final aim which God has proposed to Himself. On the contrary, it is clearly apparent, from a comparison of the word of God pronounced upon the Israelites in the time of Moses, a word confirmed by an oath, with the account of the rest of God on the seventh day, that, according to the gracious designs of God, the rest, which He has enjoyed alone from the foundation of the world, should eventually become a rest of God which He enjoys in communion with His people. It is therefore indubitably certain, that even after the completion of the work of creation and the ensuing of the rest of God, there is still something outstanding [unfulfilled], an ἀπόλειπόμενον, and this consists in the fact that some, received by God into communion with Himself, are made partakers of that repose of God. This view is a mistaken one, because—(1) As regards the assumed proof, the assertion that in the oath of God, spoken of in the words of the psalm, mention is made of a yet future rest of God, is entirely untrue. Not of a particular form of the rest of God, which is still future, is the discourse, but only the fact is represented as future that it is shared on the part of men who enter into it. For a rest of God which has already existed long is not opposed to a rest of God which is still future, nor is the rest of God, mentioned Gen. ii., distinguished as of another kind than that mentioned in the psalm. On the contrary, the rest of God, or—what is identical therewith—the Sabbath-rest of God, has existed in fact and without change from the time of the completion of the works of creation, and this same rest of God it is, the participation in which was once promised to the Israelites on the condition of faith, and now upon the same condition is promised to the Christians; it is a question therefore only of the Christians taking warning from the example of the fathers, and not, like them, losing the promised blessing through unbelief. (2) That the author was desirous of

still proving the *καταλείπεσθαι ἐπαγγελίαν*, cannot at all be supposed. For this was a fact which, as self-evident from that which precedes, stood in no need of a demonstration; it is therefore expressed not only ver. 1, but also ver. 6, in a mere subsidiary clause, consequently in the form of logical subordination; and even ver. 9, in which it is introduced in an apparently independent form, decides nothing against our explanation, because ver. 9, while forming a certain conclusion to that which precedes, yet contains only the logical substructure for the exhortation attaching itself afresh at ver. 11. That at which the author alone aimed, in connection with ver. 2 ff., was therefore the impressive confirmation of the paraenesis, ver. 1; and just this paraenetic main tendency of our section likewise fails of attaining due recognition in connection with the explanation of Delitzsch and Riehm. But when Delitzsch thinks he can support his view, that the *καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας*, ver. 1, is first proved in the sequel, by declaring the otherwise to be accepted "thought that the promise of entering into God's rest has remained without its fulfillment in the generation of the wilderness, and thus is still valid," to be "entirely false," and exclaims: "What logic that would be! The generation of the wilderness perished indeed, but the younger generation entered into Canaan, came to Shiloh (the place in the heart of the land, which has its name from the *rest*, Josh. xviii. 1), and had now its own fixed land of habitation, whither Jehovah had brought and planted it, and where He fenced it in (2 Sam. vii. 10);" such conclusion would be justified only if the author had not understood the promise given to the fathers in the time of Moses, of entering into God's *κατάπαυσις*, at the same time in a *higher* sense, but had regarded it as fulfilled by the occupation of Canaan under Joshua; such, however, according to the distinct statement of ver. 8, is not the case.—*καί*] after *καθάπερ*, the ordinary *καί* after particles of comparison. See Winer, p. 409 [E. T. 440].—*ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς*] [LI c.] Periphrasis of the notion *ἐπαγγελία*, ver. 1: *the word of that which is heard* (*ἀκοή* in the *passive* sense, as Rom. x. 16; Gal. iii. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 13; John xii. 38), *i. e.* the word of promise which was heard by them, or proclaimed to them. This periphrasis is chosen in order already at this stage to point out that it was by the fault of the fathers themselves that the word of promise became for them an unprofitable word, one which did not receive its fulfillment. It remained for them a word heard only externally, whereas, if it was to profit them, they must manifest receptiveness for the same, must believingly and confidingly appropriate the same. This culpability on the part of the fathers themselves is brought into direct relief by the participial clause *μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν*, containing the indication of cause to *οὐκ ὠφέλησεν*, wherein *τῇ πίστει* forms an emphatic opposition to the preceding *τῆς ἀκοῆς*. The sense is: *because it was not for the hearers mingled with faith;* the dative *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* denoting the subject, in relation to which the *μὴ συγκ. τῇ πίστει* took place. See Winer, p. 206 [E. T. 219].[1] But that the fault of this not being mingled was not in

[1] Thus interpret Erasmus, *translation*, Calvin, Castellio, Gerhard, Owen, Calov, Limborch, Bengel, Kypke, Storr, Stuart, Reiche, *Comm. Crit.* p. 30; Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des He-*

the word but in *the men*, was naturally understood from the connection. *συγκεκραμένος* is not to be connected with *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν*, so that *τῇ πίστει* would have to be taken as the *dativus instrumentalis*: "because it did not, by means of faith, mingle with them that heard it, become fully incorporated with them" (Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Dorscheus, S. Schmidt, Wolf, Rambach, Michaelis, Carpzov, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Valckenaer, Klee, Paulus, Stein, Delitzsch, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner). For manifestly the centres of thought for the adversative clause lie in *τῆς ἀκοῆς* and *τῇ πίστει*, while *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* only takes up again the indication of the persons, already known to us from the *ἐκείνους*, although now as characterizing these persons in attaching itself to *τῆς ἀκοῆς*.—*τοῖς ἀκούσασιν*, however, not the mere demonstrative pronoun, is put by the author in order thus once more to place *hearing* and *believing* in suggestive contrast. Further, the author did not write *μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ πίστει τῶν ἀκουσάντων*, because he would thereby have conveyed the impression that the Israelites in the wilderness *possessed* indeed *πίστις*, but the word of promise which was heard did not blend into a unity with the same; whereas by means of *μὴ συγκεκραμένος τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* he denies altogether the presence of *πίστις* in them.

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

bräerbr. p. 696, *note;* Maier, and others. Heinsius, Semler, Kuinoel, *al.*, take *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν* as equivalent to *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων*, which is open to no grammatical objection (cf. Winer, p. 206 [E. T. p. 219]), and makes no alteration in the sense.

[LI *c.*] Scripture proof for the first half of ver. 3, from the already cited words of Ps. xcv. 11. Wrongly is *καθὼς εἴρηκεν* connected by Piscator with ver. 1, by Brochmann and Bleek II. with ver. 2. For to suppose parentheses before it is unwarranted. In quite a contorted manner Hofmann (p. 187): with *καθὼς εἴρηκεν* begins a protasis, which finds its apodosis in *πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν*, ver. 7; and even the fact that the latter is apodosis to *ἐπεὶ ἀπολείπεται* does not, according to him, preclude the possibility of this construction, because this second protasis is connected by *οὖν* with the first, as a deduction from the same!—*εἴρηκεν*] *sc.* *ὁ θεός*.—*ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου*] *sc.* at their unbelief and obstinate perverseness, which naturally suggested itself to the readers from the passage of the psalm more copiously adduced in the third chapter, and the reasoning of the author there attached to it. —*καίτοι τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γενηθέντων*] *although the works were completed from the creation of the world;* and accordingly the *κατάπαυσις* of God was something long present and lying in readiness, in which the Israelites, if they had been believing, might well have obtained part. The words, therefore, serve to point out the deep significance of the divine oath.[1] Wrongly are they taken ordinarily as epexegesis to *τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου*, in supplying *κατάπαυσιν* afresh after *καίτοι*. Then either *τῶν ἔργων κ.τ.λ.* is made dependent on the *κατάπαυσιν* supplied, in that *καίτοι* is taken, contrary to linguistic usage, in the sense of "et quidem:" "into the rest, namely, from the works which had been completed from the creation of the world" (so Schlichting, S. Schmidt, Wolf, Carpzov, Kypke, Baumgarten, Stuart, Heinrichs, Klee, Bloomfield), to which construction, moreover, the repetition of the article *τῶν* after *τῶν ἔργων* would have been in any case necessary; or else *τῶν ἔργων . . . γενηθέντων* is regarded as a *genitive absolute:* "namely (or even, although), into a rest, which ensued upon the works of creation being completed" (so Vatablus, Calvin, Beza, Limborch, Cramer, Böhme, Bisping), which however, in like manner, must grammatically have been otherwise expressed. But, in general, the author cannot here have been at all occupied with the subjoining of a definition with regard to the *kind of rest* which was meant, since he does not anywhere distinguish several kinds of rest, but without further remark presupposes that the *κατάπαυσις* which ensued for God after the completion of the works of creation is identical with that once promised to the Israelites and now promised to the Christians.—*τῶν ἔργων*] *sc.* *τοῦ θεοῦ*. The necessity for thus supplementing is apparent from ver. 4; comp. also ver. 10. Very arbitrarily, and forcing in a thought entirely foreign to the context, Ebrard understands *τῶν ἔργων* of the works *of men*, supposing that with *καθὼς εἴρηκεν* "the author proceeds to show to what extent even the O. T. itself points out the insufficiency of the law and its *ἔργα*" (!), regards *τῶν ἔργων* as antithesis to the preceding *οἱ πιστεύσαντες* (!), and finds the thought, "that all that which

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

can be called ἔργα has been wrought from the time of the creation of the world, but has not sufficed to bring mankind to the κατάπαυσις, to a condition of satisfied repose," whence follows "that an entirely new way of salvation—not that of human doing and human exertion, but that of faith in God's saving deed—is necessary in order to attain to the κατάπαυσις" (!).—ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου] *from the foundation of the world, i. e.* since the world began. Comp. ix. 26; Matt. xiii. 35, xxv. 34; Luke xi. 50; Rev. xiii. 8, xvii. 8.

Ver. 4. [On Vv. 4–10, see Note LII., pages 497, 498.] Scripture proof for the thought implicitly contained in καίτοι κ.τ.λ., ver. 3, viz. that the *actual existence* of the divine κατάπαυσις, from which the Israelites were to be excluded, has not been wanting. [LII *a*, *b*.]—The citation is from Gen. ii. 2, according to the LXX., with some non-essential variations.—To εἴρηκεν we have to supply as subject, not ἡ γραφή (Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Bisping, *al.*), but ὁ θεός. For although, in the citation, God is spoken of in the third person, yet in εἰρηκεν, ver. 4, the subject must be the same as in καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν, *sc.* εἰρηκεν, ver. 5; in this latter passage, however, the subject *can* only be ὁ θεός, as is proved by the following μου.—που] see on ii. 6.—περὶ τῆς ἑβδόμης] *with regard to the seventh day.*[1]

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

Vv. 6, 7. The author, founding his reasoning, on the one hand, on the truthfulness of God, and on the other, on the actual state of matters declared from ἀλλά, ver. 2, to κατάπαυσίν μου, ver. 5, now returns to the statements: καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας, ver. 1, and καὶ γάρ ἐσμεν εὐηγγελισμένοι καθάπερ κἀκεῖνοι, ver. 2, in order, by means of the opening words of the psalm cited, to render clear the truth contained in these statements concerning the non-fulfillment of the promise as yet, and also the necessity for not closing the heart against the same.[2]—The sense is: *since then it still remains, i. e.* is to be expected with certainty, *that some enter therein* (inasmuch, namely, as God carries also into effect that which He promises), *and the earlier recipients of the promise did not enter in because of their unbelief, He marks out anew a definite day*, etc. From this relation of the first half of the protasis to the second, as that of a general postulate

[1] Comp. Winer, p. 549 [E. T. 590]; Buttmann, p. 71 [E. T. 81].

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

to a special historic fact, is explained also the indefinite *τινάς* in the first clause. Wrongly Delitzsch, according to whom *τινάς* signifies: "others than those." Some, again, find in *ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολείπεται τινὰς εἰσελθεῖν* the meaning: since then the promise, of entering into His rest, is still left, *i. e.* awaits its fulfillment. So substantially Bleek: "since it now remains, that the divine rest has not yet been already closed by the complete (?) fulfillment of the prophecy relating thereto, in such wise that no more entrance exists for them." Against this, however, pleads the fact that the author would then have illogically co-ordinated, the one with the other, the two protases ver. 6, since the first would surely contain the result of the second. For the sequence of thought would then be: *the former recipients of the promise came short of attaining salvation, and the consequence thereof is that the κατάπαυσις stands open for others.* It must thus have been written: *ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολείπεται τινὰς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτήν, τῶν πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντων οὐκ εἰσελθόντων δι ἀπείθειαν.*—*οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες*] *sc.* the Israelites in the wilderness.

Ver. 7. The apodosis. We have not to construe in such wise that the first *σήμερον* shall be taken as apposition to *ἡμέραν*: "He marks out, therefore, again a definite day (fixes anew a term), namely, 'a to-day,' in that —as was before observed—He says in David, so long time after, '*To-day, etc.*'"[1] Nor yet so that the first *σήμερον* is connected with *λέγων*: "He fixes, therefore, again a day, in that, after so long a time, He says in David 'to-day;' even as it says: 'To-day, if ye, etc.'"[2] On the contrary, the first *σήμερον* already begins the citation; is then, however,—on account of the words parenthetically introduced by the author: *ἐν Δαυὶδ . . . προείρηται*,—resumed in the second *σήμερον*.—*ἐν Δαυίδ*] not: *apud Davidem*, i. e. *in the Book of Psalms*,[3] but: *in the person of David*, as the instrument of which God made use for speaking. The ninety-fifth psalm, although not Davidic, was ascribed to David in the superscription of the LXX., whom our author follows.—*μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον*] from the time of Joshua (ver. 8).—*καθὼς προείρηται*] Reference to iii. 7 f., 15.

Ver. 8. Justification of the *πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν*, ver. 7. If Joshua had already introduced into the rest of God, God would not still have spoken in the time after Joshua of a term (period) of entrance into the same.—*αὐτοῖς*] *sc.* *τοὺς πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντας*, ver. 6.—*καταπαύειν*] here (in accordance with the classic usage) *transitive*, as Ex. xxxiii. 14, Deut. iii. 20, v. 33, *al.*: *to lead into the rest.*—*ἐλάλει*] *sc.* *ὁ θεός.*—*μετὰ ταῦτα*] belongs not to *ἄλλης ἡμέρας* (Hofmann, *al.*), but to *ἐλάλει*, and corresponds to the *μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον*, ver. 7.

Ver. 9. [LII *c.*] Deduction from vv. 7, 8, and consequently return to the first half of ver. 6. "Thus still remaining, still awaiting its advent, is a Sabbath rest for the people of God," inasmuch, namely,—what the author in reasoning with the Hebrews might presuppose as admitted,—as

[1] Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Jac. Cappellus, Carpzov, Schulz, Klee, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Maier, M'Caul, Moll.

[2] Zeger, Schlichting, Heinrichs, Stengel.

[3] Dindorf, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, Ebrard, Alford, Woerner, *al.*; with comparison of Rom. xi. 2, ix. 25.

from David's time down to the present no one had entered into the κατάπαυσις of God. As *Sabbatic rest* the author characterizes the rest of God, in adherence to the thought of ver. 4. As a type of the everlasting blessedness do the Rabbins also regard the Sabbath.[1]—ἀρα] at the beginning of a sentence is, in prose, foreign to the classics. Comp. however, Rom. x. 17; 2 Cor. vii. 12; Luke xi. 48; Winer, p. 519 [E. T. 558]; Buttmann, p. 318 [E. T. 371].—The expression σαββατισμός (from σαββατίζειν, שָׁבַת, *to observe the Sabbath*, Ex. xvi. 30, *al.*) only here and with Plutarch, *De Superstit.* c. 3.—τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ] *to the people which appertains to God*, is recognized and treated by Him as His people, since it has believingly devoted itself to Him. Comp. Gal. vi. 16: ὁ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Ver. 10. [LII *d.*] There is not an establishing of the reasoning in ver. 9 by a reference to the *essence* of the Sabbatic rest (Delitzsch and Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 804), but justification of the expression σαββατισμός, employed ver. 9. For not that which constitutes the nature of the Sabbath is here brought out, but the fact that in the case supposed a καταπαύειν can be ascribed to man, even as to God. Wrongly (because at least εἰσελθὼν γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. must have been written) does Schulz refer ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθών to ὁ λαός: "and when it has entered," etc. And just as wrongly, because the context affords no point of support for the same, do Owen, Alting, Starck, Valckenaer, and more recently Ebrard and Alford, find in ὁ εἰσελθών a designation of *Christ*, in connection with which the ἔργα are then understood of the redemption completed, or also of the sufferings and death undergone. On the contrary, ver. 10 contains a universal proposition: *for whoever has entered into His* (namely, *God's*) *rest, has also on his part attained to rest from his works* (the burdens and toils of the earthly life:[2] *even as God from His own* (works, the works of creation); for him has thus the Sabbath of everlasting blessedness set in.

Vv. 11–13. [On Vv. 11–13, see Note LIII., page 498.] Conclusion by way of warning admonition.—σπουδάσωμεν] not: *festinemus* (Vulg.), but: *let our earnest effort be directed to this end.*—οὖν] [LIII *a.*] deduces the inference from all that has been hitherto said, from iii. 7 onwards.—ἐκείνην τὴν κατάπαυσιν] that very κατάπαυσις, of which the discourse has heretofore been, which was described as a κατάπαυσις of God, as one already promised to the fathers, and then again to us, as a possession which they, on account of their disobedience and unbelief, failed to obtain,

[1] Comp. *e. g. Jalkut Rubeni*, fol. 95. 4: Dixerunt Israëlitae: Domine totius mundi, ostende nobis exemplar mundi futuri. Respondit ipsis Deus S.-B.: illud exemplar est sabbatum. R. D. Kimchi et R. Salomo *in Ps.* xcii.: Psalmus cantici in diem Sabbati, quod hic psalmus pertineat ad seculum futurum, quod totum sabbatum est et quies ad vitam aeternam. See Wetstein and Schöttgen *ad loc.*

[2] Comp. LXX. Gen. iii. 17: ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου; v. 29: οὗτος διαναπαύσει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λυπῶν τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ἧς κατηράσατο κύριος ὁ θεός. Comp. also Rev. xiv. 13. What is meant is not the works or labor "of sanctification" (Tholuck, Grimm, Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmst. *A. K.-Z.* 1857, No. 29, p. 664); and still less the *ritual ordinances* of Judaism (Braun, Akersloot, Cramer, Semler, and Griesbach).

but which is still open to us as an ideal Sabbatic rest and everlasting blessedness, if we manifest faith and confidence.—*ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι πέσῃ τῆς ἀπειθείας*] *lest any one fall into the same example of unbelief, i. e.* lest any one fall into the same obstinate perversity as the fathers, and like them become a warning example for others.[1] *πίπτειν ἐν* is also quite usual in classical authors; see Passow and Pape *ad voccm.* From *πίπτειν εἰς* it is distinguished only by a greater degree of significance in that it does not merely like this express the *falling into* something, but also the subsequent *lying in* the same. Others,[2] take *πέσῃ absolutely: "fall,* i. e. to be brought to ruin, perish." In that case *ἐν* is explained either by *per* (Wolf, Stengel, Ewald, *al.*), or "comformably to [*gemäss*]" (Tholuck), or *propter* (Carpzov), or, what with this construction would alone be correct, of *the condition, the state in which one is* (Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, Maier, Moll): "in giving the same example." But this whole construction is artificial. Opposed to it is likewise the position of *πέσῃ.* For had this word such emphasis as it must have so soon as it is taken in the absolute sense, it would not have been inserted in such subordinate, unaccentuated fashion between the other words, but have been introduced at the very beginning of the proposition: *ἵνα μή τις πέσῃ κ.τ.λ.*

Vv. 12, 13. Warning demonstration of the necessity for compliance with the exhortation uttered ver. 11.[3]—*ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*] *the word of God.* [LIII *b.*] By these words we have not[4] the hypostatic word of God, or Christ, as the second person of the Godhead. For although this mode of designating Christ in the case of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, according to i. 1–3, and on account of the points of contact he displays with Philo, can present nothing strange in itself, yet the expression was

[1] Thus the Vulgate, Luther, Beza, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Abresch, Alford, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and others.

[2] As Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Vatablus, Calvin, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Wolf, Bengel, Carpzov, Schulz, Heinrichs, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bisping, Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt *A. K.-Z.* 1857, No. 29, p. 664; the last-named because the expression "to fall into an example," instead of "to afford an example," is supposed to be a forced one,—the expression, however, is only a concise one (see above),—and because *πίπτειν* is probably chosen with a retrospective glance to iii. 17, the passage to which reference is here made, with the difference that the word there denoted the *physical* destruction. But such intention in connected with the choice of the word is not at all to be assumed), Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 774), Maier, Kluge, Moll, Ewald.

[3] Ebrard's commentary here too abounds in quixotic caprice, such as disowns all linguistic basis. According to Ebrard, the preceding warning of ver. 11 is yet further enforced, ver. 12, by the reminder that in our case (!) that excuse (!) is removed, which, according to ver. 2 (!), still existed in the case of the contemporaries of Moses. For us nothing is wanting (!) on the part of the word of God; for (!) the word of God is living, powerful, penetrating into the soul; if we (!) should fall victims to unbelief, the guilt would rest upon ourselves alone (!). According to Ebrard, the genitive *τοῦ θεοῦ* forms an opposition to the first person plural *σπουδάσωμεν* (!), and ver. 12 a supplementary material opposition to ver. 2 (!). That "this profound and delicate connection has hitherto been overlooked by all expositors" is natural enough. Even after Ebrard has discovered it, it will still remain unnoticed.

[4] With many Fathers, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Thomas Aquinas, Lyra, Cajetan, Clarius, Justinian, Cornelius a Lapide, Jac. Cappellus, Gomar, Owen, Heinsius, Alting, Clericus, Cramer, Ewald, *al.*

too unusual for it to be employed and understood without further indication, in this special sense, where the connection did not even lead up to it. Moreover, the predicates *ἐνεργής, τομώτερος κ.τ.λ.*, and *κριτικός* (instead of *κριτής*), seem better suited to an impersonal than a personal subject. The majority understand *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ* of *the word of God*, as proclaimed and as preserved in Scripture. They refer it then either to *the gospel*,[1] or to *the threatenings* of God,[2] or, finally, to the *threatenings and promises* of God taken together.[3] *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ* is to be understood quite generally: "that which God speaks," as, indeed, the whole proposition, vv. 12, 13, contains a general sentence. But that "that which God speaks" was then, in its application to the case here specially coming under notice, the call to receptivity of heart repeatedly made by God through the psalmist, and the exclusion from His *κατάπαυσις* threatened in the event of obstinate disobedience and unbelief, was for the reader self-evident from the connection.—The word of God is characterized in progressive enhancement. It is called *ζῶν, living*, on account of its inner *vital power* (not on account of its everlasting, intransitory continuance, Schlichting, Abresch; nor as "cibus ac nutrimentum, quod hominum animis vitam conservat," Carpzov; nor, in opposition to the rigid lifeless law, Ebrard); *ἐνεργής, effective*, on account of its asserting itself, manifesting itself vigorously in the outer world. The latter is the consequence of the former, and *both* in this connection refer to the power of punishing its contemners, which is inherent in the word of God.—The penetrating sharpness of this power of punishment is described in ascending gradation in the sequel. —*καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον*] *and more trenchant than every (any) two-edged sword.* *ὑπέρ* after a comparative (Luke xvi. 8; Judg. xi. 25, LXX. Cod. Vaticanus), like *παρά*, i. 4. *μάχαιρα δίστομος*, a sword with twofold mouth, *i.e.* with an edge on both sides (*ἀμφοτέρωθεν ὀξεῖα*).[4]—The proof for the statement: *τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον*, is contained in the words: *καὶ διϊκνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν*] *and piercing to the separating of soul and spirit, joints as well as marrow.* [LIII c.] *μερισμός* denotes the action of separating, and the separating subject is the word of God. Wrongly does Schlichting (comp. also Böhme) take it locally, or as reflexive: *to the secret spot where soul and spirit separate.* Such construction is to be rejected, as otherwise the clause following would have also to be explained in like manner: where joints and marrow separate. Joints and marrow, however, not being, in the human organization, things coming into direct contact, the thought would be inappropriate, whether we understand *ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν* in the literal or non-literal sense. Schlichting, to be sure, will make *ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν* no longer dependent upon *μερισμοῦ*, but take it as co-ordinate with *μερισμοῦ*

[1] Cameron, Grotius, Wittich, Akersloot, Ebrard, *al.*

[2] Schlichting, Michaelis, Abresch, Böhme, Heinrichs, *al.*

[3] Beza, Schulz, Bisping, *al.*

[4] The same expression in the LXX. Judg. iii. 16; Prov. v. 4. Comp. *ῥομφαία δίστομος*, Rev. i. 16, ii. 12; LXX. Ps. cxlix. 6; Ecclus. xxi. 3. Similarly, Eurip. *Helen.* 989: *ἐμὸν πρὸς ἦπαρ ὧσαι δίστομον ξίφος τόδε*; *Orest.* 1309: *δίπτυχα, δίστομα φάσγανα.*

("... ut gladius iste penetrare dicatur ad loca in homine abditissima, etiam illuc, ubi anima cum spiritu connectitur et ab eo dividitur, itemque ubi sunt membrorum compages et medullae"). But for this distinction the repetition of ἀχρι before ἁρμῶν would have been necessary. An entire failure, finally, is also the method proposed by Hofmann[1] in order to preserve the *local* acceptation, in making ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος dependent on ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν: "to the point at which it dissects and dissolves both joints and marrow of the inner life, the secret ligaments of its connection and the innermost marrow of its existence." For then the readers would be required to understand an arrangement of the words which has not, as Hofmann thinks, perhaps "its parallel" in Heb. vi. 1, 2, but which is, on the contrary, altogether impossible, on account of the addition of μερισμοῦ already to ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, and therefore nowhere finds its analogon in the N. T., not to say in the Epistle to the Hebrews. All four words: ψυχῆς, πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν, and μυελῶν, depend upon μερισμοῦ, and not *a dividing of the soul from the spirit, of joinings or joints from the marrow*, is intended, nor yet *a dividing of the soul and spirit from joints and marrow* (Böhme), but a dividing of the soul, the spirit, etc., *each in itself* is meant. The two last substantives, however, are not *co-ordinate* to the two first (Calvin, Beza, Cameron, Storr, Delitzsch, *al.*), but *subordinate*. For ψυχή and πνεῦμα, which are distinguished from each other as characterizing respectively the lower sensuous life and the higher life of the spirit, here set forth without any more special limitation the inner side of human life generally, in opposition to the σῶμα or body, which latter alone an earthly sword is able to pierce, and ἁρμοί τε καὶ μυελοί is not to be understood of the joints and marrow *of the body*,[2] but of the ligaments and marrow of the ψυχή and πνεῦμα, is thus a figurative expression to denote the innermost, most hidden depth of the rational life of man. In such transferred signification μυελός is used also with the classics.[3]

[1] *Schriftbew.* I. 2 Aufl. p. 297, and likewise still in his *Comm.* p. 192.

[2] So Delitzsch still explains, who represents the author as giving expression to the grossly sensuous conception, regardless whether such conception is in harmony with the author's refined mode of thought,—that the word of God points out "to man the antitheistic forces of his bodily nature, which has become wholly, and to all the joints and marrow (cerebral marrow, spinal marrow, etc.), a seat of sin and death!" The expression is supposed to adapt itself, without itself becoming figurative, to the figure of the μάχαιρα. It is presupposed that the word of God has already accomplished its work of dissection (!) to the skeleton, with its bones and sinews (!), or at least presupposed that all, so far as this, is manifestly to be performed with ease. A stop, however, is not made here, but it further separates the joints of the bones, with the sinews or tendons serving to their movement, and cuts through the bones themselves, so that the marrow they contain is laid bare. Thus, then, the word renders the whole man transparent to God and to himself, and unveils in sharpest and most rigid analysis his most psychico-spiritual and innermost physical (!) condition; whereby it is then seen that, in so far as the man has not yet given scope to the work of grace, and in so far as the latter has not yet been able to accomplish itself, the marrow of the body is as corrupt as the spirit, which is as it were the marrow of the soul, and the joints of the body as corrupt as the soul, which is as it were the joint of the spirit (!).

[3] Comp. Themist. *Orat.* 32, p. 357: (ὀδύνη) εἰσδεδυκυῖα εἰς αὐτόν που τὸν μυελὸν τῆς ψυχῆς; Eurip. *Hippol.* 255 f.: χρὴν γὰρ μετρίας εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλίας θνητοὺς ἀνακίρνασθαι καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἄκρον μυελὸν ψυχῆς.

ἁρμός, however, *a fastening together, uniting, joint*, could likewise be employed metaphorically, inasmuch as it receives its signification as joint of the human body only from the addition of τοῦ σώματος or from the connection, but elsewhere occurs in the most varied combinations and relations.[1]—It is, moreover, worthy of notice that Philo also ascribes to his divine Logos a like cutting and severing power. He calls the same τομεὺς τῶν συμπάντων, which God has whetted to the most piercing sharpness, which on that account not only separates all sensuous things and penetrates to the atoms, but even divides the supra-sensuous, separating the soul into the rational and irrational, the reason into the true and false, the perception into the clear and the obscure.[2]—καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας] *and qualified to take cognizance of, or to judge* (wrongly Heinrichs, Kuinoel, *al.: to condemn*), *the dispositions and thoughts of the heart.*—ἐνθυμήσεων] Matt. ix. 4, xii. 25; Acts xvii. 29.—ἐννοιῶν] 1 Pet. iv. 1.

Ver. 13. Transition from the word of God to God Himself. That the twofold αὐτοῦ and the ὃν, ver. 13, cannot be referred to Christ,[3] follows from the correct interpretation of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 12. That, however, in general not the total notion ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (so Ebrard still) can form the subject of the pronouns, ver. 13, but only the ὁ θεός to be deduced therefrom, is evident from the expression τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, which is appropriate only to the latter, not to the former. The transition from the word of God to God Himself was, moreover, a very natural one, inasmuch as in *the word of God*, God Himself is present and operative.—κτίσις] as Rom. viii. 39, and frequently, in the most universal sense: *any creature*, and indeed here not merely as regards its external existence, but also as regards its inner essence. Quite mistakenly Grotius, who is followed by Carpzov: Videtur mihi hoc loco κτίσις significare *opus hominis*, quia id est velut creatura hominis.—δέ] *on the contrary.* See on ii. 6.—τετραχηλισμένα] *laid bare.* Hesychius: πεφανερωμένα. τραχηλίζειν means: *to bend back the neck* of the victim, in the act of slaying, in order to lay bare the chest, then generally: *to lay bare, disclose, expose to view.* See the Lexicons of Passow

[1] Comp. *e. g.* ἁρμὸς θύρας, Dionys. Hal. v. 7; ἁρμοὶ λιθῶν, Ecclus. xxvii. 2, *al.*

[2] Comp. especially, *Quis rerum divinarum haeres.* p. 499 (with Mangey, I. p. 491): Εἶτ' ἐπιλέγει· Διεῖλεν αὐτὰ μέσα [Gen. xv. 10] τὸ τίς οὐ προσθείς, ἵνα τὸν ἀδίδακτον ἐννοῇς θεὸν τέμνοντα τάς τε τῶν σωμάτων καὶ πραγμάτων ἑξῆς ἁπάσας ἁρμόσθαι καὶ ἡνῶσθαι δοκούσας φύσεις τῷ τομεῖ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ· ὃς, εἰς τὴν ὀξυτάτην ἀκονηθεὶς ἀκμήν, διαιρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ αἰσθητὰ πάντα· ἐπειδὰν δὲ μέχρι τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ λεγομένων ἀμερῶν διεξέλθῃ, πάλιν ἀπὸ τούτων τὰ λόγῳ θεωρητὰ εἰς ἀμυθήτους καὶ ἀπεριγράφους μοίρας ἄρχεται διαιρεῖν οὗτος ὁ τομεύς . . . Ἕκαστον οὖν τῶν τριῶν διεῖλε μέσον, τὴν μὲν ψυχὴν εἰς λογικὸν καὶ ἄλογον, τὸν δὲ λόγον εἰς ἀληθές τε καὶ ψεῦδος, τὴν δὲ αἴσθησιν εἰς καταληπτικὴν φαντασίαν καὶ ἀκατάληπτον.—*Ibid.* p. 500 (I. p. 492): Οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ἀκονησάμενος τὸν τομέα τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγον διαιρεῖ τήν τε ἄμορφον καὶ ἄποιον τῶν ὅλων οὐσίαν, καὶ τὰ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀποκριθέντα τέσσαρα τοῦ κόσμου στοιχεῖα, etc. Comp. also *de Cherubim.* p. 112 f. (with Mangey, I. p. 144), where Philo finds in the φλογίνη ῥομφαία, Gen. iii. 24, a symbol of the Logos, and then observes with regard to Abraham: Οὐχ ὁρᾷς, ὅτι καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ὁ σοφός, ἡνίκα ἠρξατο κατὰ θεὸν μετρεῖν πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ἀπολείπειν τῷ γενητῷ, λαμβάνει τῆς φλογίνης ῥομφαίας (*i. e.* of the divine Logos) μίμημα, πῦρ καὶ μάχαιραν [Gen. xxii. 6] διελεῖν καὶ καταφλέξαι τὸ θνητὸν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ γλιχόμενος, ἵνα γυμνῇ τῇ διάνοια μετάρσιος πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀναπτῇ.

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

and Pape on the word.[1] Others[2] would, after the precedent of Perizonius, *ad Aeliani Var. Hist.* xii. 58, derive the signification "lay bare" to *τραχηλίζειν*, from the practice in antiquity of laying hold of transgressors by the neck when they were being led away to execution, and bending back the head, that they might be exposed to the gaze of all. Appeal is made not amiss to Suetonius in favor of this custom, *Vitell.* 17: donec (Vitellius) religatis post terga manibus, injecto cervicibus laqueo, veste discissa, seminudus in forum tractus est . . . reducto coma capite, ceu noxii solent, atque etiam mento mucrone gladii subrecto, ad visendam praeberet faciem neve submitteret. In like manner to Pliny, *Panegyr.* 34, 3: Nihil tamen gratius, nihil seculo dignius, quam quod contigit desuper intueri delatorum supina ora retortasque cervices. Yet a Roman custom cannot in itself afford a standard for determining the signification of a Greek word. Yet others, as Cameron, Brochmann, and Klee, suppose the general signification: "to lay bare," for *τραχηλίζειν*, to arise from the circumstance that the verb is used also of *the wrestler*, who grasps his opponent by the throat, and hurls him down backwards, whereby the face of the latter is exposed to the full view of the spectators.[3] But the exposing of the face of the thrown opponent was a circumstance of no importance in the *τραχηλίζειν* of the athlete, because not at all necessarily connected therewith. Further, and not less improbable derivations, see in Bleek.—*πρὸς ὃν κ.τ.λ.*] [LIII *d.*] is to be taken in close combination only with the *αὐτοῦ* immediately preceding, not likewise, as is done by Michaelis, Bloomfield, and Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. 2 Aufl. p. 104), with the first *αὐτοῦ*, and upon *ἡμῖν* falls no emphasis (against Ebrard and Alford). The words for the rest have too little the character of independence to justify our taking them alone, with Alford, and separating them by a colon from that which precedes.—*πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος*] *towards whom exists for us the relation*, i. e. *with whom we have to do.* Calvin: vertendum erat: cum quo nobis est ratio: cujus orationis hic est sensus, Deum esse, qui nobiscum agit, vel cum quo nobis est negotium, ideoque non esse ludendum quasi cum homine mortali, sed quoties verbum ejus nobis proponitur, contremiscendum esse, quia nihil ipsum lateat. Comp. 1 Kings ii. 14 and 2 Kings ix. 5: *λόγος μοι πρὸς σε.*[4]—Incorrectly do Luther, Vatablus, Cameron, Schlichting, Cornelius a Lapide [Piscator hesitates between this and the rendering above given], Grotius, Calov, Wolf, Schulz, Stengel, *al.*, generally with an appeal to *πρός*, i. 7, 8, and a comparison of v. 11, take *πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος* as equiv-

[1] Comp. Hom. *Il.* i. 459: *αὖ ἔρυσαν, sc. τὸν τράχηλον τοῦ ἱεροῦ*; Orpheus, *Argon.* 311: *ταῦρον σφάζον, ἀνακλίνας κεφαλὴν εἰς αἰθέρα δῖαν*; P. Fr. Ach. Nitsch, *Beschreibung des häuslichen, gottesdienstlichen u. s. w. Zustandes der Griechen*, 2 Aufl. Th. I. p. 667.

[2] As Elsner, Wolf, Baumgarten, Kuinoel, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, and Maier.

[3] Cameron: Videtur esse metaphora petita a re palaestrica. Nam luctatores tum demum adversarium dicuntur *τραχηλίζειν*, cum obstricto collo ita versant, ut objiciant spectatorum oculis nudum conspiciendum et retectum undiquaque, id quod tum demum maxime fit, quum ejus cervicibus inequitant.

[4] Aristides, *Leuctr.* iv. p. 465: *ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο θαυμαστὸν φαίνεται, εἴ τις τὸ μὲν Θηβαίους μόνους ἀντιπάλους ἡμῖν καταλειφθῆναι δέδιε, τὸ δὲ πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους ἡμῖν εἶναι τὸν λόγον, οὐδενὸς ἄξιον κρίνει φόβου.* Further examples in Wetstein and Bleek.

alent to *περὶ οὗ ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος*. Moreover, something entirely foreign is imported by Ewald when, with a reference to ii. 10 f., he finds in the words the sense: "to whom, as a friend and brother, we can always most confidently speak." Finally, the Peshito, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Erasmus *Paraphr.*, Clarius, Zeger, Owen, Limborch, Michaelis, Whitby, Cramer, Stuart, Hofmann, *al.*, explain: to whom we shall have to give an account of our actions. In itself this interpretation would be admissible; but, inasmuch as the words must in consequence thereof be taken in reference to an event yet future, we should necessarily expect the addition of *ἔσται*.

Ver. 14–x. 18. [On Vv. 14–16, see Note LIV., pages 498, 499.] The author has, in that which precedes, compared Christ with the angels and then with Moses, and proved the superiority of Christ over both. He applies himself now to a third point of the comparison, in that he institutes a comparison between Christ and the Levitical high priests, and developes on every side the exalted character of His high-priesthood above the Levitical high-priesthood, with regard to His person, with regard to the sanctuary in which He fulfills His office, and with regard to the sacrifice presented. The copiousness of this new dogmatic investigation —which is subservient to the same paraenetic aim as the preceding expositions, and therefore opens with an exhortation of the same nature with the former ones, and is presently interrupted by a somewhat lengthy warning-paraenetic interlude—is to be explained by the greater importance it had for the readers, who, in narrow-minded over-estimate of the temple cultus inherited from the fathers, regarded the continued participation in this cultus as necessary for the complete expiation of sin and the acquiring of everlasting salvation, and, because they thought nothing similar was to be found in Christianity, were exposed to an imminent peril of turning away from the latter and relapsing entirely into Judaism.[1]— The transition to this new section is formed by vv. 14–16.

Ver. 14. The introductory phrase: *ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα*, presupposes that the author has already had occasion to speak of Jesus as *ἀρχιερεύς*. We are therefore led back for *οὖν* to ii. 17, iii. 1. But, since there is further added to *ἀρχιερέα* the qualification *μέγαν* and *διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς*, and thus also these characteristics must be presupposed as known from that which precedes, we have consequently not to limit *οὖν*, in its backward reference, to ii. 17, iii. 1, but to extend it to the whole disquisition, i. 1–iii. 6, in such wise that (logically, indeed, in a not very exact manner) *μέγαν, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς* glances back in general to the dignity and exaltedness of the person of Jesus, as described in these sections. —Erroneously does Delitzsch suppose that by means of *οὖν* the exhortation *κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας* is derived as a deduction from vv. 12, 13. Such

[1] Compare the explanation already given by Chrysostom, *Hom.* viii. *init.*: Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐδὲν ἦν (*sc.* in the New Covenant) σωματικὸν ἢ φαντασικόν, οἷον οὐ ναός, οὐχ ἁγία ἁγίων, οὐχ ἱερεὺς τοσαύτην ἔχων κατασκευήν, οὐ παρατηρήσεις νομικαί, ἀλλ' ὑψηλότερα καὶ τελειότερα πάντα, καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν σωματικῶν, τὸ δὲ πᾶν ἐν τοῖς πνευματικοῖς ἦν, οὐχ οὕτω δὲ τὰ πνευματικὰ τοὺς ἀσθενεστέρους ἐπήγετο ὡς τὰ σωματικά, τούτου χάρ τοῦτον ὅλον κινεῖ τὸν λόγον.

opinion would be warranted only if, with the omission of the participial clause, merely *κρατῶμεν οὖν τῆς ὁμολογίας* had been written. For since *κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας* has received its own justification in the prefixed *ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ.*, apart from that which immediately precedes, it is clear that, in connection with ver. 14, there is no further respect had to the contents of vv. 12, 13. It is not therefore to be approved that Delitzsch, in order to make room for the unfortunate reference to vv. 12, 13, will have *οὖν* logically attached to *the verb* *κρατῶμεν*, instead of *the participle*, with which it is grammatically connected, and to which, as the most simple and natural, the like passage, x. 19 ff., also points. What labored confusion of the relations would Delitzsch require the reader to assume, when he is called to regard *ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ.* as being at the same time a recapitulation of that which has been said before, and continuation of the argument; and yet, spite of all this, to look upon *κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας* as a deduction from vv. 12, 13! In any case, the connection asserted by Delitzsch to exist between ver. 14 and vv. 12, 13: "the word of God demands obedience and appropriation, *i. e.* faith, not, however, as merely a faith locked up within the breast, but also a loud Yea and Amen, unreserved and fearless confession, *ὁμολογία* from mouth and heart, as the echo thereof," is in itself a baseless imagination; because the before-demanded *πίστις* and the here demanded *ὁμολογία* are by no means distinguished from each other as a *minus* and a *majus*, but, on the contrary, in the mind of the author of the epistle are synonyms. It results that *οὖν* stands in a somewhat free relation to the foregoing argument, consequently must not at all be taken as, strictly speaking, an illative particle, with which that which precedes is first brought to a close, but as a *particle of resuming*, which, in the form of a return to that which has already been said before, begins a new section. —*μέγαν*] does not in such wise appertain to *ἀρχιερέα* that only in combination with the same it should form the idea of the high priest (Jac. Cappellus, Braun, Rambach, Wolf, Carpzov, Michaelis, Stuart), but is indicative of the *quality* of the high priest, and means *exalted*, just as *μέγας*, x. 21, in combination with *ἱερεύς*. Comp. also xiii. 20.—As the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews represents Christ the Son of God, so also does Philo[1] represent the divine Logos as *ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεύς*.[2]—*διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς*] elucidatory demonstration of *μέγαν*. Wrongly is it translated by Luther (as also by the Peshito): *who has ascended up to heaven;* by Calvin, Peirce, Ernesti, *al.: qui coelos ingressus est.* It *can* only signify [Piscator, Owen, Bengel, Tholuck, Stuart, *al.*]: *who has passed through the heavens, sc.* in order, exalted above the heavens (cf. vii. 26; Eph. iv. 10), to take His seat upon the throne of the Divine Majesty (i. 3, 13). Allusion to the high priest of the Old Covenant, who, in order to make atonement for the people, passed through the courts of the Temple, and through the Temple itself, into the Most Holy Place. Comp. ix. 11.—*Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν*

[1] *De Somn.* p. 598 A, with Mangey, I. p. 654.

[2] Comp. *ibid.* p. 597 (I. p. 653): *Δύο γάρ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἱερὰ θεοῦ, ἓν μὲν ὅδε ὁ κόσμος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος λόγος, ἕτερον δὲ λογικὴ ψυχή, ἧς ἱερεὺς ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπος.*

του θεοῦ] emphatic apposition to *ἀρχιερέα μέγαν κ.τ.λ.*, in which the characterization of Jesus as the *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* (i. 1, 5, vi. 6, vii. 3, x. 29) serves anew to call attention to the dignity of the New Testament High Priest. Quite mistaken are Wolf and Böhme in their conjecture that the object in the addition of *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ* is the distinction of Jesus from the Joshua mentioned ver. 8. For the mention of Joshua, ver. 8, was, as regards the connection, only an incidental one, on which account there also not even a more precise definition was given to the name.—*κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας*] *let us hold fast* (vi. 18; Col. ii. 19; 2 Thess. ii. 15; wrongly Tittmann: *lay hold of, embrace*) *the confession*. *ὁμολογία* is not, with Storr, to be referred specially to the confession of Christ as the High Priest, but to be taken in general of the Christian confession. The expression is here too used objectively, as iii. 1, of the sum or subject-matter of the Christian's belief.

Ver. 15. Further justification of the demand, ver. 14, of stedfast adherence to the Christian confession.[1] For the High Priest of Christians is not merely a highly exalted One (ver. 14), He is also qualified, since as Brother He stands very closely related to believers, and has been tempted as they are, to have sympathy for their weaknesses. Comp. ii. 17, 18.[2] Whereas *δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι* and *πεπειρασμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα* bring out the homogeneity of the New Testament High Priest with that of the Old Testament (comp. v. 2), the dissimilarity at the same time existing between the two is rendered apparent by *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*.—*συμπαθεῖν*] *to have sympathy*, compassionate feeling.—Comp. x. 34. Preliminary condition to bestowing succor and redemption.—*αἱ ἀσθένειαι ἡμῶν*] the conditions of human weakness, as well moral as physical, which have been called forth by the entrance of sin into the world.—*πεπειρασμένον δέ*] contains in the form of a correction of *μὴ δυνάμενον* the proof of the capacity for having sympathy.—*κατὰ πάντα*] Comp. ii. 17.—*καθ' ὁμοιότητα*] *sc. ἡμῶν*, (comp. vii. 15: *κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα* Μελχισεδέκ), or *ἡμῖν*,[3] or even *πρὸς ἡμᾶς*[4] *in like* (similar) *manner as we*.—*χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*] *without sin, i. e.* without sin arising out of the temptations, or more clearly: without His being led into sinning, as a result of His being tempted. Comp. vii. 26; 2 Cor. v. 21; 1 John iii. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 22. When Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 37) and Delitzsch will discover in these words the additional

[1] Incorrectly does Ebrard take ver. 15 as elucidation of *ἔχοντες ἀρχιερέα*.

[2] Calvin: In nomine Filii Dei, quod posuit, subest ea majestas, quae nos ad timorem et obsequium adigat. Verum si nihil in Christo aliud consideremus, nondum pacatae erunt conscientiae. Quis enim non reformidet Filii Dei conspectum, praesertim quum reputamus, qualis sit nostra conditio, nobisque in mentem veniunt peccata nostra? Deinde Judaeis aliud obstare poterat, quia Levitico sacerdotio assueverant: illic cernebant hominem mortalem unum ex aliis electum, qui sanctuarium ingrediebatur, ut sua deprecatione reconciliaret fratres suos Deo. Hoc magnum est, quum mediator, qui placare erga nos Deum potest, unus est ex nobis. Haec illecebra poterat Judaeos illaqueare, ut sacerdotio Levitico semper essent addicti, nisi occurreret apostolus, ac ostenderet Filium Dei non modo excellere gloria, sed aequa bonitate et indulgentia erga nos esse praeditum.

[3] Comp. Polyb. xiii. 7. 2: *Ἦν γὰρ εἴδωλον γυναικεῖον, πολυτελέσιν ἱματίοις ἠμφιεσμένον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μορφὴν εἰς ὁμοιότητα τῇ τοῦ Νάβιδος γυναικὶ διαφόρως ἀπειργασμένον.*

[4] Comp. Philo, *de Profugis*, p. 458 A, with Mangey, I. p. 553: *κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τἄλλα ὁμοιότητα.*

indication that *in the case of Jesus temptation also found no sin present*, this is indeed true as to the fact, but open to the misconception of being supposed to imply that even the possibility of sinning on the part of Jesus is denied, whereas surely this possibility in itself must be conceived of as an essential factor in the idea of being tempted; and opposed to the context, because *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* is the continued note of modality of *πεπειρασμένον*, and thus cannot possibly specify something that was already present, even before the *πειράζεσθαι* came in. More in accordance with the context, therefore, does Alford express himself: "Throughout these temptations, in their origin, in their process, in their result,—sin had nothing in Him: He was free and separate from it." Wrongly Jac. Cappellus, Calmet, Semler, Storr, Ernesti, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others: *tempted in all things, sin excepted.* For in that case *χωρὶς τῆς ἁμαρτίας* (with the article) would be written, and this be connected immediately with *κατὰ πάντα*. Mistaken, however, is also the explanation of Oecumenius, Schlichting, Dindorf: *without having committed sin, as a guiltless one;* an interpretation which would be admissible only if *πειράζεσθαι* could be referred specially to the enduring of outward sufferings, which might be seen to be a consequence of sin.—Comp., for the rest, on *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* likewise the kindred statements concerning the divine Logos in Philo.[1]

Ver. 16. Encouragement, derived from the character of the High Priest of the New Testament, as brought into relief, ver. 15.—*προσέρχεσθαι*] *approach, draw near,* in order to have community with something. Comp. vii. 25, x. 1, 22, xi. 6, xii. 18, 22. Too specially Delitzsch, Kurtz, and Ewald, who explain: drawing near in prayer for aid or succour.—*μετὰ παῤῥησίας*] *with confidence* (iii. 6), inasmuch as we possess, in the very office of intercessor, a High Priest who is not only exalted, but also full of sympathy, who thus has not only *the power*, but also *the will* to help.—*θρόνος τῆς χάριτος*] not: *Christ Himself* (Gerhard, S. Schmidt, Carpzov, Ernesti, *al.*), not: *the throne of Christ* (Primasius [also Tena, arguing from the Vulgate of ii. 9], Schlichting, Limborch, Ch. Fr. Schmid, *al.*), but *the throne of God*, at whose right hand Christ is seated. Comp. viii. 1, xii. 2 [Eph. ii. 18]. It is called, however, the throne of grace, because the nature of the New Covenant has, as its presupposition, not strictly judicial retribution, according to the works of men, but compassion and grace on the part of God; the believer feels himself united to God as a loving Father, who has remitted to him the guilt and punishment of sin. A reference for the rest to the cover of the ark of the covenant, regarded as the seat of the Godhead in the sanctuary (the כַּפֹּרֶת or *ἱλαστήριον* of the Old Covenant), assumed by Piscator, Schöttgen, Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Abresch, Kuinoel, Paulus, *al.*, and still in recent times by Bloomfield and Bisping (comp. also Kurtz *ad loc.*), in connection with the expression: *ὁ θρόνος τῆς χάριτος*, is not indicated by anything in the text.—To *obtain*

[1] *De Profugis*, p. 466 B (with Mangey, I. p. 562): **Λέγομεν γάρ, τὸν ἀρχιερέα οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῖον εἶναι, πάντων οὐχ ἑκουσίων μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκουσίων ἀδικημάτων ἀμέτοχον.**—*Ibid.* p. 467 C (I. p. 563): **ἀμέτοχος γὰρ καὶ ἀπαράδεκτος παντὸς εἶναι πέφυκεν ἁμαρτήματος.**

mercy and find grace (Luke i. 30; Acts vii. 46; comp. חֵן מָצָא, Gen. vi. 8, xviii. 3, and frequently) are synonymous terms. All distinctions, as that of Böhme: ἔλεος magis id appellat, quo indigebant calamitatibus oppressi lectores, χάρις, quo peccatis non carentes; of Stein, that ἔλεος relates to compassion towards the sinner, χάρις to *every* manifestation of grace; of Bisping, that ἔλεος refers more to the forgiveness of sins and deliverance from sufferings, while χάρις refers to the communication of higher gifts of grace; of Hofmann, that χάριν εὑρίσκειν means "to be brought into a state of favor with any one, to become an object of his good-will;" λαμβάνειν ἔλεος, on the other hand, is "a receiving of that which the kind and gracious One accords to those in need of His kindness, just on account of their need," and many others, are untenable.—*εἰς εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν*] *for timely help, i. e.* in order that we may in this manner attain to a help which appears on the scene, while it is still the right time, before it is yet too late (iii. 13). Wrongly Tholuck, Delitzsch, Moll, Kurtz, and Hofmann: "before the one in conflict with the temptations succumbs;" and others (also Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 740): "as often as we stand in need of the *βοήθεια*."

Notes by American Editor.

LI. Vv. 1–3.

(*a*) Vv. 1–10 constitute the third part of this extended hortatory passage (see Note XLIX *a* above), in which the readers are reminded of the danger that they might fail of entering into the rest of God from the same cause which had led to the failure of the ancient Israelites—namely, *ἀπιστία*. Οὖν of ver. 1 refers to what is said of the Israelites in vv. 15–19; *φοβηθῶμεν* calls to mind the reason for apprehension, and, at the same time, urges the course of action which such apprehension would naturally suggest; *δοκῇ* and *ὑστερηκέναι* are to be explained, with Lünem., the former as an intentional softening of the expression, and the latter as in the perfect because, at the time of decision as to who shall find entrance, these will prove to have already failed. The genitive-absolute clause, intermediate between *φοβηθῶμεν* and *δοκῇ ὑστ.* (*καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας . . . αὐτοῦ*) stands in a circumstantial relation to the sentence. This is indicated by the position of the words after *μήποτε*, which shows that they do not give a reason for the exhortation to be apprehensive of the danger and thus avoid it, but set forth a circumstance connected with the statement of the thing to be apprehended. They were to fear lest, their condition being the same with that of the Israelites, in respect to the fact of the promise, the result at the end might be the same. The emphasis on *καταλειπομένης* and the use of the word are connected rather with the thought developed later in the chapter (see vv. 3 ff.), than with the demands of the thought in this verse. The omission of the article with *ἐπαγγελίας* is due, no doubt, to the fact that it was the idea of *promise*, rather than of *the particular promise*, which was here prominent in the writer's mind. That the great promise of God is *one and the same* is made sufficiently clear in subsequent verses.—(*b*) Ver. 2, as Lünem. remarks, "corroborates in its first half the *καταλειπομένης* (ver. 1), while the second half shows the danger of the *ὑστερηκέναι* in the example of others." This verse belongs, thus, immediately with ver. 1, and serves to complete its idea. It

is to be observed, however, that the substance of this verse is really gathered up into the οὖν of ver. 1 with the following καταλειπ., and consequently that it has a repetitious character, such as we often see, in similar cases, in Paul's writings.

(*c*) As to the text and construction of ver. 2 *b*, the following suggestions may be offered:—1. The nominative of the participle (συγκεκ.) is read by Tisch. 8, as Lünem. states in his critical notes, but Lachm., Treg., W. & H., Alf., R. V., read the accusative. The external evidence, as may be seen by the presentation of it given by Lünem., strongly favors the accusative, which is also favored by the consideration that it is the more difficult reading. The change from ος to ους, however, is only a slight one, and might, easily, as it would seem, have been made by a copyist, who, without carefully examining the bearing of it on the thought of the sentence, was influenced, by the preceding ἐκείνους, to put the participle in the same case.—2. The reading with the accusative—because they were not mixed in faith, or united by faith, with those who heard—presents a thought which is not in the special line of the surrounding context. This is evident for the following reasons: *first*, because the context does not call attention to those who received the word by faith, in the early times, but finds all its emphasis in centering the thought upon those who did not thus receive it; *secondly*, because the context uses *hearing* in the more objective or passive sense, i. e. that hearing which is involved in the proclamation, and not *receptive* hearing; *thirdly*, the context, in ver. 2 *a* and also in ver. 6, distinctly sets forth the persons, to whom the good tidings were preached, as the same with the disobedient ones—the same with those who had been mentioned in iii., 16 ff.; *fourthly*, the argument of the context which follows is to show, that the rest remains for the readers to enter into it, because it had not been entered already;—but, to make an allusion to Caleb and Joshua, who, in a certain sense, had entered it, would not only be wholly unnecessary, but would diminish the rhetorical force of the passage. On the other hand, the reading with the nominative places the sentence in the direct line of all that is said from iii. 15 to iv. 10. Like Rom. v. i., therefore, this verse must be reckoned among the small number of passages, where it seems probable that the internal evidence is to be regarded as out-weighing the external. The internal evidence, in this case, is supported by ℵ and by Vulg., and some other authorities which read the nominative. A. R. V., reads the nominative in the text and the accusative in the margin; R. V., the acc. in the text, and the nom. in the margin.

(*d*) In ver. 3 *a*, there is a twofold emphasis—on εἰσερχόμεθα, by reason of its position and as related to vv. 4–10; and on οἱ πιστεύσαντες, as related to the idea of faith which, through τῇ πίστει and ἀπιστία, is made so prominent in the preceding context. There is a turn in the thought, in this verse, from the danger of failure through unbelief, and the vital necessity of faith, to the certainty of the reward in case we have faith. In order to the setting forth of this certainty, which is expressed in the emphatic εἰσερχόμεθα, the writer proceeds in vv. 4–10 to establish the fact that the rest really awaits the entrance of the true believers.—(*e*) In the latter part of ver. 3, two points are to be noticed:—1. That καθώς εἰρηκεν κ.τ.λ., introduces the proof of the necessity of faith, which is suggested in οἱ πιστ. This proof lies in the fact that the Israelites were refused entrance notwithstanding that the rest had long since been prepared—it must have been their disobedience, therefore, occasioned by their ἀπιστία, which caused their rejection. 2. That

the clause following καίτοι, though connected by that word, as just indicated, with the καθώς clause, gives in its own suggested thought the foundation for the next verses, 4–10.

LII. Vv. 4–10.

(*a*) In the development of the proof given in these verses (with which, as already stated, the last clause of ver. 3 is, in thought, to be connected), there are, apparently, four steps: 1. The rest of God was established by Him at the end of the work of the creation of the world. 2. This rest was not entered by the Israelites of Moses' time; it remained, therefore, open for others. 3. It was not entered, in the full sense, in the time of Joshua; it was reserved for men who should follow afterwards. 4. It was not entered, even in David's time, as indicated by the very exhortation of his Psalm, which is still read in the days present to the writer and his readers. The arrangement of the steps is not in the order of direct succession, but according to the incidental suggestions of each sentence as introducing the next. It follows, as we may say, the grammatical, rather than the logical law of connection and progress. But the thought may be easily traced; and the conclusion is reached in ver. 9, that there is a rest yet remaining, and that it is a σαββατισμός—a rest such as God Himself had "when the works were done."

(*b*) With respect to the immediate and grammatical connection of the passage (4–10), the following points may be observed:—1. γάρ of ver. 4, grammatically, gives the reason for the whole sentence from ὡς ὤμοσα to γενηθέντων, and it covers in its force ver. 4 and ver. 5. In the special progress of thought in vv. 4–10, ver. 4 may be regarded as giving the proof of what is suggested as to the first provision of the rest in ver. 3 *c*, and ver. 5 repeats, for the purposes of this passage, the statement of the failure of the Israelites in the times of Moses, which is still further mentioned in ver. 6 *b*. Vv. 5, 6 *b*, thus contain the second step of the proof.—2. οὖν of ver. 6 connects ἀπολείπεται κ.τ.λ., as an inference, with what precedes, and ἐπεί introduces these words as a protasis, to which ὁρίζει κ.τ.λ. (ver. 7) answers as an apodosis. The chief statement of these two verses is, evidently, that of ver. 7, and, in relation to the main thought of the passage, these verses declare that the exhortation in the Psalms shows the rest to be still open for entrance, in the time of David.—3. γάρ of ver. 8 introduces that verse as a proof or justification of the words πάλιν ὁρίζει ἡμέραν. There would have been no such reference to a new day, if the rest to which Joshua led the people had been all that was meant. It is evident, however, that the placing of ver. 8 after ver. 7 and the connecting of the two by γάρ belong only to the incidental and grammatical progress of the verses, and not to the historical order of the proofs.

(*c*) The introduction of the word σαββατισμός (ver. 9), in place of κατάπαυσις, cannot be satisfactorily explained without giving it a deeper significance. The progress of the steps in the argument, which shows that nothing in the past has exhausted the meaning of the offer of entrance into the rest, points to the same significance. The word ἀπολείπεται, also, which carries with it the idea of remaining over, and the implication that what is referred to had not yet been fully realized, accord with this deeper sense. The rest which remains is a future and heavenly one—the one clearly revealed by Christ.

(*d*) The two views respecting ὁ εἰσελθών of ver. 10—that it refers to Christ, and that it designates the individual believer, whoever he may be—are, both of them, liable to serious objections. Without expressing a confident opinion on the sub-

ject, the writer of this note would offer the following suggestions, which may be regarded as favoring the reference to Christ:—(1) If we consider ver. 3, by its emphatic *εἰσερχόμεθα*, as intended to turn the thought of the readers to something outside of the mere exhortation—namely, to the certainty that they will enter the rest, if they believe,—we may find a most appropriate conclusion to the development of this idea in the statement of ver. 9, that the rest is a *σαββατισμός*, and in the proof of this statement, which is found in the fact that it is the rest which Jesus entered at the end of His work.—(2) This view of the matter removes, in some measure, the prolonged and repetitious character of the hortatory section, iii. 7—iv. 13, by connecting these verses with the idea (which is suggested in ch. ii. 9, 10) of Jesus as leading the sons of God to the glory awaiting them. At the same time, however, it does not destroy the close union of the verses with those which precede, and their manifest grammatical subordination to the exhortation of vv. 1, 2.—(3) A certain rhetorical parallelism, in this grammatically subordinate passage, to the thought of ch. ii. is thus given—though not such an elaborate parallelism as is supposed by Ebrard—and this we might naturally expect in these chapters.—(4) The reference of ver. 10 to Jesus makes this verse a declaration that Jesus has entered the heavenly rest, as ch. ii. 9 affirms His entrance into the heavenly glory—in both cases, leading the way for His people.—(5) By means of this declaration, the way is prepared—as it is not so fully otherwise—for the introduction of vv. 14–16, which correspond so closely with ii. 17, 18.—The objections to this view are found in the fact that Jesus is not mentioned by name in the verse, and in the absence of any allusion to Him in connection with *οἱ πιστεύσαντες*, in ver. 3, or even in the entire passage iii. 7–iv. 9. The objections to the other view are the use of the aorist instead of the present, both in the participle and the verb, and the emphatic *αὐτός*, which is less easily accounted for if the reference is to any believer whatsoever.

LIII. Vv. 11–13.

(*a*) *οὖν* of ver. 11 deduces the inference from iii. 7 onwards, according to Lünem.'s view. More probably, we are to refer it to the preceding verses of this chapter (vv. 3–7); so Alford and others. This latter reference is unquestionable, if the design of these verses as following *εἰσερχόμεθα*, which has been alluded to, is to be admitted. In any case, there is undoubtedly a special pointing of *οὖν* to the idea expressed in *σαββατισμός*.—(*b*) The *λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ* (ver. 12) must, at least, be regarded as including and giving prominence to the idea of a threatening of punishment, if, indeed, it is not to be limited in its meaning to this.—(*c*) The four genitives *ψυχῆς κ.τ.λ.* (ver. 12) may, each of them, depend on *μερισμοῦ*, or the last two may depend on *μερ.*, and each of the first two on both of the last two. The latter construction is, perhaps, to be preferred.—(*d*) The explanation of *πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος* to which Lünem. gives his assent, is the most satisfactory one. The danger attending neglect of the new revelation and the certainty of punishment in case of falling away are suggested here, as in other places, in connection with the one, ever-repeated exhortation.

LIV. Vv. 14–16.

(*a*) The view of Lünem. and other writers, who regard these verses as properly to be united with ch. v., is to be rejected. This is evident, first, because of the

very striking parallelism between these verses and those at the end of ch. ii., both in their words and thoughts and in the manner of their introduction; secondly, because ch. v. introduces the discourse respecting the subject of the high-priesthood in the most natural way, by presenting certain essential qualifications and then adding the statement that Christ had these qualifications, and thus most appropriately opens the new section; thirdly, because these last verses of ch. iv. are mainly hortatory, and are accordingly, in contrast to v. 1 ff., adapted to form the conclusion of the preceding section. The dividing point between the first and second main divisions of the epistle is the end of ch. iv.—(*b*) As to the correspondences and differences in the words here used and those in ii. 17, 18, see Note XLVII *b*. above. The second part of the first main division closes, like the first part, with a brief passage which is a foreshadowing of and preparation for the thoughts of the later chapters.

CHAPTER V.

VER. 1. Instead of the *Recepta* δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας, Lachm. and Tisch. 1 read merely δῶρα καὶ θυσίας. But the single testimony of B (D**?)—for nothing is here to be inferred from the Latin versions—does not suffice for the condemnation of the particle. τε is protected by A C D*** (D*: τε δῶρα) E K L ℵ, by, as it appears, all the cursives, Epiph. and many others. Cf. also Heb. viii. 3, ix. 9.—Ver. 3. Elz.: διὰ ταύτην. Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, *al.*: δι' αὐτήν. To be preferred on account of the better attestation by A B C* D* ℵ, 7, 80, *al.*, Syr. utr. Chrys. ms. Cyril. Theodoret (*alic.*).—Instead of the *Recepta* ἑαυτοῦ, there is placed in the text by Lachm., after B D*, αὐτοῦ; by Tisch. 1, αὐτο῀ῦ.—But ἑαυτοῦ is found in A C D*** E K L ℵ, almost all min., and many Fathers, and is on that account to be retained, with Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, and others. —The preference over the *Recepta* ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν (supported by C*** D*** E K L, the majority of the min. Chrys. Theodoret *ad loc.*, *al.*; defended by Bleck, and more recently by Bloomfield and Reiche) is merited by the reading περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, already commended to attention by Griesbach; adopted by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, with the assent of Delitzsch and Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 434), partly on account of the stronger attestation by A B C* D* ℵ, 17, 31, 47, 73, 118, Chrys. codd. Theodoret (*semel*), partly because περί might easily, on account of the περί placed twice before, be altered into ὑπέρ, in conformity with ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, ver. 1.—Ver. 4. ἀλλὰ καλούμενος]. So rightly already the Editt. Complut. and Plantin.; in like manner Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, after the preponderating authority of A B C* D E K ℵ, 23, 37, 44, *al. plur.*, Chrys. Damasc. Procop. Oecum. The article added in the *Recepta*: ἀλλὰ ὁ καλούμενος, is not only badly attested (C** L, Constitutt. apostoll., Theodoret, Theophylact), but also unsuitable, since not a new subject in opposition to the unemphatic τις is required by the context, but an antithetic nearer defining in opposition to the significant οὐχ ἑαυτῷ.—Instead of the *Recepta* καθάπερ (C** D*** E K L ℵ*** Theodoret), approved by Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Bloomfield, *al.*, Lachm., after C* (?) Chrys. Procop. reads: καθώς; Tisch., with Alford, after A B D* ℵ* Damasc.: καθώσπερ. The last, in favor of which Delitzsch also declares himself, deserves the preference as the best attested, and as most in keeping with the predilection of the author for harmonious combinations.—The article ὁ before Ἀαρών in the *Recepta* was already with justice deleted in the edit. Complut., and later by Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford, and others. Against it decides the weighty authority of A B C D E K L ℵ, many min. and Fathers.—Ver. 9. Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield: τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ πᾶσιν. But preponderating witnesses (A B C D E ℵ, 17, 37, *al.*, Syr. utr. Copt. It. Vulg. Vigil. Cassiod. Chrys. Cyril, Theodoret, Damasc. Theophyl.) require the order:

πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ. Already recommended by Griesbach. Adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Alford. Approved also by Delitzsch. The sequence of the words in the *Recepta* is a later alteration, in order to bring out the more noticeably the paronomasia of *τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν* with the foregoing *τὴν ὑπακοήν.*—Ver. 12. *καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς*] So Elz. Lachm. Bloomfield, Alford, *al.;* while Tisch. 2, 7, and 8 has, after B** C, 17, ℵ* Copt. Vulg. Orig. (thrice) Cyril, Chrys. ms. Aug. Bede, only *οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς.* But *καί* is protected by A B* D E K L ℵ*** the majority of the min., many versions, and several Fathers.

Vv. 1–10. [On Vv. 1–10, see Note LV., pages 519–522.] Emphasizing of two main qualifications of the earthly high priest, in which Christ likewise is not wanting. [LV *a.*]

Vv. 1–3. [LV *b.*] *The first qualification:* the capacity, as man, who himself is subject to human weakness, to deal leniently with erring humanity. To what extent and under what modification this characteristic of the earthly high priest is applicable also to Christ, is not discussed by the author in our passage. This might appear remarkable, since with respect to the *second* necessary qualification of the earthly high priest, further added ver. 4, the parallel relation in the case of Christ is expounded in detail from ver. 5 onwards. But yet there was no need of an express application to Christ, of that which was observed vv. 1–3. What the author had had to say with regard to this was already clear to the readers from the earlier disquisitions of the epistle itself. The element of the homogeneity of Christ with the Jewish high priest, namely, that He, like the Jewish high priest, can have sympathy with sinful man, since He had become in all points like unto men His brethren, had been fully traced out in the second chapter, and attention is called anew to it in iv. 15 by the *δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν* and *πεπειρασμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα.* The element of the dissimilarity, on the other hand, namely, that while the Jewish high priest had to offer for his own sins, Christ was without sin, is first brought prominently forward in iv. 15 by means of *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας,* and, besides this, followed already from the exalted position the author had, in the opening chapters of the epistle, assigned to Christ as the Son of God.—That, in reality, also the paragraph vv. 7–10, no less than vv. 5, 6, is subordinate to the second main consideration, expressed ver. 4, has been denied, it is true, by Beza, Schlichting, Hammond, Limborch, Storr, Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, and others. They are of opinion that from ver. 5 onwards an application of all the statements, vv. 1–4, to Christ ensues; that this, however, takes place in inverse order, so that vv. 5, 6 refer back to ver. 4, vv. 7, 8 to ver. 2, and finally, vv. 9, 10 to ver. 1. The untenable character of such opinion is self-evident. For—(1) vv. 7, 8 cannot have the design of applying to Christ that which was observed ver. 2, because only the parenthetic clause of ver. 7 (*δεήσεις . . . εὐλαβείας*) adapts itself to any extent to the contents of ver. 2, and this parenthetic clause stands in logical subordination to ver. 8 as the main point of the argument, consequently just ver. 8 and ver. 2 must present a

similarity of contents, which is not the case. (2) That vv. 9, 10 should be referred back to ver. 1 cannot be accepted as correct, because ver. 1 forms in itself no independent and complete statement, but stands in closest concatenation with ver. 2, so that only with this verse comes in what is for ver. 1 the all-essential point of nearer definition.—From the foregoing it results that the harmonizing view of Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 444, 447) is unwarranted. According to this view, vv. 7, 8 are indeed, "in the first place," or "formally," a link in the demonstration that Christ did not become high priest by an act of arbitrary self-glorification, but as regards the "contents" or "tenor" form, "at the same time also an indication corresponding to vv. 1–3, and pointing out that Christ upon His path of suffering has passed through experiences which were adapted not only to make Him acquainted with the human *ἀσθένεια*, but also to prove in Him the capacity for the *μετριοπάθεια*."—With Tholuck, for the rest, to take vv. 1–3 still in relation to the preceding chapter, as an antithesis to ver. 15, and to begin a new section with ver. 4, is not permissible. For a comparison of the main contents of vv. 1–3 with the main contents of iv. 15, points to the fact that the author designs to bring out a relation of resemblance and affinity. We cannot possibly, therefore, attach, with Tholuck, to the particle *γάρ*, v. 1, the sense: "the distinction namely arises, that." The consideration, moreover, presents itself, that ver. 4 can only appear in relation to vv. 1–3, alike as regards tenor of contents as with regard to its lax grammatical nexus, as a further co-ordinate link in an enumeration, before begun, of the qualifications essential to the character of every earthly high priest, consequently is not appropriate to the introduction of a section entirely separated from that which precedes.

Vv. 1, 2. Justification of the *δύνασθαι συμπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν*, iv. 15, as a necessary qualification in the case of Christ, since it is an indispensable requirement even in every earthly high priest. *γάρ* does not glance back to iv. 16, as is maintained by Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 395) and Delitzsch. For v. 1–3 can in point of contents be taken neither as enforcement nor as elucidation of the admonition, iv. 16. The supposition of Hofmann and Delitzsch, however, that *γάρ* logically controls the whole section, v. 1–10, is arbitrary, inasmuch as ver. 4 ff. is logically and grammatically bounded off from vv. 1–3, and the assertion that the aim in the section, v. 1–10, is to enforce the exhortation, iv. 16, by a reminder "of the nature of the high-priesthood of Jesus, how on the one hand it bears resemblance to that of Aaron, and on the other hand to the priesthood of Melchisedec" (Hofmann), or of the "blending of Aaronitic humanity (tenderness) with the Melchisedecian dignity in the person of Jesus" (Delitzsch), is entirely erroneous; because, vv. 5–10, Aaron and Melchisedec are not yet at all distinguished from each other as the lower and the higher; but, on the contrary, this relation—in which the one stands to the other—is for the present left wholly in abeyance, and all that is insisted on is the fact that Christ, even as Aaron, was called *by God* to the high-priesthood, and that a high-priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec.—*πᾶς*] refers, as is evident from *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος*, and

from ver. 3, to the *earthly, i. e.* the Levitical, *high priest.* Wrongly, because going beyond the necessity of the case and the horizon of the epistle, Grotius (comp. also Peirce): Non tantum legem hic respicit, sed et morem ante legem, quum aut primo geniti familiarum aut a populis electi reges inirent sacerdotium. But neither is ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος a part of the subject ("every high priest taken from among men, in opposition to the heavenly One;" Luther, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Akersloot, Peirce, Wetstein, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Abresch. Kuinoel, Paulus, Stengel, comp. also Tholuck),—for then the order πᾶς γὰρ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς would have been chosen,—nor is it intended "to lay stress upon the phenomenon, in itself remarkable, that the high priest has to represent men, who are thus his equals, in their relation to God" (Hofmann, (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 396, 2 Aufl.),—for thereby a reference altogether foreign to the connection is introduced, and the thought thus presupposed is itself a singular one, because, so far from its being remarkable, it is, on the contrary, natural and appropriate that like should be represented by its like; it would be remarkable and unnatural if, for instance, a man should represent angels,—but it contains a note of cause to ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται. The twice occurring ἀνθρώπων stands full of emphasis, and presents a correspondence between the two. By the ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος the ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται is explained and justified. For the very reason that the high priest is taken from among men, is he also appointed or installed in his office as mediator with God.—καθίσταται] not *middle*, so that τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν were accusative of object thereto (Calvin: Curat pontifex vel ordinat, quae ad Deum pertinent; Kypke), but *passive*, so that τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, as ii. 17, is to be taken as an accusative absolute. —ἵνα κ.τ.λ.] epexegetic amplification of ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.—δῶρα [קָרְבָּן, מִנְחָה] and θυσίαι are properly distinguished as gifts and sacrifices *of every kind*, and *bloody* sacrifices. The distinction, however, is not always observed. Comp. *e. g.* LXX. Lev. ii. 1 ff., Num. v. 15 ff., Gen. iv. 3, 5, where θυσία is used of unbloody sacrifices; and Gen. iv. 4, Lev. i. 2, 3, 10, *al.*, where δῶρα is used of bloody sacrifices. In our passage the author has, without doubt, specially the bloody sacrifices in mind; as, accordingly, in the course of the epistle he opposes the sacrifice presented by Christ to the Levitical victims in particular.—ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν] *i. e. for the expiation thereof.* It belongs not merely to θυσίας (Grotius, Limborch, Bengel, Dindorf) or to δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας (Owen, Alford), but to the whole clause of the design.

Ver. 2 is to be coupled with ver. 1 without the placing of a comma, in such wise that the participial clause: μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος, connects itself immediately with the preceding clause of the design. The purpose of the author is not to mention the bare fact that the high priest presents gifts and sacrifices for the expiation of sins, but to dwell on the fact that he presents them as one who is capable of μετριοπαθεῖν.[1] μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος

[1] When for the rest Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 396, 2 Aufl.) supposes that for the expression of this relation of thought only καθίσταται . . . ἵνα προσφέρῃ could be chosen, and not καθίσταται . . . εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν, since the latter would "only be a declaration of the

is therefore neither to be resolved into *ἵνα δέηται μετρ.* (Heinrichs), nor is it connected, by reason of a negligent participial construction, like *λαμβανόμενος* with *ἀρχιερεύς* (Stengel), nor is it added merely "appendicis loco" (Böhme).—*μετριοπαθεῖν*] stands not in opposition to *συμπαθῆσαι*, iv. 15, for the indication of a difference between the human high priest and the divine one (Tholuck); it is not, however, identical in meaning with *συμπαθεῖν* (Oecumenius, Calvin, Seb. Schmidt, Baumgarten, Semler, Storr, Abresch, *al.*), but expresses a kindred notion. It is by virtue of its composition equivalent to *μετρίως* or *κατὰ τὸ μέτρον πάσχειν*, and is accordingly used of the moderating of one's passions and feelings, as opposed to an unbridled surrender thereto, but also as opposed to that absolute *ἀπάθεια* which the Stoics demanded of the sage.[1] Here the moderation or tenderness in the judgment formed upon the errors of one's neighbor is intended, as this is wont to arise from a sympathy with the unhappiness of the same which is produced by sin. Thus: *to be tenderly disposed or equitable.* —*τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν καὶ πλανωμένοις*] Dativus commodi: *in consideration of the ignorant and erring.* Lenient designation of sinners. Perhaps, however, designedly chosen (comp. also ix. 7: *ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων*) in order to bring into relief only one species of sins, the sins of precipitancy and without premeditation, inasmuch as according to the Mosaic law the sacrificial expiation extended only to those who had sinned *ἀκουσίως*; those, on the other hand, who had sinned deliberately and with forethought were to be cut off from the congregation of Jehovah, Num. xv. 22–31; Lev. iv. 13 ff.—*ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περίκειται ἀσθένειαν*] Confirmation of the *δυνάμενος*: *since he indeed himself is encircled* (as with a garment) *by weakness* (altogether beset with it). *ἀσθένεια* is to be understood, as vii. 28, of the *ethical* weakness, thus also actual sin, comprehended under this expression; comp. ver. 3.—The construction *περίκειμαί τι*, which in the N. T. occurs likewise Acts xxviii. 20, is genuine Greek.[2]

Ver. 3. Logical consequence from the second half of ver. 2. The words form a merely incidental observation. They would be on that account better regarded as an independent statement than, with de Wette, Delitzsch, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 397), and Woerner, thought of as still dependent on *ἐπεί*, ver. 2.—*δι' αὐτήν*] *sc. ἀσθένειαν.* Quite untrue is the assertion that the feminine is used Hebraistically instead of the neuter, which even Bengel and others, with a mistaken appeal to Matt. xxi. 42 (see Meyer *ad loc.*), still hold to be possible.—*ὀφείλει*] Reference not, as is supposed by Böhme and Hofmann, *l. c.*, to the precept in the law of Moses (Lev. iv. 3, ix. 7, xvi. 6, *al.*), but, as ii. 17, to the inner

vocation" of the high priest, while the former "can take to itself the participial clause *μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος*, and thereby signify to what end it serves in the exercise of his office, that he has been in this way appointed thereto," this is grammatically altogether baseless. Either turn of discourse was equally open to the choice of the author. Only, in case the latter was chosen, the nominative *δυνάμενος* must naturally be changed into the accusative *δυνάμενον*.

[1] Comp. Diogen. Laert. v. 31: *ἐφὴ δέ* (*sc.* Aristotle), *τὸν σοφὸν μὴ εἶναι μὲν ἀπαθῆ, μετριοπαθῆ δέ.* Further instances in Wetstein and Bleek.

[2] Comp. Theocrit. *Idyll.* xxiii. 14: *ὕβριν τᾶς ὀργᾶς περικείμενος*; Kühner, *Gramm.* II. p. 231; Winer, p. 215 [E. T. 229].

necessity arising from the nature of the case. Non-natural the view of Delitzsch and Moll, that *both alike* are intended.—*προσφέρειν*] stands, as Luke v. 14, Num. vii. 18, *absolutely*. With Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 434), to look upon *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν* as definition of object to *προσφέρειν* is inadmissible, inasmuch as only the singular form *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is employed to indicate the notion of "sin-offering" with the LXX., as also in our epistle. Comp. Reiche, *Commentarius Criticus ad loc.* p. 35.

Ver. 4. [LV *c.*] *The second necessary qualification:* to be no usurper of the office, but one called of God to the same.—*καὶ*] Progress, not from ver. 3, nor yet from ver. 1, in such wise that *λαμβάνει*, ver. 4, should form a paronomasia with *λαμβανόμενος*, ver. 1 (Böhme, Bleek, Bisping, Alford, Maier), but from vv. 1–3.—*And not to himself does any one take the honor* (here under consideration), *i. e.* not any one appropriates or arrogates to himself the high-priestly dignity on his own authority.[1]—*ἀλλὰ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*] *sc. λαμβάνει αὐτήν*, he receives it. The *λαμβάνει* here to be supplied has consequently—what is wrongly denied by Delitzsch, Hofmann, and Woerner—another notion than the *λαμβάνει* before placed. This diversity of notion, nevertheless, comes out more strongly in German, where two different verbs must be chosen to indicate it, than in Greek, where one and the same verb combines both significations in itself. —*καθώσπερ καὶ Ἀαρών*] *sc. κληθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτὴν εἴληφεν.* These words still belong to that which precedes. They are unnaturally referred by Paulus to the sequel, as its protasis.—Aaron and his descendants were, according to Ex. xxviii. 1, xxix. 4 ff., Lev. viii. 1 ff., Num. iii. 10, xvi.–xviii., called by God Himself to the high-priesthood.[2] Not until the time of Herod and the Roman governors were high priests arbitrarily appointed and deposed, without respect to their descent from Aaron.[3] That, however, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Abresch, and others conjecture, the author intended by the words of ver. 4 at the same time to indicate that the high priests of that period were no longer true high priests at all, since they had acquired their office at the hand of men, and in the way of venality, is not very probable, inasmuch as the author would otherwise have expressed himself more clearly with regard thereto.

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

Ver. 5. In like manner also Christ appointed not Himself to be High Priest, but God the Father has appointed Him. The main emphasis in the verse falls upon *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν . . . ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας*. With Hofmann for the rest (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 398, 2 Aufl.), to take the opening words of the verse: *οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός*, separately as an independent clause, is not

[1] Comp. Xiphilinus, *Galb.* p. 187: *νομίζων οὐκ εἰληφέναι τὴν ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ δεδόσθαι αὐτῷ.*

[2] Comp. *Bammidbar rabba*, sec. 18, fol. 234. 4 (in Schöttgen and Wetstein): Moses ad Corachum ejusque socios dixit: si Aaron frater meus sibimet ipsi sacerdotium sumsit, recte egistis, quod contra ipsum insurrexistis; jam vero Deus id ipsi dedit, cujus est magnitudo et potentia et regnum. Quicumque igitur contra Aaronem surgit, contra ipsum Deum surgit.

[3] Comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. 10. 5: Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterb.* I. p. 591, 2 Aufl.

warranted on any ground. *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα*] *He did not glorify* (comp. John viii. 54) *Himself* (arbitrarily encircle Himself with honor and glory) *in order to be made a high priest.*—*ἐδόξασεν*] is to be taken quite generally, so that it first acquires its nearer definition and completion, under the form of the intention, by means of *γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα*. See Winer, p. 298 [E. T. 318]. The referring of the verb, with de Wette, specially to the *glorification*, mentioned ii. 9, is forbidden by the parallel relation to ver. 4, in that *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα* manifestly corresponds exactly to the foregoing statement, *οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμήν*. On account of this parallel relationship in itself, clearly indicated as it is above by the *οὕτως καί*, is the view of Hofmann too (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 398 f. 2 Aufl.) entirely erroneous, namely, that *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν* acquires its nearer defining of signification from vv. 7, 8, in that this relative clause denotes the same thing as that negative clause, and consequently is to be brought into relief; not a path of self-glorification was it, but a path of anguish and suffering, by which Christ attained to glory. The violence done in this explanation is already shown, in the fact that the relative clause, ver. 7 ff., is logically subordinate to the *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν*, as a farther demonstration of the truth thereof; and, moreover, in this relative clause the mention of the suffering of Christ forms not the main element, but only a subsidiary member.—*ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ.*] *sc. αὐτὸν ἐδόξασεν γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα.* The participle aorist *λαλήσας* is anterior in point of time to the *ἐδόξασεν*. Thus *ὁ λαλήσας*: *He who had said, sc.* before the creation of the world; comp. 1–3. Inasmuch as the connection with that which precedes, and the opposition *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας*, place it beyond doubt that the author can here only design to mention the person or authority by virtue of which Christ possesses His high-priesthood, it results that in the words *υἱός μου εἶ σὺ κ.τ.λ.* a proof for the fact *that* Christ is High Priest is not to be sought. Against Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, Limborch, Whitby, Peirce, Stengel, Ebrard, Maier, and others. If it were here already a question with the author of adducing a proof, he would have written without an article *ἀλλ' ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας* ("but God, in saying to Him," etc.), instead of writing with the article *ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας*. But why does not the author simply say *ὁ θεός*? Why does he employ the periphrasis of the idea of God by means of the words (already cited, i. 5) from Ps. ii. 7? In order to render already apparent, by this designation of God, how little ground can exist for surprise that He who occupies the rank of the Son of God should, moreover, also of God be appointed High Priest.

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

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

Vv. 7–10. [LV *d.*] Further proof—accessory to the Scripture testimony, ver. 6—that Christ did not on His own authority usurp to Himself the high-priesthood, but was invested with the same by God. Far removed from all self-exaltation, He displayed in His earthly life the most perfect obedience towards God. In consequence thereof He became, after His consummation and glorification, the Procurer (*Vermittler*) of everlasting blessedness for all believers, and was appointed by God High Priest after the manner of Melchisedec.—We have to reject the explanation—mainly called forth by the expression *προσενέγκας* (compared with vv. 1 and 3)—of Schlichting, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Limborch, Akersloot, Cramer, Baumgarten, Heinrichs, Böhme, Klee, Bloomfield, and others, according to which the design in vv. 7–10 is to show that Christ already discharged the functions of the high-priestly office during His earthly life, in that He offered prayers as sacrifices to God. For evidently the main gist of vv. 7–10 lies in the words of ver. 8: *ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν*, to which the statements vv. 9, 10 attach themselves only for the completion of the figure traced out vv. 7, 8, and for leading back to ver. 6. But by the fact that Christ manifested obedience, it cannot by any means be shown that He was already executing the office of High Priest.—Quite mistaken also is the opinion of Kurtz, that, vv. 7–10, a "third requirement of the Levitical high-priesthood, namely, *obedience to the will of Him that founded it*" (?), is shown to be satisfied in Christ. For neither does the form of the grammatical annexing of ver. 7 to that which precedes point in any way to the conclusion that the author designed to string on to the two necessary qualifications of the earthly high priest yet a third one of equal value; nor, as regards the import, is anything else to be found in vv. 7, 8 than a wider unfolding of the foregoing statement, *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδοξάσεν γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα*, ver. 5.

Ver. 7. *Ὅς*] [LV *e.*] refers back to the last main idea, thus to *ὁ Χριστός*, ver. 5. The *tempus finitum* belonging thereto is *ἐμαθεν*, ver. 8, in that vv.

7–10 form a single period, resolving itself into two co-ordinate statements (*ὃς ἔμαθεν . . . καὶ ἐγένετο*). To connect the *ὃς* first with *ἐγένετο*, ver. 9 (so Abresch, Dindorf, Heinrichs, Stengel, and others), is impossible, since ver. 8 cannot be taken as a parenthesis.—*ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*] *in the days of His flesh*, i. e. during the time of His earthly life.[1] On the whole expression, comp. ii. 14; on *αἱ ἡμέραι*, in the more general sense of *ὁ χρόνος*, x. 32, xii. 10. False, because opposed to the current linguistic use of *σάρξ* (Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. x. 3; Phil. i. 22, 24; 1 Pet. iv. 2, *al.*), and because *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ* obtains its opposition in *τελειωθείς*, ver. 9,—whereby, in general, the period of Christ's life of humiliation is contrasted with the period of His life of exaltation,—Schlichting: what is specially meant is "tempus infirmitatis Christi, et praesertim illud, quo infirmitas ejus maxime apparuit . . . dies illi, quibus Christus est passus." The note of time: *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*, however, is to be construed with the main verb *ἔμαθεν*, not with the participles *προσενέγκας καὶ εἰσακουσθείς*, which latter form a simply parenthetic clause.—As the occasion of this parenthetic clause *δεήσεις . . . εὐλαβείας*,—in connection with which we have neither, with Theophylact, Peirce, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Maier, Kurtz, and others, to derive the coloring of the linguistic expression from the author's having respect to certain utterances of the Psalms (as Ps. xxii. 25 [24], *ibid.* ver. 3 [2], cxvi. 1 ff.), nor with Braun, Akersloot, Böhme, *al.*, to suppose a reference to the loud praying of the Jewish high priest on the great day of atonement; neither is there an underlying comparison, as Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 399 f. 2 Aufl.) strangely supposes, of the supplication of Jesus, which He before (!) the learning of obedience offered for Himself as a sacrifice on account of weakness (!), with the sin-offering which, according to ver. 3, the Levitical high priest had on this day to present for himself before he could yet offer on behalf of the people,—the author has present to his mind, according to the prevailing and, beyond doubt, *correct* view, the prayer of Christ in Gethsemane, as this was made known to him by oral or written tradition. [LV *f.*] Comp. Matt. xxvi. 36 ff.; Mark xiv. 32 ff.; Luke xxii. 39 ff. It is true we do not read in our Gospels that Christ at that time prayed to God *μετὰ δακρύων*. But, considering the great emotion of mind on the part of the Saviour, which is also described in the account given by our evangelists,[2] that fact has nothing improbable about it; comp. also Luke xix. 41; John xi. 35. On account of the addition *μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς*, others will have us understand *the loud crying of Christ upon the cross* (Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34), either,[3] *besides the prayer in Gethsemane*, or,[4] *exclusively*, or even,[5] *the last cry, with which He departed* (Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark xv. 37;

[1] Theodoret: Ἡμέρας δὲ σαρκὸς τὸν τῆς θνητότητος ἔφη καιρόν, τουτέστιν ἡνίκα θνητὸν εἶχε τὸ σῶμα.

[2] Comp. in particular, Matt. xxvi. 37: ἤρξατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν; Mark xiv. 33: ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν; Luke xxii. 44: καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο· ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ ἱδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

[3] As Calvin, Cornelius a Lapide, Piscator, Owen, Limborch, Schulz, Stein, Stuart, Delitzsch.

[4] As Cajetan, Estius, Calov, Hammond, Kurtz.

[5] As Klee.

Luke xxiii. 46). The supposition of such references we cannot, with de Wette[1] characterize as "entirely unsuitable." For de Wette's objection, that the author "manifestly regarded the prayer as the preparation and condition of the *ἔμαθε*," that it must "thus precede the suffering," does not apply, since *προσενέγκας* is not to be resolved into "after," but into "in that," or "inasmuch as." Not as "preparation and condition of the *ἔμαθε*" is the prayer looked upon by the author, but rather is the historic fact of the fervent prayer of Christ mentioned by him as an evidence that Christ in reality submitted Himself to God, even in the severest sufferings. For that which Hofmann (*l. c.* p. 67) objects hereto, that the author, if he had meant this, would have written: *μαθὼν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοὴν δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας προσήνεγκεν*, is devoid of sense; because, by means of such a transposition, that which is merely a secondary statement would be made the main statement. Yet the supposing of such references is not necessary, since also the plural *δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας*, to which appeal has been made, is sufficiently explained by the repetitions of the prayer in the garden of Gethsemane.—To *ἱκετηρία*, which conjoined with *δέησις* further occurs LXX. Job xl. 22 [27], as also with the classic writers, *ἐλαία* or *ῥάβδος* (not *κλάδος*) is originally to be supplemented, inasmuch as it denotes the olive branch which the supplicant pleading for protection bore in his hand. Later it acquired like signification with *ἱκετεία* or *ἱκεσία*. It implies thus the prostrate or urgent entreaty of one seeking refuge. As an intensifying of *δέησις* it is rightly placed after this.—*πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου*] is most naturally referred to *προσενέγκας* (so Calvin, Abresch, *al.*). To the connecting with *δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας*[2] we are forced neither by the position before *μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς*, nor by the fact of the combination of *προσφέρειν* with the dative being chosen elsewhere in the epistle (ix. 14, xi. 4), as it is also the more usual one with classical writers, since likewise the conjoining with *πρός* is nothing out of the way. Comp. *e. g.* Polyb. iv. 51. 2: *προσενεγκάμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἀχαιὸν* (equivalent to *τῷ Ἀχαιῷ*) *τὴν χάριν ταύτην*. In the characteristic of God as the One who was able to deliver Christ from death, there lies, at the same time, the indication of that which Christ implored of God. *σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου*, however, may denote one of two things, either: *to save from death*, in such wise that it needs not to be undergone, thus to preserve from death, or: *to save out of* the *death* to which one is exposed, so that one does not remain the prey of death, but is restored to life. In favor of the former interpretation seems to plead the fact that Christ, according to the account in the Gospels, in reality prayed that He might be spared the suffering of death. Nevertheless what decides against this, and in favor of the second, is the consideration, in the first place, that Christ in reality still suffered death, and then the addition in our verse that the prayer of Christ was answered. And then, finally, we have to take into account the fact that, according to our Gospels also, Christ does not pray *absolutely* to be pre-

[1] Comp. also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 70 f. 2 Aufl.

[2] Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll.

served from death, but makes this His wish dependent upon the will of the Father, thus entirely subordinates Himself to the Father.—*καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας*] *and being heard by reason of His piety*, or fear of God. [LV *g.*] In this sense is *εὐλάβεια* (cf. xii. 28) rightly taken by Chrysostom, Photius, Oecumenius, Theophylact, the Vulgate (*pro sua reverentia*), Vigil. Taps., Primasius, Lyra, Luther, Castellio, Camerarius, Estius, Casaubon, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Calmet, Rambach, Heinrichs, Schulz, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 327), Alford, Reuss, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others.[1] *ἀπό, as an indication of the occasioning cause*, is also of very frequent occurrence elsewhere; cf. Matt. xxviii. 4; Luke xix. 3, xxiv. 41; John xxi. 6; Acts xii. 14, xx. 9, xxii. 11; Kühner, *Gramm.* II, p. 270. Christ, however, was heard in His prayer, inasmuch as He was raised out of death, exalted to the right hand of God, and made partaker of the divine glory. To be rejected is the explanation of the word preferred by Ambrose, Calvin, Beza, Cameron, Scaliger, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Hammond, Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Wetstein, Whitby, Carpzov, Abresch, Böhme, Kuinoel, Paulus, Klee, Stuart, Stein, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Grimm (Theol. Literaturbl. to the Darmstadt *A. K.-Z.* 1857, No. 29, p. 665), Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 69, 2 Aufl.), and many others, according to which a pregnancy of meaning is assumed for the same, and *εὐλάβεια* is interpreted in the sense of "metus:" "*heard* (and delivered) *from the fear*." There is then found expressed in it either the thought (and this is the common acceptation) that Christ was delivered from His agony of soul by the strengthening on the part of the angel, Luke xxii. 43, or *εὐλάβεια* is understood by metonymy of the object of the fear, *i. e. death*, from which Christ was delivered by the resurrection. So, among others, Calvin: "exauditum fuisse Christum ex eo, quod timebat, ne scilicet malis obrutus succumberet, vel morte absorberetur;" and Schlichting: "a metu i. e. ab eo, quod metuebat, nimirum morte." But against the first modification of this view pleads the fact that the being heard must refer to the same thing as that for which Christ had prayed, but from that which precedes it is evident that Christ had besought God not for deliverance from the agony of soul, but for deliverance from death. Against both modifications pleads the fact that the strong signification of *fear* is never expressed by *εὐλάβεια*. Only the mild signification of *timidity* or *awe* (whether reverential awe of the Godhead, *i. e.* piety, or shyness of earthly things), as well as the notion arising from that of timidity, namely heedfulness, discretion, circumspectness in arranging that which is adapted to the bringing about of a definite result, lies in the word; as accordingly also the Greeks themselves, particularly the Stoics, expressly distinguished from each other *φόβος* and *εὐλάβεια*, and pronounced *φόβος* to be worthy of reprobation; *εὐλάβεια*, on

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

the other hand, to be a duty. See the instances in Bleek. Nor do the passages anew adduced by Grimm, *l. c.*, Wisd. xvii. 8, 2 Macc. viii. 16, Eccles. xli. 3, in which the word is supposed to be used in the sense of *fear*, and the demonstrative force of which is acknowledged by Delitzsch (p. 190, and Observv. and Correctt.), Riehm (*l. c.*), and Moll, prove what they are thought to prove. For in the first-mentioned passage we have to understand by *κατεγέλαστος εὐλάβεια* the perverted, idolatrous, and therefore ridiculous religious awe of the Egyptian magicians; the second passage is only a dissuasive against standing in any awe of the outward superiority in force of the hostile army; and the third, finally, against feeling any awe of death, since this is the common lot of all men. The notion of mere awe, however, is, on account of the preceding strong expressions, *μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων*, unsuited to our passage.[1] In addition to this, the assumed *constructio praegnans* in connection with a verb like *εἰσακουσθῆναι* is, in any case, open to doubt, and is not yet at all justified by the alleged parallels which have been adduced.[2]—The addition *καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας* contains, for the rest, logically regarded, merely a parenthetic remark, called forth only by the contents of the foregoing participial clause.

Ver. 8. Καίπερ ὢν υἱός] belongs together. With Heinrichs and others, to construe *καίπερ* with *ἔμαθεν*, and in this way to enclose ver. 8 within a parenthesis, is forbidden by the grammar, since *καίπερ* is never combined with a tempus finitum. *καίπερ ὢν υἱός*, however, is to be connected neither, by virtue of an hyperbaton, with *δεήσεις . . . προσενέγκας*, which Photius (in Oecumenius) and Clarius consider permissible, but which is already shown to be impossible by means of the addition *καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας*,—nor yet with *καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας* itself (Chrysostom, Theophylact). For against *the latter καίπερ* is decisive, according to which the property of Sonship is insisted on as something in consequence of which the main statement might appear strange; it is not, however, strange, but, on the contrary, congruent with nature, if any one is heard by the Father on account of his sonship. *καίπερ ὢν υἱός* belongs, therefore, to *ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν*, and serves to bring the same into relief by way of contrast. Notwithstanding the fact that Christ was a Son, He

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

[2] Namely Ps. xxii. 22 [21] (וּמִקַּרְנֵי רֵמִים עֲנִיתָנִי, which, however, the LXX. did not understand, and reproduced without pregnancy); LXX. Job xxxv. 12 (*ἐκεῖ κεκράξονται καὶ οὐ μὴ εὐσακούσῃ [καὶ] ἀπὸ ὕβρεως πονηρῶν*, where, however, *ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ.*, as in the Hebrew, refers back to the first verb); Ps. cxviii. 5 (*καὶ ἐπήκουσέ μου εἰς πλατυσμὸν κύριος*); Heb. x. 22 (*ἐῤῥαντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς*).

learned from suffering (learned, in that He suffered) obedience, resignation to the will of the Father. Comp. Phil. ii. 6–8.—The article before *ὑπακοήν* marks *the definite virtue* of obedience. The article here cannot denote, as Hofmann will maintain (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 72, 2 Aufl.), the obedience "already present," or the obedience "in which Jesus stood." For, on the one hand, there must then have been previous mention of the obedience of Jesus, which is not the case; and then, on the other hand, we cannot any longer predicate the *learning* of a virtue of one in whom this virtue is already present. But altogether, that which Hofmann brings out as the import of ver. 8 is a wonderful Quid pro quo. Instead of recognizing, to wit, in vv. 7, 8 the sharply and clearly defined leading statement: *ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ . . . ἔμαθεν . . . τὴν ὑπακοήν*, in itself, and in its simply confirmatory relation to *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν*, ver. 5, Hofmann will have the stress to be laid upon the subsidiary defining note *ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν*, and then, moreover, make the whole weight of the words: *καίπερ ὢν υἱός*, fall upon that same *ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν*! In this way the thought expressed in ver. 8 is, forsooth: that Jesus afterwards (!) suffered that (!) for the averting of which He had made entreaty. The special point is not that He learnt anything as Son, nor that He learnt obedience (?!). He did not learn to obey, but the obedience in which He stood, He now (!) or in a new manner (!) *so* learnt, as it should there (!) be exercised, where (!) it was a question (!) of suffering. And this is to be taken as the meaning, in spite of the fact—apart from all other arbitrary assumptions —that we have *ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν* written, and not even *ἐν οἷς ἔπαθεν*, which at least must be expected as a support for such an exposition as that?—*ἔμαθεν*] The *disposition* of obedience Christ possessed even before the suffering. But this needed, in order to become vouched for, to be tested in action. And this continued development of the disposition of obedience into the act of obedience is nothing else than a practical learning of the virtue of obedience.—*ἀπό* with *μανθάνειν*, as Matt. xxiv. 32, xi. 29, denoting the starting-point.—*ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν*] well-known attraction in place of *ἀπ' ἐκείνων ἃ ἔπαθεν*.—The combination *ἔμαθεν . . . ἔπαθεν* is also of frequent occurrence with the classic writers and with Philo.[1]

Ver. 9. *Καὶ τελειωθείς*] *and being brought to consummation, i.e.* being crowned with glory by His exaltation to heaven (comp. ii. 9, 10), *sc.* in consequence of the obedience to God proved by His sufferings and death —*ἐγένετο*] *He became.* Author and Mediator of everlasting blessedness for His believers, Christ certainly was even during His earthly life. But in an eminent manner, because formally and manifestly accredited by God as such, He became so first by His resurrection and exaltation.—*πᾶσιν*] perhaps added in order to indicate the equal claim of the believing Gentiles also, to the salvation in Christ.—*τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ*] The expression

[1] Comp. Herod. i. 207: *τὰ δέ μοι παθήματα, ἐόντα ἀχάριστα, μαθήματα γέγονεν*; Soph. *Trach.* 142 f.: *ὡς δ' ἐγὼ θυμοφθορῶ, μήτ' ἐκμάθοις παθοῦσα*; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* iii. 1. 17: *πάθημα ἆρα τῆς ψυχῆς σὺ λέγεις εἶναι τὴν σωφροσύνην, ὥσπερ λύπην, οὐ μάθημα*; Philo, *de specialt. legg.* 6 (with Mangey, II. p. 340): *ἵν' ἐκ τοῦ παθεῖν μάθῃ.* Many other instances in Wetstein.

attaches itself in point of form to *τὴν ὑπακοήν*, ver. 8, with which it forms a paronomasia; in point of subject-matter it is not different from *τοῖς πιστεύουσιν* (iv. 3). Comp. Rom. x. 16; 2 Thess. i. 8, *al.*—The mode of expression: *αἴτιόν τινι εἶναι σωτηρίας* (comp. *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν*, ii. 10), [LV *h.*] is also often met with in Philo, Josephus, and the classical writers.[1] The adjective *αἰώνιος* with *σωτηρία* in the N. T. only here. Comp., however, LXX. Isa. xlv. 17.

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

Ver. 11–vi. 20. [On Vv. 11–14, see Note LVI., pages 522, 523.] The author is on the point of turning to the nearer presentation of the dignity of High Priest after the manner of Melchisedec, which pertains to Christ, and thus of His superiority over the Levitical high priests. But before he passes over to this, he complains in a digression of the low stage of Christian knowledge at which the readers are yet standing, whereas they ought long ago themselves to have been teachers of Christianity; exhorts them to strive after manhood and maturity in Christianity, and with warning admonition points out that those who have already had experience of the rich blessing of Christianity, and nevertheless apostatize from the same, let slip beyond the possibility of recall the Christian salvation; then, however, expresses his confidence that such a state of things will not be the case with the readers, who have distinguished themselves, and still do distinguish themselves, by works of Christian love, and indicates that which he desires of them,—namely, endurance to the end,—while at the same time reminding them of the inviolability of the divine promise and the objective certainty of the Christian hope.

Ver. 11. Περὶ οὗ] [LVI *a*] *sc.* Χριστοῦ *ἀρχιερέως κατὰ τὴν τάξιν* Μελχισεδέκ. To this total-conception, as is also recognized by Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 780), is *περὶ οὗ* to be referred back. We have to supplement not merely Χριστοῦ (Oecumenius, Primasius, Justinian), because that would be a far too general defining of the object, inasmuch as confessedly

[1] Instances in Wetstein, Kypke, and Bleek.

the discourse is not first about Christ in the sequel, but everywhere throughout the epistle. But neither is *Μελχισεδέκ* to be supplied to *οὗ*.[1] For even though—a fact to which Bleek appeals—the author, after having concluded the digression (vii. 1 f.), begins by characterizing this same Melchisedec, yet this description is subordinated to a higher aim, that of setting forth the high-priestly dignity of Christ; as surely also the reference of vii. 1 ff. to the close of the digression (vi. 20) clearly shows, since the former is represented by *γάρ* as only the development now begun of the main consideration: *Ἰησοῦς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, taken up anew, vi. 20. To take *οὗ* as a *neuter*,[2] and to refer it to the *high-priesthood* of Christ after Melchisedec's manner,—according to which *οὗ* would thus have to be resolved into *περὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιερέα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ*,—is possible indeed, but not so natural as when it is taken as a *masculine*, since the discourse in that which precedes was about the definite person of Christ.—*πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος*] *sc. ἐστίν.* [LVI *b.*] Wrongly, because otherwise *ἂν εἴη* must have been added, and because a detailed development of the subject really follows afterwards; Peshito, Erasmus, Luther, and others: concerning which we should have much to speak.—*καί*] *and indeed.*—*λέγειν*] belongs to *δυσερμήνευτος*. Heinrichs erroneously joins it with *ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος*.—Even on account of the connectedness of the *λέγειν* with *δυσερμήνευτος*, but also on account of the preceding *ἡμῖν*, followed by no *ὑμῖν*, it is inadmissible,[3] to suppose the difficulty of the exposition or rendering intelligible of the *λόγος* to exist on the part of *the readers*, and thus to interpret *δυσερμήνευτος* in the sense of *δυσνόητος*, 2 Pet. iii. 16. On the contrary, as *the author* has abundant material for discoursing on the subject announced, so is it also difficult for *the author* to render himself intelligible thereon to the readers. The ground of this difficulty which obtains for him is introduced by the clause with *ἐπεί*, which on that account is to be referred only to *δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν*, not at the same time (Hofmann) to *πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος*. For the rest, Storr and Bleek have already rightly remarked, that in the connecting of *λόγος* with the two predicates *πολύς* and *δυσερμήνευτος* a sort of zeugma is contained, inasmuch as *λόγος* is to be taken in relation to the first predicate *actively*,[4] in relation to the second *passively*. On the high-priesthood of Christ after the manner of Melchisedec, the author has much *to speak*; and truly it is difficult for him to make plain to his readers the *contents* or *subject* of his discourse. —*γεγόνατε*] [LVI *c.*] characterizes the spiritual sluggishness or dullness of the readers not as something which was originally inherent in them, but only as something which afterwards manifested itself in connection with

[1] Peshito, Calvin [Piscator hesitates between this and the following application], Owen, Schöttgen, Peirce, Semler, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford, Maier, *al.*

[2] With Grotius, Cramer, Storr, Abresch, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Stengel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Kurtz, and others.

[3] With Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Valckenaer, Kuinoel, and others.

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

them.[1]—*νωθρός*] in the N. T. only here and vi. 12.—*ταῖς ἀκοαῖς*] *with regard to the hearing*, i. e. the spiritual faculty of comprehension.[2] The plural is used, inasmuch as the discourse is of a multitude of persons. On the *dative*, instead of which the accusative might have been placed, comp. Winer, p. 202 [E. T. 215].

Ver. 12. Justification of the reproach: *νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς*, ver. 11. —*καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι*] *for when ye ought to have been teachers.* *καί* gives intensity to the *ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι*. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 10, *al.* Arbitrarily Bloomfield (ed. 8), according to whom an intermediate link is to be supplied in connection with *καὶ γάρ*: "[And such ye are,] for though ye ought, according to the time, to be teachers," etc.—*διὰ τὸν χρόνον*] *by reason of the space of time, i. e.* because already so considerable a space of time has passed since ye became Christians. In like manner is *διὰ τὸν χρόνον* often employed by classical writers.[3]—As regards that which follows, there is a controversy as to whether we have to accentuate *τινα* or *τινά*. [LVI d.] The word is taken as an *interrogative particle* by the Peshito and Vulgate, Augustine, *Tract.* 98 *in Joh.*; Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Wolf, Bengel, Abresch, Schulz, Kuinoel, Klee, de Wette, Tischendorf, Stengel, Bloomfield, Conybeare, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 780: Reuss, Maier, Moll. Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, and the majority. As an *indefinite pronoun*, on the other hand, it is taken by Oecumenius, Luther, Calvin, Peirce, Cramer, Heinrichs, Böhme, Lachmann, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, Bisping, Alford, Woerner, and others. The latter alone is grammatically possible. For in the opposite case, since the subject is a varying one in the *tempus finitum* (*χρείαν ἔχετε*) and the *infinitive* (*διδάσκειν*), either the infinitive passive must be written, *τοῦ διδάσκεσθαι ὑμᾶς*, or to the infinitive active a special accusative of the subject (perhaps *ἐμέ*) must be further added. Nor is 1 Thess. iv. 9 decisive in opposition hereto, since there the reading of Lachmann: *οὐ χρείαν ἔχομεν γράφειν ὑμῖν*, is the only correct one. See, besides, the remarks in my *Commentary on the Thessalonians, ad loc.* As, moreover, in a grammatical respect, so also in a logical respect is the accentuation *τίνα* to be rejected. For upon the adopting thereof the thought would arise, that the readers anew required instruction upon the question: *which articles are to be reckoned among the* *στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ*, or else: *of what nature these are.* But manifestly the author is only complaining—as is plain also from the explicative clause: *καὶ γεγόνατε κ.τ.λ.*—of the fact that the readers, who ought long ago to have been qualified for instructing others, themselves still needed to be instructed in the *στοιχεῖα*. While, for the rest, de Wette and Riehm erroneously find in the indefinite *τινά*

[1] Chrysostom: *τὸ γὰρ εἰπεῖν ἐπεὶ νωθροί γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς δηλοῦντος ἦν, ὅτι πάλαι ὑγιαινον καὶ ἦσαν ἰσχυροί, τῇ προθυμίᾳ ζέοντες, καὶ ὕστερον αὐτοὺς τοῦτο παθεῖν μαρτυρεῖ.*

[2] Comp. Philo, *Quis rer. divin. haeres.* p. 483 (with Mangey, I. p. 474): *ἐν ἀψύχοις ἀνδριάσιν, οἷς ὦτα μέν ἐστιν, ἀκοαὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔνεισιν.*

[3] Comp. *e. g.* Aelian, *Var. Hist.* iii. 37: *οἱ πάνυ παρ' αὐτοῖς γεγηρακότες . . . πίνουσι κώνειον, ὅταν ἑαυτοῖς συνειδῶσιν, ὅτι πρὸς τὰ ἔργα τὰ τῇ πατρίδι λυσιτελοῦντα ἄχρηστοί εἰσιν, ὑπολειπούσης ἤδη τι αὐτοῖς καὶ τῆς γνώμης διὰ τὸν χρόνον.*

"too strong a signification," Delitzsch is equally mistaken in characterizing it as "unmeaning" and "flat." With justice does Alford remark, in opposition to the last-named: "So far from *τινά, some one,* being, as Delitzsch most absurdly says, 'matt und nichtssagend,' it carries with it the fine keen edge of reproach; *q. d.* to teach you what all know, and any can teach."—*ὑμᾶς*] preposed to the *τινά,* in order to bring into the more marked relief the antithesis to *εἶναι διδάσκαλον.*—The notion of *rudimenta* already existing in *τὰ στοιχεῖα* is made yet more definitely prominent by the genitive *τῆς ἀρχῆς* (Calvin: "quo plus incutiat pudoris"). Thus: *the very first primary grounds* or *elements.*[1]—*τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ*] *of the utterances of God.* Comp. Acts vii. 38; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Rom. iii. 2. What is intended is the saving revelations of Christianity, which God has caused to be proclaimed as His word. To think of the Old Testament prophecies, and their interpretation and reference to the Christian relations,[2] is inadmissible; since the expression *τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ,* in consideration of its generality, always acquires its nearer defining of meaning only from the context, while here, that which was, ver. 12, mentioned as *τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ,* is immediately after (vi. 1) designated *ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος.*—*γεγόνατε*] reminds anew, even as the preceding *πάλιν,* of the earlier more gladdening spiritual condition of the readers. —*γάλακτος καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς*] On the figure, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 2: *γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα.*[3]—By the *milk,* the author understands the elementary instruction in Christianity; by the *solid food,* the more profound disclosures with regard to the essence of Christianity, for the understanding of which a Christian insight already more matured is called for. In connection with the former, he thinks of the doctrinal topics enumerated vi. 1, 2 (not, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Clarius, and others suppose, of the doctrine of the humanity of Christ in contradistinction from that of His Godhead, which is foreign to the context); in connection with the latter, mainly of the subject, just the treatment of which will pre-eminently occupy him in the sequel,—the high-priesthood of Christ after the manner of Melchisedec.—The statement of ver. 12 has been urged by Mynster,[4] Ebrard, and others, in proof that the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot have been addressed to the Palestinean congregations, particularly not to the congregation at Jerusalem. The tenor of the verse might, it is true, appear strange, considering that the congregation at Jerusalem was the parent congregation of all the others, and out of its midst had proceeded the most distinguished teachers of Christianity. Nevertheless this last fact is not at all called in question by

[1] Analogous is the use of the Latin *prima rudimenta,* Justin. vii. 5; Liv. i. 3; *prima elementa,* Horace, *Serm.* i. 1. 26; Quintil. i. 1. 23, 35; Ovid, *Fast.* iii. 179.

[2] Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Schulz, Stengel, and others; comp. also Hofmann and Woerner *ad loc.*

[3] Philo, *de Agricult.* p. 188 (with Mangey, I. p. 301): Ἐπεὶ δὲ νηπίοις μέν ἐστι γάλα τροφή, τελείοις δὲ τὰ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα, καὶ ψυχῆς γαλακτώδεις μὲν ἂν εἶεν τροφαὶ κατὰ τὴν παιδικὴν ἡλικίαν, τὰ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου μουσικῆς προπαιδεύματα· τέλειαι δὲ καὶ ἀνδράσιν εὐπρεπεῖς αἱ διὰ φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἁπάσης ἀρετῆς ὑφηγήσεις. *Quod omnis prolus liber,* p. 889 A (II. p. 470), *al.*

[4] *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, H. 2, p. 338.

the statement of the verse. For the author has present to his mind the condition of the congregation as it was in his own time; he is addressing —in favor of which also *διὰ τὸν χρόνον* pronounces—a second generation of Palestinean Christianity. The narrow-minded tendency, however, which this second generation had assumed, instead of advancing in its growth to the recognition of the freedom and universality of Christianity as the most perfect religion, might well justify with regard to it the utterance of a reproach such as we here meet with. Only thus much follows from the words,—what is also confirmed by xiii. 7,—that when the author wrote, James the Lord's brother had already been torn from the congregation at Jerusalem by death, since he would otherwise certainly have written in another tone.

Vv. 13, 14. Establishing of the *γεγόνατε χρείαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς*, ver. 12. Sense: *for it is universally characteristic of him who* (in a spiritual respect) *has need of milk, that he is, because not of ripe age, still inexperienced in the λόγος δικαιοσύνης; and this is just your case. Solid food, on the other hand, is proper only for the τέλειοι; τέλειοι, however, ye are not yet.* [LVI *e.*] In connection with this acceptation of the words, there is no occasion for finding anything out of place in the *γάρ* in relation to that which precedes, and either, with Storr, making it co-ordinate with the *γάρ*, ver. 12, and referring it back like this to ver. 11,—which on account of the figure vv. 13, 14, retained from ver. 12, is already seen to be inadmissible,—or for saying, with Bleek and Bisping, that the progress of thought would come out more naturally if the author had written: *πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης μετέχει γάλακτος· νήπιος γάρ ἐστιν.—ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος*] *he who* (in a spiritual respect) *partakes of milk, i. e.* only in this possesses his nourishment, is not in a position to take in solid food.[1]—*ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης*] *sc. ἐστίν, he is still inexperienced in the word of righteousness.* [LVI *f.*] Expositors have almost without exception been guided by the presupposition (as also Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Kurtz still are) that *λόγος δικαιοσύνης* is only a varying form of expression for the same idea as is expressed, vv. 12, 14, by *στερεὰ τροφή*, or, vi. 1, by *τελειότης*. *λόγος δικαιοσύνης* has then either been taken as equivalent to *λόγος δίκαιος* or *τέλειος*, and the higher, more perfect type of doctrine found indicated in the expression.[2] Or *δικαιοσύνης* has been more correctly regarded as genitive of the object. In the latter case *δικαιοσύνη* is taken either, as Michaelis, *ad Petr.*, with an appeal to the Hebrew צְדָקָה, in the sense of *ἀλήθεια*,[3] as

[1] Bengel: Lacte etiam robusti vescuntur, sed non lacte praecipue, nedum lacte solo. Itaque **notantur** hoc loco ii, qui nil denique nisi lac **aut** capiunt aut petunt.

[2] So Schlichting ("sermo justitiae videtur positus pro sermone justo, h. e. perfecto ac solido"), Grotius ("Hic *δικαιοσύνης* dixit pro *τελειότητος* . . et genitivus est pro adjectivo"), Abresch ("doctrina vel institutio justa, h. e. perfecta, plena, omnia complectens, quae ad perspicuam distinctamque pertineant doctrinae Christianae intelligentiam"), Schulz ("that true [rightly so called] higher doctrine"), Kuinoel, Bisping, Kurtz, and many others.

[3] Delitzsch, too, with an illusion to the use of צֶדֶק, יֹשֶׁר, מֵישָׁרִים, takes *δικαιοσύνη* as a synonym of *ἀλήθεια*; but will then have the genitive *δικαιοσύνης* looked upon not as expressing the contents, but as a defining of the quality of *λόγος*, and will interpret *λόγος* of the faculty of speech. Thus, then, *λόγος*

the doctrine of the essence of the matter itself, in opposition to the typical figures thereof; or *λόγος δικαιοσύνης* is understood specially, as by Oecumenius, of the *λόγος περὶ τῆς θεότητος τοῦ κυρίου*, or, as by Carpzov, of the: "doctrina de sacerdotio Jesu Christi Melchisedeciano, quae dicitur *ὁ λόγος δικαιοσύνης* propterea, quia Melchisedecus, vi nominis, *βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης* vertitur, vii. 2, eaque appellatio ad Christum sacerdotem applicatur, cujus *πρέπον* fuit *πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην*, Matt. iii. 15;" or the words are made to refer, as by Primasius, Zeger, Bengel, de Wette, and others, to *intellectual and moral perfection in general*, as also already Chrysostom, who explains the expression by *ἡ ἄνω φιλοσοφία* (and after him Theophylact), leaves us the choice of understanding the *βίος ἄκρος καὶ ἠκριβωμένος* (according to Matt. v. 20), or *τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τὸν ὑψηλὸν περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον*. But the fundamental presupposition, out of which all these interpretations have sprung, is an erroneous one. For the emphasis falls not upon *λόγου δικαιοσύνης*, but upon the *ἄπειρος*, on that account preposed. Not for a non-possession of the *λόγος δικαιοσύνης*, but only for a want of experience in the same, only for an insufficient, schoolboy's knowledge of it, does the author blame the readers. The *λόγος δικαιοσύνης* in itself, therefore, stands as indifferently related to the notion of the *στερεὰ τροφή* or *τελειότης* as to the notion of the *στοιχεῖα*, to which Ebrard reckons it. Only by the more or less exhaustive imparting of its subject-matter does it become the one or the other. For the word of righteousness is nothing more than a periphrasis of Christianity or the gospel, inasmuch as just the righteousness availing with God[1] is the central-point of its contents.

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

[1] Of the righteousness availing with God (comp. also xi. 7), have Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Peirce, Storr, Klee, Tholuck, Bleek, Stein, Ebrard, Bloomfield, and others already rightly interpreted *δικαιοσύνη*.—In the above exposition, Alford, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 733), and Woerner have concurred; save that, according to Riehm, by virtue of an over-refined distinction, the gospel is not called the word of righteousness "because the righteousness availing with God is the central-point of its contents," but "because it leads to righteousness;

Quite analogous to this mode of designation is the Pauline characterization of the gospel office of teaching by *ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, 2 Cor. iii. 9, and of the teachers of Christianity by *διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης*, 2 Cor. xi. 15; on which account also it is unnecessary, for the justification of the expression chosen, with Bleek, Bisping, and Maier, to assume an allusion to the exposition of the name Melchisedec, *βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης*, given vii. 2.—*νήπιος γὰρ ἐστιν*] *for he is still a babe*, a novice in Christianity. Setting forth of the naturalness of the *ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης*.

Ver. 14. The opposition: for perfect or more matured Christians, on the other hand (and only for them), is the solid food.—*τελείων* is with emphasis preposed.—*τῶν διὰ τὴν ἕξιν κ.τ.λ.*] more precise characterizing of the *τέλειοι*: *for those who*, etc.—*ἕξις*] like the following *αἰσθητήριον*, in the N. T. a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*. It corresponds to the Latin *habitus*, and is used in particular of the condition produced by use and wont. Here it denotes the capacity or dexterity acquired by practice.[1]—*τὰ αἰσθητήρια*] *the organs of the senses*; transferred to that which is spiritual: *the power of apprehension*.[2]—*γεγυμνασμένα*] Predicate; literally: *as exercised*.[3]—*πρὸς διάκρισιν κ.τ.λ.*] *for the distinguishing of good and bad.* [LVI *g*.] The words may be taken with *γεγυμνασμένα*, or they may be taken with the whole expression *γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων*. The *καλόν τε καὶ κακόν*, however, is to be understood of the *right* and the *wrong*, or of the *wholesome* and the *pernicious*, not, with Stein, of that which is morally good or evil.[4] [LVI *h*.]

Notes by American Editor.

LV. Vv. 1–10.

(*a*) This passage presents, as is generally admitted by commentators, two qualifications which are necessary for the high-priestly office. The first of these is set forth in vv. 1–3; the second, in ver. 4. The second qualification is perfectly evident from the words used: the high-priest must not take the office for himself, but must be called to it by God. There can be as little doubt as to the general meaning of what is said respecting the first qualification. The construction of the sentence in which it is described, however, is somewhat questionable. The order of the words, as Lünem., also remarks, shows that *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων*

because, by its proclamation to man, the possibility is created and the opportunity is afforded of entering into a condition of the rightness of his relation to God, inasmuch, namely, as he assumes a believing attitude towards the word proclaimed." But why should the author, familiar as he was with Paul's manner of teaching, and attaching his own doctrinal presentation thereto,—albeit with independence of character,—have shrunk from recognizing, as the central theme of the gospel, "the righteousness which avails with God," since even this was only a general notion, which did not exclude a peculiar conception and treatment, where it was a question of the development of details, and insistance thereon?

[1] Comp. Quintil. x. 1. 1: firma quaedam facilitas, quae apud Graecos ἕξις nominatur.

[2] Comp. LXX. Jer. iv. 19: *τὰ αἰσθητήρια τῆς ψυχῆς μου*.

[3] On the whole turn of discourse, comp. Galen, *De dignot. puls.* 3 (in Wetstein): *ὃς μὲν γὰρ . . . τὸ αἰσθητήριον ἔχει γεγυμνασμένον ἱκανῶς . . . οὗτος ἄριστος ἂν εἴη γνώμων*.

[4] Chrysostom: *νῦν οὐ περὶ βίου αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος, ὅταν λέγῃ· πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ (τοῦτο γὰρ παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ δυνατὸν εἰδέναι καὶ εὔκολον) ἀλλὰ περὶ δογμάτων ὑγιῶν καὶ ὑψηλῶν, διεφθαρμένων τε καὶ ταπεινῶν*.

λαμβανόμενος belongs with the predicate, and not with the subject. It is clear, also, that the writer is not, as yet, contrasting the heavenly and the earthly high-priests, as he does in chs. vii ff., but is, in these introductory verses, simply showing what the high-priest must be, and that Christ answers to the demands of the office. It would be out of the line of thought, therefore, to make these words a part of the *subject*, as designating the priest who is taken from among men. But, if they are united with the predicate, the question may be asked whether they have a more prominent, or a less prominent position. Is this participial clause a mere incidental expression, the chief emphasis resting upon what follows ἵνα to the end of ver. 2: Every high-priest is appointed, etc., taken as he is from among men, in order that, etc.? Or does it contain in itself the chief point, which is, as it were, only unfolded in the ἵνα clause: Every high-priest is appointed as one who is a man, and this to the end that, etc.? The emphatic position of the words and the fact that they seem scarcely necessary, if they express only a secondary and incidental idea, strongly favor the latter view of the construction. In either case, the general meaning is, that the high-priest must be a man, or one who, as a man, is able to sympathize with men in their infirmities.

(*b*) The γάρ at the beginning of ver. 1, connects the idea of the necessity of this sympathy with the statement, in iv. 14–16, that we have a high-priest who has been tempted like ourselves; but this connection is grammatical, rather than the necessary logical connection of the main thought. The main thought turns here into a new line, of which, as already remarked, iv. 14–16 (like ii. 17, 18) gives only a foreshadowing hint.—δυνάμενος has nearly, if not precisely, the same relation to προσφέρῃ κ.τ.λ., which λαμβανόμενος has to καθίσταται, if the latter is explained in the second way mentioned above: his appointment *as being a man* is in order that he may offer the *sacrifices as one who is able*, etc.—Ver. 3 is, not improbably, best explained, with Lünem., as an independent sentence, containing an observation which is incidental, so far as the chief point in discussion in the other verses is concerned.

(*c*) That, in vv. 4–6, Christ is declared to have the second of the two qualifications mentioned, is admitted by all. With reference to special points in these three verses, it may be remarked: 1. That in ver. 5 the writer substitutes for ὁ θεός (ver. 4) the sentence ὁ λαλήσας κ.τ.λ. This sentence includes the characteristic word used by the author to describe divine utterances and revelations, and also the passage cited from the Psalms, which was introduced at the very beginning of the first part of the epistle (i. 5); 2. That ver. 6 does not stand in a parallelism with ver. 5 *b*. Ver. 5 *b* is simply a description of the One who calls Christ to the office of high-priest—ὁ λαλήσας with its dependent words being the subject of the verb to be supplied from ἐδόξασε. Ver. 6, on the other hand (see καθώς), gives the proof that ὁ λαλήσας κ.τ.λ., did what is indicated by ἐδόξασε.—3. From these two facts it is to be inferred, that the author wrote his sentences intentionally in this way. He designed, with rhetorical force and in an artistic manner, to unite the beginning of the second division of his work with the beginning of the first, and to call the attention of his readers to the thought, that He who had made Christ His agent in introducing the N. T. system, had also made Him His agent in carrying it forward.

(*d*) In vv. 7–9, Christ is presented as having the first of the two qualifications for the high-priestly office. That such a presentation is the design of these verses is proved by the following considerations:—1. The artistic arrangement of the

epistle, which is so clearly manifest in all its parts, renders it extremely improbable that, after having formally stated the two things mentioned in vv. 1–4, the first one, and the one which had been set forth with greatest fullness, should be passed over without notice in the application of the matter to Christ. 2. What is said respecting Christ in vv. 7–9, both as to His own experience and as to the result of it, is wholly unconnected with the statement of vv. 5, 6; but, on the other hand, it accords with what is indicated in vv. 1–3. That in consequence of His having gone through the experiences of human weakness and suffering, as attendant upon His being a man, He is enabled to be the high-priest for men, is the thought of these verses;—that such experience and qualification are essential to the office, is the thought of vv. 1–3. 3. There is no satisfactory reason for denying this reference to the first verses of the chapter—neither the absence of the phrase *ἐξ. ἀνθρ. λαμβ.* or of the word *ἄνθρωπος*, for the idea is sufficiently suggested by the words "in the days of his flesh," as well as by the other indications of human experience; nor the fact that certain expressions are found which remind us of the second chapter, for the high-priestly office, and its work for men, find their full significance only as they help men to eternal salvation; nor the correspondence in some points with iv. 14–16, for, as has been already intimated, that passage is only preparatory to this, and is not determinative of the plan or main ideas of this introduction to the second leading division of the letter; nor the repetition, in ver. 10, of the words of ver. 6, for this repetition is only for the purpose of forming a transition from the introductory passage to the development of the first point connected with the exaltation of Christ's priesthood above the O. T. priesthood,—namely, that it is after the Melchisedek order, as contrasted with the Aaronic or Levitical. This writer does not turn aside from his line of thought without coming back to it again, as Paul does under the influence of some new idea or word. He is a rhetorician, rather than an ardent advocate, and he cares for the form, as well as for the substance. When he leaves his thought in incompleteness, he returns to it again. The plan is never forgotten. But, at the same time, he is not slavishly bound to the use of the same words. He moves in the circle of ideas, not of mere expressions, and so he readily brings out a new thought, or application of thought, in words kindred to those which he may have already employed elsewhere and for a different purpose.

(*e*) The close connection of ver. 7 with vv. 5, 6 by the relative *ὅς* may be accounted for after the same manner with many other unions of sentences in this epistle, and in Paul's letters. It is a characteristic of epistolary writing to connect independent thoughts in this dependent way.—(*f*) The correct view of the expressions referring to Christ's prayers, etc., seems to be this: that they are intended to be descriptive of His whole earthly life, in this regard, but that they are chosen, to a considerable extent, if not altogether, under the influence of the story of the scene in Gethsemane. It is improbable that the sole reference, in the thought, is to that scene. But that the writer should make the language belonging to, or suggested by, this decisive hour of Christ's history serve to represent His whole history of suffering, supplication, obedience, is not at all strange or unnatural.—(*g*) The view of Lünemann, and the many writers whom he mentions as agreeing with him, respecting *εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας*, is to be adopted.—(*h*) The use of *αἴτιος* in ver. 9, instead of *ἀρχηγός* which is found in ii. 10, may, not improbably, be due to the fact that the writer has not here in mind the idea of leading the way as the first of a great company, but only of *cause* as connected

with the work of the high-priest.—(*i*) The connection of ver. 10 with ver. 9 is like that of ver. 1 and ver. 7 with the verses which immediately precede them. As to the relation of ver. 10 to the main thought, see under (*d*) above.

LVI. Vv. 11–14.

(*a*) The reference of *οὗ* (ver. 11)—whether to Melchisedec, or to Christ as priest after the order of M., or (as neuter) to the topic of Christ's Mel. priesthood—is uncertain. In any case, we have the same general purpose in the passage. The fact that Christ is the principal subject of the preceding verses, that ver. 10 is opened by a participle referring to Him, that it is His doctrine, in its elementary and deeper parts, which is mentioned at the beginning of ch. vi., and that His correspondence with Melchisedek in the matter of the priesthood is presented in ch. vii., may lead to the conclusion that the writer intended to refer, not to Melchisedek, and not to the mere topic or proposition, but to what is set forth in the words of ver. 10, *i.e.* Christ as high-priest after the Melchis. order. Lünem.'s view, therefore, though not certainly correct, is probably to be adopted.—(*b*) The verb to be supplied with *πολὺς ὁ λόγος* is, undoubtedly, *ἐστίν*, and so the meaning is: we have many things to say (R. V.). The strict sense of the words, accordingly, is that which Lünem. gives: "the author has abundant material for discoursing on the subject announced." When connected with the following phrase *δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν*, however, it is not impossible that, along with this primary and proper meaning, the words are intended to suggest that the unfolding of the subject, being *δυσερμήνευτος*, requires for the readers an extended presentation. This possibility is suggested, also, by the *ἐπεί* which follows, if this word, as may be intimated by the form of the sentence, is to be connected in thought with the whole clause *περὶ οὗ . . . . λέγειν*.—(*c*) The verb *γεγόνατε*, like many other words and statements in the epistle, implies that the readers were falling back, rather than pressing forward in their Christian life.—(*d*) On the possibilities of the construction of *τοῦ διδάσκειν* and *τινά* (ver. 12), see Buttm. pp. 260, 268, Winer p. 339, and Lünem.'s note on 1 Thess. iv. 9, to which he himself refers in his remarks on the present verse. That the use of the infinitive active, in such a case, without the supply of a new subject, and instead of the infinitive passive, is possible, may, perhaps, be admitted—though, to say the least, it seems questionable. But that it is improbable in a sentence which can be otherwise explained satisfactorily, may be safely affirmed. The present sentence, however, can not only be interpreted without serious difficulty, by making *τινα* the subject of *χρήζειν*, but, if this construction is adopted, the meaning accords with what we must believe the writer to have intended. It is scarcely conceivable that he meant to say, that the readers had become so dull and sluggish in all their Christian understanding as not to know whether repentance and faith were fundamental and elementary doctrines. There is certainly nothing in the context which implies this. The context intimates only that they needed milk, i. e., instruction in the elementary things, (not information as to whether these things were elementary or not) (vv. 12 *b*, 13), and that they should move beyond these things to those which were higher, or should open their minds to the truth so as to receive and understand a discourse on the higher things (vi. 1 ff.). There can be little doubt, therefore, that *τινα* is the indefinite pronoun, not the interrogative.—(*e*) The explanation given by Lünem. of the sequence of thought in vv. 12 *b*, 13, shows that it is not necessary

to suppose, that the author sacrificed the sense to the word-arrangement in the order of the clauses of vv. 13, 14. But it can hardly be doubted that Bleek is correct in saying, that the reverse order would have carried forward the thought more simply and naturally. Ver. 12*b* is only a renewed expression, in a figurative way, of what it is involved in 12 *a*. The object of vv. 13, 14 is to prove—not so much that the one who partakes of, or needs, milk, rather than solid food, is in want of instruction—as that the one who is inexperienced in the word of righteousness, being *νήπιος* and not *τέλειος*, requires milk i. e. elementary teaching. Not improbably, the writer places the *μετέχων γάλακτος* first, under the influence of his tendency towards rhetorical word-arrangement.—(*f*) Grimm (Lex. N. T.) regards *λόγος τῆς δικαιοσύνης* as equivalent to *doctrina de modo quo homo conditionem deo probatam consequatur*, giving thus a general meaning to *δικ.* This is one of the instances in which this writer may intend to use the word in the distinctively Pauline sense. But that he does have this intention cannot be confidently affirmed. The only case where the Pauline idea is beyond doubt is xi. 7. Grimm says of *βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης* in vii. 2—the interpretation of the name of Melchisedek—that it means *rex, qui ipse deo probatur et cives suos deo probatos reddit.* The fact that the verses of ch. vii. and those here used are both connected with the allusion to Melchisedek renders it not improbable that the writer's idea of righteousness in the two cases was the same; but the separation of the two verses by the sixth chapter, and the fact that the word is not immediately joined with what is said of Christ's Mel. priesthood, make it somewhat doubtful. The most that can be stated with confidence is, that *λογ. δικ.*, as here used, *may* mean the doctrine of righteousness by faith, and *may*, also, mean the doctrine of righteousness in the more general signification of the word.—(*g*) The reference of the thought of the passage to doctrine and teaching shows that *καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ* has the same reference. The same fact, also, shows that *αἰσθητήρια* means the perceptive faculties, or, as Alf., says, the inner organs of the soul.

(*h*) This passage (vv. 11–14) is evidently a mere digression and parenthesis, as related to the direct development of the thought suggested in ver. 10, and carried on in ch. vii. It is however, a digression which is very easily and naturally made. Ch. vi. is introduced in connection with the last part of this passage, i. e., the present *νηπιότης* of the readers, when they ought to be *τέλειοι*. But it is not a part of the same parenthesis. It is, on the other hand, the hortatory passage belonging to this new sub-section of the epistle, which is introduced *before* the argumentative part of the section—instead of *after* it, as in other cases—because it was so readily suggested to the writer's mind by the closing verses of ch. v.

CHAPTER VI.

VER. 2. Instead of the *Recepta* διδαχῆς, Lachm. reads διδαχήν. But the accusative has the support only of B and the Latin translation in D (doctrinam), and is a mere transcriber's error.—Ver. 3. Elz.: ποιήσομεν, after B K L ℵ, It. Vulg. Basm. Copt. Syr. utr. Ambrose. Retained by Lachm. Tisch. and Bloomfield. Defended also by Reiche. But as more original, on account of the symmetry with φερώμεθα, ver. 1, appears the conjunctive ποιήσωμεν, already commended to notice by Griesbach; approved by Bleek, Delitzsch, and Alford. It is attested by the strong authority of A C D E, 23, 31, 39, *al. mult.*, Arm. Chrys. (codd.) Theodoret (comment.), Oecum. Damasc.—Ver. 7. ἐπ' αὐτῆς] B** 213, 219** *al.*: ἐπ' αὐτήν. Alteration in favor of the more prevailing linguistic usage.—To the *Recepta* πολλάκις ἐρχόμενον, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford have preferred the order ἐρχόμενον πολλάκις. The external accrediting is for both substantially equal. The *Recepta* is attested by A C K L, Vulg.; Lachmann's reading by B D E ℵ, 37, 116, *al.*, It. Syr. utr. Copt. *al.* But in favor of the originality of the latter pleads the greater euphony, for which the author is wont to show a predilection.—Ver. 9. The mode of writing κρείσσονα, followed by Bengel, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford, *al.*, after the precedent given by the Edd. Complut. and Plantin., instead of the *Recepta* κρείττονα, is here required by A B C D*** (E?) L ℵ, *al.* Otherwise, i. 4, vii. 7, and frequently.—Ver. 10. καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης] Elz. Matthaei: καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης. But τοῦ κόπου is wanting in A B C D* E* ℵ, 6, 31, 47, *al.*, Syr. utr. Erp. Basm. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. Clar. Germ., with Chrys. (twice) Antioch. Theoph. Jerome. Already condemned by Beza, Mill, Bengel, *al.* Rightly deleted by Griesb. Knapp, Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. Alford, Reiche, and others. Gloss from 1 Thess. i. 3.—Ver. 14. Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2, Bloomfield, Reiche: ἢ μήν. Instead thereof, Lachm. Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, and Alford have εἰ μήν. The latter, approved also by Bleek and others, is, on account of the weighty authority of A B (C L**: εἰ μή) D (D corr.: εἰ μή) E ℵ, 17, 23, *al.*, Didym. Damasc. Vulg. It. Ambrose. Bede (: nisi), to be looked upon as the original reading. ἢ μήν is a later conversion of the non-Greek expression of the LXX. into Greek.—Ver. 16. ἄνθρωποι μὲν γάρ] So Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, and Alford. But μέν is wanting in A B D* ℵ, 47, 52, Cyril. Rightly rejected by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8.—Ver. 18. θεόν] Bleek and Tisch. 8, after A C ℵ*, 17, 52, Cyril, Didym. Chrys. *al.*: τὸν θεόν.—Ver. 19. Instead of the *Recepta* ἀσφαλῆ, which is confirmed also by the *Codex Sinaiticus*, Lachm., in the stereotype edition, writes, after A C D*: ἀσφαλῆν (so also Tisch. 7), in the larger edition: ἀσφαλήν. But the form is hardly to be justified. Yet comp. Winer, p. 64 [E. T. 66].

Vv. 1–3. [On Vv. 1–3, see Note LVII., pages 549, 550.] It is disputed whether in these verses the author carries out his purpose of advancing,

with the pretermission of the Christian elementary instruction, to objects of deeper Christian knowledge; or whether there is contained in the same a summons to the readers, no longer to cling to the doctrines of the first principles of Christianity, but to strive to reach beyond them and attain to Christian maturity and perfection.[1] The former supposition is favored by Primasius, Luther, Vatablus, Zeger, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Peirce, Cramer, Michaelis, Morus, Storr, Abresch, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Klee, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Reiche (*Comment. Crit.* p. 36 sqq.) Conybeare, Reuss, M'Caul, Hofmann (*Komm.* p. 231), and many others; the latter, on the other hand, by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, Gennadius (in Oecumenius), Theophylact, Faber Stapulensis, Calvin, Clarius, Justinian, Jac. Cappellus, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* I. p. 636, 2 Aufl.), Moll, and others. [LVII *a.*] The connection with the preceding and following context decides against the first acceptation and in favor of the second. The author has just now charged the readers with dullness, and complained that they are still children in Christian understanding. It is not possible, therefore, that he should now continue in the strain: "on that account he purposes, passing over the doctrines of the initial stage, to treat in his address of objects of higher, profounder Christian knowledge;" whereas, on the other hand, the exhortation to ascend to a higher stage fittingly links itself to the complaint of the lower standpoint of the readers, which still continues unchanged notwithstanding all legitimate expectation to the contrary. No wonder, then, that expositors have been forced, in connection with the first-named explanation, to have recourse to arbitrary interpretations of the διό, vi. 1; either in completing the idea, as Grotius, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, and others,

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

by: "therefore, because surely no one of you wishes to remain a *νήπιος*," —which, however, as the middle term, must have been expressly added, since no reader could divine this from that which precedes,—or in referring it, as Schlichting and Reuss, to the first words of v. 11: *περὶ οὗ πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν*, and regarding all that intervenes in the light of remarks appended by way of parenthesis,—which, nevertheless, is to be rejected, even on account of the intimate connection of *δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν*, v. 11, with the following *ἐπεὶ κ.τ.λ.*,—or finally, what is lexically impossible, denying to it a causal signification, and then translating it either, as Morus, by "yet" (*doch*), or, as Zachariae, by "nevertheless" (*indessen*), or as Abresch, by *vero, enimvero*.—But no less does the *coherence with that which follows* decide against the first interpretation and in favor of the second. For it is quite comprehensible how the reason given, ver. 4 ff., should be able to lend emphasis to a preceding exhortation, but not how the declaration of the author, that he now intended to pass over to more difficult, more profound themes for instruction, should be explained thereby. (See on vv. 4–6.) In *ἀφέντες* there lies no decisive ground in favor of either the one or the other view (against de Wette, Bisping, and others), and *ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα*, as also *θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι*, is more relevant to the case of the readers than to that of the author (*vide infra*).—*Διό*] [LVII *b* 1.] *therefore, i. e.* since the solid food is suited only to *τέλειοι*, ye, however, do not yet belong to the number of the *τέλειοι*.—*ἀφιέναι*] is not only employed by orators and historians to indicate that they intend to pass over some subject or leave it unmentioned,[1] but serves with equal frequency to denote the leaving unnoticed or leaving aside of an object in actual conduct.[2] In our passage it is the leaving aside of the lesser, in order to reach beyond it and attain to the higher. Entirely akin to the *ἀφιέναι τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον* is that which Paul, Phil. iii. 14, denotes as *ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι τὰ ὀπίσω*. As in the passage named Paul speaks of a forgetting of that already attained upon the path of Christian perfection, only with a glance at the goal as yet unattained, and not in an absolute sense,—as though he would in reality deny all actual significance to that which was already attained,—quite so does the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews stir up the readers to an *ἀφιέναι τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον*, only inasmuch as they are called to rise, beyond that which forms a mere preliminary stage, to something higher, without in any way implying thereby that the *τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος*, which certainly, as a base presupposed as already present, remains necessary for all subsequent building, should at all cease to be their possession. The objection, that *ἀφέντες* cannot be referred to the readers, because instead of a leaving aside (letting go) a holding fast or renewing of the *τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος* must rather be demanded as a means for attaining to the *τελειότης*, has therefore no force.[3]—*τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον*] *the word of the beginning concern-*

[1] Comp. *e. g.* Demosth. *de Falsa Legat. p.* 433, 28: *πάντα τὰ ἄλλα ἀφείς, ἃ πάντες ὑμεῖς ἴστε ἐρῶ.*

[2] Comp. *e. g.* Mark vii. 8: *ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων*; Luke v. 11: *ἀφέντες πάντα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ*; Eurip. *Androm.* 393: *ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀφεὶς πρὸς τὴν τελευτήν, ὑστέραν οὖσαν, φέρῃ.*

[3] Comp. Calvin: Jubet autem omitti ejus-

ing Christ, i. e. the Christian doctrine in its first rudiments or elements. τῆς ἀρχῆς locks together with τὸν λόγον into a single notion, and upon this total-notion τοῦ Χριστοῦ depends. The whole expression, however, amounts to the same thing as was before (v. 12) denoted by τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ.—ἡ τελειότης] in connection with our apprehension of vv. 1–3, determines itself naturally as *perfection, i. e.* manhood and maturity in Christianity, and that in an intellectual respect, not in an ethical or practical one, in which latter sense the expression has been accepted—arbitrarily, because opposed to the connection with v. 11–14—by Chrysostom (βίος ἀριστος).[1] Those who find in vv. 1–3 a statement of the author concerning his intention, must naturally understand τελειότης of the perfection of doctrine, *i. e.* of the deeper disclosures with regard to Christianity. But this is, at all events, a forced interpretation of the simple notion of the word, such as neither corresponds to the usage in other cases (comp. Col. iii. 14), nor in our passage appears in keeping with the context. For, since immediately before the discourse was of τέλειοι in opposition to νήπιοι, so here only the condition of the τέλειοι can consistently with nature be the meaning of the τελειότης. Had the author intended the perfection of doctrine, he must at least have written ἐπὶ τὰ τῶν τελείων instead of ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα; for only in this way would he have acquired a notion corresponding to the preceding ἡ στερεὰ τροφή, v. 14.—φερώμεθα] The author includes himself in the exhortation (cf. iv. 14, *al.*), and thereby tempers the same. φέρεσθαι ἐπί τι, *to be carried away to something*, to strive with zeal after something.—θεμέλιον καταβάλλεσθαι] a formula fully current in later Greek style (Dionys. Halicarn. iii. 69; Josephus, *Antiq.* xi. 4. 4, *al.* [whereas Paul and Luke employ τιθέναι, 1 Cor. iii. 10; Luke vi. 48, xiv. 29]), to denote the laying of the foundation. Even on account of the usualness of this mode of speech, it is quite a misapprehension of the meaning when Ebrard would here vindicate for καταβάλλεσθαι the signification: "demolish." But also the position of the word decides against this, since καταβαλλόμενοι must have its place before θεμέλιον, whereas *the placing of it after* shows that the emphasis must fall upon θεμέλιον, not upon the verb; θεμέλιον thus stands in antithesis to the following τελειότητα. The participial clause: μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβ. κ.τ.λ., accordingly forms an elucidation to ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον.—The genitive μετανοίας, etc., indicates the *material* with which the foundation is laid, and, indeed, each two of the instances named belong together, so that three pairs of the first principles of Christianity are enumerated. The article before the single substantives is omitted throughout; not, as Böhme and Bleek suppose, out of a consideration for

modi rudimenta, non quod eorum oblivisci unquam debeant fideles, sed quia in illis minime est haerendum. Quod melius patet ex fundamenti similitudine, quae mox sequitur. Nam in exstruenda domo nunquam a fundamento discedere oportet; in eo tamen jaciendo semper laborare ridiculum.

[1] Gennadius (χρηστὴ πολιτεία καὶ τῆς πίστεως ἀξία), Photius (ἡ ἐν ταῖς ἀρεταῖς προκοπή, ἡ τῶν θλίψεων καὶ διωγμῶν καὶ πειρασμῶν ὑπομονή), Oecumenius (ἡ τῶν ἔργων φιλοσοφία), Clarius (non solum superioris illius de Christo theologiae comprehensio, quantum homini fas est, verum etiam profectus in virtutes et afflictionum persecutionumque tolerantia), and others.

the rhythm, lest otherwise the articles should too greatly accumulate, but because the sense is: *with things such as* μετάνοια, etc.—Further, as subject in καταβαλλόμενοι we have to regard *the readers of the epistle* (not the author), because the same subject is presupposed for the μετάνοια and the θεμέλιον καταβάλλεσθαι; but the μετάνοια, which cannot denote the *doctrine* of the change of mind,—since otherwise, as with the words in ver. 2, the addition of διδαχή could not have been wanting,—but expresses the *act* of the change of mind itself, beyond doubt relates to the readers of the letter, not to the author.—Not anew are the readers to lay the foundation by μετάνοια ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων and πίστις ἐπὶ θεόν; since this foundation has with them already been laid, it is now thus only a question of continuing to build upon the foundation laid. Not in such wise are they accordingly to behave, that the primary requirement of turning from the ἔργα νεκρά and having πίστις towards God, must ever afresh be made with regard to them. —The construction μετάνοια ἀπό, as with μετανοεῖν, Acts viii. 22; LXX. Jer. viii. 6.—ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων] [LVII *b* 2.] By νεκρά the works are not characterized as *sinful*, and by sin occasioning death (Piscator, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Peirce, Abresch, Bisping, Stuart, and others), nor as *defiling*, as according to the law of Moses contact with a dead body defiled (Michaelis, *al.*), but as *in themselves vain and fruitless* [see on ix. 14]. Perhaps the author has—what is on no sufficient grounds contested by R. Köstlin (*Theol. Jahrbb. von Baur und Zeller*, 1854, II. 4, p. 469 ff., Remark), Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 568), and Kurtz—before his mind the service of works under the Mosaic law, from which the readers had not yet been able to free themselves. A contradiction, as Riehm supposes (*l. c.* p. 835 f.), of the fact recognized, p. 16, that πίστις with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews does not, as with Paul, involve an opposition to the νόμος and the ἔργα νόμου, lies not in this expression. For neither in our passage is mention made of νεκρὰ ἔργα in relation to πίστις, but only in relation to the factor of the μετάνοια which precedes the πίστις.—καὶ πίστεως ἐπὶ θεόν]. The positive reverse side to the negative μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων. The ideas conveyed by the μετανοεῖν and πιστεύειν, the μετάνοια and the πίστις, likewise associated with each other, Mark i. 15; Acts xx. 21. These words, however, are to be understood, as Abresch, Bleek, and others rightly insist, in accordance with the signification, which the author is otherwise wont to attach to πίστις, of the believing confidence in God, as the one who in part *has* already *fulfilled* the promises of salvation given in the person of Jesus Christ, in part *will yet completely fulfill* them.

Ver. 2. Βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς] [LVII *b* 3.] We have not to divide by a comma, with Cajetan, Luther, Hyperius, Sykes, Semler, Morus, Heinrichs, Schulz, de Wette, Conybeare, and others [after the Syriac], in such wise that βαπτισμοί and διδαχή are each separately enumerated as a particular subject for elementary instruction in Christianity. Διδαχή must in this case mean the elementary instruction in Christianity connected with baptism, imparted either before or after the same. But since, at the close of the verse, the ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν and the κρίμα αἰώνιον are mentioned, while the treatment of these subjects for teaching belonged equally to the

first stage of instruction in Christianity, it is not easy to perceive why, in addition to that διδαχή, these two points, presupposed in the same, should be brought into special relief by the author. Then there is the consideration that all the particulars which are mentioned before and after as constituent parts of the θεμέλιον, are designated by a double expression. Seeing the care bestowed by the author upon the symmetrical proportions of his discourse, we should therefore naturally be led to regard βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς as a corresponding double expression. But even as thus apprehended the expression is capable of a twofold explanation. The question, namely, is whether the author is speaking of βαπτισμοὶ διδαχῆς or of a βαπτισμῶν διδαχή. In the first case *baptisms with a view to doctrine* are meant, in the second *instruction concerning baptisms*. In the first acceptation the term is taken by Bengel, Michaelis, Maier, Kurtz, as also Winer, p. 181 [E. T. 192] (less decidedly, 5 Aufl. p. 217); in the last, by Bleek and the majority. Against the first view pleads, on the one hand, the fact that the addition διδαχῆς would be something too little characteristic, almost unmeaning, since a Christian baptism, not preceded, accompanied, or followed by instruction in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, would be something inconceivable; on the other hand, that in this way the erroneous secondary meaning would arise, that there were, in addition to the Christian baptisms with a view to doctrine, also other Christian baptisms. We follow, therefore, the second mode of interpretation. In connection with this the plural βαπτισμῶν still presents some difficulty. Gerhard, Dorscheus, Ernesti, M'Lean, Stuart, and others arbitrarily set aside this difficulty, in that they suppose just the plural to be placed for the singular. But neither is the plural to be explained by the assumption that respect is had to the proneness of the Hebrews for often repeating the Christian baptism, in conformity with the many βαπτισμοί in Judaism,[1] or, at the same time, to the outward and inner baptism.[2] Just as little by the supposition that reference is made to a plurality of baptismal candidates or baptismal acts,[3] or to a repeated immersing of the candidate. Most in its favor has the opinion of Jac. Cappellus, Seb. Schmidt, Schöttgen, Wolf, and others;[4] namely, that the author is thinking not so much of Christian baptism in itself, or exclusively, as along with it at the same time of the relation of the same to the Jewish lustrations, and perhaps also to the baptism of John. This view appears at least to acquire a point of support from ix. 10, according to which the readers still continued to esteem the washings enjoined by the Mosaic law as of importance for Christians too. Yet it seems to be precarious, with Jac. Cappellus, Bleek, and others, to urge in favor of this acceptation the distinction that in the N. T. only βάπτισμα is used for Christian baptism in the proper sense of

[1] Oecumenius, Theophylact.

[2] Grotius, Whitby, Braun, Brochmann; Reuss: la différence du baptême d'eau et du baptême d'esprit.

[3] Theodoret, Primasius, Beza, Er. Schmid, Owen, Heinrichs, *al.*

[4] In which more recently also Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Bleek, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 724), Alford, and Moll have concurred.

the term, *βαπτισμός*, on the other hand, being in the N. T. a word of wider signification (ix. 10; Mark vii. 4); precarious, because the expression *βάπτισμα* not occurring at all with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews [as also Josephus designates the *rite of John* only by *βαπτισμός*, the *action* by *βάπτισις*, *Antiq.* xviii. 5. 2], with regard to his usage in this respect thus nothing can be determined.—In close inner connection with the *βαπτισμοί* stands the *ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν*. As therefore the readers ought no longer to be in need of teaching concerning the nature of the former (and concerning its pre-eminence over the kindred institutions of Judaism), so was it also to be reasonably expected that they should experience a necessity for being instructed concerning the nature of the latter (and concerning the eminent blessings which attend thereon). The reference is to that laying on of hands by which those previously baptized were fully received into the communion, and through which the reception of the Holy Ghost was wont to be vouchsafed to them. Comp. Acts viii. 17 ff., xix. 6. From this close inner connectedness of the *ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν* with the *βαπτισμοί* results that, also as regards the external arrangement of words, the genitive *ἐπιθέσεως* does not depend immediately upon *θεμέλιον*, but like *βαπτισμῶν* upon *διδαχῆς*. But, moreover, even the following genitives, *ἀναστάσεως* and *κρίματος*, are, as rightly apprehended by Storr, Böhme, Ebrard, Bisping,[1] Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, and Woerner, governed by *διδαχῆς*. For not by the resurrection of the dead, and the everlasting judgment itself, since these facts will first unfold themselves in the future, but only by the doctrine thereof can the foundation be laid in Christianity. It would, however, be arbitrary to assign to the words *ἀνάστασις* and *κρίμα* in themselves a signification which they can only have in combination with the foregoing *διδαχῆς*. A grammatical harshness (de Wette) is not to be discovered in this construction, on account of the close connection of the last clauses by means of *τε* and *τε . . . καί*; any more than de Wette is right in regarding *βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς*, in the mode of interpretation above followed, as an unnatural trajection without an example in the writings of our author; for *βαπτισμῶν* is preposed because the emphasis rests on that word, and an analogon in our epistle is already afforded by the *πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς*, ii. 4.—*ἀναστάσεώς τε νεκρῶν καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου*] Two dogmas already belonging to the Jewish theology, which obtained by means of Christianity only their more definite, concrete signification. The expression in both these clauses is used quite generally. We have therefore no warrant for limiting, with Estius,

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

Schlichting, Schöttgen, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, and others, the ἀνάστασις to the godly, the κρίμα to the ungodly. On the contrary, both have reference to the pious or believers, and the ungodly or unbelievers in common.

Ver. 3. Repetition of the exhortation, ver. 1, in order immediately to give thereto so much the greater emphasis by attaching the warning, ver. 4 ff.—καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσωμεν] [LVII *b* 4.] *just this let us do.*—τοῦτο] *sc.* τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φέρεσθαι, ver. 1.[1] To τοῦτο we cannot supplement from the participial clause, ver. 1: τὸ θεμέλιον καταβάλλεσθαι, as was done, on the presupposition of the reading ποιήσωμεν, by Jac. Cappellus (who, however, besides this gives also the true reference, and comes to no decision), Schlichting, Grotius, Dorscheus, Wittich, Limborch, Calmet, Zachariae, Storr, Abresch, and is still done by Hofmann, as it is also regarded by Tholuck as possible; in such wise that there should issue the sense: this also, namely, the laying of the foundation, the author will do, *sc.* at another and more favorable time, if God permit. For—apart from the unsuitability of the sense resulting, according to which the author would declare his intention of treating the more difficult earlier than the more easy, which latter surely contains the preliminary condition for the understanding of the former—against such *supplementing* the fact is decisive, that the μή in connection with καταβαλλόμενοι, ver. 1, would be arbitrarily set aside; against the *apprehending in this sense*, the fact that for the expression of such a meaning ποιήσομεν δὲ καὶ τοῦτο must have been written.—ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ θεός] *provided that God permits it* (1 Cor. xvi. 7), inasmuch, namely, as all things, even the carrying into effect of good resolutions, are subordinated to the higher decree of God. Incomprehensible, therefore, is the assertion of de Wette, who has therein followed Abresch, that the addition ἐάνπερ κ.τ.λ. is plainly irreconcilable "with the taking of our verse in the sense of a demand." For the supposition, that in this case "the encouraging belief in God's gracious assistance" must be expressed, is an altogether erroneous assumption, since the author in the present passage is by no means aiming at the consolation of the readers, but, on the contrary—as is shown by vv. 4–8—at the alarming of them. To an encouraging and pointing to God's gracious help the discourse first advances, vv. 9, 10.

Vv. 4–8. [On Vv. 4–8, see Note LVIII., pages 550, 551.] Warning enforcement of the foregoing exhortation, by dwelling on the impossibility of leading back Christians who have already experienced the abundant blessing of Christianity, and for all that have fallen away again from the same, anew to a state of grace. [LVIII *a*.] Very appropriately (against de Wette) does this warning justification attach itself to the preceding demand; since the readers were not merely still far from the τελειότης in Christianity, but were, moreover, upon the way of entirely falling off again from Christianity. Comp. especially x. 25–31. In order, therefore,

[1] Theodoret; ἀντὶ τοῦ σπουδάσωμεν, ἐπιθυμήσωμεν, πάντα πόνον ὑπὲρ τῆς τελειότητος ἀσπασώμεθα.

to deter them from such contemplated apostasy, there is very fitly set before the eyes of the readers the magnitude of the culpability which the completed apostasy would involve, and the terrible nature of the divine punitive judgment which it would entail.—In connection with the other view, that a declaration of the purpose of the author is contained in vv. 1–3, the connection of thought would be: Passing over the subjects of catechumenical instruction in Christianity, I shall apply myself to the subjects of deeper Christian knowledge. For it is surely impossible to convert anew Christians who have already been enlightened, and then have fallen away again. By the fruitlessness of enlarging on the initial doctrines, therefore, the author would justify his resolution. But one does not perceive the relevancy of this statement to the case of the readers. For since a preparatory transition, such as is afforded by the paraenetic *φερώμεθα*, ver. 1. and *ποιήσωμεν*, ver. 3,—in that the endeavor after Christian perfection necessarily includes the putting away of all that is opposed to it, thus also of the inclination to apostasy,—would then be entirely wanting, on the contrary, the declaration of the purpose of the author would connect itself with the censure expressed, v. 11–14; in this way the explanation of this resolution must be found in the presupposition either that the readers already actually belonged to the number of the *παραπεσόντες*, or else that, since they must already be reckoned among the *τέλειοι*, what is said admits of no application to them. In the first case, however, the author would represent his own undertaking, for the benefit of *such* readers to pass over to the higher subjects of teaching, as a fruitless one; in the last case, having already just before blamed the readers for their *νηπιότης*, would have fallen into self-contradiction.

Ver. 4. Γάρ] goes back to the last main utterance,—thus to *τοῦτο ποιήσωμεν*, ver. 3, and[1] by means thereof to *ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα*, ver. 1, not to *μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι*, ver. 1,[1] nor yet to *ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ θεός*, ver. 3,[2] still less, at the same time, to *ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ θεός* and *μὴ πάλιν θεμέλ. καταβ.*[3]—*ἀδύνατον*] *it is impossible*. The import of the expression is absolute; and to weaken it into "difficile est,"[4] according to which we should have to suppose a rhetorical exaggeration, is an act of caprice. Nor are we justified in seeking to obtain a softening of the declaration, as is done by Er. Schmid, Clericus, Limborch, Schöttgen, Bengel, Cramer, Baumgarten, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Bloomfield (comp. already Ambrose, *de Poenit.* ii. 3), by urging the force of the *infin. active* *ἀνακαινίζειν* as pointing to *human* activity, and thus, with a reference to Matt. xix. 26, making the impossibility to exist only on the part of men, not on the part of God. For only the impossibility of the *ἀνακαινίζειν* in itself is accentuated, without respect to the person by whom it must otherwise be effected. Instead of the infinitive active, therefore, the infinitive passive *ἀνακαινίζεσθαι* might have been chosen by the author without affecting the

[1] Whitby, de Wette, Bloomfield, Conybeare.
[2] Piscator, Abresch, Delitzsch, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner.
[3] Schlichting.
[4] So, after the example of the Latin translation in D and E: Ribera, Corn. a Lapide, Clericus, Limborch, Storr, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others.

sense.—*τοὺς ἅπαξ . . . αἰῶνος*, ver. 5] characterizing of such as have not only become Christians, but also have already experienced the plenitude of blessing conferred upon Christians.—*τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας*] *those who were once illumined* (x. 32), *i. e.* had already, through the preaching of the gospel, been made participants of the light of the knowledge (*sc.* of Christianity as the perfect religion). As regards the thought, the same thing is said by *μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας*, x. 26.—*ἅπαξ* belongs, as to *φωτισθέντας*, so also to the three following participles (against Hofmann), and finds its opposition in *πάλιν*, ver. 6. It does not signify "plene" or "perfecte" (Wolf), nor does it denote an act which admits of no repetition (Delitzsch); contains, however, the implication, that the once ought to have sufficed and satisfied. Comp. [ix. 26] x. 2; Jude 3.—*φωτίζειν τινά*, [LVIII *b.*] of the spiritual enlightenment effected by teaching, is purely Hellenistic.[1]—*γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου*] *and have tasted the heavenly gift. γεύεσθαί τινος*, to taste or receive a savor of a thing, figurative indication of perception by one's own experience. See on ii. 9. The construction of the verb with the genitive (instead of being with the accusative, as ver. 5) does not justify us, with many strict Reformed expositors, in finding a mere "gustare extremis labris" in the expression. Besides, such an interpretation would be in conflict with the design of the writer, since it cannot be within his intention to represent the culpability of the persons in question as small; he must, on the contrary, aim at bringing out the same in all its magnitude.—By *δωρεὰ ἐπουράνιος*, Primasius, Haymo, Estius, Michaelis, Semler, and others understand *the Lord's Supper;* Owen, Calmet, Ernesti, Whitby, M'Lean, Bloomfield, *the Holy Ghost* (against which the following special mention of the same is decisive); Klee, *regeneration in general*, in contradistinction from the special communication of the Spirit in baptism; M'Caul, "the persuasion of the eternal life, the *χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ*, Rom. vi. 23;" Hofmann, *righteousness;* Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, *Paraphrase;* Cameron, Hammond, Rambach, Ebrard, Maier, *the forgiveness of sins;* Justinian, Schlichting, Grotius, *the peace of mind* arising from forgiveness; Pareus, *faith;* Seb. Schmidt, Dorscheus, Peirce, Bengel, Carpzov, Cramer, Bisping, and others, *Christ;* Morus, Heinrichs, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Stengel, and others, *the Christian religion* or *the gospel;* Abresch, Bleek, *the enlightenment* imparted to men through the preaching of the gospel, or *the heavenly light itself*, which effects the enlightenment, and by means thereof communicates itself to men. Inasmuch as *τε* points to a close connection between the second clause and the first, and the emphasis rests upon the foregoing *γευσαμένους*, *ἡ δωρεά* is at any rate to be taken quite generally. Most naturally, therefore, shall we think in general of the *gift of grace, i. e.* of the abundant grace of Christianity. It is called *heavenly*, inasmuch as Christ was sent forth from heaven in order to communicate it, and heaven is the scene of its full realization.—*καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου*] *and were made par-*

[1] Comp. Eph. iii. 9; John i. 9; LXX. Ps. cxix. 130; 2 Kings xii. 2, xvii. 27, *al.*

takers of the Holy Ghost. The consequence and seal of the gift of grace just mentioned.

Ver. 5. Καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα] *and have tasted the refreshing word of God.* That the author already makes use afresh in this place of the verb γεύεσθαι, after he has only just before employed it ver. 4, Bleek ascribes, not wrongly, to a certain perplexity on the part of the writer about finding for the idea to be expressed another term of the same import. For the supposition of Delitzsch, that the repetition of the same expression is to be explained from the design of bringing out so much the more strongly the reality of the experiences made and of their objects, would be admissible only if the second γευσαμένους, like the first, were placed emphatically at the beginning of its clause, and there were not already another verb inserted between the two γευσαμένους. γεύεσθαι is here, as John ii. 9, construed with the accusative, which occurs only in the Hellenistic, never with the Greek classic writers. To assume, however, a different signification in the case of the two constructions,—Bengel: "alter (genitivus) partem denotat; nam gustum Christi, doni coelestis, non exhaurimus in hac vita; alter (accusativus) plus dicit, quatenus verbi Dei praedicati gustus totus ad hanc vitam pertinet, quanquam eidem verbo futuri virtutes seculi annectuntur;" Bloomfield: "here (ver. 4) γεύσασθαι signifies to have experience of a thing, by having received and possessed it; whereas in the clause following it signifies to know a thing by experience of its value and benefit;" Delitzsch (comp. also Moll): "with γευσαμένους τῆς δωρ. τῆς ἐπουρ. is combined the conception that the heavenly gift is destined for all men, and is of inexhaustible fullness of intent; with καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα, however, the conception that God's precious word was, as it were, the daily bread of those thus described,"—is already forbidden by the homogeneity of the statements, ver. 4 and ver. 5.—The expression ῥήματα καλά serves, LXX. Josh xxi. 45, xxiii. 15, Zech. i. 13, for the rendering of the Hebrew הַדָּבָר הַטּוֹב and הַדְּבָרִים טוֹבִים and is used of words of consolation and promise spoken by God or the angel of God. In accordance therewith, we shall best also here refer καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα to *the gospel*, inasmuch as God thereby gives promises, and fulfills the promises given.[1]—Others[2] understand the expression of the gospel in general; in connection with which some, as Calvin and Braun, see denoted in καλόν a contrast with the Mosaic law, the characteristic of which was judicial severity. According to Bleek, finally, we have to think of a *personified attribute of God;* which is supposed to be here mentioned because the gospel, with its consolatory message, is an efflux from the same,—an interpretation, however, which finds no sort of support in the context.—δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος] *and powers of the world to come.* What is intended is the extraordinary miraculous

[1] So Theodoret (τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν τῶν ἀγαθῶν), Estius, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Owen, Whitby, Abresch, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz.

[2] As Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Faber Stapulensis, Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Bengel, Peirce, Heinrichs, Alford.

powers wrought by the Holy Ghost, as these were called forth by the new order of the world founded by Christ. The *αἰὼν μέλλων*, namely (comp. *οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα*, ii. 5), is for the author nothing purely future,—so that we have not[1] to think of the everlasting life, or of the glory coming in with the Parousia of Christ, of which believers have received a foretaste here upon earth,—but already begins, according to his view, with the appearing of Christ upon earth, in that only its consummation still belongs to the future, namely, the time of Christ's return.

Ver. 6. **Καὶ παραπεσόντας**] *and* (in spite of this) *have fallen, i. e.* have fallen away again from Christianity.—**πάλιν**] belongs to *ἀνακαινίζειν*. The taking of the same with *παραπεσόντας* (Heinsius, Alting, Peirce, and others) has the position of the word against it. A pleonasm, however (Grotius), is not produced by *πάλιν* along with the *ἀνα* in *ἀνακαινίζειν*. For *ἀνα* marks out the becoming new as a change ensuing, in opposition to the preceding state of the old man; whereas *πάλιν* has reference to the fact that the class of men described have already experienced that change, namely, at their first conversion.—**ἀνακαινίζειν**] *to renew*, to fashion inwardly new. To supplement an *ἑαυτούς* to the verb (Erasmus, Vatablus, *al.*), according to which the preceding accusatives of the object would be changed into accusatives of the subject, is arbitrary.—**εἰς μετάνοιαν**] not equivalent to *διὰ μετανοίας* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Zeger, Corn. a Lapide), but under the form of conception of *the result:* in such wise that change of mind or repentance should arise therefrom.—**ἀνασταυροῦντας κ.τ.λ.**] *since they*, etc. Note of cause to *ἀδύνατον ἀνακαινίζειν*. The impossibility of the renewal is explained by the magnitude of the culpability. By their action such men bear witness that the Son of God is in their estimation a transgressor and deceiver who has been justly crucified.—The compound form *ἀνασταυροῦν* occurs with classic writers only in the sense of "nailing up to the cross."[2] In itself, however, the explanation is equally admissible: "crucify afresh." Thus it is accordingly taken without questioning by the Greek interpreters, and probably was so meant by the author.—**ἑαυτοῖς**] Dativus incommodi: *to their own judgment.* Vatablus: in suam ipsorum perniciem. Too weak, Bleek,—to whom Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 769), and Alford give in their adhesion,—"they crucify Him to themselves, in so far as, by that crucifying again, they rob Him of themselves, who were in His possession." False is the interpretation of Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Böhme, Bisping: *as much as in them lies*, *ὅσον τὸ ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς*; Heinrichs: *each one for himself;* Schulz: *by themselves* [by their own act]; Grotius, Abresch, Tholuck, explaining by the supposition of the so-called Dativus localis: *in themselves;* Hofmann: *as regards their own persons;* Klee: *to their contentment;* Stengel: *to the joy and pleasure of their obdurate heart;* Kurtz: *to the gratification of their hatred or their enmity against Him.* Over refinedly Bengel and Delitzsch: *sibi*, as an opposition to *παραδειγματίζ-*

[1] With Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Böhme, Kurtz, and others.

[2] Comp. L. Bos, *Exercitatt.*, and Wetstein *ad loc.*

ὄντας, ostentantes, *sc. aliis.*—*τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ*] A more palpable manifestation of the enormity of the crime than would have been the case had he written *τὸν Χριστόν* or *Ἰησοῦν*. Comp. x. 29.—*παραδειγματίζειν*] to expose to scorn and insult; here, inasmuch as the death of the cross was a shameful one. *παραδειγματίζειν* stronger than the simple *δειγματίζειν*, Matt. i. 19.

Concluding remarks on vv. 4–6.—The declaration of vv. 4–6 has been of importance for the controversy of the early church, as to the question whether those who relapsed from the gospel renounced for ever the hope of salvation, or whether by means of sincere repentance they might once more attain to a state of salvation. The rigoristic view was especially maintained by the Montanists and Novatianists; and already Tertullian, *de Pudicitia*, c. 20, appeals to our passage in favor thereof. In opposition to this view, another sense was universally put upon the passage in the orthodox church from the time of the fourth century. The words were interpreted of an impossibility of imparting a second time the baptism once administered, and the consequent condemnable character of such an act, in that according to a later *usus loquendi* (first met with in Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 62, 65) they took *φωτίζειν* to be a designation of baptism, referred *ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν* to the repetition of baptism, and in *ἀνασταυροῦντας κ.τ.λ.* found the indication of that which such repetition would produce or involve.[1] That this interpretation, which is still followed among later expositors by Faber Stapulensis, Clarius, and Calmet, is a wrong one, is now generally admitted. The justification, however, of this passage, which furnished to Luther a determining reason for denying to the epistle canonicity in the narrower sense (see the Introduction, p. 18), is afforded by the fact that—as is also pointed out, x. 26–31—the author is speaking not of a falling away in general, but of a clearly defined falling away, *i. e.* as is rightly urged by Calvin, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Estius, Seb. Schmidt, Peirce, Carpzov, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 341 f. 2 Aufl.), Maier, and others, those Christians are described who commit the sin against the Holy Ghost (Matt. xii. 31 f.; Mark iii. 28 f.; Luke xii. 10), or the *ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον* (1 John v. 16). For Christians are described who fall away, not, *e. g.*, from mere weakness, from a mere wavering of conviction, but in spite of a better knowledge, and in spite of having experienced the treasures of grace in Christianity; Christians who, according to the parallel passage, x. 26 ff., against their better consciousness and conscience, tread under foot the Son of God as though He were a deceiver, brand His blood

[1] Comp. *e. g.* Theodoret: *Τῶν ἅγαν ἀδυνάτων, φησίν, τοὺς τῷ παναγίῳ προσεληλυθότας βαπτίσματι καὶ τῆς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος χάριτος μετειληφότας καὶ τῶν αἰωνίων ἀγαθῶν δεξαμένους τὸν τύπον αὖθις προσελθεῖν καὶ τυχεῖν ἑτέρου βαπτίσματος. Τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδέν ἐστιν ἕτερον, ἢ πάλιν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ σταυρῷ προσηλῶσαι καὶ τὴν γεγενημένην ἀτιμίαν πάλιν αὐτῷ προσάψαι. Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἅπαξ τὸ πάθος αὐτὸς ὑπέμεινεν, οὕτω καὶ ἡμᾶς ἅπαξ αὐτῷ προσήκει κοινωνῆσαι τοῦ πάθους. Συνθαπτόμεθα δὲ αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος καὶ συνανιστάμεθα. Οὐκ οἷόν τε οὖν ἡμᾶς πάλιν ἀπολαῦσαι τῆς τοῦ βαπτίσματος δωρεᾶς. Χριστὸς γὰρ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔτι ἀποθνήσκει, θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔτι κυριεύει. Ὃ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ, ὃ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ. Καὶ ἡμῶν δὲ ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι, τοῦ θανάτου τον τύπον δεξάμενος.*

shed for redemption as the blood of a transgressor, and scoff at the Spirit of grace as a spirit of falsehood. In regard to men of this kind, the ἀδύνατον πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν is employed in its full right, since with them there must be inwardly wanting every kind of receptiveness or receptibility for the μετάνοια. The reference of the declaration to the sin against the Holy Ghost is, moreover, so much the more unquestionable, inasmuch as the author by no means says that the readers have already committed it, but, on the contrary, only sets at once before their eyes as a terrible warning the extreme length to which their conduct may lead them.

Vv. 7, 8. Confirmation of the ἀδύνατον κ.τ.λ. on its *objective side;* since in connection with so great culpability and such ingratitude the divine punishment cannot fail to ensue. This thought is rendered manifest by means of a similitude. The common subject for ver. 7 and ver. 8 is not merely γῆ, but γῆ ἡ πιοῦσα τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλάκις ὑετόν taken together. For the intention of the author is to point to the diversity of result arising from equally favorable preliminary conditions. The main point of the similitude, however, lies in ver. 8, while ver. 7 serves only by way of preparation, and as a means of bringing out into bolder relief the following opposition.—γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιοῦσα . . . ὑετόν] *for the field which has drunk in the rain frequently coming down upon it.* Figure of the men before described, who ofttimes have experienced God's gracious benefits, and have received the same into themselves.—The participle aorist πιοῦσα is chosen, while then participles present (τίκτουσα, ἐκφέρουσα) follow, because the fact already historically completed is to be emphasized, from which, then, two different effects are developed for the time present.—A πίνειν, τίκτειν, etc., is ascribed to the γῆ, because this, as in general is very frequently the case, is personified as a part of the life-displaying, assiduously productive nature.—ἐπ' αὐτῆς] The construction of ἐπί with the genitive, after a verb of motion, is distinguished from the more usual one with the accusative, in this respect, that the former includes in itself at the same time the notion of *tarrying.* Comp. Winer, p. 352 [E. T. 376].—καὶ τίκτουσα] In place of this, merely τίκτουσα or τίκτουσα μέν would have been more correctly written. Καί, however, does not stand in the sense of "also" (Hofmann), but is the ordinary "and."—βοτάνη] in the N. T. only here, employed by the LXX. as a rendering of דֶּשֶׁא (Gen. i. 11, 12), עֵשֶׂב (Ex. ix. 22, x. 12, 15), and חָצִיר (Job viii. 12), denotes, according to its derivation from βόσκω, originally herbage or pasturage, but then also every kind of vegetation or produce of the field.—εὔθετος] *well-placed,* fit, profitable. Comp. Luke ix. 62. xiv. 35.—ἐκείνοις] may be referred to εὔθετον (Böhme and the majority), but it also admits of being referred to τίκτουσα (Bleek, Alford, Hofmann).—δι' οὓς] *for whose sake.* Grammatically false, the Vulgate, Zeger, and others: *a quibus* Calvin: *quorum opera;* Erasmus, Vatablus, Heinrichs, and others: *per quos;* Luther: *for those who till it;* Schulz: *for those who labor on it;* Wieseler (*Comm. üb. d. Br. P. an die Gal.,* Gött. 1859, p. 111): *at whose command and disposal.*—καὶ γεωργεῖται] *it also* (or *even*) *is cultivated,* brings into relief the naturalness of the τίκτειν βοτάνην

εὔθετον ἐκείνοις, in that the ἐκεῖνοι are the *proprietors* of the land, to whom the cultivation and produce of the same pertains. Incorrectly Schlichting (as likewise Böhme, Kuinoel, Hofmann): Ait autem "*et* colitur," ut ad imbrium irrigationem etiam terrae istius diligentem accedere culturam ostendat. In the application of the figure, the ἐκεῖνοι, δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται are God and Christ; not God alone (Schlichting, Grotius, Cramer, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford), since in this way justice is not done to the plural.—μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ] *receives part in the blessing at the hand of God*, namely, in that its fruitfulness is progressively augmented. Comp. Matt. xiii. 12; John xv. 2. Too weak, Grotius, Wittich: it is praised or commended by God.—ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ] *from God* (as the bestower), is best connected with μεταλαμβάνει, not with εὐλογίας.

Ver. 8. The contrast.—Ἐκφέρουσα] [LVIII *c.*] as to its signification not different from the preceding τίκτουσα. Without justification by usage is it supposed by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Wittich, Valckenaer, Klee, and Bloomfield, that the word is to be taken *in malam partem*, namely, in the sense: "Ejicere quasi abortus."—ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους] *Thorns and thistles.* Proverbial designation of rankly springing weeds and wild growth.[1]—ἀδόκιμος] *sc.* ἐστίν, it fails to stand the test, *is rejected*, namely, *in the judgment of God*, as is self-evident from the ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ in the preceding clause. Wrongly, therefore, Hofmann: it is unworthy to be treated as arable land.—καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς] *and near to the curse, i.e.* not: devoted to the execration of men (Hofmann), but exposed to the peril of being abandoned by God to everlasting barrenness and desolation. Enhancement of ἀδόκιμος. At the same time, however, there is to be found in ἐγγύς a softening of the expression, manifestly with a reference to the fact that it is not yet too late for the readers to combat their lustings after defection, and to return fully into the right way (comp. ver. 9 ff.).[2]—ἧς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν] *sc.* ἐστίν, *and its ultimate fate issues in burning.* ἧς is referred by Camerarius, Abresch, Heinrichs, Stuart, Bleek, to κατάρας; but more correctly by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther, Seb. Schmidt, Bengel, Carpzov, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stengel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 773), Alford, Maier, Kurtz, Ewald, Woerner, and the majority, to the main subject; in such wise that the relative is to be complemented by γῆς, ἐκφερούσης ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους. In connection therewith, however, to take εἶναι εἰς, with Carpzov, Böhme, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Bisping, Maier, and others, as a Hebraism (לִהְיוֹת), is inadmissible. See Winer, p. 173 [E. T. 184.]—The understanding, moreover, of a burning of the field, or of its produce, in order that the land may be improved, as that which is intended by καῦσις (Schlichting, Bloomfield, and others), is forbidden by the connection, since no other than the divine punitive judgment bursting in upon it has to be described. What is meant is the burning up of

[1] Comp. Gen. iii. 18; Hos. x. 8 (קוֹץ וְדַרְדַּר); Matt. vii. 16.

[2] Chrysostom: Βαβαί, πόσην ἔχει παραμυθίαν ὁ λόγος. Κατάρας γὰρ εἶπεν ἐγγύς, οὐ κατάρα· ὁ δὲ μηδέπω εἰς τὴν κατάραν ἐμπεσὼν ἀλλ' ἐγγὺς γενόμενος καὶ μακρὰν γενέσθαι δυνήσεται.

the field itself by fire and brimstone coming down from heaven; by which, *e. g.*, the soil of Sodom and Gomorrah was rendered for ever incapable of tillage (Bleek, Tholuck, Ebrard, Alford, Maier, Moll, *al.*). Comp. Gen. xix. 24; Deut. xxix. 23; also Heb. x. 27: *πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους.*

Ver. 9. [On Vv. 9–12, see Note LIX., pages 552, 553.] Softening of the foregoing warning representation by attestation of the confidence, that this description will not be applicable to the readers.—*Πεπείσμεθα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν*] [LIX *a.*] *But we are convinced in regard to you.* Comp. Rom. xv. 14.—*πεπείσμεθα*] stronger than *πεποίθαμεν.*—*περὶ ὑμῶν*] has the emphasis. It is therefore already placed here, not first after *σωτηρίας.*—The appellation *ἀγαπητοί* only here in the epistle.[1]—*τὰ κρείσσονα*] *of that which is better.* This may refer to the subjective side, but it may also refer to the objective side of the foregoing comparison. In the first case the sense is: that your condition is a better one, than that you should be compared to a land bringing forth thorns and thistles; in the latter case: that your fate will be a better one than curse and perdition. On account of the plural *τὰ κρείσσονα* we shall do best to combine both factors together, as, indeed, the last is but the consequence of the first. When, however, Hofmann thinks that *τὰ κρείσσονα* does not at all point to the foregoing comparison, but stands by itself without any reference, in that it denotes only the good in opposition to the bad, this is not only opposed to the context, but also grammatically false, since the comparative is never placed for the positive. See Winer, p. 227 f. [E. T. 242 f.]—*καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας*] *and of that which stands in contact with salvation, i. e.* that you will attain to salvation. [LIX *b.*] *ἐχόμενον*, with the genitive, denotes that which is closely joined to an object, that which is either outwardly (logically or temporally) or inwardly bound up with it. Instances in Bleek, II. 2, p. 220 ff.—*εἰ καὶ οὕτως λαλοῦμεν*] Chrysostom: *βέλτιον γὰρ ὑμᾶς τοῖς ῥήμασι φοβῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀλγήσητε.*—*οὕτως*] *sc.* as was done vv. 4–8.

Ver. 10. Reason for the good confidence expressed ver. 9. [LIX *c.*]—*οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεός, ἐπιλαθέσθαι*] *for God is not unjust, that He should forget.* God exercises retributive righteousness. Since, then, the readers have performed, and do still perform, actions worthy of Christian recognition, it is to be expected that God will be mindful thereof, and, provided they will only perform their own part fully (comp. vv. 11, 12), will conduct them with His grace and lead them to the possession of salvation. A claim to demand salvation of God, on account of their behavior, is not conceded by the words of ver. 10; only as a factor which God, by virtue of His retributive righteousness, will take into account in connection with the final result, is this brought forward for the consolation and encouragement of the readers; while, moreover, reference is at once made anew, ver. 11 f., to the still unsatisfactory character of their Christian state, and

[1] Schlichting: Apposite eos sic vocat, ne putarent, eum aliquo ipsorum odio laborare, sed ut scirent, eum amore Christiano erga ipsos flagrare, qui amor facit, ut semper meliora ominemur iis, quos amamus, et, si quid severius dicimus, animo corrigendi non nocendi cupido dicamus.

in general to the peril of falling again from their state of grace.—*ἐπιλαθέσθαι*] The infinitive aorist expresses the mere verbal notion, without respect to the relation of time.[1] It is to be taken neither in the sense of a preterite (Seb. Schmidt: ut oblitus sit) nor of a future (Bisping and others).—*τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν*] *your work* (as lying completed), *i.e.* that which you have done. The expression is quite general. A more precise limitation thereof may be found in the following *καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης*, by taking *καί* as the epexegetic "and indeed," "and that." So Peshito, as also Kurtz and Woerner. But since, in any case, the passage x. 32 ff. is to be compared as a real (though not verbal) parallel to the statement ver. 10, and there, in addition to the love displayed, the stedfastness manifested by the readers under persecutions is lauded, it is most natural, with Schlichting, Grotius, and others, to suppose that just to this the general *τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν* in our passage also more especially alluded.—*τῆς ἀγάπης*] [LIX *d.*] has not in itself alone the notion of love "to the brethren," in such wise that *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* would have to be translated: "for His name" (Matt. x. 41, 42, xviii. 20), *i.e.* to His honor (Vulgate: in nomine ejus; Böhme and others: *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ*, Matt. xviii. 5). On the contrary, *τῆς ἀγάπης* acquires its object in the *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, to be construed in relation to *ἧς ἐνεδείξασθε* (not to *διακονήσαντες κ.τ.λ.*, to which Beza was inclined). Thus: *the love which ye have shown to His name* (sc. *God's* name, not *Christ's*, Ernesti and others). This is the more general object, which only then obtains its more special reference and indication of purport by *διακονήσαντες κ.τ.λ.* A love exercised towards Christian brethren, inasmuch as Christians, as God's children, bear the *name* of God.—*διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις*] *in that ye have rendered service to the saints* (the fellow-Christians), have aided them when they were in distress and affliction (not specially: in poverty). But that this was not merely a virtue exercised once for all, but one still continuously exercised, is clearly brought out by the addition *καὶ διακονοῦντες.* [LIX *e.*]

Vv. 11, 12. To that which the author hopes with regard to the readers, he now attaches that which he wishes to see performed by them.—*ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δέ*] [LIX *f.*] *now we long*, most ardently desire. Stronger expression than *θέλομεν* or *βουλόμεθα* [to set one's heart on it, Matt. xiii. 17; Acts xx. 33; 1 Tim. iii. 1, etc.].—*ἕκαστον ὑμῶν*] More emphatic and accentuating than the mere *ὑμᾶς* would be. There is denoted by it, on the one hand, that the heart-felt interest which the author cherishes in the readers extends to every single one of them. On the other hand, there lies in it the thought that if haply single individuals among the readers already correspond to the demand here made, it is still of supreme importance that every one of them should so comport himself as is mentioned.—In the sequel, *τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν* is not in such manner to be taken together with *ἄχρι τέλους* that the main stress should fall upon this, and *πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος* be regarded as a mere subsidiary factor. In connection with this mode of interpretation,[2] the

[1] See Kühner, II. § 445, 2.

[2] Adopted by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Grotius, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, and others.

demand of the author would amount to this, that the readers should manifest the same zeal which, according to ver. 10, they have already displayed, even to the end or in all future time. But in such manner it is assumed that the author has every reason for being satisfied with the Christian condition of the readers, and desires nothing more than a continuance of the same, whereas the whole epistle testifies that the state of things with the Hebrews was very different from this. Hence it is evident that the emphasis rests quite as much upon *πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος* as upon *ἄχρι τέλους*. The thought must thus be: the author longs for the readers to display the same zeal which they have already manifested in regard to an active love, in equal measure also in another relation, namely, in regard to the *πληροφορία κ.τ.λ.*,[1] in connection with which, however, *ἄχρι τέλους* is best taken, not, as is generally the case even with this correct determination of the thought, with *ἐνδείκνυσθαι*, but in close juxtaposition with *πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος*.—*πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἄχρι τέλους*] [LIX *g.*] *in regard to the full certainty of conviction concerning the Christian's hope, unto the end, i. e.* in such manner that ye cherish and preserve to the end the Christian's hope of the Messianic kingdom to be looked for at the coming again of Christ, as a firm confidence of faith, untroubled by any doubts. Comp. iii. 6, 14. Opposite is the wavering conviction that the subject of the Christian hope is one founded in objective truth; the standing still upon the path of Christianity before the goal is reached, and the tendency to fall away again from Christianity and to relapse into Judaism.—*πληροφορία*] We have not,[2] to apprehend in the *active* sense of "perfecting, making full or complete;" but to take it, as everywhere in the N. T. (1 Thess. i. 5; Col. ii. 2; Heb. x. 22; comp. also Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5),[3] in the *passive* sense.—*ἄχρι τέλους*] *unto the end, i. e.* until (at the Parousia of the Lord) hope passes over into the possession [of the kingdom] itself.

Ver. 12. Further prosecution of *πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἄχρι τέλους*, ver. 11.—*ἵνα μὴ νωθροί γένησθε*] *that ye become not sluggish.* The *γένησθε*, pointing to the future, stands in no contradiction with *γεγόνατε* at v. 11. There, the sluggishness of the intellect was spoken of; here, it is sluggishness in the retaining of the Christian hope. There is therefore no need of the conjecture *νόθοι* (after xii. 8) for *νωθροί* (Heinrichs).—*μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομούντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*] *but rather imitators of those who, through faith and perseverance, inherit the promises.* Of the two substantives *πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας*, the latter forms the leading idea; comp. ver. 15, where only *μακροθυμήσας* is placed. *καί* is therefore the more nearly defining "and indeed." Thus: *by faith, and indeed by persevering constancy in the same.*—The *μακροθυμία*, elsewhere usually the divine attribute of long-suffering or forbearance, is likewise predicated

[1] So Bengel, Cramer, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others.

[2] With Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, and others, after the example of the Vulgate: "ad expletionem spei."

[3] With Erasmus, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting,

of men, Col. i. 11; Jas. v. 7, 8, 10; LXX. Isa. lvii. 15 (*ὀλιγοψύχοις δίδοὺς μακροθυμίαν*), and frequently, and in the first-named passage combined with *ὑπομονή* as a synonym.—The *ἐπαγγελίαι* are those given by God in the time of the Old Covenant, which by means of Christianity attain to their full realization. Comp. vii. 6, viii. 6, xi. 13, 17, 33; Rom. ix. 4, xv. 8; 2 Cor. i. 20, vii. 1; Gal. iii. 16. Comp. also the singular *ἡ ἐπαγγελία*, ix. 15, x. 36, xi. 39.—*κληρονομεῖν τὰς ἐπαγγελίας* denotes: *to enter into the heritage of these promises, i. e.* to attain to the enjoyment or possession of the blessings placed in prospect by them. That in our passage (comp. ix. 15, x. 36, xi. 39) *κληρονομεῖν τὰς ἐπαγγελίας* cannot be understood, with Schulz and Bleek, of the mere "receiving of the imparting of the promises as such, apart from their fulfillment," is shown by the very position of the words, according to which the main force of the statement is contained not in *τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*, but in *κληρονομούντων*. Comp. also ver. 15, where for the same reason *ἐπέτυχεν* is placed before the substantive *τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*. Besides, it is also evident from the fact that in such case there would be nothing in ver. 12 to correspond to the conception of the ensuing *possession itself*, indicated as this is in the *ἄχρι τέλους* of ver. 11.—In connection with *τῶν κληρονομούντων* almost all expositors,[1] think of *the patriarchs*, especially Abraham, and of them either alone or with the inclusion of all believers of the New Covenant. This interpretation, however, to which they were without any necessity led by the consideration of ver. 13, is untenable. For, in order to harmonize with it in its first-named form, the writing of *κληρονομησάντων* would have been necessary,—for which, accordingly, many will have the participle present to be taken; to harmonize with it in its last-named form, the writing of *κληρονομησάντων τε καὶ κληρονομούντων* would have been required. The characterizing *οἱ διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομοῦντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας* is, on the contrary, quite a general one, and the participle *present* marks out that which assuredly takes place, or in accordance with a constant and fixed rule (as a rewarding of the fulfilled preliminary condition of *πίστις καὶ μακροθυμία*). The thought is therefore, not that the readers should take the patriarchs as a model, but in general that they should take as such those who manifest persevering constancy in the faith, and, on that very account, beyond doubt attain to the possession of that which is promised.

Vv. 13–15. [On Vv. 13–20, see Note LX., pages 553–555.] Proof of the general truth that stedfast endurance leads to the possession of the promised blessing, from the special instance of Abraham. [LX *a*.] Calvin: exemplum Abrahae adducitur, non quia unicum sit, sed quia prae aliis illustre. —*τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὁ θεός*] *for when God had given promise to Abraham.* [LX *b* 1.] *ἐπαγγειλάμενος* we have, with de Wette, to take as in point of time anterior to *ὤμοσεν*. It has reference to the promises which God had already, Gen. xii. 7, xvii. 5, 6, xviii. 18, imparted to Abraham, and which were then, Gen. xxii. 16–18, not merely repeated to him

[1] Including Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Kluge. Calov, Wolf, Abresch, Heinrichs, Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, and the majority.

by God, and confirmed by an oath, but likewise, in part at least, were fulfilled (see at ver. 15).—ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐδενὸς κ.τ.λ.] *because there was no greater or higher* (οὐδενός, *masculine*, not, as Hofmann supposes, *neuter*), *by whom He could swear, He sware by Himself.* [LX *b* 2.] Relation of the words, LXX. Gen. xxii. 16: κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ ὤμοσα, λέγει κύριος, with the reason for this form of declaration inserted.[1]

Ver. 14. Εἰ μὴν κ.τ.λ.] Adducing of the declaration, Gen. xxii. 17, with the difference, that in the case of the LXX. πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου is in harmony with the original put in place of πληθυνῶ σε. This deviation is not to be explained by the supposition that the author chose σε instead of τὸ σπέρμα σου merely "for brevity's sake" (Jac. Cappellus), or "in order to present the promise in a form as concentrated as possible" (Delitzsch), or that he cited from memory (Abresch), or that he wished to place in the background all thought of the merely physical descendants of Abraham, and direct the glance of the reader exclusively to the spiritual or heavenly posterity of Abraham, which was appointed to him through Christ (Böhme, Bisping, and others). It has its ground simply in the fact that the author was here occupied exclusively with the person of Abraham himself (Bleek, de Wette, Maier).—εἰ μήν] in place of the Greek ἢ μήν, or of the εἰ μή, formed after the Hebrew אִם־לֹא, is met with elsewhere in the LXX. (Ezek. xxxiii. 27, xxxiv. 8, xxxv. 6, xxxvi. 5, *al.*), not, indeed, so far as concerns our passage in the *Cod. Alex.* and *Cod. Vatic.*, but yet in other ancient Mss.; and in any case, our author found it in the copy of the LXX. used by him.—The combination of the participle with the *tempus finitum* of the same verb (εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω κ.τ.λ.) is a well-known Grecising of the Hebrew *infin. absol.*, occurring exceedingly often in the LXX., and serving generally—as here—for the augmented and solemn emphasizing of the idea contained in the verb. See Winer, p. 332 [E. T. 354].

Ver. 15. Καὶ οὕτως] [LX *b* 3.] *and in this way, i. e.* since God on His part had in such manner afforded documentary evidence for the solemnity of His resolve. οὕτως belongs to ἐπέτυχεν. The combining of it with μακροθυμήσας, as is done by Stein, Tholuck,[2] and Bisping, and consequently taking the participle as an epexegesis of οὕτως, is inadmissible, because in that case the μακροθυμία of Abraham in particular must have been spoken of immediately before. The opinion of Delitzsch, however, who is followed by Maier, that "the combination of the two combinations" is "the right one," refutes itself, since it requires that which is logically impossible. —μακροθυμήσας] *because he showed* [or: *had shown*] *persevering steadfastness* (*sc.* in the faith, comp. ver. 12), in particular by the fact that he had just now been so ready at God's behest to sacrifice his son Isaac, although this

[1] Comp. Philo, *Leg. allegor.* iii. 98 E (with Mangey, I. p. 127), where, with regard to the same passage of Scripture, it is said: οὗ καὶ τῷ ὅρκῳ βεβαιώσας τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν. καὶ ὅρκῳ θεοπρεπεῖ. Ὁρᾷς γὰρ ὅτι οὐ καυ' ἑτέρου ὀμνύει θεός—οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ κρεῖττον—ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, ὃς ἐστι πάντων ἄριστος.

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

soon appeared to afford the only hold for the realization of the divine promise.—*ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*] *he obtained the promise, i. e.* the thing [LX *b* 4, 5.] promised, inasmuch, namely, as not only Isaac was given back alive to Abraham, but he further lived to see the time when two sons were born to Isaac (comp. Gen. xxi. 5, xxv. 7, 26), and thus the divine promise was fulfilled in its earlier stage. Not a fulfillment, which Abraham first witnessed in the life beyond the grave (Maier, Hofmann), is intended. Nor have we here to take *ἐπαγγελία*, with Bleek, in the *active* sense [the giving of a promise], and to refer it to the Messianic salvation placed in prospect. For, apart from the consideration that in this case *ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας* would, in relation to *ἐπαγγειλάμενος*, ver. 13, indicate no advance, the emphatically preposed *ἐπέτυχεν* can be understood only of the obtaining possession of the promised object itself. The promise repeated to Abraham, Gen. xxii. 17, 18, presented itself under a twofold point of view. His seed was to be multiplied, and in his seed were all nations of the earth to be blessed. Only the first of these in its earlier stage could Abraham, from the nature of the case, live to see; the fulfillment of the latter was attached to the appearing of Christ upon earth, which was to be looked for in the distant future. The first-named reference obtains ver. 15. The last-named mode of contemplating the subject underlies the *κληρονόμοις τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*, ver. 17. That, too, which we read xi. 13, 39, is spoken from the last-named point of view, on which account there is not to be found in these passages a contradiction of ours.

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

Ver. 16. *Γάρ*] [LX *d* 1.] establishes the *ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐδενὸς κ.τ.λ., ὤμοσεν καθ ἑαυτοῦ*, ver. 13. Not, however, ver. 16 merely (against Hofmann), but the whole paragraph, vv. 16–18, is to be looked upon as an establishing of these words. For ver. 16 is only a lemma, only a preparation for ver. 17 f.; and, indeed, ver. 16 states the practice valid among men with regard to the taking of the oath, while ver. 17 f. there is shown in connection with this the object contemplated by God in His declaration upon oath.—*κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος*] *by the Higher One.* *μείζονος* is not *neuter* (M'Caul: "to a thing that is greater, *e. g.* the temple, the altar;" Hofmann), but *masculine*, and thereby *God* is intended.—With *καί* the second half of the sen-

tence, ver. 16, is closely attached to the first: "and so," "and consequently." To the habitual practice of men just mentioned, the legal relation therefrom arising is joined on.—*πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὁ ὅρκος*] *the oath is to them an end to every kind of* (every conceivable) *contradiction, unto establishment.*[1]—For *ἀντιλογία* as "contradiction"[2] comp. vii. 7, also xii. 3; Jude 11. The signification "dispute," "litigation,"[3] is certainly perfectly warranted by the usage alike of the classical writers (Xen. *Hellen.* vi. 3. 9) as of the LXX. (Ex. xviii. 6, Heb. רָב; Deut. xix. 7, הָרִיב; Prov. xviii. 18, מְרִיבִים, *al.*). But here this meaning is remote from the connection, since ver. 16 serves for the explanation of the trustworthiness of a divine declaration, but not the explanation of a contention between God and men (Bleek). [LX *d* 2.] The meaning "dubitatio," "doubt," assigned to the word by Grotius and Cramer, it never has.—*εἰς βεβαίωσιν*] *unto ratification*, or the creation of an indefeasible claim. Wrongly do Jac. Cappellus, Peirce, Paulus, and others take *εἰς βεβαίωσιν*—which belongs to the whole second clause, not merely to *πέρας* (Böhme, Bleek, Bisping, Alford)—along with *ὁ ὅρκος*: "the oath given in confirmation," which must have been expressed by *ὁ εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὅρκος*.—It results as a necessary inference from ver. 16, that the author did not regard the taking of the oath on the part of men as anything forbidden. Comp. Calvin: Praeterea hic locus docet aliquem inter Christianos jurisjurandi usum esse ligitimum. . . . Nam apostolus certe hic de ratione jurandi tanquam de re pia et Deo probata disserit. Porro non dicit olim fuisse in usu, sed adhuc vigere pronuntiat.

Ver. 17. Ἐν ᾧ] *Upon the basis of which fact, i. e.* in accordance with this human custom, as one valid among men. *ἐν ᾧ*, namely, refers back to the whole contents of ver. 16 (not merely to *ὁ ὅρκος*), and coheres not with *βουλόμενος ἐπιδεῖξαι*,[4] nor yet with the whole clause following,[5] but with *ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ.—περισσότερον*] is to be taken along with *ἐπιδεῖξαι*. It does not, however, signify *unto redundancy*, since this was not at all required (Beza, Schlichting, Seb. Schmidt, Carpzov, Storr, Klee, and others), but: *so much the more*, or: *more emphatically*, than would have been done by the mere imparting of the promise.—*τοῖς κληρονόμοις τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*] *to the heirs of the promise.* By the *κληρονόμοι*, Grotius, Owen, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others understand *the patriarchs as well as all believers;* Tholuck and others, *only the Old Testament saints;* Morus even (notwithstanding the plural), *only Abraham;* Calvin, *the Jews.* But, as is clearly apparent from the elucidatory *ἵνα ἔχωμεν*, ver. 18, only *the Christians* can be meant.—*τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ*] *the unalterable-*

[1] Comp. Philo, *de sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, p. 146 (with Mangey, I. p. 181): Τοῦ τε μὴν πιστευθῆναι χάριν ἀπιστούμενοι καταφεύγουσιν ἐφ' ὅρκον ἄνθρωποι· ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ λέγων πιστός ἐστιν· ὥστε καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ βεβαιότητος ἕνεκα μηδὲν ὅρκων διαφέρειν . . . Οὐ γὰρ δι' ὅρκον πιστὸς ὁ θεός, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτὸν καὶ ὁ ὅρκος βέβαιος.

[2] Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Woerner.

[3] Assumed by Theophylact, Erasmus, Zeger, Cameron, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Heinrichs, Böhme, Stengel, and the majority.

[4] Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Rambach, Hofmann, *al.*

[5] Delitzsch, Alford.

ness of His decree, namely, to make all believers blessed through the seed of Abraham. [LX *d* 3.] Arbitrarily, because to the violent setting aside of the nearest circle of thought furnished by the context itself, Abresch (and similarly Michaelis, Storr, and Delitzsch): "crediderim, non juratam eam promissionem spectari, quam Abrahamo factam in superioribus dixerat, sed illud nominatim jusjurandum, quo Christus sit pontifex creatus ad Melchisedeci rationem" (Ps. cx. 4). Neither ver. 20, nor vii. 1 ff., nor vii. 20, 21, 28, nor v. 10, contains a justification of this view.—The substantively employed adjective brings out the idea of the unchangeableness, about the accentuation of which the author was here principally concerned, more emphatically than if *τὴν βουλὴν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀμετάθετον* had been written.—*ἀμετάθετος* in the N. T. only here and at ver. 18.—*ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ*] *He came forward, as an intervening person, with an oath.* As an intermediate person, *sc.* between Himself and Abraham. Men swear by God, because He is higher than they. Thus, in the case of an oath among men, God is the higher middle person [so *μεσίτης*, Josephus, *Antiq.* iv. 6. 7], or the higher surety, for the fulfillment of the promise. But when *God* takes an oath He can only swear by Himself, since there is no higher one above Him, and thus only Himself undertakes the part of the surety or middle person. *μεσιτεύειν*, in the N. T. only here, is employed transitively and intransitively; in the latter sense here. It is taken transitively by Oecumenius, who supplements *τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν*; and Böhme, who supplements *τὴν βουλήν*.

Ver. 18. Indication of purpose to *ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ*, ver. 17, and consequently parallel to the participial clause there, *περισσότερον βουλόμενος ἐπιδ. τοῖς κληρονόμ. τῆς ἐπ. τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ*, but no mere repetition of the same, since the divine purpose, which was there presented purely objectively in relation to Christians, is now subjectively turned in relation to them.—*διὰ δύο πραγμάτων ἀμεταθέτων*] *by virtue of two unalterable facts*, namely, by virtue of the promise and the oath. Against the connection (comp. vv. 13, 17) Reuss: l'une de ces choses c'est la parole évangélique apportée par Christ, l'autre le serment typique donné à Abraham.—*δύο*] See Winer, p. 63 [E. T. 64]; Buttmann, p. 25 [E. T. 28].—*ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι θεόν*] *in which* (*i. e.* in connection with their fulfillment) *it is impossible that God should have lied* (deceived). For God is faithful. His bare word is trustworthy; how much more thus when He confirms it by an oath! To supply a *ἡμᾶς* to *ψεύσασθαι* (Heinrichs) is inadmissible.—*παράκλησιν*] not "consolation,"[1] but, as the hortatory tendency of our whole section requires: *encouragement*.[2]—Upon *παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν*, not upon *οἱ καταφυγόντες*,[3] does *κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος* depend; so that

[1] Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Böhme, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, and the majority.

[2] Oecumenius, Theophylact, Estius, Semler, Carpzov, Stuart, Bleek, Tholuck, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others.

[3] Primasius, Erasmus, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Akersloot, Wolf, Carpzov, Abresch, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, de Wette, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 749), Alford, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, and many others.

οἱ καταφυγόντες is to be taken[1] *absolutely.* [LX *d* 4.] οἱ καταφυγόντες] *those who have fled,* with the subordinate notion of having found refuge, thus *the sheltered, saved ones.* As regards the sense, the expression is to be thus filled up: we who have fled *out of* the sinful world, and have fled *to* God. As an analogon is compared οἱ σωζόμενοι (Acts ii. 47, *al.*).—κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος] *to hold fast*[2] *to the hope lying in readiness.* To interpret κρατῆσαι as "to lay hold,"[3] with a right combining with παράκλησιν, is forbidden by the connection; comp. ver. 11, according to which the readers already possess the ἐλπίς, but not as yet any πληροφορία thereof; comp. further the διὰ μακροθυμίας, ver. 12, and μακροθυμήσας, ver. 15.—τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος [LX *d* 5.] is not the same thing as τῆς ἐλπίδος τῶν προκειμένων, "to the hope of the blessings of salvation which lie before us, which await us,"[4] in such wise that a mingling of the objective notion of ἐλπίς with the subjective notion thereof would have to be assumed. Still less are we at liberty[5] to interpret ἐλπίς in itself alone as "res sperata" (comp. Col. i. 5). On the contrary, ver. 19 points to the Christian hope in the *subjective* sense. As προκειμένη, however, *lying at hand,* or existing in readiness, this is characterized, since it is already infused into the Christians, has already been communicated to them as a blessing for possession, with their reception of Christianity.

Ver. 19. Description of the absolute certainty of this Christian hope.—ἣν] *sc.* ἐλπίδα. The referring back to παράκλησιν (Grotius and others) is possible only in connection with the erroneous interpretation of this word as "solatium," whereas, with the right apprehension of ver. 18, παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν serves for the mere introduction of κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος; ἣν thus most naturally links itself with ἐλπίδος as the last preceding leading thought. To this must be added the consideration that frequently also elsewhere in antiquity—though nowhere else in Holy Scripture—the anchor is already employed as a figure of hope, and appears also upon coins as a symbol theoreof.[6] ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς] *which we possess even as an anchor of the soul, i. e.* in which we possess, as it were, an anchor of the soul, which affords it support and protection against the storms and perils of the earthly life.—There exists no good reason for making ἐ χειν equivalent to κατέχειν,[7]—ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην κ.τ.λ.] *which* (*sc.* anchor) *is sure and firm, and reaches into the interior of the veil.* Wrongly does Carpzov (and so also Reuss) construe all these words with ἣν (*sc.* ἐλπίδα). For, in order to render this possible, ἔχομεν must have received its place only after τῆς ψυχῆς, in such wise that ὡς ἄγκυραν τῆς ψυχῆς should admit of being separated by commas from that which precedes and follows. Equally inadmissible is it, however, when Abresch, Böhme,

[1] With Oecumenius, Camerarius, Cameron, Seb. Schmidt, Heinrichs, Bleek, Maier, Hofmann, and others.

[2] Luther, Schulz, Stuart, Bleek, Conybeare, Maier, Moll, Hofmann, and others.

[3] Wolf, Tholuck, de Wette, Alford, Kurtz, Ewald, *al.*

[4] Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Maier.

[5] With Grotius, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Peirce, Limborch, Heinrichs, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Bloomfield, Alford, Hofmann, and others.

[6] See Wetstein, Kypke, and Kuinoel *ad loc.*

[7] Abresch, Dindorf, Bloomfield, and others.

Bleek, Bloomfield, and others take only *ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν* along with *ἀγκυραν*, and then refer back *εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος* to *ἣν* (*sc. ἐλπίδα*). For although the figure of an anchor reaching on high, instead of penetrating into the depths, is an incongruous one, yet metaphors are never to be pressed, and in our passage the choice of the expression *εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον* points to the retention of the figure of the anchor, as well as the closely uniting *τε . . . καὶ . . . καί* to the intimate coherence of the three characteristics.—*καταπέτασμα*] [LX *d* 6.] with the LXX. *usually* (Ex. xxvi. 31–35, xxvii. 21; Lev. xxi. 23, xxiv. 3; Num. iv. 5, *al.*), in the N. T. *always* (x. 20; Matt. xxvii. 51; Mark xv. 38; Luke xxiii. 45) of the *second* (ix. 3), or innermost curtain of the temple, the curtain before the Most Holy Place (הַפָּרֹכֶת).[1]—*τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος*] *the interior of the veil, i. e.* that which is the interior with respect to the veil, or exists *within* the same, thus *behind* it. Designation of the Most Holy Place. Comp. Ex. xxvi. 33; Lev. xvi. 2, 12, 15. The Most Holy Place is spoken of as a symbol of heaven, where God is enthroned in His glory, and at His right hand is enthroned the exalted Christ.

Ver. 20. Close of the digression made from v. 11 onwards, and apt return to v. 10.—*ὅπου*] *whither.* Inexact, as Luke ix. 57, John viii. 21 f., and often, instead of the *ὅποι*, which is never used in the N. T. (see Winer, p. 439 [E. T. 472]); yet more significant than the latter, since it contains, in addition to the notion of *having entered*, the additional notion of *remaining.*—*πρόδρομος*] *as harbinger.* The expression, in the N. T. only here, characterizes Christ as the first member in a series, thus glances at the fact that those who believe in Him shall attain to the Most Holy Place. Comp. John xiv. 2, 3.—*ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*] *in our interest*, or *for our eternal welfare*, namely, to obtain pardon for us (ix. 12), to represent us in the presence of God (ix. 24), and to open up for us an entrance into heaven itself (x. 19 f.). *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* is to be construed, not with *πρόδρομος* (Heinrichs, Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, and others), but (as already the Peshito) with *εἰσῆλθεν.*—In that which follows the emphasis rests upon *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν* Μελχισεδέκ (Böhme, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Hofmann), which on that account is preposed; not upon *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (Bleek, Woerner), which latter, on the contrary, as an additional note of definition is derived only from the *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν* Μελχισ.

[1] Comp. also Philo, *de vita Mosis*, iii. p. 669 B (with Mangey, II. p. 150): *ἐν δὲ τῷ μεθορίῳ τῶν τεττάρων καὶ πέντε κιόνων, ὅπερ ἐστὶ κυρίως εἰπεῖν πρόναον, εἰργόμενον δυσὶν ὑφάσμασι, τὸ μὲν ἔνδον ὃν καλεῖται καταπέτασμα, τὸ δ' ἐκτὸς προσαγορεύεται κάλυμμα. Ibid.* p. 667 C (II. p. 148): *ἐκ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν τό τε κατα πέτασμα καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον κάλυμμα κατεσκευάζετο· τὸ μὲν εἴσω κατὰ τοὺς τέσσαρας κίονας, ὧν ἐπικρύπτηται τὸ ἄδυτον· τὸ δ' ἔξω κατὰ τοὺς πέντε κ.τ.λ.*

Notes by American Editor.

LVII. Vv. 1–3.

(*a*) The question which is suggested by Lünem., at the beginning of his note on these verses, is one respecting which the most able scholars have taken opposite sides. The possibility of both explanations should be acknowledged, and the considerations on both sides should be fairly presented and weighed. In favor of the view, which makes the verses contain an exhortation to the readers to press forward in their Christian life to higher things, the following arguments may be urged. 1. The special point of vv. 12–14 is the fact, that the readers have not advanced as they should have done. The exhortation, that they should now move onward, is the most natural thing to follow. 2. The word used to describe the condition in which the readers now are, is *νήπιοι*; that in which they should be, is *τέλεοι*. It was more natural, it would seem, to exhort them to press on to *τελειότης*, than to propose to go on himself, while they were yet *νήπιοι*, to discuss a theme appropriate to those who had become *τέλειοι*. 3. The thought presented in vv. 4–6 is that of the danger which threatened, in case the readers should fall away from their Christian position, and the fact of this danger is made a reason for what is said in vv. 1–3. But this fact is not adapted to such a purpose, if those verses merely set forth a proposal to treat of the Melchisedek priesthood, rather than repentance, while it is peculiarly fitted to be a ground of moral exhortation to the readers. 4. The illustration drawn from productive and unproductive land in vv. 7, 8, can only be applied to growth in character and progress in Christian development. 5. When the writer proceeds to speak hopefully of the readers, in vv. 9 ff., he refers to their faith and love, and urges them to press on in hope. 6. In addition to these points belonging to the detail of the chapter, there is another consideration of great weight, which seems to the writer of this note almost decisive—namely, the fact that ch. vi., as stated in Note LVI *i*, contains the *common exhortation* of the epistle—not to apostatize, but to go forward—as *founded upon the present portion of the argument* (Christ's Mel. priesthood). This common exhortation of the epistle, however, is *always addressed to the readers*, and *has reference to their moral life*.

The arguments in favor of the other view are, 1. that *ποιήσομεν* of ver. 3 is quite appropriate as a statement that the author will proceed to discuss the higher theme, but seems unsuitable, and not to be expected, if the reference is to an exhortation to grow in Christian life, addressed to those who were still *νήπιοι* when they ought to be *τέλειοι*. This is the strongest point on this side of the question. Lünem., indeed, defends the reading *ποιήσωμεν*. But, in the first place, this reading has the majority of the best authorities against it, and is rejected by Tisch., Treg., Lachm., W. and H.: and, in the second place, even if the subjunctive be read, such a peculiar repetition of the exhortation appears antecedently improbable. 2. The words *καταβαλλόμενοι κ.τ.λ.*, present a certain difficulty as connected with making the words a moral exhortation, for these persons had already begun the Christian life, and had thus already laid the foundation, and vv. 4–6 seem to indicate that the writer was not contemplating a second beginning. On the other hand, if vv. 1, 2 are applied to a discourse upon higher subjects, as distinguished from lower, this participle might easily be used. 3. Although the thought of vv. 12–14 is of Christian development, there is a

special reference in those verses to the difficulty resulting from the *νήπιος* condition in the matter of apprehending the higher truths, and the whole passage is introduced by, and subordinate to, a declaration as to the difficulty of unfolding the subject of the Melchisedek priesthood.

(*b*) With reference to individual words and phrases in these verses, it may be remarked:—1. *διό* refers to the verses which immediately precede. If *φερώμεθα κ.τ.λ.*, is a moral exhortation, *διό* refers to the fact that the readers have not progressed in their Christian life as far as they ought, considering the time which had elapsed since their conversion. If *φερ.* is a word expressing the desire and purpose of the writer to discuss the higher subjects, *διό* apparently has reference to the fitness that the Christian, who has been long in the new life, should turn his thoughts to these things.—2. *ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων.* The word *νεκρά* here and in ix. 14 is best explained by deW. and Thol., as "die nicht aus rechter Lebenskraft hervorgegangen sind." This view corresponds with that of Bleek, Alford: "dead i. e. devoid of life and power," and others. Grimm says, *vi et fructu carentia.* Lünem.; *in themselves vain and fruitless.*—3. That the view of Lünem., respecting *βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς* is correct, is rendered probable by the fact that baptism is everywhere connected with faith, as belonging to the beginning of the Christian life, and by the fact that, as the whole Christian course moves in the sphere of teaching (comp., *διδάσκαλοι, διδάσκειν*, v. 12), it is improbable that the writer would speak of teaching, or of the baptism of teaching, as one of the elementary things. His view with respect to the reference of *ἐπιθέσεως χειρῶν* to the laying on of hands which was connected with reception into the full communion of the church, and the dependence of this and the following genitive phrases, as well as of *βαπτισμῶν*, on *διδαχῆς*, is, also, to be accepted.—4. If we read *ποιήσομεν* in ver. 3, and consider ver. 1 as containing a moral exhortation, we must regard the author as adding to his exhortation an expression of confidence—in some measure kindred to that in vv. 9 ff.—that the readers will press forward. The sentence, however, becomes parenthetical under these circumstances, for *γάρ* of ver. 4 must be connected with the exhortation. If we read *ποιήσωμεν*, this verb is a repetition, in substance, of *φερώμεθα*. The *ἐάνπερ* clause is better adapted to the future *ποιήσομεν*, and it must be admitted that it favors the application of *ποιῆς*, to the writer's purpose with reference to his own discourse.

LVIII. Vv. 4–8.

(*a*) With respect to these verses the following points may be noticed. 1. The emphatic expressions which are used and the repetition of substantially the same idea under so many forms—once enlightened, tasted of the heavenly gift, made partakers of the Holy Spirit, tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come—prove that the writer had in mind persons who had actually entered upon the Christian life. 2. He supposes the case of the falling away of such persons. 3. He says that, if they fall away, it is impossible to renew them again to repentance. 4. The illustration given in vv. 7, 8 must be regarded as conveying the author's meaning in the verses which it is intended to illustrate. 5. The kindred passage x. 26, 27, is so similar in its thought to the present verses, that it may be properly regarded as further expressing the writer's idea of the subject presented.

The points thus mentioned may suggest certain conclusions, or possible inferences. 1. As to the bearing of the passage on the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints—it must be admitted that it cannot be cited among the proof-texts establishing that doctrine. Whether it can be reconciled with the doctrine, as applying to all actual cases of those who become Christians, will depend on the question whether the writer means to present the matter only in a hypothetical way, or to convey the idea that there are instances in which apostasy really occurs. The determination of the probabilities in respect to this question may, perhaps, both justify and require the examination of passages which are to be found in other parts of the N. T. 2. As to the question whether the persons here alluded to are those who commit the sin against the Holy Ghost, it may be remarked (*x*) that the sin against the Holy Ghost, so far as the indications of the passages in the Gospels, where it is mentioned, are concerned, involves a bitter hostility to Jesus (as indicated by the Pharisees' charge, that He cast out the demons by Beelzebub), which is not clearly set forth, either here, or even in x. 26, 27; (*y*) that that sin is spoken of in the N. T. as committed by persons who were not Christians; and (unless the sin πρὸς θάνατον, 1 John v. 16, is to be understood as meaning this, which is, to say the least, open to question) is spoken of *only* as committed by such persons; (*z*) that the purpose for which, apparently, the writer introduces these verses—namely, to warn the readers against falling by pointing to the dangers consequent upon it—makes it probable, that he intended to present the case of those who fell *as they were themselves likely to fall*, unless they arrested their course; whereas he does not intimate that they were moving on in a heaven-daring way, but rather were allowing themselves to drift away from the truth by carelessness and neglect, or by an over-estimate of the Jewish system. So far as the illustration in vv. 7, 8 goes, it may be added, the non-production of fruit is placed in a parallelism with falling away.—3. With regard to the word ἀδύνατον, two suggestions may be offered:—(*x*) The corresponding passage in the tenth chapter says: "there remains no longer a sacrifice for sins," which seems to mean, that there is no other and further *provision* for redemption. (*y*) There would seem to be an antecedent improbability that a man who falls away, should be placed absolutely beyond the power of regaining the blessing by renewed repentance and faith. In view of these two considerations, the question may be raised whether the writer does not mean by ἀδύνατον simply what he means by the words in x. 26, and whether his thought, in both cases, is not, that, if the way which Christ has opened is left, no other way except or beyond this will open. The suggestion of punishment which both passages distinctly present must be borne in mind, however, in the consideration of such points.

(*b*) The several phrases, φωτισθέντας κ.τ.λ., have apparently the same general purpose, and present the same general idea under different forms. With respect to two of these phrases, it may be remarked that δωρεά apparently means the gift of grace (comp. Rom. v. 15. 17), and that the δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος are the miraculous spiritual gifts, or powers, of every kind, which belonged to the Christian dispensation as the readers knew it. The expression αἰὼν μέλλων is very probably used, because it had already been spoken of as the age or world of Christ and His people, in ii. 5.—(*c*) The words γῆ ἡ πιοῦσα .... νέτόν, καί of ver. 7 are, doubtless, to be supplied in thought before ἐκόερουσα of ver. 8. It was the land which had experienced the gifts of God (the abundant rain) and yet brought forth only thorns and thistles, which was cursed.

LIX. Vv. 9–12.

(*a*) δέ of ver. 9 is *however*—the turn of the thought, at this point, being in the line of correcting a possible misapprehension: In saying this which I have said of those who fall away, I do not mean that you are of this number and are to meet their fate.—(*b*) It will be noticed that κρείσσονα and ἐχόμενα are united under one article. They refer, therefore, to the same things, which are described as both better and pertaining to salvation. This common reference of the two—the latter evidently designating the future reward—and the fact that the thought of the preceding verses, with which this verse is immediately connected, is of the fate awaiting those who fall, prove that the writer is speaking in these words only of the *objective* side, as Lünem calls it, not of the *subjective* side, of the heavenly reward, i. e., not of character and life. The καί which unites the two words is like the καί which we sometimes find in Paul's writings, adding a more specific to a more general word, and answering to our expression *that is to say*: "Things that are better and, to explain the word more definitely, pertain to salvation. I am persuaded that you will not be rejected, but saved." The rendering of A. V., and R. V., may possibly lead the reader to suppose that the writer had two different classes of things in mind.—(*c*) γάρ of ver. 10 introduces, as the ground of the writer's confidence, that his readers will attain the reward of salvation, the fact that God is righteous. It is evident, however, that the righteousness of God is not here referred to as suggesting the idea of salvation by works; for the doctrine of this author, as truly as that of Paul, is, that men are saved by faith. The reference must be to the fact that God, having promised to reward those who believe for their Christian living and action, will not unrighteously fail to fulfill His word. Were He to forget their work and love, it would, in view of His promise, be unrighteous. The words δίκαιος and ἄδικος are to be understood, generally, in the N. T., in the sense of *righteous* and *unrighteous*, rather than of *just* and *unjust*. The latter word is used in the same larger sense here, involving the idea of not being conformed to right i. e. to what one ought to be or do; but in the connection there is, apparently, a suggestion of the thought of a kind of injustice in relation to those who had depended on His promise.—(*d*) The τοῦ κόπου of T. R., which precedes τῆς ἀγάπης is undoubtedly to be omitted, and the latter expression is added by καί in τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν for the purpose of bringing out distinctly the relation which the work had to God—it was an exhibition of love towards Him, (hence the words ἐνεδείξασθε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ). To forget the ἔργον, therefore, would involve an unrighteousness on the part of God—a failure to do what His promise to His people bound Him to do. Comp. also ver. 13 ff.—(*e*) The work, which was the manifestation of love to God, consisted in their past and present rendering of service to their fellow-Christians. The representation, which is frequently made to the N. T., of God and Christ as experiencing or feeling what is experienced or felt by believers, is found in this passage; and in connection with such passages as this, we may get some light with respect to the interpretation of statements like those in Col. i. 24. See notes on that passage.—(*f*) δέ of ver. 11 is not, apparently *now*, as Lünem. renders it, nor *and*, as in R. V.; but it has somewhat of adversative force, as suggesting that, while they had done well in the line of love, there was another line in which they had not yet as faithfully fulfilled the duty of the Christian life. In connection with this movement of the thought, it becomes plain that by *the same zeal* or *diligence* the writer means the same which

they had shown in the line of love and work. The other line, in which he would have them press forward, was that of hope and stedfast endurance.—(*g*) πρός, *with a view to*, as looking towards, the full assurance of hope. The question whether πληροφορία means *full assurance* or *fullness* arises in every passage where the word occurs. The indications of this Epistle, in its general thought, seem to favor the former meaning, for we are led by these indications to the conclusion that the persons addressed were losing confidence in the Christian system, in their Christian faith and hope, and that the writer desired them to gain full assurance, and not to fall entirely away. On the general question as to this word, the notes of Bleek on this passage, and Lightfoot on Col. ii. 2 may be compared.—(*h*) that μακροθυμία of ver. 12, and μακροθυμήσας of ver. 15 have a sense kindred to that which is elsewhere expressed, in the substantive form, by ὑπομονή, is made evident by the demands of the passage.

LX. Vv. 13–20.

(*a*) The writer, by way of encouragement to the readers to yield to his exhortation, gives in these verses two facts, on the ground of which they may have confidence that, if they stedfastly endure, they will receive the promised reward. These facts are both derived from the O. T., as his proofs throughout the entire epistle rest upon these older writings to which, as they were looking towards Judaism, the readers were turning with a renewal of their early trust. They are, 1. The experience of Abraham—he patiently endured and in consequence thereof obtained the promise (vv. 13-15); and 2. The oath of God, which was added to His promise (vv. 16–20).

It will be noticed that, in the development of the thought, these two things are united in vv. 13–15. In a letter so truly Pauline in many of its characteristics, it is natural that there should be such an intermingling of the two, since the promise which included the oath was given to Abraham, and the author's wish was evidently to make an historical reference to Abraham's case. But it will, also, be noticed by the careful reader, that the emphasis in vv. 13–15 is laid upon the statement of the 15th verse, and that, while the oath is alluded to in vv. 13, 14, the development of the thought respecting it, as bearing upon the point in discussion, is found wholly in vv. 16–20. There can be little doubt, therefore, that the writer intended, in his argument, to make these two points co-ordinate, and to present each with its independent force. If the arrangement of the verses had corresponded precisely with the movement of the leading thoughts, the order would have been ver. 13 *a*, ver. 15, and then v. 13 *b*, 14, united with ver. 16 ff.—the construction of the sentences being slightly changed by reason of the change of order.

(*b*) With reference to the individual words and phrases, the following points may be noticed:—1. The purpose of the argument, as indicated above, accounts for the emphatic position of Ἀβραάμ in ver. 13. The case of Abraham is selected, both because the promise was made to him and, also, because of the fact, on the ground of which Paul, in his epistles, carries back his O. T. arguments to Abraham's history, namely, that he was the one with whom the old covenant was made, and the one on whom the Jews fixed their thoughts.—2. The adding of the oath to the promise is suggested in this first statement; and, as Lünem. remarks, the aorist participle ἐπαγγειλάμενος is to be accounted for in this way:

after He had promised, (Gen. xii, xvii, xviii), God confirmed the promise by an oath (Gen. xxii. 16, 17, the passage here cited).—3. *οὕτω* refers to the fact stated in vv. 13 *b*. 14, and thus is one of the words which belong to the arrangement adopted by the author, as indicated above.—4. The "obtaining" alluded to in ver. 15 is best explained as that which Abraham actually realized, but which is viewed, not simply in itself, but in its foreshadowing and assurance of the future.—5. *μακροθυμήσας* signifies that the *μακροθυμία* was both antecedent to and, in one sense, the cause of the "obtaining."—6. *ἡ ἐπαγγελία* in this place (ver. 15), as also in ix. 15, x. 36, xi. 13, etc., has the sense of *the fulfillment of the promise*. Comp. Gal. iii. 14 and some other passages.

(*c*) The object of vv. 16–20 *a*, is evidently to show that the oath of God insures absolute certainty of the result. The development of the thought here involves five points:—1. With men an oath is the highest and final thing in the way of confirming what they say. 2. The force of the oath lies in the fact that it is sworn by the one greater than themselves i. e. by God. 3. God, in order to give the strongest emphasis to His promise, adopts the same course with men; He gives His oath, and, as He is Himself the greater one, He swears by Himself. 4. Those who lay hold of the hope which God has revealed, have, therefore, two things on which to rest, the promise and the oath, both of which are immutable, and in both of which there can be no falsehood. Their hope, therefore, will be to them as an anchor to the soul. 5. And since this is a hope entering within the veil, Jesus—who, as leading the sons of God to glory, has, first among them all, been crowned (ch. ii)—has, also, as their forerunner passed within the veil, in His priestly character, for these and on their behalf. Thus naturally and easily the line of the discourse is brought once more to the priesthood; the digression v. 11–14, which passed into the common exhortation vi. 1 ff., is brought to its close; and with the words of ver. 20 *b*, which repeat very nearly those of v. 10, the subject of Christ's Melchisedek-priesthood is again set forth. Chap. vii then proceeds with the discussion of this subject.

(*d*) As to the words and phrases in vv. 16–20, we may remark:—1. *γάρ* of ver. 16 belongs, in thought with ver. 13 *b*, and like *οὕτω* of ver. 15, might probably have been omitted or changed for some other construction, had the arrangement of the sentences been according to the succession of the main thoughts.—2. R. V. renders *ἀντιλογίας* (ver. 16) *dispute*, but the suggestion of Bleek quoted by Lünem., that the context points, not to a contention between God and man, but to the trustworthiness of a divine declaration, is of much force, and it seems quite probable that the word here means *contradiction*. Dr. Angus, in Schaff's Pop. Comm., gives the sentence thus: "and for confirmation, when any statement of theirs is contradicted, the oath is final."—3. Lünem. regards *βουλῆς* (ver. 17) as meaning God's *decree* to make all believers blessed through the seed of Abraham. This may, not improbably, be the correct view, but it may be that the word has a somewhat more general meaning—*will* or *counsel*, in general.—4. The construction of *κρατῆσαι* (ver. 18) is uncertain. But as it may depend on *καταφυγόντες*; as the phrase *οἱ καταφυγόντες* seems to call for some word which may complete its idea; and as *παράκλησιν*, if it means *consolation*, does not require any such additional word, or, on the other hand, if it means *encouragement*, may find one easily in the thought of the *κρατῆσαι* already introduced with *οἱ κατ.*, it is probable that the author intended to connect it with the participle.—5. *ἐλπίς* of ver. 18 is, apparently, to be taken in the subjective sense:—hope which

the Christian may have in his soul, rather than the objective:—the thing hoped for, because of the descriptive words in ver. 19 which characterize the former. This subjective hope, however, is viewed, as faith is sometimes viewed in the Pauline Epistles, in an objective light, and is thus made dependent on the verb *κρατῆσαι*. Thus, also, it has the participle *προκειμένης* united with it—it is said to be set before us as something which we may lay hold of. This view of *ἐλπίς* satisfies the demands of the entire sentence of vv. 18, 19 better than that of Lünem., who makes the hope merely subjective, and gives to *προκειμ.*, the meaning *lying at hand*, or that of Alford and others, who regard it as equivalent to *the thing hoped for*, or even that of Bleek, deW., Thol., and others, who consider the meaning to be *the hope of the things which lie before us*, *τῆς ἐλπίδος τῶν προκειμένων*.—6. The closing words of ver. 19, which are descriptive of the hope viewed under the figure of an anchor, easily lead to those of ver. 20 and, in connection with the latter, form the transition to ch. vii. With *τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος* the more particular reference of the writer's language to the old tabernacle begins, and, by these words and *πρόδρομος*, he shows that he is now passing from the thoughts of the earlier section of the epistle (ch. ii. etc.) to those of the later part.

CHAPTER VII.

VER. 1. Instead of *τοῦ ὑψίστου*, Elz. has only *ὑψίστου*. Against A B C D E K L ℵ, 23, 44, 46, 48, *al. pl.*, Clem. Chrys. Theodoret, *al. mult.*—*ὁ συναντήσας*] Lachm. and Alford, after A B C (corr.) D E K ℵ, 17, 117, *al.*: *ὃς συναντήσας*. Notwithstanding the strong support of authorities, manifest error, arising from the reading together of the article and the initial letter of the participle.—Ver. 4. Instead of the *Receptа ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην*, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 read, after B D* E* Vulg. (Amiatin. Toletan.) It. Copt. Basm. Syr., merely *ᾧ δεκάτην*. Certainly *καί* is not indispensable, and might be regarded as a later gloss from ver. 2. But with quite as much probability it may be supposed that it was added by the author himself, the words of ver. 2 being still present to his mind. It is therefore, since it has in its favor the considerable attestation by A C D*** E** K L ℵ, by, as it appears, all the cursives, by the Vulgate (also Demidov. and Harlej.), Syr. Philonex. *al.*, by Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. *al.*, Aug. Bede, with Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Alford, to be retained.—Ver. 6. The article *τόν* before *Ἀβραάμ* is deleted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, and Alford, after B C D* ℵ* 23, 57, 109, *al.* In favor of the omission pleads the very sparing use made of the article before proper names in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the article as a rule being placed only where, as in xi. 17, the perspicuity of the discourse imperatively demanded it.—Ver. 9. In place of the received *Λευΐ* we have here, with Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 2, to write *Λευΐς*, after A (*λευις*) B C* ℵ*** (*λευεις*). In the ed. vii. and viii. Tisch. writes: *Λευΐς*.—Ver. 10. Elz.: *ὁ Μελχισεδέκ*. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, Alford, after B C* D* ℵ, 73, 118, *al.*, Chrys.: *Μελχισεδέκ*. The rejection of the article is to be approved on the same grounds as in ver. 6.—Ver. 11. The *Receptа ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομοθέτητο* (defended by Reiche) has decisive witnesses against it. Instead of *ἐπ' αὐτῇ* is *ἐπ' αὐτῆς* (approved by Grotius, placed on the inner margin by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford), required by A B C D* E* ℵ, 17, 31, 46, *al.*, Cyril; instead of *νενομοθέτητο* is *νενομοθέτηται* (already approved by Camerarius and Grotius, adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford), required byA B C D* ℵ, 17, 47, 73, *al.*, Cyril.—Ver. 13. *προσέσχηκεν*] Tisch. 1, after A C, 17, *al.*: *προσέσχεν*. Commended to notice by Griesb. also. Rightly, however, do Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche (*Commentar. crit.* p. 56, note 9), prefer the *Receptа προσέσχηκεν*. In favor of this pleads, besides the yet stronger attestation (B D E K L ℵ, Oecum. *al.*), the paronomasia with *μετέσχηκεν*, consonant with the style of the Epistle to the Hebrews.—Ver. 14. Elz.: *οὐδὲν περὶ ἱερωσύνης*. But A B C* D* E ℵ, 17, 47, *al.*, It. Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Cyr. Chrys. (codd.) have: *περὶ ἱερέων οὐδέν*. Rightly adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford. *περὶ ἱερωσύνης* is a glossematic elucidation.—Ver. 16. Instead of the *Receptа σαρκικῆς*, Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford have adopted *σαρκίνης*, after A B C* D* L ℵ (also H in the title), many min. and Fathers. Rightly, *σαρκίνης* might easily be changed into *σαρκικῆς* by transcribers,

since σαρκικός is an adjective of very frequent recurrence in the N. T., σάρκινος a rare one.—Ver. 17. μαρτυρεῖται] Elz.: μαρτυρεῖ. Against preponderating testimony (A B D* E* ℵ, 17, 31, *al.*, Copt. Sahid. Basm. Slav. Cyr. Chrys. Theophyl.).—Ver. 21. After αἰῶνα Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Lachm. Bloomfield, Reiche add once more: κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ. Deleted by Bleek, Tisch. and Alford, after B C, 17, 80, Vulg. Sahid. Basm. Arm. Ambr. (?) Bede. Rejected also by Delitzsch. But without sufficient ground. For the words are found in A D E K L ℵ*** It. Syr. utr. Copt. *al.*, with Chrys. Theodoret, *al.*, and the omission of them is to be explained by the fact that immediately after the same (ver. 22) the discourse is continued afresh with κατά; the eye of the transcriber might thus easily wander from the first κατά to the second κατά. Also for ℵ* there was found in the twofold κατά the occasion for overlooking not only κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, but in addition to this likewise εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.—Ver. 22. τοσοῦτον]. So Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomfield. But the weighty authority of A B C D* ℵ* Athan. (cod.) *al.* decides in favor of the form of the word preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, τοσοῦτο.—Ver. 23. *Recepta:* γεγονότες ἱερεῖς. So also Tisch. 2, 7, and 8. As better attested, however (A C D E, Cyr. [twice] Chrys. [ms.]), the order of words: ἱερεῖς γεγονότες, is to be preferred, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, Delitzsch, and Alford.—Ver. 26. Elz.: ἔπρεπεν. More correctly, however, Griesb. Lachm. Bleek, Scholz (?), Tisch. and Alford, after A B D E, Syr. utr. Arab. Erp. Euseb.: καὶ ἔπρεπεν.

Vv. 1–10.[1] While the author now in reality passes over to the work of developing the high-priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec, proper to Christ, and consequently of illustrating upon every side the pre-eminence of the same above the Levitical high-priesthood, he dwells first of all upon the person of Melchisedec himself, in that, following the thread of the Scripture narrative, he brings vividly before his readers the exaltedness of Melchisedec's position, and draws their attention to a threefold superiority of Melchisedec over the Levitical priests. [On Vv. 1–3, see Note LXI., pages 577–579.]

Vv. 1–3. [LXI *a.*] Elucidation of κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, vi. 20, by a delineation of the character of Melchisedec. [LXI *b.*] Vv. 1–3 form a single proposition, in which μένει is the *tempus finitum*. [LXI *c–h.*] The characterization of Melchisedec combines in the first half (βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ . . . ἐμέρισεν Ἀβραάμ, ver. 2) the historic traits which are afforded of him in Genesis (xiv. 18–20), while in the second half (πρῶτον μὲν κ.τ.λ.) the author himself completes the picture of Melchisedec, in reasoning from that historic delineation.—βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ] *king of Salem*. By *Salem* is understood, on the part of the Targumists, Josephus, *Antiq.* i. 10. 2, the majority of the Church Fathers, Grotius, Drusius, Owen, Michaelis, Gesenius, von Bohlen, Winer, *Realwörterb.* II. 2 Aufl. p. 95, Stuart, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Knobel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Auberlen, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, and others, *Jerusalem*. On the

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

other hand, Primasius, Zeger, Jac. Cappellus, Whitby, Cellarius, Reland, Rosenmüller, Bleek (see, however, at ver. 2), Tuch, Ewald, Alford, Maier, and others think of the place Σαλείμ, mentioned John iii. 23, situated eight Roman miles south of Scythopolis. The latter was, as we learn from Jerome (Ep. 126, *ad Evagrium*), the view already espoused in his day by the "eruditissimi" among the Hebrews, in opposition to "Josephus et nostri omnes," as accordingly also it was thought that the ruins of the palace of Melchisedec were still to be shown at the last-named place in the time of Jerome. This Σαλείμ, mentioned John iii. 23, has, moreover, been held by some recent expositors, as Bleek and Alford, to be likewise identical with the Σαλήμ, Judith iv. 4. More correct, however, is the first-named view. For, besides the earlier name *Jebus* for Jerusalem (Judg. xix. 10, *al.*), occurs also the early name *Salem* (Ps. lxxvi. 3 [2]), and the narrative in Genesis (xiv. 17 ff.) points unmistakeably to the southern part of the land.[1]—*ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου*] *priest of God, the Most High.* In the monotheistic sense, as in Genesis, *vid. ibid.* ver. 22—*ὁ συναντήσας Ἀβραὰμ κ.τ.λ.*] *who went to meet Abraham when he was returning from the smiting of the kings* (Gen. xiv. 12 ff.), *and blessed him.*—*καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτόν*] Gen. xiv. 19, 20. Wrongly is it alleged by Heinrichs that *εὐλογεῖν* denotes only: gratulari de victoria tam splendida.

Ver. 2. *To whom also Abraham portioned out the tenth of all* (*sc.* that he had gained as booty; comp. *ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων*, ver. 4).—*πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενος βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης*] he who first, interpreted (*i. e.* if one translates his Hebrew name מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק into Greek), is King of Righteousness.[2] The author of the epistle, however, following more closely the sense of the Hebrew words, renders the name by *βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης* (instead of rendering it *βασιλεὺς δίκαιος*, as Josephus does), and thereby brings out more clearly the part sustained by Melchisedec as a type of Christ, inasmuch as the latter is not only Himself righteous (comp. Zech. ix. 9; Jer. xxiii. 5), but also the mediatorial author of righteousness for others. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 30; Jer. xxiii. 6; Mal. iv. 2; Dan. ix. 24.—*ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὅ ἐστιν βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης*] *and then also king of Salem, which is* (denotes) *king of peace.* Comp. with regard to Christ as our peace and peace-bringer, Eph. ii. 14, 15, 17; Rom. v. 1; also Isa. ix. 6, 7.—*ὅ ἐστιν*] corresponds to the *ἑρμηνευόμενος* of the previous clause. There is no reason for taking *Salem*, with Böhme and Bleek, after the precedent given by Petrus Cunaeus, *de Rep. Hebraeorum*, iii. 3, as not being the name of a place at all, but *βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ* together as forming the further name of the man, since the author of the epistle might discover a typical reference to Christ not only in the personal name of Melchisedec, but also in the name of the state over which he ruled as king and prophet. The author, for the rest, interprets the name of the place as though not שָׁלֵם (peaceful) but שָׁלוֹם

[1] Comp. specially Knobel, *Genesis*, 2 Aufl., Leipz. 1860, p. 149 f.

[2] Comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* i. 10. 2: **Μελχισεδέκης, σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο βασιλεὺς δίκαιος.—***Bell. Jud.* vi. 10: **ὁ δὲ πρῶτος κτίσας (Ἱεροσόλυμα) ἦν Χαναναίων δυνάστης, ὁ τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ κληθεὶς βασιλεὺς δίκαιος· ἦν γὰρ δὴ τοιοῦτος.**

(peace) had been written in the Hebrew,—a mode of rendering in which Philo had already preceded him.[1]

Ver. 3. Ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος] *without father, without mother, without pedigree, i. e.* of whom neither father, nor mother, nor pedigree stands recorded in Holy Scripture. This is the usual interpretation of the words, which has been the prevalent one in the church from early times to the present. Less natural, and only in repute here and there, is the explanation: *who possessed neither father nor mother*, etc., according to which the sacred writer must have recognized in Melchisedec a higher, superhuman being, who had only for a time assumed a human form. The latter view was taken by Origen and Didymus, who would maintain that Melchisedec is to be regarded as an angel; in like manner the unknown authority in Jerome, *ad Evagr.*; Hilary, *Quaestt. in V. T.* quaest. 109, and the Egyptian Hieracas in Epiph. *Haeres.* 67, who saw in him an ensarcosis of the Holy Ghost; as also the Melchisedecites, a section of the Theodotians, who described him as μεγάλην τινὰ δύναμιν θείαν, surpassing in exaltedness even Christ Himself, since Christ appeared after the likeness of Melchisedec; finally, single individuals in the orthodox church, in Epiphanius, *Haer.* 55. 7; as also afterwards, P. Molinaeus, *Vates*, iv. 11 sq.; P. Cunaeus, *l. c.*; J. C. Hottinger, *de Decimis Judaeorum*, p. 15; d'Outrein, Starck, and others, who supposed that in Melchisedec the Son of God Himself had appeared in human form. This whole method of interpretation has against it the fact that ἀγενεαλόγητος—for not ἀγένητος is placed—can be understood without violence only of the neglect to cite the genealogical table of Melchisedec in the narrative of the Book of Genesis [comp. ver. 6]; and ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ must be taken conformably with the elucidatory ἀγενεαλόγητος, thus are likewise to be explained merely of the father and mother being passed over unnamed in the historic account, not of their actual non-existence. The characteristics ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, moreover, are to be referred—since ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ cannot yet be brought into correspondence therewith—only to Melchisedec, without our being obliged to seek for them a special point of comparison with Christ, as is done by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Cornelius a Lapide, Jac. Cappellus, Bisping, *al.* (comp. also Kurtz *ad loc.*), in applying the ἀπάτωρ to Christ's humanity, the ἀμήτωρ to His divinity, and the ἀγενεαλόγητος either likewise to His divinity or to His New Testament high priesthood.[2]—By means of ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, Melchisedec appears as presenting a contrast to the Levitical priests, since in the case of these scrupulous attention was paid to the descent.—The expression ἀγενεαλόγητος only here in all Greek literature.—μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων] *without beginning of days and without end of life,*

[1] Comp. *Legg. allegor.* iii. 25, p. 75 (with Mangey, I. p. 102 f.): καὶ Μελχισεδὲκ βασιλέα τε τῆς εἰρήνης—Σαλὴμ τοῦτο γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται—ἱερέα ἑαυτοῦ πεποίηκεν ὁ θεός.

[2] Comp. *e. g.* Theodoret: Ἀμήτωρ μὲν γάρ ἐστιν ὡς θεός· ἐκ μόνου γὰρ γεγέννηται τοῦ πατρός· ἀπάτωρ δε ὡς ἄνθρωπος· ἐκ μένης γὰρ ἐτέχθη μητρός, τῆς παρθένου φημί· ἀγενεαλόγητος ὡς θεός· οὐ γὰρ χρήζει γενεαλογίας ὁ ἐξ ἀγεννήτου γεγεννημένος πατρός.

namely, in that nothing is related in Holy Scripture either of his birth or his death. The statement is quite a general one. To limit it to the beginning and end of *the priesthood*,[1] is arbitrary. Nor is the meaning of the words, that Melchisedec was not born in the ordinary human way, and, something like Enoch and Elijah, was taken up to heaven without experiencing death,[2] a sense which conflicts with the right apprehension of the opening words of the verse.—*ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ*] *on the contrary* (therein) *made entirely like unto the Son of God*, namely, as type of the same. The words do not belong to *μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* (Peshito, Grotius, *al.*). For with justice does Theodoret already observe: *ἐν μέντοι τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ οὐ Μελχισεδὲκ μεμίμηται τὸν δεσπότην Χριστόν, ἀλλ' ὁ δεσπότης Χριστὸς ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ.* They form, by means of the closely combining *δέ*, a more precise positive defining to the negative *μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων.*[3]—*μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*] *remains priest for ever*, in that, as of his end of life so also of the cessation of his priesthood, nothing is recorded. He remains so in the reality of his office, but only as a figure and type of Christ. Against the view of Auberlen (*l. c.* p. 497), that Melchisedec is termed an everlasting priest in no other sense than as, according to the Apocalypse, all the blessed in heaven are so, see the observations of Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 202 f., Remark. The subject, moreover, in *μένει* is naturally the Melchisedec of Genesis, not, as Wieseler contends (*Schrr. d. Univ. zu Kiel aus. d. J.* 1860, VI. 1, p. 40): "the Melchisedec of the passage in the Psalms just mentioned (vi. 20), or the true antitypal Melchisedec or Messiah." For it is not grammatically allowable, with Wieseler, to take the words *βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ . . . ἀφωμοιώμενος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ* as an apposition merely to *ὁ Μελχισεδέκ*, and not to the whole expression *οὗτος ὁ Μελχισεδέκ*, and in connection with *οὗτος ὁ Μελχισεδέκ* to rest the emphasis exclusively upon *οὗτος*.—*εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*] of the same import as *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, vi. 20. Comp. x. 12, 14.

Ver. 4. [On Vv. 4–10, see Note LXII., pages 579, 580.] *Θεωρεῖτε*] is imperative, whereby a strain is to be put on the attention for that which follows: *but behold*, namely, inwardly, *i. e. consider.*—*πηλίκος*] *how great, i. e.* how high and exalted.—*οὗτος ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν κ.τ.λ.*] Resuming of the historic notice already adduced at the beginning of ver. 2, in order then further to argue from the same. By the choice and position of the words, however, the author brings out the *πηλίκος* in its truth and inner justice. (Choice of the words *ἀκροθίνια* and *πατριάρχης*,—the latter in place of the elsewhere more usual *ὁ πατήρ* in regard to Abraham,—and effective placing of the characterizing title *ὁ πατριάρχης* at the close of the proposition at a far remove from the name *Ἀβραάμ*.)—*καὶ δεκάτην*] *καί* is not the merely copulative "also," as ver. 2 (Hofmann), but is used

[1] Cameron, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Whitby, Kuinoel, Hofmann, *al.*

[2] Hunnius, Braun, Akersloot; comp. also Bleek, p. 322 ff.; Nagel: "On the significance of Melchisedec in the Epistle to the Hebrews," in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, H. 2, p. 332 ff.; Nickel in *Reuter's Repertor.* 1858, Feb. p. 102 f.; Alford.

[3] Chrysostom: *Ἀφωμοιωμένος δέ, φησί, τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ποῦ ἡ ὁμοιότης; Ὅτι καὶ τούτου*

as giving intensity. It gives intensity, however, not to the *subject* (so Luther, Grotius, Owen, Carpzov: "Abraham himself also"),—for then ᾧ καὶ Ἀβραάμ δεκάτην ἔδωκεν must have been written,—but the *predicate: to whom Abraham gave even the tenth.*—ἀκροθίνια] composed of ἄκρος and θίν, in the N. T. a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, denotes the uppermost of the heap, the choice or best thereof. The expression is most current with regard to the first-fruits of the harvest presented to the Godhead; not seldom, however, is it used of the best, which was selected out of the spoils of war as an offering consecrated to the Godhead. In our passage, too, ἀκροθίνια denotes not simply the spoils acquired by Abraham,[1] but *the choicest, most valuable articles thereof.* Theophylact: ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων τῶν κρειττόνων καὶ τιμιωτέρων. Not that the meaning of the author is, that Abraham gave to Melchisedec the tenth part of the most choice objects among the booty acquired, but that the tithes which he presented to Melchisedec consisted of the choicest, most excellent portions of the booty.—ὁ πατριάρχης] *he, the patriarch.* The sonorous name of honor πατριάρχης, composed of πατριά and ἀρχή, designates Abraham as the father of the chosen race, and ancestor of the people of Israel. Comp. Acts ii. 29, where David is distinguished by the same title of honor, and Acts vii. 8, 9, where the twelve sons of Jacob are so distinguished.

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

Vv. 5–7. *First point of superiority.* The Levitical priests, indeed, take tithes of their brethren, although these brethren, in like manner as they, have descended from Abraham: they have thus, it is true, a pre-eminence above these; but they are inferior to Melchisedec, since this man took tithes of Abraham himself, the common ancestor of the Jewish people, and blessed him.

Ver. 5. Admission of the relatively privileged position of the Levitical priests.—καί] the explanatory: *and certainly.*—οἱ μὲν κ.τ.λ.] preparatory to the adversative ὁ δὲ κ.τ.λ., ver. 6.—οἱ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες] *those of the sons* (descendants) *of Levi who obtain the office of priest.* For not all Levites, but only those of them who claimed lineage from the house of Aaron, were entitled to enter upon the priesthood. Comp. Ex. xxviii. 1 ff.; Num. iii. 10, 38, xvi., xviii. 1 ff., *al.* Mistaken is the opinion of Delitzsch, Maier, and Moll (in coinciding with Hofmann), that the ἐκ in ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ is the *causal* ἐκ of *origin:* "those who receive the priesthood from the sons of Levi, *i. e.* by virture of their descent from Levi, in such wise that their person is not taken into account as such, but only in so far as they belong to this lineage." If that had been intended, οἱ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ ὄντες καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες must have been written.—ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν ἀποδεκατοῦν τὸν λαὸν

κἀκείνου τὸ τέλος ἀγνοοῦμεν καὶ τὴν ἀρχήν· ἀλλὰ τούτου μὲν παρὰ τὸ μὴ γεγράφθαι, ἐκείνου δὲ παρὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι.

[1] So Chrysostom: τὰ λάφυρα; Oecumenius: ἐκ τῶν σκύλων καὶ λαφύρων; Erasmus, Luther, Vatablus, Calvin, Schlichting, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Bloomfield, and the majority.

κατὰ τὸν νόμον] *have a charge to tithe the people according to the law.*[1]—κατὰ τὸν νόμον] belongs not to τὸν λαόν,[2] against which even the non-repetition of the article after λαόν decides; nor yet to ἀποδεκατοῦν,[3] but to ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν.—In the closing words, τουτέστιν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν, καίπερ κ.τ.λ., Bleek, after the example set by Böhme, erroneously finds the sense: "that, although they are the posterity of Abraham, the lauded patriarch, who are tithed by the Levitical priests, yet they are, after all, still the brethren of the latter, *i. e.* fellow-Israelites; which cannot be so astonishing as when Abraham himself paid the tithes to Melchisedec." On the contrary, the elucidation of τὸν λαόν by τουτέστιν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν serves to bring into more striking relief the singularity of the ἀποδεκατοῦν; since elsewhere only the higher receives tithes from the lower, not the equal from the equal (as here an Abrahamides from an Abrahamides), and this singularity of the ἀποδεκατοῦν is then yet further manifested by καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος Ἀβραάμ. The author can therefore only design, by means of ver. 5, to characterize the priests as *primi inter pares.* This superiority, however, in regard to their own fellow-Israelites, the author concedes only in order immediately after, ver. 6, to oppose to the same the inferiority in regard to Melchisedec.—ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος τινός] So the LXX. render the Hebrew יֹצְאֵי כִרְכָּי, Gen. xxxv. 11; 2 Chron. vi. 9.

Ver. 6. Notwithstanding this privileged position of the Levitical priests (ver. 5), Melchisedec yet occupies a far higher position.—ὁ δέ] is not to be taken alone, as by Böhme, Kuinoel, and Klee, and then to be supplemented by τὴν ἱερατείαν λαβών from ver. 5; but ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν belongs together: *Melchisedec, on the contrary, without (μή) his family or descent being derived from them, received tithes of Abraham.*—ἐξ αὐτῶν] refers neither to the Israelites,[4] nor to *Levi and Abraham,*[5] but to the υἱοὶ Λευί, ver. 5.—The parallel clause, καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας εὐλόγηκεν] *and blessed him who had the promises,* serves yet further to make manifest the dignity and exaltedness of Melchisedec. For, by the fact that Abraham had received the divine promises, that his seed should be multiplied, and in him all nations of the earth should be blessed (Gen. xii. 2 f., xiii. 14 f.), he had been already most highly favored of God. How high thus must that man stand, who imparts his blessing to one already so highly favored, since truly—as is immediately expressly added, ver. 7—

[1] Comp. Num. xviii. 20–32; Deut. xiv. 22–29; Neh. x. 38, 39; de Wette, *Lehrb. der hebr.-jüd. Archäologie,* 3 Aufl. p. 273 f.; Delitzsch, *Talmudische Studien,* XIV. *Justification of Heb.* vii. 5 (in Guericke's *Zeitschr. f. d. gesammte luth. Theol. u. Kirche,* 1863, H. 1, p. 16 ff.). The justification consists of the attempted proof that in the post-exilian age the tenth was no longer levied in the first place by the Levites,—who had been wont only afterwards to render to the priests the portion pertaining to the same,—but the priests themselves had entered upon the right of levying the tenth, which had been originally assigned to the Levites. Nevertheless, however the matter may have stood in this respect, there was hardly any need of a justification of the words Heb. vii. 5, since no statement whatever as to the mode of receiving the tenths is contained in the same; on the contrary, these words are equally appropriate for indirect as for direct levying of the tithes.

[2] Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, Starck, Böhme, Hofmann.

[3] Owen, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Ewald.

[4] Epiph. *Haer.* 67. 7; Cornelius a Lapide Braun, Ernesti, Schulz.

[5] Grotius.

the dispenser of the blessing is ever more exalted than the recipient of the blessing![1]

Ver. 7 joined on by means of δέ, since the verse contains the major of a syllogism. The minor is already furnished in the second half of ver. 6, and the conclusion: "therefore Melchisedec is more exalted than Abraham," is left to the readers themselves to supply.—The neuters τὸ ἔλαττον and τὸ κρεῖττον serve for the generalization of the statement, inasmuch as the author has only persons in view. Comp. Winer, p. 167 [E. T. 178].—The truth of the statement, however, is apparent, in that the author is thinking of the blessing imparted in the name of God and by virtue of the divine authority. For Melchisedec as the priest of God was the representative of God, or one divinely commissioned, in the communicating of the blessings.

Ver. 8. *Second point of superiority.* The Levitical priests are mortal men; but of Melchisedec it is testified that he lives.—By καὶ ὧδε μέν, "and here," reference is made to the Levitical priests, by ἐκεῖ δέ, "but there," to Melchisedec, because the Levitical priesthood still continues to exist to the time of our author, thus having something about it near and present; the historic appearing of Melchisedec, on the other hand, falls in the period of hoary antiquity.—δεκάτας] The plural, on account of the plurality of tithes levied by the Levitical priests.—ἀποθνήσκοντες] as the principal notion placed before ἄνθρωποι.—ἀποθνήσκοντες ἄνθρωποι] *men who die* (irrevocably or successively), comp. ver. 23.—ἐκεῖ δὲ μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ] *but there, one who has testimony that he lives, sc.* δεκάτην ἔλαβεν. That by reason of the coherence with that which precedes only *Melchisedec* can be understood, and not[2] *Christ*, scarcely stands in need of mention. ζῇ, as opposition to ἀποθνήσκοντες, can be interpreted only absolutely, of the life which is not interrupted by death. That the author, in connection with μαρτυρούμενος, had before his mind a testimony contained in the Holy Scriptures of the Old Covenant, admits of no doubt. Whether, however, he derived the testimony of Melchisedec's continued life from the silence of Scripture as to Melchisedec's death, or found in the declaration, Ps. ex. 4, a direct proof therefor, or, finally, combined the two facts together, and deduced his conclusion from both in common, is a question hardly to be decided.[3]

Vv. 9, 10. *Third point of superiority.* In Abraham, Levi the receiver of the tithes has also already been tithed by Melchisedec.—The formula ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, of very common occurrence with classic writers, as likewise frequently met with in Philo, is found in the N. T. only here. It denotes either: *to say it in one word* (*in short*), or: *so to say*, i. e. *in some sense.*[4] In

[1] Oecumenius: ἐξῆρε τὸν Ἀβραάμ, ἵνα πλεῖον ἐξάρῃ τὸν Μελχισεδέκ.

[2] With Justinian, Jac. Cappellus, Heinsius, and Pyle.

[3] The *first* supposition is entertained by Calvin, Estius, Drusius, Piscator, Grotius, Owen, Wolf, Bengel, Stein, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, and others; the *second*, by Theodoret, Zeger, Whitby, Heinrichs, Bleek, Bloomfield, Alford, Conybeare, Kurtz, M'Caul, Woerner, and others; the *third*, by Böhme, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* pp. 201, 454, and others.

[4] Theophylact: Τὸ δὲ ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ἢ τοῦτο σημαίνει ὅ, τι καὶ ἐν συντόμῳ εἰπεῖν, ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω.

the former sense our passage is apprehended by Camerarius, Jac. Cappellus, Er. Schmid, Owen (preferably), Elsner, Wolf, Bengel, Heumann; in the latter,—and this is here the more correct one,—the Vulgate, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Carpzov, Kypke, Heinsius, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority. The author himself feels that the thought he is on the point of expressing has something singular and unusual about it. Thus he mitigates and limits the harshness thereof by *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν*, whereby he indicates that the ensuing statement is, notwithstanding its inner truth, not to be understood literally.—*δι' Ἀβραάμ*] *by Abraham, i. e.* by the fact that Abraham gave the tenth. Ἀβραάμ is a genitive. Mistaken; Augustine (*de Genes. ad lit.* x. 19): *propter Abraham;* Photius (in Oecumenius): *διὰ τὸν δεκατωθέντα Ἀβραάμ φησι τρόπον τινὰ καὶ ὁ ἐν τῇ ὀσφύι αὐτοῦ ἔτι ὢν Λευὶ δεδεκάτωται.—Λευίς*] As is shown by the *participle present* in the addition *ὁ δεκάτας λαμβάνων*, we have not to think of the mere individual personality of Levi, but of him in connection with his posterity, thus of Levi as ancestor and representative of the Jewish priests.

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

Vv. 11–17. The Levitical priesthood in general has, together with the Mosaic law, lost its validity. [On Vv. 11–19, see Note LXIII., pages 580, 581.]

Ver. 11. From the inferiority of the Levitical priesthood to the priesthood of Melchisedec, just proved, it followed that the former was imperfect and incapable of leading to perfection. This fact is now presupposed by the author as a self-evident consequence, and he proceeds at once to demonstrate the truth thereof. [LXIII *b–e.*]—*οὖν*] deduces the conclusion from vv. 5–10, not from vi. 20 (de Wette, Bisping), whereby an interruption ensues in the continuity of the development begun by the author.—*εἰ*] with the *indicative preterite* (iv. 8, viii. 4), supposition of an *impossible* case: *if there were, if there existed;* in combination with *διά*: *if it were effected.—τελείωσις*] *perfection, i. e.* attainment of the highest goal of man-

kind in a moral and religious respect. There is included in it the obtaining of the expiation of sins and the glory to come. Comp. ix. 9, x. 1, 14, xi. 40.—*ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς νενομοθέτηται*] *for the people on the ground thereof hath received the law.* These words can be taken only as a parenthesis (against Stein). *νομοθετεῖν τινί* signifies *to give laws to one*, to provide one with a law (here the Mosaic law). The mode of transposing this active construction into the passive *ὁ λαὸς νενομοθέτηται* is quite the usual one; comp. Winer, p. 244 f. [E. T. 261].—*ἐπ' αὐτῆς*] relates not to *τελείωσις*,[1] but to *τῆς Λευϊτικῆς ἱερωσύνης*. *ἐπί*, however, denotes: upon the *ground* or *condition* of the existence of the Levitical priesthood, *i. e.* the Levitical priesthood is indissolubly conjoined with the Mosaic law which the people has received; it forms a foundation pillar upon which the latter rests, so that with the fall of the one the other also must fall (ver. 12). Erroneously,—because the statement thus arising would be too insignificant, and because *ἐπί* in this sense is used only with *verba dicendi*,[2]—Schlichting and Grotius [as also Whitby]: *de* sacerdotio Levitico legem accepit [an interpretation already rejected by Junius and Piscator]; as likewise Bleek I.: the people had received legal instruction *concerning* the Levitical priesthood.—But to what end the parenthesis? Its design is to indicate the ground on which one might expect to attain to the *τελείωσις*,—if the Mosaic law were at all capable of leading thereto,—by the intervention of the Levitical priesthood, since the Mosaic law is erected upon this very Levitical priesthood as its basis.—*τίς ἔτι χρεία*] *sc.* *ἦν*, or *ἂν ἦν*. The words following *χρεία* are not to be blended together into one thought,[3] in such wise that *λέγεσθαι* is governed immediately by *χρεία*, and again all the rest (*κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρών*) by *λέγεσθαι*. The position of the words would then be contorted, and one explicable on no justifying grounds. On the contrary, the infinitive clause *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα* depends at once upon the immediately preceding *τίς ἔτι χρεία*; and to this first infinitive clause the second *καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρὼν λέγεσθαι* forms an epexegetic parallel clause: *What need was there still then* (or: *would there then still have been*) *that another priest should arise* "after the order of Melchisedec," *and not be called* (priest) *after the order of Aaron?*—*ἕτερον*] in distinction from *ἄλλον*, brings prominently forward the *dissimilarity* of his nature and constitution as compared with that of the Levitical priests.—To *καί* we have not to supplement the whole idea *ἕτερον ἱερέα*, but only *ἱερέα*.—*οὐ*, however, is placed, not *μή* as the infinitive *λέγεσθαι* might seem to require, because the negation extends to only a part of the clause. *οὐ*, namely, is closely associated with *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρών*, and forms with the same merely a more precise definition to the *ἱερέα* which is to be supplied, so that the total expression *καὶ* (*ἱερέα*) *οὐ*

[1] So, upon the supposition of the reading *ἐπ' αὐτῇ*, Vatablus, but undecided; Seb. Schmidt, Starck, Rambach.

[2] Comp. Gal. iii. 16; Heindorf, *ad Plat. Charm.* p. 62; Bernhardy, *Syntax*, p. 248.

[3] Faber Stapulensis, Luther, Baumgarten, Chr. Fr. Schmid.

κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρών presents an opposition to the foregoing total expression *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἕτερον ἱερέα.*—*λέγεσθαι*] namely, Ps. cx. 4. That *λέγεσθαι* is not to be taken in the sense of *eligi* (Kuinoel, Stein, *al.*) is already shown by the *λέγεται*, ver. 13.

Ver. 12. In the parenthesis, ver. 11, the author has brought forward in general the close connectedness of the Levitical priesthood with the Mosaic law, and thereby already indicated that if the former is an imperfect and unsatisfying one, the same also is true of the latter; the perishing of the one involves also the perishing of the other. This truth the author now further specially urges, by means of a corroboration of the parenthetical remark, ver. 11. So in recent times also Alford and Woerner. Otherwise is the connection apprehended by Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 484), Maier, and Moll. They refer *γάρ* to the main thought in ver. 11, and find in ver. 12 an indication of the reason "why a change of the sacerdotal order would not have ensued without an urgent cause, namely, because such change would have involved also a change of the law in general." But subject-matter and form of expression in ver. 12 point back to the parenthesis, ver. 11. For in both the author is speaking of the inseparable conjunction of the Levitical priesthood with the Mosaic law; and *ἐπ' αὐτῆς*, ver. 11, is resumed by *τῆς ἱερωσύνης*, ver. 12; *νενομοθέτηται*, ver. 11, by *νόμου*, ver. 12.—*μετατιθεμένης*] denotes, like the *μετάθεσις* immediately following, certainly as to its verbal signification, only a *transformation* or *change* (not specially, as Chrysostom, Piscator, Grotius, Bengel, Heinrichs, Stuart, and others suppose, a transference of the priesthood to another tribe of the Jewish people, or to a non-Aaronides.) As regards the thing intended, however,—as is manifest from the parallel *ἀθέτησις*, ver. 18,—an actual *rendering obsolete* or *abrogation* is spoken of. The author thus still expresses himself with delicacy of feeling.—That, further, *νόμος* is to be limited, neither[1] to the *law of the priesthood*, nor[2] to the *ceremonial law*, but is to be interpreted of the *Mosaic law in general*, is self-evident.

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

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

[1] With Beza, Pareus, Piscator, Grotius, Wittich, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Zachariae, Whitby, Schulz.

[2] With Calvin, Cornelius a Lapide, Jac. Cappellus, Carpzov, Kuinoel, Klee, and others.

Ver. 14. Further evidencing of ver. 13.—*πρόδηλον γάρ, ὅτι*] *for it is clearly apparent that.* The *προ* in *πρόδηλον* is not to be taken, with Peirce (following Owen), *temporally*, according to which the sense would be, that Christ's descent from the tribe of Judah was made known beforehand, *i. e.* before He had yet arisen upon earth,—with which, in the first place, the perfect *ἀνατέταλκεν* does not harmonize,—but contains the notion of lying manifestly *before the eyes.* Theodoret: *τὸ πρόδηλον ὡς ἀναντίῤῥητον τέθεικε. προ* serves, therefore, only for the strengthening of the simple *δῆλον.* Comp. 1 Tim. v. 24, 25.—*ἐξ Ἰούδα*] *out of Judah, i. e.* from the tribe of Judah (comp. Rev. v. 5; Gen. xlix. 9, 10). With emphasis preposed.—*ἀνατέταλκεν*] *has arisen* or *sprung forth.* The figure which underlies the verb is either that of a rising star (comp. Num. xxiv. 17; Mal. iv. 2; Isa. lx. 1), or of a tender shoot coming up from the ground (Gen. xix. 25; Isa. xliv. 4; Ezek. xvii. 6; comp. also *ἀνατολή*, צֶמַח, with reference to the Messiah, Jer. xxiii. 5; Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12).—*ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν*] Jesus Christ.—*εἰς ἣν φυλήν*] in reference to which tribe.—*περὶ ἱερέων*] *sc.* who should be taken out of the same.

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

Ver. 15. *Καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλόν ἐστιν*] *and the more still is it evident,* namely, that with the Levitical priesthood the whole Mosaic law, too, is changed (and deprived of validity), ver. 12. Comp. also ver. 18. Not: what difference there is between the Levitical and the N. T. priesthood;[1] nor yet that perfection is to be found, not in the Levitical priesthood, but in the priesthood of Christ;[2] and just as little: that the priesthood is changed.[3] Quite mistakenly Ebrard: to *κατάδηλόν ἐστιν* we have to supply from ver. 14 the clause *ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν*: "that Jesus descended from Judah is first in itself an acknowledged fact (ver. 14); this, however, is so much the more clear, since (ver. 15) it follows from the Melchisidecian nature of His priesthood that He could not be born *κατὰ νόμον*!" How then could it be inferred from the fact that Jesus could not be born *κατὰ νόμον*, that He must have descended precisely "from Judah"?!—*κατάδηλον*] a similar intensifying of the simple form, as previously *πρόδηλον.*—*εἰ . . . ἀνίσταται*] *if, as surely is the case, their arises.*[4] *εἰ* thus, as to the sense, equal to *ἐπειδή.*[5]—*κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδέκ*] as the main idea placed first, and *ὁμοιότης* an elucidation of the *τάξις* in the passage of the Psalms.—The *subject* in the conditional clause is *ἱερεὺς*

[1] Chrysostom: *τὸ μέσον τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἑκατέρας, τὸ διάφορον*, Clarius, Zeger, Bisping.

[2] Jac. Cappellus, Bengel, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 551; Delitzsch.

[3] Primasius, Justinian, Owen, Hammond, Rambach, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Stuart, Klee, Paulus.

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

[5] Oecumenius, Theophylact.

ἕτερος (if . . . another priest arises), not merely ἕτερος (Schulz: "if . . . another is appointed as priest"), nor yet *Jesus* (if He . . . arises as another priest).

Ver. 16. [LXIII *g*, *h*.] Nearer indication as to what is implied by the chararacteristic κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδέκ, ver. 15, what peculiarity of priesthood is expressed by the same.—ὅς] *sc.* ἱερεὺς ἕτερος, not: Μελχισεδέκ. —ὃς . . . γέγονεν] who . . . has become so (*sc.* priest).—οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης κ.τ.λ.] *not according to the law of a fleshly command, but according to the power of indestructible* [or *indissoluble*] *life*. In connection with νόμος, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Böhme, Kuinoel, Tholuck, Delitzsch, and others think of the *Mosaic law*; but against this argues the singular ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης, to take which, with the expositors mentioned, in the sense of the plural (according to the Mosaic law, whose essence consists in fleshly ordinances), or as a collective designation of the constituent parts of the law as ὁ νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν, Eph. ii. 15, is arbitrary. νόμος is therefore to be taken, as Rom. vii. 21, 23, in the more general sense: *norm* (rule, standard), and the ἐντολή is the special *precept* or *ordinance* which the Mosaic law contains regarding the Levitical priesthood.—It is called *fleshly*, however, according to Carpzov, Böhme, Stuart, and others, because it is mutable and transitory; more correctly, nevertheless: because it lays stress only upon *external, earthly things*, which fall a prey to transitoriness, and (comp. the contrast ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν κ.τ.λ.) appoints as priests only *mortal men*, of whom one after another is snatched away by death.[1]—κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου] *i. e.* inasmuch as the power of living for ever is inherent in Him. Comp. vv. 17, 24. Improperly do Cameron, Dorscheus, Calov, *al.*, refer it *as well*, or *solely*, to Christ's power of communicating intransitory life *to others*. But wrongly, too, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. ½, 2 Aufl. p. 551 f.), Delitzsch, and Alford: the ζωὴ ἀκατάλυτος is to be limited to that life of Christ which began with His resurrection. On the contrary, the ζωὴ ἀκατάλυτος is thought of as a property inherent in the ἱερεὺς ἕτερος, without respect to relation of time.[2]

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

Vv. 18, 19. [LXIII *i*, *j*.] Elucidation of that which is signified by this proclamation in the psalm, of the arising of a new everlasting priest after the manner of Melchisedec (ver. 17). By virtue of that proclamation of God, the Mosaic institution of the priests, and with it the Mosaic law in

[1] Schlichting: carnale (praeceptum) vocatur, quia totum ad carnem spectabat, carnisque rationem habebat. Partim enim ad certam stirpem, nempe Aaronicam, sacerdotii dignitatem adstrinxerat, partim mortalitati pontificum, quae carnis propria est, consulens, successionis jura descripserat. Inde enim factum est, ut unum alteri succedere juberet, quo, morientibus sacerdotibus, sacerdotium tamen ipsum perpetuaretur.

[2] Comp. also Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 458, *Obs.*

general, is declared—and that with good reason—to be devoid of force; and, on the other hand, a better hope is brought in.[1]—Vv. 18, 19 contain a single proposition, dividing itself into two halves by means of μὲν . . . δέ, for which γίνεται forms the common verb, and in which οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος constitutes a parenthesis.[2] Others construe differently, in taking each of the two verses as an independent statement in itself. They then vary as regards the interpretation of ἐπεισαγωγή, ver. 19, as this is looked upon either as predicate or as subject. As *predicate* it is taken by Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus (*Version*), Vatablus, Calvin, Hunnius, Jac. Cappellus, Pyle, Ebrard, and others, in supplying ἐστίν or ἦν, and regarding as subject thereto ὁ νόμος. According to this, the sense would be: for *nothing* has the law brought to perfection; but it is (or its meaning consists in this, that it is) a bringing in of a better hope. But against this argues the fact that, if ἐπεισαγωγὴ δέ was intended to form the opposition to the first half of ver. 19, the author could not possibly—after having placed a verb (ἐτελείωσεν) in the first half, consisting as it does only of a few words—have continued in the second half otherwise than with a verb; he must have written ἐπεισάγει δὲ κρείττονα ἐλπίδα instead of ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ κ.τ.λ. Moreover, ἐπί in ἐπεισαγωγή would have remained without any reference upon the supposition of this construction. As *subject* ἐπεισαγωγή is looked upon by Beza, Castellio, Pareus, Piscator, Schlichting, Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Carpzov, Whitby, Michaelis, Semler, Ernesti, Valckenaer, Heinrichs, Stuart, and others. The sense would then be; the law indeed brought nothing to perfection; but the bringing in of a better hope *did* lead to perfection. Against this view, however, the consideration is decisive, that in such case, inasmuch as the preceding νόμος has the article, ἐπεισαγωγή also must have obtained the article.—The statement of ver. 18 is to be understood in special relation to the subject in question (not, as is done by Schlichting, Heinrichs, and others, as a truth of universal import). The article before προαγούσης ἐντολῆς is wanting, because the design was to express the ἐντολή regarding the Levitical priesthood as *one which had only the character of an* ἐντολὴ προάγουσα.—ἀθέτησις] *a declaring void of force, abrogation.* Comp. ἀθετεῖν Gal. iii. 15. The *substantive* only here and ix. 26.—γίνεται] *results*, namely, in the declaration of God, Ps. cx. 4.—The ἐντολή, *the command*, denotes not *the whole Mosaic law*,[3] but the ordinance regarding the Levitical priesthood therein contained. Only with ver. 19 does the author transfer to the whole that which he here states concerning a part.—The ἐντολή, however, is termed προάγουσα (comp. 1 Tim. i. 18, v. 24), because, as a constituent part of the O. T., it preceded in point of time the institution of the New Covenant. Yet, at

[1] Theodoret: Παύεται, φησίν, ὁ νόμος, ἐπεισάγεται δὲ ἡ τῶν κρειττόνων ἐλπίς.

[2] So, rightly, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Luther, Zeger, Camerarius, Estius, Peirce, Bengel, M'Lean, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Conybeare, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 592), Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority.

[3] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Calvin, Grotius, Hammond, Owen, M'Lean, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Klee, Bloomfield.

the same time, there lies in the emphatically preposed participle, on account of its reciprocal relation to *ἐπεισαγωγή*, ver. 19, at least the additional indication delicately conveyed, that this *ἐντολή*, since just as a mere *precursor of something future* it points beyond itself, naturally bears the character of the merely *temporary* and consequently *unsatisfactory*.—*διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές*] *on account of its weakness and unprofitableness.* The *ἐντολή* was *weak*, since it did not possess the strength to attain its object, namely, the reconciliation of men to God; but, because in such manner it did not fulfill the end of its existence, it became for that very reason something *unprofitable* and *unserviceable*. On *ἀσθενές*, comp. Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 9.—*οὐδέν*] is not to be limited by means of *οὐδένα* (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Schlichting, Grotius, Carpzov, Kuinoel, Bisping), but, on the contrary, is to be left in the full universality of the neuter. *Completion* in general, in whatever respect, the law was not in a position to bring about.—*ἐπεισαγωγή*] a doubly composite term. Literally: *introduction upon or in addition to, i. e.* the bringing in of something new in addition to, or over and above, an object already present (here: in addition to the *προάγουσα ἐντολή*, ver. 18). *ἐπί* in *ἐπεισαγωγή* corresponds therefore to the *πρό* in *προαγούσης*.—*κρείττονος ἐλπίδος*] *of a better hope, sc.* than the *προάγουσα ἐντολή* was in a position to afford.[1] Better, more excellent, is the hope founded upon the newly instituted priesthood, in that this hope is certain and infallible, thus in reality leads to the desired goal.—*δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ θεῷ*] *by means of which we draw nigh unto God* (Jas. iv. 8). Comp. vi. 19: *εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος*, and x. 19 ff. In contrast with the character of the Old Covenant, since the people were not permitted to enter the Most Holy Place, where the throne of Jehovah was. Cf. ix. 6 ff.

Vv. 20–22. [On Vv. 20–28, see Note LXIV., pages 582, 583.] As one element in the superiority of the everlasting priesthood after the manner of Melchisedec, assigned to Christ, over the Levitical priesthood has been already implicitly brought forward, vv. 18, 19, namely, that the goal, for the attainment of which the strength was lacking to the Levitical priesthood, is really attained by the everlasting priesthood. A second point of superiority in the new order of things over the old follows in vv. 20–22. Of less moment than the everlasting priesthood of Jesus must the Levitical priesthood be; for the former was constituted by God by virtue of a declaration upon oath, the latter without a declaration upon oath. Vv. 20–22 form again a single period, the protasis being contained in *καὶ καθ*,

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

ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας, to which then *καὶ τοσοῦτο κ.τ.λ.* ver. 22, corresponds as the apodosis, while all that intervenes (*οἱ μὲν γάρ*, to the end of ver. 21) is a parenthesis. [LXIV *a*.] Wrongly do Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, Calvin (in the translation), Er. Schmid, and others join *καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας*, too, to the closing words of ver. 19: *and, indeed, a hope which is better, inasmuch as it is not brought in without an oath.* So also Luther: "and moreover, which is a great thing, not without oath;" while, with not less violence, Lud. Cappellus, who, in enclosing vv. 18, 19 within a parenthesis, and taking *καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας* with ver. 17, gives as the sense: "Deus constituit Christum sacerdotem secundum ordinem Melchisedec, et quidem non sine jurejurando."—*καί*] coupling on a farther link in the chain of enumeration, as vv. 8, 9, 23.—*καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας*] *sc. ἱερεύς ἐστιν γεγονώς*; *and inasmuch* (ix. 27) *as He has become priest not without a declaration upon oath, i.e.* He has not become so without God having sanctioned His appointment to be a priest by a declaration upon oath (namely, by virtue of the oath, with which the declaration, Ps. cx. 4, is introduced). Only this mode of supplementing is warranted by the connection, as is shown partly by the *οἱ μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες* immediately following, partly by the circumstance that the author is still engaged in the exposition of the Scripture statement, ver. 17, this statement thus containing for him the gist of the matter; as, accordingly, this declaration of Scripture is repeated anew, ver. 21, and then likewise the *εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες* recurs in the further member of the thought, ver. 23 f. The explanation therefore of Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Heinrichs, Böhme, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Alford, Kurtz, and others is to be rejected, when to *καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας* they supplement from the apodosis *διαθήκης ἔγγυος γέγονεν*; as also that of Storr, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch, Moll, and Hofmann, when they supply *τοῦτο* (*sc. ἐπεισαγωγὴ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος*) *γίνεται* (*γέγονεν*).—*οἱ μὲν γάρ*] [LXIV *b*, *c*.] namely, the Levitical priests.—*χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας*] since nothing is related in Scripture of an oath of God, when He destined Aaron and his posterity to be priests.—*εἰσὶν γεγονότες*] forms one idea: *have become.* Wrongly, Paulus and Klee: are priests who have become so without an oath. Böhme (and so also Hofmann): "sunt sacerdotes, sed sine juramento (illi quidem singuli deinceps) facti"—which must have been expressed by *εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας γεγονότες*. Still more widely mistaken the view of Michaelis *ad Peirc.*: "*fuerunt, i.e.* esse desierunt,"—which is grammatically as well as logically impossible. The *tempus periphrasticum εἰσὶν γεγονότες* marks the fact already belonging to the past as still extending onwards into the present.—*ὁ δέ*] namely, *Christ.*—*μετ' ὁρκωμοσίας*] *sc. ἱερεύς ἐστιν γεγονώς.*—*διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς αὐτόν*] *i.e.* in the sense of the author: *by God*, not: *by the psalmist* (Rambach, Heinrichs), although certainly the statement, Ps. cx. 4, that God hath sworn and will not repent of this oath, forms not a constituent part of the words of God Himself, but a remark of the psalmist, with which he introduces the words of God. Yet, when in the psalm it is said that God has sworn, and of this oath He will not repent, and then there is adduced as the subject-matter of this oath the declara-

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

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

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

Ver. 23. *Καί*] parallel to the *καί*, ver. 20.—*καὶ οἱ μὲν πλείονές εἰσιν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες*] *and they on the one hand have as several* (or *as a plurality*) *become priests, i. e.* of Levitical priests there is a multiplicity. Attention is not here called to the peculiarity that many priests always existed contemporaneously the one with the other (so Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, Braun, Delitzsch), or that "the Levitical priesthood was not given to *one*, but to a lineage" (Hofmann). That which is meant is—as is evident from the immediately following *διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν*, and from ver. 24—the *successive* plurality, in that one dies after another, and consequently the one succeeds the other. For the author in thus speaking has before his mind the *high priests*, since it is just with these that Christ is placed in parallel. Comp. ver. 26 ff., *al.*—*διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν*] *because* (wrongly de Wette: "by the fact that") *they are* (wrongly de Wette and Bisping: "were") *prevented by death from continuing.*—*παραμένειν*] not: *ἐν τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ*.[1] It denotes, as is clear from the corresponding *διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, ver. 24, *to continue in life.*[2]

[1] So Oecumenius, who is followed by Grotius, Seb. Schmidt, Storr, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* pp. 459, 437; Alford, Maier, Kurtz Hofmann, Woerner, and others.

[2] Comp. also Phil. i. 25, and Meyer *ad loc.*

Ver. 24. *The other, on the other hand, because* (not "by the fact that," de Wette, Bisping) *He abides unto eternity, has His priesthood as an unchangeable one.*—*μένειν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*] must not be explained, with Estius, Seb. Schmidt, and others, of abiding for ever *as priest*. For in this way the declaration of ver. 24 becomes tautological. The expression denotes the everlasting duration *of life* (comp. John xii. 34, xxi. 22, 23; 1 Cor. xv. 6; Phil. i. 25), is thus equivalent to the *πάντοτε ζῆν*, ver. 25.—*ἀπαράβατος*] a word belonging to later Greek (comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 313), save here, foreign to the N. T., as also to the LXX. Erasmus, Schlichting, Bengel, Schulz, Böhme, Stengel, Stuart, Ebrard, Hofmann, Conybeare, and the majority, take it in the *active* signification: not passing over to another, thus *remaining with the same person*, or *unchanging*.[1] More correctly, however, because more consistently with the demonstrable usage of the language (see instances in Wetstein and Bleek), does Bleek, after the precedent of Elsner, insist upon the *passive* signification: "that which may not be overstepped, transgressed; therefore: inviolable, unalterable, immutable," which then, it is true, includes likewise the notion of "unchanging."

Ver. 25. *Ὅθεν*] *Wherefore, sc.* because His priesthood is an everlasting one.—*καί*] *also*, represents the statement, ver. 25, as being the natural effect of the *ἀπαράβατον ἔχειν τὴν ἱερωσύνην*, ver. 24, as its cause.—*εἰς τὸ παντελές*] means: *perfectly, completely, entirely* (comp. Luke xiii. 11), and combines with *σώζειν* in one idea. Theodoret: *αὐτὸν γὰρ σώζειν ἡμᾶς εἴρηκεν καὶ τελείαν σωτηρίαν παρέχειν.* The meaning: *in perpetuum*, attached to the word by the Peshito, the Vulgate, Chrysostom (*οὐ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν μόνον, φησίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ ζωῇ*), Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, Schlichting, Grotius, Heinrichs, Schulz, Stein, Stengel, and others, in joining it either with *σώζειν* or with *δύναται*, is in accordance neither with the etymology nor the usage (instances in Bleek), but arises only from the connection, and is consequently to be rejected.—*σώζειν*] *save*, embraces the deliverance from the misery of sin and its consequences, and, on the other hand, the communication of everlasting blessedness. Too restricted, Hofmann: the answering of prayer, and deliverance out of every assault.—*τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ*] *those who through Him, i.e.* through faith in Him, *draw near to God.*—*πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν*] *seeing that He evermore lives, to make intercession for them* (Rom. viii. 26, 27, 34), or *to represent them* (*sc.* in the presence of God). More precise unfolding of the notion already lying in *ὅθεν*.—Similarly for the rest does Philo, too, ascribe to his Logos an intercession with God.[2]

Vv. 26–28. [LXIV *f–i.*] *Fourth point of superiority of the priesthood of*

[1] So, as it would seem, already Theodoret (*οὗτος δὲ ἀθάνατος ὢν εἰς ἕτερον οὐ παραπέμπει τῆς ἱερωσύνης τὸ γέρας*), Oecumenius (*ἀδιάδοχον, ἀτελεύτητον*), Theophylact (*ἀδιάκοπον, ἀδιάδοχον*).

[2] Comp. *Vit. Mos.* iii. p. 673 C (with Mangey, II. p. 155): *Ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἦν τὸν ἱερωμένον τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρί, παρακλήτῳ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρετὴν υἱῷ, πρός τε ἀμνηστίαν ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ χορηγίαν ἀφθονωτάτων ἀγαθῶν.*—*Quis. ter. div. haer.* 42, p. 509 B (with Mangey, I. p. 501): *Ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἱκέτης μέν ἐστι τοῦ θνητοῦ, κηραίνοντος ἀεί, πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον.*

Christ over the Levitical priesthood, in the form of an establishing of ver. 25. The Levitical priests are sinful men, who need daily to offer for their own sins and the sins of the people; Christ is the sinless Son of God, who once for all has offered up Himself as a sacrifice.

Ver. 26. Proof for the actual existence of a high priest who is able in a perfect manner to procure salvation, since He ever liveth to represent in the presence of God those who believe in Him (ver. 25), derived from the *meetness* and *adaptedness to our need* of just such a high priest: *for such a high priest* (as had just been described, ver. 25) *also becomed us.* τοιοῦτος begins no parenthesis, so that ὅσιος κ.τ.λ. were only "the continuation of a series begun with πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν" (Hofmann), nor is "οἷος ὁ Ἰησοῦς to be supplemented from ver. 22" (Woerner), nor does it serve for the introducing or preparing the way for the following predicates, ὅσιος κ.τ.λ. (Grotius, Tholuck, *al.*), but refers back to the characterization, ver. 25; while, then, with ὅσιος κ.τ.λ. a newly beginning further description of this so constituted high priest, or a further unfolding of the τοιοῦτος, follows, in such wise that the ὅσιος κ.τ.λ. thus attached is best rendered by: He, *since He is holy*, etc., becomed us.—καί] *also, i. e.* exactly. See Winer, p. 408 [E. T. 438].—ὅσιος] *holy* or *pure*. In regard to the relation *towards God*.[1]—ἄκακος] *free from* κακία, from craft and malice. In regard to the relation *towards men*.[2]—ἀμίαντος] *unstained by any kind of impurity*. In regard to the relation towards Himself.[3]—κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν] *separated from the sinners, i. e.* not: different from them by reason of His sinlessness,[4] but—as is evident from the member immediately following—*withdrawn by His exaltation to heaven from all contact with the sinners*, so that He cannot be defiled by them. As the Levitical priests in general, so must very specially the high priest preserve himself free from defilement (Lev. xxi. 10 ff.); before the great day of atonement he must, according to the Talmud, spend seven days in the temple, apart from his family, in order to be secured against defilement.[5]—καὶ ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος] *and* (not "also" or "even," as Hofmann contends) *raised above the heavens*, inasmuch, namely, as He διελήλυθε τοὺς οὐρανούς, iv. 14. Comp. Eph. iv. 10: ὁ ἀναβὰς ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν.

Ver. 27. In the πρότερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν, ἔπειτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ there is an apparent allusion to the sacrifice of the high priest on the great day of atonement (Lev. xvi.), comp. ix. 7. We are prevented, however, from referring the words to this alone (perhaps to the including of the sin-offering prescribed, Lev. iv. 3 ff.) by καθ' ἡμέραν, instead of which, as at ix. 25, x. 1, 3, κατ' ἐνιαυτόν must have been placed. For καθ' ἡμέραν can signify nothing else than "daily" or "day by day." To foist upon it the

[1] Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 10; Eph. iv. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 8; Tit. i. 8. With the LXX. for the most part translation of חָסִיד, *e. g.* Ps. iv. 4 (3), xvi. 10 (Acts ii. 27, xiii. 35), xxx. 5 (4).

[2] Chrysostom: Ἄκακος τί ἐστιν; Ἀπόνηρος, οὐχ ὕπουλος· καὶ ὅτι τοιοῦτος, ἄκουε τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· Οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ (Isa. liii. 9).

[3] Comp. Jas. i. 27; 1 Pet. i. 4.

[4] So the Peshito, *separatus a peccatis*; Vatablus, Calvin, Cameron, Carpzov, Owen, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Klee, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Kurtz, and others.

[5] See Tract. *Joma*, i. 1. Comp. also Schöttgen, *Horae Hebraicae*, p. 963 f.

signification: "yearly on a definite day" ("*καθ' ἡμέραν ὡρισμένην* or *τεταγμένην*"), with Schlichting (secundum diem, nempe statam ac definitam, in anniversario illo videlicet sacrificio), Piscator, Starck, Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, M'Lean, Storr, and others; or to take it in the attenuated sense, as equivalent to "saepissime, quoties res fert" (Grotius, Owen), or "*πολλάκις*" (Böhme, Stein), or "*διὰ παντός*" (de Wette), or in the sense of "one day after another" (Ebrard, who supposes the author is overlooking a succession of centuries, and so a succession of days present themselves to his eye, in which the high priest again and again offers a sacrifice!), is linguistically unwarranted. In like manner it is a mere subterfuge and arbitrary misinterpreting of the words, when Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 438), and Alford, concurring in the suggestion of Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 404 f., 2 Aufl.), seek to put into them the sense: that Christ needeth not to do daily that which the high priests do once every year, but which He—if He is to be a constant mediator of an all-embracing expiation of sin—must needs do day by day. For all that is expressed is the fact that Christ needs not to do daily that which the Levitical high priests need to do daily.[1] Nor does it avail anything that Kurtz will take *καθ' ἡμέραν* in conjunction only with *οὐκ ἔχει ἀνάγκην*, since these words do not occupy an independent position alone, and only acquire their more precise definition by that which follows. For that *καθ' ἡμέραν* has "nothing whatever to do with the *θυσίας ἀναφέρειν*," is a mere assertion on the part of Kurtz; and his contention, that only the "daily renewal and daily pressing necessity," of the O. T. high priest on account of his daily sinning, the necessity, "ere (on the great day of propitiation) he could offer for the sin of the whole people, of first presenting a sacrifice for his own sins," was to be brought into relief, is a violent perversion of the words,—admitting as they do of no misapprehension,—from which even the *πρότερον, ἔπειτα*, expressive of a relation of *parity*, ought to have kept him: in place of which, in order to bring out the subsidiary character of the one half of the statement, *πρὸ τοῦ* with the infinitive, or *πρίν* (*πρὶν ἤ*), must have been written. We have therefore to conclude, with Gerhard, Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Wolf, Carpzov, Bleek, and Tholuck, that the author had present to his mind, besides the principal sacrifice on the great day of atonement, at the same time the ordinary daily sacrifice of the Levitical priests (Ex. xxix. 38–42; Num. xxviii. 3–8), and by reason of an inexact mode of expression blended the two together; to which he might the more easily be led, in that, according to Josephus, the high priest—not indeed always, but yet on the Sabbaths, new moons, and other festivals (according to the Mishna tr. *Tamith*, vii. 3: in general as often as he was so minded)—went up with the other priests into the temple, and took part in the sacrificial service.[2] To be compared also are the words

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

[2] Comp. Josephus, *de Bello Judaico*, v. 5. 7: *Ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀνῄει μὲν σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀεί, ταῖς δ' ἑβδομάσι καὶ νουμηνίαις, καὶ εἴ τις ἑορτὴ πάτριος ἢ πανήγυρις πάνδημος ἀγομένη δι' ἔτους*

of Philo, who, *Quis rer. divin. haer.* p. 505 A (with Mangey, I. p. 497), remarks that in the daily sacrifice the priests offered the oblation for themselves, but the lambs for the people,[1] and *de Speciall. Legg.* p. 797 E (with Mangey, II. p. 321), equally as our passage, ascribes to the high priest the offering of a daily sacrifice.[2] Recently also Delitzsch[3] has further drawn attention to the fact that likewise, *Jer. Chagiga*, ii. 4, and *Bab. Pesachim*, 57*a*, it is said of the high priest *that he offers daily.*—τοῦτο] namely, τὸ ὑπὲρ τῶν νοῦ λαοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίαν ἀναφέρειν. So rightly—as is even demanded by ver. 28 (comp. iv. 15)—Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, Estius, Piscator, Clericus, Seb. Schmidt, Owen, Peirce, Carpzov, Whitby, Storr, Heinrichs, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 463), Alford, Kurtz, and others. Less suitably do Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Bengel, and Ebrard supplement τὸ θυσίας ἀναφέρειν; while, altogether wrongly, Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, and Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1. 2 Aufl. pp. 405, 401 f.) refer back τοῦτο to the whole proposition πρότερον . . . λαοῦ. For in the application to Christ, to explain the ἁμαρτίαι as the "dolores, qui solent peccatorum poenae esse, et quas Christus occasione etiam peccatorum humani generis toleravit, et a quibus liberatus est per mortem" (Grotius), or as "Christi infirmitates et perpessiones" (Schlichting, Hofmann, according to which latter in connection with ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας, besides Christ's suffering of death, His prayer in Gethsemane (!) is at the same time to be thought of), becomes possible only on the arbitrary supposition of a double sense to the preceding words, and is equally much opposed to the context (ver. 28) as to the linguistic use of ἁμαρτίαι.—ἐφάπαξ] *once for all;* comp. ix. 12, x. 10; Rom. vi. 10. Belongs to ἐποίησεν, not to ἀνενέγκας.—ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας] *in that He offered Himself.* Christ is thus not only the High Priest of the New Covenant, but also the victim offered. Comp. viii. 3, ix. 12, 14, 25 f., x. 10, 12, 14; Eph. v. 2.

Ver. 28. Establishment of τοῦτο ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ, ver. 27, by the definite formulating of the statement of the *fourth point of superiority of the New Testament High Priest over the high priests of the Old Covenant*,—a statement for which the way has been prepared by vv. 26, 27. The law constitutes high priests men who are subject to weakness, and thus also to sin (comp. v. 2, 3), on which account they have to offer, as for the people, so also for themselves, and have ofttimes to repeat this sacrifice; the word of the oath, on the other hand (comp. ver. 21), which ensued after the law,—namely, only in the time of David.—and consequently annulled the law, ordains as high priest the Son (see on i. 1), who is for ever perfected, *i. e.* without sin (iv. 15), and by His exaltation withdrawn from all human ἀσθένεια, however greatly He had part therein during His life on earth;

[1] Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἐνδελεχεῖς θυσίας ὁρᾷς εἰς ἴσα διῃρημένας, ἥν τε ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀνάγουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς διὰ τῆς σεμιδάλεως καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν δυοῖν ἀμνῶν, οὓς ἀναφέρειν διείρηται.

[2] Οὕτω τοῦ σύμπαντος ἔθνους συγγενὴς καὶ ἀγχιστεὺς κοινὸς ὁ ἀρχιερεύς ἐστι, πρυτανεύων μὲν τὰ δίκαια τοῖς ἀμφισβητοῦσι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, εὐχὰς δὲ καὶ θυσίας τελῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν.

[3] *Talmudische Studien*, XIII., in Rudelbach and Guericke's *Zeitschr. für die luther. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1860, II. 4, p. 593 f.

wherefore He needed not for Himself to present an expiatory sacrifice, but only for the people, and, inasmuch as this fully accomplished its end, He needed not to repeat the same.—Entirely misapprehending the reasoning of the author, Ebrard supposes that even the first half of the proposition, ver. 28, is likewise to be referred to Jesus. The author, he tells us, presupposes as well known, that Christ has been as well *ἀνθρωπος ἀσθένειαν ἐχων* (according to chap. v.) as *υἱος τετελειωμένος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (according to chap. vii.), and is here recapitulating (!) the two. Thus, then, *ὁ νόμος γὰρ. . . ἀσθένειαν* contains a concession (!) having reference to chap. v., and the thought is: "the law (in so far as it has not (!) been annulled) demands of all high priests (consequently (!) also of Jesus) that they be *ἀνθρωποι ἐχοντες ἀσθένειαν*; the sworn word of promise, however (given after the law), proceeding far beyond and above the same, constitutes as high priest the Son for ever perfected" (!). A misinterpreting of the meaning, against which even the opposition of *ὁ νόμος . . . ὁ λόγος δέ*, as a manifest parallel to *οἱ μὲν . . . ὁ δέ*, ver. 20 f., ver. 23 f., ought to have kept him.—*τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον*] The author did not write *ὁ μετὰ τὸν νόμον*, according to which the Vulgate and Luther translate, because he wished to accentuate *ὁρκωμοσία* as the principal notion.

Notes by American Editor.

LXI. Vv. 1–3.

(*a*) Chap. vii. has an introductory passage (vv. 1–3), which sets forth the fact that Melchisedec and Christ correspond in their priesthood to each other, and then an argument to prove the superiority of Christ's priesthood to the Levitical, because it is after the order of Melchisedec. This superiority is set forth, 1. as connected with the matter of tithes, vv. 4–10; 2. as connected with the inability of the Levitical system to accomplish the end proposed (*τελείωσις*). vv. 11–19; 3. as connected with the appointment with an oath, vv. 20–22; 4. as connected with permanent life, vv. 23–25; 5. as connected with the completeness of the single sacrifice, vv. 26–28.

(*b*) *γάρ* of ver. 1, evidently connects vv. 1–3 with vi. 20 *b*. The object of these three verses, accordingly, is to set forth the fact that the priesthood of Christ and that of Mel. are of the same order. For the accomplishment of this object, the writer brings out with emphasis the great and fundamental point in which their priesthood differs from the Levitical—the point in connection with which all the other distinguishing peculiarities of the Melchisedec-Christ-priesthood naturally arise or manifest themselves. He thus prepares the way for the most impressive and effective presentation of the detailed argument which follows.

(*c*) From the connection of the verses with vi. 20 *b*, we might naturally have expected the form of statement to be: For Jesus, the Son of God, was made like to Mel., in respect to the permanent character of his priesthood. Instead of this, we find the author beginning with Mel., as the subject; and it is said of him, that, being made like the Son of God, he abides a priest continually. This change of form, however, was easily adopted by the writer, because of the fact that the name of Mel. was the closing word of the preceding chapter. The meaning, with either

form, must be essentially the same.—(*d*) With reference to the interpretation of the passage, accordingly, it must be noticed, that the subject under discussion, in this section of the Epistle, is the priesthood of Christ, and that the comparison of Christ with Melchisedek relates only to this point. When it is said, therefore, that Mel. was without father and mother, and that he had neither beginning nor end of life, the meaning of the writer is not: that Melchisedek *as a man* differed from all other men, having no descent from ancestors and existing always; but that, *in respect to his priestly office*, he did not depend on the tracing of a genealogy, as the Levitical priests did, but had his priesthood "continually abiding." There is in ver. 3 a parallelism, each part of which consists of three elements,—the last of the three explaining the force and meaning of the first two. Without father, without mother, that is to say, without genealogy; having neither beginning of days nor end of life, that is to say, abiding a priest continually. The last-mentioned phrase, by the exigencies or accidents of the sentence, is put in a verbal form; but, when the thought is carefully examined, it is evident that the writer had in mind the likeness of Mel. to Christ in the points just mentioned, and thus that, if the sentence had been written in precise accordance with the leading idea, it would have read *μήτε . . . . ἔχων, μένων δὲ ἱερεὺς εἰς. τ. διην, ἀφωμοιώθη τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ.*—(*e*) We may believe that the writer did not intend to make any formal declaration respecting Melchisedek, for the purpose of explaining to his readers who or what that O. T., personage was. Such a declaration was unnecessary and was hardly to have been expected. But in his setting forth of the exalted character of Christ's priesthood, as compared with the priesthood known to the Jewish system, he takes this remarkable case of a priest, who suddenly appears on the scene, in the O. T. history, having his priestly office in its full privileges and prerogatives, and disappears again as suddenly, still having it and still in life—a priest who rests his claims on no tracing of his genealogical line, and who, so far as the narrative goes, has no recorded beginning or ending of his official life—and he makes him serve as a means of accomplishing the end which he has in view.

(*f*) In the presentation of the case of Melchisedek, the writer gives the details of the brief O. T. story, and afterwards moves, in the development of his thought, in the sphere of these, and of the Psalm-passage already cited which refers to him, just as he does in all the other parts of the Epistle where he quotes from the O. T. These details however, do not—as the careful reader will notice—belong to the leading thought of this passage (vv. 1–3). The verb to which Mel. is subject is *μένει* of ver. 3, and the important or essential words connected with the subject, in its relation to the verb, are those of the earlier part of ver. 3. The words of vv. 1, 2 set forth only what is secondary, so far as the present sentence is concerned, and what is to find its use and emphasis in the verses which follow (4–10). The significance of the name of Melchisedek and of the place where he was king is not alluded to afterwards, but it is probably brought out as giving a certain additional fitness and force to the comparison between him and Jesus.

(*g*) The view held by Alford and some other writers, that Melchisedek is here declared to be a person differing from common men in a mysterious and wonderful manner—not having been born in the ordinary human way, and not having been removed from the world by death—rests on the assumption that the author of the Epistle could not have used the case of Mel. as illustrative, without intending to make some dogmatic statement respecting him, an assumption which is neither

necessary nor capable of proof. This view is, also, exposed to three serious, if not fatal objections:—1. that the author of the Epistle is so far from making any full and clear affirmation on the subject, that even such writers themselves are compelled to admit (as Alf. does) that, "when they come to inquire *what* high and mysterious eminence is here allotted to Mel.," they "have no data whereon to decide"; 2. that the O. T. gives, in the story in Genesis, not even the slightest hint of any such mysterious eminence, and makes no allusion whatever to Melchisedek elsewhere, except in the Psalm-passage cited in v. 6; 3. that we have no reason, independently of what is supposed to be discovered in these verses, to believe that any man since Adam has been actually without father or mother, beginning of days or end of life, and, on the other hand, every reason to believe that no such man has existed.

(*h*) The phrase *μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν κ.τ.λ.* is, as Lünem. says, not to be limited to the beginning and end of the priesthood (as Hofmann and some others hold), but is to be taken as meaning, that nothing is related in Holy Scripture either of his birth or death. But the reference of the *whole sentence* is to the priesthood, and *these words*, by reason of this reference, are to be understood as indicating that Mel. had *an office* which was independent of the record of birth and death, and was, therefore, permanent by virtue of a life-force (comp. ver. 16), in contrast to the Levitical priests.

LXII. Vv. 4–10.

(*a*) The whole of this passage has reference to the matter of tithes, as connected with the story of Melchisedek and Abraham. The subject is presented in three points: 1. vv. 5–7; 2. ver. 8; 3. vv. 9, 10, as, also, set forth by Lünemann, in his note. It is to be observed, however, with respect to the second point, that the fact of death and life as bearing on the priesthood is not here considered independently, as it is in vv. 23–25, but in relation to the taking of tithes.

(*b*) As to the words and phrases of this passage, the following points may be noticed. 1. The writer takes special pains to set forth the exaltation of Mel., as illustrating that of Christ. This is evident from his mode of expression; comp. *πηλίκος*, with the imperative *θεωρεῖτε* calling attention to it; the placing of *ὁ πατριάρχης* at the end of the sentence (ver. 4), as showing that the head of the Jewish race acknowledged the dignity of Mel.; the manner in which the exaltation of the Levitical priests above the rest of the descendants of Abr., is presented in ver. 5, and in which they are then made inferior to Mel., in that the latter was above Abr. himself; the adding of the fact of the blessing which Mel. pronounced, as indicating elevated position.—2. There can be little doubt that Lünem. is correct in his explanation of *θεωρεῖτε* (ver. 4) as an imperative; of *κατὰ τὸν νόμον* (ver 5) as qualifying *ἐντολὴν ἐχουσιν*; of *ἐξ αὐτῶν* (ver. 6) as referring to the sons of Levi; and of the connection of ver. 7 with ver. 6 by *δέ*—ver. 7 being the major premise of a syllogism and ver. 6 the minor, while the conclusion is left to be supplied from the evident suggestion of the two verses.—3. With reference to the question where the writer found the declaration alluded to in the words *μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ* (ver. 8)—whether in the silence of Gen. xiv. or in the words of Ps. cx. 4, or in both—the fact that the expression is in a positive form; the presence of the participle *μαρτ.*, when compared with *μαρτυρεῖται*, followed by the

Ps., passage, in ver. 17; and the introduction of the verse from the Ps. in connection with the allusion to the priesthood as by virtue of a life-force, vv. 16. 17, favor the second supposition. If this view is correct, however, it does not involve the necessity of believing that Melchisedek never died.—4. The statement that Levi paid tithes to Mel., because he was in the loins of Abraham, who was his great-grandfather, is suggestive as to the question of the propriety of interpreting the popular language of the N. T. writers according to the ordinary rules and usage of such language.

LXIII. Vv. 11–19.

(*a*) The superiority of Christ as priest after the Melchisedek-order is presented in these verses (see note LXI *a*) as connected with the inability of the Levitical system to accomplish the end proposed, namely, the perfecting of the worshipers. The development of this subject is as follows:—1. If the Levitical priesthood could have secured the end, no other priest of a different order, would have arisen, vv. 11, 12; 2. Such a different priest, however, has arisen, as is shown (*x*) by the fact, that our Lord came from a different tribe; namely, from that of Levi, vv. 13, 14, and (*y*) by the fact, that the source of His priestly office and power is different from that of the Levitical priestly office, vv. 15–17; 3. Accordingly the old priesthood is set aside and a better one introduced.

(*b*) The first of these points (vv. 11, 12) is rendered more emphatic by the suggestion, that, if the priesthood was to be changed, it would involve the change of the entire legal system, since this institution was the central and fundamental thing in that system. This explanation of ver. 12 and the parenthetical clause of ver. 11 is objected to by Lünem. He holds that there are two co-ordinate thoughts, which the writer designs to bring out—that the Levitical priesthood, and also the Mosaic law, have lost their validity; Ver. 11, in its parenthesis, shows the close connection of the priesthood and the law, and implies that, if the former is imperfect and unsatisfying, the same is true of the latter; ver. 12, on the other hand, is simply a corroboration of the parenthesis of ver. 11. But there is no indication in the passage of any such co-ordination of the two thoughts. As the priesthood is the one subject of this whole section of the epistle, and of this entire chapter, so it is the one subject of this passage. The law comes in only in two places, here and in ver. 19; and, in both cases, in a parenthetical and secondary clause. The emphasis is wholly on the points mentioned above—that, if the old priesthood had been sufficient, there would have been no new and different one; that a new one has been established; and that the provision establishing the old one has been removed. The explanation given in this note, on the contrary, satisfies all the demands of the passage and bears along the thought in the most simple and natural way.

(*c*) Alf. renders εἰ μὲν οὖν by the English *if again*. He and Bleek carry back the thought to vi. 20 *b*. Lünem. connects immediately with vv. 5–10. As related to the development of the main idea Alf. and Bleek are probably correct, but it may be that the writer intended, in vv. 5 ff., to suggest the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood, though of course, only subordinately, to the principal thought of those verses.—(*d*) The insertion of the words ὁ λαὸς γὰρ κ.τ.λ. parenthetically, in ver. 11, instead of placing them in their more natural position after that verse, was undoubtedly for the purpose of carrying the additional force of the suggestion,

which they contain, into the conclusion expressed in *τίς ἔτι κ.τ.λ.* Such an arrangement of sentences is characteristic of Paul, and may be observed e. g. in Rom. v. 15–17 as related to the preceding and following context.—(*e*) R. V. gives *law* as a marginal rendering of *νόμου* (ver. 12). This rendering is proved to be incorrect, here, by the fact that the writer is speaking of the Levitical priesthood; by the fact that *νενομοθέτηται* must refer to the Mosaic law; and by the fact that *ὁ νόμος* is used in ver. 19. It was the vital relation between the Levitical priesthood and the particular law to which it appertained, that was to be emphasized.—(*f*) *γάρ* of ver. 13 proves the truth of the negative implied in *τίς ἔτι χρεία κ.τ.λ.* of ver. 11. In thought, though not grammatically, it may be regarded as covering both ver. 13 and vv. 15, 16. *γάρ* of ver. 14, on the other hand, gives the proof of the statement of ver. 13. Ver. 15 and ver. 13 are co-ordinate, not ver. 15 and ver. 14.—(*g*) The distinction between the Mel. priest and the Levit., which made them to be of two "different orders," is set forth in ver. 16. The latter was appointed in accordance with, and by virtue of, the rule or provision of an earthly temporary ordinance (*κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης*); the former by virtue of the power of his own indestructible life-force (*κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου*). The words are suggested, on the one hand, by the provisions of the Mosaic law, and, on the other, by the fact respecting the story of Melchisedek which is noted in ver. 3 (*μήτε . . . . ζωῆς*), and by the declaration of Ps. cx. 4. *Σαρκίνης* has reference here to what is external and passing away, rather than what is evil, or what is merely physical. *Ζωῆς ἀκαταλ.* denotes, not endless life as a general idea, but the indissoluble life in Christ Himself.—(*h*) The variation in the arrangement of the words in the Ps.-passage, in the different places where it is cited, will be noticed by the careful reader. The arrangement is in accordance with the emphasis desired in each case.

(*i*) Vv. 18, 19, being introduced by *γάρ*, are grammatically, and in the immediate connection of thought, united with vv. 15–17. They serve to show that the argument of vv. 15, 16 may properly be urged, because the Psalm-passage really involves what is said in vv. 18, 19. But, as related to the main idea of the whole passage (vv. 11–19), they may be regarded as suggesting the conclusion of the argument, or the summation of the thought (see (*a*) above): "There is a disannulling," etc.—(*j*) As to the words of these two verses, it is to be noticed: 1. that *μέν* of ver. 18 and *δέ* of ver. 19 are correlative; 2. that *γίνεται* is correctly explained by Lünem.—if the grammatical connection only is considered—as meaning *results* i. e. in the declaration of God, Ps. cx. 4; if the development of the leading thought is considered, however, the meaning *takes place* may be suggested. The translation of A. V. and R. V. *there is* may, possibly, be regarded as including the two; 3. that *ἐντολή* refers to the ordinance respecting the Levitical priesthood, and not to the whole law. This is evident from the use of *ἐντολή* in ver. 16, and from the distinction made, both in this verse (*ἐντολή* and *νόμος*) and in vv. 11, 12, between the institution of the priesthood and the law, as between a part and the whole; 4. that the words *ἀσθενές* and *ἀνωφελές* are to be determined in their special force and application by the *τελείωσις* of ver. 11; 5. that the parenthetical clause (*οὐδὲν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.*) reasons from the whole to the part—as the law made nothing perfect, so the ordinance respecting the priesthood was weak, etc.; 6. that the hope is "better" because sure to be realized; 7. that in the words *δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ Θεῷ* there is a foreshadowing of a thought which has its development in the next section (viii. 1–x. 18).

LXIV. Vv. 20–28.

(*a*) The explanation which Lünem. gives of the construction of vv. 20–22 is to be adopted, as is also his view respecting the words to be supplied with *καθ' ὅσοι οὐ χ. ὁρκωμ.* (namely, *ἱερεῖς ἐστιν γεγονώς*). The arguments which he presents for the supply of these last-mentioned words, rather than *τοῦτο* referring to *ἐπεισαγ. κ.τ.λ.* of ver. 19, or *διαθήκης ἔγγυος γέγονεν*, are conclusive. These verses, however, are not to be regarded, (as he supposes), as having a sort of parallelism with vv. 18, 19,—the former verses setting forth one element in the superiority of the everlasting priesthood, vv. 15, 16, 17, and these latter verses setting forth a second element. The parallelism of vv. 20–22 is with vv. 11–19 and vv. 4–10, and they present a third point of superiority in the Mel. priesthood above the Levitical. The view of Lünem. is incorrect, because the object of vv. 15–17 is not to set forth the everlasting priesthood of Christ after the order of Mel., but the fact that it is by virtue of the life-force in Himself (which is, indeed, indestructible), and not of an ordinance of the law.—(*b*) The parenthetical passage, in its relation to the development of the argument, is kindred to the similar passages in vv. 11, 19, though there is a slight difference occasioned by the demands of the thought in each case.—(*c*) The fact that here the words of the Psalm-passage: "The Lord sware" are introduced, as they have not been before—the argument here requiring them,—and the fact that in *κρείττονος διαθήκης* we have again a foreshadowing of the idea specially brought out in the next chapters, will be remarked by the attentive reader.

(*d*) In vv. 23–25 the *fourth* point in the writer's presentation of Christ's superiority as Mel.-priest (not the *third*, as Lünem. holds, see (*a*) above) is set forth. This fourth point is the everlasting and unchanging character of the priesthood.—(*e*) Of the words in these three verses it may be said:—1. that *παραμένειν* may be understood either of continuing in life, or in the priesthood. Lünemann holds the former view. The parallelism of the clauses, however, favors the latter: they are many in number, because death prevents their continuance in office; he is one permanent priest, because he abides ever in life;—2. that *ἀπαράβατον* is probably dealt with in the right manner by R. V. (comp. also A. V.)—being rendered in the passive sense in the text, *unchangeable*, and in the active in the margin, *that doth not pass to another*. The possibilities of the case are such, that both meanings must be recognized; but the probabilities favor, in some degree, the passive sense. See Bleek Comm. on Heb. 1st. ed. Vol. II. pp. 396 f.

(*f*) Vv. 26–28 present the fifth point of the argument (see Note LXI *a*). The main thought of these verses is that of the sinlessness of Christ, in contrast to the infirmity of the Levitical priests, as making the sacrifice which He offers sufficient and complete, while theirs needed to be constantly repeated. This passage, again, is introduced by *γάρ* in a grammatical subordination to the verses which immediately precede, but logically, and in the development of the argument, it evidently has an independent force.—(*g*) The distinction made by Lünem. in the reference of *ὅσιος* and the two following adjectives—that they point to Christ's relation to God, to men, and to Himself—is not improbably correct, but it is doubtful whether it can be affirmed as certainly so.—(*h*) With respect to *καθ' ἡμέραν* (ver. 27), the most satisfactory explanation may be this: that the high priest, being the head of the priesthood, is viewed as fulfilling all the requirements of the O. T. system, and that all the other offerings are looked

upon as, in a sense, pointing to and finding their consummation in the great offering of the High-priest on the day of atonement.—(*i*) υἱόν of ver. 28 is translated by R. V., and correctly, *a Son*. The word is used here as it is in i. 2, and, though it refers to Christ, it does not, like ὁ υἱός, designate Him as *the Son of God*, but describes Him as in contrast to the O. T. high-priests. He was not one who held an office merely as a man, but one who stood in the relation to God of a Son in the highest sense; as, in i. 1 f., He is set forth, by the use of the same word, in contrast to the prophets. The peculiarity of the writer's style (noticed already in connection with v. 5, and elsewhere) by which, in an artistic, rhetorical way, he unites one part of his epistle with another in the forms of expression employed, is again manifest in this place.—(*j*) That the writer, as he draws near to the closing section of his Epistle, should anticipate its thought and expressions is not strange. It seems, even, to be a part of his plan to do so; comp. ii. 17 f. iv. 14 ff.

CHAPTER VIII.

VER. 1. *ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις*] B: *ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις*. Explanatory gloss.—Ver. 2. *Recepta*: *καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρωπος*. But *καί* is wanting in B D* E* ℵ, 17, It. Arabb. Euseb. Already rejected by Mill. Rightly deleted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford.—Ver. 4. Elz. Matth. Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, have *εἰ μὲν γάρ*. Defended also by Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 504, *Obs.*), and Reiche. But *γάρ* cannot be referred back to ver. 3, and upon the referring of it back to ver. 2 the addition, ver. 3, would become aimless and inexplicable. More in keeping logically, and better attested (by A B D* ℵ, 17, 73, 80, 137, Vulg. It. Copt., *al.*), is the reading: *εἰ μὲν οὖν*, already commended to attention by Griesbach, and adopted by Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Alford, which is accordingly to be preferred.—Instead of the *Recepta τῶν ἱερέων τῶν προσφερόντων* (approved by Bloomfield, who, however, encloses the first *τῶν* within brackets, and Reiche), Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford have rightly adopted merely *τῶν προσφερόντων*. Preferred also by Delitzsch. *τῶν ἱερέων*, to the rejection of which already Grotius, Mill, and Griesbach were inclined, is an elucidatory gloss. It is condemned by the decisive authority of A B D* E* ℵ, 17, 67** 73, 137, *al.*, Vulg. It. Copt. Aeth. Arm.—*τόν*] before *νόμον* in the *Recepta* (recently contended for by Bloomfield and Delitzsch) is to be deleted, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, after A B ℵ* 17, 57, 80, *al.*, Theodoret. The later addition of the article is more easily to be explained than its omission.—Ver. 5. Elz.: *ποιήσῃς*. But all the uncial mss., many cursives, Orig. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. Oecum. Theophyl. have *ποιήσεις*, which also is found in LXX. Ex. xxv. 40. Commended by Griesbach. Rightly adopted already in the edd. Erasm. 1, Ald. Stephan. 1, 2, and recently by Matthaei, Scholz, Bleek, Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. Approved also by Delitzsch and Reiche.—Ver. 6. In place of the *Recepta νυνὶ δέ*, Lachm. reads, but without sufficient authority (B D* Ath.): *νῦν δέ*. The more euphonious *νυνὶ δέ* is protected by A D** D*** E K L ℵ, min., and many Fathers.—Instead of the *Recepta τέτευχε* (B D*** ℵ*** min. Damasc. [once] Theophyl. [cod.]), there is found in the edd. Complut. Plantin. Genev. the peculiarly Attic form: *τετύχηκε*. This is supported by 47, 72, 73, 74, *al.*, Athan. (thrice), Bas. Antioch. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. Best attested is the form: *τέτυχεν* (by A D* K L ℵ* 80, 116, 117, *al.*, Athan. Oecum. Theophylact), which is therefore rightly preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford.—Ver. 8. *αὐτοῖς*] So Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, after B D*** E L ℵ***, likewise, as it seems, almost all min. Chrys. Damasc. *al.*—Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 8 read *αὐτούς*. But the attestation of the latter (A D* K ℵ* 17, 39, *al.*, Theodoret) is not at all decisive, and the accusative, seeing it requires the conjoining with *μεμφόμενος*, opposed to the context; see the exposition.—Ver. 10. *ἡ διαθήκη*] Lachm.: *ἡ διαθήκη [μου]*, after A D E. *μου* is found, indeed, also with the LXX. in most mss. (but not in the *Cod. Alex.*); yet, nevertheless, since it forms a tautological

addition, and does not correspond to the Hebrew original (כִּי זֹאת הַבְּרִית), it probably arose only by a mechanical repetition from the preceding *διαθήκη μου*.—Ver. 11. *Recepta:* *τὸν πλησίον*. But the weighty authority of all uncial mss. (B: *τὸν πολείτην*), most cursives, as well as that of Syr. utr. Arabb. Copt. Arm. It. *al.*, Chrys. (codd.) Theodoret, Damasc. Aug. requires the reading: *τὸν πολίτην*, already presented by the edd. Complut. Stephan. 1, 2, *al.*, and later approved by Bengel and Wetstein, as also adopted by Griesbach, Matthaei, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche, and others.—*ἀπὸ μικροῦ*] Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield: *ἀπὸ μικροῦ αὐτῶν*. But *αὐτῶν* is wanting in A B D* E* (?) K ℵ, 17, 31, 61, 73, 80, *al.*, Copt. Arm. It. Vulg., with Cyr. Chrys. *al.* Already suspected by Griesbach. Rightly deleted by Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 1 and 8, and Alford.—Ver. 12. *καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν*] The concluding words: *καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν*, have been taken for a gloss by Bleek, Tisch. 1, 2, and 8, and Alford (comp. already Beza and Grotius); and in accordance with B ℵ* 17, 23, Vulg. Copt. Basm. Syr. Arab. Erp. rejected. They are also declared suspected by Delitzsch. But in favor of their retention (Lachm. Bloomfield, Tisch. 7, Reiche) decides partly the preponderating authority of A D E K L ℵ*** *al.*, partly the recurrence of the same words on the repetition of the citation x. 17. The addition might easily be overlooked on account of the homoioteleuton.

Vv. 1–13. [On Vv. 1–6, see Note LXV., pages 595, 596.] Not merely, however, as regards His person is Christ highly exalted above the Levitical priests: the sanctuary, too, in which He fulfills the office of High Priest, is highly exalted above the Levitical sanctuary. For Christ sustains His high-priestly office in the heavenly tabernacle, erected by God Himself, of which as the archetype the earthly tabernacle, in which the Levitical priests fulfill their office, is a mere copy. So much the more excellent is the priestly ministry of Christ, in proportion as the Covenant of which He is the Mediator is a better covenant, because resting upon the foundation of better promises. The character of this promised New Covenant is a more inward, spiritual one; and by the promise of a New Covenant the Old is declared to be outworn and no longer serviceable.

Vv. 1, 2. [LXV *b-e.*] Κεφάλαιον δέ] *Now a main point is.* Κεφάλαιον is not accusative absolute (Bengel), nor yet the ordinary accusative with a *λέγω τοῦτο* to be supplemented (Ebrard), but *nominative*, and apposition to the whole ensuing proposition: *τοιοῦτον . . . ἀνθρωπος*, ver. 2. Comp. Rom. viii. 3. Just as *κεφάλαιον δέ* are also the kindred formulas: *τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, τὸ δὲ δεινότατον, τὸ ἔσχατον, τὸ τελευταῖον*, etc., very frequently prefixed to a whole clause by way of apposition.[1] The expression *κεφάλαιον* itself is here understood by many expositors in the sense of "*sum*;" according to which the author would express the intention of immediately comprehending or recapitulating the substance of all his previous disquisition in a single statement.[2] This signification, however, although linguistically

[1] See Kühner, II. p. 146, *Obs.* 2.

[2] So Laurentius Valla ("in summam autem"), Erasmus, Clarius, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, H. Stephanus, Grotius ("post tot dicta haec esto summa"), Carpzov ("ut rem summatim et uno verbo complectar"), Stengel, Hofmann (*Schriftbeic.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 405), Conybeare, M'Caul, etc.

justified, is here *inadmissible*, since the author is passing over to something essentially new; a recapitulation of the previous argument accordingly does not take place at all. But neither is the anarthrous *κεφάλαιον*—although in itself this is not inadmissible—to be taken as equivalent to *τὸ κεφάλαιον*, as is done by Theophylact (*ἵνα εἴπω τὸ μέγιστον καὶ συνεκτικώτερον*), Bleek ("the essential thing, to which all else is subordinated"), Ebrard ("the keystone"), Bisping ("the core of all"), Stuart, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* pp. 464, 481; Alford, Maier, Ewald, and others. For, besides the further main point in the superiority of the N. T. High Priest over the Levitical high priests, here to be mentioned (namely, His ministering in a better sanctuary), the author has yet before his mind the elucidation of a *third* leading distinction (that of the better sacrifice presented by Christ). Comp. ix. 9 ff.—*ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις*] cannot be referred back specially[1] to that which has already been said. For therewith the participle *present* *λεγομένοις* does not agree; *εἰρημένοις* must have been put instead of it. Nor, accordingly, can the sense be: "in addition to that already treated of" (Calov, Wolf, Rambach, Peirce, Storr, Ebrard, *al.*). On the contrary, *ἐπί* must be taken in the signification: "upon the supposition of," "in the case of," as ix. 17 and frequently, and *ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις* has essentially the same meaning as the genitive *τῶν λεγομένων*. Thus: *now a main point in the case of those things we are speaking of* (or: *in our argument*) *is the following*.—With the utmost violence does Hofmann tear the words asunder,[2] in that he will have *κεφάλαιον δέ* separated from *ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις*, and to the latter would supplement *ἀρχιερεῖσιν*, and renders: "besides those who are called high priests, we have a High Priest who has sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty." That, moreover, the thought thus resulting would be a senseless one,—inasmuch as it would then follow that Christians have *several* sorts of high priests,—has already been pointed out by Nickel.[3] For how arbitrary it is when Hofmann seeks further to twist the statement, gained with so much toil, in the sense: "that the Christians possess a High Priest, compared with whom those who are so called have for them no significance," hardly needs to be observed.—*τοιοῦτον*] is a preparation for the following *ὃς ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ.* Wrongly does Böhme refer it back to *τοιοῦτος*, vii. 26, and Carpzov to *ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος* in the same verse. The latter, moreover, with an erroneous accentuation of the *ἐχομεν*: "*habemus* omnino talem pontificem *sc. ὑψηλότερον τῶν οὐρανῶν*, quippe qui adeo consedit ad dextram Dei *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*," in connection with which the progress of the discourse is lost sight of, and the fact remains unnoticed that the centre of gravity in the statement, vv. 1, 2, is contained only in ver. 2.—*ὃς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*] *who has sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven* (Ps. cx.). Comp. i. 3: *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς*.—The opinion of Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch,

[1] As is assumed by Erasmus, Clarius, Zeger, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Hammond, Carpzov, Schulz, Stein, Stengel, Ebrard, Ewald, and many others.

[2] *Schriftbeic.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 406, and so still in his commentary, p. 302 f.

[3] In Reuter's *Repertor.* 1858, Feb. p. 110.

Klee, Bleek, and Alford, that the author designed by *ἐκάθισεν*, too, to indicate a point of superiority in Christ over the Levitical high priests,—inasmuch as the latter, when they entered the Most Holy Place, instead of sitting down were required to stand,—is far-fetched. There is nothing in the context to lead to such a supposition. It is otherwise (on account of the express opposition there met with *ἕστηκεν . . . ἐκάθισεν*) chap. x. 11, 12. *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*] belongs to *ἐκάθισεν*, not to *τῆς μεγαλωσύνης* (Böhme), since otherwise the article would have been repeated; still less to the opening words of ver. 2 (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 405 f.), since in that case *τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς λειτουργός* would have been the only natural expression, the rhythmical proportion of vv. 1, 2 would have been destroyed, and the *ἐν ὑψηλοῖς*, i. 3, parallel to the *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* in our passage, would have remained unnoticed as regards its coherence with that which precedes.

Ver. 2. Declaration of the capacity in which Christ has sat down at the right hand of God: as a sacrificing priest of the *true* sanctuary and tabernacle, which the *Lord* erected, not a man. Ver. 2 is to be joined without any comma to ver. 1. For only the qualification of the *ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 1, which is first added by means of ver. 2,—not merely the fact of the *καθίσαι* in itself, since this had already been often mentioned in the epistle,—contains the new main feature which the author aims at bringing into prominence.—*τῶν ἁγίων*] is not *masculine*[1] but *neuter;* it denotes, however, neither the *holy things*,[2] nor *that which is required for the priestly service*,[3] nor "such holy things as stand in essential relation to the *σκηνὴ ἀληθινή*" but *the sanctuary*,[5] *in which* (or: *in regard to which*) *the priestly service is performed.* Comp. ix. 8, 12, 24, 25, x. 19, xiii. 11.—Synonymous with *τῶν ἁγίων* is the *τῆς σκηνῆς*, added by way of elucidation; and from the adjective of the latter, *τῆς ἀληθινῆς*, we have also to supply in thought the corresponding adjective *τῶν ἀληθινῶν* (comp. ix. 24) to the foregoing *τῶν ἁγίων.* For even the earthly high priest was a *τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός*; only a *τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἀληθινῶν λειτουργός* he was not.—*λειτουργός*] Comp. *λειτουργεῖν*, x. 11, and *λειτουργία*, ver. 6, ix. 21; Phil. ii. 17; Luke i. 23. With the classic writers, *λειτουργός* denotes the bearer of any public office, or office of the State. In the *general* sense of a "servant" it stands i. 7; Rom. xiii. 6; Phil. ii. 25. But already with the LXX. (Neh. x. 39; cf. Ecclus. vii. 30, *al.*) it is spoken specially of him who discharges priestly service. In accordance therewith it has here, too (comp. ver. 3), as well as Rom. xv. 16, the signification: *sacrificing priest.* *τῆς ἀληθινῆς*] The *σκηνή* is called *true*, not in opposition to the *false*, but as the *archetype*[6] existing in heaven in contrast with the earthly *image of the same* (ver. 5), which latter, as is always the

[1] Oecumenius: *ἀρχιερεύς φησι τῶν ἡγιασμένων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπων· ἡμῶν γάρ ἐστιν ἀρχιερεύς*, Primasius, Cajetan, Schulz, Paulus, Stengel.

[2] Luther, Hunnius, Balduin.

[3] Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Rambach, Ewald.

[4] Kurtz.

[5] According to Erasmus, Jac. Cappellus, Böhme, Stuart, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 513; Alford, Maier, and others, *specially:* the Most Holy Place.

[6] Comp. Wisd. ix. 8: *εἶπας οἰκοδομῆσαι ναὸν . . . καὶ . . . θυσιαστήριον, μίμημα σκηνῆς ἁγίας, ἣν προητοίμασας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.*

case with the copy in relation to the original, could be only something imperfect. *ἣν ἐπηξεν*] Comp. Ex. xxxiii. 7.—*ὁ κύριος*] is here *God*, as elsewhere in our epistle only in the O. T. citations.—*ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἀνθρωπος*] Comp. *σκηνῆς οὐ χειροποιήτου*, ix. 11; *οὐ χειροποίητα ἅγια*, ix. 24.

Ver. 3. [LXV *f.*] Subsidiary remark in justification of the expression *λειτουργός*, ver. 2. The *λειτουργεῖν*, or the presenting of sacrifices, is just something essential in the fulfillment of the office of every high priest; a *λειτουργός*, or sacrificing priest, must thus (*Christ* also be. By the statement, ver. 3, the argument itself is not interrupted. For enclosing the verse within a parenthesis, with Cameron, Stengel, and others, there exists therefore no reason.—*γάρ*] the explanatory *namely*. On *πᾶς γάρ . . . καθίσταται*, comp. v. 1: *πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς . . . καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας. ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον*] *sc. ἦν*[1] not *ἐστίν*.[2] For the author knows only one single sacrificial act of Christ, an act performed once for all (not one continually repeated), as is evident partly from the parallel passages, vii. 27, ix. 12, 25, 28, x. 10, 12, 14, partly from the preterite *προσενέγκῃ* in our passage.—*ἐχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον, ὃ προσενέγκῃ*] *that also this* (High Priest) *should have somewhat that He might offer up*. By the *τί* the author understands Christ's own body, which He gave up to death as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sinful world. The indefinite mode of expression by *τί*, however, was chosen just because the reference to the sacrifice in this place was only an incidental one, and that which was intended could the less be misunderstood by the readers, in that immediately before, vii. 27, it had been declared by means of *ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας* in what the sacrifice of Christ consisted.

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

Ver. 4. A sacrificial priest Christ can only be, *either* in the earthly *or* the heavenly sanctuary; for a third, besides these two, there is not. The author now proves, ver. 4, that He cannot be a priest in the earthly sanctuary, whence it then follows of itself that He must be so in the heavenly one.—*εἰ ἦν*] not: *if He had been* (Böhme, Kuinoel), but: *if He were*. To *εἰ μὲν οὖν ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς* we have, moreover, neither[3] to supply *μόνον*, nor[4] *ἀρχιερεύς* or *ἱερεύς*. It signifies nothing more than: if He were now on earth, had His dwelling-place upon earth.—*οὐδ' ἂν ἦν ἱερεύς*] *He would not even be a priest*. Incorrectly Bleek, Bisping, and Ewald: *He would not even be a priest—not to say a high priest*. For the augmenting *οὐδέ* can refer only to the whole proposition, not specially to *ἱερεύς*, since otherwise *οὐδ' ἱερεὺς ἂν ἦν* must have been written. *ἱερεύς* is therefore to be taken as a more general expression for the more definite *ἀρχιερεύς*. Yet more erroneously

[1] Syriac, Beza, Piscator, Owen, Bengel, Bleek, de Wette, Hofmann, *Komm.* p. 306; Woerner.

[2] Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, Schlichting, Schulz, Böhme, Stuart, Kuinoel, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 407; Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 505; Alford, Maier, Moll, Ewald, M'Caul, *al.*

[3] With Grotius, Wolf, and others.

[4] With Zeger, Bengel, Carpzov, Heinrichs, Böhme, and others.

Primasius, Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Rambach, Carpzov, and others: "He would not be that unique, real, or true priest, that everlasting priest after the manner of Melchisedec"—which, without an addition, the words cannot by any means signify.—The reason why Christ, if He were dwelling upon earth, could not at all be a priest, is contained in the ὄντων . . . τὰ δῶρα. For on earth there are, of a truth, the legally appointed priests already present, and with these Jesus, since He belonged not to the tribe of Levi, but to the tribe of Judah (vii. 14), has nothing in common.—ὄντων τῶν προσφερόντων κατὰ νόμον τὰ δῶρα] *since assuredly there are present* (ὄντων has the emphasis), *sc.* on earth, *those who in accordance with law* (*i. e.* according to the norm of the Mosaic law) *offer the gifts*, namely the Levites, among whom Christ could not be reckoned. ὄντων and προσφερόντων designate that which is still existing at the time of our author. To take the words as participles of the *past* (Peshito, Vulgate, Grotius,[1] Braun, and others), is already forbidden by the *present* λατρεύουσιν, ver. 5.

Ver. 5. The author at once attaches to the proof given, ver. 4,—that Christ must be High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary,—the testimony of Scripture that the earthly sanctuary, in which the Levitical priests officiate, is a mere copy of the heavenly, thus only an imperfect sanctuary. Schlichting: Vel rationem quandam div. autor his verbis exprimit, cur Christus, si in terris esset, sacerdos esse non posset, nempe quia sacerdotes illi, qui in terris degentes offerunt, umbrae tantum serviunt coelestium; vel tantum a contrario illustrat id, quod de pontifice nostro dixerat, nempe eum esse veri tabernaculi ministrum, legales vero pontifices umbrae tantum et exemplari illius coelestis tabernaculi servire. Not to enclose within a parenthesis (Griesbach, Schulz, Scholz, *al.*), since the same easily joins on syntactically to ver. 4, and διαφορωτέρας, ver. 6, points back to its subject-matter.—οἵτινες] *nimirum qui.*—ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ] *a copy and shadow.* ὑποδείγματι corresponds to the δειχθέντα σοι in the ensuing citation, and denotes here (otherwise iv. 11) that which is shown only by way of hints, or only in its general outlines (comp. τὰ ὑποδείγματα, ix. 23), has thus the notion of a merely imperfect sketch or copy. Yet more emphatically is the notion of imperfection brought out by means of καὶ σκιᾷ. For σκιά stands not merely opposed to the σῶμα, as the *unsubstantial* to the *substantial*,[2] but also to the εἰκών, as the *shadowy image* melting into obscurity, and only to be recognized in its exterior outlines to the *likeness* distinctly struck off, containing light and color, and enabling one to recognize the original.[3]—λατρεύουσιν] is taken unnaturally by Calvin, Pareus, Bengel, Peirce, Schulz, and others in the *absolute* sense: "who serve God in a copy and shadow." The datives ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ τῶν

[1] This writer with the explanation entirely foreign to the subject: "Erant, nempe quum psalmus iste scriberetur."

[2] Col. ii. 17; Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* ii. 2. 5: σκιὰν αἰτησόμενος βασιλείας, ἧς ἤρπασεν ἑαυτῷ τὸ σῶμα; Philo, *de confus. linguarum*, p. 348; with Mangey, I. p. 434.

[3] Comp. Heb. x. 1: σκιὰν . . . οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων: Achilles Tatius, i. p. 47 (in Wetstein *ad* x. 1): οὕτω τέθηκεν καὶ τῆς εἰκόνος ἡ σκιά: Cicero, *de Officiis*, iii. 17: Sed nos veri juris germanaeque justitiae solidam et expressam effigiem nullam tenemus; umbra et imaginibus utimur.

ἐπουρανίων form the *object* of the verb (comp. xiii. 10): "who minister (as priests) to that which is but a copy and shadow of the heavenly."—*λατρεύειν* here, by virtue of the connection, entirely equivalent to *λειτουργεῖν*; in general, however, of wider signification, and differing from *λειτουργεῖν* as the Hebrew עָבַד from שָׁרַת.—*τῶν ἐπουρανίων*] not "of the heavenly things" (Luther), "of the heavenly relations and facts of redemption" (Ebrard), "of the heavenly relations and divine thoughts" (Moll), "of the ideal possessions in general, belonging to the kingdom of God" (Tholuck); but: *of the heavenly sanctuary.* Comp. the citation immediately following, as also ver. 2 and ix. 23, 24.—*καθὼς κεχρημάτισται Μωϋσῆς*] *according to the response, or divine revelation, which Moses received.* The *passive χρηματίζεσθαι* in this sense only in the N. T. (xi. 7; Matt. ii. 22; Acts x. 22, *al.*) and in Josephus (*Antiq.* iii. 8. 8, xi. 8. 4).—*ἐπιτελεῖν*] denotes here not the completion of that which is already begun. What is meant is the execution of that which had previously only been resolved on.—The citation is from Ex. xxv. 40. The *γάρ*, even as *φησίν*, belongs to the author of our epistle, on which account *ὁρᾶ γάρ φησιν* is to be written without placing a comma after *γάρ*.—*φησίν*] *sc. ὁ χρηματισμός*, the divine response, or, since in Exodus (xl. 1) God is expressly named as the speaker: *ὁ θεός* (Heinrichs, Bleek, Stengel, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Kurtz, *al.*), not *ἡ γραφή* (Böhme).—*πάντα*] is wanting with the LXX.—*κατὰ τὸν τύπον*] *in accordance with the pattern* (תַּבְנִית), *i. e.* corresponding to the archetype presented to the contemplation of Moses in the manner of a revelation, or by means of a vision. Comp. Acts vii. 44. Over-refined, indeed, although linguistically not less admissible than the other, is the interpretation of Faber Stapulensis, Rivetus, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Storr, Bleek, and Maier, that in connection with *τύπος* we have to think of a mere copy of the archetype, so that the Levitical priests served in priestly guise the copy of a copy.—*τὸν δειχθέντα*] LXX.: *τὸν δεδειγμένον.*—*ἐν τῷ ὄρει*] *upon the mount*, namely Sinai.

Ver. 6 repeats, in the form of an antithesis to vv. 4, 5, the main proposition of the new section, that Christ accomplishes His priestly service in the *heavenly* sanctuary (ver. 2); in the progress of the discourse, however, advances an additional argument in favor of this main proposition: in that the naturalness of the fact asserted *is evidenced by the superiority of that covenant* which has been brought in by Christ. As, therefore, the author (vii. 20–22) had deduced from the higher priestly rank of Christ the more excellent nature of the covenant brought in by Him; so here, conversely, from the better nature of the covenant established by Him, is inferred the higher order of His priestly ministry. *νυνὶ δέ* forms the opposition to *εἰ μὲν οὖν*, ver. 4, while *διαφορωτέρας* points back antithetically to the contents of ver. 5.[1]—*νυνὶ δέ*] not in the *temporal*, but in the *logical* sense: *but now.*—*διαφορωτέρας λειτουργίας*] inasmuch, namely, as

[1] Theophylact: *Ἐκείνου τοῦ νοήματος ἤρτηται ταῦτα, τοῦ Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἱερεύς· νυνὶ δὲ μὴ ὤν, φησίν, ἐπὶ γῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔχων ἱερατεῖον, διαφορωτέρας ἐπέτυχε λειτουργίας· τουτέστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ ἡ λειτουργία τοιαύτη, οἵα ἡ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀρχιερέων ἀλλ' οὐράνιος, ἅτε τόπον ἔχουσα τῆς οἰκείας τελετῆς τὸν οὐρανόν.*

the σκηνή, in which He fulfills His office, is the ἀληθινή, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἀνθρωπος (ver. 2).—On the comparative διαφορωτέρας, see at ii. 4.—καί after ὅσῳ renders distinctly apparent the inner correspondence of the two principal members in the proposition, ver. 6.—μεσίτης] *Mediator* (ix. 15, xii. 24; Gal. iii. 19, 20; 1 Tim. ii. 5; LXX. Job ix. 33), inasmuch as He has proclaimed the *New* and better *Covenant*, and has sealed the same by His death on the cross. [On Vv. 6 *b*–13, see Note LXVI., page 596.]—ἥτις] *which, as such.* Introduction of the proof that the covenant of which Christ is made the Mediator is a *better* one (vii. 22), *i. e.* affords full satisfaction to the heart seeking salvation and deliverance, which the Mosaic covenant was incapable of pacifying. [LXVI *a*–*c*.] The proof for this superiority the author derives from the fact that the New Covenant has been enacted upon the ground of (ἐπί [cf. vii. 11; Acts xiv. 3]) better promises, *i. e.* promises more excellent with regard to their subject-matter. The expression νενομοθέτηται is chosen not in order to denote the similarity of nature in the two covenant-foundings, but, after the analogy of the Pauline mode of expression, Rom. iii. 27 (ix. 31), in order to oppose to the Mosaic law, hitherto in operation, the New Covenant as in some sense a new law (comp. νόμους μου, ver. 10) now come into force.—κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις] What is meant is without doubt the several factors in the contents of the passage from Jeremiah cited immediately after—to wit, the promise of the forgiveness of sins (comp. ver. 12), which the Old Covenant was not able to bring about (Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iii. 10 ff.), in connection with the character of *inwardness* of the New Covenant in general (vv. 10, 11), as opposed to the *externalism* of the Old.—The explaining of the κρείττονες ἐπαγγελίαι, with Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Clarius, Bengel, Carpzov, Whitby, M'Lean, Bisping, and others, of *everlasting blessedness* and the other eternal blessings of Christianity, in opposition to the purely terrestrial and temporal promises of Mosaism (the peaceful possession of the land of Canaan, a long life upon earth, etc.), is to be rejected; because—apart from the contradiction in which this interpretation stands with the elucidation given by the author himself by virtue of the ensuing citation from Scripture—it is, as Bleek rightly observes, improbable that the author should have referred the promises deposited in the Mosaic law to merely *earthly things*, in place of referring them to the object of which he understands the promise already imparted to Abraham—the bringing in of the great salvation for the people of God in the person of Christ.—The view, too, that the ἐπαγγελίαι of the New Covenant are called κρείττονες *because they are better guaranteed* (Stengel and others), has the context against it.

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

Ver. 7. [LXVI *d*.] Justification of the κρείττονος and κρείττοσιν, ver. 6.—εἰ ἦν] *if it were* (vii. 11, viii. 4).—ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη] *sc.* διαθήκη. On the *superlative*, quite in keeping with the linguistic usage of the Greek, see

Winer, p. 229, [E. T. 244.] *Obs.* 1.—*ἀμεμπτος*] *faultless* (Phil. ii. 15, iii. 6), *satisfactory, sufficient.* Theodoret: *τὸ ἀμεμπτος ἀντὶ τοῦ τελεία τέθεικε.—οὐκ ἀν δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο τόπος*] *place would not have been sought* (*sc.* by God, in the O. T., or in the passage of Scripture immediately adduced) *for a second* (covenant); *i. e.* it would not have been expressed by God Himself, that a second covenant is to come in beside the first, and replace it. In this general sense *ἐζητεῖτο τόπος* is to be taken, and the form of expression in the apodosis to be explained from a mingling of a twofold mode of contemplation (*οὐκ ἀν δευτέρα ἐζητεῖτο καὶ δευτέρας οὐκ ἦν ἀν τόπος*: a second would not be sought by God, nor would there be any place for a second). No emphasis rests upon *τόπος*; on which account it is over-refining, when Bleek finds in *ἐζητεῖτο τόπος* the reference that to the New Covenant, according to ver. 10, the place was assigned in the hearts of men, while the Old was written upon tables of stone.

Ver. 8. Making good of the assertion, ver. 7, that the Old Covenant was not free from fault, and God on that account made known His purpose of establishing a New one. Since *μεμφόμενος* manifestly corresponds to the *ἀμεμπτος*, ver. 7, and *there* the non-freedom from blame regards the covenant itself, not the possessors thereof, it is more natural to combine *αὐτοῖς* with *λέγει*[1] than—what is certainly possible in a grammatical respect (see the Lexicons)—to join it to *μεμφόμενος*.[2]—*λέγει*] *sc.* *ὁ θεός*. Comp. the thrice-occurring *λέγει κύριος* in the following citation (vv. 8, 9, 10).—*αὐτοῖς λέγει*] *He saith unto them*, namely, the possessors of the *πρώτη διαθήκη*.—The citation beginning with *ἰδού*, and extending to the close of ver. 12, is from Jer. xxxi. (LXX. xxxviii.) 31–34, after the LXX., with slight deviations.—*λέγει κύριος*] so in the LXX. of the *Cod. Alex.* The *Cod. Vatican.* and others have *φησὶ κύριος*.—In place of *καὶ συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα*, it reads in the LXX.: *καὶ διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰούδα*. Perhaps a change designedly made in order to characterize the New Covenant as a completed or perfect one.

Ver. 9. *Οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν*] negative unfolding of the foregoing positive expression *καινήν* (namely, a covenant): *not after the manner of the covenant* (לֹא כַבְּרִית) *which I made for their fathers, i. e.* one qualitatively different therefore, and that as being a better one.—*ἣν ἐποίησα*] LXX.: *ἣν διεθέμην.—τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν*] in the Hebrew אֶת־אֲבוֹתָם, *with their fathers.* The mere dative with *ἐποίησα* excludes the notion of reciprocity in the covenant-founding which has taken place, and presents it purely as the work of the disposition made by God.—*ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου κ.τ.λ.*] *in the day* (at the time) *when I took hold of their hand, to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt*

[1] Faber Stapulensis, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Peirce, Michaelis, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Kuinoel, Klee, Bleek, Stein, Bloomfield, Reiche, *Comment. crit.* p. 65 sq.; Conybeare, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, and others.

[2] Peshito, Vulgate, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Er. Schmid, Bengel, Wolf, Carpzov, Heinrichs, Böhme, Stengel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Hofmann, *al.*

(בְּיוֹם הַחֲזִיקִי בְיָדָם לְהוֹצִיאָם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם). An unwieldy but not exactly incorrect construction (see Winer, p. 531 [E. T. 571]), in place of which Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph. Jud.* 11, in citing the same words of Scripture, has chosen the less cumbrous *ἐν ᾗ ἐπελαβόμην*. The note of time characterizes the covenant as *the Mosaic* one.—*ὅτι*] *for;* not: "because," as protasis to *κἀγὼ κ.τ.λ.* as the apodosis (Calvin, Böhme, Hofmann, *al.*).—*κἀγώ*] emphatic personal opposition to *αὐτοί*: *and consequently I also concerned not myself about them.*—*λέγει κύριος*] LXX. (*Cod. Alex.* too): *φησὶ κύριος*.

Ver. 10. Justification of the *διαθήκην καινήν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην κ.τ.λ.*, vv. 8, 9, by a definite indication of the nature of the covenant to be instituted.—*ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη κ.τ.λ.*] *for this* (or the following) *is the covenant which I will institute for the house of Israel. αὕτη* introduces with emphasis the material characterization following with *διδοὺς κ.τ.λ.*—*οἶκος Ἰσραήλ*] here embraces the whole nation, while in ver. 8 it denoted one of the two kingdoms into which it had been divided.—*μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας*] *after those days, i. e.* after the days which must first have elapsed, before the *ἡμέραι* mentioned, ver. 8,—in which the New Covenant is to come into existence,—begin to dawn.[1]—*λέγει κύριος*] LXX.: *φησὶ κύριος*.—*διδούς*] So LXX. *Cod. Alex.*, while *Cod. Vatic.* and other MSS. of the LXX. have *διδοὺς δώσω*. In the Hebrew נָתַתִּי. *διδούς* does not stand for *δώσω* (Vatablus, Schlichting, Bengel, and others). Just as little have we to supplement it with *δώσω* (Heinrichs, Stengel, *al.*), or with *εἰμί* or *ἐσομαι* (Kuinoel, Bloomfield), or *διαθήσομαι αὐτήν* (Delitzsch). Nor have we to join it to the following *ἐπιγράψω* (so Böhme, but undecidedly, and Paulus), in such wise that we must render *καί* before *ἐπιγράψω* by "also." It attaches itself grammatically to the preceding *διαθήσομαι*. In order to obviate any unevenness of construction, we may then place a colon after *διάνοιαν αὐτῶν*. The separation, however, of the *καὶ ἐπιγράψω* from that which precedes is not actually necessary, since instances of a transition from the participle to the *tempus finitum* are elsewhere nothing strange. See Winer, p. 533 [E. T. 573].—*διάνοια*] *mind, i. e.* soul, innermost part (קֶרֶב). Accentuation of the character of *innerness* in the New Covenant, as opposed to the *externalism* of the Old. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 3.—*καρδίας*] either *accusative* (Deut. iv. 13, v. 22, *al.*) or *genitive* (comp. Ex. xxxiv. 28; Num. xvii. 2, 3, *al.*). In favor of the latter pleads the *singular* in the Hebrew original; in favor of the former, the reading of the *Cod. Alex.*: *ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας*. We cannot take into account, in favor of the accusative, the greater conformity to the character of the Greek language, according to which, on account of the plurality of persons (*αὐτῶν*), one must also speak of *καρδίαι* in the plural. For without regard to this distinction the singular *διάνοιαν* has already been just placed, and in like manner the singular *τῆς χειρός* is placed, ver. 9.—In place of *ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτον ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς*, the *Cod. Alex.* of the LXX. has: *ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν*, and the *Cod. Vatic.*: *ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν γράψω αὐτούς*.—*καὶ*

[1] Wrongly Oecumenius: *ποίας ἡμέρας; τὰς τῆς ἐξόδου, ἐν αἷς ἔλαβον τὸν νόμον.*

ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεὸν κ.τ.λ.] Comp. already Ex. vi. 7; Lev. xxvi. 12, *al.*; also 2 Cor. vi. 16.—The Hebraizing *εἶναι εἰς* (לִהְיוֹת לְ) as i. 5.

Ver. 11. The consequence resulting from the *διδόναι νόμους εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 10. Comp. Joel iii. 1, 2; 1 John ii. 27.—*καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν*] *and then they shall not instruct* (Winer, p. 472 [E. T. 507]; Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr.* p. 183 [E. T. 211]), as regards the *sense* equivalent to: and then it will not be needful that they instruct each other; the reason for which is stated immediately after, in the *ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσίν με κ.τ.λ.* On the intensifying *οὐ μή*, see Winer, p. 471 f. [E. T. 505 *f.*]—*τὸν πολίτην αὐτοῦ*] *his fellow-citizen.* So in the LXX., *Cod. Vatic.*, and most mss., while *Cod. Alex.* has in the first member *τὸν ἀδελφόν*, in the second *τὸν πλησίον.*—*γνῶθι*] in the Hebrew the plural: דְּעוּ.—*μικροῦ*] With the LXX. in most Codd.: *μικροῦ αὐτῶν.*—*ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν*] *Young and old* (לְמִקְטַנָּם וְעַד-גְּדוֹלָם). Comp. Acts viii. 10; LXX. Jer. vi. 13; Jonah iii. 5; Gen. xix. 11, *al.*

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

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

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

Notes by American Editor.

LXV. Vv. 1–6.

(*a*) The second section of the second leading division of the Epistle begins with viii. 1. So far as its argument is concerned, it ends with x. 18; but, if the hortatory passage belonging with it is included, as it should be, it does not end until xii. 29. The superiority of Christ, as the instrumental agent employed by God to carry on the N. T. system, to the instrumental agents (the Levitical priests) employed to carry on the O. T. system, which is set forth in this section, consists in the fact that He is the minister of a higher sanctuary which is connected with a better covenant. There are two subordinate sections:—1. referring to the higher sanctuary; 2. referring to the better covenant. These two subjects are developed, in a more general way, in ch. viii. (1, vv. 1–6 *a*,; 2, vv. 6 *b*–13), and in a more particular and detailed manner, in ch. ix. (1, vv. 1–14; 2, vv. 15–28). They are finally restated, in a summary form, in ch. x. (1–18). By the fullness of his presentation of this subject, by the threefold repetition alluded to, and by the fact that he places it at the end of his whole discussion, and makes all which precedes move towards it, the author shows that this was, indeed, the κεφάλαιον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις.

(*b*) That κεφάλαιον (ver. 1) means *chief point*, not *sum*, is proved by the fact that what the writer says in this verse cannot be separated from what he adds in ver. 2, and by the fact that what is contained in the two verses, or in the whole passage (vv. 1–6), is not the sum of what he is saying in the whole epistle, but only a principal matter in the development of the main subject. That κεφ. may mean either *a* chief point (as Lünem.) or *the* chief point (as Bleek and others) cannot be denied. The argument presented by Lünem. as establishing the former meaning—that, in addition to the chief point mentioned in vv. 1, 2, there is another (the better sacrifice) in ix. 9 ff.—is without any proper basis, for there is no such second chief point. The point here alluded to is that which is suggested in vv. 1–6—that Christ is the minister of a higher sanctuary connected with a better covenant. The thought of the better sacrifice is only a subordinate one, which is connected with the presentation of this principal thought. The writer sets forth but one chief point. Whether he speaks of it as *a*, or *the*, chief point is uncertain, but, in whichever way he presents it, it is the only one which he deems it necessary to bring before the minds of his readers. The antecedent probability, under the circumstances, would seem to be, that a writer of such a rhetorical character would desire to give the emphasis here which belongs to the expression "*the* chief point."—(*c*) ἐπί has here the meaning *upon*, as resting upon—as the head, which is a part of the body, rests upon the body, or as Alf. says "lying, as it were, by and among." *In* of R. V. is, in accordance with the English idiom and usage, a satisfactory rendering.—(*d*) The close connection between the earlier and later parts of the Epistle, already noticed in v. 5, is manifest again in the words ὁς

ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ., as compared with i. 3.—(*e*) That *τῶν ἁγίων* (ver. 2) means *the sanctuary* (R. V. text), and not *the holy things* (R. V. marg.), is indicated by the connection of the word with *σκηνῆς*, and by the fact that it is repeatedly used in ch. ix. as referring to the sanctuary.—(*f*) The course of the writer's thought in vv. 3-6 *a* seems to be the following: As a high priest, He must hold the office in connection with some sanctuary. The office, however, as related to the earthly sanctuary, is already filled by others. He, therefore, belongs to the heavenly.

LXVI. Vv. 6 *b*–13.

(*a*) It will be noticed that, both in this chapter and the next, the writer closely unites the sanctuary and the covenant. He does not present them as two independent things in their relation to the subject in hand, but, by the form of his sentence in ver. 6, and again in ix. 15, he shows that, as the minister of the higher sanctuary, Christ is also, and as it were necessarily, the mediator of a better covenant; ver. 6, *διαφορωτέρας τέτυχε λειτουργίας ὅσῳ καὶ κρείττονος κ.τ.λ.*;—ix. 15, *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν*.—(*b*) The "better" character of the covenant is here connected with the fact, that it is established as an institution or system ("enacted" R. V.) upon the foundation of better promises. The "better" character of the promises is indicated in the following verses, and the central point of the thought is, that the end in view is to be accomplished—that which the religious system aims at, namely *τελείωσις*, involving forgiveness of past sin and conformity to the will of God, is to be certainly secured. See vii. 18, 19.—(*c*) The argument to prove that the covenant and the promises are better, is similar to that respecting the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood in vii. 11 ff—namely, that, unless there had been imperfection, no new arrangement would have been made, whereas such a new arrangement has been introduced. That the new covenant is established is proved here by a citation from Jer. xxxi. 31–34, which constitutes the central O. T. passage of this section, after the analogy of others in other sections already noticed. To this argument there is added another, in ver. 13, namely, that the fact that the covenant to be made is, according to the O. T. passage, called *new* implies that the former one is old, and, like all things old, is ready to pass away.

(*d*) With reference to the words of vv. 7–13 it may be remarked:—1. that *αὐτοῖς* in ver. 8 has a slight preponderance of external evidence as compared with *αὐτούς*, but the other reading and the construction of the sentence adopted by Lünem., and placed by A. R. V. in the margin, should be recognized as possibly correct—if indeed, they should not be preferred;—2. that the words *ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον* with *συντελέσω*, as contrasted with the simple dative *τοῖς πατράσιν* (ver. 9) and *τῷ οἴκῳ* ver. 10, may suggest the thought that the covenant is not merely made with, but imposed or enjoined upon, the people by God (*ἐνετείλατο* ix. 20).—3. the description of what the new covenant will be or involve begins with *διδοὺς* of ver. 10, which is thus equivalent to *δώσω*, in substance of thought;—4. that the same element of the legal system is here hinted at, which seems to lie at the basis of Gal. iii. 20—the weakness connected with the necessity, for its success, that men should perfectly fulfill the requirements of the law;—5. *ἐν τῷ λέγειν* corresponds with *ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι* of iii. 15, only that here the active is used, because God is the subject of the following verb, while in iii. 15 the mere words of the cited passage are thought of as setting forth a historical fact.

CHAPTER IX.

Ver. 1. *ἡ πρώτη*] Elz.: *ἡ πρώτη σκηνή*. But the addition *σκηνή* is condemned as a gloss by the fact of its being wanting in all the uncial mss., in many cursives, in Syr. utr. Basm. Aeth. Arm. It. Vulg., with Gregory Thaumaturgus, Cyril, Chrys. Damasc. Theoph. Photius, *al.* On the ground, too, of internal evidence it is to be rejected, since, on the one hand, the coherence with viii. 13, and through that with viii. 7 ff., leads to *διαθήκη* as the main idea to be supplemented; and, on the other hand, the expression *ἡ πρώτη σκηνή*, ix. 1, would be made to denote something quite different from that which the same expression denotes in ix. 2. For, while in ver. 2 the outer division of the tabernacle is indicated thereby, in ver. 1 only the first or Old Testament, earthly tabernacle, in opposition to the New Testament, heavenly one, thus something entirely dissimilar, could be intended by this expression.—Ver. 2. After *ἄρτων*, B, Basmur. add *καὶ τὸ χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον*, and in return omit the words *χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον καί*, ver. 4. Violent intentional transposition, with a view to the removal of the archaeological difficulty.—Instead of *ἁγία*, Lachm. writes *ἅγια ἁγίων*, after A (*αγια· αγιων*) D* E, It. But *ἅγια ἁγίων* is a mere slip on the part of the copyist, occasioned by ver. 3, and is to be rejected as devoid of sense.—Ver. 5. *Χερουβείμ*] A: *Χερουβείμ*, B D*** (and so Lachm. Tisch. 7 and 8): *Χερουβείν*, D* ℵ: *Χερουβίν*. In the case of the LXX., too, the mss. are wont equally to vary as regards the final syllable of the word.—Instead of the *Recepta δόξης*, Griesb. and Scholz have erroneously placed in the text *τῆς δόξης*. The article has against it all the uncial mss. and other witnesses.—Ver. 9. In place of the *Recepta καθ' ὃν* (D*** E K L, min. It. Copt. Sah. Basm. Syr. utr. Chrys. Theodoret, Theoph.), Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, Delitzsch, Alford have rightly preferred the reading *καθ' ἣν*, in accordance with A B D* ℵ, 17, 23* 27, *al.*, Vulg. Slav. codd. Damasc. Oecum. (comment.). Already approved by Mill, *Prolegg.* p. 1046, and placed by Griesb. upon the inner margin. The *καθ' ὃν*, as affording an easier mode of appending to that which precedes, is a later correction of the more difficult and ill-understood *καθ' ἣν*.—Ver. 10. The *Recepta* reads: *καὶ δικαιώμασι σαρκός*. But *καί* is wanting in A D* ℵ* 6, 17, 27, 31, *al.*, with Cyr. (twice) in Syr. Copt. Sahid. Arm. *al.*; and in place of *δικαιώμασι*, A B ℵ, ten cursives, Cyril., and many versions have *δικαιώματα*, while in D* It. Sahid. there is found *δικαιωμα*. Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, Alford have therefore adopted *δικαιώματα σαρκός*, which was already approved by Grotius, Mill, *Prolegg.* p. 1355, and Bengel, and recommended by Griesb. Delitzsch and Reiche likewise give it the preference. This reading is in reality to be regarded as the original one. For it is more easily explicable that *δικαιώματα* should, on account of the foregoing datives, be changed into *δικαιώμασι*, and joined on to them by means of *καί*, than that the *καὶ δικαιώμασι*, if it already existed, should, on account of the closing word *ἐπικείμενα*, be converted into *δικαιώματα*.—Ver. 11. In place of the *Recepta τῶν μελλόντων*, Lachm. and Tisch. 1 read, after B D* It. Syr. utr. (yet the Syr. Philonex. has the *Recepta* in the margin) Arab. petropol.

and some codd. of Chrys: *τῶν γενομένων*. Defended by Ebrard. But the reading is not in keeping with the carefully chosen diction of our author, and its sense: "High Priest of the good things which have arisen," does not commend itself. It is manifestly a transcriber's error, occasioned by the presence of the foregoing *παραγενόμενος*.—Ver. 12 *εἱράμενος*] D* (E ?), 27, 44, 80, *al.*, and some Fathers: *εὑρόμενος*.—Ver. 13. Elz.: *ταύρων καὶ τράγων*. With Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford, to be transposed into *τράγων καὶ ταύρων*, in accordance with the decisive authority of A B D E ℵ, Cyr. Theodoret, Bede, Syr. Copt. Basm. It. Vulg. *al.*—Ver. 14. *πνεύματος αἰωνίου*] D* ℵ*** many cursives, Copt. Basm. Slav. It. Vulg. *al.*, Chrys. Cyr. Didym. (?) Damasc. *al.*: *πνεύματος ἁγίου*. Interpretative gloss.—In place of the *Recepta συνειδησιν ὑμῶν*, Bengel, Knapp, Lachm. Tisch. 1 and 2, Alford read more suitably, in accordance with A D* K, 44, 47, 67, *al.*, Syr. Copt. Arm. Vulg. ms. *al.* Athan. Cyr. Chrys. (comment.) Theodoret, Theoph.: *συνειδησιν ἡμῶν*. Recommended likewise by Griesb., and already placed in the text in the Edd. Complut. Genev. Plant.—To the mere *θεῷ ζῶντι* in the *Recepta*, Lachm., with A, 21* 31, 66 (in the margin), Copt. Slav. Chrys. (comment.) Macar. Theoph., has added the words *καὶ ἀληθινῷ*. These words are, however, to be deleted. They are a gloss from 1 Thess. i. 9.—Ver. 17. *μήποτε*] D* ℵ* and Isidor. Pelus. iv. 113 (. . . *οὕτω γὰρ εἶρον καὶ ἐν παλαιοῖς ἀντιγράφοις*): *μὴ τότε*.—Ver. 18. Instead of *οὐδ'* in the *Recepta*, we have, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 2, and 7, Delitzsch, Alford, to write *οὐδέ*, in accordance with A C D E L, 4, 44, 52, Chrys. Theodoret, Oecum.—*ἡ πρώτη*] D* E* It.: *ἡ πρώτη διαθήκη*. Exegetical gloss.—Ver. 19. Elz.: *κατὰ νόμον*. But the better attestation by A C D* L ℵ*** 21, 47, 71, *al.*, Copt. Basm. Chrys. ms. Theodoret, Theoph. requires the reading preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, and Alford: *κατὰ τὸν νόμον*.—In like manner is the article *τῶν* wanting in the *Recepta* before *τράγων* to be added, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, in accordance with the weighty authority of A C D E (D E, Aeth.: *τῶν τράγων καὶ τῶν μόσχων*) ℵ* 80, *al. mult.* It. Vulg. Theodoret, ms.—So, in place of the *Recepta ἐῤῥάντισε* here and ver. 21, we have, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, in accordance with all the uncials, to write *ἐράντισεν*.—Ver. 24. The order of the words followed by Lachm. in the stereotype edition, as well as recently by Tisch. in the ed. vii. and viii.: *εἰσῆλθεν ἁγια*, rests only upon the testimony of A ℵ, 37, 118. In the larger edition of Lachm., therefore, this has rightly given place to the *Recepta ἁγια εἰσῆλθεν*.—Better attested than the *Recepta ὁ Χριστός* is the mere *Χριστός* (A C* D* ℵ, *al.* [Cod. B in its original form extends only to *συνειδησις*, ix. 14]), preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, and Alford.—Ver. 26. Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Bloomfield, Delitzsch: *νῦν δέ*. Better Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, in accordance with A C L (?) ℵ, 37, 39, 40, Orig. Chrys.: *νυνὶ δέ*.—*ἁμαρτίας*] A ℵ, 17, 73. Lachm.: *τῆς ἁμαρτίας*. Against C D*** E K L, almost all the min. Orig. (once) *al. mult.*—Ver. 28. *οὕτως καί*] Elz. has only *οὕτως*. Against decisive witnesses (all the uncial mss., most min., many translations and Fathers).—After *εἰς σωτηρίαν*, Lachm. in the stereotype edition had added, with A, 31, 47, *al.*, Syr. Philonex. Slav. codd. Damasc., the words *διὰ πίστεως*. Rightly, however, has he deleted them in the larger edition. The addition is a complementary gloss, which has against it the testimony of C D E K L ℵ, many min. versions, and Fathers, and betrays its character as a gloss by its changing position (Arm. 27, 31, 57, 61, *al.*, have it *before εἰς σωτηρίαν*).

Vv. 1–14. [On Vv. 1–14, see Note LXVII., pages 629–631.] The author has in chap. viii insisted upon the fact, as a second main particular of the superiority of Christ as a high priest over the Levitical high priests, that the sanctuary in which He ministers is a more excellent one, namely, the heavenly sanctuary. He has made good this proposition by the consideration that no place would be found for Christ, as regards priestly service, in the earthly sanctuary; and then has proceeded to show the naturalness of the fact that He accomplishes His ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, by the proof that He is the Mediator of a better covenant. This train of thought is still pursued in the beginning of chap. ix., in that attention is now finally called to the fact that in the arrangement of the Mosaic sanctuary itself, and the order of the priestly service corresponding thereto, there lies an indication on the part of God that Mosaism is not itself the perfect religion, but only an institution preparatory thereto (vv. 1–8). With this, however, is then connected, by means of one of those sudden transitions of which the author is so fond, the reference to the further truth, that, indeed, the Levitical *sacrifices* also, since they belong to the domain of fleshly ordinance, are not able really to atone; whereas the sacrifice presented by Christ, by means of His own blood, possesses, by virtue of an eternal Spirit, everlasting power of atonement (vv. 9–14), and thus *a third main point in the high-priestly superiority of Christ is introduced*, the development of which occupies the author as far as x. 18. [LXVII *a*.]

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

Ver. 1. [LXVII *b–e*.] Εἶχεν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη] *sc.* διαθήκη. Against the supplementing of σκηνή (Cameron, Peirce, Whitby, Wetstein, Semler), see the critical remark.—εἶχεν] *had.* ἔχει is not written by the author, although the cultus of the Old Covenant was still continuing at the time when he wrote, not so much because—as is shown by ver. 2—it was his intention to describe the primitive arrangement thereof (comp. viii. 5), which is the opinion of Böhme, Kuinoel, Stengel, and Tholuck, as, what is more naturally suggested by the coherence with viii. 13, because the Old Covenant had already been declared by God in the time of Jeremiah to be feeble with age and nigh unto disappearing, and consequently now, after the actual appearance of the promised New Covenant, has no longer any valid claim to existence.[1]—μὲν οὖν] *now truly.* Admission that that which the author is about to detail is indeed something relatively exalted. The antithesis, by which again this admission is deprived of its value and significance, is then introduced by ver. 6 (not first with ver. 11, as is supposed by Piscator, Owen, Carpzov, Cramer, Stuart, Bloomfield, Bisping, Maier, M'Caul, and others); yet in such wise that the material antithesis itself is first contained in the statement, ver. 8, which is connected syntactically only as a parenthetic clause.—καί] *also.* Indication that with

[1] Chrysostom: ὡσεὶ ἔλεγε, τότε εἶχε, νῦν οὐκ ἔχει· δείκνυσιν ἤδη τοῦτῳ αὐτὴν ἐκκεχωρηκυῖαν· τότε γὰρ εἶχε, φησίν. Ὥστε νῦν, εἰ καὶ ἔστηκεν, οὐκ ἔστιν.

the Old Covenant the New is compared, and possessions of the former are enumerated, which also (although, it is true, in a more perfect form) are proper to the latter.—*δικαιώματα λατρείας*] *legal ordinances*[1] *in regard to worship, i.e.* regulations made by virtue of divine authority respecting the cultus.—*λατρείας*] is *genitive*. To take the expression as *accusative* (Cameron, Grotius, Hammond, *al.*), according to which *δικαιώματα, λατρείας*, and *τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν* would as three members be made co-ordinate with each other, is untenable; because the signification of *δικαιώματα* in itself would be too extensive to fit in with the further development of ver. 1, to which the author himself at once passes over, from ver. 2 onwards. For as the statement *τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν* receives its more full explication by means of vv. 2–5, so does the discourse in vv. 6, 7 return to the unfolding of the twofold *δικαιώματα λατρείας*, blended as this is in a logical respect into a unity of idea.—*τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν*] *and the mundane sanctuary.* Since, in accordance with the *καί*, possessions of the Old Covenant are to be mentioned, such as this has in common with the New,—while to the New Covenant there pertains no mundane, earthly sanctuary,—*τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν* must be regarded as a concise mode of designation for *καὶ ἁγιόν τι, τὸ κοσμικόν*, "and a sanctuary, namely the mundane." That such is the meaning of the author, is indicated by the fact that the article is placed before this second member, although it ought properly to have been inserted before *κοσμικόν* also. Yet the omission of the article in the case of adjectives placed after their substantives is not a thing unknown among other writers of the later period. See Bernhardy, *Synt.* p. 323; Winer, p. 126 [E. T. 133]. Forced is the explanation of Delitzsch, with the adherence of Kurtz and Woerner, that *κοσμικόν* as an adjectival predicate is to be taken in association with *εἶχεν*: "the first covenant had likewise *δικαιώματα λατρείας*, and its sanctuary as mundane, *i.e.* a sanctuary of mundane nature." Had the author intended the readers to suppose such a conjoining, he would also—equally as vii. 24, v. 14—have indicated the same to them by the position of the words. He must, in order to be understood, at least have written: *εἶχεν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη δικαιώματα λατρείας κοσμικόν τε τὸ ἅγιον.* Under an entire misapprehension, further, does Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 408 f., 2 Aufl.) suppose that *τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν* is not to be taken as a second *object* attaching itself to the *δικαιώματα λατρείας*, but as a second *subject* joining itself on to *ἡ πρώτη*,—a construction which, upon the presupposition of the *Recepta ἡ πρώτη σκηνή* being the correct reading, already Olearius adopted (comp. Wolf *ad loc.*), and upon the same supposition also more recently M'Caul maintained, in connection with which, however, *τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν* would limp behind in an intolerable manner, and would afford evidence of a negligence of style, such as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews would least of all have been guilty of.—The view of Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Zeger, Carpzov, and others, that *ἅγιον* is to be taken not in the *local* sense (sanctuary), but in the *ethical* sense (holiness, *ἁγιότης*, sanctitas, mundities), is altogether

[1] Wrongly Stengel: "Means of justification."

erroneous; since the expression chosen would be a remarkable one, the immediate sequel does not point thereto, and the more exalted seat of the cultus of the New Covenant forms the theme of the fresh train of thought opened up with the beginning of chap. viii.—Quite as much to be disapproved is the opinion of Wolf, who will have *ἅγιον* to mean "vasa sacra totumque apparatum Leviticum."—*κοσμικός*] means: *belonging to the world, worldly, mundanus.* Comp. Tit. ii. 12. The expression is equivalent to *ἐπίγειος*, and to it *ἐπουράνιος* stands opposed, as in general *ὁ κόσμος* in the N. T. very frequently has its tacit contrast in *ὁ οὐρανός*. *Τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν* is consequently nothing else than *ἡ σκηνή, ἣν ἔπηξεν ἄνθρωπος* (comp. viii. 2), or *ἡ σκηνὴ χειροποίητος, τουτέστιν ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως* (comp. ix. 11), or *τὰ χειροποίητα ἅγια* (ix. 24), and a twofold idea is expressed in the adjective, first, that the sanctuary of the Old Covenant is one existing in the terrestrial world, then, that it is accordingly something only temporary and imperfect in its nature. Remote from the connection are the suppositions of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, and others: that the Jewish sanctuary was called *κοσμικόν*, because the access to the same stood open to the *κόσμος*, *i. e.* the Gentiles; a statement, moreover, which possesses historic truth only with reference to *a part* thereof, the court of the Gentiles (comp. Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* v. 5. 2; Acts xxi. 28), while here the sanctuary *as a whole* must be indicated;—of Theodorus Mopsuesten., Theodoret,[1] Grotius, Hammond, Wetstein, Böhme, Paulus, and others: because the Jewish sanctuary symbolically represented the universe; the holy place, earth; the most holy, heaven; and the curtain before the latter, the firmament;—of Kypke, because the sense is: *toto terrarum orbe celebratum* (comp. Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* iv. 5. 2, where the Jerusalem high priests, Ananus and Jesus, are represented as *τῆς κοσμικῆς θρησκείας κατάρχοντες, προσκυνούμενοί τε τοῖς ἐκ τῆς οἰκουμένης*), which, however, could only be said with reference to the temple, not with reference to the tabernacle itself, of which the author is here specially thinking.—Entirely baseless, finally, is the opinion of Homberg, that *κοσμικόν* is to be apprehended in the sense of "adorned, well-ordered." For only *κόσμιος, κοσμητικός*, and *κοσμητός* are used for the expression of this notion; never is *κοσμικός* put for it. See the Lexicons.

Vv. 2–5. Unfolding of the collective idea *τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν*, as regards its several essential component parts. That the author has before his mind the Jewish sanctuary in its original form, *i. e.* the Mosaic tabernacle, is evident alike from the expression *σκηνή*, as from the use of the aorist *κατεσκευάσθη*. That, however, he likewise thinks of this original disposition as still preserved in the temple of his day, is manifest partly from the *present* *λέγεται* immediately following, partly from the proposition: *τούτων δὲ οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων . . . εἰσίασιν*, ver. 6.—*σκηνὴ γὰρ κατεσκευάσθη ἡ πρώτη*] *for a tent was prepared* (set up), *namely, the first* or *anterior one* (the fore-

[1] Τὴν σκηνὴν οὕτως ἐκάλεσε, τύπον ἐπέχουσαν τοῦ κόσμου παντός. Καταπετάσματι γὰρ μέσῳ διῃρεῖτο διχῇ, καὶ τὰ μὲν αὐτῆς ἐκαλεῖτο ἅγια, τὰ δὲ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων. Καὶ ἐμιμεῖτο τὰ μὲν ἅγια τὴν ἐν τῇ γῇ πολιτείαν, τὰ δὲ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων τὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐνδιαίτημα. Λυὸ δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ στερεώματος ἐπλήρου τὴν χρείαν.

tent). σκηνή stands first as the general notion, and only acquires its nearer definition by the ἡ πρώτη afterwards brought in, without, however, our having, with Beza, Bloomfield, and others, to place a comma after κατεσκευάσθη. That σκηνὴ ἡ πρώτη is not to be combined immediately in one, as expressing the signification: "the fore-part of the tent" (so Valckenaer, who compares *in ultimis aedibus*, and the like; also Delitzsch), is shown—although such acceptation presents no grammatical difficulty—by the corresponding σκηνὴ ἡ λεγομένη ἅγια ἁγίων, ver. 3, whence it follows that the author is regarding the two divisions of the tent separated by the veil in front of the Most Holy Place as two tents.—πρώτη] not *temporal*, but *local*.—κατεσκευάσθη] namely by Moses, at the behest of God (comp. viii. 5).—ἐν ᾗ ἥ τε λυχνία] *sc.* ἐστίν (not ἦν, Alford, Kurtz, against which λέγεται and ver. 6 are decisive): *in which there is the candlestick* (or *lamp-stand*). Comp. Ex. xxv. 31–39, xxxvii. 17–24; Bähr, *Symbolik des Mos. Cultus*, Bd. I., Heidelb. 1837, p. 412 ff. In the temple of Herod, too, there was, according to Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* v. 5. 5, vii. 5. 5, only *one* lamp-stand in the Holy Place, while in the temple of Solomon there were *ten* of them present; comp. 1 Kings vii. 49; 2 Chron. iv. 7.—καὶ ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων] *and the table and the setting forth of the bread* (or *loaves*), *i.e.* wherein is found the table, and the sacred custom is observed of placing thereon the shew-bread. Comp. Winer, p. 590 [E. T. 636.] Wrongly do Vatablus, Zeger, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Bengel, Bloomfield, and others explain ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων as hypallage or antiptosis for οἱ ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως. Yet more unwarrantably do Valckenaer (and similarly Heinrichs) maintain that ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων is equivalent to ἡ τράπεζα τῶν ἄρτων τῆς προθέσεως. According to Tholuck, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Klugé, and Moll, πρόθεσις is, like the Hebrew עֲרֻכָּה, to be taken *concretely*, strues panum. But πρόθεσις never has the passive signification of strues. On the matter itself, comp. Ex. xxv. 23–30, xxvi. 35, xxxvii. 10–16; Lev. xxiv. 5–9; Bähr, *l.c.* p. 407 ff.—ἥτις] *sc.* σκηνὴ ἡ πρώτη. Not conjoined with the mere ἥ, because the fact alleged is something which is familiar to the readers.—ἅγια] *Holy Place* (קֹדֶשׁ). So (as *neuter plur.*), not, with Erasmus, Luther, Er. Schmid, Mill, Whitby, Heinrichs, and others, ἁγία (as *fem. sing.*), have we to accentuate the word. It stands opposed to the ἅγια ἁγίων, ver. 3, and denotes the Holy Place, or the outer portion of the tabernacle, in opposition to the Most Holy Place, or the more secluded, inner portion of the same. Likewise with the LXX. and with Philo, the plural τὰ ἅγια in this sense is interchanged with the singular τὸ ἅγιον.—ἁγία, however, not τὰ ἅγια, is placed, because the author was less concerned about mentioning the definite name coined for the expression thereof, than about bringing out the signification which this name has.

Ver. 3. Μετά] *after* or *behind*. Of local succession (Thucyd. vii. 58, *al.*), in the N. T. only here.—τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα] *the second veil* (פָּרֹכֶת). For before the Holy Place, too, there was a veil (מָסָךְ). On the former, comp. Ex. xxvi. 31 ff.—σκηνή] *sc.* κατεσκευάσθη.—ἅγια ἁγίων] *Most Holy Place.*

Periphrasis of the superlative (see Winer, p. 231 [E. T. 246]), and translation of קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים.

Ver. 4. Θυμιατήριον] is either interpreted as *altar of incense* or as *censer*. The latter, and indeed as a *golden censer*, which was employed by the high priest on the great day of atonement, is thought of by Luther, Grotius, de Dieu, Calov, Reland, Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Wetstein, Carpzov, Whitby, Schulz, Böhme, M'Lean, Stuart, Kuinoel, Stein, Bloomfield, Bisping, Alford, M'Caul, and others, after the precedent of the Peshito, Vulgate (*turibulum*), and Theophylact. The *altar of incense*, on the other hand (כִּזְבַּח הַזָּהָב or כִּזְבַח הַקְּטֹרֶת), of which mention is made as a constituent part in the Mosaic tabernacle, Ex. xxx. 1–10, xxxvii. 25–28, xl. 5, 26, as a constituent part in the temple of Solomon, 1 Kings vii. 48, 2 Chron. iv. 19, and as a constituent part in the Herodian temple (Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* v. 5. 5), is understood in the case of the Latin translation in D E (*altare*), as well as by Oecumenius (*ad* ver. 7), Calvin, Justinian, Piscator, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Owen, Gerhard, Brochmann, Mynster (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, p. 342 ff.), Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 489 f., *Obs.*), Maier, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Conybeare, Hofmann, Woerner, and others. Instances from the classical writers in favor of either reference, see in Bleek, II. 2, p. 480 f. That a censer is intended may be urged from the language of the LXX., since with them for the indication of the altar of incense the expressions: τὸ θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος (Ex. xxx. 1, 27; Lev. iv. 7), τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν θυμιαμάτων (1 Chron. vi. (vii.) 49, xxviii. 18; 2 Chron. xxvi. 16, 19), τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν (Ex. xl. 5, 26, *al.*), τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ (ὂν) ἀπέναντι κυρίου (Lev. xvi. 12, 18); and, where the altar intended is clear from the context, merely τὸ θυσιαστήριον (Lev. xvi. 20, *al.*), are regularly employed, and only in unimportant Mss. of the same θυμιατήριον presents itself in some few passages as a variation of reading. To this usage of the LXX., however, is to be opposed the equally important fact of the usage of Philo and Josephus, according to which, at their time, τὸ θυμιατήριον was quite the ordinary appellation of the altar of incense.[1] Of the altar of incense, accordingly, the expression must be understood in our passage. For the manner in which the χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον is mentioned, as a parallel member to τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης, shows that the former must be an object of equally great importance as the latter. But, since that is so, something as non-essential as a golden censer cannot be meant, but only the altar of incense, which formed an essential constituent part of the tabernacle. Besides, there is nowhere any mention in the O. T. (not Lev. xvi. 12 either) of a particular censer, which had been set apart for the

[1] Comp. Philo, *Quis rerum divin. haeres.* p. 511 sq. (with Mangey, I. p. 504): τριῶν ὄντων ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις σκευῶν, λυχνίας, τραπέζης, θυμιατηρίου; *De vita Mos.* p. 668 (II. p. 149): Ἅμα δὲ τούτῳ ἐδημιουργεῖτο καὶ σκεύη ἱερά, κιβωτός, λυχνία, τράπεζα, θυμιατήριον, βωμός. Ὁ μὲν οὖν βωμὸς ἱδρυτο ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ κ.τ.λ.; Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* v. 5. 5: καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον μέρος . . εἶχεν ἐν αὐτῷ τρία θαυμασιώτατα καὶ περιβόητα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἔργα, λυχνίαν, τράπεζαν, θυμιατήριον; *Antiq.* iii. 6. 8: μεταξὺ δὲ αὐτῆς (τῆς λυχνίας) καὶ τῆς τραπέζης ἔνδον . . , θυμιατήριον, ξύλινον μὲν κ.τ.λ., *al.*

service on the great day of atonement. About the existence of such a censer *at the time of the Mosaic tabernacle*, which the author after all has mainly before his mind, nothing is known with certainty. Only from the Mishna, tract. *Joma*, iv. 4,[1] do we learn something about it. Moreover, according to tract. *Joma*, v. 1, vii. 4, this censer was first fetched out of the storehouse, carried by the high priest into the Most Holy Place, and upon the completion of the service again carried forth therefrom; even as it would be *a priori* improbable in the highest degree that such instrument should be kept within the Holy of Holies. For, according to Lev. xvi. 12, 13, the high priest was first to enter with incense into the Most Holy Place, in order that through the cloud thereof the glory of God, enthroned above the cover of the ark of the covenant, might become invisible to him, to the end that he died not. And yet ἔχουσα compels us to think of an *abiding* place of the θυμιατήριον; to explain ἔχουσα of the mere *appertaining* of the θυμιατήριον to the Most Holy Place as an object of use for the latter, as is usually done by the one class of expositors,[2] is—inasmuch as the author sharply separates from each other in his description the two main divisions of the O. T. sanctuary, as well as the objects peculiar to each of these divisions, by means of μετὰ δέ, ver 3, and thus ἔχουσα, ver. 4, unmistakably corresponds to the ἐν ᾗ, ver. 2—altogether arbitrary. If, then, we understand θυμιατήριον of the altar of incense, as we are compelled to do, there arises the archaeological difficulty that this altar had its standing-place not in the Most Holy Place, as is here presupposed by the author, but, on the contrary, in the Holy Place (Ex. xxx. 1 ff.). This point of inconsistency with historic truth is to be admitted, and therefrom the conclusion to be drawn, that the author did not himself live in the vicinity of the Jewish sanctuary, but had drawn his knowledge with regard to the same only from the Scriptures of the O. T., whence the possibility of an error is explicable. In favor of this possibility, Bleek rightly urges the following considerations: first, that Ex. xxvi. 35 there are mentioned as standing within the Holy Place only the table and the candlestick, but not the altar of incense also. Then, that where the standing place of this altar is actually spoken of, the form of expression chosen certainly, by reason of its indefiniteness, admitted of misconstruction.[3] Finally, that in the Mosaic law the altar of incense was brought into peculiar significance in connection with the solemnity of the atonement, since on this day it was sprinkled and cleansed by the high priest with the same blood which the high priest had carried into the Most Holy Place (Ex. xxx. 10; Lev. xvi. 18 f.).—χρυσοῦν] since the emphasis rests on it, is prefixed. The article, however, is wanting, because the sense is: *a golden altar, namely, the*

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

[2] But also by some advocates of the opposite view, as Jac. Cappellus, Piscator, Owen, Mynster, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Conybeare, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 490, *Obs.*; Maier, Moll, Hofmann, and Woerner, with an appeal to חַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֲשֶׁר־לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, 1 Kings vi. 22.

[3] So Ex. xxx. 6: καὶ θήσεις αὐτὸ ἀπέναντι τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦ ὄντος ἐπὶ τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῶν μαρτυρίων; *ibid.* xl. 5: καὶ θήσεις τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν εἰς τὸ θυμιᾶν ἐναντίον τῆς κιβωτοῦ; ver. 26: ἀπέναντι τοῦ καταπετάσματος; Lev. iv. 7, xvi. 12, 18: ἐναντίον or ἀπέναντι κυρίου.

altar of incense, in distinction from the *brazen altar* existing in the court, namely, the altar of burnt-offering.—*καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης*] *and the ark of the covenant;* comp. Ex. xxv. 10 ff., xxxvii. 1–9.—*περικεκαλυμμένην πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ*] *overlaid on every side* (within and without; comp. Ex. xxv. 11) *with gold* (plating of fine gold). According to 1 Kings viii., the ark of the covenant was also brought into the temple of Solomon. On the destruction of this temple by the Chaldeans it was lost, and the second temple was without an ark.[1]—*ἐν ᾗ στάμνος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα κ.τ.λ.*] *wherein was a golden pot with the manna, and Aaron's rod which had budded, and the tables of the covenant.* *ἐν ᾗ* does not refer back to *σκηνή*, ver. 3 (Ribera, Justinian, Pyle, Peirce, and others),—for to the *ἐν ᾗ*, ver. 4, the *ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς*, ver. 5, forms an opposition,—but it refers to *κιβωτός*. On the pot of manna, comp. Ex. xvi. 32–34; on Aaron's rod, Num. xvii. 16–26 (1–11); on the tables of the covenant, Ex. xxv. 16; Deut. x. 1, 2. According to 1 Kings viii. 9, there was nothing more in the ark of the covenant, at the time of its removal into the temple, than the two tables of the law; and according to Ex. xvi. 33, Num. xvii. 25 (10), the two first-mentioned objects were not to have their place *within*, but *before* the ark of the covenant. The same opinion, however, which the author here expresses as to the place of the preservation of the pot of manna and Aaron's rod, is found likewise with later Rabbins, as with R. Levi Ben Gerson at 1 Kings vii. 9 and at Num. xvii. 10, and Abarbanel at 1 Kings viii. 9. See Wetstein on our passage.

Ver. 5. The author turns from the objects to be found *within* the ark of the covenant to that which is *above* the same.—*ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς*] *sc. τῆς κιβωτοῦ.*—*Χερουβίμ*] comp. Ex. xxv. 18 ff., xxxvii. 7 ff.; Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterb.* I. 2 Aufl. p. 262 ff.; Bähr, *Symbolik des Mos. Cultus*, Bd. I. p. 311 ff. There existed two of them, of fine gold, one at each end of the cover or lid of the ark of the covenant, upon which, with faces turned towards each other, they looked down, and which they covered with their outspread wings. In the midst of the cherubim was the glory of God enthroned (1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; 2 Kings xix. 15; Isa. xxxvii. 16), and from this place God would speak to Moses (Ex. xxv. 22; comp. Num. vii. 89).—*Χερουβίμ* is here treated as a *neuter*, as likewise generally with the LXX., with whom the *masculine οἱ Χερουβ.* occurs but rarely (*e. g.* Ex. xxv. 20, xxxvii. 7). The neuter is not, however, to be explained by the supposition that *πνεύματα* is to be supplied to it in thought (comp. Drusius on our passage), but from the fact that the cherubim were regarded as *ζῶα*.[2] —The cherubim are called *Χερουβὶμ δόξης*. That may mean *cherubim of glory* or *brightness*, to whom glory or brightness is proper (so Camerarius, Estius, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Stuart, Kuinoel, *al.*), or the *cherubim which pertain to the divine glory*, the כְּבוֹד יְהוָה, *i. e.* who are the bearers

[1] Comp. Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* v. 5. 5: *Ἔκειτο δὲ οὐδὲν ὅλως ἐν αὐτῷ, ἄβατον δὲ καὶ ἄχραντον καὶ ἀθέατον ἦν πᾶσιν, ἁγίου δὲ ἅγιον ἐκαλεῖτο.*

[2] Comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* iii. 6. 5, where the Mosaic cherubim are described as *ζῷα πετεινά, μορφὴν δ' οὐδενὶ τῶν ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων ἑωραμένων παραπλήσια.* Comp. also Ezek. x. 15: *καὶ τὰ Χερουβὶμ ἦσαν τοῦτο τὸ ζῶον, ὃ εἶδον κ.τ.λ. Ibid.* ver. 20.

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

Vv. 6, 7. After the collective expression τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν, ver. 1, has been analyzed into its single constituent parts, vv. 2–5, and a recapitulatory reference has been made to the total result of this given analysis by means of τούτων οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων,—the opposition to μέν, ver. 1, being formally introduced by δέ, and then receiving its more precise material defining by means of the statement, ver. 8, which is attached in a grammatical respect as a subsidiary clause,—the discourse advances to the development of the further general idea, which is placed in the forefront, ver. 1, but has hitherto remained unnoticed, the twofold expression δικαιώματα λατρείας.—From the *present* εἰσίασιν, as from προσφέρει, ver. 7 (comp. also ver 8 f.), it follows that the Mosaic cultus was still continuing at the time when the author wrote. The participle *perfect*, κατεσκευασμένων, however, denotes that which is extending out of the past into the present, and is still enduring in the present (see Winer, p. 254 [E. T. 270 f.]). The present hereby indicated can, of course, only be that in which the author himself is living and writing. The endeavor to explain it of a present into which the author only mentally places himself, is as little warranted grammatically as is the asserting, with Hofmann, that the present in which the discourse here moves is "not a past, nor actual, nor something still continuing, but that set forth in the word of God, where it is to be read how the sanctuary erected by Moses was constituted, and what priests and high priests do in the same;" or with Mangold (in Bleek's *Einleit. in das N. T.* p. 617), to find the Scripture picture of the tabernacle drawn in our passage as a "purely ideal magnitude, which by no means guarantees the actual continued existence of the temple worship." For, in order to render possible suppositions of this kind, the conjoining of the *presents* with a participle *aorist* would have been indispensably necessary.

From the form of discourse chosen: *τούτων οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων* ("in that these objects have been in such wise regulated"), in union with the present tenses *εἰσίασιν* and *προσφέρει*, it therefore follows of necessity that the author, although here entering only upon the presentation of the typical significance of the two main divisions of the Mosaic sanctuary, nevertheless thinks of these two main divisions, together with all that appertains to them,—which he has just now enumerated,—as still preserved in being, thus also as still present in the Jewish temple of his day; by which supposition, it is true, he becomes involved in contradiction with the historic reality, inasmuch as alike the ark of the covenant as the vessel of manna and Aaron's rod were wanting in the second temple. *Vid. supra ad* ver. 4. With very little reflection does Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 491, *Obs.*) object to this conclusion, that "with just the same right one might infer from the present in xiii. 11 that the author supposed the Israelites of his time to be still dwelling in a camp." The passage xiii. 11 has nothing whatever in common with ours, since it is here a question of the combination of a participle *perfect* with verbs in the present. That, too, which Delitzsch sets against it, that the *τούτων οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων*, pointing back to *κατεσκευάσθη*, ver. 2, certainly shows that the author has the Mosaic period before his mind, utterly collapses, inasmuch as the participle *perfect*, and not the participle *aorist*, has been employed. Phrases, however, like those met with in Delitzsch: that the author was writing for just such readers as would not have given him credit for an ignorance like this, are peremptory decisions, for which the result is already fixed before the investigation, and consequently intimidations of the grammatical conscience.—*ἡ πρώτη σκηνή*] as ver. 2, *the fore-tent* or *Holy Place*.—*διὰ παντός*] *continually, i. e.* day by day. Opposite *ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ*, ver. 7.—*οἱ ἱερεῖς*] opposite *μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς*, ver. 7.—*τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες*] *performing the religious actions*. Daily, morning and evening, an offering of incense was presented, and daily were the lamps of the sacred candlestick placed in readiness and kindled. Comp. Ex. xxx. 7 ff.

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

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

Ver. 8. Now follows (apparently as a *subordinate thought*) the main consideration, with a view to which the author has been led more fully to describe the ἅγιον κοσμικόν and the δικαιώματα λατρείας of ver. 1.—τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου] *the Holy Ghost indicating this very thing* (following).—τοῦτο] has the emphasis, and acquires its development of contents by means of μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι . . . στάσιν.—τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου] The arrangement of the sanctuary and priesthood prescribed by God to Moses is thought of by our author as carried into effect by Moses under the assistance and guidance of the Holy Ghost; the idea expressed in that arrangement might therefore very easily be represented as an indication designed by the Holy Ghost.—μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν, ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν] *that the way of the sanctuary is not yet manifested, so long as the fore-tabernacle still exists.*—τῶν ἁγίων] is erroneously apprehended by the Peshito and Schulz (comp. also Zeger) as *masculine*. It is *neuter*. Does not, however, as ver. 2, denote the *Holy Place*, but, as vv. 12, 24, 25, x. 19, xiii. 11 (comp. also τὸ ἅγιον, Lev. xvi. 16, 17, 20, *al.*), the *Most Holy Place*, and that not the *earthly* one (Kurtz),—for that would be a trifling statement; whereas surely τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου prepares the way for a deeper truth, *vid. infra*,—but the *heavenly reality*, the throne of the Godhead.—ἡ τῶν ἁγίων ὁδός signifies *the way to* the Most Holy Place.[1]—ἐχειν στάσιν further means: to have existence, to exist. We have not, however, with Böhme, to import into it a secondary reference to *firmness* or *legal validity*, and ἡ πρώτη σκηνή is not the one first in point of time, *i. e.* the earthly, Jewish sanctuary in opposition to the heavenly (Hunnius, Seb. Schmidt, Carpzov, Semler, Baumgarten, Bloomfield, *al.*), still less the tabernacle in opposition to the later temple (Peirce, Sykes), but the fore-tabernacle or Holy Place, in opposition to the interior tabernacle or Most Holy Place. The thought is: by the ordering that the Most Holy Place, the presence-chamber and place of manifestation of God, might not be entered, save on one single day of the year, and by the high priest alone, while the daily Levitical service of the priests is accomplished in the Holy Place, and thus approach to the former debarred and shut off by the latter, the Holy Ghost proclaims that so long as the Levitical priesthood, and consequently the Mosaic law in general, continues, the immediate access to God is not yet permitted; that thus, in order to the bringing about and rendering possible of a full and direct communion with God, the Old Testament covenant-religion must first fall, and the more perfect one brought in by Christ (ver. 11) must take its place.[2]

[1] Comp. Matt. x. 5: εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν; Jer. ii. 18: τῇ ὁδῷ Αἰγύπτου, *al.*; Kühner, II. p. 176, *Obs.* 4: Winer, p. 176 [E. T. 187].

[2] Comp. Matt. xxvii. 51, as also Josephus.

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

Ver. 9. [LXVII *f, g.*] Ἥτις] is not synonymous with ἥ. It is employed argumentatively, in that it presents the following declaration as a fact, the truth of which is manifest.—We have not, however, to take ἥτις with παραβολή as a designation of the subject (Calvin, *al.:* which emblem was only for the present time; Storr, *al.:* which emblem was to continue only to the present; Zeger, Semler, de Wette, *al.:* which emblem has reference to the present time). For the verb to be supplemented would not be the mere copula; it would have a peculiar signification, and thus could not be omitted. ἥτις alone is consequently the subject, and παραβολή the predicate. Yet ἥτις is not to be referred back to στάσιν (Chr. Fr. Schmid), for the expression στάσιν does not occupy a sufficiently independent position in the preceding context to justify this; still less—what is thought possible by Cramer—to τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν, by which the idea would be rendered unmeaning. Nor have we to assume an attraction to παραβολή, in such wise that ἥτις should stand in the sense of ὅτι (so Bengel, who makes it point back to vv. 6–8; Maier, who makes it refer to vv. 7, 8; Michaelis, who makes it refer to μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι κ.τ.λ., and others), or, what amounts to the same thing, to supplement to the phrase ἥτις παραβολή, comprehended together as a subject, παραβολή ἐστιν as a predicate: which emblem (described vv. 6–8) is an emblem for the present time.[1] For, in the course of vv. 9, 10, respect is had just to the closing words *alone* of ver. 8: ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν. The exclusively right construction, therefore, is the referring back of ἥτις to τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς, ver. 8.—παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα] *sc.* ἐστίν. παραβολή in the Gospels very frequently a fictitious historic likeness. Here a likeness by means of a fact, an emblem. Not incorrectly, therefore, is it explained, on the part of Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, by τύπος.—εἰς] *in reference to*, as regards. Instead of εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, consequently, the mere τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦ ἐνεστηκότος might have been written.—ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς] *the present time.* The opposite thereto is formed by the καιρὸς διορθώσεως, ver. 10, by which the reader is referred to the *Christian* epoch of time, the αἰὼν μέλλων (vi. 5; comp. also ii. 5). ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς is therefore synonymous with the αἰὼν οὗτος elsewhere, and indicates the pre-Christian period of time still extending

Antiq. iii. 3. 7: τὴν δὲ τρίτην μοῖραν [τῆς σκηνῆς] μόνῳ περιέγραψε τῷ θεῷ διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεπίβατον εἶναι ἀνθρώποις.

[1] So Nickel in *Reuter's Repertor.* 1856, März, p. 183 f.

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

Ver. 10. *Μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμ. καὶ πόμ. καὶ διαφ. βαπτισμοῖς δικαιώματα σαρκὸς κ.τ.λ.*] *which, together with meats and drinks and divers washings, are only fleshly ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation.* Apposition to *δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι, μὴ δυνάμεναι κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 9.—*μόνον*] belongs to *δικαιώματα σαρκός*, but is placed in advance of this on account of the addition *ἐπὶ βρώμασιν κ.τ.λ.*; and *ἐπί* expresses the accession to something already present (Winer, p. 367*b* [E. T. 393]), or the existence externally side by side.[3]—Otherwise is it explained by others, in that they take *μόνον ἐπί* in close combination, give to *ἐπί* the signification "in reference to," and place both words still in relation to ver. 9. They then regard *μόνον ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ.* either as nearer definition to *προσφέρονται* (so, substantially, Vatablus, Schlichting, and others), or as opposition to *κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι* (so Schulz, Ebrard, *al.*). But against the first supposition the *material* ground is decisive, that the presentation of sacrifices in reality had reference by no means exclusively to the expiation of offences against the ordinances regulative of food and lustrations; against the second, the *linguistic* ground that *ἀλλ' ἐπὶ βρώμασιν μόνον κ.τ.λ.* must have been written instead of *μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασιν κ.τ.λ.* Yet others take *μόνον ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ.* in close conjunction

[1] Quite mistaken (as is already apparent even from the opposition to *καιρὸς διορθώσεως*, ver. 10) is the opinion of Delitzsch, with whom Alford concurs, that *ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς* denotes the present begun with the *καινὴ διαθήκη*, the present of the New Testament time, in which the parable has attained its close. See, on the contrary, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 494, *Obs.*, and specially Reiche, *Commentar. Crit.* p. 74 sq.—That, for the rest, by *ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς* only *that* present in which the author lived and wrote can be meant, needs not another word of explanation. When Kurtz and Hofmann deny this,—and the former will understand only an "imagined present," into which the author "only transposed himself;" the latter, "*that* present in which the Holy Ghost prophesied by means of that which was written in the law,"—this is done only in the interest of their wrong interpretations of ver. 6.

[2] Oecumenius, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Nickel, *l. c.*, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 495, *Obs.*; Alford, Woerner, *al.*

[3] Comp. *e. g.* Hom. *Od.* vii. 120: *ὀγχνη ἐπ' ὀγχνῃ γηράσκει, μῆλον δ' ἐπὶ μήλῳ*; Thucyd. ii. 101: *ὑποσχόμενος ἀδελφὴν ἑαυτοῦ δώσειν καὶ χρήματα ἐπ' αὐτῇ*.

with *τὸν λατρείοντα*, ver. 9. So perhaps already the Vulgate (perfectum facere servientem solummodo in cibis), then Luther ("him that does religious service only in meats and drink," etc.), Estius, Corn. a Lapide, Olearius, Semler, Ernesti, Ewald, Hofmann, and others. But the additional words would too greatly drag, the thought resulting would be incommensurable with *κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι*, and the formula *λατρεύειν ἐπί τινι* in the sense indicated without example.—The *βρώματα καὶ πόματα* are interpreted by Peirce, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Heinrichs, Maier, and others of the *sacrificial meals;* by Bleek and de Wette, of the partaking of the *paschal supper* in particular. But the mention of these practices would be, here at any rate, something too special, and the words xiii. 9 can furnish no standard for the interpretation of our passage. More correctly, therefore, is it thought in general of the meats and drinks permitted, as of those forbidden, in the Mosaic law. Comp. Col. ii. 16; Rom. xiv. 17. With regard to drinks, there are in the Mosaic law prohibitions only for special cases; comp. Num. vi. 3; Lev. x. 9, xi. 34. Comp. however, also Matt. xxiii. 24; Rom. xiv. 21.—*καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς*] Comp. Ex. xxix. 4; Lev. xi. 25, 28, 32, 40, xiv. 6–9, xv. 5 ff., xvi. 4, 24 ff.; Num. viii. 7, xix. 17 ff., *al.*—*δικαιώματα σαρκός*] *ordinances of the flesh, i. e.* ordinances that relate to the flesh, and thus bear the impress of the earthly and transitory.—*μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα*] *imposed* (only) *until the time of reformation.* The *καιρὸς διορθώσεως* is the *epoch* of the promised New and more excellent Covenant (viii. 8 ff.), which has begun with the appearing of Christ.—*διόρθωσις*] only here in the N. T.—*ἐπικείμενα*] Oecumenius: *βάρος γὰρ ἦν μόνον τὰ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, καθώς φασιν οἱ ἀπόστολοι.* Comp. Acts xv. 10, 28.

Vv. 11, 12. [LXVII *h–k.*] Antithesis to vv. 9, 10. *What the religion of the Mosaic covenant was unable to effect, that has been accomplished by Christ.*—*παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*] having appeared as High Priest of the good things to come. The verb in the same sense as Matt. iii. 1, 1 Macc. iv. 46; synonymous with *ἀνίστασθαι*, Heb. vii. 11, 15. Strangely misapprehending the meaning, Ebrard: *παραγενόμενος* is to be looked upon as an "adjectival attribute" to *ἀρχιερεύς*, and the thought is, "as a present High Priest,"—an acceptation which is incompatible with the participle of the *aorist.*—High Priest of the good things to come (comp. x. 1) is Christ called, inasmuch as these good things are the consequence and result of His high-priestly activity. They are the blessings of everlasting salvation, which the author, ver. 12, sums up in the expression *αἰωνία λύτρωσις*; and they are called *future,* inasmuch as they are proper to the *αἰὼν μέλλων* (vi. 5), or the *οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα* (ii. 5), and the full enjoyment of them will first come in at the consummation of the kingdom of God, to be looked for with the return of Christ.—*διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς κ.τ.λ.*] through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, which is not made with hands—that is to say, not of this world. The words belong to *εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἅγια*, ver. 12, and *διά* is used in the *local* sense: "through" (not instrumentally, as the *διά*, ver. 12). To join the words to that which precedes, and find in them an indication of that

by means of which Christ became *ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν* (Primasius, Luther, Dorscheus, Schulz, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, pp. 409, 412 f., 2 Aufl.,—which latter will accordingly also take the *διά*, ver. 12, in both cases along with *ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*; otherwise, however, in the *Comm.* p. 337,—Moll, and others), is erroneous, because by virtue of *οὐδέ*, ver. 12, the existence of an already preceding link in the nearer definition of *εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἅγια* is presupposed.—But to interpret the *σκηνή* through which Christ has entered into the Most Holy Place as *the body* of Christ, or *His human nature*,[1] or as the *holy life* of Christ,[2] or as the (militant) *church upon earth*,[3] or, finally, as *the world* in general,[4] is inconsistent with the point of comparison suggested by the comparatives *μείζονος* and *τελειοτέρας* in accordance with the foregoing disquisition, in general is opposed to the connection with vv. 1–10, and has against it the antithesis in which *τὰ ἅγια*, ver. 12, stands to *σκηνή*, ver. 11, as also the addition *οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως*. The lower spaces of the heavens are intended —corresponding to the *πρώτη σκηνή* of the earthly sanctuary (vv. 2, 6, 8)— as the preliminary stage of the heavenly Holy of Holies. Comp. iv. 14: *διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς.—μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας*] *sc.* than the Mosaic *σκηνή*. —*οὐ χειροποιήτου*] Comp. viii. 2: *ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος*, Acts vii. 48, xvii. 24; Mark xiv. 58; 2 Cor. v. 1.—*οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως*] *not belonging to the earthly created world* (the earth) *lying before one's eyes* (*ταύτης*). Wrongly Erasmus, Luther, Clarius, Vatablus, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Wolf, Bengel, Kuinoel, Friederich, *l. c.* p. 296, and others: *not of this kind of building*, *sc.* the same as the earthly sanctuary; or: as earthly things in general.

Ver. 12. Οὐδέ] *nor.* Οὐδέ is written by the author, misled by the foregoing notes of negation: *οὐ χειροποιήτου* and *οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως*, whereas, properly, *καὶ οὐ* ought to have been written, since that which is introduced by *οὐδέ* is parallel, not to the negative expressions further characterizing the *σκηνή*, but to the preceding *διά*.—*δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων*] *by* (by means of) *blood of goats and calves*, by which the entrance of the earthly high priests into the Most Holy Place was made possible on the great day of atonement. Comp. Lev. xvi. 14, 15.—*διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος*] the Levitical high priest entered the Most Holy Place not merely by means of the blood of animals, he entered at the same time *with* this blood (ver. 7). The author, however, has respect, with reference to the Levitical high priest also, only to the former notion, since only this, and not at the same time the latter, was suitable for application to Christ (Schlichting). If he had desired that the notion of the *μετά* should also be supplied in thought in our passage (Kurtz), he would have known how

[1] So, on account of x. 20, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Clarius, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Piscator, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Hammond, Owen, Bengel, Peirce, Sykes, Ernesti, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Friederich, *Symbolik des Mos. Stiftshütte*, Leipz. 1841, p. 296 ff., and others; also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 415, 2 Aufl., who, however, will have us think of the *glorified* human nature of Christ.

[2] Ebrard.

[3] Cajetan, Corn. a Lapide, Calov, Wittich, Braun, Wolf, Rambach, Michaelis, *ad Peirc.*, Cramer, Baumgarten.

[4] Justinian, Carpzov.

to express likewise this "somewhat gross material conception" (Bleek II.).—ἐφάπαξ] *once for all.* Corresponds to the following *αἰωνίαν.*—εἰς τὰ ἅγια] *into the inner sanctuary of heaven.*—αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος] *having obtained* (by His sacrificial death) *eternal redemption.* Incorrectly do Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, and Moll take εὑράμενος as something coinciding in point of time with εἰσῆλθεν. If it had been so intended, the participle present would have been placed instead of εὑράμενος.—εὑρίσκεσθαι signifies: *to find* (for oneself), *obtain.* The λύτρωσις became Christ's peculiar possession, thus—since He Himself, as the Sinless One, needed it not—to make it over to those who believe in Him.—This λύτρωσις is the ransoming, *i. e.* redemption from the guilt and punishment of sin, and it is called *αἰωνία, eternal,* or of indefeasible validity, in opposition to the sacrifices of the O. T. priests, which had to be renewed every year, since they were designed each for the [typical] expiation of the sins of a single year.—The feminine formation *αἰωνία* in the N. T. only here and 2 Thess. ii. 16.

Vv. 13, 14. Justification of *αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος,* ver. 12, by an argument *a minore ad majus.* With the *quantitative* augmentation, however, expressed by *εἰ . . . πόσῳ μᾶλλον,* there is at the same time blended a *qualitative* augmentation by means of *πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα* and *τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμ. κ.τ.λ.,* in such wise that the two following thoughts are enfolded the one in the other:—(1) If even the blood of animals works cleansing . . . how much more the blood of Christ? (2) If that effects the purity of the flesh, this effects purity of conscience.—*καὶ σπόδος δαμάλεως*] *and ashes of an heifer.* According to Num. xix., those who by contact with a dead body had become defiled, must be sprinkled with a mixture of water and the ashes of a spotless red heifer wholly consumed by fire, of which the ashes were preserved in a clean place without the camp (with the so-called מֵי־הַנִּדָּה, Num. xix. 9, 13, 20, 21; LXX.: ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ), in order to become clean again.—*ῥαντίζουσα τοὺς κεκοινωμένους*] *sprinkling those who have been defiled.* Free mode of expression for: with which (ashes) those who have been defiled are sprinkled.—*τοὺς κεκοινωμένους*] belongs, since *ῥαντίζουσα* most requires an express addition of the object, to this verb,[1] not to *ἁγιάζει,*[2] which latter stands absolutely: *works sanctification.*—*πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα*] to the (producing of the) purity of the flesh. *πρός,* as v. 14. Indication of the result.

Ver. 14.[3] Incomparably more efficacious must the sacrifice of Christ be. For—(1) *Christ offered Himself, i. e.* He gave up His own body to the death of a sacrifice, while the Levitical high priest derives his material of sacrifice from a domain foreign to himself personally; then: He offered Himself from a free resolve of will, while the Levitical high priest is placed under the necessity of sacrificing, by the command of an external ordinance, and the sacrificial victim whose blood he offers is an irrational ani-

[1] Erasmus, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, Hofmann, Woerner, *al.*

[2] Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, Bengel, Schulz, *al.*

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

mal, which consequently knows nothing of the end to which it is applied. The Levitical act of sacrifice is then an external one wrought in accordance with ordinance, a sensuous one; Christ's act of sacrifice, on the other hand, one arising out of the disposition of the heart, thus a moral one. From this it is already evident how it could be said (2) that Christ offered Himself *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου*. The ethical belongs to the province of the spirit. Christ accordingly offered Himself by virtue of spirit, because His act of sacrifice was, in relation to God, an act of the highest spiritual obedience (Phil. ii. 8), in relation to the human brethren an act of the highest spiritual love (2 Cor. v. 14, 15). *Διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου*, however, by virtue of *eternal* spirit did Christ offer Himself, inasmuch as the notion of the eternal belongs inseparably and essentially to the notion of spirit, in opposition to *σάρξ*, which has the notion of the transitory as its essential presupposition. The adjective *αἰώνιον* is added in natural correspondence with *αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν*, ver. 12. For only by virtue of eternal spirit could a redemption which is to be eternal, or of ever-enduring validity, be accomplished.—The majority have interpreted *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου* of the *Holy* Spirit; then thinking either, as Clarius, Estius, Whitby, and others, of the third person in the divine trias, or as Bleek, de Wette, and others, of the Spirit of God which dwelt in Christ in all its fullness, and was the principle which animated Him at every moment. But this application is too special. For, in accordance with the force of the words and the connection of the thoughts, there can stand as a tacit antithesis to the expression: *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου*, only the general formula: *διὰ σαρκὸς προσκαίρου*, whereby the mode of accomplishing the Levitical acts of sacrifice would be characterized. Moreover, if the Holy Spirit had been intended, the choice of the adjective *αἰωνίου* instead of *ἁγίου* must have appeared strange, because indistinct and liable to being misunderstood; finally, the absence of the article also is best explained on the supposition that the formula is to be understood *generically*. Too special, likewise, is the explanation of the words adopted by Aretius, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Gomarus, Calov, Wolf, Peirce, M'Lean, Bisping, and many others, in part coinciding with the second form of the first main interpretation, according to which, by *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον*, *the divine nature* of Christ, or "the principle of the eternal Sonship of God indwelling in Christ" (Kurtz), is designated. This view already finds its refutation in the fact that *πνεῦμα* has its opposite in *σάρξ*, and *πνεῦμα* and *σάρξ* are contrasted as *spirit* and *body*, not as *divine* and *human*. To be rejected farther is the procedure of Faustus Socinus, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Carpzov, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 525 ff.), Reuss,[1] Kurtz, Woerner, and others, in making the *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον*, as regards the thing intended, equivalent to the *δύναμις ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου*, vii. 16, whereby the essentially *ethical* import of the expression in our passage is lost sight of;

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

entirely false and arbitrary, however, is the interpretation of Döderlein Storr, and Stuart, who refer *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον* to Christ's *state of glorification* after His exaltation; of Nösselt (*Opusc. ad interpret. sacr. scripturr.* fascic. I. ed. 2, p. 334),—as also van der Boon Mesch, *l. c.* p. 100,—who espouse the opinion: "*πνεῦμα* esse victimam, quam Christus se immolando Deo obtulit, eamque *αἰωνίαν* dici propterea, quod istius victimae vis ad homines salvandos perpetua atque perennis futura sit;" of Michaelis, *ad Peirc.*, who finds the sense, that Christ presented Himself not according to *the letter* of the Mosaic law, but yet certainly according to *its spirit;* and of Planck (*Commentatt. a Rosenm.* etc., *edd.* I. 1, p. 189), who even maintains that the spirit of prophecy in the prophets of the Old Covenant is thought of. Strangely also Oecumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, and others (comp. already Chrysostom): *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου* stands in opposition to the *fire*, by which the Levitical sacrifices were offered to God. Similarly Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 420, 2 Aufl.), who is followed by Delitzsch and Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 527, *Obs.*): "the spirit by which Christ offered Himself is called an *eternal* spirit, in opposition to the fleeting spirit of the animals which the O. T. high priest presented." Of a "spirit" of the animals the author (cf. iv. 12) can hardly have thought, inasmuch as, though in the O. T. a *πνεῦμα* is often ascribed to animals, this is understood only in the lower sense of the *ψυχή*. Needlessly, in the last place, does Reiske conjecture *ἀγνεύματος* instead of *πνεύματος*.—*διά*] denotes not the mere *impulse* or *impelling motive* (Vatablus, Ribera, Estius, *al.*), nor yet the *condition* or *sphere* (Stengel, Tholuck, *al.*), but the higher *power*, by virtue of which the offering was accomplished and made effective.—*ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν*] is understood by Bleek, with whom Kurtz concurs, after the precedent of Faustus Socinus, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, and others, in the sense *that Christ offered to God, in the heavenly Holy of Holies, His blood which was shed upon earth;* which, however, is violent on account of *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου*, since these words appertain to the whole relative clause, and are not to be referred, with Bleek, as a nearer definition merely to *ἄμωμον*. The undergoing upon earth of the death of the cross is that which is meant.—*ἄμωμον*] *as a spotless sacrifice*, yielding full satisfaction to God. The Levitical victim must be *ἄμωμος* (תָּמִים), physically free from blemish. Here *ἄμωμος* is used of the higher, ethical spotlessness, and has reference to the sinlessness of character manifested by Christ during His earthly life. Erroneously Bleek: the expression has respect to "the condition of Christ after death and the resurrection, in which, raised above even the infirmities to which as very man He was subject upon earth, He could in particular no more fall a victim to death."—*τῷ θεῷ*] is to be taken along with the whole relative clause, not merely with *ἄμωμον*.—*ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων*] *forth from dead* (legal) *works*, so that we free ourselves from them as from something that is unfruitful and useless, rise above them. The notion of the *νεκρὰ ἔργα* here the same as at vi. 1.

Vv. 15–28. [On Vv. 15–22, see Note LXVIII., pages 631, 632.] *In order, however, that Christ might become the mediator of the New Covenant, it was matter of necessity that He should suffer death.* This follows from the very

notion of a διαθήκη, since the same is only ratified after the death of the διαθεμενος has been proved; as accordingly the first or O. T. διαθήκη was not inaugurated without blood. For the inauguration of the earthly sanctuary the blood of slain animals sufficed; for the consecration of the heavenly sanctuary, on the other hand, there was need of a more excellent sacrifice. This Christ has presented once for all in the end of the world, by His sin-cancelling sacrificial death. [LXVIII *a*, *b*.]

Ver. 15. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν] *and just for this cause is He the Mediator of a New Covenant.* [LXVIII *c*, *d*.] By means of καί, ver. 15 attaches itself closely to the preceding context, and διὰ τοῦτο points back to the main thought contained in vv. 9–14; just for this reason, that the sacrifice of Christ accomplishes that which the Levitical sacrifices are unable to accomplish; namely, that, presented by virtue of eternal spirit, brings in an eternal redemption, these, on the other hand, as ordinances of the flesh, are able to effect only purity of the flesh. Not specially to τὸ αἷμα, ver. 14 (Sykes, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Maier), does διὰ τοῦτο glance back. For in this case δι' αὐτό, or rather διὰ τοῦ αἵματος, would more naturally have been written. Nor is διὰ τοῦτο to be taken together with ὅπως, as a mere preparation thereto (so Schlichting, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, Stengel, Ebrard, and many). For thereby ver. 15 would be torn from its connection with that which precedes.—Upon καινῆς there does not rest an emphasis, as is supposed by Bleek and Delitzsch. For otherwise the adjectives must have been prefixed to the substantive. On the contrary, what is to be specially emphasized is διαθήκης. For just the inner nexus of the N. T. διαθήκη, with the redemptive death of Christ as its mediating cause, is to be brought out; whereas the adjective καινῆς could be presupposed as familiar from the disquisition viii. 8 ff., in that there the perfect covenant promised by God was sufficiently characterized as a *new* one.—ὅπως] *in order that.* False the interpretation of Heinrichs: "unde sequitur." The final clause ὅπως κ.τ.λ. is not designed to develop more nearly the διὰ τοῦτο; it depends upon διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν, and indicates the *goal* to which, in accordance with the decree of God, the διαθήκη καινή should lead, and at the same time the way and means by which the attainment of this goal should be accomplished.—θανάτου γενομένου] *a death having ensued.* The death of Christ is that which is meant. The author, however, expresses himself *generically*, because he has already in mind that which is to be observed, vv. 16, 17.—Εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων] *for redemption from the transgressions* (or *sins*) *committed under the first covenant* (or *at the time of the first covenant*). Note of design to θανάτου γενομένου, not to λάβωσιν.—τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν] *the promise*, *i.e.* the promised blessing itself. With τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν we have to combine τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας, as a declaration wherein the promised blessing consists (genitive of *apposition*). By the separation of the two closely connected words, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν is brought out more emphatically, and the discourse gains in point of rhythm. Less suitably, although free from objection on linguistic grounds, did the Peshito, Faber Stapulensis, Braun, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Stein, Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 594),

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

Vv. 16, 17. [LXVIII *c.*] Demonstration of the necessity of the θάνατον γενέσθαι by means of a truth of universal application. That Christ might be able to become the Mediator of a new διαθήκη, His death was required. For, to the validity of a διαθήκη, it is essential that the death of the διαθέμενος be first proved. Since immediately before (ver. 15) and immediately after (ver. 18 ff.) διαθήκη was employed in the sense of "covenant," elsewhere usual in our epistle, we might naturally, on account of the conjunction of vv. 16, 17, by means of γάρ, with ver. 15, and on account of ὅθεν, by which again ver. 18 is joined to vv. 15, 16, expect this signification of the word to be found also in vv. 16, 17. This has accordingly been insisted upon, here too, by Coducus (*Critt. sacrr.* t. VII. P. ii. p. 1067 sqq.), Seb. Schmidt, Peirce, Whitby [in com.], Macknight, Michaelis, Sykes, Cramer, Paulus, and others, lastly also by Ebrard. But it is altogether inadmissible. For if we take διαθήκη as covenant, ὁ διαθέμενος could only designate him who makes or institutes the covenant; to take ὁ διαθέμενος as the mediator of the covenant, as is generally done in connection with that view, and to understand this again of the sacrificial victims, by the offering of which the covenant was sealed, is pure caprice. The thought, however, that for the validity of a covenant-act the death of the author of the covenant must first ensue, would be a perfectly irrational one. Irrational the more, inasmuch as, vv. 16, 17, only an entirely general truth is contained, passing for a norm in ordinary life. Ebrard finds expressed the thought: "Where a sinful man wishes to enter into a covenant with the holy God, the man must first die, must first atone for his guilt by death (or he must present a substitutionary עוֹלָה)." But all these definings have been arbitrarily imported. For vv. 16, 17 nothing is said either about a "sinful man," or about a volition on his part, or about the "holy God," or about an "atoning for guilt," or about a "substitutionary עוֹלָה." From what has been said, it follows that διαθήκη, vv. 16, 17, can be taken only in the sense, likewise very frequently occurring with the Greek authors, of "testament" or "disposition by will." It is true there arises therefrom a logical inaccuracy,[1] owing to the fact that διαθήκη is used in these two

[1] For the author does not reason, as de Wette supposes, from the mere "*analogy* of a will or testament."—The course, moreover, pursued by Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 426 ff.), in order to manifest the non-existence of a logical inaccuracy, in that, namely, in the whole section, ver. 15 ff., he will have διαθήκη signify neither "covenant" nor "testament,"

verses in another sense than before, and the formal demonstrative force of that which is advanced by the author—although the underlying thoughts are in themselves perfectly just—is thereby sacrificed. It is, however, to be observed that while for us, since we are obliged to employ a twofold expression for the reproducing of the diversity of sense, the transition from the one notion to the other appears abruptly made, this transition for the author, on the other hand, might be an imperceptible one, inasmuch as in the Greek one and the same word included within itself both significations. Thus, accordingly, it has happened that the ancient Greek interpreters explain *διαθήκη*, vv. 16, 17, expressly in the sense of a testament or will, then at once pass over to the declaration contained in ver. 18, without so much as noticing the logical inaccuracy which presents itself. The sense consequently is: *where a testament or deed of bequest exists, there it is necessary, in order to give it validity* (comp. *ἰσχύει*, ver. 17), *that the death of the testator first be proved.* The New Covenant, therefore, which Christ has established between God and man by His sacrificial death, the author here represents—in accordance with the figure of the *κληρονομία*, ver. 15—as a testamentary disposition on the part of Christ, which, however, as such could only acquire validity, and put the heirs in possession of the blessings bequeathed to them, by means of the death of Christ.—*θάνατον*] emphatically preposed, while *τοῦ διαθεμένου*, upon which no emphasis falls, comes in at the end of the clause.—*φέρεσθαι*] *be declared* or *proved*. Wrongly Grotius: the verb to be regarded as equivalent to *exspectari* ("est enim exspectatio onus quoddam"); Wittich: it denotes the being *endured* on the part of the relatives; Carpzov, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Schulz, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Stengel, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 428), and others, that it denotes nothing more than *ensue* or *γίνεσθαι*, ver. 15.

Ver. 17. Confirmatory elucidation of ver. 16. The words of the verse are connected together as parts of a single statement. We have no right to break up the same, in such wise that *διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία* is made a parenthesis, and *ἐπεὶ κ.τ.λ.* joined to ver. 16 (Hofmann).—*ἐπὶ νεκροῖς*] *in the case of dead persons, i. e.* only *upon condition that* the author of the *διαθήκη* is dead, or has died.—*βεβαία*] *firm* or *inviolable* (comp. ii. 2), inasmuch, namely, as, after the death of the testator has supervened, the abrogation or alteration of the testament on his part is no longer possible.—*μήποτε*] *never*. [LXVIII *f.*] The making of *μήποτε* equivalent to *μήπω* or *nondum* (Vulgate, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Luther, Schlichting, Böhme) is linguistically inadmissible. Oecumenius, Theophylact, Lud. de Dieu,

but throughout the whole only "disposal" (Verfügung), is, as also Delitzsch and Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 598, *Obs.*) acknowledge, an utter breakdown. See likewise the observations of Nickel in *Reuter's Repertor.* 1858, März, p. 194 f.—Nor will it do, with Kurtz, to set aside the logical inaccuracy, at which he takes so great offence that he thinks himself obliged to designate such inaccuracy, in case it were present, an "inexcusable confusion" (!), in taking not only at vv. 16, 17, but also in like manner at vv. 15, 18, the *διαθήκη* in the special sense of "establishing as *heir*." For the connection with that which precedes (comp. vii. 22, viii. 6 ff, ix. 1, 4) leads at vv. 15, 18 exclusively to the idea of a covenant.

Heinsius, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Lachmann, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 429), Delitzsch, and Ewald regard the word as an *interrogative particle*, which does not alter the sense, and might appear the preferable course, since, on the supposition of an assertory statement, the objective *οὔποτε* might have been expected in place of the subjective *μήποτε*. Nevertheless, elsewhere too, with later authors, the placing of the *subjective* negation is not at all rare after *ἐπεί*, when it introduces an objectively valid reason. See Winer, p. 447 [E. T. 480]; Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr.* p. 304 [E. T. 353.].—*ἰσχύει*] *sc.* *διαθήκη*, not *ὁ διατιθέμενος* (Peirce).

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

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

Vv. 19, 20. Historic proof for the assertion, ver. 18, with a free reference to Ex. xxiv. 3–8.—*κατὰ τὸν νόμον*] is taken by Schlichting, Calov, Jac. Cappellus, Seb. Schmidt, Bengel, Storr, Böhme, Bleek, Bisping, *al.*, along with *πάσης ἐντολῆς*: "every precept according to the law, *i.e.* as it was contained in the law." So already the Vulgate: lecto enim omni mandato legis. But against this construction the absence of the connecting article and the strangeness of the preposition *κατά*. Rightly, therefore, have Oecumenius, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Vatablus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Wittich, Braun, Schulz, Kuinoel, Klee, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Hofmann, and others referred *κατὰ τὸν νόμον* to *λαληθείσης*. Only we must not explain, as is ordinarily done, "in accordance with the commandment received of God," but the sense is: after, in accordance with the law received of God, every precept had been proclaimed by Moses to the whole people. The standard for the proclamation of the *ἐντολαί* was the *νόμος*, since it contained these *ἐντολαί*.—*παντὶ τῷ λαῷ*] Ex. xxiv. 3 stands only *διηγήσατο τῷ λαῷ*. But *παντί* resulted from the *ἀπεκρίθη δὲ πᾶς ὁ λαός* there immediately following.—*καὶ τῶν τράγων*] *and of the goats.* Of goats slain in sacrifice the underlying narrative of Exodus says nothing. Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Bengel, Böhme, and others therefore suppose that the author had in view the burnt-offerings mentioned before the thank-offerings of oxen, Ex. xxiv. 5; inasmuch as, according to Lev. i. 10 ff., iv. 23 ff., ix. 2, 3, Num. vi. 10, 11, vii. 27, rams and he-goats, as well as other smaller animals, might be selected for burnt-offerings. Nevertheless, it is also possible that, as conjectured by Bleek, de Wette, and Bisping, there was present to the mind of the author that sacrifice of bullocks and goats already referred to, vv. 12, 13, which the high priest was to offer on the great day of atonement.—*μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ*

ἐρίου κοκκινου καὶ ὑσσώπου] *along with water and crimson wool and hyssop.* With regard to this also, nothing is stated in the corresponding passage of Exodus. But all three things are elsewhere mentioned in connection with legally enjoined aspersions for purification. Comp. Num. xix. 6, 17 f.; Lev. xiv. 2 ff., 49 ff. In accordance therewith, a mixture of fresh spring water in some cases with the ashes of the red heifer, in others with the blood of a slain bird, was prescribed in the case of aspersions which were appointed for the cleansing of one defiled by contact with a corpse or by leprosy. In like manner, according to the passages above referred to, *hyssop* (אֵזוֹב, comp. on this plant, Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterb.* Bd. II. 2 Aufl. p. 819 f.) and *crimson wool.* With the latter the hyssop stem was probably bound round, and this served as a brush for sprinkling the blood. Comp. this use of hyssop in Ex. xii. 22.—*αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν ἐράντισεν*] *he sprinkled as well the book itself as also the whole people.* *τὸ βιβλίον* is the *βιβλίον τῆς διαθήκης*, Ex. xxiv. 7. Of a sprinkling likewise of this book of the covenant, nothing, however, is told us in Exodus. It has therefore been proposed, by way of removing the difference, to make *τὸ βιβλίον* still dependent upon the preceding *λαβών*.[1] But the *καί* following *βιβλίον* renders this impossible. For the setting aside of this *καί* by pronouncing it spurious (Colomesius, Valckenaer), or by the assumption of a pleonasm (so ordinarily), is an act of violence; while we are prevented from placing it, with Bengel and Ewald, in correspondence with the *καί*, ver. 21, as "et . . . et vero," or "non modo . . . vero etiam,"—apart from the clumsiness of construction thus arising, and leaving out of consideration the inconvenient *δέ*,—*by the twice occurring of the verb ἐράντισεν*, vv. 19 and 21. —*πάντα τὸν λαόν*] LXX. ver. 8: Λαβὼν δὲ Μωϋσῆς τὸ αἷμα κατεσκέδασε τοῦ λαοῦ.[2] —*ἐράντισεν*] *sc.* for consecration and purification.

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

Ver. 21 adds to that mentioned vv. 19, 20, not a simultaneous fact, but only something occurring later. For when the law was proclaimed by Moses, and the people promised to observe the same, the tabernacle had not yet an existence. Ex. xl., where we have the account of the erection and inauguration of the tabernacle, only an *anointing* of the tabernacle and its vessels *with oil* is enjoined, not a *sprinkling* thereof *with blood.* Comp. *ibid.* ver. 9. Similarly in Leviticus, a *sprinkling* indeed *with blood* (viii. 15, 19, 24) is supposed in regard to the altar; in regard to the tabernacle and its furniture, on the other hand, only an *anointing* (viii. 10 ff.). It is possible, however, that Jewish tradition preserved more precise details. At least mention is made by Josephus also (*Antiq.* iii. 8. 6) of an aspersion of the tabernacle and its furniture, on the part of Moses, with blood.—

[1] So, after the precedent of the Coptic and Armenian versions, Grotius, Wittich, Surenhus, Cramer, Bengel, Michaelis, Storr, Morus, Ewald, and others.

[2] Schlichting: Omnem autem populum conspersisse dicitur, quia qui ex proxime astantibus conspersi fuerant, universi populi personam hac in parte gessere, ita ut totus populus conspersus fuisse censeretur.

Erroneously, for the rest (on account of the *aorist*), do Owen, Seb. Schmidt, Wittich, Cramer, and others find mentioned, ver. 21, in place of the one act of Moses, a sprinkling enjoined by the law of Moses, and occurring at different fixed periods, in connection with which the majority will have the sprinkling which is made on the great Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 14 ff., to be meant.—*καὶ . . . δέ*] *but also.* Luke ii. 35; John viii. 16, *al.*—*τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας*] *the vessels designed for sacred use.*

Ver. 22. Confirmation of the special historic facts adduced vv. 19–21, by the general rule, which throughout the whole domain of Mosaic law was recognized as, with hardly any exception, of binding obligation.—*σχεδόν*] *almost, nearly* (Acts xiii. 44, xix. 26), does not belong to *ἐν αἵματι* (Bengel, Böhme). Still less is it to be joined to *καθαρίζεται*, as is done by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, and Primasius, who, in opposition to the cohesion with that which precedes and follows, will find the thought expressed that the purification accomplished in accordance with the law is only a partial, bodily one, and thus only imperfect, since it is not able to cancel sins. It belongs logically to *πάντα*. The author, however, does not write *καὶ ἐν αἵματι σχεδὸν πάντα καθαρίζεται*, but, on the contrary, prefixes *σχεδόν* to the whole clause, in order to imply that the limitation contained in this expression extends to both members of the clause. The sense is consequently: and one must almost say that all things are according to the law purified with blood, and that without the shedding of blood no remission takes place.[1] As concerns the thought, Grotius in his day aptly refers us to the saying of the Talmud (tract. *Joma*, fol. 5. 1; *Menachoth*, fol. 93. 2): אֵין כַּפָּרָה אֶלָּא בְּדָם, non est expiatio nisi per sanguinem. The conceding, moreover, of the existence of single exceptions, by virtue of *σχεδόν*, finds its justification, as regards the first half of the clause, in Ex. xix. 10; Lev. xv. 5 ff., 27, xvi. 26, 28, xxii. 6; Num. xxxi. 22–24; as regards the second half, in Lev. v. 11–13.—*πάντα*] *all universally* (men as well as things), which as Levitically impure has need of cleansing. Wrongly Peirce and Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 563): all the furniture and utensils of the sanctuary.—*κατὰ τὸν νόμον*] *in conformity with the law, i. e.* so soon as the norm fixed by the Mosaic law is taken into account. The addition *κατὰ τὸν νόμον* is likewise to be supplied in thought to the second member of the clause.—*αἱματεκχυσία*] a word not elsewhere met with in Greek literature. What is meant is not specially *the pouring out of the blood* upon the altar,[2] but in general, *the blood-shedding* by the slaying of sacrificial animals.[3]—*ἄφεσις*] *remission, sc.* of the guilt incurred.

Vv. 23–28. [On Vv. 23–28, see Note LXIX., pages 632–634.] If the earthly sanctuary needed to be cleansed and consecrated by such things as these, there was required of necessity for the dedication of the heavenly sanctuary a more excellent sacrifice. This Christ has presented

[1] So, rightly, Bleek, Winer, p. 514 f. [E. T. 554]; Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 500; Alford, Maier, Hofmann, and Woerner.

[2] De Wette, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 435, *al.*

[3] Bleek, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz, Hofmann, *Comm.* p. 363.

in the end of the world by means of His sin-cancelling sacrificial death; and at His return, which is now to be expected for the salvation of those that hope in Him, no repetition of His sacrifice will be required.

Ver. 23. [LXIX *a*, *b*.] The first of the two statements dependent on ἀνάγκη οὖν (τὰ μὲν . . . . καθαρίζεσθαι) is deduced as a necessary consequence from vv. 18–22, while then the second statement (αὐτὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.) is derived as a necessary postulate from the first, and in such manner a return is effected to the necessity for the death of Christ, already shown at vv. 16, 17, in order to set forth the same on a fresh side. The necessity of the first-mentioned fact of ver. 23 is evident from the norm instanced, which is of validity in the domain of the Mosaic law; the necessity of that last mentioned, from the difference between the Christian and the Judaic. The main thought, however, lies in the second half of the clause, to which the first forms logically only the bridge.—*οὖν*] *sc.* because blood is so necessary a means for expiation and consecration.—*ἀνάγκη οὖν*] *it is then needful.* To *ἀνάγκη οὖν* we have to supplement *ἐστίν*, not, with Faber Stapulensis, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, Kurtz, and others, *ἦν*. For although the author has only one special fact in mind in connection with both members of the sentence, yet, as is shown by the *plural θυσίαις, he expresses himself universally;* because he is reasoning from the inner necessity, as this is presupposed by the state of the matter itself.—*τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι, αὐτὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.*] [On some words in Vv. 23 ff., see LXIX *g*.] *that the copy, indeed, of that which is in heaven should be purified with these, but the heavenly place itself with better sacrifices than these, i. e.* for the characteristically Judaic the means of expiation and consecration are necessarily determined in accordance with the norm specified in the Mosaic law; but since Judaic and Christian are distinguished from each other as the mere copy of the heavenly place and the heavenly place itself, so of necessity must the means of expiation and consecration in the Christian domain be a more excellent one than in the Judaic.—By *τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* and *τὰ ἐπουράνια* we have to understand neither the heavenly possessions,[1] nor yet the Christian Church and its members.[2] Still less can these expressions denote: "that which, where God is essentially present, brings with it His relation to the Church, *i. e. first*, His dwelling with it,—namely, in that the glorified human nature of Christ is the dwelling for the whole fullness of the divine nature; *secondly*, the human nature, in its consecration to God, in which Christ presents and offers it up to the Father; and *thirdly*, the place where God's wrath against human sin meets with expiatory satisfaction, by which it is averted,—thus Christ, who, as the propitiation for our sins, stands between the Church and its God" (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 436 ff. [comp. also Owen]). Rather is the *heavenly sanctuary* specially meant thereby, as is evident from ver. 24. For in ver. 24 the meaning of *ἁγία* is supposed to be already known from ver. 23;

[1] Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Rambach, and others.

[2] Zeger, Estius, Corn. a Lapide, Calov Böhme, Stengel, *al.*; comp. also Tholuck.

inasmuch, namely, as ἅγια is there almost accentless, while all the emphasis is laid upon the adjectives χειροποίητα, etc. In accordance with this, too, is determined the meaning of τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς as the *earthly sanctuary*, inasmuch as it was the imperfect imitation or copy of the former, as accordingly already, at viii. 5, the Levitical sanctuary had been characterized as ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιὰ τῶν ἐπουρανίων. The plural τὰ ὑποδείγματα is placed, just because the author has already before his mind, in ver. 23, the plural τὰ ἅγια, ver. 24. Thus, then, the first clause of ver. 23 has respect to the special fact already brought forward at ver. 21, whereas the second clause receives its elucidation by means of the special fact of which mention is made at ver. 24.—τούτοις] *by such things as these, i. e.* by blood of slain animals, and similar means of purifying, which belong to the earthly sanctuary; to which general rubric, also, the ashes of the red heifer mentioned at ver. 13, but not here coming under consideration, belong. With marvellous inversion of the sense, Paulus: "to be declared pure *for these, i. e.* the Israelites."—καθαρίζεσθαι] is *passive*. Arbitrarily is it taken as a *middle* by Heinrichs, who will have ἡμᾶς supplemented as object. Against this the tenor of the foregoing verse is in itself decisive. The notion of *being purified* is not, it is true, applicable to the second clause, αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια κ.τ.λ. For the heavenly sanctuary is removed from contact with the sinful world; it has no need, therefore, of an expiation or purification.[1] We are warranted, however, in supplying in thought, without any hesitation, from καθαρίζεσθαι, a kindred verb to the second member of the sentence, by the assuming of a zeugma. But since now, in accordance with that which precedes, the καθαίζεσθαι is an idea which entirely subordinates itself to the idea of the ἐγκαινίζειν, ver. 18, the former having only the design of the latter, we shall best extract from the notion of *being purified*, in the first clause, the notion of being *consecrated to the service of God*, for the second clause, understanding this consecration of the heavenly sanctuary of the opening up of the access

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

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

Ver. 24. [LXIX *c.*] Confirmatory justification of *αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια*, ver. 23, by the proof that in reality the *heavenly* sanctuary is that consecrated by the sacrifice of Christ. Wrongly is it assumed by Delitzsch, that at ver. 24 the indispensable requirement of better sacrifices for the heavenly world is proved from the actual nature of the one rendered and presented to God. For the argument passes over to the character of Christ's sacrifice, as offered once for all, only at ver. 25.—*οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα ἅγια εἰσῆλθεν Χριστός*] *for Christ entered not into a holy place* (*i. e.* most holy place, see at ver. 8) *made with hands* (ver. 11).—*χειροποίητα*] as the main idea emphatically preposed.—*ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν*] a copy of the true (viii. 2), *real one.* *ἀντίτυπα* denotes neither *the copy of a copy*, as is supposed by Bleek, after the precedent of Michaelis, *ad Peirc.*, Cramer, Chr. Fr. Schmid, upon the presupposition that the author already thought of the *τύπος*, viii. 5, as a mere *copy of the original*; nor is it to be taken as equivalent to the simple *τύπος*, as is done by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Grotius, Wolf, Carpzov, and others. What is meant is the *corresponding image*, *i. e.* the copy or imitation, formed after the proportions of the *τύπος* or pattern, which God had shown to Moses (comp. viii. 5). The expression, therefore, is of essentially the same import as *ὑπόδειγμα*, viii. 5, ix. 23.—*ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν*] *but into heaven itself*, into the heavenly Holy of Holies, where the throne of God itself exists, in opposition to the *earthly* Most Holy Place, not to the *heavenly fore-tabernacle*, ver. 11.—*νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*] *now to appear before the face of God on our behalf* (as our advocate, and intent upon our salvation, comp. vii. 25).—*νῦν*] *now*, after He has obtained His abiding dwelling-place in heaven.—Before the face of God. In this respect, too, a pointing to the exaltedness of Christ, the heavenly high priest. For, according to Ex. xxxiii. 20, no man could continue to live who had seen the face of God; on which account also the earthly high priest might not even enter the earthly Holy of Holies until this had first been filled with the smoke of the altar of incense, and in this way the typical presence of God there existing had been veiled from his glance. Comp. Lev. xvi. 12, 13.

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

Ver. 25. *Οὐδέ*] *nor yet, sc. εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.*—*προσφέρειν ἑαυτόν*] denote

not the presentation of Himself with His blood before God in the heavenly Holy of Holies,[1] but the offering of Himself as a sacrifice upon earth. The sense is: Christ entered into the heavenly Holy of Holies, not that He might presently leave it again, in order afresh to offer Himself as a sacrifice upon earth.—*ὁ ἀρχιερεύς*] *the Levitical high priest.*—*τὰ ἅγια*] *the earthly Holy of Holies.*—*ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ*] *with blood not his own.*—*ἀλλοτρίῳ*] opposition to *ἑαυτόν.*

Ver. 26. [LXIX *e. f.*] Proof of the necessity that Christ's sacrifice should take place only once for all, from the non-reasonableness of the opposite. For if the sacrifice of Christ sufficed not once for all for the cancelling of sin, He must oftentimes in succession—because no generation of mankind, so long as the world has endured, has been free from sin—have undergone death since the beginning of the world. But now, seeing this is contrary to reason, the matter stands in reality quite otherwise. From this reasoning it is evident that the author supposed an expiation of the sins *of all the earlier generations of mankind too,* by virtue of the sacrificial death of Christ. An erroneous statement of the connection of thought is given by Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 441), Delitzsch, and Alford. See, on the other hand, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 552, *Obs.*—*ἐπεί*] *since otherwise, alioquin.* Comp. 1 Cor. v. 10, vii. 14, *al.*—*ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν*] *it were needful that He should often suffer.*—On *ἔδει* without *ἄν*, see Winer, p. 266 [E. T. 283].—*παθεῖν* specially of the *suffering of death,* as xiii. 12.—*ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*] *from the foundation* or creation *of the world onwards* (comp. iv. 3), *i. e.* here: *so long as there are men in the world.*—*νυνὶ δέ*] as viii. 6, in the *logical* sense: *but now.* Opposition to *ἐπεὶ κ.τ.λ.*—*ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων*] *in the end of the ages,* periods of time. Antithesis to *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου,* and equivalent in signification to *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων,* i. 1. Comp. also *ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος,* Matt. xiii. 40, 49.—*εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ*] *for the canceling of sin by His sacrifice.* These words belong together. The conjoining of *διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ* with *πεφανέρωται,* which has been preferred by Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Carpzov, Heinrichs, Schulz, Böhme, Tholuck, and others, is, in connection with the right determination of the sense of the verb (*vid. infra*), harsh and unnatural, and not at all justified by the alleged analogon: *ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος,* 1 John v. 6. Tholuck's objection, however, that *ἅπαξ . . . αἰώνων* is antithetically opposed to the *κατ' ἐνιαυτόν,* ver. 25, and *πεφανέρωται διὰ τῆς θυσίας* to the *εἰσέρχεται ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ,* does not apply, inasmuch as the second clause of ver. 26 forms the antithesis to the first clause of that verse, but not to ver. 25; on which account also *ἐπεὶ . . . κόσμου* is not, with Beza, Mill, Griesbach, Carpzov, Schulz, Bloomfield, and others, to be enclosed within a parenthesis.—No *emphasis* for the rest falls upon the personal pronoun employed with *θυσίας,* in such wise that the sense would be: *by the sacrifice of Himself.*[2] It means simply: *by His sacrifice* (Bleek, de

[1] Böhme, Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, and others; comp. also Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 474.

[2] So Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, in their translations, Piscator, Jac. Cappellus, Owen, Limborch, Schulz, Heinrichs, Böhme, Stuart, Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Conybeare, and others.

Wette), so that not *αἵτοῦ*, but *αὐτοῦ* is to be written. The contrast between His own blood and the blood of other victims was already sufficiently brought out afresh at ver. 25.—*πεφανέρωται*] *He has been manifested, i. e.* He has appeared or come forth before the sight of men upon earth. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 20; 1 John iii. 5, 8; also Col. iii. 4; 1 John ii. 28; 1 Pet. v. 4 [1 Tim. iii. 16]. To explain the expression of the *appearing before God*, and to make it of like import with *ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ*, ver. 24 (Jac. Cappellus, Heinrichs, Schulz, *al.*), is forbidden alike by the absence of the, in that case indispensable, addition *τῷ θεῷ*, as by the *ἐκ δευτέρου ὀφθήσεται*, ver. 28, corresponding as it does to the *πεφανέρωται*.

Vv. 27, 28. Further (*καί*) enforcement of the *ἅπαξ*, ver. 26, by means of an analogy. As death is appointed to men once for all, they, after having *once* suffered death, do not need to die again, but after death nothing more follows for them but the judgment; so also Christ has once for all offered up Himself for the canceling of sin; at His return He will not again have to offer Himself for the canceling of sin, but He will return once again, only to put the believers in possession of the everlasting salvation.—*καθ' ὅσον*] *inasmuch as* [cf. vii. 20], is not entirely synonymous with *καθώς*, which one might have expected on account of the following *οὕτως*, and which Grotius and Braun conjecture to have been the original reading; for, whereas *καθώς* would express the bare notion of *comparison*, this contains at the same time an indication of *cause*. The indication of cause, however, has reference merely to *ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν*, to which then the *ἅπαξ προσενεχθείς*, ver. 28, corresponds; but not likewise, as Kurtz maintains,[1] to the addition *μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις*, since to this an element of dissimilarity is opposed at ver. 28. The sense is: inasmuch as men, regarded generally, have only once to undergo death, so also Christ, since He was herein entirely like unto His brethren, could not die more than once.—*ἀπόκειται*] *is appointed* (in the decree of God). Comp. Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 8. The verb originally of that which has been laid aside, and so lies ready for future use.—*ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν*] *to die a single time*, or *once for all*. Comp. Sophocles in Stobaeus, ii. 120: *θανεῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἐξεστι τοῖς αὐτοῖσι δίς*.—Calvin: Si quis objiciat, bis quosdam esse mortuos, ut Lazarum et similes (comp. Heb. xi. 35), expedita est solutio, apostolum hic de ordinaria hominum conditione disputare: quin etiam ab hoc ordine eximuntur, quos subita commutatio corruptione exuet (comp. Heb. xi. 5).—*μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις*] *sc.* *ἀπόκειται*, not *ἐστίν* or *ἔσται*. Whether, for the rest, the *κρίσις* is thought of by the author as ensuing immediately after the death of each individual (Jac. Cappellus, Kurtz, *al.*), or as a later act coinciding only with the general resurrection of the dead (Bengel, Bleek, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, *al.*), the elastic *μετὰ τοῦτο* affords us no intimation.—*κρίσις*] *judgment*, is to be taken quite generally. Wrongly is it

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

understood by Schulz (and so also Böhme) specially of the judgment unto punishment or unto condemnation, in that he supposes—erroneously, because at variance with the absolute τοῖς ἀνθρώποις—two different classes of men (those to be punished and those to be blessed) to be opposed to each other in vv. 27, 28. [Yet comp. John v. 24.]

Ver. 28. Ἅπαξ προσενεχθείς] *once offered* (by the suffering of death). Chrysostom: ὑπὸ τίνος προσενεχθείς; ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ δηλονότι. Wrongly (comp. ἑαυτόν, vv. 25, 14) Delitzsch: in connection with the passive προσενεχθείς we have "to think of the violence proceeding from the human and demoniac power, which Christ endured, in order to become the προσφορά for the propitiation of mankind;" Kurtz and Hofmann: ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ is to be supplemented, which, accordingly, is interpreted by Kurtz into the signification of the "sending of the Son into the world, in behoof of the vicarious atoning for sin by means of His sacrificial death;" by Hofmann: into a "being brought to that place where He was to be at the disposal of Him who had ordained Him to be an expiatory sacrifice for sins." The words ἅπαξ προσενεχθείς correspond to the ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, ver. 27, and προσενεχθείς forms a paronomasia with the following ἀνενεγκεῖν: *borne* as a sacrifice, that He might *bear* away, *dargebracht, um fortzubringen* [*oblatus ut auferret*]. For ἀνενεγκεῖν denotes not *the bearing up* (and fastening) *to the cross*,[1] or *the substitutionary bearing*[2] or *the offering up* of the sins, as it were, as a sacrifice,[3] but the expiation of sins, conceived under the form of the result immediately of necessity attaching itself thereto, *i. e. the putting away of sins*, in such wise that it takes up again the idea expressed by εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας, ver. 26, and becomes identical with ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας, x. 4. From a linguistic point of view this interpretation encounters no difficulty (against Delitzsch and others), since the ἀνά in ἀνενεγκεῖν was employed not otherwise than, *e. g.*, very frequently the ἀνά in ἀναιρεῖν. How easily the notion of *bearing* in φέρειν could pass over into that of *bearing away* or *doing away with*, is shown in the kindred verb βαστάζειν, which is unquestionably used, Matt. viii. 17, John xx. 15, in the sense of *auferre*.[4] —πολλῶν] here too, as ii. 10 and often (see p. 122), lays stress only on the notion of *multitude* or *plurality*, without regard to the question whether this plurality constitutes the totality of mankind or not.—ἐκ δευτέρου ὀφθήσεται] *shall appear the second time* before the eyes of men, namely, at His Parousia. According to Bleek, there arises a difficulty from the words, if we explain προσενεχθείς of the death suffered upon earth, and not, with him, of an action accomplished in heaven, only after the resurrection, inasmuch as in the former case Christ *already* appeared in a visible form the

[1] Jac. Cappellus, Calov, Wolf, Bengel, and others, after 1 Pet. ii. 24, where, however, ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον is employed with it.

[2] Augustine, *de pecc. mer.* i. 28; Estius, Seb. Schmidt, Böhme, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 544 f.; Alford, Maier, Conybeare, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Hofmann, and others, in accordance with the signification of the verb, Isa. liii. 12, LXX.: αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε, an utterance which certainly may have been before the mind of the author at the time of his writing this passage.

[3] Peshito, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Michaelis.

[4] Comp. also Galen, *de compos. medicam.* 2: ψώρας τε θεραπεύει καὶ ὑπωπια βαστάζει.

second time after His resurrection. But such difficulty does not at all present itself in connection with that application of *προσενεχθείς* either. For *ἐκ δευτέρου ὀφθήσεται* can only be understood of a second appearing in a visible form upon earth; when, however, Christ after His resurrection appeared again to His disciples, He had not yet left the earth; those manifestations of the risen Christ before His ascension belonged consequently to His first visible coming forth upon earth.—*χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*] forms the opposition to *εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας*, is therefore to be interpreted after the analogy of these words. (Erroneously Bleek, according to whom *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* forms the opposition to *εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται*, ver. 26.) Christ has once offered Himself up for the expiation of the sins of men; when He returns to earth the second time, He will not once more have to do with the expiation of human sin, but *He will, apart from sin, or free from all relation to sin, appear to bring the σωτηρία to the believers.* Free from the guilt and punishment of sin, Christ *has* already rendered His believers by means of His sacrificial death at His first appearing upon earth. *Positively*, He will bless them with salvation at His return. To combine *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* with *τοῖς ἀπεκδεχομένοις* by means of an hyperbaton (so Faber Stapulensis and Grotius) is grammatically impossible. The sense, however, cannot be either, as the Irvingites will, that *Christ Himself* will be free from sin at His second appearing, in opposition to the lust which they suppose to have attached to Him during His first appearing; for that Christ during this period too, notwithstanding all the temptation to which He was subject, was free from sin, the author certainly distinctly asserts at iv. 15. Incorrectly also does Bleek[1] take *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* as equivalent in signification to *μὴ οὔσης ἁμαρτίας*, so that the sense would be: "at the return of Christ sin will no longer be present, at least in the domain to which the operation of the Redeemer will relate." Even in a grammatical respect this application of the words is inadmissible, since *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* must stand in relation to the *subject* in *ὀφθήσεται*, thus cannot be torn away from this reference by being made equivalent to an independent participial clause. But also the thought thence arising would be encumbered with difficulty, as Bleek himself admits, by the addition of "at least," etc., although Bleek has sought to justify it. Additional misinterpretations of *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* are met with in other writers. Thus it is supposed to mean: without, again vicariously laden with the sins of men, being made sin (2 Cor. v. 21) for them,[2] which is already refuted by the erroneousness of explaining the foregoing *ἀνενεγκεῖν* of the vicarious bearing of sins; without the punishment of sin;[3] without the sufferings undertaken for sin;[4] sine corporis,

[1] After the example of Theodore of Mopsuestia (*τὸ γὰρ χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι μὴ κρατούσης ἔτι τῆς ἁμαρτίας οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ἔξω παντὸς ἀνθρωπίνου πάθους ὀφθήσεται τότε*) and of Theodoret (*οὐκέτι τῆς ἁμαρτίας κρατούσης, ἀντὶ τοῦ χώραν οὐκέτι ἐχούσης κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς ἁμαρτίας*).

[2] Oecumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, Akersloot, Wolf, Carpzov, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Heinrichs, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 545, *Obs.*; Alford, Maier, Moll, and others.

[3] Klee, *al.*

[4] Tholuck.

peccato obnoxii, mortalitate;[1] sine sacrificio pro peccato;[2] not as a *suffer* for the guilt of others, but as the holy *judge* of the guilt of others,[3] and so forth, all of which have the plain expression of the language against them.—*εἰς σωτηρίαν*] belongs to *ὑφήσεται*, not, as it is true, upon the retention of the *spurious* addition (see the critical remark) *διὰ πίστεως*, it must be conjoined, to *ἀπεκδεχομένοις*.[4] For *τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις* contains a non-essential element of the statement, ver. 28; *εἰς σωτηρίαν*, on the other hand, an essential element of the same. *εἰς σωτηρίαν*, namely, is the positive nearer defining of the negative *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*, and forms consequently, like the latter, an antithesis to *εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας*. The whole clause, however, *ἐκ δευτέρου . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν*, corresponds to the second member of the clause, ver. 27: *μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις*.

Notes by American Editor.

LXVII. Vv. 1–14.

(*a*) The subject of viii. 1–6 *a* is taken up anew and presented more in detail in these verses. In the development of the thought, as here given, there are four steps, as follows:—1. (vv. 1–5). The old covenant had its arrangements for worship and its sanctuary. The old tabernacle had two parts, an outer one—the holy place, and an inner one—the holy of holies, with furniture appropriate to each. 2. (vv. 6, 7). This being the arrangement of the tabernacle, the rule respecting it was, that to the outer part free admission was given to the priests, at all times, but into the innermost part entrance was prohibited to all except the high-priest, and to him it was allowed only once a year. 3. (vv. 8–10). This rule was a divine indication that, so long as the old tabernacle, with its exclusion from the holy of holies, i. e. from immediate access to God, continued, the more perfect system was not yet reached. 4. (vv. 11–14). This more perfect system Christ brings, when He passes through the veil and, entering the higher, i. e. the heavenly sanctuary, as the heavenly high-priest opens the way for all His followers to the immediate presence of God.

The view of Lünemann here—that, in ver. 9 ff., the writer, "by means of one of those sudden transitions of which he is so fond," turns to a new topic, the inability of the Levitical *sacrifices* "really to atone," and thus introduces "*a third main point* in the high-priestly superiority of Christ," is erroneous. That the writer is fond of making such sudden transitions, may be doubted. Here, at least, he does not make one in the way that Lünem. supposes. What is said of the Levitical sacrifices is only incidental and subordinate to the progress of the thought as set forth above, and neither here, nor in ch. viii., does the writer move beyond the idea of Christ as superior to the Levitical priests because He is the minister of a higher sanctuary connected with a better covenant. (See also Note LXV *b*.)

(*b*) *κοσμικόν* of ver. 1 is added, as Lünem. remarks, not in the way of an independent predication respecting the *ἅγιον*, but rather as a passing suggestion of its character as contrasted with the *ἅγιον* which is to be alluded to afterwards.—

[1] Zeger.

[2] Jac. Cappellus, Stuart, M'Caul, and many.

[3] Ebrard, Delitzsch; similarly Stein and others.

[4] So Primasius, Faber Stapulensis, Camerarius, Wolf, Klee, Paulus, Stein.

(*c*) The several things which are mentioned in vv. 2–5 as connected with the two parts of the tabernacle, are not specified for the purpose of giving a detailed description of the arrangements. This is evident, both from the fact that the object of the whole passage is inconsistent with such a purpose, and also from the closing words of ver. 5. The writer simply wishes to present the fact, with emphasis, that there was this division, with appropriate arrangements, preparatory to the presentation of the rule of the old system, which he is about to mention, and which is distinctively characteristic of it—one of its essential elements as a religious system. This peculiarity in the writer's purpose may fairly be considered, in connection with the difficulties which his distribution of the things specified occasions. So far as some of these difficulties are concerned, it may offer a satisfactory explanation; as e. g., when he says that the Holy of Holies had (*ἔχουσα*) the golden altar or censer, it may suggest that the participle is used in a looser sense than would be possible, if the purpose were to give a minute description. But with reference to the bearing of these verses on the question of the Pauline authorship, the fact of this peculiarity will hardly be sufficient to account for his presenting the matter in this way.—(*d*) The question whether the altar or the censer is intended by *θυμιατήριον* (ver. 4), is one which cannot be answered with confidence. R. V. places *censer* in the text, and *altar of incense* in the margin. A. R. V. place the former in the margin and the latter in the text. The considerations presented by Lünem. make it not improbable that A. R. V. is correct. But we cannot properly go beyond this position, and exclude *censer* altogether—(*e*) In vv. 2, 4, *ἅγια* and *ἅγια ἁγίων* being distinguished from each other, the former means the Holy place, but everywhere else in the chapter *ἅγια* (vv. 8, 12, 24, 25) means the Holiest place i. e. the immediate presence of God. In a similar manner, the demands of the thought in different places change the sense of *πρώτη*, so that, while in ver. 1 it means first in time, in vv. 2, 3, 8, it has the local sense. Thus in ver. 8, the writer evidently means to say that, so long as the outer part of the tabernacle continued—that is, so long as there was a veil shutting off the inner part,—the way of access to God was not fully opened.

(*f*) Ver. 9 declares that the *πρώτη σκηνή* (ver. 8)—which involved, so long as it continued, the existence of a separating veil—was a *παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρ. ἑνεστ.*, i. e. a figure or emblem of the Jewish system in its imperfection, with reference to the *καιρός* or period to which it belonged. The Holy place, as divided from the Holy of Holies, became in itself, to the mind which rightly apprehended its meaning, a kind of parabolic representation of Judaism, and just as the Holy place, as thus separated, must cease to exist and the Holiest place be opened, in order to perfect communion with God, so the Jewish system must pass away and open into something higher and better.—*τὸν κ. ἑνεστ.*, is best taken as in contrast with *καιροῦ διορθώσεως*—(*g*) *καθ' ἣν.*—Lünem. is probably correct in referring *ἣν* (like *ἥτις*) to *πρώτης σκηνῆς*. It was in accordance with the arrangement which thus shut out the presence of God by a veil, i. e. the existence of a *πρώτ. σκ.*, that imperfect and temporary offerings were instituted. This reference to gifts and sacrifices is not for the purpose of introducing a new thought, but only of showing, more fully and emphatically, the imperfection of the religious system which involved the outer part of the tabernacle and the separating veil. The offerings are essentially connected with the approach of the worshiper to God, with the perfecting which is the end in view, and hence with the work of the high-priest as ministering in a sanctuary. The allusion to them, therefore, is a

part of the presentation of Christ's ministration as compared with the Levitical. But the main thought is the same throughout the entire passage: that He is superior because He is priest of a higher sanctuary.

(*h*) Vv. 11–14. The parallelism of *διὰ τῆς μείζονος . . . σκηνῆς* and *διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος*, (comp. ver. 7, the high-priest goes in through the veil, not without blood), indicates the correctness of the view that the sacrifices are mentioned as entirely subordinate to the ministry in the sanctuary. The use of *διά* in the second case, instead of *with*, is doubtless for rhetorical impression.—(*i*) That *διά* of ver. 11 has the local sense is shown by the correspondence with ver. 7, and by the prominence of the local idea throughout all the preceding verses. That the greater and more perfect tabernacle means the lower heavens, as Lünem. holds, is suggested by the comparison with iv. 14: "passed through the heavens." The objection made to this view, on the ground that the heavenly sanctuary has no outer part, may be met, perhaps, by supposing that the writer conceives of Christ as removing the veil by thus passing through the heavens, and that it was in this way that the higher sanctuary became open to all, with immediate access to the Divine presence. But the writer may, possibly, have no idea of an outer part here, and may refer simply to a passing from the door of the sanctuary to the place of offering, the throne of God—the lower, visible heavens being the door of entrance.—(*j*) *εὑράμενος* is best understood, with Lünem., as antecedent to *εἰσῆλθεν* and as referring to Christ's sacrifice of Himself. By making this sacrifice He obtained a redemption which was eternal, and not for a time only, and then He entered into the presence of God with this offering. Comp. vv. 24 ff. of this chapter.—(*k*) *αἰωνίου πνεύματος* (ver. 14) does not seem to refer to the Holy Spirit, (1) because, as Lünem. says, the substitution of the adj. *αἰων.* for *ἁγίου* would be indistinct and liable to be misunderstood—we may add, such a substitution would here be unnecessary; (2) because the course of thought in the chapter does not suggest the idea of the Holy Spirit; (3) because the contrast with the Levitical sacrifices implies an act of Christ's own spiritual nature, as distinguished from the offering of a victim other than Himself. The absence of the article, also, renders it improbable that the Holy Spirit is referred to, for, though the article might be omitted with *ἁγίου*, we should not expect such an omission, in a passage like this, with the adjective *αἰωνίου*. The reference must be, accordingly, to Christ Himself. It was His own eternal spirit, through the action of which He offered His sacrifice. That the writer of the epistle believed Christ to have a divine (spiritual) nature, is not to be doubted. Whether he intended, however, to express this thought, in this phrase, may be questioned. More probably, he is moving in the sphere of thought which is suggested by the contrasts of the chapter, and in which also, in the recapitulatory passage (x. 1 ff., comp. especially vv. 5 ff.), he evidently moves.

LXVIII. Vv. 15–22.

(*a*) In vv. 15–28 the thought of viii. 6 *b*–13 is developed more in detail:—As minister of a higher sanctuary, Christ has connection also with a better covenant. The close relation of the two thoughts is indicated by *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο* at the beginning of ver. 15.—(*b*) The presentation of the subject is as follows:—1. The statement of the fact, ver. 15 *a*. 2. In order to His becoming the mediator of the new covenant —the divine covenant having a testamentary character—His death was necessary,

vv. 15 *b*–17. 3. This necessity of a death was recognized in the Mosaic system, vv. 18–22. 4. For the higher system—that connected with the new covenant and the heavenly sanctuary—a nobler sacrifice was needed, and with this sacrifice Christ entered as high-priest into the presence of God, vv. 23, 24. 5. The offering which He has there made does not need to be repeated, vv. 25–28. It will be noticed that here, as in the previous passages, the idea of the sacrifice is subordinated to that of the offering in the sanctuary.

(*c*) *διὰ τοῦτο* refers to vv. 11–14, which present the idea of Christ as having appeared as the minister of the higher sanctuary, and as accomplishing thereby, as high-priest, the work of the higher system, *τελείωσις*.—(*d*) The retroactive working of the death of Christ is here presented, as it is, in a way somewhat similar, in Rom. iii. 25.—(*e*) The word *διαθήκη* passes from its regular N. T. sense of *covenant* into that of *testament* as the discourse moves from ver. 15 to vv. 16, 17, and returns again to that of *covenant* in vv. 18 ff. Kay, in the Bible Comm., Angus, in Schaff's Pop. Comm., and one or two recent American writers have attempted to show that the meaning *testament* is to be rejected, and *covenant* to be adopted in vv. 16, 17; following, in this point, the writers mentioned by Lünemann. The attempt is unsuccessful, and the arguments presented by Lünem., Bleek, Alf., Moll, and others against this view are conclusive. As Moll remarks, it is "convicted of error at once by the utter falseness of the idea that in the formation of a *covenant* the death of him who framed it is indispensable, as well as by the intolerable harshness of any other mode of explaining *ὁ διαθέμενος*." The fact that the Divine covenant involves an inheritance (*κληρονομία*) gives it a certain testamentary character, which completely accounts for, and at the same time justifies, the change in the shade of meaning from covenant to testament (testamentary covenant). With this change, the clauses of vv. 16, 17 become sufficiently simple; without it, hopeless difficulties arise.—(*f*) *μήποτε* is made an *interrogative* word by R. V. text, a *negative* word by R. V. margin. A. R. V. places the negative in the text, and the interrogative in the margin. That *μήποτε* is used in the later Greek after *ἐπεί* as substantially like *οὐποτε*, is shown by what Winer says in his N. T. Gram., p. 480, and, if it can be thus used, the negative is somewhat more in harmony with the simple and confident style of the argument than the interrogative.—(*g*) *ὅθεν*—the inference is legitimate so far as the covenant is of a testamentary character, which is the view taken of it here. The victims and blood of the O. T. system were, like all things in that system, imperfect and symbolic, but all the arrangements and ordinances, in this regard, followed in the line of the universal principle and necessity alluded to. This is set forth, first, in the statement of what Moses did at the inauguration of the old covenant and afterwards (vv. 19–21), and, secondly, in the setting forth of the general provision of the law (ver. 22).

LXIX. Vv. 23–28.

(*a*) Ver. 23 is introduced by *οὖν* and presents a twofold conclusion from what precedes. In the progress of the thought, however, the connection would be more naturally given, if the verse had read: If it was necessary that the copies, etc., or, As, accordingly, it was necessary, etc., it was, as a natural consequence, necessary that the higher sanctuary should be purified with better sacrifices.—(*b*) *καθαρίζεσθαι* need not be pressed, in its application to the heavenly tabernacle, into the same meaning that it has as applied to the earthly one. Throughout the entire

section, the writer uses words with reference alike to the earthly and heavenly, which he trusts the intelligence of his readers to modify in their meaning, and to interpret according to the demands of each case. Here the word is, probably, carried over to the heavenly sanctuary, only as indicating that there must be a better sacrifice before men can find free access to the immediate presence of God. —(*e*) Ver. 24 suggests the thought: "and it is into this heavenly sanctuary that Christ has entered." The writer introduces the verse with the particle *γάρ*, which, as Lünem. says, confirms the *αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουρ.*, by showing that it is, in reality, the heavenly sanctuary that is consecrated by the sacrifice of Christ. This, however, may be regarded as only the grammatical and more immediate or minor connection of the thought In the main connection and progress, the suggestion mentioned above gives the force of the verse, which forms a transition from ver. 23 to ver. 25 ff. It is into the heavenly sanctuary that Christ entered, taking with Him the offering of the nobler sacrifice. He did this once for all, since the offering needed to be made only once.—(*d*) The nobler character of the offering is presented, in vv. 25 ff., especially in the point that it did not need to be repeated. Lünemann is clearly wrong in his interpretation of *προσφέρειν* (ver. 25) as referring to Christ's offering Himself as a sacrifice on earth. This is what is indicated by *παθεῖν* of ver. 26. The whole course of thought in the passage, which has reference to the high-priest in the sanctuary; the *εἰσῆλθεν* and *ἐμφανισθῆναι* of ver. 24; the *εἰσέρχεται . . . . ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρ.*; the contrast with *παθεῖν*;—all these things show that *προσφέρειν* denotes Christ's presentation of Himself with His blood before God in the heavenly Holy of Holies. The sacrifice is, accordingly, as everywhere in this section of the epistle, subordinate to the offering of the blood in the sanctuary. The high-priest's ministry in the presence of God is the subject constantly kept before the reader's mind.

(*e*) That the offering does not need to be repeated is proved by two arguments:—1. By the fact that, if there were such need, there would be a similar necessity of a *repeated sacrifice*, as in the Levitical system—but that there is no such necessity of ever-renewed sacrifices is indicated by the historical facts of the case. He has not suffered oftentimes since the foundation of the world, but now, at the consummation of the ages, He has been once manifested to put away sin by His sacrifice. 2. By the analogy of the case of men. As they die but once, and that which is appointed for them afterwards is not death, but judgment; so He has died once for all, and what awaits Him in the future is another thing than death—an appearance for the bringing of salvation to those who wait for Him.

(*f*) The development of the thought in these later verses is subordinated to the statement of ver. 15 *a*, and serves to show how the covenant of which Jesus is the Mediator is a better one than that connected with the O. T. law. The covenant, is better, since it secures salvation. But that He, as High-Priest, is the mediator of the new covenant, only as He is the minister of the higher sanctuary, is also shown by the development of these verses.

(*g*) As to particular words and phrases in vv. 23 ff., the following points may be noticed:—1. The writer uses words as descriptive of the old tabernacle in an unusual sense, in some cases, as e. g. *ὑποδείγματα* (ver. 23, comp. also viii. 5) in the sense of *copy*, and not *example* or *pattern*, its original meaning (comp. *παράδειγμα*); *ἀντίτυπα* of the earthly (ver. 24) and *τύπον* (viii. 5) of the heavenly. The O. T. things, according to the more natural mode of regarding them, are *τύποι*; the N. T. and heavenly things, the *ἀντίτυποι*. The conception of this writer, in these

places, is not of types, in the ordinary sense, but of the heavenly pattern and the earthly copy answering to it.—2. *ἐπουράνια* (ver. 23) means the heavenly sanctuary.—3. The emphatic position in the sentence which is given to *εἰς χειροπ. ἁγ.*, and, by contrast, to *εἰς αὐτ. οὐρανόν* (ver. 24), indicates both the grammatical and logical connection of this verse with ver. 23 and the following context. See (*c*) above.—4. *νυνί* (ver. 26) is the logical, not the temporal adverb: *as the case stands.*—5. *συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων* (ver. 26):—comp. Matt. xx. 28, *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*; 1 Cor. x. 11, *τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν*;—the ending together of the ages.—6. *ἅπαξ*, as used in this chapter, means *once*, apparently in the sense of *once for all.*—7. *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*, apart from those relations to sin which He had when He appeared the first time on earth and made atonement for it by His sacrifice of Himself.

CHAPTER X.

VER. 1 reads in the *Recepta*: *Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι.* Instead thereof, Lachm. takes the words *Σκιὰν . . . πραγμάτων* as an independent clause, placing a full stop after *πραγμάτων*. He then, in the stereotype edition, omits the relative before *προσφέρουσιν*,—while in the larger edition he has again added the *ἃς* of the *Recepta* before this verb,—places a comma after *προσφέρουσιν*, and writes *δύνανται* in place of *δύναται*. This punctuation and form of the text given by Lachm. is in all essential respects to be unhesitatingly rejected. In connection with the breaking off of the opening words of the verse into an independent statement, *ἐστίν* must be supplemented to *ἔχων*. Such supplementing, however, would be altogether opposed to the linguistic character of the Epistle to the Hebrews; moreover, it would remain inexplicable, from the very brevity of the clause, how the participle *ἔχων* should come to be written for the finite tense *ἔχει*, which naturally suggests itself. In addition to this, the joining to that which precedes by means of *γάρ* would occasion a difficulty, and the clause following would become an asyndeton. Besides, this following clause, in the absence of any connecting relative, would not even comply with the laws of grammar. The relative before *προσφέρουσιν* is wanting in A, 2, 7* 17, 47, Syr. utr. Arm., and A** 31, Syr. Philonex. then insert *αἵ* before *οὐδέποτε*. Instead of the *Recepta ἃς προσφέρ.* there is found, however, in D* L (?), 73, 137, in an ancient fragment with Matthaei, which Tisch., in the edit. vii. (comp. Pars I. p. cxci.), has designated as N, with Theodoret, as well as in a MS. of Chrysostom and in the Latin version of D E: *αἷς προσοίρ.*, and the latter is preferred by Bleek, Tisch. and Alford. Yet the *Recepta ἃς*, which is supported by C D*** E (?) K ℵ, the majority of the cursives, and many Fathers, is to be defended. Since the three words immediately preceding end in *αις*, *ἃς* might easily also be changed into *αἷς*. The *Recepta δύναται*, finally, is attested by D (* and ***) E K L, very many cursives, Vulg. It. Copt. *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret (text), Oecum. (comm.) *al.*, while the plural *δύνανται* (preferred also by Tisch. I, and already placed by Griesbach upon the inner margin) is presented by A C D** ℵ, about thirty cursives, Syr. *al.*, Chrys. (codd.) Theodoret (comm. ?), Damasc. Theophyl. *al.* But the plural is devoid of sense, and can on that account be regarded only as a transcriber's error, which was occasioned by the foregoing plural *προσφέρουσιν*.—Ver. 2. *Ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο*] Elz.: *ἐπεὶ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο*. Against the decisive authority of all uncial mss., of most cursives, vss. and Fathers.—The preference to the *Recepta κεκαθαρμένους* is deserved by *κεκαθαρισμένους* (approved by Grotius, Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Delitzsch, Alford), as better attested. In favor of *κεκαθαρισμένους* pleads not only the testimony of D E K ℵ, 23** 37, 39, *al.*, but also the form which in A C has risen as a transcriber's error from the same *κεκαθερισμένους*, which latter Lachm. has adopted.—Ver. 6. *Recepta* here and ver. 8: *εὐδόκησας*. Better at-

tested, however, here (by ℵ A C D* E, the early fragment in Matth. *al.*) and ver. 8 (by ℵ A D* [E?], *al.*, Cyr. Theodoret) is the reading, chosen by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, as also approved by Delitzsch: *ηὐδόκησας*.—Ver. 8. In place of the *Recepta θυσίαν καὶ προσφοράν*, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford rightly read the plural: *θυσίας καὶ προσφοράς*, in accordance with ℵ A C D* ℵ* 17, 23, 57, *al.*, Vulg. It. Syr. Copt. Sahid. Arab. Erp. Cyril. Already commended to attention by Griesbach. The singular is a later change, with a view to its conformation to ver. 5.—In like manner we have, with Lachm. and Tisch., to delete *τόν*, which the *Recepta* adds before *νόμον*, as not being found in ℵ A C, ℵ, 37, 46, 71, 73, *al.*, Sahid. Cyril, Chrys. Theodoret. The insertion of the article was more easily possible than its rejection.—Ver. 9. *τοῦ ποιῆσαι*] Elz.: *τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ θεός*. Against ℵ A C D E K ℵ* 17, 39, 46, *al. mult.* It. Copt. *al.*, *ὁ θεός* is a complementary addition from ver. 7. Rightly deleted by Griesbach, Lachm., Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche.—Ver. 10. Instead of the mere *διά* in the *Recepta*, Matthaei and Tisch. 2 and 7 read, after the precedent of the Edd. Complutens. Erasm. Colin. Stephan.: *οἱ διά*. Bloomfield places *οἱ* within brackets. But *οἱ* (*sc. ἡγιασμένοι*) is wanting in ℵ A C D* E* ℵ, 31, 47, *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret, and owes its origin to an error of the eye, in that the termination *σμένοι* in *ἡγιασμένοι* gave rise to the writing of *ἐσμὲν οἱ*.—In place of *τοῦ σώματος* in the *Recepta*, D* E, with their Latin translation, have *τοῦ αἵματος*. Mistaken emendation, since *τοῦ σώματος*, ver. 10, was chosen in manifest correspondence to the citation *σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι*, ver. 5.—'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ.] Elz.: *τοῦ 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. But the article has against it the testimony of all the uncials, many cursives and Fathers, and is rightly rejected by Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford.—Ver. 11. Elz. Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, Bloomfield, Reiche read: *πᾶς μὲν ἱερεύς*. Defended also by Böhme, Tholuck, and Delitzsch. The preference, however, is deserved by the reading: *πᾶς μὲν ἀρχιερεύς*, which is furnished by A C, 31, 37, 46, *al.*, Syr. utr. (yet in the Philonex. with an asterisk) Basm. Aeth. Arm. Theodoret (text), Cyril. Euthal. *al.*, was already adopted in the Editt. Complut. Plantin. Genev., and more recently has been restored by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, and Alford. If the ordinary Levitical priests had been intended, *οἱ ἱερεῖς* would, as is rightly observed by Bleek, have been written instead of *πᾶς ἱερεύς*, since each single Levitical priest had by no means daily to offer sacrifice. Less unsuitable, on the other hand, is the statement of the daily presentation of sacrifice in regard to the high priest, since that which was true of the Levitical priests in general could indeed be ascribed to the high priest as the head and representative of the same. In any case we have here, at the close of the argument, and because of the parallel with the person of Christ, to expect not so much the mention of the ordinary Jewish priest, as the mention of the Jewish high priest. The reading: *πᾶς μὲν ἱερεύς*, is therefore to be looked upon as a later correction, made on account of the following *καθ' ἡμέραν*, since this stood in apparent contradiction to *πᾶς μὲν ἀρχιερεύς*.—Ver. 12. *οὗτος δέ*] Elz. Matthaei, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield: *αὐτὸς δέ*. But *οὗτος δέ* (recommended by Griesbach; adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Scholz, Tisch. 1 and 8, Alford, Reiche; approved also by Delitzsch) is demanded by the preponderating authority of ℵ A C D* E ℵ, 67** 80, 116, *al.*, Syr. utr. Arr. Copt. Basm. Aeth. Arm. It. Vulg. *al.*, Chrys. Cyr. Damasc. *al.*—Instead of the *Recepta: ἐν δεξιᾷ*, Lachm. had written in the stereotype edition: *ἐκ δεξιῶν*, which, however, is only feebly attested by A, 31 (ℵ* has *ἐκ δεξιᾷ*, which by ℵ***

was changed into ἐν δεξιᾷ). Rightly, therefore, has Lachm. returned in his larger edition to the *Recepta*.—Ver. 15. μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰρηκέναι] Elz. Matth. Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, Reiche: μετὰ γὰρ τὸ προειρηκέναι. Against decisive witnesses (A C D E ℵ, 17, 31, 47, *al. m.* Syr. utr. Arr. Copt. Basm. Aeth. It. Vulg. Chrys. Theoph. Ambrose, Sedul.). Already held suspected by Griesbach.—Ver. 16. Elz. Griesbach, Matthaei, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche: ἐπὶ τῶν διανοιῶν, after D** and *** E K L, most cursives and vss., Chrys. Theodoret, *al.*, Ambrose, *al.* On the other hand, A C D* ℵ, 17, 31, 47, *al.*, Vulg. (Amiat. Harlej.* Tolet.) have: ἐπὶ τὴν διάνοιαν. Approved by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, and probably the original reading.—Ver. 17. Elz. Matthaei, Scholz, Bloomfield: μνησθῶ. More correctly, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, after A C D* E ℵ* 17: μνησθήσομαι, which Griesbach has placed upon the inner margin. μνησθῶ was carried over from viii. 12.—Ver. 22. *Recepta*: ἐῤῥαντισμένοι. After A C D* ℵ* Lachm. writes: ῥεραντισμένοι, Tisch. and Alford: ῥεραντισμένοι.—Ver. 29. The words ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη are deleted by Lachm. in the stereotype edition; but are rightly, since they are omitted only by A and Chrysostom, retained by him in the larger edition.—Ver. 30. The addition following ἀνταποδώσω in the *Recepta*: λέγει κύριος, is rejected by Tisch. 1, 2, and 8, after D* ℵ* 17, 23* 67** Vulg. It. Copt. Syr. Aeth. Arab. Erp. Ambr. Bede, and is regarded by Mill (*Prolegg.* 496), Bengel, Griesbach, and others as probably a gloss. Bloomfield encloses it within brackets. It is nevertheless protected by A D*** E K L ℵ*** etc., Syr. Philonex. *al.*, and many Fathers. Rightly, therefore, has it been received again by Tisch. into the edit. vii. Delitzsch, Alford, and Reiche also have lately decided in favor of its genuineness.—The *Recepta* κύριος κρινεῖ we have, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, after A D E K ℵ* 31, 73, *al.*, Vulg. It. Syr. utr. Aeth. Theodoret (semel), to transpose into κρινεῖ κύριος. Bleek and Delitzsch read, after D E, 55, 71, Vulg. It. Theodoret (sem.): ὅτι κρινεῖ κύριος. Quite similarly, LXX. Deut. xxxii. 36; Ps. cxxxv. 14.—Ver. 34. τοῖς δεσμίοις] Thus we have to read, with Griesbach, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, and others, after A D* [as Cod. B breaks off at ix. 14, so also x. 24–xii. 15 is wanting in Cod. C] 47, 67** 73, *al.*, Syr. utr. Arab. Erpen. Copt. Arm. Vulg. Chrys. Antioch. Damasc. Theodoret (comm.), Oecum. (comm.) Pelag. Ambrose, *al.* From τοῖς δεσμίοις arose, by a slip on the part of the copyist, τοῖς δεσμοῖς, which is found with Origen, *Exhort. ad martyr.* 44, and to which the *vinculis eorum* of the Latin translation in D E corresponds; while, then, τοῖς δεσμοῖς was completed by means of a gloss into the *Recepta*, still defended by Matthaei, Bloomfield, M'Caul, and Hofmann: τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου (D*** E K L ℵ, etc.), in that Paul was regarded as the author of the epistle, and thus was found expressed an acknowledgment of the sympathy manifested by the Palestinian Christians towards himself during his imprisonment.—In that which follows, the reading: ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς, very strongly confirmed by D E K L, almost sixty cursives, Chrys. Theodoret, Isidor. iii. 225, Damasc. Theoph., already adopted into the Editt. Complut. Erasm. 1, Steph. 1 and 2, and later preferred by Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, is to be held the original one, inasmuch as from this reading the rise, as well of the *Recepta*: ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (which, as it would seem, rests only upon a few cursives), as also of the reading afforded by A ℵ, four cursives, the early fragment in Matthaei, Vulg. It. *al.*, and followed by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8: ἐχειν ἑαυτοὺς, is to be explained.—The addi-

tion: *ἐν οὐρανοῖς* after *ὑπαρξιν* in the *Recepta* is wanting in A D* ℵ* 17, in the early fragment with Matthaei in the text, in Copt. Aeth. Vulg. It., with Clem. Al. Bed., and stands with Theodoret only after *μένουσαν*. Elucidatory gloss, suspected by Mill (*Prolegg.* 1208) and Griesbach, rightly rejected by Lachm. Bleek. Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford.—Ver. 35. *Recepta: μισθαποδοσίαν μεγάλην.* With Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, Alford, we have to transpose into *μεγάλην μισθαποδοσίαν*, after A D E ℵ the early fragment in Matthaei, 73, 116, *al.*, Clem. Al. Orig. Eus. It. Vulg. Copt. *al.*—Ver. 38. The *Recepta* omits the *μου*, which is found in most MSS. of the LXX. after *πίστεως*. D* Syr. utr. Copt., the Latin version in D E, Eus. Theodoret (alic.), Cypr. Jerome have it after *πίστεως*. On the other hand, it is found after *δίκαιος* in A ℵ, Arm. Vulg., in the early fragment with Matthaei by the first hand, with Clem. Al. Eus. (alic.) Theodoret (alic.), Proc. Sedul. Bed. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford have adopted it at this latter place, and probably the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews so read, inasmuch as it is found with the LXX. at this place in Cod. A.

Vv. 1–4. [On Vv. 10–18, see Note LXX., pages 658–660.] Presentation in a clearer light of the necessity for Christ's offering Himself only *once* for the expiation of sins (ix. 25–28), by pointing to the ineffectiveness of the expiatory sacrifices continually repeated within the domain of Judaism. This constant repetition attests that sins are still ever present, as indeed a canceling of sin by the blood of bullocks and of goats is impossible. [LXX *a*.]

Ver. 1. [LXX *b* 1, 2.] Establishment of the *ἅπαξ προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας*, ix. 28, as being the main thought lying in ix. 25–28, by making good the opposite state of the case in the province of the O. T. theocracy: "For since the law contains only a shadow of the future good things, not the actual likeness of the things, it is not able by means of the same sacrifices every year, which are unceasingly offered, ever to make perfect them that draw nigh." The emphasis of the proposition rests partly upon the characterization of the law as *σκιὰν ἔχων κ.τ.λ.*, partly upon *κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*. The author, however, cannot thereby mean, as the words at first hearing might seem to imply, that the law, in case its contents were no mere *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*, would in reality effect the *τελείωσις* by means of its ever-repeated expiatory sacrifices. For, as is shown by vv. 2 and 3, the author already bases upon the very fact of the yearly repetition of the Mosaic expiatory sacrifices the proof for their inadequacy. We must therefore suppose that two independent particulars of thought have been blended together into a single statement. One can resolve the matter either in such wise that *οὐδέποτε δύναται τελειῶσαι* is looked upon as the common predicate for both particulars: the law is *incapable* of leading to *τελείωσις*, because it contains a mere *σκιά κ.τ.λ.*; and certainly it is incapable, by means of its ever-repeated sacrifices, of leading to *τελείωσις*. Or in such wise that the second particular is thought of originally as an inference from the first, from which the *οὐδέποτε δύναται κ.τ.λ.* is then progressively derived: because the law contains a mere *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων*

ἀγαθῶν, there is found in its domain an unceasing repetition of the same expiatory sacrifices; by this unceasing repetition, however, it is never able to lead to perfection. The latter analysis is to be preferred, because by means of it the opposition, required by the course of the argument, between the once offered and the ofttimes repeated expiatory sacrifice, comes out clearly and definitely in all its severity; while the characterization of the νόμος, on the other hand, as σκιὰν ἔχων κ.τ.λ., is made only that which here, in harmony with the context, it alone can be, *i. e.* a mere subsidiary factor in the argument.—σκιάν] *a shadow*, which is unsubstantiated, melts away into obscurity, and only enables us to recognize the external outlines. Opposite to this is the εἰκών, the *image* or impress, which sets before us the figure itself, sharply and clearly stamped forth. See on viii. 5. Freely, but not incorrectly, does Luther translate: "the very substance of the good things."—τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν] see at ix. 11.—τῶν πραγμάτων] different from τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν only as respects the more general form of expression.—κατ' ἐνιαυτόν] belongs neither to οὐδέποτε δύνανται,[1] nor to ἃς προσφέρουσιν,[2] in which latter case the words would have to be resolved by ταῖς θυσίαις, ἃς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν τὰς αὐτὰς προσφέρουσιν, or something similar. But κατ' ἐνιαυτόν is rather to be taken in intimate combination with ταῖς αὐταῖς: *with the same sacrifices every year*. The author forebore writing ταῖς αὐταῖς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν θυσίαις, in order that he might accentuate each notion equally strongly. As, moreover, with κατ' ἐνιαυτόν in this place, so also elsewhere with adverbs which in point of meaning may be compared with it, such as ἀεί, πολλάκις, etc., a *transposing* is nothing rare. Comp. Winer, p. 514 f. [E. T. 553.]—ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις] Those meant are, as is required by κατ' ἐνιαυτόν (comp. also ver. 4) *only the sacrifices on the great day of atonement*, not also the *daily* sacrifices of propitiation (ver. 11), as Böhme, Stein, and others suppose.—προσφέρουσιν] *sc.* the Levitical high priests. Wrongly Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 446), who in general has entirely failed in his interpretation of the statement:[3] the προσερχόμενοι.—εἰς τὸ διηνεκές] Note of time to προσφέρουσιν. If we should seek, with Paulus, Lachmann, and Hofmann, *l. c.*, to conjoin εἰς τὸ διηνεκές with that which follows, the relative clause ἃς προσφέρουσιν would be deprived of all signification.—τοὺς προσερχομένους] those who approach God through the medium of the Levitical priests, thus identical with τοὺς λατρεύοντας, ver. 2, ix. 9. [LXX *b* 3.]

Ver. 2. [LXX *b* 4.] Proof for the κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐτ. θυσ. οὐδέποτε δύνανται τοὺς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι in the form of a question: *for otherwise would not their presentation have ceased? because the worshipers, so soon as*

[1] Ebrard, Delitzsch, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 446; Alford.

[2] Calvin, Er. Schmid, Wolf, Heinrichs, Bleek, de Wette, Bloomfield, and others.

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

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

Ver. 3. Contrast to τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας.[3] In such wise, however, that the offerers should have no more consciousness of guilt, the matter does not stand; on the contrary, there lies in the yearly repetition of the sacrifices the yearly reminder that sins are still remaining, and have to be expiated.[4]—ἐν αὐταῖς] *sc.* ταῖς θυσίαις.—ἀνάμνησις] not: *commemoratio*,[5] or *commemoratio publica* (Bengel and

[1] Beza: alioqui non desiissent offerri; Matthaei: non cessavissent, non sublata essent; comp. Theodoret: Διὰ τοῦτο τέλος ἐκεῖνα λαμβάνει, ὡς οὐ δυνάμενα συνείδησιν καθαρὰν ἀποῦναι.

[2] Comp. Eph. i. 16; Col. i. 9; Acts v. 42, *al.*; Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 771; Winer, p. 323 f. [E. T. 345].

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

[4] Comp. Philo, *de Victim.* p. 841 A (with Mangey, II. p. 244): Εὔηθες γὰρ τὰς θυσίας μὴ λήθην ἁμαρτημάτων, ἀλλ' ὑπόμνησιν αὐτῶν κατασκευάζειν.—*De plantat. Noë*, p. 229 B (I. p. 345) αἱ . . . θυσίαι . . . ὑπομιμνήσκουσαι τὰς ἑκάστων ἀγνοίας τε καὶ διαμαρτίας.—*Vit. Mos.* iii. p. 669 E (II. p. 151): Καὶ γὰρ ὁπότε γίνεσθαι δοκοῦσιν (*sc.* the θυσίαι and εὐχαί of the impious), οὐ λύσιν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀλλ' ὑπόμνησιν ἐργάζονται.

[5] Vulgate, Calvin, Clarius, *al.*

others), so that we must think of the *confession of sin*[1] which the high priest made on the great day of atonement with regard to himself and the whole people;[2] but: *reminding, recalling to memory.* Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25; Luke xxii. 19.

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

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

Ver. 5. Διό] *Wherefore, i. e.* in accordance with the impossibility declared at ver. 4.—λέγει] *He saith.* As subject thereto is naturally supplied *Christ*, although He was not mentioned again since ix. 28. This determination of the subject is already placed beyond doubt by the whole connection, but not less by the pointing back of τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 10, to σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, ver. 5. According to the view of our author, Christ is speaking[3] in the person of the psalmist. The psalm itself, indeed, as is almost universally acknowledged, refuses to admit of the Messianic interpretation (comp. especially ver. 13 [12]). The *present* λέγει, moreover, might be placed, because the utterance is one extending into the present, *i. e.* one which may still be daily read in the Scripture.—εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον] *at His coming into the world, i. e.* on the eve of coming (see Winer, p. 249 [E. T. 265]) into the world[4] (*sc.* by His incarnation). This determining of time is taken from the ἦκω, ver. 7. According to Bleek,[5] the author in penning the words εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον was thinking "less of the moment of the incarnation and birth than of the public coming forth upon earth to the work assigned to Him by the Father, in connection with which His entrance into the world first became manifested to the world itself." But in that case εἰσελθών must have been written, and the formula εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον (John i. 9, vi. 14, xi. 27; Rom. v. 12; 1 Tim. i. 15, *al.*) would lose its natural signification. The same applies against Delitzsch, who, bringing in that which lies very remote, will have the words explained: "incarnate, and having entered upon the years of human self-determination, signified Isa. vii. 16."—an exposition which is not any the more rendered acceptable, when Delitzsch adds, with a view to doing justice to the participle *present*: "we need not regard the εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον as a point; we can also conceive of it as a line."[6] For the

[1] Tract. *Jom.* iv. 2, iii. 8, vi. 2.

[2] Schlichting, Grotius, Braun, *al.*

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

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

[5] Who is preceded therein by Grotius, and followed by de Wette, as more recently by Maier and Beyschlag, *die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, Berl. 1866, p. 192.

[6] So, in accord with Delitzsch, also Alford, who observes: "It expresses, I believe, the whole time during which the Lord, being ripened in human resolution, was in intent

author cannot possibly have thought of Christ's *εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, and His *λέγειν* temporally therewith coinciding, as something constantly repeated and only progressively developed.—*θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας*] *sacrifice and offering* (bloody and unbloody sacrifices) *Thou didst not will.* Kindred utterances in the O. T.: Ps. l. 7–15, li. 18 ff. [16 ff.]; Isa. i. 11; Jer. vi. 20, vii. 21–23; Hos. vi. 6; Amos v. 21 ff.; 1 Sam. xv. 22. That, however, the author founded his Scripture proof precisely upon Ps. xl., was occasioned principally by the addition, very important for his purpose: *σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι*, which is found there.—*σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι*] [LXX *b* 8.] *but a body hast Thou prepared me, sc.* in order to be clothed with the same, and by the giving up of the same unto death to fulfill Thy will. Comp. ver. 7. Thus, without doubt, the author found in his copy of the LXX. But that the Hebrew words: אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִי (*the ears hast Thou digged to me, i. e.* by revelation opened up religious knowledge to me), were even originally rendered by the LXX. by *σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι*, as is contended by Jac. Cappellus, Wolf, Carpzov, Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Maier, Moll, and others, is a supposition hardly to be entertained. Probably the LXX. rendered the Hebrew words by *ὠτία δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι*, as they are still found in some ancient MSS. of that version, and *σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι* arose, not "from the translator being unable to attach any satisfactory meaning to the words 'the ears hast thou digged to me,' and therefore altering them with his own hand" (Kurtz); but only from an accidental corruption of the text, in that Σ, the final letter of the *ἠθέλησας* immediately preceding, was wrongly carried over to the following word, and instead of TI the letter M was erroneously read.

Ver. 6. *In burnt-offerings and sin-offerings hadst Thou no pleasure.*—LXX. Cod. Vatic.: *ὁλοκαύτωμα . . . οὐκ ἤτησας*; Cod. Alex.: *ὁλοκαυτώματα . . . οὐκ ἐζήτησας.—καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας*] Oecumenius: *τουτέστι προσφορὰν περὶ ἁμαρτίας*. Elsewhere also occasionally (Lev. vii. 37; Num. viii. 8, *al.*) the LXX. denote the sin-offering by the mere *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, in that the additional notion of *sacrifice* is naturally yielded by the context. Stein's expedient for avoiding all supplementing of the idea, in translating *καί* by "also" ("Thou hast also no pleasure in offerings for sin"), is grammatically inadmissible.—*εὐδοκεῖν*] with the *accusative* also not rare elsewhere in Hellenistic Greek. Comp. LXX. Gen. xxxiii. 10; Lev. xxvi. 34, 41; Ps. li. 18, 21; *al.* Besides this in the Hellenistic *εὐδοκεῖν ἐν* (x. 38), with Greek writers *εὐδοκεῖν τινι.*

Ver. 7. *Τότε εἶπον*] *then said I.* In the sense of the writer of the epistle: then, when Thou hadst prepared for me a body. In the sense of the composer of the psalm: then, when such deeper knowledge was revealed to me. Contrary to the usage of the language, Carpzov, Stein, and others take *τότε* as equivalent to *ideo*, propterea, while just as capriciously Heinrichs makes it redundant as a particle of transition.—*ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ*] is a parenthesis; so that *τοῦ ποιῆσαι* depends not on

devoting Himself to the doing of His Father's will: the time of which that youthful question, 'Wist ye not that I must be *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου*?' was one of the opening announcements."

γέγραπται, as Paulus thinks, but upon ἥκω: *Lo, I come to do, O God, Thy will.* Comp. ver. 9. Otherwise truly with the LXX. (and in the Hebrew), where τοῦ ποιῆσαι is governed by the closing verb ἠβουλήθην, which is omitted in the Epistle to the Hebrews (τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου, ὁ θεός μου, ἠβουλήθην: to do Thy will, O God, is my delight).—ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ is in the Hebrew differently connected and applied. In the sense of our author: in the prophecies of the O. T. it is written of me.—κεφαλίς, *little head*, then the knob at the end of the staff, around which the manuscript roll was wound in antiquity. κεφαλὶς βιβλίου consequently denotes the *book-roll, volume.* Elsewhere also the LXX. translated the Hebrew מְגִלָּה (*volumen*), with and without the addition of βιβλίου, by κεφαλίς. Comp. Ezek. ii. 9, iii. 1–3; Ezra vi. 2.—τὸ θέλημα] in the sense of our author: the obedient presentation of the body as a sacrifice for the redemption of mankind.

Vv. 8–10. Contrasting of the two main elements in the citation just adduced, and emphasizing of the fact that *the one* element, upon which God lays no stress, is represented by Judaism; *the other*, to which value is attached in God's sight, is represented by Christianity.—ἀνώτερον] *above*, in the opening words of the declaration.—λέγων] *sc.* ὁ Χριστός. The participle *present*, in place of which Schlichting, Grotius, Bleek, de Wette expect that of the *aorist*, is employed here, even as λέγει, ver. 5, because the utterance, as being recorded in Scripture, is one still enduring. Only the author makes manifest, by the fact that he writes λέγων, not εἰπών or λέξας, that less importance is to be attached to the indication as to the relation of time, in which the two statements are placed to each other, than to the contrasting of these two statements themselves; thus: *while He saith above*, etc., *He has then said*, etc.—ὅτι] recitative participle, as vii. 17, xi. 18.—θυσίας καὶ προσφοράς] The plural appropriately serves for the generalization of the utterance.—αἵτινες κατὰ νόμον προσφέρονται] *as those things which are presented by virtue of legal precept.* Suggestive reference to the imperfection and ineffectiveness of Judaism, since this makes salvation dependent precisely upon those ordinances of external sacrifice which God willed not, and in which He has no pleasure. The words are no parenthetic clause, as is still maintained by Bleek and Kurtz, but an addition essential to the argument of the writer, which does not interrupt the construction. They form *the application*, thus emphatically appended, of the first half of the thought in the Scripture citation, *to Judaism*, to which the parallel is formed in ver. 10 by *the application* of the second half *to Christianity.*—αἵτινες] refers back to the whole of the preceding substantives.

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

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

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

Vv. 11–14. Renewed emphasizing of the main distinction between the Jewish high priest and Christ. The former repeats day by day the same sacrifices without being able to effect thereby the canceling of sin; Christ has by His single sacrifice procured everlasting sanctification. This the main thought of Vv. 11–14. Into the same, however, there is at the same time introduced a subordinate feature, by virtue of the opposition of the ἕστηκεν and ἐκάθισεν, by which likewise is manifest the pre-eminence of Christ over the Levitical high priests. The Jewish high priests were required to accomplish their ministration *standing* (comp. Deut. x. 8, xviii. 7; Judg. xx. 28, *al.*), were thus characterized as servants or inferiors (comp. also Jas. ii. 3); whereas in Christ's sitting down at the right hand of God, His participation in the divine majesty and glory is proclaimed.

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

Ver. 12. Οὗτος] comp. iii. 3.—εἰς τὸ διηνεκές] belongs to ἐκάθισεν.—With that which precedes is it conjoined by Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Bengel, Böhme, Stein, Ewald, and others; whereby, however, the manifest

antithesis, which εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐκάθισεν forms to ἕστηκεν καθ' ἡμέραν, ver. 11, is destroyed, and the symmetry of the proposition, ver. 12, is lost.

Ver. 13. Τὸ λοιπόν] *henceforth, sc.* from the time of His sitting down at the right hand of God. What is meant is the time yet intervening before the coming in of the Parousia. The taking of τὸ λοιπόν in the *relative* sense: "as regards the rest, concerning the rest" (Kurtz), is, on account of the close coherence with ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως, unnatural, for which reason also the passages adduced by Kurtz as supposed parallels, Eph. vi. 10, Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8, 1 Thess. iv. 1, 2 Thess. iii. 1, do not admit of comparison. —The object of the waiting is expressed by our author in the language of Ps. cx. 1.—The ἐκάθισεν . . . τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως . . . involves for the rest the supposition that the destruction of the enemies of Christ is to be looked for even *before* His Parousia. The author accordingly manifests here, too, a certain diversity in his mode of viewing the subject from that of the Apostle Paul, since the latter (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 22–28) anticipates the destruction of the anti-Christian powers only after the time of Christ's Parousia. [LXX *b* 11, 12.] The supposition, which de Wette holds possible for the removal of this difference, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews "thought only of the triumph of the gospel among the nations, even as Paul also expected the universal diffusion of the gospel and the conversion of the Jews before the appearing of Christ," has little probability, considering the absolute and unqualified character of the expression here chosen: οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ.

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

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

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

ber, by means of *λέγει κύριος*. The supposition that the second, or concluding, member of the citation begins only with ver. 17, and that thus before this verse a *λέγει*, an *εἶτ' ἐπιλέγει*, a *τότε εἰρηκεν*, or something of the kind is to be supplemented,[1] is to be rejected,—although the main consideration, about which the author is quite specially concerned, follows only in ver. 17,—because it is opposed to the literary accuracy elsewhere prevailing in the Epistle to the Hebrews. For the same reason, too, the *ὑστερον λέγει*, which several MSS. (but only among those of late date) and some translations add at the close of ver. 16, is to be regarded as a gloss.

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

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

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

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

Vv. 19–25. [On Vv. 19 ff. see Note LXXI., pages 660–662.] The readers, in possession of such an exalted High Priest, and of the blessings obtained by Him, are with decision and constancy to persevere in the Christian faith, to incite each other to love and good works, and not—as had become a practice with some—to forsake the assemblies for Christian worship. So much the more should they thus act, since the Parousia is near at hand. Comp. on vv. 19–25 the similar exhortation iv. 14, 16. [On Vv. 19–25, words and phrases, see Note LXXII., page 662.]

Ver. 19. *Οὖν*] Conclusion from the investigations made chap. v. onwards. —*ἀδελφοί*] iii. 1, 12, xiii. 22.—*παῤῥησίαν*] not: *freedom* or *authorization*,[2] but: *firm, joyful confidence*.—*εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων*] *in respect to entrance into*

[1] Primasius, Clarius, Zeger, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Limborch, Wolf, Carpzov, Stuart, Heinrichs, Alford, Conybeare, Reuss, Hofmann, and others.

[2] Vatablus, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Ernesti, Schulz, Böhme, Stengel, *al.*

the sanctuary, i.e. of entering into the sanctuary, or heavenly Holy of Holies (τῶν ἁγίων, of the same import as εἰς τὰ ἅγια, comp. ix. 8). Arbitrarily would Heinrichs refer the words to the entering of *Jesus*, in that he regards εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγ. ἐν τῷ αἵμ. Ἰησοῦ as equivalent to εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, which is impossible.— ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ] *upon the ground, or by virtue of the blood of Jesus.* Belongs to the whole proposition: ἔχοντες παῤῥησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων, not merely to εἴσοδον.[1] The passage, ix. 25, by no means pleads in favor of the latter mode of apprehending it, since at ix. 25, but not in the present passage, ἐν can be understood in the *material* sense: "with;" the reference of the ἐν αἵματι in the two places is an entirely different one.

Ver. 20. Ἣν] *sc.* εἴσοδον. Not as yet with ὁδόν (Carpzov, Stuart, and others) is ἣν to be combined as indication of object, in such wise that merely πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν would form the predicate; but still less is παῤῥησίαν (Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, *al.*) to be supplemented to ἣν. For against the former decides the order of the words, against the latter the manifest correspondence in which εἴσοδον, ver. 19, and ὁδόν, ver. 20, stand to each other. The ὁδός, namely, characterized ver. 19 as to its *goal* (as εἰσοδος τῶν ἁγίων), is, ver. 20, further described with regard to its nature and constitution (as ὁδὸς πρόσφατος and ζῶσα).—ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν] *which He for us* (in order that we may walk in it) *has consecrated* (*inaugurated*, in that He Himself first passed through it) *as a new* (newly-opened, hitherto inaccessible, comp. ix. 8; Theodoret: ὡς τότε πρῶτον φανεῖσαν) *and living way.* πρόσφατος, originally: *fresh slain;* then in general: *fresh, new, recens.*[2]—ζῶσα, however, that way or entrance is called, not because it "ever remains, and needs not, like that into the earthly sanctuary, to be consecrated every year by fresh blood" (Bleek, after the precedent of Ernesti, Schulz, and others; comp. also Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact), but because it is *living in its efficacy* (comp. ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, John vi. 51), in such wise that it leads to the goal of everlasting life. The contrast is found in the inefficaciousness of the entrance into the earthly holy of holies.—διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τουτέστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ] *through the veil, that is to say, His flesh.* As the high priest must pass through the concealing veil, in order to come within the earthly Holy of Holies, thus also the flesh of Christ formed a veil, which must first be withdrawn or removed (comp. Matt. xxvii. 51; Mark xv. 38; Luke xxiii. 45) ere the entrance into the heavenly Holy of Holies could be rendered possible.—διά] is to be taken *locally*,—wrongly is it understood by Stein as *instrumental*,—and is not to be combined with ἐνεκαίνισεν,[3] but is to be attached to ὁδόν, as a nearer definition, standing upon a parallel with πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν, seeing that an οὖσαν or ἀγουσαν naturally suggests itself by way of supplement.—τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ] depends immediately upon the preceding διά, not first, as Peirce and Carpzov maintain, upon a τοῦ καταπετάσματος to be supplied.

[1] Akersloot, Storr, Schulz, Böhme, Klee, Paulus, Bleek, Bisping.

[2] See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 374 f.

[3] Böhme, Delitzsch, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 253; Alford, Kluge.

Ver. 21 is still governed by *ἔχοντες*, ver. 19. As *τὰ ἅγια*, ver. 19, was chosen as a general designation instead of the special *τὰ ἁγία ἁγίων*, so here (comp. v. 6, vii. 1, 3, *al.*) the general *ἱερέα* stands in the sense of the special *ἀρχιερέα*, and *μέγαν* is, as iv. 14, expression of the exaltedness of this High Priest (against Stuart, Klee, Stein, Ewald, M'Caul, and others, who take *ἱερέα μέγαν together* as a designation of the High Priest).—*ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ*] *over the house of God.* Comp. iii. 6. Theodoret, Oecumenius, Estius, Grotius, Calov, Tholuck, Stengel, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 454), Maier, Kurtz, and others understand by these words, in accordance with iii. 2, 6, *the household of God*, or the *believers*, by which, however, the unity of the figure is needlessly destroyed. The allusion is to *heaven* or the heavenly sanctuary, as the dwelling-place of God, over which Christ rules as High Priest.[1]

Ver. 22. *Προσερχώμεθα*] *let us then draw nigh, sc.* to this *ἁγία*, ver. 19, and this *ἱερεὺς μέγας*, ver. 21, or, what is, as regards the matter itself, not different, *to God*; in such wise that *προσερχώμεθα* is here, like *τοὺς προσερχομένους*, ver. 1, used *absolutely*, or else receives its supplementation from the *τοῦ θεοῦ* immediately preceding. Comp. vii. 25, xi. 6; also iv. 16.—*μετ' ἀληθινῆς καρδίας*] *with true, i.e.* sincere *heart*, so that we are really in earnest about the *προσέρχεσθαι*.—*ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως*] *in firm conviction of faith, firm inner certainty of faith.* Comp. vi. 11. Epexegesis of *μετ' ἀληθινῆς καρδίας*, for the clearer defining of the contents thereof.—*ἐῤῥαντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς*] *inasmuch as our hearts have been sprinkled from an evil conscience*, so that we have been delivered from the same (see Winer, p. 577 [E. T. p. 621]). Indication of the *subjective* qualification for the *προσέρχεσθαι*, while vv. 19–21 contain the *objective* qualification for the same. What is meant, is the *justification* of Christians through Christ's bloody sacrificial death (ix. 14), after the analogy of the sprinkling with blood, whereby the first Levitical priests were consecrated and qualified to approach God. Comp. Ex. xxix. 21; Lev. viii. 30.

Ver. 23. The words: *καὶ λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ*, are, by the Peshito, by Primasius, Faber Stapulensis, Luther, Estius, Wolf, Baumgarten, Storr, Kuinoel, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 741, *Obs.*), Alford, Maier, Kluge, and others, *combined in one*, and referred still to *προσερχώμεθα*, ver. 22, as a second participial clause. Better, nevertheless, shall we conjoin *καί* with *κατέχωμεν*; so that *λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ* becomes a parenthetic clause, which specifies the subjective qualification to the *κατέχειν*, exactly as *ἐῤῥαντισμένοι κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 22, brought out the subjective qualification to the *προσέρχεσθαι*. In connection with the first-named construction,[2] the rhythmical symmetry of the members, vv. 22, 23, would

[1] That Delitzsch—who is followed therein by Alford—will have us understand, as the *οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ* in our passage at the same time "the church" *and* "the heaven of glory," can be looked upon only as an instance of manifest error.

[2] A third mode of combining, followed by Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, 2 Aufl. p. 178 f.), according to which *ἐῤῥαντισμένοι* is separated by a full stop from that which precedes, and is conjoined with *κατέχωμεν*, will—since thereby the harmonic clause-formation of the

be needlessly sacrificed, and *κατέχωμεν* stand there too much torn from the context. For the supposition that *καί* might have been wanting before *κατέχωμεν*, since a third verb (*κατανοῶμεν*) follows at ver. 24, the placing of the *καί* was thus necessary only before this last, is erroneous; inasmuch as the author could hardly, from the very outset, comprehend ver. 24 in thought with ver. 22, and ver. 23, on the contrary, only brings in later that which is observed at ver. 24 as a new and independent exhortation, while *προσερχώμεθα . . . καὶ κατέχωμεν* stands together in the closest inner relation (as a decided approaching to the communion with God opened up by Christ, and a persevering maintenance of the same).—*λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ*] *inasmuch as our body has been washed with pure water* [washed as regards the body with pure water]. Reference to the sanctifying of Christians by Christian baptism. Comp. Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5. Analogon in the Levitical domain the washings, Ex. xxix. 4, xxx. 19 ff., xl. 30 ff.; Lev. xvi. 4. To find denoted in a merely figurative sense (to the exclusion of baptism), with Calvin [Owen] and others, in accordance with Ezek. xxxvi. 25: *the communication of the Holy Ghost*; or, with Limborch, Ebrard, and others: *the being cleansed from sins*; or, with [Piscator and] Reuss: *the blood of Christ* "Il s'agit ici, comme dans toute cette partie de l'épître, du sang de Christ. C'est ce sang, qui nous lave mieux que l'eau des Lévites"); or, with Schlichting: "Christi spiritus et doctrina, seu spiritualis illa aqua, qua suos perfundit Christus, ipsius etiam sanguine non excluso," we are forbidden by the addition of *τὸ σῶμα*, which implies likewise the reminiscence of an outward act.—*καθαρῷ*] that which *is* pure, and in consequence thereof also *makes* pure.—*κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῆ*] *let us hold fast the confession of hope as an unbending unswerving* one.—*κατέχωμεν*] inasmuch as the *ὁμολογία* became at once, with baptism, the possession of believers.—*τὴν ὁμολογίαν*] may here be taken *actively* (the confessing of the hope), but it may also be taken *passively* (the confession which has as its subject the Christian's hope).—*ἀκλινῆ*] stronger than *βεβαίαν*, iii. 6, 14.—*πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος*] *for faithful* (so that He keeps that which He promises; comp. 1 Cor. i. 9, x 13; 1 Thess. v. 24) *is He who has given the promise* (namely, *God*). Ground of encouragement for the *κατέχειν*.

Vv. 24, 25. Progress from that which the Christian has to do with regard to himself, to that which he has to do with regard to his fellow-Christians.—*καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους*] *and let us direct our view to each other* (comp. iii. 1), so that we may endeavor to emulate the good and salutary which we discover in our neighbor, and, on the other hand, to put away the bad and hurtful in ourselves and him. For limiting the expression, with Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Michaelis, *ad Pierc.*, Bleek, and others, to the first-named particular, no reason exists; since the positive *εἰς παροξυσμὸν κ.τ.λ.* is yet followed by the negative *μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες κ.τ.λ.*—*εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων*] *that incitement*

whole delicately-arranged period, vv. 19–23, is rudely shattered—hardly meet with approval on any side. The period so ingeniously commenced would be lacking in the appropriate conclusion, the supposed new clause in the appropriate beginning.

to love and good works may arise therefrom.—παροξυσμός] Acts xv. 39; Deut. xxix. 38; Jer. xxxii. 37, and elsewhere in the bad sense: *irritation, i.e.* embittering. Here, however, as occasionally with the classic writers, the *verb* is used[1] in the good sense.—ἀγάπη] *brotherly love*, and καλὰ ἔργα, the single manifestations thereof.

Ver. 25. Μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τισίν] *while not forsaking* (ceasing to frequent), *as is the custom with some, our own assembly*, and thereby, in connection with the already prevalent tendency to apostasy from Christianity, setting a pernicious example.—τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν] is taken by Calvin, Böhme, Bleek, and others as designation of the Christian congregation or Christian religious society itself. But in this case the only signification which could be attached without violence to ἐγκαταλείπειν would be that of apostasy from Christianity; to understand the expression, in that case, of the leaving to its fate of the Christian church, sunk in poverty, peril, and distress, by the refusal of acts of assistance (Böhme), or of the escape from the claims of the church to the cherishing and tending of its members, by the neglecting of the common religious assemblies (Bleek), would not be very natural. We are prevented, however, from thinking of an actual *apostasy* from Christianity by the addition καθὼς ἔθος τισίν, according to which the ἐγκαταλείπειν was an oft-recurring act on the part of the same persons. τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, therefore, is best explained as: *the assembling of ourselves*, in order to be united together (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 1), *i.e.* our own religious assemblies.—ἑαυτῶν] has great emphasis; for otherwise the simple ἡμῶν would have been written. It has its tacit opposition in the alien, *i.e. Jewish* religious assemblies, and contains the indication that the τινές gave the preference to the frequenting of the latter.—ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες] *sc.* ἑαυτούς (comp. iii. 13) or ἀλλήλους, which is easily supplemented from the foregoing ἑαυτῶν: *but animating one another*, namely, to the uninterrupted frequenting of our own Christian assemblies. Quite unsuitably, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, 2 Aufl. p. 379) would supply in thought to παρακαλοῦντες, as its subject: τὴν ἐπισυναγωγήν.—καὶ τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὅσῳ βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν] *and that so much the more, as ye see the day itself drawing nigh.* Reinforcing ground of obligation to the παρακαλεῖν.—βλέπετε] The transition from the first to the second person plural augments the significance of that which has been remarked, since the author can appeal to the verdict of the readers themselves for the truth thereof.—The ἡμέρα is *the day* κατ' ἐξοχήν, the day of the coming in of the Parousia of Christ, which the author thinks of as quite near at hand (comp. ver. 37), and which the readers themselves already saw drawing nigh in the agitations and commotions which preceded the Jewish war, such as had already begun to appear.

Vv. 26–31. [On Vv. 26–31, see Note LXXIII., pages 662, 663.] In the ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, ver. 25, there was manifested a luke-

[1] Comp. Xen. *Memor.* iii. 3. 13: Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὔτε εὐφωνίᾳ τοσοῦτον διαφέρουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι τῶν ἄλλων, οὔτε σωμάτων μεγέθει καὶ ῥώμῃ, ὅσον φιλοτιμίᾳ, ἥπερ μάλιστα παροξύνει πρὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ ἔντιμα; Thucyd. vi 88, *al.*

warmness in Christianity, which might lead to apostasy therefrom. In warning notes, therefore, the author points out that the man who knowingly slights recognized Christian truth, and sins against it, will infallibly be overtaken by the punitive judgment of God. To be compared vi. 4–8.

Ver. 26. Ἑκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας] *For if we sin willfully* (*i.e.* against our better knowledge and conscience) *after having received the certain knowledge of the truth*; so that we become recreant to Christianity (comp. ver. 29), to which the ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν forms the dangerous preliminary step. The ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτάνοντες are the opposite of the ἀγνοοῦντες καὶ πλανώμενοι, v. 2,[1] and the participle *present* indicates the continuous or habitual character of the action.—ἡ ἀλήθεια is the truth *absolutely*, as this has been revealed by Christianity. The ἐπίγνωσις of this absolute truth, however, embraces, along with the recognition thereof by the understanding, also the having become conscious of its bliss-giving effects in one's own experience. Comp. vi. 4, 5.—οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία] *there remains in relation to sins, i.e.* for the expiation thereof, *no more sacrifice*; inasmuch namely, as the sin-canceling sacrifice of Christ, the communion of which we then renounce, is a sacrifice which takes place only *once*, is not further repeated, while at the same time the Levitical sacrifices are unable to effect the canceling of sins. Bengel: Fructus ex sacrificio Christi semper patet non repudiantibus; qui autem repudiant, non aliud habent.

Ver. 27. Φοβερὰ δέ τις ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως] *sc.* ἀπολείπεται: *but there remains indeed*, etc. The ἀπολειπόμενον is of two kinds, something *subjective* (φοβερὰ . . . κρίσεως) and something *objective* (πυρὸς . . . ὑπεναντίους).—φοβερὰ ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως] denotes not "a terrible banquet of judgment," as Ewald strangely translates it, nor is it any hypallage in the sense of ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως φοβερᾶς, as Jac. Cappellus, Heinrichs, and Stengel suppose, and to which the choice is left open by Wolf. The terribleness is transferred to the subjective domain of the expectation. For one who has sinned against better light and knowledge, even the expectation of the divine judgment is something terrible.—φοβερά τις] *an exceedingly terrible one.* On the τις, added with rhetorical emphasis to adjectives of quality or quantity, comp. Kühner, II. p. 331; Winer, p. 160 [E. T. 170].—κρίσις] is used here, too, as ix. 27, quite without restriction, of the divine judgment in general. That this will be a punitive judgment is not indicated by the word; it only follows from the connection.—In the second member the emphasis rests upon the preposed πυρός, on which account also the case of the following participle conforms itself to this, not to ζῆλος. We cannot,

[1] The assertion of Kurtz, that, if this remark were true, the author would be expressing "a dogma in its consequences truly subversive, and destructive of the whole Christian soteriology," inasmuch as it would "imperatively follow therefrom, that even under the New Covenant only those who transgressed from ignorance and error could find forgiveness with God for Christ's sake, while all who had been guilty of a conscious and intentional sin must beyond hope of deliverance fall victims to the judgment of everlasting damnation," is a precipitate one, since the special limitation within which the expression ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν was used was naturally afforded to the reader, quite apart from the investigation already proceeding at vi. 4 ff., even from our section itself.

therefore, with Luther and others, combine together πυρὸς ζῆλος in a single notion ("fiery zeal," *sc.* of the divine wrath). The πῦρ is personified, and in such way a ζῆλος, a fury, ascribed to the same. There was probably present to the mind of the author in connection with the last member, LXX. Isa. xxvi. 11: ζῆλος λήψεται λαὸν ἀπαίδευτον καὶ νῦν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδεται.—τοὺς ὑπεναντίους] *the adversaries.* The empiric usage of the term forbids our attaching to it, with Braun and Paulus, on account of the ὑπό, the notion of *secret* foes. See Meyer on *Col.* ii. 14, 4 Aufl. p. 331.

Vv. 28, 29. That in reality the consequences of an ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας are so terrible as was asserted at ver. 27, the author renders evident by a conclusion *a minore ad majus.* Apostasy from the Mosaic law itself is punishable with death; how much greater thus must be the punishment of him who, by apostasy from Christ, has treated with contumely the Son of God, of whose redeeming benefits he has already had experience! With the conclusion in vv. 28, 29 we may compare, as regards the thoughts, ii. 2, 3, xii. 25: as regards the form, however, the utterances just noticed differ from that before us, in the respect that there the first member of the comparison appears as a hypothetical premiss, here as an independent statement.—ἀθετήσας τις νόμον Μωϋσέως κ.τ.λ.] *He who has set at nought the Mosaic law,* has in opposition to his better knowledge and conscience violated or broken it, *dies, without any one compassionating him, upon the deposition of two or three witnesses.* Although death was imposed as the punishment for many single transgressions of the Mosaic law (Ex. xxi. 15 ff., xxxi. 14; Lev. xvii. 14; Deut. xxii. 22 ff., *al.*), yet the author certainly has reference, as is evident from the addition: ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν, and as is required also by the parallel relation to ver. 29, quite specially to the ordinance, Deut. xvii. 2–7 [cf. also Num. xv. 30, 31], in conformity with which the punishment of death was inflicted upon the man who, by idolatry, apostatized from Jehovah. Comp. *l.c.* ver. 6, LXX.: ἐπὶ δυσὶ μάρτυσιν ἢ ἐπὶ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν ἀποθανεῖται.—ἐπί] as ix. 17: *upon condition that* two or three witnesses depose against him.

Ver. 29. *Of how much more severe punishment, think ye, will he be counted worthy, who,* etc.—With δοκεῖτε the author leaves the decision to the readers, inasmuch as on the question how this will be given, no doubt whatever can prevail.—ἀξιωθήσεται] *sc.* by God at the judgment.—τιμωρία in the N. T. only here.—ὁ καταπατήσας] *who has trodden under foot,* as though it were a contemptible, useless thing. A strong expression. Designation of the bold contemning and insulting of Him who is nevertheless the Son of God, and with whom one has become personally acquainted as the Redeemer.—τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης] *the blood of the covenant, i.e.* the blood which Christ shed for the sealing of the New Covenant for the redemption of mankind. Comp. ix. 15 ff.—κοινόν] either: *as common, ordinary blood,* not distinguished in any respect from other blood,[1] or—

[1] Peshito, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, Beza, Schlichting, Bengel, Schulz, Stuart, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, and others.

what is better, because stronger, and on that account more in accord with the other statements—*as impure*,[1] *i.e.* as the blood of a transgressor, which Christ must be, if He was not the Son of God and the Redeemer.—*ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη*] contrasting addition to *κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος*, and paronomasia: *by the communion with which he was nevertheless sanctified*, or: *the sanctifying efficacy of which he has nevertheless felt in his own person.*—*καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας*] and has done despite to the Spirit of Grace, *sc.* by scorn and mockery of the wondrous unfolding of that Spirit's power in the life of the Christians. The compound form *ἐνυβρίζειν τινί* or *τί*, found, apart from the poets (Soph. *Phil.* 342), only with the later Greeks. In the N. T. a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*.—*τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος*] the Holy Spirit, who is a gift of the divine grace.

Ver. 30. The *χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας*, ver. 29, is a matter for the most serious consideration. This the declarations of God Himself in the Scriptures prove.—*οἴδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα*] *for we know Him who hath spoken, i. e.* we know what it means when God makes predictions like those which follow.—The first utterance is without doubt from Deut. xxxii. 35. It deviates from the Hebrew original (לִי נָקָם וְשִׁלֵּם), but still more from the LXX. (*ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω*); on the other hand, it agrees to so great an extent with Paul's mode of citing the same in Rom. xii. 19, that even the *λέγει κύριος*, which is wanting in Deuteronomy, is found in both these places. This agreement arises, according to Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, and Reiche, *Comm. Crit.* p. 97 (comp. also Böhme), from a deriving of the citation from the Epistle to the Romans; while according to Meyer (at *Rom.* xii. 19, 2d. 3d. and 4th ed.) the identical words: *ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω*, are to be traced back to the paraphrase of Onkelos (וְאָנָא אֶשְׁלֵם) as the common source employed by Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Yet with much greater probability is the coincidence to be explained by the supposition that the utterance, in the form adopted here as with Paul, had become proverbial. This was also the later view of Meyer (see Meyer on *Rom.* xii. 19, 5th ed. p. 551 f.).—The second utterance: *κρινεῖ κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ*, attached by means of *καὶ πάλιν* (i. 5, ii. 13), is found in like form, Deut. xxxii. 36 and Ps. cxxxv. 14. This *κρίνειν τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ* has, in the mind of the author of the epistle, the general signification of the holding of judgment upon His people, so that the recreant members among the same will not be able to escape punishment. Different is the sense of the original: *He shall do justice for His people*. Delitzsch, it is true, who is followed therein by Maier, Kluge, Moll, and Hofmann, will not acknowledge such diversity of the sense. But he is able to remove such diversity only, in that—manifestly led thereto in the interest of a mistaken harmonistic method—he foists upon the author of the epistle the statement: "the Lord will do justice for His church, and punish its betrayers and blasphemers;" a statement of which the first half—as opposed to the grammatical meaning of *κρίνειν*, as well as to the

[1] Vulgate, Luther, Grotius, Carpzov, Michaelis, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 769; Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others.

connection with ver. 26, since this latter leads of necessity not to the idea of rendering justice to any one, but exclusively to the idea of punitive judgment—is only arbitrarily imported.

At ver. 31 the whole train of thought, vv. 26–30 is briefly summed up, and with this the warning brought to a close. *Fearful is it to fall into the hands of the living God, i. e.* to fall a victim to the divine punitive judgment. Comp. Matt. x. 28; Luke xii. 4, 5.—*ἐμπίπτειν εἰς χεῖρας κυρίου* occurs also with the LXX. 2 Sam. xxiv. 14, 1 Chron. xxi. 13, Ecclus. ii. 18, but is there used in the mild sense, in that it is opposed to falling into the hands of men. Bengel: Bonum est incidere cum fide; temere terribile. —*θεοῦ ζῶντος*] see at iii. 12.

Vv. 32–39. [On Vv. 32–39, see Note LXXIV., page 663.] There follows after the warning an arousing. Mindful of the Christian manliness which the readers had displayed in former days, they are not to lose Christian joyfulness, but rather with patience to persevere in the Christian life; for only quite a short time will now elapse before the return of Christ and the coming in of the promised fullness of blessing. Comp. vi. 9 ff.[1]—Of the facts themselves, of which mention is made vv. 32–34, nothing further is known from other sources. That the author, as Bleek, II. 2, p. 707, thinks possible, had before his mind "the whole first period of the Christian church at Jerusalem, in which the church still held firmly together, and particularly the persecutions which preceded and followed the martyrdom of Stephen," is hardly to be supposed. For only in a very indirect way could praise be bestowed upon the recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews for their behavior under *these* afflictions, seeing they formed a second generation of the Palestinian Christians, who, according to xii. 4, had as yet been spared persecutions having a bloody termination.

Ver. 32. *Φωτισθέντες*] *after ye were illumined, i. e.* after ye had recognized Christ as the Saviour of men, and ranked yourselves among His confessors. Comp. vi. 4.—*ἄθλησιν*] a word of the later Greek style, in the N. T., however, a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, combines with *παθημάτων* into a single idea: *contest of sufferings.*[2]—*ὑπομένειν*] *to sustain*, here with the subsidiary notion of stedfastness and unweariedness.

Ver. 33: *Τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δέ*] *on the one hand . . . on the other; partly . . . partly.* A genuinely Greek formula (comp. Wetstein *ad loc.*). In the N. T. only here.—*τοῦτο μὲν ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσιν θεατριζόμενοι*] *in that, on the one hand, by conditions of infamy* (xi. 26, xiii. 13) *and by tribulations, ye were made a spectacle* (were exposed publicly to reviling). *ὀνειδισμοί* (belonging to the later period of the Greek language)[3] has reference to the assaults upon honor and good name, *θλίψεις* to assaults upon the person (the life) and outward possessions.—*θεατριζόμενοι*] comp. 1 Cor. iv. 9: *θέατρον*

[1] Theodoret: Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ταῦτα ἱκανὰ ἦν αὐτοὺς ἀνιᾶσαι, ὀλιγωρίαν αἰνιττόμενα καὶ τῶν θείων ἀμέλειαν, κεράννυσι τῶν εἰρημένων τὸ εὐστηρὸν τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν ἤδη κατορθωμένων. Οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως εἰς προθυμίαν διεγείρει, ὡς τῶν οἰκείων κατορθωμάτων μνήμη.

[2] Chrysostom: οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἶπεν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε, ἀλλὰ μετὰ προσθήκης τοῦ πολλήν. Καὶ οὐκ εἶπε πειρασμούς, ἀλλὰ ἄθλησιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐγκωμίου ὄνομα καὶ ἐπαίνων μεγίστων.

[3] See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 512.

ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις. The verb only here and with the Church Fathers.—*τοῦτο δὲ κοινωνοὶ . . . γενηθέντες*] and, on the other hand, ye became associates (fellow-sufferers) . . . *sc.* by the administering of consolation, and by efforts for the alleviation of their sufferings. *κοινωνοὶ γενηθέντες* is elucidated by *συνεπαθήσατε*, ver. 34, thus alludes equally as the first half of the sentence to historic facts. Arbitrarily therefore Ebrard: the expression indicates that the readers, "by the act of their conversion, had become once for all associates in that community, of which they knew that it thus fared, or was thus wont to fare with it."—*τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφομένων*] *of those who were in such condition* (*sc. ἐν θλίψεσιν καὶ ὀνειδισμοῖς*). Kypke, Storr, Böhme, Kuinoel, and others supplement the *οὕτως* from the *πολλὴν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων*, ver. 32: *of those who thus walked, i. e.* sustained with great stedfastness the contest of sufferings. In favor of this interpretation the authority of the ordinary Biblical use of *ἀναστρέφεσθαι* may no doubt be urged. Since, however, *πολλὴν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων*, ver. 32, is the general statement, which afterwards, ver. 33, separates into two special subdivisions by means of *τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δέ*, so *οὕτως* in the second member can only refer back to the immediately foregoing characterization in the first member.

Ver. 34. [LXXIV *c, d.*] Confirmatory elucidation of ver. 33, and that in such form that *καὶ . . . συνεπαθήσατε* corresponds to the latter half of ver. 33, and *καὶ . . . προσεδέξασθε* to the former half thereof.—*καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε*] *for ye had both compassion* (iv. 15) *on the prisoners*, in that ye bestowed upon them active sympathy.—*καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.*] *and also accepted* (comp. xi. 35) *with joy the plundering of your goods*, with joy, or willingly submitted to it. Wrongly Heinrichs, according to whom *προσδέχεσθαι* here expresses, at the same time, the idea of "exspectare" and of "recipere," so that we have to translate: "ye looked for it."—*γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὕπαρξιν καὶ μένουσαν*] indication of motive for *καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν κ.τ.λ.*: *knowing that ye have for yourselves* (as your true possession) *a better property* (Acts ii. 45), *and that an abiding one*, namely, the spiritual, everlasting blessings of Christianity, of which no power of the earth can deprive you. Comp. Matt. vi. 20; Luke xii. 33.

Ver. 35. Exhortation deduced from vv. 32–34. The self-sacrificing zeal for Christianity displayed in the past ought to animate the readers to a joyful maintenance of the same likewise in the present, since of a truth this very stedfastness in zeal leads to the longed-for goal.—*ἀποβάλλειν*] here not the involuntary *losing* (Jac. Cappellus, Lösner, and others), but the voluntary *casting from one*, or *letting fall away* (comp. Mark x. 50), as though it were a question only of a worthless, useless thing; *μὴ ἀποβάλλειν* thus the same as *κατέχειν*, ver. 23, iii. 6, 14, and *κρατεῖν*, iv. 14, vi. 18.—*τὴν παῤῥησίαν ὑμῶν*] *your joyful confidence, sc.* towards Christ as your Saviour. The free, courageous confession of Christianity before the world, of which Beza, Grotius, and others understand the expression, is only the *consequence* of the *παῤῥησία*, which here, too, as ver. 19, iii. 6, iv. 16, denotes a frame of the mind.—*ἥτις*] *which of a truth.* Introduction of a well-known, indisputable verity.—*μεγάλην μισθαποδοσίαν*] *great rewarding retribution* (see at ii. 2),

namely, the promised everlasting blessedness (ver. 36).—The *present* ἔχει, although the μισθαποδοσία is as yet something future, of the undoubted certainty of its containing in itself, or having as a consequence.

Ver. 36. Justification of the foregoing exhortation μὴ ἀποβάλητε. It is true the readers have already distinguished themselves by Christian manliness; but what is needing to them in order to reach the goal is stedfastness and perseverance, since they are beginning to grow lukewarm in Christianity. ὑπομονῆς is therefore, as the principal notion, emphatically prefixed.—τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ] *that which God wills*, or *requires*, *i. e.* in accordance with the context: not merely the having become believers in Christ, but also *the stedfast continuance in faith unto the end*. Theophylact: θέλημα θεοῦ τὸ ἄχρι τέλους ὑπομεῖναι. Against the connection Bleek: τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ is "the sanctification of men by the sacrifice of the Son of God" (vv. 7, 9, 10), and consequently the ποιεῖν thereof the willing submission to be sanctified by the Redeemer. Too general the acceptation of Tholuck (similarly Stein and others): "the regulation [*Normirung*] of the life in accordance with the divine will," without further limitation, is that which is meant.—ποιήσαντες] refers not to that which, according to ver. 32 ff., has already been accomplished by the readers (Bengel); nor does it denote something simultaneous with the κομίζεσθαι, or rather without regard to time therewith coinciding (Delitzsch, Alford); it is employed in a strictly *aoristic* sense, and points on to the future, inasmuch as the ποιήσαι must already have become a completed fact, before the κομίζεσθαι, as yet belonging to the future, can be realized.—τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν] *the promise*, *i. e.* that which is promised, the promised everlasting blessedness.

Vv. 37, 38. Ground of encouragement to the ὑπομονή, of which the readers stood in need, expressed with a free application of the words of Hab. ii. 3, 4, according to the LXX. Continuance is necessary for the readers, and that continuance, indeed, only for a short time, since the return of Christ is to be looked for within a very short space of time, and then to those who have persevered in the faith everlasting life will be the portion conferred; the apostates, on the other hand, shall be overtaken by destruction.—The words ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον are not a constituent part of the citation, but proceed from the author himself.—μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον] is found Isa. xxvi. 20, and signifies literally: a little, how much, how much! *i. e.* a very, very little, or *a very short time*. μικρόν (John xiv. 19, xvi. 16 ff.) is *nominative*,—not accusative to the question *when*, as is supposed by Bleek (but only in his larger *Comm.*; otherwise in his later *Vorlesungen*, p. 417), Bisping, Alford, and Hofmann, as also Meyer on John xiii. 33,—and nothing more than ἐστίν is to be supplemented to the same (see Winer, p. 544) [E. T. 585]. The reduplication of the ὅσον, however, serves for the significant strengthening of the notion.[1]—ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ] *and then He that cometh will come, and will not delay*.—LXX. *l. c.* ver. 3: διότι ἐτι ὅρασις εἰς καιρὸν καὶ ἀνατελεῖ εἰς πέρας καὶ οὐκ εἰς κενόν· ἐὰν ὑστερ-

[1] To be compared Aristoph. *Vesp.* 213: τί οὐκ ἀπεκοιμήθημεν ὅσον ὅσον στίλην; Arrian, *Indic.* xxix. 15: ὀλίγοι δὲ αὐτῶν σπείρουσιν ὅσον ὅσον τῆς χώρης. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* 726.

ἦσῃ, ὑπόμεινον αὐτόν, ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ. In the sense of the prophet, the discourse is of the certain fulfillment of the prophecy regarding the overthrow of the Chaldees. The LXX., however, wrongly translated the words, and as the *ἐρχόμενος* looked upon either *God* or *the Messiah*, of whom also the later Jewish theologians interpreted the passage (see Wetstein *ad loc.*). Of the *Messiah* the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also understands the expression, and therefore adds the article *ὁ* to *ἐρχόμενος*. In like manner *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* appears, Matt. xi. 3, Luke vii. 19, as a current appellation of the Messiah (based upon Dan. vii. 13; Zech. ix. 9; Mal. iii. 1; Ps. xl. 8 [7], cxviii. 26). Only in the instances mentioned the *first* appearing of the Messiah upon earth is intended, whereas in our passage (as also very frequently by *ἔρχεσθαι* elsewhere in the N. T., *e.g.* 1 Cor. xi. 26; Acts i. 11; Matt. xvi. 27, 28; John xxi. 22, 23) the *return of Christ*, as of the Messiah crucified upon earth and exalted to heaven, for the consummation of the kingdom of God, is that which is referred to. Arbitrarily Carpzov, Heinrichs, Bloomfield, Ebrard, and others: a coming *for the destruction of Jerusalem* is here to be thought of.

Ver. 38. [LXXIV *c.*] Continuation of the citation, yet so that the author adduces the two clauses of Hab. ii. 4 in inverted order. For in the O. T. passage the words read: *ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ· ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου* [*ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως*] *ζήσεται.* The transposition is intentional, in order to avoid the supplying of the subject *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* to *ὑποστείληται.*—*ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*] *my* (of *God*, not of *Christ*: Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 621, *Obs.*) *righteous one* (the devout man belonging to me), *however, shall live by faith. ἐκ πίστεως*, namely, is, in the sense of the author of the epistle, to be referred to *ζήσεται.* To conjoin it here, too, as Rom. i. 17 and Gal. iii. 11, with *δίκαιος* (so Baumgarten, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Stengel, *al.*), is inadmissible, because, according to the connection, the design is not to state by what any one becomes *δίκαιος*, but by what he will obtain the *ἐπαγγελία*, or, what is the same thing, the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος.* The notion of the *πίστις* here closely attaches itself to the Hebrew אֱמוּנָה. The meaning, in harmony with the conception prevailing elsewhere in the Epistle to the Hebrews, divergent from that of Paul, is the believing, faithfully enduring trust *in God and His promises.* The second member, *καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται κ.τ.λ.*, has been misunderstood by the LXX. In the Hebrew: הִנֵּה עֻפְּלָה לֹא־יָשְׁרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ behold, lifted up, not upright is his (*sc.* the Chaldean's) soul in him.—*ἐὰν ὑποστείληται*] *if so be that he with faint heart draws back.* Comp. Gal. ii. 12. In the application: if he becomes lukewarm in Christianity, and apostatizes from the same. *ὑποστείληται* does not stand impersonally; nor have we, with Grotius, Maier, and others, to supply *τίς*, or, with de Wette, Winer, p. 487 [E. T. 523] (less decidedly, 5th ed. p. 427), and Buttmann, p. 117 [E. T. 134], to supplement from the foregoing *ὁ δίκαιος* the general idea *ἄνθρωπος* as subject. The subject is still the foregoing *ὁ δίκαιός μου.* This is, moreover, placed beyond doubt, since *δίκαιος* above is not to be taken in the narrower Pauline sense, but in the general sense of the devout man; he, however, who is in this sense *δίκαιος*, ceases by the *ὑποστέλ-*

λεσθαι to be a δίκαιος.—ἡ ψυχή μου] μου has reference to *God*, not to *Christ* (Oecumenius, as likewise, but with hesitation, Theophylact, as more recently Riehm, *l. c.*), still less to the author of the epistle (Calvin: perinde accipiendum est, ac si ex suo sensu apostolus proferret hanc sententiam. Neque enim illi propositum fuit exacte recitare prophetae verba, sed duntaxat locum notare, ut ad propriorem intuitum invitaret lectores).

Ver. 39. The author expresses his confidence that the readers and himself belong not to the class of men who, because they draw back from Christianity out of cowardly misgiving, fall a prey to destruction, but rather to the class of those who do not grow weary in the Christian faith, and therefore attain to life. This expression of confidence is in its essence an admonition, and indeed a more urgent one than though the direct form of exhortation had been chosen.—To ἐσμέν Grotius, Wolf, Carpzov, Heinrichs, and many others erroneously supplement τέκνα or υἱοί. For εἶναι, with the mere genitive, is a well-known genuinely Greek manner of expressing a relation of *pertaining* to a thing,[1]—εἰς ἀπώλειαν . . . εἰς περιποίησιν ζωῆς] Corroborative allusion to the result of the two opposite lines of action.—ἀπώλεια is everlasting perdition, and περιποίησις ψυχῆς (comp. 1 Thess. v. 9; εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας) *gaining of the soul, i. e.* everlasting life and everlasting blessedness. Wrongly Ebrard: of the *bodily deliverance* from the judgment impending over Jerusalem, is the discourse to be understood.—Ψυχῆς, moreover, belongs simply to περιποίησιν, not already, as Böhme and Hofmann will have it, to ἀπώλειαν, since only περιποί., not also ἀπώλ., stood in need of an addition.

Notes by American Editor.

LXX. Vv. 1–18.

(*a*) These verses state, once more, in a recapitulatory or summary way, the thoughts which have been already set forth in chs. viii. ix., (see Note LXV *a*). The development of the passage is as follows:—1. The legal system, with its offerings, was unable to accomplish the end in view, ver. 1. This is proved, (*x*) because, if the end had been accomplished and the conscience of the worshipers had been purified, the offerings would have ceased, instead of being repeated continually, vv. 2, 3, and (*y*) because offerings, like those of the law, are, in their very nature, inadequate to the actual removal of sin, ver. 4.—2. Christ, by His voluntary offering of Himself in obedience to God's will, has accomplished and secured the sanctification of His people, vv. 5–10.—3. Having thus offered Himself as a sacrifice, He has taken His seat at the right hand of God—not presenting in the heavenly sanctuary repeated offerings, like the Levitical priesthood, but the one offering once for all—and He there waits for the final and glorious consummation, vv. 11–14.—4. And all this is divinely indicated in the passage from the prophecy of Jeremiah respecting the new covenant, which was cited in the eighth chapter, vv. 15–18. These eighteen verses, accordingly, bring out once more the superiority of Christ, as High-priest of a higher sanctuary, vv. 11 ff., in connection with the new

[1] See Bernhardy, *Syntax*, p. 165; Kühner, II. p. 167.

and better covenant, vv. 15 ff., to the Levitical priesthood as related to the system to which they belonged, vv. 5 ff. comp. with vv. 2 ff.

(*b*) As to the individual words and phrases of this passage, the following points may be noticed:—1. The connection of ver. 1 with what precedes by γάρ is by way of proof of the main suggestion of ix. 24–28, that Christ needed to appear with the one offering of His own blood. This was necessary because the law, etc.—2. The law is presented as having the σκιά, instead of the εἰκών, of the ἀγαθὰ μέλλοντα. The ἀγαθά themselves are in heaven; the εἰκών, or exact representation of them, is in the Gospel; the σκια, or mere outline or foreshadowing, is found in the Law-system.—3. Tisch. 8, Alf., A. R. V. agree with Lünem. in reading δίνανται; R. V. Treg. W. & H. read δύνανται. The remark of Tisch., that the writer nowhere speaks of the priests as unable to make the worshipers perfect, but only of the law or sacrifices (as in ver. 11), suggests a strong reason for believing δίνανται to be the true reading; and when the peculiar break in the sequence of the sentence is considered, as well as the ease with which an error of a copyist might have introduced the plural, it must be regarded as probable that the singular is what the author actually wrote.—4. That οὐκ of ver. 2 is to be adopted as the correct text, is proved by the external evidence. That, if this text is accepted, the sentence is interrogative, is hardly to be doubted; for, in opposition to the other rendering: "otherwise their presentation would not have ceased," it may not only be urged that, inasmuch as the Levitical system was still continuing at the date of the Epistle, it could not be alluded to as if it had actually passed away (see Lünem.'s note), but also that the point of the author's argument, in this part of it, is that the sacrifices of that system which is able to accomplish its end will (not be ever repeated, but) cease.—5. ἀλλά of ver. 3 is equivalent to *whereas, on the other hand*.—6. The second point in the development of the thought is introduced (vv. 5 ff.) by an O. T. passage (Ps. xl. 6–8), in which the peculiarity of the new system, in its contrast with the old, is set forth. Here, again, as so frequently elsewhere, the writer takes pains to base his argument on the words of the O. T.—7. There can be no doubt, as Lünem. says, that the selection of this particular passage is due to the presence of the word σῶμα in it, as found in the LXX.—a word which served the author's purpose in a most satisfactory way, see ver. 10.—8. As to the word σῶμα, its origin in the LXX. may, perhaps, be accounted for correctly by Lünem.'s supposition of a copyist's error for ὦτια, or it may have been due to the interpretation given by the Sept. translators to a different text of the Hebrew, or, possibly, to a free expression on their part of what they believed to be the meaning of the original—a mode of setting forth the idea of willing obedience. Whatever may be the true explanation of this point, it will be observed by the careful reader, (*x*) that the use of the word which the writer of the epistle makes is only secondary to the expression of his main thought—that of obedience to the will of God; (*y*) that, in his repetition of the words of the Psalm in ver. 7, he does not introduce σῶμα; and (*z*) that, even when he does mention it again, in ver. 10, it is only in a subordinate way, διὰ τοῦ σώματος, while the θέλημα is the sphere in which the sanctification of Christians takes place.—9. λέγων and εἰρηκεν of ver. 8 are to be explained as connected with the propositional and permanent character of the sentence, which the writer desires to give to it in his application to the subject in discussion. He explains by the use of λέγων, as in ἐν τῷ λέγειν viii. 13, and ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, iii. 15.—10. καθ' ἡμέραν is to be explained as in vii. 27—the high-priest being at the head of the priest-

hood, all that is done in the priestly service is spoken of as if done by him. Where a distinction between him and the other priests is a matter of importance, as in ix. 6, 7, it is clearly presented, but, in cases like the present, it is of no consequence.—11. The supposed discrepancy between the statement of ver. 13 and 1 Cor. xv. 22–28 (see Lünem.'s note) has no real foundation in fact, for the thought, both of this writer and of Paul, is that Christ is to hold His position as head of the Messianic work and kingdom until all enemies shall have been subdued. Paul expresses this by the word *βασιλεύειν*; this writer, by *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ*. The only difference between the two is, that this author does not refer to the Parousia, which he has no occasion to mention. Paul makes the end follow immediately after the Parousia and the resurrection which then takes place, (or, to say the least, he may be understood in this way), and he makes physical death, which ceases with the resurrection, the last enemy that is subdued.—12. It is worthy of notice that, at the end of this section, ver. 13, as at its beginning, viii. 1, the author presents Christ as having sat down at the right hand of God—recalling thus, with characteristic rhetorical art, the words of i. 3.

LXXI. Vv. 19 ff.

With the 19th verse the hortatory passage which belongs to the last section of the argument, viii. 1—x. 18, is introduced. As in connection with each previous section the general exhortation of the epistle is given, so here it is added once more, and is based upon what has been stated in these last preceding chapters. *οὖν* of ver. 19, goes back in its force only to viii. 1, and not, as Lünem. says, to v. 1. This hortatory passage extends as far as xii. 29. The view, therefore, that there is here the beginning of a Practical section of the Epistle, which has a parallelism with the whole Doctrinal section, after the manner of the Pauline Epistles, and the view that from x. 19 to xiii. 25 we have a third main division of the epistle (so Alf.) having reference to "our duty in the interval of waiting between the beginning and accomplishment of our salvation," or a fifth division (so Ebr.) "the laying hold of the N. T. salvation," are erroneous and involve a misconception of the author's plan.

That this hortatory passage is connected with viii. 1—x. 18, as that which is found ii. 1–4 is connected with i. 4–14, and iii. 1 with ii. 5–16, and, again, vi. 1–20 with vii. 1–28, is made evident by the fact that the language here employed and the thought presented are wholly in the line of what has been set forth since the beginning of the eighth chapter—see, for example, the expressions "to enter into the holy place," "the blood of Jesus," "the way which he inaugurated for us, a new and living way," "through the veil, that is to say, his flesh," "having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." That it extends to the end of the twelfth chapter, is indicated (1) by the fact that, in the final and climactic passage of that chapter (xii. 18–24), which contrasts the Christian and Mosaic systems, the idea of Jesus as the mediator of the new covenant, and of the blood of sprinkling, is given the position of greatest emphasis; and (2) by the fact that there is a steady and closely-connected development of thought throughout the entire passage, according to which everything is subordinate to, and grows out of, the direct exhortation x. 19–25.

The development of thought, x. 19—xii. 29 is as follows:—1. The general exhortation of the epistle is given (as founded upon the last section of the argu-

ment, viii. 1–x. 18) *in a positive form*—to stand fast, x. 19–25. 2. This exhortation, as thus given, is pressed upon the readers by two considerations: (*x*) the danger and punishment which will follow in case they do not hold fast to their confession, x. 26–31, and (*y*) the encouragement which they might derive from calling to remembrance the stedfastness of their earlier Christian life, x. 32–34. 3. The exhortation is repeated, but now *in a negative form*—not to fall away, x. 35. 4. This exhortation is founded upon two reasons: (*x*) the necessity of stedfast endurance, in order to the attainment of the reward, x. 36; and (*y*) the fact that this endurance is demanded only for a brief period, before the end shall come, x. 37. The immediate connection of all the verses with 19 ff., is clearly manifest. With x. 38 begins a new thought, but yet evidently in the same line of subordination to 19 ff.—5. The stedfast endurance, involved in holding fast and not falling away, must be in the line of faith, x. 38, 39. This is proved by the statement of what faith is, xi. 1, and the citation of a long list of examples from the O. T. and Jewish history, which show how the stedfastness of the ancient heroes had been in the line of faith, and how those heroes had thereby gained their honorable fame and reward, xi. 2–40.—6. In view of the fact that this multitude of witnesses are, as it were, looking, as spectators in a race-course, upon us in our Christian life, the exhortation to press on with stedfast endurance is again presented—and now with a pointing to Jesus, as the head of the great company of the saints, xii. 1, 2.—7. This repeated exhortation is, again—in its turn—based upon two grounds:—(*x*) the fact that the readers have not yet been called to such sufferings, in their course, as had come upon some of the O. T. heroes, and upon Jesus, xii. 3, 4; and (*y*) the fact that, in calling His people to endure afflictions and trials with stedfastness, God is dealing with them in love, as a father treats his children, xii. 5–11.—8. In view of this, the readers are urged to remove all hindrances to stedfast endurance, in the case of all members of their church:—to lift up the hands that hang down, etc., and make straight paths, that the lame may not be turned out of the way, xii. 12, 13; to follow after peace and sanctification, xii. 14; and to see to it that there be among them no one falling back from the grace of God, no one who shall, as a root of bitterness, cause trouble and defilement, and no one who shall sell his birth-right for nothing, as did Esau, xii. 15–17.—9. An encouragement is given to hold fast the Christian confession, instead of falling away, which is founded upon the nature of the new system—it is a system of hope and love, not of terrors; of immediate and free access to God and communion with Him; of spiritual and heavenly life; and a system which involves the noblest sacrifice and a new and better covenant, xii. 18–24.—10. In view of this character of the Christian revelation, as thus presented in its contrast with the Mosaic, and in its encouraging influence towards stedfastness, the writer closes with the solemn warning to his readers not to turn away from it, lest they should meet with sorer punishment than those who had rejected the Mosaic law, xii. 25–29.

The progress of the thought from the beginning of the passage to the end, therefore, proves that it is all connected with x. 19 ff.; that it is, as it were, all dependent on the οὖν of x. 19, and thus founded upon viii. 1—x. 18; and that it is the hortatory addition to this last section of the epistle. The artistic character of the plan which the author adopted is thus clearly seen, as it is traced from the earliest to the latest chapter; and its fundamental difference from any plan which Paul follows, in any of his epistles, is most conspicuous.

LXXII. Vv. 19–25.

(*a*) οὖν of ver. 19 points back immediately to the recapitulatory passage, vv. 1–18, but more remotely to that which is only presented in a summary way in these verses—namely to viii. 1—ix. 28.—(*b*) The view of Lünem., with respect to ἣν, that it refers to εἴσοδον, and with respect to ζῶσα, that it designates the way as living in its efficacy, leading to the goal of everlasting life, and thus its contrast to the inefficaciousness of the entrance into the earthly sanctuary, is to be adopted. Christ "dedicated" (R. V.), or inaugurated this entrance way, by first passing through it. He passed through it by dying—the veil of his flesh was rent at that time and by that means, and the way was thus opened for free access to God.—(*c*) That οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ refers to heaven, not to the church or to heaven and the church on earth, is indicated by the manifest connection of all the other words and phrases, in these verses, with the priesthood of Christ in the higher sanctuary, and not, as in iii. 6, with His sonship and His presiding in the church.—(*d*) On πληροφορία comp. note LIX. *g* above.—(*e*) R. V., in the text, joins the words: "and our body washed with pure water" (ver. 22) with the preceding words, making them qualify the verb προσερχώμεθα. In the margin, it unites them with κατέχωμεν of ver. 23. A. R. V. adopts the opposite course. The reasons for believing that R. V. text gives the author's thought correctly are: 1. that it joins faith and baptism in the manner which is common in the N. T., making the latter the outward symbol of the inward state; 2. that the other connection gives to baptism an undue emphasis, placing the words referring to it before κατέχωμεν, while, in both the preceding and following clauses, the corresponding participial or defining words follow after the verb. Such an emphasis seems quite improbable, and is certainly uncalled for, so far as any suggestion of the context is concerned; 3. that the washing of baptism as symbolizing the inward cleansing has a close relation in thought to worshiping God with a sincere heart, but no such relation to holding fast our hope. The view of Lünemann with respect to this point is to be rejected.—(*f*) Vv. 24, 25 add to what is said of the subjective condition of the persons addressed an exhortation to incite one another. For this end, they were not to forsake their Christian assemblies. παρακαλοῦντες seems to be a general word, not limited, as Lünem. takes it, to the animating one another to the uninterrupted frequenting of the Christian meetings. Rather, in the Christian meetings, which they were not to forsake, they should animate one another to love and the other Christian virtues.—(*g*) That τὴν ἡμέραν means, not the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, but the day of the Lord's coming, is proved by the usage of the N. T. writers. That the sentence is most naturally interpreted as implying an expectation that that day would come soon, can hardly be questioned. That it must be so interpreted, however, is, perhaps, not to be affirmed.

LXXIII. Vv. 26–31.

(*a*) The correspondence in thought between this passage and vi. 4 ff. is striking, and each of the two may serve to explain the other. Comp. Note LVIII above. 1. There is the same indication here as in ch. vi., that the persons referred to are those who had really entered the Christian life. 2. The turning away is here more distinctly described as a voluntary thing. 3. The result mentioned is, not

that it is impossible to renew them again to repentance, but that they will find no other way of access opened—there remains no longer a sacrifice for sins. 4. Stronger language is used here in describing the sin, than in ch. vi., but the connection of this passage with the context and the light which the two passages throw upon each other seem to imply that the expressions are intended to set forth what apostasy actually is and involves, rather than any deadly or heaven-daring opposition to Christ, such as the Pharisees exhibited when they said that He cast out the demons through Beelzebub.

(*b*) The comparison with regard to penalty which is made in vv. 28 ff. and the words of ver. 31 are strikingly similar to what is found in xii. 25 and 29. This fact is, in itself, an indication that the entire passage x. 19—xii. 29 is intended by the writer to develop one line of thought.

LXXIV. Vv. 32–39.

(*a*) In the grammatical connection and the progress of the thought from sentence to sentence, δέ (ver. 32) may be regarded as serving the same purpose as δέ of vi. 9—that is, contrasting the hopeful element in the condition of the readers with the hopeless state of those who have just been mentioned. There can be little doubt, however, that in the main development of the thought, vv. 32–34 give a ground for the exhortation to hold fast, or not to apostatize.—(*b*) The reference to the past career of the readers, in ch. vi., calls to mind their love and ministering to the saints; here, it suggests persecutions and sufferings which they had endured. But, in both cases alike, the words used imply a feeling on their part of sympathy towards their fellow-believers.—(*c*) As to the first of the two principal text-variations, in ver. 34, the critical editors and commentators are now generally agreed, that τοῖς δεσμίοις is to be read, instead of τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου. The grounds for the acceptance of δεσμίοις are set forth by Lünem., in his textual note on this verse. It is not improbable that this is the correct reading, but the Sin. MS. adds much to the weight of the evidence on the other side. In view of this fact, and of the fact that, while the connection of Paul's name with the Epistle may have been a motive to introduce the reading δεσμοῖς μου, it is possible, on the other hand, that the allusion to prisoners in xiii. 3 occasioned the introduction of δεσμίοις, it seems questionable whether the former reading can be so decisively set aside, without any recognition of its claims, as it is by some writers and by R. V.—(*d*) The second variation is between ἑαυτοῖς and ἑαυτοῖς;—for ἐν ἑαυτοῖς of T. R. has no sufficient claims to be considered. ἑαυτοῖς is adopted by Tisch. 8, Treg., W. & H., R. V. text, A. R. V. marg., and others, and seems to have the greater external authority. ἑαυτοῖς, however, is read by Griesb., Alf., A. R. V. text, R. V. marg., and others. If the accusative is accepted as the true reading, the explanation given of the meaning of the clause by A. R. V. marg: "ye have your own selves for a better possession," is to be preferred to that of R. V. text: "ye yourselves have a better possession." Bleek, who adopts ἑαυτοῖς, agrees with R. V. text. ἐν οὐρανοῖς inserted by T. R., with some authorities, after ὑπαρξιν is undoubtedly to be rejected.

(*e*) Ver. 38 is a part of the same citation with ver. 37, and ver. 39 expresses the writer's belief that his readers are not among those referred to in the passage as drawing back. The verses are thus closely related to those which precede. But evidently they form a connecting link with ch. xi., and in the development of the main thought they hold the place mentioned in note LXXI.

CHAPTER XI.

VER. 3. *μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων*] Instead thereof there is read in the Peshito: ex illis, quae non cernuntur; in the Vulgate: ex invisibilibus; in Lat. D E: ex non apparentibus. These translations, however, are a mere interpretative gloss, from which the actual existence of an early reading: *ἐκ μὴ φαινομένων*, cannot at all be inferred.—The preference to the *Recepta: τὰ βλεπόμενα*, is merited by the reading *τὸ βλεπόμενον*, commended to attention by Griesbach, adopted by Lachm., Bleek, Tisch. and Alford, approved also by de Wette, Tholuck, Delitzsch, and others. To be preferred partly on account of the better attestation by means of A D* E* ℵ, 17, It. Copt. Clem. Didym. Ath. Cyr. *al.*, partly because a mutation from the singular into the plural was more naturally suggested than the opposite.—Ver. 4. Elz.: *μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ*. Instead of this, A D* ℵ* 17 have: *μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ*. Adopted by Lachm. But the thought: "in that Abel, in regard to his offerings, gave testimony to God," would be unintelligible, and, moreover, incorrectly and unhappily expressed. Besides, since *μαρτυροῦντος κ.τ.λ.* is the unmistakable nearer definition to *ἐμαρτυρήθη*, the context naturally points to *God* as the subject in *μαρτυροῦντος*. Beyond doubt, therefore, *τῷ θεῷ* arose only from the eye of the copyist wandering to the *τῷ θεῷ* at the beginning of the verse.—In place of the *Recepta λαλεῖται*, Griesbach (who, however, attaches equal value to the *Recepta*), Bleek, Scholz, Tisch. Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche rightly read *λαλεῖ*. In favor of this is decisive, on the one hand, the important authority of A ℵ, 17, 23, 31, 39, *al. mult.*, Syr. utr. Arabb. Copt. Armen. Slav. rec. Vulg. Clem. Orig. Athan. Nyss. Chrys. (in comment.) Epiphan. Austerius, Damasc. Chron. alex. Theodoret (in textu), Photius ms. Oecum. Theophyl., on the other hand, the *usus loquendi*. For neither in taking *λαλεῖται* in the *middle* sense, with Beza, Er. Schmid, Wolf, Carpzov, Baumgarten, nor yet in the *passive*: praedicatur, laudatur, in omnium ore est, with Jos. Scaliger, Lud. de Dieu, Wetstein, Heinrichs, Stengel, should we be warranted on linguistic grounds: quite apart from the fact that, in the latter acceptation, the statement would be a very trivial one.—Ver. 5. Elz.: *εὑρίσκετο*. Better attested, however (by A D E ℵ, 109, Epiphan.), is the form *ηὑρίσκετο*, which is found likewise in the LXX. Gen. v. 24, in the Cod. Alex. Rightly adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford.—In place of the *Recepta: τῆς μεταθέσεως αὐτοῦ*, we have to write, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, and others, after A D* ℵ 17, 67** 80, Vulg. It. Copt., merely: *τῆς μεταθέσεως*, and in place of the received form *εὐηρεστηκέναι*, with Lachm. Tisch. 1, 2, and 7, Delitzsch, and Alford, the form better attested (by A K L, 46, 71, 73, *al.*, Theophyl.): *εὐαρεστηκέναι*.—Ver. 8. Elz.: *καλούμενος*. But A D (E?) Vulg. It. Arm. Theodoret, Jer. Bed. have *ὁ καλούμενος*. Approved by Mill. Rightly placed in the text by Lachm. and Tisch. 1.—The article *τόν*, inserted in the *Recepta* before *τόπον*, we have, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 7, and 8, and Alford, after A D* ℵ*, to delete; and, after

A D* K, many min. Chrys. Damasc. Theophyl., with Lachm. Tisch. 1, 2, and 7, and Alford, to write *ἐμελλεν* in place of the *Recepta* *ἤμελλε*.—Ver. 9. *καὶ παρῴκησεν*, which D* E, together with their Latin translation, furnish in place of the *Recepta*: *πίστει παρῴκησεν*, is a later corruption, inasmuch as in ver. 9 a fresh evidence is given of the *πίστις* of Abraham.—*εἰς γῆν*] Elz.: *εἰς τὴν γῆν*. But the article is wanting in A D** K L ℵ, very many cursives, with Damasc. and Oecum. It is suspected by Griesbach, rightly rejected by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford.—Ver. 11. *καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας*] Elz.: *καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας ἔτεκεν*. But *ἔτεκεν* is a later gloss, which is condemned by A D* ℵ* 17, Vulg. It. Copt. Sah. Aeth. utr. Chrys. (codd.). It was already regarded as spurious by Beza, Grotius, Mill (*Prolegg.* 1355), Bengel; and is rightly deleted by Griesbach, Knapp, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Alford, and others.—Ver. 12. In place of the *Recepta* *ἐγεννήθησαν*, Lachm. Bleek, Delitzsch, and Alford read *ἐγενήθησαν*, which, on account of the stronger attestation by A D* K, 109, 219* *al.* (Vulg. It.: orti sunt), is to be preferred.—*ὡς ἡ ἄμμος*] So already the Editt. Complut. and Steph. 2, then Bengel, Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, and others. Elz.: *ὡσεὶ ἄμμος*. Against A D (* and ** and ***) [1] E K L ℵ, 23, 37, 46, 47, *al. mult.*, Chrys. (codd.) Damasc. Oecum. Theophyl.—*ἡ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος*] is wanting in D* E, in their Latin translation, and in Aeth. utr. The origin of the omission is to be traced back to a mere error in writing, to which the resemblance of sound of the closing letters in *ἄμμος* and *χεῖλος* gave occasion.—Ver. 13. In place of the *Recepta* *μὴ λαβόντες*, Lachm. reads *μὴ προσδεξάμενοι*. But the *Recepta* is supported by the considerable authority of D E K L ℵ*** almost all the cursives, Theodoret, and others; while the reading of Lachm., probably arising from ver. 35, has only the testimony of A in its favor, and is devoid of meaning. For *προσδεξάμενοι* could, in accordance with the usage prevailing elsewhere, only signify either the subjective *having expected* (having awaited), or the subjective *having admitted*. But neither of these meanings would be compatible with the statement of ver. 13, which would be suitably expressed only if *προσδεξάμενοι* could be explained of the objective *having received*, what is never denoted by this verb. The reading *μὴ κομισάμενοι* in ℵ* some cursives (17, 23* 39, *al.*), and, with Chrys. (in comment.) Damasc. Theophyl. (adopted by Tisch. 8), was only called forth by the similar turn x. 36, xi. 39.—*ἰδόντες*] Elz.: *ἰδόντες καὶ πεισθέντες*. But the addition *καὶ πεισθέντες* has almost all the witnesses (also ℵ) against it. It is found in only two or three cursives, and is an explanatory gloss to *ἀσπασάμενοι*. Comp. Chrysostom: *οὕτω πεπεισμένοι ἦσαν περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς καὶ ἀσπάσασθαι αὐτάς*; Oecumenius: *καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι πεισθέντες*.—Ver. 15. *ἐξέβησαν*] Elz. Griesbach (who, however, has placed *ἐξῆλθον* on the inner margin), Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Bloomfield: *ἐξῆλθον*. Against A D* E* ℵ* 17, 73, 80, Athan. (ed. Bened.; edd. *al.*: *ἐξεβλήθησαν*) Chron. alex. Damasc.—Ver. 16. *νῦν δέ*] Elz. Matt. Bloomfield: *νυνὶ δέ*. Against decisive witnesses (A D E ℵ, 44, 48, *al. perm.*, Athan. Chrys. Theodoret, Oecum.).—Ver. 19. The *Recepta* *ἐγείρειν* has the support of D E K L ℵ, almost all min. Orig. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. *al.*; Lachm. and Tisch. 1 read, after A (*ἐγειρε*), 17, 71, Cyr. Chron. alex.: *ἐγείραι*.—Elz.: *δυνατός*; A D**: *δύναται*. Adopted by Lachm. into the text.—Ver. 20. In place of the *Recepta* *πίστει*, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 2, 7, Alford have adopted *πίστει καί*,

[1] D* 31: *καθὼς*

after A D* 17, 23, 37, *al.*, Vulg. It. Chrys. (but not in all mss. and editt.) Theodoret, Damasc. Sedul. Bede. Rightly. καί might appear superfluous, and on that account was more likely to be omitted than added.—Ver. 23. Instead of the *Recepta* διάταγμα, Lachm. reads δόγμα. But this reading is founded only in a conjectural manner upon A, inasmuch as all the letters of the word except the δ have been torn away from the Codex. Apart from this, δόγμα is found only in one cursive ms. of the twelfth century (Cod. 34). It is probably a gloss from Luke ii. 1.—At the close of ver. 23, D* E (as also their Latin translation, as well as three codd. of the Vulgate) further add the words: πιστει μεγας γενομενος μωυσης ανιλεν τον αιγυπτιον κατανοων την ταπινωσιν των αδελφων αυτου, as to the spuriousness of which, although Zeger and Mill (*Prolegg.* 496) held them to be genuine, no doubt can exist, even on account of the μέγας γενόμενος, ver. 24. They are a complementary addition in conformity to Acts vii. 23 ff.—Ver. 26. τῶν Αἰγύπτου] Elz.: τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ. Against D E K L ℵ (also against the later supplementer of B), 31, 44, 46, *al plur.*, Syr. utr. Copt. *al*, Clem. Euseb. *al.* Rejected by Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, *al.* The τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτου, adopted by Lachm., after A and some cursives (3, 71), owes its origin to an uncompleted correction.—Ver. 28. Instead of the *Recepta* ὁλοθρεύων, A D E, Damasc. have the more correct (ὀλέθρος) form ὀλεθρεύων, which is rightly preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1, 2, 7, and Alford. —Ver. 29. Elz. has merely ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς. But, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Delitzsch, and Alford, we have to add γῆς, after A D* E ℵ, 17, 31, 47, *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret (cod.) and probably all the versions. Since γῆς was no necessary addition, it could easily get omitted.—Ver. 30. *Recepta:* ἔπεσε. But, after A D* ℵ, 17, 23, 31, *al.*, Chrys. ms., ἔπεσαν (in favor of which, also, ἔπεσον in 37, and Chrys. ms., testifies) is to be looked upon as the original reading. Adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford. Approved by Delitzsch.—Ver. 32. Elz.: ἐπιλείψει γάρ με. With Lachm. Tisch. 7 and 8, and Alford, after A D* ℵ, we have to transpose into: ἐπιλείψει με γάρ.—In that which follows, the *Recepta* reads: περὶ Γεδεών Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψὼν καὶ Ἰεφθάε, Δαυὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουήλ.—Instead thereof, Lachm. reads (and so also Tisch. 1 and 8), as it also stands in the *Codex Sinaiticus:* περὶ Γεδεὼν Βαρὰκ Σαμψὼν Ἰεφθάε Δαυεὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουήλ. On internal grounds neither of these forms of the text commends itself. For, in the case of both, the persons here further mentioned would have been enumerated, in contradiction with the mode of proceeding hitherto observed, without regard to the chronology; inasmuch as, historically, Barak was to have been mentioned before Gideon, Jephthah before Samson, Samuel before David. And yet the regularity with which each time the second name designates a person earlier in a chronological respect, points to an order of succession chosen with design. Observe, further, that in the last member, Δαυὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουήλ, there is nowhere found a variation with regard to the particles. There can thus hardly be room for doubt that the foregoing names also were originally arranged in groups of two. It appears, accordingly, the better course to retain the *Recepta*, with the two modifications,—that, with D*, καὶ Βαράκ is read in place of the mere Βαράκ; and then, with A, 17, Vulg. Copt. Arm. Clem. Cyr. Al. Epiphan. Ambr. Bede, the mere Σαμψὼν is read instead of τε καὶ Σαμψών. (The καί before Ἰεφθάε is supported by D E K L, almost all cursives, Syr. *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. *al.*) Thus arises the text: περὶ Γεδεὼν καὶ Βαράκ Σαμψὼν καὶ Ἰεφθάε, Δαυὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουήλ, and the sense is: "of Gideon as

well as of Barak, of Samson not less than of Jephthah, of David even as of Samuel." In connection with this form of the text, the otherwise very strange breach in the chronological order disappears, since the discourse advances historically with the addition of each new double member; while, in the double members themselves, the mention of the later person before the earlier is justified by the mention on each occasion of those who are in point of time contemporaries, as also from the consideration of rhetorical effect.—Ver. 34. After A D* ℵ, Lachm. has adopted *μαχαίρης* (and so also Tisch. 7 and 8) instead of the *Recepta* *μαχαίρας*, and, after A D* ℵ*: *ἐδυναμώθησαν* (so also Tisch. 8), in place of the *Recepta*: *ἐνεδυναμώθησαν*.—Ver. 35. *γυναῖκες*] Lachm. has, after A D* ℵ*: *γυναίκας*, what, however, rests upon a mere error in transcribing, and is to be rejected as meaningless.—Ver. 37. *μαχαίρας*] D* ℵ, Lachm. Tisch. 7 and 8: *μαχαίρης*.—Ver. 38. The *Recepta* *ἐν ἐρημίαις* is attested by D E K L, min. Clem. Orig. (twice) Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. *al.* Lachm. and Tisch. 7 and 8 read, with A ℵ, 71, 73, 118, Orig. (once) Socrat: *ἐπὶ ἐρημίαις*, which, however, can have arisen only from an error of the copyist.—Ver. 39. Elz.: *τ ν ἐπαγγελίαν*. A, 80, Arab. Polygl. Lachm.: *τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*.

Vv. 1–40.[1] The author defines the nature of the *πίστις* which he requires of the readers, and then presents to them in chronological succession examples thereof from the days of old.

Ver. 1. [On ver. 1, see Note LXXV., page 694.] *The definition.* This is no scholastic, exhaustive one, but brings out only that element as the essence of the *πίστις*, with which the author was here alone concerned; inasmuch as, according to x. 35 ff., just the inner certainty of conviction with regard to the Christian hope, and the stedfast continuance in the same dependent thereon, was that which was lacking to the readers. The words: *ἐστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις*, are to be taken together as a single statement, and *πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων* forms an apposition to *ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις*: "faith, however, *is* a firm confidence in regard to that which is hoped for, a being convinced of things which are invisible." *Πίστις* is accordingly *subject*; *ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις*, as well as *πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων*, *predicate*; and *ἐστιν* (which, standing at the beginning, is to be accentuated as the *verbum substantivum*, see Kühner, I. p. 72) emphatically preposed *copula*, with the design of attaching to the presupposition, expressed x. 39, of *πίστις* as a quality present in the readers, the statement as to the nature and essence of this *πίστις*. Quite similar is the use of *ἐστιν* in the beginning of the proposition, 1 Tim. vi. 6: *ἐστιν δὲ πορισμὸς μέγας ἡ εὐσέβεια μετὰ αὐταρκείας*, and Luke viii. 11: *ἐστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή*. Grammatically admissible indeed, but to be rejected—because in that case a thought would be expressed which is not suggested by the connection, and, moreover, a truth in regard to which no contradiction whatever was to be expected on the part of the readers—is it when Böhme (as formerly also Winer, *Gramm.*, 3d and 4th Ed.; otherwise 5th Ed. p. 70, 6th Ed. p. 56, 7th Ed. p.

[1] P. J. L. Huët, De antiquissimorum Dei cultorum, qui in epistolae ad Hebraeos capite xi. memorantur, fide diversa eademque una. Lugd. Batav. 1824, 8, pp. 27–82.

58 f. [E. T. 59 *f.*]) will have *ἐστιν* taken as a verb substantive, and *ὑπόστασις*, as likewise *ἔλεγχος*, taken as apposition to *πίστις*: "there is, however, a faith, a confidence," etc.—*πίστις*] without an article, since the author will define the notion of *πιστις* in general, not exclusively the notion of specifically Christian faith.—*ὑπόστασις*] is by many explained as "reality" (entity, *Wesenheit*), and placed on a par with *οὐσία*, *substantia*, *essentia*, and the like, which, however, is already proved to be inadmissible from the fact that the notion of "reality" cannot be immediately applied, but, in order to become fitting, must first be changed into that of an "endowing with reality," in such wise that one can then make out the sense: faith clothes things which are not yet at all present with a substance or real existence, as though they were already present.[1]—But likewise *ὑπόστασις* is not to be interpreted either by "fundamentum,"[2] nor by "placing before one."[3] For neither of the two affords in itself, without further amplification, a satisfactory, precise notion, quite apart from the fact that the last-mentioned signification can hardly be supported by the testimony of linguistic usage.—The alone correct course is consequently,[4] to take *ὑπόστασις*, as at iii. 14 (*vid. ad loc.*) as *inner confidence.*—*ἐλπιζομένων*] *gen. objecti: of that* (or: *with regard to that*) *which is still hoped for, has not yet appeared in an actual form.* The main emphasis in the predicate rests upon *ἐλπιζομένων*, as also upon the concluding words, corresponding in apposition thereto, *οὐ βλεπομένων.*—*πραγμάτων*] belongs to *οὐ βλεπομένων.* The conjoining with *ἐλπιζομένων* (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Estius, Böhme, Woerner, and others) deprives the two halves of the proposition of their rhythmical symmetry.—*πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων*] *a being convinced* (in mind or heart) *of things which are invisible, i. e.* a firm inner persuasion of the existence of unseen things, even as though they were manifest to one's eyes. *ἔλεγχος* here expresses not the active notion of the *convincing* or *assuring*, but, corresponding to the notion of the forementioned *ὑπόστασις*, indicates *the result* of the *ἐλέγχειν* (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 24), as *λόγος* that produced by the *λέγειν*, *τύπος* that effected by the *τύπτειν*, etc. To be rejected as unsuitable are the explanations: Proof, *argumentum* (Vulgate, Ambrose, Schlichting, Wolf, Heinrichs, and others); *indicium* (Erasmus); *demonstratio*

[1] This mode of interpretation was followed by Chrys., (*ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίδι ἀνυπόστατα εἶναι δόκει, ἡ πίστις ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῖς χαρίζεται· μᾶλλον δέ, οὐ χαρίζεται ἀλλ' αὐτό ἐστιν οὐσία αὐτῶν· οἷον ἡ ἀνάστασις οὐ παραγέγονέν οὐδέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑποστάσει, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐλπὶς ὑφίστησιν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ψυχῇ*), Theodoret (*δείκνυσιν ὡς ὑφεστῶτα τὰ μηδέπω γεγενημένα*), Oecumenius (*πίστις ἐστὶν αὐτὴ ἡ ὑπόστασις καὶ οὐσία τῶν ἐλπιζομένων πραγμάτων· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίσιν ἀνυπόστατά ἐστιν ὡς τέως μὴ παρόντα, ἡ πίστις οὐσία τις αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις γίνεται, εἶναι αὐτὰ καὶ παρεῖναι τρόπον τινὰ παρασκευάζουσα διὰ τοῦ πιστεύειν εἶναι*) Theophylact (*οὐσίωσις τῶν μήπω ὄντων καὶ ὑπόστασις τῶν μὴ ὑφεστώτων*), by the Vulgate (substantia), by Ambrose, Augustine, Vatablus (rerum, quae sperantur, essentia), H. Stephanus (illud, quod facit, ut jam exstent, quae sperantur), Schlichting, Bengel, Heinrichs, Bisping, and others.

[2] With Faber Stapulensis, Clarius, Schulz, Stein, Stengel, Woerner, and others.

[3] With Castellio (dicitur eorum, qua sperantur, *subjectio*, quod absentia nobis subjiciat ac proponat, efficiatque ut praesentia esse videantur, nec secus eis assentiamur, quam si cerneremus) and Paulus.

[4] With Luther, Cameron, Grotius, Wolf, Huët, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 702, Alford, Maier, Moll, and others.

[5] Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 703; Moll, Hofmann.

(Calvin, H. Stephanus, Jac. Cappellus, Bengel, Alford, *al.*); *apprehensio* (Clarius); "*a certain assurance, guarantee*" (Stein), and many others. οὐ βλεπόμενα, however, on account of the objective negation, combines together into the unity of notion "invisible," and is a more general characterization than ἐλπιζόμενα. While the latter is restricted to that which is purely future, the former comprehends at the same time that which is already present, and denotes in general the supra-sensuous and heavenly.[1]

Ver. 2. [On Vv. 2, 3, see Note LXXVI., pages 694, 695.] Justification of the characteristics mentioned, ver. 1, as those that are essential to the faith. Just *this quality* of faith was it by which the Old Testament saints were distinguished, and on that account became objects of the divine satisfaction and the divine favor.—ἐν ταύτῃ] not equivalent to διὰ ταύτης (Luther, Vatablus, Calvin, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Bengel, Böhme, and the majority; comp. vv. 4, 39), or: *ob eam* (Wolf and others), or *touching faith, in point of faith* (de Wette, Tholuck, Moll); but: *in possession of a faith so constituted* (Winer, p. 362, [E. T., 387 Note [1]], Bleek, Bloomfield, Kurtz).—μαρτυρεῖσθαι] *to obtain a testimony*, and that according to the connection, *a good, commendatory testimony*, whether by words or deeds[2].—οἱ πρεσβύτεροι] *the ancients* (Schulz: *the early ancestors*), *i.e.* the forefathers under the Old Covenant; with the accessory idea of venerableness. A like name of honor, as elsewhere (i. 1, *al.*) οἱ πατέρες.

Ver. 3. [LXXVI *b. c.*] The author is on the point of proving out the truth of ver. 2, in a series of historic instances from the Holy Scriptures of the O. T., when the thought forces itself upon him that the very first section of that sacred book of Scripture relates a fact of which the reality can only be recognized by means of faith. He first of all, therefore, calls attention to this fact, before proceeding, in ver. 4, to the designed enumeration of those historic examples. Certainly not very aptly, since ver. 3 cannot, as ver. 4 ff., serve in proof of the assertion, ver. 2, but, on the contrary, introduces into the examination something heterogeneous in relation to ver. 4 ff. For ver. 3 shows only the necessity for πίστις on our part in regard to a fact belonging to the past and recorded in Scripture; ver. 4 ff. there are placed before our eyes as models historic persons in whom the virtue of πίστις, so constituted as the author demands it of his readers, was livingly present. This judgment, that ver. 3 forms a heterogeneous insertion, is pronounced, indeed, by Delitzsch, to whom Kluge and Moll have acceded, an "unfair one." But the counter observation of Delitzsch: "the author had already at ver. 2, in connection with οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, and particularly in connection with ἐμαρτυρήθησαν, the O. T. Scripture before his mind; so that the statement,

[1] Calvin: Nobis vita aeterna promittitur, sed mortuis; nobis sermo fit de beata resurrectione, interea putredine sumus obvoluti; justi pronuntiamur, et habitat in nobis peccatum; audimus nos esse beatos, interea obruimur infinitis miseriis; promittitur bonorum omnium affluentia, prolixe vero esurimus et sitimus; clamat Deus statim se nobis adfuturum, sed videtur surdus esse ad clamores nostros. Quid fieret, nisi spei inniteremur, ac mens nostra praelucente Dei verbo ac Spiritu per medias tenebras supra mundum emergeret?

[2] Oecumenius: ἐμαρτυρήθησαν ὑπὸ θεοῦ εὐηρεστηκέναι αὐτῷ.

although sounding thus personal, is equivalent to the proposition that the O. T. Scripture concedes no recognition to any mode of life which lies not within the province of faith," labors under the defect of logical deliquescence; it is a mere rationalizing of the words of ver. 2, simply and clearly preposed as the theme for that which follows.—*πιστει*] *Dat. instrumentalis: by virtue of faith.*—*νοοῦμεν*] *we discern.* *νοεῖν* is the inner perception, accomplished by means of the *νοῦς*. Comp. Rom. i. 20.—*κατηρτίσθαι*] *has been prepared* (comp. LXX. Ps. lxxiv. 16, lxxxix. 38). More expressive than if *πεποιῆσθαι* had been written. It represents the *having been created* at the same time as a *having been placed in a completed or perfect condition* [xiii. 21].—*τοὺς αἰῶνας*] *the world;* see at i. 2.—*ῥήματι θεοῦ*] *by the word* (or authoritative command) *of God.* Reference to the repeated: "And God said," Gen. i.[1] The supposition of Bleek (comp. also Ewald, p. 123), that the author here too thought of the word of God as a personified property, has nothing in its favor, since the expression is sufficiently explained without it. Nor does the *δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας*, i. 2, compel us to adopt this supposition. For above the special mode of mediately effecting the creation of the world there indicated, stands the higher authorship of God, to which the writer here points in general by the expression *ῥήματι θεοῦ*.—*εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι*] not: *so that*, etc.[2] *εἰς τό* with the infinitive preserves here, too, its ordinary *telic* signification, in that it introduces the purpose of God with regard to the *ῥήματι καταρτίζειν τοὺς αἰῶνας*. [LXXVI *d.*] The sense is: *that in accordance with the decree of God, the fact should be averted, that from φαινόμενα the βλεπόμενον should have sprung;* consequently that the human race should from the beginning be directed to the necessity for *πίστις*.—*μή*] belongs to the whole object-clause. [LXXVI *e.*] So rightly Beza, Piscator, Seb. Schmidt, Er. Schmid, Bengel, Storr, Schulz, Huët, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Bloomfield, Bisping, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 58), Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, M'Caul, and Hofmann; while the Peshito, Vulgate, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, and almost all later expositors, including also Stengel and Ebrard (Delitzsch is undecided), comprehend *μή* with *ἐκ φαινομένων*, and then interpret this in the sense of *ἐκ μὴ φαινομένων*.[3] The latter, in favor of which the supposed parallels which have been adduced prove nothing, is by reason of the position of the words (to say nothing of the fact that *οὐ* must have been written in place of *μή*; for neither 2 Cor. iv. 18, as Delitzsch supposes, nor Rom. iv. 17, as Maier supposes, decides against this rule. See Meyer *ad loc.*) a grammatical impossibility.—*τὸ βλεπόμενον*] *that which is seen*, or the outward, visible world. The singular represents the same as one complex

[1] Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 5; LXX. Ps. xxxiii. 6, cxlviii. 5. Philo *de sacrif. Abel. et Cain.* p. 140 D (with Mangey, I. p. 175): Ὁ γὰρ θεὸς λέγων ἅμα ἐποίει, μηδὲν μεταξὺ ἀμφοῖν τιθείς.

[2] So still Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Alford, Conybeare, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Woorner, and the majority of recent expositors.

[3] Calvin alone forms an exception, who would have *ἐκ* blended together with *φαινομένων* into a single word, and finds the sense: "ut non apparentium fierent visa h. e. spectacula," in such wise that the "doctrina" harmonizing with that of Rom. i. 20 should result: "quod in hoc mundo conspicuam habeamus Dei imaginem."

whole. τὸ βλεπόμενον resumes under another form only the foregoing τοῖς αἰῶνας, whereas the emphasis in the negative final clause rests upon the ἐκ φαινομένων, which is on that account preposed.—φαινόμενα] are things which appear in outward manifestation, and are perceived by the senses. The expression indicates the domain of the corporal, the material, and there underlies it the conception that the universe did not spring forth by the power of nature from earthly germs or substances, but was created by the mere word of God's omnipotence. In this is contained, it is true, the conception of the creating of the world from nothing. [Cf. 2 Macc. vii. 28.] The opinion of Estius, Schlichting, Limborch, Michaelis, Baumgarten, and others, that the author, with a reference to Gen. i. 2 (specially after the translation of the LXX.: ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος), thought of a visible arising of the worlds out of the invisible chaos already existing, has for its presupposition the erroneous transposal of the μὴ ἐκ into ἐκ μή, and fails to maintain itself in presence of the fact that the γεγονέναι ἐκ φαινομένων, as antithesis to the foregoing κατηρτίσθαι ῥήματι θεοῦ, must receive from this latter its nearer defining of signification. Quite untenable is consequently also the opinion of Delitzsch, who, with the assent of Kluge and Kurtz, supplements ἀλλ' ἐκ νοητῶν as opposition to μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων, and in connection with the μὴ φαινόμενα—or if μή is combined with the verb, in connection with the tacitly assumed opposite of the φαινόμενα—imagines the author to have thought, in harmony with the Philonian doctrine, *of the divine ideas*, out of which the world is supposed to have sprung, in that they were called forth by means of the divine word from their seclusion within the Godhead into the outer phenomenal reality. See against this also Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 59, *Obs.*

Ver. 4 [On Vv. 4–40, see Note LXXVII., pages 695, 696.] *The example of Abel.* Comp. Gen. iv. 3 ff.—Πίστει] belongs to the whole statement: πλείονα . . . θεῷ. The conjoining of the same merely with πλείονα (Bisping) has against it the analogy of the following instances, and would weaken the force of the emphatically preposed πίστει. The dative, however, indicates, as Rom. xi. 20 and frequently, the cause or occasion. See Winer, p. 202 f. [E. T. 216.] *By reason of his faith* (or because he had faith) *Abel offered to God a greater sacrifice than Cain; i. e.* the faith of Abel, which was wanting to Cain, was the cause that in the estimation of God Abel's sacrifice had greater value than that of Cain.—πλείονα θυσίαν] *a greater sacrifice*, namely, in a *qualitative* respect, thus a better, more excellent one. Comp. iii. 3; Matt. vi. 25, xii. 41, 42, *al.* The *quantitative* acceptation (Valla: *plus hostiarum;* Erasmus, Clarius: *copiosiorem hostiam;* Zeger: *abundantiorem*] finds no point of support in the narrative of Genesis, and would unsuitably accentuate a purely external feature.—παρὰ Κάιν] is by Grotius and others made equivalent to παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Κάιν, which is admissible, it is true, but not at all necessary. On παρά after the comparative, see at i. 4.—δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος] *By it he obtained the testimony that he was righteous.*—δι' ἧς] sc. πίστεως, not θυσίας (Cramer). For the πίστις is the main idea in the whole description, and δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη manifestly glances back at ἐν ταύτῃ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν, ver. 2.—

ἐμαρτυρήθη.] [LXXVII *a.*] Of whom? Not of *Christ*, by virtue of the declaration Matt. xxiii. 35 (Primasius, Faber Stapulensis, Justinian), but of *God*; as, accordingly, the author himself adds, more nearly defining the *ἐμαρτυρήθη*: *μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ*] *in that*, namely, *God gave testimony in respect of his offerings.* What is meant is the testimony given *in the fact* that God looked with satisfaction upon Abel and his sacrifice (comp. LXX. Gen. iv. 4: *καὶ ἐπεῖδεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἄβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ*), thus, in point of fact, recognized him as a *δίκαιος* (comp. Matt. xxiii. 35: *Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαίου*, and 1 John iii. 12).—*καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ*] *and by virtue of the same* (namely: his faith, not: his sacrifice) *he yet speaks after his death.*—*ἀποθανών*] is a purely parenthetic member: *although he has died*, and forms with *ἔτι λαλεῖ* an oxymoron. Hardly is it in accordance with the intention of the author to comprehend in one *ἀποθανών* and *δι' αὐτῆς*. In addition to the ordinary one, *this* explanation also is proposed by Oecumenius, in referring the pronoun back to the *θυσία* by which the violent death of Abel was occasioned; it is followed by Bengel, with the difference that he supplements *δι' αὐτῆς* by *πίστεως*, and will have *διά* taken in the sense of *κατά* or *ἐν*.—*ἔτι*] is not the *temporal: still, adhuc*,[1] so that *λαλεῖ* would signify: he speaks to us of himself and his faith or piety,[2] or: he summons posterity to the imitation of his faith.[3] Rather is *ἔτι* employed, as Rom. iii. 7 and frequently, in the *logical* sense, and serves for the emphasizing of the contrast: "even being dead," or: "notwithstanding he is dead, he nevertheless speaks," while *λαλεῖ* is to be regarded as the more vividly descriptive *praesens historicum* (Winer, p. 250), [E. T. 266] and is to be referred to the thought that the shed blood of Abel called to God for vengeance, and God, listening to this cry, was concerned about the slain Abel, as though he were still living. For manifestly, as appears also from the parallel xii. 24, there is an allusion in *λαλεῖ* to the words, Gen. iv. 10: *φωνὴ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρός με ἐκ τῆς γῆς.*

Vv. 5, 6. *The example of Enoch.* Comp. Gen. v. 21–24.—*Πίστει Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη*] *By reason of his faith Enoch was caught away*; *i.e.* even during his lifetime was, like Elijah (2 Kings ii.), caught up to God in heaven.[4]—*τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον*] not consecutively [*so that*], de Wette, Bisping, *al.*, but indication of the design of God: *that he should not see* or undergo *death* (comp. Luke ii. 26).—*καὶ οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο, διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός*] derived verbally from the LXX. of Gen. v. 24, as given in the text of the Cod. Alex.—*πρὸ γὰρ . . . γέγονεν*; ver. 6] It is related in the Scripture concerning Enoch that he was acceptable to God. But this presupposes that he had faith. For to obtain God's approbation without the possession of

[1] Theodoret: *μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος.*

[2] Theodoret: *τὸ δὲ ἔτι λαλεῖ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀοίδιμός ἐστι μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος καὶ πολυθρύλλητος καὶ παρὰ πάντων εὐφημεῖται τῶν εὐσεβῶν*; Heinsius, Bengel: loquitur de se et sui similibus contra Cainos, *al.*

[3] Chrysostom: *ὁ γὰρ παραινῶν τοῖς ἄλλοις δικαίοις εἶναι, λαλεῖ*; Cornelius a Lapide, Valckenaer, Kuinoel, Paulus, Klee, Bloomfield, and others.

[4] Comp. Ecclus, xliv. 16: *Ἐνὼχ εὐηρέστησε κυρίῳ καὶ μετετέθη ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς*; *ibid.* xlix. 14: *οὐδὲ εἷς ἐκτίσθη οἷος Ἐνὼχ τοιοῦτος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*; Joseph. *Antiq.* i. 3. 4: *ἀνεχώρησε πρὸς τὸ θεῖον.*

faith is impossible.[1]—*πρὸ τῆς μεταθέσεως*] [LXXVII *b.*] may be equally well conjoined with *μεμαρτύρηται*,[2] or with *εὐαρεστηκέναι*.[3] In the former case the sense is: before mention is made in the Scripture of his rapture, the testimony is borne to him in the same, that he pleased God.—*εὐαρεστηκέναι*] By *εὐηρέστησεν* the LXX. translate the Hebrew וַיִּתְהַלֶּךְ: אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים *and he walked with God, i.e.* in communion with God, as His most devout worshiper.—Ver. 6 is a truth of wholly universal application, so that only *ἐστίν* is to be supplemented to *ἀδύνατον*. With Er. Schmid, Limborch, Wetstein, and Schulz, to regard the first hemistich of the verse: *χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαρεστῆσαι*, as a special statement respecting Enoch, is grammatically inadmissible, since in that case *χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον ἦν αὐτὸν εὐαρεστῆσαι* or *χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον αὐτὸν εὐαρεστηκέναι* must have been written.—*εὐαρεστῆσαι*] *sc.* *τῷ θεῷ*, naturally understood from that which precedes and follows. The *infin. aorist* expresses, as in the case of the immediately succeeding *πιστεῦσαι*, the pure verbal notion, without regard to the relation of time. See Kühner, II. p. 80.—*ὁ προσερχόμενος τῷ θεῷ*] is *he who approaches God, sc.* to worship Him; comp. vii. 23, x. 1. Wrongly; Luther, Calov, Wittich, Rambach, Schulz, Ebrard (transl.): *he who* (as Enoch) *will come* (or *is to come*) *to God.*—*ὅτι ἐστίν*] *that he is*, or *exists*. Arbitrarily importing, Jac. Cappellus: "Series sermonis suadet, ut suppleamus *ὅτι ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ θεός*, i. e. qui accedit ad Deum, credere debet eum esse suum Deum." But also the complementing the verb by: "that He exists as one to whom man can draw near with confidence, as the truly living, personal, almighty, all-wise, all-beneficent One" (Bleek), is an unjustifiable act of reading *into* the text. The expression contains only the idea of *existence.*—*καὶ*] still dependent upon *ὅτι.*—*μισθαποδότης*] *recompenser, sc.* for the piety manifested in the *ἐκζητεῖν αὐτόν* (Rom. iii. 11; Acts xv. 17).

Ver. 7. *The example of Noah.* Comp. Gen. vi. 8 ff.—*Πίστει*] is conjoined by Schulz, Stengel, and others with *χρηματισθείς*. But *χρηματισθείς* forms only a subsidiary element for the making up of the historic situation, whereas that by which Noah proved himself a model of faith is specified by *εὐλαβηθείς κατεσκεύασεν*. *πίστει* is therefore, as is also done by most, to be combined with this last.—*χρηματισθεὶς περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων*] belongs together (against Grotius and Hofmann, who unnaturally construe *περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπ.* with *εὐλαβηθείς*): *instructed by an utterance of God concerning that which was as yet invisible.* The choice of the expression was conditioned by the definition of *πίστις*, laid down ver. 1, and the subjective negation *μηδέπω* means: concerning the well-known (*τῶν*) events, before these were yet to be seen, or their occurrence was to be conjectured. By *τὰ μηδέπω βλεπόμενα*, however, is meant not only the impending flood, but also, from the use of the plural, the determined destruction of the whole corrupt race of men. With strange inversion of the sense, even "ipsa *κιβωτός* constru-

[1] Chrysostom: *πῶς δὲ πίστει μετετέθη ὁ Ἐνώχ; ὅτι τῆς μεταθέσεως ἡ εὐαρέστησις αἰτία, τῆς δὲ εὐαρεστήσεως ἡ πίστις.*

[2] Piscator, Owen, Huet, Bleek, de Wette, Conybeare, Delitzsch, Kurtz, Hofmann, *al.*

[3] Schlichting, Bengel, Maier, and others.

enda" is reckoned by Böhme as belonging to that "qualem ante nunquam vidisse Noachum facile credi potest." For the ark was surely something which was made by Noah himself at the command of God, whereas by *τὰ μηδέπω βλεπόμενα* can be only meant that which, independent of human activity, rested in the hands of divine omnipotence alone.—*εὐλαβηθείς*] *in devout precaution*, in that he reposed unconditional belief in the word of God, and on that very account took the enjoined measure of preparation in order to remain in safety under the impending destruction. Vatablus, Cornelius a Lapide, Schulz, and others explain: *in the fear of God.* But the *τὸν θεόν* therein to be supplemented (comp. Ecclus. vii. 29; Prov. ii. 8, xxx. 5; Nah. i. 7) could hardly have been omitted.—*δι' ἧς*] refers not to *σωτηρίαν*,[1] nor yet to *κιβωτόν*,[2] but to *πίστει*,[3] as the foregoing main idea; and *καὶ τῆς . . . κληρονόμος* is the second member of the relative clause, not, however, as Bisping and Delitzsch think, parallel to the *κατεσκεύασεν*.—*ὁ κόσμος*] denotes the unbelieving sinful world of men. This Noah condemned (too weak the rendering of Heinrichs: *put to shame*) by his faith, namely, by the act, in that he set forth the culpability of its conduct by the contrast of his own conduct. Comp. *κατακρίνειν*, Matt. xii. 41, 42, Luke xi. 31, 32, and *κρίνειν*, Rom. ii. 27.—*καὶ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος*] [LXXVII *c*, *d*.] Allusion to the fact that Noah is the first who in the O. T. is expressly called צַדִּיק or *δίκαιος* (Gen. vi. 9).[4]—*ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη*] is *the righteousness obtained in accordance with faith*, or *by the way of faith.* Since the notion of *πίστις* is different with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews from that of Paul, the righteousness of faith here spoken of cannot, as is still done by Böhme, Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford, and others, be regarded as identical with the righteousness of faith in the Pauline sense. Yet Bleek is perfectly right in saying that the notion: *righteousness of faith*, "here appears as one already formed, and is presupposed as one well known, a fact very easy to be explained from the relation in which the author of the epistle stood to Paul."—*κληρονόμον γίνεσθαι*] denotes no more than *to obtain as a possession.* We have not, with Justinian, Bengel, Huet, and many, to press the form of expression; as though the *δικαιοσύνη* were thought of as actual *inheritance*, which Noah had received as coming down from the fathers, Abel, who in ver. 4 had been called *δίκαιος*, and Enoch.

Vv. 8–10. *The example of Abraham.*

Ver. 8. [LXXVII *e*.] A proof of believing confidence in God it was that Abraham at God's command wandered forth without knowing whither. Comp. Gen. xii. 1, 4; also Acts vii. 2, 3.—*ὁ καλούμενος*] is not: "*he who is called Abraham*, whereas, namely, he formerly bore the name of Abram"

[1] Hunnius, Balduin, Pareus.

[2] Chrysostom: *ἔδειξεν αὐτοὺς ἀξίους ὄντας κολάσεως, οἳ γε οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς κατασκευῆς ἐσωφρονίζοντο*; Oecumenius, Theophylact, Faber Stapulensis, Calvin, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Carpzov, Cramer, Michaelis, Bisping, *al.*

[3] Primasius, Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Cajetan, Wolf, Bengel, and almost all modern expositors.

[4] Comp. Ezek. xiv. 14, 20; Ecclus. xliv. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 5. Philo also, *de congressu quaerendae eruditionis gratia*, p. 437 B (with Mangey, I. p. 532), lays special stress upon this particular: *πρῶτος δ' οὗτος δίκαιος ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἀνερρήθη γραφαῖς.*

(Theodoret, Clarius, Zeger, Bisping, Ewald, *al.*), which would be a very tame addition. It signifies: "Abraham, who was thereto (*sc.* to the ἐξελθεῖν) called or summoned by God." That this sense could have been expressed only by καλούμενος without the article (Bleek, Delitzsch, Reiche, *Comm. Crit.* p. 108; Maier, Moll, Kurtz), can hardly be maintained. The only difference between the two modes of expression is, that *with* the article the καλεῖσθαι is merely stated as an historic fact; *without* the article, on the other hand, is at the same time represented as a cause of the ὑπακοῦσαι. The participle *present*, moreover (not κληθείς), is chosen in order to accentuate the immediate sequence of the καλεῖσθαι and the ὑπακοῦσαι.—εἰς τόπον ὃν κ.τ.λ.] namely, to Canaan.—ποῦ] inexactly used, instead of ποῖ. Comp. Winer, p. 439 [E. T. 471].—On the *indicative* ἔρχεται, see Winer, p. 279 f. [E. T. 298]; Buttmann, p. 218 [E. T. 254].

Ver. 9. A proof of a believing confidence in God was it further that Abraham dwelt as a stranger in the land which was promised him as a possession. —παροικεῖν] in classic Greek of *dwelling beside* or *in the neighborhood*; in Hellenistic, however, ordinarily as here: to dwell as a stranger in a land, without rights of citizenship or possession. Even in Genesis the sojourning of Abraham and his sons in the promised land of Canaan is designated as a παροικεῖν, and they themselves are characterized as πάροικοι in the same; comp. Gen. xvii. 8, xx. 1, xxi. 23, 34, xxiii. 4, xxiv. 37, xxvi. 3, xxviii. 4, *al.* —εἰς] receives into the idea of a permanent dwelling that of a previous migration. Familiar breviloquence. See Winer, p. 386 [E. T. 414].—ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν] Comp. Acts vii. 5, 6.—ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας] Theophylact: ὅπερ τῶν ξένων ἐστί, τῶν ἀλλοτε εἰς ἄλλο μέρος μεταβαινόντων διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τι ἴδιον. Comp. Gen. xii. 8, xiii. 3, xviii. 1 ff., xxvi. 25, *al.*—μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ κ.τ.λ.] which Theophylact, Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Tischendorf, and others refer to παρῴκησεν, belongs, as is shown by the singular ἐξεδέχετο with which the author continues at ver. 10, to κατοικήσας.—Isaac and Jacob, however, are called heirs with him of the same promise, because the promise was given to Abraham not for himself alone, but at the same time for his seed; comp. Gen. xiii. 15, xvii. 8.

Ver. 10. Inner motive for the πίστει παρῴκησεν, ver. 9. His believing expectation was directed not so much to earthly possession, as to the possession of that which was higher and heavenly. His true home he thought not to find upon earth, but only in heaven.—τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἐχουσαν πόλιν] *the city which has the foundations, firm and enduring city.* The opposite to the tents, which form only a temporary lodging, and may be easily broken up and carried away. What is meant is not *the earthly Jerusalem* (Grotius, Clericus, Dindorf), to which the author, considering the excessive attachment of his readers to the earthly city of God and the earthly sanctuary, could only have alluded most unsuitably, but the archetype of the same: *the heavenly city of God, the heavenly Jerusalem*, of which the possession for the Christians also is as yet something future, since they will obtain a dwelling therein only at the epoch of the consummation of the Messianic kingdom. The idea of a heavenly Jerusalem was already current among the Jews its descent to earth was expected on the arising of

the Messiah.[1] From the Jews this conception passed over to the Christians, in so far as that which the Jews expected at the first arising of the Messiah was placed by the latter in the time of the return of Christ. Comp. further vv. 13–16, xii. 22, xiii. 14; Gal. iv. 26; Rev. iii. 12, xxi. 2 ff. 10 ff.—*ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ θεός*] *of which the designer and artificer* (creator) *is God.* *δημιουργός* in the N. T. only here, as in the O. T. only 2 Macc. iv. 1.

Vv. 11, 12. *The example of Sarah.*

Ver. 11. *Καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα*] *even Sarah herself, sc.* although she had before been unbelieving. At first, namely, when she had received the divine promise that she should yet bear a son, she had, in consideration of her great age, laughed thereat, and thus manifested unbelief; presently afterwards, however, she was afraid, and denied her laughter, had thus passed over from unbelief to belief. Comp. Gen. xviii. 12, 15. Erroneously is the enhancing *καὶ αὐτή* interpreted by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Bengel, Böhme, Stein, Tholuck (the last-named, however, undecided): *even Sarah also, the wife,* or: *although she was only a woman;* Kurtz: "Sarah herself and no other," namely, not Hagar. Just as false the interpretation of Schlichting, Schulz, and others: *even Sarah herself, although she was barren.* To the last mode of supplementing points also the gloss *στεῖρα,* or *στεῖρα οὖσα,* or *ἡ στεῖρα,* which is found, with Theophylact, in some cursives, translations (including Vulg.), and early editions. Quite wrongly will Delitzsch, followed therein by Alford and Hofmann, have no gradation whatever recognized in *καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα,* in that he supposes *καὶ αὐτή* to serve only for extending a like statement to a second subject, and consequently placing the first mother of the chosen race side by side with the first father thereof. If the author had wished to express nothing more, he would have written merely *καὶ Σάρρα.* For *αὐτός* or *αὐτή* is in the N. T. never used in the nominative for the unaccented *he* or *she.* See Winer, p. 141, *Obs.* [E. T. 150].—*εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος*] *for the founding of a posterity.* *καταβολή* is employed, therefore, in the same sense as in the expression *καταβολὴ κόσμου,* iv. 3, ix. 26, and *σπέρμα,* as ver. 18, ii. 16, and frequently. The words cannot denote; *she received power to conceive seed,* as is interpreted by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact (who, however, is undecided), the Peshito, Vulgate, Erasmus, Vatablus, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Er. Schmid, Grotius, L. Bos, Wolf, Bengel, Carpzov, Schulz, Heinrichs, Huet, Stengel, Bloomfield, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, and others. For this must have been expressed by *εἰς ὑποδοχὴν (σύλληψιν) σπέρματος.*[2] Constrained and unnatural, however, is also the explanation, first mentioned by Theophylact, and subsequently adopted by Drusius, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting,

[1] See Schöttgen, *de Hieros. coelesti,* in his *Hor. Hebr.* p. 1205 ff.; Wetstein, *N. T.* II. p. 229 ff.: Ewald, *Comm. in Apocal.* pp. 11, 307.

[2] Michaelis and Storr would therefore, in writing *καὶ αὐτῇ Σάρρᾳ,* refer the statement, ver. 11, still to Abraham, in connection with which, however, more meaning must be put into *εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος* than can lie in the expression, and which has in other respects much in the context against it. See Bleek, II. 2, p. 767 f.

Heinsius, Wittich, Rambach, and others: *she received power for the bringing forth of seed.*—καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας] *and that contrary to the favorable period of life, i. e.* since the δύναμιν λαμβάνειν, on account of the youthful freshness being already lost, was opposed to all probability. Incorrect, because in that case the *full* signification of καιρός (*opportunitas*) is not brought out, Delitzsch: "in contradiction with the time of life, namely, the ninetieth year, in which she was."—ἐπεὶ πιστὸν ἡγήσατο τὸν ἐπαγγειλάμενον] comp. x. 23.

Ver. 12. The wondrous result of the faith displayed by Sarah.—ἐγενήθησαν] *sc.* through Sarah as mother and ancestress. γίνεσθαι, of *being born*, usual also elsewhere in classic (Xen. *Cyr.* i. 2. 1, *al.*) and Hellenistic Greek (Rom. i. 3; Gal. iv. 4, *al.*).—ἀφ' ἑνός] *from one*, namely Abraham. Wrongly does Carpzov apprehend ἑνός as a *neuter*, in that he will have it supplemented by σπέρματος or αἵματος. Just as wrongly Zeger: "vel ab uno Abrahae et Sarae corpore (juxta illud: Erunt duo in carne una)."[1]—καὶ ταῦτα] *and that too, and more than that.* According to Winer, p. 153 [E. T. 162], equivalent to καὶ τοῦτο. But the plural is, no doubt, placed because the author has in his mind, besides the νενεκρωμένον εἶναι of Abraham, also that remarked in ver. 11 with regard to Sarah (her former unbelief and her advanced age).—νενεκρωμένου] has reference to the dead power of generation, as Rom. iv. 19.—*Of one were born even as the stars of heaven in regard to number, i. e.* of one were descendants born innumerable in multitude as the stars of heaven. A supplementing of ἔκγονοι or ἄνθρωποι (so still Bleek) is, moreover, unnecessary. The comparison of the multitude of descendants to the stars of heaven, and the countless sand upon the sea-shore, is based upon the use of the same figures in the words of the promise given to Abraham; comp. Gen. xiii. 16, xv. 5, xxii. 17, xxvi. 4, xxxii. 12; Ex. xxxii. 13; Deut. i. 10.—χείλος] for *shore* occurs also with the classics, and that in prose equally (Herod. ii. 94; Polyb. iii. 14. 6, and frequently) as with the poets (Hom. *Il.* xii. 52). Comp. also Plin. xxxi. 2: Herba in labris fontis virens; Caes. *de bello Gall.* vii. 72: ut ejus (fossae) solum tantundem pateret, quantum summa labra distabant.

Vv. 13–16. General observations with regard to the forementioned patriarchs.

Ver. 13. Κατὰ πίστιν] [LXXVII *f.*] is ordinarily (by Bleek, too, in the larger commentary) conjoined exclusively with ἀπέθανον. According to this, the dying comformably to faith, in distinction from the faith already manifested during life, would become the main idea of the verse, and the participial clauses would be made to contain the proof for the κατὰ πίστιν ἀποθανεῖν. The sense would be: "they died in faith (not in sight), since they had not received the promises, but only saw them from afar," etc. (Bleek). Against this apprehension of the words, however, decides the subjective negation μή before λαβόντες, instead of which (particularly in the case of the opposition following with ἀλλά, see Kühner, II. 408) the

[1] Comp. already Theodoret: Ἀφ' ἑνὸς τοῦ Ἀβραάμ· εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀμφοτέρους ἕνα νοήσαιμεν, οὐχ ἁμαρτησόμεθα· ἔσονται γάρ, φησίν, οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

objective negation *οὐ* must have been placed. We have therefore, with Schulz, Winer p. 376 [E. T. 103]), Moll, Bleek, *Vorles.* p. 434, Kurtz, Ewald, to refer *κατὰ πίστιν* to *ἀπέθανον* in close comprehension of the latter with the participles. The sense is: In accordance with faith these all died without having received the promises, but as those who, etc.; *i. e.*, it was conformable to the nature of faith that they, without having attained to the possession of the promised blessings themselves, beheld them only from afar and greeted them, and witnessed the confession that they are strangers and pilgrims upon earth.—*οὗτοι πάντες*] is referred by Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Ribera, Justinian, Drusius, and Bloomfield to all the before-mentioned persons, from Abel onwards, with the single exception of Enoch. Nevertheless, as is evident from the contents of the following verse, only those among them can have been thought of to whom promises were given, thus Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, and Jacob. Comp. specially ver. 15.—*μὴ λαβόντες*] see at vi. 15.—*τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*] in the *objective* sense, as *τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν*, ix. 15.—*πόρρωθεν*] belongs equally to *ἀσπασάμενοι* as to *ἰδόντες*.—*ἀσπάζεσθαι*] *joyfully greet or welcome*, as the traveler the longed-for journey's end. Comp. Virg. *Aen.* iii. 522 sqq.:

> Quum procul obscuros colles humilemque videmus
> Italiam. . . . Italiam lacto socii clamore salutant.

—*καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες, ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*] Reference to the utterances of the patriarchs in the Book of Genesis, particularly xxiii. 4, where Abraham says to the children of Heth: *πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος ἐγώ εἰμι μεθ' ὑμῶν*, and xlvii. 9, where Jacob, in addressing Pharaoh, describes his own life in general as a pilgrimage: *αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ζωῆς μου, ἃς παροικῶ, ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα ἔτη.*[1]

Ver. 14 ff. That the patriarchs are *ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι*, they have themselves confessed; that they were so *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, the author has added by way of more nearly defining. The legitimacy of this exposition of their words he now proves (ver. 14 . . . *ἐπουρανίου*, ver. 16). By those utterances the patriarchs declare that they have not already a country, they are only seeking it. If, now, they had set their hearts upon an earthly country, they would certainly have had time and opportunity enough to have returned to that which they had left, but this they did not; they must thus have longed for a heavenly country.—*ἐμφανίζουσιν*] Theodoret: *δηλοῦσιν*. Oecumenius and Theophylact: *δεικνύουσιν*.—*ἐπιζητεῖν*] *ardently to seek* or *desire* something.

Ver. 15. *Καί*] *and indeed*.—*μνημονεύειν*] is taken by the majority in the *intransitive* sense: *to be mindful* (xiii. 7). More naturally, however, may we understand it, with Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Moll, Kurtz, and others, *transitively: to make mention*, *sc.* in the utterances to which the author has

[1] Comp. LXX. Ps. xxxix. 13, cxix. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 11; Philo, *de Agricult.* p. 196 E (with Mangey, I. p. 310): *παροικεῖν οὐ κατοικεῖν ἤλθομεν· τῷ γὰρ ὄντι πᾶσα μὲν ψυχὴ σοφοῦ πατρίδα μὲν οὐρανόν, ξένην δὲ γῆν ἔλαχεν; De Confus. Ling.* p. 331 C (I. p. 416): *Διὰ τοῦτο οἱ κατὰ Μωϋσῆν σοφοὶ πάντες εἰσάγονται παροικοῦντες· αἱ γὰρ τούτων ψυχαὶ στέλλονται μὲν ἀποικίαν δή ποτε τὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.*

respect. Comp. ver. 22; 1 Thess. i. 3.—εἶχον ἂν] *they would have had.* The imperfect of the *continuing* possibility.

Ver. 16. Νῦν δέ] the logical: *but now.* Comp. viii. 6.—ὀρέγεσθαί τινος] elsewhere in the N. T. only 1 Tim. iii. 1, vi. 10.—διό] *wherefore, sc.* on account of their seeking after the heavenly country.—θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν] Epexegesis to αὐτοῖς: *God is not ashamed of them, namely, to be called their God.* Reference to Ex. iii. 6: καὶ εἶπεν· ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρός σου, θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ. Comp. *ibid.* vv. 15, 16.—The οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται κ.τ.λ. presupposes the idea of an intimate communion of God with the patriarchs. Comp. also Matt. xxii. 31 f.; Mark xii. 26 f.; Luke xx. 37 f. The fact instanced in proof of this communion is added in the concluding words: ἡτοίμασεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν] for He has prepared for them a city. By the πόλις is again meant, as ver. 10, *the heavenly Jerusalem.* ἡτοίμασεν, however, may equally well signify: *He has prepared it for them, that they may one day possess the same as a dwelling* (Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Calov, Böhme, de Wette, Delitzsch, Hofmann), as: *He has already conferred it upon them as a possession* (so Braun and Bleek).

Vv. 17–19. The author returns once more specially to Abraham, in that he further, by way of addition, dwells on the most distinguished act of faith on the part of this patriarch, that he had not refused at God's behest to offer his only son as a sacrifice; comp. Gen. xxii. 1 ff.—προσενήνοχεν] not: "he was on the point of offering," against which stands the perfect. It can only signify: *he offered* (made an offering of). The author could thus express himself, since the offering was really intended by Abraham, although it afterwards came, it is true, to a bloodless issue. Comp. Jas. ii. 21: Ἀβραὰμ . . . ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον.—πειραζόμενος] *when he was tempted, i. e.* was put to the test by God with regard to his faith. Comp. Gen. xxii. 1. πειραζόμενος belongs still to προσενήνοχεν, not, as Hofmann quite unnaturally requires, to προσέφερεν.—καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ . . . σπέρμα, ver. 18] Unfolding of the greatness of the act. It was (1) his only son whom he gave up, (2) the son whose life was necessary, if the promises given to Abraham were to receive their fulfillment.—καί] *and of a truth.*—τὸν μονογενῆ] No respect is had to *Ishmael,* since he was not of equal birth, and stood outside of all relation to the divine promises.—προσέφερεν] *here* the imperfect; since the author now presents to himself, as though he were a spectator, the act of the offering itself.—ὁ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀναδεξάμενος] *he who had believingly embraced the promises.* With Schulz, Heinrichs, Bengel, Ebrard, Bisping, and others, to find indicated by ἀναδεξάμενος the mere *having received,* contradicts the ordinary use of the word, instead of which λαβών must have been placed.

Ver. 18. Πρὸς ὃν] not: "of whom" (more accurately: "in relation to whom," comp. i. 7), in such wise that it should be referred to Isaac (Faber Stapulensis, Luther, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Carpzov, Michaelis, Chr. Fr. Schmid, and others), but: *to whom, sc.* Abraham.—ὅτι ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα] *In Isaac shall a seed be named* (called) *to thee, i. e.* through Isaac shall the posterity, whose forefather thou shalt be called, be founded. The emphasis falls upon ἐν Ἰσαάκ, and the citation

is from Gen. xxi. 12. ὅτι, however, which has there causal significance, the author takes as a recitative.

Ver. 19 contains in its first half the motive ground of Abraham for such believing action. Abraham trusted in the omnipotence of God, by virtue of which he is able, even in presence of the actual sacrifice of Isaac, to realize the promises given to him.—λογισάμενος, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.] *since he judged that God is able to raise even from the dead.* The proposition introduced with ὅτι contains a universal truth. It is erroneous to supplement αὐτόν to ἐγείρειν (Jac. Cappellus, Huët, Kuinoel, Stein, Bloomfield, *al.*), yet more erroneous to supplement σπέρμα (Schulz, Stengel).—ὁθεν κ.τ.λ.] Declaration of the divine reward for such believing action and such believing confidence. ὁθεν means, as everywhere else in our epistle (ii. 17, iii. 1, vii. 25, viii. 3, ix. 18): *on which account, wherefore;* παραβολή, [LXXVII *g.*] however, denotes, conformably to the well-known use of παραβάλλεσθαι (Hom. *Il.* ix. 322; Thuc. ii. 44, *al.* See the lexicons), *the imperilling,* and forms with the ἐκομίσατο an oxymoron. The sense is: *on which account he bore him away, even on the ground of* (or: *by means of*) *the giving up.* Abraham obtained Isaac as a reward, received him back again as a possession, by the very act of setting his life at stake, giving up to the death of a sacrifice. This is the simple and only correct sense of the variously explained words.—With this exposition earlier interpretations agree in part, though by no means entirely, so far as ὁθεν and ἐκομίσατο are concerned, but all different in regard to ἐν παραβολῇ. Instead of the *causal* signification, "on which account," Calvin, Castellio, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Lamb. Bos, Alberti, Wolf, Michaelis, Schulz, Huët, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Ewald, Hofmann, and others have asserted for ὁθεν the *local* signification "whence, *sc.* from the dead." In connection with this, L. Bos, Alberti, Schulz, and Stengel [as also Whitby] understand ἐκομίσατο of the *birth* of Isaac; while Calvin, Bleek, and the majority rightly understand it of the deliverance of Isaac's life in consequence of the prevention of the sacrifice. The former explain: whence he indeed had received him, inasmuch as Isaac's parents at the time of his conception and birth were virtually dead. The latter: as he accordingly also received from the dead. But against the first acceptation decides the fact that in such case, because an event conceived of as possible in the future is placed in definite parallel with a past event, the *pluperfect* must necessarily have been used in place of the aorist ἐκομίσατο; and then, even apart from this, since all the emphasis would fall upon ἐκομίσατο, the order of the words must have been otherwise, namely as follows: ὁθεν ἐν παραβολῇ καὶ ἐκομίσατο αὐτόν. But also the last-named interpretation is forbidden by the order of the words. For καί must, in connection, therewith, be referred, as is also expressly required by Schlichting, Böhme, and others, to the whole clause, whereas from its position it can only form a gradation of ἐν παραβολῇ; thus ὁθεν καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο must have been written.—Finally, as regards ἐν παραβολῇ, the signification "in similitudine," or "in a resemblance," is attached thereto by Theodore of

Mopsuestia,[1] Calvin, Castellio, Beza, Schlichting, Grotius, Jac. Cappellus (figurate), Scaliger, Er. Schmid, Wittich, Limborch, Zachariae, Dindorf, Koppe (in Heinrichs), Huët, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Hofmann, Woerner, and others. The sense is, according to Bleek: "as accordingly he received him from thence in a resemblance; so that Isaac was indeed not really delivered out of death, but yet his deliverance was a kind of restoration from the dead, since Abraham already regarded him as the prey of death." But this "in a resemblance" is, strictly taken, nothing else than "in a manner," with which it is also exactly identified by Stengel and others; for the expression, however, of the notion "in a manner," the author would hardly have chosen the altogether unusual, and therefore unintelligible, formula ἐν παραβολῇ; much more natural would it have been for him to employ instead thereof, as at vii. 9, the familiar ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν. Moreover, since that addition could only be designed to exert a softening effect upon the ὀθεν (*sc.* ἐκ νεκρῶν), it must also have followed immediately after this word. The author would thus have written ὀθεν, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκομίσατο.—Yet more untenable is the exposition akin to that just mentioned; *as a type* (Luther: *zum Vorbilde*), *sc.* in regard to the *resurrection in general* (Hunnius, Balduin, Michaelis, Böhme, *al.*), or specially in regard to the *sacrificed and risen Christ* (Primasius, Erasmus, Clarius, Vatablus, Zeger, Calov, Carpzov, Cramer, Ebrard, Bisping, Reuss), or in regard to *both* alike (Theodoret: τουτέστιν ὡς ἐν συμβόλῳ καὶ τύπῳ τῆς ἀναστάσεως.—ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ προεγράφη καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους ὁ τύπος). For the express indication of that which was typically represented by this event could not have been wanting.—Equally far wrong, because far-fetched and unnatural, is the supplementing of ὤν to ἐν παραβολῇ on the part of Bengel ("Abraham . . . ipse factus est parabola . . . Omnis enim posteritas celebrat fidem Abrahae, offerentis unigenitum"), and the explanation of Paulus: "against an equalization," *i. e.* in return for the ram presented as a substitute (comp. already Chrysostom: τουτέστιν ἐν ὑποδείγματι· ἐν τῷ κριῷ φησιν . . . ὡς ἐν αἰνίγματι· ὥσπερ γὰρ παραβολὴ ἦν ὁ κριὸς τοῦ Ἰσαάκ).—To the interpretation of ἐν παραβολῇ, above regarded as correct, several expositors approach, to the extent of likewise thinking that we must make the usage with regard to the verb παραβάλλεσθαι our guide in determining the signification of παραβολή. They deviate, however, essentially from the above interpretation, in that they take ἐν παραβολῇ *adverbially*, in the sense of παραβολῶς: consequently refer the expression, which above was equally referred to subject and object, to the *subject*, and that without any advantage to the peculiarity of thought.[2]

[1] Τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι ἀκολούθως ἔτυχεν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίστει· τῇ γὰρ ἀναστάσει πιστεύσας, διὰ συμβόλων τινῶν ἀποθανόντα αὐτὸν ἐκομίσατο. Τὸ γὰρ ἐν πολλῇ τοῦ θανάτου προσδοκίᾳ γενόμενον μηδὲν παθεῖν, τοῦ ἀληθῶς ἀναστησομένου σύμβολον ἦν, ὅσον τοῦ θανάτου πρὸς βραχὺ γευσάμενος, ἀνέστη μηδὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου παθών· τὸ γοῦν ἐν παραβολῇ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν συμβόλοις.

[2] So Camerarius, who, besides other possibilities of apprehension, suggests also this: *in that he exposed himself to danger, namely, that of losing his son;* Loesner, Krebs, Hein-

Ver. 20. *The example of Isaac.* Comp. Gen. xxvii.—Πίστει καί] καί is the more nearly defining: *and in truth, and in sooth.* A faith was manifested in the imparting of the blessing, by the very circumstance that this benediction extended with inner confidence to facts as yet belonging to the future.[1] Comp. Theodoret: Οὐ γὰρ ἂν τὰς οὐχ ὁρωμένας ἐδωκεν εὐλογίας, εἰ μὴ τοῖς λόγοις ἀκολουθήσειν τὸ ἔργον ἐπίστευσεν.—περὶ μελλόντων] *concerning things as yet future, i. e.* concerning the future lot of his two sons, and the pre-eminence of the younger son over the elder.—Jacob, the younger son, is here first mentioned, since he was first blessed by Isaac, and was altogether of greater significance for the history of the people.

Ver. 21. *The conduct of Jacob,* Gen. xlviii., *analogous to the fact adduced ver.* 20. Here, too, the blessing related to the future, and in like manner as ver. 20, to the pre-eminence of the younger son (Ephraim) over the elder (Manasseh).—ἀποθνήσκων] *when he was dying.* Reference to Gen. xlvii. 31: ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποθνήσκω.—καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ] *and he worshiped* (bowing) *upon the top of his staff, i. e.* in that from weakness he supported himself with his face resting upon the top of his staff. Addition from LXX. Gen. xlvii. 31 (inexactly referred to this place), for the bringing out of the solemn, devotional frame of Jacob in uttering this benediction [the same spirit being breathed in xlix. 18]. In the Hebrew the words read: וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל־רֹאשׁ הַמִּטָּה (*i. e.* according to Tuch: "*and Israel leaned back upon the head of the bed;* but, more correctly, according to Knobel: "*and Israel bowed himself upon the head of the couch,* inasmuch as he had before, during his conversation with Joseph, been sitting upright upon his couch (comp. xlviii. 2), but now leaned forward to the upper end thereof, and blessed God for the granting of the last wish"). The LXX., however, read the vowels הַמַּטֶּה, and their translation was followed by our author in this passage as elsewhere. Strangely does Hofmann perceive in the subordinate particular καὶ προσεκύνησεν κ.τ.λ., a "second thing" adduced as proving the faith of Jacob. The first is, according to him, Jacob's last testament, the second his departure from life (!).—The supposition that τῷ Ἰωσήφ is to be supplemented to προσεκύνησεν,[2] is, equally, with the view akin thereto, that αὐτοῦ is to be referred to Ἰωσήφ, and ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ is to be regarded as the *object* to προσεκύνησεν,[3] to be rejected as untenable. The first-named has against it the fact, that in that which precedes, the discourse is not of Joseph himself, but of his sons; the latter, that the

richis: in summo discrimine, παρ' ἐλπίδα, παραδόξως; Raphel: praeter spem praeterque opinionem; Tholuck: in bold venture.

[1] How Delitzsch has been able so greatly to misunderstand the above words as to read in them the assertion, that περὶ μελλόντων is to be combined with περὶ καί instead of ηὐλόγησεν, I do not comprehend.

[2] So Chrysostom: τουτέστι καὶ γέρων ὢν ἤδη προσεκύνει τῷ Ἰωσήφ, τὴν παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ προσκύνησιν δηλῶν τὴν ἐσομένην αὐτῷ; Theodoret, Photius in Oecumenius, Theophylact, and others.

[3] So the Vulgate: et adoravit fastigium virgae ejus; Primasius: virgae ejus i. e. virgae Jos.: Oecumenius: τοσοῦτον . . . ἐπίστευσε τοῖς ἐσομένοις, ὅτι καὶ προσεκύνησε τῇ ῥάβδῳ, δοκῶν ὁρᾶν τὰ ἐσόμενα; Clarius, Bisping, Reuss: "Jacob, after having received the oath of Joseph, bowed (*s'inclina*) towards the head of the latter's staff, in token of submission, that is to say, in order solemnly to

making of *ἐπί τι* a note of *object* to *προσκυνεῖν* is opposed to all the usage of the language.

Ver. 22. *The example of Joseph.* Comp. Gen. l. 24, 25. Firm faith, that the promise already given to Abraham (Gen. xv. 13–16) should be fulfilled, was it that Joseph, when he was near to death, gave direction as to that which should be done with his bones at the time of the accomplishment of that promise.—*τελευτῶν*] the same as *ἀποθνήσκων*, ver. 21; the choice of the expression was called forth by Gen. l. 26: *καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰωσήφ*.—*περί*] in connection with *μνημονεύειν*, which as at ver. 15 signifies *to make mention*, stands instead of the bare genitive, after the analogy of *μνᾶσθαι περί τινος*. See Kühner, II. p. 186, *Obs.* 1.—*ἡ ἔξοδος τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ*] *the* (future) *departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt.*—*ἐμνημόνευσεν καὶ . . . ἐνετείλατο*] Form of parallel arrangement; while, as regards the matter itself, the second member as an accessory point is subordinated to the first member as the main point.

Vv. 23–29 the author passes over from the patriarchs to Moses, dwelling upon a series of facts in the history of the latter which bear a typical character. First—

Ver. 23 he points to the faith manifested by the relatives of Moses at the time of his birth. Comp. Ex. ii. 2. The special beauty of the newborn child awakened in them the belief[1] that God had chosen him for great things and would be able to preserve his life, and in this belief they hid the child in opposition to the commandment of the Egyptian king.—*ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων*] *i. e. by his parents.*[2] Bengel understands *πατέρες* of the still living ancestors of Moses ("a patribus, id est a patre [Amram] et ab avo . . . paterno, qui erat Kahath"), and he is followed by Chr. Fr. Schmid, Böhme (yet with wavering), and others; while Stein, who expressly rejects both explanations, wonderfully supposes "the mother," together with "a few concurring friends, who as it were took the place of parents," to be intended. In the Hebrew, Ex. ii. 2, the *κρύπτειν* is predicated only of the mother; the LXX., however, with whom the author agrees, have: *ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸ ἀστεῖον, ἐσκέπασαν αὐτὸ μῆνας τρεῖς*.—*ἀστεῖον*] *fair and graceful in form.* Theophylact: *ὡραῖον, τῇ ὄψει χαρίεν.* In the Hebrew stands טוֹב.—*καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως*] might, on account of the plural *οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν*, be considered, together with *εἶδον*, in opposition to the passive *ἐκρύβη*, as still dependent upon *διότι*. But more logically exact is the taking of the words, as also is mostly done, as a parallel to *ἐκρύβη*. For much more natural does it appear that the author wished to represent that *κρύπτειν* as an act from the accomplishment of which fear did not deter, than that he should think of fearlessness

acknowledge Joseph as head of the family. The staff is the symbol of power;" and others.

[1] Kurtz is in a position to add further particulars on this point, inasmuch as he supposes the "presupposition" is to be derived from the state of things narrated, "that a special divine admonition spoke to the parents out of the eyes of the child."

[2] For this elsewhere unusual employment of *πατέρες*, Wetstein aptly directs the reader to Parthenius, *Erot.* 10: *Κυάνιππος εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν Λευκώνης ἐλθών, παρὰ τῶν πατέρων αἰτησάμενος αὐτὴν ἠγάγετο γυναῖκα*, as well as to the Latin *patres*, Stat. *Theb.* vi. 464: Incertique patrum thalami.

as the motive cause of that action.—*τὸ διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως*] *the command of Pharaoh*, to drown all new-born male children of the Israelites. Comp. Ex. i. 22.

Vv. 24-26. Progress from the child Moses to the adult Moses. *μέγας γενόμενος*, namely, corresponds (comp. Ex. ii. 11) to the *γεννηθείς*, ver. 23, and *μέγας* is to be understood not of worldly power and honor (Schulz, Bretschneider), but of being grown up.[1]—*ἠρνήσατο λέγεσθαι*] *refused* or disdained *to be called*.—*θυγατρός*] not *τῆς θυγατρός* is placed (as Ex. ii. 5 ff.), since the author combines *θυγατούς* with *Φαραώ* into one single (more general) notion: *of a Pharaoh's daughter*, i.e. *of an Egyptian royal princess*.

Ver. 25. Justificatory explanation of the *ἠρνήσατο*, ver. 24: *in that he preferred to suffer evil treatment with the people of God, in place of possessing a temporary sinful enjoyment*.—*μᾶλλον αἱρεῖσθαι ἤ*] in Holy Scripture a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*; in profane literature, on the other hand, of very frequent occurrence. Instances in Wetstein.—The compound *συγκακουχεῖσθαι* only here; the simple form *κακουχεῖσθαι* alone (ver. 37, xiii. 3) is found elsewhere.—*τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ*] see at iv. 9.—*πρόσκαιρον ἀπόλαυσιν*] *an enjoyment only temporary, of brief duration*, sc. of the earthly joys of life. Contrast to the enjoyment of everlasting blessedness.—*ἁμαρτίας*] not *genit. objecti* (Theophylact, Schlichting, Schulz, Stein, Stengel, *al.*), but *genit. auct.*: Enjoyment, such as (the committing of) sin affords. By *ἁμαρτία* is meant apostasy from God, by the abandoning of the communion with the people of God. [LXXVII *h*.]

Ver. 26. Indication of cause for ver. 25, in such wise that *ἡγησάμενος*, ver. 26, is subordinated to the *μᾶλλον ἑλόμενος*, ver. 25.—*τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ*] *the reproach of Christ*. That signifies not: *the reproach for Christ's sake*, which he endured, namely, by virtue of the hope in the Messiah (Castellio, Wolf, Carpzov, Böhme, Kuinoel, Bloomfield, and others). For by the mere genitive this notion cannot be expressed. The sense is: *the reproach, as Christ bore it*, inasmuch, namely, as the reproach, which Moses took upon him to endure in fellowship with his oppressed people at the hand of the Egyptians, was in its nature homogeneous with the reproach which Christ afterwards had to endure at the hands of unbelievers, to the extent that in the one case as in the other the glory of God and the advancement of His kingdom was the end and aim of the enduring. Comp. *τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες*, xiii. 13, and *τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 2 Cor. i. 5; as also *τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Col. i 24.—*ἀπέβλεπεν γὰρ εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν*] *for he looked stedfastly to the bestowal of the reward*. The determining ground for his action.—*ἀποβλέπειν* in the N. T. only here.—*ἡ μισθαποδοσία* is *the promised heavenly reward*, the everlasting salvation; comp. vv. 39, 40. Unsuitably does Grotius limit the expression to the promised possession of the land of Canaan.

Ver. 27 [LXXII *i*.] is referred either to the flight of Moses to Midian (Ex. ii. 15), or to the departure of the whole people out of Egypt.[2] Only

[1] Comp. viii. 11; LXX. Gen. xxxviii. 11, 14; Hom. *Od.* ii. 314, xviii. 217, xix. 532.

[2] The former supposition is favored by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theo-

the opinion first mentioned is the correct one. Against it, indeed, the objection appears to be not without weight, that Ex. ii. 14 a *φοβηθῆναι* of Moses is spoken of, whereas here, by means of *μὴ φοβηθεὶς κ.τ.λ.*, the opposite is asserted. But the contradiction is only an apparent one. For in the account of Exodus a fear on the part of Moses is mentioned only in the objective relation, whereas the fearlessness, which the author of our epistle intends, belongs purely to the subjective domain. Moses was alarmed that, contrary to his expectation, the slaying of the Egyptian had already become known, and apprehended as a consequence being exposed to the vengeance of the king, if the latter should obtain possession of him. On this very account also he took steps for the saving of his life, in that he withdrew by flight from the territory of Pharaoh. With this fact, however, it was perfectly reconcilable that in the consciousness of being chosen to be the deliverer of his people, and in the confidence in God, in whose hand alone he stood, he felt himself inwardly, or in his frame of mind, raised above all fear at the wrath of an earthly king. There is therefore no need of the concession (de Wette), that the author of the epistle, when he wrote down his *μὴ φοβηθείς*, did not remember the words *ἐφοβήθη δὲ Μωϋσῆς*, Ex. ii. 14. But just as little is it permissible, with Delitzsch, to press the expression *κατέλιπεν*, chosen by the author, and to assert that *καταλιπεῖν* expresses the repairing hence *without fear*, whereas *φυγεῖν* would denote the repairing hence *from fear*. The author might also have written without difference of signification—what is denied by Delitzsch—*πίστει ἔφυγεν εἰς γῆν Μαδιάμ, μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως*.—The referring, on the other hand, of the statement, ver. 27, to the leading forth of the whole people, is shown to be entirely inadmissible—(1) from the consideration that, in the chronological order which the author pursues in the enumeration of his models of faith, the departure of Israel from Egypt could not have been mentioned before the fact on which he dwells in ver. 28, but only after the same; (2) that to the departure of the people out of Egypt the expression *κατέλιπεν* (*sc.* *Μωϋσῆς*) *Αἴγυπτον* is unsuitable; (3) finally, that according to Ex. xii. 31 that departure was commanded by Pharaoh himself; in connection with the departure, therefore, any fear whatever at the wrath of the king could not arise.—*τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκαρτέρησεν*] *for having the invisible* (God) *as it were before his eyes, he was strong and courageous.* *τὸν ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν* belongs together, and *τὸν ἀόρατον* stands absolutely, without, what is thought most probable by Böhme, as also Delitzsch and Hofmann, our having to supplement *βασιλέα* to the same. Contrary to linguistic usage, Luther, Bengel, Schulz, Paulus, Stengel (wavering), Ebrard combine *τὸν ἀόρατον*

phylact, Zeger, Jac. Cappellus, Heinsius, Calmet, Bengel, Michaelis, Schulz, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bouman (*Chartae theolog* lib. II. Traj. ad Rhen. 1857, p. 157 sq.), Delitzsch, Nickel (in Reuter's *Repertor.* 1858, März, p. 207), Conybeare, Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Ewald; the latter by Nicholas de Lyra, Calvin, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Owen, Calov, Braun, Baumgarten, Carpzov, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Huet, Böhme, Stuart, Kuinoel, Paulus, Klee, Bleek, Stein, Bloomfield, Ebrard, Bisping, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and others.

with *ἐκαρτέρησεν*: *he held firmly to the invisible one as though seeing Him;* according to Ebrard, *καρτερειν τινα* signifies: "to comport oneself stedfastly in regard to some one" (!), and the expression of our passage is supposed to acquire a pregnancy in the sense of *τὸν ἀόρατον τιμῶν ἐκαρτέρησεν* (!). *καρτερεῖν τι* can only denote: *stedfastly to bear or undergo something; καρτερεῖν τινα,* however, cannot be used in Greek.

Ver. 28. Comp. Ex. xii.—*Πίστει*] *in believing confidence, sc.* in the word of God, at whose command he acted, that the blood of the paschal lambs would become the means of delivering the Israelities.—*πεποίηκεν τὸ πάσχα*] *he ordained the Passover.* In the *perfect* there lies the characterization of the regulation then adopted as something *still continuing* in force even to the present. With the notion of the meet *ordering* of the Passover blends consequently the idea of the *institution* thereof; although it is true only *τὸ πάσχα,* not likewise the addition *καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος,* is suitable thereto.—*καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος*] *and the affusion of the blood.* What is intended is the sprinkling or anointing of the door-posts and lintels of the Israelite houses with the blood of the slain paschal lambs, enjoined by Moses at the command of God, Ex. xii. 7, 22 f.—*πρόσχυσις*] in Holy Scripture only here.—*ἵνα μὴ ὁ ὀλοθρεύων τὰ πρωτότοκα θίγῃ αὐτῶν*] *that the slayer of the first-born might not touch them.* By *ὁ ὀλοθρεύων, the destroyer,* the LXX. at Ex. xii. 23 have translated the Hebrew הַמַּשְׁחִית, *the destruction,* thinking in connection therewith of an angel of destruction sent forth by God. Comp. 1 Chron. xxi. 12, 15 (*ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐξολοθρεύων*); 2 Chron. xxxii. 21; Ecclus. xlviii. 21; 1 Cor. x. 10 (*ὁ ὀλοθρευτής*).—*τὰ πρωτότοκα*] Ex. xii. 12: *πᾶν πρωτότοκον . . . ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους.* Comp. *ibid.* ver. 29. We have to construe *τὰ πρωτότοκα* with *ὁ ὀλοθρεύων,* not, as Klee, Paulus, Ebrard, and Hofmann will, with *θίγῃ,* since the combination of *θιγγάνειν* with an accusative is not usual.—*αὐτῶν*] namely *the Israelites.* This reference of the *αὐτῶν* was self-evident from the connection, although the Israelites are not previously mentioned. See Winer, p. 138 f. [E. T. 147].

Ver. 29. Comp. Ex. xiv. 22 ff.—*Πίστει*] Oecumenius: *ἐπίστευσαν γὰρ διαβήσεσθαι καὶ διέβησαν· τοσοῦτον οἶδεν ἡ πίστις καὶ τὰ ἀδύνατα δυνατὰ ποιεῖν.*—*διέβησαν*] namely, *the Israelites under Moses.*—*ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς γῆς*] *as through dry, firm land.* The less usual *διά* with the genitive, alternating with the ordinary accusative in connection with *διαβαίνειν,* was probably occasioned by the reading of the LXX. Ex. xiv. 29 (*οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπορεύθησαν διὰ ξηρᾶς ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης*).—*ἧς πεῖραν λαβόντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι κατεπόθησαν*] *in the essaying of which the Egyptians were drowned.*—*ἧς* refers back to *τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν,* not, as Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Stein, Stengel, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Kurtz suppose, to *ξηρᾶς γῆς.* For the former is the main thought, of which the readers are reminded anew by *κατεπόθησαν,* whereas *ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς* contains only a subsidiary feature, attached by way of comparison.—*πεῖραν λαμβάνειν τινός* stands here in the *active* sense. Otherwise ver. 36—*καταπίνεσθαι,* however (comp. Ex. xv. 4), is a more general expression for the more definite *καταποντίζεσθαι,* which latter (*κατεποντίσθησαν*) is found also in our passage, in some cursives, as likewise with Chrysostom and Theodoret.

Ver. 30. The example of faith afforded by the Israelite people in connection with the siege of Jericho, Josh. vi.—Πίστει] *on the ground of faith*, which, namely, the people displayed. Wrongly Grotius, who supposes πίστει is to be construed with κυκλωθέντα.—ἐπέσαν] On the plural of the verb with the *neuter* plur., see Winer, p. 479 [E. T. 514 f.].—κυκλωθέντα] *after they* (daily with the ark of the covenant, heralded by trumpet blast) *had been encircled* (incorrectly Schulz, and others: *beleaguered*).—ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας] *for seven days, seven days long.* Comp. Winer, p. 381 [E. T. 408].

Ver. 31. The *example of the Gentile woman Rahab*, Josh. ii., vi. 17, 22 ff. Her conduct had proceeded from the recognition that the God of the Israelities is a God in heaven and upon earth, and from the confidence thereon based, that this God would lead them to victory. Comp. Josh. ii. 9 ff.—Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη] Comp. Jas. ii. 25; Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* c. 12. The epithet ἡ πόρνη is to be left in its literal sense. To interpret it, with Jac. Cappellus, Valckenaer, Heinrichs, and others, after the precedent of the Chaldee paraphrase and the Arabian version, by *the hostess*, or, with Hofmann, *the harlots' hostess*, or, with Braun and others, *the heathen woman*, or finally, with Koppe (in Heinrichs) and others, *the idolatress*, is arbitrary. The designation of Rahab as ἡ πόρνη is an *historic* characterization, in accordance with Josh. ii. 2, vi. 17 ff., and without any ground of offence. For it has already been rightly observed by Calvin: "hoc (epitheton) ad anteactam vitam referri certum est; resipiscentiae enim testis est fides." Comp. further, Matt. xxi. 31, 32.—τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν] the inhabitants of Jericho. They had shown themselves disobedient, because they had resisted the people of God (Josh. vi. 1), although not to them either had the mighty deeds of this God remained unknown (Josh. ii. 10).—δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκόπους μετ' εἰρήνης] *seeing she had received the spies with peace, i.e.* without practising acts of hostility towards them, to which she might have been incited by reason of their nationality.

Vv. 32–40. On account of the multitude of models of faith which are still to be found in the O. T., the author must abandon the attempt of presenting them singly to the readers. He relinquishes, therefore, the previous description in detail, and briefly sums up that to which he could further call attention. He mentions first, at ver. 32, another series of heroes of the faith; and then portrays in general rubrics their deeds of faith, and that in such form that ver. 33 . . . ἄλλοι, ver. 35, deeds of *victorious* faith are brought into relief, and thence to the end of ver. 38 deeds of *suffering* faith.

Ver. 32. Καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω;] *And to what end do I still speak? i.e.* what need is there yet, after that which has already been mentioned, of a further description in detail? and what end can it serve, since, considering the abundance of the historic material, an exhaustive presentation is surely impossible?—λέγω] is *indicative*. See Winer, p. 267 [E. T. 284].—ἐπιλείπειν] only here in the N. T.—ἐπιλείψει με γὰρ διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος. περὶ Γεδεὼν κ.τ.λ.] *for the time will not suffice me for relating of Gideon*, etc.[1] ὁ χρόνος]

[1] Comp. Demosth. *de Corona*, ed. Reisk. p. 324: ἐπιλείψει με λέγοντα ἡ ἡμέρα τὰ τῶν προδοτῶν ὀνόματα; Julian. *Orat.* 1, p. 341 B: ἐπιλείψει με τἀκείνου διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος.

Oecumenius: *ὁ χρόνος ὁ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, φησίν, ἁρμόδιος καὶ οἷον ἡ συμμετρία*; Theophylact: *ποῖος; ἡ ὁ πᾶς· εἰρηται δὲ τοῦτο, ὡς σύνηθες ἡμῖν λέγειν, ὑπερβολικῶς· ἡ ὁ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ σύμμετρος.—περὶ Γεδεὼν καὶ Βαρὰκ κ.τ.λ.*] *of Gideon, as well as of Barak*, etc. That here too, in connection with the correct text, the regard to chronology is not lost sight of, see in the critical remark.—On *Gideon*, comp. Judg. vi.–viii.; on *Barak*, Judg. iv., v., on *Samson*, Judg. xiii.–xvi.; on *Jephthah*, Judg. xi. 1–xii. 7.—The last double member is yet enlarged by the addition *καὶ τῶν προφητῶν* to *Σαμουήλ*, because Samuel opened the series of the prophets; cf. Acts iii. 24.

Ver. 33. *Οἱ διὰ πίστεως κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας*] *who by virtue of faith subdued kingdoms.* The *διὰ πίστεως* with emphasis placed at the head dominates the whole description following, so that it continues equally to sound forth in connection with all the finite verbs as far as *περιῆλθον*, ver 37.—*οἱ*, however, connects in a lax manner that which follows with that which precedes, in so far as, vv. 33, 34, respect is had, in part at least, to yet other persons besides those mentioned ver. 32. As regards the subject-matter, therefore, there would have been more accurately written in place of the mere *οἱ*: "who with others like-minded."—*καταγωνίζεσθαι* further, in the N. T. a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, signifies *to get the better of* or *overpower*. With Böhme to attach to the same the signification: "to acquire by fighting" ("certamine sibi paraverunt regna; quod nostra lingua succinctius ita dixeris: *sie haben sich Herrscherwürden erkämpft*"), is opposed to the *usus loquendi*.—The statement itself for the rest is true, as of David, who vanquished the Philistines (2 Sam. v. 17–25, viii. 1, xxi. 15 ff.), Moabites, Syrians, Edomites (2 Sam. viii. 2 ff.), and Ammonites (2 Sam. x., xii. 26 ff.), so also of the four judges, mentioned ver. 32, inasmuch as Gideon smote the Midianites (Judg. vii.), Barak the Canaanites (Judg. iv.), Samson the Philistines (Judg. xiv. ff.), Jephthah the Ammonites (Judg. xi.).—*εἰργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην*] *wrought righteousness and justice*, namely, for their subjects, in virtue of their quality as judges or kings. Comp. *ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην*, 2 Sam. viii. 15; 1 Chron. xviii. 14; 2 Chron. ix. 8, *al.* Too generally Erasmus, Schlichting, Grotius, Schulz, Stein, and others (comp. already Theodoret: *τοῦτο κοινὸν τῶν ἁγίων ἁπάντων*): *they did that which was morally good or pious.*—*ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν*] *obtained promises*, i. e. either: *came into the possession of blessings which God had promised them*,[1] or: *received words of promise on the part of God*.[2] Either interpretation is admissible. Yet in the first case, that no contradiction with ver. 39 (comp. also ver. 13) may arise, only, what the absence of the article before *ἐπαγγελιῶν* also permits, blessings and successes of earthly nature could be meant. In the first case, one may think of Judg. vii. 7 and the like, while in the second case the words are specially to be

Parallel is also the Latin: *deficit me dies, tempus*, *e. g.* Liv. xxviii. 41: Dies me deficiat, si . . . numerare velim; Cic. *pro Rosc. Amer.* c. 32, init.: tempus, hercule, te citius, quam oratio deficeret. Further instances (also from Philo) see in Wetstein and Bleek.

[1] Piscator, Owen, Huët, Böhme, Stuart, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority.

[2] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Schlichting, Primasius, [Whitby?], Bleek, Ebrard, Kurtz, *al*

referred to the Messianic promises given to David and the prophets.—*ἐφραξαν στόματα λεόντων*] *closed the jaws of lions.* Comp. with regard to *Daniel*, Dan. vi. 22 (1 Macc. ii. 60); with regard to *Samson*, Judg. xiv. 6; with regard to *David*, 1 Sam. xvii. 34 ff.

Ver. 34. *Ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρός*] *Quenched the violence of fire* (fire's violence).[1] To be compared is the statement with regard to Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, the three companions of Daniel, Dan. iii. Comp. 1 Macc. ii. 59: *Ἀνανίας, Ἀζαρίας, Μισαὴλ πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν ἐκ φλογός.*—*ἐφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας*] *escaped the swordpoints; e.g. David*, comp. 1 Sam. xviii. 11, xix. 10, 12, xxi. 10; *Elijah*, comp. 1 Kings xix. 1 ff.; *Elisha*, comp. 2 Kings vi. 14 ff., 31 ff.—*ἐνεδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας*] *out of weakness were made strong.* These words Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, and Theophylact refer to *the strengthening of the whole people by liberation from the Babylonian captivity;* Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Owen, Heinrichs, Huët, Böhme, Stuart, Stein, Tholuck, Ebrard, and the majority, partly exclusively, partly, among other things, to *the recovery of Hezekiah* (2 Kings xx.; Isa. xxxviii.); certainly more correct, however, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Bleek, de Wette, Hofmann, to *the reinvigoration of the weakened Samson* (Judg. xvi. 28 ff.).—*ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ*] *waxed valiant in battle.* Theodoret *καὶ οἱ προῤῥηθέντες καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ματταθίου παῖδες Ἰούδας καὶ Ἰωνάθης καὶ Σίμων.* That the author was thinking of the Maccabees also, in particular, in addition to the judges and David, is certainly very probable.—*παρεμβολὰς ἐκλιναν ἀλλοτρίων*] *Made armies of aliens flinch* or give way. Theodoret: *τὸ αὐτὸ διαφόρως εἰρηκεν.*—*παρεμβολή*, as מַחֲנֶה, in the signification of *army;* likewise Judg. iv. 16, vii. 14; 1 Macc. v. 28, 45, and frequently. With the Greeks this signification of the word is rare.[2]—*κλίνειν*, in the sense indicated, is found in Holy Scripture only here.

Ver. 35. *Ἔλαβον γυναῖκες ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν*] *Women received back their dead* (their sons) *through resurrection.* Those meant are the widow of Sarepta (1 Kings xvii. 17 ff.), whose son was awakened out of death by Elijah, and the Shunammite woman (2 Kings iv. 18 ff.), whose son was raised by Elisha. Far-fetched is the supposition of Biesenthal (in Guericke's *Zeitschr. f. die ges. luther. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1866, H. 4, p. 616 ff.): reference is made to the tradition, preserved to us in the rabbinical and talmudic literature, of the cessation of the dying away of the male population in the wilderness on the 15th Ab.—Syntactically ver. 35 begins a new proposition (against Böhme, who, as unnaturally as possible, makes the statement *ἔλαβον . . . αὐτῶν* still dependent on *οἵ*, ver. 33, and regards *γυναῖκες* as apposition to *οἱ*).—With *ἄλλοι δέ*, to the close of ver. 38, the discourse passes over to examples of a *suffering* faith, which remained still unrewarded upon earth.—*ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν*] *Others, on the other hand, were stretched on the rack.* Allusion to the martyr-death of Eleazar (2 Macc. vi. 18 ff.), and of the seven Maccabean brothers, together with their

[1] Theophylact: *οὐκ εἶπε δὲ ἔσβεσαν πῦρ ἀλλὰ δύναμιν πυρός, ὃ καὶ μεῖζον· ἐξαπτόμενον γὰρ ὅλως δύναμιν τοῦ καίειν οὐκ εἶχε κατ' αὐτῶν.*

[2] Comp., however, Aelian, *Var. Hist.* xiv. 46: *Πνίκα δὲ ἔδει συμμίξαι, ἐνταῦθα οἱ μὲν κύνες προπηδῶντες ἐτάραττον τὴν παρεμβολήν.*

mother (2 Macc. vii.). τυμπανίζεσθαι means: to be stretched out upon the τύμπανον (comp. 2 Macc. vi. 19, 28), an instrument of torture (probably wheel-shaped, Josephus, *de Macc.* c. 5, 9, 10: τροχός),—to be stretched out like the skin of a kettledrum, in order then to be tortured to death by blows (comp. 2 Macc. vi. 30).—οὐ προσδεξάμενοι] *not accepting, i. e* since the expression, by reason of the objective negation οὐ, blends into a single notion: *disdaining.*—τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν] *the deliverance*, namely the earthly one, which they could have gained by the renouncing of their faith. Comp. 2 Macc. vi. 21 ff., vii. 27 ff.—ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν] *that they might become partakers of a better resurrection.* Motive for the contemning of earthly deliverance. Comp. 2 Macc. vii. 9, 11, 14, 20, 23, 29, 36, as also 2 Macc. vi. 26. κρείττονος stands not in opposition to the resurrection of the ungodly unto judgment, Dan. xii. 2,[1] neither does it form any antithesis to ἐξ ἀναστάσεως in the beginning of the verse,[2] which is too remote; but corresponds to the ἀπολύτρωσιν immediately preceding. A much higher possession was the resurrection to the eternal, blessed life, than the temporal deliverance from death; which latter could be regarded, likewise, as a sort of resurrection, but truly only as a lower and valueless one.

Ver. 36. *Others endured mockings and scourges, yea, moreover, bonds and prison.* Ἕτεροι, in accordance with its verbal signification, introduces a heterogeneous class of heroes of the faith, *i. e.* a particular species of the ἄλλοι, mentioned as the genus ver. 35. As regards the subject itself, indeed, inexact, since, ver. 35, with ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν κ.τ.λ. reference was made not merely to 2 Macc. vi., but—as the addition ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν clearly shows—at the same time to 2 Macc. vii.; the mention, however, of the scourging along with the mocking seems to admit of explanation only from the author's referring to 2 Macc. vi. 30 (μαστιγούμενος) and vii. 1 (μάστιξί καὶ νευραῖς αἰκιζομένους), as indeed the enduring of public mockery is expressly mentioned (in addition to 1 Macc. ix. 26) at 2 Macc. vii. 7 (τὸν δεύτερον ἦγον ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμπαιγμόν), and again 2 Macc. vii. 10 (μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ὁ τρίτος ἐνεπαίζετο). On the other hand, however, it seems evident that it was the intention of the writer at ver. 36 in reality to draw attention to a dissimilar class of men; from the fact, even apart from the choice of the expression ἕτεροι, that in the case of the previous ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν κ.τ.λ. we are constrained to think of a death by martyrdom, while at ver. 36 the enhancing ἔτι δέ forbids our thinking of the martyr's death, since, according to this, bonds and dungeon were a more severe trial than mocking and scourging. We must therefore suppose that the author designed further to refer to those, as forming a special category, who, without suffering actual death, were exposed to other kinds of tortures and miseries; that he still derived, however, the main colors for this new picture

[1] Oecumenius: κρείττονος . . . ἤ οἱ λοιποὶ ἄνθρωποι· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάστασις πᾶσι κοινή, ἀλλ' οὗτοι ἀναστήσονται, φησίν, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ οὗτοι εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον. Comp. Theophylact.

[2] Chrysostom: οὐ τοιαύτης, οἵας τὰ παιδία τῶν γυναικῶν; Theophylact, who does not, however, decide; Bengel, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Stengel, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 617, *Obs.*; Alford, Maier, Kurtz, and others.

from the historic figure which but just now had been present to his mind in connection with the ἐτυμπανίσθησαν κ.τ.λ.—The enhancing ἔτι δέ is to be explained from the fact that ἐμπαιγμοὶ καὶ μάστιγες denotes the *more transient* suffering, in point of time more brief; δεσμοὶ καὶ φυλακή, on the other hand, the *longer enduring* sufferings.—πεῖραν λαμβάνειν] here in the passive sense: *to have experience of something.* Otherwise ver. 29.—δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῆς] Comp. 1 Macc. xiii. 12; 1 Kings xxii. 27; Jer. xxxvii., xxxviii., *al.*

Ver. 37. Ἐλιθάσθησαν] *They were stoned.* To be referred to Zechariah, son of Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiv. 20–22; comp. Matt. xxiii. 35; Luke xi. 51), and probably also to Jeremiah, of whom at least later tradition reports death by stoning.[1] Less suitably do Oecumenius, Theophylact, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, and others think also of Naboth, 1 Kings xxi.—ἐπρίσθησαν] *were sawn asunder.* Death by sawing asunder (comp. 2 Sam. xii. 31; 1 Chron. xx. 3) was, according to early tradition, that suffered by Isaiah at the hands of Manasseh, king of Judah.[2]—ἐπειράσθησαν] *were tempted.* [LXXVII *f.*] This general statement has about it something strange and inconvenient, inasmuch as it occurs in the midst of the mention of different kinds of violent death. Some, therefore, have been in favor of entirely deleting ἐπειράσθησαν,[3] in doing which, however, we are not justified by external evidence;[4] while others have thought that ἐπειράσθησαν is a corruption, in itself early, of the original text, which latter must be restored by conjecture. It has been conjectured by Beza, edd. 3, 4, 5, that we have to read ἐπυρώθησαν; Gataker, *Miscell.* 44, Colomesius, *Observ.* 5, Moll, and Hofmann: ἐπρήσθησαν; Fr. Junius, *Parall.* lib. iii., and Piscator: ἐπυράσθησαν; Sykes and Ebrard: ἐπυρίσθησαν, *they were burned.*[5] Further, Luther (transl.), Beza, edd. 1 and 2, Knatchbull, Fischer, *Prolusa. de vitiis Lexic. N. T.* p. 538; Ewald, p. 171, read ἐπάρθησαν (?), from πείρω, *they were pierced, transfixed;* Wakefield, *Silv. crit.* ii. 62: ἐπειράθησαν, from περάω (?), *they were spitted, impaled;* Tanaq. Faber, *Epp. crit.* ii. 14, and J. M. Gesner in Carpzov: ἐπηρώθησαν, *they were mutilated;* Alberti: ἐσπειράσθησαν or ἐσπειράθησαν, from σπεῖρα (?), *they were broken on the wheel;* Steph. le Moyne in Gronov. *Int. Gr.* vii. p. 301: ἐπράθησαν, *they were sold.* Others yet other conjectures; see Wetstein, Griesbach, and Scholz *ad loc.* Bleek, too, assumes an error in the text, in that he holds a word which signifies "to be consumed,

[1] Comp. Tertull. *Scorpiac.* 8; Hieronym. *adv. Jovinian.* ii. 37; Pseudo-Epiphan. (*Opp.* ii. p. 239), *al.*

[2] See *Ascens. Jes. vat.* v. 11–14; Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 120; Tertull. *de Patient.* 14, *Scorpiac.* 8; Origen, *Epist. ad African.*; Lactant. *Institt.* iv. 11, *al.*; *Tr. Jevamoth*, f. 49. 2; *Sanhedrin*, f. 103. 2.

[3] Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Marloratus, Grotius, Hammond, Whitby, Calmet, Storr, Valckenaer, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Delitzsch, Maier, *al.*

[4] It is wanting only in some cursives, in the Peshito,—whose daughter, the Arabian version in Erpen., also omits it,—in the Aethiopic version, which also omits ἐπρίσθησαν, with Origen (once, as compared with four times), Euseb. and Theophyl.

[5] Reuss, too, regards ἐπυρίσθησαν [as does Conybeare ἐπυράσθησαν] as the most likely conjecture, but regards it, likewise, as possible: "que le ἐπειράσθησαν dans le texte vulgaire ne fût qu'une conjecture très superflue, destinée à remplacer le mot ἐπρίσθησαν (ils furent sciés), parce que l'Ancien Testament ne fournit pas d'exemple de ce dernier supplice."

to perish by fire," as *ἐπρήσθησαν*, which is found with Cyrill. Hieros., and in Codd. 110, 111 for *ἐπρίσθησαν*, or *ἐπυρισθησαν*, or even one of the forms more commonly employed for the expressing of this idea,—*ἐνεπρήσθησαν* and *ἐνεπυρίσθησαν*,—to be the original reading, and then supposes the author perhaps to have thought once more of martyrs under the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes, 2 Macc. vi. 11, vii. 4 f.; Dan. xi. 33, *al.*[1] Similarly Reiche, *Commentar. Crit.* p. 111 sqq., who leaves open the choice between *ἐπρήσθησαν* and *ἐπυρώθησαν*.—If *ἐπειράσθησαν* is genuine, it must have been added by the author for the sake of the paronomasia with *ἐπρίσθησαν*, and be referred to the enticements and temptations to escape a violent death by means of apostasy (comp. *e. g.* 2 Macc. vii. 24).—*ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον*] *died by slaughter of the sword.* Comp. 1 Kings xix. 10: *τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ*; Jer. xxvi. 23: *καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ* (namely, the prophet Urijah). For the expression *ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας*, comp. LXX. Ex. xvii. 13; Num. xxi. 24; Deut. xiii. 15, xx. 13.—*περιῆλθον . . . τῆς γῆς*, ver. 38, now further emphasizes the fact that the whole *life* of the last-named class of the heroes of faith was one of want and distress.—*περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν*] refers specially to single prophets. Comp. Zech. xiii. 4.[2]—*περιῆλθον*] *they went hither and thither*, without being in possession of a fixed dwelling-place. Theophylact: *τὸ δὲ περιῆλθον τὸ διώκεσθαι αὐτοὺς δηλοῖ καὶ ἀστατεῖν.*— *ἐν*] *in, i. e.* clothed with.—*ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν*] *in sheep-skins, in goat fells.* The latter, as designation of a yet rougher clothing, is an ascent from the former, and on that account placed last. *μηλωτή*, the hide of smaller cattle in general, and specially of sheep. A *μηλωτή* is mentioned as the garment of Elijah, which, on his being caught up to heaven, he left behind to Elisha, 1 Kings xix. 13, 19; 2 Kings viii. 13, 14.—*ὑστερούμενοι, θλιβόμενοι, κακουχούμενοι*] *in want* (*sc.* of that which is necessary for the sustenance of life), *affliction, evil-treatment* (comp. ver. 25).

Ver. 38. *Ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος*] *Men, to possess whom the* (corrupt) *world* (ver. 7) *was not worthy.*[3]—*ὧν*] goes back to the subject in *περιῆλθον*, ver. 37. In a forced manner Böhme (as also Kuinoel, Klee, and Stein): it points to that which follows, and the sense is: oberravisse illos in desertis tales, quibus vulgus hominum, ut esse soleat, pravum ac impium, haud dignum fuerit, quocum illi eodem loco versarentur. Not less unnaturally does Hofmann look upon *ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος* as only a following definition

[1] Comp. also Philo, *ad Flacc.* p. 990 A (with Mangey, II. p. 542): *κατελύθησάν τινες* (*sc.* Alexandrine Jews, by Flaccus) *καὶ ζῶντες οἱ μὲν ἐνεπρήσθησαν οἱ δὲ διὰ μέσης κατεσύρησαν ἀγορᾶς, ἕως ὅλα τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐδαπανήθη.*

[2] Also Clemens Romanus, *ad Corinth.* 17: *μιμηταὶ γενώμεθα κἀκείνων, οἵτινες ἐν δέρμασιν αἰγείοις καὶ μηλωταῖς περιεπάτησαν, κηρύσσοντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· λέγομεν δὲ Ἠλίαν καὶ Ἐλισσαῖον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰεζεκιὴλ τοὺς προφήτας.*

[3] Theophylact: *Οὐκ ἔχετε, φησιν, εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἁμαρτωλοί ὄντες τοιαῦτα ἔπασχον, ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτοι, οἷοι καὶ τοῦ κόσμου αὐτοῦ τιμιώτεροι εἶναι.* Calvin: Quum ita profugi inter feras vagabantur sancti prophetae, videri poterant indigni, quos terra sustineret. Qui fit enim, ut inter homines locum non inveniant? Sed apostolus in contrariam partem hoc retorquet, nempe quod mundus illis non esset dignus. Nam quocunque veniant servi Dei, ejus benedictionem, quasi fragrantiam boni odoris, secum afferunt.

of subject to *περιῆλθον*, in that he begins a new section of the discourse with *περιῆλθον*. To a yet greater extent, finally, has Carpzov missed the true interpretation, when, taking *ὧν* as a *neuter*, he supplies *κακῶν* (*ὑστερήσεων, θλίψεων*), and gives as the sense: quorum indignus malorum erat mundus. Id est: tam crudelibus affecti sunt suppliciis, ut illa mundo indigna sint; ut orbem terrarum non deceat, tam horrenda ac *φοβερώτατα* de eo dici.—*ἐν ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι κ.τ.λ.*] *wandering in deserts and upon mountains, and in caves and the clefts* [clifts] *of the earth.* Comp. 1 Kings xviii. 4, 13, xix. 4, 8, 9, 13; 1 Macc. ii. 28, 29; 2 Macc. v. 27, vi. 11, x. 6.

Vv. 39, 40. General remark in closing.—*Καὶ οὗτοι πάντες*] *And these all.* Refers back to the totality of the persons named, from ver. 4 (not merely, as Schlichting, Hammond, and Storr suppose, to those mentioned from *ἄλλοι δέ*, ver. 35).—*μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως*] *although by virtue of their faith they received a* (glorious) *testimony* (in Scripture).—*οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν*] *did not bear away the promise* (wrongly Ebrard: the aorist stands "pro plusquamperf."), *i. e.* attained not, so long as they lived, to the possession of that which was promised, namely, the Messianic blessedness.

Ver. 40. [LXXVII *k*.] The ground for the *οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν* lay in the decree of God, that those believers should not apart from us attain to the consummation.—*τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν κρεῖττόν τι προβλεψαμένου*] *God having, with regard to us, foreseen* (pre-determined) *something better.*—*προβλέπειν*] in the N. T. only here.—On account of the emphatically preposed *περὶ ἡμῶν*, which forms the contrast to *οὗτοι πάντες*, ver. 39, *κρεῖττόν τι* cannot be placed *absolutely:* "Something better than would otherwise have been our portion" (Schlichting, Seb. Schmidt, Huët). With this thought, moreover, *ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσιν* would not have been in keeping, since, instead thereof, *ἵνα σὺν αὐτοῖς τελειωθῶμεν* must have been written. The sense can only be: *in regard to us something better than in regard to them.* In regard to us something better, inasmuch as when they lived the appearing of the Redeemer as yet belonged to the distant future, and was an object of longing desire (Matt. xiii. 16 f.; Luke x. 23 f.); but now Christ has in reality appeared, has accomplished the redemption, and presently after a brief interval will return, to bring to full realization the Messianic kingdom with all its blessings of salvation. Comp. x. 25, 36 f.—*ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσιν*] Declaration of the *divine design: that they not without us should attain to the consummation.* Without us, *i. e.* without our having entered into the joint participation in the consummation, they would have attained to the consummation, if Christ had already appeared in their time, and so they had already attained during their lifetime to the possession of the promised Messianic bliss. For then *we* should not have been born at all; since, according to the declaration of the Lord (Matt. xxii. 30; Mark xii. 25; Luke xx. 35 f.), in the consummated kingdom of God a marrying and being given in marriage will no longer take place.

Notes by American Editor.

LXXV. Ver. 1.

(*a*) The definition of faith, which is given in this verse, is, as Lünem. remarks, not an exhaustive one, and it is, undoubtedly, not intended to be so. It sets forth only that element or characteristic of faith which the subject under discussion suggests. There is no evidence, therefore, in this verse, that the writer did not have the same view of faith which Paul had. Indeed, Paul's idea of faith was that of trust; and this, in relation to the unseen and unrealized things of the future, is, and must be, just what this author here says: conviction and assured confidence. Had Paul discoursed upon the subject of this epistle and moved along the line of this writer's general plan, he might well—not to say, must—have expressed himself in substantially the same way. The evidence against the Pauline authorship of the epistle is not to be found in the Christian ideas which it presents, but in the style and plan, the rhetorical character and modes of expression, the points, in a word, which justify what Origen says—that the *νοήματα* are the Apostle's, but the *φράσις καὶ σύνθεσις* belong to another. The author was a Pauline disciple, who had no new system of thought, but who wrote his epistle by and for himself. He was Apollos, rather than Paul.

(*b*) The two peculiarities of the things revealed by the N. T. system, as related to stedfast perseverance, are that they are objects of hope (being not yet realized), and that they are unseen. Faith, as the thing demanded by the N. T. system, has that which answers to each of these peculiarities:—it is *ὑπόστασις* in the former aspect, and *ἔλεγχος* in the latter. The meaning of these two words is thus made clear. *ὑπόστασις* is *confidence* (comp. iii. 14), and *ἔλεγχος* is *conviction*. That this is the true interpretation is confirmed by the fact that, inasmuch as faith is subjective to the mind, the things which are declared to be equivalent to or descriptive of it must also be subjective. The rendering of *ἔλεγχος* by A. R. V., *a conviction* (Lünem.: a firm inner persuasion) is, accordingly, to be preferred to the renderings given by R. V. text, *the proving*, and R. V. marg., *the test*.

LXXVI. Vv. 2, 3.

(*a*) That the author's design in the remaining verses of the chapter is to illustrate the nature of faith, as thus defined, and as that in the sphere of which the *ὑπομονή*, or stedfast endurance, is to be maintained to the end, is evident both from the *γάρ* of ver. 2 and the opening verses of ch. xii. The *γάρ* of ver. 2 covers in its force the sentence which fills that verse. As the persons referred to in all the following verses, however, are included in the "elders" who are mentioned in this sentence, the force of this *γάρ* extends, in thought, to the end of the chapter.—(*b*) It is noticeable that ver. 3 follows the general statement of ver. 2. It would seem, therefore, that the author must have intended, in some way, to bring this verse within the historic review of the O. T., and to give it, in some sense, a parallelism with the individual cases or records which follow. As de W. remarks: On opening the book of examples (the O. T.) he did not find, indeed, an example of faith at the very beginning—as he did afterwards in the record—but a proof of the necessity of faith. For this or a kindred reason, we may believe that he introduced this verse into his list of illustrations.—(*c*) The inaptness which Lünem. finds in the insertion of this verse is not to be especially insisted upon, because—

although the movement of faith here is not precisely in the line of that in the following verses—the fact, that even with reference to the beginning of all earthly things we can only have conviction of the unseen, lies directly in the course of proving the necessity of continuing in faith, which is the fundamental thought of the entire passage in its relation to what precedes and follows.—(*d*) *εἰς τό* is taken by Lünem. in the telic sense, and probably rightly. It does not appear to be so clear, however, that *εἰς τό* with the infinitive always, and necessarily, has this sense, and not the ecbatic, as it does in the case of *ἵνα* with the subjunctive. *εἰς* suggests the end of motion, and this may convey the idea of *the result*, as well as of *the purpose*.—(*e*) *μή* belongs, as Lünem. takes it, with the whole object-sentence. "In all that we see with our sense, of re-creation and reproduction," says Alford, "*τὸ βλεπόμενον ἐκ φαινομένου γέγονεν*. The seed becomes the plant; the grub the moth. But that which is above sight, viz., faith, leads us to apprehend, that this has not been so in the first instance: that the visible world has not been made out of apparent materials."

LXXVII. Vv. 4–40.

In these verses the following points may be briefly noticed:—(*a*) *ἐμαρτυρήθη* (ver. 4). This verb seems here, and in the other cases where it is used in this chapter, to refer to the testimony given or implied in the O. T.—(*b*) The words *πρὸ τῆς μεταθέσεως* (ver. 5) may, indeed, be connected either with *μεμαρτύρηται* or with *εὐαρεστηκέναι*. As it seems to be of no moment, however, to the author's purpose to state the *time* of the O. T. testimony, that Enoch was well-pleasing to God—whether this testimony was given, in the record, before or after his translation;—but is of consequence, that his pleasing God, which involved faith, was the cause of his translation, as shown by the O. T. declaration that the former preceded the latter,—the connection with *εὐαρεστηκέναι* is to be preferred. The point of the author's thought, in all cases, seems to be that the O. T. witness was given and still remains, but not that it was given at one period or another in the history of the person to whom reference is made.—(*c*) The reference of the phrase *δικαιοσύνης κατὰ πίστιν* to the thought suggested by the words of x. 38, which is the starting-point of this chapter, can hardly be overlooked. The allusion to Gen. vi. 9. where Noah is called righteous, is also probable. The similarity of the expression to the Pauline *δικ. ἐκ πίστ.*, and yet the difference in respect to the preposition, will not fail to be noticed by all careful readers. We must determine the question as to the writer's idea in the use of this phrase in view of these points. It may be remarked, 1. that though it does not seem absolutely necessary to give to *δικαιοσύνη* here the Pauline sense—i. e. the condition of being declared right by God as before His tribunal,—the suggestion of x. 38, as the author employs the words of that verse, is, nevertheless, favorable to this sense; 2. that the contrast with the verb *κατέκρινεν*, which is, to say the least, hinted at, favors the same meaning; 3. that the striking similarity to the Pauline phrase is most easily explained by giving *δικ.* this sense; and 4. that the use of *κληρονόμος* adds some force to the previous considerations. We may say, therefore, either that the writer's idea coincides with that of Paul, or, if this be not certain, that it presupposes the existence of the Pauline doctrine.—(*d*) The fact that the author uses *κατὰ πίστιν*, and not *ἐκ πίστεως*, and the fact that he does not use the phrase with reference to Abraham, are both to be accounted for in the same way. He is not discussing the doctrine of justification, but presenting circumstances in the

history of O. T. saints which indicated their trust in God, through their confidence in things hoped for or a conviction respecting things not seen. The prominent acts of Abraham's life evidencing his faith, rather than the statement that he was justified by faith, were adapted to impress the thought of ὑπομονή in the line of faith on the minds of the readers.—(*e*) From the history of Abraham the four great facts are selected, which were especially connected with the covenant and salvation:—his obedience to the call of God, his sojourning in the land of promise, the birth, and the sacrifice of Isaac. With the birth of Isaac, Sarah is mentioned, as an additional illustration of faith. The presentation of the case of Abraham is so truly Pauline in its suggestions, that the Pauline influence on the author's thinking can scarcely fail to be noticed. But the turn of the discourse is all towards his hope of the future and faith in the unseen, not towards his justification.—(*f*) The explanation of κατὰ πίστιν (ver. 13) given by Lünem., is the correct one: namely, that the words qualify, not ἀπέθανον only, but that verb in union with the participles. The phrase seems, more probably, to mean *in accordance with*—as equivalent to: *in the line of faith* they died, with a greeting of the promises from afar, than as implying that their thus dying was (so Lünem.) conformable to the nature of faith. The insertion of vv. 13–16 before ver. 17 is, not improbably, to be explained by the fact that, to the author's mind, the beginning of the development of the plan of salvation was at the deliverance of Isaac from death. This was the starting-point of a new history, and, before turning to it, he sums up, as it were, the heroic elements of the faith of the earliest saints.

(*g*) παραβολή of ver. 19 is hardly to be explained, with Lünem., as connected with παραβάλλεσθαι, in the sense *to expose to danger*, because of the doubt as to whether the noun ever has this sense in Greek usage previous to this writer's time, and certainly does not anywhere else in the N. T. It is, however, favored by Grimm (Lex N. T.), and, if the meaning *imperilling* or *giving up* can be allowed, the explanation of the καί is more simple and easy than with any other meaning. If we adopt the ordinary sense of the word, we may here understand it as equivalent to *figure*, rather than *parable*. But it is more than ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν.—(*h*) The expressions πρόσκαιρον ἀπόλαυσιν ἁμαρτίας (ver. 25) and τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ are, apparently, used from the standpoint of the writer's time and thought—ἁμαρτία being connected with the idea of apostasy (Lünem.) and the reproach of Christ being regarded as overflowing, as it were, upon the saints of former ages; as, in Col. i. 24, His sufferings are conceived of as passing over, in a sense, to believers.—(*i*) The reasons presented by Lünemann in favor of the supposition that in ver. 27 the writer refers to Exod. ii. 15, though not decisive, are so strong as to lead to its adoption.—(*j*) The presence of the general word ἐπειράσθησαν (ver. 37) in the midst of a series of special words, is in accordance with what we find in similar lists in Paul's writings (comp. Rom. i. 29 ff. Gal. v. 22 f.), and is an evidence that the writer's intention was not to classify with care, but simply to give emphasis by multiplying words.—(*k*) Ver. 40. The explanation of this verse is suggested by the following points:—1. The *better thing* is contrasted with not receiving the promise—it would seem, therefore, to be the fulfillment of the promise in the full N. T. revelation and salvation. 2. If they had received it, they would have been perfected without us. The writer, accordingly, seems to conceive of the whole work as having been consummated and "the end of the world" as having come, in the opposite case supposed, before the time of the readers—so that they would not have lived.

CHAPTER XII.

VER. 2. *κεκάθικεν*] Elz.: *ἐκάθισεν*. But the perfect, adopted into the Editt. Complut. Genev. Plant., as also by Bengel, Griesb. Matth. Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Bloomfield, Alford, Reiche, and others, has the preponderant attestation of all the uncials, most cursives, and many Fathers in its favor; and is likewise preferable on internal grounds, since it represents the having sat down as a result extending into the present time.—Ver. 3. In place of the *Recepta εἰς αὐτόν* or *εἰς αὐτόν*, which has the support of D*** K L, almost all the cursives and many Fathers, there is found *εἰς αὐτούς* in ℵ***, with Theodoret (*τὸ εἰς αὐτοὺς ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς ἑαυτούς*), and in Cod. 17; *εἰς ἑαυτούς*, however, in ℵ*, in the Peshito (quantum sustinuerit a peccatoribus, qui fuerunt adversarii sibi ipsis), in D* E*, together with their Latin version (recogitate igitur, talem vos reportasse a peccatoribus in vobis adversitatem), and in some mss. of the Vulgate; while the Sahidic and Armenian vss. entirely omit the words, and Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, de Wette write *εἰς ἑαυτόν*. The latter, which is attested by A and the Vulgate (in semetipsum), indirectly also by D* E*, is to be held the original reading; the plural, on the other hand, to be rejected as devoid of sense.—*ἀντικατέστητε*] In place of this, Tisch. 2 writes, after L* 46, *al.*, Chrys. ms. Theodoret, Theophyl. ms.: *ἀντεκατέστητε*. This form of the word (see on the twofold augment, Winer, p. 69 f. [E. T. 72]) must, it is true, be adopted upon strong attestation, but is not in a position here to set aside the *Recepta ἀντικατέστητε*, where *ἀντεκ.* has against it the preponderating testimony of A D E L,** ℵ, etc. Rightly, therefore, has Tisch. restored *ἀντικ.* in the editt. vii. and viii.—Ver. 5. Elz.: *Υἱέ μου*. D*, some seven cursives, as also the Latin translation in D E, have only *Υἱέ*. Bleek has on that account suspected *μου*, and enclosed it within brackets. External authority, however, does not warrant our deleting the pronoun. The occasion for its omission might be afforded by the occurrence of a similar initial letter in the following word, or by the text of the LXX. in which it is wanting.—Ver. 7. *εἰ παιδείαν ὑπομένετε*] Instead of this, Matth. Lachm. Tisch. 1, 7 and 8, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 758), and Alford read *εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε*, and Griesbach has placed *εἰς* upon the inner margin. In favor of *εἰς* pleads, it is true, the greatly preponderating authority of A D E (?) K L ℵ, of more than thirty cursives, Vulg. It. Syr. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Arm. Damasc. Procop., while *εἰ* is found only with Chrys. Theodoret, Theophyl. Slav. (?), and, as it seems, in many cursives. Nevertheless *εἰς* is inadmissible. For, whether *εἰς παιδείαν* is taken still with *παραδέχεται*, or, as Hofmann will have it, with *μαστιγοῖ*, —whereby, however, that which follows would become deformed,—or it be combined with *ὑπομένετε*, in any case *παιδεία* must be understood in the sense of "education," whereas of a certainty, alike from that which precedes as from that which follows, the signification "chastisement" becomes a necessity. Consequently the *Recepta εἰ παιδείαν ὑπομένετε* is to be looked upon as that written by the author. The originality and correctness of this reading (defended also

by Reiche, p. 115 sqq.) becomes manifestly apparent from the fact that upon its recognition vv. 7, 8, in accordance with the usual accuracy of diction prevailing in the Epistle to the Hebrews, are in perfect mutual correspondence as type and antitype, alike as regards the protasis as also the apodosis.—In place of the *Recepta* τίς γάρ ἐστιν, we have, with Lachm. and Tisch., after A, ℵ* Vulg. Sahid. Orig., to write merely: τίς γάρ.—Ver. 8. Elz.: νόθοι ἐστὲ καὶ οὐχ υἱοί. With Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, Delitzsch, Alford, we have to transpose into: νόθοι καὶ οὐχ υἱοί ἐστε, after A D* and D*** [in Cod. E all the rest is wanting from πάντες, ver. 8, to the close of the Epistle] ℵ, 17, 37, 80, *al.*, Vulg. It. Chrys. (codd.) and Latin Fathers.—Ver. 9. Elz.: οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον. But A D* ℵ (D* ℵ*** with the addition of δέ) have οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον. Rightly preferred by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford.—Ver. 15. In place of the received διὰ ταύτης, we have to adopt, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 2, and Alford, after A, 17, 67** 80, 137, 238, Copt. etc., Clem. Chrys. (comment.): δι' αὐτῆς; and in place of the *Recepta* πολλοί, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, after A ℵ, 47, Clem. Theodoret: οἱ πολλοί. The article was lost sight of in the homoioteleuton πολλοί.—Ver. 16. Lachm. (and Tisch. 2 and 7, as well as Alford, have followed him therein!) has placed in the text, from A C, the form of the word ἀπέδετο; but this, although not altogether unexampled (see Buttmann, *Gramm. des neut. Sprachgebr.* p. 40 f. [E. T. 47]), is manifestly a corruption of the *Recepta* ἀπέδοτο, which is confirmed by the Cod. Sinait.—On the other hand, the reading ἑαυτοῦ, given by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, merits, on account of its more decided attestation by A C D** and D*** ℵ*, the preference over the *Recepta* αὐτοῦ or αὐτοῦ. —Ver. 18. Elz.: ψηλαφωμένῳ ὄρει. ὄρει, furnished by D K L, in like manner, as it seems, by almost all cursives, Vulg. (ed. Clem.) Arab. polygl. Slav. Athan. Theodoret, Damasc. Oecum., is wanting indeed in A C ℵ, 17, 47, in many mss. of the Vulg., in Copt. Sahid. Syr. Arab. Erp. Aeth., with Chrys. (comment.), Theophyl. Mart. pap. Bed., and was already suspected by Mill (*Prolegg.* 1071) as a gloss, and then deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 8, as likewise by Alford, is, however, *indispensable*, and is naturally called for by the opposition ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει, ver. 22 (comp. also τοῦ ὄρους, ver. 20), as well as the confusion of idea in a πῦρ ψηλαφώμενον. Rightly, therefore, has Tisch. 2 and 7 placed ὄρει again in the text—καὶ ζόφῳ] Elz.: καὶ σκότῳ. Against A C D* ℵ* 17, 31, 39, *al.* Suspected by Griesb. Rightly rejected by Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. Delitzsch, Alford. σκότῳ was introduced from the LXX. Deut. iv. 11, v. 22.— Ver. 19. In place of the *Recepta* προστεθῆναι, Lachm. in the stereotype edition had adopted προσθεῖναι, after A. Rightly, however, has he retained the *Recepta* in the larger edition. This reading is borne out by C D K L ℵ, by, as it seems, all the cursives and many Fathers.—Ver. 20. After λιθοβοληθήσεται, Elz. adds further: ἢ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται. Against all uncials (A C D K L M ℵ), most min., all translations, and many Fathers. The words, deleted by Griesbach, Scholz, and all later editors, are a gloss from LXX. Ex. xix. 13.—Ver. 23. Elz.: ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀπογεγραμμένων. But the decisive testimony of A C D L M ℵ, 37, *al. m.*, Syr. Copt. Vulg. and many Fathers demands the transposition adopted by Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford, and others: ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς.—Ver. 24. κρείττον λαλοῦντι] Elz.: κρείττονα λαλοῦντι. Against A C D K L M ℵ, most min. Syr. Arr. Copt. Sahid. Armen. Vulg. *al.*, and many Fathers.—Ver. 25. Elz.: ἔφυγον τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς παραιτησάμενοι χρηματίζοντα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον. Instead of this, however, we have to

read, with Lachm. Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. (who, however, in the edit. vii. has given the preference to the verbum simplex *ἔφυγον*, over the verbum compositum *ἐξέφυγον*) Alford: *ἐξέφυγον ἐπὶ γῆς παραιτησάμενοι τὸν χρηματίζοντα, πολὺ μᾶλλον*, in that *ἐξέφυγον* (already approved by Grotius) is demanded by A C ℵ* 57, 118, *al.* (Vulg. D, Lat. Slav. Epiph. in cant. cantic.: effugerunt), Cyr. Chrys. Philo Carpas. Oecum.; the deleting of the article *τῆς* before *γῆς* (already omitted in the Editt. Erasm. Complut. Colin., afterwards also by Bengel, Griesb. Matth. Scholz) is required by all the uncial mss. (including ℵ), most min., and very many Fathers; further, the placing of the article *τόν* only after *παραιτησάμενοι* is required by A C D M ℵ* Cyril. Damasc.; finally, *πολύ* is required by A C D* ℵ, Sahid.—Ver. 26. Elz.: *σείω*. But A C M ℵ, 6, 47, *al.*, Syr. Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Slav. Athan. Cyril. Cosm. Andr. Areth. have *σείσω*. Approved by Grotius, recommended by Griesb., rightly adopted by Lachm. Scholz, Bleek, Tisch. Alford, Reiche.—Ver. 27. *Recepta: τῶν σαλευομένων τὴν μετάθεσιν*. Better accredited, however (by A C ℵ*), is Lachmann's order of the words: *τὴν τῶν σαλευομένων μετάθεσιν*, which on that account is to be preferred. Bleek and Tisch. I have entirely rejected the article *τήν*. It is wanting, however, only in D* and M.—Ver. 28. The reading *ἔχομεν*, which Calvin, Mill (*Prolegg.* 750), Heinrichs, and others approve, and which Luther also followed in his translation, is unsuitable, and insufficiently attested by K ℵ, more than twenty min., most mss. of the Vulg., Aeth. Cyr. Antioch., while the reading *ἔχωμεν* rests upon the testimony of A C D L M, etc., Copt. Syr. Aeth. *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. *al.*, as also a ms. of the Vulg.—In that likewise which follows, the indicative *λατρεύομεν*, which Griesbach has placed on the inner margin, stands in point of external attestation below the *Recepta λατρεύωμεν*. The former is found in K M ℵ, about fifty min., with Athan., in mss. of Chrys., with Oecum. and Theophyl. On the other hand, A C D L, very many min. and many Fathers have *λατρεύωμεν*.—At the close of the verse the *Recepta* reads: *μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ εὐλαβείας* instead of which, however, we have, with Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. and Alford, to adopt the reading (recommended also by Griesb.): *μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους*, after A C D* ℵ* 17, 71, 73, 80, 137, Copt. Sahid. Slav. ed. (*al.: μετὰ δέους καὶ εὐλαβείας*. Vulg.: cum metu et reverentia. D, Lat.: cum metu et verecundia).

Vv. 1–13. In possession of such a multitude of examples, and with the eye uplifted to Jesus Himself, are the readers with stedfastness to maintain the conflict which lies before them, and to regard their sufferings as a salutary chastisement on the part of that God who is full of fatherly love towards them.

Ver. 1. [On Vv. 1, 2, see Note LXXVIII., pages 722–724.] Conclusion from the total contents of chap. xi.—In the animating summons expressed vv. 1, 2, the addition *δι' ὑπομονῆς*, appended to the main verb *τρέχωμεν*, has the principal stress; comp. x. 36, xi. 1. Of the participial clauses, however, the first and third are of the same kind, and are distinguished in equal degree from the second; as accordingly the former are introduced by participles of the *present*, the latter by a participle of the *aorist*. The first and third contain a ground of animation to the *δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχωμεν*; by the second, on the other hand, the historic preliminary condition to the *δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχειν* is stated. The euphonious *τοιγαροῦν* elsewhere in the

N. T. only 1 Thess. iv. 8. [LXXVIII *a.*]—*καὶ ἡμεῖς*] *we also*, namely, like the saints of the Old Covenant described chap. xi.—*τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων*] [LXXVIII *b.*] *since we have so great a cloud of witnesses around us*, or: *since so great a cloud of witnesses surrounds us.* *ἔχοντες περικείμενον* is intimately connected together, and is a periphrasis of the mere verbal notion, inasmuch as a genitive absolute: *τοσούτου περικειμένου ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.*, might have been employed instead. *νέφος* is a figurative designation (also of frequent occurrence with classical writers) of a densely compact crowd.[1]—Those meant by the *τοσοῦτον νέφος μαρτύρων* are the persons mentioned chap. xi. [LXXVIII *c.*] When, however, these are characterized as a cloud of witnesses, the author does not intend to imply that these witnesses are present as *spectators* at the contest to be maintained by the readers,[2] but represents them thereby as persons who have borne testimony for the *πίστις* which he demands of his readers,[3] and who consequently have become models for imitation to the readers as regards *this* virtue.

To this signification of *μαρτύρων* points with necessity the whole reasoning immediately foregoing. For as *δι' ὑπομονῆς*, xii. 1, attaches again the discourse to *ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε χρείαν κ.τ.λ.*, x. 36, so also the contents of chap. xi., which stand in close connection with the latter, are recapitulated by the words: *τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων.* On account, however, of this close connection of the first participial clause, xii. 1, with chap. xi., *μαρτύρων* cannot be otherwise interpreted than after the analogy of the characterization there made: *μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, xi. 39; *ἐν ταύτῃ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν* xi. 2; *δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη*, xi. 4; and *μεμαρτύρηται*, xi. 5, in that only the slight distinction is made, justified in a natural manner by the varying form of designation, that while the persons named were before represented as those to whom a laudatory testimony was given in scripture on account of the *πίστις* manifested by them, they now appear as those who, by their conduct, have delivered a testimony in favor of their virtue of *πίστις*, and consequently have become patterns of the same for others. On account of this intimate coherence of the first participial clause, xii. 1, with chap. xi., a more nearly-defining addition, *τῆς πίστεως* to *μαρτύρων*, was, moreover, superfluous. That, however, *μαρτύρων* is in reality employed with reference to the *πίστις* which the author demands of his readers, is further shown by *τῆς πίστεως*, xii. 2, from which it is clearly apparent that the notion *πίστις* is still before the mind of the

[1] Theodoret: *πλῆθος τοσοῦτον, νέφος μιμούμενον τῇ πυκνότητι.* Comp. Hom. *Il.* iv. 274: *ἅμα δὲ νέφος εἵπετο πεζῶν, al. Eurip. Hec.* 901 f.: *τοῖον Ἑλλάνων νέφος ἀμφί σε κρύπτει. Phoeniss.* 1328 ff.: *πότερ' ἐμαυτὸν ἢ πόλιν στένω δακρύσας, ἣν πέριξ ἔχει νέφος τοσοῦτον, ὥστε δι' Ἀχέροντος ἰέναι*; Herod. viii. 109: *νέφος τοσοῦτον ἀνθρώπων.* Similarly also is the Latin *nubes* employed. Comp. *e. g.* Liv. 35. 49: rex contra peditum equitumque nubes jactat.

[2] Hammond, Calmet, Böhme, Paulus, Klee, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Bisping, Hofmann.

[3] The supposition of Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 757), Alford, Maier, and Moll, that in *μαρτύρων*, ver. 1, the idea of "spectators" blends with that of "witnesses to the faith," bears its refutation upon the face of it. For the combining of that which is logically irreconcilable is not exegesis.

writer at ver. 2. It is therefore to be supposed that the discourse turns round to the figure of the *race*—to which, indeed, *περικείμενον* would already be appropriate, but to which this participle is not at all of necessity to be referred—only with *ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι κ.τ.λ.*—*ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα*] *having put off every hindrance* (opposed to the context, Bengel and others: *every kind of pride or arrogance;* Hofmann: *all earthly care and sorrow*). The man contending in the race avoided, in order to keep his body light, oppressive clothing and the like. In the application, the clinging of the readers to external Judaism is certainly, in particular, thought of as the hindrance. Yet the expression is quite general, and sin in the strict sense of the term, which is immediately after quite specially emphasized, is likewise included thereunder. For *καί* is not, with Grotius and others, to be taken *explicatively*, but further brings into relief, in the form of a parallel classification, a definite species, taken, on account of its special importance, out of the before-named genus.—Sin is termed *εὐπερίστατος*. [LXXVIII *d.*] This adjective exists only here in the whole range of Greek literature. It is most naturally derived from the middle voice: *περιίστασθαι, to place oneself round*, or *encompass*. The sense is therefore: *sin, which easily surrounds us and takes us captive*. So the majority. Others derived *εὐπερίστατος* from the active *περιίστημι*, then taking the word either in a passive or active sense. The explanation of Ernesti (*ad. Hesych. gloss. sacr.* p. 140 sq.), that "as *περίστατον* denotes that which is thronged about by people who come to admire it, and *ἀπερίστατος* is said of a man about whom others do not stand, thus, who is destitute of friends; so *εὐπερίστατος* characterizes sin as rich in friends and patrons, as generally esteemed and liked," has against it the consideration that from *εὐπερίστατος*, in this acceptation, the idea of that which is *public and manifest* is inseparable; but this idea is out of keeping with the notion of sin, which is just as often perpetrated in secret as in public. The interpretation: *sin, which is easily to be gone round, encircled, or avoided*,[1] would yield an unsuitable thought, since it could not possibly be the design of the author to represent the power of sin as small. The *active* explanation: seductive or enticing,[2] has against it the fact that all the other derivatives from *ἵστημι*, such as *στατός, ἀστατος*, etc., have an intransitive or passive signification. Others, again, in their explanations of *εὐπερίστατος*, follow the significations of the substantive *περίστασις*: *sin, which easily plunges us into danger;*[3] *which brings with it many hindrances;*[4] *which has circumstantias* (surroundings), *whereby it commends itself and seduces us;*[5] *quae bonis utitur rebus circumstantibus*, i.e. *quae habet suisque affert bonam fortunam atque voluptates* (Böhme).—The *ἁμαρτία* is *sin* in general; not specially:

[1] Chrysostom: *ἢ τὴν εὐκόλως περίστασιν δυναμένην παθεῖν λέγει· μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦτο· ῥᾴδιον γάρ, ἐὰν θέλωμεν, περιγενέσθαι* [*get the better of*] *τῆς ἁμαρτίας*; Pseudo-Athanasius, *de parabol. Script. quaest.* 133: *εὐπερίστατον εἶπε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐπειδὰν μόνιμον στάσιν οὐκ ἔχει, ἀλλὰ ταχέως τρέπεται καὶ καταλύεται*; Clericus, Morus, Ewald, p. 172.

[2] Carpzov, Schulz, Stein.

[3] Er. Schmid, Raphel, Bengel, Storr; comp. already Theophylact: *ἢ δι' ἣν εὐκόλως τις εἰς περιστάσεις ἐμπίπτει· οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτω κινδυνῶδες ὡς ἁμαρτία.*

[4] Kypke, Michaelis, Dindorf, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Bloomfield.

[5] Hammond.

the sin of apostasy from Christianity. On account of ἀποθέμενοι, the ἁμαρτία is thought of as a burden which we bear within us as a *propensity*, or about us as an *encumbering garment*.—τρέχειν ἀγῶνα] *to run a race*.[1]—δι' ὑπομονῆς] Rom. viii. 25.

Ver. 2. Second factor in the encouragement. Not only the example of the O. T. witnesses for the faith, but also the example of the Beginner and Perfecter of the faith, Christ Himself, must animate us to a persevering τρέχειν.—ἀφορῶντες] [LXXVIII *c.*] *in that we look forth* (for our encouragement and for our ardent imitation). ἀφορᾶν (as, immediately after, τελειωτής) only here in the N. T.—εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν] [LXXVIII *f.*] *to the Beginner and Perfecter of the faith, Jesus, i. e.* to Jesus, who has begun or awakened in us the Christian faith, and carries it on in us to perfection, or to the close (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, and the majority), which last particular then naturally includes the attaining of salvation. But it is going too far when one finds—as Grotius, Bloomfield, and many others—in τελειωτής the figure of the βραβευτής, the judge or umpire of the games, who, on the completion of the contest, awards the prize of victory; for the expression itself does not warrant this special application. According to Bengel, Baumgarten, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Grimm (*Theol. Literaturbl. z. Darmst. Allg. Kirch.-Zeit.* 1857, No. 29, p. 667), Nickel (Reuter's *Repertor.* March 1858, p. 208 f.), Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 326), Maier, Moll, Kurtz,—comp. also Theodoret: Κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ἀμφότερα τέθεικεν, —ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτὴς Ἰησοῦς has the sense: *Jesus, who in manifestation of the faith has preceded us by His example, and in the manifestation of this faith has carried on the work unto perfection*.[2] But the *virtue* of faith the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews could not possibly predicate of Christ in like manner as he does of the Christians. From the lofty conception he had of the person of the Redeemer, he must, like the Apostle Paul, regard Him by whom the divine decrees of salvation were to be realized, as *object* of the πίστις. More than this, τελειωτής can be used only *transitively*, not also *intransitively*. ἀρχηγὸς τῆς πίστεως stands, therefore, in a sense quite analogous to that of the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας, ii. 10; and the exemplary characteristic in Jesus, to which the author directs his readers, is not already expressed by His being designated as ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτὴς τῆς πίστεως,—which, on the contrary, is only designed to make us aware of the assistance which Christ affords the Christians in the τρέχειν,—but first *is* expressed by means of the following relative clause.—ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς] *who for the* (heavenly) *joy lying ready for Him*, the obtaining of which should be the reward of His suffer-

[1] Comp. Herod. viii. 102; Dion. Hal. vii. 48; Eurip. *Orest.* 875.

[2] Inconsistently does Delitzsch adhere to this explanation (and similarly Alford and Kluge),—in reference, indeed, to the notion ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγός,—but rejects it in reference to the notion, necessarily combining in homogeneity therewith, ὁ τῆς πίστεως τελειωτής. The sense is supposed to be: "Jesus is the Prince of faith: for upon the path on which faith has to run, He has gone first to open the way; He is faith's Completer: for upon this path He leads us to the goal." That Jesus Himself reached the goal upon this path, is then supposed to be an unuttered intermediate thought (!).

ings.[1] *ἀντί*, as ver. 16. For *χαρά*, however, comp. Matt. xxv. 21. Comprehended under the *προκειμένη αὐτῷ χαρά* is also the joy over the completed work of redemption, with its blessings for mankind; yet it is erroneous, with Theodoret (*χαρὰ δὲ τοῦ σωτῆρος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ σωτηρία*), to limit it thereto. The sense is not: *instead of the heavenly glory which He already had as the premundane Logos, and which He might have retained, but which He gave up by His incarnation.*[2] Nor is it: *instead of the earthly freedom from suffering, which, as the sinless One, He could have procured for Himself;*[3] or: *instead of the joys of the world, which Jesus, had He willed it, could have partaken of.*[4] For the immediate concern of the author must evidently be to point to the prize which Christ was to receive in return for His sufferings, in order thereupon further to indicate that to the readers likewise, upon their persevering in the conflict, the palm of victory will not be wanting. A further consideration is, that also the closing member of the verse, which is closely attached by means of *τέ* to that which precedes, has for its subject-matter still the thought of the reward conferred upon Christ.—*ὑπέμεινεν σταυρόν, αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας*] *endured the cross, in that He contemned the infamy.* For the death of the cross was crudelissimum teterrimumque supplicium (Cic. *Verr.* 5. 64).—*ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκάθικεν*] *and has sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.* [LXXVIII *g.*] Comp. i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12.

Ver. 3. [On Vv. 3–11, see Note LXXIX., pages 724, 725.] *Γάρ*] is here, on account of the imperative, the corroborative: *Yea!* [LXXIX *a.*] (comp. Winer, p. 415 f.) [E. T. 446]; and *ἀναλογίζεσθαι*, in the N. T. a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, denotes *the comparing or reflecting contemplation.* Bengel: Comparatione instituta cogitate: Dominus tanta tulit; quanto magis servi ferant aliquid?—*ἀντιλογία*, however, denotes nothing else than *contradiction;* and what is meant is, the contending against Christ's divine Sonship and Messianic dignity. [LXXIX *b.*] The notion of *opposition* and *ill-usage in act*, which is ordinarily assigned to it (still also by Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, and Maier) along with that of *contradiction*, this word never has. Even *ἀντιλέγειν*, to which appeal is made, has nowhere the sense of a hostile resistance manifesting itself in outward actions. See Meyer on Luke ii. 34; John xix. 12; Rom. x. 21.—*τοιαύτην*] *such*, i.e. *one so great, sc.* that He was compelled to undergo the ignominious death of the cross (ver. 2), in comparison with which your sufferings are something insignificant.—*ἵνα μὴ κάμητε κ.τ.λ.*] *that ye may not grow weary, desponding in your souls.* *ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν* is to be conjoined with *ἐκλυόμενοι*,[5] not with *κάμητε*,[6] since other-

[1] So Primasius, Piscator, Schlichting, Grotius, Bengel, Whitby, Schulz, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 357), Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and the majority.

[2] Peshito, Gregory Nazianz. in Oecum.: *ᾧ ἐξὸν μένειν ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας δόξης τε καὶ θεότητος, οὐ μόνον ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν ἄχρι τῆς δούλου μορφῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ σταυρὸν ὑπέμεινεν κ.τ.λ.*; Beza, Nemethus, Heinrichs, Ewald.

[3] Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Zeger, Jac. Cappellus, Calov, *al.*

[4] Calvin, Wolf, Carpzov, Stein, Bisping, *al.*

[5] Beza, Er. Schmid, Hammond, Kuinoel, Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Hofmann, *al.*

[6] Luther, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Schulz, Böhme, and others.

wise something of a dragging character would be imparted to the participle.

Ver. 4 ff. [LXXIX *c.*] The sufferings which have come upon the readers are only small, and a salutary chastisement at the hand of God.—Οὔπω *μέχρις αἵματος κ.τ.λ.*] *Not yet unto blood, i.e.* to such extent that bloodshed should result, that a martyr's death[1] among you should be a necessity (as such death had but just now been mentioned of the O. T. saints, chap. xi., and of Christ Himself, xii. 2), *have ye offered resistance in your contest against sin.* The author has, as x. 32 ff., only the present generation of Palestinian Christians, to whom he is speaking, before his eyes. It is otherwise at xiii. 7.—*πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*] belongs to *ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι* (against Bengel, who conjoins it with *ἀντικατέστητε*), and *ἡ ἁμαρτία* stands not in the sense of *οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί*, ver. 3,[2]—for there would exist no reason for the avoiding of this concrete expression,[3]—but is the inner sin, conceived of as a hostile power or person, which entices the man (visited with sufferings and persecutions) to an apostasy from Christianity. Comp. *ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, iii. 13.—In *ἀντικατέστητε ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι*—both verbs in the N. T. only here—the author has, what is wrongly denied by de Wette and Maier (in like manner as Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 26), passed over from the figure of the race to the kindred one of the combat with the fists.

Vv. 5, 6. Καὶ *ἐκλέλησθε κ.τ.λ.*] [LXXIX *d.*] *And have ye forgotten,* etc.? The words are most naturally to be taken[4] as a *question.* If we would, as is usually done, take them as an assertory statement ("and ye have forgotten"), the reproach contained in the same would come out more strongly than is consonant with the mild character of the discourse in this section. The verb *ἐκλανθάνεσθαι*, as presently after *ὀλιγωρεῖν*, in the N. T. only here.—*τῆς παρακλήσεως*] *the consolation* (or else: *the animating address*).—*ἥτις ὑμῖν ὡς υἱοῖς διαλέγεται*] *which, of a truth, speaks to you as to sons.* By virtue of *ἥτις* (in place of which there is no sufficient ground for writing, with Hofmann, *ἥ τις*) the following consolatory utterance (Υἱέ . . . *παραδέχεται*), adduced from Prov. iii. 11, 12,—from which also Philo, *de congressu quaer. erudit. gr.* p. 449 D (with Mangey, I. p. 544 f.), reasons in a similar manner,—is presupposed as one sufficiently familiar

[1] Wrongly is it supposed by Holtzmann (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1859, H. 2, p. 301; *Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1867, p. 4) that a reminder of a martyrdom not yet endured is remote from the connection. The discourse is said to be of a resistance *πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*. Sin, in this conflict with the flesh, would not allow it to be continued unto blood. For this very reason it is necessary to resist sin *μέχρις αἵματος*, ever anew to reanimate the weary limbs for the continuance of the conflict (xii. 12). In the same manner, too, does Kurtz find only a proverbial figurative expression for an earnest, decided, and unsparing resistance to the sinful desire in *μέχρις αἵματος*. But though in German "bis auf's Blut" (even to blood) has proverbial figurative acceptance in the sense of "to the very uttermost," yet assuredly neither *αἷμα* nor yet *sanguis* is anywhere else employed in this proverbial sense.

[2] Carpzov, Heinrichs, Stuart, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Maier, Kluge, Grimm in the *Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1870, p. 43, *al.*

[3] At least no one will recognize as apposite that which Ebrard adduces as such,—to wit, that in ver. 3 "the whole (!) of mankind as the sinners (the class of sinners) might be opposed to Christ; whereas to the readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who were themselves *ἁμαρτωλοί*, the enemies of Christianity could not be opposed as the sinners."

[4] With Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Braun, Jos. Hallet, Heinrichs, Böhme, Stuart, Lachmann, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Ewald.

to the readers. By διαλέγεται, however, the same is personified; since διαλέγεσθαί τινι denotes *conversing with any one* (here, as it were, the answering in reply to the complaint breathed forth by the readers); Υἱέ μου] With the LXX. only: Υἱέ.—*μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου*] *despise not chastening from the Lord, i.e.* be thankful for it, when the Lord chastens thee.—*μηδὲ ἐκλύου ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος*] *nor despond when thou art corrected of Him* (by means of sufferings which He imposes upon thee).

Ver. 6. Παιδεύει] *him He chasteneth.* So in the LXX. Cod. A, and fifteen other MSS. The remaining manuscripts of the LXX. have, what is probably the original reading: ἐλέγχει.—*μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται*] *and scourges every son whom He receives* (adopts as His). According to present punctuation, the words in Hebrew read: וְנֶאֱב אֶת־בְּנוֹ יְרָצֶה, *and* (He chastens) *as a father the son in whom he delights.* Instead of בְּנוֹ, the LXX., however, read בָּאַב, (*to cause pain*).

Vv. 7, 8. Application of the word of scripture to the readers.—Εἰ παιδείαν ὑπομένετε] [LXXIX *c.*] *If we endure chastening.* The opposite of this is formed by the εἰ δὲ χωρίς ἐστε παιδείας, ver. 8. The emphasis falls, therefore, upon παιδείαν; and to explain ὑπομένειν as a "stedfast" or "persevering" enduring[1] is inadmissible.—*ὡς υἱοῖς ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ θεός*] *God deals with you as with sons,* treats you as sons. By as harsh a construction as possible (comp. ὑμῖν ὡς υἱοῖς, ver. 5), Ebrard will have ὡς taken as a conjunction, and translates,—espousing the incorrect reading (see the critical obs.) εἰς παιδείαν,—"*for your instruction endure manfully, even as* (or *when, so long as*) *God offers Himself to you as to sons!*"—For the genuine Greek formula προσφέρεσθαί τινι, which does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., see examples in Wetstein.—*τίς γὰρ υἱὸς κ.τ.λ.*] *sc.* ἐστίν: *for what son is there, i.e.* where is there a son, *whom the father chastens not?* This comprehending together of τίς υἱός (Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford, Maier, Kurtz, Ewald) is more natural than that one should regard τίς alone as the subject: *who is indeed a son, whom,* etc. (Delitzsch, Moll, and others); or, with Böhme, as the predicate: *of what kind is a son, whom,* etc.

Ver. 8. Εἰ δὲ χωρίς ἐστε παιδείας] *If, on the other hand, ye are free from chastisement* (have been spared it).[2]—*ἧς μέτοχοι γεγόνασιν πάντες*] of which all (*sc.* whom God—like the saints of the O. T. enumerated chap. xi.—has really acknowledged as His sons) *have become partakers.* That the relative clause contains no statement of entirely universal import, applicable also to the relation towards the *earthly fathers* (Camerarius, Beza, Limborch, *al.*), but, on the contrary, one affecting exclusively the relation towards God, is clear from the parallel with ver. 7, as well as from the perfect γεγόνασιν.—*νόθοι*] *bastards,* begotten out of wedlock, for whose weal or woe their father is not wont to be greatly concerned.

Vv. 9, 10, a second argument follows. The readers must not become disheartened at the sufferings imposed upon them. For not only is there

[1] Theodoret, Erasm: *Paraphr.*, Stein, Ebrard, Bloomfield, *al.*

[2] Wrongly Theodoret: εἰ τοίνυν καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν παιδείαν ἐκκλίνετε.

to be seen, in the fact of their having to struggle with afflictions, the manifestation that God treats them as His children; it is, moreover, *the heavenly Father* who visits them with this chastening, and that for the very reason that He has their own highest good in view.—*εἶτα*] then, *further, deinde*. Not to be taken as an *interrogative particle*, with Alberti, Raphel, Heinrichs, and others. For otherwise the discourse would have proceeded in the second half of the verse with *καὶ οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον*, instead of the mere *οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον*. Ingeniously, but without constraining reason, does Reiche (*Commentar. crit.* p. 121) conjecture *εἴ τε* instead of *εἶτα*, while quite unsuitably Hofmann will comprehend *εἶτα* with the closing words of ver. 8.—*τοὺς τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας*] *fathers of our flesh, i. e.* our bodily, earthly fathers.—*εἴχομεν παιδευτὰς καὶ ἐνετρεπόμεθα*] *we had as chasteners, and heeded them, i. e.* we gave heed when we had them as chasteners. Inasmuch as the author is addressing grown-up persons, the imperfects characterize the period of the bygone youth (*we used to give heed*). The combining of *ἐντρέπεσθαι*, however, with the *accusative* of the object is in later Greek style the ordinary one. With the earlier authors the *genitive* is used.—The absolute statement *εἶτα . . . ἐνετρεπόμεθα* takes the place of a hypothetical premiss (comp. x. 28 f.; 1 Cor. vii. 18, 21, *al.*), and the whole verse contains an argument *a minore ad majus*.—*οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑποταγησόμεθα τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ ζήσομεν*;] *shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and* (*i. e.* so that we in consequence thereof) *live?* By *ὁ πατὴρ τῶν πνευμάτων* naturally *God* is meant. With Hammond, to think of *Christ*, is forbidden by the connection (comp. ver. 7). *To the Father of spirits, i. e.* God, who is Father in regard to the higher spiritual domain of life. That God, as the Creator of all things, is the Final Cause also of the bodily life of man, is a fact not excluded by the expression; only that which is the main thing as concerns God's fatherly relation is here emphasized. *ὁ πατὴρ τῶν πνευμάτων* does not designate God as Creator of the *souls*, in the sense of Creatianism as opposed to Traducianism.[1] Nor as the One who *makes provision for our souls*.[2] Just as little is *πνεύματα* to be understood *of the angels*,[3] or *the gifts of the Spirit*.[4] It is possible there was present to the mind of the author the characterization of God, LXX. Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16, as a *θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός.—καὶ ζήσομεν*] Declaration of the result of this obedience, in the form of a parallel arrangement. *ζῆν* of the enjoyment of the *everlasting life* of bliss, as x. 38; Rom. viii. 13, and frequently.

Ver. 10. Justification of the *πολὺ μᾶλλον*, ver. 9, by presenting in relief the diversity of character borne by the disciplinary correction of the earthly fathers from that of the heavenly Father. The emphasis falls upon *κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς* and upon *ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον*, while *πρὸς*

[1] Calvin, Estius, Justinian, Beza, Jac. Cappellus, Drusius, Carpzov, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 678; Kurtz, *al.*

[2] Morus, Dindorf, Kuinoel, Böhme, and others.

[3] Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact: *ἢ τῶν ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεων.*

[4] Theodoret: *πατέρα πνευμάτων τὸν πνευματικὸν πατέρα κέκληκεν ὡς τῶν πνευματικῶν χαρισμάτων πηγήν.* Comp. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact.

ὀλίγας ἡμέρας is an unaccentuated addition, which belongs equally to both members of the sentence.[1] For if πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας belonged only to the first member, and served for the indication of a further particular of diversity, an antithetic addition corresponding to the same could not have been wanting in the second member. But to find such antithesis[2] in εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν κ.τ.λ., is inadmissible, since these words are only an epexegetical amplification of ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον. Πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας [LXXIX *f.*] denotes, therefore, not the *period of the earthly life*, brief in comparison with eternity,[3] in such wise that the thought would be expressed, that the earthly fathers aimed in connection with the παιδεύειν at a benefit or gain merely in regard to the earthly lifetime; God, on the other hand, at a gain for eternity,—by which at any rate a false opposition would arise, since the first half of the statement could not be at all conceded as a universally valid truth. Rather do the words affirm that the chastisement on the part of the natural fathers (and not less that on the part of the heavenly Father) continued only a few days, lasted only during a brief period. In a sense quite corresponding is πρός employed immediately after, ver. 11, as well as 1 Cor. vii. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 17, and very frequently elsewhere.—κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς] *according to their judgment*, which was not always an erroneous one.—The imperfect ἐπαίδευον stands there for the same reason as the imperfects, ver. 9.—ὁ δέ] *sc.* πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας παιδεύει.—ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον] *with a view to that which is salutary* (our infallible welfare).—εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ] *in order that we may be made partakers of His holiness*, may become ever more free from sin, and in moral purity ever more like God Himself.

Ver. 11. *The blessing of every chastening.* Comp. Diog. Laert. v. 18 (cited by Wetstein): τῆς παιδείας ἔφη (*sc.* Aristotle) τὰς μὲν ῥίζας εἶναι πικράς, γλυκεῖς δὲ τοὺς καρπούς.—πᾶσα παιδεία] comprises the human and the divine chastening; yet the author in connection with the second clause (ὕστερον δὲ κ.τ.λ.) has no doubt mainly the latter before his mind.—πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν κ.τ.λ.] *seems indeed for the present* (so long as it continues) *to be no object of joy, but an object of grief; later, however* (*i. e.* when it has been outlived), *it yields to those who have been exercised by it* (comp. v. 14) *the peace-fraught fruit of righteousness.*—δοκεῖ] characterizes the opinion of man; since the matter is in reality very different.—δικαιοσύνης] [LXXIX *g.*] *Genitive of apposition: peaceful fruit*, namely *righteousness, i. e.* moral purity and perfection. It is called a peaceful fruit because its possession brings with it peace of soul. δικαιοσύνης is not to be understood as a *genitivus subjecti* (Piscator, Owen, Stuart, Heinrichs, Stein, and others): *a peaceful fruit which is yielded by*

[1] Riehm's objection to this (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 762, *Obs.*), that in such case κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς must have been placed before πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, is entirely without weight. Just the preposing of πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας was, if these words were to be referred to *both* members of the sentence, the most appropriate order; because κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς and ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον then as contrasts stood in so much the more immediate opposition to each other in the two halves of the sentence.

[2] With Bengel, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Hofmann, and others.

[3] Calvin, Estius, Justinian, Cornelius a Lapide, Schlichting, Limborch, Er. Schmid, Bengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bisping, Maier, Kluge, *al.*

righteousness; for surely παιδεία is mentioned as the subject producing the καρπὸς εἰρηνικός.

Vv. 12, 13. [On Vv. 12–17, see Note LXXX., pages 725, 726.] Animating conclusion of the exhortation to stedfastness continued up to this point. —διό] *Wherefore, sc.* because the sufferings you have to undergo manifest to you that ye are sons of God, and are salutary for you.—τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα ἀνορθώσατε] *make firm again the slackened hands and the weary knees.*[1]—ἀνορθοῦν] literally, *to make the crooked straight again;* then in general to restore anything to its original right or perfect condition. [Cf. Luke xiii. 13; Acts xv. 16.]

Ver. 13. Καὶ τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν] *and make straight tracks with your feet, i. e.* advance with straight course upon the Christian path of life you have once entered upon, without bending aside to the right or to the left; that is to say, without mingling up that which is Jewish with that which is Christian, or suffering yourselves to be enticed to a relapse into Judaism. Incorrectly do Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 789), Alford, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Hofmann, and others explain τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν: *for your feet.* For, apart from the fact that this interpretation destroys the harmony with the figure employed at ver. 12, that of the παρειμέναι χεῖρες and παραλελυμένα γόνατα, the author cannot possibly intend to say that the readers themselves have first to prepare the way for themselves. *The way has already been prepared for them by Christ* (x. 20), and it is now only a question of their making advance upon the same in the right way. [LXXX *b.*]—For the expression, which accidentally forms a hexameter[2] (see Winer, p. 595 [E. T. 641]), comp. LXX. Prov. iv. 26: ὀρθὰς τροχιὰς ποίει σοῖς ποσί.—ἵνα μὴ τὸ χωλὸν ἐκτραπῇ, ἰαθῇ δὲ μᾶλλον] *that not* (even) *that which is lame may turn aside from the way, but rather be healed.* τὸ χωλόν denotes not the suffering member in an individual, but within the larger community, thus the member of the Christian communion who is lame or halting, *i. e.* who makes only a tottering progress in Christianity, and falls away from the same if he does not gain a support in the rest of the community advancing in a straight course [Gal. ii. 14]. On τὸ χωλόν, as figurative designation of the wavering between two different bents of belief, comp. LXX. 1 Kings xviii. 21: ἕως πότε ὑμεῖς χωλαίνετε ἐπ' ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς ἰγνύαις; *how long do ye halt upon both knee-joints-*(sides), *i. e.* do ye hesitate between the service of Jehovah and that of Baal?—To the verb ἐκτρέπεσθαι, Fr. Junius, Grotius, Wolf, Carpzov, Heinrichs, and many others, finally Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Kurtz, Ewald, on account of the opposition ἰαθῇ δὲ μᾶλλον, assign the *passive* signification: *to be dislocated.* But justified by the usage of the language

[1] Comp. LXX. Isa. xxxv. 3: ἰσχύσατε χεῖρες ἀνειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα. Ecclus. xxv. 23: χεῖρες παρειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα. Comp. also Deut. xxxii. 36: εἶδε γὰρ παραλελυμένους αὐτοὺς καὶ . . . παρειμένους.—Theophylact: δεικνύων ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν κυριωτέρων μερῶν, ὅτι ὅλοι παρειμένοι εἰσὶ τῇ ψυχῇ· αἱ μὲν γὰρ χεῖρες ἐνεργείας, οἱ δὲ πόδες κινήσεως σύμβολον.

[2] Quite improbable is the supposition of Ewald (pp. 139, 172), that the words consist of a verse which "was derived from some one

(see Wetstein at 1 Tim. i. 6) is the *middle* signification alone: *bend aside* (from the way), *turn aside*. This signification is therefore to be maintained here also, and ἰαθῇ δὲ μᾶλλον continues in an abbreviated form the figure employed, in that its meaning is: *but rather through the animating example given by the whole body, may be cured of his wavering, and briskly advance with the rest.*

Vv. 14–17. *Exhortation to concord and to growth in holiness.*

Ver. 14. Μετὰ πάντων] *with all*, even the non-Christians. [LXXX *c.*] Comp. Rom. xii. 18. For limiting the πάντες, with Michaelis, Zachariae, Storr, Bleek, Stein, de Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, to *the members of the Christian community*, there exists no reason; and it has against it the mode of expression, since we should then have expected μετ' ἀλλήλων.—καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν] the general virtue, of which the endeavor after concord is only a particular outflow. ἁγιασμός, namely, is here *sanctification* or *moral purification* in general; too restricted is the reference of Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Jac. Cappellus, Bengel, Bloomfield, and others, who explain it as—what at 1 Thess. iv. 3 (see at that place) is certainly the correct explanation—the virtue of *chastity*.—τὸν κύριον] By this expression some understand *God* (comp. Matt. v. 8), others *Christ* (comp. ix. 28). A certain decision is impossible. The *beholding* represents in an emblematic manner the idea of innermost union, and the whole is a designation of the Messianic blessedness in the consummated kingdom of God.

Vv. 15, 16. Further amplification of διώκετε τὸν ἁγιασμόν, ver. 14. That endeavor after holiness is not only to be in active exercise in the case of each one with regard to his own person; it is also, in equal degree, to be watchful that the Christian brethren preserve themselves free from immorality.—The *subject* in ἐπισκοποῦντες consists, as in διώκετε, ver. 14, with which the participle is conjoined, of all members of the congregation, not specially the presidents thereof (xiii. 17) or ἐπίσκοποι (Böhme); and ἐπισκοπεῖν signifies: *to direct one's view to a thing with close attention or solicitude*.—μή τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ] is no independent clause, so that ᾖ would have to be supplemented.[1] For the choice of the *tempus periphrasticum* would be here unnatural and justified by nothing.[2] The words are a mere introducing of the subject, which is then further resumed by μή τις ῥίζα κ.τ.λ., in such wise that ἐνοχλῇ forms the common predicate to both parts of the sentence introduced by μή.[3]—μή τις ὑστερῶν κ.τ.λ.] *that no one, in that he remains far from the grace of God, i. e.* in that he turns the back upon the grace of God which was afforded him in Christ, by immorality withdraws from it, and loses it (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10). The unusual ὑστερεῖν ἀπό τινος is consequently by no means equivalent in

of the many Hellenistic poets (?), whose books were at that time greatly read even by Christians."

[1] So the majority, as also Böhme, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Ebrard, and Maier.

[2] Hofmann will on that account have ᾖ indeed added in thought, but then have this explained not as a mere copula, but in the sense: *there being present.*

[3] Heinrichs, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, Ewald.

signification to the ordinary *ὑστερεῖν τινος*. While the latter would represent the coming short of the possession of the divine grace absolutely, as an objective result, the former includes the idea of voluntary activity or of one's own culpability. Comp. Ecclus. vii. 34: *μὴ ὑστέρει ἀπὸ κλαιόντων*. Analogously stands also the mere *ὑστερεῖν*, Num. ix. 7: *μὴ οὖν ὑστερήσωμεν προσενέγκαι τὸ δῶρον κυρίῳ*. Num. ix. 13: *ἀνθρωπος, ὃς . . . ὑστερήσῃ ποιῆσαι τὸ πάσχα.—μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ*] *that*, I say, *no root*, (plant) *of bitterness* (of which the fruit is bitterness)—*i. e.* a man[1] in whom, in consequence of his unholy walk, the bitter fruit of everlasting perdition is ripening—*growing up* (as in the case of a plant, of which the root was before covered with earth) *cause trouble or disquiet* (to the congregation). The words are moulded after the LXX. of Deut. xxix. 18, according to the corrupted text of the *Cod. Alexandr.*: *μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ καὶ πικρία* (distorted from the original text contained in the *Cod. Vatic.*: *μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ*). That the reading in the *Cod. Alex.* of the LXX. only arose from a regard to our passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Jos. Hallet, Wolf, Delitzsch, Hofmann, and others) is not probable, since the author elsewhere in the O. T. citations follows the form of text in the *Cod. Alex.*—*πικρίας*] Chrysostom: *οὐκ εἶπε πικρά, ἀλλὰ πικρίας· τὴν μὲν γὰρ πικρὰν ῥίζαν ἐστι καρποὺς ἐνεγκεῖν γλυκεῖς, τὴν δὲ πικρίας ῥίζαν . . . οὐκ ἐστι ποτὲ γλυκὺν ἐνεγκεῖν καρπόν· πάντα γάρ ἐστι πικρά, οὐδὲν ἔχει ἡδύ, πάντα πικρά, πάντα ἀηδῆ, πάντα μίσους καὶ βδελυγμίας γέμοντα.—ἐνοχλεῖν*] in the N. T. only here (and Luke vi. 18?).—*καὶ δι' αὐτῆς μιανθῶσιν οἱ πολλοί*] *and by it the many* (the multitude or the great mass) *become defiled* (namely, by infection), *i. e.* likewise led astray into an unholy walk. Comp. Gal. v. 9.

Ver. 16. *Μή τις πόρνος*] *sc. ἐνοχλῇ* (comp. ver. 15): *that no fornicator trouble you*. Yet we may, with Grotius, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Alford, Maier, Kurtz, and the majority, supplement merely *ᾖ*: *that no one be a fornicator*. *πόρνος* is to be taken in the natural sense, as xiii. 4. The taking of it as a figurative designation of one who is unfaithful to Christ, in order to hold unlawful intercourse with Judaism (Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 155, and others), is unsuitable, because ver. 16 is nothing else but the continued amplification of the *διώκετε τὸν ἁγιασμόν*, ver. 14.—*ἢ βέβηλος ὡς Ἠσαῦ*] *or a profane person* (a man of unhallowed, common mind, centred upon the earthly), *as Esau*. *ὡς Ἠσαῦ* belongs only to *βέβηλος*. It is not to be referred also to *πόρνος* (so still Delitzsch and Alford), since nothing is related in scripture concerning a *πορνεία* of Esau (more, it is true, the later Rabbis have to tell us; see Wetstein at our passage), and the elucidatory relative has respect only to *βέβηλος*.—*ὃς κ.τ.λ.*] Comp. Gen. xxv. 33.—*ἀντί*] indication of the *price*, as ver. 2.—*τὰ πρωτοτόκια*] *the birthright* with its privileges. Classic writers employ for it *ἡ πρεσβεία* or *τὸ πρεσβεῖον*.

Ver. 17. Warning reference to the pernicious result of Esau's behavior. Comp. Gen. xxvii.—*ἴστε*] not *imperative* (Vulgate: *scitote*; Luther: *wisset*

[1] Comp. 1 Macc. i. 10: *καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτῶν ῥίζα ἁμαρτωλός, Ἀντίοχος Ἐπιφανής.*

aber), but *indicative*, since to the readers as born Jews the fact itself was a perfectly familiar one.—*ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα, θέλων κληρονομῆσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν, ἀπεδοκιμάσθη*] *that later also, when he wished to inherit* (to receive as a possession) *the blessing, he was rejected.* *καί* accentuates the *ἀπεδοκιμάσθη*, as the appropriate natural consequence of the *ἀπέδοτο*, ver. 16. *ἡ εὐλογία*, however, is the blessing absolutely, *i. e.* the more excellent blessing, which was appointed to the first-born as the bearer of the promises given by God to Abraham and his seed. To *ἀπεδοκιμάσθη*, finally, there is naturally supplemented: *by Isaac, in consequence of the higher occasioning or leading of God.* —*μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὗρεν, καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν*] *for he found no room for change of mind, although he eagerly sought it with tears, i. e.* for Esau did not succeed in causing his father Isaac to change his mind, so that the latter should recall the blessing erroneously bestowed upon the younger brother Jacob, and confer it upon himself the elder son; in this he succeeded not, though he besought it with tears. [LXXX *d.*] This acceptation of the words, which Beza,[1] H. Stephanus, Piscator, Jac. Cappellus, Schlichting, Owen, Er. Schmid, Seb. Schmidt, Calmet, Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Michaelis, Storr, Schulz, Böhme, Klee, Paulus, Stengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bloomfield, Bisping, Grimm (*Theol. Literaturbl.* to the *Darmst. A. K.-Z.* 1857, No. 29, p. 677), Nickel (*Reuter's Repertor.* 1858, March, p. 210), Maier, Moll, Kurtz, and others insist on, is most naturally suggested by the context itself, yields a clear, correct thought, and best accords with the narrative in Genesis. Comp. LXX. Gen. xxvii. 33: *εὐλόγησα αὐτὸν καὶ εὐλογημένος ἔσται.* Ver. 34: *Ἐγένετο δέ, ἡνίκα ἤκουσεν Ἡσαῦ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰσαάκ, ἀνεβόησε φωνὴν μεγάλην καὶ πικρὰν σφόδρα καὶ εἶπεν· εὐλόγησον δὴ κἀμὲ πάτερ.* Ver. 35: *Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ· ἐλθὼν ὁ ἀδελφός σου μετὰ δόλου ἔλαβε τὴν εὐλογίαν σου.* (It was thus a question not of a blessing in general,—*that* Esau also still received afterwards, comp. ver. 39 f.,—but about the definite blessing pertaining to the first-born.) Ver. 38: *Εἶπε δὲ Ἡσαῦ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ· μὴ εὐλογία μία σοι ἐστι πάτερ; εὐλόγησον δὴ κἀμὲ πάτερ. Κατανυχθέντος δὲ Ἰσαάκ* (this addition, peculiar to the LXX., accentuates afresh the fact that Isaac's resolution remained inflexible, since he regarded the blessing already bestowed as *irrevocable*), *ἀνεβόησε φωνῇ Ἡσαῦ καὶ ἐκλαυσεν.* Nor is that which Bleek, de Wette, and Delitzsch have advanced against this mode of interpretation of great force. They assert (1) that there is here nowhere any mention of Isaac, so that we cannot think of him in connection with *μετανοίας* either. But a distinct allusion to Isaac, though not an express mention of him, is certainly contained in that which precedes. Partly in *τὴν εὐλογίαν*, partly in *ἀπεδοκιμάσθη*, there is found a reference to him; since it was just he who had to bestow the blessing, and afterwards under God's disposing refused it to Esau. An addition of *τοῦ πατρός* to *μετανοίας* was therefore unnecessary. (2) That the formula: "he found no place or room for a change in the mind of his father," in the sense: "he could not bring about such change in him,"

[1] Yet Beza, as likewise Er. Schmid and Bisping, then refers back, without justifying reason, *αὐτήν* to *τὴν εὐλογίαν* instead of *μετανοίας*.

would be a very unnatural one. But why, pray, may not *τόπον μετανοίας εὑρισκειν* equally well and naturally signify: "to gain room for a *μετάνοια* to unfold and assert itself," as at Acts xxv. 16 *τόπον ἀπολογίας λαμβάνειν* signifies: "to obtain room for an *ἀπολογία* to unfold and maintain itself," or *τόπον διδόναι τῇ ὀργῇ*, Rom. xii. 19 (comp. Eph. iv. 27): "to give room to the divine wrath to unfold itself and make itself felt"? (3) That the expression *μετάνοια* itself is unsuitable, inasmuch as "this word can surely only denote an inner emotion of the mind, but not the bare outward recalling of a measure or a verdict" (Bleek), or, as de Wette expresses himself, "in the N. T. is ordinarily employed of human penitence." Nevertheless there attaches likewise to the notion of the "change of mind," as above insisted on as its primary requisite, the notion of a proceeding in the inner or spirit-life of the man; which, however, naturally does not exclude the accessory notion that this inner process has also as its necessary consequence an external action. If, further, *μετάνοια* in the N. T. "ordinarily" serves for the designation of human penitence, this presents no difficulty to the supposition of its having on one occasion preserved its original verbal signification;[1] specially in a passage where not an article of faith is to be expressed, but simply an historic fact to be related. (4) That the thought thus obtained would not accord with the object of the author and the parallel vi. 4–6 (de Wette). But the author's object is no other than to show, by the warning example of Esau, that the member also of the Christian community who is *βέβηλος* may for ever come short of the attainment of salvation; that, however, ver. 17 is to be explained in accordance with the standard furnished by vi. 4–6, is an arbitrary presupposition. (5) That this interpretation did not enter into the mind of the Fathers. But this argument, added by Delitzsch, as it in like manner frequently recurs with him, is an unscientific one. For to the Greek Fathers and their expositions can only be applied that which was said of them long ago by Joh. Gerhard (tom. I. of the *Loci Theologici*, chap. v. p. 30): "sint et habeantur lumina, non autem numina."—Others[2] refer *μετανοίας* to Esau himself, and then regard the words *μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὗρεν* as a parenthesis, and make *αὐτήν* glance back to *τὴν εὐλογίαν*. The statement: *μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὗρεν*, is then understood either *objectively: he found no place for the repentance which he actually experienced*, or *subjectively: he found no place in his heart for the feeling of repentance;* in the former sense, *e. g.* Calvin: "nihil profecit vel consequutus est sera sua poenitentia, etsi cum lacrymis quaereret benedictionem, quam sua culpa amiserat," and Bleek: "he found no longer any place for repentance, change of mind, inasmuch as it was too late for that, and it could avail him nothing now, however much he might regret it;" in the latter sense, *e. g.*, Bengel: "It could no longer be awakened in Esau. Natura rei recusabat." But *against the*

[1] Comp. *e. g.* Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* i. 4. 4: *ἐμίσουν τὴν μετάνοιαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ τρόπου τὸ ἀνώμαλον.*

[2] As Theophylact, Calvin, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Bleek, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 771), Ewald, Hofmann, Rönsch in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1874, II. 1, p. 127 ff., and already *τινές* in Oecumenius.

first modification of this rendering decides the thought which would thus arise, false at least for the application of the statement, since in the Christian domain a repentance that is worthy of the name can never be too late, never ineffectual (comp. Luke xxiii. 39–43); *against the second*, the internal contradiction in which this interpretation is involved with the concession *καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν*, since surely by this very fact the actual presence of a repentance was manifested; *against both*, finally, the harshness and unnaturalness of the grammatical construction, by which the syntactical order is forced out of its simple connection. Others, finally, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Primasius, Luther, Grotius, Nemethus, de Wette, Alford, Reuss, rightly indeed refer *αὐτήν* back to *μετανοίας*, but then understand *μετάνοια* of *Esau's* change of mind. Luther: "for he found no room for penitence, although he sought it with tears." De Wette: "For repentance (penitence, amendment, *i. e.* for the return to the theocratic union by the laying aside of his unhallowed, frivolous character) he found no room, no place, no scope (*i. e.* there was not granted him, by the delaying of the sentence of reprobation, the possibility of manifesting a more worthy spirit, and of becoming reconciled to God), although he sought it with tears." But if one takes the statement with Luther subjectively, it yields a harsh, repulsive, contradictory thought; if one takes it, with de Wette, objectively, it would be incorrectly expressed, since in that case *αὐτόν* (*sc.* *τόπον*) must of necessity have been written in place of *αὐτήν* (*sc.* *μετάνοιαν*). Moreover, for this whole mode of explanation the narrative in Genesis affords no point of support.

Vv. 18–29. To the endeavor after sanctification the readers are bound, by the constitution of that New Covenant to which they have come. While the Old Covenant bore the character of the sensuous, earthly, and that which awakens merely fear, the New Covenant has the character of the spiritual, heavenly, brings into communion with God and all saints, and confers reconciliation (vv. 18–24). Against apostasy, therefore, from the New Covenant (by an immoral walk), are the readers to be on their guard; for their guilt and culpability would be thereby incomparably enhanced. Rather are they to be filled with thankfulness towards God for the participation in the immovable kingdom of the New Covenant, and with awe and reverence to serve Him (vv. 25–29).

On vv. 18–24, comp. G. Chr. Knapp in his *Scripta varii argum.*, ed. 2, Hal. Saxon. 1823, tom. I. pp. 231–270. [On Vv. 18–24 see Note LXXXI., pages 726, 727.]

Ver. 18. Γάρ] [LXXXI *a.*] enforces, by a reason adduced, the exhortation to sanctification at ver. 14 ff., inasmuch as there is an underlying reference to the fact that, according to Ex. xix. 10 f., 14 f., the people of Israel in their day, before they were permitted to approach Mount Sinai in order to receive the law, had to sanctify themselves (Ex. xix. 10: *ἁγνισον αὐτούς*; ver. 14: *καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτούς*), to wash their clothes, and to preserve themselves free from all defilement.—*οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε*] *for ye did not, sc.* when ye became Christians, *draw near.* [LXXXI *b.*] Comp. Deut. iv. 11: *καὶ προσήλθετε καὶ ἐστητε ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος.*—*ψηλαφωμένῳ ὄρει*] *to a*

mountain which is touched, i.e. felt, or laid hold of with hands. That which is intended is Mount Sinai, the place of revelation of the Mosaic law, mentioned also Gal. iv. 24, 25 as the representative of Judaism. As a mountain, however, which is *touched or felt with hands* this mountain is spoken of, in order thereby to express its character of externally perceptible, earthly, in opposition to the supra-sensuous, heavenly (ἐπουράνιον, ver. 22). The form ψηλαφώμενον is not to be taken as synonymous with ψηλαφητόν, *that could be touched*, as is still done by Knapp, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Ebrard, Bisping, Kurtz, Ewald, and the majority of modern expositors. For the participle is indeed employed for the verbal adjective in the Hebrew, but never in the Greek. Neither can ψηλαφώμενον signify: "touched of God by lightning, and therefore smoking" (Schöttgen, Kypke, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, Heinrichs, and others; comp. Ex. xix. 18: τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινὰ ἐκαπνίζετο ὅλον διὰ τὸ καταβεβηκέναι ἐπ' αὐτὸ τὸν θεὸν ἐν πυρί; Ps. civ. 32: ὁ ἁπτόμενος τῶν ὀρέων καὶ καπνίζονται), since ψηλαφᾶν signifies not the contact made with the view to the producing of an effect, but only the touching or feeling (handling), which has as its design the testing of the quality or the presence of an object. Comp. Luke xxiv. 39; 1 John i. 1; Acts xvii. 27. Moreover, the participle *present* is unsuitable to this explanation, instead of which a participle of the *past* must have been chosen.—καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρί] is understood by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Knapp, Paulus, Stuart, Stengel, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 114), Maier, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, *al.*, as a new particular, co-ordinate with the ψηλαφωμένῳ ὄρει: "and enkindled fire." On account of the like nature of the additions, καὶ γνόφῳ κ.τ.λ., immediately following, this acceptation seems in itself the more natural; but since, in the passages of the Pentateuch which were before the mind of the writer in connection with this expression, there are found the words: καὶ τὸ ὄρος ἐκαίετο πυρί (comp. Deut. iv. 11, v. 23, ix. 15), it is more probable that the author referred κεκαυμένῳ still to ὄρει, and would have πυρί taken as *dativus instrum.* to κεκαυμένῳ: *and which* (mountain) *was enkindled*, or set on flame, *with fire.*—καὶ γνόφῳ καὶ ζόφῳ καὶ θυέλλῃ] *and to gloom and darkness and tempest.* Comp. Deut. iv. 11, v. 22: σκότος, γνόφος, θύελλα.

Ver. 19. Καὶ σάλπιγγος ἤχῳ] *and to the sound of trumpet.* Comp. Ex. xix. 16: φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος ἤχει μέγα. *Ibid.* ver. 19, xx. 18.—καὶ φωνῇ ῥημάτων] *and clang* (piercing note) *of words*, which, namely, were spoken by God at the publication of the law, Ex. xx., Deut. v.[1]—ἧς οἱ ἀκούσαντες κ.τ.λ.] *they that heard which begged to be spared* (ver. 25; Acts xxv. 11), *that it should be further spoken to them* (*sc.* on account of the terribleness of that already heard).[2] Comp. Deut. v. 25: καὶ νῦν μὴ ἀποθάνωμεν . . . ἐὰν προσθώμεθα ἡμεῖς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν φωνὴν κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἔτι; Deut. xviii. 16; Ex. xx. 18,

[1] Comp. Deut. iv. 12: καὶ ἐλάλησε κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρὸς φωνὴν ῥημάτων, ἣν ὑμεῖς ἠκούσατε.

[2] Calvin: Cæterum quod dicit populum excusasse, non ita debet accipi, quasi populus renuerit audire Dei verba, sed deprecatus est, ne Deum ipsum loquentem audire cogeretur. Persona enim Mosis interposita horrorem nonnihil mitigabat.

19.—*ἧς*] goes back to *φωνῇ*, and is dependent not on *λόγον* (Storr), but upon *ἀκούσαντες*.—*μή*] after verbs of *seeking to be excused, denying, warding off*, etc., quite ordinarily. See Kühner, II. p. 410; Winer, p. 561 [E. T. 604].—*αὐτοῖς*] looks back to the Israelites (*οἱ ἀκούσαντες*), not to *ῥημάτων*.

Vv. 20, 21 form a parenthesis, and *γάρ* adduces a reason for the thought of the terribleness of the mode of revelation under the Old Covenant. The words *οὐκ ἔφερον γὰρ τὸ διαστελλόμενον*, however, contain no independent statement, in such wise that *τὸ διαστελλόμενον* should refer back to that which is before mentioned (Oecumenius, Theophylact; comp. Schlichting). For in that case *κἂν θηρίον κ.τ.λ.* would stand without connection. Rather are the words an introductory formula for the citation immediately attached. *τὸ διαστελλόμενον*, further, does not stand in the sense of a *middle: that which ordained, or the divine voice ordaining* (Storr, Schulz, Heinrichs, Delitzsch), which is constrained, but in a *passive* sense: *that which was ordained, the divine commandment.* The sense is, consequently: for they endured not the mandate, "Though only a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned."—The citation is freely reproduced from Ex. xix. 12, 13, in an abbreviated form, and one bringing out at once the gist of the narrative. In Exodus the words read: *καὶ ἀφοριεῖς τὸν λαὸν κύκλῳ, λέγων· προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς τοῦ ἀναβῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ θίγειν τι αὐτοῦ· πᾶς ὁ ἁψάμενος τοῦ ὄρους θανάτῳ τελευτήσει. Οὐχ ἅψεται αὐτοῦ χείρ· ἐν γὰρ λίθοις λιθοβοληθήσεται ἢ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται· ἐάν τε κτῆνος, ἐάν τε ἄνθρωπος, οὐ ζήσεται.*

Ver. 21. *Καί*] is the ordinary conjunctive "and." It belongs not to *οὕτως φοβερὸν ἦν τὸ φανταζόμενον*, in such wise that *Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν κ.τ.λ.* "is added by way of appendix, with an accentuation of the subject which renders any connecting particle unnecessary" (Hofmann), but to *Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν*, in such wise that *οὕτως φοβερὸν ἦν τὸ φανταζόμενον* forms an exclamation, inserted parenthetically within the greater parenthesis: *and—so terrible was the appearing!*—Moses *said, I am sore afraid and tremble.* *καί* cannot be taken, with Jac. Cappellus, Carpzov, Schulz, Knapp, Böhme, Bloomfield, and others, for the enhancing "even." For, from its position, it can only serve for the connection of the clauses, while for the indication of the sense alleged an additional *καί* immediately before *Μωϋσῆς* (or even an *αὐτός* before the same) would have been required. Yet the right feeling underlies this interpretation: that, regarded as a fact, ver. 21 contains an ascending gradation from ver. 20, inasmuch as the being seized with fear, which at ver. 20 was asserted of the people, is now in like manner predicated of Moses, the leader of the people.—*τὸ φανταζόμενον*] equivalent to *τὸ φαινόμενον, the appearing*, the visible covering in which the invisible God manifested Himself to the Israelites.[1]—The verb *φαντάζεσθαι* in the N. T. only here.—*ἔκφοβός εἰμι καὶ ἔντρομος*] In the accounts of the promulgation of the law given in the Pentateuch, an expression of this kind on the part of Moses is not met with. According

[1] Theodoret: *φανταζόμενον δὲ εἶπεν, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ αὐτὸν ἑώρων τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν ἀλλά τινα φαντασίαν τῆς θείας ἐπιφανείας.*

to Zeger, Beza, Estius, Schlichting, Chr. Fr. Schmid [M'Lean, with hesitation], Heinrichs, Stuart, Stein, and others, the author drew the same from tradition; according to Owen and Calov, he gained the knowledge even from immediate inspiration; while Carpzov will not have an actual utterance of Moses thought of at all, but, on the contrary, takes the formula: "Moses dicit: horreo et tremo," as of the same meaning with the bare "Moses horret et tremit;" and Calvin has recourse to the not less violent expedient: "Mosem nomine populi sic loquutum, cujus mandata quasi internuntius ad Deum referebat. Fuit igitur haec communis totius populi querimonia; sed Moses inducitur, qui fuit veluti commune et omnium." Without doubt the words of LXX. Deut. ix. 19 [cf. ver. 15] were present to the mind of the author, where in another connection Moses says: *καὶ ἐκφοβός εἰμι*. These words he then transferred, by virtue of an inexact reminiscence, to the time of the promulgation of the law.

Vv. 22–24. Contrast to vv. 18, 19. Positive characterization of the communion into which the readers have entered by the reception of Christianity. The description, vv. 22–24, corresponds not in detail to the particulars enumerated, vv. 18, 19 (against Bengel, who ingeniously constructs a sevenfold antithesis; as likewise against Delitzsch, Kluge, and Ewald, who have followed the same), although we should be led to expect this from the corresponding words of commencement, vv. 18, 22. Moreover, the succession of clauses contained in vv. 22–24 is no strictly logical one, since at least *καὶ πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων* would have been more appropriately placed *before* than *after* *καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων.—ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ*] *but drawn near have ye to the mountain Zion and the city of the living God, namely, the heavenly Jerusalem.* The three substantive-appellations contain a single idea, in that to the closely connected twofold expression: *Σιὼν ὄρει καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος*, the following *Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ* forms an explanatory apposition. As *Mount Zion* (in opposition to the Mount Sinai, ver. 18) the heavenly Jerusalem is designated, because in the O. T. the Mount Zion is very frequently described as the dwelling-place of God, and the place whence the future salvation of the people is to be looked for. Comp. Ps. xlviii. 3 [2], l. 2, lxxviii. 68, cx. 2, cxxxii. 13 ff.; Isa. ii. 2, 3; Joel iii. 5 [ii. 32]; Mic. iv. 1, 2; Obad. 17, *al.* Likewise also is the heavenly Jerusalem called *the city of the living God* (comp. too in relation to the earthly Jerusalem: *πόλις ἐστὶν τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως*, Matt. v. 35), not so much because the living and acting God is its architect (xi. 10), as because He has His throne there.—*καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων*] [LXXXI *c.*] *and to myriads of angels,* the servants, and as it were the court of God. *καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων* belongs together,[1] without, however, our having[2] to refer likewise *πανηγύρει*, ver. 23, to the same as an apposition. For such apposi-

[1] Beza, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Calov, Braun, Kypke, Carpzov, Cramer, Baumgarten, Storr, Dindorf, Tholuck, Kurtz, Hofmann, and others.

[2] With Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Clarius, Vatablus, Calvin, Corn. a Lapide, Piscator, Grotius, Tischendorf (ed. 2), Bloomfield, Conybeare, Ewald, and others.

tion, consisting of a bare individual word, would be out of keeping with the euphonious fullness of the whole description; and, if *this* construction had been intended, *καὶ μυριάδων ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει* would have been written. But just as little must we with others (also Bleek and de Wette) take *καὶ μυριάσιν* alone, as standing independently; whether, as Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Rambach, Griesbach, Knapp, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stengel, Bisping, Maier, Moll, we regard as apposition thereto merely *ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει*, or, as Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Ernesti, Schulz, Lachmann, Bleek, Tischendorf (ed. 1), Ebrard, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 117), Alford, Kluge, Woerner, both the following members: *ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς*—in connection with which latter supposition, however, the more nearly connecting *τε καί*, of frequent use with the author (ii. 4, 11, iv. 12, *al.*), would have been more naturally expected than the bare *καί* before *ἐκκλησίᾳ*. For *μυριάσιν* is a very indefinite notion, which, where its reference is not self-evident from the connection, requires a genitival addition; besides, the accentuation of the idea of plurality alone would here be meaningless. Further, the reasons advanced against our mode of explanation, that in such case we ought, after the analogy of the following members, to expect a *καί* before *πανηγύρει* (Seb. Schmidt, Bleek, Ebrard); that *πανηγύρει* and that which follows would become in the highest degree dragging (Bleek); that *πανηγύρει* would be superfluous (de Wette),—are without weight. For *καί* was omitted by reason of the euphonious *πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, into which a *καί* placed also before *πανηγύρει* would have introduced a discordant note; the charge of dragging would have been justified, only if a *καί* had really been added before *πανηγύρει*; nor, again, is *πανηγύρει* superfluous, since it contains a very significant notion, and one different from that of *ἐκκλησίᾳ*.

Ver. 23. *Πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων, ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς*] *to the festive assembly and congregation of the first-born, who are enrolled in heaven.* *πανήγυρις*, in the N. T. a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, designates the total gathering under the form of conception of *a being gathered together* in festivity and jubilant joy [cf. Joseph. *Antt.* v. 2. 12]; whereas *ἐκκλησία* characterizes those assembled as *bound together in inner unity*. To be enrolled in heaven, however, signifies to stand recorded upon the book of heaven's citizens, or to have part in the rights and privileges of the heavenly citizens. From the connection (*προσεληλύθατε Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων*) beings must be intended, who already dwell in heaven, are actually in possession of the civil rights and immunities of heaven, not those by whom the enjoyment of the same is only to be looked for in the future. Since, then, they are by means of *πρωτότοκοι* represented as those who in point of time *first* (before others as yet) became sons of God, we have to think most naturally, with Calvin, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Woerner, and others, of *the patriarchs and saints of the Old Covenant* (comp. chap. xi.), who, it is true only upon the condition of union with Christ (xi. 40), but yet by reason of their filial relation to God, did, in a temporal respect *before* the Christians, receive a dwelling-place and rights of citizenship in

heaven. According to Nösselt, Storr, Kurtz, and others, we have to understand by the *πρωτότοκοι* still the angels before mentioned, as being the earliest inhabitants of heaven; but for the designation of the angels, the characteristic *ἀπογεγραμμένοι ἐν οὐρανοῖς* is unsuitable. The majority discover in *πρωτότοκοι* a reference to the Christians; and that either, as Primasius and Grotius suppose, specially to *the apostles*—against which, however, stands *πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, which involves the idea of a great host; or, as Schlichting, J. L. Mosheim (*de ecclesia primogenitorum in coelo adscriptorum*, Helmst. 1733, 4to), Schulz, Bleek, Ebrard, and others, to *the first believers* from among the Jews and Gentiles, particularly the former, quite apart from the question of their being now dead or still living; or, as Knapp, Böhme, Kuinoel, Tholuck, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 117), Alford, Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 147, 2 Aufl.), Moll, and others, specially to *the church which is still upon earth*, so that in connection with *πρωτότοκοι* we have to hold fast only to the particular fact of the dignity, while we retain no reference to time; or, as de Wette and Maier, specially to *those who have fallen asleep in the faith of Christ*, and perhaps even were glorified by martyrdom; or finally, as Piscator, Owen, Carpzov, Stein, Stuart, Stengel, and others, to *the members of the New Covenant in general*. But the thought of Christians in this place is a remote one; since the mention of them, in harmony with the order of relating now chosen, would more naturally take place only later, in connection with the mention of Christ Himself, and not already here, between that of the angels and God.—*καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων*] *and to Him as Judge, who is God over all.* *πάντων* is usually construed with *κριτῇ*. But from its position it can depend only upon *θεῷ*. *πάντων* is masculine, and refers not merely—as Knapp and Bleek suppose—to the fore-mentioned angels and *πρωτότοκοι*. It stands absolutely; so that God, in delicate opposition to the Jewish particularism, is characterized as in general the God of all. The apparently unsuitable characterization of God in this connection (because one containing nothing specially Christian), namely, *as the Judge*, is justified from the aim of the writer, to warn the readers against laxity of morals, and consequently against apostasy from Christianity (comp. vv. 25, 29).—*καὶ πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων*] *and to the spirits of the perfected just ones.* *πνεύματα*: designation of the departed spirits, as divested of the body (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 19; Luke xxiv. 39; Acts vii. 59), inasmuch as these only at the resurrection will be clothed with a new body. Most probably *the Christians fallen asleep* are those meant.[1] Others[2] think of the saints of the O.T. (chap. xi.); or,[3] alike of the departed saints of the O. T. and those of the New. The *δίκαιοι*, however, are called *τετελειωμένοι* not in the sense of the "perfect just ones"[4]—for which the expression *τέλειοι* would much more naturally have presented itself,—nor yet because they have finished their life's course and overcome the weaknesses and

[1] Grotius, Mosheim, Bengel, Sykes, Baumgarten, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Storr, and many.

[2] As Corn. a Lapide, Schlichting, Wittich, Wolf, Schulz, Bleek, de Wette, Ebrard, Maier.

[3] As Knapp, Böhme, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 122), Alford, Moll, Kurtz.

[4] Theophylact, Luther, Stengel, *al.*

imperfections of the earthly life,[1] but because they have already been brought by Christ to the goal of consummation. Comp. ii. 10, x. 14, xi. 40.

Ver. 24. Νέας] characterizes the covenant as new in regard to the *time* of its existence (*foedus recens*), whereas καινή, viii. 8, 13, ix. 15, described it as new in respect of its *quality* (*foedus novum*). Wrongly Böhme, Kuinoel, and others (de Wette likewise wavers): νέας is here to be taken as of the same import with καινῆς.—καὶ αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ] Jesus' atoning blood is called blood of sprinkling, inasmuch as those who believe in Him, in spirit sprinkled therewith, are cleansed from their sins and sanctified to God. Comp. ix. 13 f., x. 22, xiii. 12.—κρεῖττον] is an adverb. Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 38. Needlessly will Kurtz have it taken as a substantive adjective. Better does the blood of Christ speak than Abel with his blood; since the latter calls for the divine vengeance, the former, on the other hand, for God's grace upon sinners.—παρά] See at i. 4.—παρὰ τὸν Ἄβελ] may be looked upon as a well-known brachylogy for παρὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἄβελ. This is not, however, at all necessary, seeing that, at xi. 4 likewise, Abel himself is represented as speaking after his death (by means of his blood which was shed).

Ver. 25. [On Vv. 25–29, see Note LXXXII., page 727.] The author has but just now, vv. 18–24, in order to enforce with reasoning his exhortation to the ἁγιασμός, ver. 14 ff., described, in a comparison of the Old Covenant with the New, the exalted nature of the communion into which the readers had entered by the reception of Christianity. As a conclusion therefrom, he warns them against falling away again from Christianity through laxity of morals (comp. also ver. 28 f.), in pointing out, similarly as ii. 2 ff., x. 28 ff., that if the Israelites in old time incurred punishment by disobedience to the O. T. revelation of God, an incomparably severer judgment would overtake those Christians who should turn back again from the N. T. revelation of God.—The simple βλέπετε, without the addition of οὖν, renders the warning so much the more powerful. Entirely mistaken, Delitzsch: οὖν is not added, in order that one may not suppose the warning to attach itself to οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε . . . ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε . . . , but, on the contrary, it should be manifest that the author thinks of the One speaking, against the refusing of whom he warns, as in most intimate connection with the speaking blood of the Mediator of the Covenant which has just been mentioned.—βλέπετε μὴ παραιτήσησθε τὸν λαλοῦντα] [LXXXII *a.*] *take heed that ye do not beg off from Him that speaketh* (to you), that ye turn not away from Him and despise Him. ὁ λαλῶν is not *Christ* (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Vatablus, Böhme, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Bloomfield, *al.*), but that *God* who still continues to speak to the readers by means of the Christian facts of salvation. For by τὸν λαλοῦντα the same person must be designated, as subsequently by τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν, *sc.* χρηματίζοντα. By the latter, however, can be meant, on account of the οὐ referring back to it at ver. 26, and by reason of the ἐπήγγελται there

[1] Calvin, Limborch, Böhme, Kuinoel, Kurtz, and others.

occurring (comp. also ver. 29), only *God*. From this it follows, too, that by ἐπὶ γῆς ὁ χρηματίζων is meant, not *Moses* (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Carpzov, and others), but likewise *God*,[1] so that there is not an insisting upon a diversity of persons in connection with the O. T. and the N. T. revelation, and thence a difference of degree inferred; but the diversity of the *mode* of revelation is accentuated, and thereby the higher value of the one revelation above the other on the one hand is marked, and on the other the higher culpability of apostasy from the one than from the other. To the Jews God spake upon the palpable earthly mountain Sinai, choosing as His interpreter an earthly man, Moses; to the Christians, on the other hand, He speaks from heaven, in sending to them His own Son from heaven as His interpreter.—οὐκ ἐξέφυγον] *did not escape*, did not evade the divine punishment. Comp. ii. 3. Wrongly Delitzsch, even because the πολὺ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ. does not harmonize therewith: *were not able to withdraw, but were obliged to stand fast.*—ἐπὶ γῆς τὸν χρηματίζοντα] *the One speaking upon earth words of revelation*. Belongs together, in that ἐπὶ γῆς was placed on account of the greater emphasis *before* the article. Similarly the postposing of ἵνα, Gal. ii. 10, and the like.—πολὺ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς] *sc.* οὐκ ἐκφευξόμεθα.—ἀποστρέφεσθαί τινα] *to turn away from any one, reject his fellowship*.

Ver. 26. Like as the author has stated the fact, ver. 25, as a sign of the inferiority of Judaism to Christianity, that God in connection with the former was One ἐπὶ γῆς χρηματίζων, in connection with the latter, on the other hand, One ἀπ' οὐρανῶν χρηματίζων, so does he now in like manner urge, as a further proof of that inferiority, the circumstance that God then only shook *the earth*, but now in accordance with the prophecy will shake not only the earth, but at the same time *also the heavens*.—ἐσάλευσεν] is to be understood in the literal sense, not, with Estius and others, in the figurative.—τότε] *then*, *sc.* at the promulgation of the Mosaic law. Comp. Ex. xix. 18 (where, however, the LXX., probably in reading הָעָם instead of הָהָר, translate: καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα); Judg. v. 4 f.; Ps. lxviii. 9 [8], cxiv. 7: ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου ἐσαλεύθη ἡ γῆ.—νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελται λέγων] *who now, on the other hand, has promised as follows*. A *constructio ad sensum*, since the words form the second member of the relative clause: but, notwithstanding that, a bound is suddenly made from the preceding subject ἡ φωνή to the subject contained in the οὗ, namely, *God* Himself.—νῦν] *now*, has certainly the sense: in regard to the present Christian period (more exactly: in regard to the epoch of the consummation of the divine kingdom by the coming again of Christ). Grammatically, however, νῦν κ.τ.λ. has arisen from the contracting of two statements in one, and is to be resolved, with Schlichting, into: nunc vero commovebit non solum terram sed etiam coelum, sicut promisit apud prophetam, dicens, etc.—ἐπήγγελται] in the *middle* sense, as Rom. iv. 21. See Winer, p. 246 [E. T. 262].—The citation is from Hag. ii. 6, but reproduced in a free and abbreviated form (LXX.: ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν

[1] Ebrard will have us think of *Christ* as the second person of the Godhead!

ξηράν).—ἔτι ἅπαξ] Faulty rendering of the LXX. instead of: yet a little while.

Ver. 27. The author, arguing from the ἔτι ἅπαξ of the prophetic word of scripture just adduced, brings out as a second feature of the superiority of Christianity, that it is abiding and intransitory.—Τὸ δέ· Ἔτι ἅπαξ] *The expression, however, Yet once more, sc.* and then not again. ἔτι ἅπαξ, namely, is taken by the writer *absolutely.*—δηλοῖ τὴν τῶν σαλευομένων μετάθεσιν] declares (points to) the changing of that *which is being shaken, sc.* the earth and the (visible) heavens, inasmuch as it is a well-known matter (τήν) that, at the epoch of the consummation of the kingdom of God, the present earth and the present heavens will be transformed into a new earth and new heavens (comp. Isa. lxv. 17 ff., lxvi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1); the shaking, however, of the heavens and the earth predicted by the prophet will be the only one, and consequently the last one, which will take place at all.—ὡς πεποιημένων] *because they are created, i. e.* visible, earthly, and transitory, *things.* The words draw attention to the constitution of the σαλευόμενα, thereby to make it appear as something natural that these should undergo a change or transformation. They are not to be taken together with the following ἵνα; in connection with which construction we have either the explanation: *which namely has been made, to the end that that which is immovable may remain,*[1]—which, however, without more precise indication, yields arbitrary variations of the meaning, but no clear thought,—or: *which was made indeed only for the purpose of awaiting that which is immovable,* and giving place to the same when this comes in.[2] Grammatically there is nothing to be alleged against this acceptation of the words, although the expression μένειν is not elsewhere employed by the author in the sense of "to await anything;" nor even against the thought in itself can any objection be raised. But then it appears unsuitable to the connection; since upon this interpretation that which the author will derive from the ἔτι ἅπαξ, namely, the coming in of that which is eternal and intransitory, is brought out in much too subordinate a form. ἵνα is therefore to be taken as dependent on τὴν τῶν σαλευομένων μετάθεσιν, inasmuch as it adduces the higher design of God in the transformation of the present earth and the present heavens: *in order that there may then abide* (have a permanent existence) *that which cannot be shaken, sc.* the eternal blessings of Christianity, into the full enjoyment of which the Christian will enter so soon as a new earth and new heaven is formed, and the kingdom of God attains to its consummation.

Ver. 28. Exhortation to be thankful to God, and to serve Him in an acceptable manner.—Διό] infers from the concluding words of ver. 27: *Wherefore,* because that which will have an everlasting existence is no other than the kingdom of God, in which we Christians have obtained part. The author himself expresses this thought in the participial clause elucidatory of the διό, βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον παραλαμβάνοντες: *since*

[1] Grotius, Bengel, Tholuck, Delitzsch, Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 130, *Obs.*; Kluge, Moll, Woerner, al.

[2] Bauldry in Wolf, Storr, Böhme, Kuinoel, Hofmann, *al.*

the kingdom which we Christians obtain (which becomes the possession of us Christians) *is an immovable, intransitory one.* The participle *present* παραλαμβάνοντες, of that which is indeed future, but which with certainty comes in. Erroneously do Calvin, *transl.*, Schlichting, Limborch, Bengel, and others understand the participial clause as a constituent part of the exhortation: "let us receive the immovable kingdom, appropriate it to ourselves by faith," which is already rendered impossible by the anarthrous βασιλείαν in itself.—ἔχωμεν χάριν] [LXXXII *b.*] *let us cherish thankfulness, sc.* towards God. Comp. Luke xvii. 9. Wrongly Beza, Schlichting, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Carpzov, Bisping, and many others: *let us hold fast the grace.* For in that case the article could not be wanting in connection with χάριν, and instead of ἔχωμεν must stand κατέχωμεν (comp. iii. 6, 14, x. 23) or κρατῶμεν (comp. iv. 14).—δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ] *and by the same serve God in an acceptable manner.* τῷ θεῷ belongs to λατρεύωμεν.—μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους] *with reverential awe* (in that we watch against that which is displeasing to God) *and fear.* Amplification of the εὐαρέστως.

Ver. 29. Warning justification of the μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους. The words cannot, however, signify: *for our God too* (the God of Christians), even as the God of the Old Covenant, *is a consuming fire* (so still Bleek, de Wette, Tholuck, Bisping, and others). For to this end καὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁ θεὸς κ.τ.λ. must have been written. Just as little may καὶ γάρ, with Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 60, *Obs.*), Alford, Moll, and Kurtz, be weakened into the mere notion of "etenim." For καί is the enhancing "more than this," and belongs to the whole clause, in connection with which it would be a matter of indifference (against Delitzsch) whether the author should write καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον or καὶ γὰρ πῦρ καταναλίσκον ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, since in either case the main emphasis in connection with the few words would fall upon πῦρ καταναλίσκον. According to the order of the words, and by reason of the intensive force of καί, the sense can therefore only be: *for our God is also a consuming fire, i. e.* He is not merely a God of grace, but likewise a God of punitive righteousness. A diversity, consequently, of the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New, which would also have been an unsuitable notion, the author does not by any means assert. Moreover, comp. LXX. Deut. iv. 24: ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεός σου πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἐστίν.

Notes by American Editor.

LXXVIII. Vv. 1, 2.

(*a*) The twelfth chapter has, evidently, somewhat of the character of a final appeal to the readers—as in the peroration of a rhetorical discourse. It is in connection with this fact that the full-toned and euphonious particle τοιγαροῦν is used at the beginning, instead of διό, διὰ τοῦτο, ὅθεν, which are found in other cases in the epistle. Delitzsch says of this particle that it is "an earnest *ergo*, τοί affirming the conditions of fact, γάρ founding upon them, and οὖν following thereupon." Grimm, Lex. N.T., calls it "*particula cum quadam vi vel solemnitate concludentis.*"

In view of the record of these O. T. heroes, the exhortation to press on with stedfast endurance is presented anew.—(*b*) The two participles ἔχοντες and ἀφορῶντες, as Lünem. says, stand in the same grammatical relation to the verb τρέχωμεν; but the relation of ἀποθέμενοι is not the same. The last-named participle is circumstantial, or expresses a preliminary condition. The other two are causal. There seems, however, to be a slight difference between them:—ἔχοντες setting forth the ground of the exhortation, and thus being immediately united with τῷ; ἀγῶνι, while ἀφορῶντες, though, in one view of it, expressing a reason for τρέχωμεν, in another view denotes the act which should accompany the running. Since we have so great a cloud, etc., let us run, etc., with our eyes fixed upon Jesus, the great leader, and with the inspiring influence which our contemplation of Him may give.—(*c*) The suggestions of Lünem. make it probable, though not indeed certain, that μαρτύρων means witnesses to faith, and not witnesses of the τρέχειν of the readers. But the latter idea is suggested by περικείμενον νέφος, and there can be little doubt that the writer had in mind a race-course, in the contests of which the combatants were surrounded by a great company of spectators who had run the same race themselves.—(*d*) καί before τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν means *and especially*, i. e., it singles out from the πάντα this one thing as the one which is especially a weight, and which especially needs to be laid aside. The laying aside (aor. part.) must take place before the race is begun. With respect to the word εὐπερίστατον, while it must be admitted that the meaning is quite uncertain, it may be said that R. V. has given the renderings which are worthy of notice, and has arranged them according to their comparative probability—placing *which doth so easily beset us* in the text, and in the margin, first, *doth so closely cling to us*, and, secondly, *is admired of many*. ἁμαρτία is to be understood, with Lünem., not of a particular sin, as e. g. apostasy in the case of the original readers, or, if an application be made to Christians of later times, of those sins to which they are especially prone, but sin in general. The article marks *sin* as the easily besetting thing, and not *any one kind of sin*.—(*e*) ἀφορῶντες is explained by Grimm: *oculos ab aliis rebus aversos defigo*. It seems to be substantially equivalent to ἀποβλέπω (xi. 26), which Grimm explains by the same words. For the latter word, he adds *attente intucor*; for this, *animum adverto*. Alf. denies that there is any intimation of "looking *off from everything else unto*," and gives the meaning, as do A. V. and R. V., *looking unto*. That there should be an attentive contemplation of Jesus is, undoubtedly, the writer's meaning.—(*f*) On ἀρχηγός, see Note XLVI *d*. The objection made by Lünem. to the explanation of Bleek and the numerous other writers to whom he refers: Jesus who in the manifestation of the faith has preceded us by His example, and in the manifestation of this faith has carried on the work unto perfection (τελειώτης), can hardly be sustained. He thinks the author must have regarded Jesus, as Paul did, as the object of faith, and therefore could not have looked upon Him as an example of faith. But we must observe that it is not faith in the peculiar aspect in which Paul conceives of it, that the writer is here discussing, but faith in the sense of that trust in God which is connected with confidence in things hoped for but not yet realized, and which inspires to stedfast endurance. Now the writer evidently suggests this hope of the future reward as inspiring Jesus, in the latter part of this verse; he evidently speaks of Jesus as an example of stedfast endurance, in ver. 3; and in ch. ii. he apparently presents Him as the one who, by being Himself perfected, becomes the leader of the children of God to their glorified state. Lünem.'s objection that τελειώτης can be used only

transitively seems, also, not to be decisive, because, as transitive, it may mean that Jesus brings faith in His own case to perfection. The view of Bleek is, accordingly, to be adopted, as being harmonious with the author's thought both in this chapter and ch. ii., the only two places where the word ἀρχηγός is used.—(*g*) The return, in this closing chapter, to the words, "and has sat down on the right hand of God," is striking as exhibiting the rhetorical carefulness of the writer, fitting his discourse everywhere, so to speak, into itself.

LXXIX. Vv. 3–11.

(*a*) These verses contain reasons for yielding to the exhortation given in vv. 1, 2. γάρ of ver. 3 is not to be taken, with Lünem., as equivalent to *yea*, but introduces a ground for the "running" ἀφορῶντες εἰς . . . . Ἰησοῦν. The mere fact that the sentence beginning with γάρ has its verb in the imperative does not prevent its sustaining this relation to what precedes.—(*b*) R. V. and W. & H. read εἰς ἑαυτοίς in the text (ver. 3). A. R. V., Tisch., Treg., Alf., read εἰς ἑαυτόν. That ἑαυτοίς has the majority of the oldest authorities in its favor can scarcely be doubted, for not only those which directly support it, but those also which have αὐτοίς may be counted. But the internal argument is strongly against it. Lünem. says the plural is "devoid of sense," and other writers use similar language. This, however, is too strong a statement, for the author may have desired to express the thought that the action of the sinners referred to was against their own well-being. Still it must be admitted, that such a thought seems antecedently improbable here—it is not in the line of the context;—while, with ἑαυτόν, the sentence becomes just what might naturally be expected. When it is considered, that the singular, either ἑαυτόν or αὐτόν, has considerable external testimony, (ℵ P D^3 E^{**} K L and many cursives having one form or the other; also some mss. of the Vulg.), and that the change from the singular to the plural is one which might be made by a careless scribe, it seems not improbable, to say the least, that we may rightly yield to the force of the internal argument. In his note on Rom. v. 1, Tisch. says that ἔχωμεν cannot be rejected unless it is evidently *ineptum*, which it is not. It must be remembered, however, that in Rom. v. 1, the external evidence is much more decisive for ἔχωμεν, than it is here for the plural.—(*c*) Ver. 4 joins the case of Christ with that of some of the O. T. heroes, and thus, in view of what both had experienced, urges upon the readers, as the first ground of his exhortation, the fact that they had not yet been called to endure such extreme trial. Ver. 4 unites itself closely, in this way, with ver. 3.—(*d*) ἐκλέλησθε of ver. 5 is to be taken interrogatively, not only for the reason suggested by Lünem., Blk., Delitzsch, and others: that otherwise the reproach is too strong for the mild character of the discourse in the section, but also because the second ground for his exhortation is not given by the writer in a charge of forgetfulness, but in a recalling to their minds of what they must acknowledge, so soon as it is mentioned: that God's chastisements are inflicted in love. The verb ἐκλέλησθε is, in relation to the main thought of the verses, quite secondary—"the discourse of God with sons" has the primary force. To give ἐκλελ. the affirmative sense makes it too prominent.—(*e*) There is a difficulty, as related to the meaning, in each of the two text-readings, at the beginning of ver. 7. If εἰ is adopted, ὑπομένετε does not seem to be the appropriate verb; we should expect: if ye are called to suffer, or if ye suffer, chastisement, ye are treated as sons;

whereas the words are: if ye patiently (stedfastly) endure. The treatment as sons consists in God's inflicting chastisement, not in our patient endurance under it. On the other hand, if εἰς is adopted, παιδείαν must, as Lünem. says in his textual note, have the sense of *education, discipline*, whereas in the remainder of the passage it means simply *chastisement*. We are obliged, therefore, to give a different shade of meaning either to ὑπομένετε or to παιδεία from that which we find in the context. Hence we must be guided altogether, apparently, by the external evidence, which is strongly in favor of εἰς. That ὑπομένετε, with this text, is indicative (R. V. text), rather than imperative (R. V. marg.), is indicated by the fact that this is not a hortatory passage, but one that presents an argument for obedience to an exhortation already given.—(*f*) The connection of πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας (ver. 10) with the chastisement of both the earthly father and the heavenly, is to be accepted (with Lünem.)—the difference in the two cases being in the κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς and the ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον.—(*g*) δικαιοσύνης of ver. 11 is to be understood—such are all the indications of the context, which points to the development of character as the end in view—as meaning conformity to what is right: moral perfection. The word has thus the ordinary N. T. sense, not the Pauline or forensic. The fact that this is the meaning, and that such is the suggestion of the passage, shows that the genitive here is that of apposition. The fruit consists in righteousness.

LXXX. Vv. 12-17.

(*a*) The exhortations in these verses (see Note LXXI.) are subordinate to the main one, and are to the end of removing hindrances, etc., so that all may press on with stedfast endurance. These minor exhortations are, by διό of ver. 12, founded upon the next preceding verses.—(*b*) The objection made by Lünem. to giving τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν the meaning *for your feet*—that the way has been prepared for them by Christ, and so they are not to make it, but only to walk in it—is worthy of consideration. But it is not conclusive, for the figurative expression as a whole may be used to denote the straight-forward walking, and not necessarily refer to the path as independent of the walking. The simplest explanation, however, is that of Lünem., *with your feet*. Alford says, favoring the other view, "If the whole congregation, by their united and consistent walk, trod a plain and beaten path *for men's feet*, these lame ones, though halting, would be easily able to keep in it." Let us substitute in this sentence of Alford's the words *with your feet*, and his suggestion favors the view of Lünem., Bleek and others;—and it is to be remarked that the author of the Epistle says, not *men's feet*, but *your feet*.—(*c*) The view of Lünem., that πάντων of ver. 14 includes all, non-Christians as well as Christians, is rendered improbable by the fact that the entire passage refers to Christians and their stedfast endurance, and here particularly to their influence upon one another.—(*d*) The considerations presented by Lünem. with respect to the words μετανοίας γὰρ κ.τ.λ. show that the rendering which he gives, and which is adopted by A. R. V. text, is to be preferred. The fact that this explanation corresponds with the history as given in the O. T., and that there is no indication that Esau did not find any place of repentance—any opportunity of changing his own mind,—and little, if indeed anything, in the Scriptures to show that any one, except the man who commits the unpardonable sin, places himself beyond the opportunity of repentance before the moment of death, is a strong, if not conclusive, argument in favor of this rendering of the words. The view of Alford, that

τόπον μετανοίας means a chance to repair the evil or remove the penalty by repentance, involves as great a change in the meaning of *μετάνοια*, as the reference of the word to Isaac instead of Esau does in its ordinary subjective application, and has no advantage in any other respect as compared with that of A. R. V. The two renderings which A. R. V. gives in the margin should, however, be recognized; namely: *rejected (for he found no place of repentance) though he sought it* [the blessing] *diligently with tears* (which is the rendering given by R. V.); and, *rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it*, etc. (which is the explanation given in A. V.).

LXXXI. Vv. 18–24.

(*a*) *γάρ* of ver. 18 connects these verses with the suggestion of the preceding paragraph—namely, that they should remove all hindrances in the way of that running with *ὑπομόνη* which had been urged upon them. It will be noticed that *γάρ* extends in its force over all these seven verses, but not beyond them, and that the writer, in ver. 25, makes an abrupt turn in the thought, and without any particle immediately connecting ver. 25 with ver. 24. The true relation of vv. 18–24 to the main thought of the chapter is that of a ground, in the way of encouragement, for the exhortation of ver. 2. Vv. 25–29, on the other hand, repeat, in emphatic closing words, the exhortation of x. 19 ff., (also found in ver. 2), which is, indeed, the one great exhortation of the epistle,—on the negative side—not to reject the new system and fall away by apostasy. This view of the passage from ver. 18 to ver. 29 is supported by all the suggestions which the passage itself and the whole progress of thought from x. 19 onward to this point offer, and is much to be preferred to that of Lünemann.

(*b*) The contrast between the Christian revelation and the Mosaic which is here presented, is that of what is terrible and forbidding and what is hopeful and inspiring. The contrast is set forth in words and figurative representations which are suggested by the O. T. record of the giving of the Mosaic law, and of the earthly Jerusalem, etc. The pointing of all the words in the second part of the contrast is, evidently, towards those of the 24th verse—Jesus the mediator, etc. Through Him as mediator of the new covenant, and by means of His blood, it is that we come to Mount Zion and the heavenly Jerusalem—and so to the company of the perfected ones. The thought returns, at the end of the whole hortatory passage belonging to this last sub-section of the epistle (viii. 1—x. 18), in a striking way, to the point from which it moved at the beginning, x. 19–22: "Having boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus." The words are not precisely the same, but Jesus and the new covenant are the great ideas at the commencement and the close. The unity of this entire passage and its connection with viii. 1—x. 18 are, thus, manifest throughout all its parts.

(*c*) The construction of *μυριάσιν κ.τ.λ.* (ver. 22 f.) cannot be determined with certainty. But, if we may regard *μυριάσιν* as independent of *ἀγγέλων*, and may make the latter word depend on *πανηγύρει*, the sentence moves on with the most satisfactory explanation of all its parts, and with the grand rhetorical emphasis and climax which we might expect of this author at the end of his discourse: and to innumerable hosts, the festal assembly of angels and the congregation of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect. If this is the correct understanding of the words, the first-born enrolled in heaven are, most simply, taken as meaning the

church on earth; the spirits of the perfected righteous, as the church in heaven; and God the judge, as standing between them and assigning the former, as they pass to their reward, their place among the latter. It may be questioned, however, whether the writer had such a carefully adjusted plan in the formation of his sentence, and whether he did not, on the other hand, allow himself to be borne on by feeling, securing his object by means of the emphasis of repetition (see xi. 33 ff.).

LXXXII. Vv. 25–29.

(*a*) λαλοῦντα is not to be regarded as suggested simply by the λαλοῦντι of ver. 24. On the other hand, it carries in itself the meaning of this verb as used throughout the epistle, and is descriptive of God's revelation, as in the first verse of the first chapter. There can be no doubt that by τὸν λαλοῦντα the writer means God. He is represented here, as in i. 1, as the author of both of the two revelations. He spoke on earth through Moses; He speaks from heaven through Christ. The striking correspondence of this final exhortation with the first one of the epistle, ii. 1–4, cannot fail to be observed.—(*b*) χάριν of ver. 28 is to be understood in the sense, not of *grace*, as R. V. text, but *thankfulness*, R. V. marg. This is indicated both by the reasons mentioned by Lünem., and by the fact that—while, on the one hand, grace is, in the N. T., viewed as the divine favor, so that we may be exhorted to seek for it or rejoice in it, but cannot so naturally be exhorted to have it—on the other hand, the suggestion to serve God with thanks for such a glorious revelation of such a better covenant, mingled with awe in remembrance that He is a consuming fire to those who reject Him, is most appropriate as following that which has been said in the preceding context.

CHAPTER XIII.

VER. 4. The preference over the *Recepta* πορνοὺς δέ is merited on account of the better attestation (A D* D, Lat. M ℵ, Vulg. Copt. Anton. Max. Bed.) by πορνοὺς γάρ. Commended to attention by Griesbach. Adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Alford, and Tisch. 8.—Ver. 8. Elz.: χθές. But A C* D* M ℵ have ἐχθές. Rightly admitted by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford.—Ver. 9. μὴ παραφέρεσθε] Elz.: μὴ περιφέρεσθε. Against A C D M ℵ, the later supplementer of B, the preponderant majority of the cursives, Vulg. Copt. *al.*, and very many Fathers. Already rejected by Grotius, Bengel, and Wetstein, then by Griesbach, Matthaei, Knapp, Scholz, Bleek, de Wette, Lachm., Tisch., Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Alford, Reiche, and others. Correction to accord with Eph. iv. 14.—Instead of the *Recepta* περιπατήσαντες, A D* ℵ* present περιπατοῦντες. Placed in the text by Lachm. and Tisch. 1 and 8, and probably the original reading.—Ver. 10. In place of the *Recepta* οὐκ ἐχουσιν ἐξουσίαν, Tisch. 2 and 7 reads only οὐκ ἐχουσιν, and already Mill (*Prolegg.* 1292) has condemned ἐξουσίαν as a gloss. But ἐξουσίαν is lacking only in D* Gr. and Lat., in M and with Damascen., whereas it is present in A C D** and*** K ℵ, etc. (with Chrysostom before οὐκ ἐχουσιν). It was erroneously omitted by reason of its similarity in sound to the foregoing οὐκ ἐχουσιν.—Ver. 11. Elz. Tisch. 8: τὸ αἷμα περὶ ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὰ ἁγια. So D K M ℵ, etc. In place of this, Lachm. and Tisch. 1 write, after C* *al.*, Copt. Syr. *al.*: τὸ αἷμα εἰς τὰ ἁγια περὶ ἁμαρτίας. By means of its varying position, however, περὶ ἁμαρτίας betrays itself as a glossematic elucidation, seeing that it is entirely wanting in A, in Aeth., and with Chrysostom, and seeing, moreover, that some cursive MSS. (14, 47) present in place of the singular the plural περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν. Rightly therefore have Bleek, Tisch. 2 and 7, and Alford deleted the addition.—Ver. 17. ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες] Instead of which Lachm. in the stereotype ed. and Tisch. 1 chose the order: ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. But the authority of A, Vulg. Bede does not suffice for the transposing. Rightly therefore did Lachm. in the larger ed., and Tisch. 2, 7, and 8, return to the *Recepta*.—Ver. 18. Elz.: πεποίθαμεν. Against the preponderating testimony of A C* D* D, Lat. (suademus) M, 17, 67** 137, which demands the reading, commended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. Alford: πειθόμεθα. To the latter points also the θα γαρ οτι καλην in the *Cod. Sinait.*, since in this codex οτι καλῆ. has been placed immediately before, only in consequence of a manifest oversight of the copyist.—Ver. 21. To the *Recepta* ἐν παντὶ ἐργῳ, instead of which the *Cod. Sinait.* presents only ἐν παντί (adopted by Tisch. 8), had Lachmann in the stereotype ed. further added: καὶ λόγῳ, which he has yet rightly struck out again in the larger edition. The addition καὶ λόγῳ is found only in A, and once with Chrysostom, whereas it is twice wanting with the latter. It is a gloss from 2 Thess. ii. 17.—Instead of the mere ποιῶν of the *Recepta*, Lachmann reads in the *Edit. Stereotypa*: αὐτὸς ποιῶν; in the larger edition: αὐτῷ ποιῶν. But αὐτός

rests only upon 71 and D, Lat. (ipso faciente); the alleged testimony of C in favor thereof is founded on an error of Wetstein. *αὐτῷ*, however, which has for it the authority of A C* ℵ* and of Gregor. Nyssen., is a disturbing addition, and manifestly arose only from a twofold writing of the *αὐτοῦ* immediately foregoing.—Elz. Lachm. Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Reiche, Tisch. 8: *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*. But *τῶν αἰώνων* is wanting in C*** D, in many cursives, in Arab. Armen., with Clem. Alex. and Theodoret. Suspected by Bengel and Griesbach; rightly rejected by Bleek, de Wette, Tisch. 1, 2, 7, and Alford. For it is more probable that the simpler formula, occurring for the rest Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27, would be enlarged into the ampler formula more usual in the case of doxologies, than that the ampler would be abbreviated into the simpler one.—Ver. 22. D* 46, 57, *al.*, Vulg. Syr. Arm. have *ἀνέχεσθαι*. Adopted by Lachmann. But the imperative *ἀνέχεσθε*, presented by the *Receptа*, is to be retained, as imparting more animation to the discourse. This reading is protected by the preponderating authority of A C D*** K M ℵ, etc., Am., Copt. Aeth. *al.*, Chrys. Theodoret (also in the Commentary), *al.*—Ver. 23. Elz.: *τὸν ἀδελφόν*. Lachm. Bleek, Tisch. 1 and 8, de Wette, Delitzsch: *τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν*. The latter is to be preferred on account of the stronger attestation by A C D* M ℵ* 17, 31, 37, 39, *al.*, all vss. Euthal. Maxim. Athan.

Vv. 1–25. Concluding exhortations partly of a general nature, partly in special relation to the main purport of the epistle, and concluding notices, followed by a twofold wish of blessing. [On Vv. 1–8, see Note LXXXIII., pages 745, 746.]

Ver. 1. [LXXXIII *a*, *b*.] Exhortation to enduring brotherly love.—*Ἡ φιλαδελφία*] *The love of the brethren*, *i. e.* love to the fellow-Christians.[1]—*μενέτω*] *abide, cease not.* For, according to vi. 10, x. 33, the readers had already exercised this virtue before, and were still exercising it. Yet in their case, since they had become doubtful regarding the absolute truth of Christianity, and in part already sought to withdraw from the outward fellowship of Christians (x. 25), and, moreover, in particularistic prejudice closed their hearts against a brotherly intercourse with the Gentile Christians, the renewed inculcation of this virtue was of special importance.

Vv. 2, 3. Summons to two particular forms of expression of the general virtue, ver. 1. [LXXXIII *c*.]

Ver. 2. Exhortation to hospitality.[2] Owing to the hatred of the Jews towards the Christians, and the almost entire absence of public places of entertainment, hospitality towards fellow-Christians on their journeys became, for the Palestinians also, an urgent necessity.—*διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες ἀγγέλους*] Enforcement of the command uttered, by calling attention to the high honor[3] which, by the exercise of this virtue, accrued to single remote ancestors of the Jewish people; for by the mani-

[1] Comp. Rom. xii. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 9; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. i. 7.

[2] Comp. Rom. xii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8.

[3] Comp. Philo, *de Abrah.* p. 366 (with Mangey, II. p. 17 f.): Ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ οἶδα τίνα ὑπερβολὴν εὐδαιμονίας καὶ μακαριότητος εἶναι φῶ περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν, ἐν ᾗ καταχθῆναι καὶ ξενίων λαχεῖν ὑπέμειναν ἄγγελοι πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, ἱεραὶ καὶ θεῖαι φύσεις, ὑποδιάκονοι καὶ ὕπαρχοι τοῦ πρώτου Θεοῦ δι' ὧν οἷα πρεσβευτῶν ὅσα ἂν θελήσῃ τῷ γένει ἡμῶν προθεσπίσαι, διαγγέλλει.

festation of hospitality some have unwittingly entertained angels. The author was certainly, in connection with this statement, thinking specially of Abraham and Lot (Gen. xviii. 19). We have, moreover, to compare the declaration of the Lord, Matt. xxv. 44, 45, according to which he who entertains one of His people, entertains the Lord Himself.—The ἐλάθον, written in accordance with genuine Greek praxis, but not occurring elsewhere in the N. T., forms a paronomasia with ἐπιλανθάνεσθε.

Ver. 3. Exhortation to have a care for the prisoners and distressed.—Μιμνήσκεσθε τῶν δεσμίων] *Be mindful* (*sc.* in order to aid them with ministering love) *of the prisoners.*—ὡς συνδεδεμένοι] *as fellow-prisoners, i.e.* with as much devotion to them as though the captivity had fallen upon yourselves. For the Christians are members of the same body; as in the prosperity, so also are they to share in the sufferings one of the other. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 26. Böhme (in like manner Heinrichs too) explains: "quippe ejus naturae et conditionis homines, qui ipsi quoque pro captivis sint, nimirum in ecclesia pressa degentes." Upon this interpretation, it is true, the twofold ὡς retains its full significance; but in order to represent the readers as "in ecclesia pressa degentes," an addition to συνδεδεμένοι could not have been dispensed with.—τῶν κακουχουμένων] *of those who suffer evil treatment.* τῶν κακουχουμένων is the *genus*, under which the foregoing τῶν δεσμίων are ranged as a particular *species.*—ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄντες ἐν σώματι] [LXXXIII *d.*] *as sojourning yourselves in a body*, thus likewise still subjected to the earthly order of the world, and not secured against the like ill-treatment. According to Calvin and others, the sense is: *since ye indeed are members of the same body* (to wit, the church),—which, however, must have been indicated by ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῷ σώματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντες. According to Beza: *as though in your own person ye were* κακουχούμενοι,—a sense which can only with violence be put upon the words.

Ver. 4. Exhortation to chastity in the narrower sense.—Τίμιος] *held in estimation, honorable, sc.* ἐστω. [LXXXIII *e.*] Others supplement ἐστίν. So already the Peshito (honoratum est connubium inter omnes), then Beza, Grotius (apud omnes gentes moratas honos est conjugio), M'Caul, and others. But against this stands the addition: καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος, since the latter could not be asserted as a truth in point of fact. Rather might the indicative rendering thereof be preserved by taking the clauses *descriptively*: "Marriage honorable in all things," etc., which then would not be different in sense from the direct requirement that marriage should be honorable. Nevertheless, this mode of interpretation too—recently adopted by Delitzsch—could only be justified if it were followed by a long series of similar statements; here, on the other hand, where imperatives are placed in close proximity before and after, it is unnatural.—ὁ γάμος] *marriage.* In this sense the word occurs frequently with the Greeks. In the N. T. it has everywhere else the signification: *wedding, and its celebration.*—ἐν πᾶσιν] is *neuter: in all things.* The majority take ἐν πᾶσιν as *masculine.* There is then found expressed in it the precept, either, as by Luther and others, that marriage should in the estimation of all be held in honor, *i.e.* not desecrated by adultery; or, as by Böhme, Schulz,

and others, that it should not be despised or slighted by any unmarried person (according to Hofmann, by any one, whether he live in wedlock, or he think that he ought for his own part to decline it); or finally, as by Calvin and many, that it is to be denied to no order of men (as later to the Catholic priests). In the two last cases it is generally supposed that the reference is to a definite party of those who, out of ascetic or other interest, looked unfavorably upon the married life. But for all three modes of explanation, *παρὰ πᾶσιν* would have been more suitably written than *ἐν πᾶσιν*; and a preference for celibacy on the part of born Jews in particular, to whom nevertheless the Epistle to the Hebrews is addressed, is an unexplained presupposition, because one not in accordance with the teaching of history.—*καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος*] *and the marriage bed* (against the ordinary *usus loquendi*, Valckenaer and Schulz: *the cohabitation*) *be undefiled.*—*πόρνους γὰρ καὶ μοιχοὺς κρινεῖ ὁ Θεός*] *for fornicators and adulterers will God judge* (condemn at the judgment of the world). Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 9 f., *al.* The *ὁ Θεός* placed at the close of the sentence is not without emphasis. It reminds that, though such sins of uncleanness remain for the most part unpunished by earthly judges, the higher Judge will one day be mindful of them.

Vv. 5, 6. Warning against covetousness; exhortation to contentedness. —*Ἀφιλάργυρος*] *free from greediness of money, from covetousness and avarice,* 1 Tim. iii. 3. Comp. vi. 24 ff.—*ὁ τρόπος*] *sc. ἔστω: let the mind and comportment, the character, be.*—*ἀρκούμενοι τοῖς παροῦσιν*] *sc. ἐστε: be contented with that which is present. τὰ παρόντα* here, as Xen. *Sympos.* iv. 42 (*οἷς γὰρ μάλιστα τὰ παρόντα ἀρκεῖ, ἥκιστα τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ὀρέγονται*), and often with the classic writers, of the earthly possession which one has.—*αὐτὸς γὰρ εἴρηκεν*] *for He Himself has said,* namely, *God,* as He who is speaking in the scripture; not *Christ* (Beza, Böhme, Klee).—*οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω*] *I will in no wise fail thee, nor by any means forsake thee.* To this citation the most similar passages are Deut. xxxi. 6 (*οὐτε μή σε ἀνῇ, οὐτε μή σε ἐγκαταλίπῃ*), *ibid.* ver. 8 (*οὐκ ἀνήσει σε, οὐδὲ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπῃ*), and 1 Chron. xxviii. 20 (*οὐκ ἀνήσει σε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃ*); although, in these passages, instead of the first person singular the third person is used. Less corresponding in point of expression are Josh. i. 5 (*οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω σε οὐδ ὑπερόψομαί σε*), Gen. xxviii. 15 (*οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω*), and Isa. xli. 17 (*οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω αὐτούς*). On the other hand, there is found a citation entirely correspondent to ours in Philo, *de Confus. Linguar.* p. 344 C (ed. Mang. I. p. 430). It is possible that, as Bleek and de Wette suppose, the author adopted the same immediately from Philo. It is, however, also possible that the utterance, in the form in which we meet with it here and in Philo, had become proverbial. According to Delitzsch and Kluge, the utterance of Deut. xxxi. 6 assumed this form in the liturgic or homiletic usage of the Hellenistic synagogue, in that reminiscences of other similar O. T. passages blended with the original passage. [According to Piscator, Owen, and Tischendorf, the reference is to Josh. i. 5.]

Ver. 6. *Ὥστε θαῤῥοῦντας ἡμᾶς λέγειν κ.τ.λ.*] *so that we boldly say* (namely, in the words of Ps. cxviii. 6): *the Lord is my helper, and I will not fear;*

what can a man do to me?—τί ποιήσει μοι ἄνθρωπος;] is an independent direct question. Grammatically false is the construction of the Vulgate (so also Jac. Cappellus and others), which takes the words as dependent on *οὐ φοβηθήσομαι*: non timebo, quid faciat mihi homo.

Ver. 7. Exhortation to a remembrance of the former teachers, and an emulation of their faith.—*οἱ ἡγούμενοι*] *the presidents and leaders of the congregation.* Comp. vv. 17, 24; where, however, those still living are indicated, while here we have to think of those already fallen asleep. By virtue of the characteristic *οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ* they appear as identical with the persons mentioned ii. 3, the immediate disciples of Christ, from whom the readers had received the gospel. —*ὧν*] has reference equally to *τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς* and *τὴν πίστιν.* —*ἀναθεωρεῖτε*] the prolonged, closely observing contemplation. Comp. Acts xvii. 23.—*τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς*] [LXXXIII *f.*] not: *the course or path of development of their walk* (Oecumenius, but without deciding, and Lud. de Dieu)—which is opposed to linguistic usage; nor yet: *the result for others of their believing walk*, inasmuch as many were thereby converted to Christianity (Braun, Cramer)—which must have been more precisely defined by means of additions; just as little: *the result of their believing walk for the ἡγούμενοι themselves*, as regards their rewarding in heaven (Storr, Bloomfield, and others), for an *ἀναθεωρεῖν* of the latter, to which the author is supposed to exhort, would not have been possible; but: *the outlet or end of their walk on earth* [1 Cor. x. 13]. Comp. *τὴν ἔξοδον*, Luke ix. 31, 2 Pet. i. 15, and *τὴν ἀφιξιν*, Acts xx. 29. That which is intended, seeing that in combination with the *ἀ ἀθεωρεῖν τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς ἃ μιμεῖσθαι τὴν πίστιν* is spoken of, is beyond doubt the *martyr's death*, endured by the earlier leaders and presidents of the Palestinian congregations, Stephen, James the elder, James the brother of the Lord, and Peter, whereby they had manifested the strength and immovable stedfastness of their faith.

Vv. 8–15. Exhortation to hold aloof from unchristian doctrines and ritual observances.

Ver. 8 [LXXXIII *g.*] is ordinarily comprehended in one with ver. 7. Expositors then find in the utterance either, as Bleek, Ebrard, Bisping, and others, an adducing of the motive for the emulation of the faithful leaders enjoined at ver. 7; or, as Zeger, Grotius, Schulz, Kurtz, and others (comp. already Theophylact), the encouraging assurance that, as to these leaders, so also to the readers, provided they only take the faith of these leaders as a model for themselves, the gracious aid of Christ —of which, however, there was no mention in ver. 7—will not be wanting; or finally, as Carpzov,[1] the more precise information as to that in which their faith had consisted. More correctly, however, on account of the antithetic correspondence between *ὁ αὐτός*, ver. 8, and *ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις*, ver. 9, are the words, ver. 8, taken as constituting the foundation and

[1] "Imitamini vestrorum praefectorum fidem, nimirum hanc: Jesus Christus heri, hodie et semper ὁ αὐτὸς Deus est."

preparation for the injunction of ver. 9. Jesus Christ is for ever the same; the Christian therefore must give no place in his mind and heart to doctrines which are opposed to Christ, His nature and His requirements. —*ἐχθὲς . . . σήμερον . . . εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*] [LXXXIII *h.*] Designation of the past, present, and future; exhaustive unfolding of the notion *ἀεί*. The expression is rhetorical, *ἐχθές* is consequently not to be further expounded, in such wise that we must think of *the time of the former teachers*,[1] or of *the time before the appearing of Christ*,[2] or to *the whole time of the Old Covenant*,[3] or even to *the eternal pre-existence of Christ*.[4]— Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is the subject, and *ὁ αὐτός* (*sc. ἐστίν*, not *ἔστω*) the common predicate to all three notes of time. Wrongly Paulus: "Jesus is the God-anointed One; yesterday and to-day is He altogether the same"—which must have read: Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός. But mistaken also the Vulgate, Oecumenius, Luther, Vatablus, Zeger, Calvin, and others, in that they *interpunctuate* after *σήμερον*: *Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day; the same also in eternity.* For that which is to be accentuated is not *the eternity of Christ*, as would be the case by means of the *ἐχθὲς καὶ σήμερον* taken alone, but *the eternal unchangeableness of Christ.*

Ver. 9. [On Vv. 9–15, see Note LXXXIV., pages 746, 747.] The exhortation itself, for which preparation was made at ver. 8, now follows.— *Διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε*] *By manifold and strange doctrines do not be seduced, borne aside from the right path.* As is shown by the connecting of the two halves of the verse by the *γάρ*, expressive of the reason or cause, the *διδαχαὶ ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι* are related to the *βρώματα* mentioned immediately after as the *genus* to a *species* coming under particular notice; and, as is manifest from ver. 10 ff., both belong to the specifically *Jewish* domain. By *διδαχαὶ ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι*, therefore, the ordinances of the Mosaic law in general are to be understood, the observance of which was proclaimed among the readers as necessary to the attainment of salvation, while then under *βρώματα* a special group of the same is mentioned. *ποικίλαι* the same are called, because they consist in commands and prohibitions of manifold kind; *ξέναι*, however, because they are opposed to the spirit of Christianity.—*καλὸν γάρ*] *for it is a fair thing, i. e.* praiseworthy and salutary.—*χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν*] [LXXXIV *c* 1.] *that by grace the heart be made stedfast*, in it seek and find its support. For no other thing than the grace of God is that which determines the character of the New Covenant, as the law that of the Old, Rom. vi. 14, *al.* Erroneously, therefore, Castellio and Böhme, *χάριτι* means *by thanksgiving or gratitude towards God*; yet more incorrectly Bisping and Maier: by the Christian sacrificial food, the Holy Communion.—*οὐ βρώμασιν*] *not by meats.* [LXXXIV *b.*] This is referred by the majority, lastly by Böhme, Stengel, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 158), Alford, Moll, Ewald, and Hofmann, to the Levitical ordinances

[1] Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, Limborch, Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Kluge, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, al.

[2] Bengel, Cramer, Stein.

[3] Calvin, Pareus, *al.*

[4] Ambrose, *de Fide*, v. 1. 25; Seb. Schmidt, Nemethus, and others.

concerning pure and impure food. But only of the *sacrificial meals* can οἱ βρώμασιν be understood. For rightly have Schlichting, Bleek, and others called attention to the fact that (1) the expression, ver. 9, is more applicable to the enjoyment of sacred meats than to the avoiding of unclean meats. Schlichting: Cor non reficitur cibis non comestis, sed comestis. Ciborum ergo usui, non abstinentiae, opponitur hic gratia; that (2) it is said of the Christians, at ver. 10, in close conjunction with ver. 9, that they possess an altar of which the servants of the Jewish sanctuary have no right to eat; that, finally, (3) at the close of this series of thoughts, ver. 15, the reference to the sacrifices is retained, inasmuch as there, in opposition to the Levitical sacrifices, it is made incumbent on Christians through Christ continually to offer sacrifices of praise unto God. Tholuck, it is true, objects to this reasoning: (1) that βρώματα may denote "the clean, legally permitted meats, with (the mention of) which is at the same time implied the abstinence from the unclean." But this expedient is artificial and unnatural; since, if we had in reality to think of the Levitical precepts with regard to food, in the exact converse of that which happens the avoiding of unclean meats would be the main idea brought under consideration. (2) That the connection of ver. 10 with ver. 9 would only apparently be lost, since one may warrantably assume the following line of thought; "Do not suffer yourselves to be led astray by a variety of doctrines alien to the pure truth—surely it is a fairer thing to assure the conscience by grace than by meats, by means of which no true appeasement is obtained; we Christians have an altar with such glorious soul-nourishment, of which no priest may eat." But this supposed thought of ver. 10 would be highly illogical. For how does it follow from the fact that Christians have an altar of most glorious soul-nourishment, that no priest may partake of the same? Logically correct, certainly, would be only the thought: for we Christians possess an altar with such glorious soul-nourishment, that we have no need whatever of the Levitical ordinances regarding food. Then again, at ver. 10, nothing at all is written about "glorious soul-nourishment;" but, on the contrary, the design of this verse can only be to make good the incompatibility of the Christian altar with the Jewish. (3) That the exhortation to the spiritual sacrifices, ver. 15, may be more immediately referred back to ver. 10. But ver. 10 stands to ver. 9, in which the theme of the investigation, vv. 8–15, is expressed, in the relation of subordination. The following οὖν, ver. 15, may therefore serve for the introducing of the final result from the whole preceding investigation. (4) Finally, that it cannot be perceived how the participation in sacrificial meals could have been looked upon as a means of justification. But the participation in the sacrificial meals was certainly a public avouchment of participation in the sacrifices themselves. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 18. Very easily, therefore, might the author be led finally to take up this preference of his readers for the Jewish sacrificial cultus in this particular form of manifestation, which had hitherto remained unnoticed in the epistle.—The supports, too, which Delitzsch has more recently sought to give to the referring of οἱ βρώμασιν to ordi-

nances regarding clean and unclean meats, are weak. For that *βρώματα* is a word unheard of in the sacrificial *thora*, but familiar in the legislation regarding food, and that *βρῶμα* is used elsewhere in the N. T. of that which is prohibited or permitted for eating, does not in any way fall under consideration; because our passage claims before everything to be intelligible *per se*, nothing thus can be determinative of its meaning which is opposed to its expression and connection. That, however, the author cannot by *διδαχαὶ ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι* have meant the ordinances of the law in general, because he has recognized their divine origin, and therefore could not have indicated them with so little reverence, is a mere prepossession. For the Apostle Paul, too, speaks of them, as is already shown by Gal. iv. 9 f., v. 2, with no greater reverence. We are prevented from thinking, with Delitzsch, of "erroneous doctrines invented in accordance with one's own will, though it may be attaching themselves to the O. T. law," by the relation in which *διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις* stands to *βρώμασιν*, ver. 9, and this again to *ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες*, ver. 10.—*ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατοῦντες*] [LXXXIV c 2.] *from which those busied therein have derived no profit*, inasmuch, namely, as by such partaking of the sacrifice they did not attain to true blessedness.—*ἐν οἷς* belongs to *οἱ περιπατοῦντες*, since these words cannot stand alone, not to *ὠφελήθησαν*.

Ver. 10. Justification of *οὐ βρώμασιν*, ver. 9, the emphasizing of the incompatibility of the Christian altar with that of Judaism. *We possess an altar, of which they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle, i. e.* he who seeks in the Jewish sacrificial meals, and consequently in the Jewish sacrificial worship, a stay and support for his heart, thereby shuts himself out from Christianity, for he makes himself a servant of the tabernacle; but he who serves the tabernacle has no claim or title to the altar of Christians. That the subject in *ἔχομεν* is *the Christian*, is acknowledged on all sides. But equally little ought it ever to have been disputed that by *οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες* persons must be denoted who are contrasted with the Christians. For, in accordance with the expression chosen, the author can only mean to say that the Christians possess the right to eat of the altar; those *τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες*, on the other hand, forego this right. Quite in a wrong sense, therefore, have Schlichting, Schulz, Heinrichs, Wieseler (*Schriften der Univ. Kiel aus d. J.* 1861, p. 42), Kurtz, and others, referred *οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες* likewise to the Christians,[1] in that they found expressed the thought: *for Christians there exists no other sacrifice than one of which it is not permitted them to eat.* They then suppose to be intended by *οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες* either, as Schlichting, "omnes in universum Christiani," or, as Schulz, particular officers of the society, who conducted the Christian worship. But in the first case—apart from the fact that then, what would alone be natural, *ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν* would have been written

[1] So also Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 1, 2 Aufl. p. 457 ff.), who will have only the twofold fact to be accentuated at ver. 10: "that we are priests," and "that we possess a means of expiation," and brings out as the sense of the verse: "that we, whose only propitiatory sacrifice, and one for all alike, is Christ, have no other profit from our means of expiation, than that we are reconciled." (!)

instead of *ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες*—the Christians would, as Bleek has already justly observed, have been designated by a characteristic which could not possibly be predicated of them; in the second, an anachronistic separation into clerics and laity would be imputed to the author, and the sense arising would be unsuitable, since the proposition, that the warrant for eating of the Christian sacrifice is wanting, could not possibly hold good of the clergy alone, but must have its application to Christians in general. By *ἡ σκηνή* can thus be understood nothing other than the earthly, Jewish sanctuary, as opposed to the *ἀληθινή* and *τελειοτέρα σκηνή* of Christians, viii. 2, ix. 11. The *τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες*, [LXXXIV *c* 3.] however, are not specially[1] *the Jewish priests* (viii. 5), but the members of the Jewish covenant people universally (ix. 9, x. 2).—The *θυσιαστήριον* further is the altar, upon which the sacrifice of the New Covenant, namely, the body of Christ (comp. ver. 12), has been presented. Not "ipse Christus"[2] or the *θυσία* itself which has been presented,[3] nor yet the *cultus* (Grotius), can be denoted thereby. But likewise the explaining of the *table of the Supper*, the *τράπεζα κυρίου*, 1 Cor. x. 21[4] is inadmissible. For then there would underlie our passage the conception that the body of the Lord is offered in the Supper, Christ's sacrifice is thus one constantly repeated; but such conception is unbiblical, and in particular is remote from the thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the presentation of the sacrifice of Christ once for all, and the all-sufficiency of this sacrifice by its one presentation, is frequently urged with emphasis; comp. vii. 27, ix. 12, 25 ff., x. 10. Exclusively correct is it, accordingly, to understand by the altar[5] the spot on which the Saviour offered Himself, *i. e. the cross of Christ*. But to eat of this altar, *i. e.* to partake of the sacrifice presented thereon, signifies: to attain to the enjoyment of the spiritual blessings resulting from Christ's sacrificial death for believers; the same thing as is represented, John vi. 51 ff., as the eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of Christ.

On vv. 11–13, comp. Bähr in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, H. 4, p. 936 ff.

Vv. 11, 12. Proof for ver. 10. The proof lies in the fact that Christ's sacrifice is one which has been presented without the camp, and consequently has been freed from all community with Judaism. Ver. 11 and ver. 12 are, as a proof of ver. 10, closely connected, and only in ver. 12 lies the main factor, whereas ver. 11 is related to the same as a merely preparatory and accessory thought (Bähr). For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest are burned *without the camp;* wherefore Jesus also, in order that He might sanctify the people through His own blood, suffered *without the gate*. That

[1] As Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 161), Alford and others suppose.

[2] Piscator, Owen, Wolf; comp. Calvin.

[3] Limborch, Whitby, M'Lean, Heinrichs, and others.

[4] With Corn. a Lapide, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Böhme, Bähr (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, H. 4, p. 938), Ebrard, Bisping, Maier, and others (comp. also Rückert, *das Abendmahl. Sein Wesen und seine Geschichte in der alten Kirche*, Leipz. 1856, pp. 212–246.

[5] With Thomas Aquinas, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Bengel, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Delitzsch, Riehm, *l. c.*, Alford, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Woerner, and others.

is to say: The N. T. sacrifice of the covenant is typically prefigured by the great atoning sacrifice under the Old Covenant. Of the victims, however, which were devoted to the latter, neither the high priest nor any other member of the Jewish theocracy was permitted to eat anything. For of those animals only the blood was taken, in order to be brought by the high priest into the Most Holy Place as a propitiatory offering; the bodies of those animals, on the other hand, were burned without the camp or holy city (Lev. xvi. 27), wherein was contained the explanation in an act (comp. Bähr, *l. c.*), that they were cast out from the theocratic communion of Judaism. But thus, then, has Jesus also, in that He entered with His sacrificial blood into the heavenly Holy of Holies, made expiation for the sins of them that believe in Him; His sacrificial body, however, has, since He was led out of the camp, or beyond the gate of the holy city, in order to endure the infliction of death (comp. Lev. xxiv. 14; Num. xv. 35 f.; Deut. xvii. 5), declared by this act to be cast out from the Jewish covenant-people. Eat of His sacrificial body, *i. e.* obtain part in the blessing procured by His sacrifice, can therefore no one who is still within the camp, *i. e.* who still looks for salvation from the ordinances of Judaism. Consequently he who will eat of the altar of Christ must depart out of Judaism, and go forth unto Christ without the camp (ver. 13).—*τὰ ἅγια*] as ix. 8, 12, 24, 25, x. 19, *the Most Holy Place*.—The tenses in the *present* mark the practice as one still continuing.—*παρεμβολή*] Characterization of the dwelling-place of the Jewish people at the time of the lawgiving, while it was still journeying through the wilderness and had tents for its habitation. The camp was the complex of the tents, enclosing the totality of the people together with the sanctuary. Thus there was combined with the idea of locality the religious reference to the people as one covenant-people, and "without the camp" became equivalent in signification to "without the bounds of the Old Covenant." But, since afterwards the city of Jerusalem, with the temple in its midst, took the place of the *παρεμβολή*, the *ἐξω τῆς πύλης* standing in ver. 12, *without the gate*, *sc.* of the city of Jerusalem, says in effect the same thing as *ἐξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς*, vv. 11, 13.—*διό*] *wherefore*, *i. e.* because the sacrificial death of Jesus has been prefigured by the type mentioned, ver. 11.—*ἰδίου*] opposition to the animal blood in the O. T. sacrifices of atonement.—*τὸν λαόν*] see at ii. 16, p. 132.—*ἔπαθεν*] comp. ix. 26.

Ver. 13. [LXXXIV *c* 4.] Deduction from vv. 10–12, in the form of a summons: Let us then no longer seek salvation for ourselves within the bounds of Judaism, but come forth from the camp of the Old Covenant and betake ourselves to Christ, untroubled about the reproach which may fall upon us on that account. Theodoret: *ἐξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐξω τῆς κατὰ νόμον γενώμεθα πολιτείας*. False, because opposed to all the connection, is it when Chrysostom 1, Theophylact, Primasius, Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, Clarius, and others find in ver. 13 the exhortation to renounce the world and its delights; or Chrysostom 2, Limborch, Heinrichs, Dindorf, Kuinoel, Bloomfield: willingly to follow the Lord into sufferings and death; or Schlichting, Grotius, Michaelis, Zachariae, Storr: willingly to

submit to expulsion by the Jews from their towns and fellowship; or Clericus: to forsake the city of Jerusalem on account of its impending destruction (Matt. xxiv.).—*τοίνυν*] as the commencement of a sentence only rare. Comp. LXX. Isa. iii. 10, v. 13, xxvii. 4, xxxii. 23; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 342 sq.—*τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ*] See at xi. 26.

Ver. 14. [LXXXIV *c* 5.] Ground of encouragement to the *φέρειν τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, ver. 13.—*ἔχομεν*] namely: *we Christians.* Not: *we men in general.*—*ὧδε*] *here upon earth.* Erroneously Heinrichs: *in the earthly Jerusalem.*—*τὴν μέλλουσαν*] *sc. πόλιν*: *the city to come*, which, namely, is an *abiding* one. Comp. xii. 22: Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐπουράνιος, and xi. 10: *ἡ τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσα πόλις, ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ Θεός.* Rightly, for the rest, does Schlichting observe: Futuram autem civitatem hanc vocat, quia nobis futura est. Nam Deo, Christo, angelis jam praesens est.

Ver. 15. Closing exhortation, through Christ, to offer to God sacrifices of praise. Deduced from vv. 8–14.—Δι' *αὐτοῦ*] is with great emphasis preposed: *through* HIM (*sc.* Christ), but not through the intervention of the Jewish sacrificial institution. Through Him, inasmuch as by the all-sufficiency of His expiatory sacrifice once offered, He has qualified believers so to do.—*θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*] *a praise-offering* (זֶבַח תּוֹדָה), thus a spiritual sacrifice, in opposition to the animal sacrifices of Judaism.—*διὰ παντός*] *continually.* For the blessings obtained through Christ are so abundant and inexhaustible, that God can never be sufficiently praised for them.—*τουτέστιν καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ*] *that is, fruit of lips which praise His name.* Elucidation of the meaning in *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*, in order further to bring into special relief the purely spiritual nature of this Christian thankoffering already indicated by those words. The expression *καρπὸν χειλέων* the author has derived from Hos. xiv. 3, LXX.: *καὶ ἀνταποδώσομεν καρπὸν χειλέων ἡμῶν* (in the Hebrew: נְשַׁלְּמָה פָרִים שְׂפָתֵינוּ, let us offer for oxen our own lips).[1]—The referring of *αὐτοῦ* to *Christ* (so Sykes, who finds the sense: *confessing ourselves publicly as the disciples of Christ*) is unnatural, seeing that God has been expressly mentioned only just before as the One to whom the *θυσία αἰνέσεως* is to be presented.

Ver. 16. [On Vv. 16–21, see Note LXXXV., pages 747, 748.] Exhortation to beneficence. By means of *δέ* this verse attaches itself to the preceding, inasmuch as over against the Christianly devout mind which expresses itself in words, is placed the Christianly devout mind which manifests itself in deeds.—Τῆς *δὲ εὐποιΐας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε*] [LXXXV *a.*] *Of well-doing, moreover* (the substantive *εὐποιΐα* only here in the N. T.; *εὖ ποιεῖν*, Mark xiv. 7), *and fellowship* (*i. e.* communication of earthly possession, comp. Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 13), *be not forgetful* (ver. 2).—*τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ Θεός*] *for in such sacrifices God*

[1] For the thought, comp. *Vajikra R.* 9. 27, in Wetstein: R. Pinchas, R. Levi et R. Jochanam ex ore R. Menachem Galilaei dixerunt: Tempore futuro omnia sacrificia cessabunt, sacrificium vero laudis non cessabit. Omnes preces cessabunt, sed laudes non cessabunt. Philo, *de Sacrificantibus*, p. 849 E (with Mang. II. p. 253): *τὴν ἀρίστην ἀνάγουσι θυσίαν, ὕμνοις καὶ εὐχαριστίαις τὸν εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτῆρα Θεὸν γεραίροντες.*

his pleasure.—τοιαύταις] refers back only to εὐποιΐας καὶ κοινωνίας, not likewise to ver. 15.[1]—The formula εὐαρεστοῦμαί τινι is elsewhere foreign to the N. T. as to the LXX.; with later Greek writers, however, not unusual.

Ver. 17. Exhortation to obedience to the presidents of the assembly. [LXXXV *b.*] Comp. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13.—Πείθεσθε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν καὶ ὑπείκετε] *Obey your leaders, and yield to them.* Bengel: Obedite in iis, quae praecipiunt vobis tanquam salutaria; concedite, etiam ubi videntur plusculum postulare. The demand presupposes, for the rest, that the author knew the ἡγούμενοι as men like-minded with himself, who had kept themselves free from the hankering after defection.—αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν] *for it is they who watch for your souls, for the salvation thereof.* —ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες] *as those who must give an account* (of the same), *sc.* to God and the Lord at His return.—ἵνα] is the subsequently introduced note of design to πείθεσθε καὶ ὑπείκετε. On that account, however, it is not permitted, with Grotius, Carpzov, and others, to enclose αὐτοὶ γὰρ . . . ὑμῶν within a parenthesis; because the subject-matter of the clause of design refers back to the subject-matter of the foregoing establishing clause.—μετὰ χαρᾶς] *with joy*, namely, over your docility.—τοῦτο] *sc.* τὸ ἀγρυπνεῖν. Erroneously do Owen, Whitby, Michaelis, M'Lean, Heinrichs, Stuart, and others supplement τὸ λόγον ἀποδιδόναι. For the latter takes place only in the future, whereas the conjunctive of the *present* ποιῶσιν points to that which is already to be done in the present.—καὶ μὴ στενάζοντες] *and without sighing, sc.* over your intractableness.—ἀλυσιτελές] *unprofitable*, inasmuch as it will bring you no gain, but, on the contrary, will call down upon you the chastisement of God. A *litotes.*—τοῦτο] *sc.* τὸ στενάζειν.

Vv. 18, 19. Summons to the readers to intercession on behalf of the author. Comp. 1 Thess. v. 25; 2 Thess. iii. 1; Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 19; Col. iv. 3.—περὶ ἡμῶν] The plural has reference exclusively to the author of the epistle. In addition to himself, to think of Timothy (Seb. Schmidt, *al.*), or of the ἡγούμενοι spoken of ver. 17 (Carpzov, Kluge), or of the fellow-laborers in the gospel in the midst of the Gentile world, remote from the Hebrew Christians (Delitzsch, comp. also Alford), or of the companions in his vocation, with regard to whom it was to be made known that they wished to be looked upon as joint-representatives of the subject-matter of the epistle (Hofmann), is arbitrary. For—apart from the fact that no mention has been made of Timothy until now, and that the presupposition that the author wished himself to be numbered among the ἡγούμενοι spoken of in ver. 17 is a wholly baseless one—the singular, which in ver. 19 without any qualification takes the place of the preceding plural, is in itself decisive against this view. For, even if perchance at ver. 19 the person of the writer had to be brought into special relief, out of a plurality of persons indicated at ver. 18, a distinguishing ἐγώ as addition to the simple παρακαλῶ could not have been wanting.—πειθόμεθα γὰρ ὅτι κ.τ.λ] [LXXXV *c.*] *for we persuade ourselves, i. e.* we suppose or take it to be so (comp. Acts

[1] Theophylact, Schlichting, Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Hofmann, Woerner.

xxvi. 26), *that*[1] *we have a good conscience, since we endeavor in all things to walk in a praiseworthy manner.* Indication of the reason on the ground of which the author believes he is entitled to claim an interest on the part of the readers, manifesting itself in intercession on his behalf. But in the fact that he regards such explanation as necessary, there is displayed the consciousness that the Palestinian Christians took umbrage at him and his Pauline character of teaching; to remove this umbrage is therefore the object of the justificatory clause.—*ἐν πᾶσιν*] belongs to that which follows, not still[2] to *ἔχομεν*; and *πᾶσιν* is not *masculine*,[3] but *neuter.*

Ver. 19. *Περισσοτέρως*] is on account of its position more naturally referred to *παρακαλῶ* than[4] to *ποιῆσαι—ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν*] *that I may the sooner be restored to you*, may be in a position to return to you. There is to be inferred from these words, neither that the author, at the time of the composition of the epistle, was a prisoner,[5] nor yet that he belonged, as member, to the congregation of those to whom he was writing.[6] The former not, because the notice, ver. 23: *μεθ' οὗ, ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται, ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς*, shows beyond refutation that the writer at the time of the composition of the epistle was able to dispose freely of his own person. The latter not, because it is illogical to place the general notion of a "being restored" to a community upon a level with the special notion of the "return of one who has been torn from his home." Only two things follow from the words, namely (1) from the *τάχιον*, that the author was still prevented, in some way or other which had nothing to do with his personal freedom, from quitting his temporary place of residence so quickly as he could wish; (2) from *ἀποκατασταθῶ*, that he had already, before this time, been personally present in the midst of his readers.

Vv. 20, 21. *A wish of blessing.* [LXXXV *d.*] Chrysostom: *Πρῶτον παρ' αὐτῶν αἰτήσας τὰς εὐχάς, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτοῖς ἐπεύχεται πάντα τὰ ἀγαθά.—ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης*] A designation of God very usual with Paul also. Its import may either be, as 1 Thess. v. 23 (see at that place): *the God of salvation*, i. e. God, who bestows the Christian salvation; or, as Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20, Phil. iv. 9, 2 Cor. xiii. 11: *the God of peace*, i. e. God, who produces peace. In favor of the first acceptation, which is defended by Schlichting, may be urged the tenor of the benediction itself. In favor of the latter acceptation decides, however, the connection of thought with ver. 18 f.

[1] Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, and others take *ὅτι*—in reading the received *πεποίθαμεν γάρ*, and then supposing this to be put absolutely—as the *causal* "for" or "because," which, however, even supposing the correctness of the *Receptа*, is forced and unnatural. Yet more unsuitable, however, is it when Hofmann, even *with* the reading *πειθόμεθα*, will have *ὅτι* taken causally. The sense is supposed to be: "if we believe that ye are praying for us, this has its ground in the fact that we have a good conscience." But to derive the more precise indication of contents for the dependent *πειθόμεθα* from that which precedes, is altogether inadmissible.

[2] As Oecumenius and Theophylact suppose.

[3] Chrysostom: *οὐκ ἐν ἐθνικοῖς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν*; Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Er. Schmid, Tholuck, Hofmann, *al.*

[4] With Seb. Schmidt, Rambach, Bengel, and Hofmann.

[5] Euthalius, Calov, Braun, Bisping, and others.

[6] R. Köstlin in the *Theol. Jahrb.* of Baur and Zeller, 1853, H. 3, pp 423, 427, and 1854, H. 3, pp. 369, 406.

For, since the closing half of ver. 18 betrayed the presupposition that the receivers of the epistle were biassed by prejudice against the person of the writer, there lies indicated in the fact, that in the following wish of blessing God is designated as the God who creates peace, the further idea, that He will also make peace between the readers and the writer, *i. e.* will bring the Christian convictions of the readers into harmony with that of the writer. So in substance Chrysostom (*τοῦτο εἶπε διὰ τὸ στασιάζειν αὐτούς. Εἰ τοίνυν ὁ θεὸς εἰρήνης θεός ἐστι μὴ διαστασιάζετε πρὸς ἡμᾶς*), Oecumenius, Theophylact, Jac. Cappellus, and others. Wrongly do Grotius, Böhme, de Wette, Bisping, and others derive the appellation "the God of peace" from the supposition that reference is made to the contentions which prevailed amongst the members of the congregation itself. For the assumption of a state in which the congregation was rent by internal dissensions, is one warranted neither by xii. 14 nor by anything else in the epistle.—*ὁ ἀναγαγὼν κ.τ.λ.*] Further characterizing of God as the God who, by the raising of Christ from the dead, has sanctioned and attested the redeeming work of the same.—*ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν*] *He who has brought up from the dead, i. e.* who has raised from death. Wrongly do Bleek, de Wette, Bisping, Maier, Kluge, and Kurtz suppose that in *ὁ ἀναγαγών* is contained at the same time the exaltation into heaven. For, since *ὁ ἀναγαγών* does not stand absolutely, but has with it the addition *ἐκ νεκρῶν*, so must that idea also have been made evident by a special addition. There would thus have been written *ὁ ἐκ νεκρῶν εἰς ὕψος ἀναγαγών*, or something similar. Compare, too, Rom. x. 7, where in like manner, as is shown by ver. 9, by the *Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν* is denoted exclusively the *resurrection* of Christ, and not likewise His *ascension*.—*τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν*] *the exalted* (comp. iv. 14) *Shepherd of the sheep*. For the figure, comp. John x. 11 ff.; Matt. xxvi. 31; 1 Pet. ii. 25, v. 4 (*ὁ ἀρχιποιμήν*). According to Theophylact, Bengel, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Alford, Kurtz, Hofmann, and others, the author had in connection with this expression present to his mind LXX. Isa. lxiii. 10, where it is said in regard to Moses: *ποῦ ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων*,—a supposition which, considering the currency of the figure in the N. T., may certainly be dispensed with.—*ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου*] [LXXXV *d* 1, 2] *in virtue of the blood of an everlasting covenant*, i. e. in virtue of the shed blood of Christ, by which the New Covenant was sealed; comp. ix. 15 ff., x. 29. Oecumenius, Theophylact, Clarius, Calvin, Bengel, Bleek, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Kluge, Kurtz, Hofmann, Woerner, and others conjoin these words with *ὁ ἀναγαγών*, but then again differ from each other in the determining of the sense. According to Bleek and Kurtz (similarly Bisping), the author intends to say: "God brought up Christ from the dead in the blood of the everlasting covenant; in such wise that He took, as it were, the shed blood with Him, in that He opened up to Himself by the same the entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, and it retained continually its power for the sealing of an everlasting covenant." But this interpretation falls with the erroneous presupposition that *ὁ ἀναγαγών* includes in itself likewise the idea of the exaltation to heaven. According to Oecumenius 2, Theophylact 2, and Cal-

vin, *ἐν*, on the other hand, stands as the equivalent in signification to *σύν*: *who has raised Christ from the dead with the blood of the everlasting covenant*, so that this blood retains everlasting virtue: while Clarius (comp. the first interpretation in Oecumenius and Theophylact) understands the words as though *εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἡμῖν εἰς διαθήκην αἰώνιον* had been written, and Bengel, as likewise Hofmann, makes *ἐν αἵματι* the same as *διὰ τὸ αἷμα* (for the blood's sake). But all these acceptations are linguistically untenable. Equally inadmissible is it to take *ἐν*, in this combination, *instrumentally* (Delitzsch, Kluge: "by means of, by the power of, by virtue of;" Alford: "through the blood"). For if one insists on the strict signification of the instrumental explanation, there arises a false thought, since the means by the application of which the miraculous act of the resurrection was accomplished is not the blood of Christ, but the omnipotence of God. If, however, we mingle the notion of *mediately effecting* with that of *the meritorious cause*, as is done by Delitzsch and Alford, inasmuch as the former dilutes the "*kraft*" (by virtue of) into "virtute ac merito sanguinis ipsius in morte effusi," the latter the "*through*" into "*in virtue* of the blood," we come back to Bengel's ungrammatical equalizing of *ἐν αἵματι* with *διὰ τὸ αἷμα*. Another class of expositors combine *ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου* with the *μέγαν* immediately foregoing; either, as Sykes and Baumgarten, in taking *τὸν μέγαν* as a notion *per se*; or, as Starck, Wolf, and Heinrichs, prolonging in connection with it the idea of the shepherd. Nevertheless, it is most natural[1] to regard *ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου* as instrumental nearer definition to the total idea *τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν*; in such wise that by the addition is indicated the means by which Christ became the exalted Shepherd, with whom no other shepherd may be placed upon a parallel. Comp. Acts xx. 28: *προσέχετε . . . παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου, ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου.*—*διαθήκης αἰωνίου*] Comp. Jer. xxxii. 40, l. 5; Isa. lv. 3, lxi. 8.[2]

Ver. 21. Καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ] [LXXXV *d* 3.] *cause that ye become ἄρτιοι, ready or perfect, in every good work.* Oecumenius: *πληρώσαι, τελειώσαι.* That, for the rest, *καταρτίσαι* is *optative*, and not, as Kurtz strangely supposes, *imperative aorist middle*, is self-evident.—*εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι*] Statement of the *design*, not of the *effect* (Schlichting and others): *that ye may accomplish.*—*τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ*] *His will, i.e.* that which is morally good and salutary. There is certainly comprehended under the expression the faithful continuance in Christianity.—*ποιῶν ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*] [LXXXV *d* 4.] *working in you* (wrongly Böhme: among you) *that which is well-pleasing in His sight, through Christ Jesus.* Modal definition to *καταρτίσαι.*—*τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*] Comp. 2 Cor. v. 9; Rom. xii. 1, xiv. 18; Eph. v. 10; Phil. iv. 18.—*διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*] be-

[1] With Beza, Estius, Grotius, Limborch, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Stuart, Stengel, Ebrard, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 601), Maier, Moll, and others.

[2] Theodoret: *Αἰώνιον δὲ τὴν καινὴν κέκληκε διαθήκην, ὡς ἑτέρας μετὰ ταύτην οὐκ ἐσομένης· ἵνα γὰρ μή τις ὑπολάβῃ, καὶ ταύτην δι' ἄλλης διαθήκης πανθήσεσθαι, εἰκότως αὐτῆς τὸ ἀτελεύτητον ἔδειξεν.*

longs neither to *καταρτίσαι* (Bloomfield) nor to *τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ* (Grotius, Hammond, Michaelis, Storr, and others), but to *ποιῶν*.—*ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*] *sc. ἐστω—ἡ δόξα*] *the glory due to Him*.—The doxology is referred by Limborch, Wetstein, Bengel, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Ernesti, Delitzsch, Alford, Kluge, Woerner, and others, *to God*; and in favor of this it may be urged that in the wish of blessing *ὁ θεός* forms the main subject. More correctly, however, shall we refer it, partly on account of the immediate joining of *ᾧ* to *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, partly on account of the design of the whole epistle, to warn the readers, who had become wavering in their faith in Christ, against relapse into Judaism, with Calvin, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Owen, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Stengel, Tholuck, Bisping, Riehm (*Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbr.* p. 286), Maier, Moll, and the majority, *to Christ*. [LXXXV *d* 5.]

Ver. 22. [On Vv. 22–25, see Note LXXXVI., page 748.] Request for friendly reception of the epistle.—*ἀνέχεσθε τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως*] [LXXXVI *a*.] *bear with the word of the exhortation*, grant it entrance with you, close not your hearts against it. Mistakenly do the Vulgate, Stein, and Kluge make *παράκλησις* here have the signification of "consolation." Neither the verb *ἀνέχεσθε* nor the tenor of the epistle is in keeping therewith.—*ὁ λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως*] Comp. Acts xiii. 15. Not merely the admonitions scattered here and there in the epistle (Dindorf, Kuinoel) are to be understood under this expression; and just as little is merely chap. xiii. (Semler), or the last specially hortatory sections, chap. x. 19–xiii. (Grotius, Calov, and others), thought of in connection therewith. Rather is there intended by it, as also the following *ἐπέστειλα* proves, the epistle in its full extent.—*καὶ γὰρ διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν*] Argument for the reasonableness of the request on the ground of the brevity of the epistle: *for I have also* (*i.e.* apart from the fact that, by reason of your perilous wavering in the Christian faith, the admonishing of you was laid as a duty upon my conscience), as you see, *written to you only with brief words*. Theophylact: Τοσαῦτα εἰπών, ὅμως βραχέα ταῦτά φησιν, ὅσον πρὸς ἃ ἐπεθύμει λέγειν. Quite remote from the meaning is that sense which Kurtz would put upon the words: *the readers were also to take into account the fact that the epistle has, owing to its brief compass, often assumed a harsher and severer form of expression, than would be the case in connection with a more detailed amplification and a more careful limitation*.—*διὰ βραχέων*] of the same import as *δι' ὀλίγων*, 1 Pet. v. 12.—*ἐπιστέλλειν*] in the signification "to write a letter," elsewhere in the N. T. only Acts xv. 20, xxi. 25.

Ver. 23. Communication of the intelligence that Timothy has been set free, and the promise, if the arrival of Timothy is not long delayed, in company with him to visit the readers.—*γινώσκετε*] is *imperative*,[1] not *indicative*.[2] For, that the author would be obliged to communicate further

[1] Peshito, Vulgate, Faber Stapulensis, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Junius, Owen, Bengel, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, I. p. 278; Stein, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Alford, Maier, Kluge, Moll, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Hofmann, Woerner, and others.

[2] Vatablus, Nösselt, *Opusc.* I. p. 256; Morus, Schulz, Bleek *ad loc.*, and *Einl. in d. N. T.*, 3 Aufl. p. 683: de Wette, *al.*

details concerning the liberation of Timothy in the case that the readers had not yet known of it, cannot be maintained; while, on the other hand, upon the supposition of the indicative, the whole notice would become superfluous.—γινώσκετε ἀπολελυμένον] [LXXXVI *b*, *c*.] *know as one released*, *i.e.* know that he has been released. Comp. Winer, p. 324 [E. T. 346]. Wrongly will Storr, Schleussner, Bretschneider, Paulus have γινώσκετε taken in the sense: *hold in honor*, or: *receive with kindness*, against which, equally as against the interpretation of Schulz: "ye know the brother Timothy, who has been set at liberty," the non-repetition of the article τόν before the participle is in itself decisive.—ἀπολελυμένον] is to be understood of liberation from *imprisonment*.[1] Of an imprisonment of Timothy nothing is known to us, it is true, from other sources, but the possibility of the same cannot be disputed. The suppositions, that ἀπολελυμένον signifies: *sent away to the Hebrews with our epistle* (Theodoret, subscription of the epistle in many cursives: ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου; Faber Stapulensis, *al.*), or: *sent away somewhither, and consequently absent from the author* (Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Limborch, Carpzov, Stuart, and others), have the simple signification of the word against them.—ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται] *if he very speedily* (earlier, sooner than I leave my present abode) *comes to me* (incorrectly Grotius, Heinrichs, Stuart, *al.*: returns).—ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς] Oecumenius: ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

Ver. 24. Request for the delivering of salutations, together with the conveying of salutations to the readers.—πάντας τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους] This designation of persons has about it something surprising, since according to it the letter would have the appearance of being addressed neither to the presidents of the assembly, nor to the whole congregation, but to single members of the latter. Probably, however, the meaning of the author is only that those to whom the epistle is delivered, for reading to the congregation, should greet as well all the presidents as also all the other members of the congregation.—οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας] [LXXXVI *d*.] is not to be explained from the absorption of one local preposition into another; in such wise that it should stand for οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, which is thought possible by Winer, p. 584 [E. T. 629]. It signifies: *those from Italy*, *i.e.* Christians who have come out of Italy, and are now to be found in the surroundings of the writer. The general expression: οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, seems to point to a compact number of persons already known to the readers. It is highly probable, therefore, that those referred to are Christians who, on the occasion of the Neronian persecution, had fled from Italy, and had settled down for the time being at the place of the author's present abode. The expression shows, moreover, that the epistle was written outside of Italy. See p. 13.

Ver. 25. Concluding wish of blessing, entirely in accord with that of Tit. iii. 15.

[1] So Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact (all three, however, with hesitation), then Beza, Grotius, Er. Schmid, Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, Wolf, Bengel, Sykes, Chr. Fr. Schmid, Böhme, Bleek, de Wette, Stengel, Ebrard, Bisping, Delitzsch, Maier, Kurtz, Ewald, M'Caul, Hofmann, and others.

Notes by American Editor.

LXXXIII. Vv. 1–8.

(*a*) Ch. xiii. contains eight exhortations, which are unconnected with the development of the main thought of the epistle and also unconnected with each other, as follows:—1. With reference to Christian brotherly love, including hospitality and sympathy with those in bonds, vv. 1–3; 2. With reference to chastity, ver. 4; 3. With reference to covetousness, vv. 5, 6; 4. With reference to imitating the deceased leaders of the Church, vv. 7, 8; 5. An exhortation not to be led astray by Jewish doctrines and observances, vv. 9–15; 6. An exhortation to beneficence, ver. 16; 7. An exhortation to obedience to the present leaders of the Church, ver. 17; 8. An exhortation to prayer for the writer, vv. 18, 19. These exhortations are brief, and they are such as might be added by any writer at the close of his letter or discourse, whatever was the plan of his work. They constitute in no proper sense a practical section of the epistle. The very marked difference between this chapter and the passage from x. 19 to xii. 29 will be noticed by all students, and will tend, as they observe it, to convince them that the last-mentioned passage is subordinate to viii. 1—x. 18.—(*b*) After these exhortations, the author adds a prayer that the readers may be blessed of God, vv. 20, 21, and then, with a request that they would kindly receive the appeal and admonition of his letter, ver. 22, an expression of his hope to visit them in company with Timothy at an early day, ver. 23, and brief salutations, ver. 24, he closes the epistle with the Apostolic benediction, ver. 25.

(*c*) The special allusion to hospitality and sympathy for the distressed—making these the prominent exhibitions of brotherly love which he would mention—is to be accounted for in connection with the peculiar circumstances and needs of the period in which the writer and readers were living. The prominence here given to prisoners among the class of those who suffer evil may, perhaps, have some weight as favoring the text-reading *δεσμίοις* in x. 34, as the original one. This word in the present verse may possibly, however, have occasioned a change in x. 34 from *δεσμοῖς* to *δεσμίοις* (see Note LXXIV *c*); but this is less probable.—(*d*) *ἐν σώματι* is correctly explained by Lünem., but whether it should be rendered, as by him, *in a body*, or, as by R. V. and others, *in the body*, is uncertain. The two English expressions, in such a case, may be nearly equivalent to each other.—(*e*) That the verb to be supplied in ver. 4 is *ἐστω*, not *ἐστί*, is placed beyond any considerable doubt by the hortatory character of the surrounding sentences and of the entire chapter. *ἐν πᾶσιν* is best taken as neuter; so Bleek, Alf., Moll, Lünem., Delitzsch, de W., Kay, in Bib. Comm., and others. A. V., R. V., Stuart, W. & Wilk., Hofm., Thol., and others regard *πᾶσιν* as masculine.

(*f*) Respecting the word *ἐκβασις* (ver. 7) Grimm (Lex. N. T.) says, "*non est simpliciter finis vitae physicae, sed modus quo vitam bene actam absolverunt mente, quam prodiderunt moriendo.*" That the reference is to a death by martyrdom, though probable, can hardly be affirmed, with Lünem., to be beyond doubt. The probability of this reference is indicated by the suggestion that *ὑπομονή* is involved in *πίστιν*, which arises from the use of the words in the previous chapters, and by the suggestion that this *ὑπομονή* was carried to the extreme point in these persons, which is connected with the fact that they are so prominently mentioned as examples of faith. Comp. xi., xii. 4. "Contemplating the way in which

(i. e. martyrdom) they end their holy manner of living, imitate their faith," (W. & Wilk).

(*g*) The connection of ver. 8 with vv. 9 ff. only, which is favored by Lünem., on the ground of the antithetic correspondence of *ὁ αὐτός* with *ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις*, is not made necessary by this consideration. On the other hand, the rhetorical force of the striking words of this verse, and the natural suggestion of the ever-continuing sameness of Jesus in the reference to the faith and perseverance of the leaders who had died, make the connection with ver. 7 more probable. The readers should imitate the faith of those whose lives were already finished, remembering the fact that "Jesus Christ is yesterday and to day the same; yea and for ever."—(*h*) The explanation of *ἐχθὲς κ.τ.λ.* as a designation of the past, present and future, which is given by Lünem., is to be preferred to any of the other explanations to which he refers. The writer has in mind, no doubt, the case of the deceased leaders, as he thinks of the past, and of those whom he addresses, as he thinks of the present. But he uses a universal expression, which covers all time and may apply to past, present and future in any age of the Church.

LXXXIV. Vv. 9–15.

(*a*) While the primary connection of ver. 8 is with ver. 7, the words of ver. 8 contain or suggest the idea of the ever-abiding sameness of the great Christian truth. This suggestion naturally leads the writer to the exhortation: not to be carried away to other doctrines.—(*b*) The principal question of these verses relates to the word *βρώμασιν* of ver. 9. The view of Lünem., Blk., and others, that it refers to the *sacrificial meats*, is favored by the fact, that the thought moves on in a single line to the end of the passage, if this view is adopted, and that the comparison of the sacrifices of the two systems is in accordance with the suggestions of the immediately preceding chapters. Moreover, this writer does not occupy himself in the Epistle with the subject of clean and unclean meats, as Paul does, but with the O. T. system as a whole, or in its central and vital parts, as a preparatory and inferior system. On the other hand, there is a reference to Levitically clean meats in ix. 10, where *βρώμασι* is used; this meaning of the word will more easily explain the adjectives *ποικίλαις* and *ξέναις*; and it is possible that the writer may intend to change the thought in ver. 10, as Alf. holds:—"those ancient distinctions are profitless; one distinction remains: that our true meat is not to be partaken of by those who adhere to those old distinctions: that Christianity and Judaism are necessarily and totally distinct." If the passage is, as Lünemann claims, to be interpreted *per se*, the view which he takes has the greater probability.

(*c*) With respect to particular words in this passage, the following points may be noticed:—1. *χάριτι* (ver. 9) means *grace*, not *thankfulness*. The writer is here speaking of what is fundamental to the Christian system.—2. *οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν* (ver. 9) is to be taken in a sense kindred to *ἀνωφελές* vii. 18, if *βρώμασιν* refers to *sacrificial meats*, and so no argument for the other meaning of *βρώμ.* can be drawn from the use of this verb. The writer regards the law in all its parts as unprofitable. It made nothing perfect.—3. Those who serve the tabernacle (ver. 10) are primarily the Jewish priests, but here they are doubtless only representatives of all who belong to the Jewish system.—4. *ἐξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς*

of ver. 13 means: outside of the Jewish system—the entire figure as applied to Christ and His sacrifice being introduced for the purpose of suggesting this idea.—5. γάρ (ver. 14) gives a reason (additional to that which is indicated in the earlier verses and pointed to by τοίνυν of ver. 13) for ἐξερχώμεθα κ.τ.λ.—the reason being this: that the readers, as Christians, are not connected with the earthly Jerusalem, but with the heavenly. This explanation seems better than that of Lünem., who makes γάρ introduce a ground of encouragement for the subordinate phrase φέροντες τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ.

LXXXV. Vv. 16–21.

(*a*) The preceding verses close with a renewed suggestion of the confession to be made through Christ—that is, of holding fast to the Christian system in and for themselves. Ver. 16 suggests that they are, as it were, to make the same confession in their works as related to others. θυσίαις continues the thought, which is presented in vv. 9–15, and serves to show that in those verses the writer has throughout the idea of sacrifice—thus bearing upon the explanation of βρώμασιν. κοινωνία here, evidently, refers to the imparting to others of what belongs to one's own possessions. It is the sharing or participation of one Christian with another, which involves such communicating of good to the other.

(*b*) The placing of the exhortation to obedience to their present leaders so near the end of the chapter, rather than in connection with the allusion to the leaders who had died, is due, not improbably, to the fact that vv. 9–15 were suggested by the thought of ver. 8, which was added to ver. 7, and, possibly, also to the fact of a remembrance of these living leaders as he was about to refer to himself.

(*c*) The γάρ clause of ver. 18 may be only a modest expression of the writer's confidence in his own Christian character and life, which he might have given at any time, or in any letter. But it may, quite probably, be intended to remove any unkind feeling which the readers, or some portion of them, had on the ground of his Pauline doctrine, and which, if set aside because of a conviction of his sincerity, etc., so that they should pray for him, might give way to a readiness to receive his letter and himself. καλῶς is better translated *honorably* (A. R. V.), than *honestly* (R. V.).

(*d*) The prayer which he now makes, in his turn, for them, is one which gathers into itself the great thoughts of the epistle—the eternal covenant, the idea of the last section; Jesus the shepherd leading His people, the idea which is suggested even in ch. ii., though not by the use of this word. The petition which he offers is to the end that the God of peace will make them perfect—the end which is secured only by the Christian system, through the new covenant and the death and resurrection of Jesus.—1. ἐν αἵματι may be most simply explained as belonging with ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν—the raising of Christ from the dead, viewed as the final consummation of the plan of God for the salvation of men, was in the sphere of the blood of the covenant. It was only as connected with this blood, and this covenant, that it had this significance.—2. αἰωνίου διαθήκης, not *the*, but *an* eternal covenant (as A. R. V.). The covenant is here spoken of only as having this character—it was an eternal one.—3. καταρτίσαι is not the same verb as τελειῶσαι, but, if the καταρτίζειν κ.τ.λ., is accomplished for the Christian, he becomes τετελειωμένος.—4. ποιῶν ἐν ἡμῖν (ἡμῖν) κ.τ.λ., in connection with ποιῆσαι κ.τ.λ.—Comp. Phil. ii. 13.—5. ᾧ (ver. 21) may refer to Ἰ. Χρ.; but, as God is

manifestly the subject of the sentence and the one to whom the prayer is addressed, there can be little doubt that it should be understood as referring to God. The argument which Lünem. gives for the reference to Christ loses its force when we consider, that Christ is everywhere in the epistle presented as the instrumental agent in introducing and carrying forward God's new revelation, and that the writer is urging the readers everywhere not to abandon God's later and greater revelation for the earlier and preparatory one.

LXXXVI. Vv. 22-25.

(*a*) *τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως.*—These words, as Lünem. remarks, refer to the epistle as a whole. They show that this epistle, like all those written by Paul, was written for a practical end—the doctrinal part being always, in this sense, subordinate to the practical. This writer makes this purpose manifest, in a striking way, by adding his one comprehensive *παράκλησις* after every section of his argument.—(*b*) *γινώσκετε* is probably, though not certainly, *imperative.*—(*c*) The probabilities, connected with the use of the two words in the N. T. and elsewhere, favor giving to *ἀπολελυμένον* the sense of *released from imprisonment*, and not giving this meaning to *ἀποκατασταθῶ* (ver. 19). The argument derived from these words either for or against the Pauline authorship of the epistle can hardly, however, be considered a very strong one.—(*d*) *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας* is, to say the least, somewhat more naturally explained as indicating that the writer was not in Italy, at the time when the epistle was written.

TOPICAL INDEX.

A.

Abraham, promise of God to, 542–544; 553–555; gave tithes to Melchisedek, 558, 563, 564, 579; example of faith, 674, 675, 679–681.
Alexander, 85; mentioned elsewhere, whether same or not, 85, 86; the coppersmith, 270, 271.
Alexandria, in Egypt, as the place to which the Epistle to the Hebrews was directed, 370–376.
Ambrose, referred to or quoted, 226, 302, 342, 434, 510, 668, 733.
American Editor, Notes by. See Notes by American Editor.
Angels, in New Testament, 131, 132; "elect," 174; as "Sons of God," 401; as contrasted with the Son of God, 406–409; superiority of Christ to, 426–432; 448–450; myriads of, 716, 717, 726.
Apollos, 320–322; thought, by Lünemann, to have been author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 364–367, 443, 447.
Apostasy, punishment of, 651, 652.
Apostles, Christ so called, 456, 457, 470.
Apostolic Constitutions, 106, 143, 170.
Appearing (ἐπιφάνεια) of the Lord, 194, 201, 212, 221, 261, 302, 303, 309.
Aquila and Priscilla, 273.
Ark of the Covenant, 605–607.
Artemas, 7, 12, 15, 320.
Assemblies of Christians for worship, 650.
Athenagoras, referred to or quoted, 117, 159, 319.
Augustine, referred to or quoted, 209, 342, 343, 433, 515, 627, 668.

B.

Baptism, 315–317, 324, 325; "doctrine of baptisms," 528–530, 550; Christian baptism, 649.
Barnabas, supposed to have been author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 351–355; epistle of, 352–354.
Basil the Great, 339, 466.
Bishop. See Episcopus.
Blood, shedding of, needful to remission of sin, 619–621.

C.

Cabbalists, in the Pastoral Epistles, 36, 37.
Caius, of Rome, 341.
Call, or calling (κλῆσις), 211.
Carpus, 270.
Carthage, synod of, 343.
Charisma, 207, 208, 220. See Holy Spirit.
Chastening, 705, 707.
"Child-bearing, the," meaning of, 108, 113.
Christ Jesus. See Logos. Priesthood of, 444, 445; High Priest, 493; qualifications of for high-priesthood, 501–513, 519–522; "after the order of Melchisedek," 557–560; superiority of to the Levitical priesthood, 561–577, 582, 583; Mediator of the New Covenant, 591, 596, 616.
Chrysostom, referred to or quoted, 4, 79, 82, 83, 84, 97, 100, 102, 108, 117, 118, 121, 125, 129, 131, 144, 145, 148, 149, 158, 164, 176, 184, 204, 227, 236, 238, 239, 249, 251, 268, 272, 281, 284, 287, 288, 297, 303, 313, 318, 339, 391, 403, 429, 433, 439, 443, 444, 468, 491, 515, 519, 534, 538, 559, 567, 574, 599, 609, 627, 641, 649, 654, 668, 672, 686, 690, 701, 703, 706, 709, 710, 716, 720, 737, 740, 741, 744.
Church organization, in the Pastoral Epistles, 48–50; the Church as the foundation, 236–238, 244.
Church, "pillar and ground," meaning of, 128, 136.
Circumcision, of the = Jewish Christians, 286.
Clement of Alexandria, referred to or quoted, 43, 44, 74, 104, 117, 187, 224, 234, 336, 345.
Clement of Rome, 25; meaning of τέρμα, or boundary, used by, 26–28; quoted,

43, 49, 101, 340; supposed by some to have written the Epistle to the Hebrews, 363, 364, 692.
Conscience, 289.
Covenant, or testament, 617, 618, 632.
Crescens, 269.
Cretes and Cretans, 6, 57; labors of Paul in, visits of to, etc., 12–17; Cretan poet quoted by Paul, 286, 287; Church in Crete, 292; heretics in, 293.
Cyprian, 340.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 339.

D.

Deacons, 123–127, 135.
Deaconesses, 124, 125, 135, 305, 306.
Death of the Messiah or Christ, 435, 450, 509, 617, 618.
Death, meaning of, 212, 213; power of, 451, 452.
Demons (*δαιμόνια*), warnings against by Paul, 139, 140.
Devil, the, in the New Testament, 121, 122, 134, 135, 245, 441, 442.

E.

Elders. See Presbyters, and Presbytery.
Elect (*ἐκλεκτοί*), *i. e.*, believers, 230.
Ephesus, 12–17, 63–66, 270.
Epiphanius, 116, 117, 339, 559.
Episcopus (bishop), meaning of the term, 115, 133, 283, 292, 293.
Erastus, 18, 20, 274.
Esau, 710–713.
Essenes, 36, 37, 38, 56.
Eunice, Timothy's mother, 1, 203, 207, 259.
Eusebius, referred to or quoted, 4, 25, 43, 67, 250, 336–339.
Exegetical Literature, 331–334.

F.

Fables (*μίθοι*), 68, 88, 144, 288, 296.
Faith, the, 267.
Faith (*πίστις*), in Epistle to the Hebrews, 347, 667, et seqq.
Families, directions to Titus respecting, 296–298.
Fatherhood of God, 439.
Felix, 31, 32.
Festus, 30–32.
First-born, Church of the, 717, 718, 726.
Foundation, the, i. e., the Church, 236–238, 244.

G.

Genealogies (*γενεαλογίαι*), meaning of, 40, 41, 68, 88, 319, 320.
Gnostics and Gnosticism, 38–42, 235, 236.
God (*θεός*), as applied to Christ Jesus, 130, 136, 137, 302, 303, 307–311, 417–420.
Good works, 318, 325.
Gregory Nazianzen, 339, 703.
Gregory of Nyssa, 129, 339, 403.

H.

Hebrews, Epistle to the, exegetical literature, etc., 329–334; Introduction, Section 1, as to the author, whether Paul, 335–351; or Barnabas, 351–355; or Luke, 355–363; or Clement, 363, 364; or Silvanus (Silas), 364; or Apollos, 364–367; Section 2, persons addressed, 367–380; Section 3, occasion, object, and contents, 380–386; Section 4, time and place of composition, 386, 387; Section 5, form, and original language, 387,388; exegesis, Chap. I. 390–410; Notes by American Editor, 410–420; exegesis, Chap. II. 422–446; Notes by American Editor, 446–453; exegesis, Chap. III. 455–470; Notes by American Editor, 470–474; exegesis, Chap. IV. 477–495; Notes by American Editor, 495–499; exegesis, Chap. V., 501–519; Notes by American Editor, 519–523; exegesis, Chap. VI., 524–548; Notes by American Editor, 549–555; exegesis, Chap. VII. 557–577; Notes by American Editor, 577–583; exegesis, Chap. VIII. 585–595; Notes by American Editor, 595, 596; exegesis, Chap. IX. 599–629; Notes by American Editor, 629–634; exegesis, Chap. X. 638–658; Notes by American Editor, 658–663; exegesis, Chap. XI. 667–693; Notes by American Editor, 694–696; exegesis, chap. XII. 699–722; Notes by American Editor, 722–727; exegesis, Chap. XIII. 729–744; Notes by American Editor, 745–748.
Hegesippus, 39, 43.
Heretics, warnings against in the Pastoral Epistles, 33–43, 186, 198; how to deal with, 232, 293, 320.
Hermas, 117.
Hermogenes and Phygellus, 216, 217.
High priest, Christ our, 456, 457, 492–494. See Christ Jesus.

Hilary, 342, 559.
Holy Ghost, sin against, 536, 537, 550, 551.
Holy Spirit, source of prophecy, 138, 139; gift by to Timothy, 149, 150, 207, 208, 220; in connection with our Lord's sacrifice, 614.
Hospitality, exhortation to, 729, 745.
"Husband of one wife," probable meaning of, 117, 118, 134.
Hymenaeus and Philetus, 35, 56, 85, 235.

I.

Ignatius, referred to or quoted, 43, 49, 52, 67, 159, 249, 442.
Incarnation of Christ, 300, 442, 452.
Inspiration. See Scripture.
Irenaeus, referred to or quoted, 43, 235, 250, 341.
Isaac, example of faith, 682.
Italy, they of, i.e., Christians, 744, 748.

J.

James, brother of the Lord, 386.
Jannes and Jambres, 250.
Jerome, referred to or quoted, 4, 30, 44, 125, 162, 167, 250, 289, 342, 559, 691.
Jerusalem, the heavenly, 716.
Jesus Christ. See Christ Jesus and Logos.
Jewish Christians, and Epistle to the Hebrews, 368–370.
Joseph, example of faith, 682, 683.
Josephus, referred to or quoted, 31, 103, 174, 373, 386, 423, 505, 558, 575, 589, 590, 603, 605, 608, 672, 712.
Judaizers, in Pastoral Epistles, 35–37.
Judgment (κρίμα), 121, 122, 135, 168.
Judgment (κρίσις), 176, 177, 626.
Justification, 317, 318, 324.
Justin Martyr, referred to or quoted, 43, 117 159, 194, 271, 691.

K.

Kingdom, heavenly, of the Lord, 273.

L.

Laodiceans, Epistle to, 371, 372.
Last days, the, 247, 258.
Law (νόμος), 72–74, 89.
Lawlessness (ἀνομία), 304.
"Laying on of hands," meaning of, 151, 156, 175, 182; in Epistle to the Hebrews, 530.
Leontopolis, in Egypt, Jewish temple in, 373.
Levitical priesthood, inferior to Christ's, 561–577, 582, 583.
Life, source of, 213.
Linus, 275.
"Lion, mouth of the," 272, 278. See Nero.
Logos, the, 131; dignity of, 393–398; world, created by, according to Philo, 395; incarnate, 398; first-born, 404; as to life of on earth, 407–409; Philo's view of, 489.
Lois, grandmother of Timothy, 1, 203, 207, 259,
Luke, 269; supposed to have been author of Epistle to the Hebrews, 355–363.
Luther, on Epistle to the Hebrews, not by Paul, 349, 350; thought it might have been, and almost certainly was, written by Apollos, 364.

M.

Macedonia, 10, 14, 63–66.
Marcion and Marcionites, 38–40, 44, 46.
Marcus and Jesus, 363.
Mark, 269, 270.
Mediator, Christ the, 98; of the New Covenant, 591, 596, 616.
Mediators of Old Testament, 399.
Melchisedek, priest of God, king of Salem, 557–560, 578. See Abraham.
Messianic kingdom, 403, 693; period, 426, 427, 449, 464, 544.
Money, love of, 190, 731.
Morality, Christian, basis of, 300, 307.
Moses, 250; inferior to Christ, 455, 459, 460, 471, 590; example of faith, 683–686.
Muratorian Canon, quoted, 28, 340.
Mystery of the faith, 123; of godliness, 129, 130.
Myths. See Fables.

N.

Nero, emperor, 25, 31, 32; perhaps "the lion," 272, 278.
New Covenant, 591, 713. See Testament.
New Testament, superior to the Old, 399, 400, 414, 415.
Nicopolis, in Epirus, 4, 14–17, 33, 320, 321.
North African Church, on Epistle to the Hebrews, 339, 340.
Notes by American Editor, 86–92, 109–113; 133–137; 153–156; 178–182;

198–201; 218–222; 241–245; 258, 259; 275–278; 290–294; 305–311; 322–325; 410–420; 446–453; 470–474; 495–499; 519–523; 549–555; 577–583; 595, 596; 629–634; 658–663; 694–696; 722–727; 745–748.

O.

Obedience to authorities, 312, 313, 322, 323.
Onesiphorus, 20; Paul's wish and prayer for, 217, 222.
Onias, temple of, in Egypt, 373, 374, 375.
Origen, referred to or quoted, 29, 94, 95, 250, 336, 337, 345, 433; on authorship of Epistle to the Hebrews, 336, 337; on Melchisedek, 559, 691.

P.

Palestine, Christians in, as those to whom Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed, 369, 376–380.
Pantaenus, 335, 336.
Parousia of the Lord, 194, 201, 215, 247, 258, 275, 302, 466, 477, 541, 650, 657, 662.
Pastoral Epistles, Introduction to, 1–59; section 1, Timothy and Titus, 1–5; section 2, contents of, 5–9; section 3, time and place of composition, 9–33; section 4, heretics named in, 33–43; section 5, authenticity and genuineness of, defended against German rationalists, 43–59.
Paul the Apostle, writes the Pastoral Epistles, Introduction to, 1–59; discussion as to his missionary journeys, etc., 1–5, 9–12; abode in Ephesus, 13, 14; imprisonment in Rome, 17; second imprisonment, 24, 25, 30, 266; visit to Spain, 26–29; places of writing Epistles to Timothy, and Titus, 32, 33; warnings against heretics, 33, etc.; who these were, 33–43; first Epistle to Timothy a sort of "business letter," according to Huther, 55; second Epistle paternal and loving, 58, 62, 205; Epistle to Titus, character of, 57, 282; love of for Timothy, 205, 206; exhorts him to courage, patience, trust, love, endurance, etc., 207–215, 224–232; advice of as to dealing with heresy, 232; exhorts Timothy to duty, 261–263; "ready to be offered," 265–266; discussion as to Paul's authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 335–351, 414, 415.
Pelagius, 145.
Perseverance of the saints, 551.
Philetus. See Hymenæus.
Philo, referred to or quoted, 143, 374, 395, 404, 435, 489, 492, 494, 515, 516, 543, 545, 548, 559, 573, 576, 589, 603, 640, 670, 678, 692, 704, 729, 738.
Phygellus and Hermogenes, 216, 217.
Polycarp, 43, 190.
Pontius Pilate, 193, 200.
Poppaea and Nero, 31, 32.
Prayer for the dead, 217, 222.
Prayer for kings and others, 94–97, 110.
Presbyters, how to be treated by Timothy, 171–175; two classes of, 181; directions to Titus respecting, 283, 292.
Presbytery, at ordination of Timothy, 3, 150, 151, 156. Cf. p. 221, 222.
Prisca and Aquila, 273.
Prophecy, as to heresies and heretics, 138, 139, 153; in the case of Timothy, 150, 156.
Prophets, the, 292.

R.

Redemption, eternal through Christ, 613.
Regeneration, in baptism, 315–317, 324.
Rest (*σαββατισμός*), 483, etc., 497, 498.
Resurrection, the, denied by heretics, 235, 236.
Riches, dangers of, 189–191, 195, 196, 199, 200.
Rome, church of, on Epistle to the Hebrews, 340, 341. See Trent, council of,

S.

Sacrifice of Christ, efficacy of, 613–615, 625, 644.
Salem, Melchisedek king of, 558.
Salvation and redemption, universality of, 97, 98, 110, 147, 300, 324, 433, 434.
Sanctuary, in temple in Egypt, 372–374; heavenly, 621–625, 632–634, 647.
Sarah, example of faith, 676, 677.
Satan, delivered to, meaning of the expression, 86, 92; under the influence of, 170.
Saviour. See God.
Science (*γνῶσις*), or knowledge, false, 197, 201.
Scripture, inspiration of, 256, 257, 259.
Second Coming of the Lord. See Parousia.
Seneca and the Apostle Paul, 350.
Silas (Silvanus), 2.
Silvanus, supposed to have written Epistle to the Hebrews, 364.

Slanderers (διάβολοι), 125, 247, 296.
Slaves and servants, how to be treated, and how to behave, 184–186, 198, 299, 300, 306, 307.
Socinus, referred to, 444.
Son of God, as declared in Epistle to the Hebrews. See Logos.
Spirit, the eternal, 614, 615, 631.
"Spirit in," of Christ, 131.
Spirits, departed, 718.
Syrian Church, how Epistle to the Hebrews esteemed by, 338.

T.

Tatian, 44, 45.
Temple of Solomon, 605; second temple, 605; temple at Jerusalem, and in Egypt, 369.
Tertullian, referred to or quoted, 43, 52, 117, 235, 236, 339, 340, 352, 691.
Testament, New, in Christ's death, 617, 618.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, referred to or quoted, 76, 117, 128, 248, 283, 339, 424, 601, 628.
Theodoret, referred to or quoted, 4, 10, 94, 98, 102, 118, 120, 123, 131, 176, 214, 227, 239, 257, 271, 287, 304, 313, 339, 433, 444, 459, 461, 466, 468, 508, 529, 534, 536, 559, 569, 571, 591, 601, 640, 647, 648, 649, 654, 668, 672, 677, 686, 700, 705, 706, 709, 715, 737, 740, 742, 744.
Therapeutae, 36.
Theophylact, referred to or quoted, 5, 83, 94, 102, 108, 118, 123, 125, 141, 185, 241, 247, 254, 286, 301, 315, 425, 429, 440, 443, 459, 466, 491, 510, 533, 535, 545, 546, 559, 561, 563, 569, 586, 590, 592, 601, 609, 627, 647, 649, 652, 668, 676, 683, 688, 692, 701, 706, 709, 716, 719, 737, 744.
Timothy, parentage and education of, 1; assistant of Paul, 1, 2; travels with the Apostle, 3; ordained, 3; mentioned in Epistle to the Hebrews, 3; first bishop of Ephesus, 3, 4; abused by de Wette, 51, 52, 58; "youth" of, 51, 52, 155; censured for lack of zeal, etc., 208, 220; Paul's advice to, 232, 243–245; urged to come to the Apostle, 274, 277.
Timothy, first Epistle to, 2, 5, 7, 9–12, 24, 33, 54–57; exegesis, Chap. I. 61–86; Notes by American Editor, 86–92; exegesis, Chap. II. 94–109; Notes by American Editor, 109–113; exegesis, Chap. III. 115–133; Notes by American Editor, 133–137; exegesis, chap. IV. 138–152; Notes by American Editor, 153–156; exegesis, Chap. V. 158–178; Notes by American Editor, 178–182; exegesis, Chap. VI. 184–198; Notes by American Editor, 198–201.
Timothy, second Epistle to, 3, 5, 7, 17–21, 33, 34, 58; exegesis, Chap. I. 203–218; Notes by American Editor, 218–222; exegesis, Chap. II. 224–241; Notes by American Editor, 241–245: exegesis, Chap. III. 246–257; Notes by American Editor, 258, 259; exegesis, Chap. IV. 261–275; Notes by American Editor, 275–278.
Titus, little known of his life, 4; assisted Paul, 4; first bishop of Crete, 4, 5; Paul's Epistle to, 280, etc.; instructions to by the Apostle, 283, 284; date of Paul's letter to, 292; directions how to deal with members of families, 296–208; course to be pursued as to slaves, 299, 300.
Titus, Epistle of Paul to, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 33, 34, 57; exegesis, Chap I. 280–290; Notes by American Editor, 290–294; exegesis, Chap. II. 296–305; Notes by American Editor, 305–311; exegesis, Chap. III. 312–322; Notes by American Editor, 322–325.
"To-day" (σήμερον), *i. e.*, eternity, 401, 402, 415; in Epistle to the Hebrews, 466, 473.
Trent, council of, on Epistle to the Hebrews, 349.
Trophimus, 16–20, 274.
Tychicus, 12, 14–16, 270, 320, 321.

W.

Water drinkers and drinking, 176; difficult topic to handle, 182.
Widows, institution of, 48; discussion as to, 50, 51; "real" widows, 159–162; other widows, 164–169; young widows, 169–171; widows in general, 178–181.
Wine, Paul's advice as to use of, 182.
Women, Christian, place, position, and duties of, 105–109, 112, 113, 124; some led astray by heretics, 249–250; directions to Titus respecting, 296–298, 305, 306.

Y.

Young men, 297, 298, 306.

Z.

Zenas, the lawyer, 321, 322.
Zion, Mount, 716.